

## The Encoding of Space in Manange and Nar-Phu (Tamangic)

Abstract: This is an account of the forms and semantic dimensions of spatial relations in Manange (Tibeto-Burman, Tamangic; Nepal), with comparison to sister language Nar-Phu. Topological relations (“IN/ON/AT/NEAR”) in these languages are encoded by locative enclitics and also by a set of noun-like objects termed as “locational nouns.” In Manange, the general locative enclitic is more frequently encountered for a wide range of topological relations, while in Nar-Phu, the opposite pattern is observed, i.e. more frequent use of locational nouns. While the linguistic frame of reference system encoded in these forms is primarily relative (i.e. oriented on the speaker’s own viewing perspective), a more extrinsic/absolute system emerges with certain verbs of motion in these languages, with verbs like “come,” “go,” and certain verbs of placement or posture orienting to arbitrary fixed bearings such as slope. This account also provides some examples of cultural or metaphorical extensions of spatial forms as they are encountered in connected speech.

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In a family as large and diverse as Tibeto-Burman, it is not surprising to see this diversity manifested in the forms and semantics of spatial relations across the languages. In Kiranti languages, for example, many dimensions of space are built into the verb paradigms, they interact with the syntax, and they are a rich part of ritual language and cultural practices (Bickel 1994, 1997, 2000, Bickel and Gaenszle 1999, Schackow 2014). Beyond these accounts, however, there has been comparatively little work done on the structural and semantic encoding of spatial categories in other Tibeto-Burman languages. The goal of this paper is to add to the knowledge base of spatial concept encoding in Tamangic languages, which are traditionally assumed to be comparatively less morphologically complex (ie. more isolating in morphological synthesis)<sup>2</sup>. Quite to the contrary, both the morpho-syntax and the lexicon in Tamangic languages play a major role in the encoding of a variety of spatial concepts in different ways in these two languages. Furthermore, this paper shows that Manange and Nar-Phu are two closely related languages that demonstrate striking differences in the structure and functions of their spatial sub-systems.

This paper compares encodings and expressions in two closely related Tamangic languages: Manange (*Nyishang*, *Nyishangte*, Ethnologue ISO-369 nmm and Glottolog mana1288) and Nar-Phu (particularly the Nar variety, *Chyprung*, Ethnologue ISO-369 npa and Glottolog narp1239). The reason for this comparison is that the languages, while quite similar in core lexicon, can be best appreciated as distinct through subtle variations in morphology and syntax. This is true also

---

<sup>1</sup> This work is supported by NSF BCS-DEL 1149639 “Documenting the Languages of Manang” and by ELDP SG0025 “Nar and Phu (Tibeto-Burman).” I am grateful to members of the Manange and Nar Phu communities for teaching me about their languages. Any errors are the sole responsibility of the author. Abbreviations: 1 = first person; 3 = third person; ABL = ablative; ADV = adverb; CC = clause chainer; COMIT = comitative; COP = copula; CVB = converb; DEF = definite; DIST = distal; ERG = ergative; EVID = evidential; GEN = genitive; IPFV = imperfective; LOC = locative; NEG = negative; NMLZR = nominalizer; PFV = perfective; PL = plural; PROX = proximal; PST = past; SG = singular; SUBORD = subordinator.

<sup>2</sup> By “Tamangic” I refer to the sub-grouping of languages frequently identified by other scholars of Tibeto-Burman as TGTM, an abbreviation comprised of the initial letters of the largest ethno-linguistic groups representing the sub-grouping: Tamang, Gurung, Thakali, and Manange (see Shafer 1955 and Mazaudon 2005). Other Tamangic/TGTM languages include Nar-Phu (this account), and Tangbe (Honda 2014).

in the expression of spatial concepts, where both languages share almost identical resources, but employ them differently.

This account makes use of both elicited structures and those encodings encountered across a wide range of discourse genres. 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 these languages may be discovered. As a preview, we see in both languages, 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 Manange and Nar-Phu. More substantial differences can be seen between the languages in that in Manange, enclitics and a small set of these locational elements do the lion’s share of spatial encoding, while Nar-Phu makes much more productive use of locational nouns. So while both languages share the same resources, their frequencies of use are different.

The linguistic frame of reference in both languages includes a complex combination of body-based relative (e.g. “left/right”) and intrinsic (“front/back” in relation to a non-egocentric frame), and also absolute (e.g. “north,” “downhill”) patterns. These patterns are encoded lexically, within nominal morpho-syntax and also in verbal concatenations. This report is organized as follows: Section 2 provides relevant typological information about Manange and Nar-Phu. Section 3 focuses on nominal enclitics, a fertile dimension for spatial contrasts. Section 4 provides a closer look at locational nouns, which are noun-like in morpho-syntax and encode both static and dynamic motion relations. Section 5 turns to spatial encodings in verbal elements. Section 6 includes discussion on selected semantic extensions and some patterns observed through anecdotal means, and section 7 concludes.

## **2. Location, Status, and Morpho-Syntactic Typology of Manange and Nar-Phu**

Manange is spoken in eight villages of the upper Manang District in central-northern Nepal; Nar-Phu is spoken in Nar and Phu villages, and some residents have relocated down-valley within Manang. (see Map 1)<sup>3</sup>. As Map 1 shows, Manange and Nar-Phu are in regional contact with Gurung and Gyalsumdo (a Tibetan variety). Both have communities residing in Kathmandu and abroad.

---

<sup>3</sup> This map was created by NAME and may be accessed at XXX (URL will be added pending manuscript acceptance). For information on the design and implementation of this map, see NAMES (2013).



Map of Manang District. Manange is represented by green points and Nar-Phu is represented by purple points.

Published reports on speaker populations for Manange are conflicting. The Nepalese Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS 2012) reports under 400 speakers, while speaker self-reporting indicates somewhere between 3,000 and 5,000. In other cases, Manange is lumped in with Gurung (Gurung 1998; Tumbahang 2012) and so the numbers are inflated. More recent surveys indicate that some 2,000-3,000 active speakers are distributed across Manang, with roughly the same number living in Kathmandu and abroad (NAME ET AL 2015). Not all diaspora Mananges are active speakers, so Manange could be classified as ‘threatened/shifting’.

For Nar-Phu the situation is more dire. Current estimated speaker numbers of Nar are at fewer than 400, and Phu has perhaps 200 active speakers. Observations of outward emigration from Nar and Phu villages, data from interviews, and information gleaned from autobiographical texts, suggest that Nar is ‘moribund’; the vast majority of fluent speakers are above the age of 50, and there is extreme disruption in transmission of the language to children.

In both languages, the basic word-order in elicited structures and in most discourse-embedded clauses is verb-final, with post-positions and post-nominal modification. 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 is likely tied to pragmatic factors (NAMES 2013). Manange and Nar-Phu lack agreement. With the exception of the negative prefix, noun and verb morphology is exclusively suffixing or enclitic. Verbal affixes code aspect and modality, and nominalization of main verbs is frequently encountered in discourse. However, despite the overall lack of morphological complexity in both languages, there is a wide range of strategies available for encoding different spatial concepts.

### 3. Spatial Relations in Post-nominal Enclitics

NAME (2004) provides a basic overview of spatial encodings in Manange, and all elicited examples come from this sketch. More extensive examples from discourse come from narratives and conversation data collected in 2013 and 2014. Michael Noonan provided some

additional semantic observations via unpublished notes on Nar Phu. The discourse examples come from narratives and conversation data recorded in 2010 and 2014.<sup>4</sup> In both 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 (static, topological ‘IN/ON/AT’), as well as dynamic, motion towards.

(1)

a. Manange IN/AT

<sup>22</sup>k<sup>hi</sup> <sup>52</sup>pwal=ri                      <sup>22</sup>t<sub>u</sub>-p<sub>3</sub>                      <sup>22</sup>mo  
3.SG    **Kathmandu=LOC**                      stay-NMLZR                      COP  
‘He lives in Kathmandu.’

<sup>22</sup>ŋ<sub>3</sub>=tse                      <sup>22</sup>f<sub>3</sub>=ko                      <sup>42</sup>fofo=ri                      <sup>42</sup>ts<sup>h</sup>or-tsi  
1.SG=ERG                      meat=DEF                      **paper=LOC**                      wrap-PFV  
‘I wrapped the meat in the paper.’

b. Manange ON

<sup>22</sup>ŋ<sub>3</sub>    <sup>22</sup>th<sup>aŋ</sup>=ri                      <sup>22</sup>t<sub>u</sub>-tsu                      <sup>22</sup>mo  
1.SG    **ground=LOC**    stay-PROG                      COP  
‘I am sitting on the ground.’

c. Manange TO/TOWARDS

<sup>52</sup>mi=ko                      <sup>52</sup>jul=ri                      <sup>44</sup>kaŋ                      <sup>42</sup>k<sup>h</sup>ja=ro                      <sup>42</sup>p<sup>h</sup>ro-tsi  
person=DEF                      **village=LOC**                      mountain                      place=ABL                      walk-PFV  
‘The person walked to the village from the mountain.’

d. Nar-Phu IN

tʃ<sup>u</sup>=re                      tʃhæ    mû  
**DIST=LOC**    tea                      COP  
‘There’s tea in this (container)’ (Noonan elicitation notes)

e. Nar-Phu ON

p<sup>h</sup>oto                      **kaŋ=re**                      k<sup>h</sup>e-tse  
photo                      **wall=LOC**                      put-IPFV  
‘(Someone) puts a photo on the wall.’ (MPI put\_028)

---

<sup>4</sup> These examples come from a variety of sources. Elicited examples are un-referenced. Some of these forms are found in brief discourses elicited via video and images from the MPI Nijmegen field stimulus materials (<http://fieldmanuals.mpi.nl/>). The stimulus file number is included with relevant examples. Some discourse-originating examples in this account have field note reference points associated with them. In example (2a) for example, NgawalM99\_F2\_009 refers to a text recorded from a female Manange speaker living in Ngawal village in 1999. This is the ninth syntactic unit in the text. Some examples taken from Noonan’s notes on Nar-Phu are indicated by “Noonan” beginning the text reference. Many discourses may be found in transcribed and translated form, with accompanying audio and video at the following archives: <https://audio-video.shanti.virginia.edu/collection/manange#>, <https://audio-video.shanti.virginia.edu/collection/nar-phu#>, <https://audio-video.shanti.virginia.edu/collection/nar-phu#>.

f. Nar-Phu IN/AT

ŋæ tʃosor            **phâlpe=re**            mû  
 1.SG now            **Kathmandu=LOC**    COP  
 ‘I’m in Kathmandu now.’ (Noonan elicitation notes)

g. Nar-Phu TO/TOWARDS

tʃʰupruŋ-se            JM    **phâlpe=re**            ni-tʃi            mû  
 Nar.village=ABL    JM    **Kathmandu=LOC**    go-PST            EVID  
 ‘JM went from Nar to Kathmandu.’ (Noonan elicitation notes)

One difference between the two languages is that in Manange discourse, most topological encoding is with the enclitic =*ri*. In contrast, in Nar-Phu, the locational nouns are more prolific (§ IV), but noun-plus-enclitic encodings are found in Nar discourse too. This is illustrated in (2).

(2)

a. Manange IN

<sup>22</sup>kɜjɜ=ri    <sup>44</sup>prin    <sup>22</sup>lɜ,    <sup>22</sup>tʰe    <sup>22</sup>jɜ-tsi  
**pot=LOC**    put    do,    keep    go-PFV  
 ‘Putting (yeast) in a pot, it is cooked...’ (NgawalM99\_F2,\_009)

b. Manange IN/AT

<sup>22</sup>tiŋi    <sup>22</sup>ŋi    pisaŋ    <sup>52</sup>jul=ri            <sup>22</sup>ŋɜ    <sup>42</sup>lo    <sup>42</sup>ŋɜtsju            epɜ=ko            <sup>42</sup>lo  
 day    1.PL    Pisang **village=LOC**    1.SG    year    five.ten            age=DEF            year  
<sup>42</sup>ŋɜ    tʃi    bahirɜ            <sup>22</sup>tʃu-tsi  
 five    class    outside            sit-PFV  
 ‘Today, we (are) in this Pisang village, as I was about to become fifty years old, I lived outside for five years.’ (PisangM2013\_M2\_007)

c. Manange TOWARDS/UNTIL

tilitsʰo            <sup>44</sup>kju    <sup>22</sup>mi=ko            <sup>42</sup>kjomtso=ri    <sup>44</sup>je-pɜ  
 Tilicho            water    source=DEF    **sea=LOC**            return-NMLZR  
 ‘Tilicho lake (the source is in Manang) flows towards the ocean/goes to the ocean.’  
 (KhangsarM13\_M1\_030)

d. Nar IN/AT

ŋæ    hʃonten            **phwɛj=re**            tʃhâŋ-tʃi  
 1.SG    education        **Tibet=LOC**            study-PST  
 ‘I was educated in Tibet.’ (Noonan, The Three Brothers)

e. Nar ON

**hotʃu=re**    pʰæ    tsam    khjeta    pʃrâ-pɛ            tæ    pʃrâ-pɛ  
**this=LOC**    iron    bridge    cattle    walk-NMLZR    horse    walk-NMLZR  
 ‘On this, iron bridges, cattle walk, horses walk.’ (Noonan, Contemporary Nar)

f. Nar IN/INSIDE

**paŋ=ɬfuke=re**      âpɛ      phruŋ-pɛ  
**pen=PL=LOC**      excrement      defecate=NMLZR  
 ‘In the pens, (the animals) defecated.’ (Noonan, Contemporary Nar)

Very rarely in Manange, location is marked only with a locational noun, without the locative enclitic, as in (3).

(3) Manange

<sup>44</sup>pu      <sup>52</sup>**naŋ**      <sup>22</sup>ts<sup>h</sup>aŋ-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 in Nar (Bickel 1994; 1997; Levinson 2003; Levinson and Wilkins 2006; Bowerman 2007). In other words, the location of an object is expressed in relation to both the viewpoint of the perceiver (speaker) and the position of another referent.

It is unclear why in discourse Manange speakers so frequently make use of only the enclitic while Nar speakers primarily make use of encliticized locational nouns. At this point, no syntactic or semantic factors emerge that align with this preference, but it is a difference that deserves further investigation.

Within the category of relative encodings, both Manange and Nar-Phu have lexemes for “left/right,” as shown in (4) and (5), and these forms are also noun-like in their morpho-syntax.

(4)

- a. Manange: <sup>22</sup>tor ~ <sup>22</sup>ja <sup>22</sup>tortse ‘left ~ left hand’, kje ~ <sup>22</sup>ja <sup>22</sup>kjetse ‘right ~ right hand’
- b. Nar-Phu: tôr ‘left side’, ke ‘right side’

(5) Nar

tepe    kap    kal=ri      nhâŋ=ri,  
 again    cup    like=LOC      inside=LOC,

kfrî    tʰaŋ-tse      p<sup>h</sup>jaŋ=ri      **tôr**  
 one    is.kept-PFV    top=LOC      **left**

**ken=ri**    lâê    tñen-tse      mo    mû  
**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).’ (MPI Classifier\_009)

In addition to relative, both languages also encode absolute systems, with lexemes for ‘north/south/east/west.’ These are not encountered in any discourse. In elicited use, the form

*aŋse* ‘side’ follows the direction word. The forms are listed in (6) and shown in elicitation in (7) through (9).

(6) Cardinal Directions

	Manange	Nar
North	<sup>52</sup> tʃaŋ	tʃhɑŋ
South	<sup>42</sup> lo	lô
East	<sup>44</sup> ʃer	ʃâr
West	<sup>52</sup> nu	nɦup

(7) Manange

<sup>22</sup>ŋʒ    <sup>52</sup>tʃaŋ    aŋse(=ri)    <sup>22</sup>jʒ-tsi  
 1.SG    north    side(=LOC)    go-PFV  
 ‘I went north.’

(8) Nar

ŋæ    thim    ʃâr    aŋse(=ri)    mo  
 1.SG    house    east    side(=LOC)    COP  
 ‘I’m at the east side of (my) house.’

(9) Nar

ŋæ    amrika    nɦup    aŋse(=ri)    ni-tʃi  
 1.SG    America    west    side(=LOC)    go-PST  
 ‘I went west to America.’<sup>5</sup>

4. “Locational Elements”

In Manange and Nar-Phu topological relations are productively encoded by what is termed by NAME (2004) as “locational roots” but what I term here as “locational nouns.” In Nar-Phu, these forms were never explicitly discussed by Michael Noonan, but these forms also noun-like in their morpho-syntax. Like ‘true’ nouns in both languages, these forms host the locative enclitic, they carry their own lexical tone, and they carry concrete (if spatial) semantics. However, unlike ‘true’ nouns, these forms never occur alone as the head of a noun phrase.

In both languages, these forms encode both static (akin to ‘basic locative’ expressions as discussed by Levinson and Wilkins 2006) 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 than in Manange. Examples are provided in (10) and (11).

<sup>5</sup> In Phu there is slight variation; the word for ‘side’ is *tʃ<sup>h</sup>o*, as in *ŋæamrika nɦup tʃ<sup>h</sup>o(=ri) ja-tʃi* ‘I went west to America.’

(10)

a. Manange <sup>52</sup>naŋ ‘inside’  
<sup>44</sup>tsu <sup>42</sup>ja <sup>42</sup>ru <sup>52</sup>naŋ=ko=ri <sup>22</sup>k3ru <sup>42</sup>p<sup>h</sup>lu <sup>42</sup>ŋ3 <sup>44</sup>prin-tse <sup>22</sup>l3-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.’ (GhyaruM2013\_M1)

b. Manange <sup>44</sup>litse ‘behind,’ <sup>22</sup>p3r ‘in between,’ <sup>22</sup>ti ‘near’  
<sup>44</sup>tsu <sup>22</sup>t<sup>h</sup>j3-p3 ku <sup>44</sup>sẽ <sup>42</sup>ts<sup>h</sup>aŋ-tse <sup>44</sup>litse=ri <sup>22</sup>mo-p3  
PROX big-NMLZR idol three put-CC **behind=LOC** COP-NMLZR  
<sup>22</sup>t<sup>h</sup>e-tsi. <sup>44</sup>u ku=ko <sup>22</sup>p3ri=ri <sup>22</sup>ti=ri <sup>44</sup>u <sup>22</sup>l3-tse  
keep-PFV DIST idol=DEF **between=LOC** **near=LOC** DIST do-CC  
<sup>44</sup>u=ko=ri <sup>52</sup>s3-ni <sup>22</sup>l3-tse <sup>52</sup>mi <sup>52</sup>ŋjo-p3 <sup>44</sup>u <sup>44</sup>tsu=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.’  
(BragaM13\_M3\_028-30)

(11)

a. Nar: p<sup>h</sup>jaŋ ‘top’ stative  
nôkju=tɛn êle=cɛ p<sup>h</sup>omi **p<sup>h</sup>jaŋ=re** t<sup>h</sup>an-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: p<sup>h</sup>jaŋ ‘top’ dynamic  
êle=cɛ=tɛn nôkju=cɛ t<sup>h</sup>ionpɛ r<sup>h</sup>ul-pi **p<sup>h</sup>jaŋ=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...’ (Noonan,  
Grammar notes)

c. Nar: n<sup>h</sup>âŋ ‘inside/into’  
nôkju=tɛn êle=cɛ kju t<sup>h</sup>ô **n<sup>h</sup>âŋ=re** pi tê-t<sup>h</sup>i  
dog=COMIT boy=DEF water lake **inside=LOC** go.fast fall-PST  
‘The dog and the boy accidentally fell into the lake.’ (Noonan, Grammar notes)

d. Nar: p<sup>h</sup>o ‘beside’  
njûku bâksa **p<sup>h</sup>o=re** mô mu  
pen box **beside=LOC** COP EVID  
‘The pen is beside the box.’ (Noonan, Grammar notes)

Most of these locational nouns convey a relative frame of reference, but ‘front/back’ seems to be absolute (i.e. the location of the object is defined in relation to arbitrary or fixed bearings). This is in (12) and in another MPI stimuli response in (13).



(12) Manange (Hoshi 1986: 198)

<sup>42</sup>tʰi                    <sup>22</sup>ŋwontse=ri                    <sup>44</sup>tʰpɜ                    <sup>44</sup>kɜtti                    <sup>22</sup>mo    <sup>22</sup>mu  
 house                    front=LOC                    monk                    many                    COP    EVID  
 ‘There are many monks in front of the house.’

(13) Nar-Phu

pjuŋ    ŋwonte                    **ŋwonte**                    pfrâ-tse  
 man    front                    **front**                    walk-CVB

ni-tʃi

go-PST

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

(MPI Set1\_105ET)



Nar speakers confirm that these forms 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 as separate body part terms. Consider the Manange words *tenje* ‘back of body,’ *ku* ‘chest/front of torso’ and Nar-Phu *rhiôte* ‘lower back side,’ *thweku* ‘upper front or back side,’ and *mæko* ‘lower front torso side.’

## 5. Dynamic Spatial Relations Encoded in Verbs

A small set of verbs in both Manange and Nar gives evidence of a second, extrinsic, frame-of-reference system at work in the language, although they are limited to those shown in (14). In Manange, the verb ‘descend’ is part of larger compounds for weather and environmental phenomena, as in (15).

(14) Select Motion Verbs in Manange

<sup>22</sup>jɜ ‘go’  
<sup>22</sup>kʰɜ ‘come’  
<sup>22</sup>ju ‘descend’<sup>6</sup>  
<sup>44</sup>je ‘ascend/return’ (distinct from <sup>22</sup>kre ‘climb’)

(15) Manange weather/environment verbs

<sup>52</sup>mo <sup>22</sup>ju-pɜ ‘to rain’ (lit. sky descend)  
<sup>42</sup>kʰi <sup>22</sup>ju-pɜ ‘to snow’ (lit. snow descend)  
<sup>22</sup>tʰi/<sup>22</sup>sɜ <sup>22</sup>ju-pɜ ‘to have a landslide/avalanche’ (lit. ground/slope descend)

(16) Manange <sup>22</sup>ju ‘descend’ in discourse

<sup>52</sup>mo    <sup>22</sup>a-ju-pɜ-ko                    ɜni    eka=ri                    <sup>22</sup>ju                    iten  
 sky    NEG-descend-NMLZR-REP    then    Yarka=LOC    **descend**                    and.then  
 ‘If there is no rain, we go down/descend to Yarka (to worship).’ (PisangM13\_M1\_014)

<sup>6</sup> It is likely that <sup>22</sup>ju/hjû ‘descend’ in Manange/Nar is syncretic with <sup>52</sup>nu/nhup ‘west’ in both languages, with \*yuk the reconstructed form for ‘descend, sink, set’ in Proto-Tibeto-Burman.

(17) Manange <sup>44</sup>je ‘ascend/return’ in discourse  
<sup>52</sup>siki <sup>22</sup>ta <sup>22</sup>ts3-tse <sup>22</sup>l3-tse <sup>22</sup>aʃaŋ=tse <sup>44</sup>je-p3  
 food what eat-CC do-CC uncle=PL **return/ascend**

<sup>22</sup>k<sup>h</sup>imi <sup>42</sup>thɿ=ri  
 3.PL house=LOC

‘After the feast/whatever foods being eaten, the uncles return, to their own homes.’  
 (TengkiM13\_M1\_025)

These verbs are similar to an extrinsic frame-of-reference in their spatial encoding in that the location of an object/referent is calculated on a fixed coordinate (in this case, slope). However, one is just as likely to encounter generic ‘come/go’ plus a locative root in discourse to express the same frame of reference, as in (18).

(18) Manange <sup>44</sup>kaŋro <sup>22</sup>k<sup>h</sup>3 ‘come up/ascend’  
<sup>22</sup>lake <sup>44</sup>kaŋro <sup>22</sup>k<sup>h</sup>3-p3 <sup>22</sup>ŋjaŋ <sup>52</sup>pi  
 again upward come-NMLZR we say  
 ‘Again, saying, we came up (to Pisang village from Kathmandu).’ (PisangN13\_M3\_046)  
 In Nar-Phu, the situation is a bit different.

In Nar, there are also verbs that orient along slope, as in (19).

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

Additionally, in Nar 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’s notes, shown in (20) and (21).

(20)

mâr ‘down towards the speaker’	tor ‘up towards the speaker’
k̄h̄juru ‘down away from the speaker’	k <sup>h</sup> enro ‘up away from the speaker’

mâr kh̄ ‘referent comes downward towards the speaker’  
 mâr h̄jû ‘referent comes/descends downward towards the speaker’  
 tor kh̄ ‘referent comes upward towards the speaker’  
 k̄h̄juru ni ‘referent goes downward away from the speaker’  
 k<sup>h</sup>enro ni ‘referent goes upward away from the speaker’ (Noonan, Grammar notes)

(21) Nar *mâr* and *tor*

<b>tor</b>	<b>kho</b>	phi-pa	a-fi-ne,	<b>mâr</b>	<b>njo</b>	phi-pi
<b>up</b>	<b>come</b>	say-NMLZR	NEG-stay-ADV	<b>down</b>	<b>go</b>	say-NMLZR

mfi=ce      su      a-re  
 person=PL      who      NEG-COP

‘Many (people) tell us to **come up**, not to settle; nobody says “you settle (lit. **go down**).”’  
 (KotoN13\_F1\_139-140)<sup>7</sup>

In Manange (and contra to Nar), a couple of transport verb concatenations are what may be termed satellite-framed (Slobin 2004) in that the manner of transport is encoded in the first element and the path is encoded in the second. These include <sup>52</sup>*por* <sup>22</sup>*jɜ* ‘take’ and <sup>52</sup>*pu* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘bring.’ These are semi-lexicalized in that they are a single lexical unit in citation and in most texts, although the manner element may occur independently, as in (22).

(22) Manange <sup>52</sup>*por* ‘take’

<sup>42</sup> t <sub>1</sub>	<sup>44</sup> ts <sub>h</sub> ana	<sup>52</sup> <b>por-tsi</b>
house	all	<b>take-PFV</b>

‘All of the houses were taken (swept away in the avalanche).’ (PisangN13\_M2\_56)

Almost the opposite pattern is evident in Nar, where the same spatial concepts *phâk* ‘bring’ and *phor* ‘take (away), take (with), accompany’ are verb-framed. These meanings are elicited as single elements, and if path/direction is expressed in a larger utterance, it is done so in an adverb clause construction, as in this negated structure in (23).

(23) Nar *phak* ‘bring’

JM=se	hleε	<b>fa-phak=ne</b>	khâ-tse	mû
JM-ERG	book	<b>NEG-bring=ADV</b>	come-CVB	EVID

‘JM came without a book.’ (Noonan, Grammar notes)

It is not currently clear why such closely related languages have such different strategies for encoding transport. These satellite-framed concatenations (also termed serialization, or versatile verbs in Matisoff 1973) are common in Sino-Tibetan. In a sample of 29 Tibeto-Burman languages examined for the verbal encoding of space, nine languages have versatile/serial-type verbs in the same spirit as Manange. However as with Nar, in other languages in this sample, transport is lexically encoded/verb-framed..

As mentioned, this strategy is virtually unattested in Nar. A rare exception to this is found in discourse in (24), where the verb *khæ* ‘come’ follows *phak*.

<sup>7</sup> One interesting (and perhaps significant) anecdotal observation with Nar speakers is that when in the Kathmandu metropolitan area, when Nar people gather and speak their mother tongue, they do not make use of slope words like those in (20). This is something that they themselves have confirmed when asked by the author; they simply say that such terms are not useful for locational referencing. This suggests a contextual dependency for this aspect of Nar grammar, and also the importance of gathering data in mother tongue-local, and locally relevant, environments. (Harrison 2006; Jukes 2011).

(24) Nar *phâk khâ* ‘bring + come’

tarten	mflaŋ	tfulatfuli	tarijaŋ	mfataje	khjer=je
like.this	black	mix	if.the.case	mix	Kathmandu=GEN

chwε **phâk khâ**.

color **bring come**

‘...And if it’s the case that it’s (the fabric) mixed black and white, then it’s been brought from Kathmandu.’ (NarN10\_M\_13)

## 6. Semantic Extensions

This area of spatial encoding is less well understood and is worthy of more study, but some interesting semantic extensions beyond physical space with the use of the locative =*ri* have been observed in conversational discourse and are worth including here. The locative enclitic (and also locational nouns) locate referents not only in space and time, but they may also locate ideas or more abstract concepts in relation to each other. This is shown in (25) for Manange.

(25) Manange <sup>52</sup>**naŋ=ri** ‘inside’

<sup>22</sup> 3tse	<sup>22</sup> mo	<sup>52</sup> pi-tse	<sup>22</sup> l3-tse	k3rtʃa	<sup>52</sup> <b>naŋ=ri</b>
like.this	COP	say-CC	do-CC	holy.book	<b>inside=LOC</b>

<sup>22</sup> 3le	<sup>22</sup> mo	<sup>22</sup> mu
like.this	COP	EVID

‘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 Gomba to the history of the village) (BragaM13\_M3\_040)

In both languages, the locative optionally appears when people elaborate on their ages, as shown in (26).

(26) Nar

ŋhaçu	ŋhar	khū	<b>ʃhukçu=ri</b>	<b>lho=ri</b>	a-jo-pe
fifty	CONJ	nine	<b>sixty=LOC</b>	<b>year=LOC</b>	NEG-reach-NMLZR

‘I’m fifty nine, one year shy of sixty.’ (KotoN13\_M1\_005)

Locative structures also relate spaces (in this case, agricultural) to people’s lives, as in (27) and (28).

(27) Nar

čâpe	thunpe	sagsəbdzi	tâ	to-ri	râŋe	<b>bari=ri</b>	mo
food	drink	vegetable	what	need-SUBORD	self	<b>field=LOC</b>	<b>COP</b>

‘Whatever we need to eat or drink, we have it right here.’ (Koto1N3\_F1<sup>8</sup>)

<sup>8</sup> In addition to the nominal enclitic =*ri*, there is also a verbal subordinator -*ri*, which may be diachronically related to the nominal enclitic. See NAME (2004) for a fuller discussion of the nominal and verbal morpho-syntax of Manange.

(28) Nar

**toŋri=re**      phaita              the-tse              mo      mu  
**animal=LOC**   benefits              be.big-IPFV      COP      EVID

‘We get many benefits from (the presence of) our animals (such as yaks).’ (NarN10\_M\_1)

Manange and Nar are once again different in how verbs of emotion, sensory, desire and cognitive recall are encoded. In Manange, the semantic extensions of directional verbs indicate that these feelings and emotions move towards or away the experiencer. Verbs like <sup>22</sup>*fomle* <sup>22</sup>*jɜ* ‘forget,’ <sup>42</sup>*tʰaŋ* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘smell an odor,’ <sup>52</sup>*saŋ* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘desire/want,’ and emotion verbs like <sup>42</sup>*tuk* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ~ <sup>22</sup>*tʰaluŋ* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘be sad,’ <sup>52</sup>*ki* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘be happy/be comfortable,’ <sup>52</sup>*su* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘feel/be in pain,’ and <sup>22</sup>*kole* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘have hardship’ are concatenations where the first element(s) encode the affect or experience, and the second element is a locational verb (rarely <sup>22</sup>*jɜ* ‘go,’ more frequently <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘come’). An example of this is in (29).

(29) Manange <sup>52</sup>*ki* <sup>22</sup>*kʰɜ* ‘happy + come’

<sup>44</sup>ta      <sup>53</sup>pi-le              sahajob              <sup>22</sup>lɜ-tse              <sup>52</sup>ki      <sup>44</sup>kʷẽ      <sup>22</sup>kʰɜ-tsi  
what   say-ADV              help              do-CC              **happy really come-PFV**

‘Saying like this, if we give help (to others), (the gods) become very happy.’

(PisangM13\_M2\_36)<sup>9</sup>

In contrast, in Nar, these concepts are encoded in a single verbal lexeme, e.g. *thuke* ‘hardship,’ or else in concatenations, where the emotion concept is the second element, and the first element means ‘mouth’, suggesting bodily containment as emotional state, as in (30).

(30) Nar emotion concatenations

kham fiwo ‘feel sick’ (lit. ‘mouth + nausea’)

kha(m) nɦâ ‘feel sad’ (lit. ‘mouth + sad’)

kha kar ‘feel happy, smile.’ (lit. ‘mouth + happy’)

One noted exception found in Michael Noonan’s unpublished glossary is ‘angry’ *ɦyetaŋ khê* ‘anger come.’ These strategies suggest that differences in the two languages are found not in their lexical inventories in a strict sense, but rather in how these concepts are incorporated into the respective morpho-syntactic systems. They also hint at a more complex use of spatial encodings in daily and ritual practices (as elaborated for Kiranti in Bickel 2000, in Gurung in Pettigrew 1999 and Tamang in Hófer 1999). Truly conventionalized metaphorical uses of locational structures in Manange and Nar Phu so far remain elusive.

## 7. Summary and Concluding Remarks

The strategies and forms for the encoding of space in Manange and Nar-Phu can be summarized and compared in Table 1.

---

<sup>9</sup> Further evidence of the semi-, but not completely, lexicalized nature of these concatenations is found in (29), where <sup>44</sup>*kʷẽ* ‘really’ is inserted between the two pieces of the concatenation for ‘happy.’

	Form(s)	Relation Type	Example(s)
<b>Stative/Topological</b>			
Manage	= <i>ri</i> LOC preferred	Relative	1a-b
Nar-Phu	locational nouns preferred		1d-e
<b>Dynamic</b>			
Manage	= <i>ri</i> LOC preferred	Relative & Extrinsic	1c, 13
Nar-Phu	locational nouns preferred		1g, 11b
<b>Cardinal Directions</b>			
Manage	locational noun(= <i>ri</i> )	Absolute	7-9
Nar-Phu			
<b>Left-Right</b>			
Manage	locational noun(= <i>ri</i> )	Intrinsic	4-5
Nar-Phu			

Table 1. Spatial Encoding Strategies in Manage and Nar-Phu

As Table 1 illustrates, it is in the Stative/Topological and Dynamic spatial encodings where differences between the two languages emerge, particularly in free discourse usage, and it is in the absolute and intrinsic relations where the two languages show similarities.

Other than in Bickel and Gaenzle (1999) or else gleaned from individual descriptions and accounts, there is still a gap in easily available information on family-internal accounts and comparisons of the spatial domain. This paper shows that even a cursory examination of this topic reveals interesting patterns and differences across closely affiliated systems. We see in Manage the use of both enclitics and locational nouns for static/topological and dynamic movement, indicating relative, absolute, and intrinsic frame-of-reference situations; On the other hand, we see in Nar-Phu that locational nouns are more frequently encountered in discourse, while Manage speakers make more use of locative enclitic =*ri*. We also see that Manage and Nar-Phu are obviously closely related within the Tamangic sub-grouping of Tibeto-Burman, and that they demonstrate a great deal of lexical and grammatical overlap, but that striking differences between the two languages may be uncovered in how spatial sub-systems operate. This comparative account will hopefully lead to additional comparative attempts within Tamangic semantics and morpho-syntactic patterns, and will also hopefully become a part of a larger cross linguistic comparison of the ways that grammars in this family encode space.

### References

- Bickel, Balthasar. 1994. *Mapping operations in spatial deixis and the typology of reference frames*. Working Paper No. 31, Cognitive Anthropology Research Group, Nijmegen.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 1997. Spatial operations in deixis, cognition, and culture: Where to orient oneself in Belhare. In Pederson, E. and Nuyts, J. (eds.), *Language and conceptualization*,

- 46-83. Cambridge University Press.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2000. Space, territory and a stupa in Eastern Nepal: Exploring Himalayan themes and traces of Bon. In Nagano, Y. (ed.), *New horizons in Bon studies*, 685-702. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Bickle, Balthasar; and Gaenszle, Martin (eds.). 1999. *Himalayan space: Cultural horizons and practices*. Völkerkundemuseum Zürich.
- NAMES. 2013. Optional ergative case marking: What can be expressed by its absence? Presentation at the 10<sup>th</sup> Biennial Association for Linguistic Typology Meeting, 15-18 August, 2013. MPI Eva Leipzig, Germany.
- Bowerman, Melissa. 2007. Containment, support and beyond. In Aurnague, M. and Hickman, L. Vieu (eds.). *The categorization of spatial entities in language and cognition*, 177-204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 2012. National Population and Housing Census 2011. Government of Nepal National Planning Commission Secretariat.
- Gurung, Harka. 1998. *Nepal: Social demography and expressions*. Kathmandu: New ERA.
- Harrison, K. David. 2006. Ethnography in documentary linguistics. In Austin, P. (ed.). *Language documentation and description Vol. 3*, 22-41. London: SOAS.
- NAME. 2004. A grammar and glossary of the Manange language. In Genetti, Carol (ed.). *Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal: Manange and Sherpa*, 2-189. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- NAME ET AL 2015. A sociolinguistic survey of the languages of Manang, Nepal: Co-existence and endangerment. *NFDIN Journal* 14.6: 104-124.
- NAMES. 2013. Multimedia mapping on the Internet and language documentation: New directions in interdisciplinarity. *Polymath* 3.1: 51-61.
- Höfer, András. 1999. Nomen est numen: Notes on the verbal journey in some Western Tamang oral ritual texts. In Bickle, Balthasar; and Gaenszle, Martin (eds.). *Himalayan space: Cultural horizons and practices*, 205-244. Völkerkundemuseum Zürich.

- Honda, Isao. 2014. Internal diversity in the Tamangic lexicon. In Owen-Smith, Thomas and Hill, Nathan W. (eds.). *Trans-Himalayan Linguistics*, 131-154. Berlin: deGruyter Mouton.
- Jukes, Anthony. 2011. Culture documentation as linguistic stimulus. *Proceedings of sustainable data from digital research*. University of Melbourne 12-14 December 2011.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2123/7934>.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2003. *Space in language and cognition: Explorations in cognitive diversity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C.; and Wilkins, David P. (eds.). 2006. *Grammars of space: Explorations in Cognitive diversity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Matisoff, James A. 1973. *A Grammar of Lahu*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 75. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mazaudon, Martine. 2005. One tone in Tamang and neighbouring languages: Synchrony and diachrony. In Shigeki, Kaji (ed.). *Proceedings of the Symposium, Cross-linguistic Studies of Tonal Phenomena: Historical Development, Tone-Syntax Interface, and Descriptive Studies*, 79-96. Tokyo: Institute for the Languages and Cultures of Asia, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Noonan, Michael. 2008. Contact-induced change in the Himalayas: The case of the Tamangic languages. In Siemunds, Peter; and Kintana, Noemi (eds.), *Language contact and contact languages*, 81-106. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pettigrew, Judith. 1999. Parallel landscapes: Ritual and political values of a Shamanic Soul Journey. In Bickle, Balthasar; and Gaenszle, Martin (eds.). *Himalayan space: Cultural horizons and practices*, 247-270. Völkerkundemuseum Zürich.
- Schackow, Diana. 2015. *A Grammar of Yakkha*. Language Science Press.
- Shafer, Robert. 1955. The classification of the Sino-Tibetan languages. *Word* 11: 94-111.
- Slobin, Dan. 2004. The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In Strömquist, S. and Verhoeven, L. (eds.), *Relating events in narrative: Vol. 2. Typological and contextual perspectives*, 219-257. Mahwah, NJ:



Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tumbahang, Govindra Bahadur. 2012. Linguistic pluralism in Nepal. *Contributions to Nepalese studies* 39: 77-104.