

NOMINALIZATION IN THE KIRANTI AND CENTRAL HIMALAYISH LANGUAGES OF NEPAL¹

David E. Watters

SIL, South Asia Group

Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University

Numerous grammars have been published on Kiranti and Central Himalayish languages in recent years and though nominalization has been a pervasive feature in most of them, it is not always clear from the nomenclature that we are dealing with nominalizations at all. Nominalization is used in many of these languages not only in converting finite clauses into relative and complement structures, but also in converting verbs and other word classes into adjectivals, participles, and demonstrative-like elements. Less well understood is the use of nominalization in ‘free-standing’ predications. Such nominalizations have been defined in various ways by different authors. I hope to demonstrate, however, that we are dealing primarily with equivalent structures and that their various functions can be distinguished, not only by their pragmatic contexts, but also by the syntactic structures in which they occur. Not all of them occur in every language, but the ones that do occur can be seen as forming different parts of a multi-functional instrument.

Keywords: Kiranti, Himalayish, nominalization, relative clauses, complement clauses, participles, free-standing nominalization, Tibeto-Burman, Bodic

1. INTRODUCTION

The nominalization of verbs, locative expressions, adverbial phrases, and whole clauses is a pervasive feature of Bodic languages, and hardly a sentence passes in natural discourse without one. Such nominalizations are used both in subordination (as adnominals and verbal complements) and in “free-standing”, finite predications. In the latter function, especially, it becomes clear that nominalization and finiteness are not at all contrastive terms in these languages, nor does nominalization necessarily signal subordination. There appears to be little agreement, however, on what free-standing, unembedded nominalization does signal.

Indeed, judging from the literature, it is not entirely clear if we should expect that a comparative study of nominalizations across Bodic languages can produce useful generalizations at all. We may have to resign ourselves to the fact that nominalizing structures have carved out different niches in different languages,

¹ I am indebted to R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Aikhenvald for inviting me to the Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, Melbourne to carry out my studies on nominalization in various Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal. This paper is an updated version of a talk that I gave at RCLT in January 2006, and I have benefited much from helpful comments that grew out of that talk, especially from Bob Dixon, Sasha Aikhenvald, Randy LaPolla, David Bradley, Alec Coupe, Stephen Morey, Mark Post, and Seino van Breugel. I also wish to thank my reviewers for their valuable comments.

and that in the modern languages some of the functions are incompatible. It is certainly clear that nominalization is a multi-functional instrument and that different languages seem to favor certain functions over others. But what I hope to do here is to draw upon descriptions of numerous Bodic, and more specifically East Himalayish (Kiranti) and Central Himalayish languages,² with a few glimpses farther afield, and attempt to delineate, in an integrated way, the general compass of nominalizing structures and functions in those languages.

As in most comparative studies, one is immediately confronted with a plethora of terminology—sometimes the use of different terms in describing the same phenomenon, and in other cases equivalent terms to describe different phenomena. Part of what I hope to do in this paper is to sort some of that out.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF NOMINALIZERS IN KIRANTI LANGUAGES

Most Kiranti languages have more than one nominalizer, and some of the nominalizers are used in more than one function. Thus, to distinguish different nominalization types, authors of Kiranti and Central Himalayish grammars have often described them in functional terms, and it is not always clear that we are dealing with the same category in two different languages, or, in some cases, even a nominalization at all. Thus, for example Watters (1978) referred to one nominalization type in Kham as an ‘orientation mode’ and later (1985) as a ‘parenthetic mode’, primarily because of its most obvious function in a narrative discourse. Likewise, Rutgers, in his grammar of Yamphu (1998), describes several nominalizations that go by more-or-less functional names—‘factitive’, ‘factitive infinitive’, ‘agent participle’, ‘object participle’, ‘active present participle’, ‘passive participle’, ‘locative participle’, and ‘adverbial participle’. The “factitive” construction, it turns out, can also be used in relative clauses and in complementation, normally a clear indicator of its status as a nominalization.

Opgenort, in his description of Wambule (2004), takes the reader on a dizzying tour of nominalizations labelled as ‘*nomen actionis*’, ‘reification’, ‘factual verbal adjective’, ‘active verbal adjective’, ‘passive verbal adjective’, and a nominalized clause “which is used for the arguments of verbs other than ‘be’” (2004:320)—i.e. complements (although he does not call them that). Several of these nominalizers use the same nominalizer *-me* or one of its variants.

In this paper, when introducing various types of nominalization, I will purposely retain the terminology of the original authors, and then attempt to

² There have already been several studies on nominalization in Bodic languages, e.g. DeLancey 1986, 2002, Noonan 1997, 2007, [2008 to appear], but those studies have been weighted heavily on the side of the ‘Bodish’ [Tibetan-like] languages of Bodic. This study concentrates primarily on the Kiranti languages of the East Himalayish branch, and also on a few languages of the putative Central Himalayish branch (tentatively, Kham, Magar, Chepang, and a few others where the data are relevant). Unfortunately, I lack sufficient data for Magar. Kham, especially, shares numerous features with East Himalayish. Though the term “Himalayish” has been used to mean different things by different authors, I will use the term as a convenient cover-term to refer to the East and Central Himalayish languages of Nepal.

integrate what I consider to be related phenomena in various languages under a common rubric, regardless of whether the same or different terminology is used. To reduce confusion, however, I have standardized most other ‘morph-names’ used in the glosses, such that “3s” will stand for third person singular in any language, “3S” will refer to third person S arguments, NML will refer to nominalizer, and so on. (See the list of abbreviations at the end of the paper.)

2.1. Participant nominalizers (“participles”)

In many Kiranti languages, a distinction is made between special participant nominalizers (referred to as participles)³ which derive nouns that make unique reference to one of the arguments of the source verb, and more general nominalizers used in numerous other functions that I will elaborate on later. Even the first type, however, can also be used in attribution (except in SE Camling; see *fn* 10). For a brief treatment of participles and other nominalizers in Kiranti, see Ebert 1994:86–89.

2.1.1. Agent nominals

In the descriptions of most Kiranti languages, like Kulung (Tolsma 1999), Thulung (Lahaussais 2002), Limbu (van Driem 1987), Athpare (Ebert 1997a), Camling (Ebert 1997b), Eastern Bantawa (Rai 1985) and Western Bantawa (Doornenbal 2007), the most common participant nominalizer reported is one that makes unique reference to the S/A argument of the nominalized verb and has been variously called an ‘active participle’, an ‘agentive participle’, or an ‘agentive noun’. All these languages use a *-pa* nominalizer in this role, perhaps ultimately derived from TB **pa* ‘father’; ‘(masc)’ (Benedict 1972), sometimes alone and sometimes in concert with a prefixed *ka-* or *kɛ-*.⁴

In Thulung, Kulung and the NW dialect of Camling, for example, (as well as in other northern languages like Khaling) the “agentive participle” is formed by *-pa* alone, as in Kulung *khai-pa* [go-NML] ‘one who is going’ or *lə-p-ci* [sing-NML-PL] ‘those who are singing’; or in NW Camling *dip-pa* [beat-NML] ‘blacksmith/one who beats’ or *khur-pa* [carry-NML] ‘carrier/one who carries’.

In Limbu, the agentive participle requires a prefix *kɛ-* in addition to the suffix *-pa*, as in *kɛ-sep-pa* [AP-kill-NML] ‘he who kills’ or *kɛ-si-ba* [AP-die-NML] ‘one

3 To add to the confusion, the authors of some Kiranti grammars have used the term “participle” exclusively to refer to the form of the medial verb in clause chains—the “conjunctive participle” of European and Indic tradition.

4 The addition of *ka-* or *kɛ-* is primarily a feature of southeastern Kiranti languages, and may be a retention of a very old prefix with widespread distribution. For example, in Tangkhul, Mortensen (2003:19) describes a nominalizing prefix *kə-*; and in Angami, Herring (1991:56) reports a verbal prefix *kə-*, which in one of its functions is used as a nominalizer. Also, Matisoff (2003:137) reports a prefixal *k-* which “serves as a relativizer when attached to a stative verb” in Daai Chin. I wish to thank one of my anonymous reviewers for pointing out that the nominalizing prefixes *kə-* and *kɛ-* also occur in Caodeng rGyalrong, as reported by Sun (2003:493), and a nominalizing prefix *kV-* occurs in Lamkang, a Kuki-Chin language (Thounaojam and Chelliah 2007).

who is dying’.⁵ In Athpare and SE Camling, the *-pa* suffix is optional in agentive participles, the more important indicator being the *ka-* prefix, as in Athpare *ka-thuk-(ba)* [AP-cook-(NML)] ‘cook’ or SE Camling *ka-dip-(pa)* [AP-beat-(NML)] ‘blacksmith/one who beats’. In Western Bantawa, too, *ka-* is the operative part of the construction, and the suffixes *-pa*, *-ma*, and *-ci* indicate male gender, female gender or plurality, respectively. Finally, in Eastern Bantawa as well as in Dumi the agentive participle combines *-pa* and the “*k*” element (possibly the same etymon as the *kε-* ~ *ka-* of Limbu, SE Camling, Athpare, and Western Bantawa), but both occur as suffixes.⁶ An example from Eastern Bantawa is *im-kaba* [sleep-AP] ‘one who sleeps’, and from Dumi *khi:-kpi-mil* [steal-AP-PL] ‘thieves’. This can be summarized in the following:

(1) “Agentive participles”:

a. Thulung		-pa
b. Kulung		-pa
c. NW Camling		-pa
d. SE Camling	ka-	(-pa)
e. Athpare	ka-	(-pa)
f. Limbu	kε-	-pa
g. W Bantawa	ka-	(-pa / -ma / -ci)
h. E Bantawa		-kaba
i. Dumi		-kpi ~ -pi / -kpa

2.1.2. Non-agent nominals

Some Himalayish languages have “participial” verb forms that make specific reference not only to the verb’s S/A argument, but to other arguments as well—i.e. to the O argument in passive participles, and to the O or LOC arguments in specific object and locative participles. Yamphu (Rutgers 1998) provides examples of all four:

5 The suffix *-pa* without the accompanying prefix *kε-* is used in Limbu as a “general” nominalizer, as well as a marker of adjectival concepts, as in:

- a. lem-pa ‘sweet’
- b. har-pa ‘dry’
- c. gugur-pa ‘black’

6 I will not speculate on how this might occur in E Bantawa and Dumi, but as a corollary, it is common in the Kham group of languages for a related affix to be suffixing in one dialect and prefixing in another. On free affix ordering in Kiranti, see Bickel et al. (2005). It is also worth noting that Kulung has a general nominalizing suffix *-kə*, Camling *-ko*, and Dolakha Newar *-gu/-ku/-u* (Genetti 1994), which may be related.

(2) YAMPHU:

a. ACTIVE PARTICIPLE:

i-beʔ yaʔmi khak-khus-æʔ coŋ-khus-æʔ cu-tta-m-e
 this-LOC person pierce-AP-ERG cut-AP-ERG fight-PF-3p-FCT
 ‘Some stabbers and slashers have been fighting here.’

b. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE:

phim-braʔa-ji
 seize-PP-NS
 ‘those who are seized’

c. OBJECT PARTICIPLE:⁷

i-doʔ-ha cet-cira-ji
 this.like-PL.NML plow-thing-NS
 ‘like these plowing things’

d. LOCATIVE PARTICIPLE:

wa:wa pen-dham yaksa-beʔ
 elder.brother sit-LCP hut-LOC
 ‘in the hut where elder brother stays’

Participles in the Kiranti languages are first and foremost nominalizations, though in most grammars they are defined as separate and more specific than the more general kind of nominalization used in relative clauses and complement clause constructions. Turning to Yamphu again for an example of a “general” nominalizer, Rutgers defines relative clauses as nominalizations that make use of a factitive construction—a fully finite nominalization marked by the general nominalizer *-æ ~ -e ~ -ye*:

(3) YAMPHU:

a. SUBJECT RELATIVE CLAUSE:

[kiriya hæk-pe:-tt-æ] yaʔmi
 oath cut-RES-PF-FCT person
 ‘a person who has taken an oath’

b. NON-SUBJECT RELATIVE CLAUSE:

[am-mi cabaŋ-æʔ khi:-ghi:-tt-æ] mottitel
 your-GEN guest-ERG carry-bring-PF-FCT kerosene
 ‘the kerosene your guest brought’

The only distinction between the subject relative clause and the non-subject relative clause in (3a–b) is in the syntactic role of the noun that is extracted and made the head of the NP. In (3a) the subject *yaʔmi* ‘person’ has been made the head of the NP, and in (3b) the object *mottitel* ‘kerosene’ has been made the

⁷ Though this is more like an instrument nominalization, I retain Rutgers’ own terminology here—“object participle”.

head. In both cases, it is the general nominalizer (which Rutgers calls a factitive) that is used, and not the active participle or object participle illustrated in (2a) and (2c).

Thus, not only do participles generally make use of a unique and more specific set of nominalizers (like those in 2a–d), it is also the case that participles are characterized as non-finite, attaching only to bare, uninflected verb roots, as in *khak-* ‘pierce’, *phim-* ‘seize’, *cet-* ‘plow’, and *pen-* ‘stay’ (in 2a–d).

Taking finiteness (whether a verb is inflected for person/number and TAM categories), then, as a primary criterial factor in distinguishing a participle from other kinds of nominalization [this is my reading on the difference between the two categories in most Kiranti grammars that I have read],⁸ it turns out that most Kiranti languages make use of participles primarily in agent nominalizations and very little elsewhere. The more general (non-participial) nominalization occurs on fully inflected clauses.

Only a few languages, like Yamphu and Wambule, are reported to have a plethora of nominalizers, and some have been turned to the exclusive production of participles. But all except the agent participles are extremely limited in scope. The so-called “object participle” in Yamphu (2c), for example, is very likely related to the Nepali word *cij* ‘thing’ and is used primarily to reference instruments as in ‘plow-thing’. It appears not to have the versatility required to reference objects in general. For that, the general nominalizer in a non-subject relative clause is required (as in 3b). Likewise, the passive participle shown in (2b) is a limited instrument and can reference objects only in the absence of an agent—i.e. in detransitivized contexts. Parallel to the object participle is the locative participle in (2d) which appears to incorporate the Nepali etymon *tham* [*dham*] < *thaō* ‘place’. Both participles are, without question, limited and unusual categories.

Athpare (Ebert 1997a) has a “patientive participle” analogous to the object participle of Yamphu, which is also limited in scope and, according to Ebert, “not very productive”. Like the Yamphu category, the patientive participle suffix of Athpare may be related to the Indic *vala* (as also suggested by Ebert), as in:

- (4) ATHPARE:
- | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------|
| athak-ŋi | thak- <u>balak</u> | mikhli |
| loom-LOC | weave- <u>PP</u> | dress |
| ‘a woven dress’ | | |

Somewhat equivalent to the Yamphu and Athpare object/patientive participle is the Wambule “reified verbal adjective of purpose”, a category that makes reference “to the intended application of an argument of the verb”, as in ‘thing to eat’. (Opgenort labels this morpheme as <RES>; I will use <REIF> to

⁸ This generalization, however, is not entirely true—some Kiranti languages, e.g. Athpare, appear to have some provision for marking the person of the object in some agent participles.

distinguish it from the resultative of Yamphu.) Opgenort notes too (2004:374) that “a reified verbal adjective of purpose is the usual citation form of a verb, corresponding to the Nepali infinitival form of a verb.” Its usage in the following sentences is also reminiscent of the Nepali infinitive. Though *thok* and *byala* are Nepali borrowings (as are *cij* and *tham* in [2c–d]), they differ from Yamphu and Athpare in that they are not verbal affixes, but are the head nouns themselves.⁹

- (5) WAMBULE:
- a. ja-ca-m thok
 eat-PURP-REIF thing
 ‘thing to eat’
- b. kəphi tu:-ca-m byala
 coffee drink-PURP-REIF time
 ‘time to drink coffee’

What I would consider true non-agent participles, analogous to the non-finite agent participles we have just seen, occur, to my knowledge, only in Camling and Bantawa. In both languages, the category is marked by the suffix *-kha*, and attaches directly to the bare verb root. Ebert (1997b) correctly calls it a patientive noun <PN>:

- (6) CAMLING:¹⁰
- a. ca-kha b. woi-kha
 eat-PN wear-PN
 ‘food’ ‘clothes’

In a western variety of Bantawa, Doornenbal (2007:174) refers to the morpheme *-kha* as a purpose nominalizer. Very often it has an instrumental interpretation, as in *dhok-kha* [dig-PNOM] ‘something to dig with’. There are examples from Camling, too, in which *-kha* has an instrumental sense, as in *bha-kha* [cut-NML] ‘knife’ (Ebert 1997b:41). In both languages *-kha* can also have a ‘place’ reading, as in Bantawa *yuj-kha* ‘place to sit’, or Camling *wa-la-kha* ‘well; place to draw water’.

9 In what could be a parallel source-construction-type, it is not difficult to imagine an earlier stage of grammaticalization for Athpare in which the *-ba* of *-balak* was a nominalizer, and *lak* the head noun. This, of course, would render the Indic hypothesis just suggested untenable.

10 Ebert reports that the patientive noun in Camling cannot be used adnominally, and as such, it is analogous to the agentive noun of Camling, which also cannot be used in attribution. Thus, the Camling *patient* form shown in (6) and the SE Camling *agent* form alluded to in (1) function only as NP heads, as in: *ka-dip-(pa)* [AP-beat-(NML)] ‘blacksmith/one who beats’. This makes Camling, and possibly Bantawa, too, unique in Kiranti.

2.1.3. “Active” and “passive” participles

Non-finite nominalizations that make specific reference to arguments other than S or A, then, are rare in Himalayish, and where they do occur they are usually limited in scope and productivity. More common is a binary distinction—the agent nominalization we have just seen (sometimes referred to as an active participle), and if a second participle exists at all, a passive participle. Thus, in addition to Yamphu, which we have already seen, Wambule, Kulung, Bantawa, Limbu and Dumi all have active and passive participles, as shown in (7–11). None appears to have distinct classes of object or locative participles (see §2.2 for their functional equivalents).

(7) WAMBULE:

a. active participle

(referred to as the “active verbal adjective” <ACT>):

gwaḍa phic-co muyo [horse bring-AP man]

‘the man bringing the horse’

b. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE

(referred to as the “passive verbal adjective” <PAS>):

ryag-bumco [write-PP]

‘written, drawn’

(8) KULUNG:

a. ACTIVE PARTICIPLE:

espa ta-p mic [yesterday come-AP man]

‘the man who came yesterday’

b. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE:

hui-mpa samkhe [roast-PP potato]

‘roasted potatoes’

(9) BANTAWA:

a. ACTIVE PARTICIPLE:

ka-set kinthəkwa-ci-ʔenan [AP-kill rebel-PL-COM]

‘with the murderous rebels’

b. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE:

ap-ma-yiṅ choṅwa [shoot-INF-PP bird]

‘a shot-at bird’

(10) LIMBU:

a. ACTIVE PARTICIPLE:

kε-sep-pa mi:n [AP-kill-NML person]

‘the person who kills’

- b. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE: (p. 208)
 mək-mna-ba cwaʔl pit-nu [heat-PP-NML water cow-milk]
 ‘heated water and milk’

(11) DUMI:

- a. ACTIVE PARTICIPLE:
 tsem-mi-kpɪ mi:n [play-do-AP person]
 ‘the person playing’
- b. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE:
 thip-mpo su:le [sew-PP thread]
 ‘sewn thread’

2.2. The “general” nominalizer

In most Himalayish languages, a separate “general” nominalizer occurs on fully finite clauses, and is used for relative clauses, marking arguments of complement taking clauses, and for referencing objects (as in 3b). The general nominalizer (except perhaps in Limbu and some Central Himalayish languages like Kham or Chepang) takes on various forms, involving different etyma, none of which are related to the ubiquitous nominalizer *-pa*. As DeLancey (2002) notes, most of these non-*-pa* nominalizers can be regarded as recent innovations, and there appears to be “no basis for attributing any [of them] to Proto-Kiranti, much less Proto-Bodic.”

The only exception might be the nominalizer *-m* or some variant of it. As a nominalizer, *-m* is widespread in TB and, in some cases, may derive from TB **mi* ‘person’.¹¹ Not only is it found in Kiranti, but also in Western Himalayish and in non-Bodic Qiangic (Noonan 2007; LaPolla 2003).

In Kiranti, *-m* occurs in Dumi, for example, and van Driem (1993:195) describes it as a derivational suffix which “can attach not only to verbs, but to adverbs, locative expressions, and even to nouns” (especially in the locative case). He also ascribes to *-m*, as he did for *-pa* in Limbu, an imperfective reading, which he ultimately relates to the nominalizer *-m*. It has two related functions, he says (1993:190): “to present an event as a temporally articulate situation and to present an event as a matter of fact”. (Later, in §8, I will comment on the relationship between nominalization and imperfectivity.)

A possibly related suffix *-me* occurs in Wambule as a “reifying” suffix, and in the same language *-meya* ~ *-mei* occurs as a “factual verbal adjective”—both with attributive and relativizing functions. Both are possibly related to the “nominalizing formative” *-me* of Bahing; to the “factitive infinitive” *-mae* and the “attributive nominalizer” *-m* of Yamphu; as well as to the “clause nominalizing” and “demonstrative deriving” morpheme *-m* of Thulung (with

11 There is also a **-ma* suffix which can at times have a nominalizing function, but which in many cases can be shown to derive from the feminine counterpart of the **-pa*/*-ma* gender contrast.

other functions as well; see Lahaussais 2003), and the “verbal noun” *-ma* of Eastern Bantawa (Rai 1985:64), which is an action nominal as in ‘going’, ‘writing’, ‘giving’, etc.

Other nominalizers also abound, some of which appear to have an older pedigree than others. Noonan (2007:7), for example, relates the Magar (Central Himalayish) attributive marker *-cyo*, used for both adjectives and relative clauses, to what he calls the “anterior” *-si* plus a *-pa/-wa* nominalizer found in languages like Chantyal. Sunwar *-fo* and the Wambule active verbal adjective *-co ~ -ce* are phonetically similar, but may or may not be etymologically related.

In Kulung, the general nominalizer is a suffix *-kə*. It functions as a relativizer in relative clauses, and as a means for deriving demonstrative pronouns from locative expressions—like ‘the one up there’, ‘the one down here’, etc. It can also be used as an adjective nominalizer—‘the red one’, and to form free-standing independent clauses (in which the main finite verb is nominalized by *-kə*) to yield notions like ‘[The fact is] I haven’t eaten since yesterday’. The Camling general nominalizer *-ko* (Ebert 1997b:59) may be related, in spite of its superficial appearance to the Nepali genitive. Such forms “can stand as a noun or as an attribute”. In Athpare (Ebert 1997a), the general nominalizer (used in relative clauses and in complements) is *-na* in its singular form and *-ga* in its plural form.

In the Kham group of languages (Watters 2002; Central Himalayish), there are two vestigial nominalizers *-pa* and *-za* that are lexicalized on a very small subset of adjectives. The first morpheme, *-pa*, is augmentative, very likely derived from TB **pa* ‘father’ which we have seen already, as in: *gehp-pa* ‘big’, *khyö-pa* ‘long’.¹² The other, *-za*, is diminutive, very likely derived from TB **za* ‘child’, as in: *zim-za* ‘small’, *twĩt-za* ‘short’, *cũt-za* ‘narrow’, *dehm-za* ‘low’, and *bom-za* ‘light (weight)’.

All other nominalizations in Kham are formed with the nominalizer *-wo ~ -o ~ -u* (possibly from TB **p < *pa* or **po*). The same general nominalizer shows up in other Himalayish languages, too, like the general nominalizer *-ʔo* of Bantawa (Doornenbal 2007:179), and the *-ʔo* nominalizer of Chepang (Caughley 1982:130).

Nominalizations in Kham are used in all of the functions cited for Kiranti languages—in free-standing independent clauses, in interrogatives, in imperatives, in miratives, in complements, in relative clauses, in appositives, in the formation of adjectives, in agent nominalizations, in object nominalizations, in locative nominalizations, in emphatic assertions, and in the formation of demonstrative pronouns from deictic primitives. Each of these functions will be

12 Though Matisoff (1992) shows that the usual augmentative morpheme in TB is derived from **-ma* ‘mother’, this is not the case for Kham. Though the augmentative *-pa* and the diminutive *-za* occur primarily on a handful of Kham adjectives (all other “adjectives” in Kham are descriptive verbs), the two morphemes can also be found on a few ‘big/small’ nouns like *kwi-pa* ‘thumb’ [hand-father] and *rwih-za* ‘bug’ [insect-child]. Compare also Thangmi (Turin 2006:705) *apa omla* ‘thumb’ (lit. ‘father finger’).

examined in this paper, along with a cross-linguistic comparative study of their manifestations and uses in various Himalayish languages (plus a few others).

3. NOMINALIZATIONS AS MODIFIERS AND COMPLEMENTS

The use of nominalized structures in modifying functions is a feature found in all Himalayish languages and beyond, in Bodish and Indo-Aryan.¹³ Though in Classical Tibetan and some West Bodish languages like Gurung (Glover 1974) or Kaike (Watters forthcoming) nominalized clauses in a relativizing function mark their subordinate status by the addition of a genitive to the nominalization, in most Bodic languages subordination is marked by the nominalization itself (Noonan 1997, Bickel 1999, DeLancey 2002).

Though in some Himalayish languages a single nominalizing structure can be used in multiple functions, in other Himalayish languages there are different nominalizing structures for different functions. As we have already seen, the same etymon in different languages can have different functions. Thus, for example, the morpheme *-pa* is used as a general nominalizer in Limbu, as a specific nominalizer for loan words in Yamphu, as an active participle in Kulung, and as a vestigial nominalizer in a half-dozen Kham adjectives. Where *-pa* is not a general nominalizer, other nominalizers have often moved in to fill the vacuum.

3.1. Subject relative clauses with the “general” nominalizer

In languages with limited nominalizers, like the Central Himalayish group of languages (tentatively Kham, Magar, Chepang, and possibly others), the same nominalizer is used in multiple functions, whether for the participial kinds of functions we have just seen or for adjectivals, relative clauses and complement clauses. Thus, in Takale Kham, the nominalizer used to create subject relative clauses (or subject nominalizations) in non-finite constructions like *ba-o mi:* [go-NML person] ‘the person who went’ (thus qualifying in some senses as a participle) is the same as the nominalizer used throughout the whole language—*-wo ~ -o ~ -u*—used in finite and non-finite constructions alike. As in the languages illustrated in (7–11), Kham too distinguishes between what might be called an active participle/nominalization and a passive participle/nominalization:

(12) TAKALE KHAM:

a. ACTIVE PARTICIPLE (referred to as a subject nominalization):

syakəri kəi-wo mi:
meat bite-NML person
‘the person who ate the meat’

13 Though Thangmi (Turin 2006) lies close to the Kiranti geographical area, it turns out to be typologically exceptional. Verbs or clauses with adnominal functions use no nominalizing morphology—such functions are marked simply by using pre-head syntax on non-preterite verb forms. To my knowledge, in the Himalayan region, only Kusunda follows this strategy (Watters 2006).

- b. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE:
 hip-si-u syakəri
 burn-DETRANS-NML meat
 ‘roasted meat’

Kham uses the same nominalizer for adjectivals, relative clauses, and verbal complements, as in the following:

- (13) a. ADJECTIVAL:
 khyo:-wo mi:
 long-NML person
 ‘a tall person’
- b. RELATIVE CLAUSE:
 ŋa: ŋa-jəi-wo zihm
 I 1s-make-NML house
 ‘the house (that) I built’
- c. COMPLEMENT CLAUSE:
 la:rə ŋa-ra-səih-zya-o řih-na-ke-o
 leopard-PL 1s-3p-kill-CONT-NML see-1s-PFV-3s
 ‘He saw me killing leopards.’

Of all the languages surveyed in this paper, Chepang (Caughley 1982:130–136) appears to be the least diversified for nominalization types. As in Kham, the subject relative clause (as shown in [12a]) and the adjectival (as shown in [13a]) are formed in Chepang by adding the realis nominalizer *-ʔo* <RN> directly to the verb root (there is also an irrealis nominalizer). As we shall see in §3.2.8, all other nominalizations in Chepang, too, whether they reference subjects or non-subjects in relative clauses, or are used as arguments of complement taking verbs, are uninflected for person and tense. Dolakha Newar appears to have similar properties of non-finite nominalizers (Genetti 1994).

- (14) CHEPANG (p. 132):
- a. RELATIVE:
 ʔowʔ ten jik-ʔo manta
 that today sick-RN person
 ‘the person who was sick today’
- b. ADJECTIVAL:
 ʔowʔ jik-ʔo manta
 that sick-RN person
 ‘the sick person’

Apparently all Kiranti languages that have an active participle (as in 7–11) can also modify the subject/agent with the more general relative clause nominal-

izer. We have seen this already in the Yamphu distinction between (2a), an active participle, and (3a) a subject relative clause. Both make reference to a subject/agent. Likewise in Kulung, Tolsma refers to the nominalization in *-pa* as an active participle, but he gives other examples of subject/agent nominalizations marked by the general nominalizer *-kə*. He does not tell us what the difference is, though in the following two examples that come from different parts of the grammar, (a) is a pre-nominal modifier and (b) is post-verbal. (The functional difference may be something entirely different.)

(15) KULUNG (p. 104):

a. ACTIVE PARTICIPLE:

espa ta-p mic
yesterday come-AP man
'the man who came yesterday'

b. RELATIVE CLAUSE NOMINALIZER (p. 91):

wa: khim woŋ-kə
chicken house enter-NML
'the chickens entering the house'

A careful examination of Dumi, too, yields two nominalization types for making reference to a single argument type. One, which is referred to as an active participle, is nevertheless used, in one example, to make reference to a non-subject argument—'place'—as in:

(16) DUMI (p. 272):

mi:n dumo: ho:-kpi thomphi-bi
man many come-AP place-LOC
'in places where lots of people come'

and in an almost identical sequence 'place' is modified by a finite clause nominalized by the general nominalizer *-m*, as in:

(17) DUMI (p. 193):

dumo: mi:n ham-ho:-t-i-m thamphi-bi mo:
many man 3p-come-NPT-23s-NML place-LOC be
'He was in a place where many people come.'

3.2. Non-subject nominalizations with the "general" nominalizer

Apart from the passive participle and some defective "object" participles mentioned above, the primary means of effecting a non-subject nominalization in Himalayish languages is through the use of a finite nominalization of the sort used in relative clauses. I have already hinted at such structures in examples like (3b), (13b), and (17).

3.2.1. Non-subject relative clauses in Kham

For some Himalayish languages, like Kham, the distinction between subject and non-subject nominalization is based first and foremost on different morphosyntactic structures¹⁴ (and secondarily on making the appropriate noun the head of the NP and deleting it from the nominalized clause). The same nominalizer *-wo ~ -o ~ -u* is used throughout.

In Kham, the subject nominalization is uninflected for person and number. The nominalizer (or optionally a progressive + nominalizer) attaches directly to the bare verb root, somewhat like the Kiranti participial structures. The resulting structure makes reference only to a third person argument – the S or A. We saw this already in the Takale Kham example (12a).

At the other end of the spectrum, the verb of a non-subject nominalization is inflected for the person and number of one or two participants, depending on whether it is transitive or not (and also depending on the particular dialect). When intransitive verbs participate in this structure, the nominalization makes reference to some non-subject peripheral argument, usually location. With transitive verbs, the default non-subject reference (in headless relative clauses) is to the O argument, and with ditransitive verbs, to the indirect object or experiencer. (In a headed relative clause with a non-subject nominalization, any non-subject argument can, of course, be made the head of the NP.)

At the risk of being repetitive, I will first present a few examples of subject nominalization to establish a base from which to compare non-subject nominalization (or relative clauses) across languages:

(18) TAKALE KHAM:

SUBJECT NOMINALIZATION (non-inflecting for person):

- a. *zihm jəi-wo mi:rə*
house make-NML person-PL
'the people who built the house'
- b. *ba-o mi:*
go-NML person
'the person who went'
- c. *si-u-rə*
die-NML-PL
'the ones who died'
- d. *zyu-wo-ra-lai*
eat-NML-PL-ACC
'to the ones who ate'

14 Dolakha Newari (Genetti 1994:157–161), too, distinguishes, in a majority of cases, between subject and non-subject relative clauses based, in part, on different morphological structures. A nominalizing suffix that Genetti calls NR1 [-*gu/-u*] associates mostly with subject relative clauses, and a different suffix, NR2 [-*a*], associates with object relative clauses.

Note that the suffix *-wo ~ -o ~ -u* attaches directly to the verb root and includes no other inflection. Note too from (18) that verbs nominalized by subject nominalization can be used as adnominals (18a–b) or function as full nominals (18c–d) taking pluralization or any other nominal case marking.

Non-subject nominalization stands apart from subject nominalization in that it always inflects for at least one participant—obligatorily the subject. In a sense, this is a kind of gapping strategy in verbal agreement markers—i.e. if there are no agreement markers in the nominalization, the nominalization makes reference to the highest participant, the subject. If, on the other hand, there is a subject agreement marker in the nominalization, the nominalization makes reference to some non-subject participant further down the hierarchy:

(19) TAKALE KHAM:

WITHOUT PERSON INFLECTION:

- a. *ba-o mi:*
 go-NML person
 ‘the person who went’

WITH SUBJECT INFLECTION:

- b. *ŋa-ba-o po:*
 1sS-go-NML place
 ‘the place where I went’

In Takale Kham, non-subject nominalizations are fully inflected for the person and number of two participants in transitive clauses (with some limitations on tense/aspect). Thus, in the following non-subject relative clauses, object indices are also included:

(20) TAKALE KHAM:

- a. *nə-ra-səih-wo bas-ma-rə*
 2sA-3pO-kill-NML goat-FEM-PL
 ‘the (female) goats you killed’
- b. *nə-ra-səih-wo-ra-lai ŋa-ra-kəi-ke*
 2sA-3pO-kill-NML-PL-ACC 1sA-3pO-eat-PFV
 ‘I ate the ones you killed.’
- c. *ge: nə-sə-thəi-si-zya-o nakhar-la-o-rə zə*
 we 2sA-CAUS-hear-1pO-CONT-NML village-IN-NML-PL EMPH
 ‘We are of the village where you made the proclamation (to us).’

In (20a–b), the nominalization ‘the ones that you killed’ includes a third person plural object referent—‘the you-killed-them goats’. In (20a) plurality is also marked on the head noun (*-rə*), and in (20b) on the nominalized head itself (*nə-ra-səih-wo-ra-lai*). Somewhat remarkably, in (20c), the plural argument ‘villagers’ is modified by a nominalization that includes first person plural (*nə-*

sə-thəi-si-zya-o)—‘we are the you-proclaimed-to-us villagers’—even though the head noun ‘villagers’ is third person.¹⁵

Gamale Kham and Sesi Kham are more restricted in this respect (Watters 2005:353–354), allowing only subject marking in adnominal clauses with third person heads (disallowing all the constructions in 20a–c). Thus we get the following contrasts:

(21) THIRD PERSON OBJECTS:¹⁶

a. TAKALE (marked for subject and object):

ŋa-ra-poh-wo mi:-rə
 1sA-3pO-hit-NML person-PL
 ‘the people I hit’

b. GAMALE (marked for subject only):

a-co-wo ru:-rə
 1sA-hit-NML person-PL
 ‘the people I hit’

c. SESI (marked for subject only):

ŋa-tup-o ru-yan
 1sA-hit-NML person-PL
 ‘the people I hit’

Where first or second person objects are involved in the relative clause nominalization, both Takale and Gamale mark the subject and object participants in the nominalized verb; Sesi marks only the subject. In Sesi, the nominalized verb in (22c), then, takes the same form as the one in (21c).

(22) FIRST OR SECOND PERSON OBJECTS:

a. TAKALE:

ñi-lai ŋa-poh-ni-u chyam
 you-ACC 1sA-hit-2sO-NML day
 ‘the day I hit you’

15 Note that this is not a case of relativizing off of location. Such a construction would be *nə-thəi-zya-o nakhar/po*: [2sA-CAUS-hear-CONT-NML village/place] ‘the village/place in which you proclaimed it’. (20c), however, refers to those persons who are of the village, and if there were to be concord between the adnominal and the head noun, we would get: *nə-ra-sə-thəi-zya-o nakhar-la-o-rə* [2sA-3pO-CAUS-hear-CONT-NML village-IN-NML-PL] ‘those of the village where you proclaimed it’. In reference to these kinds of constructions, Ebert (1997b:54–55) makes the claim that “the concept of ‘agreement’ does not apply to the Camling verb.” See also Bickel (2000).

16 If these constructions were headless, the plural marker on the head noun would attach directly to the nominalization (making the plural marker itself the head), as in: (a) *ŋa-ra-poh-wo-rə* [1sA-3pO-hit-NML-PL]; (b) *a-co-wo-rə* [1sA-hit-NML-PL]; and (c) *ŋa-tup-o-yan* [1sA-hit-NML-PL] —‘those that I hit’.

b. GAMALE:

nəŋ-tuŋ a-co-sə-o chyəŋ
 you-ACC 1sA-hit-2pO-NML day
 ‘the day I hit you’

c. SESI:

nəŋ-jəhn ŋa-tup-o chim
 you-ACC 1sA-hit-NML day
 ‘the day I hit you’

In Sesi, the marking of two participants in nominalization is admitted only in stand-alone nominalizations and in verbal complements, not in adnominals. The fully inflected nominalized equivalents of (21c) and (22c) are: *ŋa-tup-əŋ-w-aŋ* [1sA-hit-1s.ECHO-NML-3pO] ‘I hit them’; and *ŋa-tup-n-u* [1sA-hit-2sO-NML] ‘I hit you’.

3.2.2. Non-subject relative clauses in Kulung

In Kulung, as in Takale Kham, one basic difference between subject and non-subject relative clauses appears to be based on inflecting versus non-inflecting nominalizations. With the scant examples in Tolsma’s grammar, however, the evidence is inconclusive. The ones translated as object nominalizations include a certain amount of person/number inflection:

(23) KULUNG:

a. SUBJECT (non-inflecting):

wə: khim woŋ-kə
 chicken house enter-NML
 ‘the chickens entering the house’

b. NON-SUBJECT (inflecting):

lat-u-kə
 wash-3-NML
 ‘the one I have been washing’

c. NON-SUBJECT (inflecting):

koŋ khat-o-kə lei
 I go-1s.PT-NML day
 ‘the day I went’

3.2.3. Non-subject relatives clauses in Wambule

It is a bit difficult to determine the status of Wambule. There appears to be no straightforward way to reference the object of a two participant clause, as in ‘the house that I built’. Opgenort makes no overt mention of relative clauses in his grammar that I can see except for a single veiled comment, “relativization by means of active verbal adjectives involves the deletion of the argument of the

modified verb that is co-referential with the nominal head” (p. 367). In another section he talks about “factual verbal adjectives”, marked by *-meyā* ~ *-mei* (a form related to the “reifying” suffix *-me*), that can be used as adnominal modifiers. Unfortunately, most of his examples are complements and free-standing nominalizations, but I did find one example of a factual verbal adjective that appears to function as the adnominal modifier of an object:

(24) WAMBULE (p. 318):

[dambi-m rat-lva parai pa-Ø-me_i] yor
 before-REIF night-LOC read do-1s-FCT word
 ‘the things [= words] that I had learned the night before’

Apart from relative clauses, which would be the most likely place to find non-subject reference, the only other viable possibility is the “passive verbal adjective” which, in fact, *does* make reference to a patient, or locative, but only in the absence of an agent (which we have already seen in example [7b]).

Wambule has another nominalizer referred to as a reifying suffix *-me*, similar to the factual verbal adjective suffix *-meyā* ~ *-mei*. The reifying suffix is used primarily to create adnominals from adverbs, postpositions, and case marked nouns. This is a common occurrence in most Himalayish languages, and I will take up this topic in §5.

3.2.4. Non-subject relative clauses in Yamphu

On the surface of it, Yamphu *appears* to use two different nominalizers to distinguish between subject nominals and object nominals, but as we have already seen, both of these are participles—the “active participle” and the “object participle” (see the examples in [2a–d])—both of which are non-finite.

The more general nominalization (which corresponds more closely to the relative clause nominalizations of Takale Kham) is a fully inflected finite clause nominalized by what Rutgers calls the factitive (FCT). The factitive nominalization turns the entire clause into an attribute, which can then be used to make reference to either the subject or the object, depending on which argument is made the head of the NP. Unlike Kham, however, even subject relative clauses in Yamphu are fully finite (which is also true for at least Athpare, Camling, Bantawa, and possibly others—see examples [28–30]), as in the following:

(25) YAMPHU:

a. SUBJECT:

[kiriya hæk-pe:-tt-æ] yaʔmi
 oath cut-RES-PF-FCT person
 ‘a person who has taken an oath’

b. OBJECT:

[am-mi caban-æʔ khi:-ghi:-tt-æ] mottitel
 your-GEN guest-ERG carry-bring-PF-FACT kerosene
 ‘the kerosene your guest brought’

c. MANNER:

[chito im-be-m-æ] khaʔla-ma
 quickly take.off-RES-INF-FACT manner-ATNR
 ‘in a quickly taking off manner’
 (the kind that can be taken off quickly)

A unique thing about the factitive nominalization in Yamphu is that it occurs following all sorts of structures, like finite verbs (25a–b) and even infinitives (25c).

Yamphu has another nominalizer, the “attributive nominalizer” *-ma* ~ *-m*, which may be related to the reifying morpheme *-meya* ~ *-mei* of Wambule and the nominalizing morpheme *-m* of Dumi. The attributive nominalizer is used primarily in creating adnominals from postpositional phrases and demonstratives, a topic that we will look at in §5, but also in creating special adnominals from adjectives that are more “delimitive” than their non-nominalized counterparts (see Rutgers 1998:89).

3.2.5. Non-subject relative clauses in Dumi

We have already seen that Dumi has an active participle, a non-inflected structure that makes reference to the S/A argument of a nominalized verb. We have also seen an example, in (16), of the same active participle modifying a non-subject argument in *min dumo: ho:-kpi thomphi-bi* [man many come-AP place-LOC] ‘in places where lots of people come’. The more usual structure for non-subject relative clauses appears to utilize the general nominalizing suffix *-m* on a finite structure (as in [17]), in combination with a gapping strategy. Following are additional examples parallel to the one in (17):

(26) DUMI:

HEADLESS:

a. ani-ʔa a-kits-ini-m-mil
 you^P-ERG MS-buy-23p-NML-PL
 ‘the things you guys bought’

HEADED:

b. [kur-u-m] bili
 carry-1s>3O.PT-NML money
 ‘the money I was carrying’

- c. [natsɪrmi-mil-ʔa ka:nd-ini-m] sura-mil
 savage-PL-ERG throw.out-23p-NML paddy-PL
 ‘the grains that the savages threw out’

3.2.6. Non-subject relative clauses in Limbu

The general nominalizing suffix in Limbu is *-pa*, a morpheme that commonly occurs on adjectives (see *fn* 4), and also in combination with a prefix *kɛ-* in creating the active participle *kɛ- -pa*, as we saw in (10a). Elsewhere, *-pa* (also occurring as *-bɛ* and *-ba*) can occur on adverbs and postpositions, the topic of §5, but also on fully finite clauses to be used as adnominals in relative clauses. It is in such constructions that the nominalization is capable of referencing objects, either in headed or headless relatives, as the following examples illustrate (both are arguments within larger sentences):

(27) LIMBU:

HEADLESS:

- a. re:diyo:lle pa:tt-u-bɛ-n
 radio-ERG speak-3O-NML-ABS
 ‘what the radio was saying’

HEADED:

- b. [anɡe a-mma-re tho:kt-u-ba] tɔk
 we^{pe} my-mother-ERG cook-3O-NML rice
 ‘the rice our^{pe} mother cooks’

3.2.7. Non-subject relative clauses in Athpare, Camling and Bantawa

These same constructions, i.e. constructions that make use of the “general” nominalizer (much like the Kham relative clauses; see examples [19–22]), can be shown for any number of Kiranti languages; here, too, functioning both as subject relative clauses and as non-subject relative clauses:

(28) ATHPARE:

a. SUBJECT:

- ka-paŋ-i taya-ci-ga
 2POSS-house-LOC come-DL-NML:ns
 ‘the two who came to your house’

b. OBJECT:

- [aŋa nis-u-ŋ-na] kiba
 I see-3O-1s-NML tiger
 ‘the tiger I saw’

(29) CAMLING:

a. SUBJECT:

[m-cha lais-yu-ko] wama
 3POSS-child take.out-3p-NML hen
 ‘a hen that has hatched chicks’

b. OBJECT:

[mahowa-pahowa-ci pa-tata-ko] dim-ci
 forefather-ECHO-NS MS-bring-NML story-NS
 ‘stories that the forefathers brought’

(30) BANTAWA:

a. SUBJECT:

mi-suw-a-da-Ø-ʔo-ci
 3ns-die-PT-eff-PT-NML-PL
 ‘dead ones’ / ‘ones who had died’

b. OBJECT:

iŋka-ʔa [i-ser-a-ʔo] kha-ŋ
 I-ERG 3AM-kill-PT-NML see-1s
 ‘I saw [a man] that they killed’

3.2.8. Non-subject relative clauses in Chepang

As already alluded to in §3.1, Chepang (along with Dolakha Newar), more than any other language of this survey, lacks any kind of inflection (person/number and TAM) both in subject and in non-subject relative clauses. Although Caughley does not specifically talk about such constructions, examples can be found in other parts of his grammar.¹⁷ The following examples are analogous to the ones we have already seen, with the exception that in Chepang there is no inflection:

(31) CHEPANG:

a. OBJECT (p. 42):

ʔowʔ yom-ʔi jəyk-ʔo manta
 that bear-ERG bite-RN person
 ‘the person the bear bit’

¹⁷ Bhujel (Regmi 2007:344-345), a language closely related to Chepang, has essentially the same properties. Regmi refers to the relative nominalizer *-o* as a participial form, and shows that the only difference between a subject, object, or indirect object relative clause is in the grammatical relation that the head noun bears to the nominalized verb. Corelatives are also unusually rife in Bhujel, like: ‘Whatever woman has black hair, that one I like’; or ‘Wherever you go, there also I will go’. (This may be related to the way in which the clauses were elicited through Nepali.)

- b. TIME/LOCATION (p. 109):
 ŋa waŋ-ʔo bela-haŋ
 I come-RN time-LOC
 ‘at the time when I came’

4. NOMINALIZATIONS AS COMPLEMENTS

The nominalization of clauses, enabling them to function as arguments in a higher matrix clause is neither unusual or surprising, nor is it something unique to the Himalayish languages of Tibeto-Burman. The same happens throughout the region, both in the Bodish languages of Tibeto-Burman as well as in the Indo-Aryan languages of the region.

In the Himalayish languages, some of the same nominalizing structures we saw operating at various levels of the grammar—like in adjectivals or in relative clauses—are used also in complement structures. At least for some of these languages, like Kham, different levels of finiteness in the nominalization can be used to reflect different degrees of “syntactic bond” and “semantic integration” (Givón 2001) between the matrix clause and its complements.¹⁸

4.1. *Non-finite nominalization in Kham*

I will use the term “non-finite nominalization” to refer to nominalizations that are bereft of person/number inflection and limited in TAM possibilities. The nominalization type used in Kham subject relative clauses is such a nominalization (see example [18]), and an identical structure is used in complements that share an argument with the higher clause. Likewise, the nominalization-type used in *non*-subject relative clauses is used in complements that do *not* share arguments with the higher clause. The whole system is motivated by the simple pragmatic expedient of participant continuity–discontinuity. Participant discontinuity requires more explicit marking because of its unpredictability.

Following are illustrations of complements in Kham in which the subject of the embedded clause is coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause—in the “desiderative” and “receipt of permission”. In both cases, the subject referent of the complement clause is easily recoverable and equi-NP deletion is effected as a pragmatic consequence. Such complements use the uninflected (non-finite) nominalization, as in:

18 In Dolakha Newari, as in Kham, the same structures that operate in relative clauses are used also in complement clauses, but with different values. For Dolakha, we again see the NR1 and NR2 suffixes described in footnote 14, but in complement clauses NR1 is used to nominalize intransitive complements and NR2 to nominalized transitive complements. In Kham the relevant feature in complement clauses is their degree of “syntactic bond”.

(32) TAKALE KHAM:

a. DESIDERATIVE COMPLEMENT:

ŋa: ba-o ŋa-pəĩ-zya
I go-NML 1sA-want-CONT
'I want to go.' (I want [I] to go)

b. "RECEIPT OF PERMISSION" COMPLEMENT:

ñi: thəi-wo nə-dəi-ke
you hear-NML 2sA-find-PFV
'You were allowed to listen.'
(You received permission for [you] to listen)

In causative and "granting of permission" complements too, (though there is outside causation), the subject of the embedded clause is coreferential with the raised object argument of the matrix clause, and as might be expected, the uninflected form is used. The complex event is conceptualized as a single event:

(33) a. PERIPHRASTIC CAUSATIVE:

ŋa-lai ba-o pərĩ:-na-ke-o
I-ACC go-NML send-1sO-PFV-3sA
'He made me go.' (He sent me, I go)

b. "GRANTING OF PERMISSION" COMPLEMENT:

je-lai lā:-wo ŋa-ya-ci-ke
you^p-ACC take-NML 1sA-give-2pO-PFV
'I permitted you^p to take it.' (I give you, you take)

4.2. Finite nominalization in Kham

Finite nominalizations (i.e. those that use the full array of person/number and TAM marking possibilities) are used in the Kham languages where the embedded clause predicates an event which is different from the matrix clause event, and thereby requires independent participant reference. Very often these are verbs of cognition, as in 'see' or 'know', as in the following:

(34) COGNITION:

a. ŋa: zihm-da ŋa-ba-zya-o ři:h-na-ke-o
I house-ALLT 1sS-go-CONT-NML see-1sO-PFV-3sA
'He saw that I was going to the house.'

b. kābul u-ri:h-zya-o ŋa-səĩ:-ke
blanket 3sA-3sO-weave-CONT-NML 1sA-know-PFV
'I knew that she was weaving a blanket.'

The difference between know-how and knowledge by direct perception is thus a difference in participant continuity/discontinuity between the matrix and subordinate clauses, signaled in Kham by the type of complement nominalization.

Knowledge by perception utilizes the inflected nominalization shown in (34b) and know-how utilizes the uninflected nominalization shown in (35):

- (35) KNOW-HOW:
 kābul ri:h-wo sǎĩ:-zya-o
 blanket weave-NML know-CONT-3sA
 ‘She knows how to weave a blanket.’

4.3. Complements in Kiranti languages

In most Kiranti languages, it appears that complement clauses make use of the same general nominalizer found in relative clauses. Examples are difficult to come by in the available grammars, and they are not carefully separated out in terms of function. Nominalized clauses, for example, are often listed together in a single section without distinguishing whether they are relative clauses or complement clauses. In Limbu, for example, the following pair of clauses are listed, the second one with an absolutive marker, and the first one without:

- (36) LIMBU (p. 196, 199):
 a. anchi a-ba·tt-ε-tch-u-ba kusin̄-mε-ni·tt-w-i·?
 we^{di} 1-speak-PT-dA-3O-NML understand-nsAS-understand-3O-Q
 ‘Did they understand what we^{di} were saying?’
 b. aŋga pa·tt-u-ŋ-bε-n kε-gheps-w-i·?
 I say-3O-1sA-NML-ABS 2-hear-3O-Q
 ‘Did you^s hear what I said?’

A likely explanation is that (36a) employs a complement clause, while (36b) employs a case-marked headless relative clause ‘that which I said’. Though no such explanation is given, it would be nice to know.¹⁹

Likewise, some nominalizations in the grammars surveyed employ fully inflected verbs while others do not. The difference between them may be one of participant continuity vs. discontinuity (as illustrated for Kham in §4.1 and §4.2), but this is far from clear. In the following examples from representative Kiranti languages, I give fully inflected forms first, followed by less-inflected ones:

- (37) BANTAWA (p. 192):
 iŋka ɕyam kələm i-pu-ʔa-ʔo kha-Ø-ŋ
 I Shyam pen 3A-give-PT-NML see-PT-1s
 ‘I saw someone give Shyam a pen.’

¹⁹ In one example (ex. 32, p. 196), case marking occurs even on an adnominal modifying ‘beer’—*anchige thuj -ε-tch-u-ge-bε-n thi* [we drink-PT-dA-3p-e-NML-ABS millet.beer] ‘The millet beer we drank tasted bad.’ This seems odd.

(38) WAMBULE (p. 320):

kwal khAɾayo glwam-Ø-mei hipt-u-Ø-m dyam
 one hare lie.down-23s-FCT see-3npA-23s-AFF REP
 ‘He is said to have seen a hare which had gone to sleep.’

(39) DUMI (p. 192):

aŋ mo:-liŋ-ə-m im-a a-du:khuts-ə ʔe
 I sit-walk-1s-NML he-ERG MS-see-1s REP
 ‘He said he saw me hanging around the place.’

(40) YAMPHU (p. 258):

rinjia ikko wo:s-æ khem-dokt-u-ŋ
 Rinjia one shout-FCT hear-find-3O-1eA
 ‘I heard Rinjia calling.’

(41) KULUNG (p. 109, etc.):

koŋ-a khim khai-m nət-o:-no
 I-ERG house go-INF want-1s.NPT-NEG.NPT
 ‘I don’t want to go home.’

Recall that in Kulung, the general nominalizer is *-kə*, as shown in §3.2.2, and is used to mark relative clauses. From examples like the one in (41), it appears that complements in Kulung are marked by *-m*, a morpheme that Tolsma calls the infinitive. (We have seen a similar nominalizing morpheme in numerous other Kiranti languages.) The only examples I have been able to find are ones in which the subject of both clauses is co-referential. One wonders how sentences like ‘I saw him plowing the field’ would be expressed.

As in relative clauses, Chepang here too appears to have only very simple, non-finite structures marked by the nominalizer *-ʔo*. Caughley also notes that most complements occur with verbs denoting desire and feeling—verbs that are naturally defective or simple in terms of their overall case frame. Regmi (2007:325) seems to corroborate these findings in Bhujel, showing nominalized clauses occurring only in sentences with dative subjects as in, ‘*That it is raining is known to me*’.

5. NOMINALIZED ADVERBS, LOCATIVES & DEICTIC PRIMITIVES

Most²⁰ Himalayish languages are capable of creating complex adnominal expressions (functionally similar to demonstratives) from adverbials, locatives, and deictic primitives—expressions along the order of ‘this’, ‘that’, ‘(the one) up there’, ‘(the one) on top’, ‘(the one) on the other side of the river’, etc. Such expressions can be used adnominally or as nominal heads themselves.

20 I was unable to find any such expressions in Chepang. This may be because Caughley’s interest was in the verb complex, not in nominal morphology or nominalizations. However, such constructions are also conspicuously missing from Regmi’s (2007) description of Bhujel.

There are already several valuable studies on deictic roots and vertical dimensions in Kiranti languages; see, for example, Ebert's (1994:90–99) study on the topic, as well as Bickel and Gaenszle's (1999) study on "Himalayan space" (which also includes a second study by Ebert on "The up-down dimension in Rai grammar"). For that reason I will reduce the details in this section as much as possible.

From the studies I have read on nominalization in Bodish languages, I come away with the impression that the nominalization of adverbials, case-marked nouns, and locative expressions is the exception and not the rule. Noonan (to appear), for example, in describing what he calls "non-relative attributive nominals", notes that, "Rather less common within Bodic, though well attested in Tamangic, is the situation where the affix used to form nominalizations is suffixed to non-verbal roots and case-marked nouns." The examples he gives are ones like: 'yesterday's ancestors'; 'trees from the forest'; and 'innards' [literally, 'inside-at-from meat'], all common fare in Himalayish languages.

It is precisely because the use of these non-verbal nominalizations is so pervasive and systematic in Himalayish languages that we need to pay closer heed to them and incorporate them into our theories of TB and Bodic nominalization as a whole. I will begin with examples from Takale Kham to show that even the so-called demonstratives in these languages are nothing more than nominalizations of a more primitive class:

(42) TAKALE KHAM:

- a. a-o
prox-NML
'this'
- b. a-kə
prox-LOC
'here'
- c. a-ka-o mi:-rə
prox-LOC-NML person-PL
'the people here / the people of this place'
- d. a-ka-o-ra-lai
prox-LOC-NML-PL-ACC
'to those of this place'

In my Kham grammar (Watters 2002) I refer to the first element < *a-* > (as shown in [42]) as a deictic primitive—a bound root from which more complex locative or demonstrative expressions can be created. There are nine in all (PROXIMATE, DISTAL, REMOTE, UP, DOWN, FRONT, BACK, RIGHT, LEFT), each of which can be followed immediately by locative or directional suffixes, or by four landmark locations (AREA, AREA UP, SIDE OF MOUNTAIN, SIDE OF VALLEY), in which case, the landmark locative must be followed by locative or directional

suffixes. The whole string I refer to as a locative expression, and this expression can be nominalized to act as a modifier. The system is highly productive and the resulting combinations are numerous (650 potential combinations in Takale Kham with 449 forms that have been instantiated). Following are expressions using the “remote” primitive in combination with directional and locational suffixes, landmark locatives, and recursion:

(43) TAKALE KHAM:

a. BASIC FORM:

ho-kə

remote-LOC

‘there (far away)’

b. NOMINALIZED FORM:

ho-ka-o

remote-LOC-NML]

‘the one there’

(44) a. BASIC FORM:

hu-ti:da

remote-side.of.mountain-ALLT

‘to the far side of the mountain’

b. NOMINALIZED FORM:

hu-ti:da-ŋa-o-ra-e

ya-zihm

remote-side.of.mt-ALLT-ADS-NML-PL-GEN 3POSS-house]

‘the house of those towards the far side of the mountain’

Recursive nominalization is also possible:

- (45) [[hu-ti:da-ŋa-o]-ra-sə-ka-o] mi:
 [[remote-SIDE.OF.MT-ALLT-ADS-NML]-PL-COM-LOC-NML] person
 ‘foreigner, enemy, rival’
 [lit. ‘a person associated with those toward the far side of the mountain’]

5.1. Vertical dimension roots and affixes

Similar structures can be found in Kiranti languages, the basic difference being that in most Kiranti languages vertical orientation—level, up, down—is specified by suffixes (or in a few languages like Wambule and Kulung, by deictic primitives *and* suffixes). In Kham, Athpare, and possibly Chhathare Limbu (Tumbahang 2007), vertical dimension is specified only by deictic primitives—vertical-dimension suffixes are lacking. Apart from that, the productivity of the affixes and their penchant for nominalization is similar. Following is an example of a language with both deictic primitives and vertical-dimension suffixes <VD suffix>:

(46) WAMBULE:

	<u>root</u>	<u>VD suffix</u>	
a.	hwa-	-na	‘at the same level’
b.	twa-	-ta	‘at a higher level’
c.	ywa-	-ya	‘at a lower level’

From the best that I can tell, deictic roots are missing from languages like Dumi and Yamphu, vertical direction being marked exclusively by local suffixes on the noun:

(47) YAMPHU:

	<u>root</u>	<u>VD suffix</u>	
a.	lacking	-yu	‘at the same level’
b.	”	-tu	‘at a higher level’
c.	”	-mu	‘at a lower level’

In Kham, Athpare, and in Chhathare Limbu, vertical direction suffixes are missing (more general “locational-directional” [*at, in, to, from, etc.*] ones are used), and direction up or down is indicated entirely by deictic roots:

(48) KHAM:

	<u>root</u>	<u>any LOC/DIR suffix</u>	
a.	nə-	any	‘distal (unmarked for level)’
b.	to- / ro-	”	‘at/to a higher level’
c.	me-	”	‘at/to a lower level’

Similarly, in Athpare and Chhathare Limbu we get Athpare: a) *ya*-LOC.DIR; b) *to*-LOC.DIR; c) *yə*-LOC.DIR; and Chhathare: a) *yə*-LOC.DIR; *to*-LOC.DIR; and *mo*-LOC.DIR for the same values as Kham (in [48a–c]), respectively.

5.2. Deictic primitives

Some Kiranti languages also have deictic primitives, bound roots from which more complex expressions are created. There appear to be several in Yamphu (all of which have similar functions to the Kham primitives) – *i-* ‘near’, *a(k)-* ‘distant’, *mo-* ‘yonder’, used as a base for pronouns like *i-go* ‘this’ and *ak-kha* ‘that’, or for locative expressions like *i-be?* ‘here’, *ak-pe?* ‘there’, and *mo-be?* ‘yonder’, plus some combinations that suggest ‘this side’ and ‘the other side’. Likewise, in Wambule there appear to be five primitives – *a-* ‘near’, *i-* ‘distant’, *hwa-* ‘distant (same level)’, *twa-* ‘distant (up)’, and *ywa-* ‘distant (down)’. All can be nominalized directly (analogous to example [42a] for Kham) by adding the nominalizing (reifying) suffix *-m* to create the following demonstrative pronouns:

(49) WAMBULE	<u>GLOSS</u>	<u>morpheme composition</u>
a. a- <u>m</u>	‘this’	[near-NML]
b. i- <u>m</u>	‘that’	[distant-NML]

- c. *hwa-m* ‘that (same level)’ [level-NML]
 d. *twa-m* ‘that (above)’ [up-NML]
 e. *ywa-m* ‘that (below)’ [down-NML]

Likewise, as we saw for Kham (in [42b] and [43a]), a locative suffix (or if not a locative suffix then a nominalizer as in [49]) must be added in Wambule to the bare primitive root to create locative expressions like: *a-lo* [prox-LOC] ‘here’ or *i-lo* [dist-LOC] ‘there’; or choosing the allative suffix *-la*, we get *a-la* [prox-ALLT] ‘to here’ or *i-la* [dist-ALLT] ‘to there’. These in turn are subject to nominalization as in: *a-lo-m* [prox-LOC-NML] ‘the one here’ or *i-lo-m* [dist-LOC-NML] ‘the one there’, *i-la-m* [dist-ALLT-NML] ‘the one toward there’, etc. Similar phenomena can be illustrated for Kulung, Yamphu, Dumi, and Limbu.

In addition to the general locational suffixes—the allative *-la*, the ablative *-ŋo*, and the locative *-lo*—Wambule has the facility to mark ‘UP’, ‘DOWN’, and ‘LEVEL’ with suffixes of ‘vertical orientation’. These suffixes, like the others, can be added to the deictic primitives to form vertical orientation expressions—*hwa-na* [level-SAME] ‘there at the same level’, *twa-ta* [up-HIGHER] ‘up there’, and *ywa-ya* [down-LOWER] ‘down there’. (I have been unable to find examples in Wambule of *a-* and *i-* combining with *-na*, *-ta*, or *-ya*, which would presumably mean ‘up here’, ‘down there’, etc.)

It is in the use of “vertical orientation suffixes” that Kham departs from some of the Kiranti languages. In Kham, vertical orientation is expressed only through deictic primitives, which is true also for Athpare and Chhathare. Thus, though there are Kham equivalents for Wambule *twa-ta-m* ‘the one up there’ and *ywa-ya-m* ‘the one down there’—Kham *ro-ta-o* [up-ON-NML] ‘the one up there’ and *me-la-o* [down-IN-NML] ‘the one down there’—the only way to express notions like ‘at the house up there’ or ‘at the house down there’ requires both a prenominal locative modifier (which contains the vertical orientation) and a suffixed head noun (which contains the direction or static location). Languages with vertical-orientation suffixes can employ a shorter version with the HIGH locative affixed directly to the noun, as in Camling *khim-dhi* [house-HIGHER] ‘up at the house’. The Camling equivalents in Kham would be:

(50) TAKALE KHAM:

- a. *ro-ta-o* *zihm-kə*
 up-ON-NML house-LOC
 ‘at the house up there’ (at the upper house)
- b. *me-la-o* *zihm-da*
 down-IN-NML house-ALLT
 ‘toward the house down there’ (toward the lower house)

Apart from this, there appear to be few differences in the sets of local expressions found in Kiranti and Kham. All are generative with their own syntax, capable of creating numerous complex locative expressions.

6. NOMINALIZATIONS AS STAND-ALONE INDEPENDENT CLAUSES

The nominalization of independent, non-subordinated clauses is a phenomenon that has been reported all across Tibeto-Burman, both within Himalayish and outside it. I refer to it here as “stand-alone” or “free-standing” nominalization. Stand-alone nominalizations are clearly marked with respect to their non-nominalized counterparts, but no two descriptions seem to agree on what semantic or pragmatic function is signaled by the construction. Perhaps Matisoff (1972:246–247) was the first to describe the phenomenon in Tibeto-Burman when he described such clauses in Lahu (Loloish). His statement deserves a full quotation:

We now come to a phenomenon that is quite alien from the point of view of standard average European languages but surprisingly widespread elsewhere—the nominalization of entire sentences that are embedded to nothing larger than themselves.

...The verbal event is being objectified, reified, viewed as an independent fact, endowed with a reality like that inhering in physical objects—in short, *nominalized*. It is standing on its own, and is not a constituent of any sentence higher than the one to which it belongs itself.

...It may help us to understand a sentence like: *yo la tu ve* ‘He will come’ by glossing it with painful literality as ‘It is the case that he will come’ or ‘It is a he-will-come case.’ But this does not mean that we have to assume that there is some higher verb floating around with the meaning ‘be the case’.”

Later, Hargreaves (1986:2) commented on stand-alone nominalizations in Newar, and also came to the conclusion that “the positing of an ‘underlying’ or ‘elipted’ [higher] predicate is unwarranted.” He also noted of interrogatives that questions cast in the simple finite (non-nominalized) form have the effect of “extreme disrespect, almost like that of an accusation”. The same question nominalized, he goes on to say, is used for “greetings or polite inquiry”. Related is Ebert’s observation (1997a:131) for Athpare, that *all* questions are nominalized (which may be a reflex of Hargreaves’ politeness principle). She also notes for Camling (1997b:59) that the sentence-final particle *raicha* (a mirative particle in Nepali) is preceded only by nominalized verbs.²¹ The reportative particle *are*, also from Nepali, is optionally nominalized. I will comment later on whether there is an inherent connection between nominalization and mirativity or between nominalization and questions.

Noonan (2007:5) describes a stand-alone nominalization in Chantyal (Bodish: TGTh) and says that “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.”

21 Doornenbal (2007:194) reports something similar for Bantawa in sentences like: *am-cha baddhe i-kharu mett-u-ŋ-o-ʔo rɔchɔ* ‘Your son appears to be very clever!’ Compare also the Kulung sentence (Tolsma 1999:105): *i-riŋ mə-pa* (NML) ‘[Look!] he speaks our language!’

This appears to be relatable to Ebert's nominalized clauses in Camling, now bolstered by the sentence final particles *raicha* or *are*. (Kulung appears to have something similar.)

Rutgers refers to the stand-alone nominalization in Yamphu as the factitive category and Opgenort refers to it in Wambule as the factual verbal adjective. Both structures have clearly related functions. In Rutgers' own words (1998:245), the factitive in Yamphu narratives "boils down to the description of situations outside the main train of events in a story." He also says (1998:247) that, "Another usage of the factitive category in narratives is in the introduction to a story. ...the speaker, who is about to relate various things that befell him, paints the setting of the story."

Opgenort (2004:314–315) uses similar terminology to describe the factual verbal adjective in Wambule—"A factual verbal adjective relates to the background of another event, rather than to a dynamic situation." Also, "Factual verbal adjectives provide facts relating to the background of the story. Affirmatives, by contrast, present the events in the story line and denote kinetic actions which carry the narrative forward."

Rutgers (1998:235; 247) and Opgenort (2004:325) both report that a major function of stand-alone nominalizations in Yamphu and Wambule, respectively, is for settings and marking background events. Doornenbal (2007:181), too, refers to one of its functions as "backgrounding", something that is "not part of the progressing story".

In a recent grammar of Nepāl Bhāsā (Kathmandu Newar) (2006:195), Hale and Shrestha comment on the phenomenon in Kathmandu Newar as well: "The event line of a narrative is populated with past conjunct and disjunct forms. The finite nominals serve to elaborate themes, or to provide summaries of previous events. In such cases nominalization marks backgrounded material that is relevant over a longer stretch or time."

6.1. A contrastive view

Ebert (1997b:60) takes a different view of stand-alone nominalizations when she says for Camling that "the function of the nominalizer [in stand-alone predications] is to focus on the whole utterance". Bickel (1999:9) shares this view for Belhare and further elaborates on it when he says that a stand-alone nominalized clause is used as a "contrastive focus" construction to mark "a particular instantiation of a variable that competes with other possible variables". He further says that such sentences have "an intrinsic potential for controversy". This, of course, is the exact opposite of the backgrounding function found in Yamphu, Wambule, Bantawa, Newar and Kham with its strong overtones of presupposition. The question is, "Can the two views be reconciled, and if so, how?"

I show (Watters 1978, 2002) that in Kham, nominalization is used in all the functions mentioned above—in free-standing independent clauses, in interrogatives, in imperatives, in miratives, in sentential complements, in relative

clauses, in appositives, in the formation of adjectives, in agent nominalizations, in object nominalizations, in emphatic assertions, and as a backgrounding device. It is important to realize, however, that for Kham (even if not in the other languages mentioned), all of these functions are found in contrastive contexts, each distinguishable from the other. There are two possible ways, then, to account for the seeming disparity of function with other Himalayish languages—1) the authors have touched on just a piece of the whole, most likely the one or ones they encountered first, or 2) different languages have grammaticalized different chunks out of the entire spectrum of possibilities. Both may be partly true, and all we can do at this stage is to look at the contexts for the various interpretations in different languages and try to integrate them into a larger whole.

6.2. *Is it embedded to an equative or not?*

In Kham, and I suspect that this may be partially true in other languages of the region as well, a distinction must be made between true stand-alone nominalized clauses and nominalized clauses embedded to an equative. The two are easily confused in languages that have a zero equative copula (which is true of several languages in this study). Fortunately, for Kham, we are helped out of the dilemma by the negative equative which *is* expressed by a copula, and by a newly emerging affirmative copula. Compare the following three examples from Takale Kham:

(51) TAKALE KHAM:

a. STAND-ALONE:

sohmlo o-ra-kəi-wo
 three 3sA-3pO-eat-NML
 ‘He ate three of them.’

b. EMBEDDED TO AN AFFIRMATIVE EQUATIVE:

sohmlo o-ra-kəi-wo (zə)_{COP}
 three 3sA-3pO-eat-NML (EMPH)
 ‘It’s the case that he ate three.’

c. EMBEDDED TO A NEGATIVE EQUATIVE:²²

sohmlo o-ra-kəi-wo ma:hkə
 three 3sA-3pO-eat-NML neg.COP
 ‘It’s not the case that he ate three.’

Comparing the sentence in (51a) with the one in (51b) the only difference is the optional emphatic marker *zə* on the second sentence. This simple device, the emphatic marker, is grammaticalizing in Kham to function like an equative

22 The stand-alone negative background nominalization includes the negative marker on the nominalized verb itself, as in: *ahjyo no pã ge-ma-səi-zya-o* [yesterday that word 1p-NEG-know-CONT-NML] ‘Yesterday we didn’t know about that matter’.

copula; it is used to disambiguate any number of constructions where the juxtaposition of a demonstrative and a noun phrase creates a possible ambiguity, as in (52a). The negative equative (52c), on the other hand, is clearly equative.

(52) TAKALE KHAM:

- a. ao mi:
this person
'this person' OR 'This is a person.' (ambiguous)
- b. [ao]_{NP1} [mi:]_{NP2} zə_{COP}
this person EMPH
'This is a person.'
- c. [ao]_{NP1} [mi:]_{NP2} ma:hkə
this person neg.COP
'This is not a person.'

Given the right conditions, the utterance in (52b–c) could also mean:

- (53) a. [Ø]_{NP1} [ao mi:]_{NP2} zə_{COP}
(elipted) this person EMPH
'It's this person.'
- b. [Ø]_{NP1} [ao mi:]_{NP2} ma:hkə
(elipted) this person neg.COP
'It's not this person.'

where the *other* NP argument is elided but recoverable from the immediate context—e.g. '[The one I am speaking about] is (not) this man.'

Thus, it is important to recognize that even with an equative clause (which is conceptually bivalent [A = B]), one of the arguments can be elided under certain conditions. This is true whether the head of the predicating NP is an inherent noun, as in (53), or a nominalized clause, as in (51b–c). In either case, the elided NP must be translated into English with a dummy place holder 'it's' or 'it's the case that'. No such mechanism is required in the languages under investigation.

Where one of the predicating NPs in an equative construction is a nominalized clause, we get a structure something like the following:

- (54) [sohmlo o-ra-kəi-wo]_{NP1} [Ø]_{NP2} zə_{COP}
[three 3s-3p-eat-NML] [abstraction] EMPH
'It's the case that he ate three.'

Note, however, that this is not at all what happens in (51a), *sohmlo o-ra-kəi-wo* 'He ate three', a nominalization that is *not* embedded to an equative. Such clauses are used as backgrounding devices, injecting presuppositions into the discourse which *cannot* be challenged.

In my grammar of Kham (Watters 2002) I devoted an entire chapter (Chapter 16) to a discussion of “Nominalized verb forms in discourse”. I show that such forms make sense only within the context of a discourse, a domain large enough that the speaker must include instructions on how the hearer should build a mental representation of what is being narrated. This includes instructions on how to integrate new, incoming information with what is already in memory store—among other things, whether it is part of the narrative event line or something subsidiary to it. In general, everything on the narrative event line is marked by regular finite forms, while everything subsidiary to it—background, parenthetical material, stage setting—is marked by nominalization (see also Watters 1978).

All of this suggests that so-called stand-alone nominalizations of the sort that can be translated as “the fact is...” (which most authors have suggested for at least some of their examples) or that have special assertive functions are, in fact, not free-standing at all—they are embedded as the asserted NP in an equative clause (as in [51b]).

6.3. Implications of the equative interpretation

Simply put, Kham has the grammatical apparatus to distinguish between true stand-alone nominalizations (of the sort shown in [51a]), and nominalized clauses which function as embedded NPs in equative constructions (of the sort shown in [51b]). The former construction type is used in backgrounded material and presuppositions, while the latter type is used as a strong assertion with “an intrinsic potential for controversy” (Bickel 1999).

Genetti (1994:165) gives at least one example in Dolakha Newari of a nominalized clause embedded to an equative copula *khyañ*. She refers to such constructions as “emphatic constructions” and says that they are “used to assert the speaker’s strong belief in the truth value of a proposition”.

Some authors of Kiranti grammars have made the claim that stand-alone nominalizations have a meaning something like ‘the fact that I said it’ or ‘the fact is’ (Rutgers 1998, Tolsma 1999, Opgenort 2004), which implies the assertive function. This is very likely true for those nominalized clauses that are embedded to an equative—indeed, it assumes an equative—though given what the same authors say about the backgrounding function of stand-alone nominalizations, it is possible that some of these languages, like Kham, support both functions.

The maintenance of the distinction between stand-alone and embedded nominalizations in Kham is certainly strengthened by the emergence of a new copula (from a grammaticalized emphatic marker). In languages with a zero copula, like Athpare and Belhare, there is no formal distinction between the two, and the semantic distinction may also have been lost.

Doornenbal (2007:193–194) implies both functions for Bantawa. He notes that stand-alone nominalizations generally have a backgrounding function in a narrative discourse, but where nominalization is used in stand-alone non-past forms, the function is more closely tied to assertion.

7. NOMINALIZATION IN NON-DECLARATIVE SPEECH ACTS

7.1. *Miratives and reportatives*

Nominalized verbs in Belhare (and several other Kiranti languages like Camling, Bantawa, and Wambule) can also be followed by the loan particle *raicha*, which signals mirativity (as it does also in Nepali). In Chantyal (Bodish, Tamangic), Noonan (2007) reports that stand-alone nominalizations most commonly signal a mirative sense. Apparently, nominalization is compatible with mirativity in many Bodic languages. In those languages in which the Nepali mirative particle *raicha* has been borrowed, the notion is further supported. In Kham, the mirative particle *oleo*, itself a nominalization of the verb ‘to be’, is obligatorily preceded by a nominalized structure:

(55) TAKALE KHAM (mirative):

a. o-ba-dhu-wo o-le-o
 3s-go-PRIOR.PT-NML 3s-be-NML:MIR
 ‘He has already left!’

b. o-ma-rəĩ-h-wo o-le-o
 3s-NEG-visible-NML 3s-be-NML:MIR
 ‘It isn’t visible after all!’

Likewise, in Wambule, what has been identified as an affirmative <AFF> is very nearly homophonous with the general nominalizing suffix *-mei* (and, in fact, Opgenort identifies it as a “grammaticalized instance” of the nominalizer):

(56) WAMBULE:

jamma gipt-u-Ø-me raicha
 in.all roll.up-3npA-23s-AFF MIR
 ‘It had fully wrapped him up!’

In Camling, the original *raicha* (from Nepali) has been reinterpreted in many contexts to signal a reportative sense (but is always preceded by a nominalization). Ebert says that the particle “characterizes narrative texts and can be repeated sentence after sentence”. Watters (2002:295) shows the same to be true of the Kham mirative—hearsay narratives that are still relatively recent are sometimes reported using the mirative in place of the reportative particle—thus, in at least two languages of this survey the mirative is not incompatible with reported events. In Camling the original nominalizing structure remains even after the introduction of the (reportative < *mirative) *raicha*, as in the following:

(57) CAMLING:

i-ra mina jal am-si khata-ko raicha
 one-CL man net throw-PURP go-NML REP
 ‘A man went fishing, it is told.’

The use of nominalizations in what might be thought of as a reportative/hearsay function (with or without a mirative marker) is certainly not unique to Himalayish. In 2006 I recorded a short, tribal-history text in Kaike (West Bodish) of 30 sentences in which every sentence of the entire text is nominalized (without mirative marking). It appears that the intent of the story is not the traditional one—narrating a series of events—but to make a statement, ‘This is who we are’ (Watters forthcoming).

7.2. *The nominalized interrogative*

As already alluded to in §6, Hargreaves (1986:2) notes for Newari that questions cast in the simple finite form have the effect of “extreme disrespect, almost like that of an accusation, whereas the same question nominalized is used for greetings or polite enquiry”. Likewise, Bickel, in his treatment of nominalized questions in Belhare, notes that such constructions are related to focus. In Athpare, Belhare’s closest relative, Ebert (1997a) claims that all questions are nominalized. This may or may not be a reflex of the “politeness principle”:

(58) ATHPARE:

un-na pak in-u-t-u-na?
 she-OBL what buy-3O-NPT-[copy]-NML
 ‘What is she going to buy?’

Nominalized questions in some languages of this survey are used as polite greetings. For example, Rutgers (1998:240) reports for Yamphu that “one of the everyday greetings ...is the following utterance containing a factitive verb form in the perfect: ‘Have you had your meal?’” He says that the speaker is not inquiring about what happened, but rather “whether a situation is the case or not”.

In Kham, the contexts in which a nominalized versus non-nominalized question is felicitous are clear-cut. Informants will sometimes claim that the direct (non-nominalized) form of a question sounds sharp or even rude, but it is nevertheless true that the non-nominalized forms are not inherently impolite. They imply some kind of personal investment in the situation being questioned and hence a right to the information. Where the context or the social relations between speaker and hearer do not warrant such, the form can sound presumptuous, as in the following:

(59) TAKALE KHAM:

a. REGULAR CONJUGATIONAL FORM:

kana nə-ba-zya
 where 2_{SS}-go-CONT
 ‘Where are you going?’
 (with the sense: ‘Just where do you think you’re going?’)

b. NOMINALIZED FORM:

kana nə-ba-zya-owhere 2_{SS}-go-CONT-NML

‘Where are you going?’ (idle curiosity; greeting)

Nominalized interrogatives are less intrusive than their simple, finite counterparts because they imply discontinuity, a distancing as it were.

7.3. The nominalized imperative

The same can be seen in nominalized forms of the imperative, which, not surprisingly, have the softened force of an optative:

(60) TAKALE KHAM:

a. IMPERATIVE:

ca-o wazə ɬi:h-də rəi-yo

good-NML only buy-NF bring-IMP

‘Buy and bring back a good one!’ (I’m holding you responsible)

b. OPTATIVE:

ca-o wazə ɬi:h-də nə-rəi-kə

good-NML only buy-NF 2_{sA}-bring-NML:OPT

‘May you buy and bring back a good one!’ (I hope they don’t cheat you).

Rutgers (1998:249–250) comments on what appears to be a similar principle in the Yamphu factitive infinitive (an infinitive followed by a factitive)—“All utterances where a factitive infinitive is the predicate verb are in essence nominal clauses... The ramifications of the modal nature of a factitive infinitive can be observed in the various functions such infinitival predicates may have, viz. modal declaratives, imperatives, adhortatives and optatives.” He provides the following (very polite) imperative senses:

(61) YAMPHU:

a. ma:ma, ca:ma ca:-si? ap-m-æ

mother rice eat-PURP come-INF-FCT

‘Mum, come and have dinner!’

b. cautara-bes-so na:-ja-ghæ?-m-æn-ji

rest.stand-LOC-too rest-eat-go-INF-FCT-NS

‘Go, resting at every roadside bench!’

8. NOMINALIZATION AND THE IMPERFECTIVE

Van Driem, in both his Limbu and Dumi grammars, makes no mention of stand-alone nominalized clauses except as headless adnominals—the general nominalizing suffix, he says, can be attached to several classes of words “to create

a nominal which can be used adnominally as an adjective or independently as a noun taking case suffixes”. As adnominals, these are what I have been referring to as relativizing structures. It turns out that the same nominalizations can also be used as arguments of complement taking verbs.

Van Driem also talks about an imperfective that uses the general nominalizing suffix *-m* in Dumi and *-pa* in Limbu. The function of the construction, he says, is “to present an event as a temporally articulate situation and to present an event as *a matter of fact*, a *circumstance* which has taken place at some point in the past or is scheduled to take place at some time in the future. It is the latter function of the imperfective which forms a semantic continuum with the meaning of the nominalizer suffix *<-m>*” (italics mine). This description comes very close to the description of the factitive in Yamphu, the factual verbal adjective in Wambule, the finite nominal in Newar, and the stand-alone nominalization in Kham and Bantawa. Following is an example from Dumi:

(62) DUMI:

ki:m-po garo thok-k-i-t-i-m
 house-GEN wall build-1p-e-NPT-e-IMPFV
 ‘We^{pe} are building the walls of the house.’

Is an imperfective reading possible for a nominalized stand-alone clause in Kham and other Himalayish languages? Indeed, where a continuous or progressive mood is part of the nominalization, such constructions are usually translated as past-imperfective or past-progressive in English. Opgenort notes that the factual verbal adjective, “when used with the progressive adverb *maŋ*, [and in combination with *thiyo* < Nepali ‘was’] the result is a past progressive situation”, as in:

(63) WAMBULE:

- a. aŋ maŋ phyars-u-mei thiyo
 she now sew-3npA-23s-FCT was
 ‘She was sewing [at that time].’
- b. im kimsul pəd maŋ los-u-mei thiyo
 that door direction now wait-3npA-23s-FCT was
 ‘the one that was waiting at the door’

Likewise, in Ebert’s discussion of the past progressive in Athpare (1997a:48), she says that her “informants insisted on the nominalizer with past progressive forms”. In Kham, a past-progressive is the only way to translate certain nominalizations into English:

(65) TAKALE KHAM:

- a. ahjya uhbyali-kə ge: nahm-ni ge-hu-zya-o
 earlier spring-LOC we low.country-ABLT 1pS-come-CONT-NML
 ‘Last spring we were coming up from the low-country.’

- b. gi-n-poh-zya-kə te, bəre:rə ro-tə chi: ya-en-zya-o
 we-d-hit-CONT-SUB CTR, south-PL up-ON grass 3pA-cut-CONT-NML
 ‘While we were beating it, the Southerners were above cutting hay.’

Clearly, then, an imperfective reading is fully compatible with stand-alone nominalizations. In most of the languages surveyed here, such nominalizations function independently to mark backgrounded material or stage settings—but they are still considered nominalizations. Van Driem apparently senses that these constructions have become grammaticalized enough in Limbu and Dumi to be regarded as aspectual markers, but he also recognizes that they form a “semantic continuum” with the nominalizer suffix (1993:191).²³

9. SUMMARY

Nominalization has been described as a central phenomenon in the structure of Himalayish languages and works at all levels, converting verbs and other word classes (especially deictic roots, postpositions, adverbial expressions, and case-marked nouns) into nominals and adnominals that function as participles, demonstratives, adjectivals, relative clauses, appositives, complement clauses, and free-standing predications. Most of the languages distinguish between finite and non-finite nominalizations, the former being used primarily in relative clauses and complement structures, while the latter are used in adjectives, demonstratives, and participles.

All Himalayish languages also use nominalizations in free-standing predications, predications not embedded to a higher matrix clause. Such nominalizations have been defined as functioning in numerous ways by different authors—“orientation mode, parenthetical mode, reification, factitive, factual verbal adjective, backgrounding device, focus device, mirative”, and others. Each of these functions can be generally distinguished, not just by the pragmatic contexts in which they occur, but also (and even primarily) by the syntactic structures in which they occur. Not all of them occur in every language, but the ones that do occur can be seen as forming different parts of a greater whole.

23 Doornenbal (2007:183) notes that though there are numerous structural and functional similarities between the Limbu and Dumi imperfectives and the Bantawa nominalized forms, the Bantawa forms are “not imperfective” and that imperfectivity is not an insightful way of describing such forms in Bantawa.

ABBREVIATIONS

1 first person; 1s>3O third person O in the environment of a first singular A; 2 second person; 23S second or third person S; 23s second or third person singular; 3 third person; 3AM third person agent in marked configuration; A ‘A’ argument; ABS absolutive; ACC accusative; ADS adessive; AFF affirmative; ALLT allative; AP agent participle, active participle; AS A or S argument; ATNR attributive nominalizer; CAUS causative; CL classifier; COM comitative; CONT continuous aspect; COP equative copula; CTR contrastive focus; d dual person; dA dual A participant; DETRANS detransitivizer; dist distal; DL dual number; e exclusive; ECHO echo; eff [undefined in source]; EMPH emphatic particle; ERG ergative; FCT factitive (Yamphu), factual verbal adjective (Wambule); FEM feminine; FUT future; GEN genitive; HUM human; IMP imperative; IMPFV imperfective; IN inessive; INF infinitive; INTRG interrogative; INV inverse; LCP locative participle; LOC locative; LOC.DIR locational-directional suffix; MS marked scenario prefix; NEG (or neg) negative; NF non-final marker; NML nominalizer; np non-plural person; NPT non-past; NR nominalizer/relativizer (Dolakha); ns non-singular person; NS non-singular number; O ‘O’ argument; OBL oblique; ON superessive; OPT optative; p plural person; PF perfect tense; PFV perfective; PL plural number; PN patientive noun; PNOM purpose nominalizer; POSS possessive; PP patientive participle, passive participle; prox proximate; PT past-tense; PURP purpose; Q question marker; REIF reifying affix; REP reported speech particle; RES resultative; RN realis nominalizer (Chepang); s singular person; s ‘S’ argument; SIDE.OF.MT side of mountain; SUB subjunctive; SUFF general suffix; TEL telic; VD vertical dimension suffix.

REFERENCES

- Benedict, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan. A conspectus*. Contributing editor: James A. Matisoff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 1999. Nominalization and focus constructions in some Kiranti languages. In Yogendra P. Yadava & Warren W. Glover (eds.), *Topics in Nepalese linguistics*, 271–296. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2000. On the syntax of agreement in Tibeto-Burman. *Studies in Language* 24:3.583–610.
- Bickel, Balthasar, Goma Banjade, Martin Gaenszle, Elena Lieven, Netra Paudyal, Ichchha Rai, Manoj Rai, Novel Kishor Rai, and Sabine Stoll. 2005. *News from the Himalayas: languages with free prefix ordering*. Leipzig: University of Leipzig.
- Bickel, Balthasar and Martin Gaenszle (eds.). 1999. *Himalayan Space: Cultural Horizons and Practices*. Zürich: Völkerkundemuseum Zürich.
- Caughley, Ross. 1982. *The syntax and morphology of the verb in Chepang* (Pacific Linguistics Series B, No. 84). Canberra: Australian National University.

- DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Nominalization as relativization in Tibetan and Newari. Paper presented at the *19th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, 1986*.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2002. Relativization and nominalization in Bodic. In Patrick Chew, (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Parasession on Tibeto-Burman and Southeast Asian Linguistics*, 55–72. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Doornenbal, Marius. 2007 [work in progress]. *A grammar of Bantawa*. Ph.D. dissertation. Leiden University.
- Driem, George van. 1987. *A grammar of Limbu*. Mouton Grammar Library 4. Berlin; Amsterdam; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Driem, George van. 1993. *A grammar of Dumi*. Mouton Grammar Library 10. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ebert, Karen H. 1994. *The Structure of Kiranti Languages: comparative grammar and texts*. Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Nr. 13. Zürich: Universität Zürich.
- Ebert, Karen H. 1997a. *A grammar of Athpare*. LINCOM studies in Asian linguistics; 01. München: LINCOM Europa.
- Ebert, Karen H. 1997b. *Camling (Chamling)*. Languages of the World/Materials 103. München; Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Ebert, Karen H. 1999. The UP-DOWN dimension in Rai grammar and mythology. In Bickel and Gaenzsle (eds.). 105–131.
- Genetti, Carol. 1994. A descriptive and historical account of the Dolakha Newari dialect. *Monumenta Serindica No. 24*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Givón, T. 2001. *Syntax: an introduction*. Vol II. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Glover, Warren W. 1974. *Sememic and grammatical structures in Gurung*. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, 49. Norman: SIL at the University of Oklahoma.
- Hargreaves, David. 1986. Non-embedded nominalizations in Newari: the interaction of form and function. Paper presented at *Conference on the Interaction of Form and Function*, University of California, Davis.
- Herring, Susan C. 1991. Nominalization, relativization, and attribution in Lotha, Angami, and Burmese. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 14.1:55–72.
- Lahaussais, Aimée. 2002. *Aspects of the grammar of Thulung Rai: an endangered Himalayan language*. Linguistics, Graduate Division, University of California, Berkeley: Ph.D.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2003. Qiang. In Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Matisoff, James A. 1972. Lahu nominalization, relativization, and genitivization. In John Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. I, 237–257. New York: Academic Press.

- Matisoff, James A. 1992. The mother of all morphemes: Augmentatives and diminutives in areal and universal perspective. In Martha Ratliff and Eric Schiller (eds.), *Papers from the first annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1991*, 293–349. Arizona: Arizona State University, Program for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Mortensen, David. 2003. *Comparative Tangkhul*. Unpublished qualifying paper 1-73: University of California, Berkeley.
- Noonan, Michael. 1997. Versatile nominalizations. In Joan Bybee, John Haiman, & Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Essays on Language Function and Language Type, dedicated to T. Givón*, 373–394. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. 2007. Nominalizations in Bodic languages. In María José López-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. *Rethinking grammaticalization: New perspectives for the twenty-first century*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. to appear. Aspects of the historical development of nominalizers in the Tamangic languages. In Foong Ha Yap and Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalizers and Copulas in East Asian and Neighboring Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Opgenort, Jean Robert. 2004. *A grammar of Wambule: grammar, lexicon, texts and cultural survey of a Kiranti tribe of eastern Nepal*: Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, vol. 5/2. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Rai, Novel Kishore. 1985. *A descriptive study of Bantawa*, University of Pune: Ph.D dissertation.
- Regmi, Dan Raj. 2007. *The Bhujel language*, Tribhuvan University: Ph.D dissertation.
- Rutgers, Roland. 1998. *Yamphu: grammar, texts & lexicon*: Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, vol. 2. Leiden: Leiden University.
- Sun, Jackson. 2003. Caodeng rGyalrong. In Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Thounaojam, Harimohon and Shobhana L. Chelliah. 2007. The Lamkang language: grammatical sketch, texts and lexicon. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30.1:1-211.
- Thurgood, Graham & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.). 2003. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Toba, Sueyoshi. 1979. Khaling. *Asian and African Grammatical Manual*, No. 13d.
- Tolsma, Gerard Jacobus. 1999. A grammar of Kulung, University of Leiden: Ph.D. dissertation in process.
- Tumbahang, Govinda Bahadur. 2007. *A descriptive grammar of Chhathare Limbu*, Tribhuvan University: Ph.D dissertation.
- Turin, Mark. 2006. *A Grammar of the Thangmi Language: with an ethnolinguistic introduction to the speakers and their culture*. University of Leiden: Ph.D. dissertation.

- Watters, David E. 1978. Speaker-hearer involvement in Kham. In Joseph Grimes (ed.), *Papers on Discourse*, 1–18. SIL Publications in Linguistics, Pub. No. 51, Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
- Watters, David E. 1985. *Some preliminary observations on the interrelatedness of Kham dialects*. 18th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Watters, David E. 1995. *An overview of nominalizations and relative clauses in Kham*. Notes on Tibeto-Burman, 2.1–53. Horsleys Green, England: SIL, South Asia Group.
- Watters, David E. 2002. *A grammar of Kham*. Cambridge grammatical descriptions. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Watters, David E. 2003. Kham. In Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Watters, David E. 2005. An overview of Kham-Magar languages and dialects. In Yogendra Yadava, Govinda Bhattarai, Ram Raj Lohani, Balarma Prasain & Krishna Parajuli (eds.), *Contemporary issues in Nepalese linguistics*, 339–374. Kathmandu: Linguistic Society of Nepal.
- Watters, David E. with the participation of Yogendra P. Yadava, Madhav P. Pokharel, Balaram Prasain. 2006. Notes on Kusunda grammar: a language isolate of Nepal. Santa Barbara: *Himalayan Linguistics*, Archive 3: 1–182.
- Watters, David E. [forthcoming]. *A grammar of Kaike*.