Austroasiatic Loanwords in Sino-Tibetan
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Austroasiatic (AA) and Sino-Tibetan (ST) have shared an extensive border or, perhaps more accurately, a series of borders (like the line encircling Khasi) for the past few millennia, yet it is a curious fact that there has been relatively little exchange of lexical material between the two stocks, apart from strictly local borrowings. Mon, to be sure, has made a sizeable contribution to the lexicons of Burmese and Karen, as might be anticipated in view of the history of the area, with Mon playing the literary, 'civilizing' role, but Khmer, the other AA literary language, became involved primarily with a non-ST language (Thai). Chinese has remained quite distant from both these seats of literary influence, as witnessed by the fact that in a recent study of early loanwords in Chinese (Benedict 1976b) little mention is made of AA whereas Austro-Thai (AT) loan sources appear in some abundance. A reexamination of AA materials has not appreciably changed this situation but it has served to point up the over-all picture, as presented below.

As might well be anticipated, the ST languages show little if any lexical evidence of specific Munda (as apart from AA) contact. Munda does have a number of unexpected lexical ties with SEA in items apparently not represented (except by loans) in MK, as shown in a recent paper on AA and AT (Benedict 1975 [hereafter ATLC]: Appendix II), e.g. the body part word: PM *nunu ‘breast, nipple, suck, suckle’ (contra Pinnow, distinct from PM *niu ‘drink’ (< PAA *niu[?]}; cf. PW *ni? < *ni?, id.): note Santali nuna ‘breast’, ni ‘drink’); PAT *nu[h]/nuh ‘breast’ (Ho. ‘nipple’) as well as two roots of extraordinary cultural interest:

PAT *(qa)/[s]alu ‘mortar/ pestle’: PWA *halu ‘pestle’; Formosa (Paiwanic/Tsouic/Atayalic) *(qa)/salu, id.; Li (Hainan) *raw ‘(rice) mortar’, from *[s]aru (with vocalic transfer [ATLC:183]; PAT */l/ > Li /ɾ/ is a regular shift); PM *saX?l: ‘The Proto-Munda form for the ‘husking hole, or mortar’, usually a hole in the stone of the verandah of a Munda house’ (A./N. Zide).2

1A list of abbreviations is given in the Appendix.

2AC/MC šk’oLtš’wo ‘pestle’, which has the calendar term ṣ-s-ŋo/ŋuo: ‘horse’ (see text) as phonetic, is a possible early loan in Chinese, from *s-k’ja (regular shift) < *skal (loss of *-l is not rare) < *ksal (metathesis) < *qsal (regular Chinese replacement of /u/ by /k/ in loans); cf. the related loan: AC/MC ṣ-gIj�wɔ/sj woŋ ‘hull grain with mortar’ (sec. voicing; regular *o’ > /u/ and *B > *A tone after *s- prefix); PT (only SW) *kloŋB, (< *gloŋA) ‘hull rice’; Kam-Sui *tyuŋB < *kloŋB, id. (contra ATLC:338-39).

MKS See archives.sealang.net/mks/copyright.htm for terms of use.
The */X/ is a reconstructed glottalization feature (N. Zide), of uncertain significance here. The */fl/, however, appears to have been metathesized, representing the Formosan (and widespread AN) */qa/ prefix, a pattern often found in the Philippines. The loan confirms the reconstruction of */s/ as initial (a long distance to go for this!) and also indicates that the mainland meaning ('mortar') is earlier than the PAN meaning ('pestle'), as usually obtains within AT in cases of this kind. This is a very 'primitive' cultural item, especially as described for Munda, and the loan must have been made at a remote time period, the phonology clearly indicating the direction (AT > Munda). It is difficult to see how this root could lack representation in MK—perhaps it will eventually turn up.

The second root comes from a later time period and appears to have Mon as well as ST associations:


It is difficult to say much about this correspondence other than that it’s remarkable! PAT has a separate root for ‘iron’: *(m)baxliag, at a much earlier level than it has any (archeological) right to be (see the discussion in ATLC:185-86), so that the PM ‘iron’ must be viewed as a derived meaning. Did the ancestral Munda people take *luŋ with them on their westward journey as their ‘metal’ term par excellence, since ‘copper’ as well as ‘bronze’ were certainly earlier than ‘iron’, then apply the term to ‘iron’ after reaching India, presumably for cultural reasons (perhaps bronze was not readily available)? Linguistic complications for this root appear when we consider the apparent early loan into Chinese and the backloans into Kadaï (KD: Tai and related languages). We might start by pointing out that the intervocalic loss of PAT medial */y/ is regular for KD (ATLC:163), so that Mon sluy could hardly have been borrowed from a KD source. The apparent S[outhern] W[est] T[ai] and C[entral] T[ai] cognate has initial */d/- rather than */l/-: SW/CT *doŋA */oo/ regularly < */ua/; note the tonal agreement) ‘copper’ (Lao, Black Tai, Tho and Nung); ‘copper/brass’ (White Tai); ‘brass’ (Ahom and Khanti); ‘gold’ (Siamese, which also has *doŋA yamA, id., with *yamA from a PAT etymon for ‘dark/red’) (Shan does not employ the term alone), the latter two languages also having (the reconstructed forms are cited, as above) *doŋA */ʔeeŋA ‘copper’ */ʔeeŋA ‘red’) and *doŋA */hiŋA ‘brass’ */hiŋA ‘yellow’); cf. also Li (Hāinān) duon ‘copper’. It was originally thought (ATLC:92-93) that a *di- cluster was to be reconstructed for this root but this does not work, and recent advances in the reconstruction of the early stages of Chinese (Benedict 1976a, hereafter STAL, with emendations in Benedict 1977: fn. 2!) point to a resolution of the problem. The evidence from the graphs along with comparative ST material indicates that Chinese experienced a major shift in initials between the earliest known stage: A[rchaic] C[hinese] (Dobson’s ‘Early Archaic’), the language of the Book of History and the earlier inscriptions (down to Karlgen’s Zhou II: 900 - circa 770 B.C.), and O[ld] C[hinese], the language of the Zuo zhuan and later classics and of the later inscriptions (Karlgen’s Zhou III and IV). Most of these shifts were associated with the ubiquitous */s/- prefix, which yielded AC/OC
contrasts such as *s-k/- (prefix type) vs. *sk/t- (cluster type). The same prefix with /l/ yielded a highly significant contrast, viz. *s-l/d/- (prefix type) vs. *sl/s- (cluster type). We have evidence in Mon sluy ‘copper’ (above) for prefixed *s- and this is confirmed by what now appears to be the correct reconstruction of the early loan into Chinese: 銅 *[s-luj]/ d’unA ‘bronze, copper’, known only from the later OC period (in Zuozhuan, as place name), hence the conjectural reconstruction; AC/OC lacked the diphthong /ua/ and the anticipated substitution would be */u/, regularly from long medial */u/ as well as */o/ and even */a/ (Benedict 1977). The early Chinese loans into P[roto] T[ai] reflect a distinctive dialect of the language, which STAL labels as L[oans to] PT and */oo/ for */u/ was characteristic of this early dialect, explaining the vocalism of the PT back-loan here. A number of AT roots of a ‘cultural’ variety show a separate spread into TB (see ATLC:78-79) and this root may be one of them although the phonology remains in some doubt; cf. WB hran- (< *srə-, poss. from *srəŋ < *sλəŋ, both of ‘non-WB’ type), found only in hran-sam ‘platinum’ (sam ‘iron’); Lushai (Kuki-Naga group) ran-, found only in ran-ka-ca’k ‘gold’ (cf. cak ‘red’) and ran-va ‘tin’ (-va not identified); Garo (Bodo-Garo group) ran ‘brass gong’, ran-ni sil ‘bronze’ (sil ‘metal’).

To turn now to the MK languages, they have long been in close contact with Karen, Burmese and other TB languages, with lexical exchange as might be predicted. This subject has been reviewed at some length by Shafer 1952 and more recently by Shorto 1973; cf. also Matisoff 1973. Most of the items involved are of strictly local interest, e.g. loans in either direction between Khani and the surrounding TB languages. Of the terms for cultivated plants only one appears to have spread very far in TB:

PMK *ʔbay ‘bean’ (Shorto): SM /boa/ ‘bean, pea; 1/16 tical’; Kh. /pəy/ ‘obsolete small coin’; cf. WB pai: (< [b]layB) ‘bean’; Lushai, Maram, Thado, Kabui (all Kuki-Naga group) be, id. (cf. Mod. B. be:—contra Benedict 1972 [hereafter STC], which sets up a root: PTB *be); Dimasa (Bodo-Garo group) səbai, id.; Tsangla (Tibeto-Himalayish group) sə-pai (both the latter with PTB *səyB ‘fruit’).

Among the cultural items travelling from ST to AA, the PST root *sryamA ‘sharp/iron’ is to be noted as an excellent illustration of how a loan can at times ‘tie together’ the pieces of a puzzling root:

---

3Proto-Min has initial *s-d- here, possibly reflecting an earlier *s-l-, but an alternative etymology is a possibility here; cf. WT sdo-ba ‘unite, join’ (> ‘alloy’) and AC/MC 同 d’un’d’un ‘together, assemble’ < PST *(s)-do-n (cited in Benedict 1976b).

4Cf. also Palaung rabai, Riang rabai ~ baì; in ATLC (p. 478) these forms are compared with PM *ramba [r, j]a ‘green gram [chickpea]’ (A./N. Zide cite *rVm ‘black gram’) in exploring the possibility of setting up for PAA a distinction between */j/ and */j/ parallelling that found in PAT (as usual in that study of AA and AT, the writer was playing the ‘devil’s advocate’ role in pushing reconstruction possibilities to the limit in order to make the best case possible for ‘Austro’—yet at the end he concluded that the best was not nearly good enough!)
a-hem (< */hriam) ‘sharp’, Garo sram ~ srem/srem (< */sryam) ‘sharp (−edged)’; also AC/MC 話 sljām/sljām ‘sharp’ < PST *sryamA, with an early loan to Tai: PT *siamB ‘sharpen/sharp’ (PT lacks *sl-); the tonal change was probably brought about by a ‘causative’ affix.

This root was duly noted in STC: fn’s 179, 457 under the form *(s-)ryam (as if *s- prefixed, but *ry- forms are lacking) and a ‘possible relationship’ was pointed out with a root of limited (eastern) distribution meaning ‘iron’:

PTB *šamA (note the tonal agreement): Gyarong šom and šam ~ šom (diff. dialects), Ch’iang sye ~ syi ~ ši (diff. dialects); Nungish: Trung šyam, Rawang šam (also ‘sword’; cf. Lushai hriam ); WB šam < PBL *šamA.

What was lacking in the STC presentation was any evidence that a PST root *sryamA, supposedly underlying a secondary šamA, ever actually meant ‘iron’. What was overlooked here was the Proto-Waic loan *hrem ‘iron’ (Diffloth), from a secondary (*sr- > hr-) TB form such as Lushai hriam with (*-ya- > -e-)! 

MK loans from TB at times ‘match up’ directly with early (written) forms, e.g. Proto-Waic (PW) *mrng ‘horse’ (Diffloth), WB mrng; id., from PTB *m-raŋ ~ *s-raŋ (STC #145). Occasionally they display interesting special features, as in the case of PW *ryah ‘100’ (fn. 5). Of special interest here are Khmu s- prefixed forms presenting direct correspondences with similar forms reconstructed by the writer for AC (!), notably Khmu skam ‘needle’, AC/MC 話 skjəm/tʃəm (phonetic is ʰsɨm/ɨsɨm ‘all’), id.; cf. also Khmu skia ‘little cry of pain’; AC/MC ʰs-k’iog/xieu (Mand. xiāo) ‘cry of alarm’. In other instances a curious areal bond appears to envelop forms from these two disparate language families (AA/ST), e.g. PW *pɨŋ ‘to blow’, *m-pɨŋ ‘wind’, from *puŋ and *m-puŋ (Diffloth 1980a:92), appear to ‘echo’ ST morphology in the following: PST *(m-)buŋ (cited in part in Benedict 1977): Ig. buŋ ‘to blow’, mbuŋ ‘wind, air’; Rawang (Nungish) nam-buŋ ‘wind’ (nam ‘sky’); Konyak *p[u’]/ŋ: Nocte pong ‘wind’; Kuki-Naga (K-N) *(m-)p [u’]/ŋ: Yacham-Tengsa mapuŋ, Nruangmei mpun, Lotha mpun, Sangtam -pong, id.; AC/MC 話 b’un/b’uŋ (loan) ‘to blow (sc. the wind’).

There is little evidence of any borrowing of lexical items of ‘core’ type by TB/ST from AA/MK. The kinship terms of these two language stocks do display rather more similarity than one might anticipate and perhaps here also we are dealing with areal features (note PT *taA ‘mat. grandfather’, *yaC ‘pat. grandmother’) as well as ‘universals’ of a kind, e.g. of the twelve kinship terms proper cited by Diffloth for Proto-Waic no fewer than five show excellent ‘fits’ in TB (note that PW lacks vocalic finals while TB lacks final -ŋ):

pointing to earlier forms with *s- prefix (variable, like other ST prefixes). In this connection, P*[roto-] W[aic] has the intriguing early loan: *ryah ‘hundred’ (Diffloth), apparently from a Karen source, cf. P*[roto-] K[aaren] *ryA, from the complex PTB *s(b-)r-gya root, but with final -h (rather than -ŋ; PW lacks vocalic finals), suggesting a variant *s- prefixed cognate; form not available for Chepang, which has a parallel development (above); Lu. has zə < *ya < *s-rg>yaA but WB has only the *a- prefix derivative: ?ara < *a-r[gy]aA; Chinese parallels mìkîr (phârô) in reflecting prefixed *s- as well as *-b-: _tipo-glāk/pok (for the initial, see the writer’s ‘Archaic Chinese initial’, to appear in the forthcoming Wang Li Festschrift).
areal features (note PT *taA ‘mat. grandfather’, *yaC ‘pat. grandmother’) as well as ‘universals’ of a kind, e.g. of the twelve kinship terms proper cited by Diffloth for Proto-Waic no fewer than five show excellent ‘fits’ in TB (note that PW lacks vocalic finals while TB lacks final -ʔ):

PW *taʔ ‘grandfather, old man’; PTB *ta ‘grandfather/ father/older brother’, AC/MC 祖 tslo/tsuo: ‘grandfather, ancestor’, from *sto (see below) <*sta < PST *s(ta).

PW *yaʔ ‘grandmother’; PTB *ya ‘mother/grandmother’ (secondary term).

PW *baʔ ‘father’; PTB *pa but PK *ba (~ *pha), id., AC/MC ≠ b ’i wo/b ’i u: < *ba, id.

PW *maʔ ‘mother’; PTB *ma, id. (not represented in Chinese as kinship term).

PW *ek ‘older brother’; PTB *ik, id. (only in WB and Mikir).

The striking fact about this group of terms is that they all refer to older-than-ego kin, paralleling patterns of kinship term loans elsewhere in Southeast Asia,6 to be attributed to the gerontocratic tradition of the region.

A pair of body part/function terms involve possible loans, at a relatively late level, from MK to the ST family. PK *goʔ ‘neck’ can be compared with Riang kok, id., an apparent cognate of PW *ŋok, id., but PK final -ʔ corresponds to PTB *-t and *-p as well as *-k, hence other comparisons (within ST) are possible, notably with WB kup ‘nape of neck’. Another Northern MK language, Danaw, has koŋ ‘neck’, comparable this time with terms within TB proper (K-N): Ao Naga tekoŋ, id.; cf. also Lu. noŋ, id., possibly from *m-goŋ.

A more likely instance of borrowing, favoured both by Shafer and Shorto (cit. supra), involves the PMK root for ‘feces’: *ʔeeć (Shorto) and K-N *(ʔ)e’k, id. The final does not present a phonological problem in view of the absence of palatal finals in TB (with the conspicuous exception of WB) but there is a morphological difficulty since the final *-k may be late, marking the derived (non-finite) form of the root *e ‘defecate’ (the Lu. pattern). PK *ʔeB ‘feces’ has been cited by the writer (Benedict 1979a) as an example of loss of final stop in Karen but this root can also be compared directly with the K-N *e rather than *e’k form; cf. also Proto-Tai (PT) *eeA ‘defecate (of children)/discharge (feces, urine)/copulate (=discharge semen)’, apparently of AT origin (ATLC:283). Another possible loan from the MK root, presenting no serious difficulties, is represented by Lepcha (Sikkim) it ~ áyit ‘feces’, as suggested by Forrest 1962, the latter form reflecting PTB prefixed *a-; this is one of the key roots, along with that for ‘year’ (below), used by Forrest in support of his suggestion that Lepcha has a MK substratum of sorts. Finally it should be noted that the MK root is involved in a group of early loans to the Chamic languages: P[roto-] C[hamic] *eh ‘defecate’ (Headley 1976).

This brings us finally to a discussion of the two ‘animal life’ MK roots that apparently ‘made it’ as loans in ST at a very early (possibly PST) level, and in this case the basic question (Why these two?) can be answered after a fashion, viz. both are raptorial: ‘tiger’ and ‘eagle/hawk/kite’. The tiger has always inspired a mixture

---

6See the discussion of loans from Chinese to Vn. and the Tai languages, also from Indic to TB languages, in Benedict 1947.
of dread and respect among the native populations of SEA, e.g. Rawang (Nungish) khanj ‘tiger’ is simply the direct address form (‘honourable sir’) of akhan ‘grandfather’, anjhan ‘master’ (< PST *kaŋ, see STC:fn. 488); Pateng (Miao group) has the precisely parallel pu ‘tiger’, a-pu (same tone) ‘grandfather’; cf. also Pekinese 老虎 lão-hû ‘(old) tiger’; for a somewhat different semantic development, cf. the Abor-Miri forms for ‘tiger’: sim-no ~ simyo ~ myo- (si- is the ‘animal prefix’), apparently derived from nyo ‘taboo’. One question may only lead to another, however, since now we must ask: why has the ‘tiger’ root (below) been so well retained on the whole in MK, even in the deviant Vietnamese (several ‘tiger’ terms: cop, hûm, hâm, as well as khái < *khal; cf. Muong khal ~ khlal < *khlə/khla). Similarly, why was the ‘eagle/hawk/kite’ root so resistant to replacement throughout MK while at the same period the equivalent roots in the neighbouring languages were being replaced by this same MK root? There is scarcely anything like it in other roots, the closest parallel coming from the root for another ‘predator’, at a lower level of animal life: PMK *plə arena ‘leech’; PNB *pləm (Smith), Proto-Semai *pləm (Diffloth); cf. Proto-Chamic *pləm (Headley); Yao has both *pləm (Highland Yao piom) and *kləm (Chiengrai Yao kiom), the former regularly from an earlier *pləm (ATLC:180-81), the latter curiously lying in with Mon kləm, further complicating an already baffling problem. It does appear that it was the ‘villains’ who travelled linguistically, whatever the circumstances, and perhaps some underlying theme is to be sought there. The roots themselves are of unusual interest; they have a similar structure [*k(ː)l-] and in TB each experienced some loss of the initial *k- through metanalysis (TB ‘animal prefix’ *k-) while in Chinese each is represented by an *s- prefixed form (< PST ‘animal prefix’ *s-), making identification difficult under the earlier (Karlgren) scheme of reconstruction.

PMK *kla? ‘tiger’ (Shorto) = *kla; cf. WB kya: < *kla, id., but PBL *(k-) la through metanalysis (above); also Garo matca, id., from B[o]-G[aro] *ma(t) -ca, from an earlier *skla (with ‘animal prefix’ *s-), parallelling other B-G roots formed with *ma(t) ‘animal’ (STC:fn. 391); for the phonology cf. the parallel (with voicing) Garo ja- ‘moon’ < PTB *s-gla (STC:fn. 109); the apparent Chinese representative is AC/OC 虻 xol/xuo: ‘tiger’, as reconstructed by Karlgren (1957, hereafter GSR); this ‘tiger’ is phonetic in the GSR:69 series: 虻 *gliu ‘food vessel’, 虻 *gliu ‘think of’, 虻 *sk’liu ‘extend’, et al. and is to be reconstructed *s-k’lo/xuo:; from an original *s-k’la (with regular final -o for *-a).

---

7 This prefix has been viewed (Matisoff 1973) as a loan from MK, where it appears in the eastern as well as northern languages (see Smith 1975 for Sedang examples), with an ultimate origin perhaps in PMK *kuan ‘child’ (see Shorto 1973, citing Vn. con chim and Old Mon kiícem ‘bird’) but it should be noted that in the B-L group, where it is best represented, it occurs also with ‘non-animal’ roots, e.g. ‘cane/rattan’ and ‘stone’ (STC:fn. 301), hence it is perhaps best seen as an areal feature.

8 See the discussion in ATLC: 468; PNB has final *-ə (vocalic) as well as *-a? and *-ə?, etc., in widespread MK roots; if this distinction is to be reconstructed for PMK the ‘tiger’ root has vocalic final (PNB *kla); it is noteworthy that the early PBL loan: *(k-) la (PBL tone *2) does not have the ‘glottalized’ PBL tone *3, as would be anticipated if the original had in fact been *kla?

9D. Solnit 1979 has compared Konyak (‘N. Naga’) *ja ‘tiger’ with the PBL root. There is an over-all special relationship within TB of the Konyak and B-G groups (STC:6-7); with strikingly similar phonology in part, and it is likely that the suggested *skla etymology holds here as well as in B-G.
regular PST root (incl. tone) can be reconstructed on the basis of the forms cited: PST *(s-)kłaB ‘tiger’. There is also a good deal of evidence (Benedict, cit. supra) that the PST root that was partially replaced was *(s-)keyA ‘tiger/leopard’, with several doublet forms.

PMK *k(a)laaj ‘bird of prey’ (generic); ‘hawk’ (Palaung, Waic, Khmu, Bru); ‘eagle’ (*

PMK *k(a)laaj ‘bird of prey’ (generic); ‘hawk’ (Palaung, Waic, Khmu, Bru); ‘eagle’ (Waic); ‘to fly without wing movements’ (Mon); ‘vulture’ (Nicobar); ‘sea-eagle’ (Nicobar); also *knleeŋ ‘hawk’; ‘a small hawk’ (Lawa); ‘eagle, kite’ (Khasi); ‘eagle’ (Hre); ‘bird of prey, kite’ (Khamer); also ‘kite, the toy’ (Khamer); (abbrev. from Diffloth 1980a); cf. PTB *(g-)laŋ (tone variable) ‘bird of prey (generic)’: Jg. läŋ ‘bird of the falcon family’, mainly in comp: ländä (~ Assam dial. lándä) ‘vulture, eagle’ (da ~ daŋ not anal.); lärŋut ‘sp. of night-hawk or screech-owl’ (duŋ not anal.); laŋgi ‘hawk, kite’, (ji is dimin.). gəlāŋ ~ kəlāŋ ‘eagle, hawk, kite’; WB laŋ: – only in comp.: laŋ-ta ‘vulture’ (cf. the Jg. comp.); hrwe-laŋ-ta ‘eagle’ (hrwe ‘gold’); laŋ-yun ‘sp. of hawk’ (cf. yun ‘hare’); perhaps also laŋ-tshwai: ‘large sp. of bat; the flying fox’ (tshwai: ‘hang’) and laŋ-wak ‘night heron’ (wak not anal.); G-B */[a]/ŋ (in comp. with G-B *dau ‘bird’): Garo do-reŋ ‘kite, hawk, (comp.) falcon, eagle, osprey’; Bodo dau-leŋa ‘eagle’ (recorded only by Hodgson over a century ago [publ.1847]; cf. Meitei [below] for the final -a); Dimasa dau-liŋ ‘kite’; Deori Chutiya du-roŋ, id.; Konyak (‘N. Naga’) *laŋ ‘eagle/hawk’ (~ ‘raven’)(often in comp. with *a ‘bird’, both Konyak and Phom have laŋa ‘eagle’, app. loans from Jg.); K-N (scattered citations; phonology not established but some forms in comp. with PTB *maw ‘eagle/hawk’ [STC #247]: Khoirao kalaŋ ‘hawk’, Tangkhul khalaŋ saa ‘eagle’, larpop ‘hawk’; Maram laŋna ‘hawk’, Zeme kaleŋ ‘eagle’, kele (prob. for *kelen) ‘hawk’, Liangmai kaleŋ ‘eagle’, takau-leŋna ‘hawk’, Yimchungrü muleŋ ‘eagle’, Mzieme lieŋum-pii, id.; Meitei telapa, id.; Mikir wə-mū-ləŋ-dō ‘osprey’, wə-mū-ləŋ-lō-pə ‘kind of eagle’ (wə-mū ‘hawk’, dō and lō not anal., pə is augment.); WT glag (< *glaŋ) ‘eagle, vulture’; possibly also Lepcha kun-thyŋ ~ pun-thyŋ (< *sklaŋ) ‘eagle, kite’. The PMK root is set up by Diffloth as an *aa/ ~ *ee/ doublet (read *k/(n/) leeng for his *knleeŋ in view of Khasi khleeŋ, Bhanaric *kleenə, Khm-Stand. khlaŋa) with suggested semantic distinction but the glosses do not appear to bear out the latter. It is clear that within TB the loan was handled as a *g- prefixed TB item rather than an initial *kl- root, hence the many forms with initial l-, including the Jg. doublet, and WT glag rather than *klag. The medial length (PTB */a/ for PMK */aa/) can be reconstructed on the basis of Konyak, which now has been shown to maintain length distinctions, as well as by the variant B-G set of -ŋ

10This doublet is perhaps to be interpreted as the product of ‘vocalic transfer’ at an early (PAA/PMK) level, with *kelaang yielding both klaang and kleey; see Benedict 1979b. An analysis of this kind is favoured by the apparent lack of any basic semantic distinction in the doublet. 

11First pointed out (for high vowels) by D. Solnit 1979. W. French (unpublished draft of Ph.D. dissertation, Grad. School, City University of New York) has shown that Konyak (his ‘N. Naga’) makes such distinctions generally, e.g. all languages of the group have final -ŋ for PNN *-ŋ but an entirely different set of reflexes for PNN *-aŋ, cf. *laŋ ‘eagle, hawk’: Tangsa (Yogli) laŋ, Phom laŋa, Nocte la, Wanche ao-la, Konyak au-lan ‘hawk’ but laŋa ‘eagle’ (identified as loan by the final -ŋ since -n is the regular reflex), Chang au-lu (Chang also has -o and -uo as reflexes here).
~ -en ~ -on reflexes (cf. STC:72), which now appear to reflect PTB *-an, as contrasted with *-an < PTB *-aq. WT glag contributes further support for medial length since it is now evident that WT regularly has final -g for PTB *-η after this feature (STAL:fn. 11 to p. 173).

The *(g-)laŋ root as set up above compares favourably with most TB etyma both as regards firmness of reconstruction and range of occurrence, hence there can be little doubt that the loan was made at the PTB level. The early Chinese loan, however, is far less obvious. STC (fn. 225) cites AC/MC 雉 glāklāk ‘kind of bird’ as a likely cognate of WT glag but the ?- (< *a- = ?a-) prefixed form fits better here: 雉 ?glāklāk ‘osprey’ (= ‘sea eagle’); old loans from Tibetan appear to be involved here (cf. the discussion of Tibetan and Chinese in STAL:177 under 2.). The same source also cites 鼎 ?iŋ/iəŋ (Karlgren’s reconstr.) ‘eagle, falcon’ in this connection but this word is better reconstructed s-kiəŋ/iəŋ and compared with WT skyin/ser ‘eagle, vulture’ (ser for gser ‘gold’, cf. the WB form cited above) (STAL: 182; this is probably the native [ST] root). The real loan in Chinese is well hidden: 揚 sgian/jiŋ (loan use in Shijing) ‘hawk’, from sgίan with -i- for -li- (cf. ‘tiger’, above) and typically palatalized; note that here in Chinese, as well as in TB, the loan is handled as a *g- prefixed item (plus the widespread PST *s- ‘animal prefix’).

Both the ‘tiger’ and the ‘bird of prey’ loans were made at the PST level or shortly thereafter (the Shijing loan for ‘hawk’ places it at the AC level in Chinese) but only the MK root for the latter was widely ‘invasive’, replacing native forms in almost all the neighbouring language stocks, including mainland AN (Proto-Chamic *kalān [Headley], with which Achinese [Sumatra] klēn is to be associated, and Malay lan ~ helan [Shorto]); also Miao-Yao (PMY *klaŋB), with only the Kadai languages holding out against it: SWT *runB ‘bird of prey’, a cognate of PWA *burun ‘bird’. These raptorial birds present a dramatic picture, to be sure, as they soar through the skies and swoop down on their prey but they scarcely present a serious menace to man, hence the secret of the extraordinary ‘invasiveness’ of this root, quite unmatched by any other in SEA, eludes one.

A handful of Chinese terms in addition to the above have come under serious consideration as possible loanwords from MK/AA. Three of these (‘river’, ‘tusk/ivory/tooth’ and ‘crossbow’) have been talked and written about for years, most recently by Norman and Mei 1970 and Benedict 1976b, while two others have only recently been proposed: ‘year’ (Benedict, cit. supra) and ‘tube’ (Shorto, cit. supra):

江 kǔŋ/kon ‘river’ (GSR), often reconstructed *krūŋ or *kron and compared with PMK *krong or kroŋ, id., which is also found as a loan in Chamic (Headley cites Proto-Chamic *kron); Norman and Mei make a strong case for this as an early loan in Chinese, pointing out that the word is relatively late in that language, absent in the oracle bones and occurring only once in the bronze inscriptions (but it does

loan by the final -η since -n is the regular reflex), Chang au-lu (Chang also has -o and -uo as reflexes here).

12PT *reŋB ‘vulture’, represented only by Siamese reŋ, Sæk reŋ, perhaps through ‘vocalic transfer’ (see fn. 10) from an earlier *irəŋ via *riŋ, offers a possible Munda link, cf. Sora ərəŋ ‘kite (bird)’.
occur in AC texts), also that it was applied only to the Yangtze and rivers to the south; l- forms do not appear in the phonetic series involved (GSR:1172) but there is indirect evidence for an initial cluster; this might also be reconstructed *kl-, however, hence one can compare the form with PTB *kluŋ ‘valley/river’ (STC, No. 127); note that Proto-Waic (Diffloth 1980a), which has both *kl- and *kr- as initial clusters, has *kloŋ ‘river’ with variant *krəŋ, pointing to a PMK doublet of this type, also that Siamese has khloŋ < *gləŋ ‘canal’, with a voiced initial not found elsewhere (possibly unrelated).

yte *ŋa ‘tusk’ (GSR), an early (OC) loan in Tai (PT *ŋa ‘tusk, ivory’) as well as in Vn. ngà < *ŋa ‘ivory’; as emphasized by Norman and Mei, the earlier meaning of the word in Chinese was ‘tusk/ivory’, with the generic ‘tooth’ a later development, reflected in the later loan to Yao (PY *ŋa ‘tooth’, with *ŋ- < *ŋ- as regular shift); the above scholars reconstruct AC *ŋa/ and compare with Proto-Mong *ŋa ‘tusk’; in this case, however, the phonetic series involved (GSR:37 and 47), kept separate by Karlgren since his reconstruction schema could not handle the problem, clearly indicate the reconstruction s-ŋo/na (< *s-ŋwa), phonetic in 鈩 s-kəl/ ‘raven, crow’ < PST *(s-)k(w)a as well as in 鈩 sgiəj ‘place name’ (this interchange of initial combinations found in other GSR series, as in one cited in fn. 2); again there is a likely comparison in TB: Lushai hŋo ‘tusk, tooth’, Mru hŋou(k), from *s-ŋo < *s-ŋ/ wəl (with ‘body part prefix’ *s-); Pa-o (Karen) has ʔəŋa ‘tooth’.

ŋo[n] /nuo: ‘crossbow’ (GSR; no AC cit.), an early (OC) loan to Tai (PT *nnaB, id.) and to Kam-Sui (Sui hna < *hna ‘bow’, the only ‘generic’ gloss for this root); these loans point to AC *s-ŋo/ rather than *ŋo/ (both yield OC /nuo/). The southern origin of this weapon seems indisputable but the origin of the term is uncertain; Norman and Mei cite Proto-Mong *səna as representing a likely source in MK; in TB the root is represented by Nakhi (BL group) ʔəna, Rawang (Nungish) ʔəna, both probably late.

ŋam /ŋəm /ŋəm: ‘harvest, year’ (GSR; no AC cit.); Lepcha nam ‘year’, cf. PMK *s[a]nam, id.: Mon and Palaung nam, Khasi snem, Khmer chnom, Sieng sənəm, PNB *hanəm; Vn. nəm; Lp. nam must be considered a relatively late loan since it does not show the regular PTB *a/ > Lp. ə/ shift (STC:70), and it apparently reflects a reduced MK form such as Vn. ɲəm; in any event it cannot be linked with the AC/OC form to set up a PST root. The AC/OC form appears to show both initial (*ŋ- for *ŋ-) and vocalic (*a/ for *a/) discrepancies, but the latter is paralleled in an early Chinese loan from AN (cited in Benedict 1976b): 瓴 [ŋ jəm] /ŋəm ~ [ŋəm] /ŋəm ‘weave’ (GSR; no AC cit.); cf. PWA *aŋəm ‘weave, plait’, but the irregular Jav. anam reflects a doublet (*anam) also mirrored in the Chinese loan! The initial remains a problem, however, since the comparative evidence (Benedict 1977) indicates that palatalization of this kind occurs only after an original (PST) prefixed *r-, hence the chances are that we are dealing here with a ‘pseudo-loan’.

dgoog /dug ‘tube’ (GSR; no AC cit.); cf. PMK *k_ŋ ~ *k_ŋ, it is of some interest, in view of the possible early loan here from MK, that Chinese should also have another apparent loan in the ‘tube’ category, this time from AT, viz. 筒 bəjuk /bəjuk (GSR; no AC cit.) ‘quiver’; cf. PAT *tla(m)buk ‘bore, pierce, hole, tube, quiver’ (cited in Benedict 1976b).

MKS See archives.sealang.net/mks/copyright.htm for terms of use.
Further questions as to just how any of the above loanwords might have got into Chinese can scarcely be answered in view of our dearth of data on the languages spoken by the various non-Chinese peoples of southern China with whom the early Chinese were in contact. The Yue (Zhejiang and Fujian: 5th and 6th centuries B.C.) are generally identified as the ancestral Vietnamese and at least one of the few Yue words preserved in ancient texts fits well here: 㹲 tsătı̍tšät (GSR) ‘to die’; Norman and Mei (cit. supra) amend the reconstruction to tsetl and compare with Vn. chét, id., et al. The same scholars also identify the second element of the Yue word for ‘dog’: 㹲 [sjo̍g]/si̍g (GSR; no AC cit.), amened by them to sjo̍i for the period of the text citation (2nd century A.D.) and compare with Vn. chô, id. et al., but the initial seems to present a problem here and the identification is in doubt. The Vietnamese kinship terminology, which has been described (Benedict 1947) as MK at the earliest level with successive overlays of Tai and Chinese, has specific ties in the parent terms with Wu (ancient state of south Jiangsu) rather than with Yue. Norman and Mei also discuss at some length the Chu term for ‘tiger’ (from a *Zuo huan cit.) 虙 jio-d’ol’j wo-d’uo (GSR) but their analysis is hampered by Karlgren’s reconstruction; as in ‘tiger’ (above), the first element can be reconstructed with a prefixed velar initial: s-kjōlj kw. showing that this is the very same ‘tiger’ loan from MK analyzed above but with -j- for -l- (see discussion of this above), from *s-klo < *s-klk, followed by an element (d’ol’d’uo) of unknown origin; this analysis is confirmed by the appearance of the tiger graph 谁 as a phonetic in two series without *-l-: 虙 k’jo/k’lj wo ‘ruins’ and (loan) s-k’jol’xj wo ‘modest’; 虙 sk’jol’ståj wo: ‘dwell, stay; keep still’, the (palatalized) prefixed cognate of 虙 kjō/kj wo ‘sit down; dwell; repose’ (contra STC: fn. 472, which reconstructs with medial *-l-).

A final note on the Chinese calendar terms is in order. These have been assigned an AT origin (ATLC: 88-91), with special emphasis on ‘horse’: 午 npol’ npuo (GSR), to be reconstructed *s-nq (see fn. 2); from *s-nq (regular vowel shift), as reflected in the early loan to Tai: *sna, (> Dioi sa through regular loss of intervocalic */ŋ/), and compared with Kadai *nja ‘horse’: S. Li nja, N. Li ka, Lati no, Kelao njia (cf. Vn. ngu; a). Norman and Mei (cit. supra) describe this as a ‘bold and exciting idea’ but then attempt to work out an AA origin for the cycle. Their comparisons are not, on the whole, very convincing, and in fact one of them involves AT (!), viz, 虎 mjwōd/mjwei ‘goat’ (GSR); cf. Atayal (Formosa) mi:ts, id., but this is from *mliit via *miyiit (regular Atayal shift), as shown by the closely related Sedik: mi: rits ~ mi:lit as well as the loan to Kuvalan: mijli: AC mjwōd regularly represents inter alia an earlier *mud < *mut + suffix, hence at first glance the finals here seem to be discrepant. There is some comparative evidence (STC: fn. 474), however, that the PST initial cluster *mr- yielded AC mjw-, hence an original *mliit (< *mliit) might very well have yielded an AC *mjwēt, since AC final -jēt < PST -it is a regular shift. AC had only mjwēt, however, so the finals here no longer present a problem. Even more to the point, the early Tai loan of this calendar term must be set up as a doublet: *mut (Ahom mut) ~ *mwet (Lü met, Dioi fat) (both f- < *mw- and -at < *e(t) are regular shifts for Dioi), corresponding precisely to the hypothetical [AC level] *mjwēt/ ~ *mjwēt! This serves not only to clarify the Tai forms but
also to furnish valuable support for yet another AT – but not AA – source for the mysterious Chinese calendar terms.\textsuperscript{13, 14}

Appendix. List of abbreviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lp.</th>
<th>Loans to</th>
<th>Proto-Chamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Austroasiatic</td>
<td>Lp.</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>Proto-Chamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Archaic Chinese</td>
<td>LPT</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>SEA Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Austroasiatic</td>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>SM Spoken Mon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Austro-Tai</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>ST Sino-Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLC</td>
<td>(=Benedict 1975)</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>STC (=Benedict 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-G</td>
<td>Bodo-Garo</td>
<td>(=Karlgren’s 7th Cent. A.D)</td>
<td>STC (=Benedict 1972)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-L</td>
<td>Burmese-Lolo</td>
<td>‘Ancient Chinese’</td>
<td>SW Southwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Central Tai</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>T Tai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR</td>
<td>(=Karlgren 1957)</td>
<td>Mod B</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>TB Tibeto-Burman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho.</td>
<td>Hova</td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>VN Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jav.</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>W Waic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg.</td>
<td>Jingpho</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>WA Western Australasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>WB Written Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD</td>
<td>Kadai</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>WT Written Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh.</td>
<td>Khasi</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td>Y Yao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-N</td>
<td>Kuki-Naga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loans to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13}The curious cryptographics of Chinese (Benedict 1978) conceal an apparent loan from MK with representation in the Cambodian calendar. A well-disguised ‘pig/goat’ is present as phonetic in the GSR:526 series: ئ؟sgį̂ wodzwii, glossed by Shuowen as ‘follow’ but, as Karlgren points out, resembling ئ؟, the principal ‘pig/goat’ script element in Chinese. In view of the equivalence of final -j(ə) (tones A and B) and -j(ə) (sandhi tone C), along with the marked tendency in the language towards secondary voicing as well as loss of medial -w-, we can take ئ؟ s-k‘jən/xyei ‘swine’ as a cognate form, pointing to an original of the type: *s-k(h)jər. This would be the regular product of an earlier *s-kur (with ‘animal prefix’ *s-); cf. the Cambodian calendar term kur ‘pig’, which Cœdès has connected with Muong forms: kul ~ kui ~ kun.

\textsuperscript{14}In a recent study, Nicholas Bodman (1980) has pointed out what appears to be a certain MK loan to Chinese at an early period: Khmer krōč, Proto-Hre-Sedang *kruç ‘citrus fruit’, AC/OC 橘 kljwât/kluet ‘orange’, which appears at the earliest (AC) period (Shuijing); the final -t for -c and medial -l- for -r- are the anticipated shifts, while AC -jwâ- regularly represents an earlier */u/ or */o/ (Bodman suggests the AC reconstruction *krwît [=the writer’s *kljweř], which leads to difficulties in the medial vowel correspondence). A southern origin for a citrus fruit term in Chinese is hardly surprising but the very early date of the loan is worthy of note.
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