

ZHANG Shuya<sup>†</sup>, Guillaume JACQUES<sup>‡</sup>, LAI Yunfan<sup>§</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Institut National des langues et des civilisations orientales, Paris; zhang.shuyafr@gmail.com

<sup>‡</sup> Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris; rgyalrongskad@gmail.com

<sup>§</sup> Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History, Jena; khroskyabs@gmail.com

## A study of cognates between Gyalrong languages and Old Chinese\*

Gyalrongic languages, a subgroup of the Burmo-Qiangic branch of the Sino-Tibetan family, are spoken in the Western Sichuan Province of China. They are polysynthetic languages, and present rich verbal morphology. Although they are not closely related to Chinese, they are of particular interest for Sino-Tibetan/Trans-Himalayan comparative linguistics with regards to their conservative phonology and morphology. Based on previous studies on Old Chinese phonology, combining with recent fieldwork data, this paper aims to show how Gyalrong languages could shed light on Old Chinese morphology and thus contribute to the Old Chinese reconstruction. It also proposes a list of possible cognates between Old Chinese, Gyalrong languages, indicating also Tibetan cognates when available.

*Keywords:* Gyalrong languages, Old Chinese language, etymological cognates, comparative morphology, historical reconstruction.

### 1. Introduction

Although Gyalrongic languages are not closely related to Chinese (Sagart et al. 2019), they are of particular interest for Sino-Tibetan/Trans-Himalayan comparative studies since they are the rare languages in the family exhibiting complex consonant clusters (Lai 2017) and conservative morphologies (Jacques 2016b; Gong 2017). However, they have hitherto been neglected by comparativists. This paper aims at providing easily accessible data on potential cognates between Old Chinese (OC) and Gyalrong, and discusses how these comparisons could contribute to improve OC reconstruction.

In section 2, we show how Gyalrong data could shed light on distinction between the anticausative and passive derivations in OC. Section 3 proposes a hypothesis on the origin of OC *\*ʃ-* from pre-OC *\*sʃ-*. Section 4 raises some issues concerning medial *\*-r-* in current OC reconstructions.

The last section contains a list of possible cognates shared among the Gyalrong languages, Tibetan and the Old Chinese, classified by OC rhymes<sup>1</sup>. The reason for choosing rhymes as the order of classification is justified by the fact that there is some consensus on the rhyme categories of OC, while there are more divergences concerning the consonants. In addition, correspondences are easier to establish between the rhymes of OC and Gyalrongic than between their onsets. Many of the etymologies in this work have been discussed before, in particular those with Tibetan cognates, for which we cite the reference in Schuessler (2007) as a summary of previous scholarship (in particular Conrady 1896; Simon 1929; Coblin 1986; Peiros and Starostin 1996; Gong 1995), and builds on previous comparative research concerning Gyalrong languages (Jacques 2004, 2005).

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the reviewers has kindly advised to add a long table as data supplement. We agree with this advice, but before making the table accessible as recommended by the reader, it is better to wait until we have data of more languages, in order to provide a more complete database.

The Gyalrong data come from three varieties, Japhug, Brag-bar (Situ) and Cogtse (Situ). For each cognate, we first list the Chinese word, provided with middle Chinese (MC) and OC reconstructions. We systematically cite Baxter and Sagart's (2014) reconstruction, but in cases when the comparisons are incompatible with their model, we propose alternative possibilities<sup>2</sup>.

## 2. Anticausative and passive derivations

Anticausative<sup>3</sup> verbs in Gyalrong languages present initial prenasalizing alternations with regards to the basic transitive verbs (Jacques 2008, 84–87; Zhang 2016, 93–95). This process is no longer productive in modern Gyalrong languages. Jacques (2015c) suggests that this prenasalizing element could be etymologically related to the spontaneous-autobenefactive prefix *nu-* in Japhug. While the prenasalizing anticausative has been lexicalized, the spontaneous-autobenefactive has undergone regularization and is still highly productive.

As shown in (1), the anticausative verb Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mblēt* 'be extinct' (S *javān* 'bee'), presents initial prenasalizing alternation in regard to the transitive verb Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-plēt* 'to extinguish' (A *kətcək* 'leopard', O *kəjōk* 'sheep').

- (1) a. Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-plēt* 'to extinguish'  
*kətcək kə kəjōk kəzē tə na-plōt.*  
 leopard ERG sheep all DET PFV-to.extinguish<sub>II</sub>  
 'The leopard has eaten all the sheep.'
- b. Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mblēt* 'be extinct'  
*tʂaɛi javān rgombâ kəsâm 'ro-ɛput rənə,*  
 Bkra.shis bee box three IFR.PFV -to.feed<sub>I</sub> but  
*u-javān jno kəzē no-'kə-mblēt*  
 3SG.POSS-bee PL all IFR.PFV-3NS.INTR-be.extinct<sub>I</sub>  
 'Bkra.shis has fed three beehives of bees, but his bees are all died.'

Note that the direction of derivation should be from a transitive/causative to an intransitive/anticausative verb. This process is not productive in modern Gyalrong languages, however Jacques (2008, 86) noticed that in Japhug it is applied to a Tibetan loanword Japhug *χtor* 'to scatter (vt.)' (Tibetan གཏོར *gtor* 'to scatter') ~ Japhug *ɲdɪr* 'be scattered (vi.)', whereas the anticausative counterpart does not exist in Tibetan (Jacques 2015c).

Many languages in the ST/TH family have voicing alternations related to transitivity. In Middle Chinese and attested Sinitic languages the prenasalized element has been lost, leaving only initial voicing alternations. Baxter and Sagart (2014) reconstructed a prenasalizing *\*N-* prefix to account for this voicing alternations attested in MC, as for instance between 別 *pjet* < B/S *\*pret* 'to separate' and 别 *bjet* < B/S *\*N-pret* 'be separated', an example semantically compatible with an interpretation as an anticausative derivation.

However, we also find in OC voicing alternations with meanings that cannot be interpreted as anticausative, such as that between 見 *kenH* < B/S *\*[k]ʰen-s* 'to see (vt.)' and 現 *yenH* < B/S *\*N-[k]ʰen-s* 'to appear (vi.)'. Anticausative verbs denote spontaneous situations and

<sup>2</sup> Since the aim of this study is to illustrate the extent to which Gyalrong languages can contribute to OC reconstruction, we provide some minor amendments to existing reconstruction systems. A full revision of OC historical phonology is beyond the scope of this paper.

<sup>3</sup> This argument demoting mechanism derives a intransitive verb from a transitive verb, by suppressing the A of the basic verb and promoting the original O to S (Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000, 315).

exclude an external cause or agent (Haspelmath 1993), and are thus incompatible with verbs of perception. It is thus difficult to compare the voicing alternation in 現 *yenH* < B/S \*N-[k]‘en-s with the Gyalrong anticausative.

In Gyalrong languages however, we also find a passive prefix (*a-* in Japhug, *o-* in Bragbar, *ŋa-* in Cogtse) originating from a nasal \**ŋa-*. Example (2) shows the triple contrast between a base transitive verb, its anticausative and its passive in Japhug.

- (2) Japhug *prɹt* ‘to cut (vt.)’  
 Japhug *mbrɹt* ‘be cut (ANTICAUS, vi.)’  
 Japhug *a-prɹt* ‘be cut (PASS, vi.)’

While a morphological distinction between passive and anticausative seems to be absent in OC, it is possible that the voicing alternation reconstructed as \*N- by Baxter and Sagart results in fact from the merger of an anticausative \*N- and a passive \**ŋ-* derivation (this would not be the only case of merger between etymologically unrelated morphological alternations in OC; the *qusheng* derivation appears to be a similar case, see Jacques 2016a).

The verbs 敗 *bæjH* / 敗 *pæjH* possibly provide evidence for a contrast between passive and anticausative derivations. The reading *bæjH* with a voiced initial has two distinct meanings ‘be damaged’ (3) and ‘be defeated’ (4), whereas that with an unvoiced initial *pæjH* only means ‘to defeat’ (5).

- (3) Anticausative 敗 *bæjH* < B/S \*N-*pʳa[t]-s*

魚 餿 而 肉 敗, 不 食  
*ŋjo nwojX ni juwk bæjH pwot zik*  
 fish decay CONJ meat decay NEG to.eat

‘He did not eat fish or flesh which has gone bad. (Translation of James Legge).’  
 《論語·鄉黨》

- (4) Passive 敗 *bæjH* < B/S \*N-*pʳa[t]-s*

梁惠王 以 土地 之 故, 糜  
*Ljan.ywejH.hjwan jiX tʰuXdijH tɛi kuH mje*  
 King.Hui.of.Liang PREP:because.of territory GEN reason to.tore

爛 其 民 而 戰 之, 大 敗  
*lanH gi mjɪn ni tɛenH tɛi tajH bæjH*  
 to.destroy POSS.3SG people CONJ to.lead...to.war PRON great be.defeat

‘The king Hui of Liang, for the matter of territory, tore and destroyed his people, leading them to battle. Sustaining a great defeat. (Translation of James Legge)’  
 《孟子·盡心下》

- (5) Transitive 敗 *pæjH* < B/S \**pʳa[t]-s*

冬, 與 越人 水 戰, 大 敗 越人  
*townj joX hjwotɲin ɛwɪj tɛenH tajH pæjH hjwotɲin*  
 winter with Yue.people water to.fight great to.defeat Yue.people

‘In the winter he had an engagement with that of Yue, on which he inflicted a great defeat. (Translation by James Legge)’ 《莊子·逍遙遊》

Since the meaning ‘be damaged’ is necessarily older than ‘be defeated’ (a semantic change ‘defeat’ → ‘destroy’ seems highly unlikely), this verb seems to provide evidence for the idea that the intransitive 敗 *bæjH* is the base form, and that the transitive 敗 *pæjH* is derived from it by a causative prefix (as was insightfully pointed out by Wang Hongzhi, pc).

However, the reasons for not reconstructing a sigmatic causative to account for these voicing alternations have been discussed at length elsewhere (Jacques 2015b; Sagart and Baxter 2012), and it is possible to reconcile OC and Gyalrong data by supposing that 敗 *pæjH* is cognate of Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-prāt* ‘to break’, Japhug *prɹt* ‘to break’, and originally meant ‘destroy, damage’. The form 敗 *bæjH* \**N-pʰrats* in the meaning ‘be damaged’ would be an anticausative form of this transitive verb (‘become damaged spontaneously, by itself’), itself cognate to Cogtse (Situ) *kə-mbrēt* ‘to break’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mbrāt* ‘to break’ and Japhug *mbrɹt* ‘to break’. The base verb then underwent semantic narrowing to the sense of ‘to defeat’, from which a passive \**ŋ-pʰrats* (merging early with \**N-pʰrats*, and undistinguishable in MC from the anticausative) was derived.

### 3. On the origin of OC \**ʃ*-

Sagart and Baxter (2012) propose a sound change chain concerning consonant clusters consisting of a presyllable \**s(ə)*- and a nasal. Pre-OC tight *s*- preinitial consonant clusters result in voiceless nasals in OC, whereas loose clusters became tight clusters in OC, as illustrated in (6):

(6) Origin of voiceless nasal in OC (adapted from Table 1 in Sagart and Baxter 2012)					
Pre-OC		OC		MC	
* <i>sm</i> -, * <i>sn</i> -, * <i>sŋ</i> -	>	* <i>m̥</i> -, * <i>n̥</i> -, * <i>ŋ̥</i> -	>	<i>χ</i> , <i>th</i> , <i>χ</i>	
* <i>sə.m</i> -, * <i>sə.n</i> -, * <i>sə.ŋ</i> -	>	* <i>sm</i> -, * <i>sn</i> -, * <i>sŋ</i> -	>	<i>s</i>	

In two sets (7), \**ʃ*- in OC corresponds to the consonant cluster *ɛl*- in Gyalrong languages, suggesting that one of the origins of OC \**ʃ*- is earlier \**sl*- (in line with Yakhontov and Starostin 1989, 218).

(7) OC		Gyalrong
失 <i>ɛit</i> < B/S * <i>ʃi[t]</i> ‘to lose’		Japhug <i>ɛluy</i> ‘to letsth.fall’
		Cogtse (Situ) <i>ka-ʃlâk</i> ‘to fall (from hand)’
脫 <i>thwat</i> < B/S * <i>mə-ʃʷot</i> ‘to take off’		Brag-bar(Situ) <i>ka-ɛlēt</i> ‘to fall (fromhand)’

We thus propose \**sli[t]* and *slʷot* as pre-OC forms of 失 and 脫.

(8) Origin of OC * <i>ʃ</i>					
Pre-OC		OC		MC	
* <i>sl</i> -	>	* <i>ʃ</i> -	>	<i>th</i> -, <i>ɛ</i> -	
* <i>sə.l</i> -	>	* <i>sl</i> -	>	<i>s</i> -	

Japhug *ɛluy* ‘to let sth. fall’ is a lexicalized causative of Japhug *luy* ‘to detach’ (the productive causative, expressing a volitional action, is Japhug *suyluy* ‘to cause to detach’), and this is a case where the OC preserves a morphological element as indirect trace only.

### 4. \**-r*- medial in OC reconstruction

The medial \**-r*- in OC only partially corresponds to medial *-r*- in languages other than Chinese. In particular, based on comparisons by Gong (1995), Handel (2002) points out that the onsets reconstructed as dental stop or dental affricates+\**-r*- generally correspond to clusters with preinitial *r*- in Tibetan, and suggests that metathesis from \**rC*- to \**Cr*- took place, as summarized in (9):

(9)	OC	Non-Chinese languages
Grave	*Cr-	*Cr-
	*r-C (>*C-)	*r-C
Acute	*r-C (>*Cr-)	*r-C
*s-	*s-	*sr- (before front vowels)
*s-	*s-	*s- (before non-front vowels)

Comparative data from Gyalrong languages could shed light at least on two aspects.

First, the comparison of Japhug *tx-zrɿm* ‘root’ to 參 B/S *\*s.rum* ‘root’ shows that Handel (2002)’s hypothesis that *\*sr-* merges with *\*s-* in languages other than Chinese before non-front vowel must be amended (Jacques 2015a).

Second, the grave initial syllables reconstructed with medial *\*r-* in OC in present reconstructions correspond in some cases to words with preinitial *r-* in Gyalrong languages (Table 1). We suggest to reconstruct preinitial *\*r-* in these cases in OC.<sup>4</sup> The difference between preinitial *\*r-* and medial *\*r-* is not detectable on the basis of Chinese-internal evidence alone, though (depending on the relative chronology of sound changes between Chinese and Viet-Muong) it is possible that preinitial *\*r-* would yield lenition in old loanwords into Vietnamese (see Pulleyblank 1981, 284 for a suggestion in these lines).

Unlike Handel, we do not think that it is necessary to suppose that metathesis took place in OC – for examples of retroflexion of dental stop by preceding liquids, see Burrow (1972) on Indic languages and Kümmel (2007, 231). Rather, the rhotic (and perhaps other types of preinitials, as suggested by Pulleyblank) became a suprasegmental rhotacized voice quality, as proposed by (Miyake 2012).

Table 1. Preinitial *\*r-* in OC

MC	B/S	Amended OC	Gyalrong cognates
冰 <i>piŋ</i> ‘ice’	*p.rəŋ	*rpəm	Cogtse (Situ) <i>ta-rpâm</i> ‘ice’ Brag-bar (Situ) <i>ta-rpâm</i> ‘ice’ Japhug <i>tx-jpyom</i> ‘ice’
眉 <i>mij</i> ‘eyebrow’	*mr[ə][r]	*rməj	Cogtse (Situ) <i>ta-rŋê</i> ‘hair’, Brag-bar (Situ) <i>ta-rŋê</i> ‘hair’ Japhug <i>tx-rme</i> ‘hair’
顏 <i>ŋæn</i> ‘face’	*C.ŋʳar	*rŋʳan	Japhug <i>tu-rŋa</i> ‘face’

There are however a number of unexplained exceptions, such as 熬 *ŋaw* < B/S *\*ŋʳaw* ‘to fry, roast’ (Cogtse (Situ) *ka-rŋô* ‘to fry’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-rŋô* ‘to fry’, Japhug *rŋu* ‘to fry’) or 名 *mjiŋ* < B/S *\*C.men* ‘name’ (Cogtse (Situ) *tə-rmê* ‘name’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-rmiê* ‘name’, Japhug *tx-rmi* ‘name’) for which no rhotacization can be reconstructed in OC. Note that Tibetan *ming* མིང་ ‘name’ also lacks a medial or preinitial *r-*.

<sup>4</sup> This hypothesis implies to abandon the reconstruction *\*r.ŋʳaʔ* for 魯 *luX* proposed to account for a *xiesheng* relationship with 魚 *ŋjo* ‘fish’.

## 5. Gyalrong cognates

### 5.1. Open syllable rhymes

#### 5.1.1. 鱼 *yu* \**a*

The rhyme 鱼 \**a* generally corresponds to the vowel *a* in Cogtse (Situ), *iε* in Brag-bar (Situ) and *a* in Japhug. The Brag-bar has undergone the \**a* > *iε* sound change.

1. 斧 *pjuX* < B/S \**p(r)a?* ‘axe’, Cogtse (Situ) *fa-rpâ* ‘axe’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ɕe-rpiê* ‘axe’, Japhug *tu-rpa* ‘axe’. The first syllable in Situ etyma is the constructed status of the noun Cogtse (Situ) *fê* ‘firewood’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ɕê* ‘firewood’. In Japhug, the *tu-* prefix is the indefinite possessive. The Gyalrongic data suggest the presence of an *r-* preinitial in Old Chinese (see section 4), but the rime *-ju* in MC is ambiguous as to the presence or absence of a rhotacizing element.
2. 下 *ɣæH* < B/S \**m-gʳaʔ-s* ‘to descend’, Cogtse (Situ) *ke-ŋgrêk* ‘fall down’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-ŋgriê* ‘fall down’, Japhug *ŋgra* ‘fall down’. The velar coda in Cogtse is unexplained. In Gyalrongic languages this verb is the anticausative of the transitive verb (see section 2), reflected by Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-kriê* ‘to cause to fall down’, Japhug *kra* ‘to cause to fall down’. An alternative etymology would be 落 *lak* < B/S \**kə.rʳak* ‘to fall’<sup>5</sup>.
3. 蘇 *su* < B/S \**s-ŋʳa* ‘to revive’. OC \**sŋ-* became *s-* in MC (Baxter 1992, 225; Sagart 1999, 65; Schuessler 2007, 482), Cogtse (Situ) *kə-mə-sŋâr* ‘feel cold’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mə-sŋiêr* ‘come to oneself’, Japhug *sŋa* ‘come to oneself’. The Situ forms have a *mə-* prefix and a *-r* coda which remain unexplained.
4. 吾 *ŋu* < B/S \**ŋʳa* ‘I, my’, Tibetan *nga* ཀ་ ‘I’ (Schuessler 2007, 518), Cogtse (Situ) *ŋā* ‘I’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ŋā* ‘I’, Japhug *a-zo* ‘I’. Northern Gyalrong languages have lost the velar nasal initial *ŋ-* of the singular first person pronouns.
5. 咀 *dzjoX* < \**dza?* ‘to chew’, Tibetan *za-ba* ཟ་བ་ ‘to eat’ (Schuessler 2007, 323). Cogtse (Situ) *ka-zā* ‘to eat’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-ndziê* ‘to eat’, Japhug *ndza* ‘to eat’.
6. 五 *ŋuX* < B/S \**C.ŋʳa?* ‘five’, Tibetan *lŋa* ལྷ་ ‘five’ (Schuessler 2007, 519). Cogtse (Situ) *kəmŋô* ‘five’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kəmŋêj* ‘five’, Japhug *kumŋu* ‘five’. The correspondence of the vowel is irregular. In addition, the correspondence between *lŋ-* in Tibetan and *mŋ-* in Gyalrong languages is also unexplained (Jacques 2004, 125).
7. 夜 *jæH* < B/S \*[*ɕ*]Ak-s ‘night’, Tibetan *zhag* ཟག་ ‘one night’ (Schuessler 2007, 561–62), Brag-bar (Situ) *rə-jāk* ‘one night’, Japhug *tx-rzab* ‘night’. The Brag-bar form takes the numeral prefix *rə-* ‘one’. While this cognate set is not in doubt, the reconstruction of the onset in OC, Tibetan and Gyalrong is problematic. Japhug *rz-* and Situ *j-* could respectively originate from \**rj-* and \**j-*, and OC might be better reconstructed with a primary yod initial.

#### 5.1.2. 支 *zhi* \**e*

1. 兒 *je* < B/S \**ŋe* ‘child’. Jacques (2004, 223) relates this word to Japhug *nɣ-rŋi* ‘baby’, although the first syllable in the Japhug etyma is unexplained. This words could also be related to a lexicalized diminutive suffix in Situ, as in Cogtse (Situ) *kho-lŋâ* ‘infant’ Brag-bar (Situ) *tapə-rŋiê* ‘infant’, however, correspondence between *i* in Japhug and *a/ie* in Situ seems irregular and needs to be further investigated.

<sup>5</sup> Etymology suggested by Laurent Sagart.

2. 髀 *bejX* < B/S *\*m-p<sup>f</sup>e?* ‘thighbone’, Tibetan *dpyi* དཔྱི ‘thighbone, hipbone’ (Schuessler 2007, 164), Japhug *tu-χpyi* ‘thigh’.

### 5.1.3. 之 *zhi* \*ə

The rhyme 之 \*ə corresponds to *a* in Cogtse (Situ), \**a* > *iε* in Brag-bar (Situ) and *a* in Japhug.

1. 富 *pjuwH* < B/S *\*pək-s* ‘rich’. Sagart (2017) relates this word to Tibetan *phag* ཕག ‘pig’. If this etymology is accepted, it is also comparable to Cogtse (Situ) *pāk* ‘pig’, Brag-bar (Situ) *piāk* ‘pig’, Japhug *paβ* ‘pig’. Schuessler (2007, 152) relates the ‘pig’ etymon to 豨 *pae* < B/S *\*p<sup>f</sup>ra* instead.
2. 子 *tsiX* < B/S *\*[ts]ə?* ‘child’. Schuessler (2007, 633) proposes that this word is the ST root for ‘offspring, child’ and relates it to Tibetan *tsha-po* ཚཤཔོ ‘grandchild; nephew’. It could be comparable to Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-tsa-pu* ‘father’s sister’s child’, Japhug *tu-ftsa* ‘father’s sister’s child; sister’s child’ (for the Gyalrong kinship systems and the designation of this word, see Jacques 2012). The Brag-bar etymon is in an incomplete status of noun-compounding since the word is attested with a penultimate accent instead of the final tonal contrast, it can be resulted by a recent suffixation of diminutive *-pu* (*ta-pū* ‘child’) on the base noun *\*ta-(p)tsa* due to changes of its kin terminology. The *p-* preinitial is preserved in the derived social relation collective Brag-bar (Situ) *kočə-ptsa-pê* ‘paternal cross cousins’ daughters’. Correspondence between *p-* preinitial in Situ and *f-* preinitial in Japhug is discussed in Jacques (2004, 269–70). Another possible cognate of 子 is only shared by Situ dialects, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-tsâ* ‘boy, son’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-zîê* ‘boy, son’. The Brag-bar etymon has undergone the *\*ts- > z-* lenition, as in Brag-bar (Situ) *\*tə-matsa > tə-mazâ* ‘mother’s sister’s child’.
3. 裘 *gjuw* < B/S *\*[g]wə?* ‘fur garment’, Tibetan *gos* གོས ‘clothes’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-wê* ‘garment’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-ŋgâ* ‘garment’, Japhug *ŋga* ‘to wear’. The *w-* initial of the Cogtse etymon can be explained by *\*g- > w-* lenition in this dialect. The Tibetan etymon is suffixed by the *-s* nominalizer.
4. 耳 *niX* < B/S *\*C.nə?* ‘ear’, Tibetan *rna* རྩ ‘ear’ (Schuessler 2007, 225–26), Cogtse (Situ) *tə-rnâ* ‘ear’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-rniê* ‘ear’, Japhug *tu-rna* ‘ear’.
5. 牛 *ŋjuw* < B/S *\*[ŋ]wə?* ‘ox’, Cogtse (Situ) *nəŋâ* ‘cow’, Brag-bar (Situ) *nəŋiê* ‘cow’, Japhug *nunŋa* ‘cow’. The first element in the Gyalrong etyma could be related to the constructed status of the word Cogtse (Situ) *tə-nū* ‘udder’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-nū* ‘udder’, Japhug *tu-nu* ‘udder’. Although most Gyalrong languages have lost the *\*-w-* medial, evidence can be found in Zbu *ŋwê?* (Gong 2018, 40).

### 5.1.4. 侯 *hou* \*o

The rhyme \**o* in OC corresponds to the back vowels in Gyalrong language. It corresponds to *uu* or *u* in Japhug, and *u* or *o* in Situ.

1. 坐 *dzwaX* < B/S *\*[dz]<sup>f</sup>o[j]?* ‘to sit’, Japhug *a-mdzui* ‘to sit’.
2. 乳 *juX* < B/S *\*no?* ‘milk; nipple’, Tibetan *nu-ma* ལུམ ‘udder’ (Schuessler 2007, 446), Cogtse (Situ) *tə-nū* ‘udder’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-nū* ‘udder’, Japhug *tu-nuu* ‘udder’.
3. 后 *yuwX* < B/S *\*C<sup>f</sup>(r)o?* ‘sovereign; queen’, Tibetan *mgo* མགོ ‘head’, Tibetan *’go-pa* འགོ་པ ‘headman’ (Schuessler 2007, 279–80), Cogtse (Situ) *ta-kō* ‘head’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-wô* ‘head’, Japhug *tu-ku* ‘head’. The initial consonant of the Brag-ba etymon has undergone the *\*k- > w-* lenition.

4. 後 *yuwX* < B/S \*[Gʷ(r)oʔ ‘after’, Cogtse (Situ) *mə-ŋkhū* ‘be after’, Brag-bar (Situ) *mə-ŋkhū* ‘be after’, Japhug *ma-qhu* ‘be after’. The Situ and Japhug etyma have a denominal prefix (Jacques 2004, 407).
5. 腑 *pjuX* < \**poʔ* ‘internal organs’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-po-lɛŋtʃê* ‘intestine’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-vo-lɛŋtʃâ* ‘intestine’, Japhug *tu-pu* ‘intestine’. The initial consonant of the cognate base in Brag-bar has undergone the \**p*- > *v*- lenition.
6. 軀 *khju* < \**kʰ(r)o* ‘body; person’, Tibetan *sku* སྐྱ ‘body, statue’ (Schuessler 2007, 435), Cogtse (Situ) *tə-skrū* ‘body’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-skrū* ‘body’, Japhug *tu-skhrū* ‘body’.
7. 寇 *kʰuwH* < B/S \*[kʰ(r)o-s ‘to rob; robber’, Tibetan *rku-ba* རྒྱལ ‘to steal’ (Schuessler 2007, 336), Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mərkâ* ‘bandit’, Japhug *murkuu* ‘to steal’. The Brag-bar form might be loanword from other Gyalrong languages, since it has an unexpected *ə* vowel.
8. 嘔 *ʔuwX* < B/S \**qʷ(r)oʔ* ‘vomit’, Tibetan *skyug* སྐྱུག ‘vomit’ (Schuessler 2007, 407, 595), Japhug *qioɓ* ‘vomit’. The final glottal stop \**-ʔ* possibly corresponds to Tibetan *-g* and Japhug *-ɓ* (Schuessler 2007, 31–32).

#### 5.1.5. 幽 *you* \**u*

The rhyme 幽 \**u* correspond to *u* in Cogtse, *u* in Brag-bar and *u* in Japhug.

1. 保 *pawX* < B/S \**pʷuʔ* ‘to take care of, protect’. In Gyalrong languages we found fixed expressions such as Brag-bar (Situ) *u-pû ka-viê* ‘to take care of’, Japhug *u-puu kɔ-pa* ‘to take care of’, consisting of a possessive prefixing action nominal and a light verb Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-viê* ‘to do’, Japhug *kɔ-pa* ‘to do’. The inalienably possessed noun *u-pû/uu-puu* in this collocation can be analyzed as an action nominal, as in other non-ambiguous cases Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-ɕmô ka-viê* ‘to steal’, consisting of the action nominal Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-ɕmô* ‘stealing’ whose corresponding verbal form is Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-ɕmô* ‘to steal’. Such analysis would suggest the existence of the corresponding verbs Brag-bar (Situ) \**ka-pû* ‘to take care of’ Japhug \**kɔ-puu* ‘to take care of’ at an earlier stage. An alternative to this light verb construction is a denominal transitive Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-ra-pupû* ‘to take care of’ (stem I *rapəpə̄*, stem II *rapəpâ*, stem I’ *rapupû*) (see 10). The verb is clearly derived from a nominal base *-pu*, by adding a denominal prefix *ra-* on the reduplicated base. It is possible that in Gyalrong languages the basic verb ‘to take care of’ has been lost, whereas the derived action nominal has been preserved and became then the base noun. A similar case is the verb *donner* ‘to give’ in French, which does not come from Lat. *dare* but was recreated from *don* (< *donum* ‘gift’) (List 2016).
2. 浮 *bjuw* < B/S \**m.b(r)u* ‘float’ could be indirectly related to Brag-bar (Situ) *zbrū* ‘boat’ and Japhug *zmbrru* ‘boat’, assuming that these nouns are fossilized sigmatic instrumental nominalizations from a verb \**mbru* meaning ‘float’.
3. 帽 *mawH* < B/S \**mʷuk-s* ‘hat’. Sagart (2017) relates this word to Tibetan *rmog* རྨོག ‘hat, helmet’. The word for ‘mushroom’ shared in all Gyalrong languages could be possible cognate, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-jmōk* ‘mushroom’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-jmōk* ‘mushroom’, Japhug *tɔ-jmɔɣ* ‘mushroom’ (Breton *tok touseg* ‘frog hat’ for ‘mushroom’).
4. 腦 *nawX* < B/S \**nʷ[u]ʔ* ‘brain’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-rnōk* ‘brain’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-rnōk* ‘brain’, Japhug *tu-rnoɓ* ‘brain’.
5. 肘 *fjuwX* < B/S \**t-[k]<r>uʔ* ‘elbow’, Tibetan *gru-mo* རྒྱལ ‘elbow’ (Schuessler 2007, 624), Cogtse (Situ) *tə-krū* ‘elbow’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-krū* ‘elbow’, Japhug *tu-zgru* ‘elbow’. The *t-* preinitial in OC could be related to the indefinite possessive prefix *tV-* in Gyalrong languages.



6. 爪 *tṣæwX* < B/S \*[ts]<sup>ʃ</sup><r>u? ‘claw’, Cogtse (Situ) *ta-ndzrū* ‘nail’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-ndzrū* ‘nail’, Japhug *tu-ndzruu* ‘nail’.
7. 九 *kjuwX* < B/S \*[k]u? ‘nine’, Tibetan *dgu* དགུ ‘nine’ (Schuessler 2007, 320), Cogtse (Situ) *kəngû* ‘nine’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kəngû* ‘nine’, Japhug *ngut* ‘nine’. The final *-t* in the Japhug etyma is an innovation in Northern Gyalrong languages; probably due to analogy from Japhug *kurcat* ‘eighy’ (Jacques 2004, 253).
8. 舅 *gjuwX* < B/S \*[g](r)u? ‘mother’s brother’, Tibetan *a-khu* འཁུ ‘father’s brother’ (Schuessler 2007, 321), Brag-bar (Situ) *a-kû* ‘mother’s brother’. The first element in Brag-bar and Tibetan etymon is the vocative prefix. This word is the common Sino-Tibetan root for mother’s brother (Benedict 1942), the Tibetan etyma has undergone a semantic shift from mother’s brother to father’s brother (Nagano 1994). Correspondence between voiced *g-* initial in OC and voiceless *k-* and *kh-* in Gyalrong and Tibetan etyma could be explained in a similar as (Jacques 2017a) proposes for 父 *pjuX* < B/S \*[N-p](r)a? and Tibetan *pha* ་པ་ ‘father’. ST kin terms are often prefixed either by vocative or by possessive, therefore it is possible that a nasal element is inserted between the possessive/vocative prefix and the root, as the case in Limbu (Davids and Driem 1985).
9. 韭 *kjuwX* < B/S \*s.[k](r)u? ‘allium’, Cogtse (Situ) *ʃkō* ‘onion’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ʃkō* ‘onion’, Japhug *ʃku* ‘onion’, Tibetan *sgog-pa* སྒོག་པ་ ‘wild onion’.

- (10) a. Brag-bar (Situ) *u-pû ka-viê* ‘to take care of’  
*nə-ta-ka-mbā-n*                      *tə ostō*    *u-pû*                      *re-viê-n*  
 1SG PFV-1→2-NMLZ-to.give<sub>II</sub>-2SG    DET    really    3SG.POSS-protection    IMP-to.do<sub>I</sub>-2SG  
 ‘Take care of what I gave to you.’
- b. Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-ra-pupû* ‘to take care of’  
*nə-ta-ka-mbā-n*                      *tə*    *ostō*    *re-nə-ra-pəpə-n*  
 1SG PFV-1→2-NMLZ-to.give<sub>II</sub>-2SG    DET    really    IMP-AUTO-DENOM-protection<sub>I</sub>-2SG  
 ‘Take care of what I gave to you.’

## 5.2. -k ending rhymes

### 5.2.1. 鐸 duo \*ak

The rhyme 鐸 \*ak in OC corresponds to *-ak* in Situ and *-aʃ* in Japhug. A few examples correspond to open syllables *a/iε* and *-a* respectively, a type of correspondence discussed by Sagart (2017).

1. 百 *pæk* < B/S \*p<sup>ʰ</sup>rak ‘hundred’, Tibetan *brgja* བརྒྱ ‘hundred’, Cogtse (Situ) *pərjâ* ‘hundred’, Brag-bar (Situ) *pərjê* ‘hundred’, Japhug *γurza* ‘hundred’. In Brag-bar, *iε* < \*a is realized as *e* after palatal stops. The initial \*p- of the OC etymon corresponds to a presyllable in Gyalrong languages, showing that OC underwent monosyllabicization in this word. The final stop in OC is discussed in Schuessler (2007, 69–70) and Sagart (2017).
2. 膊 *phak* < \*p<sup>ʰ</sup>ak ‘shoulder blade’, Tibetan *phrag* ཤམས་ ‘shoulder’ (Schuessler 2007, 170), Cogtse (Situ) *tə-rpāk* ‘shoulder’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-rpiāk* ‘shoulder’, Japhug *tu-rpaʃ* ‘shoulder’. Since Tibetan lacks a \*rp- cluster, the comparison between Gyalrong and Tibetan suggest that a metathesis \*rp- → \*pr- took place in pre-Tibetan in this etymon.
3. 薄 *bak* < B/S \*[b]<sup>ʰ</sup>ak ‘thin’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-mbâ* ‘to be thin’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mbiê* ‘to be thin’, Japhug *mba* ‘to be thin’.

4. 莫 *mak* < B/S \**mʰak* ‘there is no X such that X ...’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-miāk* ‘not be’, Japhug *maɣ* ‘not be’. This a common Sino-Tibetan negative copula, it is also related to the negative prefix *mV-* in Tibeto-Burman languages (Lai 2017, 248). Pulleyblank (2000) (also mentioned by Schuessler 2007, 70) considered the coda *-k* in \**mʰak* to be a distributive suffix \**-k*, and 莫 is derived from 無 \**ma* > *mju* ‘not have’. Another example provided by Pulleyblank (2000) is 或 \*[*G*]<sup>w</sup>ək > *ɣwok* ‘someone, something’, derived from 有 \*[*G*]<sup>w</sup>əʔ > *hjuwX* ‘have, exist’. Pulleyblank’s hypothesis is not compatible with the comparison presented above.
5. 胳膊 *kak* < B/S \*[*C*.*q*]<sup>ʰ</sup>ak ‘armpit’, Tibetan *lag* ལག ‘arm’ (Schuessler 2007, 252), Cogtse (Situ) *te-jək* ‘arm’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-jāk* ‘arm’, Japhug *tui-jaɣ* ‘arm’. This comparison would be more compatible with a reconstruction such as \**klʰak* in OC.
6. 腋 *jek* < B/S \*[*G*](*r*)Ak ‘armpit’, Tibetan *bzhag*.’og བཞག་འོག ‘armpit’ Japhug *tui-pjaɣpa* ‘armpit’ (the syllable *-pa* is a noun meaning ‘down, bottom part’). This comparisons suggest either a primary yod or a lateral in OC rather than a uvular.

### 5.2.2. 錫 *xi* \**ek*

1. 隻 *tsjek* < B/S \**tek* ‘single’, Tibetan *gcig* གཅིག ‘one’ (Schuessler 2007, 614), Cogtse (Situ) *kə-tək* ‘one’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-rīk* ‘one’, Japhug *tɣɣ* ‘one’. The initial consonant *r-* of the Brag-bar etymon is due to the \**t-* > *r-* lenition. A *t-* initial allomorph can be found in Brag-bar (Situ) *zja-tək* ‘eleven’.
2. 滴 *tek* < \**tek* ‘to drop; drop’, Tibetan *thigs-pa* རྗེགས་པ ‘a drop’, Tibetan *’thig-pa* འཕྲིག་པ ‘to drop’ (Schuessler 2007, 209), Cogtse (Situ) *nthək* ‘drop CLF’, Brag-bar (Situ) *rə-nthāk* ‘drop’.

### 5.2.3. 職 *zhi* \**ək*

A general correspondence between \**ək* in OC and *ak* in Gyalrong languages can be found. The vowel *iε* < \**a* is realized as *iaC* before velar codas in Brag-bar.

1. 革 *kek* < \**kʰrək* ‘hide’ could be compared with Cogtse (Situ) *ka-klāk* ‘peel off’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-kliāk* ‘peel off’, under the assumption that the meaning ‘hide’ derives from ‘skin that has been peeled off’.
2. 慝 *thok* < B/S \**nʰək* ‘evil’ Tibetan *nag-po* རྒྱལ་པོ ‘black’ (Schuessler 2007, 493), Cogtse (Situ) *kə-nək* ‘be black’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-nāk* ‘be black’, Japhug *ɲaɣ* ‘be black’. The meaning ‘evil’ is also found in the lexicalized nominal form Japhug *u-ɣɲaɣ* ‘disastrous consequence’, in which the preinitial *ɣ-* is a lenited form of the velar participle prefix.
3. 織 *tɕik* < B/S \**tək* ‘to weave’, Tibetan *btags* བཏགས ‘to weave (PST)’ (Schuessler 2007, 615), Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-tiāk* ‘to weave’, Japhug *taɣ* ‘to weave’.
4. 色 *srik* < B/S \**s.rək* ‘color; countenance’. Jacques (2015a) relates this word to Japhug *tɣ-zraɣ* ‘shame’, despite the semantic gap. Alternative cognates 赤 *tshjek* < B/S \*[*t-qʰ*](*r*)Ak, 赫 *xæk* < B/S \**qʰrək* ‘red’ are proposed by Schuessler (2007, 451).

### 5.2.4. \**ik*

1. 節 *tset* < B/S \**tsʰik* ‘joint’, Tibetan *tshigs* ཚེགས ‘segment’ (Schuessler 2007, 312), Brag-bar (Situ) *rə-rtsāk* ‘a segment’, Japhug *tui-rtɣɣ* ‘segment’. The first syllable of the Brag-bar etymon is the numeral. It could also be related to Cogtse (Situ) *ka-ra-ntsīk* ‘to cut (into segments)’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-ra-ntsīk* ‘to cut (into segments)’ (Stem I *ra-ntsāk*, Stem II *ra-ntsīk*, Stem I’ *ra-ntsīk*, details of stem alternations in Brag-bar see Zhang 2018).

2. 蝨 *ʃit* < B/S \**srik* ‘louse’. \*-*ik* in OC became -*it* in MC (Baxter and Sagart 2014, 236). Schuessler (2007, 461) compares this word to Tibetan *shig* ཤིག ‘louse’. Japhug *zruy* ‘louse’ is also related. The correspondence between \**sr-* in OC, Tibetan *ʃ-* and *zr-* in Japhug is treated in Jacques (2015a).

### 5.2.5. 屋 *wu* \**ok*

1. 曲 *khjowk* < B/S \**k<sup>h</sup>(r)ok* ‘to bend’ and 局 *gjowk* < B/S \**N-kh(r)ok* ‘be bent, curved’, Japhug *kɔɣ* ‘to curve’ and its anticausative Japhug *ɲgɔɣ* ‘be bent’
2. 啄 *træwk* < B/S \**mə-t<sup>ʰ</sup><r>ok* ‘to peck’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-ntōk* ‘beak’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-ntēk* ‘beak’. The vowel *e* in the Brag-bar etymon is due to a \**o* > *e* sound change. This noun originates from a verb ‘to peck’ also indirectly attested as a fossilized participle in the compound Cogtse (Situ) *ʃi-kō kə-ntōk* ‘woodpecker’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ʃewo-’kontek* ‘woodpecker’, which can be regarded as a lexicalized s/A deverbal noun (Sun and Lin 2007; Jacques 2016c).
3. 殼 *khæwk* < B/S \**[k<sup>h</sup>]ʳok* ‘shell’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-rkhō* ‘bark’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-rkhō* ‘bark’, Japhug *u-rqhu* ‘bark’, Tibetan *skogs-pa* སྐོག་པ་ ‘bark’. The absence of -*k* coda in Gyalrong etyma is unexplained.
4. 角 *kæwk* < B/S \**C.[k<sup>h</sup>]ʳok* ‘horn’. Schuessler (2007, 309) relates this word to Tibetan *rwa* རྩ་ ‘horn’ (on the rhyme -*wa* in this word, see Jacques 2009). Cognates are found in Cogtse (Situ) *tə-rū* ‘horn’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-rū* ‘horn’, Japhug *ta-bru* ‘horn’.

### 5.2.6. 覺 *jue* \**uk*, \**iwk*

1. 毒 *dowk* < B/S \**[d]ʳuk* ‘poison’, Tibetan *dug* དུག ‘poison’ (Schuessler 2007, 216), Cogtse (Situ) *tāk* ‘poison’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-ndōk* ‘poison’, Japhug *tɔ-ndɔɣ* ‘poison’. Cogtse (Situ) *tāk* ‘poison’ is a loanword, otherwise we would expect a voiced initial. Note that in Japhug, the loanword Japhug *tuy* ‘poison’ (Jacques 2004, 166) coexists with the cognate form Japhug *tɔ-ndɔɣ* ‘poison’.
2. 六 *ljuwk* < B/S \**k.ruk* ‘six’, Tibetan *drug* འུག ‘six’ (Schuessler 2007, 362), Cogtse (Situ) *kə-tšōk* ‘six’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kətšōk* ‘six’, Japhug *kutšɔɣ* ‘six’. The initial consonant *tš-* in Situ and Japhug comes from the Proto-Gyalrong consonant cluster \**tr-* (Jacques 2004, 294).
3. 腹 *pjuwk* < B/S \**p(r)uk* ‘belly’, Tibetan *phugs* ཕུགས ‘innermost part’ (Schuessler 2007, 246), Cogtse (Situ) *tə-pōk* ‘belly’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-vōk* ‘belly’, Tibetan *bug* ཐུག ‘hole’. The Brag-bar etymon presents \**p-* > *v-* lenition.
4. 目 *mjuwk* < B/S \**C.m(r)[u]k* ‘eye’, Tibetan *mig* མིག ‘eye’ (Schuessler 2007, 392–93), Cogtse (Situ) *tə-mṅāk* ‘eye’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-mṅāk* ‘eye’, Japhug *tui-mṅaɔɔ* ‘eye’. The consonant cluster *mṅ-* in Gyalrong etyma comes from \**mj-* in Proto-Gyalrong (Jacques 2004, 299).
5. 蹙 *tsjuwk* < \**ts<sup>h</sup>iwk*. The rhyme \**iwk* is reconstructed for this word given its *xiesheng* relation 蹙 *tshek* < B/S \**s.t<sup>h</sup>iwk*. A comparison with Japhug *sthov* ‘to press’ would be possible if the sound change \**st-* → \**ts-* is accepted (Bodman 1969).

### 5.3. -*ŋ* ending rhymes

Gyalrong languages have lost final \*-*ŋ* in native words, so that cognates with Chinese generally have open syllables corresponding to OC \*-*ŋ*.

## 5.3.1. 陽 yang \*aŋ

The rhyme 陽 \*aŋ of OC corresponds to -o in Japhug and Situ.

1. 紡 *phjaŋX* < \*p<sup>h</sup>aŋ? ‘twist, spin’, Tibetan *’phang-ma* འཕང་མ་ ‘spindle’ (Schuessler 2007, 232), Cogtse (Situ) *ka-pô* ‘to spin’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-pô* ‘to spin’, Japhug *pyo* ‘to spin’. The *ɣ* medial in the Japhug etymon comes from the velarized vowel of Proto-Gyalrong \*pa’ŋ.
2. 孟 *maengH* < B/S \*m<sup>h</sup>raŋ-s ‘eldest, great’ is possibly related to Tibetan *mag-pa* མག་པ་ ‘son-in-law’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-nmak* ‘son-in-law’, Japhug *tɛ-nmak* ‘husband’. Another etymology suggested by L. Sagart relates this word with Cogtse (Situ) *kə-mbrô* ‘be tall’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mbrô* ‘be tall’, Japhug *mbro* ‘be tall’.
3. 攘 *jaŋX* < \*naŋ? ‘to oppose; disturb’, Cogtse (Situ) *ka-nô* ‘to chase’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-nô* ‘to chase’, Japhug *no* ‘to chase’. 攘 is related to 讓 *jaŋH* < B/S \*naŋ-s ‘to allow’, and could be possibly related to Tibetan *g.nang-ba* གནང་བ་ ‘to give, allow’.
4. 想 *sjaŋX* < B/S \*[s]aŋ? ‘to think’, Cogtse (Situ) *ka-səsō* ‘to think’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-səsō* ‘to think’, Japhug *suuso* ‘to think’. The verbs in modern Gyalrong languages are possible reduplicated forms of \*saŋ > \*so.
5. 剛 *kaŋ* < B/S \*k<sup>h</sup>aŋ ‘strong, hard’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-rkô* ‘be hard’, Japhug *rko* ‘be hard’, Tibetan *mkhrang-po* མཁྲང་པོ་ ‘be hard’. The form 劬 *gjæŋ* < (possible reconstructions would include \*graŋ, \*N-kraŋ or \*N-rkaŋ) possibly reflects a variant of the same root with a \*r like the Gyalrong and Tibetan cognates.
6. 羊 *jaŋ* < \*laŋ B/S \*gaŋ ‘sheep’, Tibetan *g.yang-dkar* གཡང་དཀར་ ‘sheep’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-jō* ‘sheep’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-jōk* ‘sheep’, Japhug *qa-zo* ‘sheep’. The first syllable in Gyalrong date is the prefix designating animals, which could correspond to the *g-* preinitial in the Tibetan etymon (< PT \*Gə-jaŋ, Jacques 2013). The *-k* coda in the Brag-bar etymon is of unclear origin. Similar phenomenon has also been reported in Kyom-kyo (Situ), in which some words can have two realisations, either with the final velar stop or not, *kəjo?* ~ *kəjok*, *kəru?* ~ *kəruk* (Prins 2016, 47–48).
7. 癢 *jaŋX* < B/S \*Cə.gəŋ? ‘to itch’, Tibetan *g.ya’-ba* གཡལ་བ་ ‘to itch’ (Schuessler 2007, 559), Cogtse (Situ) *ka-rajâk* ‘to itch’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-rejâk* ‘to itch’, Japhug *rɛʒa* ‘to itch’. *rV-* in the Gyalrong etyma could be the denominal prefix. The *-k* coda in Situ is unexplained. This etymon is better reconstructed with a primary initial yod in OC (Jacques 2013).

## 5.3.2. 耕 geng \*eŋ

The rhyme 耕 \*eŋ in OC corresponds to *e* in Situ and *i* in Japhug. A group of \*i/\*e in Brag-bar became *ej*, whose phonetic condition remains to be investigated.

1. 名 *mjiēŋ* < B/S \*C.meŋ ‘name’, Tibetan *ming* མིང་ ‘name’, (Schuessler 2007, 387). The Gyalrong cognates Cogtse (Situ) *tə-rmê* ‘name’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-rmiê* ‘name’, Japhug *tɛ-rmi* ‘name’ have a *r-* preinitial without equivalent in Chinese and Tibetan.
2. 鳴 *mjæŋ* < B/S \*m.reŋ ‘cry (of birds or animals)’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-mərê* ‘be loud’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mbrêj* ‘be loud’, Japhug *mbri* ‘be loud’. The consonant cluster \*mr- in Cogtse became two syllables, with the insertion of *ə*, whereas in Brag-bar and Japhug, \*mr- > *mbr-* (Jacques 2004, 137).
3. 繩 *ziŋ* < B/S \*Cə-m.rəŋ ‘string, cord’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-mbrē* ‘rope’, Japhug *tu-mbri* ‘rope’.

## 5.3.3. 蒸 zheng \*əŋ

The rhyme 蒸 \*əŋ corresponds to *o* in Japhug, after merger with \*aŋ.

1. 冰 *piŋ* < B/S \**p.rəŋ* ‘ice’, Cogtse (Situ) *ta-rpâm* ‘ice’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-rpâm* ‘ice’, Japhug *tx-jpyom* ‘ice’, (Schuessler 2007, 168). The -*ɣ*- medial of the Japhug etymon comes from the velarized vowel \**a*<sup>ʷ</sup> in Proto-Gyalrong. The consonant clusters *rp-* in Situ and *jp-* in Japhug come from the Proto-Gyalrong \**lp-*. This comparison suggests an alternative reconstruction \**rpəm* with labial dissimilation (see section 4).
2. 夢 *mjuwŋH* < \**muŋs* B/S \**C.məŋ-s* ‘dream’, Tibetan *rmang-lam* རྩང་ལམ་ ‘dream’ (Schuessler 2007, 381), Cogtse (Situ) *ta-rmô* ‘dream’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-rmôk* ‘dream’, Japhug *tu-jmŋo* ‘dream’. Like the other velar nasal ending rhymes in OC, the rhyme \**uŋ* also corresponds to a single vowel in Gyalrong languages. However, the -*k* coda of the Brag-bar etymon is likely to be secondary for two reasons. First, the cognate forms in other Gyalrong languages all end in an open syllable. Second, the denominal verb *ka-va-rmô* ‘to dream’ has no coda. The *r-* preinitial in Situ and *j-* preinitial in Japhug comes from the \**l-* preinitial of Proto-Gyalrong (\**lm-* > *rm-* in Situ, *jm-* in Japhug). In addition, the -*ŋ-* medial in Japhug is due to the velarized rhyme \**lma*<sup>ʷ</sup>*ŋ* in Proto-Gyalrong (Jacques 2004, 44).
3. 乃 *nojX* < B/S \**n’ə(ŋ)?* ‘your’, this word is the possessive form of 汝 *nyoX* < \**na?* ‘you (SG)’ (Schuessler 2007, 446). It is comparable to Cogtse (Situ) *nô* ‘you’, Brag-bar (Situ) *nə-jâ* ‘you’, Japhug *nx-zo* ‘you’. The second element in the Brag-bar and Japhug etyma is the root of the reflexive pronoun *təjâ* ‘oneself’ in Brag-bar and *tu-zo* ‘oneself’ in Japhug. The cognate pronoun in Brag-bar and Japhug etyma might occur in their constructed status.
4. 蠅 *jiŋ* < B/S \**m-rəŋ* ‘fly’, Japhug *ɣzo* ‘bee’, Tibetan *sbrang* སྤང་ ‘honey’ < \**smraŋ*.

## 5.3.4. \*iŋ

The rhyme \**iŋ* in OC generally corresponds to a single high vowel in Gyalrong languages, *i* in Japhug and *e* in Situ.

1. 薪 *sin* < B/S \**[sli[n]* ‘firewood’, Tibetan *shing* ཤིང་ ‘tree’ (Schuessler 2007, 538–39), Cogtse (Situ) *fê* ‘wood, firewood’ Brag-bar (Situ) *çê* ‘wood, firewood’, Japhug *si* ‘wood, firewood’.
2. 新 *sin* < B/S \**s.ts<sup>h</sup>i[n]* ‘be new’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-fik* ‘be new’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-çək* ‘be new’, Japhug *çɣɣ* ‘be new’. This series is also a case of a non-checked rhyme \**iŋ* in OC corresponding to a checked rhyme in Gyalrong languages.
3. 身 *çin* < B/S \**ŋi[ŋ]* ‘body, self’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-fnê* ‘heart’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-çnê* ‘heart’, Japhug *tu-sni* ‘heart’, Tibetan *snying* སྤོང་ ‘heart’.
4. 田 *den* < B/S \**l’iŋ* ‘field’, Tibetan *ziŋ-kha* ཞིང་ཁ་ ‘farmland’ (Schuessler 2007, 496), Japhug *tu-ji* ‘field’. It is also related to Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-jê* ‘farming’ and Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-jê* ‘to plant’, the verb is derived by replacing the nominal prefix *tə-* by the dynamic infinitive prefix *ka-*. Backformation from the noun to the verb is also possible, though less likely.

## 5.3.5. 東 dong \*oŋ

1. 撞 *dæwŋH* < B/S \**[N-t]<sup>f</sup><r>oŋ-s* ‘strike’, Japhug *ɛndu* ‘to hit’, Tibetan *rdung-ba* རྩུང་བ་ ‘to beat’.

## 5.4. -t ending rhymes

## 5.4.1. 月 yue \*at

1. 殺 *ɕet* < B/S \*s<r>at ‘to kill’, Tibetan *bsad* བསྐྱེད ‘to kill’ (Schuessler 2007, 452), Cogtse (Situ) *ka-sāt* ‘to kill’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-siēt* ‘to kill’, Japhug *sat* ‘to kill’. For the correspondence between \*sr- in OC and s- in Gyalrong and Tibetan etyma, see Jacques (2015a).
2. 敗 *pæjH* < B/S \*pʳra[t]-s ‘to defeat’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-prêt* ‘to break’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-prāt* ‘to break’, Japhug *prɔt* ‘to break’. 敗 also has an anticausative form *bæjH* < \*N-pʳra[t]-s/\*brats ‘suffer defeat’, cognate forms are also found in Gyalrong languages, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-mbrêt* ‘to break’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-mbrāt* ‘to break’, Japhug *mbrɔt* ‘to break’.

## 5.4.2. 月 yue \*et

1. 八 *pet* < B/S \*pʳret ‘eight’, Tibetan *brgjad* བརྒྱེད ‘eight’ (Schuessler 2007, 152), Cogtse (Situ) *wurjat* ‘eight’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kərcēt* ‘eight’, Japhug *kurcat* ‘eight’. The Cogtse form suggests (as in the case of ‘hundred’) that \*pʳret may have come from an earlier form such as \*pV-rʳjat with primary yod through loss of the vowel in the first syllable and monosyllabicization. Among Gyalrong languages, the Brag-bar and Japhug etyma have the irregular onset rc-, for the expected correspondence would be \*rj- > rʃ- and \*rj- > rʒ-, as in Zbu *və-rjêt* (Gong 2018, 130). The Tibetan etymon has undergone the fortition change \*ry > rgy (Li 1959; Hill 2011).

## 5.4.3. 月 yue \*ot

1. 脫 *thwat* < B/S \*mə-ʎot ‘to take off’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-ɕlēt* ‘to fall (from hand)’ (stem I *ɕlēt*, stem II *ɕlôt*).
2. 刮 *kwæt* < B/S \*[kʷʳ]ra[t] ‘to scrape’, Cogtse (Situ) *ka-khrōt* ‘to scratch’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-khrāt* ‘to scratch’, Japhug *qhrut* ‘to scratch’.
3. 掘 *gjut*; *gjwot* < B/S \*[g]ot; \*[g]ʷat ‘to dig out (earth)’, Cogtse (Situ) *ka-səkū* ‘to bury’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-səkū* ‘to bury’, Japhug *skuu* ‘to bury’, Tibetan *rko* རྒྱུ ‘to dig’.

## 5.4.4. 質 zhi \*it

1. 躓/蹶 *\*tr-lit-s\** B/S [t-l]ri[t]-s ‘to slip’ (Schuessler 2007, 619), Japhug *axdɔt* ‘slip’. Schuessler (2007, 619) also relates this word to Tibetan *dred-pa* འདྲེད་པ་ ‘to slip’.
2. 滅 *mjiet* < \*mit B/S \*[m]et/ ‘to destroy’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-rmēk* ‘to extinguish’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-māk* ‘to extinguish’, Japhug *mi* ‘to extinguish’. The Japhug etymon has lost the final \*-k > -ɣ after the high vowel *i* Jacques (2004, 224). The correspondence between the final -t in OC and -k in Gyalrong languages is unexplained.
3. 七 *tshit* < B/S \*[tsʰ]i[t] (possibly \*s-ŋit) ‘seven’. Schuessler (2007, 419) relates it to ‘seven’ in Gyalrong languages. Cogtse (Situ) *kəfnās* ‘seven’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kəfnēs* ‘seven’, Japhug *kuɕnuuz* ‘seven’.
4. 失 *ɕit* < B/S \*li[t] ‘to lose’, Cogtse (Situ) *ka-flāk* ‘to fall (from hand)’, Japhug *luɣ* ‘to fall’, Japhug *ɕluɣ* ‘to let sth. fall without any attention’. The Gyalrong etyma could be evidence showing that the rhyme \*-it originates from \*-ik in this word (Baxter and Sagart 2014, 236). The preinitial ɕ- is the lexicalized causative prefix.

5. 痺 *pjiH* < *pits* ‘stiff’, Japhug *ndzaurpuut* ‘stiff (IDEO)’<sup>6</sup>. Syllable break of the Japhug etymon is unclear between *ndzūu.rpuut* and *ndzūur.puut*.

## 5.5 -n/-r ending rhymes

### 5.5.1. 元 *yuan* \**an/r*

The rhyme 元 \**an* possibly corresponds to *a* in Gyalrong languages, but this cannot be confirmed until more cognates are found.

1. 顏 *ɲæn* < B/S \**C.ɲʳar* ‘face’ could be compared with Japhug *tu-rɲa* ‘face’, an etymology which would imply an alternative reconstruction \**rɲan* in OC. Schuessler (2007, 551) proposes two other etymologies of this word: derivation from 御迓訝 *ngjoH* < \**[ɲ](r)a-s* ‘to meet’ by suffixation of *-n* nominalizer, or cognate of Tibetan *ngar* །ར་ ‘front side’.

### 5.5.2. 元 \**en/r*

1. 鮮 *sjen* < B/S \**s[a]r* ‘fresh’, Tibetan *gsar-pa* གསར་པ་ ‘fresh,new’ (Schuessler 2007, 528), Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-tsâr* ‘fresh’, Japhug *sɻr* ‘fresh’.

### 5.5.3. 元 \**on/r*

1. 酸 *swan* < B/S \**[s]ʳor* ‘sour’, Cogtse (Situ) *kə-tôôr* ‘be sour’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-tôôr* ‘be sour’, Japhug *tɕur* ‘be sour’  
 2. 晚 *mjonX* < B/S \**m[o][r]ʳ?* ‘late’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-môr* ‘night’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-mēr* ‘night’ < \**tə-môr*, Brag-bar (Situ) *rə-môr* ‘one night’, Japhug *tu-ɣmur* ‘night’. The *ɣ-* preinitial in Japhug etymon comes from wrong segmentation from the numeral prefix ‘one’, as is the case in Japhug *tu-xpa* ‘one year’ (Jacques 2017b).

### 5.5.4. 文 *wen* \**ən/r*

1. 蚓 *jinX* < B/S \**[G](r)ə[r]ʳ?* ‘earthworm’ (Schuessler 2007, 574), Japhug *qa-ndze* ‘earthworm’, Tibetan *srin* སྲིན་ ‘worm’. Japhug *-ndze* comes from Proto \**nre-* (Jacques 2004, 295).

### 5.5.5. 文 *wen* \**un/r*

1. 昏 *xwon* < B/S \**m̥ʳu[n]* ‘dusk, dark’, Japhug *tuurmuu* ‘afternoon’, Tibetan *mun-pa* མུན་པ་ ‘darkness’, Tibetan *mun-po* མུན་པོ་ ‘dark’.  
 2. 熏 *xjun* < B/S \**qʰu[n]* ‘to smoke’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-khâ* ‘smoke’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-khû* ‘smoke’, Japhug *tɻ-khuu* ‘smoke’.

## 5.6. -p ending rhymes

### 5.6.1. 緝 *ji* \**əp* \**ip*

1. 立 *lip* < B/S \**k.rəp* ‘to stand’, Cogtse (Situ) *ka-rjāp* ‘to stand’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-rjēp* ‘to stand’.

<sup>6</sup> Etymology suggested by Gong Xun.

2. 汲 *kip* < *kəp* ‘to scoop water’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-kiēp* ‘to carry water on back’, Japhug *kaβ* ‘to carry water on back’. Brag-bar (Situ) *sa-kāp* ‘well’, Japhug *sakaβ* ‘well’ are lexicalized locative participles, formed by adding the oblique participant nominalizer *sV-* (Sun 2006; Jacques 2016c).

## 5.7 -*m* ending rhymes

### 5.7.1. 侵 *qin* \**əm* \**um*

1. 頤 *yomX* < B/S \*[*ɕ*]<sup>h</sup>[*ə*]*m*? ‘jaw, chin’, Japhug *ta-mgom* ‘pliers’.
2. 枕 *tqimX* < B/S \*[*t.k*]<sup>h</sup>[*ə*]*m*? ‘pillow’, Brag-bar (Situ) *tə-mkâm* ‘pillow’, Japhug *tɣ-mkum* ‘pillow’. The *t-* preinitial in OC could be related to the indefinite possessive prefix in Gyalrong languages.
3. 三 *sam* < \*<sup>h</sup>*səm* B/S \**s.rum* ‘three’, Tibetan *gsum* གསུམ ‘three’ (Schuessler 2007, 449), Cogtse (Situ) *kəsâm* ‘three’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kəsâm* ‘three’, Japhug *χsum* ‘three’.
4. 參 *šim* < \*<sup>h</sup>*srəm* B/S \**s.rum* ‘plant root’, Cogtse (Situ) *tə-srêm* ‘root’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-srâm* ‘root’, Japhug *tɣ-zrɣm* ‘root’ (Jacques 2015a).
5. 覃 *dom* < \*<sup>h</sup>*ləm* B/S \**N.r*[*o*]*m* ‘to extend, spread’, Brag-bar (Situ) *rə-kcâm* ‘length of two arms’, Japhug *tu-ɣom* ‘length of two arms’, Tibetan *ndom-pa* འདོམ་པ་ ‘armspan’. The initial consonant *ɣ-* of the Japhug etymon may have come from the Proto \**lj-*, and *nd-* in the Tibetan etymon from \**nl-* (Jacques 2004, 148). The preinitial *k-* in the Brag-bar etymon remains unexplained.
6. 針 *tqim* < B/S \**t.k*[*ə*]*m* ‘needle’, Cogtse (Situ) *ta-kāp* ‘needle’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-wiēp* ‘needle’, Japhug *ta-qaβ* ‘needle’, Tibetan *khav* ཁམ ‘needle’. The preinitial \**t-* in OC could be related to the indefinite possessive in Gyalrong languages. The *w-* initial in Brag-bar etymon is due the \**k-* > *w-* lenition.
7. 陰 *?im* < B/S \**q(r)um* ‘be cloudy, dark’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-ncâp* ‘dark side of the mountain’, Japhug *nqiaβ* ‘dark side of the mountain’. The consonant cluster with a uvular initial and *-j-* medial in Northern Gyalrong languages corresponds to the palatal initial in Situ, Proto-Gyalrong \**uvular-j-* has been palatalized in Situ Jacques (2004, 309).
8. 熊 *hjuwŋ* < B/S \**C.[ɕ]**w(r)əm* ‘bear’, Tibetan *dom* ཇོམ ‘bear’ (Schuessler 2007, 542), Cogtse (Situ) *təwām* ‘bear’, Brag-bar (Situ) *təwām* ‘bear’. The Tibetan etymon comes from \**dwam*, \**wa* could have been monophthongized to *o* (Jacques 2009) as in Japhug \**ɕwa* > *ɕya* ‘tooth’ and Tibetan \**swa* > *so* སོ ‘tooth’.

## 5.8. -*w* ending rhymes

Gyalrong languages lack *-w* coda in native words.

### 5.8.1. 幽 *you* \**iw*

The rhyme 幽 \**iw* corresponds to a non-front vowel in Gyalrong languages, *ə* in Cogtse (Situ), *u* in Brag-bar (Situ) and *iu* in Japhug.

1. 梟 *kew* < \*<sup>h</sup>*kiw* ‘owl’ (Schuessler 2007, 535), Cogtse (Situ) *pka-khā* ‘owl’, Brag-bar (Situ) *pow-khū* ‘owl’, Japhug *pyɣ-khuu* ‘owl’. The first syllable of the Gyalrong etyma is the word designating ‘bird’, Cogtse (Situ) *pka-tfû* ‘chicken’, Brag-bar (Situ) *pa-tɕû* ‘chicken’, Japhug *pyɣ-tɕuu* ‘bird’.



## 5.8.2. 宵 xiao \*aw

1. 熬 *ɲaw* < B/S \**ɲ<sup>h</sup>aw* ‘to fry, roast’, Tibetan *rngo* མོ་མོ་ ‘to fry’ (Schuessler 2007, 151), Cogtse (Situ) *ka-rɲô* ‘to fry’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-rɲô* ‘to fry’ (Stem I *rɲô*, stem II *rɲē*, stem II’ *rɲô*), Japhug *rɲu* ‘to fry’. The Gyalrong forms could also be loanwords from Tibetan.
2. 号 *ɣawH* < B/S \*[*g<sup>h</sup>*aw-s ‘command’, 號 *haw* < B/S \*[*C.g<sup>h</sup>*aw ‘call out’.. It is comparable to Cogtse (Situ) *ka-ɲa-khō* ‘to shout, call’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-okhō* ‘to shout, call’, Japhug *akhu* ‘to shout, call’.

## 5.9. -j ending rhymes

## 5.9.1. 歌 ge \*aj

1. 羆 *pje* < B/S \**praj* ‘brown-and-white bear’, Cogtse (Situ) *prī* ‘Asiatic brown bear’, Brag-bar (Situ) *prī* ‘Asiatic brown bear’, Japhug *pri* ‘Asiatic brown bear’.

## 5.9.2. 脂 zhi \*ij

1. 屎 *ɕijX* < B/S \*[*q<sup>h</sup>*ij? ‘excrement’, Japhug *tuu-qe* ‘excrement’. An alternative reconstruction \**lhij?* is proposed by Schuessler (2007, 465), it is comparable to Tibetan *lci-ba* ལེ་བ་ ‘excrement’ < PT \**lhyi*, and Japhug *tuu-ɣli* ‘excrement’ < Proto-Gyalrong \**klij* (Jacques 2004, 313).
2. 米 *mejX* < \**mij?* B/S \*(C.)*m<sup>h</sup>[e]j?* ‘millet or rice grains’, *smai-khrī* “小米” (Huáng and Sūn 2002, 550). The second element of this etymon is the widespread word of ‘rice’ in Situ, Cogtse (Situ) *khrī* ‘rice’, Brag-bar (Situ) *khrī* ‘rice’, also found in Japhug *khruu-zwa* ‘cooked rice’. This word is related to Tibetan *khre* མེ་ ‘millet’.
3. 矢 *B/S* \**lilj?* ‘arrow’, Japhug *tuu-di* ‘arrow’. The voice initial consonant *d-* in Japhug might come from \**ld-* in Proto-Gyalrong (Jacques 2004, 313).
4. 死 *sijX* < B/S \**sij?* ‘to die’, Tibetan *shi* ཤི་ ‘to die’ (Schuessler 2007, 478), Cogtse (Situ) *ka-fi* ‘to die’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kə-ɕi* ‘to die’, Japhug *si* ‘to die’.
5. 妣 *pjijX* < B/S \**pij?-s* ‘deceased mother’, Schuessler (2007, 162) relates this word to Tibetan *phyi-mo* ཕྱི་མོ་ ‘grandmother’, which according to Benedict (1942) is the common Tibeto-Burman root for grandmother. The Gyalrong words Cogtse (Situ) *ta-wî* ‘grandmother’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-wî* ‘grandmother’, Japhug *tx-wi* ‘grandmother’ are possible cognates.
6. 畀 *pjijH* < \**pij-s* B/S \**pi[t]-s* ‘to give’, Cogtse (Situ) *ke-wû* ‘to give’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-mbī* ‘to give’, Japhug *mbi* ‘to give’, Tibetan *sbyin* སྤྱིན་ ‘to confer’. The initial consonant of the Cogtse etymon presents \**b-* > *w-* lenition.
7. 二 *nijH* < B/S \**nilj]-s* ‘two’, Tibetan *gnyis* གཉིས་ ‘two’ (Schuessler 2007, 226–27), Cogtse (Situ) *kənês* ‘two’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kənâs* ‘two’, Japhug *ɛnuuz* ‘two’.

## 5.9.3. 微 wei \*aj

The rhyme 微 \**aj* \**uj* corresponds to a high/mid-high vowel in Gyalrong languages, *i/e* in Cogtse (Situ), *i/e/ej* in Brag-bar (Situ) and *i/e* in Japhug.

1. 眉 *mij* < /\**mrāj* B/S \**mr[a][r]* ‘eyebrow’ (Schuessler 2007, 377), Cogtse (Situ) *ta-rɲê* ‘hair’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-rɲê* ‘hair’, Japhug *tx-rme* ‘hair’. This root is also found in compound nouns Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-we-rɲê* ‘hair’, Japhug *tuu-kɣ-rme* ‘hair’, the first syllable is the constructed status of Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-wô* ‘head’, Japhug *tuu-ku* ‘head’.

2. 尾 *mjiX* < B/S \*[m]aj? ‘tail’, Cogtse (Situ) *ta-jmî* ‘tail’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-jmî* ‘tail’, Japhug *tx-jme* ‘tail’. The *j-* (*jm-*) preinitial in the Gyalrong etyma comes from the *\*l-* (*\*lm-*) preinitial before labial initials (Jacques 2004, 271), which has no equivalent in OC.
3. 邇 *nyeX* < B/S \*n[aj]r? ‘near’. Schuessler (2007, 226) relates this word to Tibetan *nye-ba* ཉེ་བ་ ‘near’ and Tibetan *snyen-pa* སྙེན་པ་ ‘to come near’. The verb root itself is not attested in Gyalrong languages, but the noun Japhug *tu-γni* ‘friend’ is a possible cognate of Tibetan *gnyen* གཉེན་ ‘friend, relative’, a noun derived from the verb root by the *g...-n* circumfix (Jacques 2018).
4. 火 *xwaX* < \*māj? (Schuessler 2007, 290–91) B/S \*[q<sup>wh</sup>]aj? ‘fire’. The phonetic evolution of this word from OC is irregular, as MC *-wa* normally comes from OC *\*-aj* or *\*-oj*. The word 火 rhymes as *\*-aj* in the *Shijing*, as in 七月流火，九月授衣 (《 豳風 · 七月 》). Schuessler (2007, 290–91) relates this word to Tibetan *me* མེ ‘fire’ (see also Hill 2013 on an alleged spelling of this word in Tibetan cited by some Sinologists). Cognate is found in Japhug *smi* ‘fire’. This word could originally be a compound *\*su-mi*, in which *su* is the construct status of Japhug *si* ‘firewood’, and cannot be used as evidence for a cluster *\*sm-* in Old Chinese.

#### 5.9.4. 微 *wei \*uj*

1. 虺 *xwojX* < \*hmaj? B/S \*[r]lu[j]? ‘snake brood; sound of thunder’ (Schuessler 2007, 287), Cogtse (Situ) *kha-brē* ‘snake’, Brag-bar (Situ) *kha-prēj* ‘snake’, Japhug *qa-pri* ‘snake’, Tibetan *sbrul* སྐྱུལ་ ‘snake’ < *\*smrul* (Jacques 2004, 137). There is no equivalent of *s-* preinitial of the Tibetan etymon in OC and Gyalrong languages. The Gyalrong etymon for ‘snake’ could also be possible cognate of 巴 *pæ* < *\*p<sup>r</sup>ra* ‘snake’.

#### 5.10. Wanderwörter

1. 菽<sup>7</sup> *syuwk* < B/S \*s-t<sup>(h)</sup>uk ‘pulse, beans’, Cogtse (Situ) *tē-stōk* ‘broad bean’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ta-stēk* ‘broad bean’, Japhug *stok* ‘broad bean’. The Brag-bar etymon has undergone the *\*o > v* sound change. Despite the regular phonetic correspondence between OC and Gyalrong words, (Sagart 1999, 185–88) points out that the bean has been domesticated too recently to be a cognate.
2. 馬 *mæX* < B/S \*m<sup>r</sup>ra? ‘horse’, Cogtse (Situ) *mbrō* ‘horse’, Brag-bar (Situ) *mbrō* ‘horse’, Japhug *mbro* ‘horse’. Sagart (1999, 196) suggests that 馬 could be an early loanword from TB, after the loss of vowel nasalization of *\*mraŋ* or *\*mrã* (also mentioned in Schuessler 2007, 373).
3. 兔 *thuH* < B/S \*f<sup>h</sup>a-s ‘rabbit, hare’, Cogtse (Situ) *ka-lā* ‘rabbit’, Brag-bar (Situ) *ka-liē* ‘rabbit’, Japhug *qa-la* ‘rabbit’ (Schuessler 2007, 502). The first syllable in Gyalrong etyma is the lexicalized nominal prefix designating animals (Jacques 2008, 52–54).

#### References

- Baxter, William H. 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.  
 Baxter, William H., Laurent Sagart. 2014. *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford University Press.  
 Benedict, Paul K. 1942. Tibetan and Chinese Kinship Terms. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 6 (3/4): 313–37.

<sup>7</sup> These Wanderwörter have related words in many other branches of ST/TH and beyond, and a full examination of the complete dataset is beyond the scope of this work.

- Bodman, Nicholas C. 1969. Tibetan *Sdud* 'Folds of a Garment', the Character 卒, and the \*st-Hypothesis. *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 39: 327–46.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1972. A Reconsideration of Fortunatov's Law. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35 (3): 531–45.
- Coblin, Weldon South. 1986. *A Sinologist's Handlist of Sino-Tibetan Lexical Comparisons*. Steyler Verlag.
- Conrady, August. 1896. *Eine indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ-Bildung und ihr Zusammenhang mit den Tonaccenten*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Davids, Irene Maria Hendrina, George van Driem. 1985. Limbu Kinship Terminology: A Description. *Himalayan Languages* XII (1-2): 115–56.
- Dixon, R. M. W., Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). 2000. *Changing Valency*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gong, Hwang-cherng. 1995. The System of Finals in Proto-Sino-Tibetan. In: William S.-Y. Wang (ed.). *The Ancestry of Chinese*: 41–92. Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series.
- Gong, Xun. 2017. Jiarong yuzu yuyan yu shanggu hanyu de xingtaixue (嘉绒语组语言与上古汉语的形态学). In: Haeree Park, Shaoxuan Cheng (eds.). *Gu wenzi yu hanyu lishi yinyunxue* (古文字与汉语历史音韵学): 134–56. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe (复旦中华文明研究专刊).
- Gong, Xun. 2018. *Le rgyalrong zbu, une langue tibéto-birmane de Chine du Sud-ouest. Une étude descriptive, typologique et comparative*. PhD thesis: Institut National des langues et des civilisations orientales.
- Handel, Zev. 2002. Rethinking the Medials of Old Chinese: Where Are the R's? *Cahier de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 31 (1): 3–32.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. More on the Typology of Inchoative/Causative Verb Alternations. In: Bernard Comrie, Maria Polinsky (eds.). *Causatives and Transitivity*: 80–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hill, Nathan. 2011. An Inventory Of Tibetan Sound Laws. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 21 (4): 441–57.
- Hill, Nathan. 2013. Old Chinese \*Sm- and the Old Tibetan Word for Fire. *Cahier de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 42 (1): 60–71.
- Huáng, Liángróng, Hóngkǎi Sūn. 2002. *Han Jiarong cidian* (漢嘉戎詞典). Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2004. *Phonologie et Morphologie du Japhug (rGyalrong)*. PhD thesis, Paris: Université Paris VII – Denis Diderot.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2005. *Jiarongyu yu shanggu hanyu* (嘉绒语与上古汉语). Hanyu shanggu yin guoji yantaohui (汉语上古音国际研讨会): December 2005. Ms., available online at: <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00137451/document>.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2008. *Jiarongyu yanjiu* (嘉绒语研究). Beijing: Nationalities Press.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2009. Tibetan Wa-Zur and Laufer's Law. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 32 (1): 141–44.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2012. The Tangut Kinship System in Qiangic Perspective. In: Nathan W. Hill (ed.). *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages*: 211–256. Leiden: Brill.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2013. On Pre-Tibetan Semi-Vowels. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 76 (2): 289–300.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2015a. On the Cluster \*Sr- in Sino-Tibetan. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 43 (1): 215–23.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2015b. The Origin of the Causative Prefix in Rgyalrong Languages and Its Implication for Proto-Sino-Tibetan Reconstruction. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 36: 165–98.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2015c. The Spontaneous-Autobenefactive Prefix in Japhug Rgyalrong. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 38 (2): 271–91.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2016a. How Many \*-S Suffixes in Old Chinese? *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* 9 (2): 205–17.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2016b. Le Sino-Tibétain: Polysynthétique Ou Isolant? *Faits de Langues* 47 (1): 61–74.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2016c. Subjects, Objects and Relativization in Japhug. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 44 (1): 1–28.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2017a. La Nasale Intrusive En Limbou. *Panchronica* (available online at: <https://panchr.hypotheses.org/1654>).
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2017b. The Morphology of Numerals and Classifiers in Japhug. In: Picus Sizhi Ding, Jamin Pelkey (eds.). *Sociohistorical Linguistics in Southeast Asia*: 135–48. Leiden: Brill.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2018. Fossil Nominalization Prefixes in Tibetan and Chinese. In: *LFK Society Young Scholar Symposium*. Taipei.
- Kümmel, Martin J. 2007. *Konsonantenwandel: Bausteine zu einer Typologie des Lautwandels und ihre Konsequenzen für die vergleichende Rekonstruktion*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Lai, Yunfan. 2017. *Grammaire Du Khroskyabs de Wobzi*. PhD thesis, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3.
- Li, Fang-Kuei. 1959. Tibetan Glo-Ba-'Dring. In: Søren Egerod, Else Glahn (eds.). *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata*: 55–59. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.

- List, Johann-Mattis. 2016. Beyond Cognacy: Historical Relations Between Words and Their Implication for Phylogenetic Reconstruction. *Journal of Language Evolution* 1 (2): 119–36.
- Miyake, Marc Hideo. 2012. Complexity from Compression: A Sketch of Pre-Tangut. In: Irina Popova (ed.). *Tanguts in Central Asia: A Collection of Articles Marking the 80th Anniversary of Prof. E. I. Kychanov*: 244–61. Moscow: Vostochnaja Literatura.
- Nagano, Sadako. 1994. A Note on the Tibetan Kin Terms Khu and Zhang. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 17 (2): 103–15.
- Peiros, Ilia, Sergei Starostin. 1996. *A Comparative Vocabulary of Five Sino-Tibetan Languages*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne, Department of Linguistics.
- Prins, Marielle. 2016. *A Grammar of Rgyalrong Jiāomùzú (Kyom-Kyo) Dialects*. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1981. Some Notes on Chinese Historical Phonology. *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 69: 277–88.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 2000. Morphology in Old Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 28 (1): 26–51.
- Sagart, Laurent. 1999. *The Roots of Old Chinese*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sagart, Laurent. 2017. A Candidate for a Tibeto-Burman Innovation. *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 46: 101–119.
- Sagart, Laurent, William H. Baxter. 2012. Reconstructing the \*S- Prefix in Old Chinese. *Language and Linguistics* 13 (1): 29–59.
- Sagart, Laurent, Guillaume Jacques, Yunfan Lai, Robin J. Ryder, Valentin Thouzeau, Simon J. Greenhill, Johann-Mattis List. 2019. Dated Language Phylogenies Shed Light on the Ancestry of Sino-Tibetan. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 116 (21): 10317–22.
- Schuessler, Axel. 2007. *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Simon, Walter. 1929. Tibetisch-Chinesische Wortgleichungen, ein Versuch. *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 32: 157–228.
- Starostin, Sergei A. 1989. *Rekonstrukcija Drevnekitajskoj Fonologičeskoj Sistemy [Reconstruction of the Phonological System of Old Chinese]*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Sun, Jackson T.-S. 2006. *Caodeng jiarongyu de guanxiju (草登嘉戎語的關係句)*. *Language and Linguistics* 7 (4): 905–33.
- Sun, Jackson T.-S., Youjing Lin. 2007. Constructional variation in rGyalrong relativization: how to make a choice? In: *Pre-Conference Proceedings of the International Workshop on Relative Clauses*: 205–226. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Zhang, Shuya. 2016. *La morphologie et la phonologie du dialecte de Brag-dbar du rgyalrong situ*. Master's thesis: Institut National des langues et des civilisations orientales.
- Zhang, Shuya. 2018. Stem Alternations in the Brag-bar Dialect of Situ Rgyalrong. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 41 (2): 294–330.

Чжан Шуя, Гийом Жак, Лай Юньфань. К вопросу о когнатах между гьярунгскими языками и древнекитайским

Гьярунгские языки, составляющие подгруппу бирмано-цзянской ветви сино-тибетской семьи, распространены на западе китайской провинции Сычуань. Они относятся к полисинтетическому типу и обладают богатыми системами глагольной морфологии. Хотя гьярунгские языки не демонстрируют близкого родства с китайским языком, они, тем не менее, представляют большой интерес для сравнительного изучения сино-тибетских (транс-гималайских) языков из-за архаичной природы их фонологической и морфологической систем. В данной статье, опираясь на предшествующие исследования в области древнекитайской фонологии и сопоставляя их с результатами новейших полевых данных, мы пытаемся показать, каким образом гьярунгские языки могут пролить свет на особенности древнекитайской морфологии и помочь тем самым скорректировать реконструкцию древнекитайского языка. В статье также приводится список возможных когнатов между древнекитайским и гьярунгскими языками, включая тибетские параллели там, где они обнаруживаются.

Ключевые слова: гьярунгские языки, древнекитайский язык, этимологические когнаты, сравнительная морфология, историческая реконструкция.