

## SINO-TIBETAN AND AUSTRO-THAI

While considering the Austro-Thai (AT) hypothesis one has to account for two groups of phenomena. First, for every language group considered we know the approximate chronological dating, counted in an independent way. The dates are as follows:

Protolanguage	Time of split (in millennia B.C.)
Para-Thai (PT) <sup>1</sup>	1–1.5
Sino-Tibetan (ST) <sup>2</sup>	3–4

---

<sup>1</sup> The PT reconstruction was made by I. Peiros and is based on three independent reconstructions: the Tai reconstruction, the Kam-Sui (KS) reconstruction and the Li (PLi) reconstruction. The Proto-Tai reconstruction is in fact a reinterpretation of the well known work of Li Fang-kuei. The KS protolanguage is reconstructed on the basis of data from six languages: Sui, Mak, Maonan, T'en, Kam and Mulao; the comparative KS dictionary includes about 800 roots. The reconstruction of Proto-Li is based on the data of a new Chinese monograph on Li dialects and some mimeographed Chinese publications of the 60's. On the whole we have descriptions of 12 dialects divided into five dialect groups. The Li comparative dictionary includes about 600 roots. After the reconstruction of protosystems for these three subgroups, to which the data of Ong-Be (OB) (M. Hashimoto's dictionary) and Lakkja languages had been added, it became possible to give a detailed reconstruction of PT. The PT dictionary includes about 350 etymologies. All the work done on the PT reconstruction has not yet been published (because of polygraphic difficulties).

<sup>2</sup> The ST reconstruction used in this paper has been made by both authors on the basis of five selected ST languages: Old Chinese (a new variant of the OC reconstruction has been developed by S. Starostin and the monograph on it is now in print), Tibetan, Burmese (including the data of the Lolo-Burmese (LB) reconstruction by I. Peiros), Kachin and Lushai (R. Shafer's reconstruction of Kuki-Chin has also been used). A detailed comparison of these languages has made possible to compile a preliminary variant of the ST comparative dictionary



evidence relating MY to AT does not seem to be reliable enough. However, this question will stay unsolved until we have obtained a phonetic reconstruction of MY based on a sufficient number of lexical comparisons within MY itself.

In this paper we will deal specifically with the relations between AT and ST languages. P. Benedict put forward a hypothesis that ST languages, and especially Chinese, had been subject to a strong influence from AT.

Let us consider different types of lexical comparisons available between ST and the two branches of AT languages.

I. PT – ST (including Chinese).

A single root is known:

1. ST *\*ŋān(-s)* / *\*ŋāŋ(-s)* ‘goose’ > OC 鴈 *\*ŋrān-s* ‘wild goose’, Tib. *ŋaŋ* ‘goose’, Brm. *ŋanh* ‘goose’, Kach. *ŋan* ‘the white-headed bungarus’.

PT: Tai *\*hān<sup>B</sup>*, KS *\*ŋān<sup>B</sup>*, PLi *\*ŋān<sup>2</sup>* ‘goose’. The initial correspondence is irregular, the Tai form pointing to *\*hŋ-* or the like, and the KS and PLi forms – to *\*ŋ*.

The mentioned irregularity points to a possibility of independent borrowing into separate groups of PT. (Cf. also the hypothesis of the Indo-European origin of the Sino-Tibetan root).

II. PT – ST (without Chinese).

No examples available.

III. PT – OC (without related forms in other ST languages). A single root is known:

2. OC 雞 *\*kē*, MC *kiej* ‘fowl’.

PT: Tai *\*kai<sup>B</sup>*, KS *\*kāi<sup>B</sup>*, PLi *\*khai<sup>1</sup>*, OB *kai<sup>4</sup>*, Lk. *kai<sup>5</sup>* ‘fowl’.

The PT forms are most close to MC (cf. especially the forms in Southern Chinese dialects like Meixian *kai<sup>1</sup>*, Chaozhou *koi<sup>1</sup>*). This and irregular vowel length correspondences between various groups of PT may be an argument in favour of borrowing from Chinese.

IV. AN (without PT) – ST (including Chinese).

There are many roots of this type. We shall adduce some of the most characteristic ones:

3. ST *\*(r-)qhō* ‘to steal’ > OC 寇 *\*khō-s* ‘to rob’, Tib. *rku*, LB *\*khəwx* > Brm. *khəw*, Lush. *ru*, Kach. *ləgu<sup>3</sup>*.

AN *\*takaw* ‘to steal’.

4. ST *\*ć(h)ok* ‘be enough, sufficient’ > OC 足 *\*ćok*, Tib. *ćhog*.

AN *\*k’ukup* ‘enough’.

5. ST *\*duk* > OC 塾 *\*duk* ‘gate-room’, Brm. *təuk* ‘house, building made of bricks’ (possibly also Kach. *sədek<sup>1</sup>* ‘a depository’).

AN *\*puṇḍuk* ‘hut’.

6. ST \*(p-)rōp > OC 乏 \*b-rap ‘to lack, exhaust’, Tib. *spribs, sbrebs* (resp.) ‘be hungry’, Lush. *rōp* ‘to have a strong desire or craving for animal food’.

AN \*lapay ‘hungry’.

7. ST \*(s-)nōk / \*(s-)nōŋ ‘pus’ > OC 膿 \*nūŋ, Tib. *rnag, snag*.

AN \*nanah (\*nanaq<sub>1</sub> [Dahl 1981]) ‘pus’.

8. ST \*ń/ī/m ‘think’ > OC 念 \*nīm-s ‘think of’, Tib. *ńam* ‘soul, mind’, *sńam* ‘to think, suppose’.

AN \*canən ‘think’.

9. ST \*phria-s ‘rice’ > OC 粳 \*bhrē-s ‘fine rice’, Tib. *ābras*.

AN \*bəyat ‘rice’.

V. AN – ST (without Chinese).

This type of roots is also rather abundant, e. g.:

10. ST \*gur > Tib. *khur* ‘burden, load’, Brm. *kun* ‘load’, Kach. *magun* ‘a load, as carried on the back’.

AN \*pikul ‘carry on the back’.

11. ST \*lam ‘road’ > Tib. *lam*, Brm. *lamh*, Kach. *lam*, Lush. *lam*.

AN \*dalan / \*d’alan ([Blust 1981]: \*Zalan) ‘road’.

12. ST \*c(h)am (or \*zam) ‘bridge’ > Tib. *zam*, LB \*cam.

AN \*hed’an ([Blust 1969]: \*(ha)ReZan / \*(Sa)Rezan) ‘bridge’.

13. ST \*(s-)Pal ‘frog’ > Tib. *sbal*, LB \*spa-x, Brm. *phah*.

AN \*labi<sup>c</sup> ‘toad’.

14. ST \*k(h)wij > Tib. *skji* ‘a medical plant, potato’, Brm. *kjwijn* ‘wild yam’.

AN \*bu(η)kul ‘tuber’.

VI. AN – OC (with no correspondences in other ST languages).

There are several roots of this type. Here are some of them:

15. OC 深 \*λam ‘deep’: AN \*daləm ‘deep’.

16. OC 蜜 \*mit ‘honey’: AN \*mamit ‘sweet’.

17. OC 秃 \*thōk ‘bald’: AN \*buṭak ‘bald’.

18. OC 朋 \*bhəŋ ‘to help, friend’: AN \*kaban ‘friend’.

Into types 4 and 6 we may include rather numerous cases where PT equivalents are also available but can be explained as independent loans into PT from ST. E. g.:

19. ST \*qwār > OC 戈 \*kwā/r/ ‘dagger-axe’, Brm. *khwan* ‘a k. of axe’, Kach. *ugon* ‘chisel’.

AN \*paŋkul ‘hoe’. In PT we have \*khwān ‘axe’ which cannot be related to the AN form on phonetic grounds, and therefore must have been borrowed later from some ST source.

20. ST \*toH > OC 主 \*to? ‘master, lord’, Tib. *thu* ‘chief’, Kach. *mədu?* ‘have rule and authority over sbmd.’.

AN *\*datu<sup>c</sup>* ‘chief’. Tai *\*caw<sup>B</sup>* and LB *\*caw-x* ‘chief, prince’ are later loans from MC *ćú* (< *\*to?*).

The most difficult to interpret are cases when the root is represented in all three groups: AN, PT and ST. We may distinguish here several types of cases:

VIIa. Roots that are represented in other geographically distant linguistic families as well.

21. ST *\*tīk* > OC 蛭 *\*tīt* ‘leech’, Tib. *sdig*, Lush. *tit* ‘scorpion’.

AN *\*lima(n)/t/ək* ‘leech’.

PT: Tai *\*dāk* ‘leech’.

Cf. various ‘Nostratic’ roots: Proto-Afrasian *\*takw-* ‘bed-bug, a biting insect’, Proto-Indo-European *\*deigh-* id.

22. ST *\*kV-liH* ‘armpit; to tickle’ > Brm. *kəli?* ‘to tickle’, *gak-kəli?* ‘armpit’, Lakher *kili* ‘to tickle’, *ba-kəli* ‘armpit’.

AN *\*kili/k/* ‘armpit’.

PT: Tai *\*kəli* ‘armpit’.

Cf. similar roots in some Nostratic languages (e. g. Proto-Samodian *\*kāl(V)n* ‘armpit’) and Yeniseian (PY *\*qol-* ‘armpit’) etc.

VIIb. ‘Areal’ roots, i. e. roots represented in several linguistic families of Eastern and South-Eastern Asia.

23. OC 弩 *\*nā?* ‘bow’.

AN *\*panah* ([Blust 1981] — *\*panaq*), PT *\*hna<sup>c</sup>*.

The root is known also in Austro-Asiatic (AA) languages.

24. ST *\*na* > 沔 OC *\*na* ‘marsh’, Tib. *na* ‘meadow’, Kach. *na<sup>3</sup>* ‘lowland, field’.

AN *\*bəna<sup>c</sup>* ‘lowland’, PT *\*hna* / *\*na* (the tone is not clear) ‘field’.

Like the preceding root, this one is also represented in AA.

25. ST *\*pōŋ* > OC 舫 *\*pāŋ-s* ‘raft’, Brm. *phauŋ* ‘a float, a raft’, Kach. *phoŋ* id.

AN *\*qabaŋ* [Blust 1973] ‘boat’, PT: Tai *\*?baŋ* ‘cl. for boats’.

This root can also be found in Mon-Khmer.

VIIc. Roots represented only in AT and ST.

26. ST *\*r/ulam* > Brm. *rwamh* ‘ripe’, Lush. *hram* ‘be high, tall, rank’, Kach. *ram* ‘to reach the age of puberty’.

AN *\*pə!/əm* ‘to ripen fruit artificially’; PT: Tai *\*?bom* / *\*?bum* id.

27. ST *\*luH* ‘head’ > OC 首 *\*s-lu?*, Lush. *lu*.

AN *\*?ulu* ([Blust 1981] — *\*qulu*, [Dahl 1981] — *\*quluH<sub>1</sub>*) ‘head’; PT *\*kl/a/u<sup>c</sup>* id.

28. ST *\*dān* / *\*dōŋ* > OC 吞 *\*thān* ‘to swallow’, Tib. *āthuŋ* ‘to drink’, LB *\*taŋ* ‘give drink’, Lush. *dōn* ‘drink’.

AN \*/t/alan 'to drink, swallow', PT \*ʔd/ial/n<sup>c</sup> id.

29. ST \*nūH / \*nūK 'brain' > OC 腦 \*nū? (or \*nāw?), Brm. *uhhnauk*, Kach. *nu?*<sup>1</sup>.

AN \*unəg 'marrow', PT \*noi (or \*noi) id.

30. ST \*suH (or \*zuH) 'to wash' > OC 糴 \*su? 'wash', 澆 \*sru? 'moisten, wash, soak', Lush. *su* 'wash' (as clothes, head).

AN \*bat'uh 'to wash', PT \*zāu 'to rinse' (the tone is not clear).

31. ST \*k<sup>w</sup>rāt 'to scratch' > OC 刮 \*k<sup>w</sup>rāt, Tib. *bgrad*.

AN \*ka//ud 'to scratch', PT \*grūt id.

32. OC 介 \*krēt-s 'armour, scales'.

AN \*kulit 'skin', PT \*kl/elt 'scales'.

In examples 31 and 32 the PT forms may turn out to be old loans from Chinese. № 26 is a clear case of a borrowing in ST from the AN protolanguage (the AN root has a reliable AT etymology). The rest of the cases in group VIIc may be explained in the same way. In that case all the examples of group VIIc may in fact belong to groups 4 and 6 (which include numerous cases of contacts between AN and ST). If a root of this type has a PT correlate, it can only mean that this AN root has an AT etymology.

The data considered in this paper allow for the following interpretation. The ST protolanguage during the period before its split had been in contact with one of the branches of the AT phylum — the AN protolanguage. These contacts also persisted for some time after the splitting of these protolanguages, which should account for a considerable number of AN-OC parallels. The process of borrowing was not unilateral, and loanwords could penetrate into both families. The direction of the borrowing requires a special investigation in each case. There were no contacts between the ST and PT protolanguages. Only on the verge of the Christian era separate branches of the PT family got into the sphere of Chinese influence. Still later certain scarce loanwords from PT languages appeared in Chinese, Burmese and other ST languages.