

OLD BURMESE *RY-* – A REMARK ON PROTO-LOLO-BURMESE RESONANT INITIALS¹

Yoshio Nishi (Translated via Nathan W. Hill)
Kobe City University of Foreign Studies (emeritus)

Abstract

Philological evidence and comparative phonology confirm the existence of an initial *ry-* in Old Burmese and Proto-Lolo-Burmese, evidence that is over looked in much scholarship (e.g. Matisoff 1979, 1991, etc.).

Keywords: Old Burmese, Prolo-Lolo-Burmese, liquid initials, reconstruction

ISO 639-3 codes: obr, mya, ahk, atb, hni, lis, lhu, ywq

We may cite the following four words that are spelled with *ry-* in Old Burmese (OB) and have cognates in other Lolo-Burmese (LB) languages.ⁱ

A.

1. *ryā* ‘hundred’: WrB *rá*,
2. *ryā* ‘(dry-crop) field’: WrB *rá* (now spelled *yá*)ⁱⁱ
3. *ryak* ‘day’: WrB *rak*ⁱⁱⁱ
4. *ryap* ‘to stand’: WrB *rap*^{iv}

Furthermore, in OB (or Pre-OB), there is a word that one may presume to begin with initial */*hry-/**:

B.

1. **hryat* ‘eight’: WrB *hrac*^v

Other examples of OB forms with an initial spelling *ry-* are found among loanwords or words with unclear origin:

C. Loanwords

e.g.,

1. *(ʔa-cī) ʔa-ryaŋ* ‘arrangement’: WrB *(ʔa-cī) ʔa-ráŋ*^{vi}
2. *charyā* ‘abbot, teacher’: WrB *chará*^{vii}
3. *taryā* ‘law’: WrB *tará*^{viii}
4. *(ʔari)mitt(i/a)ryā* ‘Maitreya’: WrB *(ʔari)metteyya*^{ix}
5. *san-ryan* ‘a kind of sedan-chair’: WrB *san-lyâŋ/ san-hlâŋ/ sam-lyâŋ/ sam-hlyâŋ*^x

¹ At the retirement of Professor Yoshio Nishi, most of his research on Burmese was anthologized in *Four Papers on Burmese* (Tokyo, 1999), but two of his early papers, written in Japanese, were excluded. An English translation of Nishi 1974 appeared in *JSEALS* as Nishi 2016. Here we publish a translation of the other paper "OB *ry-*について (1) OB *ry-* ni tsuite (1)" [On OB *ry-*] 鹿兒島大學史録 *Kagoshima Daigaku Shiroku* 8 (1975):1-16. Although *JSEALS* prefers short footnotes, Nishi's extensive and insightful endnotes are here retained. In addition, Nathan W. Hill (SOAS, University of London) adds sparing editorial notes, including the updating of citations of unpublished versions of Matisoff 1979 and Thurgood 1977 to their published versions. After repeated attempts, the editors have failed to reach the original copyright holders and will at their request gladly remove this translation from circulation. We thank Ulatus for preparing the translation under the auspices of the European Research Council funded project "Beyond Boundaries: Religion, Region, Language and the State" (ERC Synergy Project 609823 ASIA).

D. Unclear Derivation

e.g.,

1. *ryā* ‘(auxiliary verb) proper, right’: WrB *rá*
2. *than-ryak* ‘palmyra jaggery’: WrB *thân-lyak*^{xi}
3. *siryak* ‘mango’: WrB *sarak*^{xii}
4. *ʔo-ryat* ‘bael (fruit)’: WrB *ʔup-hrac/ʔu-shyac*^{xiii}

With the exception of C.4, all the OB forms in the examples above are spelled *ry-* with remarkable consistency and are distinguished from words spelled with *r-*.^{xiv} Since there are few sources for the period spanning from late OB to early MB, one can only conjecture, but I suspect this OB *ry-/*hry-* lasted until around the late 15th century, i.e., the early MB period (=WrB), at which time it came to be spelled exclusively as *r-*. Almost all of these words have come to be spelled with initial *r-* in WrB, the three exceptions being OB (*ʔari*)*mitt(i/a)ryā*, *san-ryan*, and *than-ryak*. Among the exceptions, it may not be possible to directly link OB (*ʔari*)*mitt(i/a)ryā* with its WrB equivalent (cf. n. 9); the remaining two cases seem to be instances of progressive assimilation of the final consonant of the first syllable. Moreover, in C.5, the WrB spelling variants with *sam-* were likely introduced after the 16th century when the distinction between the finals *-n* and *-m* was lost. The only actually problematic example, (A.2) *ryā* ‘(dry-crop) field’, is unique in that in modern Burmese dictionaries this word is spelled *yá* instead of *rá*. However, the argument that this word, too, was in fact spelled *rá* in MB (=WrB) is based on the fact that the spellings *rá/yá* both appear at the time of the confusion of the spellings *r-/-r-* and *y-/-y-* in the context of the merger */r-/ > /y-/* in the early Konbaung period; one can presume that *yá* subsequently became the more general spelling eventually coming to supplant *rá*. It is also quite conceivable that at the time, an attempt to distinguish this word from *rá* ‘hundred’ (A.1) assisted this trend. The fact that in the *Miǎndiàn guǎn yìyǔ* 緬甸館譯語 (published by the Asia Society アジア協会), compiled around the turn of the 16th century and presumably expresses a dialect of Central Burmese from this period, this word appears as *rá* (‘garden’, cf. NT 1972, no. 61), indicates that this was the conventional spelling at the time.

Accordingly, even on the basis of spelling alone, from the remarkably consistent distinction in OB between *ry-* and *r-* (and in parallel a fashion between **hry-* and *hr-*), and the apparent regular change in WrB from *ry-* to *r-*, one may suggest the OB initials listed above were not */r-/* but */ry-/* (*/*hry-/*). Moreover, it is natural to posit **/ry-/* for the PLB forms of A. 1-5. However, Matisoff and Thurgood reconstruct the PLB forms of these examples as summarized in the following table, reconstructions that do not predict the *-y-* (1, 3, 4, 5) or *r-* (2) of the OB forms; the rime reconstructed for (5) is also problematic.²

Table 1: Lolo-Burmese cognates of OB *ry-*^{xv}

	PLB	OB	WrB	Atsi	Maru	Lasha	Akha	Hani	Lisu	Lahu	Nyi	Ahi	Nasu
1. ‘hundred’ (GT 112)	*ʔra ¹	ryā	rá	só RB	yò RB yò NT	so	yá	xo ⁵⁵ GHN	h’yàè	ha	ha ³³	xo ²²	xo ²²
2. ‘field’ (GT 95)	*ʔya ¹	ryā	rá	yó RB	yò RB ye NT		yá		h’a	hɛ			
3. ‘day; night’ (JAM 174; GT p. 10)	*ʔrak	ryak	rak			yo	yá		h ‘ya’	há	he ²²	xo ⁴⁴	xa ⁴⁴
4. ‘to stand’ (JAM 175; GT 201)	*ʔrap	ryap	rap	yap RB yap ³¹ HT	yeʔ RB yeʔ NT	yap	yò	šo ³¹ HT xo ³³ KNH	h’i	hu	hx ²²	xo ⁴⁴	xǎ ²⁴
5. ‘eight’ (JAM 171; GT p. 10)	*ʔrit	*hryat	hrac	śit RB śit ⁵⁵ HT	śeʔ RB śe NT	sêi	yè	se ³¹ HT xæ ²¹ GHN	h’i	hi	he ²²	xi ⁴⁴	xè ²⁴

² [Editor’s note: On the basis of this paper, Thurgood revised his reconstructions to **rya*¹ ‘hundred’, **rya*¹ ‘(dry-crop) field’, **ryak* ‘day’, **ryap* ‘stand’, and **s-ryat* ‘eight’ (1977: 178). Matisoff has yet to update his views accordingly, for example reconstructing PLB **ʔ-ra* ‘hundred’ on the basis of WrB *rā* (1991: 493) showing no awareness of OB *ryā* nor of Nishi’s paper.]

Thurgood's argument for *ʔya¹ instead of *ʔra¹ as the PLB form for 'field' is likely due to his belief that the WrB form is *yá*, rather than because its Lisu and Lahu forms and those for 'hundred' differ in their finals. Oddly enough, in his paper Thurgood argues that "although no examples of *ʔy- exist, I would expect the *ʔy- initial to pattern after both the *ʔr- and *ʔw- initials"³ (1974:31).^{xvi} In other words he expects to find *ʔy- > Lisu *h'*-, Lahu *h-*. However, if we follow his method of reconstruction in Proto-tone *1 (on which Matisoff agrees; cf. JAM 1977, Figure 3a), tones in Lisu that derive from *'glottalized' initials must not be laryngealized mid-tones (i.e., *h'a) (cf. p. 157, Table 1). (For the same reason, if we consider tonal correspondences, this also means that it is an error to posit the PLB initial for 'hundred' as the *'glottalized' initial *ʔr-).^{xvii} Similarly for the remaining PLB forms (3), (4), and (5), although the two correspondences seen in the initials of OB/WrB, Atsi, Maru, and Lashi in 'day; night' and 'to stand' on the one hand and seen in 'eight' on the other hand are clearly distinct, Matisoff and Thurgood posit the same *ʔr- for both.

With the exception of R. Burling's (1967) attempt at PLB reconstruction, generally in studies of Lolo-Burmese scholars such as R. Shafer (1952), T. Nishida (1964, etc.), J. A. Matisoff (1970, 1972, 1979), and G. Thurgood (1977) employ WrB forms (and sometimes OB forms, if rarely) as indices in the summary of correspondence series for the positing of PLB forms. R.A. Miller (1970:148-149) has already pointed out Burling's error in reconstructing PLB intentionally excluding OB/WrB forms and making use only of CB forms. In particular, the reconstruction of *resonant initials, *medial consonants, and *final consonants is difficult if one ignores OB/WrB cognates.^{xviii} Of course, while we cannot say that OB/WrB forms always reflect PLB forms more faithfully, it is surely no great mistake to think that they possess a greater index value than any other LB language with regard to the aforementioned points.

In a future paper, as well as showing how the correspondences of OB *ry-* and *hry- are distinguished from those of OB/WrB *r-* and *hr-*, and examining the pros and cons of reconstructing a medial *-y- in the PLB forms for cognate sets A.1-5 and B.1, I will attempt to re-examine the reconstruction of *resonant initials in PLB from a more general perspective.⁴

Bibliographic Abbreviations

- AL = Liétard, A.
 CM = 程默 Chéng Mò
 GHN = Gāo Huánián 高華年
 GT = Thurgood, Graham
 HT = Hú Tǎn 胡坦 and Dài Qìngxìà 戴庆夏
 JAM = James A. Matisoff
 JOF = Fraser, J. O.
 MXL = Mǎ Xuéliáng 馬学良
 NT = Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄
 NY = Nishi Yoshio 西義郎
 PKB = Benedict, Paul K.
 PL = Lewis, Paul
 RB = Burling, Robbins
 RIF = Ruì Yìfū 芮逸夫
 RS = Shafer, Robert
 YJH = Yuán Jiā huá 袁家驊

³ [Editor's note: This sentence does not appear in Thurgood 1977, the published version.]

⁴ [Editor's note: The intended second part of this article appears never to have been published.]

References

- Haudricourt, A.-G. 1965. Mutation consonantique en Mon-Khmer. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 60:160-72.
- Benedict, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: a Conspectus*. Princeton Cambridge Studies in Chinese Linguistics II. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Burling, Robbins. 1967. *Proto-Lolo-Burmese*. Publication 43 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics. The Hague.
- Chéng Mò 程默. 1956. 載瓦語簡介 Zàiwǎ yǔ jiǎnjiè [Introduction to the Zaiwa Language]. 中国語文 *Zhōngguó yǔwén* [Chinese Language] 53 (November):41-44.
- Fraser, J. O. 1922. *Handbook of the Lisu (Yawyin) Language*. Rangoon: Superintendent, Govt. Print., Burma.
- Hú Tǎn 胡坦 and Dài Qìngxià 戴庆夏. 1964. 哈尼於元意的松緊 *Hāní yǔ yuán yī de sōngjǐn* [Tightness in Hani Vowels]. 中国語文 *Zhōngguó yǔwén* [Chinese Language] 128.1:77-87.
- Ruì Yìfū 芮逸夫. 1948. 記栗僂語音兼論所謂栗僂文 *Jì Lìsù yǔyīn jiān lùn suǒwèi Lìsù wén* [Notes on the Sounds of the Lisu Language with Remarks on the Lisu Script]. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 17:303-326.
- Gāo Huáníán 高華年. 1955. 揚武哈尼語初探 *Yángwǔ Hāní yǔ chūtàn* [Preliminary exploration of the Akha and Hani languages]. 中山大學學報 *Zhōngshān dàxué xuébào* 2:175-230.
- Gāo Huáníán 高華年. 1958. 彝語語法研究 *Yí yǔ yǔfǎ yánjiū* [A Grammar of the Yi Language]. Beijing: 科學出版社 *kēxué chūbǎnshè* [Science Press].
- Lewis, Paul. 1968. *Akha-English Dictionary*. Data Paper 70. Southeast Asia Program. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- Liétard, A. 1911. Essai de dictionnaire Lo-Lo Français, dialecte Ahi, ' *T'oung pao* 12 :1-37; 123-156; 316-346; 545-558.
- Mǎ Xuéliáng 馬學良. 1951. 撒尼彝語研究 *Sānī yí yǔ yánjiū* [Research on the Sani Yi language]. 語言學專刊第二種 *Yǔyánxué zhuānkān*, no. 2. Beijing: 中國科學院 Chinese Academy of Sciences.
- Matisoff, James A. 1970. Glottal Dissimilation and Lahu High-Rising Tone: A Tonogenetic Case-Study. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90.1:13-44.
- Matisoff, James A. 1972. *The Loloish Tonal Split revisited*. Research Monograph No. 7 of the Center for South and Southeast Asia Studies. University of California, Berkeley.
- Matisoff, James A. 1979. Problems and progress in Lolo-Burmese: Quo Vadimus? *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 4:11-43.
- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Sino-Tibetan linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20:493.
- R. A. Miller. 1970. Review of R. Burling's Proto-Lolo-Burmese. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 12.2:146-159.
- Nishi Yoshio 西義郎. 1974. WrB - ac ni tsuite [The PLB and OB Sources of WrB -ac]. 東洋學方 *Tōyō Gakuhō* (*Journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*) 56.1:1-43. [Editor's note: Published in English translation as Nishi 2016].
- Nishi Yoshio 西義郎. 1975. 哈尼語綠春方言と揚武方言 Hani-go ryokushun hōgen to Aka hōgen [Hani and Akha: problems of the subgrouping of Proto-Lolo-Burmese initials]. アジア・アフリカ計数研究 *Ajia Afurika keisū kenkyū* [Computational Analyses of Asian and African Languages] 2:53-81.
- Nishi Yoshio 西義郎. 2016. Proto-Lolo-Burmese and Old Burmese Sources of Written Burmese -ac. *Journal of the South East Asian Linguistics Society* 9: 97-129. [An English translation of Nishi 1974.]
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄. 1964. ビルマ語とロロ諸語: その成長体系の比較研究 *Biruma-go to Roro shogo: Sono seichō taikai no hikaku kenkyū* [Burmese and Lolo Dialects]. 東南アジア研究 *Tonan Ajia kenkyū* (*Southeast Asian Studies*) 1.4:13-28.
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄. 1967. リス語の研究: タイ国ターク県におけるリス族の言葉の予備報告 *Risu-go no kenkyū: Tai kuni tāku ken ni okeru risu-zoku no kotoba no yobi hōkoku* [A Preliminary Study on the Lisu Language in Tak Province, Thailand]. 東南アジア研究 *Tonan Ajia kenkyū* (*Southeast Asian Studies*) 5.2:276-307.

- Nishida Tatsuo 西田 龍雄. 1972. 緬甸館訳語の研究: ビルマ言語学序説 *Mendenkan yakugo no kenkyū* : *Biruma genggogaku josetsu* [A Study of the Burmese–Chinese vocabulary, Mien-tien-kuan i-yu : an introduction to Burmese linguistics]. 華夷訳語研究叢書 Kai yakugo kenkyū sōsho, Vol. 2. Kyoto: 松香堂 Shōkadō.
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田 龍雄. 1973. 多統訳語の研究 新言語トス語の構造と系統 *Tosu yakugo no kenkyū*: *Shin gengo tosugo no kōzō to keitō* [A Study of the Tosu–Chinese Vocabulary Tosu I-yu: the structure and lineage of Tosu, a new language]. 華夷訳語研究叢書 Kai yakugo kenkyū sōsho, Vol. 4. Kyoto: 松香堂 Shōkadō.
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田 龍雄. (n.d.). *An English-Bisu Vocabulary*. Unpublished manuscript. 13 pages.
- Shafer, Robert. 1952. Phonétique historique des langues lolo. *T'oung Pao* 41:191-229.
- Thurgood, Graham. 1974. Lisu and Proto Lolo-Burmese. Unpublished manuscript (a draft version of Thurgood 1977, consulted by Nishi).
- Thurgood, Graham. 1977. Lisu and Proto Lolo-Burmese. *Acta Orientalia* 28:147-207.
- Yuán Jiā huá 袁家驊. 1953. 阿細民歌及其語言 *Āxì míngē jí qí yǔyán* [The language and folksongs of the Axi people] (語言学專刊第五種 Yǔyán xué zhuānkān, no. 5). Beijing: 中国科学院 Chinese Academy of Sciences.

Reviewed: Received 31 December 2016, revised text accepted 31 December 2016, published 10 July 2017

Editors: Editor-In-Chief Dr Mark Alves | Managing Eds. Dr Paul Sidwell, Dr Nathan Hill, Dr Sigrid Lew

ⁱ Abbreviations: OB=Old Burmese, WrB=Written Burmese, MB=Middle Burmese, CB=Central Burmese (Rangoon-Mandalay dialect), LB=Lolo-Burmese, PLB=Proto-LB, PBsh=Proto-Burmish, PLsh=Proto-Loloish.

OB forms mainly rely on the following sources.

1. Pe Maung Tin and G. H. Luce, *Pugám kyokcá hñwànpôn* (*Selections from the Inscriptions of Pagan*). Rangoon, 1928.
 2. E Maung, *Pugám kyokcá lakrwécân* (*Selections from the Inscriptions of Pagan*). Rangoon, 1958.
 3. Ba Shin, *Lokatheikpan-Early Burmese Culture in a Pagan Temple*. Rangoon, 1962.
 4. *Hrêhôn mránmá kyokcá* (*The Old Burmese Inscriptions*). Rangoon, Vol. I (B.E. 474-600), 1972.
- In addition, I have referred to various articles of G. H. Luce.

Late OB and MB rely on the following documents and materials.

1. Than Tun, 'History of Burma: A.D. 1300-1400,' *Journal of Burma Research Society* 62 (1959): 119-133.
2. Tin Hla Thaw, 'History of Burma: A.D. 1400-1500,' *J. Burma Res. Soc.* 62 (1959): 135-151.
3. Po Lat, *Mránmá cakrâ ṛaphwàṅ Kyàm—Mránmá ṛabhīdhāñtikā* (3vols.) Rangoon, (Vol.1) 1962; (Vol.2) 1963; (Supplement) 1964.
4. NT 1972 (vid. References).
5. J.A. Stewart, 'Burmese Dedicatory Inscription of A.D. 1683,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 7 (1934): 541-544.
6. Pe Maung Tin, 'Phonetics in a Passport,' *J. Burma Res. Soc.* 12 (1922), 127-132.
7. Ohno Toru. 1966, "十八世紀末期のビルマ語 -ヨーロッパ人の記録を中心として [The Burmese language at the end of the 18th century - seen in the records of European visitors]", 大阪外国語大学学報 *Ōsaka Gaikokugo Daigaku gakahō*. (*Journal of the Osaka University of Foreign studies*) 16:179–228.

WrB forms rely on the following dictionaries and reference works.

1. *Judson's Burmese-English Dictionary* (Centenary Edition). Rangoon, 1953.
2. *A Burmese-English Dictionary* (compiled by J .A. Stewart, et al.); London, (Part I) 1940; (Part II) 1950; (Part III) 1955; (Part IV) 1963. (Part V) 1969.
3. Chén Rúxìng 陳孺性, 模範緬華大辭典 *Mófàn miǎn-huá dàcídiǎn* (*A Model Burmese-English Dictionary*). Rangoon, 1962; reprinted by the Toyo Bunko, Tokyo, 1970.
4. One Shwe, *Satpum ṛabhīdhan*. Rangoon, 1956.
5. Tha Myat, *Mránmácá rethumñ kyâm* (*The Burmese Orthography*), Rangoon, 1972? .

For the transliteration of OB and WrB see NY 2016[1974], n.1. In addition, when there is no need to mention the alternate spellings of an OB form, only a standardized form is given according to the orthography of the *Mahāther Nāgasamin* inscription (pl. 3; BE 512) [in this inscription the creaky tone -' is not written except for in *ʔe'*] or of the *Mahāsenapati anantasūra mōjhnām* inscription (pls. 73-82; B.E. 585-589) etc. Nonetheless, except for in loanwords the distinction between -VC and -VC̄ is not indicated in the standardization. Direct or indirect loanwords from Pali, Sanskrit, etc. which are orthographically unmodified in Burmese are transcribed literally even in the WrB form and do not use tone marks.

- ii Judson, Chén, One Shwe, and Tha Myat all hold this to be *yá*. However, One Shwe, in the text cited (see the previous note) mentions that it is written *rā* in inscriptions (likely referring to inscriptions later than OB) and the *Wohārattha-pakā-sanī kyām* of the second Kyaw Aung Sang Hta Sayadaw (compiled BE 1131). Hla Pe, in his article “A Tentative List of Mon Loan Words in Burmese” (*J. Burma Res. Soc.* 50 [1967].1: 71-94), holds that WrB *yá* ‘a cultivated spot of ground’ is a loanword from Mon *ye* (Modern Mon /yèa/, spelled *yā*) ‘forest clearing’, and that it first occurs in Burmese documents in the fifteenth century. However, the Old Mon form that would correspond to this term is not recorded in H.L. Shorto’s *A Dictionary of the Mon inscriptions from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries* (London, 1971). In addition, as I show in the text, even if in points this is a somewhat irregular correspondence, because there are cognates in other LB languages the loan relationship must be in the other direction, if indeed there is any relationship at all between WrB *yá* and Mon *ye*, as Hla Pe suggests. [Editor’s note: R. Yanson (‘A List of Old Burmese Words from 12th Century Inscriptions,’ *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages*. Christopher I. Beckwith, ed. Leiden, 2002:166) independently arrives at the conclusion that the loan must be from Burmese to Mon.] As for *yá* found in fifteenth century documents, it may be necessary to heed the words of U Wun “... No autograph text seems to have come down to us, except the original inscriptions. Our books are made from transmitted texts or copies of copies. During the course of many years, which were often disturbed by wars, errors, both voluntary and involuntary, have crept into the texts. Mistakes on the part of scribes and correctors, misunderstanding and misinterpretation, misplaced learning and irrelevant scholarship are also responsible for them.” (‘Some Problems of a Lexicographer in Burmese,’ *J. Burma Res. Soc.* 39.2 [1956]:180). Accordingly, if Hla Pe is not referring to inscriptional sources when he refers to 15th century documents, whether he has given sufficient consideration to spelling revisions in the course of transmission might pose a problem.

Po Lat, in Volume 2 of the text cited (see the initial note), as a result of a survey of the evolution of the spelling of WrB *yá* in inscriptions and documents, writes that although the spelling *ryā* during the Pagan period gradually shifted to *rā* from the late Pagan period, up until the Bodawpaya period of the Konbaung Dynasty (1781-1819), of the words that had originally been spelled *ry-* in OB, only the *rā* of *tōŋ-rā* and *lāy-rā* had come to be spelled *yā* (279-301). While this view is consistent with my own conclusion, there are many inconsistent points, such as his opinion that although words that had been spelled *ry-* during the Pagan period had later come to be pronounced as they are today (*y-*), they continued to be spelled *r-*, and that he regards the *rā* of *tōŋ-rā* and *lāy-rā* as being the same as *ʔa-rā* ‘place, site’ (in compounds *ʔim-rā*, *né-rā*, etc.) (the OB form of the latter is *rā* not *ryā*). While Po Lat does not make any strict distinction in this text between ‘original’ and non-original sources and suffers from the defect of relying overly on non-linguistic reasoning, much in the same manner as Ch. Duroiselle; it is noteworthy that his method itself, in attempting to determine the “correct” spelling by citing abundant sources from inscriptions and documents and undertaking a comparative investigation of spelling variants found therein, is not incorrect and quite replete with examples worthy of reference.

- iii OB *ryak/ryāk/ryāk/rek/rik/rak*. Of these, *ryak* and *ryāk* occur with the highest frequency. We could probably interpret -(y)e as /-ya-/ (cf. NY 2016:109 [1974:16-17]). Although *rik* is found on the obverse (pl. 111) of the *Sanḅkrī Nāti Lat San* inscription (pls. 111, 112; BE 482), on the reverse (pl. 112) it appears as *ryāk*. Although the same word appears as *rak* in the *Māṅsā gū bhurā* inscription (pl. 120a; BE 579), it is difficult to accept that this spelling variant reflects the pronunciation of the period. This word is spelled *ryak* with remarkable consistency through the end of the fifteenth century. Accordingly, in the *Māṅsā gū bhurā* inscription the -y- was probably dropped by mistake.
- iv OB *ryap*, aside from being used as a verb (pl. 73; BE 585), is found as a derived noun *ʔa-ryap* (WrB *ʔa-rap*) ‘height’ (pl. 130; BE 600) and in compound words (*purhā+a-ryap*) as in *purhā-ryap* (pl. 66; BE 577), *purhā-ryap* (pl. 130; BE 600; etc.) ‘Buddha’s statue’.
- v OB *hat/hyet/hyat/rhec*. On the interpretation of these OB forms, cf. NY 2016 (pp. 108-110 [1974:16-18]).
- vi Cf. Old Mon *reñ/reñ* in *reñ lār/lar* ‘to arrange, lay out, ready for use’ (H. L. Shorto, *op. cit.*:322).
- vii OB *chāryā/charyā/chāryā/chryā/chryā/chryā/chryā*. While this is written as *chryā* on line 12 of the *Ratnākumṅthan* inscription (West face: pl. 87; BE 587), it appears as *chryā* on line 15. In both cases, this spelling was likely intended to be *chryā/chryā*, just as *skhiñ* is considered a spelling for which *sikhañ* was intended. Together with examples such as OB *taryā/tryā* (see the next note) and *skhañ/skhiñ/sakhañ* ‘lord’, in cases where the central vowel of the first syllable CV- is spelled Ø/i/a, it is possible to interpret as CV- = /Cə-/ (a light syllable). However, doubts remain as to whether or not it is acceptable to completely forego consideration of differences of time and space. For example, rather than considering all the spellings *myā/myiā/miyā/miyā/miyā* ‘wife’ (WrB *mayā*) to have been

notations for OB /məyâ/, there are some cases in which I think it would be better to postulate OB /məyâ/ ~ /mi(y)yâ/ (cf. NY 2016[1974], n. 3). That said, in the case of OB *charyā* and *taryā* (see the next note), there does not seem to be much problem interpreting these as /chəryâ/ and /təryâ/, respectively. Cf. Sanskrit *ācārya* ‘a spiritual guide or teacher’, Pāli *ācariya*; Old Mon ‘*ācār* /ʔacarj/ ‘teacher, spiritual preceptor; learned man, one skilled in a branch of learning or a craft’ / *acā* / *acār*.

viii OB *tāryā/taryā/tāyā/tryā*. Variant spellings occur in the same inscription, e.g., *taryā/tryā* (e.g., pl. 796; BE 595) and *tāryā/tāyā* (e.g., pl. 308; BE 584). We may consider this to indicate OB /taryâ/. See Than Tun, ‘Religion in Burma, AD. 1000-1300’ (*J. Burma Res. Soc.* 42.2 [1959]:54-58) for a detailed discussion of this term. There is as yet no established theory on the etymology of this term, but Prof. Luce, in ‘Old kyaukse and the Coming of the Burmans’ (*J. Burma Res. Soc.* 42.1 [1959]:75-112) states that OB *taryā* is ‘a spoonerized form of the Hindu *ṛta* “the divine law”’ (p. 101), an explanation that Than Tun also cites (*op. cit.* 1972:54); I believe that the etymology of this word requires further investigation.

ix OB (ʔari)mittiryā/ (mahā)mittiryā/ (mahā)mittiryā/mittyā. Whereas these spelling variants probably express the *learned* form of the day, other variants such as *myactāñ* (pl. 122a; BE 587) and *mittāñ* (pl. 946; BE 598) express the *vulgar* form. Cf. Sanskrit *mātreya* ‘name of a Bodhisattva and future Buddha (the fifth of this age)’, Pāli *metteya*; among the OB forms the ‘learned’ form could be a hybrid of Sanskrit and Pāli; cf. also Old Mon *mettey/metteya* ‘the coming Buddha, all who see whom will attain Nirvana’; note OB ʔari- < Sanskrit *āriya*, Pāli *ariya* ‘noble, holy’; OB *mahā*- < Sanskrit/Pāli ‘great’. As another example of a loanword which suggests the existence of both learned and vulgar forms, we may cite OB ʔamatyā/ʔamattyā (learned) vs. ʔamat/(maṅ-) mat (-kri) (vulgar) ‘minister’. The latter is an abbreviated form of the former, and WrB *ʔamat* could be said to derive from this vulgar form. Cf. Sanskrit *amātya* ‘a companion of a king, minister’ / *āmātya*; Old Mon ‘*āmāt* /ʔamat/ ‘minister of state’ ~ ‘*amāt* /əmat/.

While a variety of WrB spelling variants for (ʔari)mitt(i/a)ryā are listed along with their pronunciation in Part V (p. 314) of J. A. Stewart et al. (eds.), *A Burmese-English Dictionary*, some of these seem to derive from the vulgar form in OB: e.g. *mitāñ/mitēñ* /mi`di/; (ri)matāñ /ri`mə`di/.

Comparing OB *mitt(i/a)ryā* with the standard spelling WrB *metteyya*, it is clear that the latter bears absolutely no relation to the former and has been borrowed directly from Pāli. Accordingly, we can infer that neither the reading pronunciation /miʔəyâ/ of WrB *metteyya* nor the standard CB form /mədēiyâ/ are likely to be the ‘later changed form’ of OB *mitt(i/a)ryā* (?/mittəryâ) (the change OB ?/mittəryâ/ > CB *meiʔəyâ is expected). Albeit only a similar type of case, the derivation of CB /py`nā/ is also not very clear and invites the following possibilities:

- (1) Sanskrit *prajñā* (loanword) → OB *prajñā* / *pracñā* : ?/pracñâ/ > MB ?/pretñâ/ > ?/prēñā/ > CB /pyínñâ/ (only the spelling was replaced with the Pāli form *paññā*)
- (2) Sanskrit *prajñā* (loanword) → OB *praññā* ... (replaced) Pāli *paññā* (loanword) → WrB(=MB) *paññā* ?/pēññâ/ > /pínñâ/ > CB /py`nā/. Cf. ‘to shoot’ OB *pac* > CB /pyiʔ/; ‘to be named’ OB *mañ* > CB /myí/.
- (3) A mixture of (1) and (2)
- (4) Sanskrit *prajñā* (loanword) → OB *prajñā/pracñā*: ?/pracñâ/ > /prēñé/ > Early MB /prēñé/ ... (replaced) Pāli *paññā* (loanword) → Late MB /pínñâ/ (reading pronunciation) > CB /pyínñâ/.

Option (4) takes account of both the 緬甸館 Miāndiànguǎn language A (MTA) form *paññā-hri* ‘to be intelligent’ (358) (cf. NT 1972:115; Chinese transcription 白列那食 [plee ña ši]; on possibilities for the interpretation of /-l-/ and /-r-/ in this case, cf. NY 2016 [1974], n. 1) and the MTB form *piññā-hri* ‘id.’ (464) (cf. NT 1972, loc. cit.; Chi. transcription 賓雅西 [piNja ši]). Nishida theorizes that MTB reflects “18C 中頃, Alaungpaya 王朝初期, いまのビルマ中央地域で話されていた言語 a language spoken in what is now Central Burma in the early Alaungpaya Dynasty in the mid-18th century” (NT 1972:17).

It is not yet sufficiently clear to me which of the above possibilities is best, or even whether there is need to consider other derivations. Moreover, the evolution of Burmese loanwords is not very clear, e.g., why OB *khet* ‘period, age’ becomes /khiʔ/ rather than /*chiʔ/ in CB. A future challenge in the historical study of Burmese is to not stop with the mere identification of the languages from which Burmese has borrowed but to provide a sufficiently linguistically satisfying explanation for what processes these words followed to arrive at their CB form after their initial borrowing.

x Hla Pe regards OB *san-ryan/san-lyan* as a Mon loanword (cf. Mon *sarean* ‘a palanquin, swing cradle’, *op. cit.*, p. 80). On the other hand, Po Lat sees the term as a loanword from Sanskrit *sallaya* (= sam-laya) ‘settling or sitting down, alighting or settling (of a bird)’ (*op. cit.*, Supplement pp. 258-261). Although there are some problems with a Mon word having *sa-* as a first syllable, the Mon word accounts well for the form and usage of the OB word.

xi OB *than-ryak/thān-ryak/tan-ryak/tan-rāk/thān-rāk* (with *-ryak* occurring most frequently). As in the case of OB *ryak/rak* ‘day’, *-rāk* should probably be considered an abbreviated spelling that dropped the *-y-*, rather than as reflecting the original pronunciation. The first element of this compound word, *than* (>WrB *thān*) ‘palmyra, toddy-

palm', is generally regarded as from Sanskrit *tāla* 'palm-tree' (see the works of G.H. Luce). However, there are a number of points that remain unclear, including the fact that it is not a usage that was borrowed directly, and that it was not borrowed through Mon; cf. Old Mon *tāl* (Luce, Hla Pe). Note, however, that this discussion is not included in Shorto's dictionary (referred to above).

- xii OB *siryak/siryāk*.
- xiii OB *ʔo-ryat/ʔu-ret/ʔū-rec/ʔū-ryac*. On the change OB *-yat* > WrB *-ac* (*/-et/*), cf. NY 2016[1974]. The initial in the OB form is *ry-/r-*; the fact that the initial became *hr-/shy-* in WrB is likely due to secondary devoicing. There is no need to posit an OB form **hry*. Although at present it can only be explained as a sporadic phenomenon, there are many examples of the devoicing of liquids, especially *l-*, in WrB and CB (cf. NY 2016[1974], n. 58).
- xiv There are more examples of OB initial *ry-* other than those listed here. Although many examples exist, such as for plant names, where the WrB form is clear, these largely follow the rule OB *ry-* > WrB *r-*.
- xv Since Bisu lacks forms corresponding with OB for A.1-4 and B.1, it has been replaced by another form, so below it is cited only for reference. The Lisu language used is an archaic dialect, represented by Lisu-JOF, it is standardized in GT. In addition, in Lisu-RIF and Lisu-NT, two dialects of Lisu not covered by GT 1977, onsets derived from *liquids manifest with a contrast of voiced *h* [y] vs. unvoiced *h* [x] (RIF) or nasalised /*h̃*/ [h̃] vs. non-nasalised /*h*/ [h] (NT), and in most cases voicing and nasalization across these two dialects match (e.g. 'to stand' *hi¹¹* RIF, *hiè* NT, 'eight' *hi¹¹* RIF, *hè* NT). However, these two dialects are more innovative dialects than Lisu-JOF, Lisu-A (nonymous), Lisu-RB, and there are also examples in which the aforementioned characteristics are not consistent (e.g. 'hundred' *hia¹²* RIF, *hia* NT). Furthermore, since some cases of Lisu-RIF are inadequate, it is still necessary to consider that this conflicting evidence reveals a difference of initials in a yet more archaic stage of Lisu. In Akha, only the Akha-PL form is cited, but its tone marking is changed as follows by displaying tight (pharyngealised) vowel with underlining. For loose vowels: high /*v^v*/ → /*v̄*/, mid (unmarked) → (id.), low /*v_v*/ → /*v̄*/, For tight vowels, mid /*v^v*/ → /*v̄*/, low /*v_v*/ → /*v̄*/, [Editor's note: According to Lewis there "are a few rare instances where laryngealized vowels occur on a high tone. These are usually borrowed words, or personal names. They are so rare, however, that one has to comb through hours of text before coming across even one" ('Tone in the Akha language,' *Anthropological Linguistics* 15.4 (1973):183).] Ahi is cited after Ahi-YJH, but if a cognate is not recorded in Ahi-YJH and there is a form in Ahi-AL, this is given. The short stopped tone of Nyi (= Sani), Ahi, and Nasu is given as ²², ⁴⁴, and ³² respectively, but when giving rime correspondences the short stopped tone of each language is given as *v̄*?. Finally, regarding phonemic notation, other than the changes *j* (Atsi-HT, Bisu, Hani-HT/GHN, Nyi, Ahi-YJH, Nasu) → *y*; *ʃ* (Atsi-HT) and *ɛ* → *ś*; *z* → *z*; *ɬ* → *hl* the notation of the source material was used as is.
- xvi Although not cited in the text of GT 1977, in "the [cognate] sets" he posits PLB **hya*² (GT 5) for 'antelope' Atsi *yò* RB : Akha *hà* : Lisu *h'ya* JOF : Lahu *hâ*. Here, the suggestion **hy-* is likely the result of having considered contrasts such as 'right' WrB *yá* : Atsi *yô* RB : Maru *yò* RB : Lashi *yo* NT : Lisu *yá* JOF : Lahu *ša* (? < *(la) *ʔ*-*ya*, cf. JAM 1979:25 : Nyi *za⁵⁵* : Ahi *zo⁴⁴* versus 'to itch' WrB *yâ* : Atsi *yó* RB : Bisu *hjá* : Nyi *za⁵⁵* : Ahi *jo* (= *zo^{55/44}*) AL, although neither of these cognate sets are put forward in GT 1977. However, the location of his source for Akha *hà* in PL 1968 is unclear, and if he took it from the second element of *cíhà* 'a barking deer', I think that this is a mistake. The Akha form that fits this cognate set is actually *yà* 'a wild goat', which exactly matches the initial and final correspondences seen for 'hundred'.
- xvii As a rule, the reflexes of *glottalized initials in Atsi and Maru should either be glottalized initials (Atsi-RB and Maru-RB) or laryngealized vowels in the syllable nucleus (Atsi-CM/HT and Maru-NT). Yet no *y-* : *ʔy-* distinction is recorded in Atsi-RB or Maru-RB. However, regarding the compatibility constraints of initial consonants with laryngealized vowels in Atsi-CM, it is only stated that aspirated and laryngealized vowels do not co-occur, and in fact, though the examples are few, 'to sleep' *yup⁵⁵* CM/HT and 'house' *yum⁵¹* CM (cf. *yúm* RB) are given. Accordingly, the fact that Burling did not record *ʔy-* in Atsi is probably due to his own error (and the same is likely true for Maru). There is an extremely limited number of examples for both Atsi-CM and Atsi-HT and, perhaps by sheer chance, no examples of laryngealized vowels following *y-* are cited other than these two. This is frustrating, as the initial *y-* for these two examples (as I have already stated in NY 2016[1974], n. 24 and n. 60) may be interpreted as secondary palatalization due to the nuclear vowel *i-*: 'to sleep' PB **ʔip* > Atsi *yup⁵⁵* CM/HT; 'house' **ʔim¹* > Atsi *yum⁵⁵* HT. Thus, it is not possible to decide on the basis of these two examples alone whether there was a *y-* : *ʔy-* distinction for Atsi initials derived from PLB *-*y-*.

Note that these two words are included in the following cognate sets.

1. 'to sleep' WrB *ʔip* : Atsi *yup* CM-HT : Maru *yap* RB, *yap* NT : Lashi *yep* : Bisu *yù* : Akha *yù* : Hani *yú³¹* HT, *i³³* GHN : Lisu *yì* : Lahu *yì²* : Nyi *yì²²* : Ahi *yì⁴⁴* : Nasu *yì⁵⁵*.

(cf. 'to put to sleep' WrB *sip* : Atsi *šup⁵⁵* CM : Lisu *ši* : Lahu *í* : Nyi *šì⁵⁵*.)

2. 'house' WrB *ʔim* : Atsi *yum⁵¹* CM, *yúm* RB : Maru *yàm* RB, *yam* NT : Lashi *yem* : Bisu *yúm* : Akha *yím* ~ *nyím* : Hani *i⁵⁵* GHN : Lisu *h'í* : Lahu *yè¹* : Nyi *hæ³³* : Ahi *xè²²* : Nasu *xə³³*.

For the former, i.e. ‘to sleep’, both Matisoff and Thurgood suggest PLB *yip (JAM 1972:180, GT 1977:150) and respectively suggest its causative form ‘to put to sleep’ as PLB *ʔyip (JAM 1972:180) and *s-yip (GT 1977:150). However, in order to explain its WrB and Atsi forms, even without accepting secondary palatalization, we would need to posit PLB *ʔyip for ‘to sleep’. In addition, with regard to the PLB form of ‘to put to sleep’, the Atsi form along with the WrB, Lisu, and Nyi forms is quite clearly derived from the prefix *s-, and the PLB form in GT 1977 is correct to an extent; to explain the laryngealized vowel in Atsi *šup* CM, it is necessary to posit PLB *s-ʔip or *s-ʔyip.

Cf.

put to sleep’	B <i>sip</i> : Atsi <i>šup</i> ⁵⁵ CM
{ enter’	B <i>wâŋ</i> : Atsi <i>vaŋ</i> ⁵¹ CM, <i>vâŋ</i> RB
	cause to enter’
{ carry on back’	B <i>wân</i> ‘load’ : Atsi <i>vun</i> ⁵¹ CM, cf. Akha <i>yé</i> (Clf.) : Lisu <i>ɣə</i> ‘load’ : Lahu <i>və</i> ‘id.’ : Nyi <i>vr</i> ³³ (Clf.):
	Ahi <i>vi</i> ³ (= <i>vi</i> ²²) ‘load’ : Nasu <i>ve</i> ¹¹ (Clf.)
{ cause to carry on back’	_i <i>xun</i> ⁵¹ CM
{ wear’	B <i>wat</i> : Atsi <i>vut</i> ¹¹ CM, <i>vut</i> RB.
cause to wear’	B <i>swat</i> , cf. Lahu <i>fī</i> : Ahi <i>fi</i> ⁵⁵ .

For the latter, i.e. ‘house’, Matisoff and Thurgood respectively posit PLB *ʔyim (> WrB, Lahu) ~ *N-yim (> Akha *nyŋ*) (JAM 1979:30) and PLB *k-yim (> Lisu) ~ *yim (> ? WrB, Lahu, Akha) (GT 1977:177, 196). However, positing a PLB form for this cognate set is problematic in many points. So, to propose a proto-alternant *N-yim on the basis of the form *nyŋ* that appears only in Akha or reconstruct *k-yim by linking the WrT cognate *khyim* with the initial *h*’- of the Lisu form is methodologically dubious. Furthermore, it is questionable that no mention whatsoever is made of cognates in languages such as Nyi, Ahi, and Nasu. At present, while we lack examples that indicate any correspondence that parallels the correspondence series for the initials of the cognates for ‘house’ (WrB ʔ- : Atsi y- : Maru y- : Lashi y- : Bisu y- : Akha y- ~ ny- : Hani Ø- (zero) GHN : Lisu *h*’- : Lahu y- : Nyi *h*- : Ahi *x*- : Nasu *x*-), despite the differences in finals, we should note that the correspondence Lisu *h*’- : Nyi *h*- : Ahi *x*- : Nasu *x*- as well as the tonal correspondence is consistent with the correspondence series for ‘hundred’. I see no obstacle to positing *ʔim¹ as a PB form for ‘house’.

^{xviii} The following example represents an erroneous reconstruction of a PLB form, resulting from the lack of an WrB form as well as insufficient examination of the correspondence series:

‘to chase, drive’ Akha *ɣà* : Lisu *gà* : Lahu *ɣàʔ* : Nyi *qe*²² : Ahi *djyé*² ~ *dyé*² (= *džé*⁴⁴) AL: Nasu *g’a*²⁴.

In JAM 1972, Matisoff suggests PLB *rak (> Lahu) ~ *ŋgak (> Lisu, Nasu) but does not cite any cognates in Akha, Nyi, or Ahi. In GT 1974, Thurgood reconstructs PLB *Nrak according to the Akha, Lisu, and Lahu forms. [Editor’s note: In 1977 Thurgood posits *m-rak, remarking that the “Lahu and Akha initials show no trace of the *m- prefix” (p. 191).] The fact that both these reconstructed forms are erroneous is clear when compared with the following correspondences:

a) WrB *k*- : Akha *ɣ*- : Hani *ɣ*- HT, *k*- GHN : Lisu *g*- : Lahu *ɣ*- : Nyi *q*- : Ahi *g*-/*dž*- : Nasu *g*’- : Hsite *ŋg*- HT.

e.g.,

1. ‘to pick up’ WrB *kok* : Akha *ɣó* : Hani *ɣu*³³ HT : Lisu *gò* : Lahu *ɣóʔ* ~ *vóʔ* : Hsite *ŋgu*³¹ HT, cf. Lahu *qò*³¹ HT : Lisu *gò*³¹ HT
2. ‘to pull, drag’ Akha *ɣó* ‘to pull, spin’ : Lisu *go* : Lahu *ɣó* : Nyi *qo*³³ : ?Ahi *go*⁴⁴ : Nasu *g’o*²⁴ : Hsite *ŋgo*³³ HT
‘to suck, inhale’ Akha *ɣó* : Lahu *ɣó* : Nyi *qo*³³ : Nasu *g’o*²¹³
3. ‘pillow’ ?WrB *ʔâm* : Akha *ɣm̄* : Hani *ku*²¹ GHN : ?Lisu *gò* : Lahu *ɣé* : Ahi *gɔ*²¹.
cf. ‘gate’ Nyi *qa*³³ : Ahi *go*⁴⁴ : Nasu *g’u*³³

b) WrB *k*- : Akha *ɣ*- : Hani *ɣ*- HT, *k*- GHN : Lisu *g*- : Lahu *g*- : Nyi *q*- : Ahi *g*- : Nasu *g*- : Hsite *g*- HT

e.g.,

1. ‘crooked, bent; to return’ WrB *kok* : Akha *ɣò* : Hani *ɣu*³¹ HT, *ku*²¹ GHN : Lisu *gò* : Lahu *qòʔ* : Nyi *qu*²² : Ahi *gu*⁴⁴ : Hsit *gu*⁵⁵ HT.
2. ‘to dance, play’ WrB *kà* : Akha *ɣa* : Hani *kɔ*⁵⁵ GHN : Lisu *gwà* : Lahu *qa* : Nyi *qa*³³ : Ahi *go*⁴⁴ : Nasu *go*³²
3. ‘free, empty’ WrB *kâŋ* : Lisu *gò* : Lahu *qó* : Nyi *qo*¹¹
4. ‘to plow’ Lahu *qó* : Nyi *qo*¹¹ : Ahi *gu*²¹
5. ‘to chew’ WrB *wâ* : Akha *ɣò* : Hani *ko*³³ GHN : Lisu *gwà* : Nyi *ga*³³ : Ahi *go*²¹

Strictly speaking, there are still some problems in positing these two correspondence series, but a) and b) seem to hold provisionally. From the fact that both series are Lahu $\gamma : q = \text{Nasu } g' : g = \text{Hsite } \eta g : g$, we can consider them to be derived from a *pre-nasalized velar : *velar distinction. Therefore, we should posit only *Ngak as the PLB form for 'to chase, drive'.

Hence, there is no need to posit *k-rok (JAM 1972, 187; GT 1977, 199) for 'to pick up' (b. 1). Even following Matisoff's reconstruction method, it is enough to posit only *Nkok (> Akha, Hani, Lahu) ~ *Ngok (> Lahu HT, Lisu HT, Hsite HT) and thus this is not an example of his "prefix-preemption" (JAM 1979:24-25). In addition, he attempts to justify *-r- by including Maru *kyuk* in the cognate set for 'to pick up'. However, even if this form was cited from F.V. Clark's *A Manual of the Lawngwaw or Maru Language*, we should not add *kyuk* to this set since WrB *-ok* : Maru *-uk* does not hold (cf. Hla Pe, 'Some Cognate Words in Burmese and Other Tibeto-Burman Languages-1. Maru,' *J. Burma Res. Soc.* 53 (1970):15).