

Tahitian citations are taken from a corpus of natural authentic text, the rest of the language examples in the paper (49 out of 55, or 90 percent) are “generated by the author.” This includes all but one of the critical examples that are used to present the case for *mea* functioning as a stative aspect marker, and so readers should be informed whether or not this is L1 data. The argument would also be more convincing if another possible analysis could be discounted, namely, that the sequences of [*mea* + lexeme] are not [STATIVE TENSE-ASPECT MARKER + predicate], but regular [head + modifier] topics in a verbless Topic NP – Comment NP equational clause. Example (63), the only one provided from natural text, is given a free translation that, in fact, supports this: “The language of Tahitian people is my thing of concern” (334). It is also noted that utterances beginning with *mea* as the proposed stative marker are more emphatic, and can be intensive or assertive, so that an example glossed originally as “Teva likes to eat turtle” is acknowledged as possibly expressing “Teva is *really* a big consumer of turtle.” If a more extended translation is possible—such as “What a big turtle-eater Teva is!”—then it might be useful to recall Moysse-Faurie’s paper discussing nominalizations as exclamatives, and this could reinforce the possibility that in the Tahitian examples in question, *mea* is not a stative marker at all, but retains its former function as a nominal proform.

Despite its diverse coverage of topics, this is a nice collection of papers that takes a number of interesting issues in Oceanic language studies to a deeper level of analysis and insight.

ROBERT EARLY
University of the South Pacific

Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta, and Janick Wrona, eds. 2011. *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*. Typological Studies in Language 96, xvii + 796 pp. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. ISBN 978-90-272-0677-0, \$158.00, hardbound.

This volume reflects a huge editorial endeavor and years of collaborative effort in investigating versatile morphemes that function as nominalizers, relativizers, and sentence-final particles. While the original project focused on East Asian languages (Japanese, Korean, and Chinese), it later expanded to include about 60 languages. The present collection contains an introductory article followed by 25 papers dealing with various aspects of nominalization in languages spoken in Asia and the Pacific, which are subdivided into major linguistic groups: Sinitic (Part I), Tibeto-Burman (Part II), Indo-European (Part III), Korean and Japanese (Part IV), Austronesian (Part V), and Papuan (Part VI). It is rounded out by two useful indexes: one on subjects and one on languages.

The papers vary in terms of linguistic and time-depth coverage. Some deal with specific languages. Among these, several concentrate on synchronic data (see, for instance, Stephen Morey’s article on Numhpuk Singpho, Seongha Rhee on Korean, or Fuhui Hsieh

on Kavalan) while others also offer a historical perspective (see Mark Post's article on Galo or Marie M. Yeh on Saisiyat). Some papers provide a contrastive analysis between two languages (for example, Mandarin vs. Cantonese; Korean vs. Japanese; Okinawan vs. Japanese). A few deal specifically with diachronic data (for example, Old and Middle Chinese). A number of papers present typological studies (for example, on Tibeto-Burman languages) or discuss nominalization in a particular language (for example, Toqabaqita) in a larger context (Southeast Solomonic/Oceanic languages).

Although this monograph includes a large number of languages and covers an array of interesting phenomena and topics, the organization of the volume itself is problematic, the sample of languages is not well balanced, and the editorial work lacks rigor. I will develop these three points before turning, in the remainder of this review, to a summary of each of the papers contained in the volume. The editors (1, 49–50) make it clear that they chose an areal, rather than a thematic, arrangement for the papers. However, there are a number of problems with such an arrangement. Most of the papers that are included in this volume address common issues, and the general themes (nominalization types, nominalization strategies, grammaticalization paths of nominalization, referential and nonreferential uses of nominalization, and the like) that run through many of the papers could (or should) have led to a different display leading to a more coherent and systematic presentation of the data across languages. The editors have tried, at times, to justify the inclusion of certain papers as related to the theme of the volume (47), even though it is apparent that they do not fit in. That is true of the paper written on Abui by František Kratochvíl, which focuses primarily on the discourse-structuring functions of demonstratives. It is only in the conclusion that the author compares the functions of demonstratives in Abui to those of nominalizations in other (unnamed) languages. Moreover, even if the classification is areal, the ordering of the papers is not always adequate. The paper written by Michael Noonan contains a useful appendix depicting the possible genetic relationships among the Bodic languages (Tibeto-Burman), many of which are discussed in Carol Genetti's typological overview that appears as the first article in the section on the Tibeto-Burman languages. In the same vein, the paper contrasting Mandarin and Cantonese by Sze-Wing Tang could have preceded the one dealing only with the grammatical marker *ge*³ in Cantonese, as it contains much more background information.

As far as the sampling of languages is concerned, it is not clear how it was made and why certain languages were included while others were not. To give but one example, three Formosan languages are discussed in this volume: Kavalan, Budai Rukai, and Saisiyat. Issues on nominalization in the first two languages have already been addressed in a volume on nominalization in Formosan languages (Zeitoun 2002), and though the questions raised in these papers are certainly interesting and/or novel, one would have expected other Formosan languages (not included in the above-mentioned volume) to be covered as well, languages like Puyuma and Bunun.

Other editorial problems arise in connection with the consistent treatment of the data and the languages. For instance, (useful) typological surveys are provided for certain language groups (Tibeto-Burman, West Iranian, Oceanic), but not for others, and short language descriptions are given by some (but not all) authors. The volume is in general well edited, although typographical errors, inconsistencies, and even mistakes (in the translation

of certain examples, for instance) appear here and there throughout. Some of these were rightfully mentioned by Gerner (2012:804) and will not be repeated here.

In their introductory paper, Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta, and Janick Wrona review the major issues pertaining to nominalization, and introduce the themes tackled in the volume from both a typological and a diachronic perspective. While discussing nominalization types and nominalization strategies, they show that the frequently observed syncretism between nominalization, relativization, and genitivization is attested among the many languages covered in the volume, and that the reanalysis of nominalizers as finite markers of tense-aspect-mood, of post-predicate nominalizers as sentence final mood particles, and of stand-alone nominalization constructions as miratives, are rather common phenomena. The relationship between nominalization and focus-marking in the Formosan and Philippine languages, the development of nominalizers into clausal subordinators, the grammaticalization from light nouns to nominalizers, and the use of referentiality marking devices (case markers, demonstratives, possessive pronouns, plural markers, classifiers) as signaling nominalization are also discussed.

Four papers deal with Sinitic languages. Foong Ha Yap and Jiao Wang discuss the grammaticalization path of two light nouns, *zhe* and *suo*, as nominalizers in Old and Middle Chinese. They argue that the development of these two nominalizers was conditioned not only on the semantic level, but also by morphosyntactic constraints. More specifically, they explain how the light noun *zhe* developed into an agent nominalizer and a conditional subordinator, and was later reinterpreted as a relativizer and a genitive marker in the presence of another lexical head noun, and as a mood particle in sentence-final position. They show that *suo* was originally a locative noun that came to be used as a patient nominalizer and an adverbial subordinator with extended functions in possessive and passive constructions. They trace back the emergence of the pronominal *suo* to the light noun *suo* and the development of the passive *wei* ... *suo* to the nominalizer *suo*.

Hui Ling Xu and Stephen Matthews discuss the polyfunctionality of *kai* in Chaozhou (a Southern Min dialect), and in particular the use of this morpheme in classifier, adnominal, nominalizer, and stance marking functions, each of which is treated as a link in the grammaticalization chain depicted by the authors.

Joanna U. Sio provides a descriptive analysis of the usages of the grammatical marker *ge*³ in Cantonese based on its distribution, that is, according to whether a nominal element occurs after *ge*³ and according to whether the pre-*ge*³ element denotes a proposition (conditional clause, contrastive topic clause, assertive sentence) or a property.

S.-W. Tang contrasts the use of *ge*³ in Cantonese with that of *de* in Mandarin in adnominal functions (genitive agent nominals, possessive objects, relativization of idiomatic expressions, verbless and internal *de* expressions). He argues for the more grammaticalized status of *de* compared to *ge*³, which explains the existence of gerundive nominals in Mandarin but not in Cantonese (where gerundive nominals occur only in the object position of contrastive constructions).

Seven papers deal with Tibeto-Burman languages. Carol Genetti provides a typological survey of nominalization in Tibeto-Burman based on five languages of the Himalayan area (Manange, Dongwang Tibetan, Zhuokeji rGyalrong, Mongsen Ao, and Dolakha Newar) taken as broadly representative of this language group. She shows that

these five Tibeto-Burman languages make extensive use of clausal nominalization. They differ noticeably in the extent to which nominalization is used to derive lexical nouns. She argues that although clausal nominalization and derivational nominalization are structurally distinct, each can give rise to the other historically.

Michael Noonan discusses the diachronic developments of nominalizing constructions in Tamangic languages, a subgroup of Bodic (Tibeto-Burman). The author demonstrates that the extensive use of clausal nominalization can be traced back to the Proto-Tamangic stage and has remained constant until modern times. Innovations, however, are noticeable, and have been caused by language contact. These include the loss of the genitive in adnominal nominalizations, the development of nominalizers carrying tense distinctions, the rise of new nominalizers, and the development of periphrastic constructions involving nominalized verbals in the verb complex.

Karen Grunow-Härsta focuses on further developments (elaboration, extension, and elimination) of nominalization constructions in Magar, a Central Himalayish language belonging to the Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman. These developments include (i) the increase of functions encoded by nominalizers and/or the increase in number of nominalizers (elaboration), (ii) the reanalysis of nominalizers as finite markers of tense-aspect-mood (extension); and (iii) the loss of certain nominalizers due to increasing specialization, grammaticalization, and/or replacement (elimination).

Mark Post offers a synchronic and diachronic analysis of nominalization types and nominalization-based constructions in Galo, a Tibeto-Burman language of the Tani branch spoken in North India. He shows, among other things, that nominalization-based constructions can be divided into two types, nominalized clauses (which resemble noun phrases) and clausal nominalizations (which are similar to final predicative clauses). Nominalized clauses occur in event nominalizations, noun complements, and relative clause constructions. They involve an uninflected nominalized predicate and exhibit an obligatorily genitive subject. In contrast, clausal nominalizations occur in framing, backgrounding, and cleft/focus constructions. The nominalized predicate can be uninflected or inflected, and the subject is marked as nominative, not genitive.

Stephen Morey discusses two nominalization processes in Numhpuk Singpho (Tibeto-Burman), spoken in Assam (India). Derivational nominalization, marked by *hpa*, is used to derive a nominal from a verb, but is also found in other functions, such as clausal nominalization, and marginally in relativization. Clausal nominalization lacks the diversity in form and function found in other Tibeto-Burman languages. It is unusually marked by one of the NP particles, the definiteness marker *wa*, or the topic marker *gaw*; that is, clauses can be nominalized without an overt nominalizer but license the presence of NP markers.

Hongyong Liu and Yang Gu discuss and contrast two types of clausal nominalizations (marked respectively by *su*³³ and *ko*³³) in Nuosu Yi, a Lolo-Burmese language spoken in the southwestern provinces of Sichuan, Yunnan, and Guizhou, from a synchronic and a diachronic point of view.

Scott DeLancey argues, based on Tibetan, Sunwar (Kiranti/Tibeto-Burman), and Kuki-Chin languages, that grammaticalization of nominalized clause constructions recurrently

leads to the development of new finite (verb or clause) constructions, including sentence-final particles that have a clause-chaining function in Tibeto-Burman languages.

The next paper deals with Iranian languages and in particular Northern Kurdish. The author, Geoffrey Haig, discusses the historical origin and the developmental pathways of the NP-internal linking particle called *Ezafe*, showing that though it shares adnominal linking functions with the *Ezafe* in Persian, it has also undergone divergent developments: for example, the development as a demonstrative (anaphoric function), similar to that of a nominalizer. In one particular dialect, Bahdîni, it has even been reanalyzed as part of the predicate, yielding the Tense *Ezafe*.

Part IV includes four papers on Korean and Japanese. Seongha Rhee examines the extended functions of nominalizers as stance-marking particles (which occur as sentential endings) in Korean. Contrasting with previous analyses of East Asian languages, Janick Wrona argues that stand-alone nominalization in Japanese represents one of several uses of nominalization. It is not derived from a copula-type (nominalized) construction, but rather developed independently. She briefly revisits other languages (Korean, Chaozhou, Classical and Lhasa Tibetan, and Rawang) and concludes that in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the nonderived view for stand-alone nominalizations advanced for Japanese should be taken into consideration.

Rumiko Shinzato traces the development of a versatile nominalized construction in Okinawan from a diachronic and comparative perspective with its sister language, Japanese. She demonstrates that the four functions originally tied to *rentaikei* in Old Japanese and Old Okinawan have been carried on in present-day Okinawan. The modern *rentaikei* maintains adnominal, exclamative, and cleft functions (with the last-mentioned further giving rise to stance marking), while the new nominalizer *si* has taken on headless relative/complementizer functions.

Kaoru Horie presents a contrastive analysis of the relative versatility of the main Japanese and Korean nominalizers found in head-internal relative clauses and sentence-final nominalized constructions.

Eight papers deal with Austronesian languages. Fuhui Hsieh discusses two functionally overlapping nominalization constructions marked by *-an* and *=ay* in Kavalan. She shows that the two markers exhibit a wider range of functions than has been reported before, including reference and modification.

Li-May Sung revisits the morphosyntactic characteristics (including the verbal and nominal features) of the two nominalizers *-ana* and \emptyset , which occur pervasively in clausal and lexical nominalization in Budai Rukai.

Marie M. Yeh shows that argument nominalization is a productive process in Saisiyat, but that there is no overt distinction between lexical nominalization and syntactic nominalization on the one hand, and between nominalization and relativization on the other. She further argues that the semantic development of *Ca/ka-* and *<in>* is similar, and reflects decategorization from verbs to subordination/modification (syntactic nominalization) and to lexical nominalization.

Naonori Nagaya argues for a recurrent grammaticalization path from referential to non-referential uses of *ang* and *yung* in Tagalog and related Philippine languages (Partido Bikol and Ilokano). He shows, among other things, that both *ang* and *yung* have a common ori-

gin in demonstratives, *ang* having been grammaticalized from Proto-Philippines **na* and *yung* from Tagalog *iyon*. After having lost its deictic meaning, *ang* is now acquiring non-referential functions, including discourse-related and subjective meanings (parentheticals and exclamatives). In contrast, the newly grammaticalized article *yung* is taking over referential functions that *ang* is losing while still preserving its original deictic meaning.

Foong Ha Yap offers an analysis of three versatile nominalizers—*yang*, *-nya*, and *punya*—in Malay, in terms of their functions, structural differences, and diachronic development. Grammaticalization paths reported elsewhere are found here as well, including the development of a stance marker from earlier nominal/pronominal to nominalizer functions.

Eric Postdam explores the syntax and semantics of exclamative clause types in Malagasy, and shows that they are syntactically nominal, the exclamative force being located in the determiner.

František Lichtenberk provides an overview of nominalizing suffixes found in Toqabaqita, an Oceanic language, and its near relatives (Longgu, Arosi, Ulawa, Oroha, Marau, 'Āre'āre, and Kwara'ae). He also discusses two nominalization constructions in Toqabaqita, the first being characterized as “double nominalization” (in oblique-object position), where the nominalizing suffix occurs twice, and the second “cognate nominalization,” where a noun phrase is headed by the same verb as the one that is the base of the nominalization.

Daniel Kaufman examines the morphosyntax of two types of nominalization (exclamatives and temporal subordinate clauses) across a wide range of Western Austronesian languages.

In the last article of the book, František Kratochvíl gives an overview of the Abui (Trans-New Guinea/Papuan) demonstratives and of the marker *ba* ‘say’ in an attempt to clarify their grammaticalization into pragmatic markers.

The succinct summary I have given of each article cannot do justice to the breadth of the data covered, the range of topics discussed, and the depth of typological and/or diachronic knowledge one may acquire by reading each paper. Despite the organizational and editorial problems mentioned here (perhaps inevitable for such a large volume), this book is a valuable contribution to the field, and scholars interested in nominalization (and nominalized-based constructions) will definitely gain many valuable insights through reading it.

ELIZABETH ZEITOUN
Academia Sinica

REFERENCES

- Gerner, Matthias. 2012. Review Article: The typology of nominalization. *Language and Linguistics* 13(4):803–44.
Zeitoun, Elizabeth (guest editor). 2002. Nominalization in Formosan languages. Special Issue of *Language and Linguistics* 3(2).