This and that in TB/ST[1]

Paul K. Benedict

Among the more neglected fields of the Conspectus (STC) that of the deictics is especially noteworthy. A basic PTB *(h)i^A ~ *(h)əw^A contrast is indicated for the following two sets:

Table I [2]

	(West)(W)T	Chepang	Dhimal	Wancho	Garo	Kezhama	WB	PTB
'this'	(ʔ)i (West)	ʔi	i-	i-	i-a	hi	ʔi	*(h)i^A
'that'	u~ o (WT)	ʔuw~ʔow	u-	u-	u-a	hu-	hui	*(h)əw^A

Notes: The lexicons describe West T i~ʔi-po as 'instead of WT 'di,' and WB hui as 'colloquial' for thui[2]. WT u (< *u or *əw)~o (< *ow) 'this' (cf. the Chp. variation), with semantic shift as in Moto Monpa ʔuhu, id. Wancho (C T) ija 'this' (cf. heja 'that [at a little distance] when somebody is sent to bring sthg.'), ucoi 'that [at a little distance]'. Garo i- < B[odo-]G[aro] */i/ 'this'; Garo u-a also '3rd [pers. prn.]'. Kezhama K[uki-]N[aga] hi 'this', hu-no 'that'; /hi/ 'this' is widespread in KN, with Lushai having hei + N + hi (pattern for deictics) as well as ì 'this' (below). Bradley (1979: 245) describes for B[urmese]-L[olo] a 'basic two-way opposition': 'this' with *-i^1 (= *-i^A) and 'that' with *-o^1 (=*əw^A > WB -ui), adding the comment, 'the *rhymes support the basic phonesthetic universal for demonstratives' but the latter rhyme is hardly represented outside WB itself (but Atsi [Tsaiwa] has xyî 'this', xâu < *xəw 'that [near]'). The (h)u type is also represented by Newari ua 'that' (thua 'this'), Lepcha hŭ '3rd', and the /i/ type by Hayu /ii/ 'this', Hruso (Aka) i '3rd', a-i 'here'; note also the concealed /u/ and /i/ in Miju and/or Taruang (below). Rawang (Nungish) has suffixed -u, a 3rd pers. agreement marker, which DeLancey (1981) has compared with /u/ in Chepang and Jyarong, both analyzed as (inverse) directional markers; this element appears to be related to the /u/~/əw/ type, the Rw. vocalism pointing to the former (STC: 60ff.). Finally, this pair of deictics can also be compared with the /i/ 'inclusive' vs. /u/ 'exclusive' (1st plural) contrast seen particularly in the eastern Himalayan region as well as KN (Tiddim), the former possibly the source also of the plural marker -i (cf. the discussion in Bauman 1975, 1975bis).

To simplify somewhat, the above *i and *u pair contrast with the wide-spread PTB *a '3rd' (STC: 121 ff.. This pronoun also appears in the suffixed -n form (Miju an 'this' - see below), in some cases at least representing the PTB/PST 'collective plural' *-n (STC: n's 284, 428); note especially the Lu. plural ăn, glossed as '....often very indefinite: 'one', 'people'. These basic forms as a group constitute a deictic (→ pronominal) system that is outrageously symmetrical, even for a proto-language:

    *i 'this' (near '1st')   *u 'that' (near '2nd')

                    *a 'that' (near '3rd') (abstract - 'the')

It should be noted here that PTB *a also appears as a deictic (Lopa a, Lepcha o<*a 'that'; cf. [below] Lahu ô<*ʒm-m(a) 'there', as a subject marker (SM) (Akha), as an ergative marker (ERG) (Hayu ha< *s-a; see below) and as a genitive marker (GM) (Monpa, Jg., Lu., Karen). The /i/ form also appears in the GM role, e.g.   'GM (only when subject is female)', but the reflexes here are difficult to disambiguate from those for an original *s-ki (see below).

Other deictics are perhaps the products of early (pre-PTB/PST) fusions, with the dental-initial forms presenting relatively few problems.
WT has 'di 'this' vs. de 'that' < PTB *day (STC: No. 21); Miri de 'that'; Jg. dai 'that', ndai 'this'; Rw. dǐl 'this'; Nocte (CT) ate '3rd', from *a-[d]a·y (but   thannin '3rd pl.' < *tʒ-n; see below), from a *da+i prototype (see below); WB has thui 'that' (see fn. 2); cf. also Wt, Chp., Thakali, Newari, Sunwari su, WB ʔa-su 'who' (WB su 'person)' also Lp. sʌ̆- with interrogatives; Nyi Lolo interrogative /sa/; Garo sa, KN *sV 'who'; perhaps also A[rchaic] C[hinese] 谁 575u śgiwʒ:/źwi, id., from *s-wʒy 'who-is' (see below). The following set can be reconstructed at the PST level: PTB *tsi^A: WB tshi 'presence: nearness'; Lahu chi 'this'; Mk. sĭ 'this here (affix with nouns: locative-emphatic deixis)'; Meitei ʌsi ~ mʒsi 'this'; Lotha (KN) si 'this; 3rd'; Miri, Dafla si 'this'; AC 此 358a tsʰǎr/tsʰiɐ: (<*tsey^`), id., with tonal shift perhaps initial-conditioned (cf. PTB *sʒy^` 'die'; AC 死 558a sjɐr/si:); PST *tsi^A ~ *tsey [ ].

*The analysis of the velar-initial forms is complicated by the special shifts found after prefixed *s- (below) but all three vowels of the basic 'triangle' come into play here, with various shifts in deixis, e.g. Lu. has the following forms (tones omitted, since tonal 'form class' involved): khi 'that (visible up there'; khu 'that (visible down there)' and kha 'that (abstract)' as opposed to hei 'this' (above) and so 'that (visible same level)' from PTB *ts[ow] (below). Each of these three deictics leads into the tortuous maze of TB/ST morpho-syntax (Thurgood 1981); in the following analysis chief attention is paid to those languages (Chinese, Tibetan, Burmese) which supply substantial time-depth for a comparative study.*
    1. Lu. khi. Lu. khi 'that (visible up there)': Jg. khi (Singpho) ~ śi (stand.) '3rd'; CL (Nyi, Jino) *kh[ʒy] 'that; 3rd'; WT -kyi ~ -gyi ~ -gi and (after vocalic final) -yi 'GM'; Tamang, Meitei, Anal (KN) -ki, id.; C. Monpa -gi (-i after prn's) 'ERG; instrum. marker (IM)'. These GM and ERG roles are linked by the fact that a nominalized SOV sentence, of the kind so characteristic of TB, can be construed as a 'special case' of the genitive construction, i.e. S = possessor

1973) (cf. comment below on Lu. -ỉn). Further analysis of this point involves
a pair of fundamental building blocks of TB (and ST) morphophonemics:
directional/causative/transitivizing *s- (verbal) and nominalizing *-n. The
-s ERG, as found in Tibetan, is readily construed as the product of metanalysis
in simple SV sentences: S+/s/+V; Tibetan also has S+/ki/+-s (see Delancey
1981 for Lhasa dial.), of similar origin. The 'striking deviation' (DeLancey)
in the Lhasa use of the ERG with certain syntactically intransitive verbs makes
sense in terms of the broader directional qualities of *s- (into the condition or
state named by the verb - see STC: 105); thus, Lhasa k'ə-s ñal-ba-red
'he-ERG sleep-PAST' reflects an underlying */sñal/. As for the -n, it is
reflected in WT -kyin~-gyin~-gin 'present participle' and the sentence-
final yin (yin-pa 'to be'), e.g. WT 'di med-pa yin 'this exist-not (it) is+ -n
(nominalizing) = 'It is because this is not here....' (Jäschke). Surely the -n here
has been suffixed to the PTB deictic/3rd*/i/ (the palatalization is typical of
WT), or perhaps even to */ki/, since in this slot the form typically follows a
vowel-final form (de yin 'so it is, yes', ma-yin-pa 'wrong', etc.) and /yi/ is
the regular form of /ki/ in this position (above). It can be argued that the
nominalizing function of *-n here merges with the 'collective plural' role found
with nouns (above), since all that has gone on in the sentence is subsumed under
this final -n: '....all these things'. Note also the transformation of */i/ or
*/ki/ from 'that/it' to '(that/it) is' (Moto Monpa has gi 'to be' = Tsona Monpa
yin = WT yin-pa), making it possible to bring into these complex cognate sets
verbal forms such as Miri i 'to be (existential/attributive)'; Rw. i 'yes' = 'it is'
(cf. Chinese shì, below); Chang ki 'to be (exist), live, dwell' (and cf. the AC
forms cited below).

The situation in WB and Lushai is complicated by the fact that both these
languages have shifts after prefixed (not cluster) *s- of the type *s-k- > 2-
(> vocalic initial), e.g. WT khyim 'house'; WB ʔim; Lu. in < *s-k(y)im, with
frequent development of 'creaky tone' (') in WB and low tone (ˋ) in Lushai
as part of the reflex (Benedict 1980). WB has -ʔi' as a GM, compared directly
with WT/ki/ in STC (fn. 260); this remains a possibility via the prefixed *s-ki
but in view of the fact that WB retains the simple ʔi (< *iᴬ) for the deictic
'this' the likelier reconstruction is *s-i, with the anticipated 'creaky tone'.
Lisu yi¹ (< *B), the apparent cognate of WB ʔi ~-ʔi' (hardly related to PL *źaŋ
'remote 3rd', as in Bradley 1979: No. 441, since both initial and final are
discrepant), serves both as '3rd' and 'GM'. WB also has the non-future full-stop
verb-final -ʔi', identical in form to the GM. According to Lehmann (1981),
who also points out this relationship, the post-particle -sañ, which 'marks the
grammatical 'case' of thematic-topical nominals, especially that most normal
topic of a clause, the subject', in Middle Burmese (beginning about the 14th
century) gradually took on the verb-final role of -ʔi', at first mostly embedded
in equational contexts, with -ʔi' 'never equationally embedded and tending
strongly to go with transitive rather than intransitive verbs'. Lehmann interprets
this situation in terms of early dialect-mixture but of special interest here is the
phonology: sañ < *sin (STC: fn. 241) *s+in (cluster type, hence no 'creaky tone';
cf. WB ip 'sleep', sip 'put to sleep') < *s-i-n. In modern Burmese sañ has come
to function as a deictic ('this').[4]

On comparison with Tibetan, the role of -n is seen to be similar but the
slots of /s/ and /(k)i/ are reversed: /s/+/i/ rather than /ki/+/s/. Lushai, which

also retains the simple /i/ forms in ĺ (< s-i) 'this, that like this, thus, as follows' and í (< *iᴬ) 'GM' (above), has ĭn < *s-in (see above) 'ERG', with no fewer than 21 separate glosses in Lorrain (!), including 'IM' and 'verbal suffix'. This Lu. -ĭn is generally omitted when an intransitive verb comes between the subject and the transitive verb, as might be anticipated if indeed there is an underlying genitive construction here (see above).

This form, from an *s-i-n prototype, is a morph-for-morph cognate of WB sañ but the morphological role is rather different.

In terms of the analysis developed above, the ERG should be either of /s/ type, in simple SV sentences, or of /(k)i/ type, in SOV sentences. Any combination of the two, as in Lhasa (reconstructed) -gyis (DeLancey), would appear to be redundant, probably as the result of copying. The WT vs. WB/Lu. reversal of elements (above) points to 'morph shuffling', to paraphrase the 'feature shuffling' of Henderson (1975). The nominalizing *-n is anticipated as sentence-final but its role in the ERG line-up (as in Lu. ĭn) is not clear at this time.

2. <u>Lu. khu.</u> Lu. khu (< *ku, *kəw or *kow) 'that (visible down there)': Rw. khu (< *kµ or *kow) 'that (on same level as speaker)'; Akha (S. Loloish) k'oeᵛ(< *kəwᴬ) 'that'; Rodong (Kiranti) khu '3rd'; WT kho (< *kow), id.; Dhimal kǫ, Sho (KN) kheo 'GM'; BG *koᴬ 'object marker' (OM); WB kui (< *kəwᴬ), id.; note also Limbu (Kiranti) kon 'this', ko-yo 'here' (< *[g]o-), with semantic shift. The WT and WB forms point to a basic *kow ~ *kəw variation in this set, which ties in with the main deictic (and GM) of Chinese (below).

3. <u>Lu. kha.</u> Lu. kha 'that (abstract)': Rw. kha 'side' (tha-kha 'above', khu-kha 'there'); also 'in, into, at, tʊ'; Jg. khan 'they two' (cf. ni 'two'); Thulung (Kiranti: cf. Rai) ka 'ERG';Hayu kɔ (< *ka) 'OM' rather than 'ERG' (Michailovsky 1981: 157: 'marque d'object de la troislème personne'); also kəmi '3rd' (cf. /mi/ 'that'); Mk. hð (< *kaᴬ) 'particle indicating that the utterance is of some special interest for the person spoken to' (nàŋ hð 'you there'); also, with voicing (and ~ -â): WT go (< *gâ) 'place; proper place, position, rank'; Miri ko (< *[g]a) '(verbal affix) place' (duŋ-ko 'sitting place, abiding place'); also 'a; an; a.....person'; C. Monpa ga 'OM (only with human beings: nouns, prn's)'; also 'locative of occurrences' (locative: both 'in' and 'to' – cf. Rw.); Lopa ko (< *[g]a) '3rd'; Gallong go (< *ga) ' OM (indef. object)'; WB ka' < *s-ga (see above for the 'creaky tone' and cf. WT sga, WB ka' 'saddle') 'SM (topic)'; cf. also PTB *(r-)ka~*(r-)ga 'earth' (STC: No. 97): Kiranti */ka/; Kadu ka; Jg. gá~əgá~n-gá; Rw. ga~rəga; CT *-[g,k]aᴮ (Chang kau, Moshang ga, Wanche ha); BG *-[g,k]aᴮ (Garo aʔa, Bodo a, Dim. ha, Deori ja); Jg. has gá (< *gaᴮ) 'earth; place, district, country'. It can be seen that the voiced (*g-) allofam has a core 'locative' meaning; note also the verbal extension, as in the *(k)i set (above): Lp. go (< *ga) 'copula.... it is, truly, certainly' = '(to be) there'; Jg. ga 'to be', couplet of ŋa, which may well represent the PTB *ŋa 'lst' root (below). If the analysis of Chinese forms (below) is correct, prefixed *s-ga can be reconstructed at the PST level both as a locative and in its ERG (< 'lst') function; cf. the parallel offered by modern Burmese ha 'SM'; ha ~ ʔa-ha = ra~ʔa-ra 'thing; place' (ra is verb formative

denoting object of an action, or place or being of an action), apparently via
*sra; Jg. has the cognate r̀à 'place', ʂərà 'place; occasion, subject matter'
(cited in Matisoff 1974: No. 125); cf. also Gurung -ra (< *-hra < *s-ra^B)
'in, at'; Miju -ra 'suffix for general sense of location'; Dimasa -ra in i-ra 'here'
(i 'this'), o-ra 'there' (cf. o-de 'in that way'), ba-ra 'where' (cf. ba-khali 'when')
< PTB *(a-,s-)ra^A~B ; an apparently *g- prefixed form: *g-ra^A is represented
by Lahu ka 'classifier for places'; Akha à-gá 'where' (with interrogative à-),
from PL *gra^A , with prefix-fusion (Matisoff 1974: Nos. 125, 267 connects
Lahu kà < *gra^A with the *r-ga 'earth' root, above, through metathesis).
  Chinese^5 appears to lack cognates for the basic */i/, */u/ and */a/ deictics
as such. It has two forms for 'this' and one for 'that', all with TB cognates:
此 358a tsʻiǎr/tsʻiɛ: 'this', from *tsey^[ ] ; PTB *tsi^A, id. (above).
兹 966b tsiə̂g/tsi (loan) 'this', from *tsow^A or *tsa^A (the -iəg reflex is
ambiguous after initial ts-): PTB *ts[ow]^A: Tsona Monpa tso 'this'; P[roto-]
T [amang] (Nepal) *tsu, id. but Lu. so 'that (visible same level)', from *ts[ow]
(above). Strangely enough, PT also has *tsa^A 'that', with an equally good fit
for the AC form! To bring these forms into line with the pattern of vocalism
shown by TB deictics generally, one would have to set up PST *-tsow^A 'that'
rather than 'this', perhaps originally as the 'emphatic' paralleling *tsi^A ~
*tsey^[A] 'this' (cf. the TB glosses for *tsi^A). For AC, at any rate, this line of
reconstruction accounts for the competing forms for 'this'. 彼 258 pia/pyiɛ:
'that' (OC also '3rd'), from *-pi^B ; PTB *(-)pi^B : Lp. pe 'there, that there (not
far) ~pf 'there, thither' (pí-ba = pe-ba 'there, just there'); also (a-) pin ~
*(a-)pyin 'the other side, the opposite place or party, the reverse; beyond;
(comp.) future'; WT phyi (~phyin-) 'behind; after; (comp.) future; outside';
C. Monpa ph(i)s-ka 'outside'; Mk. (a-)phī (<*pi^B) 'backside, behind, back,
after(wards), in the rear, next, last'; cf. also WB ʔa-phi' ~ ʔa-bhi' 'ancestor
of the 4th [=remote] degree'; also PBL *pi.n^B '(comp.) day after the day after
tomorrow' (Bradley 1979 cites the form as *pin^2 under No. 475 but WB has
phin:- < *pi.n-, the length reflecting the suffixation: *-i-n). TB also has
allofams with initial b- and m-, apparently not represented in Chinese
(possibly 皮 25a bʻia/bʻyiɛ 'skin' = 'the outside part'): Lp. (a-)bf 'place'
(diŋ-bf 'the standing place'); (postp.) in, to; place, direction (more definite
than -ba)', e.g. (with o < *a 'that') o-ba and (more definite) o-bf 'there, in that
place'; also me 'there below', me-ba 'there below (distant)', me-bf 'id. (less
distant)'; Gallong bí ~ mi '3rd'; Miri bui, id.; also bə.....bə 'that down there, that
downstream'; also mə 'OM' and (occ.) 'GM'; Dafla bə 'he, that down the hill';
also mi '3rd'; Sunwari meko (< *məy-) 'that' (eko < *əy- 'this'); Hayu /mi/
'that', kəmi '3rd' (see above for kɔ-); Bodo bi, Garo bi-a '3rd'; Mk. [p- < *b-]
pi-nĩ ~ mi-nĩ 'today', pe-níŋ ~me-níŋ 'this year', pe-náp~me-náp 'tomorrow'
(cf. Jg. mənàp 'early morning').
  The Chinese velar-initial forms here are of much interest and, potentially
of great significance although studies to date of the AC material (oracle bones,
bronze inscriptions and early texts) have been hampered by inadequate
reconstructions which fail to bring out the extensive allofamic relationships
(Matisoff 1978) of the various forms. The nature of much of the material
itself (oracular formulae, hexagrams of the Yi-jing, poetry of the Shi-jing)
presents another stumbling block. The relevant AC forms with GSR glosses

are presented below, with numbering (in brackets) as above (* = post-AC = 'Classical'):

[1.]   狋   1h' s-kia/ʔiᴇ⁶ 'final part.' < *s-ki

     俿   604a s-kiər/ʔi 'this; part. '[final] < *s-kəy

     殹   589b s-kiər/ʔiei- 'part.' (GSR calls 'cg.' of above) < s-kə·y

Cf.   幾   547a kiər/ki 'near; *nearly (→'small') < *C-kəy

     近   4438 gʿiən/gʿiən 'near' = '(this) near (place)' < *gə(y)-n

The s-kiər/~ s-kiər/ – pair reflect PST *s-kə(·)y, a doublet of *s-kia/ < PST *s-ki (cf. the TB *u~*əw doublet); s/kiər/ʔi has yielded modern Min forms for '3rd': Amoy and Fuzhou i.

These few forms present some of the problems encountered in comparisons at this (linguistic) distance and, more especially, at these discrepant time-depths, with over a millenium and a half separating AC (ca. 1,000 B.C.) from WT, the earliest (in any detail) recorded TB language. Special weight must be accorded the AC evidence, to be sure, but AC was clearly innovative in many ways, phonologically and otherwise, and cannot serve as a magical guide of some kind in reconstructing PST. In these forms for [1.], for example, the following points can be made: (1) the AC forms tend to be prefixed, usually by *s- but also often by *C- (< *g-, *d-, *b- or [usually] *m-) and occasionally by ʔ- (< *a-); note that AC forms with voiced aspirated obstruents (e.g. gʿ- in 'near') may also have been prefixed (AC kʿ- < *k- and k- < *C-k- but gʿ- < both *g- and *C-g-), hence for *gə(y)-n read *(C-)gə(y)-n (2) the AC forms largely reflect PST final *-əy rather than *-i (3) the basic deixis here is for 'this' rather than 'that' (4) the AC forms show a verbal extension to 'near', paralleling that to 'far' under [2.], with parallels also in TB (below, under *wəy) (5) the dominant *s-ki~*s-kəy doublet reflected by the AC forms invites comparisons with similar forms in TB, e.g. AC s-kia/ and WB -ʔi' (< *s-i or *s-ki) 'final part.', but almost certainly these forms came about through independent evolution – and this applies to the vast bulk of these TB/AC correspondences.

[2.]   侯   113a gʿu/ɤəu (loan) 'part.' [initial] *gu

     其   { 952a kiəg/kyi: (loan) 'part.' [final] < *C-kow

          952a kiəg/kyi- (sandhi tone) 'this, that' < * C-kow+cl. junct.

          952a gʿiəg/gʿyi 'his, her, its, their; *this; modal part.: will probably; wish that' < *(C-)gow

     息   9535 kiəg/kyi- (loan) 'final part.' < *C-kow

     佡   9761 giəg/ɤi: 'final part.' (contra GSR, not irreg.) < *+gow

     之   962a śkiəg/tśi: (loan) 'this; him, her, its, them; genitive and attributive part.' < *śkow (palatalized)

     止   961a śkiəg/tśi: (loan) 'part.' [final]

     抑   915a [s-k]iək/ʔiək (loan) 'initial part.; and, but, or else' < *[s-k]ow (final -k is *s- reflex)

     寔   866s śgiək/źiək 'this, this is; really' < *śgow (palatalized)

     思   973a s-[g]liəg/si (loan) 'part.' [final ~ non-final] < *s-gow

     厥   301c kiwăt/kiwɒt (texts) (loan) 'his, her, its, their'

     仡   302a kiwăt/kiwɒt (inscr's) < *C-ko(w)-s

     軎   305a giwăt/ɤiwɒt 'part.' [initial] < *+go(w)-s

     瑴   303e giwăt/ɤwɒt (loan) 'part.' (note basic gloss: 'pass over to; far away')

     爰   255a giwăn/ɤiwɒn (loan) 'part.' [initial] < *+go(w)-n

     爰   227a giwən/ɤiuən (loan) 'part.' [all slots] < *+go(w)-n

These */kow/~*/goy/ forms, directly related to WT kho '3rd', are well disguised, even for AC'. They show the allofamic differentiation so typical of AC: cluster vs. prefix *s- reflexes, secondary palatalization (*ski- > *skyi- > śki-) and secondary final -k as one part of the prefixed *s- reflex (Benedict 1980 and Forthcoming). Interesting allofams of kiwăt/ are represented by Cant. k'ǿy '3rd', from an (AC-level) doublet: *k'ĩwad/- < *kiwăt+ (unprefixed, before cl. junct. >second. voicing) and Kienyang (Min) i⁷ 'this', from *s-kĩwăt/, with 'softened stop' reflex (Benedict 1976) (the anticipated *s- prefix doublet); for the final, cf. xi⁷ 'tangerine', from *s-k'ĩwăt/; AC 柑橘 507g kĩwăt/kĩuĕt 'orange'. Fuzhou i, Amoy e (both on 'low' tone A) 'GM' are probably derivatives of a 'close juncture' (+-) form of g'ĩəg/ (Amoy lit. reading: ki). The standard AC forms for '3rd' are pre-verbal (S) g'ĩəg/ < *gow, post-verbal (O) śkĩəg/< *śkow and determinant (G) kiwăt < *C-ko(w)-s; the usual determinative particle is śkĩəg/, occasionally g'ĩəg/ and rarely kĩwăt/, i.e. *N+s-kow+N~(occ.) *N+gow+N~(rare) *N+ko(w)-s+N; cf. prefixed *s- with '1st' and '2nd' (below) and the 'morph shuffling' found in TB.

It is noteworthy that in these final *-ow forms, as in the *-i~*-əy forms, the deixis is 'this' rather than 'that', but kĩəg/- is glossed 'this, that' (Couv. has reading g'ĩəg/ 'celui qui' in Shi-jing cit.) and giwăn/: 'far' is a derivative of '(that) far (place)'.

[3.] 居 49c' kĩo/kĩwo (loan) 'final part.' <* C-ka

乎 55a g'o/ɣuo 'at, on, at side of' (locative) < *ga

所 91a s-gĩo/sĩwo: 'where, the place where; quem, quam, quod' <*s-ga
Chinese has reflexes for PST final *-â rather than *-a in the dental-initial series (below) and the modern (pinyin) suǒ for 所 reflects an early (AC-level) *s-gâ (dial. 啥 shà < *s-gɔ+suffix), matching the final in WT go ~*gâ 'place'. GSR places 所 in a separate series (91) but the phonetic is 戶 53a g'o/ɣuo 'door'; the AC allofams are 所 60i s-k'ĩo/xĩwo: (loan) 'a place' (both 所 and 所 are used as loans for the identical s-k'o/xuo: 'sound of hewing' - note the 'sx' in the latter!), from *s-kha; 處 85a śk'ĩo/tś'ĩwo; 'dwell, stay; keep still; *to place'~ śk'ĩo/tś'ĩwo- (sandhi form) 'a place', also from *s-kha (cluster form, with palatalization) and (sandhi form) *s-kha+ (nominalizing) suffix; GSR places 虛 78a in a separate series (85) but it belongs under GSR-78 with phonetic (and allofam) 墟 k'ĩo/k'ĩwo < *ka (the unprefixed form) 'abandoned city, ruins; *site'< 'place' (the cryptoglyphic phonetic in both is the 'tiger' - see Benedict 1978); also 居 49c' kĩo/kĩwo 'dwell, reside in, occupy; settlement, residence; repose; tranquil', from *C-ka (and note the loan use as a final particle, above).

Apart from this series, which high-lights the 'locative' aspects of *ga (~*gâ)~*ka, Chinese offers only the modern form: Kienyang (Min) 佳 cf.95g ky² '3rd', from an early (AC-level)*gĩo < *C-ga; also, from an early *ka doublet, Cant. ko 'that'< *C-kâ, and ke 'GM'< *kĩa < *C-kâ; (pinyin) zhè 'this' < *tśĩa-< śkĩa- < *śkâ-; note the 'this'~ 'that' variation even dialectically in modern Chinese. It seems clear that the -a~-â variation in this set must be reconstructed at the PST level.

The following AC doublet appears to be a derivative of */ga/: 是 866a sgiĕg/zie: 'this; this is, is; (to be thus:) to be right' < śgay: (palatalized) < *s-ga-i 是/ 869a s-giĕg/sie (loan) 'this, this is; really' <*s-gay <*s-ga-i

This pair nicely illustrates the cluster vs. prefix *s- reflexes in AC (note that 其 952a kiəg/: [above] is phonetic in the latter).

The sandhi form (/-) of śgiĕg/: has survived as the modern (pinyin) copula shì, also glossed 'correct, right' (cf. Rw. i 'yes', above). Parallel derivatives have been turned up in TB, incl. Purik (W. Tib. dial.) khyen-ti (< *khe(n)-<*khay) '3rd'; Limbu khen (< *khe-n) 'that; 3rd', khé-yó (< *khay-) 'there'; Bahing -ke (<*-kay) "GM'; Mk. hè (< *kay^A) 'particle indicating that the utterance is made with a special interest for the speaker' (Arlēŋ má 'Are you a Mikir?: Arlēŋ hè ' Yes, of course'); also, with voiced initial, Gallong -gə (< *-gei < *-gay) 'GM'; also Mk. -kè (< *-gay^A) 'suffix indicating emphasis, introducing the topic' (recó-kè 'the king and not somebody else'). As in the case of other *-i derivatives (below), it is uncertain whether *kay~*gay should be set up at the PST level.

Both TB and Chinese show dental-initial forms with final *-â (~ *-a), with TB also having an *-i derivative (*day 'that'—→'this', above): WT do (< *dâ) 'this' (mainly in comp.: 'tonight', 'today'); also da (< *da) 'now; (comp.) this (morning, year)'; coll. 'mark of emphasis', e.g. loŋ da yod ŋul med 'time da exist silver not-exist' = 'time [I] have, it is true, but no money' (Jäschke); Lp. do (< *da or *dâ) '(after prn's) self; own; identical, personal, peculiar; the same; even, exactly', a-do '2nd'(hó is basic '2nd' prn.: hó-do 'thou, thyself, is usually used when it is required to give particular emphasis to the person'); Hruso (Aka) da 'habitual present tense marker'; Digaro (Taying) ta 'now'; C. Monpa dan '3rd' (pl. daśi; cf. nan '2nd', pl. naśi); dei < *da-i < *da-gi '3rd-ERG' (see above for -gi; cf. nei '2nd-ERG'); also strangely 'added to genitive forms to emphasize possession', e.g. uthu ŋíduk ja-a-dei dei pha-śi 'this umbrella 1st-GM-dei 3rd-ERG bring-IMPERF.' = 'He brought the umbrella for me [because it belongs to me]' (brackets by Das Gupta, who considers the two dei's distinct - diff. tones?): C. Monpa also ta 'that (in 'particularization of agent') and a-tha 'here'; BG (generally) *da 'now; this (time, day, night)' but Deori dai < *da-i; Nocte thannin < *ta-n(-in) '3rd pl.'; Mk. tò < *[d]a^A 'well, right, okay' (cf. coll. Tib., above): Meitei -da~ta 'at' (cf. Bai locative -nɔ̄, below); Lu. tǎ < *[d]a^B 'signifying ownership or possession, also used as a sign of possessive case when not followed by a noun' ('......is mine'); â-tǎ 'GM (3rd)'; also â-mà?-tǎ~â-mà?-â-tǎ, id. (see below for â-mà?); Lahu a-tha (< *-ta^A) 'what' (with interrogative à-); Lisu (CL) tha^4 (< *ta^A) 'here, hither', the^4 'this', probably from *tam < *ta-ma (see below for parallel ne^4, je^4).

In general, the temporal and 'emphatic' aspects of this set stand out; cf. also the Gurung derivatives: dǎ< *da[n] 'emphatic' (ŋa-dǎ...."] certainly....'), from *da-n; dai 'emphatic [final part.' (ŋeba dai 'to-cry dai' = 'It's crying!'), from *da-i. Finally, this set also appears to have its verbal extension: "(to be) now/present"; cf. Gallong do (< *da) 'to be (simple predication)'; Mk. dó (< *s-da) 'to be, exist, have, possess, be present; to live, stay, dwell'

which one would think she would use for this correspondence, but she uses it instead for one of the problem correspondences which I discuss later in this paper (see Table 2a in the next section of this paper).

For the correspondence �early-ɰɯj-ɰɯj (which parallels the correspondence ɰa-ɰɯ-ɰɯ — Lungchow ɰɯ and ɰɰ are conditioned variants of the same phoneme) Sarawit has *ɨay (parallelling her *ɨa) and I think that Li likewise ought to have *ɯei (parallelling his *ɯe) not *ɯi. Here, however, Li was trying to account for the irregular Siamese reflex ɯɯj, which occurs in some words in place of the expected ɰaj.

Finally, for the correspondence uaj-uuj-uuj (which parallels the correspondence ua-uu-uu) Sarawit has *uay (parallelling her *ua) and I think that Li likewise ought to have *uei (parallelling his *ue) not *uai. In this case, however, there is a special problem which I discuss under Table 2c in the next section of this paper.

Table C: Syllables with final nasal or stop.

Sarawit reconstructs various length contrasts for Proto-Tai closed syllables: *i vs *i:, *e vs *e:, and so forth. Li reconstructs qualitative contrasts instead: *ɨ vs *ɨə, *e vs *ɛ, and so forth. In modern dialects these contrasts are sometimes lost, sometimes show up as length contrasts (e.g. i vs ii), sometimes show up as qualitative contrasts (e.g. e vs ɛ, not exemplified in any of the three dialects cited here), and sometimes show up as contrasts in both length and quality (e.g. e vs ɛɛ or ɛ vs ee).

Siamese (SW)	Lungchow (C)	Po-ai (N)	Sarawit's PT	Li's PT	Section in Li
ia	ii	ii	*ia	*ie	15.2
ɰa	ɰɰ	⎰ɰɯ ⎱ii (after palatals)	*ɨa	*ɨe	15.3
ua	uu	u, uu	*ua	*ue	15.4
i, ii	i	i	*i:	*i,*iə	14.3.1, 14.3.4
ɰɰ	ɰ	ɰ	*ɨ:	*ɨə	14.4.3
u, uu	u	u	*u:	*u,*uə	14.5.1, 14.5.3
i	i	i	*i	*i	14.3.1
ɰ	ɰ	⎰ɰ ⎱a (before velars)	*ɨ,*ə	*ï	14.4.1
u	u	u	*u	*u	14.5.1
e	i	ɛ	*e	*e	14.6
a	a	a	*a	*ə	14.7
o	⎰u ⎱ɰ (before dentals)	ɔ	*o	*o,*uï	14.8, 14.8.1
ɛɛ	ee	ee	*e:	*ɛ	14.9
aa	aa	aa	*a:	*a	14.10
ɔɔ	oo	oo	*o:	*ɔ	14.11

The above table requires four comments:

First, note that in closed syllables, corresponding to Sarawit's long vowels *i: and *u:, Li regularly has the diphthongs *iə and *uə. But sometimes he has the monophthongs *i and *u, which normally, in closed syllables, correspond to Sarawit's short *i and *u. This is because Li has been misled by vowel shortening in Siamese: see Sarawit, and also Brown (1965) and Hartmann (1976).

Second, notice that for the correspondence o-u/ɤ-ɔ, Li sometimes reconstructs *ụ̈ instead of *o. Li posits *ụ̈ to account for those words in which Lungchow has ɤ instead of u, but he says that Lungchow ɤ is probably conditioned by final dentals so that *ụ̈ may be unnecessary.

Third, notice that for the correspondence ɯ-ɤ-ɯ/a, Sarawit sometimes reconstructs *ə instead of *ɨ. Sarawit's *ə is a complex problem which needs a more extensive treatment than is possible here.

Fourth, with reference to the correspondence a-a-a=Sarawit's *a, Li's *ə, I must add that in Po-ai the sequence wa coalesces to ɔ. Thus we have (Li, section 14.7.1):

	Siamese (SW)	Lungchow (C)	Po-ai (N)	Li's Proto-Tai
smoke	khwan[1]	van[2]	hɔn[2]	*ɣwən A2
spirit	khwan[5]	khwan[1]	hɔn[1]	*xwən A1
day	wan[1]	van[2]	ŋɔn[2]	*ŋwən A2
to be upside down	khwam[3]	khum[5](?)	hɔm[3]	*xwəm C1

The only one of these words treated by Sarawit is 'day'. We would expect her to reconstruct *ŋwan A4, but, oddly enough, she has *ŋwən A4 (page 411).

The Problem Correspondences and the Evidence for Proto-Tai Ablaut

The problem correspondences involve no additional sounds not found in the straightforward correspondences. Rather they are cases in which some dialects seem to reflect one straightforward correspondence and other dialects seem to reflect a different straightforward correspondence. For example for the word 'fire', we have on the one hand such forms as Siamese faj[1] or Lungchow faj[2] which seem to reflect what Sarawit would write as Proto-Tai *vay A4 and Li would write as Proto-Tai *vəi A2, and, on the other hand, such forms as Po-ai fii[2] which seem to reflect what Sarawit would write as Proto-Tai *vi: A4 and Li would write as Proto-Tai *vi A2. Sarawit and Li each propose a special diphthong to account for the correspondence in 'fire'. Sarawit writes this diphthong *ia:y and Li writes it *ɛi. Whichever way the diphthong is written, no dialect preserves it as a distinct unit. In some dialects it merges with what Sarawit writes as *ay and Li writes as *əi and in other dialects it merges with what Sarawit writes as *i: and Li as *i.

suffixation (*-a•⁻i > -a) and re-suffixation (> qùshēng – see above)! Finally, Cantonese parallels WT in prefixing (original) *a- in the deictic 'this', with anticipated */i/ ∼ */ǝy/ vocalism: yi ∼nei 'this', from (MC-level) *n̄i, regularly from (AC-level) *ʔdiǝr < PST-level *a-dǝy, a doublet of *a-di (> WT 'di).

In addition to the above, both Chinese and Bai present evidence for setting up a basic *(a-)ba element, perhaps originally an 'emphatic' that later acquired deictic properties, with labial stop initial and */a/ rather than */i/ vocalism. The key Chinese form here is 夫 101a (loan use) b'i̯wo/b'i̯u (<*baᴬ) 'this, that' (Shi-jing), in the later Classical language glossed as 'the one in question' (Lunyu) and 'as to' (Zuozhuan), both suggesting use as a topic-marker. The Bai forms for '3rd' appear to be directly cognate but the tones reflect P-Bai *B rather than *A: DL pɔ̃ (<*bâᴮ)∼JC mɔ̂ (<*ʔbâᴮ), with corresponding, tonally differentiated final -ð∼ -ɨ forms (< suffixed *-i; cf. DL tð- 'this' in Table II) in the roles of genitive (for '3rd') and of deictic ('that'). It is possible that a Sinitic *baᴬ∼ *(a-)bâᴮ doublet is involved here but the Bai vocalism has apparently been influenced by the forms for '1st' (see Benedict 1982 for the detailed Bai analysis), pointing rather to *(a-)baᴬ∼ᴮ. The comparable TB deictics (> '3rd') show a matching suffixed *(-i) but with initial unvoiced stop: Tsona Monpa pe (<*pa) '3rd'; Mk. pe- (<*pay-) 'prefix having demonstrative ('this') power' (cf. pe-níŋ 'this year', pe-nǎp 'tomorrow', above); KN *p[ay] '3rd': Khoirao pai, Ao (Chungli), Sema, Nzieme pa, et al.; see also below for further correspondences.

We have now to consider Thurgood's 'copula *wǝy'[9], represented in TB inter alia by Sherpa (Tib. dial.) clause-final wə̀y, Jg. present tense particle we, Lu. sentence-final (v)e and, within Loloish, Lahu ve, Akha eu and Lisu rgh³ = ɣ³, a widespread particle of subordination both of noun to noun (as 'GM') and verb to noun (relative-clause-type relationship) as well as sentence-final declarative mood marker. The reconstruction of PL rimes being a precarious business, at best, especially after initials like *w-, it is hardly surprising that Thurgood has set up PBL *wǝy (tones are variable) whereas Bradley (1979) has *way for the same particle, agreeing better with forms such as Jg. we and Lu. (v)e (contrast Jg. gui, Lu. ui 'dog' < PTB *(s-)kwǝy). The *-ay rime will do for Akha (but *-ǝy can hardly be excluded) and *-ǝy for Lisu but Lahu ve appears to require an *-an (Matisoff 1973: 15), as shown by the following:

Table III

	PBL	WB	Lahu	Akha		Lisu
'hawk'	*dzwan¹	tswan	á-cê	kʿa̬ dzeˇ		dzye³
[part.]	*s-wan¹	–	ve	–		–
'buy'	*way¹	way	vɨ̂	zeu	= zǝˇ	wu⁴
[part.]	*[s-]way²	–	–	euᵥ	= ǝᵥ	–
'far'	*wǝy²	we:	vɨ̂̂	–		rgh⁵ = ɣ⁵
[part.]	*s-wǝy¹	–	–	–		rgh³ = ɣ³

Prefixed *s- reconstructed on basis of tonal reflexes (ambiguous in Akha):
Lahu mid-tone; Lisu, id. (glottalized).

Lahu ve has been analyzed in depth by Matisoff (1972, 1973), with emphasis on its basically nominalizing quality, fitting nicely with the reconstructed *-n here < PTB nominalizing *-n suffix. The fore-and-aft affixation closely parallels that of WB sañ < *s-i-n (above) but the core is /wa/ rather than /i/. In view of the functions of these particles, however, and in the light of all the comparative material (above) on TB/ST deictics of various shapes, one must ask whether these Loloish forms might not have a deictic rather than copulative origin. If the former is in fact the case, PBL *wəy² 'far' can be brought into the picture, as in Chinese (above); note also the cluster *s+ variant shown by the Lu. cognate: thúi (< *súi < *swəy < *s-wəyᴬ) 'far' (→'high' →'long'). The following material from two 'N. Assam' languages (Miju and Taruang) and Karen not only supports this alternative view but also suggests an ultimate derivation from the basic deictic units in TB:

Table IV

	Reconstruction		Miju	Taruang	Karen (PK)
'this'	*an	*a-n	an		-
	*ə y			e	
'that'	*wan < *u-a-n		wan		-
	*wə y	*u-ə y		we	
'3rd'	*wə y	*u-ə y	wi		
	*hway < *s-u-a-i			-	*hweᴬ

For Tar. final -e (uncommon), cf. Tar. me 'man' < PTB *r-məy[10]; Miju an < *a-n (cf. a-ra 'here', with locative -ra); for Miju wi (also 'OM'), cf. Miju kui 'dog' < PTB *(s-)kwəy; PK hweᴬ also appears in curious relative clause constructions (STC: 130); PK final *-e < PTB/PST *-ay is regular shift but with some puzzling -e~-ai reflex variation (STC: 149-50 and fn. 409). PK *mw[ay]ᴮ 'to be, exist' can also be set up on the basis of Pa-o mwài, Pwo mè; it appears to be a derivative of */way/ with the PTB stative *m- prefix, with a probable cognate in Lahu mɨ 'to sit, rest', from *s-m[w]əyᴬ. It can be seen that the Loloish particles as reconstructed in Table III would fit very comfortably also in Table IV, final *-n and all! The last may well be due to convergence but the PK initial *hw- < *sw- < *s-w- shows a significant correspondence to the same prefix in the Loloish forms. The forms all tie *in together, in any event, with deictic as well as verbal allofamic components,* as in other sets examined above; cf. here also Mk. a-wi (< *a-wəyᴬ=*a-u-əyᴬ) 'surely, really'. Note that the *s-u-a-i prototype underlying PK *hweᴬ as well as Akha eu contains no fewer than four of the (theoretical) maximum five 'blocks' (*s-u-a-i-n); also that the prototype *i-a-u, mirroring *u-a-i, is represented by PK *(h)yɔᴬ 'this', from *(s-)yaw (STC: 149-50), suggesting that the nature of the deixis is determined by the initial element (contrast Miju wan, Taruang we 'that'); cf. also the 'verbal extension': WT yod-pa (resp. and elegant) 'to be (=yin-pa); to be in a certain place; to exist, to be on hand (with genit. or dat.) to have (like the Latin est mihi 'I have')', from *yo-d < *yaw (STC: 62).

Chinese has cognates for the */wəy/ > AC giwər (regular shifts) or giwəd- (sandhi tone), viewed by sinologists primarily as a copula (see Thurgood 1981) but with pronominal overtones. GSR-575 has 隹 575a śkiwər/tświ 'kind of dove' as phonetic but in Yin and early Zhou sources (bone/bronze inscr/texts) used as a loan for the copula sgiwər/iwi, also in loan use 唯 575i , later (Classical) 惟 575n and 維 575o. In the early sources 隹 is closely related to 叀 cf. 533a gʻiwəd/ɣiwei- (Serruys 1974: 'usually both are considered the same'), probably 'cicada' but here a loan for the unprefixed *giwər (tone/sandhi not significant in these loan uses) in view of the prefixed sgiwər/.[11] The pronominal dimension of sgiwər/ appears in usages such as 隹王 739a 'It is the king' or 'He is king' (Serruys: 24). The same scholar (p. 74) points out that the 'regular negation' of 隹 999a is 不隹 piwə̃g sgiwər < *pəw *s-wəy (writing the cluster as the earlier prefixed form) whereas that of 叀 is 503a 勿叀 miwət giwər < *miwos wəy (the *-s > -t shift is regular), apparently through metanalysis from *miwo s-wəy (PST *-ot > AC -iwăt~-iwət); cf. 无 106a, 毋 107a miwo/miu and 無 103a [s-]miwo/miu 'not (have)' < PST *ma (general negation). The *pəw alternative invites comparison with the Tai negative of this general shape (DeLancey, p.c. - see fn. 1): P-Tai *bɔɔC~*buaC (C. Tai and N. Tai doublets) (Li 1977: 4.4 - tone C=Li's B and corresponds to AC sandhi tone /-/). The -ua form is earlier here (Benedict 1975), the prototype (PAT level) being *mpua < *(m)pu-a (PAT suffixed *-a, of uncertain function), hence the *pəw can be seen as an early AT (rather than Tai) loan.[12]

The */wəy/ thus set up appears to enter into a number of AC forms, incl. (from the same GSR-575 series) 誰 575u śgiwər/źwi 'who' (cited in Thurgood), comparable to the *s(u)- forms of TB (above); also 雖 575v s-giwər/swi (loan) 'although', also 'even if it is', this pair showing the typical cluster (palatalized) vs. prefix *s- reflexes. The negatives 非 579a piwər/pywei (cited in Thurgood), 弗 500a piwət/piuət and 不 999a pwət/puət (early reading reflected in all modern dialects) can also be tied into this scheme, although not necessarily in the same fashion, along with 未 531a miwəd/mywei- (loan), analyzable either as a voiced (before close juncture, hence the sandhi tone) form of miwət/ or as a sandhi form of 微 584d miwər/mywei (loan).

There remains for analysis only the -/i/ as pronominal suffix. Under No. 406 (p. 93) STC gives the following:

[W]T ŋa, Kiranti aŋ (Rai, Rungchengbung)~aŋ-ka (Waling)~ka-ŋa (Rodong) ~ əŋa (Limbu), Nung [Rawang] ŋa, [W]B ŋa, G[aro] aŋ 'I', with which must be grouped *ŋay 'I; self', and perhaps Khimal ka, L[u.] (and general Kuki) ka 'I'.

PTB *ŋay (No. 285) is represented by WT ŋed '1st' (elegant) (cf. suffixed -d in other WT pronominal forms), Jg. ŋāi '1st'; Lu. ŋéi '(with prn's) self' and (below) Mk. ne-né '1st'; Phom ŋei < *ŋay, id. (but CT generally *ŋa).

STC: 160-61 presents only the Chinese pronominal forms from the relatively late (Classical=Dobson's 'Late Archaic') period, based primarily on a 1920 study by Karlgren that later came into great dispute among sinologists. The table below, drawn up largely on the basis of the presentation in Dobson (1959, esp. App. III; 1962) but with some additions from GSR, separates the AC and the O[ld] C[hinese] (=Classical) forms: S subject ('agentive'); G genitive ('determinant'); O object ('verb affectee'):

Table V

88

		PTB	Pre-AC			
1st		*ga	*s-ga	予	83a sgio/iwo (inscr. 余 82a) S (~O)	
	AC			台	976p sgiậg/i S (~O)	
		*(s-)ŋay	*ŋa·y	我	2a ŋâ/ŋâ: S~O~G (high status)	
	OC	*(s-)ŋa	*ŋa	吾	58f ŋo/ŋuo S (emph.)~G	
2nd		*na	*ħa	汝	94j ħio/ńi̯wo: (inscr. 女 94a) S (OC: emph.)	
	AC	*(s-)naŋ	*nậŋ⁺	乃	945a nəŋ⁺/nậi: G	
				而	982a ńiậg/ńi G	
		*na·ŋ	*ħa·ŋ	戎	1013a ħioŋ/ńĭuŋ S~G (~O?)	
	OC	*na	*s-ħa	若	777a ħiak/ńĭak O (~S?~O?)	
		[*ney]	[*ħey]	爾	359a [ħiăr/ńię:] S~G	
			*ħi		ńia/ńię:	

Notes on Table V:

Tones not indicated for TB: *ŋa^A and *ŋay^A for '1st' but P-Tamang *hŋa^B< *s-ŋa^A (?) (poss. tonal effect - cf. note on AC ŋâ̂:). Usually tone *A also for '2nd' forms but both Lu. and Garo have reflexes for *B, corresponding to the AC tone (-/:) (the tones on loan forms such as ħi̯ əg/ and ħi̯ôŋ/ not significant here), suggesting that the PST tone was *B, with the *A tone forms in TB developed through a form class (for prn's).

Mk. nè < *ŋay^A '1st' (reg. shifts) but nè < *s-ŋay as 'emphatic' form (see Benedict 1980 for *s- > Mk. tone´); similarly, nàŋ as 'emphatic' form of nàŋ < *naŋ^A '2nd'.[13]

TB/TK *na '2nd': Monpa, Dhimal, Rawang, Karen; an allofam at the PST level (cf. Chinese) reflecting the medial length of the 'full' form: *na·ŋ (velar finals tend to drop in ST in this position), as shown by the BG and CT reflexes; Lu. nàŋ reflects another allofam: *naŋ (the vowel of WB naŋ is ambiguous).

PTB *[ney] only in secondary forms, e.g. C. Monpa /na/ '2nd' + gi 'ERG' > nei; cf. /da/ '3rd' + gi > dei (see above).

The AC sgio/~sgi̯əg/ doublet arose from 'competing' reflexes for PST final *-a: >-(i)o after velars but >-i̯əg after dental spirants/affricates (Benedict 1977); note the parallel doublet from the same GSR series (82, 876): 余 82g sgio/i̯wo-～台 sgi̯əg/i (loan of above character) 'pleased'; note also PTB *(s-) ga 'chin': Dim. khu-s ga (khu 'mouth'); 臣 960a sgi̯əg/i, id. (phon. in 姬 960f ki̯əg/kyi 'family name', etc.).[14]

AC ŋâ/:< *ŋâ·y, as shown by Min reflexes (Bodman 1977); AC shows loss of final *-y after /â·/ and perhaps other V + length combinations (contra STC: fn. 487); an initial [s-] is suggested by the use as phonetic in 義 2y s-k^ɕia/xyiɛ 'proper name' and 犠 2z id. 'sacrificial animal'.

AC nəŋ⁺/ > nəg/ in close juncture as 'G', part of a widespread pattern in AC (Benedict 1976: 185); note the use as phonetic in 仍 945e ħi̯əŋ/ħi̯əŋ 'repeat'. The basic /nəŋ/ form here is seen as a development from the PST *naŋ allofam through reduced stress.

Note PST medial */a·/ > /ô/ [=ô·] in ħi̯ôŋ, paralleling the regular shift: PST final *-a > -(i)o (after most initials); the Wu dialects have /nuŋ/ '2nd' here (P. Yang, p.c.), reflecting a doublet *nôŋ at the PC level.

AC ńiak/< *s-ńa is regular shift (Benedict 1980).

AC 爾 ħia/ '2nd' is loan use of this character, basically read ħiăr/ńię: (~niər/niei:), suggesting an early doublet: ńiăr/:< *ńey; an initial [s-] is suggested by the use as phonetic in 璽 359j shiăr/się: 'seal'; note also that 爾 is a Shi-jing loan for 邇 359c ńiăr/nię: 'near'; cf. PTB *ney, id. < PST *ney. The modern (pinyin) nǐ, Cant. néi '2nd' point to an unpalatalized

As shown in Table IV, the pre-AC ('Proto-Chinese') forms match those of
PTB quite closely, even as to *s- prefixation here and there. The following
points are to be noted:

1. PTB *ga[A] '1st' is much more widely represented than indicated in STC,
underlying the '1st' forms of Lp., Hayu, Sunwari, Bahing (and Kiranti group
generally) and turning up even in Loloish (Ahi go < *ga^A); cf. also Lu. ká <
*[g]a^A (the tone apparently matches that of *ŋa^A and *ŋay^A). The Kiranti
'1st' forms generally (incl. those cited in STC, above) have been derived from
a curious combination of the two *ga and *ŋa roots, with or without */a/
(note that in the Khambu subgroup initial *g- yields k-; see STC: 21): *ga ~
*a-ga~ga-ŋa~*a-ŋa and even *a-ŋa-ga (Waling aŋ-ka); the *a-ŋa prototype
also accounts for Garo aŋ '1st'. Bauman (1975) has suggested reconstructing
a disyllabic root (*gaŋa) but this seems unlikely for TB, even for this one
division. As Bauman points out, the /ŋa/ and /na/ prominal agreement forms
are found precisely in this eastern Himalayan region. It would seem that the
independent pronoun *ŋa became specialized as a (verbal suffix) agreement
form as pronominalization developed[15], with replacement by *ga in the subject
position (and similarly for *na '2nd), resulting in the *ga~*ŋa mishmash in
Kiranti. This implies inter alia that replacement, for one reason or another,
has also led to the /ga/ forms found elsewhere in TB.

2. AC sgio/ (the main form) appears as S, rarely as O (but the O positions
are uncommon, anyway, in the available AC material) and never as G, where
only a low-status form (< ' [your] servant') and the high-status ŋâ/: appear.
It appears only as an archaism in the Classical (OC) period and thus, oddly
enough, never 'competed' with ŋo/ , which is common in the period (texts/
inscriptions), both in S and G position, the former only in 'emphatic exposure'
(Dobson), possibly a form of disjunction. This character (吾) is read on
'high' (yin) tone in Shanghai (Sherard 1982), indicating an earlier *s-ŋo/<*s-ŋa^A.
This all strongly indicates that a *s-ga~ŋa (~*s-ŋa) alternation of Kiranti
type also existed at the pre-AC level - and note that it is generally held
by sinologists (cf. STC: fn. 486) that OC is in many ways a 'sister' rather than
'daughter' language of AC, a point strongly supported by this pronominal evidence.

3. The prefixed *s- of sgio/<*s-ga and ñiak/<*s-ña appears to tie in with
P-Tamang *hŋa<*s-ŋa and possibly with the *s-ŋay and *s-naŋ forms set up
for (proto-)Mk. as 'emphatics'. It seems not unlikely that the /s/ here was
basically an ERG, as in WT, affixed here to the *ga root (see above); cf. the
*s-a>ha 'ERG' of Hayu (above), with *s- there affixed simply to the *a root. If this
is in fact the origin of sgio/, the form is a direct morph-for-morph cognate
of WB ka' 'SM', from *s-ga (above), suggesting that the WB particle also
originally served an ERG function. The 'lapsing' of function took many
different forms, including even the 'emphasis' of Mk.

4. To come finally to the *-i forms, the phonology supports the view that for '1st' the *-i suffixation was late, with final *-â·y yielding the final *-â̂ of the AC form: ŋâ/· (see above), paralleling the shift from -a⁺n to *-â̂n (or *-â·n, merged in AC) (STC: fn. 428). Inasmuch as ŋâ/:, unlike sg̣io, appears in the G position, the *-i here can be taken as representing an original GM, comparable with WT /-ki/ or perhaps even a descendant of the velar-initial form (cf. WT -yi for -ki after vocalic final). The evolution of this pronoun as a high-status form can also be tied to an original GM function. The Lu. semantic specialization as 'self' (above) is also of interest here, especially since it is exactly matched by ŋâ/:, which occurs (OC) in the sense 'themselves, ourselves, us'; 'when the speaker identifies himself with the state to which he belongs, in sense of 'us, our state' (Dobson 1959: 137) - and cf. 予 964a 吾 103a 我 2a tsi̯əg: mi̯wo ŋâ: '(the) Master not-have 1st '=' Confucius n'avait pas d'égoïsme' (Couv. cit. from Lunyu). This pronoun, which lacks special status in OC, yielded the modern (pinyin) wǒ. The interpretation of *-i (reconstructed) as originally a GM in this pronoun is greatly strengthened by the fact that the Bai possessive forms for all three person pronouns can also be reconstructed with *-i (see above).

5. The above analysis of '1st' pronouns in AC/OC finds some support in the '2nd' forms, with ńi̯ak <*s-ĥa paired with sg̣io/ as representing an earlier ERG-prefixed pronoun. The AC forms in G position were from an underlying */nəŋ/ (see above) but the prominent OC form in this position was ĥia/:, apparently an early doublet of *ńi̯ár/: <pre-AC *ńey, these forms displaying progressive palatalization from *ńai<*na-i (paralleled in TB - see above). The ĥia/: form in the Classical language also 'competed' actively with the ńi̯o/: pronoun in the S position and much has been written on the nature of this distinction. Dobson (1959: App. III) describes the latter as the '(emphatic) exposed' form (see above) yet also offers evidence that an 'element of status' was involved, e.g. he cites a passage from Mencius re the 'niceties' of exploiting this distinction. In any event, it is a curious fact that the two *-i derivatives: ŋâ/: '1st' and ĥia/: '2nd', have survived (the latter in the unpalatalized form - see above) to become the regular pronouns of the modern language: (pinyin) wǒ and nǐ.

In review, it now appears that PST possessed a core $*/i/\sim*/u/\sim*/a/$ triangle with velar, dental and labial initial increments that in time gave rise to highly complex, interlocking pronominal~verbal (be/exist, near/far) ~ particle (marker) word-families on a scale to gladden the heart even of that famous allofamist, J. Matisoff (1978). As can be seen from the various 'shapes' in Table V. (below), most of the available 'slots' have been filled in one language or another but the reconstructions at the PTB and, a fortiori, the PST level remain problematical. Palatal initials, which are uncommon in TB/ST, are scarcely represented here but note Lu. tsu=chu in Fn. 3, from *cu or *cəw; note also that s- forms are lacking although PTB *su (above) may well have had a deictic origin (PBL *su[1] 'remote 3rd'). In the following table the relatively isolated forms are underlined; see Notes for forms not cited above:

Table V - TB/ST Deictics

*(h)i ($\sim$ *- ə y)	*(h)a	*(h)u ($\sim$ *-ow $\sim$ *- ə w)
*ki $\sim$ *gi ($\sim$ *- ə y)	*ka $\sim$ *ga ($\sim$ *-â)	*kow $\sim$ *gow ($\sim$ *- ə w)
*ti $\sim$ *di ($\sim$ *- ə y)	*ta $\sim$ *da ($\sim$ *-â)	*t ə w $\sim$ *d ə w
*ni or *ney	-	*nu or *now
*tsi ($\sim$ *-ey)	*tsa	*tsow
*pi $\sim$ *bi ($\sim$ *- ə y)	*pa $\sim$ *ba	*pu, *p ə w or *pow
*mi ($\sim$ *- ə y)	*ma	*mow

Notes:

*ha: CT *ha[A] 'this': Chang ho, Phom ha, Konyak hato~to (hato also 'that'), Wancho haya ($\sim$ iya = ija; see above), Tangsa a-; (Chang also hau '3rd', from *ha[B].); Mk. há 'yonder, there', however, is probably from an earlier *s-ka (but PTB final *-a regularly > Mk. -o). *ti and *ni: Moto Monpa ʔuthi "this" (= ʔuhu, above),/ ʔuhi 'that'; C. Monpa thi-nuŋ 'today' but uthu 'this' and uhu 'that' through assimilation, cf. also WB ʔa-ti 'what', paralleling ʔa-su 'who' (above). Phom ni 'that'; Bisu (BL) niŋ~ni 'this'; Cant. yi~nei 'this', however, appears to represent an earlier *ʔd- form, paralleling Northern (pinyin) nà 'that', from *ʔdâ (see above): for the *ni or *ney form, cf. PTB/ PST *ney 'near' (above).

*t ə w $\sim$ *d ə w: WB thui <*t ə w[A] 'that' (above); cf. also Newari thua 'this' (ua 'that'); Meitei madu <*-d[ə w] 'that' (adu = asi = masi 'this'; see above).

*nu or *now: Mpi (Loloish) nu[5] (<PBL *nu[B]) 'that (far)'.

*tsa: PT *tsa[A] 'that' (above); perhaps also WB tsa 'thing' (cf. Cant. ye 'thing' < *-dâ; see above) but this WB form may be from an earlier *dza, belonging with WT ɾdzas 'thing, matter, object, goods, property' <PTB *[r-]dza(-s); cf. also Gurung sa'e (<*sa[B]) 'thing'.

*mow: Tsona Monpa mo 'that' (tso 'this'); also (verbal extension) WT mod-pa 'to be (emphatic)', from *mo-d (cf. yod-pa, above).

*pu, *p ə w or *pow: Mk. pú (< *s-pu) 'ever there, yonder'.

*pa $\sim$ *ba: see the analysis (under Chinese) above, which points to a variation between PTB *pa(-i) and Sinitic (Chinese and Bai) *ba(-i) 'this/that' '3rd'. Mention is made there of an apparent 'emphatic' feature in the case of Chinese (OC gloss), suggesting a further relationship to Miju -pha 'genitive case: suffixed for the sake of emphasis and for indicating the object belonging to oneself' ('.....is mine'); Garo -ba 'suffix intended to emphasize'(u-an-ba 'he is the very person who....' -see above for the u- and -an-). It also seems likely that the widespread TB nominalizing suffix *-pa~*-ba (STC: 96 - add Gurung -ba, Lp. -bo<*-ba; also Jg. -pha), said to be 'probably connected' with the masculine *-pa suffix (ibid.), is rather to be considered allofamic with the above. Lahu has -pā (<*s-ba) for both 'male' and 'agentive nominalizer', declared by Matisoff (1965-69) to be 'historically identical'. Convergence now appears to be preferable as an explanation here; note that AC makes a careful distinction between the deictic 夫 101a (loan use) b⁴jwo/b⁴ju < *ba[A] 'this/that' and both 夫 101a piwo/pju 'amn [male]' <*-pa[A] and 父 102a b⁴jwo/b⁴ju: < *ba[B] 'father; old man' piwo/pju: *C-pa[B] 'honorific second part of personal name', the last three constituting a complex word-family *ba[B]~*pa[A-B] (old)male/father' (cf. the initial/tone

*ma: the conplexities here make the above look like an elementary exercise in allofamy. In this case we are mercifully spared any complications arising from Sinitic, which seems to lack cognates for this word-family, if such it be. At the same time, however, we are unable to look to Chinese or Bai for any solutions. It will be seen that there are some parallels with the above as well as some differences, with 'locative' as well as 'emphatic' features in evidence. In the hope, probably futile, of avoiding utter obfuscation the unprefixed forms are considered first, followed by the *s- prefixed:

On the basis of material now at hand, the unprefixed root: *ma^A appears only as follows:

1. locative: Rw. ma 'place', probably from an earlier 'place down there'; cf. WT dma-ba (bound form /ma/) 'low'.

2. Postposition: Lu. â-má (<*-ma^A) '3rd (G)', added to the basic PTB *a '3rd'; also â-mà? (<*-mas<*ma-s) '3rd (S/O)', the reconstructed *-s probably representing an earlier ERG; note also the strange compounds: â-mà?-â ~ â-mà?-â-tá '3rd (G)' (see above for -tá); also mà? 'even,rather', perhaps an earlier emphatic; Lisu (CL) a^5-ma^4 (<*-ma^A) 'who', with interrogative a^5-. Lehman (1976), defining Lu. -ma? as 'emphatic, contrastive and restrictive', adds comparable material from another KN language (Haka); he also suggests a comparison with WB locative -hma (below).

3. pronominal: Meitei ma '3rd' (also madu 'that', masi = asi 'this'; see forms cited above) and the related KN *ma, id. (Meluri, Ntenyi ma); this pronominal use, which can be viewed as a development of the foregoing: *a(-ma) > *a-ma > *(a-)ma > *ma, appears to underlie the widespread stative *m- prefix of TB (STC: 111 ff.).

The *s- prefixed derivatives make this family rather resemble a tribe or even a conglomerate. The 'downness' appears in PT *hma^B < *s-ma^B: Gurung ma 'lower down in altitude', Thakali ma-wa 'low'; also the Burmish (excl. WB) deictic: *s-ma^A: Maru mɔ (for ?mɔ) 'that'; Atsi (Tsaiwa)?mô 'that down there'. The KN/Mk./Jg. root of the same shape: *(s-)ma^A, however, displays a 'frontness' rather than 'downness', with interesting locative/temporal aspects: Lu. hmá (<*sma^A<*s-ma^A) 'in front, the space in front of', also glossed 'early, soon' as well as 'the immediate task which one has set oneself [=before one] in weeding or cutting a field; the strip of field [so involved]; to cut or weed [such] a strip'; nî-kùm hmâ-sà 'year before last' (with tone sandhi; nî-kùm 'last year'); Mk. mò (<*ma^A) 'after(wards), in a short time (pointing into future or sthg. that has happened just now), just now', also glossed 'a strip of field' (possible loan in this sense; cf. Lu.); mò-níŋ~mò-níŋ 'next year'; Jg. ma- 'before last' (ma-niŋ 'year before last'). PBL *s-ma^A can be set up as a locative (in 'here', 'there', et al.) on the basis of WB -hma, Lisu -ma^3 (<*s-ma^A, contrasting with -ma^4 <*-ma^A in 'who', above). The Lisu -ma^3, however, also functions as a nominalizer, thus nicely tying in with Lahu -ma<*s-ma^A (Matisoff 1973: 'This -ma must have been some sort of nominalizer'): note also Lahu ma 'expressing strong emotion or emphasis' (Matisoff 1965-69). Now PBL also has *s-ma^A (WB -ma', Lahu ma-, Lisu -ma^3) 'female (bound form)' yet no one to date, it seems, has attempted to link the two, perhaps because of some 'deep structure' sexism! In any event, the 'non-sexist' suffixed -ma appears in WT and other TB languages as well

as Lahu, at times along with the suffixed -ba, and it is suggested here that both these 'orphaned' (or [Matisoff] 'morphaned') elements have a similar deictic origin, with convergence playing a role in both cases. Finally, the 'downness' reappears in an apparent Lahu derivative: cf. the following series: Lahu (Matisoff 1973: 51-53) ô<*am^B<*a-ma 'there'; chô 'here' (cf. chi 'this', cited above); cô 'way over there' < *jam^B (Lisu je ^{4}; cf. Lu. tsu = chu in fn. 3); nô 'up there' < *nam^B (Lisu ne^4; Phunoi has hnã 'that [far]' < *s-naɪn; cf. Gurung nù', Thakali no-wa 'high', from PT *hn [ow]^A < *s-n [ow]^A); Lahu mô 'down there' < *mam^B, to be looked upon as a rare example of a non-reduplicative auto-allofam, if the above analysis holds: mô < *mam^B < *ma-ma!

Proleptically, one might argue that by attempting to relate so many forms one runs the risk of relating none. At this early stage of investigation, however, it seems preferable to present the available forms in a fashion calculated to bring to the surface whatever deeper connections that might exist. An attempt has been made, at the same time, to disambiguate where this seems feasible, as in the *pa~*ba and *ma elements, where convergence seems to have occurred with the similar 'masculine' and 'feminine'*-pa and *-ma suffixes. From an ultra-Matisoffian point of view one might even regard the approach in this paper as being on the conservative side! It ignores the whole matter of extensions in the area of pronominals from '3rd' to '1st' and even to '2nd'[16] as well as the baffling problems relating to the interplay of deictics and interrogatives, as seen most clearly in the Chinese and Bai forms in Table II[17].

The basic problem, ultimately, concerns the assignment of specific pieces of this gigantic jigsaw collection to a PTB or even PST level, as opposed to any of a number of later levels. The three corner pieces of the TB deictic triangle: *i~*u~*a (with variants) were certainly all still free (unbound) morphs at the PTB level, hence must also be set up at the earlier PST level despite the apparent lack of any representation (in this 'primitive' shape) in Sinitic. This freedom means that they could be moved about in a 'morph shuffle' (above), with the initial element apparently determining the nature of the deixis ('this' or 'that'), as indicated above. The further possibility of combining these basic morph groups, in whatever order, with the polytropic TB */s/ and */n/ affixes makes for a staggeringly large number of morphological end-products. The glosses usually follow along predicted lines, e.g. Garo u-an-ba, from *u ('that') + *a ('the one') + *-n (nominalizer) + *-ba (emphatic) = 'he is the very person who....' (cited above). The evidence for *ba as an emphatic of sorts is fairly substantial, even at the PST level, while PST *dâ as an emphatic is even more strongly supported. It also appears that 'ergative systems, both of */s/ and */(k)i/ types (or the equivalent) must be recognized at the PTB level, whether or not they originated in metanalysis and genitive constructions, respectively, as suggested above. There is also solid evidence for an AC system of the former type: *s-ga→'1st', with implications for the reconstruction of ergativity as a process at the deeper PST level.

1. This paper is a vastly enlarged version of an original Note on the TB
/i/~/u/ contrast in deixis. This expansion grew out of papers presented at
the recent ST conference in Gainesville, Fla. by S. DeLancey, F. K. Lehman
and G. Thurgood, the last with a Comment circulated by the writer. It owes
much to discussions with DeLancey and Lehman re ergativity and with
Thurgood re his copula *wəy (see his Reconstruction notes, which suggest
that the AC *s- in this root represents an earlier suffixed *-s) as well as with
J. Matisoff re allofamy, and Lahu forms and phonology.

2. The /h/ forms may well be secondary, especially in view of the rarity
of *h- as ininitial in PTB (STC: 33). As presented in Benedict 1981, an
earlier *s- regularly yielded /h/ in Hayu, even in vowel-initial position,
e.g. im (<*ip) 'sleep', him 'put to sleep' (corresponding to WBʔip~sip). WB has
three or four apparent doublets of this kind, notably ʔa (< *aᴬ) 'crack open,
gape'~ha' (with typical 'creaky tone') 'open the mouth, gape open', with a
likely cognate in Hayu hɔ(< *ha <*s-a) 'open', but this reflex apparently
obtains only on roots with (unmarked) tone *A since PTB *(m-)aᴮ 'dumb
(mute)' yielded WB ʔa' < *s-aᴮ (paralleling AC p𝄪 805f ʔag/ʔa: < *s-aᴮ).

It is possible that WB hui represents an earlier *s-uiᴬ < *s-əwᴬ, although
'creaky tone' would be anticipated. It can further be regarded as a possible
doublet of thui, from *s-thui; cf. the parallel doublets (both with medial -w-):
hwe'~khwe' 'push with head, butt'; hwak~phwak 'hide, conceal'. Akha and
Phunoi (S. Loloish) /he/ 'here' represent PBL: *hiᴬ, perhaps from *s-i
(see below).

3. These glosses, based on fieldwork by E. Hillard on Lu. informants in the
U.S.A. (cited in Matisoff 1978) clarify the less precise distinctions presented in
Lorrain and Weidert, especially as regards so; note that Lorrain glosses kha
as 'that, which, who; that, that by you'; also that Lu. has still another deictic:
tsu 'distant (invisible)', tsu-tsu 'that yonder (invisible)' Weidert); Lorrain glosses
the same form (chu) as 'emphatic particle; who, which, that', chu-chu 'that,
this'! (dial. diff.?).

4. Lehmann notes that WB mań 'future tense marker' has the same rime as
sań; the indicated reconstruction is *min. In this case, however, the analysis
appears to be *mi-n, exactly matching CT *mi(-n), id., even as to the
suffixation: Kimsing (Tangsa) mi, Nocte min! This is perhaps simply an extension
of the deictic */mi/ (text), as suggested by comparison with the allofamic
Lp. (a-)pyin and WT phyi(n), both glossed as 'future' (text); note also the double
force of Gurung -m, both a 'future tense marker' and an 'emphatic suffix
with nouns and verbs', very likely from an earlier *-m(i); cf. also Mk. mɔ̀
'after(wards)', etc. (text). A similar origin probably also obtains for WB
ʔam', the earlier 'future tense marker' found in the inscriptions: *s-a-m(i) >
ʔam' (regular reflexes for this double-prefixed form). WT min is of entirely
distinct origin: min = ma yin '(it) not be' (see text for yin).

5. Chinese forms are cited as A[rchaic] C[hinese] / M[iddle] C[hinese], the AC period ending ca. 750 B.C.; for the phonology see Benedict 1976, modified and extended in Benedict, forthcoming; also (for vocalism) Benedict 1977 and ((or affixation) Benedict 1976 bis.

6. GSR isolates this form under 604 but the initial velar can be reconstructed on the basis of the phonetic: 尹 1251-l [sgiwǒn]/jǔen 'govern, governor' (banished in GSR to the 'unreconstructables' under 1251-l), which is also the phonetic of the GSR-459 series: 君 459a kiwən/kiuən 'lord, prince' (allofam of above), et al. (the final -n~-r variation is seen in the preceding 458 series and others).

7. AC regularly has -əg corresponding to PTB final *-ow (WT -o, Lu. -ou, WB -u), as in PTB *(-)mow 'woman/(kin)female': WT mo 'woman, female', rmo/mo 'grandmo.'~'mo's y. sister', rmo-rmo 'mo's mo.'~(dial.) 'mo.-in-law' (see Benedict 1942); Lu. móu 'daughter-in-law' (reciprocal term of above); AC 母 947a məg/məu: 'mother'; also PTB *low: Lu. lóu 'verbal affix signifying motion towards the speaker', lóu-kāl 'come' (kāl 'walk/go'); AC 來 944a ləg/lâi (loan) 'come'; PTB *(s-)low: Lu. hló (< *s-lo) 'a weed'; AC 萊 944j ləg/lâi,- 'a kind of weed'; PTB *(s-) low: WB hlu (< *s-lu) 'give for a religious purpose'; AC 釐 944k ləg/lâi- 'give'; PTB *(s-)tsow: WB tsu' (< *s-tsu) 'collect, gather together'; AC 采 942a tsəg/tsʻâi: 'gather, pluck'. The anticipated palatalized (-i-) version of this reflex is omitted in Benedict 1977 (Table: PST Medial Vowel + Glide); it is well illustrated by the –iəg reflex for 'this' above and for this PST *kow~gow deictic/3rd root, paralleled by the following: WT go-ba 'understand, comprehend; to mean, imagine'; AC 思 973a s-[g]iəg/si 'think'~s-[g]iəg/si- (< suffixed form) 'brood'; PST *(s-)gow.

8. The only gloss (as loan) attested for AC is 'much, ample; *fine, beautiful', the same word as 儺 152k ʔdâr/nâ,: (loan) 'rich, ample, fine', with 難 152a tʻân/tʻân,- as phonetic (see Benedict 1976: 185 - for ʔt- there, read ʔd-). The later loan use of this character for the deictic indicates an original (AC-level) *ʔdâ rather than *ʔdâr (final -r > -ø by the Classical period, along with the ʔd- > n- shift).

9. See Thurgood 1981; also Comment by writer (circulated at the same 14th ST conference, Gainesville); that analysis now modified by the comparative evidence presented below.

10. STC: fn. 301 cites PTB *r-mi(y) but the final here has now been disambiguated by the C[hang] -T[angsa] (STC: Konyak group) *məy (Moshang mai, Yogli, Nocte, Wancho mi; also Chang mat < *mai+); the PST final for this root yeilds a basis for the AC doublet: 民 457a miən/~mięn/ 'people' (with 'collective plural' -n).

11. See Serruys 1974 for the extensive literature on this sgiwər/~giwər contrast, all largely vitiated by inadequate reconstructions of the *jwər/, *diwər/ or even *riwər/type for sgiwər/, effectively disguising the nature

Abbreviations

AC Archaic Chinese; AT Austro-Tai; BG Bodo-Garo; BL Burmese-Lolo;
C Central; Chp. Chepang; CT Chang-Tangsa; DL Da-li; ERG ergative-
marker; G genitive (determinant); GM genitive-marker; GSR (see Karlgren
1957); JC Jian-chuan.; Jg. Jinghpaw; IM instrumental-marker; KN Kuki-Naga;
L Loloish; Lp. Lepcha; Lu. Lushai; MC Middle Chinese; Mk. Mikir; N noun;
O object; OC Old Chinese; OM object-marker; P Proto-; prn. pronoun;
PT Proto-Tamang; Rw. Rawang; S subject; SM subject-marker; ST Sino-Tibetan;
STC (see Benedict 1972); Tar. Taruang; TB Tibeto-Burman; V verb; WB
Written Burmese; WT Written Tibetan.

Tone notation: high ´, mid -, low ˋ, falling ^, rising ˅; note that AC/MC
/â/ is 'back a'; in GSR the tones are indicated as follows: píng (<*A) (unmarked),
shàng (<*B) by :, and qù (< sandhi tone before close-juncture) by -.

Bibliography

Bauman, J. 1975. Pronouns and Pronominal Morphology in Tibeto-Burman.
Ph.D. dissertation. University of California: Berkeley.

___, 1975bis, Pronominal roots in Tibeto-Burman. Sino-Tibetan Conference
VIII: Berkeley.

Benedict, P. K. 1942. Tibetan and Chinese kinship terms. HJAS 6. 313-37.

___, 1972. Addendum to Yang, Paul Fu-mien, 'Prefix kə- in modern Chinese
dialects and Proto-Chinese. 5th ST Conference: Ann Arbor. [Monumenta
Serica Vol. XXXIII (1977-78). 286-299].

___, 1972. Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus. Contrib. Editor, J. Matisoff.
Cambridge Univ. Press: Cambridge, U.K.

___, 1975. Austro-Thai: Language and Culture. HRAF Press: New Haven.

___, 1976. Sino-Tibetan: another look. JAOS 96. 168-97.

___, 1976bis. Archaic Chinese affixation patterns. Sino-Tibetan Conference
IX, Copenhagen.

___, 1977. PST vowels. Sino-Tibetan Conference X, Washington.

___, 1978. Chinese Cryptoglyphics. Sino-Tibetan Conference XI. Tucson.

___, 1980. The PST tone/accent system: additional TB data. Sino-Tibetan
Conference XIII, Charlottesville.

___, 1981. TB/Karen cluster vs. prefix *s-. Sino-Tibetan Conference XIV,
Gainesville.

___, 1982. Sinitic and Proto=Chinese: Part II. Bai and LPT. Sino-Tibetan
Conference XV. Beijing.

___, forthcoming. Archaic Chinese initials. To appear in Papers Presented
to Wang Li on his Eightieth Birthday.

___, forthcoming bis. PST interrogative *ga(ŋ)~*ka.

Bodman, N. 1948. The function of jywe in the Shàng Shū. JAOS 68. 52-60.

___, 1977. Proto-Coastal=Min correspondences to the 豉 ke rhyme.
187th Annual Meeting of the Americal Oriental Society, Ithaca.

Bradley, D. 1979. Proto-Loloish. London and Malmö: Scandinavian Institute
of Asian Studies, Monograph Series No. 39.

Couvreur, F.S. 1930. Dictionnaire classique de la langue chinoise. Imprimierie
de la mission catholique: sien-hsien.

Das Gupta, K. 1968. An Introduction to Central Monpa. North-East Frontier
    Agency: Shillong.
DeLancey, S. 1934. Lhasa Tibetan: A Case Study in Ergative Typology.
    Sino-Tibetan Conference XIV: Gainesville.
___, 1981. The category of direction in Tibeto-Burman. LTBA 6.1. 83-101.
Dobson, W. 1959. Late Archaic Chinese. Univ. of Toronto Press: Toronto.
___, 1962. Early Archaic Chinese. Univ. of Toronto Press: Toronto. 1981.
Jäschke, H.A. A Tibetan-English Dictionary. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner
    & Co. Ltd., London.
Karlgren, B. 1957. Grammata Serica Recensa. Bulletin of the Museum of
    Far Eastern Antiquities 29. 1-332.
Kepping, K.B. 1975. Subject and verb agreement in the Tangut verb. LTBA
    2.2. 219-31.
Lehman, F.K. 1976. A brief note on the reconstruction of ma in Tibeto-
    Burman. Sino-Tibetan Conference IX. Copenhagen.
___, 1981. On internal syntactic reconstruction in Burmese: ergativity and the
    nominal-verbal cycle. Sino-Tibetan Conference XIV. Gainesville.
Li, Fang-kuei 1977. A Handbook of Comparative Tai. University Press of
    Hawaii.
Lorrain, J.H. 1940. Dictionary of the Lushai Language. Royal Asiatic Society
    of Bengal.
Matisoff 1965-69. Lahu-English Dictionary. First draft (unproofed & xeroxed).
___, 1972. Lahu nominalization, relativization, and genitivization. In John
    Kimball, ed., Syntax and Semantics I. Seminar Press: N.Y.
___, 1973. The Grammar of Lahu. Univ. of California Press: Berkeley.
___, 1974. The tones of Jinghpaw and Lolo-Burmese: common origin vs.
    independent development. Acta Ling. Haf. 15. 153-212.
___, 1978. Variational Semantics in Tibeto-Burman. Institute for the Study
    of Human Issues. Philadelphia.
Michailovsky, Boyd. 1981. La langue hayu. Doctoral dissertation. Université
    Paris III.
Serruys, P. 1974. Studies in the language of the Shang oracle inscriptions.
    T'oung Pao LX. 1-3. 12-118.
Sherard, M. 1982. Voicing and tone register in Shanghai. Sino-Tibetan Conference
    XV. Beijing.
Thurgood, G. 1981. The Sino-Tibetan copula *wəy. Sino-Tibetan Conference
    XIV. Gainesville.
___, 1982. The Sino-Tibetan copula *wəy. Cahiers de linquistique asie
    orientale 11.1.65-82
Weidert, A. 1975. Componential Analysis of Lushai Phonology. John Benjamins.
    B.V. Amsterdam.
Yang, P. 1982. Sinitic and Proto-Chinese: Part I. Archaic Chinese and Proto-Min.
    Sino-Tibetan Conference XV. Beijing.