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THE DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS, DECCAN COLLEGE
POSTGRADUATE & RESEARCH INSTITUTE, PUNE: A PROFILE

The Deccan College Post-Graduate & Research Institute is one of the oldest institutions of modern learning in India. Its beginnings stretch back to the Hindoo College which was established on 6th October 1821 from the Dakshina Fund of the Peshwas on the initiative of Mountstuart Elphinstone, the enlightened Governor of the Bombay Presidency. The College started functioning on the new campus at Yerwada on 23rd March 1868. Many illustrious persons like R.G. Bhandarkar, Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Gopal Ganesh Agarkar, Gurudev Ranade, R.N. Dandekar, Sumitra Magesh Katre, M.A. Mehendale and Ashok Kelkar were associated with this Institute either as faculty or as students.

In recognition of the excellence achieved by the Institute both in teaching and research, the H.R.D. Ministry, Govt. of India, on the advice of the University Grants Commission awarded the status of a Deemed University to it on 5 March 1990. The Institute started functioning as a Deemed University from 1 June 1994.

The Institute, apart from giving instruction to postgraduate students and producing over 300 Ph.D. dissertations, carried out outstanding research in Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Linguistics, Medieval and Maratha History, Sociology-Anthropology and Sanskrit Studies. Eminent scholars such as Professors R. N. Dandekar, Padmashree M. K. Dhawlikar, S. M. Katre, A. M. Ghatage, M. A. Mehendale, Iravati Karve, Padmashree A.R. Kelkar, Padmashree K. Paddaya, H. D. Sankalia, C. R. Sankaran and T. S. Shejwalkar, as well as other staff members over the years made significant research contributions. On account of these contributions the Institute achieved a preeminent status not only in India but also outside the country. Another significant contribution made by the Institute is the undertaking of a long term project for the preparation of An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles.

The Institute has three teaching-cum-research Departments, namely (a) Department of Linguistics, (b) Department of Archaeology, and (c) Department of Sanskrit and Lexicography. The Institute has two museums: (a) Archaeology Museum and (b) Maratha History Museum. A Museum for Heritage Studies is taking shape on the campus.

UGC-SAP Department of Linguistics (2011-2016)

The University Grants Commission of India awarded the Special Assistance Programme to this department in 2011 to conduct research in the thrust area of Language Contact in India. Under the SAP, faculty and students in the department took up individual projects on language contact (especially across language families) including the following contact situations: Marathi-Kannada, Telugu-Marathi, Kolami-Marathi, Nagpuri Marathi, Korlai Portuguese-Marathi, Gondi-Hindi, Galo-Hindi, Khasi-English, Nagpuri Hindi, Nagamese and Arunachali Hindi. Under the Programme, the department organized a national seminar ‘Investigating Language Contact in India: Methods, Techniques and Issues’ in February 2012. This was followed by an international conference on ‘Language Contact in
India: Historical, Typological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives’ on 6-8 February 2013. The international conference on Indian Languages in Contact Situations: Historical, Typological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives was held on 4-6 February 2016.

Establishment of the Department

The Department of Linguistics at the Deccan College was established in 1939. The first postgraduate degree course in Linguistics in India began in this department in 1958.

History of the Department

Post-independence the development of Indian languages and dialects of the four language families became an urgent need. These languages were expected to take on the responsibility of serving as vehicles of both literary and scientific works, and in due course of time to function as medium of education and instruction. The state of linguistic studies in Indian universities at the time was not adequate to handle such problems and the need to expand, modernize and reorient language studies became a pressing need. Under the circumstances, a lead was taken by the Poona University by calling a conference in 1953 to discuss these issues in addition to the urgent problem of a common medium in Indian universities. This was followed by another conference called by the Deccan College for developing linguistic studies in the universities with the specific purpose of applying their findings to problems of cross-cultural communication. As a consequence of these two conferences, the Deccan College started a large-scale language project with a munificent grant made by the Rockefeller Foundation of New York over a period of six years (1954-1960).

The Role of the Department in the Propagation of Linguistics in India

Under the able guidance of Prof. Sumitra Mangesh Katre, Deccan College, Pune spearheaded in the 1960s the firm establishment of the modern discipline of Linguistics in India. To popularise this discipline, summer, autumn, and winter schools of six weeks’ duration were conducted in Deccan College and in various other parts of the country starting from 1954.

The Summer and Winter Schools (1954-62)

In the 1950s not many in the field of education knew about Linguistics. The Rockefeller Foundation placed its funds meant for the propagation of Linguistics in India at the disposal of Dr. S. M. Katre who was then the Director of the Deccan College. Dr. Katre's futuristic vision was instrumental in giving Linguistics a strong foothold on the academic scene in India. A series of summer and winter (or Autumn) schools of Linguistics funded by the Rockefeller Foundation through the Deccan College and organized by Indian universities in various parts of the country proved to be a powerful instrument in the propagation and popularization of Linguistics in the country. Both Indian and American scholars taught in the Schools. A large number of teachers of languages and other interested scholars in humanities got acquainted with the more recent trends in linguistics in these Schools. A limited number of selected scholars were also able to specialize in Linguistics at the Deccan College over a period of one or two years. Many of the fellows of the Schools had the further opportunity to
pursue studies in the USA for one or two years; the majority of the first generation of Indian teachers of linguistics came from this group. Dr. N.G. Kalelkar, Dr. C. R. Sankaran, Dr. H. S. Biligiri, Padmashree (Dr.) Ashok R. Kelkar, Dr. M. A Mehendale, Dr. A M. Ghatage (former director of the Deccan College, Pune), Dr. P. B.Pandit (former Head, Department of Linguistics, Delhi University), Padmashree Dr. D. P. Pattanayak (the founder Director of the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore), and Dr.J.D.Singh were among the illustrious members of this group. Thus the Deccan College spearheaded in the 1950s and 60s the firm establishment of the modern discipline of Linguistics in India.

Post-Graduate Departments of Linguistics at the Deccan College and other Indian Universities

Building on the popularity of this new discipline in India, a postgraduate diploma in Linguistics was started at this Institute in 1956. Some of the prominent scholars in Indian linguistics such as Dr. Braj Kachru, Dr. Yamuna Kachru, Dr.A.K.Ramanujan, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Dr. B. P. Mahapatra, Dr. D. P. Pattanayak, Dr. L. M. Khubchandani, Dr. R. R. Mehrotra, Dr. K. Meenakshi, were among the participants of the diploma course. 1958 saw the beginning of a formal postgraduate degree in Linguistics at the Deccan College, the first in India in this field. In the same year Deccan College and the University of Poona organized a conference of Vice- Chancellors and linguists. A special committee of this Conference prepared a comprehensive report on linguistic studies in the country laying down the main guidelines for their growth. The UGC accepted the proposals of this committee and, as a result of it, a number of departments of Linguistics were established in Indian universities and the continuation of the summer and Winter Schools was sanctioned. After the grants of the Rockefeller foundation had been used up, the Schools continued with assistance from the University Grants Commission of India. In the years that have followed, alumni of this Institute have gone forth and established departments of Linguistics in various nooks and corners of the country.

Research and Teaching in Linguistics at the Deccan College

There was a flurry of linguistic activity and publication at the Deccan College in the 1960s and 70s. These activities included the beginning of the Sanskrit Dictionary Project, description of the dialects of the Marathi language in central, western and southern India, and descriptions of some dialects of Kannada in addition to doctoral studies of a number of other Indian languages.

Today Linguistics continues to be taught as a postgraduate subject at the Deccan College. The Linguistics Faculty now includes two Professors and four Assistant Professors. Members of the faculty conduct research activities alongside their teaching assignments. The Department concentrates on the core branches of Linguistics as well as on applied aspects of the discipline; the department has specialized in the analyses of languages of all the four language families of the subcontinent. The department has had a regular intake of students from various Indian states as well as from countries like Srilanka, Thailand, Iran and Korea. So far over five hundred students have completed post-graduation in Linguistics from this
Institute. In the same period about one hundred and eighty-five research scholars have obtained doctorate degrees.

**Contributions of the Alumni and Associates of the Department**

The following is a brief listing of some of the major scholars and their important work in some branches of Linguistics produced in this department:

**Sanskrit Studies:**
Dr. V.M. Apte (Grhya Sutras), Dr. N.J. Shende (Bhrgvangiras Element in the Mahabharat), Dr. U.S. Taraporewala who has written on the Bhagvadgita and the Gathas of Zarathushtra, S.M. Katre (Panini Studies), Dr. M.A Mehendale (Aspects of Indo-Aryan Linguistics), K.P. Jog (Bhadaaranyakopanishadbhashya of Sankaracharya), E.D. Kulkarni (Epic Variations in the Critical Edition of the Mahabharata), Mantrini Prasad (Language of Yaska), K. Meenakshi (Epic Syntax), S.D. Laddu (Evolution of Syntax from Panini to Patanjali), S. Vaidyanathan (Indo-Aryan Elements in Cankam Literature), M.M. Patkar (History of Sanskrit Lexicography), D.G. Koparkar (Evolution of Grammatical Gender in Indo-Aryan), G.B. Palsule (Sanskrit Dhatupathas), S.M. Ayachit (The Ganapatha - A Critical Study).

**Modern Indian Languages:**

**Tibeto-Burman Languages:** P. Sinha (Lepcha), S. Subba (Magar), S.K. Tiwari (Kabui), M.S, Ningomba (Maring), S.K. Sthapit (Nepali and Newari), D.N.S.Bhat (Manipuri, Bodo), S.R. Sharma (Descriptive Studies of Tibeto-Burman languages of the western Himalayas), Novel Kishore Rai (Bantawa), L. Mahabir Singh (Tangkhul), Hanjabam Surmangol Sharma (Manipuri and Khasi), U.V. Joseph (Rabha), M. Ashalata and H. Binod Kumar Sharma (Meithei).

**Austro-Asiatic Languages:** H.S. Biligiri (Kharia, Mundari, Sora); K.S. Nagaraja (Khasi, Korku, Nahali), Rajyashree Swain (Remo/Bonda), Anil Kumar Chand (Santali).

**Dravidian Languages:** A.S. Acharya, U.P. Upadhyaya, D.N.S. Bhat, R. Mahadevan, G.S. Gai (Dialects of Kannada), D.B. Polkam (Merolu Telugu), Peri Bhaskararao (Konekar Gadaba, Telugu).

**Indo-Aryan Languages:** N. G Kalelkar, AM. Ghatage, AR.Kelkar, S.B.Kulkarni, I. Junghare, M.L.Apte, R.V.Dhongde, U. Ranade, A Jha, N. More, V. Durge, S. Mahajan, S.S. Pundalik and others (on aspects of the Marathi language); P. Dasgupta (Bangla); P. Gidwani, M.D. Bhawnani (Sindhi), S. Mukherji (Rajasthani).
Activities undertaken in the Department for the Dissemination of Linguistic Knowledge during the last five years

Short-term courses

Taking cognizance of the changing language needs of the industry, the department has since 2006-07 organised short-term courses for the general public; these include courses in Computational Linguistics, Phonetics for corporate language trainers, Phonetics for school-teachers and a certificate course in Linguistics.
Munda Languages

Introduction

Munda languages constitute the western branch of the Austro-Asiatic linguistic phylum. There are over 10 million speakers of Munda languages in India, living in an area stretching from the western part of the country i.e from Maharashtra all the way to the Northeast of India. Munda speaking people live mainly the states of Orissa and Jharkhand; significant Munda language speaking group are also found in the states of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Chhattisgarh and through migration to virtually all areas of India.

Figure 1: Map of Munda languages
(Anderson 2007:7, reprinted with kind permission of the author)

Munda languages have interacted with most of the other major language groups of India over several millennia, and have logically both influenced and been influenced by various other families of languages of South Asia, e.g., Dravidian (Bhattacharya 1975a,
Anderson 2003). Further, the Munda languages have their linguistic cousins to the east, so they also have features reflecting their shared history with various language groups of Southeast Asia from an earlier historical period (Anderson 2014).

**Comparative growth of Munda languages of India 1971, 1981, 1991 and 2001**
(Census of India, Statement 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhumij</td>
<td>51,651</td>
<td>50,384</td>
<td>45,302</td>
<td>47,443</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gadaba</td>
<td>20,420</td>
<td>28,027</td>
<td>28,158</td>
<td>26,262</td>
<td>37.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>751,389</td>
<td>783,301</td>
<td>949,216</td>
<td>1,042,724</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Juang</td>
<td>12,172</td>
<td>19,038</td>
<td>16,858</td>
<td>23,708</td>
<td>56.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kharia</td>
<td>191,421</td>
<td>212,605</td>
<td>225,556</td>
<td>239,608</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Koda/Kora</td>
<td>14,333</td>
<td>23,113</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>43,030</td>
<td>61.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Korku</td>
<td>307,434</td>
<td>347,661</td>
<td>466,073</td>
<td>574,481</td>
<td>13.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Korwa</td>
<td>15,097</td>
<td>48,079</td>
<td>27,485</td>
<td>34,586</td>
<td>218.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Munda</td>
<td>309,293</td>
<td>377,492</td>
<td>413,894</td>
<td>469,357</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mundari</td>
<td>771,253</td>
<td>742,739</td>
<td>861,378</td>
<td>1,061,352</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Santali</td>
<td>3,786,899</td>
<td>4,332,511</td>
<td>5,216,325</td>
<td>6,469,600</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Savara</td>
<td>222,018</td>
<td>209,092</td>
<td>273,168</td>
<td>252,519</td>
<td>-5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keynote Address
The Munda languages appear to be perfect laboratories for the study of mutual influences in South Asia. Some features of originally non-Munda origin have entered the Munda languages at various times, through borrowing or through (partial) structural accommodation or ‘metatypy’ (Ross 2007). But as the comparative study of the Munda languages, independently and within Austroasiatic broadly, remains in its infancy, much remains preliminary and impressionistic (Pinnow 1959, 1960, 1963, 1966, Anderson 2004, Sidwell and Rau 2015). Further, since Munda languages have their linguistic cousins to the east, they also have features reflecting their shared history with various language groups of Southeast Asia at an earlier period. It is generally assumed that Munda accrued various new features from different South Asia sources, and that its sister languages retain a more pure/original state, with no basis for these beliefs. The exact nature and range of such varied areal and temporally defined influences however have not yet been adequately investigated. The history of Munda languages remains elusive. Nevertheless, investigators of South Asian languages have and continue to evoke contact with, or influence from (or on), ‘Munda’ to ‘explain’ a whole range of unexpected lexical or structural features or elements in non-Munda language groups of South Asia, without any basis for identifying what is old or what is new in Munda, or any other means of scientifically assessing such claims, while conversely, Southeast Asianists assume that features of Munda that are rare/ atypical or unattested in Southeast Asian branches of the broad Austroasiatic phylum can be dismissed as reflecting later and thus historically ‘uninteresting’ South Asian areal features. Claims that Munda languages show structures that are ‘exactly the opposite’ of their related sister languages (Donegan and Stampe 2004, Donegan (1993) and Stampe and Donegan 1983)-a de facto defense of the ‘Sinosphere’ vs. ‘Indosphere’ division—although neat, simple and appealing, in no sense account for the actual facts, and have hindered serious comparative work until now.

A systematic comparative and synchronic study of the Munda language family has been underway to help to determine how exactly to situate the Munda languages within the broader South Asian areal context, as well as the precise nature of their relationship to other Austroasiatic language groups, which themselves in turn constitute core members of the rather different Southeast Asian areal linguistic complex. Munda linguistic features examined here are thus situated in their broader South Asian and Southeast Asian comparative contexts, including features relating to the phonological and prosodic structure of Munda words and phrases, the nature of their lexica and nominal and verbal derivational systems, and features of their inflectional and morphosyntactic systems, to begin to unravel and explain the complex layering of historical influences that these languages reveal. While all Munda languages are typically SOV and proto-Munda was likely this too, with V Aux
structure that gave rise to the verbal complexes, there are post-verbal slots generally filled by (pro)nominal subject and topics, such that VS order is also found and this is likely old (Jenny et al. 2015). There are both prefixes and suffixes (and infixes) that are morphotactically distinct from proclitics and enclitics in different individual Munda languages, but proto-Munda may have had only inflectional clitics (e.g., subject proclitics), except for a slot for either TAM/(I)TR and/or OBJ suffixes. Various prefixes found in Munda lexical items can be found in relict forms in other Austroasiatic branches, as can the putative case prefix on speech act participants. Noun incorporation was also found. Word-level prosody in proto-Munda was likely *[Weak-Strong]\textsuperscript{WORD} while phrasal level prosody may have become *[Strong-Weak]\textsuperscript{PHRASE} in certain Munda languages (Anderson 2015). In short, proto-Munda seems very Austroasiatic indeed!
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Towards the Proto-Kherwarian verb: Historical-comparative study of negation, TAM and person-indexing interdependencies
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Kherwarian Munda languages show complex systems of tense-aspect-mood markers interacting with markers of transitivity, argument indices and negative marking. To date, how such a system arose has not been well explored. Previous historical studies for Kherwarian verbal systems include Pinnow (1966) and some comments that can be extracted from Anderson (2007). While indeed complex as outlined in this study, the system of Proto-Kherwarian can be determined and such a system compared with Korku to glean insight into Proto-North Munda, as well as with various southern Munda groups to infer possible earlier systems in the development of the Munda languages. The different types of systems in modern Kherwarian languages and in the Proto-Kherwarian ancestral tongue can be determined and some features of Proto-North Munda likewise may be recovered. The Proto-Munda data remain more obscure in part due to inadequate data yet for some languages necessary to do preliminary and intermediate-level reconstructions. All data presented here are analyzed in light of both internal developmental tendencies and variation seen in the Kherwarian languages, and in a broader areal-typological perspective, and similarities or differences that can be identified in both related Munda languages and unrelated Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages with which they have been in significant contact over the past centuries and millennia. Only once we have a thorough understanding of the Kherwarian and North Munda systems and their internal variation can we begin to understand how the different systems may have arisen or interacted with non-Munda languages as well and thus whether and which features may have arisen through contact-driven processes of change such as borrowing or metatyping. Clear examples of borrowing (from Indo-Aryan) in Kherwarian morphosyntax include the primary object marker –ke (1) or the clause-initial complementizer ki (2) from Birhor (field notes). This study represents a step in this direction, working towards a reconstruction of negative formations in Kherwarian and in the Munda family as a whole. Here one finds significant interdependencies between negation, TAM marking and argument indexing that can be projected back to the Proto-Kherwarian stage, such as the oddity that across Kherwarian we find animate possessa encoded as objects in present positive forms but as subjects in the past negative ones (3)-(4), as in Bhumij (field notes). Data mainly however comes from fieldwork on Munda languages in Jharkhand and Odisha. Data comes from the following six Kherwarian languages: Bhumij, Birhor, Ho, Kera? Mundari, Santali and Tama?ija Mundari, as well as non-Kherwarian languages such as Kharia, Gta?, Gutob, Juang, Remo and Sora, in addition to published data resources such as Osada (1992, 2008) on Mundari, Grierson (1906) and Osada (1993) on

(1) \(iŋ\) hini \(h\text{-}ta\)-ke lel-le-\(d=\text{i}ŋ\) \(d\text{e}\) iŋ-ke ko\(h\text{n\)-udubai-i\(\text{n}-ke\)-n-a
I DEIC person-CLASS-OBJ see-TAM-TR=1SUBJ [CO:REL.HUM] I-OBJ story tell:APPL-1OBJ-TAM-ITR-FIN
‘I saw the man who told me the story’ [Birhor]

(2) iŋ sari-\(kan=i\text{ŋ}\) ki \(h\text{t}r\) am-ke le-le-d-me-a=k\(o\)
I know-IPFV=1SUBJ COMP person you-OBJ see-TAM-TR-2OBJ-FIN=3PL.SBJ
‘I know that the men saw you’ [Birhor]

(3) iŋa bōria kuri-hon-kin mena-kin-a
I:GEN two daughter-DL COP-3DL.OBJ-FIN
I have two daughters. [Bhumij]

(4) iŋa bōria kuri-hon ka=\(k\)in taiken-a
I:GEN two daughter NEG=3DL.SBJ PST.COP
I did not have two daughters. [Bhumij]
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New issues in the study of Mundari Expressives
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While research on the study of expressives in Mon-Khmer languages has gradually gained some momentum (Diffloth 1979, Williams 2013), the Munda branch of Austro-Asiatic, despite its rich repertoire of expressives, has been overlooked. It has been proposed that expressive language is fundamentally different from the prosaic language (Diffloth 1972 and others). This presentation will outline a new agenda in the study of expressives for Mundari, drawing on the works of Osada (2010), as well as recently conducted fieldwork with a native speaker. The first part will discuss whether, as with some Mon-Khmer languages, there exists an expressive phonology in Mundari distinct from the prosaic language, and also whether expressives could be considered a separate word class, a controversial issue for Munda (Osada and Evans, 2005). The second part looks at the semantics-pragmatics interface in the study of expressives, drawing on Dingemanse’s notion of expressives as a form of “depiction” (2012) to discuss how gesture, performative deployment, and morphology are critical to understanding the semantic scope of expressive language. Examples will be provided from video data to illustrate the points.
Issues of culture, contact and honorification in Santali
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Abstract

The term ‘culture’ can be defined as the symbolic knowledge of the ‘real observable things and events’ that is historically accumulated and shared by a society across different generations (White, 1959; Scupin, 2012). The linguistic and cognitive ability plays a vital role in shaping of the culture. Therefore, Brown considered language as one of the cultural universals shared by different societies (as cited in Scupin, 2012). One of the important aspects of culture is values which is a significant factor for guiding the behaviour of the members of a particular society (Scupin, 2012). Respect, both self-respect and interpersonal respect (Darwall, 1977), is considered to be an important value. Although it is unanimously agreed that every language has a particular sociolinguistic system of expressing respect, not all languages have grammaticalized honorifics (Irvine, 1992). The term honorification can be defined as a relationship indicating ‘social status’, ‘respect’ and ‘deference’ among the participants (Agha, 1994). While respect is generally associated with psychology, deference is more of a sociological concept since it is related to social distance and status (Haugh, 2010). The term status is closely linked to hierarchy which is an important concept in a society. The terms ‘society’ and ‘culture’ are again interrelated. In Santali, the concept of honorification is intertwined with different cultural and societal aspects. Different sociocultural communities focus on the maintenance of certain politeness strategies and ‘diffusing others’ (Subbarao et al., 1991). Thus, while in many Indian languages the second person pronoun has a ‘two- or three-level hierarchy’ (Subbarao et al., 1991), in Santali there is no honorific pronoun (Ghosh, 2008). However the first and second person dual pronouns are used in a restricted sense while referring to in-laws and are considered to be a ‘sub-system of honorific usage’ (Ghosh, 2008; Choksi, 2010). However in the recent years, the dual pronoun of the second person is used as a generalized honorific, mostly by the young and educated speakers (Ghosh, 2008) who are proficient in the Ol Chiki script of Santali. This is also observed in the region of south-western Bengal (Choksi, 2010). Hence, the issue of language contact plays an important role for the increasing generalized use of honorific. Therefore, this paper attempts to show how the interaction of subtle aspects of culture like values and respect with societal aspects like status and hierarchy is manifested in Santali language using the concept of honorification and also how language contact affects the concept of hierarchy in egalitarian tribal societies as mentioned by Fried and Service (as cited in Palumbo, 1987) like that of Santals. Moreover, in the absence of specific honorific pronouns in Santali like other Indian languages, this paper also attempts to investigate if the syntactic features of Santali are used as politeness strategies. However, the work presented here is no novelty. This is more of a convergence between the anthropological tradition and linguistic issues. This work attempts to take up certain implicit aspects of a tribal society namely Santali and its culture and give it an overt verbal expression from the perspective of the linguistic feature of honorification.

Keywords: Santali, honorifics, culture, pronoun forms, language contact
1. Introduction

Culture can be defined as a process of learning that is shared by a group of people belonging to a particular community about the knowledge pertaining to norms, values, meanings and behaviour (Birukou et al., 2013). It is considered to be one of the fundamental constituents in the formation of an ethnic group. Ethnicity can be defined as the sense of belongingness that is shared by a group of people on the basis of their common descent and shared enculturation and is, therefore, not restricted by geographical boundaries. This paper focuses on the ethnic group of Santals. The Santals are a tribal society who can be defined as a settled simple society with stable headship. Their identity is marked by the homogeneity in their cultural traditions. According to Somers, even after subject to aggressive assimilation from other communities, the Santals have been successful in maintaining their cultural heritage (as cited in Prasad, 1991). In order to understand the interrelation between a society and its culture, it is important to analyse the functioning of honorifics in the particular society. The choice of honorific terms indicates the important social distinctions in terms of status, social distance, demeanour, solidarity, power, respect (Keating & Duranti, 2006). In this regard, it is important to discuss the concept of linguistic relativity commonly termed as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Although, the proposals like language as language-of-thought and linguistic determinism are rejected both on theoretical and empirical grounds, it is worth mentioning that the other manifestations of this linguistic relativity like thinking for speaking, language as meddler, language as augmenter, language as spotlight, language as inducer have been found to be relevant based on empirical evidence (Wolff and Holmes, 2011). It is in this respect of linguistic relativity that honorifics can be considered to be an important ethnic marker. The term ethnic marker can be defined as a bundle of features that includes intent, ecologically adaptive knowledge, cooperating conspecifics and coordinating norms (McElreath et al., 2003). Honorification can be defined as the relationship between participants in a conversation that indicates social status, deference or respect (Agha, 1994). While respect is a psychological concept, deference is a sociological concept. This paper attempts to show how the concept of honorification in Santali is a direct reflection of their culture and society. Santals have migrated to towns and cities nearer to industrial areas in West Bengal, Bihar, Jharkhand, Orissa and also have migrated to Assam (Ghosh, 2008). This has resulted in language contact between the dominant language community and Santali which can be observed in the use of honorific terms. However, the most striking aspect of Santali honorification is the absence of honorific pronouns. It is important to note that the mutual knowledge of the members’ public self-image and the intent to cooperate in terms of ‘face’ is universal though the degree of such intent may vary from culture to culture (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Therefore, this paper attempts to analyse the syntactic strategies of Santali in order to understand the usage of politeness strategies in this language.

The paper is divided into five sections. The first section which is the current section gives an overview of the paper in general. The second section analyses the functioning of respect which is fundamental to honorification as an important ethnic marker for the Santals and the absence of deference in this tribal society. The third section discusses the use of honorifics by Santals in Purulia district of West Bengal and Mayurbhanj district of Orissa in the light of language contact. The fourth section discusses the syntactic structure and
resulting politeness strategies used in Santali on account of absence of honorific pronouns. The fifth section deals with observations made in the previous sections.

2. Respect as an ethnic marker for Santals

Respect can be defined as an object-directed behaviour that reflects consideration and acknowledgement by the subject. Recognition respect (Darwall, 1977) can be considered to be one of the aspects of unconditional positive regard since it implies recognition of the object irrespective of the individual’s conformation to social expectations of others. Appraisal respect (Darwall, 1977), on the other hand, can be considered to be an example of conditional positive regard since it emphasises on the approval of the object in specific pursuits which can be understood in terms of social expectations of others. Deference can be defined as an expression of submission or regard towards a person of higher status resulting in social distance (Haugh, 2010). This section discusses how this respect, both recognition as well as appraisal, functions as an ethnic marker for the Santals based on the criteria given by McElreath et al. (2003) as mentioned in the previous section. Therefore, it is important to understand the religion, occupation, marriage and judicial system of the Santals in order to analyse how respect and deference work in all these aspects.

In Santal tribal society, the traditional religion is termed bongaism. The bongas are believed to be the spiritual beings who are associated with nature. According to Troisi, there are two aspects of the worship of bongas which include an instrumental aspect and an expressive aspect (as cited in Saha and Goswami, 2013). While the instrumental aspect emphasises on the alliance between bongas and the people, the expressive aspect involves rites, feasts, festivals and also offerings made on behalf of the group as a means to acknowledge the presence of the bongas. However, the sacredness associated with each bonga does not vary with its degree and nature of relationship with the Santals. So, for example although Maran Buru is considered to be the chief of bongas but he is also considered as a kind grandfather of the Santal tribe (Saha and Goswami, 2013). This implies that the Santals have developed a close affinity with the bongas whether they are tutelary spirits or spirits of other categories who are responsible for the welfare of the tribe or even the malevolent spirits who need to be pleased with sacrificial offerings so as to keep away the ill-effects. In other words, Santals recognise the presence of all the bongas which can be considered as a form of recognition respect. As a result, the relationship between the Santals and the bongas is one of respect and not that of deference. This respect towards the religion and associated bongas can be considered to be an example of ecologically adaptive knowledge. This is because this acknowledgement of the both the good and malevolent bongas has helped the Santals to adapt and selectively learn from the environment. Next, the primary occupation of the Santals is agriculture. Therefore, the different agricultural activities require adequate labour force which is met by primarily employing consanguineal kin members and later, if need arises, by affinal kin members. They are provided with handia, a kind of country liquor, instead of wages to show gratitude and regard for the work done (Parida, 2015). This marks as a gesture of positive appraisal of the kin members which can be considered to be an example of cooperating conspecifics. This is because this recognition of the primary kin members helps in selective cooperation with family members.
thus strengthening family relations. Therefore, this sharing of agricultural activities removes the concept of social distance between family members and hence, the concept of deference. Marriage is an important social institution in any society. The Santal society is organised in terms of exogamous sibs or clans who are further sub-divided into sub-sibs or sub-clans. Marriages between sub-clans belonging to the same clan are prohibited and are considered as taboos (Chattopadhyay, 1957; Santal, 2014). Therefore, the marital relations between different clans emphasise on the equality of each clan which can be considered as an example of recognition respect. Such respect acts as a signal of intent as it indicates the intent of the members of the Santal tribal group to participate in maintaining cordial relations in terms of shared social interactions with each other. Thus, the equality among all clans in terms of marital relations again emphasises on the fact that social hierarchy and resulting concept of deference is not a part of the Santal cultural values. The Santal judiciary system is divided into three levels, namely- village council, pargana and khunt council. The lowest court to the apex court in Santal judicial system is organised in the order of manjhi baisi, mapanjhi baisi, pargana baisi and lo bir baisi. In Santali, the word ‘baisi’ means committee. Manjhi is the chieftain of the village who functions as the presiding judge in the village court. Mapanjhi baisi is the next higher court where the guilty person can appeal if the accused is not satisfied with the punishment imposed on him or her by the manjhi. This court consists of five to eight manjhis of the locality. The next higher court is pargana baisi where the pargana functions as the chieftain of the Santals of a particular area, where the number of villages ranges from ten to one hundred and sixty. Lo bir baisi is the highest court in the Santal tribal society where the dehri functions as the presiding judge of the separate proceedings of the five sub-committees during the annual hunt and the assembly includes only the adult male members of the Santal society (Arijumend, 2005). However, an interesting thing which is common to all these four levels of courts is that the assembly consisting of the villagers is given equal importance as that of the presiding judges or the jury members. This implies that the villagers of a particular village or of different villages, in case of dispute between two villages, have to ratify the verdict. In case of any objection by the assembly, the jury members try to modify the verdict keeping in terms with the objection raised. This importance that is given to the assembly can be considered to be an example of recognition respect. This respect forms an important ethnic marker in terms of coordination norms because it emphasises on the fact that Santal is an egalitarian tribal society. This also indicates the fact that absence of deference among the Santals due to lack of social hierarchy is an important social norm.

Thus, the different aspects of Santal religion, occupation, marriage and judicial system indicate that social interaction is central to this tribal society and marks the basis of solidarity which forms the essence of the Santal culture. Thus, it is respect which is upheld in this tribal society and not deference which affects the use of honorifics in Santali that is discussed in the following section.

3. Honorification in Santali

Santali has a sociolinguistic system of showing respect and therefore has no grammaticalized honorifics. Grammatical honorifics are defined as linguistic expressions
that are ‘isosemantic’ meaning they have same reference and predication values but they
differ only in their pragmatic values thus indicating degrees of social distance, age, social
position and so on (Irvine, 1992). This section focuses on how the pronoun forms and
address terms are used to show respect in the absence of honorific pronouns in Santali. The
paper focuses on the Santal speakers of Nutandi village in Purulia district of West Bengal
and Nuagaon village in Mayurbhanj district of Orissa for the present analysis.

In Santali, the personal pronouns are divided into three numbers – singular, dual and
plural. The following chart shows the distribution of the pronouns in Santali (Ghosh, 2008):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>EXCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>/iŋ/</td>
<td>/alan/</td>
<td>/əliŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>/am/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/aben/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>/ac’/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/əkin/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/uni/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/unkin/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second person dual pronoun is termed as /aben/ by Santal speakers of West
Bengal and as /abin/ by Santal speakers of Orissa. In the following lines, however, the form
/aben/ is chosen to represent both /aben/ and /abin/. The honorific pronouns are not generally
used, except in a restricted sense while speaking to elder in-laws (Choksi, 2010). It is
interesting to note that the speaker distinguishes between consanguineal kin members and
affinal kin members distinctly. Thus, while the second person singular pronoun /am/ is used
to refer to both the brother, either elder or younger, as well as younger brother-in-law of the
speaker, the specific suffix indicates whether the relation is that of common descent or of
marriage. So, if we compare the two words /am/oja/ and /am/oho/ both of which mean
‘you’, the suffix /jɑ/ indicates that the person referred to is a consanguineal kin member of
the speaker irrespective of his age and the suffix /ho/ indicates that the person referred to is
an affinal kin member and is younger to the speaker. Here, the bound morpheme /o/ is a
definite marker. However, it is also important to note that the word /am/oho/ can be used to
refer to both younger brother-in-law as well as someone whom the speaker does not know
well, for example a stranger. Thus, the social setting and the context of utterance are the only
two factors that indicate whether the person referred to is an affinal kin member or stranger
to the speaker. The chieftain of the Santal village, God and the earth whom
they consider to be sacred are referred to as /bɑp/ /n/. The pronoun forms are never used to refer to them.
However, the influence of dominant language of the region like Bangla or Oriya where there
is a three-level hierarchy in second person pronoun forms can be observed in the usage of the
honorific pronouns in Santali. Thus, a number of educated young speakers of Santali use the
second person dual pronoun /aben/ in the general sense (Ghosh, 2008; Choksi, 2010). So, for
example, besides the in-laws, the teacher and also the chieftain are now referred to using
/aben/. Moreover, the affinal kin members are now referred to using /aben/ irrespective of
their age and gender. Also, the pronoun /aben/ is now used to refer to a stranger, both male
and female. However, it is important to note that this usage is not reflected in the written
forms using Ol-Chiki script but only in the spoken forms. In fact, there is a wide
disagreement in its usage as a generic term of respect. The dual form /aben/ is used to refer to the elder in-laws considering the presence of both in-laws in the particular scene even if either of them is not physically present. Thus, its usage as a singular honorific pronoun is considered as a contradiction to its morphological feature of number by some Santali speakers. Moreover, it is also feared that the concept of equality as an inherent feature of Santal society is challenged by this generalised use of the dual pronoun as an honorific term (Choksi, 2010). A striking feature as observed in Santali is that the use of second person singular pronoun /am/ or the suffixes /ho/ and /ja/ are restricted only to the men of Santal society. The women in Santal society are always referred to on the basis of their relations to the speaker. The use of /aben/ to refer to mother-in-law is an exception for it implicitly refers to both father-in-law as well as mother-in-law. So, the wife of the speaker’s elder brother will be referred to as /hili/ and not using any personal pronoun form. It is interesting to observe that in order to refer to an unfamiliar woman, the speaker uses the word /tera/ which means ‘family’ followed by the relation that the speaker wants to associate with the woman, for example /dai/ meaning ‘elder sister’ or /maii/ meaning ‘a teenage girl’ or /biiti/ meaning ‘a small girl’ or /hatam/ meaning ‘father’s sister’. However, one can again observe the wide use of /aben/ to refer to women in Santal society especially by the young educated Santal speakers. These variations in the use of pronoun forms as well as address terms indicate the role of setting and scene (Wardhaugh, 2006) as well as the influence of dominant language and culture of the region where Santali is spoken as sociolinguistic determinants for maintenance of face.
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How much the Munda and Khasian languages of India deviate from Austroasiatic phylum?
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According to the Census of Indian (2001), there are 14 Austroasiatic languages spoken in India out of the 170 languages\(^1\) spoken around the globe. Austro-Asiatic languages have a disjunctive distribution across India, Bangladesh and Southeast Asia, separated by regions where other languages are spoken. Laos recorded the highest number of AA languages; it is home to more than 51 languages, followed by Vietnam; 47 languages. Thailand and Cambodia home to 26 and 16 AA languages respectively. Myanmar recorded of having around 11 languages. Minority AA languages are also found in Malaysia and along the border line of China; 18 languages are spoken in Malaysia and 23 are spoken in the two provinces of China. The location of AA languages is extended to the India sub-continent such as Bangladesh (8 languages) and Nepal (3 languages). Majority of the Munda group of languages and the Khasian group along with the Nicobarese languages are spoken in India which added roughly to a total of 30\(^2\) AA languages spoken in the country.

The Munda group is believed to have arrived in India much earlier than the Khasian. Due of their long contact with the other language family, many features and vocabularies have borrowed and shared among these languages spoken in India. This paper attempts to discuss to what extents these AA languages of India deviate from the rest and from the Proto-Austroasiatic and also an attempt has been made to discuss the Proto-AA features still retained by these languages despite long contact with others.

Notes  
1. Source: www.ethnologue.com/statistics/family  

Reference

http://www.censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/stateme
nt9.aspx
www.ethnologue.com/statistics/family (Ethnologue: Languages of the World)
The ‘Cyclic’ Nature of Clitic Placement in Munda
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The fact that the “Central Māgadh Prākrit” (CMP) languages (Bhattacharya 2016) like Maithili, Magahi, Angika, etc. all have what is known as “multiple” agreement, may indicate a possible contact situation where the substratum Munda languages influence these languages in terms of multiple agreement (as conjectured in Chatterji 1926). Given that some of languages spoken in areas adjoining the CMP geographical region are in fact Munda languages (like Mundari, Santali, Korwa, etc.), this is a reasonable thesis. Chatterji further considers development of the agreement system in CMP languages as a later development as the language of Vidyapati (14th C) had, according to him, a much simpler verb-system, “...with its freedom from the ramifications of pronominal infixes and affixes.”

Comparing this impression on the so-called complex verbal agreement system with the overall framework of studying these languages in the much earlier study of Grierson (1887, 1903), one cannot help but notice a much more refined analysis of the same phenomenon, who does not furthermore identify the complexity of the agreement pattern to Munda languages. However, Grierson (1909) himself in LSI, III, conjectures that various traits possessed by the many Himalayan languages are proto-Munda, and pronominalisation is one such trait, deriving thereby the conclusion that Mundas once lived in the Himalayas.

Thus, there seems to be a contradiction in the two views: whereas for Chaterji, multiple agreement in CMP languages is due to “southern” Munda influence, for Grierson, Munda languages basically arrived from the north. This northern origin of the Munda languages is an older theme to be traced at least in Max Muller (1854) and Forbes (1881) in terms of the so-called Turanian origin of a pre-Aryan race in India.

Add to this the fact that there are many Tibeto-Burman languages that show agreement/pronominalisation phenomenon, are we then to suppose that all those too also have come under the influence of Munda in some way or other? I will instead suggest that the apparent similarity of a certain phenomenon across unrelated languages is not a sufficient condition for/ evidence of migration through a certain landmass.

In this connection, the paper will investigate whether the phenomenon shown in Munda languages is to be considered agreement at all. I will run various diagnostics to argue that the concord phenomenon in Munda languages is different from multiple agreement seen in CMP languages. This will be argued on the basis of at least the following types of evidence:
i. Clitics as forms of pronominals
ii. Optionality of agreement marking
iii. Bi-personal verb forms as not being the norm
iv. Pro-clitic split
v. Presence of applicative suffixes

Furthermore a crucial difference between CMP languages and Munda languages in terms of the sequence of the ‘agreement’ morphemes postverbally will be shown to accentuate the difference between the two phenomena, and more importantly, it highlights a syntactic (rather than prosody-based) analysis of the theory of clitic-placement in Munda languages. I will argue against Hock (2013) by pointing out that the various possibilities of clitic placement that he suggests for Munda languages (i.e. P2, P -2, preverbal, and postverbal), also assumes structure dependency (e.g. P2 in the domain of the predicate), which point towards a syntactic analysis of clitics that was missed by earlier scholars because the crucial feature of cyclicity was not taken into consideration.
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Temporal and spatial expansion of Indian Austroasiatic speakers
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Austroasiatic (AA) speakers constitute the eighth largest language family in terms of native speakers in the world. Nevertheless, their origin and path of dispersal to their present dwelling in South and Southeast Asia was in dispute. Our recent study took the advantage of developing genomewide approach and showed dual ancestry of Indian Austroasiatic populations. Comparing the ancestry proportions of the Indian AA speakers with the other non-Austroasiatic populations of India, as revealed through the fine scale population structuring from the ADMIXTURE analysis, demonstrated the presence of a substantial proportion of a distinct East/Southeast Asian component, which was otherwise absent among non-Austroasiatic (Dravidian and Indo-European) populations of India. Furthermore, we observed differences in the genetic structuring of two Indian AA speaking tribes, Munda and Khasi, complementing their linguistic and geographic distinction. With the advancement of analytical and technical approaches we generated new datasets which has helped us to delineate the Austroasiatic migration spatially and temporally.
Kinship Terminology in Munda language of Assam
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The British tea Planters brought Adivasis to Assam as labourers in the nineteenth Century mostly from the Southern, Eastern and Central parts of India. The umbrella term Adivasi covert with Austro-Asiatic, Indo-Aryan and Dravidian linguistic community. They are mostly indentured and after their indentured period they prefer stay in Assam instead of going back to their homelands. There are mostly two types of Adivasis: The first one is tea garden worker and second one is settled down in villages and took cultivation as their livelihood. A very minimum portion of Adivasis have taken other profession. Munda is one of the linguistic community of Adivasis who came from central parts of India. Still these people use their languages for intra-group communications. They use Sadri or Sadani (which is different from Sadri of Chatisgarh’s Sadri) and Assamese for inter-community communications.

Kinship terminology used in languages to refer to the persons to whom an individual is related through kinship. The classifications of kinship relations varying according to their cultural patterns and that’s why it varies different system of kinship terminology. Culturally defined relationship established on the basis of blood ties or through marriage. Principles of classifying kinship terms are as follows:

Generation, Relative age, Lineality vs. Colaterality, Gender, Consanguineal vs. Affinal kin, Sex of linking relative, Side of the family.

On the basis of these principles, the kinship terms of Munda language will be discussed. My propose paper will also explore the societal relationship of Mundas through the kinship terms.

Research Methodology

The research methodology includes a literature review on the language, survey of the tea gardens and interaction with the native speakers. Language data have been collected from the native speakers through questionnaires and interview schedules. The informants are mainly from the age group of 20 to 60 years.
Infixation is one of the most productive processes of word formation in Munda. Beside nominalization infixation operates in the sphere of verbal base formation, formation of adjectives and demonstratives. While Santali displays the process very faithfully with a good number of infixes that does not hold for other Munda languages.

Here in this discussion the main thrust is nominalization in Munda with infixes and draw their parallels in some Austroasiatic languages. In case of nominalization Santali employs a number of infixes and the nouns derived belongs to different categories like agentive, instrumental, abstract and so on. The other Munda languages though employ the process of infixation across a number of classes like nominals and verbals the number of infixes employed in nominal derivation are not as many as those of Santali. In one respect the languages in question are similar. In case of nominalization the most common infix employed across the Munda languages is /-Vn-/ (with variance of /-nV-/ also) and this also collaborates with some Austroasiatic languages of Southeast Asia. In the Mon-Khmer group of the Austroasiatic family, especially Khmer, the infix /-n-/ is also very productive one and helps to derive nouns across different classes. The infix /-m-/ in Khmer runs parallel with Santali /-m-/ in deriving nouns.

Along with focus on infixes and their functions in Munda and some Austroasiatic languages, especially with /-n-/ and /-m-/ the present deliberation will also focus on reconstruction of the source roots by comparison with the roots and their derivatives in other Munda languages where the root of the derived nouns are not found. Again beside structural parallels of infixes between Munda and Austroasiatic the present deliberation will also focus on functional parallels of different derived nouns and their interactions with the roots in both the groups. In that respect the focus will be both descriptive and historical.

Data used for Santali, Remo, Gta' and Gutob are primary while those of the other Munda and Austroasiatic languages are secondary.
Santali phonestheme /phu-/: the sound symbolism of puffing

IAN JOO
National Chiao Tung University
il.y.en.a@outlook.com

A significant portion of Santali words that begin with /phu-/ have meanings that are mutually associated. I suggest that the prototype at the core of these meanings is the notion of puffing, i.e. “opening” the lips, “swelling” the cheeks and “swiftly” “letting out” “slight amount of” wind from the mouth. Each word listed in Table 1 represents a part of the prototypical meaning, either directly or metaphorically.

In Table 1, I have gathered 26 words out of all 52 words listed in Campbell 1899 that begin with /phu-/. I have counted only monomorphemic words and ignored (what I judge to be) polymorphemic words or reduplicative derivations. Synonyms, where Campbell omits the definition and simply marks as “cf. [other word],” are excluded as well. Phonological variations that are listed as a single entry are counted as a single word. The words are written in Campbell’s orthography.

If my categorization is valid, then it can show how a diverse array of words can bear family resemblance to a phonestheme in regards to its articulatory gesture.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1. Letting out (wind) from the mouth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>phū. / phu.</strong> Imitative of the sound produced by blowing with the mouth, to blow with the mouth, to sigh or breath through the mouth. phuk. / phuk phuk. To breath quickly and heavily. phukni. A piece of hollow bamboo used as a blowpipe, the Indian substitute for bellows. phukur / phukur phukur. To breath quickly and heavily. phuphuåu / phupuåu. To blow, to hiss, as a snake; to snort; (an imitative word.) phur. To eject from the mouth, as the stone of a fruit, &amp;c, to blow out of the mouth, to snort. phuski. To privately inform, to whisper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2. Letting out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phuskuć. To slip out. phuskút / phåskút. To slip, to let slip. phuṭ. To separate, to break off from, to be unpaired, to become odd, as one of a pair, the other having died. phuṭå phuṭi. To separate, to disperse, each to go his own way. phurkåu. To spout up or out, to rise up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3. Opening, bursting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phukår. An opening, an aperture, a hole through and through, as in a wall, a chimney opening. phul. A flower. phula. The Matkom (q. v.) flower, the fresh flower of the Matkom (q. v.) phuṭåu. To spring, to burst, to arise, as a smell; to make public, to begin, to start.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group 4. Swelling

**phulṣu.** To swell, to distend, to be proud, vain, overweening, vain-glorious. **phudphud. / phudphudṣu.** To flap, to bubble, an imitative word. **phulṣad.** The second scum which forms on sugar cane juice when being boiled.

### Group 5. Swift

**phucuṣ. / phucuṣ phucuṣ.** Quickly, without delay. **phuṣ. / phuṣ phuṣ.** To twang, as a bowstring, to swish, as a stone flying through the air, an imitative word. **phurti. / phuṛti.** Quickly, rapidly, to be quick.

### Group 6. Slight

**phuhi. /puhi.** To rain gently, to drizzle. **phusphas. / phasphus.** Slightly, very slightly, trivially, very, small in quantity. **phusuṣ phusuṣ. / pusuṣ pusuṣ.** Well, quietly, comfortably. **phusur phusur. / pusur pusur. / lusur phusur.** Gently, softly, whisperingly.

### References
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The geographic origin and time of dispersal of Austroasiatic speakers, presently settled in Southeast, East and South Asia, is debated. Two rival hypotheses, both assuming a demic component in the language dispersal, have been proposed, one of which places the origin of Austro-Asiatic speakers in Southeast Asia with a later comparatively recent dispersal to South Asia whereas the second hypothesis advocates Indian origin of the populations of this language family. Previous genetic studies have revealed region-specific patterns of mtDNA contrasted with across-regional spread of one particular Y chromosome haplogroup, O2a, providing the first genetic correlate for the spread of this language group. However, there is no consensus yet about the timing and source of the dispersal of this haplogroup. To test the different scenarios emerged by archaeological, archeaobotanical, linguistic and genetic studies, for the first time, we analyzed Indian populations at 650,000 common single-nucleotide polymorphism loci which has revealed a major South Asian and minor Southeast Asian ancestry component among Austroasiatic speakers of India. At this resolution we were able to discover two major genetic components among Indian populations, divided geographically. Moreover, significantly higher Y-STR diversity and coalescent time of O2a in Southeast Asia as compared to India are consistent with Southeast Asian origin of this haplogroup. The result further bolstered by the geographic/linguistic distribution of the 1540C polymorphism in EDAR gene, reportedly under strong positive selection in East Asian populations. Our results support the model of Southeast Asian origin of Indian Austroasiatic populations and their extensive admixture with local groups of other linguistic affiliation.
The Past Suffixes of Hill Korwa

MASATO KOBAYASHI

1. Introduction

Hill Korwa, called Ernga (Erngha) by the speakers, is an Austroasiatic language spoken in a few villages of Northern Chhattisgarh.

In his first description of Korwa, Grierson [Konow] (1906:147‒166) mentions “Erṅgā or Singlī” as “a slightly different dialect” of Korwa, spoken in Jashpur by about 500 people (148f.). Since the Plains Korwa speak local Indo-Aryan languages, and since the Hill Korwas in Surguja no longer speak Korwa according to our fieldwork, Ernga is the only Korwa still in active use. In this paper, we call Ernga Korwa simply ‘Korwa’. Since 2013, we have visited three Ernga Korwa villages in Jashpur District of Chhattisgarh, and this is a report of our ongoing descriptive work on the language.

In his survey, Grierson pointed out several features of Hill Korwa: frequent use of the infix n as in anam ‘the very you’ from am ‘you’; the progressive suffix -ta instead of -tan, which is sometimes used for the past; simple past in -eɖ, -aɖ, -en (-yan), and -an; perfect in -ted, -tedə, -ter and -ter as in sab-ted-a ‘have seized’; past suffixes -ked and -ken as in yam-keɾ-a ‘got’, goɕ-ken-a ‘died’; and the suffixes -led, -len for remoter past. Grierson concludes that Hill Korwa is closely related to Asuri, based on features such as distal demonstrative with m like man ‘that’.

Barker (1953) conducted fieldwork in Surguja and recorded many forms in addition to identifying the phonemes. In his vocabulary, Bahl (1962) confirmed that Hill Korwa has Kherwarian basic vocabulary, such as ayum ‘to hear’, jonoʔ ‘broom’, huɖiŋ ‘small’. Prasad (1985), which is a Hindi-Korwa phrase book, contains many verb forms, even though it does not explain them. We know that Hill Korwa is securely grouped as a Kherwarian language. In the following sections, we will discuss the tense or aspect marking of Korwa verbs.

2. Verb Morphology of Hill Korwa

Like in other Kherwarian languages, Hill Korwa has head-marking verbal morphology, and marks the direct and indirect objects on a verb.

A verbal root may be extended with the causative prefixes a- and ece-, by reduplication, or by the suffixes -n and -oʔ. A verbal root serves as the imperative with or without -me, e.g. datrom=me agu-aɾu {sickle=2SG bring-leave} ‘Bring and leave a sickle!’ Verbal roots are also used as infinitives, e.g. wec awei-ta {come can-NPST} ‘can come’, and also as nouns, as in jauʔ which means ‘food’ as well as ‘to cook’.
Although both -n and -oʔ mark reflexiveness, -n denotes that the agent is the direct object of the verbal action as in oko-n-ta ‘hide oneself’, while -oʔ denotes that the verbal action affects the agent, as in um-uʔ-ta ‘takes bath’. -oʔ also derives spontaneous intransitive verbs such as pel-uʔ-ta ‘is visible’.

A verbal base is followed by a past or perfect tense suffix, or an indirect object marker called the benefactive (or applicative) suffix, and then by the non-past suffix -tan or direct object marker, after which the finiteness marker -a usually follows. The verb forms I have found so far consist of the following five slots.

1 {RED/a-ROOT}+2{-n/-oʔ} +3 {PST/PRF/BEN}+4 OBJ+5{-a/-ta}.

A direct object marker follows the verbal base or the past or perfect suffix as in
gog-e-a {take.away-3SG.OBJ-FIN} ‘takes it away’;  
jog-e-a {chase-3SG.OBJ-FIN} ‘chases it’ vs. joʔ-a {chase-FIN} ‘chases’;
ader-ku-me {get.in-3PL.OBJ-IMP} ‘get them in!’;
aflu-ter-i-a {leave-PRF-3SG.OBJ-FIN} ‘left him’;
am joʔ-kid-jaŋ-a {you.chase-PRF-1SG.OBJ-FIN} ‘you chased me’;
puɽq-ke-m-ta tear-PRF-2SG.OBJ-NPST ‘(she) will have torn you apart’.

When an indirect object is marked, it occurs with the benefactive suffix -o/-w, as in
kata-o-e-tan {speak-BEN-3SG-NPST} ‘speaks to him/her/it’;
jauʔ-w-alay-a {cook-BEN-1DU.OBJ-FIN} ‘(she) cooks for us’.

Verbal roots are combined as a serial verb to denote two consecutive or concurrent actions, just as Pucilowski (2013:98) describes about Ho.
joʔ-bolo-ter-i-a ‘chased and cornered it’;
dega-eneec ‘-tan ‘jumps and plays’.

A few morphemes combine with another root as a vector verb and mark aspect or voice. For example, -jom serves as the middle voice marker, as in
pel-jom-me {look-MID-IMP} ‘watch for yourself!’
-god is a completive marker, as in
goc-god-ke-m-a {kill-COMPL-PRF-2SG.OBJ-FIN} ‘will finish killing you’.

Another interesting innovation of Korwa verb morphology is that the subject marker often becomes a proclitic and belongs to the same phonological domain as the following verb, as in the clause-initial VP, kin=kudae-a {3DU=return-FIN} ‘they come back’.
3. Tense or Aspect Markers
   I will now discuss how the tense and aspect are marked on the verb.

a. -ta
   Korwa has non-past -ta, which covers the present and future tenses. It always occurs in contexts referring to the future. It occurs with both transitive and intransitive verbs, e.g.
   \texttt{wec-ta} ‘come’, \texttt{sen-ta} ‘go’, \texttt{raʔ-kə-ta} ‘call them’, \texttt{jalm-əp-ta} ‘lick me’.
   -ta looks like the present marker of South Munda such as Kharia (Anderson 2007:101ff.). However, -ta is often pronounced -tan, and Korwa often drops final /n/ as in \texttt{idan} ~ \texttt{ida} ‘be’, and Korwa -ta is probably cognate with the Kherwarian imperfective -tan in Mundari or Ho.

b. -a
   Korwa has the suffix -a, which is found in Mundari, Ho and Santali as a finiteness marker. Many verbs are not marked for the tense and only have this suffix. Some of them occur with words like \texttt{rōj} ‘everyday’ and signal the habitual aspect, as in
   \texttt{rōj=ə sēn-a} ‘He goes everyday’, and \texttt{rōj waku-a=ə} ‘She gives everyday’.
   But forms with only -a also occur in past contexts as well, e.g.
   \texttt{sodor-a} ‘arrived’, and \texttt{iyə jəug-e-a} ‘who cooks/cooked it?’, even though these might be cases of the historical present often found in narratives.
   Some verbs are marked with the completive aspect marker -gəd and -a, without a tense marker, e.g.
   \texttt{kata-gəd-a} ‘spoke’.
   Based on these examples, we conclude that -a is a tense-neutral finiteness marker occurring in non-future contexts. Verb roots ending in a, such as \texttt{tora} ‘go’, \texttt{ida (idan)} ‘is’ do not take the suffix -a.

c. -d
   -d or -ed occurs in past contexts, e.g.
   \texttt{aʈu-d-a} ‘cooked and left’, and \texttt{sen-e-d-a} ‘went’.
   Anderson (2007:123, 2008:223) glosses -e as an aspect marker. If it is a separate morpheme, it might be cognate with Mundari ‘cislocative’ aspect marker -a (Osada 1992:94f.). Since an independent use of -e is not identified in Korwa, we would like to analyze -ed as an allomorph of -d. As Anderson comments, it is strange that -d occurs in an intransitive verb, for it is a transitive suffix in Ho (Pucilowski 2013:118,158). See d. below for more discussion on the function of -d.

d. -k
   The suffix -ked or -ker occurs in transitive verbs, as in \texttt{joʔ-kid-ən-a} ‘chased me’, \texttt{sab-kept-ə} ‘caught you’, \texttt{sab-ker-a} ‘caught’, \texttt{hatər-ker-a} ‘stalled’.
   Forms with this suffix refer not only to past action but also to future action, as in \texttt{pute-d-kəm-ta} ‘will tear you off’, and it should be viewed as a perfective aspect marker rather than a tense marker, as in Ho (Pucilowski 2013:118).
Since intransitive forms such as *ayman-ki-a ‘have a hunch’ has no \( \ddot{d} \) or \( r \), \( \dot{d} \) or \( r \) looks like a transitive marker as in Ho. However, there is a cooccurrence restriction that \( \dot{d} \) or \( r \) does not appear when there is an overt aspect marker, e.g. *joʔ-ki-\( \ddot{d} \)-a ‘chased me’ vs. *goe-go-ke-m-a ‘will kill you’

and I would like to propose that Korwa -\( \ddot{d} \) ( -\( e \ddot{d} \) after a consonant), unlike -\( \ddot{d} \) in Ho, functions as a past tense marker. Pucilowski (2013:122) discusses about Ho -\( \ddot{d} \)-e, it might be an experiential marker in conversation, but I need to observe conversation to judge about it.

Pucilowski (2013:161) argued that Ho -\( \ddot{d} \) and -\( n \) were reanalyzed as past tense suffixes. The same seems to have happened to Korwa -\( \ddot{d} \). The connection of Korwa -\( \ddot{d} \) and Santali present tense marker -et (Anderson 2007:119) is not clear.

e. -\( \dddot{t} \)er/-\( \dddot{t} \)ar

Like -ked or -ker, the suffix -\( \dddot{t} \)er occurs with transitive verbs, such as *asul-\( \dddot{t} \)er-a ‘was keeping’, *atu-\( \dddot{t} \)er-i-a ‘left him’, *t\( \dddot{u} \)rao-\( \dddot{t} \)ar-a ‘collected’

Pucilowski (2013:124) analyzes Ho -\( \dddot{t} \)aq as a punctual marker. Use of -\( \dddot{t} \)er as a past suffix is also found in Kera’ Mundari (Kobayashi and Murmu 2008). Korwa -\( \dddot{t} \)er is always used in past contexts, but the difference between -\( \dddot{t} \)er and -ked or between -\( \dddot{t} \)er and -ed is difficult to identify in narratives.

In \( \dddot{d} \)-atu-\( \dddot{d} \)-a ‘dropped and left’, someone dropped a broom on the road and disappeared, while in \( \dddot{d} \)-a tu-\( \dddot{t} \)er-i-a ‘hanged and left him there’, a lady hangs up her husband and is watching him, and the difference might consist in whether the result of the action is still left or not.

-\( \dddot{t} \)er also occurs as a stylistic variant of perfect -ked. For these two reasons, we tentatively call -\( \dddot{t} \)er a perfect suffix.

f. -\( \dddot{e} \)n/-\( \dddot{t} \)e/-\( \dddot{t} \)a

The past or perfect suffix -\( \dddot{e} \)n and -\( \dddot{t} \)e/-\( \dddot{t} \)a, occurring only with intransitive verbs, such as *sodor-\( \dddot{e} \)n ‘arrived’, *durub-\( \dddot{e} \) ‘sat’, *g\( \dddot{u} \)tao-\( \dddot{e} \)-\( \dddot{a} \)-a ‘decreased’, *w\( \dddot{e} \)-\( \dddot{a} \)-a ‘came’

-\( \dddot{e} \)n occurs as a past marker in Naguri and Kera’ Mundari too, such as Kera’ hej ’-\( \dddot{e} \)n-a ‘came’.

As -\( \dddot{e} \)n would easily result from metathesis of -\( \dddot{e} \)n, -\( \dddot{e} \)n-a can be explained as an allomorph of -\( \dddot{e} \)n, occurring after a vocoid. Because of the phonological and functional similarity, it is considered to be cognate with Ho -ya-n, a past intransitive marker as in hoba-ya-n-a ‘became’ (Pucilowski 2013:116).

g. -\( \dddot{d} \)

There is yet another morpheme occurring in past contexts, -\( \dddot{a} \) or -\( \dddot{d} \).

\( \dddot{u} \)ruy-e-\( \dddot{a} \)-\( \dddot{a} \)-a ‘winnowed (rice)’, jo-\( \dddot{a} \)-\( \dddot{a} \)-a ‘she ran’, tora-\( \dddot{a} \)=kin ‘they two went’, jiya-\( \dddot{a} \)-\( \dddot{a} \) ‘lived’

to-tomb-\( \dddot{a} \)-\( \dddot{a} \)-a ‘pecked’.

Since the glottal stop is an allophone of /\( g \)/ between vowels as is found in the alternation jog-e-a ‘chases’ vs. jo-\( \dddot{a} \)-a ‘ran’, the origin of this morpheme should probably be sought in a velar stop. Although we cannot find a cognate of g as a past suffix in other Kherwarian
language, it might be possible to connect ? with k, which we know is a perfective morpheme. If ? and k are allomorphs, we can explain that k surfaces as ? between non-high vowels.

4. Discussion

At first sight, the verb morphology of Korwa looks unique, due to the sound changes it has undergone. Closer comparison with other Kherwarian verbs tells that Korwa has a set of past suffixes similar to Ho, even though their distribution is more limited. As shown in Table 1, Korwa and Ho share -t and -en/-yan as preterite markers, while they do not have the morpheme -ja that Mundari has.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-d/-d</th>
<th>-k</th>
<th>-t</th>
<th>-en/-ne</th>
<th>-ʔ</th>
<th>-aka</th>
<th>-le</th>
<th>-ja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korwa</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>PNCT</td>
<td>PST -ya</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundari</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Kera’-en</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>INGR</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santali</td>
<td>TR -t’</td>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>RES</td>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANT: anterior; INGR: ingressive; PNCT: punctual

In addition to the smaller number of slots in verb suffixation, Korwa verb morphology is characterized by the loss of the transitivity contrast by -d/-n. Instead, -d and -n are incorporated in tense and aspect suffixes in Korwa. The transitive-intransitive contrast is reduced, and only the originally transitive marker -d/-r occurs in limited contexts. As far as narratives is concerned, marking of tense and aspect is not made consistently. Since Korwa is undergoing wholesale attrition of morphology and lexicon, the reduced state of verb morphology is probably not archaism but innovation.

Notes

1. I thank Bablu Tirkey and Tetru Oraon for arranging the fieldwork, and Pandri Bai and Phaguwa Ram for their kind help. The abbreviations in the gloss are taken from Leipzig Glossing Rules unless otherwise mentioned.
2. In this paper, we call a verbal root with morphological extension a ‘verbal base’.
3. -ka as in ece-sab-ka {CAUS-catch-PRF} ‘caught’, also found in Kera’ Mundari (Kobayashi and Murmu 2008:180), might belong to this suffix.
4. -ne is not always past: daʔ-kun asejom ero bārao-ne {water-and.so.on beg not be.all.right-PST?} ‘It will become impossible [for the elder brother] to beg her water and so on.’
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Introduction

The term ‘clitic’ (from Greek kli:no ‘lean’) is used for different kinds of formatives in languages, especially when it is difficult to classify such formatives as independent words or as derivational or inflectional affixes. Among the suggested bewildering array of definitions and diagnostics for clitics in the literature, one is likely to find that there is no one definition or a negotiated common understanding of what constitutes or does not constitute a clitic. The extreme theoretical positions on clitics and definitional disagreements are more likely to overwhelm the researcher than give clear yardsticks for the identification of clitics.

According to one of the common definitions of a clitic available with the SIL web portal1, “A clitic is a morpheme that has syntactic characteristics of a word, but shows evidence of being phonologically bound to another word.” The listed features of a possible clitic includes one or many of the following:

- Phonologically bound but syntactically free
- Function at phrase or clause level
- Cannot be integrated into standard discourse without being bound to some other form
- Often have grammatical rather than lexical meaning
- Belong to closed classes like pronouns, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, and conjunctions
- Usually attach to the edges of words, outside of derivational and inflectional affixes
- Often attach to several syntactic categories of words such as head noun, non-head noun, preposition, verb, or adverb
- Phonologically unstressed

Clitics in Munda languages

Almost all languages have clitics. But they remain mostly unrecognized, at least not to the extent that words and affixes are recognized. This is primarily so, because of their own characteristics, that make them resemble words in some contexts and affixes in some other. Clitics in Munda languages have been recognized for a while now, and it is heartening to note that different scholars use different definitional properties of clitics to identify them.

In sentences like (1) from Mundari, the subject agreement markers in both the clauses are clearly identified as clitics because of their property to phonologically attach to any word or
different words within a phrase or a clause. This is a typical behaviour of clitics in many languages.

1. \( ranci-te=n \quad sen-ke-n-re \quad sinema=n \quad lel-ke-d=a \)  
\( \text{ranchi-OBLQ}=1\text{SG} \quad \text{go-AOR-ITR-LOC} \quad \text{cinema}=1\text{SG} \quad \text{see-AOR-TR}=\text{DEF} \)  
‘When I went to Ranchi, I saw the cinema’  
(Osada 1992: 121)

The kind of clitics that this paper explores is the type of clitics, noted in Peterson (2008) for Kharia. In Kharia, some bound elements are said to “attach to the right-most element of the phrase, regardless of its status, whether lexical or genitive attribute” (441) when their lexical hosts are dropped or not known, as in (2).

2. \( adi=ya? \quad g\theta ol \quad beta=dom=ki=te \)  
\( \text{ANAPH}=\text{GEN} \quad \text{ten} \quad \text{son}=3\text{POSS}=\text{PL}=\text{OBLQ} \)  
‘his ten sons’  
(Peterson 2008: 441)

Examples (1) and (2) present very contrasting approaches to the diagnostics and study of clitics. In cases like (2), the bound elements are actually seen not as attaching to stems, but rather as attaching to the entire phrase. This idea of analyzing a set of bound elements as phrasal affixes and not as word level affixes is very promising with respect to diagnosing clitics in languages. This is in keeping with scholarly traditions that have looked at clitics and affixes at a level deeper than mere surface level choice of hosts. This methodology analyses clitics more on the basis of the level of attachment, than the choice of host for attachment. As phrasal affixes, clitics are those bound elements, which are adjoined to syntactic phrases and are phonological reflexes of morphological rules that do not apply to word stems, while affixes are those which are adjoined to words (Anderson (1992)). In this regard, clitics are not necessarily always bound forms of free words in the language. Phrasal affixes are seen not as inflected lexical items but rather as markers, which are attached to phrases to express inflection. Their positions are determined by rules of phrase-level morphology, qualifying them to be special clitics.

In this paper, I would like to present examples from different Munda languages of attachment of different bound elements that must be treated as phrasal affixation, that is, as clitics. The paper argues that apart from the agreement clitics that choose their hosts indiscriminately, like in Mundari and Santali, a large number of clitics in the Munda languages are those which are not recognizable by that criteria alone. In many Kherwarian languages, like Mahali, Karmali, Turi and Bhumij, the subject enclitics may appear only at the end of the verb complex, yet are to be analyzed as clitics due to their status as phrasal affixes. The examples (3) and (4) are from Mahali and Karmali respectively, where the agreement marker is treated as a clitic because of its phrasal attachment.
3. \textit{em-a-d-in}=me  
give-BEN-TR-1=2  
‘You gave me (it)’  
(Grierson 1906: 78)

4. \textit{meta-ke-t-ku}=e  
tell-ASP-TR-PL=3  
‘He told them’  
(Grierson 1906: 73)

\textbf{Clitics as phrasal affixes:}

The idea of treating phrasal affixes as clitics, as is argued in this paper, has not always met with universal acceptance. For example, Zwicky (1977, 1987) insists on making a distinction between clitics and phrasal affixes. This distinction is proposed on the basis of a difference in interaction that is noted to happen between a host and a clitic and between a host and a phrasal affix. According to Zwicky (1977, 1987), a clitic is only prosodically associated with its host, whereas a phrasal affix shows morphological interaction with its host. This analysis had even ruled out the English possessive [-s] as a clitic on this count. This position, however, is not borne out in most instances of what are recognized as clitics in the literature. This erstwhile understanding of clitics as only being prosodically associated with their hosts and as being blind to the morphological properties of their hosts, stands revised in most analysis of clitics today. Many recent works like Anderson (1992) and Klavans (1985) take the view that clitics are phrasal affixes. Klavans (1983) maintains that for clitics, the actual phonological host can belong to any word class as long as the dominating phrase belongs only to a particular class. Phrasal affixes have also been referred to in the literature as lexical clitics (Halpern, 1995), and characterized as elements, which have “the distribution of a clitic but the morphology and/or phonology of an affix”. In these works, clitics are seen as playing grammatical roles and sometimes even having lexical content.

Clitics, especially pronominal and verbal clitics have been called phrasal affixes owing to the scope properties of these elements. The clitics as opposed to affixes have been observed to take a phrase and not a word as its domain of scope. Anderson (1992), for example, notes that clitics and affixes have similar behaviour and the only difference between them is that clitics are phrasal affixes, that is, they are adjoined to syntactic phrases and are phonological reflexes of morphological rules that do not apply to word stems, while affixes are adjoined to words. He looks at clitics as bundles of morphosyntactic features, which are added to the heads. Within the framework of A-morphous morphology, he introduces the category of DEPENDENT features whose value is assigned to the phrase and transmitted to all its daughters. According to him phrasal affixes which are not inflected lexical items but rather agreement markers which are attached to phrases to express inflection and whose position is determined by rules of phrase-level morphology qualify to be a ‘special’ clitic in the sense of Zwicky (1977). He claims that morphosyntactic
representations have no internal structure at all and morphemes interpret the morphosyntactic features provided by the syntax, rather than contributing them, thus, positing that morphology converts syntax into phonological strings. He considers inflectional morphology to be the morphology of syntax as it involves grammatical categories that play an important role in the syntax of a language. He looks at the terminal nodes of syntactic structure as bundles of morphosyntactic features that are not phonologically instantiated.

Anderson (1992) defines special clitics as those whose position within some phrasal unit is determined by principles other than those of the non-clitic syntax (201-202). Anderson sees ‘special clitics’ “as material introduced into Phonological Form by rules of phrasal affixation entirely parallel to the introduction of affixes within words by Word Formation rules” (75). Special clitics are then an “overt manifestation of a class of ‘Word Formation Rules’ that operate on phrases” (81), or as he puts it in Anderson (2005), special clitics constitute the morphology of phrases. He characterizes clitics on the basis of three parameters:

- Its SCOPE: the clitic is located in the scope of some syntactic constituents which constitutes its domain
- Its ANCHOR: the clitic is located by reference to the {FIRST vs. LAST vs. HEAD} element of the constituent in which it appears
- Its ORIENTATION: the clitic {PRECEDES vs. FOLLOWS} its anchor.

For Anderson these same parameters can be used to define affixes, and hence he finds clitics and affixes to “belong to a single unified class of rules” (77). Anderson (1992, 1993) consider the theory of clitics to be integrally related to issues of phrasal assignment of inflectional properties like tense, case etc., that is, the application of morphological spellout rules to a phrase. He demonstrates that clitic positioning can be described in terms of the interaction of a small set of conflicting alignment constraints, an approach inspired by the tenets of optimality theory. Anderson (2005) contends that the presence of a corresponding free form should not be always taken as being mandatory to declare accentless forms as being clitics. Considering that in many languages, clitics are often created by the operation of phonological rules on existing forms, he rules out the possibility of considering clitics as a primitive, like the other lexical categories. He argues for a two-way classification of clitics as phonological clitics and morphosyntactic clitics. The major focus of Anderson (2005) is his comparison of clitics with affixes, which he demonstrates by comparing the properties of clitics with various properties of affixes, which leads him to conclude that clitics are at best described as belonging to morphology, and are neither syntactic objects or phonological, specifically the morphology of phrases, and hence be called as “phrasal affixes” (83).
Clitics as phrasal affixes in the Munda languages

Agreement markers

In the North Munda Kherwarian languages (Mundari, Santali, Ho) both subject and object are indexed. However, Korku only shows object agreement. The subject is not necessarily realized by an affix to the verb complex but also by subject markers enclitic to the word immediately preceding the verb. When appearing on the verb complex, it follows the (DE-) FINITIZER suffix becoming enclitic to the entire verbal complex, that is, as a phrasal affix.

Anderson and Harrison (2008) talk of a series of subject enclitics (589) used in Remo (as they say, it is in Kharia and Gutob). The subject enclitic (or suffix) forms are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>-ninŋ, -inŋ</td>
<td>-nayŋ</td>
<td>-nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND</td>
<td>-no</td>
<td>-pa</td>
<td>-pe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD</td>
<td>-Φ,-ga</td>
<td>-Φ,-ga</td>
<td>-Φ,-ga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.17. Subject enclitic/suffix forms in Remo*

As can be seen, there is no difference between the SINGULAR, DUAL, and PLURAL forms of the 3rd person. Anderson and Harrison (2008)’s motivation for calling them enclitics is not very clear, because they also refer to them as ‘suffixes’ in brackets. In all the examples, the agreement markers come with the verb as their host. The possible motivation is once again the argument of them being phrasal affixes, in a kind of long distance hosting, for they can never come immediately after the root and are separated by other inflectional affixes like the TAM categories, and hence come at the end. Thus the only fixed position they have is that they are the last elements of a predicate. Some examples of their use are as follows:

5. *sap-go-to-nay*
   come-PST.II-N,PST.II-1PL
   ‘We all have come.’
   (Fernandez 1968: 26)

6. *ju-to*
   see-N.PST.I
   ‘He/she sees’
   (Fernandez 1968: 25)

7. *bondagada=na remo-le uli sum-to*
   Bondagada=GEN person-PL mango eat-N.PST.I
   ‘The people of Bondagada eat mango[es]’
   (Anderson and Harrison 2008: 589)
8. \(bəba\) \(qən-t-iŋ\)
   RDPL: slap      PROG-NPST-1
   ‘I am slapping’
   (Fernandez 1968: 35, 54)

9. \(a-sum\) \(qən-gi-t-iŋ\)
   NEG-eat      PROG-PST.ITR-NPST-1
   ‘I have not been eating’
   (Fernandez 1968: 58)

In Gtaʔ, subject agreement seems to be prefixal/proclitic on the predicate. It can come prefixed to the verb stem or be separated from it by the NEG. The NEG itself has to be understood as a phrasal affix (if it is bound) in any construction due to its semantic scope not just over the verb but the entire predicate represented by the verb and its arguments. The following examples demonstrate the same:

10. \(bʰo-k[e]-ne\) \(dəpne\) \(həʔ-baŋ\) \(naŋ\) \(ljo\) \(ce?mwa\)
   fear-T/A-NF immediately today-ABL 1SG field grass
   \(nə=a=big\) \(qak-ce\) \(basoŋ-ke\)
   ‘Fearing he said: From today will you or will you not sow my field?’
   (Anderson 2008: 686 [Mahaputra and Zide, no date, I. 26])

**Evidence from incorporation**

Incorporation also raises a very pertinent question on relatedness of elements within a complex word form. That is, if we look at the following examples from Sora, one would notice that with the nominal incorporated, it appears between the verb-head and other verbal inflectional affixes, which would have been attached directly to the verb, had the noun not been incorporated. But with the noun incorporated, these verbal inflectional affixes now appear in close proximity to the incorporated nominal rather than the verb whose inflectional affixes these are. Unless, one posits that these are actually phrasal affixes, and thus clitics, one would be hard-pressed to explain how these verbal affixes still could modify the verb with a nominal in between, with which they have no relationship. If one were to accept this argument, then a host of verbal affixes would have to be treated as phrasal affixes, that is, as clitics, including agreement markers, same subject markers, intransitive marker, the infinitive marker, etc. The only contrary position one could take is the incorporated nominal is invisible to the affixes and therefore the integrity of the word headed by the verb remains unaffected even post incorporation, which is a difficult position to establish. Verbal functional elements, separated from the verb head by an incorporated nominal, are analyzed to be in a long distance hosting relationship with the head. Therefore, they are treated as clitics, which also establishes their presence as bound markers, even in non-incorporated structures as a kind of lose bonding, leading to a possible clitic analysis for them in all structures.
The following sentences from Sora, show not only the incorporation of an argument, object in the first case and subject in the latter, they also show how inalienable possession is marked with the help of enclitic pronouns, which when the possessor is incorporated appear enclitic to the verbal complex itself. No agreement markers appear in the verbal complex.

14. **soi-tam=t=am**
    burn-mouth=NPST=2
    ‘I will burn your mouth’
    (Ramamurti 1931: 142)

15. **kuŋ-bəb=t=əm**
    shave-head=NPST=2
    ‘Your head is shaven’
    (Biligiri 1965b: 240)

In verb complexes with incorporated subject and/or object and serialized verbs, the person and number markers always appear in final position:

16. **paŋ-ti-dar=ɪŋ=te:n**
    bring-give-cooked.rice=1=3.PST
    ‘He brought and gave me cooked rice’
    (Ramamurti 1931: 43)

The flexibility of the PST and NPST markers in these sentence is quite interesting. Do these markers have the flexibility to come after the 1st verb, both verbs or at the end? Is this flexibility possible for an inflectional affix or only for a phrasal affix? And what does the flexibility or the random appearance and non-appearance of agreement markers tell us about their status as normal or phrasal affixes? When talking of the order of elements, Anderson (2007: 193-94) says that “the order of elements in serialized and incorporated sequences is mostly set in Sora…”", but also adds that “… the intransitive marker may appear following
either verb₁ or verb₂.” How does one explain such flexibility in the positioning of elements within a word unless one assigns them the categorical status as clitics, which would then explain such freedom that bound affixes retain/show. The fact that the bound markers representing GNP and TENSE, appear only once but have a scope over both the compounded verbs, is taken as a very clear evidence of the affixation being phrasal. This argues for treating both the GNP and the TENSE markers in the language as clitics.

17. \(gil=le-jir=i\)n
   see=PST-leave=1
   ‘See me before you go’
   (Ramamurti 1931: 44)

18. \(ti-jum=t=am\)
   give-eat=N PST =2
   ‘I’ll give you to eat’
   (Ramamurti 1931: 44)

**Evidence from compound verb constructions**

In compound verb constructions in Mundari, the agreement clitic appears on the preceding element to the compound verb and only once. The definitizer clitic also appears at the end of the compound verb form and only once. The TAM categories also appear only once, as in the following:

19. \(ne~ga\textinf{ṛ}a~pot\textinf{ṭ}i=te=ko\)
   \(har\textinf{parom}=ke=d=a\)
   this river mortarbike=INSTR=3 PL drive-cross=COMPL=TR=DEF
   ‘They drove the motorbike and crossed the river’
   (Osada 2008: 136)

Unless we are to conceptualize ‘driving a motorcycle and crossing a river’ as a single event, we have to look at the above structure as involving two different verbs, but modified only by a single set of inflectional markers of ASPECT, TRANSITIVITY and FINITENESS. This is possible, as is discussed in the literature on clitics, only if these bound markers are treated as having scope over both the coordinated elements by being attached phrasally. That is, these bound markers have to be treated as phrasal affixes, that is, as clitics.

In Gutob too, in a compound/complex verbal predicate [For example, ‘Beat up and come back’; ‘go and come’, etc.], the pronominal subject agreement appears enclitic, and appears enclitic after the TENSE marker either on the first verb or the second verb. This is clearly another instance of an affix being attached phrasally with scope over multiple verbs. Thus, the agreement marker is clearly established as a phrasal affix, that is, as a clitic.

20. \(jom=lai~niŋ~bu-o?\)
    \(pi=loŋ=niŋ\)
    Jom=ACC I beat.up-PST:TR come-FUT:ITR =1
    ‘I will beat up Jom and come back’
    (N Zide 1997: 316)
The attempt to see how conjunctive participles are treated in these languages, if they are present did not meet much success. Most languages do not seem to have them, and **Bhumij**, which has them uses them for the stringing together of many clauses in a sentence, as is expected. While Ramaswami has translated them as finite subordinate clauses, Bhumij speakers use it as non-finite clauses with the verb showing no agreement or having no definitizer. **Santali** is slightly different though. When two actions are reported as consecutive in nature, then the two verbs representing the actions are ordered in their sequence of occurrence next to each other, without any conjunctive markers, and then the personal markers, tense/aspect and definitizer follow, as though the two share these. This is clearly a phrasal attachment, and therefore a characteristic clitic.

In a study of clitics, serial verb constructions would be very informative on the status of the bound elements coming with these verbs. With serial verbs, the question of the scope of certain affixes becomes a very pertinent issue. For example, if only one of the two serialized verbs carry tense marking but the tense applies to both the verbs, then with the scope of that marking extending to both the verbs it would be quite untenable to maintain that the marker is just an affix limited to the verb that hosts it. Considering the scope of the marker beyond the word that hosts it, it has to be treated as a phrasal affix, that is, as a clitic. In this regard, we look at AGREEMENT, TAM, DEF, SS and DS markers, among others, to analyze their status as inflectional affixes, or as clitics. Munda languages do throw up such markers, which have to be rightfully analyzed as phrasal affixes due to their scope properties.

In **Mundari** serial verb constructions, the first lexical verb bears the subject enclitic (as a word immediately preceding the next verb) and the second verb comes with the DEFINISER/FINITISER. The TENSE marker appears on the first verb. Since both FINITENESS and TENSE have semantic and syntactic scope over both the verbs, as both the verbs are to be read as finite as well as tensed, we have to treat these as phrasal affixes, that is, as clitics.
Neukom (2001: 176), reports the following interesting example with respect to subject and object incorporation in serial verb constructions in Santali.

24. \( b^{ə}gtə=ko \quad rara-led-e \quad nam-led-e \)
   \( \text{quickly=}3\text{PL.SUBJ} \quad \text{release-PLUP:A-3SG.OBJ} \quad \text{find-PLUP:A-3SG.SUBJ} \)
   that \( təryup-də-e \quad rə-gət-ked=a \)
   ‘No sooner had they let him out and found him than the leopard/tiger said’
   (Neukom 2001: 176),

In the above sentence while the object agreement marker repeats itself on all the verbs, the subject agreement clitic appears just once, on the word preceding the first verb and the definitizer clitic appears also just once, but on the last verb of the series. We can also see that multiple verbs host the \( \text{PLUP:A} \) marker. That the object agreement marker appears repeatedly on all verbs, and so does the \( \text{PLUP:A} \) marker, with which it has a relationship, shows that they are typical inflectional affixes. In contrast the appearance of the \( \text{DEF} \) marker only on the last verb but with a scope extending to all the verbs, makes it a classic case of a phrasal affix, that is, a clitic.

In Asuri (Jashpur), in serial verb constructions, the subject agreement marker appears on all the verbs in the series. The subject agreement marker behaves like a typical inflectional affix, with its scope relations met locally. However, the use of the \( \text{DEF} \) only once but with a scope on both the verbs, makes it a fit case to be considered as a phrasal affix, that is, a clitic. However, since the agreement marker in (320) can be furthered from its host, by a clitic (=\( \text{DEF} \)), it has to be treated as a clitic, in a long distance relationship with its host.

25. \( \text{sen-e-n-a:} \)
   \( \text{go-ASP-TR-DEF} \)
   ‘He went’
   (Grierson 1906: 139)

26. \( \text{holate iŋ huɾu iɾ=iŋ sen-tehin-en=a=iŋ} \)
   \( \text{yesterday I paddy cut=}1 \quad \text{go-T/A-ITR=DEF=}1 \)
   ‘Yesterday I went and cut rice’
   (Grierson 1906: 142)

In the following example of verb serialization in Sora, it is curious to find the agreement marker repeated both in the beginning and at the end of the verbal complex.

27. \( \text{bagun-ben a-il-le-ga-sal-n-e} \)
   \( \text{both-2PL 1/2PL-go-PST-drink-liqur-ITR-1PL} \)
   ‘Both of you went and drank liquor’
   (Anderson and Harrison 2008: 360)

However, in the following examples from Sora, we see that the agreement and TAM markers appear only once, but with scope over all the verbs in the construction, giving them a phrasal affix (clitic) status. The double-marking of agreement could be a possible instance...
of the language moving its agreement markers from a clitic to an affixal status, as is also observed in some other Munda languages which have such alliterative markings.

28. \( p_{\text{an}}-\text{ti-dar}=i\text{j}=\text{te}:n \)
   bring-give-cooked.rice=1=3.PST
   ‘He brought and gave me cooked rice’
   (Ramamurti 1931: 43)

29. \( \text{anin} \; i\text{jai}=\text{te}=\text{n-gu}=\text{am} \)
   he come=NPST=ITR-call=2
   ‘He came and called you’
   (Ramamurti 1931: 44)

In Gtaʔ serial verb constructions or in constructions with complex verb stems, the agreement is seen to come only once. This will be difficult to explain unless, we give the marker the status of a phrasal affix with its scope on all the predicates – a clitic then, as in the following. In the following example, this can be contrasted to the RECIP marker, which appears on all the verbs where it is relevant and thus is a typical inflectional affix with its scope satisfied locally.

30. \( \text{wi}_\text{ngha}=\text{har}=\text{ke} \; \text{ho-m-m-og} \; \text{ho-t-m-u} \; \text{ho-s-m-i}?+\text{ho-s-m-a}?-\text{har}-\text{ke} \)
   quarrel=PL=T/A RECIP- RECIP- RECIP-cut/RECIP/+RECIP-beat/RECIP/ throw.stone/RECIP/ catch/RECIP/-PL-T/A
   ‘They beat each other, threw stones at each other, caught and butchered each other.’
   (Anderson 2008: 720 [Mahapatra and Zide, no date, F. 17])

Gtaʔ, however, does not have a very productive PERSON agreement marking system, though it does mark NUMBER. However, it is important to note in the above example, the appearance of the NUMBER agreement marking and the T/A marking only once in a complex verb series with scope over all the verbs. The NUMBER agreement marking and the T/A marking, thus have to be treated as a phrasal affixes (clitics).

In Gtaʔ, in a serial verb construction, all verbs except the last one have the SAME SUBJECT or DIFFERENT SUBJECT markers – the last verb carries the finite inflection – it is attached to the verb like in other South Munda languages. The same subject (SS) marker in Gtaʔ may be followed by the enclitic [=ka] meaning ‘only’ or EMPHATIC (also found in Remo). The appearance of the TENSE marking only on one verb but with scope over all the other verbs in the following sentences, must be taken to indicate a phrasal affix/clitic status for the TENSE marker.

31. \( \text{d}ukr\text{i} \; \text{ho}=\text{ru}=\text{ho}=\text{r}i\text{a}=\text{ce} \; \text{swa} \; \text{e}=\text{r}r\text{o}=\text{ra}=\text{j}=\text{ce} \)
   old.woman weep=ECHO=SS fire go-RDPL:carry-
bring=SS
hanḍa-nda-ne  mɔr-ke  cwar=ce  aʔ-nswar-bo=ke
husband-3.REF- corpse-OBLQ  dry=SS  CAUS-dry-keep=ke.PST

‘The old woman wept a lot and then made a fire, dried up her husband’s corpse and preserved it’
Anderson (2008: 750 [Mahapatra and Zide n.d.])

32. wig=la  hṛząn  hanḍa-ŋde  pag=liʔ  we=ke
    go=DS  afterwards  husband-RFLXV  break=shoots  go=ke.PST
‘She went and afterwards the husband went for bamboo shoots’
Anderson (2008: 753 [Mahapatra and Zide n.d.: 47])

33. hliʔ  pag=ce  conke=la  poga  sgwa  bsaeʔ  laʔ=ke
    shoot  break=SS  taste=DS  tobacco  like  bitter  AUX=ke.PST
‘He broke the shoots and tasted them, they were bitter like tobacco’
Anderson (2008: 754 [Mahapatra and Zide n.d.: 47])

It is interesting that in Gtaʔ we do not find any productive agreement marking. However, the SS and the DS markers are used extensively but not/never on the final verb with which the actual scope of the SS and the DS markers rest. The DS marker is used when a verb has a different subject from that last verb; the SS marker is used when a verb shares the same subject as that last verb. But very curiously, most of the times as the data seem to suggest, this last verb carries no marking of any agreement with the subject. Are we to assume a zero-marked verb? Otherwise, how do we interpret the SS and the DS markers? The SS and the DS markers have a scope over a larger constituent than the verb on which they appear and therefore are clear instances of phrasal affixes/clitics.

In multi-verb constructions in Gutob, either compounded or serialized, it is possible to have the agreement clitic on each verb or only on the final verb in the series, as can be seen in the examples below. With not all verbs carrying them, but their scope extending over all of them, these are phrasally attached clitics.

34. simra-gu  ḍu-loŋ=nen
    enjoy=PST.I  AUX-FUT.I=PL
‘They will have enjoyed it’
(N Zide 1997: 314)
Evidence from case marking

All case markers, when bound, have to be seen as having scope over an entire noun phrase, and not merely over the word that it chooses as its host. Therefore, all bond case markers in the Munda languages have been treated as clitics in this study. Mundari nominals/pronominals bear no case marking. Their position within the VP/verb complex, or relative order outside the VP, gives indication of their grammatical roles. The
prototypical order of overt nominals is SUBJECT-INDIRECT OBJECT-DIRECT OBJECT, as can be seen in the following examples:

40. \( \text{gomke dasi}=e \quad \text{rak-}\text{i}=a \)

master servant=3SG call-3SG=DEF

The master called the servant.

(Hoffmann 1903: 130)

41. \( \text{gomke dasi talab}=e \quad \text{oma-}\text{i}=a \)

master servant wage=3SG give-3SG=DEF

The master gave the servant his wages.

(Hoffmann 1903: 130)

The other oblique case relations in Mundari are expressed with the help of bound post-positional markers, which owing to their scope over the entire phrase are considered phrasal affixes and therefore treated as clitics. They are discussed in detail in Section 3.6.

In Santali too (cf: Ghosh (1994)), the nominative and the accusative are left unmarked with no overt case marking. There are overt post-positional or bound case markers for the instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive and locative. These bound forms, owing to their scope over the entire phrase are considered phrasal affixes and therefore treated as clitics (See, section 3.6). Bound markers that appear after such phrasal affixes (like the INTENS marker in the example below) are also to be treated as clitics, as a bound morph coming after clitics, cannot be considered integral enough to the structure of the word to be an affix.

The following examples demonstrate INSTRUMENTAL and DATIVE marking:

42. \( \text{i}=\text{n}=\text{te}=\text{ge}=\text{n} \quad \text{mak-akan}=\text{a} \)

1SG=INSTR=INTENS=1SG cut-PERF=DEF

I am cut by myself

(Ghosh 1994: 42)

43. \( \text{g}_\text{r}=\text{a}=\text{n}=\text{me} \)

help=DAT=1SG-2SG.IMP

Help me

(Ghosh 1994: 42)

It is important to note that the DATIVE marker [a], in the example above, is not a real case marker – it can never form an independent word with the nominal/pronominal argument it marks. It satisfies more of a role that personal clitics play in the language – marking the presence of an argument in a particular syntactic/semantic role (indirect object/beneficiary). When used, it appears attached before the personal agreement clitics in the verbal complex. However, as a DATIVE marker, it has less to do with the verb that hosts it, than to the pronominal marker in the verbal complex. The dative marked form is an already complex and derived form \((a=\text{n})\), though not independent. This derived form is attached to the verb complex. As bound forms that are derived independently before attaching to the verbal
complex, these bound markers, at least together have some form of an independence from
the verb, and therefore are to be treated as clitics. The DATIVE marked forms, when present,
replace the ACCUSATIVE marked form and appear in that slot. See examples below:

44. \( gəŋə=ən=me \)
    help=DAT=1SG=2SG
Help me!
Ghosh (1994: 42)

45. \( iɲ \ ul=ɨɲ \ ɛm=əm=ə \)
    1SG mango=1SG give=DAT=2SG=DEF
I will give you a mango
Ghosh (1994: 61)

46. \( uni \ ɬi=a=ko=ə=e \)
    3SG tell=DAT=3PL=DEF=3SG
He will tell them
Ghosh (1994: 61)

In the above examples, since the dative marked forms are treated as clitics, bound markers
that appear after such markers (like the DEF marker) are also to be treated as clitics, as clitics
as post-inflectional markers, are to be understood to have appeared after the end of the
derivation of the word. This leaves no place for another bound marker to appear as an affix
on the same word after a clitic. It should also be noted that in the above examples, there are
no TENSE/ASPECT markers. When there are TENSE/ASPECT markers, according to Ghosh
(1994: 61), the DATIVE marker fuses with them. And, as bound markers that appear after
clitics, they are also to be treated as clitics, as one cannot have affixes coming after clitics.

47. \( uni \ ɬi=a=d=ɨɲ=ə=e \)
    3SG tell=DAT=PST=1SG=DEF=3SG
He told me
(Here a-d = a-ked)
(Ghosh 1994: 61)

48. \( aləŋ \ həɾ=laŋ \ əɡu=əd=e=a \)
    2PL.INCL man=2PL.INCL bring=DAT=PST=3SG=DEF
We brought the man something
(Ghosh 1994: 61)

49. \( uni \ ɬe \ ɬi=ə \)
    3SG 1PL cock=3SG send=DAT=PERF/PST=1PL=DEF
He has sent us a cock
(Ghosh 1994: 61)

In the above examples, the properties of the personal clitics remain the same as in
sentences without DATIVE arguments. The sentence above shows all the arguments in their
overt forms before the verbal complex, the last of which takes the subject marking enclitic.
The order of occurrence is: SUBJECT-IO-DO. Inside the verbal complex, the DO is not represented, following the general rule that if both ACC and DAT can be represented (because they are both animate), then by preference it is the DAT that gets represented inside the verbal complex.

A very important aspect that needs to be noted in the DATIVE constructions is that the DATIVE marker pushes the OBJ-DEF-SUBJ complex further away from the verb root, by coming in between the verb root and the TENSE/ASPECT marker. It would have been interesting if Santali had DATIVE subjects as well, like the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages of India, and in which case it would have been interesting to know what form the SUBJECT CLITIC takes. In constructions, which have DATIVE subjects in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages, Santali seems to follow the syntax of normal assertive sentences, as in the following sentence, though it is not clear what the li/l attached to the 1SG is:

50. ruak-kan=a=liŋ
   fever-PROG=DEF=1SG
   I am getting fever
   (Ghosh 1994: 52)

In Ho, overt case marking is reported to be absent for the NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE and ERGATIVE functions. However, the BENEFACTIVE, INSTRUMENTAL, LOCATIVE, COMITATIVE, GOAL roles are reported to be expressed “by a case or clitic postposition following a noun or pronoun” (Anderson, Osada and Harrison 2008: 206). Though the authors do not say why they think they could be clitics, one of the arguments that can be used to argue a clitic status for some of these markers is the optionality in their use, as can be seen in the following example of an instrumental marking (also used for ablative marking).

The more important reason though, is the phrasal nature of their attachment to their hosts:

51. jilike=m huju?-ye-n-e
   how=2 come-T/A-ITR-DEF
   ‘How did you come (here)?’
   (Anderson, Osada and Harrison 2008: 207)

52. jilike=te=m huju?-ye-n-e
   how=INSTR/ABL=2 come-T/A-ITR-DEF
   ‘How did you come (here)?’
   (Anderson, Osada and Harrison 2008: 207)

Not all Munda languages report an absence of overt marking of nouns/pronouns in the subject or object positions. Case is marked in Gorum, though only on object forms of pronominals, with a prefixal/proclitic e=, as can be seen in such pairs as noʔd-enoʔd [3SG.NOM-3SG.ACC], moʔ-emoy [who-to whom], etc., (Anderson and Rau 2008: 391-92). Such bound case forms due to their scope extending over an entire phrase are considered clitics. Case is also marked post-positionally, using etur, ʔtur, etc., to signify locational/genitive relations (Anderson and Rau 2008: 388). However, it is also noted that markers like etur are found obligatorily only with nominals while they appear optionally with pronouns and inanimate nouns (Anderson and Rau 2008: 389). If etur is an independent
word and not a bound form, as is represented in our source, such optionality will be insignificant for us. There is as such no evidence of a clitic status for any of the overt case markers found in Gorum. However, this is only true as long as we can accept the analysis of these as given in the texts. However, the function or placement of a marker like *etur* is far from clear, if one were to look at the sample sentences that appear below (Anderson and Rau 2008: 424-25):

53. *zōtn qa-ru ḍu rusi-ɖi babey ə*
   guardian do-PST and priest-FOC think.AFF that

   *kuntur e-n̄s̄d etur kua-nen zum-tu la?-tu*
   rat OBJ-s/he OBJ crow-this eat-NPST AUX-NPST

   ‘Having taken care of him, the priest thought “that shrew, this crow will eat him up, for sure”’

54. *mịŋ bɔʔpɔtʰ-t-ay bɔyragi-ɖi etur sun-ru ɖruka-ɖi*
   1SG frighten-NPST-CLOC priest-FOC OBJ say-PST tiger-FOC

   ‘“I will frighten you” said the tiger to the priest.’

55. *dinek gɔrzɔn qa-ru ḍu boyragi-ɖi etur*
   one.day roar do-PST and priest-FOC OBJ

   *leʔn-u zum-u qaʔd ui*
   catch-INF eat-INF for go.AFF

   One day he roared and went to catch and eat the priest’

In Sora too, as the following examples demonstrate, OBJECTIVE case is marked as a prefix on all nouns and pronouns, and because of its potential scope over an entire phrase, is treated as a clitic:

56. *kuni a=tarbaŋ-ji a=maŋɖra tij-a*
   those OBJ=flower-PL OBJ=man give-IMP

   ‘Give those flowers to the man’
   (Bhattacharya 1975: 162)

57. *bab-ɲen a=ʔ?
   head-1 POSS=hair

   ‘the hair of my head’
   (Bhattacharya 1975: 169)

In his description of Kharia morphology, Peterson (2008: 441) considers many bound forms in the language to be clitics/enclitics, including case markers. He draws our attention to the fact that the schematic overview of the NP in Kharia would be as follows:

   GEN DET DEM QUANT GEN DET LEXEME(S)=POSS=NUM=CASE
One can notice that the elements listed in the right end are mostly clitics. Peterson justifies this classification/nomenclature in the following words: “… if the lexical base is not overtly present (e.g. if it is unknown), these markers simply attach to the right-most element of the phrase, regardless of its status, whether lexical or genitive attribute. That is, unlike affixes, these markers do not attach to stems. Rather, they attach to the entire phrase” (441). The above description can easily be taken as one of the most defining characteristics of clitics.

The following examples show the status of these bound markers as clitics:

58. \[ \text{a}d\text{i}=\text{ya}\hat{\text{a}} \quad \text{g}^\text{ol} \quad \text{be}\text{\text{}t}\text{a}=\text{d}\text{o}\text{m}=k\text{i}=\text{te} \]

\text{ANAPH=GEN} \quad \text{ten} \quad \text{son}=3\text{POSS}=\text{PL}=\text{OBLQ} \\
‘his ten sons’

(Peterson 2008: 441)

59. \[ \text{a}d\text{i}=\text{ya}\hat{\text{a}} \quad \text{m}\text{o}\text{n} \quad \text{d}^\text{\text{}a}\text{ŋ}\text{g}\text{ar}=\text{d}\text{o}\text{m}=\text{te} \quad \text{g}\text{a}\text{m}=o\hat{\text{a}} \]

\text{ANAPH=GEN} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{servant}=3\text{POSS}=\text{OBLQ} \quad \text{say=A.PST} \\
‘He said to one of his servants’

(Malhotra 1982: 127)

Peterson also notes that if no further information exists within the NP, on account of them being known from the context “these markers attach directly to the demonstratives, which then serve as pronominals of the third person, for example, \( \text{h}\text{o}=k\text{i}=\text{te} \) (that=PL=OBLQ) ‘them’, from ‘that’” (441). The movement and attachment of clitics to the right-most ending phrase in situations where the host word is dropped because it can be retrieved from the context of the discourse, is discussed in the section on number marking as well. Here, we will focus on the use of case markers, and their status as possible clitics.

Peterson considers the overtly marked oblique and genitive cases to be enclitics. The oblique marker \( =\text{te} \) is seen to be marking definite objects, indirect objects and adverbials, and the genitive is marked by \( =(y)a\hat{\text{a}} \). While the guiding principle in declaring number markers as clitics is an ability to attach to elements unrelated to them, when their hosts are dropped in familiar contexts, the case markers are argued to “attach directly to the bare nominal (or rather, the last element of the lexical base of the NP)” (443). Peterson also notes that both, the oblique and genitive case marking clitics, can appear together in one particular type of construction. In this construction “if semantic head of the NP is not overtly expressed, the (enclitic) oblique marker \( =\text{te} \) attaches to the right-most element of the remaining lexical base of the NP, regardless of its status. If this element is a genitive determiner, this results in apparent ‘double case marking’” (443), as in:

60. \[ \text{i}n=a\hat{\text{a}}=\text{te} \quad \text{say}\text{k}\text{a}l \quad \text{ai}^\text{\text{}j} \]

\text{1SG=GEN=OBLQ} \quad \text{bicycle} \quad \text{PRS.COP} \\
‘I have a bicycle’

(Peterson 2008: 443)

The structure above is a reduced form of the structure below:
61. \( iɲ=a? \)  \( bo?=te \)  \( saykal \)  \( ayi^2j \)
   1SG=GEN  place=OBLQ  bicycle  PRS.COP
   ‘I have a bicycle’ (lit. There is a bicycle at my place)
   (Peterson 2008: 443)

   So, one can see, that the basis on which, number and case markers are considered
   enclitics are similar (except that, bound case markers are considered clitics primarily because
   they are phrasal affixes) and there seems to be a definite pattern that these elements follow,
   which arguably makes them fit cases to be considered clitics.

   The bound nature of the Juang case markers, like the GENITIVE, and the
   DEFINITENESS marker, makes them clitics. This is because, case markers have a scope that
   goes beyond word.
62. \( aɪn=a \) \( uji=n=qe \) \( kəsəkə=ra \) \( ele \) \( ape=a \) \( səpa=rə \)
   1SG=GEN  shirt=1=DEF  dirty=DEF  but  2PL=GEN  clean=DEF
   ‘My shirt is dirty, but yours is clean.’
   (Patnaik 2008: 519)

Juang subjects when in the DATIVE, show no agreement with the verb (Patnaik 2008: 519), as
   can be seen in the following example.
63. \( aɾa ki \) \( aɾa ka+aɾa ka \) \( diɾ \) \( ku-buji=ri=ki \)
   3PL  each.other  well  RECIP-do=DEF=PL
   ‘They love each other.’
   (Patnaik 2008: 523)

If we look at CASE marking in Remo, it is noted to have an objective case marker \( a= \)
   which is considered a very unusual feature in Remo nominal morphology by scholars.
Anderson and Harrison (2008) note that this case marker “is nearly obligatory with pronouns
   and in a number of contexts with nouns as well” (570). More importantly they note that
   “structurally speaking, the \( a= \) OBJECTIVE is not a prefix, but rather a proclitic which targets
the leftmost edge of the relevant NP that it seems to mark. Thus, it may appear on a
demonstrative, a possessive pronoun or anything likely to precede a noun or come initially in
a Remo noun phrase” (572). They are thus, treated as clitics for their scope properties.
Following are examples of the use of this marker:
64. \( a=kon \) \( bire \) \( kur \)
   OBJ=that  stone  roll
   ‘Roll down that stone’
   (Fernandez 1968: 67)

65. \( a=kon \) \( soka \) \( oyja \) \( dabu \) \( ɖi=ta \)
   OBJ=that  shirt  how.much  money  COP-NPST.II
   ‘How much does that shirt cost?’
   (Fernandez 1968: 67)
66. niŋ a=niŋ-ŋa qiio uriŋ-t-iŋ
   1 OBJ=1-GEN house walk-NPST-1
   ‘I will walk to my house.’
   (Fernandez 1968: 119)

67. gitin remo a=mona?bay selane kiyaŋ bed-o?
   that.CLOSE man OBJ=fat girl rice give-PST.1
   ‘That man gave rice to the fat girl.’
   (Fernandez 1968: 119)

Anderson and Harrison (2008) also refer to the adpositions in Remo as bound/enclitic postpositional or case elements. Though the authors do not make it clear, it is being assumed that the clitic status has probably got to do with the phrasal nature of the affixation of the bound elements. Postpositions or prepositions, as heads of adpositional phrases, have a scope over the entire phrase.

The clitichood of case markers in Gtaʔ need to be understood in terms of its position in a word/phrase and its interaction with number marking. Number markers usually come attached to the noun stem. However, the number marking can be separated from the stems when inalienable possession is marked. This is difficult to explain unless we assume a phrasal affix-like nature for the plural marker, which makes it a clitic. And, if the case marker appears in the noun phrase after such a clitic like marker, it also has to be understood as phrasal/enclitic. The following example (where the PLURAL or the CASE marker is not treated as clitics in the original source), shows the case marker coming after the number marking enclitic:

68. huŋ-ɗe=hin=ke
   child-3=PL=CASE
   ‘(to) his children’
   (Anderson 2008: 688)

Gtaʔ has no object marking, except for the 3PL marker =har, marking the plurality of objects in some constructions, as in the following sentence. As a bound marker, with its scope extending over a phrase, it is treated as a clitic. The tense marker following a clitic in the example below, has also to be treated as a clitic.

69. gte-la naŋ mria?-ce a=mæ-hiŋ-ke m-bagwe?=har=e
   then I rise-SS OBJ=3-PL-CASE 1-kill=PL:OBJ=FUT
   ‘Then, I will get up and kill them all.’
   (Anderson 2008: 723 [Mahapatra and Zide, no date, D. 11])

The status of the OBJECTIVE marker a= in Gtaʔ in the above structure needs to be considered in consonance with the analysis of the same in Gutob and Remo as a proclitic, for the reasons advanced for them there.
The OBJECTIVE marker \( o= \) in Gutob, has been considered a proclitic for the same reasons as the parallel marker \( a= \) in Remo, and the OBJ marker \( a= \) in Gtaʔ, have been considered proclitics by Anderson and Harrison (2008) and Anderson (2008) respectively. The nature of affixation being phrasal, these are rightly treated as clitics.

**Miscellaneous clitics**

In (71) below, the Q particle \( c^h i \) in Mundari, is considered an enclitic, because its scope extends over the entire clause, and therefore, it is not a word-level affix, but a phrasal affix.

70. \( \text{sena}=m=c^h i \)  
\( \text{go}=2\text{SG}=\text{Q} \)  
‘Will you go?’  
(Hoffmann 1903: 71)

It can be noticed that the general pattern for the enclitic in Bhumij is to attach to the word preceding the verbal complex. Sentence (72) below is a compound sentence and the agreement enclitic is seen to repeat for each of the predicates – in the first instance appearing on the verb itself and in the second appearing on the word preceding the verb. (72) is also a very important structure as far as the clitic status of the DEF marker is concerned. The DEF/COP appearing only once, is an instance of its scope over all the elements of a coordinated structure, making it clearly a phrasal attachment, and therefore, a clitic. This is as per the criterion discussed in Miller (1992) with respect to recognizing clitics in coordinated structures.

71. \( \text{aŋ} \text{ sen}=i\text{ŋ} \text{ ar}=i\text{ŋ} \text{ auy}=a \)  
\( 1\text{SG} \text{ go}=1\text{SG} \text{ CONJ}=1\text{SG} \text{ bring}=\text{COP} \)  
‘I will go and bring’  
(Ramaswami 1992: 131)

A clear evidence of the agreement markers in Gutob being clitics comes from the marking of PROH NEG. The PROH NEG in Gutob, is not a separate word but an add-on to regular negation. As a bound particle within the verbal complex, with a scope over the entire clause, the PROHIBITIVE NEGATION marker is a clitic. It also, by appearing next to the verb stem, furthers the subject agreement marker from the verb, as in the following sentence. As, a bound inflectional marking appearing immediately next to a clitic, which is a phrasal affix by virtue of its scope properties, the agreement marker even though bound, has to be seen as being affixed phrasally. Therefore, it is clearly a phrasal affix and therefore a clitic.

72. \( a=\text{do}=ge=pe \)  
\( \text{NEG}=\text{flee}=\text{PROH}=2\text{PL} \)  
‘Don’t flee!’  
(Anderson 2008: 706 [Mahapatra and Zide, no date, J. 23])
Conclusion
Due to the limitations of space, a large number of phrasal affixes in the Munda languages that have been analysed as clitics have not been presented here. However, it is hoped that this brief discussion on the possibility of recognizing a wide array of particles as clitics because of their morphosyntactic properties and their phrasal level of attachment, opens up an important dimension to the study of clitics in not only the Munda languages but also into the presence of clitics in other highly agglutinating languages.

Notes
1. Available at <http://www-01.sil.org/linguistics/glossaryoflinguisticterms/whatisacliticgrammar.htm>
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Of all the items of Folklore, Riddles is perhaps one of the most easily collected item. Yet, not much scholarly interest has been shown for the study of riddles mostly because riddles are considered to be a thing for children, with adults joining them occasionally for fun. But if we consider children to be the future of any society and that incidents in childhood shape our adult life, we can safely say that Riddles are one of the most powerful tools to influence an entire community.

The present paper tries to bring out the cultural values, the worldview and the philosophy of the Munda tribe's way of life through the study of their riddles. The Munda riddles has been documented satisfactorily, if not perfectly, by many writers. The book “Munda Duray” (A Munda Song Book) which is a collection of Munda folklore by S.A.B. Dilbar Hans, devotes its last chapter to 350 riddles or nutum kani. For the present paper we are using secondary data from this book and since the number of riddles is small we are cross checking its authenticity with primary source. The riddles though small in number, are sufficient to cover the topics which we intend to study. Of course, further dedicated collection of riddles is necessarily required. To analyse the riddles we are using certain techniques, like the structural analysis of riddles as proposed by Alan Dundes and Robert Georges, the analysis of linguistic ambiguity in the riddles as given by W. Papicello, Thomas Green. The analysis is also aided by other Munda folklore items, like their myth, folktales, folksongs etc.

At the surface, Riddles may just appear to serve the purpose of entertaining people and to some extend educating them, but implicitly they heavily carry the culture, worldview and accepted pattern of behaviour of a community. For example, the gender role among the Munda tribe is very much reinforced through riddles, take a look at the riddle “api horo kuriko, miad ge catu” (Three maidens, one pot), the answer to this riddle is cula (stove). Here, the ambiguity in riddle is achieved through likening of maidens with stove. The association of kitchen objects with females makes the gender roles evident, which is emphasised in the subconscious mind of the children through riddles. The example, “ror duṭu dal lere budu haiko nir uṛṇoʔa” (On beating a dry log, the budu fish come out running), the answer to which is “dhank”, the musical instrument which when heard, the people come out running to join the dance. This shows the Munda people's love for dance and music which is also emphasised through their proverb “sen ge susun, kaji ge durang” (Walking itself is dancing, talking itself is singing). Likewise, few riddles reinforce cultural values which are also present in other folklore items, example, “ne disum re baria ge paraʔ san” (The world is cut into two logs of wood), the answer is “ote sirma” (earth and sky),
this riddle stems out from the Munda belief system that the earth and sky were once together, they were later separated to facilitate the Creation. This riddles reflects the Munda value of looking everything in pairs, which is also reflected in their folklife, be it singing two songs or drinking two cups of rice beer before giving up. Few riddles are of recent invention and reflect the discontentment with the present system of justice, “ror daru baṭjan re sipai ko hijuga” (The soldiers come when dead tree falls), the answer is “guri? re rokoko hijuga” (the houseflies coming for cowdung), here the riddle is made ambiguous by the very description of the situation. The Munda people, who until recently were outside the influence of any external governance system, find it funny when a dead tree falls and the people from forest department (soldiers, houseflies) come to pick it up and to fine any Munda who tries to bring it home and use it, which until recently they did without any restriction!
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मुंडा लोगों के सांस्कृतिक इतिहास

सोहन मुण्डा
शोधाध्यायी
जनजातीय एवं क्षेत्रीय भाषा विभाग,
रांची विश्वविद्यालय, रांची
झारखंड।

मुंडा आदिवासी लोगों का अपना सांस्कृतिक इतिहास है। इनके इतिहास के पनों में साफ झलकता है। मुंडा आदिवासियों की भाषा, साहित्य और उनकी सांस्कृतिक अति प्राचीन है। प्राचीन भारतीय इतिहास में भी मुंडा आदिवासी लोगों का इतिहास दिखाई देता है। मुंडा आदिवासियों की वंश परम्परा अत्यन्त प्राचीन है।

प्रियसन महोदय ने भी इस बात को तो स्वीकार किया है कि मुंडा शब्द हिन्दुओं की देन है जिसकी उत्पत्ति के लिए “सांस्कृत” भाषा में खोज की आवश्यकता है। वैसे मुंडा आदिवासी स्वयं को ‘होड़ोको’ कहते हैं। ‘होड़’ का अर्थ मुंडारी भाषा में मनुष्य होता है। गैर मुंडारी शब्दशास्त्रियों ने इनके लिए ‘कोल’ शब्द का भी प्रयोग किया है, किन्तु इनकी इतिहास प्राचीन है। का
मुण्ड उपशाखाओं (मुण्डारी, संताली, हो) के माध्यम भाषाएं भिन्नता

दुमनी मई मुर्तु
शोधार्थी
जनजातीय एवं क्षेत्रीय भाषा विभाग
राँची विषयविधालय, राँची (झारखण्ड)
dumnimaimurm@gmail.com

प्राचीन काल में संताल, मुण्डा और हो शब्द नहीं था। विदेशी अंग्रेजों ने ही इनका नामकरण किया। पहले ये खेतराड़ के नाम से जाने जाते थे। खेतराड़ अपने को सिंहु घाटी सम्पत्ति से जोड़ते थे। इनके पव-त्योहार, रहन-सहन, भाव-विचार एवं सांस्कृतिक-रीतिविधाज एक ही था। इनके द्वारा बोली जानी वाली भाषा भी एक ही थी। किसी कारणवश जब ये सिंहु घाटी से विलुप्त हो गये तब ये विभिन्न दिशाओं में भोजन व सुनस्का की तलाश में भटकने लगे। इनके क्षेत्र विस्तार के कारण इन लोगों के बीच संपर्क बढ़ता चला गया। फलस्वरूप पव-त्योहार, रहन-सहन, भाव-विचार, सांस्कृतिक-रीति-विधाज बाबू भाषा परिवर्तन हो गया। इस तरह मुण्डा- “होड़ा”, संताल- “होड़ा” व हो अपने को “हो” से सम्बोधित करने लगे। जिनका शाब्दिक अर्थ “आदमी” है। यदि इन तीनों का पयावारी शब्द खोजने लगे तो सभी समान ही लगेगा किन्तु सामान्यता के बावजूद भी इनकी बोलचाल में फरक है— जैसे संताली शब्द में है— “होय या है” तो मुण्डारी में “हैय” और हो में ‘एया’ कहा जाता है। इनके सांस्कृतिक पक्ष को देखा जाए तो मृत्यु सांस्कृत में मुण्डा का सासान दीवी या दीवी चाची प्रथा है। हो में सासान व्यवस्था नहीं है। दीवी तेन और दूल्हन ही दीवी मिलती और संतालों में झाल होर (अस्थि विशेषण) की परंपरा है। इस तरह से इनके सांस्कृतिक क्रियाकलापों में भी विभिन्नता है। इनके नृत्य-गीतों को भी देखा जाए तो संताल बाहा नृत्य को छोड़ सभी रजी-पुश्प हाथों में हाथ पकड़े नृत्य करते हैं। हो लोग भी बा पूर्व को छोड़कर रजी-पुश्प कपड़े पकड़ कर (कमर से पीछे से एक दूसरे को पकड़ना) नृत्य करते हैं और मुण्डाओं में रजी व पुश्प अलग-अलग दलों में नृत्य करते हैं। इनके भाषिक उच्चारण को देखा जाए तो हो अल्पमान का ही प्रयोग करते पाये जाते हैं। मुण्डारी में अल्प प्राण और महाप्राण दोनों है किन्तु भाव (कोड में) के अनुसार ही महाप्राण का प्रयोग होता है तथा संताली में अल्पप्राण एवं महाप्राण दोनों ही समान रूप से व्यवहार होता है।

इस तरह संताली, मुण्डारी व हो के विनिमय, रहन-सहन, प्रथा-पर्याप्ताओं में भी भाषा-विविधता का प्रभाव अधिक पड़ा है। इनके भाषिक विविधता बहुत ही सूक्ष्म है। इनके लिए गहन अध्ययन व शोध की आवश्यकता है, जिससे भाषिक परिवर्तन में हुए भाषा विकास को प्रत्यक्ष रूप से जाना सके।
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The Andaman and Nicobar Islands geographically located between South and Southeast Asia. It is known for the Negrito tribes who live mainly in Andaman Island. Other Mongoloid tribes called Nicobarese live in neighboring Nicobar Island. With the current knowledge, it is not known that how these tribes are related to the South Asian, Southeast Asian and Andaman Island populations. To resolve this complexity, we have used more than 600K autosomal SNPs to study their demographic history. Our result was in agreement with their linguistic affiliation suggesting their strong link with the Southeast Asia. Interestingly, the gene flow from South Asia or from Andaman Island was negligible.
Research on Expressives - In the case of Mundari

TOSHIKI OSADA
Emeritus Professor
Research Institute for Humanity and Nature
Kyoto, Japan
osada-t@mub.biglobe.ne.jp

This paper attempts research on Expressives in Mundari Language*. The result of analysis of Mundari Expressives will be presented in this presentation.

*It attempts to follow Nathan Badenoch’s research on Expressives in language which not only target the Austroasiatic languages in South East Asia but also in several languages in South Asia, including Bengali, Telugu and Mundari.
Noun Categorization in Khasi, Korku, Santali and Kharia
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Almost all world languages use some sort of noun categorization devices to classify nouns. Gender and Classifiers are two such devices which reflect the way native speakers categorize objects and concepts in their world. This paper focuses on the noun categorization devices Khasi, a Mon-Khmer language spoken in Meghalaya; Korku, a North Munda language spoken in Nimar region of Madhya Pradesh; Santali, a North Munda language spoken in Jharkhand and Kharia, a South Munda language spoken in Jharkhand. It specifically aims to assess the semantic basis for the assignment of gender and numeral classifiers in Khasi; the nominal categories, gender and number in Korku; gender and numeral classifiers in Korku, Santali and Kharia.

Khasi has a predominant semantic assignment system with three genders: $u$ for masculine nouns; $ka$ for feminine nouns and $i$ for common nouns. Though the genders of Khasi nouns have a semantic core, the rules are very complex which leaves out many nouns unaccounted for. Humans are assigned masculine or feminine gender on the basis of their biological sex. On the other hand, the semantic rules are not straightforward with other nouns. For instance, all fruits are masculine except banana which is perhaps not considered as a ‘fruit’ by the native speakers. All external body parts are feminine except a few (tongue and neck are masculine, for instance). Interestingly, all internal organs are masculine except ‘brain’. These exceptions may not be significant in proportion to the number of nouns in the language but they cannot be dismissed. Khasi has two numeral classifiers: $nyut$ for animate and $tylli$ for inanimate nouns. It is used only with numerals more than one and the plural word $ki$ is obligatory in the numeral classifier construction.

Gender in Korku is not a part of the grammatical system itself. Gender distinction in Korku is expressed by the addition of affixes meaning ‘female’ for non-human animates. The unmarked form is masculine in Korku and the female form is derived by adding $japai$. $/-je/\text{ is used to mark the feminine gender and $/-te/$ is marked for masculine gender especially in kinship terms.}$ Kharia has no grammatical gender system. On the other hand, Santali has both grammatical and lexical gender. There are a few words in these three Munda languages that are specified with gender just like Indo-Aryan ($/-i/$ for feminine and $/-a/$ for masculine forms).

All the three Munda languages in our study show a three-way distinction of number i.e. singular, dual and plural. Singular nouns are unmarked, dual and plural are marked by the suffixes $-ki\text{n}$ and $-ku$ in Korku and Santali while the forms $-kiyar$ and $-ki$ are used in Kharia to mark dual and plural nouns. Interestingly, only animate nouns inflect for dual and plural while countable inanimate nouns take numerals or quantifiers to express plurality in Korku.
Unlike Khasi, there are no numeral classifiers in Korku. Both Santali and Kharia have numeral classifiers. There are three distinct classifiers in Santali that are used with numerals: ʈɛn/ ʈɛc’ along with the numeral for ‘one’; ea: for numerals from ‘two to four’ and ɡɔʈɛn/ ɡɔʈɛc’ for numerals from ‘five to ten’. Kharia has a small set of numeral classifiers: -o is the general classifier and there are some specific sortal classifiers based on the notions of animacy and shape.

While preliminary, the investigation has yielded a systematic semantic classification of nouns, a mix of ‘natural scientific’ (purely relying on the prototypical properties of the members in each class) and ‘socio-cultural nature’. This provides us a better insight of the worldview of the speakers with regard to nouns which in turn helps us understand the gender and numeral classifier systems of Khasi, Korku, Santali and Kharia that could be used to arrive at typological generalizations of gender and numeral classifiers.
Pronouns of the Santhali Language of Assam
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Introduction:
Some of the important languages of the Munda sub-branch are Santhali, Mundari, Bhumij, Ho, Kharia, Murmu, Sabar, Kurku, etc. Speakers of each of the above mentioned languages are found more or less in Assam. The colonialist Britishers imported a huge number of labourers from different states of India like West Bengal, Bihar, Odisha, Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand etc. for running their newly established tea gardens in Assam. These bonded labourers became an indispensable part of the Assamese nation in due course of time. A sizeable portion of the tea labourers of Assam belong to the Santhal community. They were brought to Assam by the Britishers mainly from areas like Purulia, Medinipur, Bankura, Birbhum, Santhal Pargona, Hazaribag, Manbhum, Singbhum, Saibacha, Chotnagpur, Dumka, Palamou, Mayurbhanj. The Santhals of Assam use their own language i.e. Santhali among themselves for day to day communication, but they resort to the Sadani language as lingua-franca while communicating with other tea labourer communities. The Santhali language not recognized as a medium of instruction in Assam, most of the Santhals study in the Assamese medium schools and small section reads in the English medium schools. The Santhals of Assam have a total of twelve clans- Baske, Bedea, Besra, Hasda, Hembram, Kisku, Mardi or Marandi, Murmu, Paoria, Soren, Sude and Tudu. As per the 2011 census Report of India, The Santhali population residing in Assam was about 4 lakh.

Introduction of the subject:
The pronouns of Santhali language of Assam are inflected for number and person. Some examples like this-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Pronouns</th>
<th>Santhali</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Per.Singular</td>
<td>Ing</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Per. Plural</td>
<td>Abo</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Per.Singular</td>
<td>aam</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Per. Plural</td>
<td>ape</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Per. Plural</td>
<td>apeko</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Per. Singular</td>
<td>uni</td>
<td>he/she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Per. Plural</td>
<td>unko</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uses of Personal Pronouns:

1st Person singular.  
Plural: ing(I): ing salab ening I had gone  
abo(we) abo salab ening we had gone

2nd Person singular Aam(you) aam salabyenam you had gone  
Plural: ape/apeko (you) ape/apeko salabyenam you had gone

3rd Person Singular uni(he) uni salaboyenai he/she had gone  
Plural: unko(they) unko salaboyenak they had gone

Scope of the Subject:
In this paper, an attempt will be made at the study of the pronoun words used in the Santhali language of Assam. Though the Santhali language of Assam resembles considerably with the Pan-Indian Santhali language, it has been influenced by the local languages of Assam to a great extent. For a clearer and wider understanding of the Subject, the Darrong, Kamrup, Sonitpur and Jorhat districts of Assam have been selected as samples of field study. The necessary data have been gleaned from the Santhali population residing in the tea gardens of the above mentioned districts.

Importance of the Subject:
Till now, no systematic study of the Santhali language of Assam has been undertaken, only a handful of articles are available dealing very briefly with the subject. In the present paper, propose to through some light on the pronouns of the Santhali language of Assam.

Purpose of the Study:

a) To bring to light the linguistic features of the Santhali language of Assam.

b) To ascertain the extent of influences of the local languages of Assam on the pronouns of the Santhali language.

c) This study will help understand the similarities and dissimilarities of the Santhali language of Assam with those of the Pan-Indian Santhali language.

Methodology of Study:
The analytical method has been chiefly applied for this study. For the collection of the data, both the primary sources as well as the secondary sources have been made use of. Field survey has been conducted among the Santhali people in a selected number of tea gardens of the state where there are high concentration of the community. For secondary sources the relevant reference books, research articles, pamphlets etc. have been consulted.
STRUCTURE OF FINITE VERB IN MUNDA LANGUAGES: 
A TYPOLOGICAL APPROACH

B. RAMAKRISHNA REDDY 
Hyderabad

The structure of finite verb in Munda languages is rich with morphosyntax, which can be taken as a morphology-driven syntax. The structural variation among different subgroups leads one to interpret the reference to subject and object (within a sentence) either as agreement or incorporation. From the perspective of object reference on the verb, the Munda languages fall, broadly, into three types: 1. Those with object incorporation whether the object refers to the first, second or third person (i.e. in all the three persons) as in the case of Santali, Mundari and other North Munda languages. 2. Those with object incorporation confined (restricted) to first and second persons only which can be treated as Speech Act Participants incorporation, as found in Savara (Sora), Parengi (Gorum) and Kharia of South Munda. and 3. Those with no object incorporation at all as in the case of Gutob (Godaba), Remo (Bondo), Didei (Gataq) and Kharia of South Munda. In other words, the third variety exhibits only the subject reference, which can be termed as a type of subject-predicate agreement.

The feature of incorporation or agreement plays a pivotal role in classifying Munda languages into distinct sub-groups. On the basis of geographical spread of the languages, Norman Zide and Davidd Stampe divide them into South Munda and North Munda. On the other hand, S. Bhattacharya classifies the languages into Upper Munda and Lower Munda on the criterion of marking object reference on the finite verb. Supporting data for the proposed typological studies will be drawn from the field notes (of the author) as well as from the published works together with relevant references.
1. Introduction

In the non-nominative subject construction we will be discussing the subject that is case-marked either ergative, locative, genitive, dative or accusative i.e. differently from what one would normally expect. In the non-nominative subject construction the verb normally agrees with the theme/patient, if nominative case-marked. Subbarao & Bhaskararao (2004) and Subbarao (2012) have shown that in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages there are some specific functional domains (types of predicates) where the subject of a sentence is a non-nominative subject.

Though Non-Nominative Subjects (NNS hereafter) are generally considered as a diagnostic feature for ‘India as a Linguistic Area’, it is significant that many, but not all, Tibeto-Burman languages and all Mon-Khmer languages do not have the NNS construction. NNS in South Asian languages have been discussed in Verma and Mohanan (1990), Pandharipande (1979), Mohanan and Mohanan (1990), Bhaskararao & Subbarao (2004), Subbarao & Bhaskararao (2004), Subbarao (2012), and Butt (2013) amongst others. However, there is no work done on the nature of NNS in any Munda language to the best of our knowledge. This paper will address that lacuna.

Like in Icelandic, German, Russian, and Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages, the non-nominative subject (non-nominative subject), though obliquely case-marked, retains its property of a subject with regard to (i) being an antecedent to an anaphor, (ii) being the controller of the notional subject, generally labeled as PRO in non-finite object complement clauses, (iii) being the controller of the embedded subject in a conjunctive participial construction etc. Except for a couple of languages of the Indo-Aryan family, the NNS does not trigger agreement on the predicate. The predicate (verb or adjective) in a non-nominative subject construction is [-transitive] and it is non-volitional. Since it is [-transitive], the predicate cannot assign accusative case to the theme or patient. Hence, the theme/patient is always nominative case-marked.

In this paper we wish to discuss a very unique phenomenon concerning agreement reversal in North Munda languages (Santali, Ho, and Mundari) in which the Subject Agreement Marker (SAM) in oblique object constructions occurs not in own canonical position, rather it
occurs in the position earmarked for an object, in spite of the fact that the predicate may be [-transitive]. We label this phenomenon as Agreement Reversal. We argue that such reversal takes place not due to syntactic principles governing agreement, but due to thematic/functional criteria due to which the nature of the predicate in a non-nominative subject construction triggers such reversal. We hope to show that agreement which is generally viewed in terms of syntactic principles governing constituent structure and is analyzed purely in terms of hierarchical structures invoking the notion of \( c\)-command may not be adequate to account for agreement reversal in the North Munda languages. In support of our hypothesis concerning the primacy of thematic/functional criteria, we present evidence from data concerning kinship constructions in which agreement reversal does not take place in one set of sentences. We will show that when the possessor in kinship is case-marked by the genitive, agreement reversal takes place indicating that syntactic criteria too play a vital role. This, we argue, demonstrates that agreement in the North Munda languages can be accounted for by invoking syntactic as well as thematic/functional criteria.

North Munda languages (Santali, Ho, and Mundari) have a rich agreement pattern where the predicate (verb or adjective) carries subject, direct and indirect object agreement markers. As we shall see, the subject agreement marker occurs either in the pre-verbal position or to the right of the indicative or \([+finite]\) marker that every sentence carries. The object agreement marker occurs to the left of the sentence marker and its position is fixed, while the position of the subject agreement marker may vary depending upon the phenomenon of pro-drop in these languages, which is quite robust in these languages.

Like in Icelandic, German, Russian, and Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages, the NNS, though obliquely case-marked, retains its property of a subject with regard to (i) being an antecedent to an anaphor, (ii) being the controller of the notional subject, generally labeled as PRO in non-finite object complement clauses, (iii) being the controller of the embedded subject in a conjunctive participial construction etc. Except for a couple of languages of the Indo-Aryan family, the NNS does not trigger agreement on the predicate. The predicate (verb or adjective) in a non-nominative subject construction is \([-\text{transitive}]\) and it is non-volitional. Since it is \([-\text{transitive}]\), the predicate cannot assign accusative case to the theme or patient. Hence, the theme/patient is always nominative case-marked.\(^3\)

Interestingly, the subject agreement marker in some (semantically restricted) constructions occurs in the position that is earmarked for the object. We label this phenomenon as Agreement Reversal. Agreement Reversal in North Munda languages, though a robust phenomenon, has not drawn the attention of scholars thus far and, hence, remains unexplicated. The aim of our paper is to explore the phenomenon of Agreement Reversal in Santali Ho and Mundari. We will argue that Agreement Reversal is the manifestation of NNS in these languages.

In sentences involving agreement reversal, we observe that the genitive postposition is incorporated in a predicate independent of the fact of the genitive postposition occurring.
with the non-nominative subject or not in such sentences. Hence, at this point it is appropriate to discuss the phenomenon of the incorporation of the genitive in such predicates. We label the incorporated genitive as the ‘verbal genitive’ to distinguish it with the genitive that occurs with a noun phrase, though both of them are homophonous. We wish to show that such verbal genitive incorporation is independent of the case marking on the logical subject (an experiencer, possessor, recipient, or an ‘undergoer’ of an ailment or disease etc.). We shall demonstrate that genitive incorporation in the predicate does not directly correlate with the occurrence of the genitive with a noun phrase and hence, they both are mutually independent of each other.

In certain specific thematic/functional domains mentioned in Section 2 below, the logical subject gets "demoted". We hypothesize that such demotion is made effective:

(i) either by case-marking on the logical subject like in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, and possibly, in languages like Icelandic, Russian. In Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages due to demotion the case-marked logical subject does not control agreement.

or,

(ii) even when it is nominative case-marked and not oblique case-marked like in Munda languages, the logical subject still loses its prominence and gets demoted, not due to lexical case marking as such, but due to functional/thematic criteria taking precedence over syntactic criteria, which is rather unique. The demotion is reflected syntactically in Munda languages by the Subject Agreement Marker (SAM) ending up as the Object Agreement Marker (OAM).

2. The Domains of occurrence of the non-nominative subject

South Asian languages, especially Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages are rich in constructions in which the subject is non-nominative case-marked. The functional/semantic domains in which a non-nominative subject occurs in South Asian languages are given below. The subject in these domains may be dative, accusative, locative, instrumental or genitive.

Domains of occurrence of the non-nominative subject: (adapted from Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004)

- a. Psychological states and emotions
- b. Physiological and mental ailments
- c. Natural phenomena pertaining to body
- d. Perceiver of visual and auditory actions
- e. To express possession and kinship
- f. Subject of predicates expressing obligation and necessity (desideratives)
- g. To denote a recipient
- h. Acquisition of knowledge or a skill
- i. Part-whole relationship (single and double dative marking)
In the following section we provide a brief description of verb agreement in Santali, and agreement patter in Ho and Mundari too is quite similar to the one in Santali.

3. Verb Agreement in Santali

The verb in Northern Munda languages exhibits agreement with subject as well as direct/indirect object subject to animacy conditions. In this paper we wish to show that in most of the domains mentioned above, the agreement pattern in Munda languages is reversed. The subject clitic which is a mobile clitic occurs in the fixed canonical position that is earmarked for direct or indirect object. We label this phenomenon as Agreement Reversal. The logical subject in such cases may be an experiencer, a possessor, or an undergoer of an ailment or disease etc. Subject in such cases is not an agent, and the predicates that occur in such domains are all [-volitional]. In Agreement Reversal the agreement clitic of the subject whether it is nominative case-marked or non-nominative case-marked occupies the slot earmarked for the object in the functional domains mentioned above. We provide data from North Munda languages such as Santali, Mundari and Ho to demonstrate that the marker for agreement of the logical subject occupies the position in the predicate that is earmarked for the object of a sentence. Before we proceed further a brief note on agreement in Munda languages is a desideratum. We shall discuss the case of Santali agreement.

In Santali subject, direct object as well as indirect object trigger agreement on the verb. Subject Agreement marker (SAM) canonically is either suffixed to the preverbal constituent or suffixed to the right of the finiteness marker of the verb as in (1a) and (1b). Every declarative sentence carries the [+finite] marker or the indicative marker /-a/ as the ultimate constituent, unless the Subject Agreement marker (SAM) occurs to its right optionally, in which case the SAM becomes the penultimate constituent.

Object Agreement Marker (OAM) /e/- in third person for example occurs to the left of the [+finite] sentence marker /-a/ or on the preverbal constituent that is, the direct object Hopni in (1a) and (1b). With [+transitive] verbs, the infix /-d/- occurs to the right of the tense marker and to the left of the Object agreement marker.

1a. inli hopni-ŋi ŋel-le-d-e(y)-a
   I Hopni-SAM see-pst-[+tr]-OAM-[+fin]
   ‘I saw Hopni.’

1b. inli Hopni ŋel-le- d- e(y)- a- ŋi
   I Hopni see-pst-[+tr]-OAM-[+fin] -SAM
   ‘I saw Hopni.’
It should be mentioned that while the position of the SAM is flexible and mobile, the position in which the OAM occurs is fixed and not mobile.

South Asian languages are pro-drop languages and in an appropriate context, any argument or non-argument (adjunct) may be pro-dropped. Any argument or non-argument that occurs in a preverbal position plays the role of the host to host the subject agreement clitic. In case the argument or non-argument is pro-dropped, the subject agreement clitic hops on to the constituent to its left. If all arguments to the left the verb are pro-dropped, it occurs to the right of the sentence marker -a. The [+finite] sentence marker which normally is the ultimate constituent in such cases becomes the penultimate constituent. Subbarao (2011) labels the process of such movement of the Subject Agreement Marker as Clitic Hopping.

When the direct object is pro-dropped, the subject agreement clitic occurs on the subject itself, as in (1c).

1c. īɳį-ɳį ɲel-le- ḍ-e(y)-a
     I-SAM see- pst-[+tr]-OAM-[+fin]
     ‘I saw Hopni.’

In case the subject and object are both pro-dropped, the SAM occurs to the right of the [+finite] marker as in (1d).

1d. proį (proj) ɲel-le-d-e(y)-a-ṇį
     (I) (DO) see-pst-[+transitive]- OAM-[+fin]-SAM
     ‘I saw Hopni.’

The SAM may also occur only to the right of the [+finite] marker, though no argument is pro-dropped as (1e) illustrates.
SAM at the final position as the final constituent to the right of the [+finite] marker.

1e. baha(i) daka-ọ ǹm- ke- ḍ-a- y(i)
baha rice eat- pst- [+tr] [+fin]-agr
     ‘Baha ate rice.’

The -ọ in (1d) indicates that the Subject agreement marker moved to the right of the final constituent, leaving this position empty.

3.1 Indirect Object agreement marking:
The Indirect Object agreement clitic occurs in the same position as the direct object clitic does as (1e) and (f) show. It thus occurs in the penultimate position to the left of the [+finite] sentence marker, unless the SAM occurs to the right of the [+finite] sentence marker.
1f. arel(i) peʁa.kɔ(j)- y(i) oɔɾɒm- ke- t- kɔ(j)- a
Arel guest.s SAM introduce-pst- [+tr] OAM- [+fin]
‘Arel introduced the guests to each other.’

1g. iɲa ciṭhi- na bheja -am- a
I letter-SAM send -2 sg- [+fin]
‘I’ll send a letter to you.’
(Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 139-140)

3.2 IO Incorporation with borrowed predicates
bheja ‘send’ is a verb borrowed from Hindi-Urdu in Santali and is conjugated like an indigenous verb. In Santali nouns borrowed from Hindi-Urdu too are conjugated like verbs, as there is no distinction between nouns, verbs and adjectives in North Munda languages.⁴

Thereafter, we shall discuss the cases in which there is agreement reversal or swapping and attempt to provide a plausible explanation to account for this seemingly contradictory behavior of the agreement clitic.

Subbarao (2012:177-178) argues that the predicate in sentences with a non-nominative subject in South Asian languages is semantically bivalent, but syntactically monovalent. It is semantically bivalent, because each predicate requires either an experiencer or possessor or recipient and a theme or patient. The logical subject is non-nominative (locative,
instrumental, dative, genitive or accusative) case-marked. There is evidence to show that the predicate is [-transitive] and it cannot assign accusative case to its theme patient. The following examples in 3.1-3.2 from some select South Asian languages are illustrative:

4.1 Possession

Possession may be of two types: Alienable and inalienable. Body parts can be cited as a prime example of inalienable possession and the possession of concrete objects as a prime example of alienable possession. In sentences that express possession, in Dravidian, Indo-Aryan, Tibeto-Burman languages except the Kuki-Chin languages the predicate is be.

The subject in such cases in not nominative case-marked, but it is non-nominative case-marked. In (2) below, the subject is genitive case-marked and the verb agrees with the theme which is nominative case-marked. The theme in (2) pūûnch ‘tail’, has the feminine grammatical gender.

4.1.1 Inalienable possession

Hindi-Urdu (Indo-Aryan)

2. is kutte kî lambî pūûnch thī
   this dogs (masc, pl) gen long tail (fem.sg) was (fem.sg)
   ‘This dog had a long tail.’

4.1.2 Alienable possession - permanent (concrete)

In Telugu the case marker that occurs with the subject depends upon whether the object of alienable possession is permanent or not. When it is permanent, the subject is dative case-marked as in (3).

Telugu (Dravidian)

3. bahā ki cālā dabbu undi
   Baha dat a lot of money be.pres
   ‘Baha has a lot of money.’

When it is temporary, that is non-permanent, the subject is locative case-marked as in (4).

4.1.3 Alienable possession (temporary)

Telugu (Dravidian)

4. bahā daggira ī pustakālu lē.vu
   Baha near these books nm, pl not.nm, pl
   ‘Baha does not have these books.’
In (3)-(4) above, the verb agrees *not* with the logical subject, namely the non-nominative case-marked possessor, but with the thing that is possessed, namely, the theme. The verb in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages agrees with the noun phrase that is nominative case-marked, and in the sentences above, the logical subject (possessor) is non-nominative case-marked. Hence, the predicate in such sentences agrees with the theme that is nominative case-marked.

### 4.2 Psychological (Psych-) predicates

Psych-predicates manifest mental states and emotions. The logical subject in such cases is an experiencer. In (5) below, the experiencer Baha is dative case-marked, and hence, does not trigger agreement. It is the theme *kōpālu.tāpālu* ‘anger and the like’ that riggers agreement, and it is in non-masculine, plural. Hence, the verb exhibits non-masculine, plural agreement with the theme.

Telugu (Dravidian)

5. bahā ki kōpālu.tāpālu ekuva.gā unṭā.yi
   Baha dat anger and the like a lot be.pres.nm.pl
   ‘Baha has a lot of anger and the like.’

A similar agreement pattern is manifested in other domains too. (See Subbarao 2012 for further details).

In Tibeto-Burman languages it is only in the Kuki-Chin languages that the verb agrees not only with subject, but also with direct object as well as indirect object.

In all semantic domains mentioned above, it is the logical subject whether it is nominative case-marked or non-nominative case-marked that controls agreement in Tibeto-Burman languages.

To sum up the discussion above, it is the nominative case-marked NP that controls and triggers agreement in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages, and the logical subject (an experiencer of possessor, for example) that is non-nominative case-marked does not control and trigger agreement. That is, agreement purely is a structural and grammatical phenomenon in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages. With this background in mind, let us now consider instances of possession in Santali. We wish to demonstrate that Santali, Mundari and Ho do not adhere to structural principles of agreement discussed above with regard to the domains mentioned above. We’ll show that it is the functional/thematic domains that are crucial for agreement reversal in Munda languages.
5. Possession in Santali

(i) Possession of Concrete Objects

Santali (North Munda)

As mentioned earlier, Santali has subject, direct object and indirect object agreement. The verb *menaʔ ~ mena* ‘be’ indicates possession too, just as the verb *be* in many South Asian languages does. In fact, except for the Tibeto-Burman languages of the Kuki-Chin family, it is the verb *be* that manifests possession in all other South Asian languages. Santali exhibits two sets of patterns with regard to possession. We shall label them as Agreeing pattern with *menaʔ* - ‘be’ and Non-agreeing pattern with *menaʔ* - ‘be’.

5.1 Agreeing Pattern

In the Agreeing pattern with *menaʔ* - ‘be’, the subject is genitive case-marked, and the verb too carries the incorporated genitive postposition –*ta*-, that occurs to the right of the verb stem *menaʔ* - ‘be’. Though the subject is genitive case-marked, the verb exhibits agreement with the subject. This shows that lexical case marking on subject has no bearing to agreement on the verb. Further, the subject agreement marker (SAM) *iɲ* - ‘1sg’ (in bold in (6)) occurs in a position that is earmarked for the object that is, to the left of the [+fin] marker. Though it occurs in the object position, it is not a subcategorized argument of the verb *menaʔ* - ‘be’, as it is [-transitive] and a [-transitive] predicate cannot permit an object to occur. Thus, such occurrence leads to a paradoxical situation, where the possessor ends up as an object of a [-transitive] verb.

Agreeing pattern with *menaʔ* - ‘be’ - Genitive incorporated

6. *iɲ-ak’ kitəb menaʔ t iɲ- a*
   I-gen book be-gen-1sg- [+fin]
   ‘I’ve a book.’
   (Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 151)

In (7) below, though the subject is pro-dropped, the subject agreement clitic –*am* - ‘2 sg’ occurs to the right of the incorporated genitive in the canonical position earmarked for the object.

Genitive incorporated - subject pro-dropped

7. *tiɲ-ak’8 kitəb menaʔ t am a nozr*
   how many. books be-gen-2sg- [+fin] [-an]
   ‘How many books do you have?’

Here is another example where the predicate exhibits agreement with the subject.

Subject Genitive Case-marked

8. *iɲ-ak’ kitəb menaʔ t iɲ a*
   I-gen book be-gen-1sg- [+fin]
   ‘I’ve a book.’
   (Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 151)
5.2 Non-Agreeing Pattern

We shall now discuss some instances where the verb does not exhibit subject agreement and there is no genitive incorporation too in the verb. In contrast to (8) above, the incorporated genitive –t- and the 1 person subject agreement marker clitic /-ŋ/ are absent in (9) below.

Non-Agreeing Pattern – no genitive incorporation in the verb

(9) iɲ-ak’ kitəb menaʔ- a
   I-gen book be- [+fin]
   ‘I’ve a book.’
   (Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 150)

(10) iɲ-ak’ bāryā kitəb menaʔ- a
    I-gen two book be- [+fin]
    ‘I’ve two books.’
    (Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 150)

The forms of the verb be, exist in Santali are mena and menaʔ. These are phonologically conditioned allomorphs. The verb stem is mena. When a consonant follows mena ‘be’, the glottal stop occurs to the right of mena ‘be’ yielding menaʔ ‘be’. The fact that in (9) and (10) above, mena ‘be’ has the form menaʔ ‘be’ with a glottal stop indicates that the incorporated genitive and the SAM are dropped. That is, the Agreeing Pattern is the normal pattern and the Non Agreeing Pattern is not and it is a derived pattern. The glottal stop on mena, we hypothesize, is a vestige left over from the Agreeing Pattern.

In the following section we shall consider data where kinship relations are manifested.

5.3 Possession: Kinship

The expression of kinship relations in language plays a very crucial relation in South Asian languages. In Hindi-Urdu and Punjabi, for example, the subject is genitive case-marked, when a kinship relation is expressed indicating that expressing kinship through language is an exclusively significant notion.

In Santali too, kinship has a critical role to play, as the expected agreement reversal does not take place, when a kinship relation is manifested.

In (11) below the logical subject iɲ ‘I’ is genitive case-marked in Santali and interestingly, the genitive ta is not incorporated in the verb, which shows that the genitive may be optional, when the patient manifests a kinship relation. In this there is no agreement reversal, as one would expect. The expected pattern is for the possessor iɲ ‘I’ to manifest agreement in the position earmarked for the object in (11). However, it is not the case as (11), (12) and (13) below show.
In (11a)-(12a) agreement marker for the possessed noun phrase occurs in its canonical position and there is no Subject Agreement Marker. (11b)- (12b) are ungrammatical, as the possessor occurs in the canonical position of the object.

Kinship Normal Agreement with no reversal

11a. ɲi rin₁ bārya boyha₂ j menaʔ- kin j- wa
     I- gen two brother be- dual- [+fin]
     ‘I’ve two brothers.’ (Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 151)

11b. *ɲi rin₁ bārya boyha₂ j menaʔ- iɲi- wa
     I- gen two brother be- l sg- [+fin]

12a. əm- rin₁ peya boyha₂ j menaʔ- ko j- wa
     you- gen three brother be- 3pl- [+fin]
     ‘You’ve three brothers.’ (Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 152)

12b. *əm- rin₁ peya boyha₂ j menaʔ- am i- wa
     you- gen three brother be- 2sg- [+fin]

Sentences (11a) and (12a) show that in the expression of kinship relations, the subject does not lose its primacy either in terms of agreement reversal nor in terms of case marking on the logical subject.

In sentence (13) and (14), there is no agreement marker at all. Such absence of the agreement marker is rather unexpected, and it needs to be further explored.

13. ɲi ic’ mid’ boyha mena- ya
     I- gen two brother be- [+fin]
     ‘I’ve two brothers.’ (Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 151)

14. uni- ren moře-gotāŋ hōpōnera menaʔ- tā- yā
     she- gen five.Cl daughters be- gen- [+fin]
     ‘She has five daughters.’ (Field notes)
(15) is an example of a non-nominative subject construction. The following points worth mentioning regarding (15).

(i) There is agreement reversal in (15).

(ii) The logical subject, that is, the possessor is genitive case-marked.

(iii) The SAM liɲ of the possessor occurs in the canonical position of the object to the left of the [+finite] marker.

(iv) The OAM ko occurs to the right of the verb menak’ ‘be’.

Possession: Kinship – Agreement Reversal

15. aļɲ- ren- dɔ mɔre~- goʃen hɔpon menak’-
    ko- ta- liɲ- ə a
    3pl (OAM)- gen- 3 dual (SAM)- [+fin]

‘We’ve five sons.’ (Folktales 3:26) (From Neukom 2001:169)

There are some sentences in which in spite of the occurrence of the verbal genitive –ta-, agreement reversal does not take place.

No Agreement Reversal – Verbal genitive –ta- present

16. thɔɾɔ- ɾẽn gidrə- menaʔ- kɔʔ- tɑ- (y)a
    Thoro- gen,pl child- has- pl- [+tr]- [+fin]

‘Thoro has children.’ (filed notes)

In contrast, in (17) and (18) agreement reversal takes place.

Agreement Reversal – Verbal genitive –ta- present

17. gidɾɔ menak’- ko- ti- nʔ- ə
    child be- 3pl- of, gen- 1sg- [+fin]

‘I have children.’ (filed notes)

18. girdɾε (kɔ) menaʔ- ko- t(a)- nʔ- ə
    child- pl have- 3 pl- gen- 1sg- [+fin]

‘I’ve children.’

To sum up the discussion above, it appears that the occurrence or non-occurrence of the genitive has no direct correlation with Agreement Reversal. We propose to account for the phenomenon of Agreement Reversal and its absence by considering more data.

Possession: Abstract

In sentences in which the possession of a quality is expressed and the predicate is mena ‘exist, be’, as is the case in many Indo-Aryan languages such as Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi and Kashmiri etc. In Santali the possessor of the quality is in the loctive case and the predicate carries the incorporated genitive –ta-.

Psychological (Psych-) predicates manifesting psychological states
Note that the verbal genitive –ta- is incorporated in (19), though the subject is locative case-marked. This shows that the occurrence of the verbal genitive –ta- is independent of the case marking on the subject.

19. uni-re endre mena- k’- ta-
   he- loc anger exist- 3 [-animate]- gen-
   e- a
   3 sg.poss- [+fin]
‘He is angry with him (or: he has anger on him.)’
(Santali Dictionary II.293), (as quoted in Neukom 2001)
We’ve seen above verbal genitive –ta- occurs:

(i) when the subject is nominative case-marked as in (17),
(ii) when the subject is genitive case-marked as in (16), and also,
(iii) when the subject locative case-marked as in (19).

This leads us to the conclusion that the occurrence of the verbal genitive in sentences expressing kinship and psychological states is not dependent on the case-marking on the logical subject, which is either a possessor or an experiencer.

6.1 Agreement Reversal in Psychological states and emotions

There is no distinction between nouns, verbs and adjectives in North Munda languages. A psych-expression such as khusi ‘happiness’, a noun borrowed from Hindi-Urdu in Santali is conjugated like a verb. There is a semantic shift in the predicate khusi ‘happiness’ and it has the interpretation of ‘like’. The sibilant /$/> of Hindi-Urdu changes to /s/, a common pattern found in many South Asian languages.

Note that though khusi ‘like’ which is semantically bivalent takes the middle [-transitive] marker When used as a verb in Santali. According to our analysis, the verb khusi ‘like’ comes under the domain of ‘psychological states and emotions’. Interestingly, in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages, such predicates are [-transitive], and they invariably take either a dative in all Dravidian languages and in languages such as Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi and Kashmiri or a genitive in Bangla, Assamese etc. In Santali too the predicate is treated as an intransitive predicate. There is no agreement reversal with such predicates. The SAM –m (in bold in(20)) occurs in the pre-verbal position on the topic marker dɔ. It it were a case of agreement reversal, the SAM –m would occur to the right of the [-transitive] marker –k’.

Santali
20. nui- dɔ- m khusi- k’- khan
   this- top- 2sg like- [-tr]- if
   ‘If you like it - - - ’ (Folktales 9:118) (From Neukom 2001:39)
6.2 Auditory and visual perceptions

In sentences with predicates expressing the notion of audible or visible, the subject in Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages is in the non-nominative case, and the predicate is [-transitive] and non-volitional.

The predicate nel.oʔka ‘appear’ in Santali comes under the category of visual perceptions. Just as in Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages in Santali too, the predicate is [-transitive], and hence, the [-transitive] marker /- oʔk/ (in bold below) occurs in the predicate. Note that there is no agreement reversal in (21).

21. unikuri əri møj nel.oʔk kän-a
that girl very beautiful see[-tr] pres[+fin]
‘The girl is looking/[appears] very charming.’
(Minegishi & Murmu 2001: 154)

6.3 Ailments

When an ailment is expressed and the predicate manifests a process, the predicate nām ‘get’ is used and the subject is in the nominative case. In such cases there is no genitive incorporation as (22) below shows. The significant point to be noted is that though the subject is in the nominative case and is the initial argument of the sentence, the agreement clitic (in bold) occurs in the position earmarked for the direct/indirect object.

Physical ailments (process)–no genitive incorporated

22. baha i ruə? nam-9- aka- d- e- y- a
Baha fever get- pst- [tr]- 3 sg- glide- [+fin]
‘Baha caught fever.’ (filed notes)

23. gidrə -(kɔ)i ruek’ nam- aka-t’- ko i- w- a
child-pl fever get-pst[-tr]- [+pl]-glide-[+fin]
‘The children caught fever.’

24. pe pon māhā-ge bəo:k’haso-ŋə:k’-le- d- e- a
three four day-foc head ache- little -pluperf[-tr]-SAM-[+fin]
‘She suffered a little from a headache three or four days.’
(Bodding Folk Tales 21:274)

Having discussed the cases in which agreement reversal takes place and also, does not, we shall attempt to show that subject (experiencer/possessor) in spite being relegated to a non-subject position with regard to agreement due to the phenomenon of Agreement Reversal, it still possesses all the properties attributed to a subject.
6.4 Subject properties of a non-nominative subject in Munda languages

(i) Subject is the first NP, that is NP of S in a sentence, where by it c-commands all the constituents in a sentence. In Munda languages in all the domains mentioned above, subject is the first c-commanding NP in a sentence.

(ii) **Antecedent to an anaphor**: In sentences with psychological predicates, Subject is in the nominative case as in (25) below and it acts as the subject with regard to agreement. It is not relegated to an object. It is also an antecedent to an anaphor at’/aprē. The intransitive marker –n- occurs with the verb.

25. upəl, at’/aprē-y icētaŋrē bejār-aka-n-a
    ‘Upel was angry/ upset with herself.’

(iii) Controller of PRO
    PRO, the notional subject of the conjunctive participial clause invariably requires the subject as its controller in the matrix clause. We provide (7) as an illustration in support of to show that subject is the controller of PRO. Let’s consider (26) below.

26. [un.kin[PRO, rābāŋ nām-akā- t- kin i- te] they(dual) cold get- perf pple -[+tr]- dual (SAM)-cpm
    orāk sen-en-ā] house go-pst-[+fin]
    ‘Having caught a cold, they (dual) went home.’

The issues that need an explanation in (26) are the following:

(i) nām ‘have, get’ is a [+transitive] verb and consequently, the [+transitive] marker –t/d-occurs with the verb. What is crucial to observe is that the notional subject of the embedded clause is PRO, which is not lexically present and which according to standard assumptions is **uncase-marked and ungoverned**. PRO in spite being the notional subject and uncase-marked, triggers agreement on the verb. Here again, the expected agreement pattern is for the subject of the [+transitive] verb to occur either in the preverbal position, or to the right of the [+finite] marker at the end of the sentence. Contrary to the expected pattern, as the embedded predicate is rābāŋ nām ‘cold get’ manifests a physical ailment. Hence, the SAM occurs in the position earmarked for the object due to the phenomenon of agreement reversal.

Note that PRO always invariably occurs only in the subject position of the embedded clause, as it has to be un gover ned and uncase-marked. This shows that the subject of the embedded predicate rābāŋ nām ‘cold get’ is the grammatical subject. In spite of being the subject, it occurs in the slot earmarked for the object. Thus, the occurrence of the subject of a predicate manifesting ailment in the position of PRO provides further support to subjecthood of a predicate manifesting an ailment.
7. Some issues
There is an example where the dual agreement marker *kin* alternates with the plural agreement marker *ko* which we did not find during our field work.

A counter-example to the normal pattern in Santali

27. *iɲ- rin barya boyha menaʔ- kin/ko-*  a
   I-gen two brothers be (loc)-dual/pl- [+fin]  
   ‘I’ve two brothers.’
   (Minegishi & Murmu 2001:151)

Passive sentences too are instances of the non-nominative subject construction, as the logical subject is case-marked by the adposition *by*. An example of the active–passive pair from Santali is given below (28) and (29).

In the active sentence, the verb agrees with the subject. In (28) below, the subject is in 3 singular and hence, the verb carries the 3 person agreement marker (in bold) to the right of the [+finite] sentence marker.

Active

28. *proɲel-* a-* e*
   (he) see- [-fin]-3sg (SAM)
   ‘He’ll see.’

In the passive sentence too, the agreement marker occurs to the right of the [+finite] marker and there is no agreement reversal. The reason for non-reversal is the subject of the passive sentence is also the same, and hence, both (28) and (29) both carry the SAM -e to the right of the [+finite] marker -a-.

Passive

29. *proɲel- ok’-* a-* e*
   (he) see- [-tr]- [-fin]-3sg (SAM)
   ‘He’ll be seen.’
   (Macphail 1974: 37)

We provide below some examples from Ho and Mundari to show that Agreement Reversal takes place in these languages too.

8. Agreement Reversal: The Case of Ho

In Ho too agreement reversal/swapping takes place just as it does in Santali. The following quote from Burrows (1980:86) is illustrative. Burrows labels this as an impersonal construction. “When conjugated impersonally, the pronominal sign [agreement-KVS] denoting the person who experiences the physical or mental condition is inserted in the verb in the same way as the *animate object-sign* [emphasis provided-KVS] of transitive verbs.” (Burrows 1980:86).
In (30) below, the Subject Agreement Marker –iŋ- occurs to the right of the predicate suku ‘please [-transitive]’ in a position that is earmarked for the direct/indirect object.

**Ho —“Impersonal” construction**

30. pro  suku- iŋ- tan- a’
   (it) please-1sg- pres- [+fin]
   ‘It pleases me.’ (Burrows, ibid)

There is a corresponding structure, according to Burrows, which he labels as personal construction. In (31) below, the Subject Agreement Marker –iŋ- occurs to the right of the [+finite] sentence marker –a, as the pre-verbal constituent is pro, which is null.

“Personal construction”

31. pro  suku- tan- a’- iŋ
    please-pres-[+fin]-1 sg
    ‘I’m pleased.’ (Burrows ibid)

In (32) below, the 2 person agreement marker me occurs to the left of the [+finite] sentence marker –a in the object position.

32. giu- ke- d- me- a
    shame (verb)  pst- [+tr]- 2 sg- [+fin]
    ‘It shamed you’ or ‘you were ashamed.’

**9. Agreement Reversal: The Case of Mundari**

Mundari too exhibits Agreement Reversal, just as Santali and Ho do. The following examples are illustrative.

**Mundari**

In (33) below, the predicate manda nam ‘to catch a cold’ manifests a physical ailment and it comes under the domains that we’ve mentioned above. The subject agreement clitic (SAM) occurs in the position of the object agreement clitic in (33) to the left of the [+finite] marker –a.

**Mundari**

33. lum- ja- n- ci manda nam-
    get- wet- [tr]- cpm cold- get-
    ja- ?- np- a
    perf- pst- 1 sg- [+fin]
    ‘As I got wet, I got a cold.’ (Osada 1992:108)
A similar phenomenon is manifested in the following sentences. We’ve marked the SAM occurring in the OAM position in bold.

34. dürum ki- ?- ṭ- a
   sleep- perf- pst- 1 sg- [+fin]

35. reŋg?- ja- ?- ṭ- a ja-
   hungry- perf- pst- 1 sg- [+fin] perf-
‘I am hungry.’ (Osada 1992:109)

A predicate such as happy like many such predicates which express emotions may be used with a [+volitional] interpretation or with a [-volitional] interpretation in South Asian languages. When expressed in the [+volitional] sense, the subject in South Asian languages is in the nominative case, and when expressed in the [-volitional] sense, it is either dative or genitive case in Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages. It appears that Mundari also makes this distinction in terms of volitionality. The data is from Osada (1992: 106). The following sentences form a good syntactic minimal pair.

(36) below is a sentence in which the predicate is [+volitional], and hence, it follows the normal agreement pattern where the SAM occurs to the right of the [+finite] marker.

36. pro suku- le- n- a- ko
   (they) happy- pst- [-tr]- [+fin]- 3 pl
‘They had been happy.’ (1992: 106)

(37) below is a sentence in which the subject is an experiencer and hence, predicate is [-volitional]. With a non-volitional predicate, there is agreement reversal and the 3 person plural agreement marker occurs to the left of the [+finite] marker.

37. pro suku- le- d- ko- a
   (they) happy- pst- [+tr?] 3 pl- [+fin]
‘They had been happy.’ (1992:106)

For the above minimal pair the translation provided by Osada (ibid) however does not reflect this distinction and hence, the interpretations need to be verified. The fact remains that there is agreement Reversal in Mundari too.

10. Conclusion
We’ve discussed a very unique phenomenon concerning agreement reversal in North Munda languages (Santali, Ho, and Mundari) in which the Subject Agreement Marker (SAM) in oblique object constructions occurs not in own canonical position, rather it occurs in the position earmarked for an object, in spite of the fact that the predicate may be [-transitive]. We labelled this phenomenon as Agreement Reversal. We argued that such reversal takes place not due to syntactic principles governing agreement, but due to
thematic/functional criteria due to which the nature of the predicate in a non-nominative subject construction triggers such reversal. We have shown that agreement which is generally viewed in terms of syntactic principles governing constituent structure and is analyzed purely in terms of hierarchical structures invoking the notion of c-command may not be adequate to account for agreement reversal in the North Munda languages. In support of our hypothesis concerning the primacy of thematic/functional criteria, we presented evidence from data concerning kinship constructions in which agreement reversal does not take place in one set of sentences. We’ve shown that when the possessor in kinship is case-marked by the genitive, agreement reversal takes place indicating that syntactic criteria too play a vital role. This, we argue, demonstrates that agreement in the North Munda languages can be accounted for by invoking syntactic as well as thematic/functional criteria.

Notes

1. Some languages of the Naga subgroup of Tibeto-Burman languages too have the NNS construction.
2. There are four languages that we know of where the theme/patient may also be accusative case-marked. These include: Bangla, Assamese, Bodo, Tamil and Malayalam. (See Subbarao 2012: 171-178).
3. There are four languages that we know of where the theme/patient may also be accusative case-marked. These include: Bangla, Assamese, Bodo, Tamil and Malayalam. (See Subbarao 2012: 171-178).
4. See the statement of Deeney 1979:iiiiv about Ho, which is equally applicable to Santali and Mundari too. Kharia too does not exhibit any such difference between nouns, verbs and adjective. See Peterson (2013) for Kharia.
5. The gender distinction in Telugu is between masculine and non-masculine. Feminine and neuter nouns are placed in the category of non-masculine.
6. Kuki-Chin languages have three distinct verbs for be (equational), be (locational) and have.
7. In most of the Indo-Aryan languages and in all Dravidian languages a case-marked NP cannot trigger agreement. See Subbarap 2012 for further details.
9. ŋam ‘get’ also means ‘meet’ and ŋa-pa-m ‘meet1-vrec-meet2’ is the reciprocal form of the verb.
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