Relative Clause Structures in the Rawang Language[*]

Randy J. LaPolla
La Trobe University

This paper discusses the types of relative clause and noun complement structures found in the Rawang language, a Tibeto-Burman language of northern Myanmar, as well as their origin and uses, with data taken mainly from naturally occurring texts. Two types are preposed relative clauses, but in one the relative clause is nominalized, and in the other it is not. The non-nominalized form with a general head led to the development of nominalizing suffixes and one type of nominalized relative clause structure. As the nominalized form is a nominal itself, it can be postposed to the head in an appositional structure. There is also discussion of the Rawang structures in the context of Tibeto-Burman and the development of relative clause structures in the language family.

Key words: Rawang, Tibeto-Burman, Sino-Tibetan, relative clause constructions, nominalization

1. Introduction

The Rawang (Rvwang [rə'wàŋ]) language is spoken by people who live in the far northern tip of Myanmar (Burma), traditionally along the Mae Hka ('Nmai Hka) and Maeli Hka (Mali Hka) river valleys. Ethnologue (Gordon 2005) gives the number of speakers as 62,074, but as the Rawangs are not counted as a separate ethnicity (they are considered part of the Kachin), there are no exact numbers. The Rawang speakers are closely related to people in north-western Yunnan Province, China, classified as either Dulong or Nu (see LaPolla 2001, 2003a on the Dulong language and Sun & Liu 2005 on the Anong language). This group of languages clearly belongs to the Tibeto-Burman branch of Sino-Tibetan, but their classification within Tibeto-Burman is still not clear (see LaPolla 2003b, 2005 for one view). In this paper we shall be discussing relative clause constructions found in the Mvtwang (Mvt River) dialect of Rawang, which is considered the most central of those dialects in Myanmar and has become the standard for inter-group communication. The Rawang orthography (Morse 1962, 1963) is based

on this dialect. In this system, most letters represent the standard pronunciations of American English, except that *i* = [i], *v* = [ə], *a* = [ɑ], *ø* = [ɯ], *q* = [ʔ], and *c* = [s] or [ts] (free variation; historically [ts]). Tones are marked with accent marks and a macron (using the letter *a* as a base): high tone: *á*, mid tone: *ā*, low tone: *à*. All syllables that end in a stop consonant (*-p, -t, -q, -k*) are in the high tone, so do not take a tone mark. Open syllables without a tone mark are unstressed. A colon marks non-basic long vowels. Four lines are used in the examples because there are many morphophonological changes that obscure the morpheme boundaries.

In terms of its typological features, Rawang morphology is generally agglutinative, and there is both dependent marking (case marking) and head marking (hierarchical person marking) morphology. The clause is generally verb-final, and a main clause will be marked for tense and mood. Tense is past vs. non-past, and past is further divided into four degrees of remoteness. There is also evidential marking for hearsay and direct experience. I have not found any syntactic pivots in Rawang for constituent order or cross-clause coreference. The order of noun phrases in a clause is decided by pragmatic principles, and cross-clause co-reference depends entirely on inference from context. Word classes and transitivity are clearly differentiated, and the distinctions are important to understanding Rawang grammar (unlike in some other Tibeto-Burman languages, e.g. Lahu; Matisoff 1976:413); there are a number of different word-class changing constructions (see LaPolla 2007) and valency-changing constructions (see LaPolla 2000). In this paper the major construction of the word-class-changing type that will be relevant is nominalization.

Nouns are defined as words that in citation are bare forms and can be head of a noun phrase; when used as head of a phrase a noun can be directly modified by a (numeral)-classifier phrase, dual or plural marking, diminutive marking, augmentative marking, and/or gender marking. Most nouns and nominals can also be used as modifiers of other nouns. In most cases a noun phrase can also include a genitive modifier, a demonstrative modifier, an adjective modifier, and a relative clause modifier. A noun phrase may act alone as an argument of a clause, but not a predicate. There can be semantic role marking on the noun phrases, and also pragmatic marking of topic and contrast, but there is no genitive marking of the type that links two nominals; such a genitive relationship is expressed by simple juxtaposition (e.g. *ngà gwìn* (*chv̀ng*) [1sg cup CL] 'my cup'—the classifier usually follows the noun, marking it as singular and specific), or, in the case of some inalienably possessed nouns, by possessive prefixes (e.g. *vpè* 'my father' vs. *nvpè* 'your father'). There is a possessive postposition (the same form as the comitative marker) for when the possessed noun does not appear in the noun phrase, e.g. *ngà-ó* 'mine'. We shall be defining nominals (nominalized forms with or without overt form-class-changing morphology) as forms which appear in a clause with the morphology of nouns and/or

have the function of a noun phrase in a clause (these two criteria are independent of each other), regardless of their form class in citation.

Classifiers, although transparently derived from nouns, form a separate class of words, as they take different plural marking, and have somewhat different distribution. Even so, as we shall see below, they are often used as proforms to represent an identifiable type of referent, much like we use *one* in English (e.g. *the one I came with*).

Words that represent attributive and gradient concepts are split into two classes: one class, representing some property concepts such as *shīng* 'different', *shòngshāng* 'separate', *krvk* 'perfect', and *tóng* 'hard', can be used as adverbs without adverbial marking, and require the copula to be predicative; and one class, representing the other types of concepts often associated with adjectives in English, can be predicative without the copula, as they are a sub-class of stative verb, and require adverbial marking to be used adverbially.

Verbs can take (hierarchical) person marking, aspect marking, directional marking (which also marks aspect in some cases), and tense marking. The different classes of verb each take morphology in citation that can be used to identify that class (the citation form for verbs is the third person non-past affirmative/declarative form). Intransitives take the non-past affirmative/declarative particle ($\bar{e}$) alone for non-past situations and in citation (e.g. *ngø̄ē* 'to cry'), and the intransitive past tense marker (*-ì*) in past situations (with third person argument; a particle marking the degree of remoteness is also generally used); intransitive verbs can be used transitively only when they take valency-increasing morphological marking (causative, benefactive). Transitives take the non-past third person P marker ($\dot{o}$) plus the non-past affirmative/declarative particle ($\bar{e}$) in non-past situations (e.g. *ríòē* 'to carry (something)') and the transitive past tense marker (*-à*) in past situations (with third person P arguments); they can be used intransitively only when they take valency-reducing morphological marking (intransitivizing prefix, reflexive/middle marking suffix). In transitive clauses the agentive marker generally appears on the noun phrase representing the A argument. Ambitransitives (labile verbs) are a subset of verbs that can be used as transitives or intransitives without morphological derivation (*á:mòē* / *v̄mē* 'to eat'). There are both S=P type and S=A type ambitransitives.[1] With the S=P type (e.g. *gvyaqē* 'be broken, destroyed' ~ *gvyaqòē* 'break, destroy'), adding an A argument creates a causative, without the need to use the causative prefix. With the S=A type (e.g. *zvtnē* 'weaving' ~ *za:tnòē* 'weaving (something)', use of the intransitive vs. the transitive form marks a difference between a general or habitual situation and a particular situation respectively. If the P is specific, then the transitive form must be used, but if the P is non-specific, it is not necessary to use the intransitive form. If no P is mentioned or

---

[1] These refer to whether the single argument of the intransitive use of the verb corresponds to the A(ctor) argument or the P(atient) argument of the transitive use.

available from context, then usually the intransitive form is used.

2. Relative clauses

2.1 Basic structure

A main clause will have a form similar to that in the second line of (1), marked for tense and generally mood (both here marked by the non-past declarative marker *-ē* in *vdv́mē* and *wāē*):

(1) Shv̄ngbēí vgō vshvpmā yà:ngà rvt,   (LaPolla & Poa 2001:16)
    shv̄ngbē-í   vgō   vshvp-ā   yàng-à   rvt
    all-AGT[2] head rub-BEN TMyrs-TR.PAST because

    vpú vgō vdv́mē, wāē.
    vpú   vgō   vdv́m-ē   wā-ē
    owl   head flat-N.PAST say- N.PAST
    'Because everybody rubbed (his) head, the owl's head is flat, it is said.'

As can be seen from the first line of (1), a subordinate clause can also take tense marking, but it does not take mood marking.

A clause functioning as a modifier of a noun (i.e. as a relative clause or noun complement) can have almost the same form as a main clause, including most tense marking (see (4) below), except that it will not have mood marking, such as the non-past declarative marker *-ē*. In the case of relative clauses (but not noun complements) there will also be an argument missing from the clause, which then appears as the head of the relative clause (given in bold following the relative clause in the examples below), as in (2):

---

[2] Abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: A: actor of a prototypical transitive clause; ADV: adverbial; AGT: agentive; BEN: benefactive applicative; CAUS: causative; CC: copula complement; CL: classifier; COM: comitative; COMPAR: comparative (='above, over'); CSM: change of state marker; CT: topic of a copula clause; DIR: direction marker (also has aspectual functions); EXCL: exclamatory particle; GEN: genitive; I.PAST: 3rd person intransitive past; LOC: locative (also used for dative, animate P); N.1: non-1st person actor (in a clause with a speech act participant); NEG: negative; NOM: nominalizer; N.PAST: non-past; P: patient of a prototypical transitive clause; PAST: past; PFV: perfective; pl: plural; PN: proper name; PROB: marker of probability; PS: predicate sequencer (marks a non-final clause); PUR: purposive; RECIP: reciprocal marker; REDUP: reduplicated form; R/M: reflexive/middle; S: single direct argument of an intransitive verb; TMhrs: marker of recent past (within a few hours); TMyrs: marker of remote past (several years at least); TNP: 3rd person transitive non-past; TOP: topic; TR.PAST: transitive past.

(2) "Vn̄ng" wā bə̀ng dènī dèyaq gə̄ wēdə̄ nī lá:ngìē. (LaPolla & Poa 2001:41)
[[vn̄ng wā]~RC~ **bə̀ng**]~NP~ dènī   dèyaq   gə̄   wē-də̄   nī   lv́ng-ì-ē
  Anang say   **name**   today tonight also that-ADV just use-1pl-N.PAST
'The name (called) "Anang", in like manner we still use today.'

In (2) the relative clause would have been based on the independent clause *bə̀ng nə̄ vn̄ng wā-ē* [name TOP Anang say-N.PAST] 'The name is called Anang'. The argument that is the topic in the independent clause appears as the head of the relative clause in (2). As shown by the bracketing, the relative clause is within the NP. There are no relative structures like English non-restrictive relatives (e.g. *He is late*, *which is a problem for us*; *my brother*, *who just flew in from NY*), co-relatives, or other types of adjoined (rather than embedded) relatives.

The head generally follows the relative clause in Rawang if it is overt; there are rare post-head appositional placements of nominalized relative clauses, but no head-internal relative clauses in Rawang. There are also no relative pronouns in Rawang; the relative clause in this structure simply appears immediately before the head, with no linker or other marking. The position of the clause immediately before the noun head, the lack of mood marking, the intonation of the expression as a whole (tonic accent on the noun rather than the verb), and inference from discourse are the clues used by the addressee in identifying the clause as a relative clause. As the Rawang relative clause is identified by a gap in the relative clause itself (and not by one in the main clause), it would then fall within the dependent marking type in the typology of Nichols (1984). This gap is also not filled with a pronoun or marked with a "hanging" adposition (such as in English *the man I gave the car **to** Ø*) in any cases I have found.

All direct, and many peripheral, arguments can be relativized on. In fact one of the most common uses of relativization is to create adverbial phrases of place or time (that is, relativization on locative or temporal non-direct arguments). In (3) we have a relative clause where the recipient of a ditransitive clause is relativized on:

(3) ngàí lègā bok zə́ngbə́ngà gə́ (Rawang Maysanzi, p.c.)
[[ngà-í   lègā   bok   zí-ng-bə́-ng-à]~RC~   **gə́**]~NP~
  1sg-AGT book CL(books) give-1sg-PFV-1sg-TR.PAST **CL(humans)**
'the one I gave the book to'

In (4) we have a relative clause with *mə́ng* 'region, land' as the head, and the noun phrase that this relative clause plus head forms modifies another nominal, *bə̀ng* 'name'.

(4) Dvmə̀ nv̀mlat v̀l yàng móng bə̀ng (LaPolla & Poa 2001:18)

[[[Dvmə̀ nv̀mlat v̀l   yàng]_{RC} **móng**]_{NP} bə̀ng]_{NP}

  PN   at.first exist TMyrs **land**   name

'the name of the land where Dameu (the creator god) lived in the beginning'

In (5) we have a common type of adverbial phrase, where a relative clause describing an event modifies a noun representing a period of time:

(5) dvbù nə̀ chóngshì lú:ngì kvt (LaPolla & Poa 2001:33)

[[dvbù nə̀ chóng-shì lúng-ì]_{RC} **kvt**]_{NP}

 happy PS jump-R/M   up-I.PAST **time**

'when (the barking deer) was happy and jumped up (with joy),...'

Lit. '(at the) time that (the barking deer) was happy and jumped up'

The non-relativized version of this would be something like in (6), where 'at that time' would be a scene-setting adverbial phrase:

(6) wēkvt nə̄ rá vtv́ng yv̀ngshà (Interview, p.24)

wē-kvt   nə̄   rá   vtv́ng yv̀ng-shà

that-time TOP again   return TMyrs-1pl.PAST

'at that time we came back'

The only patterns I have not found with relativization are relativizations on the complements of certain postpositions. For example, in (7) we have a comitative construction and in (8) we have a comparative clause. I have not found relativization on the noun marked by the comitative or comparative postposition, possibly because the relational marker would be dropped, and then the nature of the structure would not be clear enough, unlike with the more common actor, undergoer, and dative constructions. Or it may be they are possible, but quite rare, and just have not turned up in the data available so far.

(7) Lúnó jay vrá wē ílé, āpèní. (Just Chatting, p.5)

Lún-ó   jay vrá   wē   í-lé   ā-pè-ní

PN-COM   a.lot get.along NOM be-EXCL this-MALE-two

'They get along well with Lun, these two (boys).'

(8) Yā mvdv̀m luqē. (LaPolla & Poa 2001:83)

yā   mvdv̀m   luq-ē

this COMPAR   be.much-N.PAST

'There are more (places) than this.'

Aside from the relative structure presented above, it is common to find nominalized clauses acting as modifiers of noun heads, that is, they seem to have the same function as these relative clause structures. Compare (2) with (9), and (10) with (11) below. In (2) and (10) we have non-nominalized clauses acting as relative clauses, whereas in (9) and (11) we have nominalized clauses modifying the same head nouns as in (2) and (10), respectively.

(9)   Gvzà luq wē í rvt,   (LaPolla & Poa 2001:47)

     gvzà   luq   wē   í-rvt
     many   enough NOM   be-because

     "wàngcè" wā wē bə̀ng vbáē.

     [[wàng-cè   wā   wē]$_{RC}$ **bə̀ng**]$_{NP}$ vbá-ē
      many-son   say   NOM   **name**   include-N.PAST

     'Since they were many, they were called by the name "(Sangza) Wangce".'

(10)   Vpə̀ng Pū:ngí shvngøt dvtú yà:ngà mvshól   (LaPolla & Poa 2001:13)

     [[[[[Vpə̀ng Pūng-í   shvngøt dvtú   yàng-à]$_{RC}$ **mvshól**]$_{NP}$
          PN   PN-AGT   teach   guide   TMyrs-TR.PAST **story**

     sv̀ng cà:nò nə̀ dvtut dvtut tvnù:ngò nə̀

     sv̀ng   cv̀n-ò   nə̀] [dvtut dvtut   tvnùng-ò   nə̀]
     LOC   follow-TNP PS   in.continuation   trace-TNP   PS

     wà yà:ngì wē dàmshà íē.

     wà   yàng-ì   wē]$_{NP/CT}$ [dàmshà]$_{CC}$ í-ē
     do   TMyrs-I.PAST   NOM   damsha   be-N.PAST

     'Following the story taught by Apang Pung, the damsha rites were handed down continually.'

     Lit.: 'That which follows the story taught by Apang Pung and has been handed down continually is the damsha rites.'

(11)   Rvwàng mvshól yālòng nə̄   (LaPolla & Poa 2001:1)

     [Rvwàng mvshól   yā-lòng]$_{NP/CT}$ nə̄
      Rawang   story   this-CL   TOP

     dv̀mshàrìí rīma:tnà wē mvshól íē, ...

     [[dv̀mshà-rì-í   rīm-at-à   wē]$_{RC}$ **mvshól**]$_{NP/CC}$ í-ē
      shaman-pl-AGT   keep-DIR-TR.PAST   NOM   **story**   be-N.PAST

     'This Rawang story is a story that was kept by the shamans, ...'

There does not seem to be any difference in meaning between the nominalized and

non-nominalized forms when the nominalizer used is *wē* (which derives from the distal demonstrative *wə̄*), and the head of the relative clause is overt. A major difference between the nominalized and non-nominalized modifiers is that in the case of the nominalized forms, the head of the noun phrase can be omitted if it is recoverable from context, as in (12) and (13), where the head noun 'person' is obvious from context.

(12) Tā rvgaqgaq í wēí, mà-shákéì.   (Interview, p.18)
  [[tā   rvgaq-gaq   í   wē]$_{RC}$-**Ø**]$_{NP}$ -í   mv-v-shá-ké-ì
   each region-REDUP   be   NOM-(**person**)-be   NEG-RECIP-know-RECIP-1pl
  'We were (people) who were of different regions, we did not know each other.'

(13) Àngní nə̄ kàgə̄ gvzà mv-shə̀n wē   (Interview, p.21)
  àngní nə̄   [[kà-gə̄   gvzà   mv-shə̀n   wē]$_{RC}$ **Ø**
  3dl   TOP   word-also   much   NEG-speak   NOM   (**person**)

  vnípè í dá:rì
  vní-pè]$_{NP}$ í   dv́r-ì
  two-MALE   be   TMhrs-I.PAST

  'They(dl) were also two guys who didn't talk much.'

In many Sino-Tibetan languages, including Chinese, this sort of nominalization can also be used to form appositional post-head relative clauses, and this is also the case in Rawang, as seen in (14). As in Chinese, this form is rare, and used for clarification of an already stated head.

(14) Àngmaq shōlaqrérì wēdə̄ mv-dī wē   (Interview, p.55)
  [[àngmaq   **shōlaqré-rì**   [wē-də̄   mv-dī   wē]$_{RC}$]$_{NP}$
   3pl   **young.people-pl**   that-ADV   NEG-go   NOM
  'The young people who do not go (to the church).'

This cannot be done with the non-nominalized structure. This is clear evidence that the difference between the form of relative clause with *wē* and the form without *wē* is not just a difference of marking, but is a difference in structure.

  Noun complements,[3] such as the ones in (15) and (16), have the same structure as a relative clause, and can be nominalized or not. Just as we saw with relative clauses, the

---

[3] Noun complements differ from relative clauses in that the head noun is not a participant in the proposition of the noun complement (e.g. *the fact that he is coming*), whereas in a relative clause the head noun is a participant in the proposition of the relative clause, and so if a gapping relative clause strategy is used, there is a gap in the relative clause (e.g. *the facts that he brought up Ø in the meeting*).

head is optional if the noun complement is nominalized, as in these examples, but obligatory if it is not.

(15) Àng dīwē (mvtú) nǿ v́mpà wv̄nlv́m rvt íē.
[[àng dī-wē]$_{RC}$ **mvtú**]$_{NP}$ nø̄ v́mpà wv̄n-lv́m rvt í-ē
   3sg go-NOM **reason** TOP food buy-PUR because be-N.PAST
'(The reason) he goes (is) in order to buy food.'

(16) dvbv́nshì yàng wē mvshǿl (LaPolla & Poa 2001:4)
[[dv-bv́n-shì yàng wē]$_{RC}$ **mvshǿl**]$_{NP}$
   CAUS-migrate-R/M TMyrs NOM **story**
'the story of the migration (of the Rawang people)'

2.2 Relative clauses with a general noun or classifier as head

One often finds relative clauses in Rawang used with noun heads that are classifiers or nouns with very general semantics, such as 'time', 'place', 'thing', as in (3)-(5) above and (17)-(18) below.[4]

(17) Mvjènà tok ràngà dvgvp nø̄, ...   (Interview, p.32)
[[Mvjènà tuq rá-ng-à]$_{RC}$ **dvgvp**]$_{NP}$ nø̄
   Myitkyina arrive DIR-1sg-TR.PAST **time** TOP
'When I arrived in Myitkyina, ...'
Lit: 'The time that I arrived in Myitkyina'

(18) Chv̀ngnv̄ngpè nø̄,   (LaPolla & Poa 2001:3)
[chv̀ngnv̄ng-pè]$_{NP}$ nø̄
   changnang-MALE TOP

cv̄nshì wē vnípè wāpè íē.
[[[cv̄n-shì wē]$_{RC}$ Ø vní-pè]$_{NP}$ wā]$_{RC}$-**pè**]$_{NP/CC}$ í-ē
   learn-R/M NOM   two-MALE say-**MALE**   be-N.PAST
'Changnang is the one called the second learner.'

The classifiers have generalized from nouns to the point that they represent a class rather than a specific referent. When these are then used as the heads of relative clauses,

---

4 In (18) the structure includes a headless relative clause within the relative clause that is the intended example of a classifier head. In this example, it can be seen that the same classifier is used as a gender marker, a numeral classifier, and as the head of the relative clause.

the result is often reanalyzed as nominalization. For example, some relative clause structures where the head noun is the general noun/classifier for 'thing' *pà*, have been reanalyzed as nominalizations, and have become the common names for certain artefacts, such as those in (19):

(19) a. *kàtvppà*
          [kà-tvp]_{RC}-pà
          word-catch-thing
          'thing which catches words' > 'tape recorder'

      b. vhǿòpà
          [vhǿ-ò]_{RC}-pà
          laugh.at-TNP-thing
          'thing which (one) laughs at' > 'joke, jest'

2.3 Nominalization as relativization

We saw in (4) how a relative clause plus head noun can be used to modify another head noun. The type of nominalization derived from a relative clause with a classifier or general noun as head just discussed is often used in this way. In these cases the structure is parallel to the relative clause structure discussed above where the relative clause is nominalized by the general nominalizer *wē*, but in these cases, the original meaning of the classifier or general noun influences the meaning of the relative clause. For example, the structure we saw in (18), with *pè* 'male referent' (< 'father') as the head of the relative clause, can also be used to modify other nouns, e.g. *dàmshà wā-pè mvshǿl* [shaman.work do-MALE story] 'story of the man who did shaman work'.

Another example is the noun *shvrà* 'place', which has generalized into a nominalizer for locations from a relative clause structure, e.g. *lǿm shvrà* [[dance]_{RC} place]_{NP} 'place for dancing'. It has grammaticalized in this usage to the extent that it can be reduced in form to a suffix -*rà*, as in *lǿmrà* 'place for dancing', an alternative form of *lǿm shvrà*. Other examples are *yøprà* '(one's usual) place for sleeping', and *rúngrà* 'place for sitting'. Such forms can in some cases also be used adnominally, e.g. *góngrà hwáng* [[enter+place]_{RC} hole]_{NP} 'hole which is a place for entering' (= 'threshold').

3. Rawang in the context of Tibeto-Burman and Sino-Tibetan

We have seen that in Rawang there are three types of relative clause. One has the head immediately following the clause, with no nominalizer on the clause. I believe this was the original Sino-Tibetan form, as this type can be found at least in some vestigial

way (e.g. what might now be called a verb-noun compound) in just about all ST languages. In another type the relative clause takes a nominalizer that was itself historically a noun head, and the head optionally follows it. As I discussed in the context of the Qiang language (LaPolla with Huang 2003:§5.2), this type developed out of the first type, as former head nouns became so generalized they were reinterpreted as nominalizers[5] (with the clauses so nominalized optionally modifying other noun heads).[6]

The so-called nominalization-relativization syncretism we often find in Tibeto-Burman languages is due to the historical development in many languages of nominalizers out of relative clauses, and their subsequent use in apposition to or as modifiers of another noun. Although I have been referring to both structures throughout this paper as relative clauses, the nominalized modifier is not a true relative clause; it represents a shift in type of structure, from [relative clause + noun] to [nominalized clause + noun] (that is, [nominal + nominal]). This develops partly because of the tendency in Sino-Tibetan languages to have nominal-nominal constructions where the first nominal modifies the second. It is this nature as a nominal rather than a relative clause that allows the nominalized clause to either precede or follow the head noun. This nominal-nominal structure is also the original structure for genitive constructions in Sino-Tibetan (and is still the structure for genitives in Rawang), though in some languages, such as Tibetan, genitive structures have developed special marking. This is why pre-nominal "relative clause" structures in Tibetan and some other languages involve a nominalized clause and genitive marker, as in (20) (adapted from DeLancey 2002:56): they are in fact genitive structures.[7]

(20) slobdpon medpa'i brtulzhugscan 'di
      [[slobdpon med-pa]$_{RC}$-'i   **brtulzhugscan** 'di]$_{NP}$
        teacher   not.exist-NOM-GEN   **ascetic**   this
      'this ascetic who has no teacher'

---

[5] This is very similar to the development of noun classifiers from nouns.

[6] In Ronghong Qiang, for example, the word *mi* 'person' was used often enough as the head of a relative clause for it to become seen as just a nominalizer for animate actor nominalizations, and these nominalizations can then be used to modify other nouns, including *mi* 'person', either as a prehead modifier or as a post-head appositional phrase. In Qiang the nominalizing form is now reduced to *-m*, but the same process happened in Dzongkha, and the form of the nominalizer is still *mi*, e.g. *naŋ=na oŋ mi mi* [inside=LOC come NOM person] 'the person who came in' (Thinley 2008:116).

[7] It is important to distinguish the type of development we find in Tibetan, where genitive marking independent of the nominalization is used, and the type we find, for example in Chinese, where there is no genitive marking independent of the nominalizer. In the latter case the nominalizer is often mis-analyzed as a genitive marker or (in some other languages) has actually developed into a true genitive marker itself.

DeLancey (2002:56) points out that the pre-nominal nominalized clause always requires the genitive because it is a nominal modifier of the head, but the nominalized clause can also appear post-nominally but then never takes the genitive marking, as it is an appositive construction. This shows the nominal nature of the relative clause, as in Rawang.

Discussions of relativization and nominalization often mention the fact that the nominalizer derives from a noun, but they do not often recognize that the structure that becomes the nominalized clause is in fact a relative clause plus head structure that later gets reinterpreted as a nominalized clause. There is a historical continuum in terms of the degree to which the original head noun has fully grammaticalized into a simple nominalizer (cf. DeLancey 1997). In reconstructing earlier stages of a language, the form of a particular structure may be the same as the modern form, but the function might be different. For example in this case I would argue that what we reconstruct is a relative clause structure, not a nominalization structure, even though they have the same structure, as it is the former that developed the function of the latter.

In the third type of relative clause in Rawang, the relative clause is nominalized by the nominalizer derived from the distal demonstrative *wē*, and the head optionally follows this. This type is an innovation, though it is common for demonstratives to develop into complementizers (cf. English *that*). This may have also been the case with -*ò* in Angami and Lotha (Herring 1991)[8] and possibly *wa* in Singhpo (Morey 2006).

Within Tibeto-Burman, aside from the four types mention above (the three found in Rawang plus the post-head type), we also find head-internal relatives in a few languages (they are rather rare, both cross-linguistically in Tibeto-Burman, and in terms of textual frequency in the languages that have them), and co-relative structures. An example of a head-internal relative clause from Ronghong Qiang is given in (21):

(21) Themle-wu stuɑhɑ təbəlji thɑlə qɑ sətɕ dɑsɑ. (Huang & Evans 2007:148)
[[themle-wu **stuɑhɑ** tə-bəl-ji]$_{RC}$ thɑ-lɑ]$_{NP}$ qɑ sə-tɕhə dɑ-sɑ
  3pl-AGT   **rice**   DIR-do-CSM that-CL(pots) 1sg DIR-eat DIR-complete:1sg
'I finished eating the pot of rice they cooked.'

In this type there is often nominalization, but in this example there is no overt nominalizer; the addressee identifies the form as a relative clause by the fact that it is followed by a demonstrative + classifier phrase, and identifies the head of the relative clause by the particular classifier used.

---

[8] Herring suggests (1991:66) that such forms arise from resumptive pronouns: "banana eating *one* (boy)". This is an interesting suggestion, but I do not know how such a pronoun would work, unless what is meant is replacive, rather than resumptive pronoun.

Co-relative structures, where the relative clause is not embedded in the noun phrase of the head, are found mainly in areas where there is contact with Indo-Aryan languages, and often involve a relative pronoun borrowed from an Indo-Aryan language, as in (22), from Chaudangsi (Shree Krishan 2001:412), of the Pithoragarh District of Uttar Pradesh, India.

(22) Hidi **əti siri** hlɛ [jo   nyarə   ra-s]$_{RC}$
      this **that boy** is   who yesterday come-PAST
      'He is the same boy who came yesterday.' (Lit.: 'This is that boy, (the one) who came yesterday')

We can see that relative clause structures can vary widely, and the different structures and the different historical origins of structures will affect their modern uses, and so it is important when possible to correctly identify the structure and the source of the marking.

References

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Grammaticalization and the gradience of categories: relator nouns and postpositions in Tibetan and Burmese. *Essays on Language Function and Language Type: Dedicated to T. Givón*, ed. by Joan Bybee, John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson, 51-69. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

DeLancey, Scott. 2002. Relativization and nominalization in Bodic. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* (*BLS*) 28:55-72.

Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. (ed.) 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (15th edition). Dallas: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com/.

Herring, Susan C. 1991. Nominalization, relativization, and attribution in Lotha, Angami, and Burmese. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 14.1:55-72.

Huang, Chenglong, and Jonathan P. Evans. 2007. Qiangyu guanxi ziju de leixing [Relative clauses types in Qiang]. *Journal of Sino-Tibetan Linguistics* 1:143-161.

LaPolla, Randy J. 2000. Valency-changing derivations in Dulong-Rawang. *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*, ed. by R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 282-311. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

LaPolla, Randy J. 2001. Dulong texts: seven fully analyzed narrative and procedural texts. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24.2:1-39.

LaPolla, Randy J. 2003a. Dulong. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, ed. by Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla, 674-682. London & New York: Routledge.

LaPolla, Randy J. 2003b. An overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, ed. by Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla, 22-42. London & New York: Routledge.

LaPolla, Randy J. 2005. Sino-Tibetan Languages. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd edition), ed. by Keith Brown, 393-397. Amsterdam & Oxford: Elsevier.

LaPolla, Randy J. 2007. Word-class-changing derivations in Rawang. Paper presented at the Workshop on Word-class-changing Derivations. Melbourne: Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, Institute for Advanced Study, La Trobe University.

LaPolla, Randy J., with Chenglong Huang. 2003. *A Grammar of Qiang with Annotated Texts and Glossary*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

LaPolla, Randy J., and Dory Poa. 2001. *Rawang Texts*. München: LINCOM Europa.

Matisoff, James A. 1976. Lahu causative constructions: case hierarchies and the morphology/syntax cycle in a Tibeto-Burman perspective. *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 6: *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 413-442. New York: Academic Press.

Morey, Stephen. 2006. Clausal nominalization in Numhpuk Singhpo. Paper presented at the Workshop on Nominalization in Tibeto-Burman. Melbourne: La Trobe University.

Morse, Robert H. 1962. *Hierarchical Levels of Rawang Phonology*. Bloomington: Indiana University MA thesis.

Morse, Robert H. 1963. Phonology of Rawang. *Anthropological Linguistics* 5.5:17-41.

Nichols, Johanna. 1984. Another typology of relatives. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* (*BLS*) 10:524-541.

Shree Krishan. 2001. A sketch of Chaudangsi grammar. *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages*, ed. by Yasuhiko Nagano & Randy J. LaPolla, 401-424. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Sun, Hongkai, and Guangkun Liu. 2005. *Anongyu Yanjiu* [*Studies on the Anong Language*]. Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Thinley, Namgay. 2008. *Dzongkha Nominalization.* Melbourne: La Trobe University MA thesis.

Linguistics Program
La Trobe University
Bundoora, Melbourne
Victoria 3086
Australia
r.lapolla@latrobe.edu.au

Randy J. LaPolla

日旺語的關係子句

羅仁地

拉籌伯大學

　　日旺語是緬甸北部卡欽州的藏緬語族語言，跟中國境內的獨龍語和阿儂語有密切的關係。本文討論日旺語裡所發現的關係子句和名詞補語 (noun complement) 結構的不同類型，並闡述其性質和歷史發展。在兩種名前的關係子句裡，其中一種帶名物化標誌，一種沒有名物化標誌。本文認為後者引起前者的產生。帶名物化標誌的關係子句有時候可以出現在中心詞後面。在漢藏語系語言裡，關係子句結構常常和名物化結構、領屬結構有密切關係，因此本文特別闡釋這三種結構之間的關係。此外，本文也討論藏緬語族語言裡所發現的其他類型關係子句。

關鍵詞：日旺語，藏緬語，漢藏語，關係子句結構，名物化