I. Introduction

• In a family as large and diverse as Sino-Tibetan/Tibeto-Burman, it is not surprising to see this diversity manifested also in the complex and interesting forms and semantics of spatial relations across the languages
• As a preview for Manange:
• Topological relations are primarily encoded in nominal suffixal/enclitic forms or else in quasi-free root-like forms variably called “relator/locator nouns/locational elements.” Additional spatial relations are encoded in verbal lexical semantics, with some variation observed across Tamangic languages
• Enclitics and a small set of these locational elements do the lion’s share of spatial encoding in Manange discourse, while Nar-Phu makes much more productive use of locational roots in both elicited and discourse contexts
• The linguistic frame of reference in both languages includes a complex combination of relative, absolute and also intrinsic patterns
• Many of these forms are easy enough to discover through formal elicitation, but it is through examination in discourse contexts that their structural and semantic intricacies may be more deeply appreciated, and that subtle similarities and differences across languages may be discovered

II. Location, Status, and Morpho-Syntactic Typology of Manange

• Manange (endonyms: Nyeshang, Nyeshante, Nyangmi) spoken in eight villages of the upper Manang District in central-northern Nepal; Nar-Phu (endonym: tshyprung/nartwe) spoken in Nar/Phu villages, with residents who have relocated to other parts of Manang; both have active communities residing in Kathmandu and abroad
• Other Tamangic languages: Tamang, Gurung, Thakali, Nar-Phu, Seke/Tangbe and Chantyal. Published reports on speaker populations are conflicting: CBS (2012) under 400 speakers while speaker self-reporting 3,000 and 5,000. In other cases, Manange is lumped in with Gurung (Gurung 1998; Tumbahang 2012). More recent research: some 2,000-3,000 active speakers distributed across Manang, with roughly the same number of members living in Kathmandu and abroad (Hildebrandt et al 2015). Not all diaspora Mananges are active speakers, so Manange could be classified as ‘threatened/shifting’; Nar is moribund
• The basic word-order in elicited structures and in most discourse-embedded clauses is verb-final, with post-positions and post-nominal modification

---
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• Relative clauses are pre-nominal; negation is prefixal or via copula suppletion
• Case marking is reliably ergative-absolutive in elicitation, but the frequency of overt realization in discourse is low and tied to pragmatic factors (Bond et al 2013)
• Manange and Nar-Phu lack agreement. With the exception of the negative prefix, noun and verb morphology is exclusively suffixed or enclitic
• Verbal affixes code aspect and modality, and nominalization of main verbs is frequently encountered in discourse

III. Spatial Relations in Post-nominal Enclitics

• Hildebrandt (2004) a very basic overview of spatial encodings, and all elicited examples come from this sketch, and more extensive examples from discourse collected in 2013 & 2014.
• Michael Noonan provided some additional semantic observations via unpublished notes on Nar Phu; almost all discourse examples in this talk come from data gathered in 2010 (ELDP), and in 2012-2014 (NSF).
• In these languages, topological relations are largely encoded via enclitics, and there is a general locative enclitic (ri~re) encoding a wide range of containment and support expressions, as well as dynamic, motion towards:

(1)

a. Manange IN/AT
22ki 52pwal=ri 22tu-p3 22mo
3.SG KTM=LOC stay-NMLZR COP
‘He lives in Kathmandu.’

22ŋ3=tse 22ŋ1=k0 42jofo=ri 42tsb’or-tsi
1.SG=ERG meat=DEF paper=LOC wrap-PFV
‘I wrapped the meat in the paper.’

b. Manange ON
22ŋ3 22t’han=ri 22tu-tsu 22mo
1.SG ground=LOC stay-PROG COP
‘I am sitting on the ground.’

c. Manange TO/TOWARDS
52mi=ko 52jul=ri 42khan 42k’ja=ro 42p’ro-tsi
person=DEF village=LOC mountain place=ABL walk-PFV
‘The person walked to the village from the mountain.’

d. Nar-Phu IN
ŋfu=re ŋψa mû
DIST=LOC tea COP
‘There’s tea in this (container)’ (Noonan elicitation notes)
e. Nar-Phu ON

photo \( \text{kan}=\text{re} \) kʰe-tse

photo \( \text{wall}=\text{lo}c \) put-PFV

‘(Someone) puts a photo on the wall.’ (MPI put_028)

f. Nar-Phu IN/AT

ŋæ tfosor \( \text{ph}=\text{alpe}=\text{re} \) mú

1.sg now \( \text{KTM}=\text{lo}c \) COP

‘I’m in Kathmandu now.’ (Noonan elicitation notes)

g. Nar-Phu TO/TOWARDS

tʃʰupruŋ-se \( \text{JM} \) \( \text{ph}=\text{alpe}=\text{re} \) ni-tʃi mú

Nar.village=ABL \( \text{JM} \) \( \text{KTM}=\text{lo}c \) go-PST EVID

‘JM went from Nar to Kathmandu.’ (Noonan elicitation notes)

- In discourse in Manange, most topological encoding is with \( =\text{ri} \); in Nar-Phu, “locator nouns” are more prolific (§ IV), but noun + enclitic are found in discourse too:

(2)

a. Manange IN

\( 22\text{kaj}=\text{ri} \) 44 prin \( 22\text{j}=\text{x}, \) 22h e \( 22\text{j}=\text{tsi} \)

\( \text{pot}=\text{lo}c \) put do, keep go-PFV

‘Putting (yeast) in a pot, it is cooked...’ (NgawalM99_F2_,_009)

b. Manange IN/AT

\( 22\text{t}=\text{n} \) \( 22\text{n} \) pisan \( 52\text{jul}=\text{ri} \) \( 22\text{n} \) 42lo \( 42\text{n} \) atsju epA=ko \( 42\text{lo} \)

day 1.pl Pisang village=loC 1.sg year five.ten age=DEF year

42nA t t bahirA 22tutsi
five class outside sit-PFV

‘Today, we in this Pisang village, as I was about to become fifty years old, I lived outside for five years.’ (PisangM2013_2_007)

c. Manange TOWARDS/UNTIL

\( \text{t}=\text{its}=\text{ho} \) 44kju mi=ko \( 42\text{komtso}=\text{ri} \) 44je-p3

Tilicho water source=DEF sea=loC return-NMLZR

‘Tilicho lake (the source is in Manang) flows towards the ocean/goes to the ocean.’ (Khangsar13_MM1_030)

d. Nar IN/AT

ŋæ fjon\text{en} \( \text{phwj}=\text{re} \) tfjæn-tʃi

1.sg education Tibet=loC study-PST

‘I was educated in Tibet.’ (The Three Brothers)
e. Nar ON
hotʃu=re  phæ tsam khjeta phɾa-pə  tæ phɾa-pə
this=LOC  iron  bridge  cattle  walk-NMLZR  horse  walk-NMLZR
‘On this, iron bridges, cattle walk, horses walk.’ (Contemporary Nar, 7)

f. Nar IN/INSIDE
paŋ=tʃuke=re  âpe  phruŋ-pə
pen=PL=LOC  excrement  defecate=NMLZR
‘In the pens, (the animals) defecated.’ (Contemporary Nar, 12)

- Very rarely (in Manange), location is marked only with a locational element, without the locative:

(3) Manange

44pu  52naŋ  22tsʰaŋ-tsi
clay.pot  inside  put-PFV
‘I put (yeast) inside of the clay pot.’

- These examples illustrate a “relative” frame-of-reference system at work in both Manange and Nar-Phu (Bickel 1994; 1997; Levinson 2003; Levinson and Wilkins 2006; Bowerman 2007) i.e., the location of an object is expressed in relation to both the viewpoint of the perceiver (speaker) and the position of another referent.  
- Both Manange and Nar-Phu have lexemes for “left/right”:

(4)
a. Manange:  22tor ~ 22ja 22tortse ‘left ~ left hand’,  kje ~ 22ja 22kjetse ‘right ~ right hand’
b. Nar-Phu: tôr ‘left side’, ke ‘right side’

- These are also nouns or noun-like:

(5) Nar, MPI Classifier_009

tepə  kap  kal=ri  nhâŋ=ri,
again  cup  like=LOC  inside=LOC,
khrî  tʃʰaŋ-tse  pʰjaŋ=ri  tôr
one  is.kept-PFV  top=LOC  left
ken=ri  læ  then-tse  mo  mú
right=LOC  do  put-PFV  COP  EVID

‘Again, that (wooden object) being put inside the cup, it is (also) put on top to the left and right (of the cup).’
And both languages have lexemes for ‘north/south/east/west’; these are not encountered in any discourse, but in elicitation (7-9 below), *aŋse* 'side' follows the direction word.

### (6) Cardinal Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manange</th>
<th>Nar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>52’tfaŋ</td>
<td>tʃfaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>42’lo</td>
<td>lô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>44’ʃer</td>
<td>fâr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>52’nu</td>
<td>nhup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) Manange

\[ \text{22} \text{ŋ3}  \quad 52'tfaŋ  \quad aŋse=(ri)  \quad 22'j3-tsi \]

1.SG north side=(Loc) go-PFV

'I went north.'

(8) Nar

ηã thim fâr aŋse=(ri) mo

1.SG house east side=(Loc) COP

'I’m at the east side of (my) house.'

(9) Nar

ηã amrika nhup aŋse=(ri) ni-tʃi

1.SG America west side=(Loc) go-PST

'I went west to America.'

### IV. “Locational Elements”

- In Manange and Nar-Phu topological relations are productively encoded by what is termed by Hildebrandt as “locational roots”; In Nar-Phu, not explicitly discussed by Noonan, but also probably noun-like in their morpho-syntax
- These forms encode both static and dynamic (motion) relations
- These are easy enough to elicit in Manange, and they are of course also encountered in discourse, but they are far more frequently encountered in Nar-Phu discourse, while the general locative =ri is more frequent in Manange discourse

---

2 In Phu, the word for 'side' is tʃʰo, as in ηãamrika nhup tʃʰo(=ri) ja-tʃi ‘I went west to America.’
a. Manange 52naŋ 'inside'

44tsu 42ja 42ru 52naŋ=ko=ri 22k3ru 42p3lu 42ŋ3 44prin-tse 22l3-tsi

PROX yak horn inside=DEF=LOC barley seed five hit-CC do-PFV

‘Inside of the (dead) yak’s horn, (the lama) put five barley seeds.’ (Ghyaru_ManM1)

b. Manange 44litse ‘behind,’ 22p3r ‘in between’, 22ti ‘near’

44tsu 22t3j-p3 ku 44s6 42ts3aŋ-tse 44litse=ri 22mo-p3 22t4e-tsi.

PROX big-NMLZR idol three put-CC behind=LOC COP-NMLZR keep-PFV

44u ku=ko 22p3ri=ri 22ti=ri 44u 22l3-tse

DIST idol=DEF between=LOC near=LOC DIST do-CC

44u=ko=ri 52s3-ni 22l3-tse 52mi 52ŋjo-p3 44u 44tsu=ko

DIST=DEF=LOC nice-ADV do-CC person look-NMLZR dist PROX=DEF

‘Having made three idols, those there in the back, those were made/kept...having done like this, (those) in between/near here, having done well, people look there (at them))/regard them.’ (Braga_13_MM3_028-30)

(11)

a. Nar: p3jaŋ 'top' stative

nokju=t3n ële=ce phomi p3jaŋ=re th3an-tse

dog=COMIT boy=DEF shoulder top=LOC keep-PFV

‘The boy kept/held the dog on his shoulders.’ (grammar notes 5:5)

b. Nar: p3jaŋ 'top' dynamic

ële=ce=t3n nokju=ce tfonpe rhu-lpi p3jaŋ=re krê-tse

boy=DEF=COMIT dog=DEF tree spoil-NMLZR top=LOC climb-CVB

‘The boy and/with the dog, having climbed to the top of the fallen/rotting tree...’ (grammar notes 5:6)

c. Nar: n3aŋ ‘inside/into’

nokju=t3n ële=ce kju t3=h n3aŋ=re pi tê-tji

dog=COMIT boy=DEF water lake inside=LOC go.fast fall-PST

‘The dog and the boy accidentally fell into the lake.’ (grammar notes 5:4)

d. Nar: pho 'beside'

njuku baksi pho=re mò mu

pen box beside=LOC COP EVID

‘The pen is beside the box.’ (grammar notes 10:1)

• Most of these locator roots convey a relative frame of reference, but ‘front/back’ appears to be absolute (ie. the location of the object is defined in relation to arbitrary or fixed bearings):
(12) Manange (Hoshi 1986: 198)

\[ 42^{th} \text{ji} \quad 22\text{njwontse=ri} \quad 44\text{ṭp3} \quad 44\text{katti} \quad 22\text{mo} \quad 22\text{mu} \]

house \quad front=\text{LOC} \quad monk \quad many \quad COP \quad EVID

‘There are many monks in front of the house.’

(13) Nar-Phu

\[ p\text{juŋ} \quad \text{ŋwonte} \quad \text{ŋwonte} \quad \text{phrâ-tse} \]

man \quad front \quad front \quad walk-\text{CVB}

\ni-\text{ṭjī}

\text{go-PST}

‘The man, in a walking manner, goes forward.’

(MPI Set1_105ET)

- Upon consultation with Nar speakers, these encode ‘front/back’ no matter where the speaker is in relation to the location or movement of the referent. ‘Front/back’ in reference to the speaker is encoded lexically: Manange tenje ‘back of body’ ku ‘chest/front of torso’; Nar-Phu rəôte ‘lower back side’, thwɛku ‘upper front or back side’, mæko ‘lower front torso side’

V. Dynamic Spatial Relations Encoded in Verbs

- A small set of verbs in both Manange give evidence of a second frame-of-reference system at work in the language, although limited to a small set of verbs; ‘descend’ is part of the larger lexical construction for weather and environmental phenomena, as in (15):

(14) Select Motion Verbs in Manange

\[ 22\text{jə} \quad \text{‘go’} \]
\[ 22\text{kʰə} \quad \text{‘come’} \]
\[ 22\text{ju} \quad \text{‘descend’} \]
\[ 44\text{je} \quad \text{‘ascend/return’} \quad \text{(distinct from 22kre ‘climb’)} \]

(15) Manange weather/environment verbs

\[ 52\text{mo} \quad 22\text{ju-pə} \quad \text{‘to rain’} \quad \text{(lit. sky descend)} \]
\[ 42\text{kʰi} \quad 22\text{ju-pə} \quad \text{‘to snow’} \quad \text{(lit. snow descend)} \]
\[ 22^{th}i/22sə \quad 22\text{ju-pə} \quad \text{‘to have a landslide/an avalanche’} \quad \text{(lit. ground/slope descend)} \]

(16) Manange 22ju ‘descend’ in discourse

\[ 52\text{mo} \quad 22\text{a-ju-pə-ko} \quad 3\text{ni} \quad \text{eka=ri} \quad 22\text{ju} \quad \text{iten} \]

\text{sky Neg-descend-NMLZR-REP then Yarka=LOC descend and.then}

‘If there is no rain, we go down/descend to Yarka (to worship).’ (Pisang13_MM1_014)
(17) Manange 44je ‘ascend/return’ in discourse

siki ta t'a-tse la-tse afan=tse 44je-p3
food what eat-CC do-CC uncle=PL return/ascend

kʰimi=ri
3.PL house=LOC
‘After the feast/whatever foods being eaten, the uncles return to their own homes.’
(Tengki13_mm1_025)

• These are like extrinsic frame-of-reference: the location of an object/referent is calculated on a fixed coordinate (in this case, slope)

• But one is just as likely to encounter generic ‘come/go’ plus a locative root in discourse to express similar frame of reference:

(18) Manange 44kaŋro kʰ3 ‘come up/ascend’

lake kaŋro kʰ3-p3 ni=pi
again upward come-NMLZR we say ‘Again, saying, we came up (to Pisang village from Kathmandu).’
(Pisang13_MM3_046)

• In Nar-Phu, the situation is a bit different. There are verbs that orient along slope:

(19) jê ‘ascend/return/go back’
hjû ‘descend’

• There are also directionals that combine with ‘come/go’ and include slope as well as orientation of movement with respect to the speaker (towards or away from), as reported by Noonan:

(20)

mâr ‘down towards the speaker’
kʰjuru ‘down away from the speaker’
tor ‘up towards the speaker’
kʰenro ‘up away from the speaker’

mâr kʰ3 ‘referent comes downward towards the speaker’
mâr hjû ‘referent comes/descends downward towards the speaker’
tor kʰ3 ‘referent comes upward towards the speaker’
kʰjuru ni ‘referent goes downward away from the speaker’
kʰenro ni ‘referent goes upward away from the speaker’ (grammar notes 3)

(21) Nar mâr and tor

tor kho phi-pa a-fi-ne, mâr njo phi-pi
up come say-NMLZR NEG-stay-ADV down go say-NMLZR
Many (people) tell us to **come up**, not to settle; nobody says “you settle (lit. go down).”
(Koto13_NF1_139-140)

VI. Semantic Extensions

- The locative enclitic and locational roots locate objects not only in space/time, but may also locate ideas or more abstract concepts in relation to each other.

(22) **Manange** 52\textit{naŋ}=ri ‘inside’
\begin{align*}
\text{52stse} & \text{COP} \text{22mo} \text{52pi-tse} \text{22lɔ-tse} \text{k3rtfa} \text{52naŋ}=ri \\
\text{like.this} & \text{COP} \text{say-cc} \text{do-cc} \text{holy.book} \text{inside}=\text{LOC} \\
\text{22a6e} & \text{COP} \text{22mu} \\
\text{like.this} & \text{COP} \text{EVID}
\end{align*}

‘We say like this, (the history of Braga village) is contained inside of the temple/in its scriptures.’ (a gentleman remarking on the relationship of the Braga Gompa to the history of the village) (Braga13_MM3_040)

- The locative optionally appears when people elaborate on their ages:

(23) **Nar**
\begin{align*}
\text{ŋịa6u} & \text{ŋiator khu} \text{thukcu}=ri \text{lho}=ri \text{a-jo-p6} \\
\text{fifty} & \text{CONJ} \text{nine} \text{sixty}=\text{LOC} \text{year}=\text{LOC} \text{neg-reach-NMLZR}
\end{align*}

‘I’m fifty nine, one year shy of sixty.’ (Koto13_NM1_005)

- Locative structures also relate spaces (in this case, agricultural) to people’s lives:

(24) **Nar**
\begin{align*}
\text{C6pe} & \text{thup6e} \text{sags6bdzi t6e to-ri r6ne} \text{bari}=ri \text{mo} \\
\text{food} & \text{drink} \text{vegetable} \text{what need-SUBORD} \text{self field}(\text{Nep})=\text{LOC} \text{COP}
\end{align*}

‘Whatever we need to eat or drink, we have it right here.’ (Koto13_NF1)

(25) **Nar**
\begin{align*}
\text{tonr6i}=\text{re} & \text{phaita the-tse} \text{mo} \text{mu} \\
\text{animal}=\text{LOC} & \text{benefits be.big-IPFV} \text{COP} \text{EVID}
\end{align*}

‘We get many benefits from (the presence of) our animals (such as yaks).’ (Nar_Lifetory_1)

- Truly conventionalized metaphorical uses of locational structures are more elusive
VII. Concluding Remarks

- Other than Bickle and Gaenszle eds. 1999 or else gleaned from individual descriptions and accounts, there is still not much in terms of family-internal comparative studies of the spatial domain.
- We see in Manange use of both enclitics and locational roots for static/topological and dynamic movement, with a combination of relative, absolutive and intrinsic frame-of-reference situations; We see in Nar-Phu that locational roots are more frequently encountered in discourse, while Manange speakers make more use of locative \(=ri\).
- This comparative account will hopefully become a part of a larger crosslinguistic comparison of the ways that T-B grammars encode space.
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