

## CORE PARTICIPANT MARKING IN KHUMI\*

David A. Peterson  
Dartmouth College

**Abstract:** In Bangladesh Khumi, core participants (S, A, P, and R) frequently occur with three apparent case markers:  $=l\acute{o}^1$ ,  $=m\acute{o}^3$ , and  $=a^1$ . Examination of these elements' distribution in a large naturalistic text corpus, however, reveals the first two have primarily discourse motivations.  $=l\acute{o}^1$  is a straightforward topic marker.  $=m\acute{o}^3$ , which occurs mainly with A participants, would appear to be an ergative marker, but its distribution is much wider than A, including obliques, adverbials, and even P and S; it is concluded that it has more of a foregrounding function, including some types of focussing.  $=a^1$  is simply an extension of a general Kuki-Chin locative marker, used mostly with animate Ps, but consideration of discourse data shows that use or omission of it may subtly manipulate the individuation of both animate and inanimate Ps.

**Keywords:** Khumi, Foregrounding, Kuki-Chin

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Bangladesh Khumi has around 2,000 speakers representing two dialects in the Chittagong Hill Tracts of southeastern Bangladesh; closely related varieties of Khumi are spoken by much larger communities on the Burma side of the border<sup>1</sup>. Unlike a number of other Kuki-Chin languages, which are described as having ergatively aligned case marking (see, e.g. Chhangte 1993 for Mizo; Peterson 2003a and b for Hakha Lai and Hyow; and So-Hartmann 2009 for Daai), under direct elicitation Khumi has an essentially nominative-accusative and mixed primitive-secundative (Dryer 1986; Haspelmath 2005) case marking system (S/A

---

\* Work on Khumi has been carried out with the support of NSF #BCS-0349021. I am grateful to Lelung Khumi and other members of the Khumi community who have assisted in the research. Thanks also go to the editors and to three anonymous reviewers for useful comments and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> The orthography used here for Khumi differs from systems I have used in the past. Superscript numerals indicate tones. Tones 1-5, as well as the locative tonal variants indicated by 10 and 11 are described in section 2.1, but a full discussion of Khumi tonal alternations is not possible here. In order to limit confusion, the data do not include the details of all alternations: only alternations related to tonal instantiation of the locative category and some other high-frequency alternations (genitive, negative, etc.) are included. Several Khumi vowel phonemes are indicated by means of umlauts, including  $\acute{e}$ , an unrounded front vowel intermediate between [i] and [e],  $\acute{a}$ , which is [æ],  $\acute{i}$ , close to [ɪ], and  $\acute{o}$ , which represents a vowel slightly higher than [ɔ].  $\acute{a}$  represents [ɔ]. For consonants, the only unexpected convention is the use of y rather than j for a palatal glide. ' indicates the short syllable of a sesquisyllabic structure. Numbers following examples indicate location in the text corpus. The text included as an appendix is given a slightly different breakdown from the examples in the paper itself in terms of organization by intonation units rather than by speaker-identified breaks.

is  $\emptyset$ -marked and animate P/R is marked by  $=a^l$ ;  $=l\ddot{o}^l$  is a topic marker, similar in many respects to well-known topic markers like Japanese  $=wa$ . However, when naturalistic data are examined, we find that lexical A participants are quite frequently marked by  $=m\ddot{o}^3$ , approximating the behavior of an ergative marker (cf. Du Bois 1987 on possible motivations for specialized marking of lexical As); there are also complications for the generalization that animate P/R is marked by  $=a^l$ .

This paper will consider these apparent case markers, which at first glance exhibit a high degree of optionality. The study is based on their occurrence in a large text corpus, supplemented by direct elicitation. I will first illustrate the basic elements of the system (section 2), including some necessary remarks about the tonal expression of case. Then, in sections 3 and 4, I will discuss deviations from the elicited patterns in some detail. I will wrap up the paper with a few brief methodological considerations and directions for further research.

To anticipate the conclusions, only  $=a^l$  constitutes case marking for P/R participants, and differential marking at that.  $=l\ddot{o}^l$  and  $=m\ddot{o}^3$  both appear to have much more of a discourse motivation than a case-marking one. Both of them occur with a wide variety of participant types;  $=m\ddot{o}^3$  does approximate an ergative marker, in that As almost always bear it in affirmative clauses, but its uses are far more varied than such a simple designation would imply.

## 2. BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE SYSTEM

### 2.1. $\emptyset$ -marked S/A, $=a^l$ marked P

The basic pattern for marking of S/A vs. P participants can be seen in sentences (1-2), which were directly elicited. Sentence (1), with a  $\emptyset$ -marked S participant, could instead have marking of S by  $=l\ddot{o}^l$ , which we will conclude is a topic marker (cf. Shafer's 1944 characterization of the related element in Khimi), but not of  $=m\ddot{o}^3$ ,<sup>2</sup> which will ultimately be deemed a marker of *foregrounding* (FGR in glosses).<sup>3</sup>

- (1) s'ra<sup>1</sup>            ce<sup>2</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>  
       hill.doctor    go-PFV  
       'The hill doctor left.' (elicited)

Sentence (2), on the other hand, shows  $=a^l$  marking the P participant in a transitive clause; the A participant is unmarked, or can be marked either by  $=m\ddot{o}^3$  or by  $=l\ddot{o}^l$ .

<sup>2</sup> Note that while speakers are resistant to using  $=m\ddot{o}^3$  with S under direct elicitation, the combination does occur in texts, albeit infrequently, as we will see below.

<sup>3</sup> This designation deviates from my earlier treatments of  $=m\ddot{o}^3$  as a focus marker. Many occurrences of this particle would seem to point to its status as a marker of contrastive focus or focal information more generally, as will be seen below, but there are also numerous instances where such functions are absent. Thus, a more unified treatment of it would appear to be as a foregrounding or highlighting device, for which focus is just one possible result.

- (2) s'ra<sup>1</sup>            uy<sup>1</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>            ca<sup>4</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>  
 hill.doctor        dog=LOC        kick-PFV  
 'The hill doctor kicked the dog.' (elicited)

Under direct elicitation, then, the language would appear to have the following associations of the participant marking devices; S:  $\emptyset$  or =l<sup>1</sup>; A:  $\emptyset$ , =l<sup>1</sup>, or =m<sup>3</sup>; P/R: =a<sup>1</sup>.<sup>4</sup>

It is important to note that primary object marking, glossed as LOC in what follows, involves either the segmental marker =a<sup>1</sup> (clearly an extension of a general locative marker with meanings like 'static location', 'allative', 'reason', 'in exchange for', and the like – hence the gloss LOC), or it involves a variant tonal realization on the final syllable of the case-marked word:

CITATION TONE	REALIZATION		LOCATIVE TONE	REALIZATION
1	low falling		10	smooth rising
2	low checked		11	extended high
3	high checked	<i>HAS</i>	11	extended high
4	rising		10	smooth rising
5	high falling		11	extended high

Table 1: Citation tones and corresponding tonal instantiations of locative case

So, for instance, c'nã<sup>4</sup>, which has a rising tone in isolation, has a variant tone 10 (smooth rising) in sentence (3), where it functions as a P participant.<sup>5</sup>

- (3) c'nã<sup>10</sup>        ni<sup>3</sup>=m<sup>3</sup>        p'döy<sup>2</sup>-ka<sup>1</sup>...  
 child.LOC    3S=FGR        kill-AUGVCL  
 'The child, he (the husband) killed...' (21.104b)

There does not appear to be any semantic difference between segmental and suprasegmental realization of locative case, and suprasegmental instantiation of it is highly frequent in natural discourse. As far as I know, either instantiation of locative case is possible in all examples given here, including (3), without any difference in meaning.

Before turning to some text illustrations of these elements, sentences (4-6) reflect a slightly different approach to teasing out the distinctions between apparent case marking options detected through simple direct elicitation. For these elicitations, a context was created, generally involving a response to a

<sup>4</sup> Showing that Khumi has a primitive/secundative object alignment is in fact problematic, especially since the text corpus does not include relevant data. Under direct elicitation, double marking (by =a<sup>1</sup>) of P and R is normal if both P and R are represented by personal names; in other cases, P is marked by =a<sup>1</sup> and the other participant may bear =a<sup>1</sup> or appear in an oblique construction involving a relational noun. Based on these considerations, object alignment is technically mixed.

<sup>5</sup> Khumi has several other morphosyntactic categories which may be marked exclusively by tonal alternations: genitive, negative, irrealis, and imperative.

hypothetical question or statement by an interlocutor; the results indicate possible connections between the occurrence of one or another marker and focus structure (see Lambrecht 1994, Van Valin and LaPolla 1997). Sentence (4), in response to a question like ‘What did the hill doctor do?’, presumably reflects predicate focus, and shows an expected topic-(predicate) focus structure, assuming the designation of  $=l\ddot{o}^l$  as a topic marker is on the right track:

- (4) s’ra<sup>1</sup>(= $l\ddot{o}^l$ )                      biw<sup>2</sup>      ca<sup>1</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>  
 hill.doctor(=TOP)      rice      eat-PFV  
 ‘The hill doctor ate (rice).’ (elicited)

In (4), the focus is on the predicate ‘ate rice’. Next, sentence (5), in response to a question like ‘What happened?’, presumably reflects a sentence focus structure, for which the entire utterance is in focus:

- (5) s’ra<sup>1</sup>=m $\ddot{o}^3$                       biw<sup>2</sup>      ca<sup>1</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>  
 hill.doctor=FGR      rice      eat-PFV  
 ‘The hill doctor ate (rice).’ (elicited)

Finally, sentence (6), in a context where the speaker is contradicting a claim that someone other than the hill doctor ate, given its copular and nominalized elements, appears to be a type of cleft construction yielding a narrow focus structure, where ‘hill doctor’ alone is narrowly focussed.

- (6) mhm<sup>3</sup>,      s’ra<sup>1</sup>=m $\ddot{o}^3$                       tew<sup>2</sup>      ca<sup>1</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>=n $\ddot{o}^3$   
 INTERJ      hill.doctor=FGR      COP      eat-PFV=NR  
 ‘No, it was the hill doctor that ate.’ (elicited)

Besides  $=l\ddot{o}^l$ ,  $=m\ddot{o}^3$ , and  $=a^l$ , which are found mainly with core participants<sup>6</sup>, there are several other case-like elements which will be seen in the subsequent discussion. These include:

- locative (in non-core uses):  $=a^l$  (or tonal marking)
- genitive:  $=\acute{e}^l$  (or tonal marking)
- comitative/instrumental:  $=h\acute{a}y^l$
- *ma* (locative or ablative, depending on tone) and other relational nouns
- other low frequency case markers: e.g.  $=cang^3$  (standard of comparison)

<sup>6</sup> Other than the obligatoriness of core participants with predicates, if only notionally, there are a few aspects of Khumi morphosyntax which distinguish between core participants (=SAPR) and optional peripheral participants. Although it may be omitted, verbal participant coding (glossed AGR) refers only to core participants (see Peterson 2006). Verbal classifiers also generally refer to S and P, but occasionally refer to A. Reference by verbal classifiers to peripheral participants is rare (see Peterson 2008).

## 2.2. =lö<sup>1</sup> topic marking

Consideration of text attestations of =lö<sup>1</sup> indicate that it has no absolute association with any particular grammatical relation, lending support to its characterization as a topic marker. =lö<sup>1</sup> is found in texts marking S participants, as in (7):

- (7) ...am<sup>1</sup>po<sup>1</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    vây<sup>4</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>    nay<sup>11</sup>b'lö<sup>1</sup>  
 father=TOP    return-PFV=REAL    then  
 '...the father returned (home) then.' (28.24)

It also is seen marking A participants (which are themselves marked by =mö<sup>3</sup>), as in (8) and (9)<sup>7</sup>.

- (8) nay<sup>11</sup>b'lö<sup>1</sup>    h'ni<sup>2</sup>    t'ay<sup>1</sup>c'kë<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    p'cöy<sup>2</sup>-lâ<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 then    DEM    red.crab=FGR=TOP    incite-instead=EVID  
 'Then this red crab incited them (monkeys) (to give fruit to a deer).' (33.5)

- (9) nay<sup>11</sup>b'lö<sup>1</sup>    sung<sup>1</sup>ngay<sup>3</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    thuy<sup>3</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>  
 then    wild.boar=FGR=TOP    say-BEN=NR=TOP  
 kay<sup>1</sup>    m'nö<sup>1</sup>    ka-k'lay<sup>3</sup>-thay<sup>3</sup>=mo<sup>4</sup>  
 1S    how    AGR-pay.fine-POT=QUEST  
 'Then what the wild boar said was, "How can I pay a fine?"' (33.49)

Furthermore, sentence (10), where there is tonal locative marking of the P associated with 'kill', shows that =lö<sup>1</sup> can even mark P participants.

- (10) areng<sup>1</sup>    lë<sup>1</sup>'ewng<sup>1</sup>lë<sup>1</sup>kiwng<sup>11</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    acora<sup>2</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>  
 king    Lie'ewngliekiwng.LOC=TOP    government=FGR  
 p'döy<sup>2</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>tla<sup>1</sup>  
 kill-PFV=PST  
 'King Lie'ewngliekiwng, the government killed...' (17.60)

=lö<sup>1</sup> also is found marking straightforward obliques, as in sentence (11):

- (11) jewbo<sup>5</sup>    thiwng<sup>4</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    sewki<sup>1</sup>-'athay<sup>3</sup>    jewbo<sup>5</sup>    kây<sup>4</sup>    süng<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 bag    inside=LOC=TOP    lime-fruit    bag    full    carry=EVID  
 'Inside their bags were limes. They carried bags full of them.' (35.110)

In addition, =lö<sup>1</sup> sometimes has a contrastive sense, where one entity is being compared to another entity in sequence, as seen in (12) and (13).

<sup>7</sup> Sequences of =mö<sup>3</sup> followed by =lö<sup>1</sup>, as in (8) and (9), would appear to involve an even greater degree of "emphasis" (be it focus or foregrounding) than is indicated by =mö<sup>3</sup> alone. It is worth noting that such sequences are not limited to occurrence with As, but also occur with Ss, Ps, and obliques in the available corpus.

- (12) ...vaykhång<sup>5</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    kay<sup>1</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup>    thuy<sup>3</sup>-p'yã<sup>12</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup>  
 tomorrow=TOP    1S=ALSO    say-POT-NEG
- vay<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    kay<sup>1</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup>    ray<sup>1</sup>ta<sup>1</sup>-kang<sup>1</sup>hüng<sup>4</sup>    âm<sup>2</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>  
 now=FGR=TOP    1S=ALSO    tradition-old    stay-IMPV
- ‘...as for the future, I can’t say, but for now, I also keep the old traditions.’  
 (30.36).

- (13) nay<sup>11</sup>b’lö<sup>1</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>    h’ni<sup>3</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    ngam<sup>1</sup>po<sup>10</sup>    pe<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>  
 then=REAL    DEM=TOP    father.LOC    give-BEN
- h’ni<sup>3</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    am<sup>10</sup>    pe<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>  
 DEM=TOP    mother.LOC    give-BEN=NR
- ‘Then this one, she gave to the father, and this one, she gave to the mother...’ (21.80)

### 2.3. =mö<sup>3</sup> marking of A

As already noted, there is a strong tendency for =mö<sup>3</sup> to co-occur with A participants, although we will see that this is not absolute. Considering some of the factors which might be responsible for hypothetical differential A-marking (as identified by Tournadre 1991, LaPolla 2004, Coupe 2007, and Chelliah 2009), A-marking often does occur with a zeroed P/R, as in (14-16). In most of these cases, the occurrence of =mö<sup>3</sup> might be viewed as a result of potential ambiguity resulting from expression of only one of the understood participants; however, the lack of P/R marking (i.e., =a<sup>1</sup>) on the =mö<sup>3</sup>-marked participant would also tend to prevent misunderstanding. In addition, considerations of verbal participant coding, relative animacy, and context in general would appear to make the use of =mö<sup>3</sup> as a role disambiguation device superfluous.

In (14), for instance, taken from the Pear Story text given as an appendix, context makes it fairly clear that it is the three boys who pick up the fruits for the boy on the bicycle who has dropped them and that it is the fruits rather than the children that get picked up. In (15), since in context a man has mentioned that he needs someone to prepare his field, it is clear that some monkeys (represented here by ‘we’) are the ones who will clear it for his benefit, rather than the other way around, and obviously they are the ones clearing the field rather than the field clearing them. Similarly, in (16), since context dictates that the tortoise is up in a tree and the wild boar is tempting fate by taking a mud bath beneath his precariously balanced shell, it is evident that the tortoise falls on the boar.

- (14) khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>co<sup>1</sup>    lewng<sup>5</sup>-thung<sup>5</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>    akhuy<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>-täng<sup>3</sup>  
 child    person-three=FGR    pick.up-BEN-again
- ‘...the three children picked them (the fruits) up (for him) again.’ (46.15)

(15) ...kay<sup>1</sup>cë<sup>5</sup>=mö<sup>4</sup>    vo<sup>2</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>                    atöyng<sup>4</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>                    kay<sup>1</sup>cë<sup>5</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>  
 1P.EXCL=FGR    clear-BEN.IRR=REAL    cut-BEN.IRR=REAL    1P.EXCL=FGR  
 ‘...We’ll clear (it=a field) for (you). We’ll cut (it) for (you)’ (18.48)

(16) tlängm<sup>3</sup>            uy<sup>1</sup>köy<sup>3</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>            tla<sup>1</sup>-hay<sup>3</sup>=b’lö<sup>1</sup>  
 suddenly    tortoise=FGR            fall-APPL=SEQ

sung<sup>1</sup>ngay<sup>3</sup>            döy<sup>2</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>tla<sup>1</sup>  
 wild.boar            die=PST

‘Suddenly the tortoise fell on him, and the wild boar died.’ (10.16)

If we take canonical word order in Khumi to be (S/A)PV, =mö<sup>3</sup> frequently does occur when a sentence exhibits non-canonical word order, as in (17-20). In sentence (17), the P precedes the A. (18) and (19) involve postposing of the P, with or without =a<sup>1</sup> marking. (20) has both A and P postposed. Any one of these factors could be what triggers =mö<sup>3</sup> marking of A in these.

(17) tlängm<sup>3</sup>            k’lay<sup>1</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>                    khây<sup>5</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>            ke<sup>2</sup>-pray<sup>1</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>...  
 suddenly    monkey=LOC            bee=FGR            bite-INTENS=TOP  
 ‘Suddenly the bees bit the monkeys relentlessly...’ (18.122)

(18) tuy<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>            p’-yâ<sup>2</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>                    k’lay<sup>6</sup>                    k’ni<sup>1</sup>  
 water=FGR            CAUS-float=NR            monkey.GEN            blanket  
 ‘The water carried away the monkeys’ blankets.’ (18.137)

(19) yâ<sup>4</sup>            yâ<sup>4</sup>            yâ<sup>4</sup>=b’lö<sup>1</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>            mây<sup>11</sup>tlewng<sup>11</sup>            akhü<sup>4</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>  
 swim    swim    swim=SEQ=REAL            ground.LOC            get.out=REAL

nökha<sup>4</sup>                    tuy<sup>1</sup>nang<sup>10</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>            athew<sup>2</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>            h’ni<sup>3</sup>=ya<sup>1</sup>  
 that.time.LOC            water.spirit=FGR            pull-PFV=REAL=EVID            DEM=LOC

‘He swam and swam and swam, and when he was getting out onto the bank (of the river), a water spirit pulled him (in), this guy.’ (42.131)

(20) hu<sup>1</sup>=ma<sup>1</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>            nay<sup>3</sup>’ë<sup>1</sup>            k’do<sup>3</sup>            a-thew<sup>2</sup>-hay<sup>3</sup>                    kay<sup>1</sup>cë<sup>5</sup>=ya<sup>1</sup>  
 there-ABL=TOP            thus            anger            AGR-come.out-APPL            1P.EXCL=LOC

h’ni<sup>3</sup>-cë<sup>5</sup>=ma<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>  
 DEM-COLL=ABL=FGR

‘So they were angry at us, these ones.’ (17.142)<sup>8</sup>

Examples (21) and (22), however, show that =mö<sup>3</sup> also may occur without zeroed participants and with canonical word order, so it is not possible to identify any absolute correlation between its appearance and one of these factors.

<sup>8</sup> Note also the occurrence of =mö<sup>3</sup> with an obliquely marked participant here; other cases like this will be taken up in section 3.2.2.

(21)  $\text{nay}^3$      $\text{khew}^1\text{s}'\text{uy}^3=\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$      $\text{b}'\text{k}\ddot{\text{o}}\text{ng}^{10}$      $\text{ke}^2\text{-b}\ddot{\text{e}}^4=\text{bo}^3$   
 thus    ant.sp=FGR    small.jungle.fowl.LOC    bite-NEXT=REAL  
 ‘So, these ants bit the small jungle fowl then.’ (33.18)

(22) ... $\text{kh}\ddot{\text{e}}\text{ng}^3\text{-cang}^2=\text{he}^1$      $\text{nang}^6$      $\text{c}'\text{po}^1\text{-c}\ddot{\text{e}}^5=\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$      $\text{kay}^{10}$      $\text{am-p}'\text{kh}\ddot{\text{a}}^2=\text{n}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$ ...  
 look-try=DEIC    2S.GEN    son-COLL=FGR    1S.LOC    AGR-beat=NR  
 ‘... “Look! Your sons have beaten me!”...’ (28.11)

A number of other potential factors, such as volitionality of the A (Coupe 2007) or unexpectedness of the activity (Coupe 2007 and Chelliah 2009), do not appear to be an issue in Khumi. Arguably, foregrounding is already a sufficiently abstract notion to accommodate these senses, as well. That is, if an S volitionally performs an action which is typically non-volitional, or an A unexpectedly performs an action, a language may have a way of drawing the listener’s attention to this status, and making something more explicit to the listener in this way is essentially what foregrounding is.

A further observation about the occurrence of  $=\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$  is that it frequently marks speakers with verbs of speaking (cf. Coupe 2007: 164), as in (23),

(23)  $\text{ca}^1\text{-ne}^1$      $\text{l}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{ng}^{12}\text{-l}\ddot{\text{a}}^3=\text{e}^1=\text{y}\ddot{\text{o}}^1$      $\text{tu}^1\text{nay}^3=\ddot{\text{o}}^1$   
 eat-ELAB (=drink)    enough-NEG=AFFIRM=EMOT    DEM=EMOT  
  
 $\text{h}'\text{ni}^3=\text{cang}^3$      $\text{l}\ddot{\text{e}}\text{ng}^2=\text{n}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$      $\text{a}\text{m}^2=\text{n}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$      $\text{tew}^2$   
 DEM=STAND    big=NR    exist=NR COP  
  
 $\text{n}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$      $\text{p}\ddot{\text{e}}^1\text{-b}\ddot{\text{e}}^4$      $\text{asay}^5=\text{te}^5$      $\text{biw}^1\text{k}'\text{c}\ddot{\text{e}}\text{ng}^1\text{co}^1=\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$   
 QUOT    say-next    do.again=EVID    Biwkciengco=FGR  
 ‘“It’s not enough to eat, that one. There are ones bigger than this one,”  
 said Biwkciengco again.’ (42.59)

or it marks multiple As performing the same action one after the other, as in example (24), which occurs in a sequence describing different As performing the same action.

(24)  $\text{hu}^1\text{ni}^3$      $\text{kang}^{11}\text{kh}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{ng}^1=\text{a}^1$      $\text{tl}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{ng}(\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}})^3$      $\text{c}'\text{pang}^1\text{b}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{ng}^{11}\text{to}^1=\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$   
 DEM    end=LOC    suddenly    C'pangbuengto=FGR  
  
 $\text{khy}^2=\text{te}^5$      $\text{bang}^{11}\text{s}\ddot{\text{e}}^1$      $\text{c}'\text{k}\ddot{\text{a}}^1\text{-vuy}^3=\text{bo}^3=\text{te}^5$   
 do=EVID    half.fathom    jump.up.to.eat-PFV=REAL=EVID  
 ‘After that, suddenly Cpangbuengto did it, he jumped up and ate a half-fathom’s length of it (a large beehive.)’ (42.70)

In the text preceding and following (24), other participants performing the same action were themselves marked with  $=\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}}^3$  in turn. In both of these types of

use, =*mö*<sup>3</sup> typically would appear to have the discourse function of reactivating semi-active (in the sense of Chafe 1994) participants: entities which were already established as given at some prior point in the discourse, but which have not been as recently referred to compared to some other participant(s).

Finally, it is especially noteworthy that =*mö*<sup>3</sup> often has contrastive nuances, as in (25-26), where the =*mö*<sup>3</sup> marked participants are contrastively (narrowly) focussed in the relevant contexts. In (25), a woman has discovered that she has left a ring behind, and her husband says that he will go back to fetch the ring rather than sending his wife to retrieve it.

- (25) j<sup>1</sup>vo<sup>4</sup>=*mö*<sup>3</sup>      kay<sup>1</sup>=*mö*<sup>3</sup>      la<sup>10</sup>...  
 husband=FGR    1S=FGR      take.IRR  
 ‘(Her) husband said, “I’ll [as opposed to someone else] get (=take) it...”’  
 (21.15)

In (26), the speaker is contrasting what happens when divorce is due to the husband’s desire to end the marriage rather than the wife’s.

- (26) nay<sup>11</sup>b<sup>1</sup>l<sup>ö</sup><sup>1</sup>      newm<sup>11</sup>co<sup>1</sup>=*mö*<sup>3</sup>      ngay<sup>12</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup>=*nö*<sup>3</sup>      nay<sup>11</sup>b<sup>1</sup>l<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>  
 then                    man=FGR                    want-NEG=NR                    then  
  
 vang<sup>11</sup>nu<sup>5</sup>      sung<sup>3</sup>      han<sup>1</sup>tang<sup>1</sup>      ång<sup>2</sup>      a<sup>1</sup>cē<sup>5</sup>      khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>6</sup>=l<sup>ö</sup><sup>1</sup>  
 bride.price      lose      as.much.as      exist      1P.INCL      Khumi.GEN=TOP  
  
 tuy<sup>1</sup>vi<sup>11</sup>      a<sup>5</sup>=p<sup>ö</sup><sup>1</sup>                    sung<sup>3</sup>  
 spear                    chicken=ALSO      lose  
 ‘Then, if it’s *the man* [as opposed to the woman] who doesn’t want (his wife), then he loses the bride price, as much as remains. That’s how it is in our Khumi (culture). He also loses the spears and chickens.’ (30.43)

Hence, although there are uses clearly tied to the indication of focus, we have seen that this is not the only role =*mö*<sup>3</sup> plays, such that a more neutral characterization of it as a foregrounding device is perhaps more fitting.

#### 2.4. =*a*<sup>1</sup> marking of animate P/R

The basic observation to make about the distribution of =*a*<sup>1</sup>, as seen in text material, is that animate Ps or Rs are generally marked by it, or its tonal equivalent, seen in (27-30) and in numerous previous examples.

- (27) nang<sup>1</sup>      nang<sup>10</sup>      kang-ca<sup>1</sup>=he<sup>1</sup>  
 2S                    2S.LOC                    AGR-eat.IRR=DEIC  
 ‘ “ I’m going to eat you!” ’ (21.33)

(28) vay<sup>1</sup> biw<sup>2</sup> tlē<sup>4</sup>-pē<sup>1</sup> ö<sup>1</sup> ni<sup>11</sup> co<sup>5</sup> may<sup>11</sup>phu<sup>1</sup> tlē<sup>4</sup>-pē<sup>1</sup>  
 now rice wrap-BEN yes 3S.LOC rice ashes wrap-BEN

ang<sup>1</sup> t'pā<sup>3</sup>-pē<sup>1</sup> sang<sup>1</sup>-kång<sup>2</sup> t'pā<sup>3</sup>-pē<sup>1</sup>-bē<sup>4</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 curry pack-BEN hair-lock pack-BEN-NEXT=EVID

‘Now she packed rice for her, yes, for her, in place of rice she packed ashes, and in place of curry, she packed locks of hair.’ (22.20)

(29) ...nga<sup>1</sup> kha<sup>5</sup> ami<sup>10</sup> pe<sup>1</sup>=lew<sup>4</sup>  
 get time.LOC who.LOC give=INTERR

pakistang<sup>1</sup> mang<sup>2</sup> ko<sup>1</sup>la<sup>11</sup> a<sup>2</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>  
 Pakistan king Bangali.LOC present-PFV

‘...when they won, who did they give (us) to? They presented us to the king of Pakistan, to a Bangali.’ (17.186)

(30) ...ha<sup>1</sup>-rē<sup>10</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup> alu<sup>11</sup>,ala<sup>1</sup> rewn<sup>1</sup> thiwn<sup>10</sup> va<sup>3</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 one-NUM.LOC=TOP itchy.leaf garden inside.LOC throw-IMPV=EVID

ha<sup>1</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup> alē<sup>2</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>11</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup> süng<sup>3</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup> nö<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 one=TOP return-IMPV one.LOC=TOP bring.along-IMPV QUOT=EVID

‘... “One (girl) they threw into an itchy leaf garden. One went back. The other one they took along,” she said.’ (24.116a)

While these examples do not rule out the possibility that there are gaps in this marking due to animacy hierarchy considerations, no such gaps have been detected. Example (27) involves a first person A acting on a second person P, and the others all involve third person participants of one sort or another ((20) and (22) involved third person A and first person P participants).

In addition, it is worth mentioning that (27) begins with a bare second singular pronoun, which the speaker changes to a case marked one, realizing this marking is required. Likewise in (29), it appears the speaker originally did not include locative marking of the R participant (*the king of Pakistan*), but then changed the expression of the R (*a Bangali*), where he included the marking.<sup>9</sup>

Inanimate Ps, on the other hand, as seen in (31) and (32), generally lack =a<sup>1</sup>:

(31) ...e<sup>1</sup>ke<sup>1</sup> nga<sup>1</sup>-ra<sup>4</sup> p'tiw<sup>1</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 AK.47 get-REAS catch=NR=EVID

e<sup>1</sup>ke<sup>1</sup> e<sup>1</sup>ke<sup>1</sup> jiwng<sup>5</sup>-nüng<sup>2</sup> nga<sup>1</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 AK.47 AK.47 CL-two get=EVID

‘They caught him because he had gotten an AK-47. He had gotten AK-47s, two AK-47s.’ (45.29)

<sup>9</sup> Alternatively, two noun phrases in apposition are involved here, and just the second one is given locative marking.

- (32) hu<sup>1</sup>=ma<sup>4</sup>    may<sup>1</sup>khü<sup>1</sup>    thew<sup>1</sup>-lew<sup>2</sup>    thew<sup>1</sup>-lew<sup>2</sup>=b'lö<sup>1</sup>    nay<sup>11</sup>b'lö<sup>1</sup>  
 there=LOC    smoke    come.out-FAR    come.out-FAR=SEQ    then  
 a<sup>1</sup>cë<sup>5</sup>    hu<sup>1</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup>    avang<sup>2</sup>    tē<sup>1</sup>-pyā<sup>12</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup>=mi<sup>1</sup>  
 1P.INCL    there=LOC    village    establish-POT-NEG=DUB  
 ‘Smoke came out far away there. It came out and we (thought) then,  
 maybe we can’t establish a village there...’ (17.57a)

### 3. DEVIATIONS FROM THE DOMINANT PATTERN FOR =MÖ<sup>3</sup>

Next, we move on to a consideration of some deviations from the observations made so far for the distribution of =mō<sup>3</sup>. We will see that =mō<sup>3</sup> appears to be rare in conjunction with negative predicates, lending support to an analysis of it as an A marker (since As of negative predicates are technically not agentive). However, we will also see that =mō<sup>3</sup> does not occur everywhere we expect it to otherwise, it can readily be omitted, and it also occurs in an array of contexts that simply do not make sense if its basic function is A-marking.

#### 3.1. =mō<sup>3</sup> absent for lexical A

First, there appears to be a tendency for =mō<sup>3</sup> to be absent with the As of negative predicates. For example, in (33), the predicate *süng*<sup>3</sup> ‘bring, carry’, which in a number of affirmative contexts elsewhere in the corpus has an A marked by =mō<sup>3</sup>, does not have such marking for its A (*the two daughters*).

- (33) ni<sup>3</sup>    c'niw<sup>3</sup>    nüng<sup>2</sup>=nō<sup>3</sup>    nay<sup>11</sup>b'lö<sup>1</sup>    nipew<sup>3</sup>    süng<sup>12</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 DEM    daughter    two=NR    then    carry.cloth    bring.NEG-EVID  
 ne<sup>3</sup>=yö<sup>1</sup>    ne<sup>3</sup>=yö<sup>1</sup>    angdo<sup>3</sup>-täng<sup>3</sup>=rây<sup>3</sup>=ö<sup>1</sup>  
 mother=EMOT    mother=EMOT    stand.up-again=still=EMOT  
 bā<sup>4</sup>    ni<sup>1</sup>lo<sup>4</sup>    üng<sup>1</sup>=ma<sup>4</sup>    la<sup>1</sup>-rây<sup>3</sup>=ö<sup>1</sup>    n'=pē<sup>1</sup>  
 younger.sibling    cloth    house=LOC    take-still=EMOT    QUOT=BEN  
 ‘The two daughters, then, hadn’t brought along a baby carrying cloth, and she (the elder daughter) said, “Mother, oh mother please stand up again, little sister’s baby carrying cloth, take (her) home, please.” ’ (5.76)

This absence with negated predicates suggests that while it does not obligatorily mark As, =mō<sup>3</sup> at least requires a relatively high level of agentivity, which does not exist for actions that are not performed. However, while =mō<sup>3</sup> does appear to be disfavoured with As in negative clauses, there are several examples in the available corpus where it *does* occur with them (for instance, see example (26)). Zero-expression of participants where possible is the norm throughout the corpus, and negative clauses are in the minority overall; lexical A expressions with negated predicates are thus also rare anyway. In (26), and at least some of the other attested cases, =mō<sup>3</sup> appears to have a fairly strong (contrastive) focal

nuance to it, but it remains to be seen whether this generalization will be borne out for a larger corpus.

### 3.1.1. =mō<sup>3</sup> expected but absent

There are also numerous other places in naturally occurring discourse where we would expect =mō<sup>3</sup> to occur, if it were in fact an A marker, but it fails to occur. For instance, in (34), the A is *the teachers from the school*, which occurs in a non-canonical afterthought position, and since the P/R participant is also zeroed, there seems to be plenty of motivation for explicitly marking the A here. Yet, it shows no marking. Note that there also appear to be no animacy-hierarchy motivations for the presence or absence of =mō<sup>3</sup> here. If such effects were relevant, it would be unsurprising that the ogre woman in (35) does not have =mō<sup>3</sup> marking (where there is a clear animacy differential between her and the cloth she is making), but the absence of marking on the third person teachers in (34) would be unexpected, given the first person P participant.

(34) m<sup>1</sup> kyewng<sup>10</sup> lüng<sup>11</sup>=nō<sup>3</sup> p'lä<sup>2</sup>-ü<sup>5</sup>,ü<sup>5</sup>=nō<sup>3</sup> tew<sup>2</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>  
 yeah school.LOC go.up.IRR=NR call-ITER=NR COP=REAL

kyewng<sup>1</sup>=ma<sup>6</sup> masto<sup>1</sup>-cē<sup>5</sup>  
 school=ABL.GEN teacher-COLL

‘Yeah, they’ve called (me) to attend the school repeatedly, the teachers from the school.’ (45.178)

(35) pung<sup>2</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>=b'lō<sup>1</sup> amu<sup>1</sup>-ampo<sup>1</sup>-cē<sup>5</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup> lä<sup>1</sup> ce<sup>1</sup> ati<sup>3</sup>=b'lō<sup>1</sup>  
 marry-IMPV=SEQ mother-father-COLL=TOP field go etc.=SEQ

nē<sup>1</sup>na<sup>1</sup> sa<sup>1</sup> ati<sup>3</sup> h'ni<sup>3</sup> uy<sup>1</sup>miw<sup>3</sup>-nu<sup>1</sup>  
 cloth make etc. DEM ogre-woman

‘They married, and the mother and father went to the field, and so on, and this ogre woman made cloth, and so on.’ (21.65)

Next, (36) and (37) involve a verb of speaking, but the speaker is not marked by =mō<sup>3</sup>, in contrast with the frequent examples of such marking seen earlier.

(36) nay<sup>11</sup>b'lō<sup>1</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup> k'lay<sup>1</sup>-cē<sup>5</sup> lä<sup>11</sup>ya<sup>5</sup> kay<sup>1</sup>=ē<sup>1</sup> j'vo<sup>4</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup>  
 then=REAL monkey-COLL poor.thing 1S=GEN husband=LOC

va<sup>8</sup> kay<sup>1</sup>=ē<sup>1</sup> j'vo<sup>4</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup> va<sup>8</sup> nay<sup>3</sup>  
 throw.IMPER 1S=GEN husband=LOC throw.IMPER QUOT

s'sa<sup>2</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>=yō<sup>1</sup>...  
 all=EVID=EMOT

‘Then, the monkeys, poor things, all said “Throw my husband! Throw my husband!”...’ (18.208)

- (37)  $n\acute{e}^1na^1$      $sa^1$      $ati^3=b'l\acute{o}^1$     (å)     $l\acute{a}^1may^1nu^1$      $nang^1ni^7akho^1=\acute{e}^1$   
 cloth    make    etc.=SEQ    widow    2D.GEN    enclosure=GEN
- $angtho^1$      $k'dew^1$      $khe^1=ksi^3$      $kay^1=ba^5$      $n\acute{o}^3=te^5$   
 rozelle    tip    break=HORT    1S=EMOT    QUOT=EVID
- ‘She made cloth and so on, and the widow said to her “Let me break some tips of the rozelle inside your enclosure.” ’ (21.66)

### 3.1.2. Other places where =MÖ<sup>3</sup> could be left out

While I have not been able to investigate the possibility exhaustively for the text corpus, I have regularly inquired as to the omissibility of = $m\acute{o}^3$  when it occurs in texts. For example, we have seen naturally occurring instances of = $m\acute{o}^3$  in sentences (15), (17), and (22) above, but speakers judge it to be optional in these contexts. It is clear that either = $a^1$  marking of a P or the animacy differential between lexically expressed participants would help to disambiguate the = $m\acute{o}^3$  marked participants as As anyway in most of these cases.<sup>10</sup>

### 3.2. = $m\acute{o}^3$ marking S

A further indication that = $m\acute{o}^3$  is not strictly an A marker is that it also is found in conjunction with S participants (e.g. (38-40)), although this is generally not the case under direct elicitation.

- (38)  $lewng^5=m\acute{o}^3$      $p'th\acute{a}y^3$      $lewng^5=m\acute{o}^3$      $p'th\acute{a}y^3$      $lewng^5=m\acute{o}^3$      $p'th\acute{a}y^3$   
 person=FGR    spit    person=FGR    spit    person=FGR    spit
- $lewng^5=m\acute{o}^3$      $p'th\acute{a}y^3$      $lewng^5=m\acute{o}^3$      $p'th\acute{a}y^3=te^5$   
 person=FGR    spit    person=FGR    spit=EVID
- ‘Someone spit, another person spit, another person spit, another person spit, another person spit.’ (21.56)<sup>11</sup>

- (39)  $m'n\acute{o}^1nay^3ra^4$      $alang^2-c\acute{e}^5$      $an\acute{e}^2$      $kha^{10}$      $py\acute{a}^4-thay^3=n\acute{o}^3$   
 why    other-COLL    wrestle    time.LOC    win-POT.NEG=NR
- $kay^1=m\acute{o}^3$      $ce^2-ya^1$   
 1S=FGR    go-IRR
- “‘Why are the others unable to win when they wrestle? I’ll go.’ ” (42.21)

<sup>10</sup> An anonymous reviewer notes that many of these instances involve either plural or collective A participants and suggests that this may be a motivation for the lack of A marking. In fact, as shown in (35), (37), and by many other examples already seen where a plural or collective nominal bears = $m\acute{o}^3$  (10, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22), this is not a decisive factor. Moreover, given the few attested A-marking splits based on number and similar categories, we would actually expect As marked with the collective (or non-singulars) to *require* A-marking in such a system, while singular As might not require it. See Peterson 2003b for a rare number-based ergative case-marking split in a different Kuki-Chin language, Hyow.

<sup>11</sup> Alternatively,  $lewng^5=m\acute{o}^3$  may be lexicalized to express ‘someone else’ or ‘another person’, which would account for its apparent use with S here.

- (40) thuy<sup>3</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=mab'lö<sup>1</sup>    nökha<sup>10</sup>    kung<sup>2</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>    ni<sup>3</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>  
 say-BEN=ANT    that.time.LOC    go.inside-IMPV    3S=FGR  
 ‘After she said it she went inside.’ (33.110)

In such cases, there is almost always a clear contrastive nuance involved for the =mö<sup>3</sup>-marked S participant.

### 3.3. =mö<sup>3</sup> in other uses

Even more suggestive that =mö<sup>3</sup> is not exclusively an A marker is the occurrence of =mö<sup>3</sup> with participant types *other* than S and A.

#### 3.3.1. marking P

=mö<sup>3</sup> can in fact occur on P participants, as seen in (41-43). Examples (41) and (42) come from a sequence in which some brothers encounter an ogre who is stealing mice from their spring-pole traps. In (41), the ogre asks whether the brother in question prefers that she (the ogre) eat the brother or the mice. (42), on the other hand, is the response to a similar question posed to the youngest brother, who somewhat later in the narrative is the only brother brave enough to confront the ogre.

- (41) ...nang<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>11</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>    kang-ca<sup>1</sup>    hây<sup>3</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
 2S=FGR.LOC=OR    AGR-eat    good=QUEST  
 p'ju<sup>10</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>    ca<sup>1</sup>    hây<sup>3</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
 mouse.LOC=OR    eat    good=QUEST  
 ‘... “Is it good for me to eat *you*, or good (for me) to eat the *mice*?” ...’  
 (28.57)
- (42) ...vay<sup>1</sup>ni<sup>4</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    kay<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>11</sup>    co<sup>2</sup>    nö<sup>3</sup>    pë<sup>1</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>...  
 today=TOP    1S=FGR.LOC    eat.IMPER    QUOT    BEN=EVID  
 ‘... “Today eat *me!*” he said, ...’ (28.67)

In both of these cases there is a clear contrastive focal sense (*you* vs. *the mice* in (41) and *me* vs. *the mice* in (42)). (43) also involves emphasis of some sort, but it is not contrastive in the same fashion; note that the =mö<sup>3</sup>-marked NPs in (43) also bear the element =pö<sup>1</sup>, which has a clear focal use in addition to simply meaning ‘also’<sup>12</sup>.

- (43) mâng<sup>1</sup>kây<sup>3</sup>    mang<sup>2</sup>    kha<sup>1</sup>    ayö<sup>1</sup>    âm<sup>2</sup>-thay<sup>12</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 Mawngkawy    king    time    dear    exist-POT-NEG=EVID

<sup>12</sup> Note further that here there is a clear sense of unexpectedness or surprise at the extreme behaviour of the king, bringing to mind the nuances mentioned by Coupe 2007 and Chelliah 2009, although here it is not A-marking that is involved, but rather P-marking.

sung<sup>1</sup>-sung<sup>1</sup>yang<sup>1</sup>=m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>=p<sup>ö</sup><sup>1</sup>    kew<sup>3</sup>    a<sup>1</sup>luy<sup>5</sup>=m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>=p<sup>ö</sup><sup>1</sup>    kew<sup>3</sup>  
 mortar-pestle=FGR=ALSO    gather    cock=FGR=ALSO    gather

tho<sup>1</sup>däng<sup>1</sup>-ang<sup>1</sup>lo<sup>5</sup>=m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>=p<sup>ö</sup><sup>1</sup>    kew<sup>3</sup>    äng<sup>2</sup>-thay<sup>12</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 bachelor-girl=FGR=ALSO    gather    exist-POT-NEG=EVID

mäng<sup>1</sup>kây<sup>3</sup>    mang<sup>2</sup>    bi<sup>4</sup>=n<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>  
 Mawngkawy    king    hot=NR

‘(In) King Mawngkawy’s time, my dear, (people) couldn’t stand it, they say. He gathered the mortars and pestles [as tribute], he gathered the chickens, he gathered the young men and women. People couldn’t stand it, they say. King Mawngkawy was so angry.’ (17.67)

### 3.3.2. marking obliques or adverbials

It is also possible for various types of oblique to be marked by =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>. For instance, (44) shows an ablatively marked entity further cliticized by =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>.

- (44) ...a<sup>1</sup>cë<sup>5</sup>=ma<sup>1</sup>=m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>    vay<sup>1</sup>    dha<sup>1</sup>ka<sup>1</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    d’ka<sup>2</sup>    n<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>    pë<sup>1</sup>  
 1P.INCL=ABL=FGR    now    Dhaka=TOP    D’ka    QUOT    BEN  
 ‘...what we now call Dhaka we called D’ka.’ (17.79a)

Cases where an overtly oblique element receives =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup> marking are relatively rare; it is more common for temporal ((45) and (46)) and other adverbial (e.g. ‘therefore’ in (47)) expressions to receive marking by =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>.

- (45) h’ni<sup>3</sup>    düng<sup>5</sup>=m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>    ce<sup>2</sup>-r<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 DEM    night=FGR    go-INCEPT=REAL-EVID  
 ‘They went that very night.’ (18.125)

- (46) nökha<sup>10</sup>=m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>    lä<sup>11</sup>=y<sup>ä</sup><sup>2</sup>=he<sup>1</sup>    nang<sup>1</sup>    më<sup>1</sup>tewng<sup>4</sup>...  
 that.time.LOC=FGR    run.away=URG=DEIC    2S    old.person  
 ‘At that time, (he said), “Run away, you old lady...” ’ (42.117)

- (47) ...pe<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=y<sup>ä</sup><sup>3</sup>    nay<sup>3</sup>ra<sup>4</sup>=m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup>    pe<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>-bë<sup>4</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>  
 give-BEN=URG    therefore=FGR    give-BEN-IMPV-next=REAL=EVID  
 ‘“...Give it (for us)!” they said, so, he gave it to them.’ (18.148)

In a few cases, =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup> occurs with idiomatic adverbial expressions and true adverbs, as seen in (48-50). In (48), *atho*<sup>4</sup> *thew*<sup>1</sup>, literally ‘strength emerges’ is an idiom which means to ‘leave in defiance’, and =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup> attaches to the more adverbial portion of it. Example (49) begins with the adverbial element *tläng*<sup>5</sup>*mö*<sup>3</sup> ‘suddenly’, which has a lexicalized occurrence of =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup> (usually not fully pronounced, but instead fused into a final coarticulated bilabial-velar nasal.)

- (48) ...lang<sup>3</sup> lang<sup>2</sup>-hay<sup>12</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup> atho<sup>4</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup> thew<sup>1</sup> nang<sup>1</sup>cë<sup>4</sup>  
 establish establish-CAUS-NEG strength=FGR go.out 2P  
 ‘... “We’ve established!” “We don’t allow you! You went out in defiance.”’ (17.134)
- (49) ...tlängm<sup>3</sup> a’ung<sup>4</sup> prä<sup>4</sup>-thla<sup>1</sup>=te<sup>5</sup>=’ë<sup>10</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>  
 suddenly gourd grow-AUGVCL=EVID=and=REAL  
 vung<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup> kangay<sup>11</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup> a’ung<sup>4</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup> prä<sup>4</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup> prä<sup>4</sup>-rö<sup>3</sup>  
 night-NUM within=FGR gourd=ALSO grow=ALSO grow-INCEPT  
 athay<sup>3</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup> athay<sup>2</sup>-rö<sup>3</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup> k’thew<sup>1</sup>pakho<sup>1</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup>  
 bear.fruit=also bear.fruit-INCEPT=NR doorway=LOC  
 ‘...Suddenly a gourd plant grew, and within one night, this gourd grew and bore fruit at the doorway.’ (24.162)

The data in (50) show =mö<sup>3</sup> attached to a different adverbial.

- (50) m’nay<sup>3</sup> vay<sup>11</sup>vay<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup> a<sup>1</sup>töyng<sup>11</sup>kya<sup>1</sup> m’nö<sup>1</sup>  
 how suddenly=FGR suddenly how  
 kã<sup>3</sup>-thay<sup>3</sup>-kha<sup>5</sup>=’ü<sup>4</sup>  
 know.how-POT-RHET.QUEST=EMOT  
 ‘How could they suddenly be able to (speak Chakma)?’ (45.129)

Note again that these last two examples carry a nuance of unexpectedness, especially in the case of the magical gourd plant of (49). In (50), the unexpectedness is more hypothetical, such that the speaker would be surprised if the two girls he is referring to were suddenly able to speak Chakma, a variety of Chittagonian Bangla spoken by a different indigenous group of the Hill Tracts.

### 3.3.3. Summary for =mö<sup>3</sup>

To sum up, =mö<sup>3</sup> most commonly marks A participants, but does not always appear to have a disambiguating role or correlate with departures from a canonical APV word order or other conditions which have been suggested in the case of optional agent marking for Tibeto-Burman languages (see LaPolla 2004). =mö<sup>3</sup> would also not appear to be a true A marker because it sometimes (inexplicably) fails to occur with A participants, and it may occur with all manner of things besides As. Given that it also often has contrastive nuances associated with it, we conclude that it is best to regard it as a kind of foregrounding marker. Incidentally, =mö<sup>3</sup> is pretty clearly related to Khumi’s reflexive element -mö<sup>3</sup>.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> At the workshop on optional case-marking in Tibeto-Burman languages, held at the 16<sup>th</sup> annual Himalayan Languages Symposium in London, I suggested that the direction for grammaticalization was probably from reflexive to foregrounding element, but Scott DeLancey contended that the opposite was more likely. It does appear that the recognized grammaticalization path is foregrounding/focus (or intensive reflexive) > reflexive (see, for

#### 4. DEVIATIONS FROM THE DOMINANT PATTERN FOR =A<sup>l</sup>

There are also deviations from the usual pattern seen above for =a<sup>l</sup> marking of P and R participants, although here the picture is at least typologically more straightforward than for =m<sup>ö</sup><sup>3</sup> marking.

##### 4.1. =a<sup>l</sup> absent with animate P/R

The tendency seen for =a<sup>l</sup> earlier was that animate P/Rs receive marking, and inanimates do not. In fact, there are a number of cases attested in the corpus where the P/R is animate, but =a<sup>l</sup> marking does not occur, such as (51-53). Given everything we have seen up to this point, we would expect P marking to occur on *aju<sup>l</sup>-cnä<sup>4</sup>*, *lä<sup>l</sup>may<sup>l</sup>nu<sup>l</sup>*, and *khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>l</sup>* in each of these.

- (51) *nay<sup>11</sup>'ë<sup>1</sup> aju<sup>l</sup>-c'nä<sup>4</sup> la<sup>l</sup> kha<sup>10</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup>...*  
 thus wife-child take time.LOC=ALSO  
 'So, also when you take a wife...' (30.58)

- (52) *hu<sup>l</sup>-wa<sup>l</sup> lä<sup>l</sup>may<sup>l</sup>nu<sup>l</sup> avung<sup>4</sup>*  
 there=LOC widow meet  
 'There they met a widow' (15.55)

- (53) *vay<sup>l</sup> anö<sup>1</sup> vayco<sup>11s</sup>'nöyng<sup>1</sup>vayco<sup>11s</sup>'nöyng<sup>1</sup> atiw<sup>3</sup> kha<sup>10</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>*  
 now like last.year last.year fight time.LOC=TOP  
*m'nay<sup>3</sup>-ra<sup>4</sup>=lew<sup>5</sup> khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>l</sup> aläng<sup>2</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup> atiw<sup>3</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=bä<sup>5</sup>*  
 how-REAS=INTERR person compete.for=NR fight=NR=EMOT  
*höy<sup>1</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup> ne<sup>4</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>=l'o<sup>5</sup>*  
 DEM=TOP correct=QUEST=TAG  
 'Like now, in the past when they would fight, why? They were competing for people. They fought. That's right isn't it?' (17.192)

It will be noted that none of the animate Ps in these are definite, although the referent in (52) is specific. Now compare example (54), where the =a<sup>l</sup>-marked participant is definite and given, and extensive identifying language (Chafe 1994) is used to further anchor it.

---

instance, Heine and Kuteva 2002). However, given that languages like Hakha Lai have the element fossilized both in their neutral independent pronominal forms and in reflexive-like elements (specifically, Lai's independent reciprocal pronouns), multiple senses for this element-reflexive and emphatic-seem to be fairly archaic, and working out a definitive argument for direction of development is not straightforward.

- (54) k'tu<sup>1</sup>-c'nä<sup>4</sup>-cë<sup>5</sup>=ya<sup>1</sup>                      thuy<sup>3</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup> m'nö<sup>1</sup>-m'nö<sup>1</sup>    thuy<sup>3</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>  
 grandchild-child-COLL=LOC    say-BEN=NR    how-how                      say-BEN=NR
- vay<sup>1</sup> kay<sup>1</sup>cë<sup>5</sup>    m'nay<sup>3</sup>-m'nay<sup>3</sup>    amyö<sup>2</sup>    kamta<sup>1</sup>    hây<sup>3</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=mo<sup>4</sup>    angöy<sup>1</sup>  
 now    1P.EXCL    how-how                      various    new    good=NR=QUEST    unite
- hây<sup>3</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=mo<sup>4</sup>    amrây<sup>4</sup>                      hây<sup>3</sup>-nö<sup>3</sup>=mo<sup>4</sup>    khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-cë<sup>5</sup>  
 good=NR=QUEST    live.peacefully    good-NR=QUEST    person-COLL
- ang-yew<sup>1</sup>-hây<sup>1</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>                      khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-cë<sup>10</sup>                      thuy<sup>3</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>-cang<sup>2</sup>=khö<sup>11</sup>'lö<sup>1</sup>  
 AGR-come-TOGETHER=NR    person-COLL.LOC    say-BEN-try=COND
- 'Now (it would be good) if you could tell your children and grandchildren, people, the people who have come together, what kind of things would be good for us now, whether it will be good to be unified and live peacefully.' (30.50)

On this basis, then, despite the strong tendency for animate P/R to be marked by =a<sup>1</sup>, it may be omitted in order to indicate a low level of individuation or definiteness.

#### 4.2. =a<sup>1</sup> present with inanimate P/R

For a handful of predicates (e.g. *krö*<sup>2</sup> 'watch over', *ciw*<sup>2</sup> 'step on', possibly *khëng*<sup>1</sup> 'look at'), it would appear all P/Rs must be marked by =a<sup>1</sup>, regardless of animacy considerations, as seen in (55) and (56).

- (55) s'khi<sup>4</sup>=yo<sup>5</sup>    nang<sup>1</sup>    vay<sup>1</sup>ni<sup>4</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup>    pä<sup>4</sup>  
 deer=VOC    2S                      today=TOP    pay.fine
- nang<sup>1</sup>    ama<sup>11</sup>kangliwng<sup>5</sup>-athay<sup>11</sup>    m'nö<sup>3</sup>    ciw<sup>1</sup>-thay<sup>3</sup>  
 2S                      white.pumpkin-fruit.LOC    how    step-POT
- '“Deer, today you pay. How could you step on the white pumpkin?”' (33.78)
- (56) tuy<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>    tuy<sup>1</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>                      krö<sup>6</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup>-ra<sup>1</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup>=ö<sup>1</sup>  
 water=FGR    water=LOC                      take.care-NEG-REAS=ALSO=EMOT
- tuy<sup>1</sup>                      hây<sup>12</sup>-lä<sup>3</sup>-ra<sup>1</sup>=pö<sup>1</sup>=ö<sup>1</sup>  
 water                      good-NEG-REAS=ALSO=EMOT
- 'The water, it's because they aren't taking care of the water. It's because the water isn't good.' (45:14)

It is not yet clear whether any significant generalizations can be made about classes of predicates which require such marking. In fact, it turns out that most bivalent predicates allow either =a<sup>1</sup> or  $\emptyset$  marking of inanimate Ps, under the right conditions, as seen in (57-59).

- (57)  $\text{nay}^3\text{'\ddot{e}}^1$   $\text{n\ddot{o}kha}^{10}$   $\text{thuy}^3\text{-p\ddot{e}}^1$   $\text{c\ddot{o}yng}^1\text{l\ddot{a}ng}^3=\text{'o}^5$   
 thus that.time.LOC say-BEN tailor.bird =VOC  
 $\text{nang}^1$   $\text{kay}^1=\text{'\ddot{e}}^1$   $\text{vay}^{11}\text{ci}^1$   $\text{kang-t'viw}^2=\text{n\ddot{o}}^3$   $\text{lew}^2=\text{a}^1$   
 2S 1S=GEN before AGR-speak=NR word=LOC  
 $\text{kay}^1$   $\text{lew}^{11}$   $\text{nang}^1$   $\text{k\ddot{a}yng}^6\text{-l\ddot{a}}^3=\text{n\ddot{o}}^3\text{tla}^1$   
 1S.GEN word.LOC 2S listen-NEG=PST  
 ‘So, then she said, “ Oh, tailor bird, you didn’t listen to my words, what I said to you before.’ (33.126)

- (58)  $\text{...vay}^{11}\text{ci}^1=\text{'\ddot{e}}^1$   $\text{athiwng}^{11}$   $\text{p'n\ddot{o}}^{12}\text{-l\ddot{a}}^3=\text{n\ddot{o}}^3=\text{p\ddot{o}}^1$   $\text{\ddot{a}m}^3$   
 before=GEN custom.LOC know-NEG=NR=ALSO exist  
 ‘...there are also those who don’t know the customs from before.’ (13.1)

- (59)  $\text{lu}^1\text{kh\dd{u}ng}^5$   $\text{tla}^1\text{-yo}^3$   $\text{h'ni}^3$   $\text{lu}^1\text{kh\dd{u}ng}^{11}$   $\text{akhuy}^1$   
 hat fall-IMPV DEM hat.LOC pick.up (46.19)  
 ‘His hat had fallen. They picked up this hat.’ (46.18-19)

In all of these cases, there is a high degree of specificity or individuation to the inanimate P in their given contexts, so this would appear to be an important factor conditioning use of  $=a^1$  with them. However, not all instances of specific/identifiable inanimate Ps receive such treatment, as, for example, in (60), where the ring in question is highly referential (in terms of referential distance) due to repeated references to it in the immediately preceding discourse context.

- (60)  $\text{nay}^{11}\text{b'l\ddot{o}}^1$   $\text{j'vo}^4=\text{l\ddot{o}}^1$   $\text{mu}^1\text{ku}^2$   $\text{kuy}^{11}\text{s'b\dd{u}}^1$   $\text{la}^{10}$   $\text{t\dd{a}}^1\text{-yo}^3=\text{bo}^3\text{...}$   
 then husband=TOP gold ring take.IRR go-IMPV=REAL  
 ‘Then her husband went to get the golden ring...’ (21.16)

Example (61) would appear to be an instance where the speaker first utters the inanimate P, ‘this country’ without  $=a^1$  marking, but then decides in the afterthought that it is appropriate to mark such a specific entity with  $=a^1$ , despite its inanimacy.

- (61)  $\text{\ddot{o}}^1$   $\text{h'ni}^3$   $\text{an\ddot{o}}^1$   $\text{h'ni}^3$   $\text{pr\dd{e}}^1$   $\text{ang-a}^2=\text{n\ddot{o}}^3$   $\text{tew}^2=\text{ba}^5$   
 yes DEM like DEM country AGR-present=NR COP=EMOT  
 $\text{phay}^1\text{lewng}^2=\text{m\dd{o}}^3=\text{ba}^5$   $\text{a}^1\text{c\dd{e}}^{12}$   $\text{pr\dd{e}}^1=\text{ya}^1$   
 English=FGR=EMOT 1P.INCL.GEN country=LOC  
 ‘Yes, like this, they gave us this country, the British, our country.’  
 (17.197)

This example also is noteworthy as the predicate has an understood recipient participant, as indicated by the participant coding, *ang-*, in the first line. Thus, R is coded by this agreement, but the P is given  $=a^1$ -marking.

### 4.3. places where =*a*<sup>l</sup> is judged possible for inanimate P/R

There are a number of places in the corpus where speakers failed to use =*a*<sup>l</sup> with specific inanimates, but it was judged that use of =*a*<sup>l</sup> would sound fine in the given contexts. For instance, the stone that the demonstrative anaphor in (62) refers to is mentioned in the immediately preceding clause and is thus quite active in the minds of the listeners, but the speaker did not include =*a*<sup>l</sup> here.

- (62) nay<sup>11</sup>b'lö<sup>1</sup> h'ni<sup>3</sup> khewng<sup>2</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=döyng<sup>1</sup>day<sup>5</sup>=lö<sup>1</sup> niw<sup>1</sup>-vuy<sup>3</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>  
 then DEM lift=NR=after=TOP see-PFV=REAL  
 'Then, after they lifted this (a stone) up, they saw her.' (33.121)

### 4.4. Summary for =*a*<sup>l</sup>

In summary then for =*a*<sup>l</sup>, the marker tends strongly to mark animate P/R participants. In terms of grammaticalization source, it is clearly an extension of a general locative/goal marker, with widely attested Kuki-Chin reflexes, to P/R via R goal marking. =*a*<sup>l</sup> may be left out when speakers want to convey a sense of genericity or indefiniteness for an animate P, which normally would be marked. =*a*<sup>l</sup> may also be used with inanimates, especially if they've achieved a high level of activation in a text, and especially if they're associated with identifying language, like demonstratives, possessors, relative clauses, etc.

## 5. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Before reviewing the conclusions of the investigation, a few methodological observations are in order.

In general, there is a tendency for =*m*ö<sup>3</sup> to be absent in procedural texts. In addition, =*a*<sup>l</sup>-marking in procedural texts is rare as it marks specific entities, but in procedural texts, the entities involved tend not to be specific. This is an interesting result in and of itself, but it also means that texts of this sort are less likely to provide crucial cases showing the kinds of distinctions that appear to be important. Narratives, historical accounts, and, of course, face-to-face conversations are the most instructive text types for sorting out the behaviour of elements like the ones under consideration here.

Alongside examination of these sorts of texts, direct elicitation based on the texts, looking at apparent deviations from dominant patterns in detail and questioning consultants about additional possibilities and what semantic or pragmatic differences a different coding option would involve are also highly useful.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the importance of mistakes, recasts, and self-repair, as well as side-conversations between narrators and their audience in clarifying the functions of markers. Several examples cited above, involving just such sorts of repair or clarification (e.g. 27, 29, 61, and possibly 56), yielded crucial insights into the functioning of these problematic case or case-like elements.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The basic designation of the system which we began with (nominative-accusative and mixed primitive-secundative) based on direct elicitation holds, although it is substantially obscured in natural discourse by two factors: differential occurrence of  $=m\ddot{o}^3$ , primarily with A participants, to indicate a particular foregrounded discourse status or focus; and differential occurrence of  $=a^1$ , primarily to indicate a relatively high or low degree of individuation or specificity for P participants.

In closing, the areal distribution of systems of A-marking fundamentally similar to this one is extensive, including at least Ao (Coupe 2007) and Meithei (Chelliah 2009), and presumably many other languages. It is easy to see how a cursory examination of a language like Khumi might lead to a characterization of its case-marking as essentially ergative, especially in light of the overall impression that ergativity is widespread in Kuki-Chin. Thus, we need to work to ensure that claims of such case marking systems, be they rigid or fluid in nature, are well-supported and documented in the first place, and to formulate an account for the widespread “optional” A-marking type seen in languages like Khumi.

### ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person	IMPFV	imperfective
2	second person	INCEPT	inceptive
3	third person	INCL	inclusive
ABL	ablative	INTENS	intensive
AFFIRM	affirmative	INTERJ	interjection
AGR	agreement	INTERR	interrogative
ANT	anterior	ITER	iterative
APPL	applicative	IRR	irrealis
AUGVCL	augmentative verbal classifier	LOC	locative
BEN	benefactive	NEG	negative
CAUS	causative	NUM	numeral building element
CL	classifier	NR	nominalizer
COLL	collective	OBLIG	obligative
COND	conditional	P	plural
CONTEMP	contemporaneous	PFV	perfective
COP	copula	POT	potential
DEIC	deictic	PST	past
DEM	demonstrative	QUEST	question
DIM	diminutive	QUOT	quotative
DUB	dubitative	REAL	realis
ELAB	elaboration (in an elaborate expression)	REAS	reason
EMOT	emotive	RHET	rhetorical
EVID	hearsay evidential	SEQ	sequential
EXHAUST	exhaustive	S	singular
EXCL	exclusive	STAND	standard of comparison
FGR	foregrounder	TAG	tag (question)
GEN	genitive	TOP	topic
HORT	hortative	URG	urging
IMPER	imperative	VOC	vocative

## APPENDIX

- (1) khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup> lewng<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup>  
 person CL-NUM
- (2) ni<sup>3</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup> lu<sup>4</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup> lu<sup>1</sup>khüng<sup>5</sup> ha<sup>1</sup> ång<sup>3</sup>  
 3S=FGR.GEN head=LOC hat one exist  
 ‘One person, his head had a hat on it.’
- (3) n’b’lö<sup>1</sup>  
 and
- (4) k’new<sup>4</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
 neck=LOC
- (5) (ö) kam<sup>1</sup>sa<sup>1</sup>-cö<sup>1</sup> ha<sup>1</sup> ång<sup>3</sup>  
 uh towel-DIM one exist  
 ‘And around his neck he had a (small) handkerchief.’
- (6) h’ni<sup>3</sup> khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>  
 DEM person
- (7) öyng<sup>1</sup>kewng<sup>1</sup> lëng<sup>2</sup>-kamo<sup>4</sup>-nay<sup>3</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
 tree big-INTENS-NR=LOC
- (8) (ö) khö<sup>11</sup>’le<sup>1</sup> ha<sup>1</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup> t’håwy<sup>2</sup>=’ë<sup>10</sup>  
 uh ladder one-NUM lean=AND
- (9) lüng<sup>3</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>  
 cimb.up-IMPFV  
 ‘This person, leaned a ladder against a very big tree, and climbed up.’
- (10) ni<sup>3</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>=’ë<sup>1</sup> p’liwng<sup>4</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
 3S-FGR=GEN heart=LOC
- (11) p’liwng<sup>4</sup> tang<sup>5</sup>=a<sup>1</sup> jew<sup>1</sup>bo<sup>5</sup> ha<sup>1</sup> t’va<sup>1</sup>-kriw<sup>1</sup>  
 heart exactly=LOC bag one carry-AUGVCL  
 ‘Across his chest, right across his chest he carried a (big) bag.’
- (12) hu<sup>1</sup> jew<sup>1</sup>bo<sup>5</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup>  
 DEM bag=LOC
- (13) p’ceng<sup>3</sup> p’ceng<sup>3</sup> p’ceng<sup>3</sup> p’ceng<sup>3</sup> athay<sup>3</sup>  
 put.inside put.inside put.inside put.inside fruit  
 ‘Into that bag he put, put, put, put fruit.’

- (14) p'ceng<sup>3</sup>-cung<sup>5</sup>=b'lö<sup>1</sup> s'tla<sup>1</sup>  
 put.inside-FINISH=SEQ descend  
 'He finished putting (them) in and came down.'
- (15) hu<sup>1</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup>  
 there=LOC
- (16) ay<sup>1</sup>tläng<sup>1</sup> k'tång<sup>2</sup> ång<sup>3</sup>  
 basket like exist  
 'There, there was (a basket) like a men's carry basket.'
- (17) h'ni<sup>3</sup> ay<sup>1</sup>tläng<sup>1</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
 DEM basket=LOC
- (18) ay<sup>1</sup>tläng<sup>1</sup> nüng<sup>2</sup> thung<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup> p'ce<sup>3</sup>- (a)  
 basket two three-NUM put.inside- (er)
- (19) kãwy<sup>4</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup> h'ni<sup>3</sup> athay<sup>3</sup> s'sa<sup>2</sup>  
 full=REAL DEM fruit all  
 'Into this basket, two or three, he put-, er, were full of this fruit, only.'
- (20) kãy<sup>4</sup>='ë<sup>10</sup> hu<sup>1</sup>=wa<sup>1</sup>  
 full=AND DEM=LOC
- (21) (a)  
 uh
- (22) khay<sup>2</sup>-s'su<sup>1</sup>  
 leave-AUGVCL
- (23) oeyng<sup>1</sup>kewng<sup>1</sup> ka<sup>1</sup>nuy<sup>1</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
 tree bottom=LOC  
 'They were full and there, uh, he kept a lot of them, under the tree.'
- (24) khay<sup>2</sup>-su<sup>1</sup>=ma<sup>1</sup>b'lö<sup>1</sup>  
 leave-AUGVCL=ANT
- (25) khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup> lewng<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup>  
 person-child one-NUM
- (26) say<sup>1</sup>kel<sup>1</sup> mewng<sup>3</sup>-t'rây<sup>5</sup> jew<sup>1</sup>  
 bicycle drive-CONTEMP come  
 'He kept them there, and then a boy came riding a bicycle.'
- (27) jew<sup>1</sup>= 'ë<sup>10</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>  
 come=AND=REAL

(28) hu<sup>10</sup>            tōng<sup>4</sup>=b'lö<sup>1</sup>  
 DEM.LOC    arrive=SEQ

(29) h'ni<sup>3</sup>  
 DEM

(30) ay<sup>1</sup>tlēng<sup>1</sup>  
 basket

(31) nūng<sup>1</sup>        thung<sup>5</sup>-rē<sup>1</sup>        kǎwy<sup>4</sup>=nō<sup>3</sup>  
 two            three-NUM        full=NR

(32) (e)    ha<sup>1</sup>-rē<sup>1</sup>        la<sup>1</sup>='ē<sup>10</sup>=ya<sup>1</sup>  
 uh    one-NUM    take=AND=LOC

(33) ay<sup>1</sup>tlēng<sup>1</sup>    ha<sup>1</sup>-rē<sup>1</sup>        la<sup>1</sup>='ē<sup>10</sup>=ya<sup>1</sup>  
 basket        one-NUM        take=AND=LOC

ni<sup>3</sup>=mō<sup>7</sup>        say<sup>1</sup>kel<sup>1</sup>        tang<sup>1</sup>=b'lö<sup>1</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>        t'ko<sup>3</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>  
 3S=FGR.GEN    bicycle        put=SEQ=REAL        go-IMPV

(34) khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup>  
 person-child

'He came, and arriving there, these two or three full baskets, he took one, he took one basket, put (it) on his bicycle and left, the child.'

(35) t'ko<sup>3</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>=b'lö<sup>1</sup>  
 go-IMPV=SEQ

(36) t'na<sup>1</sup>=b'lö<sup>1</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>        ni<sup>3</sup>=mō<sup>3</sup>        mo<sup>5</sup>=ma<sup>4</sup>        khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup>  
 pass=SEQ=REAL        3S=FGR.GEN        front=LOC        person-child

(37) ha<sup>1</sup>-rē<sup>1</sup>        jew<sup>1</sup>-bē<sup>4</sup>  
 one-NUM    come-NEXT

(38) say<sup>1</sup>kel<sup>1</sup>        mewng<sup>3</sup>-t'rāy<sup>5</sup>  
 bicycle        ride-CONTEMP

'He left, and after a while, in front of him a child came riding a bicycle.'

(39) ni<sup>3</sup>-    ni<sup>7</sup>        öhāy<sup>5</sup>        tōm<sup>4</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>        n'b'lö<sup>1</sup>=ho<sup>1</sup>        ni<sup>3</sup>='ē<sup>1</sup>  
 3S    3S.GEN    side        arrive=LOC        then=DEIC        3S=GEN

(40) s- (ö)    say<sup>1</sup>kel<sup>1</sup>        tlewng<sup>5</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
                  bicycle        top=LOC

(41) (ö)

- (42) ni<sup>3</sup>  
3s
- (43) kây<sup>1</sup>yay<sup>3</sup> athay<sup>3</sup> âng<sup>2</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>  
guava fruit exist=NR
- (44) kây<sup>1</sup>yay<sup>3</sup> athay<sup>3</sup> bây<sup>11</sup>bây<sup>2</sup> (ö) tla<sup>1</sup>-püng<sup>1</sup>  
guava fruit all fall-EXHAUST  
'When she arrived alongside him, on top of his bicycle, the guavas that were there, all of the guavas fell down.'
- (45) tla<sup>1</sup>-püng<sup>1</sup>=’ë<sup>10</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>  
fall-EXHAUST=AND=REAL
- (46) hu<sup>10</sup> khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup> lewng<sup>5</sup>-thung<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup> ado<sup>3</sup> ni<sup>3</sup> teng<sup>10</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
DEM.LOC person-child person-three-NUM stand 3s near=LOC  
'After they had fallen, three boys appeared beside him there.'
- (47) khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup> lewng<sup>5</sup> thung<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup> jew<sup>1</sup>=’ë<sup>10</sup>  
person-child person three-NUM come=AND
- (48) khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup> lewng<sup>5</sup>-thung<sup>5</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>  
person-child person-three=FGR
- (49) akhuy<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>-täng<sup>3</sup>  
pick.up-BEN-again
- (50) p’ceng<sup>3</sup>-  
put.inside
- (51) p’ceng<sup>2</sup>-p-  
put.inside-BEN
- (52) p’ceng<sup>2</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>-täng<sup>3</sup> ay<sup>1</sup>tlëng<sup>1</sup> thiwng<sup>4</sup>=a<sup>1</sup>  
put.inside-BEN-AGAIN basket inside=LOC  
'These three boys came and, and the three boys picked them up for him again, they put them inside for him, put them inside the basket for him again.'
- (53) nay<sup>11</sup>b’lö<sup>1</sup> ni<sup>3</sup>  
then 3s
- (54) say<sup>1</sup>kel<sup>1</sup> tang<sup>1</sup>=’ë<sup>10</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup> t’ko<sup>3</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>  
bicycle put=AND=REAL go-IMPV  
'Then after he had put them on his bicycle, he set off.'

- (55) bäng<sup>1</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup>      t'ko<sup>3</sup>=b'lö<sup>1</sup>  
 half-NUM      go=SEQ
- (56) h'ni<sup>3</sup>      hu<sup>10</sup>      amlë<sup>2</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=ra<sup>10</sup>  
 DEM      there.LOC      fall=NR=PLACE.NR.LOC
- (57) lu<sup>1</sup>khüng<sup>5</sup>      t'më<sup>2</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>  
 hat      forget-IMPFV  
 'After he had gone a ways, there, where he had fallen down, he had forgotten his hat.'
- (58) lu<sup>1</sup>khüng<sup>5</sup>      tla<sup>1</sup>-yo<sup>3</sup>  
 hat      fall-IMPFV  
 'His hat had fallen.'
- (59) h'ni<sup>3</sup>      lu<sup>1</sup>khüng<sup>11</sup>      akhuy<sup>1</sup>  
 DEM      hat.LOC      pick.up
- (60) h'ni<sup>3</sup>      khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup>      lewng<sup>5</sup>-thung<sup>5</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>  
 DEM      person-child      person-three=NR=FGR
- (61) lewng<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup>  
 person-NUM
- (62) lewng<sup>5</sup>-thung<sup>5</sup>=nö<sup>3</sup>      thiwng<sup>4</sup>='ë<sup>1</sup>      lewng<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup>=mö<sup>3</sup>      akhuy<sup>1</sup>= 'ë<sup>10</sup>=ya<sup>1</sup>  
 person-three=NR      inside=GEN      person-NUM=FGR      pick.up=AND=LOC  
 lu<sup>1</sup>khüng<sup>5</sup>      pe<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>-täng<sup>3</sup>  
 hat      give-BEN-again  
 'They picked up this hat, these three boys, one of them, (and) after one of the three boys had picked it up, he gave the hat to him again.'
- (63) pe<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>= 'ë<sup>10</sup>  
 give-BEN=and
- (64) h'ni<sup>3</sup>      khu<sup>11</sup>mi<sup>1</sup>-co<sup>1</sup>      käng<sup>2</sup>= 'ë<sup>10</sup>=bo<sup>3</sup>  
 DEM      person-child      happy=and=REAL
- (65) kây<sup>1</sup>yay<sup>3</sup>      athay<sup>3</sup>  
 guava      fruit
- (66) athay<sup>3</sup>      thung<sup>5</sup>-rë<sup>1</sup>      pe<sup>1</sup>-pë<sup>1</sup>  
 fruit      three-NUM      give-BEN  
 'He gave it to him and this child was happy and he gave three guavas to them.'

## REFERENCES

- Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chelliah, Shobhana. 2009. Semantic role to new information in Meithei. In Jóhanna Barðal and Shobhana Chelliah (eds.), *The role of semantics, pragmatics, and discourse in the development of case*, 377-400. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chhange, Lalnunthangi. 1993. Mizo syntax. Eugene: University of Oregon Ph.D. dissertation.
- Coupe, A. R. 2007. *A grammar of Mongsen Ao*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dryer, Matthew. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antitativity. *Language* 62(4).808-845.
- Du Bois, John W. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. *Language* 63(4).805-855.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2005. Argument marking in ditransitive alignment types. *Linguistic Discovery* 3(1).1-21.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LaPolla, Randy. 2004. On nominal relational morphology in Tibeto-Burman. In Ying-jin Lin, Fang-min Hsu, Chun-chih Lee, Jackson T.-S. Sun, Hsiu-fang Yang, and Dah-an Ho (eds.), *Studies on Sino-Tibetan languages: Papers in honor of Professor Hwang-cherng Gong on his seventieth birthday*, 43-74. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Peterson, David A. 2003a. Hakha Lai. In Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*, 409-426. London: Routledge.
- Peterson, David A. 2003b. Agreement and grammatical relations in Hyow. In David Bradley, Randy LaPolla, Boyd Michailovsky, and Graham Thurgood (eds.), *Language variation: Papers on variation and change in the Sinosphere and in the Indosphere in honour of James A. Matisoff*, 173-183. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics/ANU.
- Peterson, David A. 2006 [2002]. On Khumi pronominal agreement morphology. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Special Session) 28.99-110.
- Peterson, David A. 2008. Bangladesh Khumi verbal classifiers and Kuki-Chin 'chiming'. *LTBA* 31(1).109-138.
- Shafer, Robert. 1944. Khimi grammar and vocabulary. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11(2).386-434.
- So-Hartmann, Helga. 2009. *A descriptive grammar of Daai Chin*. Berkeley: STEDT monograph 7.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1991. The rhetorical use of the Tibetan ergative. *LTBA* 14(1).93-105.

Van Valin, Robert and Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.