VOLUME 9 NUMBER 1 JUNE 2010

himalayan linguistics

Himalayan Linguistics: a free peer-reviewed web journal and archive devoted to the study of the languages of the Himalayas

www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/HimalayanLinguistics

Himalayan Linguistics
a free peer-reviewed web journal and archive devoted to the study of the languages of the Himalayas

Himalayan Linguistics is an online peer-reviewed journal specializing in the languages of the Himalayan region. We also publish grammars, dictionaries, and text collections. *Himalayan Linguistics* is free; that is, there is no subscription fee. The primary reason for this — and, indeed, for using the web journal as opposed to the printed paper format — is to make the information contained in the journal accessible to scholars in developing countries, in particular the countries of the Himalayan region. Web access is steadily increasing in these areas, and this technology allows fast and affordable access to current research. It is our hope that scholars from the Himalayan region will not only be able to access *Himalayan Linguistics,* but will also be active contributors to it.

The term "Himalayan" is used in its broad sense to include north-western and north-eastern India, where languages of Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Tibeto-Burman, and Austro-Asiatic linguistic stocks are spoken; the languages of Nepal, Bhutan and the Tibetan Plateau; the languages of northern Burma and Sichuan; and the languages of Nuristan, Baltistan and the Burushaski speaking area in the west.

ISSN 1544-7502
www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/HimalayanLinguistics

Table of contents

Note from the Editor

Issue 9.1 of *Himalayan Linguistics* represents a turning point for the journal. As most of our readers know, 2009 saw the deaths of two beloved colleagues, Michael Noonan and David Watters, who were both Associate Editors of *Himalayan Linguistics*. Admittedly, the journal languished for some months following this tragic coincidence of events, as I considered the best way to move forward with this important enterprise. In the fall of 2009, I called a cyber-meeting of the original *Himalayan Linguistics* Editorial Board, also attended by other interested scholars. The meeting was held through the medium of a wiki, and touched on a number of current issues in the scholarly publishing of online journals. The goal was to allow Himalayanist scholars a voice in the future directions of the journal and to determine changes that could be made in order to better meet the needs of the Himalayanist community. In addition, as there have been many changes in the practice of online scholarly publication since *Himalayan Linguistics*' inaugural issue in 2003, we also discussed how to update the journal so that it meets or exceeds current standards of practice.

Following this meeting, a number of significant changes were made. The most important of these was the constitution of a new Editorial Board, which is now made up of the following members; their geographic areas of expertise are given in parentheses:

It gives me great pleasure to have the assistance of such a senior and accomplished group of scholars, who together represent the entire breadth of the Himalayan region. From this point forward, submissions can be made to either the Editor or any of the Associate Editors, who will play an active role in the editorial process.

The other major change to *Himalayan Linguistics* is in the frequency of publication. Previously, each paper constituted a unique issue in either the articles section, the book reviews and notices section, or in the Archive of grammars, dictionaries, and texts. We are now combining journal articles, book reviews, and book notices into semi-annual issues, to be published in June and December of each year. We hope that this will provide motivation to authors and editors alike to keep up a brisk pace of work on submissions. This will also allow the journal to be judged on its timeliness, so that after establishing a track record of regular publication we can be considered for ranking. Although many (including myself) view the current attention to comparative rankings of academic journals as an unfortunate development – especially for journals like Himalayan Linguistics, which are designed for specialists of a comparatively small academic audience – many

universities are considering these rankings quite seriously in assessing the quality of faculty in the hiring and promotion process. Not being ranked can constitute a disincentive to publish in a journal, especially for young scholars in the pre-tenure phase. We are hoping to address this issue with these changes.

It is important to note that this new semi-annual packaging will only affect the timing of journal articles and book reviews and notices. Grammars, dictionaries, and text collections will continue to constitute a separate series of independently published monographs referred to as the "Archive". These have an independent numbering system (e.g. Himalayan Linguistics Archive 2 is Michael Noonan's *Chyantyal Discourses*) and will appear with variable frequency, as they are completed.

Other changes include the following:

- A redesign of the website, allowing searchable pages for all HL articles, reviews, and Archive issues
- The institution of "double-blind" peer review, as explained in our statement on peer reviewing
- The use of "keywords" to increase the likelihood that an article will be found by a browser in an Internet search
- A new layout for the article with a distinctive "publishing-house" look
- The ability to download the entire *HL* issue, as well as individual pieces

I am very happy to inaugurate the new changes with *Himalayan Linguistics* 9.1. The items in this volume represent both the diversity and the excellence of scholarship in this region. Geographically, the languages represented here span the entire Himalayan area: from the Chitral Valley in Pakistan (Liljegren), to Nepal and the Tibetan plateau (Jacques; Zeisler's review of Huber), northeastern India (Peterson), and Sichuan (Shirai). The articles are also diverse in their subject matter, ranging from detailed syntactic analysis (Liljegren), to sensitive semantic investigation (Shirai), the creative genius of elaborative expressions (Peterson), and erudite historical studies (DeLancey and Jacques). DeLancey's vast work on Tibeto-Burman verb morphology is of particular note. It represents the culmination of decades of scholarship and provides a definitive statement on one of the most hotly contested issues in Tibeto-Burman linguistics. What this compendium illustrates is the richness, subtlety, and complexity of language as seen through the many lenses of Himalayan linguistic communities. Zeisler's review of Brigitte Huber's *Grammar of Lende* rounds out the volume, reflecting the immense value the Editors of *Himalayan Linguistics* place on the production of high-quality descriptive materials.

The Editorial Board hopes that you will be pleased with these changes. As always, we welcome your feedback and suggestions.

Carol Genetti
Editor

Abstracts

Towards a History of Verb Agreement in Tibeto-Burman

Scott DeLancey
University of Oregon

ABSTRACT
This article contributes to the case for reconstructing verb agreement for Proto-Tibeto-Burman. It shows first that, given the distribution of cognate agreement systems across the family, there is no alternative to reconstructing it for the proto-language. Secondly it describes the paths by which agreement has been lost in those languages where it is absent.

Evidence is presented to demonstrate the prevalence of evidence for the PTB paradigm in languages across the family. It is shown that, contrary to assertions which have been made in the literature, the agreement systems of Jinghpaw, Nocte, and Northern Chin are cognate to those of the so-called "Rung" branches (Kiranti, rGyalrongic-Qiangic, Nungish, and West Himalayan), and that even without, but especially with, this evidence the "Rung" hypothesis is inconsistent with other proposals for subgrouping Tibeto-Burman. Once the cognacy of the Jinghpaw and Nocte systems is recognized, there is no further reason to believe in a genetic "Rung" unit. Several case studies are presented which show that agreement systems can be quickly and easily lost in TB languages, as a result of intense language contact and/or through the replacement of older finite structures by innovative new constructions based on clausal nominalization.

KEYWORDS
Tibeto-Burman, verb agreement, subgrouping, Rung, Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw

---

A possible trace of verbal agreement in Tibetan

Guillaume Jacques
CNRS (CRLAO)
INALCO

ABSTRACT
In the Sino-Tibetan family, some languages have complex verbal agreement systems (Rgyalrong, Kiranti), while others (such as Chinese, Lolo-Burmese and Tibetan) seem to show no trace of any relational morphology on the verb. No consensus has yet emerged concerning the antiquity of agreement morphology in Sino-Tibetan: some scholars view it as retention, while others argue it to be the result of independent innovations.

In this article, we propose that the irregular verb za 'to eat' in Tibetan preserves an indirect trace of verbal agreement. The past tense of this verb, zos, presents an -a/-o alternation without equivalent elsewhere in the language, and a similar irregular alternation is found in the cognates of this verb in various Sino-Tibetan languages (including Kiranti and Qiangic). Evidence from Kiranti languages show that this vowel alternation originally reflects the fusion of the stem vowel with a third person patient past tense *-u suffix. This suggests that Tibetan and other Bodish languages used to have a full-fledge agreement system which disappeared at an early stage, only leaving indirect traces.

KEYWORDS
Tibetan, agreement, irregular verbs, Limbu, Bantawa, Tangut

Where have all the verbs gone?
On verb stretching and semi-words in Indo-Aryan Palula

Henrik Liljegren
Stockholm University
SIL International

ABSTRACT
The prevalence of complex predicates consisting of a verb component (verbalizer) and a non-verb component (host) is well-known from descriptions of languages in large parts of West and South Asia. Looking particularly at data from the hitherto less-studied Indo-Aryan Palula (Chitral Valley, Pakistan), we will explore their position within the total verb lexicon. Instead of regarding the verbalizers and hosts as building blocks that due to their respective properties license particular argument structures, as has been done in some previous descriptions, I propose that it is the construction as a whole, and its semantics, that assigns case and selects arguments. Rather than seeing a strict dichotomy between verbalizers (also called "light verbs") used in complex predicates and the corresponding simple verbs, a few highly generic verbs (BECOME, DO, GIVE) seem to be exposed to a high degree of "stretching". As such they stand as syntactic models – basic argument templates (BAT) – when forming novel complexes, sometimes involving host elements that lack a lexical identity of their own (hence semi-words) in the language as of today.

KEYWORDS
Palula, light verbs, complex predicates, basic argument templates, semi-words, verb stretching

---

Khumi Elaborate Expressions

David A. Peterson
Dartmouth College

ABSTRACT
This paper investigates the phenomenon of elaborate expressions (EEs) as manifested in Bangladesh Khumi, a language belonging to the Kuki-Chin branch of Tibeto-Burman. In strictly formal terms, Khumi EEs are quasi-reduplicative, compound-like structures consisting of an element which imparts meaning to the whole expression, and a second element which ranges from reduplicative template (e.g., mi-maay, elab(oration)-fire 'fire') to formally constrained nonce elements (srúng-sraaw, elab-tobacco 'tobacco'), to otherwise meaningful elements which bear some semantic resemblance to their paired element (uy-klaay, dog-monkey 'dog'). Consideration of the use of EEs in a large naturalistic text corpus suggest that their occurrence in Khumi encodes relatively expectable meanings associated with reduplicative structures, rather than simply being used for stylistic or aesthetic effect. EEs often appear to be involved in marking the intensified or distributed nature of the event, hardly surprising given the tendency for reduplication to code such categories cross-linguistically. More noteworthy, however, is the incidence of EEs in contexts where they indicate a more abstract nuance, attributed to the emotional intensity of what a speaker or narrator is expressing. EE use in these contexts may nevertheless be accounted for under the general rubric of intensification.

KEYWORDS
elaborate expression, reduplication, intensification, templatic morphology, Kuki-Chin, Khumi

Perfect constructions with existential verbs in nDrapa

Satoko Shirai
Nagoya Institute of Technology

ABSTRACT
This paper aims to provide a full analysis of perfect constructions with existential verbs in nDrapa. Semantically, such construction conveys either a resulting state or a persistent situation, in accordance with the aspectual type of the situation. Syntactically, the existential verb in the perfect construction is not thoroughly grammaticalized as an aspect marker, but retains some element of its core meaning such as denoting that an entity exists. Moreover, they show distinct features from the serial verb constructions in terms of the affixation. Regarding a possible historical origin of the perfect constructions with existential verbs, I conclude that it is the functional borrowing from the neighboring languages.

KEYWORDS
existential verb, resultative, perfect, aspect, language contact

Himalayan Linguistics, Vol. 9(1). © Himalayan Linguistics 2010
ISSN 1544-7502

Towards a History of Verb Agreement in Tibeto-Burman[*]

Scott DeLancey
University of Oregon

In this paper I return once again to the question of the Proto-Tibeto-Burman provenance of the suffixal verb agreement system which is substantially retained in Kiranti, Kham, Chepang, Nungish, and rGyalrongic, and remains in clearly recognizable form in many other languages of the Qiangic, West Himalayan, East Bodish, Mizo-Kuki-Chin, and Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw branches of TB. Over the past several decades a strong case has been presented that these languages retain agreement morphology from a paradigm which is reconstructible for Proto-Tibeto-Burman (Henderson 1957, Bauman 1974, 1975, 1979, DeLancey 1980, 1981a, 1983, 1988, 1989, van Driem 1993a, 1999, Sun 1983, 1988, 1995, Watters 2002, inter alia). However, there remains a significant body of opinion in the field which holds that the case has not yet been made, and that it is more likely that the verb agreement is a secondary feature which has developed in a subset of the family (Matisoff 1993, Nishi 1995, LaPolla 2001, 2003a, 2005). With this contribution I hope to finally lay the issue to rest.

0 Introduction

After a century and a half of research on Tibeto-Burman, the question of the historical status of verb agreement in the family remains one of the more vexed and controversial issues in TB linguistics. As implied by the name, the original European conception of TB grammar was based on the two great literary languages of the family, Tibetan and Burmese. Since neither language has any system of agreement in the verb, the absence of any such feature has traditionally been considered a part of what Bauman (1975) calls the "morpho-syntactic stereotype" of the family. On the other hand, the fact that some languages of the family do show very elaborate verb agreement systems has been known since the pioneering work of Hodgson (1857). But since this feature is not part of the traditional "stereotype" of TB, it was assumed to be a secondary development, possibly borrowed from Indo-European or Munda. Over the course of the second half of the 20th century, an ever-increasing amount of evidence has accumulated which shows evidently cognate verb agreement paradigms to be widespread throughout the family.

There remains, however, a body of opinion which adheres to the older view that the phenomenon of verb agreement is somehow foreign to the spirit of TB, and that everywhere that it occurs in the family it is necessarily a secondary development. Randy LaPolla, the leading exponent of this view, has argued steadily against the idea that agreement should be reconstructed

[*] I am grateful to David Bradley and Guillaume Jacques, whose advice and suggestions have materially improved this paper.

for PTB. In earlier work, LaPolla threw out a volley of objections to the hypothesis of PTB agreement, not all of them mutually compatible (LaPolla 1989, 1992, 1994). In recent statements (LaPolla 2003a, 2005), he moves to a position considerably closer to the majority view, in that he recognizes that many of the agreement systems in the family, in branches not formerly considered to be genetically close, are cognate and must be reconstructed for the common ancestor of a substantial portion of the family. He now acknowledges that the agreement systems of West Himalayan, Kiranti, rGyalrongic, and Nungish are indisputably cognate, and suggests (2003b) that Qiang is also associated with this branch, thus conceding the greater part of the argument. However, he considers these groups to represent a distinct genetic subgroup of TB, "Rung", and attributes the agreement system only to the common ancestor of that branch. He still states that the suffixal agreement paradigms of Jinghpaw and Nocte, which are generally recognized as belonging to the same Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw (Burling's "Sal") branch of the family (Burling 1983, Thurgood 2003), are not cognate with each other, much less with these others, and thus presumably must have been independently innovated, either through parallel evolution or through contact. He also maintains his argument that branches of the family such as Lolo-Burmese which lack verb agreement must never have had it.

Thus there remain two major issues between LaPolla and those who attribute verb agreement to PTB: the cognacy of the Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw (and Northern Chin, as we will discuss below) suffixes to the rest of the family, and the origin of non-agreement in branches such as Bodo-Garo and Lolo-Burmese. In this paper I will present a set of arguments in which these issues are intertwined. In Section 2, I will argue that the agreement systems of Nocte, Jinghpaw, and Northern Chin are cognate to those of the rest of the family, so that any "Rung" solution will have to be even broader and more improbable than the current proposal. In Section 3, I will present case studies showing the primary mechanisms by which TB languages, including close relatives of Jinghpaw-Nocte and of Northern Chin, have lost verb agreement, and evidence that these mechanisms are in fact the explanation for the prevalence across the family of languages which lack this feature.

As a preface to this I will outline in Section 1 the overall logic of the argument for reconstructing a verb agreement paradigm for Proto-Tibeto-Burman. This is for only for background to the following sections, and is not intended as a definitive demonstration or reconstruction. The case for PTB agreement, with proposed reconstructions, is laid out in detail in the references listed in the first paragraph. I will, however, note in passing remnants of the PTB system in a few languages outside the established genetic nuclei, including both languages which conceivably could be Rung, if such a thing existed (Newar, Thangmi) and languages which presumably would not be (Kaman, Dhimal, Lepcha). I bring these in partly for their evidentiary value, but also to counter the assertion sometimes made (e.g. LaPolla 1992:301) that verb agreement systems are a rare phenomenon in the family.

The substantive contributions of this paper are the further demonstration (after Henderson 1957, Bauman 1975, DeLancey 1989, and van Driem 1993a) that the Jinghpaw, Nocte, and Northern Chin agreement paradigms are highly relevant to the issue, and the presentation of a set of mechanisms which can easily explain the widespread independent loss of verb agreement in many languages and branches of the family.

1 The Agreement Hypothesis

The simple reason for the controversy is that a substantial number of TB languages have verb agreement, and a substantial number lack it. Neither pattern is restricted to a particular genetic or areal subset of the family; rather, both "Pronominalized" and non-"Pronominalized" languages are found across major branches, and throughout the length and breadth of the geographical range of the family. LaPolla once wrote of "the small number of languages that have verb agreement systems" (1992: 299), "almost all geographically contiguous" (1992: 300), neither of which is an entirely reasonable claim. There are over three dozen languages with indisputably cognate agreement systems in eastern Nepal alone, with at least as many more (depending on exactly how one counts "languages") scattered across the rest of the family. And TB languages with apparently cognate suffixal agreement systems range from Rangpo in Uttarakhand in the west to Jinghpaw in Yunnan in the east, and from rGyalrongic in Sichuan in the north to Northern Chin in Manipur and western Burma in the south – an area which is "contiguous" only in the sense that all Tibeto-Burman-speaking territory is contiguous.

The various agreement systems show both striking morphological similarities and important differences. On the one hand, we find systems whose similarities are of a sort which cannot possibly be due to chance in languages widely separated geographically and (at least on any plausible current subgrouping scheme) genetically, as between Kiranti and Jinghpaw. On the other, we find systems which cannot plausibly be cognate – for example, the exclusively or almost exclusively prefixal agreement paradigms of the Mizo-Kuki-Chin languages cannot be directly cognate to the primarily or exclusively suffixal systems of Qiang or Western Kiranti.

LaPolla wants to place most of the languages with verb agreement in a genetic "Rung" unit within Tibeto-Burman comprising rGyalrong, Nungish, Kiranti, Kham, and Western Himalayan, on the basis of "clearly cognate complex person marking systems",[1] which he regards as a Rung-level innovation. He also reconstructs for Proto-Qiangic an agreement system which he suspects "may be related at a very deep time depth to the system of the Rung group" (2003a: 30); Thurgood's version of Rung, which LaPolla presumably supports, explicitly includes Qiangic as well as the Central Nepal languages Kham and (provisionally) Magar and Chepang (Thurgood 2003). This does begin to sound like "deep time depth" indeed, but for LaPolla it is not yet PTB. LaPolla mentions agreement in Jinghpaw and Nocte, but doubts that these systems are cognate with one another, and asserts without argument, or reference to the contrary claims of Bauman (1975), DeLancey (1989), and van Driem (1993a), that the Jinghpaw system "is not cognate with that of the Rung group" (2003a: 32).

In section 1.1 and 1.2 we will examine a small sample of the abundant evidence for the cognacy of these and other agreement systems. Since the cognacy of the agreement systems of the West Himalayan, Kiranti, Kham-Chepang, Nung, and Qiangic (including rGyalrongic) groups is no longer in dispute (see sec. 1.1), I will not present detailed arguments for this claim; more extensive comparisons have been given elsewhere (see the references above), and need not be repeated here. In outlining these languages I will concentrate on data which will be useful in our comparison of these with the Jinghpaw-Konyak and Northern Chin paradigms in Section 2.

[1] Almost all comparative research on the verbal suffixes discussed here is based on the inspectional similarity of contemporary forms, rather than on phonological comparison or branch-level reconstruction. I will therefore adopt Bauman's (1975) convention of marking inferred suffixes with # to indicate that these are preliminary reconstructions whose exact form remains a question for further research.

1.1 First and second person suffixes

The essential case for reconstructing an agreement paradigm is easily illustrated by a few verb forms (see Sun 1983 for a similar illustration using a substantially different set of languages).

1.1.1 First person indices

In each of the examples below, the final morpheme indicates 1st person singular agreement:[2,3]

lCogtse (rGyalrongic)	jə-pi-**ŋ**	'AORIST-come-**1SG**'
Trung (Nungish)	ta-**ŋ**	'hear-**1SG**'
Sunwar (Kiranti)	pi-**ŋa**	'come-**1SG**'
Rangpo (W. Himalayan)	rha-**ŋ**	'come-**1SG**'
Jinghpaw (BKJ)	wa r-**iŋ**	'return CISLOCATIVE-**1SG**'
Nocte (BKJ)	ka ^{1}r-**ʌŋ**	'go CISLOCATIVE-**1SG**'
Tiddim (Mizo-Kuki-Chin)	pai \n-**iŋ**	'go FUTURE-**1SG**'

Table 1: Tibeto-Burman 1st person singular forms

Obviously, given independent evidence that these are related languages, our first reaction to these data will be to hypothesize that the agreement markers, and the system of which they are part, are cognate. But, of course, if the issue were so simple there would be no debate about it.

One long-standing argument is that the pronominal origin of these suffixes is so transparent that they must be relatively new developments. In most of the languages on the list (though not, let us note, in Sunwar, Rangpo, or Tiddim) the independent 1st person pronoun is a very direct reflex of PTB *#ŋa*, and this would seem to be the source for the agreement suffix. Thus it might be possible to imagine this set of data as representing widespread independent parallel developments. To support this argument Matisoff (1993) presents a purported instance of recent development of pronominal verb agreement in the Loloish language Sangkong. Sangkong has a conjunct (DeLancey 1992a) or egophoric (Tournadre 2008) particle *ŋa*^{55}, which is homophonous with the 1st person singular pronoun. Since conjunct or egophoric forms occur primarily in 1st person declarative sentences, one can understand the temptation to interpret the particle as a grammaticalization of the pronoun, and thus an example of an innovative verb agreement system. But what is described for Sangkong is quite clearly an egophoric system, not a true agreement system. Note first that the system makes only a two-way distinction, between 1st and non-1st person; typical TB agreement systems, in contrast, tend to pay particular attention to 2nd person, often distinguishing it with extra or innovative marking. But the critical evidence – explicitly noted

[2] Sources for data used in this paper will be cited at first mention of the language.

[3] Sunwar data in this paper are my own (see also Genetti 1988a, Borchers 2008); Jinghpaw data are my own, provided by LaRaw Maran (see also Hanson 1917, Dai and Xu 1992); Nocte forms are from unpublished notes of the late Alfons Weidert (see also Weidert 1985), who re-elicited the paradigms in Das Gupta 1971. Other sources for this table are: lCogtse (Nagano 1984), Trung (Sun 1982, also Lo 1945), Rangpo (Zoller 1983), Tiddim Chin (Henderson 1965).

by Matisoff – that the system is fundamentally an evidential system, not an agreement paradigm, is the fact that 3rd person clauses occur with the supposed "1st person" affixes to indicate direct evidentiality (Matisoff 1993: 132-3). Finally, Matisoff provides a very plausible etymology for the non-1st person form in an old copula **ray*. All of this is quite normal for a conjunct-disjunct system, which, unlike true verb agreement, is actually attested in Loloish, in Akha (Egerod and Hansson 1974). The oddity of Sangkong, if it were actually the case, would be the intrusion of a pronominal element into the system, which is not in the least typical of conjunct-disjunct marking. But this is illusory. The conjunct particle in Sangkong, and its Akha cognate *ŋáa*, are related not to the pronominal root but to the locative copula represented by Akha *ŋə* 'to be', Jinghpaw *ngà* 'to be, exist, be located', Japhug rGyalrong *ŋu* 'be' (Jacques 2004: 304), etc. Both Loloish languages have very ordinary, well-behaved egophoric systems, based on copulas as such systems in TB typically are, and have no connection to pronouns or to verb agreement systems.

1.1.2 Second person indices

We see a different problem in the 2nd person forms. In Table 2 I have added one more Nungish and two Kiranti languages for reasons that will become evident:[4]

lCogtse (rGyalrongic)	**tə**-po-**n**	'2-go-**2SG**'
Trung (Nungish)	**nɯ**-tɔ	'2-hear'
Rawang (Nungish)	**é**-di	'2-go'
Sunwar (Kiranti)	pi–**ye**	'come-**2SG**'
Thulung (Kiranti)	jar-**na**	'fall-2SG'
Limbu (Kiranti)	**kɛ**-thaŋ	'**2SG**-come.up'
Rangpo (W. Himalayan)	gya-**n**	'go-**2/3SG**'
Jinghpaw (BKJ)	wa r-**in**	'return CISLOCATIVE-**2SG**'
Nocte (BKJ)	ka **ɔʔ**	'go-**2SG**'
Tiddim (Mizo-Kuki-Chin)	pai **tɛʔ**	'go-**2SG**'

Table 2: Tibeto-Burman 2nd person singular forms

We have here a presumptive case for a 2nd person suffix *#-n(a)*, but we also have several apparently non-cognate forms, as well as several languages with a prefix instead of or in addition to a suffix. One striking fact is that these innovations appear to be quite shallow; note that within Kiranti, Thulung has retained the original suffix, while Sunwar seems to have replaced it with a different suffix, and Limbu with a prefix. Similarly note that Jinghpaw and Nocte, which we will see are closely related, both retain the old 1st person suffix, but Nocte has innovated a new 2nd person morpheme. Finally, note the prefixes; not only are the rGyalrong, Limbu, and Nungish forms different, even the two Nungish forms have no evident resemblance to each other. In fact, as

[4] Rawang (Barnard 1934), Thulung (Allen 1975, Lahaussois 2003), Limbu (van Driem 1987).

documented by Bauman (1975) there is a tendency across the family to innovate not only new 2nd person forms, but whole new constructions, often involving new prefixes.[5]

1.1.3 The transitive paradigm

Many TB languages have distinct intransitive and transitive verb conjugations. Comparison of the transitive paradigms provides stronger and deeper evidence for cognacy. Consider the following forms, where e.g. "1→2" labels a verb form with 1SG subject and 2SG object. (The meaning of "P" in the Jinghpaw and Nocte columns will be given below in Section 2.1):[6]

	lCog-tse	Proto-Qiang	Rawang	Sunwar	Jinghpaw	Nocte
1→2	tə-a-V-n	*V-aŋ	V-ŋ	V-na	P-ŋ	P-ɛ
1→3	V-ŋ	*V-w-aŋ	V-ŋ-u	V-ŋa	P-ŋ	P-ʌŋ
2→3	tə- V(-u)	*V-wa-n	é-V-u	V-wa	P-n	P- ɔʔ
3→3	V-u	*V-wa	V-u	V-wa	P-uʔ	P-a
3→2	tə- V-n	*V-s-an	é-V	V-n	P-n	P-h-ɔʔ
3→1	u-V-ŋ	*V-s-aŋ	é-V-ŋ	V-yi	P-ŋ	P-h-ʌŋ
2→1	kə-u-V-ŋ	*V-n	é-V-a	V-yi	P-ŋ / -n	P-h-ʌŋ

Table 3: Transitive verb forms in "Rung" and Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw

There are two important correspondences across these forms which provide strong evidence for their cognacy. The first is the *-u* ~ *-wa* found in 3rd person object forms in rGyalrongic, Qiangic, Nungish and Kiranti. It has generalized to a 3rd person index (i.e. not restricted to objects) in Jinghpaw (see Section 2.1.1), and we will see it indexing 3rd person in other secondary subject-agreement paradigms. This etymon is important because, unlike the 1st *-ŋ* and 2nd *-n* forms, it does not represent a widespread pronominal root; although demonstrative roots in /o/ or /u/ occur in various languages, and it is quite likely that the agreement suffix is related to a PTB distal demonstrative root *#u* ~ *ə* (Benedict 1982), we cannot look at most of the languages in Table 3 and immediately see the likely source for *-u* as an agreement marker, as we often can for the 1SG suffix. The suffix cannot be explained away as a recently grammaticalized pronoun in a language or branch which has no such pronoun. (For additional evidence for the antiquity of *#-u* see DeLancey 1981a, Turin 1998, van Driem 2004, Jacques 2009, and Section 1.3 below).

The second correspondence is the hierarchical agreement pattern, where the verb indexes a 1st or 2nd person argument in preference to 3rd, regardless of which is subject or object – note in particular the consistent 1st person marking across all the languages in the 3→1 row. This is a typologically marked pattern (which is to say that, in languages of the world, simple subject agreement is much more common), and thus its consistency across all the branches is evidence that the systems are cognate.

[5] See King 2002 for a useful discussion of the exceptionality of sentences with 2nd person objects.

[6] Proto-Qiang reconstructions are from Evans 2004; cp. LaPolla 2003b:144.

1.2 The "Rung" paradigm

In earlier work LaPolla disputed the likelihood that any of the paradigms exemplified in Tables 1-3 could be actually cognate any deeper than the branch level. He now (2003a: 30) recognizes the cognacy of all but the last three systems (Jinghpaw, Nocte, and Northern Chin, the last omitted from Table 3 because it manifests neither the hierarchical pattern nor the 3rd person *#-u*), which presumably then must still be explained as parallel evolution, "drift", borrowing, or something. The other languages LaPolla groups into his "Rung" unit, whose sole motivation seem to be to create a place for an ancestral agreement system which is more recent than PTB. The "Rung" branch is based on the indubitable cognacy of these forms (LaPolla 2003a: 30):

	1SG	**1PL**	**2PL**	**DU**	**reflexive/middle**[7]
Proto-rGyalrong	*-ŋ	*-i	*-ñ	*-tsh	
Proto-Nungish	*-ŋ	*-i	*-n	*-si	*-si
Proto-Kiranti	*-ŋ	*-i	*-ni	*-ci	*-nsi
Proto-W. Himalayan	*-g/ŋ	*-ni	*-ni	*-si	*-si

Table 4: LaPolla's evidence for Rung

Of course, to postulate suffixes with these functions in a language implies a fuller paradigm; presumably no 2SG form is included because, as we have seen, the evidence is not quite so overwhelming as it is for 1SG *#-ŋ*. There is in fact considerably more evidence than this to connect these branches, and others as well. We have seen that the 2SG form is subject to some variation, often at quite shallow levels. Nevertheless, note that the 2SG suffixes of lCogtse, Rangpo, the Kiranti languages Thulung and Limbu, and Jinghpaw are evidently cognate, so that both the 1st and 2nd singular forms match across any plausible genetic classification of the languages listed. We can easily reconstruct 2nd person *#-n* or *#-na* for rGyalrong-Qiangic as well as for Proto-Kiranti (for which see van Driem 1990, 1991, 1992), even though many languages of both branches also use innovative prefixes to mark 2nd person. Saxena (1997) reconstructs 2SG intransitive **-na* for Proto-West Himalayan. Thus just in the branches which LaPolla assigns to Rung there is as much evidence for PTB 2SG *#-n(a)* as for the reflexive suffix. Add in Jinghpaw and the case is effectively as strong as for 1SG *#-ŋ*. (I am considering here only the languages where the 2SG *#-n* is found as a suffix; there is a number of languages with a coronal nasal 2nd person prefix, often the only prefix in the paradigm (Watters 2003)).

LaPolla has claimed that the hierarchical indexation pattern is evidence that these paradigms represent "relatively recent grammaticalizations of discourse prominence" (1989: 358; this is said a bit more obliquely in 1992: 311); later in the same paper he describes such systems as reflecting "a pragmatic rather than a structural principle" (1989: 361). The logic of this assertion is not explained, and seems to be incorrect. The pragmatic motivation of the hierarchical pattern has long been evident (see DeLancey 1981b), but I do not see how this entails that such a system

[7] I will not discuss this form much in this paper, since there is no evidence for it in most of the languages that I am primarily concerned with (but see Section 1.3). But in the general spirit of this work I will mention in passing the Meithei reflexive *-cə / -jə* (Singh 2000:49-50, Chelliah 1997:213-5)), as a cognate far outside the "Rung" orbit.

cannot be maintained over time or integrated into the syntactic organization of a language. In any case the implied claim, that hierarchical agreement is evidence of a recently grammaticalized system, is empirically false. Hierarchical systems very similar to those found in Tibeto-Burman occur in many languages around the world (DeLancey 1981b, Klaiman 1992, Givón 1994, Zuñiga 2006, inter alia), and in many cases – most notoriously Algonquian – they are deeply involved in the basic syntactic organization of the clause, and are clearly not recent developments. In families such as Algonquian and Kiowa-Tanoan the system is indisputably coeval with the family. (LaPolla now acknowledges that the original "Rung" system was hierarchical (2003a: 30), so, depending on the time depth attributed to Rung, this issue may no longer be in dispute).

1.3 Evidence from other Bodic languages

All classification schemes for Tibeto-Burman include a Bodish unit which includes Tibetan, Tamang-Gurung-Thakali, East Bodish and Tshangla. All except for Thurgood and LaPolla include the West Himalayan group as quite closely connected with these, and Kiranti and the Central Himalayan languages (Kham, Magar and Chepang) as a separate branch of a larger Bodic or Western unit (see sec. 2.3). For LaPolla it is necessary that not only Kiranti but even West Himalayan be Rung, so that all languages with self-evidently cognate agreement systems can belong to some unit more recent than PTB. We will briefly look here at evidence from two presumably Bodic, and probably closely related, languages, Newar and Thangmi. These may or may not be more closely linked to the Kiranti side of Bodic, and thus do not necessarily furnish direct independent witness for the paradigm outside of "Rung". However, Newar provides an excellent example of the rapid loss of a verb agreement system, which we will return to later (Section 3.1.2). We note here in passing that we also find verb agreement paradigms including material from the PTB paradigm in the "Archaic East Bodish" languages of Bhutan (van Driem 1995, 2001: 926-33). There is as yet very little published material on these languages, but if they are in fact Bodish, then the fact that they retain an agreement paradigm relatable to that of the other branches is a lethal threat to the Rung hypothesis. All of these languages serve as particularly strong witnesses to the age of the agreement paradigm in the family: in each language we find a velar nasal 1SG suffix, but either the stop-initial or some completely innovative 1SG pronoun. Thus in these languages, as in others which we will consider later, verb agreement predates the contemporary pronominal paradigm, and so cannot represent a recent grammaticalization of independent pronouns.

Kathmandu Newar, the standard and best-known Newar variety, shows a fascinating egophoric or conjunct/disjunct system (Hale 1980, DeLancey 1992a, Hargreaves 2005, Hale and Shresta 2006), but no immediately evident trace of verb agreement. However, the Dolakha variety has subject agreement for three persons, singular and plural, across four tense/aspect categories (Genetti 1994, 2007). The plural forms seem to be innovative, and in two tenses there is a 1SG suffix *-gi* of uncertain origins. But Genetti (1994: 102-3, 133-4) is able, by very shallow internal reconstruction, to identify 1SG *-ŋ*, 2SG *-n*, and 3SG *-u* as basic elements of the Dolakha paradigm. Kansakar (1999) adduces additional evidence from Classical Newar for the retention of 3SG *#-u* to and beyond Proto-Newar. There can hardly be any doubt that these morphemes reflect the corresponding forms in the original conjugation, although the paradigm as it occurs in Dolakha has been drastically simplified (Genetti 1994, van Driem 1993c).

A much more elaborate and conservative agreement system is found in Thangmi, also spoken primarily in Dolakha district of Nepal (Turin 1998, 1999, In press). The verb agreement system is much more similar to Kiranti, with familiar suffixes in the familiar hierarchical pattern. Thangmi has lost the dual and exclusive categories in the verb, but otherwise has the full set of etyma which we have discussed so far: reflexive *-ʃi*, 1SG *-ŋa*, 2SG *-na*, 1PL *-(ʔ)i*, 2PL *-ni*, 3OBJ *-u*, as well as a composite form *-uŋ* in the 1SG→3 configuration, which precisely matches a form in the same paradigmatic slot in Limbu and several other Kiranti languages, and appears also in East Bodish. In the closely-related Barām language the "system of verbal agreement has all but decayed" (Turin 1998: 477).

Until the recent work of Turin, Thangmi was virtually undocumented, and it is not mentioned in the major contemporary essays at classification of the family. But there is significant lexical evidence suggesting a close relationship with Newar (Turin 2004, van Driem 2001, 2004). Turin (1999, 2004) notes that the lexical similarities of Thangmi lie primarily with Newar, and the morphological similiarities more with Kiranti. But if the paradigm shared by Thangmi and Kiranti is common inheritance from PTB, or even Proto-"Mahakiranti", then the similarities between Thangmi and Kiranti in and of themselves need not indicate an especially close relationship. Since we know from the Dolakha evidence that Newar inherited some version of the PTB agreement paradigm, whether we place Thangmi and Newar together in a separate group, or assign them both to a larger Mahakiranti, we have a case study here of a drastic reduction of the original paradigm in Dolakha, and its complete and rapid disappearance in Kathmandu and apparently Barām. We will return to this later (Section 3.1.2).

2 Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw, Northern Chin, and "Rung"

Other languages which have figured prominently in the case for the PTB agreement paradigm are Jinghpaw, Nocte (a Konyak or Northern Naga language of Nagaland), and the Northern Chin languages Sizang and Tiddim. It is possible that all of these may belong to the same major subgroup of TB; in any case all have always been generally recognized as belonging to branches distinct from the Bodic languages. All show a highly grammaticalized system in which the agreement indices are suffixed to a set of morphemes, generally consisting of a single consonant, forming a syllable which follows the lexical verb as an independent word. My purpose in this section is to demonstrate two points: first, that contrary to LaPolla's interpretation, the systems of Jinghpaw and Nocte are unquestionably cognate with one another, and thus agreement must be reconstructed for the common ancestor of Jinghpaw and the Konyak group and, quite likely, of Bodo-Garo as well (we will return to this question later), and second, that this system is also cognate with those in the other branches. This is a challenge to the Rung hypothesis, since Rung with Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw packed into it would be even more of a grab-bag than the present proposal. We will also examine the Northern Chin evidence, which will be an important part of another argument later in the paper, and which, in that it shows that not only Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw but also Mizo-Kuki-Chin (and hence Kuki-Chin-Naga) share the ancient suffixal agreement paradigm, adds one more layer of implausibility to the idea that all the necessary languages can be lined up in one genetic subunit of the family.

2.1 Jinghpaw and Nocte

LaPolla asserts that "Within [Bodo-Konyak-Garo] only Nocte and Jinghpaw have person-marking systems, and they do not appear to be cognate" (2003b: 32). In fact, while some Konyak languages (Chang, Phom, Konyak) lack verb agreement paradigms, others, in particular those referred to as "Tangsa", do have paradigms unmistakably related to that of Nocte (Das Gupta 1980, Morey In press). (The division between Konyak languages with and without agreement correlates very neatly with the division of the group which Marrison (1967: 260-68) proposes on phonological and lexical grounds). Similarly, there are varieties of Jinghpaw (particularly the Singpho language of Assam) which show no trace of verb agreement. However, although the Jinghpaw system is more complex than anything reported for Konyak, there are direct correspondences between some of the morphemes and basic structural principles of the Jinghpaw system and those of Nocte (DeLancey In press a), such that the system must be reconstructed for their common ancestor, and thus for the ancestor of Singpho and Chang. In this section I will concentrate on evidence which shows that the Jinghpaw and Nocte systems are cognate; in Section 2.3 we will look at additional evidence from each language which links it to some or all of the "Rung" paradigms.

2.1.1 Person indices

In Table 5 are listed the singular agreement suffixes in Jinghpaw and Nocte. An important point of correspondence between them is an alternation in both languages between two series of agreement suffixes. In Jinghpaw the alternate 1st and 2nd forms are the inherited nasals and their homorganic stops, while the 3rd person forms are distinguished by a vowel alternation. In Nocte the 1st person forms are exactly parallel to those in Jinghpaw, and the 3rd person forms are distinguished by the presence or absence of /ʔ/. The distinction between the two paradigms has been lost in Nocte in the innovated 2nd person form, which is further evidence that this form is a later, Konyak-internal intrusion into an old paradigm inherited from the common ancestor of the two languages:[8]

	Nocte	Jinghpaw
1sgI	-¹ʌŋ	-iŋ/-eŋ
1sgP	-ʌk	-iʔ/-eʔ (coda /-ʔ/ < *-k)
2sgI	-ɔʔ	-in/-en
2sgP	-ɔʔ	-it/-et
3sgI	-a	-uʔ
3sgP	-aʔ	-aʔ

Table 5: Jinghpaw and Nocte singular agreement suffixes

[8] I have glossed the alternate forms as 'I' and 'P' to imply a broad aspectual force which is still present in Jinghpaw, where the stop series is associated with inceptive, perfective, and punctual values. In the limited Nocte data available, the two series are never in direct contrast, each occuring with a particular set of initial particles, so that, for example, the cislocative *r*- requires the I series, while the past *t*- and negative *m*- both require the P series.

The paired agreement series are a shared innovation between Jinghpaw and Konyak, with no direct parallel elsewhere in the family. It is probably also noteworthy that the languages share the *-aʔ* 3rd person form. This may be of Proto-Tibeto-Burman provenance (see van Driem 1995:241) and thus shared retention, but it is absent in many other languages with very conservative verb paradigms. The rest of the material of the paradigms is all familiar: 1st *-ŋ* and, in Jinghpaw, both 2nd *-n* and 3rd *-uʔ*.

2.1.2 The morphological structure of agreement

In Jinghpaw, Nocte, and Tangsa (as well as Northern Chin, which I will discuss below), agreement suffixes are attached to grammatical particles marking tense/aspect, mood, and other verbal categories (the "P" of Table 3). The resulting "sentence-final word" (Dai and Diehl 2003) is phonologically independent of the lexical verb. In the modern languages these particles are something of a descriptive problem, but diachronically they represent highly grammaticalized auxiliary verbs. All TB languages have grammaticalized verbs which carry out auxiliary functions. In languages with verb agreement, the final auxiliary will inflect for person; typically the lexical verb does not (although there are exceptions). In the forms below, the agreement morphemes are attached to the cislocative particle *r-* (DeLancey 1985, In press a).

	Jinghpaw *sa* 'go'	Nocte *ka(t)* 'go'
1SG	sa r-ing	ka ¹r-ʌŋ
2SG	sa r-in	ka r-ɔʔ
3SG	sa r-aʔ	ka r-aʔ
1PL	sa ra-gaʔ	ka r-iʔ
2PL	sa mă-r-in	ka ¹r-ʌn
3PL	sa mă-r-aʔ	ka r-aʔ

Table 6: Jinghpaw and Nocte paradigms (with cislocative *r-*)

We can see that, while there is significant correspondence between the singular forms, there is little or none in the plural series. We will return to this issue in Section 2.3.

In both languages the verb can occur without a following particle. In Nocte, the agreement markers then occur as independent syllables: *ka ¹ʌŋ* 'go 1SG'. In Jinghpaw, the agreement is likewise syllabic, but is then repeated prefixed to the sentence-final particle *ai*: *sa wa ng-ng-ai* 'go 1SG'. Although forms like Nocte *¹ʌŋ* are synchronically best analyzed as lacking a particle, they must historically reflect an original inflected copula which functioned as an auxiliary (Section 2.4.1).

2.1.3 Hierarchical agreement

One last important point of correspondence between the two systems is that they share hierarchical agreement, i.e. indexation of a 1st or 2nd person object in preference to a lower-ranked subject (see

Section 1.1.4, DeLancey 1981a, b, In press a). Recall from Table 3 that in both languages a 1st or 2nd person argument is indexed in preference to a 3rd person, regardless of grammatical role. The relevant forms are repeated here:

	Jinghpaw	Nocte
1→3	P-ŋ	P-ʌŋ
3→1	P-ŋ	P-h-ʌŋ
2→3	P-n	P- ɔʔ
3→2	P-n	P-h-ɔʔ

Table 7: Hierarchical agreement in Nocte and Jinghpaw

A striking feature of the Nocte paradigm, not shared with Jinghpaw, is explicit marking of the grammatical category called inverse. The argument to be indexed on the verb is determined by person, rather than by grammatical or semantic role; the *h-* 'inverse' morpheme indicates that the indexed argument is not the A or subject argument.

Thus the Jinghpaw and Nocte paradigms have in common some morphological material, a unique morphological alternation, the "sentence-final word" system, including a cognate cislocative particle, and hierarchical agreement. There can hardly be any doubt that an agreement system including this material and structure must be reconstructed for their common ancestor. But, while the structure, and several of the basic forms, of the Jinghpaw and Nocte paradigms correspond perfectly, many of the actual indices in the two paradigms do not. We will look again at both the Jinghpaw and Nocte paradigms in Section 2.5, where we will see that, in simplifiying the complex paradigm inherited from PTB, each language has preserved a partially different set of etyma. And, since substantial parts of the system can be derived easily from the proto-"Rung" system (see Section 2.3), it follows either that Jinghpaw and Konyak must also be Rung – a solution which we will examine in Section 2.5 – or else that the agreement system is even older than Rung, which is to say, is of PTB age.

2.2 Dhimal and Kaman

As we have noted, LaPolla considers the agreement systems of Nocte and Jinghpaw to be independent developments. We have seen, on the contrary, that these languages are indubitably cognate, and retain significant parts of the PTB agreement paradigm. Here we will note evidence from two other languages which are probably most closely related to the Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw nucleus. In both cases there is good evidence connecting the attested paradigm to the PTB system. The agreement system in both languages is greatly altered from the original paradigm, with loss of old and addition of new material. As in Newar-Thangmi, Archaic East Bodish, and Northern Chin, also in Dhimal and Kaman we find evidence of the old 1SG suffix *#-ŋa* in languages which do not have the corresponding nasal stem as an independent pronoun, attesting to the age of the paradigm. (These paradigms are not recent, in any case, unless they have achieved their current morphological opacity in a remarkably short time).

2.2.1 Kaman, Jinghpaw, and Rung

Kaman (格曼 Geman), also called Miju Mishmi, has been grouped with the other Mishmi languages, but Mishmi, like Naga, Kachin, and other terms used as language names in the Tibeto-Burman realm, is an ethnopolitical concept, not a linguistic one. It is evident on inspection that Kaman is not particularly closely related to the other languages which are referred to as "Mishmi" (Burling 2003). It is apparently most closely connected with Jinghpaw, Nungish, or both (Sun 1983, 1988, 1995, Thurgood 1984). This question bears on the way in which Kaman data are relevant to issues of subgrouping and reconstruction. Sun and Matisoff both propose a close genetic connection between Jinghpaw and Nungish. If this is the case, then either Jinghpaw (and, thus, Konyak, and thus, presumably, Bodo-Garo) are Rung, or there is no Rung, and the arguments presented below in Section 2.3 are otiose. However, I am inclined at present to share the doubts expressed by Thurgood (2003: 15) and LaPolla (2003b: 674) about this proposal. If there is no branch-level unit including both Jinghpaw and Rawang, then Kaman cannot be particularly close to both of them, but may be closely-related to one or the other.

Like Dolakha, Kaman has a suffixal subject-agreement paradigm (Sun et al. 1980: 264-7; cp. Das Gupta 1977) including apparent innovations overlaid on material suggestive of the original PTB paradigm. By internal reconstruction Sun (1983: 21-24) identifies inherited 1SG *-ŋā*, 2SG *-ɲ*, and 2PL *-nìn*, all relatable to PTB etyma, and all attested in either Jinghpaw (1SG *-ŋ*, 2SG *-n*) or Nocte (1SG *-ŋ*, 2PL *-n*). This is part of the basis for Sun's classification of Kaman in a group with Nung and Jinghpaw (1983, 1988), though as with Thangmi and Newar we must be cautious in using what we can now see to be common inheritance in subgrouping.[9]

2.2.2 Dhimal

Dhimal (King 2002, 2009) does not have a generally-accepted classification, but the best current guess associates it with Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw, most closely with Bodo-Garo (van Driem 2001: 549-53). Dhimal has several constructions which show person agreement, each built on material inherited from the PTB paradigm. Like Kaman, Dhimal has a suffixal subject-agreement paradigm showing considerable secondary development, but including 1SG *-ŋ*, 2SG *-n* (King 2002: 45, 61-2), as well as a 1/2DU *-niŋ* which is probably relatable to the PTB 2PL *#-ni* (see below). Since both Kaman and Dhimal have stop-initial 1st person pronouns (Kaman *kì*, Dhimal *ka*), the 1SG suffixes cannot represent recent developments in either language. In fact, both languages have other 1SG agreement suffixes which do appear relatable to the independent pronouns, supporting the inference that the nasal indices are archaisms. In any case in both languages these forms occur in the most archaic portions of the verb paradigm (Sun 1983: 21, King 2002: 61). Thus the latest possible age for the origin of the Jinghpaw-Konyak agreement forms is pushed farther back, to their common ancestor with Dhimal and Kaman.

---

[9] Many forms from the Kaman paradigm look like forms from other paradigms, but with completely different values, e.g. a 1SG *–i*, which resembles the PTB inclusive plural. I have suggested (1989) that some of these might in fact represent reanalyses of forms from the PTB paradigm. If this very speculative idea has any merit, then the paradigm seems to have more in common with Nungish than with Jinghpaw.

There is a second paradigm used "to index the marked social relationship among affinal kin groups". The forms, 1SG *-kya* and 2SG *-nya*, reflect the plural indices *#-ka* Exclusive (see Section 2.3) and *#-na* 2PL (King 2002: 46). The evidence for *#-ka* here is particularly important: it is attested elsewhere only in Kiranti and Jinghpaw (Section 2.3), and thus its occurrence in Dhimal supports the classification of Dhimal with Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw. The PTB dual *#-si* remains in the Dhimal dual imperative *-se* and dual adhortative *-siŋ* (King 2002: 47); as noted above, it has been replaced in the indicative paradigm by a form of 2PL *#-ni*.

But the most striking residue of the original paradigm is found in two 2nd person object forms (to which King attaches the peculiar label "imperious"): 3s→2 *-nau* and 1s→2 *-niŋ*. The first of these is a secondary development, but manifestly built of ancient material. Most TB languages have simple 2nd person indexation for 3→2 configurations (see Table 3), and we can recognize this in the first two segments of the Dhimal form. Even without comparative evidence we might then infer that the /u/ was originally a 3rd person index, thus adding subject agreement to the original indexation of the 2nd person object. With comparative evidence, we can identify the /u/ as the 3rd person *#-u*. In the original paradigm this was restricted to forms with 3rd person object (and hence can plausibly be interpreted as an inverse marker rather than person agreement per se, see DeLancey 1981a), but we have seen that in Jinghpaw it now indexes 3rd person subjects, so the shift is not only attested elsewhere, but attested in a closely related language.[10]

The 1s→2 *-niŋ* is presumably the same form as the 1/2DU, which is a very plausible source for a form which indexes the combination of 1st and 2nd person. (Nocte likewise uses the 1PL form for the 1→2 transitive configuration (DeLancey 1981a)). It has no evident source in either function within Dhimal. King suggests deriving it from the PTB 2PL *#-ni*. The explanation for the final segment of the form is not certain. As King notes, a few other languages, Rawang for example, also have *-niŋ* as a 2PL; compare also the Kaman 2PL *-nìn* above. The Trung 2PL form is *-n* < *#-ni*, but *-nìŋ* does occur in forms where a 1st person is requesting permission from a 2nd person (Sun 1982: 108-9). Unravelling the history and interconnections of these various forms is beyond the scope of this paper, but the striking similarity of a set of forms all associated with some combination of 1st and 2nd person must reflect some common inheritance.

2.3 Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw and the rest of TB

We have seen already that the Jinghpaw and Nocte paradigms share several significant features with the "Rung" languages. The substantive correspondence of agreement morphemes like 1SG *#-ŋ*, 2SG *#-n*, and, in the transitive paradigm, 3rd person *#-u* is bolstered by the structural correspondence of hierarchical agreement. Below (Section 2.4) we will see a 2nd person coronal stop form in the Jinghpaw paradigm which is related to 2nd person forms elsewhere in the family, including Northern Chin *-tɛʔ* (again see Bauman 1975). In this section we will examine other correspondences between the Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw paradigms and those of the rest of the family. Let us look again at the agreement morphemes, extracted from the forms in Table 6:

[10] Van Driem (1993:322-3) suggests the opposite course of development, with an originally general 3rd person index specializing in Kiranti into a patient marker.

	Jinghpaw	Nocte
1SG	-ing	-ʌŋ
2SG	-in	-ɔʔ
3SG	-aʔ	-a / -aʔ
1PL	-gaʔ	-iʔ
2PL	mă-P-in	-ʌn
3PL	mă-P-aʔ	-a / -aʔ

Table 8: Jinghpaw and Nocte agreement affixes

The Nocte paradigm includes three of LaPolla's five characteristic etyma. Nocte has lost the dual category, and we have no information on how the language expresses reflexive, but the other Rung hallmarks are there: 1SG *-¹ʌŋ*, 1PL *-iʔ* and 2PL *-¹ʌn*, especially when taken as a set, are evidently related to the LaPolla's **-ŋ, *-i*, and **-ni*.

Jinghpaw shows only one of LaPolla's five, since he does not reconstruct the 2SG suffix which we have discussed above, but its plural forms show two very important points of connection specifically with Kiranti in the 1PL and 3PL morphemes. Consider the following sampling of Kiranti plural forms:[11]

	1PL EXC	1PL INC	2PL	3PL
Limbu	-i-ge		-i	mɛ-
Chamling	-ka	-i	-i	mi-
Dumi	-k-i	-k-i	-i-ni	ham-
Khaling	-kaa	-ki	-ni	-nu
Thulung	-ku	-ci	-ni	-mi
Hayu	-kok	-ke	-ne	-me
Sunwar	-ka/-ki	-i	-ni	-me
Proto-Kiranti	#-(i)-ka	#-i/#-ka	#-i/#-ni	#me-/#-me

Table 9: Kiranti plural affixes (intransitive)

While the daughter paradigms show a great deal of mixture of the two categories, Bauman (1975) makes a case for reconstructing *#-ka* exclusive and *#-i* inclusive for Proto-Kiranti.[12] The inclusive PL *#-i* and 2PL *#-ni* are two of LaPolla's common Rung features, and we have already seen that both are preserved in Konyak. Exclusive *#-ka* and 3PL *#ma-* are not attested in rGyalrong, Nungish, or West Himalayan. Thus, on the Rung hypothesis, they must both be Kiranti

[11] Chamling (Ebert 1997), Dumi (van Driem 1993b), Khaling (I. Toba 1973, S. Toba 1979), Hayu (Michailovsky 1988).

[12] Van Driem (1993a) segments the exclusive form into a *#k* 1PL and *#ya* EXCL, but that does not affect the argument here.

innovations. However, they both have cognates in Jinghpaw, the 1PL *-ga?* and 2/3PL *mă-* from Table 8. Although both of these forms are widespread in the family, as far as I know they are not attested as a part of the verb system outside of Kiranti and Jinghpaw. The 2/3PL form is particularly important since it corresponds not only in form and specific paradigmatic meaning, but also in marked prefixal position. In Kiranti it occurs exclusively as a suffix only in those Western Kiranti languages which lack agreement prefixes altogether; in languages with prefixes it occurs as a prefix in the intransitive paradigm, but often as a suffix *-m* in transitive forms. In Jinghpaw it occurs prefixed to the TAM+Agreement syllable: *mă-l-it, mă-r-a?,* etc.

If we consider these correspondences to reflect features of the PTB paradigm, then the shared retention of both in two independent branches requires no special explanation. Otherwise we seem to be looking at shared innovation, implying a special relationship between Kiranti and Jinghpaw. But that idea is as contrary to the Rung hypothesis as it is to every other subgrouping scheme, so shared innovation limited to these two groups can be eliminated as a possible hypothesis. Independent innovation cannot be completely ruled out; the abundant evidence for an independent pronominal root *#ka* has been discussed in the literature (Bauman 1975, Thurgood 1985, Benedict 1998), and reflexes of it are widely attested in 1PL forms, some of which have specifically exclusive reference. Bauman notes the similarity of the Tiddim Chin independent pronouns */ei* 1PL Inclusive and *\kou* 1PL Exclusive to Kiranti *-i* and *-ka*, and the exclusive root is attested also in Qiangic, e.g. Longxi Exclusive *qà lià*, Inclusive *ú lià*. But independent innovation of both forms, with their paradigmatic relationship, and the unusual positional behavior of *#ma-* seems unlikely.

And such an explanation – independent parallel grammaticalization of two number agreement morphemes in two different branches – is only necessary if we assume a priori that the Jinghpaw and Kiranti paradigms cannot be cognate. For if they are, then the obvious explanation for the distribution of *#-ka* as an agreement suffix in TB is that the exclusive/inclusive distinction, coded by the opposition between *#-ka* and *#-i,* was part of the original conjugation. The opposition remains only in Kiranti; other branches collapsed the distinction, with Jinghpaw retaining *#-ka* as 1pl and losing *#-i,* and the other branches retaining the *#-i* suffix and losing the exclusive form.[13] Again, there is no other evidence than this to lead us to imagine a particularly close relationship between Jinghpaw and Kiranti, and such a supposition runs counter to all other available evidence. Thus the evident explanation for the fact that these cognate morphological constructions are shared by Jinghpaw and Kiranti is that they represent shared inheritance from their nearest common ancestor – which can only be PTB.

2.4 Northern Chin

Since the Luce expedition of 1954 (Luce 1959), the Mizo-Kuki-Chin branch has played a role in the question of TB verb agreement. Mizo-Kuki-Chin is a low-level branch of Tibeto-Burman, defined as a genetic unit in part by striking morphosyntactic innovations, including a unique paradigm of proclitics or prefixes manifesting subject agreement, which are largely identical with the possessive pronominal clitics. But participants in Luce's "linguistic tour" documented two

[13] This requires that the inclusive/exclusive distinction was maintained in Proto-Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw, since Nocte has retained the inclusive form and Jinghpaw the exclusive.

Northern Chin languages, Tiddim or Tedim (Henderson 1957, 1965) and Sizang or Siyin (Stern 1963), which also have a suffixal agreement paradigm, with evident deep TB roots, alternating with the characteristic K-C proclitic construction.

2.4.1 The morphological structure of agreement

In both languages the suffixes occur in exactly the same morphological construction as in Nocte. As in Nocte, the agreement morpheme may occur as a separate word (Tiddim, Henderson 1965):

(1) *\pai \iŋ*
go 1SG
'I go.'

Or it may be attached to a grammatical particle of *C-* or *CV-* form to create a syllable which is then the final word of the sentence:

(2) *\pai /ke-ŋ*
go NEGATIVE-1SG
'I don't go.'

(3) *\pai /n-iŋ*
go FUTURE-1SG
'I will go.'

(4) *\pai \le:-ŋ*
go CONDITIONAL-1SG
'If I go.'

This paradigm is attested in the Northern Chin languages of Manipur (Singh 2002, Bareh 2009). The precise conditions under which it occurs instead of the newer prefixal paradigm vary somewhat across the languages. As in Nocte, these forms never suffix directly to the verb stem. In all the languages, the postverbal paradigm occurs with a particular set of tense/aspect/modality markers, usually including the negative, with which they form a syllable which is independent of the main verb. In some, like Tiddim, they can occur directly after the main verb, with no other tense/aspect/modality morpheme, but always as an independent word. In Taraon these forms function as the equational copula (Singh 2002: 49):

(5) *kəy dəktər əŋ*
1SG doctor 1SG
'I am a doctor.'

(6) *nəŋ dəktər ce*
2SG doctor 2SG
'You are a doctor.'

(7) *əmai dəktər*
3SG doctor
'He is a doctor.'

This suggests that where, as in Tiddim and, presumably, Nocte we see what appears to be the agreement morphemes alone as independent words, what we actually, or at least historically, have is a conjugated copula which was integrated into the tense/aspect paradigm in the typical Tibeto-Burman fashion (DeLancey In press c). Further evidence for this is the fact that in Konyak and Northern Chin, the negative marker attaches directly to the agreement suffixes in the manner of a tense/aspect/modality morpheme. This is especially significant in Konyak, which retains the ancient PTB negative prefix *#ma-*. In the Nocte 1SG negative *m-ʌk* we must infer an earlier stage in which the *m-* was prefixed to an auxiliary, which also bore person agreement. The vowel of the independent 1SG agreement syllable is the last remnant of this form.[14]

2.4.2 Northern Chin and PTB

If the Northern Chin suffixal paradigm is a direct reflection of the PTB paradigm which we have posited, there is very little left of it. The only suffixes left are 1SG *-ŋ*, 2SG *-tɛʔ* (palatalized to *ce* in the "Old Kuki" languages of Manipur), and plural *uʔ*. But all of these have good TB pedigrees. The 1SG suffix is directly relatable to forms across the family, as we have already seen, and thus presumably reflects the PTB paradigm. The plural morpheme appears relatable to the 3PL *#-u* suffix reconstructed for PTB by Van Driem (1993a: 320). The second person form may or may not be related to the *#-n* which we reconstruct for 2SG, but, as first noted by Bauman (1975), it has cognates in other languages, including rGyalrongic (note the 2nd person *tə-* prefix in Table 2), Chepang 2nd person *-teʔ* (Caughley 1982), Magar 2nd person *-də/tə-* (Angdembe 1999b) and in Jinghpaw 2nd person forms like *nin d-ai*.

Thus the postverbal agreement forms must predate Proto-Mizo-Kuki-Chin, since they have cognates outside the branch. Since neither of the roots occurs in the Proto-KC pronominal system (Thurgood (1985) reconstructs 1SG **kai*, possessive **ka* for Northern Chin, **kei* for Mizo-Kuki-Chin), the 1st person form must have grammaticalized as an agreement marker at a time when the ancestor of Proto-Mizo-Kuki-Chin still retained the old *#ŋa* root as an independent pronoun. The 2nd person *#te* forms in other languages are generally bound forms, as in Northern Chin.

This is absolute evidence only for the relative age of the paradigm – Mizo-Kuki-Chin, like almost all of the generally-recognized subgroups of TB, is relatively shallow, and Proto-MKC could have had time to innovate new grammar between the time of its divergence from PTB and its jettisoning of the nasal pronominal forms; so it is hypothetically possible that what we see here is an independently developed suffixal paradigm which predates Proto-MKC, but postdates the early divergence between Rung and the rest of the family. But given the evidence that the Jinghpaw-Konyak paradigms are cognate with the rest of the family (see Section 2.3), Rung is dead (see

[14] Consider, for example, the Trung copular paradigm (Sun 1982:91): 1SG *ūŋ*, 2SG *nu-è*, 3SG *è*.

Section 3), and there is no longer any reason to seek such complex explanations for simple comparative facts.

2.4.3 The history of agreement Jinghpaw, Konyak, and Northern Chin

The structural similarity of the Northern Chin and Jinghpaw-Konyak verb could well represent shared inheritance from a common ancestor, but the evidence to hand does not compel this conclusion. What Jinghpaw, Konyak, and Northern Chin have in common is a system in which the agreement suffixes combine with a set of morphemes of *C-* or *CV-* form into syllables which follow the main verb. The source construction for this pattern is the inflected auxiliary or serialized verb, an ubiquitous phenomenon in TB. The cislocative *r-* which we have seen in Nocte and Jinghpaw is a grammaticalization of the verb *#ra* 'come', which is widespread in the family (e.g. Byangsi *ra,* Rangpo *rha*), and shows up as a grammaticalized cislocative also in several Naga languages (DeLancey 1985). We can see an analogue of the source construction which gave rise to the Jinghpaw-Konyak cislocative in the Hayu example (16) (Michailovsky 1988: 152), where the verb *la-* 'go' is lexically secondary to *khok* 'walk', and functions to provide deictic specification for the motion verb:

(8) *gu khok la-ŋ*
I walk go-1SG
'I'm leaving'

One common outcome of further grammaticalization of such a construction is amalgamation of the entire complex into one word, which is common in Kiranti. What Jinghpaw-Konyak and Mizo-Kuki-Chin have done instead is to keep the TAM-AGREEMENT complex as a separate word as it grammaticalizes. Compare the Kiranti, Jinghpaw, Konyak and Northern Chin forms:

Sunwar *pʔĩ-n-uŋ*
come-NONPAST-1SG
'I am coming'

Jinghpaw *sa n-iʔ*
go PERFECT-1SG.P
'I have gone'

Moklum[15] *wat n-ang*
beat FUTURE-1SG
'I will beat'

Tiddim *\pai /n-iŋ*
go FUTURE-1SG
'I will go'

[15] Das Gupta 1980, Morey In press.

The Sunwar form represents a very recent morphologization of an earlier Nominalizer+Copula construction (DeLancey 1992b) based on the copula *na*. This is a widespread form in TB, and it is quite possible – though obviously not a given – that any or all of the *-n* morphemes in the other languages might reflect this same root.

This difference in development is probably determined by prosodic differences in the various languages, and prosodic patterns can be shared areally, so it is possible that the very similar verbal morphosyntax of Northern Chin and Jinghpaw-Konyak might represent shared areal development rather than shared inheritance. But as we can see, at the root of the system is a construction with a grammaticalized auxiliary inflected with agreement suffixes which fit neatly into the pan-TB system. The secondary developments which have led to the apparent differences between the modern "Rung" and BKJ/KC systems are easily identified and "deconstructed", to borrow a term from LaPolla (1989), and what is left behind is quite recognizable as inheritance from our original PTB paradigm.

2.5 The Rung hypothesis

No one disputes that the agreement paradigms of the languages which LaPolla groups in Rung are indeed cognate. The issues are, whether Rung, which is a major break from other classification schemes, is a plausible subbranch of the family, and, even if so, whether reflexes of the same paradigm may be found outside of it, thus forcing the ancestral paradigm to an even deeper level.

The Rung hypothesis, which is based in part on earlier work by Thurgood (1984, 1985), is incorporated into Thurgood's (2003) most recent classification scheme for TB. His classification (with Karen and some irrelevant languages omitted) is summarized below. Bolded languages/branches have some version of the suffixal agreement paradigm. In all but Mizo-Kuki-Chin it is prevalent throughout the branch. Italicized languages are the members of LaPolla's and Thurgood's putative Rung branch:

Bodic	**BKJ**	**KCN**	**Rung**	**Lolo-Burmese**
Tibetan	**Jinghpaw**	**Kuki-Chin**	***rGyalrongic***	Loloish
TGT	**Konyak**	Angami	***Nungish***	Burmish
E. Bodish	Bodo-Garo	Ao	***Kiranti***	
(Tshangla)		Zeme	***West Himalayan***	
		Tangkhul	***KCM***	
		Karbi	***Qiangic***	
		Meithei		

(KCN = Kuki-Chin-Naga, TGT = Tamang-Gurung-Thakali, KCM = Kham-Chepang-Magar)

Table 10: The Thurgood-LaPolla classification

Taking the rest of the classification seriously, the identification of cognate agreement machinery in Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw and Mizo-Kuki-Chin gives us attestation in three of six (counting Karen)

branches, thus effectively requiring that the ancestral paradigm be reconstructed for PTB even with every other suffixal agreement paradigm in the family gathered together in one branch. But, if the only relevant criterion for inclusion in Rung is possession of an agreement system, then Rung could be preserved by simply tossing in the Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw branch (we will see later what happened to the system in Bodo-Garo), and tossing out the Northern Chin data as too thin to be reliable, thereby saving the hypothesis that Tibetan and Lolo-Burmese have never had a verb agreement system.

The resulting branch, however, is quite a gryphon, including a range of languages with little in common beyond shared PTB heritage and cognate verb systems. For example, compare Thurgood's classification with that of Matisoff (1996); again languages which in the Thurgood-LaPolla classification are assigned to Rung are italicized:

Himalayish	**Kamarupan**	**Jinghpo-Nungic**	**Tangut-Qiangic**	**Lolo-Burmese**
Bodish-***WHim***	**Konyak**	**Jingphaw**	***Tangut***	Loloish
Kiranti-KCM	**Kuki-Chin**-Naga	***Nungish***	***Qiangic***	Burmish
	Bodo-Garo	Luish	***rGyalrong***	
	Meithei			
	Karbi			

Table 11: Matisoff's classification

The systems which I have argued are cognate are spread across four of Matisoff's six (counting Karen) branches, and thus on this classification must unavoidably be reconstructed back to PTB. But even ignoring the Jinghpaw-Konyak and Chin data, we still see that the "Rung" languages are spread across no less than three of the six branches. The same is true if we look at Bradley's (1997) classification:

Western	**NE India**	**Central**	**Eastern**	
			NE	**SE**
Kiranti- KCM	Bodo-Garo-**Konyak**	***Nungish***	***Qiangic***	Lolo-Burmese
WHimalayan	Luish-**Jinghpaw**	Tani	***Tangut***	Karen
Tshangla	(**Kuki-Chin**-Naga)	Digarish	***rGyalrong***	
Bodish		**Kaman**	Naxi	
			Moso	

Table 12: Bradley's classification

Once again, we see languages with reflexes of the original paradigm in four of five branches, and "Rung" languages spread across three of five.

In other words, Rung is substantially inconsistent in one way or another with all other classifications of the family. Thurgood's original Rung proposal (1984) includes Jinghpaw, and in earlier work LaPolla (1987, 1992) gave some credence to the idea that Jinghpaw and Nungish should be grouped together, as in Matisoff's classification. In fact, LaPolla in 1992 argues against

an earlier version of the argument I have given in this section for the cognacy of the Jinghpaw paradigm by suggesting that Jinghpaw might well be "Rung", although he was not yet using that term (1992: 300). But, as we have noted, in more recent work he explicitly denies the cognacy of the Jinghpaw and Rung systems (2003: 32). In principle, the more languages and branches which have to be stuffed into "Rung" in order to keep the reconstructed verb agreement paradigm away from PTB, the more implausible the resulting construct. But since I don't see any principled evidentiary basis for either version of Rung, I can't really see that a Rung which includes Jinghpaw, or for that matter the whole of Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw, is significantly more or less implausible than one without. Both versions deviate considerably from past and present consensus – in particular, the connection between the Bodish languages, including Tibetan, and West Himalayan is recognized by every other scholar in the field. The reality is that by any plausible classification of Tibeto-Burman, including the Thurgood classification which incorporates LaPolla's claims, we find demonstrably cognate agreement suffixes in a majority of the major branches of the family.

3 How has verb agreement been lost?

LaPolla (1992: 301-2) seems to consider the independent loss of agreement three different times, in Tibetan, Newar, and Lolo-Burmese, to be an improbable idea requiring strenuous explanation. He considers it strong evidence against reconstructing agreement for PTB that:

> Those languages that do not have verb agreement systems, the vast majority of all Tibeto-Burman languages, have *no trace whatsoever* of ever having had one. (LaPolla 1992: 301, emphasis original)

He is, of course, quite incorrect about the "vast majority". The rest of his objection presupposes that the loss of an agreement system must take place gradually over time, through the mechanisms of "phonological attrition and leveling" (1992:304), so that, as in French, we will see fewer and fewer distinct forms in the paradigm over an extended process of loss . But in fact relatively or even extremely sudden loss of complex morphology is not only possible, but quite common – probably more common than LaPolla's scenario. Indeed, all of the languages which we have considered here have close relatives which have nearly or completely lost their agreement systems, many in quite a short time: Dolakha and Kathmandu, Thangmi and Barām, Nocte-Tangsa and Chang-Phom, Dhimal and Bodo-Garo, Jinghpaw and Singpho. So clearly it is neither a rare occurrence nor necessarily a drawn-out process.

So, if PTB had a complex agreement system, the modern languages give us more than the occasional example of its disappearance – we have several whole branches where it is gone without a trace. Critics of the hypothesis of PTB agreement have legitimately held this issue up as a challenge. In this section I will show that the challenge is not in the least difficult to meet. There are no doubt a number of idiosyncratic paths away from agreement to be discovered in Tibeto-Burman; we will look briefly at the complex reorganization of the paradigm in Newar (for other studies of radical simplification and reorganization see Qu 1983 and Angdembe 1999a, b; Qiangic gives striking examples of the decay of the suffixal paradigm through phonological attrition). My main purpose in this section is to describe two prevalent causes or mechanisms for the loss of agreement which, between them, are entirely adequate to deal with the question: creolization, the

morphosyntactic simplification and regularization which a language often undergoes when it is used as a lingua franca, and the well-known tendency of TB languages to recruit new finite main clause constructions from old nominalizations.

3.1 Newar-Thangmi

LaPolla (1992: 301) singles out as especially compelling witnesses to the recency of verb agreement in TB the languages "which have writing systems more than four centuries old", yet lack any trace of agreement: specifically Tibetan, Newar, Burmese and Yi. (He notes that the fifth, Tangut, does have agreement). I find this argument puzzling in many ways (for example, why are Burmese and Yi being presented as independent witnesses?). While scholars may differ on the question of the time depth of PTB, it surely must be enough that four centuries constitutes a relatively small proportion. But even if we take the argument at face value, we can see that the testimony of Newar is precisely the opposite of what LaPolla wants it to be. We have seen (Section 1.3) that Proto-Newar must have inherited some version, perhaps already somewhat simplified, of the original paradigm, and that its common ancestor with Thangmi, probably a close relative, inherited something very close to the Kiranti paradigm. Thus Newar-Thangmi serves in a sense as Tibeto-Burman writ very small, in that we have conservative varieties with inherited agreement material and very closely-related varieties with no agreement at all.

In the case of Kathmandu Newar, we are not dealing with the simple disappearance of the paradigm, as we will see below in Singpho. Rather, the original paradigm has been replaced by a new verbal system based on a different set of categories: egophoric/non-egophoric rather than argument indexation (Genetti 1988b, 1994: 134-6). Most of the finite forms of the modern Kathmandu paradigm occur in Classical Newar also as nominalized and relative clauses, suggesting that, like other languages we will discuss below, Kathmandu abandoned the older inflected verb forms in favor of new constructions based on nominalizations (Genetti 1994: 135).

Of particular interest for our present purpose is the occurrence of an *-u* suffix in some disjunct (roughly, non-1st person) forms. Genetti (1988b: 188) suggests, very plausibly, that this may be a reanalysis of 3rd person *#-u*, which occurs in Dolakha and thus was present in the Proto-Newar paradigm. If this is correct, then even in Kathmandu it is not the case, as LaPolla contends, that we find "no trace whatsoever" of the old agreement paradigm. There may indeed be many such traces to be found, once we understand what to look for. In fact, we find traces of this same *#-u* in irregular verb stem alternations conditioned by 3rd person in several languages, including others besides Newar where there is no other recoverable trace of the old paradigm (Jacques 2006: 11 (fn. 12), 2009). One telling example is Lepcha, a language never suspected of Rungish sympathies, where the verb 'give' has a stem *bi* used when the recipient is 3rd person, and *bo* when the recipient is 1st or 2nd person (Plaisier 2007). The /o/ form appears to represent 3rd person *#-u* (which must then have functioned as a subject rather than an object index; cf. fn. 11).

In Newar we see operating both of the factors which I am proposing as the explanation for the loss of agreement morphology. The primary mechanism by which the paradigm was lost in Kathmandu seems to have been the replacement of the original conjugated verb forms with nominalizations. In this case it is quite evident that language contact was a driving force behind this shift. As both Genetti (1994, 2007) and van Driem (1993c) point out, the history of Kathmandu Newar – much more than that of Dolakha – involves an extended period of intense

language contact, one which continues to the present day. It is well-known that archaic linguistic traits tend to be better preserved in small, isolated communities, while the language contact and mixing which accompanies urbanization and state-level political organization commonly leads to simplification (van Driem 1993a, McWhorter 2007).

3.2 Nominalization

The readiness of TB languages to shed verb agreement (and to replace TAM morphology, but that is a separate topic) is a result of the common pattern in which an erstwhile nominalized clause construction is reanalyzed as a finite pattern, and ultimately replaces the earlier finite construction (Noonan 1997, Bickel 1999, DeLancey In press c). Since nominalizations typically do not inflect for person, the result is a new finite clause construction in which there is no agreement – although, rather than say that agreement has been lost, it is more accurate to say that the construction in which agreement was manifested has been replaced by one where it is not. If the nominalized verb does show agreement, it is likely to be in the manner of nouns, rather than verbs; we see in most of Mizo-Kuki-Chin the complete replacement of the old finite conjugation with a new one based on nominalizations, with agreement indices derived from possessive clitics.

3.2.1 Nominalized Clause Constructions

Most TB languages have at least one tense/aspect construction which is built on a nominalized clause treated as an argument of a finite copula. This is clearly the case, for example, for much of the verb paradigm in the modern Tibetan languages, as in the Central Tibetan perfective forms, which consist of the verb nominalized with *-pa* in construction with one of the equational copulas *yin* and *red* (see DeLancey 1992a):

(9) *nga phyin-pa yin*
I went-PERFECTIVE/EGOPHORIC
'I went'

(10) *kho phyin-pa red*
he went-PERFECTIVE
'He went.'

Some languages which mark agreement on the verb may use an inflected form of the lexical verb in a similar construction, as in Sunwar (DeLancey 1992b):

(11) *kyarše 'sad-a 'baâ-ta*
goat kill-3SG exist-3SG.PAST
'He killed a goat [I hear or infer].'

This is the origin of the peculiar "repeated agreement" which we see in some Kiranti and other languages. But more commonly the lexical verb is in nominalized form; for example, contrasting

with the inferential construction, Sunwar has a mirative/direct evidential form built on the same copula, but with the lexical verb in an invariable nominalized form:

(12) *kyarše 'saî-šo 'baâ-ta*
goat kill-NOMZ exist-3SG.PAST
'He was killing a goat/goats.' [I saw]

Note that in both constructions the copula is in the 3SG form, with the result that the mirative construction in (14) no longer inflects for person of any argument in the clause. Thus in this construction agreement no longer functions. If one or more constructions of this type completely replace the older finite construction, agreement can disappear instantly. Let us look at some other examples of this phenomenon.

3.2.2 Mizo-Kuki-Chin

In the Mizo-Kuki-Chin branch, the PTB suffixal paradigm has been replaced with a new set of proclitic agreement markers (section 2.4). As we have seen, traces of the original paradigm remain in the Northern Chin languages; elsewhere in K-C they have completely disappeared. The structure of the new finite clause construction betrays its origins in a nominalized clause construction.

Two facts about the Mizo-Kuki-Chin paradigm argue for this origin. First, the agreement proclitics are also the possessive proclitics; we can see them in both functions in these Sizang examples (Stern 1984):

(13) *na-lá:i hong thák ka-ngá: a:*
2nd -letter CISLOCATIVE send 1st-receive NONFINAL
'I having received your letter which [you] sent to me ...'

k-ong thûk kí:k lâ-lê:u hî:
1st-CIS reply again once more FINAL
'I in turn reply to you.'

Here we see the proclitics functioning both as possessives (***na***-*lá:i* 'your letter') and as agreement markers (***ka***-*ngá:* 'I receive', ***k***-*ong thûk* 'I reply [to you]').

The second piece of evidence is the final particle *hî:*, which terminates the clause chain. This is homophonous with the equational copula *hî:*, and that is clearly its origin. Thus the original construction must have been a Nominalizer+Copula construction with a nominalized verb stem, its subject expressed as a grammatical possessor, and the copula as the finite verb. Final particles in general can be taken as traces of an older Nominalizer+Copula construction (see below), but when the form is transparently identical to the synchronic copula the case is clear.

This construction – the finite verb with a possessive proclitic representing subject agreement, and a sentence final particle relatable to the copula – is ubiquitous throughout Mizo-Kuki-Chin, and clearly must be reconstructed for the proto-language. But, as we have seen, the suffixal paradigm must represent inheritance from an earlier stage where some nasal reflex of *#ŋa*

still existed as a pronominal form. It thus predates Proto-MKC, even if it has persisted to the present in only one subbranch. Thus both paradigms must have been present in Proto-MKC. That is, Proto-MKC, or some precursor of it, was a language like those discussed by Noonan (1997) and Bickel (1999) in which a nominalized construction is used instead of the ordinary finite construction for some marked purpose. This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that the suffixes are in complementary distribution not only with the proclitics, but with the entire construction – the final particle occurs only on clauses with proclitic agreement, never with a suffixed verb. Henderson's data suggest that the function of the alternation between the old finite and the nominalized clause constructions may have been stylistic, with nominalization associated with more formal style.

Thus the Mizo-Kuki-Chin languages furnish an example of how quickly the nominalization cycle can erase any trace of a verb agreement system. Mizo-Kuki-Chin is a very cohesive, shallow group, more on the order of Bodo-Garo than of Bodo-Jinghpaw-Konyak, but between Proto-MKC and most of the modern languages what was once a thriving suffixal verb agreement system has been entirely discarded. The copula was presumably a 3SG form (probably zero-marked), so as the old finite construction is replaced by the new nominalized construction, the old agreement paradigm is gone.

3.2.3 Copulas, nominalizers and final particles

The observation that many finite constructions in TB languages are built on a grammaticalized copula will hardly surprise any Tibeto-Burmanist, nor is there anything typologically unusual about such constructions. But it becomes very relevant to our present concerns once we realize how easily the innovation of such constructions can erase the older inflected construction. I will not rehearse here a list of languages which have recent, unmistakable constructions of this type; rather, in this section we will look at a less transparent type of evidence which is widespread across the family.

Many TB languages, for the most part languages which lack agreement, have more-or-less obligatory sentence-final particles in declarative sentences. These are often identifiable as identical with or derived from nominalizers or copulas, or as reflexes of etyma which occur in both functions. We have seen that in Mizo-Kuki-Chin the final particle, which occurs throughout the branch, attests to the origins of the modern finite construction in an older nominalization construction. Final particles are ubiquitous throughout the Naga, Lolo-Burmese, and Bodish languages, including Classical Tibetan – a fair sampling of the languages and branches which have completely lost agreement.

Since Tibetan is the most anciently attested TB language, and shows no sign of verb agreement even it its earliest attestations, it is often invoked as an argument against PTB agreement (LaPolla 1992: 301). In fact, from its earliest attestation, the Tibetan finite clause construction shows the stigmata of a Nominalizer+Copula origin. We find a declarative final particle *'o*, which geminates a preceding final consonant (examples from Hahn 1974: 39):

(14) *nyi = ma 'char ro*
sun rise FINAL
'The sun rose'

This can serve duty as an equational copula:

(15) *bram = ze de dbul = po zhig go*
Brahmin that pauper a FINAL
'That Brahmin was a pauper.'

(16) *khyim de chen = po-'o*
house that big FINAL
'That house is big.'

So we can interpret it as the reanalysis of an original copula in a nominalization construction. The final particle *'o* has evident cognates in copular forms in other Bodish languages, as in West Himalayan (which Tibeto-Burmanists other than LaPolla and Thurgood consider to be genetically quite close to Tibetan) Rangpo *hwə-* (Zoller 1983), and Kiranti forms such as Limbu existential *wa·* (van Driem 1987). All of these reflect the widespread TB copula **way* (Thurgood 1982, Matisoff 1985, 2003: 35).

Throughout the family we find numerous languages in which the ordinary finite sentence ends with a final particle, which may or may not be synchronically identifiable with a copula or nominalizer. The famous case is Lahu *ve* (Matisoff 1972), a reflex of a declarative verb particle **way*[3], which Bradley (1979: 376-7) reconstructs for Proto-Loloish, and ultimately of the PTB copula (Matisoff 1985). Most if not all Lolo-Burmese languages have one or more such final particles, often synchronically identifiable as nominalizers, e.g. Burmese *sany* (Okell and Allot 2001: 245-7). The phenomenon seems to be equally prevalent among the Naga languages, e.g. the Mongsen "declarative mood marker" *-uʔ* (Coupe 2007: 142-4).

That the innovation of new finite structures out of nominalizations is a common phenomenon can hardly be controversial. If the presence in a language of a declarative final particle is evidence of such an episode in a language's past, then this phenomenon is not simply common, but ubiquitous throughout the family. And in that case the widespread loss of the PTB agreement system is not at all mysterious.

3.3 Creolization

A very common route to loss of morphology throughout the world is creolization, in the broad sense. When a significant proportion of the regular users of language in an area are adult second language learners of it, who have learned and use it as a lingua franca, drastic morphological simplification can occur very quickly (McWhorter 2007). We have seen in Newar how intense contact can be associated with the replacement of complex morphological structures with simpler forms: the pressures of language contact may then be a causal factor in the process of change discussed in the preceding section. In two case studies within Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw we can see the process of language replacement resulting in dramatic and immediate abandonment of agreement morphology. Elsewhere the evidence is not (or not yet) as clear, but where we do not have historical evidence we can infer a history involving the kinds of processes which are attested in better-understood cases.

3.3.1 Singpho and Valley Jinghpaw

Even without the comparative perspective developed in Section 2, the particle + agreement system of Jinghpaw seems to have fairly deep roots, purely on internal grounds. However, it is absent in Singpho, spoken in Assam, the westernmost member of the Jinghpaw dialect chain. I have previously suggested this as evidence of how quickly and easily such a system can be lost (DeLancey 1989). LaPolla turns this argument on its head, suggesting instead that Singhpo represents the original Proto-Jinghpaw situation, and that all the other Jinghpaw dialects must have innovated their systems relatively recently:

> It seems far more likely that that dialect, out of range of the areal features to the east, never developed a verb agreement system at all. If this were the case, it would give us a time depth of less than one thousand years for the development of the Jingpo verb agreement system, just what we would expect judging from the Tangut data. (1992: 303)

Since the agreement systems of the other attested dialects are indubitably cognate, down to idiosyncratic details, this would entail a claim that there is a fundamental genetic split within Jinghpaw between Singpho and everything else – a claim for which I have not seen any independent evidence. There is no question that the entry of the Singpho into Assam is quite recent, considerably less than one thousand years (see e.g. S. Baruah 1985: 376, T. Baruah 1977). Nor is there any evidence to suggest that the languages are as divergent in any other respect as they are in the stark contrast between the complete lack of agreement in Singpho and the complex and opaque paradigm found throughout most of the rest of the group. The sole exception proves the point; according to LaRaw Maran (personal communication), the agreement system is rarely used in the "Valley" Jinghpaw spoken as a lingua franca by other "Kachin" and neighboring groups in northern Burma.

In any case, as we have seen, there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Jinghpaw and Nocte agreement systems contain cognate elements, which means that a common ancestor of both, and thus a fortiori of Singpho, had an agreement system. The loss of the system in Singpho then requires explanation, and the evident explanation is that it came to be spoken by significant speakers of other languages, and thus underwent typical simplification through creolization. In the case of Singpho, a major locus of creolization must have been the numerous Assamese slaves who worked ricefields for the Singpho (Maran 2007: 58-60). The spread of Jinghpaw to other communities in China, Burma and Northeast India (as Singpho) continues into modern times (Leach 1954: 294-7, Dai 1999: 57-8).

3.3.2 The origin of Bodo-Garo

And, once we have demonstrated that the Jinghpaw-Konyak agreement system is ultimately cognate to those of the other TB languages, and thus represents inheritance from PTB, the same logic then requires that the lack of agreement in the Bodo-Garo languages must be a secondary development. In fact, when we compare Bodo-Garo with comparable branches such as Kiranti, Jinghpaw, or Mizo-Kuki-Chin, we note that it doesn't have that much morphology at all, and most of what there is looks very new and fresh (Wood In press). A few traces of older structures, such as

the PTB prohibitive prefix *#da-* and a remnant use of the widespread TB nominalizing prefix *#kV-* (Konnerth In press) on modifying adjectives, confirm that the language does have a respectable TB ancestry. But in general the grammatical structure of Bodo-Garo languages involves simple and regular combination of fairly transparent, loosely-bound elements, the characteristic sign of newly-developed grammar. The Bodo-Garo branch is also notable for its geographical extent. Even today Bodo-Garo languages are spoken from southeastern Nepal and northern Bangladesh all across Northeast India. In modern times most of this territory is Assamese or Bengali-speaking, and Bodo-Garo languages occur only in patches, but it appears that formerly Bodo-Garo was the predominant speech over the entire Brahmaputra Valley, perhaps as recently as a few centuries ago.

Burling (2007) has recently suggested that the grammatical transparency and regularity of Garo suggests an origin as a creolized lingua franca, similar in structure and function to contemporary Nagamese or Naga Pidgin. This suggestion can certainly be taken further: the wide distribution, shallow time depth, and grammatical regularity of the Bodo-Garo languages in general can best be explained by supposing that Proto-Bodo-Garo was a widespread lingua franca throughout the area, and came to be adopted by originally non-TB (or, at least, non-BG) communities. Like Singpho and Plains Jinghpaw, it was adopted in its most levelled and regularized form, which was then the ancestor of the modern languages. This interpretation of the linguistic evidence is in accord with the little historical information available (see also DeLancey In press b).

Most scholars assume a demographic sequence in Assam which begins with an autochthonous Austroasiatic-speaking population, followed by Tibeto-Burman-speaking migrations from the north and east, beginning around 1,000 BCE or earlier (Kakati 1941, S. Baruah 1985, van Driem 2001, inter alia). The identification of the pre-Tibeto-Burman stratum as Austroasiatic is plausible but unproven (but see Przyluski 1921-2, 1924-9); nevertheless the Brahmaputra Valley is clearly not the original center of dispersal for Tibeto-Burman, so there must have been a pre-TB stratum, whatever languages may have been involved. Serious Indic influence apparently dates from about the 4th century CE; the earliest datable inscriptions, in Sanskrit, date from the 6th century. In the 7th century the Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang notes that the language of Kāmārupa is "slightly different from that of Central India" (1996: 299), suggesting that the Aryanization of the area was already well advanced. His comment must be in reference to the court language; even today the territory of Kāmārupa is not completely Assamese-speaking, and it certainly was not 1400 years ago, when Indic language and culture were still a relatively recent introduction into the region. There is no explicit historical evidence of the identity of the vernacular languages of the area at the time, but tradition suggests that some Bodo-Garo language, which we may identify with Proto-Bodo-Garo, was the dominant language, and presumably a lingua franca, in the middle Brahmaputra valley well into late antiquity (Barua 1933, Pulloppillil 1997), and in subsequent centuries, prior to the Ahom invasions of the 14th century, the central Brahmaputra valley consisted of Boro or "Kachari" kingdoms (Endle 1911, Shakespear 1914, Gait 1926).

Even without inferring any special status for Proto-Bodo-Garo, we can expect it to have been subject to creolizing influences. There is no doubt that, whenever Tibeto-Burman languages first moved down the Brahmaputra, the valley was already populated, so that whatever TB languages were in the mid- or lower Brahmaputra valley would have been subject to significant creolizing forces from the beginning. But we can further infer that Proto-Bodo-Garo was probably already present and widespread in what is now Assam already during the period of Aryanization –

a historical circumstance in which some sort of lingua franca would be a necessity. If we take Proto-Bodo-Garo to have been that lingua franca, we neatly explain both its geographical extent and relative lack of divergence, and the peculiarities of its linguistic structure when compared with its nearest relatives. And, among the peculiarities which are explained is the complete loss of the agreement system which is retained in Konyak and Jinghpaw.

3.3.3 Creolization in other branches

The role of language contact and creolization in the creation of Chinese is well-known (Ballard 1984, La Polla 2001, Ansaldo and Matthews 2001, Blench 2008, inter alia). Chinese originated as a Tibeto-Burman-like, SOV language[16] which adopted the characteristic Southeast Asian creoloid syntactic pattern from local languages (Benedict 1972, Nishida 1976, see also van Driem 2008). It is likely that a similar story could be told for Lolo-Burmese (DeLancey 2010). If we follow Bradley and van Driem in recognizing an Eastern branch subsuming Qiangic and Lolo-Burmese, then Lolo-Burmese stands to the morphologically more conservative Qiangic (and especially rGyalrongic) languages as Bodo-Garo does to Jinghpaw. And, as with Bodo-Garo, so with Lolo-Burmese it is very plausible on historical and ethnographic grounds to imagine creolization as an important factor in the formation of the branch. Yunnan, the presumptive cradle of Lolo-Burmese, is in historic times the meeting ground of languages of most of the families of Southeast Asia, including several very distinct branches of Tibeto-Burman. Early Chinese sources record an equally multiethnic population (Fan 1961). Thus there is reason to project the kind of fluid system of ethnic identity and language choice described for the region in recent times by Leach and others (see e.g. Davies 1909) very far back in time, as does Blench (2009), who sees the "Southern Yunnan Interaction Sphere" as having been a region of intense language contact since long before Proto-Lolo-Burmese. By the time of the Nánzhāo kingdom (737-902 CE), the Loloish-speaking population – which at that date could conceivably have not yet diverged into distinct daughter languages – had achieved considerable political power and status in the region (Blackmore 1960, 1967, Backus 1981, Luce 1985). This must have been preceded by a long period of expansion, involving the spread of Proto-Lolo-Burmese and then its young daughters to new communities, as Yi and, more spectacularly, Burmese then continued to do over the next millennium. It has long been alleged on physical grounds that the culturally and linguistically Yi population must represent a coalescence of physically distinct earlier groups (see e.g. Feng and Shryock 1938, Luce 1985: 103-4), from which one might infer language contact as a feature of the initial formation of the language.

4 Summary

There is no longer any disagreement that several important branches of TB share reflexes of an ancient suffixal verb agreement system; all participants in the discussion now acknowledge that the agreement systems of rGyalrong and Qiangic, West Himalayan, Kiranti, Kham, and Nungish are

[16] This is self-evidently the case independent of the question of whether Sinitic is best considered one branch of Sino-Tibetan or a branch or sub-branch within Tibeto-Burman.

cognate. The remaining dispute has to do with whether this ancestral agreement system is to be reconstructed for PTB or for a more recent proto-language which is ancestral only to these branches, but not to Bodic, Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw, Mizo-Kuki-Chin-Naga, or Lolo-Burmese. In this paper I have demonstrated that the agreement paradigms of Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw and Northern Chin are cognate with those of the "Rung" languages. We have seen evidence that several other languages of uncertain classification likewise share inheritance from the original paradigm, and that some of these (Newar-Thangmi and especially Archaic East Bodish) threaten to pull Bodish, one of the last remaining substantial genetic units untainted by remnants of the ancient agreement paradigm, into the set.

At that point the non-Rung remnant of the family would consist of Karen, Lolo-Burmese, Naga, Meithei, Karbi, Mishmi (minus Kaman), Tani, and a handful of other currently unclassified languages. Even with Bodish added back in, we have on this list only individual languages and low-level genetic units, with the shallow Bodish and Lolo-Burmese units the largest and deepest nuclei outside of the gargantuan Rung. In effect, the set of languages and higher-level units where there is no trace of the original agreement paradigm is simply a bag of leftovers, and it is difficult to see how the resulting classification of the family has any plausibility. Since the only evidence for Rung is shared agreement morphology, if that morphology derives from PTB, the Rung hypothesis is pointless. And this is particularly so once we realize how easily languages can lose their agreement morphology, as an effect of creolization and/or through natural grammaticalization processes. We have examined a number of cases where this has happened quickly and simply, so there is no reason to imagine that it could not have done so repeatedly in other branches where we do not know the history.

References

Angdembe, Tej Man. 1999a. "Rise of honorific marking and the demise of the verbal agreement system". *Gipan* 1.1: 43-99.

Angdembe, Tej Man. 1999b. "Anomalous conjugation of copulas, development of tense/aspect morphemes and loss of agreement prefixes". In: Yadava, Yogendra; and Glover, Warren (ed.), *Topics in Nepalese linguistics*, 498-524. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academny.

Ansaldo, Umberto; and Matthews, Stephen. 2001. "Typical creoles and simple languages: The case of Sinitic". *Linguistic Typology* 5.2.3: 311–326.

Backus, Charles. 1981. *The Nan-chao kingdom and T'ang China's southwestern frontier*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ballard, W.L. 1984. "The Mother Soup: A South China recipe for tonometamorphogenesis". *Computational Analysis of African and Asian Languages* 22: 43-70.

Bareh, Curiously. 2009. "Verbal agreement in Monsang". Paper presented at the 4th International Conference of the North East India Linguistic Society, Shillong, Meghalaya, India.

Barua, Kanak Lal. 1933. *Early history of Kāmārupa, from the earlist times to the end of the Sixteenth Century*. Shillong: K.L. Barua Bahadur. [Reprint: Guwahati: Lawyers Book Stall, 1966].

Baruah, S. L. 1985. *A comprehensive history of Assam*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Baruah, Tapan Kumar. 1977. *The Singphos and their religion*. Shillong: Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh.

Bauman, James. 1974. "Pronominal verb morphology in Tibeto-Burman". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 1.1: 108-55.

Bauman, James. 1975. *Pronouns and pronominal morphology in Tibeto-Burman*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Bauman, James. 1979. "An historical perspective on ergativity in Tibeto-Burman", In: Frans Plank (ed.), *Ergativity: Towards a theory of grammatical relations*, 419-433. New York; London: Academic Press.

Benedict, Paul. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A conspectus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benedict, Paul. 1982. "This and that in TB/ST". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 7.2: 75-98.

Benedict, Paul. 1998. "The first person pronoun in Archaic Chinese and with a note on duplex characters". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 21.2: 1-2.

Bickel, Balthasar. 1999. "Nominalization and focus constructions in some Kiranti languages". In: Yadava, Yogendra; and Glover, Warren (ed.), *Topics in Nepalese linguistics*, 271-296. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academny.

Blackmore, Michael. 1960. "The rise of Nan-Chao in Yunnan". *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 1.2: 47-61.

Blackmore, Michael. 1967. "The ethnological problems connected with Nanchao". In Drake, Frederick Sequier (ed.), *Historical, archaeological and linguistic studies on Southern China, South-East Asia and the Hong Kong region*, 58-69. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Blench, Roger. 2008. "Stratification in the peopling of China: How far does the linguistic evidence match genetics and archaeology?" In: Sanchez-Mazas, Alicia, et al. (ed.), *Past human migrations in East Asia: Matching archaeology, linguistics and genetics*, 105-132. London: New York: Routledge.

Blench, Roger. 2009. "Why we don't need Austric or any other macrophyla in SE Asia: The Southern Yunnan Interaction Sphere". Unpublished manuscript. http://www.rogerblench.info.

Borchers, Dörte. 2008. *A grammar of Sunwar : descriptive grammar, paradigms, texts and glossary.* Leiden: Brill.

Bradley, David. 1997. "Tibeto-Burman languages and classification". In: Bradley, David (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas*, 1-72. Canberra: Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics Series A, 86; Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics 14].

Bradley, David (ed.). 1997. *Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas*. Canberra: Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics Series A, 86; Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics, 14].

Burling, Robbins. 1983. "The Sal languages". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 7.2: 1-32.

Burling, Robbins. 2003. "The Tibeto-Burman languages of Northeastern India". In: Thurgood, Graham; Matisoff, James A.; and Bradley, David (ed.), *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan area: The state of the art*, 169-191. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University [Pacific Linguistics Series C, 87].

Burling, Robbins. 2007. "The lingua franca cycle: Implications for language shift, language change, and language classification". *Anthropological Linguistics* 49.3-4: 207-236.

Caughley, Ross. 1982. *The syntax and morphology of the verb in Chepang*. Canberra: Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics Series B-84].

Coupe, Alec. 2007. *A grammar of Mongsen Ao*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dai, Qingxia 戴庆厦; and Xu, Xijian 徐悉艰.1992. *Jingpo yu yufa* 景颇语语法. Beijing: Minzu Chu Ban She.

Dai, Qingxia. 1999. "On the languages of the Jingpo nationality". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 22.2: 1-59.

Dai, Qingxia; and Diehl, Lon. 2003. "Jinghpo". In: Thurgood, Graham; Matisoff, James A.; and Bradley, David (ed.), *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan area: The state of the art*, 401-408. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University [Pacific Linguistics Series C, 87].

Das Gupta, K. 1971. *An introduction to the Nocte language*. Shillong: North East Frontier Agency.

Das Gupta, K. 1977. *A phrase book in Miju*. Shillong: North East Frontier Agency.

Das Gupta, K. 1980. *The Tangsa language*. Shillong: North East Frontier Agency.

Davies, H. R. 1909. *Yün-nan: The link between India and the Yangtze*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 1980. *Deictic categories in the Tibeto-Burman verb*. Ph.D. diss, Indiana University.

DeLancey, Scott. 1981a. "The category of direction in Tibeto-Burman". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 6.1: 83-102.

DeLancey, Scott. 1981b. "An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns". *Language* 57.3: 626-57.

DeLancey, Scott. 1983. "Tangut and Tibeto-Burman morphology". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 7.2: 100-108.

DeLancey, Scott. 1985. "The analysis-synthesis-lexis cycle in Tibeto-Burman: A case study in motivated change". In: Haiman, John (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax*, 367-89. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.

DeLancey, Scott. 1988. "On the evolution of the Kham agreement paradigm". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 11.2: 51-61.

DeLancey, Scott. 1989. "Verb agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 52.2: 315-33.

DeLancey, Scott. 1992a. "The historical status of the conjunct/disjunct pattern in Tibeto-Burman". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 25: 39-62.

DeLancey, Scott. 1992b. "Sunwar copulas". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15.1: 31-38.

DeLancey, Scott. 2010. "Language replacement and the spread of Tibeto-Burman". *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 3.1:40-55.

DeLancey, Scott. In press a. "Nocte and Jinghpaw: Morphological correspondences". In: Hyslop, Gwendolyn; Morey, Stephen; and Post, Mark (ed.), *North East Indian Linguistics II*. New Delhi: Foundation/Cambridge University Press India.

DeLancey, Scott. In press b. "On the origins of Bodo-Garo". In: Hyslop, Gwendolyn; Morey, Stephen; and Post, Mark (ed.), *North East Indian Linguistics III*. New Delhi: Foundation/Cambridge University Press India.

DeLancey, Scott. In press c. "Finite structures from clausal nominalization in Tibeto-Burman". In: Yap, Foong Ha.; and Wrona, Janick. (ed.), *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological. Volume I: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian languages.* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Driem, George van. 1987. *A Grammar of Limbu*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Driem, George van. 1990. "An exploration of Proto-Kiranti verbal morphology", *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 22: 27-48.

Driem, George van. 1991. "Bahing and the Proto-Kiranti verb". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 54.2: 336-356.

Driem, George van. 1992. "Le proto-kiranti revisité, morphologie verbale du lohorung". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 24: 33-75.

Driem, George van. 1993a. "The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 56.2: 292-334.

Driem, George van. 1993b. *A grammar of Dumi*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Driem, George van. 1993c. "The Newar verb in Tibeto-Burman perspective". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 26:23-43.

Driem, George van. 1995. "Black Mountain conjugational morphology, Proto-Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax, and the linguistic position of Chinese". In: Nishi, Yoshio; Matisoff, James A.; and Nagano, Yasuhiko (ed.), *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*, 229-259. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [Senri Ethnological Studies 41].

Driem, George van. 1999. "The Limbu verb revisited". In: Yadava, Yogendra; and Glover, Warren (ed.), *Topics in Nepalese linguistics*, 209-230. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academny

Driem, George van. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas*. Leiden: Brill.

Driem, George van. 2004. "Newaric and Mahakiranti". In: Saxena, Anju (ed.), *Himalayan Languages: Past and Present*, 413-18. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Driem, George van. 2008. "To which language family does Chinese belong, or what's in a name". In: Sanchez-Mazas, Alicia, et al. (ed.), *Past human migrations in East Asia: Matching archaeology, linguistics and genetics*, 219-253. London: New York: Routledge.

Ebert, Karen. 1997. *Camling (Chamling)*. München; Newcastle: Lincom Europa [Languages of the World, Materials 103].

Egerod, Søren, and Inga-Lill Hansson. 1974. "An Akha conversation on death and the funeral". *Acta Orientalia Hafniensia* 36:225-84.

Endle, Sydney. 1911. *The Kacháris*. London: Macmillan.

Evans, Jonathan. 2004. "The Reconstruction of Proto-Qiang verb inflection". In: Lin,Ying-chin, et al. (ed.), *Studies on Sino-Tibetan Languages: Papers in honor of Professor Hwang-Cherng Gong on his seventieth birthda*y, 201-238. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica. [Language and Linguistics Monograph Series W-4].

Fan, Ch'o 樊綽. 1961. *Book of the Southern Barbarians (Man shu* 蠻書, English translation by Gordon Luce*)*. Ithaca: Dept. of Far Eastern Studies, Cornell University [Southeast Asia Program Data Paper 44].

Gait, Edward. 1926. *A history of Assam*. 2nd revised edition. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink. (repr. Guwahati: LBS Publications).

Genetti, Carol. 1988a. "Notes on the structure of the Sunwar transitive verb". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 11.2:62-92.

Genetti, Carol. 1988b. "A contrastive study of the Dolakhakli and Kathmandu Newari dialects". *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale* 17.2:161-91.

Genetti, Carol. 1994. *A descriptive and historical account of the Dolakha Newari dialect*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa [Monumenta Serindica 24].

Genetti, Carol. 2007. *A grammar of Dolakha Newar*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Givón, Talmy (ed.). 1994. *Voice and inversion*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Hahn, Michael. 1974. *Lehrbuch der klassischen Tibetischen Schriftsprache*. Bonn: Michael Hahn. [Reprint: Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1985].

Hale, Austin. 1980. "Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari". In: Trail, Ronald (ed.), *Papers in South-East Asian linguistics no. 7*, 95-106. Canberra: Australian National University [Pacific Linguistics Series A 53].

Hale, Austin; and Shresta, Kedar. 2006. *Newār (Nepāl Bhāsā)*. München: Lincom Europa [Languages of the World, Materials 256].

Hanson, Ola. 1917. *A hand-book of the Kachin or Jinghpaw language*. Rangoon: American Baptist Mission Press.

Hargreaves, David. 2005. "Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar". *Himalayan Linguistics Journal 5*. 1-48.

Henderson, Eugenie J.A. 1957. "Colloquial Chin as a pronominalized language". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20: 323-7.1997.

Henderson, Eugenie J.A. 1965. *Tiddim Chin: A descriptive analysis of two texts*. London: Oxford University Press.

Hodgson, Brian. 1857. "Comparative grammar of the broken tribes of Nepal". *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 26: 317-332.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2004. *Phonologie et morphologie du Japhug (Rgyalrong)*. Ph.D. diss, Université Paris VII - Denis Diderot.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2006. "La morphologie du sino-tibétain". L'école des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris, 4 mars 2006. http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00173948/fr/.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2009. "The origin of vowel alternations in the Tangut verb". *Language and Linguistics* 10.1: 17–28.

Kansakar, Tej Ratna. 1999. "Verb agreement in Classical Newar and modern Newar dialects". In: Yadava, Yogendra; and Glover, Warren (ed.), *Topics in Nepalese linguistics*, 421-443. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academny.

Kakati, Banikanta. 1941. *Assamese, its formation and development : a scientific treatise on the history and philology of the Assamese language*. Gauhati, Assam, Govt. of Assam in the Dept. of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Narayani Handiqui Historical Institute. [Reprint: Guwahati: Lawyer's Book Stall, 1962].

King, John. 2002. "Marked transitive scenarios and archaic biactinal agreement morphology in Dhimal". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensa* 34: 39-69.

King, John. 2009. *A grammar of Dhimal*. Leiden: Brill.

Klaiman, M.H. 1992. "Inverse languages". *Lingua* 88: 227-61.

Konnerth, Linda. In press. "The nominalizing velar prefix in Tibeto-Burman languages of North East India". In: Hyslop, Gwendolyn; Morey, Stephen; and Post, Mark (ed.), *North East Indian Linguistics II*. New Delhi: Foundation/Cambridge University Press India.

Lahaussois, Aimée. 2003. "Thulung Rai". *Himalayan Linguistics Archive* 1.1–25.

LaPolla, Randy. 1989. "Verb agreement, head-marking vs. dependent-marking, and the 'deconstruction' of Tibeto-Burman morpho-syntax". In: Hall, Kira, et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of the fifteenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 356-67. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

LaPolla, Randy. 1992. "On the dating and nature of verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 55.2: 298- 315.

LaPolla, Randy. 1994. "Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman: Evidence of Sapir's 'drift'". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 17.1: 61-80.

LaPolla, Randy. 2001. "The role of migration and language contact in the development of the Sino-Tibetan language family". In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra; and Dixon, R.M.W. (ed.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance*, 225-54. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LaPolla, Randy. 2003a. "Overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax". In: Thurgood, Graham; Matisoff, James A.; and Bradley, David (ed.), *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan area: The state of the art*, 22-42. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University [Pacific Linguistics Series C, 87].

LaPolla, Randy. 2003b. *A grammar of Qiang, with annotated texts and glossary*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

LaPolla, Randy. 2005. "Sino-Tibetan languages". In: Brown, Keith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd edition), 393-397. London: Elsevier.

Leach, Edmund R. 1954. *Political systems of highland Burma: A study of Kachin social structure*. London: Bell and Sons.

Lo, Ch'ang-p'ei 罗常培.1945. "A preliminary study on the Trung language of Kung Shan". *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 8: 343-48.

Luce, Gordon. 1959. "Chin Hills-Linguistic tour (Dec.1954) - University Project". *Journal of the Burma Research Society*. 42.1: 19-31.

Luce, Gordon. 1985. *Phases of Pre-Pagán Burma: Languages and history*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Maran, LaRaw. 2007. "On the continuing relevance of E. R. Leach's *Political Systems of Highland Burma* to Kachin Studies". In: Robinne, François; and Sadan, Mandy (ed.), *Social dynamics in the highlands of Southeast Asia*, 31-66. Leiden: Brill.

Marrison, Geoffrey. 1967. *The classification of the Naga Languages of North-East India*. Ph.D. diss, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Matisoff, James. 1972. "Lahu nominalization, relativization, and genitivization". In: Kimball, John (ed.), *Syntax and semantics I*, 237-57. New York: Seminar Press.

Matisoff, James. 1985. "God and the Sino-Tibetan copula, with some good news concerning selected Tibeto-Burman rhymes". *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 29: 1-81.

Matisoff, James. 1993. "Sangkong of Yunnan: secondary "verb pronominalization" in Southern Loloish". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16.2: 123-42.

Matisoff, James. 1996. "A pragmatic subgrouping of Tibeto-Burman languages". In: Matisoff, James A., *Languages and dialects of Tibeto-Burman,* 177-8. Berkeley: Center for Southeast Asia Studies [STEDT Monograph Series 2].

Matiisoff, James. 2003. *Handbook of Tibeto-Burman: System and philosophy of Sino-Tibetan reconstruction*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press [University of California Publications in Linguistics 135].

McWhorter, John. 2007. *Language interrupted: Signs of non-native acquisition in standard language grammars*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Michailovsky, Boyd. 1988. *La langue hayu*. Paris: CNRS [Collection Sciences du Langage].

Morey, Stephen. In press. "Person and TAM marking in Tangsa". In: Hyslop, Gwendolyn; Morey, Stephen; and Post, Mark (ed.), *North East Indian Linguistics II*. New Delhi: Foundation/Cambridge University Press India.

Nishi, Yoshio. 1995. "A brief survey of the controversy in verb pronominalization in Tibeto-Burman". In: Nishi, Yoshio; Matisoff, James A.; and Nagano, Yasuhiko (ed.), *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*, 1-16. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [Senri Ethnological Studies 41].

Nishi, Yoshio; Matisoff, James; and Nagano, Yasuhiko (eds.), 1995. *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [Senri Ethnological Studies 41].

Nishida, Tatsuo. 1976. "Some problems of morpheme stock in Sino-Tibetan: A preliminary observation". In: *Genetic relationship, diffusion, and typological similarities of East and Southeast Asian languages: Papers for the 1st Japan-US Joint Seminar on East and Southeast Asian Linguistics*, 30-38. Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Noonan, Michael. 1997. "Versatile nominalizations". In: Bybee, Joan; Haiman, John; and Thompson, Sandra A. (ed.), *Essays on language function and language type: In honor of T. Givón*, 374-94. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Okell, John; and Allot, Anna. 2001. *Burmese/Myanmar dictionary of grammatical forms*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.

Plaisier, Heleen. 2007. *A grammar of Lepcha*. Leiden: Brill.

Przyluski, Jean. 1921-1922. "De quelques noms anaryens en indo-aryen". *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 21: 209ff. (1921); 22: 205-210 (1922).

Przyluski, Jean. 1924-1929. "Emprunts anaryens en indo-aryen". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 24: 70ff., 118-123, 255-258 (1924); 25: 66-71 (1925); 26: 98-103 (1925); 30: 196-201 (1929).

Pulloppillil, Thomas, 1997. "The Bodos: An introduction". In: Pulloppillil, Thomas; and Aluckal, Jacob (ed.), *The Bodos: Children of Bhullumbutter*, 1-8. Guwahati and Delhi: Spectrum.

Qu, Aitang 瞿霭堂. 1983. "Jiarong yu dungci de rencheng fanchou 嘉绒语动词的人称范畴". *Minzu Yuwen* 民族语文 1983.4: 35-48.

Sanchez-Mazas, Alicia, et al. (eds.). 2008. *Past human migrations in East Asia: Matching archaeology, linguistics and genetics*. London: New York: Routledge.

Saxena, Anju. 1997. "Towards a reconstruction of the Proto West Himalayish agreement system". In: Bradley, David (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas*, 73-94. Canberra: Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics Series A, 86; Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics 14].

Shakespear, L.W. 1914. *History of Upper Assam, Upper Burmah and North-Eastern Frontier*. London: Macmillan.

Singh, Chungkham Yashawanta. 2000. *Manipuri grammar*. New Delhi: Rajesh.

Singh, Chungkham Yashawanta. 2002. *Tarao grammar*. New Delhi: Akansha.

Stern, Theodore. 1963. "A provisional sketch of Sizang (Siyin) Chin". *Asia Major* (n.s.) 10: 222-78.

Stern, Theodore. 1984. "Sizang (Siyin) Chin texts". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 8.1: 43-58.

Sun, Hongkai 孙宏开.1982. *Dulong yu jianzhi* 独龙语简志. Beijing: Minzu Chu Ban She.

Sun, Hongkai 孙宏开. 1983. "Wo guo Zang-Mian yu dongci de rencheng fanchou" 我国藏缅语动词的人称范畴. *Minzu Yuwen* 民族语文 1983.2:17-29.

Sun, Hongkai 孙宏开. 1988. "Shilun woguo jingnei Zang-Mianyude puxi fenlei 试论我国境内藏缅语的谱系分类" (A classification of Tibeto-Burman languages in China). In: Nishida, Tatsuo Nishida; and Eguchi, Paul Kazuhisa (ed.), *Languages and history in East Asia*: *festschrift for Tatsuo Nishida on the o ccasion of his 60th birthday*, 61-73. Kyoto: Shokado.

Sun, Hongkai. 1995. "A further discussion on verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman languages". In: Nishi, Yoshio; Matisoff, James A.; and Nagano, Yasuhiko (ed.), *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*, 17-29. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [Senri Ethnological Studies 41].

Sun, Hongkai 孙宏开, et al. 1980. *Menba, Luoba, Dengren de yuyan* 门巴，珞巴，僜人的语言 Beijing: Zhongguo She Hui Ke Xue Chu Ban She.

Thurgood, Graham. 1982. "The Sino-Tibetan copula *wəy". *Cahiers de linguistique Asie Orientale* 11.1: 65-82.

Thurgood, Graham. 1984. "The "Rung" languages: a major new Tibeto-Burman subgroup". In: Brugman, Claudia, et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 338-349. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Thurgood, Graham. 1985. "Pronouns, verb agreement systems, and the subgrouping of Tibeto-Burman". In: Thurgood, Graham; Matisoff, James A.; and Bradley, David (ed.), *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan area: The state of the art*, 376-400. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University [Pacific Linguistics Series C, 87].

Thurgood, Graham. 2003. "A subgrouping of Sino-Tibetan languages: the interaction between language contact, change, and inheritance". In: Thurgood, Graham; and LaPolla, Randy (ed.), *The Sino-Tibetan language*s, 3-21. London; New York: Routledge..

Thurgood, Graham; Matisoff, James; and Bradley, David (eds.). 1985. *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan area: The state of the art*. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University [Pacific Linguistics Series C 87].

Thurgood, Graham; and LaPolla, Randy (eds.). 2003. *The Sino-Tibetan language*s. London; New York: Routledge.

Toba, Ingrid. 1973. "The Khaling verb". In: Hale, Austin (ed.), *Collected papers on Khaling, Kulunge, Darai, Newari, Chitwan Tharu*, 1-14. Kathmandu: Summer Institute of Linguistics Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies [Nepal Studies in Linguistics I].

Toba, Sueyoshi. 1979. *Khaling*. Tokyo: Asia Africa Gengo Bunka Kenkūzyo, Tokyo gaikokugo Daigaku [Asian and African Grammatical Manual 13d].

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2008. "Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct'/'disjunct' in Tibetan". In: Huber, Brigitte; Volkart, Marianne; and Widmer, Paul. (ed.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und*

Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, 281-308. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies GmbH.

Turin, Mark. 1998. "The Thangmi verbal agreement system and the Kiranti connection". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61.3: 476-491.

Turin, Mark. 1999. "Whence Thangmi? Historical ethnography and comparative morphology". In: Yadava, Yogendra; and Glover, Warren (ed.), *Topics in Nepalese linguistics*, 451-477. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academny.

Turin, Mark. 2004. "Newar-Thangmi lexical correspondences and the linguistic classification of Thangmi". *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 68: 97-120.

Turin, Mark. In press. *A grammar of Thangmi with an ethnolinguistic introduction to the speakers and their culture*. Leiden: Brill.

Watters, David. 2002. *A grammar of Kham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watters, David. 2003. "Some preliminary observations on the relationship between Kham, Magar, (and Chepang)". Paper presented at the 36th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Melbourne.

Weidert, Alfons. "Nocte paradigms". Unpublished manuscript.

Weidert, Alfons. 1985. "Paradigmatic typology and its application to verb agreement analysis". In: Pieper, Ursula; and Stickel, Gerhard (ed.), *Studia linguistica diachronica et synchronica: Werner Winter, sexagenario anno MCMLXXXIII*, 903-936. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wood, Daniel. In press. "Proto-Bodo-Garo verb morphology". In: Hyslop, Gwendolyn; Morey, Stephen; and Post, Mark (ed.), *North East Indian Linguistics II*. New Delhi: Foundation/Cambridge University Press India.

Yadava, Yogendra; and Glover, Warren. (eds.). 1999. *Topics in Nepalese linguistics*. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.

Xuanzang. 1996. *The great Tang dynasty record of the western regions*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation & Research [BDK English Tripitaka 79].

Zoller, Claus. 1983. *Die Sprache der Rang pas von Garwhal*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zuñiga, Fernando. 2006. *Deixis and alignment: Inverse systems in indigenous languages of the Americas*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins [Typological Studies in Language 70].

Scott DeLancey
delancey@uoregon.edu

Himalayan Linguistics, Vol. 9(1). © *Himalayan Linguistics* 2010
ISSN 1544-7502

*A possible trace of verbal agreement in Tibetan**

Guillaume Jacques
CNRS (CRLAO)
INALCO

1 Introduction

In the Sino-Tibetan family, some subgroups, like Rgyalrong and Kiranti, have extensive verbal agreement morphology, while others such as Chinese, Lolo-Burmese or Tibetan seem to have no trace of any agreement on the verb. These facts have been interpreted by scholars in several ways. Some, such as Bauman (1975), DeLancey (1989), and van Driem (1993b) have proposed that the agreement morphology found in various ST languages is ancient and must be reconstructed for the proto-language. Others, such as LaPolla (1992) have adopted a more sceptical stance and argued the evidence was not sufficient for reconstructing an agreement system, proposing that all the agreement morphology found in these languages was late and (at least partly) independently innovated.

This polarized debate has mainly focused on attested regular forms, whereas little attention has been paid to irregular paradigms, though these are more informative for historical reconstruction (Jacques 2007). In addition, little effort has been made to look for indirect traces of agreement morphology in the languages that have no productive system. If such traces could be brought to light, this would provide argument for the antiquity of the agreement systems.

2 The Tibetan verb "to eat"

The Tibetan verbal system is known for its highly irregular morphology. According to the traditional terminology, Tibetan volitional verbs have four stems respectively called present (da.lta.pa), past ('das.pa), future (ma.'ongs.pa) and imperative (skul.tshig). Although these names are somewhat misleading (Zeisler 2004), we will use them in the present paper for the sake of convenience.

The verb "to eat" has an irregular paradigm, present ***za***, past ***zos***, future ***bza***, imperative ***zos***. The future and imperative forms are what one would anticipate for a root such as √za, but the past form is exceptional: it is the only instance in the Tibetan language of an a/o alternation between present and past forms (the a/o alternation found in the imperative, however, is entirely regular). The present tense ***za*** is also slightly irregular: *'dza would be expected instead. The regular past form ***bzas*** is also attested.

* I greatly benefited from extensive discussion with Boyd Michailovsky about the Kiranti verbal system. Without his help, writing this paper would not have been possible. I also thank Peter Austin, Paul Hastie, Nathan Hill, Randy LaPolla, Alexis Michaud and Laurent Sagart as well as two anonymous reviewers of *Himalayan Linguistics* for comments and corrections. I remain alone responsible for the errors and inadequacies that may remain in the present paper. this paper was corrected after acceptance by the reviewers during my stay as a visiting scholar at the Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, LaTrobe University. I am grateful to Randy LaPolla for having made this visit possible.

In Old Tibetan texts, ***zos*** is by far the most common past tense form:

(1) yab lha.ltong.te.mye.ku ni sha rlon-du zos khrag rlon-du 'thungs pags
father Lhaltongtemyeku TOP flesh raw-ALL eat.PST blood raw-ALL drink.PST skin
rlon-du gyond
raw-ALL wear.PST
He ate father Lhaltongtemyeku's raw flesh, drank his raw blood, and wore his raw skin. (ITJ.0731, v35-36)

(2) 'ung-gis khrel-ltas myed-cïng mna' zos-pa sdïg-ste
he-ERG shame-omen not-CONV oath eat.PST-NMLZ sinful-CONV
Hence, being sinful oath-swallowers, unabashed, (ITJ.0734:1r25)[1]

Only one example of the syllable ***bzas*** as a form of the verb $\sqrt{za}$ is found in Old Tibetan:

(3) khyi sbad-pa-s/ zhang.lond/ zhig bzas-de
dog excite-NMLZ-ERG Zhanglond DET eat.PST-CONV
If someone sets on a dog, and it bites a ***Zhanglond***, (PT1023.18)

In later Tibetan texts, the form ***zos*** is still the most common one:

(4) nged-kyis ni khyod-kyi gzhis phrogs-pa yang med la pha nor
we-ERG TOP you-GEN household plunder.PST-NMLZ even not CONJ father fortune
zos-pa yang med-do
eat.PST-NMLZ even not-ASSERT
We have not plundered your household, or eaten your father's fortune. (Milaraspa 2.2).

Although the philological evidence does not prove beyond doubt that the irregular form ***zos*** is older than ***bzas***, it is significant that the form ***zos*** is the one found in archaic dialects such as Balti (Bielmeier 1985, p. 234). The form ***bzas*** can be explained as a secondary form created by analogy to regularize the otherwise aberrant paradigm of the verb "to eat".[1]

Against the interpretation of past tense ***zos*** as an archaic form, it could be argued that it comes from the imperative ***zos***: this past form would have been created by analogy with the intransitive verbs, where past and imperative do not have a distinct form.[2] However, this idea is problematic: Tibetan intransitive verbs never present a/o alternation. The Past / Imperative of these verbs is either marked by an –s suffix or unmarked. Therefore, it is not likely that the past tense formzos is analogically derived from the imperative, as analogy cannot create an entirely new kind of alternation; if it were the case, we would rather expect a paradigm such as *za / *zas.

3 Vowel alternations in the Kiranti verb

Specialists of Kiranti languages have long noted that transitive verbs ending in –a exhibit vowel alternation. In most languages, the alternation is between –a and –o, though Dumi (van Driem 1993a) has more complex vowel alternation patterns for ancient –a stem verbs due to extensive

1 Translation following Thomas (1957, p. 77).

2 This idea was proposed by Peter Austin.

sound changes.

Such an alternation has been reported in Hayu (Michailovsky 1988, pp. 101-3), Limbu (van Driem 1987, pp. 392-5), Yamphu (Rutgers 1998, p. 165), Bantawa (Doornenbal 2009, pp. 401-2) and most other Kiranti languages. The exact distribution of the –a and –o forms varies greatly from language to language. The complete paradigms of Limbu transitive verbs are illustrated in tables 2 and 3, taking √hipt "to hit" and √ca "to eat" as examples.[3] The first one √hipt is an entirely regular verb, while the second √ca exhibits a/o alternations. These paradigms follow the layout given in Michailovsky (2002, xiii): rows indicate agents, and columns indicate patients. Limbu conjugation marginally distinguishes between non-past and past forms. Past forms distinct from non-past are indicated between brackets.

Table 3 shows that in the non-past, only six forms have –o:

1. 2SG>3SG
2. 2SG >3DU/PL
3. 3SG>3SG
4. 3SG >3DU/PL
5. 3DU/PL>3SG
6. 3DU/PL >3DU/PL

Michailovsky (2002, xiv) argues that this a/o alternation can be explained as a case of vowel fusion between the –a of the radical and the –u vowel of the suffixes. While this explanation seems logical, it is not without problems : the 1SG>3 and 1PL>3 suffixes, respectively *–uŋ* and *–um*, do not trigger vowel fusion, only the –u suffix found in 2>3 and 3>3 forms do.

The intriguing situation found in Limbu can be explained when a language such as Bantawa is taken into account. In Bantawa, the a/o alternation in correlated with both person and TAM: non-past forms have –a, and and past forms have –o where a third person patient –u suffix would be expected (Doornenbal 2009, p. 138). Non-past and past forms are identical if the patient is not third person.

In table 1, we present selected non-past and past forms of the verb "to eat" in Bantawa, compared with their corresponding Limbu forms and with the regular Bantawa verb √khatt "to take". In Bantawa regular verbs, the distinction between non-past and past also exists in some forms of the paradigm (especially with a dual agent), but not in the forms presented here.

	khatt "to take"	*ca* "to eat"		Limbu
		non-past	past	
1SG>3SG	*khattuŋ*	*caŋ*	*coŋ*	*caŋ*
1SG>3DU/PL	*khattuŋciŋ*	*caŋciŋ*	*coŋciŋ*	*caŋsiŋ*
1PL>3SG	*khattumka*	*camka*	*comka*	*cambɛ*
1PL>3DU/PL	*khattumcimka*	*camcimka*	*comcimka*	*camsimbɛ*
2SG>3SG	*tikhattu*	*tica*	*tico*	*kɛdzo*
2SG>3DU/PL	*tikhattuci*	*ticaci*	*ticoci*	*kɛdzosi*
3SG>3SG	*khattu*	*ca*	*co*	*co*
3SG>3DU/PL	*khattuci*	*caci*	*coci*	*cosi*
1SG>2SG	*khatna*	*cana*	*cana*	*canɛ*

Table 1: Bantawa paradigms

	1s	1di	1de	1pi	1pe	2s	2d	2p	3s	3d 3p
1s						*hipnɛ*	*hipnɛsiŋ*	*hip(nɛ)niŋ*	*hiptuŋ*	*hiptuŋsiŋ*
1di						*hipnɛsigɛ*			*ahipsu* (*ahiptusi*)	*ahipsusi*
1de									*hipsugɛ* (*hiptusigɛ*)	*hipsusigɛ*
1pi						*hipmasigɛ*			*ahiptum*	*ahiptumsim*
1pe									*hiptumbɛ*	*hiptumsimbɛ*
2s	*kɛhipma* (*kɛhiptaŋ*)								*kɛhiptu*	*kɛhiptusi*
2d			*agɛhip* (*agɛhiptɛ*)						*kɛhipsu* (*kɛhiptusi*)	*kɛhipsusi*
2p									*kɛhiptum*	*kɛhiptumsi(m)*
3s	*hipma* (*hiptaŋ*)	*ahipsi* (*ahiptɛsi*)	*hipsigɛ* (*hiptɛsigɛ*)	*ahip* (*ahiptɛ*)	*hiptigɛ*	*kɛhip* (*kɛhiptɛ*)	*kɛhipsi* (*kɛhiptɛsi*)	*kɛhipti*	*hiptu*	*hiptusi*
3d	*mɛhipma* (*mɛhiptaŋ*)	*amhipsi* (*amhiptɛsi*)	*mɛhipsigɛ* (*mɛhiptɛsigɛ*)	*amhip* (*amhiptɛ*)	*mɛhiptigɛ*	*kɛmhip* (*kɛmhiptɛ*)	*kɛmhipsi* (*kɛmhiptɛsi*)	*kɛmhipti*	*hipsu* (*hiptusi*)	*hipsusi*
3p									*mɛhiptu*	*mɛhiptusi*

Table 2: Limbu *hipma* "to hit"

	1s	1di	1de	1pi	1pe	2s	2d	2p	3s	3d 3p
1s						*canɛ*	*canɛsiŋ*	*ca(nɛ)niŋ*	*caŋ*	*caŋsiŋ*
1di						*canɛsigɛ*			*adzasu*	*adzasusi* (*adzasi*)
1de									*casugɛ*	*casusigɛ* (*casigɛ*)
1pi						*caasigɛ*			*adzam*	*adzamsim*
1pe									*cambɛ*	*camsimbɛ*
2s	*kɛdzaa* (*kɛdzɛyaŋ*)								*kɛdzo*	*kɛdzosi*
2d			*agɛdza* (*agɛdzɛyɛ*)						*kɛdzasu*	*kɛdzasusi* (*kɛdzosi*)
2p									*kɛdzam*	*kɛdzamsi(m)*
3s	*caa* (*cɛyaŋ*)	*adzasi* (*adzɛyɛsi*)	*casigɛ* (*cɛyɛsigɛ*)	*adza* (*adzɛyɛ*)	*cɛyigɛ*	*kɛdza* (*kɛdzɛyɛ*)	*kɛdzasi* (*kɛdzɛyɛsi*)	*kɛdzɛyi*	*co*	*cosi*
3d	*mɛdzaa* (*mɛdzɛyaŋ*)	*amdzasi* (*amdzɛyɛsi*)	*mɛdzasigɛ* (*mɛdzɛyɛsigɛ*)	*amdza* (*amdzɛyɛ*)	*mɛdzɛyigɛ*	*kɛmdza* (*kɛmdzɛyɛ*)	*kɛmdzasi* (*kɛmdzɛyɛsi*)	*kɛmdzɛyi*	*casu*	*casusi* (*cosi*)
3p									*mɛdzo*	*mɛdzosi*

Table 3: Limbu *cama* "to eat"

The Limbu paradigm looks like a conflation of the two Bantawa paradigms: the non-past form was generalized in the first person, while the past forms were generalized in second and third person forms. Since Limbu is explainable from Bantawa but the reserve is not the case, it is tempting to assume that Bantawa better preserved the proto-Kiranti paradigm. In other words, we would assume that in proto-Kiranti, just like in Bantawa, vowel coalescence of the third person patient –u suffix with the stem of –a verbs only occurred in the past tense.

4 Vowel fusion in other Sino-Tibetan languages

The –a/–o alternations found in Kiranti languages are in fact widespread in the Sino-Tibetan family. However, outside of Kiranti, the alternations are purely conditioned by person, never by TAM. It has been proposed (Jacques 2009) that the –ji / –jo alternation found in Tangut conjugation could also be explained by the coalescence of the ancient *–(j)a stem verb radical with the *–u third person patient suffix; the change from *–ja to –ji in Tangut is regular.

	Proto-Tangut	Attested Tangut
1SG/2SG>3	*–ja-u	–jo
other forms	*–ja	–ji

Incidentally, one of the verbs presenting this alternation in Tangut is the verb "to eat" 䕶 ***dzji***[1] / 𗍊 ***dzjo***[1], cognate with Tibetan ***za*** and Limbu ***cama***. The vowel fusion in Tangut must have been very ancient: it occurred before the change from *–(j)a to –ji, which did not apply on any Chinese or Tibetan loanword. This would imply that this sound change predated the first historical contact of the Tangut with the Chinese in the seventh century.

Traces of this phenomenon also occur in Dulong: ***waŋ***[55] "I do", ***ɔ***[53] "he does" (Sūn 1982, pp. 91-92).

In Pumi, some of the vowel alternations described in Fù (1998, pp. 106-112) are potentially related to coalescence with the *–u suffix in the third person. In Northern dialects such as the Shuiluo variety studied by the author, there is an <u> infi appearing in third person perfective forms of transitive volitive verbs.

In Rgyalrong languages, we do not fid vowel coalescence of –a stem verbs with the –u suffix. Some languages do not have any third person patient –u suffix (Japhug, Tshobdun, Zbu). In Eastern Rgyalrong (Situ), we fid a third person –w suffix corresponding to Kiranti –u which occurs in 3>3and 2>3 forms of transitive verbs with open syllable stems. –a stem verbs do not present vowel coalescence: for instance, the 3SG>3 Aorist form of ***–pa / –pô*** "to do" is ***to-pô-w*** (Lín 2003, p. 264). The absence of coalescence in Situ is the result of analogy: the person suffixes are very regular and similar to possessive prefixes and free pronouns, which would not be expected if the system was archaic. Vowel coalescence inherited from the proto-language was lost and replaced by a more transparent formation. In this respect, Rgyalrong is less archaic than Kiranti, Dulong or Tangut.

Other languages may show traces of this alternation, for instance Shixing, where a ***–ɜ / –u*** alternation appears in the imperative forms of some verbs, including [HL]***dzɜ*** "to eat" the cognate of Tibetan √za (Chirkova 2009, p. 40), unless the vowel alternation in these imperative forms is related to the Tibetan imperative /o/ vocalism.

The vowel coalescence observed in these languages is most probably to be interpreted as a retention from a common proto-language (arguably proto-Sino-Tibetan or very close to it),

though we cannot entirely exclude the possibility that a parallel evolution took place (cf. the parallel development of Umlaut in plural forms in Germanic and Celtic languages).

5 The past tense / perfective –s suffix

Assuming that the –a / –o alternation as found in Bantawa reflects the original paradigm of proto-Kiranti and of an even earlier proto-language, the Tibetan irregular verbza /zos could be explained as the last retention of person agreement in the Tibetan language. This trace of person agreement could only be preserved precisely because the –u third person patient suffix not only marks person, but also TAM: it is only in its function of distinguishing between non-past and past that it could survive after the person agreement system collapsed.

However, unlike Kiranti, the Tibetan past formzos has an –s suffix which deserves comment. In Tibetan, the "past tense" –s suffix regularly occurs in some transitive and intransitive verb classes (see Coblin 1976). As pointed out by one of the reviewers, this raises the question of the relative place of these suffixes in the suffixal chain and how these suffixes interacted with one another.

Although the Tibetan –s suffix has not left direct traces in Kiranti languages, potential cognates of this suffix can be found in Qiangic languages and perhaps also in Jingpo, as Huáng (1997) pointed out, and some scholars have proposed to reconstruct a *–s perfective suffix in Old Chinese (Jīn 2006). This suffix could be of proto-Sino-Tibetan antiquity.

The third patient –u and the perfective / past tense –s are both attested in only a few languages, especially in the Qiangic branch. Data from these language are therefore crucial to see how these two suffixes interact with each other. Let us examine the cognates of the Tibetan past tense –s suffix in Japhug and Situ, two of the four Rgyalrong languages, and then in Tangut.

In Japhug, the –t or –s past tense suffix (depending on the dialects) occurs in the Aorist and Past Imperfective 1SG>3 or 2SG>3 forms of transitive verbs whose stem ends in open syllable (Jacques 2010b, p. 136). Japhug has no suffix corresponding to the third person patient –u found in Kiranti languages, so this language is of little help to determining the order in which these suffixes would occur.

In Situ Rgyalrong, as in Japhug, the past tense –s suffix occurs in the Aorist and Past Imperfective and only appears on verbal forms ending with an open syllable (Lín 2003, p. 262). However, transitive forms normally do not bear this –s suffix, as the 3 person patient –w suffix (on this suffix, see section 4) and the –s suffix are always incompatible as in the example ***to-pô-w*** "he made it" cited above: –s only appears with intransitive verbs.

In Tangut, as mentioned in the previous section, the *–u suffix did not remain as an independent syllable, but left an indirect trace as vowel alternation. A possible cognate to the Tibetan –s suffix is the perfective 䒑 ***sji²*** suffix, which appears as an independent syllable in Tangut, though it could also be a coincidence.

In conclusion, the exact function and distribution of the #–s suffix and the nature of its interaction with #–u (where # represent an approximate reconstruction) is not easy to determine given the contradictory data found in Qiangic languages. At the present stage of our knowledge, it is better to entertain several hypotheses than one.

First, the simplest hypothesis would be that the third person #–u was closer to the verb stem than the past tense #–s. Tibetan and Tangut would have preserved the older pattern.

Second, we can also suppose that, as in Situ Rgyalrong, the two suffixes excluded each other

in the proto-language, so that the past tense of transitive verbs was marked by #–u, and that of the intransitive ones was marked by #–s; later, the –s suffix was analogically extended to the past tense of "eat" in Tibetan; the original past tense of √za ought to have been *zo.

A third hypothesis would be that #–s was placed before #–u, but the vowel alternation occurred nevertheless by Umlaut. This third possibility does not seem very likely, as in this case we would expect to find traces of vowel alternations with all types of verbs, including verbs ending in closed syllables. However, examples of this type can be found in Tangut. One of such example is the verb "to fear", whose basic form is 𗍊 *kjạ*[1], and 1/2SG>3 form 𗍊𗍊 *kjị*[2]. This verb is related to Japhug *nɤscɤr* "to fear, to be startled", and the two stems can be respectively reconstructed in proto-Tangut as *S-kjar and *S-kjor from *S-kjar-u (Jacques 2010a). Since examples of this kind are restricted to Tangut, we consider it to be a Tangut innovation.

6 Conclusion

Apart from √za, other –a stem transitive verbs exist in Tibetan, for instance √bya "to do". Under the theory presented in this paper, these verbs ought to have vowel alternation too. However, it can be safely assumed that analogy has eliminated all other –o past tense forms. It is not uncommon for a verb meaning "to eat" to be among the most conservative verbs in the language.

If the hypothesis proposed in this paper is valid, this would be an important support for the theory that verbal agreement goes back to an early stage of proto-ST.

References

Bauman, James John, 1975. *Pronouns and Pronominal Morphology in Tibeto-Burman*. University of California, Berkeley dissertation.

Bielmeier, Roland. 1985. *Das Märchen von Prinzen Cobzang. Eine tibetische Erzählung aus Baltistan*. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Chirkova, Katia. 2009. "Shixing, a Sino-Tibetan language of South-West China: A grammatical sketch with two appended texts". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 32.1: 1–90.

Coblin, Weldon South. 1976. "Notes on Tibetan verbal morphology". *T'oung Pao* 62: 45–70.

DeLancey, Scott. 1989. "Verb agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 52.2: 315–333.

Doornenbal, Marius, 2009. *A Grammar of Bantawa: Grammar, paradigm tables, glossary and texts of a Rai language of Eastern Nepal*. PhD Dissertation, Leiden University.

van Driem, George. 1987. *A Grammar of Limbu*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

van Driem, George. 1993a. *A Grammar of Dumi*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

van Driem, George. 1993b. "The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61.2: 292–334.

Fù, Àilán. 1998. "普米語動詞的語法範疇 *Pǔmǐyǔ dòngcí de yǔfǎ fànchóu*" *(The categories of the Pumi verb)*. 北京：中國文史出版社 Běijīng: Zhōngguó wénshǐ chūbǎnshè.

Huáng, Bùfán. 1997. "原始藏緬語動詞後綴*-s的遺跡 yuánshǐ zàngmiǎn yǔ dòngcí hòuzhuì *–s de yíjì" (Traces of the Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal *–s suffix). 民族語文 *Mínzú yǔwén* 1: 1–7.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2007. "A shared suppletive pattern in the pronominal systems of Chang Naga and Southern Qiang". *Cahiers de Linguistique - Asie Orientale* 36.1: 61–78.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2009. "The origin of vowel alternations in the Tangut verb". *Language and Linguistics* 10.1: 17–28.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2010a. *Esquisse de phonologie et de morphologie historique du tangoute*. Thèse d'habilitation, Paris.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2010b. "The inverse in Japhug Rgyalrong". *Language and Linguistics* 11.1: 127–157.

Jīn, Lǐxīn. 2006. 上古漢語形態 *Shànggǔ Hànyǔ xíngtài (Old Chinese morphology)*. 合肥：黃山書社 Héiféi: Huángshān shūshè.

LaPolla, Randy. 1992. "On the dating and nature of the verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 55.2: 298–315.

Lín, Yòujīng. 2003. "Tense and aspect morphology in the Zhuokeji rGyalrong verb". *Cahiers de Linguistique - Asie Orientale* 32.2: 245–286.

Michailovsky, Boyd. 1988. *La langue hayu*. Paris : Editions du CNRS.

Michailovsky, Boyd. 2002. *Limbu-English Dictionary*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.

Rutgers, Roland. 1998. *Yamphu, Grammars, Texts and Lexicon*. Leiden: Research School CNWS.

Sūn, Hóngkāi. 1982. 獨龍語簡誌 *Dúlóngyǔ jiǎnzhì (A brief description of Dulong)*. 北京：民族出版社 Běijīng: Mínzú chūbǎnshè.

Thomas, Frederick William. 1957. *Ancient Folk Literature from North-Eastern Tibet*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Zeisler, Bettina. 2004. *Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Languages. A comparative study*. [Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs, 150]. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Himalayan Linguistics, Vol. 9(1). © Himalayan Linguistics 2010
ISSN 1544-7502

Where have all the verbs gone? On verb stretching and semi-words in Indo-Aryan Palula

Henrik Liljegren
Stockholm University
SIL International

1 Introduction

In this paper I focus on complex predicates composed of two distinct lexical items, a verb and a non-verb component (whose lexical identity is an issue we will return to below). Examples from Indo-Aryan Palula of such CPs are *hamlá the* 'attack' (lit. 'do/make attack') as in (1), *širóó the* 'start' (lit. 'do/make start') as in (2), and *milaáu bhe* 'meet' (lit. 'become met') as in (3).[1]

(1) *se* *íṇci* *mulaaseeb-á* *ǰhulí* ***hamlá*** ***thíil-u***
DEF she-bear Mullah.Sahib-OB on attack(M) do.PFV-MSG
'The she-bear attacked Mullah Sahib.'

(2) *táal* *khaṭíl-ii* *pahúrta* *ba* *so* *tasíi* *čaukeeṭ-íi* *kráam*
ceiling cover.PFV-GN after PRT 3MSG.NOM 3SG.GN door.frame-GN work

širóó ***tháan-u***
start do.PRS-MSG
'When the ceiling has been covered, he starts the work with the door frames.'

(3) *ma* *áaǰ* *tas* *sangí* *baazóor-a* ***milaáu*** ***bhíl-u***
1SG.NOM today 3SG.OB with bazaar-OB met become.PFV-MSG
'I [male person] met him at the market today.'

We have no problem recognizing the construction as found in Urdu and other languages of the Indian subcontinent. The same lexical material of the non-verb elements (sometimes referred to as hosts), combined with certain verbs (variously referred to as verbalizers and light verbs) close in meaning to the Palula ones, are found in virtually all languages in South Asia, Indo-Aryan and non-Indo-Aryan alike (see Section 4). As a matter of fact, there are possibly no languages where this construction is not found at all. In (4)-(8) examples are given from some of the languages spoken in the vicinity of Palula.

[1] The (underlying) verb stem is used as citation form for Palula verbs in this paper.

(4) (Urdu)

hamaaree	*dušmanoo~*	*nee*	*gaaoo~*	*par*	***hamla***	***kar***	*diyaa*
our	enemy.OB.PL	ERG	village.OB	on	attack	do	give.PFV.MSG

'Our enemies attacked the village.'

(5) (Charsadda Pashto: Ahkam Ullah)

zmung	*dušmanaano*	*pə*	*kəli*	***hamla***	***okṛa***
our	enemy.OB.PL	on	village	attack	did.FSG

(6) (Gawri/Kalam Kohistani: Muhammad Zaman Sager)

muu~	*dušmänäänä*	*lääm*	*rä*	***hamla***	***kiir***
our	enemies	village	on	attack	did

(7) (Torwali: Inam Ullah)

mhun	*dušmane*	*gam*	*zet*	***hamla***	***ki***
our	enemies	village	on	attack	did

(8) (Khowar: Afsar Ali and Farid Ahmad)

ispa	*duṣmanan*	*deho*	*sora*	***hamla***	***areni***
our	enemies	village	on	attack	did

They are not altogether different from cognate-object constructions (Givón 2001: 165) in English, such as *give birth*, *pay attention, take pride in*, *have a rest*, *get along with, put an end to,* etc., where a verbal idea is being expressed jointly by the verb and another (non-verb) lexical item (Butt 2003: 1-2). However, such complex predicates are extremely abundant in Indo-Aryan languages, and most of these are semantically equivalent to simple verbs (rather than complex verbs) in European languages. They express a wide range of ideas, and, as previously pointed out (e.g. Gambhir 1993: 85), serve as a productive – or sometimes the only – way of incorporating loans into the verb lexicons.

1.1 Problem(s) defined

The problem arises when trying to define the syntactic status and lexical identity of the non-verb element in a complex predicate (CP). Likewise, we face a challenge when describing the particular verbs occurring in CPs: Are these verbs in any significant way different from most other verbs in the language? And if so, do these differences justify a distinct syntactic or lexical category to account for them? Following on that we want to be able to say what properties of CPs determine the argument structure of the whole clause and the case roles assigned to its arguments. Do they rest in: a) the verb component only, b) the non-verb component only, or, c) in both of them? Finally, we need to ask whether there is a descriptive need to differentiate between different types of CPs, or if we are better served by a unified account.

Most of these questions are far from new. They have been addressed in various ways (Butt 1995; 2003; Follie et al 2005; Gambhir 1993; Goldberg 2003; Haig 2002; Karimi-Doostan 2005;

Masica 1991: 368-369; 1993; Mohanan 1993; 1994; Verma 1993), both the phenomenon in a larger macro-area and as it occurs in Indo-Aryan (in the latter referred to as "conjunct verbs", see Masica 1991: 326, or "denominative verbs", see Schmidt 1999: 95-96), but my hope is that I will be able to approach the matter from a slightly different angle and suggest answers that lie somewhat outside of what has been presented in earlier works.

1.2 Background: Palula

Palula is an Indo-Aryan language spoken by approximately 10,000 people in the Chitral Valley in northern Pakistan's mountain region. Apart from my own research (see Liljegren 2008 for a grammatical description), this language has largely remained undocumented. The language samples presented in this paper are based on first-hand data, collected and analyzed in close collaboration with Palula-speaking language consultants during the period 1998-2009.[2] If not specifically noted (such as a B for the Biori Valley dialect), the examples are taken from the speech of the Ashret Valley, one of two main dialects.

Palula belongs to a group of speech varieties subsumed under the heading Shina, which in their turn are part of a cluster of Indo-Aryan languages traditionally referred to as "Dardic", all spoken in a mountainous region in the extreme northwest of the subcontinent. "Dardic" is not an established genetic grouping, but for reasons of geographical proximity, some shared areal characteristics as well as some shared retentions, they are often – but controversially – lumped together under this term (see Bashir (2003: 822), Strand (2001: 258), and Zoller (2005: 10-11) for contemporary but differing views on classification and the use of terminology).[3]

According to local historical tradition, the ancestors of today's Palula speakers migrated from the Chilas area in the main Indus Valley some fifteen generations ago and have since then not participated in any regular interaction with other Shina-speaking communities, resulting in an ever-increasing degree of linguistic divergence between Palula and the speech varieties within the main Shina belt. While Palula in its essence has retained many features common to Shina at large, and in some respects have retained features since lost in the other varieties, it has also been subject to important influences from languages in its present environment. Insofar as most features discussed in this paper are concerned, Pashto (Southeastern Iranian), Persian (Southwestern Iranian) and – in modern times – Urdu (Indo-Aryan), appear to have been the more influential donors.[4]

---

[2] Although several people have given assistance throughout a ten-year period, Naseem Haider (a language activist native of Ashret), who has been my main language consultant, deserves a special mention. The two of us have collaborated extensively since 2003, through the Forum for Language Initiatives (Islamabad), and I owe much of my insights into various aspects of Palula to him.

[3] The major groups that feature in the "Dardic" cluster (Bashir 2003: 824-825) are the following, with examples of individual languages within parentheses: 1. Pashai, 2. Kunar Group (Gawarbati, Dameli), 3. Chitral Group (Khowar, Kalasha), 4. Kohistan Group (Gawri, Torwali), 5. Shina (Palula, Gilgiti, Kohistyõ), 6. Kashmiri.

[4] English may be added to this list, although English lexical material almost exclusively (at least until very recently) has been transmitted and "filtered" through Urdu or Pashto.

2 The verb lexicon in Palula

Although verbs form a major word class in most, if not all, of the world's languages, the way events are encoded varies a great deal. One effect of this is a dramatic variation in the number of verbs found in languages. While at one extreme, the main European languages, such as English, can boast 10,000 or more verbs, there are at the other extreme languages in other parts of the world with markedly different lexical structures that manage with minimal verbal systems of 10-40 simple verbs, as Kalam in Papua New Guinea (Viberg 1993: 347-8, 2006: 409), or in extreme cases with only a handful of verbs, as Jingulu in Australia (Baker 2003: 88-94). In the light of that we will try to discern whether Palula has a verb lexicon similar to European languages or should be included in the category of languages with minimal verbal systems, or at least be said to share some lexical characteristics of either one.

Regardless of the size of the verb lexicon, the twenty most frequent verbs in any one language tend to have some characteristics in common, and a number of basic meanings coded as verbs are bound to show up here (Viberg 2006: 209), such as GO, GIVE, TAKE, MAKE, SEE and SAY, verbs that Viberg (2006: 409) refers to as "nuclear", covering the basic semantic notions of motion, possession, production, verbal communication and perception. Not all the twenty most frequent verbs of European languages are *nuclear* in the same sense and must therefore be defined as language- or area-specific. This is the case with BE and HAVE, the first one being the overall most frequent in almost all European languages, and the second a verb with few parallels outside Europe.[5]

A similar tendency can be seen when studying the twenty most frequently used verbs in Palula (Table 1). We find many nuclear verbs here, too, and as in European languages, an equivalent of BE tops the list by a wide margin.[6] More interestingly, however, BE is immediately followed by two other high-frequency verbs: *bhe* 'become' and *the* 'do, make'.

	Verb stem		% text occurrence
1	*hin*	'be'	25.0
2	*bhe*	'become'	8.2
3	*the*	'do, make'	7.7
4	*be*	'go'	5.5
5	*mané*	'say'	5.0
6	*háans*	'live, exist'	3.9
7	*de*	'give'	3.6
8	*yhe*	'come'	3.6
9	*thané*	'call, say, name'	2.3
10	*whe*	'get down'	1.8
11	*kha*	'eat'	1.7

[5] In English the modals *will, can, may, shall* and *must* are all among the twenty most frequent, and in many other European languages the modals CAN and MUST are found in this frequency range (Viberg 1993: 346-9).

[6] The suppletive and defective verb *hin-* with its invariable Past tense form *de* is the Palula copula as well as an important auxiliary participating in the formation of a number of periphrastic tense-aspect categories.

12	*nikhé*	'appear, get out'	1.4
13	*daḉhé*	'look'	1.2
14	*har*	'take away'	1.1
15	*mhaaré*	'kill'	1.1
16	*ǰe*	'hit, beat'	1.1
17	*uṛí*	'let out, pour'	0.9
18	*bheš*	'sit down'	0.9
19	*čhooré*	'put'	0.8
20	*khooǰá*	'ask'	0.8
			77.7

Table 1: The 20 most frequent Palula verbs (drawn from 40 texts, only finite forms counted)

Moving on from this list, another striking observation we can make has to do with the relative textual verb occurrence within certain frequency ranges. Viberg (2006: 409) claims that the twenty most frequent verbs tend to cover close to fifty percent of the textual frequency in European languages. He compares that with the language Kalam in Papua New Guinea, with a total number of simple verbs around one hundred, of which fifteen verbs account for ninety percent of the total textual occurrence. As indicated in Table 2, Palula places itself between these two, with close to eighty percent (51.5% + 26.2%) accounted for by the twenty most frequent verbs. That makes it significantly different from the European type, but it is still quite different from languages with minimal verbal systems.

Frequency range (number of verbs)	% finite verb occurrence
1-5 (5)	51.5
6-20 (15)	26.2
21-40 (20)	10.0
41-138 (98)	12.3
All (138)	100.0

Table 2: Palula textual verb occurrences related to frequency ranges

Interestingly, half of the occurrences in text are accounted for by only the five topmost verbs, among them the two most productive verbs occurring in complex predicates, bhe 'become' and *the* 'do, make', with the other fifteen verbs in the "twenty list" comprising another quarter of all verbs. The following twenty verbs account for a tenth, while the remaining hundred or so verbs only represent twelve percent of the total number of verbs occurring in the text corpus. This does not mean that Palula has no more than 138 simple verbs,[7] but it does suggest that the total number is likely to be in the hundreds rather than in the thousands, and that any verbs beyond these 138 are quite rare. It also suggests that the verbs *bhe-* 'become' and *the-* 'do' have a special status in the Palula verb

[7] I have in fact elicited more or less complete paradigms for over 350 Palula verb stems.

lexicon: The way in which they are productively used as building blocks in the language compensates for the relatively small number of simple verbs.

3 Complex predicates in Palula

The Palula verb lexicon shares the ability associated with the "minimal type" (as discussed above) of encoding specialized events by means of complex predicates. Two common strategies world-wide (Viberg 1993: 348) are: (a) CP-formation by combining certain verbs with a noun or an adjective (often referred to as a light verb construction, Bowern 2008: 163-165); and (b) CP-formation by combining two verbs (sometimes referred to as a serial-verb construction, Baker 2003: 227-230). Only the former strategy is well attested in Palula, where it is a productive and easily applicable strategy, especially for verbalizing culturally new concepts, and we find, perhaps not surprisingly, a substantial number of loan words (primarily from Urdu or Pashto) filling the so-called "host" slot of such complexes.[8]

3.1 Transitivity and grammatical relations in Palula

Before launching into a meaningful discussion of complex predicates, some crucial grammatical features of Palula need to be given a basic introduction. The relevant features are transitivity, case alignment and verb-agreement patterns.

Like Urdu, but unlike most other Shina varieties, Palula verb agreement is sensitive to the aspect expressed in the clause. While the inflected verb agrees (in person or in gender/number) with the intransitive and transitive subject alike (S and A, using Dixon's (1994: 6) conventions) in all non-perfective tense-aspect-modality (TAM) categories, the verb always agrees (in gender/number) with the intransitive subject and the transitive object (S and O) in the perfective.[9] Phrased another way, we can say that Palula shows accusative alignment in the non-perfective, as in example (9). Here the transitive verb *khyáanu* 'is eating' agrees with *so* 'he' (A). In the perfective, on the other hand, it displays ergative agreement, as in example (10). The intransitive verb *yhóolu* 'came' agrees with *karáaṛu* 'leopard' (S), while the transitive verb *khóola* 'ate' agrees with *kučúra* 'dogs' (O).

(9) *so* *gúuli* *khyáan-u,* *wíi* *piláan-u*
he bread(FSG) eat.PRS-MSG water(MSG) drink.PRS-MSG
'He is eating bread and drinking water.'

(10) *karáaṛu* *yhóol-u,* *kučúra* *khóol-a* *thaní*
leopard(MSG) come.PFV-MSG dog.PL(M) eat.PFV-MPL QT
'[She] said: "A leopard came and ate the dogs."'

[8] A unitary account of complex predicates of both types (as found in Urdu and some other South Asian languages and traditionally defined as "conjunct verbs" and "compound verbs", respectively, Masica 1991: 326) is suggested by Butt (2003: 2).

[9] Person agreement is limited to future and past imperfective (both non-perfective TAM categories), whereas gender/number agreement is applied to all other (participle-based) TAM categories.

As far as inflectional case is concerned, only the transitive subject (A) may receive non-nominative (i.e. ergative) case marking, and only in the perfective, i.e. exactly in those cases where we have ergative verb agreement (as described above).[10] This case marking is exemplified by the *-a* added to *ǰaangúl* in (11). Nouns occurring as heads of any other core NPs (including direct objects), such as *ǰaangúl* in (12), are always coded in the nominative, as are also all heads of the A relation in the non-perfective.

(11) *ǰaangul-á* *ma* *bhanǰóol-u*
Jan.Gul-OB 1SG.NOM beat.PFV-MSG
'Jan Gul beat me up.'

(12) *ǰaangúl* *ba* *áak* *gáaḍ-u* *míiš* *de*
Jan.Gul PRT IDEF big-MSG man be.PST
'Jan Gul, however, was an old man.'

Pronominal case is slightly more complex (for a fuller treatment, see Liljegren 2008 (109-128, 258-259)), but suffice it to say that apart from an all-present pronominal contrast upheld between A and S in the perfective, the direct object (O) receives a differential (accusative) case marking, too.[11] The first person plural accusative case form *asaám,* as in (13), contrasts with the nominative *be* (1PL.NOM) as well as with the ergative *asím* (1PL.ERG).

(13) *ninúi* *dapáara* *asaám* *koó* *mhaarúin*
3PL.PROX.GN for 1PL.ACC some.NOM kill.3PL
'Because of them some people may kill us.'

Transitivity is a feature of individual Palula verb stems. There is a strict distinction between intransitive and transitive verb stems, which means that a particular Palula verb triggers, almost without exception, either an ergative or an accusative alignment. Labile verbs (transitivity-wise) are very rare in the language. There is, on the other hand, a fairly productive valence-changing morphology, as illustrated in (14) and (15) with the transitive *nuuṭ-á* 'turn s.t.' (PFV *nuuṭóol*) derived from the intransitive *núuṭ* 'turn' (PFV *nuuṭíl*).

(14) *xu* *bhíilam* *ma* *nuuṭíl-i* *hín-i*
but of.fear 1SG.NOM turn(ITR).PFV-F be.PRS-F
'But because of fear I have turned back.'

(15) *ghaš-í* *ba* *ghúuṛu* *nuuṭóol-u*
catch-CV PRT horse turn(TR).PFV-MSG
'Holding it he turned the horse around.'

[10] Most nouns have an oblique case form (used as ergative or locative marker and in postpositional phrases), but in one of the declensions there is no oblique form different from the nominative.

[11] This is not the case for 1SG and 2SG, for which NOM and ACC have fused historically.

Apart from the fundamental subcategorization of verbs into transitive and intransitive, there is another distinction to be made between fully saturated intransitive/transitive verbs and intransitive/transitive verbs with an oblique object, the latter exemplified with *yarí* 'peak' in (16). Since verbs in Palula do not license double objects, such an oblique object usually needs to be coded by a postposition, here *the*, to set it apart from the direct object. While the oblique object tends to be inanimate, that is by no means always the case, as will become evident in our continued discussion of complex predicates.

(16) *se* *yar-í* *the* *asím* *tas* *phedóol-u*
DEF peak-OB to 1PL.ERG 3SG.ACC bring.PFV-MSG
'We brought him to that peak.'

3.2 Complex predicate composition in Palula

While there is a small group of verbs that can participate in the more conventionalized complex predicates in Palula, the two inflected verbs, *bhe* 'become' and *the* 'do, make', displayed in (1)-(3), are by far the most common. As we also saw, these two are some of the overall most frequent verbs in the language. As for transitivity, *bhe* is lexically intransitive, as can be seen in (17), whereas *the*, as in (18), is transitive, the latter triggering ergative alignment (i.e. verb agreement in feminine singular with the direct object *ǰang* 'fight') and case assignment (the oblique form *tíi* of the third person singular and not the nominative *so*) in the perfective.

(17) *ǰang* ***širóo*** ***bhíl-i***
fight(F) start become.PFV-F
'A fight broke out.'

(18) *índi* *yhayí* *tíi* *ǰang* ***širóo*** ***thíil-i***
here come.CV 3SG.OB fight(F) start do.PFV-F
'When he had come here he started a fight.'

As for the non-verb component (NVC) it can either be a noun, an adjective or a lexical item that, for one reason or another, cannot be easily defined as either one of the two. A number of frequently occurring CPs are displayed in Table 3.

Verb	Gloss	NVC	Approx gloss	Probable origin/parallels[12]	CP	Gloss
bhe	'become'	*angaá*	'conscious'	Cf. Prs *āgāh* 'knowing, informed'	*angaá bhe*	'wake up, remember'
		ašáq	'in love'	Ar *ʿišq* 'excessive love'	*ašáq bhe*	'fall in love'
		bač	'safe'	Cf. H *bač-* 'be saved, escape'	*bač bhe*	'escape'
		čhub	NO IND MEAN		*čhub bhe*	'ride, sit up'
		ḍup	'deep, drowned'	OIA **ḍubb* 'sink'	*ḍup bhe*	'drown'
		milaáu	'met, meeting'	Cf. H *milāp* 'union, meeting'	*milaáu bhe*	'meet'
		óol	NO IND MEAN		*óol bhe*	'guard'
		paidóo	'born'	Prs *paidā* 'born, created'	*paidóo bhe*	'arise, be born'
		rawaán	'move'	Prs *rawān* 'going, moving'	*rawaán bhe*	'get going'
		ráal	'elevated, high'	OIA **uparalla-* 'upper'	*ráal b*	'rise'
		sáaz	'well'	Prs *sabz* 'fresh, good, healthy'	*sáaz bhe*	'recover'
		široó	'started'	Ar *šurūʿ* 'beginning'	*širóo bhe*	'begin'
		ṣúum	NO IND MEAN		*ṣúum bhe*	'defeat'
		tang	'narrow'	Cf. Prs *tang* 'confined, tight'	*tang bhe*	'suffer, feel upset'
		teér	'passed'	Psh *ter* 'passed, lapsed'	*teér bhe*	'pass'
		ṭing	NO IND MEAN		*ṭing bhe*	'challenge, stand'
		xox	'liking'	Psh *xwax* 'pleased, attractive'	*xox bhe*	'like'
		yaád	'remembrance'	Prs *yād* 'memory, recollection'	*yaád bhe*	'remember'
the	'do/make'	*baáṭ*	NO IND MEAN	Cf. *báaṭ* 'stone' < OIA **varta*	*baáṭ the*	'sharpen'
		bač	'safe'	Cf. H *bač-* 'be saved, escape'	*bač the*	'save'
		bhootû	'plowing'	OIA **upōpta* 'sown'	*bhootû the*	'plough'
		ḍóo	NO IND MEAN	Cf. *ḍóok* 'back' < OIA **ḍhākka*	*ḍóo the*	'carry (on back)'
		hamlá	'attack'	Ar(Prs) *ḥamla* 'attack, assault'	*hamlá the*	'attack'
		hawaalá	'handover'	Ar(Prs) *ḥawāla* 'custody, care'	*hawaalá the*	'hand over'
		hiǰrát	'migration'	Ar(Prs) *hiǰrat* 'departure, flight'	*hiǰrát the*	'migrate'
		ibaadát	'worship'	Ar(Prs) *ʿibādat* 'religious service'	*ibaadát the*	'worship'
		inkaár	'refusal'	Ar *inkār* 'denial, refusal'	*inkaár the*	'refuse'
		ǰamá	'collection'	Ar(H) *ǰamaʿ* 'collection, sum total'	*ǰamá the*	'gather, collect'
		ǰargá	'council'	Psh *ǰirgah* 'assembly, council'	*ǰarga the*	'consult'
		ǰhaní	'marriage'	OIA *ǰáni* 'woman, wife'	*ǰhaní the*	'marry'
		káaṇ	'ear'	OIA *kárṇa* 'ear'	*káaṇ the*	'listen, give heed'
		kráam	'work'	OIA *kárman* 'act, work'	*kráam the*	'work'
		madád	'help'	Ar *madad* 'help, assistance'	*madád the*	'help'
		muqaabilá	'contest'	Ar(Prs) *muqābala* 'contest, facing'	*muqaabilá the*	'compete'

[12] The information under *Probable origin/parallels* is only included in order to give some suggestions as to relatedness (marked cf.) and likely source languages. In many cases it is obviously very difficult to say with any certainty by which route a word came to be used in Palula, or even whether it is a loan or an item inherited from an earlier stage of Indo-Aryan, such as OIA. For most lexical material of ultimately Arabic origin we can safely assume that it was mediated through one of the more immediate languages of wider communication in the region, thus partly reflecting the use such words already would have acquired in those languages. Ar(Prs) should be read as: corresponding to Persian form of Arabic origin word.

		nimóos	'prayer'	Prs *namāz* '(Muslim) prayer'	*nimóos the*	'pray (ritual prayers)'
		phóom	NO IND MEAN		*phóom the*	'take care of'
		qisá	'story'	Ar(Prs) *qissa* 'tale, story'	*qisá the*	'tell'
		ráal	'elevated, high'	OIA **uparalla-* 'upper'	*ráal the*	'raise'
		sáaz	'well'	Prs *sabz* 'fresh, good,	*sáaz the*	'build, repair'
		široó	'started'	Ar *šurū'* 'beginning'	*široó the*	'start'
		šišoó	'game'		*šišoó the*	'play'
		šuwéeli	'goodness'		*šuwéeli the*	'treat well'
		šúug	'affection'	Cf. Gaw *šūk* 'love, desire'	*šúug the*	'show affection'
		táma	'expectation'		*táma the*	'expect, wait eagerly'
		tang	'narrow'	Cf. Prs *tang* 'confined, tight'	*tang the*	'oppress, trouble'
		ṭoóp	'leap'		*ṭoóp the*	'jump'
		xox	'liking'	Psh *xwax* 'pleased, attractive'	*xox the*	'choose'
		yaád	'remembrance'	Prs *yād* 'memory, recollection'	*yaád the*	'recall'
de	'give/fall'	*baát*	'word, talk'	OIA *vārttā* 'business, tidings'	*baát de*	'tell, talk'
		čéɣi	'cry'	Psh *čiɣ* 'noise'	*čéɣi de*	'scream'
		daawát	'invitation'	Ar(Prs) *da'wat* 'invitation, feast'	*daawát de*	'invite'
		dhreég	NO IND MEAN	OIA *dairghá* 'length'	*dhreég de*	'lie down'
		ḍhoó	NO IND MEAN		*ḍhoó de*	'appear, come across'
		géeli	NO IND MEAN		*géeli de*	'accuse, make unhappy'
		haát	'hand'	OIA *hásta* 'hand'	*haát de*	'touch'
		húkum	'order'	Ar *ḥukm* 'order, decree'	*húkum de*	'order'
		káanga	NO IND MEAN	Cf. *kéengi* 'comb' < OIA	*káanga de*	'comb'
		kháaḍ	NO IND MEAN	Cf. *kháaṭu* 'lid'	*kháaḍ de*	'cover'
		póo	NO IND MEAN	OIA *pā́da-* 'foot'	*póo de*	'step on'
		rhoó	'song, recitation'	Cf. Gaw *rō* 'song, poem'	*rhoó de*	'sing, recite'
		šúug	'affection'	Cf. Gaw *šūk* 'love, desire'	*šúug de*	'feel affection'
ḍhak	'touch'	*ǰáar*	'fever'	OIA *ǰvará* 'fever'	*ǰáar ḍhak*	'have a fever'
ǰe	'hit, beat'	*bhéengi*	'swimming'		*bhéengi ǰe*	'swim'
ǰháan	'know'	*šóo*	'good'	OIA *šubha* 'bright, good'	*šóo ǰháan*	'be fond of, like'
ṣač	'rise'	*šid*	'coldness'	OIA *śītá* 'cold'	*šid ṣač*	'feel cold'
be	'go'	*nū́ndram*	'sleep OB'	OIA *nidrā́* 'sleep (N)'	*nū́ndram be*	'fall asleep'
yhe	'come'	*nū́ndra*	'sleep'	OIA *nidrā́* 'sleep (N)'	*nū́ndra yhe*	'feel sleepy'

Table 3: Examples of complex predicates in Palula
Gaw=Gawri/Kalam Kohistani (fr. Baart 1997), H=Hindustani (fr. Platts 1884), OIA=Old Indo-Aryan (fr. Turner 1966), Prs=Persian (fr. Platts 1884), Ar= Arabic (fr. Platts 1884), Psh=Pashto (fr. Raverty 1982 [1901])

For those CPs whose NVC is clearly identified as a noun, it is also an argument of the verb. This is obvious from the ergative verb agreement displayed with the NVC. In (19), *ṭoóp* is the direct object with which the verb agrees in gender/number.

(19) *eendáa* *maní* *ba* *íṇç-a* *kaṭamuš-á* *dúši* ***ṭoóp*** ***thíil-i*** *hín-i*
like.this say.CV PRT bear-OB Katamosh-OB toward leap(F) do.PFV-F be.PRS-F
'Having said that, the bear jumped toward Katamosh.'

In many CPs, the NVC is clearly adjectival, such as *tang* in (20), and is thus not treated as an argument of the verb.

(20) *thíi* *aní* *zangal-í* *buṭheé* ***tang*** ***thíil-a*** *hín-a*
2SG.GN PROX forest-OB all narrow do.PFV-MPL be.PRS-MPL
'You have troubled all [living beings] in this forest.'

Many complexes of the latter type have parallel constructions consisting of NVC+DO and NVC+BECOME in which the NVC remains the same (cf. *tang the* 'trouble, oppress, make miserable, upset' as in (20) and *tang bhe* 'suffer, feel upset' as in (21)). Often (but not without exception) the semantic relationship between these two is straightforward.

(21) *bakáara* *húluk-a* ***tang*** ***bhéen-im***
flock heat-OB narrow become.PRS-FPL
'The flock [of sheep and goats] suffers in the heat.'

An identical situation is found in many other languages in the region, most importantly in the donor languages of wider communication. Sometimes the very same elements are found as NVCs in those languages, combined with DO and BECOME (or BE). Some illustrative examples of such correspondences between Palula, Pashto and Urdu are given in Table 4.[13]

Verb	Palula	Pashto (PFV in parentheses)	Urdu	
BECOME	*paidóo bhe*	*paidaa kedəl*	*paidaa honaa*	'arise, be born'
DO	*paidóo the*	*paidaa kawəl*	*paidaa karnaa*	'produce, create'
BECOME	*široó bhe*	*šoro kedəl*	*šuruu honaa*	'begin'
DO	*široó the*	*šoro kawəl*	*šuruu karnaa*	'start'
BECOME	*tang bhe*	*tang-edəl (tang šwəl)*	*tang honaa*	'suffer, feel upset'
DO	*tang the*	*tang-awəl (tang kṛəl)*	*tang karnaa*	'oppress, trouble'
BECOME	*ǰamá bhe*	*ǰama kedəl*	*ǰama honaa*	'assemble, gather (ITR)'
DO	*ǰamá the*	*ǰama kawəl*	*ǰama karnaa*	'collect, gather (TR)'
BECOME	*teér bhe*	*ter-edəl (ter šwəl)*	--	'pass (away)'
DO	*teér the*	*ter-awəl (ter kṛəl)*	--	'pass (over), spend'
BECOME	*xox bhe*	*xwax-edəl (xwax šwəl)*	--	'take one's fancy, like'
DO	*xox the*	*xwax-awəl (xwax kṛəl)*	--	'choose, charm'

[13] The glossing of the complexes is approximate at best and is not taking into account any minor differences in semantics or usage that may be at hand between these languages. It should also be noted that some of the Pashto predicates show a higher degree of NVC-and-verb fusion in some of its tenses (Lorenz 1979: 86-88) as compared with Palula and Urdu.

BECOME	*xalóos bhe*	*xalaas-edəl (xalaas šwəl)*	--	'be set free, escape'
DO	*xalóos the*	*xalaas-awəl (xalaas kṛəl)*	--	'release'

Table 4: Examples of parallel complex predicates in Palula, Pashto and Urdu

Although a great deal of CPs conform to the aforementioned patterns and it seems to be how most newly acquired CPs can be described, they do not capture the entire phenomenon, at least not at first glance. Most importantly, a number of NVCs are nouns (at least historically or in the source language in case of borrowing), but still do not show the expected agreement pattern. Instead, another NP in the clause appears to be the direct object as far as syntax is concerned. In (22), for instance, the NVC *yaád* is not treated as the direct object in Palula, although it is a noun in Persian, the ultimate source of this borrowed element.

(22) *míi* *tas* ***yaád*** ***thíil-u***
1SG.GN 3SG.ACC memory do.PFV-MSG
'I remembered him [i.e. recollected having seen or met him].'

The NVC in (23) should be compared to the masculine noun *káaṇ* 'ear', which in all likelihood is its historical source. The direct object in this clause, however, is the feminine noun *baát* 'word, speech, talking'. Here, we are probably witnessing a language-internal relexicalization, perhaps aided by or modeled on a semantically and compositionally similar construction in a language of wider communication.

(23) *ǰamǰaá* *baačaá* *tasíi* *baát* ***káaṇ*** *na* ***thíil-i***
Jamja king 3SG.GN word(F) NVC='ear' NEG do.PFV-F
'King Jamja didn't heed his [the prophet's] words.'

Two other, in this respect, similar CPs (listed in Table 3) are *ḍóo the* 'carry (on one's back)' and *baáṭ the* 'sharpen [e.g. a knife]', where in all likelihood *ḍóo* is related to the noun *ḍóok* 'back', and *baáṭ* to the noun *báaṭ* 'stone'.[14] In neither complex is the NVC treated as the direct object. (See examples (44) and (45) for example sentences with these CPs.)

The picture becomes even more diverse when we include CPs with other verbs. The most common verb participating in CPs after *bhe* 'become' and *the* 'do' is *de* 'give', see Table 3. Interestingly, we have some CPs with *de* that has an NVC that is treated as a direct object, such as *géeli* in (24), including verb agreement in gender but without being synchronically transparent. Such an NVC does not occur outside of this construction, and speakers of the language seem to be unable to gloss it independently.[15]

[14] The two words *báaṭ* and *baáṭ* differ in pitch-accent, a phonemic contrast described in Liljegren & Haider (2009).

[15] As pointed out by one of the reviewers, this may be a calque (probably of some age, as the connection is obscured by an umlaut and a slight semantic shift) of Urdu *gaalii denaa* 'to abuse, scold'.

(24) *tíi* *máa-the* ***géeli*** ***dít-i***
3SG.OB 1SG.NOM-to NVC give.PFV-F
'He accused me [i.e. reminded me of my faults].'

In some such cases, as with *póo* in (25), we can trace the NVC to an earlier stage of the language (*pā́da-* 'foot' in Old Indo-Aryan, Turner 1966: 8056), where it really had full noun status, but obviously it does not exist in the modern-day language as a lexical item with independent reference.[16]

(25) *yágdam* *tíi* *áa* *ǰhandrayí* *ǰhulí* ***póo*** ***dít-i***
suddenly 3SG.OB IDEF snake.OB on NVC give.PFV-F
'Suddenly he stepped on a snake.'

In many other cases, as in examples (26) and (27), whether or not the NVC is part of the argument structure, it is indeed difficult to exactly define the word lexically, an issue we will have reason to return to shortly.

(26) *iṇç* *ba* *kaṭamuš-á* *the* ***óol*** ***bhíi***
bear PRT Katamosh-OB to NVC become.3SG
'The bear, however, will [stay and] guard Katamosh.'

(27) *eesé* *xalk-íim* *the* *bíiḍ-i* *ziaát* ***phóom*** ***thíi*** *de*
REM people-OB.PL to many-F much NVC do.3SG PST
'He was taking very good care of such people.'

Although a full treatment of CPs in Palula, and a deeper understanding of their history, needs to include an analysis of complexes with verbs other than *bhe* and *the*, due to lack of space and time, I will focus almost exclusively on CPs with *bhe* and *the* in the remaining sections.

3.3 Complex predicate categorization

Several scholars have already identified two distinct structural types of CPs depending on the syntactic status of the NVC, more specifically whether or not the NVC plays the role of the direct object or not. Although Haig (2002) largely restricts his discussion to noun+verb CPs, I will use his terminology and refer to these two as non-incorporating and incorporating CPs, respectively, regardless of the lexical identity of the NVC. While the present analysis is built on Palula data and the CP composition in that particular language, I believe the following has a bearing on categorizing CPs in Indo-Aryan at large.

The non-incorporating CPs are those for which the NVC is considered part of the argument structure (as in examples (19) and (24)-(25) above). All non-incorporating CPs are transitive, and

[16] The only word in current use for 'foot, leg' is *khur*. However, cf. *naalpoó* 'barefoot'.

syntactically the NVC is the direct object of clauses headed by such CPs. No additional direct object can occur in those clauses. However, there are a few important subtypes, depending on the number of other possible participants in the events verbalized by non-incorporating CPs and how these are treated syntactically (again, I follow Haig (2002: 29) rather closely): a) saturated CPs, b) oblique complement CPs (Haig calls this type adpositional complement CPs), and c) possessor complement CPs.

Here it will be necessary to introduce the concept of "verb stretching" that I will be using throughout the rest of this article. Rather than seeing verbs as having an entirely fixed or lexically predefined argument structure, it is more helpful to identify argument structure constructions that a certain verb may be semantically compatible with and therefore picked out for. As more than one verb can fit into a particular construction of this sort, it is, likewise, not uncommon for a particular verb to appear in more than one construction. For example (from Goldberg 1995: 11), the word *kick*, can be used in no less than eight different argument structures: *she kicked the wall, she kicked him black and blue, she kicked the football into the stadium, she kicked at the football, she kicked his foot against the chair, she kicked him the football, the horse kicked, she kicked her way out of the operating room*. Although this can be applied in a less elaborate way for many verbs, some verbs are obviously more flexible than others and are susceptible to a higher degree of "stretching", i.e. are or have become applicable to a wider range of arguments. These seem to be high-frequency verbs with a very generic semantics (Goldberg 2006: 77-79), and there is certainly no accident that some of those verbs are extensively used in complex predicates of the type discussed here.

Returning to the subclassification of non-incorporating CPs, saturated CPs express what can be termed semantically intransitive propositions. They normally involve only one participant coded by the syntactic agent subject, whereas the syntactic object refers to an event or an action. The CP *hijřát the* 'migrate', exemplified in (28), is a saturated CP.

(28) *tíi* *taayúu* ***hijřát*** ***thíil-i***
3SG.OB from.there migration(F) do.PFV-F
'He migrated from there.' (B)

Oblique complement CPs occur with another argument in addition to the agent subject. Depending on the individual CP, this additional argument is coded as a particular non-nominative complement, usually as a postpositional phrase, such as *kaafiraanóom sangí* in (29). This oblique complement is often the semantic patient (usually human), whereas the syntactic direct object (i.e. the NVC), again, refers to an event. Other examples of oblique complement CPs are *phóom the* 'take care of' with *the* 'to' coding the additional argument (*xalkíim the* in example (27) above) and *hamlá the* with the postpositional argument headed by *ǰhulí* 'on' (see example (1) above).

(29) *so* *aní* *[kaafir-aan-óom* *sangí]* ***madád*** ***tháan-u***
3MSG.NOM PROX infidel-PL-OB with help do.PRS-MSG
'He's helping these infidels.'

Possessor complement CPs also have an additional argument but one which is coded as a possessive of the NVC, such as *xudáyii* 'God's' in example (30). These, however, seem to be less stable in Palula,

and some CPs alternate between possessor coding and oblique coding of their complement (cf. (31) with (29)).[17]

(30) ***sirf*** ***áak*** ***[xudá-yii]*** ***ibaadát*** ***tha***
only one God-GN worship do.IMP.SG
'You shall worship one God only!'

(31) ***áak*** ***maaldaár*** ***míiš-a*** ***[ɣariib-aan-úm-ii]*** ***madád*** ***thíil-i***
IDEF wealthy man-OB poor-PL-OB-GN help do.PFV-F
'A wealthy man helped the poor.'

Incorporating CPs are those where the NVC does not have argument status in the clause. While some scholars make an additional distinction between CPs with noun-NVCs and adjective-NVCs, the more relevant classification is the one where the differentiation between NVCs *with* argument status and NVCs *without* argument status is taken as the main diagnostics, regardless of the "independent" lexical status of this component. The reason for this will become even more obvious when we discuss the lexical identity of the NVC (see section 4). Incorporating CPs are formed with *bhe* (as in (32)), *the* (as in (33)), as well as with *de* (as in (34)). See (17)-(18), (20)-(23) and (26) for other examples of incorporating CPs.

(32) ***tu*** ***ba*** ***ǰaangul-á*** ***the*** ***bi*** ***na*** ***ṭing*** ***bhíl-u-(w)ee***
2SG.NOM PRT Jan.Gul-OB to also NEG NVC become.PFV-MSG-Q
'So you couldn't even face Jan Gul?'

(33) ***tíi*** ***šíiṭi*** ***áak*** ***máakaṛ*** ***šúka*** ***meewá*** ***ǰamá*** ***the*** ***bheš-í***
3SG.OB inside IDEF monkey dry.MPL fruit collection do.CV sit-CV

heensíl-u ***de***
stay.PFV-MSG PST
'Inside [the cave] a monkey was sitting with dry fruit that he had collected.'

(34) ***míi*** ***aní*** ***kéengi*** ***ghin-í*** ***teeṇíi*** ***déeṛi*** ***káanga*** ***dít-i***
1SG.GN PROX comb take-CV REFL beard(F) NVC give.PFV-F
'I took this comb and combed my beard.'

This goes back on an even more fundamental split between what I call two "basic argument templates", that is basic syntactic structures (or particular verb-argument configurations, Du Bois 2003: 42) on which most clauses involving a CP seem to have been modeled, particularly the more productive ones. The first *basic argument template* (from here on simply BAT) is the combination of NVC and DO, as exemplified in (35), where NVC is an abstract noun denoting an activity carried out by the only participant (Part1), here the transitive subject:

[17] A detailed study, however, may very well conclude that such "alternations" contribute to semantic nuancing.

(35) *ak* *buzrúg* *teeṇíi* *ghooṣṭ-á* *maṇḍa-yí* ***nimáas*** ***thíi*** *de*
IDEF pious.man REFL house-OB veranda-OB prayer do.3SG PST
'A pious man was praying on the veranda of his house.' (B)

Often such CPs have a semantics of "carry out, perform NVC", where NVC is an abstract noun denoting an *activity* carried out by the transitive subject:

Part$_1$ NVC$_{activity}$ DO *(BAT 1)*

All CPs modeled this way are non-incorporating CPs. Perhaps the CPs belonging to the saturated subtype (as exemplified in (28) and (35)) can be seen as the more basic or "trivial" case, whereas the oblique complement and possessor complement subtypes, as seen in (29) and (30), respectively, represent further "stretching" of the particular verb, involving a second participant (Part2):

Part$_1$ on/with/to-Part$_2$ NVC$_{activity}$ DO *(stretched BAT 1)*
Part$_1$ Part$_2$'s NVC$_{activity}$ DO *(stretched BAT 1)*

The second BAT is the combination of NVC and BECOME. Essentially NVC+BECOME combinations are – trivially one might say – examples of adjectival predication, such as the one in (36), with an approximate semantics of "becoming/being NVC", where NVC is the *property* of the intransitive subject.

(36) *dhuumíi* ***paidóo*** ***bhíl-i*** *hín-i* *oóra* *ghooṣṭ-á* *the* *yhéel-i* *hín-i*
smoke(F) born become.PFV-F be.PRS-F this.here house-OB to come.PFV-F be.PRS-F
'Smoke has arisen and has filled the house.'

All such CPs are incorporating:

Part$_1$ NVC$_{property}$ BECOME *(BAT 2)*

The corresponding incorporating NVC+DO is a causative derivation of the NVC+BECOME construction, thus resulting in a transitive subject "making someone become Y", as in (37), where the second participant is coded as a (syntactically) regular direct object.

(37) *alataalaá* *aní* *insaan-íi* *faidá-yii* *dapáara* ***paidóo***
Allah.Exalted 3PL.PROX.NOM human.being-GN benefit-GN for born

thíil-a *hín-a*
do.PFV-MPL be.PRS-MPL
'Allah the Exalted one has created them for the benefit of man.'

Note that on the surface the verb MAKE-BECOME (property) is identical to DO (activity):[18]

Part$_1$ Part$_2$ NVC$_{property}$ MAKE-BECOME *(causative from BAT 2)*

As with the first-mentioned BAT, this one, too, can be stretched and involve additional, obliquely coded, participants, such as the third person singular in (38).

(38)	*ma*	*[tas*	*sangí]*	***milaáu***	***bhíl-u***	*hin-u*
	1SG.NOM	3SG.ACC	with	met	become.PFV-MSG	be.PRS-MSG

'I have met him.'

While it can be argued that such events are semantically transitive, the syntax as well as the agreement pattern remains intransitive:

Part$_1$ on/with/to-Part$_2$ NVC$_{property}$ BECOME *(stretched BAT 2)*

Taking it one step further, this "stretched" structure can also be subject to a causative derivation, thus providing room for a third participant (as shown in example (39)):

Part$_1$ Part$_2$ on/with/to-Part$_3$ NVC$_{property}$ MAKE-BECOME *(causative from stretched BAT 2)*

(39)	*míi*	*tu*	*muníir-a*	*sangí*	***milaáu***	***thíil-u***
	1SG.GN	2SG.NOM	Munir-OB	with	met	do.PFV-MSG

'I introduced you to Munir.'

For a large number of CPs in Palula we seem to be able to define them according to this categorization, and some examples are given in Table 5.

[18] While many verbs can go through valence increase through a regular morphological process (adding a suffix *-á* as shown above) this is not possible with *bhe* whose causative/transitive counterpart always is *the*. A discussion of the reverse process, by which valence-reduced counterparts of non-incorporating DO-complexes are derived (i.e. replacing *the* with *bhe*) is not pursued here due to lack of space and the need for further research. However, that does not seem to be widely applied (and unavailable for some NVCs), and such NVC *bhe* constructions also compete with the application of the regular passive suffix *-ĩ̃* to the verb: NVC *thaĩ̃*.

Basic argument template		Stretching with possessive complement	Stretching with oblique complement[19]
BAT 1	⇒		
bhootũ the 'plow' [DO plowing]		*X-GEN ibaadát the* 'worship X' [DO X's worship]	*X-OB ǰhulí hamlá the* 'attack X' [DO attack on X]
hiǰrát the 'migrate'		*X-GEN táma the* 'wait for, expect X'	*X-OB sangí ǰhaní the* 'marry X'
kráam the 'work'			*X-OB sangí madád the* 'help X'
nimóos the 'pray'			*X-OB the phóom the* 'take care of X'
			X-OB dúši ṭoóp the 'jump toward X'
NON-INCORPORATING			
INCORPORATING			
BAT 2	⇒		
bač bhe 'escape' [BECOME safe]			*X-OB the ašáq bhe* 'fall in love with X' [BECOME "in love" to X]
ḍup bhe 'drown'			*X-OB sangí milaáu bhe* 'meet X'
ǰamá bhe 'gather'			*X-OB the óol bhe* 'guard X'
ráal bhe 'rise'			*X-OB dũi ṣúum bhe* 'defeat X'
rawaán bhe 'get going'			
⇓			⇓
Causative BAT 2			
bač the 'save' [MAKE X safe]			*X Y-OB sangí milaáu the* 'introduce X to Y' [MAKE X met with Y]
ǰamá the 'collect'			*X Y-OB the óol the* 'make X guard Y'
ráal the 'raise'			

Table 5: Categories of Palula complex predicates based on *basic argument templates*

The reasoning, however, assumes that all incorporating CPs with *the* are causative derivations of a more basic CP with *bhe* and an identical NVC. There are some challenges to this. First, the relationship between some *bhe*-complexes and their *the*-counterparts is not always entirely straightforward, neither semantically or syntactically. The CP *ṭing bhe*, exemplified in (40), fits into the category "stretched BAT 2", with two human arguments, and the complex can be glossed as 'face, challenge (someone)'. Its *the*-counterpart, however, is a "causative from BAT 2", without any additional third argument, and its semantics – something like 'hold, keep, support (someone/something)' – is not immediately deducible from the former, although a reconstructed glossing of the NVC as 'immovable' to a certain extent would explain how these two parallel complexes have lexicalized.

(40) *nis* *the* *koó* ***ṭing*** *na* ***bháan-a***
3SG.PROX.ACC to someone NVC NEG become.PRS-MPL
'No-one could face him.'

[19] The postpositions exemplified are: *dũi* 'from', *dúši* 'toward', *ǰhulí* 'on', *sangí* 'with', *the* 'to'.

(41) *se* *bi* *čúur* *páanǰ* *bhe* *ma* *na* ***ṭing*** ***tháai*** *bhóon* *de*
3PL.NOM also four five become.CV 1SG.NOM NEG NVC do.INF be.able.3PL PST
'Even they, being four five people, were not able to hold me.'

Another example of a *bhe/the*-pair with a somewhat unexpected semantic relationship is *yaád bhe* vs. *yaád the*. Instead of a simple valence relationship, there is a contrast between, on the one hand, an involuntary experience, 'come to one's mind, suddenly remember', as in (42),[20] and on the other, a voluntary or conscious cognitive act carried out, 'think about someone, recollect something, memorize something', as in (43) (= (22) presented above).

(42) *tasíi* *se* *baát* *ma* ***yaád*** ***bhíl-i***
3SG.GN DEF word(F) 1SG.NOM NVC become.PFV-F
'I [male speaker] remembered what he had said.' / 'His words came to my mind.'

(43) *míi* *tas* ***yaád*** ***thíil-u***
1SG.GN 1SG.ACC NVC do.PFV-MSG
'I remembered him.' / 'I thought about him.'

It should be noted that the corresponding contrast in Urdu is captured by the two CPs *yaad aanaa* (NVC + COME) and *yaad karnaa* (NVC + DO), respectively.

Second, there are NVC+*bhe/the* pairings where the *the*-complex is by far the more frequently occurring and in some cases seems to be the more basic of the two. The incorporating CP *ḍóo the* 'carry on one's back', as exemplified in (44), is one of these.

(44) *tíi* *tas* *uchí* ***ḍóo*** ***thíil-u***
3SG.OB 3SG.ACC lift.up.CV NVC do.PFV-MSG
'He lifted him up and carried him on his back.'

Some incorporating NVC+*the* complexes, such as *baáṭ the* 'sharpen' in example (45), apparently lack any natural *bhe*-counterpart altogether.

(45) *míi* *kaṭéeri* ***baáṭ*** ***thíil-i***
1SG.GN knife(F) NVC do.PFV-F
'I sharpened the knife.'

[20] The form of the "non-nominative experiencer" (cf. Hook's "dative subject" (1990: 326-330)) does not contrast with the nominative in 1SG, while for e.g. 3SG, 1PL, 2PL, 3PL an accusative form must be used, and for nouns the oblique (which is also used to express some locative meanings). In this sentence the intransitive syntactic subject, with which the verb agrees in feminine gender, is 'his words'. The literal meaning can be captured by something like: 'His word became recollected in/by me.' Cf. other expressions with a non-nominative experiencer, such as *míiš-a bhíili ṣéeti* 'The man became frightened [was overcome by fear]', where 'man' is an oblique noun and 'fear' a nominative noun with which the intransitive verb 'adhered' agrees.

None of these objections, however, invalidates the claim that we are dealing with two fundamental structures, and although there are some discrepancies, especially when considering constructions with a longer history in the language, the tendencies for NVC+*bhe/the* pairings to be related in terms of valence are strong enough to stand as important models for newly acquired CPs. This is further strengthened by the abundance of such pairings in languages of wider communication (as described above and exemplified in Table 4).

There is another piece of evidence for a fundamental differentiation between the two templates, or rather for placing these two structures differently along a fusion (or perhaps rather a co-lexicalization) scale. While a negative particle *na* can only occur immediately before the inflected verb in a non-incorporating CP, it can occur either before the verb or before the entire incorporated CP, as displayed in Table 6. Here it becomes clear, when comparing the incorporating CP category with the non-incorporating CP category, that the former is further ahead of the latter in terms of co-lexicalizing the NVC with the verb component. Haig (2002: 42-44) suggests a similar categorization of different types of CP in Kurdish as well as for Iranian at large.

	Incorporating CP	**Non-incorporating CP**
Pre-NVC negation	***na*** *bač bhílu* 'didn't escape' ***na*** *ḍóo thûlu* 'didn't carry'	****na*** *ǰargá thûlu*
Pre-verb negation	*bač* ***na*** *bhílu* 'didn't escape' *ḍóo* ***na*** *thûlu* 'didn't carry'	*ǰargá* ***na*** *thûlu* 'didn't consult'

Table 6: Negative particles in incorporating vs. non-incorporating CPs

It is certainly no coincidence that some of the well-established and semantically more opaque CPs are also the ones where we frequently find the negative particle in the pre-NVC position, as in example (41) above, and in (46) below, rather than in the immediate pre-V position.

(46) *karáaṛu asée baát [na] **kaṇ** **thíi,** asaám ghaší ba khúu*
leopard 1PL.GN word NEG NVC do.3SG 1PL.ACC catch.CV PRT eat.3SG
'The leopard won't listen to our words. He'll catch us and eat us.' (B)

Here I need to point out that I am not proposing entirely homogenous and discrete categories, since the data suggest that we are dealing with a degree of fusion, a continuum, along which these two structural types tend to cluster, but where a small minority of CPs do show ambiguity (as to whether they are incorporating or not) and where a few incorporating CPs obviously are even further ahead of other incorporating CPs in its development into a higher degree of co-lexicalization, which may or may not lead to fusion (see Section 4) between the NVC and the verb component.

4 Possible approaches

Already in the previous section we made an attempt at categorizing and analyzing the CPs found in Palula. However, there are a number of questions yet to be answered relating to this phenomenon:

What is the origin of CPs in Palula? What is their role in the language of today? What is the syntactic and lexical identity or status of CPs and their verb and non-verb components, respectively?

It is obvious that the CPs found in Palula are of various kinds (see Table 3) and have arisen at different time periods. That in itself suggests not one single origin but multiple origins, where structures already well-established or native to the language (or language family) have facilitated the incorporation of new lexical material along the same lines,[21] further reinforced by the existence of very similar structures in a larger area (comprising at least South and Central Asia (Bowern 2008: 165)) and in languages belonging to a number of different genetic groupings: Indo-Aryan (Masica 1991: 326, 368), Iranian (Haig 2002; Folli et al. 2005; Babrakzai 1999: 110-112), Nuristani (personal communication with Richard Strand 2009), Tibeto-Burman (personal communication with Scott DeLancey;[22] Watters 2002: 76-77), Dravidian (Krishnamurti 2003: 370-373), Turkic (Bowern 2004; Öztürk 2005: 55-56), Burushaski (Lorimer 1927: 513; Berger 1998: 212-218), and Kusunda (Watters 2006: 77, 90). This process is particularly pertinent to the interaction between Palula and the languages of wider communication that it has been exposed to (Pashto, Urdu and, probably more indirectly, Persian). We can perhaps talk about internal structure facilitating, and eventually accommodating to, external pressure.[23]

We already saw some example of old "native" CPs, consisting of the verbs BECOME, DO or GIVE and an NVC that originally may have been a noun, and in some cases still is a homophone of a regular noun. At some stage it ceased to be regarded as a nominal argument of the verb, opening up for a second participant to be coded as the direct object.

We may be able to trace an even older layer of particle verbs on which these early complexes may have been modeled, as suggested for Sanskrit "verbal compounds" with *kṛ* 'make', *bhū/as* 'be', *dhā* 'put' and *i* 'go' already by Whitney (1960 [1889]: 396, 400-401). Considering the high degree of fusion between the NVC and the verb of some of the older CPs in Palula we may consider them as already losing their independent status as words, perhaps on their way of (if they survive) eventually becoming morphologically fused with the verb. While those probably served as models in the past for new complexes to be formed in the language, often with foreign lexical material in the NVC slot, that role has been taken over by the numerous and still transparent DO $NVC_{activity}$ and BECOME $NVC_{property}$ templates. In many cases these complexes are direct calques of CPs in Urdu or Pashto, an observation in line with previous claims that there is a strong cross-linguistic correlation between loan verbs and complex predicates using DO (Bowern 2008: 173).

In some works on this topic (Verma 1993: 201; Mohanan 1993: 165; 1994: 214), a strict distinction has been drawn up between the verbs used in CPs as so-called verbalizers or light verbs and their corresponding use/specification as "full" (i.e. simple) verbs. Often the verbs as used in CPs are described as "emptied" or "bleached" of their "original" semantic content. I do not propose such

---

[21] Cf. Berger (1998: 212) on NVC+verb complexes ("Verbalkomposita") in Burushaski: "Das System der verbalen Komposition ist im Bur. zweifellos heimischen Ursprungs, doch haben bei der weiteren Ausbildung auch Lehnübersetzungen aus dem Urdu mitgewirkt." ['The system of Verbal Composites is without doubt native to Bur., although calques from Urdu have contributed to its further development.']

[22] The feature is more prevalent in those Tibeto-Burman languages that have been in contact with Indo-Aryan longer and more intensely, an areal linguistic grouping (after Matisoff (1990: 113)) referred to as "Indospheric" as opposed to "Sinospheric" languages.

[23] This idea is somewhat echoed in Masica's (1993: 161) statement: "Borrowed vocabulary […] seems to be a necessary but insufficient cause of conjunct verb formation."

a distinction, as I think it is less helpful in explaining why complex predicates arise in the first place (as duly pointed out by Masica (1993: 159-160)). Instead I suggest that there is a limited number of verbs (in Palula *bhe*, *the* and possibly *de*, and in many other languages verb with a similar semantics, i.e. BECOME/BE, DO/MAKE and GIVE/PUT) that are already extremely generic or skeletal (Goldberg 1995: 40-41), and with the passing of time, and with the growth in number of CPs, have become even more "stretched",[24] an idea also embraced by Butt (2003: 18).[25]

While more specialized verbs have a much narrower scope, these generic verbs used in CPs have a large "repertoire" and are semantically flexible and open to a number of argument structures. To use Givón's (2001: 105-171) terminology, all syntactic frames or prototypes (approximately corresponding to my BATs) needed to express virtually any proposition in the language are provided by this severely limited group of verbs, often through metaphorical extension (2001: 140). For instance, quite a few CPs in Palula, such as *iraadá the* 'decide' (47) and *išaará the* 'signal' (48), take a clausal complement, each of a particular kind.

(47) *alataalaá* *[tas* *dubaará* *dunya-yí* *the* *phray-ainií]* ***iraadá*** ***thíil-u***
Allah.Exalted 3SG.ACC again world-OB to send-VN decision do.PFV-MSG
'Allah the Exalted one decided to send him another time to the world.'

(48) *se* *kuṇaak-á* *the* ***išaará*** ***thíil-u*** *ki* *[ma* *khúna* *yha]* *thaní*
DEF child-OB to signal do.PFV-MSG COMP 1SG.NOM near come.IMP.SG QT
'He signaled to the child to come to him. (lit. He signaled to the child, saying: Come here!)'

The formal limitations of each individual verbalizer are to do mainly with morphological transitivity. This sometimes results in a "mismatch" between the syntactic structure triggered by a CP and the semantics of the same clause. We may for instance use a transitive *the*-CP to capture what is essentially a single-participant event, such as *kráam the* 'work', which in a semantic sense is intransitive. On the other hand we may use an intransitive *bhe*-CP for what is really a two-participant event, such as *ašáq bhe* 'fall in love' in (49), where the second participant syntactically is treated as an oblique complement, while it in a semantic sense is an essential core participant in the proposition. (See (42) for another "mismatching" example.)

(49) *se* *phaí* *[se* *maçook-á* *the]* ***ašáq*** ***bhíl-i***
DEF girl DEF Machoke-OB to in.love become.PFV-F
'The girl fell in love with Machoke.'

[24] It is in fact quite likely that the verb *the* 'do', now reserved for abstract-noun objects denoting activities, has lost a previous connotation of concrete creation. In the (in many respects) more conservative dialect spoken in Biori Valley a concrete use of the same verb is attested in expressions such as *ak šúunge uṣṭúm tháanu* 'He makes a yoke from a [tree] branch', whereas in Palula of the Ashret Valley, the verb *samá* 'build, make' has to be used for physical creation of that kind.

[25] Butt's focus, however, is on verb-verb complexes rather than on nonverb-verb complexes.

Turning to the NVC, we have already seen that its syntactic status may somehow be that of a noun (in non-incorporating CPs) or that of an adjective (in incorporating CPs). That is also how so-called conjunct verbs in Indo-Aryan are described by, for instance, Masica (1991: 326). But as pointed out by both Radloff (1998: 34), and Schmidt & Kohistani (2008: 207), many NVCs in Shina do not fit neatly into any one of these two part of speech categories. Instead both the Gilgiti and the Kohistani varieties contain a great number of CPs with an NVC that never or rarely occur outside a CP. Radloff refers to them as *precategorical*, whereas Schmidt & Kohistani use the terms "quasi-nouns" and "quasi-adjectives", and describe them as largely abstract in meaning and often corresponding to English gerunds or infinitives. Indeed, even syntactically they have lost some of the abilities associated with more typical nouns or adjectives. Although there is a certain variability between individual NVC, they are, for instance, seldom or never modified (the nouns by adjectives, or the adjectives by adverbs). As for the "adjectival" NVCs, these are usually not used attributively, and the "noun-like" NVCs cannot normally take a determiner.

Morphologically, too, the NVCs are less typical in their adjectiveness or nounness. Unlike firmly established descriptive adjectives, the adjectival NVCs are – to my present knowledge – never inflected for gender, number or case agreement. The latter lines up with the fact that most newly acquired adjectives (outside CPs) used in the language are morphologically invariant as well as distributionally limited. Noun-like NVCs are usually not inflected for case or number, although there are some cases where this is possible, such as in *hamleé thíila* 'attacked (lit. did attacks)', capturing the idea of a repeated or continuing attack.

There is nothing suggesting that the NVC would be anything less than a phonological word, or that any individual NVC would be in the middle of a phonological fusion process with the verb component.[26] Its relatively independent word status vis-à-vis the verb word is further supported by the possible insertion of the negative particle between the NVC and the verb, as described above. Lexically, however, the individual identity of NVCs is often weak, as evidenced by the following: a) Some entirely native NVCs do not occur outside a CP, and are thus by themselves not synchronically transparent (e.g. *óol* in (26)), b) The meaning of some native NVCs is only traceable by access to an earlier stage of the language when the item had an individual lexical reference, now lost to modern-day speakers (e.g. *póo* in (25)), c) The NVC may be homonymous or near-homonymous with e.g. another noun in the language with which it for good reasons can be considered etymologically related, but its use as a component of a CP does not straightforwardly justify the item to be treated as a special sense of its "regular" use (e.g. *ḍóo* in (44)), d) Many non-native NVCs do not occur, or only exceptionally occur, outside the CP, and although such words can be looked up in a dictionary of e.g. Urdu or Pashto where they may be labeled as nouns or adjectives with certain meanings, and those meanings are known to educated people in the community, it is uncertain to what degree that can be directly applied to Palula and the average language user (e.g. *ašáq* in (49)).

All of the above leads us to consider a great many NVCs as semi-words (Bickel & Nichols 2007: 193). Although they in some senses behave word-like, they also lack very many important characteristics of "full" lexical words and, perhaps most importantly, they stand in a close-knit relationship to the particular verb they team up with within CPs. It therefore makes sense to regard

[26] Although Butt (2003: 13-16) holds that so-called light verbs do not (easily) enter into a grammaticalization cline, instead tend to remain very stable, there are diachronic examples, in the region, of complex predicates co-lexicalizing and thereby giving rise to idiosyncratic morphological and/or phonological patterns within its verbal paradigm (Genetti 2008; Watters 2006: 59).

CPs as lexical elements by themselves, perhaps as "distributed lexical verbs" (Givón 2001: 162-163). In any case, I conclude that the resulting argument structure best be treated as a feature of the construction as a whole – particularly its semantics – and not as deducible from any one of its two components or as the straightforward result of a certain combination of an NVC and a particular verb.

Along the lines of Cognitive Construction Grammar (Goldberg 2006: 77-79, 213ff.), I am suggesting that the generic verbs that occur in CPs also are the verbs among the earliest acquired by children and other language learners (although it should be pointed out that no such focused study has been carried out on Palula). As such they lead the way in acquiring syntax and a strong link is thus gradually established between the constructions these verbs occur in and the general semantics of certain propositions in terms of agentivity, causativity and predication. As vocabulary increases and more combinations of generic verbs and NVCs are incorporated, generalizations over the syntax-semantics interface – approximating the *basic argument templates* suggested above – facilitates further learning and makes it easy to assimilate new verbal meanings into these patterns. Such an analysis would also account for on-the-spot creations of new complex predicates or novel uses of this small class of generic verbs, by native speakers and second-language users alike (Goldberg 1995: 28-29, 40-42, 2006: 58-59).

Apart from a recognition of a general interplay between syntax and semantics in the formation and use of constructions such as CPs, it remains to be shown whether and how the particular subsets of complex predicates (i.e. my *basic argument templates*) identified above can be related in a systematic way to certain discourse profiles, as predicted by Du Bois (2003: 42-43, 51-52) in his Preferred Argument Structure approach where "[p]opulations of verbs and constructions may be seen as organized into collectives based on similarities" in a cognitive-pragmatic sense (2003: 47).

Although my treatment, hopefully, has shown a great degree of systematicity in the way many, if not most, CPs are modeled on certain *basic argument templates*, I largely excluded from my discussion such Palula CPs that are formed with other verbs than BECOME and DO. In a fuller treatment, however, we would need to address the descriptive challenges that CPs formed with GIVE, HIT, COME, etc. present us with, and address the question of idiomaticity, which is not an entirely straightforward one (Anderson 1992: 307-308), and one that would be best served by a scalar treatment such as the six-stage process of idiomatization (ranging from complete innovation to opaque idioms) outlined in Clark & Clark (1979: 804-805).

An issue that would need future attention is the role played by complex predicates vis-à-vis simple predicates in the individual languages, and whether it is possible to spot any clear tendency for the number of complex predicates to increase in proportion to the total verb lexicon and in frequency of use. An interesting, and related, question is, on the one hand, to what extent the coining of new complex predicates contributes aspectual or fine-semantic nuances as compared to simple predicates with a very similar semantics, and, on the other hand, to what extent complex predicates replace synonymous or near-synonymous simple predicates. In the latter case we would expect a rather radical restructuring of the entire verb lexicon, eventually leading to a minimal verbal system (as described in Section 2) with only a remnant of simple verbs left, whereas in the former case the result would be an enriched verb lexicon with numerous parallel complex and simple verbs, making fine-semantic differentiations possible and providing new means for the language user to express different registers.

5 Conclusions

The two central queries addressed in this paper, with special regard to Indo-Aryan Palula, were the following: First, what is the grammatical and lexical identity of complex predicates and their integral components? Second, is it possible to pin down any specific properties of a complex predicate or any one of its components that govern or sanction a particular argument structure?

As for the first main question, an inventory of a Palula corpus identifies complexes consisting of the verbs BECOME and DO as the overall most common CPs in the language. A systematic analysis of a large number of such CPs makes it possible, on the basis of the syntactic behavior of the non-verb component (NVC), to categorize them as either incorporating or non-incorporating. The diagnostics is whether or not the NVC is treated as a direct object with regard to perfective verb agreement. All BECOME-CPs are incorporating, whereas CPs with DO can be either incorporating or non-incorporating. The perfective transitive verb in non-incorporating CPs invariably agrees in gender and number with the NVC, as is also the case with simple transitive predicates vis-à-vis nouns functioning as heads of their direct objects. The NVC in an incorporating CP, on the other hand, never triggers verb agreement of this kind. While most NVCs are invariable as to their form, there are a few NVCs of the non-incorporating type that can be preceded by an attribute or a determiner or even be pluralized under certain circumstances. However, to define the NVC as either a lexical noun or as a lexical adjective on these grounds turns out to be premature, as a great many NVCs, regardless of their diachronic or etymological identity, rarely or never occur outside a CP. Instead, it seems the CPs are better regarded as a subtype of distributed lexical verbs, consisting of two clearly discernable phonological words, one of them a verb (belonging to a small subclass) with a very generic semantics and the other a semi-word with a varying degree of independent lexical status. Although morphological material, such as the negative particle, can be inserted after the NVC and immediately before the verb, most of the time they are syntactically contiguous. However, incorporating CPs seem to display a higher degree of fusion or co-lexicalization, as the negative particle can occur either in the pre-verb position or in the pre-entire-complex position, and the latter even more so with certain well-established NVCs. This variation is not observed with the non-incorporating CPs, where pre-complex negation is considered ungrammatical.

As for the second question, the analysis of the various clauses in which CPs with BECOME and DO occur makes it possible for us to make some interesting generalizations and suggest that an overwhelming majority of these are modeled on two so-called *basic argument templates*: 1. DO ACTIVITY, and 2. BECOME PROPERTY. Typically the NVC used in the first template is an abstract noun denoting an activity carried out by an agent, such as 'work', 'prayer' or 'migration', syntactically coded as a transitive subject and a direct object, respectively: 'She does prayer' (= 'She prays'). The NVC used in the second template is an adjective denoting a quality or propensity, typically applicable to humans, such as 'well', 'safe' or 'whole', and syntactically it is coded as an adjectival predication: 'He becomes safe' (= 'He escapes'). Either of these templates can be syntactically expanded, or "stretched", in various ways, as to accommodate semantic propositions involving e.g. additional participants. The BAT with DO can, for instance, add an oblique argument to express an activity done to/with/for someone; the activity is still the direct object, syntactically, but the semantic patient finds a place in the argument structure as, e.g., a postpositional phrase: 'She does help with me' (= 'She helps me'). By causativizing the second BAT (through (re)using DO to mean 'make s.o. become') the speaker is provided with the structure MAKE-BECOME PROPERTY: 'He

makes me become safe' (= 'He saves me'). A prerequisite for this structural "elasticity," is that the few verbs used in CPs are extremely generic without being entirely devoid of semantic content or showing even the slightest tendency of losing their intrinsic syntactic transitivity.[27] However, no matter how productive or pervasive certain patterns seem to be, with all metaphorical extensions that are possible and all the idiosyncrasies or idiomatizations that are bound to have evolved over the large time spans that CPs have existed, any attempts at systematically mapping any one argument structure to a particular nonverb-verb combination would naturally fail. Instead, it makes more sense to see each complex predicate, with its unique semantic properties, as a whole (just like any simple predicate), which assigns case and sanctions particular arguments.

Abbreviations

A	transitive subject function
ACC	accusative
BAT	basic argument template
COMP	complementizer
CP	complex predicate
CV	converb
DEF	definite
ERG	ergative
F	feminine
GN	genitive
IDEF	indefinite
IMP	imperative
ITR	intransitive
NEG	negative
NOM	nominative
M	masculine
NP	noun phrase
NVC	non-verb component
O	transitive object function
OB	oblique
PFV	perfective
PL	plural
PROX	proximate
PRS	present
PRT	particle
PST	past
Q	question marker
QT	quotative
REFL	reflexive
REM	remote
S	intransitive subject function
SG	singular
TAM	tense, mood, aspect
TR	transitive
1	first person
2	second person
3	third person

References

Anderson, Stephen A. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 62].

Baart, Joan L. G. 1997. *The sounds and tones of Kalam Kohistani: With wordlist and texts*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University and Summer Institute of Linguistics [Studies in Languages of Northern Pakistan 1].

Babrakzai, Farooq. 1999. *Topics in Pashto syntax*. Ph.D. diss, University of Hawai'i.

[27] Note that this "elasticity" is markedly different from the "empty" semantics of e.g. Japanese *suru*, the now classical example of a *light verb* (Grimshaw and Mester 1988: 210).

Baker, Mark C. 2003. *Lexical categories: verbs, nouns, and adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 102].

Bashir, Elena L. 2003. "Dardic". In: Cardona, George and Jain, Dhanesh (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages* 818-94. London: Routledge.

Berger, Hermann. 1998. *Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nager*. Teil I (Part I), *Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag [Neuindische Studien 13].

Bickel, Balthasar and Nichols, Johanna. 2007. "Inflectional morphology". In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol 3, *Grammatical categories and the lexicon* 169-240. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowern, Claire. 2004. "(Some notes on) complex predicates in Turkic". http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~bowern/Mypapers/WAFLBowern.pdf (Accessed 26 August 2009)

Bowern, Claire. 2008. "The diachrony of complex predicates". *Diachronica* 25.2: 161-185.

Butt, Miriam. 1995. *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Butt, Miriam. 2003. "The light verb jungle". *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 9: 1-49.

Clark, Eve V. and Clark, Herbert H. 1979. "When nouns surface as verbs". *Language* 55.1: 767-811.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Du Bois, John W. 2003. "Argument structure: Grammar in use". In: Du Bois, John W.; Kumpf, Lorraine E.; and Ashby, William J. (eds.), *Preferred argument structure: Grammar as architecture for function* 11-60. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company [Studies in Discourse and Grammar].

Folli, Rafaella; Harley, Heidi; and Karimi, Simin. 2005. "Determinants of event type in Persian complex predicates". *Lingua* 115: 1365-1401.

Gambhir, Vijay. 1993. "Complex verb phrase: A diachronic and synchronic view". In: Verma, Manindra K. (ed.), *Complex predicates in South Asian languages* 77-95. New Delhi: Manohar.

Genetti, Carol. 2008. "A note on the history of adjectival verbs in Newar". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 71.3: 475-492.

Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press [Cognitive Theory of Language and Culture].

Goldberg, Adele E. 2003. "Words by default: The Persian complex predicate construction". In: Francis, Elaine and Michaelis, Laura (eds.), *Mismatch: Form-function incongruity and the architecture of grammar* 83-112. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grimshaw, Jane and Mester, Armin. 1988. "Light verbs and θ-marking". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.2: 205-232.

Haig, Geoffrey. 2002. "Noun-plus-verb complex predicates in Kurmanjî Kurdish: Argument sharing, argument incorporation, or what?" *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 55.1: 25-48.

Hook, Peter E. 1990. "Experiencers in South Asian languages: A gallery". In: Verma, Manindra K. and Mohanan, Karuvannur Puthanveettil (eds.), *Experiencer subjects in South Asian languages* 319-34. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Karimi-Doostan, Gholamhossein. 2005. "Light verbs and structural case". *Lingua* 115: 1737-1756.

Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 2003. *The Dravidian languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liljegren, Henrik. 2008. *Towards a grammatical description of Palula: An Indo-Aryan language of the Hindu Kush*. Ph.D. diss, Stockholm University.

Liljegren, Henrik and Haider, Naseem. 2009. "Palula: Illustrations of the IPA". *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 39.3: 381-386.

Lorenz, Manfred. 1979. *Lehrbuch des Pashto (Afghanisch)*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.

Lorimer, D. L. R. 1927. "A Burushaski text from Hunza". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London* 4.3: 505-531.

Masica, Colin P. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Masica, Colin P. 1993. "Subareal variation in conjunct verbs". In: Verma, Manindra K. (ed.), *Complex predicates in South Asian languages* 157-62. New Delhi: Manohar.

Matisoff, James A. 1990. "On megalocomparison". *Language* 66.1: 106-120.

Mohanan, Tara. 1993. "Verb agreement in complex predicates in Hindi". In: Verma, Manindra K. (ed.), *Complex predicates in South Asian languages* 163-75. New Delhi: Manohar.

Mohanan, Tara. 1994. *Argument structure in Hindi*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

Platts, John T. 1884. *A dictionary of Urdu, classical Hindi, and English*. London: W. H. Allen & Co.

Radloff, Carla F. and Shakil A Shakil. 1998. *Folktales in the Shina of Gilgit: Text, grammatical analysis and commentary*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University and Summer Institute of Linguistics [Studies in Languages of Northern Pakistan 2].

Raverty, Henry George. 1982 [1901]. *A dictionary of the Pukh'to, Pus'hto, or the language of the Afghâns*. Peshawar: Saeed Book Bank.

Schmidt, Ruth L. 1999. *Urdu: An essential grammar*. London: Routledge.

Schmidt, Ruth L. and Kohistani, Razwal. 2008. *A grammar of the Shina language of Indus Kohistan*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag [Beiträge zur Kenntnis südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen 17].

Strand, Richard F. 2001. "The tongues of Peristân". In: Cacopardo, Alberto M. and Cacopardo, Augusto S. (eds.), *Gates of Peristan: History, religion and society in the Hindu Kush*. Appendix 1. 251-259. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.

Turner, Ralph Lilley. 1966. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford University Press.

Verma, Manindra K. 1993. Complex predicates and light verbs in Hindi. In: Verma, Manindra K. (ed.), *Complex predicates in South Asian languages* 197-215. New Delhi: Manohar.

Viberg, Åke. 1993. Crosslinguistic perspectives on lexical organization and lexical progression. In: Hyltenstam, Kenneth and Viberg, Åke (eds.), *Progression and regression in language* 340-85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Viberg, Åke. 2006. Verbs. In: Brown, Keith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics* 408-11. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Watters, David E. 2002. *A grammar of Kham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Cambridge grammatical descriptions].

Watters, David E. 2006. "Notes on Kusunda grammar: A language isolate of Nepal". *Himalayan Linguistics Archive* 3: 1-182.

Whitney, William Dwight. 1960 [1889]. *Sanskrit grammar: Including both the classical language, and the older dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zoller, Claus Peter. 2005. *A grammar and dictionary of Indus Kohistani*. Vol 1, *Dictionary*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Henrik Liljegren
henrik@ling.su.se

Himalayan Linguistics, Vol. 9(1). © Himalayan Linguistics 2010
ISSN 1544-7502

*Khumi elaborate expressions**

David A. Peterson
Dartmouth College

1. Introduction

A frequently cited areal tendency for Southeast Asian languages is the use of *elaborate expressions* (Matisoff 1973; Solnit 1995; Goddard 2005). For initial purposes, elaborate expressions can be described as reduplicative or quasi-reduplicative, compound-like structures used in place of simpler structures for expressive or aesthetic effect. Bangladesh Khumi speech of most sorts is typically rich in such structures. For instance, consider sentence (1), from a folkloric narrative, and sentence (2) from conversation.

(1)

nayboeloee	khieeng=te		sangkáng=aa	tuydí-tuydueéng
then	look=EVID		fireplace.shelf=LOC	ELAB-water.gourd
l'i-l'aawng	saybii	soraa	plang-noe='oe	thúy-raemo=te
ELAB-pot	plate	bowl	move-past=EMOT	say-NEG.IMP=EVID
noekhaa=poee		ngo'-lae=te		
then=also		get-NEG=EVID		

'Then he (a tiger) looked (for her) on the fireplace shelf, he moved the water gourds and the pots, and the plates and the bowls so much I can't tell you, but again, he didn't get her.' (1.33)[1]

* My research on Khumi has previously been supported by a Fulbright fellowship and by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology; currently work is supported by NSF grant #BCS-0349021. An earlier version of this work was presented at SEALS 14. Special thanks go especially to Lelung Khumi for our extended collaboration on Khumi grammar and to all members of the Khumi community who have contributed to our work. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers whose insightful suggestions have greatly improved the final result.

[1] The Khumi orthography used here requires a bit of explanation. Clitic boundaries are indicated by =, and – indicates an affix boundary. Most symbols have their usual IPA value, with a few exceptions: *Ch* indicates an aspirate plosive, *ng* indicates a velar nasal, *j* is an alveopalatal affricate, *y* is a palatal glide, and *s* indicates an alveopalatal fricative, except for certain lexical items where it freely varies with [s]. Apostrophes indicate glottal stop or the short vowel associated with a sesquisyllabic structure in case it is unpredictable for a syllable-initial consonant sequence (e.g., for the initial sequence *tk-*, as in the word 'tiger' in example (3h), this short vowel is predictable, since initial *tk-* sequences are impossible. In other cases *C'h* indicates an inaspirate plosive-initial sesquisyllable as opposed to an aspirate plosive (*Ch*). In addition, ' sometimes occurs syllable-finally, where it indicates an extremely checked tone variant associated with the negative suffix or corresponding to an omitted genitive case clitic, as in example (1), *ngo'* '(not) get' or (17) *nang'* '2S.GEN'. The orthography conflates representation of the Khumi tonal system (five underlying distinctions) and representation of the vowel system. For a vowel indicated by a single symbol ([a], [i],

(2) atlae-ahuung-noe=poee poo-waa vaay
kill.each other-ELAB-NZ=also increase-IRR now

diwng=aa=loee=baee luútkhue=poee=baee
generation=LOC=TOP=EMOT wergeld=also=EMOT

'The one [a fine in the Khumi traditional legal system] for killing each other will also increase, in this generation, also the fine for killing someone.' (43.38)

In these sentences, the underlined portions consist of two parts. The part given a full lexical gloss (e.g., *tuydueéng* 'water gourd' in the first sentence), would be sufficient to convey what the speaker wants to express. However, in these instances, the speaker has chosen to use a more extended expression. The extension in question is the part of the form glossed here as ELAB for *elaboration*; all elaborations are underlined in subsequent examples.

This study has two goals. First, it will provide an account of the phenomenon of elaborate expressions as manifested in Bangladesh Khumi (a Tibeto-Burman language belonging to the Kuki-Chin subgroup)[2] in terms of their overall structure and composition. Looking at this issue is important, because Khumi elaborate expressions do not entirely correspond in terms of structure to what have been designated as elaborate expressions in the study of other languages, although they do appear to have the same general functional motivation that has previously been cited. This account of Khumi elaborate expression structure is based primarily on their occurrence in a text corpus[3] collected in southeastern Bangladesh since 1999, supplemented by directly elicited or offered forms. As a second goal, I will examine representative examples of their use from the corpus and will make some observations concerning tendencies in their text

---

[e], [u], [o]), there are five possible representations, depending on tone: e.g., *a* (low checked tone), *á* (high checked tone), *aa* (low falling tone), *áa* (high falling tone), and *aá* (rising-falling tone). Several digraphs (and trigraphs) are used to represent additional vowels of the system (*ie/iee* is a tense vowel intermediate between [i] and [e], *ue/uee* is approximately [ɣ], *oe/oee* is close to [ə], and *aw/aaw* is [ɔ]); for these vowels, the accent associated with high checked and high falling tones is written over the first vowel, and with the rising-falling tone it is written over the last vowel of a trigraph. E.g., for *oe/oee*: *oe* (low checked tone), *óe* (high checked tone), *oee* (low falling tone), *óee* (high falling tone), *oeé* (rising-falling tone).

Abbreviations in interlinears include: 1 'first person', 2 'second person', 3 'third person', ACCID 'accidental', AFFIRM 'affirmative', ALL 'allative', APP 'applicative', AUG 'augmentative', AUGVCL 'augmentative verbal classifier', CAUS 'causative', CL 'classifier', COM 'comitative', COND 'conditional', COP 'copula', DIM 'diminutive', DIMVCL 'diminutive verbal classifier', ELAB 'elaboration (in an elaborate expression)', EMOT 'emotive', EVID 'hearsay evidential', EXHAUST 'exhaustive', FOC 'focus', GEN 'genitive', IMP 'imperative', IMPFV 'imperfect', INCL 'inclusive', INTENS 'intensifier', INTERJ 'interjection', INTERR 'interrogative', IRR 'irrealis', LOC 'locative', MID 'middle', NEG 'negative', NZ 'nominalizer', P 'plural', PERF 'perfect', PFV 'perfective', PST 'past', QUOT 'quotative', REFL 'reflexive', S 'singular', TOP 'topic' VOC 'vocative'.

[2] In Bangladesh there are two varieties of Khumi, one spoken in more northerly communities, in the vicinity of Ruma, and the other spoken south and southeast of Thanchi towards the Burmese border. The southerly variety appears to be more similar to varieties spoken over the border in Burma, although the level of mutual intelligibility between the Bangladesh varieties is extremely high. The data in this paper all comes from the Ruma dialect.

[3] Numbers following translations refer to a text attestation of the elaborate expression, although absence of such a number does not preclude attestation of it in the corpus.

distribution. Ultimately, I will suggest that at least in Khumi, the use of elaborate expressions is tied to the marking of intensification, either of a fairly ordinary sort, or at a more abstract level.[4]

2. The elaborate expression prototype

The term elaborate expression was apparently first used by Haas 1964 to refer to a particular type of structural parallelism manifested in Thai. For Haas, the following quote sums up the essential characteristics of Thai elaborate expressions:

> [Elaborate expressions are] frequently based on compounds…expanded by repeating a part of the compound and adding a new part, by inserting a syllable for the sake of rhyme, or by inserting a syllable which has some vague semantic relation to one of the original parts. Most of these expressions are made up of four parts. The semirepeated expressions have the same item as the first and third or as the second and fourth part. [e.g., *phûu-làg-phûu-jàj* 'reduplication (person)-basis/principle-person-great'='one's superiors, elders' or *hŭŋ-hăa-ʔaahăan* 'cook (rice)-look.for-food'='to cook, prepare food']. The expressions that are characterized by rhyme always show internal rhyme (i.e., the rhyming of adjacent syllables) between the second and third parts. The rhyming part is the one in second position and may be an item which (1) has no meaning and therefore functions only as a rhyme, (2) has a meaning inconsistent with the rest of the expression and again functions only as a rhyme, or (3) has a meaning of greater or less consistency with the rest of the expression and also rhymes [e.g., *mŭu-hèd-pèd-kàj* 'pig-mushroom-duck-chicken'= 'meats of various kinds', where *hèd* 'mushroom' may have greater or lesser consistency of meaning]. (xvii-xviii)[5]

Matisoff describes a highly comparable phenomenon in Lahu:

> Elaborate expressions are a particularly interesting type of construction which are typical of Southeast Asian languages in general, and which are intermediate in structure between ordinary compounds and reduplications….An elaborate expression (Elab) is a compound containing four (usually monosyllabic) elements, of which either the first and third or the second and fourth are identical (A-B-A-C or A-B-C-B). They characteristically convey a rather formal or elegant impression. Skillful speakers sprinkle Elab's liberally thorough their conversation, using four syllables where two would have conveyed the same information… (1973: 81-82)

---

[4] A reviewer suggests that reduplicative structures like these indicating intensification is predictable, as this is the most common function of reduplication throughout South and Southeast Asia. I am not aware of any study that has actually demonstrated that intensification is *the* most common function of reduplication in this part of the world, and am not even sure how such a hypothesis would be reliably tested. So I would opt to characterize this finding as *unsurprising* rather than predictable, as I believe the cross-linguistic association of reduplication and intensification worldwide to be relatively uncontroversial.

[5] Haas gives further examples, but most appear to instantiate her 'semi-repeated' rather than the 'rhyme' type of elaborate expression, and it is not entirely clear which examples are meant to represent which subtype. The examples I include here give a taste of the structures she is concerned with, however.

Solnit recognizes elements which exhibit a quadrisyllabic structure involving repetition of specific syllables in his discussion of the more general phenomenon of parallelism in Kayah Li (1995).[6] However, he also allows disyllabic structures which involve no reduplication and larger structures with no repetition to be included under the same rubric as items that have a more canonical-looking elaborate expression structure. Finally, it is also noteworthy that Mortensen 2003, in his treatment of Hmong elaborate expressions, likewise appears amenable to treating structures which deviate from those involving repetition of an element as a kind of elaborate expression.

If we take the most conservative possible definition of elaborate expression, that of a construction consisting of four monosyllables, of which two are identical, many of what I refer to in Khumi as elaborate expressions technically do not qualify. At best they would be regarded as quasi-elaborate expressions (as characterized by Matisoff 1973). In particular, we will see that a good number of what functionally correspond to elaborate expressions do not involve the repetitive pattern seen in the prototype elaborate expressions. In other cases, the elaboration of a monosyllabic form simply involves one additional syllable, which also does not conform to the quadrisyllabic canon. All of these structures nevertheless are recognized by speakers as representative of the same phenomenon, and from the perspective of their text distribution, they appear to be doing the same sorts of things.[7]

In light of elaborate expressions as seen in Khumi, I suggest a more general use of the term based on functional characteristics: as already noted, Khumi elaborate expressions occur in all discourse genres that I have data from, including conversation, folkloric narratives, historical accounts, procedural texts, etc. Invariably they are judged to be an optional device at any given point in a text, but they are regarded as indicative of the linguistic sophistication of the speaker using them—acknowledged good speakers of Khumi adorn their speech with elaborate expressions, much as speakers of Lahu do, according to Matisoff's account. However, later we will see that Khumi elaborate expressions in most cases appear to have an alternative general motivation besides their clear stylistic consequences.

---

[6] For what it is worth, Khumi discourse also exhibits parallelism in other respects besides its use of elaborate expressions, just as Solnit claims for Kayah Li. Here I will concentrate on this subtype of parallelism, but want to underscore that Solnit appears to be on the right track in terms of trying to describe elaborate expressions as simply a particular manifestation of a more general preference given languages may have for parallelism.

[7] One reviewer suggests that given Khumi's position in the South Asian linguistic area, it might be more fruitful to pursue a characterization of this phenomenon in Khumi based on South Asian patterns of reduplication (e.g., as described in Abbi 1992), in particular 'echo-word' formation. I agree that some formal patterns seen in Khumi, especially total reduplication, do bear some similarity to many South Asian reduplicative phenomena, but I want to emphasize that I do not view Khumi elaborate expressions as being all that different from those seen in Southeast Asia. Despite some formal discrepancies, in terms of their semantic and stylistic function, Khumi elaborate expressions ally the language more closely with the Southeast Asian linguistic area than with that of South Asia.

3. The structural composition of Khumi elaborate expressions

Since elaborate expressions are often assumed to be a subtype of compound and may involve reduplication, a few words are in order about compounding in general and other reduplicative structures in Khumi before we get into a detailed account of the strategies that the language has for forming elaborate expressions.

In Khumi, as in other languages, simple compounds involve two (or, rarely, more) usually independent bases which are morphosyntactically bound in the sense that they generally cannot have elements intervening between them; in phonological terms, the lefthand base of a compound in Khumi differs phonologically from an independent use of that base in not having the full range of possible tonal variation on its final syllable, such that there are tonally distinct allomorphs for lefthand compound elements when they occur in compounds rather than independently. For instance, *tuydueéng* 'water gourd', is a compound with *tuuy* 'water' as its lefthand component. Normally *tuuy* has a low falling tone, but in this compound, the tone is low and level; a further characteristic of the tone in the isolation form of this word is that it is unchecked, or the vowel is relatively long, but in the compound the 'water' portion is neither checked nor particularly long.

Khumi elaborate expressions show similar properties to compounds in terms of the tonal potential for their lefthand member, but do not always resemble compounds in terms of the free nature of their elements: not infrequently, an elaboration occurs *only* in an elaborate expression. Moreover, elaborate expressions differ from prototypical compounds in that their parts exhibit a higher degree of separability. Examples of this separability are rare in the corpus, so I do not discuss this phenomenon in detail here, but an example will be seen in example (26) below.

A further type of compound commonly seen in this part of world is the 'father-mother' type of coordinate compound. Khumi has a number of these, primarily, but not exclusively, based on relationship terms (e.g., *am-ampoo* 'mother-father=parents', *jay-báee* 'elder sibling-younger sibling=siblings'). This is a distinct phenomenon from the one under discussion here.

We will see that some elaborate expressions make use of a reduplicative template, but the kind of reduplication involved is different from other reduplication observed in the language. One additional instance of reduplication is seen with verbal classifiers, which may undergo total reduplication (see Peterson 2008 for further discussion). The only other systematic use of reduplication that I am aware of is with one class of bound postverbal aspectual elements, which may have their initial consonant reduplicated, creating a sesquisyllable.[8] The function of both of these reduplications is not clear at this point, but it is notable that the class of aspectual elements primarily involves meanings like 'progressive', 'habitual', 'iterative', and 'durative', which would seem especially amenable to expression involving reduplication. In Khumi reduplication is never used to indicate a distributive or collective meaning for nouns, with meanings such as 'various kinds of N' or 'N and such things', as is common in South Asia.

[8] If the shape of the element is *CVng*, it may show full reduplication, as for the element *pueng* 'EXHAUST(IVE)', shown in its reduplicated form in example (14) below.

So, while elaborate expressions resemble compounds in terms of phonology, they may differ from them in other respects. Elaborate expressions built by reduplication involve a type of reduplication which is different from other reduplication phenomena seen in the language.

We can now move on to look at the specific strategies Khumi has for composing elaborate expressions. Structurally, elaborate expressions (henceforth, EEs) are left- or right-headed—either the left or the right member of the expression determines what entity or action the expression as a whole refers to. There are a handful of exceptions to this generalization fitting into two general categories:

- reversible EEs: *jawkhawng-jangnóeeyng/jangnóeyng-jawkhaawng* 'old times' (11.38, 14.32), in which *jangnóeeyng* is a meaningful element by itself, but *jawkhaawng* occurs only as an elaboration; *kliwng-pvúuy/pvúy-kliiwng* 'snake' (*kliiwg* actually means 'maggot')

- EEs which involve a fixed sequence, but for which either member can function as the head: *tmiw-tmáay* 'god-fog'='god' (14.83) or 'fog' (15.44); *kni-khóeleewng* 'sun-ground'='rain' (in conjunction with the predicate *knií nay* 'to rain' (37.19)) or 'ground' (44.350)

3.1. Default elaboration templates

Depending on one's analysis, there are either two or there is just one default template used for elaboration. The default structure for right-headed expressions involves total reduplication of the head and replacement of its final rhyme (including syllable final nasals) with the vowel *-i*. A selection of examples is given in (3); (3a-e) involve monosyllabic bases, (3f-i) involve sesquisyllabic bases, and the remainder involve disyllabic bases.[9]

(3) a. mi-maay
ELAB-fire
'fire'

b. i-aang	'curry'
c. khí-khoó	'hole'(1.111)
d. mi-mang	'king'
e. i-'áa	'chicken'
f. l'i-l'aawng	'pot' (1.33)
g. m'ni-m'náy	'which' (29.11)
h. tki-tkáay	'tiger'
i. pkhi-pkhaw	'beat'
j. tupli-tuplaa	'box' (1.26)

[9] One reviewer suggests that it is misleading to treat (3a-e) as involving total reduplication, when an alternative account would be that really just a single consonant is involved; however, treating all of these cases as a unified phenomenon is surely preferable to positing different reduplication strategies for the monosyllabic vs. other base types.

k. tuydí-tuydueéng	'water gourd'(1.33)
l. ayti-aytoeeng	'drum' (1.100)
m. angngyi-angyieeng	'cymbal' (1.100)
n. bawhí-bawhuú	'swell up' (1.111)
o. jawytí-jawytáang	'marfa' (15.39)
p. saypí-saypúeeng	'railing'(15.58)
q. koli-kola	'Bangali'
r. krámi-krámoo	'Marma'
s. phangli-phanglá	'bat' (33.52)
t. luvi-luváang	'wergeld'

As long as the base form is sesquisyllabic or disyllabic (as in example 3h or 3j, respectively), this templatic default produces EEs which essentially conform to the A-B-A-C prototype exhibiting identity between the first and third syllables. However, as seen here, forms for monosyllabic bases deviate from the prototype.

There is a possible left-headed template which would similarly involve total reduplication and substitution of either an *–o* or an *–a* rhyme for the final rhyme of the reduplicant, exemplified by those in (4).

(4) a. skhí-skhaá
deer- ELAB
'deer'

b. atá-ato	'prayer' (4.10)
c. ayúeng-ayo	'vine' (4.15)
d. pyo-pyaa	'enjoy, be happy' (15.21)
e. khúmi-khúmaa	'Khumi'

However, these structures are far less common than right-headed default template EEs Moreover, if these were treated as defaults, it would not be possible to predict whether the *–o* or the *–a* rhyme will occur in the reduplicant. An alternative to treating these as left-headed default elaborations would be to simply subsume these under a different category of EE discussed below (nonce-elaborations exhibiting similarity with the head). Since these are relatively rare, and for a given form the vowel of the template would have to be stated explicitly anyway, treating these as a type of arbitrary elaboration rather than as representative of a type of default would not tremendously complicate the description of elaboration types. Doing so would also have the potentially desirable consequence that all default elaboration involves right-headed structures, something which would simplify representation of how elaboration works for a given item in lexical descriptions.

3.2. Form-specific elaboration

Form-specific elaborations override default elaboration if they exist. The sources for these elaborations are highly varied.[10]

3.2.1. Nonce elaboration

An elaboration may be a nonce, unpredictable from the phonological structure of the base, though sometimes similar to it. Such nonce elaborations can be either right- or left-headed. (5) gives a number of right-headed cases where the nonce element bears some resemblance to the head.[11] Specifically, the initial syllable of the head usually corresponds to the initial syllable (or half-syllable, in the case of a sesquisyllabic head) of the elaboration; if the head has a final nasal consonant, sometimes the nonce element also will have a nasal, although this is not without exception.

(5) a. srúng-sraaw
ELAB-tobacco
'tobacco'

b. klúng-klaay	'monkey'
c. amso-amnáay	'friend' (3.2) (*ámsoo* means 'genuine (of a human')
d. apsi-apthoe	'sacrifice' (29.5)
e. amúng-amaang	'dream' (4.8)
f. tmung-tmang	'mistaken' (14.41)
g. mrung-mráang	'betel' (15.20)
i. smiwng-stáang	'gayal' (24.120)
j. kasung-kapay	'business' (27.130)
k. atewng-amóo	'spirit specialist, witch doctor' (44.7)
l. biski-paeski	'name for children's game' (2.1)

If the shared prefix is identified as a separate syllable or element at the relevant level of analysis, this group could be regarded as prototypical EEs in the sense of Haas and Matisoff. It

[10] In the lists given below, it might appear that there is a tendency for these non-default elaboration types to be left-headed, such that while default elaborations would potentially all be right-headed, non-default elaborations would be predominantly left-headed; however, since the lexicon presently available (about 5000 items) has not been evaluated in its entirety, it is not possible to draw such a conclusion at this time.

[11] One reviewer is unconvinced that what I classify as nonce elements here are semantically empty and suggests instead that these are frozen compounds with the meaning of one stem lost. It indeed seems likely that some of these have frozen compounds as their source (ultimately, perhaps they all do), but these are nevertheless categorized together with elaborate expressions by speakers and the elaborations make no clear semantic contribution in any of them. Speakers may be able to discern relationships between the meanings of the parts, though they are usually opaque to them for this class of elaborations. In the lists below I will mention some potential frozen elements, although the meaningfulness of these elaborations is nowhere near as blatant for speakers as are those for the elaborations discussed in the next section, where both elements are clearly meaningful.

is not possible to do so for Khumi synchronically, although these may well have been analyzable prefixes historically.

(6) and (7) give comparable examples of left-headed nonce elaboration structures. In (6) there is no resemblance between the elaboration and its head, whereas in (7) there are similarities of the sort seen in (5).

(6) a. kási-táwkiee
star-ELAB
'star' (20.24a) — (a *tawkie* is a species of lizard; it is unclear how this is related)

b. areng-súraay — 'king' (29.41-42)
c. tvó-l'hiiwng — 'river' (44.12)
d. tuy-saay — 'sweet' (42.49)
e. ca-pii — 'study' (44.8)
f. biwcúeng-angka — 'sacrifice type' (17.151) (*angkaa* means 'Tuesday', but speakers detect no association with this day)

(7) a. ací-akhaang
story-ELAB
'story'

b. asi-akhaang — 'medicine' (44.25)
c. amúeng-aloo — 'name' (12.37)
d. abáw-asaá(ng) — 'perform a sacrifice' (14.34)
e. atho-ajiiwng — 'strength' (42.68)
f. atlae-ahuung — 'cut/attack each other' (43.38) (*huúng* means 'murder')
g. snoeyng-snaawy — 'year' (44.182)
h. sra-smá — 'cow' (23.9)
i. knu-ksaang — 'breast'
j. kni-kthaawng — 'blanket'
k. móecewng-mríi — 'stream'
l. kewngsi-kewngngiee — 'leprosy' (1.81)
m. lungsewng-lungcoeéyng — 'stone' (23.91)
n. tuysi-tuydaáng — 'place in river which never runs dry' (29.17) (*daáng* means 'to get cooler', which is possibly related)
o. vaynoeyng-vaykew — 'oath' (30.20) (*kew* means 'gather together')
p. rengpuy-rengtaang — 'feast of merit' (30.75)
q. cónoeyng-cokraang — 'uncooked, pounded rice' (44.71)
r. toeyng-tang — 'correct' (29.88)
s. móey'e-m'awy — 'eyesand' (44.321)
t. m'téwng-ataang — 'old person, adult' (13.3) (*taang* means 'old', 'mature')
u. dayci-daeráeeng — 'jungle' (28.80)
v. niena-thawngnaa — 'skirt'

Again, many of the above examples fit the A-B-A-C prototype, as long as sesquisyllables are considered. Recall also that (7) represents the group that the left-headed default elaboration type discussed earlier could instead be included under.

3.2.2. Semantically-motivated elaboration

If the elaboration is not a default reduplicative form or a nonce, it may have a meaning similar or related to the meaning of the head. Some examples of right-headed and left-headed forms involving a semantically-motivated elaboration are seen in (8) and (9), respectively.

(8) a. kási-lo
star-moon
'moon' (28.28)

b. ákhu-cóeyngkang	'grasshopper-lizard'='lizard'
c. thoeyngpuy-thoeyngrií	'tree.AUG-hardwood'='hard, middle part of tree' (8.202)
d. húsi-húdaay	'small piece of bamboo'-'bamboo'='bamboo' (7.16)
e. khámuy-thoeyngbáeng	'tree stump-firewood piece'='firewood piece' (24.28)

(9)a. tuy-maay
water-fire
'water' (29.20)

b. doey-hoeyng	'die-live'='die' (4.18)
c. law-ueeng	'swidden-house'='swidden' (44.325))
d. móey-no	'eye-nose'='nose' (15.76)[12]
e. thi-naáy	'blood-pus'='blood' (31.73)
f. váng-núu	'bride price-female'='bride price' (6.6)
g. aju-cnaáw	'wife-child'='wife' (28.79)
h. lie-mroe	'paddy-city'='city' (27.76)
i. uy-klaay	'dog-monkey'='dog'
j. có-ploo	'rice-cotton'='rice'
k. plo-ktiíwng	'cotton-sesame seed'='cotton'
l. plewng-paang	'boat-raft'='boat'
m. reng-tlae	'hold cattle ceremony-cut'='hold cattle ceremony'
n. pie-ksaaw	'spear trap-spear'='spear trap'

In most cases it is easy to see a semantic relationship between the elements; sometimes (e.g., (8d) and (9l)) they resemble synonym compounds (cf. Ourng and Haiman 2000). Other cases verge on antonymy, as in (9a) and (9b). A few cases are less straightforward, like (10m). A possible explanation for this particular collocation is suggested by a Khumi folktale in which some monkeys take a man's dogs as wergeld (a fine paid by the killer to family members of a murdered

[12] In fact, the full word for 'nose' is *notráeeng*, but only the first part of this reflects the etymological root.

individual) for their leader, who the man has killed (a context in which this EE failed to occur, however). Nevertheless, in this case, as in other such pairings, it is not possible to predict whether the left- or the right-hand member is the head.

Unlike the 'nonce' category of elaborations, few of the members of this category adhere to the formal prototype for EEs, although there are some fortuitous exceptions, such as (8c-d), which just happen to have the same initial lexical root ('wood' and 'bamboo', respectively) and those seen in (10), which all happen to consist of elements which share the same initial sesquisyllable.

(10)a.	ajo-athuy	'argue-talk'='fight with each other' (30.55)
b.	plíwng-pthúeng	' heart-liver'='heart' (22.47)
c.	plew-plaáy	'vomit-tongue'='vomit' (17.180)
d.	pci-plaáy	'spit-tongue'='spit' (44.182)
e.	knó-kseewng	'ear-flower'='ear'[13]

3.2.3. Elaboration with a borrowed element

The elaborating element may also be a loan from Marma, an Arakanese variety which exerts extreme lexical borrowing pressure on Khumi. By way of comparison, Matisoff discusses a number of Lahu elaborations stemming from Shan and elsewhere (1973:83). Some examples from Khumi are seen in (11).

(11)a. noéyng-akhoeeyng
time-time [from Marma]
'time' (28.53)

b.	theewng-kaayng	'prison'
c.	priesu-priesa	'country' (13.3)

Sometimes an EE is simply borrowed from Marma in its entirety, as seen in (12):

(12) a.	dúkha-súkha	'suffering, misfortune' (27.128)[14]
b.	koeyng-kaayng	'luck, fortune' (4.18)
c.	acora-skhaang	'government' (17.158b)[15]

[13] For this one, it might be that some similarity is perceived between ears and flowers. A more likely motivation, though, is the association of these two items by virtue of the fact that Khumi traditionally wear flowers and other fragrant grasses and leaves in their ear holes in place of earrings.

[14] As both reviewers suggest, this probably derives in its entirety from Pali via Burmese and/or Marma.

[15] In (12c), the first part is clearly from Marma, and the second part may be from the Marma word for 'camp' (*c'khayng*), although nativization of a Marma loan would normally retain the diphthong of this form, so ultimately some other explanation may need to be offered.

3.2.4. A final source for elaborations

Rarely, the second element may be semantically synonymous with the root, but taken from an auxiliary language used in traditional song:

(13) ksewng=khúraay
flower=flower [song language]
'flower'

It should be noted that other cases in which the elaboration appears to be a nonce may in fact fit into this category because I have not been able to check the status of all of these with speakers of song language. However, this elaboration source still appears to be highly uncommon.

3.2.5. Summary

To briefly wrap up this section on the structural characteristics of Khumi elaborate expressions, then, EEs are either right-or left-headed, depending on which portion of the structure determines the EE meaning. Elaborations, the non-meaningful portions, come from the auxiliary song language, borrowing, lexical items with some semantic relation to the head, nonce forms (which may ultimately come from frozen compound elements), or a default reduplicative template. In the latter case, it would appear that the simplest account is one in which only right-headed default elaboration occurs.

4. The text distribution of elaborate expressions

In this section I move on to a consideration of the use of EEs in discourse. Observations about the text distribution of EEs are based on a corpus of forty-five texts of various sorts, comprising approximately 1000 pages of interlinearized, translated material.

4.1. Lexical class and semantic domain

Although essentially any lexical item may be elaborated, if only by the default template, there are still some discernible tendencies in terms of lexical class and semantic domain of the elaborated elements if their use in discourse is considered. In terms of lexical word class, while they also occur for verbs or other categories (as indicated by some of the examples already given), EEs in texts usually involve nouns. In terms of semantic domain, EEs tend to be used for animal and plant names, natural phenomena, supernatural/spiritual elements, and for Khumi-specific material culture items.

4.2. Distribution according to other semantic/discourse factors

4.2.1. Intensification

EEs frequently appear when an action or state is particularly intense, often occurring in tandem with other dedicated intensifiers in the verb complex or syntax which emphasizes the speaker's perception of the event as intense. For instance, the following is drawn from a narrative in which a daughter seeks revenge on her parents who abandoned her in childhood by sending them home from a visit with boxes full of bees and instructing them not to open the boxes until they have completely sealed their house. The elaboration of the first instance of 'hole' reflects the intense and complete nature of closing up the house. The bound postverbal element-*puengpueng* in the verbal complex, rather than the preceding EE, however, is actually what indicates that the holes of the house are *all* affected by the action, and hence that the action was performed intensively or exhaustively.

(14)

ueéng	toeéng=te	khi-khoó	pdoeyng-puengpueng=te
house.ALL	arrive=EVID	ELAB-hole	close.up-EXHAUST=EVID

ha=poee	khoó	boe'-lae=te…
one=FOC	hole	exist-NEG=EVID

'They reached the house, (and) they closed up all the holes; not even one hole remained…' (1.111)

Just afterwards in the same text, the parents open the boxes filled with bees, and the following ensues, in which elaboration of the predicate *bawhuu* (itself consisting of *baw* 'swell up', and a verbal classifier indicating a large S participant, -*huu*) indicates the extreme nature of the swelling that occurs.

(15)

…kháawy=moe	ke-noe	amoe-cie	níingci	knoó	bawhii-bawhuu
bee=FOC	bite-NZ	REFL-P	very	ear	ELAB-swell.up

k'noó	bawhii-bawhuu=te	doey-puengpueng=bo=te
ear	ELAB-swell.up=EVID	die-EXHAUST=PERF=EVID

'…the bees really stung them. Their ears swelled up, their ears swelled up, and they both died.' (1.111)

Here again, probably the primary expression of the intensity of the swelling is the adverb *níingci*, but the EE reinforces it. Similarly, in (16), where a wildcat gets rained on, the use of an EE correlates with the intensity of raining, although here the primary indication of intensity occurs in the postposed remark about the completeness of the drenching:

(16) vaáwy vaáwy vaáwy-boeloee láwyáa kni-khóeleewng
return return return-WHEN poor.thing sky-ELAB

náy-hay-noe suy-ple-ngaw=khue=coee…
rain-APP-NZ wet- DIMVCL-ACCID=just=AFFIRM

'He returned and returned and when he returned, the poor thing, it rained on him, he was maybe completely wet…' (37.19)

Example (1) from the beginning of the paper also represents this sort of intensification through elaboration, the multiple EEs of that sentence underscoring the intensity of the tiger's efforts to locate the girl, although as in (16), the main indication of intensity comes from the speaker's parenthetical remark following the basic sentence.

It should be noted that sometimes intensification is implied without any accompanying syntax or morphology as its primary expression. For instance, in (17), the elaborations of 'wound' and 'medicine' serve to underscore the size of the wound (from a trickster-genre text in which treeshrew consistently gets the better of bear):

(17) amnáay=oee nang' tmoó-klieng lieng-noe asi-akhaang thie-noe
friend=EMOT 2S.GEN wound-ELAB big-NZ medicine-ELAB spread-NZ

"'Friend [treeshrew talking to bear], your wound has gotten big, where you spread the medicine." ' (31.109)

However, a caveat about (17) is in order. After considering a couple of other low-frequency types of EE use, I will suggest that a second high-frequency use of EEs is for the indication of emotional intensification. (17) would probably also be consistent with an analysis as such, although it is doubtful that treeshrew's sympathy for bear is genuine.

4.2.2. Minor uses of elaboration

Another apparent trend, although not nearly as well-attested across the available corpus, is for an EE to cooccur with events which are durative, repeated or habitual, or somehow distributed in nature. In (18), elaboration of various elements appears to be relatable to the durative nature of the event in question.

(18) nayboeloee mrung-mráang t'áy (m)
then ELAB-betel chew (filler)

asewng-ayaa caa-nee ahaawy-noetlaa
lie.down-ELAB eat-drink do.together-PST

nayboeloee vúngtoto pyo-pyaa-noetlaa
then all.night enjoy-ELAB-PST

'Then they chewed betel (um), they lay down and ate and drank together. Then they enjoyed themselves all night.' (15.20-21)

However, it must be admitted that while durativity of the events may be one conditioning factor for the appearance of EEs, the events described in (18) might simply be in some sense intensified by their use.

An example with a slightly different semantic nuance is (19).

(19)

ee hnoe	khaá='iee	a-pcáwy-aploeéyng-noe=loee	hunoe	nay=tew=bo
yes thus	time=and	MID-pay fine-ELAB-NZ=TOP	thus	thus=COP=PERF

'Yes, and when this happens [when a man allows his anger to get out of hand with his wife and violence occurs], what we do is pay fines to each other.' (36.48)

Clearly, while the action necessary to occasion the fines in question would be extreme, and possibly intense, in (19) elaboration does not appear to correlate with any intensity of fine paying; rather, it seems that here, if anything, the elaboration relates to the ritual or habitual nature of the event.

(20), on the other hand, contains an EE which perhaps underscores the distributed nature of the houses in a village as viewed by the participants in a narrative.

(20)

kníi	sló='iee	kásii	khieeng-noe	ataeng=te	kási-táwkiee
Sky	above=GEN	star	look-NZ	like=EVID	star-ELAB

khieeng-noe	ataeng=te	kraro=khue=te	uymíw	avang
look-NZ	like=EVID	bright.motion=just=EVID	ogre	village

'It was like looking up in the sky at the stars, like looking at the stars, it glimmered, the ogre village' (35.97).

Next, EEs are occasionally situated at the beginning of a text, with the apparent purpose of capturing listeners' attention, as in (21) or (22).

(21)

anglóo	rempá=hawy	cawngthinglang=hawy	thaeng	kníi-rie
young.girl	name=COM	name=COM	small	day-CL

khaá=dingday'ie	ueeng	pkáay=aa	biski-paeski	tpueéng
time=since	house	near=LOC	ELAB-game.name	move

kaso	khaá=day'ie	thodaeeng	caeng-boeloee	anglóo
after	time=since	bachelor	grow.up-WHEN	young.girl

caeng-boeloee	áynii	apung	ngo-waa	nay	akdi-hawy-noe=te
grow.up-WHEN	1INCL.D	marry	get-IRR	QUOT	agree-together-NZ=EVID

'A young girl named Rengpa and Cawngthinglang since childhood played paeski [a children's game involving rocks and leaves] near the house; and when the bachelor and young girl grew up they agreed, "We'll get married".' (2.1)

(22)

amso-'amnáay	léewng	nueng-rie	t'aay	khewng	ahaawy-noe
ELAB-friend	person	two-CL	crab	dig.for	do.together-NZ

hní	tvóo=loee	tvóo	háwy-pray='iee	psuy-raemo=baa
this	river=TOP	river	good-INTENS=AND	whistle-NEG.IMP=EMOT

psuy-boeloee	uymíw	kawng-noe	awm=baa
whistle-COND	ogre	become-NZ	exist=EMOT

'Two friends were digging for crabs together at this river, a very good river, but don't whistle [when you're there] because if you whistle it's possible that you'll become an ogre.' (3.2)

When asked to explain why a speaker would use EEs in this sort of position, consultants speculate that by using elaboration here, perhaps the speaker attempts to draw listeners in with something that sounds exciting at the beginning. This sense of excitement that speakers evoke in these cases is perhaps related to the more abstract sort of intensification that EEs potentially involve, to which we now turn.

4.2.3. Emotional intensification

Besides their use in conjunction with events involving straightforward intensification, use of an EE is most commonly coupled with surprise or heightened emotional intensity from the perspective of a participant or the speaker, as in (2), where the speaker is indignant about the way that various costs seem to keep rising. A similar feeling of indignation on the speaker's part is accompanied by an EE in (23) where an elephant disputes the charge that he is culpable for stepping on a king's daughter; rather, as he explains (in the subsequent text), it was because a bat flew into his ear:

(23)

nayboeloee	kaay=loee	ciiw-noe=poee	apaeé-ngaw=khue=coee
then	1S=TOP	step.on-NZ=FOC	encounter-ACCID=just=AFFIRM

kaay=loee	móey-no=poee	niw'-lae=bo
1S=TOP	eye-ELAB=FOC	see-NEG=PERF

'"…then the one I stepped on, I came across only accidentally. I wasn't able to see."' (33.37)

Later in the same sequence, (24), the jungle pig likewise denies responsibility for the death of the king's daughter due to her disturbance of the bat (which flew into the elephant's ear, such that it then stepped on the king's daughter), again, with an EE:

(24)

kaay='iee	phangli-phanglá	awm-noe	amii
1S=GEN	ELAB-bat	exist-NZ	who

pnóe=moo=noe	piee
know=INTERR=QUOT	say

' "As for me, who could know that there was a bat (there)?" she said.' (33.52)[16]

Another example is seen in (25), where a mother is filled with happiness at the return of her son after an extended absence; an EE coincides with this emotional intensity:

(25)

aw	ngá'aay	ang-toeéng=bo	vaynií=loee
INTERJ	father (=son)	1-arrive=PERF	today=TOP

mnoee	mnoee=moo	ngá'aay='oo
how	how=INTERR	father(=son)=VOC

amúng-amaang	anoee-taeng=loee	kaay=loee=noe	piee=te
ELAB-dream	like-AGAIN=TOP	1S=TOP=QUOT	say=EVID

' "Oh, son, you've come back to us today. How are you son? It's like a dream to me," she said.' (34.230)

In (26), shortly afterwards, the same mother is instead concerned that her son is about to kill her and will so incur a fine (at least that is what she ostensibly is concerned about), and an EE emphasizes the deepness of her concern:[17]

(26)

amnuu=moe	de	ngá'aay='oo	kláay	ngo-noe	ksíi	ngo-noe
mother=FOC	no	father (=son)=VOC	fine	get-NZ	ELAB	get-NZ

'The mother said, "No, son, you'll incur a fine!" ' (34.243)

[16] The genitive marking of the 1s pronoun here is anomalous; the topic marker =*loee* would sound more natural, according to speakers.

[17] Here each part of the EE occurs in conjunction with the same predicate, which is repeated. It is not clear at this point what additional function separating the parts of an EE would have compared to simple use of the EE with a single occurrence of the predicate. Note also that another level of parallelism is involved here, in which the predicate occurs twice rather than just once. This is an instance of the more pervasive tendency towards parallel structures alluded to earlier.

In (27), two young women express, in part through elaboration, their surprise at a proposal by a male caller (actually a tiger in disguise) that he bring up a marfa, a cucumber-like vegetable (by which the tiger indirectly means a pig), to cook.

(27)

maá	tahuu='oee	kay-ní'	jawytí-jawytáang=poee	boe'-lae=baee
where	darling=EMOT	1.EXCL-D.GEN	ELAB-marfa=FOC	exist-NEG-EMOT

jaw-noe=poee
take.up/out-NZ=FOC

"'Where, darling? We have no marfa for you to take up!'" (15.39)

A final example is (28), from the same text about two women, where the narrative-internal speakers' tones can only be described as maudlin; at this point, the speakers (the two women the story is about, Sluy and Slay) realize that they are both going to die:

(28)

ahaawy=baa	naang=loee	kási-táwkiee	laáwng=baa
friend=EMOT	2S=TOP	star-ELAB	become=EMOT

arreng-súraay='iee	rengpuy-rengtaang	thaw	khaá
king-ELAB=GEN	fesast.of.merit-ELAB	hold	time

avang-thlo=baa	noe	piee=te
shine-AUGVCL-EMOT	QUOT	say=EVID

sluy=loee	kási-táwkiee	laáwm-yo-noetlaa
Sluy=TOP	star-ELAB	become-IMPFV-PST

slay=loee	ahaawy=baa	naang=loee	khuytmiíw	laáwm=baa
Slay=TOP	friend=EMOT	2S=TOP	bee.species	become=EMOT

(m)	areeng-súraay-cie='iee	laaw	móo-tang='iee	sewruú
(filler)	king-ELAB-P=GEN	swidden	section-middle=GEN	bean.variety

bayci	paw	p'yaaw=baa
bean.variety	flower	suck=EMOT

"'Friend, you become a star, and when rich people hold a feast of merit, you shine brightly!" Sluy said. And she became a star. And Slay said, "Friend, you become the white marking on the head of the *khuytmiw* bee and suck (the nectar) from bean flowers in the middle of rich people's fields.'" (15.93-95)

4.2.4. Summary

In summary, the preceding examples have demonstrated that we can characterize the text-function of EEs quite generally: they are used in situations where a speaker wants to indicate or underscore some kind of intensification, either of a prototypical sort (including various nuances that merge with aspect, such as durative, habitual, etc.), or of a more abstract, emotional sort. At the same time, the impression that speakers have when EEs are used is similar to what has previously been cited for their use, namely that they convey a sense of elegance and speaking competence.

There is a clear tendency for certain speakers to use specific EEs, such that it would appear that when put into a more or less formal speech situation (e.g., in relating a narrative, or conversing with someone in a higher social position, like a village leader or elder), speakers may have a repetoire of EEs that they draw on to embellish their speech. However, different speakers do appear to use the same EEs, at least for those attested in text material. For instance, compare (29) and (30), which are from two separate speakers on different occasions, but employ the same elaboration for 'clothing', in what are also remarkably similar situations, although the details of the surrounding narratives are quite distinct.

(29) atewng-alang tláeeng(moe) loeeyng-pueng
clothing-ELAB suddenly take.off- EXHAUST

ní=moe a-tewng-tlaw
3S=REFL MID-put.on-INSTEAD

'Suddenly she (an ogre) removed all her (another woman's) clothing and put it on herself instead.' (21.29)

(30) atewng-alang loeeyng-pueng='iee
clothing-ELAB take.off- EXHAUST=AND

ní=moe' kang-thúu-baaw p-tewng-tlaw
3S=REFL.GEN NZ-crazy-AUGVCL CAUS-put.on-INSTEAD

'She removed all her (a daughter's) clothing and dressed her crazy one (another daughter) up in it instead.' (24.95)

What the situations do share, however, is the sense that all of the clothing is involved in the switch, the intensity of the action associated with the change.

5. Concluding remarks

In this study, I hope to have shown that EEs in Khumi can be given a succinct formal characterization. There are only a small number of elaboration subtypes, many of which correspond to the EE prototype defined for languages like Thai and Lahu. The assumption that a default template only occurs for right-headed elaboration is a further simplification.

At the same time, there are semantic similarities that cross-cut given instances of EE use. Elaboration, a reduplicative or quasi-reduplicative process, tends to occur with various types of intensification, something which reduplication is otherwise well-known to correlate with cross-linguistically. While there are clear stylistic reasons for elaboration, which speakers are most acutely aware of, it would appear that it is not simply stylistic considerations that motivate the use of an EE on any given occasion in Khumi.

It is furthermore noteworthy that initial investigations of EE use in Mru, clearly an areally affiliated language although not in the same Tibeto-Burman subgroup, suggest that it has a use of EEs which exhibits similar semantic motivations. This raises the issue of whether the tendencies seen in Khumi are part of an areal phenomenon. Alternatively, a universal trend in the use of EEs, as a subtype of reduplicative structure, may be responsible. To the best of my knowledge, so far there have been no studies to test this question directly, and future research will have to address this issue

On a more practical note, the EE phenomenon in Khumi makes clear the need for lexical entries to include elaboration information, at least for EEs that do not make use of the default template. If form-specific elaboration exists for a given form, this is essential information that must be included for the lexical entry of that form. And while considered from a cross-speaker/cross-text perspective it would appear that there is consistency in speaker usage of EEs, as suggested in the summary of section 4, it is unclear that this will be the case when EE formation is tested for a variety of speakers and forms belonging to lexical fields not typically subject to elaboration. I will not attempt to delve further into these issues of lexicography here, but simply wish to bring them to the attention of linguists working on documentation of languages in South and Southeast Asia.

References

Abbi, Anvita. 1992. *Reduplication in South Asian languages: an areal, typological and historical study*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Limited.

Goddard, Cliff. 2005. *The languages of East and Southeast Asia*: *an introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haas, Mary R. 1964. *Thai-English student's dictionary*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Matisoff, James A. 1973. *The grammar of Lahu*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mortensen, David. 2003. "Hmong elaborate expressions are coordinate compounds". UC Berkeley Ms.

Ourng, Noeurng and John Haiman. 2000. "Symmetrical compounds in Khmer". *Studies in Language* 24.3:483-514.

Peterson, David A. 2008. "Bangladesh Khumi verbal classifiers and Kuki-Chin 'chiming'". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 31.1:109-138.

Solnit, David. 1995. "Parallelism in Kayah Li discourse: elaborate expressions and beyond". In Leela Bilmes, Anita Lang, and Weera Ostapirat, (eds.). *Berkeley Linguistics Society 21, Special session on discourse in Southeast Asian languages*: 127-140.

David A. Peterson
david.a.peterson@dartmouth.edu

Himalayan Linguistics, Vol. 9(1). © Himalayan Linguistics 2010
ISSN 1544-7502

Perfect constructions with existential verbs in nDrapa[*]

Satoko Shirai
Nagoya Institute of Technology

1 Introduction

In the Mätro dialect of nDrapa (Qiangic, Tibeto-Burman: Sichuan, China),[1] the combination of a verb and an existential verb is used as an aspectual device that can have implications such as resulting state and persistent situation. For example, in (1) below, the combination is used to describe a resulting state or persisting result of the previous event; that is, a man has come to the speaker's place and is there until the time of the utterance.

(1) *ŋoro1* *a-tɛ-a3* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG DIR:DOWN-come-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He has arrived here.' (He has come and is still here.)

The basic construction of such combinations has the suffix *-a* affixed to the head of the predicate (such as *a-tɛ3* 'come' in (1)), followed by an existential verb (such as *tɕʉ-ɛ2* in (1)). In this paper, this combination in nDrapa is called the "*-a* + EXIST" construction. The *-a* in an "*-a* + EXIST" construction is simply labeled as "-[a]" in the morpheme gloss.[2]

The formation of "*-a* + EXIST" constructions is distinct from both the auxiliary construction and the typical serial verb constructions in nDrapa, in which left-hand verbs cannot be affixed with

---

[*] This paper is the revised and extended version of the one presented at The 41st International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, 2008, held at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London. I am very grateful to the participants of the symposium for their comments.

This study is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology ("Areal Study of the Multilingual Societies in Southwestern China"; No. 19720095; Satoko Shirai).

[1] The nDrapa (Zhaba) language is spoken by around 8,000 people in Daofu County and Yajiang County of Kanze Prefecture, Sichuan, China. The Mätro dialect is spoken in the Mazhong village of Zhongni District, Zhaba Area, Daofu County. The following are the phonemes of Mätro nDrapa: consonants /ph [pʰ], th [tʰ], ʈh [ʈʰ], ch [cʰ], kh [kʰ]; p, t, ʈ, c, k, ʔ;b, d, ɖ, ɟ, g; tsh [tsʰ], tɕh, [tɕʰ]; ts, tɕ; dz, dʑ; m, n, ɳ, ŋ; hm [m̥m], hn [n̥n], hɳ [ɳ̊ɳ], hŋ [ŋ̊ŋ]; fh [fʰ], sh [sʰ], ɕh [ɕʰ]; f, s, ɕ, x; v, z, ʑ, ɣ; w, j; l, r [ɽ]; l̥ [l̥], r̥ [ɽ̊]/; vowels /i, ɨ, ʉ, u, e [ɪ], ɵ, o, ɛ, ʌ, ə, a; ei/, and tones: 1 (High-level), 2 (High-falling), 3 (Low-rising) and 4 (Low-rising-falling).

[2] The identity of this suffix is one of the topics of this paper. It has the same form as one of the "Pattern B" suffixes that is used in the point-of-view system (See sections 3.1.2, 3.2.3 and 4.3). The Pattern B suffix *-a* implies the objective (non-egophoric) attitude of a statement in the perfective aspect. Please refer to Shirai (2006a, 2007) for the details of the point-of-view system.

-a. On the other hand, the "*-a* + EXIST" constructions appear to be parallel to constructions in the neighboring major languages such as Sichuan Chinese and Khams Tibetan,[3] where the combination of a perfect verb and an existential verb convey a resulting state.

In this paper, I will provide a full analysis of the combination of a verb with *-a* and an existential verb in the Mätro dialect of nDrapa. Such phenomena have not been discussed in the previous descriptive studies on nDrapa dialects, such as Huang (1991) and Gong (2007).

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 analyzes the semantics of the two aspects that are expressed with the "*-a* + EXIST" construction. Section 3 describes the morphosyntactic structure of such constructions. Section 4 discusses the origin of the "*-a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa in light of similar constructions found in neighboring languages. The conclusions of the paper are summarized in Section 5.

2 Semantic implications of the "*-a* + Exist" construction

2.1 Tense/aspect values: perfect aspect

The "*-a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa can have one of the following two tense/aspect values: the "perfect of result" (Comrie 1976: 56) or "perfect stative" (Smith 1997: 106), such as *John has arrived* in English; and the "perfect of persistent situation" (Comrie 1976: 60) or "present perfect" with an "open interpretation" (Smith 1997: 188), such as English *I've been waiting for hours*. An example of each pattern is shown in (1) (repeated below) and (2), respectively.

(1) *ŋoro1* *a-tɛ-a3* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG DIR:DOWN-come-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He has arrived here.' (He has come and is still here.)

(2) *ŋa1* *tɕuu2* *co3* *ko-hdo1* *hce-a3* *tɕʉ2.*
1SG now friend DIR:UP-sit PST-[a] exist$_6$
'I have been waiting for a friend (and continue to do so now).'

Moreover, in a few examples, the construction seems to have an iterative or habitual implication, as seen in (3). However, this implication can be viewed as a variation of the perfect of persistent situation, as in the roughly comparable English example *I've shopped there for years* (Comrie 1976: 60).

(3) *rendʑo3* *kʌ-hteire = hce-a1* *tɕa = rɛ3.*
often DIR:IN-overcloud= PST-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'It often becomes cloudy.'

[3] In the areas where nDrapa is spoken, Tibetan is the traditional lingua franca, and more recently, Chinese has become the dominant language. Many loanwords from Tibetan and Chinese are found in nDrapa, and loanwords from Tibetan are found even in rather basic vocabularies such as *loma3* 'leaf' and *meto3* 'flower.' They are so familiar to nDrapa speakers that the consultants of my fieldwork recognize them as native nDrapa words (Shirai 2006a: 5-6, 2008: 3).

Other meanings that are often associated with the perfect in other languages, such as experience and the recent past, are not necessary entailments of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa.

My semantic analysis of this construction is based on the two-component theory of Smith (1997). The two-component theory assumes that "sentences present information about aspectual situation type and viewpoint. The two types of information are independent." (Smith 1997: 2). There are three main viewpoint types: perfective, imperfective, and neutral. Moreover, aspectual situations are classified into five types as listed below:

- *States*: static, durative
- *Activity*: dynamic, durative, atelic
- *Accomplishment*: dynamic, durative, telic, consisting of process and outcome
- *Semelfactives*: dynamic, atelic, instantaneous
- *Achievement*: dynamic, telic, instantaneous (Smith 1997: 3)

It is natural to consider the difference between the two values of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction mentioned above as being derived from the aspectual viewpoints: the perfect of result has the perfective viewpoint and the perfect of persistent situation has the progressive viewpoint. Moreover, such viewpoints appear to be restricted by the situation type of the event expressed in the sentence, a point I pursue in the subsequent sections.

2.1.1 The perfect of result

If the event expressed in an "-*a* + EXIST" sentence is telic (i.e., there is a natural final endpoint of the event), the construction has a strong tendency to have the reading of resulting state. In other words, if the situation type of the event expressed in the sentence is Accomplishment or Achievement, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction implies that the event is viewed as a whole from the perfective viewpoint and that a result of the event exists at the time of reference. For example, Accomplishment situations, such as "put on certain clothes" and "open a certain window," as seen in (4) and (5) respectively, show this pattern. Moreover, Achievement situations, such as "crack a certain cup" and "break a certain cup," as seen in (6) and (7), also have the reading of resulting state.

(4) *ŋoro1* *pɵtɕhe3* *ʌ-ʔci-a1* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG Tibetan.clothes DIR:UP-put.on-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He is wearing the Tibetan clothes.' (He has put on the Tibetan clothes and is still wearing them.)

(5) *ŋoro1* *ngezɨ3* *o-ʔchu1* *hce-a3* *tɕa=rɛ3.*
DEM window DIR:UP-open PST-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'That window is open.' (Someone has opened that window and it is still open)

(6) *koro1 ʈondo1 kʌ-ʔʈe-a1 tɕa=rɛ3.*
DEM cup DIR:IN-become.cracked-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'This cup is cracked.' (This cup has been cracked since someone dropped it.)

(7) *koro1 ʈondo1 a-ʈhɛ-a3 tɕa=rɛ3.*
DEM cup DIR:DOWN-break-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'This cup is broken into bits.' (Someone has broken this cup, and the fragments remain scattered on the floor.)

In the "-*a* + EXIST" construction with the resultative implication, the perfective viewpoint is located between the time when the action is finished and the time when the resulting state changes. The latter temporal point is referred to as "F + 1" by Smith (1997: 71–72) and as "the reset time" by Igarashi and Gunji (1998: 82–3). For example, in (4), the situation "he put on the clothes" is the Accomplishment type. The viewpoint is the perfective type, which includes the initial endpoint (I) and the final endpoint (F) of the action, and the result of the action is his wearing of the clothes. Moreover, the viewpoint is located in the period when he is wearing the clothes, that is, the period between the time when he finishes putting on the clothes (F) and the time when he takes them off (F + 1: a change of state from F).

In nDrapa, the perfect of result interpretation of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is only acceptable if the result of a telic situation is visible. In addition to the examples above, situations such as *ŋa=rə3 tianxua4 xaoma3 kʌ-rʌ3* [1SG=GEN telephone number DIR:IN-write] '(I) write my telephone number,' *hɟara-kə3 mɛto-rɛ3 ŋo-hbo3* [garden-inside flower-PL DIR:OUT-bloom] 'the flowers in the garden open up,' and *tʌ3 ʌ-hca1* [water DIR:UP-boil] 'the water comes to a boil' are found to express the perfect of result when placed in the "-*a* + EXIST" construction. However, if the result is invisible, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is judged to be odd or unacceptable by native speakers. I will return to this problem in section 2.2.

2.1.2 The perfect of persistent situation

Example (2), repeated below, expresses a persistent situation: the speaker began waiting for a friend in the past and continues to wait until the reference time. In this pattern, the reference time is identical with the time of utterance.

(2) *ŋa1 tɕuɯ2 co3 ko-hdo1 hce-a3 tɕɯ2.*
1SG now friend DIR:UP-sit PST-[a] exist$_6$
'I have been waiting for a friend (and continue to do so now).'

If the situation expressed in the sentence is the Activity type, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction conveys a persistent situation. If the final endpoint of the situation is not well-defined, that is, out of the aspectual view, and if the situation has time duration, that is, the initial endpoint is not identical with the final endpoint, then the aspectual viewpoint is easily located in the interval between the two endpoints. Examples with the activity situations "live with someone" and "help someone do something" are provided in (8) and (9), respectively.

(8) *tshɛri1* *lɵza = ntsha3* *hdo = wu4* *mɵ = hce-a3* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
PN PN =COM same.place=ACC live=PST-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'Tseri has been living with Loza (since marriage).'

(9) *ŋoro1* *tɕuu2* *hgehgɛ = wu1* *kə-ji1* *hce-a3* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG now teacher=ACC DIR:IN-help PST-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He has been helping the teacher (and continues to do so now).'

In nDrapa, the progressive aspect is usually indicated by the imperfective auxiliary *ʈʌ*, which follows the main verb stem, as shown in (10a). The semantic interpretations of (10a) with the imperfective auxiliary and (10b) with the "*-a* + EXIST" construction are so similar that native speakers have difficulty describing any difference.

(10) a. *ŋa1* *tɕəti-ta1* *ntɕhi = ʈʌ1.*
1SG book-upside look= IPF
'I am reading.'

b. *ŋa1* *tɕəti-ta1* *kə-ntɕhi-a1* *tɕʉ2.*
1SG book-upside DIR:IN-look-[a] exist$_6$
'I have been reading.'

Example (3), which is repeated below, has an iterative implication: the sky becomes cloudy again and again. Moreover, the situation is regarded as continuing until the time of reference.

(3) *rendʑo3* *kʌ-hteire = hce-a1* *tɕa = rɛ3.*
often DIR:IN-overcloud= PST-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'It often becomes cloudy.'

A parallel pattern is found in (11) and (12). In (11), the subject wears Tibetan clothes one day, again the next day, and keeps putting them on in the morning and taking them off in the evening all the way up until the day of utterance. Similarly (12) implies that the subject repeats the cycle of reading books up to the day of utterance.

(11) *ŋoro1* *ɲʌreɲʌ3* *pɵtɕhɛ3* *ʌ-ʔci-a1* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG every.day Tibetan.clothes DIR:UP-put.on-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He wears Tibetan clothes every day.'

(12) *ŋoro1* *ɲʌreɲʌ3* *tɕəti-ta1* *kə-ntɕhi-a1* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG every.day book-upside DIR:IN-look-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He reads every day.'

The form of sentence (11) is almost the same as that of (4), repeated below, except that (11) has the adverbial *ɲʌreɲʌ3* 'every day.' Sentence (12) is also similar to (10b) with the exception of the adverbial.

(4) *ŋoro1* *pətɕhe3* *ʌ-ʔci-a1* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG Tibetan.clothes DIR:UP-put.on-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He is wearing the Tibetan clothes.' (He has put on the Tibetan clothes and is still wearing them.)

(10) b. *ŋa1* *tɕəti-ta1* *kə-ntɕhi-a1* *tɕʉ2.*
1SG book-upside DIR:IN-look-[a] exist$_6$
'I have been reading.'

The important point here is that the situation types depend on the whole sentence, including the adverbial.[4] Therefore, the situations "He wears Tibetan clothes" and "He wears Tibetan clothes *every day*" belong to different types: The former is the Accomplishment type, and the latter, the Semelfactive type. On the other hand, since both situations of (12) and (10b) belong to the Activity type, the inference of iterativity is due to the presence of the adverbials such as *rendʑo3* 'often' and *ɲʌreɲʌ3* 'every day.'

To conclude, if the situation is atelic, that is, the Active type or the Semelfactive type, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction tends to convey a persistent situation. Moreover, it can also have an iterative-like implication in accordance with the context expressed by adverbials.

2.2 Situations unacceptable in the "-a + EXIST" construction

Interestingly, some situations are incompatible with the "-*a* + EXIST" construction.

Situations of the State type are not found with the "-*a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa. For example, in (13), even though the stem of the main verb (*ra3*) may seem stative ('resemble'), the situation expressed with the affixed verb (*a-ra-a3*) is the Achievement type ('come to resemble'). In nDrapa, the verbal stems that have stative meanings, such as *tɕi1* 'big' and *ʔʈhe1* 'white,' generally form change-of-state verbs such as *ʌ-tɕi-a1* 'grow up' and *ʌ-ʔʈhe-a1* 'turn white' once they are affixed with a directional prefix and -*a*.[5]

---

[4] The situation type does not depend on the inherent features of the verb. Although both the examples below involve the verb *ŋi-nɲi1* "listen/hear," the situation in (i) "I hear the message" is the Accomplishment type, but the situation in (ii) "the mother listens to the child's talk" is the Active type.

(i) *antha1* *no1* *a-ɕjɛ-mərʌ3* *ŋa1* *ŋi-nɲi1* *нce-a3* *tɕʉ2.*
just 2SG DIR:DOWN-say-NMLZ 1SG DIR:OUT-listen PST-[a] exist$_6$
'I have heard what you have just said (and I remember the message).'

(ii) *tɕuu2* *pʌнʝʌ3* *tɕhi-pe4* *ɕjɛ=ʈ-ɛ1.* *me3* *ŋi-nɲi-a1* *tɕʉ2.*
now child something-a.little say=IPF-B.IPF mother DIR:OUT-listen-[a] exist$_6$
'The child is saying something (obscure). His mother has been listening to it.'

[5] In this respect, the function of the suffix -*a* is identical to that of the Pattern B suffix of the perfective aspect. This suggests that suffix -*a* is the same, or at least has the same origin, as the Pattern B suffix of the perfective aspect. See sections 3.2.3 and 4.3.

(13) *ŋa1 phe=wu3 a-ra-a3 tɕʉ=ʈ-ɛ1.*
1SG father=ACC DIR:DOWN-resemble-[a] exist$_6$=IPF-B.IPF
'I resemble my father.' (I have grown up and come to resemble my father.)

Another type of incompatibility is found with events denoting death. Even though the final endpoints of the events are significant, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is not accepted if the event implies extinction, as in "a man died many years ago." Again we see that the "-*a* + EXIST" pattern cannot be used if the subject of the resulting state is not visible. This phenomenon indicates that the existential verb in the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is not thoroughly grammaticalized as an aspect marker but retains some element of its core meaning of denoting that an entity exists.

For example, example (14a) is unacceptable using the "-*a* + EXIST" construction, even though the situation is one where the father had died in the past and hence is dead at the time of the utterance. This type of situation is expressed by a simple perfect sentence that does not contain an existential verb, as shown in (14b).

(14) a. **koro3 pʌhɟʌ=rʌ3 phe3 tʌ-ɕ-a1 tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
DEM child=GEN father DIR:NEUT-die-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
Intended meaning: 'The father of this child has died.'

b. *koro3 pʌhɟʌ=rʌ3 phe3 tʌ-ɕ-a1.*
DEM child=GEN father DIR:NEUT-die-B.PFV
'The father of this child has died.'

It is worth noting that the acceptability of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is slightly improved in (15), though the implication also becomes slightly different. (14a) uses an animate existential verb *tɕʉ2* in the "-*a* + EXIST" construction, but (15) uses an inanimate existential verb *tɕa3*.[6] Consequently, (15) may imply that an inanimate subject, a dead body, exists in the sight of the speaker.

(15) *? koro3 pʌhɟʌ=rʌ3 phe3 tʌ-ɕ-a1 tɕa=rɛ3.*
DEM child=GEN father DIR:NEUT-die-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'The father of this child has died (and his dead body is laying there).'

The intended meaning of (16a) is that the ice in a lake has melted and the resultant water still remains in the lake. The situation cannot be expressed with the "-*a* + EXIST" construction, as shown in (16a), but can be expressed with a perfect form of a sentence without an existential verb, as shown in (16b). This is because the subject of the resulting state is intangible; it no longer exists. If the situation is opposite, that is, if the water has turned to ice, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction can be used, as seen in (17). This is appropriate as the ice has come into existence.

[6] For details on the distinction of existential verbs, please refer to section 3.1.1.

(16) a. **ɕʉ-ta=rʌ1 nphei1 a-j-a3 tɕa=rɛ3.*
lake-upside=GEN ice DIR:DOWN-melt-[a] exist$_4$=COP
Intended meaning: 'The ice in the lake has melted.'

b. ɕʉ-ta=rʌ1 nphei1 a-j-a3.
lake-upside=GEN ice DIR:DOWN-melt-B.PFV
'The ice in the lake has melted.'

(17) *ɕʉ-ta1 nphei1 kʌ-tɕa-a3 tɕa=rɛ3.*
lake-upside ice DIR:IN-exist$_4$-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'The lake has been frozen over.' (The ice in the lake has come to exist.)

Other situations with invisible results are also incompatible with this construction. These include mental situations expressed by such verbs as *hto3* 'be afraid of' or *hmʌ1* 'forget'. Situations expressing changes in temperature that have no visible verifiability, such as "become cold," are not acceptable with this construction, but those denoting changes in temperature that can be visibly verified are acceptable, as shown in (18) and (19), respectively. In (18), the change in temperature is invisible; on the other hand, in (19), the bright sunshine is visible.

(18) **ʌ-ve-a1 tɕa=rɛ3.*
DIR:UP-cold-[a] exist$_4$=COP
Intended meaning: 'It has become cold.'

(19) *ɲʌmi1 ko-zo-a1 tɕa=rɛ3. ɲʌmi1*
sun DIR:IN-hot-[a] exist$_4$=COP sun
'The sun shines brightly and it has become warm.'

Moreover, Activity situations that produce sound, such as "a child is saying something" with the verb *a-ɕjɛ3* 'speak' and "A monk beats a drum" with the verb *ŋo-hɟo1* 'beat (a drum)', cannot be expressed with the "-*a* + EXIST" construction.

Other situations that are incompatible with the "-*a* + EXIST" construction seem arbitrary. For example, most of the situations consisting of a compound verb with the verb stem *mɵ1* 'make,' such as *hteimu3 a-mɵ3* 'marry' and *khʌnʤi1 ŋʌnʤi1 a-mɵ3* 'walk around,' cannot be expressed with the "-*a* + EXIST" construction, as shown in (20). However, *htsoma1 joma3 a-mɵ3* 'arrange (things in order)' is acceptable, as shown in (21).

(20) **ŋonɛ1 hteimu3 a-mɵ-a3 tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3DL wedding DIR:DOWN-make-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
Intended meaning: 'They have been married.'

(21) *je-kə1 htsoma1 joma3 a-mɵ-a3 tɕa=rɛ3.*
house-inside clean/ordered DIR:DOWN-make-[a] exist$_4$=COP
'The house has been arranged.' [FT]

2.3 Serial verb construction with the verb 'put'

In nDrapa, there is another type of construction that conveys either the meaning of a resulting state or a persistent situation: the serialization of a general verb and the verb *lɛ3* 'put.' For example, the meanings of (22a, b) are almost the same as those of (1), which is repeated below; both denote the resulting state of a man's arrival.

(22) a. *ŋoro1* *a-tɛ3* *lɛ=hce-a3.*
3SG DIR:DOWN-come put-PST-B.PFV
'He has arrived here.' (He has come and is still here.)

b. *ŋoro1* *a-tɛ3* *lɛ=ʈ-ɛ3.*
3SG DIR:DOWN-come put-IPF-B.IPF
'He has arrived here.' (He has come and is still here.)

(1) *ŋoro1* *a-tɛ-a3* *tɕ~~ʉ~~-ɛ2.*
3SG DIR:DOWN-come-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He has arrived here.' (He has come and is still here.)

Similarly, the meanings of (23a, b) are also very similar to that of sentence (2): the persistent situation of waiting for a friend.

(23) a. *ŋa1* *tɕuu2* *co3* *ko-hdo1* *lɛ=hɟe3.*
1SG now friend DIR:UP-sit put-PST:1
'I have been waiting for a friend (and continue to do so now).'

b. *ŋa1* *tɕuu2* *co3* *ko-hdo1* *lɛ=ʈʌ3.*
1SG now friend DIR:UP-sit put-PST:1
'I have been waiting for a friend (and continue to do so now).'

(2) *ŋa1* *tɕuu2* *co3* *ko-hdo1* *hce-a3* *tɕ~~ʉ~~2.* *ŋa1*
1SG now friend DIR:UP-sit PST-[a] exist$_6$ 1SG
'I have been waiting for a friend (and continue to do so now).'

In nDrapa serial verb and auxiliary constructions, no suffix can be added to the left-hand verb stem, as shown in (24) and (25), as well as in the verb plus *lɛ3* serial construction just exemplified.

(24) *th~~ʉ~~3* *tʌ-**thɛ=ji1*** ***~~ʉ~~-ɛ3.***
LOG DIR:NEUT-egest=go need-B.IPF
'(The boy said,) "I must go potty."' [FT]

(25) *ŋa1* *tʌ3* ***le3*** *a-**ji3*** *wu-a2.*
1SG water draw DIR:DOWN-go/come PFT-B.PFV
'I have already gone to draw water.'

By contrast, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction, as shown in (1) and (2), is morphologically distinct from typical serial verb/auxiliary constructions in that the left-hand verb is obligatory suffixed with –*a*.

It should be noticed that nDrapa has both the "-*a* + EXIST" construction and the serial verb construction with *lɛ3* 'put' to express a resulting state or a persistent situation; moreover, the former has an atypical form in the nDrapa system of verb serializations. Further discussion on the structural differences between "-*a* + EXIST" and serial verb constructions is given in section 3.2.

3 The formation of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction

3.1 Existential verbs

In nDrapa, existential verbs constitute a subcategory of verbs. Thus, similar to all nDrapa verb stems, existential verb stems can become heads of predicates and take affixes such as directional prefixes and Pattern B suffixes, as shown in (26).

(26) *tʌpo3* *hdʑʉsɛpe3* *to-**tɕʉ**-a1* *rɛ3.*
riverside fish.killer DIR:NEUT-exist$_6$-B.PFV COP
'There was a fisherman at the riverside.' [FT]

3.1.1 The choice of an existential verb

There are as many as six existential verb stems in nDrapa, as shown in Table 1.[7] In existential sentences, existential verb stems are chosen in accordance with the animacy of the subject and its manner of existence (Shirai 2006b, 2008).

STEM		ANIMACY	TEMPORALITY	MANNER
1.	*po3*	animate/inanimate	constant	settled
2.	*nʌ1*	animate	constant/temporary	(any)
		inanimate	temporary	gained
3.	*ɕi2*	inanimate	constant/temporary	immobile
4.	*tɕa3*	inanimate	temporary	not wrapped
5.	*tɕʌ3*	inanimate	temporary	within something
6.	*tɕʉ2*	animate	temporary	(any)

Table 1. Existential verb stems

[7] In the glosses of the examples in this paper, the existential verbs have subscripts that indicate their corresponding stem in Table 1.

Only the last three existential verb stems are found in "-*a* + EXIST" constructions:[8] *tɕʉ2* (exist$_6$) is used if the subject of the resulting state/persistent situation is animate, as shown in (27) and (28). On the other hand, if the subject of the resulting state/persistent situation is inanimate, *tɕa3* (exist$_4$) is usually chosen, as shown in (29) and (30); however, *tɕʌ3* (exist$_5$) is also found if such a subject is contained within an object, such as a bag or clothes, as shown in (31) and (32).

(27) *ŋa1* *ko3* *ʌ-hdʑi-a1* *tɕʉ2.*
1SG here DIR:UP-sit-[a] exist$_6$
'I have been sitting here.' (I sat down here, and I am still sitting here.)

(28) *woko1* *thapi3* *rapha=tɕʉ3* *ʌ-tɕhw-a3* *tɕw-ɛ2.*
smoked.pork upside mouse=NCL DIR:UP-go-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'A mouse is on the big smoked pork.' [Proverb][9] (A mouse has climbed to the top of the smoked pork and is still there)

(29) *ŋa1* *nkho3* *ʈotsi-ta3* *kʌ-hti-a1* *tɕa3.*
1SG key table-upside DIR:IN-put-[a] exist$_4$
'I have kept the key on the table (and the key is still there).'

(30) *ŋa1* *mɛto-ta3* *tʌ3* *ko-tʉ-a1* *tɕa3.*
1SG flower-upside water DIR:IN-pour-[a] exist$_4$
'I have watered the flowers (and they are still wet; so you don't need to water them).'

---

[8] It is difficult to determine why the other three stems *po3, nʌ1* and *ɕi2* are not used in the "-*a* + EXIST" construction, but the implications of these stems appears to be less suitable to the construction: neither the resulting state nor the persistent situation are recognized as constant or immobile.

Moreover, the existential verb *nʌ1* appears to be related to the experiential auxiliary *nʌ2*. Examples are shown in (i) auxiliary and (ii) existential verb. However, the word *nʌ2* in (i) is completely grammaticalized as an auxiliary, even if it is assumed to originate from an existential verb. Since the verb to the left of *nʌ1* cannot be affixed by -*a*, the structure is different from the "-*a* + EXIST" construction. Therefore, I will not discuss the issue further in this paper.

(i) *ŋa1* *pɵtɕhɛ3* *ʌ-ʔci1* ***nʌ2.***
1SG Tibetan.cloths DIR:UP-wear EXP
'I have worn Tibetan cloths.'

(ii) *ndankhɛrə3* *vi3* *pɛpɛ3* ***nʌ1*** *ʈhe3.*
fomerly dhole a.lot exist$_2$ PST:HBT
'There used to be many dholes.'

[9] This proverb refers to a position above oneself. A *woko1* (wholly-smoked and fermented pork)—which is known as Chou-Zhu-Rou (臭猪肉; smelly pork) in Chinese—hung above a fireplace, is a traditional food in nDrapa. It has a very important place in the nDrapa way of life, while a mouse is much smaller and less important.

(31) *no=ro3* *nkho3* *ŋa=rʌ3* *mʌ-kʌ3* *a-xu-a3* *tɕʌ3.*
2SG=GEN key 1SG=GEN bosom-inside DIR:DOWN-stow-[a] exist$_3$
'I have stowed your key away in my bosom[10] (and the key is still in my bosom).'

(32) *koro-kʌ1* *rɛra3* *a-hku-a3* *tɕʌ3.*
teapot-inside tea DIR:DOWN-pour-[a] exist$_3$
'I have poured tea into the teapot (and the teapot is still full with the tea).'

If more than one argument is possible as the subject of the resulting state/persistent situation, the choice of an existential verb stem is dependent on what the speaker focuses on. For example, different existential verbs are found in (33a) and (33b), even though the meanings of the two sentences are similar—the resulting state of a third person shutting his mouth. Since the human subject (*ŋoro1* 'he') is considered to be the subject of the resulting state in (33a), the existential verb stem used here is *tɕʉ2* (exist$_6$), which indicates that the subject of existence is animate. On the other hand, since the inanimate object (*nɛmɛ3* 'mouth') is considered to be the subject of the resulting state in (33b), the inanimate existential verb stem *tɕa3* (exist$_4$) is used here.

(33) a. *ŋoro1* *nɛmɛ3* *tʌ-ʔkɛʔkɛ1* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
3SG mouth DIR:NEUT-be.silent exist$_6$-B.IPF
'He keeps his mouth shut.'

b. *ŋoro1* *nɛmɛ3* *tʌ-ʔkɛʔkɛ1* *tɕa=rɛ3.*
3SG/DEM mouth DIR:NEUT-be.silent exist$_4$=COP
'His mouth is kept shut.'

3.1.2 The point-of-view system

The existential verb in the "*-a* + EXIST" construction alters its form according to the point-of-view system (Shirai 2007), which is comparable to the so-called conjunct/disjunct system described for Newari (Hale 1980, Hargreaves 2005), Tibetan (DeLancey 1990, 2001), and other neighboring languages.[11] In the point-of-view system, sentences can be divided into two patterns: Pattern A and Pattern B.[12] Pattern A implies that the locutor is familiar with the content of the sentence. In other words, the sentence is produced from the locutor's point of view. On the other hand, Pattern B implies that the sentence is uttered objectively, that is, without considering the locutor's point of

[10] *mʌ* is the space between a jumper and a blouse.

[11] I avoid using the term "conjunct/disjunct" in this paper, although I have used it in my previous papers. There have been criticisms against the use of this term (Tournadre 2008).

[12] Pattern A corresponds to "egophoric" forms (Tournadre 2008: 295) or a conjunct pattern, and Pattern B to "factual and sensory" forms (Tournadre 2008: 302) or a disjunct pattern.

view. nDrapa has two verbal suffixes to mark Pattern B: *-a* (B perfective) and *-ɛ* (B imperfective). Pattern A lacks an overt suffix.

Let us compare (34) with (27), which is repeated below. (34) is a Pattern B sentence in which the existential verb *tɕʉ2* is affixed with *-ɛ*. On the other hand, (27) is a Pattern A sentence in which the existential verb *tɕʉ2* lacks the suffix.

(34) *tɕhuʈi3* *tɛ=i-kʌ2* *hɟɛ=ʑja1* *ʌ-hdʑi-a3* *tɕʉ-ɛ2.*
car one=NCL-inside eight=NCL DIR:UP-sit-[a] exist$_6$-B.IPF
'Eight people are in one car.' (Eight people have sat down in the seats of a car, and they are still there.)

(27) *ŋa1* *ko3* *ʌ-hdʑi-a1* *tɕʉ2.*
1SG here DIR:UP-sit-[a] exist$_6$
'I have been sitting here.' (I sat down here and I am still sitting here.)

The Pattern B forms of the stems *tɕʉ2* and *tɕʌ3* are formed with *-ɛ*, and the forms are *tɕʉ-ɛ2* and *tɕj-ɛ3* respectively. On the other hand, the Pattern B form of the stem *tɕa3* is formed with the copula *rɛ3* to make *tɕa=rɛ3* (Shirai 2006b: 158–169).

3.2 Contrast with serial verb constructions

The structure of the "*-a* + EXIST" construction contrasts with that of serial verb and auxiliary constructions. I will briefly outline the distinct patterns of affixation found with these constructions below. For more detailed discussion, see Shirai (2009).

3.2.1 Serial verb constructions

In serial verb constructions,[13] we find two major patterns of affixation: First, the major verb is not affixed by suffixes (i.e., is just a stem), while the rightmost minor verb, that is, the rightmost verb of serialization, carries a directional prefix and may take a Pattern B suffix. The minor verb of this pattern is necessarily a motion verb, as seen in (35). In this pattern, only a directional prefix is found between the serialized verb stems.

(35) *atɕi3* *tshʌpi3* ***hdʉ3*** *to-**tɕho**-a1* *rɛ3.*
sister after search DIR:NEUT-go-B.PFV COP
'He went to look for his sister.' [FT]

[13] The serial verb constructions in nDrapa are "asymmetrical" (Aikhenvald 2006: 21), and the major verb(s) precedes the minor verb(s). That is, only the leftmost verb is from an unrestricted class, and the following verb(s) is/are from a rather restricted class. Verbs *ɕʉ3* 'need,' *ndu3* 'can do,' *lɛ3* 'put,' *wu3* 'finish,' and motional verbs (come/go) are commonly found as the minor verbs.

The second pattern of affixation in serial verb constructions has the major verb affixed by a directional prefix; it may not take a Pattern B suffix. The rightmost minor verb is affixed by a Pattern B suffix, as shown in (24), repeated below. In this pattern, the verb stems are serialized without any interruption by suffixes.

(24) *thɯ3 tʌ-**thɛ**=**ji1** **ɕɯ**-ɛ3.*
LOG DIR:NEUT-egest=go need-B.IPF
'(The boy said,) "I must go potty."' [FT]

Thus, the typical serial verb construction of nDrapa is summarized as follows:

- A directional prefix and a Pattern B suffix occur just once in a sequence.
- The major verb cannot be affixed by any suffix.

3.2.2 Auxiliary constructions

The nDrapa auxiliaries follow the major verb to mark the tense/aspect of the sentence, as shown in (36): *ji1* 'go' is the major verb and *ʈʌ3* is the auxiliary. The auxiliary *ʈʌ3* cannot become the main verb of a sentence.

(36) *ŋa1 hka-ta1 **ji**=**ʈʌ1**.*
1SG mountain-upside go=IPF
'I am going up the mountain.'

In the auxiliary construction, the major verb may be affixed with a directional prefix but may not carry a Pattern B suffix. On the other hand, the auxiliary stem may not be affixed with a directional prefix, but may be affixed with a Pattern B suffix and a negative prefix, if necessary. This pattern is the same as that found in the second type of verb serialization. In example (37) below, a directional prefix *kʌ-* is attached to the verb stem *ʔtsi*, and both the negative prefix *mʌ-* and Pattern B suffix *-a* are attached to the auxiliary stem *wu2* (*w-*).

(37) *ŋoro1 ɕitsi3 kʌ-**ʔtsi**1 mʌ-**w**-a2.*
3SG supper DIR:IN-eat NEG.PFV-PFT-B.PFV
'He has not had supper yet.'

3.2.3 Number of predicates

In my previous fieldwork, I found one example of an "*-a* + EXIST" construction, wherein the existential verb was affixed with both a directional prefix and a Pattern B suffix. In this case, the main verb preceding the existential verb had both a directional prefix and *-a*, as shown in (38). The form of the Pattern B perfective suffix and that of *-a* in the "*-a* + EXIST" construction was exactly the same.

(38) *o-sho3* *wu-a=ne2* *kʌ-ntɕhi=ta=ne3,* *zɨpʌhɣʌ=ne3*
DIR-dawn finish-B.PFV=then DIR-look=WHEN=TOP son/boy=TOP

n̥ʌ2 *ŋjɛʔʈhɨ-ta3* *o-tɕho-a1* *to-tɕɯ-a1* *rɛ3.*
gold bed-upside DIR:UP-go-[a] DIR:NEUT-exist$_5$-B.PFV COP
'When morning broke, the boy found himself on a golden bed.' (The boy had gotten onto a golden bed, and he was on it when he opened his eyes in the morning.) [FT]

Such affixation of the main verb by *-a* or by the Pattern B suffix is impossible in the typical serial verb and auxiliary constructions mentioned above. In such constructions, a Pattern B suffix occurs just once in a sequence, and it can be attached only to the rightmost verb, as shown in (35). This fact supports the idea that a verb serialization forms one predicate.

(35) *atɕi3* *tshʌpi3* *hdɯ3* *to-tɕho-a1* *rɛ3.*
sister after search DIR:NEUT-go-B.PFV COP
'He went to look for his sister.' [FT]

Therefore, if we find a sequence of verbs where both the verbs involve Pattern B suffixes, as shown in (39) and (40), we should not regard it as verb serialization, but as a sequence of two predicates.

(39) *nɛvo1* *chɛpi=rʌ1* *ŋo-hdo-ʔʈhu1,* *to-mo-hku-a1,* *o-tɕho-a1* *rɛ3.*
sister elder=NMLZ DIR-wait-CAUS DIR:NEUT-NEG-obey-B.PFV DIR:UP-go- B.PFV COP
'(Although he) tried to keep his elder sister waiting, she ignored him and went upstairs.' [FT]

(40) *ŋa=rʌ3* *ja-ta1* *mɛnna3* *ko-zw-a1,* *ko-hlu-a1.*
1SG=GEN hand-upside oil DIR:IN-splash-B.PFV DIR:IN-get.burned-B.PFV
'(When I was cooking,) oil splashed onto my hand, (and I) got burned.'

In fact, the semantic relationship between the two verbs in (39) is different from the one in (35), although the rightmost verb stem is the same (*tɕho1*). In (35), the actions of searching and going take place simultaneously. On the other hand, in (39), the sister first ignores him, *and then* she goes upstairs. That is, two separate events occur in sequence. Similarly, in (40), first the hot oil splashes, *and then* the subject gets burned.

However, the "*-a* + EXIST" construction does not show this contrast. Example (38) does not imply that the boy began to exist after he climbed into the gold bed. Rather, the existential verb indicates the continuance of his situation after he climbed into the bed. Thus, we can conclude that the "*-a* + EXIST" construction indicates a single event, although its form seems to have two Pattern B suffixes and involve two predicates.

Moreover, only a few sentence-final particles can occur on the right-hand side of the Pattern B suffix, for example, the hearsay evidential particle *tɛ3* shown in (41); however, no content

words, barring existential verbs, can occur. Thus, in this regard, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is once again exceptional.

(41) *ahɟa3* *ɕjɛ=rɛ1,* *ngu?tɕhi-rɛ2* *hkatɕha1* *a-ɕjɛ3* *wu-a2* *tɛ3.*
father say=COP leader-PL speech DIR:DOWN-say PFT-B.PFV HS
'Father says the leaders have finished giving their speeches.'

4 Discussion on the origin of "-*a* + EXIST" constructions

As noted above, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa cannot be analyzed as a serial verb construction. Moreover, nDrapa has other constructions that convey similar meanings, as mentioned in section 2.2. This poses the following question: What is the state of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa? To answer this, we will consider its possible origins.

4.1 Similar structures in major languages

The two dominant languages in the nDrapa-speaking region—Khams Tibetan and Sichuan Chinese—both possess constructions that consist of a verb in the perfect form followed by an existential verb (henceforth referred to as a "perfect-existential" construction). As with the nDrapa "-*a* + EXIST" construction, the constructions in Khams and Sichuan express a resulting state or a persistent situation.

In Khams Tibetan (the sDe-dGe dialect), when the existential verb follows a main verb in perfect form, the construction indicates that the result of the action still remains (Gesang-Jumian and Gesang-Yangjing 2002: 141), as shown in (42) and (43).

Khams Tibetan (sDe-dGe)

(42) *ŋɛ˩˧* *ji˩˧ ke˥˩* *tɕi?˥˩* *tsi˩˧* *jø?˩˧.*
1SG.ERG letter one write.PFT exist:CONJ
'I have written the letter.' (Gesang-Jumian and Gesang-Yangjing 2002: 141 [49])

(43) *khø˥* *tsha˥ pa˥* *tɛ˥* *ŋge˥˩.*
3SG.ERG newspaper look.PFT exist:DISJ
'He has read the newspaper.' (Gesang-Jumian and Gesang-Yangjing 2002: 141 [51])

In the Sichuan dialect of Chinese,[14] *tsai*^{4} (在) is an existential verb, and the main verb with *tao*^{4} (到)/*tɕ*^{h}*i*^{3} (起) plus *te*^{2} (得)/*tsai*^{4} (在) conveys the persistant result of a previous event (Zhang et

[14] In this paper, on the basis of Zhang et al. (2001), the tones of the Sichuan dialect are indicated phonemically: if the syllable is pronounced independently, number 1 indicates the high-level tone [55]; number 2, a low-falling tone [21]; number 3, a high-falling tone [53]; and number 4, a low-falling-rising tone [213]. Note that the dialect is characterized by complicated tone sandhi.

al. 2001: 68), as shown in (44) and (45). This construction is not found in Standard Chinese (*Putonghua*; 普通话).

Sichuan Chinese (Zhang et al. 2001)

(44) 他 在 屋-头 坐-到 在。
tʰa^{1} *tsai*^{4} *u*^{2}-*tʰəu*^{2} *tso*^{4}-*tao*^{4} *tsai*^{4}.
3SG LOC house-inside sit-RESULT exist
'He is sitting inside the house.'

(45) 花-园 里 前-几-天 还 开-起 花 在, …
xua^{1}-*yan*^{2} *li* *tɕʰiɛn*^{2}-*tɕi*^{3}-*tʰian*^{1} *xai*^{2} *kʰai*^{1}-*tɕʰi*^{3} *xua*^{1} *tsai*^{4}, …
flower-garden inside former-a.few-day still open-RESULT flower exist
'In the garden, until recently, flowers were still blooming…' (Zhang et al. 2001: 70)

As shown in (46) and (47), -*tɕʰi*^{3} (起) itself implies the resultative:

(46) 缸-头 装-起 水。
kaŋ^{1}-*tʰəu*^{2} *tsuaŋ*^{1}-*tɕʰi*^{3} *sui*^{3}.
jar-inside put.in-RESULT water
'There is water in the jar (because someone has put water in the jar).' (Zhang et al. 2001: 70)

(47) 戴-起 眼镜儿 找 眼镜儿。
tai^{4}-*tɕʰi*^{3} *iɛn*^{3}*tɕiə*^{r4} *tsau*^{3} *iɛn*^{3}*tɕiə*^{r4}.
put.on-RESULT eyeglasses look.for eyeglasses
'(He) has put glasses on, and (while wearing it,) is looking for the glasses.' (Zhang et al. 2001: 71)

We can conclude that in this region, the perfect-existential construction is commonly used to express the persisting result of a previous event.

4.2 Strategies in the Qiangic languages

The "-*a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa is similar to this commonly found structure, because the suffix -*a* that is affixed to the main verb has the same form as the Pattern B suffix of the perfective aspect. This suffix is found in many perfect sentences with the perfective viewpoint, as shown in (48).

(48) *ŋoro1 a-nphw-a3.*

3SG DIR:DOWN-be.defeated-B.PFV

'He was defeated.'

However, it should be noted that *-a* in nDrapa is not a proper marker of the perfective aspect or the perfect tense, but is rather a marker of modality (Shirai 2007: 134–147). For example, *-a* is not added to perfect sentences in Pattern A, as shown in (49).

(49) *ɲjɛ1 a-npho3.*

1PL DIR:DOWN-be.defeated

'We were defeated.'

Therefore, we cannot claim that the "*-a* + EXIST" pattern in nDrapa is parallel to the perfect-existential constructions in the neighboring languages in a straightforward way.[15]

There is another problem that we encounter when we conduct an overview of the languages that are genetically closer to nDrapa, the Qiangic group of languages, which are spoken in the neighboring area. To the best of my knowledge, neither the perfect-existential construction nor the "*-a* + EXIST" construction is mentioned in the descriptions of the Qiangic languages.[16]

For example, Qiang—one of the most thoroughly described languages in the group—utilizes a copula, not an existential verb, to express a resulting state: "An ongoing state resulting from a change of state or action can be expressed using the prefixed (achievement or accomplishment) form of the verb, the change of state marker, plus the copula." (LaPolla 2003: 171). An example is shown in (50).

---

[15] In Newar, the left-hand verb of a serial verb construction may be affixed with a conjunct marker. "The first verb in the concatenation subcategorizes the core arguments in the clause and occurs in the invariant /*-ā*/ form, which is identical to the past conjunct form." (Hargreaves 2005: 20) In the example cited below, the main verb *wan-* 'go' is marked with the concatenation marker *-ā,* which is identical in form to the past conjunct suffix.

Newar:

ji	*yala-e*	*wan-ā*	*cwan-ā.*
1.ABS	PN-LOC	go-CM	stay-PST.CONJ

'I was/am going to Yala (Patan).' (Hargreaves 2005: 20 [80])

Such a construction in Newar is similar to the "*-a* + Exist" construction in nDrapa, in the sense that a marker of the so-called conjunct/disjunct pattern is found in the middle of the verb serialization. This suggests that it is a possible construction in the Tibeto-Burman languages, although we can hardly imagine a direct relation between the two languages either by way of close genetic relationship or the language contact situation.

[16] I found one comparable example in rGyalrong from Jacques (2008: 267), which involves an existential verb and conveys a similar implication to the "perfect of result." However, the existential verb in this example takes a nominal argument ('tale'); therefore this is not structurally identical to the perfect-existential construction.

tɕeri	*ʑlawiɕɤrɤɤβ*	*ku*	*tɕhos*	*pu-asu-zgruβ*	*u-fɕut*	*tu*
however	PN	ERG	Buddhism	PST-PROG-practice	DEM-tale	exist

'However, it has been said that Zla-ba-shes-rabs was practicing asceticism of Buddhism.'

Qiang (LaPolla 2003)

(50) *dʐy-le:* *de-ʐgə-ji* *ŋuə.*

door-DEF:CL DIR-open-CSM COP

'The door is open.' ('The door remains open.') (LaPolla 2003: 171[4.120])

According to Lin (2003: 276), in rGyalrong, a persistent situation is expressed by the past imperfective, which is formed by the affixation of *na-*, as shown in (51).

rGyalrong (Lin 2003)

(51) wəjō tə-saksəŋkʰû na-nə́za-s. wədzəs mə-tə-nəzâ-n to-tsə̂-n.

3SG one(whole)-afternoon IPF:PST-dine$_2$-S no.more NEG:IMPR-2-dine$_1$-2SG IMPR-say$_1$-2SG

'He has been eating the whole afternoon. Tell him not to eat any more.' (Lin 2003: 276 [56])

Given similar characteristics in other Qiangic languages, it is doubtful that the "-*a* + EXIST" construction can be reconstructed to the level of Proto-Qiangic; it does not appear to be an inherited feature in nDrapa.

4.3 Conclusion on the origin of the "-a + EXIST" construction in nDrapa

I tentatively conclude that the "-*a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa originates from the functional borrowing of the perfect-existential construction from the neighboring languages, and that the Pattern B suffix of the perfective aspect, -*a*, is used as an alternative to the perfect marker.

The most important argument in support of this conclusion is that the major languages in the nDrapa-speaking region have a structurally and functionally parallel construction—the perfect-existential construction—while the related Qiangic languages do not appear to. Moreover, since the structure of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is distinct from those found with verb serialization—a structure commonly found throughout Qiangic—the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is typologically unusual for the family, hence unlikely to be native to nDrapa. Finally, the fact that nDrapa has another construction which expresses a similar meaning (the serial verb construction with the verb *lɛ*^{3} 'put') also argues that the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is a late development in nDrapa triggered by a contact with the region's dominant languages.

5 Conclusion

The "-*a* + EXIST" construction in nDrapa has interesting semantic, syntactic, and historical features.

Semantically, a sentence with the "-*a* + EXIST" construction conveys either a resulting state or a persistent situation. If the situation is of the Accomplishment or Achievement type, and if the result of the event is visible, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction tends to convey a resulting state. In this pattern, the aspectual viewpoint can be located between the final endpoint of the action and the point when the resulting state changes. If the situation is of the Activity or Semelfactive type, the "-*a* + EXIST" construction tends to convey a persistent situation. In this pattern, the aspectual viewpoint is located between the initial and final endpoints of the situation.

Syntactically, the existential verb in the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is not thoroughly grammaticalized, but it retains its state as a verb: the existential verb stem is chosen in accordance with the animacy and the manner of existence of the subject of the resulting state or persistent situation. In consideration of this point, the structure of the "-*a* + EXIST" construction is found to be exceptional: although it appears to be one of the serial verb constructions in nDrapa, it is atypical in that the left-hand verb is affixed by a suffix. Moreover, it is also exceptional among the predicate structures in nDrapa because a content word follows a verb with -*a*.

This problem can be resolved if we assume that the "-*a* + EXIST" construction originates from a functional borrowing, and that the suffix -*a* that is attached to the left-hand verb is an alternative to a perfect marker of the source language. There is a high probability that this was a contact-induced change, given that major languages of the nDrapa-speaking region—Khams Tibetan and Sichuan Chinese—have parallel constructions.

ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person	2	second person	3	third person
ABS*	absolutive	ACC	accusative-dative	B	Pattern B suffix
CAUS	causative	CM*	concatenation marker	COM	comitative
CONJ*	conjunct	COP	copula	CSM*	change of state marker
DEF*	definite marker	DEM	demonstrative	DIR	directional prefix
DL	dual	ERG*	ergative	EXP	experiential
FT	folk tale	GEN	genitive	HBT	habitual
HS	hearsay	IMPR	imperative	IPF	imperfective
LOC*	locative	LOG	logophoric pronoun	NCL	noun classifier
NEG	negative	NMLZ	nominalizer	PCL*	particle
PFT	perfect	PFV	perfective	PL	plural
PN	proper name	PROG*	progressive	PST	past
SG	singular	TOP	topic marker		
=	formation of a phonological word				

* The abbreviations marked with an asterisk are used only in the cited examples.

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. "Serial verb constructions in typological perspective". In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y.; and Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.) *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Typology*. pp. 1–68. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Comrie, Bernard 1976. *Aspect*. Reprinted with corrections 1978, 1981. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, Scott 1990. "Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan". *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.3: 289–321.

DeLancey, Scott 2001. "The mirative and evidentiality". *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369–382.

Gesang-Jumian and Gesang-Yangjing 2002. *Zangyu Fangyan Gailun* (An Introduction to Tibetan Dialects). Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Gong, Qunhu 2007. *Zhabayu Yanjiu* (Study of the Zhaba language). Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Hale, Austin 1980. "Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari". In: Ronald L. Trail et al. (eds.) *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics No. 7* (Pacific Linguistics, Series A - No. 53). pp. 95–106. Camberra: The Australian National University.

Hargreaves, David 2005. "Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar". *Himalayan Linguistics* 5: 1–48.

Huang, Bufan 1991. "Zhabayu" (The Zhaba language). In: Dai, Qingxia; Huang, Bufan; Fu, Ailan; Renzeng-Wangmu; and Liu, Juhuang (authors) *Zangmianyu Shiwu-zhong* (Fifteen Tibeto-Burman languages). pp. 64–97. Beijing: Beijing Yanshan Chubanshe.

Igarashi, Yoshiyuki; and Gunji, Takao 1998. "The temporal system in Japanese". In: Gunji, Takao; and Hashida, Koichi (eds.) *Topics in Constraint-Based Grammar of Japanese*. pp. 81–97. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Jacques, Guillaume 2008. *Jiarongyu Yanjiu* (Study of the rGyalrong language). Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

LaPolla, Randy J. 2003. *A Grammar of Qiang*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lin, You-Jing 2003. "Tense and aspect morphology in the Zhuokeji rGyalrong verb". *Cahiers de Linguistique—Asie Orientale* 32.2: 245–286.

Shirai, Satoko 2006a. Dapago ni okeru siten hyoozi sistemu no kenkyuu (Study on the point-of-view system in nDrapa). Ph.D. dissertation. Kyoto University.

Shirai, Satoko 2006b. "Analysis of multiple existential sentences in nDrapa". In: "Studies on Eurasian Languages" Publication Committee (ed.) *A Festschrift in Honour of Professor Masahiro Shōgaito: Studies on Eurasian Languages*. pp. 145–173. Kyoto: "Studies on Eurasian Languages" Publication Committee.

Shirai, Satoko 2007. "Evidentials and evidential-like categories in nDrapa". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30.2: 125–150.

Shirai, Satoko 2008. "Effects of animacy on existential sentences in nDrapa". *Gengo Kenkyu* 134: 1–22.

Shirai, Satoko 2009. "Auxiliary constructions and serial verb constructions in nDrapa". In: Endo, Mitsuaki et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Chulalongkorn-Japan Linguistics Symposium*. pp. 241–250. Fuchu: Global COE Program, "Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education", Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Smith, Carlota S. 1997. *The Parameter of Aspect*. 2nd ed. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Tournadre, Nicholas 2008. "Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct/disjunct' in Tibetan". In: Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart and Paul Widmer (eds.) *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbeck, Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier*. pp. 281–308. Halle: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag GmbH.

Zhang, Yizhou; Zhang, Qingyuan; and Deng, Yingshu 2001. *Chengdu Fangyan Yufa Yanjiu* (A Study of the Grammar of the Chengdu Dialect). Chengdu: Bashu Shushe.

Satoko Shirai
xirai@nitech.co.jp

Himalayan Linguistics, Vol. 9(1). © Himalayan Linguistics 2010
ISSN 1544-7502

Review

The Tibetan dialect of Lende (Kyirong)
By Brigitte Huber
(Beiträge zu tibetischen Erzählforschung herausgegeben von Dieter Schuh 15.)
Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag 2005
ISBN 3-88280-069-0
xiii + 345 pages

Reviewed by Bettina Zeisler

The Lende valley is situated in Kyirong county in the western part of the Tibetan Autonomous Region on the border to Nepal. Its dialect shows an interesting mixture of Central Tibetan and West and Western Tibetan features. One of its peculiarities is the partial preservation of the Old Tibetan clusters labial plus palatal glide or alveolar trill.

The book is organised in ten sections with further subsections. Section 1, 'Introduction' is followed by the description of 'Phonetics and Phonology' from a synchronic point of view (section 2), while section 3, 'Diachronic Phonology' describes the relation between the orthography of 'Written Tibetan' and the realisation in Lende separately for word-initial onsets, syllable-initial onsets, and the rhymes. Section 4 deals with the 'Noun Phrase', starting with nouns, but passing to number, definite 'article', and case, before describing the other constituents of a noun phrase: pronouns, numerals, and adjectives. Section 5 covers the 'Verb Phrase', starting with the feature of control, a discussion of valency, the verb stems, evidentiality, followed by a description of the copulas, tense-aspect categories, negation, directive illocutionary acts, "other auxiliaries", interrogatives, miscellaneous verb suffixes, and serial verbs. Section 6 deals with 'Other Word Classes', that is, mainly adverbs and relator nouns (postpositions). Section 7, 'The sentence' discusses clause types and sentence final particles. Textual evidence is given in section 8, in form of a single, interlinearised narrative (253 numbered, mostly single, lines). Section 9 contains the glossaries: (a) Kyirong – English – Written Tibetan (plus index with page references), (b) English – Kyirong – Written Tibetan, and (c) Written Tibetan – Kyirong – English. Section 10 contains the bibliography.

Each larger descriptive unit is followed by a historical annotation. This signals a special interest in diachrony, but one should not expect to get more than 'Written Tibetan' equivalents. While written Tibetan has a documented history of about twelve hundred years, the term 'Written Tibetan' merely reflects the standardised orthographic conventions of the 19th century Classical Tibetan dictionaries. Without further specification, 'Written Tibetan' does not open up a very deep historical horizon. Moreover, the standardised language of the classical texts can only indirectly give diachronic evidence, insofar it preserves features of Old Tibetan. The modern dialects are certainly not descendants of Classical Tibetan and also not always descendants of the kind of Old Tibetan that we find in the early documents.

The author (henceforth H.) apparently lacks first hand knowledge of Classical Tibetan (not to speak of Old Tibetan), and thus relies on the available dictionaries and grammatical descriptions.

This leads at times to rather misleading, in the worst case, even wrong statements. E.g., H. states that "[c]omparisons are made with the particles *las* […] or *pas* [!] and the unchanged positive form of the adjective" (p. 82). No reference is given, but this must be taken from Beyer (1992: 201), who starts with two nominal adjective derivations, H.'s "positive form", before giving examples with the verbal adjectival. The use of nominals in expressions of comparison, if not Beyer's invention, is certainly not the standard pattern, except in adverbial usage (because it is always the modified verb that enters into the comparison: *khyilas rta (mgyogspor rgyuggo)* 'in relation to a dog a horse (runs quickly)', Hahn 1985: 97). Normally, property verbs, either tensed or nominalised, are used, cf. ibid.: *rtalas khyi chuŋba yin* 'in relation to a horse a dog is (a) small-ing (one)'. Cf. also ibid. p. 185 for the second relational morpheme, which is *-bas*, not **-pas*. H. apparently misread Beyer's *"-Pas"*, used to indicate allomorphic variation, although only *-bas* is found with comparative expressions. For a tensed form cf. Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed (1992: 46): *khruŋkhruŋlas rmabya gzugs mdzes* 'in relation to a crane the peacock, as to its body, beaut-ies/-ied'.

Lende follows the general pattern, that is, most often the verbal noun and a copula is used (pp. 79, no. 36, 80, no. 38). Alternatively, a tensed form can be used, which takes a future inferential marker (p. 80, no. 37). Unaware of the inherently verbal character of Tibetan property ascriptions, H. eventually misses the point: "The construction in example 37) looks very much like a verbal construction. The suffix *-bɛ:* can, however, be attached to each adjective stem, not only to those which also have verbal function in K[yirong]T[ibetan]" (p. 89) In a footnote she adds: "Although it is homophonous with the verbal morpheme expressing "future inference" […], its function does not seem to be related." H. can be assured: Ladakhi shows a similar construction, where the future inferential marker (/-ak/, /-ok/, or /-bok/) expresses a kind of reticence: /zgoe riŋbobasaŋ Tsheriŋ riŋok./ 'With respect to the length of the door Tshering might tall / seems to tall.' This is not the only possible tensed form in Ladakhi, and it would thus be interesting to know whether not other tensed forms can be used in Lende alike.

Needless to say that neither the common construction (verbal noun plus copula) nor the tensed form can be described as an instance of 'degree' in terms of Latin grammar.

The task of finding Written Tibetan forms for a given spoken word is certainly not always an easy one,[1] nevertheless, cases, such as /ɖʐø̱:m-bi: jy̱:/ *ḥbyonpaḥi yul* 'the land where [she] has gone (h)', p. 203, n. 179, with /ɖʐø̱:m-/ glossed as "go?" without etymology and totally lacking in the glossaries, /nāgrĩ:/ *nagrim* 'black magic' (from *nag̱po* 'black' & *rim(ḥ)gro* 'homage, offering'; cf. also the honorific form *skurim* 'offering'), p. 195, glossed as "nag ?", or /tɕa̱bĩ:/ 'drinking bowl (h)', CT *jaḥbiŋ* 'tea pot, kettle',[2] p. 202, glossed as "?" should not have posed that much problems. On the other hand, we are confronted with a 'Written Tibetan' etymology "char ?" for the loan /tɕʰātīrì:/ 'umbrella', although not for the obviously related /tɕʰātā/ id. (only the latter is classified as New-

[1] E.g. in the case of /khāblɛ̄:/ < *kha* & *blas* 'talking, flirting', lit. 'mouth-work', it is not evident that the classical word *las* 'work' originally had the form *blas*. For Old Tibetan *blas* 'work', cf. Uebach & Zeisler (2008: 310-314). The reviewer should like to take the opportunity and add *dkaḥblas* 'hard work' as found in various Ladakhi dialects: Tia, Domkhar /rhkab-las/ 'difficulties' (own data); cf. also Balti: Kapalu /rhkaphlas/ (Read 1934: 21), Skardu /rhkaflas/ (Sprigg 2002), /ʂkaphlas/ (*Comparative Dictionary of Tibetan Dialects,* Bielmeier et al., in preparation, hereafter CDTD), Purik: Ciktan /skablas/, Kargil /kablas/; Nubra (Panamik) /skabla/, Western Tibet: Spiti (Tabo), Ngari (Ruthok, Gar) /kāblē/; Amdo (Chabcha, Labrang, Rngaba) /ʂkapli/, /çkable/, /ʂkabli/ (all CDTD sub *dka' las*).

[2] One could have expected the realisation /tɕa̱mbĩ:/. The word is a loan from Chinese, the second element *ping* (*bing) 'jar, jug, pot' being borrowed into Tibetan at different times (Laufer 1916: 505f.). At least the element *ja* 'tea', likewise a loan from Chinese, should have been recognised.

Indoaryan loan in the glossaries and in the short section on loans, p. 10). Umbrellas are not only protecting against rain, and thus we also find the loan /ʧʰatiri/ in Ladakh, particularly for a big tent-like construction used for parties. In none of the Ladakhi dialects could the first element of *charpa* 'rain' turn into a mere /ʧʰa(:)-/. Ultimately, the word is from Persian *čāder*, and one may come across a Written Tibetan rendering, although not in the dictionaries, as *phyather* 'tent' (Laufer 1916: 483).

The Lende verb shows at most three different stem forms. According to H., stem I[3] is, "in some cases […] clearly related to the W[ritten] T[ibetan] future stem, and not to the present stem" (p. 92). This is quite misleading, but behind this statement lurks an assumption gaining ground in Tibetan linguistics: since all spoken varieties show at most only three different stem forms, the written Tibetan system of up to four stem forms was an artificial invention of some grammarians. According to this reasoning, stem III would have been the true original 'imperfective' stem, stem I would have been a suppletive form, peculiar to East Tibetan (Bielmeier 2004: 400f.).

Like West Tibetan and in contrast to some of the Western and Central Tibetan dialects, Lende apparently does not show any trace of the Old Tibetan complex prefix and *ablaut* systems in verb stem formation.[4] Stem forms have been levelled out, typically towards the original stem II, but not infrequently also towards stem I (more often than this is the case in West Tibetan). Most of the Old Tibetan stems II and III vary only with respect to the presence or absence of a past tense suffix *-s*, so that assimilation towards stem II does, in fact, automatically include assimilation towards stem III. With the further overgeneralisation of the past tense suffix in stem II,[5] the new stem I is a derivation of stem II minus this suffix. This becomes evident from a small group of about 50 Old Tibetan verbs where stem II and III differ not only with respect to the prefixes but also with respect to the voicedness of the radical. In all 14 instances of such verbs found in the glossaries, the Lende form unmistakingly corresponds to the unvoiced stem II and not to the voiced stem III. This corresponds fairly well to the situation in West Tibetan and, most probably, all other modern Tibetan varieties.

The glossaries, however, would indicate an important exception: the Old and Classical Tibetan verb I: *ḥgegs* ~ *ḥgog,* II: *bkag,* III: *dgag,* IV: *khog* 'hinder, stop, lock up' is linked – correctly – with its high tone counterpart I/II: /kà:/, IV: /kò:/ 'stop', derived from stem II: *bkag*, but also with the low tone form I/II: /kạ^{ɦ}:/, IV: /kọ^{ɦ}:/ 'lock up, lock in', which might look like a derivation from stem III: *dgag*. This alleged double realisation is nowhere commented upon. The only problem with H.'s implicit analysis is that there are two more related verbs in Old and Classical Tibetan: I: *sgag* ~ *sgog* II: *bsgags*, III: *bsgag*, IV: *sgogs* 'bind, tie', also as collocation 'make so. swear an oath', and I/III:

---

[3] Stem I is traditionally called 'present', stem II 'past' or 'perfect', stem III 'future', stem IV 'imperative'. While none of these labels resists closer scrutiny, the alternative use of 'imperfective' for stem I and 'perfective' for stem II, subscribed to by H., is likewise inappropriate.

[4] Since there are only about 240 verbs in the glossary, this statement might perhaps be somewhat premature.

[5] Like in West Tibetan, this must have accompanied the process of simplification. But since final consonant clusters are not preserved in Lende, this suffix is only found where the verb root shows an open syllable. In such cases, the suffix, represented by an *umlaut* is predictably found with agentive verbs, but likewise also quite frequently with inagentive verbs. While this is fairly in accordance with the observable traces of a similar trend in the dialects of Upper Ladakh, it may well be the case that another feature, peculiar to Lende and some Central Tibetan dialects, namely the contraction of stem I plus genitive morpheme, has enhanced, if not triggered this process for the inagentive verbs (cf. p. 94).

bgag,[6] II: *bgags*, IV: *bgogs* 'block'. Both could have yielded the Lende low tone form. Cf. also Lower Ladakhi /zgak, zgaks, zgok/ 'stop sth., so., hinder (from running away)' besides (and in contrast to) /kak, kaks, kok/ 'block, stuff (in order to block); lock up, pen up'. The present version of the CDTD (II/2008, cf. n. 1) lists the low tone form of the Kyirong verb together with Spiti (Tabo) /ga̲(k), ga̲:, go̲:/ and Upper Ladakhi (Man Merak) /ga̲q/ accordingly under *sgag*. An earlier version dating from 1997 (H. used the 1998 version) lists only Tabo /ga̲k ~ ga̲:/, still under the entry *bgag*, which is now dropped, and not under *sgag*, where, nonetheless, the Ladakhi and Balti forms could have been found.

Given the possible theoretical impact, this misinterpretation is all but trivial. The representation of Old Tibetan I: *ston*, II: *bstan(d)*, III: *bstan*, IV: *ston(d)* not only with the correct meaning 'show, teach', but also with the meaning 'take out', which belongs to I: *ḥdon*, II: *bton*, III: *gdon*, IV: *thon*, appears to be less momentous. Both verbs have become homophonous in many Central Tibetan dialects (/tʊ̄n/ in Lende). The first shows assimilation towards stem I, the second towards stem II and clearly not towards stem III.

In the historical annotations, H. also frequently discusses synchronic similarities with Central Tibetan varieties, but unfortunately she hardly ever compares her data with the Western or West Tibetan varieties. Of the three morphemes shared with West Tibetan, the nominaliser {-kẽ} (< *mkhan*), also used in particular evidential constructions in the hitherto undescribed Upper Ladakhi dialects, the nominaliser /-tɕɛ̀:/ *cas*, and the citation marker /lo/ *lo*, only the second one is related to the West Tibetan varieties, although all three forms are mentioned in Bielmeier (1985) for Balti. No notice is taken of other work on West Tibetan, such as, e.g., Koshal (1979) for Ladakhi, who apparently gave the first description of the citation marker *lo*.

Arguably, a good synchronic description does not depend on the correct understanding of the earlier stages of the language, and the sympathetic reviewer would have been ready to overlook the above mentioned calamities, had they not been deliberately exposed to the critical eye by means of the special 'historical annotations' – and were there not, throughout the whole book, too many other traces of, well, carelessness. Some concern comparatively trivial issues, such as the obvious restructuring of the book without always adjusting the references,[7] the deviation from the traditional order of the Tibetan alphabet in the Written Tibetan glossary for the cluster *dby-* (not found after *dbo-*, but after *g.yo-*), the loss of all entries with initial /ɬ/ (< *lh*) in the Kyirong glossary, the incomplete and misleading glossing of classical verbs as (in)transitive, "vt" or "vi" in the glossaries,[8] a missing rule for the morphemes {-ba} and {-bɛ:} after final /-j/ (< *-l*) in the description of the nominalisers and the inferential future morpheme on p. 147, or the misclassification of the form /mɛ̄:-nu:-lo/ *smrasḥdug lo* as "say-IPFV.SENS-QUOT" (p. 182 and in all glosses of the narration)

---

[6] The noun *bgegs* ~ *gegs* 'hindrance' indicates that stem I might have had the form *bgegs* originally.

[7] On p. 45 we are referred to 5.10.2.3 for the feature of "*k*-insertion" (better: *k*-retention), where we are referred back to 5.6.1, while the crucial information is actually found in 5.10.3. A subsection concerning the sentence final morpheme /-na:/ is referred to as 4.9.4 on p. 146, but is eventually found in 7.2.4. Similarly, the historical annotation, p. 157 comments upon the serial verb /tø^{ɦ}(d)-/ *sdod* 'sit', which is no longer found in the preceding descriptive sections.

[8] Apparently derived from the Tibetan terms *thadadpa* 'with difference [from an agent]' and *thamidadpa* 'without difference'. In the dominant Tibetan grammatical school, these terms are not referring to syntactic transitivity: inagentive transitive ergative verbs like *mthoŋ* 'see' are classified as *thamidadpa* because they lack a semantic agent. In such cases, H. has "vi" without further comment.

– the verb stem in question is 'perfective' (stem II of /mā, mɛ̀:, mɔ̀:/ *smra, smras, smros* 'speak'), and the construction thus corresponds to a present perfect (described pp. 116-119).

Quite surprising is the second part of a statement on p. 143, here in italics: "The modal particle *ʈo* is described for most other Central Tibetan dialects (Tournadre 1996a, 253 for SST [Standard Spoken Tibetan, = Tournadre 1996], Kretschmar 1995, 161 for Southern Mustang, and Haller 2000, 97 for Shigatse). *In none of these descriptions, however, is a suggestion as for its origin given.*" Except for Kretschmar, this is simply not true. It is generally accepted that this morpheme is related to *ḥgro* 'go', which already in Old Tibetan is used as a future tense auxiliary, albeit without the modern modal connotation. Tournadre (1996) does not give any phonetic form but only the transliterated classical orthography, Haller (2000) cites the classical form in his glossary.

More serious objections concern the unreflected use of terminology ('comparative', 'relative clause', etc.), which is never defined but more or less applied according to how certain expressions are translated into English. An extreme case is found on p. 174, concerning the morpheme {-patã} *padaŋ*: "When added to the serial verb *si̱n* [Classical Tibetan *ʑin*] 'to be finished' expressing accomplished aspect, the temporal relationship of the clauses is posterior [read: is one of posteriority]." The temporal relationship between two clauses can only be that of either simultaneity or non-simultaneity. If one of the two clauses expresses posteriority with respect to the other, the latter necessarily expresses anteriority with respect to the former. Interestingly enough, H. defines that clause as expressing posteriority, the event of which is located *earlier on the time line* and vice versa. Her reason seems to be that verbs marked as being earlier on the time line can be translated into English with relational expressions, such as *since X* and *after X* (cf. also p. 176), seemingly indicating posteriority (*after*ness), while verbs marked as being *later* can be translated as *before X* and *until X* (cf. also p. 175), seemingly indicating anteriority (*before*-ness). But *since* and *after* are usually treated as expressions of anteriority, *before* and *until* as expressions of posteriority, possibly because relational expressions, like verbal morphemes, inversely posit the event X in relation to a (yet to be established) reference point (the next mentioned event), but cannot *refer* to the next mentioned event Y in order to relate this latter event back to X.

Among the serial verbs, H. describes the vector verb /o̱ŋ/ *ḥoŋ* 'come', which follows directly stem II or the converb form in {-te} of a motion verb, yielding the notion 'move hither' (p. 156). Its counterpart /ʈo/ *ḥgro* 'go (away)' is not mentioned. /o̱ŋ/ is also used for a purposive construction, where it follows directly stem I of the verb of the purposive clause (p. 156). The latter can be combined not only with motion verbs but with any verb that allows a purposive complement. In the narration we additionally find the verbs 'go', 'arrive', and two different verbs of sending. It is quite strange to see this usage described as a serial verb construction, where, according to the definition, the final verb should be semantically bleached (p. 151).

In Tibetan linguistics it has become quite fashionable to treat the verbal morphology in terms of *aspect* rather than of *tense*. The notion of *aspect*, however, is appropriated uncritically and typically without a further understanding of its implications. H. is no exception. Neither does she attempt a definition of this highly ambiguous terminology, nor does she waste a single word on the question why it accounts for the verbal morphology in Lende. Examples for the incidence scheme (X happened while Y was going on) are lacking as are those for the interaction of 'aspectual' verb forms with event structure. These would have been the most crucial tests for the existence of grammatical aspect. One will also search in vain for an explanation how 'perfective aspect' is related to an additional "accomplished aspect" or why a marker for "accomplished aspect" must follow an

'imperfective' stem.[9] No notice is taken of the fact that the above-mentioned two usages of /oŋ/ contradict the 'aspect' of the stems: in a purposive clause the 'imperfective' stem I represents the action as such (holistic, perfective view), while the 'perfective' stem II followed by vector verbs represents the action as ongoing.

To a certain extent, these shortcomings are compensated by the data itself and, in some parts, remarkably in-depth descriptions. This holds especially for the well-informed treatment of phonology, case marking, and the discussion of the evidential markers.

One of the most remarkable phonological traits of Lende is its system of tones. Unlike most Central Tibetan varieties or the tonal West(ern) Tibetan varieties, the Lende dialect does not show a binary tone distinction (high vs. low), but a ternary distinction (high, medium, low). Medium tone corresponds to originally voiced root consonants of Old Tibetan not preceded by any affix, low tone to originally voiced root consonants preceded by oral or nasal affixes. Reflexes of both types of affixes are preserved, so that oral affixes lead to breathy voice, while nasal affixes lead to prenasalisation, which H. takes as a merely concomitant feature of voicedness: "Initial voiced stops and affricates are realised with a strong prenasalization, which is not phonemically contrastive. It is exclusively used to reinforce the voiced character of the stops and affricates. The voiced consonant can be almost devoiced after the prenasalization" (p. 15). One wonders then, whether voice is not a concomitant feature of prenasalisation, and low tone not a concomitant feature of some kind of voice (breathy or prenasalised). In any case, this kind of distinction between former nasal and oral affixes is not found in most other tonal varieties. Further more, the description clearly shows that voice and/or low tone constitute a bundle of features, and it is interesting to observe that the more prominent the remnants of voice are, the lower the tonal realisation. Incidentally, we find similar features in the tonal dialects of Upper Ladakh, where the informants classify the still voiced consonants as being perceptibly lower than the devoiced consonants (only the latter enter into a phonemic tonal opposition with the voiceless non-aspirated consonants).

Another peculiarity of the Kyirong variety is that, despite the overall reduction of the syllable structure, very much in accordance with the Central Tibetan dialects, it has preserved the clusters labial plus palatal glide before back vowels and the clusters labial plus alveolar trill. These are features shared only with the westernmost West Tibetan dialects, Balti, Purik, and western Sham, as well as with two exceptionally conservative Khams dialects, Sprosnang and Melung, described only recently (Suzuki 2009). But in two instances, the Lende dialect also shows the replacement of an apparently palatalised labial (palatalised because followed by a palatal vowel *i* or *e*) with the cluster labial plus alveolar trill. The first instance is /prekā/ 'walking stick' instead of expected /pekā/ for *berka*, interpreted as metathesis (p. 57), the second is /prīwā̃:/ 'violon' for *piwaŋ* 'lute', not being commented upon (*piwaŋ* is apparently a loan word, the donor of which remains unknown, cf. Laufer 1916: 512f.).[10]

---

[9] The diachronic reason is that the complementiser *zin* 'be able to get finished' originally followed a gerundive (stem III ± locative-purposive case marker), but in this function, stem III was already getting obsolete and replaced by stem I in Old Tibetan.

[10] A third case, likewise not commented upon, would have been the alternation between /phjā, phjɛ̀:, phjø̀:/ and /phrā, phrɛ̀:, phrø̀:/ 'blame' for *ḥphya* as found in the glossaries. However, as the reviewer came to know through Roland Bielmeier (email communication, 19.01.2009), H. now thinks that the second form was given by the consultant only in order to do her a 'favour'.

The functional description of the evidential markers is likewise very detailed and accurate, although the chosen terminology is somewhat strained. In contrast to Central Tibetan, but in accordance with West(ern) Tibetan, Lende does not have an experiential/ non-volitional counterpart for the copula and auxiliary *yin*, such as Central Tibetan *red*. The evidential system thus shows some interesting variation on the general theme, e.g. with the use of the 'generic' marker {-kẽ:} to be discussed in the following. This marker is not only shared with Western Tibetan varieties, but was originally also shared with the Upper Ladakhi dialects, where it is, however, only marginally preserved.

A literal understanding of the term 'generic' implies that an item belongs to a class (*genus*) of like items, in the case of events, that it happens repeatedly or always, in the case of states, that it holds always. It is already somewhat questionable whether the term 'generic' can be used for specific historical events if they are *generally known* by all members of the speech community. It is even more problematic if the 'general' knowledge should be found only with the speaker.

The reviewer thus does not find it very intuitive that the morpheme {-te}, commonly used in narrations for single events, should express genericness: "To express that some action or event is part of the old, general knowledge of the speaker, he can use the morpheme *-te* with both controllable and non-controllable verbs. In such a case he is sure about what he is saying, without necessarily having witnessed it and without knowing details of it. He has simply been aware of the fact for a long time" (p. 119). While this form resembles a shortened present perfect in Ladakhi, H. states in note 137 that it functionally corresponds to the disjunct simple past /-parè:/ in Standard Spoken Tibetan, which is given a neutral 'assertif' value by Tournadre & Sangda Dorje (1998: 106). Tournadre (1996: 245) calls it 'assertif/gnomique', but also points to the fact that it is characteristic for narrations (p. 247f.). Narrated events are typically singular, and even if the narration itself might be well known, the events are not narrated as well-known and thus somewhat boring facts, but as something quite unique and surprising.

Similarly the reviewer does not really understand how future acts of the speaker can be subsumed under 'old generic knowledge'. The 'generic' morpheme in question: {-kẽ:} (< *mkhan*) is described for the 'imperfective' or present tense constructions quite convincingly in the following manner: "The morpheme *-kẽ:* is used for generic statements about habitual actions or states which the speaker has not necessarily perceived directly or experienced personally. They are part of his old, convinced knowledge; the way of acquiring the information is not important" (p. 110), whereas the description of its use for future events, leaves it open, what the generic aspects are: "The auxiliary *-kẽ(jĩ:)* is used whenever the speaker is absolutely certain about an action or an event that will take place in the future. For himself, this means that he has known for some time already that he will perform a certain action, which does not necessarily be of his own will" (p. 124). Quite apparently, the planned event is a single one, not a matter of fact, and not generally known by the speech community.

The above citations show that, despite the terminological looseness, H. has developed a precise understanding of the often quite subtle pragmatic functions of the evidential markers. Similarly, her criteria for differentiating between the homophonous ergative and instrumental cases turn out to be well-reasoned and helpful: ergative marking is used primarily with animate nouns, instrumental marking with non-animate nouns; only the ergative but not the instrumental marker can be replaced by absolutive marking, ergative marking is used mainly with contrastive or emphatic function (pp. 60-63). The same holds for her elaboration of when ergative marking is

used (pp. 61-63) and the specification of the rules for the use of plural marking: only definite referents are marked, and mostly they must be animate (p. 57).

The overall evaluation remains ambivalent. Typologists who do not attach too great importance to terminological preciseness will certainly be able to retrieve what they are looking for. Readers with a good command of Old and Classical Tibetan and some foundation in the Tibetan dialect studies will appreciate the many highly interesting features in the Lende dialect of Kyirong.

References

Beyer, Stephan V. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan language.* New York: State University of New York.

Bielmeier, Roland. 1985. *Das Märchen vom Prinzen Čobzaṅ. Eine tibetische Erzählung aus Baltistan. Text, Übersetzung, Grammatik und westtibetisch vergleichendes Glossar*. (Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung 6). St. Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Bielmeier, Roland. 2004. "Shafer's proto-West Bodish hypothesis and the formation of the Tibetan verb paradigms". In: Anju Saxena (ed.), *Himalayan languages: Past and present.* (Trends in Linguistics 149). 395-412. Berlin: Mouton.

Bielmeier, Roland et al. In preparation. *Comparative Dictionary of Tibetan Dialects*. Vol. I: Verbs. Version II/2008, Preprint no. 1 (1997).

Hahn, Michael. 1985. *Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache*. (Indica et Tibetica: Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indotibetischen Kulturraumes 10). Bonn: Indica et Tibetica.

Haller, Felix. 2000. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Shigatse.* (Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung 13). Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Koshal, Sanjukta. 1979. *Ladakhi grammar.* Delhi, Varanasi, Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

Kretschmar, Monika. 1995. *Erzählungen und Dialekt aus Südmustang*. (Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung 12). St. Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Laufer, Berthold. 1916. "Loan-words in Tibetan". *T'oung Pao* 17: 403-552.

Read, Alfred F.C. 1934. *Balti grammar.* (James G. Forlong Fund 15). London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed. 1992. *Bodkyi brdasprod rigpaḥi khridrgyun rabgsal meloŋ : Le clair miroir. Enseignement de la grammaire tibétaine.* Traduit, adapté et commenté par Heather Stoddard et Nicholas Tournadre. Arvillard: Editions Prajñā, Collection Tibétaine.

Sprigg, Richard Keith. 2002. *Balti-English English-Balti dictionary*. London, NY: Routledge-Curzon.

Suzuki, Hiroyuki. 2009. "Deux remarques à propos du développement du *ra-btags* en tibétain parlé". *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 16: 75-82.

Tournadre, Nicholas. 1996. *L'ergativité en tibétain : Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée.* (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale 33). Paris, Leuven: Peeters.

Tournadre, Nicholas and Sangda Dorje. 1998. *Manuel de tibétain standard, langue et civilisation : Bodkyi spyiskad slobdeb*. Paris: Langues & Mondes/L'Asiathèque.

Uebach, Helga and Bettina Zeisler. 2008. "*rJe blas*, *pha los* and other compounds with suffix *-s* in Old Tibetan texts". In: Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart and Paul Widmer (ed.) *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, Band I: Chomolangma* 309-334. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.

Bettina Zeisler
zeis@uni-tuebingen.de