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Eugénie Henderson is, as we all know, a most impressive phonetician and linguist. Not only that, but, as is obvious from what follows in this collection of papers, she is also a most informative and charming woman. Several years ago, I had the idea of offering this token of awareness to her, and the response was, as can readily be seen, high-powered.

I have, therefore, divided the contributions alphabetically into language families (from Austro-Asiatic through Austronesian and Tai to Tibeto-Burman) and within these sections, once again alphabetically, by the surnames of the contributors, in an attempt to express the range and equality of interest that Professor Henderson has in South-East Asian languages.

There is no need for me as editor to discuss the topics presented; their authors need no introduction and will, without doubt, attract readers; the papers speak for themselves. With that comment, I can only say that I, among many others, look forward eagerly to Eugénie's work on Bwe Karen and all else.

Jeremy H.C.S. DAVIDSON
S.O.A.S. 1989
EDITOR'S NOTE

Certain technical details found in this book may require clarification.

Romanizations: Languages which are not normally written in roman alphabets are romanized. The systems used are as follows: Burmese is a transcription of the spoken language, not a transliteration of the script, and (where possible) follows the system advanced by John Okell, *A guide to the romanization of Burmese* (London: Luzac 1971, 66-7); Chinese is romanized into pīnyīn, unless indicated otherwise for the sake of clarity in particular articles; while Khmer is written in accordance with the transliteration used by Saveros Lewitz, 1969, *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* 55, 163-9. Thai follows the phonetic systems described in the next section. Variations may occur; naturally, names of places and people may differ.

Transcriptions: Thai specialists who have contributed papers may have evolved their own phonetic transcriptions (e.g. Egerod, Gedney, Haas, Li) which vary somewhat from one to another. Since all Thai specialists will be familiar with these representations, I have left them as they are rather than choose a 'standard' form.

Bold face was not available for a wide range of IPA symbols for type-setting in this volume. These are set in roman and, for ease of reading, are underlined when they occur in the running text.

Translations: Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from languages presented are by the authors of the papers in which they appear. Translations of entries do not always follow their originals directly but may follow and 'reproduce' a group, for the sake of linguistic connection.

All Chinese or nôm characters are written by Jeremy Davidson.

* * * * * * * *

I should like to thank all those who have helped to make the task of editing the fifteen contributions easier. I also wish to thank the Publications Committee of S.O.A.S. (especially its three consecutive Chairmen, Professors J.C. Wright, R.H. Robins, and C. Shackle, and its Secretary Mr Martin Daly) for their help and support. Finally, I owe a particular debt of gratitude to the Editorial Secretary Miss Diana Matias and to the
staff of the S.O.A.S. Support Section, especially Mrs Joyce Hutchinson, and to the photographer Mr Paul Fox for the production of the present volume.

Jeremy H.C.S. DAVIDSON

The photograph on the cover is by Hans Hinz and is reproduced by permission from *Thai Painting* published by Office du Livre, Fribourg.
EUGÉNIE J.A. HENDERSON: A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

R.H. Robins

This introduction is not the place for a biography or even a full-length appreciation of Eugénie Henderson's scholarly career. Although she formally retired on 3 September 1982, from her post in the School of Oriental and African Studies and in the University of London as Professor of Phonetics, no one of her many friends and colleagues, nor she herself, surely, regards her retirement from teaching as the final conclusion of her active participation in linguistic studies and research. But the contributions from the international world of scholarship to this volume of studies, like those in the volume published in 1979 by Chulalongkorn University (Thongkum 1979), testify to the esteem and affection in which she is held by the now large community of her colleagues, former students, and friends.

Eugénie Henderson's involvement in the School of Oriental and African Studies began in 1942, when she was appointed to a lectureship in phonetics. This appointment, like those of a number of her contemporaries, was part of the immediate response by the armed services to the requirements created by the Japanese entry into the Second World War. The Department of Phonetics and Linguistics, under the headship of Professor J.R. Firth, was almost wholly given over between 1942 and 1945 to Japanese language courses for Royal Air Force and Royal Navy personnel, including some highly specialized courses in Japanese phonetics for specific intelligence purposes. Eugénie Henderson's part in the development, administration and teaching of these courses was probably second only to that of Firth himself.¹

Some of its continuing framework of teaching in the Department had its origin in the forced response of its staff to wartime conditions (cf. Firth 1945), and the impetus behind its expansion was maintained after the war by the University of London's implementation of the Scarbrough Report (1947), which recommended a strong development of Oriental and African studies -- linguistic, cultural and historical -- a development which, naturally, was concentrated in the School dedicated to such studies.

The post-war expansion of linguistic work in the Department of Phonetics and Linguistics covered languages from several different areas of the Far East, the Middle East, and Africa. While still a postgraduate student under Professor Daniel Jones at University College London in 1937, Eugénie Henderson had begun the study of Thai, which laid the foundation

¹
of her lifelong connection with the languages, peoples and cultures of South East-Asia.

Her studies in Thai were reinforced after 1945 with studies, mainly through informants in London, in other South-East Asian languages, including Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Mon. In 1946 the Department of South-East Asia and the Islands was re-established, and significantly enlarged soon afterwards, with lectureships in Thai, Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Mon; during their first years of appointment, the lecturers appointed to these posts were attached to the Department of Phonetics and Linguistics and came directly under the supervision of Eugénie Henderson. The 'pro-seminar' that she organized as a forum for the presentation and discussion of their research became a model for the later postgraduate seminar of the Department.

In 1953 she was appointed Reader and, in 1964, Professor of Phonetics in the University of London.

Eugénie Henderson's involvement in South-East Asian languages was further strengthened by her service, after the retirement of Professor D.G.E. Hall, as Acting Head of the Department of South East Asia and the Islands, from 1960 until 1966, during a crucial period in the consolidation of that Department. At the same time she continued to play a full part as a senior member of the Department of Phonetics and Linguistics and, from 1966 until 1970, after the retirement of Professor N.C. Scott, she was Head of this Department.

Throughout the years 1945 to 1981 Eugénie Henderson involved herself in the subject of general linguistics as a whole. Since 1954 she has been a member of the Council of the Philological Society, serving as the Society's Treasurer from 1965 to 1974, and from 1977 to 1980 she was Chairman of the Linguistics Association of Great Britain.

Though her studies of the languages of South-East Asia were mainly conducted in this country, she has made two fairly extensive visits to that part of the world. In 1954 she visited Burma as a Visiting Professor of Rangoon University and engaged in fieldwork on Bwe Karen and Chin, this latter research resulting in the publication of her book Tiddım Chin (Henderson 1965a), while in 1975 she taught in Thailand, in a summer institute organized by the Thailand Research Project in Bangkok.

Eugénie Henderson's publications have been mainly concerned with the phonetics and phonology of South-East Asian languages, in some cases breaking entirely new ground and also applying the theory of prosodic phonology, developed by Firth during the 1940s and early 1950s, to different language material. Her 1948 'Prosodies in Siamese: a study in synthesis' (see Henderson 1970a) has for long been recognized as one of the most
thorough and revealing studies in prosodic analysis that we have, and is regularly recommended to students embarking on this aspect of phonological theory, especially since its republication in 1970 in Palmer's *Prosodic analysis*.

A glance at her bibliography, however, shows that South-East Asian languages by no means exhaust her fields of interest. She has contributed papers on typological and historical topics at international congresses (e.g. Henderson 1965b, *Indo-Pacific linguistic studies Pt. II*), and has published phonetic studies of Ossetic (e.g. Henderson 1949) and of other Caucasian languages. In this latter area, her article 'Acoustic features of certain consonants and consonant clusters in Kabardian' (Henderson 1970b), though quite brief, has become something of a classic in the literature of experimental phonetics.

British phoneticians look back with pride on the great nineteenth-century phonetician and Anglist Henry Sweet, and Firth himself often claimed that his prosodic theory was, in part, a development of ideas latent in Sweet's own work. Sweet's writings were voluminous, and in 1971 Eugenie Henderson performed a valuable service to anyone concerned with the history of phonetics and phonology by selecting and making available the most important passages from his books and articles in a single book, *The indispensable foundation: a selection from the writings of Henry Sweet* (Henderson 1971).

It was also the happiest of circumstances that in the month in which she retired Professor Henderson was honoured by the world community of linguists in speaking as an invited *rapporteur*, at the Plenary Session on Phonetics and Phonology, on the present state and the prospects of this branch of linguistics, at the Thirteenth International Congress of Linguists in Tokyo in September 1982. In this year she was also elected a Fellow of University College London and, in 1984, President of the Philological Society.

NOTE

1. The exigencies of wartime language teaching left an indelible and ultimately treasured impression on those of us who were involved in it. I have a vivid personal memory from 1944 of Eugénie Henderson and myself shouting each other down while endeavouring to conduct simultaneous classes in Japanese pronunciation and Japanese grammar as we sheltered with our students (all service personnel) in the corridor of our departmental territory, to avoid the worst effects of *Vergeltungswaffen I*, affectionately known as 'doodlebugs'.
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"mắt cá: FROM "FISHES' EYES" TO "ANKLEBONES":
A VIETNAMESE CALQUE?

Jeremy H.C.S. Davidson

"mắt cá là cái gì\(^1\) (nôm= 相鉤 [鰓] 錯教): "what are fishes' eyes?", 'asks Vietnamese (VN). The earliest record so far discovered in answer is Alexandre de Rhodes' Dictionarium entry (1651:456): 'mắt cá: artelho do pé: talus, i.', in which the Latin talus means 'ankle, anklebone'. Legrand de la Liraye (1874:150b) translates it as 'cheville du pied', Taberd (1877: 271a) as 'Occulus piscis; malleoli', while Ravier (1880:706a) notes 'malleolus #4. mắt cá (nó chẩn tay)' (=place of the feet/legs and hands/arms). Cùa (1897:86b) describes it as 'fleshy bone swelling out on both sides of the foot at the point where it joins the leg'; Trú đê (1898:q.3, 3a4, p.51 = p.216, 1.19) uses it cryptically to translate the Chinese character 拇指 'ankle' (> 'anklebone'), hủi in Modern Standard Chinese (=putòng hủi/MSC). Again, Bonet (1899:407a) records it as 'cheville du pied; litt. oeil de poisson', Huệ (1937:555a, 2) repeating it as 'cheville du pied, cor, chevillon', while Trú (1960:299b) defines it as 'heads of bones jutting out at the neck of legs (=ankle)' (qv. Trú 1970:II, 894a) and the Hội Khai Trí (1968:337b) tells us that it is 'the head of a bone budding out near the neck of the leg' (=i.e. the ankle), hence 'the anklebone'.\(^2\)

This seems to be highly figurative language,\(^3\) a descriptive pun (qv. Emeneau 1947; Hoà 1955; Davidson 1978:37ff., 1986a:354, n.37), for to find a fish's eye, probably rather dead in appearance, looking up at you from the anklebone of a person's leg, bulging out\(^4\) dull, then whitish as it stretches from where it peaks to the darker skin surrounding it on legs that have travelled in fields of paddy, sea-salt, or whatever else, in a Vietnamese-style climate, will certainly provide yet another superb and humorous expression of the impression intended, since the Vietnamese have long associated their vital environment with all the other natural symbolism that they envisage (e.g. Davidson 1978).

Such visual association (qv. n.3),\(^5\) is frequently complemented by word-play afforded by the opportunities of homophony. An encounter is the Modern Mon (MM) /mòt còi̯g/ 'anklebone' (lit. 'eye of the elephant'; Shorto 1962:170b mòt còi̯g; ref. p.96b còi̯g\(^1\) 'elephant'), while in inscriptive language one finds cín\(^2\)/cĩ̯/ n. 'elephant' (Shorto 1971:98) and jú/jùn/ 'lower limb' (ibid.,125), where a mat\(^2)/mòt/ n.'eye' (ibid.,285) plus jù̯ would have provided us with the expected
Mon-Khmer (MK) and Malayo-Polynesian (MP) 'eye of the leg' for an 'anklebone'! This 'confusion' may well have stemmed from, or led to, folk-etymology and folk taxonomy -- an investigation lying in wait -- but it further emphasizes the point already made of the desire for the use of figurative language and especially for descriptive punning.

Parts of the body are, however, often not identified with any precision in basic and vernacular Vietnamese language, that is, language which excludes or may not include the use of the specific, pointed Hán-Việt (HV) vocabulary found in the literary language of the educated elite, and which is also 'pre-modern', that is, prior to the introduction of western, scientific and other specialist vocabulary. A general area of the body may be referred to, but not a specific part of it, by a single, special word. So, chân (var.ench, chũn) stands broadly for both 'leg' and 'foot', tay for 'arm' and 'hand', while together chân tay means 'limbs'. When an anatomical feature does captivate attention and is accorded a specific term, structural or functional perception of it is a common reason for the formation of the word or words describing it. So, many South-East Asian languages have captured in their vocabularies' imagination the concept of the ankle or wrist as the 'neck' of the leg or arm and the anklebone as the 'eye' of the leg/foot' even though in actuality it is not a part of the ankle itself but a swelling out on both sides of the lower end of the two leg bones (tibia and fibula) at the point at which they articulate with the tarsal bones (qv. Cùa 1987:86b).

Naturally, words for 'hands' and 'arms', 'feet' and 'legs' may well have changed in the language families that inhabit South-East Asia, China, South Asia, Oceania and other related areas as their languages developed from the early through to the modern forms, but the phonetic similarity is even now often noticeable. The same is also evident for the words for the 'eye' (e.g. Shorto 1971:285, i.a.) since one finds links between the Sino-Tibetan, Sino-Tai, Austroasiatic and Austro-nesian forms in both their phonetics and the semantic functions performed. So, as in Vietnamese we have an 'arm' tay, its 'neck' cÖ becomes immediately recognizable as the 'wrist' cÖ tay, as does the leg's 'neck' become an 'ankle' cÖ chân (e.g. Gouin 1957:181b). Other examples are numerous (qv. n.8 below) but, especially when we find the 'board, table' (bàn cf. van 'plank') helping to structure a 'hand' bàn tay or 'foot' bàn chân, why do we not 'eye' the 'leg' (*mót chân) to make an 'anklebone'?! After all, we have already met the partially successful Modern Mon attempt of mót coin and the Malay mata kaki. Bahnar provides us with mót jʊŋ 'cheville du pied' (Dourisbourne 1899:203; cf. Katu máníót máníit, identified as mót ca in the Vietnamese equivalents but translated as 'ankle' in the English (Costello 1971:27, 30) and probably from ma 'eye', cf. katam (loc. cit.), while Sedang gives us ma cheàng 'ankle' (lit. 'eye...
of the leg/foot') and mā kong 'wrist' (Smith 1962:15-16) and we can note en passant the Chrau jāng 'leg, foot' (Thomas 1966:24), unfortunately with no further relevant data. Going south in present-day Vietnamese territory, we discover more support from the Cham mōtā takai (cf. taken takay, Moussay 1971:379b 'cheville du pied'; cf. ibid., 224 mōtā le 'cheville') with the other common uses of the eye/face' word as 'node, joint', etc. The same occurs in Nicobarese (Roepsforff 1884:78, 122, 149, mathou, --okloaka-la; --olmat, etc.; cf. Man 1898-9:6, 178a).

This Vietnamese 'neck' of the 'arm' or 'leg', joining them to 'hands' or 'feet', finds many other Mon-Khmer language equivalents, two directly apparent examples being Modern Khmer ko: day 'wrist', ko: cvin 'ankle' (Jacob 1971:1) and Modern Mon ko?cān 'ankle', ko? toa 'wrist' (Shorto 1962:53a). Of immediate interest, therefore, and suggestively cognate is the Lao khā: thāo 'ankle' (lit. joint of the foot) (Kerr 1972:129b; cf. ibid., 118b khā:;) which is supported by the Modern Standard Thai (MST) khā: thaaw 'ankle'; lit. joint of the foot' (not 'leg', khā:, (n.b. Li 1977:213, §10.6.29 among other entries, e.g., §2.23, 14.11.4, etc.) -- with a secondary vernacular taa tūm (thaaw) 'eye of the node (of the foot)' >'anklebone'. Thus, the possibility of 'link' cognates -- joint-neck-tibia-shin -- keeps springing to mind. Indeed, there is an impression of 'joining, uniting, linking' and of 'reaching, attaining, going to' (see GSR 155a-d; e.g. *gōp/ya/ho [MSC hē] encouraged by the noun character for 'neck', which one also finds as Hān-Việt, and in the MSC compound khōu ~ 'skeleton', (= kho? lā; cf. MSC gūcī 'ibid.' ~HV cōt cach). Additionally, there is the Vietnamese word for 'joint; physical articulation' kho? (>'tibia'; (cf. GSR 156a, *g'ieng/yien/gihng leg, shank (Lunyu)'), as well as the two pronunciations for 'neck' MSC jing e.g. jingū 'shinbone' (> 'tibia'; (cf. GSR 151)), g'jeng/gieng/gihng 'leg, shank (Lunyu)'), as well as the two pronunciations for 'neck' MSC jeng/jing (GSR 831n. *kieng/kjang/k'ing, and *g'jeng/g'jang/k'ing... (Tso)), all of which are related, at least phonetically. Hence the pronunciations for the word for 'neck' in Vietnamese cath, the Thai kho?2, Lao khā:; a large number of Mon-Khmer languages (qv. Shorto 1971:52), and Archaic Chinese *k'ōg (GSR 1166p), thrust cognacy before us. The image of an articulated (=joint), tube-like connection of varying lengths between the torso and its ending appendages does, of course, bring the possible linked, root-origins of such words together, while the closeness in pronunciation of the 'leg' word
in a range of South Eastern Chinese dialects (qv. Bauer 1987), e.g. kĥê, keûk (=HV kuɔc, also read khùc, giving rise to gòc 'base, foot (of a tree)' [n̂hú] (Tru 1960:46a)) reconstructed as Archaic Chinese *kia̰ (GSR 776-g-h), forcefully implies a pre-sinitic origin of the word that ends up as the Chinese character 足/腳

But here the Vietnamese mät cả 'anklebone' remains distinctly in the forefront of one's mind. If the base word chàn 'leg, foot' which qualified other associated ideas giving us words like 'ankle', 'foot', 'toe', 'toenail', 'heel', etc., (qv. n.6 below) fulfils its purpose, then why does an 'anklebone' suddenly turn from the "eye" of the leg into a 'fish's eye'? Naturally, in a Vietnamese language situation such as this, one looks to the Chinese reservoir of vocabulary for help in solving the problem. In Archaic and in Ancient Chinese one does not find the 'anklebone' separately listed, one finds the 'ankle' (GSR 351j. *g'lẅar/wa/hua ankle (Li) = MSC hù̯a, huài), the Hán-Việt reading for which is hòa (Thiệu Chù 1966: 560a)17 but which is intriguingly identified as an 'anklebone' (ibid.), and clearly recorded as such in the Tự Cẩm (1898:q.3, 3a4-p.51 =p.216, 1.19 as :khòa mät cả) while the MSC gives us huài for 'ankle' and huâiẑî for 'anklebone' (cf. i.a. MacIver 1929: 1090 kûa-gaûk]. Other HV 'pedal' terms flourish too. Meanwhile, the MSC 'ankle' occurs as jìâō̯yang (var. jìâouched, jùyén) while the Ningpo kyâh tsan̄ 'ankle' (cf. kyâh gao [Hk.=Fàzhou] 'ankle-joint', Morrison 1876:20b) relates directly to a Hakka kòk tsan̄ 'heel', and the Hakka 'ankle' kiok muk (cf. kiok ngā̯, MacIver 1926: 288b) connects well with the Shanghai kyak mok. Yet, focusing on the 'eye' as the centre of attention in this 'joint', this 'link', strikingly important is the awareness of the "eye" of the "leg", foot, in Southern, and in particular in South Eastern Chinese dialects. There is Cantonese keûk ngaan (kwut) 'anklebone' (qv. MSC, above; cf. MacIver 1926:344b, Hakka këva kwut 'the anklebone'), Lungtu khâa muk, Fúzhóu kâ ngû mek bô (='the leg [Joint]'s ox's eye') (Maclay 1929:1021),18 the Swatow kha-màk 'anklebone' (and variants, Lechler 1883:9) and the Amoy 'ankle' k'â bâk (liter. kiok bok, kha-bâk, kiẑ bâk; cf. C. Douglas 1899: 10a, 257b, kha-bâk, 'ankle', R. kiok, col. kioh). The thought came to my mind of a word of pre-sinitic origin preserved in what are termed South Eastern Chinese dialects and then spurred into a calque by the creative imagination of the Vietnamese because it rhymed descriptively with the phonetic and thence the visual awareness of a 'fish's eye' (mät cả <kìa). And, almost instinctively one senses that the Hokkien Hk.¼Fúzhóu1 dialects offer the greatest suggestions. Among them, I think that Tie-chiu [=Châozhou] enlivens us. In it we find mäk mën 'eye (Goddard 1883:103a)19 and k'â 'foot' (ibid., 63a), the tone, pitch and contour of whose pronunciation conform well with the Vietnamese mät cả, strengthening the argument since it was the speakers of Tie-chiu who made up the largest Chinese
population contributing to the 'early' Vietnamese vocabulary, just as it appears to be Swatow speakers who influenced Thai (Egerod 1959).

For here, it seems, we do have a Chinese-Vietnamese calque created by the Vietnamese who, hearing this South Eastern 'Chinese' word *k'á (〈TC= Hkn.) for 'foot', visualized its sound association with their word  mat ca' fish' and, preferring the fun 21 behind a 'fish's "eye", mat ca, 22 to the neutrality of such words as might otherwise have been their special terms (e.g. *gò chân 'hillock of the leg/foot', *mất chân 'eye of the leg/foot'), transposed the Tie-chiu k'á mák ('foot's eye' >'anklebone') 23 into their own language, reordering the word as mák k'á to fit their syntax, to create a calque, so that the 'anklebones' became 'fishes' eyes', mat ca

NOTES

1. Immediately, we are alerted to an unusual etymology. Normally, mat 'eyes' are classified as animate by con so that con mat ca would mean 'the eye of fishes' even though the syntactic rhythm feels heavily clumsy. But here, it is classified as inanimate by cai, suggesting a variant meaning. What is the reason? (qqv. Thiệu Chinh 1966:660a Chân-Việt (HV= Sino-Vietnamese) hó, (or kho). 1. cai mat ca chân 'the "anklebones" of the legs'; cf. Anh 1957:510b Loa, "fishes' eyes' on the two sides of the ankle', i.e. anklebones).

2. Listings of dictionary entries could continue, but they are not being included as they are meaningfully repetitive, if not identical; e.g. Hung 1955:414a; Thanh Nghĩ 1967:885a; 'balls of bone jutting out on both sides of the ankle'; Hôa 1967:270a, etc.

3. So, too, is the Palaung ra-ngyē jūng 'ankle' (lit. 'joint of the leg') (Milne 1931:18), with 'anklebone' (loc.cit.) a ka-āng i-är, that is, 'bone of the fowl, hen' (?cockspur [bone]; cf. VN cùa  'cockspur'; xuông = 'astragalus').

4. Note, interestingly, that in Chinese we have the word 'eye', MSC yên, reconstructed as GSR 4167. *ngen/ngen:/yen eye (Yi) which is also a 'loan for *ngen/ngen:/en protrude as a knob (Chouli)' (loc.cit.). The HV is nhàn/nhàn (qqv. de Rhodes 1651:548, cf. 456; Tự Đức 1898: q.3, 5a3-4, p.52 =p.218, 1.5 'nhàn mạt'; Davidson 1975:597, no.487). In passing, 'faces' and 'eyes' do, understandably, go together (e.g. Shorto 1971:285; Tự Đức 1898: q.3, 1a5, p.50 面相 =p.215, 1.9 'diện mạt').
5. For instance, there is trứng cá 'eggs of fishes' (qv. Bonet 1899:34la trứng cá 'œuf de poisson'), whence comes 'spawn' and then, because of the visual similarity, 'blackhead, comedo' (Hoa 1967:516a; Huê 1937:1088b; cf. Gouin 1957:141b). This is possibly a play on words, on chủng 'symptom of an illness' (MSC 1967:78; MSC 1967:78) plus cá 'fishes', whence 'small white face pimplles'. Another example is hôn dái 'testicles' (Hoa 1967:64a; Huê 1937:191b) paralleled by trứng dái 'sperm' (Bonet 1899:34la; cf. Gouin 1957:148b, i.e.). Note dái 'to urinate' (also sometimes written in NOM). Similarly, one finds go ма 'vulva', literally 'mound/knoll of the cheek', so 'cheekbone' (Bonet 1899:230b 'joues, pommette'; Huê 1937:114a; Gouin 1957:482b), but why mắt cá for 'anklebone'?

6. The play on words could also have given us một coin¹ 'eye of the elephant' and một coin² 'eye of the ridgepole of the house' (Shorto 1962:96b). Compare the Archaic Chinese use of jiao (MSC jiāo 'tibia') for 'the tapering end of the spoke of a wheel (Chouli)', (GSR 1166p.).

7. Nowadays, the scientific and medical vocabulary of Vietnamese is as detailed in its anatomical and other descriptions and recognitions (e.g. Thanh Nghĩ 1967:1532a; Hoa 1967:565a-b) as its main new source language, French; in fact, it is probably made richer by ready recourse to Chinese wherever that proved necessary. Thus Vietnamese has a very rich vocabulary and usually treats technical-type terms in three ways:

(i) identifying them by direct translation into VN - e.g. 'astragalus' = xưng cựa 'cockspur bone';

(ii) by use of Chinese terms in the HV pronunciation of their characters, although a degree of Vietnamese word-ordering may be introduced -- e.g. 'haemophilia' = bểnh huyết hủt <MSC xuêyou bìng 血友病; or,

(iii) by transliteration from the French -- e.g. 'xanthin' = xằng-tin.

8. qvv. Shorto 1971:125; Davidson 1975:597, esp. nos. 471, 489-92. So, paralleling one another, are such compounds as:

bàn ('table/board') chân 'foot' - bàn tay 'hand'
ngón ('toe/finger') chân 'toe' - ngón tay 'finger'
móng ('nail/claw') chân 'toenail' - móng tay 'fingernail'
co ('neck') chân 'ankle' - co tay 'wrist'
(Hoa 1967:58a, 407b; also Bonet 1899:407a; i.a.; cf. cảng 'paw, leg (of animal)'). Nonetheless, there are independent words for special parts of the body, e.g. gòi 'knee', versus

10. The use of the 'eye' as a node of the bamboo (e.g. Bonet loc.cit., mât tre 'noeud de bambou'; Huê 1937:555a2, ibid.; Gouin 1957:801b. ff.) and sometimes as the joint of a part of the body and so on, is also well observed throughout South-East Asian languages (see i.a., Shorto 1962:170a ff.; 1971:284ff.; Moussay 1971:224).


12. In Malay, one apparently circles the leg to form an ankle (Wilkinson 1932:I, 338a, gelang, cf. 290a; 496a kaki) but the 'anklebone' is still the mata kaki 'eye of the leg' (Loc. cit., & II, 114a, mata). The thought that the Vietnamese mât ca might embalm an MP variant of this is farfetched (even given the *proto-language forms being proposed at present) because of the distinctly Mon-Khmer word for 'leg' in Vietnamese.

13. In Bahnar, I understand that /kpa:ŋ/ is a possible reconstruction. Might this imply a MK k- 'body' prefix which is now lost in modern Vietnamese?

14. Pacoh deals where relevant with bones but does not seem to have a special term for the 'anklebone'. (Watson 1979:382; cf. parreat (ati)).

15. Note that h-/h-/ and kh-/X/ variants are common in Vietnamese, e.g. n.1 above.

16. Relevant, too, are the semantic similarities and, to a certain extent, the various reconstructed readings of MSC jiā, jiē (*GSR 630a *kān/kān/kia be on both sides of (Shi); support (Shu);... loan for 630l. all around (Shu) [=MSC jiā] and especially jiē tsiep/tsie [=MSC xié] encompass, embrace (Shi); all around (Chouli).); n.b. GSR 630k, too.
17. But 1oa in Anh (1957:510b; Tru 1970:278a4) which implies an original *kl- initial consonant cluster and a shift from it to h- and kh- variants. cf. n.15 above.


19. From the Chinese in which there is 目 MSC mù 'eye', reconstructed *mik/miuk/mù (GSR 1036a-c), comes the Hán-Việt muc (de Rhodes 1851:488; muc, vide muc; 483 mọc, con mắt: olhos: ocuļ; Tu 1898: q.3, la4, p.50 目相 =p.215, 2.7 muc mắt). En passant, we may note that final -t and -c /k/ are often interchanged, especially in southern Vietnamese dialects.

20. A large Tie-chiu refugee migration -- one which preceded the late nineteenth century influx of Cantonese who then also provided a vast source of vernacular, material culture vocabulary -- is known to have taken place during the Míng dynasty, and Tie-chiu loans to, and pronunciations of Chinese characters in, Vietnamese -- as distinct from the Hán-Việt forms one normally encounters -- are numerous. Many of such words are readily found in Cũa (1897: e.g. 374a thao; 380a thâu; 402a thác; 433b tía 'daddy' [cf. Egerod 1959: no. 159]; 451a toa [cf. Bonet 1899:323b]) and in Tru (1970: e.g. II, 17a măng, etc.) but not all dictionaries are as detailedly precise. En passant, no Tie-chiu words have, it seems been recorded in de Rhodes' Dictionarium, a compilation principally of the northern dialect.

21. As seen in the more risqué or vulgar puns like ńu-me for (Paul) Doumer and ńit-cua 'crab's arse' for the much despised 'discours'.

22. And its irony. Note the idiom (thánh ngư): ngu' muc hồn châu 魚目混珠 'fishes' eyes may be taken for pearls', meaning that true and false are confused. Its main application in both China and Việt-Nam was to people who used fake materials to make counterfeit, 'real'-looking, goods, thus deceiving others. This was usually jewelry for women and girls.

23. Perhaps this also refers obliquely to notice of a lot of Chinese migrant labour?
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SOME FEATURES OF MODERN KHMER LITERARY STYLE

Judith M. Jacob

The literary or formal style under review here is that of modern prose, particularly that to be found in journals, speeches and novels. Interest in this aspect of the Khmer language was stimulated by the realization that certain assumptions are made about it without any attempt at justification. For example, one feels, especially when translating, that it is an unnecessarily verbose style, containing far more words than can be represented in the translation. Is this really so, or is it a false impression due to language differences? One also tends to say, without any specific parallels in mind, that modern Khmer journalese is clearly imitative of its French equivalent. This paper attempts to summarize the various linguistic differences between the consciously formal modern style and the spoken, or informal. Material has been collected for the purpose from articles (post-1930) on literature and religion, particularly those in the journal Kambujasuriya, from newspapers (1950-72) and from novels (1938-71). I am very much aware that there may be many constructions, associable with style, which have been missed and I present this analysis as a precursor of others.

The increase in the output of prose writing as compared with poetry in the last few decades, during which, for example, both the novel and the printed newspaper in Khmer have developed from scratch, has caused prose writing to be held in higher esteem than it traditionally was in Cambodia. Authors of novels and writers of articles were trying consciously to raise the standard of prose style in the 1950s and 1960s in response to the general wave of nationalistic feeling. Interesting changes in style which thus took place in post-war Cambodia, especially since independence in 1953, may be observed by comparison with the factual and simple narratives of the Chronicles, composed in the nineteenth century, or of the first written versions of folktales, or of the esteemed early twentieth century writer Suttantaprija In. The analysis of these developments might be presented in many different ways. I have decided to arrange the various points in four sections which suggest my own idea of their possible origin. These are:

1. Features which seem to be present in order to clarify long, involved sentences;
2. A feature which suggests conscious or unconscious imitation of Thai;
3. Features which suggest conscious or unconscious imitation of French;
4. Features which seem to reflect the desire to embellish, using the traditional devices of Khmer literature.

1. Features which seem to be present in order to clarify long, involved sentences

In the 1950s and 1960s, when upwards of 3000 new technical terms based on Sanskrit and Pāli were invented so as to avoid using French loanwords any longer, the introduction of this unfamiliar vocabulary added to the need to explain some old loans to a general reading public and had some effects on the style of written Khmer:

(i) In the early years of the use of the new vocabulary it was common practice to place two words, one Khmer, one Indian, side by side. Thus /smōm yī:ecāk/ (Khm. + Skt.) 'beggar', /svks̩a: sō:t-rōn/ (Skt. + Khm.) 'education', /pr̩t̩h-cī:r̩t mī:stophu:m/ (old + new borrowing) 'one's native country', all occur in the newspapers of the 1950s.

(ii) The unwieldy sentences produced by use of the new words in complex clauses led to the excessive use of the literary particles /n̩y̩/ and n̩y̩/ which are used only with restraint in earlier prose writing such as that of the Chronicles, the folktales, or the writing of Suttantapri Jā In.

/n̩y̩/ (spelt nū). In Khmer, the object, when it is expressed, normally follows the verb immediately, e.g. /m̩:1 kon/ 'see a film'. In an informal or colloquial style, no particle connects the object to the verb. The use of /n̩y̩/ as an indicator that the object of the verb follows is a literary device which is useful when, as in journalese especially, several phrases occur between the verb and its object and it is helpful to know that the next word, or words, will be the object, e.g.

/coh phsa:y pī: l̩:k kn̩q sa:p̩[n̩d̩m̩:an n̩ek-cī:r̩t-n̩y̩m publish, print two times in newspaper nationalist n̩y̩ rūng/ (particle) story

'twice printed the story in the Nationalist newspaper'.

Once established in modern literary usage, however, /n̩y̩/ began to be used when there was no need for it because the object followed the verb immediately:

/tr̩̪m-tr̩̪: r̩:q n̩y̩ 'ɔm̩p̩:n̩m-tr̩̪:/ endure undergo (particle) matter pillage

'put up with the pillaging'.
/nèy/. In the colloquial, or informal, language, two nouns occurring in close junction may represent an object and its possessor, e.g. /phtèah vî:ə/ 'their house'. A more elaborate way, especially useful if attributes of the first noun follow it before the occurrence of the possessor-noun, is found both in colloquial speech and in the literary language: /phtèah thom râbôh vî:ə/ (house big possession they) 'their big house'. In a literary modern sentence, however, the role of /râbôh/ is played by the particle /nèy/ 'of', e.g. /lô:k ?akkètə:sə?phîba:1 nèy prətə:h o:stra:l:ə/ governor general of country Australia 'the Governor-General of Australia'

It may be pointed out that, in the Chronicles, many similarly long instances of possession and possessor are expressed without /nèy/ by simple juxtaposition, and that /nèy/, like /nỳu/, came to be used between short familiar words in modern writing too.

(iii) Among the seemingly unnecessary words which help to give the verbose impression to modern literature are many sentence-final nuclei which corroborate a word, often a particle, which has occurred earlier in the sentence. Examples are in this case given (see next page) without full sentences, for the most part, since the point seems clear from the meanings given and they are divided according to the grammatical functions of the two elements.

The practice illustrated in these examples, which occurs freely in the colloquial language as well as the written, seems to have become a characteristic feature of journalese, where it has a clarifying role, not so much because the meaning is reaffirmed as because the sentence-final nucleus, or sometimes several of them together, confirms that the end of a clause has been reached.
(a) Meaning of pre-verbal particle\(^5\) (pre-v.p.) corroborated by sentence final element:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pre-v.p.</th>
<th>final particle</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>extra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nỳu-tae</td>
<td>nỳu-laey</td>
<td>'is still arguing about (it)'</td>
<td>'still'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(still</td>
<td>argue</td>
<td>(pre-v.p.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pùm-tèn</td>
<td>nỳu-laey</td>
<td>'is not yet extinguished'</td>
<td>'still'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not yet</td>
<td>extinguished</td>
<td>(pre-v.p.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sot-tæ</td>
<td>tèøg-?øh</td>
<td>'all without exception became soldiers'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all</td>
<td>tîtreh:øn</td>
<td>(adverbial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exception</td>
<td></td>
<td>particle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srap-tæ</td>
<td>phlì:øm</td>
<td>'suddenly they were there'</td>
<td>'immediately'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(suddenly</td>
<td>immediately)</td>
<td>(verb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaø</td>
<td>pùm kha:n</td>
<td>'shall be sure to come across one of their nests'</td>
<td>'without fail'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(certain</td>
<td>vi:e</td>
<td>(pre-v.p.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with nest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi:e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miss)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Meaning of general particle (gen.p.) corroborated by a final particle (f.p.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gen.p.</th>
<th>f.p.</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>extra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nỳu</td>
<td>tae</td>
<td>'there were only four left'</td>
<td>'just so'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sol</td>
<td>bu:øn</td>
<td>(left over only four just so)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Meaning of pre-nominal particle (pre-n.p.) corroborated by adverbial particle (adv.p.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pre-n.p.</th>
<th>adv.p.</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>extra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?oh pù:ak</td>
<td>tèəŋ-?oh</td>
<td>'the whole group'</td>
<td>'all'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all group)</td>
<td>all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krùp rù:p</td>
<td>tèəŋ-?oh</td>
<td>'all of them'</td>
<td>'all'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(complete person)</td>
<td>all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Meaning of post-nominal particle (post-n.p.) corroborated by adverbial particle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>post-n.p.</th>
<th>adv.p.</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>extra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pùm tetũ:al</td>
<td>bontec-bontu:ec laey</td>
<td>'did not receive any news at all'</td>
<td>'the slightest'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dəmnyŋ ?vy</td>
<td>slightest at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not receive news any)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Meaning of main verb corroborated by final particle or verb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>f.p. or verb</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>extra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaen</td>
<td>t'yu muk tlest</td>
<td>'will increase'</td>
<td>'further'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(increase on further)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Meaning of attributive verb corroborated by an adverb:

| y:b:k khaet :......ba:n krùp tèəŋ-?oh mõ:k vən | managed to recover all the provinces | 'all' |
| (take province manage complete all come back) | | |

(g) Plurality of a reduplicative compound corroborated by sentence final nucleus:

| rebok thom-thom | cî:s craen | 'many large objects' | 'in numbers' |
| (thing big and numerous in numbers) | | | |
2. A feature which suggests conscious or unconscious imitation of Thai

In colloquial speech, the only numeral coefficients which have to be used are those of which the meaning is a term of measurement, e.g. /kì:lo/ in the phrase /skò: pì: kì:lo/ 'two kilos of sugar'. In a formal or literary context, however, there is a tendency to use unnecessary numeral coefficients. Thus, for example, the numeral coefficient for human beings /nək/ (e.g. /mənəh pì: nək/ 'two men'), which has been in evidence since the seventh century, is used more frequently in literature; the general word for 'item', /prəka:/ is found (e.g. /hæt pì: prəka:/ 'two reasons'), and various coefficients indicating shapes (e.g. /dɔm/ 'lump'; /səsəy/ 'strand'; /dəm/ 'long thin thing') occur. In addition to the increased use of numeral coefficients in connection with counting, however, there is also a different construction which occurs in modern literature, involving the use of numeral coefficients when counting is not taking place, e.g.

/ceːcʃɛn vʊən nǐː/ (ring circle this) 'this ring'
/prəɛə nìːcːə 'ɔŋ nǐː/ (revered king body this) 'this king'.

In such constructions, reminiscent of Thai, the numeral coefficients, here /vʊən/ and /'ɔŋ/, are behaving as true classifiers.

3. Features which suggest conscious or unconscious imitation of French

Slight changes in grammatical usage which seem to be due to French influence are illustrated below under four heads: (i) the use of abstract nouns in preference to verbs; (ii) the attempt to express some nuances contained in the meanings of various verbal forms in French; (iii) changes of Cambodian word-order in imitation of the French. Under (iv), the practice of word-for-word translation of French turns of phrase is illustrated.

(i) The use of abstract nouns in preference to verbs

The Khmer natural idiom uses a verb rather than a noun whenever possible. When an abstract noun is essential Khmer has its own ways, based on verbs, of supplying the need. Nouns formed by infixation of the verb are still in use, e.g. /kɔməhoh/ 'a wrong' < /khoh/ 'to be wrong'. Sometimes an abstract noun is produced by juxtaposing two verbs of opposite meaning, e.g. /tətəl khoh-trov:/ (lit. 'to accept wrong-right') 'to take responsibility for'. Another means is to form a noun by placing the word /ka:/ 'action' or /ɔmɛʔ:/ 'activity' or /sekɛʔv/
'matter' before a verb or attributive verb, e.g. /kaː pʰəŋːɹːk/ (lit. 'matter open up') 'development'. However, many abstract nouns were nevertheless borrowed from French and have now been carefully replaced and supplemented by new Indian borrowings. Also of importance is the position of an abstract noun in a natural Khmer sentence. It seems that when abstract nouns are used in Khmer, they do not usually occur, except in philosophical discourse, as the subject of the sentence. Sentences in modern writing in which new nouns occur often seem very un-Cambodian and, especially if nouns do occur as sentence subjects, suggest French influence to me, e.g.

/kûmnuːt mâŋ sakaməpʰiː ap nîn pûm mîːәn prəsəvthiːpʰiː ap / (idea and action these not have effectiveness mûːәy rûːy phiːak rûːy) one hundred part hundred)

'These ideas and activities were not one hundred percent effective'.

/saːrəpʰiː ap srok yəːŋ cîːә saːrəpʰiː ap srok vîːәl tûmniː ap/ (truth country we is truth country plain low)

'The essential nature of our country is that of a low plain' / 'Our country is essentially a low-lying plain'.

(ii) The attempt to express some 'nuances' contained in the meanings of various verbal forms in French

(a) /daoy/ This word may occur as a clause-marker (conjunction). and, if so, the unexpressed subject of the clause is always the same as that of the main clause. In everyday usage it occurs with the meaning 'through the fact (that); because (of)'. In novels, /daoy/ has been observed in occurrences such as these but also in contexts where it seems to indicate that the action of the verb in the clause it introduces takes place simultaneously with the action of the main verb and where no cause is given, e.g.

/kraok chôː khvt ceŋ chŋaːy, daoy somdaeq / (get-up stand move off afar, (through) show prəs–kaːy–vîːka: s'op–khpːm royal–gesture despise)

'He stood up and moved away some distance, making a gesture of contempt.'

A native Khmer way of expressing simultaneous action which might have been used is to place the word /dɔmnaː/ after each of the two verbs. In the example, however, the Khmer sentence seems to imitate the ability of French to bring the present participle into play ('faisant' or 'en faisant').
(b) /kompûŋ/ occurs as a pre-verbal particle meaning 'in the middle of verb-ing' and precedes a main verb of action in normal everyday usage. In novels it has been found in occurrences where it seems to be added in as an extra word, e.g.

/prêhreh phnê:k nûŋ sat-chlû:h mû:øy kompûŋ chô: sî: smau/

(meet eyes with mouse-deer in-the-middle-of standing eat grass)

'Their eyes lit upon a mouse-deer standing grazing'.

Here /kompûŋ/ occurs unusually before a verb used attributively in close junction with a noun, where the same phrase without /kompûŋ/ would be normal in Khmer and where French might have a present participle or a relative clause with imperfect tense.

(c) Khmer sentences, spoken or written, tend to depend as far as possible on context and meaning to indicate relative time, and can proceed with a minimum use of words such as /ba:n/ (past), /nûŋ/ (future) and /haøy/ (completion). Time relationships between two clauses may not need any clause marker, such as /kraoy-dael/ 'after', if any of the other indicators is present. It seems probable that it was familiarity with the precision of the various tenses in French which caused a much fuller use of indications of relative time in recent written Khmer, e.g.

/kraoy-dael ba:n sâp secûɗy thlae oy kôp haøy, prêh-søy ko: ba:n som’dâŋ secûɗy rî:k-rî:øy/

(after have listened-to matter express through-to-end already monks then have shown matter joyful)

'After they had listened through to the end of the address, the monks expressed their delight...'

Since the whole context of this sentence was already known to be past, /ba:n/, which occurs in both clauses, was not needed at all. In speech /haøy/ at the end of the first clause would be enough to indicate the relative time of the actions of the two clauses. The French 'après avoir écouté...' seems possible as a model for this.

(iii) Changes of Cambodian word-order in imitation of the French

In spoken, or simply written Khmer, adverbs, adverbial phrases, attributive verbs modifying a main verb, and post-verbs completing the meaning of a main verb all characteristically follow the main verb and its object and occur in clause or sentence final position. In newspaper style, however, changes of word-order such as the following may take place made possible by use of the particle /nûŋ/ discussed in section 1 (ii).
'put the water policy into operation many years ago'

This seems to me to reflect French 'depuis de longues années' placed between verb and object.

The following example comes from an article in Kambujasuriya (1966):

'A conference of this kind produces important results' (lit. 'produces for [particle] result').

Normally /?aoy/ 'to give; for' would come after the object; it suggests 'for (us, people, the participants, one)'. Perhaps the aim of the un-Khmer-like position of /?aoy/ is to avoid a construction which is so unlike French?

(iv) Word-for-word translation of French turns of phrase

(a) The Khmer language has its own metaphorical vocabulary, some of which uses the same imagery as French or English, for example, in associating the ideas of heat or fire with anger. In the following examples, from newspapers, however, the metaphors of French idiom are used rather than those which the Khmer language offers:

'/rûmch:al harûtêy ya:q crî:al-crû/ (agitated royal-feelings manner deep) 'deeply disturbed'. Here Khmer idiom would have /khaq/ 'strong' instead of 'deep'.

/kho;rîya:ka:h rî:k-rî:ay/ (in atmosphere joyful) 'in a happy atmosphere'. This use of the new Khmer loanword /borîya:ka:h/ metaphorically is entirely due to French.

(b) Many instances may be found in newspapers of direct translation of the complete French phrase:

'/kù: tha:/ (that-is to-say) 'c'est à dire'. /kà:/ alone rather than /kù: tha:/ would seem more natural judging from older Khmer prose.

/mî:an ka: pîsaot/ (have matter experiment) 'avoir l'expérience'. Use of the simple verb /pîsaot/ rather than the expression would seem more idiomatic in Khmer.

/bae ?aoka:h hoc ?aoy/ (if opportunity pass-across for) 'si l'occasion se présente'. /hoc/ normally has an object following it, even in a metaphorical use such as in the Khmer phrase /hoc khlû:en ?aoy pra showers. (pass-across self so-that use-services-of) 'offer one's services'.
4. Features which seem to reflect the desire to embellish, using the traditional devices of Khmer literature

These features are discussed under three heads: (i) elevation of style; (ii) reduplication and repetition of ideas; and (iii) expansion and variation.

(i) Elevation of style

Several features which have been discussed in preceding sections help to elevate the style; for example, the Thai-inspired use of numeral coefficients mentioned in section 2. Here, however, two specific means are considered: the choice of vocabulary and the use of particles preceding attributive verbs.

(a) Four waves of loanwords from Sanskrit and/or Pāli have come into the language to fill gaps: legal, religious, and political terms in the pre-Angkor and Angkor periods; Pāli Buddhist terms, chiefly from the eleventh century onwards; the bulk of the royal vocabulary from sometime after the end of the Angkor period onwards; and the new vocabulary during the last few decades. The 'high' language of poetry has been drawn from the first three of these categories. Terms from all four kinds of borrowing are characteristically to be found in modern prose, causing the style to differ profoundly from that of the spoken language.7

(b) /do:/ In Khmer an attributive verb follows immediately the noun it modifies, in the normal structure of colloquial and informal language, e.g. /mì:an phtēah thom/ 'had a big house'. In the literary language, however, /do:/ has long had the role of preceding an attributive verb and attaching it to the noun. It is still used and has the effect of highlighting the attribute: e.g.

/a:riyoretē:h mūøy do tracah-traco~/ (civilised country one particle shining) 'a magnificent civilization'
In newspapers, however, its use is extended so as to attach other categories of word to the nouns:

/thlaeiJ ?om.no: kiln do: kray lë:q/ (express joy (at) good-deed particle very very) 'express (my) great gratitude'

/lathaphol da: ci:e tî: koap cvt/ (result particle being focus suit feelings) 'a satisfactory outcome'

In the first of these examples, an adverb /kray lë:q/, and in the second, a phrase /ci:e tî: koap cvt/, are treated in the same way as attributive verbs.

Another extension of the use of /do:/ in journales is to allow it to attach two attributes to the noun:

/?oh ka:l do: yù nìnq do: lùmba:k/ (whole time particle long and particle difficult) 'during this long and difficult period'

/do:/ is not really necessary as a clarifier of the construction even in the long phrases of the literary language; it is an embellishment used particularly in descriptive passages in novels or flowery parts of public speeches.

/ya:q/ This word, meaning 'way', is in competition with /do:/, now as a means to attach attribute to noun: e.g.

/tatù:al para:çèy ya:q ?a:mah/ 'suffered a humiliating defeat'

Unlike /do:/, however, it occurs also when an attributive verb occurs post-verbally (usually to be translated into English by an adverb), e.g.

/ka: ta:n-tvq ba:n kæt mà:en laeq ya:q khlaq-kla:/ (matter tense has risen is-there rising way strong) 'tension has arisen to an extreme degree'

Khmer grammar does not require the presence of any particle before such an attributive verb and it would not be present normally in informal and colloquial speech (cf. /kæt seckdy tro:y/ 'think the matter out correctly'). The particles /nỳu/ and /nèy/, discussed in section 1 as having a clarifying role, also, like /do:/ and /ya:q/, contribute by their mere presence to the literary flavour of a sentence.

(ii) Reduplication and repetition of ideas

As is well known, Khmer is a language in which reduplication occurs structurally at the levels of phonology, morphology, and syntax. Repetition of ideas occurs in the formation of compounds. Both exact reduplication using
phonaesthetic words, sometimes specially created, and repetition of ideas using poetic vocabulary, also occur as literary devices and have done so since the beginning of Khmer poetic composition. The following examples, taken from modern prose, merely illustrate the use of the same devices in modern writing.

(a) **Reduplication**

\[/rùt-tae chû: khlaŋ laŋ khlaŋ laŋ/ \text{ (increasingly ill strong up strong up)} \text{'became more and more seriously ill'}}\)

\[/khlaŋ laŋ/ \text{could have occurred without reduplication.}\)

\[/cî:k kûal cî:k rûn su:e/ \text{ (dig tree-stump dig roots ask)} \text{'make a thorough investigation'}}\)

\[/cî:k kûal rûn/ \text{could have occurred without the interpolated reduplication.}\)

\[/cî:e nêc cî:e ka:l/ \text{'always'}}\)

This use of interpolated reduplication, based on a compound loanword (Pali: niccakālaṇ) produces an understandable phrase because both components of the compound are familiar to Khmer readers as separate words. Word-play exercised on Indian loanwords is used as a poetic embellishment.

(b) **Repetition of ideas**

The examples under this heading are from both novels and newspapers:

\[/cî:e ?ûla:rûk ?athûk-?athûk/ \text{ (being grand splendid)} \text{'in a very grand manner'}}\)

\[/cî:e/ \text{usually precedes one attributive verb in this much-used pattern for forming clause final adverbial phrases with the meaning 'in a -- manner'}}\)

\[/nûu-tae prakaek mûn-tœen tætû:al prû:m nûu-laŋy/ \text{ (still refused not-yet accept agree still)} \text{'still staunchly refused'}}\)

The whole meaning is in effect said twice in different ways, very much in the poetic tradition, particularly of the nineteenth century.

A certain means of expression, which I have noticed particularly in the written language, and of which I have found instances in Middle Khmer poetry, consists of following up the main verb with a short clause which merely repeats the intention expressed by the verb in another way: e.g.
This kind of clause seems to occur, in journalese especially, rather more often than the contexts warrant. However, it may, in some cases, seem more necessary to Khmers than it does in the translation because the clause fills out the meaning of the preceding verb, which, on its own in Khmer, has a limited meaning, being able to convey neither the sense of finiteness nor the ideas of completion or result which one can convey in English or French by use of the past tense.

(iii) Expansion and variation

The simple forms of everyday speech or writing are constantly expanded and varied in the formal, literary style. Some examples are given (see next page).

Traditional poetic forms which parallel these examples are to be found, e.g. /sôh sa:/ 'utterly' (pro/sôh/); /nûh nêy/ 'that, those' (pro/nûh/), and /hak bvy rû:/ 'as though' (pro/do:c-cî:a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple form</th>
<th>Expanded or varied form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/mù:øy tìət/ (one further)</td>
<td>'Moreover,...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/myaːŋ tìət/ (one way further)</td>
<td>'And another thing:...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mìm tæ ponnəh/ (not only like that)</td>
<td>'Furthermore...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/bontec/ (a little, soon)</td>
<td>'Soon...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/knoŋ pèːl yùː kɔnloːŋ mɔːk nùh/ (in time long past coming along that)</td>
<td>'In the distant past...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/tëŋ/ (also)</td>
<td>'and also'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/khaːŋ/ (side)</td>
<td>'in the direction of'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/dɔl/ (as far as)</td>
<td>'until'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/tæː/ (only)</td>
<td>'only...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/baːn cːə/ (get to be)...pruːəh</td>
<td>'The reason why...was because'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/mù:øy tìət saot/ ( + moreover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/myaːŋ vən tìət/ ( + again, now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/mìm tæ ponnəh prɔːm təŋ...tìət/ ( + join also...further)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/bontec pìː pèːl nùh bontec mɔːk/ (next from time that a little coming-along)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/knoŋ ?advtkaːl kɔnloːŋ mɔːk yùː ?ɔŋvɛːŋ hasy nùh/ (in past-time coming-along long long already)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/prɔːm təŋ/ (join also)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/thaem təŋ/ (add also)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/phnaek khaːŋ/ (section side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/dəɾaːp mɔːk dɔl/ (all the way come as-far-as)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/trvym tæː/ (up-to-the point only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/haet-dael...kùː daøy/ (cause which...was through...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple form</td>
<td>Expanded or varied form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/haet nīh haay ba:n ciːə/ (cause this completed get to be)</td>
<td>'This was the reason why' /daoy ?aːsray haet nīh haay tːp mīːən/ (through depend-on cause this completed so have)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/coːj/ (wish)</td>
<td>'wish' /mīːən boʊməːŋ coːj/ (have desire wish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nah/ (very)</td>
<td>'very' /pɛːk nah/ (too-much very)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/saː həːəj/ (particles)</td>
<td>'at all' /?əːoy tɔəl-təe soː/ (give so-far-as at all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mən khaːn/ (not miss)</td>
<td>'without fail' /daoy khaːn mən baːn/ (through miss not possible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A further kind of expansion takes place in the use of some idioms which have already been formed on a literary pattern and which take part in a larger grammatical construction. Two examples are:

/yaːŋ saen khoː: khvʊ/ (way 100,000 aggressive) 'in an extremely aggressive manner'

/taŋ-pːː rœp saːvatvəet/ (since count centuries) 'for some centuries'

These are both based on idiomatic phrases which occur in literature. /saen/ '100,000' functions in literature as a particle 'very' modifying a following attributive verb, here /khoː:-khvʊ/. (Khmer particles with this function would occur after the attributive verb; /saen/ as a numeral would normally occur preceding a numeral coefficient, not a verb.) In the phrase /yaːŋ saen khoː: khvʊ/ the expansion consists in taking this instance of an established literary idiom and using it in place of the attributive verb which usually, as was shown in 4(i), follows /yaːŋ/. In the second phrase, /rœp/ 'to count' occurs idiomatically with several words in a slightly formal language style, e.g. /rœp rəːy/ 'in hundreds'. Here this idiomatic adverbial form is used after a pre-nominal particle instead of the noun, which is expected in that position (e.g. /taŋ-pːː chnam nʊːh/ 'since that year').

Some features described in the foregoing sections, particularly the use of particles, of time indicators, and of corroborative nuclei when there is no need for them, seem to confirm that there is a tendency to wordiness in Modern Khmer written style. With regard to the influence of French, examples have shown that, ironically, although loanwords from French have, in principle, been discarded, some aspects of French grammar have been incorporated! In presenting together all the points which I have observed, I may have given the impression that all modern writing of news, articles, speeches and novels is packed with these features. In fact, however, many writers of articles have used a restrained style and many novelists have used a very simple style even in descriptive passages; one for example, is Dik Keam in his novel *Brok tae kāngaen* (1967). In any case, much of a novel is concerned with narrative and conversation and, for the presentation of conversation, a good tradition of writing both naturally and interestingly seems to have been built up by Khmer novelists, stemming perhaps from the lively little conversation passages which are found in the verse novels (/satra: lbāeq/). In fact, for a thorough assessment of a style one would have to separate the genres of writing which have been treated together here.

Although it has been interesting for me to attempt to analyse recent changes in style, I personally prefer the simple, restrained
one. However, perhaps foreigners should confine themselves to factual description and not presume to judge style qualitatively. From a Khmer point of view, as section 4 shows, the long-established literary tradition, which is the tradition of poetry, has encouraged embellishment by the use of long loanwords and of reduplicative and repetitive patterns, all of which produce more words.

NOTES

1. The writing of prose in Khmer was traditionally intended for practical reasons only. Literature for artistic purposes was always composed as poetry; at first, from the seventh to the thirteenth centuries, in Sanskrit.

2. My source for this has been a photographed manuscript of the Chronicles in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies. Some historical writing is easily available in print, however, in Huffman (1977: 38–78).

3. Reproduced in print in the early volumes of the Prājum rīoēn breh khmaer.

4. The transcription used here was based on Professor Henderson's pioneering analysis of Khmer pronunciation (Henderson 1952).

5. Terms for grammatical categories are as given in Jacob (1968).

6. This is not to say that French loans for which new vocabulary was invented went out of use completely. They are still heard.

7. Many Indian loans are so completely naturalized that their presence in the colloquial language passes unnoticed, e.g. /bon/ 'festival' < puya 'good work'.

8. /nɒu/, /nēy/ and /dɔː/ were briefly treated in Jacob (1978) together with /rɪː/ as literary particles. /rɪː/ does not seem to occur so much in recent writing.

9. That is, in words having reduplicated initial consonants which are no longer, or have never been, analysable as consisting of base and reduplicating prefix, e.g. /bəbəː/ 'soup', /tətəːl/ 'receive'.

10. Reduplicative prefixes consist chiefly of single consonants (e.g. the frequentative /k ⟨e⟩kaːy/ from /kaːy/ 'to dig into the earth with hands, paws') but include some examples of rhotized consonants (e.g. /tr ⟨a⟩tʊən/ which occurs in
/tr(a)te:h-tr(a)tuan/ 'graceful' from /tuan/ 'soft, supple') and of consonants followed by a nasal consonant (e.g. /s(a)nsaam/ 'dew' from /saam/ 'wet'). Reduplicative compounds are formed by the juxtaposition of alliterative, rhyming, chiming, or repeated word-forms (e.g. /cat-caen/ 'to organize' /ri:ey-ml:ey/ 'untidily scattered'); /kme:q-kma:q/ 'children (in quantity)'; /proh-proh/ 'the menfolk, the boys'.

11. Reduplication in syntax intensifies meaning, e.g. /craen laaq craen laaq/ 'increasing in quantity', is more emphatic than /craen laaq/. Reduplication with interpolation also occurs, especially with components of compounds; e.g. /prap ke: prap 'aelJ/ 'tell everybody', /pro prap ke:-'aelJ/ id. The reduplicated form is more stylish.

12. Frequently a compound with specialized meaning or with abstract meaning has been formed of components, each of which has, when used alone, approximately the same meaning, e.g. /ciah-vi: alJ/ 'to dodge', and /vi:alJ/ 'to follow a winding course, go round (an object)'.

13. The following are poetic examples /thla: thlaa alJ co:-ca: prap/ (explain converse tell); /kru:alJ kru:p 'aphivi:at v~anti:/ (shrink prostrate-oneself salute salute) 'greet respectfully'.

14. By the nineteenth century this poetic device began to be overdone. See Jacob (1979).
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KHASI KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

†Lili Rabel-Heymann

Irawati Karve, the acknowledged authority on Indian kinship, who admits to unfamiliarity with the Khasi language, lists twelve Khasi words in her study of kinship (Karve 1965), but none of these words are included in U.R. Ehrenfels (1953) paper, nor are they recorded in the four Khasi dictionaries (Nissor Singh 1906, 1920; Leemuel 1965 (= Diengdoh); and Khakhongngor 1968) known to me. Since these same twelve words were also never mentioned by any of my Khasi informants, they should probably be considered as non-existent in the Khasi language; Karve's erroneous listings may be understandable, however, as her only sources were Roberts (1891), Grierson (1904), and Gurdon (1914). U.R. Ehrenfels' article (1953) is, therefore, the only modern treatment of Khasi kinship terminology; it had apparently not come to Karve's attention.

Ehrenfels includes an almost complete list of kinship terms in four dialects -- Plateau Khasi, that is, the standard language; War Khasi; Pnar (or Jaintia); and War Jaintia — indexed under 43 English glosses, the purpose of which was one of comparison. Although the author collected the vocabulary in an actual field situation, aided by native interpreters, his spellings are not always reliable and the literal meaning of most terms remains hidden from the reader unfamiliar with the language. I, therefore, see my task as that of amplifying Ehrenfels' work, of correcting some errors, especially in the orthography, and of explaining the underlying morphemes occurring in the incredibly complicated Khasi system.

Khasi kinship terminology is based on three principles:

1. a differentiation between blood relatives and relatives by marriage;
2. classification by relative age of each member with regard to the person they are related to; and
3. distinction between terms of address and terms of reference.

Khasi society is generally considered to be matrilineal and matrilocal; the kinship system could be called 'bifurcate merging' since mother is equated with mother's sister, father with father's brother, while mother's brother and father's sister are denoted by distinct terms. Ancestry is traced through the
mother's clan, *ka kur*, often used as an 'imitative' \(^3\) *ki kur ki kmie* (lit. 'the clans the mothers'). Gender number \(^4\) morphemes (called 'prefixes' by the Khasis) must precede each noun; *ka* indicates feminine, *u* masculine singular; *ki* is used for plural number and *i* for respect, endearment, and smallness, the latter two not distinguishing gender.

Upon marriage, the husband remains in his mother's clan while his children belong to his wife's clan. *kur* is used in three phrases: *jadei kur* 'to have a relationship on the mother's side, to be related within the same clan'; in the compound *para kur* 'children of mother's siblings', and in the verb *tait kur tait jaid*, \(^5\) an imitative 'to be banished from the clan' (lit. 'reject clan, reject kind, caste').

The most respected member in the clan is the mother's elder brother, *u kim* or *kim rangbah* (*rang-bah* translates as 'adult male, an elder' and is composed of *rang*, the combining form of *shynrang* 'man' and *bah* 'older brother', probably based on the verb *bah* 'to be big'). The *kim* is addressed as *mama* or *ma*, a word which seems to be of Indo-European (IE) origin since Hindi, Bengali, and Assamese use it for 'maternal uncle' as well. The *kim* is consulted on all important decisions and acts as the ultimate arbiter in disputes. Mother's other brothers are referred to as *kim pdeng* 'middle brother' and *kim khadduh* \(^6\) 'mother's youngest brother; the very last' respectively. The latter two uncles are addressed as *ma-deng* and *ma-khadduh* or *ma-duh*; *duh* 'the last, the youngest' is used for blood relatives only, never for those related by marriage.

The word for 'mother' has two forms which are probably not related morphologically (see discussion below). *kmie* is used for reference and *mei* for address; mother's sisters are also addressed as *mei* plus the appropriate modifier for age-ranking.

Father is referred to as *i kpa* and addressed as *papa* or *pa*, a term strangely familiar to speakers of Indo-European languages. His brothers, as well as the husbands of his sisters and of his mother's sisters are all referred to as 'fathers' (*pa*—used in compounds is explained below). Father's sisters are all addressed and referred to as *kha*. *Kha* is based on a verb meaning 'to give birth', thus, according to Ehrenfels (1953: 408), apparently recognizing the father's biological function in procreation. *Kha* also functions as the second constituent in compounds designating father's mother, *kmie-kha*, and cousins on the father's side, *shi para kha-shi* is the numeral 'one' used for units and measurements (as opposed to *wei* 'one'); *para* designates brothers and sisters of one's own generation.

Parallel cousins and cross-cousins are distinguished both in terminology and in marriage practices; marriage between
parallel cousins is sang 'taboo', while marriage between cross-cousins is permitted though not common. Mother's brothers' children are also referred to as ba-kha, since by definition his children will belong to their own mother's clan.

All brothers and sisters within the immediate family are designated by terms that specify whether they are older or younger than the speaker; there are also terms to indicate a 'middle' brother or sister and terms for the youngest brother and sister (Table 1).

The oldest sister is kong or kong ieit, 'sister-beloved', the oldest brother is bah bah 'brother big', or bah rangbah 'brother grown-up man', terms that show a position of respect occupied by the elder siblings. There are actually two homophonous morphemes bah, one meaning 'brother', the other 'to be big'; and since modifiers follow the noun in Khasi, kong ieit would have to be translated as 'sister who is beloved' and bah rangbah as 'brother who is grown-up'.

Unfortunately, Table 1 shows some gaps. Also, no two of the young Khasi speakers who recently supplied me with information agree on all terms; they have all been living abroad for a long time and have become accustomed to our simplified Western terminology using aunt, uncle, cousin, etc. One speaker also suggested that address by name is coming into vogue among the younger generation.

khynnah 'child' is used for the youngest brother, bah khynnah 'kid brother'; i rit (lit. 'little one') and i duh (lit. 'the last one') are best rendered by 'kid sister'. One word glosses for hep and hymen are difficult to suggest; older people, even non-relatives, can address young people as hep; it is a term of endearment and is roughly equivalent to the American usage of 'sonny' or 'kid' when used by men for little boys, or 'dear' when used by old ladies for younger women. The morpheme hy- occurs in several other Khasi words that relate to 'time past, ago': folk-tales always begin with hyndai-hynthai... 'once upon a time...'; hyne means 'a short time ago', hymnin 'yesterday', so that hymmen could perhaps be rendered by 'born before, born some time ago'. The morpheme -men occurs in tymmen 'old man or woman', so that it may mean 'old human being'.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elder S/B*</th>
<th>Middle S/B</th>
<th>Younger S/B</th>
<th>The Youngest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>'kong ieit'**</td>
<td></td>
<td>'hep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kong, hynmen kynthei</td>
<td>kong-deng</td>
<td>hep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i rit, i duh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's husband</td>
<td>'hynmen kynsi'</td>
<td></td>
<td>'para kynsi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kong heh, hynmen kynsi</td>
<td>kong-deng</td>
<td>'hep kynsi' (by female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(by female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kyn-um (by male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>'bah, bah bah, bah heh'</td>
<td>'bah khynnah'</td>
<td>'bah duh'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'bah rangbah'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hep (by female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B's wife</td>
<td>hynmen shynrang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'kong kynsi'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Abbreviations used here and in following tables are: B = Brother, F = Father, M = Mother, S = Sister
** Quotation marks indicate terms of address

Table 1: *Khasi sibling terms of address and of reference*
kynsi and kyn-um are best translated by 'in-law';

the minor syllable kyn- occurs in so many words, nouns and verbs alike, that it is impossible to assign a definite lexical meaning to it.9 Ego's, i.e. the speaker's, maternal and paternal aunts and uncles are, as Table 2 shows, classified according to the same system as siblings; older or younger than parent referred to, in-between the older and the younger aunt or uncle, and a designation for the youngest aunt or uncle. Mother's and father's in-laws take their age-ranking appellations from their respective spouses rather than from their actual age. Terms of address and terms of reference are usually identical in the second and third ascending generation (grandparents and great-grandparents), and for the first descending generation (children, nephews, and nieces): terms are, however, as Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate, differentiated for ego's siblings and for ego's parents and their siblings. The term of address is often a shortened or reduced variant of the full term which is used for reference; the shortened variant, also used in compounds, is derived by loss of the initial consonant (usually k-), or loss of the initial syllable in bisyllabic words. Examples are:

pa vs. kpa 'father', rād vs. kynrād 'lord, master', mei vs. kmie 'mother', -rang vs. shynrang 'adult male'.

Most family members, it will be noticed, are not addressed or referred to by name but by their kin classification; even husband and wife have traditionally referred to each other as 'the mother (of) [oldest child's name]' e.g. i kmie u Doni, and i kpa u Doni 'the father (of) Doni'. One woman informant told me that a woman can also address her husband's sister's husband, i.e. her brother-in-law, as the kpa of the first-born child. Husband and wife address each other by phi, the polite second person pronoun 'you'. Younger Khasis state that nowadays husband and wife may use names for addressing each other. Another Khasi friend gave me the terms of ka lok for 'wife' and u lok for 'husband', but a young man said: 'lok is a harsh word, don't use it.'

The reference terms for parents-in-law, kiaw for 'mother-in-law' and kthaw for 'father-in-law', do not distinguish between maternal and paternal ancestry. The terminology for grandparents is structured parallel to that of one's own parents; however, distinctions between terms of address and of reference are not as varied. 'Mother's mother' is mei-rād, 'mother's father' is pa-rād; their respective siblings add -heh for the older sister, -deng for the middle sister, but the youngest is simply another mei-rād. Great-grandparents on the mother's side are mei-buh and pa-buh;11 father's mother and father are kmie-kha and pa-kha respectively. Referential terms for parents in all generations take the respectful 'prefix/article' i.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>'mei'</th>
<th>Older than M/F</th>
<th>Middle S/B</th>
<th>Younger than M</th>
<th>The Youngest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M's Sisters</td>
<td>i kmie</td>
<td>mei-san</td>
<td>mei-deng</td>
<td>mei khynnah</td>
<td>nah rit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M's Ss' Husbands</td>
<td></td>
<td>pa-san</td>
<td>pa khynnah</td>
<td>pa khynnah</td>
<td>pa khynnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M's Brothers</td>
<td>'mama rangbah'</td>
<td>'ma-deng'</td>
<td>'ma, mama'</td>
<td>'ma khadduh'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M's Bs' Wives</td>
<td></td>
<td>fia</td>
<td>fia</td>
<td>fia</td>
<td>fia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>'pa, papa'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F's Brothers</td>
<td>i kpa</td>
<td>pa san</td>
<td>pa-deng</td>
<td>pa khynnah</td>
<td>pa-duh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F's Bs' Wives</td>
<td></td>
<td>nah</td>
<td>nah</td>
<td>nah</td>
<td>nah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F's Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td>kha rangbah</td>
<td>kha-deng</td>
<td>kha-duh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F's Ss' Husbands</td>
<td></td>
<td>pa-kha? mama?</td>
<td></td>
<td>mama?</td>
<td>mama?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the unfilled slots definitive information is lacking
Quotation marks indicate terms of address; terms of reference have no quotes. When only one term is listed, address and reference are the same
Khasi usage of hyphens is not systematic; my own usage is to hyphenate 'reduced' morphemes

Table 2: Khasi terms for maternal and paternal aunts and uncles
Parents refer to and address their children's spouses as pyrṣa, the term also used for maternal nephews and nieces, pyrṣa kurim (kurim 'wife'); uncles and great-uncles on the mother's side refer to a child as pyrṣa kṣiēw while the child addresses his great-uncle as bah. kṣiēw, or khūn kṣiēw, are the terms for 'grandchild', and kṣiēw tun for 'great-grandchild'. Great-grandchildren are referred to as khūn miaw (lit. 'cat children'), and great-great-grandchildren as khūn khnaī (lit. 'mouse children'). Step-children are referred to as khūn ruiḍ /khuon ruj/ and 'stepfather' is u kpa nah according to Nissor Singh (1906: 38, 45). Unfortunately, no sources of information, informants or dictionaries, could provide a literal meaning for tun or ruiḍ.

Kinship terms are generally assumed to be of native stock, along with body parts and numerals. However, Khasi has borrowed extensively from the geographically surrounding languages with many loans so well integrated into the native sound structure that their detection is difficult, if not impossible. Three words may be of Indo-Aryan derivation: (i) pa (see above), but a prefixed k either indicates a very early borrowing or would be counter-indicative; (ii) para (see above) is listed by Karve (1965) under Hindi, Sindhi, and Punjabi as referring to blood-related maternal/paternal grandfathers, while in Khasi this word is used for younger relatives on the mother's side; and (iii) kurim 'wife', has an unchecked long vowel in the first syllable which, according to my earlier findings, points to Indo-Aryan origin; kurim 'wife' and kur 'clan' are definitely not related.

GLOSSARY

The following is a complete inventory of all kinship terms with which my informants supplied me, many of which are listed in Nissor Singh's famous dictionary (1906). The alphabetical order is that commonly used for European languages; it deviates from the established Khasi alphabet in three respects: the aspirated stops kh, ph, and th are treated as separate phonemes and are, therefore, not arranged within the k, p, and t listings; k and kh are listed after letter j and not after letter ḷ as in the Khasi alphabet; ng /ŋ/ follows n instead of taking the place of ʃ.

bah to be big; u bah 'big brother'; a polite form of address for any man older than speaker /ba?/

bah bah, bah heh, bah rangbah 'older brother' /ba?he?/, ba?−raṭba?/

bah duh, bah khynnah 'youngest brother' /ba?du?/, /ba?khnna?/
ba-kha  children of mother's brothers; relationship between mother's children and maternal uncle's children (Nissor Singh 1906:6), also includes 'paternal aunt' (qv. also Kharkhongnor 1968:10b).

bih  form of address for a young girl (bi?/)

bu  affectionate form of address for a young boy (not common)

deng  from pdeng  'in the middle, between', used in compounds /pdeŋ/

  kha-pdeng referring to mother's middle brother
  kha-deng addressing father's middle sister
  ma-deng addressing mother's middle brother
  mei-deng addressing mother's middle sister
  pa-deng addressing father's middle brother

duh  from khadduh  'the last one, the youngest' /khat-duʔ/

  kha-khadduh  'mother's youngest brother's wife' /Ma-khat-
  duʔ/
  i duh  'the youngest sister, baby sister'

heh  'big'

hep  a polite way of addressing and referring to anybody younger than the speaker; used for younger siblings; woman addressing and referring to brother-in-law if married to younger sister; same as kong hep kynsi, woman referring to younger sister's husband /knsi/

hynmen  i referring to elder sister /hnmen/
       u referring to elder brother

  hynmen hynbew (imit.), elder brother or sister /hnbew/
  hynmen kynsi younger sister addressing older sister's husband
  hynmen kynthei referring to elder sister
  hynmen shynrang referring to elder brother /hnmen šnrag/

ieit  'to love, to be loved' /ʔret/

  mei ieit addressing mother's mother
  pa ieit addressing mother's father
  kong ieit addressing elder sister

ing, iing, ying  'house'

  ka iing ka sem household, family (ka sem 'stable, shed, shelter') /ka yreŋ ka sem/ (imit.)

klaw  mother-in-law
kmie 'mother' when referred to (reduced form i mei) /kmi/

kmie hep referring to father's mother
ki kmie ki kpa 'parents' (imit.)
kmie kha referring to father's mother
kmie-nah referring to mother's younger sister; stepmother
also: i mei-nah khadduh /?i mey-na? khat-du?/
kmie-rād referring to mother's mother /kmi-raat/
kmie-san referring to mother's elder sister

kū u, i mother's eldest brother (=kū rangbah, p.44 above),
the most respected person in the clan; he is addressed as ma
or mama

ki kū ki kpa relatives on mother's side (imit.)

kūia ka, i mother's brother's wife; in compounds kūa /kwa/

kūia-kha addressing and referring to father's sisters
kūia-kha rangbah father's oldest sister
kūia-khadduh father's youngest sister /kā-khat-du?/
kūia-pdeng father's middle sister

kong ka, i addressing and referring to older sister; man
addressing wife's female relatives; polite form of address for
any woman older than speaker; in compounds also used for males

kong-deng husband of middle sister, brother-in-law
kong heh woman addressing and referring to brother-in-law
kong kynsi addressing older sibling's spouse

kpa u, i referring to 'father', pa when addressed and in most
compounds

kpa-nah referring to step-father, nah from khynnah
kpa-rād referring to father's father; /raat/ from knraat/
'lord'

pa-buh i great-grandfather on mother's side
pa-deng father's middle brother
pa-ieit addressing mother's father /pa-?Iet/
pa-kha referring to father's father (cf. Nissor Singh 1906:
147; 'pakha, u, n. a male relative (father's side)')

pa-khynnah addressing father's youngest brother and mother's
youngest sister's husband
pa-rād i addressing father's father, mother's father
/pa-raat/

pa-san addressing father's older brother, also mother's
older sister's husband

ksiew ka, u, i grandchild /ksiw/
ksiew tun great-grandchild
khun ksiew i referring to grandchild; is addressed by name
para ksiew mother's mother's sister's son (grand-nephew)
pyrsa ksiew man referring to sibling's grandchildren; a grand-niece or grand-nephew on mother's side

kthaw addressing and referring to father-in-law /kthaaw/

kur ka clan; ka kur ka jaid* (imit.), a relative on mother's side /ka jai/

ki kur ki karo, ki kur ki kmie (imit.), considered obsolete
iaidei kur to be related within the same clan (lit. 'come together (in) clan') /yadey/
para kur member of the same clan, children of mother's siblings
tait kur tait kmie (imit.), obsolete, and
tait kur tait jaid*(imit.), to be banished, excommunicated from the clan; /taj/ from /kntaj/ 'to reject, set aside'

kurim ka wife, spouse; to have intercourse (probably of Indo-European origin)
kiaw kurim ka mother-in-law (Singh 1906:40)
shong kurim to marry (lit. 'lie with wife')
shong kurim shong kupai (imit.) kupai! = ? from Hindi ?
jingshong kurim marriage (lit. 'lie with wife') /jiŋšoŋ/

kynsi addressing and referring to brother- or sister-in-law
hep kynsi = para kynsi woman referring to younger sister's husband
kynmen kynsi woman referring to elder sister's husband
kong kynsi woman addressing elder sibling's spouse

kyn-um u, i man addressing and referring to sister's husband
/knʔum/

kha to give birth, to bring forth
kha deng father's middle sister
kha-duh father's youngest sister
kha-rangbah father's older sister
kmie-kha referring to father's mother; she is addressed as mei-kha
para kha (shi) father's brother's children; cousins /ši/ 'one' (numeral)

khadduh to be last /khat-duʔ/ see duh
kíi khadduh referring to mother's youngest brother
ma-khadduh, ma-duh addressing mother's youngest brother
pa-duh addressing father's youngest brother

* From Hindi, see n.5. (Ed.)
khun ka, u, i child, girl, boy, baby /khuon/
khun ksniew grandchild (maternal uncle's child)
khun kshnnai great-great-grandchild (lit. 'mouse child')
/khuon kshnaay/
khsun miaw great-grandchild (lit. 'cat child')
khsun ruidd step-child /khuon ruj/

khynnah ka, u, i to be young; girl, boy /khnnn?/

pa-khynannah addressing and referring to father's younger brother, also to mother's younger sister's husband (cf. p.45)
khsynraw u referring to a young man
ka referring to a young woman
u khynraw u samla (imit.) (arch.)

lok friend (arch.)
ka lok wife
u lok husband
paralok friend

luud to be young (arch.)= khynraw /luot/

mama, me addressing mother's older brother who is referred to as u kmi

ma-deng addressing mother's middle brother
ma-khadduh, ma-duh addressing mother's youngest brother
ma-Rangbah (or: mama--) addressing mother's oldest brother

mei i mother, alternate form for kmie, used in all compounds

mei-buh great-grandmother on mother's side
mei-deng addressing mother's middle sister
mei-hep respectful appellation of an older woman (Nissor Sing 1906:131)
mei-ieit addressing mother's mother
mei-kha addressing father's mother
mei-khynannah referring to mother's younger sister
mei-nah addressing mother's younger sister and father's younger brother's wife
mei-rad referring to mother's mother
mei-san addressing mother's oldest sister

myngkew ka, i used by wife when referring to husband's older sister (arch.)

nah reduced form of khynannah to be small, be the youngest (used in compounds)

mei-nah i addressing mother's younger sister; also father's younger brother's wife; addressing stepmother
nah rit mother's youngest sister
\textit{nia} reduced form of \textit{kfia}, referring to mother's brother's wife

\textit{kfia/}

\textit{nia kha}, ka addressing father's sister
\textit{nia kha rangbah} referring to father's older sister
\textit{nia kha khadduh} referring to father's younger sister
\textit{nia kha pdeng} referring to father's middle sister

\textit{pa} father, reduced form of \textit{kpa}, used in compounds

\textit{para ka, u, i, ki} children, brothers and sisters of same generation

\textit{para ar kmie} mother's sister's children (lit. 'children (of) two mothers') /\textit{para ?aar kmli}/
\textit{para briew u} having no relationship either by blood or by marriage; fellow human being
\textit{para ksiew} mother's mother's sister's son, i.e. grand-nephew on mother's side
\textit{para kur} member of the same clan, mother's sister's children
\textit{para kynsi} referring to wife's younger sister and her husband
\textit{para lok} friend
\textit{para mynshong} u wife's sister's husband
\textit{para shong-kha} husband's sister's husband, two men marrying into the same family
\textit{para trai ka, u} brothers and sisters of the same parents
\textit{para kha shi} children of father's sisters and brothers, first cousins and half-siblings on father's side

\textit{pyrsa} referring to one's own children and to sister's children; and nephews and nieces on mother's side

\textit{pyrsa ksiew} mother's mother's brother referring to speaker; i.e. great-uncle on mother's side referring to speaker
\textit{pyrsa kurim} referring to child's spouse

\textit{phi} 2nd person pronoun (polite), used by husband/wife in addressing each other

\textit{rangbah} to be grown-up; an older respected person, an elder

\textit{bah rangbah} addressing older brother
\textit{mama rangbah} addressing mother's oldest brother (even if younger than mother)
\textit{kha rangbah} addressing father's oldest sister

\textit{rad} reduced alternate of \textit{kynrad} 'master, lord' used in compounds

\textit{kmie-rad}, \textit{mei-rad} mother's mother
\textit{kpa-rad}, \textit{pa-rad} mother's father
rit small

\[ i \text{rit} = i \text{duh} \text{ the youngest sister} \]
\[ \text{nah rit} \text{ mother's youngest sister} \]

samla marriageable young person

san to grow up, grown-up

\[ \text{mei-san} \text{ mother's older sister} \]
\[ \text{pa-san} \text{ father's older brother, mother's older sister's husband} \]

(sang taboo)

tnge ka wife, when referred to (arch., 'a harsh word')
\[ \text{u husband, when referred to} \]

trái u lord, master /?u traay/

\[ \text{para trái ka, u, i brothers and sisters of the same parents} \]

NOTES

1. This article represents a thoroughly revised version of a paper delivered at the American Oriental Society Annual General Meeting in Toronto, Canada, 11 April 1978.

2. Bowing to Khasi preference, I have decided to abandon my usual practice of using phonemic transcriptions for Khasi sounds; I use instead established Khasi spelling and only add transcriptions in those cases where the standard spelling system fails to indicate vowel length or vowel quality. Sometimes it will be necessary to separate morphemes by means of hyphens, although some of these hyphens are not used by the Khasis themselves. Certain morphological features, necessary for the reader's better understanding, will be explained at the appropriate places.

3. 'Imitatives', which I called 'redundants' in Rabel (1968), consist of two nouns whose combined meaning is equal to that of the first constituent alone; the meaning of the second constituent is often unknown to the native speaker. Sometimes the second word is a borrowing from Indo-European.

4. The Khasis call the four gender/number indicators 'prefixes'; I called them 'articles' in Rabel (1961). Neither term is entirely adequate since these words are free morphemes which also function as 3rd person pronouns.
5. \text{jaid}/ja\text{j}/, with a short vowel, is of Hindi origin.

6. \text{khadduh}/kha\text{t}-\text{d}\text{u}\text{?}/, is a compound of /kha\text{t}/ 'to dole out' + /\text{d}\text{u}\text{?}/ 'to be last.'

7. \text{deng} is the reduced form of \text{pdeng}; see n.10 below for loss of initial consonant.

8. 'minor' syllables have no full vowel nucleus, the second consonant -- a liquid or nasal -- functioning as the vocalic element; they are always unstressed.

9. Referring to n.10, it may be derived from (k + stem) + infix -\text{n}-.

10. A theory first proposed by Pater Wilhelm Schmidt (1904) and elaborated by Henderson (1976) states that initial k should be considered a fossilized prefix denoting living things (kinship terms, body parts, animals, plants). Since simplification of initial clusters is otherwise never accompanied by vowel change, it seems unlikely that \text{mej} 'mother' is related to \text{kmie}.

11. Dictionaries do not list \text{buh}; one speaker pronounced this word /bu/, two others said /bu\text{?}/.

12. Khasi kinship terminology is, as we have seen, an interesting topic and remains, as this paper demonstrates, a subject of varying interpretation and discussion. Not all of the terms mentioned in this article are included in its glossary, or vice versa, nor do they correspond precisely when they are; nor, for example, do they always agree with the dictionary definitions (when these occur) of U Nissor Singh (1906) or E. Bars (1973), among others. This is, however, the most recent study of the question and makes it most intriguing and informative. (Ed.)
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From the earliest days in the study of the Fijian (FI) language the origins, functions and the degree of predictability of its verbal suffixes have bewildered all those who have tried to understand Fijian grammar, and they continue to do so. The problem in question is a suggestive example of the interaction between synchronic and diachronic factors in language and of its consequence for linguistic analysis.

It will be remembered that a Fijian word-stem or base (the latter term being widely employed in the description of Austronesian languages to distinguish 'content words' from 'functors') subsumes both verbal and nominal word classes. It may be disyllabic (CVCV), by far the most common statistically, or trisyllabic (CVCVCV). The vowel slots are always filled, but in disyllabic bases the initial and/or the medial consonant is optional. In trisyllabic bases the medial and/or the final consonant is optional. There is also a small number of bases of more than three syllables.

When a base is a verb it may occur in any one of these three standard forms. It is then said to be stative or intransitive, according to certain syntactic criteria. When a verb is followed by a monosyllabic suffix (C)V or by a disyllabic suffix (C)VCV it is said to be transitive. Recent studies, however, have questioned the applicability of terms such as 'transitivity' to this feature of Fijian grammar (Hockett 1976: 192; Naylor 1978: 405; Schütz 1981: 197-203).

One of the most interesting problems in the comparative study of Austronesian languages is that on the one hand in Fijian, as in other Oceanic languages:

1. The occurrence or non-occurrence of transitive suffixes is subject to certain semantic and syntactic criteria which are not yet fully understood; and

2. The consonant of a monosyllabic suffix: (C)V, and the first consonant of a disyllabic suffix: (C)VCV, is selected from a limited series within the total inventory of consonants (cf. Pawley 1978: 113-40).

In many other members of the Austronesian family, on the other hand, and especially in Indonesian languages, cognate
verbs may occur which, in a fairly large number of cases, show regular sound correspondences between their (non-significant) stem-final consonants and the consonants of the verbal suffixes of Fijian and other Oceanic languages.

Thus, Proto-Indonesian *tagit 'cry' corresponds to Fijian tagica7 /taqiäa/ 'cry for (i.e. so as to obtain) something'.

Proto-Indonesian *davat 'reach; obtain' corresponds to Fijian rawata 'get, obtain'.

Since the stem-final consonants of verbs like Proto-Indonesian *tagit and *davat are not known to have had a grammatical function and the corresponding stem-final consonants of verbs in modern Indonesian languages do not have such a function, while corresponding consonants in Fijian and other Oceanic languages occur in suffixes entering into regular grammatical relations, intriguing questions arise regarding the origins, nature and the precise functions of these features. In particular, three immediate questions which arise are:

1. How can one account for the fact that these sound correspondences can be attested in a significant number, but by no means in a majority of cases?

2. Are the stem-final consonants of modern Indonesian verbs vestigial in the sense that they might be the extant reflexes of 'archaic' grammatical suffixes which have now disappeared but continue to function in Oceanic languages such as Fijian? (cf. Dahl 1973:11). This is a question which should be asked even if it cannot be answered in the present state of our knowledge.

3. Should the verbal suffixes of Fijian be regarded as an integral part of the bases to which they may or may not be attached? That is to say, is the choice of consonant determined:

   (a) By the base and suffix considered as an articulated (and of course separable) but integral lexical entity, or:

   (b) By semantic and syntactic factors, that is to say, by the independently variable relations which can obtain between a verb and its potential objects or complements?

In the earliest days of the study of the Fijian language, Hazlewood (1872: 32-3), in his work originally published in 1850, after listing 'The Definite-Transitive Terminations' in two classes, states that:
1. Those which consist of one syllable. These are, -a, -ce, -ga, -ka, -ma, -na, -ra, -ta, -va, -wa and -va ...

Later he adds that:

2. There appears to be no certain rule to determine which termination a verb will take. This must be learned from the natives, or from the Dictionary.

3. But notwithstanding that there is no invariable rule, yet we are persuaded that they (sc. the terminations) are not always used arbitrarily ... (1.) It seems to amount to a rule, that verbs formed from nouns without prefixing vaka-, shall take na for their termination ... (2.) It appears also to be a rule, that verbs of motion will take va for their termination; as lakova, ciciva, kadava, drodrova, ... Va here means to. It is also true that many other verbs besides those of motion take va, but for these perhaps there is no rule. (3.) When verbs reject a termination of the first or monosyllabic class, and take one of the second, or disyllabic, they frequently have either a more intensive sense, or take a different object.

Nearly a century later, Churchward in A new Fijian grammar (1941: 17-8; 71-2) speaks of: 'definite-transitive verbs', and he states that:

different verbs take different suffixes and there seems to be no rule for determining which suffix any particular verb will take.

This is also the view taken by the present writer in his Fijian grammar:

There is no known rule to indicate which suffix is appropriate to what base. It is advisable therefore to learn each new base together with its correct suffix or suffixes. (Milner 1972: 27-8)

These words, written nearly thirty years ago, must now be qualified, not only in the context of the result of subsequent study by the present writer and his colleagues which have become available in the meantime, but also in the light of recent attention given to the same problem in connection with the preparation of a new Fijian dictionary.

It is necessary first to refer to Dempwolff's (1934-9) Vergleichende Lautlehre, which has for over forty years been an indispensable text in comparative Austronesian linguistics. It will be remembered that in his first monograph (Dempwolff 1934:
27-8) he distinguishes five categories of word stems (Wortstämme). The first, which makes up 70% of his field of 1000 items, consists of those which conform to the pattern CVCVC (e.g. *lanit). Next in frequency comes word-stems of the same pattern with the addition of an optional nasal 'connector' (Nasalverbindung), hence of the pattern CV(C)CVC (*sugson, *guntin). They make up another 20% of the total. Another 5% consists of reduplicated items, followed by 3% made up of word-stems of more than two syllables. The remainder, approximately 1%, consists of monosyllabic word-stems.

In his second monograph (Dempwolff 1937: 125-66) he compares two Melanesian languages with his reconstructed Proto-Austronesian (PAN) word-stems, one of the two being Fijian, the vocabulary of which is examined in detail in order to arrive at regular correspondences (ibid., 126-46). He is struck by the number of irregular, as well as regular, reflexes of his proposed reconstructions in Fijian. Of particular relevance to the problem under discussion here are the following passages:

Phonetic disagreements (lit. non-agreements of sound: Lautunstimmigkeiten) (occur) especially frequently with the final consonants of Fijian before a supporting suffix...

From these data we shall draw the conclusion here that these phonetic disagreements of Fijian must be interpreted as 'false' analogy... (ibid., 133-4, para. 127(a) 6).

It is interesting that perhaps in order not to give hostages to fortune, Dempwolff used inverted commas for 'false' in 'false analogy'. At the time when he was assembling his data, knowledge of the vocabulary of Fijian was much less advanced than it is now, half a century later. With hindsight, therefore, and the advantage of greater knowledge of Fijian grammar than Dempwolff had either the possibility or the opportunity of acquiring, it was useful for me to check his data where they bear directly on the correspondences between Fijian verbal suffixes and the reconstructed final consonants of PAN verbs.

Looking again at his PAN glossary in detail (Dempwolff 1938) with this particular end in view, I find 143 items which are suitable for comparison. Of these, 61 (i.e. two more than he was prepared to accept) show 'correct' (i.e. regular) correspondences, assuming, that is, that one accepts his own criteria for what is (and what is not) 'regular'.

67 are 'incorrect'. This total subsumes not only cases where the proposed correspondence is 'irregular' according to Dempwolff himself, but cases where there is another reason for rejection. Some of the non-admissible comparisons arise from an
incorrect interpretation of the Fijian data (in some instances because the information available to him was misleading or inadequate). Other pairs proposed for comparison seem to be semantically altogether too far-fetched to be acceptable.

15 correspondences are uncertain, in the sense that they are insufficiently supported, but there is no reason why, given additional evidence, they could not be confirmed and accepted; for example, PAN *palu 'beat, strike' and Fijian valu 'fight'; PAN tin[d]ey 'consider accurately' and Fijian *tirova 'look at one's reflection in water'.

Turning now to the regular correspondences, it is of interest to note that the following occur most frequently between stem-final consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAN</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>PAN</th>
<th>FI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*∅</td>
<td>∅ (11 instances)</td>
<td>*h</td>
<td>∅ (7 instances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*t</td>
<td>t (9 instances)</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>k (7 instances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*t'</td>
<td>c (8 instances)</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>v (5 instances)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[It is important to note that in the above table, *t' in PAN represents a reconstructed palatal: c and v in Fijian represent two fricatives, a voiced interdental and a voiced bilabial respectively.]

The next important contribution to a better understanding of the problems under consideration appeared a decade after the publication of Dempwolff's third monograph. In *A study in the phonetics of Fijian*, Scott (1948: 737-52) presented the first detailed analysis of Fijian phonology by a modern professional linguist. In particular, he was the first to draw attention to the structural — and incidentally remarkably symmetrical — relationship between the classes of consonants. Though he was not primarily concerned with orthography, his analysis fully, if only implicitly, vindicates the consistent and economical alphabet devised by the pioneer missionaries Cargill and Cross.

The table (see next page) reproduced from the article in question (Scott 1948: 743, Table 3: Correlations between consonantal phonemes and alphabetic script in Fijian) illustrates the quasi-complete one-to-one relationship between Fijian consonant phonemes and the letters used in that alphabet.
Scott makes an important contribution to the problems under discussion here, pointing out that not only are the non-nasalized sounds (v, t, r, and k) 'articulated at corresponding points', (sc. to b, d, dr, and q) 'and except for v, in a corresponding manner', but 'v is linked with the t, r, k set functionally; for like them, it enters into "transitive suffixes" which b, d, dr, q never do.' In a footnote he adds that: 'It does not seem that anything in Fijian indicates that the consonant does not belong to the suffix, though the large number of forms serving apparently the same purpose suggests a problem' (ibid., 742, n.4).

We come now to the most comprehensive contribution so far to the understanding of this problem, a doctoral dissertation by the Rev. David Arms (1975), a New Zealand missionary who had already spent several years in close contact with Fijian-speaking communities. Arms analyses the phonotactic constraints which govern the occurrence of the verbal suffixes. He shows (ibid., 130-47) that, with very few exceptions, the place of articulation of any consonant in Fijian verb rules out the occurrence of a verbal suffix with a consonant (or first consonant in the case of disyllabic suffixes) with the same place of articulation.

His data are significant, both from a diachronic and a synchronic point of view. It is likely, for instance, to suggest an explanation for at least some of the cases of non-correspondence between Dempwolff’s PAN verbs and Fijian verbal suffixes.

As Arms points out (1975:140), the general constraint operating on consonants in suffixes, also helps to account for the fact that the nasalized stops (b, d, dr, and q, phonetically [mb], [nd], [ndr], and [ng] respectively), do not occur in verbal suffixes; if they did, they would be unacceptable after verb bases which have a nasalized stop in the initial or the medial consonant position, and these are very numerous.

I have also made a detailed analysis of the synchronic system of these dissociations in order to discover to what extent it conforms with Scott’s (1948:743) table of Fijian consonants reproduced above. This shows that except in one or two cases, it is also possible to classify places of articulation
if one treats dissociation as a sole criterion. In the table below, consonants which regularly dissociate from one another have been placed in the same column.

Table 1: Consonantal dissociation in Fijian

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dr</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following observations can be made regarding the table above:

1. Consonants which occur in verbal suffixes are those underlined. l and s are entered in for the sake of completion, but since neither occurs in monosyllabic suffixes and l only occurs in the disyllabic suffix -laka (which is 'intensive' in its effect and apparently not subject to any phonotactic constraints), it is difficult to decide in which column to enter it.

2. In a monosyllabic suffix, zero consonant (∅) (i.e. the absence of a consonant) occurs very frequently. A suffix is then reduced to -a after a front vowel and -ya after the open vowel or a back vowel.

3. -ta regularly dissociates from d or t in the base, apparently with the sole exception of (vaka)dinata 'bear out, confirm'.

4. r and n regularly dissociate from each other, apparently with the sole exception of karona 'take great care of, value greatly'.

5. It is necessary to give l a separate column from r, not only because the suffix -raka can occur after l (and conversely -laka after r; cf. Arms 1975: 141, n.4) but because l and n associate freely: e.g. lomana, lawana, etc. (cf. ibid., 139).

6. Scott had regarded the interdental place of articulation of c [ɔ] as relatively less important from the point of view of classification, and entered it in the same column as the two dental consonants t and d. For the same reason he had regarded n, which is, in fact, alveolar, as being intermediate between the dental and alveolar places of articulation. In both cases, his decision was probably influenced by considerations of structural symmetry. It is worth noting, however, that the dissociation principle firmly confirms c [ɔ] as being distinct from d and t. Likewise n (alveolar) is distinct from d and t. This is consistent with the articulatory data, even though it entails a sacrifice of symmetry or 'elegance'.
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Having recorded our debt to Arms, it is now necessary to register strong reservations about the remainder of his analysis, which I now summarize.

Because of his extensive knowledge of spoken Fijian, based on regular practice in the course of his activities, both pastoral and informal, his views merit to be treated with special attention, although still open to rigorous examination. He implies that, granted a reasonable competence in the language, if a speaker is given any one base, together with its approximate semantic reference, he should be able to predict with a fair degree of accuracy what the consonant of its transitive suffix (or suffixes) is likely to be. He suggests that, subject to the phonotactic constraints which have already been examined, the majority of bases which can be followed by the same suffix have common semantic characteristics.

As noted earlier, this is a view which Hazlewood had already hinted at and which, in the case at least of verbs of motion (without defining motion more precisely for the moment), is relatively easy to substantiate. What Arms posits, however, is that each of the consonants which occur in transitive suffixes is associated with one or more semantic notions or connotations. Thus, for instance:

-\(\text{-c-}\) is associated with 'pliancy, gentle contact, bodily experience' (Arms 1975: 104)

-\(\text{-k-}\) with 'hardness, force, opening out'.

-\(\text{-m-}\) with 'insertion, going inside', ... 'the idea of one thing going inside another, whether it be in order to stay there or to draw it out' (ibid., 107).

-\(\text{-t-}\) is associated with the use of a limb or instrument, moderate force, performative' (ibid., 110-12)

-\(\text{-v-}\) has to do with 'motion to, motion for, motion over'.

Difficulties arise, however, when the consonant is zero (\(\emptyset\)). There is a large number of bases in this category and at first Arms considered them to represent a 'spill-over category'. Later on, he declares, he was able to identify a 'common denominator': 'mild force, miscellaneous': 'Thus the \(\emptyset\) ending is very common with verbs of rubbing, tapping, folding, plucking, taking off, separating'. It also embraces verbs for 'finding and buying' (ibid., 113).

There are also complications with -\(\text{-g-}\) and -\(\text{-n-}\). The former, in particular, (ibid., 105-6) has 'no convincing semantic correlation', but appears to have exclusively grammatical functions, like -\(\text{-n-}\), which often has the function of forming verbs from nouns (ibid., 107-8), a point already made by Hazlewood (1872: 32-3).
Now, in most cases, Arms has no great difficulty in providing plausible, if not invariably convincing, lists of examples in support of his view. In each case he only gives ten examples, and the more the examples that are produced, the greater the difficulty of finding a common semantic denominator. This weakens his argument and, at least arguably, it weakens it unnecessarily.

There are, in fact, two main difficulties. The first is that Arms seems to be under the impression that covert semantic connotations attach to the actual choice of certain sounds — consonants in this case — much as they do in most languages, including English. Yet cases like the suffixes with -g- and -n-, which point to grammatical rather than semantic functions, as well as the large number of bases with -ʔ- consonant which do not have either a clear or an obvious common semantic denominator, should have alerted him to the possibility that the genuine semantic burden of verbal suffixes rests, not on their phonetic character, conferring on the preceding verb the membership badge, as it were, of a covert semantic category, but on a complex of grammatical relations which remain to be investigated.

The second difficulty is this: the phonotactic constraints which Arms discusses militate in many cases against the occurrence of a particular suffix when semantic considerations would seem to require it. Although he does consider such cases (for instance, Arms 1975: 151-4, esp. note to p.152), it does not seem that he has attempted to make a systematic study of what I shall call replacement suffixes, i.e. those which, for phonotactic reasons, are substituted for the suffixes which can normally be expected to occur, and of the effect of those substitutions on the synchronic system as a whole.

One could even argue that Arms seems to hedge his bets. The phonotactic constraints which he has clearly set out are incontrovertible, but failing a more extensive investigation of their effect, it is very difficult to accept his thesis as to the correlation between individual suffixes and specific semantic notions. He might have chosen to sacrifice the latter but, in actual fact, he appears to have spoilt his case by emphasizing the wrong argument.

Stated briefly, one could present the dilemma as follows: On the one hand, (a) the pattern of verbal suffixes in modern Fijian could be the result of interaction between diachronic phonology and synchronic syntactic and/or semantic constraints. On the other hand, (b) it could represent the effect of diachronic semantic factors which are inhibited by synchronic phonotactic constraints.

I should, therefore, like to propose a different approach to these problems. In view of their complexity, however,
one cannot hope to do more than to suggest lines of inquiry which seem to be more promising than others and to try to adumbrate a possible solution.

Let me then proceed from known and generally-accepted facts and examine the general distribution of monosyllabic verbal suffixes. I shall attempt to establish, first, what grammatical functions can be determined for a given suffix, and secondly, what effect phonotactic constraints have on the occurrence of that suffix, both when the constraints are present and absent.

On Arms' evidence (1975: 126) -t- and -∅- are statistically by far the most commonly occurring suffixes. Together they account for 569 recorded endings from his total field of 1680. Not only does it seem unlikely that any two particular 'meanings' (i.e. semantic associations or connotations) would so greatly predominate over the rest, but those are evidently also the two suffixes to which Arms was hardest put to attach any particular 'meaning' (cf. ibid., 110-12 for -t--; 113-4 for -∅-).

Any attempt, it would appear, to find a common semantic denominator between all the verbs that take a verbal suffix in -t-, or between all those that take a verbal suffix in -∅-, is likely to end inconclusively. If we are looking for a common 'meaning', it will not be a property of the suffix alone, but of the interplay of syntactic variables within the verb phrase, in which suffixes play a vital but not an exclusive role. We must, therefore, look elsewhere and we are given valuable guidance by two widely-accepted observations of Hazlewood (1872: 33), namely, that:

1. -n- is a 'denominal' suffix, i.e. it has the function of providing a method of forming verbs derived from nouns.

2. -v- is associated with verbs of motion; without defining this class more precisely for the moment.

I have argued elsewhere (Milner 1980: 1-4) that the slow development of Austronesian studies during the last 100 years is to some extent due to the geographical fragmentation of the work and also to the intellectual isolation of the scholars concerned, which can be ascribed to relative lack of communication and in general to relative ignorance of one another's problems and progress. There has also been a noticeable lack of comprehensive studies of individual languages as well as too great a concentration of effort on comparative studies, particularly on topics such as subgrouping and putative chronology at the expense, if not the exclusion of detailed description. For the greater part of the twentieth century, students of Austronesian languages, while paying lip service to their common origin and striving to make sense of an extensive common stock of words, have neglected comparative grammar. It is only in the last
decade, with the organization of international conferences on Austronesian linguistics, that the syntactic features of languages as diverse as those of Taiwan, the Philippines, and Madagascar, have begun to throw light on the solution of problems that have long baffled students of Oceanic and Indonesian languages (Dahl 1978; Naylor 1978).

As a case in point, it would appear that the focus and topic approach to the understanding of Fijian syntax (Naylor 1978) is likely to help us make significant progress. Let us then examine, if only provisionally and in order to discover if one can establish prima facie evidence, the hypothesis that Fijian too has a system of focus marked by verbal affixes.

I propose to use the term 'focus' in the sense that is widely, though by no means unanimously, accepted in Philippine linguistics, i.e., 'the syntactic relationship between the verb and the surface subject, signalled by the verb's focus affix in conjunction with the subject form of noun phrases and pronouns. For example, a sentence is in instrumental focus if the surface subject is in the role of instrument and the verb has an instrumental affix; the verb "focuses" on the subject as instrument' (Naylor 1975: 12-3).

On this hypothesis, by reason of their frequency of occurrence alone, the two suffixes -t- and -φ- should be examined afresh in order to establish whether they represent the Fijian equivalent of what has been identified elsewhere, particularly in Taiwan and Philippine languages, as goal focus affixes.

A few years ago Dahl (1978) suggested that four types of focus were perhaps Pan-Austronesian in their distribution, namely: actor focus, goal focus, referent focus (the person in whose interest the action is carried out or the place where the action is performed) and instrument focus which he characterized as follows: 'The fourth focus, generally called instrument focus (IF) got its name because it focuses something for performing the action, for instance an instrument' (Dahl 1978: 384).

In elaborating his interpretation, Dahl (ibid., 385-6) goes on to explain that one of the separate functions of the fourth focus has to do with the displacement of a moving object, either away from the actor (as in Minahasan languages) or in any direction (within the actor, towards him, or away from him (as in Malagasy).

In her contribution to the same volume, Naylor makes a similar point with reference to Tagalog:

What appears to be at play here is not a contrast between transitive and intransitive, rather it is whether the action is viewed as centrifugal or
centripetal. Like aspect, however, the contrast between centrifugal and centripetal is situational as well as a matter of perspective. When the action is viewed as going outward from the actor and ends outside of him, then it is centrifugal;... When the action itself is viewed as beginning and ending with the actor himself then it is centripetal. (Naylor 1978: 405)

One of her pairs of examples is suggestive from the point of view of Fijian. She mentions two Tagalog verbs in actor focus but with different affixes: magbili 'sell' (centrifugal) as opposed to bumili 'buy' (centripetal). Both are formed on the base -b--ili. There is a similar situation in Fijian where a similar pair is formed from the cognate base voli, namely, volia 'buy' and volitaka 'sell' (cf. veivoli 'buy and sell, market' (perhaps also 'exchange, barter' in a pre-contact economy).

Earlier in the same article, Naylor (1978: 400-01) identifies, in the case of Tagalog, four types of focus (actor, goal, locative and instrumental) (ibid., 396) and six kinds of role (actor, goal, locative, comitative, benefactive and instrumental).25

It will be evident from the views quoted from Naylor and Dahl that there is, as yet, no consensus among the scholars interested in this approach, not only as to the exact nature of the syntactic relations subsumed by focus and topic but also as to the number to be distinguished and identified and the technical terms to be used to describe them. Nevertheless, there is abundant evidence that a rich and promising area of research lies before us in Austronesian studies (e.g. Dahl 1981; Ferrell and Stanley 1980; Lopez 1978; Naylor 1980).

It seems, therefore, that a good case can be made for a new approach to the problem of verbal suffixes in Fijian. Thus what Dahl calls the 'moving object focus' clearly has an equivalent marked by disyllabic suffixes such as -vaka and -taka (as in cicivaka 'run with something', or viritaka 'throw something (at a target)') but this moving object focus (which might be termed 'locomotive') will have to be defined rigorously with special reference to what has also been called 'comitative, benefactive and instrumental'. Likewise the -ra suffix shows evidence of being associated with a locative focus. Within the limited scope of the present article, however, one can hardly do more than point to the complexity of the problems and to the direction in which progress is likely to be made.

Let me first make a point of theory and consider for a moment the phonotactic constraints which restrict the occurrence of any one verbal suffix with any one verbal base. A thorough-going attempt to establish beyond doubt that Fijian does indeed have a topic and focus system will have to distinguish carefully
what might be called the 'canonical' suffixes from 'adventitious' or 'intrusive' suffixes, that is, those which are imposed by phonotactic constraints. For instance, it was Hazlewood who first stated that while verbs of motion take the suffix -va, so do many others. It follows that, before we can establish a firm correlation between any one suffix and any category of verbs, two factors must be taken into consideration:

(a) Assuming that the suffix -va can, under certain circumstances, mark a type of focus which we might call 'displacive' or 'locomotive', it cannot appear whenever a verb of motion includes a bilabial consonant. The suffix -va will then be replaced by another as the following examples show:

1. -ta instead of -va
   
   cabeta 'go up to'  
   kabata 'climb up to'  
   kevuta 'climb down along'  
   sobuta 'go down along'  
   volita 'go round sth.'

   cumuta 'butt with the head against'  
   ribata 'strike against (in springing back)'  
   lavota 'score a hit (with small object), cast into'  
   livata (of lightning)  
   robota 'extend over, stretch over'

2. -ca instead of -va
   
   kuvuca 'blow (smoke) against'  
   vukaca 'fly towards'  
   yamoca 'gropes for sth.'  
   vuloca 'roll (sennit) over thigh'

   dromuca 'sink below, go under sth.'  
   lomoca 'dip(sth.) into'  
   mumuca 'swarm towards'  
   luvuca 'flood over; plunge under'

3. -ka instead of -va
   
   virika 'throw(sth.) at'  
   tebeka (of stone etc.)'skim on surface of water, ricochet'

   dumuka 'raise, lift up (on end of stick)'  
   vodoka 'embark on, go aboard'

   butuka 'step on, tread on against sth.'

(b) Conversely, where a consonant (other than -v-) is constrained from occurring as a verbal suffix because a homorganic consonant occurs in the base, -v- may be adventitious, that is to say, it
may be substituted for a suffix that would otherwise have been used. Note, for instance, the following cases where -ta or -a might have been expected to occur if, that is, we assume that either of them can signal a goal focus affix:

-va instead of -ta or -a:

- talova 'ladle, scoop' (yaqona etc.)
- tagava 'use (two or more layers etc.)'
- todrava '(of sun)burn, scorch'
- dolava 'open'

though, interestingly, -a does, in fact, occur after tara, but in a different sense: 'touch etc.'.

At this point, it is worth examining in some detail what Arms (1975: 106-7) has suggested with regard to the suffix -ka. He states that 'it is associated with verbs where the action is by nature a forceful one; verbs of "breaking, squeezing hard, striking violently" (sometimes involving a missile) are typical members of this class.'

When Hockett (1974) reviewed the general problem of these verbal suffixes in a paper presented at the First Conference on Comparative Austronesian linguistics in Honolulu, the occurrence of -ka was one of only two instances where he concluded that Arms' thesis could be upheld. Indeed, if we look at the semantic distribution of verbs followed by this suffix, it is difficult at first flush to see how one can arrive at any other conclusion. A more recent article, however, (Milner and Nawadra 1981: 186-94) shows that of 81 verbs having to do with 'breaking, splitting, cutting and grating', only 18, i.e. 22.23%, have a suffix in -ka. Of these 18 verbs, 3 also have an alternant suffix in -a.

The other difficulty is that, in a large number of instances, -ka occurs in bases that seem to have little to do with force, violence or disruption. In addition to butuka and vodoka, the following three verbs represent instances where -ta or -a might have been expected to occur (if, that is, we assume that either of them can signal a goal focus affix):

- tomika 'pick up'
- todoka 'lift up, stretch out (hand)'
- tevuka 'unfold, open up'

In actual fact, of course, all three bases include a t or d which
rules out -ta as a suffix. On the other hand t or d also occur in bases which do have a violent or disruptive connotation, which again suggests that phonotactic rather than semantic factors are relevant:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vidaka} & \quad \text{'split, cleave'} \\
\text{teveka} & \quad \text{'circumcise'} \\
\text{tunaka} & \quad \text{'gut, disembowel'} \\
\text{muduka} & \quad \text{'cut off'}
\end{align*}
\]

Other verbal suffixes occur much less frequently than those which have been mentioned so far. They include -ra, -ma, -na, and -ga.

There is a clear association, it would seem, between the suffix -ra and what may be a locative focus, as the following examples show:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{cigira} & \quad \text{'stick into, slip into a narrow place'} \\
\text{tubura} & \quad \text{'grow on'} \\
\text{tagara} & \quad \text{'place, lay (on top of)'} \\
\text{tubera} & \quad \text{'carry, hold (in the hand)'} \\
\text{davora} & \quad \text{'lie on'} \\
\text{gisora} & \quad \text{'poke (with stick etc.)'}
\end{align*}
\]

Not infrequently -ra occurs when the base is preceded by the prefix vaka-:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vakasobura} & \quad \text{'put sth. down'} \\
\text{vakamocera} & \quad \text{'put someone to sleep'} \\
\text{vakayacora} & \quad \text{'carry out, perform'} \\
\text{vakadabera} & \quad \text{'make someone sit down'}
\end{align*}
\]

If r, or one of the other two consonants subject to the same phonotactic constraint (i.e. dr or n) occurs in the base, another consonant must be substituted for an (assumed) r in the suffix. It may be one of the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
m & \quad \text{as in: darama 'slip into' } \\
\text{tanuma} & \quad \text{'dip into'} \\
r & \quad \text{as in: miraca 'fall gently'} \\
\text{rubeca} & \quad \text{'hang sth. on'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
t & \quad \text{as in: ravita 'lean on'} \\
\text{suruta} & \quad \text{'sneeze on'} \\
g & \quad \text{as in: ravoga 'warm (cold on food) on'} \\
\text{raraga} & \quad \text{'heat (banana leaves) on'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
k & \quad \text{as in: tonoka 'dab on'} \\
\text{ramaka} & \quad \text{'cast (light) on'}
\end{align*}
\]
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The remaining monosyllabic suffixes, namely, -ma, -na, and -ge, do not occur very frequently. Arms (1975:106) is not able to correlate -ge with any special connotation and he considers it to be similar to -na. In his opinion, the latter has a grammatical function, that is to say (as Hazlewood had already suggested), it serves to form verbs from nominal bases. There is much evidence to support this view as the following examples show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baca</td>
<td>'bait'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kato</td>
<td>'box'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buka</td>
<td>'fuel, fire'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taga</td>
<td>'bag'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duva</td>
<td>'plant used as fish poison'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siga</td>
<td>'day; sun'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bacana</td>
<td>'bait, entice'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katona</td>
<td>'put into a box'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bukana</td>
<td>'add fuel to'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tagana</td>
<td>'put into a bag'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duvana</td>
<td>'poison (fish) with duva'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sigana</td>
<td>'sun; dry in the sun'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not to say, however, that all bases which can be followed by the suffix -na are formed from nouns. A relatively small number of them appear to be verbal bases 'in their own right'. It can hardly be a coincidence that, for most of them, an expected suffix in -ta (assuming again that this is the normal or 'canonical' form of the goal focus affix unless phonotactic constraint rules it out) does not occur because t or d occurs in the base:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dab ana</td>
<td>'do up in parcels'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domona</td>
<td>'love, desire'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagina</td>
<td>'bathe (eyes)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tavuna</td>
<td>'roast on embers'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tokona</td>
<td>'prop up; stay'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukuna</td>
<td>'relate, tell announce'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tawana</td>
<td>'occupy, populate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomana</td>
<td>'accompany; help'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuvana</td>
<td>'arrange in order, set in rows'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Up to this point this article has dealt with the phonotactic constraints of consonants, and only with those associated with monosyllabic suffixes. One phenomenon remains to be mentioned briefly. There is evidence that not only consonants but vowel quality also is a factor relevant to the occurrence of the verbal suffixes we have examined.

Of the ten verbs mentioned by Arms (1975:107) which are followed by a suffix with m for instance, eight end with a back vowel (u or o) and two with the open vowel (a). He also (ibid., 203-5) gives a fuller list of 35 bases followed by -m, of which 29 end with a back vowel, 1 with the open vowel and only 5 with a front vowel. Of the latter, only 2 (silima 'dive for' and sigema 'suddenly realize') are attested beyond all doubt. Likewise, a very high proportion of verb bases is followed by -na (zero consonant: Arms (ibid., 254-68) lists 30. Of those, the vast majority, 261, ends with a front vowel (i or e); only 43 (i.e. approximately 14%) end with a back vowel,
and many of those either need to be confirmed as correct, or admit the possibility of another suffix as an alternant.

In conclusion, I hope to have shown, if only by implication, first, that comparative studies in Austronesian languages will rest on a surer foundation (and therefore advance more rapidly), not only when the quality of the data for comparison, as well as the quantity, is more satisfactory, but also when more comprehensive studies of carefully selected languages are available. At present, much of our data can scarcely be said to be more abundant or more reliable than it was in Dempwolff's time. Recent studies (Geraghty 1983; Geraghty & Pawley 1981) show the wealth of hitherto unpublished and hitherto unknown evidence from a relatively well-known language area like Fiji.

Secondly, studies of individual languages will increasingly be assessed by the criterion of the extent to which the author shows that he is, if not familiar at first hand, at least aware of the whole field of Austronesian grammar and of recent progress made in areas other than his own and, moreover, that he has considered its relevance to his own work. In particular, serious consideration should now be given to the question of establishing whether the topic and focus approach to Austronesian syntax is relevant to the understanding of Oceanic languages.

Two other contributions which are especially relevant to the present article have been made since it was written (Schütz 1985; Milner 1986).

NOTES

1. A contribution to the solution of the old and refractory problem of the Fijian verbal suffixes from a phonological and prosodic point of view seems to be appropriate in this collection of articles. I should also like to express my thanks to a number of colleagues who have generously commented on, and suggested improvements to, the original draft of this article; especially to Professor Bruce G. Biggs of the University of Auckland, Professor Otto C. Dahl of the University of Oslo, Professor Charles F. Hockett of Cornell University, Professor Albert J. Schütz of the University of Hawaii, and Dr Paul Geraghty of the Fijian Dictionary Project in Suva, Fiji. My thanks are also due to the Rev. Dr David G. Arms of the Columban Fathers, Professor Robert Blust of the University of Hawaii, Professor Jack Carnochan of the University of London, Professor Viktor Krupa of the University of Bratislava, and
2. For a detailed analysis of the relationship between 'word', 'morpheme' and 'base' in Fijian, see Schütz 1975.

3. As, for example, in uca 'rain' or bā (CVV) 'fence'. (I am aware that in recent years the one-vowel-per-syllable analysis of Fijian phonology has been criticized, notably by Schütz and Biggs, though for reasons that will not be discussed here I remain unconvinced.) There are also rare instances of bases where both consonants are zero, as in ia 'proceed, take place' and ua-(ca) 'beat with a stick (laundry, etc.).'

4. Only one instance is known to me of a trisyllabic base where the initial consonant is zero: Paul Geraghty has written to me that uea exists as a verb 'to fish trap'. This must be the base Hazlewood gives as wea 'a fish trap' and it could take its name from the island of Uvea (Wallis), a Polynesian-speaking community under French administration. The only other case I know of a trisyllabic base where both the medial and the final consonants are zero is biau 'wave' which is almost certainly a Polynesian loan (peau). Other instances, however, cannot be ruled out.

5. This statement must be qualified by adding that these suffixes are also found in combination with other affixes, in which case they may not be 'transitive'. This is not strictly relevant to the problem considered here.

6. The consonant in parentheses can either be zero, or -- following the open vowel a or the back vowels o and u -- the palatal approximant written y. In disyllabic suffixes, the second consonant is always -k- (cf. n.16 below).

7. Andy Pawley (1978:120 (also nn.17,179); 135, 136-9, esp.137) has put forward the view, which others have accepted, that from a comparative point of view the verbal suffixes in -Ca and -Caka of standard Fijian are 'irregular' or at least untypical of Fijian dialects in general, and that they represent a conflation of two vowels (i.e. *Ci-a to -Ca and *Caki-a to -Caka). David Arms (1975:28, 31-4) seems to have come to the same conclusion at about the same time and independently of Pawley. There is much evidence to support this view but, in order to avoid confusion with the so-called 'passive' suffixes in -Ci, I prefer not to quote examples in the 'canonical' *Ci form as Pawley and others do, but to give them with an 'active' -Ca suffix. Regarding Fijian spelling, see n.14.

8. This view is often associated with the phrase 'thematic consonant'. Charles Hockett, in a letter about his article
The behaviour of the Fijian thematic consonants was one of the real facts about languages that led me slowly but surely to abandon what I now refer to as the 'atomic morpheme theory', the theory of grammatico-lexical structure I helped develop in the 1940's and to which I clung for a long time. That theory proposes that every phonemically relevant piece in any utterance must be a part of one or another morpheme (or of the phonemic representation of one or another morpheme), and that morphemes are minimum meaningful elements in much the same sense in which we all assumed phonemes were minimum meaningless but differentiating elements. By that theory there would be only three possibilities for Fijian: (1) rai-ca, as with Churchward, so that the suffix has ten different alternants; (2) rai-c-a, as proposed by Bloomfield for Samoan, so that the stem has two different alternants (as do most verb stems); (3) rai-c-a, the thematic consonant being a separate morpheme.

9. Cf. ibid., 67-8; 89-90; 105-6. This work was originally published in 1956.

10. See, especially, the references to Arms, Geraghty, Hockett, Naylor, Pawley, and Schütz.

11. Thanks to the sponsorship, first of Mr Raymond Burr, a well-known American television actor, and later of the Australian Government Cultural Fund as well as the support of the Government of Fiji, a monolingual dictionary of the Fijian language is being compiled and is now approaching completion. The Director of this Project was, until early 1986, Mr T.R. Nawadra; Dr Paul Geraghty currently holds the post.

12. 'Besonders häufig sind Lautunstimmigkeiten bei Auslauten des Fidji vor stützendem Suffix...' 'Aus diesen Tatsachen wird hier gefolgert, dass diese Lautunstimmigkeiten des Fidji als "irrige" Analogie zu deuten sind;...'

13. Earlier studies include a monograph by Kern (1886). Scott’s data on Fijian were mainly derived from his study of the pronunciation of Josua Bogidrau, a Fijian civil servant who had been seconded to the School of Oriental and African Studies, London University (1946-48), and who also helped me to learn his language at first hand.

14. The orthography chosen for Fijian by the first two missionaries, David Cargill and William Cross, in the 1830s,
was remarkably advanced for its period and, in particular, almost anticipated phonemic theory, at least by implication, by about 75 years. Thus, with one exception (dr), each consonant phoneme is always represented by one, and only one, letter, despite the fact that Roman conventions (supplemented by the conventions of English orthography) require that digraphs should be used. So, there are three voiced stops, each preceded, at least in non-initial position, by a non-phonemic homorganic nasal: /mb/ (written b), /nd/ (written d), and /ng/ (written g). The voiced interdental fricative /θ/ is written c (instead of th) and the velar nasal is written g (instead of ng). A fourth nasalized voiced 'stop' is written dr (actually /ndr/).

Apart from using diacritics in a somewhat arbitrary and unpredictable manner, however, the orthography of Fijian does not take vowel length into account. Since the latter is phonemic, it is a serious defect in an otherwise elegant system. (Native speakers seldom use or require diacritics since to them the exact pronunciation is usually clear from the context.)

I am indebted to Professor Otto C. Dahl for drawing my attention to his article on the origins of Malagasy spelling (Dahl 1966). This shows that, although Fijian orthography was much in advance of its time in its economy and its disregard for non-significant sounds, it was neither entirely original, nor an isolated attempt to devise an alphabet based (1) on a one-for-one equivalence between letters and phonetic values and (2) on internal consistency without obligatory regard to the spelling conventions of English, or for that matter, of French orthography.

In actual fact, in the early 1820s, the same principles had been consciously observed by the three Welsh-speaking pioneers of the London Missionary Society in Madagascar: David Jones, Thomas Bevan, and David Griffiths, who devised the first system of Roman orthography for Malagasy. Their training in England, at a theological academy in Gosport presided over by Dr David Bogue, included a linguistic component which owed much to the well-known grammarian Lindley Murray (1745-1926). The latter had stated in his English grammar that:

a perfect alphabet... would contain a number of letters, precisely equal to the number of simple articulate sounds belonging to the language. Every simple sound would have its distinct character; and that character be the representation of no other sound.  (Murray 1813:15)
Murray in his turn was directly indebted to Samuel Johnson's short 'Grammar of the English tongue' which precedes his Dictionary of the English language. In that short essay, Dr Johnson ends his remarks on orthography and pronunciation with references to various attempts made in the past 'to accommodate orthography better to the pronunciation' and he notes that some reformers have endeavoured to proportion the number of letters to that of sounds, that every sound may have its own character, and every character a single sound. Such would be the orthography of a new language to be formed by a synod of grammarians upon principles of science. (Johnson 1828:33)

It is interesting to note also that, just as Fijian spelling (in accordance with the ideal system for a previously unwritten language recommended by Johnson and Murray) uses c, g and q, for example, without regard to the conventions of English spelling, the three Welsh-speaking pioneers in Madagascar proposed initially to use c for an affricate /ts/, q for the velar nasal, and most interestingly of all, w for the close back vowel as in Welsh, instead of oo as in English or ou as in French. Regrettably, however, this imaginative proposal was abandoned in the face of opposition from other Europeans whose first language was English or French and not Welsh.

This resistance in Madagascar has parallels in the Pacific. Thus, because it is an unconventional alphabet from a purely Western point of view, Fijian orthography has long been the target of well-meaning but uninformed criticism (often aggravated by patronizing ridicule) in English-speaking circles. At one point during the Colonial period, in the late 1930s, the desire to 'reform' Fijian spelling even led to a debate in the Legislative Council of Fiji (Schiitz 1972: 14 ff., esp. 20-2). There is not much evidence, however, that the Fijian people have ever wanted to introduce spelling changes, though, undoubtedly, some Fijians are irritated when they hear the names of people and places mispronounced by ignorant expatriates or overseas news-readers.

Arms (1975:130-1) acknowledges an article (Krupa 1966) which had appeared eight years previously and mentions associative and dissociative tendencies between groups of consonants in Oceanic languages, including Fijian, according to their place, or their mode, of articulation. He states, however, that Krupa was concerned with 'groupings of consonants according to their place of articulation or after their mode of articulation, not to the associative
and dissociative tendencies of individual consonants — the item of particular interest here' (ibid., 131). Albert Schütz informs me in a letter that Arms' dissertation was the first full analysis of these phenomena to be published, but Bruce Biggs was already discussing consonant restrictions in the early 1960s although he did not publish his findings. Moreover, Paul Geraghty's (1973) unpublished term paper on this subject had been heard by 1973, while Peter Lincoln had also studied the same problem. I am now indebted to Paul Geraghty for sending me a copy of the term paper in question. He reminds me that the problem is also discussed in his doctoral dissertation (now published as Geraghty 1983. See esp. 260-70).

16. The second consonant of a disyllabic suffix is always -k:- -caka, -kaka, -laka, -maka, -naka, -raka, -taka, -vaka, -yaka. Unlike the first consonant, it is not subject to any constraints of occurrence. (A comprehensive analysis of the distribution and function of disyllabic suffixes has not been possible within the scope of the present article.)

17. In addition to constraints governed by the place of articulation of consonants, Arms also points to one or two cases where the constraint seems to be linked with the mode of articulation. Thus, the occurrence of a velar nasal g in the initial or medial consonant of the base, rules out the nasal suffix -ma: e.g. gunuva 'drink', whereas the reconstructed PAN form *inum (as well as Polynesian reflexes such as Samoan inumia, not to mention Fijian dialectal variants) would have made one expect *gunuma (Arms 1975: 153); see also *ceguma. The occurrence of a close back vowel before a suffix in -m- is also considered in the discussion of vowel quality on p.74 above. The converse is also true: there is no recorded instance of a base with a bilabial nasal taking the velar nasal suffix -ga. Curiously, however, the alveolar nasal suffix -na can occur without restriction following a bilabial or a velar nasal in the base. The same observations apply to the labio-velar approximant w-; the occurrence of which in a base rules out the bilabial (with some exceptions. See liwava mentioned in n.26 below and the velar nasal suffixes -ma and -ga, but not the alveolar nasal suffix -na (cf. Arms 1975).

18. Thus, for instance, one can see at first glance that at least six of Dempwolff's reconstructed word-stems: *dengw, *giliw, *langak, *padam, *pag'et' and *temuk have final consonants which are deemed to be articulated in the same place as a medial or an initial consonant. This alone rules out the possibility of finding direct one-to-one reflexes in the suffixes of the Fijian verb bases which, in other respects, show regular correspondences with
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19. The terms 'associative', and 'dissociative', with reference to consonants and vowels that may, or may not, respectively, occur within the same base, with or without a suffix, are used by both Krupa and Arms. In a letter, Professor Biggs points out that prenasalisation did not occur finally in PAN and that in his view this fact alone, even without dissociation, is enough to account for the absence of prenasalisation in the suffixes.

20. In a letter, Paul Geraghty informs me that karona is probably a modern form of karauna (cf. garauna with similar meaning) and that the restrictions may not be so strict at a distance of two vowels.

21. This statement is based on a conversation I had with David Arms some years ago. He was presumably thinking of an expatriate learner of Fijian like himself who had already acquired some knowledge of its covert categories. Yet, when he tried the experiment of making up imaginary bases (nonce words) and then of asking native speakers to suggest appropriate suffixes and 'meanings' for them, he got replies which sharply contradicted his expectations. (Arms 1973; 1975:147-8).

22. See especially Arms 1975:128-9). He mentions, for instance, the connotations linking words in English beginning with sl- as in: slick, slip, slime, slide, slouch, slut, etc.


24. As, for example, when he argues (Arms 1975:122 ff.) that, for each 'passive' ('spontaneous') prefix, there is a corresponding, specific and identifiable semantic content, and what is more, that there is a one-to-one relationship of identity between the occurrence of some of those consonants in spontaneous prefixes and their occurrence in suffixes. Thus: 'The meaning of -c was given as "pliancy, gentle contact, bodily experience": The meaning for ca- could be regarded as a semantic specialisation: a shift from bodily experience in general to the particular bodily experience of sound' (ibid., 122). This view would seem to require much more supporting evidence than Arms provides if it is to be accepted.

25. This distinction has to do with the fact that, in Tagalog, the locative focus has to be analysed in relation to a number of subcategories: 'locative goal focus, locative proper, and locative beneficiary (directional or dative)'.
The instrumental role is, likewise, subclassified into: 'instrumental goal (portative or displacive), instrumental proper, and instrumental benefactive'.

26. I am also reminded by Al Schütz that one aspect of the complexity of this problem is that most speakers of standard Fijian use it as a second language and that for them there is often an element of doubt as to which verbal suffix is 'correct' or 'appropriate'. Thus in 1953 even a very senior chief and distinguished Colonial civil servant from the Lau group of islands (in the south-eastern part of Fiji), the late Ratu Sir Lala Sukuna, asked his wife Lady Maraia in my hearing if liwa '(of the wind) blow' was followed by the suffix -ca (liwaca) or the suffix -va (liwava). She spoke Standard Fijian as a first language (unlike her husband) and she immediately replied with assurance: 'liwava'.

27. This paper appeared later as Hockett (1976, 1977). In a recent letter, he adds:

If thematic consonants are separate morphemes they ought to have determinable meanings. One of Pawley's students made an assessment ... of semantic associations of the thematic consonants. I did the same thing independently, and came out with this. Of a random set of 500 stems: Of 51 with thematic consonant k, 28 or 55% denoted breaking, splitting, or other such forceful operations. For this sort of meaning no other thematic consonant scored so high. Of 74 stems in v, 24 denoted motions or positions; again stems with this meaning but with other thematic consonants scored much lower. Also, I found some dissimilative tendencies -- after certain first and second consonants, certain thematic consonants are disfavorued (this thing having to do with sound, of course, not sense).

28. He (loc. cit.) identifies a subclass of verbs having to do with 'opening out, unfolding, extending', which regularly take the -k- ending. He claims, nevertheless, to see a semantic connection with the rest on the ground that "smashing, breaking, cleaving" all involve disintegration of some entity'. I do not accept this view and consider that it is just as likely that the process of prosodic constraint is involved here too. Thus, -k- is ruled out in tevuka and dodoka.

29. Some verbs with the suffix -n- do not seem to be formed on nouns and yet the occurrence of this suffix cannot be accounted for on the ground of prosodic constraint: cugena 'support', kumuna 'gather, collect', sogona 'assemble'.
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30. Arms, following Krupa, uses the term 'dissociative'; Hockett speaks of 'dissimilative tendencies', while I have spoken in this article of 'phonotactic constraints' and of 'prosodic constraint'. The preferential association of certain suffixes with certain vowels in the base which is discussed here is the opposite of a constraint. Hence the title of the article which attempts to subsume both phenomena under the term 'prosodic' in the sense first used by J.R. Firth and the London school of linguists with which he is associated (cf. Firth 1948).

31. In a letter, Al Schütz writes as follows:

See my article on borrowings (Fiji Museum Publication), 1978 especially on 'natural syllables'... The point was that there are phonetic (articulatory, that is) reasons for certain C + V associations. I was looking at it from the point of view of the C being fixed and the V open to choice; your observation ... approaches the matter from the opposite direction. (cf. Schütz 1978).

REFERENCES


Hockett, C.F. 1974. The reconstruction of Proto-Fijian-Polynesian. (Paper delivered at the first international conference on comparative Austronesian linguistics, Honolulu.)


In the Danish National Archives a considerable number of documents are preserved from the files of the (Danish) Asiatic Company and from the Government of Tranquebar. The Asiatic Co. file no. 2188b has the title: Documents with reference to Pegu, Siam, Kedah, Johore, Cambodia, and Manila, 1682-1776. Only one letter in this package is written in Siamese. It is dated 7 December 1776, and is accompanied by a Portuguese translation -- or perhaps, more precisely, a Portuguese version of the letter -- under the same seal as the original, that of the Siamese King's 'Primeiro Ministro' (プラクラット/ in Siamese). The recipient is the Danish governor of Tranquebar, (David) Brown. On an accompanying sheet is added information that the letters have been extracted from a bamboo tube.

The letter was registered by Henning Engelhart in 1780 together with other documents concerning Tranquebar and the following résumé of its contents was given (here translated from Danish): 'A letter in the Siamese language, from the King of Siam or his Prime Minister, to Governor Brown, containing requisitions of ammunition, inviting to trade with Siam, and promising assistance.'

In 1973 the National Archives asked Pensak Chagsuchinda, Lecturer in Thai in the University of Copenhagen, and me for a comment on the accuracy of the above résumé, and we supplied the Archives with a somewhat more detailed translation. Recently I had occasion to look at the letters again and decided to translate the original Siamese as well as the Portuguese versions and to supply some notes on both.¹

Transcription of the Siamese text

1. นั่งสบม้าว้าบถ์ถั่นถั่นถ้ําพล่าพะจักร้าว?klhaŋphûuŋjaŋná?krungthîebphrá?-máññanákhoon miimáthûrâ?

2. คิ้งดันดีษันนีเซา maathæŋjooŋbroonsënaacawdiimmag- phûupencâwmyag'raakabânâad dûaj


Søren Egerod
7.4. phrá?banthuunsürásíghánásaddamrándnýakláwnyäkrâmômsásÝgáa
ná?môorásüm
5. piivö?gätâthäsógkâpítanlég?šogmaacâdsÝyyynná?myaŋtraŋ-
kaabâadphanhôoghkâwpaðthuun
6. klâwthuunkrâmâmthâawâaj tâŋphrä?râadchâprâsögppynkhâab-
silaa?ñasmyynbsög cyq
7. těŋhâjkâpítanlég?šogmaacâdsÝyná?myaŋtraŋkaabâad
khâhâjácâwmyaŋtraŋkâa
8. bâadhënkeðtha'ungephrä?râadchâmajtRéi læmajtriichâu-
thammü?bamruçcâdçëhâjkâpítan
9. lâgdâjpyynmbsöggwâmrâmgmaacoqsâdñuqg thâacâwmyaŋtraŋ-
kaabâaadca?tâękaandîibug
10. kâ?hâjtëŋkampânkhâwmaarâb?awdîibügkëkkâpítanlègná?-
myaŋthålểqágqobgëq3o
11. phaarâa thâacâ?tâŋgaanqaachââëngìmaínkhrâasëñdajná?-
krunthëebphrä?mâhânâkhoonkâpí
12. tanlëgrùuraakahajûulëw hâjtëŋkampânbanthügsypynkhâw-
maasödâjthèeqkrunthëebphrä?
13. mâhânâkhooncâ?khrâeqkaahâjhròbtaamcammuñkaapppyn-
mi?hâjkhâänkeenkhâdsonjûuddj prâ
14. kàannâythâacâwmyaŋtraŋkaabâadcâ?tëŋkampânbanthügphânh-
phâaphrêephansínkhrâakhw
15. pajkhâskhâajná?krunthëebphrä?mâhânâkhoon lærâaahkan-
phâarãakahâaaaachâaëngìmajsîn
16. ná?krunthëebphrä?mâhânâkhoonnân kâpítanlëgrùulëw-
hâjtëŋkampânbanthügkhâw
17. pajthëedrawcâ?tûajthammü?bamruqmi?hâjphanhëasâínkhrâ-
khèögâwmyaŋtraŋkaabâadkhâdhâajjûuddîpen?anâkhâd
18. thiidiawñásëyyamaâná?wan?akhaâandyan?aajrëëmsib-
khâmcunlèsâqkârâadphanhôoksâmsîbëdsbîwpôg?âdhäsög

Notes to the text

2.1. /mäŋsý/ 'letter'. The /a/ is written by means of the
diacritical sign which is now reserved for the tonal marker
/mâjthoo/. In this letter no distinction is made between
/mâjhan ?aakâad/ and /mâjthoo/. This will not be pointed out
in every single case in the following notes.

/náwàab/ 'Nabob'. The first syllable is spelt with the letter /nɔo neen/ as if it meant 'at, in'. The scribe may well have misunderstood the expression, thinking that /wàab/ was a noun designating something like 'residence, domicile'. But cf. /nákhoon/ below.

/thàñ/ 'title'. This title is spelt with a long /aː/ as in the modern orthography, but without the tonal marker /máj?eeg/.

/câw/ 'lord'. In this word the /májthoo/ has its usual force. All examples of this will not be pointed out below.

/phájàa/ 'title' is written with a conventional ligature.

/phrâʔ/ 'honorable prefix' is written with a ligature in which the /r/ does not take on its usual shape.

/jàj/ 'big' is spelt with /májmálaaj/ rather than /májmúan/, and with /májthoo/ instead of /máj?eeg/.

/kruq/ 'capital city' is in this letter consistently equipped with a /jàadnámkháaŋ/.

/nákhoon/ 'city'. The first syllable is spelt with /nɔo neen/ rather than with /nɔo nuu/, and the second has the vowel /ɔo/ written out instead of the /r/ serving for vowel plus final consonant.

/mii/ 'have' is spelt with a vowel symbol consisting of modern /sàràʔ ñʔ/ plus modern /máj?eeg/ (a combination of /sàràʔ ñʔ/ with both /jàadnámkháaŋ/ and /fonthooŋ/). This symbol is used in this style for any of the vowels /i/, /ii/ or /yy/. We shall call it the 'general i/y vowel'.

/máthúrãʔ/ 'sweet'. Both of the short /a/ vowels are indicated with the /wisãnchánii/. There is not much consistency in the use or non-use of this symbol in this style.

1.2 /cid/ is spelt /cìdtrà/ even though the meaning is probably 'mind, heart' rather than 'variegated, wonderful'. The two are not consistently kept apart in modern usage either. The word is spelt with the general i/y vowel.

/sânîd/ 'amiable' is spelt with final /còo caan/ instead of /thòo thàñhàan/ or /thòo thòŋ/, the vowel is written with the general i/y.

/sànèeʔaʔ/ 'friendship' has the vowel /ee/ placed between /s/ and /n/ and is written without a tonal marker.
"reach" is spelt with a combination of preposed /sərə?/ ə/ and the general i/y. This combination could not indicate any other vowel than /əə/.

/broon/ can also be read /bruən/. /sərə?/ ə/ and /wə wən/ are not clearly distinguished in this style.

/diınməg/ 'Denmark' reflects Portuguese Dinamarca. The /n/ is spelt with /noo ryə/ (see also the discussion of the Pidgin Portuguese forms for 'Denmark' in Egerod 1958:111-14). The vowel is spelt with the specific symbol for long /ii/.

/pen/ 'to be'. The vowel shortener /məjtəjkwu/ does not appear in this text.

/myaŋ/ 'city' is spelt with the usual elements, except that the superscript symbol is the general i/y vowel (perhaps with an added unexplained /fonthoo/, cf. l.5 below).

/trəŋkaabəd/. The final consonant /d/ is spelt with /thoo thanəan/, reflecting an original supradental -ɖ, which comes out as -r in Portuguese, Danish, etc. The initial /b/ in /bəd/ is joined with the vowel /aa/ in a ligature involving the /khɔom/ script form of the letter /b/.

l.3 /səmdəd/ 'royal prefix'. The /om/ is spelt with both the superposed /jəadnəmkhəaq/ and the /m/, thus presenting a mixture of Siamese (/m/ only) and Cambodian (/jəadnəmkhəaq/ only) conventions.

/kəəsand/ 'king' has an unetymological /r-/ (Skt. ksatriya) /səo syə/ rather than /səo ryyssii/. The /i/ of /-əhəəand/ is the general i/y.

/thii/ is spelt in exactly the same way as /thyy/ would now be spelt.

/meːn/ is spelt as if it were Skt. məraṇa 'killing'. The word is, however, of Cambodian origin and is the equivalent of Siamese /mii/ 'to have'. The example used in the Thai Royal Academy dictionary (Photchananukrom 1950:695b) we find here /meːn pʰraʔbānθun/ which is parallel to the preceding phrase /mii pʰraʔrəəadchəʔoŋkəan/.

l.4 /bānθun/ 'command' is spelt with /noo nəu/ in the first syllable and /lʊo lɪŋ/ in the second, where the present official orthography has /noo nəen/ and /noo ryə/. Pallegoix (1854:47) has /lʊo lɪŋ/ finally as in Cambodian.

/sərə/ is spelt with a long /uu/ by confusion of /sərə/ 'godly' with /suərə/ 'hero'. The /r/ is doubled for no obvious reason.
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/'sik/ in /sikhânaad/ 'lion's roar' is spelt with /ii/;
/'nâad/ with /doo cháâda/ through confusion of 'roar' /-thoo thânaan/ with 'dancing' (though this is normally spelt with 'long t' rather than 'long d').

/'damrââd/ 'royal speech' has final /doo dêg/ instead of /sâo syâ/.

/'nya/ 'above' has superscript /ii/ rather than /yy/ the first time, the general i/y the second time.

/'mâm/ in /krammêm/ 'top of head', no tonal marker.

/'sâq/ 'command', no tonal marker.

/'môrââsêm/ 'monsoon'. The /cc/ is spelt out. /râ/ is spelt with the rare letter /ryy/, perhaps by false association with words beginning with /moory/-, designating 'death', and also perhaps with /rûduu/ 'season'.

l.5. /piî/ 'year' is written with a special ligature combining features of the superscript part of /pco plaa/ and the superscript vowel which serves the same purposes as the general i/y symbol.

/'âdthâ/ '8'. The /thoo thâan/ is replaced by the simpler /doo cháâda/.

/'sôg/ 'year' is written with the /fannûu/ or 'rat's teeth' (also so named in Cambodian) to indicate the short, otherwise 'inherent' /o/. The two consonants are joined in a special ligature with a lower than normal position of the upstroke of the /sâo sâlaa/.

/'kâpîtan/ 'Captain'. The first syllable is spelt with /fonthôoc/ (identical with modern /májëeg/). The second syllable is spelt exactly like the word /piî/ 'year' above.

/'lêg/ 'Personal Name'. Since no vowel shortener is used in this style, we do not know whether /lêg/ or /lêeg/ is intended. Whichever it is, it is likely to be wrong (see below: Notes to the translation).

/'sôy/ 'buy', no tonal marker.

/'pyyn/ 'gun' contains the same ligature as is used for /piî/ and /pî/ above.

/'myâ/. The vowel is /sârë ?i/? plus /fonthôoc/; the element /jâadnâmkhâaq/, used in l.2 above, is missing.
'/khāw/ 'enter' is written with a ligature which blends /khōo khāj/ and /sārā? ?aa/ into one symbol.

l.6. /thāwāaj/ 'give' has a superfluous /mājḥān?aakāad/ = /mājθoo/ to indicate the short /a/.

/tṁq/ 'must', no tonal marker.

/prāsoq/ 'desire'. The 'inherent' /o/ is indicated with /fonthōo/, and not the /fannūu/ as in /sōg/, l.5 above. There is no silent /khōo khwāaj/ finally.

/sīlāa/ 'flintlock' is nonsensically spelt with initial /sī/ 'prefix of splendour' -- the guns could not have been that exceptional!

/mīyn/ '10,000', no tonal marker.

/cyq/ 'then', with general i/y.

l.7. /tēq/ 'arrange' has /mājθoo/ instead of māj?ēg/.

/khōo/ 'ask' is spelled with /khōo khūad/, which would be etymologically correct for the homophonous word meaning 'hook'. There is a /fannūu/ over the consonant.

/l.8. /kēq/ 'to', no tonal marker.

/majtrii/ 'friendship' is twice spelt with /sārāʔ ?ʔʔʔ/. /chūaj/ 'help', no tonal marker.

/thammuʔʔ/ 'tend', spelt with /noo neen/. /ceeq/ 'prepare' is spelt with /mājθoo/ for no obvious reason.

l.9. /pyyn/ has been equipped with an extra /mājʔēg/. cf. l.5 and 6 above.

/coeq/ 'make to be'. The 'inherent' /o/ is indicated by means of /fonthōo/ as in /prāsoq/, l.6 above.

/cāʔʔ/ 'verbal auxiliary'. In this word the /fonthōo/ is used for the short vowel /a/ instead of the /wisāncḥānii/.

l.10. /kāʔʔ/ 'then' is spelt with /kōo kāj/ and no markers.

/kampān/ 'ship', no tonal marker.
/thâlãq/ 'Place Name'. The short /a/ is spelt with /fonthoo~/; cf. /kãpitã/, 7.5 above.

/hõg/ 'six' has /jàadnãmkhãq/ to indicate the short /o/; cf. /sõndõd/ 7.3 above.

/tõo/ 'per' has the vowel written out plus a /fannũu/ above the /t/; cf. /khõo/ in 7.7 above.

7.11. /chãaŋ/ is written with a ligature that joins some features of /choo chãaŋ/ with the /aa/.

/nõña/ 'meat' is spelt with /sårã? ?i?/ instead of /?yy/ and has no tonal marker.

/mãj/ 'wood' has /mãjmûan/ instead of /mãjmãlaaj/, and no tonal marker.

/sêñ/ 'goods' is spelled with the general i/y symbol, as is also /sîñ/ 'thing' (no tonal marker).

/dãj/ 'any' has /mãjmãlaaj/ instead of /mãjmûan/ and is equipped with a meaningless final /joo jãg/.

7.12. /jùu/ 'be at', no tonal marker.

/banthug/ 'load'. The official orthography writes double /roo rya/ to indicate /an/, a convention not followed here.

/sõŋ/ 'send'. The 'inherent' /o/ is indicated with /jàadnãmkhãq/ (cf. 7.7. 3,10) above; there is no tonal marker.

/dãj/ 'can' is spelt with /mãjmûan/ rather than with /mãjmãlaaj/.

7.13. /khõd/ 'calculate' is spelt with /sårã? ?i?/ (or /sårã? ?i?/) with superposed /fonthoo~/.

/raakahã/ 'price' is equipped with a /mãjthoo/ on the second syllable -- not used in the line above -- through confusion with /khãa/ 'price', spelt the same way later in this line, with /mãjthoo/ instead of /mãj?eeg/.

/khrõb/ 'complete' has /jàadnãmkhãq/ for /o/ as in several other words above.

/camnuan/ 'amount'. The final /-n/ is written /roo rya/.

/mî?/ 'not' has the same elements as /mîi/ in 7.1, but with the /fonthoo~/ closer to the /jàadnãmkhãq/, which is, however, not the case in 7.17 below.
/kháaŋ/ 'unfinished'; no tonal marker.

/kæən/ 'exceed'. The superscript is /sàrâ? ?yy/ and not /sàrâ? ?i?/.

/sõn/ in/khâdsõn/ 'needy' has /jàadnámkháaŋ/ for /o/ as in /khrõb/, etc., above.

2.14. /nỳq/ 'one' is spelt /nỳq/. This is often the actual pronunciation in modern Thai; the word has a complicated history with dialect variants contradicting each other as to tone and initial consonant category.

/phan/ 'kind, sort' is lacking the final /nøo neen/ in the first, but not in the second instance, whereas a /mâjhan?aakâad/ is used in the first, but not in the second instance.

/phaa/ 'cloth', no tonal marker.

/phrçe/ 'silk' has double /roo rya/ for no obvious reason, surrounded by two occurrences of /phan/, correctly spelled with double /r/.

2.15. /khâaj/ 'sell'. The initial plus the vowel are written by means of a ligature combining /kh'; khaad/, not etymologically correct, and /aa/.

/nâʔ/ 'at, in' seems equipped with a /fønthoog/, differently from 22. 1 and 16.

/raakhaa/ is spelt as in 2.13; /phan/ as in the first instance in 2.14.

/nỳa/ is written with the general i/y vowel, differently from 2.11.

2.16. /nán/ 'that' is equipped with two superimposed markers identical with modern /mâjthoo/, the lower one indicating the vowel, the upper one the tone.

/kápitán/ has no marker on the first syllable.


/chhàaj/, no tonal marker.

/miʔ/ seems equipped, on top of the general i/y vowel, with a meaningless /mâjthoo/.
/phanphâa/ is spelt as in Z.14.

/खोण/ 'of' is spelt with /खो खाद/, which happens to be etymologically correct.

/त्रांकाबाद/ 'Place Name'. The last syllable has a meaningless /माञ्जोो/.

/खाद/ 'lack' begins with the same ligature as /खाज/ in Z.15, again not etymologically correct. The last syllable of /अंक्हाद/ 'absolutely' seems to be spelt the same way. The words in between /खाद/ and /अंक्हाद/ are hard to make out, because of the seal which is superimposed upon them.

Z.18. /थी/ 'instance' is spelt like the modern /थ्य/. /अंक्हान/ 'Mars, Tuesday' is spelt with a long vowel /ाा/ found in the first syllable as well.

/द्यान/ 'month' has superscript /सारा? आौ/ instead of /सारा? आौ/. /साण/ 'first', no tonal marker.

/सिं/ '10' has /सारा? आौ/ instead of /सारा? आौ/. /फान/ '1000' is written with final /र/, differently from Z.5 above.

/रोो/ '100', no tonal marker.

The orthography in the present letter, besides being old-fashioned, is also extremely inconsistent. The usage of the superscript vowels, including the general i/y symbol, is completely haphazard. The tonal marker /माँहेeg/ is not used, but the identical /फॉन्थू/ indicates (inconsistently) /ा(?)/ or /ा/. The tonal marker /माञ्जोो/ is identical with /माञ्जहान आकाद/, while the /फन्नुा/ occasionally marks the /ा/, or is added above the consonant preceding /सारा? आौ/. Several now obsolete ligatures are employed.
Translation of the Siamese text

7.1. This is a letter from the Nabob, the Lord Grand Minister of the Treasury in the mighty city of Krungthep, with kindness

2. and affection to (John?) Brown, Danish officer who is the Governor of Tranquebar, to the effect that, in accordance with

3. H.M. the King and Supreme Ruler's order and

4. command uttered by him; during this monsoon

5. of the Year of the Monkey, the Eighth year of the Decade, Captain Leit went to arrange for the purchase of 1000 flintlock guns in the city of Tranquebar and has reported back

6. to H.M. and made delivery. As the King now wishes further 10,000 guns, so

7. I have charged Captain Leit with sailing to Tranquebar and arranging for the purchase there. I ask you, Lord Governor of Tranquebar,

8. for the sake of H.M.'s friendship to be good enough to assist and take care of arranging for Captain Leit

9. to acquire the 10,000 guns and get them safely here. If you, Lord Governor of Tranquebar, should want tin

10. you may arrange for a ship to come and receive the tin through Captain Leit in Phuket, delivering 6 guns per

11. load. If you should want ivory, wood, or other kinds of merchandise from the mighty city of Krungthep, Captain

12. Leit is informed about the price. Please arrange for the ship to load the guns and carry them to the mighty city of Krungthep.

13. We shall calculate the price in full agreement with the total value of the guns so that there is no deficit or inadequate pay. Furthermore,

14. if you, Lord Governor of Tranquebar, will arrange for the ship to carry various sorts of cloth and silk as well as other merchandise
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15. to be traded in the mighty city of Krungthep, then as for the price of the cloth (as compared to) the price of ivory, wood, and other merchandise

16. in the mighty city of Krungthep, Captain Leit is already informed about it. Please arrange for the ship to be loaded and carry

17. the merchandise here. We shall assist and see to it that none whatsoever of your merchandise, Lord Governor of Tranquebar, will remain unsold.

18. This letter was written on Tuesday, the First Lunar Month, the Tenth Day of the Waning Moon, in the Year 1138 of the Lesser Era, the Year of the Monkey, in the Eighth Year of the Decade.

Notes to the translation

1.1. 'Nabob'. The Siamese form is /nawāb/, very close to Urdu nawāb*, and Malay nawab*. The usage of this Mogul title does not seem to have been common in Thailand; it is not recorded in the dictionaries.

'Minister of the Treasury'. /kla~/ is the Treasury, but the actual function of this official was, at the time, more like a Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Portuguese version says 'primeiro Ministro'.

'Krungthep'. In 1776, when this letter was written, the capital was at Thonburi, alternatively called T'anaburi and Dhonburi (see Hall 1966). Taksin installed himself as king in Thonburi in 1767; Chakri was crowned in Bangkok, across the river, in 1794).

1.2. '(John?) Brown'. The Siamese text says /jɔŋ brɔɔn (or bruant)/. The name of the Governor of Tranquebar in 1776 was David Brown, a member of a Scottish family which had settled in Denmark. David Brown lived from 1734 till 1804 and was Governor of Tranquebar for the period 14 February 1775 - 17 January 1779. His elder brother John Brown (1723-1808) was a well-known merchant and shipowner. In 1776 the Danish king bestowed upon

* nawāb, from the broken plural of the Arabic naib 'deputy' was treated as a singular by the Persians, and exported as such by them. (See also Yule 1886:467a-9a). (Ed.).
him the honorary title of Commissioner-General of War. John Brown served as a member of the Board of Directors of the (Danish) Asiatic Company in 1770-75 and 1779-85; he carried on private shipping with East India from 1774. It seems that the author of the letter had somehow mixed up the two brothers. Tranquebar was Danish from 1624 till 1845.

1.3. 'The King of Siam' was Phaya Taksin (1767-1782).

1.5. 'Captain Leit'. The Siamese text has /lè(e)g/, but the Portuguese translation says Leit. The final /-g/ may have seemed more natural to the Thai letter writer, since there is no Thai word /lèd/. Were the Captain a Dane, Leth would be a likely guess, but cf. to 1.5 of the Portuguese translation. As regards the calendar terms, see 2.18 below.

1.10. 'Phuket'. The Siamese text has /thâlãaã/, i.e. Ujong Salang or Junk-Ceylon (see Yule 1886:361b).

1.11. 'Load'. The Siamese text says /phaaraa/ from Skt. bhāra (= 20 tula or 'quintals').

'Wood'. The Siamese /nñamāj/ means the 'flesh' or grain of the wood, the wood stripped of the bark. The Portuguese translation makes it clear that the fragrant 'eagle-wood' is meant.

1.15. 'Other merchandise'. The letter says only /sin/ 'goods', the equivalent of /Sînkhaa/ in 2.11 and 14.

1.18. The 'Lesser Era' (L.E.) or Minor Era /cunlásãgkãrãad/ began in A.D. 638, so L.E. 1138 = A.D. 1776 or 'Buddhist Era' (B.E.) 2319.

'Year of the Monkey'. /pii wɔɔg/ is the ninth year in the cycle of twelve.

'Eighth Year'. /ʔãdthãsɔɡ/ is the eighth year in the cycle of ten.
São Paulo, 7 de Dezembro de 17.

Foi por ordem do Sr. Reitor, que o Capitão recebeu carta do Sr. Reitor, em que lhe forneceu todos os detalhes sobre a situação econômica do reino de Siam, e solicitou que fossem enviados mercadorias para lá.

O Capitão respondeu que, com base em suas informações, seria possível enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, mas que, devido à distância e ao clima, poderia ser um processo lento.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.

O Sr. Capitão também informou que, se o Sr. Reitor estivesse interessado, ele poderia enviar um barco com mercadorias para o reino de Siam, e que, devido à distância e à dificuldade do transporte, seria importante que o Sr. Reitor agisse com urgência.

O Sr. Reitor agradeceu e disse que, com o apoio do Sr. Capitão, seria possível fazer um acordo para a compra de mercadorias e enviar mercadorias para o reino de Siam.
Excellentissimo Senhor

1. Supost esperando a boa aceitação, receba V.E.ª estas minhas regras, com alguma carícia, dizendo em primeiro lugar que V.E.ª prospera e feliz saúde com muitos augments e alegres de felicidades de dia em dia maiores no seu nobre Estado, e feliz governo.

2. Veio nesta monção o Capitão M.º Leit neste Reino de Siam, e fez soma-

3. baya a S. Majestade, que elle dito Capitão tem comprado em Trangabar mil espingardas e apresentou a S. Majestade, e S. Majestade ficou bastante contente com as ditas Espingardas: de presente S. Real Majestade executou ordem a mim primeiro Ministro de S. Majestade que escrevesse esta Carta a V.E.ª pedindo que favoreça ao dito Capitão M.º Leit em Trangabar, porque vai o dito Capitão M.º Leit com ordem expressa de S. Majestade procurar mais dez-mil Espingardas em Trangabar:

4. peço a V.E.ª por boa amizade, que o Capitão Leit com a faculdade de V.E.ª se ache elle dito Capitão Leit as ditas dez-mil Espingardas, e se V.E.ª quizer Calaem mende barco de V.E.ª a Jonkseilº receber Calaem das mãos de Capitão M.º Leit, elle dito se entre-

5. gará por seis Espingardas, hum bar de Calaem, e se quizer marfim, aguilla, e mais fazen-

6. das deste Reino de Siam, o Capitão M.º Leit entende, e sabe o preço das ditas fazendas, e
De V.E. a

Todo afectuoso

Assignamos com nosso selho

Siam a os 7: de Dezembro de 1776

Notes to the Portuguese version

1.1. V.E. a, i.e. Vossa Excellencia

Lugar Logre. In the transcript, the capitalization of the original has more or less been followed, and these two words are clearly capitalized in the original. There are, however, quite a few cases where it has been impossible to decide whether an initial consonant represents a stylistically enlarged small letter or a true capital. For the interpretation, this, luckily, plays no role.

1.3. [a?]ges. Because of a fold in the paper, the word is not clearly legible.
M.\textsuperscript{r}, i.e. Mister. Ms Diana Matias has kindly called to my attention the recent article by Professor E.H.S. Simmonds (*Bull. Sch. Or. Afr. Stud.* **50** (3), 1987, 529-531) entitled 'A letter in Thai from Thalang in 1777' which describes a transaction very similar to the one treated in the present article. No doubt our Capitão Leit is identical with Captain Francis Light in the 1777 letter. In both letters the Siamese transcription is /lèg/ with /hō nam/. See also Professor Simmonds' article for further bibliographic information on Francis Light.

\textit{l.15. hum, i.e. um.}

\textit{l.18. algua, i.e. alguma.}

\textit{l.19. pessas, i.e. peças.}

\textit{l.20. panos, i.e. pannos.}

\textit{l.24. apprecando, i.e. apreçando}

\textit{muita} and \textit{maiores} are written by means of ligatures. The first one could perhaps be read \textit{melhora} instead of \textit{muita}. 
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Translation of the Portuguese version

Most excellent Sir

2.1. Hoping for your kind acknowledgement, I ask your Excellency to receive these lines of mine with some favor, while at the same time I express the wish that you may enjoy a prosperous and joyous health with much success and plenty of happiness increasing day by day in your noble state and felicitous government.

5. During this present monsoon the Captain Mr. Leit arrived in this Kingdom of Siam and paid obeisance to His Majesty, [reporting] that he, the said captain, had bought one thousand flintlocks in Tranquebar, and he delivered them to His Majesty, and His Majesty was rather satisfied with the said flintlocks: now His Majesty has issued an order to me, His Majesty's Prime Minister, to write this letter to Your Excellency, asking you to favour the said Captain Mr. Leit in Tranquebar, so that he with His Majesty's express order shall procure further 10,000 flintlocks in Tranquebar:

12. I ask Your Excellency, for the sake of good friendship, that Captain Leit through your authority acquires the said 10,000 flintlocks, and if Your Excellency wants tin, send a ship of yours to Junk-Ceylon to receive tin from the hands of Captain Mr. Leit, who in exchange for six flintlocks will deliver one load of tin, and if you wish ivory, eagle-wood and other merchandise from this Kingdom of Siam, Captain Mr. Leit is acquainted with them and knows the price of the said merchandise, and
2.17. Your Excellency should order the transfer of the flintlocks on your boat to this Kingdom of Siam, and when they arrive

18. the accounts for the said flintlocks will be settled without any difficulty; and if it pleases your Excellency

19. to send a ship to this Kingdom of Siam, [as regards] the price of linens, firearms, etc., Captain Mr. Leit knows

20. already the price of the said cloth, firearms, etc. And as the said Captain Mr. Leit also knows the price of ivory,

21. and other further merchandise of this Kingdom of Siam, Your Excellency can direct a ship to trade

22. in this Kingdom, and we, Minister to His Majesty of Siam, [will] assist and facilitate the said dealings,

23. and give satisfaction punctually. -- And since, for the time being, there are no more items of business at hand, we shall continue

24. to esteem highly a long life for Your Excellency, good health and greatest progress in possessions and happiness, such as

25. with due respect we wish for you that it may always be.

Your Excellency's

devotedly

we endorse with our seal

Siam, the seventh of December, 1776

Notes to the translation

2.3. 'plenty of'. This translation is based on a reading auges 'apogee', for [a?]ges, suggested to me by Luis de Vasconcelos.

2.6. 'obeisance'. Translates sombaya, probably from Malay sembah or sembahyang.
Z.12. 'friendship'. From the Portuguese version of the letter one could gain the impression that the Minister and the Governor were well acquainted. The Siamese original says, however, expressly, 'His Majesty's friendship'.

Z.13. 'tin'. The term is calaem, from Arabic.

Z.14. 'Junk-Ceylon', i.e. Phuket, from Malay Ujong Salang. (See also Yule 1886:361(b).)

Z.15. 'load'. The Portuguese version uses bar, corresponding to the Siamese original /phara/, both from Skt. bhāra.

'eagle-wood' translates Portuguese aguilla. (See also Yule 1886:258ab who traces the word to Malayalam.)

Z.19. 'firearms' translates the Portuguese peças 'pieces, firearms', here evidently referring to the flintlocks already mentioned.

Z.24. 'long' translates muita. If we read melhora instead, the meaning will be 'best possible'.

'devotedly'. The Portuguese says todo affectuozo 'totally devoted'.

NOTE

1. I have benefited from correspondence with Dr Theraphan L. Thongkum and, through her, Professor Preecha Changkhwanyuen, concerning the Siamese text; as well as with Palle Kroman M.A. and, through him, Lecturer Luis de Vasconcelos, concerning the Portuguese text. The final responsibility is, in all cases, my own.
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TAI NAMES FOR THE OX

William J. Gedney

For many of the common domestic animals, languages of the Tai family use names which show complete uniformity and agreement throughout the Tai-speaking domain. For the 'pig', for example, forms cognate with Siamese (Si.) muu\(^5\) occur everywhere, always showing the phonological developments expected in the particular language or dialect. Such regularity is exhibited also in the terms for the 'water buffalo' (Si. khwaay\(^1\)), the 'horse' (Si. maa\(^4\)), the 'dog' (Si. maa\(^5\)), the 'chicken' (Si. kay\(^2\)), and the 'duck' (Si. pet\(^2\)). One infers that these animals were known to the speakers of Proto-Tai, the parent language of the family, and that these names go back to that period.

But the Tai names for some other domestic animals show irregularity from one language to another. For example, the term for the 'goose' (Si. haan\(^2\)) often exhibits forms which violate the usual phonological correspondences, suggesting late acquisition of the animal and its name in the various branches of the Tai family. The name for the 'cat' (Si. maa\(^4\)) is also sometimes irregular, suggesting onomatopoetic innovation from place to place. For the 'goat', most Tai languages use a name which ought to be *bez\(^3\) in Siamese, but Siamese uses instead the form phe\(^4\)), which cannot be cognate with the usual Tai term; one suspects that the old name was lost -- goats are rarely seen in Central Thailand -- and replaced by a loanword. The Shan term (Cushing 1914:419) is also aberrant.

One of the most interesting examples of disagreement in domestic animal names among the Tai languages is found in terms for the 'ox', terms which show not only phonological irregularity but often completely different words from one area to another; a situation described here by studying the various forms of the names used and determining their geographical distribution; and also suggesting a reason for this disparity.

In general, three different names for the 'ox' are found in Tai languages, each one used over a wide area. These three areas coincide closely with the three branches which Li Fang-Kuei (1977) has postulated for the Tai family: South-Western, Central, and Northern.

South-Western type: Siamese qua

South-Western Tai languages are spoken in Thailand, Laos, Burma, Assam, southern Yunnan, and north-western Viêt-Nam.
Languages of this group all agree in having in their words for the 'ox' the diphthong -ua (as in Si. nua) everywhere that this diphthong exists, i.e., in Siamese and all other Tai dialects of Thailand, all dialects of Lao, and in Black Tai and Red Tai. The diphthong has changed to -oo in all dialects which have made the regular change of the high diphthongs ia, ia, ua to the mid monophthongs ee, ea, oo respectively. Dialects which have made this change of high diphthongs to lowered monophthongs cover a wide arc extending from White Tai in the east, through Lü and Tai Nüa in southern Yunnan, to Shan and Khamti in the west. So far as tone is concerned, all South-Western languages agree in giving this word the tone (whatever it happens to have become phonetically) belonging to A-tone words of the parent language with an originally voiced initial, so that in each modern dialect the word for 'ox' has the same tone as, for example, 'to have' (Si. mii), 'ricefield' (Si. naal), 'boat' (Si. ral), and so on. Because of this absolute tonal regularity, which implies that the word existed with the A-tone and a voiced initial in South-Western Tai languages before the tonal splits many hundreds of years ago, tone marks will be omitted from the forms cited.

Cognates of Siamese gua in other South-Western Tai languages and dialects agree, then, with Siamese in the vocalic nucleus and in tone. If only these constituents were involved, we would feel confident in reconstructing a Proto-South-Western-Tai form *gua. But this turns out to be impossible because the initial shows considerable variation and irregularity. Besides forms with initial g-, other forms occur, sometimes in addition to the form with initial g-, and sometimes as the only recorded form for the particular language or dialect. The other initials that appear are w- (or v-) and h-. Siamese has nua as the usual colloquial form, but also wua which is used in more formal and educated speech. How this situation came about in the Standard Thai dialect of Bangkok is a puzzle which ought to be addressed by students of the linguistic history and dialectology of Thailand. The old Pallegoix dictionary of 1854 (l81, 869) gives both nua and wua, as do modern dictionaries. Egerod (1961:80) in his paper on Thai dialects cites wua for Bangkok (he must have had an educated informant, or one given to putting on airs), and also for Loei in the North-East, nua for Yuan (the dialect of Northern Thailand), and hua for Phatthalung, Phuket, and Trang. Initial h- in these Southern dialects in Thailand is the regular reflex of earlier *h-, so that these forms with initial h- are really examples of earlier *gua. Purnell's glossary (1963:73) of the dialect of Northern Thailand gives nua.

Both the Reinhorn (1970:396) and Kerr (1972:266b) dictionaries of Lao give nua for that language (see also p.115 below). White Tai has nua (Ngêu 1970:253, ngo; Gedney, fieldnotes); Black Tai has nua (Gedney, fieldnotes); Red Tai has
nua (Robert 1941:130). For Lü (in Yunnan, directly north of Northern Thailand) I have recorded voo and hoo in the dialect of Chiang Rung, but noo in the Lü dialect of Moeng Yong across the border in Burma. For Lü, Li (1977:240) also gives variants: noo, voo, hoo. Tai Nüa, located still further north in Yunnan, has voo in the dialects which I recorded, but Harris (1975:211) found noo. For Khün (the dialect of Chiang Tung in Burma) Egerod (1961:80) gives woo, which he also gives for Shan (ibid.); while Cushing's Shan dictionary (1914:623, cf.154) gives both woo and noo; he also enters a form moo (see below p.115). Harris (1976:126) found noo in Tai Mao and in Tai Khamti; Weidert (1977:51) also records noo for Tai Khamti.

For Ahom, both the earlier much-cited dictionary of Borua (1920:298-9) and the more recent lexicon by Barua and Deodhai (1964) give the transliteration hu; the vowel u often appears in Ahom forms which have cognates in other South-Western Tai languages with the diphthong ua.

There seems to be no way within the usual rules of comparative Tai phonology to reconcile the three different initials occurring in the forms nua (or noo), wua (or woo or voo), and hua (or hoo). So far as the alternation n - w is concerned, both Egerod (1961:80) and Li (1977:239-40) have suggested a reconstructed initial cluster *gw-; a possibility mentioned much earlier by Haudricourt (1948:218). It seems to be an ad hoc guess for which there is really no very convincing evidence or argument from other examples, especially since this word occurs only in the South-Western branch of Tai.

And besides the n - w alternation, the initial h- of hua and hoo is just as baffling, and makes matters even worse. The initial h- in dialects of Southern Thailand is, as indicated above, a local matter, a regular development of voiced initial *g-. But initial h- elsewhere cannot have any such explanation; in these other dialects all other words with initial *g-, such as 'snake' (Si.nuul), 'sesame' or 'ivory' (both Si.qaal), have regularly modern initial g-. (An unusual exception is Tai Nüa, where I found the initial palatal nasal n-, and Harris (1975:211, e.g.) found n- in words which elsewhere have the initial velar nasal g-.) In many of these dialects modern initial h- with a tone indicating an earlier voiced initial corresponds to Siamese initial r-; this is true, for example, in Lao, White Tai, Black Tai, Red Tai, Lü, Shan, and so on. It is not true, however, for Ahom, where initial Siamese r- regularly corresponds to Ahom r-, but Ahom has, as we have seen, initial h- in the words for 'ox'. In any case, initial r-, which has changed to h- in some languages, clearly has nothing to do with our word.

The voiceless counterpart of Proto-Tai voiced *g-, that is, voiceless *k- or preaspirated *kh-, regularly changes to h- in many Tai dialects. It seems impossible that this change
can have anything to do with the occurrence of initial $h-$ in the word for 'ox', which everywhere has a tone reflecting an earlier voiced, never voiceless, initial. Voiced *$r-$ should yield modern $q-$ everywhere, except for the unusual local developments in Southern Thailand and in Tai Nûa. Modern $h-$, with a tone reflecting an original voiced initial, is from earlier *$r-$ in dialects where the change *$r-$ > $h-$ has occurred. Elsewhere, as in Siamese, initial $h-$ with a tone reflecting an original voiced initial is a historical impossibility; the few words of this kind that occur have to be modern innovations.

The whole phonological picture involved in these forms with alternating initial $r-$, $w-$, and $h-$ is bizarre in the extreme. Whether further detailed research into the forms for 'ox' in every local dialect would throw light on this problem seems doubtful; more information on the geographical distribution of initial $r-$, $w-$ (or $v-$), and $h-$ in this word would not ameliorate the basic phonological anomaly.

The likeliest explanation is probably that this is a loanword, borrowed by different Tai dialects from different non-Tai source languages or dialects, perhaps at different times. The different initials would then be due to differences in the source forms, either in space or time.

What looks like the same word is found in the Bê language of Hainan, which is geographically remote from the South-Western Tai languages and genetically somehow remotely related to the Tai family. The Savina-Haudricourt dictionary (1965:62) gives the Bê form as ngJu, and Hashimoto's lexicon (1980:20) gives it as nu. Haudricourt identifies this Bê form as a Chinese loanword.

Central type: moo or maa

Languages of Li's Central branch of Tai are spoken in the north-eastern part of Viêt-Nam, where they are known by such names as Thô and Nùng, and across the Chinese border in adjacent areas of Guăngxi province. There is also a displaced Central Tai dialect farther west in the neighbourhood of Lao Kay, about half-way across the northern border of Viêt-Nam, on which I have done fieldwork and which I have designated Western Nùng.

All Central Tai dialects, whether in Viêt-Nam or China, exhibit amazing uniformity among themselves in calling the 'ox' by the term moo or maa. These are the same form, phonetically [mo:]. In some dialects there is a distinction between the vowels oo and oo; in such cases our word has the form maa. But in many areas there is no such distinction, and phonetic [o:] is commonly phonemicized as /oo/, giving our word the transcription moo. This vowel [o:], whether phonemicized as /oo/ or /oo/, corresponds historically to the vowel oo in Siamese, as in
Siamese phoo³ 'father', moo³ 'pot'. This Central Tai word moo or moo always has in these dialects (like qua above) the tone which developed from an earlier A-tone with originally voiced initial, so that the Siamese cognate of this Central Tai word, if it occurred, would be *moo¹.

To give a few examples, this form of the word for 'ox' is given in Savina's (1924:61a) dictionary of Mûng and also in his (1910) dictionary of Tay. Li (1977:240) also cites it from Diguet's glossary of Thô. It is the word for 'ox' in the displaced Western Mûng dialect mentioned above. Across the border in China, Li (1940:261b; cf.1977:172) gives this form for the dialect of Longzhou, and I have recorded it in the dialects of Lung Ming, Lei Ping, Ning Ming, and Ping Siang.

The complete agreement among these Central Tai dialects in the form of this word suggests that it is old in this branch of Tai. Whatever its ultimate origin, whether native or a loan-word from elsewhere, its shape suggests an onomatopoetic creation.

This word for 'ox' is recorded also as occurring in two languages of the South-Western branch, which otherwise and more commonly have for 'ox' words of the type qua described above. Both the Reinhorn (1970:1672) and Kerr (1972:930a) dictionaries of Lao have brief entries for moo 'ox', marking it as 'archaic' -- one would like to know when and where and how this word was used in Lao -- and Cushing's (1914:509) Shan dictionary has an entry for moo glossed as 'a couplet for woo, as ka⁵ woo⁴ ka⁵ moo⁴ "to traffic in bulloces"', apparently roughly equivalent to Siamese khaa⁴ qua⁴ khaa⁴ khwaay⁴ ('to trade in cattle', lit. oxen and water buffalo). Both the Lao and the Shan forms agree in tone with the Central Tai word. Can it be that in early times traders from Viet-Nam far to the east brought oxen (and their name for the ox) to sell in Laos and even as far as Burma?

Li (1977:240) cites moo forms from Mûng, Thô², and Shan under his entry for Siamese qua with a query. There seems to be no doubt that moo and qua are actually entirely different words. The phonological problems involved in the word qua, discussed above, are bad enough without dragging in moo¹.

The Dôi dictionary (Esquirol 1908:319) of a Tai dialect of the Northern branch gives a form moo¹ glossed as 'cri du boeuf'. The example given makes it clear that the word is a verb. The tone is that of an original B-tone word with an original voiced initial, so that the cognate in Siamese, if it existed, would be *moo³. We may safely assume that this is a local onomatopoeia, no more significant for comparative purposes than the English 'to moo'.

Interestingly, the Saek² word for 'ox' is boo⁴, which is at least partially similar to our Central Tai type moo or moo.
but it may well be that the Saek form has nothing to do with the Central Tai word. The tone of Saek \textit{boo4} marks it as a non-native word. The Saek 4th tone (phonetically high rising-falling) occurs on words that had the earlier A-tone with an originally voiced initial (like, for example, Saek \textit{naa4} 'ricefield', cognate with Si.\textit{naa1}; or \textit{raa4} 'house', cognate with Si.\textit{ran1}); no native Saek words with initial \textit{b-} occur with this tone. Saek \textit{b-} words with the original A-tone have now the first tone (phonetically mid level with a slight rise), e.g., \textit{blian1} 'moon', cognate with Siamese \textit{dian1}. It looks as if Saek speakers during their southward migration from the Northern Tai areas of China lost (or never had) the typical Northern Tai word for 'ox', and somewhere acquired the Vietnamese name for the animal.

\textbf{Northern type: Yay sia}

Tai languages of the Northern branch are spoken in a fairly large area of southern China -- especially in eastern Yunnan, southern Guizhou, and western Guangxi -- with a small spill-over across the border into Viet-Nam, and there is also the displaced Northern Tai language, Saek, now located far to the south.

So far as available data show, all these Northern Tai languages, except Saek, agree in using the same word for the 'ox'. In Yay, spoken in the neighbourhood of Lao Kay near the Chinese border in Viet-Nam, the form of this word is \textit{sia4} (Gedney, fieldnotes), while the old much-cited Dioi dictionary by Esquirol and Williatte (1908:46) gives the form \textit{chie2} for this Guizhou dialect.

Northern Tai forms cited in Li (1977:169,172) are Po-ai \textit{sii}, Dioi \textit{chie}, Hsi-lin \textit{sie}, and Wu-ming \textit{sii}, all with Li's tonal category A2. For Po-ai the index to the book gives a different vowel, \textit{sii} (Li 1977:339). In the glossary of Li's monograph on the dialect of Wu-ming the form is transcribed, with two tones indicated, high falling or low falling (Li 1956:222b, \textit{gu}).

\textit{Buyi}, the Chinese publication on forty dialects of Pu-yi in southern Guizhou also enters the word for 'ox' (\textit{Buyi} 1959:223,0219). These forms are: \textit{gie2} at Points 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 16, 19; \textit{wu3} at Point 3; \textit{gi2} at Points 8, 13-15, 17, 30; \textit{tsie2} at Points 10, 20; \textit{tsue2} at Points 11, 12, 22, 24-26, 28, 29, 36, 40; \textit{sew2} at Points 18, 38; \textit{tsel2} at Points 21, 39; \textit{tsue2} at Point 23; \textit{tsuem2} at Point 27; \textit{toi2} at Points 31-35; \textit{si2} at Point 37.

There would seem to be no doubt that all these Northern Tai forms are variants of the same word. Many of the apparent differences among them are due merely to different transcriptional conventions; a conspicuous example of this is found in
Li's two different (1956 v. 1977) transcriptions of the Wu-ming form. Some of the Pu-yei forms obviously reflect minute allophonic variants rather than genuine phonological differences, while in other cases there seem to be genuine phonological differences; for example, four different vocalic nuclei seem to be represented, the monophthongs \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{ii} \) (high back unrounded) and the diphthongs \( \text{ia} \) and \( \text{ia} \).

For our purposes the interesting question here is whether the genuine differences among the various Northern Tai forms (setting aside mere differences in transcription and non-phonemic phonetic variants) agree with, or violate, regular phonological correspondences among these various Northern Tai dialects. If they agree, then the inference is that this name for the 'ox' is old in this branch of Tai. If they fail to agree, then we must suspect a later innovation borrowed from outside or borrowed from one dialect to another, or both. To test this question we must examine three elements, the tone, the initial, and the vocalic nucleus.

So far as tone is concerned, virtually all the forms have tones which are the regular development of the earlier A-tone in words having an originally voiced initial. This is true of the 4th tone in Yay, Li's A2 category, the 2nd tone in Pu-yei, and the raised 2 symbol in Dioi. We find only two apparent exceptions. Pu-yei Point 3 has not 2nd tone but 3rd. The Pu-yei 3rd tone is the one normally developed from the earlier C tone with an originally voiceless initial. This might be an error in transcription, though usually the editors of the Buyi material mark forms where they suspect error, but make no comment here. Other 2nd tone words in Pu-yei have the expected 2nd tone at Point 3, with a great many examples, but with one other exception: Pu-yei pen2 'expensive' (Buyi 1959:197,0025, cognate with Si.\( \text{pheet} \)), has 3rd tone at Point 3, just like 'ox'. This inconsistency can hardly be the result of mishearing by the recorder; at Point 3 the 2nd tone is low falling, the 3rd tone high rising (ibid.16).

And for Wu-ming we have the puzzling indication of two tones on the word for 'ox' in Li's monograph (1956:222b), although in his Handbook (1977:240) he seems to disregard the first of the two tones given in the glossary. Of the two tones in the glossary, the latter one, low falling, is the one expected for Li's A2 category. The former, high falling, is the one developed from the earlier C tone in words having an original voiced initial, such as Wu-ming ram 'water' (cognate with Si.\( \text{naam} \)); this tone would be historically wrong for our word.

It is difficult to decide whether these two apparent tonal deviations, in Pu-yei Point 3 and in Wu-ming, are significant enough to cast doubt on the age of our word in Northern Tai. If it turns out that our study of the initials
and the vocalic nuclei shows phonological regularity, then we would probably be justified in disregarding these two minor tonal deviations and assume that they have some explanation.

Turning to the initial, Northern Tai languages all have two contrasting sounds of this general phonetic type (sibilants and similar sounds). In Yay, these two sounds are s and θ respectively. In Li's Po-ai material cited throughout the Handbook (1977), they are ʂ and ʐ (a voiceless lateral fricature). In his Wu-ming glossary (1956), they are q and θ. In Dioi (Esquirol 1908) they are represented respectively by ch (presumably meant, in the French manner, to indicate the sibilant ʂ) and s. In Buy?, the first is represented by a great many different phonetic symbols, as shown in the list of forms cited above; the second is represented by s.

The first of these two Northern Tai sounds (Yay s, Po-ai ʂ, etc.) is the one occurring as the initial of our word for 'ox'. This initial occurs both in words whose tone indicates an original voiced initial and in words whose tone indicates an original voiceless initial. In the former category, the one which concerns us, this initial usually reflects an original voiced ʂ, appearing in modern Siamese as ch. There are a few other Northern Tai words in which this initial has other sources, e.g., Yay saw', 'evening meal', 3 cognate with the obsolete Siamese word phraw1, and a few other words believed to have had an original voiced cluster initial (see Li 1977:95). It seems unlikely that these need concern us, since the vast majority of words with this Northern Tai initial go back to ʂ, but anyone seeking the ultimate origin of the Northern Tai word for 'ox' will have to keep such alternative sources of the initial in mind.

In attacking the question of regularity of phonological correspondences in initial in the word for 'ox' among the Northern Tai dialects, one looks, of course, for words in each dialect having the same initial. One is at first overwhelmed by the abundance of available examples; each source has dozens of words with this initial. Therefore, a selection of half a dozen of the more familiar examples is made here to try to render the material manageable. 4

'early' (Si. chaaw ʰ): Yay saw6, Po-ai šau C2 (p.168); Dioi chaou3 (p.36); Wu-ming šзу (p.170) gau (p.217); Pu-yi (p.219, 0180) gau ʰ at Points 1-7, 16, 17, 19; šau ʰ at Points 8, 13, 18, 38; tsau ʰ at Points 22-25, 30, 32-35, 40; tsau3 at Points 31, 36; form missing at Points 9-12, 20, 21, 26-29, 37, 39.
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'rope' (Si.čhāk³): Yay saak⁵; Po-ai saak D2L (pp.31, 35, 168, 282); Dioi cha (p.23); Wu-ming saak (p.171), ⁵
gök (p.25); Pu-yi (p.219, 0192) gök at Points 1, 2: ga⁶ at Points 3-7, 16, 17; sa⁶ at Points 8, 9, 13-15, 37; tsa⁸ at Points 10, 22, 24, 40; tsak⁸ at Points 11, 12, 20, 21, 26-28, 39; sak⁸ at Points 18, 38; ga⁸ at Point 19; tsa⁷ at Point 23; tsak⁷ at Point 25; tsa⁶ at Points 29-31, 36; tsa³ at Point 32; tsa at Points 33-35.

'name' (Si.čhī³): Yay soo⁵; Po-ai sī (pp.169, 265); Dioi cho (p.54); Wu-ming soo (p.172), gā (p.221); Pu-yi (p.220, 0196) gō⁶ at Points 1-7, 16, 17, 19; go⁶ at Points 8, 9, 13-15, 18, 38; tso⁶ at Points 10, 12, 20, 22-2⁴, 26, 28, 32-3⁴, 36, 40; tse⁶ at Points 11, 29; tso² at Point 27; tseau⁶ at Point 29; tseau⁶ at Points 30, 31, 35; form missing at Points 21, 25, 37.

'hole' (Si.čhō³): Yay soq⁵; Po-ai sōq B2 (p.169); Dioi chō (p.60); Wu-ming so (p.171), gā (p.221); Pu-yi (p.220, 0202) gō⁶ at Points 1-7, 16, 17; so⁶ at Points 8, 9, 13-15, 37, 38; tso⁶ at Points 10-12, 30, 39; suan⁶ at Point 18; quin⁶ at Point 19; tsuan⁶ at Points 20, 21, 23-2⁹, 31-3⁶, 40; tseau⁵ at Point 22.

'to soak' (Si.čhē³): Yay see⁵; ⁶ Dioi che (p.38); Pu-yi (p.221, 0204) ge⁶ at Points 1-7, 16, 17, 19; se⁶ at Points 8, 9, 13-15, 37; tse⁶ at Points 10, 20, 22-2⁶, 32, 36, 4⁰; tse⁶ at Point 11; toe⁶ at Points 21, 2⁵, 3³, 3⁴; tse¹ at Point 27; tāi⁶ at Point 29; ge⁶ at Point 30; toe⁶ at Point 35; form missing at Points 12, 1⁵, 3¹, 3⁸, 3⁹.

'female organ' (a Northern Tai word; Central and South-Western Tai use another word, hii⁵ in Si.): Yay siat⁵; no Po-ai form available; Dioi chat, chieut, chieu (p.37); Wu-ming siat D2L (p.253), guat (p.223); Pu-yi (p.222, 0213) *qíː at Points 1-2, 4-7, 9, 13, 1⁹, 3⁷, 3⁸; qet at Points 8, 119

* Bùyû 1959: 222, 0213 nushēng zhǐqi 'female genitalia'. (Ed.)
The initials of our word for 'ox' and the six other words cited show exact correspondences, with no exceptions, in four languages: Yay ʈ, Po-ai ʈ, Dioi ʈ, and Wu-ming ʈ in Li's *Handbook* transcription, ʈ in the 1956 glossary.

The initials in the Pu-yi material are more complicated. The transcription apparently aims at extreme phonetic refinement, in the manner traditional in dialect geography. The Editors of *Buyr* (1959) recognized that these initials are all the same phonologically (or perhaps historically) by grouping the forty­odd examples together (ibid., 217­23). To study in detail the allophones and geographical variants exhibited in the initials of our seven words ('ox', plus 'early', etc.) would also divert us from our purposes. What matters to us is that, as in Yay, Dioi, Po-ai, and Wu-ming, the initial of 'ox' corresponds with that of the other words; although Pu-yi shows some slight variation from point to point in one word or another, it is clear that in general these seven words have the same initial, or possibly at most two phonemic initials.

The facts concerning the Pu-yi initials in our seven words may, therefore, be summarized as follows, disregarding occasional missing forms at one point or another: there are, in general, two phonetic types, the first ʈ or ʈ, and the second ʈ.

Initial ʈ is found in all seven words at Points 1­7, 16, 17, 19. Initial ʈ is found in all words except 'female organ', which has ʈ, at Points 37, 38. Initial ʈ is found in all words except 'ox' and 'female organ', which have ʈ, at Points 8, 9, 13­15. Initial ʈ is found in all the words except for ʈ in 'to soak' and 'female organ' at Point 18. Environment (i.e. the following vowel) seems to account for some alternations -- that is, ʈ tends to occur before front vowels -- but in many cases the fluctuations seem to be due merely to accidental shifts in the recorder's choice of symbols.

The second type, ʈ, is found in all seven words at Points 10­12, 22­25, 36, 39, 40. Initial ʈ is replaced by ʈ at Points 21, 28, 29, 33­35 in 'to soak', at Point 26 in 'female organ', and at Points 31­35 in 'ox'. ʈ is replaced by ʈ at Point 30 in 'ox' and 'to soak', and at Point 33 in 'female organ'. Again, there is a tendency for ʈ and ʈ to occur (or for the recorder to think he hears it) instead of ʈ when a front vowel follows. ʈ rather than ʈ in 'ox' at Point 27 is surprising,
as is  in 'female organ' at Point 21.

We cannot be sure without looking at the entire inventory of Pu-yi initial consonants, but it seems as if a phonemicist attempting a synchronic analysis of these data would probably conclude that there are two initial consonant phonemes involved, each in a different geographical area, one /s/, with [q] as an allophone occurring especially before front vowels, and the other /ts/, with various allophones, many of them likewise conditioned by a following front vowel. Each of these contrasts with all other Pu-yi initial consonant phonemes, except for one complication. This arises out of the occurrence now and then in the data of [tq]. This sound coincides with an entirely different Pu-yi initial consonant found in such words as toa 'rice seedling, shoot' (Bu¥¥ 1959: 277, 0625) (cognate with Si.kla tä) and toan 'middle' (Bu¥¥ 1959: 278, 0637) (cognate with Si. klaan), 7 a phonemic problem fortunately irrelevant to our subject.

The evidence, then, is for phonologically regular correspondences in the initial of the word for 'ox' in the Northern Tai languages, supporting a view that this word is old in that branch.

We turn now to the vocalic nucleus of the word, which as we have seen varies among the two monophthongs i and a and the diphthongs ia and a, with here and there some other vowel. Ideally, we would like to find other Northern Tai words exhibiting forms rhyming exactly in each dialect with the word for 'ox'. Such evidence would argue conclusively that these words are old in this branch, going back at least to the period of Proto-Northern Tai unity. Unfortunately, a search of the available Northern Tai material has failed to turn up any other words rhyming everywhere with 'ox'. But two other words, those for 'ear' and 'snake', agree rather closely, sufficiently so to justify a study of them. 8

The forms for 'ear' (Si.huu) are: Yay ria; Dioi theueu (i.e. $\delta$ia) (p.506); Po-ai lii A2; Wu-ming rii (Li 1977: 233-4). The Pu-yi forms (p.246, 0392) are $\delta$we at Points 1, 2, 4, 10, 16, 19, 20, 23; $\delta$w at Points 3, 8, 14, 18, 24-29, 39, 40; $\delta$ie at Points 5-7, 9; $\delta$w at Point 11; $\delta$w at Points 12, 37, 38; $\delta$i at Points 13, 15, 17; $\delta$ei at Point 21; $\delta$w at Point 22; $\delta$e at Points 30-35; form missing at Point 36.

The forms for 'snake' (Si.juu) are: Yay ria; Dioi gueeu (i.e. $\xi$ia) (p.145); Po-ai qi A2; Wu-ming qii (Li 1977: 204-5); Pu-yi (p.295, 0759) $\theta$we at Points 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 16, 19, 20, 23; $\theta$w at Points 3, 8, 9, 11, 13-15, 17, 18,
We must now undertake a comparison of the vocalic nuclei in our three words in all these Northern Tai dialects, a situation which turns out to be less complicated than in the case of the initials. Three different patterns of correspondences emerge from the data. In the first pattern, all dialects have the same vocalic nucleus in all three words. In the second type, 'ear' and 'snake' agree, but 'ox' is different. In the third pattern, 'ox' and 'ear' agree, but 'snake' is different.

FIRST PATTERN (same vocalic nucleus in all three words):
\( \ddagger \ddagger \) in all three words: Po-ai (if \( \ddagger \ddagger \) is the correct vowel in the Po-ai word for 'ox'), Wu-ming, and Pu-yi Points 3, 11, 18, 22, 24-28, 38, 40. \( \ddagger \ddagger \) in all three words at Pu-yi Point 21; \( \ddagger a \) in all three words at Point 23.

SECOND PATTERN (same vocalic nucleus in 'ear' and 'snake', but a different one in 'ox'): \( \ddagger a \) in 'ox' but \( \ddagger a \) in 'ear' and 'snake' in Yay, Dioi, and Pu-yi Points 1, 2, 4, 10, 16, 19, 20. \( \ddagger i \) in 'ox' but \( \ddagger \ddagger \) in 'ear' and 'snake' in Po-ai (if \( \ddagger i \) is the correct vowel in the Po-ai word for 'ox') and Pu-yi Points 8, 14, 37. \( \ddagger i \) in 'ox' but \( \ddagger \ddagger \) in 'ear' and 'snake' at Pu-yi Point 39.

THIRD PATTERN (same vocalic nucleus in 'ox' and 'ear' but a different one in 'snake'): \( \ddagger a \) in 'ox' and 'ear' but \( \ddagger a \) in 'snake' at Pu-yi Points 5-7, and \( \ddagger \ddagger \) in 'snake' at Point 9. \( \ddagger i \) in 'ox' and 'ear' but \( \ddagger \ddagger \) in 'snake' at Pu-yi Points 13, 15, 17, 30, 31, and \( \ddagger \ddagger \) in 'snake' at Points 32-35. \( \ddagger \ddagger \) in 'ox' and 'ear' but \( \ddagger \ddagger \) (diphthong ending in a high back unrounded semi-vowel) in 'snake' at Pu-yi Point 12, and \( \ddagger \ddagger \) at Point 29 (perhaps also Point 36, for which the form for 'ear' is missing?).

It is clear from these data that 'snake' is the most conservative of the three words so far as its vocalic nucleus is concerned. This word has the high back unrounded vowel \( \ddagger \ddagger \) or the diphthong \( \ddagger a \) in almost all dialects (all except \( \ddagger i \) at Pu-yi Point 21 and \( \ddagger \ddagger \) at Points 32-35); the vocalic nucleus has undergone fronting in many dialects in the word for 'ox', and in a somewhat smaller number of dialects in the word for 'ear'.

There is, of course, no doubt that 'ear' and 'snake' are genuine inherited native Tai words; cognates occur in every Tai language or dialect. Hence, our data permit us to formulate
the following hypothesis: these two words, and also the word for 'ox', all had, in the prehistoric Proto-Northern Tai parent language of this branch, the diphthong *ia. In some of the Northern dialects all three words still preserve the agreement in vocalic nucleus. In a long list of Northern dialects, however, the vocalic nucleus has been fronted to ii or ia in 'ox' because of the palatal initial, while in a somewhat shorter list of Northern dialects, such vowel fronting has taken place in the word for 'ear'. The word for 'ear' is believed to have had, in Proto-Tai, an initial cluster of obstruent plus liquid; change of the post-initial liquid to y then caused the vowel fronting. Since Northern Tai *ria 'ear' is cognate with Siamese huu, and Northern Tai *nia 'snake' corresponds to Siamese nuu, one must conclude that if Siamese had the cognate for the Northern Tai word *nia 'ox' (as, of course, it does not have, since *nia is limited to the Northern Tai group), the shape of the Siamese word would be (mirabile dictu!) *chuul, or perhaps *phruul.

South-Western Tai qua and its variants are limited to this branch of the Tai family; the various initials occurring in this word cannot be accounted for by the rules of comparative Tai phonology. The word must, therefore, be an innovation of some sort within this branch, and the various scholars who have reconstructed Proto-Tai forms for this word have surely been mistaken in taking it back to the parent language; they have probably been misled by its occurrence in the more familiar Tai languages. It seems probable that qua and its variants were borrowed at an early period from other non-Tai sources.

Central Tai moo appears from the complete regularity of correspondences among the Central dialects to have probably been present in this group of Tai languages from very early times. The sporadic occurrences of this form to the west, in Shan and Lao, admits of various possible explanations. One is that the Central form underwent some slight diffusion to the west, perhaps in connection with trade. Another is that moo was the word for 'ox' at a more remote period of Central/South-Western Tai unity, but was later replaced almost completely by qua and its variants in the South-Western languages, except for vestigial marginal survivals of moo in Lao and Shan. Still another possibility is that the resemblance is due to coincidence; either the Central form, or the marginal Lao-Shan form, or all of them, may have been independent onomatopoetic creations.

Northern Tai sia dates back to the period of Northern Tai unity, which would mean that Saek broke away from the group at an earlier time, or that Saek may have had the word at one time, but later replaced it by the loanword baa.

Did the speakers of Proto-Tai have a word for the 'ox' as they certainly had for the buffalo? In view of our findings, it is difficult to imagine that either moo or sia (qua being
excluded as certainly a later innovation) could have been the Proto-Tai word for 'ox' and then vanished without a trace except in a single branch. It seems much more plausible to assume that the speakers of the Proto-Tai parent language had no knowledge of this animal, and no name for it. Then later, after the separation into the major Tai groups, the animal came to be known, either through domestication or through introduction from outside, and a name was acquired by each of the major Tai groups. We are unable to say much about dates, but if Proto-Tai is put at about two thousand years ago, as many scholars believe, then this introduction of the various names would have occurred somewhat later, perhaps some fifteen hundred years ago.

The close correlation in the geographical distribution of our three words for the 'ox' with Li Fang-Kuei's three branches of Tai perhaps lends some support to his view of a tripartite genetic branching. On the other hand, the whole matter of the names for the 'ox' may be involved not so much with genetic branches as with ethno-linguistic areas.

The scope of this paper has been intentionally restricted to seeking out and presenting the Tai linguistic evidence on the subject. Two other areas have been deliberately excluded. For one thing, it would be tempting to rummage around in dictionaries and wordlists of non-Tai languages of South-East Asia and the Far East for possible sources of our three words as loans from foreign languages into Tai. But it is felt wiser to leave this to specialists in those other languages, especially as considerable background in their historical phonology would be necessary to identify with certainty possible outside sources, at some time perhaps a millennium and a half ago, for *qua and its variants *wua and *hua in the South-West, *mo in the Central area, and *sia in the North. For another, we understand that students of South East Asian archaeology and prehistory have some theories and knowledge as to when the ox was domesticated in, or introduced into, South East Asia. It is hoped that our evidence that each branch of the Tai family seems to have acquired a name for the 'ox' as an innovation some time after the break-up of the original parent language may be of interest and use to scholars in those disciplines.

NOTES

1. This paper was originally presented at the XIVth International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics held at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A., on the 30th October to 1st November, 1981.

2. Saek is a language belonging to the Northern branch of Tai
(see the next, third type), now displaced far to the south and surviving in a few villages in the province of Nakhon Phanom in north-eastern Thailand and in a few villages on the Lao side of the Mekhong River near Tha Khek.

3. cf. Bütt 1959: 217, 0179: $\text{gau}^2$ at Points 1-7, 16-17, 19; $\text{tsau}^2$ at Points 8-12, 20, 22-4, 39-40; $\text{yau}^2$ at Points 13-15, 18; $\text{tsau}^2$ at Points 21, 25-8, 30-5; $\text{tay}^2$ at Point 29; $\text{tsaw}^2$ at Point 36. (Ed.)

4. Yay forms are from Gedney fieldnotes; Po-ai from Li 1977; Dioi from Esquirol 1908. For Wu-ming, two forms are given (more transcriptional variants), the first from Li 1977, the second from Li 1969; Pu-yi forms are from Bütt 1959. In these word entries they are coded, after Pu-yi, as e.g. (p.219, 0180) instead of (Bütt 1959:219, 0180).

5. This is a typographical error; in the Handbook (Li 1977), long $\text{a}$ is written elsewhere with a single letter $\text{a}$, short $\text{a}$ with the letter $\text{a}$ and a brève.

6. This is not treated in Li (1956 & 1977), so there are no Po-ai or Wu-ming forms available.

7. Abundant examples of this other initial are given in Bütt 1959:277-82. It is represented by $\text{c}$ in Yay ($\text{caa}^3$, $\text{caaq}^1$); $\text{k}$ in Dioi ($\text{kia}$, $\text{klang}$); $\text{t}$ in Po-ai ($\text{taa}$ Cl, $\text{caaq}$ Al); and $\text{kl}$ in Wu-ming ($\text{kla}$, $\text{klaa}$).

8. Words with vocalic nuclei similar to those of 'ox', 'ear', and 'snake', but with a final consonant, appear to have undergone completely different changes, and are not helpful here.

9. Some scholar is, indeed, going to have great fun working out the vicissitudes of the word 'ear' in these and other Tai dialects!
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FIRST AND LAST IN THAI, OR THE ORDER OF OPPOSITIONS

†Mary R. Haas

In 1943 the well-known Chinese writer, Lin Yutang, published a book entitled Between tears and laughter. To me this title was vaguely disquieting—indeed, it seemed quite awkward. Then I realized that the opposition of 'tears' and 'laughter' is normally rendered 'between laughter and tears' in English. In other words, the order is the reverse of that used in Lin's title. Perhaps in Chinese the order is the reverse of English—this I do not know.* In Thai, however, binomials (Malkiel 1968) within this semantic range are regularly the reverse of those in English, and this paper is concerned with binomials containing opposites.

Thai is a language in which the head always precedes the attribute in modifying constructions (e.g. man-good = good man) whereas English is a language in which the opposite order usually pertains. Both languages also make considerable use of various kinds of what are often described as coordinate constructions, and in many of these where the languages appear to have equivalent expressions the word order is the same in both languages. On the other hand, in the case of coordinate constructions involving oppositions, it frequently happens that Thai uses the reverse of the English order, something that has even been observed in expressions which may be calques from English, such as 'black and white (photograph)', rendered in Thai as 'white (and) black (photograph)'.

In studying examples of the order of coordinates which are opposites, I have included coordinate phrases as well as compounds. In the following examples (Haas 1964) Thai word order is the reverse of the English:

1. thûg–gû 'sorrow-happiness', Eng. 'joy and sorrow'
2. prîawwâan 'sour-sweet', Eng. 'sweet and sour'
3. yînthoon 'silver-gold', Eng. 'gold and silver'
4. binpaj–bimmaa 'fly-go fly-come' or 'fly on, fly back' Eng. 'fly back and forth'

* It is lei xiào shì jiàn 'between tears and laughter', which is also better rhythmically in pǔtōnghuà (Mandarin). (Ed.)
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5. thlī mādjīi'kāmī', thīidīi'kāmī' 'some bad, some good', Eng. 'some are good, some are bad'.
6. dīawklàj̄ dīawklàj̄ 'now near, now far', Cf. Eng. 'far and near'.

Theoretically speaking, it would seem that coordinate items could be listed in any order in both English and Thai, but most, if not all, languages have a preferred order which in any given expression will remain fixed. Nevertheless, the question regarding the examples above is: why does Thai have the reverse of English (or English the reverse of Thai)? It appears that while English prefers the order 'favourable:unfavourable' (good and bad, light and dark, etc.), Thai prefers 'unfavourable: favourable.' Lin Yutang's use of 'tears and laughter' rather than 'laughter and tears' thus fits the Thai pattern nicely, but goes against the normal English one.

There are, however, other examples of coordinate oppositions in which somewhat more flexibility exists. Even in examples which are very close semantically, one may have one order and another its reverse, both in Thai and in English.

7. khūu bāawsāaw̄ 'pair groom-bride', Eng. 'bride and groom'
8. sāamīi' phanrajaā (elegant term) 'husband-wife', Eng. 'husband and wife'
9. thāqīī̄ lochaaj̄ 'both women and men', Eng. 'men and women'
10. phāomē̄ 'father and mother, parents', Eng. 'mother and father' (but also 'dad and mom')*

So examples involving male and female oppositions in both languages show a little more flexibility between expressions, even though a given expression tends, as already noted, to remain fixed. An example showing such variation within one expression is the following variant for (8):

8a. phanrajaā sāamīi' 'wife-husband', Eng. 'husband and wife'

This latter has the advantage of showing inner rhyme (-jaa sāa-), a device favoured by some speakers. The examples given here are chosen to show some variation, though it turns out that Thai and English expressions involving male and female opposition tend to place the male term first. But one does find a few expressions placing the female term first, as in English (7) and (10) and Thai (8a) and (9).

* Most commonly 'mum and dad' in England. (Ed.)
In undertaking this study I was hoping to find some explanation for those cases where Thai and English have reverse order in coordinates, but beyond the observation already made that English prefers 'favourable:unfavourable' and Thai prefers the reverse, it would appear that the treatment of oppositions is not subject to generalization. Instead, each expression tends to have its own explanation in both languages. One disruptive influence that occurs in Thai is the desire of many speakers to use inner rhyme, as in (8a), and this may entail the rearrangement of the items in order to bring about the adjacency of the rhyming segments, a device which also accounts for a few cases where two orders are possible in Thai; thus (8) vs. (8a).

Further studies of Thai binomials might, indeed, profit from an areal approach, i.e. a comparative study of the problem in other languages of the area (see Haas 1978).
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Les enquêtes de F. Savina (1931) et de Wang (1951) notaient trois tons dans les syllabes sonores des dialectes* qu'ils décrivaient. C'est seulement en 1963 que Ouyang et Zheng indiquent que si la majorité des dialectes ont trois tons, il en existe à six tons, et ce n'est qu'en 1980 que ces auteurs publient une étude avec un vocabulaire comparé d'un dialecte à trois tons (le parler de Băoding, dialecte Ha3) et d'un autre à six tons (parler de Tongza, dialecte Gei4) (see Table 1, below). La comparaison nous permettra de montrer que le système à trois tons est le plus ancien et que le système à six tons resultera du dédoublement des tons comme dans les langues du continent (chinois, miao-yao, tai-yai et dong-sui).**

Ce dédoublement provient toujours de la fusion d'initiales sonores et d'initiales sourdes, mais le dialecte qui n'a pas mué n'a pas forcément conservé les anciennes initiales, et quatre cas se présentent:

1. Le dialecte de Băoding a conservé les sonores, assourdis dans celui de Tongza (comme thai-commun y devenant i).

**Exemples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Băoding</th>
<th>Tongza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>van53</td>
<td>fan11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vau53</td>
<td>fau11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veu53</td>
<td>feu11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo:n53</td>
<td>fo:n11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ve:q55</td>
<td>fe:q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va55</td>
<td>fwa13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ve:q11</td>
<td>fe:q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi:p55</td>
<td>fi:p13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Savina described the regional dialect of the Southern day, Wáng Lì that of Báišā, hjm:nl dialect (MSC běndì). (Ed.)

** Dong-Sui = Kam-Sui (Ed.)
Nous pouvons donc, sur ces exemples opposer, à Tongza, une série tonale basse: 11, 131, 13 à une série tonale haute: 33, 51, 55. L'ordre dans lequel nous avons rangé les tons de Baodìng est celui de l'ancien chinois: le premier ton le plus fréquent est égal, le second est montant (il coïncide avec celui des mots à occlusive finale, donc il avait à l'origine un glottal stop final) et le troisième est descendant; donc même origine probable que le chinois et le vietnamien.

Nous avons les même correspondances tonales avec les sifflantes si nous remarquons que la sifflante sourde s se réalise en latérale sourde comme dans nombreux dialectes du continent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Éxemples:</th>
<th>Baodìng</th>
<th>Tongsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zai53</td>
<td>t'ai11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zen53</td>
<td>t'en11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zeiq53</td>
<td>t'ei11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ziq53</td>
<td>t'i11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>za55</td>
<td>t'a131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zuw55</td>
<td>t'au131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>za:u55</td>
<td>t'a:u131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zi:m55</td>
<td>t'i:m131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zi:q55</td>
<td>t'iaq131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zu:i11</td>
<td>t'u:i14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zok55</td>
<td>t'ok13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrastant avec</td>
<td>t'ao53</td>
<td>t'a33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'ai53</td>
<td>t'ai33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'an53</td>
<td>t'an33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'oe:i53</td>
<td>t'ai33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'ew53</td>
<td>t'eu33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'wu:n53</td>
<td>t'wu:n33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'en53</td>
<td>t'en33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'ai:n55</td>
<td>t'ai:n51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'un55</td>
<td>t'un51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'a:u11</td>
<td>t'a:u55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'au11</td>
<td>t'au55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'eq11</td>
<td>t'eq55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'i:n11</td>
<td>t'i:n55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'wu:q11</td>
<td>t'wu:q55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'a:c55</td>
<td>t'a:t13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'ip55</td>
<td>t'ip13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'o:k55</td>
<td>t'o?:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'u:t55</td>
<td>t'u:t13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t'u:k55</td>
<td>t'u?:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oreille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>givre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jaune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sangsue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>serpent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dévêêtir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lâcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>doigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voler, dérober</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Li (peuple, langue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>choisir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>salive; plusieurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gendre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s'éveiller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chaud, tiède</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chapeau de paille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>langue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clair (temps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foudroyeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>profond; sourd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cerveau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. La confusion des initiales s'est faite au profit des sonores en Tongza (comme thai-commun hw devenant y)

**Exemples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bao Ding</th>
<th>Tongza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>za⁵³</td>
<td>za¹¹ vieux; remède</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zu:m⁵³</td>
<td>zu:m¹¹ oeuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za:u¹¹</td>
<td>za:u¹⁴ grenier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zu¹¹</td>
<td>zo¹⁴ mari de soeur ainée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zum¹¹</td>
<td>zum¹⁴ rapide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exemples s'opposant à

| hja⁵³ | za³³ Imperata, herbe à paillotte |
| hjau⁵³ | zau³³ haricots |
| hjo:n⁵³ | zo:n³³ chanter |
| hja:m⁵⁵ | za:m⁵¹ franchir |
| hjan⁵⁵ | zu:n¹¹ ver |
| hjau⁵³ | zau³³ reins |
| hja⁵⁵ | za:u²¹ avaler |

Il s'agit d'anciennes semi-voyelles: j; et nous avons un cas analogue avec les anciens y, y (noté g, comme en vietnamien puisque b, d sont des glottalisées).

**Exemples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bao Ding</th>
<th>Tongza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gwa⁵³</td>
<td>gwa¹¹ semer, planter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga:m⁵³</td>
<td>ga:m¹¹ demander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga⁵³</td>
<td>gau¹¹ nous (inclusif)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwa:i⁵³</td>
<td>gwa:i¹¹ laver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwa:n⁵³</td>
<td>gwa:n¹¹ cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei⁵³</td>
<td>gei¹¹ esp. de palmier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geu⁵³</td>
<td>geu¹¹ mince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gia⁵³</td>
<td>gia¹¹ tousser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go:i⁵³</td>
<td>ga:i¹¹ fer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gou⁵³</td>
<td>gou¹¹ huit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gom⁵³</td>
<td>gom¹¹ son de riz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu:q⁵³</td>
<td>gu:q¹¹ cadets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bāoding vs. Tongza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bāoding</th>
<th>Tongza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ga:i⁵⁵</td>
<td>ga:i¹³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwai⁵⁵</td>
<td>gwai¹³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gou⁵⁵</td>
<td>gou¹³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwou¹¹</td>
<td>go¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gom¹¹</td>
<td>gam¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwiu¹¹</td>
<td>gwiu¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gi:q¹¹</td>
<td>giaq¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwei¹¹</td>
<td>gu:i¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gat⁵⁵</td>
<td>gat¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gip⁵⁵</td>
<td>gip¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ge:k⁵⁵</td>
<td>ge:?¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu:k⁵⁵</td>
<td>gu:?¹³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contrastant avec

| wa:u⁵³      | gwa:u³³    | bol        |
| hwa:i⁵³     | gwa:i³³    | dépasser   |
| hwan⁵³      | gwan³³     | ver de terre |
| hwo:n⁵³     | go:n³³     | fumée      |
| hwom⁵³      | gom³³      | rond       |
| hwat⁵⁵      | gwat¹³     | dur        |

3. Mais nous avons un cas où l'ancienne sonore, conservée en Tongza, est devenue sourde en Bāoding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bāoding</th>
<th>Tongza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hwan⁵³</td>
<td>van¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwo:n⁵³</td>
<td>vo:n¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwi:q⁵³</td>
<td>viaq¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwi:n⁵³</td>
<td>vi:n¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwan⁵⁵</td>
<td>van¹³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwi:q⁵⁵</td>
<td>viaq¹³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwe:k⁵⁵</td>
<td>ve:?¹³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C'est que ces dialectes n'ont plus de semivoyelles sonores mais seulement: `hi`, `?i`, `hw`, `?w`. 
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4. Enfin dans le cas suivant où nous n'avons plus que des sourdes actuelles, nous ajouterons les mots recueillis par Savina (1931) dans un dialecte du sud actuellement disparu qui pourra nous éclairer.

**Exemples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baoqing</th>
<th>Tongna</th>
<th>Dialecte de Savina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pou 53</td>
<td>pau 11</td>
<td>porc mâu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa 53</td>
<td>pa 11</td>
<td>chien mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa: n53</td>
<td>pu: n11</td>
<td>cinq mâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peu 53</td>
<td>pa: u11</td>
<td>venir mûn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>po:i 53</td>
<td>pa: i11</td>
<td>stupide -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pui 53</td>
<td>pui 11</td>
<td>ivre mûi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pou 55</td>
<td>pau 131</td>
<td>année mâu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pai 11</td>
<td>pi 114</td>
<td>mère mèi**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pom 11</td>
<td>pam 14</td>
<td>bouche môm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pue: m11</td>
<td>pue: m14</td>
<td>barbe mûm, mûm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan 11</td>
<td>pan 14</td>
<td>humide mên</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put 55</td>
<td>put 13</td>
<td>fourmi -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>po:t 55</td>
<td>po: t13</td>
<td>puce mât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiu 53</td>
<td>tiu 11</td>
<td>rat niù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teu 53</td>
<td>teu 11</td>
<td>dessus nôr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tom 53</td>
<td>tom 11</td>
<td>six nôm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta 55</td>
<td>ta 131</td>
<td>rizière nà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten 55</td>
<td>ten 131</td>
<td>droite nîn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta: u11</td>
<td>ta: u14</td>
<td>long nào</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tseu 53</td>
<td>tseu 11</td>
<td>tirer*** -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan 53</td>
<td>kan 11</td>
<td>argent ngôrô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keu 53</td>
<td>keu 11</td>
<td>sésame ngôrô</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Savina's transcriptions are often irregular (e.g. 1931: 147b mâu 'porc', 108a mâu; 109a mâu 'année', 148a mâu, 181b mâu), so entries here are based on his 'Lexique day-français' and 'Différences dialectales...', 107-10, not other parts of the article. (Ed.)

**See, esp., Savina 1931: 104, 148b. (Ed.)

***Savina 1931: 170b thô 'tirer', 154b nhôt 'flèche'. (Ed.)
Aucun dialecte actuel ne présente les b, ð, t, k, attendu mais les nasales que Savina nota vers 1925 devaient être des nasales fortes longues qui ont donné des seminasaless: mb, nd ... engendrant les sonores nécessaires à la mutation tonale. Certain de ces mots ont en thai commun une initiale complexe: hm- (v. 'porc, chien'), hm- (v. 'rat'), 'rizière' est rna en khmu, et 'cinq', 'six' ont du être lma, ?nom (austro-nésien: lima, ?onom); parmi les étymologies indonésiennes on peut ajouter: 'sésame' l nga (indonésien: lenga) (Dempwolff 1938:95a).


Exemples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baoding</th>
<th>Tongsa</th>
<th>Savina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ku:n⁵³</td>
<td>ku:n³³</td>
<td>cu:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko:i⁵³</td>
<td>ka:i³³</td>
<td>(ći 'miel', l19a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te:ŋ⁵³</td>
<td>te:ŋ³³</td>
<td>tĕng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pok⁵⁵</td>
<td>pok⁵⁵</td>
<td>(bông, l114b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

En réalité, ces anciennes occlusives sourdes sont aussi issues de groupes de consonnes, comme le suggère le nom du 'chemin' (ku:n), thai-commun: hron; Dong-Sui: khwan. A la différence des langues du continent, la mutation des initiales qui a produit le dédoublement des tons n'a concerné que les anciennes occlusives longues (issues de groupes) et les spirantes. Les anciennes occlusives simples sont représentées par les occlusives aspirées (comme l'a montré R. Shafer, 1957:391-95), qui n'ont pas participées à la mutation, non plus que les occlusives nasales (puisqu'il n'y avait pas de nasales sourdes), formant ainsi une série moyenne dont les réalisations tonales se confondent avec la série haute.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Tones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tongsa (gei₁)</td>
<td>1₄ 3₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2₅ 1₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4₁ ₁₁C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5₉ 5₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6₆ 1₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8₈ 1₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9₉ 4₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baoång (ha³)</td>
<td>1₄ 5₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3₁ ₁₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1₄ 5₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3₁ ₁₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ 5₅(8₈ 1₃)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Båishå (hjw:n¹)</td>
<td>1₄ ₁₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2₇ 3₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3₁ ₃₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1₁ ₁₁(₄ ₅₁)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2₇ 3₁(₅ ₇₅)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3₁ ₃₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8₈ ₁₁(₇ ₇₅)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8₈ ₁₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ ₅₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xifång (mo:i¹ fæu¹)</td>
<td>1₄ 5₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3₁ ₂₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1₄ 5₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2₇ 5₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3₁ ₂₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ ₅₅(₈ ₁₃)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ ₅₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇ ₅₅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Major differences between tones of the Li dialects:

gei₁, ha³, hjw:n¹, and mo:i¹ fæu¹.

(Adapted from Ouyång 1980:88. Ed.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In *A handbook of comparative Tai*, published in 1977, I reconstructed two Proto-Tai (PT) consonants *kh- and *x-. These two consonants merge into kh- in most of the South-Western and Central Tai languages, such as Siamese and Lungchow, but they are distinguished in the Northern group of Tai languages, such as Po-ai, where PT *kh- becomes k (unaspirated) and PT *x- becomes h-. A few examples may be given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT *kh-</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>Lungchow</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to kill'</td>
<td>khaa Cl</td>
<td>khaa Cl</td>
<td>kaa Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'horn'</td>
<td>khau Al</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>kau Al</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT *x-</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>Lungchow</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to enter'</td>
<td>khau Cl</td>
<td>khau Cl</td>
<td>hau Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to step across'</td>
<td>khaam Cl</td>
<td>khaam Cl</td>
<td>haam Cl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reconstructions are obvious enough, but there is some disturbing evidence from the South-Western group of languages which makes me reconsider the whole problem, particularly the problem of aspiration in Proto-Tai.

In White Tai and some of the Lü dialects, and also, I believe, in Old Siamese, i.e. of the Sukhothai period or about that time, there is a split of both PT *kh- and *x-. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT *kh-</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>White Tai</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to kill'</td>
<td>khaa Cl</td>
<td>xa Cl</td>
<td>kaa Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'arm'</td>
<td>khœn Al</td>
<td>xœn Al</td>
<td>òen Al</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT *x-</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>White Tai</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'white'</td>
<td>khaau Al</td>
<td>xau Al</td>
<td>haau Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to enter'</td>
<td>khau Cl</td>
<td>xāu Cl</td>
<td>hau Cl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. PT *kh-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>White Tai</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khum Al</td>
<td>khum Al</td>
<td>kum A2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PT *x-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'ditch, pit'</th>
<th>'to ride on horseback'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khii Bl</td>
<td>khi, khii Bl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly my Lü material, as yet unpublished, from Cheng Tung in Yunnan province, shows the same split as in White Tai. It is evident that kh- or x- represent both PT *kh- and *x in White Tai and Lü. This is not a random split, as it has its reflexes in the Northern Tai languages. x- appears in words which show tone series 1 (indicating original voiceless initials) in all dialects, but kh- appears in words which show tone series 2 (indicating original voiced initials) in the Northern Tai languages. Now, White Tai and Lü are South-Western languages, far removed from the Northern group; the split which agrees with the tone alternation in the Northern group must indicate some early phonological condition in the Proto-Tai period. It is for this reason that I wish to amend my previous reconstruction.

Siamese orthography formerly provides two symbols for the modern consonant kh-; one corresponds to the Indic letter kh- (kJ), and the other is a modified form of the Indic kh- (kj). There must have been a difference in pronunciation between these two letters, although they merge in modern Siamese. At the present time the modified form of Indic kh- is no longer used. From the Sukhothai inscriptions, some words which show the modified form of kh- -- such as khaa Cl 'to kill'; khesn Al 'arm'; khaau Al 'white'; khin Cl 'to ascend'; khaam Cl 'to step across', etc. -- all agree with x- in White Tai and Lü. This fact had already been noticed by Burnay and Coedès (1928:125). It may imply two things. First, we may simply assume in modern Siamese (Modern Standard Thai, i.e. MST), that the two distinct sounds of the Sukhothai period have merged, and, therefore, also assume that modern Siamese is a direct descendant of Sukhothai speech; or rather we may conclude that modern Siamese is not a direct descendant of the Sukhothai dialect, but a closely related dialect.

It seems that what has been reconstructed as *kh- and *x- must be given two different forms for each of the PT consonants, i.e. two forms for PT *kh- and two forms for *x. The reconstructed forms must be able to explain the split into
kh- and x- in White Tai, Lü, and Old Siamese, and also the alternation of tone, from series 1 to series 2 in the Northern dialects. It has been known that such alternation of tones occurs chiefly in words with aspirated initials, hence it is quite possible that the aspiration may be the cause of such tone alternations.2

I make the assumption that there were two kinds of aspiration in Proto-Tai, namely *h- and *f-, an assumption based on the aspiration as reflex in the South-Western and Central dialects. *h- is perhaps a voiced aspiration or murmur. Thus, we have in Proto-Tai both *kh- and *kf-; the latter type of consonant being quite common among the Wu dialects in China.

We may now amend our reconstruction of *kh- and *xf- and their development in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>White Tai</th>
<th>Lungchow</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT *kh-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
<td>x-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT *kf-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PNT *g- &gt; k-³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT *x-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
<td>x-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT *f-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
<td>kh-</td>
<td>PNT *h- &gt; h-³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems reasonable to assume that all the aspirated stops may show two forms; one shows no tone alternation, and the other an alternation of tone series 1 to series 2. For example, what have been reconstructed as *tfi- and *~ must also be given two forms each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>White Tai</th>
<th>Lungchow</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT *th</td>
<td>th-</td>
<td>th-</td>
<td>th-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT *tfi</td>
<td>th-</td>
<td>th-</td>
<td>t-(&lt; PNT *d-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT *ph</td>
<td>ph-</td>
<td>ph-</td>
<td>ph-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT *pfi</td>
<td>ph-</td>
<td>ph-</td>
<td>p-(&lt; PNT *b-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assumption seems to explain a fairly large number of tone alternations4 of this type, but by no means explains all alternations of tones.5

NOTES

1. In the following examples, letters A or C after the cited forms indicate the tone class, and the numeral 1 indicates that the initial consonant was originally voiceless. (Li 1977:25).
2. See appropriate sections on PT aspirated stops and on *x- in Li (1977:63-5, 102-4, 192-8, 207-14).

3. PNT (Proto-Northern-Tai) *ɡ- and *ɣ are assumed because they give the same reflexes in the modern Northern Tai dialects as PT *g- and *ɣ.

4. There are other types of tone alternation, such as B2 ~ C2, Cl ~ Bl, C1 ~ B2, etc. It is impossible to take them into consideration at this juncture.

5. Professor William Gedney proposed a new series of voiced initials in Proto-Tai in a paper at the Sino-Tibetan Conference in Paris in 1979. The paper is not published* but, while his idea agrees in general with mine, the reconstructions are different.
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* Professor Gedney's paper, 'Evidence for another series of voiced initials in Proto-Tai', has now been published in his Selected papers on comparative Tai studies ed. R.J. Bickner et al. (Michigan papers on South and Southeast Asia 29, 1989, 229-69). (Ed.)
Introduction: The position of Burmese in Sino-Tibetan

Burmese is the Sino-Tibetan (ST) language with the second largest number of speakers after Chinese. It was the fourth to develop an orthography -- preceded by Chinese, Tibetan, and extinct Xīxiā (Tangut); surviving Burmese inscriptions date from 1112 AD onwards.

Its historical linguistic position within Sino-Tibetan is represented in the following language tree:

![Sino-Tibetan language tree](image_url)

**Fig.1:** Sino-Tibetan language tree
This classification is based on patterns of sound correspondence found in non-borrowed vocabulary, and on proportions of shared basic vocabulary.²

Burmese has a number of regional dialects. The 'standard' language, or central dialect, has subdialects: that of Upper Burma centred on Mandalay, and that of Lower Burma centred on Rangoon. The Arakanese dialect, spoken along the north-western coast and into Bangladesh, has the second largest number of speakers, and is archaic in a number of ways; there are also several other dialects.

Quite closely related to Burmese are Atsi (Tsaiwa), Maru (Lawngwaw) and Lashi, spoken in north-eastern Burma by smaller groups which are part of the 'Kachin' culture complex. These languages show extensive influence from Jinghpaw ('Kachin'), a Baric Tibeto-Burman language according to Burling (1971), and of particular interest within these languages is the wide range of terms used for uncles and aunts.

Terms for Uncles and Aunts

A. Burmese

The system of kinship terms for parents' siblings is an area of substantial dialect difference in Burmese, and of extensive changes observable by comparing older and more recent sources on these dialects. Inscriptional data, mostly summarized in Luce (1981), with some data in Ba Shin (1962) and Than Tun (1958), provide early evidence for some forms though the exact referents of the terms are often hard to determine. Judson (1953) provides early nineteenth century data, and Tun Nyein (1906) gives normative early twentieth-century forms. Two anthropological studies have investigated modern Rangoon usage: Brant and Mi Mi Khaing (1951), and Burling (1965). Most recently, Spiro (1977) discussed the kinship system in depth, with 1960s usage for a village near Mandalay in Upper Burma, reporting 'old' Upper Burma forms, and current Rangoon forms. The three last sources disagree extensively and, indeed, my Burmese informants have always had trouble with these terms, which are in a state of flux: Tun Nyein (1906) actually contains a basic error, calling the father's sister terms 'maternal' and the mother's sister terms 'paternal'. Table 1 below summarizes the data:
| Period: Early Late c.1850 c.1900 'old' (Spiro) c.1960 (Spiro) |
| Source: Inscriptions Judson Tun Nyein Upper Burma Upper Burma Mandalay Rangoon |

<p>| ùyi | MeB | MB | MeB_1 |
| ùyi| MeB_1 |
| wøyi | MeB_2 |
| ùjì | MeB | MeB_2 | PeB_2 |
| ù | MB | MB |
| ùlæjì | PeB_3 |
| ùmin | MyB |
| ùlè | MyB | MyB | PyB |
| wøyîlè | MyB |
| bájì | X | FeB | PeB_1 |
| bábá | FeB (address) | PeB_4 (intimate) |
| bábájì | PeB_5 (intimate) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period:</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>c.1850</th>
<th>c.1900</th>
<th>'old' (Spiro)</th>
<th>c.1960 (Spiro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Inscriptions</td>
<td>Judson</td>
<td>Tun Nyein</td>
<td>Upper Burma</td>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>Rangoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>c.1850</th>
<th>c.1900</th>
<th>'old' (Spiro)</th>
<th>c.1960 (Spiro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ba thwe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FyB</td>
<td>FyB</td>
<td>FyB</td>
<td>FyB</td>
<td>FyB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miyê</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyîjî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FeS</td>
<td>FeS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyîlê</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FeS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miîlê</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MeS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>MeS₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jîdo</td>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>MeS₂</td>
<td>MeS</td>
<td>MeS₁</td>
<td>PeS₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jîjî</td>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
<td></td>
<td>FeS (address)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PeS (intimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PeS₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)dajî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MeS₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mîthwê</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MyS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>MyS₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thwêdô</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)dô</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>MyS₂</td>
<td>MyS₁</td>
<td>PyS₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period: Early</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>c.1850</td>
<td>c.1900</td>
<td>'old' (Spiro) c.1960 (Spiro)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Inscriptions</td>
<td>Judson</td>
<td>Tun Nyein</td>
<td>Upper Burma</td>
<td>Upper Burma</td>
<td>Mandalay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)dolè</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MyS₂</td>
<td>MyS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dodo</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Burmese uncle and aunt terms*

* Forms which occur in inscriptions are indicated by X. Abbreviations are: P = Parent; F = Father; M = Mother; B = Brother; S = Sister; Sb = Sibling; W = Wife; H = Husband; e = elder; y = younger.
Apart from the basic form /y1/, all the above are historically analysable compounds. /u/ is 'head'; /j1/ is 'big' or 'elder'; /lè/ is 'little' or 'younger'; /mīn/ is 'king', /bā/ is a now archaic form for 'father', and /mf/ similarly for 'mother'; /thwè/ is another word for 'younger'; /do/ is probably derived from the royal honorific suffix /to/; and /a/ is a formative prefix used with stative verbs and bound suffixes to form nouns.

In addition to their use as kin terms /u/ and /do/ are now used as honorific prefixes to male and to female names respectively. The radical restructuring of the Rangoon kinship system, with bilateral extensions of all surviving terms, results in extensive confusion among Burmans about the referents of these terms: some of this confusion is reflected in the data of Brant and Mi Mi Khaing (1951). An additional factor is the possibility of kin numeratives (with /j1/ for the first, /la?/ for the second last, and /lè/ for the last; or in inscriptions, /j1/ and /thwè/, /o/ 'old', and /thwè/, or /o/, /thwè/ and /qe/ 'little', in relative order of birth). These numeratives are no longer used in 'standard' Burmese, though Arakanese and other dialects still have them.

B. Arakanese

Forms from the Arakanese dialect are found in Bernot (1967), for the Marma dialect as spoken by a group who fled to what is now Bangladesh at the time of the Burmese conquest in the 1780s, and for 'Magh', the Bengali name for the Arakanese, in Lévi-Strauss (1952), who does not indicate tones. The least Burmanized Arakanese is probably Marma; the Arakanese spoken along the coast in Bangladesh and northern Arakan shows several innovative terms, while in southern Arakan, Burmanized forms are used, as seen in Table 2 below.

The Arakanese /ri/ is regularly cognate with Burmese /y1/, as are /gri/ and /j1/, /thwi/ and /thwe/. The innovative mother's brother term is used for address only in Marma, which also retains conservative forms for the other aunts and uncles. There is a Burmese couplet for husband and wife, /khin bun/, whose first syllable 'husband' may be related to the Arakanese term; this semantic shift may be connected with the Arakanese preference for mother's brother's daughter — father's sister's son marriage. Arakanese /bye/ could be derived from an alternative form of 'father'; /ywe/ is more problematic, though there is a Burmese bound couplet /ywe/ 'to associate familiarly and affectionately' (Judson 1953:864), but if this is the source, the Burmese spelling is etymologically wrong, although it is not unparalleled for the Burmese spelling, when representing a dialect which has merged /r/ into /y/, to 'respell' words incorrectly. Arakanese further has traces of suffixes for birth-order differences which provide for up to four ordered possibilities, as shown for Rangoon Burmese by Brant and Mi Mi Khaing (1951).
Table 2: *Arakanese uncle and aunt terms*

C. Burmish

In other Burmish languages, many of the uncle and aunt terms are loanwords from Jinghpaw ('Kachin'). Burling (1971) demonstrates that the kinship structure of Maru has been rearranged into the Jinghpaw pattern, and that Maru has borrowed a number of Jinghpaw terms. Table 3 shows the overall pattern.
Atsi shows two Jinghpaw loanwords, for the cross-uncles and cross-aunts; and Maru dialect reported by Burling has shifted the meanings of some terms and, like Atsi and Jinghpaw, does not distinguish relative age for cross-uncles and aunts. Under the 'Kachin' system of marriage, there is a strong preference for mother's brother's daughter—father's sister's son marriage, so it is not too surprising that the Lashi term for mother's brother is, in fact, cognate with the usual Burmish term for wife's father. In the 'Kachin' system, each lineage is in a wife-receiving relationship with one other patriline and is in a wife-giving relationship with another patriline. The Atsi are the Burmish group most tightly integrated into this system.

As in Burmese, the terms for parallel uncles (father's brothers) and aunts (mother's sisters) are mostly compounds containing the term for father or mother respectively. The Maru mother's brother/parent's elder sibling term /ŋ-yi/ or /n-yi/ may be almost regularly cognate with Burmese /yì/; Maru occasionally shows additional prefixes in other etyma too. Many /nâ/ or /nà/ and Lashi 'ning' (father's sister) suggest *ni₂, which has cognate forms in Loloish, Naxi, Ugong and elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman, but not in Burmese.

For Atsi, for which I have more data, it seems that the order of birth suffixes is quite regular and productive: /mo/ 'first', /l?at/ 'second', /nu/ 'third' and /thaŋ/ 'fourth'.

Table 3: Burmish and Jinghpaw uncle and aunt terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language:</th>
<th>Maru</th>
<th>Atsi</th>
<th>Lashi</th>
<th>Jinghpaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Okell</td>
<td>Burling</td>
<td>Benedict</td>
<td>Burling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeB</td>
<td>yənyi</td>
<td>nyì</td>
<td>ts?ā</td>
<td>yuk-pho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyB</td>
<td>yəm³</td>
<td>nyì</td>
<td>ts?ā</td>
<td>yuk-pho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeB</td>
<td>phəm³</td>
<td>phəm³</td>
<td>məŋ/pha-mə</td>
<td>pha-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FyB</td>
<td>yəgän</td>
<td>phəkän</td>
<td>məŋ/pha-thaq</td>
<td>pha-thang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeS</td>
<td>yənyi</td>
<td>mó</td>
<td>m?i mo</td>
<td>mye-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyS</td>
<td>yəth³</td>
<td>m?ikan</td>
<td>m?i than</td>
<td>mye-thang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeS</td>
<td>nā m³</td>
<td>nà</td>
<td>moi</td>
<td>ning-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FyS</td>
<td>nā th³</td>
<td>nà</td>
<td>moi</td>
<td>ning-thang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D. Burmic

For the Loloish languages, quite closely related to Burmese and Burmish, the mother's brother and father's sister etyma found in Burmish are also represented, as well as several other terms.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akha</th>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Lisu</th>
<th>Naxi</th>
<th>Ugong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MeB</td>
<td>a_v'g'oe</td>
<td>g'ui(pa_)*</td>
<td>ŋvvy</td>
<td>ʁ uy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyB</td>
<td>a_v'g'oe</td>
<td>g'ui(pa_)*</td>
<td>ŋvvy</td>
<td>ʁ uy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeB</td>
<td>a_ui_v</td>
<td>ŋu(ph)</td>
<td>ŋbū</td>
<td>ā bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FyB</td>
<td>a_zaw_v</td>
<td>ŋu(ph)</td>
<td>ŋbū</td>
<td>ā bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeS</td>
<td>a_ui_v</td>
<td>ŋu(ma)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyS</td>
<td>a_mui_v</td>
<td>meh</td>
<td>ŋu(ma)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeS</td>
<td>a_k'o_v</td>
<td>ŋu(ma)</td>
<td>ŋni</td>
<td>ʁ ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FyS</td>
<td>a_k'o_v</td>
<td>ŋu(ma)</td>
<td>ŋni</td>
<td>ʁ ni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: **Other Burmic uncle and aunt terms**

* Where appropriate, Central Loloish terms often have male or female suffixes, too. These are shown in parentheses.

Various shifts of meaning can be seen, such as the generalization of father's sister to parent's sister in Lijiang Naxi; the generalization of Lisu /ũ/ to parallel uncle or aunt, unlike Lahu and Akha; or the Akha generalization of /a-ui-v/ to parent's elder sibling (same sex) =father's elder brother/mother's elder sister; also, the extension of Ugong /ku/ to refer to father's elder brother, in addition to mother's brother. Analysable forms in Ugong contain /dâŋ/ 'big' (elder); the mother's elder sister term is composed of /mɛʔ/ 'mother' and /dâŋ/ 'big' (in the Sangkhla dialect it is /bâk/ 'mother' plus /dâŋ/). /jeʔ/ patterns like a 'small' (younger) suffix for some of these terms, though not generally in Ugong; its core meaning seems to be mother's younger sister.

2. Proto-Sino-Tibetan and Burmic terms

Of the various etyma for uncles and aunts reconstructed for Proto-Tibeto-Burman in Benedict (1972) and for Chinese in
Karlgren (1957), only two have Burmic cognates. Karlgren (1957) GSR 1067b *g'iȫg/g'iü:/ 'maternal uncle; wife's father'; Benedict (1972: #255) *kew 'mother's brother/wife's father' is found in Ugong /ku/ and Naxi /gï/ and has shifted its meaning in Burmese to form part of the 'elder brother' term /eko/. Karlgren (1957) GSR 359d *nier/niei; 'mother'/; Benedict (1972: #316) *niy 'father's sister/mother's brother's wife/wife's mother' shows a strange semantic shift in Chinese, and has been replaced by another term there (cf. Karl...
the 'head' form as noted above. The 'mother's brother' term also survives in the term for 'elder brother's wife' or 'wife's elder sister' in Burmese, /mæyʃ/; this is less paradoxical given the survival of the Proto-Sino-Tibetan term for 'mother's brother' in the Burmese term for 'elder brother', /ako/. In Rangoon, /ayi/ is not an 'aunt' term, having been eliminated when the aunt and uncle terms 'went bilateral'; but /mayʃ/ survives -- two steps removed from the original meaning of /yl/. The various compound forms also show an interesting pattern of development. The suffix /jì/ 'big' (elder) has survived, but the earlier /thwe/ 'younger' has mostly been replaced by /lè/. Interestingly, the former form for 'father' /bá/ has been replaced by a fused form /phe/, from /phá ?e/ in its core meaning, but it survives in some 'father's brother' or, in Rangoon, 'parent's brother', terms. And just as /b/ 'head' has replaced /yl/ in the meaning 'mother's brother', /jì/ 'big' seems to be acquiring the additional meaning of 'mother's elder sister' (or, in Rangoon, 'parents' elder sister'). Also, the 'royal' suffix /to/ in a voiced form /do/, seems to have acquired the meaning of 'mother's younger sister', and in Rangoon 'parents' younger sister'.

The radical restructuring of kinship terms in Rangoon has resulted in the total elimination of /yl/ as an 'uncle/aunt' term; in the final elimination of the /thwe/ 'younger' suffix, due to the loss of the 'father's younger brother' term which survives in Mandalay; in the generalization of /bájì/ 'mother's elder brother' and /bá(bá)jì/ 'father's elder brother' so that both are used for 'parents' elder brother', while /lè/ 'mother's younger brother' takes over 'father's younger brother' as well. And, as noted, /jì/ compounds become 'parents' elder sister', while /do/ compounds become 'parents' younger sister' -- both generalized from 'mother's sister' terms, eliminating the 'father's sister' terms found elsewhere.

Arakanese developments are more conservative in some ways, but more innovative in three new terms: /abye/ 'father's younger brother', /aywe/ 'mother's younger sister', and /akhan/ 'mother's brother', in most dialects.

3. History of Burmese marriage and kinship

Based on comparative evidence summarised in Benedict (1942), it seems likely that Proto-Sino-Tibetan society was patrilineal, with a preference for matrilateral cross-cousin marriage. Bradley (1979b) has discussed the Loloish groups, and concludes that Proto-Loloish society was also patrilineal, preferring mother's brother's daughter -- father's sister's son marriage. It also appears likely that there was a bride price (payment by the groom and his family to the bride's family) and, in addition, or instead, a requirement for several years of bride
service (the groom living with, and working for, his parents-in-law). The location of residence after marriage was, thus, at first uxorilocal, but subsequently virilocal, that is, with or near the groom's family.

Some modern Loloish societies have changed certain aspects of these patterns; for example, most Lahu groups are bilateral, and regard cross-cousin marriage as incestuous, while most Lisu groups prefer bride price and virilocal residence. However, some Lahu groups, such as the Shehleh (a Black Lahu subgroup) and the Banlan (a Yellow Lahu subgroup), still allow, or even prefer, matrilineal cross-cousin marriage, and many Lisu grooms do bride service, as do nearly all Lahu ones. The Lisu are patrilineal, and do allow cross-cousin marriage, while the Akha, for example, prefer it.

Not surprisingly, the 'Kachin'-influenced Maru, Atsi and Lashi show Jinghpaw-like patterns for the non-reciprocal exchange of spouses; one lineage always, and only, provides the grooms to another which provides brides to the first. Hence, a hierarchy of lineages is created, with obligations created by the receipt of wives. This pattern is not characteristic of Burmese society, despite the close historical linguistic connection within Burmish, including Burmese, Maru, Atsi and Lashi.

In Arakanese society, as in most Loloish societies, Naxi society and Ugong society, there is a stated preference -- frequently carried out -- for marriage between mother's brother's daughter and father's sister's son. Moreover, the evidence of the Burmese kinship terms suggests the same at an earlier stage for the rest of Burmese society: it is only with this marital pattern (mother's brother's daughter and father's sister's son) that the mother's brother's wife will normatively be the father's sister (and, of course, father's sister's husband = mother's brother), and so the mother's brother term can generalize to mother's brother/father's sister, as /yì/ does in Burmese. In this marriage pattern, there would be a direct exchange of women for women between two linked patrilines.

Spiro (1977) postulated exchange of siblings as the earlier Burmese pattern, based on kin term equivalences which equally support reciprocal cross-cousin marriage. It is, of course, possible that the earlier pattern of exchange between two specific lineages, which comparative evidence supports, could have developed into a general possibility of exchange between any two lineages, particularly with the vast expansion of Burmese society entailed by the politico-military success of the Burmans. After this proposed intermediate stage of sibling exchange, the Burmese marriage and inheritance system has again changed to a bilateral one, in which cross-cousin marriage is at least regarded unfavourably, with many, especially in Rangoon, regarding it as incest. However, there is still some feeling that
patrilineal ties are closer, and incest taboos are stronger patrilaterally.

It was traditional until fairly recently for Burmans to do about three years of bride service and to pay a substantial bride price. These are exactly the postulated Proto-Burmese-Lolo customs, which are appropriate in a patrilineal system. Other aspects of the system of kin terms also support this conclusion.

A final property of the Burmese system, found also in other Burmish and some Loloish societies, is a differentiation of terms based on relative age: elder or younger. There are separate, unrelated terms for younger sister, younger brother, and elder brother in Burmese; and a Proto-Burmese-Lolo term for elder sister which is not represented in Burmese. There is also widespread use of verb-adjectives (i.e. stative verbs) such as 'big' and 'small', as suffixes to indicate relative age of the parent and the aunt or uncle. Perhaps this age-grading, which reaches its extreme among the 'Kachin'-influenced Atsi, is a relatively recent characteristic of Burmese-Lolo societies. The suffixes used differ in different languages and are generally productive; so it would be risky to postulate very early age-grading.

In conclusion, Burmese kin terms for uncles and aunts show extensive differences between dialects and considerable variations within some dialects and the comparison of these kin terms with one another, with the corresponding terms from closely related Burmic languages, and from reconstructed Sino-Tibetan, has permitted the formulation of a hypothesis that pre-Burmese society was patrilineal, with cross-cousin marriage. Similarly, one may also postulate the presence of certain other characteristics in pre-Burmese society, such as bride service and bride price, from an analysis of comparative cultural evidence within the linguistic groups under study.

NOTES

1. This paper was originally prepared for the Language, Gender, and Society Panel of the Asian Studies Association of Australia, to be presented at its Fourth National Conference held at Monash University, Melbourne, on May 10-14, 1982. The support of the Australian Academy of Humanities and of the Myer Foundation (1976), the Australian Research Grants Committee (1977), and the Social Science Research Council of the American Council of Learned Societies Joint South East Asia Program, sponsored by the Ford Foundation (1980), is gratefully acknowledged.
2. Some useful sources on Sino-Tibetan genetic classification include Benedict (1972) on Sino-Tibetan; Bradley (1975) on Naxi-Burmese-Lolo; and Bradley (1979b) on Burmese-Lolo, which which is known as Lolo-Burmese in Burling (1971), qv.

3. Indispensable information on, and discussion of, Jinghpaw kinship terminology is to be found in Leach (1954) and Leach (1977). (Ed.)

4. Further Maru data were provided by John Okell. Benedict (1942) has collected older data on Maru, Atsi, and Lashi, and Bradley (n.d.) has more recent data on Atsi.

5. Data are drawn from Southern Loloish Akha (in manuscript); Central Loloish Lahu (reconstructed Common Loloish Lahu from Bradley (1979a), in manuscript), and Central Loloish Lisu (Bradley and Hope, 1986). Naxi, which is less closely related, is represented by two dialects, those of Lijiang (Bradley 1975) and Yangning (Fu 1979). The data on the language most divergent from Burmese within Burmic, Ugong (Kok Chiang dialect), was collected in Thailand by the author in 1980-81.
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1. Sesquisyllabism in South-East Asian Languages

The languages of South-East Asia are overwhelmingly monosyllabic in structure (the notable exception being the Austronesian family) at least in the sense that their morphemes are only one syllable long. Yet, as all South-East Asianists can ruefully testify, this ‘monomorphosyllabism’ is by no means to be equated with phonetic simplicity! The South-East Asian monosyllable often seems to be bulging at the seams with phonetic material: consonantal, vocalic, and supra-segmental. Diachronically, phonemic features frequently bounce back and forth from one segment of a South-East Asian syllable to the other. Adjacent vowels and consonants unidirectionally or mutually influence each other’s articulation — something I have been known, rather inelegantly, to refer to as ‘intersegmental stopover’. More strikingly, decaying consonantal contrasts in syllable-initial or -final position may be ‘transphonologized’ into the suprasegmental realm, so that previously redundant tonal features acquire a compensatory phonemic status.

The intersegmental attraction is by no means confined neatly within the boundaries of individual syllables. A voracious South-East Asian monosyllable may also absorb phonetic material from a neighbouring syllable, incorporating it into its own substance. These adjacent syllables belong originally to other morphemes — these are after all ‘monomorphosyllabic’ languages — yet the fusional process respects no lexical boundaries.

A. Prefixization of compound constituents

Especially vulnerable to trans-syllabic absorption are weakly stressed morphemes that stand in a modifying or subordinate relationship. A modifying syllable in a lexical compound may undergo such radical phonological reduction that its original morphemic identity is obscured. Once this happens, it can become more like a meaningless affix or ‘formative’ than like a full noun or verb and, although elements in compounds may also suffer this fate, even in non-monosyllabic languages like English, the process of ‘affixization’ or ‘cliticization’ comes into full flower only in truly monomorphosyllabic language families like
Tibeto-Burman (TB):

--The now meaningless pa- in Written Burmese (WB) parwak 'ant' (>Mod.Bs. pawé?) descends from the free morpheme *buw 'insect, bug' (Benedict 1972:#27), reflected by forms like Written Tibetan (WT) 'bu' and by the independent WB word pā 'bug'. The fully dissyllabic compound for ant is explicitly attested by forms like Lahu (Lh.) pā-kā? 'ant' (*buw-rwak), where the vowel of the first syllable retains its quality and has not been reduced to shwa.5

--The prefixal element sa- in WB samak 'son-in-law' (>Mod.Bs. ṣame?) is a reduction of the full morpheme *za *tsa 'child, son' (ibid.,#59). The unprefixed root *ma.k (ibid.,#324) is reflected in forms like WT mag-pa and Lushai ma.k-pa. The dissyllabic prototype *tsa-mak is directly preserved in the Ch'iang cognates ts'ê-me and ts'ê-mja. Forms like Dhimal hma-wa and Lahu s-mâ-pa have taken the fusional process even further than Burmese, preserving only indirect traces of a sibilant feature before the root.6

Sometimes the telescoping of two proto-syllables into one is so complete in TB that the dissyllabic prototype can only be established at the cost of considerable comparative-historical toll. The TB root for lungs that Benedict reconstructed as *tsywəp or *tswap (ibid.,#239), largely on the basis of Lushai tsuap, has since been shown to be a fusion of two separate roots *tsi-wap, with a second element that originally meant 'spongy, porous'. (Matisoff 1978:113-23, esp.115).

In Jinghpaw (= 'Kachin'), an important TB language of northern Burma and adjacent areas of China and India, the process of prefixization has been carried very far, to the point where hundreds of nouns and verbs have the phonological shape CpaCi (G) V (Cp)'. Most of these unstressed prefixal or 'pre-Initial' syllables (C a-) seem to be relatively recent accretions to their roots, and have no plausible etymologies or definable meanings. Others are reductions of semantically obscure but fully syllabic prefixes like güm- or niy-, with which they sometimes alternate. One prefix, ḫe- ḫe, has a clear-cut grammatical function and has been generalized to all verbal roots with the meaning causativizer/transitivizer. Still others -- and these cases are the most interesting in the present context -- are reductions of fully syllabic root-morphemes that were once the first constituent in compounds. An example of this latter type is the pair lakhrá 'right' and lepbëi 'left', where the le is a reduction of the widespread Proto-Tibeto-Burman (PTB) root

---

* Refer to linguistic symbols/abbreviations at the head of the NOTES. (Ed.)
*lak 'hand' (Benedict 1972:#86) (cf. WB lak-ya 'right hand').

In some TB languages, the vowel of the reduced prefixal syllable is not exactly a centralized shwa, but rather an unstressed front or back vowel, like Angami Naga -ẽ- (e.g. měkrũ 'dove'; ṡẽ- 'causative prefix') or Gyarung -ơ- (e.g. körök 'ant'). In any case, these prefixal syllables are so stressless that they usually cannot bear a full tone -- and it is universally true that even if a tone contrast does exist in such syllables, as has been claimed for Jinghpaw (Maran 1971) it is on the rudimentary side (never more than a two-way, high vs. low distinction).

Important as these reduced pre-syllables are in TB, they seem to play an even more basic structural role in the languages of the Austro-Asiatic (AA) or Mon-Khmer (MK) family. In almost all branches of MK, except Vietnamese, these 'minor syllables' abound. Compared to TB, there is generally a wider variety of possible consonants in MK minor syllables, and it is seldom possible to derive such a syllable from any semantically plausible fully syllabic prototype. This makes it look as if the MK minor syllables go back to remote antiquity, and were present in the family ab initio.

In any event, it is clear that untold thousands of words in South-East Asian languages are neither monosyllabic nor disyllabic, but rather what we might call sesquisyllabic: a 'syllable-and-a-half' long.

B. Suffixization and fused vocalic nuclei

This paper is concerned primarily with bulging at the other end of the syllable, i.e. the vocalic nucleus.

In SOV, the postpositional languages, grammatical functors like case- and aspect-particles follow the nouns or verbs with which they interact. Since these functors have a high textual frequency and are naturally unstressed by comparison with their preceding root-word, they are prime candidates for sloppy articulation and phonological reduction.

In a language like Lahu -- a member of the Central Loloish group of the Lolo-Burmese branch of Tibeto-Burman -- postpositional particles are apt to lose their initial consonant in rapid speech. Sometimes both variants are used almost interchangeably (e.g. tā ~ ā 'perfective aspect'; thā? ~ ā? 'accusative case') (Matisoff 1973a:38); but the disproportionately large number of modern Lahu particles that begin with a vowel all the time makes one suspect that in some cases an old initial consonant has been lost for good.
Once its initial consonant has disappeared, a functor is so phonologically slight that it may be helpless to resist the pull of the voracious, fully-stressed noun or verb that precedes it. If circumstances are right the functor's vowel and/or tone may be incorporated bodily into the vowel of the head-syllable, resulting in a complex, fused vocalic nucleus that is 'a mora-and-a-half' long. The 'sesquimal' syllables of Lahu are synchronically anomalous and marginal, but the strains to which they subject the phonology are of fundamental importance, since they might well presage an eventual radical restructuring of the entire vowel system.

In what follows, we shall focus on an elusive type of Lahu sesquimal syllable, which was only recognized after many years of work on the language: echo-vowel adverbials. First, however, we should consider the whole phenomenon of vocalic fusion in Lahu in terms of the forces operating to tear down or build up the phonetic substance of the syllable.

2. Diachronic dimensions of the phonological system of Black Lahu: intersegmental influence and the economy of the syllable

The Black Lahu dialect of Chiangdao, Chiang Mai Province, Thailand, has a system of nine simple vowels rather similar to that of Siamese:

\[
i \quad u \\
\varepsilon \quad o \\
\varepsilon \quad a \quad \circ.
\]

If only syllables with these nuclei are taken into account (and they comprise the vast majority), the Lahu syllable-canon can be formulated as:

\[
T \\
(C_i) V.
\]

This starkly simple syllabic structure, maximally comprising an initial consonant, a vowel, and a tone, represents an extreme reduction from the point of view of the complex syllables reconstructed for PTB:

\[
[T] \\
*(P_1)(P_2)C_i(G) V (:)(C_f)(s).^{17}
\]

The final stops */-p -t -k/ of Proto-Lolo Burmese (PLB) have lost their oral occlusion in Lahu, though they have usually left their trace in the form of a post-vocalic glottal stop.\(^{18}\) Although such syllables are transcribed with the symbol '\?\'
written on the line after the vowel (e.g. tɔʔ, khɔʔ), I prefer to consider this glottalization to be a suprasegmental, 'tonal' feature from the synchronic point of view (see Matisoff 1973a: 25-6). There is a two-way tonal contrast in these Lahu 'checked syllables' (as in similar syllables in most other Loloish languages), symbolized by the digraphs /Af/ (high-stopped tone) and /af/ low-stopped tone). Black Lahu is thus a seven-tone language, with 5 open tones and 2 checked ones.  

Although the former three-way positional contrast in PLB final stops has been neutralized in Lahu, leaving only stopped tones as the pale reflection of the proto-occlusion, the position of articulation of the *Cf has differentially affected the quality of the preceding vowel, so that in many cases there has been no loss of contrast with respect to the syllables as a whole (Matisoff 1972):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PLB} *-ak & > \text{Lahu} -a? : \text{PLB} *wak \ 'pig' \ (ibid., \#168) > \text{Lh. } və? \\
\text{PLB} *-at & > \text{Lahu} -e? : \text{PLB} *k-r-wat \ 'leech' \ (ibid., \#167) > \text{Lh. } vê? \\
\text{PLB} *-ap & > \text{Lahu} -o? : \text{PLB} *k-r-ap \ 'needle' \ (ibid., \#191) > \text{Lh. } ñə?.
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, the three *nasal C's of PLB have totally departed from the segmental scene, leaving their traces only in the quality of the preceding vowel:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PLB} *-an & > \text{Lahu} -o : \text{PLB} *nɑn \ 'you' > \text{Lh. } nɔ \\
\text{PLB} *-an & > \text{Lahu} -e : \text{PLB} *wɑn \ 'dhole' > \text{Lh. } vɛ \\
\text{PLB} *-am & > \text{Lahu} -o : \text{PLB} *wɑm \ 'otter' > \text{Lh. } ñɛ-ñɔ-lo.
\end{align*}
\]

As these examples indicate, Lahu shows assymetry in the degree of decay of original syllable-final consonants according to whether they were *stops or *nasals. While almost all originally *stopped syllables have preserved at least a post-vocalic [ʔ] -- the exception being 'doubly glottalized' syllables, which lost their occlusion entirely (qv. n.18 above) -- the *nasal C's have not even caused a nasalization of the preceding vowel; so that the feature of nasality has disappeared completely from the rhyme of such syllables. (But see 2.A.c,d,e, below.)

These transphonologizations may be symbolized by

\[
\begin{align*}
&V \leftarrow C_f & \text{and} & V \rightarrow C_f \\
&[\text{where } C_f \text{ was } /p t k/] & [\text{where } C_f \text{ was } /m n \eta/].
\end{align*}
\]
That is, final *stops have been transphonologized into both suprasegmental (tonal) and vocalic dimensions of contrast, while final *nasals have influenced only the oral quality of the preceding vowel and have not superimposed any coarticulatory feature upon it.

A. Secondary glottalization and nasalization in Lahu

Counteracting the overall decline in syllable-final occlusion in native inherited lexical material is a variety of disparate phenomena which are 'conspiring' to increase or introduce the suprasegmental features of glottalization and nasalization.

(a) Loans from Tai and Burmese where the donor language had /-p -t -k -ʔ/ are usually borrowed into Lahu under a stopped tone (e.g. ʰā 'love' [<_ Shan; cf. Thai rāk]), and this same treatment is sometimes accorded to loans where the donor language had a short vowel followed by a nasal (e.g. ʰat-nā 'police' [<_ Thai tam-rāt]), or even a liquid (e.g. moto-sāk 'motorcycle' [<_ Eng.]).

(b) Any Lahu action-verb that is under one of the five open tones may be given imperative force by shortening its vowel and pronouncing it with a glottal stop: dɔ 'drink' > ʰā-ɡā dɔ-ʔ 'Drink some tea!'\(^2^3\)

(c) Loans from Tai and Burmese with -m, -n, -ŋ/ or a nasalized vowel are sometimes pronounced with a nasalized vowel\(^2^4\) in the careful speech of Lahu who have a fair knowledge of the donor language (e.g. ʰā-bo - ʰā-bon 'merit; advantage' [<_ Shan (cf. Thai bun), ultimately < Pāli]; a-khwā - a-khwān 'permission' [<_ Bs.]).

(d) Syllables whose initial is h- or zero, and whose vowel is -ā or -ā, are optionally nasalized by the widespread phenomenon I have called rhinoglottophilia: ʰā(n) 'four', ʰā-ha(n) 'spirit', hā(n) 'to coil', hā(n)-hā(n) 'fast', etc.\(^2^5\)

(e) A few verbs acquire vowel nasalization in vivid adverbial expressions involving the particle kā? (Matisoff 1973a:4.14):

\(\text{pā (v) 'spread open'} > \text{nān kā? (AE) 'wide open'}; \text{thē (v adj) 'be straight'} > \text{thēn kā? 'straight as an arrow'}\).

Marginal and heterogeneous as such secondarily glottalized and nasalized syllables may be as far as their historical status is concerned, they are of considerable potential importance for the future of Lahu phonology. As a general rule of thumb, once some feature is present phonetically in a South-East Asian monosyllable, no matter how redundant or trivial it may appear, it is available for future exploitation and transphonologization.
3. Complex vocalic nuclei in Lahu (Matisoff 1973a: 15-20)

Our streamlined syllable canon, \((C_i)V_i\), fails to account for any but the nine simple vocalic nuclei mentioned above. In addition, Lahu has a wide assortment of 'complex' nuclei consisting of more than a simple vowel. These may be roughly subdivided into 'intrinsically complex' (i.e. occurring within a single morpheme) vs. 'fusional' (the result of phonetic telescoping across morpheme boundary). Almost all intrinsic complex nuclei have come into the language through borrowing.

A. Intrinsic falling diphthongs

The most frequent diphthong of this type is /ay/ \([a\acute{a}]\), found in a great many loanwords from Tai: lāy 'several', hāy 'evil, fierce', vāy 'fast', tāy 'to plough', etc. Other, rarer, diphthongs found in loanwords include /aw/ \([a\acute{a}]\) (gāw 'tell, narrate', mā'aw 'coconut') and /ew/ \([e\acute{e}]\) (mā'ew 'gambling, card-playing', khē-mew? 'a Meo, a Hmong').

B. Intrinsic rising diphthongs in loanwords

Lahu rising diphthongs always begin with a labial (never a palatal) semivowel. We write this phonemically as /w/, though its precise phonetic quality depends on the height of the following vowel, thus: /w/ [wə], /we/ [we], /we/ [we], /wa/ [wa]. A large proportion of these syllables are loans from Burmese or Tai, e.g. pwē 'festival' [< Bs.], s-khwa(n) 'permission' [< Bs.], hwē-si 'oyster' [< Shan (cf. Thai hād)], kwē(n) 'govern' [< Bs.], nā'-we'-si 'candy' [< Shan (for 2nd syll. cf. Thai ?3j 'sugarcane')], etc.

The labial element strikes the ear as more vocalic than consonantal, especially before non-high vowels. It is articulated laxly, without very pronounced puckering of the lips, so that the syllable sounds 'sesqui-moral.' Syllables which begin with this labial glide (as in 'candy', above) are deemed to have zero-initial. That is, the /w/ is a feature of the vocalic nucleus rather than of the \(C_i\).

C. Labialized doublets of syllables with back vowels (Matisoff 1973a:19, #1.43)

Further support for the analysis of /w/ as part of the syllable's rhyme is provided by an extremely interesting and rather productive type of doublet formation, wherein syllables with simple back vowels /u o\(\circ\)/ may also be pronounced with nuclei consisting of /w/ plus the front vowel of the corresponding height /i e\(\acute{e}\)/: i.e. u - wi, o - we, o - we. Thus, nā-ku - nā-kiwi 'dried fish'; lā?-ogō - lā?-awē 'stick inserted in bobbin of spinning-wheel to take wound thread off'; yē-mī-tō - yē-mī-twē 'a bear'; o 'cooked rice' ✴ a-qhā-wē (lit. 'rag-weed..."
rice') 'ritual rice sent to grave of dead man', etc. This doublet-making is still a living process in Lahu, and is even applied to loanwords: k"u - kwk 'bed' [< Shan < Ba. kh"u'taq 'bedstead']; co - cwe 'era, period of time' [< Shan (cf. Thai ch"ua)]; \(\text{\textdagger}13\) - \(\text{\textdagger}1\wz\) 'terraced field' [< Shan]; \(\text{\textdagger}13\) - \(\text{\textdagger}1\wz\) 'swim' [< Shan (cf. Thai luj 'wade')].

As far as native lexical material is concerned, the 'basic' variant in these pairs is clearly the one with the simple back vowel. Thus the word for 'cooked rice' is always \(\text{\textdagger}1\) (< PLB *han), except in the single compound \(\text{\textdagger}1\)-gha-\(\text{\textdagger}1\wz\). Yet for certain words the labialized variant occurs more frequently, and may even have displaced the simpler one entirely (e.g. ch\(\text{\textdagger}\)-p\(\text{\textdagger}\)-gw\(\text{\textdagger}\) 'barking deer (Cervulus muntjac)', but never *ch\(\text{\textdagger}\)-p\(\text{\textdagger}\)-g\(\text{\textdagger}\)).

Among the loanwords which receive this doublet treatment, some had complex nuclei involving a labial element in the donor language (e.g. era, swim), but others originally had only a simple back vowel (e.g. bed). There are also cases where a Tai syllable with a falling diphthong consisting of a back vowel plus palatal semivowel (e.g. \(-\text{\textdagger}\sigma\)) gets borrowed into Lahu with a prelabialized nucleus with no non-labialized doublet (e.g. oyster, candy)(3.B above).

This doublet formation seems originally to have developed internally within Black Lahu, though it clearly has been reinforced and encouraged by attempts to approximate the complex vocalic nuclei in the languages with which these Lahu have recently been in the closest contact: Burmese, Shan, Northern Thai, and Siamese.

The question arises whether the labialized variants should be considered 'intrinsic' or 'fusional' complex nuclei. It will be recalled that the labial element we write abstractly as /w/ is really a semi-syllabic vowel whose phonetic height is the same as the following full vowel: \(\text{\textdagger}1\wz\) = [\(\text{\textdagger}\wz\)], \(\text{\textdagger}\wz\) = [\(\text{\textdagger}\wz\)], /we/ = [\(\text{\textdagger}\wz\)]. These complex nuclei are, therefore, 'fused' in the sense that something has been attached to their basic vowel /u o e/, displacing it from the syllable's 'peak of sonority' in the process: u > u o > o, o > o. This 'something' which usurps the peak of sonority is the front vowel of the corresponding height /i e e/i. But this front vowel does not mean anything -- it does not belong to any separate morpheme. It is essentially a meaningless extrusion or extension from the original nuclear monophthong. All it does is provide some phonological bulk, a benign bulging of the syllable's substance.29 As indicated in Section 3 above, we prefer to reserve the term 'fusional' for cases where there has been a phonetic telescoping across morpheme boundary, and these labialized doublets do not quite meet this criterion.
D. Revising the syllable canon

In any event, this doublet formation has conspired with the influence of foreign words (3.B above) to reintroduce the slot 'G' into the Lahu syllable. Revising our syllable canon to accommodate these cases, we get:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
T^* & (C_i) & (G) V \\
\end{array}
\]

or, more specifically,

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
T^* & (C_i) & (w) V \\
\end{array}
\]

where \( T^* \) may include the feature \([?]\), and where everything except \( C_i \) belongs to the rhyme of the syllable.

While we are at it, we should also add to our canon the feature of secondary vowel nasalization and the intonational feature of imperative glottal stop (2.A above), as well as the post-vocalic semivowels /-y -w/ that we have encountered in loanwords (3.A above). By now, we are faced with an overall syllable structure of surprising complexity:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
T & y \\
(C_i) & (w) V & w \\
(N) & ? \\
\end{array}
\]

We shall continue to refine this formula as we go along. 30

E. Fusions of verb-particles to their verbs

(a) With \( \delta \) (Pv). When the verb-particle \((P_\delta)\) \(\delta\) (Matisoff 1973a: #4.64), indicating 'change of state' or 'completed action', follows a verb under the same tone as itself \(\uparrow\), the two syllables are fused into a single sesqui-moral nucleus without affecting the quality of either vowel. We write these sequences with a hyphen: \(p\delta-\delta\) '[It's] finished now'; \(g\delta-\delta\) '[We've] arrived already'; \(m\delta-\delta\) 'Now [I] see [it]'.

Phonetically 'a-o' is identical to the intrinsic diphthong found in loanwords like \(g\bar{a}\)w \(\{\bar{a}w\}\) 'narrate' or \(c\bar{a}\)w \(\{\bar{a}w\}\) 'lord' (3.A above), but there is no reason to obscure the morphemic structure of verb-plus-\(\delta\) sequences by such spellings as \(p\bar{a}\)w, \(g\bar{a}\)w, or \(m\bar{a}\)w.

(b) With \( e \) (Pv). The verb-particle \(e\) (Matisoff 1973a: #4.61) indicates 'transitive motion', or figuratively 'departure from the center of interest; departure into a new state'. It usually maintains its syllabic integrity with respect to its verb: \(h\acute{a}\) e 'go to spend the night', \(ph\acute{o}\) e 'run away', \(\ddot{s}\acute{i}\) e 'die, pass away', \(t\ddot{s}\) e 'go out from'. In a few cases, however, the two syllables fuse into a sesqui-moral unit: \(p\ddot{a}-e\) [pa\ddot{a}] 'fall down, fall over', \(n\acute{a}-e\) [na\ddot{a}] 'get well, recover, heal'. Although these fused syllables in 'a-e' rhyme exactly with intrinsically diphthongal loanwords like \(\acute{l}\acute{a}\)y 'several' or \(m\acute{a}\)y 'wood' (3.A above),
their bimorphemic status induces us to write them with a hyphen.

The most interesting case of all is provided by one of the commonest and most important verbs in the language, \textit{qay} [qa\textsuperscript{a}] 'go'. This word rhymes perfectly both with the monomorphemic loanwords in -\textit{ay} (3.A) and with the bimorphemic fused nuclei \textit{pa}-e and \textit{na}-e. The sequence *\textit{qay} e does not occur. Since there is no evidence that \textit{qay} is of non-Lahu origin, I have suggested (Matisoff 1973a:15-16) that it might well represent an ancient fusion of a now obsolete verb *\textit{qa} with the directional verb-particle \textit{e}: *qa-e.\textsuperscript{31} Unlike the cases of \textit{pā} 'fall down' and \textit{na} 'be cured, which occur independently in other contexts than before \textit{e}, modern Lahu has no simple verb \textit{qa} with the meaning 'go'. For this reason, I write the word \textit{qay} with the same symbols used for the rhyme of the monomorphemic loanwords in -\textit{ay}. This is a striking instance of a fusion that has occurred so thoroughly that all traces of the 'seam' or 'suture' have disappeared, (somewhat analogous to the loss of previously existing morphemic boundaries among English speakers; qv. n.4). When fusion reaches this point (which we might call superfusion), the nucleus achieves a new wholeness or 'intrinsicality', no less real because it is diachronically secondary.

We have thus identified three stages of intimacy between a verb and the following verb-particle \textit{e}:

1. separate and equal moras (2 syllables)
   \textit{hā e} 'go to spend the night'

2. fused sesqui-moral unit (one-and-a-half syllables) with sense of morpheme boundary preserved
   \textit{na-e} 'get better'

3. 'superfused' sesqui-moral unit (one-and-a-half syllables) with sense of morpheme boundary obliterated
   \textit{qay} 'go'

By now it will be evident that the whole distinction between 'intrinsic' and 'fusional' complex nuclei is a fuzzy one, since it can be no more precise or stable than the concept of morpheme boundary on which it is based.

F. Fusion in lexical compounds (Matisoff 1973a: 18-9, #1.42g)

There are a number of nouns in Lahu which exhibit a peculiar complex vocalism: the syllable peak is a central vowel (esp. \textit{a} or \textit{ə}), which is then followed by a non-syllabic palatal offglide: /-iy/[\textit{a}ı], /-ay/[\textit{a}ə], /ay/[\textit{a}əı]. This second element is suffixal, since most of these words have alternate pronunciations with simple vowels /\textit{a} or \textit{a}/. It is impossible to assign any definite meaning to the suffix, however, so we are again faced with an elusive 'morpheme boundary'. It seems in fact that the
/-y/ may represent a merger of more than one originally independent lexical item. Our examples are almost all native Lahu words, but include at least one borrowing from Tai.

(a) ꧆-lêy

This noun means 'something extra, something special, something left over', and is also pronounced ꧆-lê. It is derived from the verb lâ 'be left over' [< Shan (cf. Thai lya [lêa])]. It is safe to assume that the second element was originally the verb-particle e (3.Eb above), since the meanings of lâ and e are highly compatible ('go on being there to the point of excess').

(b) ꧆-may

This word means 'powder', and occurs without the prefix in such compounds as ꧆a-ma-may 'cornmeal', vê?-mey 'pollen' ('flower-powder'), kêy-may 'glass fragments' (kèw- 'glass' < Tai), jê?-mey 'dust' ('earth-powder'), etc.32

In this case there is no doubt at all that the -y is a reduced and incorporated version of the P ए, since there exists an independent verb ma 'to powder, reduce to a powder' and the fused form may (< ma + e) retains full verbal force, as in ꧆-lê? may ve 'to powder salt, reduce rock-salt to powder'.

(c) mê?-gây

This interesting word, meaning 'mirror, hand-mirror', seems to involve a fusion with quite a different morpheme, namely the diminutive M pfx े.33

The basic form is mê?-gô?, comprising the morphemes mê? 'eye' (< PLB *s-myak (Matisoff 1972: #1h5)) and gô? (M pfx) 'something shiny; shadow' (< PLB *k-rip (ibid., #189)), i.e. 'something shiny to the eye'. A synonymous variant with secondary high-rising tone also occurs (mê?-gô).34 The meaning of mê?-gô? × mê?-gô? ranges from (1) 'glass as a material, a glass object' to (2) 'a sheet of glass' to (3) 'a looking-glass; mirror' to (4) 'eyeglasses'.35 Since this is a broad range, it is easy to see how a diminutive coinage mê?-gô-े 'little (sheet of) glass' (big enough for a hand-mirror but too small for a window) came to be specialized both phonetically (fused nucleus gây) and semantically ('hand-mirror'):

mê?-gô? > mê?-gô > mê?-gô-े > mê?-gôy

(d) ꧆-pêy; ꧆-kêy; -gây

Other words of this type, where the morphemic identity of the fused element is not so clear, include ꧆-pêy 'salmon-pink, something pinkish-orange in colour'; ꧆-kêy (赅 ƙê) 'a scar'; and -gây 'a doubled or forked digit' (lâ?-no-gây 'forked finger', khâ-no-gây 'forked toe' [* lâ?-no-qa, khâ-no-qa]).
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In a few words beginning with palatal initials, there is a distinctive complex nucleus /ɛt/ that is 'almost two moras' in length -- i.e. the nucleus takes longer to utter than a sesquimoral one like /ey/ or /we/, but somewhat less time than two full vowels in hiatus.

The first segment of [ɛt] is the superhigh buzzing vowel [ɛ], the normal allophone of /ɛ/ after palatal initials (Matisoff 1973a: 6). The second segment is a true low front vowel [t], not merely a palatal semivowel. This diphthong /ɛt/ [ɛt] is thus neither 'rising' nor 'falling' in the usual sense, but rather what we might call co-valent, in that each mora receives more or less equal prominence (though each by itself is somewhat less than a full vowel).

The principal words with this vocalism are as follows: ga?̃-ɛt?̃ 'measles'; ŋo?̃-ɛt?̃ 'drizzling (of rain)'; tɔ̃-chɛt?̃ te ʋe 'to whisper'; and -cɛt -cɛ -cɛ 'object smaller than the norm.'

This last morpheme occurs as a bound constituent in compounds like lá?̃-no-cɛt 'little finger, pinkie-finger'; khé-no-cɛt 'little toe'; má-no-cɛt 'small species of figtree'; nà-ŋu-cɛt 'small-leaf banyan' (a species smaller than the ordinary banyan, which is called nà-ŋu-cɛ). The meanings suggest that the fused element is our diminutive morpheme ɛ, appearing in only 'semifused' guise -- not totally fused as in mə?-ɛy 'mirror' (3.Fc above). This -cɛt is of especial interest since it has two variants with simple vowels, -ɛt and -ɛt.

Collectively the various allomorphs exemplify the process of phonetic fusion at several different stages. The compound a-phèt-cɛ 'small sp. of chilli-pepper' has the allomorph with simple /ɛ/. This -ɛt is presumably the basic root-form of the morpheme, probably related to the important word ɛ (Mpf) 'a joint; section of a long object' [< PLB *¿dzik (Matisoff 1972: #45). In contradistinction to this unfused form, there has also developed a superfused variant -cɛt, which is optionally used in the words for the smallest digits: lá?̃-no-cɛt (-là?̃-no-cɛt) 'little finger', khé-no-cɛt (- khí-no-cɛt) 'little toe.' Here, the vowel of the superadded diminutive morpheme /ɛt/ has actually displaced the original nuclear vowel of the root-syllable entirely. In the process the initial consonant becomes a phonetically palatal affricate instead of the dental allophone it had been when the /ɛ/ was still there: cɛt [tsɛt] > ɛt [tɛt]. However, the Lahu palatal series /c ch j ɲ y/ has dental allophones before /ɛ/, viz. [ts tʃ dʒ s z] (qv. Matisoff 1973a:6).
To recapitulate:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{c} & \varepsilon & \epsilon & \text{id.} \\
\text{section} & \text{'little'} & \text{'less than norm'} & \text{'id.'}
\end{array}
\]

In order to accommodate these nuclei with /\#\varepsilon/ vocalism, another complication must be introduced into our syllable canon:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
T^* & \gamma & (C_i) & (w) & V & (N) \\
\end{array}
\]

Constraint: \(\epsilon\) occurs as second member of a complex nucleus only if the preceding vowel is /\#/. In such syllables the \(C_i\) is usually a palatal, but may also be a non-palatal voiceless spirant.

4. Fusions in adverbial expressions

One of the most important bits of grammatical hardware in Lahu is the subordinating particle \(\hat{\epsilon}\), which serves to mark a wide variety of structures as attributive to a nominal or verbal head. (see Matisoff 1973a: #1.42d, 1.8, 3.612, 3.617c, 3.618, 3.62, 4.2b, 4.42, 5.424, 6.114c, 6.493). In keeping with its high frequency, predictability in well-defined syntactic constructions, and slight phonological shape, \(\hat{\epsilon}\) is a phonetically unstable morpheme. Though usually under the open low-falling tone /\#/, it sometimes acquires a glottal closure in rapid speech, becoming /\#\hat{\epsilon}/.

There is another particle pronounced \(\hat{\mathfrak{e}}\) which occurs in quantified noun-phrases with a 'minimizing' meaning that is often best translated 'only'. This is also a kind of subordinating function, and I believe this particle to be of the same historical origin as the subordinator \(\hat{\epsilon}\). Synchronously, however, they should be distinguished, since they co-occur in attributive constructions involving the 'minimized extentives'. To complicate matters, our minimizing \(\hat{\mathfrak{e}}\) is also tonally unstable. It, too, is sometimes pronounced under the low-stopped tone /\#\hat{\mathfrak{e}}/. Furthermore, in the minimized extentives (4.A below), it has developed high-rising or high-falling tone /\#\varepsilon/ or /\#\mathfrak{e}/, making it look like the etymologically distinct 'diminutive' M \(\text{pfx}\ v\mathfrak{e}\) we have already encountered.

The same factors (phonetic slightness, high frequency) which make these particles tonally unstable also make them prone
to fusion or incorporation into the preceding syllable. The rest of this paper will be devoted to fusional nuclei involving the various constructions in which subordinating and minimizing occur. Most of these will be passed over very briefly, since they have already been discussed in detail in Matisoff (1973a). Only in the case of echo-vowel adverbializations, which were not discovered until 1977, will we expatiate at greater length.

A. The minimized extentives

A few Lahu adjectives referring to measurable quantities have morphophonemically related forms that occur together with the determiner chi 'this' to yield expressions of 'extentive' meaning.

mã 'be many' / chi mã 'this many, this much, this amount'
ẽ 'be big' / chi ẽ 'this big, this size'
yẽ 'be long' / chi yẽ 'this long, as long as this'
yẽ 'be far' / chi yẽ 'this far, this distance'
mu 'be tall, high' / chi mu 'this high, this tall'.

To these extentives may be added a further morpheme, to be identified with the particle ë 'only', which serves to minimize the degree of the quantifiable characteristic in question. The resultant nuclei are fused, and acquire the high-rising tone /~\ (at least in their onset). Two stages in the fusional process are exemplified in these words: in the partially fused items the second element retains the vowel quality /-e/; in the totally fused words, the second element has been reduced to the palatal semivowel /-y/. Of our five extentives, two are minimized only with /-e/, two either with /-e/ or /-y/, and one only with /-y/. See Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDINARY EXTENTIVES</th>
<th>MINIMIZED EXTENTIVES</th>
<th>Partially Fused</th>
<th>Totally Fused</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chi yẽ 'this long'</td>
<td>chi yẽẽ - chi yẽẽ ẽ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'only this long'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi mu 'this high'</td>
<td>chi muẽ [m ẽ] ẽ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'only this high'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi ẽ 'this big'</td>
<td>chi ẽẽ - chi ẽẽ ẽ ẽ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'only this big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi yẽ 'this far'</td>
<td>chi yẽẽ - chi yẽẽ ẽ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'only this far'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi mã 'this much'</td>
<td>chi mãẽ [m mã] mã</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'only this much'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The vocalism of extentive morphemes in Lahu
It is noteworthy that the two stages of fusion we observe in these expressions are exactly paralleled in the non-extensive lexical compounds we have already discussed, e.g. me-gey 'mirror' (total fusion: 3.Fc above) vs. -cèf 'smaller than the norm' (partial fusion: 3.G above).

Furthermore, if we look more closely at the partially fused minimized extentives, it becomes clear that further fusional substages can be recognized --- and that indeed it is artificial to try to compartmentalize a gradual process into discrete stages. When a native speaker feels there is a tonal difference between the two parts of the nucleus (e.g. chi hèf), less fusion has occurred than if there is no such perceptible difference (e.g. chi hèf).

B. Types of adverbial/adnominal expressions with subordinating è

Lahu has several kinds of adverbial structures which can also be subordinated to nouns via the genitive-relative particle ve. We refer to these collectively as 'subordinate expressions' (or SEs). (Matisoff 1973a: 278-301, #4.42). They include gha-adverbials, stative adverbials, reduplicated verbs, intensified adjectives, and verbal elaborate expressions. It is characteristic of SEs to include the subordinating particle è. In the case of gha-adverbials, this è is occasionally fused into the vocalic nucleus of the preceding morpheme.

In order to lay the groundwork for our discussion of the fusional type of SE par excellence -- echo-vowel adverbials -- we should first list examples of these other kinds of modifying structures. See Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SE</th>
<th>ADVERBIAL USE</th>
<th>ADNOMINAL USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minimized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gha-adverbials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qha + V + è + Vh</td>
<td>gha + V + è + ve + Nh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qha bû? è ca</td>
<td>qha bû? è ve ji</td>
<td>'eat to satiety'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be satiety of liquor'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M + è + Vh</td>
<td>M + è + ve + Nh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nî è qey</td>
<td>nî è ve è-pô</td>
<td>'be red, become red'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'red' (lit. 'go redly')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C. Echo-vowel adverbialization

Still another type of subordinate expression exists in Lahu, though its subtle and elusive phonetic realization prevented me from becoming aware of it until 1977. Syntactically these expressions behave identically to the other kinds of SEs. In their adverbial guise they occur only before 'dummy' abstract verbs like go', 'be', 'do'. As adnominals they are connected to their head-noun via the relative/genitive particle *Ve. The big difference lies in the way the subordinating particle *Ve is realized. Instead of always having the vowel quality [e], the particle takes on the same vowel quality as the nucleus of the previous syllable. For this reason I would like to call them echo-vowel adverbials, or EVAs for short.54

By the end of my 1977 fieldtrip I had collected 22 examples of EVAs. Though this is a relatively large number, I have the distinct feeling that this is only the tip of the iceberg, and that many more remain to be identified.

By happy chance, the present corpus of EVAs includes examples of the echoing of all nine of the basic vowels of Black Lahu. The largest number have back vowels /u o ə/, with /o/
being especially frequent. The least-often echoed vowels are central /\ a a/. As for the cases with /\/, it becomes an intricate matter to distinguish an echo-vowel formation from the usual kind of stative adverbial with the 'intrinsically' \-coloured particle \ (see below). Nearly half of our echoed syllables are under checked tones /" "?/; phonetically the glottalization here is perceived as a slight interruption of the phonation somewhere in the middle of the prolonged sesquimoral syllable.56

An echoed vowel sounds like a single long vowel with a double 'tonal pulse.' To my ears the tone contour of the syllable usually changes noticeably at a point about halfway through the vowel, ending up almost always as mid-tone (unmarked in the orthography).57

Morphologically, all the EVAs consist of two parts. The first element (the 'head') is a fully meaningful morpheme (usually an adjectival verb) that can occur independently in other contexts. The second element (the part that is fused with its echo-vowel -- let us call it the 'tail') is typically a bound, restricted entity that occurs nowhere else than after its particular head. (I have called such hapless, meaningless formatives 'morphans', i.e. orphans. See Matisoff 1973a: 60-1, #3.333.) In this respect, the EVAs most resemble intensified adjectives (Matisoff 1973a: #4.424) where the otherwise meaningless intensifier is also selected by one, or at most two specific head-morphemes.58 (We adopt the orthographic convention of separating the head from its tail by an equals sign ' = '.)

The total EVA is almost always 'two-and-a-half' syllables long.59 An EVAs 'ideal' shape is: HEAD=TAIL=ECHO.

\1 \1 \1/2

Often, however, variations are possible (as we shall see when the EVAs are listed individually). The echo may optionally be omitted:

HEAD=TAIL(-ECHO).

Sometimes, the tail may be followed either by an echo-vowel or by the ordinary unfused subordinating particle \:

HEAD=TAIL=ECHO = HEAD=TAIL + \.

And sometimes, the head and tail may reduplicate with each other (either ABAB or AABB), with nothing following at all (neither an echo-vowel nor unfused \):

HEAD=TAIL=ECHO = HEAD-TAIL-HEAD-TAIL = HEAD-HEAD-TAIL-TAIL.

One thing we never find, however, is an echo-vowel co-occurring in the same expression with an unfused \:

*HEAD=TAIL=ECHO + \.
This proves that the echo-vowel is nothing more than a superfused reduction of the underlying particle itself.

D. The EVAs listed according to their tail-vowel

[II] with u-u

(1) ghô?=tū-u 'hollowed, emaciated (as a face)'.
   
   /< ghô? (V_adj.) 'be concave, cupped, sunken, dented'; also
   ghô? ê (AE_stat.). E.g. mê ghô?=tū-u gâv ve 'have a sunken face'/

(2) ci=cû-u 'all sour'
   
   /< ci (V_adj.) 'be sour'; also ci-cû-ci-cû/

(3) šâ?=qû-u 'all rough (as an unplaned board)'
   
   /< šâ? (V_adj.) 'be rough'; also šâ?-qû ê or just šâ?-qû.
   E.g. vê-khî-do chi qha-dê?-dê? mä lê? šê -- šâ?=qû-u phê?
   šê 'This housepost isn't properly smooth yet -- it's still all rough.'  NB: The same head occurs in another EVA with a different tail and a slightly different meaning (see šâ?=qê-ê), IX.20 below).61/

[III] with o-o

(4) i=lô-o 'great big; on a large scale, in a big way'
   
   /< i (V_adj.) 'be big' and -lô (B_n) 'big thing, something big'.62
   E.g. i=lô-o te gô 'if (you) make it so big' [adverbial use];
   yê i=lô-o ve ñ-phû? câ pa šô ve 'He has eaten up the biggest rice-cake' [adnominal use]. NB: i-lô also occurs as the unitary head of i-lô=ma-å (qv. n.59)./}

(5) kî=gô?-o 'all scarred up'
   
   /< kî (M_pfx) 'scar' (cf. ñ-kî - ñ-kîv [3.3d above]); gô? is perhaps an allofam of gô (V_adj.) 'be dried up and brittle (as fallen leaves)' and gwê (B_n) 'dried thing' (as in ñ-gwê-gwê (N) 'hide, dried animal-skin'). NB: The same head occurs in a synonymous EVA with a different tail (see kî=chê-ê, IV.12 below)./
(6) cú=kô?-o 'all shrivelled up; dry and puckered'
    /< cú (V) 'be tightly closed, puckered up; close something tightly', as in tê-cú 'sew up tight', mê? cú ve 'shut one's eyes tight (OV); be blind (Nspec-V).' E.g. á-phè? bê cú go ñ-phè? cú=kô?-o gay ve 'When there's blight on the chilli-peppers the leaves get all shrivelled up.'/

(7) tê?=pô?-o 'short and broad (of a person or thing); stumpy, squat'
    /tê? is not a free morpheme, but it recurs in ñ-tê?-nê, chò-tê?-nê (N) 'a short person, a shorty', and tê?-nê è (AEstat) 'short', á-pô?-tê? (N) 'kind of short, stubby banana'; the compound tê?-pô? is a true verb, and can be negated (mà tê?-pô?). E.g. yô tê?-pô?-o yô 'He's a dumpy little guy.'

(8) pê?=chô?-o 'tasteless, insipid (of food); barren (of land)'
    /< pê? (V) 'dissipate, lose its power; be tasteless, get stale (food); get flat (beer, soda); be infertile (land); be shallow (objects, water)'. E.g. kho-mû chi pê?=chô?-o gay 'This bread has gone stale.'/

(9) chô=nô-ô 'all bruised'
    /< chô (V) 'be bruised (people, fruit)'; the compound chô=nô is also a full verb. E.g. á-pô chi chô=nô-ô gay 'These bananas are all bruised.'/

(10) phi=phô?-ô 'grayish (like clouds)'
    /< phi = phi (V_adj) 'be gray'; also phi (B) 'something gray', phi è (AEstat) 'gray(ly)', phi-phô? è (AEstat)/

(11) lê=lô-ô 'big and round; big and lumpy'
    /lê is not a free noun or verb, but appears in lê è (AEstat) 'cylindrical' and ñô?-lê-lô (N) 'hunk of wood'. NB: This EVA apparently occurs only in combination with another one of similar meaning, chu=pê?-e (VIII.17 below).
(12) \( kî=chî ?-i \) 'all scarred up'
/This EVA is evidently quite synonymous with \( kî=gô ?-o \)
(qv.) E.g. \( yô \) ve \( më ?-phû \) \( kî=chî ?-i \) gav 'His face is all
scarred up.'/

(13) \( i-lô=ma-û \) 'on a grand scale; so that it's big'
/The roughly synonymous morphemes \( i \) (V\text{adj}) 'be big' and
\( -lô \) (B\text{n}) 'something big' here form a compound head for the
EVA. This is a more complex variant of \( i=lô-o \) [qv.], where
\( -lô \) is in the tail. E.g. \( i-lô=ma-û \) te go ni sô jå 'If it's
made nice and big it'll look very fine.'/

(14) \( chê ?=qâ-a \) 'too thin, watery (of a liquid which should be
thick, as honey, paint, soup)'
/There is no independent morpheme \( chê ? \) with a meaning
anything like this. E.g. \( phê ?-qô \) chi \( chê ?=qâ-a \) mâ gav --
nê ve vô 'This honey isn't watery -- it's thick.'/

(15) \( no=vî-i \) 'light green; light blue'
/\( no \) (N; B\text{n}) 'green, blue; something green or blue';
cf. also \( nô \) (AE\text{stat}) 'blue, green'/

(16) \( gê ?=lê ?-e \) 'all scraped up; scraped and abraded; red and
raw (skin); mangy (of animal)'
/\( gê ? \) (V) 'get scraped, abraded; irritated, mangy-looking';
also occurs reduplicated as \( gê ?-gê ?-lê ?-lê ? \)

(17) \( chu=pê ?-e \) 'plump, chubby'
/\( chu \) (V\text{adj}) 'be fat'; also \( chu=pê ? \) lê ? (AE\text{stat});
\( chu=pê ? \) is a free verb in its own right. E.g. \( chu=pê ?-e \) te
ve 'be chubby' [adverbial use]; \( chu=pê ?-e \) ve cho 'a chubby
person' [adnominal use]. NB: This EVA occurs as a constituent in a number of more complex and emphatic expressions: chu=pè?-e-dī-qu (N) 'big fat person; butter-ball'; chu=pè?-e ṭó ē (AE echo + AE stat) 'fat and round'; chu=pè?-e lē=lā-ō (AE echo + AE echo) 'rolling with fat; hulking and blubbery.'

(18) pā=nē?-e 'very thin (as paper); sharp (of a blade)'
/< pā (V adj) 'be thin (of people, objects); be sharp (of blades)'; also occurs unfused as pā-nē? ē (AE stat)/

IX] with e-e

When the vowel of the tail-syllable is intrinsically /e/ anyway, it is sometimes hard to decide whether we are dealing with an EVA or simply an ordinary stative adverbial. If the echo-mora is mid-tone, it is safe to assume the expression is an EVA [#19,20f.] Otherwise we have a problem [#21,22f.].

(19) qa=pē=-e 'spread out, splayed; swooping (as with spread wings)'
/< qa (V) 'be forked, branch out from [archaic]' × gā (M pf) 'branch' × ำāv (B ) 'something forked' [3.Fd above]; ult. related to qay (V) 'go' < *qa + e (Pv) (3.Eb above).
The bound morpheme pē = pē recurs in a few other compounds (e.g. ṭē?-qā-pē 'fork in a tree; forked stick', pē-lī-kā 'armpit'. E.g. pū qa=pē=-e qay ve 'have one's thighs spread apart'; tē khā lē hē-bī qa=pē=-e cō mū-gō tō' la ve yō 'All of a sudden a plane came swooping out of the sky over there.'/

(20) ṭā?=qī=-e 'rough and raspy (as the voice of an adolescent boy)'
/< ṭā? (V adj) 'be rough'; this same head occurs in another EVA with a different tail and a slight semantic difference (cf. ṭā?=qū-u). E.g. yō ṭ-khō ṭā?=qē-e qay ve 'His voice is getting rough and raspy.'/
(21) \( \text{hō=vēʔ-ɛ(ʔ)} \) 'warped, twisted out of shape (as wood, metal); twistedly, spirally'

/\( \text{hō (V)} \) 'get bent (esp. of metal)' and \( \text{vēʔ (M\text{prefix})} \) 'a screw'. E.g. \( \text{sō-bā chi hō=vēʔ-ɛ? qy} \) 'This sheet of metal is warped'; \( \text{vē-lō tē khe sāʔ-gō qho hō-vēʔ-ɛ? tōʔ la ve} \) 'A big snake came twisting out of the hollow tree.' NB: Since the last element is not under mid-tone, this expression might better be analysed as an ordinary AE stat: \( \text{hō-vēʔ ɛ(ʔ)}. / \)

(22) \( \text{gō=lēʔ-ɛ(ʔ)} \) 'peacefully; quietly'

/\( \text{gō (V adj)} \) 'be cool; be miserable, in trouble'; also \( \text{gō ɛ (AE stat)} \) 'cold; silent, quiet'; \( \text{tāʔ-ī-gō-lēʔ} \) \( \text{tāʔ-ī-gō-ɛ} \) 'in absolute silence'. E.g. \( \text{gō=lēʔ-ɛ ーション a mē} \) 'Please stay there quietly.' NB: This is the most problematic of our EVAs. The last element is not under mid-tone. Furthermore, \( \text{lēʔ(ʔ)} \) can be an allomorph of the subordinating particle \( \text{ɛ} \) itself, (qv. n.45) as illustrated by the variant pronunciations of \( \text{tāʔ-ī-gō-ł(1)ɛ(ʔ)}. /66/ \)

E. Secondary vowel length and the Lahu syllable canon

The echo-vowel adverbials are no doubt marginal to the Lahu phonological system, but they have nevertheless introduced the feature of contrastive vowel length into the language.67

Although our original simple syllable canon, \( \text{(C}_1\text{T* \text{\textup{V}}} \) is still adequate to characterize the 'core-system' of Lahu phonology, a much more elaborate schema is required to accommodate all the secondary or marginal features we have been discussing. Adding vowel-length /:/ to our formula, we arrive at the following monstrous result:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{(C}_1\text{)} & \text{T*} & \text{V} \\
\hline
\text{(w)} & \text{Y} & \text{w} \\
\text{(N)} & \text{ɛ}* & \\
\end{array}
\]

(* where T includes the checked tones /\( \text{~~} \) /; ** this is imperative/intonational glottal stop, distinct from the checked tones; *** occurs as second element of a complex nucleus only if /\( \text{ī/} \) precedes).
5. The bulging monosyllable: decay and rebirth

There is no reason to feel sorry for the poor little monosyllables of languages like Lahu. Despite the phonological reduction they have undergone, these syllables teem with the seeds of new life. Among all the marginal features floating around these syllables, some will certainly catch on and eventually penetrate to the core of the system. The monosyllabic languages of East and South-East Asia show an uncanny homostatic ability to regulate themselves in cyclic swings of expansion and contraction. What is absorbed and incorporated here will be diffused or extruded there.68

The accretional or augmentative tendencies do not of course stand in a simple one-to-one replacement relationship versus the tendencies toward reduction and attrition. Things are more indirect and slow-moving than that. Nonetheless, it is hard not to believe in some kind of overarching regulatory principle which eventually ensures that things will not go too far in any one direction. There is no harm in referring to this by some functional label like the 'economy of the syllable'.69

In a more cosmic vein, these phenomena furnish one more bit of reassuring evidence that the forces of creativity have nothing to fear from the forces of destruction.

Symbols and abbreviations not explained in the text are as follows:

\(\) belongs to the same word family as; as an allofam of

AE adverbial expression

\(\)AE stat stative adverbial morpheme

\(B\) bound nominal morpheme

\(B_v\) bound verbal morpheme

\(C_f\) final consonant

\(C_i\) initial consonant

\(C_p\) prefixal consonant

G glide

M morpheme

\(M_{pfx}\) prefixable morpheme
MSC Modern Standard Chinese
n,N nasal(ization)
N noun
Nh noun-head; head-noun
Ns spec specifying noun
OV object-plus-verb
P prefix
Ph noun-particle
Pv verb-particle
PST Proto-Sino-Tibetan
s suffixal-s
SE subordinating expression
SOV subject-object-verb
ST Sino-Tibetan
SVO subject-verb-object
T tone
V vowel; verb
Vadj adjectival verb; adjective
Vh verb-head; head-verb
VP verb phrase

NOTES

1. However, in most languages of the region (including Chinese) the pervasive process of compounding has ensured that a large percentage of the words in the lexicon are polysyllabic. A language may thus be simultaneously monomorphosyllabic but polylexosyllabic.

2. 'There is something about the tightly structured nature of the syllable in monosyllabic languages which favors the shift in contrastive function from one phonological feature
of the syllable to another' (Matisoff 1973b:78). Henderson (1975) has dubbed this phenomenon 'feature shuffling'.


4. Familiar examples include 'bonfire', 'daisy', 'hussy', 'window', 'nostril' (see Partridge 1978, entries).

5. The Lahu independent morpheme for 'bug' is pà. The high-rising tone in pà- already represents an incipient fusional process since it occurs (albeit sporadically) as a sort of sandhi-tone in several other compounds, e.g. hé 'field, swidden', but hē-pà? 'wild chicken' ('field-chicken').

6. The Dhimal voiceless nasal hm- must descend from *g-m-, while the high-rising tone of Lahu mā bespeaks a Proto-Loloish prefix *ʔ- (< *g-), ultimately < *ga or *tga 'child, son'. (See Benedict 1972:#59; Matisoff 1970; and 1972:#153.).

7. For example, fully 36 pages of Hanson (1906/1954:242-78) contain words beginning with ke-; there are 25 pages of se- words (ibid., 631-56), etc.

8. This causative prefix appears as jo- before roots beginning with sibilants or aspirates, and as se- otherwise. This formation descends from a sibilant causative prefix that must be set up for PTB itself (Benedict 1972:105). This is one of the rare cases where a morphological element with a well-defined meaning can be imputed to the proto-language already in 'reduced' prefixal form. At a still earlier time-depth, however, we may speculate that even this *g- prefix derived from an independent full syllable, maybe the prototype of the Old Chinese causative auxiliary verb MSC sì, reconstructed as *siang/si (Karlgren 1957: GSR 975n). (See Maran 1971:151ff., 1976; Matisoff 1976:431).

9. These designations are not quite synonymous. In current usage, 'Mon-Khmer' comprises all branches of the Austro-Asiatic family except for the Munda languages of India.

10. We owe this convenient and widely accepted term to Henderson (1952), who first applied it to Cambodian. For a brief discussion of minor syllables in Old Mon, see Shorto (1971: xv); for Khmer, Huffman (1972); for Northern Mon-Khmer (Palaung-Wa), Shorto (1960, 1963); for Khasi, Rabel (1961: 17-9); for Senoi, Diffloth (1973).

11. The phrase 'syllable-and-a-half' I first heard from the lips of Gordon Downer (LSA Summer Institute, 1967);
the Latinized version 'sesquisyllabic' was introduced in Matisoff (1973b:84ff.).

12. This includes all the branches of TB except Karen, which under heavy Mon and/or Tai influence, has evolved into a prepositional SVO language.

13. This also happens with the high-frequency negative adverb mà, very often pronounced â in colloquial style. Adverbials are a 'prepositional' class in Lahu, preceding the verbs they modify.

14. Cacophonous as this term may be, it is certainly better to be sesqui-moral than utterly immoral, and less equivocal than to be bi-moral.

15. The discussion in this section is based on Matisoff 1973a: 10-38.

16. These 9 vowels are, however, compressed into a much higher and narrower range of phonetic space than in Thai. Thus the vowel written /a/ is like that of Eng. bed (not like bad, as in the Siamese vowel often transcribed with the same symbol). The mid-vowels /e ø o/ are so high that they often vary with /i ù u/.

17. P = prefix (up to two 'prefix-slots' are posited even at the PTB stage); C₁ = (root-)initial consonant; G = glide /w y r l/; V = vowel; ′:′ = vowel length; C_f = final consonant /-m -n -ŋ -p -t -k -r -l -s/; s = suffixal -a, which could occur after root-final C_f's. It is still controversial what status to impute to tone at the PTB stage, though this language family seems always to have been 'tone-prone'.

18. In certain types of syllable with a glottalized initial, even this postvocalic [-ʔ] has disappeared by 'glottal dissimilation', leaving a compensatory high-rising tone (Matisoff 1970; 1972).

19. One reason out of many is that glottal stop disappears in Lahu singing, as do all other tonal features (pitch, contour). Additional support for this suprasegmentalist approach is provided by the phonetic behaviour of the echo-vowel adverbials,4.C below). For a clear account of glottalization in the context of 'phonation types' in general, see Egerod (1971).

20. This contrast has been explained in terms of the influence of the voicing or voicelessness of various elements in the syllable-initial (see Matisoff 1972, passim.).
21. We use the same diacritics in our digraphs for the stopped tones as are used for two of the open tones, /~/ and /~/'. This is entirely a matter of orthographic parsimony, since there is no historical or synchronic connection whatever between /~/ and /~/', or between /~/ and /~/'. We regard the open and checked tones as constituting quite separate subsystems in Lahu phonology.

22. Note that the *w- functions here as the PLB *C_i, not as a *G. For 'pig!', the proto-rhyme is *-ak and the Lahu reflex is -a?_. Contrasting to this are syllables like *twak 'emerge', where the proto-rhyme is *-wak, i.e. where the -w- is functioning as a feature more closely associated with the nuclear vowel than with the C_i. Here the vowel quality is changed, and the Lahu reflex is -a?.

23. The -? comes after the completion of most of the verb's tonal contour, so that there is usually no question of confusing these imperatives with other verbs having 'intrinsic' checked tones (Matisoff 1973a:352-3).

24. These are written with -n for orthographic convenience, though we conceive of the nasality as a suprasegmental or coarticulatory feature.

25. As these last examples show, this blind phonetic process operates even in syllables under stopped tones, so that the same vowel can be nasalized and glottalized simultaneously. This is another bit of evidence for the suprasegmentality of the feature of glottalization. Similarly, Burmese 'creaky' tone may occur on syllables with nasalized vowels (e.g. ?akhwin! 'permission'). (See Matisoff 1975.)

Most Lahu syllables that begin with nasal C_i's do not show pronounced nasalization of the following vowel, with the notable exception of /mu/, where the vowel is so nasalized that it is almost completely swallowed up by the initial: [mV~J ~ [mV]. (Lahu labials /p ph b m/ are affricated before /u/ to [p^ ph^ b^ v m^].) Parallel developments have occurred in other Loloish languages like Akha. Thus, PLB *s-muw1 'mushroom' > WB hmu1, Lahu m.fixed [mV~J, Akha hm~.

26. Phonetically, the second element is a semivowel intermediate in height between e and i, [e~].

27. /w/ never occurs before the back vowels /u o o/ or the central vowels /i e/.

28. PLB initial consonantal *w- developed regularly into Lahu v-, as in PLB *wak 'pig' > Lh. v~a?., PLB *wa2 'bamboo' > Lh. v~a, etc.
29. This is not to say that there is no difference whatsoever between the two variants. Sometimes the prelabialized form seems to convey a stylistic nuance of familiarity, a more colloquial or folksy tone than the plain variant. Strictly speaking, however, this is not a 'morphemic' difference. It is somewhat similar to the 'dropping of the -\(e\)' in the present participles of verbs in certain varieties of American English (e.g. singin' [‘sɪŋɪn] instead of singing [‘sɪŋɪŋ]).

30. To keep things simple, certain constraints have not been built into the formula: (a) No Lahu syllable has yet been encountered with both a prevocalic glide and a postvocalic -\(\text{y}\) or -\(\text{w}\). (Such syllables do exist in Tai, e.g. Siamese dúaj 'together', díaw 'single'); (b) A verb that already is intrinsically under a checked tone undergoes no change in the imperative.

31. Subsequent research has thoroughly borne out this hypothesis. A general TB root *\(kæ\) \*\(gæ\) can now be set up with the meaning 'go' deriving ultimately from the notion of striding or spreading the legs (cf. Benedict 1972:#469, and below 4.D (19)).

32. It also appears without the suffix, either as \(\text{b}-\text{me}\) or \(\text{b}-\text{mê}\), with the variant under very-low tone /\(\text{v}\)/ occurring in the compound ná?-\(\text{me}\) 'gunpowder.'

33. A 'M\(p\)fx' or 'prefixable morpheme' is a root which occurs either in 'general' form with the prefix \(\text{b}-\), or in 'specified' form modified by another noun (Matisoff 1973a: 3.34). The general prefixed form \(\text{b}-\text{ê}\) means 'child, baby'. In specified form it serves as a productive diminutivizer (pʰ\(\text{ê}-\text{ê}\) 'puppy', \(\text{b}-\text{how}-\text{ê}\)-\(\text{ê}\) 'small intestine', \(\text{yê}-\text{ê}\) 'little house').

34. For alternations between /\(\text{e}\)/ and /\(\text{ê}\)/, which are 'mechanical' in nature, see Matisoff (1973a:1.63, p.28). It is the open-toned variant that occurs in the compound më?-\(\text{ê}\)-lwê 'firefly.'

35. This term is used by Lahu in Burma. Lahu resident in Thailand now tend to say më?-kêw for 'eyeglasses'. The same semantic association between 'shadow' and 'mirror' is displayed by the Japanese root kage 'shadow' and its derivative kagami 'mirror'. (I owe this observation to Susan Matisoff.)

36. If anything /\(\text{ë}\)/ is more like a rising diphthong, since \(\text{ê}\) is such a high vowel that it is quasi-consonantal (almost a semivowel), with less acoustic energy than \(\text{ê}\). This nucleus is somewhat comparable to the three centralizing diphthongs of Siamese, sometimes written
/ia əa ua/ and sometimes /ie əe ua/. As the latter transcription suggests, the second element is less prominent than the first, but it is still a true vowel, not a semi-vowel. Rather than calling these 'falling diphthongs', the term 'co-valent' seems appropriate here also.

37. The meaning of the fused element in 'measles' is obscure! For 'drizzle' and 'whisper', it is undoubtedly the adverbializing particle ə (4.B below) which has become amalgamated with the preceding syllable in underlying stative adverbial constructions (ibid., esp. n.49) of the form *a'? ə, chə? ə.

38. For complex nuclei which show free variation between 'totally fused' /-y/ and 'semifused' /-e/ vocalism, see the discussion of the minimized extentives, below 4.A.

39. The word lə?-no-ce (lit. 'finger-joint') means 'knuckle, phalanx' (in the sense of a finger-section from joint to joint). The word for 'little finger' (lə?-no-ce - lə?-no-ce) seems thus to be derived from a fuller form *lə?-no-ce [lə?-no 'finger' and ce-ə 'small joint'], i.e. 'small-knuckled finger; the finger with the smallest phalanges.'

40. This is quite analogous to a phenomenon at the other end of the syllable that I have called prefix preemption, whereby a prefix comes to drive out the original root-initial consonant. (See, e.g., Matisoff 1979.)

41. For such syllables as həə and rəə, see the discussion of minimized extentives (4.A below).

42. Lahu checked syllables take less time to utter than open ones. A number of Lahu syllables under high-rising or very-low tones /'~/' have allegro variants under high-checked or low-checked tones /'~/' /'~, respectively. See Matisoff (1973a:#1.63l, p.28), and the discussion of mə?-gə? - mə?-gə (3.Fc above).

There is evidence that this particle ə derives historically from a syllable with lateral initial /lə/ which still survives as an alternant of ə in certain collocations. As noted above (1.B), several functors optionally drop their C₁ in Black Lahu, including such essential items as mə - ə (Adv) 'negative', tə? - ə? (P) 'accusative', and tə? - ə? (P) 'perfective'.

43. E.g., chi həə c ve cho 'such a small person'. See below 4.A and 4.B (esp. Table 2) and Matisoff (1973a:130).

44. See Matisoff 1973a:#1.42f, 3.62. These words are called 'diminutive extentives' throughout that work, but we adopt
the label 'minimized' here to avoid confusion with the
distinct morpheme $\text{M}_{\text{prefix}}$ that we are calling 'diminutive'.

45. My most reliable informant (1977) insisted that he felt a
slight drop in pitch on the second mora, and suggested it
be written with the symbol for high-falling tone $\bar{\text{1}}$.

46. The initial consonant is here affricated, the fused vowel
$[\text{כ}]$ is nasalized to $[\text{ט}]$, and the original nuclear vowel,
unrounded to $[\text{ו}]$ in this environment, is deprived of its
syllabicity.

47. The high-rising tone acquired by the extentives in their
minimized form is similar to what we find in a number of
stative adverbials (4.8 below), where a mid-tone base form
becomes high-rising tone before the subordinating particle
$\ddot{\text{כ}}$: \text{phu} 'white' $\rightarrow \text{phū} \ddot{\text{כ}}$ 'whitely', \text{chu} 'fat' $\rightarrow \text{chū} \ddot{\text{כ}}$ 'fatly',
etc. See Matisoff (1973a:1.641, p.30).

48. The adverb $\text{qha}$ means 'all'; $\text{V}_h$ = verb-head, $\text{N}_h$ = noun-head.
Examples of fused nuclei in qha-adverbials include:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qha pēy} & \quad [\text{פּּי}] \quad 'completely' < \text{qha pē} \ddot{\text{כ}} < \text{פּ} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'to finish', \\
\text{qha ġay} & \quad [\text{גּי}] \quad 'until it is reached, up to the point that' \\
& \quad < \text{qha ġē} \ddot{\text{כ}} < \text{גּ} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'to reach', \\
\text{qha māy} & \quad [\text{מּי}] \quad 'equally, to the same extent' < \text{qha mā} \ddot{\text{כ}} < \text{מּ} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'be many', \\
\text{qha cvē} & \quad [\text{כָּוי}] \quad 'perfectly, correctly' < \text{qha cē} \ddot{\text{כ}} < \text{כּ} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'be correct', \\
\text{qha lvē} & \quad [\text{לּוי}] \quad 'sufficiently' < \text{qha lē} \ddot{\text{כ}} < \text{לּ} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'be enough', \\
\text{qha ū} \; [\text{עּי}] \quad 'in the same way' < \text{qha ū} \ddot{\text{כ}} < \text{עּ} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'be the
same' (Matisoff 1973a:17, 20).
\end{align*}
\]
This last example involves the doublet formation $\text{u} \sim \text{wi}$
(3.C above).

49. The morpheme preceding $\ddot{\text{כ}}$ in a stative adverbial is some­
times an independent verb in its own right e.g. $\text{ba}$ ($\text{V}$)
'shine, be bright!' $\rightarrow \text{ba} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'clearly, brightly'. Sometimes
it may be more nounlike $[\text{סּי} (\text{N})] 'gold' > \ddot{\text{סּ}} \ddot{\text{כ}} 'yellow,
gold-coloured'$. In many cases the morpheme only occurs
in the adverbial construction, so it is hard to tell what
its intrinsic form-class is. To cover all these contingencies we are using the non-committal symbol 'M' (for
'morpheme').

50. The verb following a stative adverbial is usually one of
a handful of highly abstract items like $\text{qay} 'go'$, $\text{te} 'do'$,
$\text{phē} 'be'$, $\text{lā} 'come'$. The chief semantic burden of the
VP is borne by the adverbial, with the verb merely providing
a cushion for its adverbiality to rest upon. The same is
true for most of the other types of SEs in their adverbial
function. (The exception is qha-adverbials, which occur
freely before any semantically appropriate verb.)
51. Especially reduplicated adjectival verbs ($V_{adj}$).

52. $B_v$ = bound verbal morpheme. We conventionally connect this intensifier to its adjective by a hyphen.

53. These are four-syllable constructions at least two of which are verbs, such that the first and third, or the second and fourth elements, are identical.

54. There will probably be little danger of confusing this term with the similar acronym used by astronauts for 'extra-vehicular activity'!

55. Larger, for example, than the number of adjective-intensifiers so far discovered. As we shall see, the EVAs resemble intensified adjectives more than any other type of subordinate expression.

56. The auditory impression is rather similar to that of the Vietnamese nga tone, though the Lahu syllables have less 'creakiness' than the Vietnamese ones.

57. Exceptions are ga=p£-£, where the root-part of the syllable is already mid-tone; and a few items like İ-lê=mo-ê, gê=lê?-ê, hê=vê?-ê, where the contour ends as a low-falling tone /\‾/. With these last two there is some question as to whether they are really EVAs (21-22) below.

58. These are very similar in status to such lexically specific English intensifiers as jet (black), scot (free), stock (still), luke (warm), etc.

59. In our corpus, the exception is İ-lê=ma-ê 'on a grand scale' (3-and-a-half syllables). But here İ-lê is functioning as a tight lexical unit. See 4.D (13) below.

60. Since reduplication by itself is already a widespread morphological technique to achieve adverbialized status in Lahu (reduplicated verbs are a kind of 'SE': see Table 2), the reduplication obviates the necessity for any subordinate particle.

61. We may symbolize the cases where a given head may have multiple tails as: HEAD=TAIL$_1$-ECHO \rightarrow HEAD=TAIL$_2$-ECHO. This again is similar to what goes on with ordinary intensified adjectives, where the same $V_{adj}$ may occasionally take more than one intensifier, with some semantic differentiation. Thus he 'be hard' may be intensified as he-kê 'stiff (as cramped muscles or an erect penis)' vs. he-tê? or he-taw? 'hard and chewy (as sugarcane)'; 'hard but resilient (as a pig's sternum)'.
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This morpheme is from Shan (cf. Thai ลำปาง), but is thoroughly integrated into Lahu, functioning as the antonym of ꜐ (Mₚꜜ ꜐) 'something small'.

In this example, the EVA occurs 'independently', with no following verb. Since Lahu adverbials tend to be the semantic centre of interest of their clauses (the following verb is usually an abstract dummy), it frequently happens that the verb is omitted, so that the adverbial becomes more verblike. (See Matisoff 1973a:#4.421, 4.422(3), 4.424, 6.47.)

The last syllable of this EVA was correctly understood to be a fusional variant of the subordinating particle ꜐ in Matisoff (1973a:17,#1.42e). However, the identification of ꜐ with the morpheme ꜐ (Mₚꜜ ꜐) 'something sharp' (as in ꜐-tho- ꜐ 'knife-blade', ꜐- ꜐ 'stinger of bee') was quite wrong. Contra Matisoff, op.cit., there is no AE stat of the shape ꜐ ꜐ ꜐[vi-i] meaning 'sharp', and ꜐-i, in fact, occurs only as the tail of ꜐ in this particular EVA.

The ꜐ is to be regarded as the fuller (presumably original) form of the subordinator ꜐ (qv. n.42).

I analysed this ꜐(2) as a variant of the subordinator ꜐ which came to be 'treated as part of the root-morpheme of the adverbial, so that another ꜐ may directly follow it' in Matisoff (1973a:565, n.144.).

We should perhaps say 'reintroduced', since vowel length is set up as a feature of PTB (Benedict 1972:70f.), though only in syllables with final consonants.

There are even excellent examples of new syllable-final oral stops developing from semivowels. In Maru (Burmish group), PLB *-uw and *-iy have become -uk and -it, respectively. (See, e.g. Burling 1967:59-61). This is similar to a development that has been traced for Archaic Chinese millennia ago, where *-ג and *-ד have been plausibly derived from earlier *-י and *-ץ (Benedict 1948).

I do not believe that A. Martinet (Économie des changements phonétiques: traité de phonologie diachronique. Berne; 1955) actually uses the term l'économie de la syllabe, though I doubt he would object to it.
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1. Introduction

It was no doubt his admitted lack of information which made Forbes (1881:56) think that the Yaw dialect of Burmese was 'certainly unintelligible to any Burman. In fact, as Houghton (1897:456) and Taylor (1921:91) observe, Yaw had few differences from Standard Burmese. A British Settlement Officer reported that, 'at first, the dialect is difficult to understand, but after a few days one finds oneself speaking it and it presents no difficulty' (Abigail 1932:6).

Few and unspectacular though the differences are, they are important, as they place Yaw (YW) several steps closer than Standard Burmese (SB) -- or any of the recognised dialects -- to Written Burmese (WB), and this feature makes it a valuable ingredient in comparative studies.

Despite its importance in this respect, Yaw has not been described in any detail till relatively recently (Kya Htún 1969; Yabu Shiro 1980). Ono (1969) allows just over a page to Yaw, and earlier studies went no further than noting a few forms in comparative lists (Buchanan 1799; Houghton 1897; Grierson 1928; Taylor 1921). A description in English, and a comparison with Standard Burmese and Written Burmese has been lacking. I was fortunate in being able to record two texts of spoken Yaw in Burma, and to have the assistance of the speakers in transcribing them. These texts, supplemented by my informants' answers to queries, provide the material for the outline description presented here.

1.1 Features of particular interest

For many, the most spectacular feature of Yaw is its rhymes /ak/ and /a~/, corresponding to Standard Burmese /e~/ and /in/. (For systems of transliteration and transcription see Okell 1971.) Yaw not only reflects more closely the ak and a~ of Written Burmese, but also -- with occasional lapses -- has velar closure for both. It also has velar closure in its YW /auk/, WB ok, SB /au~/, though not, curiously, in its YW /aun/,
WB on, SB /aun/. For the standard array of eight final consonants in Written Burmese, none of the other major dialects now has anything more than glottal stop (for Written Burmese obstruents) or nasalised vowel (for Written Burmese nasals). In these circumstances, Yaw's velar closure is a remarkable relic.

Yaw has also not yet allowed initial, or medial /w/ to alter the quality of the following vowel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>at</th>
<th>an</th>
<th>wat</th>
<th>wan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For WB</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>wap</td>
<td>wan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where SB has</td>
<td>/a?</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>wu?</td>
<td>wun/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaw stoutly preserves</td>
<td>/e?</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>we?</td>
<td>wen/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One other point worth mentioning here is the consistency of the Yaw rhyme /e/ (rarely /e/) for Written Burmese ahn. Like the reflexes of this rhyme in other dialects, Yaw's consistency shows how eclectic Standard Burmese has been with its /i/, /e/ and /e/ realizations.

1.2 Location and numbers of the Yaw

My informants said the main town centres of the Yaw are at Yaw itself, and at Htì-lìn and Gàn-gàw, which places them at the head of the Myit-thà valley, with the Chin Hills on the west, and the Pon-daung and Pon-nya ranges on the east — a geographical setting that might be expected to isolate them somewhat. This location is confirmed by Kya Htùn (1969:142) and by the Swe-zon kyàn (1970:2). The Linguistic survey of Burma (LSB, Webb 1917), however, records the majority on the plains side of the watershed, 'between Saw and Seikpyu', with a few outliers further north on the western edge of the plain, reaching as far as Kani on the Chin-dwìn river.

It is difficult to reconcile this discrepancy without a further survey. Some of the more obvious possibilities are that respondents to the LSB questionnaire in the valley, which the survey did cover, did not fully understand what was being asked; or my informants, being valley men, may have been unaware of the numbers of Yaw on the plains side; or there may have been appreciable population movements in the sixty years since the survey itself. There is also mention in the literature of a group of Yaw who fled to the upper Mù valley in the Katha District (Harvey 1925:262) and of two Yaw villages way up near Myit-kyî-nà (Webb 1917:33).

The present number of Yaw speakers is unknown. The LSB (Webb 1917:55) recorded over 24,000. This stands in marked contrast to the Census (1933) figures, but these can hardly claim serious consideration anyway, in view of their incredible fluctuations: in the five decades from 1891 to 1931 they give
370, 5, 0, 2 and 877 respectively! The low response to the Census (1933) is presumably due partly to uncertainty over the criteria that qualify one as a Yaw, and partly to a reluctance to identify oneself as a Yaw anyway (Scott 1900:569; Hardiman 1912:29).

1.3 Background

The antecedents of the Yaw are obscure, and have attracted some divergent speculations:

Dr Mason classes the Yaw as a Burmese tribe. In this he is followed by Dr Cushing. Mr Houghton is inclined to doubt the accuracy of this classification. The Shan chronicles of Mōng Kawng (Mogaung) seem to claim them as Shans, though perhaps they may be the Nora spoken of as earlier owners of the land. They themselves have a legend that they are descended from a clan of the Palaungs called Parawga or Payawga. This in time was shortened through Yawga to Yaw. There are still to be found Parawga sayas among them, oracles or mages, who make their divinations on the Tai cycle tables, which is significant. The common folk say that the reason why their dialect differs from Burmese is that they drink the water of the mountain streams.... The dialect is a hybrid, nearest to Burmese now; possibly it was at one time nearer to Shan or to some of the Chin dialects (Scott 1900:569)

Other writers choose one or other of the alternatives offered here: primitive Burmans (Forbes 1881:56), from the Irrawaddy valley (Houghton 1897:456), captive Shans sent from Mogaung (Owens 1913:16), Burmese-speaking Chins (Taylor 1921:91), or Chin-tainted Burmans (Saw Shwe Boh 1973:18) -- all indicative of a notable absence of hard facts. Equally fanciful is the identification with Tavoyan (Symes 1800:2, 235), and the attempt to derive Yaw from Standard Burmese /Yɔ-nakā/ 'Shan' (Saw Shwe Boh 1973:16).

The only real evidence one has for the origins of the Yaw is the dialect, and the closeness of this to Standard Burmese and Written Burmese indicates fairly strongly that as Kya Htun (1969:141) suggests, the Yaw are nothing more exotic than a group of plains Burmans cut off from the mainstream of Standard Burmese development comparatively recently by a degree of geographical isolation.

The 'Payawga' derivation sounds like a folk etymology, based on the fact that the Yaw have a reputation for skill in the magical arts, one form of which -- by no means a Yaw monopoly -- is called /pəyɔ-gà/ in Standard Burmese, from Pāli payoga. Among the many varieties of Palaung listed in the LSB, none has a name resembling this word. Again, the idea that the
Yaw once spoke some more distant or unrelated language (Chin, Palaung, Shan) and subsequently adopted Burmese is an implausible explanation of the peculiarities of their dialect. Such differences as there are between Yaw and Standard Burmese in phonology, grammar and lexicon are not of a kind that can be considered vestiges of an unrelated language. Nor are alleged resemblances to Tavoyan persuasive.

In better documented times, there are records of a kind of Yaw autonomy. There was at one stage a Yaw-lei-Myo-wun, with jurisdiction over the four towns of Pauk, Hti-lin, Saw and Lang-shei, and each of these towns was governed by a Saw-bwa (shades of the alleged Shan connection). The Saw-bwa were replaced by Myo-thagy~ after a rebellion in the reign of Naung-daw-gyi (1763-65) (Owens 1913:15f.), and at the turn of the century the Yaw were still described as 'governed by chiefs of their own, but tributary to the Burmans' (Buchanan 1799:224) — perhaps not wholly inconsistent with Symes' (1800:1, 235) information that 'the Yoos are subjects of the Birman state, and observe the same religious worship'. Their relative remoteness from central government at this stage is perhaps indicated by the attitude of the clerk who told Symes that they were 'exceedingly ugly, having protuberant bellies and white teeth'. My informants were, in fact, quite good-looking.

1.4 Source of material

I did not go to the Yaw area, but made some recordings in Rangoon of unprepared speech by some students from Gan-gaw who had arrived in Rangoon for the first time only a few days previously. One recording describes some distinctive features of the Yaw area and its people, and the second, by a different speaker, is a folktale.
2. Outline phonology

2.1 Phoneme inventory

2.1.1 Tones:
   - low  /+/
   - high plain  /\/
   - high creaky  /\/
   - high stop  /+?/ or /+k/
   - weak  /a/

2.1.2 Rhymes:
   - open syllables
     - weak:  ə
     - full:  i e ø a o u
   - closed syllables
     - nasal:  ain ein ðn æg in oun aun

2.1.3 Heads:
   - with med /y/  med /w/  all but
     - g d b j z  by  w
     - k t p c s  py  ø (/w-/
     - kh th ph ch sh ð  phy  h (/hw-/
     - n m ð  my
     - hq hn hm ðn  hmy
     - ? l w y r  (ly)
     - h hl hw j  (hly)

2.2 Phoneme description

As in Standard Burmese, except for:
   - /ɛn, ð?: vowel lower than in SB /ɛ?/
   - /æg, ak, auk/: final velar consonants -- the stop not released -- clearly audible in slow speech, but sometimes realized by nasalization and glottal stop respectively. The vowel in /æg, ak/ is more open and back than in SB /an, a?/, and close to the SB /a/ of open syllables. Given /auk/ one would expect /au?/ to match, but it is not attested in my material.
   - /(ly, hly)/: rare variants for /y, j/, used in formal styles.
2.3 Comparison with Written Burmese

2.3.1 Tones: as for Standard Burmese

2.3.2 Rhymes:

open

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YW /i e a o u e/

closed nasal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aŋ</td>
<td>aŋ</td>
<td>aŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aŋ</td>
<td>aŋ</td>
<td>aŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uŋ</td>
<td>uŋ</td>
<td>uŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

closed stop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>/i?/</td>
<td>i?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>a?</td>
<td>a?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap</td>
<td>ak</td>
<td>ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ak</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uik</td>
<td>uik</td>
<td>uik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 Heads: as for Standard Burmese

3. Notes

3.1 Phonemes

3.1.1 WB aŋ corresponds regularly to Yaw /e/, but not also to /i/ or /e/ as in SB, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lhaŋ:</td>
<td>hlɛ</td>
<td>hlɛ</td>
<td>'cart'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saŋ:</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɔi, ɔi</td>
<td>'this'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khyaŋ:</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛi, ɛi</td>
<td>'cotton (thread)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mraŋ:</td>
<td>myɛ</td>
<td>myɛ</td>
<td>'taste'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kraŋ:</td>
<td>cɛ</td>
<td>cɛ</td>
<td>'look'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam-mrak-caŋ:</td>
<td>tɛbys-ɛ-si</td>
<td>tɛbys-ɛ-si</td>
<td>'broom'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tacaŋ:</td>
<td>tɛzɛ</td>
<td>tɛzɛ</td>
<td>'a bundle'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kraŋ:</td>
<td>cɛ</td>
<td>ɔi</td>
<td>'be clear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naŋ:</td>
<td>nɛ</td>
<td>nɛ</td>
<td>'way'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caŋ:</td>
<td>sɛ</td>
<td>sɛ</td>
<td>'be crowded'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praŋ:</td>
<td>pyɛ</td>
<td>pyi</td>
<td>'pyi (measure)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praŋ:</td>
<td>pyɛ</td>
<td>pyɛ</td>
<td>'be full'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I did encounter a few words with Yaw /e/:

- paccaññ: pyi?-sè pyi?-sì 'thing'
- man-kyaññ: mejè mejì 'tamarind'
- caññ:-we: sè-wè sì-wè 'meet'
- tuin:-praññ: taìn-pye taìn-pye 'country'

There seems to be no environment feature corresponding to the use of Yaw /e/ rather than /ɛ/; in the list above the heads pr-, c-, and ky/khy- occur with both rhymes.

3.1.2 Initial and medial w do not affect the pronunciation of the rhymes WB an, am and at, ap, as they do in SB, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wam:</td>
<td>wèn</td>
<td>wùn</td>
<td>'stomach'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kam:</td>
<td>kèn</td>
<td>kàn</td>
<td>'bank'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lwat</td>
<td>lwè?</td>
<td>lu?</td>
<td>'be free'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tat</td>
<td>te?</td>
<td>ta?</td>
<td>'know'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 Yaw has only /θ/ where Standard Burmese has /θ/ and /ʒ/, e.g.

- sum:sonñ: əœùn-əaùn əœùn-əaùn 'thirty thousand'

3.1.4 The continuant series has some examples of aspiration in words not aspirated in Standard Burmese, e.g.

- mya: hmyà myà 'be many'
- 'anam a̯hnen a̯nan 'side'
- rañ hqi̯n qin 'draw'
- lwam: hlwèn lùn 'too much'

3.1.5 Loanwords from Standard Burmese occasionally cut across the general pattern, e.g.

- YW & SB /pyi-ðà pyi?-sì kə-po-rè-ʃìn/ for *YW /pye-ðà pyi?-sè kə-po-rè-ʃàq/ 'People's Trade Corporation'

3.2 Morphophonemical

3.2.1 Voicing occurs, as in Arakanese, only with plain initials, not with both plain and aspirate as in Standard Burmese, nor with /θ/, e.g.
This feature reveals some aspirates that one would not expect from Written Burmese and Standard Burmese:

Voiced initial in Yaw:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ne-tā-ka</td>
<td>ne-da-gā</td>
<td>ne-da-gā</td>
<td>'staying'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-khu-khu</td>
<td>takhū-khū</td>
<td>takhū-gū</td>
<td>'something'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thā:tay</td>
<td>thà-de</td>
<td>thà-de</td>
<td>'(they) place'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yokyā:thak</td>
<td>yauk-cà-thak</td>
<td>yau?-cà-de?</td>
<td>'more than men'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lū-nyui</td>
<td>lu-byo</td>
<td>lu-byo</td>
<td>'bachelor'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twe.phū</td>
<td>twé-phù</td>
<td>twé-bù</td>
<td>'ever see'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lū-cri</td>
<td>lu-jī</td>
<td>lu-jī</td>
<td>'elder'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-khyaŋ</td>
<td>pyā-chaŋ</td>
<td>pyā-jin</td>
<td>'want to say'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhac-nam-cap</td>
<td>hñhn-eñ-zë?</td>
<td>hñnan-za?</td>
<td>'sewn together'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'apo-chum</td>
<td>əpō-shuñ</td>
<td>əpō-zoûn</td>
<td>'most abundant'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hañ:sī</td>
<td>hāq-ñī</td>
<td>hīn-ñī</td>
<td>'vegetable'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possibly Written Burmese spelling has been altered from a more etymologically correct form.

Some words in Standard Burmese have voiced initials even when they are not in close juncture. Their counterparts in Yaw often have voiced initials in the same way, but a number have aspirate initials, e.g.

Voiced initial in Yaw:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gwam</td>
<td>gwēn</td>
<td>gūn</td>
<td>'cotton'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gui</td>
<td>gō</td>
<td>gō</td>
<td>'goal'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khwa</td>
<td>gwā</td>
<td>gwā</td>
<td>'fork'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāt</td>
<td>ðā?</td>
<td>ða?</td>
<td>'relic'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byuiñ</td>
<td>byaìn</td>
<td>byaìn</td>
<td>'paddy bird, egret'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khye</td>
<td>jē</td>
<td>jī</td>
<td>'dirt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jhe</td>
<td>zē</td>
<td>zē</td>
<td>'market'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chak-krui</td>
<td>zak-cō</td>
<td>ze?-cō</td>
<td>'reins'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aspirate initial in Yaw:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Written Burmese</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khō̂n</td>
<td>khaṅn</td>
<td>gaṅn</td>
<td>'head'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhā:</td>
<td>thā</td>
<td>dā</td>
<td>'knife'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhā, bhāy</td>
<td>pha, phē</td>
<td>ba, be</td>
<td>'what? which?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhôn-bhī</td>
<td>phaṅ-phi</td>
<td>baṅ-bi</td>
<td>'trousers'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhu-raṅ</td>
<td>phyaṅ</td>
<td>bayin</td>
<td>'king'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bū:</td>
<td>phù</td>
<td>bù</td>
<td>'gourd'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhī:</td>
<td>phi</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>'comb'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khyit</td>
<td>chei?</td>
<td>jei?</td>
<td>'hook'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khrui</td>
<td>cho</td>
<td>jo</td>
<td>'horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khyok</td>
<td>chau?</td>
<td>jau?</td>
<td>'chasm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jhī:si:</td>
<td>shį-ši</td>
<td>zį-ŋį</td>
<td>'wild plum'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is hardly enough evidence here to sort out the various factors involved. Some of the Yaw voiced initials can be accounted for by being loans, e.g.

/gɔ/ from English goal
/deʔ/ from Pāli dhātu

Others may have been voiced in Standard Burmese by the formative voicing and then borrowed in this form into Yaw (e.g. /gwā/) -- assuming, on the evidence of words such as Yaw /chei?, chau?/, that the voicing formative does not operate in Yaw. Others again have probably been voiced in Standard Burmese by close juncture and later lost the first syllable but retained the voicing (cf. e.g., the older forms, Written Burmese: ū:khō̂n, ū:khrui). In Yaw the first syllable may have been dropped in the same way, but no voicing remains as aspirate initials would not have been voiced in this position.

Forms like Yaw /thā, phū, phē, shį/ are the most interesting. They could well be survivals of a hypothetical period when Burmese had no voiced obstruents. By this theory, voicing has supervened in Standard Burmese while Yaw holds out against this development. Such words also suggest an explanation for the otherwise bizarre spellings of Written Burmese.

3.2.2 Weakening and induced creaky tone occur much as in Standard Burmese. (See the texts for examples.)

3.3 Grammar

3.3.1 Particles seem to match those of Standard Burmese closely. Two with not quite regular reflexes occur in the recordings.
In Written Burmese and Standard Burmese both have different forms for colloquial and formal styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WR</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coll.</td>
<td>form.</td>
<td>coll.</td>
<td>form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nai.</td>
<td>nhañ.</td>
<td>ná</td>
<td>nē</td>
<td>hnín</td>
<td>'with'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ìa:</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>ła</td>
<td>ła</td>
<td>(interrog.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yaw /ná/ corresponds to Arakanese, Tavoyan, and In-tha /ná/; Standard Burmese is the odd man out here. Yaw preserves the older form /lā/ which is not used in colloquial Standard Burmese and even in formal Standard Burmese is being ousted by the colloquial /là/.

3.3.2 Some selectives show different forms from Standard Burmese:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WR</th>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saññ</td>
<td>òe</td>
<td>ìi, ì</td>
<td>'this'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhay, bha</td>
<td>phè, pha</td>
<td>bè, ba</td>
<td>'which?, what?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dañ</td>
<td>tha</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>'that (thing)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sañ</td>
<td>òaq</td>
<td>òin</td>
<td>'that (year)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these, the first two show regular correspondences, with Yaw voicelessness for Standard Burmese voicing. The last item is rare in Standard Burmese; it is not used in colloquial, but occurs in older literature, and then only with the noun nhac 'year'. Yaw preserves it in speech.

3.4 Vocabulary

There were a few items that differed from Standard Burmese.

3.4.1 Forms which appear not to have cognates in Standard Burmese:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jè-dañq</td>
<td>poun-byin</td>
<td>'story'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>këzauk-këzak</td>
<td>òmyà-jì</td>
<td>'much, a lot'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Forms with different meaning or use in Standard Burmese:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ein-hmú</td>
<td>€ khan</td>
<td>'greet, welcome'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf. €, hmú</td>
<td>'visit, do'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loun-gwâŋ</td>
<td>loun-ji</td>
<td>'lon-gyi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf. kwîn</td>
<td>'circle'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si-shâq</td>
<td>si-zin</td>
<td>'arrange'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf. shin</td>
<td>'set up, set out'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other vocabulary items are listed in Kya Htûn (1969:152f.) and Yabu Shiro (1980:169f.)

4. Recordings

The following two texts are extracts from the recordings mentioned in the introduction, the lower line showing the Standard Burmese equivalents. In the transcription of the Yaw version, the rhymes /auk, ak, aq/ are written /au?, a?, an/ where this seems closer to the actual pronunciation on the recording. Irregularities such as the occasional voicing of aspirate initials, presumably the result of Standard Burmese influence, are marked with a (B) and shown as they are spoken. False starts, where the speaker corrects himself, are enclosed in square brackets. Sentences are numbered to facilitate reference to the translation.

4.1 Texts

4.1.1 Yaw customs: courting and hospitality

(1) (B) Gù pyó-chaŋ-da-gá [Gën-gë-ne:-ma jí-dë o]
(1) Gù-pyó-jin-da-gá [Gën-gë-ne:-ma jí-dë o]

Yë-ne:-ma jí-dë lu-byo hlé-dë delë-lë phy?i?-pa-de
Yë-ne:-ma jí-dë lu-byo hlé-dë delë-lë phy?i?-pa-de

(2) Lu-byo hlé-dë delë-gá phë-lo-lë sho-dë cenö-dë
(2) Lu-byo hlé-dë delë-gá bs-lo-lë sho-dë cenö-dë

Yë-ne:-ma jí-dë ka-lâ-ßá-de - ka-lâ-ßá sho-da-gá
Yë-ne:-ma jí-dë ka-lâ-ßá-de - ka-lâ-ßá sho-da-gá

[øywë yauk-ë³ echein o - ] oywë yau?-ë³ echein ëëak shë-jo
[øywë yau?-ë³ echein o - ] oywë yau?-ë³ echein ëëë? shë-jo
hnëshë ps?-wën-jaŋ-ma jí-dë lu-byo-de-ha - ka-lâ-ßá-de-ha
hnëshë ps?-wën-jin-ma jí-dë lu-byo-de-ha - ka-lâ-ßá-de-ha

øywë le-dë alë jí-jë-dë.
øywë le-dë ëëëë jí-jë-dë.
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(3) [epyo le-dé élé jí-da-gá è - ]
(3) [epyo le-dé élé jí-da-gá è - ]
epyo le-lá-wá-lé jí-yaq, epyo ein tak-te.
epyo le-lá-wá-lé jí-yin, epyo ein te?-te.

(4) epyo ein tak-lé jí-yaq, epyo-né segá py³-yá-de.
(4) epyo ein te?-ló jí-yin, epyo-né segá py³-yá-de.

(5) epyo-ha la-dé lu-byo-dáin-go, ka-lá-thá-daín-go,
(5) epyo-ha la-dé lu-byo-dáin-go, ka-lá-thá-daín-go,
é-hken-tí segá py³-de.
é-hkan-bí segá py³-de.

(6) é-lo é-khen-bí segá py³-dé akha-ma
(6) é-lo é-khan-bí segá py³-dé akha-hma
lepha?aye-jën-dó - ëthu-ëephyáq pë-hlo,
lephe?aye-jën-dó - ëthu-ëphyín pë-hlo,
Yë-ne-ma thwak-té pë-jën-hlo,
Yë-ne-hma thwe?-té pë-jën-hlo,
nau?-pë-dó-má thenak-ko, (B) ëmyá-shoulrn te-dc.
nau?-pë-dó-hma thené?-ko, ëmyá-zouùn te-dc.

(7) Nau?-pë-dó-má é-lo é-khen segá py³-dé akha-ma-lë
(7) Nau?-pë-dó-hma é-lo é-khan segá py³-dé akha-ma-lë

θu-dó-ha lak-ná elou?-ná pyë?-té echein-ye-ló mejí-phu.
θu-dó-ha le?-né elou?-né pya?-té echein-ye-ló mejí-bu.

(8) Séga py³-dé akha-ma, bain-go hqaa-ló-thë-lagaùn,
(8) Séga py³-dé akha-hma, bain-go qin-ló-thë-lagaùn,
nau? tehkù-(B)gù elou?-ko lou?-pë-má ë-khen-dé alé jí-de.

(9) ë-tha-má θu-dó-ma-lë segá py³-yá-da lwe-ku-dc.

(10) Nau?-pë-dó bain hqaa chë-chá-pë-dó-má ë-khen-dé
(10) Nau?-pë-dó bain qin chi-chá-pë-dó-má ë-khan-dé
alé jí-de.
alé jí-de.

(11) ë lepha?ye-de pha-de θauk-pì é-khen-dé, pho-ywe-dc
(11) ë lepha?ye-de ba-de θau?-pì é-khan-dé, pho-ywe-dc
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(12) Techa-ni-ga la-de lu-dain-go-lë Thu-dö-ga [θe ni-ma]
(12) Techa-ni-ga la-de lu-dain-go-lë Thu-dö-ga [di ni-ma]

(ji-de) ta-teka-ga, øyaq teka twé-phù-dë-etain, twé-phu-ælo
(ji-de) ta-teka-ga, øyin teka twé-bù-dë-etaïn, twé-bù- ëlo

coum-(B)bù-ælo shak-shen-de, pho-ye-de.
coum-bù-ælo shë?-shän-de, pho-yew-de.

(13) ë-ðë aül-ha ë-ðë-ma sho-lë ë-yaq
(13) ë-di aül-ha ë-ðë-ma sho-lë ë-yin

chi?-seya kaün-de aül tekhú phyi?-te-lë sho-chaq-de.
chi?-seya kaün-de aül tekhú phyi?-te-lë sho-jin-de.

(14) Nau?-pi øphe-øme-ha sho-lë ë-yaq-lë
(14) Nau?-pi øphe-øme-ha sho-lë ë-yin-lë

e-ë ko-ðë-de aël la-ë aëneïn-ma, Thu-dö-ga
ë-ë ko-ðë-de aël la-ë aëneïn-ma, ëu-dö-ga

θæb cá-de: Yë ënë-ë aëne-në sho-lë ë-yaq wën myauk-cá-de.
theta cá-de: Yë ënë-ë aëne-në sho-lë ë-yin wën myau?-cá-de.

(15) ë-ë ko-ðë-thë-de aël la-ë aëneïn-ma Thu-dö-ha së-ðë-së-zë
(15) ë-ë ko-ðë-thë-de aël la-ë aëneïn-ma Thu-dö-ha së-zë-së-zë
eï?-ya waq-de?-te aël ë-yaq-de.
eï?-ya win-da?-te aël ë-yin-de.

(16) Ko-ðë-thë-de aël la-ë aëneïn-ma
(16) Ko-ðë-thë-de aël la-ë aëneïn-ma

ko-ðë-thë-de-më [θæb-ga o -] ñæb cá-de sho-lë ë-yaq,
ko-ðë-thë-de-më [θæb-ga o -] ñæb cá-de sho-lë ë-yin,

Thu-dö-go pyo-byo jwaq-jwaq ne-ze-chaq-de,
Thu-dö-go pyo-byo jwin-jwin ne-ze-jin-de,
lwë?-lwë? le?-le? ne-ze-chaq-de ñæb.
lwë?-lwë? le?-le? ne-ze-jin-de ñæb.

(17) Hta-jaun-hmô-lë ë-ðë øphe-øme-de-ha
(17) Da-jaun-hmô-lë ë-di øphe-øme-de-ha

sho-lë ë-yaq-lë Thu-dö-de-më ñæ Thu-dö
sho-lë ë-yin-lë Thu-dö-de-më ñæ Thu-dö

wàin-phwë-lë-thë-lagañ, lu-jë-çhaq
wàin-phwë-lë-thë-lagañ, lu-jë-jin

wàin-phwë-lë-thë-lagañ, tha-hmë masaë? së-zë së-zë
wàin-phwë-lë-thë-lagañ, da-hmë masaë? së-zë së-zë
eï?-ya waq-de aëne-në-thë-lagañ,
eï?-ya win-de aëne-në-thë-lagañ,
4.1.2 **The tale of the tiger and the elephant**

(1) ę-daun-gá cā-ná shaq-gá jī-de kävé.
(1) ę-daun-gá cā-nē shin-gá jī-de kävé.

(2) ę-tha ę-do dō twē-jå-dō, tēgō pyain-yā-aun sho-pî-mā
cā-gá pyō-pyā-de.
(2) ę-da ę-do dō twē-jå-dō, tēgō pyain-yā-aun sho-pî-mā
cā-gá pyō-pyā-de.

(3) ę cā 'phē-lo pyain-jå-mēlè' sho-dō
(3) ę cā 'be-lo pyain-jå-mēlè' sho-dō

[ho -] lak-pên-baŋ-bo-ma [lak -] shēyak-tei
[ho -] le?-pan-bin-bo-wa [le? -] zeys?-tei

(4) ę-tha-go - ho shēyak-tei-go [ǒu -]
(4) ę-da-go - ho zeys?-tei-go [ǒu -]

'Māŋ øθen-gá kaūn-là - mān-gā pyen-hnain-aun
'Mīn øθen-gá kaūn-là - mīn-gā pyen-hnain-aun
lou?-hnain-mēlè, ē-gā pyen-hnain-aun lou?-hnain-mēlè'
lou?-hnain-mēlè, ē-gā pyen-hnain-aun lou?-hnain-mēlè'
shō-bī lou?-cå-dō,
shō-bī lou?-cå-dō,

(5) [hawa -] 'Māŋ-gā øyaŋ ø kwē' lō pyō-de - shaq-go.
(5) [hawa -] 'Mīn-gā øyin ø kwē' lō pyō-de - shin-go.

(6) ę-tha cā shaq-gā ø-yō.
(6) ę-da cā shin-gā ø-yō.

(7) Tekha ø-dō [ho -] shēyak-te-gā ønāŋ-kēn
(7) Tekha ø-dō [ho -] zeys?-te-gā ønīn-kan
shu-ne-ya-gā-ne-pī-dō-mā tei?-ôwā-de.
shu-ne-ya-gā-ne-pī-dō-mā tei?-ôwā-de.
(8) Nau?-tekha o-lai?-tó [ho -] tegaun hnekaun
(8) Nau?-tekha o-lai?-tó [ho -] tegaun hnekaun
thá-pyen-(B)ówá-de.
thá-pyen-ówá-de.

(9) Nau?-tekha o-lai?-tó Thoûn-lé- gaun, lè-qâ-shë-kë-gaun
(9) Nau?-tekha o-lai?-tó Thoûn-lé- gaun, lè-qâ-shë-kë-gaun
pyen-ówá-de-le.
pyan-ówá-de-le.

(10) è-nau? cá-dó [ho -] shayak-te-gá ømyá-jì-ha-gô:
(10) è-nau? cá-dó [ho -] zayr?-te-gá ømyá-jì-ha-gô:
êkoun mopyen-(B)bû-le.
êkoun mopyan-bû-le.

(11) è cá 'Ne-oûn kwá: màq o-da Thoûn-kha sî-ôwá-bi.
(11) è cá 'Ne-oûn kwá: màq o-da Thoûn-ga sî-ôwá-bi.
ña o-phalé yau?-pi' sho-pì-dó-mà, cà-gá-ne-pì-dó-mà
ña o-bó ahlé yau?-pi' sho-pì-dó-hmà, cà-gá-ne-pì-dó-ma
tekha-dë-nà o-pelai?-ta.
tekha-dë-në o-pelai?-ta.

(12) [Shayak-oun-ma ho -] lak-pën-baen-ma shayak-ka
(12) [Zayr?-oun-ma ho -] le?-pan-bin-ma zayr?-ha
tegaun-mà mecn-(B)bû: pyen-(B)ówá-de.
tegaun-mà mecn-bû: pyan-ówá-de.

(13) è cá-dó Tho-dó osà-shoûn kedì thà-da-gà [hewa -]
(13) è cá-dó Tho-dó osà-zoûn kedì thà-da-gà [hewa -]
'Mãg-gá Thôn-lë jì-yaq, màn-gà qa sà-ms;
'Màn-gá Thôn-lë jì-yìn, màn-gà qa sà-ms;
ña-gá Thôn-lë jì-yaq, màn-gà qá-go sà' sho-pì-mà
ña-gá Thôn-lë jì-yìn, màn-gà qá-go sà' sho-pì-mà
ê-tha-myô [hewa -] lou?-thà-da-le.
ê-da-myô [hewa -] lou?-thà-da-le.

(14) [è cá-dó hewa -] nau? cá-dó
(14) [è cá-dó hewa -] nau? cá-dó
'Phe-né-gá-ne-bì sà-hma-lë' sho-dó
'Be-né-gá-ne-bì sà-hma-lë' sho-dó
'Khun-neyak amàn-go hewa - chèn-ôa -]
'Khun-ney' màn-go hewa - chèn-ôa -]
khun-neyak-ko màn-gà pë-me kws: øyak-shaín
khun-ney' ko màn-go pë-me kws: øye?-shaín
khun-neyak pë-me' sho-pì-dó-mà lou?-cà-dó,
khun-ney' pè-me' sho-pì-dó-mà lou?-cà-dó,
4.2 Translations

4.2.1 Yaw customs: courting and hospitality

(1) What I would like to talk about now is the way courting is done in the Yaw region.

(2) Now, these courtship customs are that the young men in our Yaw region -- by young men I mean boys who have come of age, boys in their teens -- these young men have a custom of visiting the girl.

(3) When they visit her they go into her house.

(4) and when they're inside they talk to her.

(5) The girl greets everyone that comes, and talks to him.

(6) While she is receiving him, mostly she will offer plain tea, and always roasted beans -- the roasted butter beans that grow in the Yaw region -- and jaggery.

(7) Then, when she is receiving him in this way, there is hardly any time when she lays down her work.

(8) While talking, she will be spinning or doing some kind of work -- that's the custom when receiving visitors,

(9) and it makes it easier for them to make conversation.

(10) They have this custom of spinning and preparing yarn while they receive visitors.

(11) At the same time they drink tea and so on, and are very friendly.

(12) Anyone who comes from outside the region too is treated in this friendly way, just as if they had met and known him before.
(13) This Yaw custom strikes me as very attractive.

(14) Then, the parents too are pleased when the young men come visiting -- it makes them happy, according to Yaw custom.

(15) They usually go to bed early when the young men come visiting.

(16) The idea is that when the young men come visiting they want them, if they approve of them, to have a good time, to be at ease.

(17) That's why the parents either sit by themselves -- just the older people together -- or go to bed early, allowing their daughters freedom to talk without constraint.

(18) That's the way courting is conducted in the Yaw region.

4.2.2 The tale of the tiger and the elephant

(1) Long ago there was a tiger and an elephant.

(2) When they met the tiger suggested they should have a contest.

(3) The contest was like this: there were a lot of mynahs in a silk-cotton tree.

(4) They were to see which of the two had the strongest voice, which one could make the mynahs fly away.

(5) So the tiger said 'You shout first' to the elephant.

(6) So the elephant shouted.

(7) The first time he shouted, the mynahs, who had been making a terrible noise, all went quiet.

(8) The next time he shouted one or two of them flew away.

(9) And the next time several more flew away.

(10) So then -- there were lots of mynahs, you see, and they hadn't all flown off --

(11) So then the tiger said 'Hold it now: you've had three shouts. Now it's my turn to shout', and he let out one terrific shout.

(12) There wasn't a single mynah left in the silk-cotton tree -- they all flew off.
(13) So then -- they'd made this agreement at the very beginning -- 'If you lose I'll eat you; if I lose you eat me' -- that's how they'd fixed it.

(14) Then, when the elephant asked when he was to be eaten, the tiger said he would give him seven days -- he'd give him seven days' grace.

(15) The elephant couldn't think what to do and just wandered aimlessly about waiting for when the seven days were up.

(16) 'Soon I shall die, when the tigers eat me up', the elephant thought, and he stood where he was and wept.

NOTE

1. It is a pleasure to record my gratitude to Ü Htûn Tûn of the Burmese Department of Rangoon University, himself a Yaw man, for his help with my queries and for arranging the recording session; and to Ko Hpôn Myûn and his friends who generously recorded for me.
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ORAL VOWELS AND NASALIZED VOWELS IN LEPCHA (RONG):
AS THE KEY TO A PUZZLING VARIATION IN SPELLING

R.K. Sprigg

1. Lepcha and related languages

Lepcha has been classified by Shafer (1955:104-7; see also Henderson 1957, 1963) as belonging 'rather precisely' to the same 'section' as the Lushai (cf. Henderson 1948) and the Tiddim and 'Teizang Chin languages (idem, 1957, 1963, 1965), though not to the same 'branch' of that 'section'; he sub-classified Lepcha as belonging to the Ao 'unit' of the Northern Naga 'branch' of Kukish, with Tengsa Naga as the language most closely related to it (Shafer 1955:106, 109). Earlier L.A. Waddell (1899:42 ff.) had proposed the Arleng (or Mikir) language, spoken in the Garo and Khasia hills, as the most closely related language to Lepcha, and since Shafer classified Mikir as forming a 'branch' of Kukish, Waddell's proposal would still place Lepcha within Shafer's Kukish 'section'; but the list of comparisons of Lepcha with thirteen other languages, including Lushai and Mikir (and four reconstructed languages) by Bodman (1968) shows Lepcha as most closely related to a language, or language group, that Shafer classifies not as Kukish, or even Burmic, but as belonging to the Misingish 'section' of the Bodic 'division', the Adi group of languages, formerly termed Abor-Miri, spoken in the new state of Arunachal Pradesh.

According to these three views, Lepcha, spoken in Sikkim and the Darjeeling District of West Bengal, is a western outlier, separated by three or four hundred miles from the languages to the east to which it is most closely related; and Shafer (1955:109-10) asks:

 Were the Rong left behind when the Northern Naga Branch (and perhaps all the Kukish peoples) migrated from the Himalayas to their present location on the Indo-Burmese border, or are the Rong a remnant left behind from a time when the Northern Naga extended clear across the Valley of Assam?

P.K. Benedict (1972:7-8) on the other hand, associates Lepcha with the Magar language, to the west, in west-central Nepal:

Dzorgai (western Szuchuan), Lepcha (Sikkim), and Magari (Nepal) all appear to be closer to Tibetan-Kanauri than to any other nucleus. Lepcha (or Rong) ... might equally
well be regarded as a separate nucleus linking Tibetan-Kanauri with Bahing-Vayu and groups on the south.

Finally, and especially because of Henderson's research interest in Khasi (1967) it should be mentioned that R.A.D. Forrest (1962:333) attempted to classify Lepcha as partly Austro-Asiatic:

... it will be seen that Rong has in common with Austro-asiatic languages as large a proportion of its phonetically identifiable prefixes as those languages have with each other. If there remains any doubt as to the reality of the Austroasiatic provenance of this feature in Rong, the probability of its affinity is corroborated by a plentiful series of lexical correspondences.

He supports this claim with a list of 70 Lepcha lexical items and their proposed Austroasiatic cognates, of which 22 are from Khasi; and the most remarkable of which are:

(i) 'Water: R. wun [\textit{tang} in my romanization], Khasi um, Riang om, Palaung om, Hua Miau au', (ii) 'Dog: R. k\textit{\textbar}ju [\textit{k\textbar\textbar}ju in my romanization], Khasi ksew, Stieng s\textbar, Biat \textbar\textbar, Riang sho, etc.', (iii) 'Dung: R. \textit{it} [\textit{it} in my romanization], Khasi cit, Khmer \textbar\textbar, Bahnar ik, Stieng ech, Biat \textbar\textbar, etc.' [\textit{ibid.}, 333-4].

'It is clear that we have in Rong a very mixed form of speech, ... it is much less easy to determine whether the Austroasiatic or the older Tibeto-Burman (or Tibetan?) stratum is the more fundamental.' [\textit{ibid.}, 335].

From these four conflicting attempts at classifying Lepcha, it is clear that its precise classification is still something of a mystery, from which my present phonetic, phonological, and grammatical observations may possibly derive an interest that the number of speakers of Lepcha would not justify: Siiger (1967:33) gives the number of Lepchas in Sikkim and the Darjeeling District of West Bengal as 25,780 according to the 1931 census, of whom about 13,000 were estimated to be in Sikkim, but it does not follow that all 25,780 spoke Lepcha; and in any case, by now, some two generations later, the number of speakers must have declined under the influence of Nepali.

2. Variation in spelling

I have found it useful to present these observations of mine in the form of an orthographic problem. The late General Mainwaring refers to the pronunciation of the vowel symbol o as follows:

\(o\) has the sound of o in no, as: \textit{\textbar\textbar}o\textit{\textbar}mo, mother, \textit{\textbar\textbar}o\textit{\textbar}bo father, \textit{\textbar\textbar}o\textit{\textbar}o I \\&c.
The Lepchas are apt to pronounce this letter as perimental text.

In some instances, this 'error' appears to be due to an attempt to assimilate loanwords from Tibetan; e.g. 'yok 'work' (Tib. g.yog) (Mainwaring 1876:95); cf. 'yuk (Macdonald 1899, in Grierson 1909:244); thop 'receive' (Tib. thob) (Mainwaring 1876:88); cf. thāp 'getting' (Macdonald, op.cit.: 242). These variant spellings correspond to differences in pronunciation, e.g. ?jok versus ?juk, thop versus thup, in which the former phonetic form of each pair is an attempt to imitate a Tibetan pronunciation, while the latter is more in keeping with the vowel distinctions of what one might term 'original' Lepcha.

The examples of variation in spelling that I wish to try and account for in this article, however, are not the same as the half-assimilated loanwords such as 'yok/'yuk and thop/thāp cited in the preceding paragraph, for, on the one hand, there is, in their case, no variation in pronunciation parallel to the variation in spelling, and, on the other, the variation results from the important distinction in Lepcha between syllables containing nasalization as a vowel feature (and therefore nasality as an initial-consonant feature) and syllables containing an oral vowel (and therefore only oral syllable-initial consonants), e.g. ngo 'fish' (Mainwaring 1876), but ngu (Sitling 1929; Tamsang 1981); 'a-mo 'consonant', 'mother' (Mainwaring 1876; Sitling 1929), but 'a-mū (Sitling 1970; Tamsang 1981); fa-ngo 'five' (Mainwaring 1876; Sitling 1929; Tamsang 1981), but fa-ngū (Sitling 1970), with which can be compared fo 'bird', oho 'book', oū '(snow) mountain', prū 'Bhutan', for which there is no variation in spelling. It is this distinction that I have taken as the subject of this study; and I have further limited it to open syllables.

3. Open syllables and open/closed-syllable lexical items

The characteristic qualities of the vowel units that need to be phonologically distinguished are (i) for oral vowels:

\[ \text{i}, \varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varphi, \varepsilon, \varepsilon/\varepsilon, \varphi/\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon/\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon: \]

and (ii) for nasalized vowels:

\[ \text{i}/\text{i}, \varepsilon/\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \text{a}:/\text{a}:, \varphi/\varphi, \quad \varepsilon/\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon/\varepsilon; \]

but (iii) for closed syllables they are:

\[ \text{i}/\text{i}, \varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varphi/\varphi, \varepsilon, \text{a}:/\text{a}, \varphi/\varphi, \varepsilon/\varepsilon, \varepsilon/\varepsilon \]

(where alternatives are given, the vowel sounds concerned are complementarily distributed in relation to differences in initial
consonant, especially palatal and palatalized versus the other types of initial consonant, and to differences in final consonant, velar versus labial and dental, and liquid versus nasal and plosive), e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i:</td>
<td>ri, rì 6</td>
<td>i: rì, rì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e:</td>
<td>ye</td>
<td>e: lem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ò:</td>
<td>gui, gual/gue</td>
<td>v: ma, ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ò:</td>
<td>ūu</td>
<td>ò: lem, lyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ò:</td>
<td>ūë, ūa/ūã</td>
<td>ù: ngù, ngo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ò:</td>
<td>dà</td>
<td>ò: lèm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u:</td>
<td>iù</td>
<td>u: nùk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o:</td>
<td>tho</td>
<td>o: rok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>œ:</td>
<td>gò</td>
<td>œ: nòng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) 'speak', 'chew', 'win', 'descend', 'know', 'sleep', 'fry', 'put', 'happy'  
(ii) 'have', 'afterwards', 'call', 'hide',  
    'stew', 'borrow'  
(iii) 'stand', 'pile up', 'play', 'is', 'fly', 'do',  
    'make', 'read', 'go'

The vowels ð, ñ, and ù are characteristically closed-syllable vowels, though they are shared with the open-syllable type when nasalized.

Open/closed-syllable lexical items

A number of verb lexical items have both open-syllable and closed-syllable forms: (a) the open-syllable forms when
colligated with a particle, apart from the nominalizing particle ('á-'), e.g. bám, syo; and (b) a closed-syllable form (i) when colligated with the auxiliary-verb category, e.g. khu, kón, or the nominalizing particle ('á-'), or (ii) when in the negative form, in -n, e.g.

a. li-bam 'am speaking'; di-syo 'shall come'
b. i. lín ma-khun 'cannot say'; ryun kón 'may it turn out well'
   ‘á-zöm 'food', 'meal'; 'á-yım 'knowledge', 'knowing'

   ii. ma-zun 'is not burning' ma-yán 'do not know'.

This type of verb includes a number of lexical items that are in very common use; indeed, having a consonant-final form like those shown at (b.i), -n, -m, -t, can almost be considered as a criterion of 'original' Lepcha status; but the same cannot be said for those at (b.ii), where the final consonant -n of the negative form is shared with lexical items that may well be loans, e.g. gó 'rejoice' (Tib. dga'), mà, ma/mà 'pray' (Tib. smon). The following is a representative set of examples:

a. b.i. b.ii. a. b.i. b.ii
bi: bin bin bi, byt bín, byín bín, byín 'give'
li: lim lin li, lí lím lín 'heavy'
di: dit din dí, dí/dít dít, d(y)ìt dìn 'come'
de: de dem de(e)n de dem den 'soothe'
tou: toum toum cu cum cuñ 'small'
bu: bvn bvn bu bun bun 'carry'
dju: dývt dývn dýu dýut dýun 'fight'
je: je:m je:n yà, ya/yà yám yán 'know'
da: dà: dà: dà dàn dàn 'sleep'
ryu: ryum ryum ryú ryûm ryûn 'good'
du: dun dun dà dun dàn 'dig'
zo: zo:m zun so zöm son 'eat'
bo: boan buan bo bón bón 'give'
go: go: goen gó gó gón 'rejoice'

A similar variation applies to certain pronouns: they have (i) a vowel-final form, and (ii) a consonant-final form
(objective) in m, e.g.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hu</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>hju</td>
<td>hju</td>
<td>kdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'he' 'him' 'they' 'them' 'myself' 'to oneself'

Verb and pronoun lexical items such as these can be classed as a sub-category of the open-syllable lexical item, an alternating sub-category: each has a closed-syllable form in addition to its open-syllable form; for verbs a form in -m, -n, or -t (b.i) and in -n (b.ii), and for pronouns a form in -m; closed-syllable lexical items, on the other hand, are invariably closed by a consonant, and do not alternate in this way.

4. The 'oral syallable-initial piece', and oral vowels

From the list of syllable-final oral vowels given in section 3, it appears that nine phonological vowel units need to be distinguished, thus forming a nine-term system, and that the phonetic exponents of each one of them are comprised in a pure vowel sound: i:, e:, a:, u:, o:, o:, o:. Indeed, Siiger and Rischel (1967:23) state:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vowels thus form a symmetric system of 3 x 3.

However, not all of these nine vowels can be treated as functionally comparable; they do not all combine with the same preceding consonant sounds and non-syllabic vowel sounds; so that from this point of view, a syntagmatic point of view, some of them have quite different implications from others as regards the possible set of preceding sounds.

A. i:

The vowel i:, for example, with closeness, frontness and lip-spreading as its features, does not, in my data from K.P. Tamsant (qv., n.4), combine with a syllable-initial non-syllabic front spread vowel (i-) or with the cluster ?j-. In Tamsang (1981), however, I do find examples of yi (his ye), the following three: yi-dam, yi-dö (mäng), yi-she (tshâ-thup); but it is significant that none of them is a verb; and, in fact, all three are loanwords, religious terms, from Tibetan: yi-dam, yi-dwags, and ye-shes respectively. I do not, therefore, consider these counter-examples powerful enough to upset my
syntagmatic generalization that \texttt{-i} does not regularly combine with \texttt{\textordmasculine i-} (and \texttt{?\textordmasculine i-}) in Lepcha.

B. \texttt{i:, e:, and e:}

On similarly syntagmatic grounds the vowels \texttt{i:, e:, and e:} belong to a different type of syllable-initial 'piece' from the remaining six: these last can combine with syllable-initial \texttt{te, tsh, and z}; but the front vowels \texttt{i:, e:, and e:} do not. Thus, \texttt{t\textordmasculine i:} 'beer', \texttt{zi: ji} 'annoy', \texttt{t\textordmasculine e:} 'fond of', and \texttt{ge: je} 'twist' occur, and so does \texttt{zen jen} 'bad'; but \texttt{*t\textordmasculine i:, *zi:, *t\textordmasculine e:, *ne:, and *zen} do not, and cannot, occur.

In fact, the last of these three vowels, \texttt{e:}, is rare, and almost certainly confined to loanwords from Tibetan, e.g.

\begin{verbatim}
the: the 'come to an end' ?Tib. thal
the: the 'excessive', 'anxious' ?Tib. 'theb
de: de 'destroy' ?Tib. 'debs, rdebs
de: ku\textordmasculine g de-k\textordmasculine g 'daphne' ?Tib. deb 'book'
te: to\textordmasculine k te-o\textordmasculine k 'whip' ?Tib. rta-lo\textordmasculine g
re: re 'wick' ?Tib. ras 'cotton'
le: le 'fate' ?Tib. las 'karma'
\end{verbatim}

C. \texttt{\textordmasculine u:, e:, a:/a:, u:, o:, o:}

These six types of vowel occur in the same type of syllable-initial 'piece', i.e. under the same prosodic conditions; hence, they are syntagmatically comparable, and form a six-term phonological vowel system applicable to that type of 'piece'. The term 'back' can usefully be applied to their type of 'piece', as opposed to the 'front piece', to which the vowels \texttt{i:, e:, and e:} of section (B) belong (but with the vowel \texttt{i:} assigned to a separate sub-section of the 'front piece', because of the syntagmatic difference stated in section (A)); and six symbols such as \texttt{Y, \textordmasculine e, A, U, O,} and \texttt{W,} need to be allotted to the terms of the 'back piece' phonological vowel system, e.g.

\begin{verbatim}
Y: \textordmasculine t\textordmasculine m: thyu 'mix'; \textordmasculine w: vu 'buzz around'
\textordmasculine e: pl\textordmasculine a: ply\textordmasculine a, ply\textordmasculine a 'produce'; fl\textordmasculine a: fla, fla 'narrate'
A: \textordmasculine v: vá 'swing'; bl\textordmasculine a: bly\textordmasculine a 'smear'
U: \textordmasculine z: zu 'burn'; \textordmasculine r: hr\textordmasculine u 'warm'
O: \textordmasculine l: lo 'dry'; \textordmasculine t: tho 'put'
W: to\textordmasculine o: o\textordmasculine Í: go'; k\textordmasculine h: khy\textordmasculine o 'overcook'.
\end{verbatim}
5. The 'nasal syllable-initial piece', and nasalised vowels

The next task is to analyse lexical items that have nasalized vowels and, therefore, syllable-initial nasal consonants, by the same syntagmatic method as was used in Section 4 for the oral-vowel lexical items. Within this second prosodic class of lexical items, I find that I need to draw a distinction between (A), those which have only a nasal consonant in the syllable initial (NV:), and (B) those in which the syllable-initial nasal combines, in a cluster, with a lateral or a rolled consonant, or a non-syllabic front spread vowel, or both a lateral and a non-syllabic front spread vowel: (NV:/rv/uv/, Nlv:).

A. NV:

The set of vowel units, six in number, that need to be distinguished in this type of 'piece' has already been listed, with examples, in Section 3, but to recapitulate, it comprises:

\[ \tilde{i}, \tilde{e}/\tilde{e}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{a}/\tilde{a}, \tilde{u}/\tilde{u}, \tilde{o}. \]

If the same syntagmatic principle is applied to these six as was applied to the oral vowels, it will be found that: (1) \( \tilde{i} \) and \( \tilde{e}/\tilde{e} \) combine with only two types of nasal, the labial and the palatal (m, n), and on that account, can be grouped together in what can be termed the 'front syllable-initial piece' (cf. also (4.c) above); and (2) the remaining four, \( \tilde{y}, \tilde{a}/\tilde{a}, \tilde{u}/\tilde{u}, \tilde{o} \), combine not only with the labial and the palatal nasal but also with the dental and the velar, a total of four (m, n, r, g), e.g.

1. 'front syllable-initial piece'

   a. \( \text{mi:} \quad \tilde{n}: \)
   
   b. \( \text{me:} \quad \tilde{e}: \)

2. 'back syllable-initial piece'

   a. \( \text{mr}: \quad \tilde{n}: \quad \text{nu:} \quad \tilde{a}: \quad \text{ngu:} \)
   
   b. \( \text{mr}: \quad \text{ny}: \quad \text{nu}: \quad \text{ng}: \)
   
   c. \( \text{mr}: \quad \text{ny}: \quad \text{nu}: \quad \text{ng}: \)
   
   d. \( \text{mr}: \quad \text{ny}: \quad \text{nu}: \quad \text{ng}: \)
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The NV₅: type of syllable, then, needs a two-term phonological vowel system for its 'front' type of syllable-initial 'piece'; and, for the 'back' type, it needs a four-term system, two of the four members of which have lip-spread rounding as a phonetic exponent, /u:/ and /ʊ:/, while the other two, /ʌ:/ and /ɔ:/, have lip-rounding.¹⁰B. Nl(j)/r/jV₅, Nl(j)Y₅:

I have left this type of nasal-initial syllable until last because it is not clear to me whether it should be classified as belonging to the nasal syllable-initial piece, the oral syllable-initial piece, or, perhaps, to a third type separate from either of those two.

The phonetic criteria that have thus far been used for classifying a lexical item as being an example of the nasal syllable-initial piece are: (i) nasalization as a feature of the syllabic vowel in association with nasality as a feature of the syllable-initial consonant; and (ii) a twofold or fourfold distinction in syllabic vowel, twofold for the front piece (iː, eː/æː), fourfold for the back piece (Yu, ɑː/ɔː, ʊ/ʊː, ɔː), as in (A)-above. In this second type of syllable, in which labial nasality occurs in association with a lateral or a rolled consonant or with a non-syllabic front spread vowel (ml/r/ʃ/-), and velar nasality in association with a rolled consonant (vr-), I have noted examples in which the nasal resonance extends from the syllable-initial nasal consonant to the syllabic vowel via the intermediate sounds, e.g. mlːu: mlːu, mlːo 'thing', mljː: mljː, mljɑ 'efface', but they are comparatively rare. It would seem that the articulatory stretch, or span, of non-nasal sounds is a formidable obstacle; and beside the example mljː: ('efface') given above, I have also noted mljː, in which the non-nasal consonant and the vowels, both non-syllabic and syllabic, are purely oral, together with such other examples as nru: ngrː 'groan' and sa'mju: sa-myː 'man' (Tamsang 1981).

In comparison with the NV₅: type of syllable analysed in section (A), the number of examples of syllables of this cluster type is very small; in fact, there are none containing the two types of vowel iː and ɛː/ɑː distinguished in the front syllable-initial piece (A.1), but this type of syllable does, however, seem to have the same fourfold distinction as was made for vowels
in the back syllable-initial piece (A.2). If, therefore, a Y-A-U-O vowel system is accepted for this nasal-cluster type of syllable too, examples of these four vowels can be given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y:</th>
<th>mlyvä, mlya 'slant'</th>
<th>mlyvä, mlya 'efface'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>mlja: mlyä 'level'</td>
<td>mja: myä 'versed in'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:</td>
<td>mlü: mlü, mlo 'thing'</td>
<td>gru: ngrü 'groan'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>se'mju: sa-myä 'man'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O:</td>
<td>mjo: myä/myo, myo 'course'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Oral syllable-initial piece and nasal syllable-initial piece compared

The various vowel units can be compared, and grouped in systems as follows, according to the type and sub-type of syllable-initial piece in which they function, and especially oral (4.A-C) versus nasal (5.A.1-2; 5.B):

- **Lip-spread**
- **Lip-rounded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>i:</th>
<th>B.</th>
<th>e:</th>
<th>ē:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>u:, o:, a:/a:, u:, o:, o:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>i:</th>
<th>B.</th>
<th>e:</th>
<th>ē:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>u:, o:, a:/a:, o:/u:, o:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in the back syllable-initial piece (4.C., 5.A.2, 5.B.), the oral type (5.C.) has three lip-spread vowel units as against two for the nasal type (5.A.2, 5.B.): u:, o:, a:/a: versus ı:, ı:/ı:; and it also has three lip-rounded units as against two for the nasal type: u:, o:, o: versus ı:/ı:, ı:.

To provide for the former three, there are the three Lepcha symbols romanized as u, ā (or a), and ō, one too many for the needs of the corresponding nasal-piece vowel units; and for the latter three there are the three symbols romanized as ē, o and ō, also one too many for the corresponding nasal-piece vowel units. It is from this lack of balance between the two sets of vowels,
three versus two, that fluctuation in spelling has arisen between (a) \( u \) and \( â \) (or \( a \)), on the one hand, and (b), more prominently, \( û \) and \( o \) on the other.

a. Lip-spreading

For \( u \) and \( â \) (or \( a \)) the fluctuation is especially to be seen in weak-stress syllables, in which the vowel is central and half-close, e.g. \( ma-rum, ma-ram/mu-ram ma'rum 'life-span', mu-su, ma-su/mu-su mo'mu: 'body', of which \( mu-rum \) and \( mu-su \) are preferable on etymological grounds because the first lexical item in each of these compounds is \( mu 'body' \).

b. Lip-rounding

For the fluctuation between \( o \) and \( û \) there are examples in Section (2) above, \( ngo \) versus \( ngû \) 'fish', 'stew', 'ã-mo v. ã-mû 'consonant', 'mother', etc.\(^ {12} \)

There are oral-initial piece lexical items that show a correspondence of Lepcha \( o \) with Tibetan \( a \), e.g.

i. oral-initial: Lep. \( fo 'bird' \), ã-\( bo 'father' \), \( zo 'eat' \)

\( \text{Tib. bya pha za} \)

so that it is tempting to suppose that the threefold distinction in back rounded vowels might be a comparatively recent development in Lepcha, whereby one of the six terms of the vowel system appropriate to the back syllable-initial piece (4.C.) developed lip-rounding as one of its phonetic exponents instead of lip-spreading.\(^ {13} \) While a resulting threefold distinction (\( u:; o:; û: \)) would present no difficulties in the articulation of oral vowels, the well-known muffling effect of nasal resonance might have been responsible for making such distinction too fine for the language to bear, whence a reduction from threefold to two-fold for nasal-initial syllables, with the consequent fluctuation in spelling between \( o \) and \( û \).\(^ {14} \) However, the possibility of comparing Lepcha \( o \) with Tibetan \( a \) in the nasal-initial syllable, too, gives the \( o \) spelling an advantage over the \( û \) spelling, e.g.

ii. nasal-initial: Lep. \( ngo 'fish' \), ã-\( mo 'mother' \), \( fa-ngo 'five' \)

\( \text{Tib. nya a-ma lnga} \)

The spelling with \( o \), then, would be the Sino-Tibetan comparatist's preference; but the Lepchas are not Sino-Tibetan comparatists and seem to be moving towards the spelling with \( û \) in these nasal-initial-piece lexical items, e.g. \( ngû 'fish', 'stew'; 'a-mû 'mother' \) (Tamsang 1981).\(^ {15} \)
NOTES

1. This was cited in Siiger (1967:27) but not available to me; similarly, I rely on Shafer (1955) since Marrison (1967) was also not available.

2. My romanization follows Mainwaring (1876) except for the following:

   Lepcha:         ० न 2 & ब । ~ स
   Mainwaring:  oh- chh- ay- -ang -ã(-) -ɪ(-)
   Sprigg:        ɔ-  oh-  ɿ- ay- -ain -ã(-) -ɪ(-)

   My -ã is for the Lepcha symbol called nyin-d6, literally 'sun-moon' (Tib. nyi-zla), resembling the oandra bindu of the Devanagari script (Lambert 1953:70).

3. For the expansion of Nepali as a lingua franca in Sikkim see Nakane 1966:261-2.

4. For a corresponding stylistic variation to that of ɔ with ʊ/ɨ in Lepcha, compare the use of /u/ in English in the loanwords Jungfrau and Sung, in imitation of the German and the Chinese pronunciation, as opposed to the /ʌ/ of 'original' English in velar-nasal-final syllables, e.g. young, sung, and, indeed, an alternative pronunciation of Sung as /sʌŋ/ (Jones 1977:280, 479, 558).

   My phonetic and phonological analysis is based on data in the Tamsangmo dialect from K.P. Tamsang, Research Assistant in Lepcha at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, in 1952; K.P. Tamsang was, at that time, Mandal of Bong Bustee, Kalimpong, and Secretary of the Darjeeling Lepcha Association. I compared these data with the pronunciation of the late J. Rongong, of Kalimpong, and of the late Pastor P.S. Targain, a speaker of the Ilammo dialect, at Kalimpong in 1965. To all three, but especially to K.P. Tamsang, I am grateful for the patience and care that they showed in helping me towards this analysis.

5. I have symbolized the vowels in open syllables as long here; but they vary in length in accordance with differences in junction.

6. The Mainwaring (1898) spelling differs from that of Tamsang (1981), I have given both, with the Mainwaring (strictly speaking, the Grünwedel) spelling following the Tamsang spelling after a comma, e.g. ɿ, ɿ, and, so that examples may be grammatically comparable, I have used verbs where possible, but this list contains one noun: nye 'afterwards'.
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7. The qualification 'almost' is necessary here because the open/closed-syllable type of verb includes lexical items that have aspiration as a syllable-initial feature; and this feature suggests loanword status, e.g. thi/thit, thi/thit 'reach' (?Tibetan thebs), khu/khut, khu/khum 'able' (?Tib. 'khyud'; Das 1902/1960:196; but Grünwedel, in Mainwaring 1898:46, suggests khus). It is significant that the aspirated initials, unlike some of the non-aspirated initials, do not combine with l and r to form initial clusters; cf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kh</th>
<th>ph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>kl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>gl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>fl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I find further support for my view of aspiration as a loan feature in Lepcha in Bodman (1968). In his lists of Lepcha-Adi cognates his occlusive-occlusive correspondences show only three, out of a total of 61 examples, in which the Lepcha word has aspiration (and, incidentally, there are no examples of aspiration in the Adi words).

8. The nasalization feature is prominent in syllables in which the (nasal) initial consonant is lingual, but less so where it is labial, indeed, I have not symbolized it in examples in which I have perceived it as weaker than in the nasalized vowels of French. The reason for this relative weakness is, presumably, that a labial closure is at the far end of the oral cavity from the naso-pharynx, with the result that, the instant that the lips part, the whole of the oral cavity functions as a resonator in competition with the nasal cavity; and the nasal resonance is correspondingly less prominent. I believe that the same (aerodynamic) reason is responsible for the lesser prominence of nasalization in association with front vowels in labial-initial syllables, e.g. mi: mt, mē 'fire', me: me 'that', as compared with syllables in which the obstruction caused by the raising of the tongue is further back in the mouth, e.g. ?mē: mē: p.206, 2.a-d; the rearward raising of the tongue, when combined with the lowered soft palate, impedes the flow of air into the oral cavity, and, as it were, directs it into the nasal resonance chamber.

9. The role of the glottal-stop type of cluster, e.g. ?m-, ?n-, ?j-, as a criterion of borrowing from Tibetan is discussed in Sprigg 1966a.
10. I should have preferred to give to the two members (i.e. 'terms') and to the four members of these two vowel systems a different set of phonological symbols from those used for the phonological vowel units of the two systems appropriate to the oral syllable-initial piece (4.B.; 4.C.), but this would mean going beyond the resources of the Roman and Greek scripts combined; so I find it necessary to use some of the same symbols as have already been used in those earlier sections. Y, A, U, and O, for example, can be re-used for the four units of the vowel system stated above for the back syllable-initial piece (5.A.2). Duplicating symbols in this way need not cause confusion provided that it is always made clear which of the systems a given symbol belongs to in any given instance, as, for example, whether the symbol U is being used for the appropriate member of the six-term vowel system that applies to the oral syllable-initial piece (4.C) or to the four-term vowel system appropriate to the nasal syllable-initial piece (5.A.2). Thus, the four sets of examples of the back nasal syllable-initial piece at (5.A.2) can also be treated as examples of each of that type of piece's four vowel units:

a. Y: \text{?mY:}, etc.;  
b. A: \text{m\text{A}:}, etc.;  
c. U: \text{?mU:}, etc.;  
d. O: \text{?mO:}, etc.


12. cf. also Rischel, Siiger (1967:25):

We do not want, however, to insist upon our transcription of /u/ and /o/ after /m/. It would be tempting to suggest that they do not commute at all in open syllable after nasal consonant. Our distinction is made mainly on the basis of the Lepcha orthography.

13. Lepcha shares the lip-rounding feature with certain related languages further east, especially Adi, e.g. abu ~ abbo 'father'; do 'eat'; eno ~ ono 'fish' (Ao ápò); pilno ~ ono 'five' (Mikir phonó); cf. also Kachin ìì 'bird' (Bodman 1968).


The ear is less able to distinguish a nasalized vowel from its near neighbour than it is to distinguish an oral vowel from its neighbour. It is harder to hear the difference between ɛ and ɛ than between e and e. Hence the acoustic confusion arising from the
existence of a number of nasalized vowel phonemes in French was considerable, and after a period of hesi-
tation there emerged the four nasalized phonemes of the present language. Even now the process of reduction seems to be proceeding.

15. A recent publication by the Government of Sikkim (Anonymous 1972) is exceptional in this respect, e.g. ’á-mo, ngo, fa-ngo, mlo (1, 4, 19, 24), and thop (21). Lepcha has recently been recognized, together with Sikkimese Tibetan and Nepali, as an official language of the State of Sikkim, so this use of the older spellings may be quite significant for Lepcha orthography.

REFERENCES


Bodman, N.C. 1968. [Handwritten Sino-Tibetan course material in which Lepcha is compared with cognates in 13 other languages, including Adi, Ao, and Mikir.]


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainwaring, G.B.</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td><em>A grammar of the Rong (Lepeha) language...</em> Calcutta: Baptist Miss. Press.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also published by the School of Oriental and African Studies

Tiddim Chin: a Descriptive Analysis of Two Texts
by Eugénie J.A. Henderson

Linguistic Comparison in South East Asia and the Pacific
Edited by H.L. SHORTO

The Short Story in South East Asia:
Aspects of a Genre
Edited by J.H.C.S. TINDO and H. CORDELL

Laï Sū' Thai: Essays in Honour of E.H.S. Simmonds
Edited by J.H.C.S. DAVIDSON