George VAN DRIEM

A PROPOS DE :

MICHAILOVSKY Boyd
La langue hayu
Paris : Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique,
Collection "Sciences du Langage", 1988, 234 p.

Hayu is a Western Kiranti (Nepali: *Kirāntī*) language of the Sino-Tibetan
language family. It is spoken in *Rāmechāp* district and neighbouring portions
of *Kābhre Pālañcok* and *Sindhulī* districts in eastern Nepal. The Hayu are
known in Nepali as *Hāyu* but in their own language call themselves *wa·ju*.
Extant ethnic Hayu villages are to be found in an elongated region along the
Mahābhārat range following the course of the *Rosī Kholā* above its
confluence with the *Sun Kosī* as far as the latter's confluence with the *Likhu
Kholā*. Amongst the settlements of ethnic Hayu the Hayu tongue only
survives as a living language in one community at *Murājor* and *Bar Ḍā̃ḍā*, a
few kilometres south of the district centre of *Rāmechāp*, and at a second
community at *Māneḍihī* and *Adhamarā*, on the southern slopes of the
Mahābhārat Lek. Michailovsky's grammar is based on the dialect of
Murājor, where he conducted field work with his wife and colleague Martine
Mazaudon, but Michailovsky also devotes attention to the dialect of the
community at *Māneḍihī* and *Adhamarā*, particularly in his chapter on Hayu
phonology.

   Michailovsky's book is a reworked version of his doctoral thesis
Grammaire de la langue hayu (1981), based on additional field work at
Murājor in 1984. *La langue hayu* is an exquisite work of descriptive
linguistics and consists of five chapters which consecutively deal with the
Hayu people and their language, Hayu phonology, the verbal morphology,
the non-verbal morphology and the syntax of the language. The book is richly

illustrated with examples and diagrams and includes two native texts complete with interlinear morpheme glosses and translations. Although the book lacks a glossary, all Hayu items and utterances are glossed wherever they occur, and both a concise index of important Hayu words, particles and morphemes as well as a well-done subject index are provided by the author. The generous use of tables and diagrams, especially in Chapter Three, along with the clarity of Michailovsky's expository prose make the vagaries of Hayu grammar, especially its complex morphology, readily accessible to the reader.

In his avant-propos, Michailovsky indicates his adherence to Prague School structuralism in matters of phonology and his theory-neutral but structuralist-inspired approach to morphology and syntax. The author explains this choice of framework as follows: 'Dans notre étude de la morphologie et de la syntaxe, nous n'avons pas cherché à adhérer à un cadre théorique précis, aucun des cadres actuellement existant ne nous semblant offrir l'équivalent du cadre pragois en phonologie, c'est-à-dire une théorie générale sur la structure des systèmes qui permette d'appréhender plus clairement les faits, même et peut-être surtout quand on est amené à transgresser la théorie cadre.' In view of the goals a linguist sets himself in writing a grammar, the integrity of such an approach recommends it as the ideal framework for any descriptive linguist.

Chapter One is a general introduction to the Hayu and their language. The author's factual descriptions of the indigenous death ritual and other Hayu traditions provide detailed data of the Hayu variety of indigenous Kiranti shamanism, furnishing valuable material for those who study the indigenous Kiranti religions in the context of pre-Buddhist, pre-Hindu Asian shamanism. In this chapter, the author explains his methodology with vivid descriptions (pp. 41-44) of what it is like to work with Nepalese informants in the Himalayan cultural context. The chapter also includes an excellent survey of Tibeto-Burman subgroupings in Nepal and of work which has been done in

this field (pp. 36-41). The author also broaches the subject of typological comparison between indigenous Tibeto-Burman languages, such as Hayu, and Nepali the Indo-Aryan *lingua franca* of Nepal. Michailovsky's appreciation of Himalayan areal norms (pp. 34-35) is reminiscent of Kirsten Refsing's experience (1986: 49-50 & personal communication, April 1986) with Ainu which, she recounts, generally translates more readily into some close Japanese equivalent than into either Danish or English.

Certainly the efficacy of Michailovsky's employment of four different systems of transcription for Nepali in a scholarly publication of this type is questionable, particularly when some of these systems do not enable an unambiguous rendering of either the native orthography or the phonological make-up of Nepali words (pp. 11-12), e.g. 'Manedihi' (Nep. *Mānedihī*), 'bhala' (Nep. *bhalā*). On the other hand, Michailovsky provides a concise and highly relevant explanation of Nepali phonology in his discussion of Nepali loans in Hayu (pp. 73-74).

Chapter Two is not only a phonology of the language but also a thorough and enjoyably lucid account of morphophonological processes in Hayu, complex regularities of great interest which give the appearance of being quintessentially Kiranti in character. For example, the assimilation and allophony of Hayu finals operate according to three distinct systems of regularities, depending on whether these finals occur (1) word-finally, (2) morpheme-finally in word-internal position or (3) syllable-finally in morpheme-internal position.

In Chapter Three, the author provides a description of verbal morphology. Like most Kiranti languages, Hayu distinguishes eleven pronominal categories. In addition to the three persons, there is a dual alongside the singular and plural, as well as an inclusive/exclusive distinction in the first person. Hayu intransitive and reflexive verbs show agreement with one

actant, whereas the transitive verb agrees with both the agent and the patient (or beneficiary) of the action.

In his table of morphemes in section 3.10, Michailovsky identifies elements in the complex, but segmentable, conjugational endings of the Hayu verb. In an article on the verbal morphology of Proto-Kiranti (Van Driem 1990), I provide a somewhat different morphemic analysis of Hayu verbal inflection based on what I believe to be a more thoroughgoing segmentation of the Hayu endings and on the identification of discrete functional positions or 'slots' occupied which these morphemes occupy in the affixal string of inflected verb forms. I rely entirely on the data provided by Michailovsky (1981) for my morphemic analysis, drawn up in order to isolate and formally and semantically define discrete entities required for a systematic comparison of the Hayu verb with the conjugations of other Kiranti languages. Since the minor differences in detail in Michailovsky's and my approach to the morphemic analysis of Hayu verbal data are made amply clear in that article (where I adhere to Michailovsky's 1981 orthography for the Hayu half-closed back vowel, i.e. /ɷ/ instead of /ʊ/), I shall limit myself here to the following five observations on several interesting topics addressed by the author in this third chapter.

First, although Michailovsky, in his typological discussion in section 5.11, claims 'Nous n'avons trouvé aucune construction syntaxique en hayu qui traite S[ujet d'un verbe intransitif] et O[bjet d'un verbe transitif] de la même façon et A[gent d'un verbe transitif] différemment, sauf évidemment l'attribution des marques casuelles. [...] Toutefois nous croyons utile de signaler que l'ergativité du hayu ne va pas au-delà des marques casuelles sur le plan syntaxique, non plus qu'elle ne pénètre le système d'accord verbale' (p. 202), the Hayu verb does in fact code differently for a first singular agent (in the form of the *portemanteau* morphemes <-ŋ ~ -N ~ -suŋ> 1s>3 and <-no> 1s>2) than it does a first singular subject or patient (<-suŋ> in the past

and <-ŋo> in the non-past), as Michailovsky points out in section 3.10. Whereas ergativity manifests itself morphologically in the Hayu verbal agreement system only the way the verb codes for a first singular actant, this morphological feature of Hayu reflects a far more widely attested split ergative system in Tibeto-Burman in which first and second person actants are encoded in the verb according to an ergative system (patient/subject vs. agent), whereas third person actants are encoded in the verb according to an accusative system (agent/subject vs. patient). Number is also encoded in Kiranti verbal agreement systems differently for first and second person actants than it is for third person actants, and beyond Kiranti a first and second versus third person split-ergative system is reflected in the verbal morphology of rGya-roñ (van Driem 1990 and forthcoming a).

Secondly, in discussing Hayu transitive verb forms, Michailovsky (1988: 83, 113-114) distinguishes between *inverse* forms expressing the transitive relationships 3>1, 3>2 and 2>1 in which 'l'action se déroule, en quelque sorte, vers le locuteur ou, dans le cas de 3>2, de l'extérieur vers l'interlocuteur' and *direct* forms expressing the transitive relationships 1>2, 1>3, 2>3 and 3>3 in which 'l'action verbale se déroule en partant du locuteur ou de son interlocuteur vers l'extérieur'. Michailovsky adopts the terms *inverse* and *direct* from Hockett (1966) who uses the terms for Algonquian. The typological phenomenon of just such a dichotomy in transitive scenarios in the conjugation has long been described by Uralic linguists, using terms such as *tárgyas* and *tárgyatlan*, *Objektkonjugation* and *Subjektkonjugation* or *centripetal* and *centrifugal* (Castrén 1854, Collinder 1960, Kortlandt 1983, van Driem, forthcoming a). The relevance of the inverse vs. direct distinction to Hayu is that the endings of inverse transitive forms are identical to those of the corresponding intransitive forms. So, although the inverse/direct dichotomy is particularly clear-cut in Hayu, Michailovsky (p. 113) clearly points out that there is no morphological marker for either a direct or inverse

scenario. A similar phenomenon is observed in Limbu where the endings of 3s>1 and 3s>2 are identical to those of intransitive first and second person forms. As I argue elsewhere (van Driem, forthcoming a), the Hayu situation does not reflect an underlying distinction between inverse and direct forms in Kiranti but demonstrably reflects the split-ergative system discussed above. Michailovsky is therefore quite right to point out that the person hierarchy which manifests itself in the apparent inverse/direct dichotomy as well as in a certain degree of formal symmetry between the inverse and the corresponding direct forms is connected with the precision with which specific morphemes encode person and number of actant in Hayu and, I might add, in Kiranti languages in general.

Thirdly, Michailovsky explains that, within the transitive conjugation, Hayu differentiates between a regular transitive and an applicative conjugation. On the basis of this criterion, Hayu transitive verbs may be divided into three groups (p. 91): (1) transitive verbs distinguishing a regular and an applicative conjugation, (2) transitive verbs lacking an applicative conjugation, and (3) transitive verbs conjugating only according to the applicative paradigm. In the applicative paradigm, the verb shows patient agreement not with the object of the action, but with the beneficiary, e.g. non-applicative *<puk- + -ko> /puxko/* 'il le lève' vs. *<puk- + -to> /pukto/* 'il le lève pour lui' (p. 89). With the exception of verbs with open stems or verbs with alternation between an open stem and a stem-final /t/ (discussed on pp. 99-103), the endings of the applicative paradigm are identical to those of the regular transitive paradigm except in 1s>3, 1pi>3, 1pe>2/3, 2s>3 and 3>3 forms (p. 89).

In his elaborate presentation of Limbu reflexes of the Tibeto-Burman directive *-t* suffix, Michailovsky (1985: 366) describes the category directive in Tibeto-Burman as covering a range of related meanings from 'causative' to 'applied', 'benefactive' and 'malefactive'. From Michailovsky's excellent

discussion of ditransitivity and actant coding in Hayu transitive verbs (1988: 139-144), it is clear that just such meanings are those conveyed by the Hayu applicative in /-t/. In a previous publication, Michailovsky (1985: 368) notes that Hayu applicative /-t/ reflects the same Tibeto-Burman directive *-t suffix which Michailovsky was the first to see reflected in the Limbu material. Moreover, Michailovsky clearly points out that the difference between the applicative and non-applicative meaning of the verb is lexeme-specific (1988: 91, 140sq.) and that the relationship between the non-applicative and applicative meaning of a verb is sometimes highly specialized and verb-specific (1988: 143-144).

All this would corroborate an alternative approach whereby, rather than assuming distinct applicative and non-applicative conjugations in Hayu, one might argue that the transitive verbs 'qui distinguent un paradigme applicatif d'un paradigme non-applicatif' are in fact pairs of lexically distinct allofamic verbs, viz. of a (non-applicative) verb and its directive (applicative) derivative. The fact that verbs with an open stem show /a ~ o/ apophony in their non-applicative conjugation, whereas their applicative counterparts show no such apophony, strongly suggests that there exist pairs of lexically distinct verbs, e.g. <to- + -suŋ> /to·suŋ/ 'il m'a placé (comme berger)' with the apophonic open stem <ta ~ to> vs. <ta·t- + -suŋ> /ta·suŋ/ 'il me l'a posé' with the stem /ta·t/ (example from p. 103). Also in cases when a particular verb, e.g. sɪ(t) 'savoir' or mo(t) 'chercher', gives the appearance of having stem-final /t/ in reflexive forms only (p. 100), there are semantic reasons for assuming two separate allofamic verbs, e.g. a non-applicative transitive verb <mo> 'chercher' vs. an applicative (directive) reflexive <mot> 'se chercher'. This would leave us with two classes of verbs in Hayu, one of verbs which show a simple pattern of paradigmatically conditioned stem alternation and another of verbs which do not.

Pairs of 'verbes vt, vtt à racine alternante en -/(t)/', i.e. pairs of verbs consisting of an open stem verb and its applicative counterpart with stem-final

/-*t*/, preserve entirely distinct paradigms, e.g. <*bu-* + -*suŋ*> /*bu·suŋ*/ 'tu me portas' vs. <*but-* + -*suŋ*> /*busuŋ*/ 'tu me le portas' (p. 100), <*hu-* + -*no*> /*hu·no*/ 'je te cherche' vs. <*hut-* + -*no*> /*hu?no*/ 'je te le cherche' (p. 101). Such verbs show no stem alternation.

On the other hand, the class of applicative verbs of which the non-applicative derivand is not an open-stem verb as well as the applicative verbs which lack a non-applicative counterpart preserve the applicative final /*t*/ only in 1s>3, 1pi>3, 1pe>2/3, 2s>3 and 3>3 forms. In other words, this class of applicative verbs in final /*t*/ exhibits a simple pattern of paradigmatically conditioned stem alternation, e.g. non-applicative <*puk-* + -*kuŋ*> /*puxkuŋ*/ 'je le levai' vs. applicative <*pukt-* + -*kuŋ*> /*puktuŋ*/ 'je levai pour lui' in contrast to non-applicative <*puk-* + -*suŋ*> /*puksuŋ*/ 'tu/il me levas/leva' vs. applicative <*puk-* + -*suŋ*> (alternatively <*pukt-* + -*suŋ*>, i.e. without assuming stem alternation) /*puksuŋ*/ 'tu levas/il leva pour moi' (re-analysed examples from pp. 84-90). The paradigmatically conditioned stem alternation explains the homophony in 1>2, 2>1, 3>1/2, 1d>2/3 and 2dp>3 forms between verbs like <*puk*> 'lever quelqu'un' and its allofamic applicative (directive) derivative <*pukt ~ puk*> (alternatively <*pukt*>) 'lever pour quelqu'un'.

In this approach, one must presume that the final /*t*/ in this class of applicative verbs causes the /*k*/ of the first plural preterit suffix <-*ki*> to elide (in 1pi>3 and 1pe>2/3 forms) as well as the /*k*/ in the third person patient preterit *portemanteau* morpheme <-*ko*> (in 1s>3/PT, 2s>3 and 3>3 forms) and the /*s*/ of the 1s>3 *portemanteau* morpheme <-*ŋ ~ -N ~ -suŋ*> (in 1s>3/NPT forms), e.g. <*sitt ~ sit*> 'tuer', <*sitt-* + -*ko* + -*m*> /*sixtom*/ 'il le tua' (re-analysed example from p. 140); <*hat ~ ha·*> 'donner', <*hat-* + -*suŋ*> /*ha·tuŋ*/ 'je lui donne' and <*ha·t-* + -*kuŋ*> /*ha·tuŋ*/ 'je lui donnai' (re-analysed example from p. 91). Elsewhere in the paradigm, this does not happen, for example, before the 1sPS/PT *portemanteau* morpheme <-*suŋ*>, e.g. <*ha·-* + -*suŋ*> /*ha·suŋ*/ 'il me donna' (re-analysed example from p. 160), <*gu sek sit-* + -*suŋ*> /*gu sek sisuŋ*/ 'tue-moi mes poux' (example from p.

142), or before the 1s>2 *portemanteau* <-no>, e.g. <*sɪt-* + *-no*> /*sɪtno*/ 'je le tue' (re-analysed example from p. 142), <*haˑ-* + *-no* + *-m*>ˈ/*haˑnom*/ 'je te donne (assertif)' (re-analysed example from p. 156). For the morphemic analysis used here, cf. van Driem 1990.

The difference in semantic content between a non-applicative verb and its applicative derivative in Hayu (pp. 139-144, 191) is of the same nature as the difference in meaning in comparable pairs of Limbu verbs studied by Michailovsky (1985). Since a Hayu dictionary would have to specify this difference in meaning for all verbs 'qui distinguent un paradigme applicatif d'un paradigme non-applicatif' or, as I contend, between all such non-applicative/applicative pairs of verbs, I propose that it would be more satisfactory to list separately as distinct entities non-applicative verbs and their applicative <-t> derivatives, e.g. <*khuˑ*> 'steal something' vs. <*khut̪*> 'rob someone, steal something from someone' (p. 108), <*huˑ*> 'look for something or someone' vs. <*hut*> 'look for something on behalf of or for the benefit of someone (= patient)' (pp. 101, 109). The lexical entry of a transitive verb would have to specify whether the verb showed stem alternation (e.g. <*rukt* ~ *ruk*> 'utiliser un animal (= patient) pour labourer, labourer un champ pour quelqu'un (= patient)', <*haˑt* ~ *haˑ*> 'donner') or whether it did not (e.g. <*buˑ*> 'porter sur le dos', <*but* > 'faire porter quelque chose par quelqu'un (= patient)', <*ruk*> 'labourer').

The fact that Hayu verbs, such as 'to give' or 'to kill', invariably conjugate as applicatives would support a specification of their stems in the lexicon as <*haˑt* ~ *haˑ*> and <*sɪtt* ~ *sɪt*>. The vowel length in Hayu <*haˑt* ~ *haˑ*> 'give' would in this way also be a feature of the lexeme, rather than being exclusively the result of morphophonological processes. Recall that vowel length in Hayu is only distinctive in an open first syllable of a polysyllabic word (pp. 47, 54-56) and that when such an open first syllable is the stem of a verb, it is automatically long (p. 68), e.g. <*haˑ dak-mi*> /*ha dakmi*/ 'il faut (assertif) donner' (re-analysed example from p. 157) and

<āsik ha·-ha· po-tshe> /āsik ha·ha po-tshe/ 'ils se sont bénis mutuellement'
(re-analysed example from p. 160). Specified in this way, the long vowel in
the Hayu verb 'to give' is also more in line with the long vowels in its Limbu
cognates <-ha·s-/-ha·-> 'apportion, share, distribute something' and
<-ha·tt-/-ha·t-> 'deal, portion out to, distribute amongst, share between'. The
fact that Hayu <ha·t ~ ha·> 'give' invariably shows patient agreement with the
beneficiary, in which respect Hayu <ha·t ~ ha·> resembles English 'endow'
more than English 'give', is likewise a morphosyntactic and semantic feature
to be specified in the lexicon. Alternatively, it may prove expedient to
accurately define the semantic function of the syntactic category of patient for
Kiranti languages (cf. Wierzbicka 1988: 391, van Driem, forthcoming b).

In addition to Michailovsky's elaborate treatment of the semantics and
morphophonology of the non-applicative/applicative distinction, the author
provides a list of 54 intransitive/transitive and non-causative/causative pairs of
Hayu verbs reflecting an ancient prefixing process (pp. 106-110). If we
adhere to Benedict's reconstruction of Tibeto-Burman derivational affixes, the
prefix suggested by Michailovsky's list is the Tibeto-Burman causative *s-
prefix (cf. Benedict 1972: 105-106, Michailovsky 1985: 367-368, 374-375,
van Driem 1987: 245-247, 266-267). Michailovsky also provides a very
interesting discussion of Hodgson's work in the middle of the last century on
the Hayu verbal paradigms (pp. 104-106).

Fourthly, the diagram on page 102 of Michailovsky's book would suggest
that there exist in Hayu independent verb forms to designate the transitive
relationship between a first person inclusive (dual and plural) agent and a
second person patient. I have not been able to find examples of such a form in
any of the many examples Michailovsky provides in *La langue hayu* and have
indeed never been able to detect or elicit such forms myself in the Limbu,
Dumi or Lohorung languages. In response to my attempts to elicit in Limbu,

for example, 'you[S] see us[di] in the mirror' or 'we[di] see you[S] in the mirror', I have only attested circumlocutions of the type:

> *Khɛnɛʔ*   *anchi*   *aina-oʼ*   *a-dhaʼp-si-ba*   *kɛ-ni.*
> you[S]   we[di]   mirror-LOC   1-be‿visible-d-NOM   2-see
> You[S] see us[di] (literally: the fact that we[di] are visible) in the mirror.

More often, informants will go to great lengths to point out the absurdity of my wishing to express a transitive scenario between a first inclusive and a second person actant, arguing quite convicingly of course that a first inclusive (dual or plural) reflexive meaning is more plausible. My understandable skepticism on this score leads me to wonder whether the transitive forms suggested by the diagram on page 102 are an accidental fluke of the diagram, resulting perhaps from the way it was drawn up, or whether Michailovsky has actually attested cases of Hayu verb forms being used unambiguously to express the transitive relationship between a first person inclusive and a second person actant.

It may be noted in passing that Hayu, like Limbu, preserves separate dual <-na> and singular/plural <-(n)ts> allomorphs of the reflexive morpheme (p. 112). Also, the Hayu verb <no(t)> 'to be' appears to be cognate to Limbu <-nur-/-nu-> 'be all right, be suitable, be fitting; be in good health, get well' and to Dumi <-noʼ-/-nu-/-nɨ-> 'be good, be all right, be fine', apparently via a semantic shift which may have taken place along the lines of 'to fare well' > 'to fare' > 'to be'. A similar development is seen in Indo-European where English *be* is cognate with the stem of Sanskrit *bhūtiḥ* 'exist, thrive, prosper' and *bhāvitaḥ* 'in good spirits'; cf. also Slavonic *izbaviti* 'save, liberate, deliver' and *zabava* 'fun, pleasure, merriment' with historically the same stem as that of *byti* 'to be'.

Fifth, in sections 3.3.5 and 5.9.1, Michailovsky describes the assertive verbal suffix <-*mi*> (~ <-*m*> after vowels). This marker of the declarative mode is suffixed only to finite indicative forms and is not found in verbs in the imperative, interrogative, conditional or in verbs expressing the conclusion of a *conditionalis irrealis* (pp. 93, 192-193). In a larger syntagm containing a series of coordinated verbs, only the final indicative finite can be marked by the suffix (p. 190). With respect to the exact meaning conveyed by the assertive particle, Michailovsky, with the detached non-presumptuousness of a truly empirical scientific mind, writes 'Nous ne sommes pas en mesure d'expliquer ces faits' (p. 193). Yet Michailovsky's use of the term 'l'assertif' and 'mode déclaratif' give us a relatively well-defined idea as to the author's assessment of the suffix's meaning.

It is possible that the parallelism between the Hayu assertive marker <-*mi*> (~ <-*m*> after vowels) and the final particle **es* (~ **s* after vowels), which in Insular Celtic underlies the difference between absolute and conjunct forms, extends beyond the typological similarity pointed out by Kortlandt (1984: 182). The distribution of the Hayu affix and its function as an assertive marker of the declarative mode strongly suggest that this suffix might reflect an inflected form of an old Kiranti copula in sentence-final position, in the meaning 'It is the case that...', i.e. an additional nexus in Jespersen's sense (Jespersen 1924: 86sq.). It is probable that the same old Kiranti copula is reflected by the Dumi clause nominalizing and imperfective aspect suffix <-*m*> (cf. van Driem 1991).

For the time being it remains a matter of conjecture whether the reflected copula are related to one or both of the ancient auxiliaries presumed in reconstruction of the Proto-Kiranti verbal system (van Driem 1990, forthcoming a). At any rate, the Hayu assertive marker <-*mi* ~ -*m*> and the Dumi nominalizing and aspect suffix <-*m*> appear cognate to the Dumi verb 'to be' for animate referents, the fourth conjugation intransitive <-*mo*-/-*mi*-/-*mu*->, which in Dumi is distinct from the copula for inanimate

referents, the fourth conjugation intransitive verb <-*go·-/-gi-/-gu-*>. Intriguing in this connexion is the parallel between the Hayu nominalizing suffix <-*m*> (p.121) and the Newari relatives, -*mhɔ* for animate referents (replaced in the plural by the plural animate noun suffix *pĩ*) and -*gu* for inanimate referents, both manifestly cognate with the Dumi animate and inanimate copulas <-*mo·-/-mi-/-mu-*> and <-*go·-/-gi-/-gu-*> (Newari examples from Hargreaves 1989):

> *Jĩ·*   *hɔy-a-gu*   *dheba*
> I(erg.)   bring-past‿conjunct-REL   money
> The money I brought

> *Dheba hɔ·-mhɔ   misa*
> money bring-REL   girl
> The girl who brought the money

The Hayu nominalizing suffix <-*m*> is closely related in function to these Newari relatives, e.g. in the adjectives *atim* 'éloigné, qui est là-bas', *utim* 'inférieur, qui est en bas' and *anim* 'supérieur, qui est en haut', derived from the adjectives *ati* 'là-bas, loin', *uti* 'bas' and *ani* 'haut' respectively. The nominalizing suffix <-*m*> in these forms is identified by the author (p. 121) with 'la postposition génitif/déterminatif' <-*mu*> (~ <-*mi*> in adjectives denoting colours). Certainly, as a suffix to lexical adjectives which converts these to attributive forms which can be used adnominally the suffix <-*mu*> is more determinative than genitive in function (p. 168). Here the function of the Hayu nominalizing suffix <-*m*> appears highly similar, if not identical, to that of the Old Persian relative reflected in the modern Persian *iẓāfat* and of the cognate Old Church Slavonic relative *jь*, found in the definite forms of Old Church Slavonic adjectives (e.g. *bělъ-jь domъ* 'house that is white'), whence the long, adnominal forms of the adjectives derive in modern Slavic

languages. The ending of the Hayu infinitive, which in some respects could be considered a verbal noun (p. 171), appears to be the same suffix <-*mu*> (p. 99).

In all three of these functions (assertive, nominalizing and determinative), the Hayu suffix appears to be cognate with the Dumi nominalizer suffix <-*m*>, which, like the Hayu suffix, apparently reflects the same etymon as the Dumi fourth conjugation copula for animate referents <-*mo·-/-mi-/-mu*-> and the Newari animate relative -*mhɔ*. Yet where the Hayu genitive/determinative suffix <-*mu*> is clearly genitive in function (pp. 166-168), rather than determinative, the Hayu suffix is clearly cognate with the Lohorung genitive suffix <-*mi*> (~ <-*m*> in pronouns). Comparative evidence therefore would suggest that the Hayu genitive/determinative suffix in nominals <-*mu*> (~ <-*mi*> in adjectives denoting colours) *in its determinative function*, the Hayu assertive suffix in verbs <-*mi* ~ -*m*> and the Hayu nominalizing suffix <-*m*> reflect the same etymon, whereas the Hayu genitive/determinative suffix <-*mu*> *in its genitive function* probably reflects a distinct etymon denoting genitive case.

Chapter Four comprises a succinct treatment of both derivational and flectional endings in Hayu nominal parts of speech. A more elaborate discussion devoted to Hayu case endings is given in the fifth chapter under section 5.3 on 'le syntagme nominal'. The absolutive case in Hayu is unmarked, as is the case in other attested Kiranti languages. The suffix of the ergative case <-*ha*>, evidently cognate to the Dumi ergative marker <-*ʔa*> and the Lohorung ergative suffix <-*ʔɛ*>. Remarkably, although Hayu possessive pronouns are highly specific as to person and number, distinguishing all eleven pronominal categories, the free forms of the pronouns are only specific for number in the second person: *gon* 'you' (singular), *gontshe* 'you' (dual), *gone* 'you' (plural). There is only a single pronoun to express a first person actant *gu* ~ *guu*, covering the meanings 'I'

and 'we' (both dual and plural, both inclusive and exclusive), and number is not distinguished in the third person: *komi* 'he/she/they' (human), *mi ~ mii* 'he/she/it/they' (human and non-human) and *i ~ ii* 'he/she/it/they' (proximal, human and non-human). The interesting Hayu phenomenon that the first person (*gu* 'I/we') and second singular (*gon* 'you^S') pronouns have special ergative forms, *ga* 'I/we(erg.)' and *gona* 'you^S(erg.)', has a parallel in Dumi and Lohorung. In Dumi, the singular pronouns *aŋ* 'I', *an* 'you^S' and *im* 'he/she' have ergative forms *aŋa*, *ana* and *ima*, with the special allomorph <*-a*> of the ergative suffix which elsewhere, in nouns but also in pronouns, has the form <*-ʔa*>. In Lohorung, the six of the eleven personal pronouns which end in /*-a*/ have special ergative forms in /*-ɛ*/, e.g. *kaŋka* 'we (plural exclusive)' vs. *kaŋkɛ* 'we (plural exclusive ergative)', and the third singular pronoun *khoˑ* 'he/she' has a special ergative form *khoˑs-ɛ* 'he/she(ergative)' whilst elsewhere, in nouns but also in pronouns, the ergative suffix is <*-ʔɛ*>.

Chapter Five is a veritable treasure trove of fascinating data and descriptions of grammatical and semantic categories and phenomena in Hayu. Not only the structure of Hayu sentences is dealt with in this chapter, but the internal syntactic structure and morphosyntax of syntactic constituents, large and small, is exhaustively treated with the aid of numerous well chosen examples. There is a lucid section on reflexivity in Hayu (pp. 144-146), following the section (5.1.5) on ditransitivity discussed above. The author provides descriptions of many periphrastic constructions of the Hayu verb, including a range of modal constructions, a true passive (where the agentive actant cannot be expressed in the syntagm) and different types of causative. The finite modal in Hayu periphrastic constructions governs either the bare stem of the main verb or, as in the case of *lɪŋ* 'obtenir de' and *bi* 'demander de', the genitivized stem of the main verb, which in Hayu is the same thing as the infinitive.

The variety of subordinating suffixes or postpositions in Hayu is of great interest to the comparative study of Kiranti syntax. Of these verbal postpositions Michailovsky says: 'Pour la plupart, ces postpositions sont les mêmes que celles qui s'emploient avec les syntagmes nominaux' (p. 179). Indeed, the nominal suffix <-*boŋ*> 'jusqu'à' (pp. 178-179) appears to be the same morpheme as the verbal subordinator<-*boŋ*> 'aussi longtemps que' (p. 183). However, the subordinator <-*noŋ*> (p. 182), which might justifiably be termed a coordinator, the linear order of the coordinated arguments reflecting the chronological order of the events they denote, appears to be cognate to Limbu <-*aŋ*> which has the same function, whereas the 'locatif-sociatif' nominal suffix <-*noŋ*> (p. 176) would appear to be cognate to the Limbu comitative suffix <-*nu*>, in both its locative and sociative senses. Have two Proto-Kiranti suffixes, still distinct in Limbu, coalesced to form the Hayu morpheme, or is the etymological relationship, if any, between <-*noŋ*> and the corresponding Limbu suffixes more complex?

First person plural inclusive is used in an impersonal sense in Hayu as it is in Limbu, Lohorung and Dumi (pp. 173, 171, 153) like French *on*, but also in much the same way as the second person is used in an impersonal, non-literal sense in colloquial Dutch or English. The Hayu phenomenon of an impersonal first plural inclusive appears to be a widespread phenomenon in languages with a first plural inclusive category, not limited to the Kiranti area of the eastern Himalayas. A similar impersonal usage is, for example, attested for the first plural inclusive pronoun *nī* in the Mesoamerican Otomangue language Popoloca (Veerman-Leichsenring 1990).

Hayu has several distinct negative morphemes: <*tha*> in the imperative, <*ma*> in the indicative, <*maaŋ*> negator of gerunds, nouns and attributes. Unlike the negative affixes one observes in most other Kiranti languages, the negative morphemes in Hayu behave like particles. A parallel for the differentiation of negative morphemes in the Hayu fashion can be found in Lohorung where the prefix <*a-*> is used in the negation of infinitives,

adhortatives and imperatives, whereas indicatives are negated by the prefix <ma-> in the preterit and perfect and by the suffix <-ni> in the non-preterit.

The affixes of the Hayu negative <ma-stem-sa> (p. 161) appear to be cognate to the Limbu negative perfect gerund <mɛn-stem-ʔeˑ>, the Lohorung negative perfect gerund stem <mɛ-stem-le/-re> and perhaps also the Dumi negative perfect gerund <ma-stem-nə>. Certainly the Hayu negative perfect gerund is virtually identical in function to these, as Michailovsky's examples (p. 184) show, and perhaps in these forms the Hayu negative morpheme <ma-> functions, or *still* functions, as a prefix. As Michailovsky remarks, 'Il est curieux de trouver toujours la particule négative /ma/ dans cette construction et non /maaŋ/, qu'on attendrait avec le gérondif' (p. 184).

La langue hayu is a major contribution to Sino-Tibetan linguistics and to our knowledge of the indigenous Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal. In producing this detailed, well-written state-of-the-art grammar of a language on the verge of extinction, Michailovsky has preserved part of the rich linguistic and cultural heritage of the Himalayas for posterity.

George van Driem
Rijksuniversiteit Leiden

References

Benedict, P.K.

  1972   *Sino-Tibetan, a Conspectus*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Castrén, M.A.

  1854   *Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*, St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Collinder, Bj.

  1960   *Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Driem, G.L. van

  1987   *A Grammar of Limbu*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

  1990   'An exploration of Proto-Kiranti verbal morphology', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 22 (2).

  1991   *A Grammar of Dumi*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

  MS a   'Le proto-kiranti revisité, morphologie verbale du lohorung'.

  MS b   'Tangut verbal agreement and the patient category in Tibeto-Burman', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*.

Hargreaves, D.

  1989   'Relative clauses in Late Classical and Kathmandu Newari', paper presented at the 22nd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics at the University of Hawa'i at Honolulu, 6 October 1989.

Hockett, C.F.

  1966   'What Algonquian is really like', *International Journal of American Linguistics* 32 (1), 59-73.

Jespersen, O.

 1924 *The Philosophy of Grammar*, London: George Allen & Unwin
  Ltd.

Kortlandt, F.H.H.

 1983 'Proto-Indo-European syntax', *Journal of Indo-European
  Studies* 11 (3-4), 307-324.

 1984 'Old Irish subjunctives and futures and their Proto-Indo-
  European origins', *Ériu* XXXV, 179-187.

Michailovsky, B.

 1981 *Grammaire de la langue hayu*, Berkeley: Ph.D. thesis, Univer-
  sity of California.

 1985 'Tibeto-Burman dental suffixes: evidence from Limbu', in
  Thurgood, G., J.A. Matisoff & D. Bradley, eds., *Linguistics
  of the Sino-Tibetan Area: The State of the Art , papares
  presented to Paul K. Benedict for his seventy-first birthday*,
  Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, pp. 363-375.

 1988 *La langue hayu* («Sciences du Langage»), Paris: Éditions du
  Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Refsing, K.

 1986 *The Ainu Language: the morphology and syntax of the Shizu-
  nai dialect*, Århus, Århus Universitetsforlaget.

Veerman-Leichsenring, J.W.

 1990 *Metzontla Popoloca*, Leiden: Ph.D. thesis, Rijksuniversiteit
  Leiden.

Wierzbicka, A.

 1988 *The Semantics of Grammar*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub-
  lishing Company.