

The Development of Subordinators from Postpositions In Bodic Languages

Author(s): Carol Genetti

Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1986), pp. 387-400

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

E. Himalayan
Limbu
Thulung
Khambu
Khaling
Sunwar

Gurung-Tamang
Gurung
Tamang
Thakali
Newari5

Three typological features of Tibeto-Burman languages are directly relevant to this study. First, Tibeto-Burman languages are rigidly verb-final, with SOV being the unmarked word order. Second, these languages are all ergative. And third, Tibeto-Burman languages are clause chaining.

Clause chains in Tibeto-Burman consist of a number of non-final clauses whose verbs lack full morphological marking, and which instead are typically marked by suffixes which link them to the final clause. I will refer to these suffixes as "non-final" (NF). The final clause in a chain is distinguished by full inflection (usually tense/aspect, modality, etc.) on the verb.

The data which I searched for in each language consisted of the full case paradigm, and a set of common subordinators:

(3) Postpositions
ergative
genitive
instrumental
dative
locative
ablative
allative
associative

Subordinators
when
while
after
before
since
because
if
although
as, like
purpose (in order to)
non-final

Appendices 1 and 2 present the data on postpositions and subordinators respectively.

Many languages exhibited syncretism across postpositional categories. The most common pattern was genitive-ergative syncretism, but this is not representative of the branch as a whole; all but one of the examples came from Tibetan languages. This is the result of loss of the final -s which differentiated ergative and genitive in Classical Tibetan. Aside from this, there is a preponderance of ergative-instrumental, dative-locative, locative-allative and locative-ablative pairs. Since the ergative and instru-

mental also often share the same functions as subordinators, ergative and instrumental will be considered a single category. While some of the other pairs, particularly locative-ablative, do at times code the same semantic meaning as subordinators, they also can differ in this regard, so will be kept separate.

Equating the functions and meanings of subordinators across languages is a more difficult task than equating cases. While every grammar gives a list of case postpositions, data on subordinators is comparatively rare. And, translations are not necessarily accurate in their reflection of function. For example, a morpheme translated in a grammar as 'when' may apply to both punctual clauses ('when') and durative clauses ('while'). Similarly, a non-final marker may be glossed alternately as 'when', 'after' and 'because', due to the pragmatics of clause chains and their role of coding sequential, and often causal, events.

Consequently, we will consider 'when' and 'while' to constitute one category, unless otherwise mentioned. The morphemes glossed as 'after' are usually identical to those meaning 'when' or the non-final markers, so 'after' will not be treated as an independent category. Similarly, 'since' is either specifically temporal or causal, so will not be considered separately. There was not enough data on 'as/like' or 'although' to establish patterns of grammaticalization. Therefore, we are left with the following five categories of subordinators:

- | | | |
|-----|------------|---------|
| (4) | when/while | because |
| | if | purpose |
| | non-final | |

Not all of the subordinators are clearly related to postpositions (e.g. Classical Tibetan tsing 'while', Vayu tiling 'because', and Newari tolle6 'while'). There are many examples of subordinators which seem to have verbal origin, such as a Sherpa non-final marker simaa which appears to be derived from the verb 'to finish' (Schoettelndreyer 1980). The subordinator 'when' is commonly derived from a noun meaning 'time'.

It is clear that the development of postpositions to subordinators is a productive process. In Classical Tibetan, the ablative las is used for 'while', and the other ablative nas for 'when' and 'because'. In Lhasa, the phonological reflexes of las and nas are lee and nee. lee is not used as an ablative, but means 'because'. nee is the ablative postposition, and has also grammaticalized as the non-final marker ne. Since the Classical Tibetan non-final marker is (s)te, and

since CT nas has a more specific subordinating function, these are presumably new developments in Lhasa.

Another example comes from Newari. In Classical Newari, the locative element was sa. In contemporary Newari, this has developed to the postposition 'if', and another locative, le, is showing up in combinations with other elements as a subordinator, for example bol-e 'time-LOC' 'when'. Along with these clear examples of the productivity of the grammaticalization process, there are enough different postpositional morphemes involved, to assure that the process is productive and not morpheme-specific.

One advantage of a cross-linguistic approach to this problem, is that a morpheme found as a subordinator but unattested as a postposition in one language, may be cognate to a postposition in another language. For example, the Lhomi subordinator for purpose and conditional clauses is tu, which is not attested in Lhomi as a postposition. However, ru and tu are the allomorphs of the allative in Classical Tibetan and Lhoke, are attested as the locative in Lahul, Jirel and Khaling, and related forms, ri and ti are found as locatives and allatives in Gurung, Tamang and Thakali. Thus, given evidence from other languages for allative markers as a source for purpose marking, we can hypothesize a locative/allative source for the Lhomi subordinator.

However, there are notorious problems in equating the phonological forms of grammatical morphemes across languages (DeLancey 1984). Little work has been done on Bodic comparative phonology. The relevant forms are often of a simple CVC or CV structure, and it is unclear to what extent a single consonant can be taken as evidence for cognacy. Furthermore, many Tibeto--Burman case forms are etymologically bi-morphemic (DeLancey 1984), and it seems likely that this is the case for some subordinators as well. My hypotheses concerning relatedness of forms are based solely on inspection. While there are many forms which are clearly phonologically and semantically related, the details of the etymologies are yet to be worked out, and it could be that some of the equations of forms are unjustified, or remain unmentioned. However, the patterns of syncretism turn up frequently enough that the suggested generalizations seem justified.

I will now exemplify the major patterns of syncretism between postpositions and subordinators, and mention some less frequent patterns and exceptions. While I will here mention only a few of the languages for each pattern, more complete data is given in the appendices.

Ergative/Instrumental. The ergative/instrumental is found most commonly as a subordinator meaning 'because'. In Newari, 'because' is gul-i, which is clearly derived from the nominalizer gul plus an allomorph of the ergative/instrumental/ablative morpheme no. In Khambu, the same derivation is found: om-a consists of the nominalizer om and the ergative a. In Bunan it is the instrumental dang, as opposed to the ergative tsi, which is the causal subordinator.

The ergative/instrumental is also found functioning as the temporal subordinator 'when/while'. In Thakali, the morpheme ce codes ergative, instrumental, and ablative as a postposition, and 'while' as a subordinator. In Thulung, 'when' is derived from the noun 'time' suffixed by the ergative/instrumental. In Limbu, the ergative/instrumental ille can mean either 'if', 'because' or 'when', so codes a causal sequence.

Ablative. The ablative is used for many of the same subordinating functions as the ergative/instrumental. Most commonly it is found as 'when/while/after'. It also codes 'because', 'if', temporal and causal 'since', and functions as a non-final marker.

As a marker of 'because', it is found, for example, in Lhasa lee Classical Tibetan nas, Purki no, and Gurung seró. In other languages the subordinator meaning 'because' looks like a Bodic ablative, but is not attested as such in that language. For example, Ladakhi pasang appears to be composed of the nominalizer pa and a morpheme sang; the latter may be related to the Classical Newari ergative sã, the Limbu non-final marker (s)ang, and the Chepang ablative søy.

The ablative appears in the derivation of temporal subordinators in Ladakhi, Classical Tibetan, Purki, Lhomi, Kagate, Vayu and Thakali. In most of these it combines with some other element, such as the non-final marker in Kagate, or the genitive/ergative/instrumental ki in Lhomi. Vayu nana 'while', appears to be related to the ablative na attested in many of the Tibetan dialects, as well as in Limbu and Newari.

The ablative is found as a non-final marker in Khambu, Limbu, Jirel and Lhasa, and is a likely source for the non-final markers in Purki, Balti and Thulung.

Locative. The most common syncretism in my data is that between the locative and 'if', which is found thirteen times. For example, in Classical Tibetan and most of the Tibetan dialects, the locative na is used for 'if'. While the Thakali locative is ri, the morpheme for 'if' la-na appears to be cognate to widespread TB locative elements *la and *na. In Ladakhi, Purki, and Lhasa, the morpheme is present in 'although'; all three are concatenations of the

locative na and the particle yang 'even, also'. Outside the Tibetan family, we find, for example, modern Newari sa, which is clearly derived from the Classical Newari locative, and Thulung la, which is both locative and 'if'.

The locative is also commonly found as 'when/-while', as in Balti na/nam, and Ladakhi zana. Outside of the Tibetan languages, this morpheme doesn't act alone as a temporal subordinator, but is found in conjunction with other elements. Examples are Sunwar's bela-mi 'when' from 'moment' plus the locative (c.f. Newari bole 'when'); and Newari tolle 'while', which could be derived from the Classical Newari noun ta meaning 'long time' and the locative le. In Bunan, the locative/allative/dative marker tog is one element of the subordinator as-tog 'when'; the first morpheme is probably an allomorph of the nominalizer -s. In Chepang the morpheme 'when' is tok (which looks to be cognate with the Bunan form), and the morpheme for 'while' is tok-hang, where hang is also attested as a locative noun meaning 'in, inside'.

Allative. The allative morphemes, when functioning as subordinators, appear most frequently on purpose clauses. Allative markers with this function were found in Lhasa, Lahul, Lhoke, Bunan, Thakali, and Thulung. Examples are the Bunan allative/purpose marker de, and the Lhasa purpose marker -r, which appears to be derived from the Classical Tibetan allative ru. The allative is also found as 'if' in Lhomi and possibly Lhoke, but there is not yet enough evidence to establish this as a general pattern.

Dative. Since there is often syncretism of dative and allative case, the two categories cannot be clearly separated, and it is not surprising to find them coding the same function as subordinators. The dative is used to code purpose in Ladakhi, Balti, Lahul, Sherpa, Nyamkat, Garhwal, Jirel, Thakali, Sunwar and Newari. When the large number of allative sources for purpose markers are considered, it is clear that this is a goal-marked category. The only dative morpheme which grammaticalizes to anything other than a purpose marker is the Bunan locative/allative/dative tog used as 'when'. This use could be associated with the locative rather than the dative meaning.

Associative. There is not enough evidence of associative morphemes being used as subordinators to determine any patterns. The little evidence available is that the associative is used for 'when/while' in Ladakhi; 'as soon as' in Ladakhi and Classical Tibetan; and is a non-final marker in Vayu, although there the associative and locative are the same morpheme.

Summary. The major patterns of co-occurrences of postpositional and subordinating morphemes are presented below. The most common patterns are listed first, others in descending order of frequency:

- (5) LOC > if/although, when/while/after
- ABL > when/while/after, because, NF
- ALL > purpose
- DAT > purpose
- ERG/INST > because, when/while/after

Now that these grammaticalization patterns have been established, it is necessary to account for both the process of semantic extension which these patterns suggest, and the syntactic mechanism which allowed for the development of nominal to verbal morphology.

The semantic explanation which I will propose to account for the patterns of grammaticalization relies on a localistic theory outlined by Lon Diehl (1975). Diehl's theory is similar to those of Gruber (1976) and Anderson (1971), in that his schema uses four deep semantic cases -- Theme, Location, Source and Goal -- to account for all basic case relations in all sentence types.

While Diehl's theory differs from other localistic approaches on a number of points, his primary innovation is the introduction of four semantic spheres or 'spaces', in which the four basic case relations function. The four spaces account for the morphosyntactic and semantic similarities between, for example, expressions of action, movement through space, and movement through time. While the relations between the cases remain stable, the interpretation of a given case is dependent upon the semantic space in which it is located.

There are four spaces in Diehl's theory. The first space is 'social' (SOC), and indicates "location with respect to positions defined or interpreted to be (human) beings" (1975: 98). The second space is 'location' (LOC), and locates physical objects in space. The third space is 'temporal' (TEM), and locates events in time. The fourth space is 'logical' (LOG), and concerns the relations of propositions. Diehl (1975: 103) discusses the inherent ordering of the four spaces -- SOC-LOC-TEM-LOG -- which is based on what he calls the "egodeictic hierarchy" as well as on relative abstractness. The main focus of Diehl's paper is the application of his schema to account for regularities in word order cross-linguistically. At this point, however, I will limit myself to discussion of the logical space, how it relates to the other three

spaces, and how it applies to the patterns of grammaticalization presented above.

The logical space is related to the other three by the regularities which exist between temporal and logical relations. Diehl (1974: 102) presents the following quote from Kimball (1973: 8-9):

There is a manifest regularity between the relations expressed by a word in its temporal and logical uses. Namely if a word W says that event E1 occurs earlier than E2 in time, then in its logical use a statement P1 W P2 means that P1 is a condition of P2. Where E1 W E2 says that E1 is temporally prior, P1 W P2 says that P1 is logically prior.

This suggests the process by which postpositions can become grammatically extended to subordinators. A postposition coding social, spatial or temporal relations becomes extended to a more abstract field, and broadens its semantic scope. However, the basic relationship it codes between arguments (here propositions or clauses) remains the same. The following chart displays how the different case relations code slightly different semantic meanings depending on the space in which they are expressed (Based on Diehl 1975):

	<u>Location</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Goal</u>
SOC	associative	ergative	dative
SPA	locative	ablative	allative
TEMP	when/while	since (abl)	until
LOG	if	because	purpose

The assignment of 'because' as the logical extension of source is straightforward. If one clause is semantically the source of another, then it is also the cause. Similarly, if one clause represents the semantic goal of another, it is the purpose. The extension of the locative to 'if' is not as obvious. For now, this question will be put aside, while I discuss the application of the Space Case schema to the patterns of grammaticalization presented in (5).

Diehl's schema easily accounts for many of these patterns. DAT and ALL are both semantic goals, with purpose as their logical extension. ERG/INST and ABL are both sources, so their functions as 'since' (both temporal and causal) and 'because' are also predicted by the schema. The ABL use as a non-final marker also follows from the standard interpretation of clause

chains as having a sequential and causal connection. Locative case in the temporal space produces 'when/while'. The patterns which seem to contradict the schema are the source categories coding 'when/while'. Also a general explanation of the LOC-'if' syncretism is called for.

Some background concerning Tibeto-Burman clause chains offers one possible explanation for source categories extending to 'when/while'. In at least some Tibeto-Burman languages a morphological distinction is made between clauses related sequentially, and clauses whose temporal relations are simultaneous (Scott DeLancey, p.c.). The natural interpretation given to sequential clauses in a sentence, is that one followed as a consequence, or was the source of, the other. Thus one hypothesis is that ablatives would develop into sequential markers, and locatives into markers of simultaneity. The problem with this is that in Jirel and Vayu, the two languages in which I found a clear distinction made between sequential and simultaneous, all simultaneous markers were derived from the ablative, and one of the sequential markers was locative. While this flatly contradicts the hypothesis, my data is limited, so the hypothesis should not be completely rejected until further research is done. The use of ablative to code 'when/while' could still be attributed to an extension from source to sequence, regardless of whether this difference is distinguished by separate non-final markers.

One other possible explanation is that the ablative may be used for 'while', whereas the locative would be used for 'when'. This seems plausible in light of the fact that the ablative is also sometimes used for path, as in 'by way of' or 'through'. Thus if it denotes an extended spatial relation it may also denote extended temporal relation.

We now turn to the question of why 'if' seems to be the appropriate interpretation of the locative in the logical space. First note that, of the twenty-two examples where 'if' appeared to be derived from postpositions, thirteen have clearly locative origins. This seems to provide evidence that the locative in the logical space does indeed code condition. The question is the nature of the semantic extension from spatial or temporal location to condition. For now I can offer only a tentative suggestion.

The subordinator 'when' in past tense sentences denotes a temporal relationship between two clauses, from which a causal relationship is often inferred. However, due to the irrealis nature of all future clauses, 'when' in the future is necessarily hypothe-

tical. If two future events are expressed in two clauses joined by 'when', the event denoted by the 'when' clause must occur prior to the other; it is interpreted as a precondition. The use of 'when' to denote hypothetical precondition thus seems like one possible derivation for 'if'. From the future, this use can then be extended to other hypothetical situations, and the subordinator takes on a clearly logical use. However, in order to fully understand the semantic derivations of these morphemes, more information is needed on the fine semantic distinctions coded by subordinators in these languages, including work on hypotheticals, counter-factuals, and modality.

Now that we have seen that the semantic extensions suggested by the grammaticalization patterns can be accounted for, it remains to consider the syntactic mechanism by which such a process can occur. This can be explained at least in part by typological features of Tibeto-Burman syntax. All Tibeto-Burman languages are rigidly verb final and postpositional. They also have a strong tendency to nominalize clauses. In Newari, for example, the nominalizer -gu not only marks relative clauses and adjectival phrases, but is frequently used on subordinate and complement clauses, on verbs before copulas indicating speakers judgement, and even on independent verbs sentence-finally (Kolver 1977, see also Matisoff 1972 for an extensive discussion of a very similar and probably cognate pattern in Lahu). Verb phrases or whole clauses are thus treated as noun phrases syntactically. When whole clauses can function as nominal constituents in a sentence, they allow for the suffixing of nominal morphology, in particular case suffixes and other postpositions.

NOTES

1. As noted by Haiman and Thompson (1984), we need an adequate typology of what are now considered 'subordinate clauses'. Here I am working with hypotactic, adverbial clauses; more work is needed to characterize these more precisely.
2. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation, grant BNS-8313502, and by a grant from the Joint Committee on South Asia, of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, with funds provided by the Ford Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Scott DeLancey has offered invaluable assistance in all aspects of this project. I alone am responsible for errors and inconsistencies.
3. A fair amount of data was taken from the Linguistic Survey of India, much of which is not necessa-

rily reliable in phonetic detail. Newari data is my own. Lhasa data was provided by Scott DeLancey.

4. The classification is roughly based on Matisoff's (1974) list of Tibeto-Burman languages arranged by the genetic affiliations proposed by Shafer. Additional suggestions were provided by Scott DeLancey.

5. Newari appears to be a Bodic language, but at this point there is no strong evidence for grouping it into any of the proposed subfamilies.

6. Information regarding transcription is given in the introduction to the appendices.

7. Diehl uses the terms IT, AT, FROM and TO.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N.J. 1975. *Sketch of Thulung Grammar*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ.
- Anderson, J. 1971. *The Grammar of Case: Towards a Localistic Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Caughley, R.C. 1982. *The Syntax and Morphology of the Verb in Chepang*. Pacific Linguistics Ser.B-84.
- DeLancey, S. 1984. *Etymological Notes on Tibeto-Burman Case Particles*. LTBA 8.1.
- Diehl, L. 1975. *Space Case: Some Principles and Their Implications Concerning Linear Order in Natural Language*. SIL Working Papers, Univ. N. Dakota 19.
- Fillmore, C. 1968. *The Case for Case*. In E. Bach and R. Harms, eds. *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Francke, A.H. 1903. *Sketch of Ladakhi Grammar*. JASB 70.
- Glover, W. 1970. *Gurung Texts*. In Hale and Pike, eds. _____ 1974. *Sememic and Grammatical Structures in Gurung*. SIL.
- _____, and D.B. Gurung. 1979. *Conversational Gurung*. Pacific Linguistics Ser.D-13.
- Grierson, G., ed. 1909. *Linguistic Survey of India*. Calcutta.
- Gruber, J. 1976. *Lexical Structures in Syntax and Semantics*. North-Holland.
- Haiman, J. and S. Thompson. 1984. "Subordination" in *Universal Grammar*. BLS 10.
- Hale, A., ed. 1973. *Clause, Sentence and Discourse Patterns in Selected Languages of Nepal*. SIL.
- _____, and K. Pike, eds. 1970. *Tone Systems of Tibeto-Burman Languages III, texts I*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois.
- Hargreaves, D. 1984. *Case Marking and Nominalization in Classical Newari*. Presented at ICSTLL 17.
- Hari, A. and A. Maibaum. 1970. *Thakali Texts*. In Hale and Pike, eds.
- Hodgson, B. 1857 & 1858. *Comparative Vocabularies of the Broken Tribes of Nepal*. JASB 26:317-522,

- Jaschke, H.A. 1881. Tibetan-English Dictionary. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____. 1954. Tibetan Grammar. NY: Frederick Ungar.
- Jorgensen, H. 1936. A Dictionary of Classical Newari. Copenhagen: Sevin and Munksgaard.
- _____. 1941. A Grammar of Classical Newari. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Joshi, P.T.R. 1909. A Grammar and Dictionary of Kanawari. H.A. Rose, ed. Calcutta.
- Kimball, J. 1973. The Grammar of Existence. CLS 9.
- Kolver, U. 1977. Nominalization and Lexicalization in Newari. AKUP 30.
- Koshal, S. 1979. Ladakhi Grammar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- _____. 1982. Conversational Ladakhi. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Maibaum, A. and E. Strahm. 1973. Jirel Texts. In Hale.
- Malla, K. 1985. The Newari Language: A Working Outline. Tokyo: ISLCAA.
- Matisoff, J. 1972. Lahu Nominalization, Relativization and Genitivization. In J. Kimball, ed. Syntax and Semantics 1. New York: Seminar Press.
- _____. 1974. Alphabetical List of Sino-Tibetan Languages and Their Affiliations. ms.
- Michailovsky, B. 1981. La Langue Hayu. Paris: Université Paris III.
- Nigam, R.C. and J. Neethivanan. 1971. Survey of Kanauri in Himachal Pradesh. Lang. Monograph 3. Calcutta.
- Pike, K. and E. Pike. 1982. Grammatical Analysis. SIL.
- Rangan, K. 1979. Purki Grammar. Mysore.
- Read, A.F.C. 1934. Balti Grammar. London: RAS.
- Roerich, G. 1933. The Tibetan Dialect of Lahul. J. Urusvati Himalayan Research Institute, v. 3.
- _____. and T.T.L. Phuntshok. 1978. Textbook of Colloquial Tibetan. New Delhi: Manjusri.
- Schottelndreyer, B. 1980. Person Markers in Sherpa. In R. Trail, ed. Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics, 7. Pacific Linguistics Ser.A-53.
- _____. and H. Schottelndreyer. 1973. Sherpa Texts. In Hale, ed.
- Schulze, M. and D. Bieri. 1973. Chaining and Spot-lighting: Two Types of Paragraph Boundaries in Sunwar. In A. Hale, ed.
- Taylor, D. 1970. Tamang Texts. In Hale and Pike, eds.
- Toba, S. 1979. Khaling. Asian and African Grammatical Manual 13d. ISLCAA.
- Vesalainen, O. and M. Vesalainen. 1980. Clause Patterns in Lhomi. Pacific Linguistics Ser.b-no.53.
- Weidert, A. and B. Subba. 1985. Concise Limbu Grammar and Dictionary. Amsterdam: Lobster Publications.

APPENDICES

Due to limitations of space, I have included in the appendices only the forms which appeared to be relevant to the grammaticalization process discussed above. Forms for which there is allomorphic variation are marked by an asterisk following the citation. Optional elements are enclosed in parentheses.

Transcription is from the original sources; tone was rarely marked, so is not included. I consistently used the following symbols to represent the IPA:

@ [ə] E [ɛ] φ [ɔ] ʋ [ʊ]
 ? [ʔ] ng [ŋ]

The languages are arranged with respect to probable genetic affiliation.

Appendix One: Bodic Postpositions

Language	erg	inst	dat	loc	abl	all	assoc
Cla.Tib.	kyis*	kyis*	la	na/la	nas/las	ru*	dang
Balti	si		la	kha	na		na-yambo
Purki	is*	na	la*	la/ka	nə	sa	
Ladakhi	yi*	naŋg*	la	na/nē	nas/ne		naŋg*
Lahul(KL)	ai*	ai*	la	la/ru*	ne		
Lahul(KK)	su/hi	su/si	la	la	na/sang		
Garhwal	go(?)		la/ba	la	su	la	nyibo
Jirel	gi/ki		la	du/pa*	la	la	tang
Kagate	i/gi		la	la/na	sale	la/sala	
Lhasa	qi*	qi*	la*	la*	nEE	la*	dang
Lhoke	kyi*		lo/lu*		lā/nā	r/tu	
Lhomi	ki	ki	la	la/na	ni		tang
Nyamkat	su	k/gi*	la*	nā/su			dang
Sherpa	s/ki/re	s	laa	nā/laa	nā/sur		laa
Danj.K.	ii		lo		la		
Kanauri	as*		nu*/pang	o	ts/ch/dok?ts		naŋg*
Bunan	tsi*	dang	rog*	mang	chi/rog	de	naŋg*
Gurung	di*	di*	lai	ri	le*/sero2	ri/samma	ne
C.Newari	sē	an*/nā	ta	sa	an*/nā	ke	va
Newari	nə*	nə*	tə	le	nə*	le	ke
Tamang	se*	se*	da*	ri*/ma*	kyam-se	ri*	chhyam
Thakali	ce	ce	ca(ri)	ri	ce	ca(ri)	
Thulung	ka	ka	lai	Da*/la	lam*	Da*	nung
Limbu	lE*	lE*	n*/le*	o*/le*	nu(le)	le/re	
Khambu	ā		lai	bi*/la	(la)ka/bika	kai	
Khaling	ā	ā		bi/tu*	kaa	thaa	
Sunwar	mi*	a	kali	m*/ga*	le	mi*	nu
Vayu	ha	ha	he/nong	khen/nong	nana		nong
Chepang	i	i	kay	hang	səy	tang	ka*/kus

Appendix Two: Bodic Subordinators

Language	when	while	because	if	NF	purpose
Cla. Tib.	la/nas	las/la	la/nas/kyis	na	te/par	
Balti	na(m)	e/se		nare	e/se	la
Purki	nø		banø	nø	sẽ*/sẽnø	
Ladakhi	zana(s)*		la/pasang	na	te	chesla
Lahul				na	e/ste*	na/tu/cela
Garhwal				yangna	tin	la
Jirel		jini			la*/gin*	la
Kagate	atesu			na		
Lhasa	duugangla3	phardu	LEE/	na	nE/cEE	r
				tsaang		
Lhoke	i		lã	nã/nu	di/te/nã	r
Lhomi		kin		tu		tu
Nyamkat				yangna	we/wa	la
Sherpa	bubelaa	ni/yin		na/si	ni/yin	la
Danj.k.				na/nu		
Kanauri	õn(?)			ma		
Bunan	astog/(s)tang	bonthreg4/	nang	ji*		de/
		(s)dang				bonthreg
Gurung		ma(1e)	sero5	ya/dubiya	i/si	elxagiri6
Newari	bole/ki	tole	gulĩ	sa/sã	a	tø
Tamang	chhyam	mã/min	se	se/sam	si/se*	ri
Thakali	kaahngri7	maa/ce	lana		si	ri
Thulung	lo na/hongnga/	belaka	la	na		Da
Limbu	lE*		lE*	lE*	(s)ang	sE*
Khambu			omã		yo/ka*/sa	
Khaling	lo	to		kho	saa	
Sunwar	nu	sha/senu/	nganu		sha	tša-kali
		belami				
Vayu		he/nana	tiling	khen/he/sa	nana/ha/nong	
Chepang	tok/	tokhang	ti/	yakay/yati	ti/?ak	lang
	tokbelahang		dharna(hang)			

Notes

1. Roerich (1933) discusses two Lahul dialects, Kolong (KL) and Koksar (KK). While he differentiates between the two when citing postpositions, he does not distinguish them in his discussion of subordinators.
2. This form and the samma allative are temporal.
3. phar: 'place in between'.
4. bon-threg is the benefactive.
5. sero is the temporal ablative. That the temporal ablative is the one to grammaticalize is nice evidence for grammaticalization as a process of abstraction.
6. This morpheme has the following derivation:
e GEN + lxagi 'sake' + ri LOC.
7. khaang: 'time'.