0. Introduction

This paper is designed to discuss the possibility of reconstructing the Proto-rGyarong initials and prefixes and to examine their relationship with Proto-Tibeto-Burman (PTB).

The rGyarong language has attracted the attention of many scholars for a long time, and it is generally thought that the language would be a sort of link between Tibetan and Burmese. In fact, Wolfenden pointed this out as early as the 1930's (see Wolfenden 1936), adding that Ao also had a system of prefixes comparable with Written Tibetan (WT), Written Burmese (WB), and Kachin (Jingpaw).

Since then, we have had several monographs dealing with rGyarong. Unfortunately, however, in spite of some sincere scholarly efforts the comparative studies do not seem to have been very fruitful.

I think that it is rGyarong's striking similarity to WT forms that has charmed students; indeed, the language has many forms identical to those in WT. But, at the same time, in a sense that similarity has misled them. Disappointingly, almost all of them merely picked those rGyarong words which supported their hypothesis and they compared rGyarong directly with WT. My purpose in writing this paper is to counteract this tendency.
I should like to repeat that, above all, it is preferable to reconstruct Proto-rGyarong before comparing modern rGyarong forms with WT directly, because, first, they are at quite a distance from each other chronologically [1] and, second, there are many problems both on the Tibetan side and on the rGyarong side which must be solved before the two branches can be compared. This is the only sound methodology for studying rGyarong [2].

Also, from the actual history of the rGyarong area, we know that there were several fairly large waves of immigration from Central Tibet to the rGyarong area. These occurred at least twice before the 15-16th centuries [3]. We have documents describing these historical events. In my opinion rGyarong borrowed many words from Central Tibetan due to these immigrations and as a consequence it is to be expected that rGyarong should have a striking similarity to WT. It is because of this that almost identical words should be disregarded and not taken into consideration when we do comparative work.

So my basic idea is that we must now collect as many dialects of rGyarong as possible, reconstruct Proto-rGyarong and, after that, compare our reconstruction with the appropriate subgroups—Ch'iang, for example [4]. It is true that field work there would be extremely difficult, but it is still possible to do it in Nepal, India, and Canada. I spent several months in India collecting some Tibetan dialectal data, and I found three rGyarong informants [5] in Sera Monastery which was originally in Lhasa but has been re-established by Tibetan refugees in South India, where they have fortunately preserved a tradition of speaking Central Tibetan as the standard language and talking in their own dialects in their dormitories, which are set up on the basis of where they came from.

This is a preliminary step towards reconstructing the Proto-rGyarong initials and prefixes and examining their relationship with WT and then with Proto-Tibeto-Burman.

0.1 General remarks about the rGyarong area

The rGyarong area is within Sichuan Province of China, on the east side of Kangze Tibetan Autonomous Region and to the north-west of Cheng-tu. The approximate number of rGyarong speakers is around seventy thousand [6]. According to the informants, the Chos-kia and ICog-rtse areas are the most densely populated, and these two dialects are frequently used for trade. A peripheral area overlaps with Amdo Tibetan in the north, with Ch'iarg in the east, with Khaams Tibetan in the west, and with Chinese in the south.

According to both the oral tradition and certain documents, there are eighteen dialects in that area [7], but we do not have sufficient data on some of them.

Some scholars refer to rGyarong as 'Jyarong', but this name seems to be based on the Amdo pronunciation of rGyarong. Their own name both for the region and for the language as well as for the people is rGyarong [جا ron].
0.2 Abbreviations and Sources


CT ICog rtse Nagano, Y.

HN Hanniu Rosthorn, A. von: Vakabarfragmente ost-
tibetischer Dialekte, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesell-
schaft 51 (1897)

KT Kham to Wolfenden, S.N.: Notes on the Jyarong dialect of Eastern Tibet, T'oung Pao 32 (1936)

PT Pati Rosthorn, A. von: ibid.


TK Tsa ku nao Chin, P'eng: Etude sur le Jyarung, Han Hie 3 (1949)


TS bTsan lha Nagano, Y.


WS Wassu Rosthorn, A. von: ibid.
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1. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PROTO-rgYARONG INITIALS AND PREFIXES

This chapter is a trial internal reconstruction of the proto-rgYarong initials and prefixes not using WT. Needless to say, since prefixes and initials are closely related to each other, I will not examine the prefixes in isolation, but consider prefixes and root initial consonants as a set, examine how those combinations correspond in the whole system, and try to reconstruct the proto-system [8].

Generally speaking, a rgYarong syllable has a \((P_1)(P_2)Ci(G)\) structure. \(G\) stands for \(w\), \(y\), \(l\), or \(r\). The prefixes which can be at the \(P_2\) position in PG are: \(#P\)-, \(#t\)-, \(#K\)-, \(#r\)-, \(#l\)-, \(#s\)-, \(#v\)-, \(#N\)-, \(#sy\)- (see also Chapter 3). The only \(P_1P_2\) is \(#gsy\)- [9].

Chapters 1-1 through 1-8 are devoted to listing the correspondences and possible reconstructions of the clusters will be shown at the end of each chapter with a short discussion. A probable system of prefixes and initials will be proposed in Chapters 2 and 3.

Although rgYarong has a complicated system of prefixes both on nominals [10] and verbs [11], those on nominals will not be considered in the historical approach of this paper, since, in my opinion, they are secondary phenomena, and thus only the nuclear initials will be examined.

In the following chapters, the original transcriptions which the original scholars used will be cited as they are---that is, without any phonemic interpretation of my own---except for certain symbols which have been changed for the sake of typing:
My own materials will be mainly used for reconstruction, with reference to the others.

1.1 Bilabial

a. CT p-, TS p-, CK p-, TK p-, SM p-, WS p-, KT py-  
   e.g. year CT pi pa, TS ?a i pa, CK te pe, TK ji-pie, SM tā pa, WS tiepō, KT tē-pyē
b. CT sp-, TS sp-, TZ sp-, SM sp-  
   e.g. pus CT ta spu, TS ta spuk, TZ raspu, SM ta spu

1 PG *sp-
c. CT shp-, TS shp-, CK shp-, TK sp-, SM sp-  
   e.g. thirsty CT shpak, TS shpak, CK kīsh'pag, TK kaspiag, SM ka spak

d. CT rp-, TS rpj-, TZ rpj-, CK rp'-, TK rp- , SM sp-  
   e.g. shoulder CT na rpak, TS ta rphak, TZ tarphak, CK tar p'eg, TK rphia, SM rpak

1 PG *rp-
e. CT mp-, TS mp-, TZ mp-, CK mp'-, TK p'-, SM p'-  
   e.g. outside CT wu mpuy, TS wa mpuy, TZ wempu, CK wu mpo'i  
   TK Nā-p'si, SM wu p'isi

1 PG *nb-
f. CT lp-, TS lp-, CK lp-  
   e.g. ash CT skyā ka lpe, TS ka lpe, CK s'kya k'al pe

g. CT ph-, TS ph-, TZ pj-, CK p'-, SM p-, WS p-, PT p-, HN p'-  
   e.g. pig CT phak, TS phak, TZ pkā, CK p'ag, SM pak, WS pāk

1 PG *p-

h. CT mph-, TS sky-, TZ stś-, CK ky-, SM mp'-  
   e.g. to vomit CT ka ma mphant, TS skyuk, TZ estśukak, CK ki kyug, SM tā mp'at

1 PG *by-
i. CT py-, CK my-  
   e.g. full CT ?u pyot, CK ki myod

1 PG *by-
j. CT phy-, TS pky, CK p'y-, KT py-  
   e.g. carpet CT ta phyo, TS ta pkyu, CK ta p'yo, KT dā-pyū

1 PG *py-
k. CT pr-, TS pr-, TZ pr-, TK pr-, ES pr-, KT pr-  
   e.g. white CT ka pram, TS ka prom, TZ keprom, CK ki prom  
   TK keprom, WS koprōm, KT kā-prōm

1 PG *br-
l. CT br-, TZ br-, CK n'br-, TK mpr-, SM mbr-, WS br-, KT br-
The most striking thing observed in those data is the fact that Øb- is not found in any rGyarong dialects. In other words, the initial b- is always found prefixed in the dialects. Though we must set up the triangle system of bilabials shown on the right if we take WT into consideration, we have a much simpler system, Øp- → Øb- as the nuclear initials of the proto-rGyarong stage if we use only the internal reconstruction. This system is much easier and much less messy when we consider the relationship between PG and PTB.

My hypothesis is that Øp- went to ph- and Øb- to p-, serially. Although prefixed *p- or *b- behave similarly, those bilabials with sh- prefixed behave differently: *shp- went to zhb- and *shb- to shp-, respectively. If those labials were with s-, r-, or l- prefixes, they were neutralized.

The following chart can be induced from the data given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*p-</th>
<th>*b-</th>
<th>*P-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Øp-</td>
<td>→ ph-</td>
<td>Øb-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shp-</td>
<td>→ zhb-</td>
<td>shb-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Np-</td>
<td>→ Nph-</td>
<td>Nb-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øpy-</td>
<td>→ phy-</td>
<td>Øby-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øpr-</td>
<td>→ br-</td>
<td>Øbr-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rGyarong forms shown on the right hand of each column are mainly those in CT and TS.

### 1.2 Dental

- **a.** CT t-, TS t-, TZ t-, CK t-, TK sw-, SM t-, WS l-, PT l-, KT t-
  - e.g. *wheat* CT tīy, TS tēy, TZ tī, CK τēi lo, TK swē, SM teɪ, WS tē, KT tō
- **b.** CT kt-, TS kt-, TZ t-, CK g't-, TK rtē-, SM kt-, WS kt-
  - e.g. *big* CT ka kte, TS ka kti, TZ ketši, CK ki g'ti, TK rtēom, SM kā ktiE, WS kōkite, KT kā-k'tī
c. CT sht-, TS sht-, CK n'dr-, TK dz-, SM št-, KT št- * PG *shT- e.g. cold CT ku mi shtak, TS ku ma shtak, CK ti wa n'dro, TK kawadzuo, SM ka ma štak, WS tevani, KT ka- mi-šte-š

d. CT rt-, TS rt-, TZ rš-, CK t- * PG *rT- e.g. hat CT wa rti, TS ta rti, TZ tarši, CK tar ti

e. CT mt-, TS Nt-, TZ mt-, TK mt- * PG *Nd- e.g. front CT mto, TS tu Ntok, TZ temto, TK mtoš

f. CT st-, TS t-, CK s't- * PG *sd-
   e.g. autumn CT stong key, TS tong ka, CK s'ton ke

g. CT zd-, TS zd-, TZ zdž-, CK s'd-, TK zt- * PG *st- e.g. cloud CT zdem, TS zdim, TZ zdžim, CK s'dim, TK ztim

h. CT th-, TS th-, CK t'-, TK t'- * PG *t-
   e.g. how much? CT this ti, TS this ti, CK t'is ti, TK t'asti

i. CT Nth-, TZ mth-, CK m't'-, SM mt- * PG *Nd-
   e.g. waist CT na Nthak, TZ temthak, CK ti m't'eg, SM te mtak

j. CT shť-, TS shť-, CK sh't-, KT št- * PG *shT-
   e.g. saliya CT me shtyi, TS ta mi shtyak, CK ti bi sh't'ig

   KT tê-mê-stik

k. CT tr-, TS tr-, TZ t-, CK tr-, TK tš-, KT t-
   * PG *dr-
   e.g. to sew CT ta trop ka pa, TS ka trup, TS teŋ, CK ti trob ki pe, TK ka-ťšup, KT tšp

l. CT shtr-, TS sr-, TZ štj-, CK sh'tr-, TK šts-
   * PG *shdr-
   e.g. sweat CT ju shtre, TS ta srep, TZ teštje, CK ta sh'trid

   TK štsid

m. CT trh-, TS trh-, CK tr'-, SM ts- * PG *tr-
   e.g. tea CT trha, TS trha, CK tr'e, SM ts'a

Among those data the examples k. through m. are retroflexives in the CT dialect, which I interpret as tr-/trh- sequences (also see the example of an sr- cluster in l.).

Also the dental series lacks a voiced-unaspirated dental to parallel the velar and bilabial series so I set up *t- and *d- as the nuclear initials. Thus the following changes can be induced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*t-</th>
<th>*d-</th>
<th>*T-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Øt-</td>
<td>th-</td>
<td>Ød-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st-</td>
<td>zd-</td>
<td>sd-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nt-</td>
<td>Nth-</td>
<td>Nd-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øtr-</td>
<td>trh</td>
<td>Ødr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>kt-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rT-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>rt-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shT-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>sht-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shT-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>shty-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The dentals are neutralized after the prefixes ɬ-, r- and sh-. Although I categorized the retroflexives in this chapter from the descriptive point of view, I understand that, from the historical point, we have some cases where r- should be regarded as root initials and t- as prefixes. It will be discussed also in Chapter 2.

1.3 Velar

a. CT k-, TS nk-, CK g-, TK g-, SM k-, WS k-, PT k-, KT k-

\[ \text{e.g. head} \quad CT \text{ na ko, TS ta } \text{nko, CK ta } \text{go, TK ta }-\text{go, SM ta-ko, WS la }\text{ku, PT } \text{ta} \text{-kō} \]

b. CT pk-, TS pk-, SM pk-

\[ \text{e.g. lid CT wa } \text{pkap, TS } ? \text{o } \text{pkap, SM ta } \text{pkap} \]

c. CT sk-, TS sk-, TK sk-, SM sk-

\[ \text{e.g. voice CT na } \text{skat, TS ska, TK } \text{nā-skē, SM tā ska} \]

d. CT shk-, TS shk-, TK šk-, CK sh'k-, TK šk-

\[ \text{e.g. onion CT shko, TS shko, TZ Šku, CK sh'ko[12], TK Škut} \]

e. CT rk-, TS rk-, CK rk', KT rk-

\[ \text{e.g. wing CT wa } \text{rkom, TS } ? \text{o } \text{rkom, CK tar } \text{kom, SM ta } \text{rk'am} \]

\[ \text{KT tā- } \text{rkōm} \]

f. CT mk-, TS mk-, TK mk-, CK g-, TK mg-, KT mk-

\[ \text{e.g. neck CT } \text{tu mki, TS te } \text{mki, TZ temki, CK tim gi, TK tā-mgā, KT tē-mkō} \]

g. CT kh-, TS kh-, TZ khj-, CK k-, TK k'-, WS k'-, HN k'-, KT k'-

\[ \text{e.g. mouth CT } ? \text{o } \text{kha, TS ta } \text{kha, TZ tek} \text{hje, CK ti } \text{ke, TK tā-k} \text{el, WS tek} \text{ā, HN k} \text{ā, KT tē-kā} \]

h. CT zg-, TS zgw-, CK y-

\[ \text{e.g. tent CT zg̃ar, TS zgwar, CK yab} \]

\[ \text{i. CT Ng-, TS rgy-, TZ ng-, CK sg-, TK nk-, SM pk-, KT sk-} \]

\[ \text{e.g. back CT Ngu, TS rgyap, TZ taŋgu, CK ti sgu, TK ūka, SM tā-pkor, KT tē-skū} \]

\[ \text{j. CT ky-, TS ky-, CK ky-, SM cē-, KT c-} \]

\[ \text{e.g. together CT ka } \text{kyas, TS kyas, CK } \text{ta- } \text{kyas, SM cē-as, KT tē-cās} \]

\[ \text{k. CT sky-, TS sky-, CK sky'-, KT scy-} \]

\[ \text{e.g. to write CT ka } \text{ra } \text{skyo, TS na ra } \text{skyu, CK na ra } \text{sky'o} \]

\[ \text{KT nā-kō-rā- } \text{scyūn} \]

\[ \text{l. CT khy-, TS ch-, TZ tsh-, CK ky'-, TK tō'-, WS c'-} \]

\[ \text{e.g. beer[11] CT khya, TS cha, TZ tšhe, CK ky'e, TK tš'iē} \]

\[ \text{WS č'iā} \]

\[ \text{m. CT ?khy-, TS kch-, CK g'ch-, SM kts'-} \]

\[ \text{e.g. short CT ka } \text{?khyen, TS ka } \text{kchen, CK ki } \text{g'chen, SM kā} \]

\[ \text{ktś'ān} \]
n. CT mwg-, TS Nǐ-, TZ d̀-, CK ny-, KT mj- * PG *Nky-
e.g. jaw CT mwg, TS ta Nĩa, TZ temdu, KT te-mjā
o. CT kr-, TS kr-, TZ nkhr-, CK kr-, TK nk'r-, SM nkr-*PG*gr-
e.g. charcoal CT ta krot, TS ta kru, TZ te nkhr, CK r'gga
    krod, TK ta nk'ru, SM ta nkrot
p. CT skr-, TS skr-, CK skr-, TK sk'r-, SM skr-, KT skr-*PG*gr-
e.g. body CT tu skru, TS tu skrug, CK tis skru, TK tāsk'ri,
    SM tu skru, KT te-skri
q. CT gskhr-, TS gshkr- *PG *Ksh-
e.g. rough CT gskr, TS gskrak
r. CT khr-, TS dr-, TZ khr-, CK n'br-, SM k'r-, WS k'r-, TR
dz-*PG *kr-
e.g. rice CT khri, TS dre, TZ khrc, CK n'bres kar, SM k'ri
    WS k'ri, TR dza
s. CT gr-, TS gr-, CK gr-
e.g. knife CT gri, TS gri, CK za gri
t. CT zgr-, TS dr-, TK zgr-, WS zgr-*PG*skr-
e.g. bracelet CT zgrok, TS drok, TK zgra, WS zgrok
u. CT Ngr-, TS gr-, TZ r-, CK r-, WS r-
e.g. star CT tsi Ngri, TS tsi gri, TZ tsurer, CK tsu'ri
    WS tseri

Since we again have no voiced-unaspirated velar in initial position,
*k- and *g- could be set up as the nuclear consonants. No PG form can
be established for s. and u., since these are loanwords from WT and
Mongolian, respectively.

The velar is neutralized after the prefixes *r- and *sh-; rk-
went to rg- before -y- and to rk- otherwise.

The following changes can be deduced. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*k-</th>
<th>*g-</th>
<th>*K-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*∅k-</td>
<td>→ k'kh-</td>
<td>*∅g- → k-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sk-</td>
<td>→ zg-</td>
<td>*sg- → sk-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nk-</td>
<td>→ Ng-</td>
<td>*Ng- → Nk-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*∅k-</td>
<td>→ k'kh-</td>
<td>*∅g- → k'-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other clusters with glides also follow these rules.
As was in the velar, bilabial and dental series, we have no ḏz- nor ḏj-, and so we have only to set up *ts- and *dz- as the nuclear initials for the former series and *c- and *j- for the latter.

The following chart will illustrate the historical changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*c-</th>
<th>*j-</th>
<th>*C-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*c̪c-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*j̪j-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dz-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ts-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 l & r

a. CT l-, TS l-, TZ l-, CK l-, KT l- e.g. milk CT tu lo, TS tu lu, TZ te lu, CK ti lo, KT tē-lūk
b. CT r-, TS r-, TZ r-, CK r- e.g. horn CT wu ru, TS te ri, TZ te ru, CK tu ru, KT tē-rē

c. CT r̄w-, TS r̄w-, CK r̄w- e.g. to get up CT ka rwas, TS ka rwas, CK kir was
d. CT ry-, CK ry- e.g. day CT ta ryak, CK tar yog
It seems to me that *r- and *l- could be set up as the initials for the series. Some dialects have the voiceless l- for the initial of the word 'god', but this must be a loanword from WT.

1.7 Nasal

a. CT m-, TS m-, CK m-, TK m-, WS m-, PT m-, HN mt'-*PG *m- e.g. to drink CT ka mot, TS ka mot, CK ko med, TK ka-mod WS komi, PT kóm, HN čint'ên

b. CT rm-, TS rm-, TZ rmj-, CK my-, TK rm-, WS rm- *PG *rm- e.g. to sleep CT ka rma, TS ka rma, TZ karmje, CK ti myed ki ju, TK kâ-rmiš, WS kormân

c. CT sm-, TS sm-, TZ sm-, CK šm-, TK sm- *PG *sm- e.g. wool CT smok, TS smok, TZ smak, CK pi s'mag, TK smag

d. CT šhm-, TS šhmy-, TZ šm-, CK šh'n-, KT šm- *PG *šhm- e.g. tongue CT ni šme, TS te shmye, TZ tešmi, CK ti sh'ni KT tê-šmi

e. CT n-, TS n-, CK n-, TK sn-, SM n-, WS n-, KT n- *PG *n- e.g. black CT ka nak, TS ka nak, CK ki-nag, TK snag, SM ma nak, WS kanák, KT kâ-nák

f. CT rn-, TS rn-, TZ rmj-, CK rw-, TK rn- *PG *rn- e.g. rib CT ko rnam, TS ta rnum, TZ tärnom, CK tor wom

g. CT ŝn-, TS ŝn-, CK šh'n-, TK ŝn-, WS ŝn-, PT ŝn-, HN ŝn- KT ŝn- e.g. nose CT ūu sna, TS te sna, CK ti sh'ne, TK ŝne, WS tešná, PT tešnî, HN snó, KT tê-šná

h. CT ng-, TS ng-, TZ ň-, CK ng-, SM ň-, WS y-, KT ň-*PG *ng- e.g. I CT nga, TS nga, TZ ňa, CK ngo, SM ňa, WS yó, KT ňó

i. CT mng-, TS mng-, CK m'ng-, KT m'-*PG *Nng- e.g. knee CT fo mąga, TS ta mngo, CK tu m'ńge, KT tê-mňë

j. CT sng-, TS sng-, CK s'ng-, WS 1-, KT ň- *PG *sng- e.g. blue CT sngon po, TS sngon po, CK s'ngon po, WS làn KT ňón-pô

k. CT ngw-, TS ngw-, TZ ňwj-, CK ng-, WS ngw-, PT ngw-, KT ň- *PG *ngw- e.g. cow CT ni ngwa, TS ti ngwa, TZ ňiįwje, CK ni nøge, TK ba lii, SM bo la, WS núngwa, PT nungvé, KT nności-

l. CT ny-, TS ny-, CK n-, TK n-, SM ň- *PG *ny- e.g. to sit CT na nyn, TS ka nyn, CK na nun, TK ka-nă SM ka-ńi

m. CT rny-, TZ rń-, CK r'ny-, TK rń-, SM rń-, KT rń- *PG *rny- e.g. hair CT ta rnye, TZ tarńék, CK ut ko r'myí, TK ko rńí SM ta rńiE, KT tâkó rńí
n. CT mny-, TS mny-, TZ ṃ-, CK my-, TK ṃ-, WS mu-, KT ṃ- 
   e.g. cye CT mnyak, TS ta mnyok, TZ temṇa, CK ti myeg, TK ṃag, WS temniāk, KT tē-ṃāk
o. CT shny-, TS shny-, CK sh'n-, TK şn-, WS šn-, KT şn- 
   e.g. today CT pi shnyi, TS ?a shnyi, CK pi sh'ni, TK Nā-şṇa, WS asnī, KT ā-snē

From the given data, the following nasal initials and clusters would be set up:

*φm-  *rm-  *sm-
*φn-  *rn-  *sn-  *shn-
*φny-  *rny-  *shny-  *Nny-
*φng-  *sng-  *Nng-

Consider the patterns found in the system as a whole, we should strongly expect *rng- and *sny-. But they are not in evidence.

1.8   w, y, h and ?

a. CT w-, TS w-, CK w-, TK w-, SM w-, WS w-, KT w- IPG *w- 
   e.g. mountain CT ta wat, TS ta wat, CK ta wed, TK ta wued SM tawat, WS tāwa, KT tāwē
b. CT y-, TS y-, TZ s-, CK y-, TK jy-, SM j-, PT y-, KT y- IPG *y- 
   e.g. sheep CT ka yo, TS ka yo, TZ kesu, CK ki-yo, TK kājyo, SM kā jo, PT koyō, KT ā-kē-yū

1.8   w, y, h and ?

a. CT w-, TS w-, CK w-, TK w-, SM w-, WS w-, KT w- IPG *w- 
   e.g. mountain CT ta wat, TS ta wat, CK ta wed, TK ta wued SM tawat, WS tāwa, KT tāwē
b. CT y-, TS y-, TZ s-, CK y-, TK jy-, SM j-, PT y-, KT y- IPG *y- 
   e.g. sheep CT ka yo, TS ka yo, TZ kesu, CK ki-yo, TK kājyo, SM kā jo, PT koyō, KT ā-kē-yū

From the data given, I set up *w-, *y- and *h-. I do not think we need to set up *?-, since in example d. the ?- came from *w- originally, and in example c. ?-o- and ?a- were in reality a set of prefixes; in other words, the examples in c. came from *a-tsik or *a-tsik.
2. DISCUSSION OF THE PROTO-RGYARONG INITIALS

Summarizing the data 1.1 through 1.8, the following chart illustrating the PG initials could be deduced:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\*p- & \*t- & \*k- \\
\*b- & \*d- & \*g- \\
\*m- & \*n- & \*n- & \*n- & \*ng- \\
\*s- & \*ts- & \*sh- & \*c- & \*h- \\
\*z- & \*dz- & \*zh- & \*j- & \*w- \\
\*r- & \*l- & \*y- \\
\end{array}
\]

However, \*sh- and \*zh, which I reconstructed, are palatal, and so, they could be re-interpreted as \*sy- and \*zy respectively; similarly, it seems also possible to interpret \*c- and \*j- as \*tsy- and \*dzy- severally.

Therefore, it is concluded that the PG had \*k-, \*g-, \*p-, \*b-, \*t-, \*d-, \*m-, \*n-, \*ng-, \*s-, \*ts-, \*dz-, \*r-, \*l-, \*h-, \*w- and \*y- as the initials.

Then, how do the PG initials correspond with the PTB ones? The following is the list of those correspondences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. velar</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td>*Ngo(1.3.a)</td>
<td>*m-gaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>*ka(1.3.g)</td>
<td>*m-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. bilabial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ash</td>
<td>*lbe(1.1.f)</td>
<td>*pla[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pig</td>
<td>*pak(1.1.g)</td>
<td>*pak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>*brom(1.1.k)</td>
<td>*bok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. dental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poison</td>
<td>*duk</td>
<td>*duk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[CT tuk, TZ tado, CK ta dog]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saliva</td>
<td>*syTyik(1.2.j)</td>
<td>*tuk/*twiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. fricative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to kill</td>
<td>*Ksat(1.4.a)</td>
<td>*g-sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>*zan(1.4.d)</td>
<td>*dzan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leopard</td>
<td>*sydzyik</td>
<td>*zik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ KT kě-sčyik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CK ki sh'chig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TZ kheštšek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM Zuk]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat</td>
<td>*syA(1.4.g)</td>
<td>*syA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liver</td>
<td>*Psyi(1.4.h)[18]</td>
<td>*m-sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. affricate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vein</td>
<td>*dza(1.5.c)</td>
<td>*r-sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hot(taste) *mar tsap *tsa
[CT mar tshap
TS mar tshap]
urine *sydzyi(1.5.1) *zay/ tsyi
goat *tsyi(t.5.n) *tsit
green *ldzuyang gu(1.5.p) *dzim[19]

f. l & r
penis *lem[20] *li
[CT u lem, TS ta lem]
horn *ru(1.6.b) *ruŋ
six *druk
[CT ka truk, TZ keto
CK ki trog, TK ka-
tso, WS koc6, HN
ktu6, KT k6t6k]
day *ryak(1.6.d) *ryak
g. nasal
ripe *smin *s-min
[CT smin, TS smin
CK ki s'min, TK smi]
black *nak(1.7.e) *nak
I *nga(1.7.h) *ŋa
h. w, y & h
tooth *swa(1.6.f) *s-wa
itchy *ra K-ya *g-ya[21]
sneeze *hap tsho(1.8.e) -----

Judging from the given data, the PG initials are almost identical with the PTB ones. It could be concluded that, in general, the PG initial system is very similar to the PTB one in regard both to the system and to particular lexical items. But, there are few correspondences between the two with regard to the fricative and affricate series. Despite attempts on my part which included setting up various intermediate stages, correspondences have not been worked out. This problem remains to be solved.

3. DISCUSSION OF THE PROTO-rGYARONG PREFIXES

The prefix system which I reconstructed also seems to coincide with the PTB prefixes fairly well. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTB</th>
<th>PG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>*b-</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*d-</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>*g-</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>*r-</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>*l-</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>PTB</td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. four</td>
<td>*b-lây</td>
<td>*gu Pli[22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CT ku bli, CK ki m'pîli)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(TK kâwûdâ, SM kâ wdi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WS kopolî, PT kopolî)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(KT kô-udî, HN zîl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liver</td>
<td>Δ *Psiy(1.4.h)[23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. six</td>
<td>*d-ruk</td>
<td>*druk(2.f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to sew</td>
<td>*d-rupt</td>
<td>*drup(1.2.k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. to kill</td>
<td>*g-sat</td>
<td>*kîsat(1.4.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>*tay</td>
<td>Δ *Kde(1.2.b)[2h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. vein</td>
<td>*r-sa</td>
<td>*rdza(1.5.c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear</td>
<td>*r-na</td>
<td>*rna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ash</td>
<td>*pla</td>
<td>*lbe(1.1.f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green</td>
<td>*dzim</td>
<td>Δ *ldzyang gu(1.5.p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nose</td>
<td>*s-na</td>
<td>*sna(1.7.g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>*s-kuw</td>
<td>*sgru[27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. father</td>
<td>*a-pa</td>
<td>*Vba[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CT ?u a pa, TS a pa, CK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>*Vma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. head</td>
<td>*m-gaw</td>
<td>*Ngö(1.3.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaw</td>
<td>*m-ka</td>
<td>*Nkya(1.3.n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lip *s-nces --> *synas
   [CT synun tsya, TS
    syna pak, TZ temtshi
    CK ti m'ch'u, TK
    mt's'e, KT tē-snäs]

heart *s-niį --> *syni(t)
   [CT u syne, TS trun
    trun, TZ tešnit, CK
    ti sh'ni, TK şni, W3
    tešni, KT tē-sni, PT
    pu' shin']

saliva *s-twą --> *sytyik(1.1.k)
cheek ?? ?2(PLB) --> *sypa
   [CT wū zhba, TS ta
    zhba?, TZ tekharpha
    CK ti zh'we, KT tē-
    sbiē]

J.rough *gram --> Δ *Ksygren(1.3.q)

Also I cannot explain the history of the prefix in *Ksygren rough. This is the only example of the PN2 prefix, and my suspicion is that *Ksy- is not a prefix at all but rather a compound consisting of two nouns.

Also I cannot explain the history of the prefix in Ksygren rough. This is the only example of the PN2 prefix and my suspicion is that *Ksy- is not a prefix at all but rather a noun meaning character. In other words, *Ksygren is a compound consisting of two nouns: Ksy [i] plus gren (character + rough). Although rGyarong has a completely separate form for character, WT has the form gshis. My hypothesis is, therefore, that rGyarong borrowed this word from WT at some stage and, since they have always used it as a compound, the word became idiomatic and the rGyarong speakers lost their awareness of its compound nature. If my hypothesis is accurate, all the rGyarong syllables have the structure P Ci(G)VCf, and the system as a whole has been made simpler and more internally consistent.

These two problems need to be solved in the near future by tracing the histories of the relevant words in other TB languages.

4. EPILOGUE

The readers will find no chapter entitled conclusion in this paper, since, in my opinion, a conclusion should be reserved until one succeeds in reconstructing the PG rhyme system; one cannot say that the proto-system of any language is established if only parts of either the prefix/initials or the rhymes have been reconstructed. Indeed, the
rhyme system for PG was proposed in a paper which I precirculated at the 11th Sino-Tibetan Linguistics Conference in 1978, but the forms shown there were really tentative.

In this chapter, I should like to abstain from saying anything decisive, and to discuss and point out some problematical aspects of the PG prefixes and initials within the limited framework which I dealt with in the previous chapters.

My intention was to counteract the previous tendency of many scholars who tended to compare rGyarong directly with WT, and to reconstruct PG first, in order to be able to compare it with some appropriate languages in the sub-groups of TB which seem to be nearer to PG than WT is. Behind this was the idea that PG would prove to have a similar historical status to Proto-lolo-Burmese(PLB) in the context of TB studies as a whole. After trying to do that, I found that my idea was basically valid, although all sorts of complications arose in practice.

A great deal of attention to the loanwords from WT or Chinese was paid, and I would believe that I succeeded in distinguishing native rGyarong words from the others. And consequently, my reconstruction has much more reliability than the other attempts made in the past few decades; in this sense, I was right. But, the forms the author has been led to hypothesize for PG are surprisingly closer in appearance to PTB itself than are the forms reconstructed for PLB. As is mentioned in Chapters 2 & 3, PG has a strikingly similar system of prefixes and initials to PTB. This could mean that PG is not on the same taxonomic level as PLB, but reflects a much older historical stage. One possible interpretation of this is that the PTB set up in STC(Benedict 1972) represents a rather recent level only, and that there might exist another and older stage of PTB than the PTB generally accepted today. Another possibility is that, if this PTB really represents the oldest stage of the TB languages, the branch-off of PG from PTB might have happened much earlier than Shafer and Hale suggest—edcf. Shafer 1966, and Hale, A.: Clause, Sentence, and Discourse Patterns in Selected Languages of Nepal(1973).

The next thing which the author would like to point out is that rGyarong seems to consist of two strata at least; one is related to the Tibetan group and the other to the Chin group. Perhaps I shall eventually be able to add the Bodo-Naga group as the third stratum which is partially comparable to PG. Even after getting rid of WT-like forms from rGyarong, the verb system is strongly reminiscent of WT. Since I could not figure out those differences of stratum in this paper, that topic will be dealt with on some subsequent occasion. By the way, the author is of the opinion that Lepcha and Trung are not so closely related genetically to rGyarong although they are widely believed to be so. It is true that rGyarong, Tā́jrun and Rong(Lepcha) have the common morph rong, meaning 'valley', but as far as I have investigated, they are not so close to each other; Trung must be in the Tibetan group, while Rong perhaps belong with Vayu-Bahing.
This paper is a preliminary step towards establishing a tentative position for RG in the TB family. In the future the author plans to pursue these investigations by checking more individual lexical items, as well as the verbal system of the language.

5. NOTES

This paper originally appeared as the master's thesis at the University of California, Berkeley, submitted in 1978. My sincere thanks are due to Professor Wallace L. Chafe, Professor James A. Matisoff and Professor Kun Chang, who have been supervising my studies at Berkeley for their suggestions and constructive criticisms.

(1) It is generally believed that Tibetan letters were introduced by Thon mi Sambhota, one of the ministers of Srong btsan sgam po, and that the same person wrote "Sum cu pa" and "rTtags kyi 'jug pa" as the principles of Tibetan grammar. Although this tradition is highly doubtful, it is attested that the letters were actually used in the middle of the 7th century. For instance, a Tibetan document from Touen-houang says as follows, in a description on Khri srong brtsan's activities:

bod la snga na yi ge myed pa yang,
btsan po 'di 'i tshe byung nas......
in Tibet there was no letter before, but
in the times of this king, (characters) came out...]
(Bacot et al.: Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet, Paris, 1940, p.118, l. 16-24)

And another document also from Touen-houang says:
blon che stong rtsan gyis, 'gor tir bka' khrims gyi yi ge bris phar lo gcig
[after the characters of authorized laws were written by Minister(mGar) sTong rtsan, one year(passed)]
("Tibetan Chronicle", the description of 655 A.D., cited in Bacot et al. 1940, p.13, l.26-7)

Those descriptions tell us that Tibetan people had had their letters by 655 A.D. at the latest.

(2) It goes without saying that it is necessary to reconstruct RG before comparing it with WT.
In the rGyarong side, we must check what kinds of strata are found in that language. Since the rGyarong area is a place where many waves of immigration by Tibetans, Uighurs, Ch'iang people and Mongolians tided, the tongue has been influenced by other languages (see Epilogue).
Also in the WT side, so-called WT has strata. I can point out two kinds of WT at least; one is the WT named chos skad (language of religion) and another is the WT which had no relation with Buddhist Tibetan and which developed on the basis of spoken features. The chos skad was developed by translating Buddhist texts brought from West India, and it
has a strongly consistent syntax and such a regular correspondence of lexical items to Sanskrit versions that we can reconstruct dispersed Sanskrit sentences canons. In this chos skad too, we can find two sorts: older way of translation and the new one. Under the reign of Khri lde srong btsan (777-815 A.D.), the lexicon called "Mahāvyutpatti" was compiled and translation has been done in a unified form since this book. We call translation since this book skad gsar (new language). The year of the compilation seems to have been 814 A.D. judging from the description of 'sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa' which is the supplement to "Mahāvyutpatti".

The second kind of WT has few relationship with the Buddhist Tibetan, but in the process of the development it was so much influenced by the Buddhist Tibetan that we can say it is a contaminated form of spoken aspects and the first kind of WT. This kind of WT is usually found in the other documents than Tibetan Tripitaka, for instance, those from Touen-houan or Turkestan and those with Bon religion's source.

In this paper, the WT I dealt with is mostly of the second kind.

(3) This fact is known by dPa'o gtsug lag 'phreng ba: Dam pa'i chos kyi 'khor los bsgyur ba rnam kyi byung ba gaal bar byed pa mkhas pa'i dga' ston, vol Ja, for instance. The first immigration from another area into the rGyarong region which can be attested by concrete documents was in the 6th century. The Khyung po family which resided at dNgul mkhar of Shang shung (west Tibet) moved to Khams stod area of Sichuan, making their colony and many Bonpo monasteries there; similarly Bon religion which we find in rGyal mo tsha ba rong (rGyarong) was brought by sBrang family in the dMu clan who was originally from Shang shung[c.f. Z.Yamaguchi: Bon-po no toosen, Annual Report of Japan Association of Tibetan Studies No. 19, 1973].

(4) cf. Kun Chang 1967

(5) I used in this paper only two kinds of dialects as the material of historical consideration; CT and TS. I got another informant from Prokho of rGyarong, but that place is not yet identified since his information of his native place does not necessarily coincide with maps. I suspect that it must be [sakho] described as 聲筒 in 松潘縣志, but I hold my conclusion until I have more precise information.

(6) cf. Chin P'eng 1957

(7) Rather recent political documents of Tibet say that rGyarong consists of 18 regions where separate dialects which are not intercommunicable are spoken. But, according to my informants, this is not the case. rGyarong is divided into two areas roughly; rGyal mo rong, which is to the west from Suo-mo, and Tsha ba rong, of which center is Tsha kho(li fan, in the modern naming).
And, those two dialects are not communicable with each other, but within each area they can communicate by their own dialects. I think this explanation is very persuasive since this division agrees with the historical events. As I mentioned in Note (3), the predominant clans of the area were Khyung po and sBrang both of which were originally from Shang shung, and both clans established their own kingdoms in the 7th century separately. This state continued until Ming dynasty's times.

(8) For example, Shafer set up the following correspondence rules the prefixes g- and d-.

Old Tibetan  Bai ti
g-  x-/___voiceless initials and nasals
     g-/___voiced initials except for nasals
d-  r-/___voiceless velars
     r-/___voiced velars

According to me, this chart is nonsense since g- and d- are in complementary distribution both in OT and modern Tibetan; g- appears before c-, t-, s-, m-, sh-, zh-, z-, s-, y-, ny- and n-; and d- appears before k-, p-, g-, b-, ng- and m-.

I will treat prefixes with their combination with initials rather than regard them as separate units from initials.

(9) See p.37.

(10) For nominals, there are three sorts of prefixes. If they want to refer to a noun as a substantial thing, they will use ta-prefix in CT an TS, and if that noun belongs to anyone---that is, if it is referred to as possessive they will use na-prefix. As for qa- prefix I cannot specify how it was used yet, but it will be allowed to say that qa- prefix can traced up to the PTB prefix a- or qa-[cf. 3.g.].

(11) Setting directional prefixes attached to verbs aside, there are two prefixes; ka- and sa-. The sa- prefix is always used for forming causative, which is comparable with WT and Kachin [cf. Nishida: Chibettogo dooshikoozoo no kenkyuu, Gengo Kenkyuu vol. 33, 1957, and Nishida: Kachingo no kenkyuu, Gengo Kenkyuu vol. 38, 1960]. The ka- prefix is rather new one, and I guess this was created much later than PG branched off from PTB. This prefix is observed in all the rGyarong dialects today. As for directional prefixes attached to verbs, see Wen Yu '43.

(12) The ' means that the informant wrote a tshég(syllable boundary in Tibetan orthography) there. I think, therefore, the actual pronunciation was like [šako].

By the way, I would like to mention the way this dialect was described. The informant of Chos-kia dialect was a professional interpreter of rGyarong and Central Tibetan who served rGyarong government, translating political documents between the two languages. Edgar handed him a list of WT, and the informant wrote down the equivalent rGyarong words in Tibetan letters.
Edgar's material is the romanization of them, and so this is a little bit different from so-called linguistic field work. However, the consistency is so strong that, if we know the Central Tibetan fairly well, we can reconstruct the phonemic system of this dialect. This sort of material is, from my experience, much more reliable than a half linguistic description. This must be ta-rkom, but since r- prefix functions to raise pitch in Central Tibetan, the informant seems to have used this transcription intentionally.

The form for 'tea' is PG *tra.

I believe that the forms of 1.4.a. and 1.4.b. have the same etymology; *Ksat. This proto-form split at some stage into the two forms in order to distinguish each other. By the way modern Tibetan also has the same expression for 'to kill fire, to extinguish' as 1.4.b.

This is perhaps a loanword from WT.

This is an example of metathesis.

We have a possibility of reconstructing msyi, using TS.

In a sense this example is not appropriate; PTB dzim originally means 'unripe'.

We have some nasals in this language whose origin cannot be traced.

Examples for 'itchy': CT ra gpya, TS ka ra ?ya, CK pag si, TR pu5 sa

The examples of CK and TR seems to have some relationship with *m-sak shown in STC. pu- and pag would come from 'skin'. The regular correspondence, PTB *l-: PG *y-, is also observed, e.g. hand PTB *lak PG *yak.

This must be a metathesis.

The K- prefix must be a new and secondary one.

see (17).

see (19).

We cannot define this etymology. My hypothesis is that the r- came from 'corpse'. In TK both corpse and body are tåskru/tå-skri, and in WT corpse is ro. But in TS and CK, corpse is wom and tom.

Both PTB and PG, this prefix is used for kinship terms.

6. ENGLISH-PTB/PG INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>PTB</th>
<th>PG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ash</td>
<td>1.1.f</td>
<td>blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autumn</td>
<td>1.2.f</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>1.4.j</td>
<td>bracelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beer</td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>carpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>1.2.b</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>1.7.c</td>
<td>cheek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>1.2.g</td>
<td>Neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>1.2.c</td>
<td>Nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cough</td>
<td>1.5.g</td>
<td>Onion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>1.7.k</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>1.6.d</td>
<td>Penis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>1.8.d</td>
<td>Pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To drink</td>
<td>1.7.a</td>
<td>Poison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>1.5.f</td>
<td>Pus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear</td>
<td>3.d</td>
<td>To put off light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To eat</td>
<td>1.4.d</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>1.7.n</td>
<td>Rib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyebrow</td>
<td>1.4.e</td>
<td>Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>3.g</td>
<td>Ripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>1.5.i</td>
<td>Rough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>1.5.m</td>
<td>Saliva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>To sew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>1.2.e</td>
<td>Sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1.1.i</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get up</td>
<td>1.6.c</td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>1.5.n</td>
<td>To sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>1.5.a</td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1.5.p</td>
<td>To sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>1.7.m</td>
<td>Sneeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat</td>
<td>1.2.d</td>
<td>Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1.3.a</td>
<td>Sweat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>3.i</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>1.6.b</td>
<td>Tent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>1.1.l</td>
<td>Thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot (taste)</td>
<td>2.e</td>
<td>Thirsty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>1.5.j</td>
<td>Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much?</td>
<td>1.2.h</td>
<td>Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.7.h</td>
<td>Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchy</td>
<td>2.h</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaw</td>
<td>1.3.n</td>
<td>Urine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To kill</td>
<td>1.4.a</td>
<td>Vein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>1.7.i</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>1.3.s</td>
<td>To vomit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard</td>
<td>2.d</td>
<td>Waist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>1.3.b</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>1.4.c</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lip</td>
<td>3.i</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>1.4.h</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>1.4.g</td>
<td>Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>1.6.a</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>1.5.h</td>
<td>Wool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>3.g</td>
<td>Wrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>1.8.a</td>
<td>To write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth</td>
<td>1.3.g</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yesterday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>