'Even/also', concessive (conditional), and indefinite expressions in Asian languages

Isao Honda
Nagoya College
State University of New York at Buffalo

1. Introduction

It is known that a number of linguistic similarities exist in Asian languages. Some of them were discussed in Masica (1976), who attempts to delimit geographical areas characterized by those similarities. Although he investigates only 5 features[1], he also lists many other linguistic features that exist in more than one Asian language group (cf. Masica 1976: 190, Appendix A).

One of them is a linguistic feature manifested by the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um*, which were discussed in Emeneau (1974). According to Emeneau, these two morphemes equally have the following 4 usages:

(1)

Usage 1:	'"also', i.e., this as well as, in close connection with, the previously stated noun, non-finite verb, predication, etc. (Emeneau 1974: 94).
Usage 2	'and'. When they are repeated, they signify the sense of 'both ... and ...'. With a negated predicate, they mean 'neither ... nor ...'.
Usage 3	'even', 'although', 'even if', 'even though', etc.
Usage 4	With interrogative words, they form indefinite expressions; e.g., 'somebody, anybody, whoever'; with a negated predicate those indefinites serve as negative indefinites; e.g., 'nobody'.

In this paper, I will deal with morphemes whose semantic structures are relatively similar to the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um*. The purpose of the study is to examine in what language groups this type of morpheme exists, and to investigate to what extent the semantic structures of those morphemes are similar.

Since this study is exclusively based on the language descriptions previously written by other linguists, the information that will be provided will

[1] The 5 features are 1) word order - SOV, 2) "causative verb", 3) "conjunctive particle", 4) "explicator compound verb" and 5) "dative construction".

probably not be new to Asian language specialists. But, by collecting together information from different language groups, I would like to add a cross-linguistic perspective to this issue.

2. Sanskrit *api* and Dravidian **-um*

As mentioned above, Emeneau (1974) points out that there is a surprising similarity between the Sanskrit *api* and the Tamil *-um* with respect to their semantic structures; i.e., they equally have the above mentioned 4 usages. In addition, both morphemes are used with numerals to signify the sense of 'totalizing' or 'summing'; e.g., Sanskrit: *sarve 'pi* 'all of them' (*sarva* 'all' + *api*), *dvāv api* 'both' or 'the two of them' (*dvāv* 'two' + *api*); Tamil: *ellārum* 'all (persons)', *ellām* 'all (animals or things)' (*ellā* 'all' + *-um* or *-m* < *-um*) - Emeneau (1974: 94).

According to Emeneau (ibid), all of these 5 usages for the Tamil *-um* (including 'totalizing') are found in the earliest Tamil records. Cognates of this suffix still survive in other South Dravidian languages, and in two other branches of Dravidian; namely North Dravidian (including Brahui) and Central Dravidian. On the basis of this, Emeneau reconstructs the Proto-Dravidian **-um*.

Observing the similarity between the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um* with respect to their semantic structures, Emeneau concludes that "The Sanskrit usages are essentially a calque of Dravidian **-um* by Sanskrit *api*". This conclusion is primarily based on the following observations. First, the 5 usages for *api* are not of Indo-European origins but are "unique and proper to Sanskrit alone" (94). Second, while usages 1 and 2, i.e., 'also' and 'and', is found in the earliest records of Sanskrit, i.e., Vedic, other usages are found only in much later texts, i.e., classical.[2] On the other hand, all of the 5 usages for the Tamil *-um* are "found in the earliest Tamil record", which are "roughly as early as the beginning of the classical Sanskrit records" (111). Third, since language contact between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian is well attested, the semantic similarity between the Sanskrit *api* and the PDr. **-um* is unlikely to be accidental. It is also improbable that this semantic structure is universal, for it is "of so specific and complex a nature" (111).

---

[2] Emeneau (ibid: 95) notes that although the meaning of 'even' for *api* is found in Vedic, the use of *api* with *yady* 'if', i.e., *yady api* 'even if, even though', is not found before the Brāhmaṇa texts.

Emeneau's investigation on the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um* is very thorough, and his argument is well grounded. Thus, there is little doubt that the 5 usages for the Sanskrit *api* have resulted from the influence of Dravidian languages, and I do not have anything to add to this conclusion. What I would like to do in this study is to call attention to the fact that morphemes whose semantic structures are similar to those of the Sanskrit *api* and the Tamil *-um* are found in a number of other Asian languages and language groups; namely, Mongolian, Tungus, Turkic, Korean, Japanese, Ainu, Tibeto-Burman and North Caucasian. In what follows, I will examine this class of morphemes, and compare their meanings and distribution.

3. Japanese, Korean, Tungus, Turkic and Mongolian

In Japanese, there is a postpositional particle *mo*, which can signify all of the 4 meanings listed in (1). In Modern Japanese, the use of *mo* for the meaning 'even if' is obsolete, and this meaning is mainly expressed by *temo/demo* (< *te/de* 'gerundive ending of a verb' + *mo*). It has often been pointed out that the semantic structure of the Japanese *mo* is quite similar to that of the Korean postpositional particle *to/do*, which can also signify the above mentioned 4 meanings (cf. Ramstedt 1968: 50, 166).

Despite the similarity between these two particles, they have usually been thought as etymologically unrelated, for they have quite different phonological shapes. Martin (1990: 494), for instance, states that "The morphemes [the Japanese *mo* and the Korean *to/do*] are not cognate with each other, but it is possible to find other morphemes in each language ...". He then suggests that the Korean *to/do* is possibly related to two other particles in Japanese, *to* and *do*.

At earlier stages of Japanese, the particle *to* was used with a predicate to signify the senses of 1) conditional 'if' or 'when', 2) concessive conditional 'even if, even though', and 3) 'and', 'then'. The particle, still extant in Modern Japanese, has all of these usages. It should be noted that in Japanese the form *to* is also found as a comitative 'and' or 'with'. This morpheme occurs after a nominal, and in this respect, differs from the particle *to* mentioned above, which occurs after a predicate. For this reason, they are usually regarded as distinct entities.

However, it has often been speculated that they are historically related. On the other hand, the particle *do* was used at earlier stages of Japanese to signify the sense of concessive 'although', or concessive conditional 'even though' or 'even if'. Although this particle still survives in Modern Japanese, it is used primarily in written (or literary) language, and in colloquial (or spoken) language its use is found mainly in some idiomatic expressions.[3]

The Korean particle *to/do* is also possibly related to several Altaic forms. Ramstedt (1968: 166) suggests that "*to/do* 'also', 'too' (North Korean *tu/du*) corresponds to the particle *da, dā* in the Tungus, Mongol and Turkish languages". The Tungus *da* referred to by Ramstedt is probably the enclitic **-dā* 'und, auch' reconstructed by Benzing (1955a: 1095). In Even, a Northern Tungus language, there exists an enclitic *-dā/də*, which also means 'und, auch' (cf. Benzing 1955b: 156-7). It is also used to form indefinite words; e.g., *jak-ta* 'etwas' < *jak* 'was, welcher' + *-də* (cf. Benzing 1955b: 79).

On the other hand, Itabashi (1988) considers that the Japanese *mo* is related to the Japanese accusative *wo*, and that both have developed from the Proto Japanese **ba*. He then suggests that this reconstructed particle is related to the Proto Tungus **ba*[4], the Old Turkish *mä/ma* and to the Mongolian *ba*. According to Itabashi (ibid: 223-5), the Old Turkish *mä/ma* can signify the meanings of 'also' and 'both-and'. It is also used to form indefinite words; e.g., *nägü-mä* 'something, anything' < *nägü* 'what (?)' - cited from Temir (1956: 255).

The Mongolian *ba* is found in both Written Mongolian and Middle Mongolian.[5] The meaning of this morpheme is discussed in Itabashi (ibid: 214-18), Street (1981: 162-3), Poppe (1974: 52) and Grønbech & Krueger (1976). According to them, the morpheme has the following usages; 1) a conjunction 'and',

---

[3] In Old and Middle Japanese, there also exist the particles *tomo* 'even if', 'even though' and *domo* 'although', 'even though'. Although the relations between *to* and *tomo* on the one hand, and *do* and *domo* on the other, are not totally clear, it has often been suggested that *tomo* has derived from *to* and *mo*, and that *domo* has derived from *do* and *mo*.

[4] The Tungus **ba* was reconstructed in Benzing (1955a) as an accusative case marker. Note that in Manchu, a modern Tungus language, the particle *ba* has, according to Itabashi (1988: 202), the following 5 functions; 1) a definite direct object marker, 2) a dative marker, 3) a subject marker in indirect discourse, 4) a prosecutive case marker, and 5) an instrumental marker.

[5] Although cognates of the Written Mongolian *ba* may also be used in modern colloquial languages, its use is probably rare. In Briat, a modern Mongolian language, for instance, there exists a "conjunction" *ba* 'and", but, according to Poppe (1960: 126), "This conjunction is a borrowing from Written Mongolian and is rerely used".

and it may be repeated to mean 'both ... and ...', 2) 'also, in addition', 3) with interrogative pronouns, it forms indefinite pronouns, e.g., *ken ba* 'whoever, somebody, anybody' < *ken* 'who (singular)' + *ba* (cf. Poppe 1974: 52).

In Written Mongolian and Middle Mongolian, there is another form, *ber*, which, according to Poppe (1974: 185), can express the 3 meanings signified by the particle *ba*. *Ber* is also used to signify two additional meanings. One is the sense of 'but', or 'although', and the other is the sense of concessive 'even if' (cf. Poppe 1974: 185). So, this particle can signify all of the 4 meanings listed in (1).[6] Since the usages and the phonological shapes of *ba* and *ber* are quite similar[7], Street (1981: 162) suggests that they are possibly related. Indeed, Poppe (1974) regards them as the same entity.[8]

In Mongolian, there is another particle *ču/či*. The usages of this particle is similar to those of *ber*; i.e., like *ber*, it can signify all of the 4 meanings listed in (1);[9] (the sense of 'even if', 'although' is expressed by *-bačču*, which is "the past tense ending in *-ba* with the particle *ču*" (Poppe 1974: 186; cf. also Street 1984: 126).[10] According to Street (1984), the particle *ču/či*.is found in Written Mongolian and in modern colloquial Mongolian languages, where it has the above usages. However, Street points out that in the Secret Histroy, a 13th century document (belonging to the early Middle Mongolian period), the meaning of the particle can be interpreted as 'even, also', but not as other senses; i.e., 1) 'both ... and ...', 2) 'even if', 'although', 3) the usage for forming indefinite words. He

---

6 Note, however, that Street (1981) points out that in the Secret History there are a number of instances in which the meaning of *ber* cannot be appropriately analyzed as either of the above meanings. He then suggests that at this stage the particle "may reasonably be considered essentially an 'emphatic' particle in one sense of this vague term" (165).

7 Street (1981: 162) notes that "Some Middle Mongolian documents contain a rare front-vowel *be* shape presumably representing this same particle ...".

8 It is important to note that the form *ber* is found in Mongolian languages also as the instrumental suffix (an alternative form is *bar*). Street (1981: 165) considers that the particle *ber* discussed above and the instrumental *ber ~ bar* have "no historical connection". This conclusion is primarily based on the following two observations. First, whereas the instrumental suffix is vowel harmonic, i.e., it is realized either as *ber* or as *bar*, the particle *ber* is regularly represented only as *ber* in Middle Mongolian texts. Second, the semantic structures of the instrumental suffix and the particle are markedly different.

9 Note, however, that, according to Poppe (1974: 185-6), whereas *ber* can be used to signify the sense of 'but', *ču* does not have this usage.

10 Poppe (1974: 183) notes that "The particle *ču* in the ending *-bačču* is sometimes written separately and may be placed before the verbal form".

thus considers that these latter usages developed at much later stages.[11] According to him, the essential meaning of the particle at this stage, i.e., the early Middle Mongolian period, is more abstract, i.e., it "verifies, asserts, or implies agreement between speaker and addressee, or suggests that the addressee should agree with the speaker" (149). Thus, he calls it "a *particle of assumed consensus*, or *consentential particle*" (149).

While Street concludes that the use of *ču/či* in the concessive *-baču* is an independent development in Mongolian, he suggests that some other usages of *ču/či*, namely 'both ... and ...' and the usage for forming indefinite words, resulted from the influence of Tibetan, "for the Tibetan concessive particle *yang* (sometimes translated as paratactic *ču*)" (Street 1984: 150) also possess those two usages.

4. Tibeto-Burman

The morpheme *yang* referred to by Street is probably the Classical Tibetan *yaṅ*, which is listed in Jäschke (1995; 505). For this morpheme, Jäschke (1995; 505) lists the following English glosses; 1) 'also, too'; when repeated, 'both ... and ...', and with a negative, 'neither ... nor ...', 2) 'even' (with a negative, 'not even'), 3) 'although', 4) 'but', 'yet', 'nevertheless', 5) 'so then', 6) 'again', 'once more', 'likewise', 'further', 7) 'again and again' - cf. also Jäschke (1989: 75-76). Besides these usages, Beyer (1992) lists two other usages for the particle; i.e., 1) 'although, even though, even if', 2) it forms indefinite expressions, e.g., *su ɣaṅ* 'anyone at all' < *su* 'indefinite human being' + *ɣaṅ* (cf. Beyer 1992: 216, 385-7).

In Tibeto-Burman, there are a number of morphemes whose meanings appear relatively similar to those of the Tibetan *yaṅ*. The following is a list of those morphemes and brief descriptions of their usages.

---

[11] Poppe (1974: 52) notes that indefinite words formed with the particle *ču* occur "mainly in the modern language", whereas the particles *ba* and *ber* are in this usage "more characteristic of the classical language". It can thus be said that this meaning (and possibly other meanings as well), which was expressed by *ber* in the early Middle Mongolian period, has gradually come to be expressed by *ču/či* It should also be noted that, according to Street (1981: 119), in the Secret History *ču/či* occurs only 5 times, while *ber* occurs 71 times.

The Lhasa dialect of Tibetan *'ää* (Bodic):
'also'; with a negative, 'even' - cf. Hoshi (1988: 434, 446). This morpheme is probably related to the second element of a concessive *nää* 'even though, even if'; (since this dialect has a conditional *na* 'if', *nää* appears to have derived from *na* + *'ää*.

Khaling *yo* (Bodic):
'also, too' to connect "nouns, noun phrase, and clauses" (Toba 1984: 37). The form *yo* is also used to form indefinite expressions such as *'sü khoyo* 'anybody' < *'sü* 'who' + *kho* 'if' + *yo*. There are also a set of negative indefinites, which are formed with a negative *mu-*; e.g., *'süyo ... mu-* 'nobody'.

Classical Newari *nwoṃ/-nam/-aṃ/-m*[12] (Bodic ?[13]):
'even, yet, still, but, also, and'. Jørgensen (1941: 94) notes, however, that "often its meaning is too subtle to be rendered in translation ...". When it is repeated to connect words, it means 'both ... and ...' (with a negative *ma*, 'neither ... nor ...'). "When connecting clauses, the meaning is something like 'but, on the other hand'" (94). The morpheme is also used to change interrogatives into indefinites. In this usage, the morpheme is suffixed either immediately to the interrogatives, or to "an intermediate *-chi-* or *-khi-*" (40); e.g., *su-chi-nwoṃ* 'someone', anyone' < *su* 'who' + *chi* + *nwoṃ*. When those indefinites are used with a negated predicate, they means 'no', 'none', 'nothing', etc. The same form, which is written in Genetti (1991) as *naM - M* stands for "nasalization of a vowel" (Genetti 1991: 251, note 9), is also found in the Classical Newari texts as a concessive 'although'. However, in the 19th century texts, the sense of 'although' is, according to Genetti (1991: 238), expressed by another form *sāM* 'even if, even though'. This form consists of a conditional *sā* 'if' and *naM*.[14]

The Kathmandu dialect of Newari *naM* (Bodic ?):
The form *naM* is also found in this dialect as a concessive 'although' (cf. *Genetti 1991: 243). It is called in Malla (1985: 102)* an "emphatic particle" 'also'. The same form is also listed in Malla (1985: 95) as a "clause coordination" meaning 'also, even'.

The Dolakha dialect of Newari *-ɯŋ*[15] (Bodic ?):
The Classical Newari *naM* and the Kathmandu Newari *naM* are probably related to this suffix. According to Genetti (1990), this suffix means

---

12 Jørgensen (1941: 94) notes that the original form is *nwoṃ*, but "later *-naṃ*, which is extremely frequent especially in the weakened form *-aṃ*, *-ṃ*" (*ṃ*stands for a nazalization).

13 This classification of Newari is based on Shafter (1955).

14 It should be noted that in the Classical Newari the form *naM* is also found as the ergative/instrumental. Genetti (1991: 238) suggests that this morpheme and the *naM* mentioned above "may well be etymologically related". Interestingly, the formal similarity between an instrumental marker and a morpheme meaning 'even, also' is also found in Mongolian (namely, the form *ber*; cf. note 8).

15 This suffix is realized as *-ɯŋ* after a consonant, but as *-ŋ* after a vowel (cf. Genetti 1990: 111).

'also', and with a negated predicate, it serves to mean 'not even', or 'not any'. The suffix is also used with interrogative pronouns to form indefinite words ; e.g., *gunuŋ* 'someone/none (with a negative)' < *gu* 'who' + *-uŋ*, *hātiŋ* 'anything/nothing (with a negative)' < *hāti* 'what' + *-uŋ*. The form *-ŋ* appears in a concessive *saŋ* 'even if, although' - (cf. Genetti 1990: 112). In addition, the suffix "is used with numerals to mean 'all of' and changes 'two' to 'both'" (Genetti 1990: 112). This usage of the suffix seems similar to those of the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um*, i.e., 'totalizing'.

Lahu *thɔ* and *kà?* (Burmic):
Both particles mean 'also, even'. When following a predicate, they signify the sense of concessive 'even if', 'even though', or 'although' (cf. Matisoff 1973: 176). Note that, according to Matisoff (1973: 176), *thɔ* can occur "after both or the second of two nominal expressions (i.e., X (*thɔ*) X *thɔ*), while *kà?* cannot.

Lisu *xə* (Burmic):
'also', 'even' (cf. Hope 1974: 59).

5. Ainu *ka* and Lezgian *-ni* (North Caucasian)

In this investigation, I found two other Asian languages that having a morpheme having all of the usages listed in (1). One is Ainu, which possess a postpositional particle *ka*. According to Refging (1986: 104), this particle has functions and distributions quite similar to those of the Korean *to* and the Japanese *mo*. It can signify the senses of 'also', 'too', and 'even'. *Ka* is also used with interrogative pronouns to form indefinite pronouns; e.g., *nepka* 'something' < *nep* 'what' + *ka*, *nenka* 'somebody' < *nen* 'who' + *ka*. When these indefinite pronouns are used with a negated predicate, they are converted into negative indefinite pronouns; e.g., *nenka* ... + a negated predicate 'nobody' (cf. Refging 1986: 104). In this language, the form *ka* is also found in the "concessive conjunctionalizer" *yakka*, which is, according to Refging (1986: 254), "probably a combination of the conditional conjunctionalizer *yak* ... and the restrictive postposition *ka*".

The other Asian language that possess a morpheme having all of the usages listed in (1) is Lezgian (North Caucasian). In this language, there is a suffix *-ni*, which is called in Haspelmath (1993: 237) "focus marker", and is glossed as 'and, also, even'. When following "the Conditional form of the verb", it signifies the sense of concessive 'although'. The suffix is also used to form several types of indefinite pronouns. In Lezgian, there are four types of indefinite pronouns,

"ordinary indefinite" (e.g., *sa wuž jat'ani* 'someone'), "free-choice indefinite" (e.g., *wuž x̂ajit'ani* 'anyone'), "specific indefinite" (e.g., *sa kas* 'a person'), and "negative indefinite" (e.g., *sa kas-ni* 'nobody'; Haspelmath 1993: 194). Haspelmath (1993: 194) notes that the two indefinite markers *jat'ani* and *x̂ajit'ani*, which are used in ordinary indefinites and free-choice indefinites, are "concessive conditional verb forms [with *-ni*] of the standard copula *ja* and the verb *x̂a* 'be', respectively. Thus, the meaning of *wuž jat'ani* is literally 'whoever it may be'". Notice that the suffix *-ni* is also used to convert specific indefinite pronouns into negative indefinite pronouns; e.g., *sa kas-ni* 'nobody' (a negative indefinite) < *sa kas* 'a person' (a specific indefinite) + *-ni*.

6. Other language groups around the world

It has been said that similarities among different languages can be ascribed to either of the following four factors; 1) genetic relationship, 2) areal diffusion, borrowing or calque, 3) sheer accident, or 4) tendencies or universals (cf. Comrie 1981: 201). In the previous sections, I have shown that a number of Asian languages possess morphemes whose semantic strucuture are relatively similar to those of the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um*. Since these languages are spoken in geographically contiguous areas, it appears, at first glance, that factor 1 and/or factor 2, which comprise genetic relationship, areal diffusion, borrowing and/or calque, are the main factors accounting for the similarities examined above.

However, in order to excluding the other possibilities, i.e., sheer accident and universals, it is necessary to examine whether or not other languages in the world possess morphemes which have relatively similar semantic structures to those of the Asian morphemes discussed above. For this purpose, I have examined all of the other major language groups in the world[16], and found a number of other languages in which there are morphemes having usages relatively similar to those of the Asian morphemes examined above.

---

[16] Namely, Khoisan, Niger-Congo, Indo-European, Basque, Uralic, Yukaghir, Gilyak, Chukchi-Kamchatkan, Sinitic (Sino-Tibetan), Munda, Mon-Khmer, Daic, Austronesian, Trans-New Guinean and other languages spoken in Papua New Guinea, Australian and all of the major language groups existing in the North and South American continents. I have not, however, examined South Caucasian languages.

One of them is Quechua (Quechuan), which is spoken in South America. This language possesses a suffix *-pis ~ -si*,[17] which, according to Weber (1989), has the following usages; 1) 'even, to the extent that', 2) 'also, in addition to', 3) 'and'; when repeated, 'both ... and ...', 4) 'even though', 'although', 5) with interrogative pronouns, it forms indefinite pronouns; e.g. *pi-ta-pis* 'to whomever' < *pi* 'who' + *ta* 'an object marker' + *pis*; with a negative *mana*, they are converted into negative indefinites; e.g., *mana ... ima-pis* 'nothing' < *ima* 'what' + *pis*; - Weber (1989: 370). In addition, the suffix *-pis ~ -si* can also serve as a marker of indefiniteness; e.g., *alli-ta-pis* 'something good' (*alli* 'good' + *ta* 'an object marker' + *pis*), and as "the right boundary marker of qualified expressions"; e.g., *llapan mundu-chaw ka-q-kuna-pis* 'all those in the world' (*illapan* 'all', *mundu* 'world', *-chaw* 'a locative marker', *ka* 'be', *-q* 'substantivizing subordinator', *kuna* 'plural').

The other languages in which I found morphemes having usages relatively similar to those of the Asian languages discussed above are all spoken in Central Africa. In Kanuri (Nilo-Saharan), for instance, there is a particle *yé*, which is glossed as 'also' in Lukas (1967: 144). This particle has a correlative usage; i.e., *yé ... yé* means 'as well .. as ..' (146), and possibly it is etymologically related to another particle *yayé* 'but, nevertheless' (144). The latter particle, which is also used to signify the meaning of 'even if' (165), forms indefinite expressions with interrogative words; e.g., *nduyayé* 'whoever' < *ndu* 'who' + *yayé* (150). The Kanuri *yé* is probably related to *yàayé* 'even, ever' in Ngizim[18] and to *yé* '(both) ... and ...' in Margi (both of which belong to Chadic/Afro-Asiatic).[19] The Ngizim *yàayé* and the Margi *yé* are both used to convert interrogative words into indefinite words; e.g., Ngizim: *tìiye* 'everyone, whoever' < *tài* 'who ?' + *yàayé* - cf. Schuh (1972: 178, 211)[20]; Margi: *wàyé* 'everybody, everyone' < *wà?* 'who ?' + *yé* - cf. Hoffmann (1963: 91, 104). These two morphemes are also used to signify the sense of concessive (conditional) 'even if', 'although', 'even though' - cf. Schuh (1972: 352) and Hoffmann (1963: 286).

---

[17] Weber (1989: 369) notes that *-pis* and *-si* are "free (unconditioned) variants".
[18] Its reduced form is *-yé*.
[19] Note that Kanuri, Ngizim and Margi are spoken in geographically contiguous areas.
[20] Schuh (1972: 205-6) notes that there are other forms for those indefinites, which are interrogative words themselves followed by *yàayé*; e.g., *tài yàayé* 'whoever'.

In Margi, there also exist indefinite expressions that are formed with interrogative words preceded by *kwá* (*kò*) 'or', 'even'; e.g., *kó wà* 'everybody' (cf. Hoffmann 1963: 104-5, 268). Hoffmann (1963: 269) notes that "*Kwá* is of foreign origin and related to H. [Hausa] *kō* 'or, whether; even; even if', &c., F. [Fulani (Niger-Congo)] *kō* 'or; even; not even', &c." Apparent cognates of this morpheme is found in a number of neighboring languages. Some of those morphemes are listed below:

Chadic

Logone *kă* 'und' (Lukas 1966: 57),
Pero *ko* (Frajzyngier 1989):
It is used with interrogative words to form indefinite expressions; e.g., *kó-nnòn* 'whoever' < *ko* + *nón* 'who' (217, 224). This is possibly related to *-kò* 'even if' (305).

Semitic

Tigre *ka* 'and', 'and so, therefore', 'then (in that case)', 'then (next in order of time)' - (cf. Raz 1983: 89).

Nilo-Saharan

Dinka *ku* 'and'; *ke*, *kek* 'and, with' (Nebel 1948: 93).
Shilluk *ke* 'and ("joining two words")'; *ka* 'and ("joining two sentences")', 'when' (Kohnen 1933: 86, 89).
Bari *ko* 'and, with' (Spagnolo 1933: 212).
Nandi *ak*, *ok* 'also', 'and, with'; *akut* 'even'; *ako* 'but' (Hollis 1969: 229, 233, 255).

It should also be noted that in Margi the sense of '(both) ... and' can be expressed not only by *yé*, but also by *má* (with a negative, 'neither ... nor'), which is also glossed as 'even' (cf. Hoffmann 1963: 262, 269). This morpheme is probably a borrowing from Semitic. The following are some of the Semitic morphemes that are supposedly related to the Margi *má*.

Tigre *ma* 'or' (Raz 1983: 89).
This morpheme is probably related to *ma*, which is used with *man* 'who?' to form *manma* 'nobody, no one' (cf. Raz 1983: 44).
Chaha *-m* 'and', 'even' (Leslau 1950: 19, 22).
This is possibly related to *-əm*, which is used with interrogative words to form indefinite words (cf. Leslau 1950: 21).

In Lamang, which is closely related to Margi, the sense of 'or' can be expressed by *bàtà*, which is used to "conjoin noun phrases", but not sentences (Wolff 1983: 260). This morpheme also serves as a "concessive conjunction" 'even if' (249), and as an "indefinite determinative" (249), which is used to form indefinite words; e.g., *bàtà wà* 'whoever' < *bàta* + **wa* (> *wé* 'who?') - cf. Wolff (1983: 211, 254).

In no other language groups, could I find morphemes which show this degree of semantic similarity to the Asian morphemes discussed in the previous sections. This of course does not mean that such morphemes do not exist in those language groups, for it is quite likely that the grammatical descriptions that I referred to fail to include morphemes meaning 'even', 'also', etc.

7. Comparison

In the previous section, I have shown that there are a number of non-Asian languages which possess morphemes whose semantic structures are relatively similar to those of the Asian languages discussed earlier. On the basis of this fact, one may consider that the existence of the similarities found between some of those Asian languages may be accidental.

Before drawing any conclusion, it is, however, important to examine to what extent the semantic structures and the distribution of the morphemes discussed above are similar each other, and to what extent they are cross-linguistically unique. For this purpose, I will first compare the morphemes of the Asian languages discussed above (in what follows, they will be called "the Asian morphemes") with English words such as *even*, *also*, *too*, etc. (7.1.). I will then compare the former with the Quechua *-pis* ~ *-si*, and with the morphemes of the African languages discussed in the previous section (in what follows, they will be called "the African morphemes) - (7.2.). Finally, I will discuss some notable similarities and differences among the Asian morphemes (7.3.).

7.1. One of the most significant differences between English and the Asian languages discussed above is that while in the former the sense of 'even' and that of 'also' are expressed by two different morphemes, in the latter they can be expressed

by one single morpheme, the meaning of which seems to depend upon the context. Thus, although the Asian morphemes can be rendered into English by *even*, *also*, etc., they are markedly different in meaning.

The Asian morphemes are also markedly different from *even*, *also*, etc., with respect to their distribution. First, the Asian morphemes can follow not only a nominal, but also a predicate. It is generally the case that when they follow a nominal, they are rendered by the English words *even*, *also*, *too*, etc., while when they follow a predicate, they are rendered by English conjunctions, *although*, *even though*, *even if*, etc.

Second, all of the Asian morphemes are postpositions or suffixes, i.e., they immediately follow the focused constituent, regardless of whether it is a nominal or a predicate. On the other hand, *even* always precedes the focused constituent. In the case of *also*, it can either precede or follow the focused constituent. These points are illustrated in the following examples.

(2) **English**

a Even [John] came to the party.
b John even [came to the party].
c [John] also [came to the party].
d John came to the party, also/too.

In (2a) where *even* precedes the subject *John*, the focus is the subject, the constituent that immediately follows. When it follows the subject (cf. (2b)), the focus is also the constituent that follows, i.e., the whole predicate, or a part of it. In the case of *also*, it can either precede or follow the potential focus (cf. (2c)). In other words, either the subject or the predicate is its focus, depending upon the stress pattern and the context. *Also*, like *too*, can also be placed at the end of a sentence (cf. (2d)). In that case the focused constituent is either the subject or the predicate.

Third, as far as the Japanese *mo* and the Mongolian *či*/*ču* are concerned, they cannot occur at the end of a sentence.[21] There are cases in which they follow a predicate. In those cases, the predicates are, however, usually non-finite verbs. In

[21] Street (1984: 124) notes that "*či*/*ču* never occurs at the beginning or end of a sentence".

this respect, those two morphemes are different from *too*, which can occur at the end of a sentence, as illustrated in (2d).

The Asian morphemes also differ from English *and*. While *and* occurs only before the last conjoined element (i.e., A, B, C, ... and Z), the Asian morphemes can occur after all of the conjoined elements (e.g., Japanese *mo*; A *mo*, B *mo*, C *mo*, ... Z *mo*).

7.2. It is apparent that there is a surprising similarity between the Quechua *-pis ~ -si* and the Asian morphemes with respect to their semantic structures. The former is also similar to the latter with respect to the distribution; that is, like the Asian morphemes: 1) it can follow not only a nominal, but also a predicate, 2) it follows the focused constituent, 3) when it is used to conjoin more than two elements, it can occur after all of the conjoined elements.

There is, however, one major difference between them. That is, the Quechua *-pis ~ -si* can be used as a marker of indefiniteness, and as the right boundary marker of qualified expressions. Although these usages seem similar to some extent to the function of 'totalizing' for the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian *-*um*, the similarity is minimal.

Similarities between the Asian and the African morphemes are less apparent. Since most of the African morphemes are described only briefly, their exact meanings, usages and distribution are difficult to ascertain. Moreover, some of the language descriptions that I referred to are old, and are often sketchy. Nevertheless, it can be said that the African morphemes are not so similar among themselves as the Asian morphemes are. Moreover, the similarities observed between the Asian languages and those noted between the African languages seem slightly different in nature. For instance, while all of the Asian morphemes follow the focused constituent, many of the African morphemes precede the focused constituent.

7.3. The similarities among the Asian morphemes have already been discussed above. So, I will only point out some of the notable differences among them here. One of these is found in the distribution of indefinite words formed with a morpheme meaning 'also', 'even'. In some languages, those indefinite words

occur only with a negated predicate; e.g., Japanese, Mongol (cf. Janhunen 1990: 87). In other words, they always serve as negative indefinites. In other languages, on the other hand, indefinite words can occur both with a non-negated predicate, and with a negated predicate.[22]

Another difference is found in concessive (conditional) constructions. In most of the Asian languages discussed above, concessive (conditional) constructions are formed with a conditional 'if' followed by a morpheme meaning 'also', 'even', etc. (often these two types of morphemes were reanalyzed as one morpheme) - e.g., Sanskrit *api* (*yadi api* 'even if', 'even though' < *yadi* 'if' + *api*), Lhasa Tibetan *'ää* (*-nää* 'even if' < *-na* 'if' + *'ää*), Ainu *ka* (*yakka* 'although', 'even though' < *yak* 'if' + *ka*), Lezgian *-ni* (*-t'a-ni* 'even if', 'although' < *-t'a* 'if' + *-ni*).[23] By contrast, in the cases of the Japanese *mo* and the Korean *to*/*do*, it can by itself signify the sense of concessive (conditional) 'even if', 'even though' or/and 'although'. This seems to be related to the fact that, in both Korean and Japanese, the conditional marker is thought to be etymologically related to a particle called 'topic' or 'contrastive' marker, which is in a complementary distribution with the morpheme meaning 'even', 'also'[24]; i.e., Korean: *-mjęn* 'if' < *-m* + *ię* + *nin* 'Topic'; Japanese: *-ba* 'if' < **pa ?? > wa* 'Topic'. In other words, the contrastive particle and the 'even, also' particle cannot cooccur on the same word (e.g., **X-to-nin, *X-nin-to; *X-wa-mo, *X-mo-wa*).[25] It is also interesting to note that, like the Japanese *mo* and the Korean *to*/*do*, the Quechua *-pis ~ -si* is used by itself to signify the sense of 'even though', 'although', and can cooccur neither with a conditional marker nor with a topic marker *-qa* (cf. Weber 1989: 369).

---

[22] It is interesting to note that whereas Written Mongolian indefinites with *cü* and Khalkha indefinites with *č* (cf. Street 1962: 237) can occur both with a non-negated predicate, and with a negated predicate, Mongol indefinites with *ci* occur only with a negated predicate.

[23] In Tamil, concessive clauses are formed either with *-aalum* (< *-aa(l)* 'if' + *-um*) or *-um* alone. Asher (1987: 45-6) notes that "If the reference is to future time, *-aalum* is added to a simple past stem .. in a positive clause, while concession clauses referring to events that took place in past time have *-um* added to a simple past stem".

[24] For the distribution of the Korean particles, see Yang (1972).

[25] Furthermore, in both languages these two types of particles can occur with a number of other postpositions such as a particle called a 'dative marker', but not with a particle called a 'nominative marker' (Korean *ka* or *i*/*i*, Japanese *ga*), nor with a particle called an 'accusative marker' (Korean *lül*, Japanese *wo*).

The other major difference among the Asian morphemes is that, while the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um* both can be used to signify the meaning of 'totalizing' or 'summing', most of the other Asian morphemes lack this kind of usage. It may be suggested that one of the usages possessed by the Dolakha Newari suffix *-uɳ* is similar to the above usage for the Sanskrit *api* and the Dravidian **-um*; i.e. with numerals, it means 'all of', and changes 'two' to 'both'.

8. Conclusion

In this study, I have shown that similar linguistic features exist or existed in a number of Asian languages. Those include Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus, Korean, Japanese, Ainu, Tibeto-Burman, Dravidian, Sanskrit and North Caucasian. Since those languages and language groups exist or existed in geographically contiguous areas, it may be speculated that the similarities noted in this study are not historical accident. However, I have also shown that similar linguistic features exist in other language groups as well, namely Quechua and some of the Central African languages (which belong either to Nilo-Saharan or to Afro-Asiatic).

Since Quechua is spoken in South America, it seems unlikely that the linguistic feature shared by the Quechua *-pis ~ -si* and the Asian morphemes is a diffused one. It seems rather more likely that the existence of this similarity is related to the fact that Quechua exhibits a number of linguistic features similar to those of the Asian languages. For instance, Quechua is a SOV language, and the case functions of nominals are expressed by nominal suffixes. Furthermore, like the Asian languages, Quechua has a number of nominal suffixes signifying various kinds of meanings, such as 'just', 'yet', etc. (those suffixes are called "shading suffixes" in Weber 1989: 357). However, more careful studies must be done in order to substantiate the proposition that there is a relation between the existence of the type of morpheme discussed in this study and certain other types of linguistic features.

This kind of typological explanation seems less likely in the case of the Central African languages discussed above, for the structural features manifested in those languages are in many respects different from those of the Asian languages. On the other hand, it is not totally inconceivable that the similarities between the

semantic structures and the usages of the African morphemes more carefully, and to explore historical relations between the Central African languages themselves.

Because there exist a number of non-Asian languages which possess morphemes whose semantic structures are relatively similar to those of the Asian ones, it is possible that the similarities found between some of the Asian languages discussed above are historical accidents, or are due to typological tendencies. At this preliminary stage of investigation, it is difficult to determine which similarities are those resulting from actual historical relations, and which are those resulting from tendencies, sheer chance, etc. Nevertheless, it may be useful to recognize that the type of morpheme discussed in this study exists in a number of Asian languages, which constitutes a wide geographical area, for otherwise one tends to pay attention to a couple of languages only.[26] It may also be useful to compare this area with the isoglosses delimited in Masica (1976) by other linguistic features.[27]

It is also important to investigate in what ways the semantic structures of the morphemes discussed above have historically evolved. It was mentioned earlier that while in modern languages the Mongolian *ču/či* has all of the usages listed in (1), in the early Middle Mongolian period it lacked some of the usages, i.e., 1) 'both ... and ...', 2) 'even if', 'although', 3) the usage for forming indefinite words. This may be regarded as a semantic broadening. A similar semantic broadening is found in the history of Japanese, where the use of the particle *mo* as a concessive was established in Middle Japanese. These facts seem to suggest that this kind of semantic broadening is quite natural.[28] This may partially account for the existence of the similaries among the languages discussed above.

It may be speculated from this that even if some of the morphemes discussed in this study are calques or borrowings from other languages, it is not necessarily the case that the borrowed items possessed all of the usages found only at much later stages. In other words, it is conceivable that after a morpheme was

---

[26] As was mentioned earlier, Street (1984) suggests that the development of some usages for *ču/či* may have resulted from Tibetan influence. However, it seems also possible that it resulted from the influence of some other languages, e.g., Sanskrit.

[27] Masica (1976) points out that a number of linguistic features are shared by Asian and East Central African languages.

[28] This may be supported by the fact that in numbers of languages a morpheme meaning 'also', 'even', etc. is used to form concessive (conditional) constructions (e.g., English *even if*).

borrowed from one language to another, the two languages have independently developed similar semantic structures for the morpheme.

There is little doubt that it is the most imperative task to determine which similarities are those resulting from areal diffusion, and which are those resulting from undiscovered genetic relationships. The relation between the Korean *to/do* and the Tungus particles such as the Even *-də* should be investigated in the immediate future, for their forms are similar, and the genetic relation between Korean and Tungus has often been suggested. The relation between the Tibetan *yaṅ*, the Khaling *yo* and the Newari *naM* is also worth being investigated. The similarities between these Bodic morphemes (particularly the Classical Newari *naM* and the Dolakha Newari *-uŋ*) and the Dravidian **-um* are interesting. As mentioned earlier, both Dolakha Newari *-uŋ* and Dravidian **-um* are used with numerals and quantifiers such as 'all' to signify the sense of 'totalizing'. Since this usage is not found in the other Asian languages discussed in this study, a particular relation between those morphemes is speculated.

References

Asher, R.E. 1987. Tamil (Croom Helm Descriptive grammars). London: Croom Helm.

Benzing, Johannes. 1955a. Die tungusischen Sprachen. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

----------. 1955b. Lamutische grammatik. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Beyer, Stephan V. 1992. The Classical Tibetan language. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981. Language universals and linguistic typology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Emeneau, M.B. 1974. The Indian linguistic area revisited. International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics. 3: 92-134.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1989. A grammar of Pero. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Genetti, Carol. 1990. A descriptive and historical account of the Dolakha Newari dialect. The University of Oregon. Ph.D. Dissertation.

----------. 1991. From postposition to subordinator in Newari. Approaches to grammaticalization, vol II: focus on types of grammatical markers, eds., by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, 227-55. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grønbech, Kaare, and John R. Krueger. [1955] 1976^2. An introduction to Classical (Literary) Mongolian. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. A grammar of Lezgian. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hoffmann, Carl. 1963. A Grammar of the Margi Language. London: Oxford University Press.

Hollis, A. C. 1909. The Nandi: their language and folklore. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
Hope, Edward R. 1974. The deep syntax of Lisu sentences: a transformational case grammar. Canberra: The Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics series B, no. 34].
Hoshi, Michiyo. 1988. Gendai chibetto-go bunpoo: Rasa-hoogen (Modern Tibetan grammar: Lhasa dialect). Tokyo: UNESCO East Asian Cultural Research Center.
Itabashi, Yoshizo. 1988. A comparative study of the Old Japanese accusative case suffix *wo* with the Altaic accusative case suffixes. Central Asiatic Journal 32: 193-231.
Janhunen, Juha. 1990. Material on Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
Jäschke, Heinrich August. [1883] 1989. Tibetan grammar. Delhi: Sri Satguru.
----------. [1881] 1995. A Tibetan-English dictionary. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Jørgensen, Hans. 1941. A grammar of the Classical Newari. Copenhagen: Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. XXVII.
Kohnen, B. 1933. Shilluk grammar. Verona: Missioni Africane.
Leslau, Wolf. 1950. Ethiopic documents: Gurage. New York: Viking Fund.
Lukas, Johannes. 1966. Die Logone-Sprache im Zentralen Sudan. Nendeln: Kraus.
------. 1967. A study of the Kanuri language: grammar and vocabulary. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall.
Malla, Kamal P. 1985. The Newari language: a working outline. Tokyo: Institute for the study of languages and cultures.
Martin, Samuel E. 1990. Morphological clues to the relationships of Japanese and Korean. Linguistic change and reconstruction methodology, ed., by Pilip Baldi, 483-509. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Masica, Colin P. 1976. Defining a linguistic area: South Asia. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Matisoff, James A. 1973. The grammar of Lahu. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Nebel, P.A. 1948. Dinka grammar. Verona: Missioni Africane.
Poppe, Nicholas. 1960. Buriat grammar. The Hague: Mouton.
----------. [1954] 1974[3]. Grammar of Written Mongolian. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
Ramstedt, G. J. 1968. A Korean grammar. The Netherlands: Anthropological Publications.
Raz, Shlomo. 1983. Tigre grammar and texts. Malibu: Undena.
Refsing, Kirsten. 1986. The Ainu language: the morphology and syntax of the Shizunai dialect. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
Schuh, Russell G. 1972. Aspects of Ngizim Syntax. UCLA. Ph.D. Dissertation.
Shafer, Robert. 1955. Classification of the Sino-Tibetan languages. Word. 11: 94-111.
Spagnolo, Fr. L. M. 1933. Bari Grammar. Verona: Missioni Africane.
Street, John. 1962. Khalkha structure. Hague: Mouton.
----------. 1981. The particle *ber* in the Secret History. Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher N.F. 1: 142-68.
----------. 1984. The particle *či/ču* in Early Middle Mongolian. Central Asiatic Journal. 28: 119-152.

Toba, Sueyoshi. 1984. Khaling. Asian & African Grammatical Manual No. 13d. Tokyo: Institute of the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Weber, David John. 1989. A grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wolff, Ekkehard. 1983. A grammar of the Lamang language. Glückstadt: Augustin.

Yang, In-Seok. 1972. Korean syntax: case markers, delimiters, complementation, and relativization. Ph.D. Dissertation. The University of Hawaii.