

Watch Out for Number ONE: Jingpho ṇāi ‘1’ and ləṇāi ‘one’ (with some speculations about Jingpho number TWO)

James A. Matisoff

University of California, Berkeley

1. INNOVATIVE NATURE AND UNIQUENESS OF THE JINGPHO FORMS FOR ONE AND TWO

The Jingpho (Jg.) word **ləṇāi** ‘one’ has always had a special place in my heart, since it was the very first form I ever elicited in a Tibeto-Burman (TB) language, in the summer of 1963, when working with LaRaw Maran. The next word to emerge in that elicitation session was of course **ləkhōṇ** ‘two.’ Already these two forms led me to a couple of false assumptions: (a) that the prefix **lə-** was very common, especially with numerals; and (b) that the high-to-low falling tone, “51” (symbolized here as /[^]/) was likewise. Both assumptions were of course premature. **lə-** occurs with no other numerals; and “51” turned out to be by far the rarest of the Jg. tones, occurring mostly as a sandhi variant of the low tone “31”¹—though it does in fact occur with one other numeral, **džəkhû** ‘nine.’

More importantly, the Jg. words for ONE and TWO are completely isolated from the comparative point of view, with no known cognates elsewhere in Sino-Tibetan (ST).² See Table 1.

With respect to PTB, Jg. preserves the numeral prefixes fairly well. In FOUR, FIVE, and EIGHT, PTB ***b-** is reflected by Jg. **mə-**. Jg. SIX, SEVEN, NINE, and HUNDRED reflect PTB ***d-**, ***s-**, ***d-** or ***s-**, and ***l-**, respectively. The prefix of

¹Several morphophonemic subclasses of these “51” words may be distinguished: (a) verbs in the low tone (31) regularly acquire “51” when preceded by the high-toned negative prefix, syllabic **ṇ-**: **lù** ‘have’ > **ṇ lù** ‘not have’; (b) low-tone verbs sometimes change to “51” when they are preceded by a nominalizing or causativizing prefix (e.g., the syllabic nasal, or shwa, or consonant plus shwa): **tà** ‘build a house’ > **ṇ-tà** ‘a house’; **thòi** ‘be light’ > **əthòi** ‘illumination’; **tùm** ‘be squandered (as time)’ > **šətùm** ‘to squander (as time)’; (c) adverbial expressions derived by a prefix from 31 verbs sometimes acquire “51”: **nì** ‘be near’ > **əṇì nì šà** ‘nearly,’ **tèm** ‘be closely shut,’ **ətèm šà** ‘soberly’; (d) kinship terms in the 31 tone become 51 when used vocatively: **kəwà** ‘father’ > **wà** ‘O father!; hey, dad!’ (See Matisoff, 1974, pp. 159–160).

²In general the numerals ONE and TWO seem to have a special status in the world’s languages. Irregularities, allofamic variations, and suppletions are more readily tolerated here than with the higher numerals (e.g., English *one* & *an* & *only*; *two* & *twain* & *between* & *twin*; *one* <-> *first*; *two* <-> *second*).

THREE has been influenced by the **mə-** in FOUR and FIVE, so that THREE to FIVE show a “prefix run.”³

Table 1. *PTB and Jingpho Numerals*⁴

	<i>PROTO-TIBETO-BURMAN</i>	<i>JINGPHO</i>
ONE	*it; *k(y)at; g-t(y)ik ⁵	ləŋâi
TWO	*g-nis	ləkhôn
.....		
THREE	*g-sum	məsūm
FOUR	*b-ləy	məli
FIVE	*l-ŋa ~ *b-ŋa	məŋā
SIX	*d-ruk	krú?
SEVEN	*s-nis	sənīt
EIGHT	*b-r-gyat ~ *b-g-ryat	mətsát
NINE	*d-kəw ~ *s-kəw ~ *d-gaw	džəkhû
TEN	*gip; *ts(y)i(y) ~ *tsyay	ši
TWENTY	*m-kul	khūn
HUNDRED	*r-gya	lətsā

2. VARIANT FORMS OF JINGPHO *ləŋâi* ‘ONE’

(a) *ləŋâi*

The standard citation form of this numeral has a lateral prefix, occurring in such collocations as **məṣa ləŋâi** ‘one person,’ **ləŋâi mī** ‘one,’⁶ **ləŋâi ŋài** ‘some; a few; one now and then,’ **ləŋâi ŋài ṣà** ‘only some; only a few,’ **ləŋâi thè? ləŋâi** ‘one by one,’ **ləŋâi phāŋ ləŋâi** ‘one after another.’

Whence this lateral prefix, which occurs also with **ləkhôn** ‘two’? A plausible source is the well-attested PTB etymon ***lak**⁷ ‘hand,’ which appears in reduced form

³For a detailed discussion of this phenomenon in TB numeral systems see Matisoff (1995a, §§ 5.2–5.5).

⁴See Benedict (1972, pp. 93–95) and Matisoff (1995a, passim).

⁵Other roots for ONE reconstructed in Matisoff (1995a, sections 3.11–3.15) include: ***ka/*ko**; ***d/tay** ✕ ***d/tan**; ***tir** ✕ ***tur**; ***a**; ***k-IV(N)**, etc.

⁶For a discussion of this morpheme **mī** see §4, below.

⁷See Benedict (1972, #86 and note 102).

in many Jg. nouns relating to the limbs (hands or feet), e.g., **lətáʔ** ‘hand,’ **ləkhrá** ‘right hand,’ **ləphàn** ‘palm,’ **ləphùm** ‘forearm,’ **ləkhôn** ‘bracelet’ (note 51 tone; < **khón** ‘wear bracelets’), **ləgō** ‘foot; leg,’ **ləphùt** ‘knee,’ **ləthîn** ‘heel,’ **ləkhrùʔ** ‘hoof,’ **lənū** ‘thumb; big toe’ (lit. ‘limb-mother’). The semantic connection would be via the practice of counting on the fingers.⁸

Once this prefix was firmly established with this numeral, it was eligible for *trans-semanticization*, so that in several common time-expressions **lə-** has come to mean ONE all by itself: **ləṇī** ‘one day,’ **lənáʔ** ‘one night,’ **ləṇīṇ** ‘one year,’ **ləphòt** ‘one morning.’⁹ The same morpheme is probably to be adduced in other quantified expressions like **ləlām** ‘a fathom,’ **lətsā** ‘one hundred,’¹⁰ **ləmùn** ‘ten thousand (one myriad),’ **ləmā**, **ləmā-ma**, **ləma-mi** ‘some; something; few.’ (In the Hkauri dialect of Jingpho, these expressions have **ṛə-** rather than **lə-**: **ṛaning** ‘one year,’ **ṛani** ‘one day,’ **ṛanaʔ** ‘one night’).

(b) ṇāi

This variant with preglottalized initial is supplied by Maran (ca. 1973, p. 870), though it is spelled simply as “**ṇgai**” in Hanson (1906, p. 513).¹¹ It appears in collocations like the following: **ṇāi mī** ‘one; a unit’ (e.g., **məṛāi ṇāi mī** ‘one person’), **ṇāi (mī) šà** ‘only one,’¹² **ṇāi ṇài** (note 31 tone in 2nd syllable) ‘someone [indef. pron.]’ (e.g., **məšà ṇāi ṇài dù sāi** ‘Someone has come.’)

⁸This “digital computational” practice is by no means confined to TB peoples (cf. English expressions like *on the one hand*, *on the other hand*). The PTB etymon for FIVE, the handlike numeral par excellence, is reconstructed with either of two prefixes, ***b-** or ***l-**. Perhaps Jingpho selected the non-lateral prefix here (**məṇā**) because of analogical pressure from FOUR. See Matisoff (1995a, § 4.14).

⁹Hanson (1906, p. 358) calls the prefix in these forms “a shortened form of **lāṅgai** ‘one.’”

¹⁰It seems possible that the liquid prefix set up for the PTB form for HUNDRED (***r-gya**) may itself derive ultimately from ***lak** ‘hand.’ Cf. the Hkauri forms with **r-** instead of **l-** (just below).

¹¹This form is lacking in Dai, Xu, Shau, & Nseng (1983), as are the variants with zero- and syllabic nasal initials cited in (c) and (d), below.

¹²This Jingpho morpheme ‘only’ seems clearly cognate to a Kamarupan root ***(t)sa** ‘one’ (Matisoff 1995a: § 3.152 and note 75).

(c) **âi**

Complete loss of initial consonant is a common enough phenomenon with TB functors, including high frequency items like numerals and pronouns,¹³ so it is not too surprising to find a vowel-initialled variant “**ʔâi** ‘one; same as **lǎngai**’” (Hanson 1906, p. 55; tone from Maran), as in **kəwá âi mī jò rīt** ‘Give me a bamboo.’

(d) **ń-ŋâi**

Finally, Hanson (1906, p. 498) cites a variant with syllabic nasal prefix: “**nngai** ‘one; same as **lǎngai**.’” The tones are supplied by Maran (ca. 1973, p. 842): **ń-ŋâi**.

Here we approach the main point of this paper. This prenasalized variant of the numeral ONE is homophonous (except for tone) with the **first person** singular agreement marker,¹⁴ used in sentences like the following: **ŋâi ʃá ñ-ŋâi** ‘I am eating’ (Hanson, 1906, p. 498); **ŋâi gò jòngmà rái ñ ŋâi** ‘I am a student’ (Dai, 1983, p. 624).

Already this is rather persuasive phonological evidence for the connection between ONE and FIRST PERSON in Jingpho. The fact that the first person agreement marker and an allofam of the numeral ONE are virtual homophones makes it highly likely that the same etymon is involved.

3. THE JINGPHO FIRST PERSON **ŋâi**

Just as the Jg. numeral ONE is highly distinctive in the context of TB/ST as a whole, so is the Jingpho independent first person pronoun **ŋâi** ‘I; me.’ While virtually all TB languages that have inherited this etymon reflect the simple vowel ***-a** (PTB ***ŋa**: Benedict, 1972, #406), Benedict is obliged to set up a separate root ***ŋai** (#285) largely to accommodate this Jg. form.¹⁵

I have recently become convinced that the ST/TB pronouns for all three persons have been suffixable by palatal and/or nasal elements at various times and places in the family,¹⁶ so that a palatal suffix is typical of the PST pronominal system in general:

¹³As random examples we may cite Lahu **â** (< **mâ**) ‘negative,’ **ā** (< **tā**) ‘durative particle,’ etc. See Matisoff (1973, p.38).

¹⁴Jingpho is a “pronominalized” or “head-marking” language, using morphemes in the VP to specify the person and number of the subject of the clause. Hanson, who provides no tonal indications, writes both the numeral and the agreement marker as “**nngai**.” Maran (**ñ-ŋâi**) and Dai (**ń³¹ ŋai³³**) agree that the tones of the two syllables of the agreement marker are low and mid, in that order.

¹⁵See the discussion in Matisoff (1985, set #182).

¹⁶Though it must be admitted that the semantic increment provided by the “suffixal” elements is

	<i>Open</i>	<i>With -y</i>	<i>With -N</i>
<i>1st Person</i>	*ŋa	*ŋay	*ŋaŋ
<i>2nd Person</i>	*na	*nay	*naŋ
<i>3rd Person</i>	*ta		*taŋ
(PLB) ¹⁷	*za	*zay	*zaŋ ɤ *yaŋ

The semantic connection between the number ONE and a FIRST person pronoun is too obvious to belabor, so we do not even need to cite the common egotistical slogan “Watch out for number one” (i.e., “Charity begins at home”; that is, one should take care of oneself before presuming to consider the interests of other people). We are all the centers of our own universes.

On the phonological side, there is a (very slight) problem. The Jg. independent first person pronoun **ŋāi** is mid tone, but the numeral is high-to-low falling tone, **-ŋāi**, which seems to bespeak an underlying low tone (cf. also the reduplicated form **ləŋāi ŋāi**, above 2a, where the reduplicate is in the low tone). But this should not cause undue distress. In the first place, it is by no means the case that all “51” syllables come from low tone;¹⁸ and in any case tonal variation is the norm in functors and other grammaticalized morphemes.¹⁹

4. SURVIVAL IN JINGPHO OF A MORE GENERAL TB ROOT FOR ONE

Aside from **ləŋāi**, Jg. also preserves in certain contexts an etymon for ONE with rather more widespread affiliations elsewhere in TB, of the shape **mī** (**ma** in the Hkauri dialect).²⁰ It is not used in counting, but functions something like an indefinite article, in post-nominal position, e.g., **má mī** ‘one/a meal,’ **láp mī** ‘one rupee.’ Often it is used redundantly in expressions that already contain the trans-semanticized prefix **lə-** (above 2a): **ləŋāi mī** ‘one unit’ (ɤ **laŋai ma** [Hkauri]), **ləŋīŋ mī** ‘one year,’ **ləphòt mī** ‘one morning,’ **lətsā ma** ‘100’ (Hkauri).

unclear and inconsistent across languages. See Matisoff (1994, §3.3: “Open, palatally-suffixed, and nasal-suffixed pronouns”). For a more detailed and general study of ST/TB palatal suffixes, see Matisoff (1995b), especially §4.1 (set #20).

¹⁷No single root for ‘3rd person’ may be reconstructed for PTB or PST. As in other language families, ST/TB third person pronouns are related to demonstratives and deictic words like ‘other.’

¹⁸Cf. e.g., **ləkhôn** ‘bracelet’ < **khôn** ‘wear bracelets’ (above §2a).

¹⁹Familiar examples include the three Lahu co-allofams **là** (V) ‘come’ ɤ **la** (Pv) ‘motion toward’ ɤ **lā** (Pv) ‘non-3rd person benefaction.’ See Matisoff (1973, pp. 319-330).

²⁰See Hanson (1906, pp. 386, 394). Probable cognates (cited in Matisoff, 1995a, §3.156b, where the Jg. form is not mentioned) include Deng Geman **ku³¹mu⁵³**, Rengma **me**, Tiddim **a-ma-sa** ‘first,’ Lotha **ma-tsa-nga** ‘one,’ Meithei **ama** ‘one,’ **ma-pan** ‘nine’ (subtractive: “one from ten”). Since there are reflexes with both front and nonfront vowels, a good reconstruction might be ***ma-y**.

It seems more than coincidental that there is also a post-verbal particle of similar shape, in the low-stopped tone, **mǐʔ**, which indicates a *first person indirect object*, e.g.:

shánthē ŋāi phèʔ tsūn mǐʔ āi ‘They told me’

shǐ ánthē phèʔ jòʔ mǐʔ āi ‘He gave us’

nánthē ŋāi phèʔ jòʔ mǐʔ ‘You (pl.) give to me’

ánthē phèʔ jòʔ mǐʔ ‘Give to us’ (Hanson, 1906, pp. 394-5)

This seems to furnish one more bit of evidence to confirm the conceptual connection between ONE and the FIRST PERSON in Jingpho.

5. SOME SPECULATIONS ON JINGPHO **lakhōŋ** TWO

Perhaps at this point I should leave well enough alone. Yet it is tempting to try to explain Jingpho **lakhōŋ** ‘two’ along similar lines: if ONE is derivable from a first person pronoun, could TWO possibly be derived from a morpheme with second person reference? This might seem implausible *prima facie*, unless we assume that the morpheme in question had the force of a *first person inclusive plural*, i.e., “you and I; the two of us; both of us.” If the lateral prefix **la-** had truly become “trans-semanticized” to mean ONE all by itself (above 2b), then perhaps the innovative numeral TWO could originally have meant something like “one [plus] you.”

At any rate, before trying to establish an etymology for **-khōŋ**, we should note certain striking parallels in the historical and synchronic behavior of the Jingpho morphemes for ONE and TWO:

(a) Just as a historically older form for ONE (**mī** ✕ **ma**) survives in certain set expressions (see §4, above), so does there survive in composition a Jg. morpheme **nī** ‘two,’ an unmistakable reflex of the most widespread TB etymon for TWO, ***g-ni-s/k**, as in: **nī nīŋ** ‘two years,’ **nī náʔ** ‘two nights,’ **nī ní** ‘two days,’ **nī phòt** ‘two mornings,’ **nī tsā** ‘200.’²¹ In post-nominal position this same morpheme has been further grammaticalized into a sort of plural or collective suffix: **?wórà nī** ‘those over there,’ **gwǐ nī** ‘the dogs,’ **mankang nī** ‘the people of Mankang’ (Maran, ca. 1973, p. 817).

(b) Just as the innovative form for ONE occurs synchronically with other onsets than the lateral prefix, so does the parallel innovative form for TWO occur with the syllabic nasal prefix (**ń-khōŋ**), or with no prefix at all (**khōŋ**; note mid tone, Maran,

²¹Contra Benedict (1972, P. 16, n. 60), this open midtoned form does *not* descend from the ***nik** allofam (that underlies, e.g., WB **hnac**), but rather from ***ni** (like, e.g., Lahu **nī**).

ca. 1973, p. 1262). The prenasalized allofam is explicitly cross-referenced to “archaic **lanhkawng**” by Maran (p. 847), though he does not give this latter form as a head entry, nor does he indicate its tone in the cross-reference. See Table 2.

Where then can we find a plausible morpheme of 2nd person reference to underlie Jg. **-khônṇ**? The most likely candidate I have found is not exactly a personal pronoun, but rather an etymon whose semantic center of gravity lies in the notion of *master; lord; authority*.²² I would like to reconstruct this putative new root as ***k(w)an**.

Of the modern Burmese reflex of Written Burmese (WB) **səkhan** ‘master; lord’ Judson (1893, p. 977) remarks, “this term is often applied in a most indiscriminate manner, and has lost its original value; it has now become the equivalent of the English *Mister*.”²³ Compounded from this same root is the polite pronoun **khan-byā** ‘you,’ defined by Judson as “sir, or madam; a term of appellation used by men to persons rather superior, whether men or women; a very polite term if used by a superior to an inferior” (p. 259).^{24, 25}

Table 2. *Variational Allofamy of ONE and TWO Compared*

	<i>lə + ⁵¹</i>	<i>ṇ-</i>	<i>lən-</i>	<i>ʔ-/ø</i>	<i>#V-</i>
ONE	ləṇāi	ṇ-ṇāi		ṇāi	ʔāi
1st PERSON		ṇ-ṇāi		ṇāi	
TWO	ləkhônṇ	ṇ-khônṇ	lanhkawng	khônṇ	

Despite a certain semantic overlap, this morpheme seems unrelated to WB **ʔəkhân** ‘business; affair’ (cf. **ʔəkhân thā** ‘treat with deference; regard as weighty’); this latter word is under the heavy tone (< PLB *Tone 2), and seems rather to be derived from

²²There is surely no need to cite examples of words for ‘lord’ or ‘lady’ being downgraded into polite second person pronouns in the world’s languages: *Est-ce que monsieur/madame désirerait déguster un petit apéritif?* ‘Would milord/milady care to try a little preprandial libation?’

²³The prefixal minor syllable **sə-** may be a reduction of the morpheme **su** ‘person.’

²⁴The second syllable is from **bhurā**, pronounced **phəyā** (**phərā** in Arakanese dialect) ‘a god; object of worship, lord; master; a pagoda; sir’ (Judson, 1893, p. 728).

²⁵Another, phonologically unrelated TB etymon seems to reflect this same semantic association between MASTER and SECOND PERSON PRONOUN, a root we may set up as ***s-raṇ** on the basis of WB **əhṛan** ‘owner; proprietor; master; lord’ and a group of Tamangic forms reflecting Proto-TGTM **^Araṇ**: Sahu (Tamang) **³raṇ** ‘self’; Tukche (Thakali) **³raṇ** ‘id.’; Taglung (Tamang) **³raṇ** ‘you (polite)’; Risiangku (Tamang) **³raṇ** “soi-même (réfléchi); employé comme pronom de la deuxième personne respectueux” (Mazaudon 1994, #837 [3.183.53]).

the verb **khaŋ** ‘master; lord’ is allofamically related to a form with medial **-w-**, WB (ʔə)**khwaŋ** ‘business, affair; commission, permission; right, reason’ (Judson, 1893, p. 23; Bernot, 1980, III, p. 159).²⁶ The creaky tone here is no problem; to a large extent it is a secondary sandhi tone that roots under either of the principal tones (< PLB *1 or *2) may acquire by derivation.

To this group of WB forms I would like to compare Jingpho **khán** ‘rule; exercise authority; govern’ (Hanson, 1906, p. 294),²⁷ and its derivative **əkhán** ‘permission, commission’ (p. 8). While it is certainly possible that these could be early loans from Burmese, the basic Jg. morpheme is a verb, while the Burmese forms seem to be underlyingly nominal.

At this point we can bring in Jg. **ləkhôn** ‘two.’ Its **-o-** vocalism corresponds regularly to WB **-wa-** (< ***-wa-**).²⁸ If all these forms do belong in the same word-family, both Jingpho and Burmese would directly reflect both the allofams with and without medial **-w-**, i.e., the rhymes **-aŋ** & **-waŋ**:

	*-aŋ	*-waŋ
WB	səkhaŋ ‘lord; master’ khaŋ-byâ ‘you (deferential)’	(ʔə) khwaŋ ‘business; permission’
Jg.	khán ‘govern; control’	ləkhôn ‘two’

While we are at it, we might compare these forms to a phonosemantically similar Chinese etymon:

OC **kwân** (Matisoff, 1985, set #157a) > Mand. **guān** ‘official’s residence; office, public charge; official, officer; function, to function’

OC **kwân** (Matisoff, 1985, set #157h) > Mand. **guǎn** ‘take care of; manage’

The problem with this comparison is of course the Chinese final **-n** versus the TB **-ŋ**, but perhaps that can be explained away as due to dissimilation of the feature [+grave] shared by the three proto-segments ***/k-, -w-, -ŋ/**. The semantic development in Chinese seems to have been a metonymic shift from *official residence* to *official occupying the residence*,²⁹ so the locational meaning might well have been the original one in PST.

²⁶In Chinese terms, I am claiming that ʔə**khwaŋ** is a “hekou doublet” of **khaŋ**.

²⁷This comparison was not made in Matisoff (1974). This word, transcribed as **khaŋ**⁵⁵, is glossed in Dai (1983, p. 232) as (1) ‘govern’ **guān-li&** (2) ‘drive (car)’ **ka-i (chē); jiàshǐ**.

²⁸Cf. e.g., WB **lwat** ‘be free, loose’/Jg. **lôt**.

²⁹This is quite similar to our metonymic expressions like “the White House denied the report...,”

To all this it might be objected that while it seems natural in the socially stratified Burmese cultural context for a word meaning 'lord' to develop into a second person pronoun,³⁰ it appears unlikely that this would happen in the more egalitarian Jingpho society, and even more farfetched that such a pronoun could then develop into a numeral. Yet stranger things have surely happened in semantic history.

REFERENCES

- Benedict, P. K. (1972). *Sino-Tibetan: A conspectus*. Contributing editor, J. Matisoff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernot, D. (1980). *Dictionnaire birman-français*. Fascicule 3. Paris: Société des Etudes Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.
- Dai, Q., Xu, X., Shau, G., & Nseng, Hk. (1983). *Jingpho-Miwa Ga Ginsi Chyum [Jing-Han Cidian/Jingpo-Chinese Dictionary]*. Kunming: Yunnan People's Publishing Co.
- Hanson, O. (1906). *A dictionary of the Kachin language*. Reprinted 1954. Rangoon: Baptist Board of Publications.
- Judson, A. (1893). *Burmese-English dictionary*. Reprinted 1966 as *Judson's Burmese-English dictionary*. Rangoon: Baptist Board of Publications.
- Maran, L. (ca. 1973). *A dictionary of modern spoken Jinghpaw*. Unpublished ms. version of a revision of Hanson (1906/1954), with tones indicated. Bloomington, Indiana.
- Matisoff, J. A. (1973). *The grammar of Lahu*. California Publications in Linguistics, No. 75. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Matisoff, J. A. (1974). The tones of Jinghpaw and Lolo-Burmese: Common origin vs. independent development. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 15, 153–212.
- Matisoff, J. A. (1985). God and the Sino-Tibetan copula, with some good news concerning selected Tibeto-Burman rhymes. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 29, 1–81.
- Matisoff, J. A. (1994). Sangkong of Yunnan: Secondary verb pronominalization in Southern Loloish. In H. Kitamura, T. Nishida, & Y. Nagano (Eds.), *Current issues in Sino-Tibetan linguistics* (pp. 588–607). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Matisoff, J. A. (1995a). Tibeto-Burman numerals and the play of prefixes. *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka)*, 20, 105–252.
- Matisoff, J. A. (1995b). Sino-Tibetan palatal suffixes revisited. In Y. Nishi, J.A. Matisoff, & Y. Nagano (Eds.), *New directions in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*. (pp. 35–91). Senri Ethnological Studies No. 41. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Mazaudon, M. (1994). *Phonologie historique du groupe Tamang-Gurung-Thakali-Manang (Népal) de la famille tibéto-birmane*. Thèse de doctorat d'état. Paris.

or "the Quai d'Orsay was very upset by today's developments..." etc.

³⁰The hierarchical nature of traditional Burmese society is reflected in the modern first person polite pronouns, which contain the morpheme **kywan** 'slave': (**kywan-to** 'I (male speaker)', **kywan-mâ** 'I (female)').

