

REFLEXIVES IN BURMESE¹

DAVID BRADLEY
La Trobe University

1. ABSTRACT

The Burmese reflexive has three alternative forms. One, attested from the earliest inscriptions, uses မိမိ /mí mí/ as the reflexive pronoun; for direct objects this is usually followed by the noun ကိုယ် /ko/ 'body', thus literally meaning 'self's body'. This reflexive has numerous cognates in Loloish languages and is ultimately derived from the Tibeto-Burman etymon *mi 'person'. Another has reanalysed the noun ကိုယ် /ko/ 'body' as the reflexive pronoun, and adds something else following it; for direct objects, the most frequent type, the form is /kó ko ko/; this comprises two occurrences of 'body', the first in possessive form, and the object marker which is also ultimately derived from 'body'; as discussed below the order of these constituents is a point of disagreement among Burmese grammarians. A third, derived by reanalysis of the second, uses any pronoun twice, separated by the noun ကိုယ် /ko/ 'body' or less frequently another body-part noun.

In a reflexive context, the use of one of these reflexives is not obligatory; but if a reflexive is not used then the sentence is ambiguous and would normally be interpreted as non-reflexive. Burmese uses reflexives quite frequently with abstract verbs for mental attitudes and states, and considerably less frequently with concrete action verbs.

In general where a cognate for the literary Burmese မိမိ /mí mí/ is absent elsewhere in Burmese-Lolo, the reflexive is instead innovatively derived from etyma for 'body' (such as Sino-Tibetan *guŋ, Burmese-Lolo *goŋ¹) or from Burmese-Lolo *daw³. In this it is unlike the Burmese spoken form, which derives from another Sino-Tibetan 'body' etymon *s-ku, Burmese-Lolo *s-ko¹. In some languages both a cognate for /mímí/ and a 'body' form occur. Grammaticalisation from words for 'body' is very widespread in languages of the area and of course semantically quite reasonable for reflexives.

¹ I would like to thank various speakers of Burmese including Daw Tin Tin Nyunt, U Sein Win and Mo Mo Aung for providing examples. I am also very grateful to various colleagues including U Thein Tun and Anna J. Allott for comments. Naturally all remaining errors in data or analysis are my own responsibility.

2. INTRODUCTION

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 various South and Southeast Asian languages with diglossia, 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 1112 AD. One of the structural differences between the High and the Low is in reflexivisation, for which there is one form in the High and two others in the Low, with interesting structural differences.

The transliteration of Old Burmese and the transcription of Modern Burmese used here have been outlined in the introduction to this volume.

The following abbreviations are used in this paper.

ACC	accusative	O	object
CLF	classifier	PF	final particle
DO	direct object	PL	plural
EXC	exclusive	PRO	pronoun
GEN	genitive	PUR	purposive
INT	intensifier	REL	relative
M	male	S	subject
NEG	negative	SG	singular
NP	noun phrase		

3. PRONOMINALISATION IN BURMESE

For full details of the pronoun system in Burmese and its development from Old Burmese to Modern Burmese, see Bradley (1993). There have been very substantial changes including the appoggiation or replacement of virtually every pronoun, in some cases more than once, during the nine centuries of records of written Burmese. Unlike most other function words, these pronouns do not differ between the modern literary High and the spoken Low.

The usual modern forms are cited in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1: PRONOMINAL FORMS IN MODERN BURMESE

ကျွန်တော်	/cəno/	I (male speaker)
ကျွန်မ	/cəmə/	I (female speaker)
ငါ	/ŋa/	I (speaking to intimate or inferior)
ကျုပ်	/cou'/	I (used in rural areas, mainly by male speakers)
ခင်ဗျား	/khəmyà/	you (male speaker)
ရှင်	/lin/	you (female speaker)
နင်	/nin/	you (speaking to intimate or inferior)
မင်း	/mìn/	you (speaking to intimate or inferior)
သူ	/θu/	he/she (usually human, always animate)

In Burmese, pronoun forms are fairly infrequent in running discourse; the unmarked assumption is that a statement has a first person subject and that a question has a second person subject, unless the context shows or implies otherwise.

Pronouns also have an attributive/possessive form which replaces a final heavy or level tone with a creaky tone, e.g. ကျွန်တော် /cəno/ 'my (male speaker)'; those which already end in creaky tone, such as ကျွန်မ /cəmə/ 'I/my (female speaker)', have the same form. The pronoun plural marker is တို့ *tuiw.* from the earliest inscriptions, regularly giving modern တို့ pronounced /dó/. This was originally voiceless /tó/ and can be related to the fairly widespread Loloish etymon **daw* 'body'; cognates are also used as a reflexive in some of those languages. In Burmese, the plural marker may be productively added to any of the above pronouns, but pronouns without the plural marker do also occur in plural contexts. All these pronouns, with or without plural marker, may occur in the Pró (possessive form) + /ko/ + Pro reflexive construction discussed below. The same marker with the formative prefix /ə/ as seen in the inscriptional form အတို့ *atuiw.* was most likely a first plural exclusive; when the prefix was later lost, it retained medial voicing² and this is the source of the modern first person plural (inclusive or exclusive) /dó/. There are various restrictions on the plural marker in reflexives, as discussed below.

While the earliest Burmese inscription, the Rajakumar (dated 1112 AD), provides evidence for juncture voicing in noun compounds such as မင်းကြီး *maṅgrī* 'king' + 'big' > 'great king' (lines 15-16), in almost all such cases later spellings show the unvoiced forms instead. Here, the modern form is မင်းကြီး: now written /mìn cì/, showing the base form of the second element but pronounced /mìn jì/, still with medial voicing. Other dialects of Burmese show much less medial voicing: some do not voice medial aspirates, others do not voice medials at

² For details and various parallel examples which have similarly reinforced the category of voiced stops in modern Burmese, see Bradley (forthcoming).

all, except where a Burmese doublet form has been borrowed. In standard Burmese this juncture voicing is one of the main markers of unity between the noun or verb stem and following associated components in a compound as well as following suffixes, modals and other markers. Juncture voicing is regular for reduplicated verbs but not reduplicated nouns.³

Many of the modern Burmese pronoun forms, including the reflexes, are denominal. The literary reflexive appears to be derived from a reduplication of Sino-Tibetan etymon **mi* 'person', while the spoken reflexive is derived from the Sino-Tibetan etymon **s-ku* 'body'. Parallels for this semantic development can be found in a number of languages of the region, as well as elsewhere. The likely process of these developments is traced below.

It is often difficult to disentangle the literal 'body' and the extended object marker or pronominal uses of /ko/ in early inscriptions. The reanalysis of ကိုဝံ /ko/ as a reflexive appears to have been fairly early; more recently, as in many other languages, this reflexive is itself shifted to a non-reflexive pronominal use. Thus, in early modern Burmese, /ko/ alone could also be used as a second person pronoun, to which the pronoun plural marker /tó/ > /dó/ could also be added. Judson (1853:203) provides some examples of /ko/ used as a second person pronoun by male or female intimates to women; Tun Nyein (1906), which is often somewhat archaic for its period, includes /ko/ in the list of second person pronouns. However, in current spoken Burmese, /ko/ alone is an informal first person pronoun mainly but not only used by male speakers, not a second person pronoun; this further illustrates the instability and openness of the pronoun system in Burmese. The form /ko dɔ/ could formerly be used as a second person pronoun to address superiors – monks and others; this is clearly another extension of the 'body' meaning with the addition of the royal or respectful suffix ɔတံ /tɔ/. Its replacement by the current အရှင်ဘုရား /əʃɪnpəyà/ is another example of the relatively rapid changes in the Burmese pronoun system.

Yet another independent development, discussed further below and in Bradley (1993), is the modern spoken object/goal/allative noun marker ကို /ko/ from the same nominal source; this has been differentiated from the nominal/reflexive spelling as noted below.

4. CASE MARKING IN BURMESE

Burmese is a typical SOV language; all marking of cases is done with suffixed cliticised markers. These are phonologically joined to the preceding nominal by various juncture phenomena which likewise link the verb and associated modals and other markers. Many of these markers are historically derived from grammaticalised nominal, verbal or other forms.

³ For example /kàun/ 'good', reduplicated /kàungàun/ 'well', but အစ်ကို /əko/ 'older brother', reduplicated ကိုကို /ko ko/.

This case marking is in large part optional, and is used relatively sparingly in spoken language. Probably due to the influence of Pali as the liturgical language of Buddhism, written language marks a far greater proportion of cases on NPs, and makes some distinctions absent from spoken style.

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; the most obvious example is the attributive/possessive pronouns. This process is reflected from the earliest inscriptions to the present; for example the 'Myazedi', lines 36 and 37, has $\text{C } \eta a$ + various kinship terms (e.g. line 36 has $\text{C } \omega\omega \eta a$ $s\bar{a}$ 'my son', instead of the usual subject pronoun form $\text{C}^1 \eta\bar{a}$). More relevantly, on the third face of the Lemyethna Pagoda inscription dated 1232, lines 12, 19, 24 and 29 show $\text{C } \alpha^{\circ} \delta^{\circ} \eta a$ *kuiw* 'me' (lit. 'my body'), here ambiguous between Pro + the noun 'body' and Pro + direct object marker – a perfect example of the right environment for a reanalysis! The origin of the /ko/ object marker from a possessor noun + possessed 'body' noun phrase is further indicated by the productive application of the noun tone creaking process before this noun marker, probably of possessive origin as discussed in Bradley (1993, forthcoming).

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 indicated in the earliest inscriptions.⁴ Alternatively, Indic short vowels (creaky tone) as opposed to long vowels (other non-stop final tones) may indicate the contrast for *a*, *i* and *u*;⁵ but the writing of this vowel-length distinction is also not very consistent in the twelfth and thirteenth 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 twelfth century, but it is quite likely. This sandhi process can perhaps be derived from a fused form of the possessive marker, inscriptional and literary /i/, modern spoken /yɛ/.

A similar alternation can be observed in possessive forms of pronouns in several other Burmese-Lolo languages including other dialects of Burmese, other Burmish languages such as Hpun, and Loloish languages in each subgroup of Loloish.

⁴ This is not too suprising 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.

⁵ Here, the short vowels and the syllables written with a subscript glottal stop are differently transliterated following the usual practice outlined in the introduction to this volume; though both presumably represented creaky tone.

As noted above, other noun-marker forms 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 suffixes such as plural if any, and a quantifier expression consisting of one or more sequences of number 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 be only briefly noted here. In early inscriptions, objects (direct and indirect) could be followed by the marker $\bar{a}(:)$, while some direct objects, especially human ones, could be followed by *kuiw* (from 'body') instead. This situation is preserved in the distribution of modern literary Burmese /à/ and /ko/, but with wider distribution and greater frequency of /ko/ after direct objects. In modern spoken Burmese /ko/ has completely replaced /à/ with indirect as well as direct objects; and there is a strong constraint restricting the occurrence of /ko/ to one NP in a sentence.

The process and chronology of the replacement of အဘ္ဍိ: à by ကိုဝ် *kuiw* in Burmese is a fascinating topic but beyond the scope of this discussion; see Bradley (forthcoming). Other changes in markers are mostly one-for-one replacement of existing markers in spoken Burmese, with the Old Burmese forms 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 (1967) for details of this so-called Nissaya Burmese.

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 and south-eastern Tibeto-Burman in general. 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.

5. REFLEXIVES IN BURMESE

The modern reflexive forms are literary မိမိ /mí mí/ and spoken ကိုယ် /ko/; more specifically, the spoken direct object reflexive is /kó ko ko/ or $\text{Pró}_i + \text{ကိုယ်} /ko/$ (or other body-part noun) + Pro_i .⁶ The literary form occurs from the earliest inscriptions; the /kó ko ko/ spoken form comes in gradually, and is derived from the noun 'body'; the $\text{Pró} /ko/ \text{Pro}$ form results from reanalysis of the /kó ko ko/ form. The spoken forms are unusual in that their components do not undergo juncture voicing.⁷

⁶ That is, any pronoun form in its possessive form with creaky tone on the final syllable plus /ko/ plus the pronoun repeated in full. Other body-part nouns may also be used in place of /ko/; see sentence (6h) below.

⁷ While reduplicated nominal forms such as kinship terms like /ko ko/ 'older brother' also do not voice,

Burmese speakers disagree as to the ‘correct’ spelling of the /kó ko ko/ reflexive. Some prefer ကိုယ်ကိုယ်ကိုယ်, that is ‘body + object marker + body’; others prefer ကိုယ်ကိုယ်ကို, that is ‘body’s body + object marker’. Both spellings are given in Ba Han (1966:1605); it is said that the government and the Burmese Department at Rangoon University prefer the latter. Both are grammatically plausible reflexives; given the semantic change ‘body’ > ‘self’, the former suggests ‘self + object marker + self’, two separate NPs; the latter implies ‘self’s body + object marker’, a single NP. However, neither is parallel to the attributive/possessive pronoun + body-part noun + pronoun reflexive construction, which here would instead suggest ကိုယ်ကိုယ်ကိုယ်, that is ‘body’s body + body’, a two-NP construction. Perhaps the various alternatives have all contributed to the modern /kó ko ko/ construction; but the lack of juncture voicing suggests that neither the second nor the third /ko/ is the object marker, as this would normally be voiced /go/ in either of the two environments suggested by the alternative spellings.

This noun ‘body’, Old Burmese *kuiw*, modern ကိုယ် /ko/ and the reflexive derived from it contain a false etymology in its modern spelling, adding a final orthographic *y* based on the unrelated but look-alike Sanskrit/Pali form *kāya*. There are also longer, more formal versions which start with /ko/ and continue with a Pali doublet, for example ကိုယ်ကာယ /ko ka yá/, ကိုယ်ခန္ဓာ /ko khan da/; these forms may be further extended with a Burmese nominal doublet, for example ကိုယ်ခန္ဓာအကောင်အထည် /ko khan da əkaun əthe/, all meaning ‘body’. An earlier grammaticalised form from the noun was the noun object marker ကို /ko/, but this is spelled without the spurious Pali-influenced final *y*. In this marker use, it is absent from the earliest inscriptions starting in the year 1112, but starts to appear by 1147. It was at first used only with animate patients, but by 1169 was occasionally being used with inanimate (non-corporeal) noun 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), generalised further to goals in ditransitive or causative constructions as well, and in current spoken Burmese covers all these functions.

It is now stylistically unacceptable 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.

In Burmese it is only a noun phrase coreferential with the subject which can be reflexive. This can be in the same clause, in an embedded clause within the same sentence, or in a following conjoined clause or subsequent sentence in the same discourse context where the

the /kó ko ko/ reflexive is not synchronically a reduplication, even though each of its three components is ultimately derived from the noun ‘body’.

antecedent is clear. As Burmese is a typical verb-final language, most embedded clauses precede the subject; so the reflexive in an embedded clause often precedes its subject antecedent if that antecedent is present. Furthermore, as Burmese is a language which does not require overt subject pronouns, the antecedent may be completely unexpressed; in such a case the reflexive is ambiguous or generic if the antecedent is not clear from the context. Like most verb-final languages, Burmese is most frequently SOV but the exact order of noun phrases is pragmatically determined. For the reflexive direct object the grammaticalised unitary construction requires what is an O+S order, or for some speakers alternatively an O+S preceded or followed by the non-reflexive form of the S.

Reflexives occur in various case roles; the main one is direct object, with more or less fossilised possessive and embedded subject forms. Other case roles, such as indirect object and so on, are filled by the possessive form of the reflexive pronoun မိမိ /mí mí/ or ကိုယ့် /kó/ plus a noun form. The Burmese reflexive does not also have a reciprocal meaning; with a plural antecedent the action is distributive, not reciprocal. Unlike the corresponding non-reflexive pronouns, the /ko/ reflexive may not add the plural marker; but the literary /mí mí/ may do so, as shown in (24) below. On the other hand, the extended /ko/ non-reflexive pronoun may have the plural marker; this pluralised usage was attested by the early nineteenth century, as indicated by an example in Judson (1853: 203).

5.1 DIRECT OBJECT

As noted above, the exact structure of the spoken Burmese direct object reflexive /kó ko ko/ is a matter of dispute. The 'standard' analysis suggests that it is a single NP comprising a possessive reflexive pronoun /kó/, the noun /ko/ 'body' (which should be creaky before an object marker) and then the object marker /ko/. The alternative spelling suggests that it is a sequence of two NPs; the first consists of a reflexive pronoun /ko/ and the direct object marker /ko/ which normally voices to /go/ and produces a creaky tone on the preceding syllable in this environment; and then a second NP /ko/ 'body' or reflexive. Despite its lack of the usual and expected juncture voicing, this operates as a unit for most speakers, who are not able to pause as is normally possible between NPs in Burmese. As will be argued below, it is likely that neither modern spelling reflects the original structure of the reflexive.

Since /kó ko ko/ alone is ambiguous as shown in sentence (1) and does not specify the subject, a subject may also be present. On the other hand /kó ko ko/ (or literary /mí mí/) alone is most frequently used for generic reflexives. If there is another pronoun, it normally follows the reflexive, as in (2); but a noun may precede or follow, as in (3); some speakers reject sentences like (3b) with the nominal subject following the /kó ko ko/. Literary equivalents are similar but may also have မိမိကိုယ် /mí mí ko/ 'self's body', မိမိကိုယ်ကို /mí mí kó go/

with the following object marker, or maximally (including the possessive marker /i/) မိမိ၏ကိုယ်ကို /mí mí í ko go/; the latter two have the direct object marker voiced, creaking the preceding syllable, unlike the spoken /kó ko ko/. There is also a non-ambiguous alternative reflexive form with any other pronoun in the first and third slots, with the first in creaky-final (attributive) form. This is an OS rather than the more unmarked SO order as in (4) and (5); it will be argued below that the /kó ko ko/ form is parallel.

- (1) *kó ko ko yai' te*
 self DO self hit realis
 Someone (unspecified but probably I unless context suggests otherwise) hits himself.
- (2) *kó ko ko cəno yai' te*
 self DO self I (M) hit realis
 I hit myself.
- (3) a. *khələ kó ko ko kai' te*
 child self DO self bite realis
 This child bites itself.
- b. *kó ko ko khələ kai' te*
 self DO self child bite realis
 The child bites itself.


The meaning difference between (3a) and (3b) is one of focus. Of course, (2) and (3) could also be expressed with the *Pró* + /ko/ or other body-part noun + *Pro* construction, as in (4) and (5); (4a) is not ambiguous so the extra pronoun is not necessary, but some speakers prefer to put one in as in (4b), always pausing after the reflexive, perhaps on the model of sentences like (2). Other speakers reject sentences like (4b) as excessively redundant. Some Rangoon speakers will accept sentences like (4c) with the extra subject pronoun first, if the additional subject pronoun is to be there at all, but for most the preference is for OS as in (4b) rather than SO as in (4c). There are also some speakers, especially from Mandalay, who prefer sentences like (4c) to those like (4b); for them the tendency to OS in reflexives must be less strong. These pronominal reflexives do not occur in literary style. Sentences like (3) with an overt 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 possibility as in (5b) below, but this is not as unlikely as the corresponding sentence with pronouns only, as in (4c); similarly, some speakers, especially those from Mandalay, may prefer (5b) to (5a) because of their preference for SO, just as they prefer (3a) and (4c).

- (4) a. *cəno kó cəno yai' te*
 I DO I hit realis
 I hit myself.

- b. *ʔcənó ko cənó cənó yai' tɛ*
 I DO I I hit realis
 I hit myself.
- c. *ʔʔcənó cənó ko cənó yai' tɛ*
 I I DO I hit realis
 I hit myself.
- (5) a. *θú ko θu khələ kai' tɛ*
 he DO he child bite realis
 The child bites itself.
- b. *ʔkhələ θú ko θu kai' tɛ*
 child he DO he bite realis
 The child bites itself.

This *Pró* + body-part noun + *Pro* form occurs with any of the core pronouns listed in the previous section, with or without plural marker; the pronominal form in first and third slots must be identical apart from the attributive creak on the final syllable of the first. Therefore sentences like (6a), (6b) or (6c)⁸ are grammatical, while sentences like (6d) and (6e) are ungrammatical. Those like (6f) and (6g) are not reflexive; the object marker does show juncture voicing, and there can be a pause before the second pronoun. Some speakers find the reflexive forms with plural marker clumsy, because they can get rather long; hence sentences like (6c) below with the plurality marked in the verb but not the reflexive may be preferred. The most frequent body-part noun, not suprisingly, is /ko/ 'body' itself; but others do occur, as in (6h), which is otherwise exactly parallel to (5a) and (5b).

- (6) a. *θú dó ko θu dó kai' tɛ*
 he PL DO he PL bite realis
 They bite themselves.
- b. *θú dó ko θu dó kai' cá dɛ*
 he PL DO he PL bite PL realis
 They bite themselves.
- c. *θú ko θu kai' cá dɛ*
 he DO he bite PL realis
 They bite themselves.
- d. **θú dó ko θu kai' tɛ*
 he PL DO he bite realis
 He bites them.
- e. **θú ko θu dó kai' tɛ*
 he DO he PL bite realis
 He bites them.

⁸ Sentences (6b) and (6c) include the verb marker  /cá/ which indicates multiplicity of the action and therefore usually a plural subject; (6c) shows that the plurality of the subject may be marked on the verb without necessarily being marked on the reflexive or the subject.

- f. *θú dó go θu kai' tɛ*
 he PL DO he bite realis
 He bites them. (fronted, topical object)
- g. *θú go θu dó kai' (cá) dɛ*
 he DO he PL bite (PL) realis
 They bite him. (fronted, topical object)
- h. *khə̀lè θú lɛ' θu kai' tɛ*
 child his hand he bite realis
 The child bites his own hand/bites himself on the hand.

These sentences are also perfectly natural with a subject noun, before or after the *Pró* + noun + *Pro* combination. Some speakers also allow this construction with kinship terms used in core or extended pronominal senses, as in (7).

- (7) *əpʰe ko əpʰe kai' tɛ*
 father DO father bite realis
 Father (or some older man) bites himself./Father, you bite yourself.

As for the /*kó ko ko*/ construction, literate speakers disagree as to the spelling which should be used for these spoken-style reflexives. It is usual to write the *Pró* + /*ko*/ + *Pro* reflexive with the noun ကိုယ် 'body' rather than the object marker ကို /*ko*/ in the middle, but some people prefer the latter. The former implies an analysis possessive *Pro* + 'body' + (subject/object) *Pro*, parallel to the ကိုယ်ကိုယ်ကို spelling of /*kó ko ko*/; the latter suggests object *Pro* in attributive form + object marker + subject *Pro*, parallel to the ကိုယ့်ကိုကိုယ် spelling of /*kó ko ko*/.

It is more likely that the /*kó ko ko*/ and *Pró* + body-part noun + *Pro* constructions are parallel and both derived from a two-NP OS structure. In this the object comprises possessive pronoun (reflexive or non-reflexive) + 'body' or other body-part NP; the following subject is an identical non-possessive pronoun; as the two are linked there cannot be a pause between them. This overcomes the problems of lack of voicing of the putative object marker and lack of creak of the form preceding the putative object marker which make both of the spellings of /*kó ko ko*/ dubious. Effectively, it is here suggested that etymologically and syntactically /*kó ko ko*/ ought to be spelled ကိုယ်ကိုယ်ကိုယ် .

A further possibility for the form with no reflexive pronouns eliminates the ambiguity by having both present, as in (8) which is otherwise identical to (4a) above; in this case the object marker voices as would normally be expected, and there is often a pause after the object marker. In effect, this is another argument against the analysis of the medial /*ko*/ in *Pró* + body-part noun + *Pro* as the object marker and thus for the analysis proposed here.

- (8) cənó ko go cəno yai' tɛ
 my body DO I hit realis
 I hit my own body (i.e. myself).

The literary reflexive also supports this analysis, showing in its direct object form /mímí/ 'self('s) + /ko/ 'body' plus optionally, as in (8), the voiced /go/ form of the object marker /ko/. As it is unusual in diglossia for the syntactic structure as opposed to the forms employed to differ too greatly, this parallelism is another argument for the analysis proposed here. On the other hand, those literate speakers who write the middle /ko/ in both constructions with the object marker ၵို /ko/ may have restructured their two spoken reflexives to a new analysis as direct object Pro + object marker + subject Pro; but they still do not have juncture voicing for the middle /ko/, reflecting the original structure as retained by others.

The earliest example of a literary reflexive is in the first extant inscription, the 'Myazedi' from 1112 AD (part of lines 14-16).

- (9) *Thuiw Rajākumar mañ su pay mayā sã*
 that Rajakumar named one who dear wife son

 mimi kiew muy so maṅgrī klañjo
 self's body raise one who great king thanks

 okmi ra kã.
 below get PF
 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 & Duroiselle 1919:25)

Note that the reflexive is the direct object in a relative clause, showing that reflexivisation for direct objects did continue beyond the clause in which they are subject, even at that early stage. Moreover, unlike modern Burmese, the reflexive in the relative clause is coreferential with the subject of the main clause, which is not the head of the relative; see (21b) below for the modern situation. The form of the Old Burmese reflexive is the same as the modern literary form, as is usually the case when modern spoken and written forms differ.

The full modern literary direct object reflexive is /mí mí/ plus optionally the possessive marker /í/ and then obligatorily the noun /ko/ 'body', optionally followed by the object marker /go/ in its juncture-voiced form. Unlike the spoken /kó ko ko/ reflexive, /mí mí/ may also be pluralised by the addition of /dó/; naturally this precedes the various markers to give a maximal /mí mí dó í ko go/ 'our/your/themselves'

Unlike the reflexive, the direct object reciprocal is expressed with the reduplicated deverbal adverb ချဉ်းချဉ်း /chìn jìn/, as in (10) below; usually but not obligatorily this also contains the verb marker ငြ /cá/ 'plural/multiple action' as a reciprocal must involve more than one actor doing something. This plural marker may also occur in reflexives with plural subjects as in (6b), (6c) and (6g) above.

- (10) *θu dó chìn jìn yai' cá dε*
 he PL each other hit PL realis
 They hit each other.

As in many other similar cases, the distinction between literary and spoken reflexive forms is gradually breaking down; this usually involves literary forms being brought into occasional spoken use. Indeed, quite a few expressions with /mí mí/ are now heard in more formal spoken Burmese. Conversely, spoken Burmese forms can also filter into informal prose. The following example is the first sentence of a short story published in 1982 by Ma Sanda.⁹

- (11) *U Maun Maun La' θi hman the dwin θúkoθu əθeəcha*
 U Maung Maung Lat Subject glass on inside himself carefully
cí mí ði
 look at by accident-realis
 U Maung Maung Lat happened to look at himself carefully in the glass.

In (11) /θú ko θu/ is written သူ့ကိုယ်သူ့, as it would be by most literate Burmans. Despite the presence of a mainly spoken-form reflexive, all the noun and verb markers here have their literary forms; see Bradley (1993) for further examples of these differences.

5.2 POSSESSOR

One of the most frequent occurrences of the reflexive other than as a direct object is in proverbs. These have the form ကိုယ့် /kó/ + noun + ကိုယ့် /ko/ + verb; they can be converted to literary or spoken style by the addition of the appropriate final verb markers. The first /kó/ is a possessive, and the second is a subject pronominal reflexive form which is no longer productive otherwise, but survives in this proverb construction which remains mildly productive, as well as in some adverbials discussed below. Some examples follow.

- (12) *kó à ko kò*
 self's strength self depend on
 Depend on one's own strength.
- (13) *kó làn ko fa*
 self's road self look for
 Find one's own way.

⁹ This is cited in Allott (1990).

- (14) *kó əlou' ko lou'*
 self's work self work
 Mind one's own business.

There are some other proverbs without the possessive, such as the following which also shows SVO order, but these are unusual and much less productive.

- (15) *ko thin gədin fwe nən*
 self think bed palace
 A bed is a golden palace if one thinks so (lit. think one's bed is a palace).

Some other proverbs combine elements in different ways, as in (16) below, where the second part of the sentence has a particle following the subject /ko/.

- (16) *kó wùn na ko ða θí*
 self's belly hurt self only know
 Only oneself knows one's own bellyache (problem).

Apart from these syntactically aberrant proverbial reflexives, it has been argued above that the origin of the direct object reflexive, and its current structure in literary and (for most speakers) spoken Burmese, is underlyingly from a possessive pronoun plus the noun ဂံဝံ /ko/ 'body' and then an identical pronoun. It will be seen below that a similar structure can be postulated for reflexives in the /ko/ + Noun construction. In both cases a reanalysis has become possible as a result of the grammaticalisation of this noun to an object marker, homophonous with 'body' but written differently as ဂံ and behaving differently by voicing in close juncture with the preceding nominal element which acquires an attributive creaky tone on its final syllable if it is not already creaky.

The literary possessive reflexive is /mí mí/ or, with the literary possessive marker, /mí mí í/; plural /mí mí dó/ or /mí mí dó í/. As these already have creaky tone on their final syllables, they can have possessive meaning with or without the marker, as seen in the direct object forms which are optionally without the /í/. These are used much more productively with NPs than /kó/, and may even be heard in spoken Burmese as possessive reflexives. The following example is in a complement clause; the main clause lacks an overt subject but the context suggests 'we'.

- (17) *mí mí tàin pyi kàun aun cò zà myi*
 self's country good in order that try irrealis
 (We) will try to make our own country better.

5.3 SUBJECT INTENSIFIER AND OTHER ADVERBIALS

Apart from the archaic or proverbial usage of /ko/ alone as a subject pronoun as in (15) above, the main reflexive-like form used adverbially after the subject is /ko dain/ as in (18) below; this also may occur without a subject pronoun as in (19), in which case it is ambiguous out of context. Some speakers reject sentences like (19) and (20) and require a subject noun or pronoun to immediately precede /ko dain/.

- (18) *θu ko dain lou' tɛ*
 he/she self-INT do realis
 He/she does/did it him/herself.

- (19) *ko dain lou' tɛ*
 self-INT do realis
 Someone (probably I unless context shows otherwise) does it himself.

This form cannot be pluralised by the addition of the pronoun plural marker /dó/; if plurality is to be indicated at all, it must be elsewhere in the sentence, for example using the verbal marker /cá/ as in (20) or plural marking on the subject nominal if that is present.

- (20) *ko dain lou' cá dɛ*
 self-INT do PL realis
 Some people (probably we unless context shows otherwise) do it themselves.

While the object reflexive operates as a unit within which a pause is not usually possible, a pause is normally required between the subject nominal and /ko dain/; furthermore, like the other reflexives, the initial /k/ does not voice to /g/. Both of these phonological facts imply that /ko dain/ is a separate, appositional constituent which immediately follows the subject; it is unusual for the two to be separated by any other constituent.

Like /kó ko ko/, the form /ko dain/ can occur in embedded clauses; for example in (21a); but /ko dain/ must be coreferential with the underlying subject of the clause in which it stands, not necessarily the subject of the main clause. Likewise, (21b) with /kó ko ko/ in a relative clause is also not ambiguous; it must be coreferential with the subject of the embedded clause, 'person', and not the subject of the main clause, 'I'; this phenomenon may be related to the fact that only a third person nominal can be the head of a relative clause, as noted below; but see also (9) above, which indicates that this constraint was not operating in Old Burmese. Sentence (21c) also shows that the constraint on multiple /ko/ object marker in one sentence can extend beyond a single clause.

- (21) a. *ko dain yai' té lu go cəno θí dɛ*
 self INT hit REL person O I (male) know realis
 I know the person who himself hits (someone).
 b. *kó ko ko yai' té lu go cəno θí dɛ*
 self hit REL person O I (male) know realis
 I know the person who hit himself.

c. *cənó go yai' té lu cənə θí de*
 I (male) O hit REL person I (male) know realis
 I know the person who hit me.

The literary equivalent of /ko dain/ is /mí mí ko dain/, which quite often occurs without any pronominal form in the sentence. In effect the reflexive /mí mí/ is functioning as the head pronoun here. Again, unlike the spoken reflexive form /ko/, a plural is possible for this literary form: /mí mí dó ko dain/.

Burmese also uses a number of other adverbial reflexive forms; for example /ko zi/ 'each person acting separately', /ko thu/ 'by oneself', /ko dù/ 'alone', /ko bain/ 'under one's own control, one's own'. These all appear to contain a fossilised reflexive subject pronoun. Most of these reflexive adverbials also have elaborate¹⁰ four-syllable alternatives. For /ko dain/ the elaborate form is /ko dain ko ja'/ or /ko dain ko já/; for /ko zi/ it is either simply reduplicated /ko zi ko zi/ or /ko zi ko ṇá/ which has an additional meaning: 'each person acting separately, but with the same purpose in mind'. The elaborate for /ko thu/ is /ko thu ko thá/; for /ko dù/ it is /ko dù ko chan/. Interestingly, there is juncture voicing of most unaspirated and some aspirated voiceless stops within these adverbials, unlike the direct object reflexives which do not voice.

Instead of an adverbial reflexive, it is occasionally possible to use the direct object /kó ko/ in subject position with the meaning 'alone', as in the following; of course there are other ways to express this with an adverbial reflexive or a non-reflexive which are much more frequent.

- (22) *kó ko ko θwà de*
 self go realis
 Someone (most likely I) goes alone, by him/herself.

Most speakers reject sentences like (22) when presented in isolation, but they do occur in Burmese discourse.

5.4 POSSESSIVE REFLEXIVE PLUS OTHER NOMINALS

A variety of nouns occur in the construction ကိုယ် */kó/ + Noun*; the most frequent examples are the pronominal /ha/ 'thing' and the nouns /pha ḍa/ 'behalf' and /'ətwə/ 'sake'. This, like the proverb and adverbial usages above, is effectively a reflexive, in this case possessive and therefore with creaky tone. It is exactly paralleled by corresponding non-reflexive forms with other pronouns in possessive form as in (23b) and (23d) below.

¹⁰ This term is due to Matisoff (1982); it refers to formal ABAC or ABCB reduplications corresponding to the usual AB forms. Often the C form is etymologically interesting as it may preserve an otherwise lost cognate.

- (23) a. *cəno kó pha ða əlou' lou' tɛ*
 I (male) self's behalf work do realis
 I work for myself.
- b. *θu cənó pha ða əlou' lou' tɛ*
 he/she my behalf work do realis
 He/she works for me.
- c. *cəno kó pha ða saou' tə ou' wɛ dɛ*
 I (male) self's sake book one CLF buy realis
 I buy myself a book.
- d. *θu cənó ətwɛ' saou' tə ou' wɛ dɛ*
 he/she my sake book one CLF buy realis
 He/she buys me a book.

An indirect object or other non-core case can only occur with a reflexive in a construction like this. There is an elaborate four-syllable /pha ðípha ða/ form of /pha ða/ which, unusually for these elaborate expressions in Burmese, has the free form second rather than first.

The literary equivalent of these /ko/ + Noun constructions is /mí mí/ + Noun, for example /mí mí ətwɛ'/ as in the following example.¹¹

- (24) *lu dó ði mí mí dó ətwɛ' əcò fí aun*
 person PL S self PL sake benefit have in order to
 in order for people to have some benefit for themselves...

5.5 EMBEDDED, CONJOINED AND LINKED CLAUSES

Given the flexibility of order of NPs in a Burmese sentence, it is possible that embedded clauses may be preceded by the subject of the main clause; indeed a sentence like (24) above may be interpreted in this alternative way, taking /lu dó ði/ as subject of the top clause which continues after the complement, rather than as subject of the complement itself. On the other hand some types of embedded clauses, such as relative clauses, normally precede their heads; so it is also possible for the antecedent of the reflexive in such an embedded clause to follow its coreferential reflexive, as in the following examples showing the two alternative spoken forms. As in most languages, relative clauses in Burmese occur mainly with third person heads.

- (25) a. *kó ko ko yai' tɛ lu məkàun bù*
 self hit REL person NEG good NEG
 The person who hits himself is not good.

¹¹ This is cited in Allott (1990), from a Burmese primary school textbook. It is typical of countries with diglossia that schools teach only the literary High; this of course makes the education system much more difficult and less useful for nearly half of Burma's population whose first language is another dialect or language.

- b. *θú ko θu yai' té lu məkàun bù*
 self hit REL person NEG good NEG
 The person who hits himself is not good.

In general the tendency to zero anaphora in Burmese is very strong, especially within the sentence; it is very bad style to repeat pronouns all through a long sentence or short discourse. Therefore many sentences which might be candidates for reflexivisation in other languages have little or no overt pronominalisation in Burmese. The reflexive is a highly topical and marked construction, and where semantically motivated it may also occur within non-main clauses embedded in a complex sentence, in conjoined clauses of a compound sentence, or even in a later sentence in the same discourse. Sentence (9) above shows that this has been the case since the earliest attested Burmese inscriptions; sentence (21b) above shows that the reflexive can now refer only to the subject of the relative clause, but (9) shows that in Old Burmese it could refer back to the subject of the main clause if this differs.

In Burmese, it is unusual to have more than one reflexive in a clause; thus combinations like the following are considered to be very bad style (though some speakers accept combinations like (26b) which involve two reflexives neither of which is /*kó ko ko*/).

- (26) a. **cəno ko dain kó ko ko yai' té*
 I (my)self self DO hit realis
 I myself hit myself.
- b. *??cəno ko dain ko ətwe' sa ou' we de*
 I (my)self for (my)self book buy realis
 I myself buy myself a book.
- c. **cəno kó ko ko ko ətwe' yai' té*
 I (my)self DO for (my)self hit realis
 I hit myself for my own sake.

There is a similar surface constraint on the spoken object marker /*ko*/, which normally may occur on only one NP in a clause. However the relevant Pro or noun still may show the creaked form as if it had the following /*ko*/, so this may be a surface deletion. Where two or more such NPs are present, it is usually an animate NP which is marked, as in the following sentences; see also (21c) above, which shows that the constraint may also extend over more than one clause of a sentence. This phenomenon reflects the origin of /*ko*/ from 'body' and the tendency for /*ko*/ to be used more frequently with animate objects in early inscriptions, as discussed in Bradley (1993).

- (27) a. *cəno sa ou' tə ou' θú go pè de*
 I book one book he/she DO give realis
 I gave him/her a book.

- b. *khəmyà cənó go sa ou' tə ou' θú pè ze dɛ*
 you I O book one CLF him/her give cause realis
 You make me give him/her a book.
- c. *khəmyà cənó sa ou' tə ou' θú go pè ze dɛ*
 you me book one CLF he/she O give cause realis
 You make me give him/her a book.

The literary /mí mí/ reflexive also occurs in non-main clauses in the same ways; for an example see sentence (17) above.

5.6 CONCLUSION

In summary, the reflexive in Burmese has three forms: the earliest, still used in literary style, is /mí mí/; as will be demonstrated below, this may have had a reflexive function in Burmese-Lolo and ultimately derives from a Tibeto-Burman etymon meaning 'person'. More recently the noun /ko/ 'body' has grammaticalised and become a spoken-style reflexive, and most recently this latter construction has been used analogically to produce a third reflexive pattern using any pronoun in place of the /ko/ form and a variety of other body-part nouns as alternatives to /ko/. The analogy is confused by the fact that the noun 'body' has also become independently and somewhat more opaquely grammaticalised into the object marker /ko/ ~ /go/, and this has affected the spelling of the two spoken reflexives.

6. REFLEXIVES IN OTHER BURMISH LANGUAGES

The various dialects of Burmese such as western Arakanese and south-eastern Tavoyan each with substantial numbers of speakers, as well as the smaller subgroups such as north-western Yaw and north-eastern Danu, Taungyo and Intha, all share virtually the same original pronoun system. This is doubtless due partly to shared inheritance and partly to continuing influence from standard Burmese. Details are presented in Bradley (1993). Unfortunately very little data on the reflexive in these dialects is available, but words for 'body' show various connections. In dialects of Burmese such as Arakanese, Intha and Tavoyan (Okell 1995) the form for 'body' is identical, /ko/. In more distant dialects it differs slightly; for example Taungyo has /kə/, prefixed /ʔəkə/, or /təkələn/ with 'one' preceding and the classifier for round things following (Yabu 1981:162). Yaw (Yabu 1980:169) has /ʔəkogaun/ showing a prefix, then reflexes of two Sino-Tibetan etyma; or like Taungyo /dəgoləun/ with 'one' preceding and the round classifier following, or a Burmanised /khendago/ showing the Pali loan *khandā*, also seen in Burmese but usually alone or in the other order, /ko khanda/. The Hpun form /ǎtù/ 'body' (Luce 1985, Henderson 1986) links this language more closely with the other Burmish and Loloish languages than with Burmese itself.

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 forthcoming) 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 AD, they and the Burmans would have been together in the hills to the north-east 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 Ngochang (also known as Achang in China). Within each group there are substantial dialect 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 (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. Atsi forms are from Xu and Xu (1984), while Ngochang are from Dai and Cui (1985).

TABLE 2: BURMISH REFLEXIVES AND 'BODY'

	reflexive	body
Atsi	/y _{um} ⁵¹ siŋ ⁵¹ /	/kuŋ ⁵¹ tu ²¹ /
Ngochang		
Longchuan	-	/a ²¹ tu ²¹ /
Luxi	-	/koŋ ²¹ to ²¹ /
Lianghe	-	/ɑ ²¹ to ³⁵ /

Most other available Burmish words for 'body' relate either to Sino-Tibetan **guŋ*, Burmese-Lolo **goŋ*¹, or to Burmese-Lolo **daw*³, or these two together in this order. For example, Pola /kauŋ³¹ to⁷¹/ (Dai & Xu 1983) and Chinese Maru /kauŋ³¹ tau³⁵/ (Dai et al. 1985) fit with Chinese Atsi and Luxi Ngochang. Northernmost Lashi provides a link to Nungish with its one-syllable forms /kuŋ³³/ or /kuŋ³¹/; compare Rawang and Eastern Dulong forms given below.

7. REFLEXIVES IN LOLOISH LANGUAGES

Details will be given on reflexives in three well-described Loloish languages, from the three main branches of Loloish as reconstructed in Bradley (1979). For Central Loloish this is Lahu, with some further information on Lisu, Lipo and Jino. For Northern Loloish the Shengza variety of Nosu in Sichuan is illustrated, with further examples from a variety of more or less closely related languages in China's Yi nationality. For Southern Loloish the

main example is Akha, but some information on cognate forms in some related languages is also cited. Unfortunately reflexives are not included in the data on Bailang, a Loloish language of what is now western Yunnan transcribed into Chinese in the first century AD and thus the earliest recorded Tibeto-Burman language.

7.1 CENTRAL LOLOISH

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

The reflexive in Lahu is formed by suffixing the noun /ð-to/ 'body' to the pronoun, which may be a stem form or one with suffixes; the following is an example.

- (28) *ɲà-hi* *ve* *ð-to* *dà?* *tù* *ve* *ð-lo* *thà?* *ǵá* *śī* *ve* *yò*
 we (EXC) GEN body good PUR REL thing 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 source¹² for the Lahu noun 'body', there is growing evidence for a Burmese-Lolo form **daw*³ 'body' in a variety 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 (1993).

There is a separate intensifier for the subject: Pro + /qhe/ 'like' + Pro, as in:

- (29) *yδ* *qhe yδ* *te* *ve*
 he/she like he/she do PF declarative
 He/she did/does it (by) himself.

This form is semantically but not of course syntactically analogous to Burmese ကိုယ်တိုင် /ko dain/; see the parallel example (18) above. Like Burmese /kó ko ko/ or Pró + /ko/ + Pro, it is not possible to pause in the middle of Lahu Pro + /qhe/ + Pro.

Lisu is spoken by about 850,000 people, mainly in north-western and western Yunnan in China, with large numbers in north-eastern Burma and some in northern Thailand and north-eastern India. It has a variety of dialects; Bradley (1994) is a dictionary of the two predominant ones, northern and central. Hope (forthcoming) describes southern Lisu, and Metcalf (forthcoming) describes what is sometimes called eastern Lisu but is more usually known as Lipo or Lolopo and is rather different from the first three; in China this is now

¹² The corresponding Thai form is /tua/, which of course also figures in the Thai reflexive /tua'eey/, literally 'one's own body'.

classified as Central Yi, with several hundred thousand speakers in northern central Yunnan. Forms are given here from the northern dialect (data from Bradley 1994) and Lipo (data from Metcalf forthcoming). The reflexive in Lisu is innovative /tɕi⁵⁵tɕ^hɛ²¹/ from a noun 'self', perhaps a Chinese borrowing. In Lipo and Lolopo reflexive pronouns are formed by Pro + /mɛ⁵⁵/ + Pro, for example /ya²¹mɛ⁵⁵ya²¹/ 'him/herself', with the middle syllable a likely cognate to the Burmese literary reflexive. Similarly in Lahu ('Western Yi') the reflexive is Pro + /mɛ³³/ or /mɛ²¹/.

The Jino are China's most recently recognised nationality; they now number about 18,000 and are concentrated in a small area of south-western Yunnan just west of the northern tip of Laos. Despite this small number, there are fairly large internal dialect differences which the standard description of Gai (1986) notes. The main dialect is spoken by about ninety per cent of the Jino. Like Lahu, it has a likely cognate of **daw*³ in its reflexive /k^hɔ⁴⁴to³³/.

7.2 NORTHERN LOLOISH

In China the Yi nationality of some 6.6 million was established after 1950, from various groups formerly called by the name Lolo. Chinese sources classify it into six separate subgroups, each speaking distinct languages. Central Yi includes Lipo and Lolopo, is in fact very closely related to Lisu, and is thus Central Loloish. Western Yi including Lahu and a variety of 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 or Nesu, 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. Nosu pronominal forms are cited from the Shengza dialect, centred on Xide in southern Sichuan, from Chen et al. (1985:120).

As in some Central and Southern Loloish languages, there are separate possessive/attributive forms for the singular pronouns: /ŋa⁵⁵/ 'my', /ni⁵⁵/ 'your (singular)', /ts^hz²¹/ 'his/her'. One of the reflexive forms is a reduplication of this attributive form, singular /ŋa⁵⁵ŋa⁵⁵/ 'myself', /ni⁵⁵ni⁵⁵/ 'yourself', and with 21 > 44 sandhi /ts^hz²¹ts^hz⁴⁴/ 'him/herself', while the plural is a reduplicated form of the fused one syllable plural with a sandhi tone on the second syllable.¹³

¹³ There are several sandhi processes by which 33 or 21 tones in Nosu change to the 44 tone; see Bradley (1990) for more details, including the plural reflexive forms.

Another more general reflexive is /tsz⁵⁵ɬɛ³³/ or /tsz⁵⁵ɬa³³/, perhaps derived from Chinese /zìjǐ/. Further reflexives include Pro + /yi²¹/, /yi²¹yi³³/ or /yi²¹du³³/; and Pro + /vi³³/ + Pro. While none of these can be related to the Burmese reflexive, there is a form /mi²¹yi⁵⁵/ 'everyone' which also shows the likely process of development from Tibeto-Burman 'person' to Burmese-Lolo 'people, everyone'; further developments to 'one', 'oneself' and a reflexive form are quite widespread in Northern Loloish as seen in Table 3 below.

Nasu or Eastern Yi is extremely widespread and probably covers much of the traditional territory of the Northern Loloish group. This includes north central and north-eastern Yunnan and western Guizhou. Indeed the Samei variety of Eastern Yi under its former name Cuan was probably the local language of the Kunming area, the capital of Yunnan, prior to the influx of the Chinese more than a millénium ago, and some remnant communities remain. The most divergent variety is spoken in south-western Guizhou around Panxian. Forms in Yi Historical Documents Section (1984), the Dafang and Panxian reflexives cited in Table 3 below, look similar to the Nosu form that is borrowed from Chinese; but the Samei reflexive and 'everyone' in Samei and some other Eastern Yi varieties shows the cognate form.

For Nisu or Southern Yi, the reflexives of some varieties show cognate forms, while all have the cognate in the 'everyone' meaning, as shown in Table 3 below. All South-eastern Yi varieties have the cognate both for the reflexive and for 'everyone'; in addition, Sani (Jin et al. 1984) has an alternative reflexive Pro + /tu³³tu³³/; this shows a cognate with the *daw³ reflexives in other Loloish languages. A source with more varieties but much less syntactic information is Yunnan (1983) which cites forms from 28 varieties of 'Yi'. Fifteen of the 24 varieties which are Northern Loloish have cognate forms as shown in Table 3; also included are reflexives from Shuangbo, Dafang and Panxian cited from Yi Historical Documents Section (1984).

TABLE 3: NORTHERN LOLOISH REFLEXIVES¹⁴

		'someone'	reflexive
Northern	Nosu	/mi ²¹ yi ⁵⁵ /	(various, see above)
	Sondi	/ʔi ²² mi ³³ /	/tsz ⁵⁵ ɬɛ ³³ /
Eastern	(Xundian)	/mb ³³ mb ²¹ /	(= Pro)
	(Luoping)	/a ³³ məɹ ³³ /	Pro + /zu ²¹ /
	(Weining)	/me ²¹ me ³³ /	Pro + /zo ²¹ dy ²¹ /
	(Dafang)		/tsz ⁵⁵ ɬɛi ²¹ /
	(Panxian)		/tsz ⁵⁵ tsa ³³ /
	Samei	/əɹ ³³ mə ⁵⁵ /	/ə ⁵⁵ mə ⁵⁵ /

¹⁴ Non-parenthesised names are autonyms; parenthesised names are names of the county where that variety is spoken. Most of the latter call themselves Nasu, Nesu or Nisu so autonyms are not very useful in distinguishing them.

South-eastern	Sani	/A ⁴² mɛ ⁵⁵ /	/A ²¹ mɛ ⁵⁵ /
	Azhe	/A ²² mæ ³³ /	/A ²² mæ ³³ /
	Axi	/A ³³ mA ²² /	/A ³³ mA ²² /
	Azha	/A ²¹ mur ⁵⁵ /	/A ²¹ mur ⁵⁵ mur ⁵⁵ /
	(Funing)	/moŋ ³⁵ /	/moŋ ³⁵ /
Southern	(Xinping)	/A ⁵⁵ məɹ ³³ /	Pro + /gu ⁵⁵ gu ⁵⁵ /
	(Shiping)	/A ⁵⁵ mɛ ³³ /	Pro + /vi ⁵⁵ vi ⁵⁵ /
	(Jiangcheng)	/A ⁵⁵ mɛ ³³ /	/A ⁵⁵ mɛ ³³ /
	(Eshan)	/A ⁵⁵ mɛ ²² /	Pro + /kɻ ⁵⁵ kɻ ⁵⁵ /
	(Shuangbo)		/ʔa ⁵⁵ mɛ ³³ /

In summary, the Northern Loloish languages show a range of reflexives, including some possibly borrowed from Chinese, some based on the Burmese-Lolo etymon for 'body' derived from **daw*³, and many showing a possible cognate for the literary Burmese form. Of the latter, seven have a reflexive meaning, and fifteen have the 'everyone/people' meaning. The reflexive use is found in three of four branches, while the 'everyone' use is found in all four branches.

7.3 SOUTHERN LOLOISH

Akha is spoken by a population approaching 600,000 in Burma, south-western 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) in China and Laos, Piyo (Chinese Biyue) in China, or Mpi in Thailand. Akha forms are cited from Lewis (1989).¹⁵

The reflexive and the intensifier both use /ha/, the same marker as seen in the third (absent) pronoun; in the reflexive this marker shows a tonal alternation. The intensifiers are /ŋà ha/ 'I myself', /no ha/ 'you yourself' and /à ha/ 'he/she him/herself'. After these forms the dual marker /ɲà/ or the plural marker /mà/ may be added. The reflexive is /yð há yð ha/; if it is not third person, the first or second person subject form pronoun may be prefixed to this to disambiguate it. The corresponding form in northern Akha as spoken in parts of China is /ya³³/, and in closely-related Hani it is /ya³³/, and in Haoni /yo³¹/; other such northern examples of /y/ are noted in Bradley (1979:40). In this case the Akha/Hani form reflects a *w initial. The full reflexive /ɰv³¹yo³¹/ in Haoni (Li & Wang 1986:147) also corresponds well to the Akha/Hani form. Interestingly, there is a creaky tone in the Akha third person animate

¹⁵ 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.

pronoun /á ỳ/ which is irregular and unexpected; but it is absent in the corresponding reflexive form /ỳ/.

8. RECONSTRUCTION OF BURMESE-LOLO REFLEXIVE FORMS

There are various reflexive pronoun cognates of Burmese မိမိ /mí mí/ in a wide variety of Northern and Central Loloish forms all reflecting a likely Burmese-Lolo etymon, Burmish **mr³mr³* reduplicated and Loloish **may²*. The Burmese **Tone 3*/Loloish **Tone 2* difference is not unparalleled; see Bradley (1979:216) for other examples which include such excellent cognates, also with Burmese high vowels, as **Cnu³²* ‘soft’, **sr³²* ‘know’ and others; and the rhyme difference is also not unusual, given the instability of front vowels in early Burmese. This Burmese-Lolo reflexive appears to be related to the widespread Tibeto-Burman etymon **mi* ‘person’, not otherwise attested in Burmese-Lolo; the semantic shift is natural enough.

Starting from ‘person, people’, the first shift to ‘everyone’ is quite natural; this meaning is still found in a variety of Northern Loloish languages, and is reflected in the generic ‘one, oneself’ meaning of Burmese /mí mí/ (and its spoken equivalent /kó ko ko/) alone. The further generalisation to a wider reflexive use is found in Burmese as well as a number of Northern and Central Loloish languages.

Nouns for ‘body’ are also prominent as grammaticalised forms including denominal pronouns. From the Sino-Tibetan cognate reconstructed as **s-ku*, Burmese-Lolo **s-ko¹* come the Burmese object marker and the Burmese reflexive /ko/, also more recently used as a second or first person pronoun in Burmese. From another Sino-Tibetan etymon, **guŋ*, Burmese-Lolo **goŋ¹* 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, **daw³*, come a variety of Loloish reflexive forms; this may be partially blended with Dai forms from Dai **tuá¹*; there are various sporadic extra-Burmese-Lolo reflexive cognates in various branches of Tibeto-Burman as well. Though not attested in Burmese itself with the meaning ‘body’, it appears to be the source of the Burmese pronoun pluraliser /tó/ and more recently a first person plural (inclusive) form by reanalysis; this may also be connected with some Burmish as well as Nungish pronoun plural suffixes, as described in Bradley (1993). Many other Burmish languages reflect a two-syllable compound form from **guŋ¹ daw³* or **ʔədaw³* for the noun ‘body’,¹⁶ and other combinations of these etyma also occur.

¹⁶ For more details see Bradley (forthcoming).

9. REFLEXIVES IN RELATED TIBETO-BURMAN LANGUAGES

According to the conventional classifications of Shafer (1966-73) and Benedict (1972), Burmese-Lolo (Shafer's Burmish Section) includes Naxi (Nakhi, Moso) of north-western Yunnan, the Xifan (Hsifan) languages of western Sichuan, and extinct Xixia (Hsi-hsia, also known to Turkic groups as Tangut) formerly spoken further north still. Benedict (1972:8) indicates that Nungish (Trung or 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" while 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 and Burmish or Burmese-Lolo 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 substantial shared innovative lexicon. Chinese linguists have arrived at a classification which includes Naxi and Bai (of north-western Yunnan) and Tujia (of western Hunan and Hubei and eastern Sichuan and Guizhou) with Loloish. Conversely, Sun (1983) demonstrated links within the Qiang group in which he includes Qiang and the various Xifan languages (Pumi, Shixing, Namuyi, Choyo, Ersu or Tosu, Muya, Guiching, Zaba, Ergong, Jiarong (rGyarung) and the very diverse Qiang 'dialects') but not Burmese-Lolo; to this some other scholars have linked Baima in northern Sichuan. 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. Thurgood (1984) suggests a Rung subgroup which is meant to include Nungish among other languages, as noted below. Data from a variety of these languages where some connection of genetic subgrouping within Tibeto-Burman or contact with Burmese-Lolo has been claimed is presented below. Other Tibeto-Burman subgroups are not discussed; these include Karen, Kuki-Chin, Baric, Kiranti and other Himalayish languages; for these such data as is available does not suggest any close links with Burmese-Lolo in the area of reflexives.

9.1 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. 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 4: NAXI REFLEXIVES AND 'BODY'

	reflexive	'body'
W Naxi	/u ³³ tu ³³ u ²¹ /	/gv ³³ mu ³³ /
EXC Naxi	/tɒ ²¹ ka ⁵⁵ /	/gv ³³ mi ³³ /

The etymon for 'body' is from the Sino-Tibetan etymon **s-ku*, and the reflexive may be related to the Loloish reflexive from **daw*³ 'body'.

9.2 NUNGISH

The following data on Nungish includes Rawang of northern Burma from R. Morse (n.d.) and from China, Dulong (two varieties, western and eastern) from Sun (1982) and Nusu further south from Sun and Liu (1986). There are many more local varieties in Burma, which S. Morse (1989) clusters into five subgroups; unfortunately he does not provide sufficient data for use here.

TABLE 5: NUNGISH REFLEXIVES AND 'BODY'

	reflexive	'body'
Rawang	Pro + /gón/	/gón/
Dulong E	/a ²¹ dw ⁵³ / or /aŋ ¹ lǔ ⁵⁵ /	/gɔŋ ⁵³ /
W	/a ²¹ dw ⁵³ /	/aŋ ²¹ gur ⁵⁵ /
Nusu N	/tsz ⁵⁵ tɕi ⁵³ /	/tɕ ^h z ²¹ gur ⁵⁵ /
C	/tɕ ^h i ⁵⁵ tɕ ^h a ²¹ /	/tɕi ³⁵ gur ²¹ /
S	/tsz ²¹ tɕi ⁵³ /	/tɕi ⁵⁵ gur ²¹ /

The Nusu reflexive forms appear to be recent Chinese loans; but it is most tempting to connect the Dulong forms with those derived from **daw*³ in Loloish. The cognate portions of forms for 'body' relate to one or other of the Sino-Tibetan etyma.

9.3 BAI AND TUJIA

The classification of Bai has long been problematic. Bai or 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 Chinese loanwords from a series of stages of Mandarin and other varieties 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 various attempts to discover the pattern of correspondences have foundered on the problem of sorting out loanwords from various stages of a related language. Similarly, the recently described Tujia language formerly spoken in a large area of south-western Hubei, western Hunan, north-eastern Guizhou and south-eastern

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 north-western Guizhou and southern central Sichuan. Data on Bai is from Xu and Zhao (1984); Tujia forms are from Tian et al. (1986).

TABLE 6: BAI AND TUJIA REFLEXIVES AND 'BODY'

		reflexive	'body'
Bai	NE	/tu ⁴² tã ⁵⁵ jĩ ²¹ /	/ts ^h ẽ ⁵⁵ kur ²¹ /
	SE	/tã ³⁵ jĩ ²¹ tsi ³³ /	/ts ^h i ⁵⁵ k ^h ou ⁵⁵ kur ²¹ /
	W	/tua ⁴⁴ tua ⁴⁴ /	/tɕ ^h i ⁵⁵ gũ ⁴² /
Tujia	N	/ko ³⁵ to ²¹ /	/so ⁵⁵ thi ²¹ /, /so ⁵⁵ thiu ²¹ /
	S	/tsho ³³ bo ³³ /	/to ⁵⁵ pho ²¹ /

It is tempting but inconclusive to connect the second syllable of the northern Tujia, the first syllable of north-eastern Bai and the reduplicated western Bai reflexives to the Burmese-Lolo **daw*³ reconstructed form for 'body'; also the second syllable in northern Tujia and the first in southern Tujia. The lack of identity in every case between the reflexives and the corresponding nouns for 'body' suggests otherwise, however.

9.4 XIXIA

Most scholars assume that Xixia or Tangut, the extinct language formerly spoken to the north-east of Tibet in Gansu and Ningxia, was a Tibeto-Burman language; some have claimed that it was Loloish, but this appears to be incorrect. The Xixia reflexive is unrelated; the putative phonetic form cited with several sentence examples in Keping (1979:237-8) is /in¹/ for possessive, or (reduplicated) /in¹in¹/ for direct object form.

9.5 XIFAN

Like Xixia, this subgroup of languages was formerly linked with Burmese-Lolo, for example by Shafer (1966-74). However Sun (1983) has shown that there is a close internal link between these languages and Qiang; hence this subgroup of Tibeto-Burman is now usually called Qiangic. Included are Pumi as described in Lu (1983), Qiang as described in Sun (1981) and, according to some scholars (but not Sun), Baima of north central Sichuan as described in Nishida and Sun (1990). However, the reflexives like many other aspects of Baima imply a closer link with Tibetan and Bodic generally. Monpa forms are from Lu (1986). Apart from the general Tibeto-Burman cognate forms for various 'body' etyma, there is nothing here to link with reflexives in Burmese-Lolo, but there is a possible look-alike second syllable in the northern Qiang word for 'body'.

TABLE 7: XIFAN AND BODIC REFLEXIVES AND 'BODY'

		reflexive	'body'
Pumi	S	/niɑ ⁵⁵ /	/gə ¹³ hmu ¹³ /
	N	/pə ⁵⁵ ɣi ³⁵ /	/ly ³⁵ pu ⁵³ / (cf. Tibetan)
Qiang	S	/u ⁵⁵ sie ⁵⁵ /	/ɕe ⁵⁵ pe ³³ /
	N	/ɲuɲu/	/ku ti/
Baima		Pro ⁵³ + rɔ ¹³ ŋge ⁵³ /	/ky ¹³ ly ⁵³ /
Monpa/Dzalakha		/rAŋ ³ /	/lu ³⁵ po ⁵³ /
spoken Lhasa		/raŋ ³ /	/su ⁷¹³ ku ⁵³ /
written		raŋ	lus(-po), gzugs, sku

9.6 RUNG

Thurgood (1984) has proposed a subgroup of Tibeto-Burman linking Xixia, various Qiangic languages including rGyarung (Jiarong) and those cited above, Jinghpaw/Kachin, the Nungish languages cited above, Luish or Sak, Miju/Kaman and Taraon Mishmi, Lepcha and various languages of western Nepal including Magar, Chepeng and Kham. This subgrouping has not gained wide acceptance.

Jinghpaw data is from Liu (1984); Mishmi data is from Sun et al. (1980); Lepcha is from Mainwaring (1898); Magar is from Shepherd and Shepherd (1972), Chepeng from Caughley (1972) and Kham from Watters and Watters (1973).

TABLE 8: RUNG REFLEXIVES AND 'BODY'

	reflexive	'body'
Jinghpaw	/ti ⁷⁵⁵ naŋ ³³ /	/k ^h um ²¹ /
Taraon Mishmi	/ɲoŋ ³⁵ xɑŋ ²¹ /	/tiuŋ ⁵⁵ /
Kaman Mishmi	/ɲo ⁵³ ki ⁵³ /	/ɕɑi ⁵³ /
Lepcha	Pro + do	zu, mǎzǔ, mǔ, mǔzǔ, ku, lu, lyǔ, lyu, puŋ, koŋ
Magar	/laha/	/jyu/
Chepeng	/lay [?] /	/ʔaŋ/, /kaa [?] /
Kham	/ʔol/	/ʔkyan/

Concerning the Taraon Mishmi reflexive, compare /ɲoŋ³⁵/ 'you' and /xɑŋ³⁵/ 'I'. Similarly, for Kaman Mishmi reflexive, compare /ɲo⁵³/ 'you' and /ki⁵³/ 'I'. These two forms appear to be derived from a first plural inclusive conjoined form – a novel source; none of the other reflexive forms here appear to derive from the noun for 'body' either. Note also the Jinghpaw second syllable, which is identical to the second person pronoun /naŋ³³/ . None of these forms suggests a relationship between the languages of different Tibeto-Burman subgroups which Thurgood has placed in the Rung group, nor with anything specifically Burmese-Lolo.

9.7 LUIISH OR SAK GROUP

Luish includes a number of small and mostly moribund languages of western Burma and adjacent areas of India. In Manipur, these were Andro, Sengmai and Chairel; in Burma, Sak, Ganan, Kadu and Taman. As noted above, Shafer groups these within his Burmic group, along with Burmese-Lolo, Nungish and a variety of other subgroups including Kuki-Chin-(Southern) Naga. Unfortunately almost no Luish data on the reflexive is available, apart from one Sak form, /à pa na/ 'myself' (Thùn Jwe Khain 1988:17); for 'body' Luce (1985 v.2:58) cites Sak /ko²/, Ganan /ko¹/, Kadu /laŋ⁴/ and Taman /tu/. Of these, the last may fit with Loloish *daw³ 'body', while the first two belong with the Sino-Tibetan etymon *s-ku, and Kadu may be linked with Gong (Burmese-Lolo) /hoŋ dúŋ/. In the absence of complete data, the connection is unclear.

9.8 MISINGISH (MIRISH, ABOR-MIRI-DAFLA)

Formerly known as Abor-Miri-Dafla from the previous and somewhat pejorative names used by outsiders to refer to the Adi, Mising and Nishi groups of what was formerly the North-East Frontier Agency or NEFA and is now Arunachal Pradesh, this subgroup of Tibeto-Burman has not received a great deal of attention, mainly due to a lack of well-recorded data. Each of these groups, especially the Adi, contains a large number of named subgroups; for some details see Marrison (1989) and Bradley in Moseley (1994). What is most likely an accidental look-alike reflexive form to the Loloish reflexive from *daw³ 'body' is found in Apatani, a component of 'Dafla' or Nishi in western Arunachal Pradesh. This is /átó/ as in the following sentence, cited from Simon (1972:7) with tones and glosses added from Abraham (1985, 1987).

- (30) *ŋo átó únè gí to*
 I self wound pull PAST
 I hurt myself (lit. pulled myself a wound).

Overall, the reflexives in Tibeto-Burman languages for which various scholars have suggested a close relationship with Burmese-Lolo do not show close parallels in the pronominal form which is used; but there are some look-alike forms in more distantly related Tibeto-Burman languages such as Apatani and Lepcha.

10. CHINESE

The other subgroup of Sino-Tibetan, Sinitic or Chinese, has two longstanding reflexive pronouns, which Karlgren (1957) reconstructs as 1237m *dz'i-, modern /zì/, and 953a *kjəg/kji-, modern /jǐ/, whose modern reflexes are compounded into the modern Mandarin Chinese /zìjǐ/ Harbsmeier (1981) convincingly demonstrates that the first was used in Classical

Chinese as an object reflexive, subject intensifier or adverbial (1981:189-199); while the second was a noun meaning 'self' extended into use as a contrastive reflexive pronoun and in embedded sentences to refer back to the subject of the main clause (1981:177-188). Of course this has no connection with the Burmese-Lolo forms, other than those in Northern Loloish which may be borrowings from the modern Mandarin Chinese two-syllable compound. Karlgren (1957:317) suggests that /zì/ "is said to be a drawing of a nose"; this reflexive may thus be derived from an earlier word for 'nose'. Karlgren also indicates that the character is used as a radical in 521c 'nose' and 1088a 'smell bad' which are of course semantically related to the nose but phonetically unrelated and non-reflexive. While /jǐ/ is written with the same character as the sixth of the ten Heavenly Stems, it is difficult to discern a clear semantic path from this to the development of a nominal 'self' meaning, so the character may be a phonetic one. In any case neither of the reflexives of Classical Chinese is similar to the various denominal Tibeto-Burman and Burmese-Lolo forms, and so there is no possibility of reconstructing a Proto Sino-Tibetan reflexive.

11. CONCLUSION

In summary, there is one likely reconstructible Burmese-Lolo reflexive form, with cognates in Burmese မိမိ /mí mí/ and widespread Loloish cognates in Northern and Central but not Southern Loloish; these all reflect a likely Burmese-Lolo etymon, Burmese *mí³mí³, Loloish *may². This appears to be derived from the widespread Tibeto-Burman etymon *mí for 'person' which is virtually unattested in Burmese-Lolo in its nominal sense; so this semantic/syntactic shift is a characteristic of Burmese-Lolo. The likely process of this shift is discussed above.

Other reflexives are derived by parallel processes of denominal innovation from words for 'body', including the Burmese ကိုယ် /ko/ form from Sino-Tibetan *s-ku. Most others derive from the Sino-Tibetan etymon *guŋ or the mainly South-eastern Tibeto-Burman etymon *daw³.

Burmese reflexives of the form described here are mainly restricted to direct objects coreferential to a subject within the same discourse; this need not be within the same clause or sentence. Since zero anaphora for subjects is very frequent in connected discourse, the subject may be absent; such sentences are ambiguous or generic. In addition, parallel constructions using the same pronominal forms (literary မိမိ /mí mí/, spoken ကိုယ် /ko/) are used with reflexive subject meaning in some adverbials; there is also a possessive form, used to express indirect objects and other nominal reflexive arguments with a following noun head, such as ဖာသာ /pha ṣa/ 'behalf' or အတွက် /ətwe/ 'sake' for indirect objects. The possessive and subject form reflexives are also combined in frozen proverbial expressions.

While no other subgroup of Tibeto-Burman or Sino-Tibetan shows absolutely convincing evidence for the Burmese-Lolo **daw*³ in the meaning 'body' (despite some look-alikes in Tujia and northern Qiang), as a reflexive it does appear to extend beyond Loloish. Examples include Naxi, Dulong, Bai, Tujia and Jinghpaw; all of these are relatively close to Burmese-Lolo within Tibeto-Burman. There are also look-alike reflexives in Lepcha and Apatani. As the form is represented in so many branches of Tibeto-Burman, perhaps it should be more widely reconstructed as a reflexive even though the development from 'body' to reflexive is so natural. It is best attested in Burmese-Lolo where it may have been reinforced from the Dai form **tua*⁴, and is a widespread Burmese-Lolo noun meaning 'body', a denominal grammaticalised reflexive form in some Loloish languages, and a pronoun pluraliser in Burmese.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, P.T.**, 1985, *Apatani grammar*. CIIL Grammar Series, 12. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
 1987, *Apatani-English-Hindi dictionary*. CIIL Dictionary Series, 3. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
- Allott, Anna J.**, 1985, Language policy and language planning in Burma. In David Bradley, ed. *Papers in South-East Asian linguistics* No.9: *Language policy, language planning and sociolinguistics in South-East Asia*, 131-154. PL, A-67.
 1990, *Introduction to reading*. MS. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Ba Han**, 1966, *The university English-Burmese dictionary*. Rangoon: Hanthawaddy Press.
- Ba Shin**, 1962, *Lokahteikpan. Early Burmese culture in a Pagan temple*. Rangoon: Burma Historical Commission.
- Benedict, Paul K.** (contributing ed. James A. Matisoff), 1972, *Sino-Tibetan: a conspectus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bradley, David**, 1975, Nahsi and Proto-Burmese-Lolo. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 2/1:93-150.
 1977, Modernization and diglossia in Burmese. *Osmania Papers in Linguistics* 3:1-12.
 1979, *Proto-Loloish*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 39. London/Malmö: Curzon Press.
 1982, Register in Burmese. In David Bradley, ed. *Papers in South-East Asian linguistics* No.8: *Tonation*, 117-132. PL, A-62.
 1990, The status of the 44 tone in Nosu. *La Trobe University Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:125-137.
 1993, Pronouns in Burmese-Lolo. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16/1:157-215.
 1994, *Dictionary of the northern dialect of Lisu (China and Southeast Asia)*. PL, C-126.
 forthcoming, Noun particles and grammaticalisation in Burmese.
- Burling, Robbins**, 1983, The Sal languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 7/2:1-32.
- Caughley, Ross C.**, 1972, *A vocabulary of the Chepang language*. Kirtipur: Summer Institute of Linguistics/Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.
- 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.
- Dai Qingxia et al.**, 1985, A brief description of the Pola vernacular spoken by Jingpo nationality [in Chinese]. *Minzu Yuwen* 1985/6:55-71.
- Dai Qingxia and Xu Xijian**, 1983, A tentative inquiry into the Langsu dialect [in Chinese]. *Yuyan Yanjiu* 1983/2:219-242.
- Gai Xingzhi**, 1986, *Outline of Jino* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.

- Harbsmeier, Christoph**, 1981, *Aspects of Classical Chinese syntax*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 45. London/Malmö: Curzon Press.
- He Jiren and Jiang Zhuqi**, 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*, 101-134. Cornell Linguistic Contributions vol.5. Leiden: Brill.
- Hope, Edward R.** (ed. David Bradley), forthcoming, *Lisu-English dictionary (southern dialect)*.
- Jin Guoku et al.**, 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 No.29.
- Keping, Ksenia B.**, 1979, *Sun Tsi v Tangutskom perevode*. 2v. Moscow: Nauka.
- 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 and Wang Ersong**, 1986, *Outline of Hani* [in Chinese]. Beijing Nationalities Publishing House.
- Liu Lu**, 1984, *Outline of the Jingpo language* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Lu Shaozun**, 1983, *Outline of Pumi* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- 1986, *Outline of Cuona Menba language* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Luce, Gordon Hannington**, 1981, *A comparative word-list of Old Burmese, Chinese and Tibetan*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- 1985, *Phases of pre-Pagán Burma: languages and history*. 2v. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mainwaring, G.B.** (revised and completed by Albert Grünwedel), 1898, *Dictionary of the Lepcha language*. Berlin: Unger.
- Marrison, Geoffrey E.**, 1989, The Adi-Dafla languages of north-east India: a sketch. In David Bradley et al., eds *Prosodic analysis and Asian linguistics: to honour R.K. Sprigg*, 205-222. PL, C-104.
- Matisoff, James A.**, 1982, *The grammar of Lahu*. Second printing. University of California Publications in Linguistics vol.75. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- 1988, *The dictionary of Lahu*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol.111. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- 1991, Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu. In Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine, eds *Approaches to grammaticalization*. vol. II, *Types of grammatical markers*, 383-453. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Metcalf, G.E.** (ed. David Bradley), forthcoming, *Lipo-English dictionary*.
- [Morse, Robert]**, n.d., *Gvray 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*, 237-250. PL, C-104.
- Moseley, Christopher and R.E. Asher**, eds, 1994, *Atlas of the world's languages*. London: Routledge.
- Nishida Tatsuo and Sun Hongkai**, 1990, *A study of the Baima-Chinese vocabulary* [in Japanese]. Kyoto: Shokado.
- Okell, John**, 1967, Nissaya Burmese: a case of systematic adaptation to a foreign grammar and syntax. *Journal of the Burma Research Society* 50/1:95-123.
- Shafer, Robert**, 1966-73, *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*. 5v. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Shepherd, Gary and Barbara Shepherd**, 1972, *A vocabulary of the Magar language*. Kirtipur: Summer Institute of Linguistics/Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Simon, Ivan M.**, 1972, *An introduction to Apatani*. Shillong: Arunachal Pradesh Administration.
- Sun Hongkai**, 1981, *Outline of Qiang* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- 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.
- Sun Hongkai and Liu Lu**, 1986, *Outline of Nusu language* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.

- Sun Hongkai** et al., 1980, *Menba, Luoba, Deng people's languages* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Academy of Social Sciences Publishing House.
- Taw Sein Ko and Charles Duroiselle**, 1919, *Epigraphia Birmanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Burma (Archeological Survey of Burma)*. vol. I part I. Rangoon: Government Printer.
- Thùn fwe Khain**, 1988, *Yəkħain myau' phyà deθa hmá θe' tàin-yìn-ðà myà* [θe' nationality from north Arakan]. Rangoon: Rangoon Offset.
- Thurgood, Graham**, 1984, The 'Rung' languages: a major new Tibeto-Burman subgroup. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10:338-349.
- Tian Desheng** et al., 1986, *Outline of Tujia* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Tun Nyein**, 1906, *The student's English-Burmese dictionary*. Rangoon: Government Printer.
- Watters, David and Nancy Watters**, 1973, *An English-Kham and Kham-English glossary*. Kirtipur: Summer Institute of Linguistics/Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Wurm, Steven A. and Peter Mühlhäusler**, eds, forthcoming, *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.
- Xu Xijian and Xu Guizhen**, 1984, *Outline of Jingpo (Atsi language)* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Yabu Shiro**, 1980, Linguistic data of 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 of 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 Documents Section**, 1984, *Yunnan Sichuan Guizhou Guangxi Yi-Chinese comparative dictionary of basic vocabulary* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Central Institute of Nationalities.
- Yunnan Institute of Nationalities and Yunnan Nationalities Language Commission**, 1983, *Yunnan Yi dialect vocabulary* [in Chinese]. Kunming: Yunnan Institute of Nationalities and Yunnan Nationalities Language Commission.