

This and that in TB/ST¹

Paul K. Benedict

Among the more neglected fields of the Conspectus (STC) that of the deictics is especially noteworthy. A basic PTB $*(h)i^A \sim *(h)\varnothing^A$ contrast is indicated for the following two sets:

Table 1²

(West)(W)T	<u>Chepang</u>	<u>Dhimal</u>	<u>Wancho</u>	<u>Garó</u>	<u>Kezhama</u>	<u>WB</u>	<u>PTB</u>
'this' (?)i (West)	?i	i-	i-	i-a	hi	?i	*(h)i ^A
'that' u ~ o (WT)	?uw ~ ?ow	u-	u-	u-a	hu-	hui	*(h)\varnothing ^A

Notes: The lexicons describe West T $i \sim ?i$ -po as 'instead of WT 'di,' and WB hui as 'colloquial' for thui². WT u (< *u or * \varnothing w) ~ o (< *ow) 'this' (cf. the Chp. variation), with semantic shift as in Moto Monpa ?uhu, Id. Wancho (C T) ija 'this' (cf. heja 'that [at a little distance] when somebody is sent to bring sthg.'), ucoi 'that [at a little distance]'. Garó i- < B[odo-]G[aró] */i/ 'this'; Garó u-a also '3rd [pers. prn.]'. Kezhama K[uki-]N[aga] hi 'this', hu-no 'that'; /hi/ 'this' is widespread in KN, with Lushai having hei + N + hi (pattern for deictics) as well as ? 'this' (below). Bradley (1979: 245) describes for B[urmesel]-L[olo] a 'basic two-way opposition': 'this' with $*-i^1$ (= $*-i^A$) and 'that' with $*-o^1$ (= $*\varnothing^A$ > WB -ui), adding the comment, 'the *rhymes support the basic phonesthetic universal for demonstratives' but the latter rhyme is hardly represented outside WB itself (but Atsi [Tsaiwa] has xyí 'this', xáu < *x \varnothing w 'that [near]'). The (h)u type is also represented by Newari ua 'that' (thua 'this'), Lepcha hú '3rd', and the /i/ type by Hayu /ii/ 'this', Hruso (Aka) i '3rd', a-i 'here'; note also the concealed /u/ and /i/ in Miju and/or Taruang (below). Rawang (Nungish) has suffixed -u, a 3rd pers. agreement marker, which DeLancey (1981) has compared with /u/ in Chepang and Jyarong, both analyzed as (inverse) directional markers; this element appears to be related to the /u/ ~ / \varnothing w/ type, the Rw. vocalism pointing to the former (STC: 60ff.). Finally, this pair of deictics can also be compared with the /i/ 'inclusive' vs. /u/ 'exclusive' (1st plural) contrast seen particularly in the eastern Himalayan region as well as KN (Tiddim), the former possibly the source also of the plural marker -i (cf. the discussion in Bauman 1975, 1975bis).

To simplify somewhat, the above *i and *u pair contrast with the widespread PTB *a '3rd' (STC: 121 ff.). This pronoun also appears in the suffixed -n form (Miju an 'this' - see below), in some cases at least representing the PTB/PST 'collective plural' *-n (STC: fn's 284, 428); note especially the Lu. plural *ān*, glossed as '....often very indefinite: 'one', 'people'. These basic forms as a group constitute a deictic (→ pronominal) system that is outrageously symmetrical, even for a proto-language:

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| *i 'this' (near '1st') | *u 'that' (near '2nd') |
| *a 'that' (near '3rd') (abstract - 'the') | |

It should be noted here that PTB *a also appears as a deictic (Lopa a, Lepcha o < *a 'that'; cf. [below] Lahu *ô* < *am-m(a) 'there', as a subject marker (SM) (Akha), as an ergative marker (ERG) (Hayu ha < *s-a; see below) and as a genitive marker (GM) (Monpa, Jg., Lu., Karen). The /i/ form also appears in the GM role, e.g. 'GM (only when subject is female)', but the reflexes here are difficult to disambiguate from those for an original *s-ki (see below).

Other deictics are perhaps the products of early (pre-PTB/PST) fusions, with the dental-initial forms presenting relatively few problems.

WT has *di* 'this' vs. *de* 'that' < PTB *day (STC: No. 21); Miri *de* 'that'; Jg. *dai* 'that', *ndai* 'this'; Rw. *ɬai* 'this'; Nocte (CT) *ate* '3rd', from *a-[d]ay (but *thannin* '3rd pl.' < *ts-n; see below), from a *da+ prototype (see below); WB has *thui* 'that' (see fn. 2); cf. also Wt, Chp., Thakali, Newari, Sunwari su, WB *ʔa-su* 'who' (WB su 'person') also Lp. *sā-* with interrogatives; Nyi Lolo interrogative /sa/; Caro sa, KN *sV 'who'; perhaps also A [rchaic] C [hinese] *ʔi* 575u *sgiwə/zwī*, id., from *s-wəy 'who-is' (see below).

The following set can be reconstructed at the PST level: PTB *tsi^A; WB *tshi* 'presence: nearness': Lahu *chi* 'this'; Mk. *si* 'this here (affix with nouns: locative-emphatic deixis)'; Meitei *asi-məsi* 'this'; Lotha (KN) *si* 'this'; 3rd; Miri, Dafla *si* 'this'; AC *ʔi* 358a *tsʰār/tsʰe*: (< *tsey^B), id., with tonal shift perhaps initial-conditioned (cf. PTB *səy^A 'die'; AC *ʔi* 558a *siə/si:*); PST *tsi^A ~ *tsey [].

The analysis of the velar-initial forms is complicated by the special shifts found after prefixed *s- (below) but all three vowels of the basic 'triangle' come into play here, with various shifts in deixis, e.g. Lu. has the following forms (tones omitted, since tonal 'form class' involved): *khi* 'that (visible up there)'; *khu* 'that (visible down there)' and *kha* 'that (abstract)' as opposed to *hei* 'this' (above) and so 'that (visible same level)' from PTB *ts[ow] (below). Each of these three deictics leads into the tortuous maze of TB/ST morpho-syntax (Thurgood 1981); in the following analysis chief attention is paid to those languages (Chinese, Tibetan, Burmese) which supply substantial time-depth for a comparative study.

1. Lu. *khi*. Lu. *khi* 'that (visible up there)'; Jg. *khi* (Singpho) ~ *śi* (stand.) '3rd'; CL (Nyi, Jino) *kh[ay] 'that'; 3rd; WT -*kyi* ~ -*gyi* ~ -*gi* (after vocalic final) -*yi* 'GM'; Tamang, Meitei. Anal (KN) -*ki*, id.; C. Monpa -*gi* (-i after prn's) 'ERG; instrum. marker (IM)'. These GM and ERG roles are linked by the fact that a nominalized SOV sentence, of the kind so characteristic of TB, can be construed as a 'special case' of the genitive construction, i.e. S = possessor

1973) (cf. comment below on Lu. -in). Further analysis of this point involves a pair of fundamental building blocks of TB (and ST) morphophonemics: directional/causative/transitivizing *s- (verbal) and nominalizing *-n. The -s ERG, as found in Tibetan, is readily construed as the product of metanalysis in simple SV sentences: S+/s/+V; Tibetan also has S+/ki/+s (see Delancey 1981 for Lhasa dial.), of similar origin. The 'striking deviation' (DeLancey) in the Lhasa use of the ERG with certain syntactically intransitive verbs makes sense in terms of the broader directional qualities of *s- (into the condition or state named by the verb - see STC: 105); thus, Lhasa k^ho-s ñal-ba-red 'he-ERG sleep-PAST' reflects an underlying */sñal/. As for the -n, it is reflected in WT -kyin~gyin~gin 'present participle' and the sentence-final yin (yin-pa 'to be'), e.g. WT 'di med-pa yin 'this exist-not (it) is+ -n (nominalizing) = 'It is because this is not here....' (Jäschke). Surely the -n here has been suffixed to the PTB deictic/3rd*/i/ (the palatalization is typical of WT), or perhaps even to */ki/, since in this slot the form typically follows a vowel-final form (de yin 'so it is, yes', ma-yin-pa 'wrong', etc.) and /yi/ is the regular form of /ki/ in this position (above). It can be argued that the nominalizing function of *-n here merges with the 'collective plural' role found with nouns (above), since all that has gone on in the sentence is subsumed under this final -n: '....all these things'. Note also the transformation of */i/ or */ki/ from 'that/it' to '(that/it) is' (Moto Monpa has gi 'to be' = Tsona Monpa yin = WT yin-pa), making it possible to bring into these complex cognate sets verbal forms such as Miri i 'to be (existential/attributive)'; Rw. i 'yes' = 'it is' (cf. Chinese shì, below); Chang ki 'to be (exist), live, dwell' (and cf. the AC forms cited below).

The situation in WB and Lushai is complicated by the fact that both these languages have shifts after prefixed (not cluster) *s- of the type *s-k- > 2- (> vocalic initial), e.g. WT khyim 'house'; WB ʔim; Lu. in < *s-k(y)im, with frequent development of 'creaky tone' (') in WB and low tone (ˉ) in Lushai as part of the reflex (Benedict 1980). WB has -ʔi' as a GM, compared directly with WT/ki/ in STC (fn. 260); this remains a possibility via the prefixed *s-ki but in view of the fact that WB retains the simple ʔi (< *i^A) for the deictic 'this' the likelier reconstruction is *s-i, with the anticipated 'creaky tone'. Lisu yi (< *B), the apparent cognate of WB ʔi ~ -ʔi' (hardly related to PL *ʔan 'remote 3rd', as in Bradley 1979: No. 441, since both initial and final are discrepant), serves both as '3rd' and 'GM'. WB also has the non-future full-stop verb-final -ʔi', identical in form to the GM. According to Lehmann (1981), who also points out this relationship, the post-particle -sañ, which 'marks the grammatical 'case' of thematic-topical nominals, especially that most normal topic of a clause, the subject', in Middle Burmese (beginning about the 14th century), gradually took on the verb-final role of -ʔi', at first mostly embedded in equational contexts, with -ʔi' 'never equationally embedded and tending strongly to go with transitive rather than intransitive verbs'. Lehmann interprets this situation in terms of early dialect-mixture but of special interest here is the phonology: sañ < *sin (STC: fn. 241) *s+in (cluster type, hence no 'creaky tone'; cf. WB ip 'sleep', sip 'put to sleep') < *s-i-n. In modern Burmese sañ has come to function as a deictic ('this').

On comparison with Tibetan, the role of -n is seen to be similar but the slots of /s/ and /k(i)/ are reversed: /s/+i/ rather than /ki/+s/. Lushai, which

also retains the simple /i/ forms in $\dot{\imath}$ (< s-i) 'this, that like this, thus, as follows' and $\dot{\imath}^A$ (< * $\dot{\imath}^A$) 'GM' (above), has $\dot{\imath}n$ < *s-in (see above) 'ERG', with no fewer than 21 separate glosses in Lorrain (!), including 'IM' and 'verbal suffix'. This Lu. $\dot{\imath}n$ is generally omitted when an intransitive verb comes between the subject and the transitive verb, as might be anticipated if indeed there is an underlying genitive construction here (see above).

This form, from an *s-i-n prototype, is a morph-for-morph cognate of WB $\dot{\imath}n$ but the morphological role is rather different.

In terms of the analysis developed above, the ERG should be either of /s/ type, in simple SV sentences, or of /k(i)/ type, in SOV sentences. Any combination of the two, as in Lhasa (reconstructed) -gyis (DeLancey), would appear to be redundant, probably as the result of copying. The WT vs. WB/Lu. reversal of elements (above) points to 'morph shuffling', to paraphrase the 'feature shuffling' of Henderson (1975). The nominalizing *-n is anticipated as sentence-final but its role in the ERG line-up (as in Lu. $\dot{\imath}n$) is not clear at this time.

2. Lu. khu. Lu. khu (< *ku, *kəw or *kow) 'that (visible down there)'; Rw. khu (< *ku or *kow) 'that (on same level as speaker)'; Akha (S. Loloish) k'oe^v (< *kəw^A) 'that'; Rodong (Kiranti) khu '3rd'; WT kho (< *kow), id.; Dhimal kə, Sho (KN) kheo 'GM'; BG *ko^A 'object marker' (OM); WB kui (< *kəw^A), id.; note also Limbu (Kiranti) kon 'this', ko-yo 'here' (< *[g]o-), with semantic shift. The WT and WB forms point to a basic *kow ~ *kəw variation in this set, which ties in with the main deictic (and GM) of Chinese (below).

3. Lu. kha. Lu. kha 'that (abstract)'; Rw. kha 'side' (tha-kha 'above', khu-kha 'there'); also 'in, into, at, to'; Jg. khan 'they two' (cf. ni 'two'); Thulung (Kiranti: cf. Rai) ka 'ERG'; Hayu kə (< *ka) 'OM' rather than 'ERG' (Michailovsky 1981: 157: 'marque d'object de la troisième personne'); also kəmi '3rd' (cf. /mi/ 'that'); Mk. hə (< *ka^A) 'particle indicating that the utterance is of some special interest for the person spoken to' (nəŋ hə 'you there'); also, with voicing (and ~ -ə): WT go (< *gā) 'place; proper place, position, rank'; Miri ko (< *[g]a) 'verbal affix' place' (duŋ-ko 'sitting place, abiding place'); also 'a; an; a....person'; C. Monpa ga 'OM (only with human beings: nouns, prn's)'; also 'locative of occurrences' (locative: both 'in' and 'to' - cf. Rw.); Lopa ko (< *[g]a) '3rd'; Gallong go (< *ga) 'OM (indef. object)'; WB ka < *s-ga (see above for the 'creaky tone' and cf. WT sga, WB ka 'saddle' SM (topic)); cf. also PTB *(r-)ka~*(r-)ga 'earth' (STC: No. 97): Kiranti *ka; Kadu ka; Jg. gá~əgá-n-gá; Rw. ga~ra-ga; CT *-[g,k]a^B (Chang kau, Moshang ga, Wanhe ha); BG *-[g,k]a^B (Garó a²a, Bodo a, Dim. ha, Deori ja); Jg. has gá (< *ga^B) 'earth; place, district, country'. It can be seen that the voiced (*g-) allofam has a core 'locative' meaning; note also the verbal extension, as in the *(k)i set (above): Lp. go (< *ga) 'copula.... it is, truly, certainly' = '(to be) there'; Jg. ga 'to be', couplet of ŋa, which may well represent the PTB *ŋa '1st' root (below). If the analysis of Chinese forms (below) is correct, prefixed *s-ga can be reconstructed at the PST level both as a locative and in its ERG (< '1st') function; cf. the parallel offered by modern Burmese ha 'SM'; ha ~²a-ha = ra ~²a-ra 'thing; place' (ra is verb formative