The New Lamp Clarifying the History, Peoples, Languages and Traditions of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.

Timotheus A. Bodt
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Preface ........................................................................................................................................... xii

Chapter 1. Monpa and Monyul: Defining some Terms ................................................................. 3

1.1. Who Were the Monpa? ........................................................................................................... 4
1.2. Geographical Extent of Ancient Monyul ............................................................................. 6
1.3. Monpa as Ethno-Political Identity. ....................................................................................... 7
   1.3.1. The Monpa Scheduled Tribe of India ........................................................................... 8
   1.3.2. The Menba Nationality in China ............................................................................... 8
   1.3.3. Monpa in Bhutan ...................................................................................................... 9
1.4. Delimitation of Research and Sources. ............................................................................... 9

Chapter 2. Ancient History of Monyul in the Context of the History of Asia ......................... 15

2.1. Available Sources of Information ....................................................................................... 17
2.2. The Buddhist Version of the ‘Common Ancestor’ Theory ................................................. 19
2.3. The Asian Journey of Modern Humans ............................................................................. 20
2.4. Pre-LGM Population on the Tibetan Plateau .................................................................... 23
2.5. Early Ascent onto the Plateau after the LGM. ................................................................... 25
2.6. Establishment and Spread of Neolithic Cultures ............................................................... 27
2.7. The Southward Migration of the Tibeto-Burmans ............................................................ 28
   2.7.1. The Qiang Tribes. .................................................................................................. 29
   2.7.2. The Minyak People. ............................................................................................... 30
   2.7.3. The Gyalrong People. ............................................................................................ 31
   2.7.4. Migrations Further Southward ............................................................................... 33
2.8. The Zhangzhung Empire of the Western Tibetan Plateau .................................................. 33
2.9. Migration along the Southern Himalayan Slopes ............................................................. 38
   2.9.1. The Kirāntī and Magar of Nepal. ............................................................................. 39
   2.9.2. The Bodo-Garo-Kachāri of the Brahmaputran Plains ........................................... 41
   2.9.3. The Tani People of Northeast India: Adi and Mishmi ........................................... 42
5.4. The Indigenous Clans ................................................................................................106
5.5. Comparison with Western Monyul .............................................................................108
5.6. Relations with Tibet and the Plains of the Brahmaputra ...........................................108

Chapter 6. the Drukpa and Tibetan Expansion .................................................................111
6.1. The Seed of Conflict ..................................................................................................115
6.2. The Conquest of Bumthang, Kurilung and Kholong .................................................117
6.3. The Annexation of Zhonggar, Trashigang and Kheng ..............................................119
6.4. The Great Eastern Uprising and the Subjugation of Gamri Lungpa...........................122
6.5. The First Tibetan-Dakpa Invasion .............................................................................124
6.6. Consolidation of the Drukpa Authority .....................................................................126
6.7. The Incorporation of Dungsam ...................................................................................127
6.8. Strengthening of Gelukpa Presence in the Dakpa and Brokpa Areas........................128
6.9. The Second Tibetan-Mongol-Dakpa Invasion ............................................................130
6.10. The Drukpa Expansion in the West .........................................................................132
6.11. Conclusions ...............................................................................................................133

Chapter 7. The Modern History of the Monyul Region ......................................................135
7.1. The Eight Spokes of the Wheel of the Eastern Region .................................................135
7.1.1. The Four Divisions of Mangde ...........................................................................135
7.1.2. The Three Tribes of Kheng ..................................................................................136
7.1.3. The Four Sections of Bumthang .........................................................................137
7.1.4. The Four Confluences of the Kuri River ............................................................137
7.1.5. The Seven Divisions of Zhonggar ......................................................................138
7.1.6. The Eight Divisions of Trashigang .....................................................................140
7.1.7. The Five Divisions of Yangtsi ............................................................................140
7.1.8. The Three Confluences of Dungsam ..................................................................141
7.2. The Thirty-two Divisions of Mon ...........................................................................142
7.3. Tax and Migration ......................................................................................................143
7.4. Increasing British Influence and Continued Migration ..............................................147
7.5. The Enlightened Monarchy.........................................................................................149

7.6. Adoption by the World’s Largest Democracy..........................................................151

Chapter 8. Pemakö, the Array of the Lotus .....................................................................155
  8.1. The Lopa: Pemakö’s Original Inhabitants. .................................................................156
  8.2. Opening the Hidden Valley of Pemakö. ...................................................................158
  8.3. Tshangla and Dakpa Migration from Monyul to Pemakö .........................................159
     8.3.1. Period of Migration..............................................................................................159
     8.3.2. Origin of the Tshangla and Dakpa speakers.......................................................161
     8.3.3 Journey and Arrival in Pemakö.............................................................................162
  8.4. Pemakö under the Kanam Depa’s Reign. .................................................................163
  8.5. Pemakö under the Gandan Administration...............................................................166
  8.6. The Chinese Annexation of Tibet ..........................................................................167
  8.7. Pemaköpa Refugees. ................................................................................................171

Chapter 9. The Tshangla, Children of Brahma ...............................................................175
  9.1. The Tshangla Dialect Continuum. ..............................................................................176
  9.2. Endonyms and Exonyms, or What’s in a Name? .......................................................178
  9.3. Origin of the Ethnonym Tshangla...............................................................................180
  9.4. Theories about the Tshangla Origin............................................................................182
     9.4.1. The Maternal Origin of Tshangla Populations.....................................................183
     9.4.2. The Paternal Origin of Tshangla Populations......................................................187
     9.4.3. Genetic Evidence for the Tshangla Origin...........................................................188
  9.5. The Tshangla Language: Classification and Previous Research...............................188
  9.6. Tshangla Phonology: the Zhonggar Standard..........................................................190
  9.7. Tshangla Tone............................................................................................................193
     9.7.1. Some Notes on Tshangla Morphology...............................................................195
     9.7.2. Explanations for Irregular Morphological Paradigms........................................198
     9.7.3. Conclusion: Tshangla Tone and Linguistic Change...........................................201
  9.8. Syllable Structure and Phonotactics............................................................................201
9.9. The Tshangla Pronoun ................................................................. 202
  9.9.1. The Dual Suffix <nyiktsing>, the Plural Suffix <bak> ...................... 203
  9.9.2. The Honorific Pronoun ............................................................ 203
  9.9.3. The Third Person Pronoun \textit{dan} .............................................. 204
  9.9.4. Divergent Set of Plural Pronouns ............................................... 205
  9.9.5. Pronoun Declensions ............................................................... 206
  9.9.6. The Tshangla Pronoun in Regional Comparison .......................... 206

9.10. Person-marking in the Tshangla Verb? ........................................ 207

9.11. Proto-Tibeto-Burman Roots in Tshangla ...................................... 210

9.12. Written Tibetan Roots in Tshangla .............................................. 212

9.13. The Tshangla Dialects ................................................................. 214
  9.13.1. The Dungsam Dialects (DKW and DKT) .................................... 217
  9.13.2. The Kalaktang dialect (KT) .................................................... 230
  9.13.3. The Dirang Dialect (DR) ......................................................... 231
  9.13.4. The Joka dialect (JK) ............................................................. 245
  9.13.5. The Lower Trashigang dialects (LT) ........................................ 245
  9.13.6. The Upper Trashigang dialect (UT) .......................................... 246
  9.13.7. The Gamri Lungpa Dialect (GL) ............................................... 247
  9.13.8. The Yabrang Dialect (YB) ....................................................... 247
  9.13.9. The Brong Doksum Dialect (BD) ............................................. 248
  9.13.10. The Tsengmi Dialect (TM) ..................................................... 249
  9.13.11. The Zhonggar Standard dialect (ZS) and its Varieties ............... 249
  9.13.12. The Pemakö dialect (PK) ....................................................... 251

9.14. Tshangla Orthography .............................................................. 256
  9.14.1. The 'Ucen Script, Chöke, and Written Dzongkha ....................... 256
  9.14.2. Use of the Tshangla Orthographies and Retention of Chöke Spellings 258
  9.14.3. The Roman Orthography ...................................................... 206
9.14.4. The 'Ucen Orthography......................................................................................261
9.15. Conclusion: The Tshangla Origin Revisited.............................................................268

Chapter 10. People of the Tripoint: the Dakpa.................................................................273

10.1. Origin of the Name Dakpa........................................................................................275
10.2. Classification of the Dakpa Language and Previous Literature...............................276
10.3. Estimated Number of Dakpa Speakers. ....................................................................277
10.4. Dakpa Phonology......................................................................................................278
  10.4.1. Simple Consonant Inventory..............................................................................279
  10.4.2. Initial Consonant Clusters..................................................................................280
  10.4.3. Vowel Phonemes ...............................................................................................281
  10.4.4. Tone. ..................................................................................................................282
10.5. The Dakpa dialects....................................................................................................283
  10.5.1. Phonological Comparison..................................................................................286
  10.5.2. Lexical Variation. ..............................................................................................287
  10.5.3. Dzala: a Language or a Dialect? ........................................................................288
10.6. Dakpa Orthographies. ...............................................................................................290
  10.6.1. Roman Orthography...........................................................................................292
  10.6.2. 'Ucen Orthography...........................................................................................292
10.7. Conclusions...............................................................................................................295

Chapter 11. Central Bodish Migrants from the Plateau: The Brokpa .........................301

11.1. The Ethnonym Brokpa in a Himalayan Perspective..................................................301
11.2. A Case of Mistaken Identity. ....................................................................................302
11.3. Geographical Extent, Population and Previous Literature........................................303
11.4. The Brokpa Origin ...................................................................................................304
  11.4.1. The Bya Clan. ....................................................................................................305
  11.4.2. Flight of the Kom, 'Lön and Rok clans from Tshona........................................306
  11.4.3. Arrival in the Southern Himalayas. ...................................................................307
  11.4.4. Seizing Land in Merak and Sakteng. .................................................................307
Chapter 12. Some Notes on Other Ethnolinguistic Groups of Monyul. .......................... 313

12.1. East Bodish Languages of the Bumthang Group........................................... 313
12.1.1. The Bumthang Dialects................................................................................. 314
12.1.2. The Language of Khengrik Namsum............................................................ 314
12.1.3. Zhake, the Language of the Upper Kuri River Valley.................................. 317
12.1.4. Mangde and 'Nyenkha. ............................................................................... 318
12.1.5. A Curious Isolate: Chalikha........................................................................ 318

12.2. Central Bodish Languages.................................................................................. 319
12.2.1. Chocangacakha of the Kuri River Valley..................................................... 320
12.2.2. Comparison of the Central Bodish Languages............................................. 322
12.2.3. A Shared Origin of the Central Bodish Speakers of Bhutan?......................... 326

12.3. Lepcha, Lhokpu, Mönpa, Gongduk: the isolates............................................. 328
12.3.1. The Lepcha.................................................................................................... 329
12.3.2. Lhokpu.......................................................................................................... 329
12.3.3. Mönpa........................................................................................................... 330
12.3.4. Gongduk........................................................................................................ 330

12.4. The Divergent Languages of Kameng................................................................ 331
12.4.1. Hrusish.......................................................................................................... 331
12.4.2. The Bugun..................................................................................................... 333
12.4.3. The Lishpa and Chukpa................................................................................ 334
12.4.4. The Sartangpa............................................................................................... 335
12.4.5. The Puroik.................................................................................................... 335

12.5. The Memba of Menchukha.............................................................................. 336
12.6. Balancing Ethnic Identity and National Unity .......................................................... 337

Chapter 13. Family and Society ..................................................................................... 341
13.1. The Extended Family as Basic Unit of Social Life .................................................. 341
13.2. Customs Regarding Childbirth ............................................................................. 342
13.3. Courtship, Marriage, and Divorce ........................................................................ 343
  13.3.1. Night-hunting ................................................................................................. 343
  13.3.2. Polygamy, Arranged Marriage and Child Marriage ........................................ 344
  13.3.3. Cousin Endogamy ......................................................................................... 346
  13.3.4. The Wedding Ceremony ................................................................................ 350
  13.3.5. Marital Residence and Inheritance ................................................................. 354
  13.3.6. Extramarital Affairs, Divorce and Remarriage ............................................... 359
13.4. The Role and Position of Women .......................................................................... 360
13.5. Death and Corpse Disposal Methods ................................................................... 361
13.6. Housing Styles ..................................................................................................... 365
13.7. Villages, Hamlets and Place Names ...................................................................... 367
13.8. Village Organisation, Castes and Class ................................................................ 369
13.9. The Poison Cult .................................................................................................. 375

Chapter 14. Livelihood Strategies: from Forests to Fields ............................................. 377
14.1. Forests Providing Livelihoods .............................................................................. 377
  14.1.1. Forest Types .................................................................................................. 379
  14.1.2. Vegetable Forest Products .......................................................................... 380
  14.1.3. The Hunting Practice .................................................................................. 384
14.2. Agricultural Cropping Systems .......................................................................... 388
  14.2.1. Shifting Cultivation ...................................................................................... 388
  14.2.2. The Transition to Dryland and Wetland Agriculture ..................................... 391
  14.2.3. Agro-ecological Zones and Agricultural Systems ......................................... 392
14.3. Major Grain Crops .............................................................................................. 394
  14.3.1. Foxtail and Broomcorn Millet ...................................................................... 395
15.2.2. The Sleeveless Apron ................................................................. 437
15.2.3. The Chuba ........................................................................... 439
15.2.4. The G{o and Kira} ................................................................. 444
15.2.5. Hairstyle and Headwear ..................................................... 445
15.2.6. Legwear, Ornaments and Tattoos ....................................... 446
15.3. Wooden Bowls and Similar Items ........................................... 447
15.4. Paper Production ................................................................. 448
15.5. Bamboo and Cane Craft ....................................................... 449
15.5.1. Cane Weaving ................................................................. 449
15.5.2. Bamboo products: the Case of Thongrong ....................... 449
15.6. Incense Making ................................................................. 453
15.7. Pottery ................................................................................. 454
15.8. Blacksmithing ................................................................. 455
15.9. Oral Transmission ................................................................. 455

Chapter 16. Buddhism as Common Factor .................................. 459
16.1. Traditional Animism and Bon .................................................. 459
16.2. Buddhism .............................................................................. 460
16.3. An Intricate Synthesis of Buddhism and Bon ....................... 462
16.4. Introduction of Buddhism and Religious Affiliation ............... 464
16.4.1. Religious Affiliation in Eastern Bhutan ............................... 464
16.4.2. Religious Affiliation in Tawang .......................................... 465
16.4.3. Religious Affiliation in Kameng ........................................ 468

References .................................................................................. 473

Tibetan and Dzongkha References .............................................. 491

Annex I to Paragraph 2.9.3. Origin of the 'Lopa of Pemakö .......... 495
Annex II to Paragraph 3.3. The Pilgrimage Site of Senge Dzong ...... 497
Annex III to Paragraph 5.1. Khandro Drowa Zangmo ................. 505
Annex IV to Paragraph 9.1. Tshangla Speakers in Bhutan ............. 513
Preface

In the past decade, many people have urged me to write a book, a kind of autobiography with all my experiences, especially those of my years spent in the eastern Himalayas since 2000. But I have not been able to imagine how these personal experiences, no matter how amazing, crazy, funny, remarkable and memorable for me as an individual, could be of much interest to other people rather than perhaps as time-pass and amusement. Still, out of a personal interest, I gathered a lot of information and knowledge on the history, linguistics and culture of the people of the area. At least part of this knowledge was originally intended to culminate in a dissertation on the Tshangla language leading to a PhD degree. Starting in early 2008, I committed myself to achieving that goal, despite being severely limited by a lack of funds and the subsequent need to work full-time for sustenance. Recently, after having arrived at a new crossroads in my life, I have taken the difficult decision to temporarily shelve this project until a later time.

However, a well-known Dutch proverb holds that Wie schrijft, die blijft or ‘he who writes, remains’. No matter what we experience, observe, and theorise within our own mind, if we do not share it with other people, no one will acknowledge or remember us. And there is another reason why this book came into being, a reason more important than a perhaps misguided drive for personal recognition so common to the Western world but so alien to the East. Late 2009, I was confronted with the inevitable impermanence of our precious human existence after the demise of my dad, to whom I would like to dedicate this book. Following his retirement, he planned to commit to writing the knowledge he had developed during more than four decades of dedicated research on the seemingly insignificant but truly indispensable earthworm. Alas, his retirement seems to have taken away the structure in his life and coupled with, or perhaps leading to, an ailing health he was never able to fulfil this goal.

I soon realised that I too had gathered a great deal of information on a wide range of topics well beyond the original scope of the dissertation. A lot of this information is taken for granted by the mostly elderly rural people of the region, but is largely unknown to the younger generations living disconnected from their background and their past. They usually find it difficult to access the existent traditional and modern literature by local authors in Chöke or Dzongkha, and the literature by (western) scientific authors is not widely available. At the same time, not much of the gathered information is known within the scientific community, and new information has about along new ideas. Taking these thoughts into consideration, the need materialised for a book which would synthesise the current state of
research and knowledge and expand it with additional information, written in a way that it could be comprehended by a wide audience.

The result is the book currently in front of you. It is meant to present all readers with an interest in the history, anthropology, language and culture of the people of the eastern Himalayas with an overview of the existing literature, both historical local documents as well as later scientific publications from India, Bhutan, Tibet and abroad, combined with the author’s individual insights. The book is meant to be of a popular scientific nature. It does not claim to be a scientific publication, but neither is it meant to be read like a novel. Some paragraphs might be too scientific for some readers, with incomprehensible terminology, although wherever possible explanations have been added. Some paragraphs, especially those with the historical information, contain descriptions that in the end illustrate a small but significant additional fact. I beg the reader to bear with this, and select the paragraphs of personal interest for more in-depth reading.

This book is divided in three clearly defined parts with the general subject expressed in the titles. The Chapters 1 to 8 present a historic overview of the area previously known as Monyul. All the dates in this book are given in BCE (Before Common Era)/CE (Common Era) notation in favour of the BC/AD notation. Chapter 2 gives a short overview of the existing theories on the prehistory of the area prior to 600 CE within the broader Asian prehistory. This is followed by the history of the area roughly between 600 CE and 800 CE, 800 CE and 1000 CE, 1000 CE and 1600 CE, 1600 CE and 1950 CE and the modern history after 1950 CE. The Chapters 9 to 12 present detailed information of an ethnological and linguistic nature of the main ethnic groups of the area, the Tshangla and the Dakpa, and concise information on several other ethnic groups. These Chapters include dialect inventories and proposed orthographies of Tshangla and Dakpa, and the possible origins of the ethnic groups are also discussed. The Chapters 13 to 16 present a selection of socio-cultural topics.

Some of the major additions this book provides to the existing literature include the identification of many of the geographical locations and ‘khar’ mentioned in the historical sources; a discussion on the clans and the lives of the common people of the area; insight into the possible origin, development, outcome and impact of the 17th century conflict between the Drukpa and the Gelukpa theocracies; detailed information on the ‘hidden land’ of Pemako and the origin of its people; phonological and dialect descriptions of several languages of the
area and first proposals for the orthographies for Tshangla and Dakpa; theories on the origin of some of the people of the area; and detailed descriptions of certain aspects of their culture.

There are a number of Annexes containing information that could not be placed in the main body of the text for want of readability. Throughout the main body of the text, references to these Annexes are made whenever deemed necessary. Footnotes, instead of endnotes, have been used throughout the text to clarify certain points to the reader or give additional information without having to flip pages searching for an endnote, a longstanding point of irritation to myself. This means that in some cases, footnotes make up more of a page than actual text, again something I request the reader to bear with. A list of tables and figures could not be included and a glossary is lacking, and I agree these are great omissions which I hope to include in a next print.

Finally, a few notes regarding the transcription and spelling. Phonemic spelling of words according to the phonological descriptions of several of the languages described in the Chapters 9 to 12 is given between slashes / /. Actual pronunciation is given between phonetic brackets [ ]. After comments by many local readers that the Wylie transcriptions of local names, e.g. Zhabs Drung mNga’ dBang Nam rGyal, were incomprehensible and decreased the general readability of a text, a conscious choice has been made to type all the local names in ‘Ucen instead of in transcription, i.e. ༠༠༠༠. This includes text taken from written sources in the ’Ucen script. In case a certain name, word or phrase occurs repetitively throughout the text, the most common transcription has also been given in italics, i.e. Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal, and all further references have been left unmarked. In other cases, especially whenever a proper name, place name or word in a local language not directly derived from Written Tibetan or Dzongkha is concerned, a phonological transcription has been given according to the most common local pronunciation. Thus, a village in the Tshangla speaking area called /khoidung/ [kʰ oidun] is written as མཁོི་ོི་ Khoidung, although a footnote might be added that an alternative Chöke spelling would be མཁོི་༔ Khödung. Most personal names and place names are written according to the most commonly used spelling. In any reference to an original source, the ’Ucen spelling of that original source is maintained, although in a footnote the current or preferred spelling might be mentioned. References to ’Ucen manuscripts are made to folio (ff.) numbers, in which (a) and (b) stand for the front and back page of a folio, respectively.
The absence of a separate word of thanks in this book is on purpose. The number of people I am indebted to is simply too large, and a real danger lurks of mentioning most, but mistakenly forgetting a few. Moreover, many people I have relied on during the process of gathering information, analysing it, and writing this book will never actually read or even see this book, perhaps because they are no longer among us, or because they live too remote, or because they are illiterate. I make no distinction between those who granted me a big favour and those who provided with a tiny insight, or were just there as a friend and companion, since I wouldn’t have been who I am and wouldn’t have achieved what I did without any of you. So, to all of you, my heartfelt and sincere ‘thank you’!

Remains to say, that this work, like its author, is far from perfect. On-going and future research will bring to light many flaws, errors, mistakes and oversights. If any reader has comments on the content of this book, even the tiniest ones, you are cordially invited to share them with me. Kindly send them by email, indicating paragraph and page number and the proposed addition or correction. Perhaps, a future print of this book can take improvements, additions and updates into account. Otherwise, a planned website with most of the information contained herein will allow for additions to be made. It is my hope and expectation that this book will encourage a lively discussion and give an impetus to propel the research into the history, anthropology and linguistics of this endlessly fascinating area forward.

One final request: this book contains pictures of a religious nature as well as text typed in the ʼUcen script. Out of respect for the sanctity of both, I would like to request all readers to treat the book with respect, store it in appropriate places, and burn it on disposal. Thank you.

(Tim Bodt/བོད་བའི་བིབས་ཀྱིས་)

Email: timintibet@hotmail.com, timonthemove2004@yahoo.co.uk.

Postal address: c/o Rosmalenstraat 22, 6843 SP Arnhem, the Netherlands.

Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/monpasang
Part 1.

The New Mirror Clarifying the Origin, Genealogy and History of the Rulers and Subjects of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.
Chapter 1. Monpa and Monyul: Defining Some Terms.

The title of this book contains the phrase *druk sharchok lungpa dang shar mon*. In order to remove any possible ambiguity from the very onset, it is pertinent that a clear definition is given of which geographical areas are specifically included in this phrase. *Druk sharchok lungpa* here refers to the area encompassed by the present-day Bhutanese dzongkhas of Trongsa, Bumthang, Zhemgang, Lhüntsi, Monggar, Trashigang, Pemagatshel, Samdrup Jongkhar and Trashiyangtsi. The main focus hereby lies on the latter six dzongkhas. *Shar mon* refers to the present-day Tawang and West Kameng district of the state of Arunachal Pradesh in India and the Lekpo area under Tshona county of Lhokha prefecture in Tibet. Although not geographically contiguous with this area, the region traditionally known as or Pemakö has in the course of history become a partial cultural extension of the area and is therefore included in this book. Pemakö is currently divided over Upper Siang district of Arunachal Pradesh and Metok county of Nyingthri prefecture of Tibet.

A central term in this book is the Tibetan ethnonym *Monpa*. Previous accounts of the Buddhist people living on the southern flanks of the Himalayas have invariably included this ethnonym or one of its various historic and contemporary cognates, such as Memba or Momba in India, *Memba* or *Moinba* in Tibet, and variations based on local pronunciation such as Monba or Mönpa. For historical and other reasons, therefore, no description of the Buddhist ethnic groups of Bhutan, India and Tibet can commence without an attempt to come to a common understanding of the ethnonym Monpa. This is especially true because in anthropology, ethnology, linguistics and politics this ethnonym is now so spuriously applied, that a common understanding of the people it refers to has disappeared.

---

1 Districts that are subdivided in *geoks* or blocks and can be subdivided in *dungs* or sub-districts.
2 For comprehensibility and readability among the general public these spellings will be maintained throughout this book, despite the fact that the official Dzongkha Romanisation (Van Driem & Tshering 1998) has as divergent Romanised Dzongkha spellings B‘umtha, Zh‘ämgang, P‘emagatsh‘äl, Samdru Jongkha and Trashi’yangtse for Bumthang, Zhemgang, Pemagatshel, Samdrup Jongkhar and Trashiyangtsi dzongkhas. This decision was made because this book is not in/about Dzongkha or Bhutan solely, and the most common pronunciations in the region itself and their most straightforward spellings have been used.
3 In Chinese: 道孚县 (Dafu county), 阿坝地区 Shämän Diü (Shannan prefecture), 西藏自治区 Xizàng Zizhiqü (Tibet Autonomous Region).
4 In Chinese: 墨脱县 Mötü Xiàn (Medog county), 林芝地区 Línzhī Diü (Nyingtri prefecture).
1.1. WHO WERE THE MONPA?

In traditional Tibetan Buddhist iconography, the Monpa, like the Kirāta, are the indigenous inhabitants of the southern Himalayan slopes who have become the retinue of the various ‘protective deities’ that were adopted into tantric Buddhism from Hinduism or from the local Bon beliefs (Nebesky-Wojkowitz 2002, Olschak 1979:89-92). They are usually described and depicted as being dressed in tiger or bear skins, wearing large earrings and flat bamboo or cane hats and carrying axes and swords with which they fight against enemies of the religion. From the 8th century CE onwards, the ethnonym Monpa can be found in Tibetan texts and vernaculars referring to those non-Tibetan, non-Indian and non-Lopa5 people living mainly to the south of the Himalayan range. Although the Lepcha people of Sikkim are thought to be of ancient provenance, oral accounts relate of people the Lepcha call the Naong, Chang, and Mon, who were ethnically, culturally and linguistically absorbed by the later Lepcha arrivals. Further to the east an ethnic group is still known by the name ‘monpa’, and together with the Lhokpu and Gongduk6 they are often though to represent the most indigenous people of Bhutan. Possible links between these people and an ancient Austroasiatic population in Northeast India linked by the same ethnonym Mon, which has contemporary connotations all the way into Southeast Asia, are explored in paragraph 2.3. The people of Tawang, Dirang and Kalaktang in West Kameng district of Arunachal Pradesh are called ‘monpa’. The people of western Tibet call the Lahauli of India ‘monpa’, and in turn the Lahauli call the Hindus of Kulu ‘monpa’ (Ramble 2003:78). The Thakalis of Nepal similarly call their southern neighbours ‘mon’ (Ramble 2003:86 footnote 15), and Ramble agrees that ‘the ethnic limits of the term seem to be highly pliable’.

The ethnonym Monpa has, however, also been applied to people that used to live on the Tibetan plateau7 itself. According to Belleza (2010), there is a multitude of ancient castles, mansions, residences, stelae, funerary structures and other archaeological remains in Upper Tibet, which includes the Tö Ngari region and the Changthang plain, that are considered to be the heritage of a people called the Mōn, who were closely linked to the Zhangzhung empires that ruled the area roughly between 1000 BCE and 700 CE8.

---

5 Lopa refers to those tribes that were considered as complete savages (Nebesky-Wojkowitz 1975:8-9), and on the exact definition of the Tibetan ethnonym Lopa, see paragraph 2.9.3, 8.1 and Annex 8.1.
6 Ref. paragraphs 12.3.2 and 12.3.4.
7 The Tibetan plateau includes present-day Qinghai, Tibet Autonomous Region and parts of Sichuan and Yunnan.
8 Ref. paragraph 2.8.
Although various etymologies of the ethnonym Monpa have been poised, see for example Pommaret (1999), an interesting derivation could be from Tibetan སྟིན [mun ~ myn] ‘darkness’. The Monpa were considered uncivilised compared to the sedentary agriculturist or nomadic livestock-rearing societies on the Tibetan plateau or the plains of India, principally due to the absence of faith in the Buddhist teachings (Ardussi 2006, Pommaret 1994 and 1999, Aris 1980), but also because of their means of livelihood. A striking correspondence between munpa in the meaning of ‘people living in darkness, uncivilised people’ can be found in the Tshangla dialects spoken in Dirang and Pemakö, where སྟིན mun refers to ‘a thick forest or jungle in which sunlight hardly penetrates to the ground’, as opposed to the standard Tshangla བོ་རང borang, which in these dialects usually refers to a more open wooded area that is not ཆོས chema ‘overgrown shifting cultivation land’. Even till present, many of the ethnic groups referred to as Monpa heavily depend on the forest for their livelihoods and it is somewhat tempting to consider an etymological connection between <mun> ‘forest, darkness’, <munpa> ‘forest dweller, uncivilised person’ and Monpa. References to the negative meaning of Monpa can be found in the Tibetan figures of speech གནོད་བུད། [mønpu pu[a] ‘savage tribesman’ and གཉིས་པ། [мон⁷⁷uk] ‘bastard’.

With the spread of Buddhism among the people of the southern Himalayan slopes, the area where the Monpa could be found became more specific and the connotation attached to the ethnonym Monpa became more positive. Monpa came to carry a less derogatory notion than the ethnonym Lopa. Evidently, even among modern Tibetan and Bhutanese scholars the old view of the Monpa persisted, as according to འབྲོ་རྗེ་ (1986:2) they adhered to the three animist cults of Bon, Deu and Drung, and were similar to the Lopa in ‘physique, dress and their stupidity in not being able to distinguish virtuous deeds from sins’.

Still, the Tibetan language has an extensive vocabulary related to plants and trees that originate in the Himalayan foothills with the prefix ‘mon-’. Examples include གནོད་འབྲུ། ‘a type of pea’, གནོད་ཀུན། ‘rice pulse Dolichos spp.’, གནོད་པཞི་ ‘green mung bean Phaseolus radiatus’, གནོད་པཞི་ ‘black mung bean Phaseolus mungo’, གནོད་འབད་པཞི་ ‘hyacinth bean Lablab purpureus’, གནོད་ཞི་ ‘rice pulse Dolichos catiang’, གནོད་དབྭུན་ ‘red kidney bean Phaseolus vulgaris’, གནོད་ཞི་ ‘medicinal herb Swertia chirata’, གནོད་དབྭུན་ / གནོད་དབྭུན་ ‘the highly invasive but medicinal sedge species Cyperus rotundus’, གནོད་ཞི་ ‘eggplant Solanum melongena’, གནོད་ ‘fruit of the areca palm Areca catechu’, གནོད་ ‘evergreen oak Quercus semecarpifolia’, གནོད་ ‘paper made from Daphne and Edgeworthia bark’ and གནོད་ ‘millet beer’. Examples of dress items made from cotton and silk traditionally not
worn on the Tibetan plateau include ‘raw silk trousers’, ‘cotton cloth’ and ‘multi-coloured striped wool-and-cotton shawl’.

1.2. GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT OF ANCIENT MONYUL.

The preceding paragraph shows that it is difficult, if not impossible, to come to a specific definition of which ethnic groups were included in the Tibetan ethnonym Monpa. Beside the ethnonym Monpa, however, Tibetan sources also describe the geo-political area of Monyul ‘Land of Mon’. According to some sources (e.g. Savada 1993), from 500 BCE to 600 CE an ancient kingdom existed on the southern borders of Tibet called Monyul. However, there is no concrete evidence of the existence of any such political entity. The Himalayas are a vast mountain range, and its southern flanks cover the area from Kashmir in the west till Burma in the east. Although perhaps at a certain moment in time this whole area might have been referred to as Monyul, the geographic area decreased as other geo-political areas, such as Ladakh and Nepal were carved out of it.

Ardussi (2003, footnote 6), for example, describes Lho Mon ‘southern Mon’ as encompassing the southern Himalayas including western Nepal. That at least Sikkim was once part of the area of Monyul becomes apparent from the name for the Lepcha king who contended with the expanding Drukpa rulers between 1668 and 1678, Monpa Acok9 (Aris 1986, footnote 6 to page 91). According to (1990, 1993) Monyul extended from Tshona Dzong in the north to the plains of Assam in the south and from Sikkim in the west to Öthang in the east. (1990:22) also lists the names of places and rivers of Monyul easily identifiable in modern Bhutan and Arunachal Pradesh. Perhaps an even more tangible description can be found in the 5th Dalai Lama’s 1656 edict formally proclaiming Tibetan suzerainty over Monyul10. The edict describes Monyul as the area presently encompassed by imaginary lines drawn from the Kuri river valley till Dungsam in the west, from there through Galingkha till Ali11 in Assam in the south, from there northwards via Thembang till Mago, and then westwards through Nyingsnga pass between Sakteng in Bhutan and Mokto in Tawang back to the Kuri valley in the north. This basically encompasses the area of present-day Lhüntsi, Monggar, Pemagatshel,

9 Gaibu ‘king’ Áchyok in Lepcha.
10 Ref. paragraph 6.9.
11 Also called Amratukha and now known as Amartulla, just beyond the southeastern-most border of present-day Bhutan.
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From the unification of Bhutan in the middle of 17th century onwards the Bhutanese sources refer to the area of Bhutan as "Lhomon Khazhi 'Southern Mon of the Four Approaches' in which the four approaches are usually described as Shar Khalingkha in the east, Lho Ghatikha in the south, Nup Dalingkha in the west and Jang Taktsekha in the north (Aris 1976). After the Tibetan Ganden Administration and the Bhutanese Drukpa theocracy settled their respective spheres of influence, the geographical extent of the area usually called Monyul was further decreased to the area south of Tshona Dzong and east of the Bhutan border till the plains of the Brahmaputra and the area inhabited by various non-Buddhist Lopa tribes to the east. Till date the majority of the people calling themselves Monpa can be found there.

During the course of history the terms Monpa and Monyul have been used to describe different peoples living in different geographical areas. Broadly speaking and excluding the Monpa peoples that lived on the Tibetan plateau, a semantic development can be observed from ‘all non-Buddhist, forest-dwelling peoples living on the southern flanks of the Himalayas’ through ‘all nominally Buddhist, partly sedentary peoples living on the southern flanks of the Himalayas east of Sikkim’ to ‘all Buddhist, sedentary peoples living under Tibetan suzerainty on the southern flanks of the Himalayas east of Bhutan’.

1.3. Monpa as an Ethno-Political Identity.

The fact that the term Monpa applies to different people in different areas at different points in time makes it risk losing clear reference (Burling 2003: 179), but the present-day spurious and indiscriminate labelling of ethnic groups and languages in the Himalayan region as Monpa is unfortunate, but understandable. The ethnonym Monpa and its various cognates has now achieved widespread political recognition in India and China. Considerable rights are attached to the coveted ‘tribal certificate’ of the Monpa Scheduled Tribe in India and to belonging to the Menba Nationality in China. From the point of view of the people themselves, these advantages well exceed any misgivings they might have of being grouped together with another ethnic group.

1.3.1. THE MONPA SCHEDULED TRIBE OF INDIA

The Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh is home to a number of ethnically and linguistically distinct people usually referred to in the census records and the literature as Monpa. Since Monpa is a Scheduled Tribe under the Constitution of the Republic of India, classification as a Monpa has many political, social and financial advantages. This classification however obscures the fact that Monpa refers to at least six ethnically and linguistically separate peoples. Furthermore, because the Census of India is a census with open categories, it depends on the respondents’ own perceived tribal affiliation. This is a major weakness in the census system, and results in inconsistencies and irregularities in the data.

Previous classifications of the Monpa of Arunachal include Northern, Central and Southern Monpa and Memba or Momba. The Northern Monpa or Tawang Monpa can be identified as the Dakpa speakers of Tawang district. What are sometimes called the Panchen Monpa belong to the same group. The Central Monpa includes the Tshangla speakers of Dirang under Kameng district and sometimes also the Kalaktang Tshangla speakers who are elsewhere called Southern Monpa. Under Memba two distinct groups of people are understood in the context of the Census of India: the group of people of diverse ethnic origin inhabiting the Menchukha valley of West Siang district and the people of the Tuting and Geling circles of Upper Siang district of Arunachal Pradesh. Other ethnic groups often labelled as Monpa in the Census of India and other Indian sources include the Sherdukpen, the Brokpa, the Lishpa, the Chukpa and the Sartangpa.

1.3.2. THE MENBA NATIONALITY IN CHINA

In Tibet, the 门巴 Menba or Moinba Tibetan nationality is subdivided in the Northern Menba, also known by the toponym Mǒtuō Menba or as Cāngluō Menba and the Southern Menba, also known by the toponym Cuònà Menba (e.g. Xizang 1987a, Xizang 1987b, Nishida 1988, Sun et al. 1980, Zhāng 1986, Lu 1986). The Mǒtuō Menba are in majority Tshangla speakers, whereas the Cuònà Menba are Dakpa speakers. The Dakpa speakers inhabit the area that from the 18th century was known as Monyul. The Chinese characters for this area mean ‘door corner’ and though presumably representing the sound of the name [mønjyl], some reference to the role of door keepers and people living on the fringes of the Tibetan world could also be inferred. The Tshangla speakers inhabit the northern part of the area known as Luoyu, the Chinese cognate of the Tibetan Լհոյուл Lhoyul ‘southern land’
which is the post-1959 name for what was considered a derogatory Tibetan name Լու (Lî & Liú 1993).

The Menba nationality is one of the 55 officially recognised ethnic minorities, or national minorities, in the People’s Republic of China. These nationalities were mainly identified in the 1950s and 1960s based on Marxist-Leninist theory (Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004:4). For such recognition, an ethnic minority has to share a common language, a common economic base, a common culture, and a common territory. As this was not always applicable in China, the markers of historical origin, migration history and agreement by the people themselves were added. But the Menba nationality is an umbrella term for two people with two distinct languages, different livelihood systems, a similar but not the same culture, a territory spread thousands of kilometres apart, and a deviating settlement and migration history. It was therefore their common reference as Monpa, their linguistic distinction from the other Tibetan dialects and their perceived shared struggle against Tibetan feudalism with earned them the coveted status under a single nationality. As is the case in India, official recognition as a national minority provides a people with a license of moral, cultural, religious and social liberties which the state does not wish to grant to the majority of the population as well as a limited degree of political autonomy. According to the national census of 2000, the Menba minority numbers a total of 8,923 people, up from 7,475 in 1990.

1.3.3. MONPA IN BHUTAN.

Unlike India and China, Bhutan does not have any policies differentiating people on the basis of ethnic provenance like the nationality status in China or the scheduled tribe status in India. The only people who are commonly referred to as Monpa in Bhutan at present are the (‘Ole) Monpa living on either side of the Black Mountain range in Trongsa and Zhemgang and in Wangdü Phodrang dzongkhak.

1.4. DELIMITATION OF RESEARCH AND SOURCES.

Because of the historically ambivalent nature of the ethnonym Monpa and the geopolitical term Monyul, conscious decisions had to be made regarding the delimitations of this book. Whenever Monyul is mentioned in this book, it refers to the geographical area defined at the onset of this chapter. Whenever speaking of Eastern Monyul, it refers particularly to the area

12 Ref. paragraph 12.3.3.

now under Arunachal Pradesh. The area now under Bhutan is referred to as western Monyul until the annexation by the Drukpa in the 17th century, and as Eastern Bhutan from then onwards. The main focus of the book will be on the two ethnic groups that form the numerical majority of the people of Monyul: the speakers of Tshangla and the speakers of Dakpa.

The fact that the area border areas of Tibet, India and Bhutan are politically sensitive due to its proximity to the disputed McMahon Line has limited scholars from conducting research in the area. When reviewing the existing literature on the Monpa, we find that the name of a people and a language is often determined by the nationality and academic background of the author, the names that the subjects themselves use, or the names they are referred to by their neighbours. The existing literature and census records cannot provide a coherent subdivision of various ethnic groups, because of a myriad of endonyms and exonyms given to various peoples at different points in time. The only sensible basis of classification, then, seems to be on linguistic grounds. In the remainder of this book, the scantily available existing literature is reviewed and the information extracted from these secondary sources is backed up with personal knowledge on the languages and the people.

Two of the most important local historical sources that survived till the present were written by a single author, Lama Ngawang of the Byar clan (ref. paragraph 5.2.3), sometimes referred to by his Sanskrit name Wagindra. The two manuscripts will be referred to in this book in their short forms the Gyelrik and the Logyu. These invaluable works written in Chöke were retrieved from the Trashigang Dzong by Dasho Tenzin Dorji and first translated into English and published by Aris (1986). They also form the basis of Dorji’s unpublished history of eastern Bhutan (n.d.) and have been referred to by western authors such as Ardussi (2004, 2007) and Aris (1979). The Gyelrik has also been extensively quoted by Bhutanese authors, including Dorji (2003), Thinley (2003), Dorji (2008), Dewa (n.d.) and others, although proper reference to the original source has often been lacking. The Gyelrik is dated to ‘year of the earth monkey’ which is astrological terms is called the ‘dagger’ year. This can be either the year 1728 as mentioned by Aris (1979) or the year 1668 as dated by Ardussi (2004, 2006:19 footnote 11). The dating by Ardussi seems more plausible, as the annexation of the area was completed by 1657, and 71 years between the occurrence of the events and actually committing them to writing is too long for the events described in the work to be

---

13 Ref. paragraph 7.6 and 8.6.
14 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.
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remembered in that much detail. The Gyelrik was drafted by Ngawang in Trashigang, at that
time called the transport station of India and Tibet', based on oral accounts and
describes the origins of the ruling families of Monyul documenting and glorifying their
family ancestry. The Gyelrik was written on request of the local chiefs
Lhatson Ngawang Phuntsok of Khaling, Gyelpo Bangrak of Chitshang Monggar, Gyelpo of Chitshang Casakhar, Yede Chöze Lugkar of Phongmi, Jobo Azang of Derang and Chöze Norbu Darge of Ngatshang Tashidingkhar, who edited and distributed the writing (ff. 47a-48b). The purpose of the Gyelrik seems to have been a glorification of the royal Tibetan ancestry of the people who commissioned it. The work was undoubtedly meant for the local rulers and their descendants only, and might be read as to somehow instigate attempts to resist any actions that would curtail their authority. In the final paragraph of the introductory verse, ff. 3a and further, the author writes
‘Nevertheless, in some future time, someone of truly high lineage and descent, endowed with courage, wisdom and intelligence, a descendant of the lords and kings having gained worldly power that came from power by heavenly appointment, will appear in the world like a star visible during daytime. This story is narrated for smiling faces of enjoyment, a celebration for the ears and the fragile noblemen alike. Even though not daring to criticise the extent of comprehension by everyone’s ears, absorb the voice of this secret little song’. A similar dedication is found in the concluding verses on folio 46b and 47a.

The Gyelrik was thus not meant as a work of egocentric pride or desire for reputation, but as a work of devotion to the past. Scholars like Dorji and Aris should be credited for making this work available to modern scholars and historians. Perhaps, they were the ‘learned, honourable and good nobleman’, ‘excellent scholars’ and ‘erudite person’ for whom Ngawang meant his work. Though unquestionably coloured by the ‘schematic preoccupation’ of the author as in Aris’ words, it is still a source too valuable to discredit.

The Addendum to the Gyelrik presents the historical and genealogical record of the Yodung Wangma clan. Similar to the addendum to the Brokpa origin history

15 Ref. Annex VII.

the addendum to the Gyelrik also appears to have been a later addition by a barely literate author, judging from the crude style and many mistakes and ambiguities (Aris 1986 footnote 121 to page 69).

The Logyu is of a later date and was written in the same author’s capacity as a monk of the Drukpa state monastic body in Trashigang Dzong. He seems to have largely accepted that the old order no longer existed and that the Drukpa hold full authority over their original homeland. This becomes clear for example from the introductory verses of ff. 1b, in which the author pays obeisance and homage to Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal.

The main reason for repeating parts of the Gyelrik and Logyu in this present work is that neither the original source by Ngawang nor the main translation are particularly accessible to the general Bhutanese public, and have probably not been accessed at all by the people of Tawang, Kameng and Pemakö. Hopefully, making part of these works available again would reiterate interest in them. On the other hand, as Aris (1986: 6 and 1986 footnote 14 to page 25) already mentioned, the geographical setting of the works remained somewhat obscure and ‘it is hoped that this serious gap will be filled at some future date’. Presently, more detailed information on many of the places that were mentioned in both texts has become available. Wherever available the geographical locations have been added, and another interesting addition might be the identification of some of the local clans with clan and place names of the present.

Another primary source is the 12-folio manuscript called ‘the concise expression of the line of descent of the Garuda from the Vinaya Scripture’. I obtained this manuscript from Naiten Wangchuk of Wangphai, Monggar, who got the manuscript in late 2010. The author, or editor, of the original manuscript was a novice-monk called Lopzang Gedun. The manuscript was composed in the fire-male-rat year of the 12th Rapjung cycle, corresponding to 1696-1697 CE. Considering the content of the manuscript, the explanation and glorification of the line of descent of the Brokpa people, it is well conceivable that this text, like the Gyelrik, was written to preserve what was still known of the origin of the people. Despite their religious alliance with the Gelukpa School and their close cultural and economic relations with Dakpa people of Tawang, they were forcefully incorporated in Bhutan, and must have felt an even greater urgency to commit their past to writing.

The manuscript appears to consist of two parts: the original text and a later addendum commencing on folio 10b and finishing at folio 12b. The manuscript has many spelling
mistakes, part of which could be from the original handwritten manuscript, but it is more likely that when the manuscript was committed to a digital version additional spelling adulterations were committed. This, combined with the use of archaic Chöke and sometimes even Dakpa and Brokpa vernaculars, as well as the superfluous reference to personal names and loconyms, have made translation of the manuscript very difficult. Even more than the original text the addendum is strewn with spelling and typographic mistakes, raising the suspicion that the author was probably a semi-literate Brokpa who used Brokpa language instead of Chöke and moreover applied a phonetic spelling instead of following Chöke spelling rules.

A final primary source consulted is the Bhutanese textbook version of the story of Khandro Drowa Zangmo (Department of Education, 1983)\textsuperscript{16}.

Part 1 of this book will first assess the prehistory of the Monyul area from various perspectives, combining as much as possible of the sparse archaeological, palaeo-environmental, genetic, mythological and historical information available at present. Perhaps the most ancient population of the southern foothills of the Himalayas arrived when the first modern humans used the area between the Bay of Bengal and the Himalayas as a corridor for migration into Southeast Asia. There are indications that Palaeolithic settlers on the Tibetan plateau might have found refuge in the southern Himalayas during the LGM. Genetic evidence also seems to indicate a spread of Mesolithic culture, back from northern Southeast Asia into Northeast India and beyond. From approximately 3,000 BCE to the 7th century CE, there were successive waves of migrants from various parts of Asia into the Monyul area. These areas included the far northeastern, eastern and far western regions of the Tibetan plateau, but also the Yunnan-Burma border area. The people that arrived in Monyul before the 7th century were called the Monpa, Tsengmi, Katsara, Lopa and ‘Indians’.

Next, evidence extracted from written sources dating from the early historical period between the 7th century CE and the 9th century CE will be presented. This period was the time of the first diffusion of Buddhism and the visit of Guru Rinpoche. It was also the time of the arrival of the first aristocratic rulers, personified by legendary characters such as Khyikha Rathö, Sindha Radza, Lhase Tsangma and the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji. They established of a clan-based society, with local chieftains claiming descent from Tibetan aristocrats ruling the indigenous subject clans. Many scientists would discount these stories as mere legends and myths. But it is paramount to realise that the half-mythological and half-

\textsuperscript{16} Ref. paragraph 5.1 and Annex III.
historical genealogical accounts of the origin of the rulers of the Monyul area clearly indicate that the incursion and migration of Tibetan aristocrats and religious figures did not herald the first arrival of humankind to the southern Himalayan slopes. The accounts themselves make perfectly clear that the religious figures came and converted an existing population to Buddhism, and that the secular figures came to impose some kind of rule and social structure on the people of Monyul. During the period between the 10th century and the 16th century CE Buddhism received a new impulse and different schools and sub-schools of Buddhism allied themselves with the clans. There were sporadic migrations from the Tibetan plateau resulting from internal strife and conflict with neighbouring countries on the Tibetan plateau. In the middle of the 17th century, Western Monyul was unified under the Drukpa theocracy of Bhutan and Eastern Monyul came under Tibetan suzerainty. The clan system was slowly abolished and oppressive tax systems resulted in widespread emigration and internal migrations, including to Pemakö. In the second half of the 20th century, Monyul was once again divided between India, Bhutan and China.

At present, few people of Eastern Bhutan, Kameng, Tawang and Pemakö are aware of their actual history. History as taught in schools in Bhutan typically does not extend further back than the arrival of the Zhabdrung in the 17th century, with minimal reference to the activities and legacy of Guru Rinpoche and several other religious figures. Similarly, in Tawang and Kameng history starts with Indian independence, and only sporadic mention is made of earlier times. Whenever reference is made to the period between the 7th and 17th centuries, the period is described as a time when the people suffered under the constant power struggles between their local rulers. On the contrary, despite the glorified textbook version of history, it is the real history that has left a lasting impression on the collective consciousness of the people of Monyul, deeply embedded in their psyche and reflected in their nature, culture and language. As Van Driem (2001b:992) rightly remarked, the integration of the eastern regions into Bhutan’s mainstream was largely by force. A remarkable change in human nature and attitude can be observed from a fiercely independent and war-like people eking out a meagre existence from agriculture and trade and zealously defending their small territories against friend and foe, to a docile, quiet and accommodating people who learnt to soften out the hardships they had to deal with.
CHAPTER 2. ANCIENT HISTORY OF MONYUL IN THE CONTEXT OF THE HISTORY OF ASIA.

Kraaijenbrink and colleagues (2004:1) earlier stated that “the greater Himalayan region is ethnolinguistically the most complex area of the Eurasian continent”. The primary reason for this situation is the topography (Kraaijenbrink et al. 2004:1). The Himalayan mountain passes, accessible only for short durations each year, can only be crossed by people with the physiological and cultural adaptation to high altitude. The fast flowing rivers that have cut deep into the landscape are difficult to ford during most of the year. Thick impregnable forests abundant with often dangerous wildlife make travelling difficult. Higher precipitation and humidity increase the risk of diseases. Furthermore, the high gradient of the mountain slopes makes permanent agriculture difficult. These are just some of the reasons that contributed to limited inward migration compared to more accessible lowland areas, to small and scattered, usually transient populations, and to relative isolation throughout history. Geographical and cultural barriers have reduced population contacts and thus increased isolation, leading to genetic drift and genetic divergence and independent linguistic change at the same time. As we will see in this chapter, another reason for the complex ethnolinguistic situation is the multiple and diverse origin of many of the modern populations of the area: multiple not only in the sense of geographical origin, but also in time.

Linguists, anthropologists, historians and others now widely accept the important role that the Himalayan heartland formed by Nepal, Bhutan, and the states of northeastern India played in human migratory history. This is evidenced by recent research continuing to expose the cultural, linguistic and genetic diversity of the region. It is now widely acknowledged that the Himalayan range formed a selective north-south barrier to migration and contact, in that it allowed populations to move from the Tibetan plateau down into the lower lying valleys on the southern slopes, but largely prevented populations from Indian subcontinent from entering mountains and the Tibetan plateau. Van Driem (2001a) already observed that the linguistic border between the Indo-European and Tibeto-Burman language families is not formed by the Himalayan mountain range itself, but rather by an imaginative line running through the foothills and lowlands parallel to the Himalayas much further south. Research by, for example, Gayden and colleagues (2007) and Kraaijenbrink and colleagues (2009) indicated that this linguistic border is matched by a genetic border. But two clearly opposing views have developed on the role of the region in east-west migrations. Some believe that the geophysical isolation of the region, flanked by the Himalayas in the north and the Bay of
Bengal in the south, could have acted as a geographical barrier and bottleneck for migration and gene flow, thus resulting in a unique genetic makeup (Cordeaux et al. 2003, 2004, Metspalu et al. 2004, Krithika, Maji and Vasulu 2008). Others, however, clearly view the region as an important corridor of extensive contact and population movement between South and Southeast Asia (Kraaijenbrink et al. 2009:181, Mohan et al. 2007). Even Krithika, Maji and Vasulu (2008) admit that although the Tibeto-Burman people of Northeast India are affiliated with the East and Southeast Asian populations, the diversity they exhibit could be the result of multiple waves of migration during different periods from the adjoining regions.

Kraaijenbrink and colleagues (2009:183) offered three possible scenarios for the diversity on the southern Himalayan slopes, namely that the area acted as corridors for the migration of people adapted to life at higher altitudes; that humans started to inhabit the area relatively late in history due to the difficult living conditions; or that the area was an ancient source of genetically differentiated populations and languages as a possible consequence of subdivision and isolation over extended periods of time.

This chapter aims at providing an overview of the present state of research on the complex and incomplete prehistorical record of the Monyul region. Whenever deemed relevant, the origin of the various peoples of the Himalayan region and Asia is described as well, even though the connections still remain tentative and intuitive. The evidence gathered regarding the migrations that took place during this long period of time clearly indicates that the absence of a written history does not mean the absence of history at all. Till now the general assumption has been that the inhabitants of the area are of Tibeto-Burman linguistic and racial stock, that their ancient origins lie in the northwest of China, and that they arrived on the southern Himalayan slopes either from the Tibetan plateau by passing through the valleys cutting through the Himalayas or by following the Brahmaputra from the Yunnan-Burma-Tibet border region. Whereas this might hold for most of the linguistic ancestors of the people of the region, recent genetic evidence seems to point to ancient South and Southeast Asian genetic contributions as well. Jiayang and Huo (quoted in Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004:6) remarked about archaeology in Tibet that ‘[it] needs a broader academic scope in which Tibet is not isolated from the rest of Asian cultures such as China, India or other parts of the Himalayas’. Similarly, the archaeological, historical and linguistic research in the Himalayas should be seen in a much broader geographical and cultural context to be able to establish the intricate linkages that developed in pre-historical and historical times. In fact, if
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1 I.e. the area encompassing present-day Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar.
the archaeological, genetic and linguistic picture of the Tibetan plateau is considered incomplete, the situation on the southern Himalayan slopes is in need of even more urgent attention.

In this chapter, as many references as possible have been given to the original sources, so that interested readers can consult them. If these sources are not available, softcopy versions can be requested from the author. Secondly, whereas questions about the origin of people at first glance may seem rather innocent and even trivial, the data and their analyses are sometimes used as a ground for ethnocentrism and racial discrimination, poising ‘the native, original inhabitants’ against ‘the later outsiders and migrants’ of a certain area. Any description of the origin and history of people should, therefore, present the historical and scientific data without giving any subjective judgement that might be used by certain people for their own advantage.

2.1. Available Sources of Information.

Human beings have the natural tendency to wonder where they originated, to wonder about the journeys their forefathers took in order to arrive at the place they are living now, and to wonder how they are related to other people at a close distance and further away. In the course of history people in all societies of the world have come up with myths and legends aimed at explaining their origin: the origin myths. In some societies these myths were not only orally transmitted but also written down and have thus been well documented. In other societies, ancient myths were replaced by later versions as native people came under the cultural, religious and political influence of other people.

In addition to these origin myths, there are other, more ‘scientific’ methods through which we can find out about the origin of people and the relations between them. Archaeology can provide evidence of the historical development of human society. Archaeology mostly uses the recovery and analysis of the material culture and environmental data that they have left behind, which includes artefacts, architecture, remains of humans, plants and animals, and cultural landscapes. Archaeology can thus give valuable insights into the culture of a people, especially when combined with anthropological research into present-day societies. Historical linguistics, or diachronic linguistics, is the study of language change and tries to describe and account for observed changes in particular languages, the history of the communities that speak them. The related field of comparative linguistics tries to reconstruct the pre-history of languages and determine their relatedness. One of the most
recent advances in modern science is the field of genetics, dealing with, among others, the patterns of inheritance from parent to offspring and with gene distribution, variation and change in populations. Of particular help is the DNA sequencing technology, which allows scientists to study not only how populations are related to each other, but also when they split from each other. Two key concepts in this field are Y-chromosome sequencing, which can trace the paternal line of humans, and mitochondrial DNA or mtDNA sequencing, which can trace the maternal line of inheritance in humans.

Although generally considered more reliable than traditional origin myths in determining the origin and history of a people, some precautions against the application of genetics, linguistics and archaeology have also been made. Van Driem (2001a, 2003b, 2006) earlier pointed out that there is a risk in combining these scientific methods when reconstructing the migration and settlement history of people in prehistoric times because they operate on different time-scales and because, unlike genes, language and culture can be borrowed as well as inherited. As peoples and societies advance, the dominant culture is often adopted or forcefully imposed on other, less advanced peoples and societies. As another example of a common fallacy in applying the scientific methods, Van Driem (2006, 2007a:8) mentioned the implicit assumption of the Farming Dispersal theory that as Neolithic agriculture spread, the genes, languages and archaeological evidence of the people that carried it moved along in the same direction. Instead he proposed the Centripetal Migration theory, citing examples where language and culture associated with technologically advanced societies not only spread to technologically less advanced societies, but in fact, through attracting plunder and pillage was taken over by a less advanced society, back-setting the material culture and introducing the languages and genes of culturally less advantaged peoples. Van Driem (2007a:4) also recognised the fact that the linguistic ancestors of a language community are not necessarily the same people as the biological ancestors of that community, and that the differences between the genetic history of a people and their linguistic history could tell us just as much about the past as the similarities that exist between them. And arguably, the differences between the languages of biologically related people and the similarities between the languages of biologically unrelated people can provide equally interesting insights into their histories as the expected linguistic similarities between biologically related people and the linguistic differences between biologically unrelated people. In the same article, Van Driem posed the Father Tongue Hypothesis based on examples in which the ‘paternal heritage’ or a religion or culture of a people corresponds with their Y-chromosomal makeup,
whereas the ‘mother tongues’ or the languages they speak correspond with their mtDNA makeup, or vice versa.

The climatic conditions in the southern Himalayas are a major limitation to archaeological research when compared to the situation on the Tibetan plateau. Whereas critical carbon-dateable vegetative and animal remains, including construction wood, remain reasonable well-preserved in the cold and dry climate of the plateau, the humid and warm conditions in southeastern Tibet and the southern Himalayan slopes result in quick decay. This severely hampers archaeological research, as the unreliable method of typological comparison of stone implements and other non-degradable artefacts is the only means of tentatively dating a certain site. Even the genetic picture of the southern Himalayas, as an area of historical migration and mixture of people with various origins, is arguably more complex than the situation on the Tibetan plateau.

Despite these shortcomings, in the almost complete absence of any reliable written historical reference material, reconstruction of the population history of Monyul has to rely by default on these methods. Perhaps, accepting the possible limitations and flaws of such an approach is the best remedy against drawing foregone conclusions, and the challenge lies in the much more complex analyses required to be able to draw them.

2.2. THE BUDDHIST VERSION OF THE ‘COMMON ANCESTOR’ THEORY.

Following the ‘common ancestor’ theory first expounded by Thomas Huxley and later expanded by Charles Darwin in the second half of the 19th century, human beings and other primates, including apes and monkeys, are now generally believed to have had a common African ancestor millions of years ago. The first modern humans or *Homo sapiens* are thought to have evolved in Africa 250,000 years ago.

Earlier to Huxley and Darwin, their theory and the evidence gathered for it, a myth had developed among the Buddhist people of the Himalayas attributing the origin of mankind to the union of Pha Tregan Jangchup Sempa ‘Father Old Monkey Bodhisattva’, a male monkey-reincarnation of Cenrezi², with Ma Drak Sinmo ‘Mother Cliff Ogress’, a female demon-reincarnation of Jomo Dolma³ (Gyelrik ff. 5a-b). This union is often thought to have taken place in the area that later became known as Poyül or Powo (Stein 1972:28). The six monkey

---

² Skt. Avalokiteshvara, the Bodhisattva of compassion.
³ Skt. Tara.
offspring from this union settle at the mountain of གོང་པོ་ི་ཝ། Gongpori near བོད་་་ Zodang⁴. There, they receive the ལོ་་་‘five kinds of grain’ from Cenrezi, and through cultivation and corresponding civilisation they lose their hair and tails to turn into the first human beings. According to གོ་ཟེ་ཞི་(1990:20), the Monpa race was one of the clans descending from this union, later settling on the southern flanks of the Himalayas.

An alternative, and perhaps even more ancient story, predating the simian origin story clearly influenced by Buddhist themes, is the primordial creation of human kind from a cosmic egg (Stein 1959), a theme recurring in the origin myth of the Brokpa people presented in Chapter 11 of this book. In both the simian and the egg story, the first generation of humans or ཝེ་་་‘little men of the interior’ are the ancestors of several proto-clans or tribes, whose exact configuration differs by source but generally includes the བྲ་ Bra, པྲ་ བོང་ Dong, བྲུ་ Brú, ལྷ་ Ga and the inferior རྡོ་ Pa and སྡོད་ Da or the ཁྲེ་ Se, ཁྲེ་ ཚོང་ Dong, ཁྲེ་ རུམ་ Mu clans (Stein 1959).

2.3. The Asian Journey of Modern Humans.

Notwithstanding this local myth of human ancestry, archaeological evidence gathered till date places the origin of modern humans firmly on the African continent. Modern humans are thought to have moved out of the Horn of Africa around 70,000 years ago, along the Arabian Peninsula, and into Southwest Asia⁵ and South Asia⁶. Early humans then moved along the coast of India into mainland Southeast Asia around 60,000 years ago (Su et al. 1999) and from there along the islands of Southeast Asia⁷ to Australia, where they are thought to have reached around 45,000 years ago (Kumar et al. 2009). Archaeological evidence for this great human migration is largely lacking, partially due to the fact that the coastal zones along which this migration took place became inundated when sea levels rose, partially because there has been limited archaeological research. But the research by Kumar and colleagues (2009), Metspalu and colleagues (2006) and Mohan and colleagues (2007) provided genetic evidence of a swift dispersal along this southern coastal route around 60,000 years ago, discrediting the second, northern route of human migration from Southwest Asia through Central Asia into East Asia⁸ hypothesised by, among others, Basu and colleagues (2003).

---

⁴ The place now known as བྲས་ཨལ་ Tsethang in Lhokha.
⁵ I.e. Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan.
⁶ I.e. the Indian subcontinent encompassing present-day India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Bhutan and Nepal.
⁷ I.e. the Malay Archipelago of present-day Malaysia and Indonesia.
⁸ I.e. present-day southern, central and northern China.
Although a swift dispersal along the coast is often advocated, modern human populations of the Indian subcontinent have certain Palaeolithic genetic and linguistic markers indicating long-term human settlement. A language isolate in central India called Nihali is sometimes considered to be a remnant of this first migration stream (Kuiper 1962, Zide 1996). Cordeaux and colleagues (2003) identified an almost extinct Palaeolithic component of the current Indian mtDNA gene pool. Many people consider the Austroasiatic speakers, including, among others, the speakers of the Munda languages, the Khasi languages and the Mon-Khmer languages, to be the genetic and linguistic descendants of this ancient migration. According to Van Driem (2007a:1) the Austroasiatic speakers still represent the native heart of the Indian subcontinent, which Kivisild and colleagues (2003) saw confirmed on the basis of Y-chromosomal evidence. The exact geographical location of the homeland of the Austroasiatic speakers, however, remains disputed. Diffloth (2005) reconstructed an Austroasiatic Stammbaum. On basis of the rich vocabulary related to rice cultivation and pan-Austroasiatic lexical roots with paleontological significance he identified the Austroasiatic homeland to be somewhere in the tropics. Some authors locate the Austroasiatic homeland on the Indian subcontinent itself, for example, around the Bay of Bengal (Van Driem 1997, 2001:265, 2006, 2007a) or Northeast India (Mohan et al. 2007) and presume an eastward spread into mainland Southeast Asia. Further evidence of this was provided by Chandrasekar and colleagues (2009:9), who concluded that Indian specific mtDNA lineages were present among the Tibeto-Burman Northeast Indian population which would indicate modern human inhabitation in Northeast India during Palaeolithic times and genetic continuity between India and Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, Kivisild and colleagues (2003), Cordeaux and colleagues (2003) and Peng and colleagues (2011) place the Austroasiatic homeland in mainland Southeast Asia, from where a back-migration took place into the Indian subcontinent. Basu and colleagues (2003) take an intermediate position, stating that the Austroasiatic speakers were the earliest inhabitants of the Indian subcontinent arriving around 55,000 years ago, although they do acknowledge that ‘a fraction of them’ entered from Southeast Asia through Northeast India. As support to the idea that the Austroasiatic homeland lies in Southeast Asia, Peng and colleagues (2011) provide indications for an inland movement of modern humans along the

---

9 Spoken in central and eastern India and including the Santal people speaking Santali or Satar, who are still the largest tribal community in India, spread over Jharkand, West Bengal, Orissa, Bihar, and Assam as well as in neighbouring Bangladesh and Nepal.

10 Including, among others, the War, Khynriam, Pnar, Bhoi and Lyngangam, who collectively call themselves khî hynñiew trep ‘seven huts’ and inhabit the Meghalaya and adjoining areas of Northeast India.

11 The speakers of the Mon-Khmer languages of Southeast Asia include the speakers of Mon in Burma, the Vietnamese and the Khmer.

Mekong River into the Yunnan-Burma border area between 14,000 and 17,000 years ago, through Northeast India 9,000 to 12,000 years ago, finally reaching the southern slopes of the Himalayas in Bhutan, Sikkim and eastern Nepal between 7,000 and 10,000 years ago. According to them, this migration, which possibly brought the maternal ancestors of the Austroasiatic peoples to the subcontinent, is attested by the mtDNA haplogroups M9a1b, F1, F1a and F1c spread in western China, Myanmar, northeast India and the southern Himalayas and even among the speakers of Indo-European languages such as Bengali. Archaeological evidence is provided by the Mesolithic cultures represented in the Garo Hills of Meghalaya (Sharma 2003) and the Patu site of Eastern Nepal (Corvinus 1996, Zöller 2000).

Whether a Southeast Asian homeland or an Indian homeland with subsequent eastward migration of the Austroasiatic people is accepted, the migration into the Indian subcontinent evidenced by the westward expansion of Mesolithic culture and mtDNA data probably brought Austroasiatic speakers along the Himalayan foothills. Their settlement area on the Yunnan-Burma border was not so different from the new areas they moved through and settled in. This migration might have thus brought the ancient maternal ancestors of present-day populations of the region as evidenced by their mtDNA. Much later Tibeto-Burman people who migrated along the fringes of the Tibetan plateau and through the southwest of China may have brought the paternal ancestors. This would partially explain the existence of distinct Tibeto-Burman populations in the eastern Himalayas, some of the peculiarities of whose languages might be remnants of an ancient Austroasiatic substrate. Similarly, matrilineal and matrilocal customs, customarily among the Austroasiatic people of the Meghalaya and also prevalent among some people of the southern Himalayas could be cultural remnants of the Austroasiatic people. As we saw in paragraph 1.1, the Lepcha call the native inhabitants of Sikkim the Naong, Chang, and Mon, who were ethnically, culturally and linguistically absorbed by the later Lepcha arrivals. Especially the latter name, Mon, and its connection to both Monyul and the Austroasiatic Mon people of the Irrawaddy valley in Burma are further tentative indications that the Austroasiatic people were once more widespread in the southern Himalayan region and the northeast of the Indian subcontinent. Perhaps, in the near future evidence of a linguistic and genetic substrate will be found. The possible absence or presence of proto-Austroasiatic roots and verbal paradigms in the Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayan region would greatly contribute to supporting or rejecting this hypothesis. At the same time, full mtDNA sequences of the Tibeto-Burman people of Northeast India, Nepal and Bhutan will provide important information.
2.4. Pre-LGM Population on the Tibetan Plateau.

The evidence from archaeology, historical records, linguistics and genetics is ambiguous as to the exact origin of the Sino-Tibetan people (Zhao et al. 2009, Kang et al. 2010). Modern humans initially settled the coastal zones of mainland Southeast Asia. From there, most authors accept a conventional expansion into central and eastern China 20,000 to 40,000 years ago, before the LGM\(^\text{12}\) (Su et al. 1999). Archaeological evidence points at Upper Palaeolithic cultures in northern Vietnam and southern China as long as 36,000 years ago, followed by Mesolithic cultures 18,000 years ago (Guangxi Liuzhou etc. 2009 and Ha 1997 in Peng et al. 2011). Based on mtDNA evidence, Peng and colleagues (2011) dated human migration into northern Southeast Asia and southeast China between 18,000 and 28,000 years ago. The mainstream view has been that after the LGM a single expansion of Mesolithic cultures into the Upper and Middle Yellow River\(^\text{13}\) basin took place (Peng et al. 2011). There, Neolithic cultures were established that later spread throughout East Asia and the Tibetan plateau.

Evidence from recent genetic research, on the other hand, reveals more intricate stories for the origin of the Tibetan peoples (Qian et al. 2000, Su et al. 2000 and Shi et al. 2008). The research by Qin and colleagues (2010) revealed two primary components in the mtDNA of Tibeto-Burman populations on the Tibetan plateau: pre-LGM inhabitants and post-LGM migrants. According to their analysis, several mtDNA haplogroups with an estimated age of 21,000 to 22,000 years, including C4d, M62, A10 and perhaps M13b (Qin et al. 2010:562), in addition to the ancient and nearly exclusive Tibetan haplogroup M16 reported by Zhao and colleagues (2009), could represent the genetic remains of pre-LGM inhabitants. Furthermore, the analysis of the pre-LGM sub-lineage A10 by Zhao and colleagues (2009) showed a strong signal of post-LGM population expansion and greater diversity in the southern part of the Tibetan plateau, indicating that it was an area of refuge when the climate dramatically changed during the LGM, followed by a population expansion around 15,000 years ago. Even the Y-chromosome evidence points into the direction of a Palaeolithic entry onto the plateau from Southeast Asia around 22,000 years ago, as Gayden and colleagues (2007) deduct from the significantly more ancient age of the isolated O3a3-M134 individuals. Similarly, Qin and

\(^\text{12}\) Last Glacial Maximum: the period between 22,000 and 8,000 (Zhang and Li 2002) or 26,500 and 19,000 (Clark et al. 2009) years ago, in which temperatures dropped, precipitation decreased, and glaciers covered considerable parts of the Northern Hemisphere, including, perhaps, parts of the Tibetan plateau. The ecological changes this period brought about is generally believed to have had considerable impact on the demography of modern humans, including migration patterns.

\(^\text{13}\) In pinyin: Huáng Hé.
colleagues (2010:560) reported that there are small but significant differences in Y haplogroups between Tibetan populations residing at the southern edges of the plateau compared to those of the northern areas of the plateau.

This genetic evidence could support the archaeological evidence (Zhang and Li 2002) that a small Late Palaeolithic pre-LGM human population existed on the plateau. In conjunction with this evidence, some authors (Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004, Brantingham et al. 2003, 2007) propose that humans moved from northern Southeast Asia and southeastern China northward to populate central and northern China before the LGM. Crucial in the population history of the Tibetan plateau is the fact that lowland people have to physiologically and culturally adapt to moving across and living on higher altitudes, making it inconceivable that agriculturalist peoples moved from lower elevations across the high, arid Tibetan plateau (Aldenderfer and Zhang (2004:21). Instead, these authors propose the gradual, stage-wise ascent onto the plateau by small populations that in several millennia managed to adapt to the conditions on high altitudes. The genetic evidence supports this theory. A crucial feature in the genetic makeup of the people of the high Himalayas is the presence of a set of genes that developed through a long process of selection and that make these people highly adaptable to the high altitude environment they live in (Simonson et al. 2010, Yi et al. 2010, Peng et al. 2010, Wang et al. 2011). These genes were not present in the Yellow River basin ancestor population and are still not present in most Central, South, East, Northeast and Southeast Asian populations. According to Peng and colleagues (2010), the key adaptive features that have enabled Tibetans to cope with the hypoxic conditions at high altitudes are the result of genetic selection since the first Palaeolithic occupation of the plateau. On the other hand, Simonson and colleagues (2010) and Yi and colleagues (2010) identified the genetic basis for these physiological adaptations and concluded that the split between the forefathers of the Tibetan and the Chinese people took place much later.

Before the LGM, the northern part of the Tibetan plateau had a relatively mild climate allowing for extensive grasslands and corresponding herbivore fauna. The age of the archaeological evidence for seasonal forays onto the plateau by small nomadic hunter bands originating from sedentary populations in northwestern China during the Palaeolithic (Brantingham et al. 2007 and Zhao et al. 2009) has recently been reduced. Although the oldest known archaeological evidence on the Tibetan plateau was thought to be the Xiao Qaidam site in Qinghai, its age was re-estimated to between 3,000 and 11,000 years.

14 In pinyin: Xiāo Cháidànmù.
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(Brantingham et al. *in press*, in Aldenderfer 2011). Other sites in Qinghai can also be dated to between 15,000 and 13,000 years ago. Instead, the Chusang site near Lhasa, exhibiting hand- and footprints and a possible hearth containing quartz crystals earlier dated to around 21,000 years ago (Zhang and Li 2002 in Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004:16) was re-estimated to 28,000 to 32,000 years ago, making it the oldest site on the plateau (Aldenderfer 2011:143). This site, located far away from possible source populations at lower altitudes, would suggest permanent pre-LGM inhabitation on the plateau in concordance with the genetic evidence.

Brantingham and colleagues (2007) earlier proposed more permanent occupation of the plateau less than 8,000 years ago. This contradiction with the genetic evidence might, according to them, be the result of a genetic predisposal of the initial colonists to rapid accumulation of mutations leading to successful physiological adaptation, or the fact that high elevation selection pressure might be more severe than earlier conceived.

2.5. EARLY ASCENT ONTO THE PLATEAU AFTER THE LGM.

During the LGM, the early settlers of northern China experienced dramatic changes in climate which caused them to abandon settlements (Xing et al. 2008 in Peng et al. 2011) and move southward (Ji et al. 2005 in Peng et al. 2011). Similarly, the Late Palaeolithic occupants of the Tibetan plateau might have disappeared as a result of the environmental conditions during the LGM, or they might have found a refuge on the southern slopes of the Himalayan range (Kraaijenbrink et al. 2009:181), or they could have been replaced by or interbred with later Neolithic settlers. The research by Zhao and colleagues (Zhao et al. 2009:21233) indicates the latter possibility, with a strong selection pressure on the M16 lineage, leaving it as the sole surviving mtDNA lineage among the earliest Palaeolithic settlers of the Tibetan plateau.

After the LGM, improving climatic conditions allowed the Proto-Sino-Tibetan settlers of northern China to resettle the higher latitudes (Goebel 2002 in Peng et al. 2011) and the higher altitudes, including the Tibetan plateau (Brantingham 2003 and 2007, Zhang and Li 2002). Low population densities could be found on the plateau between 18,000 and 12,000 years ago. As mentioned before, most of the positively inhabited sites in Qinghai date back to between 15,000 and 11,000 years ago (Brantingham et al. 2007, Brantingham et al. *in press*, in Aldenderfer 2011). Smaller groups of foraging people expanded between 12,000 and 10,000 years ago in the most productive areas, particularly in the southeast (Aldenderfer and

Zhang 2004:21). With an improving climate between 11,000 and 6,000 years ago, increasingly adaptive populations settled across the plateau. Prior to the re-estimations of the Chusang site, Brantingham and colleagues (2007) dated permanent occupation of the Tibetan plateau by hunter-gatherers as a result of competitive exclusion by settled agriculturalists at the lower lying areas to the north and northeast to 8,200 years ago (Brantingham et al. 2007).

Curiously, Peng and colleagues (2011) found the presence of mtDNA haplogroups M9a1a2 and M9a1b, as well as haplogroups F, F1a and F1c among ethnic Tibetan populations of the northeastern, eastern, southeastern and southern fringes of the Tibetan plateau. From this, one might consider that from the Yunnan-Burma border, where humans settled between 14,000 to 17,000 years ago (Peng et al. 2011), changing climatic conditions on the Tibetan plateau after the LGM had also facilitated an early, gradual ascent of small groups of people along the rivers of the Héngduàn corridor into the southeastern parts of the plateau.

Summarising, genetic and archaeological evidence indicates that human populations existed on the Tibetan plateau well before the usually purported arrival of the Tibeto-Burman carriers of a Neolithic culture that used the Héngduàn corridor around 6000 to 5000 years ago. These later arrivals might have intermixed with the early settlers. Their arrival could also have resulted in the dispersal of some of the early settlers southward, across the Himalayas onto the Indian subcontinent, where they might have mixed with the ancient Austroasiatic populations and with the people who arrived during the LGM to form populations that predate the arrival of later Tibeto-Burman people in the region.

15 Crucially, according to Aldenderfer and Zhang (2004), palaeoenvironmental data of this period show a warmer and more humid climate in the eastern parts of the plateau leading to increased forest cover in the southeastern river valleys.
16 The Héngduàn corridor, also called Tibetan-Yi/Zang-Yi corridor (Shi 2008) or the Tibeto-Burman/Zang-Mien corridor is the area in southwest China on the border of southeast Tibet, northwest Yunnan, western Sichuan and northern Burma. The area has several parallel north-south mountain ranges through which the Yangtze, Mekong and Salween rivers run. The area is widely considered to have been a corridor for human migration, mainly from north to south, although ancient south to north migrations cannot be disregarded.
2.6. ESTABLISHMENT AND SPREAD OF NEOLITHIC CULTURES.

According to the mainstream view of the peopling of Asia, around 10,000 to 13,500 years ago Neolithic cultures were established in the Upper and Middle Yellow River Basin (Su et al. 1999, Van Driem 2001a:77-84, 408-433, 2003b), including the millet-based Proto-Sino-Tibetan Yângsháo culture on the northeastern margin of the plateau in Qinghai (Aldenderfer 2007:153). Archaeological research has identified Neolithic sites in Qinghai dating between 9100 and 6400 years ago (Aldenderfer 2011:144). These expansions of Neolithic culture from the Yângsháo culture could have taken place particularly during the wetter and warmer pulses that have been recorded from the western, central and northeastern parts of the Tibetan plateau between 10,000 and 9500, 9500 and 8700 and 7200 and 6300 years ago (Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004:13). Neolithic cultures estimated to be 7000 years old are known from Sichuan (Bureau of Cultural Relics 1985:178 in Aldenderfer 2011).

(1997:12) reports, that since 1973 archaeological sites near the villages of Jumu, Beibeng and Maniweng have yielded Neolithic artefacts including stone axes, chisels and spinning wheels perhaps dating back 7,000 to 8,000 years ago. The sites in Sichuan and Pemakö, though fraught with inconsistencies in proposed dates, could also have been established as the Neolithic extensions of the Mesolithic cultures of the Yunnan-Burma border area mentioned in the previous paragraph.

The Proto-Sino-Tibetan people of the Yângsháo culture split into the Proto-Chinese who moved to the north, east and south populating most of China and forming the ancestors of the Hán Chinese, and the Proto-Tibeto-Burmans who formed the Mâjîyâo culture in the Upper Yellow river basin between 5400 and 4800 years ago (Su et al. 1999, 2000, Aldenderfer 2011:144). A local variant dating between 5600 and 4000 years ago can be found just below the plateau in Zongri in Qinghai (Chen 2002 in Aldenderfer 2011) and other sites dating between 6500 and 4950 years ago have been unearthed on the plateau in Qinghai itself (Aldenderfer 2011:145). The Qinghai settlements were inhabited by local plateau

17 Jomo village south of the present-day town of Bayi in Nyingthri.
18 The Tshangla villages of Bipung and Maniwung under Metok Dzong in Pemakö.
19 Aldenderfer (2011), based on Chayet (1994:46-47), ascribes a later Neolithic origin to these sites contemporary to the Chögong site. Van Driem (2001a) proposes a well-established Neolithic culture in the Pemakö area around 5,000 years ago.
20 Also referred to as Northern Tibeto-Burman or Proto-Sino-Bodic people.
21 The archaeological, historical, linguistic and genetic evidence is in stark contrast to the conclusion by Yi and colleagues (2010) who asserted that the Hán Chinese diverted from the Tibetans genetically no more than 2750 years ago.
populations who had adopted traits of the agricultural and ceramic practices of the nearby Mājiāyáo culture (Chen 2002 in Aldenderfer 2011). Neolithic sites can furthermore be found in the southeast of the plateau as well as along the Yarlung Tsangpo river\textsuperscript{22}. Much further to the west, the Burzahom site in Kashmir has been dated to 4500 years ago (Sharma 2000). According to Aldenderfer (2011:145) the sites dating from the period between 6500 to 3750 years ago all indicate permanent settlement of the plateau.

Genetic evidence that modern Tibeto-Burmans can be traced to these Epipalaeolithic and Neolithic immigrants can be found in the mtDNA (Torroni et al. 1994, Chandrasekar et al. 2009:9, Cordeaux et al. 2003, Gayden et al. 2009, Kang et al. 2010 and Zhao et al. 2009) and Y chromosomes (Su et al. 2000, Gayden et al. 2007 and Wen et al. 2010). The mtDNA from Tibeto-Burman populations across the plateau similarly indicates a mostly northern East Asian\textsuperscript{23} maternal ancestry (Qin et al. 2010, Gayden et al. 2007 and Torroni et al. 1994) and thus a shared origin with the Sinitic people\textsuperscript{24}. The data by Chandrasekar and colleagues (2009) also show that relative to the South Asian haplogroups, the East Asian haplogroups are more widely represented in the Tibeto-Burman people of Northeast India. These include several lineages under the sister subhaplogroups C and Z of haplogroup M8, predominantly having a northeast Asian and central East Asian radiation respectively. Also well represented among northeast Indian populations are subhaplogroups D4 and D5 of haplogroup D, which has the highest frequency in Central and East Asia. Haplogroup E shares M9 defining mutations and has a Central and East Asian geographic distribution, with the highest frequencies reached in Tibet. Haplogroup M10 and M12, which have a high diversity in China but a high frequency in Tibet, are relatively poorly represented among northeast Indian Tibeto-Burman populations, just as haplogroup G occurring most frequently in northern China and Central Asia (Chandrasekar et al. 2009:6).

2.7. THE SOUTHWARD MIGRATION OF THE TIBETO-BURMANS.

Leaving aside possible pre- and early post-LGM inhabitation, it is generally concluded from the evidence provided by genetic (e.g. Wang et al. 2011), historic (e.g. Zhao 2009, Harrell 2001:28) and linguistic (e.g. Van Driem 2001a) research that a further split took place in the Proto-Tibeto-Burmans of the Mājiāyáo culture. Successional waves of migrants moved southward, through the Héngduàn mountains into Sichuan and northern Yunnan. There they

\textsuperscript{22} Ref. paragraph 2.10.
\textsuperscript{23} East Asia includes present-day Mongolia, Siberia, Japan, China and Korea.
\textsuperscript{24} I.e. the people who, at least numerically, mainly encompasses the Hán Chinese.
formed the ancestral populations from whom many present-day populations of the eastern, southeastern and southern fringes of the Tibetan plateau descend. The Yi people, who will not be discussed further in this book, still live in the Héngduàn mountains and have been shown to be East Asia’s closest genetic relatives of the Tibetans, although the Yi’s genetic variability shows contributions from Han Chinese and indigenous people (Wang et al. 2011, Harrell 2001:29, 34)

2.7.1. The Qiang Tribes.

Chinese sources recount of a nomadic pastoralist people in the eastern part of the Tibetan plateau around 1000 BCE alternatively called the Qiang, Ch’iang, or Di-Qiang by the Chinese (Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994 in Zhao 2009). The Qiang people are generally considered ethnically and culturally distinct from the Tibetan people (Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004:40), and their settlement on the Tibetan plateau from northwestern China seems compatible with classical genetic studies on contemporary indigenous Tibetan populations (Wang 1994 in Zhao 2009). The Qiang were perhaps the speakers of a language called Nam by Thomas (1948) on basis of ancient documents. This language is considered to be Tibeto-Burman, but ‘non-Tibetan’, i.e. non-Bodic.

Contemporary to the Zhangzhung empires25 (ref. paragraph 2.8), the northeastern regions of the Tibetan plateau were controlled by the Azha26 Empire that had defeated the Qiang tribes in 284 CE. The Azha Empire was defeated by the Tang dynasty in 634 CE and consequently destructed and annexed by the Yarlung Empire in 636 CE. Some of the Qiang tribes became the present-day Qiang nationality, speaking two mutually unintelligible languages, a northern and a southern variety. According to Darragon (2010), a common ground for all Qiang tribes is a sheep-based economy with an important ritualistic function for sheep. Another characteristic aspect of the descendants of the Qiang tribes is the construction of stone towers in various shapes and of various heights between 200 and 1500 CE (Darragon 2010). These round earthquake-proof towers of lower height, reinforced with vertical ridges, were built to serve defensive, storage, prestige and watchtower functions. The most recently built towers can be found in the Minshan mountain range in Sichuan province, where the Qiang people live in fortified villages with defensive towers made with smaller stones and more mortar. Wood-carbon dating showed that the oldest tower there was built

25 Ref. paragraph 2.8.
26 In Chinese 吐谷浑 tú yù hún.

with wood dating between 1320 and 1350 CE and that the most recent towers were built with wood dating between 1930 and 1950 CE. Darragon (2010) admits that the stones these towers were constructed with have been reused throughout the centuries, and that the wood samples were therefore not representative of the age of the towers. Age-wise, the towers in the Kongpo, Minyak and Gyalrong areas predate the Qiang towers, and the tower architecture seems to have been adopted by successive cultures in a south to north direction.

2.7.2. THE MINYAK PEOPLE.

It appears that the endonym of at least twelve Qiang tribes inhabiting the highlands of the Upper Yellow river was Minyak (Stein 1955). After the defeat of the Qiang by the upcoming Yarlung dynasty, many of the Qiang tribes were assimilated in the Tibetan people to form the Amdowa and Khampa Tibetans. Some tribes or clans dispersed and settled in other areas. From the 6th century onwards, several Minyak kingdoms existed in northwest Sichuan. As a result of the Yarlung expansion, other Qiang tribes were forced to disperse from the Kokonor lake region in Qinghai. In collaboration with many other tribes, including Hán Chinese and Aryan Tocharians from Central Asia, these people later formed the powerful Buddhist Minyak kingdom that lasted from 981 until its destruction by the Mongols in 1227 CE (Vitali 2004). The southern Minyak kingdoms continued to exist and speakers of the Minyak language can still be found in Sichuan today. The Minyak area used to have many of the characteristic towers, but most have been destructed and the stones have been used for other constructions. According to Darragon (2010), carbon-dating of the wood of the towers showed an estimated age between 1030 and 1390 CE. From Kongpo, the tower architecture probably spread northeast to the southern Minyak area, where bigger stones and less mortar were used particularly for star-shaped towers.

The Gurung of Nepal retrace their origins to a place they call Nasa in Tsô, which according to some authors is a variation of Tsongkha, the Tibetan name for an 11th and 12th century kingdom of the Minyak people, and the nine Gurung clans are collectively called ‘minakugi’ which might derive from Tibetan ‘seven lineages of Minyak’ (Ramble 2003:77). Similarly, the Limbu people of Sikkim refer to themselves as Tsong, and trace their origins to the northeast of the Tibetan plateau, which might similarly be related to Tsongkha. The Limbu are also called /tsong/ by the Tibetans and

27 Tangut is the Mongolian name, whereas the Chinese called it the Xixia kingdom.
the Bhutanese. The Sherpa people of Nepal are also thought to descend from ancient Minyak migrations, and their very name Sherpa is said to derive from the occasional reference of the people of the central Tibetan plateau to the Minyak as शर्पा Sharpa (Darragon 2010). Linguistically, the Sherpa language is distinctly Bodish and not related to any of the Qiangic languages, and they are therefore more likely an offshoot of later Central Tibetan migrants.

### 2.7.3. The Gyalrong People.

To the north and west of the area inhabited by the modern day Qiang and Minyak people lie Ngawa\(^{28}\) Tibetan and Qiang autonomous state and Gardze\(^{29}\) Tibetan autonomous state in northwestern Sichuan province, inhabited by the speakers of what are called the ग्याल्रौंग Gyalrong, Gyalronic, or Jiaronig languages. The Gyalrong area has often been identified with the legendary ‘kingdom of women’ ruled by a queen of the Dong clan and described in both Chinese and Tibetan sources\(^{30}\), and the Gyalrong are thought to be descendants of the aboriginal Bra clan (Stein 1959). The Gyalrong people are known as nomadic herdsman and horse-breeders and their contribution to the Yarlung Empire is well known (Stein 1972:24). According to Darragon (2010), the Gyalrong region was divided in one-valley kingdoms since the 14\(^{th}\) century. Each of these kingdoms maintained independence and in the course of history around nine or ten distantly related but mutually unintelligible languages developed. The Bon religion maintained a stronghold in the region, even after the ग्लुक्पा Gelukpa School took over control after the 18\(^{th}\) century. The Gyalrong area is particularly well-endowed with tall, free-standing, star-shaped or square defensive towers built with larger stones and less mortar, the majority of whose age based on carbon-dating of wooden beams ranged between 1155 and 1530 CE (Darragon 2010), suggesting that the architectural style had arrived in Gyalrong from the Minyak area.

The Gyalrong dialects were described by Jacques (2004), Nagano (2003) and Sun (2003). Phonologically, the Gyalrong languages are characterised by archaisms, including a high number of distinctive simple consonant and vowel phonemes, a typical lack of diphthong vowel phonemes, and a very large number of two- and three-member initial consonant clusters (Jacques 2004). Morphologically, the languages maintain a complicated

---

28 Chinese Aba.
29 Chinese Ganze.
30 Stories about a mythical kingdom of women or ‘tricksters’, far to the north in Tibet, can also be found in the southern Himalays, for example among the Taraon Mishmi (Elwin 1993:208) and Hill Miri (Elwin 1993:204), who call the kingdom Miyuman.
system of affixation that could be regarded as reflexes of Proto-Tibeto-Burman morphology (Nagano 2003, Jacques 2004). Nagano (2003) also states that most of the similarity between Gyalrong and Written Tibetan is the result of cultural loans, with a basic Gyalrong vocabulary more reminiscent of Proto-Tibeto-Burman. He therefore places Gyalrong outside the Bodic branch. Sun (2003) places Gyalrong together with Lavrung and Horpa in a separate cluster among the Tibeto-Burman languages. The authors differ on the presence of distinctive tone in the Gyalrong languages, perhaps the result of dialect variations.

The name Gurung, as well as /rōng/, the endonym the Lepcha use, is sometimes considered to be ultimately connected to the Gyalrong people (Chemjong 1967).

The ancient Qiang people and their modern-day descendants, including the speakers of the Minyak and Gyalrong languages, speak Tibeto-Burman languages that appear more closely related to Proto-Tibeto-Burman and fall outside the Bodic languages characteristic of the Tibetan plateau. During several moments in history, particularly after the defeat of Azha by the Yarlung Empire in the 7th century and the defeat of Minyak by the Mongols in the 13th century, speakers of the Qiangic languages could have dispersed across the Tibetan plateau. Limited resources and competition from Bodic populations that had settled most of the plateau might have forced some of them to cross the Himalayan range into the Monyul area. Although till date no convincing evidence for this hypothesis exists, further linguistic research into the Qiangic languages and their position vis-à-vis each other as well as other languages of the greater Himalayan region could shed more light on this. Similarly, analysis of the genetic composition of maternal and paternal DNA of contemporary ethnic Qiang, Gyalrong and Minyak populations, rather than populations divided on basis of geographical origin31, and comparison with other Tibeto-Burman populations would greatly contribute to revealing the position of the Qiang people in relation to the Proto-Tibeto-Burman people and their modern descendants.

---

31 As has been the common practice till date, e.g. populations of various prefectures in Tibet, Sichuan and Qinghai, or ‘Tibetan’ populations of certain areas, or Kham Tibetans and Amdo Tibetans. These divisions based on geographical background do not acknowledge the often mixed ancestry of these populations, and at the aggregate level therefore will not present a reliable picture of genetic origin and relationship.
2.7.4. Migrations Further Southward.

During the past 2600 years, further southward migration took place from Sichuan into southwestern China and mainland Southeast Asia (Su et al. 1999, Wen et al. 2004). These Tibeto-Burman speakers intermixed with native Austroasiatic Mon-Khmer and possibly Daic and Hmong Mien populations. This is supported by the genetic information presented in, for example, Wen and colleagues (2004) but also in the matrilineal and matrilocal culture of the Karen people. According to them, the influence of the northern migrants was stronger in the male lineages whereas the southern native influence was stronger in the female lineages. Based on historical records and their genetic analysis, they subsequently differentiated three main populations in Yunnan: the native Bai, Naxi and Yi, later Tibeto-Burman migrations into southern Yunnan and Hunan; and later migrations into northwestern Yunnan. The last of these Tibeto-Burman waves were the ancestors of the Lolo-Burmese and Karen branches moving into mainland Southeast Asia around 1500 years ago (Su et al. 1999). These migrations are, however, beyond the scope of this book.

2.8. The Zhangzhung Empire of the Western Tibetan Plateau.

On the Tibetan plateau a mosaic of clans developed, all living along the major river valleys and engaged in warfare and alliance building with a leadership based on divine kingship, Bon as the religious belief system and an economy based on sophisticated agriculture and livestock rearing. Zhangzhung in western or Upper Tibet is the most well-known and extensively researched expression of these societies (Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004:41).

Around 4500 years ago, migrating bands of people from the northeastern corner of the Tibetan plateau reached the far western extremity of the Tibetan plateau and Kashmir, where they established Neolithic cultures (Norbu 1981, Van Driem 2001a,c, Sharma 2000). Their language, culture and empire are known as Zhangzhung. Like the Qiangic languages, the language Zhangzhung was probably Tibeto-Burman, but not Bodish. The original teachings of the Bon religion are thought to have been propagated in Zhangzhung (Van Driem 2001c), and Zhangzhung is still the language in which most secret Bon texts and invocations are held. Intensive contacts with people and states to the west must have also had considerable influence on Zhangzhung culture and language.

32 Including the Aini, Hani, Jino, Lahu and Tujia.
33 Including the Lisu, Nu, Pumi and Tibetans.
The Zhangzhung culture is thought to have consisted of various phases. These include perhaps a late Bronze Age period from around 1200 BCE to 800 BCE, an early Iron Age period from approximately 1000 BCE to 500 BCE, the developed Iron Age from 500 BCE to the start of the common era, the Proto-historic or ‘legendary monarchic period’ from 200 BCE to 700 CE, and the historic period from 600 to 1300 CE (Bellezza 2010). Bellezza (2010) provides a detailed overview of recent archaeological surveys in the Upper Tibet region. Architecture in the early period is thought to have been characterised by all-stone corbelled constructions with heavy wall buttressing, corbels, bridging stones, roofing slabs, random-rubble slab wall fabric and rear walls are set entirely below the level of the slope. Bellezza (2010) furthermore reports a multitude of archaeological sites, including castles, mansions and other residential buildings but also stelae, tombs and pillars that are locally attributed to the Mon people. These includes various ‘Mon castle’, ‘Mon tombs’, ‘Mon stones’, ‘Mon enclosures’ and ‘Mon houses’. The buildings were mostly one or two stories high, made primarily of stone and with wooden roofs. Adobe walls, defensive towers, high-walled buildings and rammed-earth constructions were rare. The sites associated with the Mon are mainly located east of the 89th meridian on the Changthang plain in Nakchu prefecture, as well as in many areas of Ngari prefecture. According to Bellezza, many of these sites are considered inauspicious by the present inhabitants of the area because they are thought represent an ancient, pre-Buddhist cultural complex.

The capital of the Zhangzhung political entity was Khyunglung Ngulkhar ‘silver mansion of the Garuda’ ruled by the Lik dynasty, but Zhangzhung and its allied states might have extended well beyond western Tibet (Karmay 1979, Stein 1972). According to Uray (2003), several of the Zhangzhung clans, including the Lho and the Ngek allied with the expanding Central Tibetan Yarlung Empire under the Tibetan king Songtsen Gampo sometime between 634 and 644 AD, and after the defeat of other clans such as the Se, Khyung, Sha and Puk, Zhangzhung was politically, culturally and linguistically assimilated until the collapse of the Yarlung Empire. Bellezza (2011) and Vitali (1996), basing themselves on the 13th century Marlungpa

34 Walls constructed of unbaked mud blocks or walls.
35 This is, interestingly, the meridian which runs right through Bhutan as well.
36 According to Ramble (2003:76), the Tamang people of Nepal, and perhaps the Gurung and Thakali as well, derive their origin from the Tibetan Se and Dong clans.
Namtar\textsuperscript{37} and local oral traditions suggest that the Bonpo tribes of the \textit{Kal} and the \textit{Mon} were driven south by the \textit{Horpa}\textsuperscript{38}. They settled in the Guge and Ngari area, where they became part of the post-Yarlung Zhangzhung cultural complex. Vitali (1996) dates this event to the period between the demise of the Yarlung Empire and the founding of the \textit{Guge} and \textit{Ngari} Korsum kingdom by \textit{Nyima Gön} in the early tenth century CE.

The Neolithic cultures that arrived in western Tibet and Kashmir by 2500 BCE and preceded the Zhangzhung cultural complex starting in 1200 BCE are generally believed to originate from northeastern Tibet. One might, on the other hand, consider Zhangzhung as an extension of the earlier phases of the Kharro culture established by 3900 BCE. The general assertion that the Kharro cultural complex was established by Bodic people might not be true, and as the manifestation of a uniquely indigenous Tibeto-Burman but non-Bodic cultural complex it could well be connected to the Zhangzhung culture. The genetic evidence, however, shows limited correspondences between the modern inhabitants of southeastern and far western Tibet, and the main defining genetic traits of the modern Tibetan populations of southeastern Tibet do not appear in the modern western Tibetan populations. Moreover, the complete absence of Neolithic cultures in the area in between Kharro and Zhangzhung until the emergence of the Chögong site around 1750 BCE is conspicuous if a westward migration along the Yarlung Tsangpo river between 3500 and 2500 BCE is proposed.

This still leaves several possibilities of the origin of some of the peoples of the southern Himalayan slopes in connection to the establishment, rise and decline of the Zhangzhung cultural complex of Western Tibet. Van Driem (2001c) and LaPolla (2001) linked the Tamangic and West Himalayish languages\textsuperscript{39} to migrations from this area back eastward over the Tibetan plateau, crossing the Himalayas and setting on the southern flanks (Van Driem 2001c). There have been several defining moments in history when migration from western Tibet into the southern Himalayan slopes would have been more plausible.

\textsuperscript{37} The text of the Marlungpa Namtar reads (Bellezza 2011) ‘The four mountains of the Kal [and] the 13,000 Mon, being people from the north, were expelled from their land by the Hor and arrived in the south. They settled in various places and built great castles. The Kelmon King Yukhe received empowerments and transmissions and commissioned a Bonkham Chen in golden letters’.

\textsuperscript{38} Horpa referred to different peoples in different periods of Tibetan history, but in general the Horpa are Altaic people from the north, be it Mongolian, Uighur or other Central Asian tribes.

\textsuperscript{39} Including Byangsi, Manchad and Bunun, Rangkas and Kinnauri.

After the defeat of the major Zhangzhung clans and the incorporation into the Yarlung Dynasty, the defeated clans, followers of Bon, might have fled cultural and religious intolerance. These clans could have been the ancestors of Tibeto-Burman, non-Bodic, non-Buddhist peoples of the southern Himalayan slopes. During the contact period with the Yarlung Empire, the Central Tibetan, Buddhist and Bodic influence on the Zhangzhung culture would have been great, and the language might have been transformed into a Bodish language with non-Bodish features. The descendants of the Kal and Mon tribes were forced to relocate themselves in the 8th century CE, during the period of extensive population displacement on the Tibetan plateau after the degradation of the Tibetan Yarlung Empire. Whereas some later appeared in the western part of Upper Tibet, others might have dispersed onto the southern slopes of the Himalayan range.

The few examples of Zhangzhung that Van Driem (2001c) presented show similarities not just with the Tamangic but also with the East Bodish languages. Of particular interest are what he calls the ‘....[use of] the Tibetan script to represent polysyllabic words and words containing clusters alien to Tibetan, e.g. rhyelsa, rhyelse, ryung, mkyus, rhyasang, khlangga’ (2001c:42). There are prominent parallels with the ubiquitous /hr/ cluster in Dakpa, as well as the /khl/ cluster occurring in the Tamangic languages and East Bodish alike. When comparing the Dakpa data in Chapter 10 with the Tamang data in Mazaudon (2003), some interesting comparisons arise. The higher simple consonant inventory of Dakpa, 33 compared to 19 in Tamang, seems to indicate a simplification of initial consonant clusters, with Tamang preserving a total of 39 permitted clusters compared to 19 clusters in Dakpa. This is still much higher than most other Bodish languages. The final consonants are similar for both languages, and whilst both languages have ten distinctive monophthong vowels, Tamang has a much higher number of diphthong vowels than Dakpa, namely 18 and six respectively. Whereas Bhutan Dakpa only makes a high versus low register tone distinction on initial syllables, Tamang has four tones. Other typological characteristics of the languages are also similar, such as basic SOV word order, ergative case marking and an exclusively suffixing morphology.

Kraaijenbrink and colleagues (2004, 2006, 2007, 2009) placed several populations in Nepal under the Tamangic group\(^40\) of the Bodic subgroup of Tibeto-Burman. According to

\(^{40}\) This coherent subgroup of languages closely related to Tibetan and the Bodish languages is called Tamang-Gurung-Thakali by DeLancey (2003: 255) and Tamang-Gurung-Thakali-Manang by Mazaudon (2003:291).
them, the Tamangic group includes, for example, the Tamang, Chantyal, Gurung, Thakali and Ghale people of Nepal. There are some phonological and grammatical descriptions of several of the dialects of Tamang, for example, Taylor (1973), Everitt (1973) and Mazaudon (1973, 1978, 2003). Gurung was described by, for example, Glover (1974). The Chantyal language was described by Noonan (2003:315).

Local sources quoted in Chemjong (1967) popularly recount myths in which the people of the Tamangic group and the Lepcha of Sikkim formed part of the 7th century army of the Tibetan king Songtsen Gampo that attempted to extend the Tibetan Yarlung Empire till the Indian plains. Popular lore holds that the ethnonym Tamang is derived from Tibetan མི་རྩལ་ ‘horse army’. The Tamang are said to be the descendants of the Dong and Se clans, with the former more commonly linked to the Qiang and the latter to Zhangzhung. The Tibetans of the areas bordering Nepal call the Tibeto-Burman people of Nepal བོད་ ‘people from the lower forested valleys and ravines’ and not ཨི་ ‘Nepalese’. The Gurung call themselves Tamu or Tamme and their language Tamukwi (Ragsdale 1990). As seen earlier, the Gurung commonly derive their ancestry from the Minyak or Gyalrong people of eastern Tibet. Whereas the Gurung came under Khâs control relatively early, the Tamang were taken over at a later moment in time as a result of which they managed to retain a more distinct Tibetan identity. The Thakali, living along one of the major trade routes, sought commercial dominance by giving up their Tibetan identity and adopting the Indo-Aryan identity much more vigorously (Ragsdale 1990).

Tamang paternal DNA characteristically lacks the YAP-insertion characteristic of Tibetan populations, which has had Gayden and colleagues (2009) to believe that the peopling of the southern Himalayan slopes took place by Baric speaking peoples from East Asia through the Tibetan plateau into Nepal and Northeast India as earlier proposed by Su and colleagues (2000). But the YAP-insertion is generally believed to have taken place in Qinghai perhaps 5000 years ago (Qian et al. 2000, Su et al. 1999, 2000). If the forefathers of the Zhangzhung people departed to western Tibet before that, which is very likely since they arrived in western Tibet around 4700 years ago, the YAP-insertion would lack in the Zhangzhung people and their descendants, including the Tamang. The prevalence of the YAP-insertion of the Tibetan populations of western Tibet could very well have been the result of prolonged admixture from Central Tibetans and Central Asians.

41 According to Olschak (1979:51), the Tibetans actually send an army to obtain relics of the Buddha from Bodh Gaya and in 648 to avenge the murder of a Chinese envoy mission. The army consisted of 12,000 mounted troops from Tibet and another 7000 from Nepal and they conquered King Arjuna’s capital at Harihati in Nihar.
2.9. MIGRATION ALONG THE SOUTHERN HIMALAYAN SLOPES.

Around 4,500 to 5,000 years ago, the first of a series of successive waves of Proto-Tibeto-Burman speakers moved south into the Yunnan-Burma border area and from there westwards into the Indian subcontinent as far west as central Nepal (Alkchin 1982, Ross 1990, Su et al. 1999, 2000:1718 and Basu et al. 2003). Van Driem (2001a, 2003a,b) suggested that ancient Tibeto-Burman speaking populations could have entered the southern Himalayas already by 8,000 BCE. There, they established the Indian Eastern Neolithic culture. Cordeaux and colleagues (2003, 2004) dated the main moment of colonisation at 4,200 years ago, followed by a strong demographic expansion around 1,400 years ago.

Several groups are thought to have settled the southern Himalayan slopes via this route. They have been distinguished based on linguistic analysis, although linguists themselves greatly differ on the exact grouping and subgrouping. A few of them will be shortly mentioned here. The speakers of the Bodo-Garo-Kachāri, Konyak-Naga-Jingpho and Tani languages are often grouped under the Baric speakers. Particular attention here will be given to the Tani and the Bodo-Garo-Kachāri subgroups. The genetic affiliation between northeast Indian tribes, including the Bodo-Garo-Kachāri and the Tani, and East Asians was earlier shown through mtDNA evidence (Cordeaux et al. 2003, Chandrasekar et al. 2009) and Y chromosome evidence (Su et al. 2000). The Kirāntī, Magaric, Dura and Dhimal of Nepal are the Tibeto-Burman subgroups that have settled farthest west (Kraaijenbrink et al. 2004, 2006, 2007, 2009), excluding those Bodic groups that entered the southern Himalayan slopes from the Tibetan plateau.

The area we earlier defined as Monyul, is located to the east of the Kirāntī speakers, to the west of the Tani speakers, and to the north of the Bodo-Garo-Kachāri speakers. Unfortunately, till date this area has remained one of the blanks in the ancient history of Asia. Archaeological, genetic and linguistic research has been limited. Hopefully, the genetic studies by Kraaijenbrink and colleagues and the grammatical descriptions of a few language isolates in Bhutan by Van Driem will shed some light on the migration history of the people of this area.

---

42 This westward movement of human populations all along the hills and mountains of the eastern Himalayas has been mirrored by a westward faunal penetration of characteristic species such as the red panda *Ailurus fulgens* and the takin *Budorcas taxicolor*.

43 Among the Baric languages, Shafer (1955) included several Naga languages. Burling calls the Baric languages the Sal languages which include Naga languages such as Wancho, Tangsa, Nocte and Konyak (1983:4) and Van Driem’s (2001b:468-500) Brahmaputran or Sal languages include the Konyak, Jingpho and Dhimal languages.
2.9.1. **The Kirāṇtī and Magar of Nepal.**

Van Driem (1992) devoted a paper to his search of Mahākirāṇtī in which he argued that the Newar, Barāṃ, Thangmi, Limbu and the Rai people of Nepal are the descendants of the Kirāṇa tribes and collectively called them Kirāṇtī. This grouping was also followed by Kraaijenbrink and colleagues (2004, 2006, 2007, 2009). The Kirāṇa tribes were already mentioned in the earliest Hindu sources. These Kirāṇa might represent the indigenous population of the area. The official origin stories of many of the Tibeto-Burman people of Nepāl have been deeply affected by the Indo-Aryan Khās Nepāl conquest of the area. In one way or the other, the non-Hindu Tibeto-Burman people were made to fit in with the mainstream Hindu Indo-Aryan society that conquered the previously independent kingdoms and principalities. The Tibeto-Burman people, in this view, are usually seen as descendants of high-caste Hindus who submitted to the temptations of alcohol and beef consumption and thus got demoted and expelled from the Hindu caste system. Grierson (1967) and Chemjong (1967) both give accounts of how the traditional written dynastic chronologies of the Limbu people were destroyed by the officials of the Shah kings in the 19th century. The same appears to have happened earlier in the 16th century to the Gurung chronicles. Similarly to the Kirāṇī of Nepal, the Rājis or Rawal of Askot in Kumaon, India speak a pronominalized Tibeto-Burman language and the might be a relict population of the early Kirāṇa settlers who were largely absorbed by later Indo-Aryan Khāsiya migrants (Krishan 2003).

Because both the Newar and the Limbu have a script, considerable written evidence exists about their origin and settlement history. The Kirāṇa had a kingdom in central Nepal and after 580 BCE an independent kingdom was established in eastern Nepal as well. The central Nepal Kirāṇa became the Newar, who throughout the centuries had considerable genetic and cultural admixture from later Indo-Aryan settlers from the south as well as contributions from the Tibetan plateau. The extent of Hindu Indo-Aryan influence has been most prominent among the Newar due to their geographic location in the Kathmandu valley, traditionally the centre of authority in Nepal. LaPolla (2003:29) placed the origin of the Newar people to the north, on the Tibetan plateau. According to Gayden and colleagues (2007), Newar paternal DNA only has Central Asian and Indian contributions. Newar maternal DNA will probably show a different picture, with a much higher South Asian and East Asian contribution.

The Limbu have similarly had considerable genetic and cultural admixture from various sources. The Limbu call themselves Yakthungba or Yakthumba, said to mean ‘yak herders’ and implying an origin on the plateau. The Limbu and Rai oral traditions state that
the original brothers from whom they descend entered the hills from the Tarāi in the south. They had arrived there from Yunnan, following the Brahmaputra river, and are therefore called the *Yunan Gotra* or ‘Yunnan clans’⁴⁴. These clans are thought to be related to the Bodo, Garo and Mikir people of Assam and the Koch people in Bengal. Curiously, the Koch people of West Bengal generally believe their closest relatives to be the Lepchas of Sikkim. But other authors claim the origin of the Kirānti people on the Tibetan plateau, from where they are thought to have travelled down the Arun, Olangchung and other river valleys into their present homeland (see, for example, Chemjong 1968, Caplan 1991 and Poffenberger 1980:31). The Limbu clans that arrived from Tibet later are called the *Lasa Gotra* ‘Lhasa clans’. All of the hundreds of exogamous Limbu clans of Nepal are placed in one of these clans, but the *Tsong*, the Limbu clans of Sikkim, all claim descent from Tibet. Further admixture appears to have taken place by Shan migrants from Burma in the 6th century (Chemjong 1968).

The Magar people of Nepal are usually divided in the Magar proper consisting of the Rana, Thapa and Ale clans, and the northern Magar, properly referred to as Kham, made up of the Budha, Pun, Gharti and Rekha clans. Watters (2002) earlier reported that Kham vocabulary shares 56-59% with Proto-Tibeto-Burman and 33-44% with Magar and Chepang. Furthermore, Kham shares 10-26% of basic vocabulary with the languages of the Gurung-Thakali-Tamang cluster, 12-15% with Tibetan, and 3-9% with the Kirānti languages Khaling and Sunwar. Although this, as well as the presence of a tone system, would suggest closer links between the Magar and the Bodic languages and thus a shared origin on the Tibetan plateau, the morphology and verbal paradigms of the Kham language, including the archaic set of person agreement forms, is more reminiscent of the Kirānti languages. Watters, therefore, suggests that the Kham-Magar and Vayu-Chepang languages form a link between the Kirānti and the Bodic languages. This assertion could well be confirmed or refuted by genetic evidence, which might show close maternal links with the Kirānti people to the east and close paternal links with the Bodic people to the north.

⁴⁴ Kibley (1903), on the contrary, reported five Limbu ‘Lhasa Gotra’ and five ‘Kāsi Gotra’ who were believed to have come from Benāres in India.
2.9.2. The Bodo-Garo-Kachāri of the Brahmaputran Plains.

The forebears of the present day Bodo-Garo-Kachāri speakers are thought to have left the Yunnan-Burma border area and entered the northeast of the Indian subcontinent around 2,600 years ago (Su et al. 1999). Whereas their Y-chromosome haplogroups are largely East Asian specific (Cordeaux et al. 2003) and homogenous, mtDNA lineages show a much more varied ancestry, with Austroasiatic contributions. On the basis of the genetic evidence, the Tibeto-Burman forbears of the Bodo-Garo-Kachāri speakers are usually considered to have partially replaced and partially mixed with the indigenous Austroasiatic people (e.g. Sahoo et al. 2006), although other authors attribute their shared mtDNA lineages to a shared origin in southern China (Basu et al. 2003).

The Bodo-Garo-Kachāri languages are often considered to have been the lingua franca of the Brahmaputran plains and these people were the rulers of the Kāmarūpan, Kachāri, Kamātapur kingdoms of Assam between the 4th and 12th centuries CE (Burling 2003:178, Burling 2007, Jacquesson 2009). According to Burling (2007), the simplicity of the grammar of the languages of this group vis-à-vis other related Tibeto-Burman languages indicates that the language structure was influenced by adult learners who adopted the language at the cost of their mother language. Like the other languages of the group, Bodo has only 16 consonant phonemes, more initial consonant clusters and diphthongs and a noted absence of unvoiced, unaspirated plosives and alveolo-palatal affricates. Bodo makes a high versus low tonal onset distinction, and is morphologically complex.

In the 7th century, the King of Kāmarūpa sent presents to King Songtsen Gampo of Tibet for having defeated his enemy, King Arjuna of Hirahati. Olschak (1979:89), basing herself on various sources, attributed a possible dual origin of tantric Buddhism as practised in the Himalaya in both Uddiyāna in the northwest of the subcontinent and in Kāmarūpa in the northeast. The hill people of Monyul held some authority over the Bodo and Kachāri people between the 10th and the 20th century, and an early distinction was already made between the Monpa, the Tsangmi, the Katsara and the Lopa. In various historic sources, such as

45 Also called the Bodo-Garo group (Jacquesson 2009) or Bodo-Garo-Koch group (Thurgood and LaPolla 2003:11, among others), The group generally includes languages such as Bodo, Kokborok or Tripuri, Garo, Rabha, Dimasa, Tiwa or Lalung, Koch, Kachāri and Deuri.
46 The Bodo language has around 1,350,000 speakers, status as a scheduled language and medium of instruction in Assam up to class X, a Roman and Devanagari orthography, and is the official language of Kokrajhar district and Udalguri sub-division since 1984.
47 Ref. footnote 41.
48 Probably the indigenous inhabitants of Monyul or the East Bodish speakers.

Gait (1926) mention is made that the indigenous people of Bhutan, their language and their rulers are related to the Khen dynasty of the Kamatapur kingdom and the Koch people. From the 13th century onwards, first Ahom, a Tai language, and later Assamese and Bengali, Indo-European languages, came to linguistically dominate the area.

The position of the 2 million Garo people of the Meghalaya, West Bengal, Assam and Bangladesh is rather unique. The Garo call themselves achik mande ‘hill people’. Based on oral Garo origin myths, their forefathers came from Tibet around 400 BCE led by a certain Jappa Jalimpa. When populations expanded and competition increased, certain groups then split to move higher into the hills of the Meghalaya, where they mixed with the local Austroasiatic population to form the present-day Garo people. This is consistent with the genetic evidence, which relates them more closely to the Austroasiatic Khasi peoples (Mohan et al. 2007, Krithika et al. 2009).

2.9.3. The Tani People of Northeast India: Adi and Mishmi.

The Tani inhabit a huge dialect continuum including East Kameng, Kurung Kumey, Papumpare, Upper and Lower Subansiri, West, East and Upper Siang districts of Arunachal Pradesh. They are traditionally known to the Tibetans as Lopa and are the most numerous language group in Arunachal. Several attempts have been made to classify these languages into subgroups (e.g. Burling 2003: 180-181). Jacquesson (2009) describes the Tani as sparse groups linked to one another culturally and linguistically in a loose but efficient way with very low population densities and small and mobile villages. Although there are numerous Tani origin myths, some of the more tangible ones place their ancestral land around the Salween and Mekong river basin from where they migrated to the Tibetan plateau through the Sila Ego Sila pass. They then reached the Ane Siang river52 on the Tibetan plateau, where they remained for a few hundred years (Tabi 2006, Lego 2005 in Krithika 2009, Nyori 1999 and Perme 1986).

49 Or the Tshangla speakers.
50 The speakers of the Bodo–Kachari languages.
51 Ref. paragraph 5.6.
52 Called Yarlung Tsangpo in Tibetan.
According to Adi origin legends, internecine conflict, invading Bodic migrants and a great flood called Pumu\textsuperscript{53} pushed the Adi peoples further south across the Himalayas, finally settling along the banks of the Siang river and the north bank of the Brahmaputra river in most of Arunachal Pradesh (Nyori 1999 and Perme 1986). This event is thought to have taken place between the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 7\textsuperscript{th} century CE (Tabi 2006, Lego 2005 in Krithika 2009). The related Idu\textsuperscript{54} and Digaru\textsuperscript{55} Mishmi\textsuperscript{56} descended along the Dibang river and settled in Upper and Lower Dibang and Lohit districts. The linguistically unrelated Miju Mishmi\textsuperscript{57} of Anjaw district place their origin directly to the east of their present area of distribution in the northern part of Burma. There is a Tibetan version of the Adi and Mishmi origin story in which a so-called mu-cord theme and a successional descend to earth is used to explain the various Lopa tribes that inhabit Pemakō (\textsuperscript{\textcopyright}2011: 66-68).

Kang and colleagues (2010:276) concluded that the deviation of the Adi and Mishmi populations from other East Asian and Tibetan populations was most probably the result of genetic drift as a result of slow population increase and even population decrease due to the difficult living conditions. Their research (2010:275) showed that whereas all the Adi groups are closely related, the Mishmi are genetically closer related to the Adi than to the Tibetans, probably as a result of founder effect, isolation and inbreeding (Kang et al. 2010:275). Krithika and colleagues (2009) report that linguistically, genetically and culturally the 12 Adi tribes can be divided in two broad groups, the Minyong, Padam, Shimong, Milang, Pasi, Panggi and Komkar and the Gallong, Ramo, Bokar\textsuperscript{58}, Pailobo and Bori. These tribes have developed as a result of internecine wars resulting in splitting of groups and migration (Tabi 2006 and Lego 2005 in Krithika et al. 2009). Limited genetic differentiation among Adi groups suggests that formation of the various Adi sub-groups was a relatively recent phenomenon. Qin and colleagues (2010:560) concluded that Y chromosome haplogroup O3a3c-M134 made up 100\% of the Adi populations whereas Tibetan and Pemakō Tshangla populations retained a high proportion of haplogroup D-YAP+ (Su et al. 2000; Cordeaux et al. 2004), suggesting that the ancestors of the Adi settled the southeastern part of the Tibetan plateau before the admixture and YAP insertion from Central Asia.

\textsuperscript{53} Adi legend has it that only the mythical mithun Polo Sobo managed to drain the flood by releasing the water through the Nyukang river at Dembi Ego pass (Nyori 1999 and Perme 1986).
\textsuperscript{54} Called Yidu Luoba in China or Chulikata Mishmi in India.
\textsuperscript{55} Called Darang Deng in China or Taraon in India.
\textsuperscript{56} Or Deng in Chinese.
\textsuperscript{57} Called Kaman Deng in China or Kamaon in India.
\textsuperscript{58} Called Boga’er Luoba by the Chinese.

2.10. THE PROTO-BODIC PEOPLE OF THE TIBETAN PLATEAU AND THEIR DESCENDANTS.

Whereas some groups of Tibeto-Burmans moved south into the Héngduàn mountain range and adjoining regions and other groups migrated further along the southern slopes westward, the Proto-Bodic people migrated from the Upper Yellow River basin through the so-called Hexi corridor to the northern fringes of the Tibetan plateau around 6,000 years ago (Su et al. 1999, 2000). One of the oldest archaeological sites is Dongshuishan in Qinghai, and evidence of several species of animals and crops, including dog, sheep, wheat, barley and rye, dates back to 4,500 to 5,000 years ago (Flad et al. 2007:172). During their stay in Qinghai the Proto-Bodic people received a significant paternal genetic contribution from Central Asia or Siberia as evidenced by the high frequency of Y Alu (YAP) insertion (Qian et al. 2000, Su et al. 1999, 2000).

From Qinghai the Proto-Bodic people migrated through the valleys of the Héngduàn mountain range, reaching the southeast of the Tibetan plateau. We can find several sites around the Zachu river, including Kharro ‘remains of a castle’ which has several levels of occupation dated between 5900 and 4145 years ago and Ngülda ‘silver arrow’ dated to around 4150 years ago (Aldenderfer and Zhang 2007, Aldenderfer 2011:145). The sites include domestic residences and storage rooms entered by ladders, decorated ceramics, chipped stone tools, ground stone and polished tools, bone tools, decorative objects, evidence of cultivated foxtail millet and wild animal and domesticated pig remains (Flad et al. 2007). Van Driem (2001a:431) earlier argued that the Kharro site is closely related to the Banshan and Machang phases of the Mājāyào culture, lasting from 2200 to 1900 and 1900 to 1700 BCE respectively. Aldenderfer and Zhang (2004:32-33) and Aldenderfer (2011:146) propose Kharro as an indigenous Tibetan development, in which the indigenous people of Kharro adopted the millet cultivation and pig rearing through cultural contact with the Mājāyào people.

Peng and colleagues (2011), Su and colleagues (2000) and Gayden and colleagues (2007) describe a subsequent Neolithic expansion in westward direction onto the plateau. This westward spread is thought to have brought the ancestors of the speakers of the Bodic

---

59 In general, admixture of South Asian and Central Asian/western Eurasian genes in the populations of the Tibetan plateau is very small (Qin et al. 2010, Wang et al. 2011), providing evidence for long time isolation and the Himalayas as a directional barrier to gene flow (Gayden et al. 2007).

60 Better known as the Mekong river.

61 Aldenderfer (2011) has Kharub, in pīnyīn Kāruò.

62 In Chinese Xiaenda.
languages of the Himalayas (see, for example, Gayden et al. 2007, Van Driem 2001a: 77-84, 408-433, 2003b, LaPolla 2001). The Bodic languages not only include the various Tibetan languages, such as Central Tibetan, Tsang Tibetan, Kham Tibetan, Amdo Tibetan and Tö Tibetan, but also various western Tibetan and Ladakhi languages as well as Sherpa of Nepal, Dränjong of Sikkim and Dzongkha, Chocangacakha and Brokke of Bhutan.

In Central Tibet, inhabitation of the Chögong site near Lhasa has been dated between 3750 and 3150 years ago and includes tombs, fine ceramics, grinding stones, bone tools and evidence of wild animal and domesticated dog, pigs, sheep and perhaps yak remains (Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004: 31-32). Flad and colleagues (2007:172) report of oats and barley remains from the nearby Thranggo site which also contains ceramics similar to Chögong. Aldenderfer (2011:146), instead of considering these sites as phased extensions of the Neolithic culture brought by migrants from the Qinghai region, considers them as indigenous developments including the domestication of yak and barley. Later finds of bronze fragments might also indicate that by the time of the Chögong culture, the plateau population had already moved from the Neolithic into the Bronze Age.

A study conducted by Meyer and colleagues (2009) found charcoal and pollen evidence of human incursions, possibly shifting cultivation and overgrazing and trampling by domesticated animals, into the highlands of Lunana in northwestern Bhutan dating back to around 4750 BCE. Archaeological evidence strikingly similar to that of Kharro, dating to around 3000 BCE, has been unearthed in the Jangu area of Northern Sikkim (Sharma, 1981), probably representing a related culture (Van Driem 2001a: 430). Van Driem argued that Tibeto-Burman migrations from Kharro to Sikkim brought the Bodic languages to the Himalayas. Meyer and colleagues (2009) hypothesised that as glaciers expanded between 4750 and 2750 BCE, human inhabitation became impossible, and that agro-pastoralist tribes from the Tibetan plateau returned to the area around 2550 BCE, with barley grown in shifting cultivation systems. If this hypothesis is true, then high-altitude inhabitation as well as agriculture and animal husbandry in northwestern Bhutan would be contemporary to that of Kharro and Chögong.

Earlier, Aris (1979: xvii) and Savada and colleagues (1993) also suggested that evidence in the form of stone implements, megaliths and stone pillars found at several places...
in Bhutan points to inhabitation from at least 2000 to 1500 BCE onwards. Examples are the megaliths found outside the Kenchosum, Ura Sumphrang66 (see plate XX) and Jakar temples and on the Ura Shaitang pass67 in Bumthang68 as well as the ‘oath-stone pillar’ at Nabi in Korpu geok in Mangdelung, Trongsa69. These megaliths have their counterparts all over the Himalayas and can be found in all shapes, sizes and contexts (Macdonald 2003, Belleza 2010, Aldenderfer and Zhang 2004: 43). Neolithic stone implements, still regularly found in various parts of the country, are generally called ‘iron sky axes’70.

2.10.1. THE PEOPLE OF THE KONGPO REGION.

The Kongpo region of southeastern Tibet includes the ancient Nyangpo kingdom. In the fourth or first century BCE (Norbu 1995a:220) the first Tibetan king, Nyathri Tsenpo, is believed to have descended from heaven in Kongpo71 along the mu-cords72, as did the kings after him. After their sons took over power, the kings would return to heaven along the same mu-cord. The mu-cords became the general theme of stories in which the first humans descended from heaven to the Tibetan plateau. This theme was adapted by many people on the southern slopes of the Himalayas, in which the mu-cords were used to descent from the Tibetan plateau. The mu-cords are, for example, used to explain the origin of the subject clans of Monyul. The Gyelrik (ff. 45b in Aris 1986:61) questions whether

66 This temple is attributed to Gyalwa Lhanangpa Zidipel (1161-1224). Viz. Fig. 2.1.
67 This stele could no longer be found during a visit in 2011.
68 On the origin and significance of the name Bumthang and its history, see Tshering (2003:127). The same author also provides etymological and historical details of the four geoks of Bumthang (2003: 131-134).
69 Ref. paragraph 4.2.
70 They are believed to be the iron weapons of the gods and demi-gods that appeared like meteorites from the sky and are usually kept in a ‘prosperity vase’ containing valuable items meant to accumulate and increase a household’s wealth and prosperity. Viz. Fig. 2.2.
71 Some authors maintain that he was born in Powo and that his mother’s name was Motsun (Karmay 1998:290,294, Norbu 1995:16).
72 Also spelled སྙིན་པར. Local variations exist, including mu-ladders and phya-cords which can be made of plantains, gold, silver and other materials. Different types of mu-cords are used to explain the origin of the ancestors of either different ethnic groups or different clans within an ethnic group.
‘as for the various stories recounted by some people, could the most popular oral version in which the origin lies in a descent to the land of the humans after grasping the divine mu-ladders and the gold and silver phya-cords be a legend based on the treasure texts of Bon?’ The Hruso origin story (Elwin 1993:139) has a similar story of successive descent of the Hruso, Monpa and Assamese people from the Tibetan plateau. Xie (2001: 356-359) analysed the mu-cords as a connection between the mountain gods and the heavenly gods in the sky and provided interesting cognates between Tibetan སི གནས། གཏ། གནས།. Dünhuáng mu, Kachin mu ‘heaven, thunder, lightning’, Nu mu ‘heaven’, to which could be added perhaps Tshangla mung ‘thunder’. The assumption that the mu-cord theme originated among the Bodic Tibeto-Burman people that settled the Tibetan plateau from the northeast primarily stems from the historically dominant position of the Tibetan empire vis-à-vis the tribes in its periphery. But perhaps, the recurring mu-theme is an extremely ancient theme that could be traced back to an early Neolithic culture in southeastern Tibet.

The Tibetan kings continued to descent to earth and ascent back to heaven along the mu-cords until the 7th king, སྲིགུམ་ཐེ་ཤེལ། Drigum Tsenpo. Drigum Tsenpo is believed to have lived in Kongpo in the 5th century CE. He became possessed by a demon and ordered his minister སྲིགུམ་ཐེ་ཤེལ། Longam Tazi73 to fight him. Longam killed the king and cut his mu-cord. The defeat of King Drigum Tsenpo by his servant Longam perhaps stands for the defeat of the Kongpo kingdom by another clan or tribe. Drigum Tsenpo was buried by his three sons གྲེང་། ལྡེང་། སྣྲེང་། Byakhri, Nyakhri and Shakhri74 on སྐྱིད་། Gyangtho mountain. Since that time, all Tibetan kings were considered mortals and therefore buried after death. Longam takes over power and dethrones the queen, and Drigum Tsenpo’s sons flee. The places they take refuge differ per source, although Sørensen (1994:141-144) maintains that Shakhri became the king of Kongpo called the གོང་ཁོབ་། Kong Karpo and Nyakhri settles in Nyangpo. Byakhri moves to གནར། Kanam in Powo and from there to Yarlung, where he becomes known as king གོང་ཁོབ་། Ode Gungyel, the mythical son of the heavenly god གོང་ཁོབ། Pude Gungyel75 (Sørensen 1994:141-144, Stein 1972:49, Dudjom Rinpoche 1991 Section 1:972, Section 2:99)76. Ultimately, the mortal kings of the

---

73 Some say that Longam was the king’s servant or stable master. Lazcano (2005) has སྒྲིགུམ་ཐེ།.
74 Some sources call them གྲེང་།, ལྡེང་། and སྣྲེང་།.
75 According to Sørensen (1994:146-147), it was during Pude Gungyel’s time that iron, copper and silver ore were first melted with charcoal to make iron, copper and silver from which the first agricultural implements were made, which made intensification of agriculture possible.
76 In later sources it, was Shakhri who took on the role of the progenitor of the Yarlung dynasty (Haarh 2003).

Yarlung Dynasty claimed their provenance from the Kongpo region. Although in the 6th century Kongpo was incorporated in the Yarlung Empire, Kongpo was accredited a prominent place during the 5th to 9th centuries CE out of respect for these shared ancestral origins (Karmay 1998:213). Only the prince of Kongpo could levy taxes on the people (Hoffman 2003:11), and the principality paid in-kind taxes of barley, grapes and rice to the Yarlung Emperor (Lazcano 2005:43). After the collapse of the Yarlung Empire, Kongpo regained full independent status until it was once again incorporated into the Central Tibetan theocracy in a later century. The culture and language of Kongpo were heavily influenced by the dominant Central Tibetan culture and language, but even till date a unique dress-style and a prominence of the Bon religion continue to distinguish the people of Kongpo.

Kongpo was the first region from where the remarkable tower constructions, later found in areas of eastern Tibet as well, were reported (e.g. Amundsen (2001:9), according to whom the towers were built as defences against the Monpa). Carbon-dating of wood fragments from these दुङ्गौ ‘demon house’77, अंग्रेज ‘castle’ or एक्स ‘fortress-castle’ towers shows that the oldest tower there was built with wood dating between 780 and 1050 CE and the most recent towers were built with wood dating between 1360 and 1390 CE (Darragon 2010). Although various theories regarding to their origin exist, they do not appear to have been built for defensive purposes. The Kongpo towers are the oldest ones, and combined with their use of small stones and more mortar, their complex cruciform shape and lesser height it appears that the tower architecture originated in the Kongpo area, from where it spread to the Qiang, Minyak and Gyalrong areas.

The traditional importance accorded to the southeastern Kongpo and Powo regions has been largely neglected as a result of the pre-eminence of the later Central Tibetan Yarlung Empire. The genetic evidence presented before, however, also points to an ancient and continued human population in the warmer, wetter and lower valleys of these regions of the Tibetan plateau. The probable origin of metalworking and subsequent intensification of agriculture from this area would suggest that, in tandem with the shift of authority, the Iron Age on the plateau might have spread from Kongpo to the Yarlung valley.

As will be argued later in Chapter 15, the cultural similarities, particularly in dress, between the people of Kongpo and the speakers of the East Bodish languages in Monyul might be an indication of a common origin from a cultural complex in southeastern Tibet. The East Bodish languages might represent the ancient tongue of the Kongpo region, where

77 Referring to their construction by the demon army of दुङ्गौ Dù Achum Gyelpo, the enemy of the legendary hero Ling Gesar.
the language in later centuries largely assimilated to the dominant Central Tibetan language. The speakers of East Bodish could have entered the southern Himalayan foothills, which are geographically not far away, between the 5th and 6th centuries. As we will see in the next two chapters, scattered populations of a people called Monpa by the later arrivals from central Tibet already inhabited the Monyul region in the 7th and 8th century.

2.10.2. THE CENTRAL TIBETANS AND THEIR DESCENDANTS.

The first permanent inhabitation of the Central Tibetan plateau is generally thought to have been in the valley of the Yarlung Tsangpo river and its main tributaries, such as the Lhasa and Chonggye rivers. This first inhabitation could be dated between 1750 and 1150 BCE. Many generations had past when in the 5th century CE Drigum Tsenpo’s son Byakhri, who when crowned became known as Byakhri Tsenpo, settled in Yarlung. Twenty-two generations later the 32nd king Namri Songtsen (570-629), also known as Namri Löntsen, conquered all the clans of the Yarlung, Chonggye and Lhasa regions and became the king of the unified Central Tibetan Yarlung empire. Under the rule of his son king Songtsen Gampo (604-650, imp. 627-649 CE) many other clans, tribes and kingdoms were annexed and conquered, such as the northeastern kingdoms of Sumpa in 627 and Azha in 636 and the western kingdom of Zhangzhung between 634 and 645. Diplomatic, marital, economic and religious relations were established with the various Central Asian kingdoms and principalities to the north and west, to the Chinese to the east, and the Indian subcontinent to the south. It is also during this time that the vernacular language of the Yarlung region was codified in what is now known as the liturgical, Classical or Old Tibetan language reflected in the Tibetan script. Although the spoken language changed during the centuries, the written language remained relatively constant.

The rise of the Yarlung dynasty at the expense of local and regional clans as well as the kingdoms on the eastern and western edges of the Tibetan plateau will have resulted in the migration of people from Central Tibet in various directions, last but not least across the Himalayan mountain range onto the southern Himalayan slopes. The exact genetic and linguistic affiliation of these people and the identification with present-day populations remains problematic to establish. Whereas all are probably Tibeto-Burman, not all necessarily have to be Bodic speakers. The various nomadic tribes and clans of the Tibetan

plateau and the Changthang, the Tibeto-Burman Bon followers of Zhangzhung, the Qiangic tribes and clans of Sumpa, Azha, Minyak and their descendants from Gyalrong, Amdo and Kham, the millet-cultivating Tibeto-Burman people from Kharro, the various Yarlung clans, the Monpa clans from the Changthang and western Tibet, the people of Kongpo and Powo: all these could have provided the genetic and linguistic forefathers of some of the people of the southern Himalayas.

2.11. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.

Most of the people of the southern Himalayas slopes, foothills and the Brahmaputran plains from Ladakh in the west to Arunachal in the east attribute at least part of their origin to the Tibetan plateau. This is the result of a conscious identification with the powerful Tibetan Empire and the Buddhist religion brought by successive waves of immigrants who travelled through the high-altitude valleys into the southern Himalayan slopes. The Himalayan mountain range acted as a selective filter, because it is more likely that people physiologically and culturally adapted to higher altitudes could enter and inhabit valleys on lower altitudes than the other way round. There are some indications that ancient Sino-Tibetans settled the Tibetan plateau before the LGM, and retreated into the valleys of the southern Himalayas during the LGM.

In east-west direction, the area between the Himalayan mountains and the Bay of Bengal might have acted as a corridor, allowing for population movement from the Indian subcontinent into Southeast Asia, but also from East and Southeast Asia into the Indian subcontinent. There are numerous groups in the eastern Himalayas who assert that at least some of the forebears came from the Yunnan-Burma border area to the east. These ancestors either moved directly westward into Northeast India and beyond, or across the southern fringes of the Tibetan plateau. There might thus have been an ancient ancestral homeland in the Yunnan-Burma border area from where Mesolithic migrations took place not only into the Indian subcontinent, but also onto the Tibetan plateau.

The Monyul area now encompassed by Northeast India and Bhutan was a major corridor for different migrations streams and thus an area of intensive contact between people belonging to different ethnic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds ever since they first modern humans arrived there around 75,000 years ago. Like a patchwork quilt, layer after layer seems to have been stitched on top of the original foundation. Sometimes, the arrival of a new people might have annihilated most of the indigenous inhabitants, but they might have
survived in a few remote pockets right until the present. In other cases, the newcomers might have intermixed with the indigenous people, resulting in genetic admixture, but either one group might have completely adopted the language of the other group. Perhaps, the newcomers intermixed with the indigenous people, and at the same time their language became intricately interwoven with the substrate indigenous language. Again, in other cases, the later arrivals might have replaced or displaced the original inhabitants, resulting in a completely new genetic and linguistic picture. The migrants might have been a whole tribe with their own language, or just a few individuals of a tribe or clan. This would again have varying results genetically as well as linguistically. In general, however, language replacement is more common than population replacement. In the event of a migration of one group of people to an area already inhabited by another, rather than replacing the entire population by warfare of migration elsewhere, the indigenous population intermixes and adopts the language of the newcomers. Further research, particularly genetic and linguistic research, will hopefully assist in reconstructing the population history of the southern Himalayas.

Figure 2.1. The author next to the Doring in front of Sumphrang Lhakhang, Ura, Bumthang, Central Bhutan.

Figure 2.2. Four stone adzes from the author’s collection.
CHAPTER 3. GURU RINPOCHE AND THE INTRODUCTION OF BUDDHISM.

Buddhism, originating from India, was introduced to the Tibetan Plateau in the 7th century CE. From the plateau, it was introduced to the southern flanks of the Himalayas. On the plateau as well as on the southern Himalayan slopes, a synthesis took place with the original belief system, often called ʰ שלנו ʼBonʼ. The two hundred year period between 630 CE and 830 CE is in Tibetan Buddhist sources usually called the period of ʰ לטר ‘early diffusion’ of Buddhism.

Two temples still existing in Bhutan can be attributed to this period. They form part of the elaborate geomantic system of temples constructed on the Tibetan plateau and its adjoining regions, supposedly to suppress a giant ʰתתס ‘ogress’. Perhaps more practically, they were meant to facilitate the spread of Buddhism across this huge geographical area. The main progenitor of this scheme of ʰ ייונ ‘four great horn suppressing’, ʰ ייונ ‘four border taming’ and ʰ ייונ ‘four area beyond the border taming’ temples was the Yarlung king Songtsen Gampo. A more detailed description of this scheme can be found in Aris (1979: 12-33). The two temples in Bhutan, supposedly built on the ogress’ foot and knee respectively, are ʱ_footer3 ‘Paro Kyerchu’ and ʱ_footer4 ‘Bumthang Jampa’. These two ancient temples are strikingly similar both in their location as well as in their original exterior design, despite later additions. The temple of ʱ_footer5 ‘Kenchosum’ in Bumthang, also called ʱ_footer6 or ʱ_footer7, is another ancient temple dating from this period. Unfortunately this temple was largely destroyed by fire on 16th February 2010, but its main relics including two halves of a megalith and an 8th century AD ʱ_footer8 ‘votive bell’ were saved. This votive bell of Tibetan origin, one of the four existing bells of such kind, is important because it not only proclaimed the sound of the Buddhist religion, but also stands as an indisputable proof of the spread of Buddhism in the southern Himalayas. Other ancient temples in Bumthang include, according to Aris (1979: 39-40), the ʱ_footer9 and ʱ_footer10 temples and the ʱ_footer11 temples and the ʱ_footer12

1 Ref. Chapter 16.
2 This temple, the name of which is now usually spelled ʱ_footer13, can still be found in the western Bhutanese valley of Paro, although there have been many later renovations and additions.
3 This temple is located in the Bumthang valley in Central Bhutan and is the site of the annual ʱ_footer14 Jambe Lhakhang Drup festival.
4 Tsering (2003:130, 138) asserts that the temple of Tselung or Kenchosum was built by the Indian king ʱ_footer15 Utôn during Songtsen Gampo’s time.
5 Located in the present-day village of ʱ_footer16 Gamling in ʱ_footer17 Tang valley, viz. Fig. 3.1.
6 Also located in the Tang valley.

Zungnge Rinchen Genye temple\(^7\). Local lore\(^8\) holds it that the ‘black and white temples of Ha’ of Ha valley and the Pelnam temple in Paro valley in western Bhutan and the Lhagyala Gonpa in Morshing or Murshing, Kameng were also constructed in this period.

For the inhabitants of Monyul and later Bhutan, all these temples, the Kyichu and Jambe temples in particular, provide proof of their ancient contacts with Buddhism and their firm placement within the Tibetan sphere of influence. Despite this, it is also recognised that at the time of their construction, the area was part of the uncivilised, barbarian country known as Monyul. Crucial, therefore, in the spread of Buddhism were the activities by the Indian Saint Guru Rinpoche, also known as Guru Padmasambhava. He is said to have made several visits to the area between 737 and 747 CE. Evidence of his activities in the region abounds, physically in the form of pilgrimage sites attributed to him, but also in the form of two myths that prominently feature him.

3.1. The Story of Sindha Radza.

Guru Rinpoche’s first visit, usually dated at 737 or 738CE is believed to have been on invitation of Cakhar Gyelpo Sindha Radza, sometimes called king Sedarkha, to settle his dispute with the Indian King Nauche to the southeast. This story has not only been told and retold as part of the local folklore, but is also contained in a manuscript called the biography of king Sindha Radza’, summarised in Aris (1979:44-48) and translated in Olschak (1979:63-88). As his name ‘radza’, derived from ‘raja’ meaning ‘king’ in most Indian languages indicates, King Sindha originates from Serkya/Sakya in India where he is a prince until he is banished and becomes the king of Sindha elsewhere in India. Whilst there he is defeated by king Nauche, who was earlier converted to Buddhism by Guru Rinpoche\(^9\). King Sindha then flees to

\(^7\) In the present-day village of Zungnge in Chume valley. The Genyen temple is mentioned numerous times by Guru Rinpoche in the Sindhu Radza’s story. Tshering (2003: 130) agrees to the inclusion of at least the Anu and Genye temples in the scheme. He also (2003:134) states that the original name of the valley is Chumik, an abbreviation of the Chumik Nyangla Lhakhang in Nanggar (now Nanggar) village, established by the Tibetan aristocrat Nyangre Nyima Özer (1124-1192).

\(^8\) See for example Tshering (2003:130).

\(^9\) According to Tshering (2003:130, 139), King Nauche’s palace and army camp was located at Nangshephel, a village still existing in Chume valley. Although the army camp might have been here, the palace would not have been located north of the proposed boundary. The original manuscript (ff. 2a) states a population of King Nauche’s kingdom had a population of of 21,000 people.

Bumthang where he resides in the Cakhar Gome ‘iron castle without doors’ by some referred to as the ‘iron castle with thirteen stories’\textsuperscript{10}. King Sindha expands his kingdom and retains the Shiva cult he brought from India whilst adopting the local spirit worship. King Sindha’s son expands the kingdom even further, but is killed by king Nauche. In revenge, a war between the two kings ensues.

In several ways king Sindha enrages the local deities who steal away his life-force, which, unlike a person’s heart which is located in a person’s heart and lasts as long as his life, can exit the body and reside elsewhere, but will not reincarnate into the next life. To cure the king, his rival king Nauche’s teacher Guru Rinpoche is summoned, who takes king Sindha’s daughter as tantric consort and convinces the chief of the local deities to return the king’s life force, in the process leaving an imprint of his body in the rock\textsuperscript{11}. The king recovers and is converted to Buddhism. Guru Padmasambhava also mediates a peace between king Sindha and king Nauche, which is agreed in the place called Nabi and solemnised by the stone pillar there\textsuperscript{12}. According to the story this place was located on the border between India and Mon.

Much like the legend of Khyikha Rathö, the legend of King Sindhu is illustrated by historical place names still identifiable at present, but although the story is much more emulated on the national level, no people in the area claim direct or indirect descent from him.

\textbf{3.2. The Story of Khyikha Rathö.}

The second myth relating Guru Rinpoche to Central Bhutan concerns the Tibetan prince Khyikha Rathö. The myth forms part of the description of the beyul or ‘hidden valley’ of Khenpajong by Pema Lingpa and can be found as annotated transcription and translation in Aris (1979:63-69). The story is also told in a slightly different version on folio 16a-19. Concise descriptions of the beyul based on Pema Lingpa’s biography can be found in Dorje (n.d.: 73-103), Wangchuk (2004) and Wangchuk

\textsuperscript{10} See Tshering (2003:130). A mistaken identity with the legendary 13-storied castle that the great yogin Milarepa was ordered to build in Lhodrak by his master Marpa seems plausible. The ‘treasure revealer’ Dorje Lingpa (1347-1405) constructed the temple of Cakhar on the same site, besides constructing several other temples in the valley (Tshering 2003:139).

\textsuperscript{11} Around this hallowed cave in Bumthang valley one now finds the ‘body imprint’ or Kurje Dorji Tsekpai Lhakhang, commonly known as Kurje Lhakhang, viz. Fig. 3.2.

\textsuperscript{12} Ref. paragraph 2.10. It is interesting to read from ff. 14-14a of the original manuscript that the border between Sindhu Radza’s Mon kingdom in Bumthang and King Nauchc’s Indian kingdom was located here in Nabi, so high up in the mountains. There is, however, no reference to Nabi in the manuscript, and although a stone pillar can be found there, the connection to Sindhu Radza’s story might have been made only later on in history.

& Dorji (2007). Beyul, a term that will occur again later in this book when describing Pemakö, is a secluded, high-altitude valley where righteous people will find a safe haven in times of war, strife and disease. Others go even further in considering a beyul as a place where the perfect geographic conditions will offer religiously perfected people place to live a life leading to the highest attainable ideals. Beyul Khenpajong is located along the Khenpajong river in Lhüntsi dzongkhak. The valley can be reached over treacherous pathways by travelling either northeast from Tshampa or Thowadrak in Bumthang, by travelling northwest from Lhüntsi Dzong, or southwards from Drowolung in Tibet. According to Khyikha Rathö’s story, on the south-eastern border of Mon lies Indian Tsanglung and that at that time the Kuri valley and all the regions of Mon were the home of Indians and all their houses were made of bamboo and grass or wood.

Khenpajong was actually inhabited by Buddhist hermits till well into the second half of the 20th century and it is the birth place of the Buddhist master of the Nyingmapa School, Dzongsar Jamyang Khentse. In 1962 the Bhutanese administration evacuated all inhabitants due to border tensions with the Chinese. The guardian deities of the beyul are Zorarake and Nöjin Gomakha who rides a ‘yeti’. The beyul is now said to be closed again, with the ‘key’ located behind a waterfall near Kulha Gangri Mountain. This mountain used to be on the border between Gasa dzongkhak and China, but recently the whole area has been surrendered to the Chinese.

According to the biography of Pema Lingpa, Khyikha Rathö is the son of the 38th Yarlung king Songdetsen and queen Margyan. Songdetsen, who has deeply rooted Buddhist sympathies, initiates the construction of Samye monastery, facilitates the initiation of the first monks in monasteries, and wants to have the Buddhist scriptures translated from Sanskrit to Tibetan. To this end he sends Bairotsana to India, who studies the ‘great perfection’ tradition and translates many texts. On

---

13 In Chökhor Tö, the upper Chökhor valley.
14 In Tang valley.
15 The second of the three great religious kings of the Yarlung dynasty Thri Songde’utsen (imp. 755CE–797CE).
16 Historically the second wife of king Songdetsen Margyan or Magyel from Tshepong, who had strong Bon sympathies.
Bairotsana’s return to Tibet, Margyan and her ministers have him exiled, ostensibly because they support Bon and do not want him to spread the Buddhist teachings.

King Songdetsen then starts to neglect Margyan, who, overcome by uncontrollable lust, fornicates with a male dog and a male goat. A son is born whose actual name is Murum Tsenpo, but because of his appearance his nickname becomes Khyikha Rathö ‘dog-mouth goat-skull’\(^ {17} \). When the king finds out about this child, he orders all Buddhist and Bonpo priests to hold a ‘thread cross ritual’, in order to catch all the evil roaming Tibet. Khyikha Rathö, the evil ministers and all his mother’s personal subjects are dressed in rags, given bags with seeds and are then expelled from Samye to Gyi in southern Tibet as a scape-goat taking all the evil that they presaged for Tibet with them. Sending off evil personified as a human being continued to be an important part of the Himalayan Buddhist practice. During later New Year festivals in Lhasa, a thread cross ritual was held to catch all the evil of a year, and the evil was expelled together with the evil ministers and all his mother’s personal subjects are dressed in rags, given bags with seeds and are then expelled from Samye to Gyi in southern Tibet as a scape-goat taking all the evil that they presaged for Tibet with them. Sending off evil personified as a human being continued to be an important part of the Himalayan Buddhist practice. During later New Year festivals in Lhasa, a thread cross ritual was held to catch all the evil of a year, and the evil was expelled together with the evil ministers and all his mother’s personal subjects.

Lügong Gyelpo, who wore a ‘ransom apparel’, a rough fur cape with turned out hair and conical cap (Nebesky 1956: 508-511). In many local festivals in Bhutan and Kameng dedicated to Guru Rinpoche and held on the 10\(^{th} \) day of the month, the dancer personifying the ‘perpetual sinner’ in the ‘dance of the judgement of the dead’ wears a similar dress and is chased and expelled by the ‘lord of death’. All these dresses are remarkably similar to the dress of the Brokpa and Dakpa\(^ {18} \).

Queen Margyan stays in Samye, but when the prince Muthri Tsenpo\(^ {19} \) is given the authority she poisons him, and the queen is expelled. King Mutik Tsenpo then assumes the throne\(^ {20} \). Khyikha Rathö and his followers, meanwhile, stay in Gyi for some time until they move on to Yangrelung, ‘foxtail millet valley’ in Khenpajong. There, they rise to great prosperity as a result of the trade between Tibet and India. Khyikha

---

17 Tibetan sources agree that the third son, Murum Murur or Murum Murug Tsenpo (764CE–817CE) was banished to the border between near Monyul for murdering a senior minister and never reigned.

18 Ref. paragraph 15.2.3.

19 Historically, Muthri Tsenpo was the firstborn son of king Songdetsen and his first wife, Lhamo Tsen of Chim. Muthri Tsenpo is known to have died at a young age.

20 Historically, it was the king’s second son Mune Tsenpo (imp. 797CE–799CE), who inherited the throne but he was murdered by his own mother. The throne was then taken up by the youngest son, Mutik Tsenpo also called Thri Desongtsen or Senaleg (imp. 790CE–815CE).

Rathö builds the castle of Tashinamdzong and then tries to attack Muti Tsenpo in Samye. Sometime between 746 and 775 CE (Tshering, 2003:136-138), the king requests Guru Rinpoche to once and for all take care of Khyikha Rathö. So Guru Rinpoche disguises himself as the heretical teacher Haranakpo. He offers Khyikha Rathö to assist him in defeating the king. Guru Rinpoche and the Buddhist religion. The two construct a magically flying wooden garuda ‘mythological bird’. When inside this flying garuda, Khyikha Rathö hears a dog bark and starts to suspect Guru Rinpoche is involved. Guru Rinpoche replies that that sound of a dog just now, was the dog language of the Indian Tsanglung’. Guru Rinpoche then flies Khyikha Rathö and all his subjects to Bumthang. According to Tshering (2003:132-133), the crashing sound on landing the wooden plane in the Tang valley is one of the etymologies of the name of the valley. Khyikha Rathö and his subjects first settle in Khyitshum village, and later in the castle called Gyellonkhar ‘king and minister castle’ and the Camkhar ‘palace of the noble lady’. Guru Rinpoche himself returns to Khenpajong which he seals up with all the wealth and treasures inside until the time comes for opening it up again and then continues to Cakhar ‘iron castle’, where he again meets with Sindsra Radza.

The few people that inhabited Bumthang around a century later on were said to be Khyikha Rathö’s direct descendants (Gyelrik f. 41b). His descendants were also believed to have settled in Wangserkungpa much further to the east (Gyelrik f. 12b-13a). A further reference to Khyikha Rathö can be found in the origin myth of the Sherdukpen.

---

21 According to Wangchuk (2004:48) the remains of this castle can still be found near the hot spring of Yonten Kunjung in the form of monolithic rocks shaped like beams, planks and other construction materials.

22 The manuscript (ff. 16a-17a) containing the Sindha Radza’s story has a different version (ref. Olschak 1979:76), in which Khyikha Rathö himself invites the Guru to Khenpajong and presents himself, his land and his subjects to the Guru.

23 Now called Kyidzom, a village in Tang valley.

24 Now pronounced Jelkhar or Jalikhar, southeast of Chamkhar town in Bumthang. Till date the people of Kidzom and Jelkhar are said to descend from Khyikha Rathö and his subjects.

25 Now the site of the main town of Bumthang, Camkhar.

26 The remains of this castle can still be seen at the temple of Cakhar in Chökhor valley of Bumthang. This castle had nine stories (ref. Olschak 1979:78). Guru Rinpoche predicted this castle, and all the other constructions in Bumthang, would be destroyed during King Langdarma’s time.

27 Ref. paragraph 12.1.4.
3.3. GURU RINPOCHE’S LEGACY.

Guru Rinpoche came to Monyul primarily to spread the Buddhist principles. He was accompanied by the translator and scribe Denma Tsemang. Guru Rinpoche took a local Monpa consort Kheudren, who was later given the name Khandro Trashi Khidrön or Trashi Cidrön. She is usually considered to be the daughter of King Hamra from Mon Tsha’og. Sarkar (1975a), basing himself on local tradition, however, attributes the origin of ‘Tashi Khyeden’ to Tawang or Kameng.

According to the religious texts, Guru Rinpoche subdued many local spirits and spend time in meditation in several places in the region. More specifically mentioned in the texts are two places identified as Senge Dzong in Lhüntsi and Monkha Shri Dzong, at present called Aja Ne, on the border of Lhüntsi, Trashiyangtsi and Monggar dzongkhaks. It is not surprising to find the two pilgrimage sites associated to Guru Rinpoche so close to each other, to the location of some of the oldest temples, and the places where the stories of Khyikha Rathö and Sindha Radza took place. An original pilgrimage guide of Senge Dzong based on a text by Rinchen Lingpa, on a text by Ugyen Chökyong Lingpa and an unknown author and on the nearby sacred site of Rongmoteng based on a text by Kunzang Rangrik Dorji have been earlier published in (n.d.b: 31-46, 167-183, 147-166 and 104-135). A description of Aja Ne based on the text by Ugyen Lingpa can be found in (n.d.b: 279-341) and Wangchuk (2004). The site is named after the appearance of one hundred syllables on the inner wall where he meditated for three months. According to Wangchuk (2004), Guru Rinpoche travelled from Gomphu Kora in Trashiyangtsi, where he subdued a local demon, to the area of Aja in order to prevent Khyikha Rathö from settling there after his exile from Tibet. The myth of Khyikha Rathö makes no specific mention of Aja Ne though.

28 This is believed to be present-day Khoma village in Lhüntsi dzongkhak. The Sindha Radza story, however, holds that this consort was the daughter of Sindha Radza himself.
29 Ref. Annex II and Fig. 16.9.
30 For centuries, an annual festival has been held here on the 8th, 9th and 10th day of the second month of the Bhutanese calendar. The festival attracts people from all over Eastern Bhutan and the adjoining areas of Tawang, and has been used as an occasion of merrymaking before the start of the agricultural production season and a venue for meeting potential marriage partners just as much as a site of religious veneration. Recent attempts to ‘clear’ the place of secular ‘defilements’ have, regrettably, removed much of its original charm.

Besides these two sites, specifically mentioned in Guru Rinpoche’s biographies, there are other sites he supposedly visited in Paro, Punakha and Wangdü in Western Bhutan, in Trongsa and Bumthang in Central Bhutan, in Lhüntsi, Monggar and Yangtsi in Eastern Bhutan, and in Tawang and Kameng. Pilgrimage guides to all of these sites have been written at certain points in history and kept by the local communities and the guardians of the sites. In Bhutan, these include the earlier mentioned Kurje Lhakhang, Lhamoi Lhakhang and Pemai Lhakhang in Chökhor, Thowadrak and Kunzangdrak in Tang, Bumthang, Sha Beyul Langdrak in Wangdü (see n.d.b 257-278, Lhundup 2001) and Omba, Gomphu Kora and Gongja Ne along the Gongri river in Yangtsi. A short description of the pilgrimage sites of Tawang is contained in n.d.b: 183-184. The Pangchen valley of Tawang has several sites associated with Guru Rinpoche. He is said to have meditated at Taktsang ‘tiger’s den’ and Ziktshang ‘leopard’s den’. Nearby Taktsang is the Ugyen Drphuk meditation cave and a rock symbolising the Zangdopelri ‘Copper Mountain Palace’ of Guru Rinpoche. The popular pilgrimage site of Bhagajang ‘purified vagina’ dedicated to Dorji Phakmo is located to the southeast of Tawang on the border with Sakteng geok of Bhutan. This area is known as Beyul Karmojong ‘the white hidden valley’ or Beyul Kitmojong ‘the hidden valley of pleasure’. A description of this pilgrimage site based on a text by Rinzin Pema Lingpa can be found in n.d.b: 23-25. Once a year in summer the Dakpa and Brokpa will make a pilgrimage to this site during which social contacts are maintained. Near Jang village is Khimne where Guru Rinpoche meditated and the founder of the Karmapa subschool of the Kagyupa School Rangjung Rigpai Dorji (1109-1192) built a monastery, heralding the start of the Karmapa affiliation with Tawang. Three minor sites located to the south of Tawang proper were also visited by Guru Rinpoche namely Terma Bumgam ‘100,000 treasure chest’ in the village of Poidar and the sites of Biga and Gomphuk. Finally, the beyul of Khrompateng and its associated monastery are associated with Guru Rinpoche. Sarkar (1975a,b) also listed the various sites in Sherdukpen territory associated with Guru Rinpoche. These include Jambring and Khang Gisih to the east of Rupa, Flujima and Machulu to the west of Rupa, Chupit and Chaksung on the way from Rupa to Jigaon, Shrahanoma to the south of Rupa, and Jakhung and Pemaloso in the southern foothills.
Many of the minor sites allegedly attributed to Guru Rinpoche, his visits, his subjugation of local demons and his conversion of the local people might not have actually witnessed his presence. For all the people who were converted to Buddhism at a certain moment in history, having a site attributed to him within their locality strengthened their belief and facilitated religious practice such as pilgrimage. The Buddhist masters, basing themselves on oral historic sources, religious insights or personal intuition opened sites associated to Guru Rinpoche and started local pilgrimage cults that continue to this day. Thus, there are uncountable भविष्यते ‘footprints’, बृज ‘hats’, अल्पबुध्दि ‘thrones’, दीर्घ ‘vaginas’, दुर्बल ‘phalluses’, शृंग ‘rock imprints of the body’ etc. attributed to Guru Rinpoche and Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal that underwent the process of lithification and can now be seen as curiously shaped stones and rocks. People’s unwavering faith in the great master translates itself in reverence and the strong conviction that they have blessing powers equal to the finest precious metal statues. For many smaller indigenous people that were converted relatively recently, such as the Sherdukpen, claiming visits by the great saint to their territory has been a way in which to claim their rightful place among the people of Monyul.

The construction of temples and castles during the period of the introduction of Buddhism to Monyul in the period from 630 to 830 CE contributed to the independent status of the area vis-à-vis India to the south and Tibet to the north (Tshering 2003: 130). The historical figures on whom the stories in this Chapter are partially based might not have actually existed, but the stories do serve an important function in sketching the situation in Monyul during that era. By the early 7th century Buddhism was introduced among the scattered populations of the higher altitude valleys of the southern Himalayan slopes. By the middle of the 8th century, there was at least one independent kingdom of the Monpa in the central-western part of the area, and the southeastern parts were inhabited by the Tsangmi. The Tibetans apparently considered both the Monpa and the Tsangmi to be related to the people of India. Their houses were constructed of bamboo and grass or wood and they cultivated foxtail millet. From the 8th century onwards, Indian Hindu and Bön and Buddhist refugees from the Tibetan plateau found a refuge in the Monyul region, sometimes allying, sometimes contending with the local rulers and gradually mixing with the local population. In those days, the people of Bumthang, for example, were found to be beastlike, wild and temperamental and to consume a lot of meat and to sacrifice animals, and the Tibetan immigrants tried to pacify the people by introducing Buddhism (Ardussi 2003:11). Guru Rinpoche’s activities among the indigenous people and recent settlers propagated the Buddhist religion, but despite this, Buddhism

appears to have taken a firm hold in the area only later, when an influx of political and religious exiles and refugees from Tibet brought Buddhism as well as an administrative set-up to the area that lasted for several centuries.

Figure 3.1. The ancient temple of Gamling Anu in Tang geok, Bumthang dzongkhak, Central Bhutan.

Figure 3.2. Kurje Lhakhang in Chökhor geok, Bumthang dzongkhak, Central Bhutan (courtesy Y. Waarts).
CHAPTER 4. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL RULE.

Many authors have written about the political and religious developments that took place on the Tibetan plateau between 800 CE and 1600 CE, and the impact they had on the Tibetan society and culture. But few descriptions have focused on the influence these developments had on the peripheral areas, including Monyul. Notable exceptions include Šɗů ŨŢī (1973) and Ŗňă (1986, 1992). The fall and disintegration of the Tibetan Yarlung Empire, the period of civil unrest that followed and the resulting prevalence of the Bon religion over Buddhism resulted in a considerable flow of refugees roughly between 840 CE and 950 CE. Most of them were members of aristocratic and religious families and the monastic establishments who lost support of their subordinate peasants and could no longer maintain their privileged position. This exodus of refugees from Central Tibet at the time when King Ťī Ţăńg, the fifth in the line of succession, comes to power, was predicted by Guru Rinpoche, as the manuscript of Sindhu Radza (ff. 24-24a in Olschak 1979) reads: ŬпƅīŢŸŤīŴƂī̽Ɓīŷ ŬŲīιīш ŬƅīųԀīιƅĴ ŤīŵžŤīůŷƅīťŬīŷ ŬŲīƂīш ŬƅīųԀīιƅĴ ‘at this time when most of Ū Tsang will escape to Mon….at the time when those who hold me in esteem will all escape to Mon’. Between 950 CE and 1250 CE, Buddhism slowly regained favour, and instead the Bon clergy and their local patrons fled.

In the period between 1250 CE and 1650 CE, competition between ruling Tibetan clans and dynasties resulted in the exile of local nobilities and their subordinates. There was also a continuous competition for religious power between the various schools of Buddhism. Each clan, principality or dynasty patronised a certain religious school or sub-school, and as a result many schools that were no longer holding authority re-established themselves in Monyul and elsewhere. Moreover, the priest-patron relations that developed between a certain school or sub-school of Buddhism and a ruling local clan or regional dynasty in Tibet was replicated in Monyul, where in due course of time many of the Buddhist schools accepted the local patronage of a ruling clan. This development culminated in the 1650s with the extension of the Gelukpa secular and religious power over the eastern part of Monyul, and the hegemony of the Drukpa Kagyupa in the west.
4.1. DISINTEGRATION OF THE TIBETAN EMPIRE.

King Thri Desongtsen had five sons of whom two, Lhaje and Lhündrup, died young (1986, 1992). The three surviving sons were Lhase Tsangma, Uidum Ten and Thri Tsugdetsen or Thri Relpacen. Lhase Tsangma was an ordained monk and was therefore not considered for succession. Uidum Ten was bypassed in 815 CE as new king because of his sympathies towards Bon and his unruly character. Instead, Relpachen became the 41st Tsenpo king of Tibet, and the last of the three great religious kings. During his rule from 815 to 838 CE, a tax system was introduced to fund the state support to the expanding monastic system and its monks. Disgruntled by having been bypassed as king, Uidum Ten plotted to overthrow his younger brother and assume the throne himself. To achieve this, he first exiled his elder brother by bribing astrologers and various other tricks in 838 CE. He then had Uidum Ten assassinated and assumed the name Langdarma. In the few years of his reign as 42nd Tsenpo King (836 CE to 842 CE), Langdarma decreased the number of monasteries and monks and their state support, in turn enabling him to reduce the heavy taxation that his predecessors had imposed on the common people (Martin 2001:3). Although this might have gained him support of the common man, it greatly disgruntled the established monastic order. In later Tibetan histories he is, therefore, usually vilified for fiercely persecuting Buddhists, destroying temples and favouring Bon.

The Gyelrik (ff. 3b to 7a) presents another version of history. The Ministers Degyel Tore and Cokdro Lekdra became dissatisfied with the honour that Relpacen had been giving to the Buddhist doctrine. On their advocacy, Relpacen sends his brother Lhase Tsangma to southern Monyul in order to avoid obstacles for the kingdom and to inquire into the welfare of the subjects and communities there. The ministers then spread the rumour that Queen Ngangtshulma and Chief Minister Pelgi Yöntan are involved in a sexual relationship. Whereas the queen commits suicide, the chief minister is executed by the king. The ministers then kill Relpacen, and Langdarma assumes the throne and completely abolishes the Buddhist doctrine.

In 842 CE Langdarma was, in turn, assassinated by Lhalung Pelki Dorji. Tradition holds it that Lhalung Pelki Dorji wore a black hat and his long black sheepskin.

---

1 Ref. footnote 15 to Chapter 3.
2 This event is still commemorated in the Black Hat dance performed at Tsechu festivals, temple inaugurations and important religious occasions to remove obstacles, hindrances and negative energy.
cloak and that he had blackened his white horse with soot. Furthermore, he had hidden a bow and arrow under this cloak, and while performing a dance before King Langdarma, he shot the arrow in the king’s heart. He then fled, passing through a river on his horse. Since the soot was washed off his horse and he turned his cloak inside out, he appeared from the other side in a white cloak and on a white horse, thus escaping from the king’s soldiers. Some of the ruling families of Monyul later claimed ancestry from Lhalung Pelki Dorji. The son of Langdarma’s brother-in-law, ʾīϓī Thride or ԕŷīٿŶלקוח Yumten, and Langdarma’s real son ŖŲŷīϓī Namde or ŤŲŷī Osung divided the Tibetan empire. The Gyetrik states that Yumten ruled central Tibet, including ŤѶƫ˺ Tsang and Ťʆ˺ Osung the eastern part including Lhokha, Kongpo, ͺ�� trách Đakpo and Kham. In Martin (2003:3), however, it is stated that Tö Ngari in the west of the plateau and Tsongkha in the northeast remained somewhat sizeable integral territories, and that Osung ruled Ӿ˦ Osung Yoru or Central Tibet to the north and Yumten ruled Ӥ_requested Wuru to the south of the Yarlung Tsangpo river. In either case, the Tibetan empire disintegrated and became devoid of both secular and religious law. A series of major եϤʹkhenglok ‘peasant revolts’ has been reported from 929 CE onwards (Martin 2001:4).

According to the Gyetrik (ff. 7b-10a), 70 years after the fall of the Yarlung Tibetan Empire the Buddhist religion was reintroduced by bringing the ѡϤڦVinaya scriptures’ that had been kept hidden in ŽϤ:String the Kham region of eastern Tibet. Buddhism was nourished through translations supported by the ruler of Tö Ngari in Upper Tibet who also invited the Indian saint Ԉ۱อม Jowoje Palden Atisha (980-1052 CE). Bringing together the original Vinaya scriptures and the new ideas and translations in Central Tibet, the Buddhist religion once again started to flourish and prosper. This is the period of ۊӰ‘second diffusion’ of Buddhism, lasting from the 10th to the second half of the 15th centuries CE. Secular rule and unity were, however, not regained until the Sakyapa monastic rule with Mongol patronage was established in 1252 CE.

---

3 Ref. paragraph 4.3.
4 As we saw in paragraph 2.7.2 and 2.8, Tsongkha and Ngari remained independent from the Tibetan Empire during various periods in history, and both areas were inhabited by tribes of non-Bodic Tibeto-Burman descent.
5 According to Norbu (2004), the name of the Buddha was not heard in Tibet for 75 years after 906.

4.2. Lhase Tsangma’s Legacy.

The most iconic of the exiles from Tibet to Monyul was the last surviving son of king Desongtsen, Lhase Tsangma. Lhase Tsangma was born in the iron male dragon year, 800 CE. Most sources claim him to have been banished as a monk in 840 CE (Aris 1979: 86) and later poisoned by his brother Langdarma’s wife. There is some disagreement in the historical sources as to whether he was banished to Bumthang, to Paro, or to Lhokha. The Gyelrik (ff. 11b) quietly disregards Lhase Tsangma’s ascribed early death, and places his entry into Monyul through Paro. Aris (1979:88-89) states that many different groups in western Bhutan claim their origins from Lhase Tsangma, most notably the Gyeldung of Paro, the Dungdrok of Thimphu, the Wangdrok or Nyungtshen and the Migyeltshen. Ardussi (2003) provides further evidence to Lhase Tsangma’s heritage in western Bhutan based on additional texts such as the histories of Nyangrel, Khepadeu and Neupandita and own fieldwork. (1986:3) mentions that the original inhabitants of Sikkim and western Bhutan requested the help of the Tibetans to drive out Indian immigrants, after which many Tibetans permanently settled in the area. But Aris (1979:51-59) discredits this reason for the Tibetan arrival, rather attributing it to the upheaval on the plateau itself. After 840 CE local power in Sikkim and western Monyul mostly came in the hands of competing Buddhist schools and sects who relied on lay support from influential local families.

In Eastern Monyul a completely different situation developed. Lhase Tsangma and his heirs and successors, or more realistically the Tibetan exiles and refugees, came to an area with a scattered native population. Through imposition of authority and intermarriage with local people, the Tibetan migrant ruling elite established themselves and over time they became the local ruling elite, secular in nature and having full control over their territory. The ruling families were divided in several exogamous patrilineal clans called rū in vernacular Tibetan or dung in honorific speech and khang in Tshangla, all meaning ‘bone’. This situation persisted for eight centuries until the subjugation of the clans in the second half of the 17th century. Whether the genealogies provided in the Gyelrik are historically correct is difficult, if not impossible, to determine for sheer lack of comparative historic material. They were largely based on written and oral sources that have since long disappeared. And

---

6 This name lives on in the village of Dungdrok, located in Darkarla geok in Thimphu dzongkhag.

7 Similar to the above, a village named Wangdrok exists just south of Dungdrok.
perhaps, their real strength lies in providing the people with a common royal ancestry and a shared identity to feel proud about. The all-permeating influence that these clans had in the society and culture of Monyul is perhaps epitomised by dung, the Tshangla word for ‘village’, indicating that in the past rather than asking a stranger for his native village or valley, the provenance of a stranger could be derived from his clan affiliation.

In the Gyelrik (ff. 11b-12a), Lhase Tsangma is said to have travelled from Paro through easily identifiable places in Thimphu, past the Chupho and Chumo rivers of the Thed valley through Wangdu Phodrang, the Bardrong bridge and Gormo in the Shar valley, Khodangkha, Ngenlung, and Mangdelung, then southward along the Mangde river through the villages of Tali, Buli and Tunglabi in Kheng. He then arrives in Zhongkar Moiwalungpa. There he constructs a tree-trunk bridge and crosses the Kuri river at Cangbum and arrives at Ngatshang located below the Kori pass.

---

8 Instead of a lexeme going back to the Proto-Tibeto-Burman root, such as Tibetan yül or lungpa, Dzongkha 'ūi, Dakpa yi or lumpa.
9 This is the old name of the Punakha valley, where on the confluence of the Phochu ‘father river’ and Mochu ‘mother river’ the Punakha Dzong was built, the seat of the Zhabdrung and the later winter capital of Bhutan.
10 Pronounced [ca:] in modern Dzongkha, the Bardrong bridge is site where later an iron chain bridge would be built, ref. paragraph 5.1. According to Norbu (2004:8) this is now known as Mangdelung. According to Norbu (2004:8) this is now known as Gogona.
11 Present-day Khotangkha under Rübis gaok of Wangdü dzongkhag.
12 The old name for the area between the Pele la pass and the Gonggo and Than Chu rivers, including the valleys of Gangte, Phobjikha, Rukhbu, Chendebji and Tangsibji.
13 The old name for the upper reaches of the valley of the Mangde river, encompassing particularly the area now covered by Nubi. Drakteng and Langthil geoks in Trongsa dzongkhag.
14 Tali and Buli are villages in present-day Nangkor geok and Dunglabi is a village under Bardo geok in Zhemgang dzongkhag.
15 This is the valley of the Moiri [mori] or [mari] river in Monggar, flowing through present-day Saling geok in Monggar dzongkhag. The phonetic change from Chöke syllable-final <ol> to Tshangla diphthong <oi> instead of Dzongkha and Tibetan <ø>, like the change from Chöke syllable-final <al> and <ul> to Tshangla <ai> and <ui> instead of Dzongkha and Tibetan <ä> and <ü> respectively, has been described in Bodt (2011, in publ.). The Moiri river valley now has a mixed population of Kheng, Chocangaca and Tshangla speakers. The Gyelrik and Logyu are inconsistent in their spelling of Zhonggar, which might reflect historic name change. Possible etymologies of the name are given in Thinley (2003:294-295). Three views of the Moiwalung valley are shown in Fig. 4.1 and 4.2.
16 An unidentified place probably near present-day Lingmethang.
17 A village and geok with the same name still exists.

Crossing the Shel river he climbs up to Bageng Bremi Helong. He then proceeds through the lands of the Tsengmi to arrive in Jamkhar, the ‘easy castle’. Lhase Tsangma then crosses the Gongri river at Tshangzam and arrives at the pasture called Thumbur at Muktangkhar. Looking back at the Drangmechu river he experiences a feeling of happiness and shoots a silver arrow which lands at an unidentified place that became known as Ngulgom. He then shoots a golden arrow which lands at a place called Sergom.

Lhase Tsangma then arrives at Wangserkungpa, where according to the Gye lrik (f. 12b-13a) he shoots a silver arrow which lands at an unidentified place that became known as Ngulgom. He then shoots a golden arrow which lands at a place called Sergom.

---

18 The present-day Shelri river flowing through Shermuhung geok from the area around Aja Ne until it drains in the Gongri river.
19 Present-day Baging village where the remains of a castle can be found. Bremi Helong later became what is now known as the geok of Drametse ‘no enemy peak’, which according to some originally was Bramitse ‘peak of the people living in yak hair tents’. Helong, via Halong, became the present-day village of Kholang. Viz. Fig. 4.3.
20 If the Tsengmi of the Gye lrik are the Tshangla of modern days, this would imply that the original homeland of the Tshangla can be located in what are now the geoks of Drametse and Narang under Monggar dzongkhak and Yangnyer geok under Trashigang dzongkhak.
21 Jamkhar is a geok located to the north of Trashigang Dzong in Yangtsi dzongkhak. Ardussi (2006:19) reports of a mani wall located there.
22 Gongri is the native Tshangla name for what is known as Drangmechu in Dzongkha. This bridge was probably located northeast of the present-day Cakzam.
23 This is the place now called Thumburzor, just above Muktangkhar where the road leading up from the Gamri river bifurcates in the road to Ramjar and the road to Bartsham and beyond. The remains of a castle can be found at Muktangkhar.
24 Probably the place called Tshergom on the north bank of the Gongri river where a medication cave associated with Guru Rinpoche can be found.
25 The area around the 3527m Phongme and 3986m Riwo Wangseng Kukhar peaks, on the border between Phongme geok in Trashigang, Yalang geok in Trashi Yangtsho and Mokto circle in Tawang district was traditionally known as Wangseng, Dakpa for ‘fir tree’, after the dominant vegetation. Wangserkungpa might be a typographic error, and the original name could well have been Wangsenglungpa ‘Fir Tree Valley’. Perhaps this is also reflected in the contemporary name of a forest where bamboo is collected called Wangneng (ref. Chapter 15). Alternatively, some local sources consider Wangserkungpa to be the 4383m high mountain presently known as Riwo Wangseng Kukhar or more popularly Jomo Kukhar, the mountain abode of the protective deity of the Brokpa people in Merak gewok (ref. Chapter 11). The ancient importance of Wangserkungpa was already stressed in paragraph 3.2.
'looking around in all directions, although the valley was clean and pleasant, there were very few inhabitants, settlements and fields, and so he did not feel inclined to reside there. Since at that time throughout the regions of Lhomon there were no more than a few houses and fields which had been appropriated by the small number of people who had come in company with king Khyikha Rathö, when the divine prince came he had no desire to stay there and so proceeded by stages in this direction'. Lhase Tsangma asks the local people where he can find more people and settlements and better land, and he is directed to Palkhar in La’ok Yulsum. But because of the closeness to the upheaval in Tibet caused by his brother Langdarma, he returns westwards to Tsenkhar in Drong Doksum.

Map I illustrates the route that Lhase Tsangma took through Monyul according to the Gyelrik. The Maps II to IV show the geographical spread of the various clan lineages descending from Lhase Tsangma, and Map V on page xx displays the spread of the lineages descending from Lhalung Pelki Dorji’s brothers and the Dung. The names in italics are the traditional names of regions. The names in bold are the names mentioned in the text, based upon the Gyelrik. Stars indicate the approximate locations of these places. Bold red lines indicate the borders of dzongkhaks and districts. Thin red lines indicate the borders of geoks and circles. For the modern names of these administrative units, kindly refer to Map VI. Thin blue lines have been used for the main rivers. Various colours indicate the spread of certain lineages in a single map. All locations are approximate. If maps II to V are combined, we can observe a number of blanks. These blanks have several reasons. The blank in lower Phangkhar of Zhemgang is attributable to the lack of human settlements in these dense forests now part of Manas National Park. The blanks in Trong and Nangkor geok of Zhemgang are attributable to the fact that the origins of the clan rulers of Tali, Buli, Subrang and Gomphu

26 This is the traditional name for the villages of Shartsho, Seru and Lhau near Tawang.
27 This is the area in the lower Kholong river valley, near the present-day village of Doksum. From time immemorial, Doksum has been an important trading post on the route between India, Monyul and Tibet. The village has kept this position, though locally, until the present, assisted by the closeness to the pilgrimage and festival site of Gomphu Kora (ref. footnote 30 to Chapter 3). It was recently shifted to the nearby village of Khitsang as a result of falling boulders from the cliff above; according to some locals the result of the removal of the iron chain bridge.
28 Ref. paragraph 4.3 and 4.4.

mentioned in the Logyu are not mentioned in the Gyelrik. The area now under Shingkhar geok of Zhemgang and the Senggor area under Saleng geok of Monggar were probably ruled by the Ura Dung. The Droksar, Kalapang and Resa area of Saleng geok and Silambi geok were probably ruled by the Khengpo clan of Zhonggar descending from the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji. The upper Kurtö area is largely uninhabited except for the settlements along the upper course of the Kuri river that were probably ruled by the Pönchen, Pönpo and Zhelngo families descending from the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji. The villages along the Khoma river perhaps did not exist at the time, and were settled from Kholongtö only later. The western part of Dungsam was most probably ruled by families claiming descent from the Dung, or alternatively, the area could have been ruled by kings claiming descent from the Je clan of Monyul Tongsum. Present day Gomdar and Wangphu geoks in Samdrup Jongkhar were probably under the Wangma clan of Manchö, who also held considerable territories in the duars. Similarly, the Je clan of Cenkhar and the Je clan of Khaling must have held control of the areas to the south and the duars, for which they are known to have contended. Jang circle of Tawang district probably fell under the authority of the Byar clan, whereas the authority of the Bapus of Dirang, Thembang, Morshing and Domkha extended all the way till the plains of the Brahmaputra and probably even included the area of present-day Langchenphu drungkhak of Samdrup Jongkhar. Finally, the various clans living in the Thengpoche and Senge areas of Tawang and Dirang and the present day Sakteng and Merak geoks of Eastern Bhutan only came under the authority of the Byar clan of the Brokpa from Tibet by the 14th century.

4.2.1. THE FIRST ROYAL CASTLE.

Lhase Tsangma settled in Mizimpa where a man called Ami Döndrupgyel lived, who belonged to the aristocratic Lang Lhazik lineage.

29 Ref. footnote 52 to 54 of paragraph 6.3.
30 Ref. paragraph 4.3. The people of these areas still speak Khengpa, and the geok is usually referred to as ‘Kheng Silambi’.
31 Including villages like Jasabi, Chusa, Sershong, Shauzhong, Tangrung and Nakling.
32 Ref. paragraph 10.5. This would also discredit the identification of Tsha’ok with Khoma, ref. paragraph 3.3.
33 Ref. paragraph 4.2.5.
34 Ref. paragraph 7.2.
35 Ref. chapter 11.
36 From this lineage also descended the illustrious Ami Jangchup Dreköl (968-1076 CE), who is sometimes believed to be the ancestor of the lineage.
from Byarpo district in Tibet. Lhase Tsangma married Ami Döndrupgyel’s daughter Sonam Pelki and they had two sons, Thrimi ‘the enthroned’ Lhai Wangchuk and Cebu ‘the beloved son’ Thonglektson (f. 13b-14a). The first royal castle was built here at Mizimpa, located near Tsenkhar in the area of Drong Doksum. In the biography of the Sixth Dalai Lama written by Desi Sangge Gyatsho (1635-1705) the place is called Mizimpai Tsenkhar and its founding is attributed to Khyikha Rathö. Ardussi (2006: 20) identified the castle of Mizimpa as the ruin at the present-day Tsenkharla village under Khamdang geok in Trashiyangtsi dzongkhag.37 Local oral tradition also identifies this ruin as the palace of Lhase Tsangma, and although over the centuries many of the stones have been used for other constructions, including the school and the health post, the remains of this castle can still be seen as Fig. 4.4 shows. Ardussi (2003, 2006:20) reports that a wooden fragment of the window frame of the ruin could be dated to 1420-1435 CE. He and Blumer (2001) suggest that this fortress was built by members of the Byar lineage who fled Tibet after the powerful Phakmodrupa family took control in Tibet in the 14th and 15th centuries. Neither author discounts the possibility that this castle was built on older foundations dating to Lhase Tsangma’s time.

4.2.2. The Jowo Clan.

Lhase Tsangma’s son Lhai Wangchuk is then invited by the people of La’ok Yulsum to become their king, and from his heirs descend the Khampa Jowo clan of Lhau (Khampa)38 and Shar Derang39. The Jowo clan also establishes castles at Grengkhar40, Rupomkhar at Seru41, Jamkhar42 and the Berkhar castle43 at Shartsho. The Jowo clan furthermore settles in Paudung44 and Sharnup45 and in Rati46 in the Gamri river valley. The members

37 It is located on top of the eastern hill at the base of which lies Doksum, with on the southern hill the geok of Ramjar and on the western hill the geok of Tongmizhangsa.
38 Present-day Lhau village near Tawang.
39 Present-day Dirang town in Dirang circle of West Kameng.
40 The village of near Surbi in Tawang circle.
41 The village of Seru still exists under Tawang circle.
42 Perhaps the hamlet now called Gyankhar near the village of Lemberdung.
43 Presently called Berkhar or Bemkhar village in Tawang, the birth place of the 6th Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso.
44 The hamlet close to Berkhar which is now known as Poudun ‘seven heroes’.

of the Jowo clan frequently intermarried with members of the Tungde and Yede clans mentioned below, and from the Jowo clan lineage descends Jowo Sumpa, who was to play a crucial role in the developments in the 17th century. Map II shows the approximate spread of the Jowo clan across Monyul.

4.2.3. The Byar Clan.

Lhase Tsangma’s youngest son Thonglektsun had three sons: Thri Tenpal and the twins Gongkargyel and Pelkedar. No mention of offspring of Palkedar is made, but Gongkargyel gains control of Kholongtö. He has four sons, and from the son of his senior wife descents the Byar clan. This clan starts the royal families of Rizung, Udzarong, Tormashong, Yangkala, Kurime and Jherezur. The Byar clan also spreads to Jokhang, Ngagla, Khomsra and Netola, all in the area previously known as Khengrik Namsam and now as Zhemgang dzongkhak. Finally, the Byar clan takes hold of the unidentified place called Cakharzung.

45 This is a hamlet near the village of Largong under Tawang circle.
46 Present-day Radi geok in Trashigang dzongkhak. The spelling had already changed in the addendum to the Gyelrik on ff. 48b
47 Ref. Chapter 6.
48 This is the upper part of the Kholong river valley, or the northern part of present-day Trashi Yangtse dzongkhak, i.e. Yangtse and Bumdeling geoks.
49 Also called Rizhungthang, ref. Dorji (2003:211), and although not positively identified, it could be present-day Riju in the Gamri river valley.
50 Still a geok under Trashigang dzongkhak with the same name.
51 Present-day Tormazhong village under Tsakaling geok in Monggar dzongkhak.
52 A mountain pass between present-day Tsamang and Salung geoks in Monggar dzongkhak.
53 The lower Kuri river valley in Lhuntse dzongkhak, now more commonly known as Kurme from which the alternative name for Chocangacakha, Kurmetpaikha or Kurmekha, is derived.
54 Present-day Jare geok in Lhuntse dzongkhak.
55 Present-day Bjoka geok under Zhemgang dzongkhak.
56 Present-day Ngagla geok under Zhemgang dzongkhak. The clan rulers of Bjoka and Ngagla existed until modern times and were known as the Bjoka and Ngagla Khoche.
57 A village with the same name under Bardo geok in Zhemgang dzongkhak.
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The descendants of the Byar clan also start the aristocratic families of Ցྱིས་ Tshase\textsuperscript{58}, Դུསྲུང་ Yurung\textsuperscript{59}, བོད་ཆིམུང་ Chimung\textsuperscript{60} and སྙན་དགེ་ Dago\textsuperscript{61}, all in Dungsam. Finally, the ཧབ་ Bapu of བསྐེར་རྩེ་ Shar Domkha\textsuperscript{62} and Morshing in Kameng, who held power over the people of the Assam plains approximately from the 12\textsuperscript{th} to the 16\textsuperscript{th} century (Aris 1979: 103-107), also descend from this clan. The various territories under the authority of the Byar clan are presented in Map II.

4.2.4. THE YEDE AND TUNGDE CLANS.

From each of his three junior wives Gongkargyel also had a son. The three queens, fearing the senior consort might hurt their sons, secretly reared them in a གཞན་ ‘trough’, a ལྷ་ ‘cane box’ and a བོད་ ‘pit’. In early childhood their father recognised them, and from them began the གཞན་ Yede, ལྷ་ Tungde and བོད་ Wangma clans in reference to the places they were raised. Under Gongkargyel’s rule, heavy taxes were imposed on the people of Kholongtö, and they revolted. Gongkargyel and his sons had to retreat back to Mizimpa. People from various places later invited his sons to become their kings (ff. 21a-23b).

The Yede clan spread on both banks of the Gamri river valley with castles at མན་ནོང་གི་སྙིང་ Jantsham\textsuperscript{63}, ལྷ་ རྣམ་རྒྱལ་ Buna\textsuperscript{64}, བོད་ བོད་ Kangmi\textsuperscript{66}, བོད་ རྣམ་རྒྱལ་ Ramagengra\textsuperscript{67}, བོད་ Khrephu ‘millet hill’\textsuperscript{68} as well as in certain

\textsuperscript{58} Present-day Ցྱིས་ Tshatshi village in བོད་ Nanong geog under Pemagatshel dzongkhag, famous as birth place of Lama Namse, see paragraph 6.1.
\textsuperscript{59} A village and geok with the same name exists under Pemagatshel dzongkhag.
\textsuperscript{60} A village and geok with the same name exists under Pemagatshel dzongkhag.
\textsuperscript{61} A village with the same name under བོད་ Shumar geok in Pemagatshel dzongkhag.
\textsuperscript{62} The historically important village of Domkha, also spelled བསྐེར་རྩེ་ (Dorji 2003:211) in Kameng, where later a dzong was built. Domkha, inhabited by Tshangla speakers, is the birth village of the 6\textsuperscript{th} incarnation of Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel, བོད་ རྣམ་རྒྱལ་ Jigme Dorji.
\textsuperscript{63} Present-day Saleng village in Bidung geok under Trashigang dzongkhag.
\textsuperscript{64} Present-day Buna village near the trading town of Rangjung in Trashigang dzongkhag.
\textsuperscript{65} Present-day Galing village in Shongphu geok under Trashigang dzongkhag. The addition kharmi indicates that the village of Galing was devoid of a khar ‘castle’, and perhaps this name later changed into Changmi, the twin village of Galing usually mentioned in one breath. There is also a hamlet called Changmikharmi.
\textsuperscript{66} Present-day Phongme geok under Trashigang dzongkhag.
\textsuperscript{67} Present-day རྣམ་རྒྱལ་ Ramjar geok under Trashiyangtsi dzongkhag.
\textsuperscript{68} Perhaps the village with the name presently spelled as བོད་ Threphu ‘tax hill’, a village under བོད་ Kangpar geok in Trashigang dzongkhag.
locations in the Tawang area, such as Taktshang and the hitherto unidentified places Langkhyim, Brengkhyim and Khangpakhar (ff.25b-26b). The spread of the Yede clan is thus mostly in the Gamri river valley and a few strongholds in the adjoining areas of Tawang.

The Tungde clan spread to Khamnang, Khyinyl and Buri Jangphu, Dütungkhar in Zanglungpa, the villages of Bemi and Sari as well as to the hitherto unidentified place Khathor (ff. 26b-27a). The Tungde clan thus mainly ruled over the villages till the present inhabited by people who consider themselves Dakpa (see Chapter 10). The location of the areas that came under the control of the Yede and Tungde clans is given in Map XX on page xx.

4.2.5. THE WANGMA CLAN.

The Wangma clan, finally, built the castle of Wangmakhar in Gangzurtö. Members of this clan were also invited by the local leader of Thempang to suppress the ‘black-mouthed Lo’ and the Lo

---

69 The village and pilgrimage site in the Pangchen valley of Tawang.
70 There are several other khars in the Tawang area, including Waikhar near Namet, Shamkhar, Brokkhar and Themkhar near Kitpi, Saikhar near Lawok Yulsum, Grangkhar near Surbi and Ungkhar near Lemberdung.
71 ‘khar’ is Tibetan as well as Dakpa for ‘house, household’. Perhaps this name refers to the hamlet of Breng under Thongrong village in Phongme geok.
72 Present-day Khamdang geok under Trashi Yangtsi dzongkhag.
73 Present-day Khinye village under Tötscho geog in Trashi Yangtsi dzongkhag.
74 Present-day Jangphutse village under Tötscho geog in Trashi Yangtsi dzongkhag. Buri is its twin village, just across the border in Tawang district.
75 Present-day Dudungkhar village, near the village now known Zanglum under Dudungkhar-Zemithang circle of Tawang, just across the border from Bhutan.
76 The villages of Bemi and Sari seem to have no contemporary connotations in present-day Tawang district, but they were located in the present-day Zemithang circle. That they were very important historically may be clear from the fact that mention is made of the soldiers from Dakpa Bemi Sari in accounts of the Tibetan invasions in the 17th century, see Chapter 6.
77 The upper part of present-day Gangzur geok in Lhüntsi dzongkhag. The Wangmakhar is unidentified, although a Wangmakhar does exist in Chali geok of Monggar dzongkhag.
78 Thembang village in Dirang circle of Kameng district.
79 Perhaps these are the Hrusso/Aka and Dhimmai/Miji tribes of Kameng, who both used to tattoo their faces (ref. Chapter 15).
Chapter 4. Establishment of Local Rule.

Khakar ‘white mouthed Lo’\(^{80}\). There, like the chiefs of the Byar clan in Morshing and Domkha, they became known as the Bapu\(^{81}\). Finally, they settled in a Mancho\(^{82}\) in lower Kaling from where they took control over the duars (ff. 27b-28b). The Addendum on ff. 48b also mentions that the Wangma clan ruled over the Sinmi and Junmi whom Aris thought to be the Sherdukpen (1986: footnote 123 to page 69).

According to the Addendum to the Gyelrik (ff. 50a/b), some members of the Wangma clan also seized the Yodung duar and hence became known as the Yodung Wangma. As is explained in Addendum II, other sub-clans of the Wangma clan, namely the Dokshing, the Yaran and the Gyeldung Mankhar Wangma contended over the duars. The Yodung Wangma then had a battle with Choka Dorje of the Je clan and the king of Cenkhar, which was fought at Jeldung Mankhar and which the Yodung Wangma clan lost. Cenkhar then took hold of the duars which were only returned when a girl of the Yodung Wangma married into the ruling family of Cenkhar. In Addendum III an overview of the lineage of Yodung Wangma clan roughly between 1550 and 1700 is given, in which a tripartite ruling coalition can be distinguished between the aristocratic Wangma chief, one or two Lama who were responsible for religious affairs, and one or two Tsorgan or village chiefs who were the intermediaries between the subject people and the clan chief\(^{83}\). Addendum IV gives the boundaries of the Yodung Wangma principality, but none of these places could be identified at present. Addendum V presents the names of the duars under Yodung Wangma rule. According to Addendum VII, the Yodung Wangma clan later lost Nyeuli duar to a competing clan from Dungsam.

According to Addendum VIII, the Yodung Wangma clan granted the Molongga duar to Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel. Addendum VI reports the lineage of the Thakhur, who were apparently some local rulers of the duar plains. According to Addendum IX, it was the chief of the Yodung Wangma who, together with Lama Trashi Wanggyel opened up the Tsachodrong pilgrimage site, now known as Hajo near Guwahati. Lama Trashi Wangje was a disciple of Pema Karpo (1527-1592), the great master of the Drukpa Kagyupa, and this

---

\(^{80}\) It is unknown which tribe this is, but perhaps the Nishi among whom facial tattoos were not practiced.

\(^{81}\) The title was also accorded to several illustrious figures in Bhutan in the 1950s and 1960s, such as the Monggar Dzongpön Babu Karchung and Babu Trashi, who also served as Trashigang Dzongpön.

\(^{82}\) Perhaps Muchu under Lumang geok where there is a Wakhar.

\(^{83}\) Until recent times, tsorgan is the name with which village elders and the ‘village heads’ are known in remote parts of eastern Bhutan, and the name is still in vogue in the Kalaktang area of Kameng district.

indicates that a patron-saint relationship between this school and the Yodung Wangma clan already existed in the late 16th century. As a result of these ties, according to the Gyelrik the Yodung Wangma clan was looked upon favourably by the new Drukpa authority. The Addenda themselves appear to have been added after the completion of the Gyelrik by the incumbent Wangma chief. As we will see in Chapter 6, this patron-saint relationship between the Yodung Wangma clan and the Drukpa Kagyu was one of the main reasons for the conflict with the new Gelukpa administration in Tibet.

4.2.6. THE JE CLAN.

From Lhase Tsangma’s eldest grandson, Thri Tenpal, who remained in Mizimpa, descended the Je clan. According to the Gyelrik (f. 15b), Langdarma’s son Ösung’s officers and subjects are said to have also fled to southern Mon, and since ‘prior to that there were not many people or settlements and in absence of a graded order among ruler and subject they disputed and quarrelled’. Thus they came to Mizimpa, and heading their request, Thri Tenpel’s son Namköde sends his three youngest sons with them as rulers. His eldest son Gungrigyel stays in Mizimpa, but the three youngers brothers Lhazangdar, Namsawang and Pelthonglek take the Tibetan exiles with them and settle in Nyima Chungrik, Nyima Cherik and Dungsamme. These names broadly refer to the present-day Trashigang, Mongar and Pemagatshel dzongkhaks in Bhutan respectively. It is said that ‘at that time the kings did not permanently seize a single settlement but instead they circulated around the settlements of the officers and subjects’ (Gyelrik ff. 16a).

Nyima Cherik could mean ‘clans of the greater sun’ and perhaps refers to the location of their territory on the west bank of the Gongri river, thus facing the rising sun. In this area, Lhazangdar and his heirs established ruling families and castles like Waichur Thumnangkhar, Casakhar and Kharnang Mude Norbugang, Ngatshang, Chitshang and Muktangkhar.85

84 This is in present-dayWaichur village in Drametse geok of Monggar dzongkhak.
85 The latter two are both in present-dayCasakhar geok of Monggar dzongkhak.
86 This is present-dayMonggar geok, which itself is also mentioned.
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Thenangbi, Drepong, Kekhar and the hitherto unidentified palaces of Betshanangkhar, Punmantshen, Kkekhar and Tshennag Shingkhar in the land of the Tsengmi (Gyelrik ff. 16b-17b).

Nyima Chungrik could, analogue to Nyima Cherik, mean ‘clans of the lesser sun’, since these villages are located on the east bank of the Gongri river, thus facing the setting sun. In the Nyima Chungrik area, Namsawang and his heirs established ruling families and castles like Bengkhar Trashigang, Rangchikhar, Cenkhar, Phragom, Khalingkhar, Tsenkhar, Domkhar, Wangserkumpa, Grongtö, and Grongme. One of Namsawang’s sons, Tongsum, and his son Tongrap travelled from Cenkhar via Gamrilungpa Rati and Phongmi.

---

87 Under present-day Jurme geok in Monggar dzongkhak, not to be mistaken with the Muktangkhar in footnote 22 of this Chapter.
88 This is present-day Themnangbi village below the Kori pass in Monggar dzongkhak.
89 This is the modern Drepung geok under Monggar dzongkhak.
90 Present-day Kaikhar under Jurme geok.
91 This is the dzong preceding the present-day Trashigang dzong. The Addendum states that it was located on a great rock stronghold, the outer wall of which was formed by the Drangmechu river. Bengkhar controlled the area between the duar of Gamri Nyauchung Sermi in the south and Tshengphu in the north. Dorji (2003:177) curiously calls this dzong Wengkhar, although both he and the Gyelrik (ff. 18a) agree this dzong was constructed by Serdung who originated in Wangserkunga.
92 This is present-day Rangzhikhar village in Samkhar geok under Trashigang dzongkhak.
93 Near Trashigang.
94 Now Thragom under Yalang geok of Trashi Yangtsi dzongkhak.
95 Present-day Khaling geog but apparently including the Artshan duars in Darrang district of the plains of Assam.
96 The ruins of this castle can still be found to the east of the Yonphu (not Yonphula) Lhakhang in Kanglung geok.
97 It was only in the 1970s that the stones of the ruins of this castle were used to construct the public Zangtopelri temple of Kanglung.
98 Dorji (2003:177), in accordance with Dzongkha spelling, mentions this place as Jongtö and the dzong established here as Kyiling Dzong.
99 According to Dorji (2003:177), Jongmē. These twin villages, the ‘upper village’ and the ‘lower village’ are probably located close to the present-day villages of Melphe and the area around the Maithidrang, the modern Trashigang town, respectively.

Khangpakhar\textsuperscript{100} to Thongrong\textsuperscript{101} where they seized a house at Wamapangdung\textsuperscript{102} before starting the royal families of Khardung\textsuperscript{103}. Cenkhar was undeniably one of the most important strongholds of the area. The addendum mentions that although it was earlier held by the Je clan, after the death of Tongrap it went into the hands of his son-in-law Dalebu of the Byar clan, but was then reclaimed by Danbu for the Je clan. The extent of the holdings of Cenkhar was considerable, if the declaration of Danbu comparing his land to a tiger on ff. 49a and 49b of the Gyelrik is to be believed: from the ‘head’ at Buri via the ‘waist’ at Cenkhar till the ‘marrow lake’ at lower Dungsam\textsuperscript{104} and the ‘tail’ at Dungsam\textsuperscript{105}.

The tiger has the mountain Phagam Jungmo supporting it from the back, Gomla Broksum as a golden trough\textsuperscript{106}, Gamri Dozhi\textsuperscript{107} like a wish-fulfilling gem and Bengkhar like the guard door to the land of the raksha demons. Cenkhar itself is compared to ‘the path along the ridge where the kata run, like the waterway where the khathra run, like the secret way where the path of humans run and like the check post on the way to India and Tibet’. In the Gyelrik it is furthermore stated (ff. 18b) that King Choka Dorje of Cenkhar ‘vied in magical skill with the Indian Raja of Darrang Duar\textsuperscript{110}, and that he won and since then this duar came under the control of the Bhutanese. The central position of Cenkhar is reiterated by the statement that ‘there is no other way than this’. It is further mentioned that the top at Yonphu\textsuperscript{111} is like a golden curtain spread out and the lower part at Domzi\textsuperscript{112} is like an elephant. The two sites of Bengkhar and Cenkhar were thus located close together, they

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{100} In present-day Phongme geok in Trashigang dzongkhak.
\textsuperscript{101} Presently a village with the same name under Phongme geok of Trashigang dzongkhak, viz. Fig. 13.2.
\textsuperscript{102} The ruins of this castle can still be seen at Wampangdung above Thongrong village, viz Fig. 4.5.
\textsuperscript{103} This is a village of the same name on the border of the present-day Radi and Phongme geoks.
\textsuperscript{104} This would correspond to present-day Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhak.
\textsuperscript{105} The present-day Pemagatshel dzongkhak.
\textsuperscript{106} Phagam Jungmo and Gomla Broksum could not be identified yet.
\textsuperscript{107} The Gamri river valley in Trashigang dzongkhak.
\textsuperscript{108} According to Aris ‘raven’.
\textsuperscript{109} These are the Lo Khathra ‘Lo with the variegated mouth’, who could not be identified yet.
\textsuperscript{110} Darrang is the border town just south of Samdrup Jongkhar and the location of the famous Mela Bazar and Godama trade areas.
\textsuperscript{111} This is Yonphula, the highest point on the Trashigang to Samdrup Jongkhar highway and the site of a monastery.
\textsuperscript{112} This site could not be identified.
\end{footnotesize}
were both ruled by the Je clan and thus closely allied and they controlled the entire trade route between India and Tibet, with the market place in India located at Bumpayer.\footnote{This site could not be identified.}

In the Dungsam area, Pelthonglek and his heirs, principally his son Ōbar and grandson Tshawo Changpo and his descendants Bangtsho and Zhongkar Tongphu\footnote{Encompassing the modern geoks of Shumar, Zobel and Khar on the east bank of the Urichu in Pemagatshel dzongkhag and Orong and Dewathang in Samdrup Jongkhar geoks. According to Pelgen and Gyeltshen, however, local sources claim Monyul Tongsum to be present-day Kupinyesa village in Minje geok in Lhuntse, probably as a result of the historic migration of the clan holders to this area.} established ruling families in Monyul Tongsum\footnote{Tongphu is located near Yongkala in Monggar dzongkhag, ref. footnote 51. Two competing clans thus established themselves at close geographic distance from each other. Later in history, the Tongphu king would play an important role, as Chapter 6 will show.} and Gungdung\footnote{This is the present-day Gongdü or Gongduk geok in Monggar dzongkhag. From the Logyu (ref. paragraph 6.6) it appears to have been a remote and inaccessible area even by the 17th century, and it was the last principality to submit to the Drukpa. Considering its geographic location between Pemagatshel and Zhonggar and the cultural contacts between these areas, its alliance with the Je clan is logical. The comparative isolation of the people of the Gungdung region throughout history has enabled them to preserve their unique language (ref. paragraph 12.3.4).} (ff. 20a-20b). Pelthonglek is the progeny of the Shalikhar Chöje, whereas from Bangtsho descend the lineages of Bangtsho Chöje and Chungkhar Chöje. These three Chöje families of Dungsam preserved a lay rather than a religious character and were thus distinct from families found in other places that descended from Buddhist religious masters.

Map IV shows the approximate location of the various petty kingdoms that were included in the Nyima Cherik, Nyima Chungrik and Dungsam areas and that were controlled by the lineages belonging to the Je clan.

A history of the Khardung Gyelpo or Khar Khoche of Pemagatshel is given in Norbu (2004). The descendants of Pelthonglek of the Je clan ruled parts of Dungsam from the castle located at Bongman Phai Chilo for 19

\footnote{The fortress of the Shalikhar Chöje was located in present-day Shumar geok of Pemagatshel dzongkhag.}

\footnote{Nowadays, the village of Bangtsho is located in the upper part of Dewathang geok in Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhag. Some people there still claim descent from the Bangtsho Chöje lineage.}

\footnote{Present-day Chungkhar in Zobel geok of Pemagatshel dzongkhag.}
generations. They became known as the ‘white castle clan’. The genealogy describes the 20th till the 26th generation after Pelthonglek. The work by Norbu (2004) also provides information on the boundaries of the area under the Khar Khoche in the 16th century and the empty landholdings. A great number of original Tshangla proper names can be found in the text besides Tibetan given names.

Some time in history, migration took place from Dungsam Bangtsho to the hamlet of Bangtsho near Umling village in Tsankhar geok of Lhüntsi dzongkhag. The people of Bangtsho still speak Tshangla, in contrast to their Chocangaca neighbours. It is in this village that an underground fortress is can be found, and some theories regarding its history have been described in Pelgen and Gyeltshen (2004). According to local folklore, Bangtsho decided to share his wealth with the younger brother Tanna on condition that he would leave the ancestral land. Tanna then left to Umling and built a nine-storied underground tower to keep his wealth from his enemies. Similar nine-storied towers were said to have existed in Khardung near Kupinyesa and in Wambur near Domkhar, all located close to Umling. The Tibetans, after learning of the wealth of the Bangtsho ruler, tried to capture the underground castle but failed due to its unique defensive location. Intelligence tests involving the counting of barley and amaranth seeds and sheep’s horns and dried gourds were all won by the Bangtsho chief. Finally, a local woman betrays the ruler’s daily schedule, and he was either killed or expelled to India, but reincarnated as a snake he still guards whatever treasures remain. During excavations in the 1990s, two bronze alloy vessels and some other artefacts were recovered. These excavations were unfortunately done unprofessionally and damaged the site, and many of the artefacts disappeared after the excavations. The ruin displays corbelled ceilings and traces of paintings similar to the architecture found in the Zhangzhung sites mentioned in paragraph 2.8, and the tower structure is reminiscent of the Kongpo, Qiang, Minyak and Gyalrong regions of Tibet mentioned in paragraph 2.10.1 and 2.7. Perhaps, the early migrants that settled the Dungsam area came from the far western or eastern regions of the Tibetan plateau, and brought with them the characteristic architectural style of their home region. As a result of the wet and warm climate and continued high population densities throughout history with resulting pressure on the local resources, the wood from many of the towers and castles that were once constructed decayed, and the stones have been used for other purposes. This would perhaps explain the general lack of archaeological finds of this kind in the Monyul area.
4.3. Lhalung Pelki Dorji’s Descendants.

Lhase Tsangma is not the only famous Tibetan historical character to start ruling families in the Monyul area. The six brothers of Langdarma’s assassin Lhalung Pelki Dorji are said to have fled from Tibet to escape the wrath of Langdarma’s followers. According to the Gyelrik (ff. 40a-43b) they started several ruling lineages in Central and Eastern Bhutan, including the Ṣbuṅ Ṣhechn families of Kurilung, the Ṣbuṅ Ṣöṅchen Pönpo in Bumthang, Kurilung and Yangtsi and the Ṣbuṅ Khengpo and Ṣbuṅ Khoche of Zhonggar. Curiously, none of the Tibetan histories make mention of any other brother of Lhalung Pelki Dorji except Ṣbuṅ Rabjor Wangpo, also known as Ṣbuṅ Rabjor Wangpo, who accompanied him when he was abbot at Samye (Karmay 2003).

According to the Gyelrik, three brothers fled from Phari through Paro and on the Bumthang. Upon arrival in Bumthang, they Ṣbuṅ Garwa Kheu Dorji came to head the pastoral families of Tshampa, Ṣbuṅ Topden Lawa Dorji became the Pönpo of Tang and Ṣbuṅ Yangtsel Preu Dorji became the Pönpo of Chökhor. According to Aris (1979:138-139), the biographies of the 2nd Gangte Trulku Tenzin Lekpai Döndrup (1645-1726) and the 1st incarnation of Druk Desi Tenzin Rapgye Mipham Wangpo

---

120 The title Khoche appears in various other places, such as in Khaling geok of Trashigang, where there is a village called Ṣbuṅ Khochehai ‘house of the Khoche’. There might also be an ancient connection between this title and the Koch tribe of Bengal, although this is purely speculative.

(1709-1738) contain a slightly variant version of this story, in which king Songdetsen’s son Dechung Döndrup has two descendants, Depo and Dechung who become the rulers of Laya. From these two descent Kheu Dorji who becomes the Dung of Ngang village also ruling over Dur, Lawa Dorji who settles in Tshampa and Preu Dorji who settles in Tang.

The Gyelrik, however, continues the story with the three brothers that came from Lhodrak, Khatsing Leki Dorji, Phomtshar Drakpa Dorji and Mrekhe Cangrik Dorji. One of them, upon arrival at Kurilung, said ‘because in this area there are only a few scattered people, villages and fields, here it will not allow for the implementation of activities by us three brothers. After going to other areas we should seek out subjects and capture district castles by means of virulence and force’. Thus Khatsing Leki Dorji became the Pönchen of Tshirap Tongphu Zhangtshen in lower Durang. King Yonglaphan of the ancestral castle of Mizimpa contended with him but lost and departed. Khatsing Leki Dorje and his descendants also became the Pönchen of Muhung Shero Samying ‘new and old Muhung Shero’. The descendants of Phomtshar Drakpa Dorji started the lineages of the Pönchen, Pönpo and Zhelngo of Kurilung, including the Pönpo of Raksa and Kyiling. Finally, Mrekhe Cangrik Dorje and his descendants started the Khoche and Khengpo families of Zhonggar, Chali, Tokari, Themung and Nyatsi.

121 A village in Gasa dzongkhag of northwestern Bhutan, inhabited by semi-nomadic Brokpa people who have a distinctive lifestyle and dress and speak a Central Bodish language.
122 A village in Chökhor geok of Bumthang dzongkhag, home to the Ngang temple.
123 Also located in Chökhor geok of Bumthang and inhabited by semi-nomadic Brokpa people speaking the Central Bodish Brokkt language.
124 This is present-day Tongmizhangsa geok under Trashi Yangtsi dzongkhag. Durang is one of the old names of the Khulong river valley. It appears that this area was also historically linked to the Tongphu kings of the Je clan, and that the Chocangaca speakers moved from Zhonggar Tongphu to Tongphuzhangtshan ‘maternal relatives of Tongphu’.
125 Raksa is located near Timula opposite Lhüntsi Dzong. Kyiling is now known as Kyilung village under Gangzur geok in Lhüntsi dzongkhag.
126 Zhonggar became home to the Zhonggar Khoche. At Zhonggar the Drukpa made an army encampment and later constructed the Zhonggar Dzong, which became the regional capital for all the eastern
Map V shows the approximate locations and delimitations of the areas ruled by the various families in Monyul claiming descent from Lhalung Pelki Dorji’s sons.

4.4. THE DUNG FAMILIES OF BUMTHANG, ZHONGGAR AND KHENG.

A final category of ruling families include the illustrious Дung lineages that ruled in Bumthang and Kheng and a single offshoot in Zhonggar, the Je family. Aris (1979: 115-139) presented various versions of the origin of these Dung families. The Ura tradition is described in the Gyelrik (ff. 32a2-36a) and in the oral account as he recorded it from Лопон Сонам Зангпо in 1973. The tradition of Zhonggar Moiwalung and Dungsam Monyul Tongsum tradition is also told in the Gyelrik (ff. 36a-40a). The Ngang tradition is found in the biographies of Tenzin Lekpai Dondrup (ff. 22b-24a) and Mipham Wangpo (ff. 5b-6b). Orally transmitted versions, partially based perhaps on written sources, and thus garbled and incomplete, have been recorded from local sources in Wangdi (2004) and Galay (2004). In the Gyelrik, Ngawang (f. 40a) himself already explained that there are more than one version of the story, because the main figure is of non-human descent, and he would have appeared differently in the eyes of different people, resulting in slight variations in the story. The various places where Dung families traditionally held authority, based on the variations of the stories presented below, have been given in Map V.

4.4.1. THE DUNG STORY: URA VERSION.

The plot of the story takes place among the descendants of Khyikha Rathö living in Monyul. Among them there is no ruler of royal descent, and they pray to Ode Gunggyel who says

’the divine son Guse Langling, having grasped the Mu cord, will descent to Ura’. Guse Langling becomes known as the ‘Divinely Emanated Dung’\textsuperscript{132}. Guse Langling, his son Lhazanggyel, and his grandson Drakpa Wangchuk rule the area, but Drakpa Wangchuk dies without an heir. Before passing away he tells his subjects that they should go to Yarlung Drongmoche in Tibet taking with them some nicely coloured pears from Mon\textsuperscript{133}. He advises his subjects to drop the pears among a group of children, and the one who manages to get the most is his emanation. After around five years the subjects follow his advice and find the boy, who happens to be a descendant of Langdarma’s son Ösung (ref. paragraph 5.1). They abduct the boy and take him back to Ura where they rename him Lhawang Drakpa and install him as the Dung. The sons from his union with Ace Dronzom from Chökhor start the Dung lineages of Chume, Gyatsha\textsuperscript{134}, Domkhar\textsuperscript{135}, Dur\textsuperscript{136} and Ngang\textsuperscript{137} in Bumthang. From the marriage of his son Drakpa Wangchuk with Ponmo Trashi Wangmo from Kheng came a son, Nyima Namgyal, who became the main progenitor of the Nyakhar\textsuperscript{138}, Tunglabi\textsuperscript{139}, Gozhing\textsuperscript{140}, Phangkhar\textsuperscript{141} and Kalamti\textsuperscript{142} Dung in Kheng and Yonglam Je\textsuperscript{143} in Zhonggar Moiwalungpa.

4.4.2. THE DUNG STORY: ZHONGGAR AND DUNGSAM VERSION.

The version told in Zhonggar Moiwalung and Dunsam Monyul Tongsum is slightly different. It has a prologue in which the Brokpa have left their ancestral home in

\textsuperscript{132} Aris interestingly makes the link between the name Guse Langling and a place called Ling Guse, Ling Guse, Ling Guse, a principality in eastern Tibet ruled by a chief claiming descent of the epic hero Gesar and a place intimately linked with the Lang clan.

\textsuperscript{133} Whereas pears are called in Tibetan and Dzongkha, in Tshangla they are known as /litong/.

\textsuperscript{134} Present-day Gyatsa village in Chume valley of Bumthang dzongkhak.

\textsuperscript{135} There is still a dzong with the same name in Chume valley of Bumthang dzongkhak.

\textsuperscript{136} Ref. footnote 121.

\textsuperscript{137} Ref. footnote 122. Apparently the origin of these two Dung are attributed to two variant stories.

\textsuperscript{138} Present-day Nyakha village under Nangkor geok in Zhemgang dzongkhak.

\textsuperscript{139} See footnote 12 on page 65.

\textsuperscript{140} Present-day Goshing geok under Zhemgang dzongkhak.

\textsuperscript{141} Present-day Phangkhar geok under Zhemgang dzongkhak.

\textsuperscript{142} Present-day Kalamti village under Bardo geok in Zhemgang dzongkhak.

\textsuperscript{143} The historical seat of the Yonglam Je remains to be identified.
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They pray to the Lord Indra who sends Guse Langling down to assist their god residing in Dungtszo Karmathang lake. He goes to the land of the Mu where he receives the name Mutsen Lhanyen Chenpo and when he looks east from the top of the Gangri Karpo mountain, he sees the mountain of Wangseng. He then builds a palace at Mukulung Tshomo where he resides as the lhatsen ‘divine protector’. Then the bride of the king of Dungsamkhar, coming from the east, sleeps a night at the lake and a white snake, the lhatsen in disguise, fathers a son with her who is named Barke ‘born interjacently’.

When Barke grows up he is prevented from reaching the duar plains by a naga demon at Ngetsang Longpai lake. He wants to meet his father to ask for assistance in removing this obstruction. His mother reluctantly tells him the way he was conceived and he goes to Mukulung lake. His father promises him an army and gives him a bamboo tube not to be opened before reaching the lake. Because Barke is curious, he opens the tube at Khrephu and some poisonous snakes come out and slither off. He quickly closes the tube and only after reaching the lake he opens it again. The snakes make the lake disappear, but in the middle of the lake stands an upside-down copper vessel.

144 The Yazang Pönpo from the Brokpa myth, ref. Chapter 11 and Annex VIII.
145 Dungtszo Karmathang could be identified with the Dungtszo ‘origin lake’ near the Jomo Kungkhar mountain, both dedicated to Ama Jomo Remati (ref. Chapter 11). Alternatively, Wangdi (2004) proposed that the name Dungsam is derived from this lake, which after drying up became the first settlement of the Khoche nobility. Dungtszo Karmathang, in the local Dungsam tradition, is located on a hill above present-day Khar village and the ruins of the first settlement can still be seen there. A spatial map of Bhutan clearly shows a depression in the middle of Pemagatshel dzongkhag, which now encompasses Yurung geok. This depression appears like an ancient lake, perhaps caused by the impact of a meteorite in ancient times, drained to the East by the Nyokho, Gongma, Gelong, Gimrong and finally Yoilam streams which flow into the Uri river and finally drain much to the north in the Gongri river. It was the sight of this depression which caused His Holiness Dudjom Rinpoche to rename the area from Dungsam Khoidung to Pemagatshel, as the area appeared to him like an opened lotus flower.
146 According to Aris (1979:83) probably a mystical land.
147 This mountain remains to be identified, or could be a mythical mountain in the land of Mu.
148 Ref. footnote 2 to this chapter.
149 This lake/place remains to be identified.
150 Perhaps the lake now known as Ngangtsho in upper Samrang geok of Samdrup Jongkhar.
151 The statue of Chana Dorje that was retrieved as treasure from the copper vessel in the lake can, as Aris (1979:133) mentioned, still be found in the Chador Lhakhang in Bartsham village in Trashigang dzongkhak. It is the main treasure of this area and because of its origin from the lake of the naga-
under which the naga demon’s maid servant is hiding. She hits Barke with a copper ladle on the forehead, he dies, and his brain is eaten by a fish. His consciousness is transferred into the fish, and he swims in the Drangmechu, the Kuri and the Moiwa rivers until he swims up the Changkhoi river and is caught by a bachelor from there. Since the fish speaks to him in human speech, the bachelor keeps the fish in a trough with water in his house. Every day after coming back from work in the fields he notices that the household chores are done and wondering how that is possible he spies to see a boy emerge from the fish. He then throws away the fish skin and makes the boy his adopted son, giving him the name Raipa Topchen ‘long haired one with great strength’, builds himself a castle at Itung pass and rules over Ura and Moiwalung. In order to see the land of his maternal uncle at Chali he orders the Tong hill to be cut down and spread out. A passing woman comments ‘it is easier to cut down a tall man than a tall mountain’. The subjects, understanding the hint, lead the king to an archery show at Karbi where the king is hit by an arrow and dies. His last words tell his people to go and look for his reincarnation in Yarlung Drongmoche by throwing a handful of cowry shells among a group of children, and the child picking up most shells is his reincarnation. Here, this version of the story ends.

demon it is said to protect the neighbouring geoks, Ramjar, Bidung and Bartsham from snakes, which is why no poisonous snakes can be found here. The copper vessel itself, taken to Ura by Dung Nakpo, was brought to Punakha dzong where it is known as the ‘the pot of the king of the great lake’.

152 This river, spelled as by Thinlay (2003:293) flows past Lingmethang and joins the Kuri river.

153 Aris (1979:134-138) already gave a textual analysis of the various myths and their comparison with superficially similar myths told by for example the Thulung Rai and in the Tunhuang literature.

154 The Raipa Topchen of this story is undoubtedly the same as the king of Tongphu in the story as recorded by Galay (2004) from Thridangbi, and clearly these are just slightly divergent versions of the origin story of the Dung.

155 The Yotongla is a minor pass near Thridangbi village in Saling geok in Monggar dzongkhak. The areas of Zhonggar Moiwalung and Bumthang Ura were traditionally closely related politically as well as economically. Even till date, most of the wetland located below Yongkala is owned by the people of Ura who also let their cattle graze in this area during winter. The people of Thridangbi act as sharecroppers and cattle herders of the Ura people. At a certain point in time, the Tongphu king of the Je clan, who originated in Dungsam and had his main palace near present-day Yongkola, appears to have subdued the other clans, until his defeat by the Drukpa forces (ref. Chapter 6).

156 An almost similar phrase occurs in the Brokpa origin myth, ref. Chapter 11.
4.4.3. OTHER VARIATIONS.

Another version is given in Aris (1979:130-133) as was told by Lopön Sonam Zangpo. This version tells about the ruler of Khangpadi on the Indian border, bringing himself as wife the daughter of the ruler of Tshona. At a place called Tsongtsongma, a naga demon makes her pregnant and she delivers a boy. From here the story is similar to the second version above until the boy, taken in by a bachelor in Trüthang, the place where nowadays the ruins of Zhonggar Dzong can be found, is made the king of this place. He dies of old age, but as in the other versions tells his subjects to look for his reincarnation in Tibet. After finding this boy, they install him as the king and he acts both as the king of Zhonggar and of Ura.

Wangdi (2004: 36-38) presents a version of the story from the Dungsam area, in which Barke was born in Dungsam, killed at Ngetsang Longpa lake, and after his consciousness enters the fish he swims through the Bronalari stream below Khar to the Changkhoi river. It is no other than Raipa Topchen who becomes known as the Casakhar masang who, since his wife is from Chali, is also known as the Chali Masang. He is asked to destroy the Shalikhar Dzong in Dungsam. The hamlet of ‘the footprint of the masang’ in Chali geok and the village of ‘little Masang’ along the Moiri river have been named after this masang.

A final version of the story is described in Galay (2004), recorded from the Chocangacac-speaking village of Thridangbi in Monggar. Tongphu in Zhonggar was one of the most powerful kingdoms established by Bangtsho. Some of the ministers in the Tongphu kingdom came from Bumthang Ura, as even in those days there were close relations between the people of Ura and the people of Zhonggar. Local lore holds it that near the palace of the Tongphu king there was a tongshing ‘wild pear tree’ stood, hence tongphu ‘wild pear hill’. His queen was from Masanggang in Chali. Apparently they did not reside together as out of love for his queen, the king daily walked up the Zarkula hill to gaze at her

---

157 Ref. footnote 24 to this chapter.

158 A masang is a kind of strong man, a human with supernatural strength, power and endurance. The name is derived from the clan representing one of the first clans of the Tibetan plateau, and Ling Gesar was also considered one of their descendants (Olschak 1979:95).

159 According to the tradition located on the slope of Zarkula mountain above Yongkala, present-day Yongkala pass, just above Thridangbi village.

house. One day he ordered his ministers to cut down the mountain, so he could look at his
queen’s house out of his bedroom window. The ministers, unable to refuse the order,
assembled a compulsory labour force from the local communities. But despite months of hard
work, no progress was made and the spot came to be known as ߜnotin obkola ‘ditch-
digging mountain’, and the people got utterly frustrated. One evening an old woman carrying
a little baby appeared and repeatedly sung the verse ߜnotin obkola ‘instead of spreading the high mountain, it is better to spread the important person’. The
message was understood, and an archery match was organised between Tongphu and the
neighbouring ߜnotin kingdom. The match went on for three days and the
scores were still tally. Although both of the kings were supposed to be the last archers, the
Tongphu ministers suggested a change in their order, and with the Drakkar king’s turn
arrived, the Tongphu king was on the other end of the archery range, near the target,
customarily trying to encourage his own team and distract his opponents. The Tongphu
archers provoked the Drakkar king by telling him he was such a bad archer, he would never
hit someone the size of the Tongphu king, let alone the much smaller target. Annoyed and
irritated, the Drakkar king took aim, and shot the Tongphu king in the chest. As described in
detail in Galay (2004), many loconyms in the area are connected to this match, the death of
the Tongphu king and the feelings the people subsequently experienced.

The myth continues how, as directed in Tongphu king’s last will uttered in his
moment of death, the Tongphu people took some pears from the pear tree near to the palace
and went to Lhasa in Tibet. They threw the pears into a crowd of children, and the small boy
who picked up the pear and commented it originated from the tree next to his palace was
abducted and taken to Bumthang. Upon reaching Ura Pangkhar, the boy, fearing a fate
similar to that of his previous incarnation, pleads to remain in Ura, where he came to be
known as Ura Dung Nakpo.

4.4.4. A POSSIBLE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND FOR THE DUNG.

A major element missing in the Dung myths recounted above is the almost complete absence
of links to historical personalities whose existence can be independently verified from written
sources originating in Tibet or elsewhere. The only exception is the link to Langdarma’s son
Ӧsung. In the stories of Lhase Tsangme and Lhalung Pelki Dorji the ruling families attribute

160 The Drakkar kingdom was located around Tsenzabi village located south of the Moiri river ref. footnote 13 to Chapter 7.
their origin to exiled aristocrats, some of whom we know have actually existed. That they actually descended from these two figures is unlikely, and it would be more acceptable to consider they descended from some aristocratic Tibetan families exiled around the same historical period. But such a historical background is missing from the Dung myths. History has, however, left us some circumstantial evidence to place the arrival of the Dung in context.

In the middle of the 14th century a group of people, perhaps a clan or tribe, called the Dung or Dungreng were defeated by the Sakya government that had taken control of Tibet in the mid-13th century CE (Petech 1990, Aris 1979: 120-121). The Dung followed the Bon religion, inhabited Lhoka in southern Tibet and were held responsible for persistent attacks on authority and communities in central and southern Tibet. They became separated in two groups, the Lhodung and the Shardung (Petech 1990). Aris (1979: 120) identified the Lhodung as the people of Bumthang and the Shardung as the people of Tawang, and as part of his evidence provided the names of various locations in the area with the suffix <-dung>. Ardussi (2004) contested that on basis of new information from written sources dating from the period 1350 to 1650. According to Ardussi, the Lhodung inhabited Sikkim, the Chumbi valley and western Bhutan (principally Ha and Paro) and they were defeated when 160 of their leaders were slaughtered in 1353. Ardussi assumes them to be the ancestors of the Dung in Western Bhutan. In 1354 the Shardung with their base in the hills of Lhodrak above Yamdrok lake led by their leader Dondrup Dar were defeated. Ardussi holds these Shardung to have fled across the Himalayas to start the Dung lineages of Ura, Ngang, Tshona, Tawang, Zhonggar and Dungsam.

4.5. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.

Between 850 and 1350, subsequent waves of Tibetan exiles and refugees settled among the native populations in the areas peripheral to the Tibetan plateau, including Monyul. From the historical sources, it appears that, probably because of the advanced culture they brought with them, they gained or seized control over the indigenous people and imposed their rule on them, becoming the aristocratic lineages of a large number of what became small self-ruling clans, principalities and fiefdoms. They also introduced a more or less standardised spoken and written language and a codified belief system. Moreover they attributed their authority to divine sources and a royal heritage, thus making acceptance of their rule to local communities easier. Despite these obvious advantages, they entered lands they had previously not lived in,

with a completely different topography, climate and vegetation, and for their daily subsistence and livelihoods they were largely dependent on the skills and knowledge of the indigenous people. This is still obvious in many of the languages of the area, where the basic vocabulary has maintained a distinctively native character, whereas the more advanced vocabulary is clearly derived from post-7th century Tibetan. The historical sources, though elaborate in their treatment of the clan lineages and ruling families, offer unfortunately limited insight into the native populations whom they encountered on their arrival in Monyul. The next chapter will analyse some of the limited information that is available, and also provide some background stories from the 800 years of local rule in Monyul.
Map I. Lhase Tsangma’s journey to Monyul.

Map II. Spread of the Jowo and Byar clans in Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.

Figure 4.1. View of Moiwalung, Monggar dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.
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Map III. Spread of the Yede, Tungde and Wangma clans in Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.

Figure 4.2. View of Moiwalung, Monggar dzongkhak Eastern Bhutan.

Map IV. Spread of the Je clan in Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.

Figure 4.4. The ruin of the khar of Bageng, Drametse geok, Monggar dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.
Map V. Spread of the descendants of the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji and the Dung in Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.

Figure 4.4. The ruin of the ancestral castle at Mizimpa Tsenkhar, Khamdang geok, Trashiyangtse dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 4.5. The chorten and ruin of a khar at Wampangdung, Phonme geok, Trashigang dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.
CHAPTER 5. LIFE IN MONYUL IN THE EARLY MEDIEVAL PERIOD.

The period between the establishment of the clan authority in the 8th century CE and the annexation by the Drukpa and Gelukpa theocracies in the 17th century is called the early medieval period of Monyul. Modern Bhutanese sources generally describe this period as a time during which the local rulers constantly waged war and conflict with each other and the subject people did not experience any peace (e.g. Tshering 2003:142). As the maps show, there were certain areas, such as Zhonggar Moiwalungpa, Chökhor and Chume in Bumthang and Gangzurto in Kurilung, where rulers of various clans had established themselves close to one another, leading to competition and conflict. The genealogies of the Gyalri and the biographies and autobiographies of Buddhist masters like Guru Rinpoche and Pema Lingpa give some impressions of life at the courts of the ruling clans and families. Much less, if anything at all, is known about subject people. But it can logically be inferred that the ruling clans of Tibetan origin assumed control over existent indigenous populations, and there are several references to this in the literature. The literature also presents some insights into everyday life in Monyul in the period between the 8th and the 17th centuries.

5.1. THANGTONG GYELPO AND KHANDRO DROWA ZANGMO.

The Tibetan Buddhist saint Thangtong Gyelpo (1385-1464) was affiliated mainly with his own Thangluk or Cakzampa tradition, a sub-school of the Shangpa Kagyu School (Gerner 2007). Thangtong Gyelpo is not only revered as an accomplished Buddhist master and treasure-discoverer, but also as one of the ‘divine madmen’. He spread the teachings through his contact with common people and his daily works, which aimed at fulfilling a vision he received from Cenrezik to relieve the people of the Himalayas from the arduous crossings of rivers and gorges. He is also credited for using the Ace Lhamo opera for collecting money and donations which would help him in his work.

The first bridge Thangtong Gyelpo constructed in 1430 AD was the Chushül Cakzam in Tibet. In 1433 he visited western Bhutan (Gerner 2007:9) where he built the extraordinary Dungtse Lhakhang in Paro. He is supposed to have imported blacksmith tools and raw iron from Tibet and forged his first iron chains in Ha and later in

---

1 Including the Byar clan in Yongkola, the Tongphu Gyelpo of the Je clan in Tongphu, and the Khengpo and Khoche families of Zhonggar, Tokari and Themong.

Paro and Genekha in Bhutan. Many of the iron chains were transported back to Tibet, but he also constructed several bridges in western Bhutan. These include the bridge at Tangcho Lhakhang, the Tsangmi Cakzam at Bardrong in Wangdu, the Chudzom Cakzam, the Chaze Cakzam, the Changchi Cakzam, the Chukha Cakzam, and the Lumboleng Cakzam.

After a few years in Tibet, in 1444 Thangtong Gyelpo visited Eastern Monyul (Gerner 2007:14). At the village of Barshong near Khaling, a rich iron ore deposit was discovered, and Thangtong Gyelpo employed the iron extracted here to construct several additional iron chain bridges, some of which survived till our time. These include the Trashitse Cakzam, the Doksum Cakzam, the Drangme Cakzam and the Khoma Cakzam. Pommaret

2 Until the 1950 tax reform, the people of Genekha fulfilled their tax commitment to the state in raw iron and wrought and forged iron products obtained from the Cakorla site.

3 Present-day Tamchok Gonpa in Paro. On royal command, the iron chain bridge which was washed away in 1969 was rebuilt in 2005 using chains from various other bridges in Bhutan, including the bridge at Doksum.

4 This is at the site where at the time of Lhase Tsangma the Bardrong bridge was located, ref. footnote 9 to Chapter 4. The Tsangmi Cakzam existed from 1433 to 1684 and is now the site of a modern and a traditional cantilever bridge below the Wangdû Phodrang dzong.

5 At the site of the modern bridge connecting Paro and Ha dzongkhaks to the Thimphu-Phüntsholing highway.


8 In Chukha dzongkhak.

9 Near present-day Khasadrappu under Mewang geok of Thimphu Dzongkhak.

10 As Rapten (2001, in Gerner 2007) reported, the iron ore deposits were exploited in a traditional manner until the present times, and the people of the area paid their tax dues largely in iron ore. The rest products, locally called perkhi ‘iron stool’ can still be found in Barshong as well as several other sites in Eastern Bhutan.

11 This bridge was located at the place still called Cakzam where now a modern bridge is located, below Trashigang Dzong. In Lhase Tsangma’s time, the river could be crossed by a cane bridge (ref. footnote 21 to Chapter 4). The bridge connected the internal regions of Monyul with India as well as India, Monyul and Tibet and was therefore of great importance. The bridge was washed away by flood in 1968, but the towers still stand, and a renovated Drupthop Lhakhang is located close to the modern bridge. Many people born in the immediate area receive the name Drupthop in Thangtong Gyelpo’s remembrance.

12 This bridge connected the village of Tomzhangtschen (ref. footnote 123 to Chapter 4) to the main trade route between India, Monyul and Tibet. It was renovated in 1969 using the iron chains from the Tashitse Cakzam. In 2004, the bridge was demolished and the chains were used to reconstruct the Tamchom Cakzam. About the central location of Doksum, ref. footnote 26 to Chapter 4.

13 This bridge is located between Kengkar geok in Monggar dzongkhak and Shumar geok in Pemagatshel dzongkhak, close to the confluence of the Uri river and the Gongri river. It lies on the historically important
(1997) reported that Thangtong Gyelpo had a local consort named Drupthop Zangmo\(^{15}\), and according to Gerne (2007:20-24) he fathered a son called Buchung Gyelwa Zangpo during his stay at the village of Gyengo\(^{16}\).

During his stay in Monyul, Thantong Gyelpo is thought to have also visited the Tawang area. Local tradition holds that he meditated at Cakhargor near the village of Kraling to the southeast of Tawang. He also constructed an iron chain bridge over the Tawang river, connecting the south bank at Mukto with the north bank at Kitpi, that exists till this day (Sarkar 1975a:22).

Beside the religious and infrastructural achievements of Thangtong Gyelpo, he is also widely accredited for starting the Ace Lhamo, the famous Tibetan folk opera, despite the fact that his biography does not make specific mention of it. In order to fund his bridge-building activities, Thangtong Gyelpo is believed to have recruited several girls who performed a combination of dances, chants and songs in the open air. He drew his repertoire from Buddhist stories as well as local myths and legends, and these were later canonised into the Ace Lhamo performed by Tibetan cultural groups till now.

For centuries the play of Khandro Drowa Zangmo was performed in Tibet and many of the areas under the Tibetan sphere of influence, including Tawang. Bhutan, however, had its own local entertainment practices, and it seems the Ace Lhamo opera never reached any noteworthy popularity. Adaptations of most of the Ace Lhamo plays, however, were translated into Dzongkha and adapted to be used as textbooks for Dzongkha education. Till present, the Brokpa, the Dakpa, the Tshangla of Dirang and the Sherdukpen of Kameng perform a dance called Ace Lhamo\(^{17}\) during festive occasions. This dance, shown in Figure 5.1, is a greatly simplified version of the traditional prelude of an Ace Lhamo opera performance. In this prelude, a group of seven ngönpo ‘hunters’ wearing large dark blue masks with white hair have the task to purify all negative forces. The two gyalu

---

\(^{14}\) This bridge is located near Khoma village in LHüntsédzongkhag.

\(^{15}\) She is thought to be Pema Lingpa’s paternal aunt who introduced him to the Buddhist teachings (Pommaret 1997).

\(^{16}\) The village of Gyengo is located in the Brokpa area near Merak, and the embalmed remains of Buchung Gyelwa Zangpo, also Buchung Gyelwa Zangpo, are thought be preserved in a gold-and-copper chorten in the local temple. Statues of this son can be seen in Paro and in Gyengo (Gerner 2007).

\(^{17}\) Including, till several years ago, the Gomphu Kora festival, ref. footnote 25 on page 57. The origin of the ‘Ajilama’ dance according to Sherdukpen folklore is given in Elwin (1993:133-134).
‘bearded men’ wearing long robes and large yellow masks have the task of overseeing whether the ngönpo carry out their task satisfactorily. At the end of the ceremony, a group of seven young maidens called Ƈī̱ī՜īŷ Ɨī ace lhamo ‘noble lady goddesses’ wearing golden crowns with large colourful fans attached come on stage, singing praises to Thangtong Gyalpo. It is only then that the narrator introduces the story to the audience. The stories that are part of the Ace Lhamo are shortly introduced in Annex III. The Ace Lhamo performed in the Monyul region usually involves two gyalu or ƂƗīŸīŵī ‘translators’ wearing goat-hide masks, two ՜īŷ Ɨī pamo ‘heroines’ or ՜īŷ ‘goddesses’ with the five-tiered ԙŢƅī̙ī crowns with fans representing the good, and one ngönpo wearing a circular band around the head representing evil, all dressed in traditional attire from the region. Usually, the dance is used to collect money for the individual dance troupe or their community.

The story of Șawməųʃьǐųнкə Khandro Drowa Zangmo is a story that originated from Monyul and it is not inconceivable that Thangtong Gyelpo on his journeys in Monyul came across this story and adapted it for performance. Zhāng (1997:17) also mentions that the background of the famous opera ‘Zhuowa Sangmu’ was the clan-based society of Monyul ruled by king ‘Ganang Wangpo\(^\text{18}\), after the collapse of the Yarlung Empire.

A description of the story of Khandro Drowa Zangmo based on two sources is provided in Annex III. In this appendix, many locations and scenes in the story have been linked to present-day locations in the Monyul area, based on local accounts. That there are intricate links between Khandro Drowa Zangmo, Thangthong Gyelpo and the people of Monyul is reiterated in a short history in the Gyalrik (ff. 30a-b). In this story Thangtong Gyelpo meets with ՟Ųī˘ŵī Jowo Dargye, grandson of ՟Үհũус Lhundrup the chief of Berkhar in Shartsho\(^\text{19}\). Jowo Dargye at that time stayed in Ramagengra\(^\text{20}\) after marrying ɱīԻŲī Usen\(^\text{21}\) of the Yede clan. On this occasion, Thangthong Gyelpo presents him with Khandro Drowa Zangmo’s űпīů Ɨűī ‘skull cap’. In Sarkar (1975a:22) we can find a slightly different version of this meeting based on local sources in Tawang, in which Thangtong Gyelpo visited Berkhar Targye\(^\text{22}\) and gave him a begging bowl saying that if he kept it carefully, seven intelligent and courageous sons would be born to him. As the prophesy materialised, the household of Berkhar Dargye became known as Űųșīŵ ƗīŵιŲī Pawodun or

\(^{18}\) I.e. king Kala Wangpo.

\(^{19}\) A descendant of the Jowo clan, ref. footnote 32 on p. 68.

\(^{20}\) Footnote 66 to Chapter 4.

\(^{21}\) Tshangla for ‘younger sister’.

\(^{22}\) I.e. Jowo Darje of Berkhar.
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Paudun ‘seven heroes’\(^{23}\). It is interesting to note how this story, with minor differences, survived in both the local folklore of Tawang and in the Gyelrik. One of the sons of Jowo Dargye, namely the third son Jowo Sumpa (Gyelrik ff. 30b) or, according to Sarkar (1975: 23) the second or seventh son was send as monk to the Gelukpa monasteries of Trashilhunpo and Sera in Tibet. This son was to play an important role in later history.

The story of Drowa Zangmo presents a picture of Monyul around the turn of the first millennium AD pretty consistent with the historical literature. The area was divided in principalities ruled by patrilineal clans. Conflict and warfare between the various principalities was common. Although Buddhism had entered the area during and after the period of the first diffusion, there were still many people, including among the clan nobility, who followed the old Bon beliefs. This makes it more conceivable that the story is placed during the time of the second diffusion of Buddhism, when Buddhist saints and their patrons tried to propagate the religion among the common people. The story revolves around this conflict between good and evil, between Buddhism and Bon, and attempts to convince the public that sinful human beings can improve their fate by taking decisions that follow the Buddhist precepts.

5.2. Terton Pema Lingpa’s Legacy.

One of the greatest Buddhist saints ever born in Monyul was the famous Terton ‘treasure discoverer’ Pema Lingpa (1450-1521). He was born Chel Baribrang in the Tang valley of Bumthang and authored several works of religious and secular nature on the history of his home region. He is, for example, believed to have authored the story of Sindha Radza and to have retrieved the terma ‘treasure text’ containing the description of the beyul of Khenpajong in which one version of the myth of Khyikha Rathö is contained. He constructed several temples such as the temple of Tamzhing Lhundrup Choling in Chokhor valley of Bumthang.

According to Aris (1989), two of Pema Lingpa’s patrons in Bumthang were Thuppa Tashi also known as Pönpo Kunthup and his brother Chöki Tashi. At that time, Bumthang was perhaps a vassal state of the Tibetan administration through the Lhalung Nangso, but with a local administration (1979:118-119, 124). The archaeological research reported in Blumer (2001) and Blumer and Blaillard (2001) revealed a fortress and funeral monument near Batpalathang.

\(^{23}\) Ref. footnote 43 to Chapter 4.

and a fortress near Tamzhing Lhakhang thought to be the Yurwashing Dzong\(^{24}\) from Pema Lingpa’s biography.

In 1504 and 1507 AD Pema Lingpa visited some of the local rulers of eastern Monyul and his account presents a vivid picture of those days (Aris 1979:104-107). Pema Lingpa described King Jophak Darma who resided in Shar Domkha\(^{25}\) as patron of the Karmapa. This king had only recently given up Hindu and Bon practices, such as human and animal sacrifice. According to the biography, this sacrifice to Shiva was required because a demon prevented the kings of Mon from crossing the age of 25. The sacrifices were only stopped after king Jophak took full refuge in Buddhism from the Karmapa and Pema Lingpa. In Domkha, Pema Lingpa also received a visit from King Nilāmbhar, the Rājā of Kāmāṭa who fled his kingdom when it was destroyed by Muslims and who apparently found temporary refuge here.

Pema Lingpa then visited the Dung of Dirang\(^{26}\), and the temple of Ugyenling\(^{27}\) close to Bemkhar\(^{28}\). He proceeded to Detongkhar in Zanglungpa\(^{29}\) where he was received by Gyepdar of the Tongde clan\(^{30}\). Pema Lingpa’s son Khedrup Kunga Wangpo settled in Kurtö. There he started the Khochung and Dungkar Chöje families, and he later moved to Trashigang where he started the Khairi Chöje lineage in Bidung which later spread to Dungsam.

Not only does Pema Lingpa’s biography give interesting insights into the life in Monyul in the early 16th century, he also contributed a lot to the spiritual enrichment and development of the Nyingmapa. His visits to the rulers of the various principalities, belonging to the major Jowo, Tungde and Byar clans, were ostensibly meant to spread the Nyingma teachings in these areas traditionally supporting the Karma Kagyupa, and to garner financial and other support by converting them into his local patrons. Despite later dominance of the Gelukpa

---

\(^{24}\) Called ‘Uishing Dzong in local speech.

\(^{25}\) The kings of Domkha were members of the Byar clan. Ref. footnote 61 to Chapter 4.

\(^{26}\) Why the king of Dirang is called Dung is unclear. The kings of Dirang descended from the Jowo clan, ref. footnote 38 to Chapter 4.

\(^{27}\) This is one of the oldest Nyingmapa monasteries in the Tawang area, dating between the 9th and 12th centuries.

\(^{28}\) I.e. Bemkhar under authority of the Jowo clan, ref. footnote 42 to Chapter 4.

\(^{29}\) I.e. Dütungkhar under authority of the Tungde clan, ref. footnote 74 to Chapter 4.

\(^{30}\) I.e. the Tungde clan.
Chapter 5. Life in Monyul in the Early Medieval Period.

School in these areas, the Nyingma School continued to have many followers, particularly among the general population. The Peling Tersar tradition within the Nyingmapa School, basing itself mainly on his teachings and revealed treasures, is one of the most flourishing Nyingmapa schools, patronised by, among others, the royal family of Bhutan. The Kings of Bhutan as well as the Queens of the Fourth King are his descendants, and his various reincarnations have their main seats in Bhutan as well.

5.3. SO WHO WERE THE COMMON PEOPLE?

The few written accounts that are available to us give some information about the lives of the ruling clans in the Monyul area, but little about who the common subject people were. Based upon the available sources, some hypothesis can be posited regarding the indigenous people of Monyul, and particularly how they were considered by the later migrants and exiles from the Tibetan plateau.

The oldest historical reference can be found in the autobiography of Pema Lingpa (1975). Although the work dates from the first half of the 16th century, the reference refers to the first half of the 8th century. The area of Kurilung and the whole of Mon are herein described as a land inhabited by ‘Indians’, who live in houses made bamboo and grass or wood and who cultivated foxtail millet. At the southeastern border of Mon lies ‘Indian Tsanglung’ where people speak the ‘dog

---

31 As members of the Dungkar Choje family belonging to the same Nyö clan as Pema Lingpa.
32 Through their paternal grandfather. From their paternal grandmother’s side, they are a descendent of the Kings of Domkha Melong (i.e. Shar Domkha, ref. footnote 61 to Chapter 4).
33 The Peling Sungrul speech reincarnations at Ugyencholing in Drametse in Monggar dzongkhak, the Peling Thukse mind reincarnations of his son Dawa Gyeltshen in Tamzhing in Bumthang dzongkhak, and the Gyelse body and action reincarnations in Gangteng in Wangdü dzongkhak.
34 The fact that the traditional name of the Kurilung valley contains the Tshangla geographical suffix <ri> ‘river’ would point to the fact that in the past the entire valley was inhabited by speakers of [Proto-] Tshangla and that the current majority of Chocangacakha speakers are indeed the descendants of later migrants.
35 Until modern times, houses in the lower Kheng, Dungsam and Kalaktang areas were commonly built with bamboo walls and grass roofing. It is conceivable that house construction from stone and wood, as is more common in the area now, was actually introduced from Tibet and only slowly penetrated southwards. Ref. also paragraph 13.6.
language of Indian Tsalung’. According to Norbu (2004:6), the oldest inhabitants of the Dungsam area were the scattered populations of the ‘Indians’ Hindus from the plains. Aris (1979:51-59) presents several theories concerning the actual origin of these two legends and the connections that exist to India and to Tibet. He also quite rigorously discounts any Indian origins of the people of Bhutan.

37 The fourth head of the Drukpa Kagyupa, Pema Karpo (1527-1592), considered Tsari the most important of the three holy mountains of Tibet (Huber 1999). Tsari has, since then, been mainly associated to the Kagyupa.
of the Brahmaputra. Not long after the arrival of Lhase Tsangma, the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji arrive in the Bumthang, Zhonggar and Kurilung areas that were sparsely inhabited by the descendants of Khyikha Rathö and they impose their rule on them. In some areas, they compete for power with Lhase Tsangma’s descendants. Lhase Tsangma and Lhalung Pelki Dorji probably symbolise the 9th century migrants from the Tibetan plateau who fled internal turmoil in Tibet.

From the writings by Ůųſīŵ Ɨī (1504-1564; 1962:f. 9a in Aris 1979:310) it appears that after the time of the Karmapa Düsum Khenpa, i.e. the second half of the 13th century, Düsum Khenpa was meditating in Mon Domtshang, his patron was the Mon king Gathung from whom descended king Döndrup who had myriarchies among the Monpa, Tsangmi, Katsara and the Indians and who came to visit [the 7th Karmapa reincarnation Chodrak Jamtsho] a clear distinction was made between the Monpa, the Tsangmi, the Katsara and the Indians.

If the identification of the Shardung with the Brokpa and subsequent offshoots establishing Dung lineages mainly in Bumthang and Kheng is correct, we see a final migration of political refugees from Tibet into Monyul in the second half of the 14th century. The Brokpa origin myth in Chapter 11 recounts of the indigenous clans of the Tawang area, and how the original Brokpa clans arriving from Tibet assumed authority over them.

We thus find a scarce and scattered indigenous ‘Tsengmi/Tsangmi’ and ‘Indian’ population who practise shifting cultivation with foxtail millet as main crop and who live in houses made of bamboo, wood and grass in the main river valleys and hills of Monyul. In the 8th century ‘Monpa’ followers of Bon, maybe speakers of East Bodish languages, arrive from certain areas of the Tibetan plateau, perhaps from the Kongpo region. At the same time, people from the Indian plains also settle in certain areas. In the 9th century, aristocratic refugees from Central Tibet settle among these earlier populations and assume control, learning the language of their subject people incompletely and introducing many loans from their Old Tibetan language in the native tongues. Between the 9th and 14th century people from various regions of the Tibetan plateau continue to migrate into Monyul, introducing their Tibetan dialects in various locations.

5.4. THE INDIGENOUS CLANS.

In section V of the Gyelrik (ff. 43b-46b) another interesting observation is made that ‘the history of the ancestral origins of generations of subjects and also about their family names’. The passage starts with a listing of the clans of Tibet and some names can be linked to the ancient Tibetan clans. It is stated on f. 44b, that later on, the human race spread and clan names appeared conforming to ‘the circumstances of their deeds, the corrupted speech of the various local clan dialects and the different natures of the families and clans’. The Gyelrik attributes the loss of these clan names to the lack of necessity to uphold them because the society was egalitarian. He then states (f. 45a) that there are numerous clan names ‘which accord with the various local dialects’ prevailing throughout the area and mentions 26 examples: Dangri, Ketong, Yubi, Risang, Bagi, Langla, Churnang, Sharro, Rama, Nyami, Namsa, Kommo, Lonmo, Rokmo, Namsa, Khumo, Brakmo, Kitmo, Sengpo, Rongbum, Thongre, Gengra, Nyinglen, Zur, Terci, Ngarik.

At the time the Gyelrik was written in the early 18th century, these clan names had already been almost rendered into oblivion, and only a few of these names have a contemporary connotation. Namsa is a common surname in the Kalaktang circle in Kameng. The Tshangla speakers of the area carry it with as much pride as the aristocratic surnames Khoche and Bapu in the Dirang and Kalaktang circles. Fürer-Haimendorf (1982) mentions that Bagipa is an endogamous clan in Sangthi village of Dirang circle. The other clans he mentions, the Thongkapa, Tshapu, Serchipa, Pechechupa, Vukshipa, Bomyakpa and Merakpa or the descendants of people from Merak and Sermu, do not resemble those mentioned in the Gyelrik. Dondrup (1991:129) also mentions three clans that settled in the village of Boha under Kalaktang circle of West Kameng. The Khochi Serbu Chakpa was supposed to have come from Thribum in Bhutan, the Namsa Chakpa from elsewhere in Bhutan, and the Serchipa from Dirang. These three clans still form the three main clans in the village till date. Chakpa, incidentally, means ‘bunch’ in Tshangla, as in a bunch of fiddlehead fern, or a bunch of incense. Other names that are sometimes used as surnames are Gonpapa and Sharchokpa in the Dirang area, Shongla and Tukshipa in the Bomdila area, Khrome, Thongchi and

38 Refer for the preceding three clans Chapter 11 and Annex VIII.
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Thungon among the Sherdrukpen and Dirkhipa among the Dakpa speakers of Dirang. To what extent these names are derived from old clans, and to what extent these names are derived from the names of hamlets could not be determined.

The geok of Ramjar in Trashiyangtsi derives its name from Ramagenga and is also mentioned as the place where the descendants of Suna of the Yede clan\(^{39}\) started a royal family as well as the home village of Usen who married to Jowo Dargye sometime in the early 15\(^{th}\) century\(^{40}\). It seems conceivable that the hill on which present day Ramjar is located was once inhabited by people of the Rama and Genga clans. Local lore holds it that the first habitation was near the Gongri river at a castle called Nongkhar, where even till date the villages’ richest wetland paddy fields are located and ruins can be found. In order to collect bamboo the people of this khar seasonally moved to upper part of the hill. With increasing population, more and more people permanently settled in places like Wungkhar, Phairau and Dungsingma. Eventually, by the early 20\(^{th}\) century people, mainly from Waichur in Mongar and Pemagatshel settled in the upper part of the village expanding it slowly to its current size.

A final reference to the clan system that seemed to have prevailed in the Monyul area can be found in the clan names that still exist among the Memba of Menchukha in West Siang district of Arunachal Pradesh (Billorey 1986: 57). The members of the Naksang clan that came from Ugyenling and Sangyeling in the Tshoksum area near present-day Tawang town were among the earliest settlers still living in Nongso, Khalung and Dechenthang villages (Norbu 1990:32 and Billorey 1986, footnote 17, 28). Norbu (1990:32) reports that Dakpa is still spoken in Khalung village. The Dorsum/Dorsam clan that settled in Lhalung (Holung) village is said to have come from Trashigang in Eastern Bhutan, which is why the people in Lhalung village still speak Tshangla (Billorey 1986, footnote 18, Norbu 1990:32). The Mane clan is also reported to have come from Eastern Bhutan, whereas the Sona clan is said to have come from the Tshona area. All the other Memba clans came from various parts of Tibet, mainly Dakpo and Kongpo. Unfortunately, none of the clan names Naksang, Dorsam or Mane is mentioned in the list from the Gyelrik. Still, it does provide concrete evidence that a clan system existed among the Tshangla and Dakpa people of Monyul even among the common people.

\(^{39}\) Ref. footnote 66 to Chapter 4.

\(^{40}\) Ref. paragraph 5.1.
5.5. COMPARISON WITH WESTERN MONYUL.

Aris (1979:51-59) acknowledges that the Tibetan immigrants must have mixed with the indigenous population of what is now Sikkim and western Bhutan to form the linguistic forebears of the Drenjongpa ‘people of the rice valleys’ inhabitants of Sikkim, and the Ngalong also called Ngenlong ‘the first to rise’ or Milok ‘those who did not return’, speaking related South Bodish languages with a native substrate. Perhaps linguistic isolates such as the Lhokpu, the ‘Ole Monpa and the Toktokpa and perhaps even the Toto of Totopara just across the border in West Bengal present the remnants of these indigenous tongues.

5.6. RELATIONS WITH TIBET AND THE PLAINS OF THE BRAHMAPUTRA.

The medieval period in Tibet was characterised by political turmoil following the demise of the Yarlung Dynasty. Dynasties of local and regional aristocratic families, all patronising certain Buddhist sub-schools, came to power and were again disposed, sometimes with outside assistance. The civil strife in Tibet that lasted from the 9th century well into the 16th century CE resulted in a continuous flow of religious and political refugees in search of a better existence. Whereas in terms of population the contact with the Tibetan plateau was largely a north-south flow of people and ideas, there was extensive trade in both directions.

The importance of Monyul in the regional trade is reiterated on ff. 48a of the Gyelrik, which states that ‘...came to take control of realms in India, Tibet and Lhomon and how having opened the doors to the duars from where all wishes and wants came forth...’. One trade route led from Kamrup in Assam through Darranga, Trashigang and following the Kholong Chu past present-day Chorten Kora into Tibet (Cooper 1933). The other route led from Sonitpur and present-day Tezpur through Doimara, Bomdila, Dirang and Tawang into Tibet. Border trade marts were established in, for example, Darrang, Doimara and Udalguri. In the summer, traders and their mules and horses would travel to Tibet from where they would bring salt, wool, woollen cloth, dried cheese, swords and other metal ware and gold and silver. In the winter they would move to the plains where they would trade these products as well as local livestock and forest produce, such as horse radish, chilli, Sichuan pepper and garlic, bamboo and cane, butter, cheese, ponies and horses, hides and pelts for salt, grains and silk and cotton cloth (Thakur 2001). Vertical trade between Eastern Bhutan and Tawang and Kameng also took place. Trade between Trashigang and Tawang used to be mainly carried out by the people of
Bartsham. They would bring hand-made incense, paper, salt and animal products such as butter, hides and horses from Tawang and Kameng. In return they would take food grains, hand-woven cloth, cattle for slaughter, fermented cheese and soybeans, and chillies to Tawang. The horses used to be traded all the way to western Bhutan. This trade, though on much more limited scale and with different products, still takes place. It was first regulated in the National Assembly meeting of 1964 (minute 7).

The clan rulers of Monyul had closer political, religious and commercial contact with the people of the plains of the Brahmaputra. The plains were nominally ruled by successive dynasties of local Bodo, Koch and Kachari descent, and by later Ahom, Assamese and Bengal rulers. These people are described in the myths of Khyikha Rathö, Sindha Radza and the Gyalrik as the ‘Indians’ and ‘Katsara’ who paid obedience to the kings and clan rulers in the hills. The clan territories thus came to be extended to the areas that were known as the Assam and Bengal work doors/duars. The Addenda to the Gyalrik describes the geographical extent of the duar holdings of the Yodung Wangma clan which could not be identified with modern place names, mainly because they are all they are all Chöke transcriptions of local names. Only the Neuli Duar can be identified, as this is the Neuli area close to Samrang in Samdrup Jongkhar. Other duars include, which might be modern Bongaigaon and might be Kokrajhar. A considerable tract of lowland area was similarly controlled by the Khar Gyelpo, who was known to the people of the plains as the Khar Radza and controlled places like Ali, Kulikatra and Derong (Norbu 2004:36-41). Bose (1997: 54-60) describes how the Ahom had given the king of Dirang, the Bapu’s of Domkha, Morshing and Thempang and the kings of the Sherdukpen the right to collect annual posa ‘in-kind taxes’, which included mainly food grains. For four months each year, the Kuriapara plains between Barnadi in the west and Deoshan in the east were under their full control. The Bapu of Thembang and the Sherdukpen kings used to share the Charduar plains, east of Rowta and west of the Bhareli river, with the

41 Ref. paragraph 2.9.2.
42 There were 8 ‘Bengal duars’ and 10 ‘Assam duars’. The Assam duars loosely controlled by the chiefs and rulers of Kheng were Ripu, Sidli and Bagh. East of the Manas river and west of the Nyera Ama river were the Warsi, Banska and Ghurkhola duars and the smaller Chapakhama and Chapaguri duars just south of present-day Nganglam drungkhak of Pemagatshel. East of the Nyera Ama river was Khaling duar, perhaps the Artshen duar controlled by Khaling, and the Buriguma duar which was probably controlled by the Bapu of Morshing and Domkha although it was claimed by the Drukpa since the 18th century.
43 Both places were near Sidli duar.

Nishi and the Hruso. Besides the posa, the clan rulers are also thought to have extracted slaves from the plains (Pain 2004).

Even until modern times, considerable proportions of the population of the Kheng, Dungsam, Dirang and Kalaktang areas migrated to the plain areas in winter, where intimate relations with the local people developed. Norbu (2004), for example, describes how until Bhutan’s Second Five Year Plan (1966-1971) the people of Khar would live in osterone for three months each year. The people of Dirang, Morshing and Domkha similarly used to move to Amrotal from mid-October till mid-February each year. During that time they would trade at the Udalguri fair.

Intriguing are also the notes on the lineage of the Thakhur mentioned in addendum VI of the Gyelrik on ff. 52b-53a. Thakur is a feudal title in several parts of India as well as the Bengali word for ‘God’. The title Thakur later became the surname Tagore used for Brahmin families that previously held other titles. Thakhur here apparently refers to local Assamese or Ahom feudal lords who controlled parts of the duars on behalf of the Yodung Wangma clan. As Aris already indicated, their identification remains an issue.

Figure 5.1. The Ace Lhamo dance performed during the three-yearly Tawang Dungyur festival.

44 Present-day Amartulla, located on the border between Bhutan and West Kameng.
CHAPTER 6. LUNG NYIKTSING BARKA JOKTANG DRABU: THE DRUKPA AND TIBETAN EXPANSION.

The Tshangla expression lung nyiktsing barka joktang drabu ‘like a potato between two stones’ means a difficult situation in which a person can find himself, placed under high pressure by something or someone and with limited possibilities to get out of it. The expression befits the predicament in which many of the local rulers and their subjects in Monyul found themselves during the second half of the 17th century, when the geopolitical situation underwent considerable changes that deeply and permanently altered the administrative setup of the region and consequently the culture of the people.

In 1565, the Tsangpa dynasty of Central Tibet took over from the Rinpungpa dynasty that had taken over from the Phakmodrupa around 1440. The Tsang Desi controlled 13 principalities, but from the Logyu (e.g. ff. 2a and 12b) the picture emerges that in the 16th and early 17th century the highland areas and upper river valleys of eastern Monyul were at least nominally under his control as well. The Tsangpa rulers strongly allied with the Karmapa sub-school of the Kagyupa, which had found patrons in the king of Dirang. Similarly, most of the rulers of Bumthang and the Bapu of Domkha, who were at least nominally under Tibetan suzerainty, patronised the Nyingmapa School.

Despite this strong Nyingmapa and Karmapa presence, the first contacts between some of the rulers of the far east of Monyul and the Gelukpa authority of Ganden Phodrang monastery in Tibet developed in the early 16th century. A crucial role in strengthening these relations was played by Jowo Sumpa, the third son of King Jowo Dargye of the Jowo clan of Berkhar. Jowo Sumpa received his ordination from the Second Dalai Lama Gedün Gyatsho (1475-1542) and received the name Lopzang Tenpe Drönme. He founded the first Gelukpa monastery at Agyadung, and after taking his main seat at Ganden Tseling monastery in Merak he became known as Merak Lama. Merak Lama was assisted by his lay associate, Meme Japten, member of the Jowo clan of Lhau (Sarkar 1975: 44). More about Merak Lama’s activities, his reincarnations and the spread of the Gelukpa School can be found in Chapter 16.

---

1 Ref. p. 71.
2 Ref. paragraph 4.2.2 and p. 102.
3 Ref. paragraph 5.2.
4 Ref. Gyelrik ff 30b, footnote 19 to Chapter 5 and footnote 42 to Chapter 4.

In the 12th century, the Drukpa sub-school of the Kagyu School first established religious establishments in Laya5 and Gön in the northwest of Monyul (Dorji 2008:44). In the early 16th century the main seat of the ‘Densa lineage’ of the ‘middle Drukpa’ Kagyu School was in Ralung in Tibet, but the lineage had established a power base in the Shar, Gön, Pa and Wang valleys of western Monyul. From there they gradually spread their religious influence eastward. In 1534 Ngawang Chögyel (1465-1540) together with his son Yongzin Ngagi Wangchuk (1517-1554) established small monastic communities on the hillocks of Cungphelgangtse and Garpanggangtse6 in Chume in Bumthang (Tshering 2003:142-145). This last site was however not destined to be, as parallel to the story surrounding the construction of Samye monastery in Tibet many centuries earlier, all the efforts made by humans during the daytime were annihilated by local demons during the night7. When in 1549 CE Ngawang Chögyel saw a white bird fly off from Garpanggangtse and land on another site, he took this as an omen that a new structure should be built at this location8 (Dorji 2008:45). Ngagi Wangchuk is credited for having established a monastery on the site of the later Chökhor Raptentse Dzong or Trongsa Dzong (Dorji 2008:45). Ngawang Chögyel also established a local branch of the Drukpa Kagyupa School in the Manchö area of lower Khaling of eastern Monyul, which was patronised by the Yodung Wangma clan9. Ngagi Wangchuk is also accredited with the construction of monasteries or hermitages at the sites of the Zhonggar Ta Dzong (Thinley 2003:301), the Lhüntsei Phodrang or Lele Dzong at the site of the present-day Lhüntsi Dzong and the Thekchentse monastery at Timula in the same dzongkhak10 (Kinga 2003:522-523 and Dorji 2008:45). Ngagi Wangchuk’s grandson,

---

5 Ref. footnote 120 to Chapter 4.
6 A hillock on the west bank of the Chamkhar river, below Kikila on the way to Chume.
7 The ruins of an unfinished building can still be found there (Blumer and Blaillard 2001).
8 Later, on this same site the Jakar dzong was built.
9 Ref. paragraph 4.2.5.
10 Probably the saint-patron relation that had been established between the Drukpa Kagyu and the Wangma clan by the Drukpa saint Pema Karpo’s disciple Lama Trashi Wanggyel (ref. paragraph 4.2.5) applied not only to the Yodung Wangma of lower Khaling, but also to the branch of the Wangma clan that had settled in Wangmakhar in Gangzurtö. The Wangma clan was only a small clan which beside these two branches had a third branch in Thembang. Alliance with the expanding Drukpa Kagyu was a strategic move for both, meant to counteract the other clans as well as the growing importance of the Gandenpa in the region. The construction of branch monasteries in the area of Gangzurtö controlled by the Wangma clan can also be explained in light of this alliance.
Tenpai Nyima (1567-1619) settled in Chorten Nyingpo in Chume, from where he continued to spread the Drukpa Kagyu teachings in eastern Monyul and is thought to have visited as far as Lawok Yulsum. Tenpai Nyima also established the monastery of Yongla in the area controlled by the Yodung Wangma clan (Dorji 2008:46). Thus, a strong relation between the Drukpa Kagyupa and the local rulers of certain areas in eastern Monyul was established during the 16th century.

The 1616 arrival of the incumbent to the throne of Ralung and son of Tenpai Nyima, Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal (1594-1651) in the area that was to become Bhutan, his subjugation of rivaling Buddhist schools, and his unification of western Bhutan under his rule has been extensively described (e.g. Dorji 2008). In fact, for most Bhutanese, the history of their country starts with the arrival of the Zhabdrung to the southern valleys of the Himalayas. In a way, the emergence of Bhutan as a nation state indeed commences with this historic event but as we have seen in the preceding chapters, the area was not devoid of people, and thus of history, before the 17th century. After 1622, the newly instituted Drukpa Kagyupa School became known as the Lhodruk ‘southern Drukpa’. By 1627, Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal had gained control over much of the area between the Koch kingdom in the south and Tibet in the north. As we read in Casella’s Relacao ‘This king known as the Dharma Raja is 33 years old: he is both king and the highest lama of this Kingdom of Cambirasi, the first kingdom of Potente in these parts’ (Baillie 2003:19). Apparently, Casella was aware that further to the east, other kingdoms existed that formed the fringes of the Tibetan sphere of influence, although he did not visit any of them. Potente is a corruption of the Sanskrit Bhota-anta ‘end of Tibet’ which later became Bhutan. The state of the Pelden Drukpa was formally established after the construction of the Zhabdrung’s seat at Pungthang Dewachenpoi Phodrang in 1638 (Dorji 2008:138-139). The Drukpa authority was formally recognised by the Tsang Desi as well as other regional kingdoms in 1640 (Dorji 2008:144).

In 1640, Gushri Khan of the Qosot Mongols who patronised the Gelukpa School took control over the eastern Dokham or Amdo and Kham regions of Tibet, followed in 1641 by central U. In 1642, he and Sonam Chöphel or Sonam Rapten (1594-1657), the regent of the Fifth Dalai Lama Ngawang Lopzang Jatsho (imp. 1622-1682), ousted the Tsangpa ruler. This was the end of the royal dynasties of Tibet, and the start of the theocratic rule of the Dalai Lama’s. Between

---

11 Later more popularly known as Punakha Dzong, see Figure 7.2.

1650 and 1700 this important development on the plateau – the end of the aristocratic rule and the imposition of theocratic rule – would become closely mirrored on the southern flanks of the Himalayas. The extension of the authority of the Ganden theocracy in the east and the Drukpa theocracy in the west heralded the end of over 800 years of semi-autonomous rule of the elite of Tibetan aristocratic ancestry over small petty kingdoms in the hills and valleys of Monyul.

Almost immediately, there was a sense of mistrust and competition between the Drukpa and the Gandenpa (Dorji 2008:157-158). This led to a persistent conflict over religious and secular power and authority. In 1644, the first combined Tibeto-Mongol invasion of the Paro valley took place, which was successfully repelled by the Drukpa (Dorji 2008:159-163). In the autumn and winter of 1648, a second combined Tibeto-Mongol attack was launched on Paro and Punakha (Dorji 2008:180-182). Again, the Drukpa managed to successfully defeat the invaders, capturing many men, horses, weapons and rations. Following these defeats, the Ganden administration considered that if the area consolidated by the Drukpa in western Monyul could no longer be taken, it was perhaps possible to increase their authority in the east. Moreover, they greatly feared the alliance between the expanding Drukpa authority and the Yodung Wangma clan. The Gandenpa threatened the Yodung Wangma and the associated monastery with annihilation (Aris 1979:97), and the Yodung Wangma sought protection from the Zhabdrung. Similarly, the people of Merak, Sakteng and adjoining areas who were loyal to the Gelukpa requested assistance from the Gandenpa against the advancing Drukpa. The subsequent military campaigns of the Drukpa army, annexing a substantial part of the area, lasted from 1653 to 1655, but local revolts occurred in the years thereafter, and Tibetan attacks persisted until peace was finally brokered in 1730.

A note of caution has to be made on the dates provided here for the military campaigns of the Drukpa. In the Bhutanese historical literature (e.g. Dargye 2001:190, Namgyel 2003:393, Dorji 2003:192, Dorji 2008) it is generally assumed that the Drukpa annexation of the previously independent kingdoms of central and eastern Bhutan took place between 1644 and 1648. Notwithstanding the chronological order of the Gyalrik, Dorji (2003:192), for example, places the dispute between the kings of Khaling in 1646, and after the conquest of the area. There are substantial arguments to maintain the order in the Gyalrik, the oldest written source, in which the mediation of Lama Namse in this dispute was one of the main triggers for the armed conflict between the Drukpa and the Ganden administrations. First of all, Lama
Namse sought advice from Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel, who made the prophesy that the eastern areas would come under the Drukpa authority. Secondly, although the fiefdom of Khaling was previously divided in a ‘inner’ and a ‘outer’ area, ruled by two kings, which obviously led to animosity, we read\(^\text{12}\) that later on Khaling was ruled by a single king, namely Changlopel, who revolted against the Drukpa. It would be illogical to presume that Tibetan mediation would be requested in a conflict that took place in an area under control of the Drukpa. The Gyalrik also firmly asserts that Minjur Tenpa and Tenzin Drukgyel introduced Lama Namse to the Zhabdrung, and Minjur Tenpa was only appointed as Trongsa Penlop in 1647 and Tenzin Drukgyel took his post as Druk Desi only in 1650. Moreover, considering the limited population strength at that time, it is improbable that whilst most of the Drukpa militia were engaging the Tibeto-Mongol forces at Paro during the summer of 1644 and in Paro and Punakha during the winter and autumn of 1648, they could at the same time be engaging against the lords and chiefs of the eastern regions. Finally, as Kinga (2003:525) mentions, construction of the Lhüntsi Dzong by Drukpa soldiers has been dated to 1654. If the Kuri river valley was indeed subjugated in 1645, as other authors maintain, it would be difficult to imagine that the Drukpa soldiers would remain in active conscription for a period of 9 years. Instead, the construction of the dzong could have taken place by part of the active army when they set up camp in Minje after the conquest of the Kuri and Kholong river valleys in 1652. Even in those days, military activity must have mainly taken place during the dry winter months, when rivers were fordable, and during the remainder of the year, the soldiers would either return home or be engaged in other activities by their commanders, including the construction of the various dzongs. The 1656 edict of the fifth Dalai Lama also maintains the greater part of eastern Monyul still under Tibetan suzerainty, although it does clearly indicate that the Drukpa forces were advancing eastward. Finally it is also inconceivable that the central area of Darkar Yulsum, just south of Punakha and Shar, was annexed after the annexation of the more distant areas of the east in 1649 (Dorji 2008:188).

6.1. THE SEED OF CONFLICT.

According to ff. 2b of the Logyu, the actual start of the conflict was a petty dispute between two local rulers in Monyul. King Dewa and King Drukgyel of Khaling

\(^\text{12}\) In paragraph 6.4.
contended over the control of the Duars, and two envoys were sent from Lhasa to settle the dispute. But as 'at the time there was not much mutual contact between India, Tibet and Southern Mon, regardless of how the history of the origin of the disagreement was told, because the two envoys did not understand the Monpa language, they indicated that they would need translators who knew Tibetan'. Thus two translators were selected: on King Drukgyel’s side Lama Namse Dorji, son of Thupten Pekar. Thupten Pekar allegedly was the son of Tenpai Nyima and thus the half-brother of Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal (Aris 1986 footnote 5 to ff. 5a). Tenpai Nyima is thought to have fathered Lama Namse with a girl from the Yodung Wangma in Tshase and a second son Chökyong in Brakkar in Lawok Yulsum 14. Thus Lama Namse Dorji was logically affiliated with the Drukpa Kagyupa School. On King Dewa’s side Lama Chöying Gyamtsho of Lawok Yulsum was appointed, who was allied to the Gelukpa School.

Although the accounts of the two kings were basically the same, it seems that the translation of King Drukgyel’s account from the local vernacular language to Tibetan was more convincing than that of King Dewa’s account, and as a result the two Tibetan envoys believed King Drukgyel’s version of story. King Dewa did not accept their judgement, and invited the two envoys to his house where he made them drunk. He then instigated the jealousy of the envoys by saying that Lama Namse kept many beautiful girls serving him limitless amounts of alcohol at his residence at Darmadarphi. The envoys then abducted two of Lama Namse’s girls and, shouting insults of ‘ki ki’, they approached his house. Lama Namse confronted them with their behaviour, guarded by two ‘yogin monks’. The envoy Captain Tensung and his servants killed the two yogin monks, after which Lama Namse stabbed Captain Tensung in his heart with a knife in retaliation.

13 Also spelled Tshatshi, present day Tshatshi in Nanong geok of Pemagatshel. As mentioned in paragraph 4.2.3, Tshase was originally ruled by a member of the Byar clan. Perhaps the Yodung Wangma had, in the period between the 9th and late 16th century, taken over this clan territory. Tshatshi village was romanticised for its pleasant location and simple lifestyle in the Tshangla song Tshatshi poktor thungka ‘on top of the hillock of Tshatshi’. No local reference to Tenpai Nyima’s sojourn in the area survives.

14 Interestingly, from Norbu’s account (2004:57) and Dorji (2008:46) we learn that Tenpai Nyima also had another illegitimate child in the east, Tenzin Drukdra, who settled in Yuling Namdungkha Gonpa near Shalikhar Dzong in Dungsam until he moved to Yuling in Trongsa and became the second Druk Desi from 1655-1667.
Lama Namse, fearing the wrath of the powerful Ganden administration, fled via Lawok Yulsum and Kurilung to Trongsa Dzong. At Trongsa, he met with Minjur Tenpa (1613-1681), who had been appointed as first Trongsa Ponlop, governor of Trongsa, by Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel in 1647. Minjur Tenpa sent him to Tenzin Drukgye the 1st Druk Desi [imp. 1650-1655], who introduced him to Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal in Punakha, just before the Zhabdrung’s death in 1651. The Zhabdrung gave teachings and initiations to Lama Namse who said (Logyu ff. 6a) ‘to propagate the Buddhist teachings in the eastern region of the sun would definitely be to the benefit of all beings. Particularly, in these eastern regions there are many chiefs possessed with pride and arrogance and not submitting themselves to one another. In those dark, savage and barbarous border lands never subdued through stern law, to extensively propagate the long-standing doctrine of the Buddhist teachings in a peaceful manner will not be successful unless they are subdued by strict law’. The Zhabdrung replied that Lama Namse should act according to the prophesy and that hence the dual system of religious law and temporal law of the Drukpa Kagyu would flourish in the eastern regions.

6.2. THE CONQUEST OF BUMTHANG, KURILUNG AND KHOLONG.

This prophecy started with the subjugation of the kings, chiefs and rulers of the Chamkhar, Kuri and Kholong river valleys (Logyu ff. 6b-9b). When Lama Namse had served three years in Trongsa, the most important patron of the Drukpa Kagyu, the Chökhor Pönpo in Bumthang rebelled against Minjur Tenpa. Despite two attempts with armies recruited from Mangde, Minjur Tenpa did not succeed to subdue him by military force, and decided to use the maternal relations of the Pönpo, i.e. the Nup Chutö Chödze, the

15 Ref. paragraph 4.3.
16 According to Kinga (2003:524) Depa Kunthup, the Chökhor Pönpo, was joined by Ura Depa (Dung) Nakpo.
17 As with most of the aristocratic lineages, intermarriage took place almost exclusively between the various families to keep their ‘bone’ pure, ref. paragraph 13.3.3. The marital relation between the paternal side of the ruling family of Chökhor and the maternal side of the religious family of Nup Chutö is another example of this. Nup Chutö, present-day Nubi geok under Trongsa dzongkhak, was traditionally regarded as a cultural extension of Bumthang, which is still apparent from the vernacular of the area, called Chutöbikha,

Chume Dung, the Domkhar Mipon and the Cakhar Nepo. Obviously, these various ruling families, particularly the Cakhar Nepo whose castle was within the Chökhor Pönpo’s area, would greatly benefit if the powerful Chökhor Pönpo would cease to rule. The forces from Tshochen and Wacenrū, Geling,Nyisho and Gaseng were led by ‘steward’ Druk Namgyel. The remaining forces, mainly conscripted from Mangdelung, were led by Minjur Tenpa. The Drukpa forces had a considerable advantage over the local rulers, namely the possession of gunpowder, firearms and muskets. In the subsequent military campaigns, a few firings of these arms were able to frighten and disperse whole armies (e.g. Logyu ff. 16a, 18a and 20b).

According to the Logyu, the Cakhar Nepo, his paternal relatives and the matrons who were the household officials of the Chökhor Pönpo let the Drukpa forces enter at his last stronghold, the fortress of Yurwazhing Dzong. The Chökhor Pönpo and his retinue fled to Tibet, and thus by 1653, Bumthang was brought under the control of the Drukpa. Minjur Tenpa appointed the blind and lame Nyerpa Longba ‘the blind steward’, considered a reincarnation of the Sindha Raja, as Dzongdak at the new Dzong of Jakar.

which is more closely related to the dialects of Bumthang than to the Mangdekha language of Trongsa and the Hengkha or Nyenkha languages to the west.

18 Ref. paragraph 4.4.1.
19 Tshochen encompasses resent-day Thimphu, whereas the other places are Rūbisa, Gelekha, Nyisho and Gaselo villages under the modern Wangdi Phodrang dzongkhag.
20 One of the earliest uses was recorded during the 1634 Tibetan attack on the Drukpa palace of Sanggag Zahdiun, on the site of the later Semtokha Dzong in 1634, which killed all the Tibetan assailters (Ardussi 1999:65, Dorji 2008:126-127). This was the second Tsangpa Tibetan invasion of the area controlled by the Drukpa Kagyupa in the southern Himalayas. The first invasion had taken place on western Monyul in 1618 (Dorji 2008:76-77). It was followed by a third attack in 1639 (Kinga 2003:521, Dorji 2008:139-140).
21 Ref. paragraph 5.2. Archaeological research at this site was conducted by Blumer and Braillard (2001), although they, and other authors, earlier identified the last stronghold of the Chokhor Ponlop with Drapham Dzong near Ngang Lhakhang, which is probably of a later date.
22 Tshering (2003) mentions 1646 as the year of the conquest of Bumthang and the establishment of the Jakar Yugyel Dzong as center of Drukpa authority in the area, which was later expanded and reconstructed in 1683. Namgyel (2003:393) and Dorji (2008:176) have 1647 as the year of the battle in Bumthang.
After the Drukpa successfully ousted the Chokhor Ponlop, they started playing out the old rivalries among the various ruling clans of Monyul. These clans had always fought internecine wars over small patches of territory and trade routes, and there was great animosity among them. So the same year, the next conquest took place further east in Kurilung, where Pönchen Darma of Kyiling and Gyelpo Gawa of Zhung Phakidung assassinated Pönpo Lhabudar of Raksa. The widow of the Raksa chief invited the Drukpa forces who, in recognition of the fact that the Raksa chief had earlier given land to Ngagi Wangchuk for the construction of Thekchentse monastery, defeated the chief of Kyiling and the king of Phakidung. The Drukpa army consequently subdued all the communities of Kurilung. In the following years, the dzong of Lhundrup Rinchentse was built by part of the Drukpa forces and a dzongpön was appointed.

Part of the Drukpa army continued moving eastward where they subjugated the chiefs and people of Kholongtö, establishing the dzong of Trashi Yangtsi at Dongti. The ruling clans and people living in the areas of Drong Doksum and Zanglung also surrendered to the Drukpa forces.

6.3. The Annexation of Zhonggar, Trashigang and Kheng.

After conquering the upper valleys, the Drukpa turned their attention to the areas to the south (Logyu ff. 9b-14b). The Drukpa army retreated to Mingye Yülsum where

---

24 See footnote 124 to Chapter 4.
25 Present-day Phagidung village under Menbi geok in Lhuntse dzongkhak. The clan affiliation of this king is unknown.
26 Ref. footnote 113 to Chapter 4.
27 As Kinga (2003:525) agrees, the dzong was completed by 1654 and built by the Drukpa forces from the west.
28 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.
29 This is what is now known as the Trashi Yangtse Dzong Mamma ‘old Trashi Yangtse Dzong’ or Dongdi Dzong after the Dongdi river joining the Kholong river at its base. According to local folklore, the dzong was built on the location of the khar built by Gongkargyel (ref. paragraph 4.2.3) and a monastery built by Pema Lingpa (ref. paragraph 5.2). After the bifurcation of erstwhile Trashigang dzongkhak into Trashigang and Trashi Yangtse in 1993, in 1997 a new dzong was inaugurated near Chorten Kora, which is now the administrative centre of the dzongkhak. The old dzong is home to the dzongkhak monastic establishment.
30 Ref. footnote 26 to Chapter 4.
31 Ref. footnote 74 to Chapter 4.
32 Dorji (2003:178-181) presented the developments as they happened in the Trashigang area in a Dzongkha version.
they set up camp. Because Tongden the king of Tongphu\(^{34}\) had been violently oppressing the Khengpo people of Zhonggar, their leader Chöze Karpodung requested the support of the Drukpa army. Most of the chiefs and their subjects of the area, having heard the stories about the defeat of the Chökhor Pönlop and the powerful chiefs of Kurilung, subjected to the Drukpa in fear. During the winter of 1653-1654, the king of Tongphu was defeated by the Drukpa force. Across the Kori pass, the chiefs of Ngatshang and Chitshang\(^{35}\) had been fighting and contending and when the Drukpa arrived at Zhonggar they all made acts of submission, including the kings Darjam from Ngatshang, Daula from Chitshang and Dore\(^{36}\) from Bageng Bremi Helong. The people of Ngatshang, having previously shown kindness to Lama Namse, were shown particular favour by the Drukpa, although Thinley (2003:318) reports that it were the people of Themnangbi and Ngatshang who were afraid of the new customs that would be imposed on them, and therefore absconded to Pemakö\(^{37}\). Druk Namgyal and Minjur Tenpa then set up camp and made preparations to build the Zhonggar Dzong.

Later in the spring of 1654, Lama Namse took a detachment of the Drukpa army to the bridge of Wengli\(^{38}\) at Uzarong and sent envoys to the ‘five hosts of the Tsengmi’\(^{39}\), the people of Bengkhar Trashigang, Kanglung and Khaling. Because of the previous history of discord between Lama Namse and King Dewa\(^{41}\), the people of Khaling came with an army to Uzarong and enlisted the support of the Uzarong people. But when 60 soldiers from Lama Namse’s army managed to swim across the Gongri river, the Khaling people got frightened. Moreover, King Dore of Bageng, who was close to the people of Uzarong, advised them that the Drukpa forces had defeated the much mightier armies of Bumthang and Kurilung, and that moreover the Khaling people migrated to the duars in the winter, leaving the defence of the bridge to the Uzarongpa alone. Thus, the people of

---

\(^{33}\) Present-day Minje geok in Lhuntse dzongkhag.

\(^{34}\) Ref. footnote 114 to Chapter 4.

\(^{35}\) Ref. footnote 16 and 85 to Chapter 4.

\(^{36}\) See also Thinley (2003:317) and footnote 18 to Chapter 4.

\(^{37}\) Ref. Chapter 8.

\(^{38}\) At present there are two bridges connecting Uzarong with the opposite bank of the Gongri river, the Shingphurtuma bridge below Jomtshang and the Sheri bridge below Bepam. A bridge called Wengli still exists, but this bridge is located further north crossing the Sheri river.

\(^{39}\) Ref. footnote 19 to Chapter 4.

\(^{40}\) Ref. footnote 90 to Chapter 4.

\(^{41}\) Ref. paragraph 6.1.
Uzarong surrendered the Wengli bridge to the troops of Lama Namse and subjected to the Drukpa rule. King Topden of Tsengmi and his chiefs and headman also rendered their service to the Drukpa in accordance with the services rendered earlier by the king of Ngatshang. The people of Khaling, however, had a large and strong army. Moreover they had the support of king Phobrang Achi Tsenkhar in Kanglung and his son, as well as of Merak Lama Lodrö Gyatsho, known to the Drukpa as Lama Nakseng. The kings of Khaling, Tsenkhar and Lama Nakseng strongly supported the Ganden authority of Tibet, and thus made only verbal acts of submission.

At that time the people of Trashigang and the people of Bikhar were contending over land. Chöze Karpodung recommended the people of Trashigang to ask the Drukpa for help. Thus king Tshewang Gyelpo of Bengkhar and king Langa of Grongtö went to the bridge at Wengli and requested Lama Namse for support, stating that the area under their control was ideal for the construction of a stronghold. It was then that all the chiefs and people of Ngatshang, Chitshang, Nyima Cherik and Nyima Chungrik declared ‘although until recently we have been the subjects of the Ganden Phodrangpa, from now onwards we submit to the authority of the Drukpa Dharma Lord’. Then Lama Namse returned to Zhonggar.

In late 1654, the Dung Norbu Wangchuk of Tunglabi requested the Drukpa to subdue the Dung of Nyakhar who reigned much of Kheng with terror. The Dung

---

42 This act has been remembered by the people of Kanglung and Khaling as an act of treason that resulted in the proverbial clumsiness of the Uzarong people. Unlike the people of Ngatshang, however, the people of Uzarong never received any preferential treatment from the Drukpa authority in recognition of the service they rendered by surrendering the bridge.

43 Later called Tongden (Logyu ff. 20a, 21b).

44 Ref. footnote 95 to Chapter 4.

45 He is considered the reincarnation of Merak Lama Lopzang Tenpai Drönme ref. the introduction to Chapter 6.

46 This village still exists under Samkhar geok of Trashigang, Bikhar was ruled by a Chöze who resisted the Drukpa annexation.

47 Spelled correctly as Ḍāngtö by Dorji (2003:177) and in the Logyu (ff. 16a, 12b). This personal name, referring to a large flat pan used for roasting grains, is usually given to a child whose elder siblings have died at a young age with the belief that children with such a name would not survive childhood.

48 Ref. footnote 97 to Chapter 4.

49 Ref. footnote 138 to Chapter 4.

and chiefs of Gozhing and Phangkhar, Subrang, Gomphu, Tali and Buli all surrendered to the Drukpa commanders. When they arrived at Nyakhar, the Drukpa shouted their war cries and fired their muskets and the Dung of Nyakhar and his people got so frightened that they subjected to the Drukpa authority. The Drukpa army then returned to Trongsa, where they were hailed by Minjur Tenpa, on the way defeating the Lama of Rephe, and sharing the wealth they had taken from the east they retired to their own homes.

6.4. The Great Eastern Uprising and the Subjugation of Gamri Lungpa.

But the allegiance to the Drukpa in the east was still not secured, and additional campaigns had to take place before the Drukpa authority could be firmly established (Logyu ff. 14b-17b and Dorji 2003:181-184). After a few months in Trongsa, Lama Namse returned to his birth village of Tshase in the east. His goals were to see whether the previous oaths of allegiance were being kept and to introduce a system of taxation and labour service. But because under the Ganden administration such a system did not exist, the people were not forthcoming to cooperate with the yokpa ‘servants’ and garpa ‘envoys’ appointed to implement it. In 1655, king Changlopel of Khaling, king Phobrang Achi of Kanglung Tsenkhar and king Sanggyelpo of Cenkhar started a rebellion. Lama Namse assembled an army commanded by Umze Damcho Rapgye and constituting of the people of Zhonggar Tsamang, Ngatshang and Chitshang, the Five Hosts of the Tsengmi and the people of Trashigang. They were welcomed by king Tshering of Domkhar in Kanglung who was in discord with King

---

50 Ref. footnote 137 to Chapter 4.
51 Ref. footnote 139 and 140 to Chapter 4.
52 A village with the name Subrang exists in Trong geok of Zhemgang dzongkhak, but the descent and affiliation of this Dung is unknown.
53 A village with the name Gomphu exists in Trong geok of Zhemgang dzongkhak, but the descent and affiliation of this Dung is unknown.
54 Ref. footnote 3 to Chapter 4. Again, it is unknown from whom these two Dung claimed descent.
55 Ref. footnote 57 to Chapter 4.
56 Obviously, the king of Cenkhar joined the rebellion in an attempt to obtain power over the area by defeating the kings of Grongtö and Bengkhar who had sided with the Drukpa forces.
57 Ref. footnote 96 to Chapter 4. The king of Domkhar obviously aspired to gain more power and authority by supporting the Drukpa in their campaign against the king of Kanglung Tsenkhar.
Phobrang Achi. King Changlopal brought his army of soldiers from Chikhor and Nangkhor\(^{58}\) to Cenkar whilst King Phobrang Achi stocked up in Phachimang. When the Khaling people saw the strength of the Drukpa army, they came out of the village stockade of Cenkar to capitulate. King Langa of Grongtö drove them back inside and also entered the stockade. King Sanggyelpo was then killed by musket fire of Umze Damchö Rapge. Enraged and panicked, king Changlopal climbed on the Thoraipa watch tower and shot arrows to the soldiers outside, but he could not hit any of them. He was then talked into surrender by King Tshewang Gyelpo of Bengkhar. A flag was hoisted on top of the watch tower, and taking this as a sign that king Sanggyeppo and king Changlope were defeated, Phobrang Achi’s soldiers fled and he himself was imprisoned. King Changlopal and King Phobrang Achi were sent to Punakha and the Thoraipa watchtower was completely demolished. The rebellion was crushed.

Lama Namse then decided to build a dzong at the ‘district castle’ of Jirizor\(^{59}\). In this, he did not heed the earlier suggestions of Minjur Tenpa and the people of Bengkhar that a dzong at Bengkhar would be more beneficial. Instead, he just made a stronghold there, held by Umze Damchö Rapge\(^{60}\). In Jirizor, the nobility of the eastern regions gathered and a court of justice was established and grain, butter, wool, meat and other taxes and labour tax were collected there. Selected officers from the Drukpa forces were also stationed in the various villages as local representatives of the Drukpa administration (Dorji 2003:189-190).

Lama Namse had earlier married the daughter of Jowo Khampa of Rati\(^{61}\), whose marriage had remained without a male heir. Unfortunately, both the king and his daughter died shortly afterwards, and Lama Namse returned to Tshase (Dorji 2003:190). But Lama Namse was worried about the influence of Merak Lama Nakseng in the Gamri area. When he arrived with the Drukpa forces at Merak, Lama Nakseng, his relatives and the Gelukpa monks had fled to Lawok Yulsum. The remaining people of Merak and Sakteng and the Gamri district,

\(^{58}\) At the time, it appears that the previous division of the Khaling area in a Chikhor and a Nangkhor area ruled by two different kings, which as we saw before was the immediate cause of the Drukpa-Tibetan conflict, had been resolved and King Changlopal had assumed power over both areas. Instead, King Tshering of Domkhar and King Phobrang Achi of Tsenkhar were contending for power in the Kanglung area.

\(^{59}\) The village of Jiri, usually called in conjunction with the neighbouring village of Lemi, still exists below the Trashigang to Samdrup Jongkhar road before reaching Barshong.

\(^{60}\) Dorji (2003:195-196) dates the construction of the dzongs at Wengkhar and Jirizor to 1646. This appears erroneous, if the chronology in the Gyalrik is to be maintained.

\(^{61}\) Ref. footnotes 37 and 45 to Chapter 4.

including the kings Zugi, Serkong and Dorji Gyelpo of Bartshosum and Wangserkunga and Sangge Jamtsho from Ramagenga subjected to Lama Namse, except for the Chöze of Bikhar who fled. The following eight months Lama Namse spent in Jirizor.

6.5. THE FIRST TIBETAN-DAKPA INVASION.

Thus by 1655, the Drukpa authority had firmly established itself as far east as the Gamri river valley and as far south as Khaling. In that same year, the Ganden administration in Tibet decided that a halt had to be called to the expanding Drukpa authority (Logyu ff. 18a-20b). The 5th Dalai Lama issued an edict in 1656 (Aris 1979) which formally proclaimed Tibetan suzerainty over Monyul. It included eastern Mon, defined as the area from the Kuri river and Dungzam in the west, via Nyingsangla and Galingkha to Mago, Thembang and Ali in the east. It specifically mentions the various regions or divisions under its control, and also includes the tribes that were subject to them, including the ‘minor Monpa’ along the Nyangshang river, the Katsara tribes of India, and certain ‘Lopa tribes, probably Khowa, Dhimma, Mei and Hruso. In the edict it is further mentioned that ‘in particular the entire welfare of eastern Mon was gradually destroyed by the evil plans of the barbarian army of the southern demons...’, referring to the Drukpa forces that by that time had already occupied the most of the western part of Monyul. Note the reference to the Drukpa forces as army of झी.
The Ganden administration found a staunch local supporter in Merak Lama Nakseng, who had been discontent with the Drukpa subjugation of Merak, Sakteng and the Gamri valley. He had earlier fled Merak for Lawok Yulsum where he continued to spread the dominion of the Gelukpa School. Whereas earlier Tibetan invasions largely consisted of Tibetan and Mongol forces with local recruits, by this time the Tibetans could enlist the support of the Dakpa people of Tawang. Not surprisingly, it was Lama Nakseng who guided the combined Tibetan and Dakpa invasion of 1656, which was commanded by Phanyül Drungtsho and Depa Dzamlha. The army established a camp at Kyilingshing. They attacked Grongtö but after Umze Damchö Rapge killed three men with his musket they retreated back to their camp. Realising that the Grongtö castle was difficult to approach and attack, the army followed the Gongri downstream and attacked the Jirizor castle. Lama Nakseng and the Chödze of Bikhar, showing the attackers local dress, foo and apparel, convinced the Khaling people that the Drukpa had surrendered King Changlopal to them. Thereupon the Khaling people rebelled against the Drukpa, and Lama Namse and his retinue fled to Tshase. They were chased by the Khaling people who killed minister Umze Norbu, displaying his head and limbs at Kyilingshing. Surrounded by enemy forces, Lama Namse then used King Norbu Achi of Narang Thungpa and his brothers, confidents of the Gandenpa, as negotiators and as a ransom he gave them the large turquoise he had received from his father-in-law, Jowo Khampa of Rati. Lama Namse was taken as a hostage to Kyilingshing, imprisoned in Lhasa and later killed during an attempt to escape.

In the meantime, Umze Damcho Rapge still resided in Bengkhar which could not be taken due to its strategic position and he went to Trongsa to ask for military support. The people of Bengkhar verbally submitted to the Gandenpa but did not hand over the dzong. Hostages were exchanged and the Tibetan and Dakpa armies dispersed. In Trongsa, Minjur Tenpa assembled an army of the people of Tshochen, Wangdi Phodrang and Mangdelung commanded by Kudrung Pekar Chöphel and Nyerpa Longba. They were guided and welcomed by King Topden of the Tsengmi and in early

---

74 This place remains unidentified, but is probably in the area of the villages of Yangnyer, Gongthung or Jamkar, on the north bank of the Gongri river.
75 This is not surprising, as he had earlier opposed the Drukpa who supported his competitors from Grongtö and Bengkhar and he had fled after the defeat of the uprising.
76 In present-day Narang geok under Monggar dzongkhak.
77 Ref. paragraph 6.2.

1657 they made camp in Gongthung. Then the Dakpa soldiers from Bemi came to Bartshosum to harass the Drukpa army. They took position on the top of Kharsingpa and confronted the Drukpa army. Umze Damcho Rapgye fired his musket and around 100 Dakpa soldiers, not having seen or heard musket fire before, fled in panic and fell to their deaths from the top of the Kharsingpa peak. The other Dakpa soldiers also fled.

6.6. CONSOLIDATION OF THE Drukpa Authority.

The Drukpa decided that in order to maintain their authority and prevent defection to the Tibetan side, they should assure that the chiefs and local people of the area under their control would be unwaveringly loyal to them (Logyu ff. 20b-24a). The Drukpa army took control of the stronghold at Bengkhar and all the people of Chikhor and Nangkhor in Khaling, Läpa and Löpa in Uzarong, Merak and Sakteng in Gamrilung and Bartshosum sent their kings, chiefs and leaders with tribute and gifts to the two commanders at Gongthung. Taking the protective deities, the elders of the armies from Tshochen, Wangdü Phodrang and Mangdelung, and the Drukpa supporters in the east such as the Chöze Gyelmo of Chutö, Karpodung of Zhonggar, King Darjam of Ngatshang, Daula of Chitshang, Dore of Bageng and Tongden of Tsengmi as their witness they all swore the oath of allegiance: ‘from today onwards, we will turn our backs on the Ganden Phodrangpa as our lords and accept the Dharma Lord of the Drukpa in front of us and we will fulfil every order given’. Collecting hostages and monk tax Nyerpa Longba returned to Punakha. Kudrung Pekar Chophel returned with his retinue to Bengkhar and took residence in the house of King Langa of Grontö where a dzong was constructed. This dzong became known

---

78 This village still exists under Yangnyer geok of Trashigang dzongkhak.

79 Ref. footnote 75 to Chapter 4.

80 In 1675, another combined Tibetan, Mongol and Dakpa attack took place from Tshona and Tawang as a result of which the Drukpa sealed the borders with Tibet.

81 The meaning of Läpa and Löpa is unclear. No villages or hamlets with these names, even in their Tshangla pronunciation Laipa and Loipa, are remembered in the Uzarong area today.

82 The system of monk-tax was formalised during the fourth Desi (imp. 1680-1696). Each family having more than three sons was obliged to send one to the state monastic body. This system was enforced every time when the number of men voluntarily joining the monkhood decreased. The family of the monks were given certain tax exemptions (KINGA 2003:527).
as the Kyiling Dradul Dzong\(^{83}\) (Dorji 2003:176). To its south, at the location of Grongtö Thongkhar, a Tadzong ‘watch tower’ was built. To the north, across the Gongri river, the Dzongme Taradzong was built. To the west, at Grongmē the ‘central tower’ and the ramparts of the Gösung Phüpo Dzong were built where Kudrung Pekar Chophel took residence with Damcho Rapge as his chief minister\(^{84}\). The two of them are described as having introduced strict but fair laws as a result of which the teachings of the Buddhist teachings flourished (Logyu ff. 22a). The main purpose of the dzong was to protect the eastern areas of the Drukpa state from attacks by the Tibetans and the Monpa and Dakpa forces (Thinley 2003:205).

It was only several years later that the last internal revolt against the Drukpa dominion took place. The King of Gungdung\(^{85}\), a remote and inaccessible area, was subdued by the Drukpa army led by Kudrung Pekar Chöphel and Sölöpn Tenpa Dönden\(^{86}\). The final folios (22b-24a) of the Logyu recount the achievements of the dual system which was upheld and promoted by the post of the dzongpön of Trashigang. Trade routes were opened, providing everyone with safe and easy access to whatever was desired, agriculture flourished, and peace and prosperity reined the area. The Logyu states that although the kings of the past only ruled their own principalities and refused to submit to each other because of pride and arrogance the fate of the defeated kings served as an example to those that were granted the right to repossess their previous possession and titles by the Drukpa.

### 6.7. The Incorporation of Dungsam.

One area that the Logyu is completely silent about is the Dungsam area. No mention is made of armed resistance of any of the local rulers against the Drukpa armies. In the 17\(^{th}\) century there were many Khoche and Chöje families in the Dungsam area\(^{87}\). Other families include

---

\(^{83}\) The ruins of this dzong could till recently still be seen to the north of the new Trashigang Dzong, across the Mithidrang stream (called ‘pearl river’ by Dorji 2003:177), at the place of the present-day Kelling lodge. The building materials of the Dzong have been used for the construction of new structures.

\(^{84}\) This dzong later became known as Trashigang Dzong.

\(^{85}\) Ref. footnote 115 to Chapter 4.

\(^{86}\) The remoteness and inaccessibility of this area, now known as Gongduk, is the likely reason why the area remained fiercely independent until relatively late, and also why the people of this area maintained their unique language, see also paragraph 12.3.4.

\(^{87}\) E.g belonging to the Byar clan, ref. paragraph 4.2.3, the Wangma clan, ref. paragraph 4.2.5, and the Je clan, ref. paragraph 4.2.6.

the NotAllowed Gyadrung inNotAllowed Khangma88, and the families ofNotAllowed Mikuri89 andNotAllowed Dunglephu90. Many of the ruling clans and subject people of Dungsam had already come into contact with the Drukpa Kagyu School earlier that century. Crucial was the missionary work of Ngawang Chögyel and Tenpai Nyima in the area controlled by the Yodung Wangma clan, including the establishment of Yongla Gonpa91. Moreover, the Dungsam area was located further away from the Tibetan border, and therefore at less risk of being attacked and absorbed by the Ganden authority from Tawang. The hills of Dungsam were relatively heavily populated and at the same time poor in resources, with most of the population depending on shifting cultivation and with little permanent agriculture, craftsmanship or livestock production. As a result of this poor resource base, most of the people depended on barter trade with the plains of India for their sustenance. As such, there was little need for the Drukpa to establish suzerainty in the area, and the Khoche and Chöje families continued to exert considerable influence until the border wars with British India in the second half of the 19th century necessitated action. Dungsam fell under the authority of the Zhonggar Dzong, and the area was used as a base for the military campaigns that resulted in the loss of the duars but a lasting peace with British India in 1865. The historically relatively autonomous situation of Dungsam vis-à-vis the Drukpa, compared to the upper valleys is perhaps the most important explanation for the preservation of the archaic Dungsam dialect of Tshangla92.


The Drukpa conquest had halted in the valleys of the Kholong and Gamri river, and although the Brokpa of Merak and Sakteng had verbally submitted to the Drukpa authority, their allegiance to the Gelukpa School and their cultural ties to the Dakpa people of Tawang was presenting the Drukpa with a problem. As explained in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.5, the role of Merak Lama Lodrö Gyatsho93 was crucial in the 17th century. Merak Lama, when receiving his teachings and initiations in Gyurme monastery of Tibet, had a prophesy that he should act fast to prevent the annihilation of the Gelukpa school in Monyul by the Kagyupa School and its extensions, the Drukpa theocracy under Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel and the patrons of the Karmapa (Sarkar 1975:25-28). He sought consult from the Fifth Dalai Lama, who advised

88 In Yurung geok of Pemagatshel dzongkhak.
89 In Dungme geok of Pemagatshel dzongkhak.
90 The village of Dechenling geok of Pemagatshel dzongkhak.
91 Ref. introduction to Chapter 6.
92 Ref. Chapter 9.
93 Ref. paragraphs 6.3 to 6.5.
him to construct a centre of Gelukpa power in the Monyul area. In Sakteng he and his student
Tenpai Özer, constructed the Trashi Chöling Gonpa and in Merak the Ganden Sungrapling or Ganden Tseling Gonpa.

In 1655 CE, Merak Lama was ousted from his seat in Merak by the Drukpa forces and moved to Sanglamphe Gonpa in Tshoksum. With him he took the most important relics of the monasteries at Merak and Sakteng, including the ‘reliquary stupa’ containing the remains of Tenpai Drönme. Since the people of the Tshoksum area were followers of the Nyingma and Karmapa schools, Merak Lama could not implement the advice of the Dalai Lama. Reporting this, the Fifth Dalai Lama issued an edict calling upon the people of Tshoksum to assist Merak Lama. While Merak Lama was in the meditation cave of Bramdongchung, his horse ran away. He retraced the horse’s footsteps and found the animal back at the place called Tana Mendrelgang, where once the palace of King Kala Wangpo stood. He called the place Tawang ‘horse empowerment’. In a manner reminiscent of the way that the outline of the great stupa of Jarung Khashor in Kathmandu was measured by strips of leather, the outline of the new monastery was measured by unrolling a ball of yarn the Dalai Lama had given to Merak Lama. And so the Ganden Namgyel Lhatseling monastery was constructed in 1680-1681 CE. It was consecrated by Merak Lama and the Dalai Lama. The Dalai Lama then appointed the dzongpön ‘governor’ of Tshona as the secular authority over the Tawang area. Merak Lama is also credited for having founded the temples at Shar Taklung and Agyadung. Merak Lama died just after completion of the Tawang monastery in 1682.

Further to the south, the kings of Morshing, Domkha, Thembang, Dirang and the Sherdukpen slowly saw their authority curtailed by the Drukpa in the west, the Dakpa allied to the Tibetans in the north and the Ahom in the south. During the 18th century, the king of the Jowo clan of Dirang and the Bapu’s of the Byar clan of Domkha and Murshing

---

94 Ref. the introduction to Chapter 6.
95 The area of Tawang, Pangchen and Lumla.
96 Ref. paragraph 5.1.
97 Present-day Talung Dzong northeast of Kalaktang town in Kalaktang circle of West Kameng.
98 Near present-day Lhau in Tawang.
99 At the 1672 battle of Saraighat, the Ahoms had defeated the Mughal invasion and extended their territory till the Manas river.
100 Ref. paragraph 4.2.2.
101 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.
accepted the nominal suzerainty of the Ganden administration of Tawang, who exerted control through two ‘gelleng’ (Bose 1997:54-57). Although, like the Sherdukpen chiefs to the east, the Ahom and later the British called them the Sāt Rāja ‘Seven Rajas’ (Aris 1979:106-7)\(^\text{102}\), there were actually just three (Bose 1997:55). The Bapu of the Wangma clan of Thembang\(^\text{103}\) and the Sherdukpen kings\(^\text{104}\) retained a much greater level of sovereignty vis-à-vis the Gandenpa until at least 1875.

6.9. THE SECOND TIBETAN-MONGOL-DAKPA INVASION.

But the Ganden administration kept challenging the Drukpa authority in the border areas with Tawang as well as in the western and central parts of the Drukpa state\(^\text{105}\). Moreover, after his flight from Merak, Merak Lama wanted to bring the reliquary stupa of Thangtong Gyelpo’s son Buchung Gyalwa Zangpo to Tawang monastery\(^\text{106}\). The Drukpa did not agree with this, and Merak Lama and the Dakpa requested the last Qosot Mongol ruler of Tibet Lhazang Khan (imp. 1705-1717) to intervene. A letter written by Lhazang Khan to the Druk Desi warned them that if they continued to disagree with Tawang monastery on this matter, a war would be waged annihilating the Drukpa authority. The eight Druk Desi, Druk Rapgye (imp. 1707-1719) was severely offended and replied that the Tibetans had earlier not managed to defeat the Drukpa, and that even if they would send their army in at that very moment, the Drukpa would be victorious (Thinley 2003:206-207). The answer came in 1714, when a combined Tibetan-Mongol-Dakpa invasion took place from Phari in Chumbi to Paro, from Tsamda to Bumthang and from Namkhdading in Tshona to Trashigang (Aris 1979: 259). Lhazang Khan led the attack on Paro which was repelled by the Drukpa. Tibetan historical sources quoted in Petech (2003) mention that Lhazang Khan had a Tibetan trustee called Pholhane (1689-1747). He originated from Pholha in Tsang and was associated with the Nyingmapa Mindröling monastery. Pholhane was the commander of the combined Mongol-Tibetan forces invading Bumthang under the Qosot general Erke Daičing. The other commander was

---

\(^{102}\) Perhaps, this division was a reduplication of the traditional division of the Ahom aristocracy in the Satgharia Ahom ‘seven houses of the Ahom’.

\(^{103}\) Ref. paragraph 4.2.5.

\(^{104}\) Whose clan affiliation remains unknown, but who in all probability fall outside of the clan system described in Chapter 4.

\(^{105}\) Another combined Tibeto-Mongol attack on western Bhutan took place between 1675-1679.

\(^{106}\) Ref. footnote 16 to Chapter 5. Merak Lama had already taken Tenpai Drönme’s reliquary stupa, but Thangtong Gyelpo’s son’s stupa was much more precious to the Drukpa, which explains their refusal.
Ngödrup, a native of Bumthang. The joined Tibetan-Mongol forces failed in capturing Jakar Dzong but Pholhane earned the respect of Lajang Khan by successfully leading most of the troops back to Tibet.

On the eastern border, the three Monpa tribes of Lawok Yülsum, Bemi Pangchen, and the Dakpa 107, although verbally agreeing not to raise any dispute with the Drukpa authority, sided with the Tibeto-Mongol army. The events of this invasion are still very much alive among the older generation in the Trashigang area, although with the demise of night-time storytelling the remembrance is quickly fading. The invading forces moved along the Gongri river below Jangphu, Khinyel and Khamdang, camping along the way. The Drukpa hid in the crevices and among the rocks below and above the footpath, firing poisoned arrows and slinging stones at the invaders, killing many of them. The army crossed the bridge at Jamkhar and arrived at Zongthung in Bartshosum 108. Approaching the Trashigang Dzong through the Gongri river valley below at dusk, they looked up and saw the lights of the dzong burning like stars in the sky. The invaders are then believed to have exclaimed ‘it is not a dzong on the earth, but a dzong in the sky’, and they are believed to have lost all hope of being able to take hold of a fortress suspended high above in the sky. When they looked at the dzong again the next morning and saw it located on top of the hillock, they corrected their earlier assertion, saying ‘it is not a dzong in the sky, but a dzong on the earth’. 109 With renewed hope they descended to the wooden bridge over the Gamri river, soon realising that the steep descent down would be followed by a steep ascent up on the opposite bank. Moreover, the hot climate and the forest dominated by chir pine trees was alien to them and they mistook the pathways used by cattle for the actual trail. On the way the seedpods with barbed thorns of the local weed /khengnangbu/ stuck deeper and deeper into their woollen and raw silk clothing, causing considerable delay and irritation, to which they exclaimed ‘the spears of the khengnangbu are stinging, is this also the Drukpa’s place?’.

---

107 This is the first moment in history that a distinction is recorded between the Monpa of Tawang and Jang (i.e. Lawok Yulsum), the Monpa of Pangchen, and the Dakpa of the modern Lumla and Mokto areas. Ref. also Chapter 10.

108 The modern village of ŕ atz in Bartsham.

109 This anecdote became so popular throughout Bhutan, that it has been replicated in connection to other dzongs as well, including the Lhüntsi Dzong (Kinga 2003:526-527) and the Shalikhar Dzong in Pemagatshel (Wangdi 2004: 28).

refuge from the heat in a grass-covered shady grove, they were attacked by hornets\textsuperscript{110}, called /zhugai–yugai/ in Tshangla or /‘brenggola/ in Chocangacakra who had made their nest there, causing considerable causalities. This prompted them wondering /phabetical/ ‘the spears of the hornet are stinging, is this the Drukpa ‘s place as well?’ Notwithstanding the natural defences the invading army had to face, the strategic location of the Trashigang Dzong and the strength and tactics of the defending army certainly contributed to the defeat and withdrawal of the invaders.

A final war took place in 1729-1730 after which a peace was brokered maintaining the status quo, in which eastern Bhutan was firmly under Drukpa rule, and Tawang and Kameng became a vassal state under the Tibetan Gelukpa administration from Lhasa (\textit{Gyatso\textsuperscript{17} 1974: ff 101a-112a}).

6.10. THE DRUKPA EXPANSION IN THE WEST.

At around the same time that the Drukpa theocracy annexed the formerly independent kingdoms in eastern Monyul, it also expanded westward into the territory traditionally occupied by the Lepcha. By the middle of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, most of the Lepcha had already submitted to the lineage of \textit{Phuntshok Namgyel} (1604-1670). Similarly to the Tibetan ruling aristocratic families further east, the Buddhist aristocratic families in Sikkim were of Tibetan descent, and Phuntshok Namgyel descended from Guru Trashi from Minyak in Kham\textsuperscript{111} who had escaped the turmoil on the Tibetan plateau in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. Phuntshok Namgyel assumed the title of Chögyel ‘religious king’ in 1642, and his lineage ruled Sikkim until the annexation by India in 1975. Skirmishes between the Drukpa and the Chögyel Dynasty were frequent in the late 17\textsuperscript{th} and early 18\textsuperscript{th} century.

Unlike the Chumbi and Teesta river valleys which came under control of the Chögyel, the lower hills and valleys in the western part, including the Damsang kingdom, present-day Kalimpong area, were annexed by the Drukpa between 1668 and 1670. The last Lepcha king,

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Vespa mandarinia}, see paragraph 14.1.3. Multiple stings of several hornets release an amount of toxin that can lead to death.

\textsuperscript{111} Ref. paragraph 2.7.2. The Minyak migrants contributed culturally, linguistically and genetically not only to the Sikkimese royal family, but also to the Bhutia, Bhutia or Drenjongpa people, who are a mix of native Lepcha and Limbu and later migrants from the Tibetan plateau.
Chapter 6. Drukpa and Tibetan Expansion.

_Pano Gaibu Áchyok_112, was murdered in his sleep by a Drukpa general. The area was subsequently annexed by the British in 1864.

### 6.11. CONCLUSIONS.

From the early 16th century onwards the Drukpa Kagyupa and Gelukpa Schools of Buddhism started establishing and expanding their relationship with the various clans of Monyul. Whereas the Drukpa Kagyu were more active in the western part of the region, gradually expanding eastward, the Gelukpa found a staunch ally among the Brokpa in the eastern part of Monyul. In the first half of the 17th century, considerable tension started to build up between the new Drukpa Kagyupa theocracy of Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel and the new Gandenpa administration in Tibet. By the middle of the 17th century, the Drukpa commenced to play out the age-old rivalries between the local rulers of Monyul. Usually, less powerful leaders would approach the Drukpa with the request to assist them to curtail the authority of their more powerful neighbours. Favouring those who pledged their allegiance, the Drukpa garnered local support. By tactically employing this local assistance, the Drukpa army which consisting mostly of monks, aristocrats and conscripts from the western regions, managed to defeat the local rulers. More often than not, stories of their previous victories impressed and frightened their opponents sufficiently to coax them into surrender without actual battles being fought. Whenever it did come to a physical stand-off, the battle tactics and weaponry employed seem to have kept number of victims relatively limited. After a final uprising in 1655 was defeated, most of Monyul was under the control of the Drukpa. They quickly built a series of fortified dzongs and set up administrative, tax and legal systems to exert their authority. The Gandenpa, in the meantime, had enlisted the support of the Brokpa and extended their control over a considerable part of eastern Monyul. But the Drukpa annexed the Brokpa villages of Merak and Sakteng and their leader fled to the Gandenpa-held territory. Seemingly trivial issues were the immediate cause of a Tibetan-Dakpa in 1656 and a Tibetan-Mongol-Dakpa invasion in 1714, both of which were successfully repelled and defeated by the Drukpa. Lasting peace between the Drukpa and Gandenpa theocracies was only signed in 1730.

From the list of people who contributed to the construction of Zhonggar Dzong and the list of people who commissioned the Gyelrik it seems that until the late 17th century the local clan rulers of the previously independent fiefdoms of eastern Monyul still retained a

---

112 Known to the Bhutanese as གཡེལཔོ་ལྡེ་བཀོད་པ་ གཡེལཔོ་ལྡེ་བཀོད་པ་ གཡེལཔོ་ལྡེ་བཀོད་པ་ Monpa Acok.

---
function within the new administrative setup of the Drukpa. They were, however, replaced by a new administrative system. In the eastern part of Monyul, on the other hand, although having formally accepted the suzerainty of the Gandenpa, the local clans remained in effective local control for at least 300 years longer.

Figure 6.1. View of Trashigang Dzong as the invading forces might have seen it from the Gongri river bed (ref. paragraph 6.9).
CHAPTER 7. THE MODERN HISTORY OF THE MONYUL REGION.

This chapter will focus on the history of the Monyul region from the 17th till the 20th century. In the western part of Monyul, the Drukpa theocracy started by Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel had taken over the previously independent fiefdoms ruled by clans claiming descent from Lhase Tsangma and other illustrious figures from Tibetan history. This area became the political entity and nation-state that was hence referred to as 'Drukyül 'land of the Drukpa’, after the dominant Drukpa Kagyu School. To the outside world, the country later became known as Bhutan. The area under Bhutanese control will henceforth be called ‘Eastern Bhutan’. The eastern part of Monyul, henceforth called ‘Eastern Mon’ was nominally part of Tibet, but the Ganden administration accorded some degree of independence to the local rulers. In the second half of the 20th century, the northern part was annexed by China as part of Tibet, whereas the southern part became the districts of Kameng and Tawang in the new Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh. Monyul was thus politically divided over the three nations of Bhutan, Tibet and Arunachal Pradesh.

7.1. THE EIGHT SPEKES OF THE WHEEL OF THE EASTERN REGION.

Eastern Bhutan was divided into the Sharchok Khorlo Tsipgye ‘the Eight Spokes of the Eastern Wheel’. These eight divisions were traditionally the area encompassed by the present day Trongsa, Zhemgang, Bumthang, Lhüntsi, Monggar, Trashigang, Trashiyangtsi, Pemagatshel and Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhaks. Historically, several bifurcations and mergers have taken place in the administrative setup of the region.

7.1.1. THE FOUR DIVISIONS OF MANGDE.

The upper Mangde river valley became known as Mangde Tshozhi ‘four divisions of Mangde’. The Mangde area was mainly inhabited by people culturally and linguistically related to the people of Bumthang and Kheng, although small indigenous populations continued to inhabit the remote forested regions. This area had not come under the control of various families claiming descent from the Tibetan aristocracy. Instead, like the area to the west of the Pelela, families deriving their ancestry from illustrious religious figures of various sub-schools of Buddhism held suzerainty over isolated valleys. It was, therefore, not difficult for the Drukpa to extend their authority in the Mangde region, and no military campaign had been necessary.

The four divisions of Mangde were the drungkhaks of Nup Chutō, Drakteng, Langthil and Tangsibi. Being the seat of Chögyel Minjur Tenpa and subsequently the Trongsa Dzongpons, the Chokhor Rabtentse Dzong maintained a geographical and political strategic position as the gateway between the Drukpa centre of power in the western valleys and the newly acquired areas in the east.

7.1.2. The Three Tribes of Kheng.

The lower Mangde river valley had become known as Khengrik Namsum ‘the three Kheng tribes’. The dzongkhak was ruled from the Zhemgang Dzong. Khengrik Namsum was traditionally divided in Nangkhor ‘inner/middle’, Chikhor ‘outer/upper’ and Thama Chokkhor ‘lower’ Kheng. Outer or Upper Kheng consists of present-day Shingkhar and Bardo geoks, Middle Kheng of Trong and Nangkor geoks and Lower Kheng of Phangkhar, Goshing, Ngangla and Bjoka geoks (Rigden and Pelgen, 1999, Dargye 2003:491). Although historically the Kheng area was not very significant, many illustrious figures of the region passed through or visited the area, including Guru Rinpoche, Lhase Tsangma, Tertön Pema Lingpa, Drupthop Thangtong Gyelpo and others (Dargye 2003:492). Most significant was the visit of Lama Zhang Dorji Drakpa, whom some have identified as Yudrakpa Tsordru Drakpa (1123-1193) and who is believed to have constructed the first structure at the location of the later Zhemgang Dzong in 1163 (Dargye 2003:493). If this identification is proven correct, this would place the arrival of the Tshalpa and Drukpa Kagyu sub-schools in the area already by the 12th century. At the end of the Drukpa military campaigns in 1655, the Dung families of Kheng lost their power, but not the respect of the common people by virtue of the pure ‘bone’ (Penjore 2009: 49). Only two drungpas were appointed in Kheng, the Tali Drungpa and the Takma Drungpa (Dorji 2003:225). A descendant of the Shingkhar Dung took the post of Drungpa and was only replaced during the time of the second King by the Wamling Gatpu, local noblemen who were accountable to the regional dzongs, until their hereditary appointment was replaced due to public concerns and free elections. Until 1963, Zhemgang was administered from Zhonggar through a dzongpön, and when Upper Kheng came under the effective control of the royal household in Bumthang, a dzongtshap. After Zhemgang

---

1 Ref. the introduction to Chapter 6 and figure 7.2.
2 Alternative names and spellings of the dzong are given in Dargye (2003:495).
3 His ancestry is unknown, as this Dung is not mentioned in any of the genealogical documents. He was probably related to or an offshoot from the Ura Dung.
dzongkhak was established between 1963 and 1966, a dzongda was appointed (Dargye 2003:490, 500-501).

7.1.3. THE FOUR SECTIONS OF BUMTHANG.

The ancient high-altitude valleys of Bumthang were called Bumthang Dezhi ‘the four sections of Bumthang’. Bumthang Dezhi consisted of Chume, Chökhor, Tang and Ura valleys and was ruled from the Jakar Dzong through the Gyeltse, Chume, Ura, Tang and Chökhor drungpas.

Of the old aristocratic families of Bumthang, the Domkhar and Ura Dung disappeared altogether. The Ngang Dung family continued as a Chöje family in Bemji in Nup geok in Trongsa. Some other Dung families such as the Chume, Dur, Gyatsa and Samdang Dung survive to date, and although they have lost all secular power, many local cults are intricately entwined their lineage.

7.1.4. THE FOUR CONFLUENCES OF THE KURI RIVER.

Kurtö and Kurme, the upper and lower Kuri river valley became known as Kuri Dozhi ‘the four confluences of the Kuri river’. Kuri Dozhi was traditionally divided in four and sometimes five subdivisions called drungwok headed by a drungpa. These subdivisions were Tangmachu, Khoma, Linggye or

---

4 Aris (1997: 128) described the cult of the Ace Lhamo dance performed by the women of Ura and linked it with the matrilineal Ace families that till very recently existed in Zangling, Samtenling, Ngang, Tamshing, Dur and Cakhar in Bumthang and Tsholing, Khoma and Nai in Kurtö. Aris (1997: 128) described the cult of the Ace Lhamo dance performed by the women of Ura and linked it with the matrilineal Ace families that till very recently existed in Zangling, Samtenling, Ngang, Tamshing, Dur and Cakhar in Bumthang and Tsholing, Khoma and Nai in Kurtot.

5 For example, the women from the Samdang Dung family in Ngangbi ‘swan valley’ play a crucial role during the yearly Ngang Lhakhang festival on the 15th and 16th day of the 10th month of the Bhutanese calendar. This festival is jointly organised by the Ngang Lhakhang Chöje, descendants of Lama Namkha Samdrup, and the Samdang Dung family. A dance is performed in honour of the local protective deity, Genyen Jakpa Melon. The dancers include the eight Zhepa ‘nobleman’ and eight Drapa ‘servants’ from the Samdang Dung side who perform the secular dances and 16 religious masked dances. Guests are received by the Dungzam, a lady of noble stature from the Samdang Dung family.

6 Present-day Menbi, Metsho and Jare geoks.

The northwestern valleys of the dzongkhak are inhabited by early migrations of East Bodish speakers probably related to migrations from the Tibetan plateau in the first millennium CE as evidenced from Khyikha Rathö’s story. Linguistically and culturally, they are closely related to the people of Bumthang. This area is also the ancestral home region of the Wangchuck Dynasty of Bhutan. In the northeastern valley along the Khoma river live East Bodish speakers descending from the people of Trashi Yangtse. The southern parts of the dzongkhak were inhabited by scattered populations until the arrival of Central Bodish speakers, perhaps from the Tibetan plateau directly or through eastern and southern Monyul as the Dung stories seem to imply. They received later admixture from soldiers and administrators from Western Bhutan who came after the Drukpa annexation, which resulted in the Chocangaca language. In the Kurtö region, the Dung families of Lukchu and Nyala survived by claiming descent from Tertön Guru Chöwang.

7.1.5. The Seven Divisions of Zhonggar.

The Zhonggar area became known as Zhonggar Tshokdün ‘the seven divisions of Zhonggar’. The Zhonggar Dzongpön maintained an important position as the intermediate between the eastern and southeastern regions and the Trongsa Dzong. He administered the area through the office of the Bageng, Ngatshang, Chitshang, Tsamang and Gungdü drungpas.

Although various stories regarding the construction of the Zhonggar Dzong exist (see Thinley 298-305), a strategic structure probably existed on the site where Ngagi Wangchuk earlier built a temple. This fortress was located in the Moiwalung valley on a strategic hillock on the right bank of the Moiwari river. The structure and its surroundings were offered to Chögyel Minjur Tenpa and the Zhabdrung by King Karpodung of Zhonggar in the 17th century. The original structure was expanded in 1725 and included the Ta

7 Present day Tsenkhar and Minje geoks.
8 Present-day Gangzur geok
9 Ref. paragraph 3.1.
10 Ref. paragraphs 4.4 and 2.3.
11 Ref. the introduction to Chapter 6.
12 Karpodung also became the first Zhonggar Dzongpön.
13 Thinley (2003:315-316) presents a list of contributors to the relics in the Zhonggar Dzong. Unfortunately the exact source and the era to which it refers is unknown. Whereas some of these places have cognates in the Gyelrik, there are several unknown names. The list includes the names of the Gyelpo ‘kings’ of unidentified
Dzong in the west\textsuperscript{14}, the central Rigyel Lhünpo Ma Dzong, the Chudzong Tsenkhar in the south, the Dumra Sibkyi Dzong in the north\textsuperscript{15} and the Dradül Dzong or Dzongchung in the east. From there the dzong controlled the route east to Trashigang, southeast to Dungsam, southwest to Kheng, north to Kurtö, northeast to Trashiyangtse and northwest to Bumthang and Trongsa. Various stories exist regarding the destruction of the dzong during the tenure of Dzongpön Namela, including a fire in 1889 and the earthquake of 1897 (Thinley 2003:321). Because local demons were thought to obstruct the location and cause harm to the people and livestock and malaria had become endemic to the area, the dzong was never rebuilt. The ruins of the dzong\textsuperscript{16} can still be seen from the Monggar to Bumthang road across the river from the bridge at Menchugang, halfway between Lingmethang and Thrinangbi. Instead, in 1951, a new dzong was constructed in Monggar which was further extended in 1960 and till date functions as the district headquarters of Monggar dzongkhak.

\textsuperscript{14} See Figure 7.3.

\textsuperscript{15} According to Thinley (2003:301), some people believe that this dzong, located between the Moiwari and Changkhoiri rivers, is the original Galingkhar ref. paragraph 2.2.

\textsuperscript{16} In 2010 the location of the ruins was cleared and restoration works were started, which were halted the same year due to lack of funds.

\textsuperscript{17} Various etymologies of the name Monggar can be found in Thinley (2003:323-325). The history of the dzong can be found in Thinley (2003:328-329).

7.1.6. The Eight Divisions of Trashigang.

The Trashigang region, often referred to as the ‘proper’ Sharchok Lungpa ‘land of the easterners’ was also called Trashigang Tshogye ‘the eight divisions of Trashigang’. It was administered from Trashigang Dzong through the Khaling Gya Drungpa who also controlled the duar plains, and the drungpas of Radi, Rongthung, Tsengmi and Bartshosum. The dzong at Trashigang, centre of power in the dzongkhak, was reconstructed in 1936 and again renovated in 1950.

7.1.7. The Five Divisions of Yangtse.

The upper and lower Dürong ‘demon gorge’ or Kholong river valley was called Yangtse Tshonga ‘the Five Divisions of Yangtse’ which consisted of Jangphu, Tomzhang, Lingchen, Beling and Womanang Zhiling drungwoks (Namgyel 2003:396) although Dorji (2003:229) mentions only four, namely Tshaling, Rinchengang, Bumdeling and Tsenkhar. The area was controlled from the Dongdü Dzong. According to Namgyel (2003:392) sources differ as to the exact date of the construction of the first dzong here. King Gongkargyel of the Byar clan took control of the upper Kholong river valley and subsequently must have built a khar in this location. This khar and the associated village of Donglum were later deserted as a result of a Tibetan invasion, earthquakes or fire.

---

18 Like the Dungsam Gya Drungpa in paragraph 7.1.8, the prefix Gya ‘Indian’ already indicated the authority these drungpas held over the duar plains in the south. In both cases, the office of the Gya Drungpa appears to have been accorded to local families that had earlier been supportive to the Drukpa, namely the Yodung Wangma clan of Manchö in lower Khaling and the Byar clan of Khangma in Yurung, who perhaps had earlier supported the Drukpa in constructing the Yongla monastery (ref. the introduction to Chapter 6).

19 The alternative spelling has been only found in Dorji (2003:229-230). In all other works, including the Gyelrik, the spelling is found.

20 Ref. footnote 123 to Chapter 4.

21 Present day Lichen village in Yangtse geok.

22 Present day Beling village in Yangtse geok.

23 Present day Womanang village in Bumdeling geok.

24 Present-day Tshaling village in Bumdeling geok.

25 Alternative, the spellings are also found (Namgyel 2003:392). The dzong is located on a hillock at the confluence of the and the Kholong rivers. Continuous reference to the valley of the Kholong river and its tributaries as a place where powerful ‘demons’ once roamed might be a justification of the spellings , dzong.

26 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.

(Namgyel 2003:392-393, 395). In the 14th century, Pema Lingpa might have further expanded the site and named the dzong as Trashiyangtsi dzong (Namgyel 2003:392, 402), and in the 17th century the Drukpa constructed a new dzong on this location. At least from 1927 onwards, Trashiyangtsi became a drungkhak under Trashi Yangtse dzongkhak, administered by a Dzongsungpa until 1961, a Rapjam between 1962 and 1983, and a drungpa from 1984 onwards (Namgyel 2003:397). At that time, only two geoks, Jangphu and Yangtse existed. In 1992, Trashi Yangtse dzongkhak was bifurcated and new dzongs were created. A new dzong was built in 1997 on the hillock of Rinchengang, where a small temple that used to be the seat of Ratnalingpa still exists (Namgyel 2003:419). This dzong houses the dzongkhak administration, whereas the old dzong, colloquially referred to as dzong manma ‘old dzong’, is home to the dzongkhak monastic body.

7.1.8. The Three Confluences of Dungsam.

Finally, the lower valleys and hills near the Indian plains were known as Dungsam Dosum ‘the three confluences of Dungsam’. The area now known as Pemagatshel was previously administered from Zhonggar through the office of the Dungsam Gya Drungpa of Khangma27 (Wangdi 2004: 21-24). The area now known as Samdrup Jongkhar was administered through the office of the Dewathang Sasungpa under Zhonggar Dzong (Ura 1995: 146-154). In 1970, Dungsam was split into two newly established dzongkhaks that were named Pemagatshel and Samdrup Jongkhar (Thinley 2003:327).

Pelthonglek of the Je clan28 of Monyul Tongsum settled at the base of Lhanangzor. His lineage continued in the form of the Shalikhar Chöje religious nobility29.

---

27 A village in Yurung geok of Pemagatshel. The Gya Drungpa collected in-kind taxes from the duar plains and sent these through Zhonggar to Trongsa.

28 Ref. paragraph 4.2.6. Later oral accounts from Pemagatshel accept Pelthonglek as their main local hero, and many places in the Pemagatshel area are associated with his life and activities. The story of his birth and upbringing as the adopted son of a fisherman couple (Wangdi 2004: 25 and paragraph 4.4.3) shows a conspicuous parallel with the origin story of the Dung. His role as servant of the Drukpa and later as ruler of Dungsam places him within the Drukpa administrative setup. He is also thought to have allied to the Gya Drungpa through marriage and murdered the Gya Drungpa in a fight after the marriage failed. The Gya Drungpa’s wife fled to Kengkhar, and their two sons later murdered Pelthonglek (Wangdi 2004). Of course, the
Later, the Shalikhar Dzong was constructed close to the main route between Trongsa, Bumthang, Zhonggar and the Duars. Secular power came in the hands of dzongpöns that were appointed from Zhonggar. Dzongpön Kolokpa was the Zhonggar Dzongpön before he was appointed as Shalikhar Dzongpön. The dzong was ransacked by the looting British Indian army during the Duar war of 1865, when the Lama of Yongla Gonpa was insulted by the Shalikhar Dzongpön Kolokpo and refused his protection of the Dzong (Wangdi 2004: 29). The survivors of this attack are said to have fled to Shar Dirang. Unfortunately, the ruins of Shalikhar Dzong are in a dilapidated condition, since most of the stones used in construction have been used for other constructions, including the Shumar Dzong.

Another story regarding the Shalikhar Dzong interestingly links back to the origin story of the Dung and the Brokpa\textsuperscript{31}. Two brothers were the local chieftains occupying the steep cliffs of Pangkhar and Guyum. They could communicate with each other across the ravines until the construction of Shalikhar Dzong obstructed this. The brothers invited the Casakhar Masang from Zhonggar to help him destroy the dzong. The masang requested one pig and one *mon* of rice to be cooked for him, but the cook, a lady from Yurung, hid one leg of the pig and one *khau* of rice for herself. As a result, the strength of the Masang was insufficient to throw the *pungdo* /short put stone/ far enough to destroy the dzong. In a slightly different version, the people of the area suffered under the Dzongpön of the Shalikhar, and requested the Casakhar Masang to kill him. Again, the central theme is a local leader who demands the people that an obstruction, in this case a dzong, has to be taken away, and the subsequent assassination of the leader by the people.

7.2. THE THIRTY-TWO DIVISIONS OF MON.

The Bapus of Morshing, Thembang and Domkha and the kings of Dirang and the Sherdukpen continued to hold certain rights among their people and also continued to extract the annual in-kind tax from the plains\textsuperscript{32}. Even till present the surname *Bapu* in Kameng denotes descent from an aristocratic family. Most of the Kagyupa and Nyingmapa monasteries were converted into Gelukpa establishments, although some, such as for example in Taklung south person of Pelthonglek cannot have been the same historical person in all these stories, as they span the period from the 10\textsuperscript{th} till the 19\textsuperscript{th} century CE.

\textsuperscript{29} The village of *Lanangzor* in Chongshing geok.

\textsuperscript{30} Ref. footnote 116 to Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{31} Ref. paragraph 4.3.3 and Chapter 11.

\textsuperscript{32} Ref. paragraph 6.8.
of Domkha (Aris 1979:107) were allowed to maintain their traditional links with the Nyingmapa.\textsuperscript{33}

In the northern part of Eastern Monyul, including the Tshona and Lekpu area of Tibet and Tawang district of Arunachal, the chiefs and kings of the various clans were largely deposed or given a merely ceremonial function under the Tawang dzongpon. In the course of history this area was administratively divided in several regions. The 1680 edict of the 5\textsuperscript{th} Dalai Lama, on the other hand, mentions (Aris 1986) as part of the Tshoksum area the Rong Doksum, Mulob Shaksum and Sharba Monu Zhi. Dorji (2003:205) mentions additionally the Mikthing Luksum and the Hropyang Dak. In the 18\textsuperscript{th} century reference is made to Monyulgi Drongdū Tshokhag, a census of households by counting the smoke of the chimneys, and Monyul Sridzin Detshen, the administrative divisions of Monyul.

Perhaps, later increase in population density required further administrative subdivision into the Monyulgi Tshoding Sumcusonyi ‘32 divisions of Monyul’ with the regional capital situated at Tshona Dzong. These 32 divisions often include: Lekpang/Lekpo Tshozhi ‘four divisions of Lekpo’, Drangnang Tshodruk ‘the six divisions of Drangnang’, Rongnang Tshozhi ‘four divisions of Rongnang’, Pangchen Dingdruk ‘the six divisions of Pangchen’, Lawok Yulsum ‘the three lands below the mountains’ and Dakpa Tshonga or Tshogye ‘the eight/five divisions of the Dakpa’ (Norbu 1999).

7.3. TAX AND MIGRATION.

Both in the Eastern Bhutan and in Eastern Monyul, the Drukpa and Gandenpa administrations established their authority by introducing their respective administrative, legal and religious systems. Central to the Drukpa government was a reincarnate lama as the spiritual head with

\textsuperscript{33} Ref. paragraph 6.4.3.
\textsuperscript{34} Ref. footnote 95 to Chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{35} The area of Lekpu in Tibet.
\textsuperscript{36} The current Zemithang circle of Tawang district.
\textsuperscript{37} The present-day Tawang, Jang and Kitpi circles of Tawang district.
\textsuperscript{38} The present-day Lumla, Dudunghar, Mokto and Bongkhar circles of Tawang district.
secular powers delegated to regents. After his death the spiritual head, the secular head, and the regional authorities constantly contested for power, resulting in instability and internal strife. The only binding factor was probably the monastic institutions that created a sense of religious and cultural unity and stability (Aris 1994). In the newly acquired areas, the Drukpa introduced a system of dzongpöns in the major dzongs, who were accountable to the Pönlop in Trongsa who was in turn accountable to the Druk Desi temporal ruler in Punakha. The dzongpöns ruled their respective areas through drungpas and sasungpas. The drungpas in turn relied on local representatives in the villages for day-to-day administration.

Through fair or unfair means, considerable areas of the most fertile and easily cultivatable land came into the possession of the state monastic institutions in the dzongs, the dzongpöns and the drungpas. In various areas, local overlords such as the Khoche, Dung and Chöje families that claimed descent from religious figures and those clans that had sided with the Drukpa, and whose existence was therefore condoned 39, also owned considerable land. The land of the monastic estates was meant to fulfil the subsistence needs of the monastic community, in return for performing the religious duties that were to keep the nation and the people safe. The dzongpöns and drungpas could officially keep part of the collected tax for their own subsistence needs. The local land-owning families were in the threpa ‘taxpayer’ class 40 and were obliged to pay taxes directly to the government. Households that worked as the servants of these households, the monastic estates, the local religious or aristocratic families or the government were called drapa ‘servants’. They were usually former taxpaying households that had revolted against the local overlord and sought refuge with a new lord, who would give them a plot of land for sustenance in return for the provision of labour and other services. A special category of servants were the garpa or be garpa 41, the lowest rank of government servants serving the court of the Zhabdrung and later the Royal family whose main task was tax collection. The sumapa 42 ‘sharecroppers’ were households that did not own any land, but instead worked the land of

39 Unlike the families claiming descent from Lhase Tsangma and other historical figures, who were seen as possible competitors and therefore gradually made redundant.
41 Why they were called ‘Tibetan garpa’ remains unclear. Perhaps, the native population of the area considered the Ngalong of western Bhutan as Tibetans Van Driem (2001b:992). Perhaps, the lingua franca among the Dzongkha-speaking servants of the royal court and the speakers of the various local tongues in the east was Tibetan.
42 Dorji (2003) has sumapa.
threpa households, usually in return for a part of the harvest and sometimes for the user rights on a small plot of subsistence land. The lowest class were the Ŭšīųī zapa ‘slaves’, who were in bound relation with the threpa or zurpa households only in return for basic survival necessities. They particularly included people raided from the Indian plains, captured Tibetan soldiers and social outcasts such as people suspected of serving poison, those suspected of being possessed by malignant spirits, Ŭšīųī ‘black magicians’ and those with birth defects and inherited diseases.

Taxation was initiated in 1647 and regularised in eastern Bhutan from 1655 onwards. The kind and amount of tax that the taxpaying households were due was theoretically based on the land and cattle holding of the household. Most taxes were collected in kind and included agricultural and horticultural produce, mainly rice and other food grains; livestock products, mainly butter; textiles; non-wood forest products such as dye, paper and madder; and copper and silver coins from Tibet, Cooch Bihar and Ahom. From 1681 onwards, each tax-paying household was also obliged to send at least one son to serve the state as a monk or a servant. Perhaps the most oppressive kind of tax was the Ŭšīųī ‘compulsory labour tax’, typically a number of labour days that had to be contributed to transportation of tax loads or the construction of state-sponsored buildings. The compulsory labour tax greatly reduced the labour availability for work on the own land, and moreover, they often owned too much land to cultivate anyway. As a result, many tax-paying households could not fulfil the tax obligations and instead, they offered loyal subservient households a small plot of land in return for contributing to the tax obligations of the taxpayer household. This contribution was usually a third of the total in kind and labour tax. These households became known as Ŭšīųī zurpa ‘collateral taxpayers’. Some tax-paying households voluntarily gave up their status often moved to vacant government land, accepting a lower social position as Ŭšīųī mephupa with lighter taxes. From Ardussi and Ura (2000:49) it appears that by 1742 the majority of the 6833 tax-paying households in eastern Bhutan belonged to the threpa or principal tax-paying household category, and that at that time zurpa households did not exist in this part of Bhutan.

Although in theory all the land was owned by the state, in practice the local authorities had full authority over its usage and exploited them and the people that worked on them for their own benefit. As the local authorities could easily manipulate and bribe the civil

---

43 This class was called /shutkela/ in Kheng (Penjore 2009). During the second king’s time the sumapa were converted into threpa and they were obliged to contribute both tax and compulsory labour.

44 Called /brela/ or /tsangla/ in Kheng (Penjore 2009). The name /tsangla/ is conspicuously similar to one of the historical names of the Tshangla people, ref. paragraph 9.2.
servants that were assigned with taking the periodical census and the yearly collection of tax, there was a continuous down reporting of the population, the area under cultivation, the number of livestock, and the agricultural and handicraft production. This occurred on all levels: from the villages to the drungpa, from the drungpa to the dzong, and from the dzongs to the central government. Thus, whereas the tax presented to the central government was limited, the ground reality was that the local people were subjected to a multiplicity of oppressive taxation systems (Ura 1995:123-141 and 219-221). Dorji (2003:225) mentions, for example, how the dzongpön and nyerchen obliged the threpa and zurpa households of Trashigang to work on the agricultural land of the dzong and the central monastic body from the moment of sowing till the harvest was collected in the dzong. The kakpa/‘bound labourers’ and sumapa did the work in the remaining six months. A similar system existed elsewhere, as is reported from Trashiyangtsi by Namgyel (2003:408-409), from Zhemgang by Dargye (2003:499) and from Lhüntsi by Kinga (2003:531). The local authorities and monastic estates were the ones that benefited most from this situation, accumulating great wealth and prosperity.

Revolts against this excessive taxation were not uncommon. The people of Kheng Shingkhar, for example, revolted against the regional authority of the Jakar and Zhemgang dzongpöns and became subsidiary to the royal family at Wangdüchöling instead of the central government (Penjore 2009: 43-44). More commonly, however, threpa households that could no longer fulfil their tax obligations migrated beyond the reach of the central and regional government, primarily to Pemakö, but also to remote areas within Eastern Bhutan. Although officially the land and other properties of threpa households that migrated or became wiped out by diseases reverted to the government, in many cases the land was occupied by zurpa and sumapa households. Because the zurpa were exempted from directly paying taxes to the central government, the departure of the threpa significantly affected the tax revenue collection, forcing the government to increase the tax pressure on the entire community. This led to a vicious cycle of tax increases, decreasing taxpaying households through migration, decreasing tax revenues against equal or higher requirements and subsequent tax increases. It was only much later that this lapse in the system was acknowledged. That migration was a common problem is also exemplified by statements such as in Penjore (2009:151) ‘history has been unkind to [Kheng Wamling’s] ancestors who were forced to migrate to eastern and

45 Ref. paragraph 7.5.
south-central districts during the medieval period (1651-1907) to avoid military conscription, heavy taxation and labour contribution for the state’.

7.4. INCREASING BRITISH INFLUENCE AND CONTINUED MIGRATION.

The British annexed Assam between 1826 and 1839. In 1836, the rights of the kings of Thembang and the Sherdukpen to collect posa\(^{46}\) were replaced by an annual cash amount (Gait 1926: 311-312 and Bose 1997:57-59), and the same happened for the posa collected from Kuriapara Duar in 1844 (Gait 1926: 311-312). Although the relations between the British and the kings of Thembang and Sherdukpen were largely cordial, there was a minor conflict with the Bapus of Morshing and Domkha in 1852. After the British took control over the Assam and Bengal Duars, the yearly trade fairs at Doimara, Udalguri and Darranga became important facilitators of this trade (Sikdar 2000: Dutta and Jha 1999). However with the opening of direct trade with Tibet through the Chumbi valley and Nepal and tensions in Tibet itself this trade greatly diminished\(^{47}\). The trade with India became even more essential from then onwards. Several border towns now became permanent trading towns, including Doimara for the people of Bomdila, Dirang and Tawang, Udalguri for the people of Kalaktang and Lauri, and Darranga for the people of Trashigang and Trashiyangtshi.

In the 1850s and 1860s increasing tension and war with the British in India resulted in migration from the Dungsam and Dewathang areas into deserted areas in the interior of Eastern Bhutan, including the Gamri river valley. There are furthermore significant Tshangla minorities in parts of Lhüntsi dzongkhag\(^{48}\) that according to Gyeltshen (2006: 14, 25) represent relatively recent migrations from Dungsam and Monggar as a result of the duar war with the British in 1864-1865. The ceding of the duars to the British resulted in great revenue losses to the central government and according to Penjore (2009:46) the local taxes were substantially increased. Several great earthquakes between 1850 and 1900 and sporadic outbreaks of infectious diseases also contributed to internal migration. This voluntary

\(^{46}\) Ref. paragraph 5.6.

\(^{47}\) The Chinese annexation of Tibet in the 1950s gave the final blow to the India to Tibet trade. In recent years, the illegal trade in animal products (notably bear bile, musk deer gland, tiger and leopard pelt and bone and rhinoceros horn) from north-eastern India to Bhutan is still said to take place mainly through Tawang and Trashiyangtshi.

\(^{48}\) E.g. the villages of Thimnyung of Menbi geok, Ungar and Bangtsho of Metsho geok, and Rotpa, Nyimshong, Lingabi, Somshing, Magar, Samling and Tongling of Gangzur geok.
migration received an additional impulse in the early 20th century when royal commands actively promote internal resettlement within Eastern Bhutan. In the same period, there was also considerable migration from the Dungsam area eastward all the way into Kameng.

Between 1872 and 1873, the British demarcated the border between Assam, Bhutan and the hills. A curious and unknown part of Bhutan’s history involves the status of the far-eastern areas of the kingdom. Traditionally, the ‘eastern approach’ of Bhutan was considered to be Galingkha or Khalingkha. This Khalingkha is not, as often thought, the village of Khaling in Trashigang, nor the area of Khaling duar where we now find the Khaling-Neuli Wildlife Sanctuary, but can instead be identified as present-day Galingkhar in Marshala geok of Samdrup Jongkhar district. The authority of this khar previously extended into the area including present-day Phuntshothang geoks and the duars to the south. The sparsely populated area to the east was, at least nominally, under the suzerainty of the Ganden administration of Tibet through the Tawang Dzong similar to the area under the control of the Sāt Rājas. In the late 19th century the Duar War caused people from the Dungsam area to settle in the area of present-day Samrang, Pemathang, Lauri, Serthi and Samrang geoks, which did not form a part of Bhutan until the early 20th century. Similarly, the geoks of Merak and Sakteng, though nominally part of Bhutan after the defeat of the combined Tibetan-Dakpa invasion of Trashigang in 1657, remained close allies of the Ganden administration due to their religious affiliation with the Gelukpa School and their cultural affiliation with their Dakpa neighbours. Evidence can also be found in an early 20th century map (Bartholomew 1907-1909), showing the border between Bhutan and Tibet to run north-south just east of Trashiyangtshi, Trashigang and Dewangiri. It appears that only after the recognition of the authority of King Ugyen Wangchuck by the British in 1907 that the eastern borders of Bhutan were settled as they are now. According to Dasho Tenzin Dorji (pers. comm., 2010), there are documents in Trashigang Dzong which confirm the acts of submission made by the people of Lauri and the people of Merak and Sakteng to the King of Bhutan after 1907, although these documents could not be retrieved.

Ref. paragraph 1.2 and 6.5.
This is also exemplified by the presence of a stone structure located on the north bank of the Gamri river, around half an hour walk eastward from the village of Breng under Phongme geok in Trashigang, which according to locals denoted the border between Trashigang/Bhutan and Sakteng/Tawang until approximately 100 years ago.
7.5. THE ENLIGHTENED MONARCHY.

The history of the Wangchuck Dynasty of Bhutan and how it came to power in the late 19th century, culminating in the coronation of the first King Ugyen Wangchuck in 1907, has been extensively described in various other sources (e.g. Aris 1994). The British in India actively encouraged the establishment of the monarchy in the hope to stabilise the volatile area and reduce the conflict and strife and the resulting tension on the border with Assam and Bengal.

In the 1940s and 1950s, when under the second King of Bhutan Jigme Wangchuck central tax collection was being standardised and monetised, the awareness developed that the people of eastern Bhutan paid little tax in kind or cash (Ura 1995:123-141, 219-221) despite being subjected to a multiplicity of diverse and oppressive taxation systems. Examples are mentioned from Khoma (Ura 1995:123-127), Bumthang (136-139) and Trashigang (139-141). The acknowledgement of this failure of the system resulted in the tax reforms and abolition of slavery under the second and third kings (ŢŲŢīŷŰ ƗŢī 1986, Gyeltshen 2006). Slavery was abolished in 1954, and many of the monastic estates were redistributed to freed slaves in return for state support to the monastic institutions. One of the tax reforms was that all households were raised to threpa status and that in-kind taxation was replaced by monetary taxation.

Although undeniable lighter, fairer and more equitable than the tax system that had existed in the past, a section of society was not satisfied with the reforms. The people of the southeastern areas of Bhutan bordering India viewed the taxation system that was imposed on them primarily in comparison with the taxation system that existed, or rather did not exist, across the border. The retention of the compulsory labour component and the forced inscription into the military service were particularly dreaded, as they drained the labour needed for the agricultural work. According to local sources, in the early 1950s, Khotsa from Narphung, Shektala from Kanglung and Lhatshapa from Kangpar, who said they represented around 400 households from Narphung, Gomdar, Orong, Kangpar, Dechenchöling and adjoining villages, approached the erstwhile Governor of Meghalaya in Shillong, thinking he was the leader of the Republic of India. They requested for their villages to be absorbed into India. Probably puzzled and amused by this request, the Governor informed the Prime Minister of India, who informed the second king of Bhutan. The king sent Gyalpoi Zimpon (Royal Chamberlain) Thinley Dorji to the area, and over 40 people were thought to have been arrested. Out of these, a dozen or so are thought to have met their fate by being thrown into the Punatsangchu river at Punakha alive. More than 200 households left Bhutan voluntarily or

were forced to leave. Although around half of them later returned, the remaining households permanently settled, primarily in the Shillong area, which is why a considerable Tshangla speaking community can still be found there. In direct reaction to these events, in 1952 a bond agreement restricting the migration of people from eastern Bhutan to western Bhutan was lifted\textsuperscript{51}. Furthermore it was proposed to install an efficient dzongda and drungpa in the eastern border areas to tackle the migration of eastern Bhutanese to India, Sikkim and Tibet diplomatically\textsuperscript{52}.

During the third king’s rule, a fully centralised state was established and the process of decentralisation was started which continues till date and aims to eventually place full power with the people. In 1975, the yearly migration of people from Dungsam across the border into India was a major annoyance to the central government, and in the 42\textsuperscript{nd} session of the National Assembly\textsuperscript{53} (minute 4) the traditional migration was discussed and in the 43\textsuperscript{rd} session this was stopped by bond and only trade was permitted henceforth\textsuperscript{54}. From 2008 onwards the people directly elect their representative to the National Assembly in a constituency.

All people of Bhutan are called Drukpa, and wherever ethnic affiliations exist, these are based on birth in a certain region or being the speaker of a certain language. The process of nation-building and identification as Drukpa was started by Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal in the 1650s and continues till the present. As more and more people from different ethnic

\textsuperscript{51} Minute 3 of 1st session of the National Assembly, 1952.
\textsuperscript{52} 1st session of the NA, part II minute 2, 1952.
\textsuperscript{53} Full text of article 4: Matter relating to restriction on the people of Eastern Bhutan from temporary settlement in India. Since the time of their ancestors, the people of Dungsam Shumar had gone to Tsoki in India for residing there in winter, and had brought back rice and other essential commodities on their return. However, in view of the government of India’s strict restrictions from this year on the export of rice to Bhutan, the people of Dungsam Shumar were not facing difficulties. As such, the Ministry of Development assured them assistance by way of providing food commodities. However, though they were permitted free movement in connection with trade, the people of Dungsam Shumar were strictly prohibited from settling down in Indian territory. The Hon’ble Home Minister would investigate the migration and report back to the next session of the Assembly for a decision on the matter.
\textsuperscript{54} Full text of article 13: Matter relating to public migration. The public of Shumar Dungsum traditionally migrated during the winter months to the Indian side in Tshoeki, returning to Shumar at the start of summer. As per decision No. 4 of the 41\textsuperscript{st} session of the National Assembly of Bhutan, the matter was investigated by the Hon’ble Home Minister through the Dzongda of Shumar and the Public of Shumar had submitted a bond agreement to the effect that they would discontinue this practice and would travel across the border in future only for trading purposes. The decision of the public was endorsed by the National Assembly.

origins intermarry, and as more and more people become bi-, tri- or even multi-lingual, the genetic and linguistic amalgamation of all the ethnic groups to a single nationality proceeds further, strengthening the ‘One Nation, One People’ policy introduced in the late 1980s but now largely abandoned. Despite allegations by exiled Nepali-speaking refugees that the policy was meant to impose Ngalong culture and traditions on ethically distinct peoples, this is generally not perceived as such by the people of Bhutan themselves. Curiously, for example, if one asks rural Tshangla speakers what ethnic group they belong to and what language they speak they will answer *Drukpa* and *Drukalo*, the Drukpa language. When asked what the national language of Bhutan is and how the people who originally speak it are called, the answer is often *Zhungkha* ‘government language’ and *Ngalong*. The traditional Nyingma home education of boys has resulted in males from non-Dzongkha backgrounds to often excel over their peers in reading and writing Dzongkha, even though it is a language not related to their mother tongue and even though their pronunciation is less perfect. Another example are the Brokpa of Merak and Sakteng, who have not only maintained their traditional dress, but beside a high level of mother tongue retention also show a surprising proficiency in written and spoken Dzongkha at all age levels and in both genders, which is probably explicity through the close relationship of their language with Dzongkha.

7.6. Adoption by the World’s Largest Democracy.

From 1914, the British exerted a policy of ‘loose political control’ (Bose 1997:59) in Eastern Mon. Attempts were made in 1914 and 1937 to bring the region under direct control, but both times the World War distracted the attention of the British. After India’s independence in 1947, the new republic made more serious attempts to include the area under their political control. In 1950, India declared the McMahon line as the official border between India and Tibet, and forced the Tibetan administration out of Tawang by 1951. In 1954 the North-eastern Frontier Agency (NEFA) was established with its headquarters in Bomdila. In 1962 China invaded the northeast, capturing the complete Tawang and Kameng area and other areas as well. After declaring victory the Chinese troops voluntarily withdrew (Johri 1968). In 1972 Eastern Monyul became part of the Union Territory of Arunachal Pradesh. In 1980 Kameng was bifurcated in the districts of East and West Kameng, and in 1984 Tawang was split off. In 1986 the State of Arunachal Pradesh was declared. The state legislature of Arunachal Pradesh is the Vidhan Sabha, at Tawang and West Kameng district level the Zila Parishad ‘district legislative body’, and at the village level there is the Gram Panchayat ‘village self-governing body’.

Figure 7.1. The Pungthang Dechen Phodrang Dzong in Punakha (photo courtesy Y. Waarts).

Figure 7.2. The Chökhor Rabtentse Dzong in Trongsa (photo courtesy Y. Waarts).
Figure 7.3. Ruin of the Zhonggar Ta Dzong, Monggar dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 7.4. Doksum Cakzam.

Figure 7.5. The Cakzam ‘iron chain bridge’ at Doksum, Trashiyangtse dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan, before it was dismantled.
Map VI. Post-17th century administrative setup of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.
CHAPTER 8. PEMAKŌ, THE ARRAY OF THE LOTUS.

As indicated in Chapter 1, Pemakō has been included in this book since, though geographically remote, in the course of history the region has become what can be considered as a cultural extension of the Monyul region. Pemakō is located in the area of Tibet around what is often called the ‘great bend of the Yarlung Tsangpo’ or the ‘Tsangpo gorges’. The Yarlung Tsangpo is the main river of Tibet and of tremendous importance not only to the people of the Tibetan plateau, but also to the people further downstream where it is called the Siang river and, after being joined by several other rivers, as the Brahmaputra. Pemakō here refers to both the banks of the Yarlung Tsangpo river from the Po valley in the north till Trutring in the south.

In Pemakō, the Yarlung Tsangpo diverts from the west-east direction of flow on the plateau to a north-south direction, cutting through the Himalayan range creating a canyon with a height difference of 5,382m. This canyon allows warm, humid monsoon air from the Bay of Bengal and the plains of the Brahmaputra to ascend, creating climatological conditions unique for the Tibetan plateau. Despite being located on the north side of the Himalayan range, the 30,000 km² Pemakō area thus has a climate reminiscent of the southern slopes of the Himalayas. Pemakō and the areas known as Tsari to its west and Dzayul to its east have remained relatively inaccessible due to these geographic and climatic conditions and the resulting vegetation cover. These areas are characterised by a similar geography of high mountains intersected by deep river gorges, a similar climate of high year-round temperatures and high precipitation in summer, and comparable vegetation, consisting of lush broadleaf and temperate forests. Pemakō has high mountains with alpine vegetation and year-round snow at altitudes over 6,000m, coniferous and temperate broadleaf forests on steep slopes between 2,000 and 3,000m and deep gorges with dense subtropical forests at 600m. It also contains the 7,782m high Namchak Barwa peak, the fifteenth highest peak in the world. The terrain is precipitous, snakes and leeches abound, the climate is cloudy and rainy, and the original population, like that of Powo, has been known to have been hostile to strangers (Lazcano 2005:41,50).

But the geography, climate and vegetation also made the area a safe refuge for human populations in times of climatic stress and religious and political upheaval on the Tibetan plateau and the southern Himalayan slopes. The Pemakō, Tsari and Dzayul areas were probably inhabited at an early moment in history, and Neolithic adzes and other artefacts

---

1 Ref. paragraph 5.3.
2 E.g. during the LGM, ref. paragraph 2.4.

have been recovered from various places in the area\(^3\). Pemakö can be translated as ‘array of the lotus’ referring to the shape of the area like a lotus flower in full bloom. In the late 16\(^{th}\) and early 17\(^{th}\) century, Pemakö obtained status as a beyul ‘hidden valley’\(^4\). The beyul valleys were supposedly hidden by Guru Rinpoche to serve as a safe refuge for Tibetan Buddhists in times of religious and political unrest, strife and persecution. The reputation of Pemakö as beyul attracted a large number of migrants from the Monyul area since the second half of the 17\(^{th}\) century onwards. Because of this migration, the Pemakö area became an important extension of the Monyul cultural area, with migration continuing until well into the 20\(^{th}\) century. Pemakö came under the rule of the Kanam Depa from Powo in the middle of the 19\(^{th}\) century, which was superseded by the Gandan administration before the Chinese annexation of Tibet in 1959.

8.1. THE LOPA: PEMAKÖ’S ORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

Before the area of the great bend of the Tsangpo river became known as Pemakö, the Tibetans called it ཏོ་ཤྨ་ Loyal, the land of the བོད་ Lopa\(^5\). The term Lopa is perhaps just as confusing as the generic Tibetan term Monpa. In various traditional Tibetan sources we can find the བོད་ Lalo, the བོད་ Khalo\(^6\) ‘mouth Lo’, the བོད་ Tinglo\(^7\) ‘Lo of the valley bottoms’, the བོད་ Lo Khakarpo ‘white-mouthed Lo’, the བོད་ Lo Khanakpo ‘black-mouthed Lo’, the བོད་ Lo Kathrapa ‘beautiful-mouthed Lo’, the བོད་ Lo Drnakpa\(^8\), the བོད་ Lo Mikyadeng, the བོད་ Lo Khathra\(^9\) ‘multi-coloured-mouth Lo’ and the བོད་ Lo Gidu\(^10\) (ref., for example, Cawdor 2001, Huber 1999, Pommaret 1999, Aris 1980). Although the Lopa tribes share with the Monpa tribes that they inhabit the southern slopes of the Himalayan range, unlike the Monpa they are not considered to share the same origin as the Tibetan race. Moreover, the Tibetans have considered them far less

---

\(^3\) Ref. paragraph 2.6.
\(^4\) Ref. paragraph 3.1.
\(^5\) Ref. paragraph 2.9.3.
\(^6\) For the Tibetans of Dakpo, Khalo refers to the Tagin and Bangru.
\(^7\) I.e. the Bangni and Nishi tribes living in the Tsari area and the adjoining areas of Arunachal. They are considered the human retinue of the protective deity of Tsari, Tsari Shingkyong.
\(^8\) I.e. the Mishmi of Pemakö, Dzayul and adjoining areas of Arunachal Pradesh, ref. paragraph 2.9.3.
\(^9\) I.e. the tribes that used tattoos on their face, such as the Hruso and Dhimmai of Arunachal. In the context of Pemakö Lo Khathra refers to the Shimong and Karko Adi, even though they do not have a practice of tattooing the face.
\(^10\) The Dakpa of Tawang call the Nishi, Dhimmai and Hruso of East Kameng also ‘gidu’. The Dakpa consider those Dhimmai and Khowa who have adopted at least a superficial Buddhist layer are now no more as Gidu.
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civilised, mainly because they have not been exposed to the Buddhist religion, or have refused to accept the Buddhist precepts.\(^{11}\)

‘the history of the beginning of human beings in Pemakö’ provides an origin story of the original tribes of the ‘upper, middle and lower Lopa’. Important elements in his account include the mythical descent of the first four Lopa brothers from heaven to Tsari Kala Dungtsho ‘Kala origin lake’ along mu cords. The Adi Pasi can be traced back to ‘Lo Zhorpa ‘Lo snout’, whose widowed wife and son travelled through a place called ‘Lo imprint’ who settled in the area known as ‘Tangam’ in Lower Pemakö\(^{12}\). The Mishmi of Upper Pemakö descend from ‘Lo Lenpa ‘Lo dumb’ (Dorjee 2011: 68-71). From ‘Lo Gapa ‘Lo blaze’ in Upper Pemakö descend, among others, the Bokar Adi,\(^{13}\) the ‘Miri and the Shimong Adi.\(^{14}\) Other Lopa clans are said to originate in other forested parts of southeastern Tibet. The ‘Adi Ashing migrated from Chego in Lower Kongpo.\(^{15}\) The ‘Lo Pojo and ‘Lo Gawo arrived from Powo, Rangpo, Ngolok, Dazhing and other places. The Showu tribe settled from Nyangpo in Kongpo, and from Tsari came the ‘Karko Adi. In the course of history, some of these clans were completely annihilated in the internecine wars. Other clans split to form new sub-clans. A number of the clans was driven further south into Arunachal Pradesh by later settlers. Finally, part of them intermarried with Poba and Khampa Tibetans, Tshangla migrants and other Lopa groups to form the ethnically mixed race known as Pemaköpa. The Lopa in Tibet are now recognised as the ‘Lhopa or Luoba minority, a semantic name change from derogatory ‘barbarians’ to

\(^{11}\) The belief system of the Lopa has been described by (2011) as ‘barbarian Bon’.

\(^{12}\) The Tangam are a small tribe of around 250 people living mixed with Tshangla in Kuging, Nering and neighbouring hamlets at higher altitude. The previously more numerous Tangam have been largely wiped out by the Shimong (Bhattacharjee 1975:24 in Van Driem 2001b:494, Lazcano 2005).

\(^{13}\) The Bokar are the most numerous Adi tribe in Tibetan Pemakö and inhabit the west bank of the Tsangpo river north of the Tshangla village of Gelling (Banerjee 1999).

\(^{14}\) The Shimong inhabit the east bank of the Siang river together with Tshangla speakers in Ngaming and Jido and are one of the most numerous Adi tribes here, with a total population of around 800. More specific information on the Shimong can be found in Bhattacharya (1965).

\(^{15}\) The Ashing can be found mainly around Trutring and number only between 100 and 150. Their numbers have been declining over the past decennia.

‘people from the south’. As with Monpa, this term masks the ethnic and linguistic diversity of the peoples it encompasses. In India, the Adi and Mishmi are both Scheduled Tribes.

8.2. Opening the Hidden Valley of Pemakō.

Beyuls can be found all over the Himalaya. (2011) lists eight great beyul: Dremoshong16, Loyul Pemakō, Shangkyi Zambuling, Mekyi Gowojong, Gyelmo Dorjijong, Lhamo Ngülkhangjong, Gyalung Dzokmojong and Mongyi Budumlung17. Pemakō is described as the most prominent of these beyuls.

In Buddhist iconography, Pemakō is considered a ‘naga or serpent deity’ that was subdued by Dorji Phakmo and is lying on its back (2011:54). The finger of its right hand is located at the golden temple of Buchu in Kongpo. The left hand, holding a snake and a frog, is supressed by a lance at the temple of Chukhaba in Powo. The face is the mountain Gyalapelri. The right breast is the mountain Namcak Barwa. The left breast is the mountain range of Dzumchen Gangri Khandroi Rawa. The two legs are the four cardinal directions (2011:52-58).

Pemakō was visited by many Nyingmapa and Kagyupa masters and tertöns who re-discovered the religious texts and other religious items that had been hidden during times of persecution to assure their survival. The first Kagyupa monastery, Phulung Chöding Rinchenpung was constructed in the middle of the 13th century (Lazcano 2005:44). Terma texts regarding Pemakō were revealed by Rikzin Jetsün Nyingpo (1585-1656CE), his disciple Rikzin Düdül Dorje (1615-1672CE) who converted many Lopa to Buddhism and opened the road to Pemakō, his disciple Taksham Nüden Dorje (1655-?CE) who wrote the pilgrimage guide and most recently Khamtrul Jamyang Dondrup Rinpoche (1959 CE) (Lazcano 2005:47).

16 I.e. Sikkim.
17 Other examples include Lapchi on the border between Tibet and Nepal, Khenpajong in Kurtō in Bhutan, Kyitmolung in Tawang, and according to Pommaret (1994) also Nabi in south-central Bhutan.
8.3. TSHANGLA AND DAKPA MIGRATION FROM MONYUL TO PEMAKÖ.

In the second half of the 17th century, stories about the opening of the hidden valley of Pemakö as a pilgrimage site and as a safe haven for persecuted Buddhists started to spread across the Himalayas. Locals and Tibetans plying the trade routes between India, Monyul and Tibet and pilgrims to Lhasa and Tsari were probably the first to bring oral accounts as well as handwritten manuscripts of the terma text by Rikzin Jetsün Nyingpo into Monyul. The spread of this news coincided with the Drukpa and Gandenpa military campaigns, the overthrow of the old regimes and the subsequent annexation of Monyul and the imposition of a repressive taxation system. It was, therefore, not surprising that many of the clan rulers who opposed the Drukpa fled either to the area under Gandenpa control or even further away, to the safe haven of Pemakö. We thus see an initial exodus of Tshangla speakers from Eastern Bhutan, followed by later groups of people migrating to Pemakö for reasons such as pilgrimage, excessive taxation and slavery by the new leaders, fear of earthquakes and the border tensions and war between the Bhutanese and the British in the 1850s and 1860s (e.g. Aris 1979, 1980, Van Driem 2001b:989, Zhâng 1986, Penjore 2009). Of these reasons, excessive taxation seems to have been the prime cause of migration.

8.3.1. PERIOD OF MIGRATION.

The large number of Tshangla speakers still inhabiting Pemakö\(^\text{18}\) thus originates from Eastern Bhutan. According to Tshangla sources in Bhutan, the first migrants departed in the second half of the 17th century after the Drukpa forces had disposed the local kings. Local oral transmission, for example, relates of how King Dore of Bageng\(^\text{19}\) and his subjects fled through the Gongri valley to Tshona and from there to Pemakö\(^\text{20}\). The people of Ngatshang andThemnangbi similarly feared the new customs and culture that would be imposed on them and fled (Thinley 2003:318). This explains the name of two of the Tshangla clans in Pemakö, Ngatshang and Chitshang. Early British explorers visiting Eastern Bhutan observed

---

\(^\text{18}\) This ‘Bhutanese’ origin of the Tshangla speakers has been questioned before, for example by Pommarret (1994) and Lam Kelzang Chhophel (pers. comm.). They cite lack of evidence, and a possible Tibetan origin of the Tshangla people as likely indicators that the migration was in the reverse direction. Others, such as Van Driem (2001b:872), however, already suspected the opposite.

\(^\text{19}\) Ref. paragraph 6.3. Curiously, the Gyelrik maintains that Pon Dore was one of the local clan leaders actually supporting the Drukpa in their campaign.

\(^\text{20}\) The village was later resettled by people from Waichur village, and the remains of the khar of the Bageng chieftain have been used for construction of the community school there, ref. plate XX on p.
many empty places without habitation but with clear indication that the land was once cultivated and terraced (White 1909:122). When questioning the dzongpön of Trashigang about this, he remarked that ‘my district is fine enough, but there are no people, no children are born now’, though White concluded that ‘the fact is that a great number of men have left the country and gone into Tibet and Sikkim to avoid the oppression of their rulers’.

According to Zhāng (1997:4), the ‘drukpa’ migrated from Eastern Bhutan around 10 generations ago and arrived in Pemakō in the middle of the 18th century (Zhāng 1997:19-21). The last migrants are said to have arrived 100 years later, around 1850 (Zhāng 1997:21). Other sources in Pemakō quoted in Baker (2004) and McRae (1995) date the arrival of the first migrants to the end of the 18th century and the first half of the 19th century, albeit to escape an earthquake. Zhāng (1997:19-20), providing local accounts from the Pemakō region, quoted his informers as saying that ‘there was a king in Drukyul who was very cruel to his people, imposing a lot of tax and wula on them. Every woman had to weave day and night to pay the textile tax, but even when the ash of the pine branches lit for lighting at night had piled up to a small hill, the cloth they had woven would not be sufficient to pay the tax. The men would sleep with the ropes used for carrying loads under their pillows, ever ready to fulfil the king’s commands. The Menba people couldn’t live like that anymore, and when they heard of a beautiful and rich place called Pemakō, located to the east of Monyul, one of the sixteen lotus shrines [...], a heaven of Buddhist happiness where people could live freely and far away from sorrow and worries, they believed this legend and moved to Pemakō to escape the kin’s rule’. And: ‘the Menba people have a ballad: “If I were alone, I would go to Pemakō as soon as possible, but since I have an extended family of the elderly and the young, where is the hope of running away?”.’

And ō (2011: 68) states that ‘Later when the tertöns gradually opened the doors to the hidden land, many tribes from other places arrived. From Bhutan, many of the Tshangla tribe came to the hidden land for pilgrimage in great faith and settled there. In the same manner people from Tshona and other places came together with the Bhutanese Tshangla and combined they became known by the name Monpa.

21 The fact that the Tshangla speakers still refer to themselves as ‘drukpa’ (Zhāng 1997: 3) indicates that their migration was after the Drukpa conquest and unification in the middle of the 17th century.
Chapter 8. Pemakō, the Array of the Lotus.

Among them are the clans Ngatshang, Chitshang, Barshok, Mon Dridukpa, Pangzhing, Tongsum and others'.

8.3.2. ORIGIN OF THE TSHANGLA AND DAKPA SPEAKERS.

The majority of the Tshangla speakers in Pemakō originate from the area of Gamrilungpa. We earlier saw that in Gamrilungpa, the opposition against the Drukpa was particularly strong. Consequently, this area also experienced the hardest repercussions and the heaviest oppression during the 18th century. As the valley was fertile and suitable for irrigated rice cultivation, far away from Punakha and Trongsa and under the control of a dzongpön and drungpa, the tax burden imposed on the local people was particularly heavy. Further evidence can be found in the reported origin of some of the Pemakō Tshangla in Sāngjīlín village of Mōbāgē Cuōsōng in Būnānkā under Trashigang Dzong (Zhāng 1997:20). According to Zhāng, the Tshangla of Pemakō trace their ancestry to the families of the bamboo craftsman Samdrup, the blacksmith Dongda’er and the lama Tashi Langji. They were the sons of the eldest son Keji Buqian, the middle son Kemaba and the youngest son Keji Buqiong, who were in turn the sons of Lhase Tsangma and the two daughters of Rūbō Zhūgū. Other evidence of the origin of most of the Tshangla of Pemakō in the Gamri area is of a linguistic nature, and will be presented in paragraph 9.13.12.

As indicated by Zhāng (2011), the Tshangla speakers from Eastern Bhutan were on the way joined by Dakpa speakers from the Pangchen or Tshona area. They also settled the Pemakō region around 1800 (Blackburn 2003:45 note 16, based on Dutta and Ahmad 1995:195 and Dunbar 1916:93, Bailey 1957:74, Dunbar 1984:266) and mostly intermarried with the Tshangla to blend to a single group. A small community of around 300 Dakpa speakers can still be found in Wenlang commune near the village of Dezhing, where they are called Brami.

---

22 E.g. the opposition posed by Lama Nakseng of Merak and the Chůze of Bikhar, ref. paragraphs 6.4, 6.5, 6.9.
23 Ref. paragraph 6.11.6.
24 Perhaps Sangcheling hamlet on the border of Phongmi and Bidug geoks on the north bank of the Gamri river.
25 Perhaps a contraction of Buna and Punakha.
26 This seems to be an extremely garbled reference to the marriage of Lhase Tsangma with Ami Dondrubgyel’s daughter Sonam Pelki out of which were born Khrimi Lhai Wangchuk and Cebu Thonglektsun (Gyelrik f. 13b-14a).
8.3.3 Journey to and Arrival in Pemako.

The route from the original homeland took the migrants north through the Nyamnyang river valley, past Pangchen and Lekpu to Tshona, then east to Rithang, north to Gyatsa Dzong on the banks of the Yarlung Tsangpo river, and from there east till Mönri and Pelung in present-day Nyangthri. Whereas some people settled there, others crossed the Dozhong La, Tamnyen La, Deyang La and Luzhar La passes into Pemako (Zhāng 1997: 19). The people that entered through the Dozhong, Deyang and Tamnyen La settled near Metok, Drepung, Bipung and Dikdong. The people that entered through the Luzhar La followed the Rigong river and settled near Geling and Kobuk in the lower Pemako.

Although Pemako was too hot, wet and humid and the indigenous Lopa were too hostile for the Tibetans of Powo and Kongpo, the Tshangla settlers found the area rather similar to their original homeland. According to local folklore (Zhāng 1997: 19-21) the first three Tshangla families that arrived in Pemako settled in Dongbuk, which was at that time inhabited by Lopa. The newcomers impressed the Lopa by showing them their cultivation techniques and crafts and were allocated a plot of land that became known as Möntrong ‘Mön village’, a site near Metok Dzong now deserted. Soon after their arrival, another three families headed by Gyatso, Thrinle and Dorje arrived through the Deyang pass and they also settled in Möntrong. Together these families formed the Ménduì Zhūbā Möndruk Drukpa ‘six Monpa families from Bhutan’ with around 30 people. Later, a hundred families with 600 or 700 people fled from Eastern Bhutan. They were headed by Jiābān Dáge, who was killed when he tried to defend his people against the pursuing Drukpa army. The remaining people settled in various locations in Pemako.

In 1717 the Kagyupa lama Rikzin Chöje Lingpa (1682-1725) converted many Lopa to Buddhism, starting with a descendent of Lo Gapa called Önta Tashi. The Pelung and Tongjug Dzong were built in second half of 18th century. At the end of the 18th and beginning of 19th century many religious masters visited
the area including the 5th Gampopa Ugyen Drodul Lingpa (1757-?) who further spread Buddhism. From the 18th century until the 1960s, internal strife on the Tibetan plateau, the constant threat from the Chinese in eastern Tibet, the attraction as a pilgrimage place and beyul and the isolation of the area providing a refuge for bandits and outlaws attracted many migrants from Powo and Kham (2011:68).

8.4. PEMAKÖ UNDER THE KANAM DEPA’S REIGN.

The Powo Kings or Kanam Depa claimed origin from Byakhri27, who was later to become the progeny of the Yarlung Empire. Byakhri had three sons, one of whom, Bra, had a son called Brakar Dakmaigar Brakar Dakmaigar has a son called Lhaje Paljam from whose ‘religious lineage’ the Kanam Depa’s claimed descent (Lazcano 2005:43). The Powo kingdom managed to maintain a semi-independent status from the Yarlung and Kongpo Empires as well as from the Ganden administration (Lazcano 2005:44). The Kanam Depa originally had their palace in the strategically located village of Kanam located at the confluence of the Purlung Tsangpo and the Po Tsangpo, but in the middle of the 17th century the capital was moved to Sholwakha (Lazcano 2005:46). According to (2011:67-71), after the subjugation of King Shingkhri of Mon the ‘religious minister’ of the epical hero Ling Gesar, Taklha Thrikar, was made ruler of Pemakö. At that time there were no permanent settlements and the area was the hunting territory of the Lopa (Lazcano 2005:47). Various competing Lopa clans were fighting internecine wars (2011:68). The Kanam Depa understood that control over Pemakö would give the Poba religious and political importance since they would control access to the area and since pilgrims would turn to them for protection and support (Lazcano 2005:46-47). But the actual presence of representatives of the Kanam Depa in Pemakö remained limited to a few lay representatives, monks and local assistants, with troops only being called if and when required. Instead the Kanam Depa used the local Tshangla and later Tibetan settlers as a tool for subduing the Lopa tribes and expanding their control in Pemakö, playing out the rivalries between them. With military support from the Poba, the Tshangla and Tibetans gradually displaced the Lopa to the banks of the Yarlung Tsangpo river far in the south, the less accessible areas around the Tsangpo gorges, and higher up the eastern banks of the Tsangpo river around the Yonggyap river28. Relations between the Lopa

27 Ref. paragraph 10.2.
28 Here we mainly find the Mishmi.
and the Tshangla and Tibetans remained ambivalent. Although considered the gate keepers of the pilgrimage sites, the Lopa were also known to attack, rob and kill pilgrims. This culminated in a yearly event in which these tribes were paid a ransom by the Powo and Ganden governments in turn for allowing the pilgrims to pass (see Nebesky-Wojkowitz 1975, Huber 1999 and Pommaret 1994).

In the late 19th century the Kanam Depa introduced taxation in Pemakô in exchange for protection from Lopa attacks. The taxes were collected in kind, as rice, cotton, cloth, money, butter and pelts but also as compulsory labour service to transport and guide all travellers authorised by the government (Lazcano 2005:52, Bailey 1957:75, Cai, 1981). Ironically, after having fled oppression and taxation in their original homeland, the Tshangla were now faced a similar situation. As resources in the area were scare, agricultural practices poor, internal strife rampant and the area isolated and difficult to access, the practice of marauding and stealing became widespread. Therefore, the Kanam Depa appointed dzongpôns in lower Pemakô to collect tax and enforce the law. The first dzongpôn was a Tshangla from the Ngatshang clan called Nonola. During his rule from 1881-1883 the Lopa tribes revolted and led by the leader of the herdsmen Dröma Wangdü they defeated Nonola, who committed suicide whilst awaiting settlement of the dispute in captivity. After that, the return tax for the Lopa was limited to axes and wool. Except for two, all the 12 dzongpôns that were appointed by the Kanam Depa between 1884 and 1916 were local Tshangla (Zhâng 1997:22). The Pemakô area was divided in Upper Pemakô or the ‘mother and six sons of Polung’ and Lower Pemakô or the ‘five divisions of Mon’ namely Tambu, Hora, Bipung, Sakar and Tangam (Zhâng 2011:71).

Late 19th century, the 8th Bakha Trulku of Bakha monastery in Powo became the choir master of Ugyen Wangchuck. Ugyen Wangchuck made generous

---

29 In (2011:69) an example of the persistent conflict is given, when a certain Gurudrung from Mensigang village of the Lo Gapa clan plays out Thangtö Pöntra appointed by the Kanam Depa against his opponent Powo Gampa Pöntragok, after which the Lopa pay rice, clay and skins in tax to the Kanam Depa who returns it with wool, salt, tealeaves, meat and barley flour. This relation continued for three generations.

30 Present-day Takmo Lhoba Township.

31 Present-day Hora/Hezha village.

32 Present-day Bipung/Beibeng village.

33 Present-day Sakar/Shaxia village.

34 This monastery was linked to the Peling Sungtrul lineage, ref. footnote 33 to Chapter 5.
donations to the restoration of Bakha monastery and the cordial relations between the later Bhutanese royal family and the Bakha Tulku’s was maintained for many years (Pommaret 2003:95-96).36

In 1905 the Adi launched a great attack as far north as Geling. The Tangam tribe of the Chime Yangsang area was largely annihilated by the neighbouring Lo Khathra and Mishmi (Van Driem 2001b:989). The remaining Tangam, the Tshangla and the Tibetans asked for support from the Kanam Depa. In response, the Kanam Depa assembled an army consisting of conscripts from Kham, Dzayül and locals, who defeated the Lo Khathra and brought the lower Pemakö area under the control of the Kanam Depa. The border was set at the Yangsang river north of Jido and marked by the Dikdong Dzong.

In the summer of 1911, the 26th Kanam Depa Prepo Pema was forced to flee from Powo to Metok by troops allied to the representative of the Qing Empire in Lhasa and the governor-general of Sichuan, Zhao Er’fang. The troops were received by the Metok dzongpön Taupo and the people of Pemakö who assisted them in tracing and finally killing Pema Tshewang (Zhang 1977:24). According to Lazcano (2005:57), however, the guerrilla techniques of the Poba prevented the Chinese from taking Powo and Pemakö, and the decimated Chinese troops retreated to Lhasa by the end of 1911. Bailey (1957:75, 92, 104, 110) during his 1913 journey of the area noticed widespread hatred of the local Poba, Monpa and Lopa population against the Chinese as a result of the widespread destruction and famine.

Although the Kanam dynasty had ceased to exist, a member of the Kanam aristocracy Wangchen Düdül assumed the throne as 27th Kanam Depa (Lazcano 2005:58). The Kanam aristocracy sent the Poba Namgyel as the dzongpön to Pemakö, who executed dzongpön Taupo and re-established Kanam authority in the area by suppressing the local people. Right until 1913 the Tshangla migrants still considered themselves subjects of

35 Who in 1907 became the first king of Bhutan.
36 After Indian independence, the Bhutanese government sent many artisans from Bhutan, particularly woodcrafters, painters and statue sculptors to the Indian part of Pemakö to assist in the restoration of the monasteries there, including Dewakota, Mankota and Payingdem (Bartshampa Meme Zogo Dakhungla, Changmipa Norbu Wangdi and others, pers. comm.).
38 According to Lazcano (2005:56), he and his younger brother tried to safeguard their possessions by carrying them to Pemakö. They were killed by the dzongpön of Metok and Cendruk on demand of the other governors of Powo. Zhang (1997:24) and Bailey (1957:87), however, maintain that it were the Tshangla who, either paid by the Chinese or in the presence of the Chinese troops executed the king and his brother.
39 Lazcano (2005) has as dzongpön and as a Tshangla, both in Metok.
the Trongsa Pönlop in Bhutan, and they considered it imperative they should visit the ruler of
Bhutan at least once in a lifetime to pay respects. But at the same time they also recognised
the authority of the Kanam Depa’s government (Bailey 1957: 74). The McMahon line of
1914 was drawn right through Pemakö. In 1926 the Tibetan government in Lhasa tried to
coax the Kanam Depa into voluntarily submitting to their authority. He refused, and when
Tibetan troops were sent in 1928, he fled from Powo to Lopa territory and was killed by the
Padam Adi. In retaliation, in 1931 the Tshangla and Shimong Adi attacked the Komkar Adi
allied to the Padam (Nyori 1993:76-77).

8.5. Pemakö under the Gandan Administration.

Despite this victory, the Ganden administration continued to face resistance from the Powo
people and their oppression of the Poba was harsh (Lazcano 2005:59). The control of
Pemakö, including tribute from the Lopa, was the taken over by the Tibetan government
through the governor of Kongpo and the conditions for the local people worsened, with even
heavier taxes imposed. Between 1931 and 1959, 12 dzongpöns were appointed, mainly by
Sera monastery. These dzongpöns controlled the Upper Pemakö area from Metok Dzong
(Zhâng 1997:25). In Lower Pemakö, local Tshangla continued to be appointed as dzongpön,
until the Lo Khathra tribes, at the instigation of the British, decided to accept British
suzerainty. In 1941 British patrols took over control of Pemakö till the McMahon line. Until
1953, however, the people of Lower Pemakö continued to pay tax to the Metok dzongpön. In
1959 the Ganden administration is deposed in Lhasa and Pemakö. Until date the McMahon
Line is the de facto boundary between Chinese Tibet and Arunachal Pradesh.

After Indian independence Lower Pemakö, including the Chime Yangsang area,
became part of the Republic of India. In the 1960s a group of Tshangla from Eastern Bhutan
arrived in the area to assist in the reconstruction and renovation of the temples in Mankota
and Dewakota. Though some eventually returned, most of them remained there and
intermarried with the local population.

---

40 Other stories hold that he died of alcoholism or dysentery (Lazcano 2005 footnote 81 on p. 59).
8.6. THE CHINESE ANNEXATION OF TIBET.

On August 15th 1950, a major 8.7 Richter scale magnitude earthquake often called the ‘Great Assam Earthquake’ hit the Indo-Tibetan border with its epicentre at Rima in the Mishmi hills east of Pemakö. Around 1,500 people died on the Indian side of the border, including over 500 people who were washed away as a result of a flash flood after an artificial dam caused by a landslide in the Siang river broke. The Dozhongla pass got blocked by falling boulders, obstructing passage from Metok to Nyangthri for over a year. The villages of Shirang, Hora, Bipung, Geling and Yortong were carried into the Tsangpo river by landslides, killing over 350 people (Zhāng 1997:59-60). It was an ominous sign for many Pemaköpas of difficult times ahead.

In late 1950 the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) of the People’s Republic of China invaded eastern Tibet, and by 1951 the Tibetan government was forced to sign an agreement relenting sovereignty. In subsequent years Chinese military and administrative presence was quickly increased, progressively parts of Tibet were incorporated under the People’s Republic and large-scale atrocities amounting to genocide were committed. In 1956 and 1957 groups of Tibetan refugees streamed into Pemakö and onward into India. In 1959 a popular revolt against the Chinese presence was brutally suppressed, and the Dalai Lama, his government, and many Tibetans fled to the neighbouring countries.

Due to its geographical remoteness and inaccessibility, the PLA was not able to take full control of Pemakö until October 1962. A document in Tibetan entitled ‘the sending of a guerrilla preparation committee to Pemakö’ narrates an eyewitness account of the events that took place in the early 1960s. In 1960 the American CIA had established a guerrilla training camp in Lo Manthang in Nepal, were Tibetan refugees were trained in conducting operations against the PLA. Realising that the lower part of Pemakö was still not occupied and could therefore be used as a base for building up and extending the armed opposition against the Chinese, a 6-man reconnaissance team was sent out in late June 1961. They met with a few local leaders who lent their support in gathering information about the activities of the Chinese. By October 1961 it became clear that although local support and loyalty towards the Chinese was limited, their provision of salt and their promise to construct a road to Metok Dzong were well received by part of the population, who welcomed their arrival in Metok. Thus by mid-November the refugees who had come to Pemakö from various parts of Tibet, the guerrilla leaders, the religious figures and the local people became separated in a group in Lhotō and another in the valley of the Cendruk River. Early November 1961 they sent a messenger to the Indian
border requesting for assistance, and by the third week of December another team of trained guerrillas entered Pemakö from India. After the Tibetan New Year they assembled a total of 1767 people between 18 and 60 years old to construct cane bridges and clear the path till Bipung and the Indian border, initially with the aim of paving the road for a possible counter-invasion. In the early days of the second Tibetan month they established a temporary headquarter at ΘīѻŢī Tamuk. But by early June 1962 the PLA occupied the west bank of the Tsangpo river and by the end of August an army of 4,000 soldiers had assembled there. Understanding that without sufficient weaponry they could not fight the PLA, they prepared for retreat. First the elderly, the women and the children went towards the Indian border. The last group were the people from Cendruk who destroyed the Bipung bridge. By October 1962 they arrived at Kobu on the Indian side of the border, and their weapons, food and clothing supplies as well as the bridge at Kobu were destroyed so the PLA could not use it. Although not succeeding in halting the Chinese annexation of Pemakö, the American-trained guerrillas did manage to evacuate part of the population of Pemakö and refugees from other parts of Tibet safely to Indian soil.

In September 1962 the PLA, deploying part of the troops that had invaded Pemakö, invaded the North East Frontier Agency in retaliation of Indian advances into what China saw as their territory and in an apparent attempt to wrest control over Tawang from India. The Chinese claim that Tawang and Kameng has always remained under Tibetan suzerainty, and until 1912 the area from the Bhutan border till the Bhareli river, i.e. present-day West Kameng and Tawang, remained under Tibetan control. But in 1913 the Tibetans ratified the McMahon line ceding most of the Tibetan areas to the south of the Himalayan watershed to British India. China, however, was bypassed and did not become a signatory to this Shimla treaty, and in reality, Tibet remained in political control in Tawang until the Second World War. To the great shock and disbelief of the Indian army and politicians, the Chinese penetrated Indian soil all the way till Bomdila before retreating back to the Tibetan plateau in November 1962. Numerous accounts of the fall of Tawang have been written since, including Johri (1968), all blaming the mishap to the unpreparedness of the Indian military and civilian authority in the region. The ultimate withdrawal of the Chinese is attributed to the long supply lines which they were unable to maintain in face of the relentless Himalayan winter. Senior inhabitants of the area still vividly remember the fear and terror of the 1962 war. Starting from the Nyamnyang river valley people started fleeing, first west into Trashiyangtsi and when the entire Nyamnyang river valley was occupied by Chinese troops, south into the Gamri river
valley and Sakteng. After October 20, Indian troops also retreated through the Gongri river valley and past Trashigang in Bhutan, causing panic among the people there, who expected a continued Chinese push southwards. Many people fled to the plain areas around Darranga. When the Chinese attacked Tawang, many people fled to Sakteng and across the Sela pass to Dirang and Bomdila. When the Chinese attacked Sela and Bomdila and captured Thembang even more people fled south to Udaiguri. Most people stayed in makeshift camps during the winter of 1962. Those born in the camps still have their ‘birth deity’ located in the southern foothills of Samdrup Jongkhar and Kameng. Until this date, Chinese maps still show Arunachal Pradesh as a part of Tibet, although they have not tried to effectuate control.

Thus by 1962 the entire area of former Tibet had come under the effective control of Communist China. The age-old cultural, religious and economic ties between the people of the Tibetan plateau and the southern Himalayan slopes were severed. The Tshangla people of Pemakö become once more divided, now between India and China. Communication between, for example, the Dakpa of the Lekpu area in Tshona county of Tibet and the Dakpa of the Panchen area under Tawang is practically cut off, and so is the communication between the Tshangla in Geling and Trutring of Arunachal and the Tshangla living near Metok Dzong. The previously important and profitable position of intermediary traders between the plains of India, Eastern Bhutan, Tawang and Tibet comes to an abrupt end. Tawang and Eastern Bhutan now have to depend on the Indian plains for salt and other commodities.

During the years of the ‘Great Leap Forward’ and the Cultural Revolution lasting from 1958-1976, policies aimed at smashing the four olds- the old ideas, culture, customs and habits-managed to eradicate the most visible symbols of Tibetan culture and Buddhist religion. The Pemakö region used to be dotted with monasteries, meditation caves and other religious sites, but the events of the 1960s have not spared even this remote region, and most places such as Pemaköchung Gonpa were destroyed. The same holds for religious relics such as prayer books, statues, religious instruments. The Chinese administration heavily focussed on exploiting the social differences between the people of Pemakö before the Chinese annexation. The existing conditions of the people were blamed on the social and religious institutions, including the Buddhist religion and the oppressive rule of the Kanam Depa and the Tibetan administration from Lhasa. Ethnic differences were exploited by presenting the Monpa and Lopa as oppressed victims of a feudal Tibetan society. The Communist take-over was clearly to be seen as the liberation of poor, marginalised peasants. The Chinese literature
on Pemakö is drenched in this rhetoric. A section of the Pemakö population actively participated in the destruction of what they saw as the remnants of the old oppressive Tibetan regime. On the positive side, education, healthcare, transport and communication have greatly progressed, particularly in the past two decades. In April 1988 the Pailung Menba Township was established “to accelerate the development of the economy and culture of local minority groups, protect their legal rights and interests and strengthen national unity”.

In 1994 a road was opened between Tramok in Pome and Metok, but landslides closed the road that same year, and it has only been sporadically opened ever since. Chinese academics have conducted and published extensive research on the Lopa and Monpa ethnic groups and their languages. Botanical research has also been conducted, and in recent years, there is a limited religious revival.

In 1964 the State Council of the PRC recognised the Menba or Monpa as one of China’s minority groups. Pemakö now falls under Tibet Autonomous Region, Nyingchi prefecture, Metok and Nyingchi counties. There is one ethnic township and there are several village committees, having considerable power in daily affairs of the village. Tshangla speakers can be found in the Po Tsangpo valley from Gompo Ne Gonpa to Trulung and on the Lhasa-Chamdo highway around Tongjiuk Dzong on the confluence of Rong Chu and Po Tsangpo. They also live in various villages in the Yarlung Tsangpo valley, such as Maniwung, Yortong, Bokthang, Dezhing, Chikcha, Gongdem, Phuparang, Tshachugang, Möndrong and several other places.

---

41 西藏自治区 Xīzàng zìzhìqū.
42 林芝地区 Línzhī diqū.
43 墨脱县 Mòtuō xiàn and 林芝县 Línzhī Xiàn.
44 民族乡 mínzúxiāng, at Pailung.
45 村民委员会 cūnmínwěiyuánhù.
46 Pailung/Pelung.
47 Dōngjū.
48 Dèxīng.
49 Mendung
50 Bēibēng.
51 Mōtuō.
52 Bāngzhēng.
Chapter 8. Pemakö, the Array of the Lotus.

In India, Pemakö administratively falls under the State of Arunachal Pradesh, Upper Siang district, Gelling, Tuting and Singa circles. The main Tshangla-inhabited villages are Geling, Bishing, Kopu, Nyukhang, Mankota, Singa Camp, Simulling and Tashigong. Moreover Tuting town, Upper Siang’s headquarters, has a sizeable Tshangla population. Especially after the 1951 invasion and subsequent occupation of Tibet by the Chinese and the subsequent flight of the Dalai Lama in 1959 there was a further influx of Tibetans settling in Yöldung, Payengdem, Nyering, Nyukhang, Mankota, Tashigong, Singa Camp and Simuling. In Arunachal the descendants of these Poba and Khampa Tibetan refugees are part of the Khamba scheduled tribe.

8.7. Pemaköpa Refugees.

Whereas some of the people that fled from Pemakö in 1962, and sporadically afterwards, found refuge among relatives on the Indian side of the border, most were resettled in three camps on land given by the Indian government in Arunachal Pradesh and Orissa. Chöphelling Tibetan Refugee Settlement was originally established in 1963 but relocated to Miao, Tirap district, Arunachal in 1976 with around 500 families and a total population of 2,800 people. The majority of them are Tshangla speakers. Dargyeling Tibetan Refugee Settlement was established in 1963 in Tindoling near Tezu, the capital of Lohit district, Arunachal. As in Chöphelling, the majority of the five villages with around 45 families each and a total population of 1,250 people are Tshangla speakers. Phüntsholing Tibetan Refugee Settlement in Chandragiri, district Ganjam, Orissa was established in 1963 and out of a total population of 2,800 people around 500 are Tshangla speakers. All these camps are under the auspices of the Central Tibetan Administration in Dharamsala. The refugees do not have Indian citizenship but possess the green Tibetan refugee card which allows them free travel and permits them to work in India. Most of the refugees are still living in the camps, and although in the beginning most did not opt for further resettlement, the younger generation is increasingly finding employment elsewhere in India. Other countries, particularly Switzerland and Canada, have been resettling refugees from Pemakö. The main livelihood in the camps is subsistence farming, and education and health care are provided by the Central Tibetan Administration sponsored by foreign donors.
Map VIII. Sketch map of the journey of the 17th to 19th century migration of Tshangla and Dakpa from the Gamri river valley and adjoining area to Pemako.
The Melodious Song Commenting on the Ethnic Groups and Languages of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.
Chapter 9. The Tshangla, Children of Brahma.

The linguistic group that can be considered the numerical majority throughout the area formerly referred to as Monyul speaks various dialects of a language most commonly known as Tshangla. With slightly less than 200,000 speakers in Bhutan, India and Tibet combined they are by far the most numerous Buddhist ethnic group. In fact, among the Tibeto-Burman people inhabiting the southern slopes of the eastern Himalayas between Sikkim and Burma, they are only outnumbered by the various Adi groups¹ of Arunachal Pradesh. Despite this, the Tshangla have not been recognized as a separate ethnic group in Bhutan, India or Tibet, and Tshangla does not have the status of an official language anywhere. It has no written script, and is not used in mother tongue education. Modern media in which Tshangla is used are very limited, and modern forms of entertainment are hardly developed. Recently, however, the Tshangla speakers have become more conscious about their language, and promotion of its usage is rapidly picking up. The modern media, particularly internet, play an important role in this development, and they also contribute to a renewed sense of a shared identity among the Tshangla in diaspora. In Bhutan, at least, a spoken standard is developing which is heavily influenced by Chöke and Dzongkha. But as Norbu (2004:14) already pointed out, despite the fact that the Tshangla language is very rich and moreover has many dialects, the absence of a written language is endangering the original language. Extensive borrowing and phonetic change as a result of language contact and a loss of a vocabulary related to the traditional culture and livelihood of the people are perhaps the main threats to the language at the moment.

The following paragraphs will present an overview of the various Tshangla inhabiting Bhutan, India and Tibet, a concise summary of their history, their origin, the meaning of their various ethnonyms and their language. This chapter will also present a first overview of the various Tshangla dialects and it will propose an orthography for the Tshangla language. The final conclusion will revisit some of the assumptions regarding the Tshangla origin in light of the new evidence provided in this chapter.


The Tshangla people inhabit a large, rugged and inaccessible area of the eastern Himalayas. The wide range of altitudes, climates and vegetation types in the Tshangla-inhabited area is a

¹ The heterogeneous Adi have a combined population of perhaps 220,000 people.
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sign of their adaptability. The original Tshangla homeland in Dungsam is characterised by undulating hills at lower altitudes with subtropical broadleaf forest. The tropical seasonal forest at lower altitudes was never permanently inhabited by the Tshangla, but was used as an area for transhumance inhabitation during the cooler and drier winters. In the course of history, the Tshangla moved further along the main north to south flowing rivers, the Gongri and the Kuri, where they settled the deep, V-shaped valleys. In these areas, the main vegetation is chir pine (*Pinus roxburghii*) near the dry subtropical river beds, whereas in the wetter valleys we can find evergreen and deciduous subtropical forests. At even higher altitudes, where most villages are located, we can find temperate deciduous and semi-deciduous broadleaf forests. In the eastern part of the Tshangla habitat, the main rivers flow east to west and include the Gamri and Nyera Amari in Bhutan and the Ziding and Dinik, Lammapiik, Dupik and Nomkro rivers in Kameng. The valleys and hills, surrounded by mountain ridges and intersected with numerous fast flowing streams, form a landscape in which people have always had to cross rivers and mountain passes. In Tshangla, as in English, crossing over these two geographic extremes is expressed by the same verb /gok/. Whereas ‘to cross a river’ is /ri gok/, ‘to cross a mountain ridge’ is /riu ~ ri gok/ and ‘to cross a mountain pass’ is /la gok/.

The rugged terrain in which the Tshangla settled favoured the establishment and persistence of small, independent fiefdoms ruled from /khar/ castles by the clans of Tibetan ancestry. The majority of the common people, belonging to the native clans and primarily engaged in subsistence agriculture, spent their entire life in the place they were born. It is this relative isolation of most of the speech communities that explains the large number of Tshangla dialects that exists today. Jacquesson, in describing the Tani dialect continuum (2009: 152), stated that ‘a dialect continuum is an embarrassing fact for politicians or census people’, with a smooth gradation from one dialect to the other despite possible loss of intelligibility at the extremes. This is also the case of Tshangla, where speakers of adjoining dialects can perfectly well comprehend each other, but speakers from two extremes, for example, the Monggar district in Bhutan and Dirang in Arunachal, have considerable

---

2 Ref. paragraph 5.6.
3 More detailed information on the climatic zones and the associated vegetation and forest types and agricultural practices can be found in Chapter 14.
4 Draining in the Tenga river.
5 All draining in the Bichom river, further downstream called Bhareli.
6 The verb /gok/ can also mean ‘burn, roast’ and thus represents one of the many homonyms in Tshangla.
7 Described in Chapter 4.
difficulty in understanding each other. No written sources in or on Tshangla exist dating prior to the middle of the 19th century, and the data available to us at this moment are too limited to make any sensible reconstruction of the Proto-Tshangla language. At this moment in time, it is even difficult to ascertain the closest linguistic relative of Tshangla. Future research into the Tshangla dialects, combined with more detailed descriptions of other languages, will possibly shed more light on this issue. What is clear though is that subsequent migrant streams from Tibet and contact with neighbouring linguistic groups have left superficial as well as more profound impacts on the language.

Tshangla is by far the most widely spoken language in Bhutan. The Population and Housing Census of Bhutan 2005 returned a total of 173,205 people speaking Tshangla as the main language within the household, 31% of the enumerated population or 27% of the total population of Bhutan in 2005\(^8\). This does not mean that the Tshangla as a linguistic or ethnic group count that number of people, because in many households of mixed ethnicity Tshangla is the language of communication. Still, Tshangla is the majority language in Monggar, Trashigang, Trashi Yangtsi, Pemagatshel and Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhaks. Outside of the original homeland, there are sizeable minority populations in Lhuntse and Zhemgang dzongkhaks as well as in all major towns and resettlement areas. Some notes on the settlement history of the Tshangla speakers outside the original homeland have been given in paragraph 7.3. Individual descriptions of the various Tshangla speaking areas can be found in paragraphs 9.13.1 to 9.13.11.

According to Sengupta (1991), who does not differentiate between Dakpa and Tshangla, the Monpa constitute 5% of the population of Arunachal Pradesh and are ‘akin’ to the people of Eastern Bhutan. The Scheduled Tribes and Castes Population Census of 1991 returned a total of 5,025 Dirak (sic. Dirang) Monpa. The Monpa nationality in China counts between 5,000 and 10,000 people in different sources and, like in India, also includes the Dakpa speakers of Tshona County. The total number of Monpa in Nyangthri Prefecture is 6,800 or 5% of the total population in Metok and Nyangthri counties, including perhaps 300 Dakpa speakers and 6,500 Tshangla speakers. They constitute 60% of the population of Metok County, the remaining 40% being Adi, Mishmi and Tibetans.

---

\(^8\) Bhutan’s total population in 2005 was estimated at 634,982 (National Statistics Bureau 2006) vs. 708,265 in 2010 (National Statistics Bureau 2011). See for a detailed overview of the number and percentage of Tshangla speakers per geok Annex IV.
The people and language now commonly referred to as Tshangla have been known by different endonyms\(^9\) and exonyms\(^{10}\) during the course of history. This has been a longstanding cause of confusion (ref., for example, Andvik 1993, 1999, 2003, 2009 and Pommaret 1994 and 1999). As earlier written in paragraphs 3.1 and 5.2, the oldest references can be found in the autobiography of Pema Lingpa. In this autobiography, an area is mentioned called ˩īŢƁīŢŸŤī Ŭ ‘Indian Tsanglung’ inhabited by people speaking the ˩īŢƁīŶīԦŤī’yīʟŰī ‘dog language of Indian Tsalung’. The next reference is made in the Gyelrik, in which Lhase Tsangma travels through the อาศัยǐฤี่ItemType={Indic},CharSet=Latin,Font={Arial,11pt}“lands of the Tsengmi”\(^{11}\).

The writings of ]\(\) (1962:102) recount the king of Domtshang as having myriarchies\(^{12}\) among the ˯-dollar ‘Tsangmi or ‘the pure people’ or perhaps ‘the people [descending from] Tsangma’, who are a different ethnic group than the ŔŲūšĪƁī Kachari and the ŔƘṳ ŠīŸīƁī Indians\(^{13}\).

Secondly, the Tshangla have historically referred to themselves by various names. The people of the Dungsam area simply call themselves /tshangla/ [ʦʰajlə], which in these dialects has retained the original meaning of ‘person, human being’ and is still used interchangeably with the more mainstream /songngo/ [sɔŋŋo] ‘person, human being’. But generally, the name Tshangla lost favour after the 17\(^{th}\) century and was widely replaced by the exonym ŔƘǀƤ Šī ‘people of the east’\(^{14}\). It is only in recent years that

---

\(^9\) The name, by which a certain people or ethnic group commonly refer to themselves and by which they are known in their own language.

\(^{10}\) The name, by which a certain people or ethnic group are commonly referred to by other people or ethnic groups and in which they are known in the particular language of that group.

\(^{11}\) Ref. footnote 18 to p. 69. Curiously, Waddell (2000 (1901):38) described a language called ‘Ching-mi’ as follows: “This little known tribe occupies the higher ranges in the extreme east of Bhotan, and extends north of the Akas across the water-parting into the Pemakoi district of Tibet on the lower Tsangpo. The Survey-explorer K.P., a native of Sikkim, who is our chief authority for them, tells me that they are very like the Lepcha in appearance and mild manners, but the men crop their hair and the women wear large pins to fix their coil of hair. A more Tibetanised section of the tribe, although living amongst the others, is called Ko-long-te-pa Ching-mi. They come into the Tibetan village of Pemakoi, bringing forest produce for sale. They are possibly the Ha-pa Tanang (sic. Apatani)’…etc. It is unclear whether Waddell refers to the Tawang Dakpa or the Tshangla. The Dakpa were never known by the name Tsengmi, and therefore the reference seems to be to the Tshangla, but the description of the habitat and the Kholong river appears to indicate the opposite. Perhaps the short vocabulary ‘K.P.’ presented in his 1888 survey report could shed more light on this.

\(^{12}\) An administrative district theoretically comprising 10,000 families.

\(^{13}\) Ref. paragraph 5.3.

\(^{14}\) Ref. paragraph 7.1.
Tshangla is regaining favour, in order to clearly differentiate with the other ethnic groups of Eastern Bhutan. Tshangla, confusingly, also call their language Drukpa ‘language of the Drukpa’. The Tshangla speakers of Kameng also call their linguistic brethren in Bhutan Drukpa ‘Bhutanese’. The speakers in Bhutan call their neighbours in Kameng Sharpa ‘people of the east’. Although essentially an exonym given by the Tibetans, most Tshangla in Kameng nowadays use Monpa as endonym instead of Tshangla. The same holds for the people of Pemakō. Whenever the people of Kameng and Pemakō use Tshangla as endonym, it is pronounced [tsɑŋla], and they offer as explanation that they descend from Lhase Tsangma.

Thirdly, the Tshangla neighbours call them by various names. The Dzala speakers of Trashiyangtsi call the Tshangla Tshengmi and their language Tshengmi mat. The Dakpa speakers of Tawang call the Tshangla by the same name, but in vernacular speech this is realised as [tsʰːjːm] and the language is called Tshengmi 'ket [tsʰjɛm'ket]. The Chocangaca speakers of Kurme call the Tshangla Tsengmi and their language Tseng ke. Brokpa speakers call the Tshangla Tepli [tɛpli] or curiously Kyabu [kʰabu] ‘sons of Indians’.

Since the 17th century, the official Bhutanese literature has included the Tshangla under the blanket term Sharchokpa. Most western Bhutanese thus came to refer to the Tshangla as [zaːtʰoːp] and their language as [zaːtʰoːbikha]. Sharchokpa, however, has proven to be a historically flexible ethnonym. Originally it seems to have referred to all the non-Dzongkha speaking people living east of the Perila pass, including the East Bodish speakers of, for example, Kheng and Bumthang. After the late 19th century Sharchokpa referred mainly to the people living east of the Thrumshingla pass, perhaps as a result of the historical provenance of the Royal Family from Kurtō and the location of the main seats of government in Bumthang and Trongsa. In the late 20th century, many ethnic groups to the east of the Thrumshingla started referring to themselves by their own endonyms, and for most people Sharchokpa became synonymous with Tshangla. Now that more and more people start using Tshangla, the word Sharchokpa might rapidly turn into disuse.

15 Dzongkha, which is in a way the ‘official’ Drukpa, since it is the national language of Bhutan, is conversely called Ngalonglo.
17 Analogous to the Gyelrik, Norbu (2004) provides the spelling Šťǐʊī. This spelling can be defended if the consonant /ts/ in Chocangaca has a distinctive high vs. low tonal onset.
18 Now usually called Pelela.
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Across the border in India, most publications and statistics group the Dakpa of Tawang, the Tshangla of Kameng and various other, smaller ethnic and linguistic groups including the Brokpa, Lishpa, Chugpa, Sartangpa and sometimes the Sherdukpen of Kameng under the same heading ‘Monpa’ (see for example Dam and Hajara 1981; Chatterjee et al. 2003; Das Gupta 1968; Duarah 1990; Dutta and Ahmad 1995; Sarkar 1975 and 1980; Sengupta 1991 and others). This significantly complicates the analyses of these data and information. The first modern publication by Das Gupta (1968) differentiated between the Northern Monpa of Tawang, the Central Monpa of Dirang, and the Southern Monpa of Kalaktang. Aris (1980) adopted Das Gupta’s earlier distinction, but asserted that the Southern Monpa are the Sherdukpen and considers them the earliest migrants later pushed south towards the Assam border. Aris furthermore stated that the Central Monpa of Dirang and Kalaktang are ‘indistinguishable from the Tsangla of Eastern Bhutan’. Chowdury (1983:25) called both the Southern Monpa from Kalaktang and the Central Monpa from Dirang as Sherchokpas (sic. Sharchokpa). Duarah (1990) later distinguished the Northern Monpa or Tawang Monpa or Brahmi (sic. Brami) of Tawang district, the Central Monpa or Dirang Tsangia (sic. Tsangla) of Dirang circle and the Southern Monpa or Kalaktang Tsangia of Kalaktang circle. Finally, Bagchi (in Dutta and Duarah 1990:40) indicated that part of the Dirang Monpa are Dakpa.

9.3. ORIGIN OF THE ETHNONYM TSHANGLA.

At present, the most favoured endonym is Tshangla. The most popular etymology of this name is from བཙང་ལ་ Tshangla or Tshangla [tʃʰanʃla], with Tshangla typically lacking the consonant /l/ natively realised as [ʃ]. བཙང་ལ། Lha Tshangpa in Tibetan theology refers to any of the Brahmas: those deities of the ན་པར་དང་འབུལ་ Rūpadhātu ‘sphere of forms’ who have an exaggerated sense of own importance, particularly as the Creator of the Universe, the role assigned to Brahmā in the Hindu theology. As a deity, Tshanglha is a super-human being, spending his nights on earth and his days riding his stallion across the skies. Mythology holds it that one day he courted a heavenly goddess called དེརང་ Dersang and stole her wish-fulfilling gem. But on his way back to earth he was apprehended by the guardians of heaven who flung him back to earth by his tongue, removed his life-heart, took back the jewel and betrothed him to Dersang. Angered by this defeat, his heavenly journeys turned into trips where he slaughtered the men and forcibly fornicated with the females, until he attempted to mate with the goddess གསེར་པ་ Ekadzati who struck him on his thigh with her turquoise-
ornamented breech-cloth. He became lame, but more than the physical impact, the goddess’ action transformed his negative energy into positive one and he was absorbed into Tibetan Buddhism as one of the protector deities of the religion. He appears most often under the name ‘White Brahma’. This white one-headed and two-armed deity is represented with a sword in his hands and mounted on a white stallion.

Tshanglha is also linked to the epic hero Gesar, king of Ling. Tshanglha’s reincarnated son Dondrup became Gesar, the king of Ling, and defeated the king of Mon, Shingkhr (see 1973 and anon. 1979-1981). One of Tshanglha’s consorts is Nene Nammen Karmo, one of the ‘nine primordial sisters’ who was later subdued by Guru Rinpoche at Palma Srintsho and transformed into the protective deity Gangkar Shame Cencikma. Nene Nammen Karmo is also considered Ling Gesar’s aunt.

Norbu (2004) offers a detailed account of how Tshanglha came to be seen as the progenitor of the Tshangla people. Tshanglha and Nene Nammen Karmo arrived at Dungsam Dewathang where seven sons and daughters were born. Tshanglha and Nammen Karmo then returned to the heaven by grasping on to the ‘heavenly climbing ropes’, but because these ropes dissolved their children were left behind in the world of men. They sat on the branches of orange and guava trees, and from the youngest son started the tradition of singing the ‘song of sorrow’ .

As we saw before, the exact ethnonym Tshangla is not mentioned in any of the historical sources prior to the 20th century. Similarly, none of the exonyms ring a particular connotation to Tshanglha. It thus appears that Tshangla/Tshanglha and consequently the mythological origin attributed to Lha Tshangpa has been a relatively recent and conscious construction by educated Tshangla. The original name of the people might therefor have well been Tsangla, or in Tibetan Tsangmi.

9.4. Theories about the Tshangla Origin.

The Tshangla people never developed a written script for their language. Their society remained largely feudal and predominantly agro-pastoral until the late 20th century, and research into the origin, culture and language has only recently begun. As a result, legends,
histories and tales were transmitted orally and therefore historical facts and mythical fiction are hard to separate. Moreover, the introduction of Buddhism and the arrival of the Tibetan-derived ruling elite since the 6th century CE and the adoption of the ‘Drukpa’ or ‘Monpa’ ethnic identity after the 17th century CE resulted in the loss of the most ancient of the origin myths. Instead, the Tshangla origin and the Tshangla history was given a firm place within the larger Tibetan and Bhutanese cultural and religious historical framework, thus creating the impression that the history of the Tshangla as a people only commenced in the 6th century CE. As paragraph earlier showed, however, the Tshangla ancestors already inhabited the area well before that time.

There are several competing theories about the actual origin of the Tshangla that do not mutually exclude each other. Authors such as Chakravarti (1979) suggested that the Tshangla speakers are the descendants of an Austroasiatic population perhaps related to the contemporary Khasi population. Part of the local traditions, although strongly maintaining that the Tshangla like the Lepcha in Sikkim are the descendants of the first humans settling the southeast of Bhutan, indeed also recognise that scattered indigenous populations of Mon Khathra inhabited the area before them (e.g. Norbu 2004:7). In general, the available historical records and the existing origin myths attribute the origin of the Tshangla to the post-6th century Tibetans that sought refuge from the turmoil on the plateau. According to Zhāng (1997:14) the Tshangla originate from a mixture between Kuqi20 aboriginal tribes of the Monyul areas and successive waves of migrants from the Tibetan plateau, including 7th century refugees from the Azha Empire21. Future genetic and linguistic research could provide evidence as to whether the Tshangla forebears came from the Yunnan-Burma border area and migrated along the foothills of the Himalayas, or whether they originated on the Tibetan plateau and were pushed southward by later Bodish migrations that settled in the higher valleys. The Tshangla origin myth in paragraph 9.3, their cultural features22 and the linguistic information presented in later paragraphs, seem to indicate the early arrival of the Tshangla people in southeastern Bhutan, and subsequent spread north- and eastwards. This would favour a southern entry into the present homeland. Unfortunately, the genetic evidence available to us till date is largely inconclusive as to the Tshangla origin.

20 What Zhāng means by Kuqi is unclear. Perhaps he refers to the Kuki-Chin languages spoken in Northeast India and Burma. Until now, no linguistic affiliation between Tshangla and these languages has been attested.
21 Ref. paragraph 2.7.1.
22 Ref. part 3 of this book.
9.4.1 THE MATERNAL ORIGIN OF TSHANGLA POPULATIONS.

As with linguistic and anthropological data reported in the literature, the genetic data on the Tshangla suffer from the inconsistency in nomenclature and the lack of understanding about the shared history of the Tshangla populations of Pemakö, Dirang and Bhutan. Full mtDNA sequencing of the Tshangla people has till date only been reported from the Dirang Tshangla (DR46 and DR100, Dirang Monpa reported in Chandrasekar et al. 2009\textsuperscript{23}), and Pemakö Tshangla (Monp 22 and Monp 25, Nyingchi Monpa reported in Peng et al. 2011\textsuperscript{24}). The genetic information on Tshangla populations from Bhutan collected by Kraaijenbrink et al. (2004, 2006, 2007 and 2009) had, unfortunately, not been published at the time of writing. Some of the available information, extracted from various sources, is presented below.

Figure 1B in Qin et al. (2010:557) shows the Pemakö Tshangla plotted outside of the mainstream Tibetan cluster and central to the Garze and Chamdo\textsuperscript{25}, Yushu\textsuperscript{26} and Nagqu\textsuperscript{27} Tibetans, which corresponds reasonably well with their geographic location vis-à-vis these groups but does not appear fully logical when their origin on the southern slopes of the Himalayas is considered.

The occurrence of southern Eurasian haplogroup U7 with frequency 2.0% among the Pemakö Tshangla, similar to the average frequency for the whole of India, is remarkable. Metspalu et al. (2004:17) showed that haplogroup U7 originates in Iran, and from there spread through Pakistan and western India, and resurfaces in West Bengal. The occurrence of this haplogroup among Changtang, Shigatse and Lhasa Tibetans might be the result of an admixture of genetic material originating to the west of the plateau, perhaps from Central Asian traders or an even older connection linked to the spread of Buddhism\textsuperscript{28} and the rise of the Zhangzhung with its connections to Central Asia, northwestern India and northern Pakistan. But the occurrence of haplogroup U7 in Pemakö Tshangla population could also be explained from an admixture as a result of a northward expansion from the Bay of Bengal, where the haplogroup is also relatively frequent (Metspalu et al. 2004:8, Figure 3), perhaps as

\textsuperscript{23} Hereafter referred to as Dirang Tshangla.
\textsuperscript{24} Hereafter referred to as Pemakö Tshangla.
\textsuperscript{25} Hereafter referred to as Kham.
\textsuperscript{26} Hereafter referred to as Amdo.
\textsuperscript{27} Hereafter referred to as Changtang.
\textsuperscript{28} As also evidenced in the low admixture of Indian-specific Y haplogroups in Tibetan populations, ref. Gayden et al. 2007.
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a result of an early expansion by seafaring traders from Gujarat. From the Tshangla homeland in Bhutan, this haplogroup might have arrived in Pemakö. This could be confirmed by the presence of the haplogroup U7 in the Bhutan Thangla population.

The eastern Eurasian components report the highest frequencies in the Pemakö Tshangla genetic material, with a total of 98.2%. These eastern Eurasian components consist mainly of macrohaplogroup M and its derived haplogroups, C, D4, D4j1, D5, D5a2, G2, G3, M*, M9a, M9d, M13*, with a total frequency of 53.1%.

Haplogroup C is most common in East Asia, Siberia and among Native Americans but occurs with less than average frequency in the Pemakö Tshangla population. Of the haplogroups that Qin et al. (2010:565) describe as typical Tibetan-specific Tibeto-Burman associated haplogroups and thought to be remains of pre-LGM inhabitants, subhaplogroup A10, haplogroup C4d and Tibetan-specific haplogroup M62 (Zhao et al. 2009) do not occur among the Pemakö Tshangla. In northeast Indian samples, however, subhaplogroups M60, M61 and M62 are clustered together (Chandrasekar et al. 2009). The Sherdukpen show a very high frequency of subhaplogroup M61a (23%) with a TMRCA of 10,000 years, also occurring among the Dirang Tshangla (2.4%), probably as a result of admixture from the Sherdukpen. Subhaplogroup M62 with a TMRCA of 8,000 exclusively occurs among the Dirang Tshangla (4.7%). If subhaplogroups M60, M61 and M62 do not, or marginally, occur among the Bhutan Tshangla, this would provide evidence against a shared maternal origin of the Tshangla and Sherdukpen people. Occurrence of these subhaplogroups among the Dirang Tshangla could then be the result of admixture from nearby Sherdukpen populations. It could also indicate a pre-LGM plateau origin of the Sherdukpen vs. a later origin of the Tshangla.

Haplogroup M9, with a frequency of 15.7% among Pemakö Tshangla, distinguishes Tibetan from other East Asian populations (Qin et al. 2010:562). Qin et al. (2010) and Peng et al. (2011) concluded that the M9 haplogroup has evolved in Southeast Asia and migrated northward during the late Pleistocene and early Holocene (Qin et al. 2010: 564). Indeed, without exception the mtDNA sequencing of the Tshangla populations shows haplogroup M9a1a1c1b typical of most Tibetan plateau populations as well as the Lachungpa of Sikkim. The Dirang Tshangla M9a1a1c1b haplogroup is located one position separated from the Pemakö Tshangla haplogroup, which is closer to the other Tibetan plateau populations: this would indicate that the maternal origin of the Dirang Tshangla is slightly different from

29 I.e. Bhutia or Drenjongpa: the mixed origin inhabitants of Lachung village in northern Sikkim, whose ancestry contains Tibetan, Lepcha and Limbu contributions.
the maternal origin of the Pemakö Tshangla, who primarily descend from Bhutan Tshangla populations. None of the Tshangla populations possess haplogroup M9a1b1 or haplogroup M9a1a2 found in, for example, the Bodo and Mech, Sonowal Kachari, Wanchoo, Gallong, various Khasi, Lepcha, some of the Adi of Northeast India and Lhoka (various sources presented in Peng et al. 2011). This indicates a northern maternal origin of the Tshangla, on or beyond the Tibetan plateau.

Among the Dirang Tshangla, the sister subhaplogroups C and Z of haplogroup M8 are represented by the subhaplogroup C7, shared with Wanchoo and Gallong (%) and the new subhaplogroup Z7 (Z6?) with lineage Z3a shared with Lepcha and Lachungpa.

Haplogroup G shares defining mutation with haplogroup M12 and occurs most frequently in northern China and central Asia. This haplogroup is present in low frequencies among the Dirang Tshangla, Wanchoo, Lachungpa and Gallong.

The only mtDNA lineage specifically associated with Tibeto-Burman populations that has survived in the Pemakö Tshangla sample is M13b. According to Qin et al. (2010), the exclusive distribution of this subhaplogroup among Tibeto-Burman populations and the deep divergence time of 21,100 ±6,100 years may indicate a pre-LGM, late Pleistocene human settlement of the Tibetan plateau and long-time isolation. The occurrence of this lineage in Pemakö Tshangla, but its absence in Dirang Tshangla, could also indicate that is the result of an admixture from Adi or Poba populations.

The subhaplogroup D4 of haplogroup D is well represented among the Dirang Tshangla. They share subhaplogroup D4j, prominent in Northeast Indian Tibeto-Burman populations, with Toto, Gallong, Lepcha and Lachungpa. Additionally, new subhaplogroup D4q was identified in Dirang Monpa shared with Toto and Sherdukpen (Chandrasekar et al. 2009:6). Haplogroup D4j1 had a low frequency of 1.96% among Pemakö Tshangla population. The cluster D5a2 is characteristic of northeast Indian Tibeto-Burman populations, including the Adi of Tibet (Qin et al. 2010).

Macrohaplogroup M is ubiquitous to India and covers more than 70% of the Indian tribal and caste mtDNA lineages (Kivisild et al. 2003, Metspalu et al. 2004, Chandrasekar et al. 2009). Despite this, the Dirang Tshangla, like most of the other Tibeto-Burman populations of Northeast India, share relatively limited genetic material with the other tribes of the Indian subcontinent (Metspalu et al. 2004), namely the mtDNA subhaplogroups M4, M33, M35, M43, M49, M60, M61 and M62 (Chandrasekar et al. 2009). Subhaplogroup M4c with a
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TMRCA\textsuperscript{30} of 3,000 years has a limited distribution among Dirang Tshangla and Sherdukpen, and M4 lineages are more characteristic of southern and western Indian tribal populations. The old (TMRCA 44,000-32,000 years) and South Asian-specific subhaplogroup M33 has a very high frequency among the Lepcha (23%), and lower frequencies among the Toto (3%), Sonowal Kachari (2%) and various tribal groups, indicating an ancient subcontinental origin of the Lepcha people with later contributions from Tibeto-Burman populations. The Dirang Tshangla share subhaplogroup lineage M35b (2.4%) with a TMRCA of 22,000 years with the Toto (12%) and various other tribal groups.

Of what appear to be typical northeast Indian Tibeto-Burman lineages (Chandrasekar et al. 2009), the Dirang Tshangla exhibit a very high frequency of subhaplogroup M49a (26%), with a TMRCA of 25,000 years, which occurs in much lower frequencies among the Sonowal Kachari, Wanchoo and the Bhoi of Meghalaya. Dirang Tshangla share subhaplogroup M43 (2.4%) with a TMRCA of 33,000 years with the Sherdukpen (5.7%).

The second Eurasian macrohaplogroup N and its derived components A4, B4*, B4a, F1 and F1b constitute the remainder of the Pemakō Tshangla genetic material, with a combined frequency of 45.1%. The comparatively high frequency of haplogroup A4 among the Pemakō Tshangla (23.5%, almost double that of the second-highest Tibetan population, Amdo), could indicate both a genetic link to the ancient populations of Northeast Asia, as well as a relatively endogamous group with relatively low levels of genetic admixture from other populations until recent times. Of all Tibetan populations, haplogroup B, one of the most common lineages in southern and eastern Asian populations, exhibited a low frequency of 4% among the Pemakō Tshangla, which is lower than the frequency in Amdo, Kham and Shannan\textsuperscript{31} populations but higher than other Tibetan populations and Lhoba\textsuperscript{32}. The historical population expansion of the major Tibetan populations suggested by the results of Qin et al. (2010) does not seem to hold for the Pemakō Tshangla and Adi samples. The Tshangla populations exhibit haplogroup F1 and F1b that are thought to mirror the Mesolithic spread from Southeast Asia into the Indian subcontinent.

\textsuperscript{30} Time to Most Recent Common Ancestor, or the estimated number of years that the individual lived from whom all the people in that population directly descend.

\textsuperscript{31} Hereafter referred to as Lhoka.

\textsuperscript{32} Hereafter referred to as Adi.
9.4.2. THE PATERNAL ORIGIN OF TSHANGLA POPULATIONS.

The parental lineages of most Indian populations, including the Sonowal Kachari, Toto and Wanchoo, are predominantly derived from the original Indian gene pool (Cordeaux et al. 2004, Chandrasekar et al. 2007). On the other hand, the parental lineages of the Dirang Tshangla, Lepcha and Sherdukpen are mainly derived from the East Asian gene pool. Y-chromosome haplogroup D has an Asian origin around 60,000 years ago, with subhaplogroups D1 (M15) and D3 occurring with high frequencies in Tibet. In fact, haplogroup D represents over 50% of the Tibetan Y-chromosome gene pool, and its subclade O3a5-M134 is also common in frequencies of around 85% in Tibeto-Burman speaking populations of Northeast India (Su et al. 2000, Cordeaux et al. 2004) and subclade M117-O3a5 among Tibeto-Burman speakers from Southeast Asia (Shi 2008). The expansion of the derivatives of haplogroup D involved two distinct demographic events around 11,000 and around 5,000 years ago (Gayden et al. 2007). The high frequency of the YAP insertion is, according to Su et al. (1999 and 2000), the result of a Central Asian insertion into the Tibetan gene pool, according to Gayden et al. (2007) around 5,000 and 11,000 years ago. The YAP insertion into Y chromosome haplogroup D has been observed from the Lachungpa (65%), Dirang Tshangla (34%), Lepcha (16%) and Sherdukpen (8%), according to Chandrasekar and colleagues (2007) the probable result of genetic drift. The high frequencies of the YAP insertion among the Lachungpa, Dirang Tshangla, Lepcha and Sherdukpen populations could be the result of the historic migration of primarily males from the Tibetan plateau who intermarried with local females. That this is a valid interpretation can also be inferred from the fact that the YAP insertion frequencies decrease as the historically attested influence of Tibetan migrants on the populations decreases, from high levels of intermixing with the Lachungpa of Sikkim till limited Tibetan contacts with the Sherdukpen of Kameng.

9.4.3. GENETIC EVIDENCE FOR THE TSHANGLA ORIGIN.

Perhaps the Father Tongue hypothesis also applies to the Tshangla, and thus explains why Y-haplogroup frequencies largely represent intrusions of Tibetan-specific Y haplogroups through admixture of primarily male migrants and refugees from across the Himalayas, whereas the mtDNA was preserved through the preference for the matrilateral cross-cousin marriage system. This seems to have been enhanced by a low degree of exogamy between the

---

33 Including 27% in Qiang, 12.5% in Tibetan and 9% in Yi.
ruling aristocratic and religious families and the common people, where female members of
the ruling clans would be wed to male members of the other ruling clans, whereas male
members of the ruling clans would either wed female members of the ruling clans or female
members of the common people. Among the common people, a largely indigenous gene pool
must have persisted at least until the early 18th century, when the last vestiges of the clan
based system were removed and replaced by a class society. Even till the 20th century, local
nobility would not readily intermarry with their subject people. Indeed, the available genetic
studies indicate a considerable Tibetan contribution to the Tshangla genetic makeup,
particularly in the Y-chromosomal DNA, indicating conform the historical sources that most
of the Tibetan exiles were males. On the other hand, the Tshangla language, once stripped
from the many loans from Tibetan and Dzongkha, presents a basic lexical inventory which is
quite distinct from any of the Bodish languages, including the East Bodish, Central Bodish
and South Bodish language of Tibet and Bhutan. Tshangla, like some other languages of the
area, including the Kiranti languages of Nepal, Lepcha of Sikkim, the languages of Kameng
and Tangkhul Naga, appears to have a more ancient Tibeto-Burman origin. This does not,
however, discount the tremendous linguistic, genetic and cultural contribution and impact
that the settlers from the Tibetan plateau made on the scattered Tshangla populations.

9.5. THE TSHANGLA LANGUAGE: CLASSIFICATION AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH.

Tshangla is a member of the Tibeto-Burman language family. Shafer (1955) placed Tshangla
in the Bodish section of the Bodic Division of Sino-Tibetan. Benedict (1972) placed it on the
Bodic side of Tibetan-Kanauri (Bodish-Himalayish) branch of Tibeto-Burman. Van Driem
(2001b: 987-993) has proposed to maintain a separate status under the Para-Bodish Branch of
Bodish, Bodic languages, Western Tibeto-Burman, in a separate branch beside Bodish (West,
Central and Eastern, possibly South) and West Himalayan. All authors agree that Tshangla is
placed close to but just outside the nucleus of Tibetan languages. The separate position of
Tshangla is justified on the basis that Tshangla has many characteristics not shared by other
Western Tibeto-Burman languages, and Van Driem mentions that the relation of Tshangla
with Tibetan is more obvious at the moment than the relation of Tshangla with other Tibeto-
analysis, the synchronic phonology of East Bodish languages, in her case Kurtöp, shows
more similarity to Tshangla than to Central Bodish, with a less developed vowel system, no
phonemic nasalisation, glottalisation, and lexical tone like Tibetan. However, in vocabulary,
75% of Kurtöp vocabulary is shared with Tibetan and only 2% exclusively with Tshangla, with 23% innovations. Lowes therefore concludes that Tshangla might be even less closely related to Classical Tibetan than East Bodish which she considers closely related to, but no directly descendant from, Classical Tibetan. Tshangla, therefore, might have more similarities with Proto-Bodish.

The first mention of Tshangla is made in the short grammar by W. Robinson in 1849 (1849a,b). Robinson calls the language Chángló, according to him because the people are dark-skinned, as /changlu/ means black. It seems more plausible, however, to consider Chángló a corrupted form of /tshanglalo/ ‘the Tshangla language’. B.H. Hodgson and L. Waddell later collected and partly reprinted Robinson’s work (Van Driem 2001b:990). In 1897, Stack made another description of Tshangla. From the turn of the century till the late 1950s, Bhutan and the adjoining areas were virtually closed off to the outside world, but from then onwards descriptions began to appear by foreign health and development workers and missionaries. Examples include Hofrenning (1959) from the border area; Holmberg (unpubl.) and Melbostad (unpubl.), with data collected around the Riserbu Leprosy Mission in Eastern Bhutan; Sture (1988); Egli-Roduner (1987), with data collected from Kanglung, Khaling and Pemagatshel in Eastern Bhutan; and Hoshi (1987) with data collected from speakers originating in Pemagatshel but living abroad. The only available studies from India are the sentences presented by Chakravarty (1953) and the short description by Das Gupta (1968), both on Central Monpa or Dirang Tshangla. Linguistic descriptions of Tshangla as spoken in Tibet include the description by Sűn and colleagues (1980) and Zhāng (1986). Mòtô Menba and Cângluô Menba are the same language referring to Metok, the county where the language is spoken, and Tshangla respectively.

The first complete Tshangla grammar was written by Andvik (1999 and 2009). He also published various articles (see, for example, 1993, 2003 and 2004). As Andvik himself indicates (2009:1-2), the main shortcoming of his grammar is the fact that he did not have proper access to conduct his research in a single community within Bhutan, but had to rely on several speakers from different dialect backgrounds in migrant communities in India and Nepal. Although his inductive approach is commendable, it has sometimes resulted in overemphasis on certain syntactic features and constructions that appear commonly throughout the corpus he examined, but are of a rather minor importance in daily speech and conversation. Nonetheless it is the first complete grammar of Tshangla written by a linguist in the English language, and therefore will remain the main reference work.

Even within Bhutan Tshangla, dialect diversity is great. The dialect referred to as the ‘Zhonggar Standard’ (Bodt and Gyatso 2012, in publ.) has been taken as the standard.

The Zhonggar Standard has 29 native and three marginal consonant phonemes, five plain vowel phonemes, five diphthong vowel phonemes, and eight initial consonant clusters, presented in Tables 9.1 to 9.5.

### Table 9.1. Bhutan Tshangla Consonant Phonemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k [k]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh [kh]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g [g]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng [ŋ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c [ts]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch [ch]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j [dʑ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny [n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t [t]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th [th]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d [d]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n [n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr [tɾ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thr [tʰɾ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dr [dɾ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p [p]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph [ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m [m]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts [s]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsh [tʃ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w [w]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z [z]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y [j]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r [r]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l [l]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh [ʃ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s [s]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h [h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be observed that the phonetic values assigned to the alveolo-palatal series /c, ch, j/ here slightly differs from the description in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.) in light of additional analysis of available data.

### Table 9.2. Bhutan Tshangla Marginal and Nativised Consonant Phonemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dz [ʣ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh [z]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lh [h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

34 Hereafter abbreviated to ZS.
The phoneme /zh/ occurs natively in some dialects, but only in borrowed items in other dialects. The phoneme /dz/ only occurs in borrowed lexemes. The phoneme /lh/ is nativised among most speakers under influence of the liturgical language Chöke and Dzongkha.

The bilabial plosive plus trill series is relatively common in all dialects. The remaining consonant clusters occur marginally. The velar plosive plus trill clusters have been placed between brackets because they occur in certain archaic dialects of Bhutan Tshangla, but have been replaced by the retroflex phonemes /tr/, /thr/ and /dr/ in the ZS. A similar trend has been observed from Lepcha in Sikkim (Plaisier 1996), where the initial clusters /kr/, /khr/ (in native orthography /hr/) and /gr/ are usually pronounced as /tr, thr, dr/ in modern speech, again under influence of Central Bodish Drenjongke. The initial consonant cluster /psh/ is only attested in a few lexemes, most notably /pshi/ ‘four’, and is a recent innovation under influence of Dzongkha, as among older speakers it is preserved as /phi/. This is also attested from Hoshi (1987) and Zäng (1986:42).

On the surface, the monophthong vowel inventory of Tshangla is relatively simple, with only five distinctive vowels. This inventory probably represents an extensively simplified vowel phonology, with a complex underlying vowel allophony. This vowel allophony will be extensively described in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.).

The vowel e /e/ has varying realisations from speaker to speaker and depending on the environment. In general it represents a long, half-closed front unrounded vowel [ɛː] in open
syllables and a short, half-closed front unrounded vowel [e] to a slightly lower [ɛ] in closed syllables and word-initially. The vowel /i/ is realised as short, closed, front, unrounded vowel [i], both in closed and open syllables and in initial position. As is explained in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.), there are strong indications that until recent times the phoneme /i/ existed, although the phoneme /i/ is now realised as either the phone [i] or the phone [ɪ] in free variation. Homonymy as a result of the phonological change will be shown (Bodt and Gyatso 2012 in publ.) to be avoided in the speech of most speakers through reanalysis. The phoneme /a/ is a short, open, back, unrounded vowel [a] in closed syllables and initial position and a long, open, back, unrounded vowel [aː] in open syllables. There are a few lexemes is which the phoneme /a/ is long even in a closed syllable. The phoneme /o/ varies from a long, half-closed, back, rounded vowel [oː] in open syllables to a short, half-closed, back, rounded vowel [o] or a half-open back vowel [ɔ] in closed syllables. The phoneme /u/ is realised as a short closed, back, rounded [u]. The allophone ȳ [y] occurs in many dialects, including the ZS, in syllable-final position after the consonants /n/ and /zh/ and in those lexemes borrowed from Chöke and Dzongkha which have native phone [y]. In other dialects we find regular phone [u] in native words and phone [i] or sometimes diphthong [ui] in loan lexemes.

In Tshangla, long vowel allophones exist only of the phonemes /e/, /a/ and /o/, and this vowel length is not distinctive. Vowel length instead depends on the syllabic position of the vowel, with long vowels in open syllables and short vowels in closed syllables. There are, however, notable exceptions to this generalisation. Intervocally in some monosyllabic words, the vowel phonemes /a/ and /o/ can be pronounced distinctly long. Examples include /kas/ [ka:s] ‘dry leaf litter used for animal bedding’, /dat/ [da:t] ‘knowledge of how to do something’, /nap/ [na:p] ‘entangled thread’, /pam/ [pa:m] ‘lower slope of a hill’ and /pop/ [po:p] ‘confidence’. Although no minimal pairs have been attested, near-minimal pairs include /jas/ ‘ration, stock’, /nas/ [nas] ‘haircomb’, /chæs/ ‘talk, conversation’, /kap/ [kap] ‘shade’, /kes/ [kes] ‘difficulty’ and /pham/ [pʰam] ‘yeast’.

In syllable-initial position, vowels /e/, /a/ and /o/ can also have a long quality as a result of pre-glottalisation of the vowel. Examples of this include /ana/ [ˈanaː] not *[aːnaː] ‘elder sister’, /ˈtʃeːniŋ] not *[eːheːniŋ] ‘some time ago’, /ˈŋen] not *[oːŋen] ‘in that manner’. As is

35 But /kasken/ [kαskn] ‘difficultly’. 
explained below, pre-glottalised syllable-initial vowels are generally in the high register tone in Pemakö and Dirang Tshangla.

**TABLE 9.5. BHUTAN TSHANGLA DIPHTHONGAL VOWEL PHONEMES.**


The diphthong vowel phonemes is extensively described in Bodt and Gyatso (2012 *in publ.*). Monophthongisation of diphthong phonemes is an ongoing process in various stages in the different Tshangla dialects. Although diphthong vowels almost exclusively occur in syllable-final position, there are some cases in which a diphthong vowel occurs between two consonants, e.g. /paip/ [p'al@] ‘window sill of the ground floor of a house’.

**9.7. TSHANGLA TONE.**

The absence or presence of tone in Tshangla has been an issue that has divided linguists for a considerable time now. Depending on the origin and background of the speaker, Tshangla is described as a language that has no tone, no distinctive tone, distinctive tone only on some onsets, or a language with distinctive high versus low register tone on all syllables.

For Bhutan Tshangla it was reported by authors such as Hoshi (1987:6), Egli-Roduner (1987), Wangdi (2005:56), van Driem (2001b), Lowes (2006:94) and Andvik (1999:32, 2003) that Tshangla has no distinctive tone contrast. This lack of tone distinction is even carried over by Tshangla speakers into other languages they might speak, including Dzongkha and Tibetan. In both languages, native Tshangla speakers do not pronounce the low-high initial tone contrast. This is a very typical feature by which Tshangla speakers of Dzongkha are easily distinguished from native Dzongkha speakers, or even Dzongkha speakers with another Central Bodish or even East Bodish language background, who are able to hear and produce tone differences. As proposed in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, *in publ.*) with an extended analysis here, ongoing research on the various Tshangla dialects in Bhutan and elsewhere is pointing to the existence of distinctive tone in some dialects.

Perhaps the most interesting but unfortunately underrepresented feature of Das Gupta’s 1968 description of Dirang Tshangla is the assertion (1968:14) that ‘tone plays a significant part. As has been observed already, k and g, c and j, t and d, and p and b owe their distinction to
their tonal values as well. Vowel lengths are also affected by tones’. He then lists the following examples: khu [rising] ‘dog’ vs. khu [level] ‘rice’\(^{36}\), sha [rising] ‘meat’ vs. sha [level] ‘tooth’, ra [rising] ‘brass’ vs. ra [level] ‘paddy’, shi [rising] ‘excreta’ vs. shi [level] ‘bamboo’ and nga [rising] ‘fish’ vs. nga [level] ‘full’. Unfortunately, in the remainder of his work no further mention is made of lexical tone.

The data from Metok presented in Žhāng (1986), Anon. (1991), Sun and colleagues (1981) show a two-tonal (high level versus low rising) contrast on all syllables. In fact, the main difference in consonant inventory between the ZS and Pemakō Tshangla stems from the fact that Žhāng does not distinguish the voiced consonants from their unvoiced counterparts. Partially in line with what Das Gupta earlier asserted, Žhāng argues that the voiceless initial consonants are only present in syllables with a high tone, and that voiced initial consonants only occur in syllables with a low tone (Žhāng 1988:4). According to Žhāng, there is a distinct two-tone contrast, namely high-level or high-falling tone, which he represents by the high-tone syllables, whereas the voiced plosives and fricatives /b/, /d/, /g/, /dz/, /dʒ/ and /z/ and the complex onsets /br/ and /mr/ are only present in low-tone syllables. Žhāng does not present minimal pairs to confirm this theory. In fact, speakers themselves consider tone as non-distinctive, at least in the Didong dialect (Žhāng 1988:10).

According to Žhāng, nine consonants can occur in both high-tone as well as low-tone syllables: [m], [n], [ŋ], [ŋ], [w], [l], [r], [j] and [e] because of the change from [z] to [e]. He then continues to list 13 (near-) minimal pairs out of his total of 2128 lexemes. It is important to differentiate between native Tshangla lexemes and nativised borrowings and changed pronunciation as a result of contact with other languages. Thus, <$ŋa$> ‘five’ might be realized

\(^{36}\) On 13-12-2011, Tenzin Chonjor in pers. comm. pointed out that in the Tshangla dialect spoken by his direct relatives (refugees from Chinese-occupied Pemakō and the first generation born in refugee camps in India) a contrast exists which he described as ‘a difference between long vowel u [u:] and short vowel u [u]’. Evidencing this he presented the minimal pair [’khu]/[bar’khu] ‘rice’ vs. [khu:] ‘dog’, in which not only vowel length but also tone appeared contrastive. If future research can provide more minimal pairs, it would mean that Pemakō Tshangla, like Dirang Tshangla as reported by Das Gupta, has preserved a two-tonal contrast even on initials in which other Bodish languages commonly have no contrasting tone (e.g. the aspirated voiceless velar plosive kh), and that this tonal contrast also affects vowel length. It would not be surprising to find a similar contrast in the Yabrang variety of Bhutan Tshangla.
as <ŋa⟩ in Pemakō Tshangla under the influence of Tibetan high-register 〈'nga⟩ (lnga), and <janj⟩ ‘wealth, prosperity’ is a borrowing from Tibetan 〈'yang⟩ (g.yang) through religious concepts such as <jan k'ukp¢> ‘to conduct a ritual to accumulate wealth’. Furthermore, in translating from one language to the other one has to be careful not to project semantic meanings onto the target language.

In order to further analyse the possible presence of tonal distinctions in some Tshangla dialects but their absence in others, it is useful to consider a possible path of tonogenesis in the Tshangla language. For this, a concise overview of Tshangla morphology is required.

9.7.1. SOME NOTES ON TSHANGLA MORPHOLOGY.

In Tshangla there are certain morphophonological rules governing the formation of adverbs and adjectives as well as the declension of nouns and the conjugation of verbs. Tshangla is described (Bodt and Gyatso 2012 in publ.) as having 18 possible syllable-finals: the simple vowels /a, e, i, o, u/, the diphthong vowels /ai, au, oi, ui, ui/, and the consonant phonemes /k/, /t/, /p/, /r/, /s/, /m/, /n/ and /ng/.

A noun root ending on the vowel phonemes, the nasal phonemes and the phoneme /r/ will generally be followed by an allomorph starting with a voiced phoneme, i.e. phoneme /g/ in the case of noun declensions or phoneme /b/ or nasal /m/ in the case of adjective formation. A noun root ending on a plosive consonant phoneme or the phoneme /s/ will generally be followed by an allomorph starting with an unvoiced phoneme, i.e. with phoneme /k/ in the case of noun declensions or phonemes /p/ or /ph/ in the case of adjective formation.

Verbs can be divided in five verbal classes based on their stem endings. The verbal classes have been labelled as the pa-class, the pha-class, the ba-class, the ma-class and the la-class. Pa, pha, ba, ma and la refer here to the simple past tense suffixes. The stem ending of the verb root is derived from the verb in the imperative tense, as this is the only tense in which the stem appears in unaltered form. In general, both transitive and intransitive verbs ending on the plosives /k/, /t/ and phoneme /s/ are in the pa-class, those ending on plosive /p/ in the pha-class, those ending on trill phoneme /r/ in the ba-class, those ending on nasal phonemes /n/, /m/ and /ng/ in the ma-class and those ending on simple or diphthong vowels in the la-class. Examples of the information given above can be found in table 9.6.37

37 Because there are no irregular forms reported from roots ending on vowels, these have been excluded from this analysis.
### Table 9.6. Examples of the Expected Choice of Morphemes from Various Parts of Speech (PoS) with Roots Ending on the Various Consonant Phonemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root-final</th>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Allomorph</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ng/</td>
<td><em>pron.</em></td>
<td>jang</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>jang.ga</td>
<td>1sg.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>my, mine, to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n.</em></td>
<td>brung</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>brung.ga</td>
<td>buffalo.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>to/of the buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>kong</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>kong.ma</td>
<td>hit.PT</td>
<td>hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>jang</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>jang.me</td>
<td>unravel.NP</td>
<td>will unravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>adj.</em></td>
<td>ring</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>ring.bu</td>
<td>lengthen.ADJ</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/n/</td>
<td><em>pron.</em></td>
<td>nan</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>nan.ga</td>
<td>2sg.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>your, yours, to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n.</em></td>
<td>lan</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>lan.ga</td>
<td>rope.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>to/of the rope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>adj.</em></td>
<td>den</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>den.mu</td>
<td>be correct.ADJ</td>
<td>correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>gan</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>gan.me</td>
<td>flee.NP</td>
<td>fleeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>ben</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>ben.me</td>
<td>lick.NP</td>
<td>will lick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/</td>
<td><em>n.</em></td>
<td>phom</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>phom.ga</td>
<td>snow.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>to/in/of the snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>jam</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>jam.ma</td>
<td>drink.PT</td>
<td>drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>chom</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>chom.ma</td>
<td>wrap.pt</td>
<td>wrapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>rum</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>rum.me</td>
<td>meet.np</td>
<td>will meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/</td>
<td><em>adj.</em></td>
<td>ser</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>ser.bu</td>
<td>gold.ADJ</td>
<td>yellow, golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n.</em></td>
<td>chur</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>chur.ga</td>
<td>cheese.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>to/of/in the cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>zer</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>zer.ba</td>
<td>measure.PT</td>
<td>measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>cur</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>cur.ba</td>
<td>usher.PT</td>
<td>ushered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/p/</td>
<td><em>n.</em></td>
<td>yap</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>yap.ka</td>
<td>attic.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>to/in/of the attic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>adj.</em></td>
<td>sop</td>
<td>phu</td>
<td>sop.phu</td>
<td>be warm.ADJ</td>
<td>warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>yip</td>
<td>pha</td>
<td>yip.pha</td>
<td>sleep.PT</td>
<td>slept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/</td>
<td><em>pron.</em></td>
<td>rok</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>rok.ka</td>
<td>3sg.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>his, to him, her, to her, hers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n.</em></td>
<td>duk</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>duk.ka</td>
<td>poison.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>in/of the poison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>adj.</em></td>
<td>phek</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>phek.pa</td>
<td>open.ADJ</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>v.</em></td>
<td>bak</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>bak.pe</td>
<td>dig.NP</td>
<td>will dig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/</td>
<td><em>n.</em></td>
<td>shot</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>shot.ka</td>
<td>lower altitude.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>to/at/of the lower altitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It has been observed that in the case of syllable-final /ng/, /n/, /m/ and /r/ there are major exceptions to the above mentioned morphophonological rules.

### Table 9.7. Attested Exceptions to the Morphophonological Rules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root-final</th>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Allomorph</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ng/</td>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>yang</td>
<td>pu (*bu/mu)</td>
<td>yang.pu</td>
<td>ease.ADJ 38</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>nang</td>
<td>ka (*ga)</td>
<td>nang.kā</td>
<td>inner.LOC</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>brang</td>
<td>ka (*ga)</td>
<td>brang.kā</td>
<td>place.LOC</td>
<td>to the place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>nyong</td>
<td>pa (*ma)</td>
<td>nyong.pā</td>
<td>get.PT</td>
<td>got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>shim</td>
<td>pu (*bu/mu)</td>
<td>shim.pu</td>
<td>be tasty.ADJ 39</td>
<td>tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>sem</td>
<td>ka (*ga)</td>
<td>sem.kā</td>
<td>mind.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>of/in/to the mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>cham</td>
<td>ka (*ga)</td>
<td>cham.kā</td>
<td>middle.LOC</td>
<td>in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>dam</td>
<td>pa (*ma)</td>
<td>dam.pā</td>
<td>close.NP</td>
<td>will close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>pen</td>
<td>pa (*ma)</td>
<td>pen.pā</td>
<td>press.PT</td>
<td>pressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>gan</td>
<td>pa (*ba/ma)</td>
<td>gan.pā</td>
<td>become old.ADJ</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>pa (*ba)</td>
<td>bar.pē</td>
<td>light up.NP</td>
<td>will light up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>ka (*ga)</td>
<td>bar.kā</td>
<td>middle.LOC</td>
<td>in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>cur</td>
<td>pu (*bu/mu)</td>
<td>cur.pū</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>sour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant in this respect is the observation that in speakers of certain dialects, such as the Yabrang and Dirang dialects, pronunciations can be heard like [ɛʰampka:] ‘in the middle’, [lunลำpa:] ‘mounted (e.g. a horse)’. This indicates that in these exceptional cases a syllable-

38 The verb /yang/ in the ma-clas means ‘spread’ as in /kholong yangme/ ‘pick up a squirrel’. The verb /yang/ in the pa-class originally means ‘easen, make easy, be easy’. It has dropped the final nasal in colloquial speech and taken the la-class verbal endings to become the verb /ya/ ‘easen, make easy, be easy’.

39 In archaic speech this adjective is /yimpu/. Under influence of Dzongkha /zhimtokto/ it became /shimpu/, by some speakers realised as /ʒimpu/.
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final consonant cluster existed, in which the nasal or trill is followed by an unvoiced plosive. This final unvoiced plosive is the phonological reason for the irregular morphology. Additional proof of this can be found in the vernacular of many Tshangla dialects, where we can find morphophonological constructions, such as stem-extensions, that proceed even further, in that the syllable-final nasal is completely replaced by a plosive and followed by the allomorph expected from a stem-final on a plosive.

**Table 9.8. Stem-final alternation in vernacular Tshangla.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>root-final</th>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>root</th>
<th>allomorph</th>
<th>lexeme</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ng/</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>dung</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>du.kha</td>
<td>village.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>to/of/in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>jang</td>
<td>sho</td>
<td>jak.co</td>
<td>sing.IMP</td>
<td>sing!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>nyong</td>
<td>nyi</td>
<td>nyok.nyi</td>
<td>get.INF</td>
<td>getting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>don</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>dot.k.a</td>
<td>ghost.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>of/to the ghost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>gan</td>
<td>nyi</td>
<td>gat.nyi</td>
<td>become.old.INF</td>
<td>becoming old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>pen</td>
<td>nyi</td>
<td>pet.nyi</td>
<td>press.INF</td>
<td>pressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>mom</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>mop.k.a</td>
<td>curry.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>in/of/to the curry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>lam</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>lap.k.a</td>
<td>road.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>on/at/to the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>sam</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>sap.k.a</td>
<td>three.LOC/DAT/POS</td>
<td>after three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>chom</td>
<td>nyi</td>
<td>chop.nyi</td>
<td>rob.INF</td>
<td>robbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>rum</td>
<td>nyi</td>
<td>rup.nyi</td>
<td>help.INF</td>
<td>helping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9.7.2. Explanations for Irregular Morphological Paradigms.**

Earlier, Andvik (1999:103-111) also noted that some nasal-final and liquid-final verb roots show the same suffix alternation as the obstruents, i.e. that some verbs ending on the nasal phonemes /ng/, /n/ and /m/ do not fall in what we have called here the ma-class and some verbs ending on trill /ɾ/ do not fall in the ba-class, but exceptionally fall in the pa-class just like verbs ending on plosives /p/, /t/, /k/ and phoneme /s/. It must be noted here that Andvik does not ascribe a separate class for verbs ending on /p/, but explains the surface form *pha* as a result of spirantised degemination of the oral labial stops (1999:113, 119). The contrasting examples Andvik mentions are irregular /lang/ ‘mount’ versus regular /lang/ ‘sit’ and irregular /sor/ ‘exchange’ versus regular /shor/ ‘loose’. He also observes that in stem-extended forms, root-final nasal /ng/ is velarized to /k/, root-final nasal /m/ is labialized to /p/,
root-final coronal /n/ is oralised to /t/ and root-final /r/ is glottalised, and that glottalisation on the nasals is possible too, especially on the labial and velar nasal. He notes that this alternation creates a displaced contrast where otherwise homophonous roots contrast whenever there is root or suffix alternation, so whereas when suffixing the copula <la> the regular forms become /langla~langna/ and /shorla/ and the exceptional forms become /lakla/ and /sorla/. A possible explanation for the exceptional verb stems Andvik (1999:105-106) mentions, is the past presence of underlying consonant /s/ in the irregular verb roots. He provides the examples of Tshangla /gan/ ‘become old’, /jang/ ‘stretch, pull’, /lang/ ‘be sufficient’ and /nam/ ‘smell’ with their respective Chöke cognates.

A different explanation follows from a combination of the above observations from the ZS with features of Dirang and Pemakö Tshangla. Apart from the distinctive tone in Dirang Tshangla, Das Gupta also reported the existence of syllable-final consonant clusters. Examples he mentions are /mangkka/ ‘short, low’, /langk/ ‘mount (a horse)’, /lamp/ ‘read, learn’, /zank ~ jank/ ‘smoke’, /zhank/ ‘make’, /nort/ ‘err’ and /lump/ ‘hatch’. Zhāng (1986) also noted some of these examples, namely /mankka/, /lump/, /lamp/, /langk/, /zank/ (p. 206, 205, 199, 197, 196 respectively). Pemakö Tshangla [lān] ‘sit’, in the ZS is /lān/ which takes the expected non-past verbal suffix <me>, and Pemakö Tshangla [lān] ‘mount a horse’ in the ZS is /lān/ which takes the irregular non-past verbal suffix <pe>. For Dirang Tshangla Das Gupta reports the lexemes /lang/ and /langk/ respectively. The morphophonological analysis of what is hypothesised to have occurred here has its direct bearings on how we consider the historical development of Tshangla as a language. What we have observed in the above can be summarised in the following paradigms of linguistic change.

1. **Regular Verbal Conjugation Paradigm:**


2. **Irregular Verbal Conjugation Paradigm:**

There are other examples but due to lexical variety within these three broad Tshangla dialect groups, particularly in Dirang Tshangla, they are incomplete. The missing Dirang Tshangla forms are preceded by an asterisk, and might be attested during further research into the dialect. E.g., Dirang Tshangla *[lom.ba] → Pemakō Tshangla [llom.ma] → ZS [lom.ma] ‘wrapped’ vs. Dirang Tshangla *[lomp.pa] → Pemakō Tshangla [llom.pa] → ZS [lom.pa] ‘embraced, hugged’; Dirang Tshangla *[jor.ba] → Pemakō Tshangla [ljor.ba] → ZS [jor.ba] ‘gulped’ vs. Dirang Tshangla *[jort.pa] cf. [nort] ‘err’ → Pemakō Tshangla [ljor.pa] → ZS [jor.pa] ‘tilt, bend’.

Additional examples from the ZS include /phangpa/ ‘threw away (e.g. a dough effigy)’ vs. /phangma/ ‘cared for’, /penpa/ ‘pressed’ vs. /penma/ ‘soaked (e.g. clothes)’, /shampa/ ‘flowed over’ vs. /shamma/ ‘divided from one unit into smaller units over more people’, /bangpa/ ‘1 occupied (land), 2 soaked (in hotspring)’ vs. /bangma/ ‘carried’, /yarpa/ ‘went away fast, ran away’ vs. /yarba/ ‘chop (leafy vegetables with a knife)’, /jangpa/ ‘1 sang, 2 pulled’ vs. /jangma/ ‘1 got used to; 2 unravelled, untied’, /kengma/ ‘burned by hot metal’ vs. /kengpa/ ‘felt shy’, /sangma/ ‘dried’ vs. /sangpa/ ‘healed’, /ganma/ ‘escaped’ vs. /ganpe/ ‘became old’, /linma/ ‘released’ vs. /linpa/ ‘jumped’, /jamma/ ‘drank’ vs. /jampa/ ‘softened, eased’, /rumpa/ ‘helped’ vs. /rumpa/ ‘met’, /yumpa/ ‘melted’ vs. /yumma/ ‘milled, turned, grinded’. Interesting in this respect is the fact that in some speakers of Bhutan Tshangla a high tonal onset can be observed in some of these homonymous verbs, for example, ['laiŋpa] ‘mounted (a horse)’ vs. ['laŋpa] ‘sufficed’ vs. ['laŋma] ‘sat’; ['penpa] ‘pressed down’ vs. ['penma] ‘soaked’, ['shampa] ‘flowed over’ vs. ['shamma] ‘divided’; ['lampa] ‘studied’ vs. ['lampa] ‘looked for’ vs. ['lawa] ‘fetched’ vs. ['lappha] ‘struck’.

9.7.3. CONCLUSION: TSHANGLA TONE AND LINGUISTIC CHANGE.

What we observe is a shift from distinctive syllable-final consonant clusters, to distinctive tone, to distinctive morphophonological features and homonymy. It appears that Dirang
Tshangla retains some archaic features of Tshangla or perhaps an older substrate language. Evidence for this can be found in the presence of complex initial consonant clusters reminiscent of Old Bodish, but above all from the presence of syllable-final consonant clusters and distinctive tone. Pemakö Tshangla represents the variety of Tshangla spoken around three centuries ago in Eastern Bhutan which has since then undergone a phonologic history of its own but still retained certain characteristics of the original language. In Pemakö Tshangla tone has not only been retained similarly to Dirang Tshangla, but under influence of tonal Tibetan dialects has perhaps even expanded in other phonologic environments. Pemakö Tshangla has also preserved some of the syllable-final consonant clusters of Dirang Tshangla. In the ZS, meanwhile, both tone and consonant clusters have simplified but they have become replaced by a more complex morphophonology and a large number of homonyms and near-homonyms. Further analysis of the Yabrang variety of Bhutan Tshangla and the absence or presence of tone and syllable-final consonant clusters in this variety will probably provide interesting insight into this hypothesis. Analysis of Tshangla pronouns and person-marking on Tshangla verbs in the various varieties in paragraph similarly contributes to unravelling the process of linguistic change.


Andvik earlier wrote that in Tshangla reduplication of consonants in consecutive syllables is not allowed, and that this is prevented through degemination of the final consonant in the first syllable. Example Andvik mentions of this include degemination of the final /p/ and /m/ in the verbal case morphology, i.e. /jam.me/ ‘drink.np’ becomes /jame/ and /yip.pe/ ‘sleep.np’ becomes /yi.phe/. Phonotactic analysis, however, points in a different direction. Although perhaps inaudible, consonants are reduplicated in consecutive syllables. In the case of */jame/ the proof for this can be found in the quality of the vowel /a/ in the first syllable. This vowel is short, and not long, as would be expected from a vowel in an open syllable. The very existence of the separate verbal pha-class which only follows verbal stems ending on phoneme /p/ can be attested from the imperative case [jip.co], not *[ji ~ ji.yo] as would be expected from a verbal stem ending on a vowel. Additional examples of the reduplication of consonants in consecutive syllables include cherrang [cʰɛːrʁæŋ] not *[cʰɛːɾʁɑŋ] ‘urine’, mrakkamrekke [mɾaːka.mɾeːke:] not *[mɾaːka:mɾeːke:] ‘stained adj.’, thappathoppo [tʰ âmrequent oː poː] not *[tʰ aː pʰ aː oː pʰ oː] ‘slow-witted’, jangngajingi [jaŋɡaːjɪŋi] not *[jaːŋɡaːjɪŋi] ‘vague’, rattarutu [ɾaːtːaːɾuːtu] not *[ɾaːtːaːɾuːtu] ‘rough (of surface)’, lammalimi [luːmaːliːmi] not
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* [la:ma:limi] ‘dim (of light)’, leppha [le:pʰa:] not *[le:pʰa:] ‘cut PT’, rokka [ro.ka:] not *
[ro:.ka:] ‘3sg.POS’, thrapphe [tʰa:pʰe:] not *[tʰra:pʰe:] ‘encounter.NP’ and trapco [tʰap.te:] not *
[tʰap.te:] ‘encounter.IMP’, lomme [lo.me] not *[lo.me:] ‘wrap.NP’, songgo [so:njo:] ‘person’ not *
[so:njo]. A more detainted analysis of Tshangla syllable structure and phonotactics can be found in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ).

9.9. THE TSHANGLA PRONOUN.

The Tshangla pronoun system is similar across most of the dialects. The basic pronoun system appears as the following, attested from Bhutan Tshangla (Andvik 1999, Wangdi 2005:95) and Pemakö Tshangla (Zhāng 1986):

**Table 9.9. Tshangla personal pronouns in the Zhonggar standard.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>jang</td>
<td>aching</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>nan</td>
<td>naching</td>
<td>nai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>rok</td>
<td>rokching</td>
<td>rokte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3sg pronoun rok has varying realisations in the different Tshangla dialects. Whereas conservative Bhutan Tshangla dialects pronounce [rok], the velar plosive has been pre-glottalised and later glottalised in the dialects influenced by Central Bodish languages, including Pemakö Tshangla, resulting in pronunciation as [ro:k] or [roʔ]. A trend can be observed in which the vowel preceding the glottal stop is lengthened and the glottal is dropped as in [roːk]40. Most refugee Pemakö Tshangla pronounce the 3sg pronoun as [ru], indicating the speed of phonological change. The 3pl pronoun used to be pronounced as [roktai]. In most dialects, including the ZS, monophthongisation of the diphthong /ai/ has resulted in this pronoun being pronounced as [rokte].

According to Zhāng (1986:48–49), in Pemakö Tshangla the dual pronouns are not pronounced as [aːɕiŋ], [naːɕiŋ], [ʁokɕiŋ] but as [aːɕiŋ], [naːɕiŋ], [ɾoːɕiŋ].

---

40 This is a common phonological development, viz. Tshangla [brak] ‘cliff’, which in some dialects becomes [braːk] → [braʔ] → [braː] → [daː], all under influence of Central Bodish pronunciation rules.
This superficially simple three-person three-number pronoun system, however, masks a much more complex underlying pronoun system.

9.9.1. The Dual Suffix <nyiktsing>, the Plural Suffix <bak>.

The suffix <nyiktsing> ‘two’ can be added to the first and second person dual pronouns. This only slightly changes the meaning of the pronoun, i.e. aching nyiktsing ‘the two/both of us’ vs. aching ‘we (two)’, naching nyiktshing ‘the two/both of you’ vs. naching ‘you (two)’. The suffix <nyiktsing> is not added to rokching, instead this becomes rok nyiktsing ‘the two of them’ vs. roktsing ‘they (two)’. Without <nyiktsing>, the fact that the pronoun refers to two people is implicitly understood, whereas more stress is placed on the ‘togetherness’ of two people when <nyiktsing> is added.

In all dialects the plural extender <bak> can be added to any of the plural forms mentioned above, to get a slight semantic variation from ai ‘we’, nai ‘you’ and rokte ‘they’ to aibak ‘all of us’, naibak ‘all of you’, roktebak ‘all of them’.

9.9.2. The Honorific Pronoun.

The honorific second person pronoun tha with its dual form tha nyiktsing and the plural form thabak occurs exclusively in Bhutan Tshangla. The absence of this pronoun in Pemakö Tshangla indicates that it only entered Tshangla after the Drukpa annexation and migration to Pemakö in response to higher levels of expected formality and courtesy that the Tshangla had to show to the Drukpa administrators. It is perhaps derived from Chöke ṭā ‘everything, all, total’.

9.9.3. The Third Person Pronoun dan.

Besides the regular third person pronoun rok, rokching, rokte, there is another third person pronoun set, namely dan, daching, dai. Usage of this third person pronoun dan has been widely reported, including from Bhutan Tshangla by Andvik (1999) and Wangdi (2005:97-98), from Dirang Tshangla by Chakravarty (1953) and Das Gupta (1968) and from Pemakö Tshangla by Zhang (1986:48). In Bhutan Tshangla usage of the pronoun is widespread, but as Wangdi (2005:97-98) reported, the usage is on the decline in the urban setting as well as in many rural areas. Although Zhang describes the third person pronoun set dan, daching, dai,
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relatively few samples of its usage are mentioned in his work, which might indicate that usage in Pemakö Tshangla is decreasing as well.

The fact that in Dirang and Kalaktang Tshangla the pronoun dan is still used as the only 3sg pronoun seems to indicate that this pronoun is the native 3sg. At some moment in time, after the historical migration of Tshangla speakers from Eastern Bhutan to Kameng and before the migration of Tshangla speakers from Eastern Bhutan to Pemakö, the 3sg pronoun rok appears to have been introduced, gradually replacing dan in most situations. The probable origin of the pronoun rok is Dzongkha /rø/ [ro:] ‘the other’, in turn perhaps derived from Chöke རོ་ ‘friend, helper’.

Several attempts have been made to capture the semantic distinction between the 3sg pronouns rok and dan in those dialects where they are used side-by-side. Zhang (1988:48-49) described the 3rd person pronoun dan as ‘abhorrent appellation’, with which he probably meant the same as Wangdi (2005:97-98), who stated that the difference between rok and dan is a difference between a normal and a rude form, with dan used when referring to someone the speaker does not feel very positive about. Andvik (1999) described the difference between rok and dan and between rokte and dai as a difference in topicality with a more topical 3rd person being referred to with the proximate 3rd person pronoun rok or rokte and the less topical 3rd person being referred to in the obviative dan and dai.

Own data point more towards a distinction based upon personal knowledge versus assimilated or assumed knowledge. I.e., whether the speaker has been a witness to the event concerning the third person referent, or whether the speaker makes a statement based upon, for example, inferred knowledge or hearsay from someone else. This is also evident from the usage of specific common verbs when referring to the third person, other than the honorific verb forms used when speaking to, or about, people of higher social standing. This concerns verbs like bi ‘give’ for 1st and 2nd person vs. ga for 3rd person, di ‘go’ for 1st and 2nd person vs. jong for 3rd person, yik ‘say’ for 1st and 2nd person vs. dak for 3rd person etc. Whereas verbs like di, bi and yik can be used for 1st, 2nd and 3rd person referents alike, jong, ga and dak can only be used for the 3rd person. Verbs like jong, ga and dak are used to present assimilated or assumed knowledge, whereas di, bi and yik are used to present personal knowledge of the

---

41 This is a common distinctive factor in Tshangla grammar, for example the difference between the copula /la/ vs. /ca/.

42 A peculiar example is the verb /nong/ ‘wait’ for the 3rd person vs. the verb /mong/ ‘wait’ for the 1st and 2nd person. The verb /mong/, in the pa-class, has underlying form [moŋk] as can be attested from the sentence jang shama mokchowana ‘I waited for quite some time’. Usage of /mong/ is rapidly decreasing, the lexeme having been almost completely replaced by /nong/.
speaker. Further analysis of existing examples will provide more insight into this element of Tshangla grammar.

A final remark on the 3rd person pronouns and gender: neither dan nor rok are gender-specific and they can refer to both male as well as female third persons. The English translation could, therefore, be either ‘he’ or ‘she’. It can only be used for animate persons, including animals, and is never used to refer to inanimate objects. For this, the indefinite pronoun uthu [u than] or unyu [u yu] ‘this, it’ is used.

9.9.4. DIVERGENT SET OF PLURAL PRONOUNS.

An additional sub-set of plural pronouns in Tshangla has not been reported by Andvik or Wangdi from Bhutan Tshangla, despite the fact that it is a common feature of almost all Bhutan Tshangla dialects. Neither has it been reported by Zhāng from Pemakō Tshangla. As with the aberrant 3sg pronoun, again it is Dirang Tshangla that has exclusively preserved this pronoun set: in Dirang Tshangla, the plural pronouns are not ai, nai, rokte/dai but ashi, nashi, dashi (Das Gupta 1968). These pronouns are reminiscent of the Pemakō Tshangla dual forms on <shing> (Zhāng 1986:48). Curiously, the form *rokshi does not exist in Bhutan Tshangla or in Dirang Tshangla, and the set is limited to ashi, nashi, dashi only. This is perhaps indicative of the ancient origin of the set. The semantic content of aberrant plural personal pronouns in Bhutan Tshangla varieties that have preserved both sets has yet to be properly analysed and described. The pronouns on <shi> are not a contraction of pronouns in the genitive case, e.g. ai + gi → *ashi but aigi or aibakki. Neither are the pronouns on <shi> indications of colloquial or rude forms with the pronouns on <i> the preferred speech, since both varieties occur in the same conversation and are not used mutually exclusive. The usage of the pronouns ending on <shi>, like the 3rd person pronouns /dan/, is rapidly disappearing in modern Tshangla. In the urban and educated setting these pronouns have all but disappeared from everyday speech, and they evoke a rural, rustic and archaic connotation. Further research into the occurrence and semantic content of this pronoun subset should receive a high priority.

9.9.5. PRONOUN DECLENSIONS.

The declension of Tshangla pronouns is beyond the scope of this present work, but nonetheless an extremely interesting part of Tshangla grammar, especially from a historical-
comparative perspective. It appears that as the pronoun systems increase in complexity, with more diverse forms of the pronoun, their declensions become simpler. Das Gupta (1968:26-29) reports a relatively simple personal pronoun system with a rather complicated declension in Dirang Tshangla in which, for example, the dative and ablative cases combine the possessive case with the suffixes <cokkai> and <mekkai> respectively. Zhāng (1988:48-49) presents the rather more complicated personal pronoun system of Pemakō Tshangla that appears to have an easier case declension, although Zhāng unfortunately does not provide detailed information. In Bhutan Tshangla, the personal pronoun system is most elaborate. But the declension is rather straightforward and simple: for example, the possessive and the dative case have merged.

9.9.6. THE TSHANGLA PRONOUN IN REGIONAL COMPARISON.

The comparison of pronouns provides some additional evidence that Tshangla is definitely Tibeto-Burman, but most probably not a Bodish language. Tshangla shares more innovations in personal pronouns with the languages of the Kho-Bwa cluster and Lepcha than with the Central and East Bodish language. Compare the data of Proto-Tibeto-Burman (Matisoff 2003), Lepcha (Plaisier 2003, 2006), Bugun (Dondrup 1990), Sherdukpen (Dondrup 1988), Puroik (Soja 2009, Remsangpuia 2008), Tshangla archaic and Zhonggar Standard (own data), Gongduk (Van Driem 1995), Rukha Black Mountain (van Driem 1995), Dakpa (own data), Kheng (own data), Dzongkha (own data) in Table 9.10. Please note that for reasons of practicality and simplicity this pronoun table excludes distinctions some of these languages make in formality, duality, gender, and in-and exclusivity as well as plural suffixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1sg</th>
<th>1pl</th>
<th>2sg</th>
<th>2pl</th>
<th>3sg</th>
<th>3pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTB</td>
<td>*ŋa-y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*na-j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*zaŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepcha</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>káyú</td>
<td>ho</td>
<td>záyú</td>
<td>hu</td>
<td>huyú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugun</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>gathie</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nathie</td>
<td>owei</td>
<td>ethue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherdukpen</td>
<td>gu</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>nang</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td>yar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puroik</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>garai</td>
<td>naa</td>
<td>wae’mui</td>
<td>nyihain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshangla (arch.)</td>
<td>jang</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>nan</td>
<td>nai</td>
<td>dan</td>
<td>dai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the above information, a basic pronoun set of *go~ko, *nan, *ho for 1sg, 2sg and 3sg and *ga, *na, *ha for 1pl, 2pl, 3pl person pronouns in the proto-form of the non-Bodish languages of the Monyul area is proposed. Rukha BM appears to exhibit an East Bodish influence on a more ancient non-Bodish substrate language, and Gongduk is by all means the most aberrant language. Sagart (1996) earlier argued in favour of PTB 1sg form *ka in lieu of the more commonly accepted *ŋa-y (e.g. Matissoff 2003). DeLancey (2011a) and Jacques (2007), however, state that though it is likely that the *ka root was a possessive or oblique form contrasting with the nominative *ŋa and that in the languages where this form has replaced the original nominative *ŋa, the original finite construction is replaced with an innovative finite form based on a nominalization, which thus takes a genitive rather than a nominative “subject” (DeLancey 2011b). The non-Bodish languages of Eastern Monyul reasonably well conform to the PTB 2sg pronoun *na-ŋ. Cognates with the PTB and PLB 3sg pronoun *zəŋ are markedly absent.

**9.10. PERSON-MARKING IN THE TSHANGLA VERB?**

As was described in paragraph 9.7.1, the standard Bhutan and Pemakö Tshangla past tense suffixes are <pa, pha, ba, ma, la>, further called the PT suffixes of the pa-group. Zhāng (1986:75) and Wangdi (2005:153-154) reported another past tense suffix <ci, shi, ji> with <ci> occurring after a verb root in the pa- or pha-class, <shi> occurring after a verb root in the ba- or ma-class, and <ji>, preceded by stem entender <n>, occurring after a verb root in the la-class. These suffixes will hereafter be called the PT suffixes of the ci-group. The same exceptions that hold for the common PT suffixes, described in paragraph 9.7.1, also hold for these suffixes. Wangdi (2005:153) noticed that these past tense suffixes are used synonymous with the past tense markers of the pa-group in his own dialect, i.e. the Radi variety of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tshangla (ZS)</th>
<th>jang</th>
<th>ai</th>
<th>nan</th>
<th>nai</th>
<th>rok</th>
<th>rokte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gongduk</td>
<td>za</td>
<td>ziŋ</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>giŋ</td>
<td>gon</td>
<td>gonmat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukha BM</td>
<td>kő</td>
<td>ɳŋak</td>
<td>ɲŋ</td>
<td>ɿŋak</td>
<td>hoʔ</td>
<td>hoŋnak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakpa</td>
<td>ɲe</td>
<td>ɳtaŋ</td>
<td>ɿi</td>
<td>ɿtaŋ</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>betaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kheng</td>
<td>ɲat</td>
<td>ɲet</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>yin</td>
<td>khit/gon</td>
<td>bot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzongkha</td>
<td>ɲa</td>
<td>ɲatee</td>
<td>te³o</td>
<td>te³o</td>
<td>k³o</td>
<td>k³oŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gamrilingpa dialect\textsuperscript{43}, but that they occur much more frequently in the speech variety of the villages of Yabrang and Phimsong under Phongme geok\textsuperscript{44}. In recognition of this, a dialect has been called the ‘Yabrang dialect’, although this dialect is rather a much more widespread sociolect than a geographical dialect, as paragraph 9.13.8 will show. The PT suffixes of the ci-group are markedly absent from the Dungsam dialects of Tshangla, but are common in the rural varieties of the Gaipa Tshangla dialects and have been attested from, for example, Khamdang, Ramjar, Monggar and Phongme geoks. Even some rural speakers of the ZS will on occasion use these past tense suffixes.

Zhāng (1986:75) observed the same alternative set of past tense markers from Pemakō Tshangla. According to him, the perfect (past) tense in the pa-group is mainly used in what he calls ‘autonomous behaviour’ of the first person, and the second person in questions, and un-autonomous behaviour in case the speaker is very positive about what he mentioned; whereas the ci-group is used for ‘un-autonomous behaviour’ of the first person and sentences with the second or third person as subject. With ‘autonomous’ vs. ‘un-autonomous’ behaviour Zhāng appears to refer to the level of control that the subject has over the action expressed by the verb in the PT.

The ancient origin of this morphological feature of Tshangla grammar is, once again, confounded by the fact that in Dirang Tshangla the 1\textsuperscript{st} person PT is formed as stem+<na> whereas for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person the PT is formed as stem+<ci, ji, shi> if the action has been witnessed by the speaker (Das Gupta 1968).

The peculiar set of PT markers of the ci-group, although no longer used in the positive PT for any person in the ZS, has survived in all Bhutan and Pemakō Tshangla dialects as the negative PT for all persons, independent of whether the positive construction would have the verb in the <pa> or in the <ci> class, e.g. rok ma dinji ‘he didn’t go’ (positive: rok diwa or rok dinji ‘he went’), achinggi waktsa ma brakci ‘we two didn’t scold the child’ (positive: achinggi waktsa brakpa ‘we two scolded the child’), jang ma ngarshi ‘I didn’t laugh’ (positive: jang ngarba).

In the Yabrang dialect, the occurrence of the PT suffixes of the ci-group in declarative sentences is almost exclusively limited to 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subjects, whereas the PT suffixes of the pa-group are almost exclusively limited to the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person subjects. In interrogative

\textsuperscript{43} Which, as paragraph 9.13.7 will show, is rather an amalgamation of various other dialects as a result of histori migration into the area.

\textsuperscript{44} Unfortunately, Wangdi did not elaborate on the conditions under which these PT suffixes were used in either of these varieties.
sentences, the PT suffixes of the ci-group are almost exclusively limited to 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subjects, whereas the PT suffixes of the pa-group are almost exclusively limited to 1\textsuperscript{st} person subjects. This might lead to the conclusion that there exists person-marking in Tshangla verbal morphology based on number and the declarative/interrogative distinction. However, there exist marked exceptions to these general rules of thumb in sentences combining different subjects, including quotations and rhetorical questions. Obviously, these exceptions will tell us more about the actual semantic distinction between the two varieties of the PT suffixes. It appears, once again, that evidentiality is a major feature of Tshangla grammar, and that to what degree to which a speaker has personally observed or experienced something or whether he is basing himself on acquired or accumulated knowledge are important factors when making their choice for the PT suffix from the pa-group or the ci-group.\textsuperscript{45} The choice between certain morphological constructions with a similar grammatical function or lexical variants with a similar meaning appears to depend on the level of evidentiality as well as on the person that is the subject of the sentence. A full analysis of this feature of the language, its spread and its possible origin remains to be done.

A grammatical feature of Tshangla closely related to the PT suffix is the past perfective form in the Yabrang variety. Wangdi (2005:173) earlier described the past perfective as an event or situation that started and completed in the past before another event occurred. In the ZS, the past perfective construction is verb+PT+chowa. The Yabrang variety has the past perfective suffix <chin>, in the construction verb+ka+chin. The origin of the past perfective suffix <chin> appears to be from the past perfective construction cho+na+chi which still occurs in Dirang Tshangla (Das Gupta 1968).

What these examples serve to show, is that a lot of linguistic features of Tshangla have yet to be uncovered, and moreover, that it is not just useful but perhaps impertinent to consider and compare the grammatical features of as many Tshangla dialects as possible. The Dirang dialect, having the most aberrant morphology and syntax of all Tshangla dialects, seems to be an important indicator of the historical development of the Tshangla language as a whole.

\footnote{Tshangla makes a distinction of a similar nature between the usage of the copula la and ca, the choice of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person pronoun and the choice of specific verbs (ref. paragraph 9.9.3) etc.}
9.11. PROTO-TIBETO-BURMAN ROOTS IN TSANGLA.

In Matissoff (2003) we can find a list of Proto-Tibeto-Burman (PTB) roots. An analysis of these roots shows that there has been a considerable level of retention of PTB roots in Tshangla. This is another indication of the relative antiquity of Tshangla as a Tibeto-Burman language. A selection of these forms is presented in Annex VI. Whereas some PTB and Tshangla forms have cognates in the Bodish languages, there are a considerable number of forms that Tshangla has retained from PTB but that have divergent forms in the Bodish languages that would indicate a distinct root in Proto-Bodish. This suggests the divergence of Proto-Tshangla from Proto-Bodish, and perhaps even Proto-Bodic, and a closer relation between Proto-Tibeto-Burman and Tshangla than has previously been assumed.


It is curious to find a considerable correspondence between Proto-Lolo-Burmese roots given in Matissoff and Tshangla as well. The Proto-Lolo-Burmese homeland is thought to have been in central and northern Yunnan from where they spread around 3600 to 3800 years ago (Peiros 1997). Examples of this include PLB *tsan₁ ‘person/human being’ Tshangla /tsangla–tshangla/ ‘person, human being’, PLB *tsap₁ ‘stick into, insert’ Tshangla /tsap/ ‘stick into, insert under’, PLB *wa² ‘snow/frost/ice/hail’ Tshangla /ba/ ‘frost’, PLB *ʔ-dzik¹ ‘joint’ Tshangla /ningzing/ ‘elbow’ and /gumzing–tongzing/ ‘knee’ PLB *bəy² ‘give’ Tshangla /bi/ ‘give’, PLB *tsin ‘liver’ Tshangla /chinpa/ ‘liver’, PLB *dat¹ ‘alive’ Tshangla /dat khe/ ‘be aware’, PLB *ŋa² ‘fish’ Tshangla /nga/ ‘fish’, PLB *s/ʔ-ŋa² ‘borrow/lend’ Tshangla /nga/ ‘borrow, lend’, PLB *s-nam¹ ‘ear of grain’ Tshangla /nammang/ ‘quantifier, e.g. cob of maize, chili etc.’, PTB *ŋwa/PLB *nwa² ‘cattle’ Tshangla /wa/ ‘cattle, cow’ and PLB *za²-mi²³ ‘daughter’ Tshangla /zamin/ ‘daughter’. This correspondence could indicate a shared origin of Proto-Tshangla and Proto-Lolo-Burmese. It could, however, also mean that the PTB roots for certain words should be amended or extended in light of the evidence from Tshangla.

What remains are some Tshangla lexemes that appear to have no obvious Tibeto-Burman roots or cognates in neighbouring languages, for example, /got/ ‘look, see’, /phurtsi/ ‘dust’, /lanyong/ ‘right’, /minyong/ ‘left’, /nam/ ‘weave’, /lang/ ‘sit’, /phai/ (and Kheng /mai/)
9.12. WRITTEN TIBETAN ROOTS IN TSHANGLA.

The Tibetan aristocrats and the religious practitioners that fled the Tibetan plateau from the 7th century onwards, finding refuge among the people of Monyul, brought with them the phonology and vocabulary of the Tibetan language as spoken on the Tibetan plateau at that time. Perhaps, speakers of other languages, for example the Qiangic languages or the Zhangzhung languages also found their way into the southern Himalayas. For a language of migrants to have a deep and lasting impact on the native tongues of a particular region, the migrants have to be either relatively numerous or more powerful. The historical sources referred to in Chapter 3 and 4 seem to suggest that the migrants from the Tibetan plateau were not large in number, but because of settling among a sparse and scattered population and moreover because of being culturally and perhaps also militarily more advanced they seized social and political authority over the native populations.

The people that migrated to Pemakö left at a time when the language of successive waves of Tibetan immigrants had already influenced Tshangla, but the mark that the western Bhutanese Drukpa, speakers of the Central Tibetan language Dzongkha left was still relatively limited. Van Driem (2001b:989) earlier suggested that Pemakö Tshangla may represent the indigenous tongue of Eastern Bhutan, and indeed a comparison of Pemakö Tshangla and the ZS in paragraph 9.13.12 shows that these two varieties are very closely related and show little phonological or lexical differences. This would indicate that the Tibetan brought from Tibet has had a more profound impact on Tshangla than Dzongkha. Still, the Central Bodish influence must have become even more pronounced once the Drukpa theocracy firmly established itself in the area. The situation of a ruling class, conversant and even literate in Chõke and Dzongkha, governing an illiterate Tshangla-speaking peasant population prevailed for several hundreds of years. Most of the honorific terms in Tshangla, though in the end largely derived from Chõke, seem to be introduced into the language after the Drukpa conquest in the 17th century, since they are largely absent form Pemakö Tshangla.

Norbu (2004) mentions several examples of what he calls as ‘corrupted forms of

---

46 Ref. Chapter 4.
47 Ref. paragraph 2.7, 2.8.
Tibetan’ in Tshangla, such as ні ‘give’, ғɪ ‘obtain, get’ , ғԮ ‘sky’, і٦ ‘cut’, ғі ‘arrive’, ғі ‘go’, ғі ‘ear’, ғі ‘nose’, ғі ‘stomach’, ғі ‘grandmother’ and ғі ‘grandfather’, according to him derived from the Written Tibetan (hereafter WT) cognate forms ғі ‘come, go, depart’ respectively. Other examples include Tshangla /drang a/ ‘count’ from WT ғі , /tram/ ‘distribute’ from WT ғі , /drik/ ‘agree’ from WT ғі , /drup/ ‘attain, complete’ from WT ғі , and less obvious derivations such as /mi/ ‘think’ from WT ғі ‘dream’, /thur/ ‘one’ from WT ғі ‘scattered, dispersed’. The majority of lexical forms related to religion, statementship and politics and other higher semantic levels are loans from Old Tibetan or Dzongkha in Bhutan Tshangla and from Tibetan or Chinese in Pemakö Tshangla. In general, Tshangla has retained a native basic vocabulary such as body parts, vocabulary related to daily housekeeping, agricultural practice and livestock keeping, forestry products, family relations etc. Rather surprisingly, therefore, is the distinctive lexeme for ‘drink’, /jam/, completely unrelated to the WT ғі , but the distinctly Bodish word for ‘eat’, /za/, from WT ғі . Closer analysis, however, learns that there are at least two native Tshangla lexemes for ‘eat’ that have been preserved in particular contexts, namely /hap/ ‘eat (rude form), 2 smoke tobacco’ and the Dungsam dialect /grong/ ‘eat (rude form), devour’, which are particularly used in to dozo hapco/grongsho ‘eat the food fast’.

9.13. THE TSHANGLA DIALECTS.

A first concise insight into the Tshangla dialects was provided in Norbu (2004), according to whom the common view is that nine Tshangla ‘tongues, dialects’ can be distinguished.

---

48 Norbu provides the spelling ғі
49 Norbu provides the spelling ғі
50 Norbu provides the spelling ғі
51 Norbu provides the spelling ғі
52 Norbu provides the spelling ғі
53 Norbu provides the spelling ғі
54 Actually, a derivation from the written Tibetan root ғі‘come, go, depart’ is more obvious.
55 In the Dungsam dialects preserved as [graʃ a].
56 In the Dungsam dialects preserved as [kram].
57 Actually, the list could be extended to cover over half of this book, but it is clearly beyond the scope of this book to do so. Serves to show, that the Chöke and Dzongkha influence on a large part of the Tshangla vocabulary has been profound.
58 Disregarding lexemes that convey specific meanings such as ‘chew’, ‘munch’, ‘bite’, etc.
Unfortunately, he does not substantiate this claim, and only gives examples of the differences between the Dungsampa dialect and the dialect of the Gaipa ‘upper people’, i.e., the people from the upper valleys of the Gongri and Kuri rivers. The following paragraphs will give a first overview of the Tshanglal dialects that can tentatively be distinguished, with more in-depth descriptions provided for some of them.

As with any language spoken across a wide geographic area, the differences across village boundaries, mountain ridges or rivers can be larger than the differences across regional or national boundaries. Tshangla dialectology is still in its infancy, and further studies and research in the near future will unquestionably bring more insights into the dialects, their origins and the relationships among them. It is pertinent that this research does take place in the near future, though, since dialect differences are rapidly disappearing as a result of increased communication and mobility, urbanisation, changing livelihood and cultural patterns and all other consequences of rapid development and modernisation. The division of the Tshangla language among various dialects is largely based on linguistic considerations. Historical considerations have also been taken into account, as well as the speaker’s own perceptions on the dialect divisions. An acronym has been assigned to each dialect or variety, which will be used in the remainder of this description. Speaker data from Bhutan are from the Population and Housing Census of Bhutan and any figures given represent the number of people that reported Tshangla as the main language of communication within their household.

What initial research into the dialects of Tshangla is beginning to show is that Tshangla is perhaps neither a Bodish language- which is quite widely accepted- nor a Bodic language. Phonologically, a recent innovation such as the initial consonant cluster /psh/, such as in, for example, /pshi/ ‘four’ and /pshilingpa/ ‘westerner’ has developed under influence of the Dzongkha consonant /zh/ and initial consonant cluster /pch/, as in the cognates /zhi/ and /pchilingpa/. In archaic dialects and among older speakers, the consonant phoneme /ph/ is retained in both lexemes, e.g. /phi/ ‘1 four, 2 fart, 3 whistle, 4 make, do’ and /philingpa/ ‘westerner’. Similarly, palatalization of the glide /y/ to /zh/ is occurring under influence from Dzongkha. A more well-established phonological change includes the change from the initial consonant clusters /kr, khr, gr/ to the retroflex phonemes /tr, thr, dr/. This is a typical Central Bodish phonological feature also observed in most Tibetan dialects and Dzongkha. In most conservative and archaic dialects, especially the various Dungsam and Kameng dialects, the velar plosive and trill clusters have been preserved and the retroflex consonants only occur in
Central Bodish loanwords, whereas in the more innovative dialects that have been exposed to Tibetan and Dzongkha linguistic influences, including the ZS, the retroflex clusters have been completely nativised. Data from East Bodish languages, notable Lowes (2009) and (Dakpa from Tibet) show that the East Bodish languages also increasingly adopt this trait.

The morphological change that Tshangla has undergone has been less extensively researched. Several Tshangla dialects, including most notably the Dirang and the Yabrang dialects, exhibit verbal morphological features that on closer observation and analysis could very well be remnants of a more complex verbal agreement pattern. The ZS shares with most Tshangla dialects a greatly simplified morphology which could be attributed to adult speakers adopting the language. As was seen before, historical sources show that in the past Bodish speakers have successively entered the Tshangla area and, assuming authority over the Tshangla people through coercion or force, intermarried with them. The Tshangla <kap> ‘when, at the time’ is, for example, a direct loan from WT ʟŵƅī <kap> ‘during, when, at the time’. This possibly explains the relative complexity of the morphology of the Kameng Tshangla dialects vis-à-vis the Bhutan Tshangla dialects, and also the retention of certain morphological features in the Kameng, Pemakō and Yabrang dialects no longer present in other Tshangla dialects. Most recent expansion of Tshangla into other non-native Tshangla speaking environments, for example in the urban setting, is expected to contribute to a further simplification of the morphology of the languages and adoption of Central Bodish morphological constructions from Dzongkha.

Lexically, we can observe a great amount of loans from the Central Bodish languages into the ZS, but the basic Tshangla vocabulary is distinctly non-Bodish. A comparison of more archaic dialects indicates that many lexemes usually considered ‘native’ in the Bhutan Tshangla dialects are actually loans from Tibetan and Dzongkha. The higher the semantic level of the lexicon, the more Bodish the lexemes tend to become, clearly indicating that Tshangla society became more complex as a result of contact with Bodish-speaking people, who introduced most of the terminology associated with, for example, law and crime, government and politics, religion and ritual etc. The basic Tshangla vocabulary, though, is distinctively non-Bodish, including the pronoun system. Semantic change has resulted in native Tshangla lexemes having been replaced by Bodish loans, in which the native lexeme has either taken on a semantic content, or disappeared altogether.

For many basic lexical items Tshangla has cognates with other non-Bodish languages rather than with the Bodish languages. Examples of this include Tshangla /tsham/ ‘hair’ viz. Sherdukpen /gzang/, Lish /kujang/, Bugun /khaziwang/, Lepcha /patsóm/ vs. Central and
Part 2. Ethnic Groups and Languages of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon.


There are several arguments why the Dungsam dialects, now spoken in the dzongkhaks of Pemagatshel and Samdrup Jongkhar, can be considered the most original and archaic of all Tshangla dialects. First of all, the local tradition regarding the mythological origin of the Tshangla people considers Dungsam as the place where the first Tshangla people descended
Moreover, the origin lake of Karmathang is thought to have been located in this area. Secondly, most Tshangla speakers consider the people of Dungsam to be the most ancient Tshangla people (e.g. Norbu 2004:14) and the most basic distinction made among Tshangla speakers in Bhutan has traditionally been between the Dungsampa on the one hand and the Gaipa on the other. Several prejudices led the Dungsampa to being traditionally considered inferior to the Gaipa. These include their archaic and particular language use, their close ties and intermarriage with the Bodo from the plains and the persistence of traditional millet-based shifting cultivation cropping patterns and transhumance livestock herding. Thirdly, Dungsam, like Kalaktang, lies on the fringes of the Tibetan and the Indian spheres of influence and both were only loosely controlled by the Tibetan theocracy through Tawang or the Drukpa theocracy through Trashigang and Zhonggar. The Central Bodish influence on the speech of the common people can be shown to decrease where the authority of the people that brought it dissipates, and as a result the most archaic Tshangla dialects are spoken in the Dungsam and Kalaktang areas. The Dungsam dialects have preserved many phonologic and lexical features that have undergone significant change in the other dialects, including the velar plosive plus alveolar trill series. Norbu (2004), for example, mentions [gran] ‘calculation’, [kʰreŋ] ‘soup of a vegetable dish’, [kʰre] ‘platform near the door’, [gre] ‘ornament’, [gran] ‘river bank’, [gроŋnaŋ] ‘small pieces of cut material like cloth or wood’, [pʰro] ‘remnant’ and [gremlinje] ‘jackfruit’. Lexically, the Dungsam dialects preserve a different and more extended kinship terminology system. Norbu (2004: 15) mentions Gaipa /kota/ vs. Dungsam /khotsa/ ‘younger brother’, /usa/ vs. /nyimin/ ‘younger sister’, /aku/ vs. /atsung/ ‘father’s younger brother’, /apa/ vs. /apha/ ‘father’, /ajang/ ‘mother’s younger brother, father’s younger sister’s husband’ vs. /achung/ ‘mother’s younger brother’ and /khochang/ ‘father’s younger sister’s husband’. Forthly, the Dungsam area is located relatively isolated from other speech communities in the region. The plains to the south have historically been sparsely populated due to humidity, heat and occurrence of malaria. During the migration in the winter months, the Bodo host families generally learnt Tshangla rather than the opposite, although many people from Dungsam

---

59 Ref. paragraph 9.3.
60 Ref. footnote 144 to Chapter 4.
61 Ref. footnote 53 and 54 to Chapter 7.
63 Ref. paragraph 7.1.8 and 7.2.
64 The Gaipa dialects typically have the pronunciations [dɑŋ], [tʰ'en], [tʰ'e], [dʰe], [dʰan], [dʰənŋ], [tʰ'o], [dᵉmse] respectively.
could speak some Bodo. The Dungsam area was bordered on the west and the north by the Gongri river, and at least until the middle of the 15th century when Drupthop Thangtong Gyelpo constructed his iron bridge, there was limited communication possible across the Gongri, at least not enough to facilitate linguistic exchange with the neighbouring Kheng and Gongduk language communities. To the northeast and east the Dungsam area borders on the Lower Trashigang dialect areas that have adopted many traits of the Dungsam dialects, and to the east the area of present day eastern Samdrup Jongkhar was largely uninhabited until the settlement by Dungsam speakers from Dungsam proper. Other Tshangla communities, such as in Monggar area with Kheng, Chali and Chocangaca neighbours, Trashigang with Chocangaca and Dakpa neighbours, and Dirang with Dakpa neighbours, had considerably more contact with other languages that contributed to linguistic change. Finally, the Dungsam area has even in historical times been a source of migrants to other regions previously inhabited by Tshangla but deserted at some moment in time. This is still evident from the occurrence of speakers of the Dungsam dialect in many villages in Trashigang65, Lhüntsi66, Monggar and Trashi Yangtshis67. The eastern areas of Samdrup Jongkhar as well as Kalaktang appear to have been settled by speakers from Dungsam as well.

There have been various etymologies of the name Dungsam. Wangdi (2004:17) presents a possible derivation from Tshangla ฐี ‘conch shell’ and ฏี ‘three’, referring to three conch-shaped hills in the area. Supporting this etymology, the poetic description of Pemagatshel in

65 Including in Bikhar and Khapti of Samkhar, ฐี Chasang, ฏี Chema, ฏี Bongman ฏี Dungsam and ฏี Kheshingri hamlets of Radio and ฏี Yangkhar in Bartsham geok. One of the descendants of the Khar Khoche started the ruling family that became known as Yangkhar Khoche, with as main seat the Chador Lhakang where an important statue of Chana Dorje is kept (Norbu 2004: 59). According to Norbu (2004: 61-62) this statue was hidden by Pemalingpa and later recovered as treasure from the ฏี Yutsangwangtsho ‘clear turquoise pit lake’ located near ฏี Khar Bodung village by the Khardung Gyelpo. Until it dried up this lake was occupied by a garuda. Other treasures that came from there are a Cenrezik that flew to the north and a statue of ฏี Pehar Gyelmo. This area later became the Khardung Gyelpo’s ฏี ‘lower residence’ after Bonman Phaichilo. Norbu (2004: 61) furthermore describes how in the 18th century the Tibetans and Dakpa from Tawang attacked Bhutan when under Desi Druk Rapgye, the people of Yangkhar fled and left the statue of Chana Dorji behind unguarded. It was stolen by someone from Yalang, who experienced very bad omens and left it behind in the forest of ฏี Monglen, from where it called the Yangkharpa to pick it up again. The absence of snakes and naga and their associated disease leprosy in Bartsham, Bidung and Ramjar geoks is attributed to this statue.

66 The Tshangla speakers of Lhüntsi descent from the Bangtscho clan, but the people of Kurtö Unggar descent from the Khoche family of ฏี Dungmin Unggar.

67 For example, in Romang in Ramjar and Durnang in Khamdang in Trashi Yangtshis.
Norbu (2004:5) compares the area to a right-turning conch-shell. Wangdi (2004:17) and Norbu (2004:72-74) also propose a corruption of Dungtsho 'people of the origin lake', but the derivation dungtsho > dungtsho > dungsapa > dungsam seems far-sought. Wangdi’s final etymology from Tshangla /dung/ ‘village’ and /sam/ ‘three’, simple and straightforward, might be another possibility. Norbu (2004:72-74) also gives several alternative etymologies of Dungsam. These include the 16th century Dungtshang, analogous to Ngatshang and Chitshang, Dungtsham, in which the Dungsam Dung lineages are thought to descent from the Dung family of Bumthang Tshampa. A less commonly heard etymology is based on the premise that the Dungsam area used to be inhabited by people of the sumapa and zapa class subservient to the Dung nobility of Zhonggar. Dungsam is then a corruption of Dungzapa/Dungsumapa > Dungsampa.

The most common spelling since the 19th century is Dungsam ‘thought of descendants’, which was first recorded by Jigme Kundrol Lam Jangchup Gyeltshen who resided at the monastery of Yongla. Perhaps the spelling was an intentional construction to lend some degree of shared noble heritage to an otherwise ancient indigenous population. During the First Five Year Plan the area was renamed Dungsam Dosum and in 1970 the great Nyingma master Dudjom Jikdrel Yeshe Dorji visited the area and renamed the newly bifurcated dzongkhaks as Pemagatshel and Samdrup Jongkhar.

The Dungsam area was traditionally divided among descendants belonging to several clans, particuarly the Je clan and the Byar clan. The Wangma clan, through its stronghold in lower Khaling, obtained more and more importance in the eastern part of Dungsam, which is perhaps epitomised by the birth of Lama Namse in the traditional Byar clan stronghold of Tshase. This early alliance to the Wangma clan and its associated Drukpa Kagyu School might have been one of the reasons for the peaceful incorporation of Dungsam. Later, several religious families claiming descent from the Dung or religious figures seized

---

68 Ref. paragraph 4.2.6.
69 Ref. paragraph 4.3.
70 Ref. paragraph 7.4.
71 Ref. paragraph 4.2.6.
72 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.
73 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3 and Chapter 6.
74 Ref. paragraph 6.7.
authority and various parts of Dungsam. The area known as Dungsam Khoidung was ruled from Zhonggar, whereas Dungsam Kothri was ruled from Trashigang.

Two main Dungsam dialects can be distinguished, namely the Dungsam Khoidung (DKD) dialect and the Dungsam Kothri (DKT) dialect. Until the 1970s, the area encompassing present-day Pemagatshel dzongkhak was known as Dungsam Khoidung. The people of this area were sometimes referred to as Khoipa ‘slaves’ and were considered the descendants of local people and Bodo tribals captured by the ruling clans during raids on the adjoining plains (Wangdi 2004: 18-19). This might explain the close historical, economic and social ties between the people of Pemagatshel and their Bodo neighbours to their south. This etymology is, however, probably spurious and incorrect. In the DKD dialect, /khoi/ means ‘valley’. The archaic lexeme /khoi/ lives on in certain loconyms across the Tshangla dialect area and beyond, such as the hamlets of Tshatsi Khoiphuk in Khar geok and Wanglakhoi in Dechenling geok of Pemagatshel dzongkhak, Khoishing in Kengkhar geok and Kawakhoi and Yoikhoi in Chali geok of Monggar dzongkhak and Khoidung in Khaling geok of Trashigang dzongkhak.

The DKD dialect is spoken in the three geoks of Nganglam dungkhak, namely Norbugang, Chökhorling and Dechenling and the geoks of Khar, Dungmin, Chongshing, Chimung, Yurung, Shumar, Zobel and Nanong. Slight variation exists between the western variety spoken in Nganglam dungkhak (DKDW) and the eastern variety of Pemagatshel proper (DKDE). Language retention in the DKD dialect is high, with over 90% of the population of these geoks speaking the language in the private setting.

Egli-Roduner (1989) presented some vocabulary from the Dungsam area, although the majority of her data were from Kanglung and Khaling in Trashigang. Hoshi (1987) provided a vocabulary of 1,000 basic lexical items of what she calls two dialects of the ‘Sharchok’ language from Bhutan. The first informant was a 41 year old native of Yutrung village who was an ordained monk living in Kathmandu for the past 10 years also conversant in Nepali, Hindi and Tibetan. Yurung features prominently in the history of Eastern Bhutan between the

---

75 The common Chöke spelling is ŇŶźŽ in which ŇŶ means ‘slave, servant’.

76 In the ZS /yoi~ye/ or /yeshong/.

77 This refers to Yurung geok. Yurung geok has 375 households spread over 15 villages: Khangma, Dungsingma, Dinang, Thongkhar, Lawung, Thunggor, Gomtshang, Porila, Wanglakhoi, Bangdala, Putshumri, Yangkhar, Khominang, Chenri and Burna. The DKDE variety is spoken here.
establishment of the Drukpa theocracy and the establishment of the monarchy\textsuperscript{78}. Despite the fact that one of the first schools in Bhutan was inaugurated in Yurung in 1959 on command of the third King, the geok was largely neglected after that, and the construction of the first road started only in early 2010. Hoshi’s second informant was a 24 year old male from Dechenling geok\textsuperscript{79} who worked and resided in Thimphu and was interviewed in Japan. His other languages included Dzongkha, Nepali, Hindi and English.

Hoshi’s consonant inventory (1987:5) does not show much divergence from the ZS consonants described in paragraph 9.6. The phoneme /l/ is realised by the DKDE speaker as loan phone [ʎ] only in nativised loans from Chöke, perhaps since the speaker is a monk proficient in Tibetan. Entry 0359, 0245 and 0736 are illustrative for this: in 0736 and 0245 the DKDE speaker pronounces the loan phone in [lo] ‘south’ and [la] ‘god’ whereas the DKDW speaker has native pronunciations [lo] and [la] respectively. The DKDE speaker does pronounce [lok] ‘read’ rather than [lok], and herein follows the native pronunciation [lok].

Based on the data by Hoshi, the phone [ʣ] appears to occur as allophone of the phoneme /z/ rather than as a distinctive phoneme, with no attested minimal pair. The DKDE speaker, again perhaps as a result of his Tibetan proficiency, uses the phone significantly more often than the DKDW speaker, as the following table shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry\textsuperscript{80}</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>DKDW</th>
<th>DKDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0029 elbow</td>
<td>neŋziŋ</td>
<td>neŋdziŋ</td>
<td>neŋdziŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0726 world</td>
<td>zambuliŋ</td>
<td>dzambuliŋ</td>
<td>dzambuliŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{78} Ref. paragraph 7.1.8.

\textsuperscript{79} Dechenling geok, where DKDW is spoken, has 497 households spread over 14 villages and neighbouring hamlets, including Shinchuri, Marshala, Gonpawung, Dungchilo, Bapta, Rizemo, Goiwung, Gonglam, Sangmari, Lharizor, Kholomzor, Yangmalashing, Nangkor, Laishingzor, Nashingbandar, Monggar, Dungphu, Bidungzor, Bazakzor, Laburzangrushing, Ngangri and Phusharang.

\textsuperscript{80} In this and the following tables, ‘entry’ numbers refer to the entries in Hoshi’s vocabulary list.
The data from the DKD dialects presents some additional light on the forthcoming description of the reanalysis of the position of the phoneme /zh/ vs. /y/ in Bodt and Gyatso (2012 in publ.), as this is an on-going process in the DK dialects. Under influence of loans from Dzongkha and Chöke the loan phoneme /zh/ has been introduced, which in borrowed lexical items occurs before the vowels /o, a, e/. For the DKDE speaker, the approximant /y/ is in some, but not all cases fricativised before closed vowel /i/, yielding a regular allophone [z]. This process could well expand itself to include fricativisation before the closed vowel /u/ and finally a neutralisation of the opposition between /y/ and /zh/ before the closed vowels /i/ and /u/ in the native part of the lexicon, as has already happened in the ZS.

**Table 9.12:** Various Stages of Fricativisation of Approximant /y/ in the (ZS), (DKDW) and (DKDE) Dialects of Bhutan Tshangla and Dzongkha (DZO).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry #</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>DKDW</th>
<th>DKDE</th>
<th>DZO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0284</td>
<td>dance v.</td>
<td>zaptʰa pʰi</td>
<td>zaptʰa pʰi</td>
<td>japtʰa phe</td>
<td>zapdɔ cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0605</td>
<td>dance</td>
<td>zaptʰa</td>
<td>japtʰa</td>
<td>japtʰa</td>
<td>zapdɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0388</td>
<td>get wet</td>
<td>zit</td>
<td>jit</td>
<td>zit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0335</td>
<td>rot</td>
<td>zit</td>
<td>jit</td>
<td>jit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0465</td>
<td>young</td>
<td>zonma</td>
<td>jonma</td>
<td>zonma</td>
<td>zom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0911</td>
<td>delicious</td>
<td>zimpu</td>
<td>jimpu</td>
<td>cimpo ~ zimpo</td>
<td>zimtokto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0893</td>
<td>melt</td>
<td>zu ~ zy</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0044</td>
<td>blood</td>
<td>zi</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0325</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>zip</td>
<td>jip</td>
<td>jip</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0055</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>zu</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0812</td>
<td>grind</td>
<td>zum</td>
<td>jum</td>
<td>jum</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0382</td>
<td>descend</td>
<td>zu</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0792</td>
<td>drop, fall down</td>
<td>zu</td>
<td>cur</td>
<td>zut</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0915</td>
<td>square-shaped</td>
<td>ḷupzi</td>
<td>ḷupji</td>
<td>ḷupzi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hoshi considers the glottal stop [ʔ] as a distinctive consonant phoneme, but from the list of lexical items it only appears as a pre-glottalised long vowel /a/, /e/ or /o/ in syllable-initial position, similar to the ZS\(^81\). Although in her phonological description also Hoshi mentions the glottal stop /ʔ/ as a syllable-final consonant, her vocabulary does not mention a single example. The phone [x] occurs exclusively as an allophone of the phoneme /h/ in the lexemes 0253 /hang ~ hangya/ ‘what’ [xang ~ xangya] and 0231 /ahabak/ ‘our’ [‘axabak].

The DKDE variety shares with, for example, the Ramjar variety of the Gamrilungpa dialect the feature that the velar nasal /ng/ in word-initial position and when followed by the front vowels /i/ and /e/ is palatalised to /ny/. Examples of this are entries 0167/0197, 0170/0651 and 0201.

Hoshi (1987:6) mentions the initial consonant clusters /pr/, /phr/, /br/ and /gr/ but in the list of lexical items we can also find the clusters /kr/ and /khr/, characteristic of the Dungsam dialects. Phonological change under influence of Chöke and Dzongkha from the velar plosive plus trill series to the retroflex series, a process which is complete in the ZS and most other Tshangla dialects, is shown to be still on-going in the DKD dialects. This process is even less advanced among rural speakers of the DKDW dialect and among speakers of the Dungsam Kothri, Kalaktang, Dirang and Lower Trashigang dialects. Examples of the /kr, khr, gr/ clusters in the DKD varieties with their ZS cognates are given in table 9.13.

### Table 9.13. Stages of Retroflexion of Initial Velar Plosive Plus Trill Consonant Clusters in the (ZS), (DKDE) and (DKDW) Dialects of Bhutan Tshangla.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>DKDW</th>
<th>DKDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0415</td>
<td>mix, blend</td>
<td>ja, tok</td>
<td>ja, krok ~ tok</td>
<td>ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0861</td>
<td>be fed up</td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>sun, krok</td>
<td>sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0529</td>
<td>piece of cooked vegetable in a curry</td>
<td>momṭeqŋ</td>
<td>momkhren ~ momṭeqŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0196</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>ḍuŋ</td>
<td>gruŋ ~ ḍuŋ</td>
<td>gruŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0085</td>
<td>mosquito</td>
<td>ṭoŋcuŋ</td>
<td>ṭoŋcuŋ</td>
<td>ṭoŋcuŋ (*kroŋcuŋ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0720</td>
<td>theft</td>
<td>ḍowun</td>
<td>ḍoban ~ ḍowun</td>
<td>ḍoban ~ ḍowun (*groban)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hoshi’s data confirm from entry 0182 ZS /psh/ ‘four’, DKDW and DKDE [pʰi], that the consonant cluster /psh/ does not occur natively in Tshangla and can be considered a recent innovation in the ZS, as earlier observed in paragraph 9.6.\(^81\)

\(^{81}\) Ref. paragraph 9.6.
Hoshi’s description of the vowel inventory of the two varieties provides interesting collaborating evidence for the theories regarding vowel allophony mentioned in paragraph 9.6 and Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.). Although for DKDE Hoshi describes the same simple five-vowel inventory, for DKDE she gives the additional vowels ç [i], ü [y] and ø [ø]. The vowels /ü/ and /ø/ are only attested from a few examples, some of which are loans from Dzongkha.

TABLE 9.14. VOWEL VARIATION IN THE ZS, DKDW AND DKDE DIALECTS OF BHUTAN TSHANGLA AND POSSIBLE LOANS FROM DZONGKHA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry #</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>DKDW</th>
<th>DKDE</th>
<th>DZO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0423</td>
<td>can v.</td>
<td>roi</td>
<td>roi</td>
<td>roi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0476</td>
<td>light, bright</td>
<td>we, wø</td>
<td>jø, wø</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>'ø:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0724</td>
<td>meaning</td>
<td>don'ta</td>
<td>don'ta</td>
<td>don'ta</td>
<td>d'onta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0680</td>
<td>seventy</td>
<td>khai p^6edan p^i</td>
<td>khai p^6edan p^i, dyntcu</td>
<td>khai p^6edan p^i</td>
<td>dyntcu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0779</td>
<td>pray</td>
<td>melam tap</td>
<td>melam tap</td>
<td>melam tap</td>
<td>melam tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0082</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td>rugenan</td>
<td>renañ, rynañ</td>
<td>ruginan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0963</td>
<td>slowly</td>
<td>tcapten</td>
<td>tcapten</td>
<td>tcapten</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More interesting from a linguistic perspective is the occurrence of a distinctive phoneme /ʏ/ in DKDW. Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.) and paragraph 9.6 propose that the vowel /ʏ/ was a distinct phoneme in Tshangla until relatively recent times, after which a merger took place with the vowel /i/ in the ZS and most other Tshangla dialects, resulting in homonyms. For DKDW, a contrastive difference can still be observed, as the examples in following table show.

TABLE 9.15. DISTINCT VOWEL PHONEME /ʏ/ [i] IN THE DKDW DIALECT VS. MERGER WITH VOWEL /i/ IN THE DKDE AND ZS DIALECTS OF TSHANGLA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry #</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>DKDW</th>
<th>DKDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0011</td>
<td>tongue</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0037</td>
<td>intestines, guts</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>lí</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0074</td>
<td>bow</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other, non-contrastive examples of the occurrence of the phoneme /i/ include: (0280) ‘say’ DKDW [jik], ZS [jik] and DKDE [jek]; (0294/0297) ‘be scared, afraid, surprised, startled’ DKDW [joŋ kʰi], ZS and DKDE [joŋ kʰe]; (0356) ‘wear’ DKDW [ji], ZS and DKDE [je]; (0360) ‘teach’ DKDW [jin bi], ZS and DKDE [je ~ jen bi]; (0413) ‘go’ DKDW [di], ZS [di], DKDE [de]; and (0848) ‘make, build’ DKDW [pʰɾi], ZS [phi], DKDE [pʰe].

The DKD syllable-final consonants are the same as in the ZS. The occurrence of the syllable-final glide /l/ is attested only in a few lexemes and that in hypercorrect pronunciations of the WT equivalents. Examples include DKDW [gelpo], DKDE [ʺepo], ZS [ʺaipo] for WT ˩Ƃīų Ɨī‘king’, [ʺelmo] or ZS [ʺaimo] for WT ˩Ƃīŷ Ɨī‘queen’; DKDW/DKDE [ʺel] or ZS [ʺai ~ ʺe] for WT ʺtax’; and DKDW and DKDE [iskul], ZS [iskuli] ‘school’ from English /school/, nowadays often replaced by the nativised loan from Dzongkha /lopdra/.

From the lexical perspective, we can make a number of observations. Hoshi observes that among basic words (entries 0001-0500) in the list the ratio of loanwords from Tibetan in 19%, and among more abstract words (entries 0501-1000) 40%. However, this includes not only loanwords from Dzongkha and Tibetan but also many words that are actually lexical cognates due to a common Tibeto-Burman root. Some entries are obvious semantic errors as a result of mistaken translations. Furthermore, the foreign language proficiency of the informants resulted in a considerable presence of loans in the lexical inventory that replaced native vocabulary. Sometimes, the informants state both the native lexeme and the loanword. Especially in the case of the DKDE speaker, the number of Tibetan and Nepali/Hindi loans

---

82 A rather comical example of this can be found in entry 0749 ‘bottom n.’ which in the ZS is /ra/ or /phrang/ but which Hoshi gives as DKDW [pʰɾaŋʰa] ‘below, under’ and DKDE [kʰincʰu ~ kʰenton] ‘buttocks’!
was high, whereas the DKDW speaker used more Dzongkha beside the Nepali/Hindi loans. Examples of this in the table below include entry number 0266, 0267, 0006, 0065, 0131, 0296, 0598, 0480, 0481, 0782 and 0958. Illustrative for this difference are also the names of the week, starting with /za mikmar/ ‘Monday’ according to the Dzongkha naming for the DKDW speaker, but with /za dawa/ ‘Monday’ according to the Tibetan naming for the DKDE speaker. The DKDE speaker reports the native vigesimal counting system, whereas the DKDW speaker also reports the Dzongkha/Tibetan decimal system.

On the other hand, some lexemes where the ZS has a nativised loan have an apparently archaic native lexeme, especially for the DKDE speaker. Some examples of this include entry number 0162, 0226, 0318, 0404, 0409 and 0574. There are also striking cognates with the LT, KT and DR dialects, especially from the DKDE speaker, such as entry number 0271, 0218, 0260, 0430, 0446, 0775, and 0960. Divergent vocabulary between the ZS and the DKDE and DKDW varieties can be either minor, in a single syllable or morpheme such as the entries 0036, 0304, 0305, 0477, or considerable, such as in entry 0067, 0115, 0133, 0158, 0287, 0314, 0450, 0747, 0796 and 0885. It appears that the lexical inventory provided by the DKDW speakers conforms more to the ZS than that of the DKDE speaker, perhaps as a result of longer exposure to other Tshangla speakers within Bhutan.

### Table 9.16: Lexical Variation Between the ZS, DKDW and DKDE Dialects of Bhutan Tshangla with Possible Written Tibetan (WT), Kalaktang Tshangla (KT) and Dirang Tshangla (DT) Cognates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>DKDW</th>
<th>DKDE</th>
<th>Cognate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0266</td>
<td>mjoŋ</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>jon</td>
<td>jon</td>
<td>WT རོ་ན།</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0267</td>
<td>lmoŋ</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>WT རོ་ན།</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0271</td>
<td>pʰiska</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>pʰitka</td>
<td>pʰitka</td>
<td>KT pʰitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006</td>
<td>miŋri</td>
<td>tear</td>
<td>mikteʰu</td>
<td>mikteʰu</td>
<td>WT རོ་ན།</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016</td>
<td>jau</td>
<td>moustache</td>
<td>jawa</td>
<td>ja'o, janda, PK, DR manra, Dzo. manra</td>
<td>jau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0036</td>
<td>tʰiŋlum</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>tʰiŋkʰulum</td>
<td>tʰiŋlom</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0065</td>
<td>cokpa</td>
<td>wing, feather</td>
<td>d'o, pu (ZS plumage)</td>
<td>d'o</td>
<td>WT རོ་དྭ་</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0067</td>
<td>tʰocu, teoptei</td>
<td>beak, bill</td>
<td>toktarinj (ZS crest)</td>
<td>tʰorteqŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0131</td>
<td>boraj</td>
<td>forest</td>
<td>boraj</td>
<td>ciŋnak</td>
<td>WT རོ་ཐར་ན།</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0133</td>
<td>sawaj, hoktei</td>
<td>hole, pit</td>
<td>horbaŋ</td>
<td>horbaŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>227</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0158</td>
<td>miduma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0162</td>
<td>karma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0218</td>
<td>tešaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0226</td>
<td>sonŋo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0260</td>
<td>oga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0287</td>
<td>coŋ janŋ, coŋ la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0296</td>
<td>ro ts'ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0299, 0303</td>
<td>pʰi, tʰup, gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0314</td>
<td>brat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0318</td>
<td>liŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0363</td>
<td>pʰek, cʰok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0364</td>
<td>dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404</td>
<td>zak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0409</td>
<td>lanŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0430</td>
<td>tʰumbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0446</td>
<td>dozo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0450</td>
<td>ja mawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0556</td>
<td>to cot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0477</td>
<td>baliŋmin, baliŋmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0503</td>
<td>muṯuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0571</td>
<td>pʰai tʰempanŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0574</td>
<td>kummarə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LHN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0598</td>
<td>goŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0864</td>
<td>zoi, nat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0480</td>
<td>jeŋlu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scant references to morphophonology and morphosyntax that Hoshi describes point in the direction of the DKDW speaker having conformed more towards the ZS, whereas the DKDE speaker has preserved the DKD morphosyntax which is closely related to that of the Dungsam Kothri, Kalaktang and Dirang dialects. A peculiar morphosyntactic feature of all the Dungsam dialects is the usage of the stem extender <p> with allomorph <ka> instead of <pa> and its allomorphs, as in /dipka/ instead of /diwa/ ‘gone’. This morphological construction is also suffixed to the copula, e.g. /gipkala/ instead of /gila/, /capka~caka/ instead of /ca/ ‘is, has’, /mapka~maka/ instead of /mala/ ‘is not, has not’. DKDE shares with Kalaktang Tshangla the non-past verbal tense suffix <li> where ZS and DKDW have <le>. For the DKDE speaker the adjective suffixes are generally, though not exclusively, <po, bo, pho, mo> whereas these are <pu, bu, phu, mu> for the DKDW speaker and in the ZS and most other dialects, and <pa, ba, pha, ma> in the Upper Trashigang dialects.

Dungsam Kothri is the traditional name of Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhak. The etymology might be from Tshangla /kothri/ ‘window’, the area being considered the window between the Dungsam area, upper Trashigang and the Indian plains. The DKT dialect is spoken by the majority of the people in the geoks of Dewathang, Orong, Gomdar, Wangphu, Martshala,
Serthi\textsuperscript{83} and Lauri\textsuperscript{84}. Dewathang features prominently as Dewangiri in the Duar war of 1864-1865, when the Assam Duars were wrested from the Bhutanese by British India. By 1907, an Edinburgh Geographical Institute map published in the Bengal Gazetteer still shows almost the entire Dungsam Kothri area as an extension of Tibetan territory that included the entire mountainous area of what is now Arunachal Pradesh. Despite this, the Dewathang, Orong, Gomdar, Wangphu and Martshala areas seem to have been inhabited for a considerable period of time as a result of eastward expansion from the Dungsam Khoidung area, although population density never appears to have been high. The Serthi and Lauri area, however, is said to have remained largely uninhabited and used as a winter grazing area for livestock from Merak. By the mid 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the government of Bhutan, through the office of the Trashigang Dzongpon, encouraged settlement from the Dungsam and upper Trashigang area\textsuperscript{85}. Although in the geoks of Hastinapur, Bakuli and Dalim, recently renamed as Langchenphu, Phûntshothang and Pemathang respectively, and in Samrang geok Nepali became the majority language during the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the DKT dialect is the principal minority language having regained popularity since the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The DKT dialect is closely related to both the DKD dialect. Some villages in Orong and Gomdar geok exhibit peculiar dialect features. Till date there has been no description of the DKT dialects.

9.13.2. THE KALAKTANG DIALECT (KT).

The Kalaktang dialect (KT) is named after Kalaktang block under West Kameng district. It is the majority language of Kalaktang circle and a minority language in Balemu circle. Considerable Kalaktang dialect speaking communities can also be found among resettled communities in Bhalukpong circle. KT speakers are not only found in Kalaktang town, with around 1,700 inhabitants, but also in Chingi, Waizer, Morshing, Domkha, Sangla,

\textsuperscript{83} In this geok, the dialect is spoken within the household by almost 1700 people in the villages of Drenphuk, Deptsang, Phakchok, Junne, Suskar, Mommola, Serthi, Tashithanggye, Barkalangnang, Menjiwung, Khandrophuk and the nearby hamlets.

\textsuperscript{84} In this geok, the dialect is spoken within the household by over 2600 people divided over 520 households in the villages of Momring, Phajo Gonpa, Sershong, Gonong, Zhanghi, Dung Manma, Roinang, Tshephu, Patpa Nadang, Tshothang, Wungthi, Lauri, Betseling, Trashiphu and the surrounding hamlets.

\textsuperscript{85} Drasho Tenzin Dorje from Galing and Cheten Tshering from Menjiwung, Lauri, pers. comm. Between 1966 and 1982 in his position of Trashigang Rapjam, Nyerchen and Dzongdak Drasho Tenzin Dorje was involved in the recruitment of settlers to the area, and ever since close relations have been maintained between the people of Galing and the people of Lauri and Serthi. Cheten Tshering’s ancestors settled the village of Trashithangge from Kalaktang during that time.
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Warongpam, Brokpalangchen, Liphakpu, Dengzi, Rangthangser, Boha, Yolongripam, Becheling, Lungdur, Balemu, Painaktang, Dimsang and Sessa villages of Kalaktang, Balemu and Bhalukpong blocks.

There are perhaps 5,500 speakers of the dialect in West Kameng. Despite the presence of an international border, the KT speakers traditionally share close matrimonial, cultural and economic ties with their neighbours in Bhutan, and the inhabitants of Kalaktang block are generally thought to have migrated from the west in historical times as a continuation of the eastward push of Tshangla speakers from the original homeland in Dungsam. The Kalaktang area was ruled from Morshing and Domkha by members of the Byar clan called Bapu\(^66\). These Bapu’s maintained control well into the 19\(^{th}\) century\(^77\).

Till date there has been no written description of KT, but a general description of its speakers in Kameng can be found in Bagchi (1987). The following information is the result of discussion with speakers from Dengzi village under Kalaktang circle. KT has considerable lexical similarities with the DKD and DKT dialects, but it also shares some vocabulary with DR (Das Gupta 1968), perhaps as the result of the same substrate language.

**TABLE 9.17: LEXICAL VARIATION BETWEEN THE ZHONGGAR STANDARD (ZS), KALATANG TSHANGLA (KT) AND DIRANG TSHANGLA (DR).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>KT</th>
<th>DR</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ibi</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morup</td>
<td>lekpu</td>
<td>lekpuja</td>
<td>pretty, beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dozo</td>
<td>jokpo</td>
<td>pasera, jokpu</td>
<td>fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noŋ, moŋ</td>
<td>tiŋ</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>stop, halt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eek</td>
<td>kʰunŋ</td>
<td>kʰunŋ</td>
<td>reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canŋ</td>
<td>nep</td>
<td>nep</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zamin/usa/uci</td>
<td>kuma/kuŋma</td>
<td>zamin</td>
<td>daughter/younger sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan</td>
<td>na dok</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sem canŋ pʰi</td>
<td>jorsem pʰi</td>
<td>kitpu a</td>
<td>be happy, enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bra</td>
<td>comma</td>
<td>bra</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par tap</td>
<td>par luk</td>
<td>par tsap</td>
<td>take picture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{66}\) Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.  
\(^{77}\) Ref. paragraph 7.2 and 7.5.
9.13.3. **THE DIRANG DIALECT (DR).**

The Dirang dialect is spoken in Dirang block of West Kameng district, Arunachal Pradesh. Speakers of DR can be found in Phasam, Namthang, Zimthung, Nujamsa, Barchipam, Sangti, Bishom, Diting, Khasa, Yewang, Mathalang Phudung, Thembang, Namshu, Lubrang, Darbu, Warju, Pedung and Sera in the Dirang, Bomdila and Thembang circles. The people of Thembang are said to have moved down via Mago and their servants are said to be the Rahungpa (Das Gupta 1968: v). The number of speakers of the DR dialect is unknown. The Dirang area was ruled from Dirang by members of the Jowo clan\(^\text{88}\), and from Thembang by

\(^8\text{8 Ref. paragraph 4.2.2.}\)
members of the Wangma clan\textsuperscript{89}. Both clans held territory in the plains of the Brahmaputra until well into the 19\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{90}.

The DR dialect is the most divergent Tshangla dialect, with intelligibility between speakers of this dialect and other Tshangla speakers rapidly decreasing from east to west across the dialect borders. This dialect is so different and incomprehensible to many other Tshangla speakers that one might perhaps even think of it as a distinct language. Although the phonological and lexical inventory is rather similar, there is considerable morphological and syntactic variation.

There are two written sources with descriptions of the Dirang dialect, both old and unfortunately lacking a consistent transcription and phonological description: Chakravarty (1953) and Das Gupta (1968). Chakravarty’s work was meant for army personnel and civil servants of the newly established Republic of India who were posted on the sensitive border in what was then known as the North East Frontier Agency of the State of Assam. The 137-page booklet presents 531 sentences in question-and-answer format. Chakravarty follows the transcription of Whitney, which makes it difficult to read and has resulted in considerable phonological distortion. Examples include the transcription of all the phonemes /c/, /ch/, /ts/ and /tsh/ as \textit{ch}, the transcription of all the phonemes /j/, /zh/ and /z/ as \textit{j}, the transcription of phones [a], [o] and [z] as \textit{a}, the transcription of both the phonemes /s/ and /sh/ as \textit{s}, and the transcription of phoneme /s/ intervocally as \textit{c}. Chakravarty presents conversations with a Tshangla speaker from Dolang village about topics relevant to the government officers of those days. Some parts of the interview, including the names of the people interviewed and their family members, the name of the village and the rivers that have to be crossed to reach Bomdila, and some of the cultural customs described, raise doubts as to whether the interview is actually a transcription of an interview with a DR speaker, or rather a translation of an interview held with a, perhaps Nishi, speaker which was then translated into Tshangla. A large part of the interview was therefore read and cross-checked with a native DR speaker to ascertain the validity of the data presented in it. The speaker himself remarked that, in the end, the work should be considered as an historical documentation of Kameng society before modern developments were initiated, rather than a linguistic description.

Das Gupta, on the other hand, presents a much more detailed description of DR, which he called Central Monpa, including the phonology, morphology, sample sentences and

\textsuperscript{89} Ref. paragraph 4.2.5.
\textsuperscript{90} Ref. paragraph 7.2 and 7.4.
vocabulary. The following comparison is on basis of Das Gupta’s work, cross-checked with own data on DR. DR has 28 native consonants, six monophthong vowels, four diphthong vowels, 10 initial consonant clusters and 2 tones. Except for a few discrepancies, comparison learns that the phonology of the ZS and DR is rather similar. The phonemes of DR are presented in Tables 9.18 to 9.21.

**TABLE 9.18. DIRANG TSHANGLA CONSONANT PHONEMES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>Kh [kʰ]</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Ng [ŋ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ch [cʰ]</td>
<td>J [j]</td>
<td>Ny [n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Th [tʰ]</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N [n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Ph [pʰ]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>Tsh [tʃ]</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W [w]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zh</td>
<td>Z [z]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>J [j]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>L [l]</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>S [s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lh</td>
<td>Lh [l]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Das Gupta noted that the phonemes /g/, /j/, /d/ and /b/ are softened, low tone varieties of the unvoiced plosives /k/, /c/, /t/ and /p/ which are always pronounced as their unvoiced counterparts in syllable-final position.

Das Gupta considered the consonant phonemes /zh/ and /lh/, occurring marginally in the ZS, as part of the native inventory in DR. Although this might be true of phoneme /zh/, the case is less convincing for phoneme /lh/. Consider, for example, the DR lexemes /zhamu/ ‘hat’, /zhot/ ‘begin’ /zhin tha/ ‘hang (cloth)’ and /zhank ~ jank/ ‘smoke (v.)’, with their ZS cognates /mukhuling/ ‘hat’, the nativised loan lexeme /go tshuk/ ‘begin (v.)’, the lexeme /yik tha/ ‘hang up something’ and the lexemes /hap/ or /jam/ ‘smoke (v.)’. As for the sample lexemes /zhun/ ‘report (v.)’ and /zhe lok/ ‘hate (v.)’, the ZS has borrowed the honorific lexemes /zhu/ ‘report, request, ask’ and /zhe lok/ ‘hate (v.)’ from Tibetan or Dzongkha. As we have seen in paragraph 9.6, fricativisation of the phoneme /y/ in certain phonological environments to the phoneme /zh/ is also a feature of the ZS, hence the word /zhi/ ‘blood’.

Das Gupta’s sample lexemes for the phoneme /lh/ are almost exclusively loans from the liturgical language Chöke or from spoken Tibetan, in which the ZS has native /l/. So whereas DR uses /lha/ ‘idol’, /lho/ ‘south’, /lhangpa/ ‘vapour’, the ZS has /la/ ‘god, deity’,
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/lo/ ‘south’ and /langpa/ ‘steam, vapour’. Therefore, in DR, as in the ZS, phoneme /lh/ can be considered a naturalised loan phoneme. The marginal phoneme /ʣ/ of the ZS is absent in DR.

---

Table 9.19. Dirang Tshangla Initial Consonant Clusters

| kr [k̚r] | khr [kʰr] | gr [gr] |
| tr [t̚r] | dr [dr] |
| pr [p̚r] | phr [pʰr] | br [br] |
| hr [h̚r] | ps [ps] |

Das Gupta did not elaborate whether the phonemes /tr/ and /dr/ described are retroflex phones [t] and [d] or initial consonant clusters of a dental plosive followed by trill /r/. There is a noted absence of the cluster /thr/, whether it is realised as [tʰr] or [t]. The /hr/ cluster is attested in a single lexeme /hremi/ ‘servant’ and is absent from the ZS. The /ps/ cluster is attested in the lexeme /psika/ ‘outside’, in which the ZS has /phiska/. The cluster /phs/ as in for example /phsi phsi an/ ‘whistle (v.)’ or /phsin/ ‘sharpen (a knife)’ is more probably the cluster /psh/, a marginal cluster in the ZS which has corresponding /phi a/ ‘whistle (v.)’.

The absence of the /kr/ cluster from the list on p. 10-11 is an omission, as Das Gupta later on lists for example /krongcungbu/ ‘mosquito’, which in the ZS is /trongcung/ but /krongcung/ in more archaic dialects. Das Gupta also several times lists lexemes with the initial syllables /phya/, /brya/ and /lya/ for example, /phyak/ ‘untie, open’, /bryak/ ‘push, acquit’ and /lyakpu/ ‘beautiful’ which according to own data from Dirang are pronounced as /phek/, /brek/ and /lek/ with a slightly lowered half-closed front unrounded vowel [ɛ], in correspondence with their pronunciation in other Tshangla dialects.

---

Table 9.20. Dirang Tshangla Plain Vowel Phonemes

| i [i] | u [u] |
| e [ɛ] | ə [ø] | o [o] |
| a [a] |

The sole difference between the simple vowels of the ZS and DR is that DR has native close-mid front rounded vowel /ö/, a feature it seems to share with the KT and DKT dialects.
Das Gupta on p. 13 lists a total of 8 diphthong vowels. Own data, however, show that the phones [ou] and [au] are variable realisations of the phoneme /au/, and that the phones [ai], [oi] and [ae] are varying realisations of the phoneme /ai/. Furthermore, Das Gupta’s diphthong /io/, as in for example the lexeme /nyiong/ ‘get’ is already contained in the palatal nasal /ny/. This reduces the distinctive diphthong phonemes in DR to the four in Table 9.21.

**TABLE 9.21. DIRANG TSHANGLA DIPHThONG VOWEL PHONEMES.**

|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|

Despite having a rather comparative phonology, DR is lexically more divergent from the ZS than the other Bhutan and Pemakö Tshangla dialects. A comparative analysis of DR and ZS shows 83% lexical similarity among 416 nouns and pronouns, 82% lexical similarity among 262 verbs, 76% lexical similarity among 68 adjectives, and 79% lexical similarity among 74 adverbs, interrogatives and interjections.

Approximately 16.2% of the lexical variation between the ZS and DR can be attributed to semantic change. Some examples of this are given in Table 9.22.

**TABLE 9.22. LEXICAL VARIATION DUE TO SEMANTIC CHANGE IN DIRANG AND THE ZS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>ZS cognate</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>DR cognate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khpzas</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>cinse:</td>
<td>khpze:</td>
<td>biscuit</td>
<td>bes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mogon</td>
<td>wool</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mogan</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>khambei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ata</td>
<td>grandfather</td>
<td>me:me:</td>
<td>ata:</td>
<td>elder brother</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bong</td>
<td>Job’s tears</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>boŋ</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>remphong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namning</td>
<td>morning</td>
<td>wun</td>
<td>namniŋ</td>
<td>tomorrow</td>
<td>ngamcha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phuci</td>
<td>belly</td>
<td>pʰo:luŋ</td>
<td>pʰu:cinuŋ</td>
<td>belly-button</td>
<td>phuci tempong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lhak</td>
<td>be in excess</td>
<td>zak</td>
<td>luk</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>khrok, zank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leng</td>
<td>buy</td>
<td>ŋo:</td>
<td>lenŋ</td>
<td>exchange</td>
<td>leng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brak tan</td>
<td>divorce</td>
<td>brai</td>
<td>brak</td>
<td>scold</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bor</td>
<td>be angry</td>
<td>ro tsʰik</td>
<td>bor</td>
<td>fry in oil</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur</td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wur</td>
<td>brag</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thik</td>
<td>arrest</td>
<td>suŋ</td>
<td>tʰik</td>
<td>tie, bind</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lem</td>
<td>dance</td>
<td>ŋaŋ  ɾaŋ</td>
<td>lem</td>
<td>swing</td>
<td>nyang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A further 18.2% of the lexical variation can be contributed to mostly modern nouns that have been naturalized from Tibetan or Dakpa in DR, but from Tibetan, Chöke, Dzongkha, Hindi or Nepali in the ZS.

**Table 9.23. Lexical Variation Due to Loans in Dirang and the ZS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Dakpa</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>DZO/WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tsøŋ</td>
<td>onion</td>
<td>tsøŋ</td>
<td>kokpa</td>
<td>g’o:p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c’es</td>
<td>ice</td>
<td>c’es</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurum</td>
<td>worship</td>
<td>melam</td>
<td>mølam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dañga</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>jola, p’atsa</td>
<td>jola, p’atsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t’aŋ, s’am</td>
<td>bridge</td>
<td>zampa</td>
<td>zampa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p’an</td>
<td>flag</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jidoŋ</td>
<td>vein</td>
<td>tsa</td>
<td>tsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bin</td>
<td>muscle</td>
<td>tsa</td>
<td>tsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>codur</td>
<td>enemy</td>
<td>dža</td>
<td>dža</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leka</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>le:ka:</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋas</td>
<td>pillow</td>
<td>ŋa:s</td>
<td>kumdariŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zok</td>
<td>lie</td>
<td>zo:</td>
<td>soda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zamu</td>
<td>hat</td>
<td>mukšuliŋ</td>
<td>zamu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chø</td>
<td>target</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>ba:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hremi</td>
<td>servant</td>
<td>zapa, jokpa</td>
<td>za:p, jo:p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eo</td>
<td>lungs</td>
<td>lowa</td>
<td>lowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋuma</td>
<td>entrails</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>ŋuma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k’ri</td>
<td>bed, bench</td>
<td>palaŋ</td>
<td>t’i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golbera</td>
<td>tomato</td>
<td>lambendaŋ</td>
<td>lambenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bene</td>
<td>guitar</td>
<td>džampen</td>
<td>džampne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sasum</td>
<td>liver</td>
<td>c’impa</td>
<td>c’impa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sis</td>
<td>smell</td>
<td>eis</td>
<td>čeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remaining 63.6% of variety in lexical items is due to actual differences in vocabulary.

### Table 9.24. Lexical Variation in Dirang and the Zhonggar Standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>DR</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>ZS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mun</td>
<td>forest</td>
<td>bo:raŋ, c':e:ma:</td>
<td>gin</td>
<td>swallow</td>
<td>ƞoi, ƞo, mui, mो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>japu</td>
<td>butter</td>
<td>wa:si, mo:si</td>
<td>phe</td>
<td>throw</td>
<td>wuk gem, (away) wa? gem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corong</td>
<td>waterfall</td>
<td>pʰa:dar</td>
<td>shum</td>
<td>bury</td>
<td>wun pʰi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athong</td>
<td>thumb</td>
<td>tʰe:ba:</td>
<td>phas</td>
<td>cross</td>
<td>gai, gok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bes</td>
<td>bread</td>
<td>kʰeptuŋ</td>
<td>zank</td>
<td>smoke</td>
<td>hap, jum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matphrokpa</td>
<td>buttocks</td>
<td>kʰicuŋ</td>
<td>zhank</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>cot, zeŋ (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phinthang</td>
<td>maize</td>
<td>acom</td>
<td>yar</td>
<td>harvest</td>
<td>dus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyiza</td>
<td>female, woman</td>
<td>mo:, me:waksa:</td>
<td>khrop</td>
<td>store, collect dus, duŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jangser</td>
<td>brother-in-law</td>
<td>kʰotkiŋ</td>
<td>hak</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rokoi</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>cʰa:ro:, j:a:ro:, to:saŋ</td>
<td>cham</td>
<td>chew</td>
<td>ƞam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variation between the ZS and DR is even greater on the morphological level than on the lexical level. The various noun and verb suffixes representing grammatical case, mood and tense in DR are markedly different from those of the ZS. Some major differences that have been observed are represented in the form of contrastive sentences. The DR sentences have been taken from Das Gupta, whereas their ZS cognates are from own data.

The ZS has two copula <la ~ na> and <ca>. The copula <ca>, hereafter called COP1, expresses personal experience on the part of the speaker, whereas the copula <la ~ na>, hereafter called COP2, expresses either assimilated or inferred knowledge or a quality. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gamthi</th>
<th>Chin</th>
<th>Ro:zu</th>
<th>Yom</th>
<th>Float</th>
<th>Bon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sos</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Tonjuk</td>
<td>Gra</td>
<td>Like, Love</td>
<td>Lek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jornak</td>
<td>Dew</td>
<td>Jur</td>
<td>Nyep</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudiangma</td>
<td>Rainbow</td>
<td>Darmizum, Mikdum</td>
<td>Pacar phi</td>
<td>Slap</td>
<td>Lap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanabre</td>
<td>Bean</td>
<td>Orea:</td>
<td>Lan</td>
<td>Join</td>
<td>Tu, Ty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grongthang</td>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>Kotsoktanj</td>
<td>Chowang Zhi</td>
<td>Urinate</td>
<td>Cεerran Wu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamba</td>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>Jonbu</td>
<td>Sar</td>
<td>Pack</td>
<td>Go:, Rok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khominmingri</td>
<td>Honey</td>
<td>Ji, Zi</td>
<td>Phara</td>
<td>Broad, Wide</td>
<td>Ka:tan, Ts:e:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richu</td>
<td>Wave</td>
<td>Bomnanj</td>
<td>Pitpa</td>
<td>Thin, Lean</td>
<td>E:ilu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daula</td>
<td>Orphan</td>
<td>Singhza:</td>
<td>Shiri</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Jitpa:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimin</td>
<td>Quiver</td>
<td>So:re:</td>
<td>Laksum</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Merbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mai</td>
<td>Floor of a</td>
<td>T:rempanj</td>
<td>Anyingza</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Da:za:, Ze:mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangshai</td>
<td>How?</td>
<td>Ha:nten</td>
<td>Cin</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Ts:a:lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Who?</td>
<td>Ibi</td>
<td>Tsematsegan</td>
<td>Always, Ever</td>
<td>Ta:bura:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestur ya</td>
<td>How much?</td>
<td>Huptur</td>
<td>Pasera, Jokpo</td>
<td>Quickly, Fast</td>
<td>Do:zo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baktur</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Tsai:ban</td>
<td>Nyampai</td>
<td>Slowly</td>
<td>Cεaptan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gezang</td>
<td>What? How</td>
<td>Hang, Huptur</td>
<td>Cane Cane</td>
<td>Again</td>
<td>Umca:tan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gai, Amu</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>Dang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
allomorph <la> is usually reserved for third person subjects, whereas the allomorph <na> is used for unspecified or expletive subjects, as in /rok dina/ ‘he is going’, /sharang ngarna/ ‘my head aches’, /ngamsu khena/ ‘it rains’. Although for COP2 <la> is also used in DR, COP1 in this variety is confusingly <na>. For first person referents, the copula <na> is used in both the past and the non-past tenses if the agent has experienced the action or if it refers to a habit or custom. In the ZS, however, the copula <ca> is only used in the present tense and for the past tense the regular past tense marker <pa> and its allomorphs is used. In both the ZS and DR the stem extender <n> is used for verbs with a stem ending on a vowel, viz. sample sentence 9.1.

Sample sentence 9.1a:
\[
\text{jai dan- ga nyugu thur bi- na} \\
\text{1sg+ERG 3sg DAT pen one give COP1} \\
\text{I give/ I gave him a pen (DR)}
\]

Sample sentence 9.1b:
\[
\text{jang rok- ka pen thur bi- n- ca} \\
\text{1sg 3sg DAT pen one give SE COP1} \\
\text{I give/ I am giving him a pen (ZS)}
\]

Sample sentence 9.1c:
\[
\text{jang rok- ka pen thur bi- wa} \\
\text{1sg 3sg DAT pen one give PT1} \\
\text{I gave him a pen (ZS)}
\]

As we saw in paragraph 9.10, the ZS has a single set of past tense suffixes, namely those of the pa-group. According to Das Gupta (1968), DR uses the copula <na> to express the past tense for 1st person referents, but uses a different set of past tense markers for the 2nd and 3rd person subject expressing personal experience or knowledge on the part of the speaker. This DR variety of the past tense has a set of suffixes similar to the past tense markers of the ci-group in the Yabrang dialect, be it with a slightly different suffix set, namely <ci ~ chi ~ ji>. E.g. the sample sentence 9.2 ‘father went to Dirang (I saw him go).

Sample sentence 9.2a:
\[
\text{apa Dirang- ga di- n- ji} \\
\text{father Dirang LOC go SE PT2} \\
\text{Father went to Dirang (DR)}
\]

Sample sentence 9.2b:
\[
\text{apa Dirang- ga di- wa}
\]
father dirang LOC go PT1
Father went to Dirang (ZS).

If the same action as above was not witnessed by the speakers, COP2 is added in both the ZS and DR to the regular past tense from the pa-group. I.e. the sentence ‘father went to Dirang (so I heard)’ in sample sentence 9.3.

Sample sentence 9.3a:
apa Dirang- ga di- n- ma- la
father Dirang LOC go SE PT1 COP2
Father went to Dirang (DR).

Sample sentence 9.3b:
apa Dirang ga di- wa- la
father Dirang LOC go PT1 COP2
Father went to Dirang (ZS).

In DR a possessive phrase combines the verb /cho/ ‘stay’ followed by COP1 with the possessive case. In the ZS, COP1 in combination with the possessive case indicates possession. Compare the sample sentences 9.4 and 9.5.

Sample sentence 9.4a:
jang- ga khu thur cho- na
1sg POS dog one stay COP1
I have a dog (DR).

Sample sentence 9.4b:
jang- ga khu thur ca
1sg POS dog one COP1
I have a dog (ZS).

Sample sentence 9.5a:
jang- ga khu ma- na
1sg POS dog NEG COP1
I don’t have a dog (DR).

Sample sentence 9.5b:
jang- ga khu ma- n- ca
1sg POS dog NEG SE COP1
I don’t have a dog (ZS).
The comitative mood is expressed in the ZS with the mood suffix \(<\text{kap}\)>. In DR companionship is expressed through the adverbia\(l\) construction \(/\text{depka}/\), from the verb \(/\text{dem}/\) ‘unite, join’ in the locative case. The suffix \(<\text{dep}\) also denotes comitativity in Lepcha (Plaisier 1996:200), and it is cognate with \(\text{ϙŵī}/\text{dep}/\) in WrittenTibetan. Pronouns are placed in the possessive case, but other nouns in the absolutive case. The NP suffixes in the ZS end on the vowel \(/e/\), whereas in DR they end on the vowel \(/o/\). Compare the sample sentence 9.6.

Sample sentence 9.6a:
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{n} \quad \text{ash} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{s} \quad \text{p} \\
2sg \quad 1pl \quad POS \quad join \quad LOC \quad come \quad DAT \quad need \quad NP \\
\text{You should come with us (DR).}
\end{array}
\]

Sample sentence 9.6b:
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{n} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{shi} \quad \text{k} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{k} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{l} \\
1sg \quad 1pl \quad excl \quad COM \quad come \quad NP \quad need \quad NP \\
\text{You should come with us (ZS).}
\end{array}
\]

The dative case in the ZS is expressed through the same suffix as the locative and possessive case suffix, \(<\text{ga} \sim \text{ka}>\). In DR the dative case is similarly expressed through the suffix \(<\text{ga}>\). If the dative is used in the meaning of ‘for the purpose of’, we can also find the dative suffix \(<\text{cokkai}>,\) with \(<\text{kai}>\) the common ablative suffix if preceded with by an unvoiced stop and \(<\text{cok}>\) of unknown origin. In the ZS, the equivalent is the dative case plus optional \(<\text{dengai}>\) ‘for the reason of, for the purpose of’, from \(<\text{dentha}>\) ‘goal, purpose, meaning’. If not \(<\text{cokkai}>\) or \(<\text{dengai}>\) is used but only the dative case suffix, confusion with the possessive case is likely, as the example sentences 9.7 and 9.8 illustrate.

Sample sentence 9.7a:
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{d} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{m} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{h} \\
\text{villager} \quad \text{ERG} \quad \text{school} \quad \text{DAT} \quad \text{building} \quad \text{make} \quad NP \quad QUES \\
\text{Will the villagers construct a building for the school? (DR)}
\end{array}
\]

Sample sentence 9.7b:
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{d} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{k} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{b} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{h} \\
\text{villager} \quad \text{ERG} \quad \text{school} \quad \text{DAT} \quad \text{purpose} \quad \text{building} \quad \text{make} \quad NP \quad QUES \\
\text{Will the villagers construct a building for the school? (ZS)}
\end{array}
\]

Sample sentence 9.8a:
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{d} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{m} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{b} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{h} \\
\text{villager} \quad \text{ERG} \quad \text{school} \quad \text{DAT}/\text{POS} \quad \text{building} \quad \text{make} \quad NP \quad QUES
\end{array}
\]
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Will the villagers construct a building for the school?
Will the villagers construct a school building? (DR)

Sample sentence 9.8b:

dukhapa- gi lobdra- ga phai cot- pe mo
villager ERG school DAT/POS building make NP QUES
Will the villagers construct a building for the school?
Will the villagers construct a school building? (ZS)

The ablative case in the ZS is expressed through the suffix <gai ~ kai>. In DR the same suffix is only used for inanimate objects. For human objects, including pronouns, the suffix <mekkai> is used, with <kai> the common ablative case suffix if preceded by an unvoiced stop. Compare the sample sentence 9.9

Sample sentence 9.9a:

jai dorji- mekkai nyugu thur pha- wo
1sg ERG dorji ABL pen one bring NP
I will bring a pen from Dorji (DR).

Sample sentence 9.9b:

jang dorji- gai pen thur pha- le
1sg dorji ABL pen one bring NP
I will bring a pen from Dorji (ZS).

In the imperative mood the ZS has the mood suffix <sho ~ co ~ yo ~ Ø> depending on the stem final of the verb. In DR a much wider range of suffixes is used, namely <u ~ i ~ ku ~ khu ~ cu ~ chu ~ shu ~ ru ~ Ø>, again depending on the verb stem final.

In the ZS, questions can be made either by using a question word and the question particle /ya/ or by using the question particle /mo/. In DR, if a question word is used in combination with a verb, the question particle is not necessary, but the verb takes a verbal stem suffix for question sentences on <e>, which in the ZS is reserved for the non-past tense. If a verb is used with the question particle <mo> the verb takes the regular tense ending. In the ZS, however, the non-past verbal suffix in negative constructions is the same as the past tense suffix in positive constructions. Compare the sample sentence 9.10 to 9.12.

Sample sentence 9.10a:

nan tochang za- lo mo
2sg food eat NP QUES
Will you eat food? (DR)
Sample sentence 9.10b:
nan to za- le mo
2sg food eat QUES
Will you eat food? (ZS)

Sample sentence 9.11a:
ba (-ga) di- le
where (DAT) go QUES
Where are you going? (DR)

Sample sentence 9.11b:
o (-ga) di- le (ya)
where (DAT) go NP QUES
Where are you going? (ZS)

Sample sentence 9.12a:
ba (-ga) di- ne
where (LOC) go QUES
Where did you go? (DR)

Sample sentence 9.12b:
o (-ga) di- wa (ya)
where (DAT) go PT1 QUES
Where did you go? (ZS)

Sample sentence 9.13a:
rincin- gi jang- ga are jam- bo mo ma jam-
rincin ERG 1sg DAT liquor drink NP QUES NEG drink
Rinchen asked me whether I would drink liquor or not. (DR)
be mo jim- shi
NP QUES QUES ask PT2

Sample sentence 9.13b:
rinchen- gi jang- ga ara jam- me mo ma jam-
rinchen ERG 1sg DAT liquor drink NP QUES NEG drink
Rinchen asked me whether I would drink liquor or not. (ZS)
ma mo jim- ma
NPNEG QUES ASK PT1

What the sentences above are intended to show, is that whereas phonologically the ZS and
the Dirang dialect of Tshangla are relatively similar, on the level of morphology and syntax
there are considerable differences between the two varieties, to the extent that mutual
intelligibility is often problematic. Dirang Tshangla is unmistakably the most aberrant
Tshangla variety. Various hypotheses can be proposed to explain the linguistic variation between Dirang Tshangla and the other Tshangla dialects. Though descending from the same Proto-Tshangla language, perhaps the settlers of Dirang and the settlers of Dungsam split at an early stage in history, leading to two very divergent versions of the same language in the course of history. In this case, however, one would actually expect a much larger phonological and lexical variation between Dirang Tshangla and the various Bhutan Tshangla dialects than has been attested till now.

If the maternal ancestors of the Tshangla people originated from the Yunnan-Burma border area and migrated through the foothills north of the Brahmaputra, it could well be that the ancestors of the Dirang Tshangla followed the Bhareli/Bichom river valley and settled among the native population in their present location. The ancestors of the Dungsam Tshangla speakers moved further westward and settled in the undulating foothills of Dungsam. But perhaps, the speakers of Dirang Tshangla, like the speakers of all Tshangla dialects, originate in the Dungsam area. They gradually moved eastward and northward along the Gongri river valley, settling the Gamri river valley where they developed in the distinct second set of past tense morphemes before moving eastward into the Dirang area. There, relative isolation and linguistic and genetic admixture from the native populations resulted in the divergent language we observe today. This hypothesis would be supported if linguistic features characteristic of the languages of the Kho-bwa cluster could be shown to form a part of Dirang Tshangla. In other words, that a historical relative of these languages forms the substrate language from which Dirang Tshangla retrieves its distinctiveness from other Tshangla dialects, particularly in morphology. A more in depth analysis of the languages spoken among and to the immediate east of the Dirang Tshangla speakers, in particular Bugun, Sherdukpen, Lishpa, Chugpa and Butpa, and especially their verbal and nominal morphologies, would provide better insight into the validity of either of these theories.

If, instead, the origin of the Tshangla people is assumed to be in the northeast of the Tibetan plateau, the split could have taken place already before the crossing of the Himalayan range. Whereas the ancestors of the Dungsam speakers followed the Kuri river valley from Lhodrak and/or the Kholong/Gongri river valley, the ancestors of the speakers of the Dirang dialect might have followed the Nyamnyang river valley and crossed the Sela pass into their present location. Later East Bodish settlers- the Kurtöp and Dzala of Eastern Bhutan and the Dakpa of Tawang- might have pushed the Tshangla further to the south. This last hypothesis
is, considering the present habitat and livelihoods of the Tshangla, less likely than the first option.


Joka geok is located in Zhemgang dzongkhak on the west bank of the Manas river, near the confluence of the Chamkarchu and Drangmechu rivers. The area was traditionally known as دیککر / دیککر Kheng Brokkar or Byokhang which in Dzongkha became دیککر / دیککر Bjoka [bjoka] but in the local vernacular is pronounced as Joka [joka].

To the west we can find Kheng speaking communities, to the north across the Chamkarchu the Gongdup speakers, and to the east and south of the Drangmechu river speakers of the Dungsam dialect of Tshangla. Almost 36% of Joka’s 2,400 strong population speaks Tshangla. Tshangla speakers can also be found in دیککر Pramaling and دیککر Idi villages of Trong geok. Joka Tshangla is similar to Dungsam Tshangla and represents a fairly recent migration from the Dungsam area, perhaps not dating from before the second half of the 19th century. Before that, Joka was inhabited by Kheng speakers and ruled by members of the Joka Khoche belonging to the Byar clan91, just like nearby Ngangla, until it was absorbed by the Drukpa state and ruled from Trongsa through the dzong at Zhemgang92. Because Kheng is the majority language in the geok, Joka Tshangla has extensively borrowed from this language. There has been no previous description of the Joka dialect of Tshangla.

9.13.5. The Lower Trashigang Dialect (LT).

The Lower Trashigang dialect is spoken in Thrimshing and Wamrong dungkhaks of Trashigang dzongkhak. The Khaling area and some of the duars were apparently divided in an inner and outer area controlled by two kings descending from the Je clan93. The area of present-day Lumang and the hills and plains to the south were ruled by the Wangma clan94, whereas the Kangpar area was the traditional territory of the Yede clan95. The entire area came under Trashigang after the Drukpa annexation96.

91 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.
92 Ref. paragraph 6.3 and 7.1.2.
93 Ref. paragraphs 4.2.6 and 6.4.
94 Ref. paragraph 4.2.5.
95 Ref. paragraph 4.2.4.
96 Ref. paragraph 7.1.6.
Broadly speaking, the southern variety of the LT dialect, spoken in Lumang, Thrimshing and Kangpar geok (LTS) slightly differs from the northern variety spoken in Khaling geok (LTN) due to the dividing factor of the Kharungla pass, with traits from the Dungsam dialects more pronounced in villages located further south. A major distinctive lexical feature that the LTS dialect shares with the DKT dialects is the usage of /pasang/ instead of /joktang/ for ‘potato’. In all geoks, language retention is high and Tshangla is spoken by over 90% of the population in Thrimshing and Kangpar and over 80% of the population in Lumang and Khaling geoks. The descriptions of Tshangla by Norwegian missionary doctors like Melbostadt and are based on this dialect, but these descriptions were not available at the time of writing.


The Upper Trashigang dialect is spoken on the east bank of the Gongri or Drangmechu river. The dialect area encompasses the geoks of Uzorong and Kanglung. Whereas Kanglung was traditionally part of the Nyima Chungrik area ruled by the Je clan\textsuperscript{97}, Uzorong was ruled by the Byar clan\textsuperscript{98}. Kanglung, with its khar at Domkhar and Tsenkhar, is located on the main trade route from Tibet, via Tawang and the historically important area around Cenkhar and later Trashigang Dzong, to the plains of India\textsuperscript{99}. Uzorong has traditionally been much more isolated, which is reflected in the minor differences that exist between the varieties spoken in these two geoks. The UT dialect is fairly close to the ZS, as Egli-Roduner’s 1987 data show. The presence of Bhutan’s first college of higher education in Kanglung has resulted in relatively low language retention of 75% to 85% of the rural population to less than 50% in Kanglung municipal area. Particular features of the dialect include the word-final vowel /u/ where other dialects have word-final vowel /a/, an advanced degree of monophthongisation of diphthongs /oi/ and /ai/ to vowel /e/ and the imperative suffix <yo> following verbal stems ending on a vowel instead of the more commonly used suffix <i>.

\textsuperscript{97} Ref. paragraph 4.2.6.
\textsuperscript{98} Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.
\textsuperscript{99} Ref. paragraph 5.6.
9.13.7. THE GAMRI LUNGPA DIALECT (GL).

The Gamri Lungpa dialect is named after the old name of the Gamri river valley. The dialect area encompasses Samkhar, Bartsham, Bidung, Radi and Phongme geoks located on the banks of the Gamri river as well as Ramjar geok directly north of Bartsham. The Je, Jowo and Yede clans\(^{100}\) ruled the area from their respective khar until the Drukpa annexation in the 17th century. After that, the area was ruled form Trashigang Dzong, with drungpas and local nobility descending from Buddhist religious figures maintaining local power.

Due to the geographic proximity and the longstanding matrimonial, economic, religious and political ties with Tawang and the Gelukpa administration there, the inhabitants of the area seem to have borne the brunt of the Drukpa campaign in the east. Moreover, since the main economic and administrative centre of Trashigang was located in the area, the villages were heavily exploited by the local administration from the early 18th till the late 19th century\(^{101}\). Migration from this area to Pemakö\(^{102}\) left the area largely deserted until the government encouraged internal migration from other areas during the early 20th century. As a result, we can find Chocangaca speakers in several villages and hamlets, most notably Dzongthung under Bartsham and Galing under Shongphu geok, Kheng speakers in Tongling village under Radi geok, Dungsampa speakers in Samkhar and Radi geok and Dakpa speakers under several villages in Radi and Phongme geoks. The percentage of Tshangla speakers in Bartsham and Shongphu geoks is slightly lower than 70%, around 75% in Radi and Phongme geoks, around 86% in Bidung, and 90% in Ramjar. Due to the extensive inward migration, the GL dialect is Tshangla is perhaps not a single dialect, but rather an amalgamation of various Tshangla dialects, most notably those of DKD and the ZS. This dialect, in particular the variety spoken in Radi, has been partially described by Wangdi (2000), and Andvik chose the dialect of Trashigang town as the standard for the description of his Tshangla grammar.


A very conspicuous Tshangla dialect was first recorded by Wangdi (2005). He noted the distinctiveness of the Tshangla variety spoken by the almost 200 households in Yabrang, Janjanma and Phimsong villages to the northeast of his home village Radi, particularly from a

\(^{100}\) Ref. paragraphs 4.2.6, 4.2.2 and 4.2.4 respectively.

\(^{101}\) Ref. paragraphs 7.1.3. and 7.6.

\(^{102}\) Ref. paragraph 8.3.2.
morphological point of view. This dialect, here called the Yabrang dialect in recognition of this primary observation, is not spoken in the nearby Tshangla village of Saleng under Bidung geok, and in the nearby village of Pengtsi (Pyaungchi) Dakpa is spoken, just like in the villages of Bemteng and Thongrong located behind the Ralang mountain. In the remainder of Phongme geok located on the opposite bank of the Gamri river the variety is not spoken either. Tshangla varieties sharing many distinctive characteristics with the Yabrang dialect have been attested from the majority of villages in Pemakō as well as from several rural Tshangla communities in Bhutan. In Khamdang and Ramjar geoks of Trashiyangtsi, the dialect occurs as a social dialect considered a crude, unrefined and old-fashioned way of speaking reserved for communication within the own family and close circle of friends. In communication with other Tshangla speakers, people who use this variety in the informal setting at home will consciously try to replace any markers of distinctiveness with what is considered the ‘standard’. The fact that many of the distinct features of the YB dialect occur in Pemakō Tshangla provide indications that this dialect closely represents Tshangla as it was spoken in the Gamri river valley and beyond before the migration to Pemakō in the latter half of the 17th and the first half of the 18th century. Perhaps, relative isolation in a remote nook of the valley meant that the people of Yabrang and Phimsong did not migrate to Pemakō.


Directly to the north of the area where the GL dialect is spoken we can find the geoks of Yalang, Khamdang and Tötsho, located on the banks of the Gongri river under Trashiyangtsi dzongkhak. This dialect has been called the Brong Doksum dialect in reference to the old name of the area. The area was the traditional territory of the Tungde and Je clans. The area is bordered by the Dakpa/Dzala speaking area to the east and north and by the Kholongchu river and the Chocangaca speaking area on the west. An east-west ridge separates the area from the Gamri river valley. Just below 75% of the people of Yalang geok speak Tshangla, with Dakpa speakers inhabiting Dukti village. For Khamdang geok, where Dakpa/Dzala and Chocangaca speakers can be found, the percentage of Tshangla speakers is almost 65%, and in Tötsho geok where Dakpa speakers form a slight majority this is less than

103 Ref. paragraph 9.9.3 and 9.9.5.
104 Ref. paragraph 8.3.2.
105 Ref. footnote 26 to Chapter 4.
106 Ref. paragraph 4.2.4 and 4.2.6.
50%. This dialect has considerable influences from Dakpa/Dzala as well as from DKD dialect due to migration in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. There are some indications that area was part of the Dakpa speaking area and that the Tshangla migrations were only of a later date. There has been no description of the BD dialect.


The area east of the Sheri river, north of the Gongri river and west of the Kholongchu river was known as the lands of the Tsengmi. Historically the area later became part of the Nyima Cherik area ruled by the Je clan. Present day Tongmizhangtshen geok was part of the area until the settlement of Chocangaca speakers. The TM dialect spoken in this area is used by almost 90% of the people in Jamkhar geok under Trashiyangtsi dzongkhak but only by around 70% of the people in Yangnyer geok under Trashigang dzongkhak, where migrant Kheng speakers can also be found. The TM dialect is furthermore spoken by over 90% of the people in Narang, Balam and Drametse geoks under Monggar dzongkhak. Slight variations exist primarily between the eastern variety spoken in Jamkhar and Yangnyer (TME) and the western variety spoken in Narang, Balam and Drametse (TMW). The TMW dialects are closer to the ZS dialect in some respects, and the inclusion of the variety spoken in Narang, Balam and Drametse geoks under Monggar dzongkhak. Slight variations are based on the historical reasons than on linguistic considerations. Especially the Drametse area has traditionally served as an area of outward migration, primarily to the Gamri area. No description of this dialect is available.

9.13.11. The Zhonggar Standard Dialect (ZS) and its Varieties.

The Zhonggar dialect consists of at least four closely related dialect varieties and a single markedly different variety spoken west of the Sheri and Gongri rivers and east of the Kuri river. The area was part of the Nyima Cherik area ruled by chiefs and kings claiming descent from the Je clan. The Zhonggar Moiwalung area just to the west of the Kuri river, however, was divided among several kings belonging to the Je and Byar clans as well as the several rulers claiming descent from the Dung. This historical division is perhaps reflected in the multilingual situation in this area, with Chocangaca, Tshangla, Khengkha and Bumthangkha

---

107 Ref. footnote 19 to Chapter 4.
108 Ref. paragraph 4.2.6 and 4.2.3 respectively.
109 Ref. paragraph 4.4.2 and 4.4.4.
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speakers living in close distance from each other. The Tshangla spoken in the villages in this area, most notably in బాంగీసీబి and త్సేన్సబి Tsenzabi, is lexically rather peculiar. To the north the area is now bordered by the Chocangaca and Chali speaking areas, to the west and southwest by the Kheng and Gongduk speaking area, to the east by the TM dialect area and to the southeast across the Gongri river to the DKD and UT dialect areas. From the 17th century onwards, the historical Zhonggar Dzon became the principal administrative centre for Eastern Bhutan, although this was moved to the current town of Monggar itself in the middle of the 20th century.

The ZS proper is spoken in the villages of Monggar geok around the present-day town of Monggar 110. In these villages language retention is well over 90%, but speakers of other languages, notably Chocangaca and Chali have settled in the bustling town of Monggar itself. Despite this, Tshangla remains the lingua franca. The ZS proper is also spoken by 95% of the population in Drepong geok. A slightly different variety of the ZS is spoken east of the Korila by around 85% of the population in Ngatshang and Sherimuhung geoks (ZSNS). In the geoks of Thangrong and Chaskhar a markedly different variety (ZSTC) is spoken within the household by over 93% of the population. The variety is mainly characterised by diphthongisation in verbal morphological construction such as /maukala/ ‘is not, has not’ instead of /mala ~ mawa/, /giukala/ ‘is, has’ instead of /gila ~ giwala/. Also peculiar is the usage of /bokpi/ ‘flour’ for ZS /to/ ‘food’ and /pan/ ‘betel leaf, betel nut, leaf and lime condiment’ for ZS /tengma/ ‘parched maize’. Another peculiar variety, in some aspects approaching the DKD dialect, is spoken by 93% of the population in Kengkhar and Jurme geoks (ZSKJ) 111. A lexical peculiarity of this variety if the use of /dorjan/ instead of /brumsha/ for ‘pumpkin’, a feature adopted by the ZS. The phonology of the ZS has been extensively described in paragraph 9.6.

---

110 These villages include Wangling, Nakling, Nekhang, Jamcholing, Barpang, Phosorong, Kidekhar, Jaibap, Wengkhar, Yakpugang, Themmanbi, Koinbar and Takehu.

111 Relations between Jurme and Kengkhar and the Dungsam area were traditionally strong. Members of the Wang Khoche of the Je clan of Kengkhar, for example, spread across the Gongri to Benangkhar, Khengzor, Pam, Naksiri and Nangkor in Dungsam (Norbu 2004: 56-57).
Chapter 9. The Tshangla.


Tshangla as spoken in Pemakö is not really a dialect, but rather reflects the diverse origin of the Tshangla people who have settled in the area since the late 17th century. The following analysis makes use of the Tshangla linguistic data from Pemakö collected from the mid 1970s till the mid 1980s as reported in Zhāng (1988). Three major complicating factors in the analysis of these data have been the inaccessibility of the source material because it is written in Chinese, the fact that at least two linguistic varieties are presented as one single language, and the bias that the linguistic background of the authors has on the description of the language.

According to Zhāng (1988) broadly two varieties can be distinguished. The variety (PKB) spoken in most villages in Pemakö, including Bipung village on which Zhāng bases most of his description, closely resembles the Yabrang dialect and would thus represent one of the earlier settlements, dating back to the late 17th and 18th century. Zhāng (1988) also refers to data from a 1976 survey in Didong village earlier published in Zhāng (1980:71-74). Although he does not specifically mention this, PKD appears to have a different origin than PKB and therefore to constitute a different dialect within PK. For example, PKD has a distinctive voiced palatal fricative [ژ] besides the unvoiced palatal fricative [ژ] (Zhāng 1988:5). This voiced palatal fricative [ژ] is absent in PKB, according to Zhāng because it merged with [ژ] (1988:11), but ostensibly also because instead the palatal glide [j] is used, a feature also present in the ZS. Furthermore Zhāng (1988: footnote p. 10) mentions that for PKD speakers a low-level and high-level tone exists, but that this tone is non-distinctive. A final difference is, that in morphological constructions in PKD involving verbal stems ending on vowels and on unvoiced plosives [k], [t] and [p], the plosive is replaced by a glottalised nasal [m], [n] or [ŋ] respectively (Zhāng:19-20). This feature is much rarer in PKB, but quite common in most Tshangla dialects in Bhutan. Thus, in terms of origin, the variety spoken in Didong village (PKD) closely resembles the ZS, and the people of Didong might therefor be the descendants of relatively more recent arrivals than speakers of the PKB variety. The phoneme inventory of PKB according to Zhāng is presented in the tables 9.25 to 9.29.
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**Table 9.25. Pemakö Tshangla Consonant Phonemes and Their Cognates in the ZS Between Brackets.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k [k~g]</td>
<td>k' [kʰ]</td>
<td>? [-]</td>
<td>η [ŋ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w [w~dz]</td>
<td>w' [wʰ]</td>
<td>η [ŋ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t [t~d]</td>
<td>t' [tʰ]</td>
<td>n [n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts [t~d]</td>
<td>ts' [tʰ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p [p~b]</td>
<td>p' [pʰ]</td>
<td>m [m]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts [ts]</td>
<td>ts' [tsʰ]</td>
<td>w [w]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r [r]</td>
<td>l [l]</td>
<td>sh [ʃ]</td>
<td>s [s~z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h [h]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zhāng (1988:5) mentions that the glottal stop [ʔ] is only present in high-tone syllables starting with a vowel and that it is generally not pronounced.

**Table 9.26. Pemakö Tshangla Marginal and Nativised Consonant Phonemes.**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dz [dz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh [ʐ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lh [ɻ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Zhāng (1988:5), the phonemes [ʂ], [dz] and [ɻ] are loan phonemes in PK, whereas phoneme [ʐ] is native in PKD, but merged with phoneme [ʃ] in PKB (Zhāng 1988:11). The few lexemes in which phoneme [ʐ] occurs or phoneme [ʃ] is present in the low tone are all lexemes borrowed from Tibetan.

**Table 9.27. Pemakö Tshangla Initial Consonant Clusters.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr [pr]</td>
<td>phr [pʰr]</td>
<td>br [bɾ]</td>
<td>mr [mɾ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The initial consonant clusters and the vowel inventories of the ZS and PK are expectedly similar, but there is more variation from a lexical point of view.

A comparative analysis of PK and the ZS shows 89% lexical similarity among 470 nouns and pronouns, 92% lexical similarity among 288 verbs, 79% lexical similarity among 79 adjectives, and 94% lexical similarity among 49 adverbs, propositions, interrogatives and interjections. Approximately 9.9% of the lexical variation between the ZS and PK can be attributed to semantic change. Some examples of this are given in Table 9.30.

It is interesting to note that 18.2% of the lexical variation can be contributed to mostly modern nouns that are nativised loans from Tibetan in PK and nativised loans from Tibetan, Chöke or Dzongkha or from Hindi and Nepali in the ZS. Some examples of nativised
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borrowings with the source languages are given in table 9.30. As earlier mentioned, the Bhutan Tshangla dialects have extensively borrowed from Chöke and Tibetan during the 1200 years of political and religious contact with the Tibetan plateau. These dialects have also extensively borrowed from Dzongkha, and Dzongkha lexical forms have replaced native Tshangla vocabulary in all semantic fields. Some archaic or native forms preserved in Pemakö and Dirang Tshangla were brought to my attention recently\textsuperscript{112}. One example is the Tibetan-derived verb टिबट ‘good, well’, Bhutan Tshangla /lek/ ‘like, enjoy, love’ as in ji nan lekla ‘I like you’ and its derivate adjective /lekpu/ ‘well, fine (also: good, nice, beautiful) as in nan lekpurang ca mo ‘are you fine?’ which in Dirang, Kalaktang and Pemakö Tshangla has retained the native /(sem) phe/ ‘like, enjoy, love’ as in Kalaktang and Dirang Tshangla ja sem nan phena ‘I like you’ and /rema/ as in Kalaktang and Pemakö Tshangla nan rema ca mo ‘are you fine?’ . ZS adjective <lekpu> ‘good’ and its negation <lekpu mala> ‘bad’ has the native <phelu> ‘good (of a person)’ and <shanpu> ‘bad, evil (of a person)’ preserved in many dialects and among older speakers. The ZS has also borrowed extensively from Hindi and Nepali. On the other hand, Pemakö Tshangla has borrowed extensively from Tibetan, and many modern terms are directly derived from Chinese or borrowed through Tibetan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PK</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>ZS</th>
<th>Dzongkha</th>
<th>Hindi/Nepali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eakl\kuml</td>
<td>liver</td>
<td>cʰiŋpa:</td>
<td>cʰiŋpa:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñe\lkurl</td>
<td>mosquito net</td>
<td>siŋre:</td>
<td>siri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e\ll-pu\lraml</td>
<td>sugar</td>
<td>cini, buram</td>
<td>cini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k\a\lparl</td>
<td>telephone</td>
<td>kʰaba</td>
<td>pʰon, jy̚tiŋ</td>
<td>jy̚tiŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñe\ls\ši\l</td>
<td>bed</td>
<td>n̚e̚ti</td>
<td>pʰa:luŋ</td>
<td>pʰa:luŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j\n\l\la\l</td>
<td>candle</td>
<td>jən̚la</td>
<td>mombatti</td>
<td>mombatti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t\sak\ls\sa\l</td>
<td>match</td>
<td>t̚ak̚ta</td>
<td>me:ti</td>
<td>me:ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo\l\sa\l</td>
<td>car</td>
<td>mətʃa</td>
<td>ga:ri</td>
<td></td>
<td>gari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t\uu</td>
<td>boat</td>
<td>ḷu</td>
<td>nau, ḷu</td>
<td>ḷu</td>
<td>nau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p\o\l</td>
<td>salary</td>
<td>to:lop</td>
<td>talap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e\na\t\la</td>
<td>the other</td>
<td>zhăn</td>
<td>bra:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ji\ls\i\l</td>
<td>soap</td>
<td>jitsi</td>
<td>kʰa:ri, ləŋlep, sabun</td>
<td>ləŋlep</td>
<td>sabun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{112} Tenzin Chonjor, pers. comm., 13-12-2011.
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The remaining 63.6% of variety in lexical items is due to actual differences in vocabulary, with some example shown table 9.31.

### TABLE 9.32. LEXICAL VARIATION IN PEMAKÖ AND THE ZS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pemakö Tshangla</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>ZS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>konl’ceŋl</td>
<td>squirrel</td>
<td>kotsoktaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roŋl’ceŋl-puŋl</td>
<td>spider</td>
<td>joŋdama, nakpuludama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munl</td>
<td>forest</td>
<td>boruŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kam’-tiŋl</td>
<td>chin</td>
<td>rozu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paŋl</td>
<td>store for cups</td>
<td>pregum, p’ak’ataŋ buŋka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p’eml</td>
<td>pancake</td>
<td>keptataŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap’-kaŋl</td>
<td>machete</td>
<td>patañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tɛ’e’lwaŋ p’iŋl</td>
<td>sprout</td>
<td>ŋom lik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k’o’roŋk-πiŋl</td>
<td>bent</td>
<td>k’arrak’orro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praŋl’puŋl</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>dukpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tɛa’-raŋk-πaŋl</td>
<td>thin (of people)</td>
<td>ŋetala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k’onl’seŋl</td>
<td>just now</td>
<td>omadįŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p’ar’ləŋŋama</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>tabunabu, taburan芳</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noted especially in this last table that a few words in PK are different in the ZS, but the same in DR e.g. /mun/ ‘forest’, /gamti/ ‘chin’, /khonsecret/ ‘just now’ and /pharjongma/ ‘always’. It is also interesting to note that PK and the ZS share the same vocabulary for some cereals and vegetables originating in the Americas and introduced to the area sometime in the 16th century, such as /ashom/ ‘maize’, /mo/ ‘amaranth’, /brumsha/ ‘pumpkin’ and /solo/ ‘chili’. A notable exception to this is the potato, which is usually called /joktang/ in Bhutan, a word said to derive from the British diplomat George Bogle who is said to have introduced the potato to Eastern Bhutan in the second half of the 18th century (jok-tang ‘George’s present’). The archaic dialects of Bhutan and DR, like PK, have preserved the much older

---

113 Pemakö Tshangla herein distinguishes between /lok/ ‘read’ and /lak-lhak/ ‘study’, whereas the ZS has /lak-lhak/ ‘read’ and /lam/ ‘study’.
/pasang/, whereas /gong/ is usually reserved for several wild tubers of the genus *Diascorea*. This observation lends further linguistic evidence to the PK origin in eastern Bhutan and the adjoining areas of Kameng, and the date of their migration sometime between the 16th and the 18th century.

### 9.13.13. **THE MIAO REFUGEE DIALECT (MR).**

Among the considerable Tshangla refugee community that now forms part of the Tibetan diaspora, a peculiar variety of Tshangla is developing. This dialect has been called the Miao Refugee dialect after the largest refugee settlement. The main characteristic of this dialect is the profuse use of Tibetan and Hindi loanwords. The phonology of Lhasa Tibetan has also influenced Tshangla phonology. But independent developments can also be observed, such as for example fricatisation of the aspirated alveolar plosive, as in Pemakö Tshangla [usu] vs. Zhonggar Standard [ut⁴u] ‘this’, and the use of first person plural pronoun /ati/ instead of /aibakki/ or /ashi/. The Miao dialect considerably differs from the Pemakö dialect spoken in Tibet, and in absence of contact between the communities this divergence is expected to increase in the near future.

### 9.14. **TSHANGLA ORTHOGRAPHY.**

For orthographic development, a certain speech variety has to be selected as the standard. Ideally, the resulting system will also be able to accommodate all phonological variation in the various dialects. The choice of the Zhonggar Standard has been defended in paragraph 10.6.

### 9.14.1. **THE ’UCEN SCRIPT, CHÖKE, AND WRITTEN DZONGKHA.**

Tibetan chronicles record that the dbucan ’Ucen script was designed by thonmi sambhotra, a minister of the first of the three great religious kings of Tibet Songtsen Gampo, somewhere in the middle of the 7th century AD. Thönmi Sambotra based his script on the northwestern variety of the seventh-century Gupta or Northern Brahmi script at that time in vogue in the Indian subcontinent. The spelling of the Central Tibetan (Lhasa) dialect of Tibetan as it is being used today represents the phonology and morphology of Tibetan, or Old Tibetan, at the time the language was codified in written form, i.e. the 7th century AD, with thirty consonants...
and five vowels and no tonal distinctions. According to DeLancey (2003: 255) ‘scribal errors in texts show that the simplification of consonant clusters distinguishing most modern Tibetan dialects from the written form had already begin by the tenth century’. Because of this linguistic change, there is no longer a one-on-one correspondence between the written and the spoken Tibetan language. The written Classical Tibetan language is called chosskad Chöke or ‘religious tongue’, the liturgical language. Classical Tibetan has been well described, and a description of Classical Tibetan can be found in, for example, DeLancey (2003:255-269).

Dzongkha, the language of the inhabitants of western Bhutan, has been the language of the higher echelons of society, government and administration since at least the 12th century AD (Van Driem 1987, 1997, 1998, 2003:3). Although based on spoken Old Tibetan which was introduced to western Bhutan by successive waves of Tibetan immigrants, spoken Dzongkha mixed with an indigenous language or perhaps several indigenous languages and underwent a process of linguistic change markedly different from spoken Tibetan. Perhaps unfortunately, Chöke has continued to exert great influence on spoken and particularly written Dzongkha. In fact, only by 1961 was Dzongkha by Royal Degree made the national language of Bhutan. Until 1971 the Dzongkha taught in Bhutanese schools was essentially Chöke. Only by 1971 did concerted efforts begin to commit spoken Dzongkha to writing in the ’Ucen script. Since then many textbooks, dictionaries, manuals and handbooks have been published for various audiences, such as primary and secondary level students, civil servants, illiterate people, Nepali-speaking citizens and foreigners. Although various attempts were made to weaken the relationship between spoken and written Dzongkha on the one hand and Chöke on the other, conservative elements in Bhutanese society have for long prevented this, and a rigorous spelling reform has not been initiated. Dzongkha has not yet adopted a modern updated phonological spelling in the ’Ucen script. This, perhaps, partly explains the perceived difficulty of learning and internalising written Dzongkha among students and civil servants, despite continued efforts to popularise the language. For many Bhutanese, reading, speaking and understanding Dzongkha is not the biggest hurdle, but when it comes to committing Dzongkha to ’Ucen writing, however, the Chöke spelling rules still permeating the Dzongkha spelling create a situation of ‘what you say is not what you should write’.

Van Driem (1987, 1997, 1998) devised a Romanisation for the standard dialect of modern Dzongkha following a phonological transcription using the Roman alphabet and three diacritic marks. The apostrophe marks high tone in syllables beginning with a nasal,
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liquid or vowel. At the beginning of a syllable the apostrophe marks a devoiced consonant followed by a low tone murmured vowel when following an initial consonant. The circumflex accent marks long vowels. The trema indicates a long, apophonic vowel.

The phonology of the other languages of Bhutan and the neighbouring areas are essentially different from the phonology of spoken Tibetan, Chôke or Dzongkha. The conventions that are required to commit these languages to writing in 'Ucen require careful analysis and discussion. The desired orthography for a viable writing system should be phonologically adequate, easy, consistent and straightforward.

9.14.2. USE OF THE TSHANGLA ORTHOGRAPHIES AND RETENTION OF CHÔKE SPELLINGS.

A standard Roman and 'Ucen orthography will be used in the following domains:

Roman Tshangla:
- A dictionary and grammar to teach Tshangla to foreign students
- Email and chatting on the internet
- Articles and blogs

’Ucen Tshangla:
- Dictionary and grammar to teach Tshangla in Bhutan, Tibet and India
- Letters, poetry, lyrics, movie scripts, novels, etc.
- Tshangla news on radio and television
- Newspaper supplements in Tshangla

Tshangla will be written phonologically according to a standard orthography that will be easy to use and can be effortlessly remembered or deduced by native speakers of the language. Nevertheless, the retention of Dzongkha and Chôke spellings for certain lexical items could be argued.

These exceptions could include toponyms and proper names with a genuine Dzongkha or Chôke etymology, such as ŧTrashigang ‘ridge of auspiciousness’, ŧGaling ‘place of joy’, ŧSanje ‘Buddha, the enlightened one’, ŧSenam ‘merit, virtue’.

Conventional Dzongkha abbreviated spelling can be used here. There can be optional retention of Dzongkha and Chôke spellings for honorific, ceremonial and religious terms. However, this should be limited to the absolute minimum, and wherever possible
phonological Tshangla spelling should be employed, e.g. ཟི་ཐོ། jaipo ‘king’, རྩི་ཨི phi ‘to offer (H.)’, and ལེི་ེ་ི་ི་lopen ‘teacher’.

But the developed orthographies should not impede, and preferably contribute to, the learning of written languages more important from a cultural or political point of view, in this case standard Tibetan and Dzongkha. The written forms of these languages, as the mother tongues of the people, can be used at the primary levels of education to familiarise the students with the orthography, phonology and spelling of another language.

Mother-tongue education is widely recognised as more efficient in learning a second language if the education in this second language is well-resourced. The main obstacle is that in the area of discussion the mother-tongue is not the national language nor the culturally dominant language nor the medium of instruction in schools, and that as a consequence education has to be at least trilingual: the mother tongue, the national language, plus in many cases English as the international medium of communication. Certain scenarios can then be foreseen. In Bhutan, mother-tongue education in Tshangla in Tshangla-dominated areas with Dzongkha and English as second languages from a certain level onwards and Dzongkha and English as medium of instruction depending on the subject from an even higher level. In Arunachal, mother-tongue education in Dakpa or Tshangla depending on the dominant language in the area, with English as second languages from a certain level and English as the medium of instruction from an even higher level, with Hindi as an additional or optional language. In Tibet, mother-tongue education in Dakpa or Tshangla depending on the dominant language in the area, with Tibetan and Chinese as second language from a certain level and as the medium of instruction from an even higher level. In Tibetan refugee communities, mother-tongue education in Tshangla, with Tibetan and English as second languages from a certain level, and English as medium of instruction on a higher level with Tibetan and Hindi as additional or optional languages. It may be clear that the ultimate choices for implementation depend on the educational policy considerations that are made on various national and regional levels. These lie beyond the current scope and it is aimed here to provide only the first outsets for the possible orthographies.

It is pertinent to note that the people who speak the languages described here are not geographically limited within the borders of Bhutan. Considerable Tshangla speaking populations can be found in India and Tibet. Because of the shared Buddhist heritage Chöke has traditionally been the liturgical language among these speakers, and at least part of the population can read and write the ’Ucen script. Modern written Tibetan is taught both among
the people in Tibet as well as among the considerable refugee population in India. In Tibet, besides written Tibetan, Chinese has become a language of communication and education. In Arunachal Pradesh, English is the primary medium of instruction in schools, with Hindi as second language.

It is for these reasons that both an 'Ucen as well as a Roman orthography have to be developed. It is for this same reason, that it has been decided that the printed or uncial writing of 'Ucen usually called ཞུས་དྲོད། tshum in Dzongkha or ཞུས་འགྱུང། tshuyi in Tibetan is preferred over the various longhand writing systems in use, such as ཆུ་མེ་ 'Ume for Tibetan and ལོ་ཇོ་ཁ་ འོ་གཏོད། jotshum or ལོ་ཇོ་ཁ་ འོ་གཏོད། jöyi for Dzongkha. The uncial writing style, whether in written or typed form, can effortlessly be converted into any of these longhand writing systems if and when required by the users of the orthographies. Arguments, like the sanctity of the tshuyi script as the script to which Chöke texts have traditionally been committed, have been taken into consideration. But the uniform applicability of this script among all the speakers of the languages is considered to outweigh these arguments.

9.14.3. THE ROMAN ORTHOGRAPHY

The Roman Tshangla orthography will also be presented in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.) and will follow closely the phonological transcription of Tshangla provided earlier in paragraph 9.6. In non-standardised Roman Tshangla, most users currently delimit words morphologically, with spaces between the morphemes that constitute a word, but no spaces between the syllables within a word. This haphazardness creates considerable confusion, as the semantic content of a phrase can change when the word and its suffixes are not recognised as a unity. It is therefore proposed that in the Roman Zhonggar standard, a word include all the suffixes that form part of the lexical unit, e.g. rok zancholagangka, bainangshinggai, jangga, brakpa. In current versions of Roman Tshangla, most users appear to generally follow the rules of English punctuation, as most users are only literate in this language written in Roman script. It is mere convenience of habituation to adopt the question mark ? in Roman Tshangla despite the presence of question words. The full stop will replace the she and the comma will replace dang or spaces of 'Ucen Tshangla in series or between conjunctions. The shenyi, druise and gojan will not be marked in Roman Tshangla. Round brackets ( ) will be sparsely used in a fashion similarly to current usage in 'Ucen Tshangla, namely, only when referring to other sources within a body of text. In representing the high tonal onset or initial glottal stop in transcription of Chöke, Dzongkha or other languages, such
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as in Ucen, the apostrophe will be used. Other punctuation marks such as the colon,
semicolon, hyphens, exclamation and quotation marks will not be employed, as they serve no
function in the language.
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9.14.4. THE UCEN ORTHOGRAPHY
The choices made regarding the Ucen Tshangla orthography will be presented in Bodt and
Gyatso (2012, in publ.). The complete scope of possible orthographical choices and some
recent updates are provided here. The Ucen Tshangla writing system, like the Tibetan
writing system from which it is derived, is syllabic. Syllable and phrase boundaries are
marked, but word boundaries are not. Ucen Tshangla differs from Tibetan and Dzongkha
orthography in that it has none of the prefixes

written above or

before the root initial. Ucen Tshangla does have consonants

written below the

initial to represent the initial consonant clusters, in which only the consonant

is missing.

This consonant is, however, present in the East Bodish languages, as the example of Dakpa in
Chapter 10 shows. The root-final codas are

. As will be explained

in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.), in syllable-final position
and voiceless. The syllable-final

are pronounced lenis

has earlier been described as having changed into a

diphthong.
The writing of the vowel phonemes is straightforward. For proper representation of the
diphthong phonemes, the grapheme for the open back rounded vowel

is introduced.

Tshangla, unlike Central Bodish languages, does not have a low tone breathy [h] represented
by

, but instead distinguishes the syllable-initial /w/ from a syllable initial vowel, for

example

ung [u ] ‘field’ vs.

wung [wu ] ‘flat area’.

TABLE 9.33. UCEN TSHANGLA SIMPLE VOWELS.
i

u
e

o
a
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**TABLE 9.34. "UCEN TSHANGLA DIPHTHONG VOWELS."**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ai</th>
<th>au</th>
<th>oi</th>
<th>ui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>āi</td>
<td>āu</td>
<td>ōi</td>
<td>ōu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simple onsets are written straightforward and direct. Marginal phonemes are between brackets.

**TABLE 9.35. "UCEN TSHANGLA CONSONANTS."**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k</th>
<th>kh</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>ng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td>tsh</td>
<td>[dz]</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zh]</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex onsets and final consonants pose considerable difficulties of representation since their written form might lead people literate in Dzongkha and Chöke to change the pronunciation to conform to the pronunciation rules of these languages. As such, various options exist for orthographical adjustments.

The choice seems desirable for the most straightforward and simple orthography, based on purely linguistic considerations, mainly of a phonological nature. In this choice, the orthography of Tshangla is considered as independent and different from the orthography of Dzongkha and Chöke as the phonology of Tshangla is from the phonology of Dzongkha and Chöke. This choice would follow the adept ‘what you write is what you say, what you say is what you write’.

But the choice also depends on political and other subjective considerations beside linguistic ones. Transferability of the orthography from one written language to the other is extremely important if the orthography is going to be used for educational purposes. Learning Tshangla in school should not impede learning Tibetan or Dzongkha in school. Religious considerations, with certain orthographical conventions being used primarily for religious scriptures that are considered sacrosanct, should also be taken into consideration considering...
the still conservative elements in society. The ultimate choice also needs discussion with experts on the other hitherto unwritten Bhutanese languages, since orthographic problems observed here are common in other languages as well.

A) In Chöke and Dzongkha orthography, the retroflex series /tr/, /thr/ and /gr/ can be represented by the subscript _sid on the dorso-velar set ʃ ʃ ʃ  or the subscript _sid on the bilabial plosive set ʃ ʃ ʃ .

1. The decision could be made to use a subscript _sid on the dorso-velar set, for example ʃ ʃ ʃ /trongcung/ [tɔŋtɕuŋ] ‘mosquito’, ʃ ʃ ʃ /thr/ [tʰiʃ] ‘bile’, ʃ ʃ ʃ /gr/ [dɾiʃ] ‘twist yarn’. The advantage is that this orthography would faithfully represent the original Tshangla pronunciation of the retroflex series /kr/, /khr/ and /gr/ preserved in some dialects, [kɾoŋtɕuŋ], [kʰɾiʃ] and [ɡɾiʃ] respectively. Moreover, this orthography is justified if it were to be decided that the Chöke and Dzongkha spelling rules should not affect the Tshangla orthography at all. The final phonological realisation depends on the dialect background of the speaker. It would also avoid problems for people literate in either Chöke or Dzongkha, as they would directly transfer the correct pronunciation from these languages on Tshangla. It would also ease later learning of Dzongkha and Chöke since the pronunciation of the graphemes does not differ from one language to the other. Interestingly, Plaisier (2007) reports that in the native Lepcha orthography, the retroflex phonemes /tr, thr, dr/, nativised loans from Tibetan, are written as ‘kr’, ‘hr’ and ‘gr’ respectively and are not distinguished from the /kr, hr, gr/ consonant clusters (consonant cluster /khr/ does not exist in Lepcha). As solution, some authors use a dot below the ‘kr’, ‘hr’ and ‘gr’ whenever representing retroflex consonants in both the native Lepcha orthography and the transliteration.

2. The decision could be made to use a subscript _sid on the bilabial plosive set, for example ʃ ʃ ʃ /trongcung/ [tɔŋtɕuŋ] ‘mosquito’, ʃ ʃ ʃ /thr/ [tʰiʃ] ‘bile’, ʃ ʃ ʃ /gr/ [dɾiʃ] ‘twist yarn’. If either option 1 or option 2 should be chosen to avoid double graphemes for a single phoneme, option 1 would be clearly preferred. This despite that fact that the spelling ʃ ʃ ʃ or ʃ ʃ ʃ /bri/ or /brui/ would faithfully represent the archaic pronunciation of the word /dɾi/ ‘write’ pronounced either as [qɨi] or [qui].

3. A next option could be to use a _sid on the dental plosive set, for example ʃ ʃ ʃ /trongcung/ [tɔŋtɕuŋ] ‘mosquito’, ʃ ʃ ʃ /thr/ [tʰiʃ] ‘bile’, ʃ ʃ ʃ /gr/ [dɾiʃ] ‘twist yarn’. This option in traditional Chöke and Dzongkha orthography represents a dental plosive plus trill cluster [tr], [tʰr], [dr], rather than a retroflex initial.
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4. Another option could be to use the *lokpa* series, i.e. འོ་ོི་ི་ི་. The *lokpa* series is a traditional Chöke orthographical convention used for writing retroflex consonants from Sanskrit in Chöke texts. The advantage is that it is a single grapheme and therefore simple and straightforward. A possible disadvantage could be the traditional association of this series with sacred religious texts.

5. An option is to use two initial consonants for the retroflex series, one representing the dental plosive, followed by one representing the trill, as in འོ་ོི་ི་ི་. The main problem would be that the inherent vowel [a] might be pronounced on the first consonant, rather than the trill, as in *[tʰa:roŋcun]*. It also makes the orthography long and complicated, with two graphemes needed to represent a single speech sound.

6. To avoid this འོ་ོི་ི་ི་ could be written: འོ་ོི་ི་ི་. Additional འོ་ོི་ི་ི་ has as disadvantage that the options are limited for writing the long vowels, a problem that does not occur in Tshangla but does require orthographical inventions in Dakpa, for example. It also makes the orthography even longer and more complicated than option 5.

7. Finally, instead of using subscript *rata*, full འོ་ོི་ི་ི་ could be used as subscript to the alveolar plosive set as in འོ་ོི་ི་ི་. This choice would emphasise the uniqueness of Tshangla orthography vis-à-vis Dzongkha and Chöke orthography. On the other hand, it would also introduce an additional orthographic notation that might confuse learners.

B) The velar plosive plus trill series exists only in archaic dialects of Tshangla, most notably that of Dungsam, that of Kalaktang and that of Dirang. In the majority of the Tshangla dialects in Bhutan and Pemakö, full phonological change from this series to the retroflex dental plosive series above has taken place. This change probably took place as a result of long and intensive contact with spoken Tibetan and Dzongkha, languages in which this change also has taken place. Other languages, such as Dakpa, have a native /kr/, /khr/, /gr/ series in all dialects, and an innovation would have to be made for this series to be correctly pronounced, and not converted into the retroflex series. Four additional options exist that could be used.

1. The first option is to add an `azur on option 1 above to accentuate the difference with the retroflex series and prevent a possible phonological change of the velar plosive
plus trill series to the retroflex series: भ्रुक्ष्य म्त्व त्र्य. Again, because of possible interference with the notation for long vowels, this option is undesirable.

2. A next option is to add a full ra under the dorso-velar set: भ्रुक्ष्य म्त्व त्र्य.

3. A next decision could be to use two initial consonants, one representing the velar plosive, followed by one representing the trill, as in भ्रुक्ष्य म्त्व त्र्य. The main problem would again be that the inherent vowel [a] might be pronounced on the first consonant, rather than the trill, as in *[ka:roŋcaŋ]. As in option 5 above it also makes the orthography long and complicated, with two graphemes needed to represent a single speech sound.

4. To avoid this, ’azur could be written: भ्रुक्ष्य म्त्व त्र्य. The same problem with the notation for long vowels arises mentioned in 3, and this option also makes the orthography even longer and more complicated than option 3.

C) The bilabial plosive plus trill clusters existed in Old Tibetan but has phonologically changed to the retroflex dental series, just like the velar plosive plus trill clusters. For the orthography in languages such as Tshangla that have preserved these clusters, the following options are available.

1. To keep it simple and write त्र्य प्रेम /prema/ [pre:ma:] ‘fringes of a cloth’, त्र्य फ़्रुक्ष्य /phrukci/ [pʰrukci] ‘blisters’, त्र्य ब्रुम /bruma/ [bruma:] ‘digit’ and त्र्य म्रस /mras/ [mras] ‘pimple’. Yet for people literate in Dzongkha and Chöke, this orthographic choice will be uncomfortable and could even result in hypercorrect pronunciation involving a phonological change to a retroflex series and lengthening of the vowel following /m/.

2. To avoid this problem, a subscript ’azur could be employed, as in त्र्य फ़्रुक्ष्य म्त्व ब्रुम. Again, confusion with the notation for the long vowels may arise.

3. Two initial consonants could be used, as in एनिरेक्ष्य ब्रुमक्ष्य म्त्व अम्ल. This could cause a problem as to where the inherent vowel [a] belongs, to the bilabial plosive or to the trill (as in *[pa:re:ma:]).

4. A solution to this could be to use two initial consonants in combination with subscript ’azur: एनिरेक्ष्य ब्रुमक्ष्य अम्ल. Again, confusion with the notation for the long vowels may arise.

5. Finally, a full ra could be used as a subscript to the bilabial plosive set as in त्र्य फ़्रुक्ष्य म्त्व ब्रुम.
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D) The two remaining marginal clusters /pl/ and /psh/ could be represented by full subscript la and sha under pa: ला and शा. The other bilabial plosive plus glide /l/ clusters will be discussed in Chapter 7.3.2 on the ‘Ucen orthography for Dakpa.

The orthography of the syllable-final /ng/, /m/ and /r/ does not pose many difficulties, e.g. ङTho /hang/ ‘what’, घभ /lam/ ‘road’, षठ /thur/ ‘1 one, 2 bit (of a horse)’. Syllable-final /n/ and /s/ present a more complicated problem, since these finals are not pronounced in either Dzongkha or Chöke and therefore writing them unaltered might result in a change in pronunciation by educated speakers.

For syllable-final /n/, five options are here proposed.

1. With a superscript ना naro over the grapheme न, as in नाTh /kan/ ‘voice’, sound. This option is sometimes used in modern written Dzongkha to represent a syllable-final consonant /n/ in the transcription of names in other languages, most notably English.
2. The लो lokpa na, as in लोTh. But the lokpa na is only used for Sanskrit loan words in Chöke and represents the retroflex [ɾ]. As such the use of lokpa na is inappropriate.
3. A subscript खैटī sogme (halanta) under the grapheme न, as in नाथ Th (software adaptation required). Although the function of the sogme is to remove the inherent vowel /a/ of the consonant, in traditional Chöke orthography the sogme has a very specific and restricted use. Moreover, a tiny diacritic like the sogme would, especially in handwritten longhand writing, be easily missed or mistaken for a slip of the pen or an impurity in the paper.
4. A subscript अ azur as in अTh. As mentioned before, this would create confusion with the preferred orthographical representation of long vowels.
5. Finally, the choice could be made to make no adaptation at all, as in न /kan/ ‘voice, sound’. Unfortunately, if this option is selected, there could be a risk that for people literate in Dzongkha, Chöke or Tibetan the pronunciation of Tshangla would be corrected in the direction of the pronunciation of the syllable in these languages, namely [ken].

For syllable-final /s/ the proposed four options could be as follows.

1. To write with ध deng-bo on the sa,
2. with srogmed,
3. with subscript अ azur on the preceding consonant
4. or no adaptation at all, as in ཡ་ནར, ཡ་ནར, ཡ་ནར or ཡ་ནར /jas/ ‘ration’. The same considerations apply as above, and the authors therefore prefer to maintain a unique Tshangla orthography, and make no adaptation whatsoever.

In Roman Tshangla, the velar, bilabial and dental syllable-final plosives will be represented by their unvoiced realisations /k/, /t/ and /p/, since linguistically voiced stops usually do not occur in syllable-final position. Yet these unvoiced stops do not occur as syllable-final consonants in Dzongkha nor Chöke orthography, where they are represented by their voiced counterpart ཤ ཤ ཤ. There is an option in 'Ucen Tshangla to make the orthographic invention and allow the syllable-final use of ཤ ཤ ཤ, such as in ཤོ་ནར /makpa/ ‘son-in-law’, ཤོ་ /cat/ ‘cut (v.)’, ཤོ /yap/ ‘attic, father (H.)’. The authors prefer to stick to writing the voiced counterparts for reasons that will be explained in more detail in Bodt and Gyatso (2012, in publ.) and that build on the observations made in paragraph 9.7.

For the present 'Ucen Tshangla orthographical system, it has been decided that the syllable-final /n/ and /s/ will be written unaltered. In another publication (Bodt and Gyatso 2012, in publ.) we defend the decision to adopt the option ཤ ཤ for the retroflex series as well as the velar plosive plus trill series, with the ultimate phonetic realisation depending on the dialect background of the speaker, and the option ཤ ཤ for the bilabial plosive plus trill series. In light of the choices that have to be made for the 'Ucen Dakpa orthography this choice was reconsidered. In Dakpa, the retroflex and the velar plosive plus trill phonemes occur within the same speech variety. They both need to be represented in the same orthographical system, as speakers are not left with a choice because there minimal pairs exist. In 'Ucen Dakpa, it was therefor decided to represent the retroflex series with a rata subscript under the dorso-velar plosive serie and the velar plosive and bilabial plosive plus trill series with the subscript rata. To maintain consistency among the orthographies proposed in this book, the 'Ucen Tshangla orthography follows the same convention.

### Table 9.36. 'Ucen Tshangla initial consonant clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Orthography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(kr)</td>
<td>སན</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>སན</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr</td>
<td>སན</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psh</td>
<td>སན</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, a short note on the syllable-final consonant clusters occurring in some dialects of Tshangla. These clusters occur only marginally and moreover do not appear to be part of the ZS. Therefore, the decision has been made not to include these clusters in the orthography yet. If need arises in the future, the orthography can rather easily be adapted, e.g. \(\text{ωī}/\text{rt}/\) as in \(\text{Ų propTypes}\) ‘erred’, \(\text{Ԉ}/\text{nt}/\) as in \(\text{多种形式}\) ‘pressed down’, \(\text{┱}/\text{ngk}/\) as in \(\text{活动}\) ‘scolded’, \(\text{juries}/\text{mp}/\) as in \(\text{活动}\) ‘helped’.

In ’Ucen Tshangla, the syllabic nature and resulting punctuation of the ’Ucen script will be closely followed. Syllable boundaries will be indicated by a triangular dot called the ‘tshek, the end of a sentence will be marked by the equivalent to a full stop ‘she and the end of a particular paragraph, quotation or text by ‘shenyi. The items in a series will be separated by the word ‘dang ‘and’. If two or more independent clauses are joined by coordinating conjunctions a space will be kept. Question words such as ‘hang ‘what’ and ‘ibi ‘who’ and question particles such as ‘ya, ‘mo, ‘mai already indicate a question. Round brackets will be conservatively used when referring to titles of external references. Except for the simple ‘drushe indicating the beginning of a text, and the ‘gojan indicating the start of a longer, more formal text, their variant forms marking the beginning of official correspondence in Tibetan and Dzongkha, will not be included in the Tshangla orthography. Some examples of Tshangla written in the ’Ucen and Roman orthographies are given in Annexes VII and X.

9.15. CONCLUSION: THE TSHANGLA ORIGIN REVISITED.

In paragraph 9.4 several possible origin theories of the Tshangla people were discussed. After evaluating the genetic and linguistic evidence, some additional remarks can be made regarding the Tshangla origin. The linguistic evidence shows Tshangla has a number of basic lexemes that, at least at first sight, have no obvious Tibeto-Burman root. But Tshangla language has also retained a considerable number of Proto-Tibeto-Burman roots, indicating a relatively ancient origin of the Tshangla people in the Tibeto-Burman homeland. Tshangla is

---

114 Ref. paragraph 9.7.2.
115 Tibetan ฎ
116 Tibetan ฎ
117 Tibetan ฎ
118 Tibetan ฎ
perhaps an ancient non-Bodic Tibeto-Burman language derived from Proto-Tibeto-Burman at a very distant moment in time. Bodic influence on Tshangla is considerable, with many nativised loans especially in the higher semantic fields. The Bodish influence on Tshangla might also be accountable for a loss of complex initial and final consonant clusters and the development of a high vs. low onset tone distinction in some dialects. Pronominalisation and a complex person and number agreement pattern found in the Kiranti languages are absent in Tshangla, but traces of person-marking do appear to exist. The most archaic Tshangla dialects appear to be spoken in the Dungsam area, and innovative phonological and morphological features are more common in the upper dialects.

The Tshangla paternal genetic information points towards major contributions from the Tibetan plateau to the paternal DNA, particularly the YAP-insertion in haplogroup D. The maternal DNA shows a much more varied origin, including contributions from the Indian subcontinent, e.g. haplogroup M49; the Mesolithic expansion from the Yunnan-Burma border area, e.g. haplogroups M9 and F1; and a considerable contribution of North and Northeast Asian lineages, e.g. haplogroup A4. Indian mtDNA lineages occurring in high frequencies among the Lepcha, e.g. M33, and the Sherdukpen, e.g. M61, are not prevalent among the Tshangla.

The historical sources indicate that from the 6th CE onwards, aristocratic rulers of Tibetan descent assumed authority over a population called the Tsengmi or the people of Tsa(ng)lung, who at present are called Tshangla. They inhabited the valleys and hills of what is now Eastern Bhutan, practiced millet cultivation, lived in houses of wood, grass and bamboo and spoke a language not intelligible to speakers of Tibetan as it was spoken on the plateau at that time. We moreover know that they were different from the Monpa people, who probably arrived in the upper valleys of the same region between the 6th and the 8th century CE, and that neither the Monpa nor the Tshangla were Buddhists. The Tshangla inhabited not only Eastern Bhutan, but also the Dirang, Thembang, Morshing and Domkha areas of adjoining Kameng district in India. They were divided in a large number of endogamous clans occupying specific geographical areas. The migrants from Tibet- mostly male aristocrats and Buddhist and Bon clergy- assumed authority over these clans and started their own ruling clans and families. This local political setup was superseded by the Drukpa and Gelukpa administrations in the 17th century, and the Tshangla speakers of Pemakö in Tibet originate from Eastern Bhutan, with their migration occurring between the 17th and the 20th century CE.
The first forebears of the Tshangla appear to have been scattered groups of forest-dwelling people with an origin on the Indian subcontinent. Later, migrants from the Yunnan-Burma border area brought a Mesolithic culture and largely displaced or intermixed with the native population. A probably swift and numerically large migration too place from the northeast of the Tibetan plateau, through the Héngduàn mountain range into the Sichuan-Yunnan-Burma border area and from there to the Himalayan foothills bordering the plains of the Brahmaputra\textsuperscript{119}. This migration brought Tibeto-Burman people speaking the Proto-Tshangla language from which all Tshangla dialects descent. This is apparent from the remarkably similar phonological inventory and the many cognates in the basic lexicon, including numerals, body parts and pronouns as well as basic verbs. The homeland of Proto-Tshangla is thought to be in the area till date exhibiting the greatest number of archaic dialects, i.e. the Dungsam area roughly between the Gongri river in the west and the Nyera Ama Ri river in the east. These Tshangla forebears mixed with the existing population and cultivated foxtail and broomcorn millet and perhaps barley and wheat in shifting cultivation fields, reared fowl and pigs and relied heavily on the forest, gradually expanding into comparable habitat between 1000 and 2500 meters altitude. From the Dungsam area they moved along the Gongri river northward into present-day Trashigang, crossing the Gongri river at the ancient ford near the confluence of the Gongri and Kuri rivers into the area between the Kuri and Gongri rivers\textsuperscript{120}. Any indigenous semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers populations they might have encountered during these stage-wise migrations must have been small in number and either pushed into the margin of the dense forests or culturally and linguistically assimilated. Linguistic evidence can be found in the numerous morphological and lexical variations we find in the present-day dialects of the Monggar and Trashigang area. The descendants of

\textsuperscript{119} There are some other linguistic indications of an ancient, northeastern origin of the Tshangla in the temperate region. Some food grains, e.g. /bong/ ‘wheat’ and /phemung/ ‘barley’ have Tshangla words with no known cognates in other languages of the region. Other food grains including the millet species have lexical cognates in both East Bodish and Central Bodish languages (ref. Chapter 15). Tshangla also has some unique lexical forms for certain climatic phenomena with no or limited cognates in Central and East Bodish languages but with striking similarities in, other languages, e.g. Tshangla /phom/ ‘snow’ viz. Tulung Rai /phomu/, Hunphun Tangkhul (Naga) /pham/, Galo and Bokar Adi and Nishi /tapam/.

\textsuperscript{120} It is in this respect that a marked similarity can be found between the Tshangla and the Kirānī languages of eastern Nepal. In the case of Kirānī (cf. Chapter 3.1.8), oral origin myths recount a migration from the Tarai plains in the south up into the hills to the present homeland. A few later traditions also claim a descent from groups originating on the Tibetan plateau and migrating southward through the river valleys. Although in the case of the Tshangla no oral myths indicting an origin in the plains of the Brahmaputra appear to have survived, the analysis of the Tshangla dialects above indicates that a northward migration is the most likely direction of movement.
these indigenous populations might be represented by the Gongduk speakers who survived in the remote area on the opposite bank of the Gongri river. Between 1000 BCE and 500 CE Bodish migrants from the north (Mon tribes of the Changthang), northeast (Qiang tribes) and west (Zhangzhung) of the Tibetan plateau into the northern valleys halted the further upward spread of the Tshangla people. Roughly between the 6th and 13th century various migrations of mainly males from the Tibetan plateau brought Bodish speakers and their associated sedentary buckwheat- and barley-cultivating lifestyle as well as a political and administrative set-up that continued to exist until the 17th century. There is no reason to discredit at least the basic notion of the genealogical histories and origin myths of the people of the area that secular aristocrats and religious figures with their retinues fled the turmoil on the Tibetan plateau and were accepted as local rulers by the indigenous people. Undoubtedly these Tibetan migrants learnt the language of their Tshangla subjects, and not the other way round. We thus see a migrant numerical minority adopting the language of an indigenous majority. After the 17th century, the split between the eastern Tshangla speakers who came under Tibetan suzerainty and the western Tshangla speakers who came under the Drukpa authority, as well as the migration from these areas to Pemakö, led to a further genetic and linguistic differentiation of the Tshangla people reflected in the diversity we observe today.

Fig 9.1. Sunset over the hills of Dungsam, Eastern Bhutan.
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Map IX. The Tshangla dialects of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Monyul.
CHAPTER 10. PEOPLE OF THE TRIPOINT: THE DAKPA.

The area where the borders of Bhutan, India and Tibet convene is the ancestral home of a people presently most commonly referred to as the Monpa. The ethnonym Monpa is, however, extremely confusing\(^1\), and therefore preference is given here to the endonym Dakpa. The Dakpa were already mentioned in Ngawang’s Gyelrik. Members of the Jowo clan started aristocratic lineages in Lawok Yülsum, including places such as Lhau Khampa, Seru, Jamkhar and Bemkhar\(^2\). The Tungde clan settled in Dakpa Bemi Sari and Zanglung\(^3\), and the upper course of the Nyamyang river valley came under the authority of members of the Yede clan\(^4\). The name Monpa in these early sources referred to what probably was a wide medley of people of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, rather than people speaking the various dialects of the language we here refer to as Dakpa.

But from the second half of the 15\(^{th}\) century onwards, the name Monpa is more specifically applied to the people speaking the Dakpa dialects, and as such they are clearly distinguished from the Tshangla or Tsangmi\(^5\). Historical and local sources, however, seem to indicate that the Dakpa were at one time considered a sub-group of the Monpa, inhabiting a specific area. Authors, such as Dorji (2003:204), make a distinction between the people of Lawok Yülsum, the Bemi Pangchenpa and the Dakpa\(^6\) and call them the ‘Monri Khaksum’ or ‘Monri Namsum’ ‘three tribes of Mon’ under the control of Tshona dzong. According to some native Dakpa speakers Monpa refers to the people from Tawang proper, i.e. the area to the north of the Tawang river\(^7\). There are also Monpa across the Sela pass in Dirang circle of West Kameng district. Monpa is also the name commonly used by the people who live in the villages in the Gamri river valley of Bhutan that were resettled from Tawang in the late 19\(^{th}\) and early 20\(^{th}\) century\(^8\). Dakpa, on the other

---

\(^1\) Ref. Chapter 1.
\(^2\) Ref. paragraph 4.2.2.
\(^3\) Ref. paragraph 4.2.4.
\(^4\) Ref. paragraph 4.2.4. The places called Langkhyim, Brengkhyim and Khangpakhar could not yet be identified, but it seems reasonable to assume that the upper Nyamyang river valley around Lekpo was an extension of the Yede clan’s territory around Taktsang in Pangchen.
\(^5\) Ref. paragraph 5.3.
\(^6\) Ref. also footnote 107 to paragraph 6.9.
\(^7\) Including villages such as Paigong, Yulsum, Surbi, Seru, Shajing, Lemberdung, Khartut, Largong, Sho, Namet, Khirimu, Kitpi and Tawang town itself in Tawang circle, and Lhoudung, Namazing and Yuthembu villages with nearby hamlets in Tawang circle.
\(^8\) Including Thongrong, Momnangkhar Me, Bemteng, Lheng, Lheng Me, Tokshimang Me, Momnangkhar Me, Lem and Shokha villages of Phongme geok and
hand specifically refers to the people living in the Mokto and Lumla circles of Tawang district and adjoining areas of Trashiyangtsi in Bhutan. The Bemi Pangchenpa, finally, refers to the inhabiting the Pangchen valley along the Nyamyang river, extending north towards and across the Chinese border. This closely follows the dialects of Dakpa that have thus far been distinguished.

The allegiance of the Dakpa of Tawang to the Gelukpa School and thus the Ganden administration brought them in frequent clashes with the expanding Drukpa, culminating in Tibetan suzerainty over a major part of their homeland. The Drukpa conquest of the Kuri, Khoma and Kholong river valleys meant, however, that part of the Dakpa area was politically separated from their kinsmen. As will be explained in paragraph 10.5.3, the vernaculars spoken by the people of Khoma geok in Lhünts dzongkhak and the people of the upper Kholong river valley in Trashiyangtsi dzongkhak in Bhutan are here assumed to be a dialect of Dakpa. This assumption creates a continuous Dakpa dialect continuum from the Khoma river valley in Lhünts dzongkhak in the west, through the Kholong river valley in Trashiyangtsi dzongkhak, the Nyamyang river valley in Zemithang circle and the Tawang river valley, till the Nyukcharong river valley in Tawang circle in the east. Although the

9 Including Bongleng, Kharung, Khet, Bomja, Gyamdung, Sherjong, Mokto and Mirba villages and nearby hamlets under Mokto circle and Bongkhar circles and Pamakhkar, Dudungkhar, Loudung, Dongmareng, Buri, Blaiteng, Sakpret, Thongleng, Mangnam, Sakyur, Thrilam, Sazo, Lumla, Yabap, Hungla and Kharteng villages and nearby hamlets under Lumla circle.

10 The areas adjoining Lumla and Mokto circles along the Gongri river in Bhutan, including Khinyel, Tötsho, Manam, Thangbrang, Jangphu, Omba, Maidung and Chemkhar villages and nearby hamlets of Tötsho geok and Dukti of Yalang geok in Bhutan.

11 Including the people of Soktsen, Zemithang, Kharman, Khopleteng, Shakti, Gispu, Muktur and Surbin village and neighbouring hamlets in Jigmethang (Zemithang) circle.

12 Ref. paragraph 10.5.

13 Ref. paragraph 6.5 and 6.9.

14 Ref. paragraph 7.2.

15 Whereas in Bhutan the Dzala or Yangtsipa and the Dakpa or Brami are often considered as ethnically, culturally and linguistically distinct, most Bhutanese think the Brokpa and Dakpa are one and the same ethnic group. The Bhutanese feature movies ‘Chorten Kora’ and ‘Arunachal to Thimphu’, the first a historical and the second a modern love story expounding on the close historic and religious ties between Bhutan and Tawang, were well received in Thimphu. Perhaps as a result of the red woollen chupa worn by the actors often identified as the typical Brokpa dress, the audience and the press mistakenly identified the movies as featuring Merak Sakteng Brokpa’s, and consequently as Tawang being the home region of the Brokpa people.
Himalayan watershed is the northern border of the Dakpa area, an exception is Lekpo sub-county, in the upper Nyamyang river valley, south of Tshona Dzong in Tibet. The southern border of the Dakpa area is formed by the areas inhabited by the speakers of Chocangacakha, Tshangla and Brokpa. At least from the time of the allegiance of the members of the Jowo clan to the Gelukpa School onwards, the center of gravity of the Dakpa-speaking area has been in the Tawang river valley. This was epitomized by the construction of the Tawang monastery. Since the 17th century the area around this monastery has been the cultural, political, religious and linguistic heart of the Dakpa people.

Dakpa is also spoken in three geographically isolated communities. During the 18th century, some Dakpa speakers from the Pangchen and Lekpo areas followed the Tshangla migrants to escape the taxation and compulsory labour service imposed by the Gelukpa administration from Tshona (Zhang 1997:21). In Pemakö, they settled in Wénlàng commune in Deshing village and in Pangzhing village. A group of migrants apparently heading for Pemakö followed the more northerly located Nyangchu river east through Kongpo, up the Draksumchu river till Draksum Tsho lake instead of tracking along the Yarlung Tsangpo river. Dakpa speakers can still be found near Draksum Tsho. Similarly, some Dakpa speakers settled in the Menchukha valley of West Siang district.

10.1. ORIGIN OF THE NAME DAKPA.

The most straightforward etymology of the ethnonym Dakpa might be from Tibetan ‘pure or clean people’. The parallel with the ethnonym ‘the pure people’ sometimes applied to the Tshangla speakers is striking. The Dakpa are called /brami/ by their Tshangla neighbours, possibly derived from Tibetan ‘yak hair tent’ and ‘people’, rather than Tshangla ‘the other’ and Tibetan /mi/ ‘people’ as some authors (Pommaret 1994) earlier
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16 Ref. Map X.
17 Ref. paragraph 6.8 and Figure 10.3.
18 Ref. paragraph 7.2.
19 Ch. Wénlàng.
20 Ch. Déxìng.
21 Or Bangshing, Ch. Bāngxīn, ref. p. 159. Perhaps this was originally ‘Pangchen’, reflecting the origin of the speakers.
22 Tournadre (in Darragon 2010), however, earlier asserted that the language spoken there has many similarities with the Qiangic languages.
23 Ref. paragraph 9.2.
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proposed. This is confirmed by Norbu (2004) who writes that the language is also known as ԾԳԲ să. When referring specifically to the Dakpa speakers, Tibetan and Bhutanese sources referred to the Dakpa as ԾԳԲ däp or dakpa, at least before the general ethno-linguistic and political term of reference became Monpa. The earlier etymology from ԾԳԲ ‘bright, open appearance of a place’ (e.g. Shafer 1954, Norbu 2004: 9) is a question of mistaken identity, since ԾԳԲ Dakpo is a region of Tibet located to the northeast of the Dakpa speaking area. The Dakpa call their Tshangla neighbours /tshengmi/ and the Tibetans /gying/ [gji].

10.2. CLASSIFICATION OF THE DAKPA LANGUAGE AND PREVIOUS LITERATURE.

Despite its large speech community and prolific and expanding usage there has been an unfortunate lack of attention for the Dakpa language. Dakpa can probably contribute much to the linguistic history of relationships between the Bodish languages. The main reason for the lack of research has been the fact that the Dakpa inhabit the tripartite border of Tibet, India and Bhutan. Since 1951, China and India have a lingering dispute about the border, and they fought a major war over it in 1962\(^{24}\). The sensitivities this creates have greatly reduced access to, and research in, the areas inhabited by the Dakpa, particularly by western researchers.

Dakpa was placed by Shafer (1954, 1955:112-116) under the Proto-East-Bodish languages. He called the language Dwags. His data, including a concise word list, are partially based on Hodgson and Campbell’s data collected in the Tawang area. Shafer indicated that Dakpa preserves certain archaic phonetic features not characteristic of Old Bodish. Instead, he proposes Dakpa to descend from Proto-East-Bodish. The first grammatical description of Dakpa can be found in Sün et al. (1980), followed by a sketch grammar by Lu (1986) and thereafter a description by Nishida (1988). Lu’s 1986 grammatical description is based on the Dakpa dialect spoken in Lekpo. In 2002 Lu produced a comparative analysis of four Dakpa dialects. Lu (2002) presented data from Mámá Menba autonomous township, data from Dáwâng, i.e. Tawang, and data from the two Dakpa communities in Pemakô. The main drawback of the Chinese sources is their inaccessibility to people not literate in Mandarin. A few short wordlists of Tawang Dakpa have been produced by Dondrup (1993) in his description of Brokkeh and by Das Gupta (1968) in his description of Dirang Tshangla. Not a single grammatical description of the languages as spoken in India has been made. The only other written information on the Dakpa language of Bhutan can be

\(^{24}\) Ref. paragraph 7.6.
found in a write-up by Van Driem (2007b) and concise written information about the Dzala dialect of Dakpa can be found in Van Driem (2007b), Balodis (2009) and Genetti (2009).

Some information on the ancestry of the Dakpa people of Kyaleng and Yomnang/Yobinang can be found in (1984: 65-72), who confirms that they are relatively recent migrants to the area with their origin in the Tawang area.

### 10.3. Estimated Number of Dakpa Speakers.

The Population and Housing Census of Bhutan (PHCB 2005) returned an approximate 1,500 people speaking Dakpa within the household from Yalang and Tötsho. Scattered Dakpa hamlets can be found in other, ethnically mixed, villages under Yangtsi and Khamdang geoks (Gyeltshen 2006). As will be shown in Chapter 10.5.3, the distinction between Dakpa and Dzala in many of these villages is one of professed identity, rather than a linguistic distinction. As one moves north along the Kholongchu river, Dakpa speakers gradually give way to Dzala speakers in a dialect continuum that indicates the close relation between the languages. The PHCB returned an approximate 1,500 Dakpa speakers from Phongme and Shongphu geoks, bringing the estimated number of Dakpa speakers in Bhutan to 3,000. This excludes perhaps around 1,000 Dakpa speakers who have migrated to other dzongkhaks, primarily as part of the armed forces, National Work Force labourers and resettlers. Van Driem (2001b:871) previously estimated the number of Dakpa speakers in Bhutan at 1,000 only. The PHCB returned 1,885 people speaking Dzala within the own household from Bumdeling geok, approximately 1,750 speakers from Khoma geok, and approximately 2,000 speakers from Yangtsi geok, including Yangtsi town. Including a rough estimate of the number of Dzala speakers that have migrated to other dzongkhaks, primarily as civil servants, the armed forces and for resettlement, the total number of Dzala speakers in Bhutan will probably not exceed 7,500. Van Driem earlier estimated the number of Dzala speakers at 15,000 (2001b:871).

The Dakpa speakers of Tawang are numerically the largest linguistic group generally referred to as the Monpa scheduled tribe in India. The number of Tawang Monpa according to the 2001 census is approximately 7,500, but this figure is an underestimation of the actual Dakpa population. Many Dakpa speaking respondents have been recorded simply as Monpa, and they form the majority ethnic group in Tawang district which had a total 2011 population of
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49,950 in the 2011 census. Smaller pockets of Dakpa speakers can be found below the Sela pass in Dirang circle of Kameng district.

In Chinese the Dakpa speakers are called Cuònà Mënê and like the Tshangla speakers of Pemakô they are included in the Mënê Tibetan nationality. The number of Dakpa speakers in Tibet is difficult to estimate, because Chinese sources consistently include the population of Tawang\textsuperscript{25} in the Cuònà Mënê minority, reflecting their claims of political suzerainty over the area. The Dakpa form a 4% minority of the population of Tshona County. The 2002 population census of China returned 612 Mënê, and Lu (2002) mentions a population of 527 Mënê in Cuònà county. These so-called ‘Southern Cuònà Mënê’ form the majority population in Le or Lekpo sub-county, including the Jîba, Gongri, Mâmâ and Le Mënê autonomous townships and the surrounding villages.

Separated geographically from the Dakpa speakers of Lekpo we can find the so-called ‘Northern Cuònà Mënê’ in Wênlâng village under Dêxing township and in Bāngxîn township of Pemakô. Wênlâng is an ethnically mixed village, consisting of Tshangla and Dakpa speakers. The origin of the speakers of Wênlâng can probably be traced to the Tshoksum area of Tawang proper. The variety spoken in Bāngxîn has many characteristics of the Thongrong Dakpa variety described in paragraph 10.4. The number of Dakpa speakers from Pemakô is around 300.

10.4. Dakpa Phonology.

The following short phonological description is based on the Dakpa variety spoken in several villages and hamlets in the border area between Bhutan and India around the sacred Tshongtshongma peak. These villages include Bongleng, Kharung and Bomja villages under Bongkhar circle and Khet under Mokto circle, Jang sub-division, Tawang district; the village of Dukti in Yalang geog, Trashiyangtse dzongkhag; and Thongrong, Bemteng and Breng villages under Phongme geog of Trashigang dzongkhag. The total number of speakers is around 1,600. These data are from Thongrong village, and this variety will henceforth be referred to as Thongrong Dakpa.

\textsuperscript{25} Which they call Mén Dâwàng.
10.4.1. **Simple Consonant Inventory.**

Thongrong Dakpa has a total of 29 consonant phonemes, 4 nativised loan consonant phonemes, 11 monophthong vowels, and six diphthong vowel phonemes. The simple consonants are given in Table 6 below.

**Table 10.1. Thongrong Dakpa Consonant Phonemes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k [k]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh [kʰ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g [g]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng [ŋ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c [tɕ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch [tɕʰ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j [ɗ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny [ŋj]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t [t]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th [tʰ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d [ɗ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n [n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p [p]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph [pʰ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m [m]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts [s]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tʃ [tʃʰ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w [w]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh [x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z [z]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y [j]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r [r]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l [l]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh [ʃ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s [s]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h [h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? [ʔ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lh [l]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phoneme /lh/ has been attested marginally in only a few nativised loan words, including [la] ‘deity’ and [la:kʰŋ] ‘temple’, as well as a few native lexemes including [laŋba tʰup] ‘mend clothes’ and [la’ma:] ‘left-over food’. All consonant phonemes, except the glottal stop /ʔ/, can occur in syllable-initial position. In syllable-final position, we can only find the phonemes /k/, /ng/, /t/, /n/, /p/, /m/, /r/, /s/ and /ʔ/.

**Table 10.2. Thongrong Dakpa Marginal Consonant Phonemes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tr [t]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thr [tʰ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dr [ɗ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz [ɗ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4.2. **Initial Consonant Clusters.**

Thongrong Dakpa has preserved a large number of initial consonant clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kr [kr]</td>
<td>krh [kʰr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ky [kj]</td>
<td>khy [kʰj]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kl [kl]</td>
<td>khl [kʰl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr [pr]</td>
<td>phr [pʰr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl [pl]</td>
<td>phil [pʰl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr [gr]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gy [gi]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl [gl]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hr [hr]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hr [hr]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br [br]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mr [mr]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ml [ml]</td>
<td>gny [ɡ̥]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exact phonetic value of the phoneme here transcribed as /hr/ could not yet be determined. It seems to vary between a voiceless trill [ɾ], a voiceless glottal fricative [h] followed by alveolar trill [ɾ], voiceless velar fricative [x] followed by alveolar trill [ɾ], or even voiceless retroflex fricative [ʂ]. Phonetic laboratory analysis should be able to determine the exact value. The clusters involving a consonant followed by the glide /l/ have been attested only in a very limited number of lexemes, whereas the other clusters are more common. In particular, the cluster /ngl/ is of interest, since this cluster does not occur in any of the other East Bodish languages or other Tibeto-Burman languages such as Tamang or Lepcha.


---

26 Increasingly pronounced as [ŋu], in which a simplification of complex initial consonant clusters under influence of Tibetan and Dzongkha can be observed.
27 Also [kʰɾo].
28 Also [glɛ:].
29 Also [pʰɾo].
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10.4.3. Vowel Phonemes

Table 10.4. Thongrong Dakpa Plain Vowel Phonemes.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ü</td>
<td>[y:]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e / ē</td>
<td>[e / ː]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŏ</td>
<td>[ɔ:/]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>è</td>
<td>[ɛ / æː]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ò / ɔ</td>
<td>[ɔ / ɔː]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a / ā</td>
<td>[a / aː]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The close and close-mid front rounded vowels /ü/ and /ö/ are inherently long. The close front unrounded vowel /i/ and close back rounded vowel /u/ are unambiguous with no distinctive length. Open-mid front unrounded vowel /e/ and open-mid back rounded vowels /o/ are long in open syllables and short in closed syllables. Vowel length is distinctive and does not solely depend on phonotactic and syllabic position in the open front unrounded vowel /a/, close-mid front unrounded vowel /e/ and close-mid back rounded vowel /o/. Examples include [kja] ‘Indian, Nepali’ vs. [kjæ:] ‘do’, [ŋa] ‘fish’ vs. [‘ŋa:] ‘rainbow’, [kʰra] ‘hair’ vs. [kʰra] ‘blood’, [‘ŋas] ‘twitter (of a bird)’ vs. [‘ŋa:s] ‘pillow’, [‘jo:] ‘servant’ vs. [‘jo] ‘milk (v.)’.

Table 10.5. Thongrong Dakpa Diphthong Vowel Phonemes.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Although speakers of Thongrong Dakpa will pronounce a large number of diphthong phonemes no minimal or near minimal pairs can be attested, and there are only six distinctive

³⁰ Also [pʰaŋ ʃo].
³¹ Also [kʰet].
³² Also [‘mlieŋ].


10.4.4. TONE.

The Thongrong variety of Dakpa marks a high vs. low register tone distinction. This tone is, however, only contrastive in syllables starting with certain initial consonants, namely the voiced nasals /ng/, /ny/, /n/, /m/ and the cluster /ml/, and the glides /y/, /w/ and /l/. The onsets starting with a monophthong or diphthong vowel and with the unvoiced and aspirated phonemes /k/, /kh/, /c/, /ch/, /t/, /th/, /p/, /ph/, /ts/, /tsh/, /sh/, /s/, /h/, /lh/, /tr/ and /thr/, including the initial consonant clusters /kl/, /ky/, /khl/, /pl/, /phl/, /hr/, /pr/ and /phr/, take the high register tone. The high register tone onset of vowel-initial syllables is characterised by an abrupt glottal release that could phonetically be transcribed as [‘V’], with V for the vowel. Syllables starting with the voiced phonemes /g/, /j/, /d/, /dr/, /b/, /zh/, /z/, /r/ and /dz/, as well as the initial consonant clusters /gl/, /gr/, /br/, /ml/, /ngl/, /ngr/ and /mr/, take the low register tone35. In the reminder of this description, only the high register tone in syllables starting with the phonemes in which tone is contrastive is indicated by apostrophe ‘/’. This choice was consciously adopted at the cost of the notation adopted by Hyslop (e.g. 2008, 2009), i.e. with an acute accent ‘/’ on the vowel in the high tone and a grave accent ‘/’ on the vowel in the low tone following the word-initial sonorant consonants and voiced obstruents whenever contrastive. The latter notation could, in hand-written transcriptions, be more confusing, particularly on the vowel /i/.


33 Also [bahu].

34 Also [pʰeʔ].

35 Although [‘bla] ‘dust’ might prove to be an exception.

36 Only in the Lekpo dialect. In Thongrong Dakpa [‘nep].


According to Hyslop (2006, 2008, 2009, 2010), Central Bodish languages have a relatively complex tonal system in which high and low tone are contrastive following sonorant consonants, with high tone predictably following voiceless initials. Voiced initials may be fully voiced with a mid-low tone or devoiced with a low/breathy-voiced tone. Central Bodish languages also have contrastive level and falling contours in the various tonal registers. East Bodish languages, on the other hand, are typically characterised by a contrastive high vs. low tone following the sonorant consonants only, with high tone following voiceless obstruents and low tone following voiced obstruents. But there are some indications that distinctive devoiced syllable onsets in the low register tone exist in Thongrong Dakpa. This was also reported by Van Driem (2007b). Conclusive evidence of this in the form of minimal or near-minimal pairs, however, has not yet been found.

Some other phonotactic peculiarities of this Dakpa dialect include a drop of word-final vowel /u/ when preceded by velar stop /k/ as in /iku/ [ik] ‘your’, /ngoku/ [ŋok] ‘mine’ and a drop of word-final vowel /i/ when preceded by phoneme /sh/ as in /’leshi/ [’leʃi] ‘garlic’ and /dashi/ [dae] ‘today’.

10.5. THE DAKPA DIALECTS.

As is always the case in dialect descriptions, dialect boundaries are often difficult to determine until and unless a comprehensive comparative study is conducted. In the case of Dakpa one can speak of a dialect continuum rather than geographically definable dialect areas, and mutual intelligibility, a key characteristic of dialects, can be attested among all
these dialects. Because of the cultural and political supremacy of the Tawang area, this
dialect is widely accepted as the standard dialect. This dialect will be referred to henceforth
as the Tawang Standard (TS). The linguistic supremacy of the Tawang dialect was also
recognised by Zhāng (1997:3). The variety spoken in Mokto and Jang (MJ), south of the
Tawang river and north of the Nyingsangla pass from Sakteng geok in Bhutan, is considered
slightly different from the Tawang Standard. A limited number of lexemes from this dialect
as spoken in Jang village have been presented by Dondrup (1993). The southward extension
of the Dakpa speaking area across the Sela pass into Dirang circle of Kameng district forms
another closely related variety, some data of which were presented in Das Gupta (1968) and

The Pangchen or Pangchennang area lies just east of the border with Trashiyangtsi in Bhutan
along the Nyamyang river in the Zemithang circle. The people of Pangchen are linguistically
and culturally distinct from the speakers of the standard Tawang. The dialect they speak is
closer to Dzalakha and the dialect of the Lekpo area, and will here be called the Pangchen
dialect (PC), in recognition of the traditional name of the area. Zhāng (1997:3) calls the
Bāngxīn dialect Xuezeng. Lu’s 2002 Tawang dialect description appears to be collected
from a speaker of this Pangchen dialect. Various etymologies exist for the name of the area.
Some believe that the name Pangchen derives from Tibetan བང་ཆེན། pang/ ‘give up, renounce’
and ཇེན། chen/ ‘large, big’ as the people of the area earlier renounced all sinful activities.
Others prefer the less poetic but geographically apt derivation from བང། pang/ ‘meadow,
grassland’ and ཇེན། big’. The modern name of the area, Zemithang circle, is said to mean
‘sand valley’, although the name is locally pronounced as བཞི་ཕོ་སྒང། Jikmethang. The
area has around 3,000 inhabitants whose main livelihood is dependent on millet cultivation
and yak, yak crossbreed, goat and sheep rearing. Pangchen is home to the Taktsang
meditation cave of Guru Rinpoche and the nearby Zangtopelri, the Gorzam Chorten and
the home of Dunmo Hacang.

The Lekpo area of Tshona district in Tibet is geographically and linguistically an extension of
the Pangchen valley. Both phonologically and lexically this dialect is most heavily influenced
by spoken Tibetan. The dialect will here be called the Lekpo dialect (LP), although its status

---

37 The etymology is unknown.
38 Ref. p. 60.
39 Ref. paragraph 16.4.2.
40 Ref. paragraph 5.1 and Annex IV.
as a separate dialect rather than a variety of the Pangchen dialect is heavily based on geopolitical considerations and the developments in the language in the past 60 years. Lu (2002) called it the Māmā dialect as he collected his data from Māmā township. Zhāng (1997:3) called this dialect Lèbū.

The upper Kholong river valley of Trashi Yangtsi dzongkhag in Bhutan forms a next dialect area. This dialect will be called according to its traditional endonym as Dzala dialect (DL). Van Driem (2007b), Balodis (2009) and Genetti (2009) earlier published on Dzala. Norbu (2004), himself from this part of Trashi Yangtsi, calls his people Džalha and their language Džakha or Džalakha. The etymology is unknown, but in written Tibetan, Džala can mean ‘interest on borrowed money’ or ‘go to waste’. As in the case of Sharpai, the addition ‘god, deity’ appears to be a recent and conscious effort to attribute a divine origin to the people. For Tshangla speakers, the name Dzala has a humorous connotation, because in their language /zala/, which in some dialects is pronounced ['zala], means ‘macaque’.

Closely related, but in terms of dialect variability markedly different, is the dialect spoken in Khoma geok in Lhüntsi dzongkhag, from here onwards called the Khoma dialect (KM). Mutual intelligibility with Dakpa was attested during a visit to Singe Dzong in 2005 and several days spent in Khoma village following that. Three speech varieties can be distinguished even within this dialect. The first is the variety spoken in the village of Nyalamdung. The second variety is spoken along the upper Khoma river and its tributary the Tsendengang river in the villages of Pangkhar, Khomang, Gangla and Tsangngo and adjoining hamlets. The local prestige variety is spoken along the lower Khoma river in the villages of B/aptong, Berpa and Gönpakâp and adjoining hamlets. The variety of Nyalamdung is so closely related to Dżalakha of Trashi Yangtsi that it most probably represents a relatively recent migration (Norbu 2004:13). The dialect of Khoma is often called Sharpai Dżalakha (Norbu 2004:14) or Sharpaikha, perhaps as a result of the location east of the historically important valleys of Bumthang and Kurtö, which were the centre of the government and the monarchy of Bhutan in the 19th and early 20th century.
The Lumla circle of Tawang on the north bank of the Tawang river and the adjoining areas of Trashiyangtsi on the north bank of the Gong river in Bhutan form a fourth dialect area, here called the Zanglung dialect (ZL) in recognition of the ancient name of the area. Van Driem’s 2003 Dakpa data belong to this dialect. Dakpa speakers from this area of Bhutan report that they do not only speak the same language variety, but also share close cultural, matrimonial and economic ties with the people from across the border. Zhāng (1997) refers to this dialect and the area as Daba. The dialect of the area to the south of the Tawang and Nyamyang rivers has been described in paragraph 10.4. The people of this area all particularly revere the sacred Tshongtshongma peak located right at the nemesis of their area. They have close economic relations with their Tshangla neighbours to the west and south, although the Tshangla have always treated these Dakpa with a certain degree of reservation and even fear and suspicion due to their ascribed unruly, lawless and rough nature. The inclusion of the Dakpa language as spoken in Pemakö as separate dialects, as Lu (2002) has done, is questionable. These dialects are phonologically and lexically rather similar to the dialects of the original homelands of the migrants. Most of the phonological and lexical differences that exist can be explained from the 300-odd years of linguistic separation and isolation from other Dakpa speakers and the linguistic influence of the Tibetan and Tshangla languages. Zhāng (1997:4) calls the dialect of Déxīng village ba mi (sic. Brami) the name by which their Tshangla neighbours call them. The geographic location and speaker population of the dialect Zhāng (1997:4) calls the Li dialect is unknown.

10.5.1. PHONOLOGICAL COMPARISON.

The Dakpa dialects show a great phonological variability. Lu’s 2002 data of the four Dakpa dialects vis-à-vis Thongrong Dakpa are presented in table 10.6.

**TABLE 10.6. PHONOLOGICAL COMPARISON OF DAKPA DIALECTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonological feature</th>
<th>Thongrong</th>
<th>Bāngxīn</th>
<th>Wēnlàng</th>
<th>Māmā</th>
<th>Dáwàng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of simple consonants</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of complex consonant clusters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of simple vowels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of diphthong vowels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contrastive tones</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monophthongisation of diphthong vowel phonemes has resulted in distinctive vowel length in the Mâmã variety from Lekpo and Lu’s Tawang data. Simplification of complex initial consonant clusters has resulted in an increase in the number of distinctive tones in the Mâmã and Tawang varieties. These two general phonological trends- monophthongisation of diphthongs leading to distinctive vowel length and simplification of initial consonant clusters leading to increased distinctive tone- are attested from these two varieties as a result of greater exposure to spoken Tibetan in these dialects. The Pemakõ varieties preserved a higher number of complex initial consonant clusters and diphthong vowel phonemes as a result of the linguistic environment, with exposure to speakers of Tshangla rather than Tibetan.

Comparison between the data in Lu (2002) and the Thongrong Dakpa data show that Thongrong Dakpa has more limitedly undergone the process of simplification of initial consonant clusters. The dialect takes an intermediate position regarding the simple and diphthong vowel phonemes. Further comparison shows the greatest phonological and lexical similarity with the data from Wênlâng village. This is curious, considering the geographical distance between Wênlâng and Thongrong as compared to for example the distance between Thongrong and Tawang. Perhaps forefathers of the people that settled Wênlâng originate in the Tawang-Bhutan border area, whereas the provenance of the Bângxîn speakers is elsewhere in the Tawang or Pangchen area.

10.5.2. Lexical Variation.

An analysis of 2000 lexemes from Lu (2002:335-338) shows a lexical similarity between the Mâmã and Tawang varieties of over 96%. A total of 889 lexemes are exactly the same, 976 lexemes have a phonological difference, 62 lexemes a morphological difference, and only 73 lexemes or 3.7% of the lexemes are entirely different. A similar analysis (Lu 2002:338-341) shows a lexical similarity between the Wênlâng and Bângxîn varieties of almost 95%. A total of 847 lexemes are exactly the same, 985 lexemes have a phonological difference, 66 lexemes a morphological difference, and only 102 lexemes or 5.4% of the lexemes are entirely different. Finally, Lu (2002: 342-350) compared the Mâmã and Wênlâng varieties. He reports that 1607, or 80%, of the lexemes are the same or similar except for minor phonological differences, with 20% or 393 words different.

There are 346 words where Mâmã and Tawang on the one hand and Wênlâng and Bângxîn on the other have exactly the same word. The variety of Wênlâng village appears to
be phonologically and lexically the most divergent, with a total of 102 words not found in any of the other varieties, vs. three in Mámä, four in Tawang, and four in the Bāngxīn variety. Some of this divergence can be attributed to loans from Tshangla, because the community of Wēnlàng has a mixed population of Tshangla and Dakpa speakers, whereas Bāngxīn is more homogene in its ethnic composition. Examples of this include gan⁵⁵ di⁵⁵ ‘chin’, Dirang Tshangla /gamthi/, to⁵⁵ tshaŋ⁵⁵ ‘friend’, Bhutan/Pemakö Tshangla /totshang/, tam⁵⁵ ‘story’, Tshangla /tam/, no⁵⁵ tsan⁵⁵ ‘thing’, Tshangla /notsang/, bon⁵⁵ ‘float’, Tshangla /bon/, ṇom⁵⁵ ṇun⁵⁵ ‘poor’, Bhutan Tshangla /nyamcung/, phar⁵⁵ chok⁵⁵ ma⁵⁵ ‘always’, Pemakö Tshangla /barjongma/.

10.5.3. DZALA: A LANGUAGE OR A DIALECT?

There are longstanding socio-cultural, religious and historical ties between the Dzala and the Dakpa. These ties have been epitomised in the story surrounding the construction of the two great chortens at Yangtsi and Gorzam. A feature movie ‘Chorten Kora’ on this topic drew huge crowds in Bhutan and Tawang, and reiterated the interest of people from both sides of the border. Dzalakha speakers readily admit that their language is mutually intelligible with Dakpa. As was mentioned before, the distinction between Dakpa and Dzala in many of the villages of the lower Kholongchu river valley is one of professed identity rather than a linguistic distinction. Van Driem (2007b) already pointed out that based on the available linguistic data, Dzala and Dakpa should be treated as a coherent subgroup within East Bodish.

When we compare the various data now collected, including own data of Dzala, Thongrong Dakpa, Tawang Dakpa, and Lu’s 2002 data of Mámä, Tawang, Wēnlàng and Bāngxīn Dakpa, it appears that there is considerable dialect variation between what are generally considered as Dakpa dialects, and that Dzala is by no means more divergent from any of these dialects to warrant a separate linguistic status. Compare for example the lexical items in table 10.7.
Comparing the phonological and lexical data on Dakpa available at present, including Lu’s data from Pemakö, Lekpo and Tawang and own data from Tawang, Thongrong, Dakpa and Dzala, it appears that the phonological and lexical variation between what are considered various Dakpa dialects and Dzala is as great as the phonological and lexical variation within these various Dakpa dialects.

Despite the close cultural and linguistic ties, the Dzala clearly profess ethnic and linguistic distinctiveness from the Dakpa. The reasons for this perhaps need to be sought in the historical developments since the 17th century. Whereas the upper and lower Kholong river

### Table 10.7. Comparative Table of the Dakpa Dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māmā</th>
<th>Tawang (Lu 2002)</th>
<th>Bāngxīn</th>
<th>Dzala</th>
<th>Wēnláng</th>
<th>Tawang (own)</th>
<th>Thongrong</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meʔ³³</td>
<td>meʔ³³</td>
<td>mek³³</td>
<td>'miløŋ</td>
<td>mek⁵⁵</td>
<td>'me:løŋ</td>
<td>'me:løŋ</td>
<td>eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niŋ⁵⁵</td>
<td>niŋ⁵⁵</td>
<td>neŋ⁵⁵</td>
<td>'neŋ</td>
<td>neŋ⁵⁵</td>
<td>'neŋ</td>
<td>'neŋ</td>
<td>heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cer⁵⁵</td>
<td>cer⁵⁵</td>
<td>ki⁵³</td>
<td>ke:</td>
<td>ki⁵⁵</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kʰra</td>
<td>blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laʔ⁵⁵ priu⁵³</td>
<td>laʔ⁵⁵ priu⁵³</td>
<td>briu⁵⁵ ma⁵³</td>
<td>'la:bruma:</td>
<td>briu⁵⁵ ma⁵³</td>
<td>'la:primo:</td>
<td>'laʔpriu</td>
<td>finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nem⁴⁴ nën⁵⁵</td>
<td>nem⁴⁴ nën⁵⁵</td>
<td>na⁵⁵ lap⁵³</td>
<td>'ne:lap</td>
<td>na⁵⁵ lap⁵³</td>
<td>'ne:la:pu</td>
<td>'nii:lap</td>
<td>ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le⁵⁵ meʔ⁵³</td>
<td>le⁵⁵ meʔ⁵³</td>
<td>li⁵⁵ min⁵⁵</td>
<td>li⁵⁵ min⁵⁵</td>
<td>li⁵⁵ min</td>
<td>li’i:ma</td>
<td>li’i:ma</td>
<td>foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si⁵³</td>
<td>si⁵³</td>
<td>dʰi</td>
<td>tsi⁵³</td>
<td>tsi⁵³</td>
<td>tsi</td>
<td>tsi</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nis⁵⁵</td>
<td>nis⁵⁵</td>
<td>niŋ⁵⁵</td>
<td>'ni</td>
<td>niŋ⁵⁵</td>
<td>'nis</td>
<td>'nis</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cen⁵³</td>
<td>cen⁵³</td>
<td>get⁵³</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>get⁵³</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ce⁵⁵ po⁵³</td>
<td>ce⁵⁵ po⁵³</td>
<td>ci⁵⁵ nu⁵³</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ci⁵⁵ nu⁵³</td>
<td>ci’nu</td>
<td>ci’nu</td>
<td>be happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meʔ⁵³</td>
<td>meʔ⁵³</td>
<td>met⁵³</td>
<td>mui</td>
<td>mou⁵⁵</td>
<td>myi</td>
<td>mui</td>
<td>sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man⁵⁵</td>
<td>man⁵⁵</td>
<td>mat⁵⁵</td>
<td>mat</td>
<td>mat⁵⁵</td>
<td>mat</td>
<td>mat</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bla⁵³</td>
<td>bla⁵³</td>
<td>'bla</td>
<td>mla⁵³</td>
<td>mla</td>
<td>mla</td>
<td>mla</td>
<td>arrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu⁵³ mo⁵³</td>
<td>pu⁵³ mo⁵³</td>
<td>bu⁵³ mo⁵³</td>
<td>burmin</td>
<td>bu⁵³ min</td>
<td>zomo:</td>
<td>zom</td>
<td>daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tšok⁵³ po⁵³</td>
<td>tšok⁵³ po⁵³</td>
<td>tšok⁵³ po⁵³</td>
<td>chʰa:ro:</td>
<td>to³⁵ tšan⁵³</td>
<td>'nom-lang</td>
<td>'nom-lang</td>
<td>friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nap⁵³ te⁵³</td>
<td>nap⁵³ te⁵³</td>
<td>mren⁵³</td>
<td>mren</td>
<td>mren⁵³</td>
<td>mren</td>
<td>mren</td>
<td>last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>təa⁵³</td>
<td>təa⁵³</td>
<td>ca⁵³</td>
<td>za</td>
<td>ca⁵³</td>
<td>za</td>
<td>za</td>
<td>bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om⁵³</td>
<td>om⁵³</td>
<td>hom⁵³</td>
<td>wam</td>
<td>wom⁵³</td>
<td>wom</td>
<td>wam</td>
<td>bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bre⁵³</td>
<td>bre⁵³</td>
<td>mu⁵³ re⁵³</td>
<td>mre:</td>
<td>mu⁵³ ri⁵⁵</td>
<td>mrui</td>
<td>mrui</td>
<td>snake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
valley was subjugated by the Drukpa military campaigns and consequently became a part of Bhutan, the Drukpa conquest was halted at Buri Jangphu in Zanglung\textsuperscript{41}. The Drukpa army did not cross the Nyamyang river valley into the Pangchen and Tawang areas, which had by that time already come under the influence of the Ganden administration. Whereas there was Tibetan, Gelukpa and later Indian influence on the Dakpa culture, religion and dialects of Zanglung, Tawang, Pangchen and Lekpo, the Kholong and Khoma river valleys were influenced by the Drukpa and Dzongkha. But Dzalakha and its sister language Khomakha are at least linguistically dialects of the large dialect family called Dakpa.

10.6. Dakpa Orthographies.

Because Dakpa is phonologically different from spoken Tibetan and spoken Dzongkha, the ’Ucen orthographies that exist for these two languages cannot be directly employed to write Dakpa. There are strong arguments, therefore, that the Dakpa orthography in both ’Ucen and Roman script should be unique and preferably have a one-on-one correspondence to the phonology. But even the orthography proposed for Tshangla in Chapter 6 cannot be directly used for Dakpa or simply adapted for Dakpa, because Dakpa phonology is inherently different from Tshangla phonology.

Dakpa is one of the phonologically more complex languages of the area due to the presence of a high number of initial consonant clusters, the presence of a high vs. low register tone distinction on voiced nasals and glides in syllable-initial position, and a more complex vowel inventory, including the presence of rounded vowels and distinctive long vs. short vowels. Although the solutions proposed for the representation of the Tshangla initial consonant clusters can also be reproduced for the Dakpa orthography, some other linguistic features do not exist in Tshangla. However, they do occur in Central and East Bodish languages.

From this observation follows a valid argument against a Dakpa orthography that disregards the Dzongkha and Chöke orthographical conventions. A growing proportion of the people who speak one of the Dakpa dialects are also conversant and even literate in Chöke, Tibetan or Dzongkha. As a direct consequence, any orthography designed for Dakpa based on the ’Ucen script should ideally closely follow the orthographic rules of these languages, especially where the traditional orthography does not allow for a one-on-one representation of the phonological feature. This is particularly pertinent when it concerns the representation

\textsuperscript{41} Ref. footnote 71 to p. 75.
of the retroflex phonemes, tone and vowel length. Although innovative solutions have earlier been proposed, these solutions will greatly inhibit correct learning of Chöke or Dzongkha at a later stage. This could be an unwanted situation, especially in Bhutan, where Dzongkha is the national language which is promoted at all levels. Similarly, people with a background in Chöke or Dzongkha will face considerable hardship and confusion if the Dakpa orthography is markedly different from the Chöke or Dzongkha orthography.

As previously argued\(^\text{42}\), the discussion of whether to write the hitherto unwritten Tibeto-Burman languages of the Buddhist people of the southern Himalayas in tshûm, jôtshûm or jôyik script is partially a meaningless discussion, because these scripts, whether in handwritten or in typed form, can be effortlessly changed from one to another. And as is the case with Tshangla, Dakpa is a language not only spoken in Bhutan, but also in India and Tibet, where the Bhutanese formal and cursive longhand writing are unknown. It is therefore decided that the uncial writing will be used here. If need prescribes, for example, for textbooks and other publications in Bhutan, the tshûm writing can be changed to jôyik whenever needed.

The following orthographies, both in 'Ucen and in Roman scripts provide a first step in the direction of developing a comprehensive Dakpa phonology. Ideally, the standard Dakpa phonology should be based on the phonology of the Tawang dialect of Dakpa, as this dialect is by any means considered the most prestigious dialect. In the absence of a complete phonological description of Tawang Dakpa, this orthography is based on the phonological description of Thongrong Dakpa given in paragraph 10.4. It is expected that once a comprehensive Tawang Dakpa phonological description becomes available, the orthography proposed here can be effortlessly adapted to include the phonological features of this standard.

10.6.1. ROMAN ORTHOGRAPHY.

The Roman orthography of Dakpa closely follows the transcribed phonemes in tables 10.1 to 10.5. Distinctive vowel length in the phonemes /e/, /o/ and /a/ is indicated by the circumflex accent, as in /ê/, /ô/, /â/. The open-mid vowels are represented with an grave accent, as in /è/
and /ö/. The main adaptation that has been made is the representation of suprasegmental tone. Even in the Roman orthography, several choices exist. Van Driem (2003) in his Dzongkha grammar has used the apostrophe /’/ for representing the distinctive high register tone onset on nasals, glides and vowels. Lu (1986) uses various tone diacritics to indicate the tones that he has observed in the Dakpa dialects he describes: the high-level tone ߅, the high-falling tone ߅, combining tone ߅ and ߅; the high-rising tone ߅, combining ߅, ߅, and ߅; and the low-falling tone ߅. In his 2002 dialect description, Lu uses the IPA notation. Lowes (in publ.) proposed to use an accent mark on the vowel following the high tone initial onset, e.g. á. In this description only the high register tone in syllables starting with the phonemes in which tone is contrastive is indicated by apostrophe /’/. As Thongrong Dakpa appears to have only a high vs. low register tone distinction on certain onsets, the usage of Van Driem’s apostrophe /’/ would be the simplest and easiest diacritic to indicate tone in the Roman Dakpa orthography. The punctuation of Roman Dakpa will be the same as the punctuation of Roman Tshangla

10.6.2. 'UCEN ORTHOGRAPHY.

Dakpa phonology is inherently different from Tshangla phonology and the Tshangla orthography of paragraph 9.14.4 can, therefore, not be simply reduplicated to produce a simple, straightforward and phonologically consistent Dakpa phonology as well. But to the farthest possible extent, phonemes that exist in both languages should be represented in the orthographies in the same way. As such, earlier choices made for 'Ucen Tshangla were adapted to accommodate for certain features of the phonology of 'Ucen Dakpa in order to maintain this consistency. The 'Ucen Dakpa orthography has not yet been completed. Certain phonological features of Dakpa are difficult to represent in 'Ucen script. These include the contrastive vowel length, the rounded simple vowels, the retroflex vowel phonemes, the large number of complex initial consonant clusters and the glottal stop. Proposals for the orthography that have been considered to date are given here, whereas further proposals for the remaining orthographical issues will be forthcoming.

In traditional written Tibetan and Dzongkha 'Ucen orthography, several options exist to represent the close-mid rounded vowels /ü/ and /ö/. These options include ལོ, ལེ, ལེ, ༩, ༩, ༩.

43 Ref. paragraph 10.4.4.
44 Ref. paragraph 9.14.3.
In 'Ucen Dakpa, however, the options with ɹ and š are not possible because /n/ occurs as syllable-final consonant in Dakpa and because it has been decided that the Dakpa final consonant /v/ would be represented in the Dakpa 'Ucen orthography by ɹ. Although Dakpa also has syllable-final consonant /s/, this consonant occurs in syllable-final position only after vowel /i/. Therefore, the proposed 'Ucen representation of the rounded vowels /û/ and /ö/ is ɹû and ɹö respectively. No decisions or proposal have yet been made to represent the distinctive vowel length in the simple vowels, i.e., how to represent vowels /è/, /å/ and /ô/ in the 'Ucen orthography. Nor has any proposal been made to represent the open-mid front unrounded vowel /è/ and open-mid back rounded vowels /ô/.

Table 10.8. 'Ucen Dakpa simple vowels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i [i]</th>
<th>ü [y:</th>
<th>ìû</th>
<th>e/e [e/e:]</th>
<th>ɹi/ ?</th>
<th>o [o:]</th>
<th>ɹö/</th>
<th>è [e ~ e:]</th>
<th>ɹö [o/o:]</th>
<th>ɹi/ ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a/a [a/a:]</td>
<td>ɹi/ ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'Ucen Dakpa orthography for the diphthong vowel phonemes closely follows the 'Ucen orthography of the Tshangla diphthong vowel phonemes. Since many allophones of the diphthong vowel phonemes exist, the 'Ucen orthography for the closest 'Ucen Tshangla cognate has been used.

Table 10.9. 'Ucen Dakpa diphthong vowels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>êi</th>
<th>ɹi</th>
<th>au</th>
<th>ɹi</th>
<th>ɹu</th>
<th>ɹi</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>ɹi</th>
<th>ɹi</th>
<th>êi [i]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ai~ei]</td>
<td>[au~ou]</td>
<td>[ou~ou]</td>
<td>[ui~yi]</td>
<td>[iu~iy]</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'Ucen Dakpa simple consonants are simple and straightforward and closely follow the Written Tibetan, Dzongkha and Tshangla orthographies. The rata is written as subscript on the dorso-velar set to represent the retroflex phonemes, so that the rata can be used on the velar plosive set to represent the distinctive velar plosive plus trill set of Dakpa. The representation of the glottal stop remains problematic, specifically because it was decided that the syllable-final consonant /k/ would be represented in 'Ucen Dakpa by ŋ, which could otherwise be used to represent the glottal stop.
TABLE 10.10. 'Ucen Dakpa simple consonants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>consonant</th>
<th>symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k [k]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh [kb]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g [g]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng [ŋ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c [ʨ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch [ʨb]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j [ʥ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny [ȵ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t [t]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th [ʦʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d [ʣ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n [ȵ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr [ʦʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thr [ʦʰʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dr [ʣ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p [p]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph [pʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b [ʡ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m [m]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts [ʦ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsh [ʦʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz [ʣ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w [ʨʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh [ʒ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z [z]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y [j]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r [ɾ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l [l]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh [ɕ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s [s]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h [h]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wide range of Dakpa initial consonant clusters will be represented in the most simple and straightforward way. Thus subscript rata, yata and lata will be used as subscript on the velar and bilabial plosive sets, the nasals and the voiceless glottal fricative to write the initial consonant clusters in 'Ucen Dakpa.

TABLE 10.11. 'Ucen Dakpa initial consonant clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>consonant</th>
<th>symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kr [kr]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khr [krʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr [ɡr]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngr [ŋr]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kl [kl]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khl [klʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl [ɡl]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngl [ŋl]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ky [kj]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khy [kjʰ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gy [ɡj]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hr [hɾ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr [pr]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phr [pʰɾ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br [ʡɾ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mr [mɾ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl [pl]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phl [pʰl]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bl [ʡl]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ml [mɭ]</td>
<td>ꡘ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we saw in paragraph 10.4.4, tone in Dakpa appears only distinctive on voiced continuants /ng/, /ny/, /n/, /m/, /y/, /w/ and /l/ and the initial cluster /ml/. The decision was made to represent contrastive initial register tone in Dakpa in the manner represented in table 10.12. In Written Tibetan and Dzongkha 'Ucen orthographies, one of the ways to indicate high register tone onset is by superscript ra. This option is simple and straightforward and has therefore been adopted in 'Ucen Dakpa as well. Since the current 'Ucen scripts do not yet allow for lata and wata subscript below ꡘ as this becomes ꡘ and ꡘ respectively, the
temporary solutions ṡş and şş have been adopted for the phonemes /y/ and /w/ in the high register tone.

**Table 10.12. 'Ucen Dakpa high tonal onset.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial phoneme/cluster</th>
<th>Low register tone</th>
<th>High register tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman  'Ucen</td>
<td>Roman  'Ucen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ng/</td>
<td>ng  ṡş</td>
<td>'ng  şş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ny/</td>
<td>ny  şş</td>
<td>'ny  šş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>n   šş</td>
<td>'n   šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>m   šš</td>
<td>'m   šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ml/</td>
<td>ml  şš</td>
<td>'ml  šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/y/</td>
<td>y   şš</td>
<td>'y   šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>w   šš</td>
<td>'w   šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>l   šš</td>
<td>'l   šš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**10.7. Conclusions.**

Despite the relatively large number of speakers and the importance of the language from a historical-comparative linguistic perspective, there is not a single grammatical description of the prestige dialect of Dakpa from Tawang proper. Existing grammatical and dialect descriptions are difficult to access since they were written in Chinese, and moreover the dialects appear to represent minor dialects from the Dakpa dialect continuum. Several Dakpa dialects have been distinguished here and wide phonological, lexical and possibly also syntactic variation between these varieties has been reported. Considering this wide variation, it is argued that Dzalakha and its sister dialect Khomakha from northeastern Bhutan ought to be considered dialects of Dakpa, at least from a linguistic perspective. A first and unfortunately incomplete proposal for a Roman and 'Ucen Dakpa orthography has been proposed here, hopefully contributing to a sound debate and eventual solutions for the outstanding issues.
Presumably, the East Bodish speakers of Dakpa originate on the Tibetan plateau, perhaps in the far western Zhangzhung region or in the northeastern areas, from where they migrated or fled from political and religious upheaval in the first millennium CE. Until their migration south across the Himalayan slopes the Dakpa belonged to the same linguistic group as the speakers of the other East Bodish languages- the Kheng, Bumthang, Mangde, Kurtö and Chali speakers. The route they took from southern Tibet was different, however. The ancestors of the speakers of the Bumthang group entered the Camkhar and perhaps Kuri river valleys through Lhodrak, whereas the Dakpa forefathers followed the Nyamyang river valley. Whereas some people remained in the Lekpu and Pangchen areas, the ancestors of the Dzala speakers of the Kholong and Khoma river valleys migrated westwards, and the majority of the people settled in the Tawang area as a result of the more favourable climatic conditions there. As we will see in paragraph 12.3, in the middle of the 14th century people belonging to the indigenous Khuzang, Ba and Kun clans inhabited the area surrounding Tawang, ruled by the Jowo clan claiming descent from Lhase Tsangma. Some of the territory of the Jowo clan is then taken over by the Brokpa refugees. The indigenous Khuzang, Ba and Kun clans probably represent the linguistic and ethnic ancestors of the present Dakpa speakers of the Tawang area.
Map X. Brokpa and the Dakpa dialects.
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Figure 10.1. The Dürong Chorten at Trashiyangtsi, Eastern Bhutan (Photo courtesy: Y. Waarts).

Figure 10.2. The Gorzam Chorten at Pangchen, Tawang,
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Figure 10.3. Crowd at the Tawang monastery during the Dungjur festival.

Figure 10.4. The clustered Dakpa village of Khinyel, Tötsho geok, Eastern Bhutan.
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Figure 10.5. Gom Kora during the yearly festival, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 10.6. Overview of Gomkora (Courtesy Y. Waarts).
CHAPTER 11. CENTRAL BODISH MIGRANTS FROM THE PLATEAU: THE BROKPA.

One of the most peculiar ethnic groups in Bhutan is the Brokpa. They are well-known all over the country for their nomadic lifestyle and distinct clothing. The Brokpa have maintained their separate identity until the present, mainly through self-imposed isolation and enforced seclusion by the government. Increasing development, including construction of a road, arrival of electricity and opening of the area to tourism, have already started to bring rapid and unprecedented change.

11.1. THE ETHNONYM BROKPA IN A HIMALAYAN PERSPECTIVE.

In the Himalayan region, ब्रोक्पा Brokpa is an ethnonym just as confusing as Monpa and ’Lopa, since the name is used for a medley of people who live in different localities, who are of very diverse ethnic origins, and who speak very different languages. An overview of some of these people can be found in Miller (2008). In Tibetan, ब्रोक्पा, pronounced [dʒøkpa], means ‘nomad’ and an at least partial nomadic lifestyle is the common characteristic of the Brokpa people. In some areas, such as the Jangthang plains of northern Tibet, the Drokpa are completely nomadic, moving with their herds of yak and yak crossbreeds, sheep and goats across the plateau in search of grazing land. They barter livestock products for other essential food items with the agriculturalist villages. Other Brokpa have a partially sedentary lifestyle, growing high altitude crops like barley, wheat, radish and turnip near homesteads and spending part of the year with their livestock in a transhumance system. Examples include the Shin, called Brokpa or Drogpa by their Ladakhi neighbours, of the villages of Da, Hanu, Darchik and Garkon in the Dahanu valley in the Kargil district of Ladakh. They are of Indo-Aryan origin and speak Brokskat- despite the Bodic name a Dardic language- but their culture has been greatly influenced by their Ladakhi and Tibetan neighbours, including an at least superficial adoption of Buddhism (Basin 2008). In the high Himalayan areas of Nepal, there are various semi-nomadic people who are called Brokpa or Drokpa, including the inhabitants of Dolpo, Lo Manthang and other areas. These people are generally speakers of Bodish languages and Buddhists. In Bhutan, the semi-nomadic people of Laya and Lunana are also called ब्रोक्पा ’Bjôp, the Dzongkha cognate of Brokpa. The people of Dur village in Bumthang call themselves Brokpa and their language Brokkat, and finally, in Eastern Bhutan and western Arunachal Pradesh we can find the people of interest to our current study.
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11.2. A CASE OF MISSTAKEN IDENTITY.

Previously it was widely assumed that the Brokpa people only inhabit the geoks of Merak and Sakteng in Bhutan (e.g. Wangmo 1990, Van Driem 1993, Aris 1979, 1984 and 2004, Dorji 2003, Chand 2004). Some authors, including Pommaret (1994), previously equated the Brokpa people of Merak and Sakteng with the Dakpa people of Tawang. This lapse to distinguish the Brokpa and Dakpa is understandable, and even most urban Bhutanese themselves usually call the people of Tawang and adjoining areas of Bhutan erroneously Brokpa. The mistaken identity can be attributed to the many religious and cultural characteristics the Brokpa and Dakpa share, including most recognisably the characteristic dress and conical, tasselled yak hair hats.

Linguistic evidence and historical sources, however, clearly indicate that the Brokpa and the Dakpa are two distinct ethnic groups. Though sharing an origin on the Tibetan plateau and inhabiting contiguous areas of the southern Himalayas, their moment of entry lies at least hundreds of years apart. The Dakpa, like other East Bodish speakers of the southern Himalayas, probably departed from the Tibetan plateau before or during the first millennium CE\(^1\). But the Brokpa language is a 14\(^{th}\) century Central Bodish offshoot of Central Tibetan. The Brokpa travelled through and settled among the Dakpa speakers, and their comparative, semi-nomadic lifestyle, geographical proximity and economic interdependence resulted in a close-knit relationship between the Brokpa and Dakpa people. This relationship is also reflected in, for example, lexical borrowing from Dakpa into the Brokpa language. The relationship was further strengthened when in the 16\(^{th}\) century the Gelukpa School in Tibet largely took over religious as well as secular power from the Sakyapa School and extend its religious influence into the area inhabited by the Brokpa and Dakpa people\(^2\).

Although since the defeat of Lama Nakseng and the Tibetan-Dakpa invasion in the second half of the 17\(^{th}\) century Merak and Sakteng were nominally part of Bhutan\(^3\), strong historical, religious and cultural ties continued to exist with the Tibetan Ganden administration in Tawang. Perhaps due to the remoteness, inhospitability and inaccessibility of the highlands inhabited by the Brokpa, the Drukpa administration was unable to, or perhaps not interested in, imposing effective authority. The area inhabited by the Brokpa became known to the Drukpa as སྣ་དོན་བཞི་བོད་ ‘four junctions of Merak’ and ལྗོན་ཐོན་ཕྲུག་ ‘three regions of Sakteng’. The Brokpa were exempted from work on the

\(^1\) Ref. paragraph 10.7.
\(^2\) Ref. the introduction to Chapter 6 and paragraphs 6.8 and 7.2.
\(^3\) Ref. paragraph 6.9.
agricultural land owned by the government and the central monastic body (Dorji 2003:225). Although in theory they had to fulfil tax obligations to the local and central government based on their livestock holdings, the actual production of sheep and yak butter, meat, wool, hides and fermented cheese was unknown. Depending on the level of authority the regional dzongpön and drungpas exerted, the tax pressure was sometimes limited and sometimes very high. The British considered Merak and Sakteng part of Tibet at least until the first decade of the 20th century. Effectively, Merak and Sakteng became fully integrated into Bhutan only after the consolidation of the monarchy and the start of the modernisation process during the latter half of the 20th century.

11.3. G EOGRA PHICAL E XTENT, P OPLATION AND P REVIOUS L ITERATURE.

In Bhutan, the Brokpa inhabit the geoks of Merak and Sakteng in Trashigang dzongkhag, which is why they are also known as Merak Saktengpa. The main villages inhabited by the Brokpa with their official names under Sakteng geok are Sakteng, Yongbazar, Bumlo, Bum Pusa, Tenmang, Murphi, Tholong, Jönkhar, Thak Thro, Borangman and Borangtse; and under Merak geok Merak, Gyengo, Khiliphu and Khasateng. The 2005 Population and Housing Census of Bhutan returned a total of 3,552 people speaking Brokpa within their household from these two geoks. Including Brokpa speakers who migrated to other parts of the country in recent decades, the total number of Brokpa speakers within Bhutan will probably not exceed 4,000 speakers, a figure earlier mentioned by Chand (2004:29). Van Driem estimated the number of Brokpa speakers at 5,000 (2001:871).

The area inhabited by the Brokpa extends from Eastern Bhutan northeast into Tawang district right till the border with Tibet, as well as eastward into West Kameng district. In Tawang, the Brokpa inhabit the villages of Jangda, Sharho, Hro, Broksar, Lagam, Mago, Thingbu and Luguthang.

4 Historically རིང་ལྷྟོང་.
5 Historically རིང་ལྷྟོང་.
6 Historically རིང་ལྷྟོང་.
7 Historically རིང་ལྷྟོང་.
8 Ref. Map X.
9 Historically རིང་ལྷྟོང་.
10 Historically རིང་ལྷྟོང་.
under Thingbu circle. The dress of the people of Thingbu circle is somewhat different from the dress of the other Brokpa groups and the Dakpa, and the typical yak hair felt hats worn by the womenfolk are much taller with 21 tassels instead of the usual eight. In West Kameng, the Brokpa can be found in the villages of Labrang, Dirme, Sumrang, Nyukmadung, Wundra and Senge. The number of Brokpa in Tawang and West Kameng is unknown, because in census records they are classified under the Monpa scheduled tribe.

Previous studies specifically focusing on the Brokpa in Bhutan include Wangmo (1990) and Chand (2004). They focus on the peculiar customs of the Brokpa people, such as their semi-nomadic lifestyle, elaborate marriage customs and the practice of drukor or ‘grain round’ in which Brokpa families would visit their nepo ‘host’ households in sedentary agriculturalist Tshangla villages during winter to barter their livestock products for rice, maize and other grains. Another concise description can be found in Van Driem (1995b, 1997, 2001b).

11.4. The Brokpa Origin.

The popular Brokpa origin story states that long time ago the forebears of the Brokpa people fled an oppressive king in Tshona in Tibet. They were led by a certain Lama Jarepa and Ama Jomo. When they reached the Nyakchungla pass, the stronger people continued on, reaching the village of Merak, whereas the weaker people stayed back in Sakteng (e.g. Chand 2004, Wangmo 1990). (1985: 54-64) earlier gave an explanation of the ancestral history of the Brokpa people according to manuscripts available to him, including and how this diverts from the popular folklore surrounding the Brokpa origin. The manuscript presented in Annex IX was earlier summarised in Dzongkha by Dorji (2003:184-199). Most Bhutanese and foreign authors, however, continue to base themselves on the popular myth, disregarding the written sources available, and thus tend to oversee the important links that may exist with the developments on the Tibetan plateau in the mid to late 14th century AD. The manuscript translated in Annex IX consists of five distinct sequences. The first part of the manuscript from folio 1b to 3b covers the line of descent of Lama Byarepa. The second part on folio 4a to 7b explains how the Brokpa forebears assassinated the tyrannical king of their original homeland near Tshona the journey they took, and in which places they settled. The third part of the manuscript on folio 8a to 10a focuses on the history of Merak, how the rulers of Merak increased their area and how the religious sites and cults devoted to Jomo Remati were
established there. The final part of the manuscript, the addendum, explains the origin and spread of the people of the Kom, Lon and Rok clans to Merak in particular.

11.4.1. THE BYA CLAN.

The first part of the manuscript describes the genealogy of the Bya clan, starting with the birth of a boy from the egg of a Jachung, the mythical bird ‘garuda’ at Guru Rinpoche’s meditation site of Yangleshö in Nepal. The boy then travels to Byasa in the Yarlung valley of Tibet. From the garuda-child descents Bya Chögyel Pelzang, who is also known by his nickname Bya Nakpo ‘the black bird’. Chögyel Pelzang is most probably the historical figure Chogyel Pel Kortsen, the founder of Byasa temple and the son of Ösung, the son of Langdarma. Chögyel Pel Kortsen ruled eastern Tsang province towards the end of the 9th century. The manuscript (ff. 2b) also indicates that he and his brothers ruled over Nyal, Loro and Byasa districts. In the manuscript, Chögyel Pelzang is said to have dispelled the invading Hor troops at Nyalrong. Historical sources quoted in Petech (2003:351), however, assert that Chögyel Pelzang was the main churchman and landowner of southern Tibet, including Nyal, Dakpo, Kongpo and Lhodrak. He pledged allegiance to the Sakyapa rulers and their Mongol allies under Aklen Dorjipel in the late 13th century. Perhaps, in the manuscript there has been a mix-up between the 9th century founder of Byasa monastery Chögyel Pel Kortsen and the 13th century ruler Chögyel Pelzang. Since the Bya clan descents from Chögyel Pel Kortsen, it would be logical to assume that the first part of the myth can be placed in the late 9th century. Another indication for this is the statement on ff. 3b that at that time the teachings of the Buddha were again propagated, an indication that it took place at the time of the Second Diffusion of Buddhism. The plot then moves forward 200 years when Bya ’Na’tum cuts off his right ear and offers it on a golden plate with offerings to the Second Karmapa, Karma Pakshi (1204-1283), which gained him the name Drupthop ’Na’tum. His son was Bya Dondruppa, and his son was Byarepa.

---

11 Modern Chasa/Jasa village is located near Tsetang, and was famous for the Byasa temple to its West. This temple was one of the oldest of Tibet, dating back to the 9th century AD, with a statue of Nampar Nangze probably made at the time of construction of the temple, and was consecutively under the authority of the Kadampa and later the Sakyapa schools. Unfortunately, the temple was completely destroyed during the Cultural Revolution.

12 Ref. paragraph 4.1.
11.4.2. FLIGHT OF THE KOM, ‘LÖN AND ROK CLANS FROM TSONA.

In the second part of the manuscript, Byarepa goes to Tshona, an area under the suzerainty of Byasa. In Tshona live the Kom, Lön and Rok clans under the tyrannical rule of Yazang Pönpo of Dükhar Dzong. The Yazang Pönpo orders his subjects to the Herculean task of cutting down the Ngangtshang hill because it obscures the sunshine from reaching his fortress. But the protective deity of the Kom, Lön and Rok clans, the emanation of Macik Palden Lhamo called Jomo Remati, appears in form of a woman with a baby who tells them ‘rather than cutting the top of the hill it would be easier to cut the head of a man’. The people, grasping the meaning, prepare themselves to kill Yazang Pönpo. They hide their hoes and axes in a milking bucket. On the pretext of offering a feast to the chieftain, they make him drunk with liquor. Then an old man stands up, and tells the youngsters that those who know how to sing should sing a song, those who know how to dance should perform a dance and those who know how to swing the hoe and the axe should take them out of the milk bucket. Thus while performing this dance, the Pönpo is assassinated. Knowing they can no longer stay in Tshona, the people request Byarepa to guide them away to a place where they can no longer see the famous landmarks of Tshona. They depart, packing their tents and taking with them their old people, their silver, their religious scriptures and their yaks and sheep. Byarepa, knowing he cannot do this alone, tells the people to supplicate to Jomo Remati, referred to by the Brokpa as Ama Jomo, who guides and protects them along their way. Since then, the Brokpa of Merak and Sakteng are by some considered the human retinue of Jomo Remati (Nebesky-Wojkowitz 2002).

11.4.3. ARRIVAL IN THE SOUTHERN HIMALAYAS.

The third part of the manuscript relates to how the refugees search for a new home. Folio 5a and 5b of the manuscript relate the events that happen on their way, including how they pitch their tents at Sokmateng, how Byarepa uses his monastic robe to make a bridge.

---

13 Note that the Kommo, Lönmo and Rokmo are three clans also mentioned by Ngawang in the Gyelrik in his list of clans of the ordinary people, ref. paragraph 5.4.

14 According to Hoffman (2003), in the late 14th century Yazang and Tshalpa were two myriarchies that were in discord with the upcoming Phakmodrukpa. They were defeated by Jangchup Gyeltshen (1302-1373) who became the Tsang Desi and unified ‘U and Tsang.

at སྣམས་ Namseng, suppresses a demon and constructs a monastery at ཕྱི་རིང་ Tsholung and how the people suffered from the ever increasing heat and snakes, frogs and other vermin as they descended to lower altitudes. Many of the places along the route can still be identified today. The place of Sokmateng appears to have been more crucial to the general story than accorded to it in the initial part of the manuscript. The addendum on ff. 11a indicates that the villages of Lhau, Shartsho and Seru had only seven, eleven and five households, and that the people living belonged to the ། བ ། Khuzang, ། Ba and ། Kun clans respectively. Lhase Tsangma visited Lhau, Shartsho and Seru in the 9th century, when their population was thought to be higher than in the areas to the west, and his son established the rule of the Jowo clan there. Apparently, some of the Brokpa refugees stayed behind in this area as chiefs of the indigenous people of the area, as the castle of Berkhar was seized by the ག ར བ ད བ ས ར ཀ General Gyang, ག ར བ ད བ ས ར ཀ Ökhar was seized by General ག ར བ ད བ ས ར ཀ Samdrup and ག ར བ ད བ ས ར ཀ Drangngakhar was seized by ག ར བ ད བ ས ར ཀ Bemi.

The remaining refugees then travel on and construct wooden houses at ལྟོ་ཁོ་ལྟེ་ཐུབས་Tsachung Lungshambhi, and they name the environs after famous landmarks in Tshona. But disputes arise among them, and they split in two factions. The ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ ‘three eastern bands’ settle in the highland pastures of ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Thengpoche, ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Thangtö, ཐོམ་ Paptra, ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Dowo 'Ngönpo, ཐོམ་ Lunggor, ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Thonggaphuk, ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Lumo Karmo, ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Thonggarong and ཐོམ་ Tshogor. These places are in the present-day Thingbu circle. The ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ ‘four western groups’ settle in the highland pastures from the peak of Kyemngakla till Thangpoche until the area of ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Galepshen. At ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Nyamgateng, Byarepa constructs a famous monastery.

11.4.4. SEIZING LAND IN MERAK AND SAKTENG.

The fourth part of the manuscript relates the particulars of the settlement history and the events that happened in Merak and Sakteng. From Nyamgateng the migrants establish a village in Sakteng where they find fields of winter fodder grass16. In Merak they establish a village at the place where a fire is made in a juniper forest17. On ff. 7b the nomadic pasture areas belonging to Merak and Sakteng are mentioned, which can still be identified with modern names of pasturelands. Byarepa’s son ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Namkha Özer establishes the ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Tsemo Gonpa and the ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Sapokhar in Merak. He becomes known by his nickname Sapo. He buys the area of ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ Khrolemang and other pasture areas from king

---

16 A more popular etymology holds that ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ sag is a kind of ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ ‘bamboo’ and ཐོམ་ means ‘field or plain’.
17 From Brokpa ཐོམ་ཐོམ་ ‘to be razed by fire’.
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Reti\(^{18}\), a descendant of the Jowo clan, thus extending the area under his authority\(^ {19}\). He also establishes the cult of appropriation of Jomo Remati at Jomogang and the river flowing from Merak down through Lauri and Serthi geoks of Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhak becomes known as the Jomochu. Every year between the 8\(^{th}\) and 9\(^{th}\) lunar month the people of Merak and Sakteng still visit the Jomo Lhatsho lake and Jomochu Jomo Kukhar mountain for offering milk, butter, cheese and alcohol. According to ff. 9b the line of descent continues from Namkha Özer with Lama Sengge, Lama Trashi, who was the lord-chief of Thrakthrö, Guru Chöwang, who had four sons, Göpa, Sumi, Pema and Lama Rinchen. The descendants of Göpa’s eldest son Dondrup Zangpo and Sumi’s sons, Dondrup Zangpo and Chödra were still alive at the time the manuscript was written in 1697.

11.4.5. THE ORIGIN OF THE KOM, LÖN AND ROK CLANS.

In the addendum of the manuscript, the origin of the Kom, Lön and Rok clans is explained as well as how the Kom clan settled in Merak. The origin of these clans is mentioned on ff. 11a and in Dorji (2003:187). The mythical forefather of the Kom clan was Jingpa Nyorpa, son of Takla Öbar. The forefather of the Rok was Paldan Lama. The forefather of the ‘Lön was Yangta Thenpo ‘great horse prosperity’ of Kangring. The Kom, Lön and Rok appear to have been native to the Tshona area. Byarepa of the aristocratic Byanak clan became their leader. According to the genealogy on ff. 9b, by 1696 no more than 7 or 8 generations had passed since the arrival of Lama Byarepa to Merak and Sakteng. This would place his era to sometime in the middle of the 14\(^{th}\) century CE. Conversely, Lama Byarepa was the grandson of Drupthrop ’Na’tumpa, a contemporary of the second Karmapa Karma Pakshi (1203-1283), also placing the era of Lama Byarepa in the same middle 14\(^{th}\) century.

---

\(^{18}\) The name Reti appears derived from Remati, and only in later ages became corrupted to the present-day Radi.

\(^{19}\) According to Dorji (2003:187-188) Jingpa Nyorpa and Kangring, in their quest for food grains, meet the king Dom and his minister Tharpa who take them to king Jowo Rakha of Rati from whom they buy considerable land.
11.5. BROKKE, THE BROKPA LANGUAGE.

Van Driem (2001b:871) classified Brokpa as a Central Bodish language. There are no written accounts on the Brokpa language in Bhutan, but comparison of own data with the data provided in Dondrup (1999) confirm that the Brokpa in Bhutan and the Brokpa in Kameng speak the same language. Some written texts in Brokpa can be found in Dorji (2003: 41-50) who presents the lyrics and citations of the elaborate Brokpa marriage ceremonies written in 'Ucen script. As with his Kheng transliterations, he applies standard Chöke and Dzongkha spelling in those words that have known cognates in these languages, and despite his own assertion that 'since, the verses are in Brokpa dialect, I did not stick to standard Dzongkha spellings’ his spelling is not phonological. It appears that the addendum of the Brokpa origin myth is also partially in Brokpa vernacular and not in Chöke. The only linguistic data available on Brokpa are from Dondrup (1993), who calls the language Brokeh, after the native name Brokke [broʔke:]. An analysis of his and own data from Bhutan shows considerable phonological similarity to spoken Tibetan, Dzongkha and Chocangaca.

11.5.1. BROKPA PHONOLOGY.

Brokpa has 32 native consonants, 10 (possibly 12) initial consonant clusters, five plain vowels and five diphthongal vowel phonemes. The consonants are presented in Table 11.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k [k]</td>
<td>kh [χ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c [ʨ]</td>
<td>ch [tɕ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t [t]</td>
<td>th [tʰ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr [tr]</td>
<td>thr [tʰɾ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p [p]</td>
<td>ph [pʰ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts [ʦ]</td>
<td>tsh [tɕʰ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh [ʦ]</td>
<td>z [z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r [ɾ]</td>
<td>l [l]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h [h]</td>
<td>lh [lʰ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides these simple consonant phonemes, 10 initial consonant clusters have thus far been attested in Brokpa, presented in Table 11.2. The presence of the clusters /kr/ and /mr/ is
expected, but they have not yet been confirmed. The Brokpa consonant clusters and their distribution are considerably distinct from Tibetan and Dzongkha, and more reminiscent of the consonant clusters of Tshangla and Dakpa.


Brokpa has a simple vowel inventory consisting of five plain vowel phonemes and five diphthongal vowel phonemes. Vowel length appears to be dependent on syllabic position only, with short vowels [e, a, o] occurring in intervocalic position and long vowels [ɛː, aː, oː] in syllable-final positions, although this needs further study. The Brokpa plain vowel phonemes are presented in table 11.3.

**Table 11.2. Brokpa Initial Consonant Clusters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>khr [kʰr]</th>
<th>gr [gr]</th>
<th>hr [hr]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ky</td>
<td>khy [kʰj]</td>
<td>gy [gi]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr</td>
<td>phr [pʰr]</td>
<td>br [br]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i [i]</th>
<th>u [u]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>[ɛ ~ ɛ ~ ɛː]</td>
<td>o [ɔ ~ ɔ ~ ɔː]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[a ~ aː]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike most of the other Central Bodish languages, Brokpa does not have the phonemes /ø/ and /y/ in native lexemes, but has preserved the syllable-final consonants. Examples include [dutpa] ‘smoke’, [bulen] ‘credit’, [jönba] ‘left’, [luspu] ‘body’ vs. [dypa], [buløn], [jönba] and [lypo] respectively.

Compared to Dakpa, Brokpa has a relatively simple set of diphthong vowel phonemes without allophones, comparatively similar to the Tshangla diphthongs.

**Table 11.4. Brokpa Diphthongal Vowel Phonemes.**

|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

Although Dondrup (1993:2) indicates that a distinctive level vs. rising pitch tone difference exists in Brokpa, he does not indicate tone in his book. Own data show that Brokpa has a high and low tonal contrast on certain onsets and a high and low register vowel distinction very much similar to Dzongkha and Chocangaca.

11.5.2. Nativised Loans from Tshangla and Dakpa.
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CHAPTER 12. SOME NOTES ON OTHER ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS OF MONYUL.

In the previous chapters, detailed information has been presented about the origin, history and language of the two majority groups of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon, namely the Tshangla and the Dakpa. Because of the availability of a detailed origin history and comparatively detailed linguistic information, a description was also given of the Brokpa, one of the major minority groups. The region is, however, home to a wide variety of other ethnolinguistic groups about which only limited historical, anthropological and linguistic information is available. This Chapter will provide some additional notes, including suggestions for further reading, on these groups.

12.1. EAST BODISH LANGUAGES OF THE BUMTHANG GROUP.

When taking a look at the linguistic map of Eastern Bhutan and western Arunachal Pradesh, we notice that across the area we find primarily the languages of what is usually called the East Bodish group. The East Bodish languages are peculiar to the area and not found beyond it. From west to east the East Bodish languages include Mangde, Bumthang, Kheng, Kurtöp, Chali, Dzala and Dakpa. Dzala and Dakpa were discussed in detail in Chapter 10. Previous comparative analysis by Michailovsky and Mazaudon (1994) and Hyslop (2008, 2010) has sufficiently proven that the East Bodish languages are not dialects of Tibetan and that Bumthang, Kheng, Mangde and Kurtöp share sufficient phonological and lexical similarities to be considered a coherent subgroup under East Bodish. Kurtöp, Kheng and Bumthang are to a large extent mutually intelligible, with Bumthang often considered a more archaic, cultured and refined form, Khengkha a more crude dialect of the same language, and Kurtöp the most divergent dialect. At least these three languages linguistically form a large dialect continuum rather than separate languages, and as with Dakpa and Dzala, the distinction between dialect varieties and languages is one of professed identity due to historical reasons rather than based on linguistic considerations. According to Van Driem (1995b) the ‘mainstream’ East Bodish languages that have not retained a conjugational morphology are spoken by people whose ancestors were among the people who brought Buddhism into the southern valleys. This in contrast to other ethnolinguistic groups, such as the Black Mountain Mönpa, who were isolated semi-nomadic communities.
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12.1.1. THE BUMTHANG DIALECTS.

Of the languages of the so-called Bumthang group, Bumthang represents the prestige language as a result of the religious, historical and political importance of the four valleys of Chume, Ura, Tang and Chökhor of Bumthang. Each of these valleys has a particular dialect. Furthermore, the language spoken in Nubi geok of Trongsa dzongkhak often called Nubikha ‘language of the people of the west’ by Bumthang speakers is linguistically a dialect of Bumthang and represents an early migration from Bumthang into the Mangde river valley. Bumthang is the most conservative and archaic of the languages of the Bumthang group. Michailovsky and Mazaudon (1994) earlier presented Bumthang data in their comparison of Kheng, Bumthang, Kurtöp and Dakpa. Van Driem (1995b) wrote a grammatical description of Bumthang, also including a proposed Roman and 'Ucen orthography. The representation of tone in Dakpa 'Ucen and Bumthang 'Ucen (Van Driem 1995b) differs in a few aspects. The representation of initial consonant clusters and final consonants is the same. Whereas Bumthang distinguishes high and low register tone on vowels represented in the 'Ucen orthography, Dakpa has distinctive vowel length for which the orthography remains to be proposed.

12.1.2. THE LANGUAGE OF KHENGRIK NAMSUM.

Kheng or Khengkha ‘language of Kheng’ is the majority language of the region historically known as Khengrik Namsum, an area now largely included in Zhemgang dzongkhak. Khengkha is also spoken further north along the Mangde river in the geoks of Korphu in Trongsa, where Khengkha is gradually replaced by the Trongsa dialect of Bumthang and Mangde. To the east, Khengkha is spoken the villages of Yangbari, Daksa, Nagor and Silambi in Silambi geok in Monggar dzongkhak, an area consequently referred to as ‘Kheng Silambi’. Considerable minority populations of Khengkha speakers can furthermore be found in Trashigang, Trashiyangtsi and Dagana dzongkhaks. Khengkha is, for example, spoken in Dalifam village under Yangnyer geok and Tongli ng village under Radi geok in Trashigang.

---

1 Ref. paragraph 7.1.3 and chapter 3. Van Driem (1995) has the Roman Bumthang equivalents Chunmat, 'Ura, Tang and Chogor.
2 About the close relations between the people of Nubi and Bumthang, ref. footnote 17 to paragraph 6.2.
3 Ref. paragraph 10.6.2.
4 Ref. paragraph 7.1.2.
5 Ref. paragraph 12.1.4.
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dzongkhak; Pang, Lhaozhing and Memung villages of Tongzhang geok in Trashi Yangtshi; and Drujegang under Dagana dzongkhak. Penjore (2009:42-43) described some of the reasons for this early migration from the Kheng homeland, and as is the case in the regions to the east, the oppressive labour and corvee system were the main causes. Considerable numbers of Khengkha speakers have furthermore opted for resettlement and can now be found in Tsirang, Samtsi and Sarpang dzongkhaks.

Several disputed etymologies of the name Kheng exist (Penjore 2009:46). Archaic Chöke /kheng/ means ‘servant, statute labourer’ whereas /kheng/ means ‘pride, arrogance, haughtiness’ and the verb /khengs/ means ‘to be full of oneself’. Neither of the two etymologies are particularly flattering for a people. This is perhaps why some Khengpa prefer the derivation from Chöke /khen/ ‘knowledge, wisdom’ and ‘to know’, and Dargye (2003:491) states that /Kheng/ means ‘land’ or ‘people’. The oldest written reference, however, can be found in the Gyelrik, where ff. 43b states about the origin of the Khengpo clans of Zhonggar Moiwalung that they were named after Mrekhe Cangrik Dorji who ‘...appeared with virile strength and pride and was thus given the clan name Khengpo and his descendants who came forth with great force...’. ‘Pride’ is taken here as a positive character trait just like virile strength. Khengkha represents a southward intrusion of East Bodish migrants who entered the southern Himalayas from the Tibetan plateau along the Kuri and perhaps Camkhar rivers. After settling Bumthang, Khengkha speakers followed the Camkhar river valley into their present habitat. In the lower valleys and hills they partially intermixed with and partially displaced earlier settlers. The descendants of these earlier settlers include the Gongduk and Mönpa, who were pushed into the inaccessible, marginal areas. The cultural adaptations that the East Bodish migrants with their high altitude, semi-nomadic lifestyle would have had to make were probably not possible without this contact with indigenous populations.


---

6 Ref. paragraph 4.3.
7 Ref. paragraph 12.3.3 and 12.3.4.
orthography, although Dorji (2003) wrote Kheng in the 'Ucen script when providing various examples of invocations, rites and songs belonging to the elaborate marriage ceremonies of the region. Although Dorji (2003:4) states that ‘I have ignored the spelling to maintain the original pronunciation and meaning’, his spelling is not phoneologic and closely follows the Chöke and Dzongkha spelling. The translation of the original phrases is liberal, often adding words and even phrases. In 'Ucen Khengkha orthography, syllable-final unvoiced plosives are represented by their voiced counterparts. Dorji has unfortunately avoided the orthographical representation of the long vowels that are distinctive in Khengkha, like in other East Bodish languages. The additional vowel ɪ in the 'Ucen orthography indicates that there is no change in the phonetic value of the vowel as a result of the syllable-final consonant ṭ or ṭ. As in 'Ucen Tshangla and Dakpa, diphthong vowels are represented by an additional ɪ. Initial consonant clusters are confusingly represented with a syllable marker in between. Finally, the distinctive high vs. low onset on obstruents is not always indicated in the 'Ucen Khengkha orthography, and in the case of cognates with Chöke and Dzongkha the spelling is the same as in the source language.

---


9 Examples from Dorji’s text include /ranpa/ [ranpa] ‘came’ not [renpa – rænpa], /phat/ [pʰat] ‘agree, ok’ not [pʰet – pʰet], /ot/ [ot] ‘bring’ not [ot], /mut/ [mut] ‘don’t have, are not’ not [myz], /gorn/ [gorn] ‘3sg’ not [gɔː]. This orthographical innovation would be rendered obsolete if the choice were made that Khengkha phonology is inherently different from Chöke and Dzongkha phonology, and that consequently the spelling and pronunciation rules of Chöke and Dzongkha should not affect the spelling and pronunciation of 'Ucen Khengkha.


12.1.3. ZHAKE, THE LANGUAGE OF THE UPPER KURI RIVER VALLEY.

Kurtöp or Kurto Bikha ‘language of the upper Kuri river valley’ is the language spoken in Kurtö and part of Gangzur goek in Lhüntsi dzongkhak. The language is known to the speakers as Zhakat or Zhake. Some Kurtöp data were presented in Michailovsky and Mazaudon (1994). Hyslop has completed a grammar of Kurtöp, and detailed information on the language and its speakers can be found in, for example, (Hyslop 2008, 2010). The Zhake speakers probably represent an early offshoot from the main Bumthang group. The hidden valley of Khenpajong is located in the Kurtö area. The Zhake speakers are perhaps the descendants of 8th century migrants escaping the political turmoil on the Tibetan plateau, an event symbolised in the story of Khyikha Rathö. The close cultural and linguistic ties between the people of Khenpajong and the nearby valleys of Bumthang can also be explained from the events as told in the Khyikha Rathö story, and it appears that Kurtö was settled before Bumthang. The story, however, clearly indicates that the Kuri river valley and the lower lying areas to the south, southwest and southeast were not empty lands at the time of the arrival of these early Tibetan migrants. Throughout history, population density in the Kurtö area appears to have been low and largely concentrated along the upper Kuri river valley. Information on the clan affiliations of the rulers of the area is scant, and indicates that the Zhelngo, Pönpo and Pönchen families largely claimed descent from the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji. A major exception was the Wangma clan claiming descent from Lhase Tsangma. Early links had developed between this clan and the Drukpa Kagyu School, which probably facilitated the later annexation of the area by the Drukpa. In due course of time, maternal clans and families claiming descent from religious masters gained some level of local authority. The royal family of Bhutan descends from such a family, the Dungkar Khoche nobility of Kurtö. Since the middle of the 19th century the Kurtö area obtained a certain status and importance and coupled with the fertile agricultural land the population of the valley remained rather stable, with many of its inhabitants obtaining important posts in the government, army and royal households.

---

12 Ref. paragraph 3.2.
13 Ref. paragraph 4.3.
14 Ref. paragraph 4.2.5.
15 Ref. p. 112.
16 Ref. paragraph 6.2.
17 Ref. paragraph 7.1.4.
12.1.4. Mangde and 'Nyenkha.

Van Driem (1998) mentioned 'Nyenkha as an alternative name for Mangde, but Mangde actually seems to be a collection of East Bodish dialects related to each other to some degree. The most divergent of these dialects are the varieties of Ngenlung or Nyenlung, the area from the Pelela pass till Cendebji\(^\text{18}\). Hyslop (2010) provides phonological and lexical evidence for a more separate status of Phobjip, the language of the Dangchu and Phobjikha valleys. This language is also called Brokpai Tshangke ‘Tshang language of the nomads’. Mangde proper includes the Chutöbi and Henkha dialects spoken in the Mangde river valley. Perhaps the speakers of the 'Nyenkha and Mangde dialects represent an early offshoot from the main East Bodish speakers, who settled the Mangde river valley directly from the Tibetan plateau, and not, like the speakers of Nubikha and Khengkha, after initial settlement in the Bumthang valley. By the middle of the 16\(^\text{th}\) century, the Drukpa Kagyu School had established itself in the Mangde river valley\(^\text{19}\) and the incorporation of the Mangde area proceeded without any major struggle\(^\text{20}\). The valley quickly obtained political and economic dominance over the entire eastern region of Bhutan\(^\text{21}\).

12.1.5. A Curious Isolate: Chaliha.

Probably the most divergent East Bodish language is Chali, spoken in Chali geok under Monggar dzongkhak. Phonological and lexical evidence advocating a more separate position of this language vis-à-vis the languages of the Bumthang group was provided by Hyslop (2010). Tshangla (1986) believed that Chali is a creole based on an East Bodish language but with considerable loans from other languages such as Chocangaca, Tshangla, and even Hindi and English. Based on this, Gyeltshen (2006) puts forward the hypothesis that people from different ethnic and linguistic background settled in the area. The Chali speaking area is bordered by Chocangaca speakers to the north and across the Kuri river to the west and by Tshangla speakers to the south and east. Geographically and linguistically isolated, the language has gone through a development different from the languages of the Bumthang group. Instead of being a creole of various languages contributed by successive migrations to

\(^{18}\) Ref. footnote 10 to paragraph 4.2.

\(^{19}\) Ref. p. 112.

\(^{20}\) Except, perhaps, the revolt by the Lama of Rephe, ref. paragraph 6.3.

\(^{21}\) Ref. paragraph 7.1.1.
the Chali area, Chali seems to be an East Bodish language with an indigenous substrate language with loans from the neighbouring languages Chocangaca and Tshangla. Chali features prominently in history. The village was ruled by a Khoche family claiming descent form one of the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji. In the Dungsam and Zhonggar versions of the Dung story, the reincarnation of the main progeny Barke, Raipa Topchen, becomes the king of Tongphu in Zhonggar Moiwalungpa. The Tongphu king/Raipa Topchen’s wife hails from Chali. No reference is made to Chali during the Drukpa campaign of the 17th century, and Chali appears to have remained relatively isolated ever since.

There has been no grammatical description of Chali. Language retention within the geok is high, with perhaps 85% of the total population or 1400 speakers using the language within the household setting. Intrusion of Dzongkha, Chocangaca and Tshangla loans is displacing native vocabulary. Even though adult speakers raised in the village but residing elsewhere have a reasonable command of the language, language acquisition among the second generation is minimal. Chali is therefore in danger of extinction and there is a great need for a grammatical description of the language.

12.2. CENTRAL BODISH LANGUAGES.

Interspersed with the East Bodish languages of Central and Eastern Bhutan and Tshangla of Eastern Bhutan we can find a number of Central Bodish languages geographically separated from the main Central Bodish language of Bhutan, Dzongkha. These languages include Dur spoken in the area around Dur village in Bumthang, Chocangaca in Lhüntsi and Brokpa in Trashigang (Van Driem 1995b). Sometimes, these languages, together with Drenjobikha of Sikkim, are called South Bodish languages, since they are spoken just outside the Tibetan dialect area on the southern slopes of the Himalayas.

The language of Western Bhutan was traditionally known as Ngalungpaikha ‘the language of the people of the first/early valleys’ or Ngalongpaikha ‘the language of the people that rose first’, i.e. the dialects of the valleys of Thed, Thim, Pa, Ha, Gasa and Shar. After the unification of Bhutan in the 17th century the prestige variety of this language became known as Dzongkha. Dzongkha is the national

---

22 Ref. paragraph 4.3.
23 Ref. paragraph 4.4.2 and 4.4.3.
24 Present-day Punakha, Thimphu, Paro, Haa, Gasa and Wangdü Phodrang dzongkhaks. This is the language now known as Dzongkha, the national language of Bhutan.
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the language of Bhutan since the 1950s. A grammar of Dzongkha was written by Van Driem (1997). The people of Dur, like the people of Laya, Lunana geoks in Gasa dzongkhag and Sephu geok in Wangdü Phodrang dzongkhag, might represent historically recent migrations from the Tibetan plateau. Unfortunately, till date neither of these languages has been adequately described, and determining their exact linguistic position vis-à-vis Dzongkha, Chöke and Central Tibetan is a matter of great urgency. Brokpa has been described in Chapter 11, and some notes on Chocangaca will be provided here. A comparison of these languages combined with the available historical material resulted in a new theory on the origin of their speakers.

12.2.1. Chocangacakha of the Kuri River Valley.

The endonym Cumhacahaka Chocangacakha derives from the words for ‘you (2pl)’ /choca  chotca/ and ‘we (1sg)’ /ngaca  ngatca/ and thus means ‘your, and our language’. The exonym Kortop is commonly applied to the people who speak Chocangaca, especially by Tshangla speakers. Strictly speaking, however, Kurtöp refers to Zhake25. Consequently, Chocangaca is properly referred to as Kormetkhaka or Kormetpatika, ‘language of the people of lower Kuri valley’, which is their ancestral homeland.

According to Gyeltshen (2006:29) Chocangaca is spoken by 100% of the population in the geoks of Minje, Tsenjjar, Jare and Metsho in the lower Kuri river valley. Chocangaca is also spoken by around 70% of the population of Menbi geok, where Tshangla and Kurtöp are minority languages. In Saleng geok, half of the population speaks Chocangaca, namely in the villages of Thridangbi and Saleng, with the remaining half of the population speaking Tshangla, Khengkha, Gonduk or Bumthap. In the geok of Gangzur, Chocangaca is spoken alongside Kurtöp and Tshangla. In Tsamang and Tsakaling geoks under Monggar dzongkhag almost 100% of the population speak the varieties of Chocangaca generally referred to by the loconyms Tsamangpatika and Tsakalingpatika.

On the origin of the Chocangaca, Gyeltshen (2006: 4), himself a Chocangaca speaker from Lhüntsi, wrote that ‘the physical evidences gleaned from their settlement patterns indicate that the Kurichu valley is undoubtedly the original homeland of Kurmedkha speaking

25 Ref. paragraph 12.1.3.
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population’. He furthermore asserts that whereas Tshangla speakers did not move northward along the Kuri and Kholong river valleys, the west bank of the upper Kuri river valley was populated by migrants from Bumthang and the east bank by migrants from Trashiyangtshi after the arrival of the Chocangaca speakers. It could indeed be true that the Kuri river, its lateral tributaries north of modern Monggar town and the mountain ridges between Monggar and Lhüntsi dzongkhaks provided natural barriers that the Tshangla did not cross. But as was noted earlier, indigenous populations inhabited the Kuri river valley even before the arrival of the first migrants from the Tibetan plateau, and 8th century East Bodish migrants most certainly outdate the Chocangaca speakers.

From the 9th century onwards, ruling families claiming descent form the brothers of Lhalung Pelki Dorji seized control of most of what are now Tsamang and Tsakaling geoks in Monggar, whereas the remaining part of the lower Kuri river valley came under the control of the Byar clan.

The Logyu (ff. 9b) indicates that one of the larger Drukpa army camps during the campaigns of the second half of the 17th century was located in Minje Yulsum. Kinga (2003:525) also mentions that after the annexation of the independent kingdoms of the Kuri river valley, the soldiers from western Bhutan were engaged in the construction of the dzong. In all likelihood many of the soldiers and civil administrators, mainly monks from the western valleys of Bhutan who came in the Drukpa army married with local women and permanently settled in the area. This 17th century settlement of speakers from western Bhutan would explain certain phonological innovations that Chocangaca shares with Dzongkha.

Outside of this original homeland, Chocangaca is an important minority language in Trashiyangtshi dzongkhak. Chocangaca is spoken by 80% of the population of Tongmizhangtshen geok. Furthermore, 50% of the people of Khamdang geok, mainly in the villages of Shakshing, Shakshing Gonpa, Khamdang, Kencholing and Shali, and 50% of the population of the village of Larjap in Jamkhar geok are Chocangaca speakers. In Bumdeling geok a few households in ‘Omanang village speak Chocangaca. In Yangtsi geok, part of the population of Lichen, Wanglo, Rapti and Gangkha speak Chocangaca. Chocangaca speakers

26 Including the Threwenchu between Monggar and Chali geoks. The name Kuri itself indicates that Tshangla could well be the most ancient tongue of this area, as /ri/ is Tshangla for ‘water, river’.
27 Ref. paragraph 12.1.3.
28 Ref. paragraph 4.3.
29 Ref. paragraph 4.2.3.
can also be found in Trashigang dzongkhak. In Bartsham geok, 25% of the population, mainly in the villages of Dzongthung, Ngalung, Muktangkhar and Majong, speaks Chocangaca. Finally, there are Chocangaca speakers in Galing village of Shongphu geok (Gyeltshen 2006). Gyeltshen (2006) also provided some notes on lexical differences between the Chocangaca settlements outside the original homeland, their origin villages and the possible reasons of migration. Gyeltshen assumes that the migration from the original homeland to these new settlements took place after the 17th century, although he does not discount earlier settlement. He bases his conclusion on ruins in many areas in Lhüntsì30 and on the family genealogies orally maintained in many of the new settlement areas. All the ruins are in areas strategically located along the post-17th century east to west trade route between Bumthang, Lhüntsi, Trashi Yangtsi and Trashigang. According to Gyeltshen, heavy taxation that lacked uniformity and depended on the local and regional authority31 and smallpox outbreaks that rapidly spread along the trade routes were the main reason for their migration eastward to other areas that had been largely left abandoned after the Tshangla people migrated. Only in the late 19th and early 20th century were the abandoned areas of the Kuri river valley resettled by landless people from nearby villages and landless Tshangla speakers from Dungsam and Monggar.

12.2.2. COMPARISON OF THE CENTRAL BODISH LANGUAGES.

For Tshangla speakers, the perfectly normal Chocangaca phrase /khong gangpo ’long song, cala gangpo thu/ ‘they all got up, pick up all the things’ has a funny connotation, since in Tshangla the words /khong/, /long/ and /thu/ mean ‘testicle’, ‘penis’ and ‘vagina’ respectively. The Dzongkha equivalent of this phrase would be /khong gera ’long yi, cala gera thu/. In Tshangla, however, the equivalent would be /rokte thamcerang thingma, notshang thamee dungsho/. Clearly, Dzongkha and Chocangaca are significantly closer to each other than Tshangla and either of these two. Till date there has been no comprehensive description of Chocangaca. Especially in the context of Bhutan this is a shame, considering the close relationship that exists between the national language Dzongkha and Chocangaca. Chocangaca could not only teach much about the origins and development of Dzongkha, but

30 He names, for example, Tachubrakpa and Langkharpa in Metsho geok, Wangzing, Langkharpokpa and Khardung Barwa hamlets of Kupinyesa, and Wambur Barwa in Minje geok.

31 He quotes examples from Saleng, Thridangbi, Wambur and Kupinyesa. Particularly heavy was the compulsory annual transportation of the taxes collected in eastern Bhutan to Bumthang.
also provide valuable lexical inputs to the development of the Dzongkha vocabulary.

Chocangaca has retained its phonology largely consistent with the spelling of Written Tibetan. As a positive outcome of this characteristic of the language, it takes comparatively little effort for many Chocangaca speakers to learn to speak and write both Bhutan’s national language in a secular setting as well as Chöke in a religious setting. At the same time, Chocangaca shares a considerable amount of phonological innovations with Dzongkha that are not present in other Central Bodish dialects and languages. Most of the distinct lexemes that are not of Central Bodish origin can be attributed an East Bodish or other substrate language once spoken in the area and to nativised or borrowed lexemes from East Bodish.

There is considerable variation in the respective Chocangaca dialects across the speech area. Gyeltshen (2006) presents a number of apparently randomly selected lexical items from a variety of Chocangaca dialects in order to compare the dialects in the Chocangaca homeland and the migrant populations. He assumes the area of Minje to represent the standard Chocangaca variety. Some of the lexical entries he presents deserve special attention because they do not appear to have cognates in Dzongkha, nor do they seem to present borrowings from any of the East Bodish languages. It is unfortunate that Gyeltshen does not present a more extensive list of basic lexical items, including numerals, kinship terms, body parts and food grains. Table 12.1 presents a selection of the lexical items presented by Gyeltshen in his Table I, III and IV vis-à-vis written several related and unrelated languages.

### Table 12.1. Comparative Table of the Chocangaca Standard from Minje (CS) vs. Chocangaca Dialects, Written Tibetan (WT), Dzongkha, Brokpa, Tshangla (DR=Dirang) and East Bodish (KT=Kurtöp, KH=Khengkha, DP=Dakpa, DL=Dzala).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>WT</th>
<th>Dzongkha</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>Chocangaca (other)</th>
<th>Brokpa</th>
<th>East Bodish</th>
<th>Tshangla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maize</td>
<td>ང་ི་</td>
<td>ལེ་ གཞུ་</td>
<td>ocon</td>
<td>jangala (Menbi), jana (Metsho)</td>
<td>pʰintan</td>
<td>acom (DP), baktupa ~ baktępʰa, teñon (KT), acom, domba (KH)</td>
<td>acom, pʰiṇaŋ (DR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bean</td>
<td>མ་</td>
<td>ལེ་ གཞུ་</td>
<td>cepen ~ cepai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>gñgali (KH), orça (DP), cepe (DL), cepen (KT)</td>
<td>orai ~ ore, oreu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sieve</td>
<td>དུབ་པར་</td>
<td>ལེ་ གཞུ་</td>
<td>sinṣan</td>
<td>sinṣma</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>zurte (KT)</td>
<td>dala, cᵉṛgen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sima, tsʰ’am</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>broom</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>tsʰ’am</td>
<td>euksaŋ ~ caksam</td>
<td>pʰjaksan (general), mecuktan (Shakshing)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>pʰiksan (KT)</td>
<td>pʰaktsʰam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladder</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>tsʰ’u</td>
<td>tk’a ~ taḥa (general), liuṭ (Shakshing)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>ka (KT)</td>
<td>redeŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>som</td>
<td>sekar -do-</td>
<td>sola</td>
<td>kʰwekar ~ kʰje (KT), dotsʰor (DP), kʰoso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pillow</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>ḥa</td>
<td>ṭaŋka ~ ṭaŋ</td>
<td>ṭuŋkspa (Jare), ṭuŋgeto (Tsamang)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>ṭaŋs (DP), ṭaŋs ~ ṭaŋsa (KT)</td>
<td>kʰumdariŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cock</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>ḡa’p’o</td>
<td>ḡa’po</td>
<td>ḡa’po (Tsenkhar, Shakshing), ḡa’po (general)</td>
<td>dz’apo</td>
<td>kʰataľiŋ (KT)</td>
<td>gowalapa ~ golapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rat</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>ḡiṣi</td>
<td>ḡiṣi</td>
<td>ḡiṣi (Menbi), biwa (Jare, Metsho), sintola (Tsenkhar, Saleng), sinṭo (Tsamang)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>ḡaṇaï (KH), ḡiwa (KT), zu (DP)</td>
<td>pʰitekpa ~ pʰiteurba, zu (DR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moon</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>dau</td>
<td>‘lawa -do-</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>‘la (KH), ‘le (DP), ‘lađar (KT)</td>
<td>laŋi ~ laŋiŋam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>amsu</td>
<td>moisa</td>
<td>moja, nesāŋ (Menbi, Jare), nemo (Metsho), mo (Tsamang)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>muiṭsa (DP), moja, mopsa (KT)</td>
<td>mewuktśa, niśa (DR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maternal aunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elder sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.2 presents some Written Tibetan vocabulary and comparative linguistic data in phonetic notation of Brokpa, Chocangaca and Dzongkha.
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**TABLE 12.2: COMPARISON OF SELECTED LEXICAL ITEMS IN CENTRAL BODISH LANGUAGES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chöke</th>
<th>Brokpa</th>
<th>Chocangaca</th>
<th>Dzongkha</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ṭuk</td>
<td>luk</td>
<td>lu:</td>
<td>lu:</td>
<td>sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la:bu:k</td>
<td>la:ru</td>
<td>la:pu:</td>
<td></td>
<td>radish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t:i:k</td>
<td>t:i</td>
<td>t:i</td>
<td></td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gja:</td>
<td>dza:</td>
<td>dza:</td>
<td></td>
<td>hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k:i:j:o</td>
<td>w:i:o</td>
<td>w:i:o</td>
<td></td>
<td>2sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k:je:m</td>
<td>b:im</td>
<td>t:im</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b:re:</td>
<td>bra:</td>
<td>b:da:</td>
<td></td>
<td>paddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bra:ma</td>
<td>brau</td>
<td>b:da:o:</td>
<td></td>
<td>sweet buckwheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b:ru:i</td>
<td>d:i</td>
<td>d:i</td>
<td></td>
<td>write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b:ruk</td>
<td>d:u</td>
<td>d:u</td>
<td></td>
<td>thunder, dragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t:u</td>
<td>t:a</td>
<td>t:ea</td>
<td></td>
<td>hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d:o</td>
<td>d:u</td>
<td>d:o</td>
<td></td>
<td>sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d:un</td>
<td>d:un</td>
<td>d:yn</td>
<td></td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jui</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>'y</td>
<td></td>
<td>village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g:</td>
<td>j:at</td>
<td>g:e:</td>
<td></td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s:olo</td>
<td>b:angala</td>
<td>'c:ma:</td>
<td></td>
<td>chilli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s:ola</td>
<td>'ula:</td>
<td>d:i</td>
<td></td>
<td>here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the preceding tables show, there are sufficient similarities between Dzongkha, Chocangaca and Brokpa to warrant grouping under the Central Bodish branch of Bodish languages. Chocangaca and Brokpa closely resemble the other Central Bodish languages.

Phonologically, Brokpa appears to be the most conservative language and might therefore constitute the most recent offshoot from Central Tibetan. Chocangaca shares some innovations with Dzongkha. Where Chocangaca and Dzongkha have lost the syllable-final velar plosive /k/, this has been preserved in Brokpa. Where Dzongkha, and in many cases also Chocangaca, have the phonological change from consonant clusters /ky, khy, gy/ to phonemes /c, ch, j/, Brokpa has preserved the original pronunciation. Where Dzongkha, like spoken Tibetan, has the change from consonant clusters /pr, phr, br/ to the retroflex /tr, thr,
dr/ or the unique Dzongkha clusters /bc, bch, bj/ Brokpa, and in many cases Chocangaca, has preserved the archaic pronunciation. The clusters /pj, phj, bj/ have changed to /c, ch, j ~ zh/ in Brokpa and Chocangaca and to /pc, pch, bj/ in Dzongkha. Unlike the East Bodish languages, however, none of these Central Bodish languages nor Dzongkha has preserved the consonant clusters /kr, khr, gr/ which in all cases changed to the retroflex series /tr, thr, dr/ and in Dzongkha in some cases to the additional series /c, ch, j/. In most lexemes, Chocangaca and Brokpa do not have the phonological change from Written Tibetan <un>, <ul>, <ud>, <us> to Central Bodish <ü>, Written Tibetan <od>, <os>, <on>, <ol> to Central Bodish <ö> and Written Tibetan <ad>, <as>, <al>, <an> to Central Bodish <ä>. Dzongkha, Chocangaca and Brokpa all have a high vs. low register tone distinction, as well as distinctive vowel length.

Whereas phonologically Dzongkha and Chocangaca are not particularly divergent and seem to have gone through a shared development, there are considerable lexical differences in certain semantic domains. Chocangaca has many lexical and morphophonological cognates with East Bodish languages, including verbal tense suffixes. On the other hand, there are many nouns unique to Chocangaca, with no apparent cognate in either Dzongkha or any of the East Bodish languages.

12.2.3. A SHARED ORIGIN OF THE CENTRAL BODISH SPEAKERS OF THE SOUTHERN HIMALAYAS?

In paragraph 4.4.4 a group of people living in Southern Tibet in the middle of the 14th century were mentioned, called the Dungreng. As a result of the Sakya campaigns against these people they were split in two factions, the Lhodung ‘western Dung’ and the Shardung ‘eastern Dung’. Aris (1979:120) earlier identified the Lhodung with the East Bodish speakers of Bumthang, and the Shardung with the Dakpa of Tawang. The East Bodish languages are, however, much earlier offshoots from the Proto-Bodish language than the Tibetan language as it was spoken on the plateau in the 14th century; it would be more logical to assume that the Lhodung and Shardung spoke languages related to Central Bodish rather than to East Bodish. Ardussi (2004) identified the Lhodung with the linguistic forebears of the Dzongkha speakers of Western Bhutan and the Shardung with the Dung lineages of Central and Eastern Bhutan. The identity and present day descendants of the Lhodung appear reasonably well established. The ’Ngalong and their language Dzongkha are considered to be a mix of the indigenous population of Western Bhutan still represented by the Lhokpu and various waves
of Tibetan migrants (Aris 1979, Van Driem 1997, 2004). One of these migrations from Tibet includes the ousted Lhodung. On the other hand, the identity and present-day descendants of the Shardung are less well established. Since the Shardung and the Lhodung were closely related groups split from the same parent population of Dungreng, their language must also have had shared features which were preserved when they crossed the Himalayan divide. Perhaps some new information can shed some light on this identification.

According to the Brokpa origin story, the Kom, 'Lön and Rok clans led by Lama Jarepa of the aristocratic Tibetan Byar clan absconded from Tibet in the second half of the 14th century. They settled in various areas in present-day Tawang and in Merak and Sakteng, and they still speak the Central Bodish Brokpa language. According to some of the origin myths of the Dung lineages they are linked to the Brokpa who fled from the Tshona area. There are also elements in the Brokpa origin myth and the stories surrounding the origin of the Dung lineages that are too similar to be attributed to mere coincidence. Examples of these similarities are a native population having to endure hardship under a tyrannical overlord, the overlord ordering a natural mountain obscuring his view to be cut, a mystical lady appearing advising the people to kill the king, and the subsequent murder of the king. Moreover, the geographical distance between the Zhonggar and lower Kurichu river valley and the area inhabited by the Brokpa and the absence of similar myths in the Tshangla speaking areas in between discounts the possibility that these themes were borrowed. The arrival of the Brokpa can be safely dated to the second half of the 14th century, coinciding with the historical sources recounting the defeat of the Dung of southern Tibet.

Considering the convergence in these myths and the convergence in time, two hypotheses are proposed. Perhaps the Kom, 'Lön and Rok clans of the Shardung were defeated in the Lhodrak area and fled to Tshona and from there south across the Himalayas into Monyul. Most of the subject people settled in uninhabited temperate and alpine areas similar to their homelands and became the forefathers of the Brokpa. The Byar nobility, including army generals and their descendants might have gradually spread their lineages into Dungsam, Zhonggar, Bumthang and Kheng. There they established aristocratic ruling families among those indigenous communities that had not earlier accepted authority of earlier Tibetan exiles. Perhaps they also ousted some of the existing clans or seized lands and

---

32 Ref. Chapter 11 and Annex IX.
33 Ref. paragraph 4.4.2.
34 We, for example, also saw that several generals assumed control over some of the castles in the Tawang area, ref. paragraph 11.4.3.
started communities in previously uninhabited areas. These aristocratic families were called Dung in reference to their old tribal appellation on the Tibetan plateau. In Bumthang, Kheng and Dungsam the influence of these Central Bodish speakers on the indigenous languages was relatively limited, perhaps due to the low number of aristocratic exiles compared to the larger indigenous population. A closely related but slightly variant hypothesis could be that the Shardung already split in two factions in southern Tibet: one that moved to the east to form the forebears of the Brokpa people, and one that moved directly south into the Kuri river valley to mix with the indigenous East Bodish speakers and form the forebears of the Chocangaca speakers.

These two hypotheses would explain the linguistic similarities between Brokpa, Chocangaca and Dzongkha. Divergent substrate languages- people related to the Lhokpu in Western Bhutan and East Bodish speakers in Central and Eastern Bhutan- would account for the lexical differences that exist between these languages. The Brokpa remained isolated from other Central Bodish speakers until fairly recently and thus retain the phonological and lexical characteristics of their version of the 14th century dialect of Tibetan. In the lower Kuri river valley and the Zhonggar area there was a strong presence of Dzongkha speakers after the Drukpa annexation of the area. This explains the phonological similarities between Dzongkha and Chocangaca. Compared to Dzongkha and spoken Tibetan, both Brokpa and Chocangaca are conservative in their pronunciation, and a proper linguistic descriptions of these two languages, and the other Central Bodish languages of Bhutan, will shed interesting light on the historic development of the Bodish languages, including Dzongkha.

12.3. LEPCHA, LHOKPU, MÖNPA, GONGDUK: THE ISOLATES.

From the area occupied by the Kirāntī speakers in eastern Nepal in the west, till the area inhabited by the Tshangla and Dakpa in the east, we can find people speaking languages that are threatened at best, and moribund at worst. This is particularly worrying, because these languages appear to represent the indigenous languages, and their speakers the direct descendants of the oldest inhabitants, of the region. Fortunately, this fact has now been duly recognized, and as a result, grammatical descriptions have been completed or are in the process of completion. These people are the Lepcha of Sikkim, the Lhokpu of the southwest

35 Ref. paragraph 11.2.
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of Bhutan, the Black Mountain Mönpa of Central Bhutan and the Gongduk of eastern Bhutan. Van Driem suspected Lepcha, Gongduk and Black Mountain Mönpa to be related to Kirāntī because of their conjunctival systems with verbal agreement with more than one actant, but closer scrutiny revealed that Mönpa was actually an East Bodish language, and that Gongduk should be placed in an independent sub-grouping. Although the detailed results of the studies by Kraaijenbrink et al. still await publication, their research already accentuated the isolated position of the Toto of West Bengal and the Lhokpu and Black Mountain Mönpa of Bhutan (Kraaijenbrink et al. 2009:187).

12.3.1. THE LEPCHA.

The Lepcha are widely recognised as the original inhabitants of the Indian state of Sikkim and the Darjeeling district of West Bengal state. Their language is also spoken in adjacent areas of Nepal and in a few enclaves in the southwest of Bhutan. The Lepcha call themselves Róng and their language Róngring. The Lepcha culture and language were previously extensively studied and described, both by foreign as well as by native authors. The Lepcha language has an indigenous script. The most comprehensive and complete Lepcha grammar till date was written by Plaisier (2007, also in 2003). The Lepcha language has a total of 32 consonant phonemes and eight vowel phonemes. Although Lepcha typically lacks diphthong vowels, there are a total of 48 permitted initial consonant clusters. Some similarities between the Lepcha pronouns and the pronouns of other languages of the region were provided in paragraph 9.9.6.

12.3.2. LHOKPU.

Lhokpu is the language of the Lhop, in Nepali called droyā. Van Driem (2004) earlier stated that Lhokpu or its linguistic ancestor might have been the substrate language on which Tibetan was transplanted, resulting in Dzongkha. Despite some lexical similarities with the Kirāntī languages, Lhokpu does not share the verbal agreement pattern. Still, Van Driem

---

36 Although they were probably not the earliest inhabitants of the area, ref. paragraphs 1.1, 2.3, 2.7.3, 2.8 and 2.9.1. The ancient origin of the Lepcha is also exemplified by the prevalence of South Asian specific mtDNA haplogroup M33, ref. paragraph 9.4.1.

37 On a possible origin of this name ref. paragraph 2.7.3.
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tentatively placed Lhokpu genetically closer to the Kiranti languages than to Lepcha (Van Driem 2001b:804). The animist belief system, burial cult, and matrilocality and matrilineal Lhokpu society appears to be a remnant of an ancient local culture. A grammar of Lhokpu by Van Driem is currently awaiting final editing and publication.

12.3.3. Mönpa

The only ethnic group in Bhutan still referred to as Monpa are the speakers of two dialects of a language called Black Mountain Monpa spoken on either side of the Black Mountain range in central-western Bhutan (Pommaret 1994 and Van Driem 1995a, 2004). Linguistically, two dialects exist. The more conservative western dialect is called 'Olekha and is spoken in the village of Rukha in Wangdü Phodrang and Reti also called Bäügang or Gongkhola in Zhemgang. The eastern dialect is spoken in the villages of Wangling, Jangbi and Phumzur of Langthil geok of Trongsa, Cungseng village in Jigmechöling geok of Sarpang and Berdi village in Trong geok of Zhemgang dzongkhak. The Black Mountain Mönpa have rapidly assimilated both linguistically as well as culturally to their 'Ngalong, Khengpa and Henkha neighbours, and their language is considered moribund.

The monpa of Berdi and to some extent those of Phumzur village lived in a traditional and long-standing lord-and-subject relationship with the Dung rulers of Tagma, and those of Cungseng with the Dung rulers of Samkhar (Dorji 2005:42-45). Additional information on the Monpa, especially those of Wangling, Jangbi and Phumzur, can be found in Giri (2004) and Chand (2009). As has been pointed by Van Driem (1992) an affiliation of Black Mountain Mönpa with Mahākiranti could not be established, and the complex conjugational verbal morphology of Black Mountain Monpa warrants a separate status of this language vis-à-vis the other East Bodish languages (1995a). Van Driem considers Black Mountain Mönpa the most archaic of all East Bodish languages and his grammatical description of the language is nearing completion.

12.3.4. Gongduk.

Gongduk is spoken in Gongdü geok, most commonly called Kheng Gongdü, in Monggar. The language shows an elaborate conjugational morphology with agreement with more than
one actant, reminiscent of the Kirāntī languages. Gongduk might represent the indigenous tongue of much of Central and Eastern Bhutan. The area was historically known as Gungdung and ruled by members of the Je clan claiming descent from Lhase Tsangma. The area was described as remote and rugged, even by regional standards, and the last revolt against the Drukpa authority took place in Gongduk. Ever since the area has been isolated and remote which has contributed to the preservation of the peculiar language. Recently, construction of the Gyelpozhing to Nganglam road is opening up access to the area. This will most probably further reduce language retention among the 1000 odd speakers of the language. Van Driem is in the process of completing a grammar of Gongduk.

12.4. The Divergent Languages of Kameng.

Across the border between Bhutan and India, the districts of East and West Kameng of Arunachal Pradesh are home to a wide variety of languages. These languages have been tentatively classified under the Hrusish languages and a number of related languages (Burling 2003:180) sometimes called the Kho-Bwa cluster (van Driem 2001c:473). Whereas the Sherdukpen, Bugun and Puroik are scheduled tribes, the Lishpa, Chukpa, and Sartangpa are classified together with the Monpa. Burlings (2003: 179) earlier stated that he could detect no special resemblance between Tshangla and Dakpa and the other languages of Arunachal except from some lexical similarities with Sherdukpen that might be explained form a shared Tibetan Buddhist influence, and that both languages seem ‘quite different’ from the languages to their east.

12.4.1. Hrusish.

The Hrusish languages (Shafer 1955, Burling 2003: 180) are spoken primarily in West Kameng and adjoining parts of East Kameng district. Hrusish includes Miji, Aka, Koro and Bangru. The language spoken by the people of the Pakesa and Bichom river valley in Nafra circle is generally known as Miji, but more comfortably called by their endonyms Dhammai, Dhammai or Sajolang (Simon 1976). The Aka people inhabit the Bichom river valley in Thrizino, Jamiri and Bhalukpong circles and prefer the endonym Hruso (Simon 1993). Till

38 Ref. paragraph 4.2.6.
39 Ref. paragraph 6.6.
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recently, the Koro language was thought to be a subgroup of the Aka but has now been described as a language. The Hruso origin story is presented in Elwin (1993:116-120) with another version, explaining the origin of the Hruso in relation to their Assamese, Tibetan, Tani, Kachari and Bugun neighbours in Elwin (1993:139). According to the first story (Elwin 1993:114) the Dhammai descend from Dhammai and the Hruso descend from Gunnu, and the two of them were brothers. The Hruso traded with the plains of Assam, and the Dhammai with Tibet. Interestingly, Elwin (1993:115-116) also recounts an origin story in which there were three brothers. The Monpa of Dirang descended from the eldest brother who was king of Lhasa, the Dhammais descent from the second brother and the youngest brother became king of Assam. The middle brother owned the land in the hills, and when the descendants of the eldest brother came to that area, they had to pay taxes to the Dhammai. The Dhimmai call the Tshangla speakers of Dirang Nichang (Elwin 1993:261). Despite this relation in the origin stories with Tibet, the Hruso claim their origin to the east (Elwin 1993:481) and the Dhammai have a tradition that they originate in the plains of Assam (Elwin 1993:480). The Bangru or Levai language (Simon, 1976) is spoken much more to the north near the Tibetan border.

12.4.1. THE SHERDUKPEN.

The Mei, commonly known as Sherdukpen, inhabit the villages of Shergaon, Rupa and Jigaon and a number of smaller settlements called pam or lurek such as Jungthuk, Musaksing, Lumbaktang, Jungpam, Thungree and Mukuthing under the Rupa and Shergaon circles in the Tenga river valley. Two distinct dialects of Sherdukpen, Thungji Nguk and Sanji Nguk are spoken in Rupa and Shergaon respectively. As Aris earlier indicated, perhaps these two dialects were spoken by the two clans called the Sinmi and the Junmi in the Gyelrik (ff. 48b), who were ruled by members of the Wangma clan claiming descent from Lhase Tsangma. The ruling clans, in the form of the so-called Sāt Rājas, maintained relative independence from the Ganden administration in Tshona and Tawang right until the 20th century. The Sherdukpen origin stories in Elwin (1993: 131-134) indicate that the Sherdukpen claim their origin from the union of the king of Lhasa with an Ahom princess. The eldest son of the first Tibetan queen became king of Tibet. The first son of the Assamese queen and the minister send to fetch her had the face of a dog and the horns of a goat. The first son of the king

40 Ref. paragraph 4.2.5
41 Ref. paragraph 13.3.4.
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and the Assamese queen Jabdung-Mawang-Namja\textsuperscript{43} became king of Bhutan, and the second son Gyaptang-Bura\textsuperscript{44} became the king of the Sherdukpen. The descendants of Gyaptang Bura are the higher Thong caste of Rupa and Shergaon. The Chao caste are the descendants of their porters. The village of Jigaon Ado is said to be inhabited by later migrants specialised in carpentry and blacksmithing from Bhutan, forming a lower caste called Yanlo (Chowdhury 1975:49). According to Elwin (1993:132-133) the Sherdukpen were not obliged to pay tax to the Tibetans because of their descent from a Tibetan king, and the Ahom gave them rights to tax the people of the duar based on their descent from an Assamese king.

Interestingly, the Sherdukpen origin myth also refers to the god of the forests Jumu-Wang-Sing who was created by the great God Lopung-Chungba (Elwin 1993:269-270). Perhaps, the original place of habitat and worship of this deity was Wangserkungpa\textsuperscript{45} where a ridge called Wangseng or Wangphu is still located. Local tradition in the Phongme area recounts the reason why the top of Ralang\textsuperscript{46} mountain is flat. Ralang, the nepo or protective host of the area, was in a dispute with his taller neighbour, Tshongtshongma. Tshongtshongma had taken Jomo Kukhar to the south as his consort. But Ralang was envious of this relationship and tried to block Tshongtshongma’s view of Ama Jomo. In a fit of anger, Tshongtshongma cut Ralang’s head off and swung it far to the east, where it landed southwest of Bomdila. The retinue of Ralang followed their host’s head and became the forefathers of the Sherdukpen and related people. A mountain shaped like the top of Ralang is still said to exist near the Sherdukpen area. Some descriptions of the introduction of Buddhism among the Sherdukpen can be found in Deuri (1976) and Sarkar (1975a,b, 1980). The only linguistic description of Sherdukpen was published by Dondrup (1988).

12.4.2. THE BUGUN.

The Bugun, commonly known as Khowa, inhabit the villages of Wanghoo, Dikhyang, Singchung, Kaspi, Magopam, Nampi, Lichini, Bichom and Sitha under Singchung circle.

---

\textsuperscript{42} Ref. the story about Khyikha Rathö, paragraph 3.2. Aris (1979:79-80) also linked reference to Khi Bu Rowa i.e. Khyikha Rathö in the Sherdukpen origin myths to Bhutan, from where the story might have been brought by later Tshangla speaking migrants.

\textsuperscript{43} I.e. Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal, Chapter 6 on p. 113.

\textsuperscript{44} I.e. Meme Gyapten, the lay associate of Merak Lama Lopzang Tenpai Drönme who introduced the Gelukpa School to Tawang , ref. p. 112 and paragraph 16.4.2.

\textsuperscript{45} Ref. footnote 23 to paragraph 4.2.

\textsuperscript{46} Locally Raleng.
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sharing the Tenga river valley with the Sherdukpen. Simon (1976) presents a few Bugun lexemes and indicates that despite geographical closeness, similarity between the Bugun and Aka language are minimal. He also notes that cognates with Lishpa and Sartangpa, which he calls Butpa, are much larger. Several Bugun origin stories are presented in Elwin (1993:108-114). According to one story (Elwin 1993:112-114) brother and sister from whose incestuous relation the Bugun descend came from the west of the area they currently inhabit. The Bugun for long lived under the suzerainty of their Aka neighbours47, according to Simon (1976) much like the relation of the Puroik versus the Nishi. Most of the agricultural work on the land of the Hruso would be done by the Bugun. Simon further remarks that the Sherdukpen call the Bugun sulung. The dominant trade position of the Sherdukpen caused many Bugun to become indebted to them (Elwin 1993:480). Sulung, then, seems to imply to both the Nishi and the Sherdukpen something like ‘slave’. Chowdhury (1975) also reported that the Bugun are remnants of the original population of the area, now culturally assimilated to the Hruso majority but retaining a separate linguistic identity. The recently ‘discovered’ Koro might similarly be descendants of the original inhabitants.

12.4.3. The Lishpa and Chukpa.

The Lishpa [lispa: ~ liepa:], who call themselves Kishpi [kiepi], and the Chukpa [cʰukpa:] inhabit several villages and hamlets in West Kameng district, Bomdila sub-division, Dirang circle, approximately 25 kilometres from Dirang. The Lishpa live in the villages of Lish Gompache with 100 households, Lish Gompalok with 25 households, Lish with 130 households and Membang with only one household. The Chukpa inhabit the village of Chuk with 100 households, which is located isolated on the opposite bank of the river. Lishpa and Chukpa are merely two loconyms for the same language. The Lishpa and Chukpa till recently formed endogamous groups and the Dirang Tshangla would consider them inferior and not allow marriage alliances (Chowdhury 1975:47) and this separate status was maintained by the Lishpa and Chukpa themselves. But owing to the Buddhist influence, except linguistically, the Lishpa are culturally and religiously assimilated in the mainstream Monpa society. There are two divergent opinions on the origin of the Lishpa and Chukpa. Many local sources

47 This is attributed in the Hruso origin story due to the descent of the Hruso from heaven on gold and silver ladders, whereas the Bugun descended from a plantain ladder (Elwin 1993:139). The story in Elwin (1993:168) explains why the Buguns were considered inferior to the Bangni (Nishi) and (1993:171) the Hruso and why they had to pay tax to them.
consider them to be original inhabitants of the area, settled here well before the arrival of the Dirang Monpa. Das Gupta (1968: v) and Chowdhury (1975: 47), however, retrace their origin several generations ago to eastern Bhutan, whereas the Chukpa are thought to have migrated from the west through Sangthi.

Except for two references in the literature, no linguistic descriptions of the Lishpa and Chukpa have previously been made. In Simon (1976) we can find a short word list of Lishpa in connection to the short description of Bugun (Khowa). In Das Gupta (1968: 163-166) we can find a more extensive list of Lishpa vocabulary and a few sentences.

12.4.4. The Sartangpa.

Even less is described about the Sartangpa, also known by various exonyms such as But Monpa, Butpa, Machopa, Rahungpa or Rongnampa Monpa. The Sartangpa inhabit the village of Rahung and to the north of Bomdila and its surrounding hamlets Salari, Khitam, Jeriagaon and Khoina (Bagchi in Dutta and Duarah 1990:40). The Sartangpa are thought by the Sherdukpen to have the same origin in Tibet (Chowdhury 1975). When they arrived under the guidance of Japtang Bura, his servants settled in the Sartangpa villages to form the Chao caste, whereas the descendants of Japtang Bura himself moved to the Rupa and Shergaon area and formed the Thong class. Except for Simon (1976), who presents a short word list of Butpa in connection to the short description of Bugun (Khowa), there is no description of this language. Butpa appears at least lexically very similar to Sherdukpen, whereas Lishpa seems more divergent.

12.4.5. The Puroik.

The Puroik or Puroit, previously known by the derogatory Nishi exonym Sulung, are a severely marginalised people living in Nafra circle of East Kameng and adjoining areas of Upper Subansiri districts of Arunachal Pradesh and adjoining areas of Tibet. They mainly inhabit the Par river valley and Kameng river valley, which they share with the Nishi. The Puroik are generally considered the original inhabitants of the area, but have been living in a feudal arrangement with their Nishi neighbours. Their language has been the subject of intense discussion among linguists and anthropologists alike. Whereas some authors place
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Puroik within the Kho-Bwa cluster\(^48\) of languages together with Sherdukpen and Bugun, other authors have doubted whether Puroik is a Tibeto-Burman language in the first place. Recent descriptions by Tayeng (1990), Soja (2009) and Remsangpuia (2008) show many Proto-Tibeto-Burman cognates as well as cognates with Tshangla and other languages of the Kho-Bwa cluster.

Puroik remains the most divergent language, especially when the Tani loans are sifted out. This language and other seemingly non-Tibeto-Burman lexical roots in the other languages, indicate a more ancient substrate language for the Tibeto-Burman languages of the southern Himalayan region. Whether these are remnants of ancient Palaeolithic migrants who moved into Southeast Asia along the coast of the subcontinent, of Palaeolithic settlers of the Tibetan plateau who moved into the warmer valleys on the southern Himalayan slips during the LGM, or the Mesolithic Austroasiatic settlers of Northeast India remains one of the challenging questions for the joint disciplines of archaeology, molecular genetics and historical and comparative linguistics to answer.

12.5. **The Memba of Mechukha: A Central Tibetan Language, But Mixed Origins.**

Menchukha circle along the मेन्चुक्का Menchukha ‘bank of the medicinal river’ in the upper Siyom valley of West Siang district of Arunachal is home to a group of people called the /mamba/ or /momba/. As Huber (Dutta 2000, Badu 2000, Huber pers. comm. 2001 in Blackburn 2003:45) earlier proposed, the Memba of Mechukha have a complex origin of different populations. This includes the descendants of Dakpa from Tawang who arrived in the early 18\(^{th}\) century (Blackburn 2003:45, Norbu 1984), the descendants of Tshangla from Dirang and eastern Bhutan (Van Driem 2001b:872, Norbu 1984), and descendants of migrants from various other locations in Tibet (Billorey 1984, 1986 and Norbu 1984). The initial settlement of the area dates back to the late 17\(^{th}\) and the 18\(^{th}\) century, when Tshangla and Dakpa migrants fled the political and religious upheaval in their home region in search of the beyul or hidden valley of Panchakshiri. Additional Tshangla speakers arrived from

\(^{48}\) The origin of the name of this cluster of from the lexemes for ‘water /kho/ and its variations (e.g. Sherdukpen kho’, Lish /khau/, Bugun /khou/ and Puroik /kua/) and the lexeme for ‘fire’ /bwa/ and its variations (e.g. Sherdukpen /ha/, Lish /bei/, Puroik /bae/–/bae/). Bugun data from Simion (1976), Sherdukpen data from Dondrup (1988), Puroik data from Remsangpuia (2008), Lish data from Simion (1976) & Dondrup (1988) and own data. Curiously, Elwin (1993:249) reports that the Sherdukpen god of fire is called Mikam, from /mi/ ‘fire’.
Pemakö in the beginning of the 19th century CE, when on the way to the pilgrimage site of Tsari instead of taking the Subansiri river they took the Siyom river. The Memba of Menchukha have traditionally been considered subjects of the Lha’lu family in Lhasa (Lazcano 2005:55 note 68). The neighbours of the Memba are Bokar, Ramo and Pailibo Adi, all in the Gallong Adi group (Van Driem 2001c; Nyori 1993). Relations with these Adi have been fluctuating: raids between Adi and Tshangla and Adi amongst each other were commonplace and alliances changed from time to time. In the 20th century the Memba have been reported to have allied with the Ramo Adi to raid the Tagin (Van Driem 2001b:486).

In the context of Menchukha, therefore, the term Memba, although derived ultimately from ‘monpa’, refers to a heterogeneous ethnolinguistic group with Dakpa, Tshangla and Tibetan origins. The work by Badu (2002) clearly shows Memba to be a Central Bodish language, and no Dakpa or Tshangla cognates could be attested. A few local sources, however, ascertain that Tshangla and Dakpa are spoken within the original clan context.

12.6. BALANCING ETHNIC IDENTITY AND NATIONAL UNITY.

Till date the history of conquest by the sword and suppression through a rigorous caste system is a contentious issue in new, post-monarchy Nepál, which is often exploited for political gain. Maoist-led proclamation of autonomous states for the various ethnic groups, such as Limbuwan for Limbus, Magarat for Magars, Tamuwan for Gurungs, Tamangsaling for Tamangs, Himali for Sherpas, Newa for Newars and Kirat for Rai, appear to be aimed at obtaining and maintaining popular support from all the ethnic groups as well as a modern example of age-old maxim divide et impera. It can only be hoped that this situation will not spiral out of control.

Hopefully, in the future growing ethnic consciousness among the ethnically diverse people of Bhutan will not similarly be misused and exploited. Till now the shared Buddhist heritage, Drukpa identity and Wangchuck Dynasty have been both the strong foundation and the cement of the nation-state. But rapid modernisation, increasing levels of education, democratisation and accelerated development result in Bhutan experiencing the typical social, political and economic problems of a developing country. Abuse of power, population growth, egoism and self-centred behaviour, corruption, unemployment, rural-urban migration, substance abuse and unbalanced regional development are just some of the issues the country has just only started to deal with. In several places in Bhutan, such as Sarpang,
Tsirang and Dagana, people of Tamang, Sherpa and Rai ethnic origin are attempting to strengthen their Buddhist and animist religion, their own language, and their own culture by taking example from the popular culture that has developed in Nepal. This appears to be an attempt to, after a long process of linguistic and cultural Indo-Aryanisation to ascertain a unique ethnic identity from among the Lhotshampa community, and it could be interpreted as a deliberate dissociation from the high-caste Hindu-led Lhotshampa revolt in the early 1990s and seeking a connect with the majority Tibeto-Burman population of Bhutan. Whereas till now self-help associations in the form of tshokpa in Bhutan have generally been geographically delimited, for example among village or geok lines, the trend is now set to do this along ethnic lines. With a majority of the villages homogenous in ethnic composition, this does not yet present a problem, but as their geographical and political extent widens, they might come into conflict with official policies that strictly prohibit regionalism, religion and ethnics influencing politics. It will require a great amount of political willingness, cooperation, participation and skill to safely fare the country to a next, advanced and stable level without committing the same mistakes and ending up in the same situation as the neighbouring state of Nepal. At least, the awareness is there. If this can be translated into appropriate action, the future looks bright for Bhutan. A very thoughtful and careful consideration has to be made of to what extent to promote and to what extent to curtail private activities of the general public and official government policies regarding language and culture on the sub-national level. Too much freedom might result in people taking too many liberties, resulting in conflict among each other. Too much suppression might result in dissatisfaction among the people, resulting in conflict with the state. It requires a very careful balance.
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CHAPTER 13. FAMILY AND SOCIETY.

Till recently, the family was the cornerstone of the societies of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon. It was the family, not the individual that counted. Family was also more important than higher levels of social organisation, such as community, village or country. Family was always considered more important than religion and politics. Until the recent introduction of democracy and party politics, religion and politics might have succeeded time and again to split nations or regions, but never families. In order to protect the basic extended family unit against any outside influences, members of the family would make great sacrifices of personal happiness and even their lives.

13.1. THE EXTENDED FAMILY AS BASIC UNIT OF SOCIAL LIFE.

Unlike in the west, the family is in general not just father, mother and their children. Most often three generations or more live together. The aged grandparents are taken care of by at least one and often several of their children, who, with their own children, stay together in the same house or sometimes in houses located at a close distance. Usually they share a single kitchen and eat together besides sharing all the work. This joint or extended family system and the relations between the family members was described in Penjore (2009: 71-73 and 79-81), among others. Consequence of such a close-knit family is an often complex kinship terminology system, the way in which one addresses various members of the family. Usually the main difference in these systems is the way in which cross-cousins are referred to in contrast to parallel cousins, which in turn depends on the condoned marital relations within the family. Kinship systems from the area have not been extensively described, given a few exceptions such as the examples in Khengkha from Wamling in Zhemgang, Dzongkha from Sha Samtengang in Wangdi, Chocangaca from Kurtö Gortsham in Lhuntsi and Tshangla from Bartsham in Trashigang in Penjore (2009: 88-93) and Tshangla in Dorji (2003:30). Moreover, kinship terms usually display extensive variation even within languages, dialects, and villages. This variation is usually minimal, encompassing one or a few relations, but can be extremely confusing where semantic shifts occur. In some Tshangla communities, for example, the eldest son and daughter in a family will call their father and mother /ata/ and /ana/ respectively, which in standard Tshangla are the terms for ‘elder brother’ and ‘elder sister’. Tshangla also

appears to be unique in that it has separate terms for the second, third and in the case of females even fourth ascending generation: /meme/ and /abi/ for grandfather and grandmother, /pepe/ and /ubi/ for great-grandfather and great-grandmother, and /dubi/ for great-great-grandmother. It is perhaps indicative of longer life expectancy of females even in the past, and the fact that girls would often marry at younger age than boys, thus allowing for a three-generation gap to develop. The Dungsam dialects of Tshangla show the most extensive kinship system, in which separate terms exist for all one’s parent’s brothers and sisters. In most other Tshangla dialects, these terms coincide in the case of parallel cousins not considered suitable for marriage. Tshangla also has separate kinship terms for siblings depending on whether the referent is male or female. As with Kheng (Penjore 2009: 88) and probably most other Bodic languages, Tshangla kinship terms referring to ascending generations usually have the suffix /’a/- a glottalised vowel [ə]. In Tshangla, seniority within a single kinship class is denoted by /chilu/, /barma/ and /zemu/ for ‘elder’, ‘middle’ and ‘younger’ respectively.

13.2. Customs Regarding Childbirth.

A new child, a new addition to the family, is according to Buddhist philosophy considered as a receptacle for the नास्त्येष्य namshe or ‘consciousness’ of another sentient being. A new child would also be seen as the continuation of the family line. At birth, a झिटै ketsi ‘birthday horoscope’ is written describing the previous lives of the new born as well as the predictions for the present and future lives, the deities that should be appropriated and the rituals to be performed to avoid misfortune, overcome obstacles and ensure a positive rebirth. After childbirth both mother and guests are served /phabin/ and other alcoholic drinks to regain strength and celebrate the birth. Children are greatly valued and as a consequence grow up protected and even pampered. The transition from childhood to adulthood is often abrupt and quick, and characterised by higher labour contributions to the household and agricultural work, customary dating practices and eventually marriage and the start of a new family unit.

More detailed descriptions on the customs and traditions surrounding child birth and childhood can be found in, for example, Penjore (2009:59-61). These practices, though local variations exist, are generally similar among all the people of the region.
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13.3. COURTSHIP, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE.

The practices regarding courtship and marriage have rapidly changed over the past decennia. Whereas elaborate traditions and complicated systems based on age-old customs and beliefs were the norm in among many people of Monyul, these have rapidly eroded and largely disappeared as a result of modern influences.

13.3.1. NIGHT-HUNTING.

Few courtship practices have been as intensely debated as the practice popularly known in Bhutan as ‘night-hunting’. Open courtship as part of local festivals and ceremonies was just as common as teasing and joking members of the opposite sex during daily activities. In general, girls are open and do not mind open advances and insinuations, as long as close relatives are not present. In general the people have a liberal attitude towards sex, even before marriage, and there is no expectation of one’s partner to be a virgin. Not only were pre-marital relations and sexual conduct condoned, the unique custom of night-hunting was, until relatively recent, rather prevalent. The practice of night-hunting is called /zamin lam/ ‘look for a girl’ in Tshangla, and according to Penjore (2009) /bomena/ ‘towards a girl’, /bome pam/ ‘look for a girl’ or /bome shai/ ‘stroll for a girl’ in Kheng. Penjore defines /bomena/ as ‘a custom whereby a boy stealthily enters a girl’s house at night for courtship or coitus with or without prior consultation’ and out rightly discards the term night-hunting as an urban-based, ethnocentric, biased and misrepresented term for the practice. He instead describes /bomena/ as a ‘social institution through which people find their partners and get married, but also providing space for socialisation, pre- and post-marital sexual access, sexual education, entertainment and a rite of passage into adulthood’ (Penjore 2003: 1). In Kheng, it appears to be an accepted, and even a required courtship custom prerequisite for marriage alliances (Penjore 2003:103). His detailed description of /bomena/ (2003:107-122) is very similar to the practice that existed in other areas of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon. A young man and woman who have usually, but not always, build up a relationship during the daytime can continue that relationship during the night. Guard houses against crop-raiding animals are a favourite place to play the riddle game of /khar/, sing /tsangmo/, and further cultivate the relationship. Such a couple is usually not entirely
random: often their families have already expressed the desirability of a relation out of kinship, property and other considerations. The man can inform his prospective mate of his intentions and if she agrees to this, he will secretly and quietly enter the first floor of the house by climbing up and opening the window pane. They can then have intercourse, despite the restrictions posed by a common bedroom for the whole family as is the usual practice, and it is often with silent consent of the parents and other relatives. Early in the morning, well before dawn, the man is expected to leave the house. In case he is found by the girl’s relatives, tradition has it they will be considered officially a couple and they might not be willing to let him depart.

Sadly, in recent times many people consider the practice the leading cause of extramarital affairs, promiscuity, illegitimate children, spread of sexually transmittable diseases, and exploitation of women and the rural poor and a host of other social evils (Penjore 2009: 145-149). It has become associated with a barbaric and primitive village culture for which there is no longer a place in the modern society. In Bhutan the development of such a negative opinion can be partially explained by the increasingly modern and western outlook of a large part of the educated and urban population. Another contributing factor is the exploitation of the custom by outsiders, especially civil servants on village tours, to gain quick casual sexual contact by offering money and promises of marriage and a better life to vulnerable village girls. In Kameng, the practice has been largely abandoned largely due to the restrictive and conservative Hindu-Indian culture, in which pre-marital sexual relations are not condoned, virginity of the bride is expected, dowry is required, women are seen as property of their husband, and marriages are traditionally arranged.

13.3.2. POLYGAMY, ARRANGED MARRIAGE AND CHILD MARRIAGE.

The general marriage practice among all the different ethnic groups has traditionally been monogamy. Among the sedentary agriculturalist people, including the Tshangla, the Hruso, the Chocangaca speakers and various other groups, polygamy occurred, in which a man who could sustain them could marry more than one wife. Usually these wives were sisters of each other, and the marriage was clearly a strategic alliance between a man and another family. The senior wife used to be called /ngama/ in Bhutan Tshangla or
Polygamy has also been reported from Kalaktang by Bagchi (1987: 49) and from Pemakō by Zhāng (1997:58). Among the nomadic Brokpa and some Dakpa fraternal polyandry, in which a woman would marry two or even more brothers, was a survival strategy in societies in which men would spend extended periods away from the household and family (Dorje 2002:48, Dorji 2003:39). Penjore (2009: 81) reports that among the Khengpa, monogamy was usually the standard, but extramarital affairs were fairly common.

Several types of marriage arrangement existed in the past. These have been described from Kheng by Penjore (2009: 125-126) and from among the Khengpa, Tshangla and Brokpa by ō (1984, 2002). Zhāng (1997:50-58) gives a detailed account of courtship, marriage and kinship relations among the Pemakō Tshangla and Dakpa of Lekpo. The arranged or negotiated marriage (Penjore 2009) often involved strategic alliances within or between clans or families. These could be meant to retain a certain power structure or to retain and strengthen an economic base, like land or livestock holdings. An arranged marriage would, however, not be according to the Hindu custom prevalent in the region, in which the prospective couple would come to know each other just before or even only during the marriage ceremony. In fact, even love marriages would have to be mediated by either a family member or a close mutual friend of the couple, and love marriages could be somewhat forced if the girl and her family would ‘catch’ the boy and not let him leave the house in the morning. Arranged marriage is becoming less and less common. Couples will nowadays express their affection and a mediator will assist in obtaining the required approvals from the respective parents. Often, a lama is consulted to see whether the marriage is astrologically suitable, and which rituals have to be performed to remove any obstacles.

In the past the Khengpa and Brokpa used to practice /chungnyen/ childhood engagement or child marriage, in Kheng called /daknyen/ ‘reserved marriage’ (1985, Dorji 2003:3, 40). In Kheng, child marriage was usually proposed already after birth of a baby by the parents of a new-born baby of the opposite sex. Among the Brokpa, child marriage would be proposed after children reached the age of eight years. Even when parents promised their children to each other, there are no formal rules
governing this, and actual marriage does not have to take place, although compensation was required from the party breaking the promise. Age at marriage was after reaching puberty in the past, but is much higher now. Isolated incidences of couples married and with children at the age of 13, 14 occur throughout the area even at present.

13.3.3. Cousin Endogamy.

Aris (1979:108-109) earlier observed that according to the Gyelrik, the ruling clans of the area had an exogamous marriage culture, like all clans in the Himalayan region. Marriages would take place outside of, and not within, the own clan. He also states that ‘western Bhutanese sometimes say that easterners are ‘extremely choosy’ when it comes to matters of marriage, as compared with themselves and other groups in the country’. Perhaps, Aris’ informers did not refer to the preference clan exogamy, but rather to cousin endogamy, a very particular marriage custom until very recently favoured by many of the peoples of Eastern Bhutan.

In cousin endogamy, a man can marry his mother’s brother’s daughter (matrilateral, the majority of cases), his father’s sister’s daughter (patrilateral) or a woman who is both his mother’s brother daughter and his father’s sister daughter (bilateral). Conversely, a woman can marry her mother’s brother’s son, her father’s sister’s son, or a man who is both her mother’s brother’s daughter and father’s sister’s son.

The preference for bilateral cross-cousin marriage is clearly reflected in Bhutan Tshangla kinship terms, in which ajang refers to the mother’s younger and elder brother and the father’s sister’s husband, as well as the father-in-law, and ani refers to both the father’s sister and the mother’s younger and elder brother’s wife, as well as the mother-in-law. Moreover parallel cousins are called ata, kota and ana, usa, elder and younger brother and sister respectively. However, cross-cousins are called khotkin and mathang for male and female respective, kinship terms also used for brother-in-law and sister-in-law, i.e. one’s spouse’s siblings and one’s sibling’s spouses. The matrilateral children would be the most preferred, and called serga ‘golden’ khotkin and mathang.

Similarly to the kinship terms in Bhutan Tshangla, in Dirang, one’s father’s sister would be called anyi and her husband ayang, one’s mother’s brother would be called ayang and his wife anyi, and one’s father and mother-in-law would also be called ayang.
and anyi. This contrasts with one’s father’s brother and mother’s sister and their spouses, who would be called atung for the female and aku for male. In the same line of thinking, the ayang and anyi’s children would be called jangsen and mathang for male and female respectively, which are also the terms for one’s spouse’s siblings and one’s sibling’s spouses. The aku and atung’s children are called the same as one’s own siblings. The children of a male’s brother or the children of a female’s sister are called za and zamin for male and female respectively, the same as one’s own children, whereas the children of a male’s sister or the children of a female’s brother are called makpa and chimin respectively, the same as one’s son-and daughter-in-law respectively.

Zhāng (1997:50) calls the past preference of both the Pemakö Tshangla and the Dakpa for maternal cross-cousin marriage a remnant of a previously matriarchal society and a means to strengthen family relationships through marriage. He notes that although in the past maternal cross-cousin marriage was preferred over paternal cross-cousin marriage, both were basically allowed. Marriages between other maternal or paternal relations, i.e. a man and his mother’s sister’s daughters or a man and his father’s brother’s daughters, was not condoned as it violated the matrilineal or patrilineal clan respectively.

Among the Brokpa, bilateral cross-cousin marriages are also highly valued. Marriage with one’s cross cousin called /tsho khruma/ was equally regarded to marriage outside one’s clan called /ngenlam gorma/. Parents will often negotiate the exchange of daughters if such a union is possible, as this combination leading to two new couples will retain property, particularly livestock, within the same family. This is also the reason why in the Brokpa kinship system the terms of address and names for the in-laws is the same as the names of the maternal uncle and the paternal aunt azhang and ane (2002:57-58).

In lower Kheng, the Tshangla speakers of Bjoka and the Kheng speakers of Ngangla and Goshing used to have a custom of /ngenzhung/ ‘core marriage’ in which cross cousin marriages are mediated in order to ensure a lasting and successful match (Dorji 2003:1). Cross-cousin marriage is also practiced among the Lhokpu of Bhutan (Van Driem 2003b), the Drenjongpa of Sikkim, the Tshangla of Kalaktang (Bagechi 1987:49) and Dirang (Das Gupta 1968), the Hruso of West Kameng and the Qiang in Sichuan. The Thakuri in Nepal prefer maternal cross-cousin marriage, and the Nyinba of Humla and
the Tamang prefer bilateral cross-cousin marriage. Even though cousin endogamy is no longer practiced in western Bhutan, the Dzongkha kinship terms, such as /azha/ for both maternal uncle as well as father-in-law and the proverb अजीयुक्तकर्मकीयम् ‘the cousin is entitled to his maternal uncle’s daughter’ indicate that in the not so distant past cross cousin marriage was condoned and even preferred in western Bhutan as well. Cross-cousin marriage is generally prohibited among the Lepcha (Plaisier 1996), the Kirānṭī tribes, the Sherpa of Nepal and Hindus.

Underlying the preference for cross-cousin marriage is the old belief, which also held sway in Tibet, that flesh and blood, /sha/ and /zhi/ in Tshangla, or /sha/ and /kak/ in Khengkha (Penjore, 2003: 16), were inherited through the female line. On the other hand, bone, or /khang/ in Tshangla, /rotpa ~ rosa/ in Khengkha and औष or honorific औष ‘bone’ in Tibetan, was inherited through the male line. As long as the bone of offspring was kept untainted, a marriage would be successful union in biological and social terms. Instead of a ‘blood lineage’, people thought in औषवसंल or honorific औषवसंल ‘bone lineages’, in which bone was inherited patrilineal. Children born from a union of parents with the same bone lineage would result in weakening of the lineage, resulting in all kinds of misfortune including physically and mentally disabled children. Marriage within the same blood lineage was considered to not only be safe, but even preferential. Thus the origin of the cross cousin marriage seems to be the perceived need among both ruling clans as well as subject clans to maintain a pure ‘bone’ lineage by encouraging unions within the same ‘blood’ lineage. This need to maintain purity of the bone lineage was found to be given as the single most important reason for preference for cross-cousin marriage, given by half of the respondents in a survey by Dorji (2002, 2003).

The second most important reason was found to be to maintain one’s children and sibling’s children close by as old-age insurance. A central role in the system of cross-cousin marriage is allocated to the mother’s brother, respectfully called /ajang ngama rinpoche/, combining the terms for maternal uncle, bride and precious teacher1. The maternal uncle traditionally serves as a second father to his sister’s children. If their real parents die or become unable to look after their children, it is the duty of the maternal

---

1 A very important role is also accorded to the maternal uncles of both the bride and the groom in the wedding customs of the Lepcha people of Sikkim (Plaisier 1996).
uncle to look after his sister’s children. Conversely, his sister’s children have the sacred
duty to look after their maternal uncle as if he were their own father. This bond is taken
very seriously. Because of preferred matrilocal residence after marriage, the marriage of a
son to an outsider would not only reduce the reliance of a father on his son, but crucially
also the reliance of a maternal uncle on his nephew. The maternal uncle would therefore
encourage and sometimes even enforce a marital union between his daughters and his
sister’s sons.

Avoiding the division of family property was mentioned as third reason by 17%
of the respondents and strengthening family ties was named by 5% of the respondents,
particularly using cross-cousin marriage as a way to re-establish the usually close bonds
between siblings weakened once they started their own families. Other reasons that were
not mentioned in the survey include the fact that in the previously isolated communities
finding a partner could be difficult and that cross-cousins know each other thoroughly
and thus a successful union was regarded more likely than with an outsider, and that non-
compliance could result in social stigma.

That the concept of bone lineages continued to maintain an important facet of Tshangla
society at least till the 1950s is attested in Chakravarty (1953). Even till date, some
marriages in Bhutan are not condoned by the respective families because there is said to
be a difference in bone, or because one of the male ancestors of one of the couple was
involved in something which was inherited by the descendants, making a marriage
alliance unwanted. In some remote Tshangla areas, village communities were stratified
according to bone. There were several kinds of inferior bone, such as /donkhang/ ‘ghost
‘zombie bone’. Families in which hereditary diseases and birth defects, psychological
problems and communicable diseases such as leprosy and tuberculosis were rife would
run a high risk of being socially ostracized and forced to endogamous marriages within
their own family, which would naturally only increase the occurrence of birth defects and
malformations and thus reinforce their position. For many such families, migration and
resettlement was often the only option.
The practice of cross-cousin marriage is in sharp decline due to factors associated with modernisation and urbanisation. A trend can be observed where bilateral cross-cousin marriage is slowly replaced by matrilateral cross-cousin marriage and finally completely abandoned. Factors contributing to this trend include higher education and awareness, increased mobility and chances of finding a partner outside the own family and community, decreased importance of, and dependence on, the extended family as basic social unit, legal limitations and even shame. It is now generally accepted that the present-day short and stout body stature, high occurrence of physical and mental functional limitations at birth and similar facial characteristics among many remote communities can be attributed to a combination of low nutritional value of the diet and high alcohol consumption with generations of inbreeding through cross-cousin marriages.

13.3.4. THE WEDDING CEREMONY.

Elaborate marriage ceremonies, often lasting several days, appear to have been practiced in the not so distant past. (1984, 2002: 49-60) and Dorji (2003:38-52) for example described the elaborate marriage custom of the Brokpa people. An important mediating role is attached to the figure of Garpa Tongsam, who seems to have been based on Garpa Tongtsan, the minister of King Songtsen Gampo who was assigned with fetching his bride Kongjo, also called Jaza or Wengcheng from China. In the ceremonies, a crucial role is given to the paternal uncle and aunt. In the /trungchang/ ceremony negotiations are started by the groom’s parents by offering /karchang/ ‘fermented grains’ and /nakchang/ ‘distilled liquor’. The /barchang/ ceremony formalises the wedding arrangement with exchange of scarves and alcoholic drinks. In the /bakmatonglen/ ceremony the marriage is celebrated in which the bride is sent from her parental home to her in-laws residence. Gifts, resembling a dowry, are given not only to the bride and the bride’s parents, but also to the mediator and the bride’s mother’s brothers and father’s sisters. These gifts include /khadar/ ‘white scarves’, clothing items including /padar/ or /pangkhep/, alcoholic drinks, food, and even jewellery and cash. These are all meant to ease the release of the bride to the

---

2 The tradition of offering khadar scarves, its origin, and the symbolic function of scarves offered by people from different walks of life and segments of society are explained in (2002: 57).
groom’s house. The elaborate offerings include pancakes, biscuits, fruits, milk, yoghurt, butter, alcohol, incense etc. arranged on ‘white and black woollen cloth’, a tradition said to date back to the time of Songtsen Gampo (2002: 52). After the bride has moved in with her husband, the bride’s family is expected to declare her ‘inheritance’ and ‘additional gift items’, usually livestock and grain stocks but also cash, jewellery and other valuables. The groom’s parents return this by donating a symbolic gift to the bride’s family.

According to Dorji (2003: 3) the people of Kheng also have a mediator similar to the Garpa Tongsum of the Brokpa, by them called Lonpo Garpa Tongthrap. Before and during the lengthy process he is responsible to assure a successful union, and his doubts or objections regarding the intentions of either party will weigh heavily in the final decision to recommend a marriage. Unique in the core marriage custom of Kheng is the fact that the groom has to serve three years of labour contribution to his ‘father in law’ and ‘mother in law’, a kind of in-house training during which he is serving his in-laws more than his prospective wife, with whom he maintains a platonic relation. The purpose of this trial period is prove to the in-laws that he is worthy of their daughter and will be able to raise a family according to local custom and the expectations of his in-laws, but also to compensate them for the loss of a labour force in their household after the bride moves in with the husband’s family. The ‘amulet giving’ ceremony is conducted after one year and is the first step in the legitimisation of the marriage. After another two years of successful completion of service to his in-laws, the groom’s parents initiate the ceremony which can last a few days. Pigs, copper cooking pots, alcoholic drinks, butter, salt, rice, eggs, chickens, large-bladed leaves and pumpkin are among the dowry that has to be brought by the groom’s family to the bride’s house. Then follows the actual wedding ceremony or in which the bride’s parents offer coins, cash, jewelleries and other valuables to the newlyweds. Within one year, the bride than moves in with the groom and his parents. The ceremony heralds the bride taking official residence in her in-laws residence, and once more gifts are offered to the couple. After one year, in the ceremony the bride’s parents give her the immobile property that is her share of the inheritance, including clothes and jewellery.
The marriage customs of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon. are dominantly described through Pemakô by Zhâng (1997:52) and closely match the marriage customs of the Brokpa and Khengpa, in that there is an important role for the matchmaker or broker between the families of the man and the woman. Although both marriage alliances arranged by parents as well as marriages initiated by the partners themselves exist, the formal agreement is brokered by the matchmaker in several visits to both the man and the woman’s house. Gifts are presented to the parents and the in-laws and the prospects of the marriage are discussed whilst drinking. If both the parents and the children agree to the proposal, the man has to pay a dowry to the woman’s family. Whereas richer families will send cattle and other valuables, whereas for poorer families the man will first have to serve two or more years in the woman’s household before he is allowed to take her as his wife. No matter what the dowry is, at least half a year’s time is left between the wedding agreement and the formal wedding. The formal wedding date is set after consultation of the astrologer. Usually the man’s relatives will fetch the bride from her house. She will be accompanied by her entire family. At the wedding dinner, the bride’s maternal uncle will occupy the main position. Similar to the custom described in Dorji (2003), the maternal uncle will judge the quality of the pork and the alcohol presented. The groom’s parents, in turn, will continue to praise the bride and soothe the maternal uncle’s until he agrees to the marriage. After presenting the couple and the groom’s parents with gifts, the bride’s family will depart for home. The newlywed couple will remain in the groom’s house for three days, and then take the dowry and depart for the bride’s house.

Even till today, dowry or bridal prize is still common practice among the Khengpa and Brokpa of Bhutan and the Tshangla and Dakpa of Arunachal and Tibet. According to Chakravarty (1953:104), a bridal prize was required from the groom’s family in Dirang in the 1950s. We learn from the interview that *mencha khung, phakpa nyitsing, khaung sam, nga rong nyitsing, chowing nyitsing amu kho thur* ‘six mithuns, two pigs, three dresses, two baskets of fish, two swords and one cooking pot’, which would be paid in instalments, is required. Non-payment of the bridal prize could result in theft cases (1953:126). Bagchi (1987: 49) states that cattle, sheep and cloth are required as bridal prize among the Kalaktang Tshangla. Cai (1981) also reports that dowry is still required.
among the Tshangla of Pemakö. Although nowadays small gifts of alcohol are offered when asking for a bride, an actual dowry is no longer required among most groups.

It became clear from, for example, ff. 29b and 30a of the Gyelrik that the various ruling clans of Monyul not only shared genealogical links, but also had intimate matrimonial contacts. As (1984) earlier stated, almost all the local clans of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon descended from the same common royal Tibetan ancestor. Because no other befitting aristocratic families were available to marry with, giving the various clans a name enabled their descendants to determine with whom they could intermarry without compromising the blood line. At the same time, to maintain purity of the royal ‘bone’, cross cousin marriage became an accepted marital custom among these clans.

Despite the fact that these elaborate marriage ceremonies including bridal prizes have been recorded from several areas of Monyul in the recent past, most societies have since long abandoned any formalised wedding ceremony. In modern times, marriage customs have greatly simplified. Love marriages are the common practice. Bride compensation in patrilocal areas is limited to a pig or a case of beer, trial periods are no longer required, but at the same time the durability of marriage unions has also decreased. A couple now simply moves in together in either the groom’s or the bride’s household, depending on the local tradition. Penjore (2003: 118-119) reports of the exchange of ‘rings’ as a symbol of acceptance of each other as partners, but indicates (2003: 122) that usually it is parental acceptance and public awareness that indicates marriage. Some merry-making with food and drinks after conducting a simple consecration ceremony would take place. According to Penjore (2009: 152) the erosion of elaborate wedding ceremonies could be explained by the fact that the socio-economic conditions of the rural populations could not afford an expensive and elaborate marriage customs, and the influence of a celibate monastic Buddhist community. Although this might be partially the reason, even less advanced rural societies further east did have marriage customs in which for example a dowry was expected, resulting in a downward depth cycle and even bonded slavery for some ethnic groups. Instead, perhaps, the courtship practice, the value placed on additional labour, and the practice of cross-cousin marriage could have
developed to replace the existence or avoid the development of a more complex dowry-based marriage system.

13.3.5. Marital Residence and Inheritance.

Two of the key social features differentiating the various ethnic groups in the area are the residence after marriage and the inheritance system. In social anthropology, there are generally three options for marital residence. The wife can move in with the husband’s family called patrilocality, the husband moves in with the wife’s family called matrilocality, or husband and wife are expected to start a completely separate household. The latter option is the preferred option in many modern societies. In patrilocal societies, the wife will move in with the husband and his family. Their family is raised there, and joint ownership of resources is assumed between the father and his sons. The extended family is usually led by the oldest male in the family, which is called patriarchy. In a patrilocal society, the moveable and immovable property a family or household possesses is distributed among the next generations through the male line, or patrilineal inheritance. Patrilocal residence and patrilineal inheritance has traditionally been favoured among most people, and the speakers of Tibeto-Burman languages are usually patrilocal and patrilineal. This includes the societies of the Tibetan plateau (Pain and Pema 2004) and ethnic groups in Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Arunachal ethnically and culturally closely related to the Tibetans. Examples include the nomadic and semi-nomadic people of Laya and Lunana in Gasa (Pain and Pema 2004), Sephu in Wangdü Phodrang and Dur in Bumthang, the Brokpa of Merak and Sakteng (2002: 51, Dorji 2003:39) and the adjoining areas of Kameng and Tawang, the Dakpa of Tawang and Lekpo (Zhāng 1997:54) and the Tshawnga speakers of Dirang (Chakravarty 1953:104, 126; Das Gupta 1968:132), Kalaktang (Bagchi 1987:40, 47-49), the Menchukha Memba, the Sherdukpen (Sarkar 1980), the Hruso and the Adi of Arunachal, the Lepcha of Sikkim (Plaisier 1996) and the Limbu of Nepal.

3 E.g., danga phai apa mekka dinya chola dina mo (403) ‘is she (the daughter) gone to live with her husband?’ ong daha phai apa depka chona (404) ‘yes, she is living with him’ (Chakravarty 1953:103) and the verb expression /chimin kos/, /phai ama kos/ and /phai ama la/ ‘fetch a wife’ (Das Gupta 1968:132).
Matrilocal residence is only found among a few societies. These societies are characterised by a relatively high labour contribution to the daily subsistence by women. In a matrilocal society the husband moves in with the wife’s family and their children are raised in that family. The head of the family is usually a female, called *matriarch*, although in practice it is usual the matriarch’s brothers that hold most of the decision power and control over the families’ resources. In a matrilineal society, resources and possessions are inherited through the female line, or *matrilineal* inheritance with a usual preference for the youngest daughter rather than the division of resources among all daughters. In theory, all children are entitled to an equal share of the parental inheritance. In practice, children no longer living in the village are excluded from inheritance of immovable assets altogether or sell or voluntarily surrender their claims in favour of those siblings that have taken residence in the maternal home. Examples of matrilocal societies in South and Southeast Asia include the Karen of Myanmar and Thailand and the Lhokpu of south-western Bhutan. The Jaintia, Lyngngam, Garo and Khasi of Meghalaya are a matrilocal and matrilineal society, although households are patriarchal. According to Jacquesson (2009:156), the reason for the most noted exceptions to this, the Garo and some Rabha and Tiwa in Assam, might be the result of a Mon-Khmer cultural influence or substrate. The other Bodo-Kachari tribes and the Ahoms ruling Assam from 1128-1826 CE were all considered to have been matrilineal and matrilocal as well, but shifted to patrilocal and patrilineal systems later on. The Qiang of Sichuan are matrilineal, and according to Penjore (2009:153) the Na of Yongning, Yunnan still preserve a strictly matrilineal society as well.

Although the popular media widely acclaims Bhutan as having a predominantly matrilineal inheritance system with matrilocal residence, in reality this is very much dependant on ethnic origin, home region and even village. Broadly generalising, matrilineal and matrilocal systems are preferred among the Ngalong of Western Bhutan (Pain and Pema 2004), the Lhokpu (Van Driem 2004), the Gongduk (Van Driem 2004), the Mangdep, Bumthap of Central Bhutan and the Kurtöp (Pain and Pema 2004) and Chocangaca speakers of Eastern Bhutan. The Tshangla of Bhutan and the Khengpa have a mixed system of both matrilocal and patrilocal residence and property inheritance to both sons and daughters (Pain and Pema 2004, Penjore 2009:99 and Penjore 2003:17).

Zhāng (1997:54) reported from Pemakö that inheritance is patrilineal, but residence can be matrilocal or patrilocal. Penjore (2009: 155) suggested that ‘this inheritance [68% matrilocal residence after marriage and 42% of land registered in female names] and the absence of a marked marriage ceremony suggests an interaction between a local social structure which has a matrilineal emphasis and an outside influence, mostly a Tibetan influence, which has a patrilineal emphasis’. Similarly, according to Zhāng (1997), the preference among the Pemakö Tshangla for maternal cross-cousin marriage, the importance given to the maternal uncles’ opinion during the wedding negotiations and the wedding party, and the preference for matrilocal residence are all remnants of a previously matriarchal society.

In present-day Bhutan, property is always registered in the name of the head of the household, and not of the individual family members. Only when households split and new households are registered can there be a division of property. Since taxes have to be paid by individual households, most families prefer to keep the inheritance in theory under a single household in the name of a single head of the household, even though the property is divided, land individually tilled and individual houses are constructed. In most rural settings, land is the most valuable immobile asset as it forms the basis for the agricultural lifestyle. The ancestral house in which the family lives is called /maphai/ in Tshangla, /mamai/ in Kheng and Bumthap, and variations of /makhyim ~ machim/ in the Central Bodish languages and Dakpa. These terms all mean ‘maternal home’, which stands in contrast with /phayul/ ‘paternal village or country’. The /chosham/ or altar including the religious effigies and relics it contains are often an inseparable part of the family residence. Moveable assets include cattle and other livestock, jewellery and other valuables such as silver coins, hand-woven silk fabrics, semi-precious stones and prized /zapshi/ wooden drinking cups.

---

4 Even to the extent that if a man’s parents-in-law die, he inherits a share of the property similar to his brothers-in-law.

5 Unfortunately, no research has been done yet to determine whether the dichotomy between matrilocal and patrilineal and patrilocal and patrilineal inheritance could have had anything to do with the dichotomy between secular and religious ruling families wanting to maintain a high ‘bone’ status and the common people who had to ensure the socio-economic viability of the household.
The reasons for the development of a patrilocal and patrilineal system in some ethnic groups, a matrilocal and matrilineal system in other ethnic groups, and a mixed system in a few ethnic groups can be found in the history of the area. Among the Tibetans and the nomadic people of the area, male labour was traditionally valued most. Whereas the gender-specific labour of women was traditionally limited near the household, the men would migrate great distances along with the livestock. This livestock and any land holdings and wealth would be inherited through the male line, the wife would move in with the husband’s family, as mentioned before polyandry was practiced, and the oldest male would be the head of the household taking the main decisions. In the hunter-gatherer and later agricultural societies that inhabited the heavily forested lower altitudes, male labour was needed for hunting and clearing and maintaining the shifting cultivation fields, taking the cattle for grazing in the forest and for protecting the homesteads. The role of women was limited to tending the kitchen gardens and fields, collecting forest produce and taking care of the livestock near the homestead. Land, house, livestock and wealth would be inherited through the male line, and the wife would move in with the man’s family. Men would have decisive power on most issues, whereas women would take decisions pertaining only to running the daily household. The idea of a line of descent through the male ‘bone’ line instead of through the female line is also central to the development and persistence of a male-dominated residence and inheritance system.

Since the 10th century, local theocratic institutions allied to certain schools of Tibetan Buddhism were established in western Bhutan, supported by local elites. These institutions might have been the main cause of change to a matrilineal and matrilocal system. With a considerable proportion of the male population enrolled in the monastic systems, called for military duty in frequent power struggles and wars, called to service at the monastic estates and the royal courts or on the way for trade, women became the dominant sex in many villages. At the same time, the development of wetland paddy cultivation in many of these areas decreased the dependence on male labour to early-season ploughing, with most of the remainder of the agricultural work being done by women or women and men combined. Out of sheer necessity a system of inheritance developed through the female line and residence of a husband with his wife’s family. For parents, the best insurance for old age would be to have the daughter inherit all he
immobile property and take care of them. Moreover, many males led an itinerant life, the
institution of marriage was weak, and bastard children in different places were not
uncommon. This made matrilocal residence also a necessity, because the only certain
parent of the child would be the mother, and the father’s family would never accept her
and the child into their household. According to Pain and Pema (2004) matrilineal
inheritance thus kept women in an inferior and disadvantaged position as opposed to
men. With the establishment of the Drukpa theocratic authority in the 17th century this
system of compulsory labour, compulsory monastic enrolment and heavy taxation and
with it the matrilocal and matrilineal system spread towards the central regions (Brauen
1997). The location of the courts at Trongsa and Bumthang would certainly have played a
significant role in this.

In areas where the degree of influence of the central authority remained the least,
such as the areas inhabited by the Khengpa and Tshangla, the patrilocal and patrilineal
system persisted much longer. The prevalence of Nyingma Buddhism would also have
been a contributing factor to this, as male enrolment in monastic institutions away from
the village was far less common than religious practitioners who would also provide
labour input to the subsistence system. The geography of the area also made shifting
cultivation the predominant agricultural system. Shifting cultivation relies more heavily
on male labour inputs as compared to permanent dryland and wetland paddy cultivation.
In response to the wars with the British in the mid-19th century, the central Drukpa
authority from Trongsa, through its’ regional extensions in Zhonggar and Trashigang and
the local institution of drungpas, increased their hold over the area and strictly enforced
the taxation system. It was only since that time that the male labour availability in the
villages started to drop and the matrilineal and matrilocal systems developed. Thus we
can still find the traditional patrilineal and patrilocal system persist alongside the
matrilocal and matrilineal system induced by male labour shortages as a result of political
changes. In Tshangla, this can also be attested by the use of the expressions *chimin di ‘go
as a bride or daughter-in-law’* denoting patrilocal residence, *makpa di ‘go as a groom or
son-in-law’* denoting matrilocal residence and *chimin pha ‘fetch a bride or daughter-in-
law’* denoting patrilocal residence besides the neutral nativised loan expression *nyen phi
‘get married’*. Curiously, an expression *makpa pha ‘fetch a groom or son-in-law’* which
would denote matrilocal residence is never heard, perhaps indicating that the initiative for
marriage would usually lie with the male. It must also be remarked that two distinctive kinship terms for in-laws exists in Tshangla, the native *khotkin* ‘son-in-law’ and *chimin* ‘daughter-in-law’ and the nativised loan from Chöke *makpa* ‘son-in-law’ and *ngama* or *nama* ‘daughter-in-law’. Similarly, Penjore (2003: 123-124) derives from the Kheng term for marriage /nyen thung/ ‘release a wife’ that a patrilocal residence was more common among the Khengpa people in the past. But he also indicates (2003: 124) that at present over two-thirds of all marriages is matrilocal. Dorji (2003:19, 21) indicates that traditionally, patrilocal residence was preferred in Kheng and that matrilocal residence is a development of the recent times only.

This situation changed after the social reforms of the 1950s, with land becoming a valuable property. Pain and Pema observed that in villages where matrilineal inheritance is common, women are also in charge of the main household decision and the household finances, indicating that with the control of land comes the responsibility of maintaining the household (2004:428). Pain and Pema attribute the present dichotomy between predominantly matrilineal marriage systems in western and north-central Bhutan and mixed systems in south-central and eastern Bhutan mainly to physical remoteness from infrastructure and thus markets, grain deficiency and surplus due to less fertile land, poverty and limited need for household labour. In the south-central and eastern regions, women owning land are still tied to their land, reducing their opportunities.

13.3.6. EXTRAMARITAL AFFAIRS, DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE.

Extramarital affairs were, and still are, relatively common among those men spending long periods away from home for trade, business and government or military duty. As long as the wife and her family remained unaware, it was usually socially condoned. Children born out of wedlock were usually accepted by the mother’s families and this carried much less social stigma than in other neighbouring societies. As long as a father would take responsibility for the upbringing of the children, many women would not see

---

6 Legally, land in Bhutan is, since the Land Act of 1979, registered in the name of the head of the household, whether male or female. The inheritance Act protects the right of individual members, again not differentiating man and women. And the beneficiaries of the distribution of government land for resettlement similarly can be male or female.
reason for a formal separation. Divorce and remarriage used to be rather common (ref. Penjore 2003: 135-136 and Zhāng 1997:55) and would not discriminate gender. Mediators would usually be employed to try to cement a broken relationship. If divorce ensued, property would be equally divided among the partners, but any dowry brought by the groom’s family would have to be returned. Compensation was sometimes required to be paid by the partner initiating the divorce. Sons would usually be adopted by the man’s family and daughters by the woman’s family, although the party initiating the divorce would often not be interested or allowed to keep any of the children. In Tshangla, a man’s second wife is called /azem/ by the children, and a woman’s second husband is called /aku/, as opposed to /apa/ and /ama/ for the biological parents. In most cases, widow remarriage was allowed, and a widow would be encouraged to marry her late husband’s brother as this would mean less complexity in property division (e.g., Chakravarty 1953: 104-106). In Bhutan, legal divorce has been made less easy and involves internal or official settlement through payment of compensation.

13.4. The Role and Position of Women.

Societies in Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon appear to have traditionally had an advanced degree of social gender differentiation. Labour division was based on physical capacities, accepting the male physique as better suited for typical male-oriented work demanding strength and stamina such as construction, woodwork, hunting, herding livestock and ploughing, and the female physique for more delicate and accurate work compatible with child nurturing, including sowing, weeding, threshing, harvesting, winnowing, weaving, firewood collection and household chores. Wikan (1990: ref 26) found that even at present, the effective head of the household, and thus the person in authority, in western Bhutan is almost always the man, even when the land is owned by his wife. The land owner would be physically tied to her land, thus reducing opportunities for education, trade etc. On the contrary, although in the south-central and eastern areas the matrilineal inheritance systems are weak, women are generally considered to have greater authority and power, at least within the household.

Traditionally, the position of female /neljorma/ or /pamo/ Bon priestesses was accorded the same position as that of male /pau/, indicating, in the words of Choden (1997:253) ‘The significant presence of women participants in some surviving Bon
rituals suggests that women had prominent positions- either real or symbolic- based on religion and ritual'. The introduction of Buddhism changed the position of women to some extent, at least in theory. Even in earliest Buddhist texts, the historical Buddha only reluctantly accepted women followers and nuns, placed them in an inferior position, warned against the defilements of the female body and biological processes involving it, including menstruation, sexual intercourse and childbirth and presented women as tempters and distractors of men from the path to enlightenment. This amalgamated in the persistent view that women have to be reborn nine times as a man before they can reach enlightenment, and translates in for example women being prohibited from entering temples when in their period or after childbirth or from entering temples dedicated to the protective deities, that nuns are less respected than monks and fewer in number and the support they receive is less and that there are very few high female incarnates except for those taken as consort by high incarnate lamas, rinpoches and trulkus (see for example Wikan 1990:35 reference 26, Brauen 1997:97 ref. 22, Choden 1997:253). The inferior position accorded to women also translates in poor participation, despite high representation, of women in meetings and gatherings (Bodt 2002), in local and national politics and in high positions in the government, largely attributable to lower female enrolment and higher drop-out rates in education in the past (Pain and Pema 2004:432). With changing times and higher educational levels, these trends are changing, and many women are now questioning the origin and the justifications for the inferior position accorded to them by society.

13.5. DEATH AND CORPSE DISPOSAL METHODS.

The rituals surrounding death and disposal of the dead body can be separated into two main practices: the pre-Buddhist Bon practice and the Buddhist practice. In fact, most of the rituals are a mixture, containing both pre-Buddhist and Buddhist elements. For most Buddhist people of the eastern Himalayas, death is considered the most important life event. Death is not considered the end of a lifetime, but a more beginning of a new life. During his lifetime a person is expected to adhere to the basic precepts of accumulating རང་སུམ་‘merit, virtue’. At the moment of dying, a lama is supposed to འབྲི་བཟང་ལྡན་‘perform the transfer of consciousness’, when the ཆོས་‘consciousness’ or ‘soul’ leaves the body through the fontanel and the bonds between the departed soul and the remaining corpse
are severed. Immediately after death, the death horoscope is consulted by a lama or an astrologer determining the cause of death and the course of action and rituals to be undertaken to assure a certain rebirth. The details are often meticulous, including the direction from which the body should be removed from house, the way of disposal of the corps, the offerings that should be made, the rituals that should be conducted and the birth years of the people that are to be involved. The corpse is usually tied in a foetal position and placed in a wooden box decorated with coloured scarves. Offerings of cooked food, fruits, *torma* ‘ritual dough cakes’ and alcoholic drinks are made to a small altar with an effigy of the deceased, a custom strongly reminiscent of pre-Buddhist practices.

After disposal of the corpse, consecutive rituals take place after 7, 14, 21 and 49 days after death occurred, and are usually repeated every year for a certain number of years. During these first 49 days, the consciousness is believed to roam in the intermediate state between death and rebirth. It is the duty of the relatives to increase the merit of the deceased. The monks and gomchens perform elaborate rituals to guide the soul from one incarnation to the next. Representatives from all the village households bring donations in cash and kind and recite the mantra *Om Mani Peme Hum* for the benefit of all sentient beings and the deceased in particular. Meals as well as profuse amounts of alcohol are consumed together. Wealthier families will hold more elaborate rituals lasting more years. According to the death horoscope, virtuous deeds might be conducted on behalf of the deceased for years to come to insure a good reincarnation.

The pre-Buddhist corpse disposal method was burial of the corpse at a non-designated place in the forest. No cemeteries seem to have existed, and the graves were usually not clearly demarcated. Burial was even the preferred disposal method in forested locations at lower altitudes across the whole area even after Buddhism spread, and cremation was reserved for important religious figures. Burial tombs of the Tibetan kings of the Yarlung dynasties exist on the Tibetan plateau, and burial has been attested to have been practiced in Tshangla speaking areas. Graves marked with large stone slabs are reported to have been found in Masang Daza village, near Lingmethang, Monggar, Bhutan. A bone

---

7 In Pemakö, even cigarettes are offered to the deceased (Zhāng, 1991:72).
fragment was unearthed, but carbon dating was not done (Ugyen Pelgen, n.d., pers. comm.). The stone slabs were used for construction purposes. Earlier assumptions that these graves could be attributed to Indian migrants to the area seem increasingly unlikely, though perhaps harder to digest from a Buddhist Bhutanese perspective than attributing the graves to early indigenous peoples. Until the mid-20th century, burial was practiced among communities in Bhutan in case of people who died of infectious diseases, mainly from smallpox. The dead would be buried along with all their possessions to prevent the disease from spreading. Even until fairly recent times, however, the corpses of people who died during the monsoon season were inhumed in graves for a lack of dry firewood, and only cremated in the dry winter season. Chakravarty (1953:109-110) that as recently as 1953 burial and water burial were the common disposal method of corpses in Dirang. In Kalaktang, both burial and cremation are practised (Bagchi 1987:42-43). According to Zhāng (1997: 73-75), the Tshangla people of Pemakō prefer burial of the corpse together with some personal belongings on a dry hillside. The grave is covered with a wooden board, banana leaves and earth and a wooden fence is constructed around the mound. Until recently, burial of corpses in the forest was also practiced by the Tshangla of Tuting area of Pemakō (Norbu Wangdi, n.d., pers. comm.).

---

8 This was reported from the Thridangbi and Wambur areas of Lhüntsi by Gyeltshen (2006: 23). This practice seems to have disappeared together with the diseases themselves.

9 The lines of this part of the interview, with their Zhonggar Standard equivalents between brackets, read: songnga shilan ga jinsek ana mo (songngo shilakap ro gokla mo) (426) ‘If a person dies, is cremation done?’ manggi, sa ga shumba na. bakhthar bakhthar cahmi cahmi (?) mam mam (?) ri ga phirpa na (427, 428) (mangi, sawang phinca. tshaibanggi zemu catnyi riga thup gemla) ‘No, (the corpse) is buried in the ground. Some will cut it into small pieces and throw it in the river.’ nashi unyi hang anyi ane (429) (naibak onyen hang anyi anca ya?) ‘Why do you do this?’ ashi ga duha chona shumsa sa zemmal (430) (aiga dakhaga sawang phibega sa nyungla) ‘The land in our village is too limited for burial.’ unyi mekka hang anyi sa hang anyi zemmane (431) (sa sho hang anyi nyungpu la ya) ‘Why is the land too limited? ung sa phelubak lai sajin (?) ca na (432) (ungsa jampu thamce ? la) ‘The good flat land all has cultivation.’ nan hang anyi io ma gokpa ne (nan hang anyi ro gokpo mala) ‘Why don’t you cremate?’ gila shing kem (?) (shing nyungpu la) ‘Because there are few trees.’. Dirang Tshangla has a verb for burial, /shum/, whereas in the Bhutan Tshangla burial is described as /wang phi/ ‘commit to a hole in the ground’. The verb /shum/ ‘bury’ does still exist though, namely in the context of /mula shumph/ ‘bury radish (or any other tuberous crop or vegetable) under a heap of leaves and earth for preservation’.
Burial has quickly lost favour among all ethnic groups as Buddhism spread, and it seems now burial has been generally abolished. In Buddhism the human body is generally conceived as nothing more than a vessel in which the ‘soul’, or rather the karma or the result of previous actions resides. Death is the transition from one vessel into the next, through reincarnation depending on one’s karma. As such no big importance is attached to either the corpse or its disposal method. It is considered beneficial though if a disposed corpse can be of benefit to other beings, which explains the concepts of sky and water burial. Moreover, at higher altitudes, particularly the Tibetan plateau, trees and wood have always been a scarce commodity, and the earth is in a semi-frozen state for much of the year, thus limiting opportunities for cremation and burial. Sky burial, or the dismemberment of a corpse and feeding it to vultures and other scavengers on a rock outcrop, as practiced by Tibetans is also the preferred method of corpse disposal among the Dakpa of Lekpo. Because it feeds the birds, it is considered preferable from a Buddhist perspective as well. Water burial, or the dismemberment of a corpse and disposing it in the river, has already been reported above by Chakravarty from Dirang. In Pemakö, water burial is reserved for those who died of infectious diseases (Zhāng 1997: 75) but water burial is the preferred method of disposal for the Dakpa and the Brokpa. In Thongrong in Bhutan, two villagers are selected on basis of their year of birth and after consultation of the death horoscope of the deceased. After certain cleansing rituals in the evening, they drink themselves in a drunken stupor and take the body to a location as prescribed by the death horoscope. First the head of the deceased is severed and hidden in the nearby undergrowth. According to a fixed scheme, the body is meticulously cut in 107 pieces, which together with the head are thrown in the river. The dead body is considered to benefit the fishes and other aquatic organisms.

A final method of disposal concerns the corpse of a stillborn foetus or infant before it has been given a name, which is usually done after several months. In most

\[10\] Despite this, there is a strong belief that the consciousness might not find its next reincarnation and will haunt the living people if the prescribed rituals are improperly conducted. Perhaps, the abandonment of burial is related to this fear of rolong or rolang ‘zombies’ that resurrect after burial. Water burial and cremation more effectively remove the corpse and thus prohibit the consciousness from returning to it. Some places, such as Kanglung in Eastern Bhutan, have a lively folklore of the living dead, people buried long ago on the lower reaches of the hill who still haunt the area.
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areas, the corpse is simply thrown in the river. In some places, however, the corpse is buried under the ground floor of the house. In Lekpu area, the Dakpa sometimes preserve the corpse, washed with salt water, in a box with sand and keep it in the attic. It is thrown in the river only after several years (Zhâng 1997:75).

Standard funeral practice in Bhutan is now cremation. Each village used to have cremation grounds nearby, although more and more official, government-recognised cremation grounds are being established. In many places, fire wood for the funeral pyre is a considerable part of funeral expenditure. The ash from the funeral pyre is either disposed in the river or mixed with clay and flour to make tsatsa votive offerings which are kept in crevices in rock outcrops.

13.6. HOUSING STYLES.

In western and north-central Bhutan, Tawang and Dirang, many settlements are clustered on the suitable flat areas of land. In Pemakö villages are clustered too for protection against marauding ‘Lopa tribes and because of the limited suitable terrain (Cai 1981:133). In stark contrast to this, the homesteads, hamlets and villages of Eastern Bhutan, and Kalaktang are scattered along the ridges and on the undulating hills. High population density means that almost every relatively plain area is inhabited and cultivated. Even on slopes normally too steep for agriculture rainfed dryland and shifting cultivation takes place. Terracing and associated irrigated agriculture is limited to the valley bottoms and undulating slopes.

In the past many houses in the subtropical southern hills and the river valleys were built from bamboo and wood on short wooden and stone pillars to protect against the damp underground and floods during the monsoon season. Wooden beams would support walls usually made of /cur/ ‘woven bamboo mats’ covered with mud, and the roofing was usually also made of bamboo mats\footnote{Ref. also p. 56. This kind of houses is called /kapkama/ in Kheng (Penjore 2009). Huts made of bamboo mats used as store rooms or sheds are called /bago/. The wood and bamboo huts built on stilts on the edge of the agricultural fields were used for guarding the crops against wild animals. They are curiously called /shama/ in Kheng, according to Penjore (2009) meaning ‘animal house’. Perhaps, this is a reference to the general Tshangla suffix <sha> for wild animals. A small bamboo and wooden hut built on wooden or stone posts is finally called a /har/ in Kheng and usually used for storing grains.} Such houses, which had to be replaced

on very regular basis and were necessitated by the humid conditions, can still be found in some poor and remote areas of lower Kheng in Zhemgang, and Jurme, Kengkhar and Gongduk in Mongar. Similar houses were also reported from Dirang (Chakravarty 1953) and Pemakō (Zhāng 1997:5). Further uphill, the houses were thatched adobe huts or two-roomed structures of oak branches with stone and mud, as can still be found in, for example, Nanong. More permanent two-storied structures of stone, wood and mud with wooden shingles as roofing and wooden planks as floors were built in the temperate areas. Over the years, these houses became of an elongated rectangular shape since each new generation would build their house attached to their parent’s house. The ground floor is traditionally used for keeping livestock, the first floor usually is a single big room used for sleeping, cooking, eating and all other social activities, and the low attic is used for storing and drying food products. Similar houses can be found in Pemakō (Cai 1981:133), Dirang and most of Eastern Bhutan. Whitewashing of the outer walls is done in Bhutan but not commonly in Tawang, Kameng or Pemakō. The presence of Corrugated Iron (CGI) sheet roofing is generally a symbol of wealth and development of the household. The rammed mud wall house usually found in western Bhutan is much less common further east.

Until the arrival of the ruling clans from Tibet, the indigenous population of Monyul lived in the bamboo, grass and wooden houses. The migrants brought with them the architectural style of the Tibetan plateau and started constructing ŋ̣ينة khar. These khar were large, elongated, two or three story stone mansions with wooden beams and wood shingled roofs. The khar had no windows on the ground floor, a retractable wooden staircase leading up to a veranda and door on the first floor, tiny windows on the upper floors and a stone or wood plank roof. Their size, building materials and style would have certainly have contrasted sharply with the simple wood, grass, bamboo and perhaps gradually stone housings of their subjects. Unfortunately, many of the khar can no longer be found. After the Drukpa annexation, the khar of some of the more resistant clan leaders were destroyed in retribution. Some were converted into what were later called

13 In more wealthy areas and modern times new buildings are often detached.
naktshang or mansions in which the drungpas or regional chiefs installed by the Drukpa leaders took residence\textsuperscript{15}. Others were occupied by religious figures holding certain worldly power over their subjects in their locality\textsuperscript{16}. But the majority of the khar were slowly but steadily dismantled, their construction materials used for the construction of houses and temples of the expanding local population. This process was exacerbated by the development activities commenced in the 1960s. Unfortunately, whether it concerned the government and local communities, local contractors or Indian contractors, all considered the nearby availability of solid, well-shaped rocks and stones a blessing for the construction of the schools, basic health units, extension centres and roads\textsuperscript{17}. But the khar live on in the many villages and hamlets named after them. A total of 30 villages and hamlets in Monggar, 30 in and Trashigang, 16 in Trashiyangtshi, 13 in Lhüntsi, 9 in Pemagatshel and 4 in Samdrup Jongkhar with the suffix \textless khar\textgreater have been identified till now\textsuperscript{18}. Perhaps the western Bhutanese suffix for place names \textasciitilde kha\textasciitilde originates from ṣī as well.

13.7. Villages, Hamlets and Place Names.

The social unit after the individual household was traditionally the hamlet. A hamlet is a sub-division of a village, and usually consists of 3 to 5 scattered houses with the surrounding homesteads and fields. The people living in these houses are often related to each other. Individual households are usually not named, but a hamlet does carry a name, and a certain house would be referred to as ‘the house of (name of the head of the household or the most prominent household member, for example, a local religious figure or leader) in the hamlet of (name of the hamlet)’. Several hamlets would make up a village. Villages are usually located on the higher slopes of the hills and mountains instead of in the drier and hotter river valleys. But paddy fields would usually be located on the alluvial plains and on the river banks. A village is separated from other villages by rivers or streams, ridges or mountains, forested tracts of land or other natural boundaries.

\textsuperscript{15} E.g. Phongme and Bidung naktshang.
\textsuperscript{16} E.g. Tsenkhar in Kanglung.
\textsuperscript{17} Examples include the khar of Bageng and Tsenkharla, suspected to be the ancestral home of Mizimpa.
\textsuperscript{18} Ref. annex XI.
that for physical barriers and thus territorial boundaries. Each village is connected to several other villages through narrow, winding footpaths and the journey from one village to the next typically lasts from 30 minutes to six hours depending on the topography.


The suffix /bi/ with an unknown meaning and the variant spellings བི /bji/ is peculiar to Bhutan. The suffix is most common in western and west-central Bhutan, where one finds the spelling བི with pronunciation /bji/ ['bji] as in བི geok in Ha, བི geok in Bji in Paro, བི /bji/ in Mâpji in Chukha, བི /bji/ in Tshalambji in Dagana, བི /bji/ in Dâmbji in Gasa and བི /bji/ in Tangsibji, བི /bji/ in Cendenbji and བི /bji/ in Bembji in Trongsa. A shift can be noted in central Bhutan to the spelling བི with pronunciation ['bji] as in བི Jangbi and བི Nabi in Trongsa, བི Tangsibi and བི Dorjibi in Bumthang and བི Artobi and བི Menbi in Lhuntsi. In Eastern Bhutan the suffix is very rare and only བི /bi/ is common, as in བི Caibi under Gongduk, བི /bji/ in Pangsibji and བི /bji/ in Tsenzabi under Saling in Monggar, and བི /bji/ in Bidung in Trashigang.

The suffixes /dung/, /zor/ ‘ridge’, /ri/ ‘river, stream, water’, /khar/ and /wung/ ‘field’ are very peculiar to the Tshangla speaking areas. There are many names of villages with the suffix <dung>, for example, གུམ་ Dungphu and གུམ་ Dungchilo ‘bigger village’, གུམ་ Dungphu and གུམ་ Dungchilo in Monggar.
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‘lower Dung’ geok in Pemagatshel; Cidungkhar in Gomdar; Dungkarcheling in Dewathang; Dungmanma ‘old village’ in Lauri and Dungkarling in Phüntshothang in Samdrup Jongkhar; Zordung in Kangpar; Khoidung in Khaling; Dungmanma in Lumang; Dungsam in Radi, and Bidung geok in Trashi Yangtse; and Maidung in Tötsho, Tsangdung and Cangmadung in Tongzhangtshen in Trashiyangtsi. Some authors, such as Aris (1979) related the occurrence of the geographical suffix /dung/ to Chöke /dung/ ‘clan, lineage, descent’ and to the defeat of the Dung of southern Tibet and their spread in Monyul as the Dung lineages. In modern Tshangla, /dung/, however, means ‘village’. This Tshangla word is thus very different from most other Bodish languages which all have some forms cognate with Chöke /yul/ or /trong/ for ‘human settlement, village’, i.e. Dakpa [yi], Dzongka [yi]. Perhaps Tshangla /dung/ ‘village’ is the result of a semantic shift from /dung/ ‘clan, lineage’? Even in modern Tshangla, one would ask for someone’s provenance by asking /nan dung oga ya/ ‘where is your dung from’ rather than /nan dung oga ya/ ‘where is your dung’. This might indicate that in the past, asking someone for the origin of his clan was the name as asking someone for his place of origin, and that this has been retained in modern Tshangla.

13.8. VILLAGE ORGANISATION, CASTES AND CLASS.

As Penjore (2003:129) remarked about Wamling village in Kheng ‘the linguistic variation among Shingkhar, Wamling and Khrisa which are only half an hour on foot from each other, is a proof of how each village functioned as a large well-knit family, a geographically bounded society’. After the extended family the next social unit is often the village. At present, in most village societies no rigid class or caste system can be distinguished. Within a community, social status of an individual and to some extent a household or family is usually determined on the basis of material and cultural capital such as descent, land holding, cattle ownership, wealth, occupation including religious professions, skills and knowledge, but it is possible to rise in social status as well as fall.

---

20 This should probably be ‘white conch shell place’.
21 Ref. paragraph 4.4.4.
Thus, voicing the general opinion of the Bhutanese themselves and foreign researchers alike, Penjore (2009:65) remarked that even the historic Bhutanese society can be generally lauded as egalitarian. In comparison to the caste-based societies of the Indian subcontinent, this view does appear to hold. The people speaking the Indo-European languages comprise endogamous social groups defined along caste distinctions. But as was the case with the pre-1950s Tibetan society, the Bhutanese society was not completely void of any social divisions, as no society has ever been. Thus the egalitarian view of society was only relative, and the factual absence of an egalitarian society was often one of the major reasons for migration. Instead, a gradual shift has taken place from a caste-based society within a clan-based society to a purely class-based society.

After the arrival of the ruling clans of Tibetan origin, each village entity was divided in a ruling caste and a subject caste. The ruling clan was made up of a single family belonging to one of the clans claiming descent from one of the illustrious historical figures of Chapter 4. The majority of the people belonged to the subject clans, who descended from one of the various indigenous clans of the area with a very diverse ethnic origin. Any given self-governing entity would consist of a single ruling family belonging to a single clan and many different subject families belonging to a few different subject clans. As clans were based on patrilineal descent- to avoid tainting of the ‘bone’- marriage within the same clan was not possible. Members of the ruling clans would marry with members of other ruling clans, i.e. from outside their own village, but usually intermarriage with the subject clans was not condoned. On the other hand, members of the subject clans would intermarry with members of other subject clans within the same village. This situation is perhaps reminiscent of a caste based society, as social mobility from the subject clans to the ruling clans or vice-versa was limited. Among the Tshangla of Pemakô a similar clan system based on consanguinal relationships existed (Zhāng 1997:37-39).

22 Ref. paragraph 5.3.
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After the Drukpa annexation of Eastern Bhutan, the ruling clans and families lost most, if not all, of their privileges. With the introduction of the taxation system\(^{23}\), the clan system lost its function. Instead, the village society was divided based on land holding and status as a taxpaying, labour contributing or subservient household. The class-based society that developed was slightly more mobile than the previous caste system within the clan system, as the status of households could change. A similar class-based system with characteristics of feudal serfdom was introduced in Pemakö under the Powo and Tibetan administrations. Even as the practicalities of this class-based system made social concepts such as matrilocal residence and matrilineal inheritance acceptable\(^{24}\), ideas regarding the purity of the patrilineal ‘bone’ line persisted. Because reliance on clan affiliation for marriage alliances was no longer possible, families had to find an alternative way to determine whether a proposed marriage alliance was violating the patrilineal lineage or not. Perhaps, this solution was found in the preference for cross-cousin marriage, particularly bilateral cross-cousin marriage, as the marriage between two bilateral cross-cousins was considered the only way to make sure that there was no ‘bone’ relation between the partners.

Remnants of the old clan- and caste-based society are still more pronounced in the areas of Eastern Mon. The Dakpa of Thongrong village under Phongme geok in Trashigang dzongkhak of Eastern Bhutan, for example, traditionally a threefold stratification existed based on origin and property status. The upper hamlets of the village were inhabited by households with considerable religious influence, land and cattle holdings. Although numerically the smallest group, they would traditionally fulfil the functions of lay monk and caretaker of the temple, own the largest houses, most cattle, and the largest wetland area. They claimed descent from migrants and religious figures belonging to the ruling clan lineages from Tawang. The numerically largest class could be found in the middle hamlets. They were traditionally engaged in trade with Tawang and cultivated their own plots of land and herd cattle for the upper class in return for dairy products. They were thought to be the descendants of migrants belonging to various subject clans from the adjoining Dakpa-speaking areas of Mokto, Bongleng and Khet. The lower hamlets of the

\(^{23}\) Ref. paragraph 7.3.
\(^{24}\) Ref. paragraph 13.3.5.
village were inhabited by people who were said to ‘smell like goats’, owning little land and usually sharecropping the land of the higher classes and of land owners in Radi and Phongme. Their darker complexion and rough facial features were thought to indicate a divergent but unknown origin. Although these social differences are slowly fading, especially with more people migrating away from the village, even at present marriage alliances between the upper and middle class are condoned, but the lower class is strictly endogamous.

A system rather similar to that in Thongrong was reported by Fürer-Haimendorf (1982) from among the Dakpa of Tawang and the Tshangla from Dirang. He stated that there was no division in egalitarian or exogamous clans but that there existed a social stratification in classes based on origin and socio-economic position. As example he mentioned the village of Sangti in Dirang. Here, the upper class are the Tshapu and Serchipa; the second class are the Pchechupa; the third class are the Thongkapa, Bagipa, Tukshipa and Bomyakpa; and the lowest class are the Merakpa and Sermu. Whilst Tshapu and Pchechukpa intermarry, other exogamous marriages do not occur. Chatterjee and colleagues (2003) reported that in Thembang village under Dirang, a social stratification exists in four upper classes with their associated lower classes. The Nimu and Pholpa were associated with the Daer Kipa Bapu; the Miracapa and

---

25 As we saw in paragraph 5.4, classes such as the Bagipa are probably remnants of the ancient clans of subject people.
26 According to him descendants of people from Merak in Bhutan.
27 Chatterjee, like Chowdhury (1975) and other Indian authors called these classes ‘castes’, probably as a result of the Hindu Indo-Aryan background in which the concept of a caste system is all pervasive. Many authors have attempted to distinguish elements of caste in all societies of the Northeast, even when they were absent or rather based on class or clan. This is rather similar to earlier attempts by for example the Shah rulers of Nepal to attribute and even enforce their caste system on Tibeto-Burman people that had a clan or class-based society. Here, preference is given to usage of ‘class’ rather than ‘clan’, as the religious connotation and rigidity of the Hindu caste system is inappropriate to the systems described here.
28 The term Bapu was first accorded to the rulers of various lineages claiming descent from Lhase Tsangma. Later it became a reference to a certain class, and now it has become a surname among the Tshangla speakers of Dirang and Kalaktang.
29 Perhaps Merakpa, people who, like in Sangti, descend from migrants from Merak in Bhutan.
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Charmo\textsuperscript{30} were associated with the Charcoopa Bapu\textsuperscript{31}; the Pholpa were associated with the Khuchlu Bapu; and the Nimu were associated with the Ata Japu Bapu. The Chukpa\textsuperscript{32} are said to be divided in five exogenous clans called the Gumpa, Khumupa, Khumuthongkor, Ngarmupa and Changmuchipa. According to Chowdhury (1975: 47) the Lishpa and Chukpa are considered inferior to the Dirang Tshangla, and that the Lishpa and Chukpa on one hand and the Dirang Tshangla on the other hand are endogamous groups. Finally, the Sherdukpen are divided in the endogamous upper Thong and the lower Chao class (Sarkar 1975, 1980). Local tradition has it that the Thong class consists of the descendants of the marriage of the Tibetan king Songtsen Gampo and a Ahom or Kachari princess. Furthermore, eight Thong clans exist, all inhabiting Rupa and Shergoan (Deuri 1976: footnote to page 27). Examples of these clans are the superior clans Khrime and Thongdok and the lower clans Megenji, Dingla and Chingchonji. The lower Chao class consists of the descendants of the porters and servants of the king living in the village of Rahung\textsuperscript{33}. A third caste called Yanlo, blacksmiths and carpenters inhabiting Jigaon Ado village, are thought to be the descendants of later migrants from Bhutan (Chowdhury 1975:49).

There are various other examples of social stratification among other ethnic groups of the region. The Hruso society is said to be divided in two classes. According to Chowdhury (1975), the Bugun are a lower caste then the Hruso. This arrangement is, however, more reminiscent of the overlordship of the Nishi over their Puroik neighbours rather than a caste or class division within a tribe\textsuperscript{34}. Dhimmai society is divided in two endogamous classes, the superior Nyubu and the inferior Nyulu, again subdivided in sub-classes (Elwin 1993:480, Chowdhury 1975:51). The society of the Gurung people of Nepal is divided in two hierarchical and endogamous castes, known by the Nepâli names Châr Jât ‘Four Castes’ and the Sora Jât ‘Sixteen Castes’. Within these two castes, a further subdivision into exogamous patrilineal clans that are segmented into local lineages can be

\textsuperscript{30} Perhaps the same Sermu class as found in Sangti.

\textsuperscript{31} Perhaps Sharchokpa Bapu, descendants of people who migrated from Bhutan.

\textsuperscript{32} Ref. paragraph 12.4.3.

\textsuperscript{33} Ref. paragraph 12.4.4.

\textsuperscript{34} Ref. paragraph 12.4.2.
found. The Châr Jât are said to consist of the indigenous Gurung people with a division in four clans imposed by Tibetan immigrants in the 15th or 16th century (Ragsdale 1990). The Sora Jât, on the other hand, include ethnic groups later incorporated into the Gurung, including Tibetan migrants, Magar, and low caste Hindus. The Limbu are subdivided in hundreds of exogamous, patrilineal Limbu clans grouped in those claiming descent from migrants from Yunnan and those claiming descent from migrants from Tibet. Marriage within the own patrilineal clan is never permitted, and neither is marriage with anyone belonging to up to five generations within the mother’s line of descent, effectively banning cross-cousin marriage. The Turung [tuunu], alternatively called Derung, Drung, or Dulong of northwestern Yunnan province are divided in 15 strictly patriarchal clans (Sun 1982).

As for village organisation, in the past, /tso/ or /tsopla/ ‘village unit’ was led and represented by an elected headman called /tsorgan/ ‘tso elder’ 35. This tsorgan would usually be an older, literate male. He would be assisted by several /tshokpa/ who would represented the various hamlets. Chatterjee et al. (2003) describe a dual Thembang village government. One consists of the representatives 36 of a caste and its associated lower caste who meet in a chanpa jumbang. The other is the overall village governing body 37 headed by the villages headman and village representatives 38 who meet in the mangma jumbang. This is approximately the same as reported from Tawang by Norbu (1999) and Lama (1999). In Bhutan, a village is traditionally headed by the gatpu 39 or elected village leader. The gatpu was traditionally assisted by several tshokpa, but in the recent reforms in the local governance system this has been replaced by the /cipon/ who represents several /tshok/ grouped together in a /ci’ok/. A similar system existed in Pemakö (Zhâng 1997:37).

35 Ngawang’s Gyelrik already mentions this post, which in some cases, like mentioned in Addendum V, was a hereditary function.
36 Called chanpa.
37 Called mangma.
38 Called gomi.
39 Derived from Dzongkha རྐྱི་ཁ, although in some places in Eastern Bhutan the gap is still referred to as tsorgan.
13.9. THE POISON CULT.

A curious but macabre cultural feature that deserves mentioning is the poison cult that existed and according to some sources still exists in certain parts of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Monyul. Notorious areas are the Kurmë area in Lhûntsi, upper Trashiyangtsi, the border areas inhabited by Dakpa, certain parts of Pemagatshel, Lish and Chuk in Dirang and the Kongpo area and Pemakô in Tibet. But practically every area has certain households suspected of poisoning guests. According to popular belief, one should never accept any hot food or alcoholic drinks from households with whom one is not thoroughly familiar. Those suspected of giving poison are always women- most commonly spinsters and widows. They are believed to poison a person in order to obtain his གཞི་ ‘life-force’. There are several ways in which the poison is prepared as well as administered. Whereas the usual poison used for hunting is made from *Aconitum* sp., the poison for the poison cult is home-made. During the new moon, the woman will paint half her face black and half her face white. She will carry an unboiled egg into the forest and whilst uttering secret mantra she will bury it at the foot of a tree. During the next full moon, she will return to this place and collect the mushroom that has usually sprouted from the egg. This mushroom will be dried and ground to a fine powder. The poison can be administered unnoticed, for example by keeping it under the fingernail and adding it to a cup of alcohol when serving it to the unsuspecting victim. The victim has to be, in order of preference, a king, a high lama, a minister, a rich man, a young man, her husband or her son. In absence of any of days, she has to consume the poison herself. Death comes slow and sudden, and often poisoning is not suspected. Households thought to be poisoners are usually outcast and stigmatised but at the same time also kept in respect out of fear that retribution might take place. Belief in the poison cult is still strong, and in many cases people suffering from sudden and severe illness are thought to be /duk rek/ ‘touched by poison’. Official policy is to discourage belief in the cult and the social stigma it entails ⁴⁰.

---

⁴⁰ In order to discourage the belief, the Fifth King of Bhutan, in a royal visit to Lhûntsi, reportedly consumed liquor from a woman about whom he was warned that she gave poison.

Figure 13.1. Dogorom and Tsiktuma village, Bidung geok, Trashigang dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 13.2. Thongrong village, Phongme geok, Trashigang dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.
CHAPTER 14. LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES: FROM FORESTS TO FIELDS.

The locations, timings and processes of the domestication of wild plants and animals and the migratory trajectories from their centres of origin to the current places of cultivation can provide important clues on the dispersal of human civilisations and cultures. Hypotheses regarding the people that introduced certain species, their origin, their date of migration and the route by which they arrived can be constructed partially based on linguistic cognates in the vernacular names of animals, plants and even agricultural production systems. Earlier, Diffloth (2005), for example, argued that from reconstructions of Proto-Austroasiatic words for certain animal and plant species and vocabulary related to rice cultivation the Austroasiatic should have been located in the tropics. It is beyond the scope of the current work to provide a detailed description of the myriad of forest resources and agricultural crops forming part of the existing livelihood systems. Instead, a more general description is provided, including some important and illustrative examples and some surmises that could contribute to reconstructing the pre-recorded history of the area.

14.1. FORESTS PROVIDING LIVELIHOODS.

Altitude and climate, mainly precipitation pattern and quantity and temperature, are crucial factors determining the ecological zone in a certain area. The centre of gravity of the population in Eastern Bhutan and eastern Mon can be found in the humid and dry subtropical and warm temperate zones. The cool temperate areas have traditionally been inhabited by the Brokpa and the other East Bodish peoples, including the Bumthap, Mangdep, Kurtöp and Dakpa. Both the wet subtropical zone and the alpine zone were only sparsely inhabited, the former due to malaria infestation, the latter due to the harsh winter climate. Whereas until the 1950s the wet subtropical zone was the winter destination for the people of the dry and humid subtropical zones and their livestock, the alpine zone still is the summer destination for the semi-nomadic people of the cool and warm temperate zones and their herds. Table 14.1 gives the six agro-ecological zones and their climatic characteristics, the altitudes at which they occur and their approximate locations.

**Table 14.1: Agro-ecological Zones of the Eastern Himalayas of Bhutan, Tawang and Kameng (Adapted from Tobgay, 2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Altitude (masl)</th>
<th>Rainfall (mm/year)</th>
<th>Mean yearly temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>3,600-4,600</td>
<td>&lt;650</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Extreme north of Trongsa, Bumthang, Lhüntsi, Trashi Yangtsi and Tawang, extreme east of Trashigang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool temperate</td>
<td>2,500-3,600</td>
<td>650-850</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Most of Trashigang and Trongsa, most of Tawang, Bumthang, Lhüntsi and Trashi Yangtsi below the alpine zone, Upper and Middle Kheng, Monggar north of Korila, northern Samdrup Jongkhar, Dirang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm temperate</td>
<td>1,800-2,500</td>
<td>650-850</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Khaling, Kanglung, Samkhar, Shongphu, Radi geoks in Trashigang, Brakteng geok in Trongsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry subtropical</td>
<td>1,200-1,800</td>
<td>850-1,200</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Along the Mangde river till Trongsa town, along the Chamkhar river in Upper Kheng, along the Kuri river and its tributaries till Menbi geok, at the confluence of Gamri and Gongri and Kholongtsi and Nyamnyangri rivers, along the Siyom and Nargumri river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humid subtropical</td>
<td>600-1,200</td>
<td>1,200-2,500</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Pemagatshel, southern Monggar, along the Gongri river valley till Trashigang, Lower and Middle Kheng, central Samdrup Jongkhar, Kalaktang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet subtropical</td>
<td>150-600</td>
<td>2,500-5,500</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>Nganglam, Dewathang, Khar in Pemagatshel, southern part of Samdrup Jongkhar, Balemu and Bhalukpong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.1.1. FOREST TYPES.

The variety and availability of forest products that contribute to human livelihoods largely depends on the type of forest that occurs in a certain location. The ecological zones in Table 14.1, in combination with factors such as aspect and gradient of the slope and soil type, are the main determinants of forest type.

Forests consist of subtropical forest between 160 and 1,000m dominated by *Tetrameles nudiflora*, *Pterospermum acerifolium*, *Phoebe hainesiana* and *Duabanga sonneratioides*. Between 1,000 and 2,000m we can find warm broadleaf forest, dominated by /tshaishing/ *Castanopsis tribuloides*, /zalashing/ *Schima walichii* and /shakorshing/ *Lithocarpus elegans*. Evergreen oak forest can be found from 1,800 to 2,600m and is characterised by dense undergrowth of shrubs, ferns, climbers, bamboos and epiphytes. In this forest, /phangkhoimashing/ *Quercus lamellosa* and /betsinangshing/ *Q. lanata* dominate alongside /serralingshing/ *Acer camphellii* and /tshaishing/ *Castanopsis hystrix*. Cool moist broadleaf forest occurs between 2,000 and 2,900m and consists of mixed deciduous and evergreen species, such as /betsinangshing/ *Q. semecarpifolia*, /bainangshing/ *Quercus griffithii*, /zhudang meto/ *Rhododendron* spp., *Castanopsis* spp., *Schima walichii*, /awashing/ *Daphniphyllum chartaceum*, /domshing, zimshing, pangtsishing/ *Symplocus* spp., /akulemshing/ *Exbucklandia populnea*, *Acer* spp., /golishing/ *Persea* spp., /gamoshing/ *Alnus nepalensis* and their associates. All kinds of broadleaf forest together constitute 34.3% of Bhutan’s land area (National Statistics Bureau 2010). The dry river valleys from 900 till 1,800m consist of /roinangshing/ chir pine *Pinus roxburghii* with undergrowth of shrubs and associates, constituting 2.5% of Bhutan’s land area (National Statistics Bureau 2010).

In the cool temperate zone above 2,600m we find mostly coniferous forests. Forest types include the blue pine forest at 1,800 to 3,000m with /cangshing/ *Pinus wallichiana*, *Quercus* spp. and *Rhododendron* spp., the mixed conifer forest between 2,000 to 2,700m, dominated by /bashing/ spruce *Picea spinulosa*, hemlock *Tsuga dumosa* and /zashing/ larch *Larix griffithiana* and the fir forest from 2,700 to 3,800m consisting of /wangshing/ fir *Abies densa* sometimes mixed with hemlock and /charshing/ birch *Betula alnoides*. 

Blue pine forest constitutes 3.2% of Bhutan’s land area, mixed conifer forest 12.1% and fir forest 8.6% (National Statistics Bureau 2010). Various alpine scrub species, including /shukposhing/ juniper Juniperus recurva and Rhododendron spp. are found in the alpine zone above the treeline.

Based on the climatic and vegetation descriptions in (2011:61) we can conclude that the agro-ecological zones and vegetation types in Pemakö resemble those of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon. The list of Tibetan names of trees found in (2011:61) shows that many of the above-mentioned tree species also occur in Pemakö, where like in Bhutan all forest types from coniferous forest dominating at higher altitudes to and subtropical forest at the lower altitudes occur.

14.1.2. VEGETABLE FOREST PRODUCTS.

This wide variety of forest types contains a high amount of species diversity, lending Bhutan and Arunachal Pradesh a place in the Indo-Burman hotspot for biodiversity conservation (Myers et al. 2000). This biodiversity provided the entire livelihood for small itinerant populations and greatly contributed to the livelihood of settled agricultural societies. Chakravarty (1953:96), for example, reports the collection of potatoes, roots, leaves and fruits from the forests of Dirang. For Dirang and Tawang, Dam and Hajara (1981) focus on the use of plants and trees for food, dye, utensils and household items. Chatterjee et al. (2003) describe a case study of natural resource use among the Tshangla of Thembang village in Dirang, including the collection of fuel wood, bamboo, timber, tapping of chir pine resin and grazing of livestock (cattle and goats) in forest and fallow and transhumance grazing of yak and sheep. In (2011:61-64) we can find a list of fruits, medicinal plants, mushrooms, vegetables, oil crops, tea leaves, found in the forests of Pemakö. Curiously, because many of these species do not occur elsewhere on the Tibetan plateau and therefore of not have Tibetan names, their names are given in Tshangla. Examples include /drimom/ ‘Elastomema spp.’ and /mencha patong/ ‘mithun’s forehead’, /abidor/ ‘grandma’s goitre’ and /pingsi/.
In Bhutan, forests are used for grazing cattle and collecting fodder and leaf litter. Fodder collected in the forest and fed to the livestock provides manure, a quintessential nutrient input to the agricultural production system. A special category of forest exists in Bhutan called /sokshing/, owned by the government but giving individual households the right to collect branches for firewood and pine needles and oak leaves for leaf litter. This leaf litter is used as animal bedding and mixed with dung for manure and mulch. The forests also provide timber and shingles for construction and firewood for heating and cooking. Bamboo and cane are made into household utensils and sold for cash income. Vines are twisted into ropes. Forest plants provide dyes for yarn, gum and resin for making incense and torches, seeds are used for extracting oil for various purposes, dried plants are used as yeast, and many species are assigned medicinal value. Mushrooms, tubers and roots, flowers, shoots, stems, leaves, fruits and nuts are eaten and some leaves are used for making tea.

A preliminary survey initiated through the Regional Forestry Planning Office and conducted by divisional and dzongkhak forest staff in Trashigang dzongkhak of Bhutan alone documented at least 125 species of medicinal plants, 12 species of bamboo, 60 species of edible plants, 60 species of edible mushrooms, 40 species of leaves used for extracting tea, 120 species of fodder trees and grasses, 90 species of edible fruits and nuts, 45 species of yeast plants, 25 species of climber, two species of cane, 15 seed-producing species for oil extraction, 20 dye plant species, 30 species of incense plants, 15 species of edible tubers and roots, and 10 species used for gum and resin. The survey included local names, scientific names whenever known, occurrence, and the particular uses.

Unfortunately, the Trashigang survey was never published and a geographically extended follow-up survey was never conducted. This is particularly unfortunate considering the rapid loss of indigenous knowledge on forest resource use. The population in the rural areas that partially depend on the forests is decreasing due to rural-urban migration. Many of the species have been rendered in disuse because of artificially produced and imported substitutes. Examples include the tea leaf species, dye plant species and gum and resin species, all hardly collected today. Increased food security from agriculture and increased dependence on food imports has decreased dependence on

the forest foods. With the reduction in their usage and their ways of processing, the knowledge of these species and with them the vocabulary is quickly disappearing. Perhaps the only exceptions to this downward trend are a few marketable species and edible plant species which are in a high demand, particularly from the urban elite. These include shiitake mushroom /tsatse bamung ~ pengpa urong/ *Lentinula edodes* sold locally and exported to Japan, lemon grass /solobang ~ sorbang ~ bangtsi/ *Cymbopogon flexuosus* from which oil is extracted which is traded to India, Himalayan goose berries /chorgense/, Kheng /kut/ *Phyllanthus emblica*, sold in India, /roinang roju/ the resin of the chir pine, which is distilled to turpentine and rosin sold in India, wild Sichuan pepper /khaigi/ *Zanthoxylum armatum* and /songgi/ *Z. bungeanum*, the bark of /shokushing/ ‘paper tree’ *Daphne bholua* and Edgeworthia gardneri used for traditional paper-making and /ringshu/ cane *Neomicrocalamus andropogonifolius* used for the weaving of baskets. Edible plants sold in local markets include, for example, fiddlehead fern /dawai/, Kheng /kwar/, Dakpa /kukuling/ *Diplazium polypodiodes* and *D. esculenthus*, leaves of /drimom/ *Elatostema lineolatum*, roots of lizard tail /mombaring/ *Houttuynia cordata*, edible river algae /lugai/ *Cladophora* spp. and *Spirogyra* spp., inner stem and flower bud of banana tree /laisishing/ *Musa* spp., leaves and stems of water cress /zhingtsi/ *Nasturtium officinale* and dried epiphyte /nyaishingjorma/ *Viscum articulatum* used for making tea. Some of the mushroom species /bamung/, Kheng /mu/, sold fresh and dried are Jew’s ear /nagur bamung/ *Auricularia auricular*, chantarelle mushroom /gogayan bamung/ *Cantharellus cibarius* and blue chantarelle /threpchang bamung/ *Polyozellus multiplex* and milk mushroom /nu bamung/ *Lactarius volemus*. Shoots eaten are, for example, wild asparagus /ngalanyom/ *Asparagus filicinus*, Himalayan rattan palm /phashi/ *Plectocomia himalayana*, cane /menji/ *Calamus acanthospathus* and bamboo /so nyom/ *Bambusa clavata*. Flowers eaten include /khaseri ~ khatsaring/, Kheng /khakshali/ *Justicia adhatoda* and ground orchid /pingpi yurung ~ olacoto/ *Cymbidium hookerianum*. Finally, wild tubers collected and eaten include yam /borang joktang/ *Dioscorea hamiltonii*, /phangtang/ *D. pentaphylla*, /gong joktang/ *D. alata*, /khalaktang, gong/ various *D. spp.* and taro /bozong/ *Colocasia esculenta* and *C. fallax*.

Finally, a very conspicuous forest food product is the palm tree. The sago palm *Metroxylon sagu* occurs from Southeast Asia till the Pacific Islands and its starch product
tapioca is a staple food for many indigenous people, especially in New Guinea. The starch is collected from the pith of the stem once the tree is approaching flowering at an age of 10-15 years (Johnson 1992). Starch from various other hapaxanthic (terminally flowering) species of palm is collected across the Himalayan region, mainly as famine food (Henderson, 2009). *Phoenix acaulis* is found from 200 to 1,500 meters altitude in open forest, scrubland and chir pine forests and is sometimes grown in semi-wild state. *Arenga pinnata* or the sugar palm is sometimes cultivated in semi-wild state and harvested for the edible pulp and used for the production of sugar. Starch is also extracted from the stem of *Wallichia disticha* and *Caryota urens* or the fishtail palm. A final minor starch species widely occurring from Sikkim till Arunachal Pradesh on cliffs in wet and humid subtropical forest at an altitude between 300 and 1,200 meters is *Phoenix rupicola*. It has been well documented that palm trees are the main food source for the Puroik people of East Kameng in Arunachal Pradesh. Their dependence on this tree has been sometimes taken to be an indication of their Austronesian, rather than Tibeto-Burman ancestry. However, palm starch was an important famine food among all the people of the Monyul area. In Sarkar (1975:18) we can for example read how some Aka men offered flour of the pith of *nik*, a species of palm, to Guru Rinpoche. Because he offered some of it to the local deities, a culm of palm trees can still be found in the pilgrimage site called Jambring. But because of the laborious extraction method, other sources of starch, including the various tubers of *Dioscorea* and *Colocasia* spp., are generally preferred over palms. Palm starch can, however, be collected year-round as long as there are trees approaching flowering, whereas tubers are seasonal. When more sedentary agriculture develops with cultivation of other carbohydrate and starch-rich crops such as rice, maize and potatoes, palm starch collection is usually one of the first forest products whose collection is abandoned. In fact, in many areas, the local names of the various palm species have already been rendered to oblivion. The marginalised situation in which the Puroik people have till date been living is therefore probably the reason for their continued dependence on starch from the palm tree. It can be observed that as Puroik communities are resettled and rehabilitated, taking up agriculture, the palm starch collection practice is also disappearing.

14.1.3. **THE HUNTING PRACTICE.**

In the past, wild animals were mainly hunted for meat, with meat, hides, pelts, horns and feathers as by-products. In Tshangla, hunting is called /sha she/ ‘kill meat’ or /sha khon/ ‘chase meat’. The recurrence of the lexeme /sha/ ‘meat’ in the names of many animals indicates that hunting was a much more widely distributed practice among the Tshangla in the past than it is at present. Chakravarty (1953) reported a heavy dependence on hunting for subsistence needs in Dirang in the 1950s, and Zhāng (1997:33) report not only retaliatory killing of wild animals but also active hunting of macaques, wild boras, bears, gorals, musk deer and takins from Pemakō and Lekpu. Hunting was done with bows /li/ and arrows /mi/ and taught from a young age. The larger mammal species were hunted with pointed metal arrows /permin/, Dirang Tshangla /dimin/ dipped in /duk/, Dirang Tshangla, /ning/ ‘poison’, usually of /tsenduk/ *Aconitum patulum, A. ferum* or made from the root of a creeper called /rushurang/ in Dirang Tshangla. After hitting the target animal, the blood trail of the dying animal would be followed. A specific kind of bamboo, causing rapidly spreading infection after entering the body, was also used to make trigger-and-release arrow traps called /gak/. These traps with a string strung over a trail frequented by animals would release the bamboo arrow when triggered. Sometimes wild mammals would be chased by hunting dogs and then killed with arrows, stones or machetes.

Wild pig *Sus scrofa* /borang phakpa/, Kheng /suriphak/ both ‘forest pig’, Dakpa /’pengphak/ ‘meadow pig’, Dirang Tshangla /risha/ ‘wild meat’ were hunted for meat. Himalayan musk deer *Moschus spp.* /lawa/, Dakpa /’lawa/, sambar deer *Cervus unicolor* /shawa/, Dakpa /’shou/ and barking deer *Muntiacus muntjak* /gasha/, Dakpa /’kasha/ were hunted for meat, hides and horns. Asian black bear *Ursus thibetanus* /omsha/, Dakpa /’wam/ [’wa:m] was hunted for meat and hides. Bear meat and particularly the paw was extremely valued, but it was also thought to cause a long-term negative health effect called /dram/, showing itself in swelling of the body which could only be cured by eating more bear meat. Sometimes, bears were caught by making a deep pit with poisoned and sharpened bamboo sticks on the bottom. Particular reverence for bears such as found further east among the Digaru and Idu Mishmi (Aiyadurai, 2007) has not been reported.
Wild goats *Naemorhaedus goral* /basha/, Dakpa /khing/ and *Capricornis thar* /shangsha/, Dakpa /kya/ ['kja] were hunted for meat and the hides worn by the Brokpa and Dakpa (see Chapter 5.4.1). The gregarious goral would sometimes be killed by herding them over a steep cliff after setting a dry forest area on fire. For the Dakpa of Tawang and Lekpu and the people living further east, the hide of the takin *Budorcas taxicolor* was also extremely valued and takin have been reported to be hunted by the Tshangla and Mishmi people of Pemako for meat and hides (Zhāng 1997:33). Takin do not occur in eastern Bhutan. People generally refrained from hunting tiger *Panthera tigris* /khaila/, leopard *Panthera pardus* /khaila barma/ and larger jungle cats such as the Asian golden cat *Catopuma temminckii* and the clouded leopard *Neofelis nebulosa*. Their strength and dominance at the top of the food chain was well recognised. This is similar to the taboo on hunting big cats that exists among the Nyishi and Mishmi of Arunachal (Aiyadurai, 2007:30). Unfortunately, Chinese and Tibetan medicine created a high demand for scales of pangolins *Manis spp.* /meyang kangyang/, musk deer glands /lartsi/, bear bile /thris ~ khris/ and tiger and leopard skin and bones.

Smaller mammals were usually caught with snares /shong/. Various species of civet, generically called /phoskong/, Dakpa /harpu/, such as the masked palm civet *Paguma larvata* and the Asian palm civet *Paradoxurus hermaphroditus* often destroying fruit crops, the spotted linsang *Prionodon pardicolor*, the large and small Indian civet *Viverra zibetha* and *Viverricula indica* known to rampage through hen houses, the Eurasian otter *Lutra lutra*, smooth-coated otter *Lutrogale perspicillata* and Oriental small-clawed otter *Aonyx cinereus*, all called /sam ~ samtoka/ and the smaller jungle cats all generically referred to as /borang danyi/ such as *Felis chaus*, leopard cat *Prionailurus bengalensis*, fishing cat *Prionailurus viverrinus*, and marbled cat *Pardofelis marmorata* were occasionally killed for their pelts. The yellow-throated marten *Martes flavigula* /gawokma/, Dakpa /shamtori/, was never purposely killed because it always appears in couples, and it is believed that killing one of the pair would cause the remaining marten to take revenge on humans. A similar taboo has been reported from among the Miju Mishmi (Aiyadurai, 2007: 30). The various species of flying squirrels *Belomys pearsonii*, *Hylopetes alboniger* and *Petaurista spp.* are called /shokha/, Dakpa /sowa/. Because they are said to be attracted by pine resin and bamboo stick torches at night, unexpectedly
flying down from trees, and because of their eerie bark and crab sounds, they were considered bad omens, and were often killed with catapults, in snares, or by pelting stones. Porcupines *Hystrix spp.* /zumbi/, Dakpa /zhusmang/ were hunted for meat and quills. A proofed method to catch porcupines would be by closing all burrow entries but two, lighting moss at one entrance and killing the animal driven out by the smoke by pelting rocks or pumpkins.

Birds were usually caught with poisoned arrows, bamboo snares /khashong/ and traps, catapults or by pelting stones. Jungle fowl /borang gowa/ and several pheasant /repkha/ and other bird species including the majestic hornbill /wagerlapa/ were hunted for meat and plumes. Feathers of certain snow cock and pheasant species were valued for making arrows, but a ceremonial value such as ascribed to hornbill beaks and feathers for hats, such as among the Nishi, Adi, Wancho and Tangsa has not been reported. Various species of freshwater fish were caught with /ngashong/ ‘fishing snare’ or /cong/ ‘fishing net’. Honey /zhing ~ ying/ was collected from hives in the forest. The larvae, pupae /topi/ and adult giant Asian hornets *Vespa mandarinia* /zhugai ~ yugai/ were prized because they were thought to eat everything, including insects and honey, fruits and vegetables, wood, meat, mineral soils and flowers and feed this to the larvae, thus forming a medicinal food item. The dried hornets were fried and eaten as snack or soaked in strong liquor. Snakes were killed out of fear and their skin was used for decoration of the handles of ceremonial swords and knives.

After the introduction of animal husbandry and agriculture, the need for hunting decreased. Moreover, killing another sentient being is not in correspondence with the Buddhist teaching introduced in the area from the 8th century CE onwards. The sinner character /dikchen nyewabum/ in the /raksha marcham/ ‘Dance of the Judgement of the Dead’, a masked dance commonly performed during all Tshechu festivals in Bhutan, is always depicted as a hunter, often donned in an animal hide and carrying a basket with a severed animal head, a bow and a quiver. A list of wild birds, gcan gzan carnivores, ri dwags herbivores, aquatic animals and reptiles and insects occurring in Pemakö is given in Tibetan in (2011: 63). In Pemakö, the Tshangla still commonly hunt, perhaps due

---

1 Ref. plate XX on p. xx.
to the long association with local Adi and Mishmi. The meat of a killed animal is also reported to be divided among the villagers, but the head and skin are being kept by the person who placed the first direct hit (Cai, 1981). From Dirang and Tawang Solanki and Chutiya (2004) report that despite the restrictions posed by Buddhism on hunting and killing, plain need means various animals are being hunted. Aiyadurai (2007:17, 31) also found that although no reference to an existing hunting practice is revealed in Tawang the presence of wild animal products in households indicates that it was or still is practiced here as well. Even in Bhutan, an evening with copious amounts of alcohol might elude hunting tales and practices dating just a few decennia back. Nowhere, though, will people openly admit participating or having participated in hunting because of the social stigma attached to it. The demise of the hunting practice is a rather recent change, still within the memory of the older generation. Curiously, nowadays the best repositories of animal parts are the gônkhangs, where stuffed animals, snake skins, animal pelts and hides, deer antlers, elephant tusks and rhinoceros horns are kept as offerings to the guardian deities.

Stringent nature conservation laws in force in Bhutan have reduced hunting even further. The practical absence of guns in the hands of the general public in Bhutan is another reason why hunting here is far less common than in neighbouring areas of India. Still, there is an on-going debate on crop and livestock depredation in Bhutan. Some people are of the opinion that the prohibition on killing all wild animals is adversely affecting farmer’s livelihoods. The ban on shifting cultivation has furthermore shifted the forest boundaries much closer to the permanent agricultural land and villages, thereby increasing the human-wildlife contact and conflict. Animal depredation on crops and livestock is the single most important constraint to agriculture in Bhutan, Dirang (Chakravarty: 24) and Pemakô (Zhâng, 1997: 27, ὦ 2011: 65). Wild boar, deer, barking deer, porcupine, squirrels Tamiops macclellandi /tepi/, Dakpa /khyenko/ [kʰjenko], Dremomys lokriah and Callosciurus spp. /kotsoktang/, Dakpa /boliteng/, rats Rattus spp. /phicakpa/, Dakpa /zhu/, Assamese macaque Macaca mulatta /zala/, Dakpa /pra/ and occasionally langurs Semnopithecus entellus and Trachypithecus pileatus /roksha/, Dakpa /roksha/ and several bird species are killed as prevention and retribution of crop predation. Especially close to the harvest time, temporary sheds on stilts are put up and the crops are guarded against macaques and birds during the day and against wild boar and porcupines during the night.

The various species of civets, wild cats and wild dogs or dhole *Cuon alpinus* /pharwa/, Dakpa /phar/, Kheng /sawaring/ are killed in retribution of livestock depredation. The mass poisoning of wild dogs by the Forest Department in Bhutan during the mid-1970s aimed at reducing cattle depredation resulted in a steady increase of their main prey, the wild boar. Subsequent crop damage by wild boars then became a main issue, but both wild dog and wild boar numbers and the damage they cause has significantly increased over the past 10 years. Snakes are still regularly killed out of fear by beating with sticks or pelting by stones, and sometimes children and youngsters use catapults to kill birds and lizards for fun.


The main cultivation systems on the slopes of the Southern Himalayas are irrigated wetland, terraced and unterraced rain-fed dryland, rain-fed shifting cultivation land and mixed cultivated land. According to the National Statistics Bureau (2010), these constituted 13%, 32.5%, 28.6% and 27.3% of the total area under cultivation in Bhutan respectively. Zhāng (1997:25) reports that in the Tibetan part of Pemakō, shifting cultivation accounts for 70% of the agricultural land, and rain-fed dryland with a few irrigated fields for 30%. Ĝi (2011: 65) also mentions about the agriculture in Pemakō that beside permanently cultivated land there is a kind of land reclamation by cutting and clearing the forest year-by-year.

14.2.1. Shifting Cultivation.

Shifting cultivation has been the dominant agricultural system ever since the forest-dwelling people settled in a fixed place, and continues to be the preferred cropping system in Northeast India and Pemakō (Zhāng, 1997: 27). According to Chakravarty (1963: 14), /ya ung/ ‘shifting cultivation’ was the main cultivation system in Dirang. Shifting cultivation is called /tsēr/ in Dzongkha, /’pang’leng/ in Bumthang and /ya’leng/ in Kheng, but land is usually described in terms of the clearing that is necessary for
cultivation, such as Tshangla /chema zam/ ‘clear an overgrown patch of forest’. A clear distinction is made between /borang/ ‘thick forest’, and /chema/ ‘overgrown shifting cultivation land’. Roder et al. (1992) still attributed a high degree of importance to shifting cultivation in Bhutan. A shifting cultivation landscape is a mosaic of patches of land with either crops or secondary growth forest in various successional stages. This variation contributes to a high biodiversity.

In Bhutan, two shifting cultivation systems exist: grass fallow shifting cultivation of buckwheat and wheat in the temperate zone, mainly in central Bhutan, and bush fallow shifting cultivation with maize, dryland rice /pangbara/ and millets in the subtropical zone, mainly in eastern Bhutan. Shifting cultivation probably started with buckwheat and millet respectively, with wheat, maize and rice introduced only later. Preparation of bush fallow shifting cultivation land would start during the dry winter, around November for newly claimed land and around February for previously cleared land. The first work would be removing the usable trees and slashing and burning the remaining vegetation. Burning the vegetation would both return the plant nutrients to the soil, release bound soil phosphate and destroy the subterranean seeds and roots of plants that might compete with the crops. Tree stumps and rocks were usually not removed. In the past, the soil would be only minimally tilled using a wooden fork called /brakshing/ in Dirang Tshangla. In Bhutan, Dirang (Chakravarty, 1953:40) as well as in Pemakö (Zhāng, 1997:27) the iron /koda/ ‘hoe’ was only introduced around half a century ago. The various seeds would then be broadcast sown or planted by digging shallow holes with a pointed stick. Weeding would be necessary only once.

After one to three years of cultivation, the shifting cultivation land would be kept fallow for two to eight years and quickly overgrow with perennial plants and weeds. In this fallow period the land would be used for firewood, fodder and non-timber forest product collection and livestock grazing. This prevented soil erosion since the land was covered with vegetation at all times and no tillage would be done. The slope gradient, the presence of stones and low labour availability were the main detriments to permanent cultivation, and the bush fallow shifting cultivation system has been said to be the most productive and least destructive land use system on the steep slopes (Roder et al., 1992).
In the grass fallow shifting cultivation system, the top soil would be cut and dried, dry pine needles and manure would be added, mounds would be made that would be burnt, the ash would be spread, and the soil would be hoed or ploughed. After two to three years of cultivation the land would revert to grassland used for livestock grazing with fallow periods between 6 and 20 years. Grass fallow shifting cultivation is highly labour intensive compared to the productivity and described as the only agricultural option in the temperate zone without external phosphate and nitrogen inputs (Roder et al., 1992).

In the past, shifting cultivation systems were well adapted to the prevailing conditions and were self-sustaining. Because of general improvements in the living standards of the people the population in many areas has considerably increased. Higher food demand resulted in expansion of the shifting cultivation area and in shorter fallow periods, which in turn resulted in environmental degradation such as soil nutrient exhaustion, soil erosion and water scarcity. At the same time, the availability of phosphate fertilisers reduced dependency on shifting cultivation and favoured more permanent agriculture. Not only has this trend been reported from Bhutan (Roder et al., 1992), but also from Pemakö (Zhāng 1997:26).

Shifting cultivation in Bhutan was gradually discouraged and has been eventually banned since the 1990s. Shifting cultivation land could be either converted to permanently cultivated dryland, or revert to government reserve forest. Many of the grass fallow shifting cultivation lands were converted to silvopastoral systems with private forestry and improved livestock breeds. Although it has not been completely abandoned, the area under shifting cultivation has decreased and everywhere former shifting cultivation fields are permanently reverting to forest. The associated problems, however, include the above-mentioned increase in wildlife depredation on crops on permanent agricultural land and a reduction in the availability of certain forest foods growing in secondary forest. A drastic reduction in food grain availability for rural populations has been prevented through food imports, rural-urban migration and an increase in productivity through non-labour agricultural inputs such as mechanisation, improved seed varieties, chemical fertilisers and pesticides.
14.2.2. THE TRANSITION TO DRYLAND AND WETLAND AGRICULTURE.

From comparative societies in Arunachal Pradesh it can be observed that villages largely depending on shifting cultivation rear mainly pigs, chickens and mithun. These animals provide little or no manure that can be used as nutrient input to the agricultural system. As rural communities evolved and became more sedentary, some of the shifting cultivation lands got a more permanent nature. This development was only possible after livestock started to include cattle. In the agricultural slack season, cattle were kept at the ground floor of the house or in a separate shed and grazed in the abandoned fields and the forest during the daytime or fed with fodder obtained in the forest. Animal bedding usually consisting of leaf litter /soiba/ [soiba ~ søba] or dried grain stalks mixed with dung was collected and at the end of the dry season used as nutrient input to the dryland field.

Dryland is usually called /kamzhing/ in Dzongkha, /ung/ in Tshangla and /'leng/ in most of the East Bodish languages. Wherever the geography allows, dryland is ploughed by manpower or by oxen using a wooden plough. The origin of the plough made of Cyclobalanopsis (Quercus) spp. with a hardwood ploughshare in Pemakö is attributed to Bhutan (Zhāng 1997:26). (2011: 65) reports from Pemakö that whereas at the higher altitudes ploughing oxen are used, at lower altitudes ploughing is mostly done manually. In Bhutan, as elsewhere, the number of oxen, and the number of people required to guide them, differs from village to village and from field to field. On steep slopes, the land is tilled by hand. The main crop grown on dryland in the temperate zone was probably barley, which was later replaced by wheat and buckwheat. The main crops cultivated on dryland in the subtropical zone were various kinds of millet and buckwheat. Later, the millet species were rapidly replaced by maize, especially in the south-central and eastern regions.

It is not known when irrigated wetland paddy cultivation was introduced to Bhutan and Kameng. Considering the limited area under wetland cultivation and the young age of the existing fields, wetland cultivation does not have a long history in the area. This, however, could also be the result of low population densities with associated lack of labour for the construction of terraces, and frequent abandonment of areas under cultivation because of migration and a lack of irrigation water. The cultivation practice

was probably introduced through contacts with the people of the Brahmaputran plains, although plain paddy cultivation and irrigated upland paddy cultivation differ greatly due to the construction of terraces. Irrigated wetland paddy fields are called /aring/ in all the languages of the area. They are usually located on alluvial plains of streams that drain in the main rivers, on the riverbanks in broader valleys, and on the lower portion of the hills above them. Various varieties of rice are grown in wetland, and ploughing is usually done with oxen.

The main criterion for wetland is the availability of a source of irrigation water. Construction and maintenance of irrigation canals has therefore been a priority of local communities and the government alike. Despite this, in all agro-ecological zones water sources have been drying up in the past decennium, perhaps as a result of changes in local climates, and increasingly wetlands are abandoned or converted in land for construction purposes or dryland. This conversion of wetland to other land use purposes and the decrease in the area under wetland cultivation is a worrying development, as it decreases local rice production and increases dependence on imported food grains. Recent attempts to entice people from the inner valleys of Bhutan to take up wetland cultivation in resettlement areas of the wet sub-tropical zone have remained largely unsuccessful. Wetland and dryland cultivation requires considerably higher labour inputs compared to shifting cultivation. In absence of a large productive working force in rural areas, in the past due to low population density in general, at present due to rural-urban migration, traditional systems of reciprocal labour exchange will continue to be essential for timely preparation and cultivation of fields and maintenance of irrigation canals.

14.2.3. AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONES AND AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS.

Table 14.2 presents examples of the diverse agriculture and livestock production systems in the agro-ecological zones of Table 14.1. The information is mainly from Bhutan, but can be easily extended to Tawang, Kameng and Pemakō. Table 14.2 presents mere examples though, and the exact cropping systems differ from location to location and from year to year.
### Table 14.2. Selected Agricultural Systems in the Various Agro-Ecological Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agro-ecological zone</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Dryland</th>
<th>Shifting cultivation</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alpine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>barley and bitter buckwheat March to August</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yak, sheep, horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cool temperate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wheat, barley Sept. to March or potato Feb. to June - sweet buckwheat July to Nov.</td>
<td>bitter buckwheat from March to July – mustard seed – fallow</td>
<td>yak, sheep, cattle, horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm temperate</td>
<td>rice March-Oct</td>
<td>wheat, barley Sept. to March or potato Feb. to June - buckwheat July to Nov.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cattle, mithun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humid subtropical</td>
<td>rice March to July – sweet buckwheat or broomcorn millet Oct. to Feb.</td>
<td>maize Feb. to June – buckwheat Aug. to Dec. or wheat Sept. to March</td>
<td>maize Feb. to June – second maize or finger millet crop July to Nov. or buckwheat Aug. to Dec. or broomcorn millet Oct. to Feb.</td>
<td>cattle, pigs, poultry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wet subtropical</th>
<th>Rice double cropped</th>
<th>July to Nov. or buckwheat Sept. to Dec.</th>
<th>Cattle, pigs, poultry, goats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14.3. Major Grain Crops

It seems unlikely that the actual shift from the traditional forest-dwelling hunter-gather societies to agricultural societies, including the domestication of wild plant and animal species, took place on the southern Himalayan slopes itself. The centres of origin of the cultivated crops lie all outside the region. It is therefore more plausible that these crops were either introduced at various moments in history by people originating from elsewhere, or introduced via other neighbouring peoples. This does not rule out the idea that an indigenous, forest-dwelling population existed in the area. In fact, the Puroik have been leading a primitive forest-dependant existence, with agriculture introduced only in recent times.

There are various grain crops that appear to have played crucial roles in the establishment of different agricultural systems. It is well conceivable that these crops were introduced by the linguistic and genetic forebears of the Tshangla and East Bodish speakers from their original homelands. Other crops were introduced from elsewhere in contact between different populations. In traditional Tibetan and Buddhist terminology, grains crops were called the "five varieties of grains" /dru'na nga/ ‘five varieties of grains’ and included /ne/ ‘barley’, /dro/ ‘rice’, /dro/ ‘wheat’, /sän/ ‘pulses/peas’ and /sowa/, an unidentified grain crop, perhaps a kind of barley. In the Bhutanese context, the diversity of the grain crops was extended to the "nine varieties of grains" /dru’na gu/ ‘nine varieties of grains’

2 Ref. paragraph 12.4.5.
including at least rice, maize, barley, wheat, sweet buckwheat and Tartary buckwheat, and for the remaining three any of the pulses, beans, and millets that were usually cultivated in the particular locality. From Pemakö (2011: 65) reports the cultivation of wheat, barley, millet, two kinds of buckwheat i.e. common and Tartary buckwheat, the unidentified grains, mustard seed, seven kinds of pulses, maize, and an unidentified kind of millet, and at the lower altitudes principally various kinds of rice besides maize and millet. Which kind of millet is exactly cultivated remains unclear, but photographic material from (source) shows at least finger millet is grown.

14.3.1. Foxtail and Broomcorn Millet.

Two species of millet still being cultivated in the region are thought to have originated in the plains of Northern China. These are foxtail millet *Setaria indica* and common, proso or broomcorn millet *Panicum miliaceum*. Carbon-dating of grains found at the Cishan site in China indicated that broomcorn millet was domesticated 10,300 to 8,700 years cal. BP, whereas foxtail millet was shown to be domesticated after 8,700 years cal. BP (Lu et al. 2009). In China, these millet species appear to have been a major food crop of the Northern Tibeto-Burmans, speaking common Sino-Bodic (Van Driem, 2001a). From this centre of origin, ancient migration streams brought the crop to the southern flanks of the Himalayas, perhaps around 3000 BC (Van Driem, 2001a).

If all millets are taken into consideration, Samtse, Sarpang and Chukha are the highest national producers, and Pemagatshel, Trashiyangtshi and Samdrup Jongkhar are the highest producers in the east. The yield per hectare is highest in Trashigang, followed by Wangdū and Trashiyangtshi (National Statistics Bureau 2010). Finger millet is mainly cultivated in the southern dzongkhaks, reflecting the preference of people of Nepali origin for this millet species. Foxtail and broomcorn millet were till recently considered the traditional crops of the Dungsam area, corresponding to where arguably the most archaic Tshangla dialects are spoken.

Broomcorn millet is grown in Bhutan from 1100-2100m in the dry subtropical and warm temperate zone, and is called /thre/ in Tibetan, /chera/ in Tshangla,

/khyong/ in Dakpa, /chaam/ in Kheng, /khre/ in Dzala, /thre/ in Chocangaca and /chaam/ or ʻī /che/ in Dzongkha. In Dzala, /khre/ nowadays refers to finger millet. The cognate forms in Hindi and Bengali are /chena/ and /china/ respectively. It is considered to be highly drought resistant and is therefore a preferred crop for the dry winter season, usually sown in October. After harvest around February, it would be removed from the stalks, usually with the feet, dried, then pounded in the mortar and eaten boiled like rice.

Foxtail millet cultivation can be found in the humid and dry sub-tropical zone from 600-2,000m. It is called /yangra/ in Tshangla, /yôn/ in Dakpa and Chocangaca, /lamdai ~ 'yon ~ ran/ in Kheng, /yangre/ in Dzongkha and /ran/ in Kurtöp and Bumthap.

The historical importance of foxtail millet can be ascertained from the fact that it features prominently in some place names. We saw a 17th century reference to a place name Yangrelung ‘foxtail millet valley’ in present-day Lhüntsi³, and in Caksakhar under Monggar we can find the hamlet of ‘field of heaped foxtail millet’. A Chocangaca expression for people living lavishly is /pra‘i migi ‘theon gangte/ ‘the macaque’s eyes are filled with foxtail millet’. Foxtail millet is traditionally consumed as porridge or mixed with rice or maize and fermented into alcoholic beverages. It is sown as a spring crop in January and harvested in May, often intercropped with maize on dryland and shifting cultivation land.

The local names of broomcorn and foxtail millet are given in Tables 14.3 and 14.4. There are considerably similarities between these names.

### Table 14.3. Foxtail Millet in Bhutanese Vernaculars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Dzongkha</th>
<th>g.yang</th>
<th>- red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dzongkha</td>
<td>'jan</td>
<td>- re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshangla</td>
<td>jan</td>
<td>- ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocangaca</td>
<td>'jon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakpa</td>
<td>'jon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kheng</td>
<td>'jon</td>
<td>ran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Ref. paragraph 3.2 on p. 57.
TABLE 14.4. BROOMCORN MILLET IN BHUTANESE VERNACULARS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Tibetan</th>
<th>Written Dzongkha</th>
<th>Dzongkha</th>
<th>Tshangla</th>
<th>Chocangaca</th>
<th>Dakpa</th>
<th>Kheng</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
<th>Bengali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khre</td>
<td>khye</td>
<td>eʰe:</td>
<td>eʰa:m</td>
<td>tʰre</td>
<td>kʰre</td>
<td>cʰa:m</td>
<td>che</td>
<td>chi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both pronunciation in the Central and East Bodish languages as well as the Dzongkha orthography suggest that a high register tone onset in *yang was present which has been lost in Tshangla. Closing and rounding of the vowel [a ~ a] to [o ~ ɔ] seems to have taken place in some languages. The phonetic change from the initial cluster /khr/ to /thr/, and of /khr/ to /khy/ to /ch/ is also attested. From this, there appear to be at least three common roots of the names for millet in the languages of Bhutan: *yang, *ra(n) and *khre. Whereas *khre appears to be of a Bodish origin, suggesting the introduction of broomcorn millet from by the East Bodish speakers from the Tibetan plateau, *yan(g) appears to be of a much older provenance and perhaps foxtail millet was a much earlier introduction by the forebears of the Tshangla speakers from the east. Perhaps *ra(n) is an ancient lexeme simply meaning ‘grain’, or perhaps it is an ancient name for one of the grain species. In Dirang Tshangla, /ra/ is still used for ‘paddy’, which is called /barra/ in the other Tshangla dialects, and the morpheme <ra> is an integral part of the names for rice, foxtail millet and finger millet alike.

A survey conducted in Bhutan by the National Biodiversity Centre found the highest foxtail millet diversity in Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhak with 27 landraces,
followed by Lhüntsi and Trashigang with 3 landraces and Pemagatshel, Paro, Samtse, Tsirang, Thimphu and Zhemgang with one landrace each. The survey finding these results only involved 26 geoks, and although more landraces could exist, the same variety might have been reported more than once and some varieties might not have been recognised as distinct due to inconsistency and overlap in local names (Asta M. Tamang, NBC, pers. comm.). Considering the imminent loss of most of the landraces, a systematic molecular and morphological characterisation of foxtail and other millet varieties should receive much higher priority. The area under cultivation and production is highest in Samdrup Jongkhar, Pemagatshel, Zhemgang and Sarpang dzongkhaks.

Even after the introduction of maize and rice cultivation, both broomcorn and foxtail millet remained important grain crops from the point of view of food security, because they can be sown and harvested consecutively during the lean season when maize and rice stocks would run at their lowest. Unfortunately, the cultivation of these millet species has now almost disappeared, the result of replacement by locally cultivated rice, maize and imported rice in combination with a lack of labour needed for constant guarding against birds. Broomcorn and foxtail millet have also lost out to the easier to cultivate and prepare finger millet. Only a few households in small remote communities still sow these grains in order to preserve the seeds. The village of Thongrong in Trashigang reported the end to broomcorn millet cultivation in the early 1990s, after cultivation ceased in the village of Dukti which was the source of seeds.

14.3.2. Barley.

A third species of grain that presumably played an important role in the establishment of agricultural societies, especially at higher altitudes, is barley. The centre of origin of two-rowed cultivated barley is generally thought to be the Fertile Crescent in the Near East, more specifically the Israel-Jordan area (Badr et al. 2000), where it was domesticated 10,000 years ago. From there the crop spread eastwards and further diversification of domesticated barley might have taken place on the Tibetan plateau. The Tibetan plateau is sometimes mentioned as a centre of genetic diversity for cultivated barley and perhaps even the centre of cultivation for six-rowed naked barley (Feng et al 2006a, 2006b).

In Tibetan, barley is called ཀྲི /nä/, in Dzongkha, Chocangaca, Kheng, Kurtöp, Brokpa it is called /na/ and in Dakpa it is called /nas/. Tshangla has the most divergent lexical form, /phemung/. Barley is the staple food of the Tibetan plateau. Husked barley is fried and eaten or made into flour called /tsampa/, traditionally mixed in a leather pouch with hot water or salted butter tea and eaten as /paktso/. In Bhutan, the main barley producing dzongkhaks are Monggar, Bumthang and Trashigang. Among the people of Eastern Bhutan, Tawang and Kameng, barley flour is eaten in the same way as in Tibet, and husked barley is boiled and eaten, a dish called /tsheknang/. Barley flour is an essential ingredient of religious dough effigies /torma/.

14.3.3. COMMON AND TARTARY BUCKWHEAT.

A wild species of buckwheat growing in the eastern Himalayas, *Fagopyrum dibotrys*, is collected and eaten as a vegetable. The Tshangla name, /themnang/, has given name to Themnangbi, a village below the Korila pass in Monggar, indicating it is an important species locally. Two species of buckwheat originate from south-western China, namely common buckwheat *Fagopyrum esculentum* from the north-western corner of Yunnan and Tartary buckwheat *Fagopyrum tataricum* from Sichuan (Ohnishi 1992: 5). Both species are thought to have been domesticated in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, with increased production since the 5th and 6th centuries CE (Campbell 1997:15-16).

Common buckwheat, also called sweet buckwheat, is called /guntsung/ in Tshangla or /braima/ in the Dungsam dialects, /kyaapu ~ kyaap/ ['kja:p] in Dakpa, /care ~ carai/ in Bumthang and Kheng, /jara/ in Chocangaca or Ɩí˨˦ /care ~ gera/ in Dzongkha and Ɩí˨˦ /gyara/ in Tibetan and is usually grown between 2,000 and 2,500m. Common buckwheat is thought to have diffused from Yunnan through northern Burma and northeast India and from there westwards to Bhutan and Nepal (Ohnishi 1992:12). The reference to rgya ~ kyaa ~ ja, which can refer to either India or China, seems to indicate that this species was introduced from the plains of India.

Tartary buckwheat, also called bitter buckwheat, is called /khala/ in Tshangla or /braima/ in the Dungsam dialects that do not differentiate between Tartary and common buckwheat, /brawo/ in Tibetan, Ɩí˨˩ /bj‘o/ in Dzongkha, /bre'mo/ in Dakpa and /bratma ~ branma/ in Bumthang and Kheng. It is thought to have diffused through south-eastern Tibet, crossing the Himalayan divide and taking a northerly route
along higher altitudes. The Tshangla name /khala/ is derived from /khalu/ ‘bitter’, and apparently the indigenous and archaic name is /braima/, indicating that Tartary buckwheat was introduced among the Tshangla speakers by East Bodish speakers from the North.

Buckwheat has a high nutritional value and contains high amounts of proteins and rutin. It has a much shorter growing period and is more versatile in preparation than barley. Buckwheat is sown and harvested in the temperate zone between March and July or between July and November. In the subtropical zone, two crops of Tartary buckwheat, which is more drought resistant than common buckwheat, can be obtained in a single year, one sown in January and harvested in May, and the second sown after the monsoon in September and harvested in December. This is perhaps why buckwheat became the preferred crop over barley soon after its introduction by or among the East Bodish people living in the cool temperate zone of the Eastern Himalayas.

A total of 11 landraces of Tartary buckwheat have been reported from Bhutan: four from Bumthang, three from Paro, two from Lhüntsi, Samtse and Pemagatshel, and one each from Zhemgang, Thimphu, Monggar and Haa. Common buckwheat has five landraces reported from Bumthang and one from all other dzongkhaks (A. Tamang, pers. comm.). The majority the buckwheat varieties is grown between 1,000 and 3,500m. The largest area under cultivation and the highest production of buckwheat can be found in Samdrup Jongkhar, Chukha and Trashigang. The highest yields per hectare are obtained in Trashiyangtsi, Tsirang, Ha and Samtse (National Statistics Bureau, 2010). Despite this, as a contributor to household nutrition and food security the crop is relatively more important in the temperate zones of Bumthang, Kurtö, Trashiyangtsi and Tawang. The food items derived from buckwheat are therefore particularly known from this region. Norbu (1995) earlier estimated that over 70% of the marginal households depend on buckwheat as the main food grain.

Although Tartary buckwheat is easier to cultivate, has a higher nutritional value and higher yield, common buckwheat is often preferred because of Tartary buckwheat’s bitter taste. Both species are often cultivated together and the grains are also milled and prepared together. If prepared separately, common buckwheat flour is prepared into dough that is simply boiled in water and consumed, whereas Tartary buckwheat is prepared into dough that is also fried. Buckwheat is sometimes husked and cooked as

rice, but more commonly roasted in a large flat two-handled frying pan without oil and made into flour /bokpi/ by grinding it on a grinding stone. The flour is then mixed with water and fried in butter to a pancake called /khule/ in Bumthap, a name that entered Bhutan Tshangla as a loan considering the pancakes are called /bes/ in Dirang Tshangla or /phem/ in Pemakö Tshangla. The flour is also kneaded into a thick dough in water boiled to a roll and eaten with butter and /kospa/, a paste made of chilli, salt, fermented cheese /chur zhitpa/ and wild pepper, or with curry. In Bumthang, cold water and fermented grains are added to buckwheat flour and kneaded in a leather pouch, and lumps of this dough called /choidam/ are eaten with wild spring onion /narang/, Bumthang /ma/, and radish leaves and a paste of chilli, wild pepper, fermented cheese Bumthang /doze/ and salt. Buckwheat dough balls are also kneaded into triangular shape and boiled in water to obtain /kontong/ eaten with chilli paste. A dish served during religious occasions in Chume valley in Bumthang is /phop/, hand-rolled buckwheat dough strings fried in hot oil. Buckwheat is commonly made into thick circular breads roasted on a flat frying pan or directly in the fire called /keptang/ or /teze/ in Bumthap eaten with chilli paste. If liquor and sugar are added to the dough and the bread is baked in hot ash it is called /laze/ in Bumthap and generally eaten during travels at high altitude. The bread is supposed to not only provide energy and fill the stomach, but also prevent altitude sickness /lane ~ lanat/. Buckwheat dough can also be pressed through a wood press into long noodles /puta ~ putang/ which are boiled in water and then mixed with garlic, chilli powder, mustard oil and salt. Additionally, fried egg and spring onion can be added and sometimes buttermilk is poured over the dish before serving. Tender buckwheat leaves can be eaten as a green vegetable, and fresh buckwheat stalks and straw are used as cattle feed and animal bedding. Like other food grains, buckwheat is also fermented and distilled into /ara/.

Buckwheat cultivation has proven to be more resilient to changing preferences and improved varieties than wheat and barley cultivation, especially at higher altitudes. Local varieties still exist that are adapted to local conditions. Several initiatives have been taken to revive buckwheat cultivation in Bumthang, and surveys of the genetic diversity of the buckwheat varieties cultivated in Bhutan are undertaken.
14.3.4. WHEAT.

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) has its centre of origin in South-eastern Turkey (Heun et al. 1997). It probably came to the eastern Himalayas through Central Asia and Tibet. An account in Markham (1876) shows that towards the end of the 18th century wheat was the second most important crop after rice. At present, maize occupies this position, with wheat the third most important food grain. Wheat is called (IEnumerable) in Tibetan, Brokpa and Chocangaca, /ko/ in Dakpa, /ka/ in Dzongkha and Kuriöp, /kar/ in Kheng. Like in the case of barley, the Tshangla word /bong/, Dirang and Pemakö Tshangla /rempong/ is the most divergent form. Wheat is grown from September to March in the wet and humid subtropical zone, but does not do well in the dry subtropical zone.

According to the National Statistics Bureau (2010), wheat production in Bhutan is mainly concentrated in the western part of the country. Wangdü Phodrang, Paro and Punakha reported the highest area under cultivation and production. Curiously, the highest yields per hectare are reported from Pemagatshel, Thimphu and Trashiyangtse. In eastern Bhutan, the highest producing dzongkhaks are Bumthang, Monggar and Trongsa. Wheat flour is primarily used to make porridge and the dough is made into unleavened bread, meat or vegetable dumplings /momo/, and /torma/. Wheat production and consumption continues to be on the decline in the area, partly because of changing social preferences, partly due to high input and low output in cultivation, and partly due to cheap import of wheat flour from India. Whereas in the past various local varieties must have existed adapted to local circumstances, these have now been replaced by improved varieties imported from India. This has increased susceptibility to diseases affecting wheat crops. All these factors make the future of wheat in the area look rather bleak.

14.3.5. PEARL AND FINGER MILLET.

Besides broomcorn and foxtail millet two other millet species have been cultivated. These are pearl millet *Pennisetum typhoides* (*Pennisetum glaucum*) and finger millet *Eleusine coracana*. Pearl millet originates from the Sahel of West Africa, where it was probably domesticated around 4,500 years ago (Manning et al. 2010). From there it was introduced to India and into the southern Himalayan foothills. In Tshangla, the crop is
called /phinang ~ pshinang/. The species has almost disappeared from cultivation in Bhutan, but the name lives on in the word for maize in Dirang Tshangla.

Finger millet originates from East Africa, presumably the Ethiopian highlands, where it is thought to have been domesticated around 3,000 BC (Hilu and De Wet 1976, Hilu, De Wet and Harlan, 1979). It is thought to have been introduced to the Indian subcontinent 4,000 years ago. The crop is called ṭrjj̩n /mönchâ/ in Tibetan, ṭrjj̩n/membjâ/ in Dzongkha and /kongpu ~ kongpo ~ kongko/ in the various East Bodish languages and Tshangla. Finger millet is called /kodo/ in Nepali, /madua ~ marwa/ in Hindi and Bengali and /maruba/ in Assamese. In Bengali foxtail millet is called /kaon/ and in Bengali and Hindi kodo millet Paspalum scrobiculatum is called /kodo ~ kodra/. The phonological similarity with the various forms of /kongpu/ seems to hint at a relatively recent introduction of finger millet among the Tshangla and East Bodish speakers. After its introduction, finger millet quickly replaced broomcorn and foxtail millet not only in Bhutan and Arunachal but also among the Tibeto-Burman speaking people of Sikkim and Nepal. As a result of the historic discontinuation of broomcorn millet cultivation in areas inhabited by the Dzala and Chocangaca speakers, a semantic shift can be observed of the name /khre ~ thre/ from broomcorn millet to finger millet.

Compared to the other millets, finger millet is less drought-resistant but easier to cultivate and to process after harvesting due to larger grains and longer storage span. Finger millet can be double-cropped in the wet and humid subtropical zones, once from January to May and once from July to November. In the dry subtropical and temperate zones a single crop is cultivated from January to May. It is usually grown on dryland and shifting cultivation between 150 and 2,300m.

Finger millet grains are usually roasted and milled. The flour is mixed in water brought to a rolling boil and eaten similarly to buckwheat. This millet dough is called /zan/ and is one of the most traditional ways of eating food grains among the Dakpa people. In Tibetan, /zan/ refers to any cooked grain eaten as dough or porridge, probably predating the word /tsampa/. Finger millet flour can be made into unleavened bread.

In Bhutan, a total of 37 finger millet landraces have thus far been recognised, 13 in Sarpang dzongkhak, 10 in Samtse, 6 in Chukha, 5 in Lhüntsi, 4 in Trashiyangtshi and 3 in Tsirang (Asta Tamang, pers. comm.). The majority of the land races, 32, can be found below 2,000m. Both the area of cultivation and the highest production are concentrated in
the dzongkhaks of Samtse, Sar pang, Tsirang and Samdrup Jongkhar, traditionally inhabited by the Nepali-speaking people. This, combined with the lexical and phonological evidence above, seems to point towards finger millet having been introduced by Nepali immigrants. Two improved varieties of finger millet were released by the Renewable Natural Resources Research Centre in Wengkhar, Monggar, in 2002.

14.3.6. RICE

The main food grain cultivated and eaten in Asia is rice *Oryza sativa*. Rice remains have been attested from the Yangtze river valley in China dating back to 11,000-12,000 BC and in India to 7000-5000 BC, but the crop was positively domesticated in the middle Yangtze river basin during the Péngtóushān culture (7500-6100 BC) and in the Huái river valley during the Jiāhú culture (6000-7000 BC) and dependence on rice cultivation developed in Southern China at the mouth of the Yangtze during the Hémūdū culture, 5000-4500 BC (Sweeney and McCough 2007). Various kinds of rice are grown in the eastern Himalayas. Paddy is called སྲིབི/dre/ in Tibetan, སྟི/bja/ in Dzongkha, /bre/ in Brokpa, /bra/ in Chocangaca, /mra/ in Kurtöp, /ra ~re/ in Dakpa and /bara ~ ra/ in Tshangla. The most divergent word is Kheng /ipa/. Rice is usually cultivated in the temperate and dry subtropical zones from March to October, and in the humid subtropical zone from March till August. In the wet subtropical zone, two yearly crops are possible. There are a few varieties called /pangbara/ ‘pasture rice’ that are cultivated from March to August on dryland and shifting cultivation land. Cultivation of the rainfed rice variety has also been attested from Dirang (Chakravarty 1953:18). The vast majority of the rice varieties, however, are grown in irrigated wetland. Local varieties of red rice /khu tsalo/ and white rice /khu balingmin/ still cover most of the total rice growing area in Bhutan, and red rice /ra tsalu/ is also the favourite rice variety grown in Dirang (Chakravarty 1953: 24).

According to the National Statistics Bureau (2010), the main rice-producing dzongkhaks are Samtse, Punakha and Sar pang, with Trashigang, Samdrup Jongkhar and Monggar topping the list in the east. Specific uses and local conditions have favoured the development of specific varieties. Improved varieties have also been developed through
cross-breeding with local varieties and these are favoured due to higher yield and pest and disease resistance.

Whereas until two decades ago rice in most rural areas was a luxury food grain that was reserved for special uses and occasions, it has rapidly become the preferred staple food cooked two to three times per day. Rice is also boiled and roasted to /khumunang/, Dzongkha བྲོལ་ /zaw/ or puffed to /phobar/ Dzongkha ཨོམ་ /bo:m/. Rice can also be cooked into a thick gruel spiced with salt, butter, ginger, chilli powder, dried cheese or bone fragments with meat and ground Sichuan pepper. This traditional breakfast is called /thukpa/ in Tshangla or རྟིག་ /pchethuk/ in Dzongkha. A rice-based dish with an important ceremonial functions is རྟིག་ /dresi/, cooked white རྲིང་ /bo:/ rice with saffron, fresh butter, brown sugar and sometimes dried raisins and nuts.

Despite the higher cost of rice, it is preferred over maize, buckwheat, wheat and millet even by the most marginalised households. Most of the Bhutanese rice demand is met by imports of white rice from India. Both producing households as well as consumers in the market show a clear preferential scale for the various rice varieties: local varieties of white rice > local varieties of red rice > improved varieties of red rice > improved varieties of white rice > imported white rice. Cash needs mean that many producers sell local varieties in the market at a premium and buy back cheaper imported rice.

14.3.7. MAIZE.

Maize Zea mays occupies the second position in grain crop cultivation and as cash crop after rice, is the most important field crop in terms of area under cultivation, and is the most important subsistence grain crop in central and eastern Bhutan, Kameng and Pemakö. Maize is called འབྲོལ་ ཁྲིམས་ /ashom ~ asham/ in Tibetan, Dzala, Kheng, Dakpa and Tshangla, cf. also Lepcha /Tázôm/ ‘food, rice’. Popular folk etymology holds it that /ashom ~ asham/ is derived from Ahom or Assam and that it was from Assam, via eastern Bhutan that maize made its way into Tibet. The Brokpa and the Tshangla of Dirang call maize /phinang/ (Dondrup, 1993) and /phintang/ (Chakravarty 1953:24) respectively, which could be attributed to a semantic change from /phinang/ ‘pearl millet’, which by the time of the introduction of maize might have already come into
Maize is believed to have been domesticated in Central America around 7,800-7,000 cal. BP (Dickau et. al., 2007). It is widely believed to have been brought to the Indian subcontinent by the Portuguese in the 16th century and to have spread from there to the northeast. George Bogle already reported the cultivation of maize in Bhutan in the late 18th century. There is some evidence that maize, and other crops originating in the New World, might have reached Asia at a much earlier stage, through sea-fearing Polynesians and Austro-Asians. Depictions and descriptions of maize from China dating back to the 14th and early 16th centuries have been reported in Uchibayashi (2005), and characteristic waxy starch maize varieties distinctive from New World maize are common in East Asia (Johannesen and Parker, 1989). The north-eastern part of the Indian subcontinent also has a great genetic diversity in maize landraces, including primitive popcorn maize with 7-9 ears in the upper 20% of the stem, dropping tassels, conical ears and distinctive leaf arrangements particular of ancient Central American varieties but not of modern cultivars (Sachan and Sarkar, 1986a, b). Johannesen and Parker (1989) also describe sculpted maize on reliefs of pre-Columbian Hindu temples, but usually these claims of a more ancient introduction of maize are refuted.

Maize is the favoured food grain because it can be used in many ways and is easy to cultivate and store. It is also less susceptible to predation by birds than the various millet species and can be easier protected against macaques, wild boars and squirrels. Maize ears are eaten boiled or roasted. Dried maize grains are also commonly milled into flour and sieved using bamboo sieves of different sizes into different particle sizes. The coarsest maize flour is called /kharang/ in Tshangla and the East Bodish languages and is cooked, usually mixed with some rice, to form the staple food of the Tshangla people. The finer flour is boiled in water and kneaded into thick dough eaten as staple food. It can also be cooked into a thick porridge /thukpa/ and, like with rice, the cooking water is made into a watery soup with chilli powder and spring onion called /yomri/ in Tshangla or /khuri/ in Dakpa. Van Driem (2001b) mentions an old Tshangla saying to garpai zanthawala, yomri waktsabakkı jamthawala, barka ama hang zaleya ‘the cooked food (rice) has been eaten by the government officials, the rice soup has been drunk by the children, meanwhile what shall the mother eat’ referring to the officials from the Drukpa
government who used to visit the villages and take all liberties in finishing food stocks, leaving little to eat for the people themselves. Maize grains can also be puffed in a large dry frying pan after which it is called /munang/ or roasted and beaten to /tengma/, Dzongkha /geza zip/, Dirang Tshangla /kakung/. This is eaten as snack with tea.

Local maize varieties include flint, dented and popcorn maize. Maize is usually grown at altitudes below 2,500m on dryland or shifting cultivation land. In the dry tropical zone, maize is often intercropped with potato or with pumpkin, beans, soybeans or amaranth, and it can be double-cropped in the humid wet subtropical region, the first from February to June, and a second from July to November. The genetic diversity among maize landraces is expected to be high, with many local varieties for various purposes and adapted to various local conditions. Improved varieties have been developed and introduced as well, which are quickly replacing the local varieties.

In Bhutan, Monggar, Samtse and Trashigang are the dzongkhaks with the highest area under maize cultivation, though production in Dagana exceeds the production of Trashigang. Despite the importance of maize as a food grain in eastern Bhutan, the yield per hectare in all eastern dzongkhaks except Zhemgang is lower than the national average (National Statistics Bureau, 2010). Chakravarty (1953:88) reported maize as the main food grain in Dirang Tshangla households, although even there a preference for rice was noted.

14.3.8. AMARANTHS.

A final group of grain crops that used to have some relevance in the area are the various kinds of Amaranthus spp. Amaranthus spp. originate in the Americas and have high protein and complimentary amino-acid content. The wild variety A. retroflexus has black seeds and is called /zhimtsi naap/ in Dzongkha, /’naam/ in Bumthap, /nam/ in Tshangla and /’nem/ or /’dau/ in Dakpa. A. cruentus has dark pink flowers and red seeds. It is called /mo ~ sharpaimo/ in Tshangla, /’mut/ in Chocangaca, and /’mon/ in Dakpa. A. hypochondriacus has white flowers and yellow seeds. It is called /lasamo/ in Tshangla, /zhimtsi kaap/ in Dzongkha, /ngude/ in Bumthap and /bla’mon/ in Dakpa. Amaranth was grown in the warm temperate and subtropical zone in small patches near the homestead. The seeds were cooked together with rice or fried into a type of /munang/ and used in
religious rituals. Popped grains were also bound together in unrefined cane sugar /gur/ and formed into cakes or balls. With the Losar approaching, the Dakpa used to make /blubo/, a peculiar type of biscuit, by flattening long strips of dough made from amaranth flour and cutting these into parallelogram shape. These were then roasted. Fresh, young amaranth leaves can be eaten as a vegetable. The species of amaranth have a long growing season, from March till December, and require constant guarding once they have set seeds. They have therefore largely come into disuse in much of the growing area.

14.3.9. FOOD GRAIN CONVERSION TO ALCOHOL.

A major usage of all the food grains is the production of alcohol. Alcohol is called /chang/ in Dakpa, /yu~zhu/ in Tshangla, /zhör/ in Kurtöp and /yor/ in Kheng. Food grains, particularly wheat, barley and maize, are boiled and fermented by adding yeast made from wild plants generically called /yangrim/. When a strainer is pressed into the mass of fermented grains and the ensuing liquid is scooped up this is called /singchang/. If hot water is poured on a mass of fermented grains and the resulting liquid is sieved this is called /bangchang/. If fermented grains are mixed with water and distilled the resulting product is called /ara/. Boiled rice, sometimes mixed with finger millet flour, is fermented into /phabin/ called /nakpa/ in Kheng and Chocangaca or /changkö/ in Dzongkha. It is usually fried in butter and egg and a traditional dish for the recovery of women just after delivery. Bangchang and singchang are generally consumed at home. In Kheng-speaking areas, fermented rice mixed with millet is /khramachang/, fermented maize mixed with millet is called /seba/. When hot water is poured in a container with fermented finger millet and drunk through a bamboo pipe it is known as /tongba/ in Eastern Nepal and Sikkim. Due to hygiene reasons the sale of this drink has been prohibited in Bhutan. Ara is by far the preferred drink and is consumed throughout the day, enabling hard physical effort. Alcoholic beverages also have an important social function.

As Dorji (2003:22) remarked 'exchange of drinks reveals the social habits; alcohol is the core social element around which the social events revolve...It is not because of the pleasure gained from consuming it but the social unity that it promotes that makes its use
so regular’. There are many occasions when alcohol is served, such as /dongchang/ ‘greeting drink’, /shuichang/ ‘farewell drink’, /tochang/ alcohol drunken together with the meal, /marchang/ offered to the local deities, /graichang/ or alcohol served to people when sitting in a row, /japchang/ or /gyapchang/ or reciprocal serve, /lamchang/ for ‘on the road’, /zimchang/ to assure a good night’s rest and /zhengchang/ drunk when waking up, the best way to get rid of a hangover. Ara is a compulsory element of any important life occasion. Production and sale often provide an additional source of cash income for rural households. On the flip side of the coin, indulgence in alcoholic drinks and addiction and the associated health risks and social evils as well as the considerable amounts of food grains converted to alcohol have warranted state intervention. Government attempts to reduce alcohol production and consumption have included banning of the local production for commercial purposes. This has affected local livelihoods besides resulting in underground production and sale. These attempts seem, however, futile in the light of unrestricted availability of whiskies, rums, gins and brandies produced under government auspices by the Army Welfare Project and imported and locally produced beers. These drinks are ostensibly more harmful to health and contribute little or nothing economically to local livelihoods, but do support the state budget directly through sale and the collection of sales and import tax revenues and bar license fees. During the past five years, rural people in Bhutan, Kameng and Tawang have clearly shifted their preference from locally produced alcoholic drinks to commercially marketed liquors and beers. Illegal trade in AWP liquor has rapidly replaced trade in fermented soybeans and cheese and traditional dress items from the border areas of Bhutan into Kalaktang and Tawang. The change in preferences is adversely affecting not only community health and social relations, but also the economic situation, particularly of low income groups. Whereas employed sectors of society, primarily in urban areas, can offset higher alcohol expenditure, rural incomes are still too meagre and increased expenditure on alcohol results in decreased expenditure on other basic necessities, a worrying trend in many rural areas. In 2011, government tax on all imported and locally manufactures alcohol was raised in an attempt to reduce the social and medical side-effects of excessive alcohol consumption. This step is laudable if properly enforced. Care should, however, be taken not to vilify all alcohol production and

consumption, as austere measures to limit local and rural household level consumption will adversely affect its deeply embedded social functions.

Closely related to the consumption of alcohol is the chewing of the betel quid. Areca nut, the nut of the areca palm Areca catechu, was once a popular condiment from the Indian subcontinent till the Pacific Islands, including South and Southeast Asia and Taiwan. The nut and the quid made from it has locally an important religious and cultural significance. In western Bhutan, /doma/ ‘betel quid’ was probably introduced only in the early 18th century, as no reports from before that date mention the habit of chewing it (Pommaret 2003). Ever since its introduction, betel nut remained an item of offering in religious ceremonies, to important religious and secular figures and a luxury condiment for the upper classes, beyond reach of the common people. It gained popularity among the masses only with increasing living standards in the late 20th century. In Central and Eastern Bhutan, common people would only receive it occasionally as special gift. Even in the late 20th century betel nut was hard to obtain for the villagers in Eastern Bhutan, and it never became really popular. Betel nut is sporadically used in Kameng and Tawang and lower Pemakō, ostensibly under Indian influence, and is notably absent from Pemakō. Betel nut is called /goyi/, /gugai/ or /gogai/ in Tshangla. It is customarily to chew the nut with betel leaves Piper betle, Tshangla /pan/, and a small quantity of slaked lime, Tshangla /tsuna/. The bark of several species of tree, such as peach tree Prunus persica and chir pine Pinus roxburghii tree, as well as the root of Potentilla peduncularis Tshangla /gongra/ are also dried and chewed as cheap local betel nut substitutes.

There is widespread and convincing medical evidence from across Asia that chewing of betel quid is an important cause of mouth, throat and stomach cancer. The perception regarding the environmental and health impact of indiscriminate spitting of betel quid saliva is also becoming increasing negative. Despite this, there has till now not been any restrictive legislation regarding betel quid in Bhutan on the historically questionable pretext of being an inalienable part of Bhutanese culture.
14.3.10. Pulses, Beans and Oil Crops

Curiously, beans and pulses were traditionally also counted under the nine varieties of grains. As was described in Chapter 2.1, the Tibetan language still described most of the beans and pulses with the suffix ‘mon’ as designation of origin. The pulses *Olichos spp.*, *Phaseolus mungo* and *Phaseolus radiates* are generally called རིན/ in Tibetan, /sim ~ sem/ in Dzongkha, /krai/ in Kheng, /shakpu/ in Tshangla and Dakpa and /kraile/ in Dzala and Chocangaca. These pulses are usually mixed with rice or other grains and eaten cooked as staple food, and are an important source of protein in a diet usually low in animal proteins. Griffith, who travelled through Bhutan including eastern Bhutan in 1837, saw scarlet beans *Phaseolus coccineus* and red kidney beans *P. vulgaris* /brokpaling orai/ being cultivated (Roder et al. 2008). Beans are generically called རིན/ in Tibetan, /shepe/ in Chocangaca and Dzala, /semcum/ in Dzongkha, /ganggali/ in Kheng and /orsha ~ orai/ in Tshangla and Dakpa.

Sometimes also counted under the ‘nine varieties of grains’ are the various oil crops. Mustard seed *Brassica juncea* and rapeseed *Brassica campestris* /memba/ are the most common oilseeds grown in all agro-ecological zones. Other oil crops cultivated at lesser scale are Niger seed *Guizotia abyssinica*, Sesame seed *Sesamum indicum* and sunflower *Helianthus annuus*. Two crops grown widely in the eastern region of Bhutan with oil-producing potential are soybean *Glycine max* and groundnut *Arachis hypogaeae*. Soybean /libi/ is commonly fermented to /libi zhitpa/, a substitute of fermented cheese and traded to Tawang and Dirang on a considerable scale, especially from the Gamri river valley. Groundnut /badam/ is eaten roasted as a snack. Oil crops were usually planted in rotation with rice and wheat in both wetland and dryland, with the oil crops grown from September to January. Many local varieties and a few improved varieties exist. Due to the limited choice of cultivars, the high labour input in both cultivation and especially processing the seeds to oil, and the cheap availability of mustard seed, soybean and groundnut oil from India, the area under oilseed cultivation has greatly diminished.
14.4. OTHER AGRICULTURAL CROPS.

14.4.1. LOCAL VEGETABLES.

The variety of vegetables cultivated and consumed in this part of the Himalayas was traditionally rather limited. Although it is beyond the scope of this book to name all of them, a few deserve special mention. The turnip *Brassica rapa* is called /jorop/ in Kheng, /donai/ in Tshangla or /endo/ in Dzongkha. The long white winter radish or daikon *Raphanus sativus* is called /labuk/ in Tibetan and Brokpa, /laphu/ in Dzongkha, /yawa/ in Kheng, /caru/ in Chocangaca, /keru/ in Dzala and /kyur/ in Dakpa. In Kurtöp it is called /muya/ and in Tshangla /mulai/, both of which are cognate to Hindi, Nepali and Bengali /mula/. The leaves of the mustard plant also used for vegetable oil production are eaten as green leaf vegetable. It is called /mom shawa/ ‘vegetable leaves’ in Tshangla, /tshonma/ in Chocangaca, /tshöse/ in Dzongkha, /ruk/ in Kheng and /hru/ ‘leaf’ in Dakpa. It is one of the most important vegetables during the dry season. These three vegetables traditionally formed the main vegetable crops on the slopes of the southern Himalayan, especially in the temperate zone. They are eaten both fresh as well as dried, and of turnip and radish, both the roots as well as the leaves can be eaten. Native varieties of garlic *Allium sativum* /lam/, /'lesh/ in Dakpa, /'lashu/ in Dzala, /'acu/ in Kheng, /'cagop/ in Dzongkha, and onion *Allium cepa* /kokpa/, /tsong/ in Dakpa and Dzala and /gop/ in Dzongkha were probably domesticated and cultivated locally. Turnips, radish and mustard greens were, next to peas *Pisum sativum* /botpa changma/ already mentioned by the Portuguese missionaries visiting Bhutan in 1627 (Roder et al., 2008). Given the popularity of the Hindi, Nepali and Bengali word /motar ~ matar/ in the local languages, peas were probably introduced from the Brahmaputran plains, although the Tshangla name /botpa changma/ ‘Tibetan peas’ suggests otherwise. A local vegetable growing at lower altitudes is the gourd /cong/ or /kuwa/ in Chocangaca and /cung/ in Tibetan. This vegetable, when emptied of its edible contents and dried, is used for scooping water and other liquids.

Turner, who visited the subtropical zone of Bhutan in 1846, reported the cultivation of /mamphung/ *Cucumis sativus*, bitter gourd /khalu kairu/ *Momordica charantia* and eggplant /bantho/ *Solanum melongena*. These species are native to the Indian
14.4.2. THE UBQUITOUS CHILLI.

By the time of George Bogle’s visit in 1774, chillies *Capsicum annum* and maize had reached the area after the long journey from the New World (Markham, 1876). Chillies were quickly adopted by the people of the region, not simply as a condiment or spice, but as a vegetable. The pungent chillies were perhaps considered to be beneficial to keeping oneself warm in the cold climate, and also added the necessary spice and taste to the otherwise bland dishes. Other spices, profusely used in the Indian and Nepali kitchens, never gained much popularity among the people of Bhutan and Kameng. Whereas the local word for maize might refer to an introduction though Assam, the word for chilli in Kheng, Bumthap, Chocangaca and Kurtöp is /banggala/ which might refer to an introduction via Bengal. Chilli in Bengali is called /morich/. In Tibetan, chilli is called བོད་གཡ་/siben/ and in Dzongkha བོད་གཡ་/ema/, which seems the result of semantic change from Tibetan and Chocangaca /'yerma/, Dakpa /'yer/) ‘wild pepper *Zanthoxylum* spp.’ which in Dzongkha is called /thinge/. In all the languages further east, including Dakpa, Dzala, Brokpa and Tshangla, chilli is called /solo/, probably derived from Assamese, /jolokia/. Jolokia refers in the northeast to all cultivated chilli species, including not only *Capsicum annum* but also *C. frutescens* /phaidar solo/ and *C. chinense*. Curiously, *C. frutescens* and *C. chinense* are called /bhot jolokia/ or /bhut jolokia/ in Assamese spoken north of the Brahmaputra river, in which Bhot/Bhut means ‘Tibetan, Bhutanese’, and /naga jolokia/ to the south of the Brahmaputra river, referring to the Naga people. Maybe these names came around because of the Naga and Bhutanese preference for chillies, or perhaps, although highly unlikely, because they were introduced from Bengal via Bhutan.

to Assam. The fact that in Pemakö Tshangla /solo/ ‘chillies’ are reported as the special local agricultural product also traded (Zhāng 1997:25) indicates that chillies already formed a major part of the Tshangla diet when the migration to Pemakö took place.

14.4.3. OTHER INTRODUCTIONS FROM THE NEW WORLD.

Three other vegetables introduced from the New World at some point in history are the pumpkin *Cucurbita moschata* called /kakuru/ in Dzongkha, /kakoro/ or /anjang/ in Kheng, /brumsha ~ dorjan/ in Tshangla and /brumsha/ in Dzala and Dakpa, the caigua *Cyclanthera pedata* /paula, kairu, patpa ore/ and two species of tomato *Solanum lycopersium* and *S. betacea* called /lambenda ~ lampentang/ and /shing lambenda/ ‘tree tomato’ respectively in all languages of Bhutan. The tomato is called /golbera/ in Kameng and Tawang, perhaps after the town in West Bengal with the same name, and not from Hindi /tamatar/ or Assamese /bilahi/. Especially the tomato is a popular vegetable used in curries as well as in chilli paste, and many different landraces exist.

Potatoes originate from the New World and their introduction to the Eastern Himalayas was perhaps sometime in the late 18th century, though Griffith did not report potatoes from his visit in 1837. Local tradition has it that the most common Tshangla word for potato /joktang/ is a contraction of /jok/ ‘George’ and /tang/ ‘present’, referring to the belief that the potato was introduced by George Bogle sometime in the 1770s. It is more likely though that a semantic shift has taken place from the wild yam *Dioscorea hamiltonii* which then became known as /borang joktang/ ‘forest potato’. The Dungsam Kothri and Lower Trashigang dialects of Tshangla use the variant /pasong ~ pasang/ for potato, which has no wild equivalent. In the East Bodish languages the potato is called /ki ~ ke/ and in Dzongkha /kewa/. The cultivated potato has replaced many species of cultivated and wild potato, yam and taro in the daily menu. Potato is usually cultivated between February and June. Since the 1970s potato has become a very important cash crop in many villages in the cool and warm temperate and dry subtropical zones. It is the third most important cash crop after rice and maize.
14.4.4. OTHER VEGETABLES.

When Turner visited Bhutan in 1846, he not only reported chilli, potato, cucumber, bitter gourd and eggplant, but also cabbage /kopi/ Brassica oleracea var. capitata, lettuce /hogi tshonma/ Lactuca sativa, watermelon Citrullus lanatus and calabash /chong/ Lagenaria siceraria. Watermelon and calabash originating from southern Africa, cabbage domesticated in the Mediterranean region and lettuce first domesticated in ancient Egypt, reached the Indian subcontinent thousands of years ago. It is interesting to note that even till present, except for perhaps eggplant, cabbage and cucumber, these vegetables have by no means reached the same popularity as radish, mustard green, chilli, potato or beans. This is reflected in the fact that they are usually called by their Bengali, Assamese or Nepali names, like /kopi ~ kauli/ for cabbage, /lauka/ for calabash and /karela/ for bitter gourd.

Vegetables even more recently introduced include broccoli Brassica oleracea var. italica /brokauli/ and cauliflower Brassica oleracea var. botrytis /meto kopi/ ‘flower cabbage’. Although gaining popularity, their susceptibility to pests and diseases means they are still not widely grown.

14.4.5. HORTICULTURE.

Finally, horticultural crops include the various members of the Citrus family grown in the subtropical zone, C. aurantifolia /kapur zemu/, C. maxima /jambur/, C. medica /numpang/, C. reticulate /tshalu/, C. sinensis /kapur/, apple, pear, plum and peach.

14.5. LIVESTOCK REARING.

Several species of livestock are traditionally reared by the people of eastern Bhutan, Kameng and Pemakö. The economic status of a particular household could and can be derived from the kind and number of livestock reared. According to Chakravarty (1953), mithun, chickens, pigs and dogs were the main domestic animals kept by the Tshangla of Dirang. Before the introduction of cattle, these were also the main domestic animals kept in eastern Bhutan. From Pemakö, (2011: 65) reports 𛄕𛄔𛄕𛄔𛄕 yaks and 𛄔𛄔 dries, their crossbreeds with cattle 𛄔𛄔 dzo and 𛄔𛄔 dzomo, 𛄔 cow, 𛄔 mithun, the mithun and

cattle crossbreed བདོན་ཟན་yangku and རྟ་ཞུན་ goats and sheep. At lower elevations རྟ་ཞུན་ jatsha and mithun are the preferred livestock.

14.5.1. THE FIRST LIVESTOCK: CHICKEN AND PIG.

Domestication of the chicken is considered to have taken place from wild Asian red jungle fowl *Gallus gallus* in different locations of Asia at least around 3,200 BC. Practically every household used to own a few domestic fowl *Gallus domesticus* for egg production and the occasional meat. Various local breeds exist alongside improved varieties, with local varieties well adapted to local conditions. In Tshangla chickens are called /gowa/, perhaps a contraction of /go/ and /kha/ ‘bird’. The word /go/ could have meant something like ‘egg’ considering /gotham/ from combining it with the verb /tham/ ‘hatch’. Eggs are an important substitute for protein from meat. Predation on poultry due to daytime free ranging and poor night time henhouses is high, mainly by various civets and birds of prey such as /khapza/. Poultry is particularly popular among lower income households. Frequent nation-wide bans as a result of poultry diseases have made poultry a profitable business if done in a proper way, but again, religious sentiments are often a barrier for people to commence it on a large scale.

Local pig breeds *Sus scrofa domesticus* are reared purely for meat production. Archaeological evidence of domesticated pigs has been found in combination with rice agriculture on the southeastern coast of China dating back to 8,200 to 7,000 cal. yr. BP, with the first pig remains from the Dadiwan culture such as the site of Xishanping I in the Wei river valley dating between 8,000 and 7,400 BP. Remains that can be positively attributed to domesticated pigs and millet agriculture from Baijiacun in the Wei river valley in northern China have been dated to 7,500 to 6,250 BP (Flad et al. 2007). From north-eastern and central China pig rearing expanded together with millet and rice cultivation around 6,500 to 5,000 BP, and from the Yangtze river around 5,000 to 4,000 BP (Larson et al. 2010). Pig remains from Kharro in Tibet are dated between 6,000 and 5,500 BP (Flad et al. 2007). Pigs and dogs *Canis familiaris* are the oldest domesticated mammals, and their domestication seems to have taken place at approximately the same moment in time.
There are indications that pigs were independently domesticated from wild boar *Sus cristatus* in the Indian subcontinent, Southeast Asia, in East Asia and several other locations at various moments in history. The genetic make-up of the domestic pigs found in Bhutan variably resemble the Indian, Southeast Asian and East Asian breeds (Larson et al. 2010), indicating introduction of domesticated pigs by different routes. Crossbreeding of wild boars with domesticated pigs maintained genetic diversity, hardiness and disease resistance of the local breeds.

The general Tibetan term /phakpa/ is used for ‘pig’ in all languages of the region. In Tshangla, the terms for ‘bear’ and ‘sow’ are /phoba/ and /moba/ respectively. The main pig rearing eastern dzongkhaks in Bhutan are Monggar, Trashigang and Zhemgang (National Statistics Bureau, 2010). Local pigs have a black skin and coarse black hair, in contrast to exotic breeds that usually have white skin. Pigs roam the village freely during daytime, and are only locked up in a stone enclosure by night. Pig slaughtering is usually done in a rather cruel way, namely by tying a pig on a tree with a short rope and waiting for the animal to suffocate itself. The squealing of the pig can be heard from a great distance, usually the tell-tale sign that some celebration is coming up and fresh pork will be available soon. The traditional significance of the pig for the people of Monyul cannot be underestimated. Phaksha sikam or air-dried cuts of streaky bacon are a local delicacy indispensable for any celebration. Slaughtering pigs is an essential part of the gruishui and yuisha ceremonies in the marriage cult of Lower Kheng (Dorji 2003: 11), and until recently, annually a pig’s head was offered to local deities in various parts of Bhutan.

Increasingly, Buddhist teachers are discouraging people from rearing pigs because a pig is purely bred for its meat, and killing a sentient being is considered a great sin in Buddhism. As a result, pig rearing has been completely abandoned in Bumthang, almost completely abandoned in Trongsa, and has all but disappeared from many villages in eastern Bhutan. Instead, people rely on imported pork which is produced in large-scale commercial farms in Assam and which, by the time it reaches the consumer, is not only expensive, but often putrid as well.

On a side note, the pygmy hog *Porcula salvania* once roamed the grasslands of the Duar plains bordering the Himalayan foothills, but has almost become extinct. Bhutan, being a frontrunner in environmental conservation, could perhaps play a more active and even
crucial role in protecting this unique species from extinction. Previously inhabited and cultivated areas in Samdrup Jongkhar and Sarpang, left fallow since the early 1990s, could be converted into breeding areas and suitable habitat to strengthen the remaining pygmy hog population in the adjoining areas of Assam.

14.5.2. GOATS, SHEEP AND EQUINES.

In archaeology, the remains of the small ruminants, sheep and goats, are usually difficult to distinguish (Flad et al. 2007). The small ruminants were thought to have been domesticated in the Near East around 10,000 BP. Together with wheat cultivation they are supposed to have reached East Asia via northwestern Asia. The first archaeological evidence of sheep from the Banpo site in the Wei river valley of central China dates to 6,900 to 5,800 BP. The first remains that can be positively attributed to domesticated sheep originate from sites such as Dahezhuang, Qinweijia and Shizhaocun V in the Wei river valley and are dated between 4,100 and 3,900 BP (Flad et al., 2007). Sheep remains from Qugong in Tibet are dated between 3,750 and 3,100 BP (Flad et al., 2007).

At lower altitudes, especially in the areas bordering the Indian plains, goats Capra spp. /raba/ have been kept for meat purposes and as a source of cash income. They were usually bartered or sold to Hindu Indians and Nepalis. Not surprisingly, most goats can be found in Samtse, Tsirang and Dagana dzongkhaks in southern Bhutan, with a considerable number in Samdrup Jongkhar. Nepali road workers in other dzongkhaks also keep small numbers of goats. Goats are no longer kept by villagers in eastern Bhutan, partially because of the same reason, but also because the government has limited the number of goats that can be kept to four per household, to be kept tethered near the home at all times, out of environmental concerns. So whereas Pasaphu village in Kangpar geok under Trashigang was once known for its goat herds, nowadays not a single goat can be found, and instead the village has shifted its focus on poultry farming. In Kalaktang, goats are still reared by most households.

In the temperate zone, sheep Ovis aries /shisha/, Dakpa /yeng/, were kept for wool. Curiously, the Bugun also call the sheep /shisha/ (Dondrup 1990). Sheep were kept together with yak in transhumance livestock systems, and near the homestead at lower altitudes. Attempts to introduce exotic breeds and crossbreeding have been largely
unsuccessful. Most sheep in Bhutan are reared in Samtse and Wangdú Phodrang dzongkhaks. In eastern Bhutan, sheep can be mainly found in Trashigang, Bumthang and Trongsa dzongkhaks, with all sheep populations in other dzongkhaks numbering fewer than 100 (National Statistics Bureau 2010). There has been a decreasing trend in sheep numbers and sheep have disappeared from most villages after cheap Indian and New Zealand wool made local wool production obsolete. Sheep rearing is of subordinate importance in Tawang, Dirang and Pemakö as well.

The horse was probably domesticated in Central Asia around 5,000 BO and the donkey in Africa between 7,000 and 5,000 BP (Flad et al. 2007). The oldest archaeological evidence of horses from Banpo in the Wei river valley dates back to between 6,900 and 5,800 BP. The first domesticated horse remains have been found in Miaoziguo in north China and date back to between 6,700 and 5,000, whereas in central China the horse does not appear to have been introduced until 2,500 BP (Flad et al., 2007). Horses, like sheep and goats, were most likely introduced from the steppes of northern and central Asia. Horses /kurta/, mules /dre/ and donkeys /bongba/ Equus spp. were kept by richer households mainly for transportation purposes and enabled people to trade on longer distances and thus maintain and expand their economic base. The local Bhutanese horse breeds were highly valued for their sturdiness and exported to Tawang, Tibet and the Indian plains. The expansion of the road network and increased mobility, finally, is resulting in fewer and fewer households keeping donkeys, mules and horses.

14.5.3. The SIRI CATTLE.

Cattle are thought to have first been domesticated from Bos primogenius in Northeast Africa and West Asia around 10,000 BP (Marshall and Hildebrand, 2002, Troy, 2001). The humped Zebu cattle Bos indicus is thought to have been domesticated in north-western South Asia between 10,000 and 7,500 BP (Loftus et al. 1994, Meadow 1996). In East Asia, cattle might have been introduced from the west or south, but wild cattle stocks might have been domesticated locally as well (Flad et al. 2007). The first archaeological evidence of cattle from the Beishouling and Xishanping II sites in China can be dated between 7,300 and 6,900 BP, with the first evidence of positively domesticated cattle from Shizhaocun in the Wei river valley in central China dating to the
Qijia and Majiayao cultures between 5,400 and 4,700 BP (Flad et al. 2007). Cattle remains from Kharro in Tibet are dated between 6,000 and 5,500 BP (Flad et al., 2007). This concerns forms of *Bos taurus*.

The Siri breed /wa/, Dakpa /b’a/ is the major cattle resource in Bhutan and is the stabilised indigenous crossbreed which evolved from the mating between the humpless shorthorn dwarf cattle *Bos taurus* from Tibet and the humped Zebu cattle from the Indian subcontinent (Payne 1970). Despite being ultimately a crossbreed, the Siri is classified as *Bos indicus*. The Siri breed is well adapted to the specific local conditions at altitudes between 800 and 3,000m, including disease resistance, traction capacity, high butterfat content of the milk and good foraging ability. Siri perform markedly less below 800m, above 2,000m, and in the dry subtropical zone (Phunchung and Roden 1996). The Siri bulls are valued as draft animals, but the milk production of cows is relatively poor, their conception delayed, the age of maturity high, fertility often impaired and calving interval high.

Local cattle are kept mainly by richer households for milk, hides, manure and draught power. Although milk is rarely consumed directly, its products like buttermilk, butter and cheese are important sources of protein for the household and are also bartered or sold in the market. Cattle are usually not killed for meat on purpose, but when they accidentally fall down and die, or die of other causes the meat people do consume the meat. Obviously, if the need for meat arises, unproductive cattle are as is often euphemistically called ‘assisted’ in falling down. During the winter months, November to March, when fodder is scarce, the Siri cattle is kept browsing the abandoned fields in and near the village for crop residues. Cattle are also few with fodder collected in the forest and hay, mainly rice stalks. In summer, cattle usually freely graze in the forest. At night, cattle are kept on the ground floor of the house. Judging from Chakravarty (1953), the Tshangla of Dirang until the 1950s did not keep any cattle, and were instead completely dependent on the mithun. Although Zhang (1997:28) does not report mithun but only local cattle, presumably indigenous *Bos taurus* breeds, from Pemakö, Хие (2011:65) clearly indicates that mithun and their crossbreed with cattle, called jatsha, are preferred for milk, butter and meat.

Due to the high labour input required for cattle rearing, combined with a decrease in labour availability in villages as a result of rural-urban migration, cattle numbers have
decreased significantly in many areas. Government policies also favour fewer high-yielding imported Holstein-Frisian, Brown Swiss and Jersey cattle *Bos taurus* cattle than so-called ‘unproductive’ local cattle breeds. More and more households prefer to keep one or two milking cows of the improved breeds near the homestead rather than herding larger herds in the forest.

14.5.4. THE YAK.

Several semi-nomadic people, including the Brokpa, the Dakpa of Tawang, Lekpu and Bangshing in Pemakō, Durpa, Bumthangpa and Mangdep, traditionally herd yak *Bos grunniens* and their various cross-breeds. These yaks are a domesticated form of the wild yak *Bos mutus*, called སྒྲོང/ *drong* in Tibetan. The few remaining wild yak, one of the most threatened species of the Tibetan plateau, are found far north of the Himalayan watershed. The wild yak is thought to have been domesticated in Northern Tibet by Qiangic tribes around 5,000 years BP (Zhāngh and colleagues 1994, Gu et al., 2007). Possible yak remains from Qugong in Tibet are dated between 3,750 and 3,100 BP (Flad et al. 2007).

A male yak is called /yak/ and a female yak is called /dri/. Yaks provide wool, meat, milk and hides. The soft, inner wool from the ventral part of the yak is called /tsitpu/ and is used for making the characteristic maroon or brown Brokpa dress, boots and conical hats (see Chapter 5.4). The longer hair is used for making ropes, tents, blankets and bags and pouches. Yak butter and fermented yak cheese are highly sought after. Yaks are kept in a transhumance system, living in the alpine zone from late May till late August and in the cool temperate zone from late September till mid May. During the summer months, yak and local cattle interbreed. The first generation offspring of yak crossbreeds are called /zo/ for male and /zom/ for female. The /zo/ is an infertile but sturdy progeny normally used as pack animal, whereas the /zom/ provides superior quantities of milk with high butterfat content. The most outstanding advantage of the /zo/ and /zom/ is the fact that they thrive at the altitude interval where neither Siri cattle nor purebred yaks do, i.e. between 3,000 and 4,000m.

A unique crossbreeding system among the Brokpa involves crossbreeding /goleng/ bulls, a type of humped Tibetan dwarf cattle *Bos taurus* previously imported

from Tibet, with purebred *Bos grunniens* female /dri/ and backcrossing with their offspring. Although according to Zhang and colleagues (1994) purposeful crossbreeding of yak with *Bos taurus* cattle in Tibet was initiated only by the mid-1900s, Winter and Tshewang (1989) had previously shown that this type of crossbreeding has always been the preferred system by the Brokpa. Since the animals as well as the breeding practice was taken by the Brokpa from their traditional homeland on the Tibetan plateau, we can safely assume that goleng sire with yak cow crossbreeding was practised in Tibet at least in the 15th century.

The offspring of a /goleng/ with /dri/ are called /zo/ for male and /zomo/ for female. The backcross of a /zomo/ with a /goleng/ bull is called /koi/ for both male and female. /Koi/ are usually culled. The subsequent backcrosses, all with /goleng/ bulls, are called /shinggoleng, shinggolengma/, /dagoleng, dagolengma/, /bagoleng, bagolengma/ and finally /goleng, golengma/ for male and female respectively. Backcrossed /goleng/ bulls are less prized than imported Tibetan /goleng/ bulls.

The closure of the Tibetan border in the late 1950s also restricted the import of goleng bulls. As a result, goleng bulls locally obtained through backcross breeding are used, which is time-consuming, produces many undesirable offspring, and is affecting the genetic makeup of the yak and yak crossbreed population. As Wangchuk also proposed, in absence of fresh *Bos taurus* genetic material from Tibet, goleng bulls could be imported from outside. Perhaps the best candidate to provide new genetic material for yak crossbreeding in Bhutan would be the Lulu breed of *Bos taurus* from the Mustang area of Nepal. This humpless cattle breed, with a population of 1,437 bulls and 4,333 cows, is kept at altitudes between 2,800 and 4,000m and probably originates from Tibet (Fujise et al. 2003). Unfortunately, even in Nepal this breed is reported to be threatened by crossbreeding with *Bos indicus*, at least at the lower altitudes.

A more widespread crossbreeding system also practiced in other parts of Bhutan involves a purebred *Bos grunniens* yak bull crossed with a purebred *Bos indicus* Siri cow. Their offspring are also called /zo/ for male and /zomo/ for female. The backcross of a /zomo/ with a yak bull are called /tui/ for both male and female, and their subsequent backcrosses with yak bulls are called /gar/, /chuk/ and /zen/, finally resulting in /yak/ and /dri/ again. In Bumthang, the successive generations of offspring are called /zo/ and

/zom/, /toila/ and /toimo/, /prela/ and /premo/, /gar/, /chuk/ and finally /yak/ and /dri/ again.

Yak are kept in 10 dzongkhaks of Bhutan benefiting around 1,400 households (Wangchuk, 2011) but yak numbers have shown an annual decline of 3-6%. Almost 9,000 yaks and yak crossbreeds can be found in Trashigang dzongkhak, almost 3,200 in Bumthang, and far smaller numbers in the remaining dzongkhaks of eastern Bhutan. For nomadic yak herders, yak rearing is still an important source of income, but government policies on the perceived threat to the forest cover, land degradation and communal grazing land and increased numbers of horses and cattle resulting in increased competition and resulting inter-communal conflicts over grazing rights threaten this unique livelihood system. As Wangchuk (2011) proposed, a blend with eco-tourism and conservation might be the best option to preserve the yak herding practice in Bhutan. In late 2009, yak, yak crossbreed and sheep sale and butchering was officially prohibited in Tawang district in an effort to preserve the dwindling populations of these traditional livestock species. It appears that modernisation of the Dakpa population has resulted in a demise of the old transhumance system in most areas, which is symptomised by herders selling off complete herds of livestock.

14.5.5. The Mithun.

Finally, the ubiquitous domesticated Bos frontalis called /mithun ~ mihan/ or /gayal/ in India is called /bamen/ in Tibetan and Dzongkha and /mencha/ in the East Bodish languages and Tshanglga. This cattle species is kept in the humid and dry subtropical agricultural zones. The mithun has been shown to have been directly domesticated from the gaur Bos gaurus (Dorji et al., 2010) which still exists in its wild form in Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent. Mithun are kept in Bhutan, Northeast India, parts of Burma and Bangladesh and south-western China. The Drung (Dulong) people of north-western Yunnan are perhaps the easternmost keepers of mithun and mithun crossbreeds, and they share many other similarities with the people of Arunachal Pradesh, including a high dependency on the forest, the application of facial tattoos for women, and a primitive agricultural system based on millet and buckwheat in shifting cultivation fields. Among the tribes of Arunachal where Buddhism has not or only superficially influenced
the culture, the mithun is perhaps the most important livestock species. It is used for meat, milk, draught power, offered on important religious occasion, part of the bridal price and in settling disputes and the main form of household wealth and status. It is called /subu/ in Apatani and Nishi, /tadok/ in Adi, and it is the state animal of both Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh. Among most of these people, the mithun is a semi-domesticated animal, kept free-ranging frequently interbreeding with wild gaur (Scherf 2000). It has been traditionally kept in a semi-wild state and is well adapted to browse on local fodder on the steep forested slopes. The male mithun is usually left to graze in the forest and lured to the village with salt. The mithun cow is kept on the ground floor of the house during night time, especially after calving, but left to browse in the forest during daytime. Although mithun milk is very nutritious, the quantity is small, and the mithun was kept mainly for meat purposes. The mithun can reach a shoulder height of up to 1 ½ meters but despite its impressive appearance is a rather docile animal.

(2011: 65) reports that among ‘striped ’lo’ of Pemakö only the mithun is kept for meat purposes. That this traditional importance of the mithun extends to the Tshangla of Dirang becomes clear from several instances in Chakravarty (1953). The presence of the mithun in Bhutan was first reported from western Bhutan by Turner in 1783. Phanchung and Roder (1996) state that in Bhutan ‘the mithun bulls were imported to the west from the indigenous mithun breeding regions’. It can indeed be hypothesised that the greater importance attached to the mithun in Dirang is due to the close proximity to the tribes further east. But given the close cultural ties that exist between the Tshangla groups, the mithun might have previously occupied a position in eastern Bhutan similar to that in Kameng described from the 1950s. Aris (1979), though confusing the Dakpa with the Brokpa, notes (footnote 95 to page 51) that the Brokpa guardian deity Ama Jomo Remati has a special association with the mithun. Aris (1979:82) also refers to an interesting account on the origin of the mithun and the jatsha. Certain cultural and historical factors might have been detrimental in the mithun’s decreased importance. Examples include the decreased availability of breeding bulls and the increased dependence on Siri cattle, the reduction in forest cover and thereby feeding grounds for the mithun, the reduction in animals required for religious functions due to the pacifying influence of Buddhism, the demise of a dowry system, the availability of other forms as wealth such as cloth, silver coins and monetisation of the economy.
In eastern Bhutan, the mithun are presently prized sires to interbreed with local siri *B. indicus* cattle. Purebred mithun bulls are crossbred with Siri cows to obtain the highly coveted /jatsha/ and /jatsham/. The Siri-Mithun backcross system is aid to go back at least one century (Phanchung and Roden, 1996). /Jatsha/ are highly valued as draught animals, and /jatsham/ provide more milk with a higher fat percentage than either Siri cows or mithun cows. Jathas are infertile, but the jatshamin is backcrossed with purebred siri bulls and their offspring are called /yanku, yankumin/. Yankumin is backcrossed with siri bulls to get /döp, döbum/, the döbum is backcrossed with Siri bull to get /datra, datram/, datra is backcrossed with siri bull to get /thrabam, thrabamin/, thrabamin is backcrossed with siri bull to get /thrabazing/ and finally /thrabazing/ cow is backcrossed with mithun bull to get /jatsha, jatshamin/. Tanaka et al. (2011) recently warned that as mithun populations decrease, hybridisation with domestic cattle is a destabilising factor in maintaining a pure and viable mithun population.

Mithun and mithun crossbreed cattle outnumber siri and improved cattle varieties in Pemagatshel and Trashigang dzongkhaks. Mithun and mithun crossbreed and other cattle numbers are more or less equal in Monggar and Zhemgang dzongkhaks, whereas siri and improved cattle breeds outnumber the mithun and mithun crossbreed cattle in the remaining dzongkhaks. Every year at the onset of winter, purebred mithun are imported by traders from Dirang, who either barter or sell them to take back home unproductive crossbreed cattle which are slaughtered for meat purposes at the advent of the Tibetan New Year. In an attempt to keep up with a rising demand for mithun bulls for crossbreeding purposes, mithun are also bred at the Erong farm in Trashigang and the Wangdügang farm in Zhemgang.

Perhaps curiously, water buffalo *Bubalus bubalis* thought to have been first domesticated in South Asia around 4,500 BP and introduced to East Asia via Southeast Asia (Flad et al. 2007), were never reared in the wet subtropical zone until the advent of the Nepali immigrants in the 19th century. Despite that a native Tshangla word for water buffalo /brung/ does exist, referring to wild water buffalo *Bubalus arnee*. 
14.6. SYNOPSIS AND CONCLUSION.

Based on the description of agricultural systems, agricultural crops, and the various species of livestock reared by the people of Monyul, and particularly the various names in the vernacular languages, we can pose some hypothesis on the population history of the region.

The ancient people inhabiting the area were fully dependant on the forest for their livelihoods. Names of wild plant and animal species differ greatly from one language to the other, hinting at their highly diverse and localised origin. Migrant groups brought with them new names, which might have replaced the old names, or the existing names might have been retained. Even at present a high variation in these names can be observed between languages, dialects, villages and even households. Names are constantly locally coined, introduced form outside, and finally abandoned. The names of wild plants and animals, therefore, do not offer a useful insight into the population history.

Domesticated dog and pig were introduced to arid northwest China and the Hexi corridor from the east. But wild boar is common throughout mainland Asia, and domestication of pigs might have independently taken place elsewhere as well. A major change occurred with the introduction of broomcorn and foxtail millet from Northern and Central China. These species, thriving well in the subtropical areas, were introduced in the southern Himalayas through south-eastern Tibet or northern Burma. Pigs and millet remains have been found in the Kharro site and are part of the basic shifting cultivation systems all over the southern Himalayas. Whereas pigs and the various millet species share comparable names in most of the languages of the area, there are considerable differences in the vocabulary for domesticated cattle, sheep, goats and horses and the other food grains. A dichotomy can be observed between the Bodish languages and languages that do not fall within this group, such as Tshangla. Proto-Tibeto-Burman roots that can be attested in many of the Tibeto-Burman languages of the area and thus indicate an ancient shared origin in the Tibeto-Burman ancestral homeland may include the lexemes for rice, dog, pig, broomcorn and foxtail millet, deer, bear and rat. Some lexemes appear to originate more towards the south, in the Yunnan-Burma border area, including goral, sweet buckwheat, cattle and tiger. Some words, such as that for cucumber, may
have multiple origins including on the Indian subcontinent. Common buckwheat perhaps originates in southeastern Tibet and spread across the Tibetan plateau and was introduced in the southern Himalayas by the East Bodish speakers. Horses and small ruminants, together with wheat, originate in the Near East and perhaps reached the Tibetan plateau via Central Asia. A second route might have been across the Gangetic and Brahmaputran plains and from there into the southern Himalayan foothills, which might explain the divergent vocabulary of, for example, Tshangla for sheep, wheat and barley. Yak, sharing comparable names in all the Tibeto-Burman languages of the area, were domesticated on and introduced from the Tibetan plateau to the southern Himalayas by Bodish speakers. Finally, some crops originate from the Indian subcontinent and beyond, and were introduced to the people of eastern Himalayas from the south. Since they spread from there to the Bodish people, the names for these crops are comparatively similar. Examples include maize, amaranth, chili and finger millet.

Figure 14.1. Paddy ripe for harvest below Thridangbi village, where double rice crops are harvested, Moiwalungpa, Saleng geok, Monggar dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 14.2. Permanent dryland and shifting cultivation land in Gomdar, Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhag, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 14.3. Full-grown yak bull at Nyingsangla, between Sakteng in Eastern Bhutan and Mokto, Tawang (courtesy Y. Waarts).
CHAPTER 15. ARTS AND CRAFTS OF MONYUL.

The craftsmanship of the people of Eastern Bhutan, western Arunachal Pradesh and Pemakō shows striking similarities that illustrate the historical and cultural ties between these regions. The various forms of craftsmanship in the area developed purely out of a need for items of daily use and were intricately linked with the availability of specific forest resources in a certain area. When allocating time and labour resources, craft production came second to agricultural production, and was mainly an off-farm activity in the winter period between the harvest towards the end of October and the start of soil preparation around February.

After the imposition of central authority across the region, certain craft items became important for the fulfilment of in-kind tax obligations\(^1\). In a society largely devoid of money, taxes were paid either in-kind or in labour. The weaving experience of the Tshangla and Kurtöp women in weaving soon became known among the authorities in central and western Bhutan, and woven cloth became one of the items with which the subjects could fulfil their tax obligations to the central government. The people of Trashiyangtsi fulfilled part of their tax obligations in turned wooden bowls and cups and handmade paper, the people of Bumthang would provide woollen cloth, the people of Kheng would provide woven baskets and the people of Kengkhar would provide /jandom/ ‘wooden alcohol containers’. This resulted in increased allocation of labour resources to craft production at the cost of agricultural production. Although the taxation in general had considerable negative impacts on the demography of certain areas, it also resulted in a continuing refinement of some crafts even to the level of art, as an individual expression of skill and imagination. After abolition of in-kind taxation, the handicraft products have found a ready market, first locally, and now also for sale to the tourists and even export. Handicraft production, though still conducted mainly during the agricultural slack season, has in some communities become an important additional source of cash income.

The crafts can be divided in various categories, based on their specific usages. The most famous craft of the area is weaving of cloth. A historical development of dress styles and the related weaving can be observed which appears to be related to the ethnic

\(^1\) Ref. paragraph 7.3.

and cultural history of the area. Wood craft includes wood masonry for construction purposes, which due to the ample availability of wood in the area is well developed, but will not be discussed here. A more delicate woodworking craft is the production of turned wooden bowls. The production of paper from the bark of certain trees is another well-developed craft. Bamboo and cane are abundant in the temperate and subtropical zones of the area, and, like the various types of wooden bowls, their products of daily use have gained great popularity in the Himalayan region and beyond. Various aromatic and medicinal plant and animal parts are used for the production of some of the finest incense products in the world. The dying art of pottery was once the specialty of certain areas where raw materials were abundant. Iron ore, available in certain locations, is historically and culturally important as it heralded great improvements in the infrastructure but also contributed indirectly to the development of one of the few examples of expressive art in the region. The societies of the region have traditionally been largely oral; as a consequence, works of poetry and prose are very limited. Finally, the virtual absence of songs in the vernacular languages is most intriguing. In Bhutan, weaving, cane craft, wood turning, paper making and blacksmithing are part of the ‘thirteen crafts’. Though less developed, most of these crafts are also practised in Tawang, Kameng and Pemakō (2011: 64-65).

15.1. Weaving.

The historical importance of weaving to sustain the need for clothing, to fulfil the in-kind tax obligations, as an income generator, and as a pastime cannot be underestimated. Weaving and the items associated with it have a prominent place in the traditional khar riddles. Spinning and weaving cotton is a popular craft for women in Pemakō and spinning and weaving wool in the Lekpo area (Zhāng 1997:32-33).

Examples of these, including a concluding verse in which the khar abi ‘khar grandma’ is send off with food items as well as weaving equipment, showing that a woman would never part with them, can be found in Annex X.
15.1.1. MATERIALS.

There are several choices of material used for weaving. The most ancient material is nettle fibre\(^3\). After the introduction of cotton, this became the most popular thread material, and weaving with cotton, though no longer locally produced\(^4\), still takes place. The next material that was introduced from the plains of India was silk, both ƃʃɛ /burse/ or /bura/ ‘raw silk’ and ƃʃɛɛɛ /sershu/ ‘fine/pure silk’. Until the early years of the 20\(^{th}\) century, silk worms were reared and raw silk was locally produced in Eastern Bhutan. Cheap availability of raw silk from India and religious sentiments against the killing of the worms halted this production. Cloth woven from pure silk is the most expensive and is usually reserved for high level government officials and for special occasions such as weddings and festivals. The designs of this cloth are usually the more intricate aikapur bingapa, bizumpa and bigupa meto designs brocaded in a supplementary weft added along with the ground weft\(^5\).

Cloth woven from raw silk was the material from which traditionally the attire of lower government officials and the military were made. The raw silk dress is not easily penetrated by weapons and very insulating. Pure silk and raw silk cloth was not worn by the common people until the late 20\(^{th}\) century, because it was simply beyond their affordability. Instead, these materials and the peculiar, intricate designs associated with them were only worn by the royalty, government officials and the local nobility. The materials were woven by women in Eastern Bhutan and part of the in-kind tax. The common people wore home-made cotton cloth dresses\(^6\). Bure later became the traditional festive and special occasion dress for the more common man unable to afford the pure silk cloth. Although lungserma and aikapur with flower designs can be found in bure too,

\(^3\) Ref. paragraph 15.2.1.
\(^4\) Ref. paragraph 15.2.3.
\(^5\) These designs with respectively three, five, seven and nine ‘legs’ determining the breadth of the bands on a plain background with in between various ‘flower’ designs which is called /rikpa~meto dung/ ‘pick the design/flower’, ref. Baker (1985).
\(^6\) Ref. paragraph 15.1.3 and 15.1.4.
more common are the plain setha and pangtse\(^7\) designs. In the upper valleys, particularly of Bumthang, therma ‘wool’ was a commonly used material for weaving\(^8\). The wool would be obtained from local Bhutanese sheep imported from Tibet or India. Wool is used for the famous Bumthang matha\(^9\) design, but setha and other designs can also be found. Since the early 20\(^{th}\) century, various industrially produced threads were imported from India. In the beginning these were pure cotton, but later the cotton became mixed with synthetic fibres as well. Examples include /tukuli/, /jachen/, /latra/ and /telikoton/ ‘terry-cotton’. These threads were imported dyed by the manufacturer, but often the colour needed to be enhanced by local materials such as the peel of walnuts or powder paint imported from India. The imported thread can be woven into any of the traditional designs and due to their affordability and easiness to wash and dry they have become the preferred material. Due to growing demand and the increasing fashion-consciousness /pesar/ ‘new samples’ are continuously designed. In the 1980s and 1990s imported ready-made material, plain or with design, from India and abroad became popular. The first years of the 20\(^{th}\) century saw an increase in cheap, machine-made Indian materials based on traditional designs. In the past few years, the ever growing demand for clothing material in the more and more affluent Bhutanese society has encouraged the Bodo and Mech people of the plains to weave cloth material specifically for the Bhutanese market, often on special order and in any material, particularly silk.

15.1.2. THE BACK STRAP LOOM.

The weaving practice has its own vocabulary. Weaving traditionally takes place on a back strap loom, and the craft is handed over from mother to daughter. In order to prepare the warp, the thread is wound around /trishing/ ‘warping frame’. This is a /tri dokhang/ ‘warping stick’ half the warping length held in place by a /brang/ ‘stand made of two short thick bamboo posts vertically set into planks’ on both sides. The warp is kept in place by the /tsukpudung/ ‘bamboo stick for keeping the warp’. The warp threads are

\(^{7}\) /setha/ ‘yellow weave’ is usually black and yellow or red checks on an orange background, /pangtse/ are usually black and red checks on a white background.

\(^{8}\) Unlike the other materials, woven on the /pangtha/ ‘back strap loom’, wool is usually woven on the /thritha/ ‘four-shaft floor loom’ introduced from Tibet.

\(^{9}\) /matha/ ‘red weave’ is usually green and blue checks of various sizes on a red background.
alternatively wound over and below the tsukpudung on both sides of the trishing in the case of double or paired warp, creating a lower web and an upper web. This process is called *trishinggi kutpa ren* ‘aligning the thread by using the warping frame’.

The complete two-shaft back strap loom and all its items is called /thakcha/ or more properly /thakcha rai/ ‘back strap loom and accessories’. The back strap loom itself is called pangtha, of which two basic kinds exist. The first is the loom that has a /thakshing/ ‘weaving tree’ or /bi tanpang/ ‘foothold’, a wooden stand that can be disassembled and moved. The thakshing are two vertical timbers standing 1m apart. Between 50 and 150cm above the floor, at intervals of about 20cm, there are 4cm diameter holes through which the beams loaded with the warp are slotted. The thakshing is sometimes immobile, built into the beams of the house or veranda. The second is a loom attached to any place with ropes. This loom is more mobile, but also less stable and thus more difficult to use. The simplicity of the back strap loom means it can be made and used by anyone, doesn’t require high investments, can be adjusted to fit any weaver\(^\text{10}\) and can be set up anywhere\(^\text{11}\).

At the upper end of the loom, the bamboo /mantan/ ‘back or warp rod or beam’ made is fastened in the frame. The mobile loom is attached to a tree or a fixed beam in a house with a rope in the shape of a Y turned upside down. At the lower end of the loom, the finished fabric will be wound around the bamboo /khom/ ‘cloth end rod’. The khom is in two halves, which sandwich together along their length to act as a single circular section of bamboo with a deep notch on each end of each halves. These form the tight gripping mechanism where the /ketha do/ ‘back strap’ is tied on to stop the weaving from slipping. Both mantan and khom need to be long enough to sustain the warp, and to comfortably allow the loom to be stretched between the frame and the weaver. The warp is transferred from the thrishing by holding it with upper and lower bar, and usually a small bamboo /nye/ ‘lease stick or coil rod’ replaces the tsukpudung. The nye has loops encircling each warp end. The nye is sometimes replaced by a lease cord and will keep the warp threads in position. When the shed roll slips out of position, e.g., when the loom is not under

\(^{10}\) Enabling children to learn weaving.  
\(^{11}\) Allowing weavers to use it inside as well as outside, at home or elsewhere.

tension, the lease stick or cord is lifted to form an opening through which the shed roll is slipped into place.

The hollow cane or bamboo stick /shogodong/ ‘shed roll’ divides the warp in half. The shogodong has the same length as the mantan and the khom and maintains the crossing of the warp threads. The /ketha/ ‘back strap’ is fitted around the weaver’s hips and back. It is usually made of plaited bamboo or animal hide reinforced on each end with a wooden hinge and connected to the khom by the ketha do. The warp tension is controlled by the weaver’s body, loosening and tightening by leaning forward and backward respectively. By leaning forward and thus lifting the shogodong, the /shong/ ‘shed’, a temporary separation between the upper and lower warp yarns, will further open, a process call /shong khik/.

The heddle thread is spirally warped around a debarked wooden sick with heddle loops called /wai/ ‘heddle rod’. The wai lifts the alternate threads of the warp. Lifting the warp threads is called /nye la/. The wai is usually intransferrable from weaver to weaver except as heirloom and together with the beater and the upper and lower end rods taken wherever the weaver goes.

The /thakcung/ ‘beater or batten’ is made of heavy wood. The thick rounded top edge tapers to a sharp knife-like edge at the bottom. It is both used to separate alternate threads of the warp to allow the /phun brum/ ‘bobbin’ to pass through them as well and to tighten the weft into the warp. This is called /thakcung thup/. The strength of the person weaving determines whether a piece of fabric is dense or loose, with densely woven fabrics usually much more appreciated. This is why the few male weavers usually obtain good prices for their fabrics. The phun brum is a thin bamboo stick around which the weft is spirally wrapped back and forth. It is usually put inside a hollow bamboo stick called /phun palang/ ‘shuttle’ to ease the passing through the shed from time to time, which is called /phun dup/. If a design has to be brocaded into the warp, called /rikpa dung/, the /sipir/ ‘flat bamboo stick with a sharp point’ or /zumbiga zu/ ‘porcupine quill’ is used to lift the individual warp threads under which the thread, rolled around a bamboo /rikpa dungtsham brum/ is woven. For smaller motives short pieces of thread are sometimes used, pulled until in the middle, and then in subsequent sheds worked equally
until the end of the design. The loose ends are then pushed through to the underside of the cloth. Again the thakcung is used to tighten the design thread into the warp.

15.2. Dress Styles

The indigenous clothing styles and the materials and techniques with which they were made shows a historical development based on climatic zone and ethnic groups. The most ancient dress style was a simple piece of nettle fibre cloth, woven on a back-strap loom and wrapped loosely around the upper part of the body. The nettle was collected in the forest and therefore the only available dress material for the hunter-gatherer societies. The nettle cloth was replaced by cotton cloth after the introduction of the cultivation of this plant in more sedentary agricultural societies. The simple single-cloth dress style was widely distributed in the subtropical zones of the southern Himalayas, and geographically it could at least be found from central Nepal till eastern Arunachal Pradesh. This dress was worn until modern times by the most conservative, traditional and isolated communities. Early migrants from the Tibetan plateau, the ancestors of the current East Bodish speakers, brought a dress style based on the Tibetan chupa for men and a peculiar type of gown, apron or tunic for women. In the 17th century Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyel introduced a distinct dress style to Bhutan that has remained the national dress till the present.

15.2.1. The Nettle or Cotton Cloth.

The ancient dress style of the Monyul region consisted of a rectangular piece of woven nettle fabric. This fabric was woven from yarn produced from the inner bark of *Girardinia diversifolia*, a species of stinging nettle. The exact procedure is unknown, but can be partially reconstructed from the method in which Dakpa women in Thongrong village of Phongme geok, Trashigang, Bhutan, till recently produced woven bags from nettle bark. The fibrous material would first be stripped from nettle stalk and the soft inner bark would be sun-dried for a few days. In order to bleach and soften the fibre, it is boiled for a few hours in water with ash and rinsed with clean water whilst being beaten with a mallet. The fibre is sun-dried once again, and then hand-spun into yarn with a spindle. The coarse yarn is then woven on a back-strap loom into a rectangular piece of fabric and stitched into a bag. These bags are durable and resistant against insect damage.

and used for storage and transportation of agricultural produce such as rice, maize and potatoes. They have now been replaced by jute rice bags imported from India. Similar nettle fibre bags were until the 1980s woven in the Khaling area of Trashigang. The Sherdukpen used to tie a piece of cloth on their back tied at the shoulders made from /hongchong/ ‘nettle’ decorated with a swastika and red, blue and black subsidiary patterns at the back forming a /bogre/ pouch for carrying daily use items.

As a dress item, the nettle fabric would be simply crossed over the chest and knotted at the shoulders, and tied around the waist with a belt. For men, the dress would be worn till knee level, creating a large pouch at the front, and for women till the ankles, creating a smaller pouch. Such a dress made of nettle fibre fabric was until very recently worn by the Monpa of the Black Mountains, where it the nettle is called /kulima/ and the dress called /page/ (Giri 2004:33), with the pouch called /kappa/. Aris (1979: xviii) reported a similar dress from the people of Toktokha, a village in Bongo geok of Chukha dzongkhak called /pakhi/. Van Driem (2004) described the nettle fabric dress of male Lhokpu /pogwi/ worn in similar fashion and tied around the waist with a /pojin/ sash. The lexical similarity between /page ~ pakhi ~ pogwi/ is striking. Nettle cloth has also been reported from Sikkim (Duthie 1960 in Singh and Shrestha 1988). Further to the east, the Puroik males until recently wore a simple loincloth tied with a cane belt at the waist and a nettle cloth covering the upper part of the body, with thread tightly bound over the lower legs. Nettle fabric is still produced by indigenous people of Nepal, perhaps indicating that nettle fabric cloth was once worn there as well.

Although no longer made from nettle fibre, a similar, simple cotton dress is worn by several peoples in the Southern Himalayas even till date. Cotton cloth was obtained from the plains of India, but cotton was until fairly recently also locally cultivated. The native ankle-length Lepcha female dress, /dumdem/, is a single piece of smooth cotton folded over one shoulder, pinned at the other shoulder and held in place with a waistband over which part of the remaining material hangs. The native male dress is knee-length and consists of a multi-coloured hand-woven cloth called /dumprá/, which is pinned together at one shoulder and held in place by a waistband. Nowadays, the /dumdem/ is worn over a long-sleeved blouse, and the /dumprá/ is usually worn over a simple white shirt and
knee-length trousers (Plaisier 1996:3). The Hruso and Dhammai men dress in a cotton cloth wrapped around the body till above the knees, tightened around the waist with a cloth belt, and fastened at one shoulder with a bamboo or metal pin. The Sherdukpen men wear the /sape/, a white piece of cotton or raw silk diagonally across the body and fastened at the shoulders with a knot or bamboo pins. The Bugun male dress is a white cotton cloth worn diagonally, knotted at both the shoulders and tied at the waist with a /phtha/. The Nishi men only wear a white cotton cloth loosely under the right arm and fastened over the left shoulder with a bamboo pin (Chanda 1991).

Curiously, the Relação, a progress report of the travels of the Portuguese Jesuit Father Estêvão Cacella (1585-1630) who visited Bhutan in 1627 on invitation of the Zhabdrung (see Baillie 1999, Aris 1986 footnote 61 to page) seems to indicate that a similar dress made of wool was the customary dress of the people from the temperate zones of western Bhutan. Cacella writes that the people of Bhutan wove ‘very good quality woollen cloth’ and regarding their dress style that ‘their arms are bare and they cover themselves with a woollen cloth from the neck to the knees over which they wrap another cloth like a cape; they wear leather belts very well made buckles’ and that they ‘normally they go barefoot but they also wear leather boots or socks made of their cloth especially when they are travelling’ (Baillie 1999: 31-32). Cacella, unfortunately, does not mention whether this dress style was peculiar to men or also worn by women.

Several additional dress items complement this cloth. The Hruso and Dhammai wear a loin cloth and a jacket called /pol/ (Chanda 1991). The Bugun jacket is called /phutuk/. A white cotton jacket called /khanjer/, the /mukhak/ or woven belt and a loin cloth usually complement the Sherdukpen dress. The Nishi, finally, wear a piece of mithun hide to cover the chest, and the lower garment consists of a loin cloth.

15.2.2. THE SLEEVELESS APRON.

The arrival of migrants from across the Himalayan range marks the introduction of a second dress style better adapted to the colder climatic conditions of the temperate and
alpine zones. For males this dress style are local variations of the Tibetan chupa. For females this dress has been alternatively described as a tunic, a gown or a sleeveless apron. The sleeveless apron consisted of a single rectangular piece of cloth with a hole for the head. In some cases it is open on the sides and is tied only at the waist. In other cases it is stitched on the sides with holes for the arms. The length varies between ankle-length to knee-length with usually sufficient material left to form a pouch where it is tied at the waist. The original material was probably wool or carded wool suitable to the cold climate at higher altitudes. The dress was later made of other materials, notably raw silk and cotton. This dress is, in various forms, till present times worn by some of the people of the area, and was the indigenous dress of the East Bodish people of central and eastern Bhutan, Kameng and Tawang. This type of gown can also be found among the Deng people of northwestern Yunnan, the Gyarong people of northwestern Sichuan, and the people of Kongpo in Tibet, perhaps indicating a common origin somewhere in eastern Tibet.

Among the Dakpa of Eastern Bhutan and Tawang, the Tshangla of Kameng and the Brokpa of Eastern Bhutan, Tawang and Kameng, the dress is called /shingka/ or /shingka metochanma/. The shingka is reddish-pink in colour with white vertical lines. Until the late 20th century the shingka was woven from raw silk dyed with madder in several villages of Eastern Bhutan and it was an important item in the trade with Tawang. Unfortunately, cheaper machine-woven cloth is also replacing this production and the associated trade. A black variety of the shingka was worn in some Dakpa villages, including Thongrong in Phongme geok of Eastern Bhutan. A completely white variety of the shingka called /singku/ is worn by the Sherdukpen and Bugun and the Hruso and Dhammerai women of Kameng. In Kongpo, both men and women wear a black tunic similar to the shingka called /goshup/ (Cai 1981). In Pemakö, the red or brown shingka is similarly called /goshe/ by the Tshangla speakers. The Tshangla speakers of Bhutan call the shingka /guntsuma/ and it was worn until the early 20th century. At the royal courts of Bumthang and Kurtö, the shingka, called /kushung/.

---

12 Ref. paragraph 15.1.3.
13 The singku has only recently replaced the short traditional female Bugun skirt called /yibiyau/.
was worn until the 1930s. Women still wear these kushung during Bon festivals in the Kurtö region.

The Brokpa, Dakpa and Tshangla of Kameng, Tawang and Lekpo complement the shingka with a /juzang tödung/ or short jacket with animal motives and geometric designs unique to this dress, inside which a /tögo/ ‘white raw silk shirt’ or /onjuk/ ‘brightly coloured pure silk shirt’ is worn. The /lhanpa/ or patch, usually a calf or goat skin used for preventing soiling of the dress when sitting down and a /khidep/, /mekhem/ or /pangkhep/ ‘woollen apron worn at the lower back’ also form part of the dress. Under the shingka a /mekri/ ‘a skirt worn as lower garment’ is worn. The short jacket is called /kuyo/ by the Sherdukpen and is also worn by the Dhammai and Hruso women. The Bugun jacket is usually plain white in colour. The waist cloth of the Sherdukpen, Dhammai and Bugun males and females is called the /musheks/ (Sarkar 1980 and Sharma 1960). In Pemakö the goshe was worn on top of short red underwear and a barrel skirt with vertical red, yellow, blue and pink cotton stripes called /meyok/ ‘underwear’ (Zhāng 1997:45).

The shingka thus appears to be a dress style originating in southeastern Tibet that was introduced to the southern Himalayas by the ancestors of the East Bodish speakers now found in the area. Both earlier inhabitants such as the Sherdukpen, Bugun and the Tshangla of Kameng as well as later immigrants such as the Brokpa adopted this dress. The fact that the Tshangla women of Pemakö wear a gown similar to the shingka might indicate that the shingka was worn by the Tshangla women of Eastern Bhutan before the Drukpa introduced the kira.

15.2.3. The Chuba.

The /chuba/, pronounced as [tɕuba] in Tibetan dialects but as [tɕupa] in Tshangla, Dakpa and Brokpa and [tɕupo] by the Sherdukpen15, is the most common dress of the people of the Tibetan plateau. The chuba is worn by both males and females, although the male chuba is worn till knee height and the female chuba till ankle height. The chuba

---

15 Sherdukpen men sometimes wear the Dakpa style chuba instead of the indigenous sape.
usually has long sleeves and is tied under the right arm, and fastened around the waist with a woven belt. Nomadic people usually wear sheepskin chubas, whereas wool and cotton chubas are more common for sedentary agriculturists, and silk chubas are worn by the nobility. A sleeveless chuba called /treche/ is worn by monks. The chuba worn by women in central Tibet is a wrap-around dress comparable to a jumper in American English or a pinafore dress in British English. Women generally wear the chuba with a short, square and complementary-coloured paler, blouse /onjuk/. Often, the collar of the blouse is folded outside the diagonal closing of the outer garment to form a cuffed border resembling a shawl collar.

From the Tibetan plateau, the chuba was probably introduced to Monyul after the Tibetan empire disintegrated. Although it was the dress of the ruling elite descending from Tibetan aristocracy in most areas, in some places it never replaced the traditional dress of the earlier settlers. The Brokpa and Dakpa of Eastern Bhutan, Tawang and Kameng wear an adaptation of the chuba (Bhattacharjee 1991). The /thokham chupa/ is a rough, thick, woolen, dark brown or red madder-dyed dress worn till the hip. In Pemakö, males used to wear a similar red or black woollen chuba in the temperate areas (Zhâng 1997: 45) or a cotton plain white cotton or Bhutanese style vertically-striped chuba in the subtropical areas (Rustomji 1983: plate 22). The Brokpa and Dakpa would complement the chupa with a white raw silk shirt called /khanjar lingsa/, /kanggo/ ‘short white woolen trousers’ and /pishup/ ‘leather leg guards’. An essential part of the Brokpa and Dakpa dress, commonly worn by males but sometimes also by females, is the /paktsa/ ‘skin’. This is usually the skin of a large animal like a takin or two smaller serows, goral, yak calves or goats sewn together. This skin is very practical it insulates against the cold in winter, with the fur turned to the inside, as well as against the heat during summer, with the leather turned to the inside. The skin also protects against the rain and when climbing trees and rocks. In Merak and Sakteng there even exists a full knee-length chupa made completely from sewn skins.

The woollen chuba worn by the Dakpa and Brokpa was unsuitable for the warmer subtropical climate of the lower valleys and hills inhabited by the Tshangla. Two distinct dress styles have been observed from the lower lying areas. Probably under the influence
from the Ahom and Assam kingdoms, the Tshangla of Kalaktang commonly wore /dorma/ ‘white raw silk or cotton pants’ that became known to the Tibetans as mon dar. On top of this, they wore a /khenjar/ or /sapo/ ‘diagonally closing raw silk or brocade jacket’. The Tibetan and Dakpa style chuba was only worn on special occasion. In Eastern Bhutan, Tibetan influence on the Tshangla influenced their dress style, and the men wore a local cotton adaptation of the chuba commonly known as /mondre chupa/ ‘chuba made from cloth cut for making a robe from Mon’ or /mondre khamung/, in which khamung is the generic term for ‘clothing’ in Tshangla. Producing this cloth used to be a laborious and time-consuming process but also reflected the locally available resources. The basic material was /mongan/, or cotton (*Gossypium* spp.). This plant used to be extensively cultivated in the lower lying areas along the Gongri, Kuri, Gamri and other rivers of Eastern Bhutan.

The cotton seeds were sown in the second month of the Bhutanese calendar after ploughing and tilling the land and would take four to 15 days to germinate. After the plants reached a height of around 30 centimetres, they would be pruned and thinned. After reaching a height of around 90 centimetres to 1.20 meters, the plants would flower and then after three to five weeks the bolls would develop which could then be harvested. In total it would require a frost-free growing season of four to six months and a lot of sunshine as well as enough moisture, but the soil and roots should be allowed to dry again. This made the lower-lying parts of Eastern Bhutan’s river valleys ideal for cotton cultivation. The plants would survive for more than one growing season.

After harvesting cotton, a simple device called a /thrishing/ consisting of two wooden planks would allow the cotton to move through whereas the seeds would be left behind. This ginning is called thrishing gi mongan runi lung shole, ‘to remove the seeds by rubbing the cotton through a thrishing’ or mongan dang lung braibe or pakpe ‘to separate the seeds from the cotton’. The cotton then had to be washed and dried. Then a small bamboo bow was used to purify the mass of cotton by removing the remaining dirt and plucking the cotton till fluffy. This carding is called mongan ligi gapni thipe nyi mongan pitsa dang bololo ngam thungkai mukpa drabu cospe ‘to hit the cotton with a bow to make it clean and fluffy like clouds in the sky’. This process created a fine white dust.

The raw cotton fibre would then be spun to a /kutpa/ thread by using a /yokpa/ ‘spindle’. This is called yokpa gi mongan jatpe, ‘to spin cotton with a spindle’. This string would then be refined, made thinner and spun into a /putang/ ‘hank’ by using a /sonaring/ ‘spinning wheel’ called sonaring gi putang cospe ‘to make a hank with a spinning wheel’. An adapted and modernised version of the sonaring is still used today all over Bhutan. This hank would then be made into a skein by using a /jinang/ ‘niddy-noddy’ called putang jinang gi dangni kutpa dangdang rile ‘to make a skein from a hank by using a niddy-noddy’. This skein could then be washed, boiled in water with maize flour to increase strength, and coloured with natural dyes called kutpa asham bukpi ga koibe ‘to boil a skein in ground maize’. The skein would then be wound into a /lomnang/ ‘ball of thread’ with a /yumdang/ ‘swift’ called yumdang gi kutpang lomni lomnang rile ‘to wind thread into a ball of thread with a swift’. This lomnang would be ready for weaving.

Several designs of cotton cloth existed. The /kamthama chuba/ was woven from the off-white cotton thread without any further processing, with both the warp and the weft white, and was the daily attire for most men. The material for other versions of the mondre chuba, however, underwent a more complicated procedure. The cotton thread was washed, dried and coloured with dye made from /yangkhagpa–yangshaba/ ‘Strobilanthes flaccidifolius’, which gives a black colour, and /lanimeto–laniru/ ‘Rubia cordifolia’ which gives a red colour. To retain colour, the thread was also soaked in /khekhoptang/ ‘the peel of walnut Juglans regia’, only for black thread, /khomnang/ ‘Choenomeles lagenaria’ or /roptangshing/ ‘Rhus simialata’. The weaver would then weave the cloth on the back strap loom into various designs depending on the area and the taste of the weaver. In Phongme /kosampa/ and /kongapa/ would be woven by weaving a pattern of alternating white, black and red weft on a white warp background. In Ramjar, single /mondre khamung/ or double /kosampa/ black and red weft would be woven into a white warp background. In general, there would be no pang or coloured thread design in the warp due to the time this would consume.

By the late 1940s and early 1950s both the increased import of thread from India as well as the import of modern, western dress such as pants and shirts quickly out-favoured the mondre khamung. The time-consuming process of preparing and dyeing the thread
steadily became replaced by first Indian made cotton thread, slowly being replaced by (latra) and finally by terry cotton. At the same time, designs such as setha and matha were no longer reserved for the elite and thus the common man could also wear them. Neither the cotton chupa nor its designs can be seen in Bhutan anymore. Whereas Eastern Bhutan less than 60 years ago was still self-sufficient in clothing, this has now changed to a situation in which the thread, the dye, and in some cases even the weavers are Indian.

15.2.4. THE G’O AND KIRA.

The male dress /g’o/, Tshangla /chupa/, /phogo/ or /go/ and the female dress /kira/, Tshangla /thara/ or /mogo/ are the national dress of Bhutan that has to be compulsory worn in government buildings, official gatherings and festivities and any other occasion when the national flag of the country is hoisted. The go and kira are conscious adaptations of the Tibetan chuba and the local dress introduced by Zhabdrung Ngawang Namgyal in the 17th century. The adaptations, including the style of wearing just above the knees whereas the Tibetan chuba is usually worn higher, the larger front pocket, and the introduction of the white /tego/ with /lagey/ ‘white cuffs’ and /gong/ ‘white collar’, were made to distinguish the culture of his adopted homeland Bhutan from that of Tibet. The report by Cacella (in Baillie 1999:31-32) also indicates that the go and kira were not yet the standard dress in Bhutan by 1627. In Tshangla, /khamung/ or /khamung sari/ ‘dress items, apparel’ refers to the go and kira but also includes the /sari/ ‘colourful cloth used to carry babies and other things on the back’ or ‘ceremonial scarf introduced by the Zhabdrung to show respect for authority’. The sari for men is a 2½ to 3 meter long, 50 cm wide cotton or raw silk piece of cloth hung diagonally from the left shoulder below the right hip, and for women the sari is an embroidered red scarf hung over the left shoulder.

16 From /g’o/ ‘male dress’.
17 From /thara/ ‘woven piece of cloth’. The word thara is rapidly falling in disuse, being increasingly replaced by the word kira.
18 From /mogo/ ‘female dress’.
19 Ref. paragraph 15.2.1.
All cloth meant for making either the go or the kira is woven in /jang/ ‘strips of fabric’ of approximately 50cm wide and 250cm long. Three strips together provide the fabric for one male or female dress and are called a /bup/. The warp in a jang for a go will always be worn vertically, running from head to toe. The warp in a jang for a kira will always be worn horizontally. As a result, for exceptionally tall or fat men, the size of the cloth woven on the back strap loom can be adjusted, making the strips longer than the usual 2½ metres by using a longer trishing, thus obtaining more material to increase the size of the go in either height or width. Although the amount of cloth wrapped around the body for a kira could be increased by making a longer jang, thus allowing for fatter women, making a kira wider than 1½ metres to allow for taller women would be difficult, since the width of the mantan and khom is a limiting factor.

For a kira the three strips of a bup are simply sewn together and wrapped around the body, fastened at the shoulders with koma ‘decorated metal pins’. Below the kira a meyok and ‘onjuk are worn and on top of the kira a tôgo\(^{20}\). The kira is fastened around the waist with a two meter long /chudang/ ‘belt’. This belt used to be around 40 centimetres wide, with motives woven into the first and last 80 centimetres, with a plain middle part folded lengthwise in three and wrapped around the waist. Nowadays, the women’s belt is usually only slightly wider than then man’s chudang, not folded anymore, and will have a design only on one side. For a go, the cloth is tailored into what most closely resembles a Japanese kimono or a bathrobe. Inside the go a white tôgo will be worn, and the cuffs of the tôgo will be folded approximately 15 centimetres over the cuffs of the go. The go is also fastened at the waist by a 2½ meter long, 8 centimetres wide /chudang/ ‘belt’, plain in design, with horizontal warp in bright colours. Above the belt a /khanang/ ‘pouch’ is formed at both front and back, used to store and carry everything and anything and a /chowang/ ‘dagger’ for males or a /khaci/ ‘penknife’ for females is usually tucked away inside the pouch under the belt.

The chudang is not woven on a back strap loom but on a tablet loom (ref. e.g., Thomas 1993, Colingwood 1991). In tablet weaving square tablets are used with a hole in each corner. The number of tablets varies from 30 to 100. The tablets vary in size from 4x4 to 6x6 centimetres and the tablets in one pack are all roughly the same size. The

---

\(^{20}\) All similar to accessories to the Brokpa and Dakpa shingka, ref. paragraph 15.2.2.
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tables were traditionally made from leather, which lasts long but also rubs the warp threads and are hard to turn. Nowadays more innovative materials are used, that last less long but are easier to work with, such as cardboard, playing cards, x-ray photo paper or telephone recharge vouchers. The weaving is warp-faced and the designs are determined by the warping colour or weaving sequence. The loose end cords on either side of the chudang are ‘prema shong’ ‘corded’ by a rapid rolling action between the hand palms, overtwisting one thread and allowing it to twist back on itself and then overtwisting the second thread, stretching them out and releasing them as a cord.

15.2.5. Hairstyle and Headwear.

In addition to the dress styles described in the preceding paragraphs, we can also find various types of hairstyle and head gear worn by the people of the area. In Arunachal Pradesh, cropping the hair in a knot on top of the hat is a very popular and peculiar hair style of the men of many of the tribes. The early exonym given to the Idu Mishmi, Chulikata, literally means ‘cropped hair’. The Bugun, Hruso and Dhammai used to wear their hair tied in a top knot and the Nishi also kept their hair long and in a/podum/, cropped on top of the head just above the forehead. The Puroik men used to wear their hair in a top knot decorated with a long wooden or bamboo pin, bear’s hair and hornbill feathers. The Bugun story how the top knot represents the gourd from which the Bugun people were born in presented in Elwin (1993:110-112). The Dhammai tell another story (Elwin 1993:115) explaining the origin of the top know among the Dhammai and the short hair of the Lamas. The male Dakpa, Tshangla and Brokpa and other people of Bhutan will wear their hair short, usually above the eyebrow, above the ears, and above the nape of the neck. For most women, the hair is kept long, till over the shoulders. Tibetan-style braids were and are popular in areas were Tibetan aristocratic migrants seized control, including among most of the Bodish people of Bhutan, Tawang and Kameng. The 17th century saw the gradual dispersal of a pixie-style, short haircut for women in the areas were Drukpa rule was imposed which persisted until the late 20th century. As with the dress style, this was probably a conscious divergence from the Tibetan hairstyle which was created to accentuate the difference between the Drukpa and their Tibetan neighbours.
In Arunachal, cane hats decorated with beaks of the hornbill, called /musgera/ by the Hruso and Dhammai and also popular among the Nishi and Puroik continue to be a compulsory part of the male festive dress. Concerns about the impact of this headgear on the dwindling population of hornbills, the state animal, has recently resulted in legislation promoting the use of wooden substitutes. The Hruso and Dhammai priests wear decorated white round caps made of palm leaf. A similar tall round hat, traditionally of palm leaf, is worn by the Bugun and Sherdukpen on special occasions. It is called /khthung/ in Sherdukpen and /khthung khleng/ in Bugun. The Lepcha traditional hat, now rarely seen, is made of bamboo and rattan strips and is cone-shaped with a narrow brim (Plaisier 1996:3). For the common people of Bhutan, the only headgear is a flat bamboo hat as protection against the sun during agricultural work.

The /zhamo tshering kingkhor/ /jorzham/ or /gorzham/ of the Brokpa, the /jamuk/ of the Dakpa, the /tsitpu mukhuling/ of the Tshangla of Kameng and the /gurdam/ of the Sherdukpen is the traditional yak hair felt skullcap with five protruding tassels. A variety of this, taller and with 21 tassels, is worn by the Brokpa of Mago and Thingbu. The Dakpa of Lekpo and Pangchen are distinguished by their round caps with a brown top, red bottom, and an orange folded brim with an opening above the right eye. Among the Dakpa of Tawang, the /jor/ or /dung/ ‘two-pronged brocade hats’ of the Kongpo and Lhoka region of Tibet have also gained popularity in recent years. Solanki and Chutia (2004) also mention the /yangcha/, a hat worn by females in Kameng and Tawang at festive occasions decorated with monkey fur, and two types of hat for males and females decorated with the fur of jungle cat.

15.2.6. LEGWEAR, ORNAMENTS AND TATTOOS.

The Brokpa and Dakpa used to wear protective leather leg guards and leather and felt boots called /palham/ or /tshanglham/. Dakpa, Tshangla and Brokpa women would wear silver necklaces with shells, /zi/ ‘cat’s eye onyx’, turquoise and coral as well as /along/ ‘large golden earrings’ and smaller earrings as well as rings around the fingers. Earrings and finger rings with turquoises were also worn by men. In the subtropical areas, the Tshangla, Dhammai, Hruso, Bugun, Sherdukpen and Nishi all used to go barefoot, but later /teptem/ ‘flip-flops’ and /rilam/ ‘gum boots’ became more
popular. The Hruso and Dhammai used to tie a cloth leg guard called /damdim/ just below the knee with strings, and the Nishi used to tie cane rings on their lower legs, both as protection against snake bites.

Hruso and Dhammai women and Bugun men and women wore large vase-shaped silver earrings. Hruso, Bugun and Dhammai women also donned a fillet of silver chain on the head, and necklaces with jade beads, silver coins and other stones. Among the Nishi, Dhammai, Hrusso and Bugun both men and women wear bead necklaces, including glass beads that figure prominently among the other tribes of Arunachal. For all men, the dao or machete is an integral part of the dress. Additionally, Dhammai often carry a decorated bear skin belt diagonally across the torso. The colourful cotton bag woven by the Dakpa and Sherdukpen is called the /daung/ in Dakpa or /arancõ/ in Sherdukpen.

Facial tattoos used to be common among certain tribes of the Eastern Himalayas, including both males and females among the Naga and Wanchoo, the Turung women of northwestern Yunnan and the Apatani, Hruso and Dhammai women. The facial tattoos of the Hruso and Dhammai consist of a straight line from the forehead till the bridge of the nose and an arrow pointing upwards on the chin. Because of these tattoos and the habit of using black sooth to paint their faces black, the Tibetans called them the /’lo khanak/ ‘black mouthed ’Lo’.

15.3. Wooden Bowls and Similar Items.

Making turned wooden bowls is a craft traditionally the expertise of the Dakpa. That this craft is not only popular among the Dakpa of Tawang, but also in Lekpo (Cai 1981: 137), Zhâng 1997:31) and in Trashiyangtse shows the close cultural connection between the Dakpa and Dzala people of the area. The turned wooden products range from small cups for drinking liquor called /gurbu/ in Tshangla, /gurku/ in Dakpa, ḋāṇţ /phôp/ in Dzongkha and ḋāṇţ /phorpa/ in Tibetan, to large wooden bowls with lid called /dapa/. The most valued cups are lined with silver inside and along the lower rim. Traditionally, the silver obtained from three 5.2 gram silver Tibetan tangka coins could line the inside of a single cup. The best quality antique cups are still believed to protect the owner against poisoning by discolouring or producing bubbles.

The cups and bowls are usually made from the wood of Rhododendron spp. and Cyclobalanopsis spp. Most prized are the bowls made from /za/ or /bou/, the underground
and sometimes above ground burl (bur) of a tree, which often have the finest and most intricate grains. The burls are cut into a rough shape, cleaned, boiled and dried and then turned into shape with a foot-peddled lathe. The traditional tools are increasingly being replaced by equipment powered by electricity. The range of products also expands as more innovative products are made depending on local and tourist demand. As a result of high demand and production, supply of the raw material is increasingly limited, and most wood is now brought from Central and Western Bhutan. Shazo or wood turning is one of the 13 traditional arts and crafts of Bhutan.

The people of Kengkhar geok under Monggar dzongkhak are renowned for the production of the /tsheden palang/, also called /jandom/, a cylindrical wooden container with silver decorations. These palang are used for storing and transporting 1½ litres of distilled liquor, and one pair is a compulsory item in each household since it is from the palang that arra is to be served to important guests, and whenever arra is taken as a gift it is traditionally presented in the palang.

15.4. PAPER PRODUCTION.

Traditional paper making is another expertise of the Dakpa people. The traditional paper is made from the bark of *Edgeworthia spp.* and *Daphne spp.* trees. The bark is stripped from the branches and transported to the production unit. The bark is soaked in water to clean it and then dried in the sun. Once it is dried, the outer hard layer of the bark is peeled off leaving only the soft inner tissue of the bark that is again soaked in water. This soft fibre is then put in a big cauldron with ash-water and boiled for several hours. The boiled fibre is beaten into with pulp heavy wooden hammers. The mixture is then poured onto a cane or mesh screen and dried in the sun. Once dry, the thin sheet of translucent paper is peeled off. These paper sheets were traditionally in high demand in Tibet as they were used for printing the religious Buddhist scriptures as well as any official correspondence and notifications. The paper contains natural insect repellents thus enabling long storage as long as it is in a cool and dry environment. This quality of the paper lent it the name /duksho/ 'poison paper', although in Bhutan it is generally known as /desho/. Beside Trashiyangtsi and Tawang, some papermaking households could be found in Trongsa. Paper was one of the products that had to be supplied as tax to the
central government in Trongsa through the Zhonggar Dzong and to the central
government in Lhasa through Tawang and Tshona (Zhāng 1997:33).

15.5. BAMBOO AND CANE CRAFT.

The various species of bamboo and cane are some of the most important and widely used
non-timber forest products in the forests of the southern Himalayan slopes. They are
widely available and serve multiple purposes, including food. Many daily use items are
made from bamboo and cane, and some of the bamboo and cane products were bartered
or sold until the introduction of cheap industrially produced alternatives. In Bhutan,
bamboo and cane craft is called /tshakzo/.

15.5.1. CANE WEAVING.

The cane craft, particularly the weaving of /bangcung/ baskets, is the exclusive territory
of the Tshangla people. In Trashigang, Pasaphu under Kangpar geok is the main
bangcung weaving area, whereas in Zhemgang the Tshangla speakers of Joka brought the
craft with them from where it spread to nearby Kheng communities. The Tshangla
speakers of Pemakö brought the craft with them from Bhutan (Zhāng 1997: 32-33). The
products produced in Pasaphu are generally considered to be of a higher standard and
quality than the Joka products, a fact which is generally reflected in their price. Although
the bangcung was and still remains the main product, a wide variety of household utensils
was made, which is now quickly being replaced by items woven for sale as souvenirs.
Traditional items include zem ‘basket’, palang, tangka bangcung ‘large round basket with
lid used for presenting offerings during occasions of official and religious nature’, /sore/
‘arrow quivers’, /jazham/ ‘round slightly conical bamboo hat’ and /poi palang/ ‘incense
container’.

15.5.2. BAMBOO PRODUCTS: THE CASE OF THONGRONG.

Weaving of bamboo products is famous from several localities, including the Sephu area
in Wangdü Phodrang, Narphung in Samdrup Jongkhar, and Thongrong under Phongme
geok of Trashigang. Zhāng (1997: 32-33) reports that the Dakpa of Lekpo and the
Tshangla of Metok also produce bamboo products. The people of the village of
Thongrong heavily depend on various species of bamboo for their livelihoods. For as
long as the first settlers of Thongrong arrived there from Tawang in India sometime in the 19th century, they have been weaving a wide variety of bamboo products that found a market in many parts of eastern Bhutan as well as adjoining areas of Arunachal Pradesh in India.

The most popular species of bamboo used for weaving a myriad of products is called /rhui/ in Dakpa, Bumthang and Kheng, /bâ/ in Dzongkha and /shi/ in Tshangla and has Borinda grossa as scientific name. This species is found in wetter temperate mixed coniferous forests, often associated with hemlock, at altitudes of 2600 - 3200 metres in central and eastern Bhutan. It is an evergreen species with hermaphrodite organs, forming large clumps from which the canes shoot. This enables other tree and plant species to germinate in between the clumps, thus not affecting regeneration. The canes have level nodes, thin walls and long internodes and split easily, thus making them one of the economically most important non-timber forest products in Bhutan. Other species of bamboo that are less often used are for example /sa–tshezhu–sazhu/, Tshangla /yur/ ‘Arundinaria racemosa’, used for making the shafts of arrows and tools for weaving, /’pung/ Tshangla /rachu–rashi/ ‘Chimonobambusa callosa’ used for mats, baskets, roofing and fencing, /’phat/, /tsigsum/ and /nyungma/.

The rhui resource can be found in various areas above Thongrong village including the holy Tshongtshongma peak, but most popular sites for collection are Wangneng which is a two hour walk from Thongrong and Shukpoteng which requires a three to four hour walk. The bamboo harvesting season starts on the 26th day of the 10th Bhutanese month and continues till the 6th or 7th Bhutanese month. The period between the 7th and the 10th month is /ridam/ ‘closure for collection’ since it is the main growing season for the bamboo and new stems and branches develop. Usually during the first Bhutanese month harvesting is also limited. The bamboo collected early in the season (between the 10th and the 12th Bhutanese month) is called /jaket/ or /damnang/ and is soft and easy to use. The outer part of the immature first year canes is used for the larger products that require greater strength and sturdiness, e.g. /’blo/ and /zhong/, whereas the inner part is used for the finer products, e.g. /dala/, /jatsa/ and /tsirmin/. The innermost layer is too soft to use and is discarded, the tender shoots consumed by humans and the leaves are used as fodder for cattle and made into brooms. After the dry winter season the top of the culms
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split, and the culms become hard and easily breakable and these are called /gorket/ or /gordum/. Collection of the bamboo usually takes a complete day. After collection the inner and outer layers of the culms are separated. The time required for weaving these products depends on the product and whether the bamboo is ready for weaving or has to be prepared first. If the bamboo is ready it would take from an hour for a runi to three to four days for a ‘blo.

The different types of carpets and their uses include (Dakpa names with Tshangla names in brackets): /'blo/ (/lo/) ‘big mat used for drying grains such as un-husked rice and maize outside’, /'blocung/ (/tsanta lo/) ‘smaller mat kept suspended above the kitchen fire to dry un-husked rice, wheat and soybeans’, /cher/ (/tsugi/) ‘mat used for walls and roofing, mostly of cowsheds and other temporary shelters’, /reba/ (/redang/) ‘mat used for fencing’, /'lem/ (/yap redang/) ‘mat used to prevent the wind from entering the attic of the house’, /bamdar/ (/bamdar/) ‘mat used for inside ceiling of the house’. The various types of storage baskets and containers include: /bren/ (/rung/ or /yom/) ‘big basket for storage of rice, maize, millet and other grains widely cultivated’, /brencung/ (/rung/ or /yom/) ‘smaller sized bren, usually for storing buckwheat, wheat, amaranth, barley and other less commonly used grains’, /khomp/ or /shompa. (/shoma/ or /sho/) ‘smaller basket or container with or without lid to keep grains’, /kyala/ (/shoma/) ‘square container for keeping dried or fermented grains’, /sopsa/ (/yu shoma/) ‘container with lid to keep grains for fermentation’, /phitung/ (/tongtsi/) ‘container with lid for keeping lunch, thread and other small household items’, /kum/ (/bangcung/) ‘small container for carrying the lunch for one person’, /'tung/ (/tung/) ‘long basket with lid keeping cloth, religious scriptures etc.’ The different baskets used for carrying things include the /phrokpa/ (/phrokpa/) ‘basket to carry a wide variety of things on the back’, /zhong/ (/rong/) ‘basket for carrying firewood’; /mepzhong/ (/derong/) ‘basket for carrying leaves (especially of oak and pine trees) used in cowsheds and for mulching and manure’. Other products include the /dala/ (/dala/) ‘winnowing pan used for husking rice and maize’, /phekema/ (/chergen/) ‘sieve used for separating different diameters of ground maize and other flours’, /shui/ (/runi/ or /rundi/) ‘belt for carrying loads on the head’, /jatsa/ (/jatsa/) ‘tea leaf strainer’, /khaikhet/ (/khaicin/) ‘strainer for bangchang (fermented grains)’, /tsirmin/ (/tsirma/) ‘strainer for /shiengmar/ (/shingsi/) or butter made from the seeds of
In the not-so-distant past the Thongrongpa used to trade their bamboo products all across the region as far as Godama in the south, Yadi and Drametsi in the west, Dirang and Bomdila in the east and Trashiyangtsi and Tawang in the north. Some weavers used to take their products to the various villages and exchange them there for food grains and other necessities, whereas others would wait for the yearly Gom Kora Tshechu to barter or sell their products there. Already around 20 years ago the market became limited, since increasing population and thus more demand against a limited production simply meant that the products were sold out sooner. At the same time the weavers became less willing to walk great distances to sell their produce, and transportation by vehicle was simply too expensive. The bamboo craft however remained the main source for food grain security as well as cash income and therefore the livelihood of the people of Thongrong.

Presently, several factors threaten the very livelihood of the people in Thongrong, resulting in a trend of outward migration, as labourers in the Public Works Department and more recently to resettlement areas in southern Bhutan. First of all, the availability of cheap, mass-produced goods from India that have been penetrating and taking over the market; and secondly the mass die-back of the bamboo resource in the past two years. The market is now saturated with cheap plastic carpets, baskets, buckets, bags, backpacks, containers, sieves and strainers. In 2006 a ‘blo cost Nu. 400/- if bought from Thongrong and could fetch up to Nu. 1,200/- at Gom Kora Tshechu, a ‘blocung was sold for Nu. 120/- to 180/- and a khomp sold at Nu. 120/- to 150/-. This includes the fee paid to the Department of Forest of Nu. 50/- per head-load of bamboo and Nu. 210/- for the permit to transport the products. Indian-made plastic sheets and carpets are sold for Nu. 150/- for the smaller size to Nu. 400/- to 500/- for the bigger sizes and buckets are sold ranging Nu. 60/- to 100/-. Besides this price difference, it is simply the changing taste and preference of people, preferring ‘modern’ imported products over ‘backward’ and ‘outdated’ local products, that has greatly reduced demand. At present, ‘blo, bren and khomp are more or less the only products woven and sold regularly, and that also mainly

*Parasassafras confertiflora*, /thekpa/ (/thakpa/) ‘rope’, /tsertamp/ (/brang phaktsam/) ‘broom’, /phrum/ (/phrum/) ‘small cupboard for drying meat whilst preventing birds and flies from consuming it’, and finally /ramp/ (/rampa/) ‘dried bamboo sticks used for lighting when travelling’.
in Radi, Shongphu, Bidung and Bartsham geog only. An added disadvantage is that, unlike the bangcung and other baskets and containers woven in Kangpara and Kheng areas, the products woven in Thongrong do not have as much decorative value and are therefore not sold as souvenirs.

A more recent and serious problem is the fact that *rhui* as a species is subject to periodic flowering. Since most of the culms energy has to be directed to producing flowers and seeds, this is usually followed by a massive ‘dieback’ of the species. Though some culms might actually die, most are just so exhausted that they will not look good and cannot be harvested for a few years. In 2006, Meme Khou from Thongrong village, who was then 98 years old, remembered such an event taking place but could not remember the exact year. In 2004 the *rhui* started flowering in the Tawang area to the northeast of Thongrong. Towards the end of 2005 this flowering reached the Tshongtshongba and Thongrong areas, first above Bemteng and later in the adjoining areas. This flowering cycle spread westward, and by 2011 it had reached the bamboo-craft area of Sephu in Wangdü Phodrang. If left alone and not disturbed, many culms will recover and grow back from the roots after several years. If disturbed, for example by browsing cattle, only the seeds will be able to result in re-growth of the species. In some areas the bamboo has already reached knee-height and the local people expect that within eight to ten years the bamboo will reach the original height and weaving can resume again. Until that time, the people of Thongrong will have to rely on other sources of income for their livelihood. It can only be hoped that before that time the village will not become completely empty, and that with the people the bamboo weaving skill and craft will not altogether disappear.

### 15.6. Incense Making.

The Dakpa of Tawang and adjoining areas have a long tradition of incense making. In recent years, incense production has sprouted up all over Bhutan and Tawang and has become a profitable business for many people. Many producers now depend on imported raw materials and use machines for the production of a wide range of incense varieties which are sold both nationally as well as find a ready market abroad. The Dakpa of Thongrong village under Phomge geog of Trashigang Dzongkhag, /pötrang/ incense sticks are produced completely by hand according to a centuries old formula and with

locally available tools. The main ingredient of the incense sticks is /shukposeng/ Juniper recurva. The wood of this tree is obtained from high altitude areas on the border between Sakteng, Tawang and Thongrong and is mostly sold by the Brokpa herders from Sakteng. Other ingredients include /sulu/ Rhododendron ciliatum, /balu/ Rhododendron setosum, düzang and gabor. Blocks of shukposeng are attached to an arm which is in turn attached to a rotating wheel. The wheel is, much like a water-turned prayer wheel, is made to turn by the water of a small stream and in this manner the wooden block is ground on a flat rock until it becomes a paste. This paste is dried to a powder and then mixed with the ground other ingredients. The bark of a tree called /dongtseeseng/ is added as a natural glue and then water is added to make a paste. This paste is pressed through a device attached to the wall, comparable to the machine used to make puta or buckwheat spaghetti in Bumthang, and the resulting strings of incense are cut in one arm span length and dried. They are then packed in bamboo and sold.

15.7. POTTERY.

The production of stone and clay cooking pots is a craft which has almost disappeared due to the availability of cheap industrial substitutes made of aluminium and other metal alloys. The Tshangla people were known for producing cooking pots in various sizes and shapes from red and yellow sand mixed into clay, moulded into shape and dried by wind and fire. The clay pots are used for cooking rice, making tea and curry and distilling alcohol. The taste of food prepared in clay cooking pots is generally believed to be better, which is why there is some demand from the new urban elite in Bhutan. The earthenware craft is presently limited to a few producers in Gangzur geok in Lhuntsi and among the Black Mountain Monpa. Among the last group, the craft is now actively promoted by the Tarayana Foundation as a means for cash income generation. The Dakpa were more famous for producing flat round pans made from grey sandstone used for making buckwheat pancakes as well as stone mortars and pestles. Clay and stone cooking pot making has almost disappeared in Pemakö as well (Zhâng 1997: 30).
15.8. **BLACKSMITHING**

In several places in eastern Bhutan, remains can be found of iron ore which are called /perkhi/ ‘iron stool’ in Tshangla. Examples include Barshong in Khaling geok, Trashigang, and on the hill from Shalikhar Dzong till Senang in Pemagatshel. Until the import of cheap iron and iron products from India, iron-containing rock was melted and the iron was removed in a traditional process. The iron was mainly used for making knife and sword blades. The ‘pool’ or depression were the iron ovens were located is still called /gartsang/. Iron production in Barshong continued until the late 20th century, but has now been completely abandoned. A few blacksmiths and silversmiths till recently provided their services during the agricultural off-season in Pemakô (Zhâng 1997:33). Blacksmithing or /garzo/ and silver- and gold ornament making or /tröko/ are two of the 13 traditional arts and crafts of Bhutan.

15.9. **ORAL TRANSMISSION**

In most societies lacking a written script, the expressive arts like songs and dances and oral storytelling are important means of keeping history alive. The people of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon had no indigenous script and literature. Tibetan literature, including the story of Khandro Drowa Zangmo, the epic of Ling Gesar, the stories of Tshongpön Norbu Zangpo and others were reasonably well known. The evening time was traditionally the time for telling tales: stories about trade, pilgrimage, religion, religious, heroes as well as fables. The arrival of electricity and other modern entertainment have greatly reduced the story culture. Many of the old stories are no longer remembered, and with them part of the culture has disappeared.

A very curious feature is the practical absence of traditional songs in Tshangla. The Brokpa and Chocangaca have a reasonably well developed vernacular song culture, although it is often difficult to determine whether the song is in the vernacular language, or in Chôke or Dzongkha. Dakpa has a limited number of traditional vernacular songs. For unknown reasons, no vernacular Tshangla songs composed prior to the late 1970s are remembered, except for the khore songs of Dungsam. At festive occasions only Chôke or Dzongkha songs are sung. Perhaps during the difficult years from the middle of the 17th century till the middle of the 20th century there was no time or occasion to celebrate with
songs and dance, and the old songs were forgotten. Perhaps the Chöke songs, with their usually religious content, were deemed superior to mundane songs about daily lives and loves.

In contrast to the song culture, there is a well-developed riddle culture in vernacular Tshangla, called khar. Khar are simple, one-line riddles in Tshangla that describe items of every-day use in a rural background. In the past, they were asked turn-by-turn in an elaborate game between youth attending various duties, such as young women and girls preparing thread and weaving and young men and boys guarding the cattle or the fields. A correct answer would be rewarded with a khar, dzong or temple depending on the location. Now that television, radio, cassettes and other forms of modern entertainment provide a new time pass, the khar tradition has almost disappeared. Dorji (2007) gave an analysis of the origin, the purpose and the practice of khar including several examples. Khar are known from the Tshangla speaking area in Bhutan, but also from Pemakö. In Annex X some additional khar are presented in both Roman and ‘Ucen Tshangla orthography. These serve both an effort to preserve the khar custom as well as to illustrate the use of the Tshangla orthographies.

As Dorji (2007) has previously shown, similar riddle games are also played among other linguistic groups in Bhutan. Examples include the sholong from the Chocangaca areas of the lower Kuri and Kholong river valley, the sholo from the Kurtö area of the upper Kuri river valley, the mekipa copcop of the Dzala speakers of the Khoma valley and even the Dzongkha shetho khep and Nepali gaun khane katha.

Modern Tshangla songs are regularly produced in Bhutan. Examples include Kharang Zaley Odo by Pelvision (1999), Kezang Dorjee’s Etho Metho ‘rhododendron flower’ by Norling (1993), Deley Deley ‘I’m going, I’m going’, containing songs warning for the dangers of the modern times, by Pelvision (2000), Nanga Tshing Tshing ‘behind you’ by Melody Studios (±2004) and Sem ka Dungtsho ‘doctor of the mind/heart’ by Phuntshok Yoezer Productions (2004). Two Tshangla movies have been produced in the past, Etho Metho and Ata Khawjey (both early 1990s) but after that only mixed Dzongkha-Tshangla-lo movies have been released. The Tshangla of Kameng have produced a VCD
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*Thongchen Thinong* ‘today is full moon’ and a movie *Samlo* ‘mind’ produced by Dencham Cultural Society that became great hits in Dirang, Bomdila, Tawang and Bhutan.

![Image of female Brokpa shingka (upper cloth) and tötung (lower cloth) attire, the tasselled yak hair felt cap and the typical Pangchen and Lekpo hat.](image)

Figure 15.1. The female Brokpa *shingka* (upper cloth) and *tötung* (lower cloth) attire, the tasselled yak hair felt cap and the typical Pangchen and Lekpo hat.

![Image of wooden products. From back to front: two *yu palang* from Kengkhar, four different *dapa* ‘bowls’ and four *gurbu* ‘cups’ from Trashiyangtsi.](image)

Figure 15.2. Wooden products. From back to front: two *yu palang* from Kengkhar, four different *dapa* ‘bowls’ and four *gurbu* ‘cups’ from Trashiyangtsi.

![Image of eight different *bangcung* ‘cane basket’ designs from Pasaphu village, Kangpar geok, Trashigang dzongkhag, Eastern Bhutan.](image)

Figure 15.3. Eight different *bangcung* ‘cane basket’ designs from Pasaphu village, Kangpar geok, Trashigang dzongkhag, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 15.4. Traditional Bhutanese cotton *thara*, middle of the 20th century, Ramjar, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 15.5. Traditional cotton *mondre chupa* cloth, middle of the 20th century, Ramjar, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 15.6. Bamboo khomp (basket), ramp (torch), dala (winnowing pan) and cover for pötrang (incense)
CHAPTER 16. BUDDHISM AS COMMON FACTOR.

16.1. TRADITIONAL ANIMISM AND BON.

Before the introduction of Buddhism, the indigenous people of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon adhered to a belief system in which there were intricate links between humans, animals, the natural phenomena and the supernatural world (Penjore 2009: 107). Trees, animals, plants, rocks, rivers, lakes, caves, the sky, heaven, rain, thunder and lightning: all were considered to possess some power or life-force which could positively or negatively affect human beings. Geographically nearby examples of such belief systems can be found in Elwin (1993), who describes a wide range of myths of the North-East Frontier of India.

In Tibetan, any kind of pre-Buddhist, non-Muslim, non-Hindu and non-Christian belief system is usually referred to as བོད /bon/ or /bön/, and when it is referred to as a coherent, canonised belief system as བོད་ཆོས Bonchö, the Bon religion. The adherents of Bonchö are known as བོད་པོ Bonpo. The Bon belief system is attributed to བོད་པོ་སྤྲུལ་བཞིན་སྤོན་པ་ Tenpa Shenrap Miwo who is believed to have lived in བོད་པོ་སྤྲུལ་བཞིན་སྤོན་པའི་ཕྱིལ་དབྱུང་ལུང་ ཆིག Tazik to the west of Tibet, perhaps in present-day Tajikistan. Van Driem (2001) argued that the Tibetan term Bon actually refers to the first introduction of the Buddhist teachings to the Zhangzhung Empire from the west, perhaps from the area now inhabited by the speakers of the Burushaski language isolate. This version of the Buddhist teachings had intricately mixed with other belief systems. Bon, in this view, is neither pre-Buddhist, nor an indigenous animist religion. The version of Buddhism introduced from India under King Songtsen Gampo was decidedly more orthodox¹. There was a clash between what were basically an older, but more heterodox, and a later, more orthodox introduction of Buddhist teachings which led to the conquest of Zhangzhung and other polities by the Central Tibetan Yarlung Empire. After the first diffusion of (orthodox) Buddhism, Bon remained strongest in Zhangzhung in western Tibet and Kongpo and Dokham in Eastern Tibet². The simmering power struggle finally resulted in the disintegration of the Yarlung dynasty in the 9th century³. Remnants of what is referred to in Bhutan, Pemakö and Lekpo (Zhang 1997:58-60) as Bon are, therefore, perhaps introductions of the Bon Buddhist teachings, probably by East Bodish people from Zhangzhung, Kongpo or Dokham, other areas where until the present day the Bon religion has many strongholds.

¹ Ref. paragraph 3.1.
² Ref. paragraph 2.7, 2.8 and 2.10.1.
³ Ref. paragraph 4.1.

16.2. BUDDHISM.

Buddhism in its original form was not a religion, but a philosophy, started by the historical Buddha Siddhartha Gautama around 500 BCE. As a young prince he escaped the royal palace and on his tour of the city he observed the sufferings of child birth, old age, sickness and death. Human life in Buddhist terms is often described as kega nachi dunge / ‘the four sufferings of birth, old age, sickness and death’. Realising this, the Buddha renounced worldly life and searched for a way for sentient beings to end this suffering. After many perils and trying many methods, including complete emaciation through fasting and overcoming temptations by Mara, the Lord of Death, he realised that the only correct approach would be the Middle Path. He then sang gaiba / ‘reached enlightenment’, ended the cycle of rebirths, and became known as Sanje / ‘the enlightened’.

Two of the fundamental underlying principles of Buddhism are the belief in reincarnation and karma, causal action or activity. There is no such thing as a permanent ‘self’ or ‘soul’. Karma sprouts from actions of body, speech and mind springing from mental intent and ripening to consequences and results. Karma - positive as well as negative - accumulated in all our past lives largely determines our situation in our present life, the reincarnation we take, our position in society, our health condition, the partner we get, our lifespan, our good luck and our misfortunes. It is thought that there are six classes of sentient beings, the ‘three happiness realms’ of the ‘gods’, ‘humans’ and ‘demi-gods’, and the ‘three miserable realms’ of the ‘animals’, ‘hungry ghosts’ and ‘beings of the hell realm’. If we accumulate more positive than negative karma in our past and present lives, we will have a good reincarnation, as a human for example, which is why a human birth is called the ‘precious human body’. Only as a human being we can consciously and willingly practice the Buddhist principles and reach enlightenment, or at least avoid rebirth in a lower realm. One cannot easily change the course of the current life, since it is largely determined by the total of past lives’ karma. In that way, there is a sense of prophecy or predestination. But because the actions in the current life will equally determine the future reincarnations, there is an incredible incentive for people to follow the basic principles, tenets and rules of Buddhism. This seemingly endless sequence of rebirths conditioned by karma can only be broken through realisation of the Four Noble Truths: 1 all life is suffering, 2 suffering arises through craving, a deluded clinging to a state of happiness, the idea of existence and selfhood, 3 suffering ends when craving ends through eliminating craving and thus reaching enlightenment, 4.reaching
enlightenment can be done by following the Noble Eightfold Path laid out by the Buddha. This is the Middle Path approach between extremes. Other basic concepts of Buddhism include impermanence: the understanding that everything is inconstant, unsteady and impermanent, everything we sense is changing, and attachment to anything thus leads to suffering because it is not permanent and we will suffer from its loss; the belief in Bodhisatvas, beings that reach enlightenment but return to teach the Buddhist faith for the benefit of all sentient beings; the idea that all phenomena arise together in mutually dependant web of cause and effect; the concept of emptiness of all phenomena, that they are without underlying essence and independence; and nirvana, the attainment of Buddhahood, the cessation of greed and craving, delusion, and hate and aversion, thus sufferings and therefore rebirths. A Buddhist will take refuge in the Three Precious Jewels: the Buddha, both as a being having gained nirvana as well as the perfect wisdom seeing reality in its true form, the Dharma or teachings of the Buddha, and the Sangha or the religious community. The or teacher is often added as final refuge.

16.3. An Intricate Synthesis of Buddhism and Bon.

The Himalayan version of Buddhism is known as Vajrayana Buddhism. The original Buddhist philosophy as expounded by the historical Buddha is still practiced in Theravada Buddhism. Through the northwest of the Indian subcontinent Buddhism was introduced to western Tibet perhaps even before the 2nd century CE. Between the 7th and the 9th century, Buddhism was introduced to central Tibet from India. After its introduction on the Tibetan plateau Buddhism accepted elements of traditional Chinese religions, and absorbed the local animist beliefs and rituals. Buddhism further developed at Nalanda University in India between the 9th and 12th century CE and elements of it were introduced during the second diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet.

A synthesis between the Buddhist philosophy and the beliefs of the local animist population was the only way in which Buddhism could become accepted by the indigenous people. The deities that ruled their environmentally harsh and hostile environment needed pacification, and many of the local spirits and deities and their complicated, extremely localised reverence rituals were absorbed into the Buddhist pantheon. Many of these local spirits were made into local protectors of the Buddhist religion. Pre-Buddhist beliefs and the associated rituals of appeasement occupy a just as important role in people’s daily lives as the

4 Ref. paragraph 4.1 on p.67.
Buddhist religion and teachings. A whole range of local deities and spirits are appeased and appropriated on a regular basis and in special circumstances. Xie (2001) presents a detailed overview of the mythology surrounding mainly of the Tibetan mountain gods. In Bon, the most revered mountain gods of the Tibetan plateau are the ‘Nine creator-gods’. The four major ones are Yarla Shampo⁵ in Central Tibet, Nyenchen Thangla⁶ in the Changthang plains of the north, and Kulha Rigya⁷ and Ode Gungyal⁸ in the south. The five minor ones are Machen Ponra⁹, Shokchen Dongra, Ganpo Lhaje, Zhoklha Gyukpo and Shu Kharak. Other classes and kinds of deities and spirits that were incorporated into Buddhism include, for example, ‘naga or serpent spirits’ inhabiting wells, creeks, small lakes and streams, marshy areas and brooks who are often appropriated in relation to climate; ‘birth deities’; ‘lord of death’; ‘tutelary deity of males/females’; ‘malignant spirits’; ‘rahu’ a class of beings linked with planetary influences and cause disturbances such as paralysis and eclipses; ‘spirit of the living’; ‘wandering spirit of the dead’; ‘mermaids’; ‘village/valley deities’; ‘protector deities’ associated with disease and hunting and usually inhabiting high peaks and rock outcrops; ‘regional deities’ protecting the pilgrimage sites; ‘local deities’; ‘local host deities’; ‘mischievous sky-travelling preta spirits’ turned into dharma protectors; ‘wicked flesh-eating female demons’; ‘mountain spirits’, ‘guardian spirits of religious treasures’; ‘yaksha or mountain spirits’ and harbingers of harm; ‘dralha’ ‘warrior gods’, ‘chösrung’ ‘protectors of the religion’; ‘spirits of the earth and soil’ usually appropriated in relation to agriculture and construction; ‘mara or evil and obstructing demons’; ‘zombies, resurrected death’.

---

⁵ The royal mountain god of the Yarlung dynasty, located in the Yarlung valley, who took over the position as primo-inter-parus from Ode Gungyal after the establishment of the Yarlung dynasty (Xie 2001:344).
⁶ Especially revered by the nomads of the Changthang plains.
⁷ The Kulha Kangri of paragraph 3.2 on p.67.
⁸ Ode Gungyal is usually considered the highest ranking father of all the mountain gods. We earlier saw part a reference to this ‘God of Heaven’ in the Dung story, ref. footnote 71 on p. 74 and footnote 130 on p. 58.
⁹ The Anye Machen revered by the people of Amdo and Kham and also featuring in the Gesar epic (Xie 2001:350)
As the Buddhist influence grew, and reforms of Buddhism took place, many pure animist elements, now referred to as Bon Nakpo ‘the black bon’, were weakened. Steadily practices such as ‘animal sacrifice’ to certain deities, fortune-telling by sacrificing and examining animals, meat and alcohol offerings during religious rituals were abandoned except in isolated cases. In Bongo, Damji, Toktokha, Meritsemo, Ketokha, Zamsa and Phasuma of Bongo geok under Chukha dzongkhag in western Bhutan, animal sacrifices to the yulha Am Yangtam and Am Yangchum were practised until 2004. The annual offerings of a pig to the chösrung Gyem Mani Naap are still conducted, and especially in Baikunza village animal sacrifice is prevalent. During the festival known as Bala Bongko in Balakha village of Bjena geok in Wangdü Phodrang, a bull would be sacrificed to the local guardian deity Radrap. This practice was replaced by offering of meat bought in the market only a few years ago. At Kurtö Senge Dzong, a male yak is sacrificed yearly to the local protective deity. Similarly, in Ha in western Bhutan yaks are sacrificed to the local protective deity Ap Chundu. Zhäng (1997:74) reports that in Pemakó traditionally every household had to kill an ox on the 22nd day of the 2nd lunar month. The Sherdukpen used to offer animals to Mikam, their god of fire, and their other gods (Elwin 1993:268) until Buddhism prohibited the killing of animals. The animals are now released as an offering. But animal sacrifice and other pre-Buddhist practices are fading. Bon Karpo ‘the white bon’ in its canonised and regularised form, is now considered one of the five major schools of Tibetan Buddhism.

According to Aris (1979:109) one characteristic of a clan society is that they have an ancestral god whose cult reinforces the clan’s unity on specific season occasions. He calls them /pholha/ ‘god of the male’, /phalha/ ‘father-god’ or /phulha/ ‘god of the inner closet’. Although in the past the clans of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon might have all had their respective pholha, with the demise of the clan system these deities also took on a different role. Instead of being linked with certain clans, they are now associated with geographical areas, such as a hamlet, a village or a group of villages. The regional and local deity or deities are appropriated at least once a year in a communal celebration as well on a periodic or even daily basis by individual households or in the community temple. An example is the triad of regional deities, the deity Ama Jomo Remati, the terdak /phulna/.

---

10 And apparently immediately caught and killed by the nearby Buguns (Elwin 1993:249-250, 269).
11 Ref. paragraph 11.4.4 and Annex IX.

Dangaling inhabiting a lake between Khaling and Merak and the tsen Tshongshongma\(^{12}\). Others include the Nepo Golang Draktsen of the Zhonggar area\(^{13}\), the Nepo Dorji Rapden in Kheng (Dargye 2003:508).

16.4. INTRODUCTION OF BUDDHISM AND RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION.

In different periods of history, different schools and sub-schools of Tibetan Buddhism were established and flourished. These developments on the Tibetan plateau were closely imitated on the southern Himalayan slopes, but with a major difference. The followers of the school that lost authority on the Tibetan plateau, usually because their secular patrons were defeated by another clan, empire or dynasty, would often flee to Monyul and re-establish themselves there. The stories surrounding the introduction of Buddhism in the Monyul area were retold in Chapter 3. Several sites in Bhutan, Kameng and Tawang associated with visits by Guru Rinpoche were described in paragraph 3.3. These are the Nyingma establishments of the period of the first and second diffusion of Buddhism. In paragraph 5.1 we read how the Shangpa and Cakzampa Kagyu tradition of Thangtong Gyelpo was introduced to the area, and in paragraph 5.2 we read how the Peling tradition of Pema Lingpa was founded in Central Bhutan. In Chapter 6 we read how the Karma Kagyu was introduced to Eastern Mon, and how the Drukpa Kagyu and Gelukpa steadily spread their dominion in Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon respectively, culminating in the eventual annexation of these areas. Saints and followers of numerous other sub-schools of the main Nyingmapa, Kagyupa, Sakyapa and Gelukpa schools visited Monyul, and some permanently established themselves, especially in western Bhutan. This resulted in a complicated picture of religious affiliation.

16.4.1. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION IN EASTERN BHUTAN.

An example of this complex religious situation can be found in Outer Kheng. As Penjore (2009: 52) reports, the Drukpa Kagyu is followed in Wamling, Shingkhar and Khrisa villages, the Peling tradition is followed in Radi, Nimjong, Thajong, Zaling, Langdurbi, Digala and Kalamti villages, the Nyingma school is followed in Khomshar, and both the

---

\(^{12}\) Ref. paragraph 10.4.

\(^{13}\) His continued protection of the Zhonggar Dzong site is epitomised in the fact that although he permitted use of the old dzong’s stone slabs for the construction of the new Monggar Dzong, slabs carried for other purposes broke before they could be used again.
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Peling and Kagyu traditions are followed in Bardo geok. As elsewhere, Bon is also practised in many of these villages side-by-side with Buddhism. The Bon kharpu ‘first offering’ festival is dedicated to Ode Gongjan and other local deities. Bon priests are usually consulted in case of sickness, to reclaim šrōk ‘life force’ stolen by evil spirits, to exorcise evil, to remove šīƁŷī /kharam/ ‘curses or malignant gossip’, to appease spirits and to generally act as a medium between humans and spirits (Penjore 2009: 53).

The majority of the people of Eastern Bhutan are affiliated with one of the Nyingmapa sub-schools. The institution of ˺škʰyimpa/ is a quintessentially Nyingma institution consisting of ˺škʰom /gomchen/ and ˺škʰo /animo/ ‘male and female lay practitioners’. They are sometimes associated with a ˺škʰo /gomde/ ‘meditation centre’. More often, however, they are villagers who learn the rituals, prayers and astrology from a teacher who can either be a lama in a more formal setting or a close relative in a hereditary position. The serkhyim institution is a way in which in the face of limited agricultural labour force the demand for people trained to conduct religious rituals can be met. A gomchen works on the land and can marry and have children. In recent years many gomchen unfortunately have moved to the urban centres where high demand means a full time job and thus more money, and in many rural areas there is an acute shortage of religious people.

Buddhism appears to have taken a firm hold in the Dungsam area relatively late. Crucial appear to have been the 16th century activities of Jigme Kündrel, also known as Jangchup Gyeltshen. He founded the Yongla Gonpa, which for the Drukpa theocracy was one of the main pillars of their religious power in Eastern Bhutan, together with Riksum Gonpa in Trashiyangtshi. This is epitomised in the saying ‘Riksum Gonpa in the upper east and Yongla Gonpa in the lower east [these are] the two counterforces to India and Tibet’.

16.4.2. Religious Affiliation in Tawang.

Among the Dakpa and Tshangla of Tawang and Kameng district, three distinct phases of Buddhist affiliation can be observed. After the introduction of Buddhism in the 8th century CE by Guru Rinpoche and aristocratic and religious Tibetan refugees (Sarkar 1975 and

---

14 I.e. 'Ode Gungyal.
15 Ref. Chapter 6 for more information on the establishment and spread of the Drukpa Kagyu school in Eastern Bhutan.

paragraph 3.3) the Nyingmapa sect became well established. Dakpa tradition has it that the Nyingmapa sect was introduce by the Tibetan monk Ṣākşıṃg Sorpion who also established the monasteries of Ṣākşıṃg Ugyenling, Ṣākşıṃg Sangeling and Ṣākşıṃg Tsorgyeling well before the 12th century CE. Another Nyingmapa monastery is Khingriangme Gonpa, established by Thechpu Rinpoche from Mindroling in Tibet and till date the seat of his reincarnations. The Nyingmapa sect, however, never became politically affiliated and remained associated with the gomchen institutional setting in rural areas of Tawang, Dirang and Kalaktang. The Pangchen area is a traditional stronghold of the Nyingma School. The Ṣākşıṃg Gorzam Chorten was constructed in Pangchen in the 12th century CE by Ṣākşıṃg Lama Sangay Pradar of Kharman village in order to subdue local spirits that prevented people from crossing the stone bridge over the Nyamyang river. The Gorzam Chorten has a twin structure in the Upper Kholong river valley called the Ṣākşıṃg Dürong ‘demon gorge’ Chorten (Chophel 2002 and Ṣākşıṃg n.d.: 135-146) 16. According to Chhophel (2002), however, these chortens were built by the Bhutanese lama Ngawang Lodrö, 3rd Head Abbot of Riksum Gonpa, and the Dakpa lama Zangpo in the middle of the 18th century. Both chortens are modelled on the Ṣākşıṃg Chorten Jarung Khashor built in Boudha, Nepal, in the 5th or 6th century CE (Ehrhard 1990). Popular folklore holds that the two lamas carved the shape of the Boudha Chorten from a radish, but that the radish shrunk on the way back, which is why the two chortens are not exact replicas of the original in either size or design. The construction of both chortens took 12 years, and it is widely believed that an eight year old Dakpa girl voluntarily went into meditation inside the dome of the chorten at Trashiyangtsi on the 15th day of the second month of the lunar calendar. Till date this day marks the Dakpa Kora, in which people form the neighbouring areas of Tawang, particularly Pangchen, visit the chorten for circumbulation. The 30th day of the month is the Drukpa Kora, mostly attended by people from the Bhutanese side of the border. This story was the central theme of the Bhutanese feature film ‘Chorten Kora’

We know from historical sources that the Karma Kagyupa School was patronised by the kings of Dirang in the 15th century.17. The first Karmapa Rangjung Rigpe Dorji is said to have founded the Khimne monastery18. The Karmapa monastery of Gangkhardung east of Tawang

---

16 See Figures 10.1 and 10.2.
17 Ref. paragraphs 5.2 and 16.4.3.
18 Ref. paragraph 3.3.
was later taken over by the Gelukpa. There is also compelling evidence of the activities of Thangtong Gyelpo and the establishment of the Shangpa Kagyu lineage to the Tawang area\footnote{Ref. paragraph 5.1.}

The spread of the Gelukpa School to the eastern areas of Monyul occurred relatively late and can be largely attributed to the activities of Merak Lama Lobzang Tenpai Drönme and his lay associate Meme Gyapten in the middle of the 15\textsuperscript{th} and early 16\textsuperscript{th} century\footnote{Ref. Chapter 6.}. He first established himself in his home village of Merak and nearby Sakteng where he constructed the Tashi Tseling monastery in Sakteng and Gaden Tseling monastery in Merak. After gaining a foothold among the ruling clans of the Brokpa and Dakpa of Merak, Sakteng and Tawang he also established relations with the Ahom kings of Assam, who donated the plains of Odalguri and Amratola to him. Subsequently the Gelukpa slowly spread to the Dirang and the Sherdukpen area. The oldest Gelukpa monastery is Agyadung, first headed by Tsanton Rolpai Dorji. In the Tawang area, Lopzang Tenpe Drönme oversaw the construction of Drakkar near Lhau, Langaten monastery near Berkhar, the monasteries in Samkhar, Sharmup, Grangkhar, Khordung, Lhargang and Kibang villages, the Sanglamphe and Tadung monasteries near Bomba and Bumteng to the east of Tawang, Taidung monastery near Thongleng and Surchiung monastery near Lumla. He was also responsible for the construction of the Namshu and Talung monasteries near Namshu and Sanglem in Dirang and the unidentified Dungsam Gonpa in Dungsam (Sarkar 1975:24). Although the introduction of the Gelukpa lineage was relatively late, they quickly gained political control as well as spiritual power in the area through a lineage of successive reincarnations of Lopzang Tenpe Drönme. Of the eleven reincarnations till date, the first, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, were ethnic Tibetans born on the Tibetan plateau, whereas the second, third, fourth, ninth, tenth and eleventh were ethnic Dakpa born in the lower Tshona and Tawang area. The eight reincarnation Thukten Kezang was born in Lhodrak in Tibet and became known as Guru Rinpoche. He settled in Sakteng and his descendants have all become successful in business and spread throughout Bhutan and the world. The father of the ninth reincarnation was form Saling in Bhutan but settled in Khamkhar near Dirang. The ninth reincarnation was recognised by the Dalai Lama but not recognised by the relatives of the eighth reincarnation. The twelfth and present reincarnation of this lineage, Tenzin Thinley Namgay, popularly known as Guru Tulku Rinpoche, is the current head abbot of Tawang monastery.
The hegemony reached by the Gelukpa sect in Tibet and in Tawang was achieved primarily through the military support the sect received on request of the fifth Dalai Lama. It is epitomised in the Ganden Namgye Lhatse Ling monastery, the largest existent Tibetan Buddhist monastery in the world. The increasing Gelukpa political influence in the Tawang and Dirang area was the main reason for the military conflicts with the Drukpa forces to the west. In the 17th century, the Mongol armies of Gushri Khan led by a general known to the Dakpa as Sokpo Jomkhar destroyed many Nyingmapa establishments in southern Tibet and Tawang, including Ugyenling, Tsorgenling and Sangeling. Whereas Ugyenling and Sangeling monasteries were rebuilt and taken over by the Gelukpa, Tsorgeling remains in ruins.

The 6th Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatsho was born near Krompateng in Beyul Kitmojong, Lawok Yulsum. His father was Tashi Tenzin, the incumbent Nyingmapa head at Ugyenling monastery, a descendant of Pema Lingpa, and his mother was Tshewang Lhamo from Berkhar village, a descendant of the Byar clan. Tsangyang Gyatsho was a less-than-ordinary Dalai Lama, his love of girls, poetry and the good life perhaps resulted in his untimely death.

16.4.3. Religious Affiliation in Kameng.

Followers of the Nyingmapa School, including those allied to the traditions of Pemalingpa and Ratnalingpa had established the gomchen institution in the villages of Dirang and Kalaktang. In the Kalaktang area the influence of local priests called /phrame/ remained strong. From the 12th to 16th century, the Kings of Dirang of the Jowo clan were in a teacher-patron relationship with the Karmapa reincarnations of their time. These are Gathung patronising Dusum Khyenpa (1110-1193); Dondrup and Jobak/Jophak Darmo patronising Chödrak Gyamtsho (1454-1506); and Pangmodar patronising Mikyö Dorje (1507-1554). According to Sarkar (1975), at a later point in time the people of Dirang send a mission to the Panchen Lama in Trashilhunpo in Tibet who send them the Karmapa Lama Drowang Rinpoche. In the middle of the 18th century, the Gelukpa school became more dominant in Kameng, and according to Nath (1997) at present the people of Dirang and Kalaktang follow a mixture of the Nyingmapa and Gelukpa Schools.

---

22 Members of the Byar clan, ref. paragraph 4.2.2.
The Sherdukpen believe that Guru Rinpoche visited their area (Deuri 1976 and Sarkar 1975), and that their ancestor is Meme Gaypten or Japteng Bura (Chowdhury 1975:49), the lay associate of Merak Lama. But they also acknowledge that Buddhism only took serious hold when it was propagated by Kezang Dorji Tenzin, the sixth incarnation of Merak Lama. He was first received by Gyapthong, an elder of Rupa village, and through incorporating the local deities into the pantheon of Buddhist protector deities and performance of supernatural feats he managed to convert the Sherdukpen. He constructed the monastery at Rupa in 1742 CE. Around the same time he constructed the monasteries in Kharsodung, Lish and Phudung. Because of their relatively late conversion to Buddhism, Sherdukpen religious practices still include a large number of pre-Buddhist elements. Whereas annual rituals performed according to Buddhist practice by lamas, the /khikjiji/ ‘local animist priests’ play an important role in daily rituals and rituals to ward off evil and cure sickness\(^\text{23}\). The Dhimmai are not Buddhists but worship certain Buddhist deities, including (Elwin 1993:261) Jumu Nuchu\(^\text{24}\) who was earlier a deity worshipped by the people of Thempang. Currently, the centre of religion for the Dirang Tshangla and Sherdukpen is the monastery of Tshona Gontse Ganden Rabgyeling built in in Bomdila in 1965. This monastery is a replica of the Gontse Gonpa in Tshona, the former seat of Tshona Gontse Rinpoche, built by his 12\(^{\text{th}}\) reincarnation who was born in Morshing. The main prayer hall was added by the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) Tshona Gontse Rinpoche who resides in Tawang.

\(^{23}\) These priests observe a taboo on eating onions, venison, pork and the meat of any fowl. Ref. Elwin (1993:270).

\(^{24}\) From Jomo and /nuchu/, Dhammai for ‘god’. Jumu Nuchu does not require animal sacrifice, unlike other Dhammai deities.

Figure 16.1. Intricate thread cross made during a ritual performed in the first month of the lunar calendar in Thongrong village, Phongme geok, Trashigang dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 16.2. 'Lütör or dough effigy made to cast away evil during the same ritual.

Plate Figure 16.3. Դիքեն Նյեվաբո Dikchen Nyewabu, the perpetual sinner, with a severed jatsha head, awaiting judgement by the Lord of Death during the annual Tsechu in Ramjar geok, Trashiyangtsi dzongkhak.
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Figure 16.4. Neten Cudruk thongdröl, appliqué thangka with the Buddha and the sixteen arhats (Buddha’s disciples) displayed during Trashigang Tshecu, Trashigang dzongkhak.

Figure 16.5. Guru Tsengye, appliqué thangka of the eight manifestations of Guru Rinpoche, Gom Kora Tshecu, Trashiyangtsi, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 16.6. Taktshang monastery in Paro dzongkhag, Western Bhutan.

Figure 16.7. The Jowo statue at Riksum Gönpa, Trashiyangtshi, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure 16.8. The holy peak of Tshongtshongma, on the border of Bhutan and Tawang.
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AFTER  King Gesar of Ling defeated  the king of Mon in the south and  'Lutsen the king of Hor in the north a few people escaped from there. Once upon a time four brothers, sons of the gods, agreed to come down from heaven to the land of humans. The place where they landed was like a mirror made of white silver. At first the eldest son held on to a mu-cord he sent via the upper ‘flight path’ and fell into Tsari Kala Dungtsho. He was thus named ‘Lo Gapa ‘Blaze’. The second son held on to a mu-cord he sent via the middle flight path and when one of his legs struck the lake, droplets of milk hit his nose and he was thus named ‘Lo Zhurpa ‘Snout’. The third son held on to a mu-cord he sent via the lower flight path. After he fell down the milk droplets scattered and the earth swelled up so his footsteps were imprinted in it. He was thus called ‘Lo Jepa ‘Imprint’. The youngest son not having reached the earth yet was not brave enough to come down via the mu-cord and was considered dumb. He was named ‘Lo Lenpa ‘Dumb’. Even though there was no difference in their ‘bone’, because of differences in their strength they became the four ‘Lo tribes: Gapa, Zhurpa, Jepa and ‘Lenpa.

The eldest son Gapa, seizing land in Upper ‘Lo called Thangdum ‘Plain of Reconciliation’ became the famous ruler of Polung Druk ‘Six Summit Valleys’. Later, a proverb came to say ‘in the unchanging upper part of the valley [lies] Phulung Gonpa, in the unchanging lower part of the valley [live] the ‘Lopa’s descendants’. The second son Zhurpa said ‘I will go to whichever place my karma appoints me’ and, after putting a spell on it, he shot an arrow which was able to reach halfway down Pemakö and accordingly he seized a place and stayed there. Afterwards the arrow became fully grown there, and even now there is a culm of bamboo called ‘Zhurpa’s arrow-bamboo’. After Zhurpa died there and his nine sons and their mother had prepared the body, a local demon transformed into a tiger and every day he carried away a son and ate him, until one day only the youngest son was left. The mother Zhurmo Tshewang Pelkyima thought to herself: ‘In fact, because this is land hit by an arrow because of a prayer, would it be appropriate to stay here? Now that the tiger does not allow us to stay, it is better to sneak away to another

place’, and she took her son, and after having crossed the Chuwo Serden river towards the left three times they arrived at the place now known as Tachungdem ‘Suspension Bridge of the Horse and Garuda’ and stayed there. The next morning crossing a mountain pass they arrived at the ancient meadow Pasidem ‘Suspension Bridge of the Cane Whistle’. That afternoon, the tiger, finding and retracing the footsteps of Zhurmo and her son with three steps in one, arrived at the place called Tachongdem ‘Suspension Bridge Holding the Tiger’ which, because of later corruption of the name became known as Tachungdem. There, not finding Zhurmo and her son, at once he also went to Pasidem and despite searching he couldn’t find them. Then, looking at Khabok pass he saw Zhurmo and her son. As they were walking over the top of the pass the sun also crossed the top of the pass, and it seemed as if Zhurmo and her son entered into the sun. He lost all his hope and send ripples through the cliff while crying, and then he returned. This pass is now called Tangul La ‘Crying Tiger Pass’. Even now, on the sides of the cliff the imprints of the tiger’s ripples can still be seen. Zhurmo and her son crossed the Chuwo Serden to the right and settled in a place called Guyül ‘seven lands’. From there Zhurpa’s lineage spread and unbroken till now it is still there. The third son ‘Lo Jepa settled in Tangam Khul ‘Area of the Horse Canyon’ and from there his lineage spread. The fourth son ‘Lo Lenpa settled close to the Indian border from where his lineage spread. The life-saving sections spreading from ‘Lo Gapa’s descendants became the Gara ‘Aging Goat’, the tribe protectors, the guest protectors etcetera, and from the people of Upper Pemakö split the people of Lower Pemakö. After that, the Lo Pojo and Gawo arrived from Powo Rangpo, Ngolok, Dazhing and other places. The ‘Lo Yashi tribe came from Chego in Lower Kongpo. The Showu tribe settled from Kongpo Nyangpo, and from Tsari came the ‘Lo Khathra tribes. All of them settled in the Upper, Middle and Lower Pemakö areas.

1 This is the Yarlung Tsangpo river.
ANNEX II TO PARAGRAPH 3.3. THE PILGRIMAGE SITE OF SENGE DZONG.

1. INTRODUCTION

Mönka Nering Senge Dzong is more popularly known as Senge Dzong. Despite its remote location in the northeast of Lhüntsi Dzongkhak right on the border with Tibet it is one of the most popular pilgrimage sites in Bhutan. The site is associated with Guru Rinpoche and his main consort, Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal. Although many people are apprehensive of the stories of a three-day uphill hike through leech-infested, muddy forests to end up knee-deep in snow, it is exactly this element of penance through physical and emotional strain that gives Senge Dzong additional value as pilgrimage site.

Like most other Tibetan pilgrimage sites, **geomancy**, or the art of divination by means of geographical features, has played a vital role in determining Senge Dzong as a pilgrimage site. The sanctity of the site is largely derived from the special natural and physical attributes rather than the shrine and images erected there. Certain naturally-occurring pilgrimage sites such as caves, rivers, mountains and lakes are endowed with subtle and ineffable powers that can trigger unusual responses from pilgrims. There is a widespread belief that they are the abodes of local deities capable of both helping as well as harming pilgrims, who appropriate the deities by making regular offerings. Mountains and mountain lakes are especially powerful since they personify the \( \text{生命力} \) life force or vital energy of the communities worshipping them as ancestral deities. The soul can be physically represented by the \( \text{男山} \) male mountain as well as a \( \text{女湖} \) female lake. The second feature that determines Senge Dzong as religious site is the connection with the life of Guru Rinpoche and Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal who have both spend considerable time at the site. Thirdly, the site obtains its sacredness from the fact that it has been a repository for sacred objects: \( \text{图像} \) images or statues symbolising the body, \( \text{经文} \) books representing the speech and \( \text{塔或窣堵坡} \) shorten or stupas representing the thought of the Buddha. Finally, special characteristics of sacred objects are the last motivational factor for people to visit Senge Dzong and other pilgrimage sites. These include, for example, statues or objects that are \( \text{自持自生} \), i.e. have miraculously spoken or produced sounds, stones that are imprinted with hand- and footprints of religious masters or shaped as their religious paraphernalia, \( \text{自持自生} \) self-manifested objects and the occurrence of holy liquid from rocks and other objects.
The overriding purpose of pilgrimage is generally the desire to benefit mankind. Most pilgrims make offerings and prayers so that fellow beings may share in the merits gained from the pilgrimage. However, personal spiritual and material gains can also be motives for the trip, for example, the desire to wipe out negative sins accumulated in the past or the expansion of religious consciousness. Both would result in a better rebirth in the next lifetime. Another purpose is to establish personal contact with a divine place, object or statue at the end of the journey.

2. HISTORY AND RELEVANCE OF THE SITE.

Senge Dzong is known as one Guru Rinpoche’s ‘Eight Secluded Places of Practice’ as well as one of the five main pilgrimage sites associated with Guru Rinpoche. During the reign of King Trisong Deutsen (755-797CE), Santaraksita, the famous head of Vikramasila University in India advised the king to invite Padmasambhava to Tibet. It was hoped that the lotus-born tantric master from Uddiyana would be able to overcome the negative forces in the country. Guru Rinpoche accepted the invitation delivered by five emissaries and on arrival in Tibet managed to subdue the entire pantheon of local demons. Tibet’s first monastery, Samye, was founded by him and Santaraksita, providing the firm foundation for the spread and consolidation of Buddhism in the entire Himalayan region.

The tradition of terma, or religious treasures, was also started by Guru Rinpoche. Before his departure from Tibet, he dictated his entire teachings to his consort Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal who then transcribed them into Tibetan, Sanskrit and Uddiyana. These valuable texts, together with ritual objects were carefully hidden in special places imbued with remarkable geomantic qualities. In later periods terton- the incarnations of Guru’s disciples- would use prophecies and visions to rediscover these relics. The terma were designed to preserve the teachings of the Guru for future generations of Buddhist practitioners.

Guru Rinpoche predicted three grand, eight great 21 powerful, 108 intermediate and 1000 lesser tertöns. The three grand ones were Nyima Özer (12th Century), Chöki Wangchuk (13th century) and Rinzin Godem Truchen (14th Century). The eight great tertöns were Ratna Lingpa, Padma Lingpa, Orgyan Lingpa, Sangye Lingpa, Dorji Lingpa, Karma Lingpa, Orgyan Dorji Lingpa and Orgyan Padma Lingpa, who all lived in the 14th and 15th centuries. Of these Ratna Lingpa is of importance since he was the tertön who visited Senge Dzong. Guru Rinpoche’s eight main cave
retreats were also used to store the terma to be discovered in later centuries by the tertön. Other religious masters also used these sites to hide their terma in the same sites.

Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal blessed Senge Dzong with her presence. She was born at Seulung in the palace of Karchen and was recognised as the incarnation of Yangchenma or Sarasvati, the Indian goddess of music. A legend recounts that when Guru Rinpoche and Yangchenma were performing a mystic ritual, a garland of red and white syllables suddenly pierced the sky and fell on the earth. Simultaneously, the king of Karchen and his wife have a vision of a young girl playing the guitar divinely. The sky burst with light and the earth moved- and nine months later Yeshe Tshogyal was born. The lake near Karchen palace grew dramatically, thus causing the King to call his new born ‘Queen of the Lake’. At the age of 16, Yeshe Tshogyal married King Trisong Deutsen and would later become the companion of Guru Rinpoche. During his teachings, she would carefully note down the essence and principles of Tantric Buddhism as expounded by the Guru. This she achieved by rendering the discourse into a special code inscribed on yellow parchment. Over time, a large number of these texts were collected. Under Guru Rinpoche’s direction, Yeshe Tsogyal wrapped and hid the sacred documents, setting into motion the relationship of terma and tertön. In this way, even the future generations had access to Guru Rinpoche’s words and deeds at the appropriate time. Yeshey Tshogyal dissolved into a rainbow and joined Guru Rinpoche in Zangtokpelri.

Guru Rinpoche spent long periods in retreat in each of the eight places, using his magical powers to exorcise Bon spirits and local demons. All are located in the high mountains in impressive settings. The eight sites are:

- Drak Yong Dzong: the embodiment of Guru Rinpoche’s ku (body): a labyrinthine cave system where 55 ascetics reached enlightenment in the 8th century and all the major Dorje Phurpa terma texts were hidden.
- Samye Chimphug: the embodiment of Guru Rinpoche’s sung (speech)
- Lhodrak Karchhu: the embodiment of Guru Rinpoche’s thug (mind)
- Yarlung Sheldrak: the embodiment of Guru Rinpoche’s yonten (wisdom)
- Nering Senge Dzong
- Drakmar Yamalung
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- Monka Nering Senge Dzong: the embodiment of Guru Rinpoche’s thinley (virtuous activity)
- Monka Sridzong
- Paro Taktsang Phug

The list of the eight most powerful hermitages of Guru Rinpoche is extracted from his biographies, mainly the Padma Thangyig Sheldrakma [བདོད་མིག་ཐང་གི་ཤེང་དྲུག་མ།], a text discovered by Orgyan Lingpa. It is written there that Guru Rinpoche performed 10,900 heroic deeds to expound his teachings. There were faithfully recorded by his five wives and then concealed as terma for the benefit of future generations. Other important texts that detailed the sacred places are the Zanglingma by Nyangral Nyima Wosel (latter half 12th century), the Kathang Denga discovered by Orgyan Lingpa (mid-14th century) and the Soldeb Lewi Dunma by Zangpo Drakpa.

Another classification places Monka Nering Senge Dzong among the five principal pilgrimage sites associated with the body, speech, mind, wisdom and embodiments of Guru Rinpoche. Of the above mentioned eight sites, this classification includes Drak Yong Dzong, Samye Chimphug, Lhodrak Karchhu, Yarlung Sheldrak and Monka Nering Senge Dzong.

3. ACCESS TO SENGE DZONG.

Access to Senge Dzong is either from the south or from the east. The eastern route leads from Pemaling in Trashi Yangtse to Rolmateng and from there to Senge Dzong. This route is hardly used due to restrictions of military nature (the whole area encompasses the sensitive border with China) as well as the fact that the area is fully located in the Bomdeling Wildlife Sanctuary. Besides that it is a much longer and more arduous journey than the usual southern approach route.

The southern approach leads from Sumpa 3 kilometres before reaching Lhüntsi Dzong northeast towards Khoma village which is a pleasant 1 ½ hour walk. In Sumpa there is an army supply post with basic guesthouse facilities upon request although most people would prefer to stay in Lhüntsi or travel directly from Monggar to Khoma. Above Khoma, on the left bank of the Khoma Chhu, approximately a one hour steep ascent, is the temple which is generally considered as the door to Senge Dzong and therefore must be visited. In Khoma there are also the
Zangtopelri Lhakhang and on the left bank of the Khoma river, after a 2 hour uphill walk one reaches the Gonpa Kap monastery. From there down towards the river is the ancient Karphu lhakhang holding the relics of Ratna Lingpa, a talking phurpa and various ancient statues brought from both Tibet and India. From Khoma the footpath follows the right bank of the Khoma river all the way till Doksum. The first one hour leads through the paddy and maize fields at the outskirts of Khoma until the river makes a left turn northwards again. From here there is a relatively steep ascent, a descent, and another steep ascent with many turnings. After that ascent the path is rather even again until two most of the time abandoned houses are reached, which are mostly used by cow herders. From here the road leads to Khomagang. In all, from Khoma to Khomagang will take around 6 to 7 hours. Khomagang is a relatively large village of some 15 households. Khomagang has a BHU which is open to pilgrims for overnight stay, but bedding and food has to be self-arranged. From Khomagang it takes another one hour past the village of Tsanggo to Tsigang, which has a joined Indian and Bhutanese army outpost for border patrol. Just outside Tsigang is a large rock which is said to represent the actual door to Senge Dzong which was opened by Ratna Lingpa. From Tsigang the path winds slowly up to Totophu, which has a cliff face where travellers halt overnight. Water and firewood are available here. After Totophu the next rest place is a dilapidated cow shed in Juli which should be passed in order to reach the much better one in Thangkarmo. It takes only 45 minutes from Juli to Thangkarmo. The total journey from Tsigang to Thangkarmo takes around 8 hours. From Thangkarmo in another 2 ½ hours one reaches Duksum. At Duksum the Khoma river is crossed to its left bank. A signboard on a tree next to the mani dungrim indicates that the hidden valley of Rolmateng is another 1 hour to the northeast from here and Senge Dzong is another 2 hours. It is advised from here onwards not to consume alcohol, tobacco or other intoxicants. From Doksum the path entails a steady climb through a rapidly changing environment. The coniferous forests dominated by spruce and birch are slowly replaced by blue pine. It also becomes noticeably cooler. After around 2 hours one reaches the low pass from where the Senge Dzong Zangtopelri can be observed. Here one is advised to pay homage to this great site by prostrating three times. There is also a small latsen with a zhabjey of Guru Rinpoche. From there a 20 minute walk through the floodplain of the river reaches to the Zangtopelri and the small guesthouse.
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4. MAIN PILGRIMAGE SITES.

Pema Dzong ‘Lotus Fortress’ is located high above the rocky stream that ends its course at the bottom of the rock face at Dorji Dzong. One path leads south-eastwards across the rocks of the stream; another easier path leads up from above Gawa Dzong. Pema Dzong is the location where Guru Rinpoche expounded the tsedrup. The zhugthri ‘chair’ can still be observed. There is also a tshetor ter. Namkha Dzong ‘Sky Fortress’ is the least accessible of all the Dzong. Ascending north-eastwards from Dorji Dzong along a steep cliff is difficult, but actual access to the Dzong becomes almost impossible when a narrow path along a steep cliff has to be crossed. Namkha Dzong is said to resemble a giant vulture that has spread its wings along the rock face. There is a cave for cleansing of sins and a ter called shelkha. The name Dülwa Dzong ‘Fortress of Monastic Discipline’ is inscribed on two rock faces in between Gawa Dzong and Dorji Dzong. The lower formation however is formally known as Tamdrin Nye containing a cave to cleanse sins and the place where Guru Rinpoche prostrated. The actual Dülwa Dzong is located above Tamdrin Nye and contains a self-emanated vajra coloured in red as well as the footprint of Khandro Yeshe Tshogyel on the rock to the left and the meditation cave of Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal to the right. A little to the north of Dülwa Dzong we can find the Tsari Nyipa which is said to be a copy of the original Tsari Ne in Tibet. Managing to circambulate the rock three times whilst expressing the syllable Ah without stopping is said to equal completion of the Tsari Rongkor itself. Tsemo Dzong ‘Peak Fortress’ is located at the entrance of Senge Dzong above Rinchen Dzong. It is the place where Guru Rinpoche bound by oath one of the 108 Jachung (mythical birds) that terrorised Tibet by feeding on human flesh. Two of the 108 Jachung did not comply with the original oath and had to be chased by the Guru till Senge Dzong where he finally mentioned to subdue them. The other one can be found at Tsho Kar. At Tsemo Dzong there is an egg of a Jachung which was unfortunately damaged when army personnel used it for playing shotput. Gawa Dzong ‘Fortress of Joy’ is the small rock outcrop located just north of the Senge Dzong Zangtopelri Lhakhang. It contains the hand imprint of Guru Rinpoche and the self-emanated six-syllable mantra ‘Om Mani Peme Hum’. Just to the northwest of Gawa Dzong are three rocks representing the Rigsum Gonpo (Chenrezi, Jambayang and Chana Dorji). The Zangtopelri Lhakhang contains as main statues of the Guru Rinpoche, Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal and Khandro Mandarawa, Ratna Lingpa as well as the statue of the Terdag Tsenta, the local protective deity residing at Terdag Lhatsho. Every year a
yak and on occasion a horse is offered to him by the government and other benefactors. The hair of this yak is considered as very valuable cure against various diseases as well as against evil spirits. The Lhakhang also contains the five phurpa that were revealed from the lake that was originally located at the bottom of the Singye Dzong valley floor. Around 50 meters to the south of the Lhakhang, past the newly constructed guest house, is the Dochhen Ama Lengoen with the throne of Guru Rinpoche and a footprint of Guru Rinpoche as well as several smaller footprints of Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal (to the east of the lake on top of the rock). On the way between Gawa Dzong and Duelwa Dzong one can find a rock containing 21 images of Dolma, the terdom of Senge Dzong containing all the important treasures, and a rock containing 108 phurpa. There is also the Guru Uzha Phug containing the hat of Guru Rinpoche, his footprint (broken) and a self-emanated syllable Ah. Rinchen Dzong ‘Precious Fortress’ is located at the entrance of Senge Dzong and contains a cave for cleansing sin as well as a foot imprint of Guru Rinpoche. The original Senge Dzong ‘Snow Lion Fortress’ is located to the south of the Zangtopelri Lhakhang. A temple has been constructed there at what is considered to be the mouth of a snow lion, hence the name Senge Dzong. In the cave, or rather inside the mouth of the snow lion is the meditation chair of Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal. To the left is a phurpa. At the entrance of the cave, to the left of the altar, are two rocks representing jagara atsara nakpo. The statue of Guru Rinpoche has been recently installed. To the right of the entrance of the meditation cave is a small temple used for performing rituals. To the left of the complex is the Guru Tshokorsum: three holy water sources with that of Guru in the middle, Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal to the left and that of Khandro Mandarawa to the right. On the hill above Senge Dzong is the cremation ground as well as two rocks one which the Guru used for pounding and mixing medicinal herbs. On the way back down can be found the place Khandro Yeshe Tshogyal used as kitchen. On the rock cliff of Dorji Dzong ‘Vajra Dzong’ there is a black frog which climbed up to eat honey from a bee hive and got stuck there. There is also a horse’s footprint and a lock with the key beside it to open the Dzong by an accomplished master. A snake can also be found here as well as the self-emanated syllable Hum. The finger imprint of Guru Rinpoche can also be seen here as well as his hat and footprint. There are also three different Ro Ngoedrupchen as well as the treasure of Zambhala with three holes in it. Placing the fingers in the three holes whilst approaching with eyes closed is said to repay all the debts to one’s parents. The hidden valley of Rolmateng is located at around one hour walk northeast from Doksum. Rolmateng is an inhabited village and lies on the old trade route between Lhüntsí,
Annex II. Senge Dzong.

Trashiyangtsi and Tibet. The altitude is less than of Senge Dzong. As the name indicates, Rolmateng is considered to be a so-called hidden land. It was opened by Terton Ratna Lingpa. Finally, there are four lakes up from Senge Dzong. The Terdak Lhatsho is the residence of the treasure guardian. The ‘white and black’ lakes are named after their colours. Finally, there is the Thimilangtsho.

Plate AII-1. The entry to the meditation cave at Senge Dzong, Khoma geok, Lhünts dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.
ANNEX III TO PARAGRAPH 5.1: THE STORY OF KHANDRO DROWA ZANGMO.

The life story of Khandro Drowa Zangmo is one of the nine plays traditionally performed in the Lhamo or Tibetan Opera. Some of the other stories include Norzang, Azhe Nangsa, Drime Künden, Zuki Nyima and Pema Öbar. The story of Norzang is based upon a Divyāvadāna story about how Crown Prince Sudhana tries to retrieve his beloved princess Manohara, and related the story of a prince who leaves his palace to search for his wife who has escaped the jealous concubines, and who on the way has to face many obstacles including the king. The story of Azhe Nangsa tells the story of a beautiful girl devoted to Buddhism who is forced to marry into a noble family. She is ill-treated till death, but the Lord of Death sends her back as a human in order to propagate the Buddhist religion. The plot of Drime Künden is taken from the Buddhist Sudhana Jataka about a prince who sacrifices his life to benefit other beings and thus reaches enlightenment. The story of Zuki Nyima tells the story of a kind and beautiful girl who after experiencing much suffering becomes a nun. The tale of Pema Öbar describes a previous life of Guru Padmasambhava under a hostile king.

According to Bacot (1990) the origin of some episodes of the play Drowa Zangmo is probably Indian, and it is mentioned that the ‘Cambogian and Siamese’ have comparable fables. Considering the strong links between the people of the southern Himalayas and the Indian plains, this cannot be discredited. Bacot bases the translation on a manuscript from Darjeeling written in 'Umed script (Bacot 1990: 120). The Bhutanese textbook version is of unknown provenance, and the text is partially translated in Dzongkha, with most of the prose in the original Chöke.

There is no correspondence regarding the probable date that the story took place according to the two sources. In the prologue of Bacot’s translation (1990: 124) it is written ‘once upon a time, in the days of the good kalpa, when men lived to a hundred years, two thousand five hundred years after Buddha emerged from sorrow, heretical doctrines flourished and Buddhism declined. Bacot himself notes that ‘this would be exactly in our day, if the author, ignoring or disdaining historical chronology, did not represent this date to himself as infinitely more remote’. In the Bhutanese version of the story, on the other hand, it is written: ‘in the
times of spiritual degeneration when the lives of men were short, and after the time when men lived to a hundred years of age, 1,500 years after the Buddha transcended from sorrow (fulfilled his enlightened intentions), when the teachings of the tirthika (heretics, Hindus) were also at their decline’ (1983:1). This seems more accurate, as it would place the story after the decline of the Yarlung Empire and Buddhism in Tibet and at a time when the Hindu religion was also at the decline, around 1,000 CE Further on in the Bhutanese text (1983: 6) we find an even more accurate date, namely, the date of birth of Khandro Drowa Zangmo being the 10th day of the 10th month in the year of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot (1990:128), this is mistranslated as ‘the year of the land of the monkey’. Combining these two date indications, this would correspond to the year 1068-1069 CE.

About the location, Bacot’s prologue clearly mentions ‘they (the khandro) saw that Buddha’s doctrine and religion were recovering a little. But in the South, in the barbarous land of the Mon, there was neither preaching nor any congregation of monks’. In the Bhutanese version, however, any reference to Mon is missing, and instead, the text only mentions नीलाचलीका विश्रामालयं देशान्तरं श्री मेन्द्रेल्रूंग मुन्यल ‘at the good time when in the worldly realm the precious teachings of the Buddha were spreading, in the valley (village) known as Mendrelgang… [followed by many examples showing that there the Buddhist religion was not followed]’. The omission of the location of Mendrelgang in the area of Mon in the Bhutanese text is conspicuous, and perhaps a conscious choice of the authors or editors of this textbook version. However, there seems to be no doubt that the village of Mendrelgang, where most of the lot is centered, is located in Monyul. A further reference to Monyul is namely made in Bacot on page 171, and in the Bhutanese version on page 77, where Drowa Zangmo says नीलाचलीका विश्रामालयं देशान्तरं श्री मेन्द्रेल्रूंग ‘at the good time when in the worldly realm the precious teachings of the Buddha were spreading, in the valley (village) known as Mendrelgang… [followed by many examples showing that there the Buddhist religion was not followed]’. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र जन्म ‘earth male monkey. In Bacot’s version then places the plot in ‘a great forest of India called forest of Santal Heruka’. The Santal are a tribe living in the plains adjacent to the Himalayas, in southern Nepal, in Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and Assam. This geographical reference is also missing in the Bhutanese version. The name of the ब्रह्मास्त्र 'beauty woman' .

Local oral tradition in the border area between Tawang and eastern Bhutan strongly points to the origin of the story there. The Ganden Namgyel Lhatseling monastery in Tawang is widely believed to be constructed on the site of King Kala Wangpo’s palace. Khandro Drowa
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Zangmo herself is believed to have been born in Khar village under Bongkhar circle under Tawang. And the land of Pemacen, where Kuntu Lekpa becomes the king, is said to be present-day Yu Pemacen hamlet of Caleng village under Phongme geok just across the border in Bhutan. The demon queen Hacang is thought to have been a native of a still existent four-storied house in the hamlet of Dung under Kharman village of Pangchen valley, Zemithang circle. The throne is located in the forest below the hamlet. And on the way from Caleng village to Merak, one can still find the black Damngon chorten which was built on top of her buried body by Kuntu Lekpa to subjugate her.

First article: Lowo and Dzema, though old, remained childless, much to their despair. The ‘five classes of Dakini’s’ feel pity and gift the couple with a child. After three months the child exclaims from the womb ‘om mani peme hum hri, may all sentient beings be freed from the suffering of the lower realms, may they be endowed with bliss’. Dzema expresses her fear that the child in her womb might be the incarnation not of a Boddhisattva but of Pehar Gyelpo and that the law of the Indian king and the law of Tibet and Hor might bear upon her, and she considers suicide. Lowo then tells her to meditate and that their child is a son he will be the reincarnation of Thuje Chenpo, the great compassionate, and if a daughter, the reincarnation of Yeshe Khandro. A girl is born, whom the Dakini’s call Khandroma Drowa Zangmo. The Dakini’s predict the three events occurring in her life. In the time of the first diffusion of Buddhism, she will be among King Kala Wangpo and Queen Hacang in Mendrelgang. In the intermediate time, she will give birth to a son and a daughter. In the time of the second diffusion of Buddhism, she will face the obstruction of a demon and leaving behind her parents and family she will have to fly to the land of the Dakini’s in the West.

Second article: Gyelpo Kala Wangpo of Mendrelgang takes his ‘multi-coloured iron bitch-dog knowing how to bark’ for a hunt, against the will of his ministers and subjects. They set off for the hunt in the forests of India, but do not find a single wild animal. They then go to a big forest on the border of India and Mon and there they shoot 37 barking deer. But in the evening the hunting dog is lost. The next morning Minister Trinadzin spots a small house in the forest of Tsandan Heruka ‘Santal Heruka’ and they go there to look for the dog. Instead, hidden in the house, they find the
beautiful Drowa Zangmo. The king immediately falls in love, and orders the Brahmin couple to give her as his wife.

Third article: Although Drowa Zangmo prefers to fly away rather than marrying the sinful king, her parents, fearing the king’s wrath, remind her that this would not be in accordance with the Dakini’s prediction. King Kala Wangpo and his court bring the bridal prize, and seated on the male horse 'White Fedlocks' and accompanied by the king on the horse ‘Mercury Goose’ and minister Trinadzin on the horse ‘Enchanting’ they proceed to the palace in Mendrelgang. Drowa Zangmo, realizing it is her mission to convert king and subjects to the Buddhist religion, preaches the principles of Buddhism to the king. The king accepts the new faith, and orders his ministers and subjects to follow the precepts of Buddhism. Once the kingdom follows them, great prosperity follows. In the 'Tara temple' Drowa Zangmo gives birth to a daughter, 'Enchanting' Lhacik Kuntu Zangmo (Kunzang) and after three years to a son, 'Enchanting' Lhase Kuntu Lekpa (Kunlek).

The Bhutanese version then recounts a 'Tara' acrostic poem missing from Bacot’s translation. King Kala Wangpo tells Drowa Zangmo:

'Truly beautiful lotus flower',
'Listen to me, the king possessing colour',
'No matter how I look at it there is no essence',
'I have absolute devotion to the sublime Dharma'.
'In the appearance of a meditator I was able to retreat as a son of the gods',
'In the house where the nine desirable beverages meet',
'The two siblings not subdued by small fish without disease(?).'
'You, white Tara Drowa Zangmo',
'Mother and children cannot be separated and expelled',
'Now stay treasuring the meditation of the sublime Dharma',
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"let it remain in your mind, beautiful maiden".

To which Drowa Zangmo replied:

‘Listen to me, king who is like a hero,
the girl who is not allowed to stay with her parents’,
‘tied together like two cows with a rope around the head’,
‘like a corpse taken out from a flock of ewes and lambs’.
‘Similar to the heat and the cold of the eight types of fear of Tsari’,
‘I arrived at this place radiating with the heat of the female demon’,
‘summoned in emergency to practice the Dharma with the king’,
‘to tread on the path of liberation of the sly king’,
‘Becoming discouraged because there is no essence in the knowledge from the crown of the head’,
‘but the desire of enjoying food and drinks is hard to repay’,
‘not practicing the sublime Dharma in the midst of business’,
‘when reaching in the incomparable presence of the law of the Lord of Death’.
‘The white she-goat surrounded by sheep’,
‘crossing mountain passes and valleys and arriving at the slaughter house of Mara’,
‘even though having an affectionate spouse’,
‘in this place sadness will arise among mother and children’.
‘On the day Queen Hacang will eat mother and children’,
‘the mother will not stay but go to the land of the Dakini’s’.

After speaking thus, Drowa Zangmo and her children revert to meditation in the Drolma Lhakhang. Then one day, a female servant of Queen Hacang called Zemarago ‘Barbed’ or ‘Goat-head Eyelashes’ sees Drowa Zangmo and her children and reports this to Queen Hacang. The Queen goes to the Drolma Lhakhang to verify the news and is enraged when she sees it is true. She vows she will eat the three of them that same day.
Fourth Article: Drowa Zangmo remembers the prediction made at her birth. She sends her son to his father, and leaving her jewellery and clothing with her daughter, tells her to meet their father as well. Then she herself flies off to the land of the Dakini’s in the west. The children go to their father who is stricken with grief when he discovers Drowa Zangmo missing. In vain, the three of them pray to Drowa Zangmo to return.

Fifth article: In the meantime, Queen Hacang assembles the ministers and promises to reward them if they cooperate with her plan to make the King mad and imprison him. They agree, and give the King छ्वेत्युं ‘grape wine’ to comfort his soul, which is actually छ्वेत्युं ‘water of madness’. The King becomes mad and is imprisoned. But Queen Hacang knows the ministers will object to killing the two children. Instead, she feigns a terrible illness and tells the ministers that only the hearts of the two children can cure her. The ministers reluctantly agree. The Queen sends for two युं खुं butcher brothers who cannot differentiate virtue from sin. The eldest brother is commanded to remove the princess’ heart and the younger brother the princes’ heart. But upon reaching the children, the prince convinces the brothers not to kill them, and feeling mercy, the brothers agree on presenting the Queen with two dog’s hearts instead, eating which she immediately recovers. The two brothers advise the children not to play in the flower garden, or the Queen might see them. But they do it after all, and the Queen is enraged once more. She again feigns great illness, and commands the ministers to call for two खुं खुं fishermen brothers. When they arrive, she orders the elder brother to throw the princess in the ocean, and the younger brother to throw the prince into the ocean. Despite the prince’s plea, the brothers do not change their mind. When the younger brother is about to throw the prince in the ocean, the prince requests a last prayer, and the brother grants it. The prince prays to the Khandro Denga and their mother, and the fishermen feel compassion and agree not to kill the children. Instead, they tell them to go to Eastern India where Buddhism flourishes and advise them to beg for food and drink there. The fishermen themselves, taking their families, flee to another land as well.

The princess leads her brother through great forests in hunger, thirst and sadness. As the princess goes off to collect water mixed with mud from a place shown by their mother in the form of raven, the prince is intoxicated by the breath of a large female black snake and falls dead. The princess laments her final loss, and Drowa Zangmo, hearing her lamentation, interrupts her preaching to the Dakinis. In the form of a white medicinal snake, she brings the prince back to life, and disappears back into the sky. As they continue their path through a
large forest their mother, in the form of a monkey, shows them to eat the fruits from the ‘Wish-fulfilling tree’.

At that same time, Queen Hacang sees the prince and princess walk through the great forest of Eastern India from the top of the palace of Mendrelgang, and she summons all the ministers and orders them to hunt down and bring them to her themselves now. The ministers lure the children to them, saying their father is cured and asks for them. This way, they catch the children, and bring them back to Mendrelgang. Queen Hacang calls for two outcast brothers who enjoy sins, and tells the younger one to throw the prince and the elder one to throw the princess into an abyss of Mount Shingri in India. The next day, they are taken to Mount Shingri, and after a prayer by the prince, the elder outcast brother feels compassion and releases the princess. But neither the elder brother nor the princess can convince the younger brother, who throws the prince in the abyss. The prince does not fall down, but remains suspended in the air, and Drowa Zangmo takes on the form of a male and a female vulture, and the male vulture, carrying the prince on his wings, drops him in the ocean. Drowa Zangmo then takes on the form of a big male and female fish, and the male fish delivers the prince from the ocean. The female vulture and fish depart, not finding the princess.

Sixth Chapter: The prince, left on his own on the shore of the ocean, does not know where to go. Drowa Zangmo takes the form of a speaking parrot from Pemacen. The prince is clad in clothes in the colours of the rainbow, white leather sandals and a cloth bound around his head like a turban that fall from the sky and he is seated under a sandalwood tree. A Brahmin hermit travels the land of Pemacen announcing the arrival of the prince, and upon seeing him, the people of Pemacen accept him as their king. Seated on the horse Ngangpa Serden he is brought to Pemacen, which prospers under his rule.

Meanwhile, the princess, in grief about her brother is about to kill herself, but withheld from this by the elder outcast. He carries her away, and in regret over all the sin he has committed, he is about to kill himself, from which she prevents him. He then advises her to go to Pemacen, where the nomads will provide her with food and drink. She collects some hair and bone from the foot of the cliff of Mount Shingri, thinking it might be her brother’s, and asks the Brahmin hermit to make it into votives and enter them into a stupa.
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Seventh Chapter: The princess arrives among the nomads who feed her and clothe her in patched clothes in three colours and give her an old dog’s bowl and cup and tell her to go to the palace of Pemacen and beg there. Arriving at the king’s palace and prostrating there, the king asks his minister Dawa Zangpo to ask the beggar girl who she is and where she is from. When the minister reports her answer to the king, he recognizes her as his own sister, and they are reunited and the kingdom of Pemacen prospers even more.

Eight Chapter: After some time, Queen Hacang, looking from the roof of the palace in Mendrelgang, sees the prince and princess reign over Pemacen and calls her ministers and subjects in order to declare war on Pemacen. The preparation for the war on both sides and the ensuing battle are described in much more detail in the Bhutanese version than in Bacot. In Pemacen, the king decides to lead the army against Mendrelgang himself. Seated on his horse Ngangpa Phurshe ‘Goose knowing how to fly’ he and his army meet Queen Hacang and her army in lower Pemacen. The king prays for his success and shoots an iron arrow at Queen Hacang, hitting her in the heart and making her fall from the horse. The Queen’s soldiers, recognizing their previous prince, surrender and pay their obedience. With the king aiming the iron bow on the Queens heart, Queen Hacang begs the king for forgiveness and for him to save her life. Recounting all the evils the Queen has done, the king realizes that saving her life is not possible, and a rain of iron arrows, small knives and spears from the four directions pierces the Queen and kills her. Her body is buried under nine layers of earth, and on top of it a black stupa is constructed. The army of Mendrelgang and people of Pemacen celebrate.

Then the king goes to Mendrelgang, taking with him three bags of death-conquering medicine. He catches Zemarago and banishes her to a place where no people live, and releases his father from prison. The king doesn’t recognize his son at first and is in bad health, but after applying the medicine he becomes better. Father and son assume the throne in the palace of Mendrelgang together. Headed by minister Dzeden and Trinadzin the ministers of Mendrelgang pay obedience, show regret and offer valuables to the king and his son. The son tells the ministers to learn from the past and put their faith in the Dharma. The king then calls for the two butchers and the two fishermen, and besides various riches, they are made the main ministers in the kingdom of Mendrelgang and the kingdom of Pemacen. The king and his son return to Pemacen, and in both kingdoms happiness and prosperity reigns.
ANNEX IV TO PARAGRAPH 9.1. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TSHANGLA SPEAKERS IN THE DZONGKHAKS AND GEOKS OF BHUTAN.

The table on the following pages shows the geoks and town areas in the 20 dzongkhaks of Bhutan, the total number of people enumerated in those geoks and towns, the number of people that speak Tshangla within the household setting, and the percentage of Tshangla speakers in that geok, town and dzongkhak. The data were collected during the Population and Housing Census of Bhutan 2005. The administrative setup, names of geoks, and linguistic composition of certain areas, particularly the towns and the resettlement areas in the south, will have considerably changed in the past six years. Despite that, these data still give a good overview of the linguistic importance of Tshangla in Bhutan.

The numbers and percentages reflected in this table do not represent the number of mother tongue speakers of Tshangla. In many mixed households, Tshangla is the main language of communication although usually only one of the partners is a mother tongue speaker. Neither do the numbers and percentages in this table represent the number of people able to speak Tshangla, which will obviously be even higher, as many people who speak another language within their household are bi-or multilingual and also conversant in Tshangla, especially in the eastern dzongkhaks and main town and resettlement areas.

Dzongkhaks and geoks were Tshangla is the majority language have been shaded dark grey. The majority language is here defined as more than 50% of all speakers. The majority languages of the geoks where Tshangla is not the majority language are given between brackets. In Monggar, Tshangla is the majority language except in the geoks of Chali (Chalikha), Gongduk (Gongdukse Ang), Silambi (Khengkha), Tsakaling and Tsamang (Chocangaca). In Trashigang, Tshangla is the majority language except in the geoks of Merak and Sakteng (Brokpake). In Samdrup Jongkhar, Tshangla is the majority language except in the geoks of Phüntshothang, Langchenphu and Samrang (Lhotshamkha/Nepali). In Pemagatshel, Tshangla is the majority language in all geoks. Tshangla is also the majority language in Khamdang, Ramjar, Yalang, Tötsho and Jamkhar geoks of Trashiyangtsi, although it is a minority language in the dzongkhak by a few percent.

Geoks where Tshangla is a sizeable minority (20-50% of all speakers) have been shaded light grey. Sizeable Tshangla minorities can be found in the towns of Jakar and Batpalathang in Bumthang, Phüntsholing and Chukha town in Chukha, Dagapela and Lhamoizingkha town in Dagana, Gasa town in Gasa, Autsho and Lhüntsi towns in Lhüntsi, Bonde town in Paro, Sipsu, Samtse and Gomtu towns in Samtsi, Gelephu and Sarpang towns
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in Sarpang, Thimphu town in Thimphu, Damphu town in Tsirang, Wangdü town in Wangdü. Moreover, sizeable Tshangla minorities as a result of historical migration can be found in Bjoka geok in Zhemgang\(^1\) and Gangzur geok in Lhüntsi\(^2\), and as a result of recent resettlement in the geoks of Gumaune in Samtsi and Bhur, Chuzergang, Gelephu and Umling in Sarpang. The Tshangla minority in Dagala in Thimphu is perhaps the consequence of the presence of a large police and inmate population in the Camgang prison there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dzongkhak</th>
<th>Gewok/Town</th>
<th>Total Enumerated Population</th>
<th>Total Number of Tshangla Speakers</th>
<th>Percentage of Tshangla Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bumthang</td>
<td>Chökhor</td>
<td>4553</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chume</td>
<td>3591</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tang</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jakar town</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bapalathang town</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camkhar town</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dekiling town</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jalkhar town</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16116</strong></td>
<td><strong>1573</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukha</td>
<td>Balujhora</td>
<td>7310</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bjacho</td>
<td>3583</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bongo+Getena</td>
<td>7773</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capcha</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dala</td>
<td>8566</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dungma</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geling</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logchina</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metakha</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phuntsholing</td>
<td>5183</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dala Town</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gedu town</td>
<td>4288</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phüntsholing town</td>
<td>20537</td>
<td>5570</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsimalakha town</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsimasham town</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chukha town</td>
<td>2855</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74387</strong></td>
<td><strong>10723</strong></td>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorona</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Ref. paragraph 9.13.4.
\(^2\) Ref. paragraphs 4.2.6 and 7.3.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dagana</th>
<th>2121</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gesarling</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gozhi</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kana</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khibisa</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajab</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashiding</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsendagang</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsangkha</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsheza</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichula</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deorali</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhamoizingkha</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daga dzong</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagapela</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drujegang</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankosh</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhamoizingkha Town</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22670</strong></td>
<td><strong>1308</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gasa</th>
<th>906</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khame</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khatō</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laya</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunana</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasa town</td>
<td>3116</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3116</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>2901</th>
<th>531</th>
<th>18%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Õsu</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsho</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samar</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombekha</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gakiling</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha town</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13008</strong></td>
<td><strong>1160</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lhüntsi</th>
<th>2690</th>
<th>682</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jare</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoma</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtō</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menbi</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menji</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Metsho 1210</th>
<th>Tsengkhar 2142</th>
<th>Tshangla Town 301</th>
<th>Lhüntsi Town 1175</th>
<th>Total 15395</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Location                  | Balam 1092 | Chali 1620 | Casakhar 2376 | Drametsi+Narang 3369 | Drepong 1094 | Gongdu 1329 | Jurme 1449 | Kengkhar 1996 | Monggar 3421 | Ngatsang 2109 | Saling 2110 | Sherimung 1830 | Silambi 1458 | Thangri 1863 | Tsakaling 1596 | Tsamang 1204 | Drametsi Town 541 | Gyalpozhing 2291 | Monggar 3502 | Lingmethang 819 | Total 37069 | 23697 | 64% |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|------------|---------------|------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------|
|                           | 1018        | 173         | 2216           | 3055                | 1036         | 204        | 1354      | 1862          | 2822        | 1762          | 813       | 1559          | 25         | 1750       | 76            | 25         | 365           | 1285       | 1929          | 368        | 23697 | 64% |
|                           | 93%         | 11%         | 93%            | 91%                 | 95%          | 15%        | 93%       | 93%           | 82%         | 84%           | 39%       | 85%           | 2%         | 94%        | 5%            | 2%         | 67%           | 56%        | 55%          | 45%        |       |     |
|                           |             |             |                |                     |              |            |           |               |             |               |           |               |             |            |               |             |               |             |       |     |

| Location                  | Dogar 2273 | Doteng 1149 | Hungrel 2016 | Lango 3336 | Lungne 2543 | Naja 3254 | Shaba 4072 | Shari 3180 | TsenTo 5253 | Wangchang 6425 | Bonde Town 570 | Tshongdu 2362 | Total 36433 | 3604 | 10% |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
|                           | 74          | 107         | 154          | 223        | 160         | 32        | 517       | 251       | 545       | 1024          | 122           | 395         |             |       |     |
|                           | 3%          | 9%          | 8%           | 7%         | 6%          | 1%        | 13%       | 8%        | 10%       | 16%           | 21%           | 17%         |             |       |     |

| Location                  | Paro 5421  | Monggar 3849 | Dratsang 4563 | Kengkhar 2264 | Lhuenti 3023 | Total 35805 | 20466 | 57% |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
|                           | 254         | 2822         | 2583           | 1862         | 2376        | 10409       | 1750  | 94% |
|                           | 6%          | 82%          | 74%            | 93%          | 93%         | 1750       | 94%   |     |

| Location                  | Paro 5421  | Monggar 3849 | Dratsang 4563 | Kengkhar 2264 | Lhuenti 3023 | Total 35805 | 20466 | 57% |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
|                           | 254         | 2822         | 2583           | 1862         | 2376        | 10409       | 1750  | 94% |
|                           | 6%          | 82%          | 74%            | 93%          | 93%         | 1750       | 94%   |     |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pemagatshel</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chimong</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chongshing</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungmin</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khar</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumar</td>
<td>3568</td>
<td>3231</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurung</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zobel</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanong</td>
<td>2351</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decheling</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbugang+Chökhorling</td>
<td>2982</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanaldang town</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kherigonpa town</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongling town</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangkor town</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemagatshel town</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalang town</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khodakpa</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanglam Town</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22287</strong></td>
<td><strong>19865</strong></td>
<td><strong>89%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punakha</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuba</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gönshari</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guma</td>
<td>4288</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabji</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbu</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenga Bjemi</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Töwang</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zomi</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barp</td>
<td>3326</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Töp</td>
<td>2421</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khuru town</td>
<td>2292</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23462</strong></td>
<td><strong>1663</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data represents the number of Tshangla speakers in different towns in Bhutan, with the percentage of Tshangla speakers in each town indicated. The total number of Tshangla speakers is 22287 in Pemagatshel and 23462 in Punakha, making up 89% and 7% of the total speakers respectively.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Samrang</th>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Certified</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samdrup Jongkhar</td>
<td>Samrang</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serthi</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samdrupchöling town</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jomotsangkha town</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewathang town</td>
<td>2644</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samdrup Jongkhar town</td>
<td>5952</td>
<td>3318</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33889</strong></td>
<td><strong>23834</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Bara</th>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Certified</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samtse</td>
<td>Bara</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biru</td>
<td>3026</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chargare</td>
<td>3155</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chengmari</td>
<td>3877</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denchukha</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorokha</td>
<td>4419</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dungtö</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gumaune</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lahereni</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nainital</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pugli</td>
<td>5057</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samtse</td>
<td>3263</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sipsu</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tading</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tendu</td>
<td>4587</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Gomtu town</th>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Certified</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gomtu town</td>
<td>4254</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samtse town</td>
<td>4981</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sipsu town</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58740</strong></td>
<td><strong>5855</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Bhur</th>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Certified</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarpang</td>
<td>Bhur</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chuzergang</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dekiling</td>
<td>3835</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doban</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gelephu</td>
<td>3975</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiley</td>
<td>2517</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jigmechöling</td>
<td>3414</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shompangkha</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sershong</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singhi</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taklai</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umling</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Gelephu town</th>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Certified</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gelephu town</td>
<td>9119</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarpang town</td>
<td>2619</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37021</td>
<td>7330</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cang</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagala</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawang</td>
<td>2582</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingzhi</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewang</td>
<td>4743</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naro</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sö</td>
<td>2421</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimphu town</td>
<td>79185</td>
<td>18635</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95167</td>
<td>20556</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartsham</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidung</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanglung</td>
<td>4749</td>
<td>3585</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangpara</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaling</td>
<td>3046</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumang</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>3996</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merak</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phongme</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radi</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakteng</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samkhar</td>
<td>2681</td>
<td>2209</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shongphu</td>
<td>3463</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrimsning</td>
<td>2435</td>
<td>2263</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzorong</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangnyer</td>
<td>2315</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanglung town</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaling town</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangjung town</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trashigang town</td>
<td>2383</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wamrong town</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riserbu town</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48783</td>
<td>35405</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bumdeling</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamkhar</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamdang</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramjar</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tötscho</td>
<td>2128</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trashi Yangtsi</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tongzhang</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalang</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangtse</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doksum town</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangtse Town</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17740</strong></td>
<td><strong>8334</strong></td>
<td><strong>47%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trongsa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drakteng</td>
<td>2697</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korphu</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langthel</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangsibji</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trongsa town</td>
<td>2695</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13419</strong></td>
<td><strong>787</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tsirang</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barshong</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beteni</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunglagang</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosaling</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikhorthang</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendrelgang</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patale</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phuntenchu</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangthangling</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semjong</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsholingkhar</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsirangtö</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damphu town</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18667</strong></td>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Athang          | 808 | 9   | 1%  |
| Bjena           | 2110 | 177 | 8%  |
| Daga            | 1347 | 32  | 2%  |
| Dangchu         | 1299 | 29  | 2%  |
| Gangte          | 1677 | 93  | 6%  |
| Gasetsho Gom    | 2241 | 98  | 4%  |
| Gasetsho Wom    | 722  | 33  | 5%  |
| Kazhi           | 1284 | 37  | 3%  |
| Nahi            | 823  | 20  | 2%  |
| Nyisho          | 2304 | 112 | 5%  |
| Phangyul        | 1127 | 56  | 5%  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wangdü Phodrang</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phobji</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rüpaissa</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sephu</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetsho</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobding town</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rurichu town</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangdü town</td>
<td>6714</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31135</strong></td>
<td><strong>2510</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhemgang</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bardo</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjoka</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshing</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangkor</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nganglha</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phangkhar</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingkhar</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trong</td>
<td>3314</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangbang town</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tingtibi town</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhemgang town</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18636</strong></td>
<td><strong>1217</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole Bhutan</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>564724</strong></td>
<td><strong>173205</strong></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ANNEX V TO CHAPTER 9.4. SOME SELECTED GENETIC DATA.

**Table XX: Frequencies of haplogroup M9a’b distribution by ethno-geographic group in the Himalayas and Northeast India (data extracted from Peng 2011 et al.).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Linguistic Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M9a1b</th>
<th>M9a1b</th>
<th>M9a1a</th>
<th>M9a1a1c1b</th>
<th>M9a1a2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mosuo (Na)</td>
<td>Yunnan</td>
<td>TB, Lolo-Burmese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Khasi</td>
<td>Meghalaya</td>
<td>Mon-Khmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bengali, Rajbhangsi</td>
<td>Bangladesh, West Bengal</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bodo-Garo</td>
<td>North and Northeast India</td>
<td>TB, Bodo-Garo (plus Jingpho, Konyak)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lepcha</td>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>TB, ?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maram, Naga, Chin</td>
<td>Meghalaya, AP, Myanmar</td>
<td>Kuki-Chin (Naga)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tani (Adi, Lhoba, Galo)</td>
<td>Shannan, Nyingchi, AP</td>
<td>TB, Tani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tibetan (Amdo)</td>
<td>NE Tibet, Qinghai</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tibetan (Kham)</td>
<td>E Tibet, Sichuan, Yunnan</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tibetan (Kongpo)</td>
<td>SE Tibet, Nyingchi</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tibetan (Lhoka)</td>
<td>S Tibet, Shannan</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tibetan (U)</td>
<td>C Tibet, Lhasa</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tibetan (Tsang)</td>
<td>C Tibet, Shigatse</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tibetan (Nakchu)</td>
<td>N Tibet, Nagqu</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
<td>W Tibet</td>
<td>TB, Bodic,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Bodish</th>
<th>6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lachungpa</td>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>TB, Bodic, Bodish/Lepcha</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tshangla (Monpa)</td>
<td>Dirang AP, Nyingchi Tibet</td>
<td>TB, Bodic?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dhimal</td>
<td>North India and Nepal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tharu</td>
<td>North India and Nepal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
In Tibet the Lhoba nationality includes the various Adi tribes, but in Nyingchi also the Deng (any of the three Mishmi groups) and in Shannan also the Puroik. Perhaps, a more precise subdivision might reveal that the single subject from Shannan belonging to haplogroup M9a1b* actually belongs to the Puroik, and perhaps a further division between Adi and Mishmi can be found among the haplogroups M9a1a2 and M9a1b1. The Bodo-Garo group includes the Wanchoo, Rabha, Sonowal Kachari, Mech, Bodo and Garo of the Tarai and Duar area, the Brahmaputran plains and part of Meghalaya. The Lachungpa of the previous literature is derived from the village of Lachung in North Sikkim. The people of Lachung are partially Bhutia (endonym Drenjongpa), descendants of early Tibetan migrants to Sikkim, and partially Lepcha. Their grouping together under ‘Lachungpa’ is therefore unfortunate and misleading. Kham Tibetan includes the populations of Kham Dechen (now Diqing under Yunnan), Kham Ngaba (now Garze under Sichuan) and Kham proper (Chamdo). Amdo Tibetan includes the populations of Qinghai and Gannan in Gansu. The occurrence of haplogroup M9a1a2 among the Tharu and Dhimal once more confirms their complex and insufficiently understood linguistic and genetic origin.

**TABLE XX: HAPLOGROUP FREQUENCIES OF mtDNA OF A 51-SUBJECT PEMAKŌ TSHANGLA (MONBA) POPULATION OF THE TIBETAN PLATEAU (ADAPTED FROM QIN ET AL. 2011 TABLE 1).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haplogroups</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4a</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subhaplgr</th>
<th>Main distr.</th>
<th>Lineage</th>
<th>Toto</th>
<th>Galo</th>
<th>Wancho</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>Lepcha</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M58</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M59</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M60</td>
<td>NEI TB</td>
<td>M60a</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M60b</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M61</td>
<td>NEI TB</td>
<td>M61a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M61b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M62</td>
<td>NEI TB</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>tribal DR/IE</td>
<td>M4c</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30</td>
<td>tribal AA/DR/IE</td>
<td>M30d</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M37</td>
<td>tribal AA/IE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M43</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>M43b</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M33</td>
<td>tribal AA/IE</td>
<td>M33a1a</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex V. Tshangla Genetic Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M33a3</th>
<th>M33b</th>
<th>M35 tribal DR/AA</th>
<th>M35b</th>
<th>M40 tribal AA</th>
<th>M40a</th>
<th>M49 NEI TB</th>
<th>M49a</th>
<th>M49b</th>
<th>M9 (E) C/E Asia/Tibet</th>
<th>M9d</th>
<th>M10 E Asia/Tibet</th>
<th>M10a</th>
<th>M11 E Asia/Tibet</th>
<th>M11a</th>
<th>M12 E Asia</th>
<th>M12a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G N/C Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2a1a</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>G2c</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>G2d</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>G6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 (C) NE/C Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4a1a1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C4a1a</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>C4a1a2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>C4a3a</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4a4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>C71a1a</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>C71a1b</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>C7a2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 (Z) E/C Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z3a</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Z3b</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Z7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (D4) N/E Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D4b2b5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>D4b2b4</td>
<td></td>
<td>D4j1a</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>D4j1b1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td>D4p</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>D4q</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (D5) S China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D5a2a</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>D5a2b</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>D5a2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>100 (28)</td>
<td>100 (40)</td>
<td>100 (22)</td>
<td>100 (12)</td>
<td>100 (20)</td>
<td>100 (13)</td>
<td>100 (32)</td>
<td>100 (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Chandrasekar et al. (2009) the frequency of haplogroup M in the total can be derived to be 93% for Toto, 85.4 for Sherdukpen, 80.8 for Dirang Monpa, 77.8 for Lachungpa, 75.9 for Lepcha, 65.5 for Wancho, 62 for Sonowal Kachari, and 49.6 for Galo. Populations known for relative isolation and endogamous marriage practices are characterised by low haplogroup diversity. This specifically refers to the Toto and the Lepcha, with 5 and 6 haplogroups respectively. The high frequency of haplogroup D4, with a TMRCA of 32,000 years, among the Toto (75%) could indicate an ancient origin in Northern China. If similar frequencies are found among other isolated groups such as the Lhokpu and the Gongduk in Bhutan and perhaps the Puroik in Arunachal and isolated groups in Nepal, there could be an indication that these populations are the remnants of Palaeolithic settlers on the Tibetan plateau who migrated south across the Himalayas as a result of worsening climatic conditions on the plateau during the LGM. There could have had admixture from indigenous Austroasiatic populations as indicated by for example haplogroup M35b (TMRCA 22,000 years). The Sherdukpen mtDNA shows a similar genetic structure, with high frequencies of haplogroups D4 but with considerable admixture of haplogroup M61 (TMRCA 10,000 years) which appears more Tibetan in origin rather than Indian, indicating an early southward migration from the Tibetan plateau after the LGM. Among the Lepcha, the high frequencies of haplogroups C4 and D4 would also indicate an origin from the Tibetan plateau and beyond, with considerable admixture from indigenous maternal lines as evidenced in the frequencies of haplogroup M33 (TMRCA 25,000-33,000 years) which is found in high frequencies among the tribal populations of India, and population expansion from South-western China or Southeastern Tibet through the Brahmaputra river valley, as evidenced by haplogroup M9d (TMRCA 27,000 years). The Lachungpa appear to represent a later migration from the Tibetan plateau into the valleys of Sikkim, with again haplogroup M61 and also haplogroups Z and G occurring in high frequencies. The relatively high frequency of haplogroup M9d could be an indication of (an admixture of) Lepcha maternal lines, as Lachungpa are a heterogeneous population of Lepcha and Tibetan (Bhutia/Drenjongpa) origin. The Dirang Monpa population shows a diverse origin. Some haplogroups, such as D4, Z and M61/M62 indicate the historical migration of people from the Tibetan plateau, which would probably also be evidenced in the occurrence of haplogroups A4 and F1 in complete mtDNA sequences, haplogroup C7 might indicate an intrusion from South-western China which also left its marking on the Wancho and likely other Naga-Kuki-Chin people of the region. Haplogroup M49 (TMRCA 25,000 years), unique to the Dirang Monpa, and high in frequency, could be another indication of the ancient origin of the Dirang Monpa.
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ANNEX VI TO PARAGRAPH 9.11 PROTO-TIBETO-BURMAN ROOTS IN TSHANGLA.
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ANNEX VII TO PARAGRAPH 9.14.4: TSHANGLA KATSOM.

Katsom ‘alphabetic poems’ are acrostic, metrical compositions in which the initial letters of each line form a continuous sequence, word or sentence. A Katsom rhyme starting with the syllables of the /selje sumcu/ ‘thirty consonant syllables’ is used to teach children the ‘Ucen alphabet. Both the Tibetan language and Dzongkha have katsom, and we have seen a Chöke example in Annex IV. Below follow three katsom varieties from the Tshangla speaking area, which could be used to teach Tshangla ’Ucen to children in mother tongue education.

The first katsom was provided to me by Naiten Wangchuk of Wangphai, Monggar.

’Ucen Tshangla:

Roman Tshangla and translation:


(2) Caka anyi ma choile. Chaku bunyi ungga di. Jate jamnyi ma choile. Nyatan kornyi lok odo. Don’t hang around idle. Carry the hoe and go to the field. Don’t stay drinking tea. Roam around over there and come back.

¹ Alphabet
² Western Bhutanese government official in the olden days.
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(5) Tsa thur ma tshangpa songngo te. Tshaga thur rang ma tshutpa. Dzati gabur ngole dang. Wa thur tshungme khelela. *Those people who are not mentally sound. Don’t achieve anything. When [they say they will] buy nutmeg and camphor. [They] have to catch a cow.*


(7) Raba shele daknyila. La thur gokpe khelela. Sha thur ngamme daknyila. Sa la phurtsi thololo. Hampa ma chi waktsate. *When wanting to kill a goat. A mountains pass has to be crossed. When wanting to eat meat. The ground is covered in dust.*

The katsom continues by adding the four vowels to each of the consonants, of which Naiten recalled the first two.

'Ucen Tshangla:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ucen Tshangla:} & \\
\text{Roman Tshangla and translation:} & \\
\end{align*}
\]


---

3 Mother’s elder sister.
4 Bamboo or wooden container for carrying water or liquor.
5 Local priest.
6 Kira, women’s dress.
7 Cross-cousin sister or sister-in-law.
8 Village near Monggar town on the way to Korila.
9 This river flows on the opposite side of Monggar town.
(2) Khi thur wule daknyila. Khu thur tshingtshing unana. Khe thur zale daknyila. Kho thur photnyi thawala. *When wanting to defecate. A dog is following behind. When wanting to eat a walnut. A cooking pot was broken.*

The second katsom can be found on the cassette ‘Deley deley’ by Pelvision, with thanks to Tshering Phuntsho of Orong, Samdrup Jongkhar for helping with the transliteration.

'Tcen Tshangla:

Roman Tshangla and translation:


(2) Caka anyi ma choile. Chaku bunyi ungga di. Jate jamnyi ma choile. Nyatan gotnyi lok odo. *Don’t hang around idle. Carry the hoe and go to the field. Don’t stay drinking tea. Look around over there and come back.*

(3) Taka mangpha kotate. Tha dang damtsi tshungshona. Data phanme ga pechasho. Nathen tsadreknyi lamcona. *It doesn’t matter boy.* Keep your loyalty. The books will bring benefit now. Study them with effort and perseverance.

(4) Patang takpe noksam dang. Phama drinlen jaibe khe. Barra aringga ma yappha. Madang pule rang ma likpa. *The aspiration to become a dasho and. The gratitude to be shown to one’s parents. If the rice is not sown in the field. It will definitely not sprout.*

---

10 Village and geok to the southwest of Monggar town in between the Kuri and Gongri rivers.
11 Mountain pass between Monggar and Trashigang.
12 Lit. ‘younger brother’ or ‘paralel cousin brother’.
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(5) Tsa thur ma tshangpa songngo te. Tshajang tshalerang mangphana. Dzadang zurka nupchole. Wate waknyirang chodona. Those people who are not mentally sound. Would never be concerned. They will enter into a nook and corner. And stay herding cattle. 


(7) Raga ashom chinyibu. Laga omshagi ngamthana. Shawa amzabakki wai. Saga solo bu zanthana. Even when sowing maize at ground level. The bear will eat the leaves. The deer family. Even eats the ginger and the chilies.


The final katsom was contributed on the website www.nopkin.com by ‘meritocean’ (Sonam Jamtsho) on August 6, 2007.

‘Ucen Tshangla:

Roman Tshangla and translation:


---

13 This is a Dzongkha loan.
14 High-level government official.
15 The last two lines were added to complete the last stanza of the song.

(3) Tabu ma chonyibu. Tha dang damtshi tshungsho. Dare thursha manggi. Nanga narang chole. *Even if you don’t stay forever. Remain faithful. Not just this year only. I will stay with you.*

(4) Pangthang sangmu nangka. Phamai chakpai sazhi. Bago phaiga nangka. Mala shonang philo. *In the dry meadow. The farmland settled by the parents. In the bago²⁰ house. I am not feeling happy.*

(5) Tsama Tokariga. Tshalu zale mala. Dzamling ogagairang Wamrong shonang phina. *Once in Tokari²¹. [There were] no oranges to eat. From all the places in this world. [I] feel happiest in Wamrong²².*


---

¹⁶ Presently called Lhamoizingkha, in Dagana dzongkhak.
¹⁷ Person from Galing village under Shongphu geok, Trashigang dzongkhak.
¹⁸ Two villages in Shongphu geok, Trashigang dzongkhak.
¹⁹ Village in the same geok.
²⁰ Hut made of bamboo mats, wood and banana leaves.
²¹ Village under Nanong geok of Pemagatshel dzongkhak famous for mandarins.
²² Town in Lumang geok, Trashigang dzongkhak.
²³ Point before reaching a mountain pass where rocks and twigs are left as offering to the mountain deity.
²⁴ A male dress with intricate flower design.
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Figure VII-1. Maize and Rice fields in Rangzhikhar village, Samkhar geok, Trashigang dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan.

Figure VII-2. The Dzong of Trashigang, Eastern Bhutan.
ANNEX VIII TO CHAPTER 11. TRANSLATION OF THE BROKPA ORIGIN STORY.

This manuscript was provided in a modern retyped and reprinted version by Mr. Naiten Wangchuk. The original manuscript was written in the fire-male-rat year of the 12th Rapjung cycle, corresponding to 1696-1697 AD. Considering the content of the manuscript, the explanation and glorification of the line of descent of the Brokpa people it is well conceivable that this text, like Lama Ngawang’s Gyelrik, was written to preserve what was still known of the origin of the people. Due to their religious alliance with the Gelukpa School and the Dakpa people of Tawang, but their submission by force to the Drukpa forces, they must have felt an even greater urgency to commit their genealogy to writing. The manuscript consists of two parts: the original text dating to 1696-1697, and a later addendum commencing on folio 10b and finishing at folio 12b. The addendum elaborates more on the origin of the Komlön Roksum and the descent of the Merak people from the Kom clan. The manuscript and particularly the addendum has many spelling and typographic mistakes, part of which could be from the original handwritten manuscript, but it is more likely that when the manuscript was committed to a digital version a great many additional spelling adulterations were committed. Combined with the use of archaic Chöke and sometimes even Dakpa and Brokpa vernaculars, as well as the superfluous reference to personal names and loconyms, have made translation of the manuscript very difficult. Examples of archaic speech include नेि (ff. 8) ‘snake’, जीि ‘discussion’ (ff. 11b), फ़िि ‘struggle, quarrel, fight’ (ff. 12a). Examples of Brokpa/Dakpa in the text include फ़िि ‘plain, plain area’, फ़ििििि ‘big, large, extended’, फ़िि ‘stone, rock’ and फ़िि ‘to perform a dance’.

[1a] बुध्यापति अमरदाति अचरित्रि पृथिवी कुञ्जानां बुध्यापति। The concise expression of the line of descent of the Garuda from the Vinaya Scripture.

[1b] Homage to the victorious Manjushri. The origin of our paternal ancestors, the concise expression of the line of descent of the Garuda in accordance with the Vinaya scripture. The King of birds बुध्यापति अमरदाति अचरित्रि बुध्यापति Bya Dapzang Darshok ‘bird with silk wings. From goodness succeeded at the time of बुध्यापति अमरदाति अचरित्रि बुध्यापति Chögyel Songtsen Gampo. By the emanation of the minister renowned world-wide. From there comes the lineage of successive descent.

[2a] And then at the cliff cave of यांगलोशो Yangleshö in नेपाल Nepal a small boy adorned with the major and minor marks of perfection ‘is born from the egg of a garuda. The limbs and subsidiary limbs are webbed fingers like those of a monkey. From the bird’s eyes is born intercourse (?). He went from there [Yangleshö] to यांगलोशो Yarlung Byasa and
looking at a throne near a bird [he] became renowned as Ja Thrizik. After that he had four sons,

[2b] one the yellow-coloured spiritual friend of the birds became known as the white bird [because of] wearing a deep-sleeved white gown. One became known as the many-coloured bird [because of] wearing a fearful silver-coloured deep-sleeved gown. The two younger brothers became known as the black birds [because of] wearing a black deep-sleeved gown. In this way there came the white bird and three coloured birds. [Then regarding] the successive lineages that came from the black birds and were banished. From these birds came Chögyal Pelzang and his two brothers. One seized Byara. One seized Loro. Chögyal Pelzang seized Nyal. And at that time the large armies of Hor caused Tibet to disintegrate. In all the Tibetan cypress forests fire was lit and they burned down causing fear for life. Bya Chogyel Pelzang received a prophesy of ‘a trilogy of razors’. He seized a fortress at the pinnacle of a cliff resembling a mirror in Nyalrong and took shelter in it from where he managed to ward off the army of the Hor, which was not yet in accordance with the prophesy.

[3a] So Bya Chogyel Pelzang, wearing a black deep-sleeved gown, seized the Gyalda cliff in Nyalrong and performed a masked dance. All the Hor (Mongols) ran away in fear thinking there was a man with four arms. The three Bya brothers crossed over the Tsangpo and died. From Bya Nakpo descended the lineage of Ami Byanak Chenpo Dorji adept in the tantric rituals. In accordance with the earlier prophesy he constructed a palace at the summit of Yangtsedrak. From a painted mural in the white chapel of Rahula naturally arose a relief image of Rahula that is still there. The trilogy of razors was entrusted to the black treasury in the palace and it is still there. The trilogy of razors consists of the protector demon, the golden deity and the rahula Vishnu. From then the protective deities of the lineage of the Bya Nakpo became this trilogy of the razors. After that Bya Nakpo was succeeded by Bya Trashi Darge.

[3b] From the black treasury he send a present. Under favourable circumstances the pure teachings of the Buddha came and were accepted spread fast. At that time when the teachings spread and flourished, Tshona was an ancient estate controlled by Byasa. The lineage of Bya Nakpo had thus spread from there to the southern regions. Bya Trashi Darge, saying ‘my descendants are also in the southern region’, went there. The Bya ‘Na’tum made a hundred offerings to Karma Pakshi, poured them on a golden plate, and on top of that cut his right ear and offered it. From the top of the gold, the ear struck three oaths in
answer. 'Na’ tum became known as Drupthop ‘Na’ tum. Because of that he went as the yellow guard at Zimpuk. His son was Bya Dondruppa. His son is Lama Bya Repa. At his time the emanating brothers spread to various places.

Then at that time when he went to Tshona, Yazang Pönpo had already taken control of Dükhar Dzong. ‘All you people of Kom’lön Roksum, the Ngantshang hill obscures the sun from the fortress’. And again and again he gave the command to dig away the top of the hill. All the Kom’lönrok considered what would be the best and they all met together. Then a lady carrying a child exclaimed ‘lo lo, rather than cutting the head of the hill it would be easier to cut the head of a man’. Grasping the symbolic meaning to kill the king, it was understood that the lady was the emanation of Jomo Remati. Then all met and they prepared the conspiracy to kill the king. They ground barley to flour. They boiled a little saffron. They brought all the yaks from the pasturelands and killed them. They gathered and put all the swords, cloth and axe handles inside an effigy and took it along with beer. Saying they wanted to appeal to the king they approached him with reverence and he invited them. Paying their respect they made him completely drunk until an old man stood up and started to speak ‘And now all the youngsters who know how to sing, offer songs to the king, those who know how to dance, dance, those who know how to use the sword, use the sword’. And at that moment all the youngsters took the swords from the effigy and throwing them at the king they killed him. Because they couldn’t stay there anymore, they said to Lama Byarepa ‘All of us have been released from the hands of the king, and we have no place to stay’. And the Lama guided them to Yamarong, Kharro Sewakhar, Phudrakmar, Dataidong, Ri Pema Gosum ‘three-headed lotus mountain’, Tshodongkha ‘radish lake’, Lamdzalam Karpo ‘the white clay path’ and when he saw Karpo the Lama prostrated and prayed he spoke thus: ‘I Lama cannot do this alone. We have to supplicate to Macik Palden Jomo Remati’.

And the Kom’lön roksum all supplicated to the Jomo. They called it Yurungri Karpo ‘white everlasting hill’. The old were carried on the back of Trashi Gyamtsho, the silver was carried in the hands of Trashi Khyilba, the artisan Kunga Gyamtsho and the calves carried the 21 phurpas, the Chögyapa, the Bum, two scriptures written in gold and the Zungdü Chenmo were loaded on a carrier yak. After dismantling the yak hair tents of the nomad camp, the people together with the gods, the horses together with the saddles, the male yaks
together with the crossbreed yaks, the sheep together with the wool, all of them went on their way. From among the patrons and subjects they appointed Lama Jarepa as the guide and left their own land. Following Dzalam Karpo and crossing Kyerchenla pass they arrived at Shaduktu. From there they passed Tagola and crossed the Bomla and reached at lower Chushô. There they crossed the free-flowing Geyakchu ‘virtuous broad river’.

[5b] Praying they should leave behind a female yak for prosperity that would not die but remain there. But instead of making the common fault to leave behind all the animals there, they released one female yak Domo that had broken its leg. Instead of leaving behind the religious scriptures for prosperity they left the cracked and broken wooden plates covering them and even now the scattered fragments can be picked up there. At that place all the people and cattle became without intrinsic shortcomings. Because the name of the place was designed as a broad area it is now known as Geyak. Because the female yak Domo with the broken leg did not go down, got separated and left there it went back and the female and male yaks of Tshona descend from her. All the other animals left and reached at the top of Geshela pass. Departing from there they at Thrimo Bumpadung. Abandoning that place the saw Sokmateng. Descending there they came down to that place and stayed there. They easily left the calves free in the hay and the place became referred to as Beuchu. They made dams in the open meadow and stayed there.

[6a] Because they could not distinguish the snakes appearing in the rising heat from ropes for tying the calves of the legs they tied a white tail at the end of the ropes. From that place onwards they could not bear the heat. For the remaining part they took the example and were no longer capable of [wearing] the red Chinese wool and the supplicated to the Lama. The Lama did a divination. Today, from the hidden pasture area a girl will beckon us with a white piece of cloth. Today, after all of you saddle and load the horses and the dzo, aim to stay at the place where the promise was breached. If anyone says that today no pack animal has died whilst loading remains to be done, tomorrow morning we will reach near the upper northern bridge of Namseng. There the Lama made a bridge from his monastic clothes and the people and cattle all crossed the river to the other side. Out of happiness they, the ancestors of the Komlön Roksum all performed the dance of Jingpa. A much needed bridge came over a river, a big river that had to be crossed.

[6b] After they had pitched the yak hair tents at Sokmateng the ‘field of fodder grass’ even now it is there for all to see. Then from there Tongzam ‘thousand bridge’ they went
to the hidden pasture land where the earth was dry and they named it ‘Namteng. Nowadays it is known as ‘Namteng. Because there were many small insects and frogs they could not stay there and via a cave covered by a cliff they arrived at Doncō ‘the commissioned place’. From there they went to Gyapchung ‘the small back’. From there they went to Punsum ‘the three siblings’. From there they reached Kyemnakla ‘the pass of the ‘beverage-notch’’. There for every two people The Lama after building a meditation hall at the fringe of the lake went into meditation and bound the lake under oath. He left a stone engraved with mani at the lake. This meditation hall is there even now. From there they went to Tsachung Lungshambi. Seizing land they built houses and although most of the places they stayed have decomposed many of the cypress-wood pegs have not decomposed and even now they are there.

[7a] In the olden days when they were staying at Tshona there were the Pema Gosum mountain and Dongkha lake. When looking around Lam Dzalam Karpo they understood that the Lama’s auspiciousness must have made the replacements. The mountain of Lungshambitengchen they named as Ri Pema Gosum and the lake [they called] Yumtsho Ngönmo ‘blue turquoise lake’. They named it as Lam Dzalam Karpo. When staying in that place they became like wildmen and disputes arose. Then the three eastern bands spread to the east. The four western platoons spread to the west. The highland pastures inherited by the three eastern bands are Thengboche, Thangtö, Paptra, Dowo ’Ngönpo, Lunggor, Thonggaphuk, Semolok, ’Lumo Karmo, Thonggarong and Tshogor. The highland pastures inherited by the four western platoons are the peak of Kyemngakla till Thangoche and till the area belonging to Galepshen. Lama Jarepa constructed a monastery at Nyamgateng. To the religious benefactors he offered food grains that arose from little lumps of clay.

[7b] Time and again he found a way to cast away the obstructions that surrounded them and a great devotion for the Vinaya teachings developed. From there the four western platoons spread into different directions. In Sakteng there were fields of winter fodder grass and they established a village and called it Sakteng. The highland pastures inherited by the Saktengpa are upper and lower Sakteng, Pelritse, Lokchen Zurkha, Semolok, Pünsum Gyapchung, Somlok, Bämik, Pamik, Butshikha, Nyakchung etcetera. Merak is called that way because a fire was made in a juniper forest and a village was established that
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became known as Merak. The highland pastures inherited by the Merakpa are the open plain of Merak, Zukmo, Yakza, Bäza, Sarpa Nakyül, Numbur Tsachung, Dowa Labrok, Wanggor etcetera. In Merak the ancestor Namkha Özer founded Tsemo Gönpa. Relying on ‘sunlight monastic robes’ he showed the marks of accomplishment and became known as Sapo. He obtained it searching for it everywhere. Becoming the lord he became known as Nepo ‘the host’.

[8a] Starting from there he founded Sapokhar in Merak. From there they went to Chödrisa. There, after building Kadum and Tadum the name Chödrisa was given. There stabbing a peg in a snake a juniper tree has grown. Going down from there they stayed at and named the place Gyingdrang. That was the time when at Reti, Rakha had seized [the position of] lord. Paying for the value of the land a golden plate they bought the area of Khrolamang, the three hills of Phunyuk, Pangphu and Karphu, lower Gyingdrang, Broklung Shambi, Danglabroksa, the upper and lower reaches of the Merak Sapokhar Urchu river, Serkhyim Narga Buplung, from Pangchung Yakpa, till the uppermost land of Yuwalung in between upper and lower Beteng Gakso, the uppermost part of Sipchung, Nangchenmo, Japho Zeman, from the uppermost part of Kukteng till the border of Wanggorsa are all the pasturelands. At the pastureland in the Jomo river there were eighteen horses. They gave seventeen horses. When giving one horse to the Merakpa its legs and muscles became exhausted in the Jomo river and it was eaten there. Then the son of Lama Byarepa, Namkha Özer, stayed in the monastery of Nyamgateng. Even though the people who summoned him bestowed again from the three inner doors of Sapo he did not heed to come. Again those summoning him called. Now if I really need to come and have to praise the ancestors, may auspiciousness prevail and everything be in accordance with auspiciousness. Listening to them he came out and stayed in Merak Tsemo Gönpa. Again until they became insistent Sapo did not heed to the need to come and when they requested him to come and stay at Salaidung. You don’t listen when I say that I am a Lama from the upper part and I have no habit of staying at the lower part. Well then, you don’t even listen when I say that moisture will evaporate when it is requested to stay on the ground. Then after he passed his own he looked at the appearance of the land,
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[9a] and said that he would stay at the centre of the forest at Panggor. Even though that is the place where the Sapo made the offerings to Jomo, built a monastery there in honor of Jomogang, Sapo transferred the place for making libation offerings to Jomo there and still it is the place for making offerings to Jomo. And from then he stayed there in the monastery constructed at Jomogang. Making the religious and offering precepts upwards passing the laptsa, downwards they got married passing Khongsharong. If taking the religious precepts and not getting married prejudice would arise to the Lama. Sending the girl away passing the laptsa and Khongsharong till Yonzong Zholerong, they offered the area behind the forests of Kyonglemang, Tongtongkha and Yenbushu, Tshanma Nakrajong Nado were obtained in the same way. In the manner as explained above, Bja Trashi Darge had said ‘my descendants will spread in the southern regions’ and the first was Na’dumpa, [then] his son Dondruppa, [then] his son Lama Bjarepa, [then] his son Namkha Özer, [then] his son Lama Trashi, [then] his son Guru Chöwang from whom came forth four sons, Göpa, Sumi, Pema and Lama Rinchen. Although from Göpa came forth five sons there were no descendants from four sons. The descendants of the eldest son Tenpa Darge are still there. From Sumi came forth two sons, Dondrup Zangpo and Chödra. Their descendants can still be found today, but no line of descent continued from Pema and Lama Rinchen. As to once again explain the accomplishments of the before mentioned line of successive descent: Drupthop Na’dumpa cut off his right ear

[10a] and offered it to Karma Pakshi. Lama Byarepa led along the Kom’lön Roksum, freely crossing over the Geyakchu into prosperity. Making a bridge from his religious attire at Jangtongzam and making holes in the cliff of Doncö and after burning a fire at Nyamgateng, because the monastery could not be constructed because of spite and discouragement and the religious scriptures could not be composed because of fatigue and spite, the monastery was encircled by spite but the scriptures of Gonpo Chakzhipa ‘the four-armed lord’ were not burnt by fire. Then, because religious attire was needed at Merak Tsemo Gönpa they were sent there. When Lama Trashi was the ruling patron of Thrakthrö,
when he was on his way he washed his hands in the waterfall of the Thrakthrö river combining into the Nyombu river a self-emanated DZambhala appeared in the Nyombu. After that when a fire razed the Jomogang monastery the Dzambhala was not burnt and because the fire had started from up there it was attributed to Chödrak.

[10b] In this way this explanation of the concise history as experienced by myself and having been edited by the relative of a novice monk Lopzang Gedün possessing the enlightened intention, 2,502 years after the enlightenment of Buddha passed in the 12th Rapjung cycle in the ‘fire-male-rat year’ may this manuscript about the empowered monks and lama’s of Mon be received with good fortune.

Om Swati Siddhi. Hommage to the Lama and Protector Jambelyang. From the historical text written in the rat year. From the golden ‘fire male’ arose brilliance. His son who came forth was Takla Öbar. His son was Jingpa Nyorpa. His son was Singsa. His son was Trashidar. His son was Pecung. His son was Goi. His son was Khandro.

[11a] When the Komlön Roksum arrived at Sokmateng, there were no more than seven households in Lhau, there were no more than eleven households in Shartsho, there were no more than five households in Seru. It was said that the people of Lhau were the children of Khuzang ‘excellent sperm’. It was said that the people of Shartsho were the children of Ba ‘cow’. It was said that the people of Seru were the children of Kün ‘universal’. At that time the place of Berkhar was seized by General Gyang. Ökhar was seized by General Samdrup. Drangngakhar was seized by Bēmi. ‘the wondrous great garuda’, ‘the patterned striped tiger’, ‘the form of the excellent lion’, ‘the eloquent me rtso’. In their language that means to say that the forefather of the Kom was Jingpa Nyorpa. The forefather of Rok was Paldan Lama. The forefather of Lön was Yang’ta Thenpo ‘great horse prosperity’ of Kangring Sum ‘three long legs’. Then Lön and Rok the two of them discussed and each of them took hold of a fortress. Lön went from the place known as the approach (duar?) of Maginala to Thongkhaphuk. Kom went to Lungzung and on to Brokthangpoche.

[11b] Jingpa and Nyorpa the two of them descended from Tsherma Gongthak to the hermitage. Expelling the lord they took Sersa and reached to Lungpatshal. At the peak of Sersa they expelled King Dom and his minister Tharpa. Holding them close by they thought ‘these men resemble someone’. Thinking that
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long ago they looked like this they seized their hold and released them. Then after carrying them from Zaibigu they discussed. Then they said ‘the two of you come here, you are not the same’. Then they inquired whether it was like the two of them arose from each other. Since they were taken up there it is said that they were looking for two people. I need the white barley, the black bean, the small brown wheat, I have come to search for the five kinds of grain. Then after twenty days, before reaching the time, they were chased out towards Kamlung. They went to Darla, Tamdrang and the peak of Takdza. Then they went to Gangsham Gorno. In the upper part they went to Serphu Nyak. They went to Brokchu Khununu. [12a] They went to Pangmar. They went to Ongkornyak. They named the mountain as Dzała. They arrived near the Kharphupa. From there they arrived at Mabrang which they named as Mabrang. Then when they arrived at Yithangzur they looked around and there were signs of horses having fought with each other. After naming it there as Tabrang they went back and named it as Damlang Khyizi. From there they called it as Lanyi Drana Kyimzi. Dränphuk they called as Tshazi. From there they called it as Gyelkhar kharmakhar. From there they called it Lönpo Sui’lang. Then they inquired who are those two, Minister Tharpa and King ’Dom? And they said they are there on the top. And they went to Khardung. When Minister Tharpa and King ’Dom appeared they inquired: the two demons we met in the district of Darpha have appeared here and established a new lineage. Fleeing from there they left. The couple Tiji (a giant saltwater fish) and Tijima the two of them straightening a rain of rice from the genuine and the fake, cooking rice dough, killed by the father and cut into pieces, accepting songs and dances, [12b] and stayed for three nights. The bloody history of sending the sheep arose from that. Experiencing the ice and the heat they went to the foreigner’s side. Then they arrived at Onggor. From there they arrived at Lham Gyalzhung. Desiring fire they lit a fire and the fire burned in the sky. Not being able to stay there they went to Tachurong. Not being able to stay there they escaped back to the lush ravine. They slept one night at Potalathongsa. Then they looked from the peak of the pasture land where they were unable to get fire and they called it me rag Merak. This is the way in which the Kom’lön Roksum established themselves at Merak.
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ANNEX IX TO CHAPTER 16. OCCURRENCE OF KHAR IN BHUTAN.

The Tibetan word མར /khar/ can be translated as ‘castle, citadel, mansion, fort’ and usually refers to a two- or three-storied, flat-roofed, stone and wood building with the main entry on the first floor reachable from ground level by a wooden ladder. Walls are usually thick and windows are typically small, more like embrasures with arrow slits, and a watch tower might be present, all indicative of the defensive functions of the khar. The ground floor of the khar was typically used for domestic animals and storage. The khar building style may have evolved from the 4,000 year old residential constructions found in the archeological site of ངང་རྩི། Kharro¹, literally ‘remains of a khar’, in eastern Tibet.

The stone and wood building style epitomized by the khar was probably introduced into the Monyul area by Tibetan aristocratic refugees from the 8th century CE² onwards. These aristocratic families ruled their small principalities from the khar, and many places are named after the original name of the khar that could be found there. Adapting to the higher precipitation, the khar were extended vertically to three or four stories, with an attic and slate or wooden shingled roofs³. The geographical affix <khar>, usually as a suffix, but sometimes also as prefix, is widespread from Central Bhutan till Tawang and Kameng. Perhaps the geographical suffix མི། <kha> often found in Western Bhutan is a corrupted form of བར། <khar> in which the syllable final /r/ was dropped in local vernacular speech⁴.

With the demise of the principalities under the Drukpa and Tibetan expansion in the middle of the 17th century⁵, the khar lost their function. On a regional level, their functions were taken over by the བོད་དོང། dzong. In time the buildings themselves were slowly demolished and their construction materials used for other purposes. Only a few khar survived after having been downgraded to residential buildings for local aristocratic or religious nobility or government-appointed Drungpa. These buildings became known as /naktsang/⁶.

The following provisional and incomplete list presents the loconyms in Bhutan, Tawang and Kameng containing the affix <khar> in a west to east arrangement. The names are given in the official Dzongkha spelling as per the Final Delimitation Order of the Election Commission of Bhutan, the proposed Roman Tshangla spelling⁶, and possible references to

¹ Ref. paragraph 2.10.
² Ref. Chapter 4.
³ Ref. paragraph 13.6.
⁴ Ref. paragraph 13.7.
⁵ Ref. Chapter 6.
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Historic sources namely the Gyelrik\(^7\). Beside the earlier remark regarding a possible origin of the western Bhutanese geographical suffix \(<kha>\) in \(<khar>\), it can also be observed that usually wherever \(<khar>\) does occur in western Bhutan it is spelled \(\text{བོ་ཞི་} \) khar ‘on top of’. Particularly Bjena geok in Wangdü Phodrang has a large number of place names not with kha but with khar. In the southern dzongkhaks, place names containing \(<khar>\) are either a crude translation or a simple renaming of older Nepali place names, or directly refer to the origin of the majority of the resettlers in that area.

Whereas limited numbers of actual khar can be found in the Central dzongkhak of Bumthang (10) and Zhemgang (8), the number exponentially increase in the six eastern dzongkhaks. It is curious to observe that in the largely Kheng- and Chocangaca-speaking geoks of Silambi, Saling, Tsamang and Tsakaling in Monggar the number of khar is notably lower than in the Chali-, Gongduk- and Tshangla-speaking geoks. The almost complete absence of khar-related loconyms in the Brokpa speaking area except the village of Jönkhar bordering the Tshangla area is also noted. That the distribution of khar is directly related to the proclaimed descent of the local rulers to Lhase Tsangma and his descendants of the Jowo, Byar, Yede, Tungde, Wangma and Je clans\(^8\), and not so much to the lineages descending from the Dung and the brothers of Lhalung Pelkyi Dorji\(^9\). Even when taking into account relative area and probable population density in the past, within Eastern Bhutan, the distribution per dzongkhak (Trashigang 33, Monggar 30, Trashi Yangtse 17, Lhüntse 14, Pemagatshel 9 and Samdrup Jongkhar 4) also clearly shows that towards the Indian border the authority of the local rulers of Tibetan ancestry diminished, which is directly related to the influence the Tibetan language had on the Tshangla vernacular\(^10\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Geok</th>
<th>Dzongkha</th>
<th>Roman Tshangla</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samtse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>ཁྲ་ཁ་</td>
<td>ལོག་ཐོག་པའི་ཁ་</td>
<td>Tsholingkhar</td>
<td>New name for Nepali Pokhari Dara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>འོད་མན་པའི་ཁ་</td>
<td>ལྷོ་ཐོག་པའི་ཁ་</td>
<td>Sonakhar</td>
<td>Resettled from Monggar Sherimuhung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha, Paro, Chukha, Gasa: none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimphu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>རྣམ་པ་</td>
<td>སྣང་རི་ཤི་</td>
<td>Kharribi</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>རྣམ་པ་</td>
<td>སྣང་བུ་</td>
<td>Kharphu</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) Ref. Chapter 4.  
\(^8\) Ref. paragraph 4.2.  
\(^9\) Ref. paragraph 4.3.  
\(^10\) Ref. paragraph 9.13.1.
### Punakha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>Punakha</th>
<th>Kharlikhar</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6n.a.</td>
<td>Khilikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6n.a.</td>
<td>Zamdongkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6n.a.</td>
<td>Dongkakhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wangdú Phodrang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>Totkikhar</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Kokokhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Lamikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Damshingkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Takarkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gangmarkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Sisidarkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gangchukhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gonkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Golekklhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Chakthaikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tsirang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>Tsholingkhar</th>
<th>New name for Nepali Tshokana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Tsholingkhar</td>
<td>New name for Nepali Tshokana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dagana: none

### Sarpaṃg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>Caksakhar</th>
<th>Resettled from Monggar Chaskhar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Caksakhar</td>
<td>Resettled from Monggar Chaskhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Samkhar</td>
<td>Resettled from Trashigang Samkhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Chortenkhar</td>
<td>New name for Nepali Sukumbasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Dungkharling</td>
<td>Misspelling of Dungkharling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Pangkhar</td>
<td>New name for Nepali Somitar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Langkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trongsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>Samling Shingkhar</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Samling Shingkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Zhempang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
<th>Kikhar</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Kikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Pangiskar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Nekhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 34 | n.a. | Ngangla | n.a. |
| 35 | n.a. | Phangkhar | n.a. |
| 36 | n.a. | Shingkhar | n.a. |
| 37 | n.a. | Cangkhar | n.a. |
| 38 | n.a. | Damkhar | n.a. |
| 39 | n.a. | Dangkhar | n.a. |
| 40 | n.a. | Khomshar | Gyalrak ff. 25a |
| 41 | n.a. | Joka | Gyalrak ff. 25a |

**Bumthang**

| 42 | n.a. | Kharsa | n.a. |
| 43 | n.a. | Kharsum | n.a. |
| 44 | n.a. | Cakkar | site of Sindhu Raja’s castle, and now Cakkar temple |
| 45 | n.a. | Chamkhar | |
| 46 | 27°32'31N 90°45'45E | Shamkhar | now wangdue choling (Gonpo Tshering 2003:139) |
| 47 | 27°33'22N 90°44'52E | Jaikhar | site of Khikha Ratho’s castle |
| 48 | n.a. | Camkhar | site of Khikha Ratho’s palace (Gonpo Tshering 2003:139) |
| 49 | 27°29'22N 90°39'56E | Domkhar | n.a. |
| 50 | n.a. | Pangkhar | n.a. |
| 51 | 27°30'00N 90°56'57E | Shingkhar | n.a. |

**Monggar**

| 52 | n.a. | Draktangkhar | n.a. |
| 53 | 27°18'11N 90°10'30E | Tongpha (Gyelpo) | Gyalrak ff. 20b |
| 54 | 27°18'30N 90°09'46E | Yongkola | Gyalrak ff. 25a |
| 55 | n.a. | Tormashong | Gyalrak ff. 25a |
| 56 | 27°16'11N 90°16'19E | Wengkhar | n.a. |
| 57 | 27°15'46N 90°15'25E | Kilikhar | n.a. |
| 58 | 27°17'00N 90°18'07E | Korila | Gyalrak ff. 12a |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cangbum</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chitshang</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 16b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>27°16'57N</td>
<td>91°16'57E</td>
<td>Themnangbi</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>27°17'00N</td>
<td>91°18'07E</td>
<td>Monggar</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Shingkharzhong</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Kharduma</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Tshangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Wangmakhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>27°04'59N</td>
<td>91°16'23E</td>
<td>Kaikhar</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>27°05'11N</td>
<td>91°13'47E</td>
<td>Muktangkhar</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>27°04'12N</td>
<td>91°15'13E</td>
<td>Mudungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Samkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gekhar</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>27°10'53N</td>
<td>91°21'29E</td>
<td>Kengkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>27°12'07N</td>
<td>91°14'58E</td>
<td>Tsangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>27°13'34N</td>
<td>91°14'46E</td>
<td>Drepong</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>27°07'14N</td>
<td>91°06'03E</td>
<td>Damkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gongduk</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Casakhar</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 16b, 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Kharnang</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gingkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Yekhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Womkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Soinakhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Caskhar</td>
<td>Gyalrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Roinangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Thongkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Selkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Yengkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>27°18'09N</td>
<td>91°26'10E</td>
<td>Zangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>27°17'35N</td>
<td>91°26'47E</td>
<td>Waichur</td>
<td>Thumnangkhar</td>
<td>Gyalrik 16b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>27°18'18N</td>
<td>91°24'20E</td>
<td>Bageng</td>
<td>Gyalrik</td>
<td>ff. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>27°30'17N</td>
<td>91°09'17E</td>
<td>Zangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>27°28'07N</td>
<td>91°06'12E</td>
<td>Kharcung</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jare</td>
<td>Gyalrik</td>
<td>ff. 25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>27°36'01N</td>
<td>91°09'20E</td>
<td>Pangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gonkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>27°33'40N</td>
<td>91°07'42E</td>
<td>Zhungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kharsa</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>27°34'03N</td>
<td>91°11'55E</td>
<td>Mukpachar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsenkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>27°29'02N</td>
<td>91°14'46E</td>
<td>Domkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kharphu</td>
<td>Gyalrik</td>
<td>ff. 24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gangzur</td>
<td>Gyalrik</td>
<td>ff. 27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wangmakhar</td>
<td>Gyalrik</td>
<td>ff. 27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>27°43'27N</td>
<td>91°25'04E</td>
<td>Pangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gangkhardung</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>27°36'03N</td>
<td>91°30'55E</td>
<td>Bimkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamkhar</td>
<td>Gyalrik</td>
<td>ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>27°23'44N 91°31'10E</td>
<td>Shingkhar</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Tshergom</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 12b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>27°29'14N 91°33'59E</td>
<td>Lengkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 13a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>27°27'53N 91°34'08E</td>
<td>Tsenkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 13a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>27°26'07N 91°34'24E</td>
<td>Doksum</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Khamdang</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Ungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 25b, 29b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Tshurkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Ramjar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Nangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Khoplakhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>27°28'48N 91°33'07E</td>
<td>Chemkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>27°28'53N 91°36'09E</td>
<td>Khinye</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>27°29'41N 91°37'45E</td>
<td>Buri, Jangphu</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 27a, 29b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>27°28'21N 91°36'42E</td>
<td>Phangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>27°25'24N 91°32'55E</td>
<td>Bainangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Wokkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>27°28'20N 91°39'29E</td>
<td>Melongkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>27°26'32N 91°38'20E</td>
<td>Thragom</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trashigang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>27°23'42N 91°36'46E</td>
<td>Bainangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Nangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>27°22'58N 91°36'41E</td>
<td>Yangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>27°22'03N 91°34'34E</td>
<td>Muktangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 12b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex IX. Khar in Bhutan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Location Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>27°23'13N</td>
<td>91°38'14E</td>
<td>Tshekhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>27°22'56N</td>
<td>91°41'20E</td>
<td>Saling</td>
<td>19a, Geyelrik ff. 23b, 25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>27°17'14N</td>
<td>91°31'33E</td>
<td>Domkhar</td>
<td>19a, Gyelrik ff. 20a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°23'13N</td>
<td>Shinangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>27°16'30N</td>
<td>91°30'58E</td>
<td>Tsenkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°17'14N</td>
<td>Thimkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>27°12'23N</td>
<td>91°36'03E</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 20a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°16'30N</td>
<td>Kharphu</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°12'23N</td>
<td>Wakhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°17'14N</td>
<td>Muchu village with Wakhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°22'56N</td>
<td>Monmangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°22'56N</td>
<td>Soikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°23'13N</td>
<td>Dimkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°23'13N</td>
<td>Kharpa</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°23'13N</td>
<td>Phongmi</td>
<td>19a, Geyelrik ff. 20b, 26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>27°24'51N</td>
<td>91°47'43E</td>
<td>Throngrong</td>
<td>20b, 26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>27°22'33N</td>
<td>91°44'49E</td>
<td>Phongmi</td>
<td>25b, 26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°21'44N</td>
<td>Breng hamlet under Thongrong?</td>
<td>25b, 26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°20'06N</td>
<td>'Lem village'?</td>
<td>26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>27°22'43N</td>
<td>91°42'05E</td>
<td>Tsankhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>27°22'43N</td>
<td>Melongkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>27°22'09N</td>
<td>91°43'28E</td>
<td>Khardung</td>
<td>20b, Gyelrik ff. 29b, 31b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>27°21'44N</td>
<td>91°41'26E</td>
<td>Radi</td>
<td>20b, 29b, 31b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>27°21'00N</td>
<td>91°47'45E</td>
<td>Jonkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>27°24'13N</td>
<td>91°55'27E</td>
<td>Sakteng</td>
<td>30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>27°18'06N</td>
<td>91°51'27E</td>
<td>Merak</td>
<td>30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>27°20'05N 91°48'08E</td>
<td>Samdrup Jongkhar</td>
<td>Samkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>27°19'37N 91°36'46E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bikhar</td>
<td>Logyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Domkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>27°18'19N 91°33'32E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangshikhar</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 18b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>27°20'06N 91°33'17E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cenkar</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 18b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>27°20'13N 91°33'03E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bengkhar</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>27°08'19N 91°44'19E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Threphu</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gengkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mankhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>27°15'26N 91°26'59E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uzarong</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 24b, 25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kharza</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kharthung</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>27°21'45N 91°38'24E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buna Rangjung</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>27°20'23N 91°38'24E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Galing</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 25b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pemagatshel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyasikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chimung</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gashikhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khekar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tshatshi</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yangkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yurung</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chuungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laishingkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dagor</td>
<td>Gyelrik ff. 24b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Samdrup Jongkhar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cidungkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsholingkhar</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex IX. Khar in Bhutan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Tawang</th>
<th>Kameng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Galingkhar n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Cakkhar n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Bangtsho n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Palkhar Gyelrik ff. 13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Lawok Yulsum Gyelrik ff. 13a, 13b, 29a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Khardung 35 Aris 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Lhau Gyelrik ff. 29a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Seru Gyelrik ff. 29b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Rupomkhar Gyelrik ff. 29b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Shartsho Gyelrik ff. 29b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Bemkhar Gyelrik ff. 29b, 31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Agyadung Gyelrik ff. 30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Paudung Gyelrik ff. 31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Sharnup Gyelrik ff. 31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Domkha Gyelrik ff. 24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Taktshang Gyelrik ff. 25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Dakpa Bemi Sari Gyelrik ff. 27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Audung Gyelrik ff. 31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Khathor Gyelrik ff. 27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Dirang Gyelrik ff. 29a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kameng**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Kameng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>27°10'35N 91°12'48E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>27°10'24N 92°12'48E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>27°21'52N 91°14'20E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PHANGKHAR: A CASE STUDY.

On a hilltop in the valley of the Gongri river between Doksum and the border with Tawang, north of and overlooking the temple of Gongja Ne and the surrounding paddy fields, southeast of the village of Khinyel and southwest of the village of Jangphu, on a hill spur connected to the village of Chemkhar, one can find the remains of a khar, viz. figure 4.6 and 4.7. The site is known by the locals as Ta Dzong but more commonly referred to as Phangkhar. The site is located between 1130 and 1190 meters altitude. The hill below the khar is strewn with loose rocks originating from the original structure. At different places, one can also find large flat stones with a hole in the middle that had been used as a mortar. It appears that in the past the hill on which the khar is located was forested, probably with chir pine trees, and that on the hill itself millets and other grain crops were cultivated, in addition to the paddy grown near the bed of the Gongri river far below. At present, the hill is barren except for drought-resistant shrubs and trees and lemon grass. Perhaps the process of climate change already affected this area long time ago. Could it be that the khar was deserted when agricultural production declined below sustenance level for the population of the khar? In recent years, more and more of the wetland is left fallow because of a shortage of irrigation water in summer. Dryland cultivation of millets has almost stopped, and maize harvests are poor due to a lack of rain. Outward migration from the area is very high.

The double outer protection walls of the khar are located 15 to 20 meters all along the contours of the hill. The inner protection walls are located around 10 meters uphill. The main khar is located on the flat top of the hill. The remains of this main structure spread along 40 to 50 meters along the ridge. The remains of the thick walls of the khar are around 120 centimeters high at most. There are the remains of two main towers, one in the northeast and one in the southwest. There is another smaller watchtower in the south, and remains of what is perhaps a residential structure. The walls have arrow loops in regular distances.

The khar was strategically located on the most direct trade route from Zhonggar and Trashigang to Tawang and Tshona, following the Gongri and Tawangchu rivers via Doksum, Manam, Namtsering and Lumla. It was also located close by fertile wetland and together with its size this seems to suggest that the khar was historically important. But Phangkhar was not mentioned in the Gyelrik or the Logyu, can any other reference be found in other sources. The absence of any construction close by the khar have preserved the site much better than other khar in the area, including the ancestral home at Mizimpa Tsenkhar in Tsekharla, Khamdang geok. During clearing work in 2010, several old cooking pots and cauldrons were recovered at that time. Research into this site and its preservation are most urgent.
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Figure IX1. The valley of the Gongri river, the area traditionally known as Brong Doksum and Zanglungpa. To the left of the river Khinyel and Jangphu of Tötsho geok, to the right Yalang geok, Trashiyangtsi dzongkhak, Eastern Bhutan. The hill of Phangkhar is located right in the centre of the photo.

Figure IX2. Part of the ruin of the khar of Phangkhar.
This Annex presents some examples of khar from different villages in the Tshangla speaking area of Eastern Bhutan and Pemakö. Although a few peculiar local khar exist, most khar occur, with slight variations, in all villages. More details on how khar are actually played can be found in Dorji (2007).

Khar from Ramjar. These have been presented in the local dialect, and not in the Zhonggar Standard. Courtesy Amci Appi, Meme Sonam Zangpo, Amci Ucimo, Ana Yeshe Dema, Khotkin Ugen Choki, Ata Jambe, Mathang Choden, Meme Appi and the other Ramjarpas.

(1) Jatsha nyiktsing rumla rumla dakpa lagi cat thakala hang ya? - Ming dang nahung. Two bulls keep on meeting, but a mountain has cut in between, what are they? - The eyes and the nose.

(2) Ama yang ringmu tharai lok cikpa yekhan hang ya? – Darshing. What is a tall woman wearing her kira only on one side? - A prayer flag.

(3) Jatsha nakseng thur lan chuktha phigi chengkhan hang ya? – Tshantalo. What is a black bull tied up with four ropes? – A tshantalo¹.

(4) Ama kukshing zasho tsaila hang ya? – Li dang mi. What are a bent mother and her active son? – A bow and arrow.


¹ A tshantalo is a medium-sized mat woven from bamboo and hung from four strings above the wood stove in the kitchen. Anything that should be dried and/or smoked is kept on this.
² The Zugongshing is a tree with large thorns but bearing tasty fruits.
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7) Ngam thur wurda phini neri to ma nongpa hang ya? – Jatsha shampen. *What swirls around like a slingshot the whole day without getting food in the evening? – The bull’s tail.*


14) Shing shing cangmashing kha thur bu thur ma naspa hang ya? – Lam kokpa/jatsha warong. *A tree, a tree, a willow tree, on which no bird nor insect will land, what is it? – Spring onion/an ox’s horn.*


---

3 The shuttle is the tool containing a cane stick with thread, used to thread the weft through the warp in weaving.

4 A tsirma is a small bamboo strainer for straining oil from seeds or bangchang from fermented grains.

5 A chergen is a large flat bamboo sieve for sieving various sizes of ground food grains, esp. maize.

6 A jandom is a black wooden flask with metal bands around usually containing liquor.
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---

7 Referring to the sound produced when using the grinding stone, and the grain flour that appears from between the two grinding stones.
8 As in footnote 7.
9 Referring to the cauldron with the fermented grains, on top of which another pot is placed with cold water to condensate the evaporated alcohol, in between which a piece of cloth is wrapped to prevent the evaporated alcohol from escaping.
10 The jinang is the niddy-noddy: a weaving implement to make a skein from spun thread. When making the skein, the jinang has to be moved up and down as if prostrating.
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(26) Ung barka gelong tsalu hang ya? – Mo. *What is a red monk in the middle of a field?* – Amaranth.


The *yumdang* is a swift: a weaving implement to make a ball from a skein. When rolling the thread to a ball, the *yumdang* will move in all directions as if performing a masked dance.

Viz. footnote 5

A *rong phrokpa* is a large bamboo basket used for carrying loads.
(31) Jang zakzak nan zakzak phai shekpakam brutken shekpa hang ya? – Biting. *I am winning, you are winning, but we reach home together, what are we?* – The legs.


Khar from Narphung (Dorji 2007).

(33) Phur bula wang luspa hang kharbe? – Mulai. *Taking the peg a hole remains, what it is?* – A radish.

(34) Wang bula phur luspa hang kharbe? – Phurgai lan phakpa. *Taking the hole a peg remains, what it is?* – Untying the rope from a peg\(^\text{14}\).


(36) Tsho nyiktsing rumla rumla dakpa phu thurki trokpa hang kharbe? – Ming nyiktsing chamka nahung. *Two lakes keep meeting but a mountain is disturbing between them what is it?* – The nose between the two eyes.

(37) Ama daksela za bi sam hang kharbe? – Ara zang dang nangkho. *What is a short woman with a son with three legs?* – The cauldron with the inner pot\(^\text{15}\).

Nangkorpa khar (Dorji 2007).

\(^{14}\) Instead of untying the knot at the end of a tether, usually entire knot is slipped off from the peg.

\(^{15}\) Inside the large copper cauldron (distillation pot) with the fermented grains, a smaller pot is kept on three wooden sticks to collect the evaporated alcohol after it condensates again.
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(40) To nowangki zala khi tharkhangkai wuwa hang? – Rangthang. *What eats food from the mouth but passes stool from the waist? – The grinding stone\(^\text{16}\).*

(41) Lung thungka shing likpa, shing thungka lung likpa, lung thungka shing likpa, shing thungka so likpa hang? – Rangthang. *What is a tree sprouting on a stone, a stone sprouting on a tree, a tree sprouting on the stone, and bamboo sprouting on the tree? – The grinding stone\(^\text{17}\).*

(42) Phashi phakpa thurki ja dang be taka hang? – Lam/Gongri. *What is a strip of cane reaching all over India and Tibet? – The path/the Gong river\(^\text{18}\).*

Finally, Dorji (2007) presented various ways in which the *khar abi* ‘grandmother of the khar’ is send off, perhaps in order to prevent evil from happening to the players of the khar. Details can be found in Dorji (2007) from whom these examples have been taken as further samples of ‘Ucen and Roman Tshangla. The original spellings of Dorji have been maintained to represent the vernacular dialect of the various villages.

\(^{16}\) This refers to the grains being poured in the central hole of the upper grinding stone, and the ground grain appearing again from between the two grinding stones.

\(^{17}\) This refers to the grinding stone being constructed of a round flat stone, on top of which another round flat stone is placed connected to the lower stone with a wooden pivot, with on the side a hole through which a wooden stick is stuck, over which a bamboo stick is placed which is held in the hand to make the upper stone circulate when grinding the grains.

\(^{18}\) Both an ancient pathway as well as the Gong river would lead all the way from the Indian plains till Tibet passing through Eastern Bhutan.
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Sending the khar abi in Narphung village, Gomdar geok, Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhak:

(1) Bukpi\(^{19}\) cho thur. Kharang lamshu thur, Khu khau thur. Arra palang thur. Khomen tshik thur. Phakpashagu\(^{20}\) dai thur. Solo namnang thur. Inca par thur. Melongbrakgai dong growu. One cho\(^{21}\) of flour. One lamshu\(^{22}\) of ground maize. One kha\(^{23}\) of rice. One palang\(^{24}\) of arra. One tshik\(^{25}\) of sugarcane. One dai\(^{26}\) of pork. One namnang\(^{27}\) of chili. One par\(^{28}\) of salt. Down the Melongbrak\(^{29}\) growu\(^{30}\)!

Sending off the khar abi with all her essential weaving tools from bridges in Bikhar village of Samkhar geok, Trashigang dzongkhak:

(2) Thakcung tom thur. Brung tom thur. Sepir tom thur. Thungdiri zampai dong growa\(^{31}\) ken, Samkharri zampai dong growa ken. Gamri zampai dong growa ken. A bundle of thakcung\(^{32}\). A

---

\(^{19}\) The ZS has \textit{/bokpi/}.  
\(^{20}\) The variant possessive allomorphs \textit{/ku~gu/} instead of \textit{/ka~ga/} are typical of the Upper and Lower Trashigang and Dungsam dialects. The other Tshangla dialects have equivalent \textit{/phakpashaga/}.  
\(^{21}\) A measuring unit of two scoops by hand.  
\(^{22}\) A volume measure of approximately 400 grams of maize.  
\(^{23}\) A volume measure of approximately 1 ½ kilo of maize or rice.  
\(^{24}\) The traditional wooden or bamboo container for 1 ½ litres of water or liquor.  
\(^{25}\) A stalk of bamboo or sugarcane between two nodes.  
\(^{26}\) A strip of dried meat.  
\(^{27}\) An ear of grain, a cob of maize or a single chili.  
\(^{28}\) A measuring unit of one closed fist full.  
\(^{29}\) The steep cliff on the Trashigang to Samdrup Jongkhar highway.  
\(^{30}\) Growu (the ZS would be growa) is the past tense of gro ‘crash’ or maybe ‘hurl’ (Dorji 2007), a lexeme that has no equivalent in the Zhonggar Standard.  
\(^{31}\) The fact that this variety also has \textit{/growa/} indicates that the origin of the speakers of Bikhar lies in the Dungsam area, where the velar plosive plus trill series has been preserved, whereas in the other dialects it has changed in the retroflex series. Viz. also paragraph 9.4, p. 194.
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bundle of brung\textsuperscript{33}. A bundle of sepir\textsuperscript{34}. {They} have to be hurled down the bridge over the Thungdiri river bridge. {They} have to be hurled down the bridge over the Samkharri river. {They} have to be hurled down the bridge over the Gamri river.

A very peculiar example from Kandrophuk village under Serthik geok, Samdrup Jongkhar dzongkhak:

(3) Yaple don...Duuu...Renganle don...Duuu...Phainangle don...Duuu...Medarangle don...Duuu...Khopotangle don...Duuu...\textsuperscript{35} A ghost in the attic. Duuu! A ghost on the ladder. Duuu! A ghost in the house. Duuu! A ghost in the hearth, Duuu! A ghost on the doorstep. Duuu!

Finally, the elaborate way of sending off the khar abi in Nangkor, Pemagatshel dzongkhak:


\textsuperscript{32} The batten, ref. page 435.

\textsuperscript{33} A bamboo stick also called brum, ref. p. 435.

\textsuperscript{34} The pattern pick also called sipir, ref. p. 435.

\textsuperscript{35} The vocabulary mentioned here is very particular and indicative of the close relation of the people and dialect of this area with that of Kalaktang to the east.
When reaching Abi Khartam Jaimo (lit. grandma queen of the khar story). She says she needs pack-lunch to eat on the way. She says she needs lamchang[^36] to drink on the way. She says she needs the weaving items to weave cloth. Dangdang the loom frame, baba the backbeam, thakthak the batten, nene the heddle rod, waiwai the closing rod, lili the temple, shosho the shed roll, phuphu the shuttle, phunphun the bobbin, khokho one breast beam, sisi the pattern pick, bubu the coil rod, bibi the leg rest. Grandma when you are tired on the way, drink liquor from the buffalo’s horn. Grandma when you are sad on the way, drink liquor from the mithun’s horn. When you arrive at the big resting place, eat the pack lunch brought in the big cloth. When you arrive at the small resting place, eat the pack lunch brought in the small cloth. When you reach at the culm of banana trees, don’t say lala lili. When you arrive at the foot of the oak tree, don’t say baba bibi. When you go along the ridges, go without saying zara zoro. Grandma auuu auuu!

[^36]: Alcohol meant for drinking during the journey.
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Figure X-1. An antique yumdang, or swift (khar 23), used for winding the skein into a ball of thread (Courtesy Y. Waarts).

Figure X-2. An antique thrishing for ginning cotton or wool, ref. p. 442 (Courtesy Y. Waarts).

Fig. X-3. A field with red and white amaranth (khar 26) in Thongrong village, Phongme geok, Eastern Bhutan.