CHAPTER TWO

OVERVIEW OF SINO-TIBETAN MORPHOSYNTAX

Randy J. LaPolla

1 SINO-TIBETAN

At the earliest reconstructable stage of the development of the Sino-Tibetan (ST) language family, possibly as much as eight thousand years ago (Thurgood 1994), the proto-language was monosyllabic. Matisoff (1991a: 490) reconstructs the syllable canon as $*(P)$ (P) C_i (G) V (:) (C_f) (s).[1] It is not clear whether the prefixes in some or all cases entailed a vocalic element. If so, the structure might have been sesquisyllabic (e.g. as in the name *tɤrùng* 'T'rung/Dulong', the vocalic element of the *tɤ-* prefix is very slight).

There was no relational morphology (LaPolla 1990, 1992a,b, 1993b, 1994b, 1995a,b), but there was derivational morphology in the form of prefixes, suffixes, and voicing alternations of the initial consonants (Wolfenden 1929; Benedict 1972; Pulleyblank 1962–3, 1972, 1973a,b, 1977–8, 1991, 2000; Bodman 1980; Mei 1980, 1988, 1989; LaPolla 1994c; Gong 2000). Following are examples of several types of derivational morphology.[2]

1.1 **s-* prefix

The **s-* prefix in most cases had a causativizing, denominative, or 'intensive' (change of state) function (Wolfenden 1929; Pulleyblank 1973a, 2000; Bodman 1980; Mei 1989). Mei (1989) argues all of these functions are manifestations of a more general directive function. For example, Old Chinese (OC) **mjang* (亡) 'be gone' : **smangs* (喪) 'to lose'; OC **mɤk* (墨) 'ink': **smɤk* (黑) 'black': Written Tibetan (WT) *smag* 'dark'; OC **C-rjɤs* (吏) 'clerk', 'minor official' : **srjɤʔ* (使) 'to cause (someone to be an emissary)', to send'; **tjuʔ* (帚) 'broom' : **stuʔ* (掃) 'to sweep'; **ljek* (易) 'to exchange' **sljeks* (賜) 'to give', 'gift'; WT: *grib* 'shade', 'shadow' : *sgrib-pa* 'to shade, to darken'; *gril* 'a roll' : *sgril-ba* 'to roll together', 'to form into a roll'.

1.2 **Voicing alternation

In both OC and Tibeto-Burman (TB), we find pairs of cognate lexical items which differ phonetically only in terms of the voicing or aspiration of the initial, and differ semantically in terms of transitivity, where the item with the voiced initial is intransitive, and the item with the voiceless initial is transitive. Benedict (1972: 124) discussed this for TB, but argued that in Chinese no consistent pattern of morphological alternation could be recognized. Most scholars now would see the Chinese forms as parallel to the TB forms, and part of a cognate phenomenon. Pulleyblank (1973a, 2000) argues these variant forms should be the result of an intransitivizing prefix **ă-* (a non-syllabic pharyngeal glide) which voiced the initial of the original transitive roots. Mei (1989) includes this prefix in a paradigm with the **s-* directive prefix and the **-s* direction of action changing suffix (below).[3] Both Pulleyblank and Mei base the idea for the prefix mainly on the Written Tibetan *a-chung* ('small a') prefix (here marked with an apostrophe). Pulleyblank also equates this prefix with the *a-* nominalizing prefix found in Burmese. Baxter (1992) adopts this view in reconstructing Chinese forms, and uses **fi-* for the form of the prefix,[4] e.g. **kens* (見) 'see' : **fikens* (> **gens*) (現) 'appear/be visible'. While this analysis is attractive from a systemic point of view, Benedict (*ibid*) points out that the prefixing and the voicing alternation in Tibetan are two different phenomena that interact in the specialization of different forms as 'present', 'perfect', 'future' and 'imperative', such that the present and future forms have the voiced initial and are intransitive or durative, while the perfect and imperative forms have the voiceless initial and are transitive or active. As an example, for the verb 'put off, pull off, take off', we have present *'bud-pa* and future *dbud*, which derive from an intransitive stem **bud*, and perfect and imperative *phud*, which derives from a transitive stem **pud*. Evidence that it is not the *a-chung* prefix that is involved in the contrast in Tibetan is the fact that in many cases both forms of a pair of contrasting forms have the prefix, e.g. Tibetan *'gril-ba* 'to be twisted or wrapped round' ; *'khril-ba* 'wind or coil round, embrace'. Bodman (1980: 54) also mentions that he did not find any Tibetan-Chinese cognates where prefixation or lack of it in Tibetan corresponds with the voicing distinction in Chinese. We also find the voicing alternation in TB languages independent of prefixation, e.g. **kh(r)jok* (曲) 'bend', 'bent' : **fikh(r)jok* (**g(r)jok*) (局) 'compressed', 'bent', 'curved (body)' :: Bahing *kuk* 'make bent' : *guk* 'to be bent' (TB **kuk ~ *guk;* Benedict 1972: 125). Pulleyblank's association of the voicing distinction in Chinese with the *a-* prefix in Burmese is also problematic, as the latter is a nominalizer, not an intransitivizer, and is independent of the voicing distinction, e.g. Burmese *phai* 'break off a small piece from a larger', 'crumble' : *pai* 'to be broken off', 'chipped'; (cf. also Qiang *ɦe-phe* 'tear (clothes)' : *de-pe* 'be torn'; TB **pe ~ *be;* Benedict 1972: 59) (:: OC **phajs* (破) 'to break' : **pajʔ* (跛) 'lame'). Other examples: OC **prats* (敗) 'to defeat' : **fiprats (*brats)* (敗) 'to be defeated'; **krujs* (壞) 'to destroy', 'ruin' : **fikrujs (*grujs)* (壞) 'to be ruined'; **trjangʔ* (長) 'grow tall', 'increase'; 'elder' : **fitrjang (*drjang)* (長) 'long'; Bodo *beŋ* 'to be straight' : *pheŋ* 'to make

---

1 P = prefix, C_i = initial consonant, G = glide, : = vowel length, C_f = final consonant, s = suffixal **-s*; parentheses mark that the item does not appear in all syllables.

2 This list is probably not exhaustive, and the necessarily brief discussion glosses over many controversies and details. As is always the case in attempting to find Sino-Tibetan correspondences, the lack of a single standard for the reconstruction of Old Chinese (ideally based mainly on the comparative method) makes comparative work difficult and more conjectural than would otherwise be the case. What constitutes a cognate set using one reconstruction system might not be seen as cognate using another system. I have here used the system of Baxter 1992, as this is the best system I have found to date, though even this system is in flux (see Baxter 1995; Baxter and Sargart 1998 for discussion of some of the recent changes).

3 In a slightly earlier paper, Mei (1988) argues for reconstructing a voiced initial rather than a prefix.

4 Baxter (1992: 221; following Chang and Chang 1976, 1977) also associates his **N-* prefix (posited to account for characters with phonetic elements that appear in syllables with both stop and homorganic nasal initials) with Tibetan *a-chung*. Gong (2000; also following Chang and Chang 1976, 1977) associates Tibetan *a-chung* with a nasal prefix, but uses it to explain the development of Middle Chinese **d-*, items that Baxter now reconstructs with **ml-* clusters (e.g. Gong: **N-ljɤk* (食), Baxter **mljɤk* (see Matisoff 1995, footnote 1; originally **Ljɨk* in Baxter 1992).

straight' (TB *bleŋ ~ *pleŋ; OC *breŋ (平) 'level'?). It seems there were intransitivizing (and nominalizing) prefixes in PTB and possibly STC, but these are represented by WT *m*- (e.g. *mkho-ba* 'desirable', 'to be wished for' : *'kho-ba* 'to wish, to want'; Wolfenden 1929: 27 – notice the *a-chung* in the active form), and possibly *b*- and/or *g*-, e.g. T'rung *rut* 'to tear down (a house)' : *brut* 'to collapse (of a house)'; *la* 'to throw (down)' : *glà* 'to fall (down)' (there is also a separate intransitivizing/stativizing *ə*- prefix in T'rung as well: *tāl* 'roll (vt)' > *ətāl* 'roll (vi)' (LaPolla 1995c; see also LaPolla 2000a)). These are independent of the voicing alternation.

Quite a few scholars have assumed that the *s*- causative prefix was responsible for all of the voicing distinctions now found in the family (e.g. Dai 2001), but, while this is true for some languages, particularly within Lolo-Burmese, the examples given in the discussion of this and the previous section show that the two are separate phenomena.

1.3 *-t suffix[5]

The *-t suffix most often has the function of transitivizing an intransitive verb, as in WT *fibye-ba* 'open', 'separate' (vi) : *fibyed-pa* 'open', 'separate' (vt), Rawang *ŋū* 'weep' : *ŋut* 'mourn', 'cry for someone (vt)', but in some cases seems to nominalize intransitive verbs, as in WT *ŋu-mo* 'weep' : *ŋud-mo* 'a sob' (see also Benedict 1991), and in still other cases seems not to have had any affect on the valency, e.g. WT *gči-ba*, *gčid* 'to urinate'; *bka* 'word', 'speech', *skad* 'speech' (for other examples and discussion, see Benedict 1972: 98–102; Dai and Xu 1992; Michailovsky 1985; van Driem 1988; Jin 1998a). In Chinese we find pairs of related forms that differ only in the final consonant, but no clear derivational pattern can be determined, e.g. *nji (尼) 'near', 'close' : *njit (昵) 'intimate', 'familiar'; 'glue' (from Pulleyblank 1972: 11; this set is cognate with WT *nye* 'near', *nyen* 'relative').

1.4 *-n suffix

The *-n suffix generally had a nominalizing function, e.g. WT *rku* 'steal': *rkun-po* 'thief'; *nye* 'near', *nyen* 'relative', but in some cases seems to have had a collective sense (Benedict 1972: 99ff), e.g. Proto-Tibeto-Burman (PTB) *r-mi* 'person' : OC *mjin (民) 'the people'. Pulleyblank (1991, 2000) also suggests that Proto-Sino-Tibetan (PST) had a morphological *-n suffix (as well as a *-t suffix), which could explain the correspondences among pairs such as *ŋja (語) 'speak' ~ *ŋjan (言) 'say'; 'word' (see also Jin 1998a for more examples). Following Graham (1983), Pulleyblank argues that the *-n suffix marks a durative or continuative aspect, and *-t marks a punctual or perfective aspect. Norman (1988: 86) argues that the forms *njan (然) and *w(r)jan (焉) are fusions of *nja (如) and *w(r)ja (于) and an *n- initial pronoun, possibly *njəjʔ (爾) or *njak (若). While a demonstrative may have been the ultimate origin of the *-n suffix, it seems this *-n could have been a more general suffix, and not the result of a chance fusion of isolated lexical items. Especially when we see the patterns of variants, it is hard not to assume there was some systematicity to it, e.g. *nja (如) 'like' : *njan (然) 'like this' : *njak (若) 'like'; 'that'. There is also *ʔa

(烏) : *ʔan (安) both 'interrogative pronoun' ('where'), and possibly *ʔak (惡) 'interrogative pronoun'.[6]

This is not to say there were no fusions. Some variation within word families may be due to a coalescence of two forms, as suggested for Tibetan by Walter Simon (1941, 1942, 1957). Simon's idea was that many of the finals in Tibetan, such as -g, -n, -l, -r, -s were from the coalescence of two syllables, the second of which originally also had lexical content, such as -s < sa/so 'place'. We find synchronic variation in Tibetan that points to this kind of development, such as *da-ra ~ dar-ba* 'type of buttermilk', *ža-la ~ žal* 'clay', *bu-ga ~ bug* 'hole', *lco-ga ~ lcog* 'lark', *nya-ga ~ nyag* 'steelyard', and *yi-ge ~ yig* 'letter'. Norman (1988: 85ff.) gives the following as examples of fusion words in OC: *tjə (諸) from *tjə ʔja (之於) '3rd person object pronoun' + adposition 'in', 'at', 'to'; *njəʔ (耳) from *njə ljəʔ (而已) 'linking particle' + 'end'; *lja (歟) from *le hwa (也呼) 'sentence final particle' + 'question particle'; *gap (盍) 'negative question ("why not") particle' from *gaj pə (何不) 'question word' + 'negative particle'.

1.5 *-s suffix

The *-s suffix generally had a nominalizing function (Pulleyblank 1973b; Mei 1980, 1989), where the derived noun is the patient of the action represented by the verb, but also had a function that Mei (1980, 1989) and Schuessler (1985) have characterized as 'change of direction' or 'inversion of attention flow' respectively. Mei (1980) suggests these two functions derive from two different homophonous suffixes, which he equates with the Tibetan nominalizing and ablative suffixes respectively. In Modern Chinese this suffix is now reflected in the 'departing' tone. In some cases, the addition of the suffix resulted in the creation of a new Chinese character, but in many cases there are simply two pronunciations for the same character. For example OC *C-rjang (量) 'measure': *C-rjangs 'an amount' :: WT *grang-ba* 'to number', 'to count' : *grangs* 'a number'; OC *tjək (織) 'weave' : *tjəks 'thing woven' :: WT *thag-pa* 'to weave' : *thags* 'texture', 'web'; OC *nup (納) 'bring in' : *nups (內) 'inside'; *mreʔ (買) 'buy' : *mres (賣) 'sell'; *djuʔ (受) 'to receive' : *djus (授) 'to give'.

1.6 *-j suffix

Matisoff (1989, 1995) discusses etyma that show palatal-final and non-palatal-final variants, and posits three different sources for variants with morphological differences: PST *s-way ⋇ *s-yay 'go'; 'motion away', for transitive motion/motion away from the deictic centre or emergent quality in stative verbs; PST *ya (⋇ *za ⋇ *tsa ⋇ *dza) 'child', 'son' for a diminutive or affective sense; and PST *way ⋇ *ray for nominalization, subordination, or other grammatical functions. The clearest examples are in the system of pronouns, where for the first person pronoun we get PTB *ŋa : ŋaj :: OC *ŋa (吾) : *ŋaj (我).

---

6 The usual reading of this last character when used as an interrogative pronoun is *ʔa, but it is written using a character that is in other contexts pronounced *ʔak. If it is the same pronunciation as the one otherwise written (烏), it seems odd to use a character that normally is read with a stop final.

1.7 *-ʔ suffix

Chinese seems to have had a glottal stop suffix which developed into the rising tone category, e.g. *trjang (張) 'to make long', 'stretch' : *trjangʔ(長) 'grow tall', 'increase'; 'elder'; *wək (或) 'someone' : *wjəkʔ (有) 'there is'; *kak (各) 'each' : *k(r/j)akʔ (舉) 'all'. In these last two examples I am assuming that the suffix caused the loss of the root final consonant, just as is assumed to have happened with the *-s suffix (Baxter 1992: 323ff.; cf. also Bodman 1980: 132), but this assumption is not widely accepted. An alternative possibility, discussed immediately below, is that there was a *-k suffix. Glottalized forms do appear in some TB languages (e.g. rGyalrong, T'rung), but it is not clear that there is any relation between the forms in these languages and those in Chinese.

1.8 *-k suffix

There may have been a *-k suffix as well, as we find a large number of lexical items in both TB and Chinese that have open final and *-k final variants, e.g. TB *yu(w) : *yuk 'descend' (Benedict 1972: 101); OC *m(r)ja (無) 'there is not' : *mak (莫) 'no one'; *djuj (誰) 'who' : *djuk (孰) 'which one'. This possibility was suggested by Pulleyblank (1972: 13, 1973a: 122) as an explanation for some of the pairs given above as examples of the glottal stop suffix: *wjəʔ (有) 'there is' : *wək (或) 'someone'; *k(r/j)aʔ (舉) 'all'; 'lift' : *kak (各) 'each'. Pulleyblank only discusses this in relation to pronominal forms, and says the suffix marks a distributive sense. There is also the set *nja (如) 'like' : *njak (若) 'like'; 'that' mentioned above. As the largest number of variants involve the difference between an open final and a *-k final (63 out of 99 rhymes in the Book of Poetry where the finals differed, as marked in Wang 1980; see LaPolla 1994c for discussion), it may be that there is more than one explanation; some velar stop finals may have dropped due to the influence of the glottal stop suffix, and some may have been the result of a *-k formative suffix (see also Jin 1998b).[7] If PST had a particle similar to Tibetan -ga, which Das (1902: 203) says 'is sometimes used as an affixed particle of a word to complete it', then this would be at least one explanation for the large number of *-Ø ~ *-k variants.

It has long been known that within Sino-Tibetan we must deal with word families rather than isolated words (Karlgren 1933, 1956; Wolfenden 1936, 1937, 1939). Given what we now know about these derivational processes, we can see clearly how the word families are created. These forms seem to have formed paradigms (sets of choices), but of derivational possibilities rather than inflectional possibilities. Following are two examples (from Baxter 1992: 317 and 324 respectively; see also Mei 1989): *kat (割) 'to injure', 'to harm' (vt) : *ɦkat (*gat) (害) 'to suffer harm or injury' (vi) : ɦkats (*gats) (害) 'harm', 'injury' (n); *trjang (張) 'to make long', 'stretch' (vt) : *trjangʔ (長) 'grow tall', 'increase'; 'elder' (intransitive active verb) : *ɦtrjang (*drjang) (長) 'long' (stative verb).

Aside from the suffixes mentioned above, Mei Tsu-lin (personal communication, November 1994) has suggested some of the frequent variations found in Chinese between homorganic stop and nasal final might be due to Chinese having had suffixes similar to WT -ma and -pa (which have both gender marking and formative functions). The nasal-initial suffix would cause a final stop to nasalize, while the stop-initial suffix would denasalize a final nasal.

---

7 Our answer to this question will affect our understanding of certain word families. For example, Pulleyblank (1991: 30) suggests that *k(r/j)aʔ (舉) 'all'; 'lift' as an allofam *kjat (揭) 'lift' (and so the latter would involve a *-t suffix). This set would stand only if we assume the root did not originally have a *-k final.

We see this sort of development with the diminutive in some dialects of Chinese, where the diminutive suffix reduces to a nasal element (e.g. in Wenzhou, and some areas of Anhui, Zhejiang, Guangxi, and Guangdong), and in some cases nasalizes final stops, e.g. in Xinyi of Guangdong, the nasal suffix -n causes final -p, -t, and -k to become -m, -n, and -ŋ respectively, as in ap^{33} 'duck' > am^{35} 'duckling'. Certainly the use of reflexes of PTB *pa (and to a lesser extent *ma) as a gender marker and as a nominalizer (usually producing an agentive noun) is widespread throughout TB, though there is the possibility that many of these were independent parallel developments, such as in the case of the frequent development of diminutives from a word meaning 'son' or 'child' (Matisoff 1995), and of causatives from a word meaning 'make', 'cause', or 'send' (LaPolla 1994b). In Chinese the form *p(r)ja(ʔ) (夫/父/甫) was used as an extra-syllabic suffix for creating agentive nouns, just as in TB (e.g. *din p(r)ja (田夫) 'farmer'), and this may be the cognate of PTB *-pa.

In terms of clausal morphology, there may have been a clause-final question particle *la, as there is evidence for such a particle in several languages across the family: OC *lja (歟), Newar lā, Burmese lâ, Meithei la (Matisoff 1995: 73–4). As mentioned above, though, the Chinese form has been said to be a fusion form, from *le hwa (也呼) (Norman 1988: 95).

Unmarked clausal negation in PST took the form of a preverbal particle *ma-. For PTB we can also reconstruct a prohibitive (negative imperative) particle *ta- (see ex. (1) below for a Lahu example), but this is not found in Chinese. Chinese instead had two negative imperative particles *mja (毋), which was homophonous with the unmarked negator but written with a different character, and *mjət (or *mjut) (勿), which is often assumed to be due to fusion of the negative *mja with another particle (assumed to be the demonstrative pronoun *tjə (之)).[8]

Most languages in the family have not grammaticalized grammatical relations, but many have grammaticalized semantic marking.[9] For detailed arguments against the existence of syntactic functions in particular Sino-Tibetan languages, see Andersen 1987 (Classical Tibetan), Bhat 1991 (Manipuri), and LaPolla 1990, 1993b (Chinese). See also the discussions of Lisu in Hope 1973, 1974 and Mallison and Blake 1981. Benedict (1972: 95ff) also expressed the view that relational morphology was not part of the grammatical system of PTB. A corollary of the fact that very few languages have grammaticalized grammatical relations is that there are few true passive constructions in the family. As the order of NPs is generally determined by pragmatic factors, variations of word order can affect the interpretation of utterances in a way similar to the effect of passives.

Classifiers were not part of PST, but evolved individually in quite a few of the languages in the family (see for example Xu 1987, 1990; Dai 1994, 1997a,b for prosodic reasons for some languages developing classifiers, and some not). There was no definite marking in PST, and only a few languages in TB, such as Qiang (see LaPolla forthcoming) have developed something that can be considered as definite marking (in the case of Qiang, the marking seems to have developed from demonstratives). Several languages that have developed

---

8 One might conjecture that the mysterious *-t final of the OC negative imperative *mjət is actually the prohibitive *ta, but we do not find *ma- and *ta- occurring together in TB.

9 By grammatical relations is meant the grammatical singling out of a particular NP (the 'pivot' of a construction) for special grammatical treatment in a construction, such that a restricted neutralization of semantic roles occurs (has conventionalized/grammaticalized) in that position in the construction for the purpose of aiding referent identification. See Van Valin and LaPolla 1997, Chapter 6, for the concept of pivot and its relation to grammatical relations. See Dixon 1995, Chapter 2, and also Hale and Watters 1973 on semantic marking vs grammatical marking.

classifiers, both in TB and among Chinese dialects, have developed a use of the classifiers that resembles definite or specific marking. This generally involves use of the classifier without a numeral, e.g. Rawang *lègā tiq bok* [book one CL] 'one book', *lègā bok* 'the book', Cantonese *yat⁵⁵ ga³³ che⁵⁵* [one CL vehicle] 'one car', *ga³³ che⁵⁵* (roughly) 'the car'. This feature is an areal feature of part of Southeast Asia (Baron 1973).

In terms of word order, all ST languages have GENITIVE-HEAD order and MODIFIER-MODIFIED order in N-N structures (the former is actually a subcase of the latter in PST). All ST languages have RELATIVE-NOUN order (Karen also has a less productive post-nominal relative clause – Solnit 1997: 249ff). Originally there were no nominalizers or relative markers in relative clauses, but various languages have developed one or the other since that time. In cases where the relative clause is nominalized, this construction then is also a subcase of the N-N modifier-modified construction. It seems the original position of attributes was after the head, but in many languages (e.g. Burmese), the attribute can be nominalized and appear before the head. This then becomes another subcase of the N-N modifier-modified construction. The overwhelming majority of ST languages have NEGATIVE-VERB order, and where there is a deviation from this, the pattern is either due to reinforcement of the original negative, as in Karen, or due to the grammaticalization of a post-main-verb negative verb out of a negative-auxiliary verb combination. We can therefore assume MODIFIER-MODIFIED order in N-N structures, and GENITIVE-HEAD, HEAD-ATTRIBUTE, NEGATIVE-VERB, and RELATIVE-NOUN word order patterns for PST. At present, the Sinitic languages (Chinese dialects), the Karen languages, and Bai have an unmarked post-verbal focus position (rather than an immediately preverbal unmarked focus position as in the other languages), and so the patient argument often appears in post-verbal position in the clause. From the fact that we can clearly see changes in the word order of these three languages over time, and cannot see such changes in the Tibeto-Burman languages other than Bai and Karen, we assume that it was Bai, Karen, and Chinese that changed rather than all the other Tibeto-Burman languages. As argued in LaPolla 1993a, these three languages show a remarkable similarity in the particular patterns they developed. In Old Chinese, verb-medial order (which implies a post-verbal position for unmarked focus) was the unmarked word order, but there was a marked verb-final word order pattern used for contrastive focus that seems to be due to an earlier preverbal focus position. In Karen and Bai, we have the same situation as in Old Chinese in terms of the major constituents: unmarked verb-medial order, but NP-NP-V as a marked word order possibility. What is significant is that the conditions on the use of the marked word order pattern in Bai are almost exactly the same as those of Old Chinese: it is used when the second NP is a contrastive pronoun or when the sentence is negative or a question (Xu and Zhao 1984). Also interesting about the use of the different word order patterns in Bai is the fact that the older people prefer the verb-final order, whereas the younger and more Sinicized people prefer the verb-medial order (ibid.). This would seem to point to the change in word order as being relatively recent. Karen (Solnit 1997; this volume) has some similar word order patterns, with genitives and nominal modifiers coming before the noun, and number and classifier follow the noun, while adjectival and verbal modifiers (i.e. relative clauses) can follow the head. Karen does not appear to have a preverbal focus position; from the data in Solnit 1997, it seems that focus position is sentence-final as in Modern Chinese. In terms of phrase-internal order, Karen is very similar to Old Chinese, differing mainly in terms of having HEAD-ATTRIBUTE order as the unmarked word order, as opposed to Chinese, which has it only as a marked order. Karen and Bai differ from most of the rest of the Tibeto-Burman languages mainly in terms of the position of the NP representing the undergoer referent and in terms of having prepositions. Based on the relative frequency of patterns and patterns of change witnessed in some languages, we can assume PST also had the

following word order patterns: DEMONSTRATIVE-HEAD, HEAD-NUMBER, NOUN-ADPOSITION, and STANDARD-(MARKER)-ADJECTIVE (see LaPolla 1993a, 1994a; also Dryer, this volume).

2 CHINESE

In Chinese, there was a gradual loss of productivity of the derivational morphology sometime around the formation of the characters (roughly 3500 years ago), and the language became more isolating. A gradual change occurred in the word order and information structure pattern to verb-medial word order and post-verbal focus position (LaPolla 1993a). There has been no grammaticalization of grammatical relations; the basic structure of the clause is topic-comment rather than subject-predicate (Chao 1955, 1959, 1968; Lyu 1979; LaPolla 1990, 1993b). Information structure is the chief determinant of word order in Chinese (LaPolla 1995d). The prepositions now found in the language all derive transparently from verbs. In the past there was an assumption among Chinese linguists that the grammar of all the dialects is roughly the same, and so until recently little serious work was done on the grammar of the dialects. With the work by Anne Yue-Hashimoto (1993, this volume), Huang Borong (1996), and Chappell (2001), serious investigation of the grammar of the dialects has begun, but much more needs to be done to understand the differences between the dialects, particularly in more difficult-to-understand areas such as information structure and its relation to grammatical structure. As Yue (this volume) and Ho (this volume) give us an overview of modern dialect grammar, I will not say more about this, and devote the rest of this chapter to the Tibeto-Burman languages.

3 TIBETO-BURMAN

After the split-up of Sino-Tibetan into Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman, there were a number of developments in the realm of grammar, some of which have areal coverage, some of which are subgroup specific. I will first discuss the different groups and some of their characteristics, and then some more general morphosyntactic phenomena.

3.1 Language groups

Based on morphological paradigms and migration history (LaPolla 2000b, 2001), I divide TB into the following groups:[10]

The Bodic group: Tibetan and the other languages, such as Tamang, Gurung, Lepcha, Dzongka, and Newar (Newari), derived from the original migrations west into Tibet and then later migrations south down into Nepal, India/Sikkim, and Bhutan; in terms of morphology, this group is characterized by an *-s ablative/ergative suffix on nouns (see LaPolla 1995a). Non-classificational morphological features include development of a conjunct-disjunct system in some languages (see for example Hale and Watters 1973: 207ff. on Jirel, Newar, and Sherpa; Hale 1980 on Newar), and a lack of a bound pronominal person marking system or reflexive/middle marking.

---

10 These groupings are not definitive, as much more work needs to be done on comparing the morphology (rather than random samples of words) to prove genetic relatedness (see LaPolla 2000b for arguments). For earlier hypotheses on the genetic groupings, see Benedict 1972; Burling 1983; Dai *et al*. 1989; DeLancey 1987; Matisoff 1990, 1991a; Shafer 1955; Sun 1988; Thurgood 1984, 1985; Bradley 1997.

The Qiangic group: Qiang, Pumi, Shixing, Ergong, Daofu, Queyu, Guiqiong, Muya, Namuyi, Zhaba, and possibly a few others, the speakers of which migrated only a short distance from the original ST homeland in Northwest China (these languages are now spoken in Sichuan and Yunnan Provinces, China). Languages of this group characteristically have a set of 5–10 directional prefixes on the verb, marking action up, down, up-river, down-river, inward, outward, towards the speaker, away from the speaker, and sometimes towards the mountain, away from the mountain, although the actual forms of the systems in different languages do not all correspond in any clear way (see Sun 1981; Huang Butan 1991). They have cognate person marking systems which often have an actor–non-actor contrast (as opposed to a hierarchical system as in many other TB languages). The exception would be Tangut, if this language is in fact to be included in the Qiangic group (Sun 1991, 2001), as the very simple person marking system there is clearly hierarchical (see Ebert 1987; LaPolla 1992a). It may be that the Qiangic system was originally hierarchical and later developed into an actor/non-actor system, as it seems this system may be related at a very deep time depth to the system of the Rung group (below), which is clearly hierarchical. These languages generally have evidential systems, but it is not clear if there is any cognacy among the systems. The case markers fill similar categories, but generally are not cognate. See Sun 1982, 1985, 2001, Huang Bufan 1991 for more on this group. Sun (1982, 1985, 2001), who first established the Qiangic group as a group, includes rGyalrong as part of the group, but the relation of rGyalrong to the Rawang and Kiranti groups is much clearer than that to the Qiangic group. The similarities rGyalrong shares with Qiangic may simply be areal influence.

The Rung group: rGyalrong, T'rung (Dulong), Rawang, Kiranti, Kham, and Western Himalayan (Byangsi, Darma, Chaudangsi, Kinauri), languages that (except for rGyalrong) migrated down along the eastern edge of the Himalayas and then across Burma and into Northern India and Nepal.[11] These languages have clearly cognate complex person marking systems, and all but rGyalrong have a *-si reflexive/middle marking suffix on the verb:

	1sg	1pl	2pl	dual	refl/middle
Proto-rGyalrong	*-ŋ	*-i	*-ñ	*-tsh	
Proto-Dulong-Rawang	*-ŋ	*-i	*-n	*-si	*-si
Proto-Kiranti	*-ŋ	*-i	*-ni	*-ci	*-nsi
Proto-W. Himalayan	*-g/ŋ	*-ni	*-ni	*-si	*-si

Within this group then, there is a branching where rGyalrong splits off from the others, as it does not share the innovation of the reflexive/middle marking. This accords well with the migrations assumed. A second branching of Western Himalayan off from Rawang and

---

11 Ebert (1990) has argued for a Kiranti-rGyalrong-Rawang genetic grouping (see also Thurgood 1985), based largely on the person marking systems; I am including also Western Himalayan in this grouping, based on the person marking and the reflexive/middle marking (LaPolla 2000b). See also Grierson (1909, vol. III), for particular characteristics shared between the Western and Eastern Himalayan pronominalized languages not shared by the Tibetan languages, and Watters (1975: 50) for discussion of the 'remarkable similarities' between the pronominals and subject marking systems of the eastern (now including Kham) and western Himalayan pronominalized languages. Chang and Chang (1975) also argued for a close connection between rGyalrong and T'rung. The name Rung was coined by Thurgood (1984), but used for a somewhat larger grouping of languages. That original grouping is no longer recognized, and so I have used the name for this grouping.

Kiranti is assumed, as the latter two share the innovation of a non-first-person-actor marking prefix.[12]

The Karenic group: The Karen were one of the earliest groups to migrate down into Burma along the river valleys. As the earliest migrants into Mon and Tai territory, this group has been greatly influenced by the latter two languages. Most striking is the verb-medial word order, prepositions, and post-nominal relative clauses (see Kato, this volume, Solnit, this volume).

The Kuki-Chin group: Now straddling the India-Burma-Bangladesh borders, the speakers of these languages closely followed the Karen down the eastern edge of the Tibetan plateau and into Burma, but went more westerly and so had less contact with Mon and Tai. This group has also innovated person marking, but independent of the system found in the Rung group. In the Kuki-Chin system we find the Proto-Kuki-Chin pronouns *kai '1sg', *naŋ '2sg', and *a-ma '3sg' grammaticalized into the person marking prefixes *ka-, *na-, and *a- respectively (Thurgood 1985).

The Lolo-Burmese group: This group came down along the same path as the Karen and Kuki-Chin but at a later time and displaced them in many areas in Burma. They are now stretched from Sichuan and Yunnan Provinces in China (the Yi languages (Nasu, Nosu, etc.), Lisu, Zaiwa, Langsu) down along the migration path to southernmost Burma. Within Lolo-Burmese, some Loloish languages have been greatly influenced by contact with Tai, while Burmese has been more influenced by Mon (see Bradley 1980). Within this group there is no relational morphology that can be reconstructed to the PLB stage. They do not show person marking, and most adpositions and auxiliaries are recent transparent grammaticalizations (see for example Matisoff 1991b).

The Bai language shared the same origin and territory as the Lolo-Burmese (initially Sichuan and later Yunnan Province in China), but broke off from the main TB group culturally (aligning themselves culturally with the Chinese), forming what was known in Chinese in the eighth century as the Bái Mán (White Barbarians), in contrast to the Wū Mán (Black Barbarians), the rest of the Lolo-Burmese, who were not as Sinophilic. Because of the cultural orientation of the Bai people, the Bai language came to be heavily influenced by Chinese, and now the lexicon is comprised largely of Chinese loanwords, and the word order is now verb medial.

The Tani group: Sun (1993a, Chapter 5; 1993b) argues convincingly that the Tani group (formerly called Mirish or Abor-Miri-Dafla, including the languages of the Adi, Nishi, Bengni, Apatani, and Mishing peoples) constitutes a separate branch of TB at the highest level. Thurgood (1985: 397) shows there is a high degree of uniformity in the case marking systems of the languages. I have little information about their migration to Southern Tibet and Northeastern India, only anecdotal information about the members of this group now in Arunachal Pradesh having come across northern Burma.[13]

---

12 Thurgood (1984) discusses the fact that rGyalrung, T'rung, and Kham all have a preverbal yes-no interrogative particle *ma- (<PTB *ma 'negative particle'), and argues this is a shared innovation (a reduction of an alternative (A not A) question) that points to a common parent language. If only these three share this innovation, it would cloud the picture presented above, unless there was an assumption that this form was lost in Kiranti, just as it is now being lost in T'rung.

13 The Rawang people feel that the speakers of the Tani languages are related to the Rawang people, being simply a further extension of the Rawang migration west. They point to the name Abor as evidence (Abur is a Rawang clan name), and tell stories of Rawangs who have been to India and can speak in Rawang with the people there and be understood. Given the major differences in the languages, this would seem unlikely.

The Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw group: This group, which includes the Luish, Bodo-Garo, Koch, Konyak, and Jinghpaw/Singpho languages (Burling, this volume), was given central importance by Benedict (1972: 6) partly because of its central geographic location. There are early Chinese records that seem to point to the Jinghpaw having been in northern Burma in the early part of the current era, but there is nothing definitive on their time of arrival. A number of linguists have grouped Rawang and Dulong (the so-called Nungish languages) with Jinghpaw, but I do not find a pattern of shared innovations that would lead to seeing them as forming a group. While Jinghpaw does have a person-marking system, it is not cognate with that of the Rung group. Resemblances between the languages seem to be due to shared retentions rather than innovations, or due to long-term contact. Within the larger grouping, only Nocte and Jinghpaw have person marking systems, and they do not appear to be cognate.

Aside from these genetic groupings, and a split in prosodic type between a Southeastern iambic stress area and a Northern trochaic stress area, there are two other broader areas of language contact, the Indo-sphere and the Sino-sphere (Matisoff 1990, 1991a). These terms refer to whether the languages are more influenced by Indic languages and culture, or by Sinitic languages and culture. There are certain features that we frequently find in languages in the Indo-sphere that we do not find in the Sino-sphere. In phonology we find, for example, the development of retroflex stop consonants. In syntax we find, for example, post-head relatives or correlatives of the Indic type (relative clauses are generally pre-head and without relative pronouns in Sino-Tibetan languages). In Sino-spheric languages we often find the development of tones. Contact with Chinese can also result in monosyllabicity and an isolating structure (the most extreme example of this is Vietnamese).

3.2 Person marking

Several branches of TB have independently innovated person marking, possibly due to areal influence (LaPolla 1992a, 1994b, in press). The marking develops from copies of the free pronouns becoming prefixed or suffixed to the verb. Even groups that do not normally have person marking systems, such as Karen and Naga, have recently developed such systems in some dialects (see for example the Delugong dialect of Sgaw Karen discussed in Dai *et al.* 1991).[14] The pattern discussed most often is that of the Rung group, because of its wide geographic distribution. This pattern has been associated with the Tangut pattern, but it is not clear whether the Rung pattern developed out of the simpler Tangut pattern (1sg *-ηa^2, 2sg *-na^2 (the same forms as for the free pronouns), first and second person plural ni^2).[15] Attempts to associate the Rung pattern with other patterns in the family and reconstruct it to PTB have been unsuccessful (see LaPolla 1992a for discussion).

3.3 Multiple existential verbs

In a number of unrelated languages we find a pattern of multiple existential or locative verbs, with the difference between them being, if there are only two, as in Idu (Sun 1983a: 72)

---

14 Independent innovation of bound pronominal paradigms in various languages in a family is not unique to TB, but occurred also in Amerind (Mithun 1991) and Australian (Dixon 1980) languages.
15 The correspondence of the latter form with the Western Himalayan first and second person plural marker *ni is interesting in this regard, but the Western Himalayan form may be due to leveling of the original second person plural form to marking both plurals.

---

a difference between an animate (Idu i^{55}) and an inanimate (Idu kha^{55}) referent. A language may have as many as seven different verbs with distinctions between the verbs being of the type animate vs inanimate, abstract vs concrete, location within a container vs location on a plane, and others. For example, Hani has a general existential dza^{33}, an existential for people and animals dzo^{55}, an existential bo^{33} for people and their organs, $d\mathfrak{z}^{31}$ for liquids, $d\varepsilon^{31}$ for general animates, $k\gamma^{31}$ for existence within a group, and one existential verb, $s\mathfrak{z}^{55}$, which is used only in the poetic language (Li and Wang 1986: 54). In Queyu there are seven existential verbs (Wang 1991: 61): $t\mathit{f}i^{55}$, for animals; $t\wp y^{13}$, for location in a vessel or certain area; $\wp o^{31}$, for non-movable objects; $\wp i^{13}$, for movable objects; lo^{13}, for an object mixed up in another object; ru^{13}, for abstract objects; and $t\mathit{f}e^{13}$, for possession by a person. In Zaiwa (Xu and Xu 1984: 80–1) there are six existential verbs, two of which are specialized for animate beings and can be causativized: nji^{51}, which seems to mark the existence or long-term location of animate beings and has the causative form nji^{51}; $lu\eta^{55}$, for short-term location of animate beings and has the causative form $lu\eta^{55}$; vo^{55}, for possession by a person; $t\mathit{f}o\mathit{?}^{31}$, for inanimates; po^{51}, for containment within a vessel; and $to\eta^{51}$, for roads and footprints. Other languages that have this feature are Jinghpaw, Apatani, Tamang, Naxi, Nusu, Pumi, rGyalrong, Qiang and most of the other Qiangic languages. While some of the categories of existential verbs correspond among the languages, particularly within Lolo-Burmese, such as 'containment in a vessel or area' (Hani $t\wp y^{13}$, Zaiwa po^{51}), 'possession by a person' (Hani $t\mathit{f}e^{13}$, Zaiwa vo^{55}), the forms used in these languages are clearly not cognate.

3.4 Causative marking

The PST *s- causative prefix and voicing alternations are no longer productive in most TB languages, and so languages throughout the family (more than eighty languages and dialects I have counted) have innovated analytical causatives, usually by serializing a verb meaning 'send on an errand', 'entrust with a commission', 'make', 'do', or 'give' to create a causative construction (Matisoff 1976, 1991b; LaPolla 1994b). For example, in Lahu the verb ci 'send on an errand' is used to create causatives, as in *Johnny thà? qay-ci-ve* [OBJ go-CAUSE-PART] 'Make Johnny run' (Matisoff 1976: 418). Though occasionally different languages will use cognate verbs to form such causatives (e.g. Lahu and Burmese), the pattern cannot be reconstructed to even some of the lower (e.g. the Proto-Lolo-Burmese) levels; it must have been independently grammaticalized in each of the languages (Matisoff 1976). Even among the very closely related languages and dialects of Northern Burmish we find radically different forms used for causative marking: Longchuan Achang xu^{55}, Xiandao Achang $\mathfrak{s}a\eta^{31}$, Bola $n\mathfrak{z}^{55}$, and Leqi/Langsu $l\mathfrak{z}\mathit{?}^{55}$. In each case we have the independent grammaticalization of a free verb into a post-verbal causative marker.

3.5 Benefactive marking

Another commonly found development among TB languages is the grammaticalization of a benefactive construction. This most commonly takes the form of an auxiliary verb derived from a verb meaning 'to give', as in Jinghpaw (-$t\mathit{f}a^{33}$), Tamang (*pín*), Tsangla (*bi*), Camling (*bi*), Belhare (*-per*), and Lahu (*pí*; for third person benefactives; Matisoff 1991b). As can be seen from these examples, the verb used in this construction is often the PST verb *biy 'give', but the constructions themselves were independently innovated. A fully morphological etymologically opaque benefactive such as is found in Rawang, where the suffix -$\bar{a}$ has

an applicative benefactive function (LaPolla 2000a; e.g. *rí-ā-ò-ē* (carry-BEN-TR.NPAST-NPAST) '(He) is carrying (something) for him') is rare.

3.6 Semantic case marking

As mentioned above, there is no relational morphology that we can reconstruct to the PST stage, but there has been grammaticalization of different types of adpositions in every branch of the family (see Hale and Watters 1973; LaPolla 1994b). These adpositions are also often used for subordinate clause marking (Genetti 1986, 1991; Ebert 1993). There is a regular path for the development of adpositions in the family, where locational markers first develop, then these are extended in use to cover other types of relation, in a predictable way along two different paths: ablative > instrumental > manner adverbial > agentive > anterior or causal clause subordinator; locative > dative > patient > purposive, temporal, or conditional clausal subordinator (LaPolla 1995b). Large-scale surveys of agentive marking (LaPolla 1994b, 1995a) and 'object' marking (LaPolla 1992b, 1994b) were carried out, and the results indicate that although 106 languages (out of 145) have an agentive marker, and such a marker can be reconstructed to some of the lower level groupings within TB, such as Proto-Bodish, there is no form that cuts across the upper level groupings to the extent that it could be reconstructed to PTB. The conditions on the use of agentive marking in each language were also surveyed. The results point to the existence of at least two major types of 'ergative' marking in TB: systemic and non-systemic (or 'paradigmatic' and 'non-paradigmatic'). Non-systemic marking can be seen as a relatively recent development, and has the same function as 'anti-ergative' marking (LaPolla 1992b), i.e. disambiguation of two potential agents. It is used only when needed for this purpose and does not pattern paradigmatically, so is unlike what is normally referred to as 'ergativity'. Systemic ergativity is much more complex, often involving semantic and pragmatic functions beyond simple disambiguation (see for example Genetti 1988; Nagano 1987; Tournadre 1991). Though discussed as two types for expository purposes, these two types, as they are manifested in TB, are actually points on a continuum of types from completely non-systemic to fully systemic, with movement along the continuum (which is unidirectional) corresponding to degree of grammaticalization.

From the survey of 'object' marking in Tibeto-Burman, it was found that out of 126 languages surveyed, twenty-two languages had no nominal object marking, twenty languages had nominal morphology consistently marking the patient as object, regardless of whether the clause included another non-agent argument (i.e. was either transitive or ditransitive), and eighty-four languages, from a broad spectrum of languages in all sub-branches and areas of TB, had a type of marking where the patient in monotransitive clauses is often or always marked with the same postposition as the recipient, beneficiary, or other non-actor argument in ditransitive clauses. For example, in the Lahu examples below (Matisoff 1973: 156–7), *thà?* marks a patient argument in (1a), but a recipient argument in (1b).

(1) a. *ŋà   thà?   tâ   dɔ̂?*.   b. *li?   chi   ŋà   thà?   pî?.*
        1sg OBJ   NEG.IMP hit   book that 1sg OBJ   give
        'Don't hit me.'   'Give me that book.'

I refer to this type of marking as 'anti-ergative' marking, as the crucial function of this type of marking is to mark an animate argument that might otherwise be interpreted as an actor as being something other than an actor. In this way it is the opposite of the type of ergative marking we find in some of these same languages, which marks an argument as being

an actor.[16] In those languages that have both types of marking, it is often optional whether to use one or the other or both, but the marking is often not systemic, as it is used only to disambiguate two arguments when that becomes necessary due to the semantics of the referents, the actions involved, or the pragmatic viewpoint (see for example Matisoff 1973: 155–8 on Lahu *thà?*, Wheatley 1982 on Burmese *kou*). It is especially common for overt marking (either ergative or anti-ergative) to be necessary when the most natural (unmarked) topic, the agent, is not the topic, and instead appears in the preverbal focus position.

Most of the languages have grammaticalized different morphemes to mark anti-ergative arguments, and so while it is possible to reconstruct forms for some low-level groupings such as Tani or Tibetan, in other branches even closely related languages have different anti-ergative markers (e.g. Lahu *(thà?)*, Akha *(áŋ)*), or differ in terms of having anti-ergative marking or not (e.g. Akha, which has anti-ergative marking, and Hani, which does not). We can assume that this marking is not of great time depth.

Those languages that have postpositions, but do not have the anti-ergative marking pattern (e.g. Tujia, Hani) generally mark NPs by strictly semantic principles. That is, a locative/goal (when marked) will always be marked the same way, and a patient/theme (when marked) will always be marked the same way, and there are no relation changing (or 'promotion') rules (e.g. passive, dative, antidative). We then have two types of role marking in Tibeto-Burman. Both are semantically based, but one (ergative and patient marking) is based on what semantic role a referent has, and the other (anti-ergative marking) on what semantic role a referent does not have. The development of both types of marking can be said to be related to the importance of semantic role, pragmatic viewpoint, and animacy to the users of these languages.

3.7 Evidential marking

Evidential marking, the marking of how one came to know the information one is reporting in making a statement (e.g. seen with one's own eyes, heard from someone else, inferred) has grammaticalized in quite a few languages within TB. The systems may be as simple as having only a contrast between hearsay and non-hearsay (e.g. Rawang, where the hearsay particle *wā* is derived from the verb 'say'), to more complex systems, as in different varieties of Tibetan (DeLancey 1986; Woodbury 1986; Sun 1993c; Hongladarom 1993). Other languages which have evidential marking are Qiang (LaPolla to appear), Newar (Hargreaves 1983), and Akha (Hansson this volume; Egerod 1985; Thurgood 1986).

3.8 Reflexive/middle marking

Reflexive marking of different types, using reflexive pronouns or verb suffixes, is found throughout the family, but a small number of languages have independently innovated patterns like that found in French, where marking that was originally used only for true

---

16 The term anti-ergative may be somewhat infelicitous, as, like the term ergative itself, it may lead the reader to credit these particles with more of a paradigmatic nature than they actually have, but this term is already somewhat established in the literature (e.g. Comrie 1975, 1978; LaPolla 1992b), and clearer than Blansitt's (1984) term for this phenomenon, dechticaetiative. I also do not use Dryer's (1986) term primary object because he defines it as a grammatical function. The use of this type of marking in most of the Tibeto-Burman languages that have it is not of the nature of a grammatical function, and in some languages it is also not limited to marking objects.

reflexives gets extended to middle voice situations (i.e. situations where there is no clear distinction between the 'doer' and the one 'being done to'; LaPolla 1996). One pattern found was mentioned above. This is the *-si suffix found in the Rawang, Kiranti, Kham, and Western Himalayan languages. For example, in Dulong, àŋ sat-çǔ 'He is hitting himself' and àŋ et-çǔ 'He is laughing/smiling' have the same morphological form, but the semantics of the reflexive are less clear in 'laugh', and this verb must take this suffix to mean 'laugh' rather than 'laugh at (someone)'. This suffix has also become extended to use as a detransitivizer in some contexts (see LaPolla 1995c, 2000a; this volume, on Dulong and Rawang). Several Tani languages, e.g. Padam, Nishi, have a similar suffix *su (Lorrain 1907; Tayeng 1983; Das Gupta 1969), but it is unclear whether this suffix is cognate to the one in Rawang. rGyalrong has a verbal prefix nə- which marks indirect reflexives and middles and also functions as an emphasizer of intransitiviness (Nagano 1984: 55; Jin et al. 1958: 81). Mizo (Changte 1993; Lorrain and Savidge 1898) has a verb prefix -in which marks reflexive, reciprocal, and middle semantics.

Quite a few other frequent patterns could be discussed, but the above should suffice to show that with the loss of the original PST derivational morphology the daughter languages each went their own way in creating new morphology, but due to inherited typological features and areal contact, there were certain regularities in the types of morphology they developed.

REFERENCES

Andersen, Paul Kent (1987) 'Zero-anaphora and related phenomena in Classical Tibetan', *Studies in Language* 11.2: 279–312.

Baron, Stephen P. (1973) 'The classifier-alone-plus-noun construction: a study in areal diffusion', ICSTLL 6, University of California, San Diego, October 19–21, 1973.

Baxter, William H. (1992) *A handbook of Old Chinese phonology*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baxter, William H. (1995) 'Old Chinese Version 1.1 (beta text version)', Paper presented at the 28th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Charlottesville, Virgunia.

Baxter, William H. and Sagart, Laurent, 'Word Formation in Old Chinese: New Approaches to Chinese', in Jerome L. Packard (ed.) *Word Formation: Morphology, phonology and the lexicon in modern and ancient Chinese*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 35–76.

Benedict, Paul K. (1972) *Sino-Tibetan: A conspectus* (Princeton-Cambridge Studies in Chinese Linguistics II, James A. Matisoff, Contributing Editor) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benedict, Paul K. (1991) 'The Proto-Burmese-Yipho nominalizing *-t suffix', *LTBA* 14.2: 149–53.

Bhat, D.N.S. (1991) *Grammatical Relations: The Evidence Against Their Necessity and Universality*, London: Routledge.

Blansitt, E.L., Jr. (1984) 'Dechticaetiative and dative' in F. Plank (ed.), *Objects: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations*, London: Academic Press, 127–50.

Bodman, Nicholas C. (1980) 'Proto-Chinese and Sino-Tibetan: data towards establishing the nature of the relationship', in F. van Coetsem and L.R. Waugh (eds) *Contributions to Historical Linguistics: Issues and Materials*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 34–199.

Bradley, David (1980) 'Phonological convergence between languages in contact: Mon-Khmer structural borrowing in Burmese', *BLS* 6: 259–67.

Bradley, David (1997) 'Tibeto-Burman languages and classification', in D. Bradley (ed.) *Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas*, Canberra: Australian National University.

Burling, Robbins (1983) 'The Sal languages', *LTBA* 7.2 : 1–32.

Caughley, Ross (1978) 'Participant rank and verbal cross reference in Chepang', in Grimes (ed.) 1980, 163–78.

Chafe, Wallace and Nichols, Johanna (eds) (1986) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of epistemology*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chang, Kun and Chang, Betty Shefts (1975) 'Gyarong historical phonology', *BIHP* 46: 391–524.

Chang, Betty Shefts and Kun, Chang (1976) 'The prenasalized stop initials of Miao-Yao, Tibeto-Burman and Chinese: a result of diffusion or evidence of a genetic relationship?', *BIHP* 47: 467–502.

Chang, Betty Shefts and Kun, Chang (1977) 'Tibetan prenasalized initials', *BIHP* 48: 229–43.

Chappell, Hillary (2001) 'Language contact and areal diffusion in Sinitic languages', in R.M.W. Dixon and A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds) *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Case Studies in Language Change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chao, Yuen Ren (1955[1976]) 'Notes on Chinese grammar and logic', in Anwar S. Dil (ed.) *Aspects of Chinese Sociolinguistics: Essays by Yuen Ren Chao*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 237–49.

Chao, Yuen Ren (1959[1976]) 'How Chinese logic operates', in Anwar S. Dil (ed.) *Aspects of Chinese Sociolinguistics: Essays by Yuen Ren Chao*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 250–9.

Chao, Yuen Ren (1968) *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Chhangte, Lalnunthangi (1993) 'A grammar of Mizo', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Oregon.

Comrie, Bernard (1975) 'Antiergative', Papers from the 11th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, ed. by R.E. Grossman, L.J. San, and T.J. Vance, 112–21.

Comrie, Bernard (1978) 'Ergativity', in W.P. Lehmann (ed.) *Syntactic Typology: Studies in the Phenomenology of Language*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 329–94.

Dai, Qingxia (1994) 'Mian-Zang yu geti liangci yanjiu (a study on numeral classifiers in Tibeto-Burman)', in *Mian-Zang yu xin lun (Recent Contributions to Tibeto-Burman Studies)*, Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Xueyuan Chubanshe, 166–81.

Dai, Qingxia (1997a) 'A study on count-noun classifiers in Tibeto-Burman languages', *Studies on Yi-Burmese languages*, ed. by the Editorial Committee of the International Yi-Burmese Conference, Chengdu: Sichuan Nationalities Publishing House, 355–73.

Dai, Qingxia (1997b) 'Jingpoyu ci de shuang yinjiehua dui yufa de yingxiang (The influence of bisyllabification of lexical items in Jinghpaw on the grammar)', *Minzu Yuwen* 1997.5: 25–30.

Dai, Qingxia (2001) 'Zangmian yuzu yuyan shidong fanchou de lishi yanbian (Historical changes in the causative category of Tibeto-Burman languages)', *JCL* 29.1: 1–10.

Dai, Qingxia, Huang, Bufan, Fu, Ailan, Renzengwangmu and Liu, Juhuang (1991) *Zangmianyu shiwu zhong (Fifteen Tibeto-Burman languages)*, Beijing: Yanshan Chubanshe.

Dai, Qingxia, Liu, Juhuang, and Fu, Ailan (1989) 'Guanyu woguo Zangmian yuzu xishu fenlei wenti (on the problem of genetic subgrouping within the Tibeto-Burman languages of China)', *Yunnan Minzu Xueyuan Xuebao* 1989.3: 82–92.

Dai, Qingxia, Xu, Xijian (1992) *Jingpoyu yufa (Jinghpaw grammar)*, Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Xueyuan Chubanshe.

Das, Sarat Chandra (1902) *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot.

Das, Gupta, K. (1969) *Dafla Language Guide*, Shillong: Research Department, North-East Frontier Agency.

DeLancey, Scott (1984) 'Etymological notes on Tibeto-Burman case particles', *LTBA* 8.1: 59–77.

DeLancey, Scott (1985) 'The analysis-synthesis-lexis cycle in Tibeto-Burman: a case study in motivated change', in J. Haiman (ed.) *Iconicity in Syntax* (Typological studies in language 6), Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co, 367–89.

DeLancey, Scott (1986) 'Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan', in Chafe and Nichols 1986, 203–13.

DeLancey, Scott (1987) 'The Sino-Tibetan languages', in B. Comrie (ed.) *The World's Major Languages*, New York: Oxford University Press, 799–810.

Dixon, R.M.W. (1980) *The Languages of Australia*, Cambridge, London, and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. (1995) *Ergativity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Downer, G.B. (1959) 'Derivation by tone change in Classical Chinese', *BSOAS* 22.2: 258–90.

Driem, George van (1988) 'Reflexes of the Tibeto-Burman *-t directive suffix in Dumi Rai', in D. Bradley, E.J.A. Henderson and M. Mazaudon (eds) *Prosodic Analysis and Asian Linguistics: To Honour R.K. Sprigg*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics C-104, 157–67.

Dryer, Matthew S. (1986) 'Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative', *Language* 62: 808–45.

Ebert, Karen H. (1987) 'Grammatical marking of speech act participants in Tibeto-Burman', *Journal of Pragmatics* 11.4: 473–82.

Ebert, Karen H. (1990) 'On the evidence for the relationship Kiranti-Rung', *LTBA* 13.1: 57–78.

Ebert, Karen H. (1993) 'Kiranti subordination in the South Asian areal context', in K.H. Ebert (ed.) *Studies in Clause Linkage*, Zürich: Seminar für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, 83–110.

Egerod, Søren (1985) 'Typological features in Akha', in Thurgood, Matisoff, and Bradley (eds) (1985) 96–104.

Genetti, Carol (1986) 'The development of subordinators from postpositions in Bodic languages', *BLS* 12, 387–400.

Genetti, Carol (1988) 'A syntactic correlate of topicality in Newari narrative', in J. Haiman and S.A. Thompson (eds) *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* (Typological studies in language 18), Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 29–48.

Genetti, Carol (1991) 'From postposition to subordinator in Newari', in E.C. Traugott and B. Heine (eds) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Vol. II, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins Pub. Co., 227–55.

Gong, Hwang-cherng (2000) 'Cong Hanzangyu de bijiao kan Shanggu Hanyu de citou wenti (Looking at the problem of prefixes in Old Chinese through Sino-Tibetan comparisons)', *Language and Linguistics* 1.2: 39–62.

Graham, Augus (1983) '"Yun" and "yue" as verbs and particles', *Acta Orientalia Hafniensia* 44: 33–71.

Grierson, George (ed.) (1909) *Linguistic survey of India*, Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.

Grymes, Joseph E. (ed.) (1980) *Papers on Discourse*, Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Hale, Austin (1980) 'Person markers: finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari', *PSEAL* 7: 95–106.

Hale, Austin and Watters, David E. (1973) 'A survey of clause patterns', in Austin Hale and David E. Watters (eds) *Clause, Sentence, and Discourse Patterns in Selected Languages of Nepal*, Part II (SIL Pub. in linguistics and related fields, no. 40), Kathmandu: SIL and Tribhuvan University Press, 175–249.

Hargreaves, David (1983) 'Evidentiality in Newari', unpublished MA thesis, University of Oregon.

Hongladarom, Krisadawan (1993) *Evidentials in Tibetan: A Dialogic Study of the Interplay Between Form and Meaning*, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Hope, Edward R. (1973) 'Non-syntactic constraints on Lisu noun phrase order', *Foundations of Language* 10: 79–109.

Hope, Edward R. (1974) *The Deep Syntax of Lisu Sentences: A transformational Case Grammar* (Pacific Linguistics B-34), Canberra: Australian National University.

Huang, Borong (1996) *Hanyu fangyan yufa leibian (A Categorization of Chinese dialect grammar)*, Qingdao Chubanshe.

Huang, Bufan (1991) 'Qiangyuzhi (the Qiangic branch)', in M. Xueliang (ed.) *Hanzangyu gailun (A general introduction to Sino-Tibetan languages)*, Beijing: Peking University Press, 208–370.

Jin, Lixin (1998a) 'Hanzangyu de mingci houzhui *-n (the noun suffix *-n in Sino-Tibetan)', *Minzu Yuwen* 1998, 1: 43–8.

Jin, Lixin (1998b) 'Hanzangyu zhong liang ge xingzhi butong de *-g yunwei (Two different *-g finals with different natures in Sino-Tibetan)', *Minzu Yuwen* 1998, 6.

Jin, Peng, Tan, Kerang and Lin Xiangrong (1958) 'Jiarongyu Suomohua de yuyin he xingtai (xu)' (The phonology and morphology of the Suomo dialect of Jiarong, part 2), *Yuyain Yanjiu* 3: 71–108.

Karlgren, Bernard (1933) 'Word families in Chinese', *BMFEA* 5: 9–120.

Karlgren, Bernard (1956) 'Cognate words in the Chinese phonetic series', *BMFEA* 28: 1–18.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1987) 'Dulong and Proto-Tibeto-Burman', *LTBA* 10.1: 1–42.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1990) 'Grammatical relations in Chinese: synchronic and diachronic considerations', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1992a) 'On the dating and nature of verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman', *BSOAS* 55.2: 298–315.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1992b) 'Anti-ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman', *LTBA* 15.1: 1–9.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1993a) 'On the change to verb-medial word order in Proto-Chinese: evidence from Tibeto-Burman', in H. Kitamura, T. Nishida and Y. Nagano (eds) *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*, Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1993b) 'Arguments against "subject" and "direct object" as viable concepts in Chinese', *BIHP* 63.4: 759–813.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1994a) 'Word order patterns in Sino-Tibetan: their significance to theories of explanation in typology', paper presented at the Symposium on Language Typology, Tsukuba University, Japan, January 19–21, 1994.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1994b) 'Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman: evidence of Sapir's "drift"', *LTBA* 17.1: 61–80.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1994c) 'Variable finals in Proto-Sino-Tibetan', *BIHP* 65.1: 131–73.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1995a) 'Ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman', in Nishi, Matisoff and Nagano (eds) (1995) 189–228.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1995b) 'On the utility of the concepts of markedness and prototypes in understanding the development of morphological systems', *BIHP* 66.4: 1149–85.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1995c) 'Reflexive and middle marking in Dulong/Rawang', *ICSTLL* 28, Charlottesville, VA, October 6–9. To appear in *Himalayan Linguistics*, ed. by George van Driem. Berlin: Mouton de Gryuter, (also published in Chinese in *Zhongguo Minzu Yuyan Luncong (1)* (*Collected essays on Chinese minority languages*, 1) ed. by Dai Qingxia *et al.*, 13–34. Central University of Nationalities Press, 1996).

LaPolla, Randy J. (1995d) 'Pragmatic relations and word order in Chinese', in P. Downing and M. Noonan (eds) *Word order in discourse*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins Pub. Co., 299–331.

LaPolla, Randy J. (1996) 'Middle voice marking in Tibeto-Burman languages', *Pan-Asian Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics*, Vol. V. Mahidol University, Thailand, 1940–1954.

LaPolla, Randy J. (2000a) 'Valency-changing derivations in Dulong/Rawang', in R.M.W. Dixon and A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds) *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 282–311.

LaPolla, Randy J. (2000b) 'Subgrouping in Tibeto-Burman: can an individual-identifying standard be developed? How do we factor in the history of migrations and language contact?', *ICSTLL* 33, Bangkok and Trang, October 2–6, 2000.

LaPolla, Randy J. (2001) 'The role of migration and language contact in the development of the Sino-Tibetan Language Family', in R.M.W. Dixon and A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds) *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Case Studies in Language Change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 225–54.

LaPolla, Randy J. with Huang Chenglong (to appear) *A Grammar of Qiang, with Annotated Texts and Glossary*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LaPolla, Randy J. and Lowe, John B. (eds) (1994) *Bibliography of the Papers from the International Conferences on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, I–XXV.* STEDT Monograph Series, No. 1, second edition. Berkeley: Center for East and Southeast Asian Studies.

Li, Yongsui and Wang, Ersong (1986) *Haniyu jianzhi (Brief description of the Hani language)*, Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Lorrain, J.H. (1907) *A Dictionary of the Abor-Miri Language*, Shillong: Eastern Bengal and Assam Secretariat Printing Office.

Lorrain, J.H. and Savidge, Fred W. (1898) *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Lushai Language.* Shillong: Assam Secretariat Printing Office.

Lyu, Shuxiang (1979) *Hanyu yufa fenxi wenti (Questions on analysing Chinese grammar)*, Beijing: Commercial Press.

Mallison, Graham and Blake, Barry J. (1981) *Language Typology: Cross-Linguistic Studies in Syntax* (North-Holland linguistic series 46), Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North Holland Pub. Co.

Matisoff, James A. (1973) *The Grammar of Lahu*, (University of California publications in Linguistics, 75) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Matisoff, James A. (1976) 'Lahu causative constructions: case hierarchies and the morphology/ syntax cycle in a Tibeto-Burman perspective', in Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions (Syntax and Semantics* 6), New York: Academic Press, 413–42.

Matisoff, James A. (1989) 'Palatal suffixes in Sino-Tibetan', *ICSTLL* 22, University of Hawaii, Oct. 6–8, 1989.

Matisoff, James A. (1990) 'On megalocomparison', *Language* 66.1: 106–20.

Matisoff, James A. (1991a) 'Sino-Tibetan linguistics: present state and future prospects', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 469–504.

Matisoff, James A. (1991b) 'Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalzation in Lahu', in E. Traugott and B. Heine (eds) *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Vol. II, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 383–454.

Matisoff, James A. (1995) 'Sino-Tibetan palatal suffixes revisited', in Nishi, Matisoff and Nagano (eds) (1995) 35–91.

Mei, Tsu-lin (1980) 'Sisheng bieyi zhong de cengci' (Strata in the use of tones to distinguish meaning), *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1980.6: 427–43.

Mei, Tsu-lin (1988) 'Neibu nigou Hanyu sanli' (Three examples of internal reconstruction in Chinese), *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1988.3: 169–81.

Mei, Tsu-lin (1989) 'The causative and denominative functions of the **s-* prefix in Old Chinese', *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Sinology*, Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Michailovsky, Boyd (1975) 'Notes on the Kiranti verb (East Nepal)', *LTBA* 2.2: 183–218.

Michailovsky, Boyd (1985) 'Tibeto-Burman dental suffixes: evidence from Limbu (Nepal)', in Thurgood, Matisoff and Bradley (eds) (1985) 334–43.

Mithun, Marianne (1991) 'The development of bound pronominal paradigms', in W.P. Lehmann and H.J.J. Hewitt (eds) *Language typology 1988*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Nagano, Yasuhiko (1984) *A historical study of the rGyarong verb system*, Tokyo: Seishido.

Nagano, Yasuhiko (1987) 'Some ergative phenomena in Tibeto-Burman', *The Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 45: 53–74.

Nishi, Yoshio, Matisoff, James A. and Nagano, Yasuhiko (1995) *New Horizons in Tibeto-Burman Morpho-Syntax* (Senri Ethnological Studies 41), Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Norman, Jerry (1988) *Chinese*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1962–3) 'The consonantal system of Old Chinese (2 parts)', *Asia Major* (new series) 9: 58–144, 206–65.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1972) 'Word families in Chinese: A reconsideration', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 5: 1–19.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1973a) 'Some new hypotheses concerning word families in Chinese', *JCL* 1: 113–14.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1973b) 'Some further evidence regarding Old Chinese **-s* and its time of disappearance', *BSOAS* 36.2: 368–73.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1977–8) 'The final consonants of Old Chinese', *Monumenta Serica* 33: 180–206.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1991) 'Some notes on morphology and syntax in Classical Chinese', in Henry Rosemont, Jr. (ed.) *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts: Essays Dedicated to Angus C. Graham*, LaSalle, ILL: Open Court Press.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (2000) 'Morphology in Old Chinese', *JCL* 28.1: 26–51.

Schuessler, A. (1985) 'The function of *qusheng* in Early Zhou Chinese', in Thurgood, Matisoff and Bradley (eds) 1985: 344–62.

Shafer, Robert (1955) 'Classification of the Sino-Tibetan languages', *Word* 11.1: 94–111.

Simon, Walter (1941) 'Certain Tibetan suffixes and their combinations', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 5: 388–9.

Simon, Walter (1942) 'Tibetan *daŋ, ciŋ, kyin, yin,* and *ñam*', *BSOAS* 10: 954–75.

Simon, Walter (1949) 'The range of sound alternation in Tibetan word families', *Asia Major* (new series) 1: 1–15.

Simon, Walter, (1977) 'Alternation of final vowel with dental nasal or plosive in Tibetan', *BSOAS* XL: 51–7.

Solnit, David (1997) *Eastern Kayah Li: Grammar, Texts, Glossary*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Sun, Hongkai (1981) 'Qiangyu dongci de quxiang fanchou' (The category of direction in the Qiang verb), *Minzu Yuwen* 1981.1: 34–42.

Sun Hongkai (1982) 'Qiangyu zhishu wenti chutan' in *Minzu Yuwen* Editorial Board (ed.) *(on the question of affiliation of the Qiang language), Minzu Yuwen yanjiu wenji (collected papers from Minzu Yuwen)*, Xining: Qinghai Minzu Chubanshe, 189–224.

Sun, Hongkai (1983a) 'Yidu Luobayu gaiyao' (A brief description of the Idu Lhoba Language), *Minzu Yuwen* 1983.6: 63–79.

Sun, Hongkai (1983b) 'Woguo Zang-Mianyu dongci de rencheng fanchou' (The person category of verbs in the Tibeto-Burman languages of China), *Minzu Yuwen* 1983.2: 17–29.

Sun, Hongkai (1985) 'Liujiang liuyu de minzu yuyan ji qi xishu fen lei' (The ethnic languages of the Six Rivers area and their genetic affiliations), *Minzu Xuebao* 3: 99–274.

Sun, Hongkai (1988) 'Shilun Zhongguo jingnei Zang-Mian yu de puxi fenlei' (A classification of Tibeto-Burman languages in China), Eguchi, *et al.* (ed.) *Languages and history in East Asia: A Festschrift for Tatsuo Nishida on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, Vol. I, 61–73. Kyoto: Shokado.

Sun, Hongkai (1991) 'Cong cihui bijiao kan Xixiayu yu Zangmian yuzu Qiangyuzhi de guanxi' (The relationship between Tangut and the Qiang branch of Tibeto-Burman from the point of view of shared lexical items), *Minzu Yuwen* 1991.2: 1–11.

Sun, Hongkai (2001) 'Lun Zangmian yuzu zhong de Qiangyuzhi yuyan' (On the languages of the Qiangic branch of Tibeto-Burman), *Language and Linguistics* 2.1: 157–81.

Sun, Tianshin Jackson (1993a) 'A historical-comparative study of the Tani (Mirish) branch', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Sun, Tianshin Jackson (1993b) 'The linguistic position of Tani (Mirish) in Tibeto-Burman: a lexical assessment', *LTBA* 16.2: 143–88.

Sun, Tianshin Jackson. (1993c) 'Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan', *BIHP* 63.4.

Tayeng, Aduk (1983) *A Phrase book in Padam*, Shillong: The Director of Information and Public Relations, Arunachal Pradesh.

Thurgood, Graham (1984) 'The "Rung" languages: a major new Tibeto-Burman subgroup', Proceedings of the 10th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 338–49. University of California, Berkeley.

Thurgood, Graham (1985) 'Pronouns, verb agreement systems, and the subgrouping of Tibeto-Burman', Thurgood, Matisoff and Bradley (eds) 1985: 376–400.

Thurgood, Graham (1986) 'The nature and origins of the Akha evidential system', in Chafe and Nichols (eds) 1986: 214–22.

Thurgood, Graham (1994) 'Tai-Kadai and Austronesian, the nature of the historical relationship', *Oceanic Linguistics* 33.2, 345–68.

Thurgood, Graham, Matisoff, James A. and Bradley, David (eds) (1985) *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan Area: The State of the Art. Papers presented to Paul K. Benedict for his 71st birthday* (Pacific Linguistics C, 87), Canberra: Australian National University.

Tournadre, Nicolas (1991) 'The rhetorical use of the Tibetan ergative', *LTBA* 14.1: 93–108.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. and LaPolla, Randy J. (1997) *Syntax: Structure, Meaning, and Function (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics Series)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, Tianxi (1991) 'Queyu', in Dai *et al.* (1991) 46–63.

Wang, Li (1980) *Shijing yundu (The rhymes of the Book of Poetry)*, Shanghai: Guji Chubanshe.

Watters, David E. (1975) 'The evolution of a Tibeto-Burman pronominal verb morphology: a case study from Kham (Nepal)', *LTBA* 2: 45–80.

Wheatley, Julian K. (1982) 'Burmese: a grammatical sketch', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Wheatley, Julian K. (1984) 'The role of verb serialization in word-order change', *BLS* 10: 350–59.

Wheatley, Julian K. (1985) 'The decline of verb-final syntax in the Yi (Lolo) languages of southeastern China', in Thurgood, Matisoff and Bradley (eds) 1985: 401–20.

Wolfenden, Stuart N. (1929) *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology*, London: Royal Asiatic Society.

Wolfenden, Stuart N. (1936) 'On certain alternations between dental finals in Tibetan and Chinese', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1936: 401–16.

Wolfenden, Stuart N. (1937) 'Concerning the variation of final consonants in the word families of Tibetan, Kachin and Chinese', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1936: 625–55.

Wolfenden, Stuart (1939) 'On the restitution of final consonants in certain word types of Burmese' *Acta Orientalia* 17: 153–68.

Woodbury, Anthony C. (1986) 'Interactions of tense and evidentiality: a study of Sherpa and English', in Chafe and Nichols (eds) 1986: 188–202.

Xu, Lin and Yansun, Zhao (1984) *Baiyu jianzhi (A brief description of the Bai language)*, Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Xu, Xijian (1987) 'Classifiers in Jingpo', *Minzu Yuwen* 1987.5.

Xu, Xijian (1990) 'Jingpoyu liangci de chansheng he fazhan', *Zhongyang Minzu Xueyuan Xuebao* 1990.2.

Xu, Xijian and Xu, Guizhen (eds) (1984) *Jingpozu yuyan jianzhi (Zaiwa) (A brief description of the Zaiwa language of the Jinghpaw people)*, Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Yue-Hashimoto, Anne O-K. (1993) *Comparative Chinese Dialectal Grammar: Handbook for Investigators*, Paris: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (CRLAO).

CHAPTER THREE

WORD ORDER IN SINO-TIBETAN LANGUAGES FROM A TYPOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE[1]

Matthew S. Dryer

1 INTRODUCTION

Word order, both at the clause level and even more at the phrase level, varies among Sino-Tibetan languages. In this Chapter, I describe some of this variation and examine it in the light of word order tendencies found among the languages of the world as a whole. In Section 1, I briefly summarize some of the variation in word order within Tibeto-Burman (TB) languages, and discuss what features of word order in these languages are typical and atypical. In Section 2, I discuss word order in Chinese, identifying some typological unusual features and discussing possible explanations for them. An overall theme shared by the two sections is that word order in Sino-Tibetan is best understood in an areal context.

2 WORD ORDER IN TIBETO-BURMAN

The discussion in this section summarizes briefly what I discuss in much greater depth in Dryer (forthcoming). It is based on examination of descriptions of ninety-three TB languages.

2.1 Order of object and verb and word order features that correlate with it

The distribution of the two orders of object and verb in TB is straightforward: all TB languages are OV, except for Bai and the Karen languages, which are VO (and more specifically SVO). Although available data varies in the descriptions, the OV languages within TB generally share a variety of other word order characteristics typical of OV languages, in employing postpositions rather than prepositions, in placing genitive modifiers before the possessed noun, in placing relative clauses (if they are externally headed) before the head noun, in placing postpositional phrases before the verb, in employing clause-final markers for subordinate