

Expressing comparison in the Tai languages

Lev N. MOREV
Moscow

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

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

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

Absolute gradation usually manifests itself by lexical means, and in some instances by a few derivational affixes. Tai languages¹ as a rule use only lexical-semantic means to express it. For instance, in standard Thai the feature *naaw⁵* 'cold' can be specified by means of different particles, e.g. *khoo³-khaang³ naaw⁵* 'rather cold', *kiap² naaw⁵* 'almost cold', *naaw⁵ maak³* 'very cold', *naaw⁵ cat²*

¹In this paper Tai is used in a broad sense to include Tai proper, Kam-Sui, and other related languages.

'extremely cold', etc. This is also true for other Tai languages. On the whole the ways and means of displaying absolute gradation in Tai lie in the field of semantics and syntax.

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

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

Mulao

hai ² lo ⁴ njaa ² (gaa ² pe ¹)	I old you (two year)
S F O Qt	I am (two years) older than you.

Maonan

fia ² van ¹ η ² (saam ¹ zjen ²)	I tall he (three inch)
	I am (three inches) taller than he.

Kam

tjiw ² naaj ⁶ jaai ³ (tjiw ² ta ⁵)	Clf. this long (Clf. three-foot)
	This (rope) is (three feet) longer than that one.

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

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

Lao	(maak ⁵ -phaaw ³ jai ⁵ tæε)	maak ⁵ -moo ² hεεη ⁴	jai ⁵
		S M F	
	(coconut big but)	watermelon much	big
	Coconuts are big but watermelons are much bigger.		

²In representing comparative constructions the following abbreviations will be used: S - subject of comparison, O - object of comparison; S and O are the two counterparts in the comparison. M - a preverbal modal particle meaning 'more, much'; F - feature words, such as adjectival and stative verbs, quantitative nouns, and a few other words; C - morphosyntactic marker indicating comparison; Pr - preposition attached to the object of comparison.

Standard Thai	naaŋ ¹ -saaw ⁵ girl This girl is much more	nii ⁴ this	jiŋ ³ more	suai ⁵ beautiful	
Lue	muu ¹ pig This pig is much fatter.	to ¹ Cl	ni ⁸ this	xwən ⁴ more	pii ² fat
Buyi	zaan ² house His house is much newer.	ti ¹ his	xən ⁶ more	moo ⁵ new	
Shan	nam ⁵ -mik ⁵ ink This ink is much blacker.	nai ⁵ this	khen ⁴ more	lam ⁴ black	
Lungming	kii ³ -lay ⁴ who Who is taller?	nok ⁴ more	soŋ ¹ tall		

The essential peculiarity of these sentences is the absence of an overt object of comparison; it is understood from the previous context but it cannot be reinstated into its natural position, so we cannot interpret this event as just an ordinary deletion. Sentences of the <S M F> pattern never start a new topic of discourse; conversely, they always follow other sentences, developing the original topic. From a discourse perspective such sentences are cataphoric. In that case a zero position after the feature word should be treated as anaphoric ellipsis with syntactic value, i.e. it implicitly represents the counterpart of the relationship in point.³

Morphemes functioning as modal particles in such sentences differ from one language to another; they include *kheer⁴* (Ahom, Khamti, Phake, Shan, Lue, Laha), *jiŋ³* (St.Thai, Lao), *heer⁴* (Lao), *laai¹* (Nung), *ham³* (Tho) *nok⁴* (Lungming) etc. All of them have the meaning 'much, more'. One of the most widely used of these is *kheer⁴*, occurring in various Tai languages spoken along the northern perimeter of Indochina. It seems that this morpheme is genetically cognate with Chinese *geng* which has the same meaning 'much, more'. From ancient times down to the present this has been used in Chinese as an elative particle for displaying the greater degree of a feature without referring to someone or something within a given sentence, e.g. *jintian tianqi geng len* 'Today the weather is much colder' (lit. today weather much cold). This similarity of form, meanings, and functions could testify equally to a common origin or to borrowing. This issue

³In my material there are only a few evidences of comparative sentences of the pattern <S M F O>, as in Laha *ta³ kwe³ khen¹ khaa⁶ su⁶ bom⁶ tər³* 'A woven chair is lighter than a wooden stool' (lit. chair weave more light stool wood). Their number is so meagre that I do not find it reasonable to make them into a separate type. It is difficult to evaluate. Looked at from different perspectives it may turn out as an archaism, innovation, or merely stylistic error or gaps in linguistic competence. But we can not rule out the possibility of an ancient origin for this construction. The arrangement of the counterparts showed the elements of the comparison and their function, and the preverbal element showed the differences in degree.

should be solved against the background of historico-comparative investigations of Sino-Tai languages as a whole.

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

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

Khamti	kon ³ S man	a-nai ² this	mai Pr than	kon ³ O man	a-nan ² that	khən ³ M more	suŋ ⁴ F tall
	This man is taller than that man.						
Phake	chaw ³ S Chaw	khən M more	phi ² F fat	han ⁴ Pr than	khom ³ O Khomsan	san ⁴	
	Chaw is fatter than Khomsan						
Ahom	man S he	nəŋ-man brother	khən M more	suŋ F high	luk Pr than	man O he	nəy-yən sister
	His brother is taller than his sister.						

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

⁴This construction with an M element resembles the French pattern <plus + adjective> in which the morpheme *plus* just signifies subjective estimation of a feature and does not show 'relationship' as such. The latter becomes evident only when the adjectival element in the construction is followed by the particle *que*. Cf. Tai-Tho *ham³ luor¹ qua² ving¹* and its French translation *plus grand que Ving* 'bigger than Ving'.

The most widespread types of comparative constructions include a special morpheme to mark the relationship of comparison (C). There are two varieties of such comparisons: <S F C O> or <S M F C O>. These are common for the majority of Tai languages, if not for all of them. In most cases the modal particle is optional, but in some cases, as in Ahom, Khamti, Nung, and perhaps others, it is obligatory. The C-unit is really a principal constituent of this pattern, as it controls the semantic and syntactic content of the whole proposition. The function of Comparative in various languages is performed by different morphemes having the original meaning 'to surpass, exceed, overpass'. Only a few of them have a different source. All of these are deverbatives, many of them still coexisting with their etymons. These morphemes can be treated as auxiliaries, and can be taken either as homonyms of their related verb, or as being the verb itself in a different syntactic function. The specific classification of these morphemes does not matter for this paper; it can be discussed elsewhere. The diffusion of these morphemes in the Tai area is quite uneven, their isoglosses may be unique, discontinuous, or intersecting, and several of these morphemes may occur in the same language. The greatest variability has been found in the Southeastern branch, perhaps because these languages have been better described and more profoundly investigated.

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

St.Thai	mɛɛ ³ -nam ⁴	khɔŋ ⁵	jaaw ¹	kwa ²	mɛɛ ³ -nam ⁴	caw ³	phra ³ -jaa ¹
	S		F	C	O		
	river	Khong	long	more	river		Chaopraya
	The Mekong is longer than the Chaopraya.						

S.Chuang	pow ⁴	nei ⁴	saan ¹	kwa ⁵	pow ⁴	han ⁴
	S		F	C	O	
	man	this	tall	more	man	that
	This man is taller than that man.					

Phutai	həə ³	lam ³	nii ³	cop ⁵	kwa ³	həə ³	lam ³	nan ⁵
	S			F	C	O		
	boat	Clf.	this	good	Comp.	boat	Clf.	that);
	This boat is better than that one.							

Lao	faa ³	mɛɛp ⁶	hur ⁴	kwa ²	dɔk-fai ²
	S		F	C	O
	sky	flash	bright	surpass	electric bulb
	Lightning is brighter than an electric light.				

Tai-Tho	slɔŋ ¹	nɔi ⁵	kwa ²	saam ¹
	S	F	C	O
	two	little	surpass	three
	Two is less than three.			

In the Kam-Sui group this morpheme appears as *taa* ⁶.

Maonan	ŋ ²	voj ¹	taa ⁶	fia ²
	S	F	C	O
	you	tall	surpass	I
	You are taller than I.			

In Li (Hlai) its allomorpheme is *duaa*².

Li	paa ¹	long ¹	duaa ²	miiw ²
	S	F	C	O
	dog	big	to surpass	cat
	Dogs are bigger than cats.			

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

Lao	njaam ²	pa ¹ -sop ¹	kh ³ -haai ⁶	man ²	joom ²	mii ²
	time	meet	misfortune	it	natural	have
	khun ² -khaa ⁴	kwa ⁵	njam ²	pok ¹ ka ¹ ti ¹		
	value	surpass	time	ordinary		

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

St. Thai	mii ¹	ngyyn ¹	sip ²	kwa ²	baat ²
	have	money	ten	surpass	baht
	There is more than ten baht.				

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

Lao	naan ²	ngaam ²	khyn ⁶	kwa ⁵	kaw ⁵	iik ⁵
	she	beautiful	rise	surpass	before	more.
	She became more beautiful than before.					

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

In all probability this type of comparative construction has some connection with the Chinese language, particularly with Cantonese. It is rather explicitly attested by their substantial and structural similarity. Note St. Thai *mai*⁴-*sak*² *kheeng*¹ *kwa*² *mai*³-*phai*² 'Teak is stronger than bamboo', St. Chinese (*tamen de shili*) *da guo renming de keming shili* '(Their forces) surpassed (lit. big surpass) the peoples revolutionary forces' (Yuwen xuexi 1953:8:22), and Cantonese ...*kow*

kwo tsyngsin saang ‘...taller than Mr. Zang (Yankiver 1987:68). The Chinese morpheme *guo/gwo* (etymol. ‘to go across, to surpass’) belongs among the most ancient lexical units of Chinese. It has been used for conveying the idea of comparison since the early times. For instance, it occurs in Lungyu (6th cent. B.C.): *yu yie hao yun kwo wo* ‘Yu was braver than I’ (lit. Yu Predic. good brave surpass I). But such usage of the morpheme *guo/gwo* was not characteristic for ancient Chinese. For this purpose the ablative preposition *yu* had been usually used, occupying the position between adjectival verb and the noun. Approximately since the second millennium the main means for exhibiting comparison in Chinese has been the construction <S compared-with O V>. As far as I know only in Cantonese does the construction with *gwo* still serve as an ordinary means for displaying comparison. So there are grounds for inferring that the Tai morpheme *kwaal/kaal/taa* was originally borrowed from Chinese, unless comprehensive historical investigations repudiate this supposition and prove a common origin for Chinese *gwo* and Tai *kwaal*.

A number of Tai languages use other morphemes than *kwaal* for displaying comparison. But their feature in common is that all of them also bear the original meaning ‘to surpass, etc’ and occupy the same position in the syntactic structure. Most well known among them are: *lyyn⁴* ‘to surpass, exceed’ in Lao, Tai-Muei, Tai-Yang, Saek; *nya¹/lya¹/ləə¹* ‘to be superior, above/over’ in Lue, Shan, Tai-Yang, Tai-Rong; *sya¹*, which looks like a phonetic variant of the former, in Laha; *kaai¹* ‘to go across’ in Tai-Yang; *nan⁴* ‘to surpass, to exceed’ in one of the dialects of Buyi; *njiu²* ‘to go across’ in the Quiba dialect of the Sha language; *hən* ‘to exceed’, which was borrowed by Nung from Vietnamese.

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

Tai-Muey	nam ² river	nii ⁵ this	vai ³ swift	lyyn ⁵ surpass	nam ³ -khong ¹ Mekong	
	The current in this river is swifter than in the Mekong.					
Tai-Yang	myy ⁶ -nii ⁶ today	naaw ¹ cold	ləə ¹ above	myy ⁶ -waa ⁴ yesterday		
	Today the weather is colder than yesterday.					
Lue	tan ⁵ he	hang ⁵ rich	ləə ¹ above	ɔɔ ⁵ -mɛɛ ⁵ parents		
	He is richer than his parents.					
Laha	lən ² house	zen ⁶ I	kwaang ² wide	sya superior	lən ² house	e ⁶ you
	My house is wider than yours.					
Buyi	faa ² metal	man ⁶ strong	nan ⁴ surpass	naam ⁶ ceramics		
	Metal is stronger than ceramics.					
Sha	tə-bee ⁴ sheep	sai ¹ clean	njiu ² surpass	tə-məw ¹ pig		
	Sheep are cleaner than pigs.					

As seen in the above cited examples, the dominant cognitive basis for making a comparison is often the notion of the superiority of one object over another with regard to a certain feature. However, in some other Tai languages the dominant cognitive basis for a comparison is the notion of separation, rejection, or repudiation of the object of comparison. This notion exists in many languages of the world, i.e. the notion that the object of comparison goes apart, moves away from the subject of comparison. It is attested by the usage of ablative case for the object of comparison in a good number of inflectional languages. In some Tai languages for this purpose they use the morpheme *se*¹, which has the etymological meaning 'to separate, lose, be separated, be lost'. This morpheme occurs in S. and N. Shan, Nora, Khuen, and White Tai.

S. Shan	man ⁴	li ⁴ -ngaam ⁴	se ¹	saaw ¹	tai ⁴
	she	beautiful	separated	girl	Tai
	She is more beautiful than Tai girls.				

White Tai	mak ² -təng ¹	waan ¹	se ¹	mak ² -keng ¹
	melon	sweet	separated	pineapple
	Melons are sweeter than pineapples.			

N.Shan (Dehun)	man ² kai ⁴	si ¹	kaw ⁶
	he	dexterous	separated I
	He is more dexterous than I.		

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

Khamti	khen ³	sung ⁴	lym-shi	a-nan ²
	muchM	high	comp.C	that
	much higher than that			

Nung	can ¹	laai ¹	həəng ³	hən ⁵	myng ³
	I	muchM	strong	surpassC	you
	I am much stronger than you.				

Laha	kən ¹	kwaang ²	sya ¹	lon ²	e ⁶
	muchM	wide	aboveC	house	that
	much wider than that house				

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

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

Lue	la ¹ -du ¹ season The summer was extremely hot.	hɔn ⁴ hot	lə ¹ Comp.	pən ⁵ other		
Lao	suk ¹ ripe riper than the rest	kwa ⁵ Comp.	muu ⁵ group			
Tai-Yang	phɛng ⁴ expensive most expensive	kaai ¹ Comp.	phəə whoever			
Phutai	cop ⁵ good best of all	kwa ³ Comp.	mət ⁵ all	muu ³ group		
Laha	kwaang ² wide widest of all	səa ¹ Comp.	məi ⁶ every			
Tai-Tho	dia ⁵ Dia Dia is taller than everybody.	luong ¹ big	qua ² Comp.	moi ⁴ every	can ⁵ person	
Lao	baang ² some kwa ⁵ surpass Some people when drunk think themselves the greatest in the world. ⁵	khon ² person baan ³ village	mya ⁶ when kwa ⁵ surpass	maw ² drunk myang ² town	lɛɛw ³ -kɔ ⁵ then	yai ⁵ big

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

St. Thai yai² thii³-sut² 'biggest'

Laha kwaang¹ nget⁴ 'widest'

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

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

⁵The words *baan³* 'village' and *myang²* 'town' here are used metaphorically with the meaning 'all the people in the country or in the world'; the repetition of the morpheme *kwa⁵* before each word testifies once more to its lexical rather than grammatical nature.

- | | | |
|----------|--------------|---------------|
| 1. S F O | 3. S F C O | 5. S M F Pr O |
| 2. S M F | 4. S M F C O | 6. S Pr O M F |

Of these the third and the fourth are standard and widely used, the first is restricted lexically, the second is anaphoric, and the fifth and the sixth are local, i.e. they occur only in some areas under the influence of alien languages.

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

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

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

REFERENCES

- Noss, R.B. 1964. *Thai Reference Grammar*. Washington: Foreign Service Institute.
- Plam, J.Y. et. al. 1972. *The Lao Language*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Si Toushen. 1953. "Bijao (Comparison)." *Yuwen xuexi* 8 (23).
- Vichin Panupong. 1970. *Inter-Sentence Relations in Modern Conversational Thai*. Bangkok: The Siam Society.
- Wang Li. 1989. *Hanyu lishi yufa* (Historical Grammar of the Chinese Language). Beijing.
- Yankiver, S.B. 1987. *Guangzhou (Cantonese) Dialect of the Chinese Language* (in Russian), Moscow: Nauka.

Received: 26 July 1996

Institute of Oriental Studies
Rozhdesventka 12
103777 Moscow, Russia