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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, Pīngwǔ) 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 Hóngkǎi, 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 Shēng Mínzú Yánjūsuǒ 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 Bùfán and Zhāng Mínghuì (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
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Research on Báimā has been made possible through the generous support of the Frederik Kortlandt Spinoza Project, Leiden University, the Netherlands.
Sūn (2003a: 71; Báimā 1) and of Huáng and Zhāng (Báimā 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 Báimā are significantly dissimilar to those in Tibetan dialects.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Báimā 1</th>
<th>Báimā 2</th>
<th>WT</th>
<th>dBus-gTsang</th>
<th>Khams</th>
<th>Amdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>i₅³</td>
<td>kæ₅³</td>
<td>gis</td>
<td>kε</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kœ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tε₅³[sic.]/tï₅³</td>
<td>tæ₅³</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kœ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>tsε₅³/te₅³</td>
<td>kæ₅³</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>no₅³/kε₅³</td>
<td>kæ₅³</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>iο₅³</td>
<td>jο₅³</td>
<td>nas</td>
<td>nε</td>
<td>nε</td>
<td>kœ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>æye₅³</td>
<td>æye₅³</td>
<td>las/bas</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>kœ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>re¹³</td>
<td>zæ₅³</td>
<td>daŋ</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker of disposal</td>
<td>i₅³</td>
<td>tæ₅³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>le₅³/nε₅³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>re₅³/nο₅³</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 Báimā spoken in the neighboring villages of Báimā 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 [kæ₅³] 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 [i^53], the same particle as the marker of disposal, and instrumental, viz. [rε^53]/[nɔ^53]. Similarly, Huáng and Zhāng analyze the form [tæ^53] 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, [tɛ^53 ~ tɨ^53] and [ɨ^53], respectively. Sūn only sees the markers [ɨ^53] (ergative and disposal) and [nɔ^53] (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 Báimā 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 Báimà stories collected in 2003-2004 in the Báimà Township (hereafter “corpus”). The stories were narrated by Zhaga Tsere [tζa^13 gα^53 ʦɛ^13 rɛ^35], a 69-year old resident of Koshi [kɔ^13 ʂɨ^53] village (Shuǐniújiā in Chinese), and Lako [lα^13 ko^53], a 75-year old resident of Iaru [ja^13 rʁ^35] 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 Báimǎ 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>ʃi₃³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite/Genitive 2</td>
<td>tɛ₃³̥~tɿ₃³</td>
<td>‘his’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental/Comitative–Conjunction</td>
<td>rɛ₃³</td>
<td>‘with, and’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>ɬɜ³³/ ɬɭ³³/ kɛⁿ³³/ nɔⁿ³³</td>
<td>‘on’/ ‘vicinity’/ ‘on, above’/ ‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>kɛ₃³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>ɭɔ₃³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>gye₃³</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my analysis, Báimǎ has seven distinct types of nominal postpositions, which can be further subdivided as follows. Báimǎ has two markers of the genitive, [ʃi₃³], identical with the marker of the agentive, and [tɛ₃³̥~tɿ₃³], identical with the definite marker. The instrumental case is expressed by the same marker as the comitative and also the coordinative conjunction [rɛ₃³]. One of the locative markers, [kɛ₃³], 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
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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 isomorphy in Báimă 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 [jɪ̂ 53]

In the corpus, the marker [jɪ̂ 53] has the following four functions:

I. (sporadically) marker of genitive (WT kyi and its allomorphs gyi, gi and yi’i), e.g. [ŋɛ̂ 53 rɛ̂ 53 jɪ̂ 53 jŷ 35] ‘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, [jɪ̂ 53] as the genitive marker is retained in oblique forms of pronouns, as discussed below.

II. nominalizer for verb phrases, e.g. [ndu 35] ‘drink’, [ndu 13 jɪ̂ 53] ‘drinkables’. [jɪ̂ 53] also typically nominalizers the clause preceding the verb [dzɛ̂ 35] ‘said’ (e.g. sentence (16)) or in future contexts and conditional sentences, the clause preceding the verb [rɛ̂ 13] ‘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”.
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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. [ŋɛ⁴³ j i⁵³] ‘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.³ 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:
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 
 `[tɛʰ ø₃ tɻu₃ kæ₃ dzæ₄ wæ₃] ‘You told me.’ (Huáng and Zhāng 1995: 113, original transcriptions), the dative marker [kæ₃] is added to the oblique form of the first person pronoun [ɻu₃].

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 [tɛʰ tɻ], 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 ExceptionHandler, 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),
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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>ɻu₃</td>
<td>tɻø₃</td>
<td>wu₃læ₃ ~ læ₃wæ₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC/GEN</td>
<td>ɻu₃</td>
<td>tɻy₃</td>
<td>wu³li₃ ~ li₅₅ ~ wu²l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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(1) te\(^h\)di\(^53\) ni\(^a\)\(^13\)tsi\(^53\) ta\(^a\)\(^13\)ru\(^55\) ma\(^a\)\(^13\)-we\(^55\) ge\(^13\).
   khyod.kyi niángzi da.ring ma-’ongs ?
   2S.OBL wife still NEG.CMPL-come:PF PF.N-VOL

   ‘Your wife hasn’t come yet.’

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

The oblique form of [ndē\(^53\)] ‘this’ is [ndi\(^53\)] ‘of this’ and that of [te\(^53\)] ‘that, he’ is [ti\(^53\)] ‘of that, his’. For example:

(2) wu\(^13\)li\(^53\) pu\(^13\)ndʒa\(^53\) re\(^13\), ndi\(^53\) na\(^a\)\(^13\)ny\(^53\) re\(^13\).
   ?.‘i’ ? red ‘di.’i nyag.nyog red
   3S.OBL wife COP this.OBL child COP

   ‘It is his wife, it is his child.’

(3) ti\(^53\) pu\(^53\) te\(^53\) t\(^h\)u\(^13\)ndʒi\(^35\) s\(^a\)\(^53\)t\(^a\)\(^53\) tse\(^53\) ni\(^53\),
   de.’i bu de Chōngqīng sa.cha slebs ni
   that.OBL boy that Chunking place reach TOP

   ti\(^53\) pu\(^53\) te\(^53\) ge\(^53\)-ku\(^13\)nbø\(^13\) ge\(^13\).
   de.’i bu de shi-? ?
   that.OBL boy that die:PF-CMPL.EMPH PF.N-VOL

   ‘After his son arrived in Chunking, he died.’

In my analysis, the forms [te\(^h\)di\(^53\)], [wu\(^13\)li\(^53\)], [ndi\(^53\)] and [ti\(^53\)] are all fusions of the
pronouns [te\(^h\)ø\(^53\)] ‘you’, [wu\(^13\)le\(^53\)] ‘he, she’, [ndē\(^53\)] ‘this’ and [te\(^53\)] ‘that’ with the

---

imperfective, perfective and imperative. Verbs with one stem are marked in the gloss line only for their

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 \([j\dot{i}^{53}]\) \((kyi)\). 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 \([t\dot{e}^{31}]\) ‘that one’ is \([t\dot{i}^{13}]\), as in \([t\dot{i}^{13}k^h\dot{a}^{53}\dot{e}]\) ‘on the top of that one’ (Gésăng 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.

\([j\dot{i}^{53}]\) 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) \(k^b\dot{w}^{53} \ t\dot{w}^{13}r\dot{u}^{35} \ gu^{13}k\dot{a}^{53} \ t\dot{a}^{53} \ y\dot{a}^{53} \ j\dot{i}^{53} \ k^h\dot{w}^{53} \ s\dot{e}^{53}-n\dot{d}\dot{g}\dot{a}^{53}\).

\(k\dot{h} \ de.\dot{r}i\dot{n}g \ d\dot{g}o\dot{n}.k\dot{a} \ da \ wa \ y\dot{i}s \ kho \ b\dot{sa}d-\dot{c\dot{h}a}^{6}\)

\(1S.\dot{L}O\dot{G}^{7} \ t\dot{o\dot{d}}\dot{i}n\) \(e\)\(v\)\(e\)\(n\)\(i\)\(ng\).\(k\)\(a\) \(w\)\(o\) \(y\)\(i\)\(s\) \(k\)\(h\) \(b\)\(s\)\(a\)\(d-\)\(c\)\(h\)\(a\)

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

(5) \(y\dot{a}^{53} \ k\dot{u}^{13}l\dot{y}^{53} \ t\dot{h}\dot{e}^{35} \ j\dot{i}^{53} \ k\dot{a}^{53}-k\dot{u}^{13}n\dot{b}^{13}\).

\(w\)\(a\) \(s\)\(k\)\(u\)\(.l\)\(u\)\(s\) \(t\)\(h\)\(a\)\(l\)\(.\)\(b\)\(a\) \(y\)\(i\)\(s\) \(b\)\(k\)\(a\)\(b\)-?

\(f\)\(o\)\(x\) \(b\)\(o\)\(d\)\(y\) \(a\)\(sh\)\(e\) \(A\)\(G\)\(T\) \(c\)\(o\)\(v\)\(e\)r\(r\)\(e\)\(m\)\(p\)\(h\)\(m\)\(p\)

‘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 \([k^h\dot{w}^{53}]\) ‘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 \([j\,i^{53}]\) commonly fuses with the pronoun \([t\,e^{53}]\) ‘that’ to \([t\,i^{53}]\). For example:

\[
(6) \quad \text{wa}^{53} \quad \text{ti}^{53} \quad \text{pu}^{35} \quad \text{te}^{53}, \quad \text{nd}^{13}\text{ny}^{53} \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{te}^{53}\
\text{fox} \quad \text{DEF.AGT} \quad \text{girl} \quad \text{DEF} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{DEF} \quad \text{DEF}\
\]

\[
\text{te}^{53} \quad \text{se}^{53}-\text{nd}\text{za}^{53} \quad \text{z}\text{u}^{341} \quad \text{se}^{53} \quad \text{se}^{13}.
\text{de} \quad \text{bsad-'cha} \quad \text{zhabs} \quad \text{byas} \quad ?
\text{DEF} \quad \text{kill-eat:IPF} \quad \text{below} \quad \text{do:PF} \quad \text{PF.N-VOL}
\]

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

The homophony of the genitive and the agentive \([j\,i^{53}]\) 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). Báimä \([j\,i^{53}]\) 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 Báimä early. This early depletion of codas also resulted in the homophony of the genitive and the agentive markers. It is plausible that subsequently \([j\,i^{53}]\) has been retained as the agentive marker, whereas a new genitive marker—

---

\(^8\)An alternative possibility is to consider Báimä genitive marker \([j\,i^{53}]\) 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 \[\check{ji}^{53}\] has been retained in a number of high frequency words.

3.2. The definite and the genitive \[t\,\varepsilon^{53} \sim \check{ti}^{53}\]

Sūn (2003: 73) and Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) disagree as to what should be seen as the genitive marker in Báimă. 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):

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{7) } & \text{ta}^{21} & z\varepsilon^{35} & nd\varepsilon^{53} & mbu^{21} & t\,\varepsilon^{h} \check{h}^{35} & t\varepsilon^{53} & z\varepsilon^{21}.
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{sta.re} \quad \text{‘di} \quad ?mù\,\check{ji}āng \quad \text{de} \quad \text{red}
\]

\[
\text{axe} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{carpenter} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{COP}
\]

‘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 Báimă 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 \([\text{za}^{21} k\varepsilon^{53} \,\check{s}\varepsilon^{53}]\) ‘elder brother’s hat’. In contrast, in addition to \[t\,\varepsilon^{53}\], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 253; original transcriptions) describes the genitive marker \[\check{ti}^{53}\], as in \([\text{a}^{13} k\varepsilon^{35} \,\check{t}\,\varepsilon^{53} \, k\varepsilon^{35}]\) ‘elder brother’s clothes’, which he sees as a probable loan from Chinese. Although the resemblance of the Báimă
genitive marker [tǐ^53] to the subordinative particle di [tǐ] 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 [tǐ^53] 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 [tẽ^53] also as a marker of disposal, as in the following example (original transcriptions, my glosses):

    bye.phrug de bya.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 [tẽ^53] 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 [lɛ^53] and [nɛ^53]. For example (original transcription, my glosses):

(9) tẽ^hø^53 jο^35 lɛ^53 kα^13 lα^53 tẽ^hɛ^13 l^13.
    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 [lɛ^53] at the end of this section. (The marker [nɛ^53] is infrequent in the corpus.) As for the marker [tẽ^53], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 258)
remarks that it is not yet clear whether the genitive \[tg^{53}\] and the definite \[te^{53}\] are two homophonous words or whether the function of \[tg^{53}\] is expanding (from genitive to definite).

In the corpus, \[tg^{53}\] 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:

\[
(10) \quad \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{tg}^{53} & \cdots & \text{tg}^{53} & \text{ts}h\text{u}^{13}-\text{n}s^{53} & \text{ts}e^{53} & \cdots \\
de & \quad \quad & \text{de} & \quad \quad & \text{ts}h\text{u}-\text{nang} & \text{slebs} \\
\text{that} & \quad \quad & \text{that} & \quad \quad & \text{here-LOC} & \text{reach}
\end{array}
\]

‘She came here…’ (T48-49)

\[tg^{53}\] is in all probability cognate with the Tibetan demonstrative and also anaphoric pronoun \(de\) ‘that, that one, he’. Hence, \[tæ^{53}\] in the expression \[mbu^{21}t\text{a}^{h}s^{35}tæ^{53}\], from example (7), is in my opinion a true demonstrative, pointing to the topic \[t\text{a}^{21}z\text{e}^{55}\] ‘axe’, literally ‘that of the carpenter’. The possessive relation is expressed by word order, modifier first, modified second.

In Jäschke’s (1998: 255) analysis, \(de\) in Written Tibetan frequently stands in the place of the English definite article ‘the’, e.g. \(pa \text{ de log-ste song-ngo}\) ‘The father went back.’, where it adds to perspicuity. \[tg^{53}\] in Báimā has an analogous function to that of \(de\) in WT, for example: \(^9\)

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

The marker \([t\iota^{53}]\) is the oblique form of the demonstrative \([t\varepsilon^{53}]\) ‘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 \([t\varepsilon^{53}]\) ‘that, he’, \([t\iota^{53}]\), in Báimā functions in a similar fashion.

\[\text{(11) } \text{ wa de } ? \text{ bzlos } ? \text{ fox DEF agree say:PF PF.N-VOL} \]

‘The fox agreed.’ (T 21-22)

\[\text{‘On the way, she met a cow turd.’ (T 25-26)} \]
(12) \( t\i^e13\, t\i53 \, z\i y^13\, d\i 35 \, t\i 53 \, p\a^13\, n\i y^53 \, t\e^53 \ldots \, t\e^53 \)

di\( \i\)nzi \ de.‘i \ yon.bdag \ de.‘i \ nyag.nyog \ de \ de
hotel \ that.OBL \ owner \ that.OBL \ child \ DEF \ DEF

\( p\u^35 \, c\e^53 \, d\e^13 \, s\e^13 \).
bu.mo \ byas \ bdog \ ?
girl \ do:PF \ PROG \ PF.N-VOL

‘The child of the owner of the hotel... eh, was a girl.’

[\( l\e^53 \)], 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.

(13) \( t\u^13\, r\u^35 \, h\o^35 \, d\a^13\, n\e^35 \, l\o^13\, i^53 \, t\e^h\, y^53 \, k\u^h\, u^13\, z\e^53 \, l\e^53 \ldots \)

de.ring \ yang \ ? \ läoyê \ khyod \ k\uizi \ ?
today \ again \ Ange \ master \ 2S.OBL \ trousers \ that

\( k\u^h\, u^13\, z\e^53 \, k\u^53 \, z\o^53 \, w\u^53 \, r\e^13 \, d\z\e^35 \).
k\uizi \ rku \ bzo \ ‘ong \ red \ zlos
trousers \ steal \ do:IPF \ come:IPF \ COP \ say:PF

‘Today Master Ange will come to steal your pants... pants, he said.’

Similar to \( [t\e^53] \), \( [l\e^53] \) is a demonstrative and an anaphoric pronoun ‘that, he’.

Whereas \( [t\e^53] \) is presumably of Tibetan provenance, \( [l\e^53] \) appears to be a native Bâimâ word, cf. the third person singular pronoun \( [w\u^13\, l\e^53 \sim l\e^53] \), stemming from a distal demonstrative pronoun. This marker is similar to one of the two definite markers, \( l/e/ \) 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 Ę53]—[t Ę53] also functions as an external possessor.

3.3. The comitative/conjunction and the instrumental [rĘ53]

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), [rĘ53], 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, [rĘ53]. Sūn (2003a: 71, 2003b: 73) posits different morphemes for the instrumental ([rƏ13]) and the comitative ([rĘ53]). The former, [rƏ13] in my transcription, is most likely the sandhi form of [rĘ53].

Furthermore, in the word list concluding Nishida and Sūn’s study (1990: 366), the Báimǎ coordinate conjunction ‘and’ is given as [rĘ53], i.e. identical in form to Sūn’s instrumental marker [rĘ53].

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 [rĘ53] changes its
under discussion is performed. Sentence (14) is an example of the use of \( [r\varepsilon^{33}] \) as a conjunction:

\[
\text{14) } y\delta^{53} r\varepsilon^{13} p\varepsilon^{35} \, n\delta\varphi^{13} - r\varepsilon^{35} \, \varepsilon\delta^{53} \, d\varepsilon^{13}. \]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{wa} & ? & \text{bu.mo} & \text{mchong-re} & \text{byas} & \text{bdog} \\
\text{fox} & \text{CONJ} & \text{girl} & \text{jump-RECP} & \text{do:PF} & \text{PROG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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 \( [r\varepsilon^{33}] \) is used as the marker of the comitative, sentence (15), and as the marker of the instrumental, sentence (16):

\[
\text{15) } y\delta^{53} \, r\varepsilon^{53} \, t\varphi^{h53} \, s\varepsilon^{53} \, \varepsilon\delta^{13} \ldots \\
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{wa} & ? & \text{phrad} & ? \\
\text{fox} & \text{COM} & \text{encounter} & \text{PF.N-VOL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The girl met a fox.’ (T 10)

\[
\text{16) } \text{t}^{3} \text{\dddot{u}}^{13} \text{n} \delta \varepsilon^{35} \, r\varepsilon^{53} \, k^{3} \lambda^{a13} \eta^{u53} \, t\varepsilon y^{53} \, n\delta^{53}, \, \delta\lambda^{35} \\
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{chu.’khyags} & ? & \text{kha.n.go} & \text{bkrus} & \text{mbod} & \text{yang} \\
\text{water} & \text{INSTR} & \text{face} & \text{wash:PF/IMP} & \text{call:IPF} & \text{again} \\
\end{array}
\]

---

original tone to the low rising when followed by a word in a high rising or high falling tone, as in example (7). \( [r\varepsilon^{33}] \) is the emphatic or citation form of the coordinate conjunction ‘and’, \( [r\varepsilon^{13}] \) 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, kyi and de, the etymology of the marker of the comitative and the instrumental in Báimǎ is less clear. In addition to [rɛ⁵³], Sǔn lists [ŋo⁵³] ‘inside’ (WT nang) used in those cases where the instrument is a container. The pair [rɛ⁵³]/[ŋo⁵³] in Báimǎ is thus reminiscent of the Shǐxīng instrumental markers [rɛ³³] and [ŋo⁵⁵] (Dài et al. 1991: 193).

3.4. The locative and the dative [kɛ⁵³]

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, [lɑ⁵³] ‘there, on’, [tɔɑ⁵³] ‘vicinity’, [kɛ⁵³] ‘above, on’ and [ŋo⁵³] ‘inside’. Of these markers, the former two are more general.

The form [tɔɑ⁵³], listed by Sǔn (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 [lɑ⁵³] see the example in footnote 8.

(17) ne⁵³re⁵³ tsa³⁵ ra¹³-jy³⁵ ndzo¹³-ne⁵³ oe⁵³ se¹³.
mi.? rtsa ra-lug ‘tsho-mi byas ?
other.people LOC goat-sheep graze:IPF-person do:PF PF,N-VOL

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

The marker [ke⁵³] ‘on, above’ indicates position above or on top of something. For example:

(18) nu¹³te⁵³ gue¹³-lev³⁵ ke⁵³ ne³⁵ de¹³…
nor.skyag sgo.ba.leb ? nyal bdog
cow.turd threshold LOC sleep PROG

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

Finally, the form [no⁵³] indicates position inside something:

(19) teʰg³³… ni¹³ndzg³³ no⁵³ dʒue³⁵ kua⁴⁵⁵ oe⁵³ kuʰu⁵³ 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 [ke⁵³] 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:

(20) ά³₉ne³⁵ gά³₉α³⁵ dze³⁵ ni₁³, ndζε³⁵ pʰά³₉ ndζu³⁵
a.mes Gesar bzlos ni ‘dre phag mchu
master Gesar say:PF TOP ghost pig snout

ke³⁵: “tʃʰ₁³₉ gα³⁵ de³¹,” dze³⁵.

‘So Master Gesar asked the ghost with a pig snout: “What are you afraid of?’ ”

As far as the etymology of the locative markers is concerned, three of them, [lα³⁵], [tʃα³⁵] and [nα³⁵], are clearly cognate with Tibetan, whereas the origin of one, the locative/dative marker [ke³⁵], is less clear.

(21) to³⁵ pe₁³₉zα³⁴¹ tʃʰε³⁵ te³⁵ tʃʰu³⁵ ti³⁵-ke³⁵ to³⁵
? spun.skya chen de chu de.’i-? ?
LNK brother big DEF little DEF.OBL-DAT LNK

ka³⁵pu³⁵ tʃʰi³⁵³³.
kǎnḥu̯i³
look.down.upon

‘So the elder brother looked down upon the younger brother.’
Finally, as for the etymology of the two case markers not discussed in the article, the ablative [jɔŋ] and the comparative [ɣyeŋ], 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. Báimǎ and the neighboring languages

As evident from WT glosses to Báimǎ examples in the text, most of the Báimǎ lexicon is of Tibetan provenance and derived from Tibetan in multiple waves of borrowings, as evidenced by complex sound correspondences between Báimǎ and Written Tibetan (Zhāng 1994; Huáng and Zhāng 1995). For example, one WT cluster khr corresponds in Báimǎ in Zhāng’s (1994: 14) analysis to [tʃʰ], [tsʰ] and [tʃʰ], and in Huáng and Zhāng’s (1995: 85) analysis, to [tʃʰ], [kʰ] and [ʃ]. To give just two examples from the cited sentences, WT l is treated in Báimǎ as j (e.g. WT lam ‘road’ is [jɔŋ] in Báimǎ, WT langs ‘bright’ is [jɔŋ], WT lug ‘sheep’ is [jyŋ]) and as l (e.g. WT locative particle la is [lɑŋ] in Báimǎ, WT rdo.lo ‘pestle’ is [claŋ luŋ]). One WT final ing is treated as [w] (e.g. [tw¹³ru⁵³] de.ring ‘today’) and as [i] (e.g. [ti¹³pa⁵³] ding.pa ‘now’).

Báimǎ nominal postpositions appear to combine WT case particles (e.g. the agentive [jìŋ] and the locative [lɑŋ]) and markers of possibly Qiangic provenance (e.g. the instrumental [rɛŋ] and the definitie [lɛŋ]). Yet some are of less clear origin
(the ablative [j o₃] and the comparative [e e₃₃]). The range of grammatical markers of arguably Qiangic origin from the quoted examples can be expanded. The linking particle [t o₃₅] is similar to a common discourse particle in Qiang, (a)tu (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, March 2005). The non-volitional past marker [s o₁³], mostly reduced to [s] rapid in speech, is reminiscent of the past particle in Qiangic languages, cf. [s i₃₃] in Shìxīng.

In sum, Bái mǎ 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. In the past, person orphan person orphan child single.


3. Other people loc goat-sheep graze:IPF-person do:PF PF.N-VOL.

4. Other people loc goat-sheep graze:PF/IMP PF.N-VOL goat-sheep.

5. Graze:PF/IMP TOP one.day INDEF TOP goat-sheep do:PF.


7. PF.N-VOL goat-sheep throw:PF-CMPL TOP goat-sheep search.

9 nag.po prob dimness TOP fox COM encounter

10 se³³, ya³³ re³³ se²³, ya³³... ya³³ re³³

11 tse³³ ni³³, ya³³ ti³³ pw³⁵ te³³, na¹³ ny³³

12 te³³... te³³ se³³-ndza³³ zu³⁴¹ se³³ ni³³, na¹³ ny³³ pw³³

13 se³³ ni³³, "ya³³, ya³³, ya³³... ya³³... ya³³... to³³

14 ti³³ dzê³⁵ ni³³, "ya³³, ya³³, ya³³... ya³³... ya³³... to³³

15 na³³ dzê³³ re³³, ya³³, ya³³, te³³ tse³³ bu³³ rw³³

16 kho nyung.ba bsad ma-'cha kho dwa.dwa red

17 kho mi.? rtsa lag.(gyog.)pa sos mi.? yi
18  jy\(^{35}\) ndzö\(^{53}\) de\(^{13}\)... rd\(^{13}\) jy\(^{35}\) ndzö\(^{53}\) de\(^{13}\)," tšu\(^{53}\) dze\(^{35}\)
lug 'tsho bdog ra-lug 'tsho bdog 'dra bzlos
sheep graze:IPF PROG goat-sheep graze:IPF PROG thus say:PF

19  se\(^{13}\). "te\(^{53}\) tu\(^{13}\) rw\(^{35}\) gu\(^{13}\) ka\(^{53}\) ndzö\(^{53}\) to\(^{35}\)... to\(^{35}\) kʰu\(^{53}\)
? khyod de.ring dgon.ka mtshan ? ? kho
PF.N-VOL 2S today evening night LNK LNK 1S.LOG

20  se\(^{53}\)-ndzą\(^{53}\) ji\(^{13}\), se\(^{53}\)-ndzą\(^{53}\) to\(^{35}\) se\(^{53}\)-ndżą\(^{53}\)
bsad-'cha yi red bsad-'cha ? bsad-'cha

21  šue\(^{53}\). ti\(^{13}\) pa\(^{53}\) na\(^{53}\) se\(^{53}\) ma\(^{13}\)-ndzą\(^{53}\)," to\(^{35}\)
shog ding.pa nyung.ba bsad ma-'cha ?
come:IMP now a.little kill NEG.CMPL-eat:IPF LNK

22  ya\(^{53}\) te\(^{53}\) ja\(^{35}\) dze\(^{35}\) še\(^{13}\). to\(^{35}\)... mo\(^{13}\) ri\(^{35}\)... na\(^{13}\) ny\(^{53}\)
wa de ? bzlos ? ? ma.rabs nyag.nyog
fox DEF agree say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK woman child

23  te\(^{53}\) ya\(^{13}\) ra\(^{35}\) ndżw\(^{53}\), na\(^{13}\) ny\(^{53}\) pu\(^{35}\) te\(^{53}\) ya\(^{13}\) ra\(^{35}\) ndżw\(^{53}\).
de ? 'gro nyag.nyog bu.mo de ? 'gro
def in.a.circle go:IPF child girl DEF in.a.circle go:IPF

24  ya\(^{13}\) ra\(^{35}\) ndżw\(^{53}\) ni\(^{53}\), nu\(^{53}\) ši\(^{53}\) ya\(^{13}\) ra\(^{35}\) ndżw\(^{53}\) we\(^{53}\). nu\(^{53}\)
?škor.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  ši\(^{53}\) ya\(^{13}\) ra\(^{35}\) ndżw\(^{53}\) we\(^{53}\), jo\(^{35}\) töl\(^{35}\) la\(^{53}\) nu\(^{13}\) tøa\(^{53}\)
bzhin.du ? 'gro 'ongs lam dkyil la nor.skyag
SIM in.a.circle go:IPF come:PF road center LOC cow.turd

26  še\(^{13}\) re\(^{53}\) tšʰe\(^{53}\), nu\(^{13}\) tøa\(^{53}\) še\(^{13}\) re\(^{53}\) tšʰe\(^{53}\): "puɾ⁵³ puɾ⁵³,
shig ? phrad nor.skyag shig ? phrad bu.mo.?
INDEF COM encounter cow.turd INDEF COM encounter girl
27  tøʰ enlightenment53  tʃʰ enlightenment53  ndata53  de13?  tøʰ enlightenment53  ... nia13  ndʒe53  no53  dʒue53 
khyod  chi  ngu  bdog  khyod  mig.'bras  nang  mehīl.ma  
2s  what  cry  PROG  2s  eye  LOC  fluid  

28  kua55  ɕe53  kʰu53  no13,  tøʰ enlightenment53  ʃjʰ enlightenment53  ndata53  de13?  
?  byas  khur  snang  khyod  chi  ngu  bdog  
ONOM  do:PF  carry  exist  2s  what  cry  PROG  

29  dʒe53.  ‘kʰw13  tw13  ru53  ndʒe53  ta53  no53  me13-jo53  ji53  re13,  
bzlos  kho  de.ring  mtshan  da  nam  mi-lang5s  yi  red  
say:PF  1S.LOG  today  night  now  sky  NEG-be.bright  NOM  COP  

30  kʰw53  me13-ndʒ53  ji53  re13,  ɣa53  re13  pw53  ndʒw13-re53  
kho  mi-‘dug  yi  red  wa  ?  bu.mo  mehong-re  
1S.LOG  NEG-reside  NOM  COP  fox  CONJ  girl  jump-RECP  

byas  bdog  bzlos  ni  mehong-re  bzlos  kho  
do:PF  PROG  say:PF  TOP  jump-RECP  say:PF  1S.LOG  

?  ?  kho  ?  ni  de.ring  
be.defeated-CMPL  PF.N-VOL  1S.LOG  be.defeated-CMPL.EMPH  TOP  today  

33  ndʒe53  ta53  ɣa53  te53  kʰw53  se53-ndʒa53  wu53  re13.”  
mtshan  da  wa  de  kho  bsad-‘cha  ‘ong  red  
night  now  fox  DEF  1S.LOG  kill-eat:IPF  come:IPF  COP  

34  “ɕe,  tɕʰ53  ma13-тɕa53.  tɕʰ53  ...  ʂa53  ...  ʂa13ma53  ne13ni53  
?  khyod.?  ma-skrag  khyod.?  sran  sran.ma  ?  
EXCL  2S.EMPH  NEG.CMPL-be.afraid  2S.EMPH  pea  pea  gruel  

35  ʃw13  ko53  ki53  zɑ341,  ʂa13ma53  ne13ni53  ʃw13  
?  gang  skol  bzhag  sran.ma  ?  ?  
cooking.pot  full  boil  put:PF/IMP  pea  gruel  cooking.pot
gang skol bzhag dgong.ka me 'de rogs 'ong full boil put:PF/IMP evening fire get.warm companion come:IPF

bdog 'dra bzlos ? ? ? zlos yang nyung.ba PROG thus say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK agree say:PF again a.little

yang yang dum.pa 'ongs yang dum.pa 'ongs ni again again one.part come:PF again one.part come:PF TOP

lam dkyil la lam dkyil chan.pa shig bdog road center LOC road center scissors INDEF exist

scissors DEF scissors DEF speak scissors

def girl 2S what do:PF PROG 2S

ngu bdog bzlos kho de.ring dgong.ka da wa cry PROG say:PF 1S.LOG today evening now fox

yis kho bsad-'cha wa ? bu.mo mchong-re byas AGT 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF fox CONJ girl jump-RECP do:PF

ni 1S.LOG be.defeated-CMPL TERM be.defeated-CMPL TERM
45  **tw'³⁵ ru'³⁵ gu'³⁵ ka³³ ta³³ se³³-ndʒa³³.** “ñe, teʰ'³³, fi̇o³³
d Phó  ng. ka  da  bsad'-cha? khyod.? yang
today  evening  now  kill-eat:IPF  EXCL  2S.EMPH again

46  ʂa¹³ ma³³  ɲe¹³  nj³³  ki³³  za³³⁴¹, gu'³³ ka³³  ɲe³³  nda³³
sran.ma  ?  skol  bzhag  dgong.ka  me  ‘de
pea  gruel  boil  put:PF/IMP  evening  fire  get.warm

47  **wu³³ de'¹³,” d泽³³  ʂê³³, “gu'³³ ka³³  ɲe³³  nda³³
‘ong  bdog  bzlos  ?  dgong.ka  me  ‘de
come:IPF  PROG  say:PF  PF.N-VOL  evening  fire  get.warm

48  **wu³³ de'¹³, ɲe³³ nda³³ ruे³³ wu³³ de'¹³.”
‘ong  bdog  me  ‘de  rogs  ‘ong  bdog
come:IPF  PROG  fire  get.warm  companion  come:IPF  PROG

49  te³³... te³³ tsʰu¹³-no³³  tse³³, ʂa³³  gue³³⁵  re³³  tsʰ'e³³,
de  de  tshu-nang  slebs  bya.sgong  ?  phrad
that  that  here-LOC  reach  egg  COM  encounter

50  fi̇o³³  tʂu³³  d泽³³  ʂê³³. fi̇o³³  “ɲe³³ nda³³ ruे³³
yang  ‘dra  bzlos  ?  yang  me  ‘de  rogs
again  thus  say:PF  PF.N-VOL  again  fire  get.warm  companion

51  **wu³³ de'¹³,” d泽³³. te³³ tsʰu¹³-no³³  tse³³, kʰ'w³³
‘ong  bdog  bzlos  de  tshu-nang  slebs  kho
come:IPF  PROG  say:PF  that  here-LOC  reach  needle

52  re³³ tsʰ'e³³, “ɲe³³ nda³³ ruे³³ wu³³ de'¹³,
?  phrad  me  ‘de  rogs  ‘ong  bdog
COM  encounter  fire  get.warm  companion  come:IPF  PROG

53  ma¹³-ɲu³³,” d泽³³. te³³ tsʰu¹³-no³³  tse³³... te³³
ma-ngu  bzlos  de  tshu-nang  slebs  de
NEG.CMPL-cry  say:PF  that  here-LOC  reach  that
54 tshu
 tse
 ye
 re
 tsh
 ho
 “ne
 tshu-nang
 slebs
 sbal.ba
 phrad
 yang
 me
 here-LOC
 reach
 frog
 COM
 encounter
 again
 fire

55 nda
 rue
 wu
 de
 ma
 ‘de
 rogs
 ‘ong
 bdog
 ma-nu
 get.warm
 companion
 come:IPF
 PROG
 NEG.CMPL-cry

56 ne
 ma
 “
 te
 tshu
 tse
 k’w
 re
 ?? ma-byas
 de
 tshu-nang
 slebs
 kho
 be.worried
 NEG.CMPL-do:PF
 that
 here-LOC
 reach
 needle
 COM

57 tsh
 ho
 tshu
 dz
 se
 te
 gi
 we
 phrad
 yang
 ‘dra
 bzlos
 de
 khyim-ongs
 encounter
 again
 thus
 say:PF
 PF.N-VOL
 that
 DIR-come:PF

58 to
 da
 re
 tsh
 da
 dz
 “k’w
 ne
 ?
 rdo.lo
 ?
 phrad
 rdo.lo
 bzlos
 kho
 me
 LNK
 pestle
 COM
 encounter
 pestle
 say:PF
 1S.LOG
 fire

59 nda
 rue
 wu
 de
 sa
 ma
 ne
 pi
 ki
 ‘de
 rogs
 ‘ong
 bdog
 get.warm
 companion
 come:IPF
 PROG
 pea
 gruel
 boil

60 za
 k’w
 ne
 nda
 rue
 wu
 de
 bzhag
 kho
 me
 ‘de
 rogs
 ‘ong
 bdog
 put:PF/IMP
 1S.LOG
 fire
 get.warm
 companion
 come:IPF
 PROG

61 ndz
 te
 ta
 ya
 te
 se
 na
 ny
 mtshan
 de
 bden.pa
 wa
 de
 ‘ongs
 night
 TOP
 really
 fox
 DEF
 come:PF
 PF.N-VOL
 child

62 te
 ndza
 we
 se
 na
 ny
 te
 ndza
 we
 de
 ‘cha
 ‘ongs
 DEF
 eat:IPF
 come:PF
 PF.N-VOL
 child
 DEF
 eat:IPF
 come:PF
72 ne\textsuperscript{35} de\textsuperscript{13}, ne\textsuperscript{35}te\textsuperscript{35} z\textsuperscript{5}w\textsuperscript{541} ne\textsuperscript{35}, "ne\textsuperscript{53} nbi\textsuperscript{53}
nyal bdog me.? zhabs nyal me ‘bud
sleep PROG large.firewood below sleep fire blow:IPF

73 ge\textsuperscript{341} re\textsuperscript{13}.” ca\textsuperscript{53}gue\textsuperscript{35} te\textsuperscript{35} p\textsuperscript{5}h\textsuperscript{55} k\textsuperscript{h}u\textsuperscript{13} ge\textsuperscript{53}, nba\textsuperscript{53}
dgos red bya.sgong de ? ?khur byas ‘bar
want COP egg DEF ONOM ?carry do:PF explode

74 t\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{35}, ya\textsuperscript{53} ku\textsuperscript{13}ly\textsuperscript{53} t\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{35} ji\textsuperscript{53} ka\textsuperscript{53}-ku\textsuperscript{13}nbo\textsuperscript{13}, ya\textsuperscript{53}
chas wa sku.lus thal.ba yis bkab-? wa
TERM fox body ashes AGT cover-CMPL.EMPH fox

75 ka\textsuperscript{53}-ku\textsuperscript{13}nbo\textsuperscript{13}, ni\textsuperscript{13}ndze\textsuperscript{35} ka\textsuperscript{53}-ku\textsuperscript{13}nbo\textsuperscript{13} t\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{35}, ni\textsuperscript{13}ndze\textsuperscript{35}...
bkab-? migr.'bras bkab-? chas migr.'bras
cover-CMPL.EMPH eye cover-CMPL.EMPH TERM eye

76 ya\textsuperscript{53}: “t\textsuperscript{h}u\textsuperscript{13}suc\textsuperscript{53}... t\textsuperscript{h}u\textsuperscript{13}ndza\textsuperscript{35} re\textsuperscript{53} k\textsuperscript{h}a\textsuperscript{13}nu\textsuperscript{53}
wa chu.bzom chu.'khyags ? kha.ngo
fox water.bucket chu.'khyags chas

77 t\textsuperscript{e}y\textsuperscript{53} nbe\textsuperscript{53}, fo\textsuperscript{35} ts\textsuperscript{h}i\textsuperscript{35} ge\textsuperscript{541} re\textsuperscript{13}, ji\textsuperscript{53}
bkrus mbod yang ‘tshol sgos red yi
wash:PF/IMP call:IPF again search want COP NOM

78 dze\textsuperscript{35}. ts\textsuperscript{h}u\textsuperscript{13}suc\textsuperscript{53} ti\textsuperscript{13}-ke\textsuperscript{53}... ts\textsuperscript{h}u\textsuperscript{13}suc\textsuperscript{53} ti\textsuperscript{13}-no\textsuperscript{53}
bzlos chu.bzom de.'i-? chu.bzom de.'i-nang
say:PF water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC

79 ye\textsuperscript{13}wa\textsuperscript{53} te\textsuperscript{53} ts\textsuperscript{h}i\textsuperscript{53} dze\textsuperscript{35} t\textsuperscript{ca}\textsuperscript{53} ge\textsuperscript{13}. to\textsuperscript{35} pw\textsuperscript{35}
sbal.ba de ? bzlos grags ? ? bu.mo
frog DEF ONOM say:PF outcry PF.N-VOL LNK girl

80 se\textsuperscript{53}-nd3a\textsuperscript{53} ga\textsuperscript{53} ma\textsuperscript{13}-re\textsuperscript{13}, se\textsuperscript{53}-nd3a\textsuperscript{53} ga\textsuperscript{53}
bsad-'cha? ma-red bsad-'cha?
kill-eat:IPF be.able NEG.CMPL-COP kill-eat:IPF be.able
81 ma-re, to “tw-rw to ma-red ? ? de-ring ?
NEG.CMPL-COP PF.N-VOL LNK today LNK

82 we ma-re, no-ue wu ge re, ? ma-red nangs.pa ‘ong sgos red
succeed NEG.CMPL-COP tomorrow come:IPF want COP

83 tw-rw p’u la tì re ma-ndzw še, de-ring pha.la chas red mi-’grub ?
today there.LOC go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL outside

84 mu la tì re ma-ndzw še,” ge tse sgo.slad
ma.la chas red mi-’grub ? sgo.slad
down.LOC go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL outside

85 ndzi, “tw-rw ta we ma-re.” ge tse tì, mchi de-ring da ? ma-red sgo.slad chas
go:IPF today now succeed NEG.CMPL-COP outside go:PF

86 nu’ca gue ke ne de, nu’ca xe nor.skyag sgo.ba.leb ? nyal bdog nor.skyag ?
cow.turd threshold LOC sleep PROG cow.turd ONOM

87 ge tì, na’nge da’lu t’hö jy we, ya
gyal chas ? rdo.lo thur.?’ongs wa
stretch.over go:PF on.the.top pestle DIR-come:PF fox

88 ngue tsi ndzu së ya se-nbo’o we, mgo dkyil ‘brab byas wa bsad-? ‘ongs
head middle hit do:PF fox kill-CMPL PF.VOL

89 tsu dze së
‘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.