Sino-Tibetan *Vulva1

Robert S. Bauer
La Trobe University

Abstract
This paper attempts the megalocomparison of the lexeme vulva across a number of languages distributed throughout East and Southeast Asia. The canonical syllable of Sino-Tibetan includes a possible prefix plus root; modern vulva forms from Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman languages suggest their historical source was a bi-syllabic morpheme which later split into two independent roots in some languages. The author tracks the surface similarities of forms in Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman languages which lead him to propose Sino-Tibetan *dzu(k) mat and Proto-Chinese *tsî mat (and several variant proto-roots). These roots are based on modern forms from two major southern Sinitic languages, Min tsî1 māî and Kejia tsî1 pîet7, and such Tibeto-Burman languages as Written Burmese tsûk pat and Northern Hpun (Mgyaw) tsû mā?, zû? mā.
The author suggests that Mandarin tsî1 pâ9 "penis" also shares the same historical source but has undergone a process of phonetic attrition and semantic flip-flop. Many vulva forms distributed across genetically related and unrelated languages of Southeast Asia and Japan appear to be related either as cognates or contact loans. The Appendix listing forms from many languages and dialects of this broad geographical area concludes the paper.

1. Introduction
This paper has three purposes: the main one is to propose a "reconstruction" for the Sino-Tibetan lexeme vulva based on the megalocomparison of vulva forms from many Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman languages. To do this I have combined Greenberg's multilateral comparison of languages. To do this I have combined Greenberg's multilateral comparison of languages. "... a method that looks at everything at once ... at many languages across a few words" (Greenberg 1987:23), with Buck's technique of sorting modern

---

1 This is a much revised version of the paper I presented at the 21st International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Lund, Sweden, October 7, 1988. It was first published in La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics 3 (1990):151-169. My thanks to my colleagues Graham Scott for transforming my original Chiwriter file into Microsoft format and Kate Burridge for editing the ms. for LTWPL.
forms by their Indo-European etyma (Buck 1949). My second purpose is much more modest: to revise Stimson’s (1966) Middle Chinese reconstruction by drawing upon forms from a number of southern Chinese dialects which have since become available. And third, taking a cue from Matisoff’s stimulating discussion of megalocomparison (1990), I have decided that while I was in the “hathouse homogenizing atmosphere of Southeast Asia” (Matisoff 1983:63) I might as well extend my net of megalocomparison and pull in phonosemantically similar forms from Benedict’s Japanese/Austro-Tai family.

For Proto-Sino-Tibetan vulva I propose the reconstruction *dzuk mat; in addition, I propose several variant roots (for the proto-period and later), namely, *dzu mat, *dzuk, *dzu, *dzuk b(j)et, *dzu b(j)et, *bat, *b(j)e t. I do not claim that I have “reconstructed” these roots because my demonstration of correspondences between initials and vowels of the proto-roots and their modern forms is both limited and tentative. In speculating on what the phonetic shapes of these roots looked like, I have been mainly guided by the modern Sinitic material; however, in examining roots reconstructed by Tibeto-Burmanists who have worked out the sound correspondences, I have happily found a high degree of phonetic congruence between their roots and mine. What is unique about my “reconstruction” is—that I have gone back one step before Tibeto-Burman *bat in proposing a bilabial nasal stop initial for the root, i.e. *mat, from which the Tibeto-Burman and Sinitic reflexes of m-, b-, p-, ph-, h- are derived. The evidence for *m- comes mainly from modern Min on the Sinitic side and Northern Hpun (Megyaw) on the Tibeto-Burman side.

Appendix: Proto-Sino-Tibetan *Vulva at the end of this paper classifies the modern forms for vulva in a number of Sino-Tibetan languages (as well as some Austro-Tai languages which appear to have Sino-Tibetan loans) under their reconstructed roots.

At the outset, I would like to set forth clearly three points that have guided my thinking in this study of the historical development of vulva in Sino-Tibetan languages. First, in devising one Sino-Tibetan root from which all the forms in the modern Chinese dialects and many forms in the Tibeto-Burman languages may be derived, I have in effect based the root on a unification theory which in itself may make it suspect. However, I have done this only in order to have a point from which to begin. The results of this study are very tentative, and where revisions are called for, I will gladly make them.

---

2 Bauer 1988, now a companion piece to the present paper, first applied this combined procedure to the lexemes tongue and lick. Let me assure anyone who may think the contrary that for now I see no special ties between this pair of lexemes and vulva. To paraphrase an old put from Matisoff (Benedict 1979:31), I’m no cunning linguist; the juxtaposition has been purely coincidental.
Second, I believe every word has a history of its own. This is not meant to imply that a particular word in the course of its historical development has defied regular sound laws. But I do not think it is surprising if a particular word has been affected by some sound changes but not others. Furthermore, we cannot rule out the possibility that a particular historical development is unique (cf. Matisoff 1972b:276). What I am saying is that we have no way of knowing all the facts about the historical development of a word so that the relationship between the modern reflex and its etymon may not be readily apparent. I have in mind the southern Sinitic forms of Min-Hongkong tsi¹ mai¹, Min-Xiamen tsi¹ bai¹, Kejia-Sixian tsı¹ piet⁷, and Yue-Hongkong hai¹: phonetically divergent as these forms are on the surface, I believe that all of them ultimately descend from the same historical source.

And third, I believe there is no area of the lexicon that is immune to lexical replacement — bodypart terms are no exception. The notion of basic vocabulary which of course includes terms for the bodyparts is a convenient heuristic device of the linguist. It helpfully distinguishes between relatively stable areas of vocabulary, such as bodypart terms and pronouns, and other areas where lexical expansion is commonly observed, such as the names of culturally-transmitted items which are simply added to the vocabulary and do not necessarily replace already existing terms. I think we need to distinguish between lexical replacement and lexical expansion, two processes which are both termed "borrowing."

A variety of situations bring speakers of different languages into contact, and as a result speakers of Language A may learn an equivalent bodypart term from Language B. Speakers of Language A may know two words for the same thing and may use both terms in variation; eventually, however, the form from B may displace the term in A if the speakers feel no need for having two ways to refer to the same thing. Further, it should go without saying that lexical replacement can take place both among genetically related and genetically unrelated languages. That two languages

3 Japanese speakers have borrowed English petits as petusu which is used by men as often as the native word chinko (Solt 1982:78). Several languages of the Middle East have borrowed Arabic kus 'vulva': Israeli Hebrew kus is the vulgar slang word (Petrucc 1986:104); cf. Afghan Persian kos, Baluchi kus (Nawata 1981:34), Mazandarani kes, Persian kos (Nawata 1984:29). Megalocomparativists, note Benedict's S-T root *bat and Hebrew pot 'vulva' (Petrucc 1986:69).

4 E.g., in bilingual families in which children grow up hearing the mother and father speak different languages; or in societies which deliberately use a foreign language in some domains, e.g. English as the vogue language of Japanese advertising. There are also language contact situations in which one ethnolinguistic group dominates another but language influence can move in either direction: English as the pre-eminent language of international business in the British colony of Hong Kong has strongly influenced both Cantonese phonology and vocabulary; on the other hand, the close but hostile contact between Jews and Arabs in Israel finds Hebrew absorbing vocabulary from Arabic.
are genetically unrelated does not mean there can be no relationship between their vocabularies — even if the forms are not genetic cognates, they may still be linked as loanwords. In some of the non-Tibeto-Burman languages of East and Southeast Asia terms for ‘vulva’ appear to be contact loans from Sino-Tibetan languages.

2.1 Previously-reconstructed Sino-Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman roots

Benedict (n.d.a:3) has reconstructed Sino-Tibetan *(s-)ba(−t) vulva derived from *(s-)bêt 'hide/hidden' which is based on Written Tibetan sbédpā, sba 'hide, conceal' (Jäschke 1985:404) and sbā-ba 'privy parts, pudenda' (403). He has connected this root to Proto-Chinese via *p’wō/puō 'hide oneself: escape' (GS #102d, Karlgren 1966:153) which he believes is derived from *s-bā. Benedict’s source of modern Chinese dialect forms (he cites Hakka piêt⁸ and Min-Klenyang pieʔ⁷) is Proto-Chinese *(s-)biêt vulva from an earlier Sino-Tibetan *(s-)bat (n.d.a:4).

[Cf. Benedict 1988:39 which listed a more phonetically detailed root *b’i̯ēt for Chinese and associated it with 躲; however, this Chinese character seems to have a relatively recent history: according to Stimson 1966:292, the graph first appeared in a dictionary of the late 17th century].

If we hypothesize a connection between Benedict’s ST root *s-bat and Min-Xiamen ts1 bai, this comparison raises several questions: (1) Can we link ST *s− with the initial syllable ts1? (2) Can we derive Modern Min b− from ST *b−? (3) Can we derive modern Min -ai from ST *-at? My answers to these questions are as follows: (1) At the proto-ST level I prefer a full prefixal syllable *dzu from which can be derived proto-Chinese *tsj and Min ts1. (2) In the history of the Min dialects modern b− initial has derived from Middle Chinese (and presumably earlier) *m−. that is, *m− underwent a process of denasalization. To accommodate Min I have proposed that proto-Chinese *mat > proto-Min *mai > modern Min bai. (3) At the moment I cannot point to any other lexical items in Min to demonstrate that one of the sources of proto-Min -ai has been proto-Chinese *-at; and the lack of such evidence may mean that this correspondence is unique. However, as we shall see below in section 3.1, comparable forms in Kjía dialects clearly indicate that the etymology’s rhyme had a −t ending.

On the Tibeto-Burman side, previous reconstructions include: Burmese-Lolo *dzük (Benedict 1972:53), Lolo-Burmese *b(j)et (Mathisson 1972a:83) and *b(j)it (Thurgood 1974:105),⁵ Tibeto-Burman *həi, *həi.

---

⁵ Originally reconstructed as b(y)et and b(y)it, these roots are rewritten with j as the palatal glide.
2.2 Sino-Tibetan *dzu(k) mat

I have reconstructed Sino-Tibetan *dzu(k) mat primarily on the basis of Northern Hpun (Megyaw) zu? ma - tsu ma? and Written Burmese tʃok pat. The discussion below on the Min and Kejia forms in the Chinese dialects will show how the Hpun forms with their bilabial nasal initial in the second morphosyllable are the key to the Sino-Tibetan reconstruction. Written Burmese tʃok pat reflects the devoicing of the affricate initial of the first syllable: the Burmese form by itself gives no reason for reconstructing *m- but it is needed in order to accommodate m- of Northern Hpun, and m- and b- of modern Min, the source of which is *m-. The Hpun forms were recorded by Luce (Henderson 1986) in a fine phonetic transcription and for several Hpun speakers, so it is not entirely clear what the glottal stops may represent; nor is it clear whether the initial of the first morphosyllable was a voiced fricative or a voiceless affricate. The Written Burmese forms, however, indicate that both morphosyllables of the etymon had stop endings and that the first morphosyllable had a voiced affricate initial.

2.3 Sino-Tibetan *dzu(k) b(j)et

ST *dzu(k) b(j)et, another bi-morphosyllabic variant root, is based on Modern Burmese sau? pe?, Burmese-Yaw sau? phe?, Akha dɔ bɛq, Mi to31 phe31, Lisu tu1 bi6, Central Yi tu55 bi21, Bisu-Hual Chomphu tɔ pe, Bisu-Tako tɔ pe. Alongside these forms we can compare forms from Austro-Tai and Japanese: Sai styat-Tungho to pi?, Japanese-Tokyo tu: bi, and Japanese-Kanagawa tu: bi (phonetically, the first syllable of the Japanese forms is tʃ-su, t- before [u] becomes an affricate). The striking phonosemantic similarity of these forms with those in Tibeto-Burman indicates some kind of relationship. I suggest these items may be instances of contact loans through lexical replacement across genetic lines.
2.4 Split etyma: Sino-Tibetan

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ * \text{dzu} (k) \text{ mat} \} \cup \{ * \text{dzu}, * \text{bat} \} & \setminus \{ * \text{dzuk}, * \text{dzu}, * \text{bat}, * \text{bjet} \}
\end{align*}
\]

Forms in some modern Tibeto-Burman and Sinitic languages indicate to me that the original bi-morphosyllabic roots split into monomorphosyllabic roots, i.e. both the first and second morphosyllables of the roots developed into independent, monosyllabic morphemes. To identify an etymon that undergoes this kind of split we may use the term split etymon. 6

The Tibeto-Burman foundation of these reconstructed monosyllabic roots is based on the following forms:

1. \(* \text{dzu} > \text{rGyarong-b} \text{Tsan Lha ?o Ndzyuk, rGyarong-lCog rtse ?u sytuk, Written Burmese tjok, Maru tjok, Atsu tju?, Chang Naga tjuk, Northern Hpun (Megyaw) so?}.

2. \(* \text{dzu} > \text{Chin (Zo)-Haka (Lai) t} \text{shu} 1, \text{Written Tibetan stu, Tibetan-Glo tu, Thakali tu, Manang-Praham tu, Chin (Zo)-Ahrang K'uni thu} 1, \text{Chin (Zo)-Wo Ma Tu ju} 1; \text{Karens-Palaychi zu} \text{[a contact loan; cf. other Karens languages: Bassein Pho lén?, Moulmein Pho lén, Taungthu lín, Moulmein Sgaw 11, Bassein Sgaw 11]}. \text{Benedict (letter dated May 5, 1988) suggests the source of the Tibetan forms is Tibeto-Burman \(^*(s-)tu 'join'.}

3. \(* \text{bat} > \text{Sak-Bawtala 2âpa?2, Ganan pâ?4, Kadu (Kantu) pâ?3.}

4. \(* \text{b(j)et} > \text{Sak-Dodem âpet, Kanauri phet:s, Akha â bèq, Lahu tsha pè?, Sant pâ?55, Haoni tsò pî, Southern Yi pi?55, Moso-Weihsi pi31.}

We also find listed under this root one form from Austro-Tal: White Mião (=Petchabun) pi? (low tone). Benedict (1975:417) derives pi? from Proto-Miao-Yao \(^*\text{bi}?\); however, the similarity of pi? (and even \(*\text{bi}?\) itself) to forms in Tibeto-Burman languages as well as to the Wu and Min forms of Sinitic (to be discussed below) suggests that the Mião form may very likely be a loan from some Sino-Tibetan language.

---

6 Split etymon is at the opposite end of split cognate, a term that has been defined by Matsuy as "cognates that have reflexes of at most one given proto-phoneme in common, since they descend from different syllables of a polysyllabic etymon" (Matsuy 1990:117). In view of the material presented here, I would like to propose another way of analyzing a polysyllabic root and modify his definition by replacing "of at most one" with "of one or more". This is to say that at a later stage a bi-syllabic proto-root can split up into two independent mono-syllabic roots, each of which is derived from one of the original syllables: i.e., Time 1. AB \(\rightarrow\) Time 2. A and B; the modern lexical reflexes of A (or B) can share one or more segmental reflexes of the proto-phonemes making up the phonetic shape of A (or B).
3.1 ST *dzu mat > Proto-Chin.*ts˥ mat > S. Sinit. {*ts˥ maɨ \{[*ts˥ bjet\)

In reconstructing the Chinese root, we cannot look to the Chinese characters for help because there are no graphs which have been associated with this morpheme in older stages of the Chinese dialects (cf. Stimson 1966:292 concerning *ts Loan ascribed to the late 17th century). Forms from the modern Min and Kejia dialects provide the basis for the reconstructed root.

ST *dzu mat, a variant root in which the velar stop-ending of the first morphosyllable has been lost, is proposed as the source of Proto-Chinese *ts˥ mat. The major sound change occurred in the first morphosyllable: devoicing of the initial and centralization of the vowel. My bi-syllabic reconstruction is more complex than Middle Chinese *poɿi proposed by Stimson (1966:293) who claimed on the basis of forms from Mandarin, Taiwan Kejia, and Taiwan Min that the Middle Chinese etymon for vulva did not have a -p, -t, -k ending characteristic of the Rusheng tone category. Further, his monomorphosyllabic root took no account of the bimorphosyllabic shape of the Kejia and Min forms.

However, the following forms from several Kejia dialects found in Guangdong clearly indicate that the etymon was bimorphosyllabic and that the second syllable did indeed belong to the Rusheng tone category: Kejia-Danshui ts˥1 pet7; Kejia-Sixian ts˥1 pit7; Kejia-Wuhua ts˥1 pit7; Kejia (Maciver 1982/1926) tfi1 pit7.

Most Min dialects show forms which are very similar to Min-Taibei tçi1 maɨ. As mentioned above, modern Min b- has developed from *m-, and Min-Hong Kong tçi1 maɨ still reflects the older initial. There is also the problem of how to account for the loss of the -t ending in Min, since some of the Min dialects such as Xiamen preserve fairly faithfully the series of final stops -p, -t, -k. At the moment, although I cannot point to any parallel examples of an actual correspondence, I am proposing that Min -aɨ is one of the modern reflexes of proto-Chinese -at. Further, in ancestral Min when the -t ending was reduced to the i-offglide, the morphosyllable changed its tone category, i.e. *maɨ became reassigned to Yin Ping (perhaps it was influenced by the tone of the preceding syllable tsi˥1).

I believe the bisyllabic Kejia and Min forms are ultimately related to the same etymon, but in the course of their development these reflexes have preserved different phonetic features of the etymon: for the second morphosyllable, the Kejia forms have kept the original Rusheng ending; while the Min forms, on the other hand, have lost the -t ending but have preserved the voiced initial and low vowel. At an early stage of the Old Chinese period the source language of modern Kejia, Yue, and Min or southern Sinitic (comparable to Norman's (1988:210) Old Southern Chinese) divided into at least two groups of speakers from whose languages
the Min and Kejia dialects have developed. For each proto-dialect family the final of the second morphosyllable developed in different ways, which is reflected in the reconstruction of two variant proto-roots: Proto-Min *tsọ̣ mai and Proto-Kejia *tsọ̣ bjet.

3.2 Split etymon 1: *tsọ̣ mat > \{\*tsọ̣ \*bjet\}

The concept of split etymon can help us explain the existence of two phonetically distinctive mono-morphosyllabic forms in some of the modern Chinese dialects. I suggest that these forms are monosyllabic reflexes of the historical bimorphosyllabic etymon *tsọ̣ mat which split into two independent monosyllabic roots *tsọ̣ and *bjet:

1. *tsọ̣ > Min-Chaoyang tsiï¹, Min-Yongan tsiï¹, Pinghua-Lingya tsei¹, Kejia tsi¹ (Maciver 1982/1926), Kejia-Hailu tsiï¹.
2. *bjet > Gan-Nanchang piét⁷, Gan-Gaowan piét⁷, Kejia-Xinzhou piét⁷, Xiang-Changsha pié⁷, Min-Chaozhou phi⁸, Wu-Puftang phíë⁴², Wu-Wenling phië⁴⁴, Wu-Songyang phi⁸⁴⁴, Min-Shaowu pié⁷, Wu-Qingtian bi²², Wu-Yongjia bi³³, Wu-Wenzhou pë¹, Mandarin Beijing pï¹, Mandarin-Cuillin pæ¹, Kejia-Huzhou pë¹, Mandarin-Xian phi¹ rinse.

The *bjet rime developed from *mat through the raising and fronting of *-a-, which led to the acquisition of an j-onglide in some Kejia, Gan, and Wu dialects.

3.3 Split etymon 2: *tsọ̣ mai → *mai → *bai → *phaï → Yue hai¹

From the point of view of their retention of the Rusheng endings, the Yue dialects are considered to be among the most conservative of the southern dialects. So, in relation to Kejia and Min, the Yue dialect forms such as Yue-Hong Kong hai¹ seem somewhat deviant with the h- initial instead of a bilabial stop, the absence of a Rusheng ending, and the monosyllable morphosyllable. Stimson (1966:292) implied that the Yue dialects did not share the same etymon as his other modern Min and Kejia dialect forms. Nevertheless, in comparison to Mandarin and Min, the tone and rhyme of Yue-Hong Kong hai¹ are right; further, the existence of ph- for some Wu and Min (as well as Mandarin-Xian) dialects (forms listed under *bjet in the Appendix) indicates that ph- as well as p- have developed from *b-. Such a development raises the possibility for the further development of ph- namely that the stop initial may have lost its labial plosive quality leaving only the aspiration behind as the initial.
There is evidence in Sinitic to support a scenario in which a glottal fricative initial is derived from an aspirated stop initial: e.g., modern Yue-Taishan h- corresponds to Yue-Guangzhou th- and kh- (as well as several other initials (Huang 1990:232-244) — these stop initials more faithfully reflect their historical sources. For Cantonese I propose that the proto-root *ts IConfiguration> mai split into two roots, *ts ConfigurationManager> and *mai; the initial of *mai underwent several developments: *mai > *bai > *phi(Configuration> ai (and *pai > *hai). Hence, I include Yue in this etymology. Also, cf. Kejia-Zhongshan hai(Configuration> pai(Configuration> 3 which seems to have joined the two syllables together.

On the Tibeto-Burman side, cf. Matisoff's roots *hǝi and *kǝi (Benedict 1979:30) based on Tankhur Naga hǝi 'sexual organ of women'. Limbu hi (ra) 'vulva', Mru kai 'vulva'.

Stimson (1966:293) rejected any link between Yue-Guangzhou hai(Configuration> 1 and Slamese hi(Configuration> 1; however, Benedict (n.d.b:3) has claimed a very early donor connection between Tai *hi(Configuration> 3 and Yue hai(Configuration> 1 in which Cantonese borrowed the lexeme from Tai. Still within Kadal, cf. Zhuang mai(Configuration> 6 with the bilabial nasal stop initial.

3.4 Lexical Replacement in Kejia

A number of Kejia dialects have been in close contact with Min dialects and have borrowed from Min their forms for Vulva: Kejia-Metxiang ts1(Configuration> pai(Configuration> 2; Kejia-Sixian ts1(Configuration> pai(Configuration> 2 (apparently in variation with ts1(Configuration> piet(Configuration> 7); Kejia-Yongding ts1(Configuration> pai(Configuration> 2; Kejia-Pinghe ts1(Configuration> pai(Configuration> 2; Kejia-Taidong ts1(Configuration> pai(Configuration> 2 – tsi(Configuration> 1(Configuration> pai(Configuration> 2. In the Min dialects the two morphosyllables belong to the same tone category but the first morphosyllable undergoes tone sandhi. For the Kejia forms the different tone categories may correspond to differences in phonetic contours of the sandhi and original tones of the Min morphosyllables at the time they were borrowed into Kejia.

3.5 Semantic Flipflop

In the northern and central Mandarin dialects and in at least one southern Wu dialect the phonetic shape of the common term for penis is very similar to the phonetic shape of the term for vulva in the southern dialects of Min and Kejia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wu-Longyu</th>
<th>Mandarin-Beijing</th>
<th>Mandarin-Changzhi</th>
<th>Mandarin-Xiaogan</th>
<th>Mandarin-Wuhan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tsi1(Configuration&gt; 2 pa(Configuration&gt; 5(Configuration&gt; 1</td>
<td>tsi1 pa(Configuration&gt; 9</td>
<td>tsi1 pa(Configuration&gt; 1</td>
<td>tsi1 pa(Configuration&gt; 9</td>
<td>tsi1 pa(Configuration&gt; 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chinese dictionaries and novels typically transcribe this word as 阴道 (yindao), where the first character means 'chicken' and the second is a nominal suffix. (One might even see some accidental semantic similarity between the Chinese form and English "cock" = penis). The choice of this graph may have been in recognition of the similar shapes of the (uncircumcised) penis and a chicken's head and neck; this would then be a case of folk etymologizing, which found a fortuitous match between sound and meaning. I suggest all such forms ultimately descend from *ts1 mat 'vulva'.

It is interesting to note that the same bipolar transposition in meaning of historically related lexical items so that in one language the word meaning vulva but in another penis has been described by linguists working with other languages of the Southeast Asian area: Matisoff (1978:271), citing examples (from Benedict 1975) in Formosan languages, has termed this development "interlingual antonymic association." Benedict (1979:21) has described the phenomenon in Karen as "genital flipflop."

Chinese semantic flipflop may have been just one consequence of the differentiation of the dialects brought about by their increasing geographical separation on the one hand and contact-borrowing among the dialects on the other. The forms for vulva in the northern, central, and eastern dialects are typically the monosyllabic form p1 [<*b(j)e t] or something similar rather than the bisyllabic words found in Kejia and Min.

Right now in Taiwan we can observe the effects of near homophony of terms meaning penis and vulva created by contact between mutually unintelligible Mandarin and Taiwanese. When mainlanders who were predominantly Mandarin-speaking evacuated to Taiwan in large numbers in the late 1940's, they brought with them Mandarin tsi1 pa9 'penis'. However, because of its near homophony with Taiwanese tsi1 pa1 'vulva' and the confusion and consternation this has caused, younger people who are typically bilingual in Taiwan Mandarin and Taiwanese have shied away from using Mandarin tsi1 pa9 and appear to be replacing it with lao4 sa6 (literally, 'old two').

3.6 Semantic shift

When the bi-morphosyllabic root *dzuk mat split into independent morphemes, in some languages or even within the same language, *ma retained its original meaning for the bodypart, while *dzuk shifted its meaning to the related activity copulate. Two Tibeto-Burman languages may reflect this kind of development: Atsi-Sadon tsho? 'copulate' (but also c tcu? 'vulva') and Kanauri tsuk (jimig) 'copulate' [jimig = verb suffix]. A comparable semantic shift in ST *dzuk may have occurred among Chinese dialects: cf. Gan-Gaoan tshok7, Gan-Nanchang tshok7, Wu Shanghai tsho7, Mandarin-Beijing tshau5, Wu-Wenzhou tsho7.


'copulate'. Finally, *dzuk may have been borrowed into at least one Austronesian language: cf. Malay ançuk 'copulate, unite with' (Abas 1983:14).

4. Austro-Tai *tupi < *tsɬ mat

In the course of working with materials on Austro-Tai languages, I have been struck by the phonetic similarity of some of their vulua forms with those in Tibeto-Burman languages. Have there been historical contact relationships among languages of these two groups resulting in lexical borrowing? Of course. This means that many modern Austro-Tai forms ultimately derive from roots reconstructed for Sino-Tibetan. Intimate and prolonged contact among the various languages of Southeast Asia has resulted in the mutual exchange of vocabulary items (cf. Matisoff 1983:62-64), and I believe this includes the lexeme vulua. So-called core vocabulary is not impervious to lexical replacement or addition. The distribution of related forms extends throughout East and Southeast Asia and includes Taiwan, Japan and the Ryukyuan Islands, and islands in the South Pacific. As the source of Proto-Austro-Tai *tupi I propose *tsɬ mat, the same proto-variant root proposed for southern Chinese which I believe was the donor source of the Austro-Tai root. Before I explain my reasoning behind this claim, let us first reconsider reconstructions for Proto-Tai and Proto-Austro-

Tai.

At the Proto-Tai level Li F. K. (1977:250) has reconstructed glottal fricative *h- initial based on the modern Southwest and Central Tai dialects which have similar forms, hi or hî: and tone 1. The close similarity between Tai and Yue leads me to agree with Benedict (n.d.b:3) that some kind of contact donor relationship links their forms: we note the correspondence between the historical tone categories and initial consonants of Siamese hî: and Yue-Guangzhou hǎi. As mentioned above in Section 3.3. Benedict (n.d.b:3) has claimed that the Yue form is an early loan from Tai, but I reserve judgment on this matter.

Benedict (1975:417) has reconstructed Proto-Tai *hi (but more recently *hï in n.d.b:3) which he derived from *hnî (this root in turn is derived from an earlier *hNgî). He has also reconstructed Proto-Miao-Yao *bi? which he claimed is derived from an earlier possible disyllabic root *biq[i] (< *buq[i]). However, I believe that White Miao pî? (with low tone and cited in Benedict 1975:417) is fairly similar to Chinese dialect forms and is more likely a loan from some Chinese dialect; cf. Min-Chaozhou phì?8 (Choy 1976:312), Wu-Songyang phì?4 (Ballard 1988).

Recently, Benedict has attempted to join Japanese to his Austro-Tai group. With respect to the lexeme in question, he (1990:258) has

With Benedict’s root *tupi we can compare very similar bi-syllabic forms from several Tibeto-Burman languages: Lsu tu:bi; Central Yi tu:bi; tu:pi31; Akha dɔ bèq: Mpi to31 phe31; Blsu-Hual Chomphu tɔ pɛ. Monosyllabic forms from Tibeto-Burman and Sinitic languages also show similarities with the Austro-Tai forms cited above: Sani pɛ55, Southern Yi p155, Moso-Wehshi pi51, Hunan-Loudi bi2, Mandarin-Befring pi1, Kiefia Huizhou pɛ3, Mandarin-Guilin pɛ1. One is certainly struck by the close phonetic similarity of the Lsu and Central Yi forms to the Austro-Tai root. We do not believe that this similarity is fortuitous, and claim that it has resulted from the diffusion of these forms into neighboring languages.

5. Conclusion

The fulcrum on which Sino-Tibetan *dzuk mat pivots is my two-paradigmatic speculation: (1) that Northern Hpun (Mgyaw) zû? mâ - tsu mâ? and Burmese-Written tʃok pät derive from the same etymon, and (2) that these Tibeto-Burman forms are historically related to two important forms from Sinitic, Kefia-Sixian *tʃi1 piɛt? and Min-Hongkong *tʃi1 mai1. But it is primarily from the Tibeto-Burman forms that *dzuk mat takes its phonetic shape.

Sino-Tibetanists may envy the highly polished shine on sound “laws” established for Proto-Indo-European, but such a feeling is tempered with the knowledge that the polishing process spans over 200 years of cumulative efforts. In contrast, the sound correspondences between Proto-Sino-Tibetan and modern Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman languages worked out over the past few decades still stand at an early stage of development (cf. Normans 1988:12-16; Chang 1973:337). Bridging the gap between the Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman branches constitutes the main challenge of Sino-Tibetan studies. Thus the Sino-Tibetan world eagerly awaits the appearance of the
first fascicle on bodypart terms to be published soon by Jim Matisoff's Sino-Tibetan Etymological Dictionary and Thesaurus project at the University of California-Berkeley. Till then, I hope my own speculative and tentative attempt to develop the Sino-Tibetan etymology of one word can take us a small step in the right direction. The larger task of tracing the historical developments of the root's initials and finals in individual Tibeto-Burman and Sinitic languages still remains.
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APPENDIX

Proto-Sino-Tibetan *Vu lva
Reconstructed Roots and Their Reflexes

Sino-Tibetan: *dzuk mat, *dzu mat

Proto-Chinese: *tsɿ maɿ < ST *dzu(k) mat

1. *tsɿ maɿ < *dzu ma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min-Hongkong</td>
<td>tɕi¹ maɿ¹</td>
<td>(Bauer 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Yllan (Taiwan)</td>
<td>tʃi¹ bai¹</td>
<td>(Lan 1980:233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Yongchun (Fujian)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ bai¹</td>
<td>(Lin 1987:315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Dongshandao (Fujian)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ bai¹</td>
<td>(Nakajima 1979:138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Dongshandao (Fujian)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ bai¹ a²</td>
<td>(Nakajima 1979:138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Taipei (Taiwan)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ bai¹</td>
<td>(Bauer 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Fuqing (Fujian)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pe¹</td>
<td>(Feng 1988:296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Fuzhou (Fujian)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ ʦe³</td>
<td>(Nakajima 1979:138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Zhongshan (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi² bai³</td>
<td>(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Meiɿxian (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pai²</td>
<td>(Hashimoto 1972:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Sixian (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pai²</td>
<td>(Hashimoto 1972:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Yongding (Fujian)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pai²</td>
<td>(Huang 1983:231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Pinghe (Fujian)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pai²</td>
<td>(Bauer 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Taidong (Taiwan)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pai²</td>
<td>(Bauer 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Taidong (Taiwan)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pai²</td>
<td>(Bauer 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tʃi¹ pai²</td>
<td>(Bauer 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin-Changzhil (Shanxi)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pa¹ = penis</td>
<td>(Hou 1985:85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin-Beijing</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pa⁹ = penis</td>
<td>(Bauer 1985)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. *tsɿ bjet < *dzu ma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Danshui (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pet⁷</td>
<td>(Bauer 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Dongguan (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pet⁷</td>
<td>(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Shenzhen (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pet⁷</td>
<td>(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Conghua (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pet⁷</td>
<td>(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Sixian (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pet⁷</td>
<td>(Hashimoto 1972:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia-Wuhua (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tɕi¹ pet⁷</td>
<td>(Bauer 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejia (Guangdong)</td>
<td>tʃi¹ pet⁷</td>
<td>(Maciver 1982:606)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. *tsɿ < *dzu

Min-Yongan (Fujian)  tsi¹
Kejia-Hailu (Guangdong)  tʃi¹
Kejia (Guangdong)  tʃi¹
Min-Chaozhou (Guangdong)  tsi¹
Min-Chaoyang (Fujian)  tsi¹
Wu-Wenzhou (Zhejiang)  tʃi¹ tʃi¹

Mandarin-Talyuan (Shanxi)  pǎ³ tʃi¹
Lingui (Guangxi)  tʃei¹

(baby term for vulva/penis)

(Wen 1981:305)

(Bauer 1985)

4. *bjet < *mat

Gan-Nanchang (Jiangxi)  piet⁷
Gan-Rujiin (Jiangxi)  pǐt⁷
Gan-Gaoan (Jiangxi)  pǐet⁷
Gan-Anyi (Jiangxi)  pǐet⁷
Yue-Jiangmen (Guangdong)  pǐt⁷
Kejia-Xinzhu (Taiwan)  pìt⁷ pìt⁷
Wu-Guzhou (Zhejiang)  ɕia³2 pie²2³
Xiang-Changsha (Hunan)  pie⁷
Min-Shaowu (Fujian)  pie⁵-pie
Wu-Wenzhou (Zhejiang)  pei⁷
Wu-Shanghai  hbi² kaʔ tsi¹
Wu-Qingtian (Zhejiang)  bì²²
Wu-Yongjia (Zhejiang)  bǐ³³
Loudi (Hunan)  bì²
Mandarin-Beijing  pì¹
Mandarin-Changzhì (Shanxi)  pì¹
Mandarin-Xinzhou (Shanxi)  pì¹
Mandarin-Dunhuang (Gansu)  pì¹
Mandarin-Wuhan (Hubei)  pì¹
Shaoyang (Hunan)  pì¹
Gaoqiao (Hunan)  pì¹
Mandarin-Guiyang (Guizhou)  pì¹
Mandarin-Luzhou (Guangxi)  pì¹
Kejia (Guangdong)  pì¹
Mandarin-Ltsi (Jiangsu)  pì¹
Lianshui (Jiangsu)  pì¹
Mandarin-Yuexi (Anhui)  pā³ pì¹
Mandarin-Taiyuan (Shanxi)  pì¹ pì³¹ tsi¹
Mandarin-Xuzhou (Jiangsu)  pì¹ pì¹
Wu-Shanghai  pì¹
Jixi (Anhui)  pì¹

(Zhang, Wang, Shen 1988:281)

(Wang 1981:125)

(Bauer 1985)

(Maciver 1982:606)

(Lu 1986:65)

(Hu 1989:133)

(Chu 1987:285)

(Wen 1981:305)

(Sherard 1982:158)

(Zhao 1989:128)
Mandarin-Guillin (Guangxi) pa1
Mandarin-Tianjin (Hebei) pa1 ts19
Kejia-Huizhou (Guangdong) pe1
Min-Yilan (Taiwan) gio2 pe1
Wu-Wenzhou (Zhejiang) po3

(Yang 1982:146)
(Li, Liu 1986:72)
(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)
(Lan 1980:234)
(Nakajima 1983:621)

5. *phjet < *bjet
Wu-Wenling (Zhejiang) phi44
Wu-Pujiang (Zhejiang) phi42
Wu-Jinhua (Zhejiang) lio44 phi422
Min-Chaozhou (Guangdong) phi8
Wu-Songyang (Zhejiang) phi44
Mandarin-Xining (Qinghai) phi1
Mandarin-Xian (Shaanxi) phi

(Ballard 1988)
(Ballard 1988)
(Ballard 1988)
(Choy 1976:312)
(Ballard 1988)
(Ballard 1988)
(Zhang, Zhu 1987:151)
(Bauer 1985)

6. *phǎi < *bài < *mai < *tsj mai
Min-Yilan (Taiwan) bai1 a3 'baby term'
Kejia-Zhongshan (Guangdong) hai5 pa13
Yue-Taishan (Guangdong) hai1
Yue-Hongkong hai1
Yue-Jiangmen (Guangdong) hei2
Yue-Xinhui (Guangdong) hai1
Yue-Jintan (Hongkong) hei1
Kejia-Dongguan (Guangdong) ho1

(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)
(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)
(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)
(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)
(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)
(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)
(Zhan, Cheung 1988:204)

7. *dzuk 'to copulate'
Gan-Nanchang (Jiangxi) tshok7
Gan-Gaoan (Jiangxi) tshok7
Wu-Shanghai tsho77
Mandarin-Beijing tshau5
Wu-Wenzhou (Zhejiang) tu1
Mandarin-Lűsl (Jiangan) zio7 pi1 'copulate'

(Xiong 1983:68)
(Yan 1982b:235)
(Sherard 1982:158)
(Bauer 1985)
(Nakajima 1983:621)
(Lu 1986:65)

Proto-Tibeto-Burman Variants:
*dzuk mat - *dzu mat, *dzuk b(j)et, *dzuk - *dzu, *mat,
*b(j)et, *həi, *kəi

Previous Reconstructions:
Burmese-Lolo: *džuk
Kukish: *tʃhu
Lolo-Burmese: *b(j)et
Loloish: *dza2 batL
Tibeto-Burman: *həi, *kəi (Matisoff's roots cited Benedict 1979:30)
1. Hpun-Northern (Migyaw) *dzu ma  *
Burmese-Written zu? mà 'pudenda (female)' (Bradley 1986)
Burmese-Modern tsok pat  
sau? pa? (Yabu 1980:169)

2. Hpun-Northern (Migyaw) *dzu ma  *
Bodo tsù mà? 'vulva' (Henderson 1986:133)
Dlmasa tfi pha (Benedict 1979:23)
Rawang si pau (Benedict 1979:23)
Chin (Zo)-Lai Len Pi mè tfhù'1 (Luce 1985:86)

3. *dzu b(j)et - *dzu b(j)et  *
Akha dò bè? 'cunt' (Brun 1973:157)
Mpi to31 phe'31 (Bradley 1986)
Bisu-Hual Chomphu tò pê (Bradley 1988:4)
Bisu-Takl tà pê (Bradley 1988:4)
Mrü tā pê1 'to copulate' (Luce 1985:91)
Lisu tui b16 (Bradley 1986)
Central Yi tu55 b131 (Bradley 1986)

4. *dzu  *
Maru d3ok (Benedict 1972:53)
rGyarong-bTsan Lha ?o Ndzyjuk (Nagano 1979:39)
rGyarong-lCog rtse ?u sjtuk (Nagano 1979:39)
Kanauri tsuk (jimig) (Bailey 1910:695)
Burmese-Written tfok  
Tangsa tsut 'vagina' (Bandyopadhyay 1989:87)7 (Benedict 1979:23)
Atsi tsu? (Benedict 1979:23)
Atsi-Sadon tçu? (Yabu 1982:21)
Atsi-Sadon tsho? 'to copulate' (Yabu 1982:21)
Chang Naga jük (Hutton 1987:115)
Hpun-Northern (Migyaw) só? 'vagina' (Henderson 1986:133)

5. *dzu  *
Vayu d3u-d3u (Shafer 1952:15)

7 Other apparently related forms are Tangsa tsit 'penis' and tsât 'intercourse' (op. cit. p. 86). [Ed.]
Lushel
tʃhu
(Shafer 1952:15)
(Shaffer 1952:15)

Chin (Zo)-Haka (Lai)
tʃhu¹
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Lushel
tʃhu²
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Me Ra (Darling)
tʃhu¹
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Loto (Hriangpli)
tʃha³
(Luce 1985:86)

Tibetan-Written
stu
(Qu. Tan 1983:21)

Gyarung
te stu
(Benedict 1979:23)

rGyarong-Tzu Ta
te štu
(Nagano 1979:39)

rGyarong-Suo Mo
te jtu
(Nagano 1979:39)

Tibetan-Written
rtu
(Nagano 1978:9)

Tibetan-Glo
tu
(Nagano 1982a:487)

Tibetan-Lhasa
tu
(Nagano 1982b:91)

Tibetan-Kag
tu
(Nagano 1982b:91)

Tibetan-Zhar
tu
(Nagano 1982b:91)

Tibetan-Dangar
tu
(Nagano 1982b:91)

Thakali
tu
(Benedict 1979:23)

Manang-Prakaa
tu³
(Hoshi 1984:160)

Manang-Gyaru
tu³
(Nagano 1984:208)

Chin (Zo)-Ahraing K‘umi
thu¹
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Ma Tu Pi
thu⁴
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Zo Tung
thu⁵
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Tan Pum
thu⁵
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Awa K‘umi
áthu
(Luce 1985:86)

Lepcha
a tú
(Benedict 1979:23)

Karen-Palaychì
zù
(Burling 1969:60)

Chin (Zo)-Kualsim
shu¹
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Hualngeu
shu²
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Tedim
shu²
(Luce 1985:86)

Chin (Zo)-Asho (Sandoway)
á`jù²
(Luce 1985:87)

Chin (Zo)-Wo Ma Tu
ju³
(Luce 1985:87)

Chin (Zo)-Xongsal
ju², su²
(Luce 1985:86)

6. *bat < *mat
Sak-Bawtala
zāpaʔ¹
(Luce 1985:62)

Ganan
paʔ¹
(Luce 1985:62)

Kadu (Kantu)
paʔ³
(Luce 1985:62)

Sak-Bawtala
ápau
(Luce 1985:62)

7. *b(j)et < *mat
Sak-Dodem
ápet
(Luce 1985:62)

Akha
à bèʔ?
(Benedict 1979:31)

Lahu
tṣa pèʔ?
(Benedict 1979:31)

Kanauri
phc:ts
(Bailey 1910:702)
Tangsas
Phunoi
Sani
Sani
Haonl
Southern Yi
Moso-Weihsi
Tamang
Bahling

8. Limbu
Tangkhur Naga
Mru

Austro-Tal Variants:

1. Sui

*bat
pat³

(Benedict n.d.a:3)

2. Saisiyat-Tungho
Saisiyat-Taai
Japanese-Kanagawa
Japanese-Tokyo

*dzu b(j)et
topi?
topi?
tubi
tu:bi

(Li J.K. 1978:163)
(Li J.K. 1978:163)
(Narusawa 1986:128)
(Narusawa 1986:128)

3. Isamorong

Malay

Isamorong

Indonesian

Japanese-Shizuoka
Be

*tzok	zok
'sexual intercourse (to have)'
ancuk
'to copulate, unite with'
ancuk
'to copulate'

(Narusawa 1986:128)
(Narusawa 1986:128)
(Hashimoto 1980:158)

(Narusawa 1986:158)

4. Japanese-Osaka
Japanese-Tokushima

*dzu
ot jot jo
ososo

(Narusawa 1986:128)
(Narusawa 1986:128)

5. Japanese-Yamagata

*mat
maʃjo

(Narusawa 1986:128)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Akita</td>
<td>*b(j)et</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babuyan</td>
<td>beEa</td>
<td>(Tsuchida et al 1987:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivsaay</td>
<td>obat</td>
<td>(Tsuchida et al 1987:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isamorong</td>
<td>ovet</td>
<td>(Tsuchida et al 1987:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isamorong</td>
<td>isbit</td>
<td>(Tsuchida et al 1987:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Miyagi</td>
<td>betfo</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Ishikawa</td>
<td>tja be</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Saga</td>
<td>tfan be</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>mbe mbe</td>
<td>(Dyen 1970:437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Ibaraki</td>
<td>bebe</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Tokyo</td>
<td>bebe</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulam (Mulao)</td>
<td>pe6</td>
<td>(Benedict n.d.a:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Okinagarabekima</td>
<td>bi:bi:</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Okinagarabekima</td>
<td>bi:bi:</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivsaay</td>
<td>bi:bi:</td>
<td>(Tsuchida et al 1987:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Okinagarabekima</td>
<td>bibi</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isamorong</td>
<td>bibi</td>
<td>(Tsuchida et al 1987:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atayal</td>
<td>pipi?</td>
<td>(Egerod 1980:470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao-White</td>
<td>p1? (low checked tone)</td>
<td>(Benedict 1975:417)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Okinawa</td>
<td>pi:</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Amami Oshima</td>
<td>pi</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokilese</td>
<td>pi</td>
<td>(Harrison, Albert 1977:162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Kikalijima</td>
<td>phi</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>hehe</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuang-Wuming</td>
<td>hi:</td>
<td>(ZHCH 1984:425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Khamti</td>
<td>hi:</td>
<td>(Harrts 1976:138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>(Li F.K. 1977:253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahom</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>(Li F.K. 1977:253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>(Li F.K. 1977:253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Tai</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>(Li F.K. 1977:253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nung</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>(Li F.K. 1977:253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>hi:5</td>
<td>(Sakamoto 1976:44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Okinawa</td>
<td>hi:</td>
<td>(Narusawa 1986:128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Kagoshima</td>
<td>hi:</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Amami Oshima</td>
<td>cji</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese-Amami Oshima</td>
<td>cji</td>
<td>(Nakamoto 1981:77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliographic Note:
This appendix cites two sources in an abbreviated form: both are listed in the bibliography.
KBTIH refers to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia-Tlong Hoa Dengan Ejaan Baru.
ZHCH refers to Zhuang-Han Cihui.