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Báimǎ nominal postpositions and their etymology¹

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 Mínzǔ 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
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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>kø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tæ/sic./ti53</td>
<td>tæ53</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>tsæ53/iæ53</td>
<td>kæ53</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>no53/kæ53</td>
<td>kæ53</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>i33</td>
<td>j33</td>
<td>nœ53</td>
<td>nœ</td>
<td>nœ</td>
<td>kœ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>œ53</td>
<td>œ53</td>
<td>las/bas</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>kœ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>re13</td>
<td>zae53</td>
<td>dan</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/næ53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>re53/nœ53</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 (Pingwū 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. \([r\varepsilon^{53}]/[\Pi\sigma^{53}]\). Similarly, Huáng and Zhāng analyze the form \([t\varepsilon^{53}]\) 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, \([t\varepsilon^{53}~t\bar{i}^{53}]\) and \([i^{53}]\), respectively. Sūn only sees the markers \([i^{53}]\) (ergative and disposal) and \([\Pi\sigma^{53}]\) (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 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 \([t\zeta\alpha^{13}g\alpha^{53}~t\varepsilon^{h}\varepsilon^{13}r\varepsilon^{35}]\), a 69-year old resident of Koshi \([k\sigma^{13}\Sigma\bar{i}^{53}]\) village (Shuǐniújiā in Chinese), and Lako \([l\alpha^{13}k\sigma^{53}]\), a 75-year old resident of Iaru \([j\alpha^{13}r\w^{35}]\) 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 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>jǐ 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite/Genitive 2</td>
<td>tē 53~tī 53</td>
<td>‘his’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental/Comitative–Conjunction</td>
<td>rē 53</td>
<td>‘with, and’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>lā 53/ tā 53/kē 53/nō 53</td>
<td>‘on’/ ‘vicinity’/ ‘on, above’/ ‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>kē 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>jō 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>gye 53</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, [jǐ 53], identical with the marker of the agentive, and [tē 53~tī 53], identical with the definite marker. The instrumental case is expressed by the same marker as the comitative and also the coordinative conjunction [rē 53]. One of the locative markers, [kē 53], 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

\[ \text{This story appears to be shared by several unrelated ethnic groups in the area. The Qiang version of the} \]
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 [jɪ^53]

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

I. (sporadically) marker of genitive (WT kyi and its allomorphs gyi, gi and yi/'i), e.g.
[ŋe^53 rɛ^53 jɪ^53 jy^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, [jɪ^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 jɪ^53] ‘drinkables’.
[jɪ^53] also typically nominalizers the clause preceding the verb [dʐɛ^35] ‘said’ (e.g. sentence
(16)) or in future contexts and conditional sentences, the clause preceding the verb [rɛ^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. [ŋe35 ji53] ‘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 Báimǎ 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>ṭu⁵³</td>
<td>ṭ²χ⁵³</td>
<td>wu⁴³li⁵³ ~ li⁵³ ~ wu²¹⁵³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC/GEN</td>
<td>ṭu⁵³</td>
<td>ṭ²χ⁵³</td>
<td>wu⁴³li⁵³ ~ li⁵³ ~ wu²¹⁵³</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 Báimà, oblique forms are precisely such base forms to which all other case markers described in this article are attached. For example, in the sentence [t²χ⁵³ ṭu⁵³ kæ⁵³ dzæ⁵³ wæ⁵³] ‘You told me.’ (Huáng and Zhāng 1995: 113, original transcriptions), the dative marker [kæ⁵³] is added to the oblique form of the first person pronoun [ṭu⁵³].

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 [t²χ¹⁵³], as in the next sentence:⁴

---

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 Báimà 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 Báimà 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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(1) \( t\text{e}^{h}i^{53} \quad ni\text{a}^{13}tsi^{53} \quad t\alpha^{13}r\text{u}^{35} \quad ma^{13}-we^{53} \quad \text{se}^{13}. \)

khyod.kyi niângzi 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 \([nd\text{e}^{53}] ‘this’ \) is \([ndi^{53}] ‘of this’ \) and that of \([t\text{e}^{53}] ‘that, he’ \) is \([ti^{53}] ‘of that, his’. \) For example:

(2) \( wu^{13}li^{53} \quad pu^{13}nd\text{z}\alpha^{53} \quad r\text{e}^{13}, \quad ndi^{53} \quad nd\text{a}^{13}ny^{53} \quad r\text{e}^{13}. \)

?.’i ? red ‘di.’i nyag.nyog red
3S.OBL wife COP this.OBL child COP

‘It is his wife, it is his child.’

(3) \( ti^{53} \quad pu^{53} \quad t\text{e}^{53} \quad t\text{j}^{h}u^{13}ndzi^{35} \quad s^{h}a^{53}t\text{a}^{53} \quad t\text{se}^{53} \quad ni^{53}, \)

de.’i bu de Chöngqing sa.cha slebs ni
that.OBL boy that Chunking place reach TOP

\( ti^{53} \quad pu^{53} \quad t\text{e}^{53} \quad \text{se}^{53}-ku^{13}nb\text{o}^{13} \quad \text{se}^{13}. \)

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 \([t\text{e}^{h}i^{53}] , [wu^{13}li^{53}] , [ndi^{53}] \) and \([ti^{53}] \) are all fusions of the pronouns \([t\text{e}^{h}\phi^{53}] ‘you’ , [wu^{13}l\varepsilon^{53}] ‘he, she’ , [nd\text{e}^{53}] ‘this’ \) and \([t\varepsilon^{53}] ‘that’ \) with the imperfective, perfective and imperative. Verbs with one stem are marked in the gloss line only for their meaning.

\textsuperscript{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 [ji\(^{53}\)] (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\(e^{23}\)] ‘that one’ is [t\(i^{13}\)], as in [t\(i^{13}\)ka\(^{53}\)le] ‘on the top of that one’ (Gésang 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 Bāimā is restricted only to the words discussed in this section.

[ji\(^{53}\)] 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) \(k^{w^{53}}\) tu\(^{13}\)ru\(^{35}\) gu\(^{13}\)ka\(^{53}\) ta\(^{53}\) ya\(^{53}\) ji\(^{53}\) k\(^{w^{53}}\) se\(^{53}\)-nd\(j^{a^{53}}\).

kho de.ring dgon.gka da wa yis kho bsad-`cha\(^{6}\)
1s.log\(^{7}\) today evening now fox agt 1s.log kill-eat:ipf

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

(5) \(ya^{53}\) ku\(^{13}\)ly\(^{53}\) t\(e^{35}\) ji\(^{53}\) ka\(^{53}\)-ku\(^{13}\)nbo\(^{13}\).

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 Bāimā, Zhongu, Chos-rje and Zhānglā (lCang.la).

\(^{7}\) The form [k\(^{w^{53}}\)] ‘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 \([j \dot{i}^{53}]\) commonly fuses with the pronoun \([t \varepsilon^{53}]\) ‘that’ to \([t \dot{i}^{53}]\). For example:

\[
(6) \quad yə^{53} \quad t \dot{i}^{53} \quad pu^{36} \quad t \varepsilon^{53}, \quad nə^{13}əy^{53} \quad t \varepsilon^{53} \quad t \varepsilon^{53} \ldots
\]

wa de.’is bu.mo de nyag.nyog de de
fox DEF.AGT girl DEF child DEF DEF

t \varepsilon^{53} \quad sə^{53}-ndʒə^{53} \quad zə^{341} \quad sə^{53} \quad sə^{13}.
de bsad-’cha zhabs byas ?
DEF kill-eat:IPF below do:PF PF.N-VOL

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

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

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

\[^{8}\text{An alternative possibility is to consider Báimā genitive marker }[j \dot{i}^{53}] \text{ as derived from the Proto-Tibetan genitive }*?1 \text{ (Simon 1942, Gong 2002: 425-426).}\]
grammaticalized from the demonstrative pronoun [t.ε⁵³]—has arisen. The old genitive [j.ι⁵³] has been retained in a number of high frequency words.

3.2. The definite and the genitive [t.ε⁵³ ~ t.ι⁵³]

Sūn (2003: 73) and Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) disagree as to what should be seen as the genitive marker in Báimǎ. Both note that the genitive is expressed by the marker [t.ε⁵³] (in Huáng and Zhāng’s transcription [t.ε⁵³]), but only when the modified part is omitted, as in example (7), quoted from Huáng and Zhāng (ibid., original transcriptions, my glosses):

(7) ta²¹z.ε³⁵ nd.ε⁵³ mbu²¹t.ε³⁵ t.ε⁵³ z.ε²¹.
    stare ‘di ?mù.jiàng 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 Báimǎ 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 [ʔa²¹k.o⁵³ ʂa⁵³] ‘elder brother’s hat’. In contrast, in addition to [t.ε⁵³], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 253; original transcriptions) describes the genitive marker [t.ι⁵³], as in [a¹³k.o³⁵ t.ι⁵³ k.o³⁵] ‘elder brother’s clothes’, which he sees as a probable loan from Chinese. Although the resemblance of the Báimǎ
genitive marker [tì 53] to the subordinative particle di [tì] in the Píngwǔ dialect of Mandarin is striking, the two are not connected, as I will argue below. It is nonetheless conceivable that the native genitive marker [tì 53] in Bāimǎ 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 [tì 53] also as a marker of disposal, as in the following example (original transcriptions, my glosses):

(8) ɹò 21 tsù 53 tæ 53 ɹ ø 21 lα 53 ɹu 35 ɹh u 21 ɹt h æ 21 ø 21.
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 [tε 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 [lε 53] and [nε 53]. For example (original transcription, my glosses):

(9) ɹt h ø 53 ɹ 35 ɹlε 53 ɹk α 13 lα 53 ɹt h ε 13 ɹl 13.
khyod srimg.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 [lε 53] at the end of this section. (The marker [nε 53] is infrequent in the corpus.) As for the marker [tε 53], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 258)
remarks that it is not yet clear whether the genitive [tɛ⁵³] and the definite [tɛ⁵³] are two homophonous words or whether the function of [tɛ⁵³] is expanding (from genitive to definite).

In the corpus, [tɛ⁵³] 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) tɛ⁵³… tɛ⁵³ tslowuⁿ⁶⁻nu⁵³ tse⁵³…
    de    de    tshu-nang    slebs
    that  that  here-LOC    reach

‘She came here…’ (T48-49)

[tɛ⁵³] is in all probability cognate with the Tibetan demonstrative and also anaphoric pronoun de ‘that, that one, he’. Hence, [tæ⁵³] in the expression [mbu⁲¹tʃɔ³⁵ tæ⁵³], from example (7), is in my opinion a true demonstrative, pointing to the topic [tæ²¹ʃɔ³⁵] ‘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 de log-ste song-ngo ‘The father went back.’, where it adds to perspicuity. [tɛ⁵³] in Báimā has an analogous function to that of de in WT, for example:\(^9\)

\(^9\) The corresponding indefinite marker in Báimā is [ʃʒ¹³] (WT 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 \( t \dot{i}^{53} \) 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’, \( t \dot{i}^{53} \), in Bāimā functions in a similar fashion.

(11) \( y_\alpha^{53} t \varepsilon^{53} j_\alpha^{35} d_\varepsilon^{35} s\varepsilon^{13} \).

‘The fox agreed.’ (T 21-22)

‘On the way, she met a cow turd.’ (T 25-26)
(12)  

\[t\text{i}^{13}\text{tsi}^{53} \, t\text{i}^{53} \, z\text{y}^{13}\text{d}^{35} \, t\text{i}^{53} \, p\text{a}^{13}\text{ny}^{53} \, t\text{e}^{53} \, t\text{e}^{53} \]

diànzì  
hotel

deo’i  
that.OBL
yon.bdag  
owner
deo’i  
that.OBL
nyag.nyog  
def

deo  
child

tó  
def

\[pu^{35} \, \text{ge}^{53} \, de^{13} \, \text{he}^{13} \, \text{bu.mo} \, \text{byas} \, \text{bdog} \, ? \]
girl
do:PF  
PROG
PF.N-VOL

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

\[l\text{e}^{53}\], listed by Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 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)  

\[t\text{u}^{13}\text{ru}^{35} \, \text{hō}^{35} \, \text{α}^{13}\text{ngε}^{35} \, \text{lo}^{13}\text{i}^{53} \, t\text{ε}^{53} \, \text{y}^{53} \, k^{h}\text{u}^{13}\text{zε}^{53} \, l\text{e}^{53} \, l\text{e}^{53} \]
de.ring  
again
yang  
Ange
\?
lāoyē  
khyod
kùzi  
\?

today
trousers
that

\[k^{h}\text{u}^{13}\text{zε}^{53} \, k\text{u}^{53} \, z\text{o}^{53} \, w\text{u}^{53} \, r\text{e}^{13} \, d\text{zε}^{35} \]
trousers
steal
do:IPF
come:IPF
COP
say:PF

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

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

Whereas \[t\text{e}^{53}\] is presumably of Tibetan provenance, \[l\text{e}^{53}\] appears to be a native Bái mā word, cf. the third person singular pronoun \[w\text{u}^{13}\text{l}\text{e}^{53} \sim l\text{e}^{53}\], 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 \( [t \varepsilon^{53}] — [t \dot{i}^{53}] \) also functions as an external possessor.

3.3. The comitative/conjunction and the instrumental \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}]\)

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), \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}]\), 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, \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}]\). Sūn (2003a: 71, 2003b: 73) posits different morphemes for the instrumental ([\(\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{13}\)]) and the comitative ([\(\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}\)]). The former, \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{13}]\) in my transcription, is most likely the sandhi form of \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}]\).\(^{10}\) Furthermore, in the word list concluding Nishida and Sūn’s study (1990: 366), the Báimǎ coordinate conjunction ‘and’ is given as \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}]\), i.e. identical in form to Sūn’s instrumental marker \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}]\).

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 \([\texttt{r} \varepsilon^{53}]\) changes its
under discussion is performed. Sentence (14) is an example of the use of [ɾ'e] as a conjunction:

\[(14) \quad \text{wa}^53 \quad \text{ɾ'e}^13 \quad \text{pu}^35 \quad \text{ndz'w}^13-\text{ɾ'e}^35 \quad \text{ɾ'e}^53 \quad \text{ɾ'e}^13. \]

‘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 [ɾ'e] is used as the marker of the comitative, sentence (15), and as the marker of the instrumental, sentence (16):

\[(15) \quad \text{wa}^53 \quad \text{ɾ'e}^53 \quad \text{t's'h}^53 \quad \text{ɾ'e}^35 \quad \text{'se}^13\ldots \]

‘The girl met a fox.’ (T 10)

\[(16) \quad \text{t's'h}^53 \quad \text{ɾ'e}^53 \quad \text{k'a}^13 \quad \text{ɾ'u}^53 \quad \text{ɾ'y}^53 \quad \text{nbe}^53, \quad \text{ɾ'o}^35 \]

original tone to the low rising when followed by a word in a high rising or high falling tone, as in example (7). [ɾ'e] is the emphatic or citation form of the coordinate conjunction ‘and’, [ɾ'e] 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 [rɛŋ], Sūn lists [nɔŋ] ‘inside’ (WT nang) used in those cases where the instrument is a container. The pair [rɛŋ][nɔŋ] in Báimǎ is thus reminiscent of the Shǐxīng instrumental markers [rɛŋ] and [nɔŋ] (Dài et al. 1991: 193).

3.4. The locative and the dative [kɛŋ]

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, [lɔŋ] ‘there, on’, [tɔɔŋ] ‘vicinity’, [kɛŋ] ‘above, on’ and [nɔŋ] ‘inside’. Of these markers, the former two are more general.

The form [tɔɔŋ], 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 [lɔŋ] see the example in footnote 8.
[tsa⁵³] is probably cognate with the Tibetan *rtsa (rtsa-ba)* ‘root, origin’ also ‘at, near, to, near’, cf. Jäschke (1998: 437) *rtsar byung-nas* ‘coming near, stepping up to’.

(17) ne⁵³ re⁵³ tsa³⁵ ra¹³-jy⁵⁵ ndzɔ⁵³-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 shepherdess to other people.’ (T3)

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

(18) nu¹³-tsa⁵³ gue¹³-le³⁵ 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) tə⁴³-hoe⁵³… ni¹³ndzoe³⁵ no⁵³ dʒue³⁵ kua¹⁴⁵⁵ oe⁵³ kʰu⁵³ no¹³.
    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:

\[(21)\]  
\[\text{'So the elder brother looked down upon the younger brother.'} \]
Finally, as for the etymology of the two case markers not discussed in the article, the ablative \([j\,\sigma^{53}]\) and the comparative \([\varrho\,\gamma\,\varepsilon^{53}]\), the former is probably derived from the Proto-Tibeto-Burman form *\(\text{lam}^{53}\) ‘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 \(\text{phyogs}^{53}\) ‘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 \(\text{khr}^{53}\) corresponds in Báimā in Zhāng’s (1994: 14) analysis to \([t\,\varrho^{53}]\), \([t\,\gamma^{53}]\) and \([t\,\varepsilon^{53}]\), and in Huáng and Zhāng’s (1995: 85) analysis, to \([t\,\varrho^{53}]\), \([k^{53}]\) and \([\epsilon^{53}]\). To give just two examples from the cited sentences, WT \(l^{53}\) is treated in Báimā as \(j^{53}\) (e.g. WT \(\text{lam}^{53}\) ‘road’ is \([j\,\sigma^{53}]\) in Báimā, WT \(\text{langs}^{53}\) ‘bright’ is \([j\,\sigma^{53}]\), WT \(\text{lug}^{53}\) ‘sheep’ is \([j\,\gamma^{35}]\)) and as \(l^{53}\) (e.g. WT locative particle \(\text{la}^{53}\) is \([l\alpha^{53}]\) in Báimā, WT \(\text{rdo.lo}^{13}\) ‘pestle’ is \([\text{cla}^{13}\,\text{l}^{53}]\)). One WT final \(\text{ing}^{53}\) is treated as \([\text{u}^{53}]\) (e.g. \([t\,\text{w}^{13}\,\text{r}^{53}]\) \(\text{de.\,ring}^{53}\) ‘today’) and as \([i^{53}]\) (e.g. \([t\,i^{13}\,\text{pa}^{53}]\) \(\text{ding.\,pa}^{53}\) ‘now’).

Báimā nominal postpositions appear to combine WT case particles (e.g. the agentive \([j\,i^{53}]\) and the locative \([l\alpha^{53}]\)) and markers of possibly Qiangic provenance (e.g. the instrumental \([r\,\varepsilon^{53}]\) and the definitie \([l\,\varepsilon^{53}]\)). Yet some are of less clear origin
(the ablative [j o53] and the comparative [g y ε53]). 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 [g ξ13], mostly reduced to [g] rapid in speech, is reminiscent of the past particle in Qiangic languages, cf. [s o33] in Shīxīng.

In sum, Bámā 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
References
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"An Orphan and a Fox"

1. An orphan and a fox?
   - in the past person orphan person orphan child single

2. Be with a person, a person's mother not exist, father not exist.
   - byas? a.pha ma-bdog a.ma ma-bdog
   - do:PF PF.N-VOL father NEG.CMPL-exist mother NEG.CMPL-exist

3. Be with a person, a person's mother not exist, father not exist.
   - other people LOC goat-sheep graze:IPF-person do:PF PF.N-VOL

4. Be with a person, a person's mother not exist, father not exist.
   - other people LOC goat-sheep graze:PF/IMP PF.N-VOL goat-sheep

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


7. Search goat-sheep

8. Search goat-sheep
9 nag.po ?rab.rib de yod-red wa ? phrad
black.NOM dimness TOP probably fox COM encounter

10 se\(^3\), ya\(^{53}\) re\(^{53}\) tš\(^{h}\)e\(^{53}\) se\(^3\). ya\(^{53}\) ... ya\(^{53}\) re\(^{43}\)
? wa ? phrad ? wa wa ?
PF.N-VOL fox COM encounter PF.N-VOL fox fox fox COM

11 tš\(^{h}\)e\(^{53}\) ni\(^{53}\), ya\(^{53}\) ti\(^{53}\) pw\(^{35}\) te\(^{53}\), na\(^{13}\) ny\(^{53}\)
phrad ni wa de.'is bu.mo de nyag.nyog
encounter TOP fox DEF.AGT girl DEF child

12 te\(^{53}\) te\(^{53}\) ... te\(^{53}\) se\(^{53}\)-ndʒa\(^{53}\) zu\(^{341}\) øe\(^{53}\)
de de de bsad-'cha zhabs byas
DEF DEF DEF kill-eat:IPF below do:PF

13 se\(^3\). se\(^{53}\)-ndʒa\(^{53}\) zu\(^{341}\) øe\(^{53}\) ni\(^{53}\), na\(^{13}\) ny\(^{53}\) pw\(^{35}\)
? bsad-'cha zhabs byas ni nyag.nyog bu.mo
PF.N-VOL kill-eat:IPF below do:PF TOP child girl

14 ti\(^{53}\) dzé\(^{35}\) ni\(^{53}\), "ya\(^{53}\), ya\(^{53}\), ya\(^{53}\) ... ya\(^{53}\) ... ya\(^{53}\) ... to\(^{35}\)
de.'is bzlos ni wa wa wa wa wa ?
DEF.AGT say:PF TOP fox fox fox fox fox LNK

15 na\(^{35}\) dzé\(^{13}\)ndʒe\(^{53}\) re\(^{13}\), ya\(^{53}\), ya\(^{53}\), te\(^{53}\) tš\(^{h}\)ø\(^{53}\) tw\(^{13}\)ru\(^{35}\)
nyung.ba ? red wa wa de khyod de.ring
a.little clever COP fox fox that 2s today

16 kʰw\(^{53}\) na\(^{35}\) se\(^{53}\) ma\(^{13}\)-ndʒa\(^{53}\). kʰw\(^{53}\) tø\(^{53}\)tø\(^{53}\) re\(^{13}\),
kho nyung.ba bsad ma-'cha kho dwa.dwa red
1S.LOG a.little kill NEG.CMPL-eat:IPF 1S.LOG orphan COP

17 kʰw\(^{53}\) ne\(^{53}\)re\(^{53}\) tsə\(^{35}\) ja\(^{13}\)wa\(^{53}\) ndʒu\(^{35}\), ne\(^{53}\)re\(^{53}\) ji\(^{53}\)
kho mi.? rtsa lag.(gyog.)pa sos mi.? yi
1S.LOG other.people LOC helper graze:PF/IMP other.people GEN
18 jy
dzö
de
ra
ndzö
de
"tsu
dže
lug
'tsho
bdog
ra-lug
'tsho
bdog
'dra
bzlos
sheep
graze:
PROG
goat-sheep
graze:
PROG
thus
say:

19 sê
"te
tu
ru
gu
ka
ndže
to
... to
k'w
? khyod
de.
dring
dgong.
ka
mtshan
? kho
PF.
N-VOL
2S
today
evening
night
LNK
LNK
1S.LOG

20 se
ndzą
ji
se
ndzą
to
se
ndzą
bsad-
cha
yi
red
bsad-
cha
? bsad-
cha
kill:
IPF
NOM
COP
kill:
IPF
LNK
kill:
IPF

21 súe.
ti
pa
na
se
ma-
ndzą
," to
shog
ding.
pa
nyung.
ba
bsad
ma-
cha
?
come:
IMP
now
a.
little
kill
NEG.
CMPL-
eat:
IPF
LNK

22 ya
té
já
dže
sê
... mo
ri
na
nyè
wa
de
? bzlos
? ma.
rabs
nyag.
yog
fox
DEF
agree
say:
PF
PF.
N-VOL
LNK
woman
child

23 té
ya
rá
ndźw,
na
nyè
pw
té
ya
rá
ndźw.
de
'gro
nyag.
yog
bu.
do
? 'gro
DEF
in.
a.
circle
go:
IPF
child
girl
DEF
in.
a.
circle
go:
IPF

24 ya
rá
ndźw
ni,
nu
ši
ya
rá
ndźw
we.
nu
?skor.
ba
'gro
ngu
bzhin.
du
? 'gro
'ongs
nu
in.
a.
circle
go:
IPF
top
cry
SIM
in.
a.
circle
go:
IPF
come:
PF
cry

25 ši
ya
rá
ndźw
we,
jo
téli
la
nu
të
bzhin.
du
? 'gro
'ongs
lam
dkyil
la
nor.
skyag
SIM
in.
a.
circle
go:
IPF
come:
PF
road
center
LOC
cow.
turd

26 sê
re
tu
nu
të
sê
re
tu:
"pw
pw,
shig
? phrad
nor.
skyag
shig
? phrad
bu.
mo.
INDEF
COM
encounter
cow.
turd
INDEF
COM
encounter
girl
27 tçıŋ³³ tʃʰʒ⁵³ ɲu³³ de¹³ʔ tçıŋ³³ ... ni¹³ ndʒe³³ no³³ dʒuे³³ khyod chi ngu bdog khyod mig.'bras nang mchil.ma
2s what cry PROG 2s eye LOC fluid

28 kua⁵⁵ ɕə³³ kʰu³³ no¹³, tcliŋ³³ tʃʰʒ⁵³ ɲu³³ de¹³ʔ?
? byas khur snang khyod chi ngu bdog
ONOM do:PF carry exist 2s what cry PROG

29 dʒe³³. tʰw¹³ ru⁵³ ndʒe³³ ta³³ no³³ mə¹³-ʃo³³ ji³³ re¹³, bzlos kho de.ring mtshan da nam mi-langṣ yi red
say:PF 1s.LOG today night now sky NEG-be.bright NOM COP

30 kʰw³³ mə¹³-ndʒy³³ ji³³ re¹³, ʃə³³ re¹³ pəw⁵³ ndʒuweb³³-re¹³
kho mi-'dug yi red wa ? bu.mo mechong-re
1s.LOG NEG-reside NOM COP fox CONJ girl jump-RECP

31 ɕə³³ de¹³ʔ, dʒe³³ ɲi³³, “ndʒuweb³³-re¹³” dʒe³³, “tʰw³³
byas bdog bzlos ni mechong-re bzlos kho
do:PF PROG say:PF TOP jump-RECP say:PF 1s.LOG

32 kʰo³³-nbo¹³ ʃə¹³, kʰw³³ kʰo³³-ku¹³-nbo¹³ ɲi³³, tw¹³ ru⁵³
? ? kho ? ni de.ring
be.defeated-CMPL PF.N-VOL 1s.LOG be.defeated-CMPL.EMPH TOP today

33 ndʒe³³ ta³³ ʃə³³ tciŋ³³ kʰw³³ se³³-ndʒa³³ wu³³ re¹³.”
mtshan da wa de kho bsad-'cha ‘ong red
night now fox DEF 1s.LOG kill-eat:IPF come:IPF COP

34 “ʃe, tʃʰə³³ ma¹³-tʃə³³. tʃʰə³³ ... ʃə³³ ... ʃə¹³ ma³³ ɲe¹³ ɲi³³
? khyod.? ma-skrag khyod.? sran sran.ma ?
EXCL 2s.EMPH NEG.CMPL-be.afraid 2s.EMPH pea pea gruel

35 lɔ¹³ wu³³ kɔ³³ ki³³ ʒa³¹³, ʃə¹³ ma³³ ɲe¹³ ɲi³³ lɔ¹³ wu³³
? gang skol bzhag sran.ma ? ?
cooking.pot full boil put:PF/IMP pea gruel cooking.pot
36 ko\(^{53}\) ki\(^{53}\) za\(^{341}\), gu\(^{13}\) ka\(^{53}\) ne\(^{53}\) nda\(^{53}\) rue\(^{53}\) wu\(^{53}\)
gang skol bzhag dgong.ka me 'de rogs 'ong
full boil put:PF/IMP evening fire get.warm companion come:IPF

37 de\(^{13}\)," tsu\(^{53}\) dze\(^{35}\) se\(^{13}\). to\(^{35}\) ja\(^{35}\) dze\(^{35}\). ho\(^{35}\) na\(^{35}\),
bdog 'dra bzlos ? ? ? zlos yang nyung.ba
PROG thus say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK agree say:PF again a.little

38 ho\(^{35}\)... ho\(^{35}\) tu\(^{13}\)nba\(^{53}\) we\(^{53}\), ho\(^{35}\) tu\(^{13}\)nba\(^{53}\) we\(^{53}\) ni\(^{13}\),
yang yang dum.pa 'ongs yang dum.pa 'ongs ni
again again one.part come:PF again one.part come:PF TOP

39 jo\(^{53}\) tei\(^{35}\) la\(^{53}\)... jo\(^{53}\) tei\(^{35}\) ndza\(^{13}\)nba\(^{53}\) se\(^{13}\) de\(^{53}\).
lam dkyil la lam dkyil chan.pa shig bdog
road center LOC road center scissors INDEF exist

40 ndza\(^{13}\)nba\(^{53}\) te\(^{53}\) ndza\(^{13}\)nba\(^{53}\) te\(^{53}\) k'a\(^{53}\)t'\(\alpha\)^{53}, ndza\(^{13}\)nba\(^{53}\)
chan.pa de chan.pa de kha.'chad chan.pa
scissors DEF scissors DEF speak scissors

41 te\(^{53}\). "pw\(^{35}\)pw\(^{53}\), t'h\(^{53}\) t'h\(^{53}\) se\(^{53}\) de\(^{13}\), t'h\(^{53}\)
de bu.mo.? khyod chi byas bdog khyod
DEF girl 2S what do:PF PROG 2S

42 nu\(^{53}\) de\(^{13}\)," dze\(^{35}\). "k'w\(^{53}\) tu\(^{13}\)ru\(^{35}\) gu\(^{13}\)ka\(^{53}\) ta\(^{53}\) ya\(^{53}\)
ngu bdog bzlos kho de.ring dgong.ka da wa
cry PROG say:PF 1S.LOG today evening now fox

43 ji\(^{53}\) k'w\(^{53}\) se\(^{53}\)-ndza\(^{53}\). ya\(^{53}\) re\(^{13}\) pw\(^{35}\) ndzu\(^{13}\)re\(^{35}\) se\(^{53}\)
yis kho bsad-'cha wa ? bu.mo mchong-re byas
AGT 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF fox CONJ girl jump-RECP do:PF

44 ni\(^{13}\), k'w\(^{53}\) k'\(\sigma\)^{53}-nbo\(^{13}\) t'h\(^{13}\), k'\(\sigma\)^{53}-nbo\(^{13}\) t'h\(^{13}\),
ni kho ? chas ? chas
TOP 1S.LOG be.defeated-CMPL TERM be.defeated-CMPL TERM
45 tw\\textsuperscript{13}ru\\textsuperscript{35}, gu\\textsuperscript{13}ka\\textsuperscript{53}, ta\\textsuperscript{53}, se\\textsuperscript{53}-ndz\\textsuperscript{a}\\textsuperscript{53}. “\textit{he, te}\\textsuperscript{h}\\textsuperscript{a}, f\\textsuperscript{o}\\textsuperscript{35}.”
def.ring, dgong.k\, da bsad-\textsuperscript{-}\textsuperscript{cha}\, ?\, khyod.\,?\, yang
today, evening\, now kill-eat:IPF\, EXCL\, 2S.EMPH\, again

46 sa\\textsuperscript{13}ma\\textsuperscript{53}, ne\\textsuperscript{13}ni\\textsuperscript{53}, ki\\textsuperscript{53}, za\\textsuperscript{34},\, gu\\textsuperscript{13}ka\\textsuperscript{53}\, ne\\textsuperscript{53}\, nda\\textsuperscript{53}
sran.ma\, ?\, skol\, bzhag\, dgong.k\, me\, ‘de
pea\, gruel\, boil\, put:PF/IMP\, evening\, fire\, get.warm

47 wu\\textsuperscript{53}\, de\\textsuperscript{13},”\, dz\\textsuperscript{35}\\textsuperscript{}se\\textsuperscript{13}, “gu\\textsuperscript{13}ka\\textsuperscript{53}\, ne\\textsuperscript{53}\, nda\\textsuperscript{53}
‘ong\, bdog\, bzlos\, ?\, dgong.k\, me\, ‘de
come:IPF\, PROG\, say:PF\, PF.N-VOL\, evening\, fire\, get.warm

48 wu\\textsuperscript{53}\, de\\textsuperscript{13}, ne\\textsuperscript{53}\, nda\\textsuperscript{53}\, rue\\textsuperscript{53}\, wu\\textsuperscript{53}\, de\\textsuperscript{13}.”
‘ong\, bdog\, me\, ‘de\, rogs\, ‘ong\, bdog
come:IPF\, PROG\, fire\, get.warm\, companion\, come:IPF\, PROG

49 te\\textsuperscript{53}...\, te\\textsuperscript{53}\, ts\\textsuperscript{h}u\\textsuperscript{13}-no\\textsuperscript{53}\, tse\\textsuperscript{53}, ga\\textsuperscript{53}gue\\textsuperscript{35}\, re\\textsuperscript{53}\, ts\\textsuperscript{h}e\\textsuperscript{53},
de\, de\, tshu-nang\, slebs\, bya.sgong\, ?\, phrad
that\, that\, here-LOC\, reach\, egg\, COM\, encounter

50 f\\textsuperscript{o}\\textsuperscript{35}\, ts\\textsuperscript{u}\\textsuperscript{53}\, dz\\textsuperscript{35}\\textsuperscript{}se\\textsuperscript{13}, f\\textsuperscript{o}\\textsuperscript{35}\, “ne\\textsuperscript{53}\, nda\\textsuperscript{53}\, rue\\textsuperscript{53}
yang\, ‘dra\, bzlos\, ?\, yang\, me\, ‘de\, rogs
again\, thus\, say:PF\, PF.N-VOL\, again\, fire\, get.warm\, companion

51 wu\\textsuperscript{53}\, de\\textsuperscript{13},”\, dz\\textsuperscript{35}, te\\textsuperscript{53}\, ts\\textsuperscript{h}u\\textsuperscript{13}-no\\textsuperscript{53}\, tse\\textsuperscript{53}, k\\textsuperscript{h}w\\textsuperscript{53}
‘ong\, bdog\, bzlos\, de\, tshu-nang\, slebs\, kho
come:IPF\, PROG\, say:PF\, that\, here-LOC\, reach\, needle

52 re\\textsuperscript{53}\, ts\\textsuperscript{h}e\\textsuperscript{53}, “ne\\textsuperscript{53}\, nda\\textsuperscript{53}\, rue\\textsuperscript{53}\, wu\\textsuperscript{53}\, de\\textsuperscript{13},
?\, phrad\, me\, ‘de\, rogs\, ‘ong\, bdog
COM\, encounter\, fire\, get.warm\, companion\, come:IPF\, PROG

53 ma\\textsuperscript{13}-\nu\\textsuperscript{53},”\, dz\\textsuperscript{35}, te\\textsuperscript{53}\, ts\\textsuperscript{h}u\\textsuperscript{13}-no\\textsuperscript{53}\, tse\\textsuperscript{53}...\, te\\textsuperscript{53}
ma-ngu\, bzlos\, de\, tshu-nang\, slebs\, de
NEG.CMPL-cry\, say:PF\, that\, here-LOC\, reach\, that
54  \text{tshu}^{13}\text{-}\text{no}^{53} \quad \text{tse}^{53}, \quad \text{ye}^{13}\text{wa}^{53} \quad \text{re}^{53} \quad \text{tsh}^{h}\text{e}^{53}, \quad \text{phrad} \quad \text{yang} \quad \text{me} \\
here-LOC reach  frog  COM  encounter  again  fire

55  \text{nda}^{53} \quad \text{ru}^{53} \quad \text{wu}^{53} \quad \text{de}^{13}, \quad \text{ma}^{13}\text{-}\text{nu}^{53}, \\
\text{‘de} \quad \text{rogs} \quad \text{‘ong} \quad \text{bdog} \quad \text{ma-nga} \quad \text{get.warm}  \quad \text{companion}  \quad \text{come:IPF}  \quad \text{PROG}  \quad \text{NEG.CMPL-cry}

56  \text{ne}^{13}\text{-}\text{ne}^{35} \quad \text{ma}^{13}\text{-}\text{qe}^{53},” \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{tshu}^{13}\text{-}\text{no}^{53} \quad \text{tse}^{53}, \quad \text{ki}^{53}\text{-}\text{we}^{53}, \\
?? \quad \text{ma-byas} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{tshu-nang} \quad \text{slebs} \quad \text{kho} \quad ? \\
\text{be.worried} \quad \text{NEG.CMPL-do:PF}  \quad \text{that}  \quad here-LOC  \quad \text{reach}  \quad \text{needle}  \quad \text{COM}

57  \text{phrad} \quad \text{yang} \quad \text{‘dra} \quad \text{bzlos} \quad ? \quad \text{de} \quad \text{khyim-‘ongs} \\
\text{encounter}  \quad \text{again}  \quad \text{thus}  \quad \text{say:PF}  \quad \text{PF.N-VOL}  \quad \text{that}  \quad \text{DIR-come:PF}

58  \text{to}^{35} \quad \text{da}^{13}\text{lu}^{53} \quad \text{re}^{53} \quad \text{tsh}^{h}\text{e}^{53}, \quad \text{da}^{13}\text{lu}^{53} \quad \text{dze}^{35} \quad \text{‘a}^{13} \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{gi}^{53}\text{-}\text{we}^{53}. \\
? \quad \text{rdo.lo} \quad ? \quad \text{phrad} \quad \text{rdo.lo} \quad \text{bzlos} \quad \text{kho} \quad \text{me} \\
\text{LNK}  \quad \text{pestle}  \quad \text{COM}  \quad \text{encounter}  \quad \text{pestle}  \quad \text{say:PF}  \quad \text{I.S.LOG}  \quad \text{fire}

59  \text{nda}^{53} \quad \text{ru}^{53} \quad \text{wu}^{53} \quad \text{de}^{13}, \quad \text{sa}^{13}\text{ma}^{53} \quad \text{ne}^{13}\text{pi}^{53} \quad \text{ki}^{53} \\
\text{‘de} \quad \text{rogs} \quad \text{‘ong} \quad \text{bdog} \quad \text{srana}\text{.} \quad ? \quad \text{skol} \\
\text{get.warm}  \quad \text{companion}  \quad \text{come:IPF}  \quad \text{PROG}  \quad \text{pea}  \quad \text{gruel}  \quad \text{boil}

60  \text{za}^{341}, \quad \text{ki}^{53}\text{-}\text{we}^{53} \quad \text{nda}^{53} \quad \text{ru}^{53} \quad \text{wu}^{53} \quad \text{de}^{13}.” \\
\text{bzhag} \quad \text{kho} \quad \text{me} \quad \text{‘de} \quad \text{rogs} \quad \text{‘ong} \quad \text{bdog} \\
\text{put:PF/IMP}  \quad \text{I.S.LOG}  \quad \text{fire}  \quad \text{get.warm}  \quad \text{companion}  \quad \text{come:IPF}  \quad \text{PROG}

61  \text{nda}^{53} \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{ta}^{13}\text{be}^{35} \quad \text{ya}^{53} \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{we}^{53} \quad \text{se}^{13}. \quad \text{na}^{13}\text{ny}^{53} \\
\text{mtshan} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{bden}\text{.pa} \quad \text{wa} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{‘ongs} \quad ? \quad \text{nyag.nyog} \\
\text{night}  \quad \text{TOP}  \quad \text{really}  \quad \text{fox}  \quad \text{DEF}  \quad \text{come:PF}  \quad \text{PF.N-VOL}  \quad \text{child}

62  \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{nda}^{53} \quad \text{we}^{53} \quad \text{se}^{13}, \quad \text{na}^{13}\text{ny}^{53} \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{nda}^{53} \quad \text{we}^{53} \\
\text{de} \quad \text{‘cha} \quad \text{‘ongs} \quad ? \quad \text{nyag.nyog} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{‘cha} \quad \text{‘ongs} \\
\text{DEF}  \quad \text{eat:IPF}  \quad \text{come:PF}  \quad \text{PF.N-VOL}  \quad \text{child}  \quad \text{DEF}  \quad \text{eat:IPF}  \quad \text{come:PF}
63 ni⁵³, ngue⁵³ ti¹³-ke⁵³ ya⁵³ ti⁵³ wa¹³tʃa⁵³ du⁵³ ce¹³, ni mgo de.'i-? wa de.'is ? ’thogs byas
top head def.obl-loc fox def.agt claw catch do:pf

64 wa¹³tʃa⁵³ du⁵³ ce⁵³, sʰe¹³-te⁵³ ja³⁵ ke⁵³ tsu⁵³ ce⁵³
? ’thogs byas so-de lag ? ’dzugs byas
claw catch do:pf comb-def hand loc prick do:pf

65 se¹³. tsʰa³⁵ sue³⁵ tsu³⁵ se¹³. “nde⁵³ tʃʰe⁵³ re¹³,”
? ’tshugs.? ’dzugs ? ’di chi red
pf.n-vol ache prick pf.n-vol this what cop

66 dze⁵³. to³⁵ sa³⁵... sa³⁵ ti¹³-ke⁵³ ndʒo³⁵ ce⁵³, kʰw³³
bzlos ? zhwa zhwa de.'i-? ’chang byas kho
say:pf lnk hat hat def.obl-loc touch do:pf needle

67 te⁵³ ze³⁵ ce³⁵, fi³⁵ ke¹³wa³⁵ ti¹³-ke⁵³ ke⁵³ ce⁵³,
de gzer byas yang rked.pa de.'i-? ? byas
def prick do:pf again waist def.obl-loc stroke do:pf

68 ndʒa¹³nba³⁵ ti⁵³... ndʒa¹³nba³⁵ ti⁵³ tʃa³⁵ ce³⁵,
chan.pa de.'is chan.pa de.'is bcad byas
scissors def.agt scissors def.agt cut do:pf

69 dze⁵³ ni⁵³, “nde⁵³ tʃʰe⁵³ re¹³, phʰu¹³la⁵³ ke⁵³ re¹³
bzlos ni ’di chi red pha.la ? red
say:pf top this what cop there.loc stroke cop

70 tsʰa³⁵ sue³⁵, mu¹³la⁵³ ke⁵³ re¹³ tsʰa³⁵ sue³⁵ zi³⁴¹ de¹³.
’tshugs.? ma.la ? red ’tshugs.? yin bdog
ache down.loc stroke cop ache cop prog

71 ne⁵³ nbi⁵³ ge³⁴¹ re¹³,” dze⁵³. ga³⁵gue³⁵ te⁵³ thᵉ¹³-nô⁵³
me ‘bud dgos red bzlos bya.sgong de thal.ba-nang
fire blow:ipf want cop say:pf egg def ashes-loc
72 ne³⁵ de¹³, ne³⁵ te³⁵ zwu³⁴¹ ne³⁵, "ne³⁵ nbi³⁵
nyal bdog me.? zhabs nyal me ‘bud
sleep PROG large.firewood below sleep fire blow:IPF

73 ge³⁴¹ re¹³.” ca³⁵ guε³⁵ te³⁵ phο³⁵ kʰu¹³ ge³⁵, nba³⁵
dgos red bya.sgong de ? ?khur byas ‘bar
want COP egg DEF ONOM ?carry do:PF explode

74 teʰ³⁵, ya³⁵ ku¹³ ly³⁵ tʰε³⁵ ji³⁵ ka³⁵-ku¹³ nbo¹³, ya³⁵
chas wa sku.lus thal.ba yis bkab-? wa
TERM fox body ashes AGT cover-CMPL.EMPH fox

75 ka³⁵-ku¹³ nbo¹³, ni¹³ ndze³⁵ ka³⁵-ku¹³ nbo¹³ teʰ³⁵, ni¹³ ndze³⁵...
bkab-? mig.’bras bkab-? chas mig.’bras
cover-CMPL.EMPH eye cover-CMPL.EMPH TERM eye

76 ya³⁵: “tʰu¹³ xe³⁵... tʰu¹³ ndza³⁵ re³⁵ kʰa³⁵ nyu³⁵
wa chu.bzom chu.’khyags ? kha.ngo
fox water.bucket water INSTR face

77 tey³⁵ nbe³⁵, fʰ³⁵ tsʰi³⁵ ge³⁴¹ re¹³” ji³⁵
bkrus mbod yang ‘tshol sgos red yi
wash:PF/IMP call:IPF again search want COP NOM

78 dze³⁵. tʰu¹³ xe³⁵ ti¹³ ke³⁵... tʰu¹³ xe³⁵ 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 ye¹³ wa³⁵ te³⁵ tʰi³⁵ dze³⁵ tʰa³⁵ ge³¹ to³⁵ pu³⁵
sbal.ba de ? bzlos grags ? ? bu.mo
frog DEF ONOM say:PF outcry PF.N-VOL LNK girl

80 se³⁵-nḍa³⁵ ga³⁵ ma¹³-re¹³, se³⁵-nḍa³⁵ ga³⁵
bsad-‘cha ? ma-red bsad-‘cha ?
killed:IPF be.able NEG.CMPL-COP killed:IPF be.able
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.