

Nominalizations in Bodic Languages

Michael Noonan

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

<http://www.uwm.edu/~noonan>

o. INTRODUCTION: Central mountain and highlands Asia has been the scene of extensive linguistic contact over a considerable period.¹ Languages of a number of different genetic phyla have been involved, but so have languages within the Sino-Tibetan phylum representing different stocks with differing typological characteristics. Indeed, the long periods of contact between speakers of Sino-Tibetan languages of different stocks has resulted in considerable lexical and grammatical borrowing, which has tended to obscure genetic relationships. As a result, there is still a good deal of uncertainty as to how even major groupings of languages should be positioned within the Sino-Tibetan family tree.

One postulated genetic grouping within Tibeto-Burman branch is an agglomeration of languages spoken in the western reaches of the Sino-Tibetan speaking area, a grouping referred to as Bodic.² While a number of interesting isoglosses cut through this group [see Noonan 2003a for some examples], on the whole they exhibit a rather impressive typological consistency. In particular, languages in this group make extensive use of nominalizations, as documented in Noonan 1997. In these languages, constructions headed by nominalizations – or forms morphologically identical to them – are used for more than the ‘expected’ functions of nominalizations such as the reification of events and processes, and the expression of clauses as arguments of predicates. For simplicity of exposition, I will refer to a morphological form and the construction that it heads as a nominalization if it includes within its uses the naming of activities or states, contrasting this term with ‘nominalization in the strict sense’, which refers specifically to the function of naming activities and states. Given this, one of the fullest range of uses of nominalizations among the Bodic languages is to be found in Chantyal, a Tamangic language spoken in Nepal (Noonan 2003b):

- (1) 1. nominalization in the strict sense [*ie* naming activities and states]
2. verb complementation

¹ The work reported on in this paper has been supported by the following grants from the National Science Foundation: DBC-9121114, SBR-9600717, and SBR-9728369.

² The languages considered Bodic for the purposes of this paper are arranged by subfamily in the Appendix. It is far from clear that the three subdivisions of Bodic as given in the Appendix – Central Himalayish, Bodish, and rGyalrong – should be grouped exclusively under a single genetic node. Further, it isn’t clear that Central Himalayish represents a genetic grouping at all as opposed to a geographic assemblage of TB languages that have been in contact in the sub-Himalayan region of Nepal for a long period. rGyalrong was traditionally not assigned to Bodic, but LaPolla (2003a) suggests that this group should be grouped together with some [but not all] Central Himalayish languages in a newly defined ‘Rung’ family. Further, Bodish and rGyalrong show interesting similarities in their relational morphology, much more than either group does with Central Himalayish – or, indeed, many Central Himalayish subgroups do with each other [see Noonan 2005b]. Unfortunately, the basic groundwork that would establish or contradict many of the relationships proposed in the Appendix has simply not been done.

3. noun complementation
4. purpose clause
5. relative clause
6. non-relative attributive
7. agent and patient nominals
8. attributive nominal
9. expression of the semantic predicate in verbal periphrasis
10. main clause

The use of nominalizations for all these functions in Chantyal is discussed in some detail in Noonan 1997; a number of examples illustrating many of these functions can be found in various places in this paper.

My aim here is to discuss a number of issues relating to the history of the grammar of nominalizations in the Bodic languages, in particular issues relating to the use of nominalizations in the modification of nouns, *i.e.* as relative clauses. In all, I will discuss briefly the following five points:

1. the areal context
2. additional features of the nominalization-relativization syncretism in Bodic
3. sources of nominalizers
4. relativization with the genitive
5. innovations in the system of nominalizations

1. THE AREAL CONTEXT: In discussing the history of the extended uses of nominalizations in Bodic languages, it is well to put the matter in its appropriate areal context. As we will see, the use of nominalizations beyond their 'core' uses is fairly widespread in Asia.

Going back at least to Jakobson (1931), scholars have recognized a special relationship between many of the languages along the 'axis' of Asia, ranging from Siberian languages in the north to South Asia, representing a speech area referred to by Massica (1976) as 'Indo-Altaic'. Within this grouping would be included the Turkic and Mongolic languages, some Siberian languages [*e.g.* Tungusic, Yeniseian, Yukaghir], Korean, Japanese, Tibeto-Burman [with a more marginal presence of the 'Sino-' component of Sino-Tibetan], Uralic, Burushaski, and Dravidian.³ The Indo-European languages found in this region opt out of many of its characteristics: Iranian to a considerable degree [Stilo 2005], Indic to a lesser degree, though modern Indic languages have continued to evolve toward more convergence with the other languages in this speech area.⁴

³ Cultural features along with linguistic features traversed this vast territory in ancient times. Eliade (1964) describes the characteristics of 'Inner Asian Shamanism', a religious complex that once pervaded Siberia, Central Asia, and the Himalayas. Elements of this tradition have been preserved in the Himalayas to varying degrees, as documented by Hitchcock 1967 and Watters 1975.

⁴ Among the features that distinguish Indic languages from other Indo-Altaic language are the use of finite clauses in subordination, [secondary] tense distinctions in non-finite verbals, and coordination of sequential clauses in narration (as opposed to the exclusive use of converbs for this purpose). For all these features there is, as noted, a trend toward convergence with the Indo-Altaic type.

A number of features characterize Indo-Altaic, though as one would expect in an assemblage this large, covering so much territory, there are also many important isoglosses restricted only to parts of the whole.

One characteristic, though, that unites many of the languages in this speech area is a special relationship between nominalization and attribution, one that is either a prominent feature of the contemporary syntax, or one that can be reconstructed for an earlier stage in the language. I will refer to this relationship as the ‘nominalization-attribution syncretism’ and mean by this the state of affairs whereby a morphological marker that functions to signal nominalizations is identical to one that functions as a marker of the genitive and/or relative clauses.⁵ In Japanese, for example, the particle *no* signals both genitives (2a) and nominalizations (2b):

- (2) GENITIVE
- a. watakushi no namae
I GEN name
‘my name’
NOMINALIZATION IN THE STRICT SENSE
- b. haha ga kaet-te kuru no o mat-te ori-mas-u
mother SUB return-CNV come NOM DO wait-CNV exist-POL-PRES
‘I’m waiting for my mother to return’

Of more central interest to us here are languages illustrating a special type of nominalization-attribution syncretism, namely the NOMINALIZATION-RELATIVIZATION SYNCRETISM. In Mongolian, for example, nominalized clauses (3a) are also used adnominally, *i.e.* as relative clauses (3b) [Binnick 1979]:

- (3) NOMINALIZATION IN THE STRICT SENSE
- a. bata-yn türgen sajn bol-x-yg bid bodo-ǰ baj-na
Bata-GEN soon well become-NOM-ACC we think-IMPV be-PRES
‘We think Bata will be well soon’
RELATIVE CLAUSE
- b. ene xüü-gijn suu-ǰ baj-x xot
this boy-GEN live-IMPV be-NOM town
‘the town in which this boy lives’

Yukaghir, a Siberian language, shows a similar pattern, whereby nominalizations (4a) can also be used to form relative clauses (4b) [Maslova 1999]:

- (4) NOMINALIZATION IN THE STRICT SENSE
- a. omo-s' tet qamie-d'e-l met-in
good-INTR:3SG you help-DETR-NOM I-DAT
‘It is good that you have helped me.’
RELATIVE CLAUSE

⁵ In claiming that the nominalization-relativization syncretism characterizes this speech area, I am not claiming that it is unique to the area. Examples can be found elsewhere, for example in English where the subordinator *that* is used with both relative clauses and finite complement clauses, the latter filling nominal slots. In European languages, however, this syncretism seldom extends to non-finite nominalizations or adnominals, whereas that is what one finds regularly in the Indo-Altaic speech area.

- b. odu-pe modo-l jalhil-pe-gi
 Yukaghir-PL live-NOM lake-PL-POSS
 'the lake where the Yukaghirs lived'

Burushaski, a language isolate spoken in the Western Himalayas, instantiates this pattern also, with (5a) illustrating a nominalization and (5b) illustrating an adnominal use of a nominalization [Anderson 2002]:

(5) NOMINALIZATION IN THE STRICT SENSE

- a. buṭ muškíl bilá góo-ltir-as
 very difficult be.IV 2SG-show-NOM
 'it is very difficult to show (it) to you'
 RELATIVE CLAUSE

- b. chá-aṭe oó-ruṭ-as huk
 post-SUPER NEG-sit-NOM dog
 'a dog which doesn't sit at its post'

The Tibeto-Burman languages, and in particular the Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman, are prime exemplars of nominalization-relativization syncretism. Except for some Western Himalayish languages which have adopted Indo-European-style relative clause constructions replete with relative pronouns and finite verbs, the Bodic languages are fairly consistent in using nominalizations adnominally. Below are some examples from Chantyal, illustrating a nominal (6a) and an adnominal (6b) use of nominalizations:

(6) NOMINALIZATION IN THE STRICT SENSE

- a. nḥi-sə reysi thū-wa a-kham mu
 we-ERG raksi drink-NOM NEG-be.able be.NPST
 'We aren't able to drink raksi'
 RELATIVE CLAUSE

- b. mənchi-sə ca-si-wa gay-ye sya
 person-ERG eat-ANT-NOM COW-GEN meat
 'the beef that the person ate'

Because adjectives align with verbs in these languages, adjectives are also prototypically found with the nominalizing affix; in the Bodic languages, the genitive, however, is always distinct.

The nominalization-relativization syncretism found in the Bodic languages is thus a subspecies of a larger phenomenon characterizing the Indo-Altaic speech area, though there are indeed special features of this syncretism in the Bodic languages that deserve special attention and will be discussed later in this paper.

The fact that the nominalization-relativization syncretism is found in a number of neighboring language families strongly suggests that it is among the set of typological features that is relatively easily susceptible to areal influence, implying that its presence, or even its particular manifestations, can't be used as evidence for genetic relatedness. This feature thus contrasts with certain other grammatical features which, as argued by Nichols 1992, Bickel 2003, and Bickel & Nichols 2003, are much more likely to be genetically stable.

2. ADDITIONAL FEATURES OF THE NOMINALIZATION-RELATIVIZATION SYNCRETISM IN

BODIC: In the Bodic languages, the nominalization-relativization syncretism prototypically involves a set of additional uses for nominalizations [beyond nominalization in the strict sense and relative clauses]. One, found throughout Bodic, is the use of nominalizations in verbal periphrasis. Nominalizations in verbal periphrasis is a difficult topic to discuss in a short paper like this because there are potentially so many complicating factors, so I will leave this topic for a future paper.

Of the additional uses, two are common enough to discuss in this context: 1) agent/patient nominals and 2) the use of nominalized clauses as main clauses.

1) Agent and patient nominals are very frequently encountered a component of the nominalization-relativization syncretism. Chantyal again can be used to illustrate:

(7) AGENT NOMINAL

a. na-sə reysi thū-wa-ye naku khway-kəy mu
I-ERG raksi drink-NOM-GEN dog feed-PROG be.NPST
'I'm feeding the raksi-drinker's dog'

PATIENT NOMINAL

b. cə ləra pari-wa-ma gətilo ləra a-ta-si-n tə
that strip make.happen-NOM-PL good strip NEG-become-ANT-SUP FACT
'those strips that I made might not have become good strips' [I110]⁶

Agent and especially patient nominals are often referred to as 'internally headed relative clauses' in the literature on Bodic languages. In the context of some languages, that might be a reasonable analysis, but for many, perhaps most Bodic languages, these constructions are probably best analyzed as agent and patient nominals. For instance (7b), the patient nominal **cə ləra pari-wa-ma** 'those strips that I made' is treated as a single nominal and the nominalized verb receives the plural suffix *-ma*.⁷

2) In Bodic languages, when nominalizations appear as main clauses, the typical effect is one of mirativity, *i.e.* the sense that the predication so expressed is in some sense surprising, contrary to expectation, or in some way exasperating. The following examples from Chantyal, all taken from spoken narratives, illustrate this sense:

(8) ci-wa də

sit-NOM FACT

'I'll stay!' [U202]

(9) aay, kattay talay tha-i nə a-tha-wa tane

gosh definitely cut-ANT FOCUS NEG-cut-NOM AFFIRMATION

'Gosh, it didn't even cut, right!' [I56]

(10) bhālu nə puli-puli la-wa ro

⁶ For the Chantyal examples, notations like [I110] refer to the clause numbers of the examples in published discourses and can be found either in Noonan 2005a [discourses A-U] or Noonan 1999 [discourses V-Z].

⁷ The patient nominal in (7b) can't be analyzed as consisting of a head followed by a postmodifier since postmodifiers don't otherwise occur in Chantyal. What are referred to here as agent and patient nominals could alternatively be analyzed as internally headed relative clauses.

bear FOCUS wiggle-wiggle do-NOM HEARSAY
'Bear wiggled!' [L21]

- (11) bənnu-ye nal tato ta-si-wa
gun-GEN barrel hot become-ANT-NOM
'The barrel of the gun had become hot!' [R29]

Ebert 1994 discusses the use of main clause nominalizations for questions and answers to questions, as in the following example from Athpare:

- (12) a-nis-u-es-u-e-n-i ni-ni-ŋ-get-ni-ŋ-na
2-see-3.PAT-PERF-3.PAT-PAST-NOM-Q see-NEG-1SG-AUX-NEG-1SG-NOM
'Have you seen it?' 'I haven't see it'

Bickel 1999 and Watters 2002 present detailed discussions of the phenomenon for the two Bodic groups, Kiranti and Kham, respectively.

These two uses of nominalizations point to two essential features of nominalizations in Bodic: they express predications, hence their ability to appear as main clauses, yet they are also NPs, which is why they can appear as agent and patient nominals. This last feature also points to the way these nominalizations figure in adnominal modification: at least in Bodic, they are probably best viewed as NPs juxtaposed to the NPs they are modifying, the two NPs constituting, therefore, a sort of appositional structure. Thus, if we take the basic meaning of **reysi thū-wa** as the agent nominal 'drinker of raksi', then the expression

- (13) reysi thū-wa mənchi
raksi drink-NOM person
'the person who drinks raksi'

can be understood as being at some level simply an appositive: 'the drinker of raksi', 'the person':

- (14) [agent/patient nominal_i]_{NP} [noun_i]_{NP}

The relative clause interpretation is arrived at inferentially in a manner similar to the way compounds are understood. At least in the context of the Bodic languages, this would account for the range of uses of these constructions.

3. SOURCES OF NOMINALIZERS: This is a large issue and I can only provide here a brief account of the situation in Bodic.

Except for rGyalrong, all branches and sub-branches of Bodic provide evidence for a nominalizing suffix ***pa** which can be traced back with this function to Proto-Bodic [DeLancey 2005]. On the basis of the comparative evidence, we can suppose that at the Proto-Bodic stage we likely had the nominalization-relativization syncretism in more-or-less its present form and that ***pa** was the major, and possibly the exclusive, marker of nominalization. At that stage there were likely no distinctions of tense and aspect: where these occur today, they are secondary [DeLancey 2005].

The origin of ***pa** cannot be definitely determined at this stage, but there is some evidence for the kind of entity it might have been derived from. In several languages in different branches of Bodic is attested a form also reconstructed to ***pa** which too must go back to Proto-Bodish. This form, which is traditionally distinguished from nominal-

izing ***pa**, is found as a gender marking suffix together with forms reconstructable to ***mo**, ***ma**, and ***pho**. All of these can be seen in the following set from the Tamangic language Nar-Phu [Noonan 2003c]:

(15)	UNGENDERED NOUN	MALE	CASTRATED MALE	FEMALE
	rho 'bond friend'	rho-pe		rho-me
	nôkyu 'dog'	nôkyu-pho		nôkyu-mo
	râ 'goat'	râ-pho	râ-pe	râ-mo
	tæ 'horse' [<*rta]	pho-tyen	phô-rte	mô-rte

Nar-Phu **-pe** derives from ***pa**, **-me** from ***ma**, **-mo** from ***mo**, and **-pho** from ***pho**. Note that the last two can appear either before or after the ungendered noun. Cognate forms are found in a number of Bodic languages including Classical and Modern Tibetan [Beyer 1992, Denwood 1999] and the Kiranti languages [Ebert 1994]. A number of these forms are clearly related to freely occurring monosyllabic words found in Classical Tibetan: ***ma** to 'mother', ***mo** to 'female, she', ***pho** to 'male'. There is no freely occurring ***pa** to which either the gendered form or the nominalizer could plausibly be related to, but it is certainly plausible that the gendered ***pa** derived from a similar sort of gendered noun.

If the source of the gendered ***pa** was a noun, as indeed it likely was, then there could well be a connection between the two ***pa**'s. Where other nominalizing suffixes have developed in Bodic, they typically have a source in a generic noun. DeLancey (2005) shows that of the four common nominalizing suffixes in Lhasa Tibetan [one of which is derived from ***pa**], two have origins in nouns: the agentive nominalizer **-mkhan**, which appears to derive from a noun meaning "one who knows a thing thoroughly, making a trade or profession of it"; the stem occurs also in the noun **mkhan-po** 'clerical teacher, professor, doctor of divinity, abbot', and is etymologically related to the adjective **mkhas-pa** 'skilled, skillful'. **-sa**, the locative-dative nominalizer, derives from the widely attested Proto-Bodic etymon ***sa** 'earth, soil'. The widely attested nominalizer reconstructable to ***mi** [found, for example, in Kiranti languages and Western Himalayish, and in non-Bodic Qiangic (LaPolla 2003b)] clearly derives from ***mi** 'person'. So, it is possible that both ***pa**'s derived from the same noun, and the gendered noun points to sort of noun it might have been.

Some other Bodic nominalizers may be traced to combinations of older nominalizers with other morphological material. One possibility is the widely attested Bodic sequential converbal suffix ***si**, which may come to signal past senses in nominalizations and which over time may merge phonologically with a nominalizer. In Chantyal, for example, ***pa** is realized as the suffix **-wa**, already illustrated in a number of examples. The converbal suffix **-si**, still found in that role in Chantyal, occurs with **-wa** to produce a tense distinction in nominalizations:

- (16) reysi thũ-wa mənchi
 raksi drink-NOM person
 'the person who drinks raksi'
- (17) reysi thũ-si-wa mənchi
 raksi drink-ANT-NOM person

‘the person who drank raksi’

[-**si** is glossed ‘anterior’ here since its function in examples like this is to provide a relative past, *i.e.* anterior, tense.] The pronunciation of **-si-wa** is commonly pronounced [šo], though the fuller pronunciation is also possible. A number of Bodic languages have nominalizers or attributives which seem to derive from this same combination of morphemes, *e.g.* Sunwar **-šo** and Magar **-cyo** [čo] (DeLancey 1992, Grunow-Harsta *in preparation*).

4. RELATIVIZATION WITH THE GENITIVE: In many of the languages designated as ‘Tibetic’ in the Appendix, a nominalization when used attributively with a noun is accompanied by the genitive. It may always be so accompanied, as in the Tamangic language Gurlung [Glover 1974],

(18) cá pxra-bá-e mxi jaga
that walk-NOM-GEN person PL
‘those walking people’ (=sentries)

(19) bana·-r-bá-e sī
forest-LOC-NOM-GEN wood
‘trees from the forest’

(20) dxĩ-r-bá-e ax-c^hyã·-bá-e gara· gadi
house-LOC-NOM-GEN NEG-good-NOM-GEN influences
‘the evil influences in the house’

or it may only sometimes occur with the genitive, as in Classical Tibetan where preposed relatives have the genitive, but postposed relatives don’t [Beyer 1992]:

(21) bla-ma-s btul-ba-i bgegs
lama-ERG tame-NOM-GEN demon
‘the demon which the lama tamed’

(22) bgegs bla-ma-s btul-ba
demon lama-ERG tame-NOM
‘the demon which the lama tamed’

(23) mgyogs-po-i rta
fast-NOM-GEN horse
‘fast horse’

(24) rta mgyogs-po
horse fast-NOM
‘fast horse’

In Tibetan, some nominalizers, *e.g.* **-mkhan**, never occur with the genitive.⁸

The addition of the genitive to the nominalization has the effect of subordinating it to the head, though it isn’t entirely clear why only preposed – but not postposed –

⁸ The postposed relatives in (22) and (24) are probably best considered to be patient nominals. The lack of the genitive in such cases, then, is explained by the fact that the construction is not really one of modification.

nominalizations should be so marked, and therefore formally subordinated, except that in Bodic genitives precede their heads.

DeLancey (2005) suggests that the construction with the genitive should be reconstructed to the common ancestor of the Tibetan Complex and Tamangic, a position that I took too in Noonan 1997, but I now believe that there are several pieces of evidence which caution against this conclusion.

First, we now have much better data on the Tamangic languages than we did in the mid-90s, and the picture appears much more complicated now than it did then. The data are summarized in (25):

(25) CHANTYAL: Never uses the genitive.

THAKALI: Georg's 1996 grammar makes no mention of the genitive with relative clauses. Hari & Maibaum 1970 assert that the genitive is optional, but it should be noted that Georg and Hari & Maibaum investigated different dialects of Thakali.

SEKE: Isao Honda (personal communication) reports that the genitive is optional with nominalizations.

MANANGE: Hildebrandt 2003 reports that relative clauses are formed with the nominalizer **-pɛ** [**<*pa**], but notes that "at times in relativized contexts the vowel quality of /ɛ/ fronts and sounds like [pe] or [pœ]." DeLancey (2005) interprets this difference to reflect the addition of the genitive: **-pɛ-i** > **-pe**. One problem with this interpretation is that the genitive in Manange is **-ɬɛ**, not **-i**. It is probable that at one point, Manange had a genitive in **-i**, the modern genitive in **-ɬɛ** deriving historically from the dative, often **-ra** in other Tamangic languages. However the data from closely related Nar-Phu suggests another interpretation of Manange **-pe**.

NAR-PHU: In Nar-Phu, relative clauses with present senses use the nominalizer **-pɛ** [**<*pa**], but those with past senses use **-pi**. This could be the nominalizer and the genitive **-ye**. However, this could also be the nominalizer and the morpheme **-i** which produces past tense interpretations in the copula, as in **mû-i**, the indirect [*i.e.* non-witnessed] past of the copula. The source of this **-i** is not clear,⁹ but it isn't likely the genitive.

TAMANG: The examples in Taylor's 1973 paper suggest that the genitive may be used with relative clauses in Western Tamang, but Mazaudon 2003 states that the genitive is not found in Eastern Tamang, and Varenkamp 2003, also discussing Eastern Tamang, says "it is most common to express the relative with the nominalization only," *i.e.* not with the genitive, though this implies that the genitive may be used also.

⁹ The best guess is that this past tense **-i** is a reduction of **-ci**, the past tense morpheme on main clause verbs. In other Tamangic languages [*e.g.* Chantyal], the cognate form reduces to **-i** under certain conditions.

GURUNG: Glover's 1974 grammar states that the genitive is always used with relative clauses, making Gurung then the only Tamangic language to use the genitive consistently.

In sum, the genitive seems firmly established only in Gurung within the Tamangic group; elsewhere it is either optional or is not used.

The other branches of Tibetic present a mixed picture. Ghale [Smith 1999] uses no case marking with nominalizations used adnominally. Tshangla [Andvik 2003] uses the dative-locative, not the genitive, with nominalizations used adnominally. It should be noted that the dative-locative and the genitive may both be expressed by **-ga**; the dative-locative, however, has an alternative form **-gu**, which is not shared with the genitive. The two cases can therefore be formally distinguished and it is the dative-locative that marks nominalizations used adnominally. Nonetheless, Tshangla, is close to the pattern found in the Tibetan Complex.

It is, of course, possible that the Tamangic languages employed the genitive formerly and subsequently lost it. It's also possible that, as a group, they never had it, that it is an innovation in the Tibetan Complex, and that the Tamangic languages that have the feature have acquired it through areal diffusion from the Tibetan Complex, as did Tshangla. It should be noted in this regard that the Tamangic speaking peoples were in times past under the cultural influence of Tibet, and many adopted either the Bon religion or Tibetan Buddhism from that source: for the Tamangic peoples, prior to the Gurkhalis conquest of Nepal, whatever literacy they possessed was likely to be in Tibetan. These languages have numerous lexical borrowings from Tibetan, especially in the languages whose speakers are still primarily Tibetan Buddhists: Manange, Nar-Phu, and Seke.

5. INNOVATIONS IN THE SYSTEM OF NOMINALIZATIONS: Innovations in nominalizations have primarily been of three types: 1) elaboration of the categories coded by nominalizers themselves, 2) extension of the nominalizer-relativization syncretism into new functions, and 3) the elimination of the nominalization-relativization syncretism.

1) Elaboration of the categories coded by nominalizers may take a number of forms. First, there is the increasing the number of nominalizer morphemes, each specialized for a particular sort of lexical meaning. As noted, Lhasa Tibetan has four common nominalizer suffixes specialized for meaning. Second, a number of languages have innovated by introducing tense-aspect distinctions [e.g. Chantyal, Nar-Phu]. The third sort of elaboration involves the creation of person-number agreement systems for nominalizations. The last is characteristic of the Central Himalayish languages, which, even if they are not a clear-cut genetic grouping, nonetheless share a similar typological profile, or at least did until Indo-European Nepali began to exert considerable influence on the development of these languages over the course of the last two or three centuries [Noonan 2003a].

Ebert 1993, 1999 has argued that the pattern of complex subordinate structures [nominalizations and converbs] in the Kiranti languages involving complex person-number agreement patterns as well as tense-aspect distinctions are the result of an an-

cient contact zone linking the Central Himalayish languages with the Munda and North-Central Dravidian languages. This pattern can also be seen in Kham, located at the opposite end of the Central Himalayish range, with the Central Himalayish languages in between exhibiting it to a greater or lesser extent.¹⁰

2) A striking example of extended uses for nominalizations can be found in Chantyal, where the nominalizer morpheme **-wa** may be suffixed onto adverbs, relative words, locative nouns, and case-marked nouns when they are used as modifiers of nouns. As these were discussed in some detail in Noonan 1997, I will simply present a few examples here.

- (26) məŋgəle-ri-wa mənchi-ma
Mangale-LOC-NOM person-PL
'people from Mangale'
- (27) syālkhərkə-ōra-wa mənchi
Syalkharka-CIRC-NOM person
'person from around Syalkharka'
- (28) təyla-wa saka
yesterday-NOM ancestor
'yesterday's ancestors' [V101]
- (29) yəwta dyammər-ma citro-ma-ye hə-sərə-wa phəlphul-ma-ye raksi
one dogwood-PL barberry-PL-GEN that-manner-NOM fruit-PL-GEN raksi
'raksi from some fruits like dogwood and barberry' [Q329]

As the next two examples show, this use of **-wa** contrasts with the genitive:

- (30) ram-siŋ-wa photo
Ram-COM-NOM photo
'Ram's photo' [*i.e.* a photo Ram owns]
- (31) ram-ye photo
Ram-GEN photo
'Ram's photo' [*i.e.* a photo Ram owns *or* a photo taken of Ram]

Suffixation of **-wa** is recursive, the limitations being those of sense and processability. Example below (32) shows a non-relative attributive formed from a case-marked attributive nominal:

- (32) məŋgəle-ri-wa-ma-siŋ-wa photo
Mangale-LOC-NOM-PL-COM-NOM photo
'the photo belonging to the people from Mangale'

Example shows (33) that this form, too, may fill a nominal slot. In other words, an attributive nominal can be built off of another attributive nominal:

- (33) na-sə məŋgəle-ri-wa-ma-siŋ-wa-ra dekhə-i
I-ERG Mangale-LOC-NOM-PL-CIRC-NOM-DAT show-PERF
'I showed it to the owners from Mangale'

¹⁰ The issue of the dating and origin of Sino-Tibetan person-number systems has been the object of vigorous debate. See, for example DeLancey 1989, LaPolla 1992, 1994, 2003a, and van Driem 1993.

While the generalization of the nominalizer as a general marker of attribution has proceeded further in Chantyal than in any other language known to me, other examples can be found: Ebert 1994, for example, describes nominalizer affixes in use with deictic and locative terms [*i.e.* markers of vertical position] in the Kiranti languages.

3) The elimination of the nominalization-relativization syncretism has happened partly as a result of contact, partly as a result of purely internal evolution. As noted, in the Western Himalayish languages, relative clauses take the form of correlative constructions [*who believes my argument, that person will be enlightened*] and include relative pronouns, some borrowed from Indo-European, some derived from native word stock, mostly from interrogative forms.

Western Himalayish aside, not many Bodic languages have lost the nominalization-relativization syncretism. Magar is an example of a language that has innovated a generalized attributive suffix **-cyo** [čö], used for both simple adjectives and relative clauses, contrasting with a nominalizing suffix **-ke**, used for both simple and complex nominalizations [Grunow Harsta *in preparation*].

6. SUMMARY: In sum, we've seen that the nominalization-relativization syncretism is a feature of a wide region — the Indo-Altaic speech area — of Asia. It is a feature that can spread relatively easily by language contact, as can particular manifestations of this feature, such as the addition of the genitive for adnominal use. The nominalization-relativization syncretism is a prominent feature of the Bodic languages, which, in general have either preserved the original system or elaborated it, incorporating new features [agent/patient nominals, main clause nominalizations]. In addition, the nominalizers themselves are often elaborated, with new semantic distinctions introduced [tense-aspect, person number distinctions, specialized nominalizers, etc.]. Generic nouns are the source of new nominalizers.

References

- Anderson, Gregory. 2002. 'Case-marked clausal subordination in the Burushaski complex sentence.' *Studies in Language* 26/3:543-572.
- Andvik, Eric. 2003. 'Tshangla.' In Graham Thurgood & Randy LaPolla, eds. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Beyer, Stephan. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan language*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 1999. 'Nominalization and focus in some Kiranti languages.' In *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*, Yogendra P. Yadava and Warren W. Glover, eds. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2003. 'Referential density in discourse and syntactic typology.' *Language*, 79/4:708-36.

- Bickel, Balthasar & Johanna Nichols. 2003. 'Typological enclaves.' Paper presented at the 5th Biannual Conference of the Association for Linguistic Typology, Cagliari, September 18.
- Binnick, Robert. 1979. *Modern Mongolian: A Transformational Approach*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1989. 'Verb agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman.' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 52:315-33.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1992. Sunwar copulas. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15:1.31-38.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2005. 'Relativization and nominalization in Bodic.' *Tibeto-Burman Linguistics: Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Denwood, Philip. 1999. *Tibetan*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Driem, George van. 1993. 'The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, LVI (2): 292-334.
- Ebert, Karen. 1993. 'Kiranti subordination in the South Asian areal context.' In Karen Ebert, ed. *Studies in clause-linkage*. Zurich: ASAS-Verlag.
- Ebert, Karen. 1994. *The Structure of Kiranti Languages*. Universität Zürich: Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Ebert, Karen. 1999. 'Non-finite verbs in Kiranti languages.' In *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*, Yogendra P. Yadava and Warren W. Glover, eds. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- Eliade, Mircea. 1964. *Shamanism: archaic techniques of ecstasy*. [Translated by W.R. Trask.] Princeton: Princeton/Bollingen.
- Glover, Warren. 1974. *Sememic and Grammatical Structures in Gurung (Nepal)*. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Norman OK.
- Georg, Stefan. 1996. *Marphatan Thakali*. LINCOM Studies in Asian Linguistics 02. München/Newcastle: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Grunow-Harsta, Karen. *in preparation*. *Magar Grammar*. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee PhD dissertation.
- Hari, Annemarie & Anita Maibaum. 1970. 'Thakali texts.' In F.K. Lehman, ed. *Occasional Papers of the Wolfenden Society on Tibeto-Burman Linguistics, vol. III. Tone Systems of Tibeto-burman Languages of Nepal, part III. Texts I*. University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Hildebrandt, Kristine. 2003. 'A Grammar and glossary of the Manange language.' In Carol Genetti, ed. *Tibeto-Burman Languages of Nepal: Manange and Sherpa*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. Pp2-189.
- Hitchcock, John. 1967. 'A Nepalese shaman and the classic Inner Asian Tradition.' *History of Religions* IV, No. 2.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1931. 'K xarakteristike evrazijskogo jazykovogo sojuza.' *Selected Writings 1*. The Hague: Mouton 1970. Pp144-201.
- LaPolla, Randy. 1992. 'On the dating and nature of verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman.' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 55.2:298-315.
- LaPolla, Randy. 1994. 'Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman: evidence of Sapir's drift.' *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 17.1:61-80.

- LaPolla, Randy. 2003a. 'Overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax.' In Graham Thurgood & Randy LaPolla, eds. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- LaPolla, Randy. 2003b. 'Qiang.' In Graham Thurgood & Randy LaPolla, eds. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Masica, Colin P. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area (South Asia)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Maslova, Elena. 1999. *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Bielefeld.
- Mazaudon, Martine. 2003. 'Tamang.' In Graham Thurgood & Randy LaPolla, eds. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Language diversity in space and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Noonan, Michael. 1997. 'Versatile Nominalizations.' In Joan Bybee, John Haiman & Sandra Thompson, eds. *Essays on Language Function and Language Type. In Honor of T. Givón*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. 1999. *Chantyal Dictionary and Texts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. With Ram Prasad Bhulanja, Jag Man Chhantyal, and William Pagliuca.
- Noonan, Michael. 2003a. 'Recent language contact in the Nepal Himalaya.' In David Bradley, Randy LaPolla, Boyd Michailovsky & Graham Thurgood, eds. *Language Variation: Papers on Variation and Change in the Sinosphere and in the Indosphere in Honour of James A. Matisoff*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Noonan, Michael. 2003b. 'Chantyal.' In Randy LaPolla and Graham Thurgood, eds. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London: Routledge.
- Noonan, Michael. 2003c. 'Nar-Phu.' In Randy LaPolla and Graham Thurgood, eds. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London: Routledge.
- Noonan, Michael. 2005a. 'Chantyal discourses.' *Himalayan Linguistics Archive 2 (2005)* 1-254. With Ram Prasad Bhulanja.
- Noonan, Michael. 2005b. 'Patterns of development, patterns of syncretism of relational morphology in the Bodic languages.' Paper to be presented at the International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Madison, July 2005.
- Smith, Holly. 1999. *Ghale Grammar*. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee MA thesis.
- Stilo, Donald. 2005. 'Iranian as buffer zone between the universal typologies of Turkic and Semitic.' In Éva Csató *et al* eds. *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Diffusion: Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic, and Turkic*. London and New York: Routledge Curzon.
- Taylor, Doreen. 1973. 'Clause patterns in Tamang.' In Austin Hale & David Watters, eds. *Clause, Sentence, and Discourse Patterns in Selected Languages of Nepal. Part II, Clause*. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Norman OK. Pp. 81-174.
- Varenkamp, Bryan. 2003. 'A Look at -ba in Central Eastern Tamang.' In Tej Ratna Kansakar & Mark Turin, eds. *Themes in Himalayan Linguistics*. Heidelberg: South Asia Institute.
- Watters, David. 1975. 'Siberian shamanistic traditions among the Kham-Magars of Nepal.' *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 2.1:123-168.
- Watters, David. 2002. *A Grammar of Kham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	IMPF	imperfect	PRES	present
ADES	adessive	INTR	intransitive	PROG	progressive
ANT	anterior	IV	concord class IV	Q	question
AUX	auxiliary	LOC	locative	SUB	subject
CIRC	circumulative	NEG	negative	SUP	suppositional
CNV	converb	NOM	nominalizer	SUPER	superessive
COM	comitative	NPST	non-past	1(SG)	first person (singular)
DAT	dative	PAT	patient	2(SG)	second person (singular)
DETR	determiner	PERF	perfective	3(SG)	third person (singular)
DO	direct object	PL	plural		
ERG	ergative	POL	polite		
GEN	genitive	POSS	possessive		

Appendix

Proposed Genetic Relationships Within the Bodic Section of Tibeto-Burman

