GENERAL INTRODUCTION

James A. Matisoff

II. NEW DIRECTIONS IN EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN LINGUISTICS

The 29 papers in this volume can be interrelated in various ways, but for convenience's sake have been grouped into six large categories. In this brief summary the lines of research pursued in the papers of each section will be placed in the context of certain pervasive Benedictine themes and ideas.

(1) Prehistoric Cis-Yangtzeana and Outside Influence on Chinese

One of Paul Benedict's most enduring contributions to the linguistics of East and Southeast Asia will no doubt prove to be his placing of Chinese into a more balanced linguistic position with respect to its coterritorial languages. Whether or not one is a true believer in the orthodox version of his "Austro-Tai hypothesis" -- the view that Tai-Kadai and Miao-Yao (Hmong-Mien) are not part of Sino-Tibetan, but are to be grouped genetically with Austronesian in a superfamily called Austro-Tai, which is itself of equal dignity and antiquity to Sino-Tibetan -- recent research in archeology, proto-history, anthropology, and linguistics confirms that what is now China south of the Yangtze was not ethnically, culturally, or linguistically Han Chinese until relatively recent times.

This vast region, comprising the islands of Hainan and Taiwan, and large chunks of the modern provinces of Yunnan, Sichuan, Guangxi, Guizhou, Guangdong, Fujian, Hunan, Jiangxi, and Zhejiang, was sparsely inhabited by a large number of ethnic groups, mostly non-Han, who from earliest times were in cultural and linguistic contact with each other. These included Austroasiatic (=Mon-Khmer) groups like the Mon and Lawa (the Palaung-Wa are the only Austroasiatics still to be found in China today); the Austronesians (=Malayo-Polynesians), still found on Hainan and Taiwan and on contiguous areas of the mainland; the Tai-Kadai and Miao-Yao peoples, still abundantly represented in S. China, though they have also moved further south to Burma, Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam; and last but not least, the only "proven" linguistic relatives of Chinese, the myriad peoples of the diverse and unruly Tibeto-Burman family, the Karen, Jingpho (=Kachin), Lolo (=Yi), Tibetans, and dozens of others, including many groups now only to be found outside of China (especially in NE India, Nepal, and Burma).

In the early period, there is no reason to believe that the Han Chinese were culturally or linguistically predominant in "Cis-Yangtzeana."[1] All the

[1] This name, meaning "the region this side of the Yangtze", is introduced in my

ethnic groups of the region must have been on a cultural par, with the edge if anything belonging to the peoples who had penetrated southward first -- it can be argued that benign climates are more favorable to the earliest advances of civilization than cold ones.

Benedict's "Austro-Tai theory" provides linguistic evidence that the flow of cultural ideas among the peoples of what is now southern China was not unidirectional. In prehistoric times the scattered groups of Han settlers must have found themselves surrounded by peoples at least as advanced as themselves in agriculture, metallurgy, weaving, warfare, astronomy, and perhaps even writing.[2]

Prehistoric Cis-Yangtzeana was mother to hundreds of languages whose speakers shared the same cultural and ecological world. These languages must have borrowed freely from each other in all directions for millennia before Chinese achieved the overwhelming cultural and political prestige that it has enjoyed in later periods. It is in this sense that it is reasonable to speak of non-Han "substrata" underlying the southern dialects of Chinese.

W. L. BALLARD's paper, "The linguistic history of South China: Miao-Yao and southern dialects,' goes a long way toward making these general ideas more precise, by identifying areas of phonological similarity between particular S. Chinese dialect groups and specific non-Chinese language families of the region.

In Ballard's view, the Wu, Yue (Cantonese), Chu (old Xiang), and Min dialect groups are not to be regarded merely as divergent variants of Mandarin that can ultimately be derived from "Ancient" or "Archaic" Chinese in the sense of Karlgren (1957), but rather represent "separate linguistic traditions that have incorporated much Chinese material." Though they have been long since "Mandarinated" through the influence of regional standard dialects of Chinese, Ballard feels that their deepest levels reflect Tai, Austroasiatic, and/or Miao-Yao substrata. While the Yue (and some Min) dialects show the influence of Tai-like languages, certain Min dialects show strong affinities with Yao, and the Wu and Chu groups display even more striking similarities with the Miao languages. Like Miao, Wu and Chu have a rich inventory of initial consonants (including a three-way manner distinction), but a degenerate system of final consonants; like Yao, Min has simpler initials, but preserves a series of four syllable-final stops. Wu and Miao both have elaborate systems of tone sandhi that function in a similar way (involving grammatical as well as phonetic conditioning), but are unparalleled by anything to be found in Mandarin. For Ballard, it is easier to suppose that the Wu dialects descend from Miao-type languages that "maintained their original tone sandhi morphology in the face of extensive Sinicization," than to suppose that Wu either borrowed or created its own tone sandhi system within the last millennium or so.

The "layer phenomena" so characteristic of S. Chinese dialects, with multiple traditions of pronunciation for each character (loosely referred to as

---

Languages of Mainland Southeast Asia [in prep.].

2 Benedict (1975, p. 130) believes that the Chinese word for 'writing-stylus' itself is a borrowing from Austro-Tai. Evidence is accumulating that even such humble writing systems as the syllabaries of the Lolo and the pictographs of the Naxi represent graphic traditions that go back thousands of years [pers. comms., Fu Maoji (1983) and Ma Xueliang (1984)].

the "literary" vs."colloquial" readings), reflect a long-term diglossia[3] where the population controlled at least two varieties of speech, a "higher" and a "lower." In modern times both varieties are considered to be forms of Chinese. In prehistoric times, Ballard surmises, the "lower" variety may not have been Chinese at all.

Jerry NORMAN's "A note on the origin of the Chinese duodenary cycle" deals with a topic that has attracted the attention of such great scholars as G. Coedès (1935) and Li Fang-kuei (1945). The calendrical cycle of Twelve Earthly Branches and Ten Heavenly Stems has been in use since the dawn of Chinese history. At an early date the duodenary subcycle was associated with the names of certain animals, even though the ordinary Chinese names for these animals bore no phonological resemblance to the pronunciations of the corresponding calendrical units. Since the Tai and the Khmer share this animal zodiac with the Chinese, it is reasonable to look at the Proto-Tai and Proto-Mon-Khmer etyma for the ordinary names of these animals.

In the 1967 version of Austro-Tai Language and Culture, Benedict proposed that the duodenary cycle had an Austro-Tai origin, basing his argument especially on the words for HORSE, DOG, and PIG. Not entirely convinced, Norman and Mei Tsu-lin sought connections rather with Austroasiatic (Mon-Khmer).[4] Norman finds that 6 out of the 12 animal names have good AA etymologies, and concludes that the Chinese were in contact with Austroasiatic peoples before the first millennium B.C. and borrowed certain cultural concepts from them. Since the Chinese forms most closely resemble words now found in the Viet-Muong branch of AA, the source language for these loans was probably spoken along the SE coast of China, perhaps in the ancient states of Wu or Yue.

It is interesting to recall that Benedict himself once subscribed to the "Austric hypothesis" -- the view (going back at least as far as Schmidt) that Austronesian and Austroasiatic are themselves ultimately related, either genetically or substratally.[5] While it may never be possible to pinpoint the exact origin of the duodenary calendrical cycle, at least it does seem to be "Austric" in the broad sense -- and pre-Chinese in any event.

Mantaro J. HASHIMOTO is another leading exponent of substratal theories of Chinese. In his conception, the Chinese dialects form a continuum with respect to their substratal composition, showing ever more pronounced Altaic influence as one goes further north and west, and increasingly greater affinities with Tai and Miao-Yao the further to the south one looks. Hashimoto agrees with Ballard that the Wu dialects strongly reflect a MY substratum, suggesting that Northern Wu is particularly close to Yao, and Zhejiang Wu to Miao.

In his paper "The interaction of segments and tone in the Be language," Hashimoto deals with a famous Mischsprache or "mixed language" of Hainan called Be (or Ong-be). Be phonology is definitely of the "Southeast Asian type" and

---

3 Benjamin T'sou [in prep.] speaks of the "collective diglossia that characterized traditional China at the grassroots level."

4 Norman's contribution to this volume was originally a section of his and Mei's important article "The Austroasiatics in ancient South China: the lexical evidence," though they omitted it as "too speculative" before presenting the paper at the Third Sino-Tibetan Conference (1970).

5 This view still has its champions today. See, e.g. Shorto (1976) "In defense of Austric."

there are numerous cognates with Tai, yet waves of Chinese influence have repeatedly swept over the language, to the point where any further increase of Chinese features might well render it virtually indistinguishable from the local dialects of Fukienese.

Ong-be, like Cantonese and Hakka, has pairs of words showing alternation between final homorganic stops and nasals, e.g. hem^4 'raise' / hep^5 'pile up.' Hashimoto contends that these "surface segmental alternations" are actually to be analyzed as underlying tonal alternations, with the final stops being tonally conditioned variants of the corresponding nasals.[6]

The dean of French Southeast Asian comparatists, André-Georges HAUDRICOURT, returns to this mixed language of Hainan in his brief article "Du nouveau sur le Be." Comparing Savina's older material with the Limkow dialect of Be presented in Hashimoto 1980, Haudricourt succeeds in reconstructing several new phonemes for Proto-Be, including *ny- (> Savina's n, Limkow z) and *r- (> Savina's z, Limkow l).

(2) EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN AREAL PHENOMENA

Benedict's approach to Asian languages is particularistic, in the sense that he focuses with unique intensity on one special problem at a time, whatever its scope on the micro-/macro-/megalo- scale. Whether he is dealing with a micro-problem concerning the Middle Vietnamese initial consonants or a multi-megalo-matter in Austro-Japanese, the nature of the argumentation and of Benedict's concern is much the same. The proto-languages that teem in the Benedictine brain are all imbued with vivid reality for him. Resolving a question in Proto-Austro-Japanese is really no different qualitatively for Benedict than discussing a point in the phonological history of a single language.

Benedict's writings have not laid much explicit emphasis on areal typological features or linguistic universals. These are primarily concerns of the general linguist, which Paul Benedict claims not to be. Yet his vast fund of erudition enable him to shift into a more "theoretical" gear when the spirit moves him. In recent years he has turned his attention to such matters as "Vocalic transfer: a Southeast Asian areal feature" (1979), and "Selective lexical retention in Southeast Asia" (1983), presenting his material in a manner calculated to capture the interest of theoretical linguists of a typological or universalistic bent.

As East and Southeast Asian linguistics gradually becomes integrated into the "mainstream" of linguistic discourse, we may confidently expect typological/areal/universalistic studies to assume an ever greater importance, not only in phonology but especially in syntax (both synchronic and diachronic). This trend is reflected by the five papers in this section.

---

6 Similar alternations among homorganic final consonants are characteristic of Tibeto-Burman (cf. e.g. Written Burmese khap [<*kap] 'draw water', Lahu qho [<*kam 'id.'], though these are usually interpreted as due to the influence of former suffixes [see Matisoff 1978, pp. 23-5]. For more discussion of the interplay between "segmentality" and "suprasegmentality" — a crucial issue in the diachrony of monosyllabic languages — see the paper of Sprigg, below.

Søren EGEROD has long emphasized the areal and typological significance of certain striking features of Southeast Asian phonology and grammar. The eminent Danish linguist returns to some of these themes in his paper "Typological features in Akha."

Early in the history of the annual Sino-Tibetan Conferences, Egerod (1971) introduced the phonetician Catford's term "phonation types" (a notion later developed by Ladefoged, Maran, and Halle) into discussions of the phonology of Chinese and SE Asian languages. The Firthian "prosodic" school of British phonologists (two distinguished representatives of which, Sprigg and Henderson, are represented in this volume) had long recognized the importance of such suprasegmental laryngeal features as "creakiness" and "breathiness." Egerod demonstrates how phonation contrasts, along with aspiration, preglottalization, and prenasalization, must be regarded as areal phonological features, since they are found in all language families of East and SE Asia.

Egerod's discussion focuses on Akha, a TB language of the Southern Loloish branch of Lolo-Burmese, where "the effects of the phonation types...tend to permeate the whole syllable, the creaky ones characterized by a general overarticulation and the breathy ones by a general underarticulation; with voiced stop initial this may manifest itself through preglottalization and prenasalization respectively."

Among areal grammatical features represented in Akha, Egerod discusses ergativity — another topic he was the first to introduce into modern Sino-Tibetan studies [1971b, 1973b] — and complex interrelated systems of sentence-particles for expressing a variety of discourse parameters like evidentiality.

In his entertaining paper "Alphabet or syllabary in Southeast Asia: new wine into old bottles," R. K. SPRIGG treats an areal feature of another sort, not merely phonological but what one might call grapho-phonological. Many of the Indic-derived SE Asian scripts are neither "alphabetic" nor "syllabic" in the conventional sense, but have become transvalued because of phonological change, to the point where they now indicate prosodic features like phonation, tone, and junction. Classic examples are Thai and Cambodian, whose writing systems distinguish between series of voiced and voiceless initial consonants, even though these have long since merged, leaving compensatory contrasts in their syllables' tone and register, respectively. The writing systems thus continue to mirror phonological contrasts, but now often in quite an indirect way, requiring a deductive process on the part of the user.

W. J. GEDNEY, one of the world's foremost specialists in Tai linguistics, raises a number of provocative questions in his deceptively simple and chatty paper, "Confronting the unknown: tonal splits and the genealogy of Tai-Kadai." Perhaps the most spectacular of all areal phonological upheavals in our region was the great wave of tonal splits that swept across East and SE Asia sometime in the first half of the second millenium A.D., affecting Chinese, Tai, Vietnamese, Miao-Yao, and (we may add) Loloish, as well as such AA languages as Mon and Khmer which developed register splits rather than purely tonal ones. The date of the split in Tai was relatively late -- Gedney places it somewhere between 1450 and 1650. Where then did these splits start, and how did they spread? Why did they diffuse so fast from language family to language

family?[7]

Even more intriguing is the basic similarity of East and SE Asian tonal systems before the splits: a pattern of no tonal contrasts in stopped ("dead") syllables, and a three-way contrast in "live" syllables (ending in a vowel or sonorant). Of these three tones, one is always much more common lexically, occurring on at least as many words as the other two combined. Many scholars have suggested that the fundamental difference among the three tonal categories must have been one of phonation type, with the predominant tone characterized by clear voice, and the others by "marked" phonation, probably breathy and creaky. How are we to explain these remarkable similarities in tonal systems and syllable structure?

Gedney's paper clearly implies the uselessness of using tonal criteria as an indicator of genetic relationship. Tonal systems, it turns out, are eminently borrowable and diffusable.

In his paper, "Observations on some cases of tone sandhi," Christopher COURT deals with a problem of pervasive interest throughout the East and SE Asian "Tonbund." Morphophonemic alternations in tone, sometimes purely phonetic but often exploited for grammatical purposes, are characteristic of languages throughout the region. Court presents data on tone sandhi patterns from a large number of Chinese, Tai, and Miao-Yao dialects, and succeeds in demonstrating that sandhi phenomena may be anticipatory as well as "recapitulative." William S-Y. Wang had suggested that tone sandhi might represent a diachronic regression in the character of a tone. In his more nuanced argument, Court furnishes evidence that sandhi processes may also foreshadow future tonological developments in a language. Sandhi seems to be "a Janus-like phenomenon that looks now forward, now backward in time."

In "Greenberg's 'universals' again: a note on the case of Karen," E.J.A. Henderson explains away the lone apparent exception to one of Greenberg's (1965) generalizations concerning initial consonant sequences: "if a language has an initial combination of two voiced obstruents, it will also have at least one combination of two unvoiced obstruents." Interpreting R.B. Jones' (1961) transcription of the Sgaw Karen cluster "bɣ-" as a sequence of voiced stop plus voiced fricative, and noting the absence in Sgaw of doubly voiceless clusters like *px-, Greenberg had proclaimed Sgaw to be the only exception to his own generalization. Henderson aptly points out, however, that this "ɣ" is not really a fricative, but rather an unrounded velar semivowel (a sound only recently recognized by the IPA, but frequently encountered in SE Asian languages). The comparative evidence firmly supports this interpretation, since Sgaw -ɣ- regularly corresponds to -r-'s and -w-'s in other languages.

Concluding the papers in this section, F. E. HUFFMAN tackles the fascinating question of "why Mon-Khmer languages have so many vowels." The merger of the PMK *voiced and *voiceless series of initials led to tonogenesis in Vietnamese[8], which was under the overwhelming cultural and linguistic influence of Chinese. Elsewhere the merger typically led to differentiation of register and/or a proliferation of vowels, often including stunning arrays of

---

7 Could the Mongol invasions have had anything to do with it?

8 Vietnamese is only the best-known MK language to have developed a full-fledged tonal system. Recent research has uncovered tonal languages in several other branches of MK, notably Waic.

diphthongs and even triphthongs. Huffman outlines a continuum of such developments in the various branches of Mon-Khmer, focussing on "restructured" systems like that of modern Khmer, where the transphonologization of the old voicing distinction in the initials has been carried through so radically that the new contrastive burden is best analyzed as falling completely on the vocalic system. Huffman offers several valuable generalizations on the diachronic consequence of vowel tenseness vs. laxness.

(3) SINO-TIBETAN HISTORICAL PHONOLOGY

In a very real sense it was Paul K. Benedict who ushered in the modern era of Sino-Tibetan historical phonology with his Sino-Tibetan: a Conspectus (1972). The Conspectus has been reviewed a dozen times, and this is not the place to undertake a thorough study of its significance. It is, as the name implies, only an overview of its vast subject, and certainly not to be regarded as the last word on every detail that it touches upon. Yet there is nothing to compare with it in scope, erudition, or insight. Dozens of Lautgesetze are formulated, testable hypotheses are offered by the bushel, and hundreds of roots are reconstructed. It is nothing less than the essential starting point for all future work in the field.

Nicholas C. BODMAN's expert knowledge of Chinese phonological history is joined to a thorough familiarity with TB languages, especially Written Tibetan. In his convincing article, "Evidence for -l- and -r- medials in Old Chinese," Bodman examines the Old and Middle Chinese reflexes of Proto-Sino-Tibetan initial and medial *(-)r- and *(-)l-, relying on evidence from TB cognates and old loans from Chinese into Tai and Vietnamese to distinguish between the two liquids in medial position.

Karlgren had set up clusters of velar or labial stop plus *-l- throughout whole phonetic series that show alternations between plain initial l- and such a stop. In reconstructing this lateral medial he took no account of the "divisions" in which the characters appeared in the Middle Chinese rhyme books. Bodman accepts Li Fang-kuei's and Pulleyblank's reconstruction of medial *-r- in syllables which appear in "Division II" in the rhyme tables, which leads him to posit -r- after dentals as well as after stops at other positions of articulation. He agrees, however, that there is little evidence for setting up clusters of the type *tr- (or, a fortiori tl-) at the PST level.[9] After velars, Bodman maintains that *-l- suffered a "circular" fate, with Proto-Chinese *kl- merging with *kr- to Early Old Chinese *kr-, which then relateralized to yield Later OC *kl-.

The difficulty of distinguishing between the two liquids at remote time-depths is compounded by the tendency of these sounds to dissimilate from each other. Bodman points out the interesting Written Tibetan canonical constraint against having the same liquid in both medial and final position in the syllable: i.e. the types krol and klor occur, but *kror and *klol do not.[10] As Norman and Mei (1976) pointed out, the Chinese word represented by Mandarin jiang 'great river; Yangtze' is actually an ancient loan from Austroasiatic,

9 Only one TB root is set up with *tr- in the Conspectus, *trak 'weave' [#17], which Benedict considers to be a loan from Austro-Tai (n. 68).

10 This is quite similar to the Latin rule that gives us such words as solar and moral, but not *solal and *morar. (The chemical term molal is a recent neologism.)

from a prototype such as *krung or *klung . Unfortunately it is so far impossible to specify the exact phonetic nature of the medial, and one might claim that it always will be impossible in principle.[11]

A similar topic is treated in Paul Fu-mien YANG's paper, "Initial consonant cluster KL- in modern Chinese dialects and Proto-Chinese," this time from the point of view of a single extended word family. After explaining how Proto-Chinese consonant clusters are recoverable via five sorts of evidence (phonetic xiesheng series of characters; allofamic relationships within word families; comparisons of ancient and modern dialects; cognates from related languages; and foreign transcriptions and loanwords), he proceeds to apply all 5 analytic techniques to his imaginative study of a large word family with the basic meaning EMPTY/HOLLOW. He is especially interested in Chinese binomes and polysyllables which might reflect "dimidiations" of earlier clusters -- a topic on which he has already contributed several important papers (Yang 1971, 1972).

In "The Arakanese dialect of Burmese and Proto-Burmish reconstruction," D. BRADLEY presents the fullest description ever to appear of the phonology of Burmese dialects spoken in Arakan. Although Arakanese is written with the same orthography as standard Burmese, its consonantal and vocalic systems have been diverging from the standard for many centuries. Of special interest are the near collapse of front vowel oppositions (with the results partly conditioned by tone); the rather regular development of the rhyme written -aiñ into /e/ (as opposed to the inexplicable multiple reflexes in standard Burmese); the "rhinoglottophiliac" nasalization of /i/ after /h/; and the preservation of the liquid r both in initial and post-consonantal position. As in standard Burmese, many Arakanese polysyllabic words have reduced syllables with shwa vocalism. Though many speakers of Arakanese now show considerable interference from the standard language, especially in more formal speech-styles, the viability of these dialects seems assured for the foreseeable future, and Arakanese will continue to provide invaluable help in the ongoing enterprise of reconstructing the Burmish branch of Lolo-Burmese.

In her beautifully reasoned paper, "Proto-Tibeto-Burman as a two-tone language? Some evidence from Proto-Tamang and Proto-Karen," Martine MAZAUDON questions both the empirical and theoretical bases for Benedict's (1972, 1973) reconstruction of a two-tone system for Proto-Sino-Tibetan. Benedict's "teleo-reconstruction" of such a system was based on data from a few carefully selected TB languages (including Tamang), which he compared directly to Chinese. He did not follow the method of step-by-step reconstruction of tones at intermediate levels of TB itself.

So far the latter method has not achieved particularly exciting results. Matisoff (1974) compared the tones of Jingpho to those of Lolo-Burmese, hoping to reconstruct the tonal categories of "Proto-Ji-bur-ish" -- with very limited success. Mazaudon's present study, based on a comparison of the tones of Proto-Tamang and Proto-Karen, arrives at a similarly negative conclusion.

Mazaudon reconstructs two tones, *A and *B, for Proto-Tamang[12], which she

---

[11] Even such a respectable Indo-European language as Sanskrit has hopelessly mixed up its r's and l's, so that Sanskrit data is powerless to decide between these two PIE phonemes in any given etymology.

[12] Tamang is a member of the Tamang-Gurung-Thakali-Manangba group of languages, spoken in Nepal.

proceeds to compare systematically to Haudricourt's current 4-tone system for Proto-Karen. The Tamang lexical items chosen for comparison do not include syllables extracted from disyllabic words. Tamang's system of "word-tones," where tonal patterns extend over two syllables, and where the tone of a syllable in a compound cannot be predicted from its tone in isolation (if it should also happen to occur in isolation!), points up the fact that it is extremely risky to use tonal data from languages with which one does not have first-hand familiarity. Once the corpus for comparison has been purged of questionable items, Mazaudon finds no significant correlation at all between the two tones of Proto-Tamang and the two major tones reconstructed for Proto-Karen.

Even if such a correlation could be found, Mazaudon feels that it would still not prove a descent from a common system of proto-tones. Since we now know that tonogenesis operates according to rather fixed phonetic principles in languages of a certain structural type,[13] the possibility of parallel independent development always looms large. The whole issue of "monogenesis" vs. "polygenesis" of tones remains one of the most crucial in TB linguistics. Benedict's monogenetic hypothesis can certainly not be considered proved at this point. In the case of Tamang/Karen, Mazaudon feels that any demonstration of genetic relationship between their tone systems will require at least three intermediate levels of investigation: (a) a more precise reconstruction of Proto-Karen, (b) the establishment of regular segmental correspondences between Tamang and Karen, and (c) an understanding of the morphological variations of tone within each subfamily.

Tatsuo NISHIDA, among his many contributions to TB studies, has produced a long series of invaluable works on the extinct Xi-xia (= Hsi-hsia = Tangut) language. On the basis of his reconstructions of the pronunciations of the complex Xi-xia graphs, he feels the language to be most closely related to Lolo-Burmese. In his paper, "The Hsi-hsia, Lolo, and Moso languages," he offers a number of cognates between Xi-xia and other TB languages. Especially striking are the cases where Xi-xia and Moso agree in having prenasalized initials.[14]

The rhyme systems of the Loloish languages are complex enough, but that of Xi-xia seems even more so. The attrition of former syllable-final consonants, as Nishida shows, is responsible for a proliferation of contrasts in the vocalic nucleus.

In his persuasive paper, "Tibeto-Burman cognates of Old Chinese *-ij and *-ɨj," W. H. BAXTER reinterprets the reconstructions of certain Old Chinese rhymes and proceeds to compare them directly to similar rhymes in TB. Following Wang Li, Baxter divides Karlgren's *-(j) r and *-(j) d rhymes into two groups, one with a front vowel and one with a non-front one. Benedict (1972, pp. 184-6) had already observed that Chinese etyma with these rhymes correspond to TB forms in *-iy. In line with the "Bodman/Baxter" reconstruction of a high-central vowel *-ɨ for OC, Baxter breaks down Karlgren's *- r rhyme into *-ij and *-ɨj, enabling him to specify that PTB *-iy corresponds only to the former and not to the latter. (OC forms in *-ɨj correspond rather to TB etyma with

[13] What Matisoff [1973b] has called the "tone-prone" monosyllabic type.

[14] There are also several good examples where Nishida's prenasalized Xi-xia forms correspond to prenasalized words in the S. Loloish language Mpi (Matisoff 1978b).

such rhymes as *-al, *-ar, *-oy, *-ul and *-ur.)

The actual Chinese/TB comparisons that Baxter makes are all interesting, and most of them are undoubtedly correct. His explanation of the sibilant initial in OC *sjijs 'four' (in the face of PTB *b-liy) as due to contamination from the *s- in 'three' (< PST *-sum) must surely be accepted, in the light of similar well-attested cases of "interdigital influence" in Indo-European. The *-u- ~ *-i- alternation which the Conspectus sets up for PTB itself might better be treated, Baxter suggests, as a paradigmatically distinct high central proto-vowel *-ɨ-, with the vowel developing to -u- in some languages and to *-i- in others. Although this is an attractive idea, there is much variation between these two vowels even within single languages, and it does not seem true that the -u- and -i- forms show clear patterns of geographical distribution.[15]

Baxter concludes by arguing that Karlgren's reconstructions of OC and MC, while brilliant for their time, are becoming obsolete and unreliable as a guide for Sino-Tibetan comparison. We are indeed entering upon a happy period of interchange between Sinologists and Tibeto-Burmanists, building on the great work of the past while remaining open to fresh new ideas from whatever quarter!

(4) SYNCHRONIC GRAMMAR

"On quantifier floating in Lushai and Burmese, with some remarks on Thai" is the sort of paper we have come to expect from F. K. LEHMAN over the years. Lehman has been one of the few to attempt to apply some of the concepts of generative grammar and the terminology of mathematical logic to TB languages. The conclusions of his paper are essentially negative, as he succeeds in demonstrating that the concept of "quantifier floating" is relevant to the grammars of the languages he considers only in the most tangential way.

Inga-Lill HANSSON's "Verb concatenation in Akha" is a valuable report on her ongoing study of 356 Akha verbs and verbal auxiliaries from the point of view of their syntagmatic and paradigmatic cooccurrence restrictions. All verbs which can occur in juxtaposition with others she terms "versatile," distinguishing between "restricted versatile verbs" (which only occur after one particular verb-head) and "non-restricted" ones (which may occur after several, or many different ones).[16] Several important differences are to be noted in the syntactic behavior of these verb-strings in Akha and Lahu. Akha has both pre-and post-head "verbal auxiliaries" (i.e. verb-particles that are not themselves full verbs, since they cannot be negated) -- while Lahu has only post-head ones. Conversely, while Lahu has both pre- and post-head versatile verbs, Akha only has them in post-head position. While in Lahu the negative morpheme may intervene at various points within a concatenation, the Akha negative must always precede the first verb. As in Lahu, however, Hansson concludes that the more semantically specific a verb is, the fewer are its "functional possibilities" (i.e. the fewer verbs it can concatenate with). Furthermore, as in Lahu, the ordering of the verbs in an Akha concatenation is a reflection of their relative "abstractness," with the more abstract verbs

---

[15] Jingpho [=Kachin] does not necessarily have -i- in these words -- cf. ʔyúp 'sleep'.

[16] This usage differs from that of Matisoff (1969, 1973), for whom "versatile" verbs by definition may co-occur in concatenation with an indefinite number of verb-heads.

able to occur further away from the head.

In "Perfectivity in Mandarin," Charles LI and Sandra THOMPSON investigate the syntactic and pragmatic conditions that favor the use of the verb-particle le 'perfective; change of state.' This particle derives form a full verb (Mandarin liao^{3}) meaning 'to finish,' and is roughly equivalent in function to similar morphemes in other languages of E. and SE Asia (e.g. Lahu ò, Thai lέεw). Complete parallelism of behavior must not be expected of particles in different languages, however, and Li and Thompson point out several idiosyncratic properties of Mandarin le. The use of le correlates strongly with a "concomitant signal of boundedness." This signal may be an inherent semantic property of a verb (e.g. die, be enough, depart), or a syntactic structure like a quantified complement or a following clause that refers to a subsequent event. An event will often qualify as bounded if the direct object is a definite NP (e.g. a name, a pronoun, or a noun preceded by certain modifiers), but the authors stress that whether a sentence is expressing a bounded event or not is basically a question of the state of mind of the speaker and the situational and discourse context of the utterance.

In other words, our grammatical analyses can go only so far.

(5) HISTORICAL GRAMMAR

A. L. BECKER's refreshing and original paper, "Person in Austro-Thai: comments on the pronoun paradigm in Benedict's Austro-Thai Language and Culture," takes the viewpoint of what one might call a cultural philologist toward Benedict's idea of Tai/Austronesian relationship. Becker mistrusts "proto-languages" as they are usually conceived. Following Gregory Bateson, for whom "resemblances do not presuppose common origins, only shared constraints," Becker looks for linguistic correlates of people's shared views of the world.

Pronominal systems, since they necessarily involve notions of personhood, can be especially revealing of cultural attitudes. Becker notes that pronominal forms may be freely borrowed, but pronominal systems and categories have great stability over time, so that etymologically new forms merely fill old cells in preexisting paradigms. The system of person is highly elaborated in both Austronesian and Tai. In many AN languages personal pronouns are inflected with temporal or locative morphemes, become affixed to nouns or verbs, or develop into complex focus systems. In modern Thai there are about 17 pronominal forms available for the 1st person, 19 for the second, and 10 for the third.

Becker agrees with Benedict that the Austro-Tai pronouns are morphologically complex, with certain well-defined 'matrix formatives' that have developed by analogical leveling. Instead of reconstructing SINGULAR/PLURAL as a basic parameter of the proto-system, however, Becker considers the underlying opposition to have been the culturally determined dimension of FAMILIAR/FORMAL or LOWER STATUS/HIGHER STATUS. In many modern AN languages, as in Old Javanese, the so-called plural forms are just as often used to indicate respect or formality of relationship.[17] Becker observes that Tibeto-Burman pronouns do not mark speaker status paradigmatically -- the TB peoples share a

[17] Cf. the switches of pronominal person and/or number to show respect in such familiar European languages as French, Spanish, German, or Russian.

different set of cultural constraints in this area!

Tsu-lin MEI presents several interesting new ST etymologies in his paper, "Some examples of prenasals and *s- nasals in Sino-Tibetan," illustrating a prefixal theory recently proposed by Kun CHANG and Betty SHEFTS CHANG. In the view of these scholars, the two prefixes *s- and *N- could cooccur in that order before a root, both in pre-Chinese and in Sino-Tibetan itself, with pre-Chinese *sm-, *sn-, and *sng- developing into Old Chinese *xm-, *hn-, and *xng-, respectively. Of particular interest is the set for FLY (n.). Li Fang-kuei has connected OC *rəng, *mrang 'fly' with Siamese mələɛŋ 'bug'. The Changs and Mei go on to relate these to such TB forms as Written Tibetan sbrang and Lepcha sum-bryong, reconstructing the double prefix *s-N - for PST.[18]

In "The meaning of early Zhou Chinese final *-s (qusheng)", A. SCHUESSLER returns to a topic that has fascinated Sinologists for 35 years.[19] The classic study by Gordon Downer distinguished eight categories of "derivation by qusheng" (e.g. deverbal, denominal, causative, passive, adverbial), firmly establishing that the qusheng (lit. "departing tone") was exploited as an all-purpose derivational device in OC.[20] The implication is that it is secondary with respect to the original two-tone system of Chinese non-stopped syllables, indeed a "sandhi tone" as Benedict calls it (Conspectus, n. 494, p. 194). Haudricourt's suggestion that this tonal category arose through the loss of suffixal *-s has come to be generally accepted, and is one of the master strokes of tonogenetic reasoning.

Schuessler assumes that this *-s was already in existence in "early Zhou" Chinese, the language of the earliest classics Shujing and Shijing. He wishes to show that, "apart from a residue," all derivations in *-s in these early texts can be accounted for by a single meaning, roughly that of an Indo-European past passive participle. Only later, by Qin times, was this derivational device "diluted enough to become the very general morpheme described by Downer."

Boyd MICHAILOVSKY's paper, "Tibeto-Burman dental suffixes: evidence form Limbu (Nepal)," is an important contribution to our understanding of the verb morphology of the Himalayish languages. The languages of the E. Himalayish (or Bahing-Vayu) group have a "flamboyant verbal agreement morphology"[21] which is of relatively recent date. Even older is a morphological stratum that featured two dental suffixes, -S and -T.[22] Many Limbu verbs still have allofams with either or both of these suffixes, e.g. HA:P 'weep' / HA:PT 'mourn' / HA:PS

---

18 The Conspectus (n. 469, p. 176) cites the same Written Tibetan and Lepcha forms, reconstructing PTB *s-brəng, though an allofam *yang must also be recognized (see set #492 and n. 448, p. 167).

19 See Karlgren 1949, Haudricourt 1954, Wang Li 1958, Downer 1959, Forrest 1960, Pulleyblank 1962, and Chou Fa-kao 1963.

20 The "creaky" tone of Burmese has a very similar status -- historically secondary and used synchronically in a variety of derivational processes. See Okell 1969, pp. 18-21.

21 I.e. morphemes attached to the verb which show agreement in person and number with the subject and/or object of the clause. Languages having morphology of this type have been called "pronominalized" ever since the Linguistic Survey of India. See Thurgood's paper, below.

22 The PTB trio of dental suffixes, *-s, *-t, and *-n, were extensively discussed by Wolfenden (1929, 1936), and are treated in the Conspectus, pp. 98-103.

'cause to mourn.' This postfinal -S is clearly causative in cases like this; the meaning of -T is more elusive, sometimes causative but often with an increment of meaning that Michailovsky calls 'directive.'[23] In other cases the suffixes may have aspectual meaning, signalling such categories as 'perfective' or 'middle voice.'

Limbu has another alternational pattern in verb-pairs: intransitives with unaspirated initial / transitives with aspirated initial. (This pattern, very similar to what is found in Burmese simplex/causative pairs, was already described in Hodgson 1858.) Michailovsky plausibly assumes these transitives to derive from forms with the *s- causative prefix, so widespread in TB. We are then confronted with a causative morpheme which was sometimes a prefix and sometimes a suffix.[24]

Michailovsky poses the interesting question of why PTB non-syllabic suffixes should have been limited to dentals, in contrast to the rich variety of PTB prefixes. Invoking Greenberg's universal that coronal consonants enjoy a favored position in syllable-final clusters, he concludes that the very fact that these suffixes are all dentals suggest that they were not only added to open syllables, but also to closed ones (contra the Conspectus, p. 98).

A tantalizing glimpse of the prefixal morphology of a Chin language is provided in L. G. LOEFFLER's paper, "Prefixation in Paangkhua." Paangkhua, closely related to Lushai and Bawm in the Central Chin group, resembles the so-called "Old Kuki" languages in its preservation of certain prefixes. Some Paangkhua prefixes can be demonstrated to derive from independent PTB root-morphemes. Thus the prefix sa- comes either from PTB *sya 'animal' [STC #181], *za or *tsa 'child' [STC #59], or *dza 'rice' [cf. Lahu cà]. While Paangkhua ra- may occasionally be referred to a full morpheme (e.g. rayaam < rua-vaam 'bamboo ashes'), in other cases Loeffler feels it descends from "original" PTB *r-. The prefix ma-, which distinguishes transitive from reflexive verb-forms and can function as a causative marker, also seems to be of considerable antiquity, though it is not obvious how it relates to PTB *m-, which generally signifies the opposite sort of categorial notions: e.g. 'durative,' 'intransitive,' 'stative,' 'reflexive,' 'middle voice.'[25]

Graham THURGOOD's paper, "Pronouns, pronominalization, and the subgrouping of Tibeto-Burman," is a valuable attempt to use the distribution of innovated pronouns as well as pronominal agreement morphology on verbs as a criterion for subgrouping the TB family. Bauman (1975) has established that these agreement systems were a native TB development, and that it is quite unnecessary to suppose that they arose due to influence from some other language family. While Bauman believed that verb-pronominalization was an inherited feature from PTB, Thurgood persuasively demonstrates that at least parts of the various modern systems represent a number of independent (though often partially parallel) developments -- so that the patterns of shared innovations provide "excellent criteria for subgrouping."[26]

---

[23] Wolfenden (1929) uses a similar term to characterize certain functions of the TB *s- prefix. Cf. such Lahu pairs as dû 'dig (in general)' / tū 'bury smn' (i.e. perform digging directed toward a particular purpose).

[24] As Michailovsky points out, Conrady (1896, p. 43) had already proposed that Tibetan prefixed s- and certain -s suffixes were the same element.

[25] See Wolfenden 1929 (pp. 26-30), Conspectus pp. 117-21.

[26] A particular etymon that has become pressed into service as a pronominal agree-

Julian WHEATLEY's important paper, "Verb serialization and word order in Loloish: a comparative study," could just as well have been included in the section on SYNCHRONIC GRAMMAR, since it focusses on a synchronic syntactic phenomenon in the N. Loloish (=Yi) languages that is also of great diachronic significance. Central Loloish languages like Lahu and S. Loloish languages like Akha are "concatenating"[27], in that they can string together series of 2, 3, 4, or even 5 verbs in simple juxtaposition, with all their normal arguments jointly preposed to this single verb-clot. The N. Loloish languages, however, as Wheatley has discovered by going though Yi texts collected by Chinese scholars, have developed certain serialized verb constructions, involving grammaticalized "co-verbs" like GIVE (for 'dative case'), USE (for 'instrumental'), DWELL (for 'locative'), etc., which are preceded by their own nominal arguments.

It seems likely that these constructions were innovated into N. Loloish under Chinese influence. Since there are some contexts where the co-verb may be omitted, "unabashedly post-verbal constituents" may be left stranded. Besides helping to standardize and clarify the terminology required to deal with all the various types of multiverbal constructions to be found in these languages (consecutivized, concatenated, serialized), Wheatley's analysis incidentally sheds great light on the possible scenario whereby the Karen languages, alone of all the TB family, came to be verb-medial rather than verb-final.[28]

(6) LEXICON AND SEMANTICS

In "Out on a limb: ARM, HAND, and WING in Sino-Tibetan," J. MATISOFF undertakes the reconstruction of some 30 PST/PTB etyma with meanings relating to the upper limbs of human and animal bodies. Forms are cited from over 100 TB languages, for many of which the laws of sound correspondence are still imperfectly known (at least to Matisoff), so a certain amount of educated guesswork is involved. This study is an illustration of the author's "organic semantic" approach to cognate identification, where a single semantic area is concentrated on at a time, and where account is taken of phonological and semantic variation at all time depths.[29] In typical fashion, the paper ends with a crude, but perhaps not unrevealing "flowchart" that schematizes the shifts and developments which seem to have occurred in this area of ST semantic space.

Y. NAGANO's paper, "A lexicon of gLo-skad (Mustang Tibetan)," provides

---

ment marker in a given language may, of course, exist with quite different functions in another language. The Nungish 3rd person prefix ang- seems certainly to be cognate to the ubiquitous Lahu noun-prefix ɔ- (< PLB *ang [cf. Bisu ʔaŋ]).

27 For the introduction of this term with respect to Lahu, see Matisoff 1969, 1973; for Akha, see Hansson [this volume].

28 Benedict's setting off of Karen as a branch coordinate with the rest of TB (Conspectus, pp. 6, 127-52) was mostly due to this syntactic aberrancy. Now that we are coming to understand how this sort of dramatic syntactic change can easily happen under protracted foreign influence, there seems much less reason to regard Karen as anything more than another subgroup of TB. (In the case of Karen this influence must have come from Mon and/or Tai.)

29 See Matisoff 1978, 1980.

phonemic transcriptions of the items in Kitamura's 1977 monograph, along with a preliminary analysis of the correspondences between the initials and rhymes of gLo-skad and those of Written Tibetan. While the Mustang dialect has some forms that show strong affinities to the Tamang-Gurung-Thakali-Manang group, the core of the vocabulary is clearly Tibetan. Nagano makes some interesting remarks on the relative progress of tonogenesis in the various Tibetanoid (= Bodish) languages, observing that "the pioneer of tone is always nasals." Amdo Sherpa has tonal distinctions only after nasal initials, while gLo-skad has them only after nasal and the lateral l-. With stops and affricates, voicing and aspiration remain as in Written Tibetan, and "tone is not needed."

The final paper in this volume is "Some archaic Vietnamese words in Nguyễn Trãi's poems," by NGUYỄN Đình-hoà, the foremost Vietnamese linguist in the U.S. In 1975, Nguyễn pointed out that the "Collected Poems in the National Language" by Nguyễn Trãi (1380-1442) contain a number of archaic words. After having collated several versions of these poems, both in quốc-ngữ (the romanized alphabet still used to write Vietnamese) and in chữ -nôm (the older, logographic writing inspired by Chinese), Nguyễn Đình-hoà now presents 50 lexemes which were used as free words in Trãi's time, but which are found only in compounds or in rare contexts in modern Vietnamese. Each item is exemplified by a passage from one of Nguyễn Trai's 254 vernacular poems.

PACIFIC LINGUISTICS

Series C – No. 87

LINGUISTICS OF THE SINO-TIBETAN AREA:
THE STATE OF THE ART
PAPERS PRESENTED TO PAUL K. BENEDICT FOR HIS 71st BIRTHDAY

edited by
Graham Thurgood
James A. Matisoff
David Bradley

with the assistance of
Grace Shiang-Juin Lin and Keith Record

Out of print book
Photocopied by Pacific Linguistics
RSPAS, Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
Australia