BOOK REVIEWS

Review of *Korku Language: Grammar, Texts and Vocabulary*, by K.S. Nagaraja, Institute for the Study of Languages of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 1999, 336 pages.

Reviewed by Norman H. ZIDE
University of Chicago, USA

1. Introduction

Nagaraja has written the first fairly comprehensive grammar of the Korku language since Drake's work of 1903. It includes 172 pages of glossed texts which no previous linguist has made available. Anyone interested in the Korku language will have to consult it.

Korku is a North Munda language spoken in several non-contiguous areas in central India, in south central Madhya Pradesh and the adjacent parts of Maharashtra (Vidarbha). It is the westernmost of the Munda languages, and thus the westernmost language of the vast Austroasiatic phylum. The North Munda family branches into Korku and Kherwarian. Kherwarian includes the languages with by far the largest populations of any of the Munda languages. According to the 1981 Census (quoted by Nagaraja) there are more than 300,000 Korkus, most of them, presumably, (still) speaking Korku. The North Munda languages with sizable populations – more than 200,000 – (besides Korku these are Santali, Ho, and Mundari) have increased in population and in number of speakers. The languages with small populations (e.g. Korwa and Turi in North Munda, and apparently, all the South Munda languages in Orissa and northern Andhra, (big (Sora) and small (Gutob, Gorum (Parenga), etc.) have been losing speakers for some time. Arlene Zide (personal communication) noted that in 1963, speakers of Gorum of middle age (c 40) spoke the language natively, but were equally fluent in the Indo-Aryan Desia (Oriya), and many preferred to use that at home. The language of these speakers had many more lexical replacements than that of the older generation. Gregory Anderson (personal communication) reported that a group of young Gorum adults he met in 2005 knew no Gorum at all.

There are important aspects of Korku that are not treated in the grammar; for example sociolinguistic matters are not discussed. Fifty years ago everyone in the Melghat Korku villages spoke Korku as a first language, and most adults – almost all of the men – were bilingual (in some variety of

Hindi or Marathi – or both). One would like to know whether this is still true – and that the children speak Korku as their first, and in their early years, their only language – in the villages near Chikhaldara where Nagaraja's informants came from. Fifty years ago in Zide's Dharni (Amravati District) villages, Hindi songs had become popular at the expense of Korku songs, particularly among the men, but less so among the women.

Although four of the linguists have worked on Korku – Drake, Girard, Zide, and Nagaraja – it is unfortunate that none have done comparative work on the easternmost dialect of Korku, Mowasi (Mawasi). Based on the little in the Linguistic Survey of India, I anticipate that new and interesting material would come out of any examination of Mowasi. What little we know of Betul, and Hoshangabad Korku, and Mowasi is found in the old (1906) fourth volume of the Linguistic Survey of India. S. Bhattacharya did work briefly on several Korku dialects, including Mowasi (in 1958), but all there is of Mowasi in print that I have seen are a very few lexical attestations in his comparative vocabularies, and very brief mentions in his 'Studies in Comparative Munda Linguistics', but no (contrastive) description of it. Zide's few days of work with a (Lahi) Hoshangabad informant turned up notable differences, e.g. the complete absence of the dual, phonological differences (the predicator is /-ò/, not Melghat /-bà/), and some differences in verb morphology, e.g. the presence of a 'confirmative construction', and a few instances of subject suffix agreement in transitive verbs. (Nagaraja notes a few in his data.) D.S. Dwivedi, at one time teaching at Sagar, published two papers on Korku that Nagaraja lists in his bibliography, but I have been unable to see these papers. It is quite possible he worked on Hoshangabad or Betul Korku. There are interesting dialect chain-like features extending across all of North India, from northern Orissa to eastern Maharashtra (e.g. in the demonstratives).

The book covers segmental phonology, phonotactics, and morphology and basic syntax in an 'old-fashioned' (nineteen sixties) model of grammar, and provides texts for twelve tales totaling more than one hundred and fifty pages of texts, wide-spaced pages with interlinear word by word, and – usually – morpheme by morpheme translation as well, with a translation of each sentence, though the latter is unidiomatic and sometimes uninterpretable. Although both Girard and Zide recorded and transcribed texts, none of these texts was published, so we are grateful to Nagaraja for his extensive text material. Girard had the advantage of recording women speakers as well as men, something the others did not – and could not – do. The only other full treatment of Korku ('Kurku') grammar published is Drake's 1903 volume, which is difficult to find. Drake's grammar uses the traditional Latin and Greek grammatical terms and concepts. He knew the language well. His book is thorough and well organized. His is the least known and appreciated of the three substantial North Munda language grammars of the early twentieth century: Hoffman's for Mundari (1903) and Bodding's for Santali (1923, 1929) are the others; both Hoffmann and Bodding build on their predecessors' work. All three of these men were foreign missionaries, Drake English, Hoffmann German, and Bodding Norwegian, and they represented different Christian denominations.

The other, more recent and more limited, studies of topics in Korku grammar, those of Girard and Zide, were published in more restricted and less accessible forms: Zide's as an American dissertation, Girard's dictionary with an appendix on grammar as a mimeographed book in India. Neither is easily obtainable. Several papers by Zide were published in journals, festschrifts, and – for the numerals – a small monograph. One should also note Dwivedi's two papers – in Indian journals apparently unavailable in American libraries.

Nagaraja's study presents his own work, data collected and analyzed by himself in considerable detail. He has very little to say about the data and analyses of others, and some of what he does say is inaccurate. What he says about Pinnow's views on the passive is misleading, and when he says that Zide finds 'a lack of glottalized stops', this is not just mistaken, but the opposite of what Zide says and discusses in detail in his dissertation (which is listed in Nagaraja's bibliography). He does note that Zide finds tone in Korku, which he – Nagaraja – does not. This is important. See the section on phonology following this one. It is not clear that he has seen all the works mentioned in his bibliography. In his earlier bibliography he listed Korku papers that were announced but never written as if, in fact, they were extant papers.

Any comparisons, different analyses, comments, material supplementing and contrasting with the data and analyses of the other Korku scholars will therefore have to be made by others. (See below.) Nagaraja shows little interest in diachronic linguistics or sociolinguistics, although he includes as an appendix a list of Mundari cognates for about 300 Korku forms. His Korku has borrowed heavily from (mostly) Hindi, but Nagaraja does not, in his glossary, mark loanwords and indicate their sources. There is a great deal of influence of Hindi in morphology and syntax as well, but Nagaraja, although he is aware of this, only rarely mentions such borrowings.

This review discusses various topics under the heads Phonology, Morphology, and Language Change, and there are some miscellaneous remarks at the conclusion of the review.

2. Phonology

This reviewer was particularly interested in what Nagaraja had to say about phonology, his analyses being based on data from the two informants from a Chikhaldara village that he worked with. He – Zide – wrote a dissertation with detailed sections on phonetics and phonology. Nagajara's descriptions and analyses were disappointing. He lists the dissertation in his bibliography but it is not clear that he read it, and if he did, he has nothing to say about the detailed analyses there, many of them very different from his own. Except for one important matter, he did not find a tone distinction. (Zide found two tones, unmarked high, and low.) I was particularly interested in dialect differences in low-toned lexemes, but since Nagaraja looked for low tone and did not find – hear? – it, he can provide no such data. He suggests instrumental phonetic analysis would be a good idea. I agree. Nevertheless, I am fairly certain that Nagaraja is wrong to state that, for instance, verbs with

initial vowel lack overt (phonologically marked) reduplication. Reduplication is a complicated matter: in my dissertation I described it at some length – and for all (several) of my informants, a verb like (intransitive) /iraʔ/, 'to return', has as its reduplicated form (transitivizing it in this case) /iìraʔ/. Similarly /higra/, 'to fear, be afraid', and /hiìgra/.

For anyone interested in reconstructing Proto-Munda (or Proto-North Munda), writing – hearing – /Do(:)/[1] – which is equivalent to /Do/ – for 'put. keep', and not /Doò/ – equivalent to /Doho/ – prevents us from seeing the correspondence – the kinds of correspondences there are – roughly – between Korku /Doho/, Kherwarian /DOhO/ and South Munda /DVko/. The semantics – 'put, keep' – are borrowed from Hindi, and do not represent the older – Proto-Munda – meanings of */DVkO/.

There are many words in Korku, most of them loanwords from Hindi, with long – double – vowels, e.g. /raato/, 'night', where the double – long – (high tone) vowel sequence contrasts with the double high-low tone vowel sequence, as in the verb 'to return' noted above, and also in borrowings from Hindi with /h(V)/ in the second syllable, e.g. Hindi /peh(V)laa/, written *pahlaa*, 'first, previous', Korku /peèla/. So I question his transcription – hearing – of the forms where I find low tone, and of length as well. (He sometimes writes length for examples of both of the above-mentioned double vowel sequences, sometimes not.) And I have doubts about his recording of glottal stop as well. The correspondences between Girard, Zide, and Nagaraja with regard to glottal stop are not systematic, but look erratic. I am less sure of his mishearing here. There is variation in certain words as they occur in different dialects and idiolects, sometimes found with and sometimes without final glottal stop.

His transcription of juncture phenomena is also, I think, questionable. He writes as one unit what the other linguists write as two phonological units – words (e.g. Number Noun, Adjective Noun, Demonstrative Noun) – not following up the implications for the syntax of such analyses. I do not hear, e.g. /ini koro/, 'this man' as Nagaraja's /inikoro/, if word junctures are defined – marked – in the usual ways. I have many other disagreements with Nagaraja at this level, but – enough.

3. Morphology

Nagaraja dedicates his book to the memory of his teacher, H.S. Biligiri, but he lacks the interest and skill in morphological analysis of Biligiri (see, for instance, Biligiri's elegant analysis of the Sora verb). He will come up with dubious morphemes, e.g. the verb stem infixes – one example of each – that he identifies, and makes as much of an unsurprising assimilation, /jophe/ (Z /jophèʔ/ for the expected */jomkhèʔ/, – /jom-/ 'to eat', /-ki/ intensive mode, /-èʔ/ 'transitive past') – as he does for the interesting, unexpected – archaic – examples of /jom-/ taking, in the transitive past, *subject*- and not object-

[1]For dentals, capital letters indicated retroflexion.

marking pronominal suffixes. But he does find and identify such forms, unlikely though they seem. /jom-/ is the only verb that he has found exhibiting such suffixation, and he finds it only with the Mode suffix /-ña/ (from /-ya/?, or is this a different (and not noted elsewhere) Mode suffix which switches pronominal suffixation from object to subject?) and in the three forms [jom-ña-piñ-ba] 'will eat (dual)', presumably second person dual. [jom-ña-lañ-ba] 'will eat (pl.)' – i.e., first person inclusive plural, and [jom-ña-ki-mi-ba], 'will eat, probably first person'. Nagaraja finds /-mi-/, for other linguists only used for second person singular, used, usually, for first person singular as well. The sequence of two Mode suffixes (/-ña/ and /-ki/) in a verb form is rare, and ought to have been noted. Nagaraja avoids questions of morphemic identity and meaning – e.g. of /-ya-/ and /-ki/ in the different tense systems by not analyzing them out in the first place. But he does point out nice semantic distinctions between the morpheme complexes /-yen/ and /-ken/ (Zide [-ya-en] and [-ki-en]), the /-en/ being the intransitive past), the former being a more remote past, the latter a (very) recent past, or even indicating an action not completed (compare /kulyen/ and /kulken/, both 'sent').

The questionable phonetics noted under Phonology leads to wrong analyses in the morphology. Even if his glottal stop-less transcriptions do accurately represent what his informants say, a simpler analysis would show the /g/ (in his /-g-àʔ/ and /-g-èn/) as part of the noun stem, and not providing additional genitive /-àʔ/ or locative /-èn/ allomorphs. The genitive has the basic allomorph /-àʔ/, and the locative /-èn/ – no /g/ allomorphs – but there is vowel sandhi whereby the vowel in these affixes is lost – the previous noun-final vowel being retained; thus there are allomorphs /-ˋʔ/ and /-ˋn/, with, additionally, for the former, the glottal stop being lost in non-final (phrase-final or sentence-final) position, the allomorph /ˆ/ i.e. low tone, that being the only mark of the genitive in these cases, and that, too, is lost in the (comparatively small number of) nouns where the final syllable is already low. Nagaraja states that there is a zero genitive where its noun ends in a final vowel, i.e. the genitive is homonymous with the nominative. If in fact the low tone is lost – which seems possible but unlikely since this would lead to a genitive identical with the nominative in such cases, and other complications, although context would usually indicate the genitivity – then there is homonymy; otherwise – with the low tone not lost – the sandhi retracts the low tone – the indication of genitivity – to the previous noun-final vowel. Thus /dadu-àʔ/ 'Dadu (name)-genitive', 'Dadu's' > /dadùʔ/ which then can become /dadù/, the final glottal stop of the affix being lost nonfinally, i.e. phrase- or sentence-medially.

There are a few examples in Nagaraja (and Girard as well) of the locative for 'in the house' being /uran/ (Zide uràn ?) instead of the usual – older – /uragèn/. Presumably for some speakers 'house' is now /ura/ and no longer /uraʔ/, and the genitive is regularized to accord with the current form.

Missed as well are such allomorphic alternations – presumably there, but not heard – not distinguished – by Nagaraja as (from the verb /koòñ/, infinitive /kokhòñ/, 'to call') //koòñ-/, occurring before suffixes with initial vowel and /koñ-/, occurring before verb suffixes with initial consonants, but

the underlying blocked-in-initial-position low tone lowering the tone of the following verb suffixes. See similar misjudgments noted in the Phonology section concerning the reduplication of verb stems with initial vowels.

I do not mean to suggest that most of the morphology is not recognized, or is obscured by Nagaraja. It is not, and he does dig out e.g. reciprocal verb stems, and other interesting and comparatively obscure verb forms. Much of his material on negation – morphological and syntactic (as noted elsewhere in this review) – is not found elsewhere, and is fully presented and well analyzed. Some of the restricted sets of morphologically contrasting forms are well presented (e.g. the complex demonstratives), and the data are there for the reader wanting to make finer morphological distinctions. Much of the data, e.g. on the verb, is fairly fully presented without benefit – or need? – of much morphological analysis. We can see that /-ki/ and /-ya/ (with a rich variety of allomorphs for the latter not found in the other recorded dialects of Korku) are mode suffixes (M) and he gives examples showing how they are used, but he does not see that /-lì/, which figures in his /-lè/ (from [-lì-èʔ] 'cislocative transitive past', and /-wa, -va/ are also mode suffixes, if less frequent, perhaps, in his material that they are in Girard's and Zide's. He has enough examples of /-lì-/ with cislocative meaning (e.g. [i-lì] 'give (me, us)', [saʔ-lì] 'bring') but he decides /li ~ le/ is a verb occurring in double verb stems. He lists other – rather different – double verb stems with /li ~ le/, but he gives no evidence that /li ~ le/ as verb occurs anywhere but in this sort of complex – modal – verb form where it occurs in mode position. Drake also misses the role of /-lì/.

4. Language Change

4.1. hoy

The form *hoy*, found in Nagaraja's materials but unknown to Drake, Girard, and Zide, is a present tense verb form obviously borrowed from Hindi and used much like Hindi *hai* 'is', except that the Korku form is used for all persons and numbers. There are intransitive verbs in Korku, e.g. /taàkhaʔ/ 'to be located, to exist', that mark subject on the verb with pronominal suffixes (but only for 3rd person), but such person-marking on a borrowed verb form like *hoy* would be highly unlikely.

hoy is found in present tense adjectival and nominal predications in Nagaraja's Korku with some optional variation with 'zero'. If there is something systematic about the variation, I am not aware of it (about locatives see below). It occurs in such sentences as /ini uraʔ khad hoy/ 'this house is big', /dadu masTar hoy/ 'Dadu is a school teacher'. It looks as if *hoy* simply – neatly – replaced 'zero' in the earlier language. But all semantic adjectives in earlier Korku (Zide, unpublished notes – there is no trace of this in Nagaraja's material) were not of the same class. The class of 'simple adjectives' (A) like *khad* 'big', took 'zero' in such sentences, but a second class, 'adjectival verbs' (AV) like *simìl* 'sweet', took the predicator /-bà/, the Present-Future marker, in such sentences as /dii ambe simìlba/ [simìl-bà], 'those mangoes are sweet'.

For Nagaraja's informants all adjectives in these constructions behave identically: they take *hoy*. Thus for Nagaraja 'those mangoes are sweet' is /dii ambe simìl hoy/. Since both classes of Zide's adjectives – like all stative verbs – take the same – usual – verbal suffixes in the other tenses, the only place these were distinguished for Zide was in the present – Present for 'zero', but for /-bà/ 'Present-Future'.

Examples of adjectival verb forms not in Present or Present-Future: /khadjen/ [khad-ya-en], 'became big, was made big' (the past passive of kakhàd, 'to make big', similarly /khadken/, [khad-ki-en], which can be translated the same way, but /khadken/ is a more recent and/or intensive past). /simìlyen/, /simìlken/, translated similarly: 'became sweet, was made sweet', etc.

An interesting question to which we can give only a tentative answer is, which (semantic) adjectives fall in which class in Zide's data? Roughly, adjectives of size and color, and loanwords (e.g., /laNRa/ 'lame') are simple adjectives (A). The rest (/simìl/ 'sweet, tasty', /khamal/, 'heavy', etc.) are adjectival verbs (AV).

Locative predications are formed (for third person subjects) with Noun-èn (locative)-3rd animate subject pronoun, e.g. /di-ku ton-èn-ku/ 'Where are they?', [di-ku] 'they', 'that-animate plural', [ton-èn] 'where', from /ton ~ Ton-/ 'which', /-èn/ locative. Nagaraja sometimes finds *hoy* alternating with zero, e.g. /am je (hoy)/, 'Who are you?', /am/, 'you' singular, /je/, 'who'.

For the past the existing form, /Dan/ (from [Da-en]?) is used for 'was'. *Da-* can appear with intransitive suffixes, 'to be, become' and with transitive suffixes 'to make' (used more or less like Hindi *honaa/karnaa*). *Da-* is used as an auxiliary to form perfectives, etc like Hindi *honaa*, where the cognates of *Taàkha(?)* (see above) 'to be located, to exist' are used similarly in the other North Munda languages. *Taàkha?* in Korku is also used to translate 'have', with the English subject in the locative /Dij-èn uphùn kon-ku Taàkha-ku/, literally 'in him four sons are', 'he has four sons'. Another – related – common intransitive *ThaàR, ThanàR* – which does not take subject suffixes – means 'to remain, dwell'.

4.2. Negatives

Korku has two negative systems: the Present-Future and imperative being formed with the adverb/negative copula *(hɛ)ban* / *(hɛ)ban(n)-è?,* and the Past with the negative clitic copula *-Dùn.* In the Munda languages this system is peculiar to Korku. For a note on the North Munda – Kherwarian – language Ho and its negatives see below. The South Munda negatives are still more different.

The partial breakdown of the two-negatives system that we find in Nagaraja's grammar – the one for the Present-Future, and a different one for the Past, with no great symmetry between Past and Present-Future negatives – might seem to bring it closer to Hindi with its negation marking common to Past, Present, and Future, but the odd 'double negative system' in Nagaraja's

data is nothing like Hindi, or like any other language I am familiar with. The recent – see Nagaraja – apparent attrition of the old system introduces – confusingly – the Present-Future negative *(he)ban* into Past sentences, but these sentences are clearly Past, and (still) marked, primarily, by the Past Negative *-Dùn*. The introduced Present-Future negatives apparently have lost their tense meaning and now function as additional emphasizers – additional to the common emphatic suffix *-ka?*.

A reconsideration of 'double negative' sentences suggests that the double negation in Nagaraja's material (and found in none of the other grammars) is not an innovation but a retention. Earlier *ban* (found in Kherwarian with no tense-restricted meaning) must have had that tense-free meaning in early Korku, but with the later development of *-Dùn* (which has no cognates in Kherwarian) *(he) ban* became reserved for Present-Future meaning only, with the Past negative being marked by *-Dùn*. In most Melghat villages this distinction – contrast – was consistently made, but not in the villages from which Nagaraja's speakers come. There the *(he)ban* in sentences with 'double negative' marking retained the earlier and still familiar meaning of 'negative' with no tense implications, so that there was no 'contradiction' or confusion, which speakers of other dialects might now find in such 'doubly negative' Past sentences.

The past negative is marked by the clitic *-Dùn* following a bare verb stem. Past positive forms can provide information on voice (there are different past markers for transitive and intransitive), person (for object suffixes), and mode (intensive, cislocative, etc). All these are 'neutralized' in the past negative, where nothing but the bare verb stem can precede *-Dùn*, the additional information to be indicated externally – externally to the verb form.

The Present-Future negative is *ban*, which occurs in the adverbial *(he)ban* either preceding or following a verb form, usually the infinitive, and the negative copula *(he)ban(n)-e?*, which occurs sentence-finally. (Korku is a SOV language.) The prohibitive 'don't (V)' is *ba-ki*, from *ban* and the intensive mode suffix *-ki*. *baki* precedes an infinitive and a Verbal-Object for transitive verbs. It precedes the intransitive infinitive V*-ù?*, the neutralized form of the three *-ù?* forms. The positive Present-Future is richer, morphologically, than the positive Past, and the negative Present-Future is more restricted; it is reduced to the following forms: the (active) infinitive, reduplicated for transitive verbs, and an intransitive infinitive, V*-ù?*, which neutralizes three different forms with *-ù?:* /-ù?/, /-yù?/, [-ya-ù?], and /-khù?/ [-ki-ù?]. (There are problems and dialect differences with regard to /-khù?/.) For some speakers, apparently verb + object occurs with *(he)ban* and *(he)ban(n)-è?*.

The 'double negatives' in Nagaraja's material add *(he)ban* to past sentences with *-Dùn*. These sentences have past meaning. Just what these 'doubly negative' past sentences mean, i.e. how they differ in their emphasizing from ordinary past-plus-emphatic-*ka?* sentences, is not clear.

Examples of negative usage in Korku with a few in other Munda languages.

Positive Present-Future forms: /kukulbà/ [REDUP-kul-bà], 'sends, will send (customary)', [kul-miñ-bà], 'sends, will send you, dual'; [kul-lì-bà], 'sends, I will send here/this way' (/-lì/ cislocative, inanimate subject(s) unmarked); /kulùba/, 'is being / will be sent'. The negatives for the transitive forms are /(he)ban-ku-kul/, /ku-kul (he)ban/, and /ku-kul (he)bannè?/. For the intransitives: /(he)ban kulù?/, /kulù? (he)ban/, and /kulù? (he)bannè?/.

The [-è?] verbalizer is homonymous with past transitive /-è?/, but not to be identified with it. It is probably to be identified with the 'exclamatory' verbalizer found with such demonstrative derivatives as [hu-ku-è?] 'There they are!' ([hu-] 'that, yonder', [-ku], plural animate, [-è?]), and /naàne?/ 'Here it/they (inanimate) is/are!' from [na-in-è?] (/na/ 'emphatic before /in/', /in/ 'this'). Inanimates are not marked for number.

Past positive forms: /kulkhè?/ [kul-ki-è?], 'send-intensive, transitive past', /kullenej/ [kul-lì-è?-ej], 'send, cislocative, him-her', /kulyen/ [kul-ya-en], /kulken/ [kul-ki-en], both 'was sent', the latter 'recently and intensively', the former a more anterior past; /ira?ken/, /ira?/ as an intransitive stem, 'to return', as a transitive stem 'to return something/someone', /ira?ken/ 'returned, was returned'. Negatives of these forms are: /kulDùn/, 'did not send, was not sent (objects, direction, voice neutralized), /ira?Dùn/, 'did not return, did not return something(s)/someone(s), was not returned, etc'.

Examples of double negatives (from Nagaraja), partly retranscribed: /Dij heba giTij-Dun/ (Zide /Dij heban giTij-Dùn/) 'He did not sleep'. Nagaraja writes "when *heba* is used, past marker *Du(n)* can also be used". I assume he means that when *Dùn* is used the sentence is past; if not, not. /Dij gITij-Dùn/, 'He/she did not sleep', occurs in Nagaraja as well as the other grammars.

On Ho negatives: *ban*, cognate with the Korku Present-Future negative, is used (see Deeney), meaning 'to not be', not, as in Korku, as a negative 'adverb' – roughly 'not' – with other verbs. Ho, like the other Kherwarian languages, and unlike Korku, has a positive copula, /mena?/. 'To have' is translated with the copula, positive or negative, the (English) subject taking /ta?-re/, /-re/ being the locative 'in'. (Compare the Korku, also using the locative (/-èn/) with a verb /Taàkha(?)/ meaning 'to be (located)', which has a Ho cognate /taikena/ that is used in have-constructions in the Ho Past.)

For the prohibitive Ho uses /alo/ plus pronoun plus a positive verb form, e.g. /alo-ben seno?wa/ ([ben], 'you, dual') 'don't you two go!'. [ka] – subject pronoun is used – suffixed – to /ka/, /alo/, and other words preceding the main verb form – in negative statements. This sort of morphosyntax, characteristic of and important in Kherwarian, has no parallel in Korku.

North Munda, if it marks subject on the verb, does so with suffixes. Probably Proto-Munda did this with prefixes (we can still see this in the South Munda languages Gorum and Gta?). Non-singular 3rd person markers on the

verb (number suffixes, dual or plural) may be old in Munda to mark 3rd person non-singular, singular being unmarked. As noted in the discussion of *hoy*, Korku lacks – has lost – subject suffixation in all but a few intransitive verbs, locatives and a few odd – irregular – others (transitives).

'Not-yet-ness', in Korku /atikà?/, Nagaraja /aThika/, plus infinitive, is similarly expressed in Ho with /auri/. It is expressed in the (South Munda) Gutob language with a separate auxiliary verb, /oroj/, roughly 'to not yet V', versus the regular 'to not V' with /ura?/.

4.3. Relative clauses and relative clause equivalents

The problems in identifying and describing changes in the repertory and uses of relative clauses and relative clause equivalents are different from those discussed above. Here there are alternative constructions, but to understand which are used when and how we need the sort of data that we lack: on discourse and socio-linguistic contexts and distinctions. For instance, the use of the borrowed relative-correlative structure seems to be correlated with the education – literacy – of the informants, and the sorts of discourse – literary, in some sense – they are commonly used for elsewhere. Our data consist of tales (all of Nagaraja's texts, some of Girard's and Zide's), personal narratives, and sentences elicited for the purpose of finding out their Korku equivalents. All of the linguists are eliciting in standard Hindi, so that it is no surprise that the relative correlative calque on the Hindi is the usual translation – initial translation – of such sentences. But we find them rarely elsewhere. This calque equivalent is not newly invented; it is familiar to most – but not all – speakers. (Miss Girard had the advantage of being able to work with female speakers, which none of the others could do, but their texts are no different – i.e. in sticking to simple sentences – than the texts from her male informants.)

In Nagaraja's texts and Girard's texts – the circa fifty pages I checked – (Drake did not publish texts) there are no relative-correlative clauses. What we find are two simple sentences connected with the usual anaphoric devices to provide the sort of information found in complex relative sentences.

Despite this, and with the knowledge of this structure becoming more widespread, these relative-correlative sentences are much rarer for Nagaraja's informants (to the extent one can judge this from his grammar) than I would have expected from my experience and data of others.

Formal communications were not written in Korku. Has this changed? The carving out of a more or less 'tribal' state, Jharkhand, from what was greater Bihar, and the resulting use of Santali, Mundari, etc., in primary education was a major event, but Santali and Mundari had been used for 'literary' purposes earlier, while Korku presumably was not, certainly not to that degree. As of the nineteen-fifties the Korku I knew were unaware of speakers of related languages in Bihar, or even of Korku dialects a hundred and fifty miles away. Are there now magazines, fiction, etc. in Korku? Is the language acceptable in the courts or in other official venues? I do not know.

The Bible translations were prepared before the relative-correlative structure was borrowed. I have not been able to examine them for participial relative usage, so all I can say is Zide and Nagaraja (and presumably Girard, but her grammatical notes do not go that far) know such structures.

The relative-correlative construction uses as relative pronoun (in Nagaraja) *jo* – like the Hindi – and (in Zide) *je* 'who', and uses as correlative *Dij* 'he/she'.

Nagaraja's example:

/jo kitab Tebalaliñen Doken Dikitab iña hoy/

[jo kitab Tebal-àʔ-liñ-èn
which book table-GEN-on.(top.of)-LOC

Doò-ki-en Di-e kitab iñ-àʔ hoy]
put INTENS.REC-INTR.PST that-INAN book I-GEN is
'Which book he put on the table (that book) is mine.'

Zide's equivalent: /je kitab Tebalàliñen Doòken Dii kitab iñ-àʔ/.

Zide observed, not so much in Korku, but more in the South Munda language Gutob, that the ostentatious use of the Indo-Aryan calque (in the Gutob case based on either Desia Oriya or Standard Oriya, usually the former) had the function of showing the linguist – a 'sahib' of some sort – that the informant was educated, did know Oriya. This function was more common – needed – for Gutob speakers (then, c 1975) than it was for Korku speakers.

The relative and relative equivalent structures noted then are the separate – nonrelative – sentences, the Indo-Aryan-like relative-correlative calque, and – more interestingly – the participial relative constructions. For the sentence, 'the teacher who beat the boy went to Amravati' the adjectival form would be '(the) (he) beat the boy teacher' and the nominalized – 'one' (*waalaa*) – form would be '(the) (he) beat the boy one'.

In the former we have a verb form with tense and animate object following the object with accusative suffix:

/poerakhèʔ muNDàkhenej masTar amraotìn olen/

[poera-khèʔ muNDà-ki-è(n)-ej
boy-ACC beat-INTENS-TR.PST-3SG.ANIM

masTar amraoti-èn ol-en]
teacher Amravati-LOC go-INTR.PST
'The teacher who beat the boy went to Amravati.'

In the latter:

/poerakhèʔ muNDàkhenej-miThaj Dii masTar amraotìn olen/

[poera-khèʔ muNDà-ki-èʔ-(n)-ej-mi(n)-Thà-ej
boy-ACC beat-INTENS-TR.PST-3SG.ANIM-one-NOM-3SG.ANIM

Dii masTar amraoti-èn ol-en]
that teacher Amravati-LOC go-INTR.PST
'The one who beat the boy (that teacher) went to Amravati.'

Further examples from Drake:

[am-àʔ bhagia iñ-àʔ-anTi-èn
you.SG-GEN servant I-GEN-for-LOC

saʔ-lì-èʔ-mi(n)-e aol ban]
bring-CISLOC-TR.PST-one-(INAN) good not
'The one your servant brought for me is not good.'

[am ghuRgi-khèʔ i-wa-ej-bà
you horse-ACC give-BEN-3SG.ANIM-PRES/FUT

jhaRa ton-èn Taàkha]
fodder which-LOC is.located.INAN
'Where is the fodder you (will) give the horse?'

This construction is noted just once in Nagaraja, but both Zide and Drake find these fairly commonly, so that I assume they are old and still in use. (Girard's grammatical appendix to her dictionary does not get to such topics.) This sort of construction is not rare in the languages of the world (and is found in Dravidian, among other language groups). I suggest that some educated speakers – e.g. my tutor and chief informant – have begun to use this participial adjective construction more frequently in formal literary discourse, i.e. to use this and not the relative-correlative construction.

A number of new scripts were devised for the various Munda languages in the first half of the twentieth century. Two of these have survived and flourished: the Ol Ceme't or Ol Ciki script of Raghunath Murmu for Santali, and the VaraN Kshiti script of Lako Bodra for Ho. (Not that all Santals or all Hos have adopted these scripts.) Korku – like Mundari and Kharia – has been satisfied to use the Devanagari script, the standard script for Hindi. The introduction of the new Santali and Ho scripts came with a great deal of cultural 'enlargement', and the increasingly promoted literacy involved some attempts at standardization of the language, e.g. with regard to relative clauses. Korku has no such complications.

Here we have a different problem, and one that the data do not allow us to get very far in answering: the factors determining the choice among three possibilities. Why and when do which speakers use non-relative – two-sentence – grammar, and, when relatives are selected, when is the borrowed

relative-correlative used and when the participial adjective? And this presupposes that we are talking of well-formed complete sentences, since there are alternative ways of conveying the information. What we need to say requires us to take a closer look at our text materials and how they were acquired. To my surprise, all of Nagaraja's texts (all older tales), and Girard's texts – and these included personal narratives, and came from Korku women as well as men – did not use relatives at all. So we ask, who needs relative constructions in Korku? What are they good for? Where do the examples we have (in Drake and Zide) come from? How were they elicited? An obvious source of bias is that the language (and context) of elicitation was standard Hindi (perhaps Marathi for Nagaraja), and if one asks for a translation of the standard Hindi relative clause – a relative-correlative construction – what one will get in Korku – at least at first – is a calque on that. That seems to the informant to be what is being asked for. Then the linguist asks "Is there any other way you can translate that?", and the skilled, cooperative informant is likely to think that a complex sentence – not two simple sentences – is being asked for, so if he comes up with any alternative, he gives Sahibji the participial adjective. What sort of 'natural language' is this? Lots of free conversation (Zide has some of this) would help, as would the elicitation of more 'formal' – literary – material. One would like to see a translation of the sort of request that a Korku literate in Hindi would have written in Korku. How would it come out in Korku? Presumably more formal-literary – Korku is more in use now that it was forty years ago, but I have no such newer materials, and Nagaraja does not give us any. The establishment of Jharkhand, a separate 'tribal' state in what used to be south Bihar, and the official recognition of Santali-Mundari-Ho as a 'national language,' the use of these languages in primary education, and the offering of these languages as subjects at Ranchi University have made a difference, and those developments would have become known to some educated Korkus. Earlier there had been publications – stories, magazines – in Santali and Mundari, and these languages were clearly far ahead of Korku in the development of 'literary' styles. So without much information on all this I cannot say much about what motivates the selection of the (old) participial adjective construction versus the (borrowed) relative-correlative construction. My surmise is that the one or two of the literate Korku I knew who would have found a 'literary style' useful would have preferred the – native – participial adjective to the borrowed relative-correlative construction, But there could be others who would make the opposite choice. The sort of extensive oral (recorded) corpora and written materials that Anderson (personal communication, 2005) has collected for Ho should be revealing in telling us about relative clauses and their information-providing non-relative equivalents in North Munda.

5. Conclusions

Nagaraja's book is full of fascinating material, but some of it is so confusingly presented that a serious reader needs to rewrite the book to make full use of that material. One must extract grammatical information from the texts to expand and revise the earlier grammatical presentation. To do this, it

helps to know a fair amount of Korku (and devote a great deal of time to the work). Unfortunately, this limits the utility of the book.

The Tokyo Institute supported Nagaraja's write-up, and put out – printed and bound – an elegant book, perhaps the most attractively printed grammar of a Munda language I know. What they should have done as well was to provide Dr. Nagaraja with a good editor, an editor who worked through and improved the whole book, not just some of its sections. (The brief sections on compound sentences and complex sentences are well edited. The exposition here is clear, concise and in good English, and the examples – Korku sentences – well chosen.) But many of the sections of the book were poorly edited, e.g. various of the example sentences are not translated, fully or at all, and without some help in a number of these cases it is not clear what the sentences could mean and what the grammatical points being made are. (See the section on imperatives for this sort of mess.) Much of the exposition is unclear, and would have benefited from rewriting. Some of it is incoherent (again, see the section on imperatives). Any close reader of the book wants – what are lacking – full indices, morpheme indices as well as topic indices. I would have been saved hours and no little irritation if 'pronominal verb suffixation, object agreement, subject agreement' and some other key topics had been indexed.

The English (starting with the title) is marred by numerous mistakes. Most of these are transparent; one understands what is meant. Some are not. Thus, when Nagaraja translates /Dij khadjen/ (Zide's transcription) 'he became young', it is not Celtic-like myths one must think of, but Hindi and Indian English translation. In Hindi *javaan* does usually mean 'young', but *vah javaan ho gayaa* does not mean 'he became young' – a good editor would have questioned such a definition – but 'he became mature, grown up'. Apparently /kad-khad/ – 'big', in Korku – as used by Nagaraja's informants, not mine – invites similar misunderstanding. The reader must retranslate /Dij khadjen/ from Nagaraja's Indian English 'he became young' (here, literally 'big') into standard English 'he became mature, grown up'. In some of the texts Nagaraja gives up on English and just gives us the Hindi as the English translation: /kula mama/ in English should be 'Uncle Tiger', not 'kula mama'; /re/, a vocative particle, can only be usefully translated 're' if he tells us in English something about *re*, et cetera.

We should be grateful to the Tokyo Institute for underwriting Nagaraja's work in Japan, and paying for the publication of the volume. Nagaraja put a good deal of work into the book. Probably there would be NO book without the support of the Institute, but if they had extended their assistance to providing good editing it would have been a better book.

6. Minor Cavils.

The brief – perfunctory – definitions in the glossary should have been made fuller and more accurate. (Compare the much better definitions in Girard's dictionary.) The item glossed can be a verb stem, reduplicated verb infinitive, non-reduplicated verb infinitive, bimorphemic complex; none of

these is labeled or analyzed, and the reader cannot know what he is getting unless he knows a fair amount of Korku, some but not all of that knowledge coming out of Nagaraja's grammar. To translate /Taàkha(ʔ)/ as 'have' is not completely wrong, but is – to say the least – misleading. /Taàkha(ʔ)/ means 'to be (located)'. The dubious justification of it as 'have' would be that to say, for instance, 'he has three sons' one says /Dij-èn aphài kon-ku Taàkha-ku/, literally 'in him three sons are'. Is the reader supposed to know or intuit this? A close reading of some of Nagaraja's texts would provide the information.

Nagaraja does not indicate which words in the glossary are loanwords – there are many – or their sources. That information would have been useful, particularly for those words borrowed from Dravidian (e.g. /bo/ 'let's go', /poTTa/ 'boy'), which Nagaraja is particularly well qualified to trace. The more than 300 Mundari cognates are useful and appropriate, but ideally the source might have been the *Encyclopaedia Mundarica*, much fuller and more accurate than Bhaduri.

Since this book would be the natural place to look for a full Korku bibliography, the bibliography should have been more complete. The booklets on Korku put out by the Madhya Pradesh government should have been listed, and the Bible translations and some of the ephemeral publications that Nagaraja listed in his Austroasiatic bibliography should also have been listed. Why Nagaraja's own earlier bibliography (which includes useful annotations on many Korku listings) is omitted here is a mystery. Several papers of mine might have been listed too – and made use of in the text, e.g. Zide (1968) on pronouns, Zide (1978) on numerals, Zide (1991) on dictionaries, the (early) Zide data on the verb in Pinnow (1966), which is listed, and, more important, Zide (1991) on demonstratives.

Nagaraja's texts, all tales, are much appreciated, and contain a good deal of dialogue, but we could have used some real (recorded) conversations, too. The reader gets some rough idea of discourse properties from the texts in the book, but a greater variety of text types would have added to these ideas. Certain sentence types, e.g. the Hindi calque relative clause, could have used some comment on, e.g. the limited discourse contexts (I assume) it occurred in, in Nagaraja's elicitations. That such constructions are not found in the sort of tales he gives us in his texts is not surprising.

REFERENCES

Bhaduri, M.B. 1931. *A Mundari-English Dictionary.* Calcutta: Calcutta University Press.

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhusan. 1975. *Studies in Comparative Munda Linguistics*. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Studies..

Biligiri, H.S. 1965. "The Sora verb, a restricted study." *Indo-Pacific Linguistic Studies II* 231-250.

Bodding, Paul Otto. 1923-29. *Materials for a Santali Grammar.* 2 vols. Benagaria: Santal Mission of the Northern Churches.

Deeney, John. 1975. *Ho Grammar and Vocabulary.* Chaibasa: Xavier Ho Publications.

Drake, John. 1903. *A Grammar of the Kurku Language.* Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.

Dwivedi, D.S. 1961. "Korku noun morphology." *Madhyabharati* 10(10).

Dwivedi, D.S. 1963-4. "Korku pronouns." *Madhyabharati* 11-13:89-92.

Girard, Beryl. 1965. *Korku-Hindi-English Dictionary.* Ramakhera and Derhtalai, Nimar District, Madhya Pradesh.

Hoffmann, John (Johann). 1903. *Mundari Grammar.* Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Press.

Hoffmann, John and Arthur van Emelen. 1928-1978. *Encyclopaedia Mundarica,* 16 vols, Patna: Government Superintendent Printing. [Reprint 1990: New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.]

Konow, Sten. 1906. "Kurku." In Grierson, George A., ed., *Linguistic Survey of India, vol. 4: Munda and Dravidian languages,* pp. 423-433. Calcutta: Superintendent, Government Printing. [Reprint, New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967, 1973.]

Nagaraja, K.S. 1989. *Austroasiatic Languages,* A Linguistic Bibliography. Pune: Deccan College.

Pinnow, Heinz-Jürgen. 1966. "A comparative study of the verb in the Munda languages." In Zide, Norman H., ed., *Studies in Comparative Austroasiatic Linguistics,* 96-193. London: Mouton & Co.

Zide, Norman H. 1960. *Korku: Phonology and Morphophonemics.* University of Pennsylvania PhD dissertation.

Zide, Norman H. 1968. "Some comparative notes on Gataʔ pronouns." In Heesterman, J.C. et al., eds., *Pratidanam: Indian, Iranian, and Indo-European Studies presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday,* pp. 348-358. (Janua Linguarum, series maior, 64.) The Hague: Mouton.

Zide, Norman H. 1978. *Studies in the Munda Numerals.* Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Zide, Norman, H. 1991a. "Possible Dravidian sources of some Munda demonstrative bases." In Lakshmi Bai, B. and B. Ramakrishna Reddy, eds., *Studies in Dravidian and General Linguistics (Festschrift for Bhadriraju Krishnamurti),* pp. 349-364. (Osmania University Publications in Linguistics 6.) Hyderabad: Osmania University.

Zide, Norman H. 1991b. "Lexicography of other languages of the Indian subcontinent: the Munda Languages." In Hausmann, Franz J., et al., eds, *Wörterbücher, vol. 3,* pp. 2533-2547. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 5.) Berlin: de Gruyter.

Received: 10 September 2009

Department of South Asia Languages
and Civilizations, University of Chicago
5801 South Ellis Ave., Chicago, IL 60637
USA
<n-zide@uchicago.edu>

****