



**HAL**  
open science

## Baima nominal postpositions and their etymology

Ekaterina Chirkova

► **To cite this version:**

Ekaterina Chirkova. Baima nominal postpositions and their etymology. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 2005, 28 (2), pp.1-41. halshs-00104301

**HAL Id: halshs-00104301**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00104301>**

Submitted on 23 Nov 2006

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Báimǎ nominal postpositions and their etymology<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Báimǎ

Báimǎ is a non-literary Tibeto-Burman language, spoken by approximately 10.000 people in three counties (Jiǔzhàigōu, Sōngpān, Píngwǔ) in the north of Sìchuān Province and one neighboring county (Wénxiàn) in the south of Gānsù Province in the People's Republic of China (PRC). The Báimǎ people reside in the immediate proximity of the Qiāng (to their South-West), the Chinese (East and South) and the Tibetans (West and North).

The Báimǎ language is currently regarded as unclassified with a tentative affiliation to the Himalayish branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family (*Ethnologue*). Sūn Hóngkǎi, who pioneered Báimǎ research in the late 1970s, classifies Báimǎ as an independent language in the Tibetan branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family (1983: 100). Other Báimǎ specialists consider it a dialect of Tibetan, probably of the Khams group.

The problematic affiliation of the Báimǎ language (separate language or Tibetan dialect) is partly due to the controversy surrounding the ethnic classification of the Báimǎ people. In 1951, the Báimǎ 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 Báimǎ (Sìchuān Shěng Míngzú Yánjiūsuǒ 1980, Zēng et al. 1987). The Dī, whose name frequently appears

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

together with that of the Qiāng in Chinese historical sources, are currently considered to be related to the Qiāng (cf. Lǐ 1987: 46, Mǎ 1984). Recently, Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 116-117) even argue for a Dī substratum in Báimǎ 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 to 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 Báimǎ has a Dī substratum equals saying that Báimǎ has some kind of substratum, which is not yet identified.

## **2. Nominal postpositions**

This article focuses on nominal postpositions in Báimǎ. 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 Báimǎ are used for marking topic, the agent, the instrument, the genitive, the locative, the ablative, the comitative, the comparative, among other functions.

Scholars who previously worked on Báimǎ, Sūn Hóngkǎi (Nishida and Sūn 1990; further developed in Sūn 2003a and 2003b) and Huáng Bùfán and Zhāng Míng huì (Huáng and 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 Sūn tabulation, lists the analyses of

---

Research on Báimǎ has been made possible through the generous support of the Frederik Kortlandt Spinoza Project, Leiden University, the Netherlands.

Sūn (2003a: 71; Báimǎ 1) and of Huáng and Zhāng (Báimǎ 2), both in original transcriptions. Sūn compares his own data with that of Huáng and 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 Báimǎ are significantly dissimilar to those in Tibetan dialects.

*Table 1—Báimǎ and Tibetan case particles (Sūn 2003a: 71)*

Case	Báimǎ 1	Báimǎ 2	WT	dBus-gTsang	Khams	Amdo
Ergative	i <sup>53</sup>	kæ <sup>53</sup>	gis	kɛ	ki	kə
Genitive	tɛ <sup>5</sup> [sic.]/ti <sup>53</sup>	tæ <sup>53</sup>	gi	ki	ki	kə
Allative	tsɑ <sup>53</sup> /iɛ <sup>53</sup>	kæ <sup>53</sup>	la	la	le	la
Locative	nɔ <sup>53</sup> /kɛ <sup>53</sup>	kæ <sup>53</sup>	na	la	le	na
Ablative	iɔ <sup>53</sup>	jɔ <sup>53</sup>	nas	nɛ	nɛ	kə
Comparative	ɤyɛ <sup>53</sup>	ɤyæ <sup>53</sup>	las/bas	le	ji	kə
Comitative	re <sup>13</sup>	zæ <sup>53</sup>	daŋ	ta	do	ra
Marker of disposal	i <sup>53</sup>	tæ <sup>53</sup>				
Definite	lɛ <sup>53</sup> /nɛ <sup>53</sup>					
Instrumental	rɛ <sup>53</sup> /nɔ <sup>53</sup>					

Though Huáng and Zhāng and Sūn all analyze the variety of Báimǎ spoken in the neighboring villages of Báimǎ Tibetan Township (Píngwǔ County, Sìchuān 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 and Zhāng's tabulation, the postposition [kæ<sup>53</sup>] marks several distinct semantic roles: ergative, allative and locative. Huáng and 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<sup>53</sup>], the same particle as the marker of disposal, and instrumental, viz. [rɛ<sup>53</sup>]/[nɔ<sup>53</sup>]. Similarly, Huáng and Zhāng analyze the form [tæ<sup>53</sup>] 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<sup>53</sup>~ti<sup>53</sup>] and [i<sup>53</sup>], respectively. Sūn only sees the markers [i<sup>53</sup>] (ergative and disposal) and [nɔ<sup>53</sup>] (locative and instrumental) as sharing different functions.

Given the discrepancy between Huáng and Zhāng’s and Sūn’s classifications, I propose a new summary of nominal postpositions in my data, also collected in the Báimǎ 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 Báimǎ stories collected in 2003-2004 in the Báimǎ Township (hereafter “corpus”). The stories were narrated by Zhaga Tsere [tʂɑ<sup>13</sup>gɑ<sup>53</sup> tʂ<sup>h</sup>ɛ<sup>13</sup>rɛ<sup>35</sup>], a 69-year old resident of Koshi [kɔ<sup>13</sup>ʂi<sup>53</sup>] village (Shuǐniújiǎ in Chinese), and Lako [lɑ<sup>13</sup>kɔ<sup>53</sup>], a 75-year old resident of Iaru [ja<sup>13</sup>rɯ<sup>35</sup>] village (Luòtōngbà in Chinese) and translated with the help of Lǐ Dégui, a 64-year old resident of

Píngwǔ. The corpus comprises over 30 texts, one of which, “An Orphan and a Fox” by Lako, is appended to the present article.<sup>2</sup> 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 Báimǎ by Huáng and Zhāng and Sūn (in original transcriptions).

Table 2 summarizes nominal postpositions as attested in the corpus.

*Table 2—Báimǎ postpositions in the corpus*

Function	Postposition	Meaning
Agentive/Genitive 1	ji <sup>53</sup>	
Definite/Genitive 2	tɛ <sup>53</sup> ~ti <sup>53</sup>	‘his’
Instrumental/Comitative~Conjunction	rɛ <sup>53</sup>	‘with, and’
Locative	lɑ <sup>53</sup> /tɕɑ <sup>53</sup> /kɛ <sup>53</sup> /no <sup>53</sup>	‘on’/ ‘vicinity’/ ‘on, above’/ ‘inside’
Dative	kɛ <sup>53</sup>	
Ablative	jo <sup>53</sup>	
Comparative	øye <sup>53</sup>	‘side’

In my analysis, Báimǎ has seven distinct types of nominal postpositions, which can be further subdivided as follows. Báimǎ has two markers of the genitive, [ji<sup>53</sup>], identical with the marker of the agentive, and [tɛ<sup>53</sup>~ti<sup>53</sup>], identical with the definite marker. The instrumental case is expressed by the same marker as the comitative and also the coordinative conjunction [rɛ<sup>53</sup>]. One of the locative markers, [kɛ<sup>53</sup>], 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

<sup>2</sup> This story appears to be shared by several unrelated ethnic groups in the area. The Qiang version of the

those languages and dialects (1995b: 1171), agentive-genitive isomoprhy in Báimǎ is of a different nature than the other patterns of isomorphy. While the syncretism of the definite and the genitive, 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 [j i<sup>53</sup>]

In the corpus, the marker [j i<sup>53</sup>] has the following four functions:

I. (sporadically) marker of genitive (WT *kyi* and its allomorphs *gyi*, *gi* and *yi/i*), e.g. [nɛ<sup>53</sup> rɛ<sup>53</sup> j i<sup>53</sup> j y<sup>35</sup>] ‘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, [j i<sup>53</sup>] as the genitive marker is retained in oblique forms of pronouns, as discussed below.

II. nominalizer for verb phrases, e.g. [ndu<sup>35</sup>] ‘drink’, [ndu<sup>13</sup> j i<sup>53</sup>] ‘drinkables’. [j i<sup>53</sup>] also typically nominalizers the clause preceding the verb [dzɛ<sup>35</sup>] ‘said’ (e.g. sentence (16)) or in future contexts and conditional sentences, the clause preceding the verb [rɛ<sup>13</sup>] ‘be’ (e.g. T 20 and T 29), transforming in both cases the clause into the object of the verb.

---

story is given in LaPolla and Huang (1996: 256-269), there titled “An Orphan”.

III. non paradigmatic agentive case marker (ergative in Huáng and Zhāng's and Sūn's analyses) (WT *kyis* and its allomorphs *gyis*, *gis* and *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 *ergativity*, for which reason he uses in his (1995a) article the term *agentive* instead of *ergative*. I take up this usage in the present discussion. Under the term *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 *kyis* and allomorphs, cf. Hoffmann 1955: 74, 78-79 and “the promise particle” in Beyer 1992: 353-354), e.g. [ɲɛ<sup>35</sup> j i<sup>53</sup>] ‘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.<sup>3</sup> Below I will concentrate on the isomorphy of the genitive and the agentive.

Sūn (2003a: 73; 2003b: 71) and Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) comment on the fact that personal pronouns in Báimǎ have special genitive/accusative forms, reproduced in Table 3:



Table 3—Nominative and genitive/accusative forms of personal pronouns in *Huáng and Zhāng* (1995: 113, original transcriptions)

Case	First person pronoun	Second person pronoun	Third person pronoun
NOM	ŋɑ <sup>53</sup>	tɕ <sup>h</sup> ø <sup>53</sup>	wu <sup>21</sup> læ <sup>53</sup> ~ læ <sup>53</sup>
ACC/GEN	ŋu <sup>53</sup>	tɕ <sup>h</sup> y <sup>53</sup>	wu <sup>21</sup> li <sup>53</sup> ~ li <sup>53</sup> ~ wu <sup>21</sup>

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 Báimǎ, oblique forms are precisely such base forms to which all other case markers described in this article are attached. For example, in the sentence [tɕ<sup>h</sup>ø<sup>53</sup> ŋu<sup>53</sup> kǎ<sup>53</sup> dzǎ<sup>35</sup> wǎ<sup>53</sup>] ‘You told me.’ (Huáng and Zhāng 1995: 113, original transcriptions), the dative marker [kǎ<sup>53</sup>] is added to the oblique form of the first person pronoun [ŋu<sup>53</sup>].

In addition to the oblique forms of personal pronouns listed in Sūn and Huáng and Zhāng, the alternative oblique form of the second person pronoun in my data is [tɕ<sup>h</sup>i<sup>53</sup>], as in the next sentence:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> 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 *kyis*, see Nagano (1995).

<sup>4</sup> This article represents work in progress; not all glosses and tone sandhi are final. Tentative WT glosses have been added to all Báimǎ 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 Pīnyīn 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 Báimǎ 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),

- (1) tɕ<sup>h</sup>i<sup>53</sup>    niã<sup>13</sup>tɕi<sup>53</sup>    tɕ<sup>13</sup>ru<sup>35</sup>    mɕ<sup>13</sup>-we<sup>53</sup>    ʂə<sup>13</sup>.  
 khyod.kyi    niángzi    da.ring    ma-‘ongs    ?  
 2S.OBL    wife    still    NEG.CMPL-come:PF    PF.N-VOL<sup>5</sup>

‘Your wife hasn’t come yet.’

Not only personal pronouns, but also demonstratives have oblique forms in the corpus.

The oblique form of [ndɛ<sup>53</sup>] ‘this’ is [ndi<sup>53</sup>] ‘of this’ and that of [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] ‘that, he’ is

[ti<sup>53</sup>] ‘of that, his’. For example:

- (2) wu<sup>13</sup>li<sup>53</sup>    pu<sup>13</sup>ndʒɕ<sup>53</sup>    re<sup>13</sup>,    ndi<sup>53</sup>    nɕ<sup>13</sup>ny<sup>53</sup>    re<sup>13</sup>.  
 ?‘i    ?    red    ‘di.‘i    nyag.nyog    red  
 3S.OBL    wife    COP    this.OBL    child    COP

‘It is his wife, it is his child.’

- (3) ti<sup>53</sup>    pu<sup>53</sup>    tɛ<sup>53</sup>    tʂ<sup>h</sup>u<sup>13</sup>ndʒi<sup>35</sup>    s<sup>h</sup>a<sup>53</sup>tʂa<sup>53</sup>    tse<sup>53</sup>    ni<sup>53</sup>,  
 de.‘i    bu    de    Chóngqìng    sa.cha    slebs    ni  
 that.OBL    boy    that    Chunking    place    reach    TOP

- ti<sup>53</sup>    pu<sup>53</sup>    tɛ<sup>53</sup>    ʂə<sup>53</sup>-ku<sup>13</sup>nbo<sup>13</sup>    ʂə<sup>13</sup>.  
 de.‘i    bu    de    shi-?    ?  
 that.OBL    boy    that    die:PF-CMPL.EMPH    PF.N-VOL

‘After his son arrived in Chunking, he died.’

In my analysis, the forms [tɕ<sup>h</sup>i<sup>53</sup>], [wu<sup>13</sup>li<sup>53</sup>], [ndi<sup>53</sup>] and [ti<sup>53</sup>] are all fusions of the pronouns [tɕ<sup>h</sup>ɕ<sup>53</sup>] ‘you’, [wu<sup>13</sup>lɛ<sup>53</sup>] ‘he, she’, [ndɛ<sup>53</sup>] ‘this’ and [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] ‘that’ with the

---

imperfective, perfective and imperative. Verbs with one stem are marked in the gloss line only for their meaning.

<sup>5</sup> Báimǎ 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

genitive marker [j i<sup>53</sup>] (*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 [t e<sup>231</sup>] ‘that one’ is [t i<sup>13</sup>], as in [t i<sup>13</sup> k<sup>h</sup> a<sup>53</sup> l e] ‘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 Báimǎ is restricted only to the words discussed in this section.

[j i<sup>53</sup>] 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) k<sup>h</sup> w<sup>53</sup>    t w<sup>13</sup> r w<sup>35</sup>    g u<sup>13</sup> k a<sup>53</sup>    t a<sup>53</sup>    y a<sup>53</sup>    j i<sup>53</sup>    k<sup>h</sup> w<sup>53</sup>    s e<sup>53</sup>-n d z a<sup>53</sup>.  
 kho        de.ring        dgong.ka        da        wa        yis        kho        bsad-‘cha<sup>6</sup>  
 1S.LOG<sup>7</sup>    today        evening        now        fox        AGT        1S.LOG    kill-eat:IPF

‘I... tonight the fox will eat me.’ (T 42-43)

- (5) y a<sup>53</sup>    k u<sup>13</sup> l y<sup>53</sup>    t<sup>h</sup> ε<sup>35</sup>    j i<sup>53</sup>    k a<sup>53</sup>-k u<sup>13</sup> n b o<sup>13</sup>.  
 wa        sku.lus        thal.ba    yis        bkab-?  
 fox        body        ashes        AGT        cover-CMPL.EMPH

‘The ashes covered the fox from head to toe.’ (T 74)

---

appropriate copula or auxiliary reflects the appreciation of the speaker of the action as performed volitionally or non-volitionally.

<sup>6</sup> 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 Báimǎ, Zhongu, Chos-rje and Zhānglǎ (lCang.la).

<sup>7</sup> The form [k<sup>h</sup> w<sup>53</sup>] ‘I’, e.g. example (1), 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

Similar to the genitive marker, the agentive [j i<sup>53</sup>] commonly fuses with the pronoun [t ε<sup>53</sup>] ‘that’ to [t i<sup>53</sup>]. For example:

(6)	ɣa <sup>53</sup>	t i <sup>53</sup>	pu <sup>35</sup>	t ε <sup>53</sup> ,	ɲɑ <sup>13</sup> ɲy <sup>53</sup>	t ε <sup>53</sup>	t ε <sup>53</sup> ...
	wa	de.'is	bu.mo	de	nyag.nyog	de	de
	fox	DEF.AGT	girl	DEF	child	DEF	DEF
	t ε <sup>53</sup>	se <sup>53</sup> -ndza <sup>53</sup>	zɯ <sup>341</sup>	œe <sup>53</sup>	ʂə <sup>13</sup> .		
	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 [j i<sup>53</sup>] 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). Báimă [j i<sup>53</sup>] is thus cognate with the WT forms *kyi* and *kyis* and all their allomorphs.<sup>8</sup>

The generalization of the allomorphs *yi/i* and *yi/'is* (following an open syllable) of all other allomorphs of *kyi* and *kyis*, respectively, might be an indication that codas have dropped in Báimă early. This early depletion of codas also resulted in the homophony of the genitive and the agentive markers. It is plausible that subsequently [j i<sup>53</sup>] has been retained as the agentive marker, whereas a new genitive marker—

---

[k<sup>h</sup>ɯ<sup>13</sup>ɲe<sup>53</sup>]. The form [k<sup>h</sup>ɯ<sup>53</sup>] is thus typical for story narrations. It does not have an oblique form and is therefore not listed in Table 3.

<sup>8</sup> An alternative possibility is to consider Báimă genitive marker [j i<sup>53</sup>] as derived from the Proto-Tibetan genitive \*ʔi (Simon 1942, Gong 2002: 425-426).

grammaticalized from the demonstrative pronoun [tɛ<sup>53</sup>]—has arisen. The old genitive [ji<sup>53</sup>] has been retained in a number of high frequency words.

### 3.2. The definite and the genitive [tɛ<sup>53</sup> ~ ti<sup>53</sup>]

Sūn (2003: 73) and Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) disagree as to what should be seen as the genitive marker in Báimǎ. Both note that the genitive is expressed by the marker [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] (in Huáng and Zhāng’s transcription [tæ<sup>53</sup>]), but only when the modified part is omitted, as in example (7), quoted from Huáng and Zhāng (ibid., original transcriptions, my glosses):

- |     |                                     |                   |   |                  |                     |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|
| (7) | t a <sup>21</sup> z e <sup>35</sup> | ndæ <sup>53</sup> | mbu <sup>21</sup> tɕ <sup>h</sup> ɔ <sup>35</sup> | tæ <sup>53</sup> | z e <sup>21</sup> . |
|     | sta.re                              | ‘di               | ?mùjiàng  | de               | red                 |
|     | axe                                 | this              | carpenter   | that             | COP                 |

‘This axe is that of the carpenter.’

When both the modifier and the modified are present, Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114; original transcriptions) argue that Báimǎ 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 [ʔa<sup>21</sup>kø<sup>53</sup> ʃa<sup>53</sup>] ‘elder brother’s hat’. In contrast, in addition to [tɛ<sup>53</sup>], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 253; original transcriptions) describes the genitive marker [ti<sup>53</sup>], as in [ɑ<sup>13</sup>kø<sup>35</sup> ti<sup>53</sup> kø<sup>35</sup>] ‘elder brother’s clothes’, which he sees as a probable loan from Chinese. Although the resemblance of the Báimǎ

genitive marker [tɿ<sup>53</sup>] to the subordinative particle *di* [tɿ] in the Píngwǔ dialect of Mandarin is striking, the two are not connected, as I will argue below. It is nonetheless conceivable that the native genitive marker [tɿ<sup>53</sup>] in Báimǎ has been reinforced due to its similarity to the Chinese subordinative particle *di* (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, September 2005).

Finally, Huáng and Zhāng (1995: 114) treat [tɿ<sup>53</sup>] also as a marker of disposal, as in the following example (original transcriptions, my glosses):

- (8)    ɸi<sup>21</sup>tɕu<sup>53</sup>    tæ<sup>53</sup>    ɸe<sup>21</sup>la<sup>53</sup>    zɿ<sup>35</sup>    k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>21</sup>    tɸ<sup>h</sup>æ<sup>21</sup>    ɕe<sup>21</sup>.  
       bye.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 [tɿ<sup>53</sup>] 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 [lɿ<sup>53</sup>] and [nɿ<sup>53</sup>]. For example (original transcription, my glosses):

- (9)    tɸ<sup>h</sup>ø<sup>53</sup>    ʃo<sup>35</sup>    lɿ<sup>53</sup>    kɑ<sup>13</sup>lɑ<sup>53</sup>    tɸ<sup>h</sup>ɿ<sup>13</sup>    ʃɿ<sup>13</sup>.  
       khyod    sring.smo    ?    ga.logs    chas    ?  
       2S    younger.sister    that    where    go:PF    PF.N-VOL

‘Where did your little sister go?’

I will return to the markers [lɿ<sup>53</sup>] at the end of this section. (The marker [nɿ<sup>53</sup>] is infrequent in the corpus.) As for the marker [tɿ<sup>53</sup>], Sūn (Nishida and Sūn 1990: 258)

remarks that it is not yet clear whether the genitive [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] and the definite [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] are two homophonous words or whether the function of [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] is expanding (from genitive to definite).

In the corpus, [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] has been identified by my language consultants as the demonstrative pronoun ‘that’. The same word is also frequently used as anaphoric pronoun, as in the following example:

- (10) tɛ<sup>53</sup>...      tɛ<sup>53</sup>      tʂ<sup>h</sup>u<sup>13</sup>-no<sup>53</sup>      tse<sup>53</sup>...  
          de            de            tshu-nang            slebs  
          that        that        here-LOC            reach

‘She came here...’ (T48-49)

[tɛ<sup>53</sup>] is in all probability cognate with the Tibetan demonstrative and also anaphoric pronoun *de* ‘that, that one, he’. Hence, [tæ<sup>53</sup>] in the expression [mbu<sup>21</sup>tɕ<sup>h</sup>o<sup>35</sup> tæ<sup>53</sup>], from example (7), is in my opinion a true demonstrative, pointing to the topic [ta<sup>21</sup>zɛ<sup>35</sup>] ‘axe’, literally ‘that of the carpenter’. The possessive relation is expressed by word order, modifier first, modified second.

In Jäschke’s (1998: 255) analysis, *de* in Written Tibetan frequently stands in the place of the English definite article ‘the’, e.g. *pa de log-ste song-ngo* ‘The father went back.’, where it adds to perspicuity. [tɛ<sup>53</sup>] in Báimă has an analogous function to that of *de* in WT, for example:<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The corresponding indefinite marker in Báimă is [ɕɐ<sup>13</sup>] (WT *shig*), as in the following example.

- (11)  $\gamma\alpha^{53}$   $t\varepsilon^{53}$   $j\alpha^{35}$   $dz\varepsilon^{35}$   $\text{ʂ}\theta^{13}$ .  
 wa de ? bzlos ?  
 fox DEF agree say:PF PF.N-VOL

‘The fox agreed.’ (T 21-22)

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

The marker  $[t\dot{i}^{53}]$  is the oblique form of the demonstrative  $[t\varepsilon^{53}]$  ‘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 meanings 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  $[t\varepsilon^{53}]$  ‘that, he’,  $[t\dot{i}^{53}]$ , in Báimǎ functions in a similar fashion.

---

$j\circ^{53}$	$t\theta i^{35}$	$l\alpha^{53}$	$nu^{13}t\theta a^{53}$	$\text{ʂ}\theta^{13}$	$r\varepsilon^{53}$	$t\text{ʂ}^he^{53}\dots$
lam	dkiyl	la	nor.skyag	shig	?	phrad
road	center	LOC	cow.turd	INDEF	COM	encounter

‘On the way, she met a cow turd.’ (T 25-26)



- (12) *tĩ<sup>13</sup>tɕɿ<sup>53</sup>* *ti<sup>53</sup>* *zy<sup>13</sup>da<sup>35</sup>* *ti<sup>53</sup>* *ɲa<sup>13</sup>ɲy<sup>53</sup>* *tɕ<sup>53</sup>...* *tɕ<sup>53</sup>*  
*diànzi* *de.‘i* *yon.bdag* *de.‘i* *nyag.nyog* *de* *de*  
*hotel* *that.OBL* *owner* *that.OBL* *child* *DEF* *DEF*
- pu<sup>35</sup>* *øe<sup>53</sup>* *de<sup>13</sup>* *ʂə<sup>13</sup>.*  
*bu.mo* *byas* *bdog* *?*  
*girl* *do:PF* *PROG* *PF.N-VOL*

‘The child of the owner of the hotel... eh, was a girl.’

[*lɕ<sup>53</sup>*], 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) *tɕ<sup>13</sup>ru<sup>35</sup>* *fɔ̃<sup>35</sup>* *ɑ<sup>13</sup>nge<sup>35</sup>* *lo<sup>13</sup>i<sup>53</sup>* *tɕ<sup>h</sup>y<sup>53</sup>* *k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>13</sup>zə<sup>53</sup>* *lɕ<sup>53</sup>...*  
*de.ring* *yang* *?* *lǎoyé* *khyod* *kùzi* *?*  
*today* *again* *Ange* *master* *2S.OBL* *trousers* *that*
- k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>13</sup>zə<sup>53</sup>* *ku<sup>53</sup>* *zo<sup>53</sup>* *wu<sup>53</sup>* *re<sup>13</sup>,* *dze<sup>35</sup>.*  
*kùzi* *rku* *bzo* *‘ong* *red* *zlos*  
*trousers* *steal* *do:IPF* *come:IPF* *COP* *say:PF*

‘Today Master Ange will come to steal your pants... pants, he said.’

Similar to [*tɕ<sup>53</sup>*], [*lɕ<sup>53</sup>*] is a demonstrative and an anaphoric pronoun ‘that, he’. Whereas [*tɕ<sup>53</sup>*] is presumably of Tibetan provenance, [*lɕ<sup>53</sup>*] appears to be a native Báimǎ word, cf. the third person singular pronoun [*wu<sup>13</sup>lɕ<sup>53</sup> ~ lɕ<sup>53</sup>*], stemming from a distal demonstrative pronoun. This marker is similar to one of the two definite markers, /le/ in Qiang (LaPolla and Huang 1996: 59).

To conclude, Báimă expresses possession by word order (modifier-modified) and by oblique forms of personal and demonstrative pronouns. Moreover, the oblique form of the demonstrative pronoun [tɛ<sup>53</sup>]—[tɪ<sup>53</sup>] also functions as an external possessor.

### 3.3. The comitative/conjunction and the instrumental [rɛ<sup>53</sup>]

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<sup>53</sup>], 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<sup>53</sup>]. Sūn (2003a: 71, 2003b: 73) posits different morphemes for the instrumental ([rɛ<sup>13</sup>]) and the comitative ([rɛ<sup>53</sup>]). The former, [rɛ<sup>13</sup>] in my transcription, is most likely the sandhi form of [rɛ<sup>53</sup>].<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, in the word list concluding Nishida and Sūn’s study (1990: 366), the Báimă coordinate conjunction ‘and’ is given as [rɛ<sup>53</sup>], i.e. identical in form to Sūn’s instrumental marker [rɛ<sup>53</sup>].

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

---

<sup>10</sup> Báimă 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<sup>53</sup>] changes its

under discussion is performed. Sentence (14) is an example of the use of [rɛ<sup>53</sup>] as a conjunction:

- (14) γa<sup>53</sup> rə<sup>13</sup> pu<sup>35</sup> ndʒu<sup>13</sup>-re<sup>35</sup> øe<sup>53</sup> de<sup>13</sup>.  
 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 instrument. Consider the following two examples, where [rɛ<sup>53</sup>] is used as the marker of the comitative, sentence (15), and as the marker of the instrumental, sentence (16):

- (15) γa<sup>53</sup> rɛ<sup>53</sup> tɕ<sup>h</sup>e<sup>53</sup> ʂe<sup>13</sup>...  
 wa ? phrad ?  
 fox COM encounter PF.N-VOL

‘The girl met a fox.’ (T 10)

- (16) “tʃ<sup>h</sup>u<sup>13</sup>ndʒa<sup>35</sup> rɛ<sup>53</sup> k<sup>h</sup>a<sup>13</sup>ŋu<sup>53</sup> tɕy<sup>53</sup> nbe<sup>53</sup>, fi<sup>õ</sup><sup>35</sup>  
 chu.ʔkhyags ? kha.ngo bkruš mbod yang  
 water INSTR face wash:PF/IMP call:IPF again

---

original tone to the low rising when followed by a word in a high rising or high falling tone, as in example (7). [rɛ<sup>53</sup>] is the emphatic or citation form of the coordinate conjunction ‘and’, [rə<sup>13</sup>] is its weakened form.

tʂ <sup>h</sup> i <sup>35</sup>	ge <sup>341</sup>	re <sup>13,,</sup>	ji <sup>53</sup>	dze <sup>35</sup> .
‘tshol	sgos	red	yi	bzlos
search	want	COP	NOM	say:PF

‘“Let me wash my face [with water] before I look for the girl again,” - said the fox.’ (T 76-78)

Whereas the markers of the agentive and the genitive in Báimǎ are most likely cognate with the WT markers *kyis*, *kyi* and *de*, the etymology of the marker of the comitative and the instrumental in Báimǎ is less clear. In addition to [rɛ<sup>53</sup>], Sūn lists [nɔ<sup>53</sup>] ‘inside’ (WT *nang*) used in those cases where the instrument is a container. The pair [rɛ<sup>53</sup>]/[nɔ<sup>53</sup>] in Báimǎ is thus reminiscent of the Shǐxīng instrumental markers [rɛ̃<sup>33</sup>] and [nō̃<sup>55</sup>] (Dài et al. 1991: 193).

### 3.4. The locative and the dative [kɛ<sup>53</sup>]

A noticeable feature of the Báimǎ 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 Báimǎ has several markers of locative, [lɑ<sup>53</sup>] ‘there, on’, [tʂɑ<sup>53</sup>] ‘vicinity’, [kɛ<sup>53</sup>] ‘above, on’ and [nɔ<sup>53</sup>] ‘inside’.<sup>11</sup> Of these markers, the former two are more general.

The form [tʂɑ<sup>53</sup>], listed by Sūn (2003: 73) as allative, is in my view an all-purpose locative marker, as in sentence (17) below. As noted by Nishida (1996: 297),

---

<sup>11</sup> For [lɑ<sup>53</sup>] see the example in footnote 8.

[tɕɑ<sup>53</sup>] 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) | ɲe <sup>53</sup> rɛ <sup>53</sup> | tɕɑ <sup>35</sup> | ra <sup>13</sup> -jy <sup>35</sup> | ndzo <sup>13</sup> -ɲe <sup>53</sup> | ɕe <sup>53</sup> | ʂe <sup>13</sup> . |
|      | mi.?                              | rtsa              | ra-lug                             | ‘tsho-mi                             | byas             | ?                  |
|      | other.people                      | LOC               | goat-sheep                         | graze:IPF-person                     | do:PF            | PF.N-VOL           |

‘She was a shepherdess to other people.’ (T3)

The marker [kɛ<sup>53</sup>] ‘on, above’ indicates position above or on top of something. For example:

- |      |                                    |                                    |                  |                  |                      |
|------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| (18) | nu <sup>13</sup> tɕɑ <sup>53</sup> | ɣue <sup>13</sup> le <sup>35</sup> | kɛ <sup>53</sup> | ɲe <sup>35</sup> | de <sup>13</sup> ... |
|      | 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 [nɔ<sup>53</sup>] indicates position inside something:

- |      |                                     |                                     |                  |                    |                    |                  |                                |                    |
|------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| (19) | tɕ <sup>h</sup> ø <sup>53</sup> ... | ɲi <sup>13</sup> ndzɛ <sup>35</sup> | nɔ <sup>53</sup> | dʒue <sup>35</sup> | kua <sup>155</sup> | ɕe <sup>53</sup> | k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> | nɔ <sup>13</sup> . |
|      | khyod                               | mig.’bras                           | nang             | mchil.ma           | ?                  | byas             | khur                           | snang              |
|      | 2s                                  | eye                                 | LOC              | fluid              | ONOM               | do:PF            | carry                          | exist              |

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

The locative marker [kɛ<sup>53</sup>] is also used to mark the dative, i.e. case of the animate being being affected by some state or action identified by the verb.

(20)	ɑ <sup>13</sup> ɲe <sup>35</sup>	gɑ <sup>13</sup> sɑ <sup>35</sup>	dzɛ <sup>35</sup>	ɲi <sup>13</sup> ,	ndzɛ <sup>53</sup>	p <sup>h</sup> ɑ <sup>13</sup>	ndzɹu <sup>53</sup>
	a.mes	<i>Ge.sar</i>	bzlos	ni	‘dre	phag	mchu
	master	<i>Gesar</i>	say:PF	TOP	ghost	pig	snout
	kɛ <sup>53</sup> :	“tʃ <sup>h</sup> ɿ <sup>53</sup>	øɑ <sup>53</sup>	de <sup>13</sup> ,”	dzɛ <sup>35</sup> .		
	?	chi	skrag	bdog	bzlos		
	DAT	what	be.afraid	PROG	say:PF		

‘So Master Gesar asked the ghost with a pig snout: “What are you afraid of?”’

Cross-linguistically, the syncretism of dative and locative, i.e. a case which primarily relates a referent to some point or location in space, of which locative is a specific subcase, is frequent (Anderson 1971: 103-106; DeLancey 1981: 633-638; Kuryłowicz 1964: 190-195; LaPolla 1995b: 1174-1176). Báimǎ exemplifies this general trend.

As mentioned in §3.1, the marker of dative in Báimǎ is linked to the oblique form of the preceding word, provided that the word has such a form. For example:

(21)	to <sup>35</sup>	pe <sup>13</sup> zɑ <sup>341</sup>	tʃ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup>	tɛ <sup>53</sup>	tʃ <sup>h</sup> u <sup>35</sup>	ti <sup>53</sup> -kɛ <sup>53</sup>	to <sup>35</sup>
	?	spun.skya	chen	de	chu	de.‘i-?	?
	LNK	brother	big	DEF	little	DEF.OBL-DAT	LNK

*kā<sup>53</sup>pu<sup>13</sup>tø<sup>h</sup>i<sup>53</sup>.*  
*kànbuqǐ*  
 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, [lɑ<sup>53</sup>], [tɕɑ<sup>53</sup>] and [nɔ<sup>53</sup>], are clearly cognate with Tibetan, whereas the origin of one, the locative/dative marker [kɛ<sup>53</sup>], is less clear.

Finally, as for the etymology of the two case markers not discussed in the article, the ablative [jɔ<sup>53</sup>] and the comparative [ɕyɛ<sup>53</sup>], the former is probably derived from the Proto-Tibeto-Burman form *\*lam* ‘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 as a comparative marker, it is certainly an innovation to usage in other Tibetan dialects.

#### 4. Báimǎ and the neighboring languages

As evident from WT glosses to Báimǎ examples in the text, most of the Báimǎ lexicon is of Tibetan provenance and derived from Tibetan in multiple waves of borrowings, as evidenced by complex sound correspondences between Báimǎ and Written Tibetan (Zhāng 1994; Huáng and Zhāng 1995). For example, one WT cluster *kh* corresponds in Báimǎ in Zhāng’s (1994: 14) analysis to [tɕ<sup>h</sup>], [tɕʰ<sup>h</sup>] and [tɕʰ<sup>h</sup>], and in Huáng and Zhāng’s (1995: 85) analysis, to [tɕ<sup>h</sup>], [k<sup>h</sup>] and [ɕ]. To give just two examples from the cited sentences, WT *l* is treated in Báimǎ as *j* (e.g. WT *lam* ‘road’ is [jɔ<sup>53</sup>] in Báimǎ, WT *langs* ‘bright’ is [jɔ<sup>35</sup>], WT *lug* ‘sheep’ is [jy<sup>35</sup>]) and as *l* (e.g. WT locative particle *la* is [lɔ<sup>53</sup>] in Báimǎ, WT *rdo.lo* ‘pestle’ is [da<sup>13</sup>lu<sup>53</sup>]). One WT final *ing* is treated as [ɯ] (e.g. [tɯ<sup>13</sup>ru<sup>35</sup>] *de.ring* ‘today’) and as [i] (e.g. [ti<sup>13</sup>pa<sup>53</sup>] *ding.pa* ‘now’).

Báimǎ nominal postpositions appear to combine WT case particles (e.g. the agentive [ji<sup>53</sup>] and the locative [lɔ<sup>53</sup>]) and markers of possibly Qiangic provenance (e.g. the instrumental [rɛ<sup>53</sup>] and the definitie [lɛ<sup>53</sup>]). Yet some are of less clear origin

(the ablative [jɔ<sup>53</sup>] and the comparative [ɕyɛ<sup>53</sup>]). The range of grammatical markers of arguably Qiangic origin from the quoted examples can be expanded. The linking particle [tɔ<sup>35</sup>] is similar to a common discourse particle in Qiang, (*a*)*tu* (Randy LaPolla, personal communication, March 2005). The non-volitional past marker [ɕə<sup>13</sup>], mostly reduced to [ɕ] rapid in speech, is reminiscent of the past particle in Qiangic languages, cf. [ɕ1<sup>33</sup>] in Shixīng.

In sum, Báimǎ 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 marker
CMPL	completion
COM	comitative
CONJ	conjunction
COP	copula
DAT	dative marker
DEF	definite
DIR	directional prefix
EXCL	exclamation
EMPH	emphatic
GEN	genitive marker
INDEF	indefinite marker
IMP	imperative verb form
INST	instrumental marker
IPF	imperfective (present-future) verb form
LNK	clause linking particle, consistently translated by my informant as the Chinese clause linking element <i>jiu</i> ‘then, just’
LOC	locative
LOG	logophoric pronoun
NOM	nominalizer
N-VOL	non-volitional
OBL	oblique



ONOM	onomatopoeic
P	plural
PROG	progressive aspect marker
PF	perfective verb form
PF/IMP	perfective-imperative verb form
RECP	reciprocal form
S	singular
SIM	simultaneous
TERM	terminative
TOP	topic marker
VOL	volitional
WT	Written Tibetan

## References

- ANDERSON, John M. 1971. *The grammar of case: Towards a localistic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BEYER, Stephen V. 1992. *The classical Tibetan language*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press.
- DÀI Qìngxià 戴庆夏, HUÁNG Bùfán 黄布凡, FÙ Àilán 傅爱兰, RÉNZÈNGWĀNGMŪ 仁增旺姆, LIÚ Júhuáng 刘菊黄. 1991. *Zàngmiányu shíwu zhong/Fifteen Tibeto-Burman languages* 《藏缅语十五种》. Peking 北京: Běijīng Yànshān Chūbǎnshè 北京燕山出版社.
- DELANCEY, Scott. 1981. "An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns". *Language* 57, 626-657.
- . 1986. "Relativization as nominalization in Tibetan and Newari." Paper presented at the 19th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. *ETHNOLOGUE: Languages of the World* (www.ethnologue.com).
- FILLMORE, Charles. 1968. "The case for case". Bach, Emmon and Robert Harns (eds.) *Universals in linguistic theory*, 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- GÉSĀNG Jūmiǎn 格桑居冕 (sKal-bzang 'gyur-med) and GÉSĀNG Yāngjīng 格桑央京 (sKal-bzang dbyangs-chan). 2002. *Zàngyǔ fāngyán gàilùn* 《藏语方言概论》 / *bod kyi yul skad rnam bshad* / *An introduction to Tibetan dialects*. Peking 北京: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè 民族出版社.
- GONG Hwang-chenng 龚煌称. 2002. *Hàn-Zàngyǔ yánjiū lùnwén jí* 《汉藏语研究论文集》 / *Collected papers on Sino-Tibetan linguistics. Language and linguistics Monograph Series No. C2-2* / 《语言暨语言学》专刊丙种 2. Taipei 台北: Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office), Academia Sinica 中研院语言所筹备处.
- HÄSLER, Katrin Louise. 1999. *A grammar of the Tibetan Sde.dge dialect*. Berne University: Ph.D. dissertation.
- HEINE, Bernd. 1997. *Possession: Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOFFMANN, Helmut. 1955. "Über ein wenig beachtetes Hilfswort zur Bezeichnung der Zukunft im Tibetischen." *Corolla linguistica: Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4 Mai 1955 dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 73-79.
- HUÁNG Bùfán 黄布凡. 1991. "Qiāngyǔ" "羌语" [Qiangic languages]. Mǎ Xuéliàng 马学良 (ed.) *Hàn-Zàngyǔ gàilùn* / *A general introduction to Sino-Tibetan languages* 《汉藏语概论》, vol. I, 208-369. Peking 北京: Běijīng Dàxué Chūbǎnshè 北京大学出版社.

- HUÁNG Bùfán 黄布凡 and ZHĀNG Míng huì 张明慧. 1995. “Báimǎhuà zhīshǔ wèntí yánjiū” “白马话支属问题研究” [A study of the genetic affiliation of Báimǎ]. *Zhōngguó zàngxué* 《中国藏学》 [Tibetology in China] 2, 79-118.
- JÄSCHKE, Heinrich August. 1998. *A Tibetan-English dictionary with special reference to the prevailing dialects to which is added an English-Tibetan vocabulary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. First published in 1881 in London.
- KURYŁOWICZ, Jerzy. 1964. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- LAPOLLA, Randy J. 1995a. “‘Ergative’ marking in Tibeto-Burman”. *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morpho-syntax*. Yoshio, Nishi, Matisoff, James A. and Nagano, Yasuhiko (eds.), 189-228. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- . 1995b. “On the utility of the concepts of markedness and prototypes in understanding the development of morphological systems.” *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 66.4, 1149-1185.
- LAPOLLA, Randy J. and HUANG Chenglong. 1996. *A grammar of Qiang with annotated texts and glossary*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lǐ Shào míng 李绍明. 1987. “Dī” “氏” [The Dī people]. ZĒNG Wéi yì 曾维益 and XIĀO Yóu yuán 萧猷源 (eds.) *Báimǎrén zúshǔ yánjiū wénjí* 《白马人族属研究文集》 [A collection of research papers on the genetic affiliation of the Báimǎ], 46-47. Píngwǔ 平武: Píngwǔxiàn Báimǎrén Zúshǔ Yánjiūhuì 平武县白马人族属研究.

- Mǎ Chángshòu 马长寿 . *Dī yǔ Qiāng* 《氏与羌》 [The Dī and the Qiāng]. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi Rénmín Chūbǎnshè 上海人民出版社
- MATISOFF, James A. 1972. “Lahu nominalization, relativization and genitivization.” Kimball, J., ed. *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. I. New York: Seminar Press, pp. 237-257.
- . 2003. *Handbook of Proto-Tibetan-Burman*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MULLIE, Jos. 1942. *Le mot-particule tchē*. Leiden: Brill.
- NAGANO Yuhiko. 1995. “Function of Written Tibetan instrumental particle, *-kyis*, revisited.” Nishi, Yoshio, James A. Matisoff, Yasuhiko Nagano, eds. *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnography, pp. 133-142.
- NISHIDA Tatsuo 西田龙雄. 1993. “白馬語” [Báimǎ language]. KAMEI Takashi 亀井孝, KŌNO Rokurō, 河野六郎, CHINO Eichi, 千野栄一 (eds.) 《言語学大辞典》 /*Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics*, vol. 5, 293-301. Tokyo 東京: Sanseido 三省堂.
- NISHIDA Tatsuo 西田龙雄 and SŪN Hóngkāi 孙宏开. 1990. *Hakuba yakugo no kenkyū: Hakuba no kōzō to keitō* 《白馬譯語の研究：白馬語の构造と系统》 [A study of the Báimǎ-Chinese vocabulary ‘Báimǎ yiyǔ’: the structure and affiliation of the Báimǎ language]. Kyoto 京都: Shokado 松香堂.
- SCHIFFMAN, Harold F. 1999. *A reference grammar of spoken Tamil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SÌCHUĀN SHĚNG MÍN ZÚ YÁN JIŪ SUŌ 四川省民族研究所 [Sichuan Nationalities Research Institute] (1980). *Báimǎ Zàng rén zú shǔ wèn tí tāo lùn jí* 《白马藏人族属问题讨论集》 [A collection of discussions on the question of the ethnic classification of Báimǎ Tibetans]. Chéng dū 成都: Sìchuan Shěng Mín zú Yán jiū suǒ 四川省民族研究所.

SIMON, Walter. 1942. "Tibetan *dang, cing, kyin, yin* and 'am.'" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. X.4, 954-975.

SUN, Jackson T.-S. 孙天心. 2003. "Phonological profile of Zhongu: A new Tibetan dialect of Northern Sichuan". *Yǔ yán jì yǔ yán yán jiū* 《语言暨语言学》 [Language and linguistics] vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 769-836.

SŪN Hóng kāi 孙宏开. 1983. "Liù jiāng liú yù de mǐn zú yǔ yán jí qí xì shǔ fēn lèi" "六江流域的民族语言及其系属分类" [Minority languages of the six river valley and their genetic classification]. *Mín zú xué bào* 《民族学报》 [Scholarly journal of nationalities] 3, 99-273.

———. 2003a. "Báimǎ yǔ shì Zàng yǔ de yí ge fāng yán huò tǔ yǔ ma?" "白马语是藏语的一个方言或土语吗?" [Is Báimǎ a dialect or vernacular of Tibetan]. *Yǔ yán kē xué* 《语言科学》 [Linguistic Sciences] 1.2, 65-75.

———. 2003b. "Is Baima a dialect or vernacular of Tibetan?" *Cahiers de Linguistique - Asie Orientale* 32.1, 61-81.

WANG Míng-ke 王明珂. 1992. *The Ch'iang (Qiang) of Ancient China through the Han dynasty: Ecological frontiers and ethnic boundaries*. Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

———. 2005. “From the Qiang Barbarians to the Qiang Nationality: The making of a new Chinese boundary”. Huang Shu-min and Cheng-kuang Hsu, eds. *Imaging China: Regional division and national unity*. Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, 43-80.

WYLIE, Turrell. 1959. “A standard system of Tibetan transcription”. *Harvard journal of Asiatic studies* no. 22, pp. 261-267.

ZĒNG Wéiyì 曾维益 & XIĀO Yóuyuán 萧猷源, editors-in-chief (1987). *Báimǎrén zúshǔ yánjiū wénjí* 《白马人族属研究文集》 [A collection of research papers on the genetic affiliation of the Báimǎ]. Píngwǔ 平武: Píngwǔxiàn Báimǎrén zúshǔ yánjiūhuì 平武县白马人族属研究会.

ZHĀNG Jìchūān 张济川. 1994. “Báimǎhuà yǔ Zàngǔ” “白马话与藏语” (上) [Báimǎ language and Tibetan]. *Mínzú yǔwén* 《民族语文》 [Minority languages] no. 2, pp. 11-24.

**“An Orphan and a Fox”**

$n\alpha^{13}ny^{53}$	$t\emptyset^{53}t\emptyset^{53}$	$r\epsilon^{53}$	$\gamma a^{53}$
<b>nyag.nyog</b>	<b>dwa.dwa</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>wa</b>
<b>child</b>	<b>orphan</b>	<b>COM</b>	<b>fox</b>

- 1  $t\circ^{13}ngo^{53}$   $ne^{53}$   $t\emptyset^{53}t\emptyset^{53}$ ,  $ne^{53}$   $t\emptyset^{53}t\emptyset^{53}$ ,  $n\alpha^{13}ny^{53}$   $t\int u^{13}te^{35}$   
 ? mi dwa.dwa mi dwa.dwa nyag.nyog cig.pu  
 in.the.past person orphan person orphan child single
- 2  $\phi e^{53}$   $\int e^{13}$ ,  $a^{13}pa^{53}$   $m\alpha^{13}-de^{53}$ ,  $a^{13}ma^{53}$   $m\alpha^{13}-de^{53}$ ,  
 byas ? a.pha ma-bdog a.ma ma-bdog  
 do:PF PF.N-VOL father NEG.CMPL-exist mother NEG.CMPL-exist
- 3  $ne^{53}r\epsilon^{53}$   $tsa^{35}$   $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $ndz\circ^{13}-ne^{53}$   $\phi e^{53}$   $\int e^{13}$ .  
 mi.? rtsa ra-lug ‘tsho-mi byas ?  
 other.people LOC goat-sheep graze:IPF-person do:PF PF.N-VOL
- 4  $ne^{53}r\epsilon^{53}$   $tsa^{35}$   $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $ndz\omega^{35}$   $\int e^{13}$ ,  $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   
 mi.? rtsa ra-lug sos ? ra-lug  
 other.people LOC goat-sheep graze:PF/IMP PF.N-VOL goat-sheep
- 5  $ndz\omega^{35}$   $ni^{53}$ ,  $ni^{13}ndzi^{53}$   $\int e^{13}$   $t\epsilon^{53}$   $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $\phi e^{53}$ ,  
 sos ni nyin.cig shig de ra-lug byas  
 graze:PF/IMP TOP one.day INDEF TOP goat-sheep do:PF
- 6  $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $p\circ^{53}-nbo^{13}$   $\int e^{13}$ .  $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $p\circ^{53}-nbo^{13}$   
 ra-lug ‘bor-? ? ra-lug ‘bor-?  
 goat-sheep throw:PF-CMPL PF.N-VOL goat-sheep throw:PF-CMPL
- 7  $\int e^{13}$ ,  $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $p\circ^{53}-nbo^{13}$   $ni^{53}$ ,  $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $ts^{hi}^{35}$   
 ? ra-lug ‘bor-? ni ra-lug ‘tshol  
 PF.N-VOL goat-sheep throw:PF-CMPL TOP goat-sheep search
- 8  $t\phi^h\epsilon^{35}$   $\int e^{13}$ .  $r\alpha^{13}-jy^{35}$   $ts^{hi}^{35}$   $t\phi^h\epsilon^{35}$ ,  $t\circ^{35}$   $n\alpha^{35}$   
 chas ? ra-lug ‘tshol chas ? nyung.ba  
 go:PF PF.N-VOL goat-sheep search go:PF LNK a.little

9	nɑ <sup>13</sup> wu <sup>53</sup> nag.po black.NOM	rə <sup>13</sup> mu <sup>53</sup> ra <sup>53</sup> ma <sup>35</sup> ?rab.rib dimness	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de TOP	zu <sup>13</sup> -re <sup>13</sup> , yod-red probably	ɣa <sup>53</sup> wa fox	rɛ <sup>53</sup> ? COM	tɕ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> phrad encounter	
10	ɕə <sup>13</sup> , ? PF.N-VOL	ɣa <sup>53</sup> wa fox	rɛ <sup>53</sup> ? COM	tɕ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> phrad encounter	ɕə <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	ɣa <sup>53</sup> ... wa fox	ɣa <sup>53</sup> wa fox	rɛ <sup>53</sup> ? COM
11	tɕ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> phrad encounter	ni <sup>53</sup> , ni TOP	ɣa <sup>53</sup> wa fox	ti <sup>53</sup> de.'is DEF.AGT	pu <sup>35</sup> bu.mo girl	tɛ <sup>53</sup> , de DEF	nɑ <sup>13</sup> ny <sup>53</sup> nyag.nyog child	
12	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	tɛ <sup>53</sup> ... de DEF	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	se <sup>53</sup> -ndza <sup>53</sup> bsad-‘cha kill-eat:IPF	zɯ <sup>341</sup> zhabs below	øe <sup>53</sup> byas do:PF		
13	ɕə <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	se <sup>53</sup> -ndza <sup>53</sup> bsad-‘cha kill-eat:IPF	zɯ <sup>341</sup> zhabs below	øe <sup>53</sup> byas do:PF	ni <sup>53</sup> , ni TOP	nɑ <sup>13</sup> ny <sup>53</sup> nyag.nyog child	pu <sup>35</sup> bu.mo girl	
14	ti <sup>53</sup> de.'is DEF.AGT	dze <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	ni <sup>53</sup> , ni TOP	“ɣa <sup>53</sup> , wa fox	ɣa <sup>53</sup> , wa fox	ɣa <sup>53</sup> ... wa fox	ɣa <sup>53</sup> ... wa fox	to <sup>35</sup> ? LNK
15	nɑ <sup>35</sup> nyung.ba a.little	dze <sup>13</sup> ndzə <sup>53</sup> ? clever	re <sup>13</sup> , red COP	ɣa <sup>53</sup> , wa fox	ɣa <sup>53</sup> , wa fox	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de that	tø <sup>h</sup> ø <sup>53</sup> khyod 2S	tɯ <sup>13</sup> ru <sup>35</sup> de.ring today
16	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	nɑ <sup>35</sup> nyung.ba a.little	se <sup>53</sup> bsad kill	mɑ <sup>13</sup> -ndza <sup>53</sup> . ma-‘cha NEG.CMPL-eat:IPF	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	tø <sup>53</sup> tø <sup>53</sup> dwa.dwa orphan	re <sup>13</sup> , red COP	
17	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	ne <sup>53</sup> rɛ <sup>53</sup> mi.? other.people	tɕɑ <sup>35</sup> rtsa LOC	ja <sup>13</sup> wa <sup>53</sup> lag.(gyog.)pa helper	ndzu <sup>35</sup> , sos graze:PF/IMP	ne <sup>53</sup> rɛ <sup>53</sup> mi.? other.people	ji <sup>53</sup> yi GEN	



- 18 jy<sup>35</sup> ndzo<sup>53</sup> de<sup>13</sup>... ra<sup>13</sup>-jy<sup>35</sup> ndzo<sup>53</sup> de<sup>13</sup>,” tʂu<sup>53</sup> dze<sup>35</sup>  
 lug ‘tsho bdog ra-lug ‘tsho bdog ‘dra bzlos  
 sheep graze:IPF PROG goat-sheep graze:IPF PROG thus say:PF
- 19 ʂə<sup>13</sup>. “tʂ<sup>h</sup>ø<sup>53</sup> tu<sup>13</sup>ru<sup>35</sup> gu<sup>13</sup>ka<sup>53</sup> ndze<sup>53</sup> to<sup>35</sup>... to<sup>35</sup> k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>53</sup>  
 ? khyod de.ring dgong.ka mtshan ? ? kho  
 PF.N-VOL 2S today evening night LNK LNK 1S.LOG
- 20 se<sup>53</sup>-ndza<sup>53</sup> ji<sup>53</sup> re<sup>13</sup>, se<sup>53</sup>-ndza<sup>53</sup> to<sup>35</sup> se<sup>53</sup>-ndza<sup>53</sup>  
 bsad-‘cha yi red bsad-‘cha ? bsad-‘cha  
 kill-eat:IPF NOM COP kill-eat:IPF LNK kill-eat:IPF
- 21 ʂue<sup>53</sup>. ti<sup>13</sup>pa<sup>53</sup> na<sup>35</sup> se<sup>53</sup> ma<sup>13</sup>-ndza<sup>53</sup>,” to<sup>35</sup>  
 shog ding.pa nyung.ba bsad ma-‘cha ?  
 come:IMP now a.little kill NEG.CMPL-eat:IPF LNK
- 22 ya<sup>53</sup> tɛ<sup>53</sup> ja<sup>35</sup> dze<sup>35</sup> ʂə<sup>13</sup>. to<sup>35</sup>... mo<sup>13</sup>ri<sup>53</sup>... na<sup>13</sup>ny<sup>53</sup>  
 wa de ? bzlos ? ? ma.rabs nyag.nyog  
 fox DEF agree say:PF PF.N-VOL LNK woman child
- 23 tɛ<sup>53</sup> ya<sup>13</sup>ra<sup>35</sup> ndzɯ<sup>53</sup>, na<sup>13</sup>ny<sup>53</sup> pu<sup>35</sup> tɛ<sup>53</sup> ya<sup>13</sup>ra<sup>35</sup> ndzɯ<sup>53</sup>.  
 de ? ‘gro nyag.nyog bu.mo de ? ‘gro  
 DEF in.a.circle go:IPF child girl DEF in.a.circle go:IPF
- 24 ya<sup>13</sup>ra<sup>35</sup> ndzɯ<sup>53</sup> ni<sup>53</sup>, ŋu<sup>53</sup> ʂi<sup>53</sup> ya<sup>13</sup>ra<sup>35</sup> ndzɯ<sup>53</sup> we<sup>53</sup>. ŋu<sup>53</sup>  
 ?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 ʂi<sup>53</sup> ya<sup>13</sup>ra<sup>35</sup> ndzɯ<sup>53</sup> we<sup>53</sup>, jo<sup>53</sup> tɕi<sup>35</sup> la<sup>53</sup> nu<sup>13</sup>tɕa<sup>53</sup>  
 bzhin.du ? ‘gro ‘ongs lam dkyil la nor.skyag  
 SIM in.a.circle go:IPF come:PF road center LOC cow.turd
- 26 ʂə<sup>13</sup> re<sup>53</sup> tʂ<sup>h</sup>e<sup>53</sup>, nu<sup>13</sup>tɕa<sup>53</sup> ʂə<sup>13</sup> re<sup>53</sup> tʂ<sup>h</sup>e<sup>53</sup>: “pu<sup>35</sup>pu<sup>53</sup>,  
 shig ? phrad nor.skyag shig ? phrad bu.mo.?  
 INDEF COM encounter cow.turd INDEF COM encounter girl

- 27 t<sup>h</sup>ø<sup>53</sup> tʃ<sup>h</sup>ə<sup>53</sup> ŋu<sup>53</sup> de<sup>13?</sup> t<sup>h</sup>ø<sup>53</sup>... ni<sup>13</sup>ndzε<sup>35</sup> no<sup>53</sup> dzue<sup>35</sup>  
khyod chi ngu bdog khyod mig.'bras nang mchil.ma  
2S what cry PROG 2S eye LOC fluid
- 28 kua<sup>155</sup> øe<sup>53</sup> k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>53</sup> no<sup>13</sup>, t<sup>h</sup>ø<sup>53</sup> tʃ<sup>h</sup>ə<sup>53</sup> ŋu<sup>53</sup> de<sup>13?</sup>”  
? byas khur snang khyod chi ngu bdog  
ONOM do:PF carry exist 2S what cry PROG
- 29 dzε<sup>35</sup>. “k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>53</sup> tu<sup>13</sup>ru<sup>35</sup> ndzε<sup>53</sup> ta<sup>53</sup> no<sup>35</sup> mə<sup>13</sup>-jɔ<sup>35</sup> ji<sup>53</sup> re<sup>13</sup>,  
bzlos kho de.ring mtshan da nam mi-langs yi red  
say:PF 1S.LOG today night now sky NEG-be.bright NOM COP
- 30 k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>53</sup> mə<sup>13</sup>-ndy<sup>53</sup> ji<sup>53</sup> re<sup>13</sup>, γa<sup>53</sup> rə<sup>13</sup> pu<sup>35</sup> ndzɯ<sup>13</sup>-re<sup>35</sup>  
kho mi-‘dug yi red wa ? bu.mo mchong-re  
1S.LOG NEG-reside NOM COP fox CONJ girl jump-RECP
- 31 øe<sup>53</sup> de<sup>13</sup>,” dzε<sup>35</sup> ni<sup>53</sup>, “ndzɯ<sup>13</sup>-re<sup>35</sup>” dzε<sup>35</sup>, “k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>53</sup>  
byas bdog bzlos ni mchong-re bzlos kho  
do:PF PROG say:PF TOP jump-RECP say:PF 1S.LOG
- 32 k<sup>h</sup>o<sup>53</sup>-nbɔ<sup>13</sup> øə<sup>13</sup>, k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>53</sup> k<sup>h</sup>o<sup>53</sup>-ku<sup>13</sup>nbɔ<sup>13</sup> ni<sup>13</sup>, tu<sup>13</sup>ru<sup>35</sup>  
? ? kho ? ni de.ring  
be.defeated-CMPL PF.N-VOL 1S.LOG be.defeated-CMPL.EMPH TOP today
- 33 ndzε<sup>53</sup> ta<sup>53</sup> γa<sup>53</sup> tε<sup>53</sup> k<sup>h</sup>u<sup>53</sup> se<sup>53</sup>-ndza<sup>53</sup> wu<sup>53</sup> re<sup>13</sup>.”  
mtshan da wa de kho bsad-‘cha ‘ong red  
night now fox DEF 1S.LOG kill-eat:IPF come:IPF COP
- 34 “fie, t<sup>h</sup>ə<sup>53</sup> mə<sup>13</sup>-tə<sup>53</sup>. t<sup>h</sup>ə<sup>53</sup>... ʂa<sup>53</sup>... ʂa<sup>13</sup>ma<sup>53</sup> ne<sup>13</sup>ni<sup>53</sup>  
? khyod.? ma-skrag khyod.? sran sran.ma ?  
EXCL 2S.EMPH NEG.CMPL-be.afraid 2S.EMPH pea pea gruel
- 35 lo<sup>13</sup>wu<sup>53</sup> ko<sup>53</sup> ki<sup>53</sup> zɑ<sup>341</sup>, ʂa<sup>13</sup>ma<sup>53</sup> ne<sup>13</sup>ni<sup>53</sup> lo<sup>13</sup>wu<sup>53</sup>  
? gang skol bzhag sran.ma ? ?  
cooking.pot full boil put:PF/IMP pea gruel cooking.pot

36	kɔ <sup>53</sup> gang full	ki <sup>53</sup> skol boil	zɔ <sup>341</sup> , bzhag put:PF/IMP	gu <sup>13</sup> ka <sup>53</sup> dgong.ka evening	ɲɛ <sup>53</sup> me fire	nda <sup>53</sup> 'de get.warm	ruɛ <sup>53</sup> rogs companion	wu <sup>53</sup> 'ong come:IPF	
37	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	tʂu <sup>53</sup> 'dra thus	dze <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	ʂə <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	to <sup>35</sup> ? LNK	ja <sup>35</sup> ? agree	dze <sup>35</sup> . zlos say:PF	fi <sup>35</sup> yang again	ɲa <sup>35</sup> , nyung.ba a.little
38	fi <sup>35</sup> ... yang again	fi <sup>35</sup> yang again	tu <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> dum.pa one.part	we <sup>53</sup> , 'ongs come:PF	fi <sup>35</sup> yang again	tu <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> dum.pa one.part	we <sup>53</sup> 'ongs come:PF	ɲi <sup>13</sup> , ni TOP	
39	jo <sup>53</sup> lam road	tɕi <sup>35</sup> dkyil center	la <sup>53</sup> ... la LOC	jo <sup>53</sup> lam road	tɕi <sup>35</sup> dkyil center	ndʒa <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> chan.pa scissors	ʂə <sup>13</sup> shig INDEF	de <sup>53</sup> . bdog exist	
40	ndʒa <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> chan.pa scissors	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	ndʒa <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> chan.pa scissors	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	k <sup>h</sup> a <sup>53</sup> tɕ <sup>h</sup> ɔ <sup>53</sup> , kha.'chad speak	ndʒa <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> chan.pa scissors			
41	tɛ <sup>53</sup> : de DEF	“pu <sup>35</sup> pu <sup>53</sup> , bu.mo.? girl	tɕ <sup>h</sup> ɔ <sup>53</sup> khyod 2S	tʂ <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>53</sup> chi what	ɕe <sup>53</sup> byas do:PF	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	tɕ <sup>h</sup> ɔ <sup>53</sup> khyod 2S		
42	ɲu <sup>53</sup> ngu cry	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	dze <sup>35</sup> . bzlos say:PF	“k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	tu <sup>13</sup> ru <sup>35</sup> de.ring today	gu <sup>13</sup> ka <sup>53</sup> dgong.ka evening	ta <sup>53</sup> da now	ya <sup>53</sup> wa fox	
43	ji <sup>53</sup> yis AGT	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	se <sup>53</sup> -ndʒa <sup>53</sup> . bsad-'cha kill-eat:IPF	ya <sup>53</sup> wa fox	rə <sup>13</sup> ? CONJ	pu <sup>35</sup> bu.mo girl	ndʒu <sup>13</sup> -re <sup>35</sup> mchong-re jump-RECP	ɕe <sup>53</sup> byas do:PF	
44	ɲi <sup>13</sup> , ni TOP	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	k <sup>h</sup> ɔ <sup>53</sup> -nbɔ <sup>13</sup> ? be.defeated-CMPL	tɕ <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>13</sup> , chas TERM	k <sup>h</sup> ɔ <sup>53</sup> -nbɔ <sup>13</sup> ? be.defeated-CMPL	tɕ <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>13</sup> , chas TERM			

45	tʉ <sup>13</sup> ru <sup>35</sup> de.ring today	gu <sup>13</sup> ka <sup>53</sup> dgong.ka evening	ta <sup>53</sup> da now	se <sup>53</sup> -ndʒa <sup>53</sup> .” bsad-‘cha kill-eat:IPF	“fiε, ? EXCL	tɕ <sup>h</sup> ɑ <sup>53</sup> , khyod.? 2S.EMPH	fiō <sup>35</sup> yang again	
46	ʂa <sup>13</sup> ma <sup>53</sup> sran.ma pea	ɲε <sup>13</sup> ɲi <sup>53</sup> ? gruel	ki <sup>53</sup> skol boil	zɑ <sup>341</sup> , bzhag put:PF/IMP	gu <sup>13</sup> ka <sup>53</sup> dgong.ka evening	ɲε <sup>53</sup> me fire	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	
47	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> ,” bdog PROG	dze <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	ʂə <sup>13</sup> , ? PF.N-VOL	“gu <sup>13</sup> ka <sup>53</sup> dgong.ka evening	ɲε <sup>53</sup> me fire	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	
48	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	ɲε <sup>53</sup> me fire	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	ruε <sup>53</sup> rogs companion	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> .” bdog PROG	
49	tε <sup>53</sup> ... de that	tε <sup>53</sup> de that	ts <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> -no <sup>53</sup> tshu-nang here-LOC	tse <sup>53</sup> , slebs reach	ɕa <sup>53</sup> gue <sup>35</sup> bya.sgong egg	rε <sup>53</sup> ? COM	tʂ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> , phrad encounter	
50	fiō <sup>35</sup> yang again	tʂu <sup>53</sup> ‘dra thus	dze <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	ʂə <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	fiō <sup>35</sup> yang again	“ɲε <sup>53</sup> me fire	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	ruε <sup>53</sup> rogs companion
51	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> ,” bdog PROG	dze <sup>35</sup> . bzlos say:PF	tε <sup>53</sup> de that	ts <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> -no <sup>53</sup> tshu-nang here-LOC	tse <sup>53</sup> , slebs reach	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho needle	
52	rε <sup>53</sup> ? COM	tʂ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> , phrad encounter	“ɲε <sup>53</sup> me fire	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	ruε <sup>53</sup> rogs companion	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	
53	mɑ <sup>13</sup> -ɲu <sup>53</sup> ,” ma-ngu NEG.CMPL-cry	dze <sup>35</sup> . bzlos say:PF	tε <sup>53</sup> de that	ts <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> -no <sup>53</sup> tshu-nang here-LOC	tse <sup>53</sup> ... slebs reach	tε <sup>53</sup> de that		

54	ts <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> -no <sup>53</sup> tshu-nang here-LOC	tse <sup>53</sup> , slebs reach	ye <sup>13</sup> wa <sup>53</sup> sbal.ba frog	re <sup>53</sup> ? COM	tʂ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> , phrad encounter	fiō <sup>35</sup> yang again	“ne <sup>53</sup> me fire	
55	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	ruε <sup>53</sup> rogs companion	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	mα <sup>13</sup> -ŋu <sup>53</sup> , ma-ngu NEG.CMPL-cry			
56	ne <sup>13</sup> ne <sup>35</sup> ?? be.worried	mα <sup>13</sup> -øe <sup>53</sup> .” ma-byas NEG.CMPL-do:PF	te <sup>53</sup> de that	ts <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> -no <sup>53</sup> tshu-nang here-LOC	tse <sup>53</sup> , slebs reach	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho needle	re <sup>53</sup> ? COM	
57	tʂ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> , phrad encounter	fiō <sup>35</sup> yang again	tʂu <sup>53</sup> ‘dra thus	dze <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	ʂø <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	te <sup>53</sup> de that	øi <sup>53</sup> -we <sup>53</sup> , khyim-‘ongs DIR-come:PF	
58	to <sup>35</sup> ? LNK	da <sup>13</sup> lu <sup>53</sup> rdo.lo pestle	re <sup>53</sup> ? COM	tʂ <sup>h</sup> e <sup>53</sup> , phrad encounter	da <sup>13</sup> lu <sup>53</sup> rdo.lo pestle	dze <sup>35</sup> : bzlos say:PF	“k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	ne <sup>53</sup> me fire
59	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	ruε <sup>53</sup> rogs companion	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	ʂa <sup>13</sup> ma <sup>53</sup> sran.ma pea	ne <sup>13</sup> ni <sup>53</sup> ? gruel	ki <sup>53</sup> skol boil	
60	zα <sup>341</sup> , bzhag put:PF/IMP	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho 1S.LOG	ne <sup>53</sup> me fire	nda <sup>53</sup> ‘de get.warm	ruε <sup>53</sup> rogs companion	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	de <sup>13</sup> .” bdog PROG	
61	ndze <sup>53</sup> mtshan night	te <sup>53</sup> de TOP	ta <sup>13</sup> nbe <sup>35</sup> bden.pa really	ya <sup>53</sup> wa fox	te <sup>53</sup> de DEF	we <sup>53</sup> ‘ongs come:PF	ʂø <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	na <sup>13</sup> ny <sup>53</sup> nyag.nyog child
62	te <sup>53</sup> de DEF	ndza <sup>53</sup> ‘cha eat:IPF	we <sup>53</sup> ‘ongs come:PF	ʂø <sup>13</sup> , ? PF.N-VOL	na <sup>13</sup> ny <sup>53</sup> nyag.nyog child	te <sup>53</sup> de DEF	ndza <sup>53</sup> ‘cha eat:IPF	we <sup>53</sup> ‘ongs come:PF

63	ni <sup>53</sup> , ni TOP	ngue <sup>53</sup> mgo head	ti <sup>13</sup> -ke <sup>53</sup> de.'i-? DEF.OBL-LOC	ya <sup>53</sup> wa fox	ti <sup>53</sup> de.'is DEF.AGT	wa <sup>13</sup> tʃa <sup>53</sup> ? claw	du <sup>35</sup> ?'thogs catch	œ <sup>13</sup> , byas do:PF
64	wa <sup>13</sup> tʃa <sup>53</sup> ? claw	du <sup>35</sup> ?'thogs catch	œ <sup>53</sup> , byas do:PF	s <sup>h</sup> o <sup>13</sup> -tɛ <sup>53</sup> so-de comb-DEF	ja <sup>35</sup> lag hand	ke <sup>53</sup> ? LOC	tsu <sup>53</sup> 'dzugs prick	œ <sup>53</sup> byas do:PF
65	ʂə <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	ts <sup>h</sup> a <sup>53</sup> ʂue <sup>53</sup> ?'tshugs.? ache	tsu <sup>53</sup> 'dzugs prick	ʂə <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	“ndɛ <sup>53</sup> 'di this	tʃ <sup>h</sup> ə <sup>53</sup> chi what	re <sup>13</sup> ,” red COP	
66	dze <sup>35</sup> . bzlos say:PF	to <sup>35</sup> ? LNK	ʂa <sup>53</sup> ... zhwa hat	ʂa <sup>53</sup> zhwa hat	ti <sup>13</sup> -ke <sup>53</sup> de.'i-? DEF.OBL-LOC	ndʒø <sup>35</sup> 'chang touch	œ <sup>53</sup> , byas do:PF	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>53</sup> kho needle
67	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	ze <sup>53</sup> gzer prick	œ <sup>53</sup> , byas do:PF	fi <sup>o</sup> <sup>35</sup> ... yang again	ke <sup>13</sup> wa <sup>53</sup> rked.pa waist	ti <sup>13</sup> -ke <sup>53</sup> de.'i-? DEF.OBL-LOC	ke <sup>53</sup> ? stroke	œ <sup>53</sup> , byas do:PF
68	ndʒa <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> chan.pa scissors	ti <sup>53</sup> ... de.'is DEF.AGT	ndʒa <sup>13</sup> nba <sup>53</sup> chan.pa scissors	ti <sup>53</sup> de.'is DEF.AGT	tʃa <sup>53</sup> bcad cut	œ <sup>53</sup> , byas do:PF		
69	dze <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	ni <sup>53</sup> , ni TOP	“ndɛ <sup>53</sup> 'di this	tʃ <sup>h</sup> ə <sup>53</sup> chi what	re <sup>13</sup> , red COP	p <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> la <sup>53</sup> pha.la there.LOC	ke <sup>53</sup> ? stroke	re <sup>13</sup> red COP
70	ts <sup>h</sup> a <sup>53</sup> ʂue <sup>53</sup> , ?'tshugs.? ache	mu <sup>13</sup> la <sup>53</sup> ma.la down.LOC	ke <sup>53</sup> ? stroke	re <sup>13</sup> red COP	ts <sup>h</sup> a <sup>53</sup> ʂue <sup>53</sup> ?'tshugs.? ache	ʒi <sup>341</sup> yin COP	de <sup>13</sup> . bdog PROG	
71	nɛ <sup>53</sup> me fire	nbi <sup>53</sup> 'bud blow:IPF	ge <sup>341</sup> dgos want	re <sup>13</sup> ,” red COP	dze <sup>35</sup> . bzlos say:PF	œa <sup>53</sup> gue <sup>35</sup> bya.sgong egg	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	t <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>13</sup> -no <sup>53</sup> thal.ba-nang ashes-LOC

72	nɛ <sup>35</sup> nyal sleep	dɛ <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	nɛ <sup>13</sup> tɛ <sup>35</sup> me.? large.firewood	ʒu <sup>341</sup> zhabs below	nɛ <sup>35</sup> . nyal sleep	“nɛ <sup>53</sup> me fire	nbi <sup>53</sup> ‘bud blow:IPF	
73	ge <sup>341</sup> dgos want	re <sup>13</sup> .” red COP	ɕa <sup>53</sup> guɛ <sup>35</sup> bya.sgong egg	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	p <sup>h</sup> o <sup>55</sup> ? ONOM	k <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> ?khur ?carry	œ <sup>53</sup> , byas do:PF	nba <sup>53</sup> ‘bar explode
74	tø <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>35</sup> , chas TERM	ɣa <sup>53</sup> wa fox	ku <sup>13</sup> ly <sup>53</sup> sku.lus body	t <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>35</sup> thal.ba ashes	ji <sup>53</sup> yis AGT	ka <sup>53</sup> -ku <sup>13</sup> nbo <sup>13</sup> , bkab-? cover-CMPL.EMPH	ɣa <sup>53</sup> wa fox	
75	ka <sup>53</sup> -ku <sup>13</sup> nbo <sup>13</sup> , bkab-? cover-CMPL.EMPH	ni <sup>13</sup> ndzɛ <sup>35</sup> mig.’bras eye	ka <sup>53</sup> -ku <sup>13</sup> nbo <sup>13</sup> bkab-? cover-CMPL.EMPH	tø <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>35</sup> , chas TERM	ni <sup>13</sup> ndzɛ <sup>35</sup> ... mig.’bras eye			
76	ɣa <sup>53</sup> : wa fox	“tʃ <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> sue <sup>53</sup> ... chu.bzom water.bucket	tʃ <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> ndzɑ <sup>35</sup> chu.’khyags water	rɛ <sup>53</sup> ? INSTR	k <sup>h</sup> a <sup>13</sup> ŋu <sup>53</sup> kha.ngo face			
77	tøy <sup>53</sup> bkru wash:PF/IMP	nbe <sup>53</sup> , mbod call:IPF	fi <sup>o</sup> <sup>35</sup> yang again	ts <sup>h</sup> i <sup>35</sup> ‘tshol search	ge <sup>341</sup> sgos want	re <sup>13</sup> ,” red COP	ji <sup>53</sup> yi NOM	
78	dzɛ <sup>35</sup> . bzlos say:PF	tʃ <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> sue <sup>53</sup> chu.bzom water.bucket	ti <sup>13</sup> -kɛ <sup>53</sup> ... de.’i-? DEF.OBL-LOC	tʃ <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> sue <sup>53</sup> chu.bzom water.bucket	ti <sup>13</sup> -no <sup>53</sup> de.’i-nang DEF.OBL-LOC			
79	yɛ <sup>13</sup> wa <sup>53</sup> sbal.ba frog	tɛ <sup>53</sup> de DEF	tʃ <sup>h</sup> i <sup>53</sup> ? ONOM	dzɛ <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	tøɑ <sup>53</sup> grags outcry	ʂø <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL	to <sup>35</sup> ? LNK	pu <sup>35</sup> bu.mo girl
80	se <sup>53</sup> -ndzɑ <sup>53</sup> bsad-‘cha kill-eat:IPF	ga <sup>53</sup> ? be.able	ma <sup>13</sup> -re <sup>13</sup> , ma-red NEG.CMPL-COP	se <sup>53</sup> -ndzɑ <sup>53</sup> bsad-‘cha kill-eat:IPF	ga <sup>53</sup> ? be.able			

81	mɑ <sup>13</sup> -re <sup>13</sup> ma-red NEG.CMPL-COP	ʂə <sup>13</sup> , ? PF.N-VOL	to <sup>35</sup> ? LNK	“tu <sup>13</sup> ru <sup>35</sup> de.ring today	to <sup>35</sup> ? LNK		
82	wɛ <sup>35</sup> ? succeed	mɑ <sup>13</sup> -re <sup>13</sup> , ma-red NEG.CMPL-COP	no <sup>13</sup> ue <sup>35</sup> nangs.pa tomorrow	wu <sup>53</sup> ‘ong come:IPF	ge <sup>341</sup> sgos want	re <sup>13</sup> , red COP	
83	tu <sup>13</sup> ru <sup>35</sup> de.ring today	p <sup>h</sup> u <sup>13</sup> la <sup>53</sup> pha.la there.LOC	tə <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>35</sup> chas go:PF	re <sup>13</sup> red COP	mə <sup>13</sup> -ndzɯ <sup>35</sup> mi-‘grub NEG-happen	ʂə <sup>13</sup> , ? PF.N-VOL	
84	mu <sup>13</sup> la <sup>53</sup> ma.la down.LOC	tə <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>35</sup> chas go:PF	re <sup>13</sup> red COP	mə <sup>13</sup> -ndzɯ <sup>35</sup> mi-‘grub NEG-happen	ʂə <sup>13</sup> ,” ? PF.N-VOL	ge <sup>13</sup> tse <sup>53</sup> sgo.slad outside	
85	ndzi <sup>53</sup> , mchi go:IPF	“tu <sup>13</sup> ru <sup>35</sup> de.ring today	ta <sup>53</sup> da now	wɛ <sup>35</sup> ? succeed	mɑ <sup>13</sup> -re <sup>13</sup> .” ma-red NEG.CMPL-COP	ge <sup>13</sup> tse <sup>53</sup> sgo.slad outside	tə <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>35</sup> , chas go:PF
86	nu <sup>13</sup> təa <sup>53</sup> nor.skyag cow.turd	guɛ <sup>13</sup> le <sup>35</sup> sgo.ba.leb threshold	ke <sup>53</sup> ? LOC	ɲɛ <sup>35</sup> nyal sleep	de <sup>13</sup> , bdog PROG	nu <sup>13</sup> təa <sup>53</sup> nor.skyag cow.turd	xɛ <sup>135</sup> ? ONOM
87	gɛ <sup>35</sup> rgal stretch.over	tə <sup>h</sup> ɛ <sup>35</sup> , chas go:PF	na <sup>13</sup> ngɛ <sup>53</sup> ? on.the.top	da <sup>13</sup> lu <sup>53</sup> rdo.lo pestle	t <sup>h</sup> o <sup>13</sup> jy <sup>35</sup> -we <sup>53</sup> , thur.-‘ongs DIR-come:PF	ɣa <sup>53</sup> wa fox	
88	ngue <sup>53</sup> mgo head	təi <sup>35</sup> dkyil middle	ndzu <sup>53</sup> ‘brab hit	œ <sup>53</sup> , ɣa <sup>53</sup> do:PF	se <sup>53</sup> -nbo <sup>13</sup> wa fox	we <sup>53</sup> , ‘ongs kill-CMPL PF.VOL	
89	tʂu <sup>53</sup> ‘dra thus	dze <sup>35</sup> bzlos say:PF	ʂə <sup>13</sup> . ? PF.N-VOL				

Narrator: Lako (b. 1930)  
Recorded: 22 December 2003



## “An Orphan and a Fox”

(English free-style translation)

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 your 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 your 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 could see better." The egg was sleeping in the ashes, under large chunks of [charcoaled] firewood. "I need to light the fire so that I could 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.