

Kanauri am 'path'

Schuessler, Axel

1999

Schuessler, A. (1999). Kanauri am 'path'. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 22(2), 73-75. <https://dx.doi.org/10.32655/LTBA.22.2.05>

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/178086>

<https://doi.org/10.32655/LTBA.22.2.05>

© 1999 The Editor(s). All rights reserved.

Downloaded on 24 Apr 2025 21:21:16 SGT

KANAURI AM 'PATH'

Axel Schuessler
Wartburg College
Waverly, Iowa

The Kanauri and Almora dialects in the Western Himalayas employ a word **am** (or **əm** in D. D. Sharma's recent publications) for 'path', which looks so close to general TB and WT **lam** 'path',¹ but for the missing initial **l-**, that R. Shafer has suspected a genetic link, but could not explain the phonological relationship (Shafer 1974:141). The Kanauri form is apparently not mentioned in Benedict 1972. There are more Kanauri words without the expected **l-**:

<i>Gloss</i>	<i>Kanauri</i>	<i>WT, TB</i>
'path'	am	<i>WT lam</i>
'stone'	uŋ	<i>TB *luŋ</i>
'sweet'	im	<i>TB *lim > WT žim (via *ljim)</i>

TB initial ***l-** is generally reconstructed on the basis of a number of TB languages, including WT. We find, however, that some languages in the Himalayas have regularly changed the ***l-** to the palatal **j-**, at least in one early linguistic layer and/or environment:

<i>Gloss</i>	<i>WT, TB</i>	<i>TGTM</i>	<i>Vayu</i>	<i>Other</i>
'path'	<i>TB *lam</i>	<i>*g-jam</i>		<i>Raji jaŋ</i>
'work'	<i>OT (b-)las</i>	<i>*g-jas</i>		
'sheep'	<i>WT luŋ</i>	<i>*g-juk</i>		
'stone'	<i>TB *luŋ</i>		<i>juŋ</i>	
'sweet'	<i>TB *lim</i>			

Raji, though at bottom an Austroasiatic language, is within the Almora orbit. This language appears to avoid **-m** in final position, hence the final **-ŋ**.

¹ Language and language family abbreviations:

<i>Lep</i>	Lepcha	<i>TB</i>	Tibeto-Burman
<i>Lush</i>	Lushai	<i>TGTM</i>	Tamang-Gurung-Thakali-Manang
<i>Mik</i>	Mikir	<i>WB</i>	Written Burmese
<i>OT</i>	Old Tibetan	<i>WT</i>	Written Tibetan

A characteristic of the old core stratum of Kanauri is the deletion of TB **j-**. This is not unique among TB languages. WB does the same:

Gloss	TB	WT	Other	but	Kanauri	WB
'day'	* rjak	žag	<i>Lep ajak</i>		hrag	rak
'ask'	* rju	žu-	<i>Mik arju < r-ju</i>		rhu (~ rju)	
'hundred'	* b-rja	brgja	<i>Lap za < ja</i>		ra	ə-ra
'stand'	* -rjap	žabs	<i>Mik arjap < *rjap</i>		rap	
'eight'	* -ret/-rjat	brgjad	<i>Lush riat</i>		re	hrac
'hand'		phjag	<i>ʔæ?</i>		pakh 'wing'	phak 'leaf'
'four'	* b-li	bži < blji			bi, pi	le^B

Note that in Kanauri the aspirated liquid **rh-** is apparently not necessarily phonemic. Sharma (1992:216) explains that **r-** and **l-** in initial position are in some dialects accompanied by aspiration. In 'four', the **j-**-glide is secondary, but may perhaps explain the total loss of **l** in Kanauri, where the development has perhaps been **bli** > **bji** > **bi, pi**.

The reason for the complete loss of initial **l-** in Kanauri is now clear: Kanauri belongs to those Himalayan languages, like TGTM, Hayu (Vayu), etc., which had changed **l-** to **j-** at some point. However, traces of this **j-** are preserved in the Raji form **janj** for 'path' and a Kanauri doublet **rju-** for **hru-** 'ask'. Characteristic for Kanauri is now the further step of eliminating all **j-**, including secondary **j-**. Unlike Kanauri, in Burmese the medial **-j-** was lost at a stage before initial **l-** and **r-** became palatal glides.

However, many words in Kanauri dialects do have initial **l-** (e.g., **lug** 'calf'; cf. WT **lug** 'sheep') and **j-** (e.g., **ju** 'rat'). But these items are obvious loans from Tibetan or from elsewhere, and belong to a different linguistic stratum. Also, Kanauri words like **mjak** 'grass', from TB ***m-ljak**, may have retained the **j-** because of the complex cluster, unless this is another case of occasional retention of the medial glide (note the doublet **hru** ~ **rju**). The Proto-Tibetan cognate for 'grass' is actually quite close to TB and Kanauri: WT ***jag-ma** 'a sort of coarse and thick grass', presumably < ***N-žak** < ***N-ljak**.

An old stratum of Kanauri thus turns out to be closer to Himalayan languages like Hayu and TGTM than to Tibetan.

REFERENCES

- BENEDICT, Paul. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: a Conspectus*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- MAZAUDON, Martine. 1985. "Proto-Tibeto-Burman as a two-tone language? Some evidence from Proto-Tamang and Proto-Karen." In *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan Area*, ed. G. Thurgood, J. A. Matisoff, and D. Bradley, 201-229. Canberra, Australia: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- _____. 1996. "An outline of the historical phonology of the dialects of Nar-Phu (Nepal)." *LTBA* 19.1:103-114.
- SHAFER, Robert. 1974. *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- SHARMA, D. D. 1989-1992. *The Tribal Languages of Himachal Pradesh, Parts I and II*. (Studies in Tibeto-Himalayan Languages, 2.) Delhi: Mittal Publications.
- _____. 1989-1990. *Tibeto-Himalayan Languages of Uttarakhand, Parts I and II*. (Studies in Tibeto-Himalayan Languages, 3.) New Delhi: Mittal Publications.