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Comparative, equative, and similative constructions in Lizu (Tibeto-Burman)

Katia Chirkova

Abstract: This paper focuses on the morphosyntax and typology of comparative, equative, and similative constructions in Lizu (Tibeto-Burman). These three types of constructions are demonstrated to show strong resemblance in their formal make-up, sharing basic structure (in which the standard NP is constructed as an adverbial phrase) and one standard marker (/pɐ/). The goals of the paper are (1) to provide a detailed synchronic description of the three types of constructions, and (2) to place their distinctive characteristics within a larger typological context. Given that Lizu comparative constructions belong to the Particle Comparative type, which is argued to be an areal phenomenon in the regions where it is attested (Stassen 1985, 2013; Heine 1997), Lizu comparative constructions (but also equative and similative constructions) are examined in the local areal context, and compared to corresponding constructions in the linguistic neighbors of Lizu: Tibetan, Pumi, Namuzi, Nuosu, and Mandarin. It is argued that Lizu’s comparative constructions are unique among its linguistic neighbors. The implications of the findings are discussed in typological, areal, and diachronic perspective.

1. INTRODUCTION

Lizu is a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in three counties in Sichuan Province in the People’s Republic of China: Jiulong (Written Tibetan [hereafter WT] brgyad zur), Muli (WT rmi lï), and Mianning (see Map 1). The total number of Lizu speakers is estimated at ca. 7,000 (Wang 2010: 3).1

Map 1: Distribution of the Lizu language (Map by Franz Huber)

The Lizu people (/lì-zû/ or /lỳ-zû/ ‘white people’) traditionally reside along the Yalong or Nyag Chu River and its tributary in Jiulong County, the Jiulong River. The group has the longest history of residence in Jiulong and Mianning counties, whereas migration to Muli is more recent, dating from the turn of the 20th century. The Lizu language is currently classified as member of the putative Qiangic subgroup of the Tibeto-Burman language family. However, it is grammatically and lexically quite distant from other Qiangic languages. The

1 CNRS-CRLAO, E-mail: katia.chirkova@gmail.com

1 Lizu are officially classified as members of the Tibetan nationality. Their total number is known by estimation only, as no official census data on the group are available.
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closest relatives of Lizu include the Duoxu and Ersu languages, which, together with Lizu, are classified as three dialects of one Ersu language (ISO-639 code ers). Given that Lizu is not mutually intelligible with Duoxu and Ersu, it is regarded here as a distinct language (for more details, see Sun 1982, Chirkova 2016).

Lizu is spoken in a historically multi-ethnic and multi-lingual area. The immediate linguistic neighbors of Lizu are Southwestern Mandarin (Sinitic) throughout all Lizu-speaking areas, and various Tibeto-Burman languages in different counties where Lizu is spoken. These Tibeto-Burman languages are Kham Tibetan (Bodish) and Nuosu (Northern Yi, Lolo-Burmese) in Jiulong County; Namuzi and Duoxu (both Qiangic) in Mianning County; and Pumi and Namuzi (both Qiangic) in Muli County. Lizu has dialectal variations across its area of distribution. All varieties are mutually intelligible and differ mainly in phonology and lexicon. This study is based on first-hand fieldwork data on /ʃætɕʰopotæ/'eastern dialect', as spoken in Kālā 卡拉 Township, Muli County.

Lizu is isolating, verb-final, and head-final (hence all modifiers precede the element they modify). Syntax operates predominantly through word order and the use of nominal and verbal particles and auxiliaries. The unmarked word order is S/A - DirO - IndO - V. The grammatical relations of subject and object are not grammaticalized. The clause structure is based on the pragmatic relations of topical material (clause-initial) vs. focal material (clause-final). The verb complex is the only necessary element for an utterance to be considered a clause, and the verb complex may be simply a predicate noun. Lizu has two open word classes: nouns and verbs, which can be defined on the basis of morphological and morphosyntactic criteria. Nouns are those forms that can take (in)definite marking, numeral-classifier phrases, and nominal particles (analytic case markers). There is no agreement with nouns of any kind marked on the verb. Verbs are those forms that can take directional or perfectivizing prefixes, the causative marker /su/, and the interrogative and negative marking. Verbs can be preceded by adverbial expressions, followed by markers expressing aspect, evidentiality, and modality, and nominalized by one of the nominalizers. Adjectives are formally a subset of verbs (intransitive stative verbs). They function as (intransitive) predicates, take verbal prefixes, and the causative, interrogative, and negative marking.

This paper focuses on one particular aspect of Lizu that is not covered in previous work on that language: the morphosyntax and typology of its comparative, equative, and simulative constructions. These three types of constructions are demonstrated to show strong resemblance in their formal make-up, sharing basic structure and one standard marker (/pɐ/). This paper aims at (1) providing a detailed synchronic description of the three types of constructions and (2) placing their distinctive characteristics within a larger typological context (sections 2-4). Given that Lizu comparative constructions belong to the Particle Comparative type, which is argued to be an areal phenomenon in the regions where it is attested (Stassen 1985, 2013; Heine 1997), Lizu comparative constructions are also examined in the local areal
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context (section 5). In contrast to other languages of the Particle Comparative type, Lizu’s comparative constructions appear to be quite unique among its linguistic neighbors. The paper is concluded with a summary of major typological, genetic, and areal characteristics of comparative, equative, and similative constructions in Lizu (section 6).

Data on which this study is based were recorded during several fieldwork trips to the Lizu-speaking areas of Muli County between 2008 and 2015. Part of the data, time-aligned and annotated, are accessible online at the Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR, SOAS, University of London) (https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MP1655514). Example sentences are drawn from a corpus of 152 interlinearized texts, which include personal narratives, song lyrics, folktales, translations from Mandarin Chinese, and procedural texts (hereafter corpus).

2. COMPARISON CONSTRUCTIONS

This section provides an overview of (a) the comparison of superiority (e.g. A is taller than B), (b) the comparison of inferiority (e.g. A is less tall than B), and (c) the superlative construction (A is the tallest of all). The present discussion adopts the terminology given by Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998) and exemplified in (1), where comparee stands for the entity being compared, parameter denotes the quality with regard to which one is comparing, and standard is the entity that the comparee is being compared with.

(1)  A  is  tall-er  than  Comparee  Parameter Parameter marker  Standard marker  B  Standard

The basic constituent order in the Lizu constructions of superiority and inferiority is provided in (2). Comparison is expressed in one single surface clause.

(2)  A (NP1)  B (NP2)  pu  jæ-/mæ-Adjective  Comparee  Standard  Standard marker  Parameter marker-Parameter

The comparee is not morphologically marked, typically occurs in the clause-initial position (topical material), and is often followed by the topic marker le, as in example (3).²

² If the standard is animate, it may be morphologically marked by the non-agentive marker v, which signals primarily human arguments of the verb (except for agent). Such use, which combs two nominal particles following the standard NP, is infrequent in the corpus.

(3a)  â têê v pu jæmbuā.
The standard NP is followed by the nominal particle /pɐ/, analyzed here as a standard marker. The main function of /pɐ/ in the corpus is to mark comparison. It is also in use as a particle with the meaning 'like', as illustrated in sentence (4).

(4) tɔmpʰɔ tʰête pɐ ʃɐ̍ tê, mjæmjæ tê
m-mouth that like be-long one eye
mjaemja tê
be-marry-be many one

“He was one (scary creature) with a mouth long like that and many eyes.”

The standard NP is formally part of an adverbial phrase, which can be marked by other nominal particles (analytical case markers) expressing locational and non-locational relations. These nominal particles include the locative particle ke, as in example (5), the non-agentive particle v, as in example (3a), or the instrumental particle læmu (see Chirkova 2016 for a detailed discussion).

(5) ntsʰołọ maɛmõ bi le sæk kʰelɔ tɔae
ntsʰołọ maɛmõ bi le sæk maɛmõ bi le sæk
man.eating.demon old.lady DEF TOP road-half
ke kʰe-lo tɔae
LOC inward-wait RES

“The man-eating old lady was waiting halfway up the road.”

Given that spatial expressions are linguistically more basic and often serve as basis / structural templates for non-spatial expressions (Lyons 1977: 178; Stassen 1985: 36-37; LaPolla 2004: 59, in relation to the source of nominal markers in Tibeto-Burman languages), the comparative expression in Lizu may be ultimately derived from a spatial expression. However, /pɐ/ has been grammaticalized to such an extent that the original meaning is no longer reconstructible. /pɐ/ has cognates in the closely related sister-languages of Lizu Duoxu and Ersu, where corresponding forms are also only used as standard markers (ba, the standard marker in comparative constructions in Duoxu,

(3) æ = i jêne le ne = i jêne pɐ jæ-mbaô
æ = i jêne le ne = i jêne
1SG=GEN younger.brother TOP 2SG=GEN younger.brother
pɐ jæ-mbaô
like more-be.tall

“My brother is taller than your brother.”

“I am taller than her.”
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Chirkova and Han 2017; and pa, the standard marker in the equative construction in Ersu, Zhang 2013: 135-136).

The parameter (an adjective) functions as head of an intransitive predicate. The predicative adjective in the Lizu comparison of superiority is marked by a special comparative prefix of unknown etymological origin: jæ-. The use of this prefix signals that the compared quality is present to a greater extent (for that reason it is glossed below as ‘more’). The use of this prefix is illustrated in sentences (3) and (6). The comparative prefix jæ- also has cognates in the closely related sister languages Duoxu and Ersu (both ja-).

(6) æ=temî jæbi neändæ pære jæzaedʒã.
1SG heart sugar downward-eat like CONJ
more-be.pleasant.

“It was even more enjoyable than eating sweets.”

The structure of the Lizu comparison of inferiority is identical to that of the comparison of superiority, but it uses the negative form of the predicative adjective, where the negator mɐ is prefixed to the adjectival root. Consider examples (7) and (8):

(7) æ=ı jênu le ne=ı jênu pɐ mɐ-mbãå
æ=ı jênu le ne=ı jênu
1SG=GEN younger.brother TOP 2SG=GEN younger.brother
like mɐ-mbãå

“My brother is not as tall as your brother.”

(8) kûtʰê lóbu dʒe bi âmã kʰê-tʃe=i jwañdeʒe pɐ dė-mã-hỹ.
kûtʰê lóbu dʒe bi âmã kʰê-tʃe=i
this stone water DEF mother inward-boil=GEN
jwañdeʒe pɐ dė-mã-hỹ
chicken-water like upward-NEG-be.fragrant

“This stone soup is not as tasty as chicken soup made by mum.”

The Lizu superlative construction is based on the comparative constructions of superiority and inferiority. It employs the same marking on the predicative adjective (the comparative prefix jæ- or the negator mɐ) and it differs from the latter two constructions in using the etymologically non-transparent form pîlã in position of the standard of comparison. By analogy with degree adverbs like ‘very’, pîlã is here taken as an adverbial form modifying the predicate adjective.3

3 An alternative strategy to form superlative adjectives is found in song lyrics. It consists of marking the adjective with the prefix tɕô-, e.g. tɕômã ‘the tastiest’, tɕômbã ‘the tallest, the highest’, as in:

---

(6) æ=temî jæbi neändæ pɐ jæzaedʒã.
æ=temî jæbi ne-dzã pɐ lae
1SG heart sugar downward-eat like CONJ
jæ-zaedʒã
more-be.pleasant.

“It was even more enjoyable than eating sweets.”
My brother is the best / the least good [the worst]."

"[You need to] search among those three hundred and sixty most wealthy people, who are wooing [the princess]."

In sum, the comparison of superiority, inferiority, and the superlative construction in Lizu share (a) the same basic constituent order, in which the standard NP and the superlative marker are adverbial elements, and (b) the same standard and parameter markers (/pɐ/, /jæ/-, /mɐ/). In Stassen's (1985, 2013) typology of comparative constructions, Lizu comparison constructions are indeterminate between a sub-type of adverbial comparatives (which essentially include Locational Comparative, see section 5) and a Particle Comparative. The latter type is characterized by the presence of a specific, etymologically opaque, comparative particle, which accompanies the standard NP. Particle Comparative also often marks a predicative adjective by means of a special affix, which is also etymologically opaque. Given that the Lizu standard marker /pɐ/ is unique to comparative constructions and that its etymology offers no decisive indication of its categorical status, the Lizu comparative constructions above are analyzed as belonging to the Particle Comparative type. Particle Comparative is cross-linguistically uncommon and has been mostly described for European languages. It is furthermore argued to be an areal phenomenon in regions where it is found. We will explore this issue in connection to Lizu in section 5.

3. COMPARISON OF EQUALITY

The Lizu equative construction (in which a quality is attributed to comparee and standard to an “equal extent”, as in A is as tall as B) is built on the model of comparison constructions. Lizu distinguishes between two types of equative

(9a) nenkʰexьте̂ xâne ne-dzâ bâzê teô-mbâ? sky bird what downward-eat fly SPRL-be.tall
"What do birds in the sky eat to fly the highest?"
constructions: (a) specific (in which the nominal standard has specific reference) and (b) generic (in which the nominal standard refers to a generic standard or a class generically) (e.g. Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998: 309-313).

The constituent order in the Lizu specific equative construction is provided in (11).

(11) A (NP1)        B (NP2)  tê ‘one’  pɐ ‘like’  Adjective
    Comparee      Standard      Parameter

Both the comparee and the standard are unmarked. The comparison can be presented from the perspective of a topical comparee (the comparee being the given topic within a discourse). This is illustrated in sentence (12):

(12) æ=î jên le ne=î jên tê pɐ mbə
    æ=î jên le ne=î jên tê pɐ mbə
    1SG=GEN younger.brother TOP 2SG=GEN younger.brother
    one like be.tall
    “My brother is as tall as your brother. (lit., As for my brother, your brother is equally tall.)”

Alternatively, the comparee and the standard can have the function of a given topic together as a unity. In that case, they may be linked with the conjunction læ ‘and, also, even’, as in sentence (13); or be one single conjoined nominal, as in sentence (14):

(13) æ=û ṭənû la=û ñe=û ṭənû tê pɐ ndê
    æ=û ṭənû la=û ñe=û ṭənû tê pɐ ndê
    1SG=GEN field CONJ that-family,GEN field one
    like be.good
    “The fields of our family and those of that family are equally fertile.”

(14) múñê netʰê tê pɐ fɐ
    múñê ne-tʰê tê pɐ fɐ
    sisters two-that one like be.long
    “The two sisters are equally long.” (from a riddle about chopsticks)

The expression /tê pɐ/ ‘like one’, positioned between the semantic standard of comparison and the predicate, consists of the numeral /tê/ ‘one’ followed by the nominal particle /pɐ/, the standard marker in comparison constructions. This expression is open to two interpretations. On the one hand, the nominal particle /pɐ/ can be taken in its basic role of the standard marker, and the numeral /tê/ ‘one’ can be analyzed as introducing an additional standard of comparison, to which both the comparee and the semantic standard of comparison are compared (yielding the literal sense ‘like one, as one’). Conversely, given that the NP standard marked by /pɐ/ in Lizu is formally an adverbial phrase, the expression
/tê pʰ/ can be analyzed as an adverbial construction modifying the parameter, that is, a parameter marker, which can be translated into English as ‘equally’.

Another interesting feature of the Lizu specific equative construction is that the form of the parameter is different from that in the positive construction, as exemplified in sentence (15). More specifically, the equative construction employs monosyllabic adjectival forms (as in examples (12-14)), whereas the positive construction uses disyllabic adjectival forms. These include reduplicated forms of monosyllabic adjectives and monosyllabic adjectives prefixed with a telicity-inducing directional prefix, as in /dê-hỹ/ upward-be.fragrant ‘have become fragrant, be fragrant’ (as in example 8). In this respect, Lizu is different from the cross-linguistically more commonly attested type of equative constructions, in which the positive degree coincides with the basic form of the adjective (as in English or French).

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
æ = í & jënu \quad mbɔ-mbɔ̂ \\
1SG=GEN & younger.brother \quad be.tall-be.tall \\
\end{array}
\]

“My brother is [very] tall.”

Lizu disyllabic adjectival forms used in the positive degree of comparison can be considered graded by means of the morphological process of reduplication and derivation (conveying respectively, the meaning of intensivity and telicity or boundedness). In languages where the positive degree coincides with the basic form of the adjective, that basic form is potentially ambiguous between (a) being compared to the standard, which is presupposed logically or by conversational implicature (which is held to be the basic interpretation of the basic form of gradable adjectives) (see Sapir 1944; Lyons 1971: 465-467, 1977: 271; Cuzzolin & Lehmann 2004), and (b) being compared to the standard mentioned in the context (which is held to be the special interpretation of the basic form of the adjective). By contrast, in Lizu, the use of the monosyllabic basic form of the adjective is restricted to explicitly comparative contexts. For that reason, the basic interpretation of the monosyllabic basic form of the adjective would rather correspond to (b) above.

In contrast to the comparison of superiority, inferiority, the superlative construction and the specific equative construction, which all contain elements of obscure etymology (the standard marker /pʰ/, the parameter marker /jæ-/), the Lizu generic equative construction is etymologically transparent. In this type of construction, the standard of comparison is a generic noun. Generic nouns (that is, nouns that refer to all members of a class or some whole) in Lizu are formed by modifying a noun with the genitive particle i and the marker su, which is generally employed in Lizu as agentive nominalizer (see example (10) above). The agentive nominalizer su transparently derives from the noun /sû/ ‘person, man’. Examples of generic nouns are provided in sentence (16).

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
gê = í & wûli & săŋgê = i = sû & gê = í & mëntʰ’o \\

gê =GEN & wûli & săŋgê = GEN=AGT & gê = GEN & mëntʰ’o \\
\end{array}
\]

(16) gê i wûli săŋgê i sû, gê i mëntʰ’o mëpzaê i sû.

“His head is lion. His tail is person, man.”
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mæ̂pزة i = sû.  
peacock=GEN=AGT  
“The beginning of this song is like a lion [‘s head], the ending of this song is like a peacock [‘s tail].”

In the generic equative construction, the standard modified by the genitive marker and the agentive nominalizer /sû/ is further modified by the morpheme /mû/ (from the verb /mû/ ‘make’), which is used in Lizu to derive manner adverbials. In other words, the standard NP is formally constructed as a manner adverbial. Finally, an adjective is used as head of the predicate. The constituent order in the generic equative construction is presented in (17).

(17) A (NP1) B (NP2)=i=su /mû/ ‘make’ Adjective Comparee Standard=GEN=AGT adverbalizer Predicate

This basic construction can be further modified by inserting the expression /tê pɐ/ between the manner adverbial ending in the adverbalizer /mû/ and the predicate, as in sentence (18). When following manner adverbials, /tê pɐ/ can only be analyzed as an adverbial element modifying the predicate (‘equally’).

(18) dʒumæ i su mû (tê pɐ) ntʃʰɐ̃ dʒumæ = i = su mû (tê pɐ) ntʃʰɐ̃ 
fox=GEN=AGT make one like be.smart  
“be smart as a fox” (literally, “be equally smart like a fox”)

A negation of the construction is formed by prefixing the negator mɐ to the predicative adjective, as in the following example:

(19) kûtʰê mæmæ tuŋkwê i su mû mɐ-fê, sãgæ i su mû mɐ-pipi kûtʰê mæmæ tuŋkwê = i = su mû mɐ-fê  
this fruit wax.gourd=GEN=AGT make NEG-be.long  
sãgæ = i = su mû mɐ-pipi pumpkin=GEN=AGT make NEG-be.flat  
“This vegetable is not as long as a wax gourd and not as flat as a pumpkin.”

Given, on the one hand, the two alternative interpretations of the expression /tê pɐ/ and, on the other hand, the fact that the comparison can be presented both from the perspective of the comparee and that of the comparee and the standard together as a unity, the place of the Lizu specific equative construction in existing typologies of equative constructions (Henkelmann 2006, Fuchs 2014, Haspelmath 2015) is indeterminate. Lizu specific and generic equative constructions clearly belong to the types in which the parameter is encoded as predicate. The Lizu specific equative construction can be viewed as either that with a standard marker or that with a parameter marker (strategy I in Henkelmann’s typology, Henkelmann 2006: 385-387). In Haspelmath’s typology, the Lizu specific equative construction would belong either to Type 1 (only equative standard marker) or Type 3 (where the comparee and the standard are a single conjoined nominal). The Lizu generic equative construction
represents a new type, which is not included in existing typologies of equative constructions, and in which the standard NP is part of a manner adverbial phrase modifying the parameter.

Lizu specific and generic equative constructions generally comply with generalizations based on word order, as outlined in Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998: 289f) and Haspelmath’s (2015). More specifically:

(a) If the parameter follows the standard, then the language generally has dominant object-verb order. Put differently, equative constructions in head-final languages have the order Standard - Standard marker - Parameter.

(b) If the standard precedes the parameter, then the standard marker generally follows the standard.

If Lizu /tê pə ‘like one’ is regarded as a standard followed by a standard marker, then Lizu equative constructions would also comply with the generalization in Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998: 295-297), formulated on the basis of head-final, nonfinite peripheral European languages (Kalmyk, Lezgian, Abkhaz), that head-final languages generally lack a parameter marker. The proposed functional explanation for that generalization would, however, not apply to Lizu. That is because that explanation relies on the identity of the parameter-adjective in the positive and comparative constructions and the analysis of the parameter marker as disambiguating between the two meanings of the predicate adjective, that is, (a) the basic interpretation of the adjective in the positive degree of comparison, as compared to the standard presupposed logically or by conversational implicature, and (b) the specific, comparative interpretation of the adjective in the equative construction. According to the explanation in Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998: 295-297), in head-final languages, where the standard precedes the parameter, as soon as the standard is processed, the hearer is warned that a special interpretation of the adjective follows. The Lizu case discussed presently does not appear to comply with this logic, because the parameter adjective in the positive degree of comparison and that in the equative construction have different forms. Hence, if to be extended to the Lizu case, the functional explanation for the generalization that head-final languages lack a parameter marker would be in need of revision.

4. SIMILATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

The Lizu simulative construction (that is, a construction expressing sameness of manner, as in He sings like a nightingale) is built on the model of the generic equative construction. Cross-linguistically, the two types of constructions tend to be similar (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998: 278). Semantically, the difference between equatives and simulatives lies in the fact that simulatives express identity of manner, whereas equatives express identity of degree or extent. Put differently, the equative construction expresses sameness of extent, which is a simple one-dimensional notion; whereas the simulative construction expresses sameness of manner, which is a complex multi-faceted notion. Formally, this difference is reflected in the choice of predicate: a gradable parameter (an
adjective) in the case of the equative construction, and a verb in the case of the similative construction, hence leaving the parameter not overtly expressed. The Lizu similative constructive has the exact form of the generic equative construction, as detailed in (17) above, but it employs a verb as head of the predicate. The standard NP is formally constructed as a manner adverbial, which modifies the predicative verb. Examples include:

(20) xwiteit su mù bżé
    xwiteit =i =su mù bżé
    bird =GEN=AGT make fly
    “fly like a bird”, literally “fly in the manner of birds”

(21) tæ i su mù dëʂu
    tæ =i =su mù dë-ʂu
    deity =GEN=AGT make upward-worship
    “[They] worshipped [her] like a deity.”

(22) tʃɛmæ bi kʰentsʰø kʰæ le [...] çædæ i su mù nêntsʰæ su
    tʃɛmæ bi kʰe-ntsʰø kʰæ le
    wife =DEF inward-pull time when TOP
    çædæ =i =su mù nê-ntsʰæ su
    raw.meat.pulp =GEN=AGT make downward-prepare CAUS
    “(He) brought the wife in and had her cut in small pieces like mashed meat.”

In terms of frequency of occurrence, the construction in (17), with the verb as head of the predicate, appears to provide the primary option for the comparison of similarity in Lizu. At the same time, Lizu also has a number of alternative schemas to express the similative meaning. They include:

(23) A (NP1) B (NP2) pʰo ‘side’ tê qشاشة nì one-manner-have
    Comparee Standard Standard marker Parameter marker
    mù ‘make’ Verb
    adverbalizer Predicate

In this schema, the standard is marked with the bound locative noun pʰo ‘side’, while the predicate marker contains the verbal phrase tê qشاشة nì, literally “have one manner,” followed by the adverbializer /mù/. Consider the following example:

(24) xwiteit pʰo tê qشاشة nì mù bżé
    xwiteit =pʰo tê qشاشة nì mù bżé
    bird =side one manner exist=ABST make fly
    “fly like a bird”, literally “fly by the side of birds in the same manner”

An alternative schema in (25) is a construction with a possessive predicate.

(25) A (NP1) B (NP2) =i + NP (quality) Verb ‘have, possess’
    Comparee Standard=GEN + NP (quality) Predicate
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In this schema, the quality being compared is formally in “possession” of the standard NP (linked to it with the genitive marker i), whereas the verb has the meaning ‘have, possess’. Consider the following example:

(26) æ ʰle ʰiNboṭʃè i ʃomô dʒè e ge le tèpi pə ljè o æ ʰle ʰiNboṭʃè = i ʃomô dʒè = e ge 1sg CONJ elephant=GEN strength contain=CS N-EGO le tʰè pə ljè o TOP 3sg like be.good INTJ

“If I too had elephant’s strength, it would be so great!”

To sum up the discussion in sections 2 through 4, Lizu comparison, equative, and simulative constructions show formal overlap, sharing (a) the same basic structure, in which the standard NP is constructed as an adverbial phrase, and (b) one standard marker (/pə/). Based on the type of the adverbial phrase with the standard NP, Lizu comparative constructions can further be divided into two sub-types:

(i) comparison construction, the superlative construction, and the specific equative construction constitute one type, in which the adverbial phrase is marked by the nominal particle /pə/ of obscure etymology
(ii) the generic equative and the simulative constructions form another type, in which the standard NP is constructed as a manner adverbial, which furthermore only contains etymologically transparent elements: the agentive nominalizer /su/, from /sû/ ‘person, man’, and the adverbalizer /mû/ from /mû/ ‘make’.

In the following section, we will explore how these two subtypes correlate to the comparative types in the linguistic neighbors of Lizu.

5. LIZU COMPARATIVE, EQUATIVE, AND SIMILATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN AN AREAL CONTEXT

Comparative constructions are held to be particularly open to borrowing and able to diffuse across all or most of the languages in a linguistic area (Stassen 1985, 2013; Dixon 2008: 813). In particular, equative and simulative constructions commonly spread through contact and are often found in Sprachbund areas (cf. Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998, Haspelmath 2015 in relation to the core SAE languages). Furthermore, as argued by Bernd Heine (1997: 126-130), there is some significant correlation between the source schemas underlying comparative constructions and their areal distribution, so that the choice of a particular scheme appears to be determined primarily by areal factors. Following this logic, the unusual Lizu type of comparative constructions, characterized by the use of elements of unknown etymology (Particle Comparison) and a strong parallelism between equative and simulative constructions may be probative of a broader areal distribution of these characteristics in the region where Lizu is spoken. This assumption is explored in this section in relation to the comparative constructions as attested in the linguistic neighbors of Lizu: Kham Tibetan, Nuosu, Namuzi, and Mandarin. For
such a comparison it is necessary that (a) there are available descriptions of all concerned languages and (b) that these descriptions provide detailed discussions of various types of comparative constructions in each of the languages. However, the area where Lizu is spoken (Southwest China) is as yet relatively little explored and many of its languages are but little documented. For that reason, the discussion below has to rely on the grammatical description of Lhasa Tibetan (Tournadre & Dorje 2003) rather than that of the Kham Tibetic variety of Jiulong County which is in direct contact with Lizu, but for which no grammatical description is available. Furthermore, the present discussion necessarily excludes Namuzi data, because existing grammatical sketches of that language (Huang and Renzeng 1991, Yin 2015) only contain information on the comparison of superiority and do not include other types of comparative constructions. The comparative discussion below focuses on the following aspects: (i) the type of the comparison of superiority in each of the languages under discussion, (ii) whether or not the equative construction shows formal overlap with the comparison of superiority, as is the case of Lizu, (iii) whether or not the similative construction is modeled on the equative construction.

The comparative constructions in the northwestern neighbors of Lizu, Tibetan and Pumi belong to the Locational Comparative type in Stassen’s typology (1985, 2013). In this type of comparatives, the NP standard is constructed as an adverbial phrase with a spatial predications. Depending on the precise meaning of the locative marker governing the adverbial phrase, Locational Comparative can be further divided into three subtypes: (i) from-comparatives, which mark the standard NP as the source of a movement, with a marker meaning ‘from’ or ‘out of’; (ii) at-comparatives, which encode the standard NP as a location, in which an object is at rest, with a marker meaning ‘in’, ‘on’, ‘at’, or ‘upon’; and (iii) to-comparatives, which mark the standard NP as the goal of a movement, with a marker meaning ‘to, towards’ or ‘over, beyond’. Tibetan belongs to the from-comparative type, because its standard marker is used as the ablative marker in the literary Tibetan language, see example (27). By contrast, Pumi comparatives belong to the at-comparative type, because its standard marker is the locative marker tu ‘on top’, see example (28). Unlike Lizu, neither Tibetan nor Pumi employs a parameter marker.

(27) gyag mdzo las che ba ABL be.big yak dzo “Yaks are bigger than dzos.” (Tournadre & Dorje 2003: 263, my glosses)

Fortunately, Tibetic languages are generally similar in their structure and morphogenesis. When differences occur, they are related to phonological and lexical variation between varieties (e.g. Tournadre 2014).

It is interesting that while the Namuzi standard marker in the comparison of superiority (wu⁵⁵dæ⁵³) is distinct from that in Lizu, the Namuzi parameter marker, the comparative prefix ja³³, is comparable in form and meaning to the parameter marker jæ- in Lizu. It would therefore be of interest to further explore similarities between Lizu and Namuzi in their comparative, equative, and similative constructions, as soon as more comparative data on Namuzi become available.
In addition to Locational Comparative, Pumi also makes use of the Conjoined Comparative type, in which comparison is expressed by juxtaposing two clauses. More specifically, Pumi employs the construction A \( \mathcal{V} \), B \( \mathcal{B} \) \( \mathcal{A} \) \( \mathcal{V} \), where \( \mathcal{A} \) is the comparee, \( \mathcal{B} \) is standard, \( \mathcal{V} \) is parameter, \( \mathcal{B} \) is a verb meaning ‘to be excessive’, and \( \mathcal{A} \) is the numeral ‘one’. Consider the following example:

\[
(29) \text{tə́pì=ɡə́}
\text{tɕʰwî, tə́pì=ɡə́}
\text{tɕʰwî}
\]

“This pen is good; this pen is even better.” (Daudey 2014: 522)

The Pumi similative construction is not modeled on the Pumi equative construction. Instead, it is characterized by a coordination of the comparee and the standard and has the verb \( \mathcal{ɖǽ} \) ‘to resemble’ as the predicate. The standard NP is marked with the coordination marker \( \text{noŋ} \), as in the following example:

\[
(32) \text{tʰɕì=nòŋ}
\text{ɖǽ}
\text{pù}
\]

“(…) one village is like one household (…)” (Daudey 2014: 523)
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Furthermore, in contrast to Tibetan and Pumi, which have standard markers, Nuosu comparison constructions are also characterized by a parameter marker, ap cy, which functions as adverbalized adjective and postverbal adverb. As an adjective, ap cy precedes the parameter and is modified by the verb mu which is used in Nuosu to form manner adverbials from adjectives. The constituent order in the Nuosu comparison of superiority is provided in (33).

(33a) Comparee  Standard  Parameter  ap cy ‘more’
(33b) Comparee  Standard-jox ‘to’  ap cy ‘more’-mu ‘make’  Parameter

Consider the following examples:

(34) mu ga nga jyx ap cy
name 1P.SG big more
“Muga is bigger than me.” (Gerner 2013: 444)

(35) mu ga ngat jox ap cy mu yy
name 1P.SG to more ADVL big
“Muga is bigger than me.” (Gerner 2013: 444)

The Nuosu equality construction is different from comparison constructions. It belongs to the type with unification of comparee and standard. The constituent order is: Comparee-Standard, followed by si nip ‘with’ (standard marker)-Parameter. The parameter can be either prefixed with the reciprocal prefix jjy- (as in 36) or preceded by an adverbial expression jjy-sux mu reciprocal-resemble-adverbializer (as in 37).

(36) yit cyx ji ngat uo nyi cyx
needle DEM.PROX CL 1P.SG hair DEM.PROX
jjy-sux-sho.
CL with RECL-long
“This needle is as long as this hair of mine.” (Gerner 2013: 448)

(37) yit cyx ji ngat uo nyi cyx ji si nip
needle DEM CL 1P.SG hair DEM CL. with
jjy-sux-sho.
RECL-resemble-ADVL long
“This needle is as long as this hair of mine.” (Gerner 2013: 448)

Historically, the eastern neighbor of Lizu, but now also the dominant language for the Lizu people across all Lizu-speaking areas, Southwestern Mandarin has a radically different type of comparative constructions, which uses verb serialization as their basis. Southwestern Mandarin historically makes use of Exceed comparatives (Chappell 2015: 47-48). Exceed Comparatives have as their characteristic that the standard NP is constructed as the direct object of a transitive verb with the meaning ‘to exceed’ or ‘to surpass’. The constituent order is Comparee - Parameter - ‘exceed’/ ‘surpass’ - Standard (literally, This house old exceed that). However, in Southwestern Mandarin dialects in contact
with Lizu, this schema is replaced by the prepositional comparative, which is common to Northern Mandarin dialects. In this latter comparative type, the comparative marker of verbal origin is part of a prepositional phrase formed with the standard NP (Li and Thompson 1981: 564-566, Chappell 2015: 37-38). The constituent order is Comparee - bǐ ‘compare’ (standard marker) - Standard - Parameter, as illustrated in example (38):

(38) tā   bǐ   nǐ   gāo
3SG  compare  2SG  be.tall
“S/He is taller than you are.” (Li & Thompson 1981: 564, my glosses)

The Mandarin equative construction is different from Mandarin comparison constructions in that it uses a different standard marker (gēn ‘with’) and a parameter marker (yìyàng ‘similarly’, literally ‘one manner’). The constituent order is Comparee - gēn ‘with’ - Standard - yìyàng ‘similarly’ - Parameter. This is illustrated in sentence (39):

(39) tā   gēn   nǐ   yìyàng   gāo
3SG  with  2SG  one.manner  be.tall
“I am as tall as you are.” (Li & Thompson 1981: 565, my glosses)

This construction is open to two interpretations. On the one hand, gēn ‘with’ can be analyzed as the standard marker (as above). On the other hand, gēn ‘with’ can be analyzed as a coordinative conjunction connecting the comparee and the standard (Henkelmann 2006: 385, 387).

Finally, the Mandarin similative construction is modeled on the Mandarin equative construction. It has a variant with the verb xiàng ‘resemble’ taking the place of gēn ‘with’ and the expression nàyàng ‘that manner’ taking the place of yìyàng ‘one manner’. This construction type is illustrated in sentence (40):

(40a) gēn   yú   yìyáng   yóu
with  fish  one.manner  swim
(40b) xiàng   yú   nàyáng   yóu
resemble  fish  that.manner  swim
“swim like a fish”

This overview of various types of the comparative, equative, and similative constructions in the languages with which Lizu is in contact suggests that the region where these languages are spoken lies at the intersection of many distinct types of comparative, equative, and similative constructions. Notably, the unique combination of characteristics of Lizu comparative, equative, and similative constructions, as outlined in sections 2-4 (such as formal overlap of comparative, equative, and similative constructions; use of the same standard marker; similarity of the equative and similative constructions), are not paralleled in any of its linguistic neighbors. Nonetheless, Lizu appears to combine various features of comparative, equative, and similative constructions of its neighboring languages. On the one hand, Lizu comparison constructions share with its
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Tibeto-Burman neighbors (Tibetan, Pumi, Nuosu) the basic structure of the NP standard, which is modeled on the locative adverbial phrase. On the other hand, the Lizu equative and similative constructions combine structural and semantic elements of the equative and similative constructions in Mandarin (that is, the formal parallelism of these two types of constructions, and the use of a parameter marker with the meaning ‘one manner’). Interestingly, Mandarin is a relatively recent newcomer to the Lizu-speaking areas (dating from the second half of the 20th century). Taken together with the transparent organization of the equative and similative constructions and their low degree of grammaticalization, the ways of expressing equative and similative meanings may be recent grammaticalizations in Lizu, likely owing to contact with Mandarin.

The cross-linguistically infrequent Particle Comparative type of comparative constructions is not attested in any of the linguistic neighbors of Lizu. The etymology of the standard marker /pə/ and the parameter marker /jæ-/ in the comparison of superiority will likely become clearer as more comparative data on the closely related languages of Lizu, Duoxu and Ersu, and its linguistic neighbors become available. Finally, if it is maintained that there is significant correlation between the source schemas underlying comparative constructions and their areal distribution, the local areal distribution of comparative, equative, and similative constructions in the Lizu-speaking areas is clearly suggestive of complex migration patterns and related complex cultural and linguistic dynamics.

6. SUMMARY

Typologically, genetically and areally comparative, equative, and similative constructions in Lizu share a number of notable features. From a synchronic point of view, Lizu comparative, equative and similative constructions bear strong resemblance in their formal make-up, for they use similar construction types (with the standard NP invariably constructed as an adverbial phrase) and same markers (/pə/, /jæ-/). From a diachronic point of view, these markers have been grammaticalized to such an extent that their diachronic origin is no longer clear. In particular, the standard marker /pə/ in its synchronic form cannot be related to other nominal markers in Lizu. That being the case, Lizu comparative constructions can be classified as belonging to a cross-linguistically infrequent type of comparative constructions: Particle Comparative. In contrast to other languages with a Particle Comparative, however, this type of comparative constructions is not an areal phenomenon in the region where Lizu is spoken. Lizu equative constructions generally comply with cross-linguistic generalizations in Henkelmann (2006), Haspelmath and Buchholz (1998), and Haspelmath (2015). At the same time, they may also challenge some functional explanations proposed to account for some of these generalizations (such as that head-final languages lack a parameter marker). Lizu data may also contribute a new type of equative constructions (with the standard NP constructed as a manner adverbial) to existing typologies.
From a genetic and areal point of view it is also noteworthy that the area where Lizu is spoken is so diverse. Lizu comparative, equative, and similative constructions appear to combine etymologically obscure markers, possibly attesting to some older patterns, with constructions typified by low degree of grammaticalization and hence likely owing to recent contact. More research into the languages of the area where Lizu is spoken will undoubtedly contribute to a better understanding of the local dynamics of language variation and change, and enrich our understanding of the typology and diversity of comparative, equative, and similative constructions.
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