



HAL
open science

Nominalization and its various uses in Thulung

Aimée Lahaussais

► **To cite this version:**

Aimée Lahaussais. Nominalization and its various uses in Thulung. Languages of the Tibeto-Burman Area, 2003, 26 (1), pp.33-57. <halshs-00004758>

HAL Id: halshs-00004758

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00004758v1>

Submitted on 30 Sep 2005

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Nominalization and its various uses in Thulung Rai¹

Aimée Lahaussais
LACITO-CNRS
Villejuif, France

The phenomenon of extensive nominalization in Sino-Tibetan languages is a pattern whose extent was first described by Matisoff for Lahu (Matisoff 1972), and has been described as typical for Sino-Tibetan nominalization (Bickel 1999), with the same morpheme found in languages throughout Tibeto-Burman for nominalization, relativization, and also sometimes to express a genitive relationship.

For Lahu, this pattern is seen in the various uses of *ve* in the following examples (all from Matisoff 1972).

Genitive

1. $\eta\grave{a}$ ve $m\acute{i}-ch\grave{o}$
 I shoulder-bag
 ‘my shoulder-bag’

Relativization

2. $v\grave{a}?$ qhe chu ve $P\acute{i}ch\grave{o}-p\bar{a}$ \hat{o} $t\hat{e}$ $\gamma\hat{a}$
 pig as fat Shan that one person
 ‘That Shan over there who’s fat as a pig’

Nominalization

3. $\text{ɔ-}\acute{s}i$ $t\acute{o}?$ la ve $th\grave{a}?$ $n\acute{o}$ $m\acute{a}$ γa $m\acute{o}$ $l\acute{a}$
 blood emergecome ACC you NEG get see Q
 ‘Didn’t you see that blood was coming out?’

The relationship between these functions and their development from an original nominalizer has also been discussed by DeLancey (1989, 1999, In press) and Noonan (1997). DeLancey describes the relationship between nominalization and relativization as follows: “relativization in TB is a subspecies of clausal nominalization. The modifying clause is nominalized, and then stands in either a genitive or an appositive relation to the head noun” (In press). As for genitivization, he states that it is “far from a universal TB feature” but still found in a number of languages, such as Jingphaw, Southern Chin, Chantyal (to cite but a few.) Noonan concurs with DeLancey’s proposals, and suggests that the ‘genitival’ use of nominalizers may be a function of the extension of the attributive sense which was associated with nominalizers through use in relative clauses.

¹This paper has benefitted greatly from discussion with Boyd Michailovsky, Martine Mazaudon, Scott DeLancey and Jim Matisoff. It differs from a presentation I gave at BLS in 2002 in that I have since identified a wider distribution of nominalizers in Thulung. The present paper also acknowledges *-pa* as a nominalizer, whereas this morpheme was not even mentioned in the BLS presentation.

The SSTN pattern is found extensively in Thulung Rai, a language spoken by about a thousand people in Eastern Nepal and grouped with other Rai languages (Ebert 2003). The purpose of this paper is to present the extent of nominalization in Thulung, and see how the work is divided among the various nominalizers. There are two main classes of these ‘nominalizers’² in Thulung: the simpler one is a nominalizer *-pa* (which DeLancey shows is found throughout the Bodic branch, and which may have a variant *-p* in Thulung), and the other is a group of nominalizers all sharing an initial bilabial nasal. The second group is made up of *-m*, *-mim*, *-mu*, *-ma* in various distributions depending on the function. I would like to argue that these constitute reflexes of a same original nominalizer (with various pieces of extra phonological material) which I will call, for lack of a better notation, *-M*.

The uses of the two sets of nominalizers are laid out in the following table. Of the two nominalizers, the *-M* set is by far the more common, with *-pa* much more limited in the scope of its nominalization. In fact, while *-m* (and variants) can combine with a variety of parts of speech to form a nominal element, the input for nominalization with *-pa* is always a verb.

Table 1. Distribution of functions of nominalizers in Thulung.

-M : -m, -mim, -ma, -mu	-pa
infinitive (<i>-mu</i>)	participial relativization
clause nominalization (<i>-mu</i> , <i>-m</i> , <i>-mim</i>)	deverbal adjectives
verbal periphrasis : perfect aspect (<i>-m</i>), progressive aspect (<i>-mim</i>)	agent/instrumental nominals
demonstratives (<i>-m</i>)	(locative nominals in <i>-khop</i> ?)
participial relativization (<i>-ma</i>)	
finite relativization (<i>-m</i> , <i>-mim</i>)	
adjectives: colour terms (<i>-m</i>)	
possessive pronouns (<i>-ma</i>)	
possessor time words (<i>-m</i> , <i>-mim</i>)	
formation of case markers from other case markers (<i>-m</i>)	
(locative nominals in <i>-khom</i> ?)	

I begin by discussing the class of nominalizers with an *-M* element, as these cover a more extensive role of functions, and also include among them prototypical examples of nominalization.

-M

Nominalization often involves verbs, and most instances of complex distributions of nominalizers involve finite verbs. As a result, a brief description of the finite verb system is given as background to the discussion.

Thulung Rai is one of the complex pronominalizing languages of Nepal, with finite verbs taking agreement markers indicating the person and number of up to two arguments. The suffixes which mark the person/number combinations constitute large paradigms, which exist for past and non-past forms. The marking of tense is a fairly complex matter, with differences between the past and non-past person/number paradigms generally reflecting what appears to be an original /t/-like past marker. In addition to the differences in the past/non-past agreement

² Like Noonan, I use the term for the apparently related morphemes which participate in the SSTN pattern.

markers Thulung also has a system of verb stem alternation.³ Generally speaking, there are two stems for each verb root, and these stems are selected more or less according to tense. (An expanded explanation of this complicated situation is given in Lahaussais 2003.) As a general rule, the least complex transitive verb forms will be those with a non-past 3s or 1pi agent and a 3s patient. These are the combinations which result in mono-syllabic verb forms.

1. Infinitive form of verbs

The infinitive suffix is *-mu*. Matisoff says that “as a general rule of thumb applicable throughout the Tibeto-Burman family, whenever one discovers the particle used in verb citation, one can be sure of having discovered the most important nominalizer of the language.”(1972: 248)

si-mu ‘to die’

po-mu ‘to eat’

Additionally, so-called infinitive forms are found in *-mmi* or *-mutsi*, with plural and dual patients/recipients respectively.

1pi, 2sP, 2p, 3sP, 3p: infinitive form in *-mmi* (as an alternative to the form in *-mu*)

1de, 1di, 2d, 3d: infinitive form in *-mutsi* (as an alternative to the form in *-mu*)

These forms are transparently the infinitive marker followed by an additional argument number marker.

2. Clause nominalization

Entire clauses can be nominalized, and can then be case-marked, to express cause or purpose, or as complements to a verb. This nominalization occurs by means of suffixes *-mu*, *-mim* or *-m*.

Nominalizations with *-mu* tend to have an unspecified S/A argument, but specification is also possible, as shown in 7.

4. make sinben-**mu** hapa *kam* bo-mu basi.
 grain plant-NOM much work make-NOM OBL
 ‘Planting grains requires a lot of work.’

5. on-**mu**-lai tsapa *bane*-mu basi.
 run-NOM-DAT strong make-NOM OBL
 ‘To run, one must make oneself strong.’

6. kho-**mu**-kam *lagi*...
 cook-NOM-GEN sake
 ‘In order to cook’

7. gui po-dji bre-**mu**-kam *lagi* *badzar* lo-mu-ŋa basi.
 1pe chicken-egg sell-NOM-GEN sake market go-NOM-EMPH OBL
 ‘We must go to the market to sell the eggs.’

In certain circumstances, the marker *-mu* can be reduced to *-m*. This is the case when the infinitive is followed by the obligation marker *basi* in rapid speech. The second clauses of

³ These alternations do not occur with all verbs, but are nevertheless an important part of the grammar.

examples 4 and 5 become *hapa kam bo-m basi* and *tsapa bane-m basi* respectively, with no difference in meaning from the versions above.

The nominalizers *-m* and *-mim* are used exclusively for finite clauses. The distribution of the two nominalizers is as follows:

-m can nominalize any clause provided its verb is at least bi-syllabic; *-mim* is used to nominalize any clause with a mono-syllabic verb, and can be used for any non-past clause (such as 16 below).⁴

8. [go *basi* dzam pe-uto-**m**]-ka homlo ntupa bu-ŋu
 [1s leftover rice eat-1s/3s.PST-NOM]-INSTR now sick be-1s
 ‘Because I ate leftover rice, I am sick now.’

9. [a-lwak-ka mysy-stu py-ry-**m**] a-mam-ka
 [1POSS-y.sibling-ERG buffalo-meat eat-3s.PST-NOM] 1POSS-mother-ERG
 bastaka stu-mri
 yesterday tell-3sP/3s.PST
 ‘My mother said that yesterday my brother ate buffalo meat.’

10. [sokmu-ra gypsy ŋur-**mim**] ɔsinda thuu-si
 [forest-LOC tiger roar.3s-NOM] here hear-1pi
 ‘Here we hear the tiger roar in the forest.’

11. [meram khram-**mim**]-ku u-jum plwas-i-ka
 [that.one cry.3s-NOM]-GEN 3POSS-power forget-1pi/3s-TEMP
 mytsy si-mi
 men die-3p
 ‘When we forget the power of his crying, people die.’

3. Verbal periphrasis

Perfect aspect is expressed by a nominalized finite verb followed by an inflected copula. The pattern of distribution of the nominalizers is as seen above.

12. bante lo-mri-**m** bu-mi
 where go-3p.PST-NOM be-3p
 ‘Where have they gone?’

13. khrekhreja be-pa lamdi lok-tsi rak-ta-**m** bu-mi
 bumpy do-PST.PRT road go-2d say-3s/3.PST-NOM be-3sP
 ‘She said “Take the bumpy road” (and it’s still what we are supposed to do.)’

14. homlo ne nemnem-ra ku-ku paip-mim
 now TOP each.house-LOC water-GEN pipe-PLU
 luk-ta-**m** bu

⁴ We see this pattern for relativization as well, as we would expect. The unusual distribution appears to reflect what was initially a more straightforward pattern: Allen reports *-mim* for non-past and *-m* for past (“It would seem that *mim* is to present tense forms what *-m* is to past tense ones” 1975: 88). Because all monosyllabic verb forms are necessarily mono-syllabic, there must have been a reanalysis of the conditioning for the two nominalizers.

emerge-3s.PST-NOM be.3s

‘Now, pipes for water come out into every house.’ (ie pipes have appeared)

I also have a limited sample of periphrasis used to express the progressive, with a non-past verb form, nominalized with *-mim*, followed by the copula.

15. *hɔʃar* by-**mim** bu
hurry make.3s-NOM be.3s
‘He’s in a hurry.’

16. *dhewan-ku tsu hɔlle-u-mim* bu-ɲu
Dhewan-GEN child rock-1s/3s-NOM be-1s
‘I am rocking Dhewan’s child.’

The above three types (infinitives, clause nominalizations, and verbal periphrasis) are classic examples of nominalization, where a verb or a clause is turned into a noun. We now look at some examples which are more distant from prototypical nominalization. The general explanation of the evolution from nominalization into other functions is the following: a nominalized phrase in apposition to a noun gets reinterpreted as a relative clause; the attributive meaning is then applied to other modifiers, such as non-relative attributives and genitive-like constructions.

4. Demonstratives

The proximal and distal demonstratives have two forms: a short form, *o* (proximal) and *mu* (distal), as well as a long form, *oram* (proximal) and *muram* (distal). The long forms appear to be composed of the deictic elements *o* and *mu*, the locative marker *-ra*, and the nominalizer *-m*.

<i>o-ra-m</i>	<i>mu-ra-m</i>
this-LOC-NOM	that-LOC-NOM
this (one)	that (one)

5. Relativization

There are two types of relativization: one type is based on finite verbs, while the other is based on participial forms.

The nominalizer *-M* participates in both types: the suffixes used in finite relativization are *-m* or *-mim*; participial relativization has a past participial form in *-ma* (while the non-past form is in *-pa*, seen below)

5.1. *-m/-mim* relativization: this type is based on a finite verb. *-m* is the general relativizer, and can be used in all cases (past and non-past) except for with mono-syllabic verbs; *-mim* is always used with mono-syllabic verbs, and can optionally be used in the non-past. This distribution is the same we saw for finite clausal nominalization.

17. [go khok-to-**m**/***-mim**] dzam brɔpa bai-ra
1s cook-1s/3s.PST-NOM rice good be-3s.PST
‘The food I cooked was good.’

18. [go dwak-pu-**m**/**-mim**] *kitab* gani-lai gwa-gwa

1s like-1s/3s-NOM book 2sP-DAT give-give
 dwa.
 like.3s/3s

'I want to give you a book I like.'

19. [gu-ka ra-**mim**/*-**m**] *bela*
 3s-ERG say.3s-NOM time
 'At the time when he says'

The original distribution appears to be based on tense (according to Allen, for whom *-mim* is the non-past and *-m* the past relativizer) but the distribution is now partly phonologically conditioned.

5.2. *-ma* relativization:

20. khok-**ma** dzam
 cook-PST.PRT rice
 'cooked rice (by anyone)'

21. mukli ra-**ma** *ʔau-nu*
 Mukli call-PST.PRT place-levLOC
 Over at a place called Mukli...

22. khlim-**ma** je
 plant-PST.PRT field
 'a planted field'

This relative form is in opposition to the non-past version, formed with the non-past-participial marker *-pa* (which is another nominalizer, described below.)

To explain the connection between relativization and nominalization, DeLancey posits an intermediary stage where the relative clause stands in apposition, as a nominal clause, to the following noun, and eventually took on an attributive sense. Thus for example 20 we can imagine a phase where

khok-ma dzam was in reality

'the cooked thing, rice'

with the nominal sense of the clause eventually evolving into the attributive sense we have now 'cooked rice'

This attributive sense is then extended to cover other situations such as adjectives appearing with nominalizers, and other types of non-relative attributives.

6. Adjectives: colour terms

lalam 'red'

gigim 'green'

kekem 'black'

ʔoʔom 'yellow'

bubum 'white'

nunum ‘blue’

The template for colour terms appears to be a reduplicated element, followed by a nominalizer *-m*. In the same way that the relative clause marked by a nominalizer has an attributive sense, the colour terms are used attributively.

7. Possessive pronouns

Each person has a generic possessive prefix, and a possessive pronoun which can be used prenominally or as an independent nominal. The possessive pronouns appear to be combinations of the prefix and a nominalizing element *-ma*.

1 person	a-	ama
2 person	i-	ima
3 person	u-	uma

23. ama/a-khlea ɖokpu bu.
1POSS-dog big be.3s
‘My dog is big.’

24. ama/*a- ɖokpu bu.
1POSS big be.3s
‘Mine is big.’

The possessive pronouns have both a modifying and nominal role, and the nominalizing element here can be seen both as nominalizing and ‘genitivizing’.

8. Possessor time words

These take *-m* or *-mim* in a genitive-like construction. The distribution is phonological: vowel-final words are followed by *-m*, and consonant-final by *-mim*. This distribution cannot be related to that for the same morphemes in relativization and clause nominalization, where syllable count and tense played a role. I do not as yet have an explanation for the distribution we see below.⁵

25. nemtha-**m** dzam
evening-NOM rice
‘the evening meal’

26. basta-**m** tsija
yesterday-NOM tea
‘Yesterday’s tea, leftover tea’

27. anep-**mim** din
today-NOM day
‘today’s days (these days)’

⁵ Functionally, the original distribution (ie *-m* for past, *-mim* for non-past) for clause nominalization and relativization was probably related to the fact that non-past forms were shorter and needed extra syllabic weight. Obviously such arguments are not valid in the context of possessor time words, and all that can be proposed is that *-m* after a consonant would be impractical to pronounce and *-mim* is therefore opted for.

The construction need not be followed by the noun it modifies, which is understood from context.

28. *tshori* *tsahi* *dams-ta,* *buddhabar-mim* *bai-ra.*
 daughter CONTR disappear-3s.PST Wednesday.NOM be-3s.PST
 ‘My daughter died, she was one born on a Wednesday.’

In the same way that finite clauses are relativized with *-m/-mim* and modify a noun phrase, the nominalizer can be used with a time word as an attribute of another noun phrase. Interestingly though, it is a very limited lexical class which can participate in this construction, namely only time words.

Noonan proposes this type of construction as being a crucial phase in explaining the association of what Matisoff calls ‘genitivization’ with the nominalizing and relativizing functions. The important step is the association of the attributive nature of the nominalizer, through its use in relativization, being extended to a genitive-type relationship (as the above could be paraphrased by using the genitive markers instead.) It is particularly significant, I believe, that we see the same two nominalizers here as we did for finite relativization, although the distribution is different in nature.

9. Case markers formed from case marker + nominalizer

I have found two case markers in Thulung for which we might posit, as an etymology, that they are derived from another case marker plus a nominalizing element. The relationship with nominalizers is much more speculative than the other types seen above, but it seems plausible that their development involved a nominalization.

9.1. Genitive marker *-kam*

One of the two standard genitive markers in Thulung is *-kam*. It alternates with *-ku*, with no difference in distribution of the two genitive markers. Both appear with body parts, kin terms, and anything else for which possession is expressed. Additionally, both can modify a noun which is already marked by a possessive pronoun (as in 30 and 32).

29. *po-ku* *d̥i*
 chicken-GEN egg
 ‘hen’s eggs’

30. *po-ku* *u-stu*
 pig-GEN 3POSS-meat
 ‘the pig’s meat’

31. *gai-kam* *gunu*
 cow-GEN inside
 ‘inside the cow’

32. *mtur-tsip-kam* *u-pap*

⁶ Sometimes the genitive marker is used in conjunction with a possessive pronoun. The doubling of possessive marking occurs with inalienable possession, such as when the possessed are body parts or kin. (But the possessive pronoun is not necessary for a grammatical expression even in these cases)

that-DU-GEN 3POSS-father
'their father'

The Thulung genitive marker *-kam* is mentioned in the Linguistic Survey of India: it is analyzed as *ka-m*, to be broken down into the instrumental 'by, by means of' and *-m* "which is originally a demonstrative pronoun or verb substantive, and which is used to form adjectives and nouns of agency in the same way as Bahing *mi*" (p 368) Although we find *-m* only in colour terms and not at all in 'nouns of agency', Konow clearly had good intuitions about the extent and role of nominalization in these languages.

One problem is the meaning of an instrumental followed by a nominalizer, and how that would result in a genitive meaning. What would make more sense as an explanation would be if the *-ka* in *-kam* were really the other genitive marker, *-ku*. In that case, we could posit another appositional situation: the genitival phrase would be nominalized by the *-m*, and in apposition to another noun; eventually, as seen elsewhere, the construction would be reinterpreted as being modifying rather than appositive, resulting in a double means of constructing a genitive: with the genitive *-ku*, and also with genitive + nominalizer, namely *-ka-m*, reinterpreted into a genitive marker of its own right. The main problem with this interpretation is the change in the vowel.

9.2. Sociative marker *-num*

Another case marker which appears to be a composite is the sociative *-num*. This appears to be made up of *-nu*, the level locative marker, and the nominalizer *-m*.

The cognitive explanation for this would be that the sociative marker implies accompaniment, and that accompaniment goes well with the notion of a locative, especially one which highlights being at the same level as: *-nu* is a locative which specifies sameness in location, at least in the vertical dimension. Perhaps accompanying it with a nominalizer utilizes the genitive function implicit in the nominalizer

33. *sathi-num* lɔs-ta
friend-SOC go-3s.PST
'She went with her friend.'

This could perhaps be abstractly analyzed as
'she, at the same level as her friend's, went'

with a possible abstracted noun [side] or the like

Thus there would be a grammaticalization from being alongside to the notion of general accompaniment. The use of the marker is then extended to cases which do not indicate accompaniment of a physical sort but rather the more abstracted sense of the sociative.

34. go hari-**num** bia bet-to
1s Hari-SOC marriage do-1s/3s.PST
'I got married with Hari.'

It is also used to indicate possession when used with the copula, as in 35. Such a usage possibly ties in with the genitive-like function seen elsewhere.

35. go-**num** wosstu tsu bu
1s-SOC male child be.3s
'I have a son.'

We have seen the variety of roles covered by the nominalizer -M, and I would now like to explore possible cognates in other languages. DeLancey shows convincingly that the nominalizer *-pa* can be reconstructed to the proto-Bodic level, but says that ‘at a glance it seems that this is the only morpheme which can be reconstructed in a nominalizing/relativizing function for Proto-Kiranti.’ I would like to propose that the nominalizer -M can be reconstructed to the Proto-Kiranti level, as I find reflexes of it in a number of Kiranti languages, such as Bahing, Wombule, Dumi, Hayu, Khaling, Bantawa and Yamphu. Granted there is a problem with speaking of reflexes when the Thulung nominalizer is several distinct morphemes sharing an *-m*, but it is this *-m* that we recognize in the other languages, in functions which are covered by the SSTN pattern, even if individual languages only cover one or two of the various functions.

Bahing (Hodgson 1880)

The suffix *-m* or *-me* is seen to have many of the various functions of -M in Thulung. It can have “genitival force” as in

36. ru di-**m** khan
garden in-’s vegetables (357)

It is found with colour terms: bubum ‘white’, lalam ‘red’ and some adjectives: kwagname ‘other’ “so that the m final is shown to be generally possessive” (357.)

When *-me* is suffixed onto these attributives, the nominal form results: bubu-**mme** ‘the white one’, lala-**mme** ‘the red one’, kwagname ‘the other one.’

“[It is] seen [for participles] that all those which have not a sign of their own (ba or na) are made participles by the annexation of the m or me particle--juju-**m** [pointed <juju, point]... This is, in fact, the general attributive affix, and its suffixure transforms all qualitives (including adverbs) into substantives or words used substantively, like the hma gu affix of Newari...” (357-8)

Additionally Bahing has several participles (p367 ff), one of which expresses the participle of the object/instrument, and is formed with suffix *-me*. (eg. for ‘to eat’ the participle expresses ‘what is usually eaten, what or whom anyone eats, what he eats with’)

Wambule (Opgenort 2002)

Opgenort (2002: 234) lists *-me/-m* as a nominaliser: “nouns, adjectives and adverbs can be turned into nominals through suffixation of the Wambule reifying suffix...”, and says it is cognate with the Bahing nominalizing formative *-me*.

37. Im phālām-syā-**m** twām-lwā-**m** thi
that iron-SIM-RES heart/mind-LOC-RES was
‘She was one with a heart like iron.’

Also in Wombule, the nominalizer for the “imperfective reification of verbs” is *-meya/-mei*, and “can be traced back to the same historical source. This historical entity with an initial /m/ seems to be related to the Dumi imperfective and nominalising suffix <-m>” (294) “The phrase *he came* is turned into the reified phrase *the fact that he came*.” (293)

38. Un nā makai jā-nu-**mei** ?
you previously maize eat-2s-IPF
‘Did you eat maize previously?’ (perhaps=have you ever eaten maize?)

Hayu (Michailovsky 1988) has infinitive forms in *-mu* (99), as well as genitive marker *-mu* (166-7). Additionally, colour terms can end in *-mi* (120). While one would not claim based on such data that there is a nominalizer -M in Hayu, we see what may be traces of it in these forms, which span the nominalizing and modifying functions.

As for Khaling (Toba 1979), we also see evidence of some earlier nominalizing element with an *-m*. Adjectives of description, such as shape and colour, end in *-m* or *-mim*. For colours, *-mim* intensifies; the colour term is otherwise in *-m*; for shape, *-mim* is used with a stative verb to derive the adjective (30-1).

Khaling also forms relatives with *-m* (5):

39. am-ā yaad-ü-**m** pungme tā-bi gö
 he-AG like-3sg-rel flower here-in be inan.
 ‘Here is the flower he likes.’

In Bantawa (Rai 1985), we also find nominalizing elements in *-M*.

Verbal nouns are formed by a verbal root and suffix *-ma*, as in

go + ma=going

open+ma=opening etc

There is also an infinitive suffix *-ma*.

As for Yamphu (Rutgers 1998), *-ma/-m* is an attributive nominalizer, used to make adjectives from various parts of speech.

40. khoriya hi:ʔmeʔla.nuɲ.**ma**
 bowl lid.SOC.ATNR
 ‘lidded bowl’ (87)

“Adjectives themselves may be modified by the attributive nominaliser.” (87)

41. mada:ŋ utthri:ʔ.**ma** akma læ:tt.a
 mother_animal white.ATNR pig be.PT
 ‘The sow was a white pig.’

Other markers we see which are encompassed by the general scope of the SSTN and have an element *-M* are the standard genitive marker *-mi/-min* (62), and the infinitive suffix *-ma/-m* (195-200).

Based on this evidence, I would say that there is some reflex of an original *-M* nominalizer, expressing at least some of the functions we see in the most extensively nominalizing languages, in all of the languages above. Because of its limited functions in some cases, we probably do not want to call it a nominalizer in all these languages, certainly not synchronically, but I believe it reflects what was originally a nominalizer at the level these languages all trace back to, that is proto-Kiranti.

The distribution of the nominalizers is summarized here:

- mu infinitive, non-finite clause nominalization
- m any poly-syllabic finite clause nominalization or relativization; verbal periphrasis (expressing perfect); vowel-final possessor time words; color terms; demonstratives; formation of case markers
- mim mono-syllabic or any non-past finite clause nominalization or relativization; verbal periphrasis (expressing progressive); consonant-final possessor time words
- ma past non-finite relativization; possessive pronoun suffix

-PA

The nominalizer *-pa* is rather different from the *-M* class. For one thing, it has one form, which helps us trace it back to its proto-form, **-pa*, reconstructible to the proto-Bodic level. Interestingly, none of the uses of this nominalizer in Thulung are prototypical nominalizations; instead we have attributive senses. This nominalizer is found with non-past participial relatives, with deverbal adjectives, and with agent/instrumental nominals (Chantyal has the cognate nominalizer, *wa*, in the same role). The three seem to be closely related.

10. Relativization

As we saw above, participial relativization is accomplished by suffixing the participial endings on verb stems. The counterpart to the past participle *-ma* seen above is the non-past participle in *-pa*.

42. [nem bane-**pa**] a-lwak
 house make-NPST.PRT 1POSS-y.sibling
 ‘my brother who builds houses’
43. [gu-ka tsa-**pa**] *mambatti*
 3s-ERG light-NPST.PRT candle
 ‘The candle he lights’
44. [ku baɬ-**pa**] *pokhari*
 water be-NPST.PRT pond
 ‘A pond with water in it’
45. *pare-**pa*** *iskul*
 learn-NPST.PRT school
 ‘School for learning’

Participial relativization makes use of both ‘nominalizers’ *-ma* and *-pa*. DeLancey points out that these are strongly reminiscent of the Classical Tibetan gender suffixes (which are considered distinct, by most scholars, from the Classical Tibetan nominalizer *-pa*). Of course, the gender associations, if this were to be the correct etymology, are completely lost at this point, and the main thing coded by these nominalizers is tense. DeLancey compares Thulung participial relativization to that in Sunwar, where the cognate nominalizer *-pa* is also used but is associated with perfective aspect. This suggests that the Thulung association of *-pa* with non-past and *-ma* with past must have come at a later stage.

11. Deverbal adjectives

The following adjectives are deverbal, for which not all the input verbs are synchronically recognizable. This is a non-productive process (although this list is by no means complete.)

- jepa* ‘high’ <jemsimu ‘to stand’
dhypa ‘long’
teɬpa ‘smart’
tsapa ‘strong’ <tsammu ‘be able to’
dzupa ‘good’
tshəkpa ‘cold’
dzalpa ‘hot’

tsisiŋpa ‘wet’
kolpa ‘big’
nypa ‘nice’
bipa ‘rough’
krokpa ‘hard’
brepā ‘lazy’ <*bremlymu* ‘to feel lazy’
saŋpa ‘dry’ <*samu* ‘to dry’
khēpa ‘bitter’ <*khēmu* ‘to be bitter’
brōpa ‘tasty’ <*brōmu* ‘to have taste’
lempa ‘sweet’ <*lemmu* ‘to lick’
dukpa ‘spicy’ <*dumu* ‘to be spicy’
dzyrpa ‘sour’ <*dzyrmu* ‘to be sour’

12. Agent/instrumental nominals

The suffix *-pa* is used to create deverbal nouns which are agents or instruments.⁷ These seem rather clearly to have been derived from the non-past-participial relative, yet there is a difference: this is not a productive process, and a *-pa*-relative + noun cannot be converted on the fly to an agent/instrumental nominal. The special agent/instrumental nominal construction can only be used if there is a specific lexical/sociocultural slot.

12.1 Agent nominals

The following verbs give agent nominals exclusively.

<i>phirmu</i> ‘to sew’	<i>phirpa</i> ‘tailor’
<i>kam bomu</i> ‘to do work’	<i>kam bepa</i> ‘worker’
<i>bimu</i> ‘to beg’	<i>bipa</i> ‘beggar’
<i>bremu</i> ‘to sell’	<i>brepā</i> ‘salesman, shopkeeper’
<i>kurmu</i> ‘to carry’	<i>kurpa</i> ‘porter’
<i>paremu</i> ‘to study’	<i>parepa</i> ‘student’
<i>sisimu</i> ‘to learn, to study’	<i>sisipa</i> ‘student’
<i>simu</i> ‘to teach’	<i>sipa</i> ‘teacher’
<i>dzhomu</i> ‘to plow’	<i>dzhopa</i> ‘plower’
<i>ɖymmu</i> ‘to make from gold’	<i>ɖypa</i> ‘jeweler’
<i>ɖymmu</i> ‘to play music’	<i>ɖypa</i> ‘musician’
<i>khumu</i> ‘to steal’	<i>khupa</i> ‘thief’

and the more peculiar (and perhaps folk-etymologized)

<i>khrenmu</i> ‘to bite’	<i>khrepa/khrepā</i> ‘witch’
--------------------------	------------------------------

12.2. Agent and instrumental nominals

The following nouns can be both agents or instruments.

<i>rjamu</i> ‘to write’	<i>rjakpa</i> ‘pen; writer’
46. meram mytsy rjak-pa	<i>retsha</i>
that person write-NOM	appear

⁷We have the exceptional denominal noun as well, probably through extension of the nominalizer: *delpa* ‘villager’ from *del* ‘village’

‘He is a writer/scribe.’

47. go-lai ko-le **rjak-pa** ren-sakji
1s-DATone-CL write-NOM bring-2s/1s.IMP
‘Bring me a pen.’

khomu ‘to cook’

khokpa ‘cook; pot’

12.3. Instrumental nominals only

In some cases, the agentive reading is blocked and only instrumental nominals exist.

tshimu ‘to sweep’

tshipa ‘broom; *sweeper’

khlysimu ‘to wear shoes’

khlysipā ‘shoes, *shoe-wearer’

phɔlm̩u ‘to cut’

phɔlpā ‘knife, *cutter’

Intransitive and stative verbs are quite different. The noun resulting from nominalization with *-pa* is usually a term which describes a main characteristic of the item or group of items it refers to. In all likelihood, the nominal form here is a matter of a deletion of a generic noun with the adjective, to represent something characteristic of a particular quality or activity. Some examples follow.

dzyrmu ‘to be sour’

dzyrpa ‘sour-tasting fruits (lemons, limes)’

dumu ‘to be spicy’

dukpa ‘chili’

dzhumu ‘to jump down’

dzhukpa ‘monkey’

simu ‘to die’

sipa ‘corpse’

48. m̩u **si-pa** phar-ra mi-lɔk-sa
that die-NOM near-LOC NEG-go-2s.IMP
‘Don’t go near that corpse.’

13. Locative nominals, in *-khom* and *-khop*

There is yet another category of nominals in Thulung, which seems to show reflexes of the *-M* and *-pa* nominalizers: I call them locative nominals. They are locative nouns ending in *-khop* or *-khom*, with the sense ‘the place where X happens/is carried out,’ where *-khom* follows a noun, , and *-khop* follows a verbal input.

Nominal input:

tosi-khom ‘place for the Tosi festival’

bia-khom ‘place for the wedding’

khɔtser-khom ‘kitchen for preparation of wedding feast’

Verbal input:

ba-khop pe-khop ‘living space’ <*bumu* ‘to be’, *pomu* ‘to eat’ (both irregular, form compounds in *ba-* and *pe-* respectively)

ɔm-khop ‘bed’ <*ɔmmu* ‘to sleep’

gɔn-khop ‘chair, stool’ <*gɔnm̩u* ‘to sit’

dzam kho-khop ‘kitchen’ <*khomu* ‘cook’

khlysi-khop ‘shoes’ <*khlysimu* ‘to wear on feet’ (also *khlysipā* ‘shoe’, as above)

I have also found *-khom* in two place names in Thulung stories, Rɔbuɕkhom and Rambokhom.

These appear to be somewhat fossilized remnants of the nominalizers *-M* and *-pa*, with the *-khop* derivations sharing the deverbal feature of other *-pa* ‘nominalizations’. While this class is rather removed from the other examples of the two nominalizers we have seen, I believe it indicates how deeply imbedded into the language the phenomenon of nominalization has become (and the relevant morphemes as well.)

In sum, Thulung has two groups of nominalizers, one made up of morphemes all sharing an *-m*, and another nominalizer *-pa* (perhaps also *-p*). The *-M* group seem to be closely related from the distribution patterns we see which, depending on the function expressed, combines various of the nominalizers. I also see evidence of a nominalizing *-M*-like etymon which is found in various languages of the East Himalayish branch of Bodic. The bulk of the nominalizing work is carried out by *-M*. *-pa* is the other main nominalizer, seen in a much more limited number of functions, and all of its current uses are deverbal. This is believed to be the more archaic of the two nominalizers in Thulung, reconstructed by DeLancey to the Proto-Bodic level.

Abbreviations

CL classifier	INSTR instrumental	PLU plural
CONTR contrastive	levLOC level locative	POSS possessive pronoun
DAT dative	LOC locative	PST.PRT past participle
DU dual	NOM nominalizer	SOC sociative
EMPH emphasis	NEG negative	TEMP temporal
ERG ergative	NPST.PRT non-past participle	TOP topic
GEN genitive	OBL obligation	
IMP imperative		

Personal agreement markers show the person and number of the two arguments separated by a / in the order A/O.

Person/number is indicated by a combination of a number followed by s (singular), d (dual), p (plural), sP (singular polite), with e and i marking exclusive and inclusive respectively.

Additionally, .PST and .IMP indicate that it is a portmanteau morpheme covering person/number and either past or imperative respectively.

All lexical items (not grammatical) borrowed from Nepali (and in a few cases, English) appear in italics in the examples. Within the text of my discussion, italics serve to distinguish Thulung words from the English.

Bibliography

- ALLEN, Nicholas J. 1975. Sketch of Thulung grammar, with three texts and a glossary. *Cornell University East Asia Papers*, 6. Ithaca, NY.
- BENEDICT, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus*. Contributing editor: James A. Matisoff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BICKEL, Balthasar. 1999. "Nominalization and focus in some Kiranti languages." In *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*, ed. by Yadava and Glover, 271-96. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- DELANCEY, Scott. 1989. "Relativization and nominalization in Tibeto-Burman". Ms, University of Oregon.
- _____. 1999. "Relativization in Tibetan." In *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*, ed. by Yadava and Glover, 321-49. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- _____. In press. "Relativization in Bodic." *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: BLS.
- EBERT, Karen. 2003. "Kiranti languages: an overview." In *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, ed. by Graham Thurgood and Randy LaPolla, 505-15. London/New York: Routledge.
- GENETTI, Carol. 1992. "Semantic and grammatical categories of relative clause morphology in the languages of Nepal." *Studies in language* 16.405-27.
- GRIERSON, G.A. (ed.) 1903-28. *Linguistic Survey of India*. Vol 3: Tibeto-Burman Family, Pt I, Specimens of the Tibetan Dialects, the Himalayan Dialects, and the North Assam Group. Calcutta, 1909.
- HODGSON, Brian Houghton. 1880. *Miscellaneous essays relating to Indian subjects* Vol. I London: Trubner and Co, Ludgate Hill.
- LAHAUSSOIS, Aimée. In press. "Nominalization, relativization and genitivization in Thulung Rai." *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: BLS.
- LAHAUSSOIS, Aimée. 2003. "Thulung Rai". *Himalayan Linguistics*: Archive No. 1

- MATISOFF, James. 1972. "Lahu nominalization, relativization and genitivization." In *Syntax and semantics I*, ed. by J. Kimball, 237-57. New York: Seminar Press.
- MICHAILOVSKY, Boyd. 1988. *La langue hayu*. Paris : Editions du CNRS
- NOONAN, Michael. 1997. "Versatile nominalizations." In *Essays on language function and language type*, ed. by Joan Bybee, John Haiman, and Sandra A. Thompson, 373-94. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- OPGENORT, Jean R. 2002. *The Wambule language*. Amsterdam.
- RAI, Novel Kishore. 1985. *A descriptive study of Bantawa*. Poona: University of Poona dissertation.
- RUTGERS, Roland. 1998. *Yamphu*. Amsterdam: Center for Non-Western Studies.
- TOBA, Sueyoshi. 1979. "Khaling." *Asian and African grammatical manual*. N. 13d. Tokyo Gaikokugo Daigaku.