Monic *clur and other Southeast Asian 'dogs'

Paul K. BENEDICT

The dog shares with the louse the distinction of having been mankind's earliest close companion and as such occupies a well-deserved niche in the Swadesh and other short lists of key lexical items. As anticipated, each of the three language phyla of Southeast Asia has a widely distributed root here, but there is unmistakable evidence of at least one early borrowing and even the possibility of two interphyla connections of the kind that light up the hearts of all good long-rangers. There are also apparently isolated forms here and there, such as Monic *clur, along with a group of onomatopoeic forms, another derived from gender-markers, and a third from a root for 'flesh/meat' > 'animal'. We shall begin with a review of these three special groups.

The onomatopoeic group includes notably White Hmong *ai* (high level tone) 'dog', *ai-ai* 'call a dog; dog cry'; apparently also Palaung *a-ʔoʔ and probably Tsou *abʔu ~ avʔu*. In one instance a male gender-marker is involved: Proto-Kadai *(k-)ma^A 'dog', from Proto-Austro Tai (PAT) *(t-, k-)ama 'father; male gender-marker'; cf. Proto-Hmong-Mien *pywa^B 'id', an early loan from Sino-Tibetan (cf. Arch. Chinese 父(Karlgren 1957:46, GSR [*Grammata Serica Recensa*] -102a) *pi̯wo^B < *piwa^B < *piwa^B 'honorific' < 'father'), with Hmongic gloss cited by Wang (1979) as 'male dog' (see Benedict: forthcoming-a); in another instance, this from Tibeto-Burman (TB), the gender-marker is female; cf. PTB *na 'female' (Benedict 1972: 187); Lisu (Burmese-Lolo) *a-na* 'dog'. Finally, in the Austronesian (AN) stock, Tagalog *ʔayam*, Bikol *ʔayam* 'dog' have been derived from PAN *qayam 'flesh/meat' > 'animal' (Benedict: forthcoming-b).

Proto-Monic *clur 'dog' has been reconstructed by Diffloth (1984: 66), who describes it as "unrelated to the usual Mon-Khmer word for dog: *cuaʔ". It is likely, however, that *clur represents as earlier *c-lur, from *cu-lur, perhaps contrasting with *cuaʔ < *cu-a (the final *-ʔ is a MK feature), in light of the AN parallels (below). It is further possible that the PMK root should be set up as *tsu(a) rather than *cu(-a), as suggested by the writer (Benedict 1990a) on the basis of Bolyu (Lai) *tsu^4 'dog', with initial *ts-* contrasting with palatal *š-* in *šən^4 'nine', from a numeral root also reconstructed with initial *c-* for PMK; cf. Vietnamese *chó* 'dog', *chín* 'nine' (not *š-* for *ts-* before /ə/ inasmuch as Bolyu has a contrasting *ts-* in this position, as in *tsən^1 'get'). This MK root perhaps, along with roots for 'water' and 'excrement', constitutes an early 'interphyla flow' into an important TB language; cf. Lepcha *kăju* 'dog' (Benedict 1972:7; fn. 24); the *kă-* represents the 'animal' *k-* prefix, found also in Burmese and other TB languages

(ibid: 107, fn. 301), but the /ʃ/ for an anticipated *c or even *ts remains unexplained.

The newly reconstituted PMK *tsu(-a) can serve as a bridge to PAN *(u-)atsu(-an), with *u- the variable nominal marker (one of Dyen's *W's) and the *-an suffix apparently represented only in Puyuma (Formosan) su(w)-an; cf. Puy. guŋ 'cattle', ka-guŋ-an 'ox'. The PMK suffixed *-a is directly comparable, however, with an animal/bird suffixed *-a represented in Formosan (Benedict: forthcoming-b). Note that in the Puy. su(w)-an the initial syllable (*a-) is lost, reflecting an underlying AN 'drift towards disyllabism' (Blust 1977), and a parallel reduction might be invoked for the loss of an earlier *a- in PMK *tsu(-a). Additionally, a conjectural Monic *clur < *c[u]-lur is nicely paralleled in Formosan: cf. Atayalic (/h/ < *ts): Atayal hu-zil, Sediq hu-liŋ. The writer (forthcoming) has described 'Austric' in playwright terms as 'a pair of lonely affixes Waiting for Good (Material)', contra the speculations of long-rangers Diffloth, Reid and now even Blust. This 'dog' can be seen as an offering from the writer, conservative as always, who prefers to view phenomena of the above kind in terms of 'interphyla flow'.

Austronesian has another 'dog' root, well disguised and sparsely represented, and it is this etymon that yields a tie to two other AT families as well as an early loan to Chinese, along with a possible bridge to Sino-Tibetan: Proto-Austronesian (PAN) *(u-)(ŋ)kuɣkuɣ: Western Malayo-Polynesian (MP) *u(ŋ)kuʔ 'dog' (Blust 1980), with variable nasal increment, loss of the final syllable through the 'drift towards disyllabism' (above) and a 'non-c[anonical]' /ʔ/ (see Benedict forthcoming-b); Formosan (Paiwanic) *kuɣkuɣ: Puyuma kurkur 'puppy'; Paiwan kuku 'toy, pet (as a puppy)'. The *u- here appears to have been a male gender marker, contrasting with *i- for females, from an earlier AT horizon, as shown by Tai *u 'father' (Shan) vs. *i 'mother' (White Tai) (ibid.). The Japanese dog was female: inu < *iŋku (signature shift), from *i-ŋku[kuɣ], with typical reduction of SYL-I and regular C[anonical] R[eduction] on-the-R[ight] (see Benedict 1990b). Hmong-Mien *klouᴮ shows a parallel development, with anticipated CRR (Benedict 1975), regular *-ou < *-u and an infixed *-l-, paralleling the liquid infixes appearing at times in Austronesian animal names, e.g. PAN *kabaw 'water buffalo', Malay ke-r-bau, Bikol k-ar-abaw, Tagalog k-al-abaw; Tagalog, Bikol ʔusa 'deer', N. Phil.: Inibaloi, Pangasinan ʔu-l-sa.

The early loan to Chinese is interesting: Late Archaic (earliest citation in Zuozhuan, 4th cent. B.C.) 狗 [GSR-108d, p. 48] kuᴮ 'dog'. The writer (1976) has pointed out other early Chinese borrowings from some mainland AT source that he has designated as D[onor to] A[rchaic] C[hinese] but these are of a distinctly cultural nature, related to agriculture and the like. In any event, the loan does attest to the presence of the root in DAC. The Sino-Tibetan root: *kwəyᴮ is widely represented in Tibeto-Burman, with Lahu (Burmese-Lolo) having p- for the *kw- (Matisoff has suggested the reconstruction of PTB *kw- here vs. *k-w- elsewhere) while other languages often display strange-looking forms, the product of 'animal *s-' prefixation, e.g. Lushai ui < *s-kui (dyadic type); Nocte hu < *s-khu (same,

aspirated); Bodo *sui* < **s-gui* < **s-kui* (with preemption); Sgaw Karen *thwi* < **skhwi* (cluster/monadic type) (see Benedict 1987: 44 ff,). In Chinese this root appears only with the 'collective plural' **-n* suffix (roots for rodents, geese [only in flocks], dogs and people); Arch. Ch.[GSR-479a, p. 132] 犬 *khiwən^B*, a circumstance that may have played a role in the borrowing from DAC.

Again an extra-AN bridge becomes available, this time leading to ST, a proto-level **kuɣ/kwəɣ* 'dog' readily yielding a PST-level **kwəy*, with **-y* = **-i* for final **-ɣ*, paralleling the development in Japanese (Benedict 1990 b), supporting Sagart's Sino-AN or the like. Sagart has also contributed to the AT literature (on tones) and apparently has in mind a Sino-Austric, while Diffloth and all long-rangers include MK in their version of AT, all making for something on the order of the old 'Indo-Chinese' of pioneer comparativists in the field. What to make of the two 'dogs' here: a larger /tsu/ and smaller /kuɣ/ or even a disyllabic /tsukuɣ/ (the inverse sounds too much like a cold!)? As pointed out by the writer (1991), this neo-Indo-Chinese has certain other problems, e.g. how to conjoin the EYE roots: PAT **mapra* (> PAN **maCa*), PST **myək* (> Tibetan *mig*, Burmese *myak*, Arch. Ch. 目 *mi̯ôk* [for lacking **mi̯ək*]) and PMK **mat* < Proto-Austro Asiatic (PAA) **mət* (indicated by Pinnow although questioned now by Zide, p.c.), a proto-level **myək* readily yielding the **mət* via **myət* < [assim.] < **myək* (PAA lacks **my-*); here a conjoined **mayəkpra* root will hardly do. The writer, unaccustomed to his conservative status here, hastens to repeat that he is still playing a three-deck 'game' in SEA linguistics, requiring much less 'shuffling'.

REFERENCES

Benedict, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: a Conspectus*. Contributing editor: James A. Matisoff. Cambridge University Press.

Benedict, Paul K. 1975. *Austro-Thai: Language and Culture*. New Haven: HRAF Press.

Benedict, Paul K. 1976. "Early Chinese Borrowing." In *Genetic Relationship, Diffusion and Typological Similarities of East and Southeast Asian Languages*. Papers for the First Japan-US joint Seminar on East & Southeast Asian Linguistics. Tokyo: The Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Benedict, Paul K. 1987. "Archaic Chinese initials." In *Wang Li Memorial Volume*, ed. Chinese Language Society of Hong Kong, English Volume, pp. 254-71. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing Co.

Benedict, Paul K. 1990a. "How to tell Lai: an exercise in classification." *LTBA* 13.2:1-26.

Benedict, Paul K. 1990b. *Japanese/Austro-Tai*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.

Benedict, Paul K. 1991. "Austric: an 'extinct' proto-language." In *Austroasiatic Language: Essays in Honour of H.L. Shorto*, ed. J. H. C. S. Davidson, pp. 83-87. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Benedict, Paul K. 1995. "Parental **pa/ba* ~ **ma* in Southeast Asia." *MKS* 25:1-11.

Benedict, Paul K. forthcoming. "Extra-Austronesian evidence for Formosan etyma." *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan.*

Blust, R. 1977. "A rediscovered Austronesian comparative paradigm." *Oceanic Linguistics* 16.1:1-51.

Blust, R. 1980. "Austronesian Etymologies." *Oceanic Linguistics* 19(1-2):1-189.

Diffloth, G. 1984. *The Dvaravati Old Mon Language and Nyah Kur.* Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Printing House.

Karlgren, Bernhard. 1957. *Grammata Serica Recensa.* Stockholm: The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Bulletin 29.

Wang Fushi. 1979. *Miaoyu fangyan shengyunmu bijiao* (Comparison of Miao initials, tone and rimes). Beijing: Academy of Social Science Publishing House.