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Báimǎ nominal postpositions and their etymology

1. Báimǎ

Báimǎ is a non-literary Tibeto-Burman language, spoken by approximately 10,000 people in three counties (Jiǔzhàigōu, Sōngpān, Píngwǔ) in the north of Sīchuān Province and one neighboring county (Wénxiàn) in the south of Gānsù Province in the People’s Republic of China (PRC). The Báimǎ people reside in the immediate proximity of the Qiāng (to their South-West), the Chinese (East and South) and the Tibetans (West and North).

The Báimǎ language is currently regarded as unclassified with a tentative affiliation to the Himalayish branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family (Ethnologue). Sūn Hóngkāi, who pioneered Báimǎ research in the late 1970s, classifies Báimǎ as an independent language in the Tibetan branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family (1983: 100). Other Báimǎ specialists consider it a dialect of Tibetan, probably of the Khams group.

The problematic affiliation of the Báimǎ language (separate language or Tibetan dialect) is partly due to the controversy surrounding the ethnic classification of the Báimǎ people. In 1951, the Báimǎ were classified as Tibetans. In the 1970s, they were argued to be descendents of the Dī people, who set up influential kingdoms in the third through the sixth centuries CE in the areas currently inhabited by the Báimǎ (Sīchuān Shěng Mínzú Yánjiūsuǒ 1980, Zēng et al. 1987). The Dī, whose name frequently appears

---

1 I would like to thank Frederik Kortlandt and Randy LaPolla for insightful comments on earlier versions of this article. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers for helpful criticism on a second draft.
together with that of the Qiāng in Chinese historical sources, are currently considered to be related to the Qiāng (cf. Lǐ 1987: 46, Mā 1984). Recently, Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 116-117) even argue for a Dī substratum in Báimā to account for a number of distinct non-Tibetan features in its lexicon, morphology and syntax. Almost nothing is however known about the linguistic affiliation or about the language of the Dī. Furthermore, the very designation “Dī” is probably a general label to a range of people in the west of ancient China, as is also the case with the name “Qiāng” (Wang 1992, 2005). For these reasons, to state that Báimā has a Dī substratum equals saying that Báimā has some kind of substratum, which is not yet identified.

2. Nominal postpositions

This article focuses on nominal postpositions in Báimā. Such postpositions are formal reflections of the roles played by noun phrases in relation to the verb or between noun phrases themselves. Nominal postpositions in Báimā are used for marking topic, the agent, the instrument, the genitive, the locative, the ablative, the comitative, the comparative, among other functions.

Scholars who previously worked on Báimā, Sūn Hóngkāi (Nishida and Sūn 1990; further developed in Sūn 2003a and 2003b) and Huáng Bùfān and Zhāng Mínghuī (Huáng and Zhāng 1995) describe nominal postpositions as case particles, in comparison to Tibetan data, thereby somewhat expanding the notion of case particles according to the traditional Tibetan model of analysis and including such markers as ‘comparative’, ‘definite’ and ‘marker of disposal’. Table 1, based on Sūn tabulation, lists the analyses of

Research on Báimā has been made possible through the generous support of the Frederik Kortlandt Spinoza Project, Leiden University, the Netherlands.
Sūn (2003a: 71; Báimǎ 1) and of Huáng and Zhāng (Báimǎ 2), both in original transcriptions. Sūn compares his own data with that of Huáng and Zhāng as well as with that of Classical Tibetan, as reflected in standard Written Tibetan orthography (hereafter WT) and the three groups of Modern Tibetan dialects spoken in the PRC (dBus-gTsang, Khams and Amdo). As noted by all authors, case particles in Báimǎ are significantly dissimilar to those in Tibetan dialects.

Table 1—Báimǎ and Tibetan case particles (Sūn 2003a: 71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Báimǎ 1</th>
<th>Báimǎ 2</th>
<th>WT</th>
<th>dBus-gTsang</th>
<th>Khams</th>
<th>Amdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>i₃[^5]</td>
<td>kæ₃⁵</td>
<td>gis</td>
<td>kɛ</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tɛ₃[sic./]u₃[^3]</td>
<td>tæ₃⁵</td>
<td>gı</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>tsæ₃/iɛ₃⁵</td>
<td>kæ₃⁵</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>no₃⁵/kɛ₃⁵</td>
<td>kæ₃⁵</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>ɔye₃[^3]</td>
<td>ɔyæ₃⁵</td>
<td>las/bas</td>
<td>lɛ</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>kø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>re¹[^3]</td>
<td>zæ₃⁵</td>
<td>daŋ</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker of disposal</td>
<td>i₃[^3]</td>
<td>tæ₃⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>le₃[^3]/nɛ₃⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>re₃[^3]/nɔ₃⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though Huáng and Zhāng and Sūn all analyze the variety of Báimǎ spoken in the neighboring villages of Báimǎ Tibetan Township (Pingwǔ County, Sichuān province), their classifications differ in a number of respects. The authors agree only in their marking of the ablative and comparative and partially also of the genitive and locative. The comitative marker, despite different transcriptions, also appears to be the same in both analyses. For the remaining particles they present dissimilar forms.

In Huáng and Zhāng’s tabulation, the postposition [kæ₃⁵] marks several distinct semantic roles: ergative, allative and locative. Huáng and Zhāng do not list instrumental and dative markers separately, because they deem the former identical with ergative and
the latter with locative as is the case in Tibetan. In contrast, Sūn distinguishes between ergative, denoted by [t̂i53], the same particle as the marker of disposal, and instrumental, viz. [r̂ε53]/[n̂o53]. Similarly, Huáng and Zhāng analyze the form [t̂e53] as combining the functions of the genitive marker and the marker of disposal. In Sūn’s classification, on the other hand, these are represented by distinct forms, [t̂e53~t̂i53] and [i53], respectively. Sūn only sees the markers [t̂i53] (ergative and disposal) and [n̂o53] (locative and instrumental) as sharing different functions.

Given the discrepancy between Huáng and Zhāng’s and Sūn’s classifications, I propose a new summary of nominal postpositions in my data, also collected in the Báimǎ Township. Furthermore, within the proposed range of postpositions, I (a) comment on the disputed points in the previous analyses (viz. markers of ergative, genitive, instrumental, definite and disposal), while arguing for isomorphism of some postpositions (genitive and agentive, definite and genitive, comitative and instrumental, locative and dative) and (b) discuss their etymology. Given that the etymology of many postpositions is yet unclear, I hope to initiate a discussion on their possible origins.

3. Nominal postpositions in the corpus

The present analysis is based on a corpus of Báimǎ stories collected in 2003-2004 in the Báimǎ Township (hereafter “corpus”). The stories were narrated by Zhaga Tsere [t̂za13ĝa53 t̂səh13 r̂e35], a 69-year old resident of Koshi [ko13ŝi53] village (Shuǐníújiā in Chinese), and Lako [la13ko53], a 75-year old resident of Iaru [ja13r̂u35] village (Luòtōngbà in Chinese) and translated with the help of Lǐ Déguì, a 64-year old resident of
Pingwū. The corpus comprises over 30 texts, one of which, “An Orphan and a Fox” by Lako, is appended to the present article. Examples in this article are mostly drawn from this story and are marked by the line numbers they appear on. Given that this one story does not encompass all the forms under discussion, I also quote examples from other texts as well as from previous work on Báimā by Huáng and Zhāng and Sūn (in original transcriptions).

Table 2 summarizes nominal postpositions as attested in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Postposition</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agentive/Genitive 1</td>
<td>ji⁵³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite/Genitive 2</td>
<td>te⁵³~tí⁵³</td>
<td>‘his’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental/Comitative–Conjunction</td>
<td>re⁵³</td>
<td>‘with, and’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>la⁵³/ta⁵³/kə⁵³/nə⁵³</td>
<td>‘on’/’vicinity’/’on, above’/’inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>kə⁵³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>jə⁵³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>gye⁵³</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my analysis, Báimā has seven distinct types of nominal postpositions, which can be further subdivided as follows. Báimā has two markers of the genitive, [ji⁵³], identical with the marker of the agentive, and [te⁵³~tí⁵³], identical with the definite marker. The instrumental case is expressed by the same marker as the comitative and also the coordinative conjunction [re⁵³]. One of the locative markers, [kə⁵³], also marks the dative.

These groupings relate to those that show significant isomorphy in LaPolla’s (1995a, 1995b) survey of 145 Tibeto-Burman languages and dialects. As is the case in

---

2 This story appears to be shared by several unrelated ethnic groups in the area. The Qiang version of the
those languages and dialects (1995b: 1171), agentive-genitive isomorphry in Báimā is of a different nature than the other patterns of isomorphy. While the syncretism of the definite and the genitive, of the comitative and the instrumental, and of the locative and the dative is due to metaphorical extensions, the agentive and the genitive are homophonous and are originally distinct forms that fell together because of sound changes.

3.1. The genitive and the agentive \(ji^{53}\)

In the corpus, the marker \(ji^{53}\) has the following four functions:

I. (sporadically) marker of genitive (WT kyi and its allomorphs gyi, gi and yi/’i), e.g. \(\text{[nθε⁵³ ɛ⁵³ ji⁵³ jy³⁵]}\) ‘other people’s sheep’ (T 17).

Genitive is a case with the basic role of marking nouns or noun phrases which are dependent on another noun. Mostly, \(ji^{53}\) as the genitive marker is retained in oblique forms of pronouns, as discussed below.

II. nominalizer for verb phrases, e.g. \(\text{[ndu³⁵]}\) ‘drink’, \(\text{[ndu¹³ ji⁵³]}\) ‘drinkables’. \(ji^{53}\) also typically nominalizers the clause preceding the verb \(\text{[dɛz³⁵]}\) ‘said’ (e.g. sentence (16)) or in future contexts and conditional sentences, the clause preceding the verb \(\text{[rθe¹³]}\) ‘be’ (e.g. T 20 and T 29), transforming in both cases the clause into the object of the verb.

---

story is given in LaPolla and Huang (1996: 256-269), there titled “An Orphan”.

6
III. non paradigmatic agentive case marker (ergative in Huáng and Zhāng’s and Sūn’s analyses) (WT *kyis and its allomorphs *gyis, *gis and *yis/*is), see examples in this section. In linguistic theory, the ergative case is taken to mark the agent of a transitive verb. Many Tibeto-Burman languages exhibit non-systematic ergative marking. LaPolla (1995a) argues this to be a relatively recent development that has as its main function disambiguation of two potential agents. LaPolla also notes that, since the ergative in Tibeto-Burman at large does not pattern paradigmatically, it is dissimilar to what is normally referred to as *ergativity*, for which reason he uses in his (1995a) article the term *agentive* instead of *ergative*. I take up this usage in the present discussion. Under the term *agentive*, I understand “the case of the (typically animate) perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb”, in Fillmore’s formulation (1968: 24).

IV. marker showing determination to do something (WT *kyis and allomorphs, cf. Hoffmann 1955: 74, 78-79 and “the promise particle” in Beyer 1992: 353-354), e.g. [nɛ^35 j ₁^53] ‘I am certainly going to sleep.’.

Semantically and etymologically, the genitive/relative and the nominalizing functions on the one hand and the agentive and the showing determination to do something on the other, can be grouped together respectively. Below I will concentrate on the isomorphy of the genitive and the agentive.

Sūn (2003a: 73; 2003b: 71) and Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) comment on the fact that personal pronouns in Báimā have special genitive/accusative forms, reproduced in Table 3:
Table 3—Nominative and genitive/accusative forms of personal pronouns in Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 113, original transcriptions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>First person pronoun</th>
<th>Second person pronoun</th>
<th>Third person pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ḟu^53</td>
<td>ḟu^53</td>
<td>wu^53 ~ la^53 ~ la^53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC/GEN</td>
<td>ḟu^53</td>
<td>ḟu^53</td>
<td>wu^53 ~ li^53 ~ li^53 ~ wu^53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my analysis, the ‘accusative-genitive’ forms are oblique. Cross-linguistically, oblique forms are commonly used to indicate possession. Moreover, oblique forms also typically serve as a base to which other case markers can be added, cf. oblique forms in Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 27). In Báimā, oblique forms are precisely such base forms to which all other case markers described in this article are attached. For example, in the sentence 
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'thø ḟu^53 kæ^53 dzæ^35 wæ^53' ‘You told me.’ (Huáng and Zhāng 1995: 113, original transcriptions), the dative marker [kæ^53] is added to the oblique form of the first person pronoun [ṽu^53].

In addition to the oblique forms of personal pronouns listed in Sūn and Huáng and Zhāng, the alternative oblique form of the second person pronoun in my data is [ṭ u^53], as in the next sentence:

---

3 On the connection between nominalization and relative-genitive constructions in Tibeto-Burman languages see Matisoff (1972) and DeLancey (1986). On the polysemy between the various functions of WT kyis, see Nagano (1995).

4 This article represents work in progress; not all glosses and tone sandhi are final. Tentative WT glosses have been added to all Báimā words in example sentences to make the article more accessible to Tibetologists. The “?” sign marks those cases where no good Written Tibetan etymology can be proposed. In Tibetan transcriptions, I follow Wylie’s (1959) standard system. Italicized words in the transcription line are loans from Chinese, in the gloss line, they are Pīnyīn transcriptions of Chinese words and also refer to place and personal names. [n-] in consonant clusters stands for prenasalization and is homorganic with the following consonant. Verbs in Báimā mostly have two stems, imperfective and perfective/imperative. Some verbs have only one stem; and a few verbs have three stems (mostly in suppletive distribution).
‘Your wife hasn’t come yet.’

Not only personal pronouns, but also demonstratives have oblique forms in the corpus.

The oblique form of [ndɛ^53] ‘this’ is [ndɪ^53] ‘of this’ and that of [tɛ^53] ‘that, he’ is [tɪ^53] ‘of that, his’. For example:

(1) tɛ^h^53 niā^13 tsi^53 tɑ^13 rɯ^35 ma^13-we^53 ʂø^13.
    khyod.kyi nĩngzi da.ring ma-ongs ?
    2S.OBL wife still NEG.CMPL-come:PF PF.N-VOL

’tYour wife hasn’t come yet.’

In my analysis, the forms [tɛ^h^53], [wu^13 lɪ^53], [ndɪ^53] and [tɪ^53] are all fusions of the pronouns [tɛ^h^φ^53] ‘you’, [wu^13 lɛ^53] ‘he, she’, [ndɛ^53] ‘this’ and [tɛ^53] ‘that’ with the imperfective, perfective and imperative. Verbs with one stem are marked in the gloss line only for their meaning.

5 Báimá shares the general Tibetan pattern, whereby one set of copulas and auxiliaries is used with first person in declarative sentences and second person subject in questions and another set with second and third person subjects in declarative sentences and third person subject in questions. The choice of an
genitive marker [jì³³] (kyi). This is similar to the genitive marking on nouns with a final vowel in Written Tibetan in Khams dialects. For instance, in sDe.dge, the genitive form of the demonstrative [tə³¹] ‘that one’ is [tì¹³], as in [tì¹³kʰa³³le] ‘on the top of that one’ (Gésāng 2002: 155-156; cf. also Häsler 1999: 99-100). In contrast to sDe.dge, however, which freely marks the genitive by vowel alternation in words with a final vowel in WT, the range of words with genitive forms in Báimā is restricted only to the words discussed in this section.

[jì³³] as an agentive marker is also relatively infrequent. It serves to disambiguate two potential agents, as in examples (4) and (5) below and, in some instances, to emphasize the agent.

(4) kʰu³³ tu³³r³⁵ gu³³ka³³ tə³³ya³³ jì³³ kʰu³³ se³³-ndʒa³³.
  kho de.ring dgong.kə da wa yis kho bsad-‘cha⁶
  1S.LOG⁷ today evening now fox AGT 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF

‘I… tonight the fox will eat me.’ (T 42-43)

(5) yə³³ ku¹³ly³³ tʰe³³ jì³³ ka³³-kə³³nbọ³³.
  wa sku.lus thal.ba yis bkab-?
  fox body ashes AGT cover-CMPL.EMPH

‘The ashes covered the fox from head to toe.’ (T 74)

appropriate copula or auxiliary reflects the appreciation of the speaker of the action as performed volitionally or non-volitionally.

⁶ Sun (2004: 834) notes that the WT verb cha.ba ‘gnaw’ is attested in the meaning ‘eat’ in many dialects of the area, including, besides Báimā, Zhongu, Chos-rje and Zhānglā (lCang.la).

⁷ The form [kʰu³³] ‘I’, e.g. example (1), is a logophoric pronoun (i.e. pronoun used in indirect speech to refer to the person whose speech is being reported) etymologically related to the third person pronoun
Similar to the genitive marker, the agentive [ji^53] commonly fuses with the pronoun [te^53] ‘that’ to [ti^53]. For example:

(6)  
\[ \begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\text{wa}^53 & \text{te}^53 & \text{puw}^56 & \text{te}^53 & \text{na}^1\text{ny}^53 & \text{te}^53 & \text{te}^53 & \\
\text{fox} & \text{DEF.AGT} & \text{girl} & \text{DEF} & \text{child} & \text{DEF} & \text{DEF} & \\
\text{de} & \text{bsad-’cha} & \text{zhab} & \text{byas} & \\
\text{DEF} & \text{kill-eat:IPF} & \text{below} & \text{do:PF} & \text{PF.N-VOL} & \\
\end{array} \]

‘The fox was about to eat the girl.’ (T11-13)

The homophony of the genitive and the agentive [ji^53] resembles the case in Modern Tibetan dialects, where the original WT distinction between the ergative marker kyis and the genitive marker kyi has become obscured through phonological attrition (cf. markers of the agentive and the genitive in Kham and Amdo in Table 1). Báimā [ji^53] is thus cognate with the WT forms kyi and kyis and all their allomorphs.\(^8\)

The generalization of the allomorphs yi’i and yis’is (following an open syllable) of all other allomorphs of kyi and kyis, respectively, might be an indication that codas have dropped in Báimā early. This early depletion of codas also resulted in the homophony of the genitive and the agentive markers. It is plausible that subsequently [ji^53] has been retained as the agentive marker, whereas a new genitive marker—

\[^{\text{[k}^5\text{hu}^13\text{]e}^53].\] The form [k\text{hu}^53] is thus typical for story narrations. It does not have an oblique form and is therefore not listed in Table 3.

\(^{8}\) An alternative possibility is to consider Báimā genitive marker [ji^53] as derived from the Proto-Tibetan genitive *ʔi (Simon 1942, Gong 2002: 425-426).
grammaticalized from the demonstrative pronoun \[t \varepsilon^{53}\]—has arisen. The old genitive \[\hat{j} \hat{i}^{53}\] has been retained in a number of high frequency words.

3.2. The definite and the genitive \[t \varepsilon^{53} \sim t \hat{i}^{53}\]

Sün (2003: 73) and Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) disagree as to what should be seen as the genitive marker in Bâimá. Both note that the genitive is expressed by the marker \[t \varepsilon^{53}\] (in Huáng and Zhāng’s transcription \[t \varepsilon^{53}\]), but only when the modified part is omitted, as in example (7), quoted from Huáng and Zhāng (ibid., original transcriptions, my glosses):

(7) \[ta^{21}z \varepsilon^{35} ndæ^{53} mbu^{21} t \varepsilon^{h,53} t æ^{53} z æ^{21} \].

stare ‘di ?mùjiàng de red axe this carpenter that COP

‘This axe is that of the carpenter.’

When both the modifier and the modified are present, Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114; original transcriptions) argue that Bâimá has no genitive marker and that the relationship of possession, belonging or ownership is expressed by the word order instead (modifier first, modified second), as in the example \[\hat{z}a^{21}\hat{ko}^{53} \varsigma a^{53}\] ‘elder brother’s hat’. In contrast, in addition to \[t \varepsilon^{53}\], Sün (Nishida and Sün 1990: 253; original transcriptions) describes the genitive marker \[t \hat{i}^{53}\], as in \[\alpha^{13}k \hat{o}^{35} t \hat{i}^{53} k \hat{o}^{35}\] ‘elder brother’s clothes’, which he sees as a probable loan from Chinese. Although the resemblance of the Bâimá
genitive marker [tɨ⁵³] to the subordinative particle di [tɨ] in the Pingwǔ dialect of Mandarin is striking, the two are not connected, as I will argue below. It is nonetheless conceivable that the native genitive marker [tɨ⁵³] in Báimǎ has been reinforced due to its similarity to the Chinese subordinative particle di (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, September 2005).

Finally, Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) treat [tɨ⁵³] also as a marker of disposal, as in the following example (original transcriptions, my glosses):

(8) ʂɨ⁵³ tʂu⁵³ ʦæ⁵³ ɕɵ⁶¹ stdexcept ɡu³⁵ Ӹhʊ²¹ ʦʰæ̃²¹ ʂɵ²¹.
by.de phrug de byag.glag ’jus khur chas ?
little.bird that eagle catch carry go:PF PF.N-VOL

‘The little bird was caught by the eagle.’

Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 257), on the other hand, notes that the marker [tɛ⁵³] can be used to emphasize the subject or the object of the sentence, which function (definite in Sūn’s formulation) is primarily performed by the markers [lɛ⁵³] and [nɛ⁵³]. For example (original transcription, my glosses):

(9) tɛʰɔ⁵³ jɔ⁶⁵ ɿe⁵³ ɿa³¹ ɿa⁵³ tɛʰɛ¹³ jɔ¹³.
khyod sring.smo ? ga.logs chas ?
2s younger.sister that where go:PF PF.N-VOL

‘Where did your little sister go?’

I will return to the markers [lɛ⁵³] at the end of this section. (The marker [nɛ⁵³] is infrequent in the corpus.) As for the marker [tɛ⁵³], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 258)
remarks that it is not yet clear whether the genitive \( t \varepsilon^{53} \) and the definite \( t \varepsilon^{53} \) are two homophonous words or whether the function of \( t \varepsilon^{53} \) is expanding (from genitive to definite).

In the corpus, \( t \varepsilon^{53} \) has been identified by my language consultants as the demonstrative pronoun ‘that’. The same word is also frequently used as anaphoric pronoun, as in the following example:

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad t \varepsilon^{53} \ldots t \varepsilon^{53} \ t\text{sh}^{13}-n\varepsilon^{53} \ t\varepsilon^{53} \ldots \\
& \quad \text{de} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{tshu-nang} \quad \text{slebs} \\
& \quad \text{that} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{here-LOC} \quad \text{reach}
\end{align*}
\]

‘She came here…’ (T48-49)

\( t \varepsilon^{53} \) is in all probability cognate with the Tibetan demonstrative and also anaphoric pronoun \textit{de} ‘that, that one, he’. Hence, \( t \varepsilon^{53} \) in the expression \( \text{mbu}^{21} t \varepsilon^{h\varepsilon}^{35} t \varepsilon^{53} \), from example (7), is in my opinion a true demonstrative, pointing to the topic \( t \varepsilon^{53} \) ‘axe’, literally ‘that of the carpenter’. The possessive relation is expressed by word order, modifier first, modified second.

In Jäschke’s (1998: 255) analysis, \textit{de} in Written Tibetan frequently stands in the place of the English definite article ‘the’, e.g. \textit{pa de log-ste song-ngo} ‘The father went back.’, where it adds to perspicuity. \( t \varepsilon^{53} \) in Báimā has an analogous function to that of \textit{de} in WT, for example: 9

---

9 The corresponding indefinite marker in Báimā is \( \varnothing^{13} \) (WT \textit{shig}), as in the following example.
Contrary to Huáng and Zhāng’s argument that \[t e^{53}\] is the marker of disposal, this meaning in example (9) is not the product of the use of \[t e^{53}\], but rather of the topicalization of a non-agent argument.

The marker \[t i^{53}\] is the oblique form of the demonstrative \[t e^{53}\] ‘that one, he’, as discussed in § 3.1. A construction where the possessor is presented as a kind of clausal topic, but also figures as a possessive modifier of the possessee, is cross-linguistically one of the most common sources for attributive possession (Heine 1997: 148). For instance, the demonstrative and the third person pronoun \[zhī\] in Classical Chinese is also a possessive marker (Mullie 1942: 6, 10-14). Commenting on the functional similarity of \[zhī\] and the WT genitive marker \[kyi\], Simon (1942: 965) notes that the original meanings of \[kyi\] “seems to be “this”, or perhaps even “this latter”, thus clearly referring to what immediately precedes it.”

The oblique form of the topic marker \[t e^{53}\] ‘that, he’, \[t i^{53}\], in Báimā functions in a similar fashion.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wa} & \quad \text{de} \quad ? \\
\text{fox} & \quad \text{DEF} \quad \text{agree} \quad \text{say:PF} \quad \text{PF.N-VOL}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The fox agreed.’ (T 21-22)

‘On the way, she met a cow turd.’ (T 25-26)
‘The child of the owner of the hotel... eh, was a girl.’

[\(\text{le}^{53}\)], listed by Sün (Nishida and Sün 1990: 257-258) as a definite marker, is also attested in my corpus, as in the following example. This sentence is quoted from a story about a legendary thief, Master Ange, who was once challenged for a bet to steal the trousers of the wife of a local mandarin.

Similar to [\text{te}^{53}], [\text{le}^{53}] is a demonstrative and an anaphoric pronoun ‘that, he’.

Whereas [\text{te}^{53}] is presumably of Tibetan provenance, [\text{le}^{53}] appears to be a native Báimà word, cf. the third person singular pronoun [\text{wu}^{13}\text{le}^{53} \sim \text{le}^{53}]], stemming from a distal demonstrative pronoun. This marker is similar to one of the two definite markers, /le/ in Qiang (LaPolla and Huang 1996: 59).
To conclude, Báimǎ expresses possession by word order (modifier-modified) and by oblique forms of personal and demonstrative pronouns. Moreover, the oblique form of the demonstrative pronoun [t e^53]—[t i^53] also functions as an external possessor.

3.3. The comitative/conjunction and the instrumental [r e^53]

The marker for the instrumental case, “the case of the inanimate force or object causally involved in the state or action identified by the verb” (Fillmore 1968: 24), [r e^53], has been identified by my language consultants as identical with that expressing the comitative (i.e. denoting persons or things which accompany or take part in the action) and the coordinate conjunction, [r e^53]. Sūn (2003a: 71, 2003b: 73) posits different morphemes for the instrumental ([r e^13]) and the comitative ([r e^53]). The former, [r e^13] in my transcription, is most likely the sandhi form of [r e^53]. Furthermore, in the word list concluding Nishida and Sūn’s study (1990: 366), the Báimǎ coordinate conjunction ‘and’ is given as [r e^53], i.e. identical in form to Sūn’s instrumental marker [r e^53].

The difference between the conjunction and the comitative marker, both linking two noun phrases, can be explained as follows. The conjunction connects two noun phrases into a single plural noun phrase. In the case of the comitative marker, one noun phrase is made the topic of the sentence, whereas the second noun phrase, followed by the comitative marker, is the object ‘together with’ or ‘accompanied by whom’ the action.

---

10 Báimǎ has four tones: low rising [13], high rising [35], high falling [53], and rising-falling [341]. The original tone of a monosyllabic word is subject to change to the low rising tone, when followed by the high rising or the high falling tone. Function words (particles, prepositions, conjunctions, modal and auxiliary verbs, etc.) follow the same sandhi rule. For instance, the comitative/conjunction marker [r e^53] changes its
under discussion is performed. Sentence (14) is an example of the use of [rε^53] as a conjunction:

wa  ?  bu.mo  mchong-re  byas  bdog
fox  CONJ  girl  jump-RECP  do:PF  PROG

‘The fox and I were competing in jumping.’ (T 30-31)

The distinction between comitative and instrumental is based on animacy. An animate object involved in the state or action identified by the verb is read as expressing human accompaniment, whereas an inanimate object involved in the state or action identified by the verb is understood as instrument. Consider the following two examples, where [rε^53] is used as the marker of the comitative, sentence (15), and as the marker of the instrumental, sentence (16):

(15) yâ^53  rε^53  tšʰø^53  øe^13 ...
wa  ?  phrad  ?
fox  COM  encounter  PF.N-VOL

‘The girl met a fox.’ (T 10)

(16) "tʃʰu^13  ndʒɔ^35  rε^53  kʰa^13  ñu^53  tøy^53  nbe^53,  ñö^35
chu.’khyags  ?  kha.ngo  bkrus  mbod  yang
water  INSTR  face  wash:PF/IMP  call:IPF  again

original tone to the low rising when followed by a word in a high rising or high falling tone, as in example (7). [rε^53] is the emphatic or citation form of the coordinate conjunction ‘and’, [rø^13] is its weakened form.
‘Let me wash my face [with water] before I look for the girl again,” - said the fox.’ (T 76-78)

Whereas the markers of the agentive and the genitive in Báimǎ are most likely cognate with the WT markers kyis, kyī and de, the etymology of the marker of the comitative and the instrumental in Báimǎ is less clear. In addition to [rε⁵³], Sūn lists [ŋο⁵³] ‘inside’ (WT nang) used in those cases where the instrument is a container. The pair [rε⁵³]/[ŋο⁵³] in Báimǎ is thus reminiscent of the Shǐxīng instrumental markers [rε³³] and [ŋο⁵⁵] (Dài et al. 1991: 193).

### 3.4. The locative and the dative [kε⁵³]

A noticeable feature of the Báimǎ system is its apparent orientation to the location of the described entity, which is a characteristic quality of Qiangic languages (Huáng 1991: 344-345). Thus Báimǎ has several markers of locative, [lα⁵³] ‘there, on’, [tʃα⁵³] ‘vicinity’, [kε⁵³] ‘above, on’ and [ŋο⁵³] ‘inside’. Of these markers, the former two are more general.

The form [tʃα⁵³], listed by Sūn (2003: 73) as allative, is in my view an all-purpose locative marker, as in sentence (17) below. As noted by Nishida (1996: 297),

---

11 For [lα⁵³] see the example in footnote 8.

(17)  ne⁵³  r⁵³  tsa³⁵  ra¹³-jy³⁵  ndzo¹³-ne⁵³  de⁵³  de¹³.  
mi.?  rtsa  ra-lug  ‘tsho-mi  byas  ?
other.people  LOC  goat-sheep  graze::PF-person  do:PF  PF.N-VOL

‘She was a shepherdess to other people.’ (T3)

The marker [kε⁵³] ‘on, above’ indicates position above or on top of something. For example:

(18)  nu¹³  tça⁵³  guε¹³  ke⁵³  ne³⁵  de¹³…
nor.skayag  sgo.ba.leb  ?  nyal  bdog
cow.turd  threshold  LOC  sleep  PROG

‘The cow turd was sleeping on the threshold…’ (T86)

Finally, the form [nɔ⁵³] indicates position inside something:

(19)  tœʰœ⁵³…  ni¹³  ndzœ³⁵  nɔ⁵³  dʒœ³⁵  kua⁴⁵⁵  n ε³⁵  kʰu⁵³  nɔ¹³.
khyod  mig.’bras  nang  mchil.ma  ?  byas  khur  snang
2s  eye  LOC  fluid  ONOM  do:PF  carry  exist

‘Your eyes are filled with tears.’ (T27-28)

The locative marker [kε⁵³] is also used to mark the dative, i.e. case of the animate being affected by some state or action identified by the verb.
Cross-linguistically, the syncretism of dative and locative, i.e. a case which primarily relates a referent to some point or location in space, of which locative is a specific subcase, is frequent (Anderson 1971: 103-106; DeLancey 1981: 633-638; Kuryłowicz 1964: 190-195; LaPolla 1995b: 1174-1176). Báimá exemplifies this general trend.

As mentioned in §3.1, the marker of dative in Báimá is linked to the oblique form of the preceding word, provided that the word has such a form. For example:

(21) \( \text{to}^{35} \text{pe}^{13} \text{zh}^{341} \text{t}^{53} \text{t}^{53} \text{t}^{35} \text{ti}^{53} \text{ke}^{53} \text{to}^{35} \)

\( ? \text{spun.skya} \text{chen} \text{de} \text{chu} \text{de.'i-}\) ?

\( \text{LNK} \text{brother} \text{big} \text{DEF} \text{little} \text{DEF.OBL-DAT} \text{LNK} \)

\( k\text{a}^{53}pu^{3}t\text{h}^{53}i^{53}. \)

\( \text{kānbuqi} \)

look.down.upon

‘So the elder brother looked down upon the younger brother.’

As far as the etymology of the locative markers is concerned, three of them, \( [l\alpha^{53}] \), \( [ts\alpha^{53}] \) and \( [n\alpha^{53}] \), are clearly cognate with Tibetan, whereas the origin of one, the locative/dative marker \( [ke^{53}] \), is less clear.
Finally, as for the etymology of the two case markers not discussed in the article, the ablative \([j \circ^{53}]\) and the comparative \([gy e^{53}]\), the former is probably derived from the Proto-Tibeto-Burman form \(*lam\) ‘road’ (Matisoff 2003: 599), a common source for locative markers in several Tibeto-Burman languages (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, September 2005). The etymology of the latter can probably be traced to the WT word *phyogs ‘side, direction’, but as a comparative marker, it is certainly an innovation to usage in other Tibetan dialects.

4. Báimā and the neighboring languages

As evident from WT glosses to Báimā examples in the text, most of the Báimā lexicon is of Tibetan provenance and derived from Tibetan in multiple waves of borrowings, as evidenced by complex sound correspondences between Báimā and Written Tibetan (Zhāng 1994; Huáng and Zhāng 1995). For example, one WT cluster \(khr\) corresponds in Báimā in Zhāng’s (1994: 14) analysis to \([t \circ^h]\), \([t \varsigma^h]\) and \([t \varsigma^h]\), and in Huáng and Zhāng’s (1995: 85) analysis, to \([t \circ^h]\), \([k^h]\) and \([\varsigma]\). To give just two examples from the cited sentences, WT \(l\) is treated in Báimā as \(j\) (e.g. WT \(lam\) ‘road’ is \([j \circ^{53}]\) in Báimā, WT \(langs\) ‘bright’ is \([j \circ^{35}]\), WT \(lug\) ‘sheep’ is \([j y^{35}]\)) and as \(l\) (e.g. WT locative particle \(la\) is \([l \alpha^{53}]\) in Báimā, WT \(rdo.lo\) ‘pestle’ is \([cla^{13}lu^{53}]\)). One WT final \(ing\) is treated as \([w]\) (e.g. \([t w^{13}ru^{35}]\) \(de.ring\) ‘today’) and as \([i]\) (e.g. \([ti^{13}pa^{53}]\) \(ding.pa\) ‘now’).

Báimā nominal postpositions appear to combine WT case particles (e.g. the agentive \([ji^{53}]\) and the locative \([l \alpha^{53}]\)) and markers of possibly Qiangic provenance (e.g. the instrumental \([r \varepsilon^{53}]\) and the definitie \([l e^{53}]\)). Yet some are of less clear origin
(the ablative [j ə 53] and the comparative [ə ɣ ə 53]). The range of grammatical markers of arguably Qiangic origin from the quoted examples can be expanded. The linking particle [t o 35] is similar to a common discourse particle in Qiang, (a)tu (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, March 2005). The non-volitional past marker [ŋ o 13], mostly reduced to [ŋ] rapid in speech, is reminiscent of the past particle in Qiangic languages, cf. [s  33] in Shìxīng.

In sum, Báimā can be seen as combining predominantly Tibetan lexicon with grammar which is arguably divergent from WT. Whether this is the result of substratum influence, language contact or genetic relationship still requires further investigation.

**Abbreviations**

1, 2, 3 first, second, third person pronouns  
AGT agentive marker  
CMPL completion  
COM comitative  
CONJ conjunction  
COP copula  
DAT dative marker  
DEF definite  
DIR directional prefix  
EXCL exclamation  
EMPH emphatic  
GEN genitive marker  
INDEF indefinite marker  
IMP imperative verb form  
INST instrumental marker  
IPF imperfective (present-future) verb form  
LNK clause linking particle, consistently translated by my informant as the Chinese clause linking element jiu ‘then, just’  
LOC locative  
LOG logophoric pronoun  
NOM nominalizer  
N-VOL non-volitional  
OBL oblique
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“An Orphan and a Fox”

1. To ngö ne te, ne te, na nyö te, na nyö te, nan na te, t'uo te
   mi dwa dwa mi dwa dwa nyag nyog cig pu
   in the past person orphan person orphan child single

2. Se se, a pa ma de, a ma ma de, byas ? a pha ma bdog a ma ma bdog
   do:PF PF.N-VOL father NEG.CMPL-exist mother NEG.CMPL-exist

3. Ne re te sa ra - jy ndzo ne se se.
   mi. ? rtsa ra lug 'tsho mi byas ?
   other people LOC goat sheep graze:IPF-person do:PF PF.N-VOL

4. Ne re te sa ra - jy ndzu sa se, ra - jy
   mi. ? rtsa ra lug sos ? ra lug
   other people LOC goat sheep graze:PF/IMP PF.N-VOL goat sheep

5. Ndzu sos ni nyin cig shig de ra lug byas
   graze:PF/IMP TOP one day INDEF TOP goat sheep do:PF

6. Ra - jy po - nbo ra - jy
   ra lug 'bor ? ? ra lug 'bor ?
   goat sheep throw:PF-CMPL PF.N-VOL goat sheep throw:PF-CMPL

7. Se, ra - jy po - nbo ni, ra - jy ts la i
   ? ra lug 'bor ? ni ra lug 'tshol
   PF.N-VOL goat sheep throw:PF-CMPL TOP goat sheep search

8. Te ke se ra - jy ts la i te ke, te
   chas ? ra lug 'tshol chas ? nyung ba
   go:PF PF.N-VOL goat sheep search go:PF LNK a little
9 นā¹³ วā³⁵ รē¹³ มū¹³ รā³⁵ มā³⁵ ตē³⁵ ซū¹³-รē¹³, ยā³⁵ รē³⁵ ตēʰ¹³
nāg.pō ṭrab.รīb de ยอด-รีด wa ṭ phrad
black.NOM dimness TOP probably fox COM encounter

10 สะ¹³, ยā³⁵ รē³⁵ ตēʰ¹³ สะ¹³. ยā³⁵ ... ยā³⁵ รē³⁵
? wa ? phrad ? wa wa ?
Pf.N-VOL fox COM encounter Pf.N-VOL fox fox fox COM

11 ตēʰ¹³ นิ¹³, ยā³⁵ ติ³⁵ ปว³⁵ ตē³⁵, นā¹³ นย³³
phrad ni wa de.'īs bu.mo de nyag.nyog
encounter TOP fox DEF.AGT girl DEF child

12 ตē³⁵ ตē³⁵ ... ตē³⁵ สะ³⁻นฏา³³ ซū³⁴¹ สะ³³
de de de bsad-'cha zhab byas
DEF DEF DEF kill-eat:IPF below do:PF

13 สะ¹³. สะ³⁻นฏา³³ ซū³⁴¹ สะ³³ นิ¹³, นā¹³ นย³³ ปว³⁵
? bsad-'cha zhab byas ni nyag.nyog bu.mo
Pf.N-VOL kill-eat:IPF below do:PF TOP child girl

14 ติ³⁵ ฉะ³⁵ นิ¹³, "ยā³⁵, ยā³⁵, ยā³⁵ ... ยā³⁵ ... ยā³⁵ ... ตō³⁵
de.'īs Ы abolish ni wa wa wa wa wa ?
DEF.AGT say:PF TOP fox fox fox fox fox LNK

15 นā³⁵ ฉะ³¹ นดะ³³ รē¹³, ยā³⁵, ยā³⁵, ตē³⁵ ตēʰ⁰³ ตū¹³ รō³⁵
nyung.ba ṭ red wa wa de khyod de.rīng
a.little clever COP fox fox that 2s today

16 ฐā²³ นā³⁵ สะ³² แม¹⁻นฏา³³ ฐā²³ ตō²³ ตō²³ รē¹³,
kho nyung.ba bsad ma-'cha kho dwa.dwa red
1s.log a.little kill NEG.CMPL-eat:IPF 1s.log orphan COP

17 ฐā²³ ยē²³ รē²³ ถะ๓² ยā¹³ วā³³ นดะʒū³⁵, ยē²³ รē²³ จิ³³
kho mi.? rtsa lag.(gyog.)pa sos mi.? āi
1s.log other.people loc helper graze:PF/IMP other.people GEN
18 jy⁵³ ndzo⁵³ de¹³… ra¹³-jy⁵³ ndzo⁵³ de¹³,” tšu⁵³ dze⁵³
  lug ‘tsho bdog ra-lug ‘tsho bdog ‘dra bzlos
  sheep graze:IPF PROG goat-sheep graze:IPF PROG thus say:PF

19 se¹³. “teʰ⁵³ tuʰrw⁵³ gu¹³ka⁵³ ndze⁵³ to³⁵… to³⁵ kʰu⁵³
  ? khyod de.ring dgonɡ.ku mtshan ? ? kho
  PF.N-VOL 2S today evening night LNK LNK 1S.LOG

20 se⁵³-ndza⁵³ ji³ re¹³, se⁵³-ndza⁵³ to³⁵ se⁵³-ndza⁵³
  bsad-‘cha yi red bsad-‘cha ? bsad-‘cha

21 su³⁵. ti¹³pa³⁵ na³⁵ se³⁵ ma¹³-ndza⁵³,” to³⁵
  shog ding.pa nyung.ba bsad ma-‘cha ?
  come:IMP now a.little kill NEG.CMPL-eat:IPF LNK

22 ya³⁵ te³⁵ ja³⁵ dze³⁵ se¹³. to³⁵… mo³¹ri³⁵… na¹³ny³⁵
  wa de ? bzlos ? ? ma.rabs nyag.nyog
  fox DEF agree say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK woman child

23 te³⁵ ya¹³ra³⁵ ndzw³⁵, na¹³ny³⁵ pw³⁵ te³⁵ ya¹³ra³⁵ ndzw³⁵.
  de ? ‘gro nyag.nyog bu.mo de ? ‘gro
  DEF in.a.circle go:IPF child girl DEF in.a.circle go:IPF

24 ya¹³ra³⁵ ndzw³⁵ ni³⁵, nu³⁵ si³⁵ ya¹³ra³⁵ ndzw³⁵ we³⁵. nu³⁵
  ?skor.ba ‘gro ni ngu bzhin.du ? ‘gro ‘ongs ngu
  in.a.circle go:IPF TOP cry SIM in.a.circle go:IPF come:PF cry

25 si³⁵ ya¹³ra³⁵ ndzw³⁵ we³⁵, jo³⁵ tɕi³⁵ la³⁵ nu¹³tɕa³⁵
  bzhin.du ? ‘gro ‘ongs lam dkyil la nor.skyaŋ
  SIM in.a.circle go:IPF come:PF road center LOC cow.turd

26 se¹³ re³⁵ tʃʰ³⁵, nu¹³tɕa³⁵ se¹³ re³⁵ tʃʰ³⁵: “pʰ⁵³pʰ⁵³,
  shig ? phrad nor.skyaŋ shig ? phrad bu.mo.?
  INDEF COM encounter cow.turd INDEF COM encounter girl
27 \( t^b\theta^{53} t^b\theta^{53} \eta^{53} \text{de}^{13}\) \( t^b\theta^{53} \ldots \eta^{13} \) \( n^{13} \) \( d^3\varphi^{53} \) khyod chi ngu bdog khyod mig.'bras nang mc'hil.ma 2s what cry PROG 2s eye LOC fluid

28 k\( u^{53} \) \( \sigma\) \( k^{h}\) \( \eta^{53} \) \( \text{no}^{13} \), \( t^b\theta^{53} \) \( t^b\theta^{53} \) \( \eta^{53} \) \( \text{de}^{13}\)?? byas khur snang khyod chi ngu bdog ONOM do:PF carry exist 2s what cry PROG

29 d\( z^{35} \) "k^{h}\varphi^{35} \) tw\( ^{13} \) ru\( ^{35} \) nd\( z^{35} \) ta\( ^{35} \) \( \eta^{35} \) \( \text{ma}^{13} \) \( j^{35} \) ji\( ^{35} \) re\( ^{13} \), bzlos kho de:ring mts\( ^{35} \) da nam mi-lang\( s \) yi red say:PF 1S.LOG today night now sky NEG-be:bright NOM COP

30 k\( ^{h}\varphi^{53} \) \( \text{ma}^{13} \) \( n^{35} \) ji\( ^{35} \) re\( ^{13} \), \( \eta^{53} \) \( \text{re}^{13} \) \( \text{pw}^{35} \) nd\( z\) \( ^{35} \) re\( ^{35} \) kho mi-'dug yi red wa ? bu.mo mchong-re 1S.LOG NEG-reside NOM COP fox CONJ girl jump-RECP

31 \( \sigma\) \( \text{de}^{13} \)," d\( z^{35} \) \( \eta^{53} \), "nd\( z\) \( ^{35} \) re\( ^{35} \)" d\( z^{35} \), "k\( ^{h}\varphi^{35} \) byas bdog bzlos ni mchong-re bzlos kho do:PF PROG say:PF TOP jump-RECP say:PF 1S.LOG

32 k\( ^h\varphi^{53} \) \( \text{nb}^{13} \) \( \text{se}^{13} \), k\( ^{h}\varphi^{53} \) k\( ^h\varphi^{53} \) - k\( ^{h}\varphi^{53} \) \( \text{nb}^{13} \) ni\( ^{13} \), tw\( ^{13} \) ru\( ^{35} \) ? ? kho ? ni de:ring be:de:feated-CMPL PF:N-VOL 1S.LOG be:de:feated-CMPL.EMPH TOP today

33 nd\( z^{53} \) ta\( ^{35} \) \( \eta^{53} \) te\( ^{35} \) k\( ^h\varphi^{53} \) \( \text{se}^{53} \) - nd\( z\) \( ^{35} \) wu\( ^{53} \) re\( ^{13} \)." mts\( ^{35} \) da wa de kho bs\( \text{d}^{35} \)-cha 'ong red night now fox DEF 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF come:IPF COP

34 "\( \text{f}\) e, \( t^c\alpha^{53} \) ma\( ^{13} \) - t\( c\alpha^{53} \). t\( c\alpha^{53} \) ... \( \text{sa}^{53} \) ... \( \text{sa}^{13} \) ma\( ^{53} \) \( \eta e^{13} \) ni\( ^{53} \) ? khyod.? ma-sk\( r^{\text{a}53} \) khyod.? sran sran.ma ? EXCL 2S.EMPH NEG.CMPL-be:afraid 2S.EMPH pea pea gruel

35 l\( o^{13} \) wu\( ^{53} \) ko\( ^{53} \) ki\( ^{53} \) z\( \text{a}^{341} \), \( \text{sa}^{13} \) ma\( ^{53} \) \( \eta e^{13} \) ni\( ^{53} \) lo\( ^{13} \) wu\( ^{53} \) ? gang sk\( \text{ol}^{35} \) bzhag sran.ma ? ? cooking.pot full boil put:PF/IMP pea gruel cooking.pot
36 ko53 ki53 za341, gu13ka53 ne53 nda53 rue53 wu53
gang skol bzhag dgong.ka me ‘de rogs ‘ong
full boil put:PF/IMP evening fire get.warm companion come:IPF

37 de13,” tsu53 dzê35 se13. to35 ja35 dzê35. ho35 na53,
bdog ‘dra bzlos ? ? ? zlos yang nyung.ba
PROG thus say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK agree say:PF again a.little

38 ho35... ho35 tu13nba53 we53, ho35 tu13nba53 we53 ni13,
yang yang dum.pa ‘ongs yang dum.pa ‘ongs ni
again again one.part come:PF again one.part come:PF TOP

39 jo53 tei35 la53... jo53 tei35 ndza13nba53 se13 de53.
lam dkyil la lam dkyil chan.pa shig bdog
road center LOC road center scissors INDEF exist

40 ndza13nba53 te53 ndza13nba53 te53 ka53 te53, ndza13nba53
chan.pa de chan.pa de kha.’chad chan.pa
scissors DEF scissors DEF speak scissors

41 te53. “pw35 pw53, te53 tê53 te53 se53 de13, te53
de bu.mo.? khyod chi byas bdog khyod
DEF girl 2S what do:PF PROG 2S

42 nu53 de13,” dzê35. “khu53 tu13ru35 gu13ka53 ta53 ya53
ngu bdog bzlos kho de.ring dgong.ka da wa
cry PROG say:PF 1S.LOG today evening now fox

43 ji53 khu53 se53-ndza53. ya53 re13 pw35 ndza13-re35 se53
yis kho bsad-‘cha wa ? bu.mo mchong-re byas
AGT 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF fox CONJ girl jump-RECP do:PF

44 ni13, khu53 kê53-nbo13 te53, kê53-nbo13 te53
ni kho ? chas ? chas
TOP 1S.LOG be.defeated-CMPL TERM be.defeated-CMPL TERM
45  `tw'u13 `ru\w53  gu\w13 `ka\w53  ta\w53  se\w53 `ndza\w53 ."  "\w\w,  te\w3\w `ha\w53  fi\w3\w
dering  dgong.ka  da  bsad-'cha  ?  khyod.?  yang
today  evening  now  kill-eat:IPF  EXCL  2S.EMPH  again

46  `sa\w3\w  `ne\w13 `ni\w53  ki\w53  za\w3\w4\w1,  gu\w13 `ka\w53  `ne\w53  nda\w53
sran.ma  ?  skol  bzhag  dgong.ka  me  'de
pea  gruel  boil  put:PF/IMP  evening  fire  get.warm

47  wu\w53  de\w13 ,"  dz\w3\w53  `se\w13 ,  "gu\w13 `ka\w53  `ne\w53  nda\w53
'ong  bdog  bzlos  ?  dgong.ka  me  'de
come:IPF  PROG  say:PF  PF.N-VOL  evening  fire  get.warm

48  wu\w53  de\w13 ,  `ne\w53  nda\w53  ru\w53\w53  wu\w53  de\w13 ."  'ong  bdog  me  'de  rogs  'ong  bdog
come:IPF  PROG  fire  get.warm  companion  come:IPF  PROG

49  te\w53 ...  te\w53  t\w3\w53 `u\w13 `no\w53  t\w53\w53 ,  qa\w53 `gue\w3\w53  re\w53  t\w3\w53 `e\w53 ,
de  de  tshu-nang  slebs  bya.sgong  ?  phrad
that  that  here-LOC  reach  egg  COM  encounter

50  fi\w3\w53  t\w53\w3\w  dz\w3\w53  `se\w13 .  fi\w3\w53  "\w\w `ne\w53  nda\w53  ru\w53\w53
yang  'dra  bzlos  ?  yang  me  'de  rogs
again  thus  say:PF  PF.N-VOL  again  fire  get.warm  companion

51  wu\w53  de\w13 ,"  dz\w3\w53 .  te\w53  t\w3\w53 `u\w13 `no\w53  t\w53\w53 ,  k\w3\w53 `w53
'ong  bdog  bzlos  de  tshu-nang  slebs  kho
come:IPF  PROG  say:PF  that  here-LOC  reach  needle

52  re\w53  t\w3\w53 `e\w53 ,  "\w\w `ne\w53  nda\w53  ru\w53\w53  wu\w53  de\w13 ,  
?  phrad  me  'de  rogs  'ong  bdog
COM  encounter  fire  get.warm  companion  come:IPF  PROG

53  ma\w13 `nu\w53 ,"  dz\w3\w53 .  te\w53  t\w3\w53 `u\w13 `no\w53  t\w53\w53 ...  te\w53
ma-ngu  bzlos  de  tshu-nang  slebs  de
NEG.CMPL-cry  say:PF  that  here-LOC  reach  that
tshu-nang slebs sbal.ba phrad yang me
here-LOC reach frog COM encounter again fire

55 nda-53 rue-53 wu-53 de-13, ma-13-ju-53,
‘de rogs ‘ong bdog ma-ngu
get.warm companion come:IPF PROG NEG.CMPL-cry

?? ma-byas de tshu-nang slebs kho ?
be.worried NEG.CMPL-do:PF that here-LOC reach needle COM

phrad yang ‘dra bzlos ? de khyim-ongs
encounter again thus say:PF PF.N-VOL that DIR-come:PF

? rdo.lo ? phrad rdo.lo bzlos kho me
LNK pestle COM encounter pestle say:PF 1S.LOG fire

‘de rogs ‘ong bdog sran.ma ? skol
get.warm companion come:IPF PROG pea gruel boil

60 za-341, k’h-53 pe-53 nda-53 rue-53 wu-53 de-13.”
bzhag kho me ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog
put:PF/IMP 1S.LOG fire get.warm companion come:IPF PROG

mtshan de bden.pa wa de ‘ongs ? nyag.nyog
night TOP really fox DEF come:PF PF.N-VOL child

de ‘cha ‘ongs ? nyag.nyog de ‘cha ‘ongs
DEF eat:IPF come:PF PF.N-VOL child DEF eat:IPF come:PF
63 ni₅³ ngue₅³ ti₁³-ke₅³ ya₅³ ti₅³ wa₁³tʃa₅³ du₃⁵ ce₁³,
   TOP head DEF.OBL-LOC fox DEF.AGT claw catch do:PF
   ni mgo de.'i-? wa de.'is ? ?'thogs byas

64 wa₁³tʃa₅³ du₃⁵ ce₅³, sʰ₁³-te₅³ ja₃⁵ ke₅³ tsu₅³ ce₅³
   claw catch do:PF comb-DEF hand LOC prick do:PF
   ? ?'thogs byas so-de lag ? 'dzugs byas

65 se₁³. tsʰ₃a₃se₅³ tsu₅³ se₁³. "ndे₅³ tʃʰ₅³ re₁³,"
   PF.N-VOL ache prick PF.N-VOL this what COP
   ? ?tshugs.? 'dzugs ? 'di chi red

66 dze₃⁵. to₃⁵ sa₃... sa₃ ti₁³-ke₅³ ndʒo₃⁵ ce₅³, kʰw₃⁵
   bzlos ? zhwa zhwa de.'i-? 'chang byas kho
   say:PF LNK hat hat DEF.OBL-LOC touch do:PF needle

67 te₅³ ze₅³ ce₅³, što₃⁵ ke₁³wa₃³ ti₁³-ke₅³ ke₅³ ce₅³,
   de gzer byas yang rk̂ed.pa de.'i-? ? byas
   DEF prick do:PF again waist DEF.OBL-LOC stroke do:PF

68 ndʒa₁³nba₅³ ti₅³... ndʒa₁³nba₅³ ti₅³ tʃa₅³ ce₅³,
   channel pa de.'is channel pa de.'is bead byas
   scissors DEF.AGT scissors DEF.AGT cut do:PF

69 dze₃⁵ ni₅³, "ndे₅³ tʃʰ₅³ re₁³, pʰu₁³la₃ ke₅³ re₁³
   bzlos ni 'di chi red pha.la ? red
   say:PF TOP this what COP there.LOC stroke COP

70 tsʰ₃a₃se₅³, mu₁³la₃ ke₅³ re₁³ tsʰ₃a₃se₅³ zi₄⁴¹ de₁³.
   ?tshugs.? ma.la ? red ?tshugs.? yin bdog
   ache down.LOC stroke COP ache COP PROG

71 ne₅³ nbi₅³ ge₄⁴¹ re₁³," dze₃⁵. ga₃⁵gue₃⁵ te₅³ the₁³-no₅³
   me 'bud dgos red bzlos bya.sgong de thal.ba-nang
   fire blow:IPF want COP say:PF egg DEF ashes-LOC
72 ne⁵⁵ de¹³, ne¹³te⁵⁵ zw⁴¹ ne⁵⁵. "ne⁵³ nbi⁵³ nyal bdog me.? zhabz nyal me ‘bud
sleep PROG large.firewood below sleep fire blow:IPF

73 ge³⁴ re¹³.” ca⁵³ gue³⁵ te³³ pʰ⁵⁵ kʰu¹³ qe⁵³, nba³³
dgos red bya.sgong de ? ?khur byas ‘bar
want COP egg DEF ONOM ?carry do:PF explode

74 tɕe³⁵, ya⁵³ ku¹³ly³³ tʰ⁵³ ji³³ ka⁵³-ku¹³nbo¹³, ya³³
chas wa sku.lus thal.ba yis bkab-? wa
TERM fox body ashes AGT cover-CMPL.EMPH fox
gas-ku³³, ni¹³ndze³⁵ ka⁵³-ku¹³nbo¹³ tɕᵉ³⁵, ni¹³ndze³⁵...
bkab-? mig.'bras bkab-? chas mig.'bras
cover-CMPL.EMPH eye cover-CMPL.EMPH TERM eye

76 ya³³: “tʃʰu¹³sue³³... tʃʰu¹³ndza³⁶ re³³ kʰa¹³nµ³³
wa chu.bzom chu.'khyags ? kha.ngo
fox water.bucket chu.'khyags INSTR face

77 tɕy³³ nbe³³, hō³³ tʃʰi³³ ge³⁴ re¹³” ji³³
bkrus mbod yang ‘tshol sgos red yi
wash:PF/IMP call:IPF again search want COP NOM

78 dzē³⁵. tʃʰu¹³sue³³ ti¹³-ke³³... tʃʰu¹³sue³³ ti¹³-no³³
bzlos chu.bzom de.'i-? chu.bzom de.'i-nang
say:PF water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC

79 ye¹³wa⁵³ te⁵³ tʃʰi³³ dzē³³ tɕa³³ ge³³. to³³ pw³³
sbal.ba de ? bzlos grags ? ? bu.mo
frog DEF ONOM say:PF outcry PF.N-VOL LNK girl

80 se⁵³-n empleado ga³³ ma¹³-re¹³, se³³-n empleado ga³³
bsad-cha ? ma-red bsad-cha ?
kill-eat:IPF be.able NEG.CMPL-COP kill-eat:IPF be.able
81 md\textsuperscript{13} re\textsuperscript{13} \, se\textsuperscript{13}, \, to\textsuperscript{35} \, “tw\textsuperscript{13} ru\textsuperscript{35}” \, to\textsuperscript{35}
ma-red \, ? \, ? \, de.ring \, ?
NEG.CMPL-COP PF.N-VOL LNK today LNK

82 we\textsuperscript{35} ma\textsuperscript{13} re\textsuperscript{13}, \, no\textsuperscript{13}ue\textsuperscript{35} \, wu\textsuperscript{53} \, ge\textsuperscript{341} \, re\textsuperscript{13},
\, \, ? \, ma-red \, nangs.pa \, ‘ong \, sgos \, red
succeed NEG.CMPL-COP tomorrow come:IPF want COP

83 tw\textsuperscript{13} ru\textsuperscript{35} \, ph\textsuperscript{13}la\textsuperscript{53} \, t\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{35} \, re\textsuperscript{13} \, ma\textsuperscript{13}-ndz\textsuperscript{35} se\textsuperscript{13},
de.ring \, pha.la \, chas \, red \, mi-‘grub \, ?
today \, there.LOC \, go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL outside

84 mu\textsuperscript{13} la\textsuperscript{53} \, t\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{35} \, re\textsuperscript{13} \, ma\textsuperscript{13}-ndz\textsuperscript{35} se\textsuperscript{13},’ \, ge\textsuperscript{13}tes\textsuperscript{53} ma.la \, chas \, red \, mi-‘grub \, ? \, sgo.slad
down.LOC \, go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL outside

85 nd\textsuperscript{53}, ‘tw\textsuperscript{13} ru\textsuperscript{35} \, ta\textsuperscript{53} \, we\textsuperscript{35} \, ma\textsuperscript{13}-re\textsuperscript{13},’ \, ge\textsuperscript{13}tes\textsuperscript{53} \, t\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{35},
mchi \, de.ring \, da \, \, ? \, ma-red \, sgo.slad \, chas
go:IPF today now succeed NEG.CMPL-COP outside go:PF

86 nu\textsuperscript{13}t\textsuperscript{53} gue\textsuperscript{13}le\textsuperscript{35} \, ke\textsuperscript{53} \, ne\textsuperscript{35} \, de\textsuperscript{13}, \, nu\textsuperscript{13}t\textsuperscript{53} x\textsuperscript{53}5
nor.skyag \, sgo.ba.leb \, \, ? \, nyal \, bdog \, nor.skyag \, ?
cow.turd threshold LOC sleep PROG cow.turd ONOM

87 ge\textsuperscript{35} \, t\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{35}, \, na\textsuperscript{13}ng\textsuperscript{53} \, da\textsuperscript{13}lu\textsuperscript{53} \, t\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{13}jy\textsuperscript{53}-we\textsuperscript{53}, \, ya\textsuperscript{53}
rgal \, chas \, \, ? \, rdo.lo \, thur.?-ongs \, wa
stretch.over go:PF on.the.top pestle DIR-come:PF fox

88 ngue\textsuperscript{53} t\textsuperscript{53}i\textsuperscript{35} \, nd\textsuperscript{53}zu\textsuperscript{53} \, se\textsuperscript{53}, \, ya\textsuperscript{53} \, se\textsuperscript{53}-nbo\textsuperscript{13} \, we\textsuperscript{53},
mgo \, dkyil \, ‘brab \, byas \, wa \, bsad-? \, ‘ongs
head \, middle \, hit \, do:PF fox kill-CMPL PF.VOL

89 ts\textsuperscript{53} dze\textsuperscript{35} se\textsuperscript{13}.
‘dra \, bzlos \, ?
thus \, say:PF PF.N-VOL

Narrator: Lako (b. 1930)
Recorded: 22 December 2003
“An Orphan and a Fox”

(English free-style translation)

In the past, there was an orphan, you know, an orphan, a single child. She had no father or mother and served as a shepherdess to other people.

One day, while herding her goats and sheep, she lost them and went to search for them. While she was looking for her goats and sheep, she met a fox somewhere in the darkness [of the forest]. [The fox and the girl had a jumping competition. The girl lost and the fox was supposed to eat her.] The fox was about to eat the girl, when the girl begged: “Fox, clever fox, please do not eat me now. I am an orphan, I am everybody’s servant. I herd goats and sheep for other people. If you are to eat me tonight, then eat me, come to eat me, but please do not eat me now. [Let me first find the lost goats and sheep.]” The fox agreed. So, the girl went back, crying as she walked. She was crying and walking and on her way she met a cow turd. The cow turd asked: “Little girl, what are you crying about? Your eyes are filled with tears. Why are you crying?” “I won’t live to see the dawn of the day, I am going to die. The fox and I had a jumping competition and I lost,” replied the little girl, “I lost and tonight the fox will come and eat me.” “Oh, don’t be afraid. Cook a pot of pea porridge, you cook a pot of pea porridge and I will come tonight. We will sit around the fire together to warm ourselves and I will help you,” said the cow turd. The little girl agreed. Again she walked for a little while and on the road she met a pair of scissors. The scissors talked to her. They asked: “Little girl, what happened to you that you are crying so hard?” The girl said: “Tonight, the fox will eat me. The fox and I had a jumping competition and I lost. I lost and now I will be eaten.” “Oh, cook a pot of pea porridge. I am coming tonight to help you,” the scissors
said, “Tonight we will sit together around the fire to warm ourselves.” Closer to the village the little girl met an egg, who also told her that it would come to help her that night. She was getting closer to the village when she met a needle. “I will come to keep your company tonight, don’t cry,” it said. As the girl approached the village, she met a frog. The frog said: “I will come to keep your company tonight. Don’t cry. Don’t worry.” So, the little girl returned home and met a pestle. The pestle said: “I will come to help you, cook a pot of pea porridge and I will come to stay with you tonight.”

That night sure enough the fox came to eat the girl. When [in complete darkness] he reached the head of the girl with his claws, the comb [in the girl’s hair] pricked him. The fox felt pain. “What is that?” he asked. So he stroked the hat of the little girl, and the needle [which was sleeping there] pricked him too. The fox then felt the waist of the girl and the scissors [which were sleeping under the belt] cut his paws. The fox said: “What is going on? Wherever I touch, I get hurt. I need to light the fire so that I could see better.” The egg was sleeping in the ashes, under large chunks of [charcoaled] firewood. “I need to light the fire so that I could see better,” repeated the fox. [As the fox fanned the fire] the egg exploded with a loud ‘plop!’ The ashes covered the fox from head to toe and got in his eyes. The fox said: “Let me wash my eyes before I look for the girl again.” But in the bucket the frog gave a loud croak: ‘ribbit, ribbit!’ The fox [got so scared that he] could not eat the girl. “Today nothing seems to work; I will come back tomorrow,” said the fox. “Whatever I do, it just won’t work. Today it just does not seem to work.” So, the fox left. The cow turd was sleeping on the threshold. It stretched over [and the fox slipped over it] ‘squish!’ The pestle fell and hit the fox on his head, and the fox was killed. This is how the story ends.