

BÁIMǺ NOMINAL POSTPOSITIONS AND THEIR ETYMOLOGY¹

Katia Chirkova
Leiden University

This article focuses on the nominal postpositions used for marking the agent, the instrument, the genitive, the definite, the locative, the ablative, the dative and the comitative in BáimǺ, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in the south-west of the People's Republic of China.

Taking previous classifications of BáimǺ nominal postpositions (Nishida and Sūn 1990; Sūn 2003; Huáng and Zhāng 1995) as the starting point, I comment on the disputed issues in these analyses, propose a new summary of nominal postpositions in my data, argue for isomorphism of some postpositions and discuss their etymology. I demonstrate that BáimǺ nominal postpositions are etymologically heterogeneous, some being cognate to their Classical Tibetan counterparts, some being of possibly Qiangic provenance, while others being of yet unclear origin. The discussion is based on a corpus of BáimǺ stories collected in 2003-2004, of which one is appended to the article.

Keywords: Tibeto-Burman. Baima, postpositions. Sino-Tibetan. Qiangic. Tibetan

1. BÁIMǺ

BáimǺ is a non-literary Tibeto-Burman language, spoken by approximately 10.000 people in three counties (Jiǔzhàigōu, Sōngpān, Píngwǔ) in the north of Sìchuān Province and one neighboring county (Wénxiàn) in the south of Gānsù Province in the People's Republic of China (PRC). The BáimǺ people reside in the

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. Research on BáimǺ has been made possible through the generous support of the Frederik Kortlandt Spinoza Project, Leiden University, the Netherlands.

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 (Sìchuān Shěng Mínpǔ Yánjiūsuǒ 1980, Zēng et al. 1987). The Dī, whose name frequently appears together with that of the Qiāng in Chinese historical sources, are currently considered to be related to the Qiāng (cf. Lǐ 1987: 46, Mǎ 1984). Huáng & Zhāng (1995: 116-117) even argue for a Dī substratum in Báimǎ 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 for 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 Báimǎ has a Dī substratum is equivalent to saying that Báimǎ has some kind of substratum which is not yet identified.

2. NOMINAL POSTPOSITIONS

This article focuses on nominal postpositions in Báimǎ. 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 Báimǎ are used for marking the topic, the agent, the instrument, the genitive, the locative, the ablative, the comitative, and the comparative, among other functions.

Scholars who previously worked on Báimǎ, Sūn Hóngkǎi (Nishida and Sūn 1990; further developed in Sūn 2003a and 2003b) and Huáng Bùfán and Zhāng Míng huì (Huáng & 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’s tabulation, lists the analyses of Sūn (2003a: 71; Báimǎ 1) and of Huáng & Zhāng (Báimǎ 2), both in original transcriptions. Sūn compares his own data with that of Huáng & Zhāng as well as with that of Classical Tibetan, as reflected in standard Written Tibetan orthography (hereafter WT) and the three groups of Modern Tibetan dialects spoken in the PRC (dBus-gTsang, Khams and Amdo). As noted by all authors, case particles in Báimǎ are significantly dissimilar to those in Tibetan dialects.

Case	Báimǎ 1	Báimǎ 2	WT	dBus- gTsang	Khams	Amdo
Ergative	i ⁵³	kæ ⁵³	gis	kɛ	ki	kə
Genitive	tɛ ⁵ [sic.]/ ti ⁵³	tæ ⁵³	gi	ki	ki	kə
Allative	tsɑ ⁵³ /iɛ ⁵³	kæ ⁵³	la	la	le	la
Locative	no ⁵³ /kɛ ⁵³	kæ ⁵³	na	la	le	na
Ablative	io ⁵³	jo ⁵³	nas	nɛ	nɛ	kə
Comparative	ɤyɛ ⁵³	ɤyæ ⁵³	las/bas	lɛ	ji	kə
Comitative	re ¹³	zæ ⁵³	da	ta	do	ra
Disposal	i ⁵³	tæ ⁵³				
Definite	lɛ ⁵³ /nɛ ⁵³					
Instrumental	rɛ ⁵³ /no ⁵³					

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

Chirkova, K. 2005, "Bǎima nominal postpositions and their etymology", in *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 1-41. (purl.org/sealang/chirkova2005bǎima.pdf)

Though Huáng & Zhāng and Sūn all analyze the variety of Báimǎ spoken in the neighboring villages of Báimǎ Tibetan Township (Píngwǔ County, Sìchuān 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 & Zhāng's tabulation, the postposition [kæ⁵³] marks several distinct semantic roles: ergative, allative and locative. Huáng & 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 [i⁵³], the same particle as the marker of disposal, and instrumental, viz. [rɛ⁵³]/[nɔ⁵³]. Similarly, Huáng & Zhāng analyze the form [tæ⁵³] 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, [tɛ⁵³~ti⁵³] and [i⁵³], respectively. Sūn only sees the markers [i⁵³] (ergative and disposal) and [nɔ⁵³] (locative and instrumental) as multi-functional.

Given the discrepancy between Huáng & Zhāng's and Sūn's classifications, I propose a new summary of nominal postpositions in my data, also collected in 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 [tʂɑ¹³gɑ⁵³ ts^hɛ¹³re³⁵], a 69-year old resident of Koshi [ko¹³ʂi⁵³] village (Shuīniújiā in Chinese), and Lako [la¹³ko⁵³], a 75-year old resident of Iaru [ja¹³ru³⁵] village (Luòtōngbà in Chinese) and translated with the help of Lǐ Déguì, a 64-year old resident of Píngwǔ. The corpus comprises over 30 texts, one of which, “An Orphan and a Fox” by Lako, is appended to the present article.² 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 & Zhāng and Sūn (in original transcriptions).

Table 2 summarizes nominal postpositions as attested in the corpus.

Function	Postposition	Meaning
Agentive/Genitive 1	jɿ ⁵³	
Definite/Genitive 2	tɛ ⁵³ ~ti ⁵³	
Instrumental/ Comitative~Conjunction	rɛ ⁵³	
Locative	lɑ ⁵³ / tsɑ ⁵³ / kɛ ⁵³ / nɔ ⁵³	‘on’/ ‘vicinity’/ ‘on, above’/ ‘inside’
Dative	kɛ ⁵³	
Ablative	jɔ ⁵³	
Comparative	ɕyɛ ⁵³	‘side’

Table 2: Báimǎ postpositions in the corpus

² This story appears to be shared by several unrelated ethnic groups in the area. The Qiang version of the story is given in LaPolla with Huang (2003: 256-269), there titled “An Orphan”.

In my analysis, Báimă has seven distinct types of nominal postpositions, which can be further subdivided as follows. Báimă has two markers of the genitive, [jɪ⁵³], identical with the marker of the agentive, and [tɛ⁵³~tɪ⁵³], identical with the definite marker. The instrumental case is expressed by the same marker as the comitative and also the coordinative conjunction [rɛ⁵³]. One of the locative markers, [kɛ⁵³], 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 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 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 [jɪ⁵³]*

In the corpus, the marker [jɪ⁵³] has the following four functions:

I. (sporadically) marker of genitive (cf. WT *kyi* and its allomorphs *gvi*, *gi* and *yi/'i*), e.g. [nɛ⁵³rɛ⁵³ jɪ⁵³ jy³⁵] 'other people's sheep' (T 17).

Genitive is a case with the basic role of marking nouns or noun phrases which are dependent on another noun. Mostly, [jɪ⁵³] as the genitive marker is retained in oblique forms of pronouns, as discussed below.

II. nominalizer for verb phrases, e.g. [ndu³⁵] 'drink', [ndu¹³jɪ⁵³] 'drinkables'. [jɪ⁵³] also typically nominalizes the clause preceding the verb [dze³⁵] 'said' (e.g. sentence (16)) or in future contexts and conditional sentences, the clause

preceding the verb [re¹³] ‘be’ (e.g. T 20 and T 29), transforming in both cases the clause into the object of the verb.

III. non paradigmatic agentive case marker (ergative in Huáng & Zhāng’s and Sūn’s analyses) (cf. WT *kyis* and its allomorphs *gyis*, *gis* and *vis/’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. [nɛ³⁵ji⁵³] ‘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.

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).

Sūn (2003a: 73; 2003b: 71) and Huáng & Zhāng (1995: 114) comment on the fact that personal pronouns in Báimǎ have special genitive/accusative forms, reproduced in Table 3:

Case	First person pronoun	Second person pronoun	Third person pronoun
NOM	ŋɑ ⁵³	tɕ ^h ø ⁵³	wu ²¹ læ ⁵³ ~ læ ⁵³
ACC/GEN	ŋu ⁵³	tɕ ^h y ⁵³	wu ²¹ li ⁵³ ~ li ⁵³ ~ wu ²¹

Table 3: Nominative and genitive/accusative forms of personal pronouns in Huáng & Zhāng (1995: 113, original transcriptions)

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 Báimǎ, oblique forms are precisely such base forms to which all other case markers described in this article are attached. For example, in the sentence [tɕ^hø⁵³ ŋu⁵³ kæ⁵³ dzæ³⁵ wæ⁵³] ‘You told me.’ (Huáng & Zhāng 1995: 113, original transcriptions), the dative marker [kæ⁵³] is added to the oblique form of the first person pronoun [ŋu⁵³].

In addition to the oblique forms of personal pronouns listed in Sūn and Huáng & Zhāng, the alternative oblique form of the second person pronoun in my data is [tɕ^hi⁵³], as in (1):⁴

⁴ This article represents work in progress: not all glosses and tone sandhi are final. Tentative WT glosses have been added to all Báimǎ 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 Báimǎ 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), imperfective, perfective and imperative. Verbs with one stem are marked in the gloss line only for their meaning.

- (1) tɕʰi⁵³ niã¹³tɕi⁵³ tɕ¹³ru³⁵ mɕ¹³-we⁵³
 khyod.kyi niángzi da.ring ma-‘ongs
 2S.OBL wife still NEG.CMPL-come:PF

ʂə¹³.

?

PF.N-VOL⁵

‘Your wife hasn’t come yet.’

Not only personal pronouns, but also demonstratives have oblique forms in the corpus. The oblique form of [ndɛ⁵³] ‘this’ is [ndi⁵³] ‘of this’ and that of [tɛ⁵³] ‘that, he’ is [ti⁵³] ‘of that, his’. For example:

- (2) wu¹³li⁵³ pu¹³ndʒɔ⁵³ re¹³, ndi⁵³ nɔ¹³ny⁵³ re¹³.
 ?.’i ? red ‘di.’i nyag.nyog red
 3S.OBL wife COP this.OBL child COP
 ‘It is his wife, it is his child.’

- (3) ti⁵³ pu⁵³ tɛ⁵³ tʂ^hu¹³ndʒi³⁵ s^ha⁵³tʂa⁵³ tse⁵³
 de.’i bu de Chóngqìng sa.cha slebs
 that.OBL boy that Chongqing place reach

ni⁵³, ti⁵³ pu⁵³ tɛ⁵³ ʂə⁵³-ku¹³nbo¹³ ʂə¹³.
 ni de.’i bu de shi-? ?
 TOP that.OBL boy that die:PF-CMPL.EMPH PF.N-VOL
 ‘After his son arrived in Chongqing, he died.’

⁵ Báimǎ 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 appropriate copula or auxiliary reflects the appreciation of the speaker of the action as performed volitionally or non-volitionally.

In my analysis, the forms [tɕ^hi⁵³], [wu¹³li⁵³], [ndi⁵³] and [ti⁵³] are all fusions of the pronouns [tɕ^hø⁵³] ‘you’, [wu¹³lɛ⁵³] ‘he, she’, [ndɛ⁵³] ‘this’ and [tɛ⁵³] ‘that’ with the genitive marker [ji⁵³] (*kyi*). This is similar to the genitive marking on nouns with a final vowel in Written Tibetan in Kham dialects. For instance, in sDe.dge, the genitive form of the demonstrative [te²³¹] ‘that one’ is [ti¹³], as in [ti¹³k^ha⁵³le] ‘on the top of that one’ (Gésāng 2002: 155-156; cf. also Häsler 1999: 99-100). In contrast to sDe.dge, however, which freely marks the genitive by vowel alternation in words with a final vowel in WT, the range of words with genitive forms in Báimǎ is restricted only to the words discussed in this section.

[ji⁵³] 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^hu⁵³ tu¹³ru³⁵ gu¹³ka⁵³ ta⁵³ ya⁵³ ji⁵³
kho de.ring dgong.ka da wa yis
1S.LOG⁶ today evening now fox AGT
- k^hu⁵³ se⁵³-ndʒa⁵³.
kho bsad-‘cha⁷
1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF
‘I ... tonight the fox will eat me.’ (T 42-43)

⁶ The form [k^hu⁵³] ‘1s.LOG’, e.g. in example (4), 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 [k^hu¹³je⁵³]. The form [k^hu⁵³] is thus typical for story narrations. It does not have an oblique form and is therefore not listed in Table 3.

⁷ 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 Báimǎ, Zhongu, Chos-rje and Zhānglà (lCang.la).

- (5) γa^{53} $ku^{13}ly^{53}$ $t^h\varepsilon^{35}$ 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)

Similar to the genitive marker, the agentive [ji^{53}] commonly fuses with the pronoun [$t\varepsilon^{53}$] ‘that’ to [ti^{53}]. For example:

- (6) γa^{53} ti^{53} pu^{35} $t\varepsilon^{53}$, $na^{13}ny^{53}$ $t\varepsilon^{53}$ $t\varepsilon^{53}$...
 wa de.’is bu.mo de nyag.nyog de de
 fox DEF.AGT girl DEF child DEF DEF

 $t\varepsilon^{53}$ $se^{53}-ndza^{53}$ zu^{341} ϕe^{53} ϕo^{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 [ji^{53}] resembles the case in Modern Tibetan dialects, where the original WT distinction between the ergative marker *kyis* and the genitive marker *kyi* has become obscured through phonological attrition (cf. markers of the agentive and the genitive in Khams and Amdo in Table 1). Báimă [ji^{53}] is thus cognate with the WT forms *kyi* and *kyis* and all their allomorphs.⁸

The generalization of the allomorphs *yi/’i* and *yis/’is* (following an open syllable) of all other allomorphs of *kyi* and *kyis*, respectively, might be an indication that codas were dropped in Báimă early. This early depletion of codas also resulted in the homophony of the genitive and the agentive markers. It is plausible that subsequently [ji^{53}] were retained as the agentive marker, whereas a new genitive marker—grammaticalized from the demonstrative pronoun [$t\varepsilon^{53}$]—

⁸ An alternative possibility is to consider Báimă genitive marker [ji^{53}] as derived from the Proto-Tibetan genitive **ʔi* (Simon 1942, Gong 2002: 425-426).

arose. The old genitive [jɪ⁵³] has been retained in a number of high frequency words.

3.2 *The definite and the genitive [tɛ⁵³ ~ tɪ⁵³]*

Sūn (2003: 73) and Huáng & 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 [tɛ⁵³] (in Huáng & Zhāng's transcription [tæ⁵³]), but only when the modified part is omitted, as in example (7), quoted from Huáng & Zhāng (ibid., original transcriptions, my glosses):

- (7) ta²¹zɛ³⁵ ndæ⁵³ mbu²¹tɕ^hɔ³⁵ tæ⁵³ zɛ²¹.
 sta.re 'di ?mùjiàng de red
 axe this carpenter that COP
 'This axe is that of the carpenter.'

When both the modifier and the modified are present, Huáng & Zhāng (1995: 114) 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 [ʔa²¹kɕ⁵³ ʂa⁵³] 'elder brother's hat'. In contrast, in addition to [tɛ⁵³], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 253) describes the genitive marker [tɪ⁵³], as in [ɑ¹³kɕ³⁵ tɪ⁵³ kɕ³⁵] 'elder brother's clothes', which he sees as a probable loan from Chinese. Although the resemblance of the Báimǎ genitive marker [tɪ⁵³] to the subordinative particle *di* [tɪ] in the Píngwǔ dialect of Mandarin is striking, the two are not connected, as I will show below. It is nonetheless conceivable that the native genitive marker [tɪ⁵³] in Báimǎ has been reinforced due to its similarity to the Chinese subordinative particle *di* (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, September 2005).

Finally, Huáng & Zhāng (1995: 114) treat [tɛ⁵³] also as a marker of disposal, as in the following example (original transcriptions, my glosses):

- (8) ɕi²¹tɕu⁵³ tæ⁵³ ɕe²¹la⁵³ zɯ³⁵ k^hu²¹ tɕ^hæ²¹ ʂə²¹.
 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 [tɛ⁵³] can be used to emphasize the subject or the object of the sentence, which function (*definite* in Sūn's formulation) is primarily performed by the markers [lɛ⁵³] and [nɛ⁵³]. For example (original transcription, my glosses):

- (9) tɕ^hø⁵³ ʂo³⁵ lɛ⁵³ kɑ¹³lɑ⁵³ tɕ^hɛ¹³ ʂl¹³.
 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 marker [lɛ⁵³] at the end of this section. (The marker [nɛ⁵³] is infrequent in the corpus.) As for the marker [tɛ⁵³], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 258) remarks that it is not yet clear whether the genitive [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 an anaphoric pronoun, as in (10):

- (10) $t\varepsilon^{53}$... $t\varepsilon^{53}$ ts^hu^{13} -no⁵³ tse^{53} ...
 de de tshu-nang slebs
 that that here-LOC reach
 ‘She came here...’ (T48-49)

$[t\varepsilon^{53}]$ is in all probability cognate with the Tibetan demonstrative and also anaphoric pronoun *de* ‘that, that one, he’. Hence, $[t\varepsilon^{53}]$ in the expression $[mbu^{21}t\phi^ho^{35} t\varepsilon^{53}]$, from example (7), is in my opinion a true demonstrative, pointing to the topic $[ta^{21}ze^{35}]$ ‘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. $[t\varepsilon^{53}]$ in Báimǎ has an analogous function to that of *de* in WT, as in the following example:⁹

- (11) γa^{53} $t\varepsilon^{53}$ $j\alpha^{35}$ dze^{35} $\text{ʂ}\phi^{13}$.
 wa de ? bzlos ?
 fox DEF agree say:PF PF.N-VOL
 ‘The fox agreed.’ (T 21-22)

Contrary to Huáng & 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.

⁹ The corresponding indefinite marker in Báimǎ is $[\text{ʂ}\phi^{13}]$ (WT *shig*), as in (i).

- (i) $j\phi^{53}$ $t\phi i^{35}$ $l\alpha^{53}$ $nu^{13}t\phi a^{53}$ $\text{ʂ}\phi^{13}$ $r\varepsilon^{53}$ $t\text{ʂ}^he^{53}$...
 lam dkyil la nor.skyag shig ? phrad
 road center LOC cow.turd INDEF COM encounter
 ‘On the way, she met a cow turd.’ (T 25-26)

The marker [tɿ⁵³] is the oblique form of the demonstrative [tɛ⁵³] ‘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 meaning 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 [tɛ⁵³] ‘that, he’, [tɿ⁵³], in Báimǎ functions in a similar fashion.

- (12) *tĩ¹³tsɿ⁵³ ti⁵³ ʒy¹³da³⁵ ti⁵³ nɑ¹³ny⁵³*
diànzi de.‘i yon.bdag de.‘i nyag.nyog
hotel that.OBL owner that.OBL child
- tɛ⁵³... tɛ pu ɕe de ʂə.*
de de bu.mo byas bdog ?
DEF DEF girl do:PF PROG PF.N-VOL
 ‘The child of the owner of the hotel... eh, was a girl.’

[lɛ⁵³], 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) *tɯ¹³ru³⁵ hō³⁵ α¹³nge³⁵ lo¹³i⁵³ tɕ^hy⁵³ k^hu¹³zə⁵³*
de.ring yang ? lǎoyé khyod kùzi
today again Ange master 2S.OBL trousers

$l\epsilon^{53}$... $k^hu^{13}z\theta^{53}$ ku^{53} zo^{53} wu^{53} re^{13} , dze^{35} .
 ? *kùzi* *rku* *bzo* ‘ong red zlos
 that trousers steal do:IPF come:IPF COP say:PF
 “‘Today Master Ange will come to steal your pants ...
 pants”, he said.’

Similar to $[t\epsilon^{53}]$, $[l\epsilon^{53}]$ is a demonstrative and an anaphoric pronoun ‘that, he’. Whereas $[t\epsilon^{53}]$ is presumably of Tibetan provenance, $[l\epsilon^{53}]$ appears to be a native Báimǎ word; cf. the third person singular pronoun $[wu^{13}l\epsilon^{53} \sim l\epsilon^{53}]$, stemming from a distal demonstrative pronoun. This marker is similar to one of the two definite markers, /le/, in Qiang (LaPolla with Huang 2003: 59).

To conclude, Báimǎ expresses possession by word order (modifier-modified) and by oblique forms of personal and demonstrative pronouns.

3.3. *The comitative/conjunction and the instrumental $[r\epsilon^{53}]$*

The marker for the instrumental case, “the case of the inanimate force or object causally involved in the state or action identified by the verb” (Fillmore 1968: 24), $[r\epsilon^{53}]$, has been identified by my language consultants as identical with that expressing the comitative (i.e. denoting persons or things which accompany or take part in the action) and the coordinate conjunction, $[r\epsilon^{53}]$. Sūn (2003a: 71, 2003b: 73) posits different morphemes for the instrumental ($[re^{13}]$) and the comitative ($[r\epsilon^{53}]$). The former, $[r\theta^{13}]$ in my transcription, is most likely the sandhi form of $[r\epsilon^{53}]$.¹⁰ Furthermore, in the word

¹⁰ $[r\epsilon^{53}]$ is the emphatic or citation form of the coordinate conjunction ‘and’. $[r\theta^{13}]$ is its weakened form. Báimǎ has four tones: low rising [13], high rising [35], high falling [53], and rising-falling [341]. The original tone of a monosyllabic word is subject to change to the low rising tone when followed by the high rising or the high falling tone. Function words (particles, prepositions, conjunctions, modal and auxiliary verbs, etc.) follow the same sandhi rule. For instance, the comitative/conjunction marker $[r\epsilon^{53}]$ changes its original tone to the low rising tone when followed by a word in the high rising or high falling tone, as in example (14).

list concluding Nishida and Sūn's study (1990: 366), the Báimă coordinate conjunction 'and' is given as [rɛ⁵³], i.e. identical in form to Sūn's instrumental marker [rɛ⁵³].

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 under discussion is performed. Sentence (14) is an example of the use of [rɛ⁵³] as a conjunction:

- (14) ya⁵³ rə¹³ pu³⁵ ndʒu¹³-re³⁵ ɤe⁵³ de¹³.
 wa ? bu.mo mchong-re byas bdog
 fox CONJ girl jump-RECP do:PF PROG
 'The fox and I were competing in jumping.' (T 30-31)

The distinction between comitative and instrumental is based on animacy. An animate object involved in the state or action identified by the verb is read as expressing human accompaniment, whereas an inanimate object involved in the state or action identified by the verb is understood as an instrument. Consider the following two examples, where [rɛ⁵³] is used as the marker of the comitative (15), and as the marker of the instrumental (16):

- (15) ya⁵³ rɛ⁵³ tʂ^he⁵³ ʂə¹³...
 wa ? phrad ?
 fox COM encounter PF.N-VOL
 'The girl met a fox.' (T 10)
- (16) "tʂ^hu¹³ndʒɑ³⁵ rɛ⁵³ k^ha¹³ŋu⁵³ tɤy⁵³ nbe⁵³,
 chu.'khyags ? kha.ngo bkrus mbod
 water INSTR face wash:PF/IMP call:IPF

flo~³⁵ ts^hi³⁵ ge³⁴¹ re¹³” ji⁵³ dze³⁵.
 yang ‘tshol sgos red yi bzlos
 again search want COP NOM say:PF

“‘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], Sūn lists [no⁵³] ‘inside’ (WT *nang*) used in those cases where the instrument is a container. The pair [rɛ⁵³]/[no⁵³] in Báimǎ is thus reminiscent of the Shǐxīng instrumental markers [rẽ³³] and [nō⁵⁵] (Dài et al. 1991: 193).

3.3 *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 locative postpositions: [lɑ⁵³] ‘there, on’, [tsɑ⁵³] ‘vicinity’, [kɛ⁵³] ‘above, on’, and [no⁵³] ‘inside’.¹¹ Of these markers, the former two are more general.

The form [tsɑ⁵³], 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), [tsɑ⁵³] 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) ne⁵³rɛ⁵³ tsɑ³⁵ rɑ¹³-jy³⁵
 mi.? rtsa ra-lug
 other.people LOC goat-sheep

¹¹ For [lɑ⁵³], see the example in footnote 9.

ndzo¹³-ne⁵³ øe⁵³ sə¹³.
 ‘tsho-mi byas ?
 graze:IPF-person do:PF PF.N-VOL
 ‘She was a shepherdess to other people.’ (T3)

The marker [kɛ⁵³] ‘on, above’ indicates position above or on top of something. For example:

(18) nu¹³tøa⁵³ guɛ¹³lɛ³⁵ kɛ⁵³ nɛ³⁵ 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) tø^hø⁵³... ni¹³ndzɛ³⁵ no⁵³ dzue³⁵
 khyod mig.’bras nang mchil.ma
 2S eye LOC fluid

 kua¹⁵⁵ øe⁵³ k^hu⁵³ no¹³.
 ? byas khur snang
 ONOM do:PF carry exist
 ‘Your eyes are filled with tears.’ (T27-28)

The locative marker [kɛ⁵³] is also used to mark the dative, i.e. the animate being affected by some state or action identified by the verb.

(20) α¹³ne³⁵ gα¹³sα³⁵ dzɛ³⁵ ni¹³, ndzɛ⁵³ p^hα¹³ ndzu⁵³
 a.mes Ge.sar bzlos ni ‘dre phag mchu
 master Gesar say:PF TOP ghost pig snout

kɛ⁵³: “tʃ^hl⁵³ ɤɑ⁵³ de¹³,” dʒɛ³⁵.
 ? chi skrag bdog bzlos
 DAT what be.afraid PROG say:PF
 ‘So Master Gesar asked the ghost with a pig snout: “What
 are you afraid of?”’

Cross-linguistically, the syncretism of dative and locative is frequent (Anderson 1971: 103-106; DeLancey 1981: 633-638; Kuryłowicz 1964: 190-195; LaPolla 1995b: 1174-1176). Báimǎ exemplifies this general trend.

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

(21) to³⁵ pe¹³ ʒɑ³⁴¹ tʃ^he⁵³ tɛ⁵³ tʃ^hu³⁵ ti⁵³-kɛ⁵³ to³⁵
 ? spun.skya chen de chu de.ʼi-? ?
 LNK brother big DEF little DEF.OBL-DAT LNK

kã⁵³pu¹³tɤ^hi⁵³.

kànbuqǐ

look.down.upon

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

As far as the etymology of the locative markers is concerned, three of them, [lɑ⁵³], [tɕɑ⁵³] and [nɔ⁵³], are clearly cognate with Tibetan, whereas the origin of one, the locative/dative marker [kɛ⁵³], is less clear.

Finally, as for the etymologies of the two case markers not discussed in this article, the ablative [jɔ⁵³] and the comparative [ɤyɛ⁵³], 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 its use as a comparative marker is certainly an innovation.

4. *Báimǎ and the neighboring languages*

As evident from the WT glosses of the 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 & Zhāng 1995). For example, one WT cluster *khr* corresponds in Báimǎ in Zhāng’s analysis (1994: 14) to [tɕ^h], [tɕʰ^h] and [tɕʰ^h], and in Huáng & Zhāng’s analysis (1995: 85) to [tɕ^h], [k^h] and [ɕ]. To give just two examples from the cited sentences, WT *l* is treated in Báimǎ as *j* (e.g. WT *lam* ‘road’ is [jɔ⁵³] in Báimǎ, WT *langs* ‘bright’ is [jɔ³⁵], WT *lug* ‘sheep’ is [jy³⁵]) and as *l* (e.g. WT locative particle *la* is [lɑ⁵³] in Báimǎ, WT *rdo.lo* ‘pestle’ is [da¹³lu⁵³]). One WT final *ing* is treated as [ɰ] (e.g. [tɰ¹³ru³⁵] *de.ring* ‘today’) and as [i] (e.g. [ti¹³pa⁵³] *ding.pa* ‘now’).

Báimǎ nominal postpositions appear to include WT case particles (e.g. the agentive [ji⁵³] and the locative [lɑ⁵³]) and markers of possibly Qiangic provenance (e.g. the instrumental [rɛ⁵³] and the definitie [lɛ⁵³]). Yet some are of less clear origin (the ablative [jɔ⁵³] and the comparative [ɕyɛ⁵³]). The range of grammatical markers of arguably Qiangic origin from the quoted examples can be expanded. The linking particle [to³⁵] is similar to a common discourse particle in Qiang, *(a)tu* (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, March 2005). The non-volitional past marker [ɕə¹³], mostly reduced to [ɕ] rapid in speech, is reminiscent of the past particle in Qiangic languages, cf. [sɿ³³] in Shǐxīng.

In sum, Báimǎ 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
cmpl	completion
com	comitative
conj	conjunction
cop	copula
dat	dative
def	definite
dir	directional prefix
excl	exclamation
emph	emphatic
gen	genitive
indef	indefinite
imp	imperative verb form
inst	instrumental
ipf	imperfective (present-future) verb form
lnk	clause linking particle, consistently translated by my informant as the Chinese clause linking element <i>jiu</i> ‘then, just’
loc	locative
log	logophoric pronoun
nom	nominalizer
n-vol	non-volitional
obl	oblique
onom	onomatopoeic
p	plural
prog	progressive aspect
pf	perfective verb form

pf/imp	perfective-imperative verb form
recp	reciprocal form
s	singular
sim	simultaneous
term	terminative
top	topic marker
vol	volitional
wt	Written Tibetan

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, John M. 1971. *The Grammar of Case: Towards a Localistic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BEYER, Stephen V. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan Language*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press.
- DÀI Qìngxìà 戴庆夏, HUÁNG Bùfán 黄布凡, FÙ Àilán 傅爱兰, RÉNZĒNGWĀNGMǔ 仁增旺姆, LIÚ Júhuáng 刘菊黄. 1991. *Zàngmiányu shíwu zhong/Fifteen Tibeto-Burman languages* 《藏缅语十五种》. Peking 北京: Běijīng Yànshān Chūbǎnshè 北京燕山出版社.
- DELANCEY, Scott. 1981. "An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns". *Language* 57, 626-657.
- . 1986. "Relativization as nominalization in Tibetan and Newari." Paper presented at the 19th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics.
- ETHNOLOGUE: *Languages of the World* (www.ethnologue.com).
- FILLMORE, Charles. 1968. "The case for case". Bach, Emmon and Robert Harns (eds.) *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- GÉSĀNG Jūmiǎn 格桑居冕 (sKal-bzang 'gyur-med) and GÉSĀNG Yāngjīng 格桑央京 (sKal-bzang dbyangs-chan). 2002. *Zàngyǔ fāngyán gàilùn* 《藏语方言概论》 / *bod kyi yul skad rnam*

- bshad* /An introduction to Tibetan dialects. Peking 北京: Mǐnzú Chūbǎnshè 民族出版社.
- GONG Hwang-cherng 龚煌称. 2002. *Hàn-Zàngyǔ yánjiū lùnwén jí* 《汉藏语研究论文集》 / *Collected Papers on Sino-Tibetan Linguistics. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series No. C2-2* / 《语言暨语言学》专刊丙种 2. Taipei 台北: Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office), Academia Sinica 中研院语言所筹备处.
- HÄSLER, Katrin Louise. 1999. *A Grammar of the Tibetan Sde.dge Dialect*. Berne University: Ph.D. dissertation.
- HEINE, Bernd. 1997. *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOFFMANN, Helmut. 1955. "Über ein wenig beachtetes Hilfswort zur Bezeichnung der Zukunft im Tibetischen." *Corolla linguistica: Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4 Mai 1955 dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 73-79.
- HUÁNG Bùfán 黄布凡. 1991. "Qīāngyǔ" "羌语" [Qiangic languages]. Mǎ Xuéliàng 马学良 (ed.) *Hàn-Zàngyǔ gàilùn/ A General Introduction to Sino-Tibetan Languages* 《汉藏语概论》, vol. I, 208-369. Peking 北京: Běijīng Dàxué Chūbǎnshè 北京大学出版社.
- HUÁNG Bùfán 黄布凡 and ZHĀNG Míng huì 张明慧. 1995. "Báimǎhuà zhīshǔ wèntí yánjiū" "白马话支属问题研究" [A study of the genetic affiliation of Báimǎ]. *Zhōngguó zàngxué* 《中国藏学》 [Tibetology in China] 2, 79-118.
- JÄSCHKE, Heinrich August. 1998. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Special Reference to the Prevailing Dialects to Which is Added an English-Tibetan Vocabulary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. First published in 1881 in London.
- KURYŁOWICZ, Jerzy. 1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.

- LAPOLLA, Randy J. 1995a. “‘Ergative’ marking in Tibeto-Burman”. *New Horizons in Tibeto-Burman Morpho-syntax*. Yoshio, Nishi, Matisoff, James A. and Nagano, Yasuhiko (eds.), 189-228. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- . 1995b. “On the utility of the concepts of markedness and prototypes in understanding the development of morphological systems.” *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 66.4, 1149-1185.
- LAPOLLA, Randy J., with HUANG Chenglong. 2003. *A Grammar of Qiang with Annotated Texts and Glossary*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lǐ Shàomíng 李绍明. 1987. “Dī” “氏” [The Dī people]. ZĒNG Wéiyì 曾维益 and XIǎO Yóuyuán 萧猷源 (eds.) *Báimǎrén zúshǔ yánjiū wénjí* 《白马人族属研究文集》 [A collection of research papers on the genetic affiliation of the Báimǎ], 46-47. Píngwǔ 平武: Píngwǔxiàn Báimǎrén Zúshǔ Yánjiūhuì 平武县白马人族属研究.
- Mǎ Chángshòu 马长寿. *Dī yǔ Qiāng* 《氏与羌》 [The Dī and the Qiāng]. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi Rénmín Chūbǎnshè 上海人民出版社.
- MATISOFF, James A. 1972. “Lahu nominalization, relativization and genitivization.” Kimball, J., ed. *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 1. New York: Seminar Press, pp. 237-257.
- . 2003. *Handbook of Proto-Tibetan-Burman*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MULLIE, Jos. 1942. *Le Mot-particule Tchē*. Leiden: Brill.
- NAGANO Yuhiko. 1995. “Function of Written Tibetan instrumental particle, -kyis, revisited.” Nishi, Yoshio, James A. Matisoff, Yasuhiko Nagano, eds. *New Horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnography, pp. 133-142.
- NISHIDA Tatsuo 西田龙雄. 1993. “白馬語” [Báimǎ language]. KAMEI Takashi 亀井孝, KŌNO Rokurō, 河野六郎, CHINO

- Eichi, 千野栄一 (eds.) 《言語学大辞典》 / *Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics*, vol. 5, 293-301. Tokyo 東京: Sanseido 三省堂.
- NISHIDA Tatsuo 西田龙雄 and SŪN Hóngkāi 孙宏开. 1990. *Hakuba yakugo no kenkyū: Hakuba no kōzō to keitō* 《白馬譯語の研究：白馬語の构造と系统》 [A study of the Báimǎ-Chinese vocabulary 'Báimǎ yìyǔ': the structure and affiliation of the Báimǎ language]. Kyoto 京都: Shokado 松香堂.
- SCHIFFMAN, Harold F. 1999. *A Reference Grammar of Spoken Tamil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SÌCHUĀN SHÈNG MÍNZÚ YÁNJIŪSUǒ 四川省民族研究所 [Sìchuān Nationalities Research Institute] (1980). *Báimǎ Zàng rén zúshǔ wèntí tāolùn jí* 《白马藏人族属问题讨论集》 [A collection of discussions on the question of the ethnic classification of Báimǎ Tibetans]. Chéngdū 成都: Sìchuān Shěng Mínzú Yánjiūsuǒ 四川省民族研究所.
- SIMON, Walter. 1942. "Tibetan *dang, cing, kyin, yin* and 'am.'" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. X.4, 954-975.
- SUN, Jackson T.-S. 孙天心. 2003. "Phonological profile of Zhongu: A new Tibetan dialect of Northern Sichuan". *Yǔyán jì yǔyán yánjiū* 《语言暨语言学》 [Language and linguistics] vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 769-836.
- SŪN Hóngkāi 孙宏开. 1983. "Liùjiāng liúyù de mínzú yǔyán jí qí xùshǔ fēnlèi" "六江流域的民族语言及其系属分类" [Minority languages of the six river valley and their genetic classification]. *Mínzú xuébào* 《民族学报》 [Scholarly journal of nationalities] 3, 99-273.
- . 2003a. "Báimáyǔ shì Zàngyǔ de yí ge fāngyán huò túyǔ ma?" "白马语是藏语的一个方言或土语吗?" [Is Báimǎ a dialect or vernacular of Tibetan]. *Yǔyán kēxué* 《语言科学》 [Linguistic Sciences] 1.2, 65-75.

- . 2003b. “Is Baima a dialect or vernacular of Tibetan?” *Cahiers de Linguistique - Asie Orientale* 32.1, 61-81.
- WANG Ming-ke 王明珂. 1992. *The Ch'iang (Qiang) of Ancient China through the Han Dynasty: Ecological Frontiers and Ethnic Boundaries*. Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- . 2005. “From the Qiang Barbarians to the Qiang Nationality: The making of a new Chinese boundary”. Huang Shu-min and Cheng-kuang Hsu, eds. *Imaging China: Regional Division and National Unity*. Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, 43-80.
- WYLIE, Turrell. 1959. “A standard system of Tibetan transcription”. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* no. 22, pp. 261-267.
- ZĒNG Wéiyì 曾维益 & XIĀO Yóuyuán 萧猷源, editors-in-chief (1987). *Báimǎrén zúshǔ yánjiū wénjí* 《白马人族属研究文集》 [A collection of research papers on the genetic affiliation of the Báimǎ]. Píngwǔ 平武: Píngwǔxiàn Báimǎrén zúshǔ yánjiūhuì 平武县白马人族属研究会.
- ZHĀNG Jìchuān 张济川. 1994. “Báimǎhuà yǔ Zàngyǔ” “白马话与藏语” (上) [Báimǎ language and Tibetan]. *Mínzú yǔwén* 《民族语文》 [Minority languages] no. 2, pp. 11-24.

Appendix

“AN ORPHAN AND A FOX”

	$\text{ɲɑ}^{13}\text{ɲy}^{53}$	$\text{tø}^{53}\text{tø}^{53}$	rɛ^{53}	ɣa^{53}		
	nyag.nyog	dwa.dwa	?	wa		
	child	orphan	COM	fox		
1	$\text{tɔ}^{13}\text{ngo}^{53}$	ɲe^{53}	$\text{tø}^{53}\text{tø}^{53}$, ɲe^{53}	$\text{tø}^{53}\text{tø}^{53}$, $\text{ɲɑ}^{13}\text{ɲy}^{53}$	$\text{tʃu}^{13}\text{te}^{35}$	
	?	mi	dwa.dwa	mi	dwa.dwa nyag.nyog cig.pu	
	in.the.past	personorphan	person	orphan	child single	
2	œe^{53}	ʂə^{13} .	$\text{a}^{13}\text{pa}^{53}$	$\text{mɑ}^{13}\text{-de}^{53}$,	$\text{a}^{13}\text{ma}^{53}$ $\text{mɑ}^{13}\text{-de}^{53}$.	
	byas	?	a.pha	ma-bdog	a.ma ma-bdog	
	do:PF	PF.N-VOL	father	NEG.CMPL-exist	mother NEG.CMPL-exist	
3	$\text{ɲe}^{53}\text{rɛ}^{53}$	tsɑ^{35}	$\text{rɑ}^{13}\text{-jy}^{35}$	$\text{ndzo}^{13}\text{-ɲe}^{53}$	œe^{53} ʂə^{13} .	
	mi.?	rtsa	ra-lug	‘tsho-mi	byas ?	
	other.people	LOC	goat-sheep	graze:IPF-person	do:PF PF.N-VOL	
4	$\text{ɲe}^{53}\text{rɛ}^{53}$	tsɑ^{35}	$\text{rɑ}^{13}\text{-jy}^{35}$	ndzʷ^{35}	ʂə^{13} .	$\text{rɑ}^{13}\text{-jy}^{35}$
	mi.?	rtsa	ra-lug	sos	?	ra-lug
	other.people	LOC	goat-sheep	graze:PF/IMP	PF.N-VOL	goat-sheep
5	ndzʷ^{35}	ɲi^{53} ,	$\text{ɲi}^{13}\text{ndʒi}^{53}$	ʂə^{13}	tɛ^{53}	$\text{rɑ}^{13}\text{-jy}^{35}$ œe^{53} .
	sos	ni	nyin.cig	shig	de	ra-lug byas
	graze:PF/IMP	TOP	one.day	INDEF	TOP	goat-sheep do:PF
6	$\text{rɑ}^{13}\text{-jy}^{35}$	$\text{pɔ}^{53}\text{-nbɔ}^{13}$	ʂə^{13} .	$\text{rɑ}^{13}\text{-jy}^{35}$	$\text{pɔ}^{53}\text{-nbɔ}^{13}$	
	ra-lug	‘bor-?	?	ra-lug	‘bor-?	
	goat-sheep	throw:PF-CMPL	PF.N-VOL	goat-sheep	throw:PF-CMPL	

Chirkova, K. 2005, "BÃima nominal postpositions and their etymology", in *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 1-41. (purl.org/sealang/chirkova2005bÃima.pdf)

7	ʂə ¹³ . ? PF.N-VOL	rɑ ¹³ -jy ³⁵ ra-lug goat-sheep	pɔ ⁵³ -nbɔ ¹³ 'bor-? throw:PF-CMPL	ni ⁵³ . rɑ ¹³ -jy ³⁵ ni ra-lug TOP goat-sheep	ts ^h i ³⁵ 'tshol search
8	tɕ ^h ɛ ³⁵ chas go:PF	ʂə ¹³ . ? PF.N-VOL	rɑ ¹³ -jy ³⁵ ra-lug goat-sheep	ts ^h i ³⁵ 'tshol search	tɕ ^h ɛ ³⁵ . to ³⁵ nɑ ³⁵ chas ? nyung.ba go:PF LNK a.little
9	nɑ ¹³ wu ⁵³ nag.po black.NOM	rə ¹³ mu ⁵³ ra ⁵³ ma ³⁵ ?rab.rib dimness	tɛ ⁵³ de TOP	zu ¹³ -re ¹³ . ya ⁵³ yod-red wa probably fox	rɛ ⁵³ ts ^h e ⁵³ ? COM encounter
10	ʂə ¹³ . ? PF.N-VOL	ya ⁵³ wa fox	rɛ ⁵³ ? COM	ts ^h e ⁵³ phrad encounter	ʂə ¹³ . ya ⁵³ ... ya ⁵³ rɛ ⁵³ ? wa wa ? PF.N-VOL fox fox COM
11	ts ^h e ⁵³ phrad encounter	ni ⁵³ . ni TOP	ya ⁵³ wa fox	ti ⁵³ de.'is DEF.AGT	pu ³⁵ tɛ ⁵³ . nɑ ¹³ ny ⁵³ bu.mo de nyag.nyog girl DEF child
12	tɛ ⁵³ de DEF	tɛ ⁵³ ... de DEF	tɛ ⁵³ de DEF	se ⁵³ -ndʒa ⁵³ bsad-'cha kill-eat:IPF	zu ³⁴¹ œe ⁵³ zhabs byas below do:PF
13	ʂə ¹³ . ? PF.N-VOL	se ⁵³ -ndʒa ⁵³ bsad-'cha kill-eat:IPF	zu ³⁴¹ zhabs below	œe ⁵³ ni ⁵³ . nɑ ¹³ ny ⁵³ byas ni nyag.nyog do:PF TOP child	pu ³⁵ bu.mo girl
14	ti ⁵³ de.'is DEF.AGT	dze ³⁵ bzlos say:PF	ni ⁵³ . ni TOP	'ya ⁵³ . ya ⁵³ . ya ⁵³ ... ya ⁵³ ... ya ⁵³ ... to ³⁵ wa wa wa wa wa ? fox fox fox fox fox LNK	

- 15 $\text{ɲ}\alpha^{35}$ $\text{dʒ}\epsilon^{13}\text{ndz}\epsilon^{53}$ re^{13} , ɣa^{53} , ɣa^{53} , $\text{t}\epsilon^{53}$ $\text{t}\epsilon^{\text{h}}\epsilon^{53}$ $\text{t}\text{w}^{13}\text{ru}^{35}$
 nyung.ba ? red wa wa de khyod de.ring
 a.little clever COP fox fox that 2s today
- 16 $\text{k}^{\text{h}}\text{w}^{53}$ $\text{ɲ}\alpha^{35}$ se^{53} $\text{m}\alpha^{13}\text{-ndʒa}^{53}$. $\text{k}^{\text{h}}\text{w}^{53}$ $\text{t}\epsilon^{53}\text{t}\epsilon^{53}$ 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 $\text{k}^{\text{h}}\text{w}^{53}$ $\text{ɲ}\epsilon^{53}\text{re}^{53}$ $\text{ts}\alpha^{35}$ $\text{j}\alpha^{13}\text{w}\alpha^{53}$ ndzw^{35} . $\text{ɲ}\epsilon^{53}\text{re}^{53}$ j
 kho mi.? rtسا lag.(gyog.)pa sos mi.? y
 1S.LOG other.people LOC helper graze:PF/IMP other.people C
- 18 jy^{35} $\text{ndz}\epsilon^{53}$ $\text{de}^{13}\dots$ $\text{r}\alpha^{13}\text{-jy}^{35}$ $\text{ndz}\epsilon^{53}$ $\text{de}^{13}\dots$ tʂu^{53} $\text{dʒ}\epsilon^{35}$
 lug ‘tsho bdog ra-lug ‘tsho bdog ‘dra bzlos
 sheep graze:IPF PROG goat-sheep graze:IPF PROG thus say:PF
- 19 $\text{ʂ}\epsilon^{13}$. “ $\text{t}\epsilon^{\text{h}}\epsilon^{53}$ $\text{t}\text{w}^{13}\text{ru}^{35}$ $\text{gu}^{13}\text{ka}^{53}$ $\text{ndz}\epsilon^{53}$ $\text{to}^{35}\dots\text{to}^{35}$ $\text{k}^{\text{h}}\text{w}^{53}$
 ? khyod de.ring dgong.ka mtshan ? ? kho
 PF.N-VOL 2s today evening night LNK LNK 1S.LOG
- 20 $\text{se}^{53}\text{-ndʒa}^{53}$ ji^{53} re^{13} . $\text{se}^{53}\text{-ndʒa}^{53}$ to^{35} $\text{se}^{53}\text{-ndʒa}^{53}$
 bsad-‘cha yi red bsad-‘cha ? bsad-‘cha
 kill-eat:IPF NOM COP kill-eat:IPF LNK kill-eat:IPF
- 21 $\text{ʂu}\epsilon^{53}$. $\text{t}\text{i}^{13}\text{pa}^{53}$ $\text{ɲ}\alpha^{35}$ se^{53} $\text{m}\alpha^{13}\text{-ndʒa}^{53}$,” to^{35}
 shog ding.pa nyung.ba bsad ma-‘cha ?
 come:IMP now a.little kill NEG.CMPL-eat:IPF LNK
- 22 ɣa^{53} $\text{t}\epsilon^{53}$ $\text{j}\alpha^{35}$ $\text{dʒ}\epsilon^{35}$ $\text{ʂ}\epsilon^{13}$. $\text{to}^{35}\dots$ $\text{m}\alpha^{13}\text{ri}^{53}\dots$ $\text{ɲ}\alpha^{13}\text{ɲy}^{53}$
 wa de ? bzlos ? ? ma.rabs nyag.nyog
 fox DEF agree say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK woman child

- 23 tɛ⁵³ ɣa¹³ra³⁵ ndʒw⁵³. ɲa¹³ɲy⁵³ pɯ³⁵ tɛ⁵³ ɣa¹³ra³⁵ ndʒw⁵³.
 de ?skor.ba ‘gro nyag.nyog bu.mo de ? ‘gro
 DEF in.a.circle go:IPF child girl DEF in.a.circle go:IPF
- 24 ɣa¹³ra³⁵ ndʒw⁵³ ɲi⁵³, ɲu⁵³ ʂi⁵³ ɣa¹³ra³⁵ ndʒw⁵³ we⁵³. ɲu⁵³
 ?skor.ba ‘gro ni ngu bzhin.du ? ‘gro ‘ongs ngu
 in.a.circle go:IPF TOP cry SIM in.a.circle go:IPF come:PF cry
- 25 ʂi⁵³ ɣa¹³ra³⁵ ndʒw⁵³ we⁵³, jo⁵³ tɕi³⁵ lɛ⁵³ nu¹³tɕa⁵³
 bzhin.du ? ‘gro ‘ongs lam dkyil la nor.skyag
 SIM in.a.circle go:IPF come:PF road center LOC cow.turd
- 26 ʂə¹³ rɛ⁵³ tɕ^he⁵³. nu¹³tɕa⁵³ ʂə¹³ rɛ⁵³ tɕ^he⁵³: “pɯ³⁵pɯ⁵³.
 shig ? phrad nor.skyag shig ? phrad bu.mo?
 INDEF COM encounter cow.turd INDEF COM encounter girl
- 27 tɕ^hø⁵³ tʃ^hə⁵³ ɲu⁵³ de¹³? tɕ^hø⁵³... ɲi¹³ndʒe³⁵ no⁵³ dʒue³⁵
 khyod chi ngu bdog khyod mig.’bras nang mchil.ma
 2S what cry PROG 2S eye LOC fluid
- 28 kua¹⁵⁵ ɕe⁵³ k^hu⁵³ no¹³. tɕ^hø⁵³ tʃ^hə⁵³ ɲu⁵³ de¹³?
 ? byas khur snang khyod chi ngu bdog
 ONOM do:PF carry exist 2S what cry PROG
- 29 dʒɛ³⁵. “k^hu⁵³ tɯ¹³ru³⁵ ndʒɛ⁵³ ta⁵³ no³⁵ mə¹³-jo³⁵ ji⁵³ re¹³,
 bzlos kho de.ring mtshan da nam mi-langs yi red
 say:PF 1S.LOG today night now sky NEG-be.bright NOM COP
- 30 k^hu⁵³ mə¹³-ndy⁵³ ji⁵³ re¹³. ɣa⁵³ rə¹³ pɯ³⁵ ndʒw¹³-re³⁵
 kho mi-‘dug yi red wa ? bu.mo mchong-re
 1S.LOG NEG-reside NOM COP fox CONJ girl jump-RECP

- 31 œ^{53} $\text{de}^{\text{13.}}$ dze^{35} $\text{ni}^{\text{53.}}$ $\text{ʷndʒw}^{\text{13}}\text{-re}^{\text{35.}}$ $\text{dze}^{\text{35.}}$ $\text{ʷk}^{\text{h}^{\text{53}}}$
 byas bdog bzlos ni mchong-re bzlos kho
 do:PF PROG say:PF TOP jump-RECP say:PF 1S.LOG
- 32 $\text{k}^{\text{h}^{\text{o}}^{\text{53}}}\text{-nbo}^{\text{13}}$ $\text{ʂə}^{\text{13.}}$ $\text{k}^{\text{h}^{\text{w}}^{\text{53}}}$ $\text{k}^{\text{h}^{\text{o}}^{\text{53}}}\text{-ku}^{\text{13}}\text{nbo}^{\text{13}}$ $\text{ni}^{\text{13.}}$ $\text{tw}^{\text{13}}\text{ru}$
 ? ? kho ? ni de.ring
 be.defeated-CMPL PF.N-VOL 1S.LOG be.defeated-CMPL.EMPH TOP today
- 33 ndze^{53} ta^{53} ya^{53} tɛ^{53} $\text{k}^{\text{h}^{\text{w}}^{\text{53}}}$ $\text{se}^{\text{53}}\text{-ndʒa}^{\text{53}}$ wu^{53} $\text{re}^{\text{13.}}$
 mtshan da wa de kho bsad-ʼcha ʼong red
 night now fox DEF 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF come:IPF COP
- 34 ʷɦe. $\text{tɕ}^{\text{h}^{\text{α}}^{\text{53}}}$ $\text{mɑ}^{\text{13}}\text{-tɕ}^{\text{α}}^{\text{53.}}$ $\text{tɕ}^{\text{h}^{\text{α}}^{\text{53}}}\dots$ $\text{ʂa}^{\text{53}}\dots$ $\text{ʂa}^{\text{13}}\text{ma}^{\text{53}}$ $\text{nɛ}^{\text{13}}\text{ni}$
 ? khyod.? ma-skrag khyod.? sran sran.ma ?
 EXCL 2S.EMPH NEG.CMPL-be.afraid 2S.EMPH pea pea gruel
- 35 $\text{lo}^{\text{13}}\text{wu}^{\text{53}}$ ko^{53} ki^{53} $\text{zɑ}^{\text{341.}}$ $\text{ʂa}^{\text{13}}\text{ma}^{\text{53}}$ $\text{nɛ}^{\text{13}}\text{ni}^{\text{53}}$ $\text{lo}^{\text{13}}\text{wu}^{\text{53}}$
 ? gang skol bzhag sran.ma ? ?
 cooking.pot full boil put:PF/IMP pea gruel cooking.pot
- 36 ko^{53} ki^{53} $\text{zɑ}^{\text{341.}}$ $\text{gu}^{\text{13}}\text{ka}^{\text{53}}$ nɛ^{53} nda^{53} ruɛ^{53} wu^{53}
 gang skol bzhag dgong.ka me ʼde rogs ʼong
 full boil put:PF/IMP evening fire get.warm companion come:
- 37 $\text{de}^{\text{13.}}$ tʂu^{53} dze^{35} $\text{ʂə}^{\text{13.}}$ to^{35} jɑ^{35} $\text{dze}^{\text{35.}}$ $\text{ɦo}^{\sim\text{35}}$ $\text{nɑ}^{\text{35.}}$
 bdog ʼdra bzlos ? ? ? zlos yang nyung.ba
 PROG thus say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK agree say:PF again a.little
- 38 $\text{ɦo}^{\sim\text{35}}\dots$ $\text{ɦo}^{\sim\text{35}}$ $\text{tu}^{\text{13}}\text{nba}^{\text{53}}$ $\text{we}^{\text{53.}}$ $\text{ɦo}^{\sim\text{35}}$ $\text{tu}^{\text{13}}\text{nba}^{\text{53}}$ we^{53} $\text{ni}^{\text{13.}}$
 yang yang dum.pa ʼongs yang dum.pa ʼongs ni
 again again one.part come:PF again one.part come:PF TOP

- 39 jo⁵³ tɕi³⁵ lɑ⁵³... jo⁵³ tɕi³⁵ ndʒa¹³nba⁵³ ʂə¹³ de⁵³.
lam dkyil la lam dkyil chan.pa shig bdog
road center LOC road center scissors INDEF exist
- 40 ndʒa¹³nba⁵³ tɛ⁵³ ndʒa¹³nba⁵³ tɛ⁵³ k^ha⁵³tɕ^hɑ⁵³, ndʒa¹³nba⁵³
chan.pa de chan.pa de kha.'chad chan.pa
scissors DEF scissors DEF speak scissors
- 41 tɛ⁵³: ˈpu³⁵pu⁵³. tɕ^hø⁵³ tʃ^hə⁵³ øe⁵³ de¹³, tɕ^hø⁵³
de bu.mo.? khyod chi byas bdog khyod
DEF girl 2S what do:PF PROG 2S
- 42 ŋu⁵³ de¹³. ˈdze³⁵. ˈk^hu⁵³ tu¹³ru³⁵ gu¹³ka⁵³ ta⁵³ ɣa⁵³
ngu bdog bzlos kho de.ring dgong.ka da wa
cry PROG say:PF 1S.LOG today evening now fox
- 43 ji⁵³ k^hu⁵³ se⁵³-ndʒa⁵³. ɣa⁵³ rə¹³ pu³⁵ ndʒu¹³-re³⁵ øe⁵³
yis kho bsad-ˈcha wa ? bu.mo mchong-re byas
AGT 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF fox CONJ girl jump-RECP do:PF
- 44 ni¹³. k^hu⁵³ k^ho⁵³-nbo¹³ tɕ^hɛ¹³. k^ho⁵³-nbo¹³ tɕ^hɛ¹³.
ni kho ? chas ? chas
TOP 1S.LOG be.defeated-CMPL TERM be.defeated-CMPL TERM
- 45 tu¹³ru³⁵ gu¹³ka⁵³ ta⁵³ se⁵³-ndʒa⁵³. ˈfiɛ. tɕ^hɑ⁵³. fiɔ~³⁵
de.ring dgong.ka da bsad-ˈcha ? khyod.? yang
today evening now kill-eat:IPF EXCL 2S.EMPH again
- 46 ʂa¹³ma⁵³ ɲɛ¹³ni⁵³ ki⁵³ zɑ³⁴¹. gu¹³ka⁵³ ɲɛ⁵³ nda⁵³
sran.ma ? skol bzhag dgong.ka me ˈde
pea gruel boil put:PF/IMP evening fire get.warm

- 47 wu⁵³ de¹³.ˊ dze³⁵ ʂə¹³. ˊˊgu¹³ka⁵³ ɲe⁵³ nda⁵³
 ‘ong bdog bzlos ? dgong.ka me ‘de
 come:IPF PROG say:PF PF.N-VOL evening fire get.warm
- 48 wu⁵³ de¹³. ɲe⁵³ nda⁵³ ruε⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³.ˊ
 ‘ong bdog me ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog
 come:IPF PROG fire get.warm companion come:IPF PROG
- 49 tε⁵³... tε⁵³ ts^hu¹³-no⁵³ tse⁵³. ɕa⁵³guε³⁵ rε⁵³ tʂ^he⁵³.
 de de tshu-nang slebs bya.sgong ? phrad
 that that here-LOC reach egg COM encounter
- 50 ɦõ³⁵ tʂu⁵³ dze³⁵ ʂə¹³. ɦõ³⁵ ˊˊɲe⁵³ nda⁵³ ruε⁵³
 yang ‘dra bzlos ? yang me ‘de rogs
 again thus say:PF PF.N-VOL again fire get.warm compar
- 51 wu⁵³ de¹³.ˊ dze³⁵. tε⁵³ ts^hu¹³-no⁵³ tse⁵³. k^hu⁵³
 ‘ong bdog bzlos de tshu-nang slebs kho
 come:IPF PROG say:PF that here-LOC reach needle
- 52 rε⁵³ tʂ^he⁵³, ˊˊɲe⁵³ nda⁵³ ruε⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³.
 ? phrad me ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog
 COM encounter fire get.warm companion come:IPF PROG
- 53 ma¹³-ɲu⁵³.ˊ dze³⁵. tε⁵³ ts^hu¹³-no⁵³ tse⁵³... tε⁵³
 ma-ngu bzlos de tshu-nang slebs de
 NEG.CMPL-cry say:PF that here-LOC reach that
- 54 ts^hu¹³-no⁵³ tse⁵³. yε¹³wa⁵³ rε⁵³ tʂ^he⁵³, ɦõ³⁵ ˊˊɲe⁵³
 tshu-nang slebs sbal.ba ? phrad yang me
 here-LOC reach frog COM encounter again fire

- 55 nda⁵³ rue⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³. ma¹³-ŋu⁵³.
 ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog ma-ngu
 get.warm companion come:IPF PROG NEG.CMPL-cry
- 56 ne¹³ne³⁵ ma¹³-œe⁵³.~ tɛ⁵³ ts^hu¹³-no⁵³ tse⁵³. k^hu⁵³ rɛ⁵³
 ?? ma-byas de tshu-nang slebs kho ?
 be.worried NEG.CMPL-do:PF that here-LOC reach needle COM
- 57 ts^he⁵³. ðõ³⁵ tsu⁵³ dze³⁵ sœ¹³. tɛ⁵³ øi⁵³-we⁵³.
 phrad yang ‘dra bzlos ? de khyim-‘ongs
 encounter again thus say:PF PF.N-VOL that DIR-come:PF
- 58 to³⁵ da¹³lu⁵³ rɛ⁵³ ts^he⁵³. da¹³lu⁵³ dze³⁵. “k^hu⁵³ ɲɛ⁵³
 ? rdo.lo ? phrad rdo.lo bzlos kho me
 LNK pestle COM encounter pestle say:PF 1S.LOG fire
- 59 nda⁵³ rue⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³. sa¹³ma⁵³ ɲɛ¹³ɲi⁵³ ki⁵³
 ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog sran.ma ? skol
 get.warm companion come:IPF PROG pea gruel boil
- 60 zɑ³⁴¹. k^hu⁵³ ɲɛ⁵³ nda⁵³ rue⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³.~
 bzhag kho me ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog
 put:PF/IMP 1S.LOG fire get.warm companion come:IPF PROG
- 61 ndze⁵³ tɛ⁵³ ta¹³nbe³⁵ ya⁵³ tɛ⁵³ we⁵³ sœ¹³. ɲɑ¹³ɲy⁵³
 mtshan de bden.pa wa de ‘ongs ? nyag.nyog
 night TOP really fox DEF come:PF PF.N-VOL child
- 62 tɛ⁵³ ndza⁵³ we⁵³ sœ¹³. ɲɑ¹³ɲy⁵³ tɛ⁵³ ndza⁵³ we⁵³
 de ‘cha ‘ongs ? nyag.nyog de ‘cha ‘ongs
 DEF eat:IPF come:PF PF.N-VOL child DEF eat:IPF come:PF

- 63 ni^{53} . $ngue^{53}$ $ti^{13}-k\epsilon^{53}$ γa^{53} ti^{53} $wa^{13}t\int a^{53}$ du^{35} ϕe^{13} .
 ni mgo de.'i-? wa de.'is ? ?'thogs byas
 TOP head DEF.OBL-LOC fox DEF.AGT claw catch do:PF
- 64 $wa^{13}t\int a^{53}$ du^{35} ϕe^{53} . $s^h o^{13}-t\epsilon^{53}$ $j\alpha^{35}$ $k\epsilon^{53}$ tsu^{53} ϕe^{53}
 ? ?'thogs byas so-de lag ? 'dzugs byas
 claw catch do:PF comb-DEF hand LOC prick do:PF
- 65 ϕe^{13} . $ts^h a^{53}\phi ue^{53}$ tsu^{53} ϕe^{13} . $\text{''}nde^{53}$ $t\int^h e^{53}$ $re^{13}\text{''}$
 ? ?tshugs.? 'dzugs ? 'di chi red
 PF.N-VOL ache prick PF.N-VOL this what COP
- 66 dze^{35} . to^{35} $\phi a^{53}\dots$ ϕa^{53} $ti^{13}-k\epsilon^{53}$ $nd\int o^{35}$ ϕe^{53} . $k^h u^{53}$
 bzlos ? zhwa zhwa de.'i-? 'chang byas kho
 say:PF LNK hat hat DEF.OBL-LOC touch do:PF needle
- 67 $t\epsilon^{53}$ ze^{53} ϕe^{53} . $\hbar o^{35}\dots$ $k\epsilon^{13}wa^{53}$ $ti^{13}-k\epsilon^{53}$ ke^{53} ϕe^{53} .
 de gzer byas yang rked.pa de.'i-? ? byas
 DEF prick do:PF again waist DEF.OBL-LOC stroke do:PF
- 68 $nd\int a^{13}nba^{53}$ $ti^{53}\dots$ $nd\int a^{13}nba^{53}$ ti^{53} $t\int \alpha^{53}$ ϕe^{53} .
 chan.pa de.'is chan.pa de.'is bcad byas
 scissors DEF.AGT scissors DEF.AGT cut do:PF
- 69 dze^{35} ni^{53} . $\text{''}nde^{53}$ $t\int^h e^{53}$ re^{13} . $p^h u^{13}l\alpha^{53}$ ke^{53} re^{13}
 bzlos ni 'di chi red pha.la ? red
 say:PF TOP this what COP there.LOC stroke COP
- 70 $ts^h a^{53}\phi ue^{53}$. $mu^{13}l\alpha^{53}$ ke^{53} re^{13} $ts^h a^{53}\phi ue^{53}$ ϕi^{34} de^{13} .
 ?tshugs.? ma.la ? red ?tshugs.? yin bdog
 ache down.LOC stroke COP ache COP PROG

- 71 ne^{53} nbi^{53} ge^{341} re^{13} dze^{35} $\text{əa}^{53}\text{gue}^{35}$ te^{53} $\text{t}^{\text{h}}\text{e}^{13}\text{-no}^{53}$
 me ‘bud dgos red bzlos bya.sgong de thal.ba-nang
 fire blow:IPF want COP say:PF egg DEF ashes-LOC
- 72 ne^{35} de^{13} $\text{ne}^{13}\text{te}^{35}$ zu^{341} ne^{35} ne^{53} nbi^{53}
 nyal bdog me.? zhabs nyal me ‘bud
 sleep PROG large.firewood below sleep fire blow:IPF
- 73 ge^{341} re^{13} $\text{əa}^{53}\text{gue}^{35}$ te^{53} $\text{p}^{\text{h}}\text{o}\sim^{55}$ $\text{k}^{\text{h}}\text{u}^{13}$ əe^{53} nba^{53}
 dgos red bya.sgong de ? ?khur byas ‘bar
 want COP egg DEF ONOM ?carry do:PF explode
- 74 $\text{t}\text{ə}^{\text{h}}\text{e}^{35}$ ya^5 $\text{ku}^{13}\text{ly}^{53}$ $\text{t}^{\text{h}}\text{e}^{35}$ ji^{53} $\text{ka}^{53}\text{-ku}^{13}\text{nbo}^{13}$ ya^{53}
 3
 chas wa sku.lus thal.ba yis bkab-? wa
 TERM fox body ashes AGT cover-CMPL.EMPH fox
- 75 $\text{ka}^{53}\text{-ku}^{13}\text{nbo}^{13}$ $\text{ni}^{13}\text{ndze}^{35}$ $\text{ka}^{53}\text{-ku}^{13}\text{nbo}^{13}$ $\text{t}\text{ə}^{\text{h}}\text{e}^{35}$ $\text{ni}^{13}\text{ndze}^{35}\dots$
 bkab-? mig.’bras bkab-? chas mig.’bras
 cover-CMPL.EMPH eye cover-CMPL.EMPH TERM eye
- 76 ya^{53} $\text{t}\text{ʃ}^{\text{h}}\text{u}^{13}\text{sue}^{53}\dots$ $\text{t}\text{ʃ}^{\text{h}}\text{u}^{13}\text{ndzə}^{35}$ re^{53} $\text{k}^{\text{h}}\text{a}^{13}\text{ŋu}^{53}$
 wa chu.bzom chu.’khyags ? kha.ngo
 fox water.bucket water INSTR face
- 77 $\text{t}\text{əy}^{53}$ nbe^{53} $\text{ho}\sim^{35}$ $\text{ts}^{\text{h}}\text{i}^{35}$ ge^{341} re^{13} ji^{53}
 bkrus mbod yang ‘tshol sgos red yi
 wash:PF/IMP call:IPF again search want COP NOM

- 78 $d\mathfrak{z}\varepsilon^{35}$. $t\mathfrak{f}^h u^{13} su\varepsilon^{53}$ $ti^{13}-k\varepsilon^{53}...$ $t\mathfrak{f}^h u^{13} su\varepsilon^{53}$ $ti^{13}-no^{53}$
 bzlos chu.bzom de.'i-? chu.bzom de.'i-nang
 say:PF water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC
- 79 $y\varepsilon^{13} wa^{53}$ $t\varepsilon^{53}$ $t\mathfrak{f}^h i^{53}$ $d\mathfrak{z}\varepsilon^{35}$ $t\varnothing\alpha^{53}$ $\mathfrak{s}\varnothing^{13}$. to^{35} pu^{35}
 sbal.ba de ? bzlos grags ? ? bu.mo
 frog DEF ONOM say:PF cry.out PF.N-VOL LNK girl
- 80 $se^{53}-nd\mathfrak{z}a^{53}$ ga^{53} $m\alpha^{13}-re^{13}$. $se^{53}-nd\mathfrak{z}a^{53}$ ga^{53}
 bsad-‘cha ? ma-red bsad-‘cha ?
 kill-eat:IPF be.able NEG.CMPL-COP kill-eat:IPF be.able
- 81 $m\alpha^{13}-re^{13}$ $\mathfrak{s}\varnothing^{13}$. to^{35} $^{..}t\mathfrak{w}^{13} r\mathfrak{w}^{35}$ to^{35}
 ma-red ? ? de.ring ?
 NEG.CMPL-COP PF.N-VOL LNK today LNK
- 82 $w\varepsilon^{35}$ $m\alpha^{13}-re^{13}$. $no^{13} ue^{35}$ wu^{53} ge^{341} re^{13} .
 ? ma-red nangs.pa ‘ong sgos red
 succeed NEG.CMPL-COP tomorrow come:IPF want COP
- 83 $t\mathfrak{w}^{13} r\mathfrak{w}^{35}$ $p^h u^{13} l\alpha^{53}$ $t\varnothing^h \varepsilon^{35}$ re^{13} $m\varnothing^{13}-nd\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}^{35}$ $\mathfrak{s}\varnothing^{13}$.
 de.ring pha.la chas red mi-‘grub ?
 today there.LOC go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL
- 84 $mu^{13} l\alpha^{53}$ $t\varnothing^h \varepsilon^{35}$ re^{13} $m\varnothing^{13}-nd\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}^{35}$ $\mathfrak{s}\varnothing^{13}, ^{..}$ $ge^{13} t\mathfrak{s}\varnothing^{53}$
 ma.la chas red mi-‘grub ? sgo.slad
 down.LOC go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL outside
- 85 $nd\mathfrak{z}i^{53}$, $^{..}t\mathfrak{w}^{13} r\mathfrak{w}^{35}$ ta^{53} $w\varepsilon^{35}$ $m\alpha^{13}-re^{13}$. $ge^{13} t\mathfrak{s}\varnothing^{53}$ $t\varnothing^h \varepsilon^{35}$.
 mchi de.ring da ? ma-red sgo.slad chas
 go:IPF today now succeed NEG.CMPL-COP outside go:PF

- 86 nu¹³təa⁵³ guε¹³lε³⁵ kε⁵³ ɲε³⁵ de¹³. nu¹³təa⁵³ xε¹³⁵
 nor.skyag sgo.ba.leb ? nyal bdog nor.skyag ?
 cow.turd threshold LOC sleep PROG cow.turd ONOM
- 87 gε³⁵ tɕ^hε³⁵. na¹³ngε⁵³ da¹³lu⁵³ t^hɔ¹³jy³⁵-we⁵³. ya⁵³
 rgal chas ? rdo.lo thur.-‘ongs wa
 stretch.over go:PF on.the.top pestle DIR-come:PF fox
- 88 ngue⁵³ tɕi³⁵ ndzu⁵³ ɕe⁵³. ya⁵³ se⁵³-nbo¹³ we⁵³.
 mgo dkyil ‘brab byas wa bsad-? ‘ongs
 head middle hit do:PF fox kill-CMPL PF.VOL
- 89 tɕu⁵³ dze³⁵ ɕə¹³.
 ‘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 you 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 you 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 can see better.” The egg was sleeping in the ashes, under large chunks of [charcoaled] firewood. “I need to light the fire so that I can 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.