

Non-referential uses of nominalization constructions: Asian perspectives

Foong Ha YAP and Karen Grunow-Hårsta
Hong Kong Polytechnic University

1. Introduction

Nominalization, the process by which we derive nominal expressions, is a highly pervasive phenomenon in the languages of the world. Nominal expressions can be derived either from existing nominal constituents (e.g. *sovereign* > *sovereignty*), often involving the formation of more abstract nominals from more concrete ones, or they can be derived from non-nominal constituents such as adjectives (e.g. *brave* > *bravery*, *friendly* > *friendliness*). Previous studies have examined nominalization phenomena in terms of their form and functions, mainly from syntactic and typological perspectives (e.g. Chomsky 1970; Comrie & Thompson 1985/2007; Hopper & Thompson 1984, 1985; Koptjevskaja-Tam 1993; Malchukov 2004, 2006). In this paper we specifically focus on extended uses of nominalization constructions to serve non-referential functions. More specifically, we adopt both typological and diachronic perspectives to examine how nominalization constructions go beyond their core function of deriving referential entities, as in (1), to perform extended non-referential functions, among them modificational functions such as relativization (2) and adverbialization (3), as well as discourse-grounding and socio-pragmatic functions such as tense-aspect-mood marking (4) and speaker stance marking (5). We illustrate with examples from a number of Asian languages, which we hope will serve as a springboard for further in-depth diachronic and typological comparisons with languages from other parts of the world.

Mandarin Chinese

(1) *zhege tamen xihuan de* (Nominalization)
DEM.CL 3PL like NMZ
'this is what they like'

(2) *zhege tamen xihuan de difang* (Relativization)
DEM.CL 3PL like REL place
'this is the place they like'

- (3) (*ruguo*) *tamen xihuan zhege dehua* (Adverbialization)
 COND 3PL like DEM.CL COND (< NMZ.say)
 ‘supposing/say/if they were bought yesterday’
- (4) (*shi*) *wo qu de* (Tense marking)
 FOC 1SG go NMZ/SFP
 ‘It was I who went.’ / ‘I did go’ / ‘I went’
- (5) *zhe jian shi wo zhi dao de* (Stance marking)
 DEM CL thing 1SG know SFP
 ‘This thing, I *knew* it.’ (Lit. ‘This thing is something I know!’)
 (*Han Yu Da Zi Dian*, Modern Chinese)

An interesting research question is whether these extensions from referential to non-referential functions are common crosslinguistically, and if so, what are the syntactic environments and pragmatic motivations that contribute to these semantic extensions? In this paper, we divide our discussion into four major sections. In section 2, we first highlight two major strategies to identify nominalization constructions, namely, (i) the use of light nouns and (ii) the use of noun phrase markers. In subsequent sections, we focus on the non-referential uses of nominalization constructions. In sections 3 and 4, we focus on their modificational uses. One modificational strategy is via the adnominal constructions such as relative clauses (§3); another modificational strategy is via subordinate adverbial constructions such as temporal, conditional and concessive clauses (§4). In section 5, we focus on the reanalysis of nominalization constructions finite structures; in such contexts, the nominalizers are often reinterpreted as tense-aspect-mood (TAM) markers. In section 6, we analyze the frequent use of nominalization with mirative, evidential, and other attitudinal functions. We summarize our discussion in section 7.

2. Light nouns and noun phrase markers in nominalization constructions

Nominalization constructions may be formed derivationally or morphosyntactically (Comrie & Thompson 1985/2007; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993; *inter alia*). Derivational nominalization (also known as lexical nominalization) is illustrated in (6), where the action of ‘pretending to be rich’ is being commented upon, and in this sense the action is being treated referentially, and is linguistically encoded as a nominal. In this example, the noun phrase *their pretence* is comprised of the noun *pretence* derived from the verb *pretend* and is further signaled by a noun phrase marker, i.e. the

possessive determiner *their*. Similar derivations are seen in other languages. In the Malay example in (7), the noun *kemalasan* ‘laziness’ is derived from the adjective *malas* ‘lazy’ via *ke-...-an* circumfixation, and is also further signaled by a noun phrase marker, in this case third person genitive or possessive enclitic *-nya* (‘his/her/its’).

- (6) *They like to pretend they are rich. Let’s see how far **their pretence** will take them.*

Malay/Indonesian

- (7) *Dia sungguh malas.*

3SG truly lazy

Ke-malas-an-nya akan mem-bawa rugi dan dukacita.

<NMZ>lazy-3SG.GEN FUT ACT-bring loss and sorrow

‘He is so lazy. His laziness will bring ruin and sorrow.’

Morphosyntactic nominalization (also known as clausal nominalization) is the focus of the present paper.¹ (8a) from Lhasa Tibetan exemplifies a clausal nominalization formed with the nominalizer *mkhan*. It is not uncommon for the same nominalizer to derive both clausal and lexical nominalizations and this is the case in Lhasa Tibetan, where *mkhan* also derives lexical nominals, as in (8b). The nominalizer *mkhan* is derived from a general noun meaning ‘person’. Such general nouns are cross-linguistically recognized as a common source for nominalizers.²

Lhasa Tibetan (DeLancey 1986, citing Jaschke 1881)

- (8) (a) *nga-'i bu=mo 'dod-mkhan*
1SG-GEN daughter desire-NMZ

¹ Elsewhere we have noted that it is possible to obtain derivational (or lexical) nominalizations from syntactic (or clausal) nominalizations (see Yap, Grunow-Härsta & Wrona in press).

² Other terms used to describe these general nouns are ‘bound nouns’ (Rhee 2008), ‘formal nouns’ (Simpson & Wu 2001), and ‘light nouns’ (Aldridge 2008; Yap & Wang, in press). The choice of terminology to some extent reflects differences in analytical approaches. The term ‘bound noun’ is essentially descriptive, highlighting that the general noun under investigation can no longer be used as an independent morpheme, as in the case of Korean *kes* (‘thing’). The term ‘formal noun’ is often used within the Japanese tradition to highlight that a morpheme derived from a lexical noun has been reanalyzed as a nominalizer. The term ‘light noun’ captures similar intuitions but places greater emphasis on semantic generalization (or ‘lightness’) as an important facilitative factor in syntactic reanalysis. Semantic generalization or ‘semantic lightness’ can be understood in terms of a morpheme’s ability to denote an increasingly wider range of meanings. In the case of ‘light nouns’, this means that the morpheme can refer to increasingly diverse referential entities, typically expanding from first order entities (e.g. more tangible referents such as persons, places and things) to second order entities (e.g. events) and third order entities (e.g. propositions) (see for example Horie 1998a; Yap, Matthews & Horie 2004). This makes general nouns ideal candidates as nominalizers.

- ‘such as are courting my daughter’
- (b) *shing-mkhan*
wood-NMZ
‘carpenter’

Similar examples are found in many other Asian languages, including Korean and Japanese. As illustrated in (9), Korean nominalizer *ki* (< ‘place’) is used to derive the complement ‘that he is living comfortably’ (Rhee, in press).

- Korean (Rhee, in press)
- (9) [*ku-ka phyenhi calcinay-koiss*]-***ki***-*lul pala-n-ta*
he-NOM comfortably get.along-PROG-NMZ-ACC hope-PRES-DEC
‘(I) hope that he is living comfortably.’

Evidence from Old Chinese shows that *suo* extended from a locative noun meaning ‘place’, as in (10a), to develop into a locative nominalizer, as in (10b), and then into a patient nominalizer, as in (10c) (see also Ting 2008; Yap & Wang, in press; *inter alia*).

- (10) (a) *ju qi suo er zhong xing gong zhi*
stay its place and many star surround it
‘(The Polaris) stays in **its place** and other stars surround it.’
(*Lun Yu*, Early Warring States, ca. 475 BC)
- (b) *ta ri jun chu,*
other day you go.out,
ze bi ming you si suo zhi
then certainly instruct officials SUO go
‘On previous occasions when you went out, you always gave instructions to your officials as to **where you were going**.’
(*Meng Zi*, Warring States period, 475-221 BC)
- (c) *min zhi suo shi da di dou fan huo geng*
people GEN SUO eat basically beans cuisine beans soup
‘**What people eat** is basically cuisine and soup made of beans.’
(*Zhan Guo Ce*, Warring States period, 475-221 BC)

The etymology (i.e. lexical source) of a nominalizer is not always transparent. Consider, for example, Chinese nominalizer *zhe* (see Yap & Wang in press for a fuller

discussion). As seen in (11a), *zhe* shows evidence of being a semantically general lexical noun, since it can be accompanied by noun phrase markers such as universal quantifier *fan* ('all'), demonstrative *ci* ('this/these'), and numeral *wu* ('five'). In (11b), *zhe* serves as a lexical head noun that can be modified by a relative clause. In (11c), without an accompanying overt relativizer, *zhe* serves as a nominalizer.³

- (11) (a) *fan ci wu zhe, jiang mo bu wen*
all these five ZHE general cannot NEG hear
'All these five items, the generals cannot afford to ignore.'
(*Xun Zi*, Warring States period, 475-221 BC)
- (b) *qi wei yun zhi zhe, jie shi xing ye*
those call fall REL ZHE all COP star SFP
'Those so called **falling things**, in fact are all stars!'
(*Lun Xing*, Eastern Han period, 97-220 AD)
- (c) [*wang er zhi zhi*] *zhe wang jian qi wu se*
watch CONN know it ZHE watch see his five colors
'The reason [one watches and knows it (=the sickness)] is that one watches and observes his (=the patient's) different color tones ...'
(*Nan Jing*, Western Han period, 225 BC)

Thus far we have described a development of nominalization constructions from light noun origins. There is also cumulative evidence that the nominal status of such constructions, even in the absence of an overt nominalizer, can be signaled by the presence of noun phrase markers, such as case markers, demonstrative and person pronoun possessive determiners, plural markers, and classifiers (e.g. Malchukov 2006). These markers are sometimes reanalyzed as nominalizers. For example, in (12), case marker *-ni* signals a nominalization construction in archaic Japanese, and in (13), demonstrative *thii* signals a nominalization construction in Literary Burmese. In (14), we see evidence of third person possessive pronoun *-nya* in Colloquial Malay being reinterpreted as a nominalizer. In (15), we see plural marker *-ko* being reanalyzed as a nominalizer in Rawang (Tibeto-Burman), and in (16), we see the same morpheme *kai* serving as a classifier and as a nominalizer in Chaozhou (Sinitic).

³ The use of agent nominalizer *zhe* was attested as early as the Zhou period in *The Book of Odes*, as shown in (i) below. Lexical uses of *zhe* found in later texts as seen in (8a) and (8b) above may be remnants of a once more productive use of lexical noun *zhe*. The etymology of *zhe* is unknown.

(i) *zhi wo zhe wei wo xin you*
know me NMZ say me heart worried
'Those (< the ones) that understand me will say that I am sad and worried.'
(*Shijing* [*Book of Odes*], Zhou period, 11th to 6th century BC)

Japanese (Horie, in press)

- (12) [yama-ni iku] -ni husawasii huku^{soo} (archaic)
mountain-to go:ATT:PRS DAT appropriate clothes
'clothes appropriate for going to the mountains' (Horie, to appear)

Literary Burmese (Simpson 2008)

- (13) (a) **thii** saaouq
this book
'this book' (p. 275)
(b) [leezeiq-twin daq-poun yaiq **thii**]-hmaa tayaa-m-win pa
airport-within photograph take NMZ-NOM not-be-legal POL
Lit. 'Taking photographs within the airport is illegal.'
Intended: 'It is illegal to take photographs inside the airport.' (p. 274)

Colloquial Malay (Yap, in press)

- (14) Budak 'ni makan-**nya** tak ikut masa.
child this eat-3SG.GEN NEG follow time
Lit. 'As for this child, his eating is not according to schedule.'
Intended meaning: 'This child is not eating regularly.'

Rawang (LaPolla & Poa 2001: 163-4)

- (15) [we-dø^ʔ i-ri[̀]] dv-dv̄m-ò-ē
that-ADV be-PL CAUS-remember/think:1S-TNP-N.PAST
'I remember things like that'. (~ 'I remember those things.')

Chaozhou (Sinitic: Southern Min)

- (16) (a) tsi no **kai** nay
this two CL person
'these two persons'
(b) [gua ti lai tiə p'aʔkay **kai**] loy si gua seŋ -kiã
outside place come here work NMZ all COP outside province SUF
'The laborers from outside (of Chaozhou) are from other provinces.'

The use of noun phrase markers to signal nominalization is not unique to Asian languages. Similar observations have been made for various languages (e.g. Comrie & Thompson 1985/2007; MacKenzie 1987; Lehmann & Moravcsik 2000; Rijkhoff

2002/2004; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993; Malchukov 2004; *inter alia*). Essentially, these noun phrase markers serve as ‘substantivization strategies’ to help identify a clause as a nominalization construction (Malchukov 2006; see also Yap, Grunow-Härsta & Wrona, in press).

To sum up thus far, we have seen that clausal nominalization constructions can be signaled in a number of ways: (i) via a light noun that grammaticalizes into a nominalizer, (ii) via a noun phrase marker, (iii) via a noun phrase marker that grammaticalizes into a nominalizer, and (iv) via combinations of the above, as seen in (16b). In the next three sections, we will examine how these various clausal nominalization constructions frequently extend to serve non-referential functions.

3. From nominalization to relativization

Numerous studies have shown that there is an intimate relationship between nominalization and relativization. Across Sino-Tibetan languages and in Japanese and Korean, the same morpheme used to construct nominalizations is also used to construct relative clauses (Bickel 1999; DeLancey 1986, 1999, 2005; Genetti 1992, in press; Genetti et al. 2008; Horie 1998a; Matisoff 1972; Noonan 1997, 2008; Rhee 2008; Shibatani 2009; Simpson 2008; Sun & Lin 2009; Yap & Matthews 2008).⁴ This phenomenon, termed ‘relativization-nominalization syncretism’ (DeLancey 2002), was first observed by Matisoff (1972) for Lahu (Loloish), wherein the same morpheme *ve* marks genitive noun phrases, nominalized verbs, as well as relative clauses, and non-embedded clauses. It is so prevalent a feature that Bickel (1999: 271) refers to this syncretic constellation as ‘Standard Sino-Tibetan Nominalization’ (or SSTN).

The following examples demonstrate relativization-nominalization syncretism, i.e. shared formal identity between nominalizers and relativizers. In (17), we see the agentive nominalizer *mkhan* in Lhasa Tibetan functioning as a relativizer. In (18), we see Magar agent nominalizer *-cyo* relativizing as well.

Lhasa Tibetan (DeLancey 1986:3)

- (17) *stag gsod-mkhan mi pha=gi red*
 tiger kill-NMZ man that be
 ‘That is the man who killed/kills/will kill the tiger.’

Magar (Grunow-Härsta fieldnotes)

- (18) *ho-lan na-kun bAdiin rup-cyo bfiirmi le*

⁴ See also Zeitoun (2002) and papers therein for discussions of similar phenomena in Formosan languages

‘There is the man who sewed/sews/will sew your clothes.’

We posit that this syncretism is not an historical accident, and that it is due, at least in part, to developments which arise from the fact that languages can modify and restrict a referent by means of juxtaposition. Thus a clause can simply be apposed to a noun phrase and in this relation, it can modify that phrase. Essentially, then, this clause functions as a relative clause, of which the noun phrase is the head. This is illustrated in Japanese (19), where the clause *asita au* (‘to meet tomorrow’) modifies the temporal noun *jikan* (‘time’). The clause and head noun together form a relative clause construction.⁵ Similarly in Colloquial Malay (20) the clause *aku beli semalam* (‘I bought yesterday’) functions as an adnominal modifier of *buku* (‘book’) in a relative clause construction.

Japanese

- (19) [*asita au*] ***jikan*** *sukoshi osoi desu ne*
tomorrow meet time a.bit late COP PRT
‘**The time** [(that we are) to meet tomorrow] is a bit late, isn’t it?’

Colloquial Malay

- (20) ***buku*** [*aku beli semalam*] *dah hilang*
book 1SG buy yesterday already disappear
‘**The book** [I bought yesterday] has disappeared.’

Very often, the head nouns of such relative clauses are general ‘light nouns’ (LaPolla 1994; Aldridge 2008; Yap & Wang, in press). These nouns often become lighter (i.e. increasingly more semantically bleached) to the point that they are reinterpreted as nominalizers and the resulting construction is treated as a nominalization construction, as in (21), where the semantically light noun *tokoro*, meaning ‘place’, has bleached to the point that it can be used to refer to a wider range of noun types, i.e. not just locative referents but also patient referents, among others.

Japanese (Horie 2008: 175)

- (21) (a) [*Dorobo-ga heya-kara dete ki-ta **tokoro***]-o *tukamae-ta*.

⁵ Previous scholars have noted that modifying clauses such as *asita au* (‘to meet tomorrow’) in (19) above are instances of “zero nominalization”, also referred to as “direct nominalization” (Martin 1975) or “non-overt nominalization” (Horie 2008). In such cases, the modifying clause is seen as a morphologically unmarked instance of clausal nominalization.

- thief-NOM room-from come out-PST NMZ-ACC catch-PST
- (i) ‘I caught a thief who was coming out of the room.’
- (ii) ‘I caught a thief as he was coming out of the room.’

In examples such as (21) above, the erstwhile (light) head noun of a relative clause is reinterpreted as a nominalizer.⁶ In such cases, light-noun-based nominalization constructions can be viewed as a type of relative clause construction.

Nominalization constructions can sometimes be further extended into a secondary-type relative clause construction, in which case their nominalizers, if sufficiently semantically bleached, can be reanalyzed as a relativizer (see Shibatani 2009; Shibatani & Khaled Awadh 2009; Yap & Wang in press; see also Givon 2009). Historical evidence for such development is attested in Chinese. As seen in (22a), *zhe* was used as an agent nominalizer in Old Chinese, but in the transition period during the Han dynasty as seen in (22b), particularly given that the use of adnominal *zhi* was declining, nominalizer *zhe* was often found in bridge contexts where it could be reinterpreted as a relativizer, and as seen in (22c) in Middle Chinese, *zhe* had begun to replace *zhi* as a relativizer (see Aldridge 2008; see also Yap & Wang, in press). This usage of *zhe* as a relativizer has not survived into Modern Chinese, being replaced instead by adnominal *di* (and its subsequent phonological variant *de*). A similarly transient development was also noted for Japanese nominalizer *no*, which was briefly used as a relativizer in pre-Modern Japanese (e.g. Horie 1998a).

Chinese (Yap & Wang, in press)

- (22) (a) [*zhi* *yu*] *zhe*
 control carriage NMZ
 ‘the one driving the carriage’
 (*Lun Yu*, Early Warring States period, ca. 5th century BC)
- (b) [*ding* *yin* *zhe*] *jiangshi*
 settle Yin NMZ general
 ‘the ones who are settled in Yin, (those) generals’
 (*Shi Ji*, Western Han period, 1st-3rd century BC)
- (c) [*zuori* *lai* *zhe* *taishiguan*]
 yesterday come REL teacher
 ‘the teacher who came yesterday’

⁶ A similar development from head noun of a relative clause to nominalizer is reported in Shibasaki (in press) for Okinawan. Shibasaki also reports that the Okinawan *si*-nominalizations have also extended from referential to non-referential functions, including concessive subordinate clause and sentence-final stance marking.

(*Yi You*, Song period, ca. 10th to 13th century AD)

3. From nominalization to subordination

The relationship between nominalization and subordination has been extensively discussed in the literature, particularly in terms of converbal and serializing forms, and in terms of their narrativizing and topicalizing functions (e.g. Matisoff 1972, Genetti 1986, 1991, 2008, Chelliah 1997, Noonan 1997, 2005, and Watters 2006 for Tibeto-Burman; Haspelmath & König 1995 and van der Auwera 1998 for various Asian and European languages). Nominalized constructions frequently take on converbal functions in Tibeto-Burman languages. This is illustrated in Manange (23), where nominalizer *-pa* is reinterpreted as a causal converb, in Mongsen Ao (24), where nominalizer *-ŋ* functions as a sequential converb, and in Bantawa (25) where nominalizer *sa* indicates a simultaneous converbal function.

Manange (Hildebrandt 2004: 83, also cited in Genetti, in press)

- (23) [*ŋ*_A=*tse*²² *mwi*⁴² *phr*_A⁴² *ky*_A=*ri*⁵² *pim-pa*²²]
 I=ERG money 100 2SG=LOC give-NMZ
*nese*²² *ky*⁵² *kola*⁵² *kyu-p*⁵²
 tomorrow 2SG clothes buy-NOM
 ‘Because I gave you 100 rupees, you will buy a dress tomorrow.’

Mongsen Ao (Coupe 2007: 423, cited in Genetti 2008: 124)

- (24) *tə-tʃhà-əɿ* *tʃhuwa-ə* *a-ki* *thùŋ*
 thus-do-SEQ emerge-SEQ NRL-house reach.PST
 ‘And then, [he] came out [of the jungle] and reached home.’

Bantawa (Doornenbal 2008: 79)

- (25) *mo-ko* *mí-na-ci* *madala* *mok-yaŋ-sa* *mí-t^h om-a-ŋ-a*
 that-REF man-PL drum hit-PROG-SIM 3PL-dance-PT-PROG-PT
 ‘While men hit the drums, they were dancing.’

Old Chinese also attests subordinators derived from nominalizers. For example, the agent nominalizer *zhe*, in addition to its primary role as agent nominalizer, also functions adverbially to convey manner, time and condition. Particularly when this type of nominalization construction is in topic position and establishes temporal or suppositional background, it functions as a subordinating adverbial clause, as in (26).

Nominalizers functioning as temporal subordinators are also found in Japanese, for example *tokoro* in (27).⁷

Old Chinese

- (26) [*nongfu duo yu tian zhe*] *ze guo pin ye*
 farmer lazy LOC field ZHE then country poor SFP
 ‘(The time) when/if the peasants are lazy in the field, then the state will be poor.’ (*Han Fei Zi*, Warring States period, 475-221 BC)

Japanese (Horie 2008: 176)

- (27) [*Kyoositu-ni it-ta tokoro*], *kyuukoo dat-ta*.
 classroom-to go-PST NMZ cancellation COP-PST
 ‘When I went to a classroom, I found (to my surprise) that the class was cancelled.’

Austronesian languages such as Budai Rukai and Kavalan (both Formosan) also show a similar development involving nominalization constructions being extended non-referentially to serve as adverbial subordinate clauses, as seen in (28) and (29).

Budai Rukai (Sung, in press)

- (28) *lu* [*ka ta-ki-tai-tai-anə*] *ŋu-a-da[anə madu maganaə]*
 if/when OBL NFUT-get-RED-taro-NMZ go-FIN-field have.to all
 ‘At the time of harvesting taros, all (of us) have to go to the field.’

Kavalan (Hsieh, in press)⁸

- (29) (a) *Raya dames utuz a yau*
 big especially earthquake LNK that
 [*m-suRaw=ay ci-aliung tu m-qaytun*]
 AF-fall=NMZ NCM-PN OBL AF-vehicle
 ‘There was a strong earthquake
 (at the time) when Aliung fell over from the vehicle’
 (b) [*wama zana iRuR=ay*] *zana iRuR=ay ma tamun-ta*

⁷ Further grammaticalization is also possible, giving rise to cause/reason and concessive subordinators, among others. Often, this involves the additional use of case markers which fuse with the nominalizers to form portmanteau subordinators. Examples include Japanese cause/reason subordinator (*no ni* ‘because’) and concessive subordinator *no ga* (‘although’) (see Horie 1998b). Shibasaki (in press) also reports concessive uses for Okinawan *sigā* (‘although’).

⁸ Fuhui Hsieh (personal comm., October 21, 2009) agrees that =*ay* in constructions such as (29) above have a nominalizing function, although she consistently glosses =*ay* as REL throughout her paper (Hsieh, in press).

only 3.POSS river= NMZ 3.POSS river= NMZ only dish-1INCL.PL-GEN
 [zana lazing=**ay** wama] zana lazing=**ay** tamun-ta
 3.POSS sea= NMZ only 3.POSS sea= NMZ dish-1INCL.PL-GEN
 ‘If/When we have only those from the river, those from the river will be
 our dishes. If/When we have those from the sea only, those from the sea
 will be our dishes.’

4. From nominalization to finite clause

There is also evidence across Asian languages of nominalization constructions being reanalyzed as finite clauses, the morphological nominalizer being reinterpreted as a tense/aspect/mood marker. This development occurs so frequently in Tibeto-Burman languages that DeLancey (in press) has concluded “that clausal nominalization in constructions with a copula is a major—indeed, the major—source of new finite clause constructions throughout the family” (see also Genetti 2008, in press; Coupe 2009 Grunow-Hårsta 2009, in press). Below we illustrate with examples from Magar, a Himalayish language, to highlight how nominalization constructions develop from referential to non-referential uses, in particular as finite clauses within the predication domain.⁹ Specifically, the nominalizer *-ke* is reanalyzed from a clausal nominalizer, marking complements as in (30a), to marking an imminent aspectual marker as in (30b), and thence developing into a future tense marker as in (30c).

- Magar (Grunow-Hårsta fieldnotes)
- (30) (a) *barfiamanya aŋ-ke pa-a*
 Barfiamanya go-NMZ seek-PST
 ‘(I) wanted to go to Barhamanya.’
- (b) *barfiamanya aŋ-ke(=le)*
 Barfiamanya go-NMZ=COP
 ‘(I) have yet to go to Barhamanya.’
- (c) *pihin barfiamanya aŋ-ke(=le)*
 tomorrow Barfiamanya go-NMZ=COP
 ‘Tomorrow, (I) will go to Barhamanya.’

Tibeto-Burman languages of the Tamangic branch, for example Nar Phu (Noonan, in press), also exhibit the non-referential use of nominalizers to encode tense and aspect distinctions. In Nar Phu, as seen in (31), the nominalizers *-p±* and *-t±*

⁹ The nominalizer *-ke* may be the dative case marker, with which it is homophonous, which has been recruited into the nominalizing system of Magar (Grunow-Hårsta 2008).

encode past progressive and past perfective respectively.

Nar Phu (Noonan, in press)

- (31) (a) *ŋā-se lakpe-re hī-ke phiri-pe mraŋ-č'in*
 I-ERG Lakpa-DAT/LOC letter write-INDET.NMZ see-PST
 'I saw Lakpa writing the letter.'
- (b) *ŋā-se lakpe-re hī-ke phiri-te mraŋ-č'in*
 I-ERG Lakpa-DAT/LOC letter write-INDET.NMZ see-PST
 'I saw Lakpa write the letter.'

In the Kiranti branch of Tibeto-Burman, Van Driem (1993: 191) has observed that in Limbu (32) and Dumi (33) imperfective aspect is encoded with the nominalizers *-pa* and *-m* respectively (glossed by van Driem as IMPFV).

Limbu (van Driem 1987: 113)

- (32) *a.tto ke-be.k-pa*
 where 2-go-IMPFV:NMZ
 'Where are you going?'

Dumi (van Driem 1993: 180)

- (33) *ki:m-po ga:ro thok-k-ġ-t-ġ-m*
 house-GEN wall build-1p-exclusive-NPT-exclusive-IMPFV
 'We (plural exclusive) are building the walls of the house.'

Similarly, among Sinitic languages, some northern Mandarin dialects have reinterpreted nominalizer *de* as a past tense marker (e.g. Simpson & Wu 2001). This can also be seen to some extent in contemporary Beijing Mandarin, as seen in (34).

Mandarin¹⁰

- (34) *(shi) wo qu de*
 FOC 1SG go NMZ/PST
 'It was me who went there' / 'I did go there' / 'I went there'

In Korean, adnominals derived from erstwhile nominalizers also express tense, aspect and mood. For example, adnominalizers *-(u)n* and *-(u)l*, derived from Old Korean nominalizers *-n* and *-l* respectively (with cognates in Manchu, Mongolian and Turkish), have evolved into anterior/past and prospective markers (see for example Lee 1993; Whitman 1997; Rhee 2008, in press; Yap & Matthews 2008). Use of adnominal *-(u)n* as anterior/past marker is illustrated in (35a), and use of adnominal *-(u)l* as prospective marker is illustrated in (35b).

¹⁰ We owe this example to Wang Jiao (personal comm., November 25, 2009).

Korean (Rhee 2008: 252)

- (35) (a) *ku-ka mek-un kes*
 he-NOM eat-ANT.ADNZ thing/NMLZ
 ‘thing that he ate’ / ‘thing he ate’
 (b) *ku-ka mek-ul kes*
 he-NOM eat-PROSP.ADNZ thing/NMLZ
 ‘thing that he ate’ / ‘thing he ate’

In some Austronesian languages focus/voice markers, which according to Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1982) derive from affixal nominalizers, have also come to convey tense-aspect-mood information. For example, in Cebuano (a Philippine language), realis/non-realis mood distinctions are made between actor voice markers *mi-/mu-*, patient voice markers *gi-/un*, conveyance voice markers *gi-/i-*, among others (e.g. Himmelmann 2005: 126, 168). In Saisiyat, another Austronesian language, the verbal suffix *-en* can be used as patient voice (PV) marker as in (36), as well as resultative/anterior/perfective aspect marker as in (37). This suffix has variant forms such as *-oen*, *-on*, *-in*, which are phonotactically conditioned.

Saisiyat (Yeh, in press)

- (36) (a) *ka-si'ael-en* (b) *ka-i:ba:-en*
 KA-eat-PV KA-wear-PV
 ‘food, something to be eaten’ ‘clothes, something to be worn’

Saisiyat (Huang & Su 2005)

- (37) (a) *Ka boway 'aewpoe'-oen 'araS-en.*
 NOM fruit hold-PF take-PF
 ‘The fruits are taken away.’ (p. 351)
 (b) *Ka tataa' tonon'-on noka kapapama'an m-asay ila.*
 NOM chicken bump-PF GEN vehicle AF-die PFV
 ‘The chicken was bumped by a car and died.’ (p. 354)
 (c) *Nisia 'aehae' kala' sisil-in 'aSkani-en ray kapapama'an.*
 3SG.GEN one basket lift-PF put-PF LOC vehicle
 ‘He lifted one basket and placed (it) on (his) bicycle.’ (p. 352)’

Saisiyat also has a verbal affix *<in>*, which is used as a derivational nominalizer as in (38), as well as a resultative/anterior/perfective/past marker, as in (39).

Saisiyat (Yeh, in press)

- (38) (a) *t<in>nawbon*

- pound.rice<PFV>
 ‘rice cake (made from pounding rice)’
- (b) *p<in>o-bae:ae*
 put<PFV>-charcoal
 ‘beer (made by brewing over charcoal)’

Saisiyat (Huang & Su 2005: 348)

- (39) *Onoka-aewhaS-a kiko m-in-potoeh ila.*
 POSS-rat-POSS tail AF-PAST-break PFV
 ‘The tail of the rat divided into two.’

Another interesting development noted in Saisiyat is that the case marker *ka* is homonymous with prefixal nominalizer *ka-*, and the latter has also further developed into an irrealis mood/future marker. As such an irrealis interpretation emerges when prefixal nominalizer *ka-* accompanies patient nominalizer *-en* as in (40a), in contrast to the realis interpretation that surfaces when *ka-* is absent in derivational-type nominalizations formed with affixal *<in>* as seen in (40b).

Saisiyat (Yeh, in press)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(40) (a) <i>ka-tawbon-en</i>
 KA-pound-PV
 ‘something to be pounded’</p> | <p>(b) <i>t<in>awbon</i>
 <PV>pound
 ‘something pounded; e.g. rice cake’</p> |
|---|--|

Such frequent syncretism between nominalization and TAM marking is congruent with observations in Formosan literature, where it is often reported that there sometimes is no formal distinction between nominalization constructions and finite main clauses. Indeed, Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1982) have posited that erstwhile nominalizers have been reinterpreted as the Austronesian-type focus/voice markers that particularly characterize many Formosan and Philippine languages. This phenomenon involving isomorphism between nominalization constructions and finite clause structures parallels those noted earlier in other languages (e.g. Tibeto-Burman, Sinitic and Korean), where nominalization constructions are known to sometimes be reanalyzed as finite clauses.¹¹

¹¹ Many of these languages have developed strategies to distinguish between the two isomorphic constructions. For example, referentiality marking devices such as demonstratives and case markers are often used to signal nominalization constructions, distinguishing them from the finite clauses in which the nominalizing elements are often reanalyzed as tense-aspect-mood (TAM) markers. Such use of referentiality marking devices (sometimes referred to as ‘substantivizing’ strategies) is consistent with crosslinguistic observations (see Malchukov 2006).

There are several pathways by which finiteness (also known in functional cognitive grammar as ‘grounding’ or ‘anchoring’) can be achieved.¹² One pathway, which we will explore here, is via the extension from focus constructions to non-focus (i.e. neutral) constructions. This has been noted in Japanese (see Iwasaki 2000), where the non-finite *rentaikei* form is used, not only as attributive nominal predicates in Classical Japanese as seen in (41a), but also in *kakari musubi* (focus-concord) constructions as in (41b), and in pragmatically affective *rentai syuusi bun* (‘attributive-final sentences’) as in (41c) (see Horie 2008 for a fuller discussion). Crucially, we see non-finite *rentaikei* forms being grounded through illocutionary force in focus or stance constructions, and as such these otherwise non-finite nominalized constructions are legitimized as ‘stand-alone’ constructions, and over time their syntactic legitimacy (initially empowered by illocutionary force) results in the extension of non-finite *rentaikei* forms to finite *shushikei* (‘conclusive’ or independent ‘stand-alone’) forms as seen in the Modern Japanese examples in (42), where *otiru* can be used not only attributively (hence non-finite and translated into English as attributive participle ‘falling’) but it could also be used ‘conclusively’ (hence finite and translated into English as a verb in present tense form ‘falls’. This extension from non-finite *rentaikei* to finite *shushikei* form was a gradual process that spanned hundreds of years, beginning in the late Heian period (794-1185) and was completed by the end of the Muromachi period (1336-1573).

Classical Japanese

- (41) (a) *oturu* *tori*
 fall.ATTR bird
 ‘a falling bird’ (Horie 2008: 171)
- (b) *ware-nomi-zo* *kimi-ni-wa* *kouru*
 I-only-FOC.PRT you-DAT-TOP yearn-ATTR
 ‘It is I alone who yearn for thee.’ (Horie 2008: 172)
- (c) *tiru-to* *mite /* *aru-beki* *mono-wo /* *ume-no-hana* //
 scatter-QUOT see.GERV exist-should thing-PRT plum-GEN-flower
 utate *nioi-no /* *sode-ni* *tomare-ru.*
 very scent-GEN sleeve-LOC lay.PRF-ATTR
 ‘It would have been best simply to watch them scatter—now, alas, the
 scent from the blossoms of the plum still lingers upon my sleeve.’
 (Iwasaki 2000- 246-247; also cited in Horie 2008: 172)

¹² The term ‘grounding’ is used extensively in work by Ron Langacker, among others (see Taylor 2003 for a highly readable discussion).

Modern. Japanese (Horie 2008: 173)

- (42) (a) *otiru* *tori*
fall.ATTR bird
'a falling bird'
- (b) *Tori-ga otiru*
bird-NOM fall
'A bird falls.'

A related pathway is via the elision of the copula in cleft-like focus constructions, as seen in the Magar (Tibeto-Burman) examples in (30b) and (30c) above, in which the copula =*le* may be optionally elided. Moreover, examples from Limbu and Dumi, exemplified above in (32) and (33) demonstrate that, in some Tibeto-Burman languages, nominalization constructions expressing tense-aspect-mood (TAM) are consistently non-embedded.¹³ This phenomenon is also found beyond Tibeto-Burman. For example, it can be seen in Mandarin as in (43 below), repeated from (34), where focus copula *shi* can be omitted and the complement nominalized by *de* is reinterpreted as an independent ('stand-alone') finite clause with *de* reinterpreted in some dialects as a past tense marker.

Mandarin

- (43) *(shi) wo qu de*
FOC 1SG go NMZ/PST
'It was me who went there' / 'I did go there' / 'I went there'

Languages such as Iranian (Haig, in press) also suggest telling relationships between demonstratives and the development of non-referential uses of nominalization constructions, including the TAM functions. From the Iranian language family, the Bahdini Kurdish “ezafe” (derived from a demonstrative) has in modern times also developed a TAM marking function. As Haig (in press) explains, “In combination with a participle, the Tense Ezafe imparts a sense of completed action (perfectivity).” For example, (44) below would only be used to describe a perfective situation in which the girl concerned was actually gone.

- (44) *xuşk-a min ya çuy-î sîk-ê*
 sister-EZ.F 1S.OBL EZ.F go:PST-PTCPL market-OBL
 ‘My sister has gone to the market.’

5. Nominalization as mood/stance marker

¹³ This phenomenon was first to observed by Matisoff (1972) for Lahu (Loloish) and thereafter by many other scholars (Bickel 1999; Matisoff 1972; Noonan 1997; *inter alia*).

Nominalization constructions are also used to express speaker stance (DeLancey 1986, 1997, 2001, in press; Noonan 1997, 2008, in press; Saxena 2000; Grunow-Hårsta 2007, in press; Watters 2008). In particular, in Tibeto-Burman languages they can express mirativity, which Delancey (1986: 205) defines as “the expression of surprise at what is ‘newly acquired and unintegrated information’ for which the mind is unprepared.” Examples of mirativity from Sunwar, Kham and Magar follow.

Sunwar (DeLancey, in press)

- (45) *kyaršE* *'sai-šo* *'baâ-tA*
 goat kill-MIR.NMZ exist-3sPST
 '(I saw) he was killing a goat/goats.' (e.g. when I discovered him)

Takale Kham (Watters 2008: 360)

- (46) *o-ma-rəi:h-wo* *o-le-o*
 3S-NEG-visible-NMZ 3S-be-MIR.NMZ
 'It isn't visible after all! (to my surprise)'

Magar (Grunow-Hårsta 2009)

- (47) *bhūt* *wfi-a-o=le*
 spirit move-MIR.NMZ=COP
 (I realize to my surprise that) 'The spirit is moving!'

As seen from the examples above, constructions expressing stance in Tibeto-Burman are frequently ‘stand-alone’ nominalizations (see DeLancey 1986, 1997, 2001; Noonan 1997, 2008, in press; Bickel 1999; Grunow-Hårsta 2007; Watters 2008, *inter alia*). The reinterpretation of a nominalizer to a stance marker within a non-embedded construction is not limited to Tibeto-Burman. For example in Budai Rukai (Austronesian), as seen in (48), the suffixal nominalizer *anə* in a non-embedded construction also conveys strong speaker stance, in this particular case mirativity. In Cantonese (Sinitic), as seen in (49), nominalizer *ge3* in sentence final position can likewise convey speaker attitude.

Budai Rukai (Sung, in press)

- (48) Q: *ma-tu-manə* *kai* *libanə*
 STAT.FIN-do-what this window
 ‘What happened to this window?’
 A: *ta-ki-kupa-anə*

NFUT-PASS-steal-NMZ

‘(It) got stolen!’ (Unbelievable!)

Cantonese (Sio, in press)

(49) *keoi5 wui5 lei4 ge3*

3SG will come GE

‘(Don't worry) he will come.’

Interestingly, Korean nominalizations such as (50) can be interpreted subjectively as a weak assertion, and increasingly also as a declarative utterance without assertive force. Essentially, we see both the subject *kes* (‘thing’) and the copula *-i* (‘be’) merging with the sentence final particle *-pnita* (also referred to as ‘sentence ender’) to express speaker’s assertive mood (albeit a weak one), somewhat akin to English subjective discourse marker (*the*) *thing is* in (51). Such assertions can be neutralized over time due to overuse, i.e. due to semantic bleaching. This semantic process then can contribute to the emergence of finite interpretations without a marked stance interpretation.

Korean (Rhee 2008: 248)

(50) *ku-ka ecey cwuk-ess-ta-nun kes-i-pnita.*

he-NOM yesterday die-PST-COMP-ADNZ thing-COP-END

‘The thing is that he died yesterday.’ / ‘He died yesterday.’

(51) (*The*) *thing is, he died yesterday.*

A number of studies in Asian languages, in particular Japanese and Korean, have also highlighted the role of ellipsis in the emergence of stance constructions derived from stand-alone subordinate adverbial clauses, some of which are known to be derived from nominalization constructions (see Ohori 1998 and Higashiizumi 2006 for Japanese; Shibasaki forthcoming a for Okinawan; Rhee 2010 for Korean). Below we illustrate with examples from Okinawan (based on Shibasaki forthcoming a and b). As seen in (52), *si* is used as a nominalizer and can be traced back to a lexical noun *su* (‘person). As seen in (53), *si*-nominalization constructions are often accompanied by case marker *ga*. When used as a subordinate clause, this *si-ga* construction is reinterpreted as a clausal subordinator within a concessive construction. As seen in (54), with ellipsis of the main clause, the remaining stand-alone subordinate clause yields a stand-alone concessive construction, in this particular example reanalyzed as a stance

construction that highlights the speaker's deep yearning and unfulfilled desire.

Okinawan

- (52) (a) *Ubudama ha inuru su du yukakiru*
 life.generating.ball TOP bless SI.person PT govern
 'the person who (can) invoke(s) certain life-generating power from
 Ubudama (is the one/person who can) govern the world' (*Omorosooshi*,
 vol. 1, 102, 16th century, Shibasaki forthcoming a: 103, citing Hokama
 1995:350)
- (b) *tsibudi tsiyu machu si*
 in.bud dew wait SI
 'the one in bud waiting for dew' (*Iriko wodori no Tokiuta*, 18th century;
 Shibasaki forthcoming a: 105, citing Shinzato forthcoming)
- (53) (a) *kashiragi nu a siga shija nu kami naran*
 head.hair NOM be SI.thing.NOM'but' humans GEN hair be.not
 '(The person i.e. Mekarushi) has a full head of hair, **but** (it) is not (like)
 humans.' (*Mekarushi*, 18th century, Shibasaki forthcoming b)
- (b) *yuufukuna sudachi shichiwuta siga*
 rich upbringing do.PST SI.thing.NOM'but'
dandan fushiyawashi tsizichi,
 gradually unhappiness continue
Shuri nu simee naran ...
 place.name GEN living NEG.be
 '(The person) was well-bred, **but** (now) is not living in Shuri because of
 adversities of life...' (*Hanauinuyin*, 18th century; Shibasaki forthcoming b)
- (54) *sinnikuihuni nu ?icuru take 'jariba*
 dugout.canoe NOM can.go ocean be.if
kiju ya ?nzi 'ugasi ?aca ja cusiga
 today PT go meet tomorrow PT come.SIGA.STANCE
 '(If my girlfriend lives within the) canoeing distance, (I can) go and meet (her)
 today and come (back) tomorrow, **but (it's impossible)**.' (*Mutudanabusi*, early
 20th century; Shibasaki forthcoming b, citing Onaga 1968:103)

Thus far we have seen examples of nominalizers (sometimes in combination with case markers) extending from their core referential function to extended, and more abstract non-referential functions such as stance-marking. Worth noting is that referentiality marking devices which signal nominalizations—in particular demonstratives and case markers—can also develop a stance-encoding function. This development is often found in Austronesian and Papuan languages. For example, the third person singular enclitic =*nya* in Malay, as seen in (55), and the Abui demonstratives (Kratochvil in press), as illustrated with the proximal demonstrative *to* (‘this one near the speaker’) in (56), demonstrate a reanalysis of verbal predicates into stance-encoding constructions, i.e. mirativity and inferential evidentiality respectively.

Malay (Yap, forthcoming)

- (55) (*Begitu*) *cantik=nya!*
 So (< ‘like that’) beautiful=3SG.GEN
 ‘Such beauty!’ / ‘He/She/It (is) so beautiful!’

Abui (Kratochvil, in press)

- (56) *hai, ni kul yaar to!*
 INTJ 1PL.E must go.CPL PRX.AD
 ‘Oh, we really must go (as you can see/understand).’

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have examined the semantic extensions of nominalizers and nominalization constructions from referential to non-referential functions. These include modifying functions (specifically relative clause and subordinate clause marking), tense-aspect-mood (TAM) marking, and the expression of speaker stance. It has also been observed that referentiality marking devices (specifically demonstratives and case markers) which signal nominalizations undergo parallel semantic extension and, like nominalizers, they may extend their functional scope from referential to non-referential functions. Specifically, they can grammaticalize into tense-aspect markers and mood/stance markers. Crosslinguistically, Traugott (1982, 1989, 1995) and others have shown that there is a strong tendency for proposition-based constructions to develop toward pragmatic-based interpretations, with subjective and/or intersubjective readings. In this paper, we have shown how events and propositions that are reified for referential purposes (i.e. nominalizations) are frequently grammaticalized to serve modificational functions and sometimes TAM encoding functions as well, and how they may also be pragmaticized to serve

subjective speaker mood/stance functions.

Acknowledgments

We wish to gratefully acknowledge generous research funding support from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Faculty of Humanities Start-Up Fund 2010-2012) awarded to the first author, as well as NSF grant BCS-0618928 and ELDP grant FTG0104 awarded to the second author. We also wish to thank numerous fellow researchers with whom we have exchanged invaluable discussions on nominalization, among them Mikyong Ahn, Kam-siu Cheung, Alec Coupe, Geoffrey Haig, Kaoru Horie, Fuhui Hsieh, Shuping Huang, Haowen Jiang, Daniel Kaufman, František Kratochvíl, You-jing Lin, Hongyong Liu, Stephen Morey, Naonori Nagaya, Mark Post, Eric Potsdam, Lawrence Reid, Seongha Rhee, Masayoshi Shibatani, Rumiko Shinzato, Joanna Sio, Michael Tanangkingsing, Stacy Teng, Li-May Sung, Jiao Wang, Janick Wrona, Huiling Xu, Marie Yeh, and Elizabeth Zeitoun.

References

- Aldridge, Edith. 2008. *Zhi* and *zhe*: A note on the historical development of Chinese relative clauses. Paper presented at Diachronic Generative Syntax (DIGS) 10, Cornell University, August 7.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 1999. Nominalization and focus in some Kiranti languages. In Yogendra P. Yadava and Warren W. Glover (eds), *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*, pp. 271–296. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- Chelliah, Shobhana L. 2007. *A Grammar of Meithei*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalizations. In R. Jacobs & P. Rosenbaum (eds), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, pp. 184-221. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn.
- Comrie, Bernard and Sandra A. Thompson. 1985. Lexical nominalization. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and Syntactic description, Volume III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, pp. 349-398. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupe, Alec. 2007. *A Grammar of Mongsen Ao*. (Mouton Grammar Series 39). Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coupe, Alec R. 2009. The origins of tense marking in Ao. Paper presented at the 42nd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages, Payap University, November 2-4.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Relativization as nominalization in Tibetan and Newari. Paper presented at the 19th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Ohio State University, Columbus.

- DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, pp. 203-213. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1(1): 33-52.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1999. Relativization in Tibetan. In Yogendra P Yadava and Warren W. Glover (eds.), *Studies in Nepalese Linguistics*, pp. 231-249. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3): 371-384.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2005. Relativization and nominalization in Bodic. *Tibeto-Burman Linguistics: Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp. 5-72. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- DeLancey, Scott. (in press). Finite structures from nominalization constructions in Tibeto-Burman. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Doornenbal, Marius. 2009. *A Grammar of Bantawa*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Genetti, Carol. 1991. From postposition to subordinator in Newari. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization. Volume 2: Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers* [Typological Studies in Language 19], pp. 227-255. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Genetti, Carol. 1992. Semantic and grammatical categories of relative-clause morphology in the languages of Nepal. *Studies in Language* 16(2): 405-427.
- Genetti, Carol. (in press). Nominalization in Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayan areas: A typological perspective. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Genetti, Carol, Alec R. Coupe, Ellen Bartee, Kristine Hilderbrandt & You-Jing Lin. 2008. Syntactic aspects of nominalization in five Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayan area. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30(2): 97-144.
- Givón, Talmy. 2009. *The Genesis of Syntactic Complexity: Diachrony Ontogeny, Neuro-Cognition, Evolution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grunow-Hårsta, Karen. 2007. Evidentiality and mirativity in Magar. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30(2): 151-194.
- Grunow-Hårsta, Karen. 2008. *A Descriptive Grammar of Two Dialects of Magar: Tanahu and Syangja. Volumes 1 & 2*. PhD dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Grunow-Hårsta, Karen. (in press). Innovations in Magar nominalization. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and*

- Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grunow-Hårsta, Karen and Foong Ha Yap. 2009. Referential and non-referential uses of nominalization constructions in Magar. Paper presented at the 15th Himalayan Linguistics Symposium (HLS-15), University of Oregon, July 31-August 1.
- Harbsmeier, Christoph. 1981. *Aspects of Classical Chinese Syntax*. [Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series 45]. London: Curzon Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König. 1995. Converbs in crosslinguistic perspective: structure and meaning in adverbial verb forms—adverbial participles, gerunds, etc. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Higashiizumi, Yuko. 2006. *From a Subordinate Clause to an Independent Clause*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publishing.
- Hildebrandt, Kristine. 2004. A grammar and glossary of the Manange language. In Carol Genetti (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal: Manange and Sherpa*, pp. 3-189. (Pacific Linguistics 557.) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds.), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge.
- Hopper, Paul and Thompson, Sandra A. 1984. Lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60(4): 703-752.
- Hopper, Paul and Thompson, Sandra A. 1985. The iconicity of the universal categories ‘noun’ and ‘verbs’. In John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax*, pp. 151-186. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Horie, Kaoru. 1998a. On the polyfunctionality of the Japanese particle *no*: From the perspectives of ontology and grammaticalization. In Toshio Ohori (ed.), *Studies in Japanese Grammaticalization: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*, pp. 169-192. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Horie, Kaoru. 1998b. Functional duality of case-marking particles in Japanese and its implications for grammaticalization: A contrastive study with Korean. In David J. Silva (ed.), *Japanese / Korean Linguistics* 8. pp. 147-159. Stanford: CSLI.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2000. Complementation in Japanese and Korean: A contrastive and cognitive linguistic approach. In Kaoru Horie (ed.), *Complementation: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives*, pp. 11-32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2008. The grammaticalization of nominalizers in Japanese and Korean: A contrastive study. In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*, pp. 169-187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Horie, Kaoru. (in press). Versatility of nominalizations: Where Japanese and Korean contrast. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona, (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives, Volume 2: Korean, Japanese and Austronesian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2000. Suppressed assertion and the functions of the final-attributive in prose and poetry of Heian Japanese. In Susan C. Herring, Pieter van Reenen and Lene Schoscler (eds.), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, pp. 237-272. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kaufman, Daniel. (this volume). Exclamatives and temporal nominalizations in Austronesian. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona, (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives, Volume 2: Korean, Japanese and Austronesian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 1993. *Nominalizations*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Kratochvil, František. (in press). Discourse-structuring functions of Abui demonstratives. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona, (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives, Volume 2: Korean, Japanese and Austronesian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1994. Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman: Evidence of Sapir's drift. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 1: 61-80.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2008. Nominalization in Rawang. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30(2): 45-65.
- LaPolla, Randy J. & Dory Poa. 2001. *Rawang Texts, with Grammatical Analysis and English Translation*. Berlin: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Lee, Hyo-Sang. 1993. The temporal system of noun-modifying (attributive) clauses in Korean from a typological perspective. *Studies in Language* 17: 75-110.
- Lehmann, Christian and Edith Moravcsik 2000. Noun. In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann & Joachim Mugdan (eds.): *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*. Volume 1, pp. 732-757. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MacKenzie, Lachlan. 1987. Nominalization and basic constituent ordering. In Johan van der Auwera and Louis Goossens (eds.) *The Ins and Outs of Predications*, 93-106. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2004. *Nominalization, Verbalization: Constraining a Typology of Transcategorical Operations* [Lincom Studies in Language Typology 8]. München: Lincom Europa.
- Malchukov, Andrej L. 2006. Constraining nominalization: Function/form competition. *Linguistics* 44(5): 973-1009.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Matisoff, James A. 1972. Lahu nominalization, relativization, and genetivization. In John P. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 237-257. New York: Academic Press.

- Nagaya, Naonori. (in press). Rise and fall of referentiality: Articles in Philippine languages. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 2: Korean, Japanese and Austronesian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. 1997. Versatile nominalizations. In Joan Bybee, John Haiman and Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Essays on Language Function and Language Type. Dedicated to T. Givon*, pp. 373-394. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. 2008. Nominalization in Bodic languages. In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*, pp. 219-237. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. (in press). Aspects of the historical development of nominalizers in the Tamangic languages. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ohori, Toshio (ed.). 1998. *Studies in Japanese Grammaticalization*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2008. On the rise and fall of Korean nominalizers. In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*, pp. 239-264. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2010. On the emergence of discourse markers of agreement: Unity-formation through ellipsis. Paper presented at the Workshop on Pragmatic Markers in Asian Languages, National Taiwan University, April 30.
- Rhee, Seongha. (in press). Nominalization and stance marking in Korean. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 2: Korean, Japanese, and Austronesian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rijkhoff, Jan. 2002. *The Noun Phrase*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (revised and extended paperback edition 2004).
- Saxena, Anju. 2000. Evidentiality in Kinnauri. In Lars Johanson & Bo Uta (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, pp. 471-483. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou. (forthcoming a) From nominalizer to stance marker in the history of Okinawan. In Marcel den Dikken and William McClure (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 18*, pp. 101-113. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou. (forthcoming b). From relativization to nominalization and more: Evidence from the history of Okinawan. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society (BLS 36).

- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2009. Elements of complex structures, where recursion isn't: The case of relativization. In Talmy Givon & Masayoshi (eds.), *Syntactic complexity: Diachrony, Acquisition, Neuro-cognition, Evolution*, pp. 163-198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi and Khaled Awadh bin Makhashen. 2009. Nominalization in Soqotri, a South Arabian language of Yemen. In W. Leio Wetzels (ed.), *Endangered Languages: Contributions to Morphology and Morpho-Syntax*, pp. 9-31. Leiden: Brill.
- Shinzato, Rumiko. In press. Nominalization in Okinawan: From a diachronic and comparative perspective. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Simpson, Andrew. 2003. On the Reanalysis of Nominalizers in Chinese, Japanese and Korean. In Audrey Yen-hui Li & Andrew Simpson (eds.), *Functional Structures, Form and Interpretation: Perspectives from East Asian Languages*, pp. 131-160. London: Curzon Routledge.
- Simpson, Andrew. 2008. The grammaticalization of clausal nominalizers in Burmese. In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*, pp. 265-288. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Simpson, Andrew and Xiu-Zhi Zoe Wu. 2001. The grammaticalization of formal nouns and nominalizers in Chinese, Japanese and Korean. In N. McCauley (ed.), *Language Change in East Asia*, pp. 250-283. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- Sio, Ut-Seong Joanna. (in press). The adnominal and sentence-final *ge3* in Cantonese. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley and Lawrence A. Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In Amran Halim, Lois Carrington & S.A. Wurm (eds), *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Volume. 2: Tracking the Travelers*, pp. 145-170. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sun, T-S. Jackson and You-Jing Lin. 2009. Constraints on relativization in rGyalrong: A cross-dialect comparison. Paper presented at the 42nd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Payap University, Chiang Mai, November 2-4.
- Sung, Li-May. (in press). Lexical and clausal nominalization in Budai Rukai. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 2: Korean, Japanese and Austronesian languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Taylor, John R. 2003. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ting, Jen. 2008. The nature of the particle *suo* in the passive constructions in Classical Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 36(1): 30-72.

- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In Winfred P. Lehmann & Yakov. Malkiel (eds.), *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, pp. 245-271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31-55.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. Subjectification in grammaticalization. In Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*, pp. 31-54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- Van der Auwera, Johan (in collaboration with Dónall P.Ó. Baoill). 1998. Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Driem, George. 1987. *A Grammar of Limbu*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Driem, George. 1993. *A Grammar of Dumi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Watters, David. 2006. Nominalization in Himalayish languages. Manuscript, La Trobe University, Melbourne.
- Watters, David. 2008. Nominalization in the Kiranti and Central Himalayish languages of Nepal. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 30.2: 1-43.
- Whitman, John. 1997. Kakarimusubi from a comparative perspective. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, Volume 6, pp. 161-178. Stanford: CSLI.
- Xu, Huiling, and Stephen Matthews. (in press). On the polyfunctionality and grammaticalization of the morpheme *kai* in the Chaozhou dialect. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yap, Foong Ha. (in press). Nominalization constructions in Malay: From referential to non-referential uses. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona, (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives, Volume 2: Korean, Japanese and Austronesian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yap, Foong Ha and Stephen Matthews. 2008. The development of nominalizers in East Asian and Tibeto-Burman languages. In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*, pp. 309-341. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yap, Foong Ha and Jiao Wang. (in press). From light noun to nominalizer: On the grammaticalization of *zhe* and *suo* in Old and Middle Chinese. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Stephen Mathews and Kaoru Horie. 2004. From Pronominalizer to Pragmatic Marker: Implications for Unidirectionality from a Crosslinguistic Perspective. In Olga Fischer,

- Muriel Norde, & Harry Perridon (eds.), *Up and Down the Cline—The Nature of Grammaticalization*, pp. 137-168. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Pik-ling Choi and Kam-siu Cheung. (in press). Delexicalizing *di*: How a Chinese noun has evolved into an attitudinal nominalizer. In An Van linden, Jean-Christophe Verstraete & Kristin Davidse (eds.), *Formal Evidence in Grammaticalization Research*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona. (in press). Nominalization strategies in Asian languages. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 1: Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yeh, Marie Meili. (in press). Nominalization in Saisiyat. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona, (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives. Volume 2: Korean, Japanese and Austronesian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth (ed.). 2002. Nominalization in Formosan languages. *Language and Linguistics* 3.2 (Special Issue).