CONCLUSION

In this work a partial outline of the possibilities that are available in Tangkhul-Naga word formation has been given, showing just how wide a range of patterns can be found.

Chapter 1 discussed the sound system taking into account some phonotactic, phonological and morphophonemic features. We found that there is not much to be explored for tonemics and morphophonemics except rising or falling of tones in reduplication, and causativized construction and phonologically conditioned aspiration of the formative/nominalizer (FX, NOMZ) before sonorants (that is, \( k\partial \rightarrow k^b\partial \)) and the non-future marker (NFUT) (that is, \( \partial \rightarrow i/y\partial/w\partial \)). Elsewhere, fixed tones and phonemic shapes are assigned to each root and grammatical morphemes even in compounding and agglutination.

Chapter 2 discussed nominals listing, apart from other, types of compound and derived noun stems and introduced a type of prefix (/a/ which has been called 'formative' prefix (FX)) that is neither inflectional nor derivational (by the usual criteria). We also found that names of many concrete nouns and some case-marking elements and cardinal members are compounded ones, and some nouns are formed from 'core element' (or root) via prefixation/derivation.
Chapter 3 explored the two types of modifiers -- noun modification and verb modification. A section was devoted to some modifying elements which may occur in noun modification, and which has been called 'adjectivals'.

The discussion on adjectivals was partly morphological in nature, and though some modifiers/intensifiers are affixable to only certain types of roots (which are adjectives in many other languages), I have not claimed adjectivals as constituting a separate word class in Tangkhul-Naga. Here, we may recollect that the tripartite distinction between nouns, verbs and adjectives was put forth by Western grammarians only in the Medieval period, and has been generally maintained since then. But more recently the dispute has once again cropped up, with some claiming that adjectives form a sub-category of verbs and others maintaining the opposite view. There have also been other contentions that all three of them (nouns, adjectives and verbs) constitute a single category called 'contentives' or 'predicators', or that there is a continuum of noun-adjective-verb, or even that adjectives form a mixed category sharing the feature (+N) with nouns and (+V) with verbs.

The question as to whether adjectives are to be regarded as constituting a distinct category or whether they are to be sub-grouped with nouns or verbs (or both) has given rise to
conflicting claims in the case of individual languages also. In case of Japanese, for example, some regard adjectives to be a subgroup of verbs\textsuperscript{19}, whereas others claim that they form a distinct category.\textsuperscript{20} Similarly, in the case of Salishan and neighboring languages, there is a long-standing dispute regarding the possibility of establishing not only adjectives, but even nouns and verbs, as constituting distinct categories. Some linguists like Kinkade consider this to be impossible,\textsuperscript{21} whereas some, like van Eijk and Hess consider it to be quite possible.\textsuperscript{22}

Even in English language, it is interesting to recall that, historically, adjectives were once called 'noun adjectives' because they named attribute which could be added (Latin adjectivus from adjecere 'to add') to a noun substantive to describe in more detail, the two being regarded as varieties of the class noun or 'name'. Thus, in the words of J. Brinsley (1612)\textsuperscript{23}:

"Q. How many sorts of nouns have you? 
A. Two: a noun substantive, and a noun adjective. A noun adjective is that cannot stand by itself, without the help of another word to be joyned with it to make it plain".

\textsuperscript{19} R.M.W. Dixon (1982), Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? Berlin: Mouton. p.3.  
\textsuperscript{20} A.E. Backhouse (1984), 'Have All Adjectives Gone? Lingua 62: 169-86.  
\textsuperscript{21} M.D. Kinkade (1983), 'Salish evidence against the universality of 'noun' and 'verb', Lingua 60: 25-40.  
Latter traditional grammarians defined adjectives as 'describing words' or 'words that tell us something about nouns'. Adjectives are differentiated from nouns and verbs by the fact that nouns denote persons, places, and things, and verbs denote events or actions, while adjectives denote properties or qualities. Such a 'notional' definition, however, is rather inadequate because there are nouns, say, in English, like *wideness* or *width* which denote properties, and verbs like *envy* which are not (very) different semantically from adjectives like *jealous*.

Again, there is the problem in Tangkhul-Naga in which even the primary functions of words are not always distinguishable from one another. Thus, the root *pak* may be translated as either 'wide' or 'be wide', and the nominalized/non-finite form *kô-pak* as 'to be wide', 'being wide' or 'wideness'. Again, there is a compound root *yui-ši* 'stare-sulk' which covers both 'envy' and 'jealous/be jealous'. At the primary level the roots *pak* and *yui-ši* readily function as verbs by taking verbal inflections, and allows affixation for nominalization and non-finite forms. Such language would apparently fail to provide any basis for a functional approach of the type in which adjectives are differentiated rather sharply from verbs by their primary function in a clause. The best solution for such language, supported by apparent morpho-syntactic characteristics and
some semantic features, would be to treat adjectives as constituting a sub-type of verbs.

The second section of the chapter explored the heterogeneity of adverbials as is evident in their semantics and morphosyntax. We found that many semantic sub-classes of adverbials are coded by either an affix or one-word adverbs or by more complex morpho-syntactic (compound or sentential) constructions. Again, we came across that even single adverbial words display relatively little cross-language comparability.

Chapter 4 discussed the verbal system. Verbs in the language exhibit derivation, inflection, compounding and serialization. Barring grammaticalized verbs and idiomatic compounds, verbal morphology in the language is comparatively very 'transparent' and demonstrates word formation produced by both 'rules' and 'analogy'.

The language share a number of typological similarities. The word order is SOV and the language (often) prefer subjectless constructions. Verbs exhibit heavy inflectional and agglutinative morphology. Syllable structure is typically simple, and many verbs have lexical and/or grammatical tone distinction.

Some typological changes are introduced by grammaticalization in inflection, derivation, explicator compound and serial constructions of verbs. If we focus on the
morpheme themselves, we can describe the changes in terms of the grammatical categories into which the verbs shift: post-position, complementizer, subordinating conjunction, adverb, auxiliary, and tense-aspect-modality marker, for example. The change can introduce a new category into the language, resulting in an 'expansion' of the number of grammatical categories in the language. If the category already exists in the language the change can add to the inventory of lexical items in that category, and can result in an increase in the frequency of occurrence of that category in discourse.

A consequence of grammaticalization is decrease in the number of verbs per clause. Often, the trend is change from a clause with a serial verb string to a clause with a single main verb accompanied by 'modifying verbs', some of which are losing verb status. Over time, a simple two-verb construction can undergo restructuring to, say, verb plus prepositional phrase, verb plus object complement and eventually subordinate clause, or verb plus adverb or auxiliary.

Again, in a two-verb construction, the semantic depletion of one verb can be balanced by the semantic enhancement of the other verb. In a sequence like $k^h$ui-ra 'bring (<take-come), a 'take' verb can become semantically depleted to the extend that it no longer indicates physical grasp (or even a separable action) and signals a transitive/causative reading
for the following verb. The 'take' verb can become semantically bleached, syntactically defective, and morphologically eroded while a following intransitive verbs acquires a transitive/causative reading.

Now, why do languages like Tangkhul-Naga prefer string like verb construction and tend to develop complementizers, deverbal adpositions, explicators and auxiliaries? There may be ways to approach a question of this sort. In some accounts of linguistic change, languages may proceed to correct deficiencies or attain greater efficiency of communication. But a judgment like this, based on criteria of efficiency rather than aesthetics, is difficult to arrive at from simply reviewing typological data. Psychological experiments can show that certain structures take longer to process than other, and studies of child language development indicate that children learn some structures before others. However, I am aware of no psychological or developmental evidence that indicates that single-verb typology is easier or more efficient than compound/serial-verb typology. The grammaticalization process does not necessarily produce a change in clause typology anyway, since some languages maintain stable clause typologies while cycles of grammaticalization proceed. Tangkhul-Naga, for example, has maintained a compound or serializing typology, with some shifts in the range of meanings, while developing de-verbal adpositions, etc. In short, we may attribute
grammaticalization to the speaker's desire for novel, vivid expression; there are limitations on the appropriateness of the devices available to speakers, so different speakers tend to use the same devices.

Chapter 5 explored the various reduplicative structures which are different linguistic structures sharing some common morpho-semantic properties. Word reduplications, echo formations and expressives are 'so expressive' that, often, similar picture or the content meaning of an utterance cannot be expressed by other words.

Echo formations in the language show structural peculiarities and wide range of semantics unlike in many other languages such as Hindi, Telugu, Tamil,, and even Mitei (though Mitei and Tangkhul-Naga belong to the same family -- Tibeto-Burman). There is no fixed replacer or replacing rule as such. All the echo words and replacers seem to be collocationally restricted. Again, it is interesting to ask why monosyllabic words cannot undergo echo formation; and why only some 50 words can have echo construction. Also, unlike in some other languages, only nouns or nominalized stems can undergo echo formation in the language.

Compared to word reduplication and echo formation, the study of expressives has often been neglected giving expressives no prominence in the field of linguistics. Some linguists posit that one reason for the neglect of expressives is
their position on the periphery of language proper, especially in structural view. Expressives are interesting to linguists just because they straddle the boundary with paralinguistic and extralinguistic phenomena. They have also been ignored because of their intractability to analysis. Their variability or invariability also presents an obstacle. In many languages, they are not regularly employed in writing texts, and in addition, they have little in the way of morpho-syntax and may heavily rely on context for interpretation.

All these factors suggest why expressives have not received the attention they rightly deserve. On the other hand, these factors also indicate why indeed they must be studied. One reason for why expressives should be brought into the mainstream of linguistics is their widespread distribution in the languages of the world. Not only in Tangkhul-Naga or other Tibeto-Burman languages and South Asian languages, expressives are also found in Aboriginal Australian languages, Russian, Lahu, Pidgins and Creoles in the New World, for example, Jamaican English, and all the African languages. Like in the African phenomenon, expressives in Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Munda, Mon-Kher, and Tibeto-Burman languages represent a sizable proportion of the lexicons. Tangkhul-Naga's lexicon of about 8000 words contains more than 350 expressives: a portion that cannot be ignored or neglected in any adequate analysis of the language.
Further comparative work can be undertaken, for instance, by making a cross-linguistic comparison of senses appealed to by expressives. Their distribution might be found to follow a species-specific pattern. Much further research needs to be done, of course, in comparing expressives cross-linguistically in Tibeto-Burman or south Asian languages and elsewhere.

Many research works on expressives have concentrated on analyzing them as constituting a separate system -- assuming that they belong outside language proper. I have tried to take the opposite assumption and I find it very productive.

The importance of expressives to literary discourse cannot be ignored. Further consideration as to how they are used in this medium can inform us as to the pragmatic conditions on their appearance. Bible translators have confronted this issue many times (both for poetic and prose forms), and the responses of the readers as to the appropriateness of expressives have been varied -- much readily accepted in the language.

There is a need to adequately describe and document the phenomenon using a reliable framework. Another focus must be on integrating expressives into the mainstream of linguistic inquiry -- treating expressives as a legitimate object of inquiry and squarely confronting the problems they pose. If our approach is confined to the referential function of
language, expressives will just remain hankering on the periphery of language.

I have tried to demonstrate how expressives and other reduplicated structures stand within language proper, while acknowledging their stand without. I hope that the present work, in spite of many shortcomings, would engender a respectability for expressives and other reduplicated structures and stimulate the investigation of them in Tangkhul-Naga and other languages.

**Summing up**

In this exploratory work I have messily presented some word formation processes in Tangkhul-Naga. No one is more aware than I of the many 'confusing' analyses and oversimplifications. The shortcomings are mainly due to my lack of expertise and partly due to morphology being inherently messy. Morphologists are in a difficult position because there is unfortunately very little agreement among them on theoretical points, and many of the descriptive studies of word formation available avoid reference to such vital theoretical points as, among others, 'productivity'.

Despite these handicaps, the study of word formation is expanding. Researchers are showing a greater willingness to blend various theoretical viewpoints when dealing with word formation: to blend synchrony and diachrony, morphology and phonology, syntax and semantics, pragmatics and psycho-
linguistics. In fact, it is the 'crossroads' nature of word formation, where so many facets of linguistics come together; and a challenge which more and more linguists are taking up. And, though it is obvious just how much research there still is to be done in word formation, and why it should be the 'deepest, most secret part of language', there are places for optimism, since even such basic problems do not seem to be insoluble in principle. Word formation seems to offer the opportunity for valuable and fruitful linguistic research, and a field which is attracting new researchers in various disciplines.