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1.0 Introduction

Gordon H. Luce's Phases of Pre-Pagán Burma, Volume II first alerted me to the potential fruitfulness of comparative work with southern Chinese dialects and Tibeto-Burman languages. In Chart N, Tibeto-Burman Languages - Chin (Zo) Group, Tone Pattern I (Luce 1985:70-71), the following forms for 'tongue' (item #19) appear:

| Xongsai | lei² | Haka (Lai) | lei⁵ |
| Tedim   | lei¹ | Mātupi | lai¹ |
| Lushei  | lei¹ | T'anp'um¹ | lai¹ |
| K'ualsim| lei | T'siapa | lai¹ |

Now, to someone familiar with Cantonese the striking phonetic similarity of the Chin forms with Cantonese lei⁶ 'tongue' (Zeng 1986:64) and lai⁶ 'lick' (ibid.:120) immediately leaps from the page and raises a couple of questions: What is the connection between the Cantonese and Tibeto-Burman forms? Why have they developed in such a similar way? With my curiosity kindled by these questions, I took another close look at Benedict's Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus and realized that in Cantonese alone—to say nothing of other southern Chinese dialects, there were forms which could be compared with two of Benedict's Tibeto-Burman roots for tongue; lick. Might other Chinese dialects also offer additional forms for comparison with his other Tibeto-Burman roots?

This paper is the fruit of my investigation of the relationship between forms for tongue and lick in southern Chinese dialects and several Tibeto-Burman roots as reconstructed by Benedict and Matisoff. In the following discussion I have combined recent material on southern Chinese dialects and Tibeto-Burman languages with that from my own fieldwork on bodypart nomenclature in southeastern Chinese dialects. The first part of the paper is devoted to Tibeto-Burman and is organized as follows: first, I have reproduced the Tibeto-Burman forms which form the basis for the reconstruction of the six roots by Benedict and Matisoff. Second, taking advantage of more recently-published material, I have appended additional Tibeto-Burman forms which appear to me on the basis of their phonetic shape to belong to these roots. The second part of the paper comprises the Sinitic material and compares forms from the southern Chinese dialect families of Yue, Kejia, Min, Xiang, and Southwestern Mandarin with these Tibeto-Burman roots. Finally, noting "the hot-house homogenizing atmosphere of South-East Asia" (Matisoff 1983a:63), I have included under the relevant roots Kadai (Austro-Tai) and Austro-Asiatic lookalikes or comparabilia (Matisoff 1976:264).

A final introductory word: I recognize that in a broad-based comparative study one needs to be aware that phonetic-semantic
similarity can stem from at least four sources: cognition, contact borrowing, coincidence, or universal tendency. My assumption is that genetic relationship generally accounts for the connection between the Chinese forms and Tibeto-Burman roots. But some items are so similar they arouse suspicion, and I suspect that the other three "explanations" must also apply to some (unknown) extent. With South China's long history of intimate contact among various languages, opportunities for contact borrowing within or across genetic lines cannot be overestimated. However, I have not tackled the intriguing problem of identifying language donors and borrowers. Finally, universal tendency may play a special role in the development of forms meaning tongue and lick: viz., many languages, regardless of genetic affiliations, display a tendency to select the apically-articulated lateral l as an initial or medial consonant in words with these meanings (cf. Bauer 1988).

2.0 Tibeto-Burman Variant Roots for Tongue/Lick

Recognizing the phonetic-semantic interplay between tongue and lick, Benedict (1972) in his Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus has reconstructed the following phonetically-related proto-variant Tibeto-Burman roots:

\[ *(s-)ly\acute{a}\acute{w} \quad \text{lick; tongue (p. 48, 211)} \]
\[ *(m-)ly\acute{a}k \sim *(s-)ly\acute{a}k \quad \text{lick; tongue (ibid.)} \]
\[ *(s-)ly\acute{a}m \quad \text{tongue; flame (ibid.)} \]
\[ *m-\text{lay} \sim *s-\text{lay} \quad \text{tongue (p. 64, 281)} \]

To this list Matisoff (1985:26) has recently added two more roots for tongue: *-ley and *-lya. As can be seen, all of these roots follow the typical canonical form of the Proto-Tibeto-Burman syllable (Matisoff 1972:275), namely,

\[(P)C_i (G)CV(C_j)\]

It is interesting to observe that all of the roots above have l- as their initial consonant, an optional or obligatory consonantal prefix which alternates between m- and s-, and all have consonant finals or glide-endings. Although these roots are reconstructed for Proto-Tibeto-Burman, I would suggest that they can be pushed back further to Proto-Sino-Tibetan on the basis of cognate relationships drawn in the second part of this paper.

2.1 Tibeto-Burman Root *(m-)liak \sim *(s-)liak Lick, Tongue

The two variant roots *(m-)liak and *(s-)liak 'lick, tongue' are reconstructed from the following forms (Benedict 1972:48):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lepcha</td>
<td>liak 'to taste, try'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Burmese</td>
<td>liak 'lick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nung</td>
<td>la \sim le 'lick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-</td>
<td>jak 'lick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garo</td>
<td>sra-k 'lick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lushei</td>
<td>liak 'lick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikir</td>
<td>i-plek 'lick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangkhul</td>
<td>k-h-me-lek 'lick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magari</td>
<td>let 'tongue'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kachin  
Written Tibetan  

fiŋlet ~ fiŋlep 'tongue'

To the above list I would add the following items:

Written Tibetan  
Tibetan-Zangskar  
Tibetan-gLo  
Tibetan-gLo  
Limbu  
Magari  
Jirel  
Sherpa  
Trung-He  
Achang-Luxi  
Achang-Longchuan  
Akha  
Lisu  
Bisu  

(Akha, Lisu, Bisu < *m-liak Thurgood 1977:197)

Lahuna, Lahuxi  

le 'lick' (Chang 1986:116)

The Lahu forms have lost trace of the original stop ending, but I follow Nishida (1968:32) who associates his Lahushi le-ve and Lahuna lw with Burmese mi-at-se 'to lick'. Matisoff (Benedict 1972:48, footnote #157) derives Lahu le?/lé 'lick'/'feed an animal', a "simplex/causative pair", from Proto-Lolo-Burmese *lick/*?lick 'lick'.

Apparently as the result of borrowing, this root has a reflex in the Taunggyi (also called Taungthu) variety of Karen of south central Burma: Karen-Pa-0 liak 'to taste, to lick' (Burling 1969:79); but Written Burmese liak is not the source of the loan according to Benedict (1972:141). As for Karen, the following varieties imply at least two different etyma for 'lick':

Karen-Moulmein Pho  
Karen-Bassein Pho  
Karen-Palaychi  
Karen-Moulmein Sgaw  
Karen-Bassein Sgaw  

lén? 'lick' (Burling 1969:79-80)

?àn lèn ibid.

?q lî? ibid.

lê? ibid.

lê ibid.

2.2 Tibeto-Burman Root *-lei Tongue

With reference to Walter French's Proto-Naga root *C-lei; 'tongue' (as reconstructed in his 1983 Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Naga: a Tibeto-Burman Mesolanguage, on the basis of Yaglim, Mancho le, Konyak ji, Phom jei), Matiasoff (1985:26) has proposed a proto-variant root *-lei based on Tiddim Chin lei and Jingpo fiŋli 'tongue'. Additional cognate forms from languages of the Chin, Naga, and Baric groups include:

Xongsai  
Khuaisalim  
Haka (Lai)  
Ngawn  

lei³ 'tongue' (Luce 1985, Volume II:70-71

lei³ ibid.

lei³ ibid.

lei 'tongue' (Ono 1965:13)
Falam \( *_{\text{le}} \) ibid.
Khiamngan \( *_{\text{le}} \) 'tongue' (Weidert 1979:119)
Tangsa \( *_{\text{li}} \) ibid.

Forms from various languages of the Kuki-Chin group support the reconstruction of \( *_{\text{m-lei}} \):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mera (Darling)</td>
<td>( põ\ \text{le} )</td>
<td>(Luce 1985, II:70-71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotu (Hriangpi)</td>
<td>( põ\ \text{li} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lailenpi</td>
<td>( m\text{e/põle} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womatu</td>
<td>( m\text{e/le} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awa Khumi</td>
<td>( ë\text{mlë} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asho (Sandoway)</td>
<td>( ë\text{mle} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anal</td>
<td>( ë\text{pa-li} )</td>
<td>(Ono 1965:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinbok</td>
<td>( ë\text{am-lei} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kom</td>
<td>( ë\text{m\text{a-lei} \text{tongue}} )</td>
<td>(Weidert 1979:119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakher</td>
<td>( ë\text{pe-lei} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms from the following Tibeto-Burman languages in Nepal appear to be related to the \( *_{-\text{lei}} \) root:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamang</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td>'tongue' (Hale 1973:51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunwar</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakali</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chepang</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghale-Keura</td>
<td>( \text{li} )</td>
<td>'tongue' (Nishi 1982:177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghale-Barpak</td>
<td>( \text{li} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghale-Gumda</td>
<td>( \text{li} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghale-Uiya (Tularam)</td>
<td>( \text{li} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghale-Uiya (Lanman)</td>
<td>( \text{li} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamang-Risiangku</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurung</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manang Gyaru</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td>ibid. (Nagano 1984:207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manang Prakaa</td>
<td>( \text{li} )</td>
<td>'e ibid. (Hoshi 1984:138)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two varieties of Menba, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in Tibet, also have forms which appear to belong to this root: Menba-Motuo \( \text{le} \) and Menba-Suona \( \text{le} \) 'tongue' (Sun 1980:336). A variety of Yi, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in Guizhou, appears to have a form cognate with this root: Yi-Dafang \( \text{le} \) 'lick' (Chen et al 1985:256). The following four Tibeto-Himalayan "dialects" have similar forms for 'tongue' (Sharma 1986):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchad (PaTani)</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunan</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinan</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinauri</td>
<td>( \text{le} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karen may also fit into the picture in some way. Cf. the following items meaning 'tongue' (Burling 1969:67-68):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen-Taungthu</td>
<td>( \text{phre} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen-Moulmein Pho</td>
<td>( \text{phle} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen-Bassein Pho</td>
<td>( \text{phlé} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen-Palaychi</td>
<td>( \text{plé} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen-Moulmein Sgaw</td>
<td>( \text{ple} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen-Bassein Sgaw</td>
<td>( \text{ple} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Tibeto-Burman Root *m-lai ~ *s-lai Tongue

Benedict (1972:64) has reconstructed *m-lai ~ *s-lai 'tongue' on the basis of the following forms for 'tongue':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Tibetan</td>
<td>ltse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimasa</td>
<td>salai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanauri</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nung</td>
<td>phelæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepcha</td>
<td>ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vayu</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbu</td>
<td>le-sot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachin</td>
<td>lai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garo</td>
<td>sre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusheei</td>
<td>lei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikir</td>
<td>de</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms for 'tongue' from other Tibeto-Burman languages which I believe also belong to this set include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaise</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>(Hale 1973:51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*s-lai &gt; Tibetan-Lhasa</td>
<td>tʃe</td>
<td>(Jin 1983:174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan-Zangskar</td>
<td>ʃtʃe</td>
<td>(Hoshi and Tsering 1978:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boro</td>
<td>sa-lai</td>
<td>(Bhat 1969:149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m-lai &gt; Trung-Nujiang</td>
<td>pʃai</td>
<td>(Sun 1982:216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trung-Hę</td>
<td>pʃai</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deng-Geman</td>
<td>blai</td>
<td>(Sun et al 1980:336)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awa</td>
<td>malai</td>
<td>(Löffler 1960:531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areng</td>
<td>palai</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔ-lai &gt; Rengmitca</td>
<td>talai</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Tibeto-Burman Root *(s-)liam Tongue; Flame

The proto-root *(s-)liam 'tongue; flame' has been derived from the following language forms (Benedict 1972:48):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahing</td>
<td>liam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khambo</td>
<td>lem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakha</td>
<td>lem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Written Burmese | ahliam | 'coruscation of flame'

Benedict (footnote #158, p. 48) suggests that "Kanauri and Thebor lem 'lick' probably belong in this set. . . ." Additional forms from several Tibeto-Burman languages in Nepal also belong with this root:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamang</td>
<td>lehm-p₃(m)</td>
<td>'lick' (Hale 1973:106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakali</td>
<td>lehm-la</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chepang</td>
<td>lehm-ṣa</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaling</td>
<td>lem</td>
<td>'tongue' (Hale 1973:51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Tibeto-Burman Root *(s-)lia'w Lick, Tongue

Benedict (1972:48) has reconstructed *(s-)lia'w on the basis of Lusheei lido 'lick (as flames)' and Kachin fìŋlòu 'tongue'. Possibly related to this root are the forms below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deng-Darang</td>
<td>lio²</td>
<td>'lick' (Sun 1980:362)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Tibeto-Burman Root *-lia Tongue

Matisoff (1985:26) has identified yet another root for 'tongue', namely, *-lia, as the source of Written Burmese hlia and Lahu ha (-te); (also cf. Lahua xa "te" and Lahuxi xa "le" [Chang 1986:103]). The following forms may be reflexes of the root:

- Achang-Luxi lias 'tongue' (Dai and Cui 1985:106)
- Achang-Lianghe lid ~ lid 'lick' (Dai and Cui 1985:118)
- Nusu-South lid 'lick' (Sun and Liu 1986:159)
- Nusu-South lig ibid.
- Takö manhlà 'tongue' (Bradley 1988:3)
- Bisu men 'hla: 'tongue' (Nishida 1966b:70)
- Akha me la 'tongue' (Nishida 1966a:36)
- Lisu la 'tshwe 'tongue' (Nishida 1968:19)
- Lisu la tshw 'tongue' (Xu et al 1986:136)
- Phunoi à la 'tongue' (Nishida 1966c:46)
- Tibetan-Lhasa tgála 'lick without eating/drinking' (Goldstein 1984:250)
- Yi-Nanjian la 'tongue' (Chen et al 1985:242)
- Yi-Dafang la 'tongue' (Chen et al 1985:256)
- Yi-Nanjian la 'lick' (ibid.:256)
- Tujia-North ji la 'tongue' (Tian et al 1986:174)
- Tujia-South dzi la ibid.
- Tujia-North la 'lick' (ibid.:189)
- Tujia-South lo' ibid.

Pumi-Qinghua li qho and Pumi-Taoba li 'tongue' (Lu 1983:113) are tentatively linked to this root.

Bradley (1985:43) assigns Haoni p li 'tongue' to his Proto-Loloish root *?-l(i)da. Forms from the following Hani languages appear to belong with it as well:

- Hani-Dazhai la ma 'tongue' (Li and Wang 1986:170)
- Yani-Gelangho la ibid.
- Hanoi-Shuigui li 'tongue' (ibid.:256)
- Biyue-Laiyuan a la ibid.

3.0 Archaic Chinese *djaq ~ *liaŋ 舌 Tongue

Benedict has linked two of his Tibeto-Burman roots with reconstructed Archaic Chinese forms, and both reconstructions are tied to the same Chinese character 舌:

1. Tibeto-Burman *(-m)-liaq ~ *(-s)-liaq (1972:165, note #442) is compared with Karlgren's Archaic/Ancient Chinese djaq/dziq (GS #288a, Karlgren 1966:201) 舌 'tongue'. Benedict says the source of the Chinese word is the root *g'ljat [舌] 'tongue', a doublet of g'ljak which is derived from *g'lijak [嘔] 'tongue' (however, it may be worth noting that this graph now means 'upper jaw': cf. Li Zhoumin 1980:335). With *g'ljat contrast Bodman and Baxter's Old Chinese *?liet 'tongue' (Bodman 1987:4).

2. Tibeto-Burman *(-s)-liaŋ 'tongue; flame' (page 172, note #458) is compared with Archaic/Ancient Chinese *tiam/t'iem [舔] 'lick, taste' (not in GSR) which is derived from [Sino-Tibetan?]
Proto-Chinese? *liam/*liem. Benedict notes "the Cantonese reading li·m" which has the same meaning and claims that "this root [*s·liam] is also represented in Chinese by the 'hidden' word for 'tongue' (*d·iam < *liam < *liam [ʰ̂u]), explaining the use of [ʰ̂u] as phonetic in *d·iam/d·iem [ʰ̂u] 'calm' and *s·iam/s·iem [ʰ̂u] 'sharp,..., also in *d·iam/d·iem [ʰ̂u] 'sweet' (not in GSR)..." 5

Luce (1985, Volume II:117) compared Written Burmese lbia, Written Tibetan lcie, ljaq, and Karlgren's Archaic Chinese d·iat 'tongue' but proposed no proto-form; for 'lick' (p. 111) he was not able to find any Archaic Chinese reconstruction which could be related to Written Burmese liak and Written Tibetan Idag-pa.

With regard to the comparison of Tibeto-Burman roots and Chinese dialect forms, my own purpose is fairly modest: I have collected forms for 'tongue' and 'lick' found in various southern Chinese dialect families of Yue, Kejia, Min, Southwestern Mandarin, and Xiang and have sorted them on the basis of their phonetic shape into the Tibeto-Burman root categories listed above. Patterns of striking phonetic similarity between the two groups suggest that the Chinese forms share cognate (and loan) relationships with the Tibeto-Burman roots.

3.1 Chinese-Min and Tibeto-Burman *(m·)lick ~ *(s·)lick

It is primarily within the Min dialect family that we find a number of forms which appear to be related to the proto-variant forms of T-B *lick. This is not surprising in view of the general understanding among Sinologists that the Min group split off very early from Proto-Chinese.

Min-Fuzhou liik¹ (~ ɕieek) 'tongue' (Nakajima 1979:134)
Min-Fuzhou liek? 'lick' (Li and Chen 1985:158)
Min-Gutian lek? 'lick' (ibid.)
Min-Zhouming lek³ 'lick' (ibid.)
Min-Fuding lek³ 'lick' (ibid.)
Min-Putian lek³ 'tongue' (ibid. 99)
Min-Youxi li³ 'lick' (ibid. 158)
Min-Yongan la³ 'lick' (ibid.)
Min-Jianou la³ 'lick' (ibid.)
Min-Jianyang lye³ 'tongue' (ibid. 99)
Min-Songxi ly³ 'tongue' (ibid.)
Min-Jianyang la³ 'lick' (ibid. 158)
Min-Songxi lp³ 'lick' (ibid.)
Min-Ningde lp³ 'lick' (ibid.)
Kejia liap¹ 'liap' (Maciver 1982:398)
Min-Jianou y³ 'tongue' (Li and Chen 1985:99)
Linghua ɕie lie 'tongue' (Wang 1979b:234)

The raised numbers 7 and 8 attached to the end of each form indicate that they belong to the Rusheng tone category whose morphosyllables historically had -p, -t, -k endings. In all cases except three the stop ending has either reduced to - or has been rephonologized as a distinctive tone contour. Min-Fuzhou tsuik¹ (~ ɕieik) 'tongue' (but tshui liik² in Hanyu Fangyap, Cihui:194) appears to retain -k. On the basis of Min-Ningde lpe³ we might infer that the original identity of the stop ending in Min may have been -p and not -k. Such a conclusion is further supported by Kejia liap¹ 'to lick'. However, for the moment I
reserve judgment on the matter because I suspect there was variation between liak and liap. Evidence for such variation in Tibeto-Burman is found in Achang-Longchuan liap⁴ (Dai and Cui 1985:118) and Kham lep-nya (Hale 1973:106) 'lick'. Contrast Kadai: Li-Jiamao lep (Ouyang and Zheng 1983:485) and Shui liak⁵ (Zhang 1980:99) 'lick'. With respect to the apparent loss of the l-initial in Min-Jianou ye⁶ and Linghua ic⁸ 'tongue', we can compare the parallel development in Modern Burmese je⁸ and Atsi jo?⁹ 'lick, lap' (Yabu 1982:28) < Tibeto-Burman *-lick.

Finally, this root also appears to have some connection with Austro-Asiatic where we find the following forms meaning 'lick' but showing some phonetic similarity to Magari le and Kachin sinlet 'tongue' (again cf. Bodman and Baxter’s Old Chinese *liet 'tongue'):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wa</th>
<th>liet 'lick' (Zhou and Yan 1984:177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulang-Xinmane</td>
<td>liat ibid. (Li, Nie, Qiu 1986:106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deang</td>
<td>liat ibid. (Chen, Wang, Lai 1986:135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammu</td>
<td>klët ibid. (Svantesson 1983:24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danaw</td>
<td>kälët⁶ ibid. (Luce 1965:116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Riang</td>
<td>liët\⁴ ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaung-Panku</td>
<td>lët⁷ ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundari</td>
<td>le?⁷ 'tongue' (ibid.:122)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Chinese and Tibeto-Burman *-lei Tongue

Matisoff (1985:26) reconstructed *-lei on the basis of Tiddim Chin lei and Jingpo sin li 'tongue'. Tibeto-Burman forms listed above in section 2.2 show a strong similarity to forms for 'tongue' from a number of Yue dialects as well as some Kejia, Min, and Southwestern Mandarin varieties:

| Yue-Guangzhou       | lei⁶ 'tongue' (Beijing Daxue 1964:194) |
| Yue-Hongkong        | lei⁶ (Lau 1977:500) |
| Yue-Yangjiang       | lei⁶ (Beijing Daxue 1964:194) |
| Yue-Conghua         | lei⁶ (Bauer 1985a) |
| Yue-Zhongshan       | li⁶ (Chan 1980:126) |
| Yue-Taishan         | li⁶ (Cheng 1973:281) |
| Yue-Yulin           | li⁶ li⁶ 'tongue' (Bauer 1985a) |
| Yue-Huaiji          | li⁶ (Bai 1987:4) |
| Yue-Gaozhou         | lei⁶ thau ibid. |
| Yue-Lianjiang       | lei⁶ ibid. |
| Yue-Yangchun        | lei⁶ ibid. |
| Kejia-Meixian       | lei⁶ (Beijing Daxue 1964:194) |
| Kejia-Danshui       | lei⁶ ma² (Bauer 1986a) |
| Kejia-Lianping      | siq⁵ lei² (Huang 1987:94) |
| Kejia-Huizhou       | li⁶ (Huang 1987:94) |
| Kejia-Wengyuan      | li⁵ tæchien⁶ (Huang 1987:94) |
| Kejia-Yongding      | li⁵ 'tongue (of large domestic animal)' (Huang 1983:226) |
| Min-Hongkong        | li⁶ (Bauer 1986a) |
| Min-Shaqi           | li⁶ (Zhang 1987:36) |
| Min-Nanlang         | tau⁶ li⁸ (Zhang 1987:36) |
| Mandarin-Liuzhou    | li⁵ tæfæ (Bauer 1985a) |
| Mandarin-Chengdu    | ni⁵ ts⁵ 'pig tongue' (Liang 1982:242) |
|                    | li⁵ ts⁵ ibid. (Luo et al 1987:132) |
majority li-forms as representative of the etymon and reconstruct Ancient Chinese *li.

Austro-Tai "lookalikes" include the following:

- Li-Yuanmen: lej "lick" (Ouyang and Zheng 1983:485)
- Dai-Xishuangbanna: lek ibid. (Yu and Luo 1983:123)
- Dai-Dehong: lek ibid.
- Tai Lo, Maw, No: lek ibid. (Harris 1975:219)
- Tai Khantmi: lek ibid. (Harris 1976:152)

3.2.2 Yue Folk Etymology for 利 lei6 Tongue

Although the modern reflexes of this Chinese root reconstructed as *li show a widespread distribution among southern Chinese dialect families and a broad geographical dispersal from Fujian through Guangdong and Guangxi and up to Sichuan, the ancient rhyme books and dictionaries which sometimes contained graphs with commentaries attributing them to particular dialects (as described by Downer 1981) seem not to have recorded such a graph that can be related to the Chinese root *li (Bai 1980 lists a morpheme plus graph for 'lick' to be discussed below but gives nothing for 'tongue'). This omission may have helped to perpetuate a Yue-centric folk etymology purporting to explain the origin of Yue-Guangzhou lei6. This etymology which is widely accepted among Chinese linguists runs as follows: Because the standard Yue pronunciation of [舌] is homophonous with Yue-Guangzhou siti6 'to lose' (sometimes written with the Cantonese graph 饴 and sometimes with the standard Chinese graph 舌 which is actually pronounced sii6) as in the phrase [舔舌] siti6 'pun 'to go bankrupt', a taboo has replaced siti6 with lei6 which is taken from the lucky expressions [吉利] kat lei6 'lucky' and [财利] jii6 lei6 'profit'; the flesh radical was then added to [舌] to make the character for 'tongue' (Yuan 1960:210; Qiao 1975:97; Rao et al 1981a:125; Rao et al 1981b:93). It is true that Cantonese-speakers are superstitious and do have their lucky and taboo expressions. However, the question of why "lei" was chosen and not some other propitious-sounding morphosyllable is never addressed in this story. In spite of the taboo or perhaps because of it, pejorative-type quadro-syllabic expressions containing siti6 'tongue' are found in Cantonese, e.g., [頂嘴頂舌] tei3 tsai3 siti6 'rebuke with sarcastic remarks'; [口甜舌滑] hau3 siti6 wat6 'glib-tongued'; [油嘴滑舌] jau2 tsai3 wat6 siti6 'glib-tongued' (Chen 1980:142). Yuan (1960:171) invokes the same folk etymology to explain Hakka-Mei-xian li6. In view of the number of Chinese dialects and Tibeto-Burman languages with reflexes of *li and *-lei, however, it must be seen as a myth.

3.3 Chinese-Yue and Tibeto-Burman *(m-)lai ~ *(s-)lai Tongue

We find the following Yue and Min forms which mean 'lick' for comparison with Tibeto-Burman *(m-)lai ~ *(s-)lai:

- Yue-Guangzhou: lai3 'lick' (Zhan and Cheung 1987:92)
- Yue-Hongkong: lai3 ibid.
- Yue-Aomen (Macau): lai3 ibid.
- Yue-Shunde: lai4 ibid.
Yue-Zhongshan  lai⁹ ibid.
Yue-Zhuai  lai⁹ ibid.
Min-Nanlang  lai⁹ ibid.
Min-Longdu  lai⁹ ibid.

Standard Cantonese reading and colloquial pronunciations are associated with the graph [舌], namely Yue-Guangzhou sai⁴ and lai⁹ 'lick'. This variation between sai⁴ and lai⁹ seems eminently relatable to the Tibeto-Burman variant root *(s-)lai 'tongue': sai⁴ could have developed through the prefix preempts the initial l-, while lai⁹ developed from the loss of the prefix.

That the phonetic history of the Chinese morpheme has been fairly complicated is suggested by the fact that no less than five different graphs are associated with it: [舌], [舌], [舌], [舌], [舌] (Li Zhomin 1980). The rhyme books Guangyun (1008 A.D.) and Jiyun (1039 A.D.) both glossed the graph [舌] and indicated it belonged to the [舌] rhyme. However, its pronunciation has changed through time and it now has moved over to the [舌] she of the second division (Bai 1980:211). Two varieties of Kejia may have reflexes of this graph, but both have changed their tone category (Yinping instead of Shang) and rhyme ([舌] instead of [舌]): Kejia-Song Him Tong (New Territories, Hong Kong) se⁴ (Sagart 1982:17) and Kejia-Meixian (eastern Guangdong) se⁴ (Beijing Daxue 1964:256). Reflecting the uncertainty of its origin, the Hanyu Fangyuan Cihui does not assign a graph to the Kejia morphosyllable.


3.4.1 Chinese-Kejia, Yue and Tibeto-Burman *(s-)liam 'tongue; flame

The following Kejia and Yue dialect forms all meaning 'lick' are compared with Tibeto-Burman *(s-)liam:

Kejia-Danshui  liam³ 'lick' (Bauer 1985a)
Kejia-Yongding  lian⁵ (Huang 1983:238)
Yue-Taishan  liam³ (Zhan and Cheung 1987:189)
Yue-Enping  li⁶ ibid.
Yue-Doumen  li⁶ ibid.
Yue-Foshan  li⁶ ibid.
Yue-Guangzhou  li⁶ (Rao et al 1981:129)
Yue-Hongkong  li⁶ (Yue-Hashimoto 1972:259)

In the above list we note that Kejia-Danshui liam³, Yue-Taishan liam³, and Yue-Enping li⁶ closely parallel the Tibeto-Burman root. Bai (1981:85) claims Yue-Guangzhou li⁶ has a variant form le⁶ li⁶ 'stick out the tongue and lick the corners of the mouth'. However, neither Yue-Hashimoto (1972) nor Rao et al (1981) recognize the morphosyllable le⁶ as one in the standard Cantonese syllabary (*-em is found only in loanwords, cf. kem¹ < "game" Bauer 1985c:107, tfem⁴ < "jam" Cheung 1972:217), so it may be a loan from some other (currently unknown but possibly Yue) dialect. It is certainly an interesting form with respect to its *-em rhyme and its occurrence here with the Burman and
Yue-Taishan and may represent some intermediate stage between -iam and -im.

Kadai comparabilia include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mulao-Siba</td>
<td>li: m^⁵</td>
<td>'lick'</td>
<td>(Wang and Zheng 1980:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-Giandui</td>
<td>le: m^⁴</td>
<td>'lick'</td>
<td>(Duyang and Zheng 1983:485)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-Tongshi</td>
<td>li: m^⁴</td>
<td>'lick'</td>
<td>(ibid.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be-Limkow</td>
<td>li: m^4</td>
<td>'tongue, lick'</td>
<td>(Hashimoto 1980:154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be-Qiongshan</td>
<td>li: m^4</td>
<td>'lick'</td>
<td>(Zhang et al 1985:430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be-Chengmai</td>
<td>li: m^4</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siamese</td>
<td>li: m^4</td>
<td>'taste (elegant)'</td>
<td>(Haas 1985:485)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.4.2 Chinese-Kejia, Min liem 'drink'

On the basis of their phonetic/semantic similarity, we can compare the following forms meaning 'drink' and 'suck' ('slurp'?), from Kejia and Min and Tibeto-Burman *(s-)liem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Sixian</td>
<td>liem^1</td>
<td>'drink'</td>
<td>(Hashimoto 1972:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Sixian</td>
<td>liem^2</td>
<td>'suck' (liem^3 thong 'suck soup')</td>
<td>(ibid.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Xiamen</td>
<td>liem^1</td>
<td>'drink'</td>
<td>(Beijing Daxue 1964:253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Chaozhou</td>
<td>liem^1</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Taipei</td>
<td>liem^2</td>
<td>ibid. (Zhang Zhenxing 1983:111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hanyu Fangyan Cihui (p. 253) claims that the Xiamen and Chaozhou forms are related through borrowing to Malay lemak, but this seems highly doubtful because this Malay word means 'fat (of meat); grease' (Yusop 1984:157), and secondarily 'a type of freshwater fish' or 'a type of tree' (Abas 1983:412). I suggest that the above forms are related to Yue-Guangzhou liem^1 which is both phonetically and semantically closer than the Malay item. The Min forms, however, have undergone a semantic shift.

3.5 Chinese-Min and Tibeto-Burman *(s-)liaw 'lick; Tongue

In four Min dialects we find forms for comparison with Tibeto-Burman *(s-)liaw 'lick; tongue':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min-Putian</td>
<td>liaw^6</td>
<td>'lick'</td>
<td>(Li and Chen 1985:158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Fuzhou</td>
<td>liaw^6</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>(Beijing Daxue 1964:256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Shuibei</td>
<td>liaw^6</td>
<td>'tongue'</td>
<td>(Zheng 1985:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Shipo</td>
<td>liaw^6</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a Kadai "lookalike": Gelao liaw^6 'lick' (He 1983:82).

3.6 Chinese-Xiang and Tibeto-Burman *-lia Tongue

With *-lia we relate the following Chinese forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xiang-Hengyang</td>
<td>lia^4</td>
<td>'lick'</td>
<td>(Li Yongming 1986:298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linghua</td>
<td>lia^3</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>(Wang 1979b:237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin-Chengdu</td>
<td>nia^3</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>(Liang 1982:242)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous comparisons have turned up items shared mainly by Yue, Kejia and Min and these are fairly concentrated in the southeastern provinces of Guangdong and Fujian. But the above three dialects form a broad triangle that joins three different dialect families and spans several provinces further south and west. Xiang is spoken in the south central province of Hunan and Linghua further southwest in nearby Guangxi. Northwest in Sichuan Chengdu dialect is representative of southwestern Mandarin in which n- and l- are not phonemically distinctive, a feature found in many Chinese dialects, usually those south of the Yangzi River. With more forms for 'tongue' and 'lick' from more dialects within this triangle we might be able to determine the significance of *-liŋ among the Chinese dialect families.

We find the following *-liŋ-"lookalikes" in Kadai:

| Siamese | lia₁ (Haas 1985:493) |
| Lao | lia₂ (Marcus 1970:123), |
| Dong | lia₂ 'lick' (Liang 1980:106; Wang Jun 1984:841) |
| T'ien-chow | lia 'lick' (Li 1977:127) |

and in Austro-Asiatic:

| Kammu | lia 'lick' (Svantesson 1983:26) |
| White Striped Riang | lia\ ibid. (Luce 1965:128) |
| Khasi | dgiliah ibid. |

4.1 Conclusion

This study has investigated the distribution of forms for 'tongue' and 'lick' in a number of southern Chinese dialects and has compared them with six Tibeto-Burman roots. This lexical evidence has been presented to support the conclusion that many of the Chinese forms are cognate to the Tibeto-Burman roots. A pattern of cross-dialectal ties among the Chinese dialect families can be represented as below:

**Figure 1. Cross-Chinese dialectal ties for 'tongue' and 'lick'**

| Min | li | lai | liek | lieu |
| Kejia | li | liam | liap |
| Yue | li | lai | liam |
| Sw Mand | li | nia |
| Xiang | lia |

In Min we find four roots represented and in Kejia and Yue three, but only reflexes of *li connect four of the five dialect families. Still, this lexical affinity for 'tongue' across Yue, Kejia, and Min may give some support to Norman's claim that these three dialect groups descend from a common source he terms "Old Southern Chinese" (1988:210). One should also keep in mind that some of the Chinese items may be loans from Tibeto-Burman languages. We can note that similar forms are not found in the northern Chinese dialects but only in the southeastern and
southwestern ones whose contact with Tibeto-Burman languages has been historically more recent. Linguistic exchange may account for the close phonetic similarity observed between some Chinese and Tibeto-Burman items. In this regard, Ramsey has made tantalizing hints that "the varieties of Chinese spoken in South China still have some features of earlier, non-Sinitic languages. . . [i]n vocabulary, too, there is evidence for non-Han substrata" (1987:36, 37). However, he provides no lexical examples of these non-Han substrata, so this is a task still waiting to be done.

4.1 Summary Table of Tibeto-Burman Roots and Chinese Forms

All the Chinese forms discussed above are listed below under their relevant Tibeto-Burman roots for ease of reference:

1. *(m-)*liak ~ *(s-)*liak 'lick; tongue'
   Min-Fuzhou liek 6 ('*eiek') 'tongue' (Nakajima 1979:134)
   Min-Fuzhou lia2 'lick' (Li and Chen 1985:158)
   Min-Gutian lei2 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Zhouming le7 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Fuding le7 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Putian fe7 'tongue' (Li and Chen 1985:99)
   Min-Youxi li7 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Yongan la7 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Jianou la7 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Jiayang la7 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Songxi le7 'lick' ibid.
   Min-Ningde le67 'lick' ibid.
   Kejia liap2 'lick' ((Maciver 1982:398)
   Min-Jiayang li6 'tongue' (Li and Chen 1985:99)
   Min-Songxi li6 'tongue' ibid.
   Min-Jianou ye6 'tongue' ibid.
   Linghua ie7 li6 'tongue' (Wang 1979b:234)

2. *-lei 'tongue'
   Yue-Guangzhou lei6 'tongue' (Beijing Daxue 1964:194)
   Yue-Hongkong lei6 (Lau 1977:500)
   Yue-Yangjiang lei6 (Beijing Daxue 1964:194)
   Yue-Conghua lei6 (Bauer 1985a)
   Yue-Zhongshan li1 (Chan 1980:126)
   Yue-Taishan li6 (Cheng 1973:281)
   Yue-Yulin li1 ti6 (Bauer 1985a)
   Yue-Huaiji li6 (Bai 1987:4)
   Yue-Gaozhou lei6 thau ibid.
   Yue-Lianjiang lei6 ibid.
   Yue-Yangchun lei6 ibid.
   Kejia-Meixian li6 (Beijing Daxue 1964:194)
   Kejia-Danshui li6 ma2 (Bauer 1986a)
   Kejia-Lianping si6 lei2 (Huang 1987:94)
   Kejia-Huizhou li6 (Huang 1987:94)
   Kejia-Wengyuan li6 t0h2 (Huang 1987:94)
   Kejia-Yongding li6 'tongue (animal)' (Huang 1983:226)
   Min-Hongkong li6 (Bauer 1986a)
   Min-Shaqui li6 (Zhang 1987:36)
   Min-Nanlang tau2 li5 ibid.
   Mandarin-Liuzhou li6 t5ho2 (Bauer 1985a)
   Mandarin-Chengdu ni6 ts1 'pig tongue' (Liang 1982:242)
   ibid. (Luo et al 1987:132)
3. *(m-)lai ~ *(s-)lai 'tongue'
   Yue-Guangzhou lai² 'lick' (Zhan and Cheung 1987:92)
   Yue-Hongkong lai³ ibid.
   Yue-Aomen (Macau) lai³ ibid.
   Yue-Shunde lai² ibid.
   Yue-Zhongshan lai³ ibid.
   Yue-Zhuhai lai³ ibid.
   Min-Nanlang lai³ ibid.
   Min-Longdu lai³ ibid.

4. *(s-)liam 'tongue; flame'
   Kejia-Danshui liam³ 'lick' (Bauer 1985a)
   Kejia-Yongding liam¹ 'lick' (Huang 1983:238)
   Yue-Taishan liam⁶ 'lick' (Zhan and Cheung 1987:189)
   Yue-Enping lim³ ibid.
   Yue-Doumenzhen lim³ ibid.
   Yue-Foshan lim³ ibid.
   Yue-Guangzhou lim² (Rao et al 1981:129)
   Yue-Hongkong lim⁵ (Yue-Hashimoto 1972:259)

5. *(s-)liaw 'lick; tongue'
   Min-Futian liaw⁷ 'lick' (Li and Chen 1985:158)
   Min-Fuzhou neu³ 'lick' (Beijing Daxue 1964:256)
   Min-Shuibeih lue⁵ 'tongue' (Zheng 1985:40)
   Min-Shipo lye⁵ ibid.

6. *-lia 'tongue'
   Xiang-Hengyang lia⁴ 'lick' (Li Yongming 1986:298)
   Mandarin-Chengdu nia³ 'lick' (Liang 1982:242)
   Linghua lia³ 'lick' (Wang 1979b:237)

Endnotes

1 This is a revised version of a paper entitled "'Tongue' and 'Lick' in Southern Chinese Dialects and Tibeto-Burman Roots for 'Tongue/Lick'" which in turn was a revised section from "Cognition of Bodypart Terms across Chinese Dialects, Part II" (Bauer 1986b).

2 In addition to comparing Yue-Guangzhou lei⁶ 'tongue' with Tibeto-Burman *lei, I have also compared pei³ 'leg' with Tibeto-Burman *pei ibid. (Bauer 1987). Here I would like to list a few more sets for Cantonese/Tibeto-Burman root comparisons:

1. Yue-Guangzhou jap⁸ 'to wave hands' (Yue-Hashimoto 1972:285)
   jep⁶ 'wave the hand' (Zeng 1986:132)

Written Burmese jap 'fan; to fan' (Luce 1985:124)
Written Tibetan (g)db-mo 'the act of fanning, waving' (Jäschke 1985:507)
Tibeto-Burman *ja'p 'fan, wave' (Matisoff 1983b:468)

   Lahu na khê³ 'excrement' (Nishida 1967:62)
   Lahu shi khê³ ibid.

Written Burmese khsiei 'excrement' (Yahub 1982:21)
Written Burmese khli⁴ 'dung' (Luce 1985:121)
Tibeto-Burman *kli³ 'excrement' (Benedict 1972:39)
   Tibeto-Burman  *(m-)na 'mother, older sister, daughter-in-law' (Benedict 1972:187)

   Written Burmese  lwot 'be free' (Matisoff 1985:12)
   Written Tibetan  glod-pa 'loosen, relax, slacken'
   Tibeto-Burman  *g-lwot

5. Yue-Guangzhou  hêi⁴ 'vulva'
   Tangkhul  hêi ibid. (Matisoff 1985:54)
   Limbu  hi-ra ibid.
   Tibeto-Burman  *hêi/kei ibid. (Benedict 1979:30, but T-B root taken from comment by Matisoff under note 40)

6. Yue-Guangzhou  lou⁹ 'guy' (Yue-Hashimoto 1972:273)
   Written Burmese  lu: 'person, man' (Yabu 1982:39)
   Tibeto-Burman  *lu:

3. Transcription convention: medial and final T-B "y" (palatal glide) is rewritten here as "i" and initial T-B "y" as "j".

4. Why should one graph have two such different readings? One possible answer is that two different languages in contact with one another were both using the Chinese characters. Bilingual speakers would read the graph with both of the semantically-equivalent forms.


6. Linghua has been identified by Wang (1979a:137) as a "mixed" Chinese dialect spoken by the Ling people in Guangxi, but he did not classify it under any of the major dialect families.

7. This is a rather simplified reconstruction. If we take the phonetic [t] as indicative of the historical development of the root's rhyme, then it would be reconstructed as Ancient Chinese *li (Wang Li) or *liii (喩 A) / *liei (喩 B) in Chou Fa-Kao's system (Chou Fa-Kao. 1984. Zhongguo Yinyunxue Lunwenji, Table 1. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong Press). Karlgren (1966:258) reconstructs Archaic Chinese *lied (GS#519a-f) which shows a close parallel to Bodman and Baxter's Old Chinese *?liet 'tongue'.

8. Lew Ballard's recent fieldwork in southern Zhejiang turned up the following items: Longquan tchya2 lie³⁴⁵ 'tongue'; Longquan li³⁴⁴, Wencheng li³⁴⁴ 'lick'. Classification of these dialects is uncertain.

9. Li (1977:125) reconstructs Proto-Tai *dl- for 'lick'.
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