This and that in TB/ST

Paul K. Benedict

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

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(West)(WT)</th>
<th>Chepang</th>
<th>Dhimal</th>
<th>Wancho</th>
<th>Garo</th>
<th>Kezhamna</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>PTB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'this' (ʔ)i (West)</td>
<td>ʔi</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-a</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>ʔi</td>
<td>*(h)iA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'that' u<del>o (WT) ʔuw</del>ow</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>u-a</td>
<td>hu-</td>
<td>hui</td>
<td>*(h)gwA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The lexicons describe West T i~ʔi-po as 'instead of WT 'di,' and WB hui as 'colloquial' for thu2. WT u (< u or *gw)~o (< ow) 'this' (cf. the Chp. variation), with semantic shift as in Moto Monpa ḡu, Id. Wancho (CT) 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. pron.].' Kezhamna 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 ʔ 'this' (below). Bradley (1979: 245) describes for; B[urmese]-L[olo] a 'basic two-way opposition': 'this' with *-i1 (= *-iA) and 'that' with *-o1 (= *gwA > 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 xṣi 'this', xāu < *xəw 'that [near]'). The (h)u type is also represented by Newari ua 'that' (thua 'this'), Lepcha ḡu '3rd', and the /i/ type by Hayu /ii/ 'this', Hruso (Aka) i '3rd', a-i 'here'; note also the suffixed /u/ and /i/ in Miju and/or Taruанг (below). Rawang (Nungish) has suffixes: -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 widespread 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 *ān, glossed as '...often very indefinite: 'one', 'people'. These basic forms as a group constitute a deictic (pronominial) system that is outrageously symmetrical, even for a proto-language:

*i 'this' (near '1st')
*a 'that' (near '2nd')
*u '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 5<<:m-m(a) 'there', as a subject marker (SM) (Akha), as an ergative marker (ERG) (Hau na <<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. 3&'this'; Nokte (CT) ate '3rd', from *a-[d]a-y (but thannin '3rd pl.' < *ta-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 7a-su 'who' (WB su 'person') also Lp. sak- with interrogatives;
Nyi Lolo interrogative /sa j Caro sa, KN *sV 'who'; perhaps also A[rchaic] C[chinese] 575u sjinwə id., from *s-wəy 'who-is' (see below).

The following set can be reconstructed at the PST level: PTB <tsi A:
WB tshí 'presence; nearness': Lahu chi 'this'; Mk. si 'this here (affix with nouns: locative-emphatic deixis); Meitei gisī 'this'; Lotha (KN) si 'this; 3rd'; Miri, Dafia si 'this'; AC <tsi 558a tšār/tsā: ( <*tsey B), id., with tonal shift perhaps initial-conditioned (cf. PTB *saw 'die'; AC 558a sjār/si); PST *tsi ~*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 initial '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 morphology (Thurgood 1981); in the following analysis chief attention is paid to those languages (Chinese, Tibetian, Burmese) which supply substantial time-depth for a comparative study.

1. Lu. khi. Lu. khi 'that (visible up there)'; Jg. khi (Sing-pho) < (stand.) '3rd'; CL (Nyi, Jino) *kh[ay] 'that; 3rd'; WT -kyi ~ -gyl ~ -gi and (after vocalic final) -yi 'GM'; Tamang, Meitei. Anal (KN) -ki, id.; C. Monpa -gi (-i after prn's) 'ERG; instrum. marker (MI)'. 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. -ln). Further analysis of this point involves a pair of fundamental building blocks of TB (and ST) morphophonemics: directional/causeative/transitivezing *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'e-s IAL–ba-red 'he-ERG sleep-PAST' reflects an underlying */sIAL/. 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 'd'i 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 Mliri l 'to be (existential/attributive)'; Rw. i 'yes' = 'it is' (cf. Chinese shi, 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 (\~) 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 (\ Abb) for the deictic 'this' the likelier reconstruction is *s-i, with the anticipated 'creaky tone'. Lisu yi (\ABB), the apparent cognate of WB ʔi –ʔi! (hardly related to PL *ʔan 'remote 3rd', as in Bradley 1979: No. 441, since both initial and final are disreponant), 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 -san, 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: san < *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 san has come to function as a deictic ('this').

On comparison with Tibetan, the role of -n is seen to be similar but the slots of /s/ and /(/ki/ are reversed: /s+/i/ rather than /ki+/s/. Lushai, which
also retains the simple /i/ forms in (::<s-i>'this, that like this, thus, as
follows' and ʃ(::<s-l>'GM' (above), has 'n in <s-in (see above) 'ERG', with no
fewer than 21 separate glosses in Lorrain (1), including 'IM' and 'verbal suffix'.
This Lu. 'n 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 san 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. 'n) is not clear at this
time.
2. Lu. khu. Lu. khu (<ku, kaw or kow) 'that (visible down there)';
Rw. khu (<ku or kow) 'that (on same level as speaker)'; Akha (S. Loloish)
k'oe (<kaw) 'that'; Rodong (Kiranti) khu '3rd'; WT kho (<kow), id.;
Dhimal ko, Sho (KN) khoe 'GM'; BG *ko 'object marker' (OM); WB ku (<
kaw), 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 ~ *kaw
variation in this set, which ties in with the main deictic (and GM) of Chinese
(below).
3. Lu. kha. Lu. kha 'that (abstract)'; Rw. kha 'side' (tha-kha 'above',
khu-kha 'there' also 'in, into, at, to'); Jg. khan 'they two' (cf. ni 'two');
Thulung (Kiranti; cf. Rai) ka 'ERG' Hayu ka (<ka) 'OM' rather than 'ERG'
(Michailovsky 1981: 157: 'marque d'objet de la troisième personne'); also
kami '3rd' (cf. /m/ 'that!'); Mk. hō (<ka) 'particle indicating that
the utterance is of some special interest for the person spoken to (nang hō
'you there') also, with voicing (and ~ -â): WT go (<ga) '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, pron'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-)*ga 'earthis (STC: No. 97);
Kiranti *ka'; Kadu ka; Jg. ga< ga-n-ga; Rw. ga=ga; CT *-[g, kla
(Chang ka; Moshang ga; Wanche ha); BG *-[g, kla (Garo a, Bodo a,
Dim. ha, Deori ja); Jg. has ga (<ga) 'earth; place, district, country'.
It can be seen that the voiced (g-) allopham 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 ga, which may
well represent the PTB *ga 'st' 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 (<'1st') function; cf. the parallel offered by modern
Burmese ha 'SM'; ha ~ ?a-ja = ra ~?a-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 ra 'place', *sra 'place'; occasion, subject matter' (cited in Matisoff 1974: No. 125); cf. also Gurung -ra (< *-hra < *s-ra) '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; an apparently *g- prefixed form: *g-ra A is represented by Lahu ka 'classifier for places'; Akha A-ga 'where' (with interrogative A-), from PL *gra, with prefix-fusion (Matisoff 1974: Nos. 125, 287 connects Lahu A-ga A with the *r-ga 'earth' root, above, through metathesis).

Chinese 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:

1) 358a ts'jar/ts'ig 'this', from *ts'ey; PTB *tsi, id. (above).
2) 966b ts'ig/ts'ei (loan) 'this', from *tsow or *tsa (the -ig reflex is ambiguous after initial ts-); PTB *ts'ow A: Tsona Monpa ts'o 'this'; Proto- T [amang] (Nepal) *tsu, id. but Lu. so 'that (visible same level)', from *ts'ow A (above). Strangely enough, PT also has *tsa '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' parallelizing *tsi A ~ *ts'ey 'this' (cf. the TB glosses for *tsi A). For AC, at any rate, this line of reconstruction accounts for the competing forms for 'this'.

258 pia/pyi: 'that' (OC also '3rd'), from *-pi; PTB *-pi: Lp. pe 'there, that there (not far) ~ p' there, thither' (pi-ba = pe-ba 'there, just there'); also (a-) pi ~ (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)-ka 'outside'; Mk. (a-)pi (A- 'backside, behind, back, after wards), in the rear, next, last'; cf. also WB ?a-phi ~ ?a-bh' ancer of the 4th [=remote] degree'; also PBL *pi.n B '(comp.) day after the day after tomorrow' (Bradley 1979 cites the form as *pin' 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 25a b b ia/b'iyi 'skin' = 'the outside part'); Lp. (a-)b 'place' (diŋ-b' 'the standing place'); (postp.) in, to; place, direction (more definite than -ba), e.g. (with o < *a 'that') o-ba and (more definite) o-bi 'there, in that place'; also me 'there below', me-ba 'there below (distant)', me-bi 'id. (less distant)'; Gallong bi ~ mi '3rd'; Miri bui, id.; also ba .... ba 'that down there, that downstream'; also mi 'OM' (and occ.) 'GM'; Daffa bo 'he, that down the hill'; also mì '3rd'; Sunwari meko (< *mã-y- 'that' (eko < *y- 'this'); Hayu /mi/ 'that', kõmì '3rd' (see above for k ð-); Bodo bi, Garo bi-a '3rd'; Mk. (p- < *b-1 pi-nĩ ~ mi-nĩ 'today', pe-nĩ ~ me-nĩ 'this year', pe-nãr-me-nãr 'tomorrow' (cf. Jg. mãnãp '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.] 1h s-kia/ki 'final part.' < *s-ki  

604a s-kia/ki 'this; part. [final] < *s-kay  

589b s-kia/ki 'part.' (GSR calls 'cg.' of above) < s-kay  

Cf. 547a kia/ki 'near'; *nearly (→ 'small') < *C-kay  

4438 gian/g'ian 'near' = (this) near (place) < *g'ay-n  

The s-kia/ki pair reflect PST *s-kay, a doublet of *s-kia/ < PST *s-ki (cf. the TB *u-*aw doublet); s-kia/ki 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. g< in 'near') may also have been prefixed (AC k< < *k- and k< < *C-k- but g< < both *g- and *C-g-), hence for *g'ay-n read *(C-)g'ay-n (2) the AC forms largely reflect PST final *-ay 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 *w'ay) (5) the dominant *s-ki-*s-ki doublet reflected by the AC forms invites comparisons with similar forms in TB, e.g. AC s-kia/ki 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 g'u/yu (loan) 'part.' [initial] *gu  

952a kia/gu (loan) 'part.' [final] < *C-kow  

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

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

9535 kia/gu- (loan) 'final part.' < *C-kow  

9761 g'ia/gu: 'final part.' (contra GSR, not irreg.) < *+gow  

962a kia/tsi (loan) 'this; him, her, its, them; genitive and attributive part.' < *skow (palatalized)

止  

915a s-ki/k'ak (loan) 'initial part.; and, but, or else' < *s-k'ak (final -k is *s- reflex)  

866s giak/k'ak 'this, this is; really' < *g'acow (palatalized)  

973a s-ki/gu/si (loan) 'part.' [final non-final] < *s-gow  

304 kwa/kwo (texts) (loan) 'his, her, its, their'  

304 kwa/kwo (inscrs) < *C-kow-s  

305a giwa/g'ow (loan) 'part.' [initial] < *g'ow-s  

305e giwa/g'ow (loan) 'part.' (note basic gloss: 'pass over to; far away')  

255a giwa/g'ow (loan) 'part.' [initial] < *g'ow-n  

237a giwa/g'ow (loan) 'part.' [all slots] < *g'ow-n  

截  

952a kia/gu (loan) 'part.' [final] < *C-kow  

589b s-kia/gu ( loan) 'part.' (GSR calls 'cg.' of above) < s-kay  

Cf. 547a kia/ki 'near'; *nearly (→ 'small') < *C-kay  

4438 g'ian/g'ian 'near' = (this) near (place) < *g'ay-n  

The s-kia/ki pair reflect PST *s-kay, a doublet of *s-kia/ < PST *s-ki (cf. the TB *u-*aw doublet); s-kia/ki 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. g< in 'near') may also have been prefixed (AC k< < *k- and k< < *C-k- but g< < both *g- and *C-g-), hence for *g'ay-n read *(C-)g'ay-n (2) the AC forms largely reflect PST final *-ay 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 *w'ay) (5) the dominant *s-ki-*s-ki doublet reflected by the AC forms invites comparisons with similar forms in TB, e.g. AC s-kia/ki 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.
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- > *skj-) and secondary final -k as one part of the prefixed *s- reflex
(Benedict 1980 and Forthcoming). Interesting allofams of kjawvt/ are
represented by Cant. k*yy '3rd', from an (AC-level) doublet: *k*jwad/- <
*kjawvt+ (unprefixed, before cl. junct. > second. voicing) and Kienyang
(Min) i' 'this', from *s-kjawvt/, with 'softened stop' reflex (Benedict 1976)
(the anticipated *s- prefix doublet); for the final, cf. xi 'tangerine', from
*s-kjw&t; AC 507g kjw&t/kjw&t 'orange'. Fuzhou i, Amoy e (both
on 'low' tone A) 'GM' are probably derivatives of a 'close juncture' (+-) form
of g*ilag/ (Amoy lit. reading: kt). The standard AC forms for '3rd' are pre-
verbal (S) g*ilag/ < *gow, post-verbal (O) skilag/ < *skow and determinant
(G) kjawt < *C-ko(w)-s; the usual determinative particle is skilag/, occasionally
g*ilag/ and rarely kjawt/, 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-*-ay forms,
the deixis is 'this' rather than 'that', but kjawt/- is glossed 'this, that' (Couv.
has reading g*ilag/ 'celui qui' in Shi-jing cit.) and giv*n/: 'far' is a derivative of
'(that) far (place).

[3.] 67 49c kjio/kjwo (loan) 'final part.' < *C-ka
55a 67 507g yuo 'at, on, at side of' (locative) < *ga

64 91a s-gio/siwo: 'where, the place where; quem, quam, quod' < *s-ga

Chinese has reflexes for PST final *-a rather than *-a in the dental-initial
series (below) and the modern (pinyin) suf for 91 reflects an early
(AC-level) *s-ga (dial. 67 shaw < *s-ga+suffix), matching the final in WT
507g 'place'. GSR places 91 in a separate series but the phonetic is
507g a/xiu 'door'; the AC allofams are 60i s-k'jio/xiwo:
(loans) 'a place' (both 91 and 91 are used as loans for the identical s-k'io/xuo:
'sound of hewing' - note the 'sx' in the latter!), from s-kha; 85a
sk'jio/t's'jwo; 'dwell, stay; keep still; *to place' - sk'jio/t's'jwo- (sandhi form)
'a place', also from s-kha (cluster form, with palatalization) and (sandhi form)
-s-kha+ (nominalizing) suffix; GSR places 78a in a separate series (85)
but it belongs under GSR-78 with phonetic (and allofam) 67 k'jio/k's'jio < *ka
(the unprotected form) 'abandoned city, ruins'; *site' < 'place' (the cryptoglyphic
phonetic in both is the 'tiger' - see Benedict 1978); also 67 49c kjio/kjwo
'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
(*ga) ~ *ka, Chinese offers only the modern form: Kienyang (Min) 91, cf.95g
ky2 '3rd', from an early (AC-level) *kio < *C-ga; also, from an early *ka
doublet, Cant. ko 'that' < *C-ka, and ke 'GM' < *kia < *C-ka; (pinyin) zhe
'this' < *tsia- < *skia- < *skia-; note the 'this' ~ 'that' variation even dialectically
in modern Chinese. It seems clear that the -a ~ -a variation in this set must be
reconstructed at the PST level.

The following AC doublet appears to be a derivative of */ga/:
666a 666a s-gie/gie (loan) 'this, this is; really' < *s-gay < *s-ga-i
This pair nicely illustrates the cluster vs. prefix *s- reflexes in AC (note that 952a _KERNEL:952a_is Phonetic in the latter).

The sandhi form (/-) of sgie̱/ 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.) khven-ti (< *khe(n)-< *khay) '3rd'; Limbu khen (< *khe-n) 'that'; 3rd', khé-yó (< *khay-) 'there'; Bahing -ke (< *-kay) 'GM'; Mk. hè (< *kay¹) 'particle indicating that the utterance is made with a special interest for the speaker' (Arlēq mà 'Are you a Mikir?': Arlēq hè 'Yes, of course'); also, with voiced initial, Gallong -ga (< *-gei < *-gay) 'GM'; also Mk. -kè (< *-gay¹) 'suffix indicating emphasis, introducing the topic' (recné-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 *-ā (< *-a), with TB also having an *-i derivative (*day 'that' → 'this', above): WT do (< *dā) 'this' (mainly in comp.: 'tonight', 'today'); also da (< *da) 'now'; (comp.) this (morning, year); coll. 'mark of emphasis', e.g. loŋ da yod jul med 'time da exist silver not-exist' = 'time [I have, it is true, but no money' (Jāschke); Lp. do (< *da or *dā) 'after prn's self'; own; identical, personal, peculiar; the same; even, exactly', a-do '2nd'(hō is basic '2nd' prn.: nó-do 'thou, thyself, is usually used when it is required to give particular emphasis to the person'); Hruso (Aka) da 'habitual present tense marker'; Digarlo (Taying) ta 'now'; C. Monpa dan '3rd' (pl. daši; cf. nan '2nd', pl. naši); dei < *da-i < *da-gi '3rd-ERG' (see above for -gi; cf. nei '2nd-ERG'); also strangely 'added to genitive form to emphasize possession', e.g. uthu giduk ja-a-dei dei pha-si '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 < *[da]¹ 'well, right, okay' (cf. coll. Tib., above): Meitei -da- to 'at' (cf. Bai locative -n, below); Lu. tā < *[da]² 'signifying ownership or possession, also used as a sign of possessive case when not followed by a noun' ('...is mine'): ʁ-tā 'GM (3rd); also ʁ-mā- tā-ʁ-mā?-ʁ tá; id. (see below for ʁ-mā?); La-ho ʁ-thā (< *-ta¹) 'what' (with interrogative ʁ-); Lisu (CL) tha⁴ (< *ta¹) 'here, hit her', the ⁴ 'this', probably from *tam < *ta-ma (see below for parallel ne⁴, je⁴).

In general, the temporal and 'emphatic' aspects of this set stand out; cf. also the Gurung derivatives: dā < *da(1) 'emphatic' (ga-dā....'I certainly....'), from *da-n; dai 'emphatic [final] part.' (nēba dai 'to-cry dāi' = '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. do (< *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 *maj-uj-aj (which parallels the correspondence m-um-um) - Lungchow um and jy are conditioned variants of the same phoneme) Sarawit has *iay (paralleling her *ta) and I think that Li likewise ought to have *tie (paralleling his *ie) not *ii. Here, however, Li was trying to account for the irregular Siamese reflex iwj, which occurs in some words in place of the expected maj.

Finally, for the correspondence uaj-uuj-uj (which parallels the correspondence ua-uu-uu) Sarawit has *uay (paralleling her *ua) and I think that Li likewise ought to have *uei (paralleling 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>Lungchow</th>
<th>Po-ai</th>
<th>Sarawit's</th>
<th>Li's</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>in Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>*ia</td>
<td>*ie</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uai</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>*ua</td>
<td>*ue</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, ii</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>*i:</td>
<td>*i, *iə</td>
<td>14.3.1, 14.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>*i:</td>
<td>*iə</td>
<td>14.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>*u:</td>
<td>*u, *uə</td>
<td>14.5.1, 14.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>14.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>14.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*aə</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*o, *u̯</td>
<td>14.8, 14.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(before dentals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>*e:</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>*a:</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>14.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>*o:</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>14.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table requires four comments:

First, note that in closed syllables, corresponding to Sarawit's long vowels *iː and *uː, 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/i-ə, Li sometimes reconstructs *yː instead of *o. Li posits *yː to account for those words in which Lungchow has ə instead of u, but he says that Lungchow ə is probably conditioned by final dentals so that *yː may be unnecessary.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>Lungchow</th>
<th>Po-aí</th>
<th>Li's Proto-Tai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>smoke</td>
<td>khwan¹</td>
<td>ən²</td>
<td>*γwən A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit</td>
<td>khwan⁵</td>
<td>ən¹</td>
<td>*γwən A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>wan¹</td>
<td>γn²</td>
<td>*γwən A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be</td>
<td>khwan³</td>
<td>həm¹</td>
<td>*γwən C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upside</td>
<td>khum³ (?)</td>
<td>həm¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only one of these words treated by Sarawit is 'day'. We would expect her to reconstruct *γwən A4, but, oddly enough, she has *γwən 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 faj¹ or Lungchow faj² which seem to reflect what Sarawit would write as Proto-Tai *vay A4 and Li would write as Proto-Tai *vai A2, and, on the other hand, such forms as Po-aí fii² 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 *iːy and Li writes it *eːi. 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 *iː and in other dialects it merges with what Sarawit writes as *iː and Li as *i.
suffixed (*-a -i > -a) and re-suffixed ( > qusheng - see above)!
Finally, Cantonese parallels WT in prefixing (original) *a- in the deictic 'this', with anticipated */i/ ~ */ayı/ vocalism: yi ~ nei 'this', from (MC-level) *ţi, regularly from (AC-level) *día < PST-level *a-dıy, 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 101a (loan use) bjlwo/bju (<*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 p3 (<*baB) ~ JC m0 (<*b0B), with corresponding, tonally differentiated final -5 -4 forms (< suffixed *-i; cf. DL t6 - 'this' in Table II) in the roles of genitive (for '3rd') and of deictic ('that'). It is possible that a Sinitic *baA ~ *(a-)baB 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-ninj 'this year', pe-nap 'tomorrow', above); KN *pl[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 *way', represented in TB inter alia by Sherpa (Tib. dial.) clause-final way, Jg. present tense particle we, Lu. sentence-final (ve and, within Loloish, Lahu ve, Akha eu and Lisu rgh3 = y3 , 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 *way (tones are variable) whereas Bradley (1979) has *way for the same particle, agreeing better with forms such as Jg. we and Lu. (ve (contrast Jg. gui, Lu. ui 'dog' < PTB *s-]kway). The *-ay rime will do for Akha (but *-ay can hardly be excluded) and *-ay for Lisu but Lahu ve appears to require an *-an (Matisoff 1973: 15), as shown by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBL</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>Lahu</th>
<th>Akha</th>
<th>Lisu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'hawk'</td>
<td>*dzwan1</td>
<td>tswan</td>
<td>ă-ce</td>
<td>k' aće dze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[part.]</td>
<td>*s-wan1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ve</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'buy'</td>
<td>*way1</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>ă</td>
<td>zeu = zăy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[part.]</td>
<td>*[s-]way2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>eu = ză</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'far'</td>
<td>*w ay2</td>
<td>we:</td>
<td>ă</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[part.]</td>
<td>*-s-way1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefixes *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 Wabo san* < *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: thuí (< *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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Miju</th>
<th>Taruang</th>
<th>Karen (PK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'this'</td>
<td>*an</td>
<td>*a-n</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*əy</td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'that'</td>
<td>*wan &lt; *u-a-n</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*wəy</td>
<td>*u-əy</td>
<td>wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*wəy</td>
<td>*u-əy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'3rd'</td>
<td>*hway &lt; *s-u-a-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Tar. final -e (uncommon), cf. Tar. me 'man' < PTB *r-məy; 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 mwāi, Pwo mè; it appears to be a derivative of */way/ with the PTB stative *m- prefix, with a probable cognate in Lahu mʻ '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 *l-a-u, mirroring *u-a-i, is represented by PK *h(y)əA '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 */way* > AC giwǝr (regular shifts) or giwǝd- (sandhi tone), viewed by sinologists primarily as a copula (see Thurgood 1981) but with pronominal overtones. GSR-575 has 575a šgiwǝr/tswi 'kind of dove' as phonetic but in Yin and early Zhou sources (bone/bronze inscr/texts) used as a loan for the copula sgiwǝr/iwi, also in loan use 575i, later (Classical) 575n and 575o. In the early sources is closely related to cf. 533a giwǝd/iwei- (Serruys 1974: 'usually both considered the same'), probably 'cicada' but here a loan for the unprefix *giwǝr* (tone/sandhi not significant in these loan uses) in view of the prefixed sgiwǝr/. The pronominal dimension of sgiwǝr/ appears in usages such as 739a 'It is the king' or 'He is king' (Serruys: 24). The same scholar (p. 74) points out that the 'regular negation' of 999a is 999a pìwǝg sgiwǝr < *s-aw *s-way (writing the cluster as the earlier prefixed form) whereas that of 503a mǝwǝt giwǝr < *miwos way (the *-s > -t shift is regular), apparently through metanalysis from *miwo s-way (PST *-aw > AC -jwaw -jwaw); cf. 106a, 107a mǝwǝt/mju and 103a [s-]miwo/mju 'not (have) < PST *ma (general negation). The *paw alternative invites comparison with the Tai negative of this general shape (DeLancey, p.c. – see fn. 1): P-Tai *bɔɔjɔɔbuaC (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 (PATT level) being *mpua < *(m)pu-a (PATT suffixed *-a, of uncertain function), hence the *paw can be seen as an early AT (rather than only AT) loan.12

The */way/ thus set up appears to enter into a number of AC forms, incl. (from the same GSR-575 series) 575u šgiwǝr/ziwi 'who' (cited in Thurgood), comparable to the *s(u)- forms of TB (above); also 575v s-giware/swi (loan) 'although', also 'even if it is', this pair showing the typical cluster (palatalized) vs. prefix *s- reflexes. The negatives 579a piwǝr/pywei (cited in Thurgood), 500a piwǝt/piwst and 999a pwǝt/pwst (early reading reflected in all modern dialects) can also be tied into this scheme, although not necessarily in the same fashion, along with 531a miwǝd/ mywej- (loan), analyzable either as a voiced (before close juncture, hence the sandhi tone) form of miwǝt/ or as a sandhi form of 584d miwǝr/ mywej (loan).

There remains for analysis only the /-i/ as pronominal suffix. Under No. 406 (p. 93) STC gives the following: [W]T ǝǝ, Kiranti ǝǝ (Rai, Rungchengbun)-ǝǝ-ka (Waling)-kǝ-ǝ (Rodong) ǝǝ (Limbu), Nung (Rawang) ǝǝ, (W)B ǝǝ, G[aro] ǝǝ 'I', with which must be grouped ǝǝ 'I'; self', and perhaps Khimal kǝ, [u.] (and general Kuki) kǝ 'I'.

PTB ǝǝ (No. 285) is represented by WT ǝǝ 1st (elegant) (cf. suffixed -d in other WT pronominal forms), Jg. ǝǝ 1st; Lu. ǝǝ 1st (with pron's) self' and (below) Mk. ǝǝ-n-ǝǝ 1st; Phom ǝǝ < *ǝǝ, id. (but CT generally *ǝǝ).

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 Karlgen 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 Old/ C[ hinese] (=Classical) forms: S subject ('agentive'); G genitive ('determinant'); O object ('verb affected');
Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>PTB</th>
<th>Pre-AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83a</td>
<td>sgo/iwo</td>
<td>inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976p</td>
<td>sgo/gi</td>
<td>S (~O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>nã/qã</td>
<td>S ~O G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58f</td>
<td>go/kuo</td>
<td>S (emph.) ~G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na</td>
<td>*na</td>
<td>*na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*s-na</td>
<td>*s-na</td>
<td>*s-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na-y</td>
<td>*na-y</td>
<td>*na-y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes on Table V:

Tones not indicated for TB: *naA and *nayA for '1st' but P-Tamang *naB < *s-naA (?)(poss. tonal effect - cf. note on AC nã/s). Usually tone *A also for '2nd' forms but both Lu. and Garo have reflexes for *B, corresponding to the AC tone (-/i) (the tones on loan forms such as kloog/ and klooy/ not significant here), suggesting that the PST tone was *B, with the *A tone forms in TB developed through a class form (for pron's).

Mk. nê < *nayA '1st' (reg. shifts) but nê < *s-na as 'emphatic' form (see Benedict 1980 for *s- > Mk. tone'); similarly, nã as 'emphatic' form of nã < *najA '2nd'.

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-y (velar initials tend to drop in ST in this position), as shown by the BG and CT reflexes; Lu. nã reflects another allofam: *naj (the vowel of WB nã 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 sgo/siog/ doublet arose from 'competing' reflexes for PST final *-a: > -iio after velars but > -iog after dental spirants/affricates (Benedict 1977); note the parallel doubling from the same GSR series (82, 876):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>82g</th>
<th>sgo/iwo</th>
<th>sgo/gi (loan of above character) 'pleased'; note also PTB *s- ga 'chin': Dim. khu-s-ga (khu 'mouth');</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>960a</td>
<td>sgo/gi</td>
<td>id. (phon. in 960f kloog/kilo 'family name', etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Note PST medial */a/ > */ã/ in nãg, paralleling the regular shift: PST final *-a > -iio (after most initials); the Wu dialects have /nug/ '2nd' here (P. Yang, p.c.), reflecting a doublet *nog at the PC level.

AC nãk/ < *s-ã is regular shift (Benedict 1980).

AC hia/ '2nd' is loan use of this character, basically read kloog/nie: (~niar/nie); suggesting an early doublet: njar/ < *ney; an initial [s-] is suggested by the use as phonetic in 3591 shiar/sie: 'seal'; note also that shi is a Shi-Jing loan for 359c njar/nie: 'near'; cf. PTB *ney, id. < PST *ney. The modern (pinyin) p. Cnt. nei '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 *na roots, with or without */a/ (note that in the Khambu subgroup initial *g- yields k-; see STC: 21): *ga ~ *a-[^a]-[^a]-[^a] and even *a-[^na]-[^a] (Waling aŋ-ka); the *a-[^na] prototype also accounts for Garo aŋ '1st'. Bauman (1975) has suggested reconstructing a disyllabic root (*ga[^na]) but this seems unlikely for TB, even for this one division. As Bauman points out, the /na/ and /na/ prominial agreement forms are found precisely in this eastern Himalayan region. It would seem that the independent pronoun *na became specialized as a (verbal suffix) agreement form as pronominalization developed15, with replacement by *ga in the subject position (and similarly for *na '2nd'), resulting in the *ga-[^na] mish mash 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 sglo/ (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 ə: appear. It appears only as an archaism in the Classical (OC) period and thus, oddly enough, never 'competed' with go/ , 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 ( $\overrightarrow{\downarrow}$ ) 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-[^na] ( < *s-[^na]) 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 sglo/ < *s-ga and hša/ < *s-[^a] appears to tie in with P-Tamang *ŋa/ < *s-[^a] and possibly with the *s-[^ay] and *s-[^na] forms set up for (propto-)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[^a] 'ERG' of Hayu (above), with *s- there affixed simply to the *a root. If this is in fact the origin of sglo/, 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 'laping' 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 *-â of the AC form: ŋâ/y (see above), paralleling the shift from -a'n to *-ân (or *-â-n, merged in AC) (STC: fn. 428). Inasmuch as ŋâ/y, unlike sgâo, 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 -yl 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 nâ/y, 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. 964 103a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a 103a 137a 2a '

5. The above analysis of '1st' pronouns in AC/OC finds some support in the '2nd' forms, with ŋâk <*s-âa paired with sgâo/ as representing an earlier ERG-prefixed pronoun. The AC forms in G position were from an underlying */nây/ (see above) but the prominent OC form in this position was ŋâ/y, apparently an early doublet of *ňâr/y: <pre-AC *ney, these forms displaying progressive palatalization from *ňai<*na-í (paralleled in TB - see above). The ŋâ/y: form in the Classical language also 'competed' actively with the ŋâ/y: pronoun in the S position and much has been written on the nature of this distinction. Dobson (1956: 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/y: '1st' and ŋâ/y: '2nd', have survived (the latter in the unpalatalized form - see above) to become the regular pronouns of the modern language: (pinyin) Wọ and N'y.

In review, it now appears that PST possessed a core */l~*/u~*/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 aloofamist, J. Matilsof (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. tsi=chu in Fn. 3, from *cu or *cwa; note also that s- forms are lacking although PTB *su (above) may well have had a deictic origin (PBL *su¹ 'remote 3rd'). In the following table the relatively isolated forms are underlined; see Notes for forms not cited above:
| *h)i (~* - ay) | *h)a | *h)u (~* -ow ~* - aw) |
| *ki ~*gi (~* - ay) | *ka ~*ga (~* - â) | *kow ~*gow (~* - aw) |
| *ti ~*di (~* - ay) | *ta ~*da (~* - â) | *taw ~*daw |
| *ni or *ney | - | *nu or *now |
| *tsi (~* - ey) | *tsa | *tsow |
| *pi ~*bi (~* - ay) | *pa ~*ba | *pu, *paw or *pow |
| *mi (~* - ay) | *ma | *mow |

**Notes:**

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

*taw ~*daw: WB thui <*tawA 'that' (above); cf. also Newari thua 'this' (uə 'that'); Meitei madu <*-d[aw] 'that' (adu = asi = masi 'this'; see above).

*nu or *now: Mpi (Loloish) nu$ (<PBL *nuB) 'that (far)'.

tsa: PT *tsaA '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 r dzas 'thing, matter, object, goods, property' <PTB *(r-)dza(-s); cf. also Gurung sa'e (<*saB) 'thing'.

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

*pu, *paw or *pow: Mk. pu ( < *s-pu) 'ever there, yonder'.

*pa ~*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 -pâ (<*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 ʕ 101a (loan use) b+jwo/b+ju < *baA 'this/that' and both ʕ 101a pjwo/pjju 'amn [male] <*-paA and ʕ 102a b+ jwo/b+ju: < *baB 'father; old man' pjwo/pjju: *C-paB 'honorable second part of personal name', the last three constituting a complex word-family *baB~*baA~*ba (old)male/father' (cf. the initial/tone patterns of the elements).
*ma: the complexities here make the above look like an elementary exercise in aloofamity. 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 unprefix ed forms are considered first, followed by the *s- prefixed:

On the basis of material now at hand, the unprefix ed root: *ma 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. a-ma (<*ma) '3rd (G)', added to the basic PTB *a '3rd'; also a-ma ( <*ma<s>ma-s) '3rd (S/O)', the reconstructed *s probably representing an earlier ERG; note also the strange compounds: a-ma- a-ma- a-ta '3rd (G)' (see above for -ta); also ma 'even, rather', perhaps an earlier emphatic; Lisu (CL) a-ma (<*ma) 'who', with interrogative a5. 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, i.d. (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 *ma < *s-<t-<ma: Gurung ma 'lower down in altitude', Thakali ma-wa 'low'; also the Burmish (excl. WB) deictic: *s-ma: Maru ma (for mma) 'that'; Atsi (Tsaiwa) mma 'that down there'. The KN/Mk./Jg. root of the same shape: *(s)-ma, however, displays a 'frontness' rather than 'downness', with interesting locative/temporal aspects: Lu. hma (<*ma<s>-ma) '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; m-kum hma-sa 'year before last' (with tone sandhi; m-kum 'last year'); Mk. m- (<*ma<s>) 'afterwards, 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.); m-nin m-nin 'next year'; Jg. ma- 'before last' (ma-nin 'year before last'). PBL *s-ma can be set up as a locative (in 'here', 'there', et al.) on the basis of WB -hma, Lisu -ma (<*ma<s>-ma, contrasting with -ma <*ma<s> in 'who', above). The Lisu -ma, however, also functions as a nominalizer, thus nicely tying in with Lahu -ma (<*ma<s>-ma (Mattheson 1973: 'This -ma must have been some sort of nominalizer'); note also Lahu ma 'expressing strong emotion or emphasis' (Mattheson 1965–69). Now PBL also has *s-ma (WB -ma, Lahu ma-, Lisu -ma, '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] 'morpahaned') 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) ʰâ<sup>*</sup>am<sup>B</sup><sup>*</sup>a-ma 'there'; chô 'here' (cf. chi 'this', cited above); cô 'way over there' < <sup>*</sup>am<sup>B</sup> (Lisu ʰû ʰa; cf. Lu. tsu = chu in fn. 3); nô 'up there' < <sup>*</sup>am<sup>B</sup> (Lisu ne<sup>4</sup>; Phunoi has hnc 'that [far]' < <sup>*</sup>s-nam; cf. Gurung nû, Thakali no-wa 'high', from PT *hn [ow]<sup>A</sup> < <sup>*</sup>s-n [ow]<sup>A</sup>); Lahu mû 'down there' < <sup>*</sup>am<sup>B</sup>, to be looked upon as a rare example of a non-redundative auto-allofam, if the above analysis holds: mû < <sup>*</sup>am<sup>B</sup> < <sup>*</sup>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 <sup>*</sup>pa<sup>+</sup>ba and <sup>*</sup>ma elements, where convergence seems to have occurred with the similar 'masculine' and 'feminine'-<sup>*</sup>pa and <sup>*</sup>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'<sup>16</sup> 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<sup>17</sup>.

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-<sup>u</sup>-<sup>j</sup>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 polytrophic TB *<sup>/<sub>s</sub></sup>/ and *<sup>/<sub>n</sub></sup>/ 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 *<sup>/<sub>s</sub></sup>/ and *<sup>/<sub>(k)l</sub></sup>/ 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 *wèi* (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 initial 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 WB[ip-sip]). WB has three or four apparent doublets of this kind, notably ña (< *aA) 'crack open, gape'-ha' (with typical 'creaky tone') 'open the mouth, gape open', with a likely cognate in Hayu hñ (< *ha <*s-a) 'open', but this reflex apparently obtains only on roots with (unmarked) tone *A since PTB *m-)aB 'dumb (mute)' yielded WB ña' < *s-aB (paralleling AC p[f] 805f ñag/ñu: < *s-aB).

It is possible that WB hui represents an earlier *s-uiA < *s-ãwA, 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 man 'future tense marker' has the same rime as sañ; the indicated reconstruction is *mi-n. 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 allofamous Lp. (a-)pyin and WT phy(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. mò 'after(wards)', etc. (text). A similar origin probably also obtains for WB ?am, the earlier 'future tense marker' found in the inscriptions: *s-a-m(i) > ?am (regular reflexes for this double-prefixed form). WT min is of entirely distinct origin: min = ma yin 'fit' not be' (see text for yin).
5. Chinese forms are cited as Archaic Chinese / Middle Chinese, 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 (for affixation) Benedict 1976 bis.

6. GSR isolates this form under 604 but the initial velar can be reconstructed on the basis of the phonetic: ꠐ 1251-1 [sgiwər] /juën 'govern, governor' (banished in GSR to the 'unreconstructables' under 1251-1), which is also the phonetic of the GSR-459 series: ꠜ 459a kiwən/kjue'n 'lord, prince' (allogam 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/ro 'grandmo. -mo's y. sister', rmo-rmo 'mo's mo.' -(dialect) 'mo-in-law' (see Benedict 1942); Lu. mou 'daughter-in-law' (reciprocal term of above); AC ꠌ 947a meq/mou: 'mother'; also PTB *low: Lu. iou 'verbal affix signifying motion towards the speaker', iou-kāl 'come' (kāl 'walk/go'); AC ꠄ 944a ləg/lai (loan) 'come'; PTB *(s-)low: Lu. hlo ( < *s-lo) 'a weed'; AC ꠖ 944j ləg/lai,- 'a kind of weed'; PTB *(s-) low: WB hlu ( < *s-lu) give for a religious purpose'; AC ꠗ 944k ləg/lai- 'give'; PTB *(s-)tsov: WB tsu ( < *s-tsu) 'collect, gather together'; AC ꠘ 942a tseg/ts'ii: '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 -əg reflex for 'this' above and for this PST *kow-əgəw deictic/3rd root, paralleled by the following: WT go-ba 'understand; comprehend; to mean, imagine'; AC ꠕ 973a s-{g}əg/si 'think's-{g}əg/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 ꠫ ꠳ 152k t'ər/nət (loan) 'rich, ample, fine', with ꠳ ꠯ 152a t'ən/t'ən,- as phonetic (see Benedict 1976: 185 - for ꠳t- there, read ꠳d-). The later loan use of this character for the deictic indicates an original (AC-level) ꠳ t'ər rather than ꠳ t'ər (final -r > -ə by the Classical period, along with the ꠳d- > 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[angsas] (STC: Konyak group) *məy (Moshang mai, Yoglī, Nocte, Wancho mi; also Chang mat < *məi+); the PST final for this root yields a basis for the AC doublet: ꠧ ꠨ 457a miən/ miēn 'people' (with 'collective plural' -n).

11. See Serruys 1974 for the extensive literature on this sgiwər/-səwər contrast, all largely vitiated by inadequate reconstructions of the *iwar/, *diwar/ or even *riwar-type for sgiwar/, effectively disguising the nature
of the contrast; also for the analysis of the 533a graph (GSR has 533a graph (GSR has 

gi wǒd/ jǐwei- 'kind of cicada' under 533).

12. For the phonology here see Benedict 1975: 168-70 (tables) and 182 (table). Strangely enough, it is the northern Chinese dialects which show *pəw (< pəw) derivatives in ordinary use (pinyin bə, Yangzhou pəw) while the southern dialects have negative forms descended from the 'original' (< PST) *(s-)miwo form' (Cant., Amoy m, Fuzhou n. This indicates that the main north vs. south dialect split in Chinese, shown here as elsewhere (cf. above for prn's), developed well after the early (AC-level) influence from AT (but P-Min itself must be considered a 'sister' dialect of AC).

13. Additional entries for the Mk. forms sound much like echoes of an earlier pronominal agreement system: nê 'particle to form indefinite prn., put after the prn. or at end of sent.\'; nάj 'particle used in front of vb. emphasizing the vb., but very often like an empty morph'.

14. The s + velar initials for GSR-82 (phon. 82a) and -83 (phon. 83a) are readily reconstructable on the basis of extensive allofamic concatenations (as in '1st' and [text] 'pleased'); as is often the case, GSR conceals the s + velar initials with 976a as phonetic (under 976) simply by placing forms of this kind in a different series: 938, including 938h s-kag/ tāi 'dust' and 938e s-kag/ xyl 'amusement' or under the 'unreconstructables': 976a 938a s-kag/ xyl 'laugh'! As elsewhere (see fn. 11), the alternative reconstructions (for AC) of these pronominal forms with initial j-, d- or r- lead to a dead end for the ST comparativist.

15. Pronominalization impresses as an innovation within TB (northern spread, but cf. fn. 13) despite its significant appearance in Tangut (Hsi-hsia), described as having an 'ergative-type case system' (Foreword by J. Matisoff, translator, in Kepping 1975); Tangut has /pə/ and /na/b both as independent pronouns and as verbal agreement forms. Chinese appears to show no trace of this feature and the very fact of substitution in the 1st person by *(s-)ga throughout the TB/ST area (text) is most readily explained by interpreting pronominalization as (relatively) late - and ergativity as early.

16. In this connection note especially Miju ki 1st'; KN commonly /hi/ forms for 'this' text but Ntenyi also 1st' (poss. tonal diff.); Meitei el 1st'; KN: commonly /i/ forms for 1st' but Lu. has i (<<iÁ) '2nd'; also WT kho 3rd' (text) but kho-bo-kho-mo 1st'; also AC kiwâτ/(text), primarily a 3rd' form but with extensions both to 1st' and to 2nd' (Bodman 1948). Bauman (1975bis: 11ff.) adduces still other 1st' forms (mainly from KN, CT, BG) in an effort to show this 3rd person influencing 1st person' phenomenon but much of his analysis is weakened by faulty phonology; a definitive study of this matter will have to await detailed reconstruction of the KN group, above all.

17. See Benedict: forthcoming bis for details, which involve several different TB and/or ST roots.
Abbreviations

AC Archaic Chinese; AT Austro-Tai; BG Bodo-Garo; BL Burmese-Lolo; C Central; Chp. Chepang; CT Chang-Tangs; DL Da-li; ERG ergative-marker; G genitive (determinant); GM genitive-marker; GSR (see Karlsgren 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 _, falling ^, rising v; note that AC/ MC /æ/ is 'back a'; in GSR the tones are indicated as follows: ping (<,*A) (unmarked), shang (<,*B) by —, and qu (<sandhi tone before close-juncture) by —.
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