

ACTA LINGUISTICA HAFNIENSIA

founded in 1939 by Viggo Brøndal and Louis Hjelmslev

EDITORS

Søren Egerod · Michael Fortescue · Jørgen Rischel
Jens Elmegård Rasmussen (secretary)

EDITORIAL ADDRESS

Department of Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, Njalsgade 96,
DK-2300. Copenhagen S, Denmark.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

C. A. Reitzels Forlag, Nørregade 20, DK-1165. Copenhagen K,
Denmark.

SEE INSIDE BACK COVER FOR INFORMATION TO CONTRIBUTORS.

LANGUAGE CHANGE, CONJUGATIONAL MORPHOLOGY AND
THE SINO-TIBETAN *URHEIMAT*

by

GEORGE VAN DRIEM

Rijksuniversiteit Leiden

The antiquity of verbal agreement in Tibeto-Burman has of late increasingly become a matter of controversy. The nature of language change itself and the location of the Sino-Tibetan proto-homeland have been drawn into the discussion. This paper is a comment on three hypotheses advanced by LaPolla (1992a), who is an outspoken opponent of the idea that verbal agreement morphology is an ancient trait in Tibeto-Burman.¹

A critical appraisal of these hypotheses is, I believe, timely because a number of the premisses central to this line of thought do not represent ideas held exclusively by LaPolla, who, to his credit, has attempted to mould them into a coherent conceptual framework, but crop up as recurrent motifs in the discussion of the historical status of verbal agreement in Tibeto-Burman, and, in my view, represent ill-defined and poorly understood notions.

Previously, either of two competing scenarios were widely held to account for the cognate conjugational systems in Tibeto-Burman languages: (1) the retention of an ancient trait and (2) what I have called 'a tendency to pronominalize, i.e. to agglutinate pronouns' to the verb, which may have existed

1. LaPolla (1992a) ventures various interpretations of Tangut conjugational morphology to support his hypotheses, but Kepping (forthcoming) deals with LaPolla's misrepresentation of the Tangut material. Verbal agreement and a number of other morphological processes in Tangut were only discovered relatively recently by Kepping (1979, 1981, 1982, 1985). Nishida (1964, 1966), for example, first denied the existence of verbal agreement in Tangut. Later Nishida (1987) not only accepted this view, but also adopts the analysis of aspectual morphology outlined by Kepping (1985), which he reproduces as received knowledge. Tangut aspect markers are shown by Kepping (1972, 1985, 1987) to derive from older direction markers.

at the Proto-Tibeto-Burman level, persisting 'in certain groups whilst petering out in others' (1991: 532-3).

For a scenario of the second type, Sapir (1978: 155) coined the term 'drift', which he described as language change which is 'cumulative in some special direction' so that 'the changes of the next few centuries are in a sense prefigured in certain obscure tendencies of the present and that these changes, when consummated, will be seen to be but continuations of changes that have been already effected'. LaPolla (1992a) latches onto the notion of drift in his more recent attempt to 'deconstruct' Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax. Yet, even the 'drift' scenario places the genesis of verbal flexional systems at a point in time shortly after the break-up of Proto-Tibeto-Burman and presumes that the syntactic factors giving rise to such flexional systems were fully operative in the Tibeto-Burman proto-language.

LaPolla (1992a: 311-12) rejects the first of these two scenarios, stating 'that we do not have sufficient evidence to allow us to confidently assert that the suffixal pattern is a case of shared retention in those languages that exhibit it, and that it was lost in those languages that do not exhibit it, so the dating of those systems that can be reconstructed for certain subgroups must be later than the Proto-Tibeto-Burman stage'. In my opinion, this conclusion is premature, as LaPolla undertakes no evaluation of the evidence. A continuing, critical assessment of analysed material is required, and the discovery and formulation of sound laws in Tibeto-Burman will facilitate an appraisal of the accumulated morphological evidence. Before discussing LaPolla's three alternative hypotheses, I shall comment on three notions germane to the discussion.

1. Zero marking, optionality and etymological transparency

There exists a widespread tendency for third person to be the zero-marked category in verbal systems, and in such systems overt marking is implicitly restricted to first and second person actants, the so-called 'speech act participants'. This well attested phenomenon does not provide sufficient grounds to warrant LaPolla's (1989, 1992a) claim that the conjugational endings in Tangut, or in any other language in which this is the case, are 'clearly pragmatically-based grammaticalizations of the discourse prominence of speech act participants', a contention which remains unsupported by any study of features which might characterise discourse in Tangut. In Tangut, agent and patient are syntactic categories, just as subject and object are in English. LaPolla's (1992a, 1992b) categorizing the latter as 'syntactic functions' and

the former as 'semantic relations' is an artificial distinction at variance with the morphological evidence. 'Every grammatical construction encodes a certain meaning, which can be revealed and rigorously stated, so that the meanings of different constructions can be compared in a precise and illuminating fashion, both within one language and across language boundaries' (Wierzbicka 1988: 3). When grammatical constructions in a language under investigation do not exactly correspond in meaning to categories in familiar languages, this alone does not justify considering the categories with unfamiliar meaning as something other than grammatical categories.

Similarly, LaPolla's (1992a: 312) conclusion 'that most of the systems we find are not of an ergative nature, and do not reflect semantic or syntactic relations, but all seem to have grown out of pragmatic pressures to mark the salient participants involved in the speech act' is unwarranted and evidently based on what are incomplete data for the conjugations of Chepang, rGya-roñ, Tangut and Hayu. LaPolla (1992a: 309) alleges that Michailovsky (1988) 'explicitly demonstrates that the verb agreement system in Hayu is also clearly not ergative'. In fact, Michailovsky (1988: 111-13) demonstrates that Hayu reflects an ergative system in the case marking of actants as well as in the way the verb encodes a first person singular actant, viz. transitive patient and intransitive subject vs. transitive agent. Other Hayu verbal suffixes, however, are indifferent with respect to the ergative vs. accusative opposition, but the different way in which the Hayu verb marks number of first and second vs. third person actants appears to match the split-ergative pattern widely attested in Tibeto-Burman conjugations. Whether ergativity is an ancient trait of Tibeto-Burman verbal morphology or just a widespread phenomenon is an unresolved question. At present, evidence may favour the former alternative. Yet rGya-roñ verbal morphology, due in part to the large number of *portemanteau* morphemes, does not as unequivocally reflect either an accusative or an ergative system, although the existence in rGya-roñ of a distinct third person transitive agent prefix <wu-> seems to lend some support to the ergative view.

The second point is that morphology is not always as historically transparent as it seems. LaPolla's claims about the optionality and etymological transparency of verbal agreement in Tangut are refuted by Kepping (forthcoming). The point I want to make here is that even if verbal agreement in Tangut were optional, this would not necessarily lend support to the contention that the conjugation is an innovation but could serve just as readily to argue that Tangut was in the process of losing its conjugational morphology and that agreement suffixes could, under certain circumstances, be dropped.

This phenomenon would be similar to the results of historical decay observed in the Bahing conjugation (van Driem 1991) and the Yamphu paradigm (Rutgers 1992).

The third point is that the assumption that the conjugation of Tangut, or of any other Tibeto-Burman language, is etymologically transparent is, given our present state of knowledge, highly precarious. This is illustrated by the first plural ending *-my* of the Polish verb, which developed from Old Polish *-mš* by analogy to the first person plural pronoun *my* 'we' (Kortlandt 1979: 63). If we knew as little about the history of Indo-European as we do about that of Tibeto-Burman, we might consider the Polish ending, in light of the pronoun, to be 'etymologically transparent', where in truth the etymological relationship is far more complex. It is precisely 'this type of teleological development' whereby conjugational endings come to 'correspond to the free pronouns in phonological shape' which LaPolla (1992a: 304) considers 'a very unlikely possibility'. In fact, it is quite possible that similar processes of analogy, widely attested in other families, took place in the historical development of Tibeto-Burman flexional systems. In Uralic studies, this very argument, viz. the identity of the flexional endings with the personal or possessive pronouns, was raised against the thesis that the opposition between the subjective and objective conjugations can be traced back to Proto-Uralic, and this argument too was shown to be inconclusive, since this identity appears to have been the result of analogic remodelling (Kortlandt 1983: 313-4).

2. Alternative hypotheses

As opposed to the ancient trait and drift scenarios, LaPolla (1992a: 301) proposes three alternative explanations for the conjugational systems observed in the many branches of the Tibeto-Burman family: '(a) those languages with verb agreement systems are genetically related on a higher level; (b) a verb agreement system independently developed in one language and spread geographically; or (c) some combination of innovation within two or more subgroups and geographical spread or drift occurred.'

(1) In defence of the first alternative, LaPolla reminds us that the lower-level subgroupings within Tibeto-Burman have not been definitely established and then regroups languages genetically in such a way as to isolate languages with modern conjugational systems into 'three out of the six' major branches of the Tibeto-Burman family, whereby the six sub-branches of DeLancey's (1987) taxonomical schema for the family are assumed: Bodish, East Himalayan, Kāmarūpan, Kachinic, Rung and Lolo-Burmese. Despite the

paramount importance of cognate morphological systems for the establishment of genetic relationships, it is methodologically unsound to base genetic sub-groupings on shared flexional systems alone, since the languages grouped together solely on this basis could in truth very well belong to disparate branches of the same family but have more fully retained a common ancestral system, as in the case of the conjugations of Russian, Sardinian and Nepali. In view of LaPolla's wishful restructuring of Tibeto-Burman, it now appears premature for DeLancey (1989: 320) to have written 'the notion that all of the Tibeto-Burman languages exhibiting a suffixal agreement paradigm belong to a single branch of the family is certainly dead'.

There are several authoritative *Stammbäume* of the Sino-Tibetan language family, although the status of sub-groupings remains controversial. Benedict stands by his 1972 taxonomical model, although whether Karen constitutes a coordinate node with or subordinate node of Tibeto-Burman 'remains indeterminate' (Benedict 1976: 167). Benedict argues that Shafer's groupings Burmic, Baric and Bodic, which DeLancey (1989) employs in his family tree, and I have in mine (van Driem 1993), 'have no demonstrable basis', and proposes instead that Kachin, Konyak and Bodo-Garo make up a group, 'perhaps even the earliest to split off of common Tibeto-Burman', and that Nungish is nearest to Lolo-Burmese, 'making up a Burmese-Lolo/Nungish group' (Paul K. Benedict, letter of 7 June 1992). In his letter, Benedict also points out that, whereas rGya-roñ and Qiāng are 'entirely distinct', Kuki-Naga, Mikir and Meithei constitute a 'supergroup', and 'Sinitic also includes Bái'. In my Sino-Tibetan family tree, I include Matisoff's grouping Kāmarūpan, which is basically a geographical group of languages spoken roughly in the territory of the mediaeval kingdom of Kāmarūpa (4th-13th centuries) and for which definitive sub-groupings have not yet been established. Recently I described the conjugation of Black Mountain Mönpa, a language of central Bhutan belonging to the East Bodish branch, which in Shafer's assessment is more conservative than either West Bodish or Central Bodish. The Black Mountain Mönpa evidence established that even in Bodish, which roughly corresponds to Benedict's Tibeto-Kanauri branch, common Tibeto-Burman conjugational morphology has been retained, which strongly suggests that the absence of verbal agreement in Tibetan is the result of a secondary development. Moreover, on the basis of internal reconstruction and comparative study, the Newar dialects which exhibit no conjugational flexion have been shown to have lost verbal agreement morphology secondarily, whereas the affixes of the Dolakhā conjugation have been shown to be cognate with Proto-Tibeto-Burman conjugational proto-morphemes (Genetti 1990, van Driem

1994). In fact, whether one adheres to Benedict's, DeLancey's (1987) or my (1993) divisions, Lolo-Burmese and Karen are the only major branches of Tibeto-Burman which have not retained the hypothetically ancestral Tibeto-Burman conjugation, and, if we accept Benedict's larger 'Burmese-Lolo/Nungish group', the absence of this conjugation in Lolo-Burmese would appear to be the results of a later development which parallels the dramatic attrition observed in the historical phonology of that branch, such as the loss of finals.

(2) LaPolla's second alternative entertains the idea of the geographical spread of cognate conjugational systems by diffusion. Areal norms and *Sprachbünde* reflect the geographical spread of syntactic, lexical, phonological and even morphological traits, but this idea is not applicable to complex cognate flexional systems. The wholesale borrowing of an elaborate flexional system such as a verbal conjugation is unattested outside the context of language death or creolization, and conjugational systems do not spread by diffusion. *Mischsprachen* do not exist because, although a language may bear components from two genetically distinct languages, these components are not equivalent. The grammar represents the inherited component, and the lexicon, or a portion thereof, is the borrowed component, which is the traditional meaning of 'loan' in comparative linguistics. Because of its characteristically Altaic grammar, an average Japanese sentence can be readily translated word by word into Mongolian, although many of the words in such a sentence might be of Austronesian or other ancestry.

Derivational morphemes are occasionally borrowed. The borrowing of flexional morphemes is rare. The third person singular <-s> of the English present is a typical example of a morpheme which is not likely to be borrowed. Such insights, which have long been commonplace in linguistics, somehow seem to get overlooked in the discussion on Tibeto-Burman historical morphology. A morpheme such as the Dutch derivational suffix <-atie>, which is of alien origin, was not borrowed from Romance as such, but entered the language exclusively as a part of Romance loans. Only when there were enough Dutch words like *administratie* 'administration', could such a typically Dutch word as *redenatie* 'argument, line of reasoning' be formed by analogy, to exist alongside the wholly native and non-pejorative *redenering*. A prefix may sometimes begin to lead a life of its own, e.g. Latin <trans-> which lives an independent existence as the French word *très*, but such cases are rare.

There is the celebrated case of Copper Island Aleut, a language spoken on one of the two Commander Islands, with Aleut derivational morphology and nominal flexion, primarily Aleut vocabulary, partially Aleut simple sentence

syntax, but with Russian negation, infinitive forms, verbal morphology (but without the Russian aspect distinction), compound sentence syntax and a partially Russian simple sentence syntax (Menovščikov 1968, 1969, Golovko and Vakhtin 1990). The Aleutians were only 'discovered' in 1741 during the second expedition of the Russian Empire in the Pacific under command of the Dane Vitus Bering, at which time the Aleuts numbered ca. 25,000. The Aleuts were ruthlessly hunted and enslaved by the Russian colonial regime, and 'by the 1790s only about 2,500 Aleuts had escaped extermination, and these survivors were all subjected to systematic exploitation' (Forsyth 1992: 152). In 1969 only between 20 and 30 of the approximately 300 Aleut who lived in the Soviet Union spoke their native language. These few speakers were elderly and bilingual in Russian and Aleut, whereas the younger generations spoke Russian exclusively (Menovščikov 1969: 133). The Russian-American Company first deported Aleuts to the previously uninhabited Commander Islands in 1826, and these Aleuts were a significant minority in the rather tiny Copper Island population, which also consisted of Russian traders, creoles, Kodiak Eskimos, Itelmen women and others. After careful assessment of the linguistic, historical and demographic data, Golovko and Vakhtin (1990: 117) conclude that it is 'more probable' that Copper Island Aleut is the surviving remnant of a pidgin 'constructed' by the Russian-speaking colonial community in Russian America and later imported to Copper Island than that this enigmatic language somehow originated from an Aleut dialect through wholesale borrowing of Russian verbal flexion on Copper Island. Here then we are dealing with a pidgin which arose under the extreme conditions of life in Russian America.

If a not quite polygot Dutchman at a posh social gathering in London attempts to speak English in order to belong to the 'in crowd' and in the process inadvertently uses many Dutch words, that man is no longer speaking Dutch, but English with an admixture of Dutch words and probably with grammatical interference from Dutch, for example in the use of the tenses. Distinguishing inherited from borrowed components of a language enables one to establish that English is a Germanic language and not a Romance tongue, that Afrikaans is Dutch and not Hottentot, and that Pidgin in Papua New Guinea is a daughter language of English and not a Papuan language. Since Müller (1861), the linguistic literature is replete with discussions, some of great subtlety, on the notion of *Mischsprache*, creolisation, pidginisation and on how a given imperfectly mastered language is to be defined. Sometimes it is difficult or impossible to establish the genetic affinity of a language, or whether a language like Russenorsk, for example, is a Norse or a Russian

creole (Broch and Jahr 1984). However, the inability of a linguist lacking adequate historical data to distinguish between the inherited and the borrowed components of a language does not diminish the reality of the distinction itself.

(3) LaPolla's third alternative is an amalgam of three heterogeneous ideas: (a) 'geographic spread', a possibility we have dismissed, (b) 'innovation', a possibility which cannot be excluded *a priori*, but for which LaPolla advances arguments which have been shown to be specious, and (c) 'drift'. LaPolla thinks that this third hybrid scenario 'seems most likely given the fact that not all of the systems we find are of the same type', yet in its present formulation this third alternative must also be rejected.

Therefore, the retention of an ancient trait and drift remain the only tenable explanations which have been advanced to account for Tibeto-Burman conjugational morphology, and at present the morphological evidence lends considerable support to the first view, viz. that an agreement system was a feature of the Proto-Tibeto-Burman verb. Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement systems thus far subjected to a morphological analysis, with the possible exception of Kham, tend to reflect a common element order. Thus, the languages which have retained conjugations, or – if we assume the drift scenario – developed them shortly after the break-up of Tibeto-Burman, are truly conservative in preserving traces of the ancestral syntactic ordering of elements, now fossilized, albeit not immutably, in their verbal agreement systems.² Whether it be the case that a verbal agreement system was a feature of Proto-Tibeto-Burman which has been retained in many disparate branches of the family, or that the conjugations observed in various Tibeto-Burman languages represent parallel developments resulting from pre-existing tendencies in the proto-language, only meticulous scrutiny of these verbal agreement systems can furnish the hard data which will enable us to delve into the realm of Proto-Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax.

3. The 'ethnic corridor' and the Sino-Tibetan *Urheimat*

The Chinese term *mínzú zōuláng*, used by Sūn (1983) and Fèi (1980) is translated by Jackson Sun as 'ethnic corridor' (in Sūn 1990). The term 'ethnic

2. 'Cases of reordering of morphemes are not very common, so it will often be the case that morpheme order reflects an earlier order of words, but it is important to recognize that morphology is not immovable fossilized syntax' (Bybee 1985: 41). Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement systems are in fact not thoroughly consistent in the order they reflect, and comparative study will have to determine cases of morpheme reordering and to account for them.

corridor' in both English and Chinese is a very suggestive one. The term as used by Sūn and Fèi, from whom Sūn adopts the term, denotes an area encompassing the broad band of territory stretching from southern Gānsù and eastern Qīnghǎi through western Sīchuān and southeastern Tibet, western Yúnnán, northern Burma, northeastern India (Arūṇācal Pradeś, Nāgāland, Manipur, Mizoram, Tripurā, the Meghālaya)³ and the Himalayas. Neither do Sūn and Fèi use 'ethnic corridor' explicitly in the sense of a major conduit for the mass movements of peoples, nor is this the sense in which the term could have been intended. In fact, both Sūn (1983: 429) and Fèi (1980: 158) point out that the ethnic corridor is an area which retains older linguistic strata and, as such, constitutes a treasure trove for historians and linguists.

Conduits for mass migrations are generally, as Toynbee (1978: 32-7) points out, not dense jungles or mountains, but plains, steppes, desert, and – following the advent of navigation – navigable rivers and the seas. This hypothesis is borne out in the case of the 'ethnic corridor', an area encompassing hills, dense jungles and the highest physical barrier on the face of the planet, the Himalayas. This corridor has historically been an area of greater relative stability, where communities maintained traditional lifestyles in relative isolation for long stretches of time, whilst the Gangetic Plain, the Tibetan Plateau, and the North China Plain served as major conduits for *Völkerwanderungen*. Significantly, the area labelled 'ethnic corridor' includes the hypothetical *Urheimat* or proto-homeland of the Sino-Tibetans which Matisoff (1973: 84) places along the upper reaches of the Yangtze, Brahmapūtra, Salween and Mekong. Linguistically speaking, therefore, the expansion has been predominantly out of and away from this area and not, until recent history, into it. The multilingualism observed in this area today is a modern phenomenon.

This linguistic scenario would fit McNeill's ecological and epidemiological hypothesis on the movements of peoples in the region. The lifestyle of early hunter-gatherers does not afford as many pathways of infection to certain pathogens as do the living conditions of sedentary agriculturalists. This is certainly true for *Pasteurella pestis*, or Bubonic Plague, which is spread from rats to man through fleas. What is held to be the original and oldest of the three endemic loci of the bacterium lies in the easternmost foothills of the Himalayas between India and China (McNeill 1976: 111-2), i.e. in the heart of the 'ethnic corridor' and bosom of the hypothetical Sino-Tibetan *Urheimat*, a region where many other traditional pestilential diseases such as cholera,

3. Historically, this area includes Assam, but the incursion of Indo-Aryan people across the Brahmapūtran Plain has led to the Aryanization of this previously Tibeto-Burman area.

rabies and dengue fever are still endemic today. Such areas were epidemiologically hostile to incursive populations, whereas it was not as perilous for indigenous groups adjusted to survival in these environments to emigrate out of such areas.

The inaccessibility and isolation of communities in the ethnic corridor resulted in the relative stability of these linguistic communities through time, making the languages in this area more likely to retain archaic traits. This would also tend to apply to peripheral ethnic groups which were pushed further back into less habitable areas, like the Himalayas. The ancestors of the Tangut, the Dǎngxiàng, were the descendants of the Mi-ñāg tribes which migrated to their new homeland from the northern end of this ethnic corridor. The language of the modern Mùyǎ of Sìchuān is related to Tangut, although modern Mùyǎ is the linguistic descendant of the language spoken by those Mi-ñāg tribes which did not undergo the upheaval of a migration northward to the Alashan. Indeed, preliminary reports (Huáng 1985, Sūn 1983) show Mùyǎ verbal agreement morphology to be more elaborate than that of Tangut. Comparative evidence supports the idea of the existence of a general tendency that the less a given people lies awash of the mainstream of world history and the more a people remains unstirred by local and regional upheavals and cultural revolutions, the more their language will tend to retain archaic traits.

References

- Benedict, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan, A Conspectus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1976. 'Sino-Tibetan: another look', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96 (2), 167-97.
- Broch, Ingvild, and Ernst Håkon Jahr. 1984. *Russenorsk, et pidginspråk i Norge* (Tromsø-Studier i Språkvitenskap III), 2. utgave. Oslo: Novus Forlag.
- Bybee, Joan. 1985. *Morphology, a Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1987. 'Sino-Tibetan languages', in Bernard Comrie, ed., *The World's Major Languages*. London & Sydney: Croom Helm, 797-810.
- . 1989. 'Verb Agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LII (2), 315-333.
- Driem, George van. 1991. 'Bahing and the Proto-Kiranti verb', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LIV (2), 336-56.
- . 1993. 'The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LVI (2), 292-334.
- . 1994. 'The Newar verb in Tibeto-Burman perspective', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 26.
- Fèi Xiàotōng. 1980. 'Guānyú wǒ guó de mínzú shìbié wèntí', *Zhōngguó Shèhuì Kēxué*. 1: 147-62.

- Forsyth, James. 1992. *A History of the Peoples of Siberia, Russia's North Asian Colony 1581-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1990. *A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Dolakha Newari Dialect*. Eugene: University of Oregon, unpublished Ph. D. thesis.
- Golovko, Eugeni V., and Nikolai B. Vakhtin. 1990. 'Aleut in contact: the CIA enigma', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 22, 97-125.
- Huáng Būfán. 1985. 'Mùyǎ yǔ gàikuàng', *Mínzú Yǔwén* 1985 (3), 62-77.
- Keping (= von Kepping), Ksenija Borisovna. 1972. A Category of Aspect in Tangut, *Acta Orientalia* XXXIII, pp. 283-294.
- . 1979. 'Elements of ergativity and nominativity in Tangut', Plank, Frans, ed., *Ergativity, Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations*. London: Academic Press, 263-77.
- . 1981. 'Agreement of the verb in Tangut', *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 6 (1), 39-47.
- . 1982. 'Once again on the agreement of the Tangut verb', *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 7 (1), 39-54.
- . 1985. *Tangutskij jazyk, morfologija*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka'.
- . 1987. 'Korreljacija između vidom i naklonenim v tangutskom jazyke', *Problemy Języków Azji i Afryki: Materiały II Międzynarodowego Sympozjum Warszawa-Kraków, 10-15 listopada 1980* (Polska Akademia Nauk, Komitet Nauk Orientalistycznych). Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 55-9.
- . forthcoming. 'The conjugation of the Tangut verb', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1979. 'Towards a reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic verbal system', *Lingua, International Review of General Linguistics* 49: 51-70.
- . 1979. 'Proto-Indo-European verbal syntax', *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11 (3-4): 307-24.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1989. 'Verb agreement, head-marking vs. dependent-marking, and the "deconstruction" of Tibeto-Burman morpho-syntax', *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* [18-20 February 1989], Kira Hall et al., eds., Berkeley: University of California, 356-65.
- . 1992a. 'On the dating and nature of verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LV (2), 298-315.
- . 1992b. "'Anti-ergative" marking in Tibeto-Burman', *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15 (1), 1-9.
- Matisoff, James Alan. 1973. 'Tonogenesis in Southeast Asia', Hyman, Larry M., ed., *Consonant Types and Tone* (Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 1). Los Angeles: Linguistics Programme of the University of Southern California, 71-95.
- McNeill, William H. 1976. *Plagues and Peoples*. Garden City: Anchor Books.
- Menovščikov, G. A. 1968. 'Aleuskij jazyk', *Jazyki narodov SSSR*, Vol. V: *Mongol'skie, Tunguso-Man'čžurskie i Paleoaziatskie jazyki*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka', 386-406.
- . 1969. 'O nekotoryx social'nyx aspektax evoljucii jazyka', Desnickaja, A. V., V. M. Žirmunskij, L. S. Kovtun, eds., *Voprosy social'noj lingvistiki*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka', 110-34.
- Müller, Friedrich Max. 1861. *Lectures on the Science of Language delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain in April, May and June, 1861*. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts.
- . 1871. *Lectures on the Science of Language* (Vols. I & II), 6th edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Nishida Tatsuo. 1964, 1966. *Seikago no Kenkyū, Seikago no Saikōsei to Saikamoji no Kaido-ku* (A Study of

- the Hsi-Hsia Language, Reconstruction of the Hsi-Hsia Language and Decipherment of the Hsi-Hsia script*), Vols. 1 & 2. Tōkyō: Zauhō Kankokai.
- . 1987. 'A Study of the structure of Hsihsia verb phrases', *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko (The Oriental Library)* No. 45, 1-24.
- Rutgers, Leopold Roland. 1992. 'Het Yamphu werkwoord: een morfeemanalyse', Rijksuniversiteit Leiden: unpublished Master's thesis (doctoraalscriptie).
- Sapir, Edward. 1978 (first published: 1921). *Language, An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. London: Granada Publishing.
- Shafer, Robert. 1955. 'Classification of the Sino-Tibetan languages', *Word, Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York* 11, 94-111.
- . 1974. *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Sūn Hóngkǎi. 1983. 'Chuānxī mínzú zǒuláng dìqū de yǔyán', Li Fēnmíng, ed., *Xī'nán Mínzú Yánjiū* (Vol. 1). Chéngdū: Sìchuān Mínzú Chūbǎnshè, 429-54.
- . 1990. 'Languages of the ethnic corridor in western Sichuan', (translation of Sūn 1983 by Jackson T.-S. Sun), *Languages of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 13 (1), 1-31.
- Toynbee, Arnold. 1978 (first published: 1976). *Mankind and Mother Earth*. London: Granada Publishing.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1988. *The Semantics of Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS:

THE MANUSCRIPT	can be in English, French, or German. It should be double-spaced, typed in 10-pitch in a clear type. Format A4, with 5 cm left margin, leaving appr. 1500 type units per page. Two clear copies should be submitted, with an abstract of 10-15 lines, and a full copy should be retained by the author (cf. on PROOFS below).
REFERENCES	should be given in the body of the text, by author's surname, year of publication and, where relevant, pagenumber. An alphabetically ordered list of references should be given on a separate sheet at the end of the text.
FOOTNOTES	should be avoided wherever possible, all points of substance being incorporated in the body of the text. If unavoidable, footnotes should be numbered consecutively and typed on a separate sheet. The appropriate number should be typed, raised, in the text, after any marks of punctuation. No bibliographical information should be given in footnotes, only in the list of references.
ILLUSTRATIONS AND DIAGRAMS	should be given on separate, numbered sheets, and with a corresponding, clear indication in the body of the text where each illustration belongs. All trees and diagrams should be drawn in black ink, in a directly reproducible form.
PROOFS	should be returned within 10 days of receipt. Note that the ms. will not be returned with the proof sheets (cf. on THE MANUSCRIPT above).

Authors not writing in their mother tongue are particularly requested to have their mss. checked for linguistic and stylistic errors.

No fees are paid for papers submitted for publication, but authors are entitled to 25-50 offprints of each published paper free of charge.