Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area
Volume 7.2 Spring 1983

The Sal Languages[1]

Robbins Burling

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich., 48109 USA

Background

The sub-classification of the Tibeto-Burman languages has been a subject fraught with considerable mystery. Among all the central and eastern Tibeto-Burman languages, there appear to be only four clear sub-groupings: 1. The Bodo languages of Assam, 2. Manipuri-Mizo-Kuki-Chin, 3. Lolo-Burmese, and 4. Karen.[2] Other subgroup names have been used from time to time, such as "Naga," "Naga-Bodo," "North Assam," and even "Kachin" but these seem to label little more than geographically contiguous groups for which no genuine linguistic reality has been demonstrated. Jinghpaw, Nung, Mikir, and all of the vast numbers of languages found in the arc to the north and east of the Brahmaputra river, from the north of Assam around to the Naga Hills, fall into an uncertain limbo--surely Tibeto-Burman, but not clearly or closely affiliated with any other particular Tibeto-Burman languages.

We have, of course, heard a good many suggestions, from time to time, about the linguistic sub-grouping of these languages, including an old suggestion that the Bodo languages of Assam show a special relationship both with Jinghpaw and with certain languages of the northeastern Naga Hills region. So far as I am aware, this was first suggested by Robert Shafer (1953:162) but Paul Benedict also pointed to the similarities among these languages in the Sino-Tibetan Conspectus (1972:6-7, hereafter referred as "STC"), and a number of others have followed suit. A number of years ago I was sufficiently impressed with the similarities between Jinghpaw and Garo (the representative of the Bodo group with which I have worked most closely), to undertake a fairly elaborate comparison between certain

---

[1]This is a revised version of a paper that I first prepared for the XVth International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics held in Beijing, People's Republic of China, August, 1982. I am specifically indebted to Paul K. Benedict and to David B. Solnit, both of whom offered helpful suggestions about a number of my entries, and I am more generally indebted to the hosts of the Beijing conference for their warm hospitality.

aspects of the two languages. I tried to show that, in spite of what appeared to me to be massive mutual borrowing between Jinghpaw and such "Kachin" languages as Maru and Atsi, evidence can still be found for an underlying special relationship between Garo and Jinghpaw (Burling, 1971). In particular, I argued that even though the phonological system and the kinship system of Jinghpaw and Maru could be regarded as almost identical, their lexicons show striking differences. In some ways, indeed, Jinghpaw appears to be lexically more like Garo than it is like Maru.

In my earlier paper I used no data from any of the "Naga" languages, and comparisons with these languages have always been difficult because of the paucity of evidence from the Naga Hills and adjacent regions. Information has been limited to rather fragmentary vocabulary lists, such as those in Grierson (1903), and while these have offered tantalizing hints, their evidence could never be definitive. In recent years, however, a number of dictionaries of Naga languages have become available, and while these are still far from the sophisticated linguistic treatments that we would like to have, they do provide enough new data to make a reassessment of the relationship among these languages worth while. There is also one bulky attempt at a comparative treatment of the "Naga" languages, G.E. Marrison's SOAS dissertation (Marrison, 1967), which can be used to supply some otherwise missing pieces. In this paper, I survey some of the available data on the Bodo, northeastern Naga, and Jinghpaw languages, and I try to reach a judgement on the likelihood of a special relationship among them.

The final judgement about sub-grouping should rest upon a close understanding of all types of shared innovations of the sub-group and upon a detailed understanding of the phonological correspondences among the languages. In our present state of knowledge about Tibeto-Burman languages, however, we must usually be content with an examination of simpler lexical similarities. We are reduced to the following fairly obvious and simple presumptions: if a group of languages 1) share lexical items that other languages fail to share, 2) show no sign that these shared terms are due either to mutual borrowing or to the residue of a still earlier stage of the language, and 3) have similarities that go beyond those expectable by simple chance, then it is plausible to conclude that these languages shared a period of common innovation and thus form a sub-group within the larger family.

The languages that I consider in this paper, for instance, have words such as sal, san, jan, all meaning 'sun,' and the phonological correspondences that relate the sounds of these words are paralleled in other sets of words. Similarities of this sort can hardly be dismissed as mere chance. Whether they might be due to borrowing or to a com-

mon historical residue that happens to have been lost from other languages is more difficult to decide, but if enough lexical items pattern in the same way as the words for 'sun' it becomes increasingly difficult to attribute the similarity to anything except common innovation at an earlier common stage of the language. It is upon the basis of a few lexical similarities of this sort, similar words that are found in Bodo, eastern Naga and Jinghpaw, but not, apparently, in other Tibeto-Burman languages, that earlier suggestions about their special relationship rested. Since the distinctive word for 'sun' has been cited particularly widely as offering evidence for the special relationships among these languages, and since the word can be plausibly reconstructed as sal, I will refer to the group as the sal languages. This paper is a survey of the lexical similarities among the languages of this group.

Sources and Affiliation

There can be little doubt that the Bodo languages form a relatively unified sub-group of Tibeto-Burman, considerably more closely related to one another than to other Tibeto-Burman languages. These Bodo languages include Boro, spoken in the lower Assam valley and recently described both by Bhat (1968) and by Bhattacharya (1977). The language that, in an earlier paper (1959), I called "Kachari" is, apparently, essentially the same as Boro, and I will supplement my own data with examples drawn from Bhat (indicated with "DNSB" in the tables) and from Bhattacharya ("PCB"). I will assume that these all come from the same language, but I have not tried to reconcile the somewhat divergent transcriptions used in the various sources. I also cite a few words from the closely related Dimasa language that I have taken from Marrison (1967). Dimasa is a dialect reasonably closely related to Boro, but it is difficult to be confidant of just how similar or different they are.

Garo, spoken in the Garo Hills in the bend of the Brahmaputra river, resembles Bodo in many ways, but the two languages are by no means mutually intelligible. Boro and Garo are the best described of the Bodo languages. On Garo, I rely upon Mason, 1954, Negminza, 1972, Holbrook, n.d., as well as upon my own knowledge of the language.[1] The transcription that I use for Garo is explained in Burling (1981). It is close, but not identical, to the transcriptions used in Garo dictionaries.

I also use materials that I collected from Atong and Wanang, two languages that are fairly closely related to

---

[1]I did ethnographic and linguistic field work in the Garo Hills from 1954 to 1956 with the help of a generous

each other within the "Koch" group that is, in turn, coordinate with Boro-Garo. I included these data from Atong and Wanang in my comparative study of Bodo phonology (1959).

I also cite a few examples from Chutia (taken from Brown, 1895) another Bodo language spoken further to the east in the Assam valley. Examples from Chutia are listed in the tables, in the "Wanang" column, but identified as coming from Chutia. The approximate location of these languages can be seen on the map (last page). The Bodo group also includes Rabha, spoken to the north of the Garo Hills, Lalung, spoken in the middle Assam valley, and the language of Tripura which lies just north of the Chittagong Hill tracts, but I include no data from any of these languages.

The relevant eastern "Naga" languages are less well known than the Bodo languages and they have been referred to under a bewildering variety of names. Present terminology seems to have settled on six language names. Ranging from southwest to northeast these are: Chang, Phom, Konyak, Wancho, Nocte, and Tangsa (see map). Earlier names, used in Grierson or in other early sources, and copied in more recent comparative literature, include (with equivalent modern terms in parentheses): Mojung (Chang); Tamlu, Chingmengnu, and Assiringia (Pom); Tableng and Angwanku (Konyak); Banpara and Mutonia (Wancho); Namsangia and Mohongia (Nocte); Moshang and Shange (Tangsa). The best known (or at least most often cited) of these languages has been Konyak, and the term "Konyak Languages" has sometimes been used as a general term for this group.

It seems fairly clear that these six languages show more similarities to one another than to the other "Naga" languages or to the languages of bordering regions, though even this modest claim should not be taken as fully proven. In spite of having been used as a general name for the group, for instance, Konyak appears to diverge in a number of respects from its neighbors (see conclusions, below). I know of no evidence at all, however, that would suggest that these languages are more closely related to other "Naga" languages than to Tibeto-Burman generally. The term "Naga" appears to be a purely geographical term that lacks linguistic significance. This "eastern Naga" group, in fact, straddles the modern border between Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh (formerly North East Frontier Agency, or "NEFA"), with Chang, Phom, and Konyak lying primarily in Nagaland, and Wancho, Nocte, and Tangsa primarily in Arunachal Pradesh. For want of a better term, however, I will continue to refer to these languages as the "eastern Naga" group.

I offer data in this paper from three of these eastern Naga languages, each described in a recent publication: Konyak, (Kumar, 1973), Nocte (Das Gupta, 1971), and Tangsa

(Ngemu, 1977). Each of these small books offers a brief grammatical description and a tri-lingual word list or dictionary (with Hindi glosses, as well as English). Unfortunately, the transcriptions in these dictionaries are not everything that a linguist might ask. A number of apparent inconsistencies crop up, and it is not always clear just how letters are being used. Under the circumstances it seems best to retain the original orthographies of the sources, with all their inconsistencies, rather than make the attempt to regularize them, and this is what I have done in the tables. One must be cautious, however, about inferring too much from the precise spelling. Marrison's long tables (Marrison, 1967) include data from these eastern Naga languages along with many other "Naga" languages, and I supplement the data of the three dictionaries with items taken from Marrison's table. As in other columns, items taken from Marrison are labeled with "M". When not marked with "M", the items in these three "Naga" columns come from the dictionaries already cited.

Of all of the languages that I consider in this paper, Jinghpaw has been the most widely cited in the comparative literature. This is due, in part, to the activities of linguist-native speaker, La Raw Maran, but much of the evidence actually cited in the literature is drawn from much older sources, particularly Hanson (1917). These sources, like so much of the older Tibeto-Burman literature, suffer from a failure to indicate either glottal stops or tones, and comparative studies such as STC that rely upon these older sources cannot fill in the gaps. STC and similar works do, however, adjust Hanson's transcriptions in some other ways (hp becomes ph, ng becomes ŋ, ă becomes ə, etc.). The majority of the examples that I cite from Jinghpaw I recorded myself, and these examples are shown with glottal stops and tone marks (◌́ high, ◌̄ mid, ◌̀, low),[1] but in other respects I try to follow the transcription conventions used in STC, for these will probably seem most familiar to linguists. Where I have taken examples from Hanson, I show this with an "(H)". These examples lack tone marks. The final column in the tables shows the TB reconstructions that are given in the Sino-Tibetan Conspectus (Benedict, 1972).

Phonological Correspondences

It is not possible, in the present state of knowledge, to offer a detailed or definitive account of the phonologi-

---

[1]I worked with La Raw Maran in the summers of 1968 and 1969. I extend my personal thanks to him for his high-spirited help, and my institutional thanks to the Center for South and Southeast Asian studies at the University of Michigan which helped to support our work together.

cal correspondences among these languages, but certain broad patterns can be sketched and these should make the significance of the lexical examples somewhat easier to judge. In the next section, as I consider particular examples, I will offer a few more detailed observations on some special problems. Here, I will point out only the broadest patterns. As in Tibeto-Burman languages generally, it is most convenient to give separate consideration to syllable initial consonants, vowels, and syllable final consonants. It would be pleasant to know more about the tones of these languages so that we could offer tonal comparisons as well, but this is not yet possible.

Initials Initial m- and n- are well attested in all of the languages. Initial ŋ- exists in Jinghpaw and, presumably, in eastern Naga, but in the Bodo languages initial ŋ has either been replaced by n- (e.g. 'fish') or attached to a preceding vowel to become a syllable final instead of a syllable initial ('I', 'five').

There are several examples of voiceless aspirated stops, usually written p- and k- in the Bodo languages, but ph- and kh- in the eastern Naga languages and in Jinghpaw. These correspond to ø- and h- in Wanang. Initial t- (th-) is less well represented. There is, however, a confusing group of words in which some languages have t- while others have c-, s-, etc. (see Table 2b.) I will consider these later.

Correspondences for voiced and nonaspirated voiceless stops are less clear than for aspirated stops, and g- is particularly poorly attested. There appear to be a number of cases where b- and d- in the Bodo languages (except Wanang where these have become p- and t-) correspond to words transcribed in the Naga dictionaries with p- and t- ('today' 'snake', 'wind', 'bat' 'flower', 'fruit, 'three', 'ash', 'next', 'straight', 'live'). There are, however, a number of difficult and contradictory cases where voicing seems rather random ('Grandfather', 'tree', 'fence', 'five') and the Jinghpaw correspondences here are obscure, in spite of the fact that many apicals and bilabials do, at least, appear as apicals and bilabials in Jinghpaw as well.

Two words ('earth' and 'mother's brother') have initial h- throughout the eastern Naga languages and Bodo, except in Garo, where the initial is lost. This h- may correspond to initial g- in Jinghpaw. The word for 'dog' also suggests that initial h- in eastern Naga may correspond to an initial velar in Jinghpaw, but the evidence is by no means decisive.

Initial c- (a voiceless affricate) in Garo, Atong, and Wanang quite regularly appears as z- in Boro ('dig', 'eight', 'far', 'hundred', 'long', 'mortar', 'stand', 'thick') but the eastern Naga and Jinghpaw correspondences

are unclear due to few and contradictory examples. Both ts- and th- appear in Jinghpaw. 'Pierce', 'salt, 'sun', 'thorn', and 'urinate' have s- in most languages, but most often have j- in Jinghpaw and h-in Konyak.

Numerous examples are found that have initial r- in all languages except Konyak, where w- (sometimes v-) appears instead (e.g. 'dry', 'horn', 'sky'). Others have l- in all languages except Garo and Atong which have r-, and Bodo which sometimes has initial r- but where the initial is sometimes lost entirely e.g. 'drink', 'road', 'stone'). Another group ('bamboo', 'father', 'fire', 'monkey', 'pig') has initial w- throughout except in Boro where the initial is lost. The Konyak and Nocte dictionaries sometimes show v- rather than w- in these words but it seems doubtful to me that this represents a real difference, and I suspect that the choice between v- and w- in these dictionaries is more or less random.

Vowels. The clearest vowel correspondences are for i, a, and u, and many unambiguous examples will be found in the tables where most or all languages share these vowels. All the languages appear to have vowels in the e and o positions as well, and a few correspondences relate them, but in a number of cases these mid vowels seem to be related to various sorts of diphthongs in some of the languages. The precise relationship among these will have to await better data and fuller study.

Final Consonants. These languages appear generally to have final -p, -t, -k, -m, -n, -ŋ, and -ʔ, and usually -l and/or -r. For the most part the correspondences among these are straightforward. However, where other languages have -k, Jinghpaw regularly has a glottal stop (not indicated by Hanson or in STC), and where the Bodo languages have glottals, Jinghpaw frequently has nothing at all. These finals are regular enough so that when a putative cognate set turns up with inconsistent finals (such as an -n in one language that seems to correspond to an -ŋ in another language), one should be skeptical of the cognate relationship. Several of the Bodo languages allow final nasals and final -l or -r to be glottalized. Jinghpaw does not, and it is impossible to know whether such sounds occur in the eastern Naga languages because glottal stops are not shown in the available transcriptions.

There is one other difficult but important set of correspondences among the final consonants. In a considerable group of words, Nocte and Jinghpaw have -n and Tangsa has -l. Some Konyak examples have -n, but the Konyak examples are too fragmentary to give confidence. In these words, Boro, Garo, Atong, and Wanang sometimes have, respectively, -r, -l, -r, -r, and sometimes -n, -l, -n, -n. The cor-

Jinghpaw are, unfortunately, few, but other examples of both types of correspondences occur within the Bodo languages (cited in Burling, 1959) and both correspondences seem thoroughly sound.

This account of correspondences amounts only to the most superficial sketch, but it may help the reader to judge the cognate status of the examples given in the next section. A few more detailed comments about apparent correspondences will be given as examples arise.

Lexical Examples

In this section I discuss, with reference to the tables, the lexical sets that offer evidence for the relationship among these languages. The tables display examples of several sorts. Tables 1a, 1b, and 1c list examples which suggest Sal languages innovations away from general Tibeto-Burman. They constitute evidence, therefore, for a period of common innovation within a common ancestor of the modern Sal languages. Inevitably, the examples vary greatly in their reliability and this serves as the basis for assigning particular examples to particular tables. Table 1a lists those examples that seem most convincing, table 1b lists less convincing but still plausible examples, and table 1c offers a number of more problematic or questionable examples.

Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c list the representatives from the Sal languages that appear more widely in Tibeto-Burman languages. Since these words appear outside the Sal languages, as well as within it, they demonstrate little about any special relationship within this group, although in a few cases the Sal forms of do appear to be more like one another than like the forms that the words assume in other TB languages. The main purpose of listing these general TB words here is to give evidence for the sound correspondences within the Sal group, for these correspondences can help us to judge the cognate status of the words that are unique to the Sal languages. As in the case of Tables 1a, 1b, and 1c, those numbered 2a, 2b, and 2c, differ in the how convincing the examples are.

In addition to these general lists, I give two tables of terms belonging to particular semantic sets. Table 3 gives numbers, and Table 4 gives kinship terms. Discussion of a number of particular examples that occur in the tables follows.

1a. Most Convincing. Table 1a lists the cognate sets that strike me as offering the strongest evidence for common lexical innovation within this group of languages. These words appear to be excellent cognates within Sal group, but examples of plausible cognates are rare or non-existent

elsewhere. Some of these sets may turn out to have cognates in other languages and such examples will then turn out not to provide evidence for the special relationship of the Sal languages, but collectively the evidence strikes me as impressive. Most of the examples in this set require some comment:

'Ash'. STC gives *pla 'ashes' (137) and *tap (18) usually meaning 'fireplace' but most, though not all, examples come from Sal languages. The combination of the two syllables seems to be unique to the Sal group, and even examples of the individual syllables are not plentiful elsewhere.

'Burn'. STC 330 is *kaŋ and words offered as related to it have such meanings as 'hot' or 'roast.' Words such as kam with the meaning 'burn,' appear to be unique to the Sal languages.

'Cook'. The Konyak term may be unrelated, but the remaining terms seem to be excellent candidates for cognate status.

'Cooking pot'. The final Jinghpaw glottal is expectable from final -k elsewhere. The initial correspondence looks convincing, and few, if any, plausible cognates of this word crop up in languages outside of the Sal group.

'Crow'. STC, pg. 99 cites a number of Sal languages in support of its reconstruction, *ka, but outside of the Sal group offers only Tibetan kha-tha and Rawang tha-kha. Rawang kha, however, is elsewhere glossed as 'domestic fowl,' (Barnard, 1934, pg. 68) which makes it unlikely to be the part of tha-kha with the meaning 'crow.' This leaves Tibetan as the only non-Sal language example in which kha can be plausibly taken to mean 'crow'. In all Sal languages, moreover, bird names are commonly constructed from a syllable with the general meaning 'bird' followed by a second syllable denoting the particular species, and this pattern does not appear in the other examples offered by STC. (I am quite mystified by the fact that several bird species have more convincing cognates in TB languages than do the mammals that one would suppose must play a good deal more salient role in the lives of the people.)

'Drink'. The lack of -ŋ makes the Jinghpaw term a very doubtful cognate. The Konyak v is unexplained and may well eliminate that word too. Still, the Tangsa term seems unarguably related to the general Bodo term.

'Far'. STC offers a TB reconstruction for this term, but the only example outside of the Sal group which it offers as a putative cognate is Lushai fa'l which strikes me

'Father'. Terms for 'father' beginning with w are rare enough in the world's languages to invite notice. Within Tibeto-Burman, these seem to be unique. A more extensive list of kinship terms is given in Table 4.

'Fire'. Except for the word for 'sun' this has probably been the second most widely cited example of a unique Sal language innovation. Plausible cognates turn up in a few other languages with the meaning 'burn' but only in the Sal languages is it the ordinary word for 'fire.'

'Insect/worm'. This word, along with leg/foot (just below), 'hand/arm' (table 2a), and 'moon' (table 1b) form a special set, with a very peculiar pattern of initial correspondences: Garo j-, Atong, Wanang c-, Konyak y-, Nocte d, and Tangsa j-. A single word with this correspondence would hardly be taken seriously, but the four together cannot be easily dismissed. Of the various Sal languages, only the Jinghpaw examples for these four words seem doubtful. One's initial reaction might be that the Jinghpaw correspondence for this initial would be l-, as it appears to be in some more distantly related TB languages, but it seems more likely to be t-. (See 'leg' below, 'hand/arm' table 2a, 'moon' table 1b.) Possible cognates of 'moon,' and likely cognates of 'hand/arm,' are found in a few TB languages outside of the Sal group, sometimes with initial l-, but the four words occur with particular regularity within the Sal group. The word for insect/worm appears to be distinctively Sal although the Jinghpaw word is questionable.

'Leg/Foot'. This is another member of the insect-arm-foot-moon group. Throughout the Bodo and eastern Naga languages, the word for 'foot' differs from that for 'hand' (table 2a) only in terminating with a glottal stop rather than with -k. An inspection of Grierson's word lists shows these two words cropping up with a bewildering range of initials, but in any single language their initials are usually alike. A few languages outside the Sal group also show possible hand/foot pairs of this sort, although the word for 'hand' seems more widespread, than the word for 'foot,' which seems more narrowly limited to the Sal languages. Outside of the Sal group the pairs are rarely as regular or as similar to each other as they are within the Sal group. If the corresponding Jinghpaw initial is t-, the Jinghpaw word for leg/foot cannot be counted as a cognate.

'Live/Green'. The glosses for this word are a bit variable and may merit some skepticism. 'Alive' and 'green' (in the sense of 'unripe') seem plausibly similar glosses, but while the Nocte word is glossed as 'live,' the examples suggest the meaning 'dwell' and this may eliminate the Nocte example from this set. The gloss for the Tangsa word lungtong is 'live' while the gloss for tong-nga is

'live'(v). I know of no similar words in non-Sal TB languages.

'Long'. The only non-Sal language cognate offered by STC for this word is Burmese lu, glossed as 'disproportionately tall.' Throughout the Sal languages it is glossed simply as 'long.'

'Mother'. Terms for 'mother' with initial n-, invite notice, just as do terms for father with initial w-. Certainly most TB languages have 'mother' terms that begin with *the familiar m-.*

'Salt.' The scattering of examples offered by STC from outside of the Sal languages seem less similar than the Sal language examples are to each other.

'Sky'. The syllable raŋ crops up in most of these languages as the first syllable of compounds that refer to celestial phenomena such as 'sun' and 'rain'. When raŋ occurs by itself, it seems always to have the meaning 'sky.'

'Sun'. As pointed out above, the words for 'sun' in these languages--san, sal or jan, sometimes preceded by the syllable for 'sky'--have been widely cited as offering the clearest evidence for the special status of the group. The correspondences that relate the various words for 'sun,' are reassuringly regular, except that the hi of the Konyak term is not an ideal cognate for the words in the other languages and is probably unrelated. STC offers a reconstruction for this set of words but, with the exception of a doubtful term from Bahing, tsyar, that is glossed as 'shine', all the STC examples come from the Sal languages. Totally different words for 'sun' are found in other Tibeto-Burman languages and, with the possible exception of Konyak, this word seems to set this group of languages decisively off from others.

1b. Suggestive Sets. The sets listed in Table 1b are suggestive of relationships among the Sal languages, but they are less convincing than those listed in Table 1a, either because they are found in fewer language of the group, because they have possible cognates in other Tibeto-Burman languages, or because their sound correspondences seem less regular. Still, taken collectively, they do seem to add some support to the feeling of special similarity among the languages of this group.

'Basket'. This set appears to be sound throughout Bodo, and it is reasonable in eastern Naga. The final glottal of Jinghpaw is the regular correspondent of final -k elsewhere, but the more usual initial correspondence in Jinghpaw would have been kh-, so the k makes the Jinghpaw word just a bit suspect. STC offers a number of possible

these tend, in various ways, to be a bit divergent, the word may not be unique to the Sal languages.

'Bone'. The STC reconstruction for 'bone' does not give Sal language examples, and it looks like a different word. The initial g- or k- found in the Bodo languages can plausibly be regarded as a prefix.

'Deer'. Mikir has a possible cognate, thidzok, and a few other languages have conceivable cognates, though they look less like the Sal language examples than the latter look like each other.

'Falcon-kite'. Burmese has words for 'vulture,' 'eagle,'etc. that look like cognates, but such words seem to be much more widely distributed in the Sal languages than elsewhere in TB.

'Moon.' This is a member of the insect-arm-leg-moon group with its odd pattern of initial correspondences. A number of TB languages have words for 'moon' with initial l- that are likely to be related to the Sal term, but the words seem particularly close among the Sal group.

'Navel.' The only putative cognate outside of the Sal languages offered by STC is Tibetan lte-ba, which seems to stretch the imagination a bit.

'Pus.' STC gives only the Jinghpaw word and Burmese tshwe 'decayed, crumbling, rotten' as examples. Even if the Burmese word really is a cognate, its meaning is notably different from the meaning of the Sal language examples.

'Stand.' STC gives a long list of TB languages with words meaning 'stand' that end in -p, but affricate initials are largely confined to the Sal languages. The Sal languages also show more consistency in the vowel, although they are not the only languages with a.

'Tree.' Tables 1b and 1c each contain a word that is most often glossed as 'tree,' although plausible cognates are glossed as 'trunk' or 'firewood' in some languages. The Jinghpaw example is a conceivable, though less than ideal, cognate to either set and I list it with both.

1c. Tantalizing Possibilities. I do not consider the sets listed in Table 1c to be more than suggestively tantalizing. Some have plausible cognates in other TB languages and some have been given reconstructions in STC. Some of these sets are represented by only two or three examples, however, and in others the correspondences seem less than fully convincing. I would certainly not want to risk exaggerated claims for those listed here. Collectively they do suggest the kinds of data to which we are driven when we try

to sort out the relationships among these languages. Only a few of these examples require special comment.

'Bark.' It is just barely possible that the Garo word meaning 'dog' is related to the Nocte word meaning a dog's 'bark.'

'Cut.' STC cites a few plausible cognates in other TB languages.

'Dung.' Here, again, a few possible cognates appear here and there in non-Sal languages, but they are not so frequent or regular that this word deserves to be entered into Table 2a or 2c.

'Mat.' The words for 'mat' seem more tempting as cognates than many of the sets listed in this table, but the initials are so strange as to make one cautious.

'Red.' The non-Sal examples offered by STC have meanings such as 'gold' which separate them from the Sal words which are glossed simply as 'red.' However, the correspondences among the Sal words are by no means certain.

'Sleep.' STC offers a number of words from various languages that may be related to the Sal words shown in the table, but some mean 'hide' or 'cover' instead of 'sleep,' most have no initial consonant, and most have the vowel i, all of which makes the Sal words seem distinctive.

2a. Most Widespread Cognates. The sets listed in Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c have more reasonable looking cognates in TB languages outside of the Sal group than do those listed in Tables 1a, 1b, and 1c. This means that they do not demonstrate any special relationship among the Sal languages except in the degree to which the Sal examples may be more like each other in form or meaning than they are like the examples from other languages. The words listed in Table 2a are the Sal language representatives of some of the most widespread cognates of Tibeto-Burman. *Even though these can* tell us little about any special relationship among the Sal languages, they do demonstrate the patterns of phonological correspondence that we should expect within the Sal group. Most of these sets should be self explanatory and they require little discussion. I will leave it for the reader to judge the degree to which these words seem to show specially close resemblances to one another within the Sal group.

2b. "Water" Group. The sets listed in Table 2b pose numerous problems. These words crop up variously with initial apical stops, affricates, and fricatives, and although my instincts are to want them to be cognates the patterns are so complex that we have to be skeptical about some of

dences within this set of words, I have been more tolerant of diversity in this table than elsewhere, and I have included a good many words of doubtful cognates status (e.g. the words for water in the eastern Naga languages).

A few of these sets appear to be related to one another, but it is not entirely clear just what these relationships are. The words for 'egg,' in some of the Sal languages, for instance, appear to mean 'bird-water' as it does in some other TB languages. The cognate set for 'egg,' however, actually seems to be more complete than that for 'water,' since the eastern Naga words for 'water' do not appear to be related to the others. In Garo, the word for 'blood' also appears to be analyzable as having the meaning *'body-water,' though in most other languages the words for* 'blood' and 'water' are different. 'Die' and 'kill' also appear to have some sort of relationship to one another.

The examples of the Bodo languages seem to exhibit an unusual number of diphthongs, and it seems probable that diphthongs had a tendency, in these languages, to turn preceding stops into affricates (Burling, 1959) but we still have a long way to go before sorting out all the relationships among these initials. All of these sets have plausible cognates in other TB languages than the Sal group alone, and STC offers reconstructions for most of them. The initials of these words demonstrate considerable confusion in languages outside the Sal group as well as within it, and about all I can do is wave readers in the direction of the table and invite them to contemplate the complexities.

2c. Less Widespread Cognate Sets. Table 1c lists a number of cognate sets that have representatives outside the Sal languages but that are represented in a rather scattered fashion within this group. These are considerably less widespread than the sets listed in Table 1a.

3. Numbers. Finally, I offer two tables, each with a group of semantically related terms, one for numbers and one for kinship terms. There can be no doubt that most numbers fall into cognate sets, but numbers change in erratic ways in the TB languages and this makes them difficult to use as a basis for judgements about sub-grouping. Adjacent numbers, for instance, seem to influence each other. 'One,' 'two,' and 'three' have picked up the prefix -go in Atong, but in Garo the related prefix is found only in 'two' and 'three.' Nocte has a different prefix in the same three words. It is tempting to note that the words for 'four' and 'five' in many of these languages have acquired a prefix that begins with b, or to note that the words for 'one' often begin with an s or with a plausibly related sound, and to conclude that the numbers give evidence for a special relationship among these languages, but it is very difficult to pin these similarities down. All, or virtually all, of

these terms are surely cognates and most surely have cognates in other TB languages, but it is difficult to find objective criteria that can help us to decide whether these words are more similar to each other than to the words in other languages. How similar is "more similar" anyway? I will leave it to the readers to make their own judgement about the degree of similarity among the numbers.

4. Kinship terms. Kinship terms raise other difficult problems. The kinship systems of the people who speak these languages are quite varied. The Garo and Atong are matrilineal, most of the others patrilineal. The Bodo languages other than Garo and Atong probably show considerable influence from the kinship system of the Indic speaking Assamese with whom the speakers are in close contact. The Jinghpaw have a very special kind of kinship system that, so far as we know, differentiates them sharply from any of the other groups considered here. Under such circumstances, one would hardly expect kinship terms to retain the same meaning from one language to another, even if the terms themselves, survive. Still, terms with related though not identical meanings may well be cognates. Many of these languages have cross-cousin marriage, for instance, and this makes it reasonable for the father-in-law to be called by the same term as the mother's brother. Thus it is worth looking at 'uncle' terms to see whether they might be possible cognates for 'father-in-law' terms in other languages.

When one takes an appropriately tolerant attitude toward the glosses for the kinship terms, there turn out to be a very considerable number of plausible cognates. In fact, the great majority of Jinghpaw kinship terms have plausible cognates in one or another of the Sal languages. By contrast, Jinghpaw and Maru share only one lonely kinship term, and this in spite of the fact that the Maru and Jinghpaw people have considerable intermarriage, and in spite of the fact that their kinship terminological systems are virtually identical (Burling 1971). Cognates to the kinship terms shown in Table 8 are, to be sure, sometimes found in languages outside of the Sal group, but the density of apparent cognates seems notably high among this group.

Conclusions

I have no doubt that a fair number of the cognates sets that I offer, even those that now seem most solid, will finally turn out to have cognates outside the Sal group, but the collective weight of the examples I have collected seems to me to demand an explanation. I doubt if this many apparent cognates could be marshalled to demonstrate similarities for most sets of TB languages. This looks like a group of languages with some sort of historical relationship, rather than like a random collection. Chance

alone does not seem to me to be a sufficient explanation for the number of similar words that unite these languages.

Nor do the similarities seem to be explainable on the basis of mutual borrowing. The languages are spread over a considerable area and, in the course of their history, they have been subjected to quite varied influences. Many Bodo languages show massive borrowing from the Indic languages, while Jinghpaw has unquestionably been strongly influenced by Burmese and by the so-called "Kachin" languages that are closely related to Burmese. The similarities among the Sal languages seem deeper, less easily attributed to borrowing, for they show up in spite of the more recent overlays of borrowing to which some languages have been subjected.

One question that inevitably arises in the course of looking at a group of languages such as these concerns their internal relationships. There can, I think, be no doubt that the Bodo languages are more closely related to each other than they are to the other languages. Nor, I think, can doubt be much greater about the special relationship among the eastern Naga languages. Numerous cognates can be found that are unique to one or the other of these groups. I have not included them in the tables, however, because they show nothing about the wider relations among the Sal languages.

Relative relationship among these two groups and Jinghpaw is more difficult to judge. As I was working on this paper, I had the feeling that Jinghpaw was often more distant from the Bodo and eastern Naga languages than the latter were from each other, but I also wondered if this might have been due to the fact that several languages are available within the other two branches, so that where one language lacks a term there is still a chance that another might supply it. If Jinghpaw lacks a term, there is no close relative to fill the gap, so it is easy to get the impression that it is harder to find cognates among Jinghpaw.

In the end it turns out that Jinghpaw offers just as many potential cognates as the other languages. For what the figures are worth, the tables contain the following number of entries for each of the eight languages (excluding the numbers, Table 3, which are virtually complete for all languages except Wanang): Bodo-113, Garo-135, Atong-66, Wanang-64, Konyak-85, Nocte-112, Tangsa-118, and Jinghpaw-138.

Of course these figures are, in large part, a function of the availability of data, but Jinghpaw appears to be at least as well represented as the other languages. I may, however, have been a bit more tolerant of questionable Jinghpaw examples, precisely because it was alone in its sub-group. The high figure for Garo is certainly an ar-

tifact my own familiarity with the language and the availability of dictionaries. Data from Atong and Wanang are limited to my very limited notes, while the Boro figure is higher because I could supplement my notes with a number of examples drawn from the Boro dictionaries.

The most curious figures are for the eastern Naga languages where Nocte and Tangsa have well over 100 entries, while Konyak has only 85. One might suppose that these figures simply reflect the quality of the data of each of these languages, but, in fact, the Konyak dictionary is considerably fuller than the dictionaries of Nocte and Tangsa. The Konyak dictionary has between 3,000 and 4,000 entries, while the other two have only about 1,000 entries each. If the three languages are equally closely related to Bodo and Jinghpaw, one would expect the fuller Konyak data to yield more apparent cognates, but the reverse turns out to be the case.

These crude figures confirm impressions I formed while working with these eastern Naga dictionaries. I began with Konyak and I was surprised at how different it seemed from the Bodo languages with which I had worked previously. When I turned to Nocte and to Tangsa, however, I was surprised, in turn, to find so much that seemed familiar. I noted many special similarities between Konyak, on the one hand, and Nocte Tangsa on the other, so I would not want to abandon the presumption that Konyak, Nocte, and Tangsa form, along with the other eastern Naga languages, a well defined sub-group, but it may seem odd that cognates seem so much easier to find in the other languages than than in Konyak. I also find it paradoxical that Konyak is the language that has been most often cited as representative of the sub-group. The languages have even been referred to quite often as the "Konyak" group. The similarities of the eastern Naga languages with the Bodo languages might have been more obvious had comparisons been made with Nocte or Tangsa instead.

One possible explanation for the greater ease of finding cognates in Nocte and Tangsa than in Konyak is that the former two languages lie further to the northeast and, therefore closer to the Singpho country that lies just beyond--Singpho being the Assamese variant of "Jinghpaw." Here is one place where mutual borrowing among the different languages of the Sal group would have been quite possible and it could have led to an artificial boost in the number of apparent cognates in Nocte and Tangsa. An inspection of the tables does not, however, give me the impression of any particularly close or obvious layer of borrowing that gives special similarities among these languages. In the end, I have found little reason to conclude that any two of the three sub-groups of the Sal languages are more closely related to each other than to the third.

Of course we have to recognize that there are real dangers in the methods I have used in this paper. I have worked extensively with Garo and to a more limited extent with several other Bodo languages and Jinghpaw. One always finds similarities among the languages one knows best, even if they as remote as English and Chinese. Thus I have spent more time looking for similarities between Garo and Jinghpaw than between, let us say, Jinghpaw and Tibetan. Someone else with more knowledge of Tibetan and less knowledge of Garo might find similarities that point in a different direction. In the end, I can only challenge others to offer competing evidence that points to other relationships.

In the mean time, the number of similarities among these languages and, in particular, the number of common innovations that they seem to show strike me as sufficiently impressive to suggest that they have a relationship that goes comfortably beyond the minimum that we expect of all Tibeto-Burman languages. The set of languages for which I propose the name "Sal" seems to me to be plausibly regarded as one major sub-group of the Tibeto-Burman languages.

Notes to the Tables

When not otherwise noted, entries in the tables are taken from the following sources: Boro, Atong, Wanang, and Jinghpaw from my own work. Garo examples are from my knowledge of the language supplemented by Holbrook (n.d.), Mason (1954), and Negminza (1972). Konyak examples come from Kumar (1973), Nocte examples from Gupta (1973), and Tangsa examples from Ngemu (1977). I supplement these main sources from a number of others. Supplementary examples in the Boro column are taken from Bhat (1968) and labeled "DNSB", or from Bhattacharya and labeled "PCB". Examples in the Boro column from the Dimasa dialect are taken from Marrison. The examples from the Chutia language that are tucked into the Wanang column derive from Brown (1895). Items labeled "H" in the Jinghpaw column are taken from Hanson's dictionary of Jinghpaw (1917). I supplement my primary sources on Jinghpaw and the eastern Naga languages with a few items from Marrison (1967) that are labeled "M". Reconstructions in the STC column, of course, are from Benedict (1967).

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
ash	ha-to-pla	tap-pra	tap-pa-ra		tüpla (M)	tap-la	taptha (M)	dàp	*tap (18) *pla (137)
burn	kam	kam-	kam-	ham-		akham	kham 'hot'		*ka*ŋ (330)
cook	soŋ 'boil' (DNSB)	so?ŋ-			yang	song-dang hum 'kitchen' (hum= 'place')	song		
cooking pot	də?	dik	dək		tük (M)	tik	koti(cik)	dì?	
crow	'daw-'kha (PCB)	do?-ka		duka (Chutia)		wa-kha	wokha	ùkhā	*ka (pg.99)
drink	ləŋ	riŋ-	raŋ-	ləŋ-	ying		ling	lù?	
dry	gə-ra?n	ra?n-	ra?n-	ran-	wan	ran			
face/ forehead	mukaŋ 'face' (DNSB)	mik-kaŋ 'face' (mik='eye')			shakeng 'fore-head' (M)	khang 'forehead'	khangkang 'forehead'		
far	gə-za?n	ce?i-	ca?n-	pi-cən-	jay		ajal (M)	tsān	*dzya*l (229)
father			a-wa	a-wa-par		wa	wa	wà	
finger	yaosi (Dimasa)	jak-si			yashao 'toe' (M)	dak-su	jaksi		
fire	o?r	wa?i-	wa?r	war	vun	van	wai	w?àn	*par, par (220)
insect/ worm	yung (Dimasa)	jo?-oŋ	co?ŋ	coŋ	yenha		jong	jīnjāy	
leg/foot	a?-ti?ŋ	ja?-	ca?	ca-tim	ya	da	ja	làgō	
live/green	taŋ-na?	taŋ-				atong	luntong tong-nga		
long	gə-lau?	ro?-	rau?-	pi-ləu-	low	alo	alo	gèlù	*low (279)
mother					nyu	nyiong	nu	nù	
pestle		ri-mol				man	mol	thummun (H)	

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
rice, uncooked	mai?-roŋ	me-roŋ	mai-roŋ		wong	wong, vong	wong		
salt	sem (Dimasa)			shing (Chutia)	hüm	sum	sim	jùm	*g-ryum (245)
shoulder	pakná koŋ 'armpit' (DNSB)	pakre, pak= 'armpit'			phakdeang			gàpha?	
sky	saraŋ 'be clear' okráŋ 'sky' (DNSB)		raŋ-wa 'rain' raŋ-san 'sun'	raŋ-gəi 'rain'	wang	rang 'sky' rang-pat 'rain'	rang 'sky' rangche 'rain'	mərāŋ, 'rain'	
sun	san	sal	raŋ-san	san	wanghi	sa:n	rangsal	jān	*tsyar (187)
wing	ga?ŋ	graŋ	ga-raŋ	ka-raŋ	yang	arang (M)	worang		

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
basket	ka?-da	kok	kok	hok	khog	chi-khok 'small basket'	khak	ká?	*kuk (393)
bone	be-ge?ŋ	greŋ	ge-reŋ	ke-reŋ	wan (M)	ra:	rang	nàrā	*rus (6)
cold	'go'zaŋ (PCB)	ka?-sin-					rangsong	kàshūŋ	
cover(vb.)	pin (DNSB)	pin-dap-						phun(H)	
deer, sambhur		mat-cok			tok (M)	cok	cɔk(khoni)	cáky ī	*d-yuk(386)
dive/sink	trəb(DNSB)	rip-						phuŋ-lip (STC)	*lip (375)
falcon/kite		do?-reŋ		durong (Chutia)	lunglieng			làŋjì	*laŋ (333)
house	no?	nok	nok	nok	nok				
moon		ja-joŋ			linyu	da	japi	shə́tā	*s-la, g-la (144)
navel		ok-ste				po-te		shə̀-dāy	
pus		min-su					tacu	mátsūy	*tswiy(183)
seed		bit-cri	ca?-ri	ca-li	ürı	khet-ali	uli	nli(H)	
stab/pierce	su?	su?-	su?-	su-tik-		su (M)	tasuh	jú	
stand			cap-	cap-		acap	chap (M)	tsáp	*g-ryap (246)
tiger	mosa (DNSB)	mat-ca			shahnyak 'leopard'	sao	shah	shàrō	
today	dinəy/dini (DNSB)				tenyih/ denyih		thaneh	dai ni (H)	
tree	pi?-pa?ŋ	bi-paŋ 'trunk'			pangpem 'beam'	bang	bang	phún	
wife/woman	hin-zau 'woman'	jik 'wife' me?-cik 'woman'		mə-cəu 'woman'	sheko	dehiak	eshik 'wife' (M)		
yesterday	miya(DNSB)	me-ja sal (sal='day')				meja, maja	baja		

Table 1c. Tantalizing Possibilities

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
animal	maɟ(DNSB)				mei(M)				
bark, of animal		a-cak 'dog'				achok			
bear					shapnyu	sap-ba	shap	tsáp	
big	dər(DNSB)	da?l-				adong	adil (M)		
bite			gak-	kak-		kak (M)	kak		
bring	lab(DNSB)	ra?-ba-					laakai (M)	la (H)	
come	pay(DNSB)				pei (M)				
cut	da?n	de?n-	da?n-					dàn	*dan (22)
dung	'khi(PCB)	ki				hi		khyí	*kliy (125)
garden/ fence	bari(DNSB)	ba-ri				pan	pai	màphān	
hold			rau?-	ləu-		aloat	lo-a		
imitate		sniŋ-						sam naŋ (H)	*naŋ(334)
light wt.	'ge'seŋ (PCB)	rit-ceŋ-					achan (M)	tsāŋ	*r-ya*ŋ (328)
mat	ém(DNSB)	am		yamshu (Chutia)		ham	xam		
new						anyian	anai	nīŋnān	
nose	go?n-to?ŋ	giŋ-tiŋ	na-kuŋ	ne-kuŋ		kho	khung		
red	gə-za?	git-cak	bi-sak	pi-sək	ütak	acak	ashang	khyēŋ	*tsyak(184)
right(hand)		jak-ra			yakja (M)	dak-cha	jak xah	khrá	*g-ya, g-ra (98)
run		kat-						gàt	
shake	samaw(DNSB)							shamu (H)	
sleep			cəu-	cu-cəu-	shipu	ajup	jip	y?úp	*ip (114)
stomach	u?-dəl	ok		ok			wok		*pu*k, buk (358)
suddenly		ra?ŋ-san						làŋlàtá?	

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
swim			huŋ-nu-	huŋ-nə-	ylang-yat	ajuk	jung-jap	phùŋ-yòt	*pyaw (176)
thin	bá (DNSB)	ba?-	ba?-	pa-ta-la-	pee			phà	*ba (25)
tickle		juk-juk-						kəjuk (H)	
urine	sidi (Dimasa)	su-bu				sa	sit	jit (H)	*ts(y)i(77)
vulture		so-gin					akun		
waist	jengkhong (Dimasa)	caŋ-ki-con					khing	nshaŋ (M)	
wind (air)						pong	rangpong	mə̀puŋ	
wolf		se?-el			shwo		shol		
wood/tree	bon 'firewood' (DNSB)	bol	ban	pan				phúŋ	

Table 2a. Most Widespread Tibeto-Burman Cognates

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
bamboo	o?-a	wa?-	wa?			wa(h)	wah	kǎwǎ	*r-wa (44)
bitter	kǎ(DNSB)	ka?-			khah	akha (M)	aknah	khǎ	*ka (8)
black			bi-nak	pe-nek	ünyak	anyia(k)	anyak (M)		*nak(pg.88)
cane	raydəŋ (DNSB)	re			wei	ri	ri-sa, ri-xat	ri (H)	*rey (478)
dog			gəi?	kui	kui	hu	hi	gùi	*kwiy (159)
dove		do?-kru					wotokhu	u khrudu(H)	*kruw (118)
dream		ju-maŋ			mang	mang (M)		y?ùpāŋ	*maŋ(82)
ear		na-cil	na-kar	na-kor		na	nah	nā	*g-na, r-na (453)
earth/ ground	ha?	a?-	ha?	ha	ka (M)	ha	hah	gǎ	*r-ka (97)
eye	mo?-gon	mik-	mək-	mək-	mük	mit(mik)	mik	myì?	*mik, myak (402)
fish	ha?	na?-tok	na?	na	nyah	nga	ngah	ŋǎ	*ŋya (189)
flower/ blossom	bi?-bar	bi-bal	bar	par	jupiang	apo	pilpung	nampan(H)	*ba*r (1)
ginger	hai?-zeŋ	e?-ciŋ	ceŋ		tieng	cing	cing		
hair/ feather		kim-il			-men			mūn	*(s-)mul, (r-)mul (2)
hand/arm	a?-kai?	jak	cak	cak-toŋ	yak	dak	jak	làtǎ?	*lak (86)
heavy	risiba (Dimasa M)				yih	ali:	alih	lī	*s-liy (95)
hole	'khor(PCB)	kol				kan		nkhun (H)	kwar (350)
horn	goŋ	groŋ	go-roŋ	ko-roŋ	üwong (M)	arong	rong	nòrūŋ	*ruŋ(85)
hot/warm	alu(DNSB)						alom	lum (H)	*lum(381)
I	aŋ	aŋ-	aŋ	aŋ		nga	nga	ŋāy	*ŋa(406)
knee		(ja?-)sku				da-ku	langku		*m-ku*k (pg.120)

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
laugh	mi-ni		mi-mi-	mi-ni-				màn$\bar{\imath}$	*m-nwi(y) (191)
name	muŋ	bi-muŋ	bi-muŋ	muŋ	min (M)	ming (M)	ming	myīη	*r-miŋ (83)
nest	buthup (Dimasa M)	bi-tip					wotip	tsíp	
palm/sole	apá (DNSB)	-pa			-pha	-pha	-pha	làphàn	*pa (418)
pig	o?-ma	wak	wak	wak		wak	wak	wà?	*pak~pwak (43)
ripe	gumun (Dimasa)	min-					min-na	myīn	*s-min(432)
road	la-ma	ra-ma	ram	lam	lam	lam	lam	lām	*lam (87)
smoke		-ku	-ku-si	-cu		(van-)khu	khuh	khùt	*kuw (256)
snake	zi-bau	cip-bu	də-bau	tu-pu	pu	put	puh	pu (H)	*buw (27)
stone	o?n-tai	ro?ŋ-te	ro?ŋ-tai	loŋ-tai	long	long, lo:ng	long	nàlùη	*r-luŋ (88)
straight	gə-təŋ	toŋ-toŋ			ting			dīη	
suck	səp			bu-sup-	jep, hüp	acup	sip	cùp	*dzo~p (69)
tail		ki?-me	di-mai	ci-mai		me(h)	me	nìη-màY	*r-may(282)
thorn	su, busu (Dimasa)	bu?-su			huh	shu	suh	jú	*tsow (276)
thou	nəŋ	na?ŋ-	na?ŋ	naŋ	nang	nang	nang	nāη	*naŋ (407)
tongue	sa-lai	sre	te-ra-pak	te-lai	yee	theli	phali	shìηlet	*m-lay, s-lay (281)
tooth	ha-tai	wa-gam	wa	ŋa	pha	pa	pa	wā	*s-wa (437)

Table 2b. "Water" Group

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jingphaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
blood	təi?	a?n-ci	təi?	ci		he	tahi	sày	*s-hwiy (222)
die	təi	si-	təi-	ci-			tia	sī	*siy (232)
dig	zau?	co?-	cau?-		sho (M)	thu (M)	thut	cé?, thù	*tu (258)
eat	za?	ca?-	sa?-	sa-	ha (M)	cha	sat	shá	*dza (66)
egg	dau?-dəi	do?-ci	dau?-dəi	tau-ci		vu-ti	woci	ùdì	
fruit	pi-tai?	bi-te	tai?	t'əi			bangti (cf. 'tree')	sì	*sey (57)
kill		so?-ot-		ga-tat-			tikduk	sàt	*g-sat (58)
mortar		ca?-am				tham		thùm	*tsum (75)
oil	taw(DNSB)	to		thu (Chutia)		tian	ten	sáw	*sa*w (272)
sit		a-soŋ-		mo-soŋ-		tong	tong	dūŋ	*tu*ŋ, duŋ (361)
sweet	déy(DNSB)	ci?-				atu		dùy	*twi(y) (166)
water	dəi	ci	dəi	ci-ka	yiang	jo	jung	khà?	*ti(y) (55)

Table 2c. Less Widespread but Possible Cognate Sets

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Bnro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
axe	ruwa(DNSB)	ru-a		loa (Chutia)	wa	wa:-ka:		ŋàwā, nìŋwā	*r-wa (441)
bat		do?-bak			oupak(M)	phakarang (M)			*ba*k(325)
bird						vu	wo	ù	*wa (99)
break	pay:(DNSB)	pe?-			pai (M)				*pe(254)
buffalo						lei	li	wáīòy	*lwa*y(208)
cattle/cow	mɔkɔw(DNSB)	mat-cu			mahu	man	man	dumsu (H)	
chin						ka, ka-ra	kah	ŋìŋ-khá	*(m-)ka, (s-)ka (470)
cry	gáb(DNSB)	grap-						khràp	*krap (116)
descend					yu (M)		ju	yu (H)	*yu(w) (p.101)
good					mai			māy	*may (300)
head	koro(DNSB)	sko				kho	kho		
leech	luwád (DSNB)	ru-at			at	wavot,sawot	sawat	wòt	*r-pat (45)
louse	te?-ma	tik	kə-rət	hə-rək		rit	tharik	tsī?	*s-rik(439)
monkey						ve	wi	wōy	*woy (314)
neck	gə-də?-na	git-dok	dok-e-reŋ	tuk-ur				dù?	*tuk (392)
owl	daokhu (Dimasa)				nyakao(M)	vakhu (M)		ùkhú	*gu/ku (p.164)
rat					yuh	ju-pu		yú	*b-yuw (93)
vomit	gaba (Dimasa)				phai	phat-phe	phat	nphat (H)	
weave		dok				kat:tak	khat-wat	dà?	*tak (17)

Table 3. Numbers

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro'	Garo	Atong'	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
one	'se	sa	goesa		ja	wan-the	ashe	lá᷄ŋay	
two	'nōy	gin-i	goeni		ni	wan-nyi	ani	lə́khô᷄ŋ	*g-nis (4)
three	'tham	git-tam	goetam		lum	wan-ram	atom	mə̀sūm	*g-sum(409)
four	'brōy	bri	biri		peli	beli, bali	bali	mə̀lī	*b-liy(410)
five	'ba	boŋ-a	banga		nga	banga	banga	mə̀ŋā	*l-ŋa, b-ŋa (78)
six	'do, 'ro	dok	korok		wok	irok	tharok	krú?	*d-ruk(411)
seven	'sni,'si'ni	sin-i	sene		nyet	ingit	sanat	sə̀nì̀t	*s-nis (5)
eight	'zad, 'daŋ	cet	chatgik		tet	set, sat	ashat	mə̀tshát	*b-r-gyat (163)
nine	'si'kho	sku	chiku		du	khu	akhu	cə̀khù	*d-kuw (13)
ten	'zi, 'zu	ci-kuŋ	chaigik		pen	chi	asi	shī	*ts(y)i(y) (408)
twenty	khon (Dimasa)	kol	kol				tokom	khūn	*(m-)kul (397)
hundred	'zow'se	rit-ca-	ratja			ca-the ('the='one')	shashe ('she='one')	lə̀tsā	*r-gya(164)

'Boro from PCB 'Atong from Grierson(1903)

Table 4. Kinship Terms

	BODO				EASTERN NAGA			Jinghpaw	*Sino-Tibetan Conspectus
	Boro	Garo	Atong	Wanang	Konyak	Nocte	Tangsa		
grandmother	bǒy(DNSB)	am-bi			opi, be	vi	wi	wǒy	
grandfather		a-cu				te(i)	te	jī	
mother					nyu	nyiong	nu	nù	
father	pi?-pa	pa-gip-a wan 'FaYBr'	a-wa	a-wa-par	pa	wa	wa	wà	*pa (24)
MoYoSi	adǒy(DNSB)	ma?-de						nu doi (H)	
MoBrWi/Mo-in-law		mani 'MoBrWi ni-o-tan 'Mo-in-law	nai?	nəi	nyei	nipa		nī	
MoBr/Fa-in-law	haw: (DNSB)	o?-bit-e 'Fa-in-law' mama-o-acu 'MoMoBr'	hau?	hau	kǔo	hopa,hapa *Fa-in-law'	ho, 'MoBr' hoca 'Fa-in-law'	gù 'FaSiHu'	*khu (225)
EiSi					yoinya nyayung		nakho	nā	
EiBr					pheipu	pho-pho	phokho	phù	
YoSib		no	nau	a-nau	nao		no	nāw	*na*w (271)
cross-cousin	benan 'sib-in-law' (DNSB)	bo-nin (male)						nīŋ (female)	
child		bi-sa	sa-	sa-sa		cha	sa (M)	shà	*tsa, za (59)
niece/nephew		nam-cik 'cross-niece'						nām 'cross niece, nephew	
nephew		gri						khrī	
grandchild		su			ho, hu	chu	ashao (M)	shù	*su(w) (p.158)

Bibliography

Benedict, Paul K. Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus. Cambridge: University Press. 1967.

Bhat, D. N. Shankara, Boro Vocabulary (With a Grammatical Sketch). Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1968.

Bhattacharya, Pramod Chandra, A Descriptive Analysis of the Boro Language. Gauhati: Gauhati University, Department of Publication, 1977.

Brown, W[illiam] B[arclay], An Outline Grammar of the Deori Chutiya Language. Shillong: Printed at the Assam Secretariat Printing Office. 1895.

Burling, Robbins. "Proto-Bodo." Language. Vol. 35, No. 3, July-September, 1959, pp. 433-453.

Burling, Robbins. "The Historical Place of Jinghpaw in Tibeto-Burman." Occasional Papers of the Wolfenden Society on Tibeto-Burman Linguistics, Volume II. F.K. Lehman, ed. Urbana: Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois, 1971.

Burling, Robbins. "Garo Spelling and Garo Phonology." Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area. Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 61-81, 1981.

Grierson, G. A. Linguistic Survey of India. Vol. III, Part II, Tibeto-Burman Family, Specimens of the Bodo, Naga, and Kachin Groups. First edition, 1903. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967.

Gupta, K. Das. An Introduction to the Nocte Language. Shillong: North-East Frontier Agency, 1971

Hanson, O. A Hand-Book of the Kachin or Jinghpaw Language. Rangoon: American Baptist Mission Press, 1917.

Holbrook, Lucy M. A Garo Word Book n.d. (Typescript).

Kumar, Brajbihari Hindi Konyak English Dictionary. Kohima: Nagaland Bhasha Parishad, 1973.

Marrison, Geoffrey E. The Classification of the Naga Languages of North-east India. Two volumes. Doctoral dissertation, University of London (School of Oriental and African Studies). 1967

Mason, M.C. English-Garo Dictionary. Tura, Garo Hills: Miranda Library, 1954.

Nengminza, D. S. The School Dictionary, Garo to English. Tura, Garo Hills: Miranda Library, 1972

Ngemu, T. Moklum Language Guide. Shillong, 1977.

Shafer, Robert, "The vocalism of Sino-Tibetan," JAOS 60:302-37 (1940); 61:18-31 (1941).

Solnit, David B. "Aspects of the Diachronic Phonology of the Konyak Languages". Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Paris France, October, 1979.

[Received December 13, 1982]