

Pronouns in Burmese-Lolo¹

David Bradley

La Trobe University
Melbourne, Australia

Abstract

Various interesting processes of grammaticalisation can be observed in the pronominal systems of the Burmese-Lolo languages. There are many innovative denominal or de-demonstrative pronoun stems. On the whole, third person pronouns are the least stable; this is also true of Tibeto-Burman in general. Diachronically they tend to be derived from demonstratives. Replacement first and second person pronouns are mostly denominal; the first person pronouns tend to belittle the self, while the replacement second person pronouns tend conversely to aggrandise or honour their referent. Reflexive pronouns derive mainly from nouns meaning 'body', with or without other associated pronouns.

A variety of denominal and deverbal suffixes for functions such as plural and case marking have developed, followed by a number of suffix fusion processes leading to the development of paradigmatic oppositions in these languages. Thus, though these languages are usually described as isolating, many of them are becoming less so.

Data is presented on Burmese and its dialects from the earliest attested texts of A.D. 1112, from closely related Burmish languages, from several languages in the three main subgroups of Loloish languages, and from other languages which scholars have claimed to be more or less closely connected to this nucleus within Tibeto-Burman. A new reconstruction of the Burmese-Lolo pronoun system is developed and this is used as a criterion for subgrouping within Burmish, Loloish, Burmese-Lolo and Tibeto-Burman. The resulting subgrouping supports the hypothesis presented in Bradley (1979b) based mainly on lexical and phonological correspondences.

¹ My thanks for comments on a preliminary version of this paper go to Maya Bradley and to Barry Blake; I am also glad to acknowledge the assistance of speakers of a large number of Tibeto-Burman languages who have provided me with data on their languages. Naturally I am solely responsible for all remaining errors.

I. BURMESE PRONOUNS

Burmese is the national language of Burma with some 30 million first language speakers, over ten million second language speakers, and a written history of nearly 900 years. It is one of the many South and Southeast Asian languages with diglossia, having a literary High (also used in some formal spoken contexts) which is distinct from the spoken Low. In Burmese, the differences are mainly in the forms of most noun and verb markers and suffixes, as well as some frequent function words such as the demonstratives; there are also other lexical differences. For details and some examples, see Bradley (1977) and Allott (1985). The literary High is in many cases more conservative, reflecting the earlier language, Old Burmese, as preserved in inscriptions from A.D. 1112. However, apart from the reflexive, these differences are not reflected in pronominal forms.

Old Burmese forms are cited here in a transliteration which probably reflects their early pronunciation; modern Burmese is cited in the transcription described in Bradley (1992). Table 1 shows the earliest and most recent forms.

The current first person pronouns are derived from the word for 'slave' ကျွန် /cun/ plus the royal or respectful suffix တော် /tɔ/ for the male speaker form, and the female suffix မ /má/ for female speakers. These forms first appear in 12th century inscriptions in their literal meaning, 'royal slave', and through a gradual process of bleaching have reached their current meanings. The current second person pronouns, the latest in a long succession of replacements for the originals, are from religious titles: the male form is probably a contracted version of သခင်ဘုရား /θəkhin phəyà/ 'Bodhisattva';² and the female form from the homophonous word /shin/ 'master.' The forms of the disyllabic pronouns vary as shown in Table 2.

² The sporadic loss of the first syllable is paralleled elsewhere; see below. The contraction of the final two syllables into one is more unusual; but compare the corresponding monosyllabic form of this Buddhist loanword in Thai /phráʔ/.

Table 1: Pronominal Forms in Old and Modern Burmese**12th century**

ငါ	ŋa	I
နင်	naŋ	you
အယင်	ʔəyaŋ	he/she/it
+ တိုဝ်	túiw	plural marker
အတိုဝ်	ʔətúiw	we
+ သူ	su	person who (nominaliser)

late 20th century

ကျန်တော်	/cəno/	I (male speaker);
ကျန်မ	/cəmə/	I (female speaker)
ခင်ဗျား	/khəmyà/	you (male speaker);
ရှင်	/shin/	you (female speaker)
သူ	/θu/	he/she (animate referent)
+ တို့	/dó/ (from OB tó)	plural marker
ခွဲ	/dó/	we

Table 2: Modern Spoken Burmese Pronoun Forms

	slow, literary	normal	rapid
1st M sp.	/cundɔ̃/	/cəndɔ̃/	/cənõ/
1st F sp.	/cunmá/	/cəmə/	/cəmə/
2nd M sp.	/khinbyà/	/khəmbyə/	/khəmyə/

An earlier first person form also derived from the noun 'slave' plus a different second syllable is now restricted to rural use and is regarded as slightly impolite. This is ၇၂၂၆ /cɔuʔ/, contracted from ၇၂၆၆၆ /cunnouʔ/ which is also occasionally heard. While the original forms ၇၂ /ŋa/ and ၆၆ /nin/ still do occur, they have become appoggiated, and are used only to very close intimates, to inferiors or as an insult.

The current third person form descends from the nominalising suffix 'one who', also used as an indefinite third person ('whoever') derived from the question word 'who?'. It is still used in these senses in modern literary Burmese. The form for 'who?' in Old Burmese was ဒုဇ္ဈာန ʔəsu, which comprises the most widespread Tibeto-Burman noun-formative prefix and the widespread agentive formative suffix *su. The beginning of the process of development from 'who(ever)' to third person pronoun can be seen from the very first dated inscription, the so-called 'Myazedi'.³ The original third person form ဒုဇ္ဈာန : ʔəyàŋ of inscriptions from the twelfth to the

³ The 'Myazedi' Inscription is so called because one version of it is next to the Myazedi Temple in Pagan. It is in four languages: Burmese, Mon, Pali and Pyu (the language of an earlier Tibeto-Burman kingdom in central Burma). It is also known as the Rajakumar Inscription from the name of the donor who caused it to be written. He was one of the sons of King Kyanzittha (1084-1112), but not the successor to the throne. This is the earliest dated Burmese inscription. Up to the end of Kyanzittha's reign the court literary language used in all inscriptions was Mon; but from 1112 to 1287 (when Pagan was sacked by the Mongols) there were a very large number of stone and ink inscriptions in Old Burmese. Many of these have survived; most relate to religious dedications and contain a great deal of information about life and language in twelfth and thirteenth century Burma.

fifteenth century is no longer used, though it is of course cognate with third person forms in other Burmese-Lolo languages.

The interrogative form ဒုသ္မိ *ʔəsu* is retained (with regular sound changes) in Arakanese. However in standard modern Burmese and some other dialects it is reprefixed with the new question prefix⁴ ဘယ် */bɛ/*, in this and some other interrogatives usually reduced to */bə/*, which is thereby generalised to all question words; for example ဘယ်လောက် */bɛlaʊʔ/* or */bəlaʊʔ* 'how much?' from this prefix plus the verb လောက် */laʊʔ/* 'enough', parallel to ဘယ်သူ */bɛðu/* or */bəðu/* 'who?'. The question words are a fascinating area of grammaticalisation in themselves. In modern spoken Burmese they include forms derived from this innovative ဘယ် */bɛ/* prefix plus noun markers such as ဘယ်လို */bɛlo/* 'how?' from လို */lo/* 'manner'; ဘယ်မှာ */bɛhma/* 'where?' from မှာ */hma/* 'at'; ဘယ်က */bɛɡá/* 'from where?' from က */ká/* 'source'; and ဘယ်ကို */bɛɡo/* 'to where?' from ကို */ko/* 'goal of motion'. Others derive from other form classes, e.g. from the number 'two' */hniʔ/* as in ဘယ်နှစ် */bɛhnə/* 'how many/how much?'; or from verb markers (e.g. ဘယ်တော့ */bɛdó/* 'when [irrealis]?' from တော့ */tó/* '[not] yet'). The modern ဘာ */ba/* 'what?' is a contraction of ဘယ် */bɛ/* plus the noun ဟာ */ha/* 'thing'; the uncontracted form ဘဟာ */bəha/* with the first syllable reduced was already "almost obsolete in ordinary colloquial" by the mid-nineteenth century (Judson 1853:723).

The commonest use of သ္မိ *su* in the earliest Burmese inscriptions is as a verb or clause nominaliser meaning 'the one who (performs the action)',

⁴ Just a century or so ago this could still appear as ဒုဘယ် */ʔəbɛ/*; cf. Judson (1853:79). Thus the word that is now the most frequent form with a voiced bilabial initial in the Burmese lexicon is a recent innovation. At a still earlier stage, it appears to derive from the nasal-initial morpheme မည် *mañ* 'what?' preceded by the prefix ဒု */ʔə/*; *mañ* itself ultimately comes from the verb မည် *mañ* (literary */mi/*, spoken */mɛ/*) 'to be named'. Interestingly, this also provides evidence for the modern */ɛ/* pronunciation of မည် (written "-añ") in spoken Burmese several centuries ago. The development from nasal to stop is not regular here, nor is the development from stop to nasal in the allegro form of the modern spoken 'you' (male speaker); but it is not unusual in high-frequency function words to encounter such irregular sound changes, involving as they do a simplification of articulation (continuing the existing nasalisation of the preceding syllable in 'you', or eliminating it in interrogatives where it is only in one medial segment).

a direct extension of its interrogative use. In the 39-line 'Myazedi' inscription there are fifteen such examples, five with the verb မည် *mañ* 'to be named' meaning 'the one who is named', eight others immediately following another verb, and two which follow a postverbal marker. Two others (lines 6 and 11) appear to be used as resumptive pronouns after long and relatively complex NP's; so while the postverbal use predominates, it is not the only one. Finally, the curse at the end of the inscription⁵ contains the most directly pronominal use, in the sense of 'whoever' or 'someone else' as given below (part of lines 36-39). This can be compared to the similar contrast in Lahu between specified third person and what Matisoff (1973/1982:661) calls 'remote third person; he; they; others', with regularly cognate forms *yô* and *šû*.

- (1) *ṇá* *noṇ* *a* *ṇá* *sa* *laṇṅoṇ*. *ṇá* *mli y*
 I after marker my son if my grandchild
- laṇṅoṇ*. *ṇá* *achuy* *laṇṅoṇ*. *Su* *tac* *thu*
 if my relative if whoever one clf.
- laṇṅoṇ*. *Iy* *púhra* *a* *ṇa* *hlu* *khá*
 if this Bodhisattva marker I dedicate marker
- sú* *kyon* *ahnip* *acak* *teh* *mu*
 one(s) who slave(s) oppression marker do
- mú* *ka, . . .*
 do marker

After me, whosoever, whether he be my son, or grandson, or relative, or any other person, if he oppresses the slaves I have offered to this Bodhisattva, ...

(Taw Sein Ko and Duroiselle 1919:24)

⁵ Most Old Burmese inscriptions record the dedication of slaves, land and goods to a temple; they start with a date, continue with some details of the donor and the occasion of the donation, list (sometimes at great length!) everything given, and end with an exhortation to one's relatives to maintain the temple and a curse on everyone who fails to do so.

In the third line above there is also an example of the use of this form after a clause ending in a verb + marker (hlu khá sú). There are two further examples of the immediately postverbal use of 'one who' in (8) below.

The modern spoken pronominal plural suffix, inscriptional ၵတူဝ်, túi w (modern ၵတူဝ်, pronounced /dó/), was originally voiceless /tó/ and probably derived from the same source as the Loloish *daw³ 'body' used in reflexives; see below. With the nominal formative prefix ဒု ၵ- the form ဒုတူဝ် ၵတူဝ် was used in inscriptions with the meaning 'we' (probably exclusive).⁶ This plural suffix was also occasionally added to nouns in early inscriptions, instead of the alternative inscriptional မျာ mya, modern မျာ: /mjà/ which is the main literary plural form for nouns,⁷ alongside modern spoken တွေ /twe/ ~ /te/. The /tó/ suffix can still be used after nouns to give a collective plural meaning in modern literary style. All pronouns to which this suffix could possibly have been added have a vowel or nasal final, so as soon as juncture voicing became completely regular its only form after pronouns would have become /dó/.

The spoken first plural pronoun provides a typical example of the source of voiced initial obstruents in modern Burmese.⁸ It can often be shown that they derive from the second syllable of an older two-syllable form from which the first syllable has subsequently been lost. If the first syllable ends in a vowel or nasal, the following initial is voiced (especially if it is an

⁶ The form ငါတူဝ် ၵတူဝ် also occurs; in all Burmese-Lolo languages a compound comprising the first person pronoun (< PBL *ṇa⁴) plus the productive plural suffix serves as the first exclusive plural, while another form (typically derived from *ni¹ in the Loloish languages) is used for first inclusive plural.

⁷ This is derived from the homophonous verb meaning 'many'.

⁸ The two most frequent morphemes with voiced obstruents are the question prefix တယ် /be/ (or its reduced form /bə/ and contracted တာ /ba/), discussed above (see footnote 3) and the spoken demonstrative ဒီ /di/ which replaces the literary ဤ /i/ which occurs (with various spellings) from the earliest inscriptions. The intermediate form and probable source of the modern demonstrative form is literary သည် /θi/. This may have developed via an unattested prefixed form ဒုသည် /ṇeṇi/, irregularly giving ဒုတည် /ṇeṇi/ with /θ/ > /ḍ/ > /d/, and finally back-formed but preserving junctural voicing to modern spoken /di/. For other examples of /θ/ > /ḍ/ > /d/ in frequent function words, see obsolete သင်: /θin/ > spoken 3C: /din/ 'that one' (Judson 1853:984) or current literary သည် /θi/ and spoken တယ် /te/ ~ /dɛ/ 'final realis marker'.

unaspirated stop, affricate, or fricative, but also regularly for aspirated obstruents in central Burmese⁹). For example, with loss of the first syllable /ù/ 'head':

- (2) ဦးဆောင် > ဆောင် /ʔùkhàun/ > /gàun/ 'head'
 ဦးချို > ချို /ʔùcho/ > /jo/ 'horn'

While the earliest Burmese inscription, the Rajakumar (dated 1112 AD) provides evidence for voicing in noun compounds such as မင်ကြံ *maṅgri* 'king' + 'big' > 'great king' (lines 15-16), in almost all such cases later spellings show the unvoiced forms instead. Here, the modern form is မင်ကြံ, written /mìncì/ showing the base form of the second element but pronounced /mìnjì/. In a few cases the modern forms have been relexified and thus respelled with a voiced stop initial, otherwise quite rare in Burmese. The modern spelling of the first person plural pronoun, which has lost its first syllable, is ခု, /dó/, which also differentiates it graphically from the homophonous pronominal plural suffix.

A productive suffix which may be added to some non-gender specific pronouns is မ /má/; cognates are also found throughout Tibeto-Burman in the same function. In modern Burmese this suffix is optional but quite infrequent for female referents in the modern third person form သူမ /θumá/ as well as with various current and obsolete second person pronouns such as မင်းမ /mìnmá/. In some forms such as the first person တပည့်တော်မ /təbýédəmə/ 'I' (female speaking to a monk) and ကျန်မ /cəmə/ 'I' (female) it is virtually obligatory.

1) Reflexives in Burmese

Another interesting set of pronominal forms is the reflexives. For a detailed discussion of reflexives in Burmese, see Bradley (1992a). The modern forms are literary မိမိ /mímí/ and spoken ကိုယ် /kó/; more

⁹ This junctural voicing also applies variably to voiceless nasals. The juncture voicing of aspirated obstruents is absent in the Arakanese dialect to the west of central Burmese; all juncture voicing is highly restricted in other peripheral dialects such as Tavoyan, Yaw, Intha, Danu, and Taungyo.

specifically, the spoken direct object reflexive is ကိုယ်ကိုယ် /kókoko/ or $Pró_i + ကိုယ်$ /ko/ (or other noun) + Pro_i ¹⁰. The literary form occurs from the earliest inscriptions, and is of uncertain etymology; the /kókoko/ spoken form comes in gradually, and is derived from the noun 'body'; the *Pró* + *noun* + *Pro* form results from reanalysis of the /kókoko/ form. The spoken forms are unusual in that their components do not undergo junctural voicing.¹¹

This noun 'body' (Old Burmese ကိုဝ် *kuiw*, modern ကိုယ /ko/ and the reflexive derived from it) contains a learned false etymology in its modern spelling, adding a final orthographic *y* based on the unrelated Sanskrit/Pali form *kāya*. The earliest grammaticalised form from this noun was the direct object noun-marker /ko/, spelled without the spurious final *y*. In the modern use as a direct object marker, *kui(w)* is absent from the earliest inscriptions but well-established by 1147. It occurred at first only with animate patients, but by 1169 was occasionally being used with inanimate (noncorporeal) direct objects, and by 1182 with complement clauses and in an allative sense. It has subsequently, as in the undated but early Lokahteikpan inscriptions (Ba Shin 1962), been generalised further to goals in ditransitive or causative constructions as well, and in current spoken Burmese covers all these functions. It is now stylistically undesirable to have more than one /ko/ in a clause, and in normal running discourse few of the direct or indirect objects have /ko/ suffixed to them. Like other such suffixes, it normally voices when the immediately preceding syllable does not end in a stop.

According to the current spelling, the full form /kókoko/ consists of a reflexive possessive pronoun /kó/ followed by the noun /ko/ 'body' and then the direct object marker /ko/ (which normally voices to /go/ and

¹⁰ That is, any pronoun form in its possessive form with creaky tone on the final syllable plus /ko/ or other noun (especially body part nouns), plus the pronoun repeated in full. For discussion of the spelling and analysis of /kókoko/, see Bradley (1992a).

¹¹ While reduplicated nominal forms such as kinship terms like /koko/ 'older brother' also do not voice, the /kókoko/ reflexive is not synchronically a reduplication, even though each of its three components is ultimately derived from the noun 'body'.

produces a creaky tone on the preceding syllable, neither of which happens here). These phonological irregularities, and the reanalysed form with another pronoun in the first and third slots, indicate that this construction should rather be analyzed as possessive (and therefore creaky) reflexive pronoun plus direct object plus a second reflexive pronoun; i.e., an OS rather than the more unmarked SO order. Despite the absence of the usual junctural voicing, this operates as a unit for most speakers, who are not able to pause in the middle as is normally possible between NPs in Burmese. Since)XóXoXo) alone is ambiguous (as shown in Ex. 3) and does not specify the subject, a subject may also be present. If this is another pronoun, it normally follows the reflexive, as in (4); but if it is a noun it may precede or follow, as in (5). Literary equivalents are similar but have မိမိကိုယ် /mímiko/ 'self's body' or optionally မိမိကိုယ့်ကို /mímikógo/ with the direct object (DO) marker present and voiced, creaking the preceding syllable.

- (3) kókoko yaiʔte
 self - DO - self hit + realis
 (Someone, unspecified but probably me unless context
 suggests otherwise) hits himself.
- (4) kókoko cəno yaiʔte
 self - DO - self I (M) hit + realis
 I hit myself.
- (5) a) khələ kókoko kaiʔte
 child self - DO - self bite + realis
- b) kókoko khələ kaiʔte
 self - DO - self child bite + realis
 The child bites itself.

Of course, (4) and (5) could also be expressed with the Pró + /ko/ + Pro construction, as in (6) and (7); (6a) is not ambiguous, so the extra pronoun is not necessary; but some speakers prefer to put one in, as in (6b),

always pausing after the reflexive, perhaps on the model of sentences like (4). Other speakers reject sentences like (6b) as excessively redundant. Almost no speakers will accept sentences like (6c), with the extra subject pronoun first; again, the preference is for OS rather than SO in reflexives. These pronominal reflexives do not occur in literary style. Sentences like (5) with an NP subject are in any case not ambiguous, so the *Pró* + /ko/ + *Pro* construction is not necessary to disambiguate them. Many speakers reject the SO alternative like (7b), but this is not as impossible as the corresponding sentence with pronouns only, (6c).

- (6) a) cənɔ́kocənɔ́ yaiʔtɛ
I - DO - I hit + realis
- b) ʔcənɔ́kocənɔ́ cənɔ́ yaiʔtɛ
I - DO - I I hit + realis
- c) *cənɔ́ cənɔ́kocənɔ́ yaiʔtɛ
I I - DO - I hit + realis
I hit myself.
- (7) a) θúkoθu khələ̀ kaiʔtɛ
he - DO - he child bite + realis
- b) ʔkhələ̀ θúkoθu kaiʔtɛ
child he - DO - he bite + realis
The child bites itself.

The earliest example of a reflexive, which is in the current literary style, is in the Myazedi inscription (part of lines 14-16):

- (8) Thuiw Rájakumar mañ sú pay
that Rajakumar named one who dear
- máya sa mími kiew muy so
wife son selfs body raise one who

maṅgri	klañjo	okmi	rá	ka.
great king	thanks	below	get	(final marker)

The son of the beloved wife, who was called Rajakumar, called to mind the favours of the king who had nurtured him.

(Taw Sein Ko and Duroiselle 1919:25)

Note that the reflexive is the direct object in an embedded clause, showing that reflexives for direct object do continue beyond the clause in which they are subject. This Old Burmese reflexive is more similar to the modern literary form, as is usually the case when modern spoken and written forms differ.

It is often difficult to disentangle the literal from the extended pronominal uses of /kɔ/ in early inscriptions. However, by early modern Burmese /kɔ/ alone could be used as a first or second person pronoun, to which the plural suffix /tɔ́/ > /dɔ́/ could also be added. Judson (1853:203) provides some examples of /kɔ/ used as a second person pronoun to women; Tun Nyein (1906) includes /kɔ/ among his list of second person pronouns. However, in current spoken Burmese /kɔ/ alone is only a first person pronoun, not a second person pronoun; this further illustrates the instability and openness of the Burmese pronominal system. With the royal or respectful suffix ၆၀၁ /tɔ́/, /kɔ́dɔ́/ can be used as a second person pronoun to address superiors—monks and others; this is clearly an extension of the 'body' meaning.

The meaning 'self' for spoken /kɔ/ and literary /mímí/ also occurs in a variety of other constructions; for example the subject intensifier ကိုယ်တိုင် /kɔ́dɔ́in/ which follows the subject, or the ကိုယ် + Noun constructions for beneficiaries like ကိုယ်အတွက် /kɔ́ ʔətweʔ/ 'for oneself, ကိုယ်ဘာသာ /kɔ́phaðə/ 'for one's own sake,' etc. See Bradley (1992a) for further details.

2) Other denominal pronouns in Burmese

Various other archaic or obsolete second person pronouns also have nominal origins. Apart from those already mentioned which contain the word ဂျန် /cun/ 'slave', the most obvious is the form မင်း /mín/ which is derived from the noun 'king'. By the mid-nineteenth century, Judson (1853:768) reported that it was already very much lowered in status, and used only in spoken language between equals or to inferiors; it has now gone out of use altogether. Similarly, the obsolete pronoun မောင်မင်း /maunmín/ or မောင်မင်း, /maunmín/, which was already 'rather imperious or disrespectful' according to Judson (1853:768), is derived from the kinship term /maun/ 'younger brother (female speaker)' plus the noun 'king'; naturally it was used for male second person referents only. The first person pronoun currently used when speaking to monks is တပည့်တော် /təbyédə/, including the noun တပည့်, /təbyé/ 'disciple' plus the royal or respect suffix; its female form (တပည့်တော်မ) was cited above.

Another long-standing but now obsolete form of obscure origin was ဘဇာန် /θin/, already used as a second person pronoun in early inscriptions; it survived into the early twentieth century as a literary form, found in Judson (1853:978) and in Tun Nyein (1906:990). Luce (1981:77) suggests a Tibetan cognate, bžin-bzang 'my dear sir' (lit. 'face-good') but it is the wrong syllable, the verb rather than the noun, that fits phonologically, so the match is quite doubtful. The tone is different but the obsolete pronominal form ဘဇာန်: sàñ /θin/ 'that one' may also belong here,¹² or perhaps it is a contraction of ဘဇာန် + ဘဇာန်: sañ + ?əyàñ /θin + ?əyìn / 'this' + 'he/she'.

Many titles and a variety of kinship terms, in core and extended meanings, are also used in place of first, second or third person pronouns in spoken Burmese. Furthermore, in running discourse pronouns are usually absent since the context makes clear the roles of the participants in the sentence. In the unmarked situation, a statement is understood to have a

¹² I have claimed that this WB demonstrative form ဘဇာန် is cognate to the Lahu 3rd person pronoun ṽṽ (<PLB *zañ²) [Matisoff 1988:1290], though WB ?əyàñ could equally well be the direct cognate of the Lahu form (< PLB *yañ²). [Ed.]

first person subject, and a question to have a second person subject, unless otherwise specified; but context may of course indicate otherwise.

3) Noun markers and pronoun morphology

There is a productive tone sandhi process which links a possessor noun to the following possessed noun, whereby the final syllable of the pronoun or other noun (if not already creaky tone) changes to creaky tone. This process is reflected from the earliest inscriptions to the present; for example the 'Myazedi' lines 36 and 37 has C ၵာ် + various kinship terms, e.g. line 36 C ၵာ် ၵာ် sa 'my son' as shown in (1) above. Also, on the third face of the Lemyethna Pagoda inscription dated 1232, lines 12, 19, 24 and 29 show C ၵာ် ၵာ် ၵာ် kui w 'me' (lit. 'my body'), here ambiguous between Pronoun + DO Marker and Pronoun + Noun—a perfect example of the right environment for a reanalysis! The origin of the /k o/ object suffix from a possessor + possessed Noun Phrase is further substantiated by the productive application of this process before this noun marker.

The early orthographic indication of the creaky tone is a final glottal stop; this and the heavy tone written (if at all at that period) with a final **h** are only very sporadically marked in the earliest inscriptions.¹³ For the three vowels **a**, **i** and **u**, the Indic orthographic distinction of length is redeployed, with short vowels indicating creaky tone, as opposed to long vowels for other non-stopped final tones.¹⁴ However, the writing of this vowel length distinction is not very consistent in the 12th and 13th centuries. Given also the provisional nature of the spelling in most of the earliest Burmese inscriptions, it is difficult to be absolutely certain whether the sandhi creaky tone was already regular and productive in the 12th century, but it appears quite likely.

¹³ This is not too surprising given that the early writers of Burmese would have been Mon speakers, whose language was then non-tonal. Bradley (1982) suggests that the Burmese tones at that period may have included various phonation, duration and vowel quality characteristics which also exist in modern Burmese though they are less prominent than the pitch differences.

¹⁴ Here, the short vowels (with creaky tone in modern Burmese) and the syllables written with a subscript glottal stop are both transliterated with an acute accent over the vowel, the indication of creaky tone in the transcription for modern Burmese used here.

As will be noted below, a similar alternation can be observed in possessive forms of pronouns in several other Burmese-Lolo languages.

Other noun marker forms may also come at the end of the noun phrase, which consists maximally of a relative clause or a demonstrative, the head noun or compound noun with optional suffixes (such as plural), and a quantifier expression consisting of one or more sequences of numeral plus classifier. Various markers have continued in use from the earliest inscriptions to the modern literary High, but most of these have been replaced in the spoken Low. These markers are the topic of Bradley (forthcoming) and will only be briefly noted here. They are summarised in Table 3.

The process and chronology of the replacement of $\text{အ} \text{ a}$ by $\text{ကျိဝ်} \text{ }^{\circ}\text{O}$ ku i w in Old Burmese is a fascinating topic but beyond the scope of this discussion. Other changes involve mainly one-for-one replacement of previously existing markers, with the Old Burmese form still retained in literary Burmese. Some of the elaboration of markers, for example the subject form in modern written Burmese, can perhaps be attributed to the influence of word-by-word calquing of Pali texts; see Okell (1965) for details of this so-called "Nissaya Burmese." The inscriptional example (1) given above contains two examples of the early use of the marker $\text{အ} \text{ a}$, one for an indirect object and one for a temporal, from an inscription of 1112 AD in which the use of $\text{ကျိဝ်} \text{ }^{\circ}\text{O}$ ku i w as a noun marker is not yet established.

What can be noted is that Old Burmese, from its earliest inscriptions, already shows the accusative marking on nouns which is characteristic of Burmese-Lolo languages. There is no evidence of ergativity in Burmese from the beginning of the twelfth century, which is rather inconvenient for those who wish to postulate ergativity as a Tibeto-Burman characteristic.

II. PRONOUNS IN OTHER BURMISH LANGUAGES

The various dialects of Burmese such as Arakanese in the west, Tavoyan in the southeast as well as the smaller subgroups such as Yaw in the

west and Danu, Taungyo and Intha in the northeast all share virtually the same pronoun system. This is doubtless due partly to shared inheritance and partly to continuing influence from standard Burmese. In particular, the dialects all show the innovative use of forms derived from ခု su as the normal third person pronoun. Examples are given in Table 4. Arakanese forms are from Okell (1992a); Intha from Okell (1992b); Taungyo from Yabu (1980) and Yaw from Yabu (1981); gaps indicate forms not present in the available data, not necessarily the absence of a form.

Table 3: Noun Markers: Old Burmese, Written Burmese and Spoken Burmese

	inscriptions (Old Burmese)	written High (in modern pronunciation)	spoken Low
subject	Ø	/θi/	Ø
topic	ka	/ká/	/ká/
possessive	é	/í/	/yé/ or creaky tone
direct object	a, kuiw	/ko/, /à/	/ko/
indirect object	a	/à/	/ko/
allative	a	/θó/	/ko/
locative	hnui k (a), twaj	/hnai?/, /twín/	/hma/
source	hmá	/hmá/	/ká/
comitative	hnaj(?)	/hnín/	/né/

Arakanese and Yaw provide evidence of an earlier Burmese first person form from the prefix ʔə plus the noun 'slave' kywán, modern /cun/. Various doublet forms in Taungyo (underlined in Table 4) show the continuing phonological input of Burmese; Taungyo and Yaw include a number of pronominal forms with earlier or more recent Burmese denominal sources. The lack of junctural voicing in the plural suffix can be

seen in Intha and Taungyo, two northeastern varieties of Burmese. Taungyo in fact has another sandhi development in the initial of the plural suffix, replacing /t/ with /l/ as in /ŋalé/, /nanlé/ or /ninlé/ and /sulé/ or /θulé/; while Arakanese shows its characteristic tendency to replace medial /t/ with /r/, phonetically a flap [ɾ]. Interestingly, Taungyo has an alternative pronoun plural suffix /sé/, not shown in Table 4 and found only with the pronouns not influenced by Burmese phonology: /ŋasé/, /nansé/, and /susé/. The forms in Table 4 are the free forms; as in standard Burmese, the attributive/genitive form has the creaky tone.

While only limited materials are available, it is interesting to note third person forms from two languages of northern Burma collected by Luce and cited in Luce (1985 v.2:57, 106) and Henderson (1986:124). These are Northern Hpun (usually assigned to Burmish) /nò/ and Ganan (usually assigned to Sak /Luish) /nã¹/. These two forms may provide a link with the corresponding third person forms with initial palatal nasals instead of /y/ in some varieties of Lashi and Ngachang, the northernmost Burmish languages, as well as Nungish. The genitive form in Hpun has a glottal stop added to the end of the corresponding pronoun form; see Henderson (1986:124). This is phonetically analogous to its creaked form in Burmese dialects, but does not correspond historically. Luce (1985 v.2:108) indicates that the regular reflex of *Tone 3 in Hpun is high falling, the same as for *Tone 2.¹⁵

The remaining Burmish languages form a subgroup quite separate from *Burmese and its dialects*. Socially they fall into the orbit of the Kachin culture complex (see Bradley in Wurm/ Mühlhäusler 1993) but linguistically their languages are much closer to Burmese than to anything else. Indeed, prior to the descent of the proto-Burmans into the plains of Upper Burma which Luce (1985) estimates at the ninth century A.D., they and the Burmans would have been together in the hills to the northeast of these plains, in what is now the Northern Shan State of Burma and the adjacent areas of westernmost Yunnan in China. They fall into two groups: (southern) Atsi, Maru and Pola; and (northern) Lashi and Ngachang (also known as Achang in China). Within each group there are substantial dialect

¹⁵ See the conclusion for further discussion of the status of this attributive form.

Table 4: Pronouns in Burmese Dialects

	Burmese	Arakanese	Intha	Taungyo	Yaw
'I'	ŋa cundo	ŋa cwendo ʔəcwɛn	ŋa	ŋa	ŋa ʔəcwɛn
'we'	ŋadó	ŋəró	ŋató	ŋaté	ŋədó couʔtó
'you'	nin (mín) khəmyà	nɛn	nɛn	nan/ <u>nin</u> ʔémín	nan mán khəmyà
'you (pl.)'	nindó	nɛnró	nɛntó	nanté/ <u>ninté</u>	nandó mándó khəmyǎdó
'he/she'	θu	θu	shu	su/ <u>θu</u>	θu
'they'	θudó	θuró	shutó	suté/ <u>θuté</u>	θudó
'who?'	bəðu	ʔəθu	phəshu	za lu*	pəðu

* This Taungyo form literally means 'what person?' and can be linked with Arakanese /za/ 'what?' which is also the prefix for all question words in Taungyo and for all except 'who?' in Arakanese. However, Taungyo is spoken to the northeast of the main body of Burmese speakers and Arakanese to the west, so the /za/ form may be residual rather than a shared innovation.

differences; and as different groups live together in the same village and intermarry, there is a lot of bilingualism between these languages and also with Jinghpaw Kachin which is a fairly distantly related Tibeto-Burman language; as well as with Burmese which is much closer. Most of the more than 300,000 speakers of these languages are enumerated as members of the Kachin group in official statistics; and indeed they use the Jinghpaw Kachin language as their medium of literacy. The following table summarises the pronoun forms. Atsi data is from Xu and Xu (1984) and my field notes; Maru data is from Dai and Xu (1983); Pola data is from Dai, Fu and Liu (1985); Lashi and Burma Ngochang forms are from my field notes, with China Ngochang varieties from Dai and Cui (1985). S indicates singular, D indicates dual and P indicates plural; I is inclusive and E is exclusive.

Forms from many other dialects could be cited, but Table 5 shows the basic pattern. The variation often encountered within one of these languages is exemplified by the two sets of Ngochang pronouns, which show extensive phonological and lexical divergence. The duals are nearly all derived from the form for 'two' in each language: Atsi /n^ík/, Maru /n^ák/, Pola /n^ě/; the variety of Ngochang spoken in China has replaced the original word for 'two' with /s^ék/ but retains it in the dual pronoun suffix /hn^ék/; while the innovative form for 'two' is used in duals in Lashi /ʔaⁱk/ and Ngochang from Burma /ø^k/.¹⁶ There are various plural suffixes including the Atsi/Pola/Burma Ngochang forms /móʔ/ /máʔ/ /moʔ/, the Maru/Lashi /n^áuŋ/ /n^úŋ/, found also for first inclusive plural in Atsi, and the Chinese Ngochang /tùʔ/ — the last perhaps to be related to the Burmese plural, the Loloish word for 'body', and the reflexive derived from Burmese-Lolo *daw³ as discussed below. Lashi and Ngochang do not distinguish inclusive vs. exclusive first person forms, nor does Jinghpaw. Atsi has an /ʔí/ inclusive; Maru conflates this plus the first person /ŋð/ into /ŋy^ǔ/; while Pola uses the latter form for a first plural stem along with some unusual combinations (including the first dual inclusive suffix /máʔ/, otherwise plural; and the first plural exclusive /n^ák/). In addition it has an alternative

¹⁶ Other varieties of Ngochang spoken in China have more similar forms for 'two': the Luxi dialect has /ʔá^k/ while the Lianghe dialect has /s^z/, the latter more similar to the 'standard' Ngochang of Longchuan in China.

Table 5: Pronouns in Other Burmish Languages (Subject Forms)

	Atsi	Maru	Pola	Lashi	Ngochang (Burma)	Ngochang (China)
'I'	S	ηó	ηά	ηó	η	ηó
'we'	DI	ηýǎ nák	ηà má?			
'we'	DE	ηó ník	ηà né	ηò aik	ηà øk	ηó hnék
'we'	PI	ηýǎ náun	ηýǎ		ya mò?	
'we'	PE	ηó mó?	ηýǎ nák	ηò núη	ηà mò?	ηó tù?
'you'	S	nán	nǎ	nèη	nèη	núan
'you'	D	nán ník	naun né	nèη ?aik	nèη øk	núan hnék
'you'	P	nán mó?	naun má?	nèη núη	nèη mò?	núan tù?
'he/ she'	S	yaη	yǎ	paη	paη	hpaη
'they'	D	yaη ník	yǎ né	paη ?aik	paη øk	hpaη hnék
'they'	P	yaη mó?	yǎ má?	paη núη	paη mò?	hpaη tù?
'who?'		?ó	khék yàun?	hpaη	hpaη	xáu

dual suffix for second and third person, /t⁵/, which may be related to the Chinese Ngochang /tùʔ/, though the nasalisation suggests otherwise.

The Lashi and Ngochang third person forms with a palatal or palatalised nasal initial instead of /y/ are unexpected; but note the initial /n/ in the Hpun and Ganan forms cited above.¹⁷ The creaky phonation in the Atsi third person form reflects the Burmese-Lolo *ʔə prefix, as does the prefix in Old Burmese and in Loloish languages such as Akha.

III. PRONOUNS IN LOLOISH LANGUAGES

Details will be given of the pronoun systems of three well-described Loloish languages, from the three main branches of Loloish as reconstructed in Bradley (1979b). For Central Loloish the example language is Lahu, with some additional information on Jino, Lisu, and 'Central Yi' Lipo. For Northern Loloish the Shengza variety of Nosu in Sichuan is discussed in detail, with further examples from several more or less closely related languages in China's Yi nationality. For Southern Loloish the main example language is Akha, but some information on cognate forms in related languages is also cited. Unfortunately the data on Bailang, a Loloish language of what is now western Yunnan transcribed into Chinese in the first century A.D. and thus the earliest recorded Tibeto-Burman language, does not include any pronouns.

1) Central Loloish Pronouns

a) Lahu

The best-described modern Burmese-Lolo language is Lahu, largely due to the work of Matisoff in his *grammar* (1973/1982), *dictionary* (1988), and many other publications on Black Lahu. Also relevant are the less extensive dictionary of Lewis (1986) and the study of dialects in Bradley (1979a). Forms are cited here in Matisoff's transcription.

¹⁷ Note also the third person forms in other varieties of Ngochang in China: Luxi /ʔàŋ/, Lianghe /siãŋ/. These forms and the number 'two' cited in footnote 13 above indicate a tendency to change voiceless apical nasals into fricatives in some varieties of Ngochang and Lashi.

The basic pronoun stems are exactly cognate to the earliest Old Burmese pronoun forms; they are first person /ŋà/, second person /nɔ̃/, third person /yô/ and "indefinite, remote or contrastive 3rd person... others; outsiders; ... somebody else" (Matisoff 1988:1189) /ʃu/. To the first three but not to /ʃu/ the plural suffix /hɨ/ can be added. The stem forms may occur alone, and do not show any tonal alternations, unlike the pronouns in most other Burmese-Lolo languages.¹⁸ The restriction against adding a suffix to /ʃu/ reflects its separate status; in most other Loloish languages this etymon serves as a nominalising suffix similar to its most frequent use in Old Burmese as described above. Its shift into the pronoun system in Lahu is less complete than in Burmese where it can take pronominal suffixes and has now completely replaced the earlier third person form still reflected in Lahu /yô/. The Lahu interrogative pronoun a-ʃu 'who' is a parallel formation to Old Burmese ʔəsu.

Matisoff indicates that there is no inclusive-exclusive first person dual or plural contrast in the variety of Black Lahu which he describes, though the forms which indicate this contrast in other dialects do occur. Lewis (1986:252, 258) suggests that this distinction exists in some varieties of Black Lahu but is not absolute. In other dialects such as Red Lahu, Lahu Shehleh, and Yellow Lahu there is such a contrast. The Black Lahu forms which correspond to the exclusive forms are, as usual in Loloish, the forms derived from /ŋà/, while the inclusive has the stem /nɨ/ or variably /nɨ̃/ which may be followed by up to two suffixes. The inclusive form is /nɨ̃/ in Red Lahu and Lahu Shehleh, and /nɨ/ in several Yellow Lahu dialects, as described in Bradley (1979a); it would be tempting to relate this form to the number '2' /nɨ̃/, but the tone and rhyme do not correspond. An unambiguous way of indicating inclusivity in any type of Lahu is to conjoin the second and first person pronouns, giving /nɔ̃ŋàhɨ̃/ 'we (inclusive plural)' (lit. 'you-I-plural').

¹⁸ There is one marginal exception to this tonal stability. When ŋà and nɔ̃ are used possessively, without the genitive particle ve, they are often pronounced with a glottal stop: ŋà-ʔ e 'my mother', nɔ̃-ʔ pa 'your father'. This phenomenon, analogous to Burmese "possessive creaky tone", was not mentioned in Matisoff 1973, but see Matisoff 1988:425, 793. [Ed.]

There is a very wide range of dual forms which are summarised in Table 6. Some of these involve contractions of three syllables into two; some involve tone sandhi affecting the suffixes. In a few cases this sandhi differs among Black Lahu dialects: e.g. the plural suffix /hĩ/ has a rising tone in three-syllable duals in the variety described by Lewis but not in that described by Matisoff.¹⁹ Forms are also cited in Yellow Lahu (Banlan) from Bradley (1979a).

Table 6: Dual pronouns in Lahu

	Black Lahu	Yellow Lahu
1 Excl.	ṇàhĩnè, ṇàné ṇàhĩmà, ṇàhĩmà, ṇàmá nèhá, nèá nèmá	ni hi mà
1 Incl.	nìhĩmà, nìhĩmà, nìmá nìhá nìhĩnè, nìné	ò nà
2	nòhĩmà, nòhĩmà nòhĩnè, nòhĩnè	nò mà
3	yôhĩmà, yôhĩmà yôhĩnè, yôhĩnè	i mà

As can be seen, there are several ways of forming the Black Lahu duals. One is by adding dual suffixes /nè/ or /mà/ to the plural form; speakers suggest that the /mà/ form is more formal, while the /nè/ form is more colloquial. In the first person these three-syllable forms can be contracted to two syllables by omitting the plural suffix and changing the dual suffix to

¹⁹ See the entry hĩ 'dualizer' in Matisoff 1988:1105. [Ed.]

high rising tone. Another variant uses an apparently bound first person exclusive stem /nè/ plus a suffix /há/ or /má/; this may be related to the general dual suffix, which could perhaps be further connected with the number 'two' /nî/, though the tone and rhyme do not correspond. On the other hand, this bound stem is also found in a first person exclusive plural form /néhɛ/ so it is not exclusively dual in meaning as a first person form. Yellow Lahu provides further evidence for the /mà/ dual; perhaps the second syllable of /ð nà/ 'first dual inclusive' contains a contraction of /nî/ 'first inclusive plural' plus /mà/ 'dual'.

Lahu has two reflexive constructions; one, parallel to that in Burmese and several other languages, is Pronoun + /qhâ/ + Pronoun; the two pronouns must be identical in Black Lahu; for details of this reflexive in Yellow Lahu see Bradley (1992a). Another way of forming the reflexive in Lahu is to suffix the noun /ð-to/ 'body' to the pronoun, which may have a suffix, as in (9):

(9)	ɲà-hɛ	ve	ð-to	dàʔ	tù	ve	ð-lɔ
	we (E)	GEN	body	good	PURP	REL	thing
	thàʔ	ǰa	ʃī	ve	yò		
	Acc	must	know	Pf	Pf		

We must know what to do in order to make ourselves good.

(Matisoff 1988:167)

While Matisoff provides a convincing Shan/Dai source²⁰ for the Lahu noun 'body', there is growing evidence for a Burmese-Lolo form *daw³ 'body' in a number of languages, many but not all in close contact with Dai languages. If this is indeed a Burmese-Lolo etymon, it shows rhyme irregularities in several languages and was at least influenced by the similar Dai word. For further discussion see Bradley (1992a).

²⁰ The corresponding Thai form is /tua/, which also figures in the Thai reflexive /tuaʔeeŋ/, literally 'one's own body'.

b) Lisu and Lipo Pronouns

Lisu is spoken by about 850,000 people, mainly in northwestern and western Yunnan in China, with large numbers in NE Burma and some in N Thailand and NE India. It has several dialects; the two main ones, Northern and Central, are described in Bradley (ed.) (1992b). Hope (1993) describes Southern Lisu, and Metcalf (1993) describes what is sometimes called Eastern Lisu. The latter is more usually known as Lipo or Lolopo and is rather different from the other dialects; in China it is now classified as Central Yi, with several hundred thousand speakers in N Central Yunnan. Forms are given in Table 7 from the Northern dialect (data from Bradley [ed.] 1992b) and Lipo (data from Metcalf 1993).

Table 7: Lisu and Lipo pronouns

	Lisu		
	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>
<i>Singular</i>	ŋwa ⁴⁴	nu ³³	yɪ ⁵⁵
<i>Plural</i>			
<i>inclusive</i>	yo ²¹		
<i>exclusive</i>	ŋwa ⁴⁴ nu ²¹	nu ³³ wa ²¹	yɪ ⁵⁵ wa ²¹
	Lipo		
	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>
<i>Singular</i>	ŋɔ ³³	ni ³³	ya ²¹
<i>Plural</i>			
<i>inclusive</i>	ʔa ²¹ ni ⁵⁵		
<i>exclusive</i>	ŋɔ ³³ vɛ ³³	ni ³³ vɛ ³³	ya ²¹ vɛ ³³

Duals can be formed by adding Lisu or Lipo /ni²¹ yo³³/ 'two + human classifier' after the singular or plural form. The dialects show different plural suffixes: northern Lipo has /bu³³/, which forms noun plurals as well, and eastern Lipo has /tʰɔ³³/ . The plural in Lisu has several forms:

first exclusive /nu²¹/ vs. second and third person /wa²¹/; the first inclusive may add the noun plural marker /bu³³/ which does not occur with other pronouns and indicates the denominal origin of this pronoun.

As in other Loloish languages cited below, Lisu has separate possessive forms for the singular pronouns: /ŋwa³⁵/ 'my', /na³⁵/ 'your' and /ye⁵⁵/ 'his/her', implying a fused high tone possessive marker /a⁵⁵/ which lowers and unrounds high vowels. There are alternative tonal forms for 'my' /ŋwa³³/ and 'your' /na²¹/ suggesting a lowering tone for this putative marker.

Lipo /ʔa²¹se²¹/ is used both for 'who?' and also as an indefinite pronoun 'whoever'; Lisu has innovative /ʔa²¹ma³³/ for 'who?' but still uses /su³³/ as an indefinite pronoun. Lipo /se²¹/ and Lisu /su³³/ are both productively used as a verb nominaliser, 'one who'. The reflexive in Lisu is innovative /tɕi⁵⁵tɕhɛ²¹/ from a noun 'self'; in Lipo reflexive pronouns are formed by Pronoun + /mɛ⁵⁵/ + Pronoun, for example /ya²¹mɛ⁵⁵ya²¹/ 'him/herself'. In general, Lisu shows innovative forms but Lipo retains a number of cognates, as for 'first plural inclusive' and 'who?'; but both also share a number of retained Loloish forms such as Lisu /wa²¹/ and Lipo /vɛ³³/ 'pluralizer of pronouns'.

A very limited amount of Lalaw data is provided in Chen et al. (1985:199, 274) which tentatively suggests that it too is Central Loloish, as do other lexical considerations. The third person pronoun is /u³³/, related to the general Burmese-Lolo form and thus not to the innovative forms in Northern Loloish (Nosu, Nasu, Nisu and Sani) as discussed below.

c) Jino Pronouns

The Jino are China's most recently recognised nationality; they now number about 18,000 and are concentrated in a small area of SW Yunnan just west of the northern tip of Laos. Despite this small number, there are fairly large internal dialect differences noted in the standard description of Gai (1986). The main dialect, spoken by about 90% of the Jino, has the pronoun forms shown in Table 8 (Gai 1986:46).

The dual suffix is identical to the number /hn⁵⁵/ 'two', while the first and second plural suffix can be related to the Lahu, Lisu, Lipo and other suffixes with this function. For this third person plural suffix, see also Burmish (above) as well as Akha, Hani and possibly Mpi (below). The nonsingular third person bound form /zo⁴²/ appears to be the cognate, while the innovative /k^hə⁴²/ may provide a link to similar forms in Nisu ('Southern Yi') and Sani ('Southeastern Yi').

Table 8: Jino pronouns

	First	Second	Third
Singular	ŋɔ ⁴²	nə ⁴²	k ^h ə ⁴²
Dual	ɑ ³³ hn ⁵⁵	ni ⁵⁵ hn ⁵⁵	zo ⁴² hn ⁵⁵ /k ^h ə ⁴² hn ⁵⁵
Plural			
inclusive	ŋu ⁵⁵ vɯ ³³		
exclusive	ŋɑ ⁵⁵ vɯ ³³	ni ⁵⁵ vɯ ³³	zo ⁴² hma ⁵⁵ /k ^h ə ⁴² hma ⁵⁵

Jino has a range of fused pronoun forms. For object forms, the singulars are /ŋɔ³⁵/ 'me', /nɑ³⁵/ 'you (O)' and /k^hə³⁵/ 'him/her'; the duals add a suffix /nɑ³³/ (with the /n/ presumably coming from the preceding syllable with its syllabic nasal); and the plurals add /ɑ³³/. The possessive forms for the first person singular include /ŋɔ³⁵/, /ŋu i³³/, /ŋuɑ³⁵/ and the partly fused /ŋuɛ³⁵/ 'my', while the second and third are the fused /nɛ³⁵/ 'your' and partly fused /k^hə⁴²ɛ⁵⁵/ 'his/her'. The dual possessives add a /nɛ⁵⁵/ suffix (again presumably the /n/ is inserted), while the plural possessives fuse the suffixes /vɯ³³/ and /hma⁵⁵/ with /ɛ⁵⁵/ to /vɛ⁵⁵/ and /hme⁵⁵/ respectively.

Jino may add these suffixes to the remote 3rd person pronoun /su⁴²/, e.g. the plural /su⁴²hma⁵⁵/ 'those other people' (Gai 1986:167), as in Burmese but not elsewhere in Loloish (see above). The same morpheme also occurs in the question word 'who?' /k^hɔ³³su⁴²/ with the generalised Jino question prefix /k^hɔ³³/, /k^hɔ⁴⁴/ (or various fusions cognate with the Lahu

interrogative /q̥hà/).²¹ Like Lahu, Jino has a likely cognate of *daw³ in its reflexive /kʰɔ⁴⁴tɔ³³/.

In summary, the Central Loloish pronouns present a coherent system with various parallels of grammaticalisation. Lahu does not show much sandhi affecting the pronoun stems; other languages, as well as Lahu, do have tone sandhi with certain suffixes; Lisu has some sandhi with the stems, while Jino has a great deal, both in pronouns and in other forms.

2) Northern Loloish Pronouns

a) Nosu

In China the Yi nationality of some 6.6 million was established after 1950, from various groups formerly called by the pejorative name *Lolo*. It comprises six separate subgroups, each speaking distinct languages. For more details see Bradley (1986, 1987). *Central Yi* includes Lipo and Lolopo; it is in fact very closely related to Lisu and is thus Central Loloish. *Western Yi*, including Lalaw and several other subgroups, is also fairly close to Central Loloish. The remaining four subgroups all had related but distinct traditional writing systems; the *Northern Yi* (who call themselves Nosu) and the *Eastern Yi* (most of whom call themselves Nasu) are quite closely related but each has substantial internal diversity. More distant are the *Southern Yi*, many of whom call themselves Nisu, and the *Southeastern Yi* which includes Sani, Axi (Ahsi, Ahi) and some other groups. A few Southern Yi also live in Vietnam.

The largest 'Yi' group is the Nosu of Sichuan and northern Yunnan, with over two million speakers, a large number of whom are monolingual. The Nosu pronominal forms in Table 9 are cited from the Shengza dialect, centred on Xide in southern Sichuan, from Chen et al. (1985:120).

The dual suffix is clearly related to the numeral 'two' /ɲi²¹/ but with tone sandhi. The plural suffix [ɣɔ⁴⁴], probably underlyingly /ɣɔ²¹/, usually

²¹ In Lahu this prefix only occurs with non-pronominal interrogatives, and not with the two subject pronominals 'who?' and 'what?', but in Jino it does. Other Loloish languages that show *k [kʰ] are Mpi and closely related Piyo, as well as Haoni and sometimes (with dialect variation) Akha (all Southern Loloish); also some Northern Loloish languages such as Nosu.

fuses with the preceding pronominal stem (which has already shown vowel harmony to the suffix; perhaps it is now doubly suffixed and has already fused once) and this one syllable has the vowel /o/ and low tone. As in some

Table 9: Nosu pronouns

	First	Second	Third
Singular	ŋa ³³	nu ³³	tshz ³³
Dual	ŋa ²¹ ŋi ⁵⁵	nu ³³ ŋi ⁵⁵	tshz ²¹ ŋi ⁵⁵
Plural			
inclusive	ni ⁵⁵ ŋo ²¹		
exclusive	ŋo ²¹ ɣo ⁴⁴ /ŋo ²¹	no ²¹ ɣo ⁴⁴ /nu ²¹	tsho ³³ ɣo ⁴⁴ /tsho ²¹

Central and Southern Loloish languages, there are separate possessive/attributive forms for the singular pronouns: /ŋa⁵⁵/ 'my', /ni⁵⁵/ 'your S', /tshz²¹/ 'his/her'. The inclusive form is a transparent compound of 'you' in the attributive form plus 'we' in the fused plural form. The reflexive is a reduplication of this attributive form, singular /ŋa⁵⁵ŋa⁵⁵/ 'myself', /ni⁵⁵ni⁵⁵/ 'yourself', and with 21 > 44 sandhi /tshz²¹tshz⁴⁴/ 'him/herself', while the plural is a reduplicated form of the fused one-syllable plural with a sandhi tone on the second syllable.²² Another more general reflexive is /tsz⁵⁵tɕɛ³³/, relatable perhaps to Chinese /zìjǐ/.

'Who?' is /kha⁴⁴di³³/, with the first syllable reflecting the *ka form of the question word prefix as seen in some forms in Lahu and Jino (Central Loloish) and Akha (Southern Loloish), etc. The second syllable is a total innovation, as in several other Nosu question words. The nominalising suffix is /su³³/ as seen in the name for this group which literally means 'those who are black',²³ while the indefinite third person pronoun 'whoever' is /su⁵⁵tsho³³/ which adds the noun 'person' and alters the tone of what is normally a suffix, or just /su³³/.

²² There are several sandhi processes by which mid or low tones in Nosu change to the 44 tone; see Bradley (1990) for more details.

²³ The 'black bone' Nosu are the aristocrats, of relatively pure Nosu descent.

b) Other Northern Loloish pronoun systems

Pronouns in a variety of languages are cited from my field notes on Northern Yinuo, Sondi and Adur, Eastern Samei, Southeastern Axi and Azhe, and Southern Nisu; other forms are cited from the Yi Historical Documents Section (1984) which includes five varieties of Eastern Yi (three from Guizhou, one from northern Yunnan and one from Guangxi), one of Southern Yi, as well as Sani and Nosu; from the Yunnan Nationalities Language Commission (1983) which provides data on 28 varieties of Yi (7 Eastern, 5 Southern, 4 Southeastern, 3 Western, 2 Northern and one Central variety, as well as six further dialects which do not fit well into this classification). Another source is the work by the Guizhou Yi Studies Research Committee (1991) which cites four varieties including Panxian.

The northernmost subvarieties of Northern Yi are Yinuo and Lindimu; their pronominal systems are virtually the same as that of Shengza, apart from some differences in tone sandhi. However the two southern varieties of Northern Yi, Sondi and Adur, have a first plural inclusive form /a³³sz⁵⁵/ which has cognates in Central Loloish Lipo as well as Eastern and Southeastern Yi.

Eastern Yi is extremely widespread and probably covers much of the traditional territory of the Northern Loloish group. This includes north central and northeastern Yunnan and western Guizhou. Indeed Eastern Yi dialects were probably the local language of the Kunming area, the capital of Yunnan, prior to the influx of the Chinese more than a millennium ago, and some remnant communities survive. The most divergent variety is spoken in southwestern Guizhou around Panxian. See Table 10.

The main innovation in this paradigm is the third person form, which may be connected to Chinese /tā/, to a former demonstrative form, or both. The plural markers are diverse. In most Guizhou varieties we find /xə³³/, a cognate of the general Loloish pronoun pluralizer; but in Panxian there is instead a form /bu²¹/ which can be linked with northern Lipo and the Lisu/Lipo noun plural, with the Nisu pronoun plural, and possibly the Zaozou first/third plural suffix. The typical Northern Loloish first inclusive form is present. The 'Hei Yi' plural forms are fusional; this is also true of the second

Table 10: Nasu (Eastern Yi) pronouns

Yunnan (Luquan), 'Hei Yi'				Guizhou (Dafang)		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
Singular	ŋo ²¹	na ³³	thi ²¹	ŋu ²¹	na ²¹	thi ²¹
Plural						
inclusive	a ⁵⁵ se ⁵⁵			ʔa ³³ ci ⁵⁵		
exclusive	ŋeɿ ⁵⁵	neɿ ⁵⁵	teɿ ⁵⁵	ŋu ²¹ xə ³³	na ²¹ xə ³³	thi ²¹ xə ³³

Guizhou (Panxian)				Guangxi (Longlin)		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
Singular	ŋu ²¹	na ²¹	thi ²¹	ŋu ²¹	na ²¹	thə ³³
Plural						
inclusive	a ²¹ ce ⁵⁵					
exclusive	nu ²¹ bu ²¹	no ²¹ bu ²¹	tə ²¹ bu ²¹	tɕhi ⁵⁵	nu ³³	thə ³³ ya ²¹

Table 11: Nisu pronouns

Xinping			Shuangbo			
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
Singular	ŋo ²¹	na ²¹	kə ⁵⁵	ŋo ²¹	no ²¹	kə ⁵⁵
Plural	ŋ ³³ bə ²¹	na ³³ bə ²¹	kə ²¹ bə ²¹	ʔu ³³ bə ²¹	na ³³ bə ²¹	kə ⁵⁵ bə ²¹

plural in the variety spoken in Guangxi, which has an innovative first plural exclusive and another form of the usual plural suffix on its third plural form.

Nasu has the nominalising suffix /su³³/ or /su²¹/, for example in the group's own name. In the indefinite pronominal usage this has been replaced in some Guizhou varieties: Dafang /p^ha³³dw⁵⁵/, Panxian /p^ha³³da³³/ (but Weining and some others retain /su²¹/ in this use). The question form 'who?' has a different rhyme, perhaps due to fusion in the question word: Luquan /a²¹se³³/, Dafang /a²¹ɕi³³/, Panxian /a²¹se³³/ and Guangxi /k^hə³³zu²¹/, the latter form containing the velar question prefix also seen occasionally elsewhere and showing medial sandhi voicing. Available reflexive forms, Dafang /tsz⁵⁵tɕi²¹/ and Panxian /tsz⁵⁵tsa³³/, look similar to their Nosu (and Chinese) equivalents.

For Nisu or Southern Yi, I use my own field data²⁴ on the variety spoken at Xinning, and the Yi Historical Documents Section (1984) material for the Shuangbo dialect. There is no first person inclusive/exclusive distinction and no category of dual in Nisu. See Table 11.

The Nisu /bə²¹/ plural suffix can be related to similar morphemes in Panxian Nasu, dialects of Lipo, and Lisu. As in most Burmese-Lolo languages, the pronoun plural stems are distinct from the singulars, and more morphologised than the noun plurals (which are also much less frequent than the corresponding pronoun plurals).

Like other Northern Loloish languages, Nisu has the nominaliser suffix, Xinning /su³³/, Shuangbo /sɔ²¹/, also used as an indefinite pronoun and in the word for 'who?', Xinning /a²¹su³³/ and Shuangbo /a²¹sɔ³³/ . The latter /sɔ³³/ shows the difference in tonal reflexes often seen in two-syllable words in Northern Loloish, due to earlier tone sandhi processes; for some discussion of this in Nosu see Bradley (1979b:214, 1990). The Shuangbo reflexive /ʔa⁵⁵mə³³/ can be directly compared to literary Burmese, Lipo and one of the Sani forms cited below (Table 12).

²⁴ I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Li Yongxiang, the speaker from whom the data was collected.

Sani ('Southeastern Yi') pronoun forms are cited from Jin, et al. (1984). Bradley (1979b) suggested that Sani and other Southeastern Yi languages are Central Loloish rather than Northern Loloish, but the pronoun forms do not support this subgrouping.

Table 12: Sani pronouns

	First	Second	Third
Singular	$\eta\upsilon^{33}/\zeta\circ^{55}$	$n\text{I}^{33}/n\text{I}^{55}$	$t^h\text{u}^{55}/k^h\text{I}^{33}$
Dual			
inclusive	$\text{A}^{21}\text{s}\text{i}^{55}n\text{i}^{21}m\text{v}^{33}$		
exclusive	$\eta\upsilon^{21}n\text{i}^{21}m\text{v}^{33}$	$n\text{I}^{33}\eta\upsilon^{33}/$ $n\upsilon^{21}n\text{i}^{21}m\text{v}^{33}$	$k^h\text{I}^{33}\text{s}\text{i}^{21}n\text{i}^{21}m\text{v}^{33}$
Plural			
inclusive	$\text{A}^{21}\text{s}\text{i}^{55}$		
exclusive	$\eta\upsilon^{21}$	$\eta\upsilon^{21}/\eta\upsilon^{21}z\text{i}^{33}$	$k^h\text{I}^{33}\text{s}\text{i}^{21}$

The $/t^h\text{u}^{55}/$ third person form, though innovative as far as Loloish goes, is archaic and literary in Sani; it can be linked with the Nasu (Eastern Yi) forms. The modern third person form $/k^h\text{I}^{33}/$ also means 'that' and is obviously recently derived from that demonstrative; this etymon is shared by Sani and the Nisu (Southern Yi) forms. The dual forms mostly contain 'two' $/n\text{i}^{21}/$ plus the general classifier $/m\text{v}^{33}/$; the sole exception is the anomalous $/n\text{I}^{33}\eta\upsilon^{33}/$ 'you two' which appears to contain the first person pronoun as its second syllable. Possessives are formed by adding $/\text{y}\text{v}^{33}/$ which as in Lahu does not change the tone of the preceding pronoun.

The nominaliser for verbs and the third person remote or indefinite pronoun 'whoever' in Sani is $/s\text{i}^{33}/$, while 'who?' is $/\text{A}^{21}\text{s}\text{v}^{33}/$; both may be derived from the Burmese-Lolo form with these meanings, but the rhyme

for 'who?' is irregular and may thus reflect the fusion of a suffix, thus paralleling several other Sani question words by ending in /ɔ/. The reflexive pronoun is /ɛ²¹me⁵⁵/, cognate with the literary Burmese form, or Pronoun + /tu³³tu³³/; the latter including the morpheme /tu³³/ that is cognate with reflexives in other Loloish languages (< PLB 'body' *daw³). Other Southeastern Yi languages such as Axi, Azhe and Azha all have the same distinction between first plural inclusive and exclusive, with the first person pronoun plus plural suffix for exclusive, and a cognate to Sani /A²¹si⁵⁵/ for the inclusive: Axi /A³³si⁵⁵/ and Azhe /A²¹sɛ⁵⁵/.

In summary, the Northern Loloish languages have replaced the Burmese-Lolo third person pronoun; but with three independent forms, all possibly from demonstratives: Southern and Southeastern with a velar initial, Northern with /ts^h/ initial, and Eastern and earlier Southeastern with a voiceless alveolar initial, usually aspirated and possibly influenced by Chinese (Mand. /t̃/). All four Northern Loloish subgroups share the retained nominalising suffix derived from *su¹, though several have changed it by fusion in 'who?' and 'whoever'; and most share an innovative two-syllable first plural inclusive form like /a³³si⁵⁵/.

3) Southern Loloish Pronouns

a) Akha

Akha is spoken by a population approaching 600,000 in Burma, southwestern Yunnan in China, northern Laos and northern Thailand. In China they form part of the composite Hani nationality, which has another million people including some 700,000 who speak extremely similar Hani dialects or other closely related varieties such as Haoni, and another 300,000 or so who speak other Southern Loloish languages such as Khatu (Chinese Kaduo), Piyo (Chinese Biyue), or Mpi (in Thailand).

The pronoun forms in Akha are given in the following table; the main source is Lewis (1989).²⁵

²⁵ The transcription is derived from that used in China, and indicates creaky syllables with an underline, high tone with an acute, and low tone with a grave accent.

Table 13: Akha pronouns

	1st	2nd	3rd (present)	3rd (absent)
Singular	ŋá	nó	à ỳ	à ha
Dual				
inclusive	á/à (dw)ṇà			
exclusive	ŋa ṇà	nɔ ṇà	à(ỳ)ṇà	à ha ṇà
Plural				
inclusive	á/à dw(mà)			
exclusive	ŋa mà	nɔ mà	à ỳ mà	à ha mà

The above third person forms are used only for animates; there is also an animate third person remote, /à c̀/, which functions somewhat like Lahu /šu/ or Burmese /θu/ in this sense; like them, it does not take dual or plural suffixes. Inanimates are referred to by demonstrative-plus-classifier or numeral-plus-classifier, not by pronouns.

Tonal alternations in the first and second person pronouns are partly grammaticalised, with high tone (the regular cognate form) in subject position, mid tone before the dual and plural suffixes, and low tone as object or possessor with certain markers, e.g. /-ṣ/ 'object', /-è/ 'possessor' as in /ŋà-ṣ/ 'me', /nè-ṣ/ 'you (S object)'; /ŋà-è/ 'my', /nè-è/ 'your (S)'.

The reflexive and the intensifier both use the same suffix as seen in the third (absent) pronoun: /ha/; in the reflexive this shows a tonal alternation. The intensifiers are /ŋà ha/ 'I myself', /nè ha/ 'you yourself' and /à ha/ 'he/she him/herself'; note that the first and second person pronoun stems are in their attributive/possessive forms. After these /-ha/ forms the dual suffix /ṇà/ or the plural suffix /mà/ may be added. The reflexive is invariant /ỳ há ỳ ha/; if it is not third person, the first or second person subject pronoun may be prefixed to this to disambiguate it.

The form which corresponds to /ha/ in northern Akha as spoken in parts of China is /ɣa³¹/, and in closely-related Hani it is /ɣa³³/; other such northern examples of /ɣ/ are noted in Bradley (1979b:40). In this case the Akha/Hani form reflects a *w initial.

The creaky tone in the Akha third person animate pronoun is irregular and unexpected; but it is absent in the corresponding reflexive form. Note also the occasional use of the prefix /à/ as an apparent third person pronoun stem, as in /à nà/ or /à ha/.

'Who?' in Akha is the regular /a³¹ su⁵⁵/, sometimes with the addition of the classifier for humans, /ɣa³¹/; but unlike its Central and Northern Loloish cognates, Akha /su⁵⁵/ is not used as a nominalising suffix on verbs in Akha or other Southern Loloish languages; though it is fossilised as the second syllable of the Bisu form.

b) Other Southern Loloish pronouns

In many of the languages most closely related to Akha, the same kind of tonal alternation in the pronoun forms extends also to vowel alternations. The Hani, Haoni and Piyo data is from Li and Wang (1986:147); the Mpi is from Duanghom (1976). In Haoni the first person alternates between four forms, /ŋɔ⁵⁵/, /ŋɔ³³/, /ŋa³³/ and /ŋw³⁵/, as does the second between /nv⁵⁵/, /nu³³/, /no³³/ and /nv³⁵/. In each case it is the first form, which occurs as subject, that shows the regular correspondence with other Loloish languages; the others presumably result from tone sandhi and fusion with following markers. Similarly, in Piyo one sees first person /ŋa⁵⁵/, /ŋɔ³³/ and /ŋɔ³⁵/ and second person /nv⁵⁵/, /no³³/ and /no³⁵/.

Unlike Akha and Hani, some other languages of this subgroup do not distinguish first person inclusive and exclusive. The plural suffixes are also somewhat different: Hani /y̥a/ for first and second person (but /m̥a/ like Akha for third plural), Haoni /t̥hi⁵⁵/ and Piyo /v̥³³/. Mpi has first and second plural suffix /t̥ɕu³³/ but third person plural suffix /m̥ɔ̃⁵⁵/; the distinction (if not exactly the forms) suggests the Hani split plural suffix pattern. Pronoun stems are levelled to /n̥ɔ̃³¹/, /nɔ̃³¹/ and /y̥ɔ̃³¹/ before

the Piyo plural suffix; Mpi levels first and second person to /ŋa³³/ and /na³³/.

The Haoni third person singular shows the cognate form followed by a suffix, /yi⁵⁵lɔ³¹/; Piyo shows it with a different suffix, /ye³¹khɔ³¹/; and Mpi has /ɲ²¹tɕɔ̃²¹/ with the first syllable reflecting the nasal-prefixed *(n)yaŋ² version of the Burmese-Lolo pronoun. However, apart from Mpi /ɲ²¹tɕɔ̃²¹mɔ̃⁵⁵/ 'they', these suffixes do not appear in the plural forms, Haoni /yi⁵⁵thi⁵⁵/ 'they' and Piyo /yɔ³¹v³³/ 'they'. The interrogative pronoun 'who?' has the regularly expected form /ɔ³¹sɿ⁵⁵/ in both languages; and the reflexive /ʒv³¹ʏ³¹/ in Haoni also corresponds well to the Akha/Hani form. In Mpi the remote third person pronoun /sɔ̃⁵⁵/ has unexplained nasalisation, as indeed it has in nearby Bisu.

Bisoid languages are spoken in northeastern Laos (Phunoi), northwestern Vietnam (Cônông), northernmost Thailand, the eastern Shan State of Burma and the southern tip of Yunnan in China (Bisu) by about 30,000 people. *The following Bisoid data, showing the regular shift of *stop-prefixed nasal to voiced stop in the first person pronoun, is from Bradley (1988) for Bisu in Thailand and Bradley (1979b) for Phunoi in Laos. In other dialects of Bisu the nasals remain nasal, while in some, e.g. that reported from China by Li (1991), they are prenasalised stops. This provides evidence for reconstructing a stop prefix with the first but not the second person pronoun in Southern Loloish, and thus presumably for Burmese-Lolo itself.*

The fused dual and plural forms, partly different in Phunoi and Bisu, presumably reflect earlier suffixes: perhaps /í/ dual and /u/ plural.²⁶ Regular correspondences would predict high tone for first and second person and low tone for third person; but the tonal contrast has been completely eliminated in Bisu and eliminated in plural forms in Phunoi. The interrogative pronoun has an irregular rhyme correspondence in both

²⁶ For some discussion of this palatal suffix -ɿ in pronominal paradigms, see Matisoff 1993 (to appear).

languages; the Bisu form may reflect paradigmatic influence from the rhyme of the second and third person pronoun, /aŋ/.

Table 14: Bisu and Phunoi pronouns

	Bisu			Phunoi	
	Singular	Dual	Plural	Singular	Plural
1st	ga	gáy	gu	gánǎm	gu
2nd	naŋ	náy	nɔŋ	nǎ	nũ
3rd	yaŋ	yáy	yɔŋ	yǎ	yũ
who?	àsàŋ			sí	

In general the pronoun paradigms in the Southern Loloish languages have arrived at relatively complex patterns through independent processes of sandhi and fusion with suffixes. They are more advanced in this respect than any of the Central or Northern Loloish languages, and much more so than the Burmish languages.

IV. ZAOZOU PRONOUNS

Zaozou is a language spoken by approximately 2,500 members of the Nu nationality in northwestern Yunnan. Other Nu speak Nungish languages more closely related to Rawang and Nusu (described below under Nungish). Very limited data on Zaozou is available from Sun (1985), including the following data on pronouns (1985:71). On various phonological and lexical grounds it appears to be a Northern Loloish language like Nosu and Nasu, but the available data is not unequivocal.

The plural suffix is /pe⁵⁵/ for first and third person, but /tɛ¹³/ for second person. The dual is formed with the corresponding plural followed by /nɛ⁵³/ 'two' and then /ia³³/ (classifier for humans). Parallel to Burmese, the first inclusive dual has the /ʔa³¹/ prefix plus the plural suffix,

not a cognate to the Central or Northern Loloish inclusions. First and second person forms appear to be cognate as elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman, but as in Northern Loloish the third person form appears to have been replaced, in this case (as in eastern Nasu) with a form beginning in /t/.

Table 15: Zaozou pronouns

	Singular	Dual inclusive	Dual exclusive
1st	ŋo ⁵⁵	ʔa ³¹ pe ⁵⁵ nɛ ⁵³ ia ³³	ŋo ⁵⁵ pe ⁵⁵ nɛ ⁵³ ia ³³
2nd	ŋau ³¹		nw ⁵⁵ tə ¹³ nɛ ⁵³ ia ³³
3rd	tu ³⁵		tw ⁵⁵ pe ⁵⁵ nɛ ⁵³ ia ³³
		Plural inclusive	Plural exclusive
1st		ʔa ¹ pe ⁵⁵	ŋo ⁵⁵ pe ⁵⁵
2nd			nw ⁵⁵ tə ¹³
3rd			tw ⁵⁵ pe ⁵⁵

V. GONG PRONOUNS

The data in this section is based on my own fieldwork. Table 16 shows the pronoun forms in Gong, which is spoken by several hundred people in west central Thailand. While it falls within the Burmese-Lolo subgroup of Tibeto-Burman, it fits neither into Loloish nor into Burmish, but forms a third subgroup of which it is the only member.

The forms which lack plurals are really demonstratives;²⁷ some speakers prefer not to use these with animate referents, while the true

²⁷ The actual demonstratives, however, operate in a rather different system:

'this'	/hèŋ/	cf. 'he/she (here)' /hóng/
'that (near)'	/thô/	cf. 'that one (further)' /thêŋ/

third person pronoun forms /hóŋ/ and /mɔ/ can only be used with animate referents. Of these two pronouns, the former reflects the general Burmese-Lolo form *ʔə(n)yaŋ², while the second is either de-demonstrative, or an indication of another Sak/Luish link, this time to Sak /ʔəma/ 'he', cf. Luce (1985 v.2:57), Htun Shwe Hkain (1988:17) and Bernot (1967:253); see also the Bai form cited in Table 21 below.

Table 16: Gong pronouns

	Singular	Plural inclusive	Plural exclusive
1st	ŋǎ	ʔa p ^h ɔ̌	ŋǎ t ^h ê
2nd	noŋ		noŋ p ^h ɔ̌
3rd (here)	hóŋ		hóŋ p ^h ɔ̌
(very near)	nɔ̌ʔ		
(there/near)	mɔ		mɔ p ^h ɔ̌
(there/further)	t ^h êŋ		
(there/far)	p ^h ɔ̌		
'who?'	ʔɔ wê		

The animate interrogative pronoun includes the fused question marker /wê/ which occurs on other question words; its stem can be compared with the noun /ʔɔ̌/ 'person'. The development from *s to Gong /ʔ/ is entirely regular, so both 'who?' and (as an innovation) the noun 'person' derive from the Burmese-Lolo suffix *su¹ 'one who'.

'that (far, S or W)' /túk/
 'that (far, N or E)' /mók/

cf. 'he/she (there/near)' /mɔ/

VI. RECONSTRUCTION OF BURMESE-LOLO PRONOUNS

In Bradley (1979b:245) I posited the four-term pronoun system reconstructed here. The data considered here suggests some minor adjustments; the revised reconstructions are:

(10)	*g-ŋa ¹	first person
	*naŋ ¹	second person
	*ʔə(n)yaŋ ²	third person
	*su ¹	third person remote/indefinite
	*mi ³ /may ²	reflexive

Of these five forms, the first two are near-universal Sino-Tibetan etyma. The third is a Burmese-Lolo etymon with a likely Nungish connection; apart from modern Burmese and Northern Loloish, it is very widespread and stable—which is most unusual for third person pronouns in Tibeto-Burman (Bauman 1975 passim) and Sino-Tibetan (Benedict 1972:93). The fourth, with a prefix *ʔə, is the regular Burmese-Lolo etymon for 'who?' as well; it appears to originate from a nominalising suffix 'one who' as demonstrated above. The fifth is found in Burmese and in Central and Northern Loloish.

A variety of Tibeto-Burman evidence for the *g prefix in the first person pronoun is presented in Bauman (1975:125ff); within Burmese-Lolo, the Bisoid forms provide evidence for a consonantal prefix (*b, *d, *g, *r) but do not indicate which.

Apart from the *su¹ suffix, which can be traced back to Proto-Burmese-Lolo in these functions, there is also extensive evidence for the Tibeto-Burman, Sino-Tibetan, and perhaps Sino-Caucasian or even Proto-Human morpheme for 'female'. The Burmese-Lolo reconstructed form is a female or collective nominal suffix *ma³. Its extension to pronominal paradigms is an innovation and is restricted to certain specific languages: Burmese in the female sense, a few Burmish and (especially Southern)

Loloish languages, in the plural or collective sense; but in Central Loloish note the Jino third plural and the Lahu dual as well.²⁸

Another widespread plural suffix in Loloish is reconstructed as **ʔ-way^{2/3}* in Bradley (1979b:336). Matisoff (1985, 1991:392-3) suggests a connection with the copula **ray/way* and cites forms from languages in other subgroups of Tibeto-Burman which also show a parallel semantic development: existence > individuation > plurality. However the suffix with the form showing **ʔ-w* initial is restricted to Loloish.²⁹ In some languages this plural suffix (variably as in Nosu or categorically as in Bisu, Phunoi and some varieties of Nasu) fuses with the pronoun stem to produce monosyllabic plural forms. Another plural suffix may link Burmish and Nungish: note Maru, Lashi and Atsi /núŋ/ and the Dulong plural suffixes.

Other plural suffixes include some that are used more frequently with nouns. These include the deverbal Central and Northern Loloish form from the verb **mpup^H* 'abundant' and the Burmese literary noun plural /mɿ̀à/ from the verb **Cmya²* 'many'. As noted above, the Sino-Tibetan collective suffix in its Burmese-Lolo form **ma³* also becomes a plural or occasionally (as in Lahu) a dual pronoun suffix.

The usual dual forms are more or less transparently derived from a suffixed form of the number 'two', but in some languages the form, such as Lahu /nè/ or (Chinese) Ngochang /hŋék/, has been grammaticalised to a greater or lesser degree and has thereby become less transparent. The least grammaticalised duals also include a classifier after the numeral; it is normal in all Burmese-Lolo languages for numerals to occur only with a following classifier.³⁰

Several nominal forms have been cited as the sources of first and second person pronouns, especially in Burmese. For the third person,

²⁸ Cf. the discussion of this etymon in "The mother of all morphemes" (Matisoff 1991b). [Ed.]

²⁹ Note the possible Naxi and western Bai cognates below, however.

³⁰ The sole exception is in counting; but in most Burmese-Lolo languages the classifier is obligatory even then.

demonstrative forms replace the putative Burmese-Lolo cognate, especially in Northern Loloish.

Nouns for 'body' are particularly prominent as grammaticalised forms including denominal pronouns. From the Sino-Tibetan cognate reconstructed as **s-ko*¹ come the Burmese object suffix and the Burmese reflexive /ko/, also independently and more recently used as a second or first person pronoun in Burmese. From another Sino-Tibetan etymon, **guŋ*¹, comes the modern Burmese classifier for animals as well as the reflexive in some Burmish languages. From a third etymon for 'body' widespread in Burmish and Loloish, **daw*³, come a variety of Loloish reflexive forms; these may be partially blended with Dai forms from **Dai tua*^A. Though not attested in Burmese itself with the meaning 'body', it appears to be the source of the Burmese pronoun pluraliser /tɔ́/; this may also be connected with central and northern Nusu plural forms. Many other Burmish languages reflect a two-syllable form from **guŋ*¹ *daw*³ or **ʔədaw*³ for the noun 'body'.³¹

While a distinction between inclusive and exclusive first person forms is not universal in Burmese-Lolo, it is fairly widespread and several reconstructible pronominal etyma occur. One is the general Tibeto-Burman form posited by Bauman (1975:131ff, 183), **i*; cognates for this are seen in some Burmish languages such as Atsi and Maru, and possibly in the rhymes of the two Loloish etyma **(ʔə)ni*¹ and **ʔəsi*¹. Forms reflecting **(ʔə)ni*¹ are found in most Central Loloish languages, with a possible but irregular cognate in Akha.³² Forms reflecting **ʔəsi*¹ are found in some Northern Loloish languages. Some other languages which make the distinction simply conjoin second and first person pronouns, with or without some degree of fusion and tone sandhi. The usual exclusive form is the first person form with the appropriate plural marker.

³¹ For more details see Bradley (1992a, forthcoming).

³² The Akha form /â dɯ/ shows an irregular development of **nasal to voiced stop*; this is also seen in some other cognates such as 'bamboo shoot' and may reflect contact with a Bisoid language which changes some nasals to the corresponding voiced stop.

The final and most subtle and complex area of grammaticalisation within the pronoun systems of these languages involves tonal alternations between the regular tonal reflexes found most typically in subject forms and different tones found most often in possessive forms. As typical SOV languages, all Burmese-Lolo languages have the possessor preceding the possessed. This close juncture environment within the same NP is an ideal environment for tone sandhi.

Bauman (1975:174ff) posits a Tibeto-Burman *ky(a) genitive suffix, reduced in different ways in the various languages. One possible source of the sandhi often found in Burmese-Lolo is a reduced form of this suffix, [k] or more likely [ʔ]. This is exactly what occurs in modern Burmese: in possessive and other attributive environments words including pronouns which end in a non-creaky tone acquire creaky tone (the reflex of Burmese-Lolo *Tone 3), which could reflect an earlier final glottal stop. In some other Burmish languages, such as Hpun, the glottal stop final is still present in the possessive forms of pronouns. In Loloish, which has desegmentalised the glottality in the reflexes of *Tone 3, the possessive forms of otherwise unsuffixed singular pronouns often reflect *Tone 3, rather than the *Tone 1 or *Tone 2 reflexes seen in the subject forms. This is not universal; some languages such as Lahu do not show tonal alternations in pronoun stems at all.³³

Of course there is also the Burmese-Lolo genitive marker reconstructed in Bradley (1979b:376) as *way^{2/3}. This Matisoff (1985) derives from the same original source as the Loloish plural suffix: the copula *way/ra y. This marker, usually reflecting *Tone 3 and reduced by regular sound change in many languages to a single vowel, is an alternative source of the tones and occasional vowel changes in the possessive pronouns via fusion with the preceding pronoun. However, Lahu regularly develops this marker (with various functions including genitive) into the phonologically rather more substantial /ve/, which is less easy to fuse and eliminate, and Lahu is one of the languages which do not have paradigmatic changes in pronoun

³³ See note 18.

tones; this could indicate that the process of tone grammaticalisation is a separate innovation in each Burmese-Lolo language which shows it.

VII. PRONOUNS IN RELATED TIBETO-BURMAN LANGUAGES

According to the conventional classifications of Shafer (1966-74) and Benedict (1972), Burmese-Lolo (Shafer's Burmish Section) includes Naxi (Nakhi, Moso) of northwestern Yunnan, the Xifan (Hsifan) languages of western Sichuan, and extinct Xixia (Hsi-hsia) formerly spoken further north still. Benedict (1972:8) indicates that Nungish (Trung/Dulong, Nu, Rawang of northernmost Burma and adjacent areas to the east in northernmost Yunnan in China) "stands fairly close to the Burmese-Lolo nucleus, yet has numerous points of contact with Kachin." Shafer groups a variety of other languages including Jinghpaw Kachin, the Luish or Sak group, Mru, Chairel, Taman and Kuki-Chin-Southern Naga along with Nungish into his higher-order Burmic Division. Shafer's classification has been superseded by the grouping of the "Sal" languages proposed by Burling (1983) which instead links Jinghpaw Kachin, Northern Naga and the Luish or Sak group on the basis of shared innovative lexicon. Chinese linguists have arrived at a classification which includes Naxi, Bai and Tujia (of western Hunan and Hubei and eastern Sichuan and Guizhou) with Loloish. Conversely, Sun (1983) demonstrated links within the Qiangish group in which he includes Qiang and about a dozen Xifan languages (Pumi, Shixing, Namuyi, Choyo, Ersu or Tosu, Muya, Guiqiong, Zhaba, Ergong, Jiarong (rGyarung) and the very diverse Qiang 'dialects'); to this other scholars have linked Baima in northern Sichuan and some of the languages of northeastern India. Adequate recent data on most of these Qiangic languages is lacking, but such data as is available does not support Shafer's proposed link with Burmese-Lolo.

1) Naxi

Concerning Naxi, Bradley (1975) shows that it does not share such defining characteristics of core Burmese-Lolo as the development of *Tone 3 and regular correspondences for the *prenasalised voiced stops, among

other things.³⁴ However on lexical and other grounds it nevertheless fits very closely with Burmese-Lolo. The following data on Naxi is drawn from He and Jiang (1985).

Table 17: Naxi pronouns

	Singular	Plural	
	direct/attributive	inclusive	exclusive
1st	ŋə /ŋǎ	ŋé ŋgù	ŋə ŋgù
2nd	nù /nǎ		nw ŋgù/nǎ ŋgù/nǎ xə
(polite)	ʔu		ʔu xə /uá xə
(polite)	ŋý		ŋý xə
3rd	tʰw /tʰǎ		tʰw ŋgù/tʰǎ ŋgù/tʰǎ xə
who?	ʔə nè		

The eastern 'dialect' of Naxi is extremely different; its pronouns are /ŋa/ 'first person', /nó/ 'second person', /tʰv/ 'third person', with the plural suffix /ʂà/ and the much more distinctive first plural inclusive form /ʎo tsw kʷ/.

It can be noted that Naxi has a similar third person form to the innovative forms in some non-adjacent Northern Loloish languages such as eastern Nasu; but both closely resemble Chinese as well.³⁵ One of the plural suffixes, /xə/, may be related to that often found in Loloish. Otherwise, there are no specific grounds for linking pronoun developments in Naxi and

³⁴ For a discussion of Naxi tonal behavior in stopped syllables, which also sets it apart from "core BL," see Matisoff 1991c. [Ed.]

³⁵ The details and chronology of pronoun developments in Chinese are beyond the scope of this paper; suffice it to say that the current Mandarin Chinese third person pronoun /tā/ is derived from a similar source as the Burmese pronoun (Karlgren 1957 (4c) 'another'). It has been the usual spoken pronoun in all Mandarin subdialects since the Tang Dynasty (from the 7th century A.D.), and is not found except as a Mandarin loan in non-Mandarin dialects of Chinese; see the discussion in Norman (1988:118-119).

Table 18: Rawang pronouns

	Mwtwang	Rvdza	Anung
1/2/3 sg	ηà/nà/?àη	ηa/nà/?àη	ηà/nà/?àη
1 du (i/e)	ηàní	ηàní	ηàpe
2/3 du	nàní/?àηní	nàní/?àηní	nàpe/?àηpe
1 pl (i/e)	nìηma?/ηàma?	?iη/ηàma?	ηàníη
2/3 pl	nama?/?àηma?	nama?/?àηma?	nàníη/?àηníη
who?	khagí/khayo?	mì?/mì?mì?	khayo?

Table 19: Jerwang and Dulong pronouns

	Jerwang	W Dulong	E Dulong
1/2/3 sg	ηà/nà/?àη	ηà/nà/?àη	gú/nà/?àη
1 du (i/e)	əné	ɰáη/íη	
2/3 du	nəné/?àηné	núné/?áη né	
1 pl (i/e)	?iη/ηàníη	ɰáη/íη	ɰúη/ɰúη
2/3 pl	nəníη/?àηníη	nuníη/áη níη	nùpúη/áηpúη
who?	?əmyi	àmi	khà mé

Table 20: Kwinpang and Nusu pronouns

	Kwinpang	C. Nusu	S. Nusu	N. Nusu
1/2/3 sg	ηà/nà/nà	ηǎ/ηó/ηó	ηó/ηó/ηó	ηà/ηǎ/ηú
1 du (i/e)		ηǎ kù/ηá kù	??	??
1 pl (i/e)	ηànì	ηà dù/ηá dù	??/ηǎ biě	??/ηà dù
2/3 du		ηò kù/ηò kù	ηò kù/ηà kù	ηì kù/ηù kù
2/3 pl	nànì/nànì	ηò dù/ηò dù	ηò biě/ηà biě	ηì dù/ηù dù
who?		khè	khǎ	khí ó

Burmese-Lolo; so this is another criterion for separating Naxi off from the main Burmese-Lolo nucleus.

2) Nungish

The data on Nungish in Tables 18-20 includes Rawang from northern Burma (R. Morse, n.d.) and from China, Dulong (two varieties, western and eastern) from Sun (1982:246, 73), and Nusu (further south) from Sun and Liu (1986:175-6, 46). There are many more local varieties in Burma, which S. Morse (1989) clusters into five subgroups; data from my fieldnotes on some of these is appended.

Apart from the near-universal Sino-Tibetan first and second person forms, there is limited evidence of a Burmese-Lolo link, but other evidence of independent innovations. The various forms for 'who?' are unrelated. Most plural suffixes are different apart from the Rawang /maʔ/ also found in some Burmish language (this is in any case a common Tibeto-Burman collective suffix). Again, the dual suffixes do not support a link, apart from some dual suffixes which are most likely independently derived from a common Sino-Tibetan form for 'two'. However, the parallels in the third person form do lend support to a Burmese-Lolo link; note the identical rhyme in Rawang and Dulong, and the preglottalised palatalised nasal initial in Nusu as in adjacent northernmost Burmish, both supporting a similar reconstruction to the Burmese-Lolo *ʔə(n)yaŋ². Note also the similarity between the plural suffixes of many of these languages and those of Maru/Lashi/Atsi. Of course, Nungish languages and the northernmost Burmish languages are geographically adjacent, so borrowing cannot be entirely ruled out. There are also various Nungish innovations, such as the use of a prefixed form of the etymon *mi 'person' for 'who?', rather than the Burmese-Lolo grammaticalisation of this morpheme to a reflexive function.

3) Bai and Tujia

The classification of Bai has long been problematic. Bai (formerly called Minchia) as the local language around Dali in western Yunnan was probably the dominant language of the Nanchao kingdom, and contact with

Chinese has been so intensive and longstanding that massive numbers of Chinese loanwords from a series of stages of Mandarin and other dialects have entered Bai and undergone subsequent phonological changes within Bai. Some scholars have given up and classified modern Bai as a Sinitic language because of this pervasive lexical influence. Chinese linguists prefer to regard it as a Loloish language, but attempts to discover the pattern of correspondences have foundered on the problem of sorting out loanwords from different stages of a related language. Similarly, the recently described Tujia language (formerly spoken in a large area of southwestern Hubei, western Hunan, northeastern Guizhou and southeastern Sichuan, and still spoken by nearly 200,000 people in the centre of this area) has been classified by Chinese linguists as Loloish. It is far to the east of any modern Tibeto-Burman language but is geographically closest to Northern Loloish at its easternmost extreme in northwestern Guizhou and south central Sichuan. Data on Bai is from Xu and Zhao (1984:175); Tujia forms are from Tian et al. (1986:207). See Table 21.

Both Bai and Tujia lack the characteristic Burmese-Lolo third person pronoun (though this is also absent from all varieties of Northern Loloish as well). Bai has a plural suffix reminiscent of the Loloish one, and southern Tujia contains a possible cognate for the first plural inclusive of Loloish (but used in Tujia for a general first person plural, and possibly instead to be related to the Sino-Tibetan second person form) as well as for the Burmese-Lolo form for 'who?' (which is however fairly widespread with this use in other branches of Tibeto-Burman as well). The northern Bai third person form may be linked with the Gong and Sak forms. On the whole, evidence from the pronouns for a Loloish or a Burmese-Lolo link with Bai or Tujia is not convincing.

4) Xixia

The extinct Xixia (Hsi-Hsia, Tangut) language was spoken in what is now Gansu and Ningxia, to the northeast of Tibetan and far to the north of the Burmese-Lolo languages. Most scholars have followed the hypothesis that it was a Tibeto-Burman language, including Nishida (1964-66), Sofronov (1968), Kepping et al. (1969) and Kepping (1979); for a contrary view see Kwanten (1983). Some, from Laufer (1916) onwards, have suggested that it

Table 21: Bai and Tujia Pronouns

	Bai		Tujia	
	Jianchuan (N)	Bijiang (W)	Northern	Southern
1/2/3 sg	ηò/nò/mò	ηò/ná/bá	ňǎ/nǐ/kǒ	ηò/ni/kà
1pl e/i	ηá/ýá	ηá yó/pò ηò	ňǎ nǐ/ňǎ nǐ xǔ ní	ʔà ni/ʔà ni tǎ si
2/3 pl	ná/má	ná yó/bá yó	sě (nǐ)/kǐ tsé	ʔǐ cǐ/kà cǐ
who?	à tò	á má ɲì	á sè	ʔa si

Table 22: Xixia Pronouns

	core form	other forms
1st person	nga ²	mIo ¹
2nd person	ni ²	na ²
3rd person	tha ²	tha ¹
3rd person remote	mI ¹	
'who?'	ldlɛ ¹	swI ¹
reflexive	In ¹ · In ¹ · In ¹	

was Loloish. Phonetic interpretation of the Xixia character-based orthography, in use from 1036 to 1348, is extremely problematic; the earliest use of this orthography thus slightly antedates the earliest surviving Burmese written materials. The pronoun forms are given in Table 22, following Kepping (1979:230-240).

The core first and second person forms are the usual Sino-Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman cognates. The third person forms do not link with the Burmese-Lolo form, and are clearly derived from the demonstrative /tʰa¹/ 'this'. They also bear a suspicious similarity to the modern Chinese third person pronoun.³⁶ The third person remote form is probably derived from the Tibeto-Burman word for 'person'. One of the interrogatives may be related to the Burmese-Lolo form, but not with the other meanings found there. The reflexives are completely different; in fact the nonreduplicated and reduplicated forms are written with different but homophonous characters. Hence, there is absolutely no evidence for a Xixia-Burmese-Lolo connection based on pronoun forms.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In summary, of the various further links proposed for Burmese-Lolo within Tibeto-Burman, the link with Naxi is supported by very limited evidence from pronoun forms, and a link with Nungish is also indicated. However, support for close links with Bai, Tujia or Xixia is even more limited, contrary to claims by some scholars that these are Loloish languages.

It can thus be concluded that the shared Burmese-Lolo and Nungish forms such as the third person pronoun *ʔə(n)ɣaŋ² reflect the earliest innovations. The Burmese-Lolo forms such as the nominaliser or indefinite/interrogative and third person uses of forms derived from *su¹

³⁶ See footnote 35 above.

and the reflexive $*mi^3/may^2$ (the latter reconstructed in more detail in Bradley 1992a), are somewhat less early; and the widespread Loloish forms such as the plural suffix and the two distinct Northern and Central Loloish first person inclusive forms represent more recent innovations.

Most of the first and second person pronoun stem innovations are denominal; most of the third person pronoun innovations are demonstrative. Innovative morphology is mainly suffixal, as would be expected given the SOV syntax of Tibeto-Burman languages. These suffixes are denominal or sometimes deverbal. The apparent chronology of these developments provides further evidence in support of existing proposals for genetic subgrouping within Burmese-Lolo and more or less closely related Tibeto-Burman languages.

REFERENCES

- Allott, Anna J. 1985. "Language policy and language planning in Burma." In David Bradley, ed. *Language Policy, Language Planning and Sociolinguistics in Southeast Asia*. Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics 9. Pacific Linguistics A-67, pp. 131-154. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Ba Shin, U. 1962. *Lokahteikpan: Early Burmese Culture in a Pagan Temple*. Rangoon: Burma Historical Commission.
- Bauman, James J. 1975. *Pronouns and Pronominal Morphology in Tibeto-Burman*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Benedict, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus*. James A. Matisoff, contrib. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernot, Lucien. 1967. *Les Cak: contribution à l'étude ethnographique d'une population de langue 'loi'*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Bradley, David. 1975. "Nahsi and Proto-Burmese-Lolo." *LTBA* 2(1):93-150.
- . 1977. "Modernization and diglossia in Burmese." *Osmania Papers in Linguistics* 3:1-12.
- . 1979a. *Lahu Dialects*. Oriental Monograph Series, 23. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- . 1979b. *Proto-Loloish*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series, 39. London/Malmö: Curzon Press.
- . 1982. "Register in Burmese." In David Bradley, ed. *Tonation*. Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics, 8. Pacific Linguistics A-62, pp. 117-132. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- . 1986. "The Yi nationality of southwestern China: A linguistic overview." Paper presented at International Symposium on the Histories, Cultures and Languages of the Minority Nationalities of China, University of California, Santa Barbara. To appear in Charles N. Li, ed. *Minority Languages of China: Language and Culture*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- _____. 1987. "Language planning for China's minorities: The Yi branch." In Don C. Laycock and Werner Winter, eds. *A World of Language: Papers Presented to Professor S. A. Wurm on his 65th Birthday*. Pacific Linguistics C-100, pp. 81-89. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- _____. 1988. "Bisu dialects." In Paul K. Eguchi et al., eds. *Languages and History in East Asia: Festschrift for Tatsuo Nishida on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, 1:29-59. Kyoto: Shokado.
- _____. 1990. "The status of the 44 tone in Nosu." *La Trobe University Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:125-137.
- _____. 1992a. "Reflexives in Burmese." In Bradley (ed.) 1992b.
- _____. Forthcoming. "Noun particles and grammaticalisation in Burmese."
- Bradley, David (ed.). 1992a. *Burmese Linguistics*. Pacific Linguistics A Series. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- _____. (ed.). 1992b. *Lisu-English Dictionary (Northern Dialect)*. Pacific Linguistics B Series. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Burling, Robbins. 1983. "The Sal languages." *LTBA* 7(2):1-32.
- CHEN Shilin, et al. 1985. *Outline of Yi* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- DAI Qingxia, and CUI Zhichao. 1985. *Outline of Achang* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- _____, and XU Xijian. 1983. "A tentative inquiry into the Langsu dialect" [in Chinese]. *Yuyan Yanjiu* 1983(2):219-242.
- _____, et al. 1983. "A brief description of the Pola vernacular spoken by the Jingpo nationality" [in Chinese]. *Minzu Yuwen* 1985(6):55-71.
- Duanghom, Srinuan. 1976. *An Mpi Dictionary*. Working Papers in Phonetics and Phonology 1(1). Bangkok: Indigenous Languages of Thailand Research Project.
- GAI Xingzhi. 1986. *Outline of Jino* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Guizhou Province Yi Studies Research Committee. 1991. *Concise Yi-Chinese Dictionary (Guizhou Volume)* [in Chinese]. Guiyang: Guizhou Nationalities Publishing House.

- HE Jiren, and JIANG Zhuyi. 1985. *Outline of Naxi* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Henderson, Eugénie J. A. 1986. "Some hitherto unpublished material on Northern (Megyaw) Hpun. In John McCoy and Timothy Light, eds. *Contributions to Sino-Tibetan Studies*. Cornell Linguistic Contributions 5, pp. 101-124. Leiden: Brill.
- Hope, Edward R. 1993. *Lisu-English Dictionary (Southern Dialect)*. David Bradley, ed. Pacific Linguistics B Series. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Htun Shwe Hkain. 1988. *Thet Nationality from North Arakan* [in Burmese]. Rangoon: Rangoon Offset.
- JIN Guoku, et al., eds. 1984. *Clear Concise Yi-Chinese Dictionary* [in Chinese]. Kunming: Yunnan Nationalities Publishing House.
- Judson, Adoniram. 1853. *Judson's Burmese-English Dictionary*. Moulmein: American Baptist Mission Press. Reprinted (1953) Rangoon: Baptist Board of Publications.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1957. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Bulletin 29.
- Kepping, Ksenia B., 1979. *Sun Tsi v Tangutskom Perevode*. Moscow: Nauka.
- _____, et al. 1969. *More Pis'men*. 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kwanten, Luc. 1983. "The phonological hypothesis of the Hsi Hsia (Tangut) language." In Chauncey Chu et al., eds. *Papers for the Fourteenth International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics*, pp. 187-255. Taipei: Student Book Company.
- Laufer, B. 1916. "The Si-Hia language: A study in Indo-Chinese philology." *T'oung Pao* 17:1-126.
- Lewis, Paul. 1986. *Lahu-English-Thai Dictionary*. Chiangmai: Thailand Baptist Convention.
- _____. 1989. *Akha-English-Thai Dictionary*. Chiangrai: Development and Agricultural Project for Akha.
- LI Yongsui. 1991. "A preliminary study of Mi/Bisu language" [in Chinese]. *Minzu Yuwen* 2:35-47.
- _____, and WANG Ersong. 1986. *Outline of Hani* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.

- Luce, Gordon H. 1981. *A Comparative Word-List of Old Burmese, Chinese and Tibetan*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- _____. 1985. *Phases of Pre-Pagán Burma: Languages and History*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matisoff, James A. 1973. *The Grammar of Lahu*. Second printing, 1982. University of California Publications in Linguistics 75. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- _____. 1985. "God and the Sino-Tibetan copula, with some good news concerning selected Tibeto-Burman rhymes." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) 29:1-81.
- _____. 1988. *The Dictionary of Lahu*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 111. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- _____. 1991a. "Areal and universal dimensions of grammatization in Lahu." In Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine, eds. *Approaches to Grammaticalisation. Vol. II: Types of Grammatical Markers*, pp. 383-453. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- _____. 1991b. "The mother of all morphemes: augmentatives and diminutives in areal and universal perspective." In Martha Ratliff and Eric Schiller, eds., *Papers from the First Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (SEALS)*, pp. 293-349. Tempe: Arizona State University, Program for Southeast Asian Studies.
- _____. 1991c. "Jiburish revisited: tonal splits and heterogenesis in Burmo-Naxi-Lolo checked syllables." *Acta Orientalia* (Copenhagen) 52:91-114.
- _____. 1993. "Sangkong of Yunnan: secondary verb pronominalization in Southern Loloish." To appear in *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16.2.
- Metcalf, G. E. Forthcoming. *Lipo-English Dictionary*. David Bradley, ed. [Morse, Robert]. [n.d.]. *Guray shansher lega* [Holy Bible in Rawang.] Place of publication and publisher not indicated.
- Morse, Stephen A. 1989. "Five Rawang dialects compared, plus more." In David Bradley et al., eds. *Prosodic Analysis and Asian Linguistics to Honour R. K. Sprigg*. Pacific Linguistics C-104, pp. 237-250.

- Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Nishida, Tatsuo. 1964-66. *A Study of the Xixia Language* [in Japanese]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Zauhō Kankōkai.
- Norman, Jerry. 1988. *Chinese*. Cambridge Language Surveys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Okell, John. 1967. "Nissaya Burmese." *Journal of the Burma Research Society* 50(1):95-123.
- _____. 1992a. "Arakanese." In Bradley (ed.) 1992a.
- _____. 1992b. "Intha." In Bradley (ed.) 1992a.
- Shafer, Robert. 1966-74. *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*. 5 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sofronov, M. V. 1968. *A Grammar of the Tangut Language* [in Russian]. 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka.
- SUN Hongkai. 1982. *Outline of Dulong* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- _____. 1983. "Nationality languages in the six valleys and their language branches" [in Chinese]. *Yunnan Minzu Xuebao* 3:99-273.
- _____, and LIU Lu. 1986. *Outline of the Nusu Language of the Nu People* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Taw Sein Ko, U, and Duroiselle, Charles. 1919. *Epigraphia Birmanica, being Lithic and Other Inscriptions of Burma*. Vol. I, Part I. Rangoon: Government Printer.
- Thurgood, Graham. 1982. "The Sino-Tibetan copula *wəy." *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 11(1):65-81.
- TIAN Desheng, et al. 1986. *Outline of Tujia* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Tun Nyein, U. 1906. *The Student's English-Burmese Dictionary*. Rangoon: Government Printer.
- Wurm, Steven A., and Mühlhäusler, Peter, eds. 1993. *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- XU Lin, and ZHAO Yansun. 1984. *Outline of Bai* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- _____, et al. 1986. *Outline of Lisu* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.

- XU Xijian, and XU Guizhen. 1984. *Outline of the Atsi Language of the Jingpo People* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Yabu, Shiro. 1980. "Linguistic data on the Yaw dialect of the Burmese language" [in Japanese]. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) 19:164-182.
- _____. 1981. "Linguistic data on the Taung'yo dialect of the Burmese language" [in Japanese]. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) 21:154-187.
- Yi Historical Document Section. 1984. *Yunnan Sichuan Guizhou Guangxi Yi-Chinese Comparative Dictionary of Basic Vocabulary* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Central Institute of Nationalities.
- Yunnan Nationalities Language Commission. 1983. *Vocabulary of Yi Dialects of Yunnan* [in Chinese]. 3 vols. Kunming: Yunnan Institute of Nationalities.
- _____. 1991. *Collected Volume of Yunnan Standard Yi Writing* [in Nasu and Chinese]. Kunming: Yunnan Nationalities Language Commission.
- ZHANG Heping, et al. 1984. *Yi Literacy Textbook* [in Chinese]. Guiyang: Guizhou Nationalities Publishing House.