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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 Baimä, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in the south-west of the People’s Republic of China.

Taking previous classifications of Baimä nominal postpositions (Nishida and Sun 1990; Sun 2003; Huang and Zhang 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 Baimä 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 Baimä stories collected in 2003-2004, of which one is appended to the article.
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1. BAIMÄ

Baimä is a non-literary Tibeto-Burman language, spoken by approximately 10,000 people in three counties (Jiǔzhàigōu, Sōngpān, Píngwū) in the north of Sichuān Province and one neighboring county (Wénxìān) in the south of Gānsū Province in the People’s Republic of China (PRC). The Baimä 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 Baimä 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 Báimā 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 Báimā research in the late 1970s, classifies Báimā as an independent language in the Tibetan branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family (1983: 100). Other Báimā specialists consider it a dialect of Tibetan, probably of the Khams group.

The problematic affiliation of the Báimā language (separate language or Tibetan dialect) is partly due to the controversy surrounding the ethnic classification of the Báimā people. In 1951, the Báimā 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 Báimā (Sichuān Shēng Mǐnzǔ Yánjíùsuò 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. Li 1987: 46, Má 1984). Huáng & 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 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 Báimā has a Dī substratum is equivalent to 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 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 Báimā, Sün Hóngkāi (Nishida and Sün 1990; further developed in Sün 2003a and 2003b) and Huáng Būfān and Zhāng Minghui (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 Sün’s tabulation, lists the analyses of Sün (2003a: 71; Báimā 1) and of Huáng & Zhāng (Báimā 2), both in original transcriptions. Sün 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 Báimā are significantly dissimilar to those in Tibetan dialects.

<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>i₃⁵³</td>
<td>kæ₃⁵³</td>
<td>gis</td>
<td>kæ</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>kæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tε₅³[sic.]/ tæ₅³</td>
<td>gí</td>
<td>kí</td>
<td>kí</td>
<td>kí</td>
<td>kæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>tsα₅³/kε₅³</td>
<td>kæ₃⁵³</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>nɔ₅³/kɛ₅³</td>
<td>kæ₃⁵³</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>jo₃³</td>
<td>jɔ₃³</td>
<td>nas</td>
<td>nɛ</td>
<td>nɛ</td>
<td>kæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>gye₃⁵³</td>
<td>gye₃⁵³</td>
<td>las/bas</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>kæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>re₁³</td>
<td>zæ₃⁵³</td>
<td>da/</td>
<td>tɛ</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>i₃⁵³</td>
<td>tæ₅³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>le₅³/nɛ₅³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>re₅³/nɔ₅³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Báimā and Tibetan case particles (Sün 2003a: 71)
Though Huáng & 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 & Zhāng’s tabulation, the postposition \([kæ^{53}]\) 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 \([i^{53}]\), the same particle as the marker of disposal, and instrumental, viz. \([ræ^{53}]/[nɔ^{53}]\). Similarly, Huáng & Zhāng analyze the form \([tæ^{53}]\) as combining the functions of the genitive marker and the marker of disposal. In Sūn’s classification, on the other hand, these are represented by distinct forms, \([tɛ^{53} \sim t i^{53}]\) and \([i^{53}]\), respectively. Sūn only sees the markers \([i^{53}]\) (ergative and disposal) and \([nɔ^{53}]\) (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 Báimā Township. Furthermore, within the proposed range of postpositions, I (a) comment on the disputed points in the previous analyses (viz. markers of ergative, genitive, instrumental, definite and disposal), while arguing for isomorphism of some postpositions (genitive and agentive, definite and genitive, comitative and instrumental, locative and dative) and (b) discuss their etymology. Given that the etymology of many postpositions is yet unclear, I hope to initiate a discussion on their possible origins.
3. NOMINAL POSTPOSITIONS IN THE CORPUS

The present analysis is based on a corpus of Báimā stories collected in 2003-2004 in the Báimā Township (hereafter "corpus"). The stories were narrated by Zhaga Tsere [tʂa¹³ gɑⁿ³³ tsʰε¹³ rɛ³⁵], a 69-year old resident of Koshi [k'o¹³ sɿ¹³] village (Shuǐnǐjiā in Chinese), and Lako [la¹³ kɔⁿ³³], a 75-year old resident of Laru [ja¹³ rɯ³⁵] village (Luòtōngbà in Chinese) and translated with the help of Lǐ Dėgui, a 64-year old resident of Pǐngwǔ. 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 & 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>ji³³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite/Genitive 2</td>
<td>te³³-ti³³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental/</td>
<td>rɛ³³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative-Conjunction</td>
<td>lɑ³³/ tsla³³/ kɛ³³/ nɔ³³</td>
<td>‘on’/ ‘vicinity’/ ‘on, above’/ ‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>kɛ³³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>jɔ³³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>ɡɛyɛ³³</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Báimā 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, Báimâ has seven distinct types of nominal postpositions, which can be further subdivided as follows. Báimâ has two markers of the genitive, [ji\(^{53}\)], identical with the marker of the agentive, and [t\(\varepsilon^{53}\sim t\)i\(^{53}\)], identical with the definite marker. The instrumental case is expressed by the same marker as the comitative and also the coordinative conjunction [r\(\varepsilon^{53}\)]. One of the locative markers, [k\(\varepsilon^{53}\)], 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 those languages and dialects (1995b: 1171), agentive-genitive isomorphy in Báimâ 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 [ji\(^{53}\)]

In the corpus, the marker [ji\(^{53}\)] has the following four functions:

I. (sporadically) marker of genitive (cf. WT ky\(i\) and its allomorphs gy\(i\), gi and y\(i/i\)), e.g. [n\(\varepsilon^{53}\) r\(\varepsilon^{53}\) ji\(^{53}\) j\(y^{35}\)] ‘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, [ji\(^{53}\)] 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\(^{13}\) ji\(^{53}\)] ‘drinkables’. [ji\(^{53}\)] also typically nominalizers the clause preceding the verb [d\(\varepsilon^{35}\)] ‘said’ (e.g. sentence (16)) or in future contexts and conditional sentences, the clause
preceding the verb \(\text{rē}^{13}\) ‘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 \textit{kyis} and its allomorphs \textit{gyis}, \textit{gis} and \textit{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 \textit{ergativity}, for which reason he uses in his (1995a) article the term \textit{agentive} instead of \textit{ergative}. I take up this usage in the present discussion. Under the term \textit{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 \textit{kyis} and allomorphs, cf. Hoffmann 1955: 74, 78-79 and “the promise particle” in Beyer 1992: 353-354), e.g. \(\text{jē}^{35}\text{jī}^{53}\) ‘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 \textit{kyis}, see Nagano (1995).
Sûn (2003a: 73; 2003b: 71) and Huáng & Zhâng (1995: 114) comment on the fact that personal pronouns in Bãimã have special genitive/accusative forms, reproduced in Table 3:

<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>ṭa₃³⁵</td>
<td>tê hø₃³⁵</td>
<td>wu²¹ lê₃³⁵ ~ lê₃³⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC/GEN</td>
<td>ŋu₃³⁵</td>
<td>tê hû₃³⁵</td>
<td>wu²¹ lî₃³⁵ ~ lî₃³⁵ ~ wu²¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Nominative and genitive/accusative forms of personal pronouns in Huáng & Zhâng (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 Bãimã, oblique forms are precisely such base forms to which all other case markers described in this article are attached. For example, in the sentence [tê hø₃³⁵ ŋu₃³⁵ kæ₃⁵ dzæ³⁵ wæ₃⁵] ‘You told me.’ (Huáng & Zhâng 1995: 113, original transcriptions), the dative marker [kæ₃⁵] is added to the oblique form of the first person pronoun [ŋu₃³⁵].

In addition to the oblique forms of personal pronouns listed in Sûn and Huáng & Zhâng, the alternative oblique form of the second person pronoun in my data is [tê hî₃³⁵], 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 Bãimã 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 Pinyin 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 Bãimã 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.
Not only personal pronouns, but also demonstratives have oblique forms in the corpus. The oblique form of [nde⁵³] ‘this’ is [ndi⁵³] ‘of this’ and that of [te⁵³] ‘that, he’ is [ti⁵³] ‘of that, his’. For example:

(2)  
\[
\text{wu}^{13}\text{li}^{55} \quad \text{pu}^{13}\text{nd}^{3}\text{a}^{53} \quad \text{re}^{13}, \quad \text{ndi}^{53} \quad \text{na}^{13}\text{ny}^{53} \quad \text{re}^{13}.
\]
\[
?\text{.i} \quad ? \quad \text{red} \quad \text{di.}\text{i} \quad \text{nyag.nyog red}
\]
\[
3S.OBL \quad \text{wife} \quad \text{COP} \quad \text{this.OBL} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{COP}
\]
\text{‘It is his wife, it is his child.’}

(3)  
\[
\text{ti}^{53} \quad \text{pu}^{53} \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{t}^{13}\text{h}^{3}\text{u}^{3}\text{nd}^{3}\text{zi}^{35} \quad \text{s}^{3}\text{a}^{53}\text{t}^{3}\text{a}^{53} \quad \text{tse}^{53}
\]
\[
\text{de.}\text{i} \quad \text{bu de} \quad \text{Chongqing} \quad \text{sa.cha slebs}
\]
\text{that.OBL boy that Chongqing place reach}

\[
\text{ni}^{53}, \quad \text{ti}^{53} \quad \text{pu}^{53} \quad \text{te}^{53} \quad \text{se}^{53}\text{-ku}^{13}\text{no}^{13} \quad \text{se}^{13}.
\]
\[
\text{ni} \quad \text{de.}\text{i} \quad \text{bu de} \quad \text{shi-?} \quad ?
\]
\[
\text{TOP that.OBL boy that die:PF-CMPL.EMPFL PF.N-VOL}
\]
\text{‘After his son arrived in Chongqing, he died.’}

---

5 Bāimā 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 [tʰi’i₃³], [wu’₁³ li₃³], [ndi₅³] and [ti₅³] are all fusions of the pronouns [tʰo’₁³] ‘you’, [wu’₁³ le₅³] ‘he, she’, [nde₅³] ‘this’ and [tᵉ₅³] ‘that’ with the genitive marker [jǐ₅³] (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 [tᵉ₂³¹] ‘that one’ is [tí₁³], as in [tí₁³kʰa₅³ le] ‘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 Báimā is restricted only to the words discussed in this section.

[jǐ₅³] 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) kʰw₅³ təw¹³ rəw³⁵ gu¹³ ka₅³ ta₅³ ya₅³ jǐ₅³
kho de.ring dgon.gka da wa yis
1s.LOG⁶ today evening now fox AGT

kʰw₅³ sə₅³-ndʒa₅³.
kho bsad-‘cha’⁷
1s.LOG kill-eat:IPF
‘I ... tonight the fox will eat me.’ (T 42-43)

---

⁶ The form [kʰw₅³] ‘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 [kʰw₁³ ne₅³]. The form [kʰw₅³] 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 Báimā, Zhongu, Chos-rje and Zhānglā (ICang.la).
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(5) ya⁵³ kuⁿ³⁵ty⁵³ te³⁵ ji⁵³ ka⁵³-kuⁿ³⁵nbə³⁵wa šku.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 [ji⁵³] commonly fuses with the pronoun [te⁵³] 'that' to [ti⁵³]. For example:

(6) ya⁵³ tiⁿ³ te⁵³ puwo³⁵ te⁵³. ndʒaⁿy³⁵ te⁵³ te⁵³... wa de.'is bu.mo de nyag.nyog de de fox DEF.AGT girl DEF DEF

tet⁵³ se⁵³-ndʒa⁵³ zhuwo³¹ se⁵³ se⁵³ 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 [ji⁵³] 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). Báimá [ji⁵³] 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 Báimá early. This early depletion of codas also resulted in the homophony of the genitive and the agentive markers. It is plausible that subsequently [ji⁵³] were retained as the agentive marker, whereas a new genitive marker—grammaticalized from the demonstrative pronoun [te⁵³]—

---

⁸ An alternative possibility is to consider Báimá genitive marker [ji⁵³] as derived from the Proto-Tibetan genitive *ʔi (Simon 1942, Gong 2002: 425-426).
arose. The old genitive [ji³³] has been retained in a number of high frequency words.

3.2 The definite and the genitive [te⁵³ ~ ti⁵³]

Sūn (2003: 73) and Huáng & Zhāng (1995: 114) disagree as to what should be seen as the genitive marker in Bāimā. Both note that the genitive is expressed by the marker [te⁵³] (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) ta²¹ze³⁵ ndæ⁵³ mbu²³te⁹⁰s⁵⁵ tæ⁵³ ze⁵².
sta.re ‘di ?miyiàng 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 Bāimā 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 [a²¹ko⁵³ sa⁵³] ‘elder brother’s hat’. In contrast, in addition to [te⁵³], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 253) describes the genitive marker [ti⁵³], as in [a¹³ko³⁵ ti⁵³ ko³⁵] ‘elder brother’s clothes’, which he sees as a probable loan from Chinese. Although the resemblance of the Bāimā genitive marker [ti⁵³] to the subordinative particle di [tî] in the Píngwú dialect of Mandarin is striking, the two are not connected, as I will show below. It is nonetheless conceivable that the native genitive marker [ti⁵³] in Bāimā 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) ɕi⁵³tʂu⁵³ tæ⁵³ çe⁵³la⁵³ zû⁵³ kʰu⁵³ tɕʰæ⁵³ ʂə⁵³.
by.e.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)  tɕʰø⁵³ sø⁵³ lɛ⁵³ kɑ́¹³la⁵³ tɕʰɛ¹³ ʃl¹³.
khyod srimg.smo ? ga.logz 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] \( tɛ^53 \ldots tɛ^53 \) \( tʃʰu^13-ŋo^53 \) \( tʃe^53 \ldots \)
\( \text{de} \) \( \text{de} \) \( \text{tshu-nang} \) \( \text{slebs} \)
that that here-LOC reach
‘She came here…’ (T48-49)

\([tɛ^53]\) is in all probability cognate with the Tibetan demonstrative and also anaphoric pronoun \( \text{de} \) ‘that, that one, he’. Hence, \([tɛ^53]\) in the expression \([mbu^21tɛʰo^35 tɛ^53]\), from example (7), is in my opinion a true demonstrative, pointing to the topic \([tə^21zɛ^35]\) ‘axe’, literally ‘that of the carpenter’. The possessive relation is expressed by word order, modifier first, modified second.

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

(11) \( və^53 \) \( tɛ^53 \) \( ja^35 \) \( dzɛ^35 \) \( ʒə^13 \).
\( \text{wa} \) \( \text{de} \) ? \( \text{bzlos} \) ?
\( \text{fox} \) \( \text{DEF} \) agree say:PF PF.N-VOL
‘The fox agreed.’ (T 21-22)

Contrary to Huáng & Zhāng’s argument that \([tɛ^53]\) is the marker of disposal, this meaning in example (9) is not the product of the use of \([tɛ^53]\), but rather of the topicalization of a non-agent argument.

---

⁹ The corresponding indefinite marker in Báimā is \([ʒə^13]\) (WT shig), as in (i).

(i) \( jə^53 \) \( təi^15 \) \( la^53 \) \( nu^11təə^53 \) \( ʒə^13 \) \( rɛ^53 \) \( tʃʰe^53 \ldots \)
\( \text{lam} \) \( \text{dkyil} \) \( \text{la} \) \( \text{nor.skyag} \) \( \text{shig} \) ? \( \text{phrad} \)
road center LOC cow.turd INDEF COM encounter
‘On the way, she met a cow turd.’ (T 25-26)
The marker [ti⁵³] is the oblique form of the demonstrative [tə⁵³] ‘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 [tə⁵³] ‘that, he’, [ti⁵³], in Báimā functions in a similar fashion.

(12) tiē¹³tsi⁵³ ti⁵³ zy¹³da³⁵ ti⁵³ na¹³ny⁵³
diànzi de.’i yon.bdag de.’i nyag.nyog
hotel that.OBL owner that.OBL child

tə⁵³... te pu ce de ʂə.
def def girl do:PF PROG PF.N-VOL
‘The child of the owner of the hotel... eh, was a girl.’

[le⁵³], 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) tuw¹³ruw³⁵ fō³⁵ aⁿge³⁵ lo¹³i⁵³ tə²⁵y⁵³ ku¹³zę³³
de.ring yang ? laoyé khyod kūzi
today again Ange master 2S.OBL trousers
Similar to [tɛ^53], [lɛ^53] is a demonstrative and an anaphoric pronoun ‘that, he’. Whereas [tɛ^53] is presumably of Tibetan provenance, [lɛ^53] appears to be a native Báimá word; cf. the third person singular pronoun [wu^13lɛ^53 ~ lɛ^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, Báimá expresses possession by word order (modifier-modified) and by oblique forms of personal and demonstrative pronouns.

3.3. The comitative/conjunction and the instrumental [rɛ^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), [rɛ^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, [rɛ^53]. Sûn (2003a: 71, 2003b: 73) posits different morphemes for the instrumental ([rɛ^13]) and the comitative ([rɛ^53]). The former, [rɛ^13] in my transcription, is most likely the sandhi form of [rɛ^53].\(^{10}\) Furthermore, in the word

\(^{10}\) [rɛ^53] is the emphatic or citation form of the coordinate conjunction ‘and’. [rɛ^13] is its weakened form. Báimá 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 [rɛ^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 Bāimā coordinate conjunction ‘and’ is given as \([r\,\epsilon^{53}]\), i.e. identical in form to Sūn’s instrumental marker \([r\,\epsilon^{53}]\).

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 under discussion is performed. Sentence (14) is an example of the use of \([r\,\epsilon^{53}]\) as a conjunction:

(14) \(\forall a^{53} \, r\,\epsilon^{13} \, pu^{35} \, nd\,\sigma^{13}\,-r\,\epsilon^{35} \, ge^{53} \, de^{13} \).
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 \([r\,\epsilon^{53}]\) is used as the marker of the comitative (15), and as the marker of the instrumental (16):

(15) \(\forall a^{53} \, r\,\epsilon^{53} \, t\,\sigma^{h}\,\epsilon^{53} \, \sigma\,\epsilon^{13} ... \).
wa \? phrad \?
fox COM encounter PF:N-VOL
‘The girl met a fox.’ (T 10)

(16) \("t\,\sigma^{h}\,\epsilon^{13} \, nd\,\sigma^{a}^{35} \, r\,\epsilon^{43} \, h\,\alpha^{13}\,\nu^{53} \, t\,\sigma^{y}\,\epsilon^{53} \, n\,\beta\,\epsilon^{53},\)
chu.'khyags \? kha.ngo bkrus mchod
water INSTR face wash:PF/IMP call:IPF
Whereas the markers of the agentive and the genitive in Báimă are most likely cognate with the WT markers kyis, kyi and de, the etymology of the marker of the comitative and the instrumental in Báimă is less clear. In addition to [ɾe\(^{53}\)], Sün lists [nɔ\(^{53}\)] ‘inside’ (WT nang) used in those cases where the instrument is a container. The pair [ɾe\(^{53}\)]/[nɔ\(^{53}\)] in Báimă is thus reminiscent of the Shǐxīng instrumental markers [ɾɛ\(^{33}\)] and [nɔ\(^{55}\)] (Dài et al. 1991: 193).

3.3 The locative and the dative [ke\(^{53}\)]

A noticeable feature of the Báimă 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 Báimă has several locative postpositions: [lɑ\(^{53}\)] ‘there, on’, [tɔɔ\(^{53}\)] ‘vicinity’, [ke\(^{53}\)] ‘above, on’, and [nɔ\(^{53}\)] ‘inside’.\(^{11}\) Of these markers, the former two are more general.

The form [tɔɔ\(^{53}\)], listed by Sün (2003: 73) as allative, is in my view an all-purpose locative marker, as in sentence (17) below. As noted by Nishida (1996: 297), [tɔɔ\(^{53}\)] 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’.

\[(17)\] ne\(^{53}\) ke\(^{53}\) tɔɔ\(^{35}\) ra\(^{13}\)-jy\(^{35}\) mi.? rtsa ra-lug
other.people LOC goat-sheep

\(^{11}\) For [lɑ\(^{53}\)], see the example in footnote 9.
The marker \([\text{ke}^{53}]\) ‘on, above’ indicates position above or on top of something. For example:

(18) \(\text{nu}^{13}\text{təa}^{53} \quad \text{gua}^{13}\text{le}^{35} \quad \text{ke}^{53} \quad \text{ne}^{35} \quad \text{de}^{13}…\)
     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 \([\text{no}^{53}]\) indicates position inside something:

(19) \(\text{to}^{h}\text{ø}^{53}… \quad \text{ni}^{13}\text{ndəe}^{15} \quad \text{no}^{53} \quad \text{dzue}^{35}\)
     khyod       mig.’bras     nang  mchil.ma
     2s          eye       LOC      fluid

\(\text{kua}^{155} \quad \text{øe}^{53} \quad \text{k}^{h}\text{u}^{53} \quad \text{no}^{13}.\)
     ?    byas    khur    snang
     ONOM   do:PF  carry    exist

‘Your eyes are filled with tears.’ (T27-28)

The locative marker \([\text{ke}^{53}]\) is also used to mark the dative, i.e. the animate being affected by some state or action identified by the verb.

(20) \(\text{a}^{13}\text{ne}^{35} \quad \text{ga}^{13}\text{sa}^{35} \quad \text{dze}^{35} \quad \text{ni}^{13}, \quad \text{ndəe}^{53} \quad \text{p}^{h}\text{a}^{13} \quad \text{ndəu}^{53}\)
     a.mes   Gesar   bzlos  ni  ‘dre   phag  mchu
     master  Gesar   say:PF  TOP   ghost   pig   snout

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) to\textsuperscript{35} pe\textsuperscript{13} za\textsuperscript{341} tʃ\textsuperscript{h}e\textsuperscript{53} te\textsuperscript{53} tʃ\textsuperscript{h}u\textsuperscript{35} ti\textsuperscript{53}-ke\textsuperscript{53} to\textsuperscript{35} \\
? spun.skya chen de chu de.'i-? ? \\
LNK brother big DEF little DEF:OBL-DAT LNK

kæ\textsuperscript{53} pu\textsuperscript{13} tʃ\textsuperscript{h}i\textsuperscript{53}.

kænbuqi
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, [læ\textsuperscript{53}], [tʂæ\textsuperscript{53}] and [nɔ\textsuperscript{53}], are clearly cognate with Tibetan, whereas the origin of one, the locative/dative marker [ke\textsuperscript{53}], is less clear.

Finally, as for the etymologies of the two case markers not discussed in this article, the ablative [jo\textsuperscript{53}] and the comparative [aɣe\textsuperscript{53}], the former is probably derived from the Proto-Tibeto-Burman form */laṃ* ‘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. Báimá and the neighboring languages

As evident from the WT glosses of the Báimá examples in the text, most of the Báimá lexicon is of Tibetan provenance and derived from Tibetan in multiple waves of borrowings, as evidenced by complex sound correspondences between Báimá and Written Tibetan (Zhāng 1994; Huáng & Zhāng 1995). For example, one WT cluster *khr* corresponds in Báimá in Zhāng’s analysis (1994: 14) to [tʰ], [tʃʰ] and [tʃʰ], and in Huáng & Zhāng’s analysis (1995: 85) to [tʰ], [kʰ] and [ʃ]. To give just two examples from the cited sentences, WT *l* is treated in Báimá as *j* (e.g. WT *l*am ‘road’ is [jɔ̠ 53] in Báimá, WT *langs* ‘bright’ is [jɔ̠ 35]), WT *lug* ‘sheep’ is [jy 35]) and as *l* (e.g. WT locative particle *la* is [lɔ̠ 53] in Báimá, WT *rdo*.*lo* ‘pestle’ is [da 13 lu 53]). One WT final *ing* is treated as [ɯ] (e.g. [tu 13 ru 53] de.*ring* ‘today’) and as [i] (e.g. [ti 13 pa 53] ding.*pa* ‘now’).

Báimá nominal postpositions appear to include WT case particles (e.g. the agentive [ji 53] and the locative [lɔ̠ 53]) and markers of possibly Qiangic provenance (e.g. the instrumental [rɛ̃ 53] and the definitiv [lɛ̃ 53]). Yet some are of less clear origin (the ablative [jɔ̠ 53] and the comparative [ɤyɛ̃ 53]). The range of grammatical markers of arguably Qiangic origin from the quoted examples can be expanded. The linking particle [tɔ̠ 35] is similar to a common discourse particle in Qiang, *(a)tu* (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, March 2005). The non-volitional past marker [sɛ̃ 15], mostly reduced to [s] rapid in speech, is reminiscent of the past particle in Qiangic languages, cf. [s1 33] in Shǐxūng.

In sum, Báimá 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
compl  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 *jiu* ‘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
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Appendix

"AN ORPHAN AND A FOX"

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na}^{13} \text{ny}^{53} & \quad \text{to}^{53} \text{to}^{53} \quad \text{re}^{53} \quad \text{ya}^{53} \\
\text{nyag.nyog} & \quad \text{dwa.dwa} \quad ? \quad \text{wa} \\
\text{child} & \quad \text{orphan} \quad \text{COM} \quad \text{fox}
\end{align*}
\]

1. to\textsuperscript{13}ng\textsuperscript{53}  ne\textsuperscript{53}  to\textsuperscript{53}to\textsuperscript{53}. ne\textsuperscript{53}  to\textsuperscript{53}to\textsuperscript{53}. na\textsuperscript{13}ny\textsuperscript{53}  t\textsuperscript{13}tu\textsuperscript{13}te\textsuperscript{35}  \\
?  mi  dwa.dwa  mi  dwa.dwa  nyag.nyog  cig.pu  \\
in.the.past  personorphan  person  orphan  child  single

2. øe\textsuperscript{53}  øe\textsuperscript{13}.  a\textsuperscript{13}pa\textsuperscript{53}  ma\textsuperscript{13}-de\textsuperscript{53}.  a\textsuperscript{13}ma\textsuperscript{53}  ma\textsuperscript{13}-de\textsuperscript{53}.  \\
byas  ?  a.pha  ma-bdog  a.ma  ma-bdog  \\
do:PF  PF.N-VOL  father  NEG.COMPL-exist  mother  NEG.COMPL-exist

3. ne\textsuperscript{53}re\textsuperscript{53}  ts\textsuperscript{35}a\textsuperscript{35}  ra\textsuperscript{13}-jy\textsuperscript{35}  ndz\textsuperscript{13}-ne\textsuperscript{53}  øe\textsuperscript{53}  øe\textsuperscript{13}.  \\
i.?  rtsa  ra-lug  'tsho-mi  byas  ?  \\
other.people  LOC  goat-sheep  graze:PF-person  do:PF  PF.N-VOL

4. ne\textsuperscript{53}re\textsuperscript{53}  ts\textsuperscript{35}a\textsuperscript{35}  ra\textsuperscript{13}-jy\textsuperscript{35}  ndz\textsuperscript{35}w  øe\textsuperscript{13}.  ra\textsuperscript{13}-jy\textsuperscript{35}  \\
i.?  rtsa  ra-lug  sos  ?  ra-lug  \\
other.people  LOC  goat-sheep  graze:PF/IMP  PF.N-VOL  goat-sheep

5. ndz\textsuperscript{35}w  ni\textsuperscript{53}.  ni\textsuperscript{13}nd\textsuperscript{35}zi\textsuperscript{53}  øe\textsuperscript{13}  te\textsuperscript{53}  ra\textsuperscript{13}-jy\textsuperscript{35}  øe\textsuperscript{53}.  \\
sos  ni  nyin.cig  shig  de  ra-lug  byas  \\
graze:PF/IMP  TOP  one.day  INDEF  TOP  goat-sheep  do:PF

6. ra\textsuperscript{13}-jy\textsuperscript{35}  po\textsuperscript{53}-nbo\textsuperscript{13}  øe\textsuperscript{13}.  ra\textsuperscript{13}-jy\textsuperscript{35}  po\textsuperscript{53}-nbo\textsuperscript{13}  \\
ra-lug  'bor-?  ?  ra-lug  'bor-?  \\
goat-sheep  throw:PF-CMPL  PF.N-VOL  goat-sheep  throw:PF-CMPL
Báimá nominal postpositions and their etymology

7  se₁³.  ra¹³-jy³⁵  po³³-nbo¹³  ni¹³.  ra¹³-jy³⁵  tsʰi³⁵
    ?  ra-lug  'bor-?  ni  ra-lug  'tshol
    PF.N-VOL  goat-sheep  throw:PF-CMPL  TOP  goat-sheep  search

8  tʰe³⁵  se₁³.  ra¹³-jy³⁵  tsʰi³⁵  tʰe³⁵.  to³⁵  na³⁵
    chas  ?  ra-lug  'tshol  chas  ?  nyung.ba
    go:PF  PF.N-VOL  goat-sheep  search  go:PF  LNK  a.little

9  na¹³-wu³³  ra¹³-mu³³-ra³³-ma³³  te³³  zu¹³-re¹³.  ya³³  re³³  tʰe³³
da:g.po  ?rab.rib  de  yod-red  wa  ?  phrad
black.NOM  dimness  TOP  probably  fox  COM  encounter

10  se₁³.  ya³³  re³³  tʰe³³  se₁³.  ya³³...  ya³³  re³³
    ?  wa  ?  phrad  ?  wa  wa  ?
    PF.N-VOL  fox  COM  encounter  PF.N-VOL  fox  fox  COM

11  tʰe³³  ni¹³.  ya³³  ti³³  pu³³  te³³.  na¹³.ny³³
    phrad  ni  wa  de.'is  bu.mo  de  nyag.nyog
    encounter  TOP  fox  DEF.AGT  girl  DEF  child

12  te³³  te³³...  te³³  se³³-ndza³³  zu³³¹  oë³³
    de  de  de  bsad-cha  zhabs  byas
    DEF  DEF  DEF  kill-eat:IPF  below  do:PF

13  se₁³.  se³³-ndza³³  zu³³¹  oë³³  ni¹³.  na¹³.ny³³  pu³³
    ?  bsad-cha  zhabs  byas  ni  nyag.nyog  bu.mo
    PF.N-VOL  kill-eat:IPF  below  do:PF  TOP  child  girl

14  ti³³  dzẹ³³  ni¹³.  "ya³³.  ya³³.  ya³³...  ya³³...  ya³³...  to³³
    de.'is  bzlos  ni  wa  wa  wa  wa  wa  ?
    DEF.AGT  say:PF  TOP  fox  fox  fox  fox  LNK
15 pa⁵⁵ dzéⁿ¹³ ndzêⁿ³⁵ re¹³. yaⁿ¹³ yaⁿ³ teⁿ³⁵ teʰⁿ³⁵ twⁿ¹³ ruⁿ³⁵
nyung.ba ? red wa wa de khyod de.ring
a.little clever COP fox fox that 2s today

16 kʰʷⁿ³⁵ naⁿ³⁵ seⁿ³⁵ maⁿ¹³-ndzᵃⁿ³⁵. kʰʷⁿ³⁵ toⁿ³⁵ toⁿ³⁵ re¹³.
kho nyung.ba bsad ma-čha kho dwa.dwa red
ls.log a.little kill neg.cmpl.eat:ipf ls.log orphan COP

17 kʰʷⁿ³⁵ neⁿ³⁵ reⁿ³⁵ tsaⁿ³⁵ jaⁿ¹³ waⁿ³⁵ ndzuⁿ¹⁵. neⁿ³⁵ reⁿ³⁵ j
kho mi.? rtsa lag.(gyog..)pa sos mi.? y
ls.log other.people loc helper graze:pf/imp other.people c

18 jyⁿ³⁵ ndzoⁿ³⁵ deⁿ¹³... raⁿ¹³-jyⁿ³⁵ ndzoⁿ³⁵ deⁿ¹³." tsuⁿ¹³ dzéⁿ³⁵
lug 'tsho bdog ra-lug 'tsho bdog 'dra bzlos
sheep graze:ipf prog goat-sheep graze:ipf prog thus say:pf

19 seⁿ¹³. "tʰⁿ³⁵ twⁿ¹³ ruⁿ³⁵ guⁿ¹³ kaⁿ³⁵ ndzeⁿ³⁵ toⁿ³⁵... toⁿ³⁵ kʰʷⁿ³³
? khyod de.ring dgong.ka mtshan ? ? kho
pf.n-vol 2s today evening night lnk lnk ls.log

20 seⁿ³⁵-ndzᵃⁿ³⁵ jiⁿ³⁵ re¹³. seⁿ³⁵-ndzᵃⁿ³⁵ toⁿ³⁵ seⁿ³³-ndzᵃⁿ³³
bsad-čha yi red bsad-čha ? bsad-čha

21 sʰⁿ³³. tiⁿ¹³ paⁿ³⁵ naⁿ³⁵ seⁿ³ maⁿ¹³-ndzᵃⁿ³³." toⁿ³³
shog ding.pa nyung.ba bsad ma-čha ?
come:imp now a.little kill neg.cmpl.eat:ipf lnk

22 yaⁿ³ teⁿ³⁵ jaⁿ³⁵ dzéⁿ³⁵ seⁿ¹³. toⁿ³³... moⁿ¹³ riⁿ³³... naⁿ¹³ nyⁿ³³
wa de ? bzlos ? ? ma.rabs nyag.nyog
fox def agree say:pf pf.n-vol lnk woman child
Bāṁā nominal postpositions and their etymology

23 te⁵³ ya¹³ra³⁵ ndz̪w³⁵, na¹³ny⁵³ pw⁵⁵ te⁵³ ya¹³ra³⁵ ndz̪w³⁵. 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 ya¹³ra³⁵ ndz̪w³⁵ ni⁵³, ŋu⁵³ si⁵³ ya¹³ra³⁵ ndz̪w³⁵ we⁵³. ŋu⁵³ ?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 si⁵³ ya¹³ra³⁶ ndz̪w³⁵ we⁵³. jo⁵³ tōi⁵⁵ la⁵³ nu¹³t̪̄a⁵³ bzhin.du ? 'gro 'ongs lam dkyil la nor.skyag
SIM in.a.circle go:IPF come:PF road center LOC cow.turd

26 phral phrad nor.skyag shig ? phrad bu.mo.? INDEF COM encounter cow.turd INDEF COM encounter girl

27 t̪̄o⁵³ t̪̄e⁵³ nan¹³t̪̄a⁵³ se¹³ re⁵³ t̪̄e⁵³: "pz̪⁵³pz̪⁵³.
shig ? phrad nor.skyag shig ? phrad bu.mo.? INDEF COM encounter cow.turd

28 kʰo⁵³ t̪̄e⁵³ ŋu⁵³ de¹³? t̪̄o⁵³... ni¹³ndže⁵³ no⁵³ dz̪u⁵³ khyod chi ngu bdog khyod mig.'bras nang mchil.ma
2S what cry PROG 2S eye LOC fluid

29 kʰw³⁵ kʰu⁵³ no¹³. t̪̄o⁵³ t̪̄e⁵³ ŋu⁵³ de¹³? "
? byas khur snang khyod chi ngu bdog
ONOM do:PF carry exist 2S what cry PROG

30 kʰw³⁵ no¹³-ndź⁵³ ji¹³ re¹³. ya⁵³ re¹³ pz̪⁵³ ndź⁵³-re⁵³
kho mi-dug yi red wa ? bu.mo mchong-re
1S.LOG NEG-reside NOM COP fox CONJ girl jump-RECP
Katia Chirkova

31 ṡe³⁵ de¹³." dzê³⁵ ni⁵³. "ndʒw¹³-re³⁵" dzê³⁵. "kʰw³⁵
byas bdog bzlos ni mchong-re bzlos kho
do:PF PROG say:PF TOP jump-RECP say:PF IS.LOG

32 kʰɔ⁵³-nbo¹³ ɕe¹³. kʰw³⁵ kʰɔ⁵³-ku¹³ nbo¹³ ni¹³. tu¹³ ru³
? ? kho ? ni de:ring
be.defeated-CMPL PF.N-VOL IS.LOG be.defeated-CMPL.EMPH TOP today

33 ndže⁵³ ta⁵³ ńa⁵³ te³⁵ kʰw³⁵ śe³⁻ndʒa³⁵ wu⁴³ re¹³:"
mtshan da wa de kho bsad-cha 'ong red
night now fox DEF IS.LOG kill-eat:IPF come:IPF COP

34 "gie. taʰa⁵³ ma¹³-təa³⁵. teʰa³⁵... șa⁵³... șa¹³ ma⁵³ ne¹³ ni
? khyod.? ma-skrag khyod.? sran sran.ma ?
EXCL 2S.EMPH NEG.CMPL-be.afraid 2S.EMPH pea pea gruel

35 lo¹³ wu⁵³ ńo⁵³ ki⁵³ zə³⁴¹. șa¹³ ma⁵³ ne¹³ ni⁵³ lo¹³ wu⁵³
? gang skol bzhag sran.ma ? ?
cooking.pot full boil put:PF/IMP pea gruel cooking.pot

36 ńo⁵³ ki⁵³ zə³⁴¹. gu¹³ ka⁵³ ne⁵³ nda⁵³ rye⁵³ wu³⁵
gang skol bzhag dgong.ka me 'de rogs 'ong
total boil put:PF/IMP evening fire get.warm companion come:

37 de¹³:" tʃu³⁵ dzê³⁵ șe¹³. to³⁵ ja³⁵ dzê³⁵. fio~³⁵ na³⁵.
bdog 'dra bzlos ? ?? zlos yang nyung.ba
PROG thus say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK agree say:PF again a.little

38 fio~³⁵... fio~³⁵ tu¹³ nba⁵³ we⁵³. fio~³⁵ tu¹³ nba⁵³ we⁵³ ni¹³
yang yang dum.pa 'ongs yang dum.pa 'ongs ni
again again one.part come:PF again one.part come:PF TOP
39 jö\textsuperscript{35} tøi\textsuperscript{35} ld\textsuperscript{3}... jö\textsuperscript{35} tøi\textsuperscript{35} ndža\textsuperscript{13}nba\textsuperscript{53} şø\textsuperscript{13} de\textsuperscript{53}. lam dkyil la lam dkyil chan.pa shig bdog road center LOC road center scissors INDEF exist

40 ndža\textsuperscript{13}nba\textsuperscript{53} tø\textsuperscript{53} ndža\textsuperscript{13}nba\textsuperscript{53} te\textsuperscript{53} kʰa\textsuperscript{53}teʰ\textsuperscript{53}. ndža\textsuperscript{13}nba\textsuperscript{53} chan.pa de chan.pa de kha.\textsuperscript{.}chad chan.pa scissors DEF scissors DEF speak scissors

41 te\textsuperscript{53}: \textquoteleft \textquoteleft pu\textsuperscript{53} pu\textsuperscript{53}. tøʰ\textsuperscript{53} tsʰə\textsuperscript{53} ce\textsuperscript{53} de\textsuperscript{13}. teʰ\textsuperscript{53} de bu.mo.? khyod chi byas bdog khyod DEF girl 2s what do:PF PROG 2s

42 ŋu\textsuperscript{53} de\textsuperscript{13}.\textquoteleft \textquoteleft kʰu\textsuperscript{53} tw\textsuperscript{13}ru\textsuperscript{53} gu\textsuperscript{53}ka\textsuperscript{53} yā\textsuperscript{53} ngu bdog bzlos kho de.ring dgong.ka da wa cry PROG say:PF 1s.LOG today evening now fox

43 ji\textsuperscript{53} kʰu\textsuperscript{53} se\textsuperscript{53}-ndža\textsuperscript{53}. yā\textsuperscript{53} re\textsuperscript{13} pu\textsuperscript{53} ndžw\textsuperscript{13}-re\textsuperscript{35} ce\textsuperscript{53} yis kho bsad-\textsuperscript{.}cha wa ? bu.mo mchong-re byas AGT 1s.LOG kill-eat:IPF fox CONJ girl jump-RECP do:PF

44 ni\textsuperscript{13}. kʰu\textsuperscript{53} kʰo\textsuperscript{53}-nbo\textsuperscript{13} teʰ\textsuperscript{53}. kʰo\textsuperscript{53}-nbo\textsuperscript{13} teʰ\textsuperscript{53}. ni kho ? chas ? chas TOP 1s.LOG be.defeated-CMPL TERM be.defeated-CMPL TERM

45 tw\textsuperscript{13}ru\textsuperscript{53} gu\textsuperscript{53}ka\textsuperscript{53} ta\textsuperscript{53} se\textsuperscript{53}-ndža\textsuperscript{53}.\textquoteleft \textquoteleft fīe. tøʰa\textsuperscript{53}. hø\textsuperscript{53} de.ring dgong.ka da bsad-\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{341}. gu\textsuperscript{13}ka\textsuperscript{53} ne\textsuperscript{53} nda\textsuperscript{53} sran.ma ? skol bzhag dgong.ka me \textquoteleft \textquoteleft de pea gruel boil put:PF/IMP evening fire get.warm
47 wu³³ de¹³.’ dze³⁵ əo¹³. “gu¹³ ka⁶³ əe³³ nda³³
‘ong bdog bzlos ? dgong.ka me ‘de
come:IPF PROG say:PF PF.N-VOL evening fire get.warm

48 wu³³ de¹³. əe³³ nda³³ rue³³ wu³³ de¹³.’
‘ong bdog me ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog
come:IPF PROG fire get.warm companion come:IPF PROG

49 te³³... te³³ tshu¹³-no³³ tse³³. əa³³ gue³⁵ re³³ tse³³.
de de tshu-nang slebs bya.sgong ? phrad
that that here-LOC reach egg COM encounter

50 hə³³ tshu³³ dze³³ əo¹³. hə³³ əe³³ nda³³ rue³³
yang ‘dra bzlos ? yang me ‘de rogs
again thus say:PF PF.N-VOL again fire get.warm compar

51 wu³³ de¹³.’ dze³³ te³³ tshu¹³-no³³ tse³³. kh³³
‘ong bdog bzlos de tshu-nang slebs kho
come:IPF PROG say:PF that here-LOC reach needle

52 re³³ tse³³, “əe³³ nda³³ rue³³ wu³³ de¹³.
? phrad me ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog
COM encounter fire get.warm companion come:IPF PROG

53 ma¹³-əu³³.’ dze³³ te³³ tshu¹³-no³³ tse³³... te³³
ma-ngu bzlos de tshu-nang slebs de
NEG.CMPL-cry say:PF that here-LOC reach that

54 tshu¹³-no³³ tse³³. ye¹³ wa³³ re³³ tse³³.
hə³³ “əe³³
shu-nang slebs sbal.ba ? phrad yang me
here-LOC reach frog COM encounter again fire
Bāimā nominal postpositions and their etymology

55 nda⁵³ rue⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³ ma¹³-ŋu⁵³.
‘de rogs ‘ong bdog ma-ŋu
get.warm companion come:IPF PROG NEG.CMPL-cry

56 ne¹³ne³⁵ ma¹³-qe⁵³.” te⁵³ tsʰu¹³-no⁵³ tse⁵³. kʰw⁵³ re⁵³
?? ma-byas de tshu-nang slebs kho ?
be.worried NEG.CMPL-do:PF that here-LOC reach needle COM

57 tsʰe⁵³. fiŋ³⁵ tšu⁵³ dzê³⁵ şe¹³. te⁵³ şɪ⁵³-we⁵³.
phrad yang ‘dra bzlos ? de khyim-‘ongs
encounter again thus say:PF PF.N-VOL that DIR-come:PF

58 to³⁵ da¹³lu⁵³ re⁵³ tsʰe⁵³. da¹³lu⁵³ dzê³⁵: “kʰw⁵³ ne⁵³
? rdo.lo ? phrad rdo.lo bzlos kho me
LNK pestle COM encounter pestle say:PF IS.LOG fire

59 nda⁵³ rue⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³ şa¹³ma⁵³ ne¹³ni⁵³ ki⁵³
‘de rogs ‘ong bdog sran.ma ? skol
get.warm companion come:IPF PROG pea gruel boil

60 za¹⁴¹. kʰw⁵³ ne⁵³ nda⁵³ rue⁵³ wu⁵³ de¹³:“
bzhag kho me ‘de rogs ‘ong bdog
put:PF/IMP IS.LOG fire get.warm companion come:IPF PROG

61 ndže⁵³ te⁵³ ta¹³nbe³⁵ ya⁵³ te⁵³ we⁵³ şe¹³. na¹³ny⁵³
mtshan de bden.pa wa de ‘ongs ? nyag.nyog
night TOP really fox DEF come:PF PF.N-VOL child

62 te⁵³ ndže⁵³ we⁵³ şe¹³. na¹³ny⁵³ te⁵³ ndže⁵³ we⁵³
der ‘cha ‘ongs ? nyag.nyog de ‘cha ‘ongs
DEF eat:IPF come:PF PF.N-VOL child DEF eat:IPF come:PF
63 ni³⁵. ngue⁵³ ti¹³-ke⁵³ ya⁵³ ti⁵³ wa¹³tʃa⁵³ du³⁵ øe¹³. ni mgo de.'i-? wa de.'is ? ?'thogs byas
top head DEF.OBL-LOC fox DEF.AGT claw catch do:PF

64 wa¹³tʃa⁵³ du³⁵ øe⁵³. sʰo¹³-te⁵³ ja³⁵ ke⁵³ tsu⁵³ øe⁵³
? ?'thogs byas so-de lag ? 'dzugs byas
claw catch do:PF comb DEF hand LOC prick do:PF

65 sə¹³. tsʰa⁵³šue⁵³ tsu⁵³ sə¹³. "nde⁵³ tʃʰə⁵³ re¹³;"
? ?tshugs.? 'dzugs ? 'di chi red
PF.N-VOL ache prick PF.N-VOL this what COP

66 dzə³⁵. to³⁵ ša⁵³... ša⁵³ ti¹³-ke⁵³ ndʒo³⁵ øe⁵³. kʰu⁵³
bzlos ? zhwa zhwa de.'i-? 'chang byas kho
say:PF LNK hat hat DEF.OBL-LOC touch do:PF needle

67 te⁵³ ze⁵³ øe⁵³. šo³⁵... ke¹³wa⁵³ ti¹³-ke⁵³ ke⁵³ øe⁵³.
de gzer byas yang rked.pa de.'i-? ? byas
DEF prick do:PF again waist DEF.OBL-LOC stroke do:PF

68 ndʒa¹³nba⁵³ ti⁵³... ndʒa¹³nba⁵³ ti⁵³ tʃa⁵³ øe⁵³.
chan.pa de.'is chan.pa de.'is bcad byas
scissors DEF.AGT scissors DEF.AGT cut do:PF

69 dzə³⁵ ni³³. "nde⁵³ tʃʰə⁵³ re¹³. pʰu¹³la⁵³ ke⁵³ re¹³
bzlos ni 'di chi red pha.la ? red
say:PF TOP this what COP there.LOC stroke COP

70 tsʰa⁵³šue⁵³. mu¹³la⁵³ ke⁵³ re¹³ tsʰa⁵³šue⁵³ zi³⁴¹ de¹³.
?tshugs.? ma.la ? red ?tshugs.? yin bdog
ache down.LOC stroke COP ache COP PROG
71 ne³⁵ nbi³³ ge³⁴¹ re¹³: dze³⁵. qa³³ gus³⁵ te³³ thè³³-no³³
me ‘bud dgos red bzlos bya.sgong de thal.ba-nang
fire blow:PF want COP say:PF egg DEF ashes-LOC

72 ne³⁵ de¹³. ne³³ te³³ zu³⁴¹ ne³³. "ne³³ nbi³³
nyal bdog me.? zhabs nyal me ‘bud
sleep PROG large.firewood below sleep fire blow:PF

73 gu³⁴¹ re¹³:” qa³³ gus³⁵ te³³ pho~³³ kʰu¹³ ge³³. nbo³³
dgos red bya.sgong de.? ?khur byas ‘bar
want COP egg DEF ONOM ?carry do:PF explode

74 tʰè³⁵. ya⁵ ku¹³ ly³³ tʰè³⁵ ji³³ ka³³-ku¹³ nbo¹³. ya³³
chas wa sku.lus thal.ba yis bkab-? wa
TERM fox body ashes AGT cover-CMPL.EMP PH fox

75 ka³³-ku¹³ nbo¹³. ni¹³ dzê³³ ka³³-ku¹³ nbo¹³ tʰè³⁵. ni¹³ dzê³³...
bkab-? mig.’bras bkab-? chas mig.’bras
cover-CMPL.EMP PH eye cover-CMPL.EMP PH TERM eye

76 ya³³: “tʰu¹³ su³³... tʰu¹³ dzê³³ re³³ kʰa¹³ nu³³
wa chu.bzom chu.’khyags ? kha.ngo
fox water.bucket water INSTR face

77 tɕy³³ nbe³³. hø~³³ tʰi³³ ge³⁴¹ re¹³: ji³³
bkrus mbod yang ‘tshol sgos red yi
wash:PF/IMP call:IPF again search want COP NOM
78 dzê₃⁵. tʃʰu₁³₃ susᵉ₃³ ti¹₁⁻kê₃³... tʃʰu₁³₃ susᵉ₃³ ti¹⁻no₃³
bzlos chu.bzom de.'î⁻? chu.bzom de.'î⁻nang
say:PF water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC water.bucket DEF.OBL-LOC

79 ye¹³wa₃³ te₃³ tʃʰi₃³ dzê₃⁵ tɔɔ₃³ sə¹³. to⁵ PW₃⁵
sbal.ba de ? bzlós grags ? ? bu.mo
frog DEF ONOM say:PF cry.out PF.N-VOL LNK girl

80 sê₃³-ndʒa₃³ ga₃³ ma¹⁻re¹³. sê₃³-ndʒa₃³ ga₃³
bsad-’cha ? ma-red bsad-’cha ?
kill-eat:IPF be.able NEG.CMPL-COP kill-eat:IPF be.able

81 ma¹⁻re¹³ sə¹³. to⁵ “tw¹³rw⁵” to⁵
ma-red ? ? de.ring ?
NEG.CMPL-COP PF.N-VOL LNK today LNK

82 wê₃⁵ ma¹⁻re¹³. no¹⁻ue₃⁵ wu₃³ ge⁴¹ re¹³.
? ma-red nangs.pa ʼong sgos red
succeed NEG.CMPL-COP tomorrow come:IPF want COP

83 tw¹³rw⁵ pʰu¹³la₃³ teʰ₃⁵ re¹³ ma¹⁻ndʒw⁵ sə¹³.
de.ring pha.la chas red mi-’grub ?
today there.LOC go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL

84 mu¹³la₃³ teʰ₃⁵ re¹³ ma¹⁻ndʒw⁵ sə¹³.” ge¹³tsə₃³
ma.la chas red mi-’grub ? sgo.slad
down.LOC go:PF COP NEG-happen PF.N-VOL outside

85 ndʒi₅⁵, “tw¹³rw⁵ ta₃³ wê₃⁵ ma¹⁻re¹³.” ge¹³tsə₃³ teʰ₃⁵.
mchi de.ring da ? ma-red sgo.slad chas
go:IPF today now succeed NEG.CMP-COP outside go:PF
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.