Project 2 - Reconstruction

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)	Correspondance set
five	fapəŋɔ	θ ãρăŋɔ	p ěpa	
four	fa ^l pěli	0 äpăli	p ěpěli	
one	fa ^l k'Λ	∂ ãk'ı? ^I	pěk'a?	
two	fa ¼¹neı¹	∂ ãnĩ¹	p ěnai?	[f]-[θ]-[p]
seven	fasðri', pðsðri'	∂ ᾶs'ǎri	p ěs'ari	
six	fa ^l tsðru'	∂ ᾶtǎruʔ''	p ětsěru?	
three	fa ^l t'əu	∂ ãt'ũ'	p ět'au	

Since [p] appears in all three languages, while [f] is only found in Mara and $[\theta]$ is only found in Zotung, [p] is being reconstructed due to the majority rules.

^{*}p > /p/ in Lailenpi (retention)

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)	correspondance set
bowels	Rİ	ri:ŋ	mě⊅ri	[R]-[r]-[r]
bone	RU'	rul	[mə]rupə? ^I	
snake	pě r i	fupo	pěri	[R]-[-]-[r]

Since [r] appears in both Zotung and Lailenpi, [r] is being reconstructed due to the majority rules.

r > /R/ in Mara (innovation)

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)
spittle	pətsi	tuıñ, tü	mə⊅pĕtji

As we can see, snake in Zotung has a very different form comparing to Mara and Lailenpi. So is spittle in Zotung. It seems that Zotung might have borrowed those words from somewhere else. So those are excluded when considering the consonant reconstruction.

^{*}p > /f/ in Mara (innovation)

^{*}p > $/\theta$ / in Zotung (innovation)

^{*}r > /r/ in Zotung & Lailenpi (retention)

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)
tooth	ho	ho	mě ⊅-ha
head	lu	lu	mě <i>7</i> I-lu
navel	pělε	larwi	mə ⊅ -pělɛri
tongue	pělı	la	mə ⊅-pěle'′
bowels	Rİ	ri:ŋ	mě ⊅ ri
spittle	pətsi	tuıñ, tü	mə ⊅pĕtji
arm	ба	kwi?¹ɓɔ	mə ⊅bə'
thigh	p'ie	p'æ	mə ⊅p'e'
snot	hn∧	na?	mə ⊅hnα?
eye	me'	mi? ^I	[mə⊅]maı?
hand	ku'	kwi? ^I	mə⊅ku?
palate	ɗa	ďãt'ăli	mə ⊅də

According to the data above, we can see that in Lailenpi, prefix $m \nearrow \neg$ shows up very often while in the other two languages, the forms are very similar but without the prefix. We can reconstruct $m \nearrow \neg$ as a prefix in proto-Maraic which was lost in Mara and Zotung.

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)
navel	pělε	larwi	mə⊅pělεri
tongue	pělı	la	mə⊅pěle"
kidney	pě kε'	kĩ	ſě∨ru⊓

Other than $m \ni \nearrow$ -, $p \ni$ - is another prefix that Zotung has lost but remained in Mara and Lailenpi. And please note that in proto-Maraic, $p \ni$ - is to be placed next to the root and $m \ni \nearrow$ - next to $p \ni$ - further away from the root.

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)
tooth	h o	h o	mě ⊅h a
snot	h nA	na?	mə ⊅h nɑʔ
song	hl∧¹	lo	h la ^l

According to the data above, the initial [h] is omitted in Zotung except if the word consists of only one syllable with the form of CV(and therefore the syllable will consist of only a V which is too short and not favorable if [h] is being omitted).

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)
rainy season	fʊ[pi]	θʊ ^l '[pi]	ʃu[pi'l]

If the reconstruction above is correct, it should be pu[pi] in Lailenpi. So we can assume that the [p] undergoes sound change under certain environment. And since

this is the only example that undergoes this sound change, the best guess we can make is that [p] will become [ʃ] if following by a [u] in Lailenpi.

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)
six	fa ^l t s aru'	θᾶtǎruʔ''	pătsăru?
hair on head	s'a	s'ã	mas'a ^l
to sing	s'Λ	s'a?' ^l	a⊅s'a?

If we take a look in the above data, the [s] in six in Zotung is not present. Since the [s] is followed by an [a] in all examples, the only possible triggering environment that triggers the [s] deletion is the preceding [t]. In another word, we can assume that in Zotung:

 $[s] \rightarrow \emptyset / t_{\perp}$

Gloss	Mara (Darling)	Zotung (Vauti)	Lailenpi (Lailenpi)
spittle	patsi	tuıñ, tü	ma⊅pătji
wild pog	ŋaɪtsa' ^l	ŋyc, ŋye ^l	ŋyɛtjapa? ^I

We can find one corresponding pair of Mara and Lailenpi above: [s]-[j] while the earlier data table shows the corresponding pair [s]-[s]. Since [s] and [j] in Lailenpi appear in the same environment, it would be difficult to explain how [s] reconstructed in proto-manaic turns into [s] and [j] in Lailenpi. The only possible way to explain is:

It seems that Lailenpi and Mara seem to be closer to each comparing to Zotung. Zotung seems to get rid of all observed prefixes reconstructed in proto-maraic and Zotung also seems to actively borrow words from somewhere else.

[1] FOUR PKC *lii

H. Lai pa-lii 'four'; F. Lai pa-lii 'four'; Mizo $p\grave{a}-\acute{l}i$ 'four'; Tedim li^2 'four'; Thado Kuki $\acute{l}ii$ 'four'; M. Cho phli 'four' (< p-lii); Sizang $\~{l}i$ 'four'; Khumi $pl\acute{u}ee$ 'four'.

[2] FIVE PKC *ŋaa

H. Lai *pa-ŋâa* 'five'; F. Lai *pà-ŋǎa* 'five'; Mizo *pà-ngá* 'five'; Tedim *nga*² 'five'; Thado Kuki *ngáa* 'five'; Sizang *ngā* 'five'; M. Cho *hma* 'five'; Asho '*ngo*'' 'five'.

It seems that in H. Lai, F. Lai and Mizo, there is a prefix *pa*- that should be reconstructed in PKC.

It would be hard to explain how the prefix only appears in those certain language without being present in other languages and the proto language itself. Therefore, the only way to plain would be the prefix has to be reconstructed in PKC as well. It

^{*}s, *j > /s/ in Mara

^{*}j > /j/ in Lailenpi (retention)

remains in H. Lai, F. Lai and Mizo while it disappears in other languages. This is exactly like $ma \nearrow$ - in proto-Maraic.