

# akup

ARBEITEN DES KÖLNER UNIVERSALIEN - PROJEKTS

Nr. 30

U. Kölver

NOMINALIZATION AND LEXICALIZATION IN MODERN NEWARI

December 1977

Table of Contents

0.	Introduction .....	1
1.	Paradigm of Affixes .....	1
2.	Distribution of Affixes .....	4
2.1.	Adjectivals .....	4
2.2.	Nominalization of Verbal Phrases .....	5
2.3.	Nominalization of Clauses and Sentences	6
2.4.	Omission of the Affixes .....	9
2.5.	Diachronic Evidence .....	11
2.6.	Affixed Genitives .....	13
2.7.	Ordinal Numbers .....	25
2.8.	Affixed Demonstratives .....	25
3.	Conclusion .....	26
3.1.	The System of Marking .....	26
3.2.	Determination and Descriptive Terms: Gradation of Constructions .....	30

## 0. Introduction

One of the striking features in modern Newari noun phrases is the wide usage of a set of affixes found in combination with the various elements that may expand a noun into an endocentric construction.<sup>1</sup> A typical example would be

- (1) tatāḥ-yā-gu bāmlā-gu hyāuḡ-gu parsi  
'elder-sister-of (aff.) pretty-(aff.) red-(aff.) sari'  
"the elder sister's beautiful red sari"

where the determiners<sup>2</sup> of the head noun are all extended by the bound morpheme -gu.

At first sight such affixation would appear as a linking device by which the subordinate constituents of a noun phrase are tied to their head noun<sup>3</sup>.

Closer investigation, however, reveals a more complex picture which I have attempted to outline in the following paragraphs. The results of this inspection lead to the conclusion that the pattern of affixation displayed in Newari mirrors the close interaction of two converse functional principles<sup>4</sup>: both the syntagmatic function of nominal determination on the one hand and a paradigmatic function - the formation of certain types of lexicalized expressions in Newari - formally tie in with each other by the application of one common technique.

### 1. Paradigm of Affixes

Newari nouns are divided into two subcategories which comprise the entire noun inventory: 1) nouns denoting animates vs. 2) nouns denoting inanimates. These are distinguished morphologically by a distinct set of case markers for each subcategory and by distinct marking of number: nouns denoting animates distinguish singular and

plural forms, while nouns denoting inanimates occur in one number only, which in itself is indeterminate, the number being inferred from the context<sup>5</sup>.

The paradigm of affixes to be investigated preserves this dichotomy: there are three separate forms each appropriate to one of the noun subsets:

with nouns denoting Inanimates	with nouns denoting Animates
	- <u>mha</u> sg.
- <u>gu</u>	- <u>pim</u> pl.

(Diagramm I. Paradigm of Affixes)

These forms are not related etymologically; their affiliations are the following:

- 1) -gu, for which no etymology can be suggested, otherwise occurs both as a numeral classifier, and as the stem of a relative pronoun in the older strata of the language<sup>6</sup>.
- 2) -mha is homophonous - and surely diachronically identical - with an independent lexical item, mha 'body, self, individual'. This is a very common noun both in the written and in the spoken language.
- 3) -pim otherwise serves as a plural morpheme in one subset of nouns denoting animates (e.g., kāy 'son' : kāypim 'sons'), the other being -ta (e.g., manu 'man' : manuta 'men'). In its function as an affix, -pim is used as a plural marker for all animates.

The use of these affixes is described variously for various contexts. From the fact that affixation is indispensable in joining the determiners to their head in phrases like the following

(2) taḥrham-gu hāku-gu gum  
big-(aff<sub>inan</sub>) black-(aff<sub>inan</sub>) forest  
"the/a large dark forest"

(3) garib-mha macā  
poor-(aff<sub>an</sub>) boy "the/a poor boy"

one might conclude that the affixes are employed in the way of connective particles that map the noun subclass of the head noun onto the determiner. This explanation, however, would not account for those cases where the affixes seem to be used optionally: for genitival constituents of a noun phrase both affixed and unaffixed constructions are currently used; e.g.:

(4) baṃjā-yā kalāḥ  
merchant-of wife "the/a merchant's wife"

(5) mirā-yā-gu lākāḥ "Mira's shoes"

In further constructions the same set of affixes is clearly applied in a nominalizing function (cf. below 2.2.-2.3.).

It seems difficult at first sight, therefore, to take one of the functions, subordination or nominalization, as the chief or primary one. Since an affix can be added to what are beyond doubt nominal forms (genitives) it does not seem plausible to say nominalization was their chief function: why should a noun in the genitive be provided with an additional nominalizer? On the other hand, there are unequivocal instances, where the affixes turn verbal forms into nouns which freely occur as heads of a construction, so that internominal connection cannot be taken as their primary function either. Neither interpretation would fully account for the way affixes are used or omitted in the case of genitival determiners.

In order to reach a conclusion we shall in §2 survey the actual distribution of the affixes in some detail and revert to the question of their function again in §3.

## 2. Distribution of Affixes

### 2.1. Adjectivals

The affixes are added to adjectivals, in this case they are obligatory in the modern language (cf. below 2.4.).

A brief comment on the label 'adjectival' is necessary in this connection: in Newari there is no distinct word class of adjectives. The function of attributes is in most cases served by verbs: the verbal form chosen for attributive use - the stative habitual form of the verbal paradigm<sup>7</sup> - is otherwise used as a finite predicate. In principle, Newari makes no difference between the equivalent of an English adjective and an English relative clause, since any verb in its stative/habitual form may be employed as an attribute, - and in this usage is extended by one of the affixes -gu// -mha/-pin.

Apart from this by far largest group a small - semantically homogeneous set of adjectives relating to such notions as size, extension, volume etc. should at least be mentioned. These adjectives morphologically form a unique type: they are each made up out of two bound morphemes that do not occur outside these fixed combinations<sup>8</sup>.

While these forms are clearly not derived from verbal bases, syntactically they are treated like the predominant group of verbal modifiers: they, too, are extended by the affixes presently discussed. This, incidentally, also holds for the numerous loans borrowed from the stock of adjectives current in Nepali, a New-Indo-Aryan language which increasingly influences modern colloquial Newari.

The use of affixes with adjectivals is illustrated in the following examples:

- (6) tiu-gu lam  
white-(aff.<sub>inan</sub>) shirt "the/a white shirt"  
(tiye "to be white")

- (7) bāmmalā-mha kvacā "the/an ugly crow"  
ugly-(aff<sub>an.sg.</sub>) crow (bāmlaye "to be beautiful")
- (8) ballāḥ-piṃ macā-ta "(the) strong children"  
strong-(aff<sub>an.pl.</sub>) child-pl (ballāye "to be strong")
- (9) taḥ-rhika-mha phay "the/a big sheep"  
big-(aff<sub>an.sg.</sub>) sheep
- (10) ci-rhaṃ-gu tā "the/a narrow bridge"  
narrow-(aff<sub>inan.</sub>) bridge

Among these phrases (8) is noteworthy in that it goes against a general rule of Newari. Newari is a group-inflecting language. Therefore, one should not expect to see the plural marked twice within the same NP: -ta of macāta 'boys' should be sufficient. Yet the determiner is invariably so marked: \*ballāmha macāta would be ungrammatical. This, then, on the face of it looks like concord: the affix chosen is that which grammatically agrees with the head.

## 2.2. Nominalization of Verbal Phrases

Second, the affixes are used as nominalizers, to form nouns which are used as heads of NPs.

### 1) -gu

jiṃ daykā means "I prepared". By affixing -gu to the verb daykā we obtain a nominal constituent in sentences like the following:

- (11) jiṃ daykā-gu tarkāri dhāi  
I prepared-(nom) vegetables is-called  
"What I prepared is called a vegetable stew"

### 2) -mha

A verbal phrase like thi mate "do not touch" which functions as a negated imperative may be transformed into a noun by affixing -mha, yielding

- (12) thimate-mha "the/an untouchable"

3) -pim

maphu as a finite predicate means "... is unable". It is nominalized by "affixing" -pim in sentences like the following:

- (13) maphu-pini-ta gvahāli yā  
not able-(nom)-to help make "Help the Weak"

The device of nominalizing any verbal phrase is in very common usage in the language, and the forms derived thus may occur wherever a genuine noun may occur. In these cases, therefore, grammatical status is not doubtful: the affixes effect nominalization of structures which in themselves clearly are not nouns. There is no reason to take (11)-(13) as adjectival or relative constructions with a deleted noun head: the units resulting are nouns.

2.3. Nominalization of Clauses and Sentences

The affix -gu furthermore nominalizes entire clauses and sentences.

Examples:

The sentence

- (14) sala hālā hāḥ  
horse crying cries "the horse is reighing"

can be turned into the noun sala-hālā-hāḥ-gu which then can be used as the equivalent of an embedded sentence in English:

- (15) sala hālā hāḥ-gu tāḥ lā  
horse crying cries-(nom) hear (interr. part)  
"Do you hear the horse reighing?"

A similar process, though seemingly without subordination to a verb, is illustrated by (16):

- (16) jitaḥ lākām nyāy māḥ-gu  
me-to shoe buy necessary-is-(nom)  
"I have to buy shoes"



The mechanism of nominalization does not present difficulties in cases like (15) where -gu is affixed to a clause which in turn depends on a main clause predicate: (14) is by means of -gu turned into a nominal complement of the main verb.

On the other hand, (16) seems odd at first sight: why should -gu be added to the predicate of a main clause? (This is the only interpretation possible for (16): in Newari, which is a typical SOV language, all subordinate clauses precede the main clause.)<sup>9</sup>

The solution lies in the fact that a copula is not infrequently omitted from Newari sentences, and the noun ending in -gu depends on this omitted copula. Cf. sentences like

- (17) dāju luṅkaḥmi  
elder brother goldsmith  
"(my) elder brother is a goldsmith"

which alternates with

- (17') dāju luṅkaḥmi khaḥ  
"(my) elder brother is indeed a goldsmith"

containing the equative copula khaḥ. Again a sentence like

- (18) thva buṃy vāmā  
this field-in rice-plant  
"There are rice plants in this field"

alternates with

- (18') thva buṃy vāmā du  
"There are rice plants in this field"

containing the existential copula du. In both cases, the copula may be omitted. In colloquial speech, this is almost invariably the case with khaḥ: (17) decidedly is the normal variant, while (17') makes the statement strongly emphasized.

Omission of the copula, then accounts for (16). There is indeed a marked difference between (16) and its non-nominalized counterpart,

(19) *jitaḥ lākāṃ nyāy māḥ*  
"I have to buy shoes"

For the copula - which though omitted is in (16) still reflected in the presence of the affix - infers a judgment on the embedded clause: the copula *khaḥ* (which, incidentally, in the case of negation must of course be overtly expressed) assigns a truth value to the embedded clause. Thus, for (16) a more appropriate, though clumsy, translation would run: "It is true that I have to buy shoes". *khaḥ*, then, functions as a logical predicate of the nominalized sentence and therefore is of 'higher' status than the predication of the embedded clause.<sup>10</sup> Alternatively- taking now up the pair (18) vs. (18') - (16) could be interpreted as omitting the existential copula *du*. On that reading, (16) would have to be rendered by something like "It applies/it so happens that I have to buy shoes".

At times, the difference between the two judgments is not a marked one. If overtly present, *khaḥ* imposes a much stronger claim to the truth of the statement. If the copula is omitted, it would of course be arbitrary to state one of them had been left out rather than the other.

Still, we can safely say that (16) is an emphasized way of expressing oneself: the range of contexts where it would be used is considerably smaller than for its unmarked equivalent (19).

To sum up the state of the argument so far: The instances we have hitherto considered show the affixes in a fairly transparent function: they transfer various non-nominal structures into units that as to syntax can be treated as nouns.

The affixes however do not provide any further morphological clue to differentiate head and modifier respectively:

this distinction depends on the syntactical position of a nominalized form in a given clause or sentence.

#### 2.4. Omission of the Affixes

One may of course assume so far that there is no vital difference between nominalization on the one hand and inter-nominal connection or nominal subordination on the other, and that both these functions are effected by the use of the same set of markers.

It becomes evident however that nominal subordination plays no part in affixation when we next consider modern Newari phrases where the affixes are omitted: Side by side with the examples cited in 2.1. Newari admits of the formation of expressions which omit the nominalizing affixes on a modifier. This would seem to contradict the statement that the affixes are used obligatorily (2.1. above). It is indeed possible to form phrases like (20) bāmlā chem̃. This expression however contrasts with the normal turn of a noun phrase bāmlā-gu chem̃ "a/the beautiful house" : the expression bāmlā chem̃ will be understood in the way of a proper name. English phrases like The White House afford obvious parallels.

In other words, when the affix is omitted there is an amalgamation of two components to form a single and unified concept which will not readily be resolved. The expression is subject to semantic narrowing which means that the meaning of the expression as a whole does not equal the sum of its constituent parts.

The affixes, then, prevent such fusion from taking place: they safeguard the conceptual independence of each constituent of the NP. This is why in concatenations of several adjectivals the affix must be repeated with each item: e.g.

- (21) thva taḥ-khā-gu bāmlā-gu hyāum-gu chem̃  
this big-(inan) beautiful-(inan) red-(inan) house

Only on the last one in the linear order of these modifiers could the affix be omitted to trigger its fusion with the following noun, while an unaffixed item would not be tolerated intervening two affixed ones.

At first sight, the opposition bāmlā chem vs. bāmlāgu chem looks like the familiar pattern of compounds vs. inflected attributes well known from Indo-European languages. While e.g. in Sanskrit krśnāh śakūniḥ means "a black bird" the karmadhāraya compound krśnaśakuniḥ means "raven". This interpretation, however, were it applied to Newari, would ignore one very essential distinction between case endings in languages of the type illustrated by Sanskrit on the one hand, and the affixes under discussion on the other. Case endings are suffixed to nouns and relate the form so marked to the rest of the sentence. As against that, the affixes serve to nominalize an item that in itself is no noun; they imply nothing about its relation to the rest of the sentence.

In other words: while the function of nominalization may so far have seemed well reconcilable with the function of linking an attribute to its head, the contrast between affixed and unaffixed attributes plainly shows that the occurrence of a nominalizing affix effects s e p a r a t i o n of the constituents of a noun phrase rather than linkage. The affixes are required to transform non-nominal forms into units that function as independent words in a noun phrase, in themselves they do not imply subordination.

Needless to say, an affix could not be omitted when a given nominal construction is to figure as the head of a construction.

## 2.5. Diachronic Evidence

For the previous stages of the language, attributive constructions without affixes are well attested. At the same time the verbal morphology of 'Classical Newari',<sup>11</sup> differs considerably from the modern paradigm. Many verbal forms of the older language may well be described as participles which function both adnominally and predicatively. These pronounced nominal features of the verb gave rise to judgements like Konow's that the Newari verb is in all essential features a noun<sup>12</sup>: that is, in his view the concept of verb rather seems to rest on syntactical evidence (predicative function) than on a tangible formal distinction between nouns and verbs. While this in my opinion is overstating the case, a new analysis of the inflection of Classical Newari verbs plainly shows their extended nominal affiliations.<sup>13</sup>

Now, the modern language has lost most of the distinctly nominal forms of older times, and has developed towards marking the finite status of forms predicatively used.

At first sight, then, we encounter two apparently separate tendencies when contrasting the older and the modern language: first in verbal inflection the modern language develops towards finite forms; second, in noun phrase structure we find that an additional set of markers comes into use which must occur whenever a form that in itself is not a noun is to figure in a noun phrase, whether as head or modifier. Obviously both these changes are connected with each other. They both tie in with a development towards a differentiation between nouns and verbs which is more pronounced than that of the older morphology.

Looking at the system of Classical Newari it is not easy to say what should have occasioned the change in verbal morphology. For two reasons I do not think a supposed requirement to formally differentiate attributive from predicative usage of the verb is, in itself, a sufficient explanation:

- 1) Newari is a rigid SOV language and thus with verbal modifiers limited to the stative/habitual form of the paradigm (cf. above 2.1.) attributive usage would still be adequately marked by its relative position preceding a noun. Word order is perfectly sufficient to keep (predication) chem̃ bāmlā "the house is nice" and bāmlā chem̃ "a/the nice house" (attributive) distinct.
- 2) We have seen that the older affixless type of construction does in fact survive alongside with the more recent affixed pattern. But bāmlā chem̃ no longer is what it was in the older language, viz., a free adjunction of noun phrase constituents; it has been narrowed into a restricted construction type that results in the conceptual fusion of its constituent parts.

The contrast of affix vs. -∅, then affords further confirmation of the analysis advanced above: that the affixes are essentially categorial markers signalling that a given item or construction belongs to the category of nouns, while it does in no way signal its syntactic status as head or modifier respectively.

The apparent deviation from group inflection observed above, 2.1., p. 5, is in accordance with this statement: in a pluralized phrase, plurality has to be marked by means of the appropriate affix -pim no matter whether the nominalized form figures as head or modifier.

A phrase that would show differentiation between head and modifier (by the choice of a different affix in each case) on the other hand is plainly ungrammatical: \*ballāh-mha manuta with a modifier formally distinguished from the corresponding independent noun ballāh-pim is not even remotely possible in Newari.

The contrast affix vs. -∅, i.e. accidental conjunction vs. semantic restriction, reveals an essential feature of noun phrase formation: an item that is to form part of a noun phrase (rather than part of a single term) must conform to the categorial status of the whole construction of which it

forms a part, i.e. it must be a noun. This is tantamount to saying that nominalization implies a concord feature: the items joined in a noun phrase must all of them bear a signal of their categorial identity.

Failure of marking categorial concord however does not automatically lead to ungrammatical expressions: phrases like bāṃlā cheṃ though not too common, retain the older pattern. But they are terms, lexical items rather than accidental syntagmatic constructions. At that, they exemplify the overlap between a tendency towards innovation and an opposite tendency of conservatism: an older technique is not altogether dropped, but it acquires a different value within the system: the diachronic development seems to show but two sides of the same coin: differentiation of nouns and verbs is essentially a syntactical development mirrored in morphology, it entails concomitant syntactical changes, substituting a new pattern of noun phrase formation for the older one. The retention of the latter exemplifies a complementary development: expressions that originally were free syntactical formations gradually tend to lose their syntagmatic power and finally end up as frozen lexical items.

## 2.6. Affixed Genitives

While nominalization plainly appears as the function of the affixes in the constructions so far inspected, no such interpretation could plausibly hold good for the fact already briefly mentioned above, p. 3 that -mha, -piṃ, -gu also occur to mark genitival determiners in a noun phrase. Apparently at first sight, they look like optional variants. It is thus both possible to say, e.g.

(22) misā-yā-gu tisā

woman-of (inan) ornament      "a/the woman's ornament (s)"

or

(23) misā-yā tisā      "a/the woman's ornament (s)"

In any case my informants found it difficult to point to a tangible difference in meaning between the two kinds of expression.

Now it is not easy to see why a genitive - which in itself clearly is a nominal form - should occur with markers that otherwise serve as nominalizers.

As to semantics, a genitive determiner in a noun phrase will in most cases indicate possession. The construction, however, is not limited to this relation: it is also used to give the relation of a whole to its parts, the material quality of an object and the like.

Fortunately, not all genitives can take or leave out the affix: there are certain preferences towards one or the other phrase which are conditioned by the semantic features of both head and determiner. For this reason, the following account will again refer to the basic dichotomy of Newari nouns (nouns denoting inanimates vs. nouns denoting animates) (cf. above p. 1).

#### 2.6.1. Genitives Depending on Heads Denoting Inanimates

Dependent genitives can come from both noun types, animates and inanimates. Examples are

##### TYPE I. Inanimate genitives

- |                         |                          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| (24) parsi-yā buntā     | "the design of the sari" |
| sari-of design          | NO AFFIX                 |
| (25) lum-yā-gu tisā     | "an ornament of gold"    |
| gold-of-(inan) ornament | AFFIX                    |
| (26) suti-yā-gu kāmīc   | "A cotton shirt"         |
| cotton-of-(inan) shirt  | AFFIX                    |



TYPE II. Animate genitives

- (27) rām-yā-gu pasah "Ram's shop"  
Ram-of-(inan) shop AFFIX
- (28) va-yā-gu lhaḥ "his hand"  
he-of-(inan) hand AFFIX
- (29) rām-yā kay-pini-gu chem "the house of Ram's sons"  
Ram-of son-(gen pl)-(inan) house

In all cases, the affix -gu - which semantically corresponds to the noun class of the head of the construction - can be missing. There is, however, a most decided predilection to use it in TYPE II. These are the cases where we observe an incongruity with respect to the features an/inan between the head and its determiner (s). This type includes most possessive relations.

As opposed to these, TYPE I (inanimate genitives added to inanimate heads) often denote relations which are not possessive in character. It is these that lead us towards a precision of the meaning of the affix.

If the word 'copper', sijā, is joined to the word for 'pot', ghah, there are the following three possibilities, all of which are grammatically correct.

TYPE IA. (noun + noun) sijā ghah

TYPE IB. (noun + gen. affix + noun) sija-yā ghah

TYPE IC. (noun + gen. affix + gu + noun) sija-yā-gu ghah

Now, as against IA and IB the meaning of IC is distinct. Both IA and IB convey a fairly similar meaning which may be glossed as 'a copper pot', 'a pot made of copper' respectively. Juncture by means of a genitive marker + -gu on the other hand brings about a contrastive value of the determiner: in this case the phrase refers to an individual pot which by virtue of its being made of copper can be distinguished from other pots that happen not to share this feature. In other words, while the notion of material quality usually has a predominantly descriptive value, it is here utilized for a predominantly referential purpose

in a particular situation, and this contrastive referential value is conveyed by the use of the affix -gu.

The contrast between the two other members of this set (IA vs. IB) is more difficult:

As Seiler (1977) has demonstrated, there is a gradation of concepts in noun phrases (squish), in which the notion of material quality figures next to the notion conveyed by the head of the noun phrase.<sup>14</sup> In this sequence of determiners, the items which denote the material quality are that section of the squish that most naturally enters into fusion with the concept denoted by the head. Now, just because within this squish, material quality is conceptually closest to the head noun, it may be difficult to clearly isolate the difference in meaning between expressions like Newari IA and IB. A native speaker of German will have the same difficulty when trying to get hold of a contrast in meaning between pairs like 'ein Kupfertopf/ ein kupferner Topf; eine Holzkugel/eine hölzerne Kugel'.

While thus the example given here does not lend itself to contrasting the forms of IA and IB, I have found another instance easier: Both kisiyā-tuti and kisi tuti may mean 'an elephant's leg'. If this phrase however is used metaphorically, to denote 'the state of an elephant's leg', i.e. 'elephantiasis', Newari will only use type IA kisi tuti.

Thus the three types figure on a scale of relatively closer or looser juncture: in kisi-yā-gu tuti the affix added to the genitive effects maximum independence of the components of the phrase. This is obviously analogous to the use of the affix on verbal modifiers: -gu in bāmlā-gu chem "a beautiful house" serves to maintain the independence of the modifier constituent which is lost in bāmlā chem, with the affix missing. Type IC kisi tuti/sijā ghaḥ 'a copper pot' on the other hand represents the closest possible juncture, which is at least potentially subject

to various kinds of semantic narrowing lexicalization, metaphorization ect. IB sija-yā ghaḥ "a copper pot" occupies an intermediate position. While the genitival ending plainly marks sijā-yā as a dependent form, its meaning is clearly kept separate from the meaning of the head noun, though due to its conceptual status in a squish of determiners, there is no vital semantic difference between a formally fused expression, like sijā ghaḥ, and an unfused one.

With this background, it is now easy to see why in Type II, i.e. in the phrases expressing possessive relations, the affixed variant is the normal turn of speech. A possessor phrase predominantly serves referential purposes, and the denotatum of the possessor phrase is naturally and normally kept conceptually apart from the meaning of the head noun. That this conceptual separation of the joined constituents again depends on the use of the affix -gu emerges clearly from a comparison of

(30) rāmyā-gu tasbir "Ram's picture"

vs.

(31) rāmyā tasbir

In the former phrase rāmyā-gu denotes the possessor and there is no descriptive value implied. The other phrase rāmyā tasbir means 'the/a picture of Ram', i.e. a picture that shows Ram. The genitive without the affix is used to convey descriptive information on the object while none is given about its possessor.

Of course, there are numerous instances where the distinction cannot be grasped as readily. Take rāmyāgu tapuli vs. rāmyā tapuli "Ram's cap": exactly analogous to the preceding pair, rāmyāgu tapuli denotes a possessive relationship. Side by side with this, rāmyā tapuli has its use, which is something like the following. The caps Ram habitually wears of course show characteristic properties: costly or cheap, made of silk or cotton, embroidered

or not, etc. Now, rather than to describe the object in a laboured way, I can shorten my task by saying rāmyā tapuli, which evokes the image of a cap as usually worn by Ram. There is a possessor, to be sure - but it is not him the speaker is aiming at; he wants to pin down the nature of the cap. No doubt this distinction such as it works out in this pair will occasionally be hard to prove as convincingly as in the case of "Ram's picture" vs. "the picture of Ram". This is why informants often say genitives with and without -gu are used indiscriminately. Still, this lack of practical determination does not really affect the conclusion. If possession is what the speaker wants to denote, then -yāgu/-pinigu will be chosen; if the affix is missing, the genitive will convey a descriptive component.

#### 2.6.2. Genitives Depending on Heads Denoting Animates

Again, genitives belonging to both noun types can depend on nouns denoting animates: (both head and determiner are thus variable for sg. and plural):

##### TYPE I. Inanimate genitives

- |                          |                                 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (32) darbar-yā-mha manu  | "the/a man from the palace"     |
|                          | AFFIX                           |
| (33) ana-yā-mha lumkaḥmi | "the/a goldsmith of this place" |
|                          | AFFIX                           |
| (34) darbar-yā manu      | "the/a man from the palace"     |
|                          | NO AFFIX                        |

##### TYPE II. Animate genitives

- |                       |                           |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| (35) jyāpu-yā me      | "the peasant's buffalo"   |
|                       | NO AFFIX                  |
| (36) va-yā kāy        | "his son"                 |
|                       | NO AFFIX                  |
| (37) pasutay juju     | "the king of the animals" |
|                       | NO AFFIX                  |
| (38) rām-yā-mha kalāḥ | Ram's wife"               |

(39) rām-yā kāypim "Ram's son"  
AFFIX (pim) IMPOSSIBLE

Affixed alternatives are frequent only in Type I. They do occur in Type II, but in that case they show a distinct and specialized meaning which we shall presently come to.

The first rule we can observe is this: Affixes referring to animates again occur when determiner and head are incongruous as to the crucial semantic feature. In our present instance, we find the affix in Type I, while with inanimate heads we had it in Type II which gives us a complementary distribution.

However, the pattern: genitive + Head<sub>an</sub> is not in all points the precise counterpart to the pattern genitive + head<sub>inan</sub>. There are two deviations emerging from the examples above.

1) Phrases like (38) rāmyā-mha kalāḥ as against its affixless variant, rāmyā kalaḥ 'Ram's wife', are of highly restricted occurrence. They presuppose the presence of a number of people present at a given time among whom the speaker wants to single out a particular individual. Thus, a paraphrase for (38) would have to run like "Ram's wife among all those who are present - (and nobody else)". This type of phrase again may assume an emotional value: ji-mha kāy "my-(aff) son" contrasted with normal ji kāy implies considerable pride on the part of the speaker.

Now the structure of (38) is peculiar: in analogy with the example sijāyāgu ghaḥ above (p. 15) one would expect a parallel contrastive effect of the affixed genitive rāmyāmha that should presuppose a contrast between Ram's wife and somebody else's. However, though the affix certainly conveys a strongly referential sense in particularizing the object denoted by the head (kalāḥ), the contrastive information is not actually contained in the genitive the affix is joined to;

2) The expected pluralized equivalent of (38) should be

(40) \*rāmyā-piṃ kāypiṃ "Ram's sons (- and no one else)"

This phrase, however, is ungrammatical. What informants will admit to denote this meaning is

(41) rāmyā-mha kāypiṃ

Speakers will not unanimously accept (41), and those who do seem to take it as a somewhat unnatural expression - particularization would be applied with a singular rather than with a plural meaning.

To account for these deviations we must revert to the fact noted at the outset that the forms -gu// -mha/-piṃ bear no etymological relations to each other:

-piṃ is the normal plural marker for honorific animates in the nominative case (kāy-piṃ in (39) exemplifies this subset). This predominant function conflicts with the application of -piṃ in the present context.

There are two reasons why a pluralization of rāmyā analogous to the pluralization of nominalized verbs (type ballah-piṃ "the strong ones") is impossible: First, rāmyā is a singular. Adding a plural morpheme would result in a conflict of number markings which Newari can neither tolerate nor resolve. Second, the ordering of affixes in Newari - which is an agglutinative language - precludes a sequence \*-yā- + -piṃ or, to take the equivalents of Classical Newari with its richer paradigm - of \*-yā + pani: the plural morpheme is always found next to the nominal root, and case markers are in all cases added to this unit.

The mechanism of affixing a form that is a noun in itself is thus blocked because of the diverging uses of the affix -piṃ. In the environment of a nominal form its other interpretation as honorific plural marker precludes the formation of items like \*rāmyā-piṃ,

Similarly, the deviation noted with (38) rāmyā-mha kalāḥ suggests an analysis that reflects the status of mha as an independent lexical item (with the meaning 'body-self/individual'). The first step is the formation of rāmyā mha 'the/an individual of Ram's'.

In a second stage, we find this individual specified: kalāḥ or kāyṣiṃ are added by way of apposition. Then, phrases like rāmyā mha kalāḥ come under the pressure of all those frequent cases where we have a sequence of Determiner + Affix + Head: instances like rāmyāgu tasbir 'Ram's picture', bhimṃmha kalāḥ 'a good wife', etc. In analogy to all these, univerbalization of expressions like (38) and (41) has taken place.

This contrast clearly shows the affixless construction to be the normal, unmarked type of expression. The ending of the genitive, -yā, marks the syntactical relation of dependent vs. governing nouns. The affix provides a significant semantic addition as against the unmarked phrase. (A similar function will be found in §2.7.).

This explanation provides an interesting sidelight on the grammatical status of the unit of genitive plus affix. The genitive, as we have said, marks syntactical dependence - and the item it depends on is mha. The formation of items like rāmyāmha 'individual of Ram's' combined with kalāḥ 'wife' in (38) is occasioned by analogy to the status of other affixed determiners (chiefly deverbatives). Now on the whole the evidence suggests that subordination of affixed items is in Newari actually much less pronounced than one would expect from other languages. In this context, the derivation of rāmyāmha here proposed is significant. Semantic analysis leads us to the conclusion that in (38) and (41) we have a conjunction of two units sharing the same status, their mutual relation being established only by juxtaposition on phrase level.

This looks like mixing diachronic and synchronic argumentation, which may be thought objectionable as such. The justification is very simple. From a synchronic point of view, with the affixes faithfully reproducing semantic features of their heads, there is no way to account for the incongruity of (41) where an animate singular determiner is in the same NP found together with an animate plural head. In any other context, this is just bad grammar. Now the explanation suggested does assume a stage where univerbation of rāmyā and mha had not yet taken place. With this assumption, the incongruity loses the offensive character it does have in the system of contemporary Newari: (41) can be shown to fit. For this reason, the assumption is not irrelevant to a synchronic description.

It was noted above that the forms -mha/-piṃ/-gu have been adopted from heterogeneous sources into an only recently developed pattern. What the deviations just discussed seem to show is that the three forms chosen have submerged in their comparatively younger function to a different extent: with -gu there is no current other usage that could create a disturbance. Against that, both -mha and -piṃ in the new pattern reflect their original and still quite current meanings to a certain extent.

This however does not seriously affect their more recent value: the only conflict arises in a marked construction where a contrastive meaning of a genitival determiner is to be transmitted; here the ungrammatical construction \*rāmyā-piṃ kāypiṃ may be readily circumvented by other possible means denoting contrast.

Finally, a word about the contrast between (32) darbaryāmha manu vs. (34) darbaryā manu 'the/a man from/of the palace'. I have found it difficult to elicit information as to the semantic difference between these alternatives. However, there seems to be a preference for the affixed form - which is in keeping with the rule that affixes



are used whenever determiner and head do not belong to the same class of nouns (see §2.6.3). It is of course possible to construct an argument analogous to the one actually attested for -gu (p. 17). Then, the conceptual junction between determiner and head should, in (34), be closer than in (32) where the affix imparts grammatical independence to the determiner. Comments by my informants were inconclusive, though.

### 2.6.3. Summary

When describing the use of affixes with adnominal genitives, we have to distinguish between a basic, unmarked and a marked variant.

In order to form an unmarked genitival determiner, both determiner and head have to belong to one and the same class of nouns, i.e. both have to share the relevant semantic features of plus or minus animate. This means inanimate determiners are joined to inanimate heads without an affix being added; animates are joined to animates the same way. If there is a discrepancy as to noun class between them, the appropriate affix will be used, which brings the determiner into the noun class of its head. The results can be conveniently assembled to form the following diagram:

Determiner (Genitive)	Affix	Head
animate	+	inanimate
inanimate	-	inanimate
animate	-	animate
inanimate	+	animate

DIAGRAM II: Distribution of Affixes after Genitives in  
Unmarked Contexts

Marked variants are set off from this by the opposite distribution. Interestingly enough, marked affixed variants (sijāyāgu ghaḥ 'the particular pot which is made of copper' and rāmyāmha kalāḥ 'the individual among those present who is Ram's wife') are held together by a common characteristic: they denote an individual or particular item selected from a number of similar ones, i.e. they presuppose an implied plural. As against these, marked unaffixed expressions are distinguished from their unmarked counterparts in that the former show a greater degree of conceptual fusion. For inanimate determiners joined to animate heads (darbāryā manū 'the/a man from the palace') this could at present only be surmised; for the inverse case (animate joined to inanimate) it has been demonstrated (rāmyā tasbīr 'the/a picture of Ram's, a picture showing Ram').

In conclusion, a look at the reflexive thaḥ 'own' may be instructive, though this is not a genitive. It is used as a possessive in cases of referential identity between subject and possessor. Here we find a distribution which is plainly governed by the same principles that genitives follow. The unmarked variant has the affix whenever the head is inanimate, while there is no affix with animate heads:

- (42) thaḥ-gu māl 'own goods' vs.  
(43) thaḥ dāju 'own elder brother'.

Now, there is an idiom which runs counter to this distribution. This is

- (44) thaḥ chem 'own house'

It is not synonymous with thaḥgu chem, formed in analogy to (42) and meaning 'own house', which may be used in any context. In contrast, (44) means 'the house one was born in, the birth place; the family home of a married woman (who after marriage of course goes to another house, that of her husband's family)'. In this instance, we again encounter the fusion of the meanings of the two constituents of the phrase.

## 2.7. Ordinal Numbers

We may at this point mention a further use of the affixes -gu/-mha that is obviously closely related to the marked affixed constructions observed with adnominal genitives.

Among Newari numerals, ordinals are formed by combining the cardinal number construction (i.e. cardinal number + numeral classifier, obligatorily conjoined) with either -gu or -mha:

Thus from

(45) chem̃ ni-khāḥ "two houses"

(46) kāypim̃ nyā-mha "five sons"  
son-(pl) 5-(clf)

the ordinals

(47) chem̃ ni-khāḥ-gu "the second house"

(48) kāy nyā-mha-mha "the fifth son"

are derived. No doubt, these formations are most easily understood in analogy to the marked types just discussed: the attention is being focused upon one of the two houses, or one of the five sons, the remaining other ones being by implication contrasted. The affix again serves to pin down a particular individual or object.

## 2.8. Affixed Demonstratives

Finally, the affixes can be added to demonstratives:

(49) thva 'this'

(i) thu-gu chem̃ 'this particular house'

(ii) thu-mha manu 'this particular man'

(iii) thu-pim̃ manuta 'these particular men'

- (50) va 'that'  
(i) u-gu chem̃ 'that particular house'  
(ii) u-mha manu 'that particular man'  
(iii) u-piṃ manuta 'those particular men'  
etc.

These forms are used the same way marked affixed genitives of the type sijayā-gu ghaḥ or rāmyā-mha kalāḥ are used: they presuppose a situation where the relevant contrastive information is supplied by the demonstrative, which for this reason is provided with an affix. Thus, affixation here again intensifies the referential properties of the demonstrative.

Now, while the contrastive interpretation of affixed genitives is essentially conditioned by the ±animate distinction in adjoining nouns, this distinction is neutralized with demonstratives:

- 1) They freely combine with both noun classes (and either number of the animate subclass),
- 2) They are anaphorically substituted for any noun.

Thus, the contrastive interpretation is, in those cases, the only possible one - since neither nominal status nor conceptual conformity have to be signaled in order to avoid semantic restrictions.

### 3. Conclusion

#### 3.1. The System of Marking

In the various distributions surveyed above several functions of affixation clearly emerge:

a) nominalization of non-nouns

and, naturally closely related in view of the pre-established subdivision of Newari nouns

b) marking of conceptual congruity with respect to the features  $\pm$ animate.

The salient point, however, which regulates the mechanism of affixation is to be deduced from the contrast of affixed vs. unaffixed constructions: it has become obvious that the affixes cannot be taken as subordination markers or linking particles. Their crucial function lies in safeguarding the conceptual autonomy of the constituents of an endocentric nominal construction. From this common basic function the different functional interpretations which suggest themselves for the different environments in which the affixes appear can all be related to each other in terms of a coherent rule observed in all nominal constructions.

In order to form a noun phrase - i.e. an accidental syntagmatic conjunction that within a sentence will figure as one nominal constituent - it is necessary for any element within the scope of the noun phrase to be identifiable as a member of the word class N. Categorical status as N is required for any element, no matter whether it is to be employed as head or determiner. Whenever an element does not in itself pertain to the category N, it has to be transferred. This transfer is effected by the use of an affix.

Now, since the category N is throughout subdivided into the subcategories  $\pm$ animate, nominalization always implies the choice of one of the subclasses which a given nominalized expression conceptually will adhere to.

If this condition is violated, fusion of the constituent parts will take place. A verb without a marker signalling categorial shift becomes an integral part of a lexicalized expression the meaning of which is not necessarily predictable from the isolated meanings of its constituent parts. This is the opposition between expressions like

(51) hyāuṃ-gu chem̃

"a red house" vs.

(52) hyāuṃ chem̃

"Redhouse" (as a place name)

This might seem tantamount to saying that any nominalized form, in that it has to be subsumed under one of the noun subcategories, is of necessity a subordinate form that derives its membership in either noun class from a - possibly deleted - noun head it depends on. On this reading, affixation would primarily appear as a mechanism of concord. This, however, surely is not an adequate explanation of the evidence: obviously, in an adjunction of several noun phrase constituents congruity is achieved by the choice of the conceptually appropriate noun subclass. This, however, is but a natural consequence of the vital condition of isolating the constituents against each other. Classmembership of Newari nouns is exclusively determined by conceptual criteria. The morphological devices that effect nominalization map the conceptual distinction on derived nominal forms by providing a different form for each subset. The choice of noun subcategory has nothing in common with grammatical concord familiar from Indo-European languages.

By the same rule it is easy to see why genitives show a more complex distribution than verbal modifiers:

- a) here the affixes operate on nouns, that is on forms that in themselves are determined as to noun class.
- b) on the other hand, the genitival ending marks a given noun as a dependent form that requires a further element for its grammatical completion - typically another noun.<sup>16</sup>

Both these conditions explain why genitives are sensitive to the class membership of the noun they are joined to. Again the salient function of affixation lies in effecting mutual independence of the constituents which depends on a uniform conceptual status of any single noun phrase element. Where this condition is fulfilled by the elements in themselves, they are freely juxtaposed - no additional marker is required. Where it is not, two possibilities arise: either the dependent constituent of the NP is assimilated to the head. This is brought about by applying the adequate affix. Or, when no affix is used, a semantically restricted

construction ensues, analogous to the semantically narrowed formations found with verbal modifiers. This is the contrast between rāmyā-gu tasbir "Ram's picture" (possessive) and rāmyā tasbir "a picture (showing) Ram", or thah-gu chem "own house" and thah chem "birthplace (of a woman)".

Now, the mechanism regulating affixation is in each case utilized to contrast an unmarked and a marked variant. Wherever the affixes are necessary to maintain the mutual independence of constituents (which is the crucial characteristic of an NP), the affixed constructions are the neutral, unmarked ones, while their affixless counterparts are marked, being subject to semantic changes that cannot be anticipated. This holds for all adjectivals and for those genitives that are incongruent as to noun subclass in a given combination of head + genitival determiner.

If, however, the individual constituents both are either plus or minus animate the unaffixed forms yield the unmarked constructions, while the corresponding affixed forms are utilized for denoting a contrastive meaning. In other words, in such marked constructions the affixes are set free to produce a syntactic effect altogether at the optional disposal of the speaker (who might also choose other contrastive devices). In this type of marked construction, then, an intensification of the separating function the affixes have in all their occurrences is brought about, because they occur with elements that in themselves are kept conceptually separate. This is illustrated by the following oppositions:

Unmarked constructions

Marked constructions

	Det	Head
{	hyāuṃ-gu	cheṃ
	"a red house"	
	rāmyā-gu	tasbir
	"Rams's picture"	
{	darbaryā-mha	manu
	"man from the palace"	
	thaḥ-gu	cheṃ
	"own house"	

	Det	Head
{	hyāuṃ	cheṃ
	"Redhouse"	
	rāmyā	tasbir
	"a picture (showing) Ram"	
{	darbaryā	manu
	"palace servant"	
	thaḥ	cheṃ
	"birthplace"	

- - - -

	Det	Head
{	rāmyā	kāy
	"Ram's son"	
	sijayā	ghaḥ
	"a pot (made) of copper"	
{	thva	cheṃ
	"this house"	
	thva	misā
	"this woman"	

	Det	Head
{	rāmyā-mha	kāy
	"Ram's son (and no one else)"	
	sijayā-gu	ghaḥ
	"a pot (made) of <u>copper</u> (and not of iron)"	
{	thu-gu	cheṃ
	"this particular house"	
	thu-mha	misā
	"this particular woman"	

3.2. Determination and Descriptive Terms: Gradation of Constructions

Taken together, the range of contrasting affixed and unaffixed constructions exemplify the close interaction of two functional principles: the syntagmatic function of nominal determination on the one hand and the paradigmatic function of forming new terms on the other.

Now, it has been shown by Seiler 1977 that the functional "tasks"<sup>17</sup> natural languages have to fulfill are to be viewed as dimensions, as graded scales of functional values. This



was demonstrated with respect to nominal determination: the converse functions of referential determination (specifying function) and conceptual determination (characterizing function)<sup>18</sup> represent a graded continuum between two opposite poles. There is one pole of maximum conceptual distance between head and determiner which represents the maximum of referential capacity, (typically expressed by determiners such as demonstrative), and an opposite pole of maximum conceptual proximity representing the maximum of descriptive capacity, expressed by certain types of descriptive adjectives.<sup>19</sup>

Similarly, the notion of gradation is valid with respect to the function of forming terms: word formations found in natural languages will range from instances of maximum transparency (items like e.g. German "Holzkugel" would be in point) to mere labels with no descriptive value at all.<sup>20</sup>

Now, the way affixation vs. non-affixation is contrasted in Newari ties in with this notion of dimensional organization: both the function of nominal determination as a syntagmatic process and the function of term formation as a paradigmatic one tie in with each other by the application of one common technique. By virtue of this technique, the constructions we have analyzed present themselves as the exponents of one contingent scale. One end of this scale is illustrated by such phrases as:

thu-gu tasbir	"this <u>particular</u> picture"
rāmyā-mha kāy	"Ram's son - (and no one else)"
sijayā-gu ghaḥ	"a pot (made) of <u>copper</u> - (and not e.g. of iron)"

Here the affixes set off a marked construction against an unmarked, unaffixed one which latter would not violate any rule of noun phrase formation. These marked constructions are bound to special conditions of the speech situation: affixation serves to achieve maximum relative independence between the constituents with the result of maximum referential capacity of the affixed forms, Such usage naturally

coincides with the fact that the affixes are altogether optional - the syntactical effect here achieved might well be brought about by employing different means.

The next section of the scale is represented in unmarked constructions like e.g.

thva khicā	"this dog"
rāmyā kāy	"Ram's son"
sijāyā ghaḥ	"a pot (made) of copper"
rāmyā-gu tasbir	"Ram's picture"
bāmlā-gu chem̃	"a beautiful house" etc.

The phrases cited are all neutral in the sense that no particular constituent of the NP is focused upon, nor do any semantic restrictions affect the meaning of the phrase. Both affixed and unaffixed constructions occur, and, at that, in referential function as well as in characterizing function (rāmyā-gu tasbir vs. bāmlā-gu chem̃) - a gradation between these two functions in a neutral noun phrase is to a certain extent borne out by word order.<sup>16</sup> The choice between the alternatives is conditioned by the rule that a normal straightforward noun phrase has to be formed of elements that all conform to an identical conceptual status, the features at issue being

- a) status as a noun of any constituent, and
- b) semantic conformity as to the #animate distinction within this category.

Due to these conditions, a demonstrative never actually requires an affix to yield an unmarked construction (cf. above §2.8., p. 25); genitival constituents cannot be a priori related to either pattern - (which construction is to be chosen simply depends on the accidental conjunction a speaker may wish to form); and finally, any adjectival constituent is obligatorily affixed. In forming a normal endocentric construction, then, the affixes fulfill their crucial function and cannot be dispensed with without essentially changing the whole construction.

Again, affixless constructions violating the rules of noun phrase formation constitute marked constructions that figure at the opposite end of the scale. These are cases like

rāmyā tasbir	"a picture showing Ram / Ram's likeness"
darbaryā manu	"a servant of the palace"
thaḥ chem̃	"birthplace"
hyāum chem̃	"the 'Redhouse'"

Here the juncture of unaffixed constituents yields expressions that cannot be interpreted in terms of noun phrase formation. The constituents form a close-knit unit, a term that is subject to different ways of semantic narrowing. Now, semantic narrowing is one of the salient features by which lexical, i.e. paradigmatic formations contrast with syntagmatic constructions. Nonetheless, the fused terms of course retain a high degree of transparency - as terms they would have to be assigned a high descriptive value within a scale of more or less descriptive word structures of Newari.

Thus, in Newari the function of nominal determination as a syntagmatic process and term formation as a paradigmatic one overlap in the application of one common technique. By virtue of this technique both these functions can in Newari be shown to be interrelated in a complementary way. Maximally referential (contrastive) expressions on the one hand and fused lexical expressions on the other are structurally related to each other: they both figure with opposite functional values in the same system of unmarked vs. marked constructions.

Footnotes

- 1) The materials used in this paper have partly been collected during a stay in Nepal in spring 1975. I should like here to express my gratitude to the numerous people who have been helping me, especially Mr. Th. L. Manandhar and Mr. B. Citrakar. Additional data have been kindly provided later by Mr. K.K. Shrestha and Mr. S.K. Shrestha whom I should also like to thank for their cooperation.
- 2) The label 'determiner' - in accordance with the terminology used in Seiler 1976 and 1977 - is here taken in a wide sense - it refers to any of the constituents that may expand a noun into an endocentric noun phrase - such as demonstrative, possessive, quantifier, adjective, relative clause. Besides this comprehensive term the labels "modifier" or "attribute" are used in this paper to denote the specific subset of determiners which predominantly serves descriptive or characterizing purposes. (Cf. Seiler 1976, p. 5, 10).
- 3) Such linking devices would not appear unfamiliar in a Tibeto-Burman language - compare e.g. the use of the particles té and mé in Burmese (Okell 1969, p. 59f.).
- 4) For the notion of "principle" cf. Seiler 1977,2, p.3: the term refers to the purposive functions which are achieved in natural languages by different kinds of techniques, typically bearing complementary relationships.
- 5) Rarely nouns denoting inanimates are found with one subset of the plural markers for nouns denoting animates. No such formation, however, conveys a real plural sense: in such cases a generic meaning is usually expressed - the pluralized forms would be interpreted as "kinds of x" instead of "more than one x".

- 6) Cf. Jørgensen 1936, s.v.
- 7) For details on verbal morphology of modern Newari cf. Hale et al. 1971, p. 79ff.
- 8) For more detail on this type of adjective formation cf. Hale and Hale 1970, p. 138, and Kölver 1978 (forthcoming).
- 9) The use observed with Newari -gu incidentally displays a striking similarity with constructions Matisoff 1972 analyzed in Lahu. The nominalizing particle -ve in Lahu is employed the same way as Newari -gu with the main predicate of a sentence turning the entire construction into a nominal form. Matisoff's claim, however, that these Lahu constructions constitute nominalizations "which are embedded to nothing larger than themselves" (p. 246) could not be maintained for the analogous Newari formations, since these can be shown to be embedded to - optionally deleted - copula in all their occurrences. Thus, in spite of the suggestive surface similarity, the Newari constructions containing a nominalizer on what seems to be the main predicate are in fact dependent on a predication outside the nominalized construction.
- 10) Thus, nominalization of entire sentences in Newari illustrates a process quite familiar in its logical structure: by way of nominalization a predication is transferred into an argument which in its turn depends on a predication on a higher level. Cf. van den Boom 1975, p. 66f. and Seiler 1975, p. 8ff.
- 11) The term "Classical Newari" referring to the older strata of the language as recorded in manuscripts throughout roughly the 17th - 19th century was introduced by H. Jørgensen.

- 12) Cf. Konow 1908, p.217.
- 13) Cf. Kölver and Kölver (forthcoming).
- 14) Cf. Seiler 1977, p. 12.
- 15) -gu otherwise is from early on found as a numeral classifier. In this meaning it could not conflict with the constructions presently discussed, since the use of classifiers is strictly limited in Newari to numerals.
- 16) Genitives in Newari may occur depending on a clause substituting for the nominative or the agentive case under certain conditions, for more detail cf. Kölver 1976, p. 102ff. In such constructions a genitive is never affixed.
- 17) Cf. Seiler 1973, p. 11.
- 18) Cf. Seiler 1977,2, p. 26.
- 19) Cf. Seiler 1977,2, especially p. 11ff.
- 20) Cf. Seiler 1975, esp. p. 41ff.

References

- Hale, A.E. and M. Hale  
1970 "Newari Texts", Occasional Papers of the Wolfenden Society on Tibeto-Burman Linguistics, ed. by F.K. Lehman, Urbana: Dept. of Linguistics, University of Illinois, 3,4,2, p. 131-281.
- Hale, A.A. et al. (= Shresthacharya, I., Maskey, J., and Hale, A.E.)  
1971 Conversational Newari, Kirtipur: Summer Institute of Linguistics (prepubl.)
- Jørgensen, H.  
1936 A Dictionary of the Classical Newari (= Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 'Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. 23,1), Copenhagen  
1941 A Grammar of the Classical Newari (= Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 'Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. 27,3), Copenhagen
- Kölver, U.  
1976 Satztypen und Verbsubkategorisierung der Newari (= Structura 10), München  
1978 "On Newari Noun Phrases", to appear in Papers from the Gummersbach Conference on Language Universals, ed. by H. Seiler, The Hague
- Kölver, B. and U. Kölver  
1978 "On Newari Verbal Morphology", to appear in Zentralasiatische Studien 12, Wiesbaden
- Konow, S.  
1908 Linguistic Survey of India, 3,1: Tibeto-Burman Family, Calcutta
- Matisoff, J.  
1972 "Lahu Nominalization, Relativization and Genitivization", Syntax and Semantics 1, ed. by J.P. Kimball, New York and London, p. 237-257.

Okell, J.

1969 A Reference Grammar of Colloquial Burmese,  
Oxford.

Seiler, H.

1973 "Das Universalienkonzept", Linguistic Workshop 1  
(= Structura 4), ed. by H. Seiler, München, p. 6-19.

1975 "Die Prinzipien der deskriptiven und der  
etikettierenden Benennung", Linguistic Workshop 3,  
(= Structura 9), ed. by H. Seiler, München, p. 2-57.

1976 "Determination: A Universal Dimension for Inter-  
language Comparison". (= Arbeiten des Kölner  
Universalienprojekts 23), (preliminary version).

1977 "Determination: A Functional Dimension for Inter-  
Language Comparison" (= Arbeiten des Kölner  
Universalienprojekts 23,2), Cologne.

van den Boom, H.

1975 "Zum Verhältnis von Logik und Grammatik am Bei-  
spiel des neuinterpretierten  $\lambda$ -Operators",  
Linguistic Workshop 3 (= Structura 9), ed. by  
H. Seiler, p. 58-92.



In der Reihe akup erscheinen die Arbeiten des Kölner Universalienprojekts (DFG-Projekt, Leitung Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler). Die Nummern 1 - 15 sind erschienen als Linguistic Workshop I - III (LW I, LW II, LW III), München: Fink 1973-75.

1. Seiler, H. 1973, "Das Universalienkonzept", LW I, 6-19
2. Lehmann, C. 1973, "Wortstellung in Fragesätzen", LW I, 20-53
3. Ibañez, R. 1973, "Programmatische Skizze: Intonation und Frage", LW I, 54-61
4. Brettschneider, G. 1973, "'Sexus' im Baskischen: Die sprachliche Umsetzung einer kognitiven Kategorie", LW I, 62-72
5. Stephany, U. 1973, "Zur Rolle der Wiederholung in der sprachlichen Kommunikation zwischen Kind und Erwachsenen", LW I, 73-98
6. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance: Instrumental, Comitative and Collective (With special reference to German)", LW II, 2-55
7. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance in Uto-Aztecan", LW II, 56-68
8. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Prinzipien für 'Universal 14'", LW II, 69-97
9. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Isomorphismus im sprachlichen Zeichen", LW II, 98-123
10. Seiler, H. 1975, "Die Prinzipien der deskriptiven und der etikettierenden Benennung", LW III, 2-57
11. Boom, H. van den 1975, "Zum Verhältnis von Logik und Grammatik am Beispiel des neuinterpretierten  $\lambda$ -Operators", LW III, 58-92
12. Untermann, J. 1975, "Etymologie und Wortgeschichte", LW III, 93-116
13. Lehmann, C. 1975, "Strategien für Relativsätze", LW III, 117-156
14. Ultan, R. 1975, "Infixes and their origins" LW III, 157-205

15. Stephany, U. 1975. "Linguistic and extralinguistic factors in the interpretation of children's early utterances", LW III: 206-233.
16. Ultan, R. 1975. "Descriptivity grading of Finnish body-part terms"
17. Lehmann, C. 1975. "Determination, Bezugsnomen und Pronomen im Relativsatz"
18. Seiler, H. 1975. "Language Universals and Interlinguistic Variation"
19. Holenstein, E. 1975. "Semiotische Philosophie?"
20. Seiler, H. 1976. "Introductory Notes to a Grammar of Cahuilla" (To appear in Linguistic Studies offered to Joseph Greenberg on the occasion of his 60th birthday)
21. Ultan, R. 1976. "Descriptivity in the Domain of Body-Part Terms"
22. Boom, H. van den. 1976. "Bedeutungsexplikation und materiale Implikation"
23. Seiler, H. 1977(a). "The Cologne Project on Language Universals: Questions, Objectives, and Prospects"  
Seiler, H. 1977(b). "Determination: A Functional Dimension for Interlanguage Comparison" (final version of Seiler, H. 1976 "Determination ...", published as akup 23, 1976).  
(To appear in: Papers from the Gummersbach Conference on Language Universals. The Hague: Mouton)
24. Moshinsky, J. 1976. "Measuring Nominal Descriptivity"
25. Seiler, H. (ed.) 1976. "Materials for the DFG International Research Conference on Language Universals"
26. Walter, H. 1976. "Das Problem der Deskriptivität am Beispiel deutscher Verbalderivation"
27. Seiler, H. 1977. "Two Systems of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Labeling and Descriptive" (To appear in the Festschrift for Madison S. Beeler)
28. Holenstein, E. 1977. "Motive der Universalienforschung"
29. Virkkunen, P. 1977. "Zum Ausdruck der notivischen Bestimmtheit im Finnischen. Mit einer Schlußbemerkung zum typologischen Vergleich des Französischen und des Finnischen von Wolfgang Raible".