This and that in TB/ST

Paul K. Benedict

Among the more neglected fields of the Conspectus (STC) that of the deictics is especially noteworthy. A basic PTB *(h)iA~*(h)gwA contrast is indicated for the following two sets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(West)(W)T</th>
<th>Chepang</th>
<th>Dhimal</th>
<th>Wancho</th>
<th>Garo</th>
<th>Kezhama</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>PTB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'this'</td>
<td>(ʔ)i (West)</td>
<td>ʔi</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-a</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>ʔi</td>
<td>*(h)iA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'that'</td>
<td>u~ o (WT)</td>
<td>ʔu~ʔow</td>
<td>u~</td>
<td>u-a</td>
<td>hu~hui</td>
<td>hui</td>
<td>*(h)gwA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The lexicons describe West T 1~ʔi-po as 'instead of WT 'di,' and WB hui as 'colloquial' for thu.2. WT u (*u or *gw)~o (< *ow) 'this' (cf. the Chp. variation), with semantic shift as in Moto Mopna ʔahu, ld. 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]'. Garo i~< B[odo~]G[aro] */i/ 'this'; Garo u~ also '3rd [pers. pron.]. Kezhama K[uki~IN[agal]] hi 'this', hu~no 'that'; /hi/ 'this' is widespread in KN, with Lushai having hei + N + hi (pattern for deictics) as well as ʔi 'this' (below). Bradley (1979: 245) describes for B[urmese~L[olo] a 'basic two-way opposition': 'this' with *-i (≡ *-iA) and 'that' with *-o (≡ *gwA > 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 xyi 'this', xai < *xaw 'that [near]'). The (h)u type is also represented by Newari ua 'that' (thua 'this'), Lepcha hu '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 Taruong (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/~*gw/ 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 *i and *u pair contrast with the widespread PTB *a '3rd' (STC: 121 f... 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: n's 284, 428); note especially the Lu. plural *m, glossed as 'often very incoherent: 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')
*a '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 o *a 'that'; as a subject marker (SM) (Akha), as an ergative marker (ERG) (Hatnu a < *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. *fll 'this'; Nocte (CT) ate '3rd', from *a-[di]ev (but thannin '3rd pl.' < *ta-n; see below), from a *da-i prototype (see below); WB has thui 'that' (see fn. 2); cf. also Wt, Chp2, Thakali, Newari, Sunwari su, WB 'a-su 'who' (WB su 'person') also Lp. sà- with interrogatives; Nyi Lolo interrogative /sa/; Caro sa, KN *sV 'who'; perhaps also A [archaic] C [chinese] 755u tiwè/zwì, id., from *s-way 'who-is' (see below). The following set can be reconstructed at the PST level: PTB *sì¹:

WB tshi 'presence: nearness': Lahu chi 'this'; Mk. sì 'this here (affix with nouns: locative-emphatic deixis); Motei sì = masi 'this'; Lotha (KN) si 'this'; 3rd'; Miri, Dafla si 'this'; AC 358a tshā/r/tsn: ( < *tsey), id., with tonal shift perhaps initial-conditioned (cf. PTB *sow 'die'; AC 358a sì/ði); PST *sì ~ *tsey [ A].

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 here) and kha 'that (abstract)' as opposed to he 'this' (above) and so 'that (visible same level)' 3 from PTB *tsow (below).

These each of these three deictics leads into the tortuous maze of TB/ST morphosyntax (Thurgood 1981); in the following analysis chief attention is paid to these languages (Chinese, Tibetan, Burmese) which supply substantial temporal depth for a comparative study.

1. Lu. khi. Lu. khi 'that (visible up there)'; Jg. khi (Singpho) ~ sì (stand.) '3rd'; CL (Nyi, Jino) *kha[y] 'that; 3rd'; WT -kyi ~ -gi ~ -gi and (after vocalic final) -yi 'GM'; Tamang, Meitei. Anal (KN) -ki, id.; C. Monpa -gi (-i after pron's) 'ERG; instrum. marker (DM). 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 Lhassa 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'I-w-s  *n*al-ba-red 'he-ERG sleep-PAST' reflects an underlying  *s/ *n*al/ . As for the -n, it is reflected in WT  -kyin<sup>-</sup>-gyn<sup>-</sup>-*gin* 'present participle' and the sentence-final yin (yin-pa 'to be'), e.g. WT 'di med-pa yin 'this exist-not (it) is'+<sup>-</sup> -n (nominalizing) = 'It is because this is not here....' (Jäschke). Surely the -n here has been suffixed to the PTB deictic/3rd<sup>+</sup>/l/ (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 Miiri I 'to be (existential/attributive)'; Rw. i 'yes' = 'It is' (cf. Chinese shǐ, 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  *lim*; Lu. in *s-k(y)im*, with frequent development of 'creaky tone' (' in WB and low tone ( ' ) in Lushai as part of the reflex (Benedict 1980). WB has -  *l/ 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  *l/ (,<sup>+</sup> ) for the deictic 'this' the likelier reconstruction is *s-i, with the anticipated 'creaky tone'.

Lisu yi (,<sup>B</sup>) the apparent cognate of WB  *l/ = -  *l/ (hardly related to PL  *n, '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 -  *l/, identical in form to the GM. According to Lehmann (1981), who also points out this relationship, the post-particle -  *n, 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 -  *l/, at first mostly embedded in contextual contexts, with -  *l/ '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:  *n, <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  *n 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 /(k)i+/s/. Lushai, which
also retains the simple /i/ forms in \( (< s-i) \) 'this, that like this, thus, as follows' and \( (< *i^A) \) 'GM (above), has \( < *s-in \) (see above) 'ERG', with no fewer than 21 separate glosses in Lorraine (I), including 'IM' and 'verbal suffix'. This Lu. \( _d\text{n} \) 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 sañ 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. \( _d\text{n} \)) is not clear at this time.

2. Lu. khu. Lu. khu (\(< *ku, *k\text{aw} \text{ or } *kow \)) 'that (visible down there)'; Rw. khu (\(< *ku \text{ or } *kow \)) 'that (on same level as speaker)'; Akha (S. Loloish) k\oe^\v (\(< *k\text{aw}^A \)) 'that'; Rodong (Kiranti) khu '3rd'; WT kho (\(< *kow \), id.; Dhimal ko, Sho (KN) kheho 'GM'; BG *ko^A 'object marker' (OM); WB kui (\(< *k\text{aw}^A \), id.; note also Limbu (Kiranti) kon 'this', ko-yo 'here' (\(< *[g]lo^\text{-} \), with semantic shift. The WT and WB forms point to a basic *kow \sim *k\text{aw} 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 k\d (\(< *ka \) 'OM) rather than 'ERG' (Michailovsky 1981: 157: 'marque d'objet de la troisième personne'); also k\text{aw}i '3rd' (cf. /mi/ 'that!'); Mk. h\d (\(< *ka^A \)) 'particle indicating that the utterance is of some special interest for the person spoken to' (n\d h\d 'you there!'); also, with voicing (and \sim \text{ ~} – s); WT go (\(< *ga \) 'place; proper place, position, rank'; Miri ko (\(< *[g]la \) 'verbal affix) place' (duŋ-ko 'sitting place, abiding place'); also 'a; an; a.....person'; C. Monpa ga 'OM (only with human beings: nouns, pron'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 *(k)a; Kadu ka; Jg. ga=aga=n-ga; Rw. ga=aga; CT *-[g,ka] (Chang kau, Moshang ga, Wanche ha), BG *-[g,ka] (Garo a^2a, Bodo a, Dim. ha, Deori ja); Jg. has ga (\(< *ga \)) 'earth; place, district, country'. It can be seen that the voiced (\*g-) allophones 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 ga, which may well represent the PTB *(a) 'is' 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 \sim a=ha = ra \sim a-ra 'thing; place' (ra is verb formative