

Wolfenden's Non-Pronominal a-Prefix In Tibeto-Burman: Two Arguments From Southern Chin And Some Proposed Semantic Correlates.

F.K. Lehman
University of Illinois, Urbana

0. The intent of this paper is to take a new look at a classical problem in comparative Tibeto-Burman linguistics. The purposes are both descriptive and historical: descriptive in the first instance, because the evidence from Southern Chin suggests very forcefully how we should treat a certain kind of a-prefix on nouns and derived nominal in a synchronic grammar; historical, because it is possible to suggest from the descriptive treatment in Southern Chin and from some comparative evidence a reconstruction in Tibeto-Burman of a particular grammatical process that has come down to several modern T-B languages, including some that seem, on Wolfenden's theory of nominal prefixes not to have the non-pronominal one. I think this double problem or purpose is proper for a paper in the tradition of synoptic Tibeto-Burman linguistics.

0.1 The facts I am going to deal with concern what Wolfenden (1929) has called the non-pronominal a-prefix on derived nominals. I shall start out by briefly recapitulating the highlights of Wolfenden's ideas and observations on the matter, since, as far as I can make out, in so far as there can be said to-day to be any on-going concern with the comparative treatment of this phenomenon in comparative T-B linguistics, no important revision or replacement for Wolfenden's treatment has been seriously advanced. For instance, Benedict's revised Conspectus (1972: section 28) does no more than state Wolfenden's attempted distinction between 3rd-person pronominal a- and a non-pronominal a- on derived nominals and then suggest that ultimately even the so-called non-pronominal a- is after all derived from proto-T-B a for the 3rd-person pronoun, and furthermore identical in derivation with Classical Tibetan h- before certain stops and affricates. He claims further than the difference between the two Tibetan prefixes a- (Wolfenden's ?a, non-pronominal, and a-, pronominal) is a matter of stress, the ?a (as opposed to [ə]=a-) being the stressed form used in front of many kinship-relational words, e.g., Burmese ?apha/?aphei, father, ?aphou, grandfather. Other than this, which amounts less to a rejection of Wolfenden's hypothesis than a claim that even more deeply the two formatives are the same, we are, certainly from the standpoint of serious morpho-syntactic analysis, hardly farther along than where Wolfenden left us.

In fact I shall try to show that Benedict's revision of Wolfenden's thesis is correct. Moreover, such pre-transformational, structuralist grammars as have become available since Wolfenden's treatise on languages exhibiting the so-called non-pronominal a-,

e.g., Burmese (Okell 1969, Cornyn 1944), seem to content themselves with listing this prefix as a formative on certain classes of nouns, generally derived or relational in character and not speculating upon its deeper lexical or syntactic relationships, whilst for example our most recent work on J̄men Chin (Jordan 1969), a language in which the pronominal a- and the so-called non-pronominal a- are clearly distinct, confuses them hopelessly. I think, then, I am justified in starting with an overview of Wolfenden's treatment and then proceeding to an analysis of the Southern Chin data, taking off from that to the more general comparative viewpoint by way of some aspects of the use of the so-called non-pronominal a- in Burmese.

1. Wolfenden begins the relevant part of his monograph at page 69, section 60, with a discussion of the Tibetan (Classical) substantives. Here he proposes to deal with the so-called non-pronominal a-prefix on certain substantives, i.e., "...the prefix ?a-, the relatives of which in other languages are traced for Kachin in section 64, for the Bodo and Naga languages in section 103, for the Kuki-Chin group in sections 185-6, and for Burmese in section 216." The kind of argument advanced by Wolfenden for considering this to be some kind of non-pronominal prefix is not altogether persuasive. Within Tibetan he claims to reconstruct a third person singular pronominal background for what is often treated or transcribed from the written Tibetan as ā-, the a-chung, and he feels forced to think of what is often transcribed as ?a- from the Tibetan, so-called preglottalized a-, as a quite separate element from the former. He takes this course for at least two reasons.

First, he has trouble finding plausible means for assigning his internally reconstructed semantic interpretation of the a- prefix as a third person (subject) marker to the orthographically distinguishable ?a- prefix. Moreover, as a prefix, the former is perhaps more usually represented on verb bases than on nominal ones, and it is this fact that enables Wolfenden to make his pronominal interpretation, while the latter, ?a-, is prefixed only to nouns, and this chiefly of certain classes such as kinship terms.

Second, starting from the last mentioned observation, one might, as various workers have suggested, interpret the ?a- prefix as a third person possessive, except that Wolfenden feels that there are strong arguments against this view. For instance (pp. 100 ff.) very different third person possessive prefixes appear before these words in such actual possessive expressions as those for "his mother" and the like. And when the true possessive is first person, it is often, in Bodo and Naga, followed by the invariant a-prefix. This again might be thought inconclusive, since it is always possible to suppose that the ?a- here represents a frozen prefixation that was, in an earlier stage of the language, not invariably attached to the base but was subsequently replaced in its productive function as a personal possessive by other forms. Wolfenden, however, appears to feel that he cannot take

this line. In the first place, he appears to find no reason to make this internal reconstruction, partly for reasons of apparent phonological distinctiveness between ʔa- and ǎ-.¹ In the second place, he feels that comparative considerations within T-B support the position he in fact takes.

That is, in such languages as Kachin and Burmese, where an a-prefix appears on at least certain classes of substantives, Wolfenden finds no basis for internally reconstructing these as ancient pronominal forms, since only very different looking forms ever appear in straightforward pronominal usage. On the other hand, in such languages as many Naga and Kuki-Chin ones, he finds both an a-prefix that he can plausibly interpret as a possessive third person pronominal and the use of a or ǎ-derived forms as independently attested third person pronouns. Of course this argument, while suggestive, is not conclusive, since the earlier forms of these T-B languages might well have represented a period at or before which the a- as a productive pronoun inherited from common T-B had simply been replaced by competing forms except in specialized possessive uses. After all, Wolfenden uses a similar argument when he discusses the succession of consonantal subject and object prefixes in Tibetan itself. Indeed, given the observation that many Chin languages, like Burmese, characteristically use the a-prefix on such relational words as those for kin relations, it might have been supposed that the a-prefixes of the latter were, like those of the former, interpreted as possessive pronouns in origin. However, Wolfenden rejects this line of argument, motivated, one imagines, by the need to discover presumptive comparative evidence for his separation of the ʔa- and the ǎ- within Tibetan. With such circularity of thought it is surprising that Wolfenden came as near the mark as I shall try to show he did come in this matter.

1.1 Let us begin by looking at Wolfenden's overview of the a-prefix on Kachin kinship words. The third person singular pronoun is ʃi-. Father is a-wà, mother a-nù, while the non-relational word, house, is ñtǎ. "His father" is usually ʃiʔ (a2) kəwǎ, where it appears that the glottal stop after the pronoun is some sort of copy of that after the possessive postposition a2; the latter, unproblematically distinct from any of the possibly pronominal particles we are considering, is then optionally deleted in such expressions. "His (or her or its) mother" is ʃiʔ (a2) nù, and "his house," ʃiʔ ñtǎ. In the first expression, we note that the a-prefix is replaced by kə-, but it remains possible to say ʃiʔawǎ, in which case apparently, the postposition -a2 is obligatorily deleted. What this is held to show is the thoroughgoing difference between Kachin personal pronouns and the a-prefix. But since Wolfenden himself, quite properly, reconstructs another pronominal prefix, one that later replaces *ba- and its reflexes in Tibetan, k(a)-, the suppletive relation in Kachin between a- and ka in the case of the word for father casts doubt on his conclusion here.²

Wolfenden proceeds to consider certain facts about Lepcha in comparison with Kachin (p. 72), and here it turns out that for both, in strictly cognate instances, the a-prefix is employed in the derivation of adverbs, chiefly manner adverbs, from adjectives--- which, of course, function syntactically as verbs in these languages. This is a crucial observation of which Wolfenden makes too little. In the first place, the use of the prefix to mark derived or deverbal substantives is widespread in T-B. In the second, comparative evidence, as we shall see, strongly suggests that these adverbs are at least underlyingly postpositional phrases whose constituent noun phrases are just these deverbal substantives. Thus the Kachin example: ateñ, truly, from teñ, to be true.

Thereupon he considers several cases where he claims that certain verb stems prefixed in Kachin by a- are adjectives, but here again Wolfenden goes wrong in not observing the verbal character of the adjectives. The prefixed forms are clearly reduced relative constructions. Thus, e.g.,

a-teñ, spotted [i.e., something spotted] from teñ, to be spotted

Wolfenden then (p. 72) makes the claim that, "this non-pronominal a- of Kachin has invaded the domain occupied in the Kuki-Chin area by the quite distinct pronominal element a-..." What he appears to mean is that, as I have pointed out above, in the Kuki-Chin languages an a-prefix is used in just these ways, but owing to the presence in these languages of a productive a- third person pronominal prefix for possessive expressions and as a marker of the subject on finite verb phrases, he feels compelled to interpret the Kuki-Chin expressions that parallel the above instanced Kachin ones as third person possessive constructions. Thus,

<u>Kachin</u>	<u>Thado</u> [Khonjai]
<u>a-k'a</u> [the] bitter,	<u>a-k'a</u> [implicitly treated here as the
sour	bitterness of SOMETHING].

What has always bothered me about this line of argument, which Wolfenden pursues at length both here and throughout his work, is its inability to make an obvious generalization. Why is it that the T-B languages that use a- as an explicit third person pronominal marker are just the ones that insist upon forming all abstract relational nouns and most nouns based upon adjectives by means of the concretizing possessive, whereas just the languages not using a- as an overt pronoun can formulate these deverbal substantives in overtly abstract fashion? The attribution to languages of an apparent incapacity to express overtly abstract forms, which Wolfenden defends in several places, simply because it appears convenient to ignore apparent homonymy of prefixed markers, seems far fetched.

Wolfenden only compounds the difficulty when he proceeds to introduce the use in Mikir and certain Bodo and Naga languages, in the same context of substantives derived from adjectives, of yet another third person pronominal form with a Tibetan cognate.

Thus (p. 73)

Kachin a-si, deatn

Mikir ke-t'i, death

where the pronoun is of the series ka-, ke, which Wolfenden proposes to relate to the old third person pronoun or demonstrative k'o. This sort of thing, rather than showing that the two a- prefixes are distinct, would seem to suggest that they have something in common. The evidence of family-wide patterning is almost overwhelming (on the velar prefix, see Benedict 1972).

1.2 It is not without interest that throughout the work Wolfenden suggests that many of the T-B pronominal forms he deals with were originally demonstratives (cf. Postal 1970).

Now on the one hand, we should consider the possibility that postulating a demonstrative origin for pronouns need not imply anything more than a demonstrative element in all personal pronouns. In particular, it need not imply that these surface pronouns are not equally representative of the dummy (pro-) nominal element. But if this be so, we can place Wolfenden's suggestion in the proper context of the evidence offered, e.g., by Benedict, that at least some of these prefixes are what we might call class prefixes, i.e., that they mark fundamental semantic categories both in (personal) pronouns and when used before full nouns. Thus he says (1972, 113) that the velar prefix seems to occur inseparably with words for body parts in many Chin languages, in konyak Naga, and so on.

If this is right, then it is plausible to suggest that despite the demonstrative element in them when used pronominally, the prefixes are fundamentally representative of the dummy PRO element in noun phrases. In that case, considering the widespread evidence from T-B languages that noun and verb bases are largely deverbal, we ought to entertain the idea that even when they appear on full nouns the prefixes represent an abstract PRO element, nominal. That is, we should consider the idea that at least most nouns are underlyingly something like relative constructions of the form ONE which VERB. E.g., we shall examine evidence from Chin and other languages that kinship words, which so frequently take Wolfenden's non-pronominal a-prefix, are deverbal substantives from underlying relational verbs or adjectives such as "to mother," "to father" and the like. There has grown up recently in theoretical linguistics a considerable literature on the hypothesis that nouns must be represented in deep syntactic structure in more or less this way (Bach 1968, Lakoff 1972, McCawley 1968, Postal 1967, Ritchie 1971, see also Lehman ms.).

I submit that the kind of evidence adduced for the prefixes by Wolfenden is already, in the light of current theory, strongly suggestive of the hypothesis that these prefixes on substantives in citation form rather than in clear possessive expressions all mark the nouns they are attached to as derivative, and that therefore even Wolfenden's non-pronominal a- is in these

languages underlyingly a PRO element in complex NP's. Hence, even though in the languages with the so-called non-pronominal a-, the element no longer functions as a surface personal pronoun, it is correct to insist, with Benedict, that it is cognate historically with the personal pronoun a in the other T-B languages. I shall try to show this in what follows.

1.3 In the light of the foregoing interpretative suggestions it seems to me wholly puzzling why Wolfenden should have taken the tack he did. After all, elsewhere in his book (e.g., p. 95) he gives sound evidence that within Tibetan itself older pronouns were eventually displaced by later ones, the former being even limited to use as prefixes. For instance, he argues that the aforementioned velar third person prefixal series is related, as already mentioned, to Tibetan k'o, which is said to have replaced an earlier *ba- as an independent personal pronoun. Moreover, not only is it the case that in Tibetan the latter came to be limited to use as a prefix, but it is also the case that Wolfenden's pronominal a- in T-B generally is said to be derived from just this *ba- (see above on a-chung). One must ask therefore why this process should not have been repeated in other T-B languages? It would account well for the striking parallels between a-prefixing on nouns in Wolfenden's pronominal and non-pronominal cases. Why indeed, reverting once more to the possible relation between Tibetan a- and ?a-, should the replacement of one independent pronoun by another form not have happened even within Tibetan more than once with respect to whatever really underlies the a-chung? Or why, putting it more precisely, could this replacement not have been gradual, taking place first in the case of the relationship words, thus producing the distinction between ?a- and *ba- (eventually a-)? Wang at least (1969) has given strong arguments in favor of the view that language change more frequently than not proceeds by means of such gradual replacements of one form by another in ever wider lexical contexts.

If this is a proper view, then we may have a better account than that of Wolfenden for the puzzling double prefixes in some of the Bodo languages that led Wolfenden to claim that in these cases the a-prefix could not be an original pronoun. It is precisely to account for such "residues" in the domain of phonology that Wang developed his hypothesis. Thus Wolfenden cites (p. 102) the case of Bodo, where we get an-ni a-fâ, my father, where an is independently required as the first person pronoun and kinship terms generally in citation form take prefixed a, but bi-fâ, his father. Here, surely, if, as Wolfenden argues, the a- of the first person expression is not related to the first person pronoun an, its replacement by bi in the third person expression need amount to nothing more than a rule copying, except in the case of the first person, the possessive pronoun in place of the invariant prefix on terms of relationship.

1.4 We can now turn briefly to Wolfenden's consideration of the Kuki-Chin languages and then to the crucial case of Southern

Hill Chin (Cho or Kxou). Here most unambiguously we find the use of a- as the marker of the third person in a wide variety of cases, and it is therefore in these languages that Wolfenden and others are led to suppose that wherever a- precedes names of body parts and family relationships and the like it has a possessive meaning. I shall take whatever examples I use for Chin other than Cho mainly from my own work on Haka Chin (Lai hol?), for the tonality of which I refer the reader to my earlier paper (1973).

In a great number of these languages a- serves as a clear cut pronominal marker of the third person singular. For the most part that of the first person is ka-, that of the second na-. The matter is not altogether straightforward, however. The cited forms are clitics placed, for example, immediately before the verb root in case an indirect object marker is not also incorporated with the subject prefix (see Lehman, in press). Thus

ka-kal, I go
na-kal, you go
a-kal, he, she, it goes.

But the citation forms for these pronouns in Haka Chin, the language of these examples, are, respectively

kei ma?, I
nan ma?, you
a ma?, he, she, it.

wolfenden discusses these facts inconclusively beginning on page 175. This discussion to the contrary, it seems for reasons not elaborated here that ma? and its cognates can be translated into English either as ONE (see above) or SELF (not reflexive); in any event it is almost without question representative of the underlying PRonoun with which the elements kei, nan, and a are demonstratives. Evidence comes in part from the existence of such expressions as ma? hin (the one here, such a one), where the preceeding demonstrative is null and the deictic element, meaning near, proximal, is postposed in the usual way (cf. hi khua hin, this village, here). Furthermore, consider certain of the Chin languages immediately to the south of the Lai/Haka area, such as Lautu and Lakher (see Lehman 1963). In these, 'he' is, roughly, a-ma pa [əmə pa], where -pa is the male affix; 'she' is a-ma nu (nu = female). Given the fact that quite generally these affixes of gender are attached, as to names for kinds of animals, after nouns, and given the fact that a-nu and a-pa mean, respectively, a man (father) and a woman (mother [indefinite]), and given, finally, that the affixes -pa and -nu are underlyingly adjectives, it is easy to see that ma? represents the mark of something like definiteness on the PRonoun in personal pronominal expressions. The PRO element is phonologically null in the indefinite, hence the superficial impression that -pa and -nu are themselves the gender-marked PRO element ONE. For further comparative data on ma? note (wolfenden p. 180) that in Meithei, a Chin-related language, ma-, rather than a- stands before at least terms of relationship, as ma-pā, father. This

is, informal Lai, also frequent as a variant of a-pa etc.³

Anyhow, it appears that, as subject pronominal clitics, ka-, na-, and a- are reduced forms. And since these languages are in the clearest sort of way so-called topic-and-comment languages (see Lehman, in press), it seems that the clitics are the result of copying rules. Thus, for the short form,

ka-kal, I go

we have the longer or full form

kei ma? cu, ka-kal.

Note that in these languages cu marks the subject topic of intransitive verbs and the object of transitives, whilst ni? marks the subject topic of the transitive verbs.

Clitics of the same form moreover serve as possessive pronouns before nouns. Wolfenden (e.g., p. 179), like other authorities, assumes tacitly that these are just the subject clitics. But this is not obviously so. We shall see at least in Southern Chin that the subject clitics represent copies of forms like kēi, nān, and a-ni, respectively, for first, second, and third person (plus, of course, the topic marker), but the possessives of the same form come from, or are direct reductions of, and not copies of forms like kēi ja?, nān pa? and anl ja?, where (C)a? is the postposition of relationality. Thus, 'my father' is either ka-pa or kēi ja? pa. The matter is by no means this clear in Haka, but there is at least some reason to suppose that possessive clitics here too are reductions or, rather, copies, obligatorily in this case, of something like the cognate forms cited for Southern Chin.

But Wolfenden assumed that these clitics are simple forms in their derivation, otherwise he could not have made the easy inference that if these clitics serve at all in such a language as markers of personal possession, then whenever they occur before a noun they must be such markers. In other words, the evidence does not actually permit us to say that a surface form like this is always of the same underlying form. Indeed, even if we could say this it would not strictly follow that wherever we get a+Noun we have a possessive construction; but where there is reason to think that this form has alternative possible derivations (is ambiguous syntactically) the inference is quite out of the question. At least in Southern Chin, as we shall see, a+Noun is ambiguous in the intended sense. Note, finally, that if a-pa can mean either father, citation form, or his father, and if possessive expressions have approximately the derivation suggested above, then surely the a-possessive in some way replaces the a- of the citation form, probably on the basis of what is called a surface constraint to the effect that a- must be deleted when it immediately follows another pronominal clitic in the same word. This is the constraint that, for instance, is

needed to describe the otherwise peculiar fact that if you have a third person indirect object the object is incorporated in the subject clitic as zero; this being the only case of zero-incorporation. E.g.,

I-to-myself	<u>kāa pē</u>	give
I-to-you	<u>kāan pēek</u>	give
I-to-him	<u>ka pēek</u>	give
you-to-me	<u>na-ka pēek</u>	give
you-to-yourself	<u>tēen pēek</u>	give
you-to-him	<u>na pēek</u>	give

and so on.

1.5 I said earlier that Wolfenden treats Kuki-Chin generally as using the a- prefix before substantives simply in the sense of his pronominal marker of possession. However, he in fact, as I have also pointed out, notices that one cannot always be certain which usage one is encountering. In particular he notices (p. 179 ff.), though he says little about it, that there is a good deal of evidence in Southern Chin that the non-pronominal a- exists in this context. When he mentions Southern Chin, of course, he means Plains Chin or Shō (ašei) (see, e.g., Stern 1962). But this sort of thing can also be seen in the case of Southern Hill Chin. Meanwhile, one should point out that some of the comparisons he makes between what he feels are clear cases of pronominal a- in Northern Chin languages and non-pronominal in Southern Chin are at very least open to a different interpretation.

It is true that a- appears in citation form before certain kinds of substantives in many of the Northern languages, and we have seen that adjectives there are proper verbs. Now Wolfenden gives examples that purport to show at least a radical difference in the meaning of the prefix in this context -- what else it shows, if anything, is questionable -- as between Southern and Northern Chin. Thus (179), "Thado a-min adj. ripe, Lushei a-m'in id.,.... Thado a-sā, a-šā adj. thick, but Shō (Southern Chin) a-s'o subst. thickness." We have already noted the fact that what Wolfenden here cites as adjectives may well be intended as substantives themselves, so that we should have "thickness" instead of "thick" in his glosses. Nonetheless, since he is aware that adjectives are syntactic verbs in these languages, it may be that these forms are, if not meant as substantives, simply adjectival verbs conventionally cited in third person form, e.g., "(it is) thick" and the like. The reason why this is not paralleled in Southern Chin however means nothing more than the following: in Southern Chin the third person singular subject clitic on finite verbs is null. This concludes what I can say about Wolfenden's treatment of the a-prefixes.

2. Having introduced the subject of Southern Chin, I wish to now look into it further, because with data from this language it can be shown that what must often appear to be the same usage

of an a-prefix is, even within one and the same Chin or T-B language, easily shown to be two quite different ones. The material I shall be citing is from the language spoken by the M̄Men people living between Mindat and the Hlet Long valley (Lehman 1963). Their name for Chin in general, themselves included, is Cho or Kxou-.⁴

First about the a-prefix. Many nominalizations on adjectives take this prefix in the form of āk-, ak n̄-, a good one, ak sen-, a red one, ak- s̄ē-, the bad, and so forth. In Jordan's dictionary some of these forms are called adverbs, and I have already commented on this. Not all adjectives do this, but it will appear that there is no obvious surface phonological distinction between those where the prefix ends in -k and those where it does not. Thus, e.g., a le-, a black one, the black one. Some that do not take -k take instead a nasal final on the prefix, as an- k̄an-, a large one, an-kxin-, a green one. This latter class in fact consists wholly of roots with an initial vocalic nasal prefix (stem prefix) ā or ṅ. Thus, ṅk̄an cī-, it is large (null third person proclitic subject), kan k̄an cī-, I am large, nan- k̄an cī-, you are large, and so on; similarly, for "green": kan- kxin- cī-, nan- kxin- cī-, ṅkxin- cī-. However, ka- sen- cī-, na- sen- cī-, sen- cī-, for "red"; ka- l̄ēk cī-, na- l̄ēk cī-, l̄ēk cī-, for "black" and so on. The vocalic nasal element is a genuine prefix; these prefixes are often derivational morphological elements, e.g., making intransitive into transitive verbs, plain adjectives into causatives and the like. However, on some roots they are simply basic. Jordan discusses them at some length in his Grammar.

The phenomena just discussed are not restricted to the case of adjectival roots: a-l̄ō-, one who goes, a going; ka-l̄ōk cī-, I go, l̄ōk cī-, he goes; a-ph̄ā-, one who catches or arrests -- ak-ph̄ā in the more easterly Mindat dialect, and there are quite a few instances of verbs differing in class membership in this regard from one dialect to another --, ka-ph̄āk cī-, I arrest someone; kā kai- cī-, I climb, and so on. It will be noticed that verbs have two stems. Stem I is that to which simple finite tense endings like -cī "present" and kh̄ai "future" are added, while Stem II is the one used for nominalizations and for such modal verb expressions as the Desiderative, which appends to the root vai-. Thus, (I) ka-ph̄āk kh̄ai-, I shall catch someone, but (II) ka-ph̄ā vai-, I must catch him, ph̄ā vai-, he/she/it must catch someone, etc. And yet, kak-d̄ai? cī-, I stab him, ak-d̄ai?-, a stabbing/one who stabs (for this verb I=II); kāk kxou- cī-, I roll something up, ak-kxou-, one who rolls something up/a rolling up of something (here too I=II, the tonal distinction being conditioned); ka-pek- cī-, I give, a-p̄eit-, something given, na- p̄eit nei-, you're the one given/ it was your giving (where nei marks the sentence as equational). In the last case the two stems are quite distinct and prefixed clitics fail to take final -k. kan-b̄an cī-, I cover myself, as with a hat or umbrella, a-b̄an-, a covering up; kak-b̄an cī-, I cause someone to cover himself.

ak-bīn, causing someone to cover up/ one who causes such a thing. Here again we find the vocalic nasal prefix and furthermore it is the taking of the final -k that goes along with the morphological derivation of a causative (transitive) verb.

If we allow ourselves to speak of verbs that induce clitic prefixes to take final -k as k-Stems, then in general adjectives are k-Stems on Stem II only, if at all. Transitive verbs generally are k-Stems either on both Stems or neither. Furthermore, just as vocalic nasal prefixes are shown to exist in large measure by the fact that they can be used as derivational markers on roots, so apparently in at least one or two instances can "intrusive" k be shown to exist in this way. This makes it seem as though, underlyingly, k-Stems are roots prefixed by -k, just as some roots are prefixed by vocalic nasals. We shall argue that this is the right conclusion to draw and that the expected occurrence of the k- prefix before certain stems is countermanded by a general phonological constraint which prevents word initial stop + C clusters. Intrusive k of k-Stems must then be a prefix of the same general class as the vocalic nasal prefixes.

The morpheme preceding a prefixed stem may be one of three types: vowel final, nasal final, or vowel plus glide final. If vowel final the following prefix becomes the final of that preceding morpheme. The k-Stem sen, red, becomes ak sen, a red one. A nasal final becomes a stop assimilated in position to the following stem initial consonant. Thus, e.g., khlei? is a k-Stem meaning to brandish, and šim means knife. šip khlei? is the name of a funeral dance and signifies the waving of a work knife. Likewise, tu, a race or category of people, a population, is a k-Stem, and than-nān is the name of the founder of a clan, who are then called collectively than-nāt tu. The Thang Nūn Folk. A vocalic nasal prefix may or may not influence the final nasal of a preceding morpheme. For some speakers or styles in the village of Bong, im, house, ākxin, green, but in kxin, green house; for others it is im kxin.

A final glide may be w (which I write u after a vowel) or i (postvocalic i). In such a case the glide is itself replaced by the prefix. Thus ūja, an adjective signifying the young female of certain species, ūi, dog, but ūn ja, a young bitch. Similarly, ai, fowl, but ak-sen, a red fowl; an-kxin, a green chicken; khōu, sun, weather, mhnāp, to be later on, khom-hnāp, day-time. Sometimes, since there is some variation in prefixes a given form can take with a given meaning, day-time is khok-hnāp.⁵

2.2 It is necessary now to look at possessive expressions, in order to see that they are formed differently from nominalizations of the kind we have just been considering, even when, as is often the case, they appear to have the same form as the latter, e.g., a + Stem. At least one reason for doing this is to provide evidence for the proposition that deverbal nouns in possessive expressions are based upon Stem I of their respective verbs while

deverbal nouns that are simply the reduction of relative clause constructions are based on Stem II.

Consider adjectives:

<u>sen-ci</u>	it is red; <u>ka-sen-ci</u> , I am red
<u>ak sen-</u>	a red one, redness (the color red)
<u>a sen-</u>	its redness (the fact that it is red)
<u>ṅkanci</u>	it is large; <u>kaṅ-kanci</u> , I am large
<u>aṅ-kān</u>	a large one
<u>aṅ-kān</u>	its gross size [Stem I=Stem II]
<u>ṅkxin-ci</u>	it is green; <u>kaṅ-kxin-ci</u> , I am green
<u>aṅ-kxin-</u>	a green one
<u>aṅ-kxin</u>	its greenness (factive)
<u>nīkci</u>	it is good; <u>ka-nīkci</u> , I am good
<u>ak nī</u>	a good one
<u>a-nī</u>	its goodness [one of a small class of verbs whose Stem I takes a final consonant just in case an auxiliary follows but not otherwise; they all seem to concern final -k. Some others are <u>cik/ci</u> , to do, to have sexual intercourse, and <u>ok/ō</u> , to drink.]

It is easy to see that in these cases, if the verb is a k-Stem it is only in Stem II. The two stems also frequently differ in tone, although some of the tonal variation, as stated earlier, is conditioned.

Now take the case of non-adjective verbs, both transitive and intransitive. As mentioned before a verb of these classes is a k-stem on both stems or on neither. Thus, ka-lōkci, I go, a-lō, his going, one who goes; but kak-dāi?ci, I stab someone, ak-dāi?, a stabber, someone stabbed, his stabbing. They are all on Stem II, like nominalizations, and are in fact always based upon factive nominalizations (see below). Thus, ka-phāk-ci, I arrest someone, a-phā, a catcher, one caught, someone's arrest; kak-khiv-ci, I speak or say something, ak-khiv, a speaker, something said, his speaking. We can readily see that, if this is correct, expressions of the form ak + root are all made on Stem II, while those of the form a + root are, depending upon the class of the root verb, either on I or II.

In this language, wherever we have an expression of the general form a(k)+X, where X can be anything and the whole can be translated as a possessive (his/her/its X), the expression is freely replaced by the longer anija?+X. Thus a-im or anija? im, his house, a-pā or anija? pā, his father, ak-dāi? or anija? dāi?, his stabbing (where "he" is either subject or object of the stabbing) and so on. This extends moreover to genitives in other persons, so: ka-pā or kēija? pā, my father, na-im or nanna? im, your house, kā sen- or kēija? sen-, my redness; and even to genitives whose first member is not a pronoun, as pāja? im (occasionally pāwa?) one's father's house. It is of course

of the greatest importance that not all expressions of the general form being considered are expanded in this way. Thus, ak-dai? in the sense of a stabber, one who stabs, cannot be replaced by anljak dai?, which, if as above it does not mean his stabbing; it means his stabber, the one who stabs him. Also, crucially, while in the case of intransitive verbs, e.g., a-lò can mean a going or his going, in which case we also get anlja? lò, his going (factive), a-lò, meaning one who goes, never takes the longer form (? his goer?).

2.3 It should be clear, especially from the last example, that a- is not identical with a?. Furthermore, it is not the case that a- is always simply a telescoping or contraction of anlja? or a clitic copy based on the latter (cf. the suggestion in section 1, above). In fact a? is a postposition, here employed with a roughly genitive meaning though it has a more general force in, for instance, locative expressions. As such it does not assimilate a following underlying k- prefix from a stem. Instead, this postposition and most if not all postpositions undergo close juncture. The postpositions almost all begin with /^o/ in citation form. They take initial glides after nouns ending in vowels or glides and take initial consonants or liquids identical with final consonants or liquids of the nouns they follow. Thus, e.g., imma?, in or at the house, nan-na?, of you, kēija?, of me, kho-mikka?, of or at the sun (kho-mik) and so on. The glide is not fully predictable, since after -a either j- (preferable) or w- (less frequent) can occur.

Now, although a reduced subject relative of the general form a + root, such as a-phà, one who arrests, does not have the expansion anlja?+root, the postposition a? indeed seems to figure in its unreduced form. Thus, suppose we replace the a- in a-lò, a goer, by the word for person, kxan-, and get from this the acceptable kxan-lò, going person. This in turn is replaceable by the unreduced relative expression lōkcija? kxan-, a person who goes, and so on for all ordinary verbs and adjectives, as in phākcija? kxan-, a person who catches or arrests someone, or ūk ni/ nīkcija? ūi, a good dog/dog that is good. Clearly the a- in such reduced relative constructions somehow represents the pronominalized head of the construction identical with the subject of the relative clause.

If, say, anlja? phà cannot, as the foregoing explains, be a-phà in the sense of one who catches, it can nevertheless have a variety of meanings: the one caught by him (anl = agent), the fact of his arresting someone (anl = patient). And all are expressible by a-phà, one arrested (by someone now unspecified, hence no anlja?), and arrest (by or of someone, unspecified, both object and subject underlying unspecified). Notice that if the subject, say, of a reduced relative expression be explicitly mentioned, as in anlino? ak-dai? (nei.) the result is necessarily an equational sentence, "He is a stabber." Here the ak-dai? is itself a reduced relative construction whose immediate subject is not mentioned and the entire sentence in

which it is embedded must have a representation of roughly the following kind:

$$s[_{np}[_{anl} (no?)] \quad np[_s[XY \text{ dāi? } (cī)]ja? \quad n[X]]_{np}]_s$$

where X is the subject NP, anl of the matrix equational sentence, and Y is the object of dāi?, to stab (no? marking the subject-agent of a transitive verb, cī being the finite verbal tense-ending).

Some further examples might be: ak-kōt, a bearer, anlū ak-kōt, the carrier of him, where cū marks objects-patients of transitive verbs, subjects of intransitives, here the object of the relative clause (reduced); and this causes the postposition a? to be deleted upon reduction of the relative construction, because a postposition cannot directly follow a topic marker: anljak-kōt, which can mean the same thing or that which he bears. (he = anl): here a noun within the relativized clause is left intact, because it is not coreferential with the head of the construction, the linking postposition ja? cannot be deleted, and it fuses with the pronominalized head of the reduced relative, a(k), giving -jak.

It is also instructive to see that, in general, expressions of the form a(k)+root cannot be derived from unreduced relatives in which the head noun of the whole construction is in identity with the object of the relative clause unless the subject or its pronoun be explicitly mentioned, i.e., as at least a specified pronoun (see Lehman ms.). Despite the convention there are such grammatical expressions as ak-kxou, something rolled up, such as a mat. In such a case the subject and the object in the relative clause are both non-specific.

We have yet to account for those cases of expressions of the general form a(k)+root whose meaning is that of a factive nominalization (see examples above), such as a-lō (a going, his going), a-phā (his arrest of or by someone), ak-dai? (his stabbing of/by someone). Crucial is the fact that these are, for the cases of transitive and intransitive verbs but not adjectives, constructed on verb-Stem II. Now Stem II is chosen when, in the case of relative clause complement constructions, the construction is reduced, i.e., the condition is reduced, i.e., the conditions are present for the finite ending to be obligatorily deleted from the verb and this surely requires late lexical insertion of verb roots. We may however ask whether there is any independent evidence that factive nominalizations are actually formed from the kinds of noun phrase complement structures just dealt with. I think such evidence exists.

But first, can it be demonstrated that what I have called factive nominals are just that? There is another sort of deverbal noun, also formed on Stem II, and this is unambiguously not a relative nominalization. I refer here to nominals formed by adding nā·k to a verb root. Examples are: phānā·k, an arrest,

more or less freely interchangeable with a-phà in the same sense, or (Jordan 1969:20, 158, but I am unsure of the tone of the verb-stem) zum-nā·k/a-zum-, belief, the act of believing. Jordan (1969: 158) explicitly cites forms of this sort as bearing the possible interpretation of object relative constructions (here, "what is believed"), but my informants categorically denied this is possible. I am not certain where the source of this conflicting testimony lies, so I shall simply treat the matter from the viewpoint of my own field notes.

Recall now that adjectival roots do not enter into constructions with nā·k and that their factive nominalizations, which indeed seem always to be preceded by true possessive pronouns or noun phrases, are inevitably on Stem I. These two observations seem to go together, because of the fact that forms with nā·k are always on Stem II. Since adjective roots, in the case of relative nominalizations, use Stem II, as we have seen, we are virtually forced to assume that the genitive-factive nominalizations on adjectives are represented peculiarly. Consider the expression a sen-, its redness. It seems correct to think of the construction as involving an embedded sentence whose verb is the adjective sen-, the moreso as the verb is in Stem I, which is that of the simple finite tenses. The sentence, however, could not be the complement of the construction in the usual sense, and if anything should be called complement here, it is surely the possessive pronoun an (ja?). On the same ground, if anything deserves to be thought of as the head of such a construction, it is certainly the embedded clause. Now, an order from left to right is correct for this view, since we have shown earlier that in the clearest cases, those which follow a clause with the finite ending followed by the linking particle a? and then a factive or relative pronoun or noun, the dependent clause is to the left of the head followed by a?. The presence at some level of a representative of what would become lexically the finite ending ci is motivated by the presence of Stem I. Therefore, at the point in the derivation where the Stem is chosen the finite ending must still be present. If then, as Lakoff (1971) suggests, there is a level of representation called shallow structure defined as that point after the application of cyclical rules where lexical insertion applies, the rule, whatever it may look like, that deleted finite endings in the case of possessive nominals based upon adjectives is a post-shallow structure, or at any rate post-cyclical, rule.

3. I now turn to another aspect of the Southern Chin material, nouns that may appear not to be deverbal but which nonetheless seem to take an inherent a-prefix. The first type of these is the term of kin relationship. I cannot list the entire kinship lexicon; besides not all of these words take a prefix. I shall therefore limit myself to a consideration of only one or two of them.

3.1 The following merit consideration:

ka-pā my father kēi jā? pa
na-pā your father nan na? pā
a-pā his/her father ani jā? pā
a- pā father

ka-nū my mother kēi ja-nū
na-nū your mother nan na? nū
a- nū his/her mother ani jā? nū
a- nū mother

zākpā a male ak-pāmī (male
human)

ak-hnū a (human) female ak-hnūmī
an-hnū a (human) female

zākpā son, male child
zāpāmī

zākhnū daughter, female child
zākhnūmī zāhnū

(Note: Jordan (1969:229) gives son and daughter without the intrusive k, but in Bong at least this is wrong; moreover, Jordan lists male and female with prefixed ak-)

zā child

kōn ak-pā a male tiger
ūk pā a male dog

kōn ak-hnū a female tiger
ūi nū kōn hnū

kōn tiger (has human character in Chin,
ūi dog hence takes hnū not nū)

Superficially, it must appear as though we have two different though etymologically related words for, respectively, father and male, e.g., pā and kpā. An argument advanced earlier concerning Haka Chin words for mother and father holds equally for Southern Chin: we must suppose that there is an underlying unlexicalized term for parent to which pā is suffixed in the usual way, as in the examples above for child, dog, etc. The dummy word for parent appears however to remove the k- prefix of the root for male. The k would become the final of a lexically empty head, and either a universal or language specific convention must ensure that a consonant final standing alone after a dummy gets deleted. I know of no discussion of such problems in the literature.

Anyhow, the apparatus we have arrived at independently of the present considerations provides a natural account of the otherwise puzzling relationship between the word for father and that for male, and similar arguments apply in principle to mother and female, although khū and nū are distinct even if related. The similarity between father, a-pā and his father a-pā is largely fortuitous, and Jordan like Wolfenden is wrong in supposing these kinship terms lexicalized possessives. In fact, although he says this at page iv of his Introduction, he is forced to draw away from this position at page 12 in the Dictionary. There he points out that a-nū, his mother, cannot be the same expression as a-nū, a grown female. Furthermore, it is easy to show that these words are verb-like.

One can say ka-nin-nū, I am your mother or, more exactly, I mother you, and this is not an equational sentence. First, there are no equational sentences with incorporated objects on their

subjects; object incorporation is defined only on subjects of transitive verbs and, for indirect objects, intransitive verbs. For the case under consideration the equational sentence would be kēi (cū) na-nū (nei.), I (subject) your mother (equational). The real problem is obvious: in the first sentence though nū functions as a verb it is a sort of defective verb and I have no idea why it fails to take a finite ending.

Second, there are expressions such as ka-nin-pā nākī, I have you as my father. These are interesting (see Jordan 1969: Dictionary p. 157; Grammar p. 12). nāk is a verb that means "to have" taking noun objects or marks factive nominalizations. These complements are not in principle equational expressions and thus the element that, like pā in this example immediately precedes nāk is a verb. This is seen not only from the fact that pā and the like must in any event be verbs but also in such related expressions (complements) as nin-šē nākī, he abused you (literally, he had you as bad), where the subordinate verbs are clearly adjectives.

From the foregoing it seems that at least relational words of this kind are built explicitly on verb-like roots. These roots appear to be k-stems on Stem II only, in view of such expressions as kēija-pā, my maleness. And the a(k)- prefix on these nouns when not intended as possessive words is derived by means of complement reduction, whereas the possessive expressions are built the way adjectivally based ones are built. This last fact seems to depend upon a fundamental relation between adjectival and what may be termed relational predicates or roots, the relation being marked at least by the fact that the two classes share the property of taking k-stems only on Stem II.

Next I want to look briefly at certain other words that may provide some additional confirmation of the hypothesis so far put forward. Consider the following:

- a. kū wa? loi. the top of a pagoda (kū)
- b. kū wa? kūn the base of a pagoda
- c. kū ak-khin. the small bells of a pagoda kūkhin.
- d. kūk tun. a post symbolically representing a pagoda
(but never *kū ak-tun.).

a. through c. are straightforward possessive phrases with the linking genitive a?. In fact there is no other way to account for a. and b. kūn might be a bare noun root, but at any rate the word for the tip or top of anything is a-loi., this being a relational formation like those we dealt with in connection with kinship terms. c. presents different problems, both because an overt manifestation of the genitive particle is absent and because, unlike a. and b., it has the shortened form at the right of the English gloss. The concept of a bell is neither adjectival-attributinal nor relational. If it is a deverbal in any sense it has to be based on an underlying "sentence"

that has a predicate meaning something like "member of a class BELL." If so, we should expect that it might not form possessive expressions that adjectives and relationals seem to do. Although this last step is still rather unsatisfactory in motivation, it is based on the observation that there is no way to get an expression with the intended meaning of the form *kū wak-khīn-. So we cannot make the shortened expression result from optionally not dropping the connecting postposition, even though for true possessives there is such an option: pā ja? īm>pā īm, father's house.

Now consider d. Superficially it appears to be like the shortened kūk khīn-, but this cannot be, in view of the fact that this expression is categorically said not to be the same in meaning as kū ak-tun-. The phrase kūk tun- appears in a song text dealing with the mythological migrations of the Cho people from the adjacent plains of Burma proper. There is an episode in which the ancestral people planted a post in Burma to stand as if it were a pagoda, marking their passage through the land. The Cho are animists and not Buddhists and do not themselves have actual pagodas.

We have a ready and natural account of this word available as resulting from a noun-and-complement construction, for it means the pagoda such that it is a post. Indeed, if kū were a pro-element, we should then get ak-tun-, after application of complement reduction. And on this reading there is simply no way to get kū ak-tun-,

3.2 Finally having regard to Southern Chin, we know that for a large part of its lexicon there is a great deal of variation as to which nouns take inherent a(k)- as a prefix and which do not. We have also seen that doing so marks a noun as in some sense deverbal, and that there are examples of such nouns not only derived from transparently obvious verbs but also from more remotely underlying verbs. We have noticed that the latter kind of instances eventuate in various sorts of nouns: relational nouns, about which Langacker 1969 as well as Jordan 1969), but also ordinary nouns. And Jordan remarks that colloquially Chins prefix a- to nouns far more generally than even his dictionary indicates.

enough is known to suggest their derivation from deep predicates (cf.

4. There is now the matter of Burmese kinship terms that take the prefixed a-. Wolfenden, noting that a is not an overt pronoun in this language, treats this phenomenon under the heading of his non-pronominal prefix. It makes no difference, one should add, whether we include the two problematical cases of (modern pronunciation) ?ema, (elder sister of a man) and ?ekou (elder brother of a man) in the list that in any case includes ?ephei (father), ?emei (mother), ?ephou, (grandfather), ?ephwa, (grandmother) and several other terms of relationship; the two problematical cases are written not with prefixed a- but ac-, which, save for syllable reduction applying to

prefixes, would otherwise be pronounced ʔiʔ. The reason that inclusion does not weaken our case is that the historically motivated separate prefix ac- is in any case an element of the same syntactic/morphological class as a-.

Do we have any reason to suppose that this prefix is of the same class as the complement-head prefix of Southern Chin? Yes: First there are the general reasons for assuming that kinship words are based upon relational predicates, reasons to be set forth in a monograph on the algebraic structure and representation of genealogical space (see Lehman and Witz; also cf. Langacker 1969: 845-846; Lakoff 1972: 599-600).

Second, Burmese uses a prefixed a- to derive nouns, chiefly from adjectives: kauN:de (is good), ʔəkauN: (that which is good), ci:de (is great), ʔeci: (one that is great), and so on productively. Now there is one strikingly interesting fact about these derived forms, namely, their ability to undergo reduplication. This reduplication is used broadly for the formation of colloquial manner adverbs and other expressions from derived nominals. Thus the prefix a- is replaced by a copy of the stem: kauN:gaun: (well), ci:ji: (a rather big one) and so forth. Okell's (1969, Vol. I, section 5.3) discussion is illuminating, because he indicates that other prefixes work in much the same way. In any event such reduplication has in almost every instance some kind of affective significance: intensive, distributive, diminutive and the like, using "affective" in roughly the sense of Klima (1964). In fact, the process of affective reduplication is to some extent iterative. In at least the distributive sense, a prefixed deverbal (even a noun that alone does not appear to be deverbal) can replace a prefix on a following (reduplicated) instance of itself: pheʔ (side), ʔəpheʔpheʔ (various sides). This example (from Okell, 1969, I: 5.3) shows, I submit, how closely in principle reduplication is related to the idea of an underlying deverbal source for nouns. And just the Burmese kinship terms that inherently take the a- prefix are subject to reduplication, with the affective sense of a diminutive and/or affectionate: mei-mei (mummy), phei-phei (daddy), phwa:phwa: (granny), kou-kou (address of endearment to an elder brother).

Consider now ʔəkauN: (the good, that which is good). we may substitute any appropriately specified noun for the prefix in this construction, e.g., that for "person," lu, and get lu-gauN: (a good person). Moreover, for each such example there is a longer form in which a dependent relative clause is attached to a head understood as in identity with the subject of the dependent clause. Thus, kauN:de.lu (a person who is good). Notice that a simple declarative sentence is involved here: lu kauN:de (a person is good), thu kauN:de (he is good), kauN:de (one--indefinite, non-specific, hence lexically null--is good). Furthermore, in the expression kauN:de.lu, the dot after the otherwise finite ending, de, that is the mark of the creaky glottal tone, unambiguously marks the construction as genitive.

Thus, cuN-no (I), sa-?ou? (book), cuN-no.sa-?ou? (my book) or the longer form cuN-no-ye.sa-?ou?. So far the situation in Burmese is not easily distinguishable from that of the deverbalizing mechanism of Southern Chin.

There is, however, one distinguishing feature of the Burmese phenomenon that I wish to pay attention to. Alongside expressions like lu-gauN: (a good fellow) we can have those like lu-?əkauN: (a good fellow). Nothing corresponds to this in Southern Chin.

Now there is an important difference between the appositively and the fully reduced relative constructions. lu ?əkauN: and nearly all appositively reduced constructions, which preserve the prefixed a-, have a contrastive sense. If lu-gauN: means simply a good person, lu ?əkauN: means something more like the/a good person.

The option of choosing either the full or the appositive reduction of a relative construction is not free, even when one intends the contrastive sense marked with extra-heavy stress on "good" above. Take, for instance, lu ci:de (the man is big). Out of this one can construct the relative, ci:de.lu (the/a big person; the person who is big), and from this, in turn, lu ?əci: (a big person). However, on this reading we cannot get lu-ji:, since there is a particular lexical item in Burmese of just this shape and it means an elder or important person. So, we have to assume that the transformational rules reducing relative constructions will operate to block the shortest reduced form just in case it would then have to lead to the lexical insertion of a lexical item with the wrong meaning.

In addition, suppose we have in Burmese the equivalent of the following English expression: the good food that they serve, where it is intended that some restaurant serves nothing but good food and I wish to refer to that good food. The Burmese will be ?əsa: ?əsa: ?əkauN:, where, of course, ?sa: ?əsa: is a compound and not a reduplication ("eating food").

This should put us in mind of what we said (footnote 2) about Kachin, where the presence or absence of the a- prefix has something to do with whether a modifying expression on a prefixed noun is intended contrastively or not. Thus, ši? (a?) wà, as against ši? (a?) kawà, has to do with whether we mean his father or his father (as contrasted with someone else's). Evidence like this tends to confirm the claim that Wolfenden's so-called non-pronominal a- prefix on substantives is a reality, i.e., that the Kachin and the Burmese phenomena are indeed much the same.⁶ Matisoff (1972) comments on the relation between the Kachin genitive particle a? and the Burmese ye, or its derivative, morphological short tone, and on the relation in T-B between nominalization; relativization and genitivization (see, however, Lehman in press).

5. There remains little to say in conclusion. I shall claim that I have gone some way toward showing that while, on the one hand, Wolfenden seems correct in distinguishing between a pronominal and a non-pronominal prefix on substantives, Benedict and others are also right in rejecting any ultimate etymological distinction between the two. Both are in some sense third person pronominal elements, even though in the second case it occurs on the surface of the language only as a marker on deverbal nouns. Personal pronouns are necessarily definite; the pronominal head of relative or other noun-complement constructions that come out as a+stem on derived substantives is indifferently definite or indefinite, as we saw in Southern Chin, for instance. It is particularly to be noted that Wolfenden's distinction was made on the supposition that the so-called pronominal a- prefix on substantive stems was in all essential respects a possessive pronoun. But we have seen that it is far from true that if a given T-B language has an overt third person pronoun of the general form a its occurrence in front of substantives in absolute form is invariably possessive.

I trust also to have added in a small way to our understanding of inherited family patterning in the syntax and morphology of Tibeto-Burman languages, a topic in comparative grammar pretty well neglected in favor of historical phonology since Wolfenden's time.

FOOTNOTES

1. Work done since Wolfenden's time appears to cast doubt on the ultimate distinctiveness of the two prefixes, though not necessarily on the thesis that their respective morphosyntactic functions are quite different, i.e., that ?a-, though possibly in origin a third person element is not a possessive. Benedict discusses this question in at least two places (1970; 1972). He observes that a- is really some kind of h-, mentioning, somewhat elliptically, that Wolfenden considers a- a variant of Classical Tibetan prefixed b- from *ba-. He further construes the a- as representing pure zero vocalization and holds that, although the classical language alternates it with glottal onset, this is only because, by means of a kind of coalescence, the glottal onset has been lost. And hence, Benedict wishes to reconstruct an earlier situation where Classical a- itself had glottal onset and so was at least phonologically identical with ?a-. Shefts (1970) discusses a-chung in a number of contexts (e.g., 16-17; 131 ff.). She, like Wolfenden, relates it closely to prefixed b- in many instances, and reconstructs *ba- from the partially complementary distribution of b- and a- in the Classical system. She argues persuasively that it certainly was voiced (present-day reflexes of syllables with prefixed a-chung are on low tone) and at least non-consonantal. Finally, Miller (1970:75) treats ?a as h-, a voiced velar spirant of some kind. Whatever else may be the case, both prefixes seem alike

to require reconstruction of a glottal and/or h-like characteristic. But even if this sort of thing argues both for an independent reconstruction of the prefix a- and for its phonological resemblance to ʔa-, it says nothing about whether the phonological resemblance, or identity, was also lexical identity. According to Benedict (1972:36) the glottal onset is non-significant, being the free or preferred equivalent of vocalic onset (for Burmese, see Okell 1969:xv-xvi). It is a poor argument, however, although it allows ones to formulate a minimally redundant phonetic transcription. That is, it makes as much -- or as little -- sense to treat the initial glottal stop as phonologically non-significant as it would to treat, say, any other, e.g., k- as redundantly predictable, because amongst non-vowels there is nothing universally least-marked, therewith "expectable," about ?.

2. There is another fact to pay attention to here, one appearing important when we consider the use of the Burmese a- prefix on nouns derived from adjectives and other verbs by means of the reduction of head-noun-plus-relative-clause (section 4, above). In some way that I am still uncertain about, the presence or absence of the prefix in possessive expressions correlates with the presence or absence of a contrastive interpretation for the verb or adjective taken as modifying the head noun (on the complex relations between focal, contrastive stress and its equivalents in other languages and the theory of relative clauses, see Lehman ms.). I mean the difference between English his father and his father, where extra heavy stress on his expresses the contrast between his father and another's father. If we can later suggest that the Burmese a- prefix marks a substantive as derived from a verbal base by reduction of relative constructions, it will strengthen a similar view of Kachin prefixed a-. For if we can argue that Wolfenden's ʔa-, whether or not strictly pronominal is such a marker on account of Burmese and other evidence, Wolfenden would appear to be right in deriving the Kachin prefix from *a- as well.

3. There is an interesting issue here. Consider Haka Chin pa and nu, meaning, respectively father and mother and also male and female (basically adjectival). It is clear that in the latter meanings these words can be affixed to substantive expressions naming categories of persons as an indication of whether we mean a male or female member of such a category. Thus, fanu and fapa, female child, or daughter, and male child, or son. The kinship usage looks superficially the same as the use of these words to mean man and woman, although the existence of common longer forms makes it certain that the words for the parents are not synonymous in Haka Chin with the words for man and woman. Thus, (mi)nu and (mi)pa, for woman and man, where mi = person.

How about parental kinship usage now? If we look just at the surface terms we are faced with a problem: nu = mother, nupi = (major) wife, where -pi is a common, productive suffix denoting the core denotata of any category. So, in, inpi, one's

own, agnatic residence; man, the price of anything, in particular marriage price, manpi, that main portion of it that goes to a bride's father or brother. Does nupi signify that a wife is thought of as a mother par excellence? Or is it that nupi implies that a mother is in the main thought of as a wife (to the males in the next superior generation of one's lineage or clan agnates whilst it is one's own wife that is of the greatest importance to one? Or, again, is it the case that mothers are simply viewed as women and one's wife is one's own woman? I have disposed of possibility three above. For the remaining two, I can say only that from the point of view of a formal analysis of the system of kinship vocabulary it is clear that neither is correct. Rather, one is forced to postulate an underlying, phonologically null category of SPOUSE, to which, in the case of wife, the female ending, nu is suffixed; -pi is added to this in the case of a major wife only, other endings for lesser categories of wife (see Lehman 1963:chapter 5). Similarly, there has to be a dummy category PARENT, to which -nu and -pa are added for mother and father respectively.

In Southern Chin, a man is ak-pāmī and a woman ak-hnūmī, whilst mother and father are a-nū and a-pā. Moreover, as we shall show, the final -k of the prefix of the words for man and woman indicates that the roots hnū and pā are underlyingly prefixed with the class prefix k-, as are numerous adjective roots. Not so, the postulated dummy element PARENT, hence the "non-pronominal" a-prefix without forward assimilation of a following k-prefix. Notice that I am claiming that k-, and class prefixes in general, can exist on phonologically null lexical items, a characteristic distinguishing such items from true zeroes.

4. The data will be taken from two sources: my own field notes and a recent grammar and dictionary by the ex-Roman Catholic Missionary, Marc Jordan (1969), who was for nearly twenty years resident amongst these people. Jordan's material lacks indications of tone and contains besides a number of questionable entries, and his grammatical description is naive and lacking in syntactic information. It is in the dialect of Mindat, somewhat different from the one I recorded at hBong, a village some thirty miles west of Mindat and on the eastern margin of the Hlet Long valley, itself a dialect area. There are fairly substantial phonological differences between the two. For instance, what is in Bong kx- is /c'-/ (ch-) at Mindat, hence the two spellings of the words for "Chin" above. Similarly, initial s- of Bong is hl- in Mindat; initial z- [ts-] in Bong is θ- ("ht" orthographically) in Mindat. Furthermore, Jordan writes in the cumbersome standard school orthography where /ɨ/ is written "au" and /ʌ/ is "u," the last two being often confused by Jordan, who writes u when he thinks he hears a front rounded vowel, actually non-existent.

A g- is used to represent /ɣ/, the voiced velar spirant, while gh- stands for the unvoiced velar spirant /x/. I retain

the use of g- but use x- in place of gh-. These two phonemes are cognates of /r/ and /rh/ of Central Chin and the g ([ɣ]) of such Northern Chin languages as Tiddim (see Henderson 1965). Second, the standard orthography writes the vowel /ɔ/ as aw and the vowel /o/ as o, which I shall write respectively as o and ou, while retaining the standard orthographic usage of e and ei to distinguish, respectively, /ɛ/ and /e/. Finally, z in the school orthography stands for a somewhat palatalized [ʒ] in Mindat, a spirantized [j] in Bong. Since in both dialects it appears to be the systematic phoneme /j/, and since I am relying mostly upon material from Bong, I write it as j.

5. It may be worth while to make two phonological points in connection with the foregoing. I have already mentioned that there is some variation between dialects in the matter of whether a verb is a k-stem or not, but that does not exhaust the questions about stem-variation either between or within dialects. Within that of Bong, we see that one source of this variation is which of several stem prefixes a stem takes when there is no derivational morphology at issue. Another source of variation is in the shape of the stem less the prefix. For instance, for many though not all verbs, e.g., not adjectives, whose stems end in a nasal consonant ordinarily, the final changes optionally to its homorganic stop in the third person singular before finite endings, in case the subject topic is not overtly marked with the postposition of agency: ka-mzōncī, I suck, ani mzōncī or ani mzonci, but ani no? mzōncī, he sucks, where no? marks the agent subject of a transitive verb. I am unable to motivate a rule accounting for this, although it appears to be related to the fact that there is no third person singular clitic subject prefix, and this may result in the elimination of a word boundary (#) in favor of a morpheme boundary (+) between the stem and the non-future finite ending, cī. It will be noticed that the assimilations we are dealing with in this description occur only across morpheme juncture. Finally, nasal stem prefix ñ becomes n before stem-initial apical stops and affricates. Thus, ñcūncī, is straight, but an-cūn, something straight, a straight one.

6. For help with the Kachin examples I thank my former assistant, Anan S. Sunantra, and I thank him as well for the systematic observations about the contrastive/non-contrastive character of the two different forms of Burmese reduced relative construction. Research for this paper, which in a slightly different form was first presented to the Fourth Annual Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics at Indiana University in October of 1971, was made possible by a grant to me from the Research Board of the Graduate College of the University of Illinois, to which I tender my thanks herewith.

REFERENCES CITED

- Benedict, Paul K.
 1972. Sino-Tibetan, a Conspectus. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.
 1970. A reconstruction scheme for Sino-Tibetan. Paper read to the Third Annual Meeting on Sino-Tibetan Reconstruction, Cornell University.
- Cornyn, W.S.
 1944. Outline of Burmese Grammar. Language Dissertation no. 38. Supplement to Language, volume 20, no. 4.
- Henderson, Eugénie J.A.
 1965. Tiddim Chin: A Descriptive analysis of two Texts. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, Marc. M.E.P.
 1969. (dated in preface only). Chin Dictionary and Grammar: Southern Chin Language. Paris: mimeographed.
- Klima, E.
 1964. Negation in English. pp. 246-323 in J. Fodor and J.J. Katz, eds., The Structure of Language. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Lakoff, George.
 1971. On generative semantics. in Danny Steinberg and L. Jakobovitz, eds., Semantics. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
 1972. Linguistics and natural logic. pp. 545-665 in D. Davidson and G. Harman, eds., Semantics of Natural Language. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Langacker, R.
 1969. Mirror image rules, II. Language 45,4: 844-862.
- Lehman, F.K.
 1963. The Structure of Chin Society. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
 ms. Shan and English relative clauses. mimeographed, 93 pages.
 ms. (in press). Remarks on the grammar of topic and comment in Burmese. Paper from the Sixth International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics University of California, San Diego (ed. B.K.T'sou).
 1974. Aspects of a formal theory of noun classifiers. Paper read to the Seventh International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Georgia State University, Atlanta (submitted for publication).
 1973. Syllable structure, tone, and the theory of phonological conspiracies. pp. 515-547 in B. Kachru et al., eds., Issues in Linguistics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Lehman, F.K. and K. G. Witz.
1974. Prolegomena to a formal theory of kinship. in P. Ballonoff, ed., Papers from the Symposium on Genealogical Mathematics. University of Texas, Houston.
- Matisoff, J.A.
1972. Lahu nominalization, relativization and genitivation. pp. 237-258 in J. Kimball, ed., Syntax and Semantics I. New York: Seminar Press.
- McCawley, J.D.
1968. Where do noun phrases come from? pp. 166-183 in R. Jacobs and P.S. Rosenbaum, eds., Readings in English Transformational Grammar. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn and Company.
- Lo, Chang-p'ei.
1945. The genealogical patronymic linkage system. Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 8: 349-363.
- Miller, R.A.
1970. A grammatical sketch of Classical Tibetan. Journal of the American Oriental Society 90.1:74-96.
- Okell, J.
1969. Reference Grammar of Colloquial Burmese. 2 volumes. London: Oxford University Press.
- Postal, Paul M.
1967. Restrictive relative clauses and other matters. type-script: Yorktown Heights, N.Y.; IBM.
1969. On so-called pronouns in English. pp. 201-226 in S. Schane and D. Reibel, eds., Modern Studies in English. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
1970. On co-referential complement subject deletion. Linguistic Inquiry 1.4:439-500.
- Ritchie, W.
1971. On the analysis of surface nouns. Papers in Linguistics 4.1:1-16.
- Shefts, Betty.
1970. The Tibetan causative; phonology, mimeographed, Berkeley: University of California.
- Stern, T.
1962. Language contact between related languages: Burmese influences upon Plains Chin. Anthropological Linguistics 4.4: 1-28.
- Wang, W. S.-Y.
1969. Competing sound change as a cause of residue. Lg 45.1: 9-25.
- Wolfenden, S. N.
1929. Outlines of T-B Linguistic Morphology. London.