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In a broad sense the comparative is a functional category exhibiting a correlation of objects in a real or imaginary world by their features: qualities, states of being, status, etc., and demonstrating their alignment on a scale of measurement. Comparison cannot be performed without the fulfillment of two prerequisites. First, there should be a basis in common; that means that objects have to be compatible, let us say, with respect to a feature of distance, size, position, etc. These features are usually represented by adjectives, certain sorts of verbs, qualitative nouns, etc. Throughout this paper such words will be called feature words (F).

Second, there should be at least three positions on the scale of comparison: a starting point and two or more points oriented to the starting point. If there are two or more objects endowed with a certain feature but there is no starting point then a comparison is not possible because either one of them could be taken as the point of reference. When, for instance, we set out to compare objects in respect to a certain feature, one of them, the object of comparison, is always marked as being a certain distance from zero, with the starting point as zero. In fact no feature is a priori attached to one definite point on the scale of measurement, but it usually represents a conventional average notion of this or that feature which is determined by the objective situation and which has been formed in the course of the acquisition of reality. For example, for villagers the word big in a phrase big building tends to be associated with one size (two or three stories), but for townspeople it tends to be associated with a different size (many stories).

In linguistics the term comparative is usually connected with an alignment of certain correlative forms on a graded scale or with the establishment of a paradigm of degrees of comparison. There are two types of gradation, absolute and relative, or in other terms, objective and subjective. The former reflects degrees of a feature irrespective of another object; the latter reflects degrees of the feature in relation to the same feature in another object.

Absolute gradation usually manifests itself by lexical means, and in some instances by a few derivational affixes. Tai languages\(^1\) as a rule use only lexical-semantic means to express it. For instance, in standard Thai the feature \textit{naaw}^5 'cold' can be specified by means of different particles, e.g. \textit{khoon}^3-\textit{khaang}^3 \textit{naaw}^5 'rather cold', \textit{kiap}^2 \textit{naaw}^5 'almost cold', \textit{naaw}^5 \textit{maak}^4 'very cold', \textit{naaw}^5 \textit{ca}^2

---

\(^1\)In this paper Tai is used in a broad sense to include Tai proper, Kam-Sui, and other related languages.
‘extremely cold’, etc. This is also true for other Tai languages. On the whole the ways and means of displaying absolute gradation in Tai lie in the field of semantics and syntax.

Relative gradation, our main interest in this paper, manifests itself in the Tai languages either by morphosyntactic means, i.e. syntactic constructions or special morphemes, or by configurational means, i.e. by word order. Of these two the morphosyntactic means is predominant. It occurs in all of the Tai languages, while the configurational means is employed only in a few Tai languages, often alongside a morphosyntactic means.²

The configurational means of showing comparison presupposes a fixed order of the sentence constituents. It can be represented by the three part formula <S F O>, that is, the feature word is at the center, with the subject and the object being compared on either side of it.

Mulao
hɔi² lo⁴ njaa² (gaa² pe¹) I old you (two year)
S F O Qt I am (two years) older than you.

Maonan
fia² van¹ _RESOURCES1² (saam¹ zjen²) I tall he (three inch)
I am (three inches) taller than he.

Kam
tjiw² naaj⁶ jaa³ (tjiw² ta⁵) Clf. this long (Clf. three-foot)
This (rope) is (three feet) longer than that one.

The use of configurational means is possible only under certain conditions, i.e. when there is a quantitative extension (Qt) showing a specific measure of difference between the two objects. This type of comparative construction we found only in languages of the Kam-Sui group, with no vestiges of it discovered in other Tai groups.

Another kind of comparison, which looks like an intermediate form between the configurational and the morpho-syntactic forms, contains a modal particle (M) in the position before the feature word, i.e. <S M F>.

Lao
(maak⁵-phaaw³ jai⁵ tee) maak⁵-moo² heen⁴ jai⁵
S M F
(coconut big but) watermelon much big
Coconuts are big but watermelons are much bigger.

²In representing comparative constructions the following abbreviations will be used: S - subject of comparison, O - object of comparison; S and O are the two counterparts in the comparison. M - a preverbal modal particle meaning ‘more, much’; F - feature words, such as adjectival and stative verbs, quantitative nouns, and a few other words; C - morphosyntactic marker indicating comparison; Pr - preposition attached to the object of comparison.
The essential peculiarity of these sentences is the absence of an overt object of comparison; it is understood from the previous context but it cannot be reinstated into its natural position, so we cannot interpret this event as just an ordinary deletion. Sentences of the <S M F> pattern never start a new topic of discourse; conversely, they always follow other sentences, developing the original topic. From a discourse perspective such sentences are cataphoric. In that case a zero position after the feature word should be treated as anaphoric ellipsis with syntactic value, i.e. it implicitly represents the counterpart of the relationship in point.3

Morphemes functioning as modal particles in such sentences differ from one language to another; they include khee4 (Ahom, Khamti, Phake, Shan, Lue, Laha), jin3 (St.Thai, Lao), heer4 (Lao), laai1 (Nung), ham3 (Tho) nok4 (Lungming) etc. All of them have the meaning ‘much, more’. One of the most widely used of these is khee4, occurring in various Tai languages spoken along the northern perimeter of Indochina. It seems that this morpheme is genetically cognate with Chinese geng which has the same meaning ‘much, more’. From ancient times down to the present this has been used in Chinese as an elative particle for displaying the greater degree of a feature without referring to someone or something within a given sentence, e.g. jintian tianqi geng len ‘Today the weather is much colder’ (lit. today weather much cold). This similarity of form, meanings, and functions could testify equally to a common origin or to borrowing. This issue

3In my material there are only a few evidences of comparative sentences of the pattern <S M F O>, as in Laha ta3 kwe3 khen1 khad2 su5 bom5 ta3 ’A woven chair is lighter than a wooden stool’ (lit. chair weave more light stool wood). Their number is so meagre that I do not find it reasonable to make them into a separate type. It is difficult to evaluate. Looked at from different perspectives it may turn out as an archaism, innovation, or merely stylistic error or gaps in linguistic competence. But we can not rule out the possibility of an ancient origin for this construction. The arrangement of the counterparts showed the elements of the comparison and their function, and the preverbal element showed the differences in degree.
should be solved against the background of historic-comparative investigations of Sino-Tai languages as a whole.

There are different definitions of these morphemes. They have usually been treated as adverbs of measure and degree, but in my opinion that is not quite correct. Unlike adverbs they always occupy the position before the verb, and they carry a meaning of subjective evaluation of a given feature rather than a relationship of comparison as such. Their modal and not relational nature will appear clearly in the objective comparative constructions discussed below. So it would be more correct to regard such morphemes as modals with residual lexical meaning. This might allow us to see these sentences as being intermediate between subjective and objective comparative sentences. They could be called anaphoric comparative sentences.\(^4\)

Cataphoric variants of the above cited anaphoric sentences take the following patterns: \(<S \ M \ F \ Pr \ O>\) or \(<S \ Pr \ O \ M \ F>\). These kinds of sentences occur only in the Tai languages in Assam and adjacent areas such as Khamti, Phake, Tai-Rong, and Ahom. The preposition (Pr) element is represented by such morphemes as \textit{mai} the marker of oblique case in Khamti, \textit{luk} the marker of Ablative in Ahom, \textit{hang} the marker of Dative or Ablative in Phake.

\begin{verbatim}
Khamti   kon^3   a-nai^2   mai   kon^3   a-nan^2   khen^3   surj^4  
S        Pr      O      M      F       
man      this    than    man    that    more    tall
This man is taller than that man.

Phake    chaw^3   khen    phi^2   han^4   khom^3   san^4  
S        M       F      Pr     O       
Chaw    more    fat    than    Khomsan
Chaw is fatter than Khomsan

Ahom     man      noj-man   khon   sun    luk    man    noj-yen  
S        M       F      Pr     O       
he      brother  more    high   than    he    sister
His brother is taller than his sister.
\end{verbatim}

These patterns in all probability have been derived from local East Indian languages, which resort to the ablative and other oblique cases in comparative constructions. It should be noted that although the syntactic functions of the nouns in such sentences are clearly established by the presence of prepositions, nonetheless the occurrence of modals is obligatory. It is probably accounted for by the fact that the opposition of direct and oblique cases marks only the relationship of comparison, while the modal element is responsible for marking the degree of the featured comparison.

\(^4\)This construction with an M element resembles the French pattern \(<\textit{plus} + \text{adjective}>\) in which the morpheme \textit{plus} just signifies subjective estimation of a feature and does not show ‘relationship’ as such. The latter becomes evident only when the adjectival element in the construction is followed by the particle \textit{que}. Cf. Tai-Tho \textit{ham^3 luon^1 qua^2 ving^1} and its French translation \textit{plus grand que Ving} ‘bigger than Ving’.
The most widespread types of comparative constructions include a special morpheme to mark the relationship of comparison (C). There are two varieties of such comparisons: \(<S \ F \ C \ O>\) or \(<S \ M \ F \ C \ O>\). These are common for the majority of Tai languages, if not for all of them. In most cases the modal particle is optional, but in some cases, as in Ahom, Khami, Nung, and perhaps others, it is obligatory. The C-unit is really a principal constituent of this pattern, as it controls the semantic and syntactic content of the whole proposition. The function of Comparative in various languages is performed by different morphemes having the original meaning ‘to surpass, exceed, overpass’. Only a few of them have a different source. All of these are deverbatives, many of them still coexisting with their etymons. These morphemes can be treated as auxiliaries, and can be taken either as homonyms of their related verb, or as being the verb itself in a different syntactic function. The specific classification of these morphemes does not matter for this paper; it can be discussed elsewhere. The diffusion of these morphemes in the Tai area is quite uneven, their isoglosses may be unique, discontinuous, or intersecting, and several of these morphemes may occur in the same language. The greatest variability has been found in the Southeastern branch, perhaps because these languages have been better described and more profoundly investigated.

Among these morphemes the best known is \textit{kwaa} (B2) ‘to go over, surpass’, which has been found in St.Thai, Lao, Phutai, Tai-Muei, Tai-Dam, Tai-Daeng, Tai-Khaw, Tho, Chuang, Buyi, Kam, Sui, Maonan, Mulao, and Li (Hlai).

\begin{itemize}
  \item St.Thai \textit{mee³-nam⁴ khoŋ⁵ jaaw¹ kwaa² mee³-nam⁴ caw³ phra³-jaal¹} S \ F \ C \ O river Khong long more river Chaopraya
  \item S.Chuang \textit{pow⁴ nei⁴ saan¹ kwaa⁵ pow⁴ han⁴} S \ F \ C \ O man this tall more man that
  \item Phutai \textit{hɔɔ³ lam³ nii³ cop⁵ kwaa³ hɔɔ³ lam³ nan⁵} S \ F \ C \ O boat Clf. this good Comp. boat Clf. that;
  \item Lao \textit{faa³ meep⁶ hun⁴ kwaa² dɔok-fai²} S \ F \ C \ O sky flash bright surpass electric bulb
  \item Tai-Tho \textit{slœŋ¹ nɔc⁵ kwaa² saam¹} S \ F \ C \ O two little surpass three
\end{itemize}

In the Kam-Sui group this morpheme appears as \textit{taa}⁶.
Maonan  
\[\eta^2 \text{ von}^1 \text{ taa}^6 \text{ fia}^2\]
\text{S F C O you tall surpass I You are taller than I.}

In Li (Hlai) its allomorpheme is \textit{duaa} \textsuperscript{2}.

Li  
\[\text{paa}^1 \text{ long}^1 \text{ duaa}^2 \text{ miiw}^2\]
\text{S F C O dog big to surpass cat Dogs are bigger than cats.}

There exist various definitions of these morphemes. For instance, J. Plam (1972:172) considers the morpheme \textit{kwaa} \textsuperscript{2} in St. Thai and Lao as an auxiliary particle of comparison; Vichin Panupong (1970:125) qualifies the same morpheme in St. Thai as a post-verbal auxiliary; R. Noss (1964:190) treats it as an adjective modifier; Udom Warotamasikkadit looks upon it as a lexical unit. The truth seems to lie somewhere in the middle. Data from St. Thai, Lao and many other Tai languages attest that such morphemes as \textit{kwaa} hardly belong to purely grammatical units. They still retain their lexical meaning and syntactic independence. It is particularly evident when they follow qualitative nouns or numerals.

Lao  
\[\text{njaam}^2 \text{ pa}^1\text{-sop}^1 \text{ kh\text{\textsuperscript{3}}-haai}^6 \text{ man}^2 \text{ joom}^2 \text{ mii}^2\]
\text{time meet misfortune it natural have}

\[\text{khun}^2\text{-khaa}^4 \text{ kwaa}^5 \text{ njam}^2 \text{ pok}^1\text{ka}^1\text{ti}^1\]
\text{value surpass time ordinary}

In time of need it is naturally more valuable than in ordinary times.

St. Thai  
\[\text{mii}^1 \text{ ngyyyn}^1 \text{ sip}^2 \text{ kwaa}^2 \text{ baat}^2\]
\text{have money ten surpass baht}

There is more than ten baht.

Its self-sufficiency is also corroborated by its separability from the feature word.

Lao  
\[\text{naan}^2 \text{ ngaam}^2 \text{ khyn}^6 \text{ kwaa}^5 \text{ kaw}^5 \text{ iik}^5\]
\text{she beautiful rise surpass before more. She became more beautiful than before.}

However, one must acknowledge that constant reiteration of this morpheme in standard comparative constructions would undoubtedly make it lose lexical meaning and acquire features of a marker of relationship, or would undergo grammaticalization to some degree.

In all probability this type of comparative construction has some connection with the Chinese language, particularly with Cantonese. It is rather explicitly attested by their substantial and structural similarity. Note St. Thai \textit{mai} \textsuperscript{4-sak} \textsuperscript{2} \textit{kheeng} \textsuperscript{1} \textit{kwaa} \textsuperscript{2} \textit{mai} \textsuperscript{3}-\textit{phai} \textsuperscript{2} ‘Teak is stronger than bamboo’, St. Chinese (\textit{tamen de shili}) \textit{da guuo renming de keming shili} ‘(Their forces) surpassed (lit.big surpass) the peoples revolutionary forces’ (Yuwen xuexi 1953:8:22), and Cantonese \ldots kow
kwo tsyngsin saang ‘...taller than Mr. Zang (Yankiver 1987:68). The Chinese morpheme guol/gwo (etymol. ‘to go across, to surpass’) belongs among the most ancient lexical units of Chinese. It has been used for conveying the idea of comparison since the early times. For instance, it occurs in Lungyu (6th cent. B.C.): yu yie hao yun kwo wo ‘Yu was braver than I’ (lit. Yu Predic. good brave surpass I). But such usage of the morpheme guol/gwo was not characteristic for ancient Chinese. For this purpose the ablative preposition yu had been usually used, occupying the position between adjectival verb and the noun. Approximately since the second millennium the main means for exhibiting comparison in Chinese has been the construction <S compared-with O V>. As far as I know only in Cantonese does the construction with gwo still serve as an ordinary means for displaying comparison. So there are grounds for inferring that the Tai morpheme kwaal kaal taa was originally borrowed from Chinese, unless comprehensive historical investigations repudiate this supposition and prove a common origin for Chinese gwo and Tai kwaal.

A number of Tai languages use other morphemes than kwaal for displaying comparison. But their feature in common is that all of them also bear the original meaning ‘to surpass, etc.’ and occupy the same position in the syntactic structure. Most well known among them are: lyyn⁴ ‘to surpass, exceed’ in Lao, Tai-Muei, Tai-Yang, Saek; nya⁷/ lya¹/ lœ⁰¹ ‘to be superior, above/over’ in Lue, Shan, Tai-Yang, Tai-Rong; sya⁷, which looks like a phonetic variant of the former, in Lao; kaaï⁷ ‘to go across’ in Tai-Yang; nan⁴ ‘to surpass, to exceed’ in one of the dialects of Buyi; njiu² ‘to go across’ in the Quba dialect of the Sha language; hœn ‘to exceed’, which was borrowed by Nung from Vietnamese.

The behaviour of these morphemes can be seen in the following sentences:

Tai-Muey
nam² nii⁵ vai³ lyyn⁵ nam³-khong¹ river this swift surpass Mekong
The current in this river is swifter than in the Mekong.

Tai-Yang
myy⁶-nii⁶ naaw¹ lœ⁰ myy⁶-waa⁴ today cold above yesterday
Today the weather is colder than yesterday.

Lue
tan⁵ hang⁵ lœ⁰ poc⁵-mee⁵ he rich above parents
He is richer than his parents.

Laha
lœn² zen⁶ kwaang² sya lœn² e⁶ house I wide superior house you
My house is wider than yours.

Buyi
faa² man⁶ nan⁴ naam⁶ metal strong surpass ceramics
Metal is stronger than ceramics.

Sha
to-bee⁴ sai¹ njiu² to-mœw¹ sheep clean surpass pig
Sheep are cleaner than pigs.
As seen in the above cited examples, the dominant cognitive basis for making a comparison is often the notion of the superiority of one object over another with regard to a certain feature. However, in some other Tai languages the dominant cognitive basis for a comparison is the notion of separation, rejection, or repudiation of the object of comparison. This notion exists in many languages of the world, i.e. the notion that the object of comparison goes apart, moves away from the subject of comparison. It is attested by the usage of ablative case for the object of comparison in a good number of inflectional languages. In some Tai languages for this purpose they use the morpheme se⁴, which has the etymological meaning 'to separate, lose, be separated, be lost'. This morpheme occurs in S. and N. Shan, Nora, Khuen, and White Tai.

S. Shan
man⁴ li⁴-ngaam⁴ se¹ saaw¹ tai⁴
she beautiful separated girl Tai
She is more beautiful than Tai girls.

White Tai
mak²-tæŋ¹ waan¹ se¹ mak²-kæŋ¹
melon sweet separated pineapple
Melons are sweeter than pineapples.

N. Shan (Dehun)
man² kæi⁴ si¹ kaw⁶
he dexterous separated I
He is more dexterous than I.

As was mentioned before, some Tai languages prefer to use a contaminated contiguous construction including both M and C elements.

Khamti
khen³ sung⁴ lym-shi a-nan²
muchM high comp.C that
much higher than that

Nung
can¹ laai¹ hæŋ³ hæn⁵ myn³
I muchM strong surpassC you
I am much stronger than you.

Laha
kæn¹ kwaang² sya¹ lon² e⁶
muchM wide aboveC house that
much wider than that house

It seems that in most events the M element should be considered desirable rather than obligatory or optional. Its occurrence depends on the intention of the speaker to emphasize the difference of degree, not on the necessity to display a comparison as such. The latter, as has been said, realizes itself by means of morphemes specialized for this function.

The S and O positions in comparative constructions can be filled by different parts of speech. Not only objects, whether real or imaginary, but also actions, states, events, etc., are able to come into a relationship of comparison. When the object of comparison is either an indefinite pronoun, or a word designating collective plurality, or a phrase with generalizing meaning, the construction in question acquires the syntactic meaning of superlative.
Lue  
la¹-du¹  hōn⁴  lə¹  pən⁵  
season  hot  Comp.  other  
The summer was extremely hot.

Lao  
suk¹  kwaa⁵  muu⁵  
ripe  Comp.  group  
riper than the rest

Tai-Yang  
phaeng⁴  kaaï¹  phēo  
expensive  Comp.  whoever  
most expensive

Phutai  
cop⁵  kwaa³  mət⁵  mUU⁵  
good  Comp.  all  group  
best of all

Laha  
kwaang²  səa¹  məi⁶  
wide  Comp.  every  
widest of all

Tai-Tho  
dia⁵  luong¹  qua²  moi⁴  can⁵  
Dia  big  Comp.  every  person  
Dia is taller than everybody.

Lao  
baang²  khon²  mya⁶  maw²  lee²-kɔ⁵  yai⁵  
some  person  when  drunk  then  big  
kwaan²  baan³  kwaa⁵  myang²  
surpass  village  surpass  town  
Some people when drunk think themselves the greatest in the world.⁵

There are only a few Tai languages that have a special morpheme to express superlative degree, e.g. St. Thai thii³-sut² ‘most’, derived from the noun phrase thii³-sut² ‘end’ (lit. place finish); Laha nget⁴ derived from the numeral ‘one, first’.

St. Thai  
yai²  thii³-sut²  ‘biggest’

Laha  
kwaang¹  nget⁴  ‘widest’

Their syntactic features, i.e. position and function, are the same as adverbs in these languages. So the above at least attests to the absence of a basic superlative degree in Tai languages.

Thus the relationship of comparison in Tai languages is largely manifested by the following six syntactic constructions:

⁵The words baan² ‘village’ and myang² ‘town’ here are used metaphorically with the meaning ‘all the people in the country or in the world’; the repetition of the morpheme kwaa² before each word testifies once more to its lexical rather than grammatical nature.
Of these the third and the fourth are standard and widely used, the first is restricted lexically, the second is anaphoric, and the fifth and the sixth are local, i.e. they occur only in some areas under the influence of alien languages.

For the greater part of the Tai languages the relationship of comparison is bound up with the concept of superiority of one object over another with respect to a given feature. This phenomenon is intrinsic not only for Tai but also for many other languages of Indochina, including Mon-Khmer, Viet-Muong, and southern Chinese dialects. In other words, it is an areal feature. For a smaller number of Tai languages the relationship of comparison is associated with the concepts of separation, alienation, or moving away that distinguish Tai and Austroasiatic languages from the adjacent Austronesian, Tibeto-Burman and Modern St. Chinese languages.

Data from Tai languages demonstrate a great variety of forms and means for displaying comparison. This attests to a rather recent adoption of the overt surface forms for exhibiting the cognitive category of comparison. And the adoption has taken place separately for each language or group of languages.

The above seems to give enough grounds to posit that Tai languages still lack a grammatical category for comparison as it is understood in general linguistics, that is, as a paradigm of regular obligatory formal oppositions. Instead there are only first signs that claim the right to become formal marks of that category. Future development will show whether these elements match such a definition or not.
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