

**REVIEW OF
NOMINALIZATION IN ASIAN LANGUAGES: DIACHRONIC AND
TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES, BY FOONG HA YAP, KAREN
GRUNOW-HÅRSTA AND JANICK WRONA (EDS)**

AMSTERDAM AND PHILADELPHIA: JOHN BENJAMINS, 2011

[Hardcover 796 pages + xvii front matter. ISBN: 978-90-272-0677-0]

Nicolas Tournadre

Lacito (CNRS) and Aix-Marseille University

Nominalization in Asian Languages: diachronic and typological perspectives, edited by Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (John Benjamins, 2011) has 796 pages and consists of a preface, a general introduction to the notion of nominalization in a cross-linguistic and diachronic perspective, twenty-five contributions on nominalization organized along areal and genetic lines (divided into six parts), a general index of linguistic terms, and an index of languages.

The discussion on nominalization mainly deals with about sixty Asian languages belonging to two major stocks: Sino-Tibetan and Austronesian. However, the scope of this study is wider and includes Iranian languages (Indo-European), Korean, and Japanese, as well as one Papuan language (Abui). One can note that, in contradiction to the title of the book, a few important Asian families are not documented, such as Dravidian, Indic, Turkic, Mongolic, Austro-Asiatic, Miao-Yao and Tai-Kadai. Most of the contributions deal only with one language, but some deal with small groups of languages or families, such as Noonan's paper on Tamangic, Sze-Wing Tang's paper on two Sinitic languages, and Genetti's paper on various Tibeto-Burman languages. Some contributions have a diachronic scope (e.g. F.-H. Yap & J. Wang's chapter on Literary Chinese), while some papers have both a geographic and a historic dimension (e.g. G. Haig's paper on Iranian languages) or are more typologically oriented (e.g. C. Genetti's and S. DeLancey's respective papers on Tibeto-Burman).

The terminology used by the various authors is not always unified, which might generate some discomfort for readers. Labels of interlinear glosses have not always been standardized within the volume, e.g. nominalizer is glossed in the volume in at least five different ways: NMZ, NMLZ, NOM¹, NOMZ and NZR.

The introductory chapter by the editors titled 'Introduction: nominalization strategies in Asian languages' (pp. 1–57) presents the general framework and the conception of nominalization reflected in the book. The editors first present various nominalization types and draw a semantic distinction between participant versus event nominalization, as well as a syntactic distinction between lexical and

¹ NOM is also used for 'nominative'.

clausal nominalization (p.5). The label ‘lexical nominalization’ could imply that the derived noun is a lexical item. However, things are a little more complex, and one could introduce a distinction between derivations which have become lexical items and constructions that ‘have the same morphosyntactic characteristics as non-derived nouns’ but are less lexicalized. For example, if we compare Standard Tibetan *kha.lag za-sa* ‘place to eat’ and *sdod-sa* /dɛ'sa/ ‘seat’ or ‘place to sit’, only the latter could be considered a lexical item or as a more lexicalized item meaning ‘seat’ (and is listed in dictionaries), while the former may be described in terms of a lexical verb *kha-lag za* ‘to eat’, which is followed by the grammatical suffix *sa*. As noticed by L. Brinton (2008) concerning light verbs, grammaticalization may coexist with lexicalization and both are a matter of degree.

Aside lexical and clause nominalization, in this volume C. Genetti makes an additional distinction by introducing action nominalization, while M. Post makes a distinction between clausal nominalization and nominalized clause, but these categories have not been integrated nor discussed in the *Introduction*. In order to take into account Genetti’s remark and maintain a consistent syntactic approach, one should perhaps propose the following categories:

- (a) argument-oriented nominalization
- (b) predicate-oriented nominalization
- (c) clause nominalization²

Concerning the marking of the arguments, the main opposition is between (a/b) and (c), since arguments may “be signaled in the same way as verb-argument relations in finite clauses (‘sentential marking’), or as head-dependent relations in NP’s” (Koptievskaja Tamm 2005).

Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (hence YG-HW) further distinguish “referential” and “non-referential” uses of nominalization. From a syntactic point of view, non-referential functions include embedded nominal clauses, relative clauses, adverbial clauses as well as independent clauses.

YG-HW provide an insightful analysis of the grammatical semantics of nominalization and their wide scope of meanings, including participants’ semantic roles (agent, patient, location, instrument, etc.), tense-aspect-mood, stance marking, as well as adverbial subordinators expressing temporal, conditional or causal meanings.

A substantial part of the introduction is devoted to the diachronic dimension and to the ‘strategies of nominalization’. Nominalization may either be morphologically marked or unmarked (‘zero nominalization’). The authors show

² Thus (a) corresponds to Genetti’s ‘lexical nominalization’, and (b) to the action nominalization. However, one may consider that both (a) and (b) can be lexicalized to various degrees. Even (c), i.e. the clausal nominalization can be lexicalized (albeit to a lesser extent), for example in the case of proverbs. Thus the category “lexical nominalization” is a rather confusing label.

that “nominalizers take various forms and positions, ranging from affixes to clitics to semantically transparent light nouns” (p.9). Not only suffixal and prefixal nominalizers are attested, but also circumfixal and more rarely infixal nominalizers are encountered. In some cases, nominalizers may be marked by reduplication (as in Tagalog) or even suppletion (as in Galo, a Tibeto-Burman language of the Tani branch). Suppletion is also attested in several Tibetic languages, such as Central Tibetan (Lhasa): *yag* is used for the patient of a non-completed event (or ‘imperfective’), while *pa* is used for the patient of a perfective. The same is true for the pair *rgyu* (‘imperfective patient’) and *pa* (‘perfective patient’) in Classical Tibetan.

Various noun phrase markers such as classifiers, plural markers, possessive pronouns, demonstratives, definiteness markers and case markers may serve to identify a nominalization construction. The same NP markers may be reanalyzed as nominalizers historically. Nominalization may also be formed “with the help of focusing strategies” (p.22). Another origin of nominalizers, frequently attested in Sino-Tibetan, Japanese and Korean, is linked to lexical nouns developing into ‘light nouns’. Among the lexical nouns, good candidates for forming nominalizers include ‘person’, ‘thing’, ‘place’, ‘manner’, etc. Referring to DeLancey (1986), YG-HW mention the main nominalizer of Classical Tibetan *pa*, which derives from Proto-Tibeto-Burman *pa* ‘father’, as well as *sa* ‘place’ and *mkhan* ‘person’ in Lhasa Tibetan.

It is worth noting here that the nominalizer *mkhan* does not mean originally ‘person’ but is derived from a lexical root *mkhan/ mkhas* whose etymology is ‘expert, learned’, attested in words such as *mkhan-po* ‘abbot’ and *mkhas-pa* ‘expert, scholar’; this meaning is also clearly mentioned by DeLancey (2005) quoting Jäschke (1881). The incorrect, or at least, approximate etymology for the nominalizer *mkhan* ‘person’ (*Introduction*, p. 29) is, unfortunately, likely to be quoted now in typological works. Classical Tibetan (hence CT) and the modern Tibetic languages (alias ‘Tibetan dialects’) provide many other illustrations of this fundamental nominalization strategy. Other sources that could have been quoted are *mi* (or its archaic form *myi*) ‘person’ (found in some Kham, e.g. Dongwang and Amdo dialects), *stangs* ‘manner’ (CT and many Tibetic languages), *srol* ‘custom’ (CT and many Tibetic languages), *yul* ‘place, residence’ (CT), *rgyu* ‘object’ (CT and many Tibetic languages), *chas* ‘thing, cloths’ (which has developed into /ya’/ in Lhasa Tibetan, generally noted as *yag* or *yas*), and *rdzas* ‘thing, object’ (in some Kham dialects), as shown in Tournadre and Suzuki (forthcoming).

Although the lengthy introduction provides a lot of information about the typology of nominalization, its structure is not very transparent. For example, the diachronic study of nominalization is presented in various sections (pp. 6–7, 27–33). The morphological, syntactic and semantic aspects could have been regrouped in a more coherent way. The introduction also lacks a general summary of all the nominalization types and functions that are being discussed. The rather specific notion of ‘stance’ is widely discussed, while other similarly related

notions such as evidentiality or epistemic modalities are not really taken into consideration. This sometimes gives the impression that in the Human sciences (and not only), the choice of the label is more a question of fashion. These flaws have also been pointed out by M. Gerner (2012), who wrote a review article on this volume in which he proposes a new organization of the data.

Part I consists of four articles addressing nominalizers in Sinitic languages. In the first article ‘From light nouns to nominalizers and more: the grammaticalization of *zhe* and *suo* in Old and Middle Chinese’ (pp. 61–107), Foong Ha Yap and Jiao Wang provide a detailed diachronic study of two light nouns *zhe* and *suo*, which have developed into nominalizers. The authors discuss the various functions of these light nouns and their evolution in Old, Middle and Modern Chinese.

The next paper by Hui Ling Xu and Stephen Matthews is entitled ‘On the polyfunctionality and grammaticalization of the morpheme *kai* in the Chaozhou dialect’ (pp. 109–124). It explores the various meanings of the morpheme *kai* in Chaozhou, a Sinitic language, which bears a lot of archaic features. The morpheme *kai* functions as a classifier, but also has adnominal, pronominal, nominalizing and stance making functions.

The paper entitled ‘The Cantonese *ge3*’ (pp. 125–146) by Joanna Ut-Seong Sio presents a descriptive overview of the Cantonese adnominal *ge3*, which functions as a modifier marker, a sentence final particle and a predicative marker.

Sze-Wing Tang’s paper ‘On gerundive nominalization in Mandarin and Cantonese’ (pp. 147–160) offers a comparative study of the gerundive adnominal *de* in Mandarin and *ge* in Cantonese. The author shows that the Cantonese *ge* has undergone less grammaticalization than the Mandarin *de*.

Concerning this first part devoted to nominalization in Sinitic languages, the two first articles by Xu and Matthews really focus on the issue of nominalization, while the remaining papers are more oriented toward to the issue of adnominal modifiers.

Part II is devoted to nominalization in Tibeto-Burman languages and starts with an article written by Carol Genetti titled ‘Nominalization in Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayan area: an areal perspective’ (pp. 163–193). The author has picked chosen five languages—Dolakha Newar, Zhuokeji rGyalrong, Dongwang Tibetan, Mongsen Ao and Manange—that “appear broadly representative of the Tibeto-Burman family within the broader Himalayan region”. I would like to take the opportunity to signal here an inaccurate use of “Himalayan”. If three of the languages are, without any doubt, located in the Himalayas, Dongwang and Zhuokeji rGyalrong are situated on the Tibetan Plateau far from the Himalayas,³ a fact which is obvious to geographers but less obvious to linguists.

³ For Dongwang, some people would argue that the surrounding mountains are part of the broader Himalayas, but in the case of rGyalrong, the Himalayan ranges are distance of a few hundred kilometers.

Another small remark concerns the choice of Dongwang Tibetan. It is one of the numerous Tibetic languages and dialects derived from Old Tibetan spoken in the traditional Tibetan province of Kham and belonging to the subgroup of Chaktreng (Suzuki, 2009). In fact, a lot of the observations concerning the nominalization strategies in Dongwang apply to other Tibetic languages (Sherpa, Ladakhi, Dzongkha, Central Tibetan, Amdo etc.). Thus, it would have been useful to know what specific features of Dongwang (if any) are not found in the other Tibetic languages. Of course the choice of this Tibetic language is due to the fact that E. Bartee's PhD on Dongwang was available to C. Genetti and is not, at first, motivated by typological reasons. Many descriptions such as, for example, Haller's monographies on Shikatse Tibetan or Themchen Tibetan could have been used, but they are less accessible because they are written in German.⁴

This remark is of course not to minimize the intrinsic quality of Genetti's article, which is a very useful typological study, and could apply to the choice of many secondhand works used in typological studies. In a very clear and convincing way, the author shows the various types of nominalization available in the given sample of languages: these include the various types of subordinate clause nominalization (complement, relative or adverbial clauses) as well as the nominalization of independent clauses⁵ ('non-embedded clause'). In the latter case, nominalization can correspond to a focus construction (Newar) or to a tense-aspect (Manange). Genetti makes the following note (p. 180): "With evidential morphology, the future interpretation is possible but not required [...]". The mention of evidentiality is a crucial point. In fact, in the volume, it is striking to see that while 'stance' is often mentioned, the field of evidentiality in relation to nominalization has not been explored sufficiently.

If we take only the case of Tibetic languages that have developed complex evidential systems, the usual constructions conveying evidential meaning are historically formed with the aid of a nominalizer followed by a copula (see Oisel 2013). This is also true for the rich paradigm of epistemic modalities, which are also formed in the same way (Vokukova 2008).

Here is a final remark concerning Genetti's analysis related to the 'derivation of lexical adjectives' by the means of relative clause structures: the author notes that there are "strong structural and functional parallels between relative clauses and derived clauses".

This type of derivation could well be explained by the fact the lexical roots that are derived as adjectives originally belong to a *verb-type category*. This explanation would work at least for many Tibetic languages. If the very existence of this category is not as problematic as in Chinese, one can say that the class of

⁴ The same is true for dozens of other works written for example in French, Chinese or Japanese.

⁵ These functions are attested in Newar and in Manange. One could also mention Classical Tibetan, which makes frequent usage of nominalization with independent clauses. The nominalizer is usually followed by the final sentence particle 'o as in: *brtsams-pa-'o* "[thus it] was composed".

“real” adjectives in these languages is somehow restricted. Literary Tibetan (Classical or Modern) and its descendants entirely lack relational adjectives. For example, there is no adjective corresponding to ‘national’, or ‘feminine, female’, so one uses an adnominal structure (N-GEN) composed of a noun in the genitive (respectively *mi.rigs-kyi*, *bu.mo-'i*) to express these meanings. Some adjectives are rendered by compound forms of the type N-A, as in *nyen-kha tsha-po* ‘dangerous’ (lit. ‘hot danger’) or *zhed-snang tsha-po* ‘horrible’ (lit.: ‘hot fear’). In the small class of “genuine” adjectives, we find mainly size, color and quality adjectives such as *ring-po* ‘long’, *bzang-po* ‘excellent’, *chen-po* ‘big’, *dkar-po* ‘white, pure’ *gsal-po* ‘clear’. However, all these adjectives are clearly derived from verbs.

Two arguments support this hypothesis: first, in Literary Tibetan, the adjective stems are sometimes inflected with a final *s* identical to verbal inflections, thus *ring* > *rings* and *che(n)* > *ches*. Second, in the modern languages, the suffix *-po* (in the above example *ring-po*, *bzang-po*, *chen-po*, *dkar-po*, *gsal-po*) is a positive suffix but other suffixes (for the comparative and superlative) are compatible with an adjective stem (*pa*, *shos*, *gi.red* etc.), some of which are also verbal suffixes. Thus, adjectives in Literary Tibetan are historically verbal roots followed by a nominalizer⁶ (*po*, *pa*, *mo*, *ma*, etc.) and the stems should be better translated as *ring(s)* ‘to be long’, *dkar* ‘to be white, pure’, *gsal* ‘to be clear’, etc. If this is correct, Classical Tibetan has derived its adjectives from nominalized verbs, which would be similar to Newar.

Michael Noonan’s ‘Aspects of the historical development of nominalizers in the Tamangic languages’ (pp. 445–472) provides a very clear presentation of nominalizers in several languages (mainly Tamang, Chantyal, Nar-Phu) of the Tamangic subgroups of Tibeto-Burman. In this language grouping, nominalizers function as clausal complements, adverbial clauses (‘purpose nominals’), adnominal clauses, agent and patient nominals, and they also express a finite clause ‘mirative sense’. The author mentions the case of nominalizers affixed to nouns (p. 200). Although historically the marker *wa* is the same as that used for agent or patient nominals, it seems a little problematic to consider that this morpheme is a nominalizer *stricto sensu*, and it might be better characterized as a nominal clitic.

In the section 3.1.2, Noonan supports DeLancey’s hypothesis about the later development of adnominals without the genitive: “In the Tibetan complex, the genitive is found consistently with adnominals utilizing reflexes of **pa*, but not with those of the other nominalizers [...]”. This assertion, which is based on DeLancey’s analysis, should be formulated in a more careful way. Indeed, the genitive is used with the adnominal followed by *pa*, but it is also used with other nominalizers such as *sa* or *yag* and even *mkhan*, although with the latter its use is

⁶ The adjective suffixes *pa*, *po*, *ma*, *mo* are also used with nouns. The variants *po* and *mo* are probably derived from the nominalizers *pa* and *ma* followed by a demonstrative **po/bo*, as already suggested by Franke in 1929 (see also DeLancey 2005), and this hypothesis is supported by the existence of this suffix in Amdo.

optional.⁷ Another interesting point discussed in Section 3 by M. Noonan is the emergence of the new nominalizers *te* and *ne* in Nar-Phu. The author proposes that these two new nominalizers ‘most likely’ derive respectively from *ta* ‘become’ and from the manner converb in **-na*, adding that the latter is otherwise unattested in Nar-Phu. Since “Nar-Phu and Manange are [Tamangic] languages most strongly within the Tibeto-sphere”⁸ (p. 209), I would like to propose two other possible etymologies related to Classical Tibetan: *te* could be derived from *te/ste/de*, a clausal connective particle, and *ne* could come from *nas*, the relative case marker which is frequently used in CT as a clausal connective.

A final remark concerns Appendix 1 of this paper (p. 214). The Tibetic branch corresponds to an impressionistic branch which groups together Ghale, Tamangic, the ‘Tibetan Complex’ and Tshangla. As shown in Tournadre (forthcoming), such use of ‘Tibetic’ replaces ‘Bodish’, which is not a well-established grouping and is not supported by common innovations. My definition of Tibetic is similar, *mutatis mutandis* to the one of Sinitic and refers to a well-defined group of languages derived from Old Tibetan; thus it could be close to Noonan’s ‘Tibetan complex’, or to the more traditional notion of ‘Tibetan dialects’. However, surprisingly, in his ‘Tibetan Complex’, Noonan does not mention various major languages spoken in Eastern and Northeastern Tibet and derived from Old Tibetan, such as Amdo and Kham, while he mentions a nearly dead language, Jad, and other very small languages such as Nyam-skat, Jirel, Dura [sic],⁹ etc. spoken in the southern Himalayas respectively in India, Nepal and Bhutan¹⁰. This minor criticism does not diminish the value of this nice contribution to this volume on nominalization and, since this book is dedicated to Michael Noonan, I take the opportunity to say again how his recent death was a great loss for our field.

The next paper is entitled ‘Innovation in nominalization in Magar, a Tibeto-Burman language of Nepal’ (pp. 215–254), by Karen Grunow-Hårsta. The author discusses five nominalizers (*-ke*, *-ma*, *-o*, *-cyo* and *-mi*) of Magar, a Central Himalayish language. These nominalizers encode various functions such as the derivation of lexical nouns, agent or patient nominals, event nominalization, complement clauses, adverbial clauses, TAM marking, evidentiality (namely ‘mirative’) etc. The article illustrates three patterns of innovation related to nominalization following Noonan’s (2008) proposal: these are (1) elaboration, i.e. the increase in the number of functions; (2) extension, i.e. the expansion of syntactic and semantic scopes; and (3) elimination, i.e. the loss of (some) nominalizing functions.

Mark W. Post describes ‘Nominalization and nominalization-based constructions in Galo’ (pp. 255–287), a Tibeto-Burman language of the Tani

⁷ It seems that the use of the genitive is less common when the nominalizer ends with a consonant, so the real parameter is a morphophonological one.

⁸ Noonan (this volume) and Tournadre (forthcoming), independently have used the concept of Tibeto-sphere, inspired by Matisoff’s notion of Indo-sphere and Sino-sphere.

⁹ This language is usually called Dur.

¹⁰ He also lists in the ‘Tibetan Complex’ a non-Tibetic language: ‘Central Monpa’.

branch. The author distinguishes various types of primary nominalizers that are “semantically abstract and functionally versatile” and secondary nominalizers, a larger class, which occurs in a “smaller range of nominalization-based constructions with relatively low text frequency”. The author makes another distinction between ‘marked nominalization’¹¹ and ‘nominalized-based constructions’, the latter being divided into ‘nominalized clauses’ and ‘clausal nominalization’. The labels corresponding to this distinction, which are ‘not commonly made in the literature’ are rather confusing for the reader.

Nominalized clauses are “centred on an uninflected nominalized predicate, and exhibit an obligatory genitive subject” (p. 283), while “clausal nominalizations [...] resemble final predicative clauses and occur in framing [...], backgrounding [...] and final construction subtypes, as well as in cleft/focus constructions [...] and exhibit nominative – not genitive – subjects”. M. Post mentions the existence of an ‘egophoric’ evidential marking in Galo (p. 276).

Stephen Morey looks at ‘Nominalization in Numhpuk Singpho’ (pp. 289–311), a Tibeto-Burman language of the Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw group. Two main nominalization processes are attested: one is marked by *pah*, which is used for nominal derivation as well as clausal nominalization and relativization. The other is *wa*, which marks clausal nominalization as well as definiteness. One of the salient features of Numhpuk Singpho is that it shows little nominalization-relativization synchretism.

Hongyong Liu and Yang Gu explore ‘Nominalization in Nuosu Yi’ (pp. 313–342), a language spoken in Sichuan (Liangshan Yi Autonomous Prefecture). The authors consider that nominalization occurs at both the morphological level and the syntactic level. Morphological nominalizers derive argument-oriented nominals (agent, patient/theme, locative, manner, location) as well as predicate-oriented nominalization. At the syntactic level, a clause (relative, gerundive) “can be nominalized by the definite article *-su*, classifiers, or the factual complementizer *-ko*, which is derived from a third person singular accusative pronoun. Nominalization may occur in the sentence-final position and mark an independent clause, indicating an ‘assertive’ meaning or focus.

The last article of Part II is by Scott DeLancey and is titled ‘Finite structures from clausal nominalization in Tibeto-Burman’ (pp. 343–359). The author convincingly argues that nominalization-based constructions developing into new finite constructions (followed or not by a copula) is the major source of synchronic finite constructions in Tibeto-Burman. Historically, the schematic representation of the finite construction is: STEM-NMLZ-COP (p. 345).¹² His contribution is exemplified through case studies from Tibetan, Sunwar (a Kiranti language) and from the Kuki-Chin branch of Tibeto-Burman.

¹¹ Post’s ‘zero or marked Nominalization’ may correspond to ‘lexical nominalization’ or to the categories I introduced on p. 116: (a) argument-oriented nominalization and (b) predicate-oriented nominalization.

¹² In some cases, the copula may be dropped.

The nominalization strategy has often replaced the old inherited verbal morphology of Tibeto-Burman or both systems coexist synchronically, as in the case of the Tibetic languages or Sunwar. This strategy of nominalization is similar to the one adopted by Romance languages for future after the collapse of Latin morphology¹³ for the future and the compound past. However, in Tibeto-Burman and particularly in languages such as Classical Tibetan or the modern Tibetic languages or Sunwar, the nominalization strategy has become fundamental. We can only agree with DeLancey's formulation: "This is a consistent, repeated pattern across the family, synchronically and diachronically, and serves as another example of how nominalization is the primary engine driving Tibeto-Burman syntax and syntactic change" (p. 357). This paper does not provide details on the semantics of the finite construction STEM-NMLZ-COP. In the case of the Tibetic languages, it may indicate not only TAM and evidentiality but also epistemic modalities.

This latter function has not received sufficient attention. Epistemic modalities of the finite verb follow the same pattern (STEM-NMLZ-COP), as shown by Vokurkova (2008). Moreover, one extraordinary feature of this strategy is its recursivity. For example, structures such as STEM-NMLZ-COP-NMLZ-COP-NMLZ-COP are attested in Modern Literary Tibetan (see Oisel 2013). Coming back to DeLancey's contribution, one can point out a problem concerning the use of the label "Tibetan". In Table 1, the same data are described as 'Lhasa Tibetan' (p. 344) or 'modern Tibetan' (p. 345).¹⁴ Given the fact that Wylie transliteration is used in the table, one could deduce that it refers to Modern Literary Tibetan. For example, the forms *za-rgyu-yin* are written in the Classical orthography, but from the gloss (e.g. 'I still have to eat'), one understands that they correspond to Lhasa Tibetan.

One should also signal a mistake in the chart for the classical orthography of the verb 'to eat' (PST), which is *bzas* and not **zas*. An archaic form *zos* is also attested, but **zas* is normally not used in Classical nor Modern Literary Tibetan. DeLancey also examines the sentence final particle 'o and shows, in a convincing way, that 'o "probably reflects a widespread Proto-Tibeto-Burman copula **way* which is also attested notably in Bodish (Kurtoep), Kiranti and Burmese". The author adds that "this etymon has no other reflex in modern varieties of Tibetan". This should be nuanced, since *no*, probably a reflex of 'o, is found in Lhasa Tibetan formal speech (see Tournadre, 2003). Let us note that the final sentence particle sometimes coexists with the oldest copulas *yin* and *yod* (see e.g. *yin-no* and *yod-do*).

¹³ For example *j'écrit-ai*, *tu écrit-r-as*, *il écrit-r-a*, etc. corresponds to the infinitive or nominalized form of the verb *écrire* followed by the auxiliary *avoir* 'have'. Eventually the auxiliary became a suffix.

¹⁴ Given the extension of the Tibetic family, Modern Tibetan is a confusing label, while Lhasa Tibetan is the spoken language. The Tibetan language available on the Web (blogs, sites, newspapers online etc.) is Modern Literary and not Lhasa Tibetan. For written purposes, Modern Literary Tibetan is used.

Part III is only devoted to nominalization in Iranian languages. It consists of a single contribution by G. Haig titled ‘Linker, relativizer, nominalizer, tense-particle: on the Ezafe in West Iranian’ (pp. 445–390). The ‘ezafe’ is a very important morpheme at the core of Iranian syntax. In modern Persian, it serves as a linker restricted to adnominal function: “it follows a noun modified by an adjective [...], a noun expressing a possessor [including a pronoun], a noun with [...] type-specifying sense. [...] or certain prepositional adjuncts.”¹⁵ However, in “northern Kurdish, [...] the ‘ezafe’ has retained many of the features of its Old Iranian ancestor, including relativizer, demonstrative and nominalizer functions”. According to Haig, the ‘ezafe’ is probably derived from a demonstrative/ relative pronoun, attested in Old Iranian.

Part IV explores nominalization in Korean and Japanese languages. The first paper is by Seongha Rhee, who examines ‘Nominalization and stance marking in Korean’ (pp. 445–472). The nominalization strategy has been very important throughout the history of this language; “numerous nominalizers came into existence, with many becoming defunct or shifting to other functions.” The author focuses on the nominalizers used in Modern Korean: mainly *-m*, *-ki*, *-ci* and *-kes*. They exhibit a great diversity of functions, which are either ‘referential’ or ‘expressive’. The former include nominal (deverbal) suffixes and the latter clausal nominalization. The ‘expressive’ functions are mainly associated with sentential endings. Some of these functions are restricted according to writing style.

One of the extraordinary features of the Korean nominalizers is the marking of a very wide range of speaker-stance meanings. Seongha Rhee provides a brief introduction to the notion of stance, which is conceived as a hyperonymic term for ‘attitudinal’, ‘epistemic’, ‘emotional’ and ‘evidential stances’. In Section 4.2, the author illustrates the numerous functions of the final sentential endings *-ci* and *-kes*, which include ‘addressee confirmation’, ‘feigned or exaggerated friendliness’, ‘approval or suggestion-giving’, ‘conviction’, ‘prediction’, ‘promissive’ and ‘exclamation’ (for the morpheme *-ci*) and ‘emphasis’, ‘conviction’ and ‘commitment’ (for the morpheme *-kes*). The diversity of the meanings conveyed by these two nominalizers suggests that they might correspond to secondary semantic effects and should not be considered as core grammatical meanings.

Janick Wrona’s article ‘A case of non-derived stand-alone nominalization, Evidence from Japanese’ (pp. 445–472) examines the question of stand-alone nominalization, mainly in standard Japanese. In this language, nominalization clauses may indicate a stance-marking, usually conveying an exclamation. The author’s main contention is that Japanese data do not support the hypothesis of a diachronic development from ‘copula-type main-clause nominalization’ to ‘stand alone main-clause nominalization’, i.e. the existence of a copulative construction associated with a nominalization is not a prerequisite for the development of stance-marking. Nominalization alone may be sufficient to generate this type of grammaticalization.

¹⁵ Additionally it comes to mark progressive aspect.

Aside from the Japanese data, the author examines this issue in a range of sample of languages including Chantyal, Korean, Chinese, Rawang, Classical and Lhasa Tibetan. One may agree with the author that ‘one has to consider two possible diachronic developments of stand-alone main clause nominalization for a given language’ [the copula-type and the stand-alone type], however the first type is probably the most frequent one. In the case of Classical and Lhasa Tibetan, the author ‘[has] been unable to find any information relating to the diachronic development of *-pa* as stance-marker’. It is true that stand-alone nominalization (with adjective stems followed by *-pa* and a dative case) such as *skyid-pa-la* (pleasant-NMLZ-DAT) ‘how enjoyable/ pleasant!’ is found in both Classical and Central Tibetan and has not been described in detail. As far as I know, this construction has never been used with a copula, so this would again support Wrona’s argument. However as shown by Oisel (2013), Vokurkova (2008), Tournadre (2001, 2003) and DeLancey (this volume), apart from this exclamative or ‘mirative’ construction, all the other stance-marking (evidential, epistemic) constructions are derived from the copula-type construction.

Rumiko Shinzato’s article ‘Nominalization in Okinawan, from a diachronic and comparative perspective’ (pp. 445–472) examines nominalization in Okinawan, a Japonic language, looking at data from the *Omorososhi* and *Kumiodori* (18th c. Okinawan traditional theater, song and dance) as well as the modern Shuri dialect of Okinawa (an endangered language). The author shows that Okinawan nominalized constructions exhibit four main clausal functions: headless relative clause, complementizer, cleft/focus and stance marking. The author’s frequent use of Japanese terminology (*rentaikei*, *kakari musubi*, *shushikei*, etc) causes a little discomfort for a reader not acquainted with these terms.

Kaoru Horie’s article ‘Versatility of nominalizations, Where Japanese and Korean contrast’ (pp. 473–496) examines nominalizations in a contrastive analysis of Japanese and Korean. Using Croft’s (2001) typological approach to complex sentences (relative clause, complement, adverbial clause and coordination), the author shows that nominalization with the morpheme *no* is versatile and may be interpreted as a head internal relative clause, a complement clause, or an adverbial clause. She also demonstrates that in this regard, Japanese nominalizations have a “greater versatility” than their Korean homologues. Finally, K. Horie compares the sentence-final nominalizations in the two languages and comes to the same conclusion about their versatility.

Part V is devoted to nominalization in Austronesian languages. Several papers are devoted to nominalization in various endangered Formosan languages of Taiwan, which display a predicate-initial word order. In the first article ‘The functions of *-an* and *=ay* in Kavalan’ (pp. 500–522), Fuhui Hsieh describes nominalizations in Kavalan, a highly endangered Formosan language, spoken in eastern Taiwan. The author discusses the functions of two nominalizers *-ay* and *-an* and uses Croft’s theory of conceptual space for part of speech as a

theoretical framework. F. Hsieh shows that “relative clauses are secondary derivations from nominalization constructions”.

In the following paper ‘Clausal nominalization in Budai Rukai’ (pp. 523–559), Li-May Sung examines nominalization in another Formosan language, Budai, spoken by about 10,000 speakers in Southern Taiwan. The author first provides a grammatical sketch of Budai and then discusses nominalization and relativization in this language, particularly by *-anə* and $-\emptyset$, which are highly pervasive in Budai and display both nominal and verbal properties. The *-anə* nominalizer is used for both clausal and lexical nominalizations.

The following paper, written by Marie Mei-Li Yeh and titled ‘Nominalization in Saisiyat’ (pp. 561–588), deals with various types of nominalizations in another Formosan language, Saisiyat, spoken by about 6,000 speakers in northern Taiwan. The author shows that the various Saisiyat nominalizers (*Ca/ka* and *-in*) may serve as TAM markers, purpose and relative clause markers, and may indicate lexical nominalization. She also proposes the hypothesis that these various meanings follow a grammaticalization pattern that implies a gradual decategorialization of the verb. According to Yeh, The verbal TAM functions (future and perfective) exhibit the highest degree of verbal categoriality, while the syntactic nominalization (purpose and relative clauses) are “low in categoriality and lie in the middle stage of the continuum, and lexical nominalization [...] represents the cases that are pushed further towards the end of decategorialization” (p. 585).

Naonori Nagaya’s paper, titled ‘Rise and fall of referentiality: articles in Philippine languages’ (pp. 589–626) examines the role of articles in Tagalog and in two other languages: Bikol (Central Philippines) and Ilokano (northern Philippines). The author first discusses the referential and non-referential functions of the articles *ang* and *yung* in Tagalog. Although these two articles play a role in nominalized clauses, they cannot be considered nominalizers. The same is true for the articles found in Bikol (*ang* and *su*) and Ilokano (*ti* and *diay*). Thus the main topic of the paper, i.e. the referential and non-referential uses of articles, is not a central issue for the understanding of nominalization, which is the essential topic of the present volume.

The next paper, written by Foong Ha Yap (pp. 627–658) on ‘Referential and non-referential uses of nominalization constructions in Malay’, is devoted to the uses of three nominalizers *-yang*, *-nya* and *-punya*, found in the Malay variety spoken in the states of Perak and Selangor in peninsular Malaysia. The morpheme *-yang*, which is probably derived from a demonstrative, has a wide range of functions including that of relative clause marker, complementizer, topic marker and definite article. The morpheme *-nya* serves as a third person genitive enclitic, ‘definiteness marker’, nominalizer and adverbial marker (derived from adjective or nominal stems). The third nominalizer *-punya* deserves a special mention. Aside from having many functions such as possessive marker, nominalizer, subordinator, preposition and stance marker (epistemic, evidential, attitudinal), it developed a relativizing function probably “under the influence of contact

languages such as Cantonese, Hakka, Hokkien, Teochew [...]”. The influence of contact languages on nominalizers seems to be rarely attested.

Eric Posdam’s article ‘Expressing exclamation in Malagasy’ (pp. 659–683) explores the syntax and semantics of exclamative clauses in Malagasy, which is also a predicate-initial Austronesian language. He discusses the clausal or nominal status of exclamative constructions and brings strong syntactic evidence in favour of the nominal analysis. The article also provides a typological analysis of exclamative constructions and data from various languages. However, nominalization *per se* is only a marginal issue in this article.

Frantisek Lichtenberk’s article ‘Nominalization in Toqabaqita and closely related languages’ (pp. 685–719) explores certain aspects of nominalization in various Oceanic languages (a subgroup of the Austronesian family), spoken in the southern-eastern part of the Solomon Islands. The data are mainly taken from Toqabaqita, but some data come from closely related languages such as Longgu, Arosi, Ulawa, Lai Kwara‘ae, Kwaio, Marau, Oroha, and ‘Are‘are.

The article is very dense and the argumentation is sometimes difficult to follow, but it provides a lot of examples about lexical nominalizations in those languages. In Toqabaqita, nominalizations also exhibit a stance function, which signals the speaker’s disapproval of the state of affairs. One salient property of these languages is the existence of a “double nominalization”, i.e. the possibility of using two nominalizers with a single verb.

The last paper of Part V is ‘Exclamatives and temporal nominalizations in Austronesian’ (pp. 721–753) by Daniel Kaufman. The author examines exclamative and gerundive constructions in Tagalog as well as other Austronesian languages from both the diachronic and synchronic points of view. According to the reconstruction in Proto-Austronesian, exclamative constructions are formed with a morpheme **ka*, which is originally an existential marker. He argues that synchronically, both the exclamative and the gerundive are “typically expressed via nominalization”. According to D. Kaufman, the fact that both exclamative and gerundive constructions are best expressed as nominals may be explained by their properties of conveying ‘anaphoric functions’ and ‘presuppositionality’.

Part VI is devoted to Abui, a Papuan language. In his paper titled ‘Discourse-structuring functions of Abui demonstratives’ (pp. 757–788), Frantisek Kratochvil examines the various grammatical functions of demonstratives and a morpheme *-ba*. Demonstratives in this language exhibit extraordinary properties and functions, which go well beyond spatial deixis and include anaphora, tense-aspect, evidentiality and assertion. The morpheme *-ba*, which is derived from the lexical verb ‘say’, also has the same range of discursive, temporal and evidential functions. This paper provides very interesting data about this Papuan language. However, the relation to the main topic of the volume is not very straightforward, since Abui demonstratives are not nominalizers. The author himself admits that “in other languages discussed in this volume, a single morpheme, identified as nominalizer, can cover similar functions as Abui demonstratives, [so] it seems problematic to speak of Abui demonstratives as nominalizers” (p. 785).

CONCLUSIONS

As with most typological collective works, this book has some flaws, which are inevitable, such as the lack of homogeneous frameworks or approaches to nominalization, variations in terminology and interlinear glosses, etc. Although the title of the book suggests an overview of nominalization in Asian Languages, nineteen papers out of twenty-five are devoted to the major Sino-Tibetan and Austronesian families. In Part IV, four articles are devoted to the Japanese and Korean isolates, while Iranian and Papuan families have only one article each, respectively in Part III and VI. Many other language families are not represented in this volume. Thus, in terms of genetic families, the organization is slightly unbalanced. It is also a little awkward to see that Japanese and Korean, which are linguistic isolates, are grouped together in Part IV, while Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman, which are genetically related, are dealt with respectively in parts I and II.

Despite this small criticism, it is clear that this volume is a major contribution to the understanding of nominalization in Asian languages and more generally to the typology of nominalization. Most articles present lots of data and valuable examples from many languages, some of which are highly endangered. This is particularly the case for Austronesian languages of Taiwan and for some Tibeto-Burman languages.

From a typological point of view, the volume corroborates the idea that “nominalization constructions frequently exhibit a mix of both nominal and verbal features” (Introduction, p. 6; for European languages also see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993, 2003; Komur 2005). It also shows the very wide range of grammatical meanings conveyed by nominalizers, extending from lexical nominalization to clausal nominalization, and including stance marking such as evidential, epistemic or attitudinal functions. This volume has additionally underlined the frequent syncretism between nominalization, relativization and genitivation as well as the role of nominalization in exclamative constructions. Finally, we can refer to the excellent typology of nominalizations made by Gerner (2012) on the basis on this volume.

REFERENCES

- Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. Where grammar and lexis meet. In Seoane, Elena and Maria José Lopez (eds.) *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.
- DeLancey, S. (2002). Relativization and nominalization in Bodic. Special session on Tibeto-Burman Linguistics. *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 28.2: 5–72.
- Gerner, Matthias. (2012) The typology of nominalization; Review article of Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) 2011. *Nominalization in Asian Languages, diachronic and typological perspectives*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. *Language and linguistics* 13.4: 803-844.

- Komur, Greta. 2005. Le transfert de l'aspect verbal sur le substantif en polonaise. In Molendijk, Arie & Co Vet (eds.) *Cahiers Chronos 12, Temporalité et attitude: structuration du discours et expression de la modalité*, 143-158. Rodopi: Amsterdam-NewYork.
- Koptievskaja Tamm, Maria. 1993. *Nominalization*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Koptievskaja Tamm, Maria. 2003. Action nominal constructions in the languages of Europe. In Plank, Frans (ed.) *Noun Phrase Structure in the languages of Europe*, 621–722. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Koptievskaja Tam, Maria. 2005. Action nominal constructions. In Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *World Atlas of language Structures*, 254-257. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oisel, Guillaume. 2013. *Morphosyntaxe et sémantique des auxiliaires et des connecteurs du Tibétain littéraire. Etude diachronique et synchronique*. Thèse de Doctorat. Université de Paris 3.
- Suzuki, Hiroyuki. 2009. Introduction to the method of the Tibetan linguistic geography – a case study in the Ethnic Corridor of West Sichuan. In Nagano, Yasuhiko (ed.) *Linguistic Substratum in Tibet – new perspective towards historical methodology (No. 16102001) Report Vol. 3*: 15-34.
- Tournadre, Nicolas & Sangda Dorje. 2003. *Manual of Standard Tibetan*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion.
- Tournadre Nicolas & Suzuki, Hiroyuki. Forthcoming (a). *The Tibetic languages*.
- Tournadre, Nicolas. Forthcoming (b). *The Tibetic languages and their classification*, Brill.
- Vokukova, Z. 2008. *Epistemic modalities in spoken standard Tibetan*. PhD thesis, Karlova Univerzita (Prague) and Université de Paris 8.

Author's address:

Nicolas Tournadre
Aix-Marseille University and Lacito (CNRS)
29 av Robert Schumann,
13621 Aix-en-Provence, cedex 1
France

Email: nicolas.tournadre@univ-amu.fr