This paper will present several new etymologies for the words 'head', 'lord, master', together with', 'pregnant', 'cord', and 'to cast (metal)' in Sino-Tibetan. What these words have in common is that they all illustrate a theory recently developed by Betty Shefts Chang and Kun Chang (1976, 1977) which asserts: (1) the Written Tibetan "a-chung" in pre-initial position was a pre-nasal N- at the time of the invention of the Tibetan script; (2) the two prefixes *s- and *N- in Pre-Written Tibetan can form a sequence *s-N- and occur before a root; (3) Pre-Chinese also has *s-, *N-, and *s-N-; (4) PC *sm- > OC *xm-, PC *sng- > OC *xng- and PC *sn- > *hn- where *hn- is the voiceless n-. It should perhaps be mentioned that (1) was first proposed by Li Fang-kuei (1933), and (4) was mentioned by Yakhontov (1960).

Several of the Sino-Tibetan comparisons to be proposed include Chinese doublets or triplets which differ considerably in their phonetic shape. What I am doing here is not suggesting several alternative Chinese cognates to a Tibetan form in the hope that one of them may turn out to be right, though I must confess that this motive is not entirely absent. The general point I wish to make via these examples is that OC has many dialects in which the same Pre-Chinese form undergoes divergent development—in the initial as well as in the final. This thesis, if accepted, has an interesting implication for Sino-Tibetan comparative studies.

In recent years a great deal of emphasis has been placed on finding regular rules of correspondence between Chinese and Tibetan. No one would wish to dispute the desirability of the neogrammarians' goal. The question is when and how we can reach it. The fact that we had some success in establishing regular correspondences means that sometimes we manage to hit upon the matching

1 Abbreviations used in this paper are: STC: Paul Benedict, Sino-Tibetan: a Conspectus; GRS: Karlgren, Grammata Serica Recensa; LHT: Li Hsiao-t'ing 李孝定 甲骨文字集釈 (A compendium of the analyses and interpretations of oracle bone script); OB: Oracle bone inscriptions; WB: Written Burmese; WT: Written Tibetan; EOC: Early Old Chinese; LOC: Late Old Chinese; PC: Pre-Chinese.

Old Chinese is transcribed according to Li Fang-kuei's system (Li 1971, 1976); where I prefer another reconstruction, the preferred reconstruction is placed in parentheses. Middle Chinese is transcribed according to Karlgren, with modifications as recommended by Li (1971). A linguistic form preceded by a single star "*" is Li's OC; my own reconstruction of PC is preceded by two stars "**".
items in the standard language of OC and Written Tibetan. However, there are equally valid comparisons whose phonology is in some sense "irregular". The most likely explanation is that a dialect word is involved. For example WT sbrang 'fly' has been compared to both བདོ་ རོང་ 'gadfly' and བདོ་ རོང་ 'fly' (Li 1976b). One of the vocalic correspondences, WT a : OC a and WT a : OC a, must be irregular. Now, if we are comparing a form in Proto-Chinese to a form in Proto-Tibetan, each capable of accounting for all the descendents in its branch, then there is every reason to insist upon regular correspondence. The internal variations, say, in Chinese would have been disposed of by rules linking the proto-form with the forms in various OC dialects. In my own estimate, we are several generations away from the millennium. At the present state of our knowledge, we will have to accept the non-uniqueness of Sino-Tibetan comparisons.

(1) WT mgo < *b-N-go 'head' 'go-pa (N-go-pa) 'headman, officer'
    CH 元 *ngwjan (*ngjon) < **N-gon or **N-kon 'head' (Shu) (K257 a-c)

(2) WT mgon < *b-N-gon 'master, lord, protector'
    CH 萬 MC kjou < *kwjan (*kjun) 'lord, prince' (K459 a-c)
    寧 MC jwan < *gwjan (*grjun) 'director, governor' (K1251 1-n)

(3) WT 'go-pa (N-go-pa) 'headman'
    CH 后 *gug (*gu) 'sovereign, lord' (Shih) 'queen' (Tso) (K112 a-b)
    侯 *gug (*gu) 'feudatory prince' (Shih) (K113 a-d)

Betty Shefts Chang gave a derivation of WT mgo as follows: *b-N-go > *m-N-go > m-go. The first step assumes that oral stops (i.e. *b-) change to nasals before nasals; the second step assumes that non-initial "a-chung" (here written as "N") is lost (B. Chang 1971: 752-753; Li 1933). She also observed that N-go is attested in some compounds, e.g. N-go-pa ('go-pa') 'officer, headman'. I assume that mgon-po 'lord, master' is cognate to 'go-pa 'headman', and the above analysis of mgon is based upon that assumption.

The graph for *ngwjan occurs in the OB; it is the picture of a man with a stroke marking the head (LHT 0011). The word was still used in its original, literal sense of 'head' in LOC: 狄 人 歸 其 元 "The Ti people returned his head" (Tso-chuan, 11-year 33); 勇 士 不 忘 懷 其 元 "The brave officer never forgets that he may lose his head" (Mencius, 滕 文 公 下).

That 元 *ngwjan 'head' has **N-g- or **N-k- as the initial segment in Pre-Chinese is supported by two pieces of evidence. First, in the phonetic series K257 headed by 元, a. to l. have the initial *ng-, and m. to u. have *g- except for a single case of *kg-; 因 'round' (K257p) has multiple readings *g- and *ng-. Additional support comes from the following S-T comparison proposed by Chang and Chang (1976b: 352).

(4) N-khrud-pa, bkrus 'to wash (clothes or hands, face)
    消 *gwan ( > *N-kwan or *N-gwan) 'to wash clothes' (K257 o)
    消 *gwan 'to wash' (K140 m)
    消 *kwan 'to wash hands' (K161 a-c)

Note that 消 belongs to K257 headed by 元.

The correspondence between WT -o- and OC *-wa- or *-ua- (in Li's
transcription) is supported by many examples; see Gong 1978:30-31. In the Baxter-Bodman system of OC, Li's *-ua- is reconstructed as *-o-, which works very well for this word (Baxter forthcoming, Bodman forthcoming). Yakhontov (1970, 1960) proposed the same reconstruction.

The only difference between Chinese and Tibetan for 'head' is the presence of *-n in Chinese. Two explanations are possible. *-n may be a suffix, already present in the Sino-Tibetan root; cf. WT mgon 'master, lord', 'go-pa 'headman', and mgo 'head'. Chang and Chang remarked that ST *N- may be a suprasegmental feature, capable of nasalizing the whole syllable; their key example is WT N-thug-pa 'thick': Ch. *nungen (CC's *naung), *djagw (CC's *djayg). They also offered a slightly different explanation; where we find nasal/oral alternation in both the initial and the final consonant, the cause may be the delayed articulation of the pre-nasal *N-. So for 'head' in Chinese: **N-go > *ngjo > *ngjon.

Yakhontov (1970 (1960)) noted that *r has 完 as the phonetic; the latter belongs to K257 headed by 完.

(5) WT rkun 'thief'
    rju-ba 'steal'
    CH 完 *khug (*khu) (**khun) 'to rob, robber, bandit'
Here the -n/-o alternation between the phonetic and the phonetic compound is reflected in the Tibetan cognates.

For (2) WT mgon 'lord': Ch. 完 *kjun 'lord, prince', 完 *grjun 'director, governor'. Chang and Chang (1972) would reconstruct 完 as *kjun, and Baxter (forthcoming) *kjun. I follow Baxter in this instance. 完 *grjun is a makeshift reconstruction of an exceedingly difficult word.

In the examples presented above, there are several varieties of vowel correspondence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WT</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-o-</td>
<td>-o-</td>
<td>'head' mgo: N-gjon (Li's ngjuan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o-</td>
<td>-u-</td>
<td>'lord' mgon: *kjun, *grjun (Li's kwjan, gwrjan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u-</td>
<td>-u-</td>
<td>'robber' rku: *khu (Li's khug)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ru-</td>
<td>-o-</td>
<td>'wash' N-khrud: *gon (Li's *gwan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phenomenon of multiple correspondences has been discussed by Gong (1978), who listed many examples paralleling the ones shown above. While I admire Gong's paper, I find his discussion of this topic not very convincing. For one thing, he assumes that Li's system for OC is valid for Sino-Tibetan, while I am not sure it is valid beyond LOC. To play the devil's advocate, I will propose an alternative explanation. Let us suppose ST -o-: WT -o-: PC -o- and ST -u-: WT -u-: PC -u-. Let us further suppose that OC has two dialects; in one **ko > *kun, and in the other **ko > *ko; raising of back vowels after velars at different rates is a widespread phenomenon among modern Chinese dialects. When these OC dialects become mixed, the result is WT -o- corresponding to both OC -o- and -u-. It is also possible that in the Chinese words for 'head' and 'lord' we have a case of ablaut as a morphological process. As to WT -ru-: OC -o-, this may be due to the centralizing effect of *-r-. I hasten to add that I am as little convinced by my simple explanation as by Gong's more elaborate effort. The truth probably lies elsewhere.

(6) WT 'krid (N-krid) 'bring along with, with'
    CH *krid 'all'; 偃 *krid 'together' (K599 a-b) 虚 *ngjan (＞
It is well known that ḍ *krid is a collective or distributive adverb in OC. It remains to add that ḍ *krid, its cognate, is also used in the sense of 'to go along with,' which is even closer to the sense of the proposed Tibetan cognate: "The state of Chao sends the Lord of P'ing-yüan to seek help from its ally Ch'u. An arrangement is made for twenty brawny retainers, skilled both in courtly and martial arts to accompany him (Shih-chi 平原君傳 )."

The fact that ḍ *krid has a doublet *ngjjan was noted by Zhu De-xi (Chu Te-hsi) and Qiu Xi-gui (Ch'i Hsi-kuei) in their exegesis of an inscription on a square drinking vessel discovered in the tomb of the King of Chung-shan. The date is around 308 B.C. The inscription says that the Son of Heaven did not forget the King of Chung-shan's great service, sent a gift via an elder, and "諸侯虜 (ngjjan) 賄 the various lords all congratulated him." Below I translate Zhu and Qiu's discussion of the word 虜 *ngjjan; the OC reconstructions are of course mine.

The oracle bone inscriptions have the graph 虜, sometimes simplified to 虜. The graph 虜 on the drinking vessel must also be the simplified form of 虜. The Shuo-wen says, "虜, the sound of two tigers fighting; a compound ideograph with 日 and 日 as the components; to be read as 虜 *ngjjan (K1251 b)*. This must be the graph under discussion. The decree of the 26th year of the First Emperor of Ch'in (221 B.C.) unifying the weights and measures says "皆明令之 they should all be explicitly made uniform". The word 旨 *krid 'all' is written as 虜 on the remnants of plaques along ancient highways (容庚, 金文續編 Jung Keng, Chin-wen hsii-pien 4.2). The word 旨 has initial *k- and belongs to the OC 虜 *-id category. The word 虜 has initial疑 *ng- and belongs to the OC文 *-an category. The文 *-an category is the nasal counterpart to the 虜 *-id category. Therefore 虜 *ngjjan and 旨 *krid can be used interchangeably. The graph 虜 *ngjjan on the drinking vessel should also be read as *krid 'all'. (Zhu and Qiu 1979:43)

My only quibble with the above passage concerns the statement that 虜 is attested in oracle bone inscriptions. This is the opinion of Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉 expressed half a century ago. Li Hsiao-ting (LHT: 0425-6) pointed out that the graph Lo identified as 虜 is a combination of the forms 覺 and 本, whose scribe 覺 form should be 虜. In the OB graph for 'tiger', 本, the tail is always turned upward, in a direction opposite to the mouth; in the form cited by Lo, the mouth and the tail of the purported graph for 'tiger' are turned in the same direction. Zhu and Qiu may have seen the OB graph 本 in a context which makes the identification certain, or they may have seen a graph with two unmistakable 'tiger'. Until such evidence is produced, the issue remains in doubt.

The rest of their argument I find entirely convincing. *-an and *-id are not exactly nasal/oral counterparts. But in the Book of Odes there are several instances of the 文 *-an category rhyming with the 虜 *-in category, the exact nasal counterpart of *-id. This example also seems to show that the prenasal *N- is a suprasegmental feature.

I will now present a set of etymologies.
The common denominator on the Tibetan side is the presence of *s-N-br- (⇒ WT sb-) or N-ph-. On the Chinese side, the phonetic 蟊 is present in each of the proposed comparisons. Pulleyblank (1962:137) already recognized that 蟾 is the phonetic of 'fly' and 'cord'. As we will see, there is philological evidence indicating that 蟏 'pregnant' has a variant graph 貓 or 蟏. 貓 *mrang 'toad' occurs in the oracle bone inscriptions as a pictograph (LHT, 3945). In the Book of Odes, it is to be read as *mjian when serving as a loan for 蘎 *mjian 'to exert oneself'. In view of the proposed etymologies and the values of the phonetic 蟾, it is likely that at least some of the phonetic compounds were formed at a time when the compounds still had **m-r-. That is, **m-r- ⇒ *r- occurred later.

(7) 'fly' has already been discussed by Li Fang-kuei (1976b) and Chang and Chang (1976: 601). Li also connects OC *rang, *mrang 'fly' and *mrang 'toad' to Siam. ma-leeng < *ml/r- A2 'insect' and Siam. meang 'insect, used also in some aquatic vertibrates.' What I would like to add is a few words about the vocalic alternation in *-ang and *mrang. According to the Fang-yen, the word 蟾 *rang 'fly' is pronounced *rang in Eastern Ch'i (present Shantung). The following doublets also show that the alternations *-ag/-aŋ and *-ang/-aŋ are widespread among OC dialects.

(10)
(a) 'islet'
何其=何居
禮記檀弓鄭注
汝*tjag (Shih, K961h) 菁*tjag (Shih, K454k)
(b) *giag
居*giag
(c) 'subord. suffix'
之*tjəg
者*tjag (see Lü (1943))
(d) 'perfect tense'
曾*dzhang (Shih, K884a) 慶*djang (Lunyu, K725f)
(e) 'class, category'
等*tang (Yi, K961i') 黨*tang (Lunyu, K725r)
(f) 登時=當時
登*tang
黨*tang

The word 蟾 *rang 'fly' is first attested in the Book of Odes, and 蟾 *mrang in the "Ch'ü-yü" section of the Kuo-yü and the Chuang-tzu. While this information is insufficient to identify the dialects involved, we can be reasonably sure that these two words are dialect doublets in OC.

Gong (1978) points out that the Burmese cognate of this word is WB yang 'housefly'. He also gives two sets of vocalic correspondences, each supported by a number of convincing examples.
By selecting *ræ̈ng as the OC cognate, Gong comes to the conclusion that the ST word for 'fly' has the *-a- vocalism. It seems to me just as valid to select *mræ̈ng as the OC cognate, in which case Gong will have to conclude that the ST word for 'fly' has the *-a- vocalism. As far as I know, there is as yet no criterion for making the choice.

Many Chinese names for insects have a prefix ma, for example 蜈蚣 ma-yi 'ant', 蟲蛾 ma-hsien, 马蝇 ma-yu 'millipede', 马蝎 ma-t'iao 'cicada', 马蝇 ma-huang 'leech'. Several of the above are attested in Han texts such as the Fang-yen or the Erh-ya. In the Chinese lexicographic tradition, the prefix ma in names of insects is usually explained as a term denoting large size; thus ma-t'iao is the "larger variety among cicadas". I believe the etymon is *mræ̈ng, which, in addition of the specific sense of "fly" also has the generic sense "insect" as in Thai. If OC *mræ̈ng 'horse' corresponds to WT *rmæ̈ng and WB *mræ̈ng, then PC *mræ̈ng 'fly, insect' can easily yield the insect prefix *mræ̈ng > ma.

In Chang and Chang's (1976) treatment of this word, they pointed out that the Lepcha word for 'fly' is süm-bryon, which implies that the reconstructed *s-N- for WT sbrang was at one time pronounced as full syllables. They also noted that the phonetic series K742 containing *x-mræ̈ng has initials *m- and *x-, and that *x-mjæ̈ng is both the phonetic and the cognate of *s-mæ̈ng. Hence has *x-mræ̈ng, and *x-m- is the reflex of PC *s-m- < ST s-N-b. In what follows I will try to show that the Chinese cognates of WT sbrum 'pregnant' underwent an analogous development.

(8) WT sbrum < *s-N-brum 'pregnant'

CH **s-N-brum > *smrum > *smram

(a) 妇, 妇 *njæ̈m <---------- *snjæ̈m <----- *smjæ̈m

(b) 身, 娃 MC śjen < *hnjæ̈m < *hnjæ̈m

(c) 孕, 臧, 娃 *ræ̈ng <-------- *mræ̈ng < ---- *mræ̈m

The derivation given above need not take place exactly in the order shown, but some of the steps are intended to be sequential. I will now try to justify (a).

(11) WT -uP 'three' : OC -əP
    WT gums 'three' : OC  səm 'three' (K648a)
    WT 'gum 'kill' : OC  kʰæm 'kill' (K651v)
    WT nub 'to sink, to set' : OC  njæ̈p 'to enter'(K695a)
    WT sbrum 'pregnant' : OC  njæ̈m 'pregnant'(K667k)
These examples show that the dissimilatory change of PC -um > OC -am is independent of the type of initial preceding **-um.

For *-r- > *-j- see Chang and Chang 1976. Especially convincing are their examples WT mkrang 'solid': Ch. *khjin, *khrin, *kin, and *khin, *khrin 'solid', and WT N-phreng 'cord': Ch. _tcp *mjiən.

**smj- > *snj-. In Tibetan there are doublets which reflect this change: WT snyug-ma, snyug-ma 'rush, reed' (OC *njauk; Chang and Chang 1976:606); WT s-nyen-ba, r-nyen-ba (OC *s-nyen-ba) 'to stretch one's self, to yawn'. We assume a similar change in Chinese. Simon (1975) in proposing the comparison WT sbrum, rum : OC *njam *s- *s-; speculates that OC -nj- comes from an earlier *mj-. Here we assume that **s- is a necessary condition for *mj- - nj-; or more formally -m- > -n-s-j-. **s- is present in WT sbrum, and also as *h- in *hnjian 'pregnant'. The alternative assumption of *mj- - nj- is rejected because under that assumption either all syllables with *mj- would have become *nj- or there would be many doublets alternating between *mj- and *nj-. Neither seems to be the case. **smr- > *snr- > *snj- is another possibility.

The question may be raised why PC **s-N-brang (: WT sbrang) did not undergo *smj- > *smr- > *snr-? The answer is it did. There is a word *njang 'locust' with the 'insect' radical which occur primarily in compounds such as *ghm- 'mantis', *pjam 'locust(?)'. This is the same insect affix as **mrang > *mrang > *mrang discussed above. So we have WT sbrang: OC mrang, njang : : WT sbrum: OC mr ng, nj m.

(b) 身, 娠 MC sjên < *hnjian < *hnjiam < *smrəm

The word 娠 *hnjian 'pregnant' is clearly a doublet of 妊 *njam 'pregnant'; hence we may assume **hnjian > *hnjian. GRS 386a gives the meaning of 常 shen as 'body, person'. But there is good reason to believe that its earlier meaning is 'pregnant'. The bronze form of 身 shen is (340), the pictograph of a pregnant woman with a protruding belly; in Ode 236 we find the line 夫 女生 此文王 "T'ai Jen became pregnant and bore this Wen Wang" (Karlgren's translation), and the word 身 shen is used in its original sense 'being pregnant'. Meng K'ang 孟康 (3rd century) in commenting on the Han-shu said, " 娠 shen is to be pronounced 身 shen 'pregnant'. Nowadays there is a tendency to use 身 to write 身. They are interchangeable." I should mention that our reconstruction of 身 shen 'body' as *hnjian 'pregnant' implies a rejection of Benedict's ST etymology, i.e. Ch. 身 MC sjên : TB *sa 'meat, flesh' (STC, p. 158, note 428).

*hnj- > MC sj- is Li's proposal, the only graph with 身 as its phonetic is 舎 *diam > MC dien (K386d). *hnj- : *d- makes the relation between the phonetic and the phonetic compound intelligible. As a further step, I will suggest that *hnj- comes from **snj-.

Pulleyblank (1963:236-237) has noted that *m sporadically assimilates to *n after a front vowel: 林 *gljam 林 *pjian; 天 *thin, 杜 *thiam, etc. This may explain why 娠, 娠 has the final *-ian instead of *-am as in 妊, 妊. Another possibility is **-um > *-ian after labial initials.
I am unable to decide between these two possibilities.

There is another word *tjian > MC têijen 娠, 娠 'pregnant' (K455 q, s) which is obviously related. Most likely they were misread according to the phonetic.

(c) 妊, 娠 *rang < *mrang < *mrâm < *smrâm < **s-N-brum

The word 妊 *rang has two graphic variants 娠 and 娠, neither of which is recorded in the GRS or the Shuo-wen. The graph 娠 occurs in the Kuan-tzu, 娠 娠不期弃 “the pregnant woman would not have premature birth or take a fall,” and the commentary says 娠 is an old graph of 妊 *rang. The graph 娠 occurs in the T'ai-hsuan-ching ( 大玄經, a Han text) “婦 其 員 impregnate her fatty substance”. The fact 妊 has these two graphic variants has been noted by Tuan Yu-ts'ai and Chu Chun-sheng.

The oracle bone form of 妊 also exists (LHT, 3707). But the two pieces of OB containing it do not provide sufficient context to determine the meaning of the graph. If this graph does mean "pregnant" then its BOC value is almost certainly **mrang.

According to some lexicographers the graph 娠 has 娠 as its phonetic; it is so analysed in the GRS, in Tuan Yu-ts'ai's commentary to the Shuo-wen, and in Chu Chun-sheng's Shuo-wen t'ung-hsûn ting-sheng. This erroneous analysis evidently derives from a version of the Shuo-wen cited in the Yi-ch'ieh-ching yin-yi 切縫音義 by Hu-t'ân-yin 季雁. But according to Hsu K'ai 徐鍇, one of the leading scholars of the Shuo-wen during the T'ang, 娠 is a pictograph. His opinion is confirmed by the OB form for 娠 ( ), which is the drawing of a person with a child inside (LHT 4315). In terms of graphic origin, 娠 shen 'body, person' (K386a) and 婦 yin 'pregnant' (K945j) are the same word; they are both pictographs of a person with a child inside (LHT 2719). The part of the OB graph representing the body 娠 is deformed into 娠, which contributed to the confusion.

Karlgrén reconstructs 娠 as *djâng > jâng (K945j). This is incorrect. This word has a 4th Division ji-initial in MC, which goes back to *r-. It is difficult to see how 娠 can serve as the phonetic of 娠 *rang. What probably happened is sometime between OC and MC, 娠 was djâng and 娠 was êjëng, and the phonetic similarity at a much later stage made the erroneous analysis plausible.

Ode 8 莫及 has an expression 莫及 *bjâg-*râg (K999i, 976g) 'Plantago', which, according to Mao's Commentary, promotes pregnancy. Wen I-to (1948, II, 121) rightly observed that the practise of women gathering Plantago, the theme of this poem, is based upon the belief in homeopathic magic—that *bjâg-*râg promotes pregnancy because it is homonymous with a term with such connotations. And he connects it with 胚胎 *phâg-*thâg 'foetus'. However, the word 胚胎 *phâg-*thâg did not seem to exist in the Pre-Ch'in period, and even if it did, it is doubtful whether during the period of the Odes 胚胎 *phâg-*thâg was a ready-made compound, and thus recognizable as a near synonym to *bjâg-*râg. As an alternative explanation, I would propose that *bjâg-*râg is the disyllabic form
of *b-rag, which in turn is the denasalized version of *mrang 'pregnant'. If this argument is accepted, then during the period of the Qjes, *mrang still, had a pre-nasalized variant *N-brag.

'Pregnant' and 'fly' underwent the same evolution in the initial segment.

\[**s-N-br- > *s-mr- > *mr- > *r-\]

For the final, we saw earlier that **smrum > *smram by dissimilation, and after the loss of *s-, the result is *mram. At this stage another process of labial dissimilation takes place, triggered by a preceding labial or labiovelar initial.

(13) 'wind'
    風 pjam > pjæng > pjung (K625h)

'phoenix'
    鳳 bjam > bjæng > pjung (K625j)

'bear'
    熊 gwjam (?) > gwjæng > jung (K674a)

(Cf. WT dom, WB wam, Proto-Min *him)

'pregnant'
    孕 mræm > mræng > ræng (K945j)

The irregular development of ɨ MC jiang into Peking yun [Yn] offers further evidence indicating that ɨ once had a rounded vowel. It's prehistory is either **smrum > mrun > run > ruan > MC jiuan > Peking yun, or **smrum > run > *run > Peking yun.

(9) WT N-phreng 'cord'

CH 绳 *mjiän (K457x)

MC dzjang > *mrjang (?) < **N-phreng (K892b)

(Cf. STC, p. 176, footnote 469 Nungish: Metu ambring 'cord')

The Metu form cited by STC offers further evidence that "a-chung" was a pre-nasal. For 绳, I assume that when the phonetic compound was formed, its value was *m-rjang, and the phonetic 绳 was *mræng. The MC initial dz̪j- sembler- is not easy to derive. There are two possibilities. (1) *rj > MC zj- is regular. One assumption is that *m- is lost first, *rjæng > MC zjæng, and 绳 MC dz̪jæng is a dialect variant of MC zjæng. (2) If we assume *mræng > MC dz̪jæng, this would constitute an apparent counter-example to Li's (1976b) assertion that OC did not have *mrj- clusters.

绳 has multiple readings *mræng and *mjiän (K1252d); the latter is identical with 绳 *mjiän 'cord'.

In examples (7) 'fly', (8) 'pregnant', and with less certainty in (9) 'cord' we see that **mr- sometimes retains the nasal feature, and sometimes loses it. This is probably a dialect phenomenon.

(14) WT lugs, ldugs-pa 'to cast, to found metals'
CH Glyph *tjugh (< *tlugh (?) < *dlugh (?)) 'to cast' (K1090 a')

(Cf. WT N-chu 'to ladle, to irrigate, to water': Ch. 注
*tjugh 'to conduct water, to pour'; 科 *tjugx 'to ladle')

Chang and Chang (1977:238) posited a pre-nasalized *l- as the source of WT ld- and OC *dj-:

(15)  Ch. *dj- : 竺 *dijg 'lick'

* N-l- --> *N-d-l- --> *dl- ---->

WT *ld- : l dag 'lick'

The alternation of l- and ld- in WT for "to cast" calls for a similar treatment: *N-l- > l dugs, *l- > lugs. The voiceless initial *tj- of 鎚 does not entirely fit the derivation given above. I assume, tentatively, that the PC initial of 鎚 was **dl- which underwent devoicing and became *tl-.

PC initial **l- for 鎚 is another possibility and it is interesting to note that Vietnamese has a word for "to cast" probably borrowed from Chinese. In the interpreter's handbook An-nan-y!-y!! of the Ming dynasty, Chinese 釣金 'to pour gold' is given in Chinese transcription of Vietnamese as 六囝 l juk vang, and 鑄鋼 'to cast bronze' is given as 路董 lu dông (Chen 1966-68: 176-177).

Two general observations will conclude this paper.

First, the comparative study of Chinese and Tibetan is integral to the study of OC dialects. As we have seen, cognates and dialect doublets which are difficult to relate within Chinese become relatable through their Tibetan cognates. Conversely, in time we should be able to sort out Chinese doublets according to their dialect origin. Then we can reconstruct older stages of Chinese by the comparative method on the basis of LOC dialects.

Second, the prenasal *N- is known to have a morphological function in Tibetan. It converts so-called adjectives into intransitives, and is sometimes called the "non-causative". *s- and *s-N- are also known to have morphological functions. It would be interesting to find out whether these prefixes serve similar functions in Pre-Chinese.