

Switch Reference in South Munda

Gregory D. S. Anderson and John P. Boyle

University of Manchester and University of Chicago

0 Introduction

In this paper, we present data from a range of languages of the South Munda¹ group of the Munda branch of the Austroasiatic language family which suggest that a system of switch reference is an archaic, characteristic feature of intra-sentential clause combining. Many languages of the world possess a system whereby clauses in complex sentences make use of special morphology to indicate whether the subject of a following clause is the same (or not) as the subject of the preceding clause. This phenomenon, first formally isolated by Jacobsen (1967) for the Hokan-Coahuiltecan languages, is called ‘switch reference’ in the literature. This feature appears to be an integral part of narrative discourse and complex sentence formation in languages as geographically and typologically diverse as Hidatsa, Chalcatango Mixtec and Chickasaw among new world languages, various Papuan languages, the Nilotic language Lango, and even the Siberian Turkic language Tuvan! See a set of representative examples in (1) – (5).

(1) Hidatsa [Siouan] (Boyle [forthcoming])

ixú xákahe:t^ha hiš^há:k iʔtaki o:raxpíwa ap^huhkaha:k ití:kipi

kúraʔak šeʔerúha:k wa:pá:hiware:c

i-xú xáka-heet^ha hiši-hée-**ak** iʔtaki ooraxpí-wa ap^húhka-hee-**ak**

3-body move-LOC red-CAUS-**SS** rabbit skin-INDEF.DET hat-CAUS-**SS**

ita-iʔkipi kúraʔe-**ak** šeʔerúha-**ak** waa-páahi-wareec

3.POSS-pipe carry-**SS** doing.thus-**SS** INDEF-sing-NE

‘Reddening his body all over, using a rabbit skin as a hat,
carrying his pipe, thus, he (Day-Sun) sang’

(2) Chickasaw [Muskogean] (Munro 1983: 223)

- i. *hiŋa-cha talowa* ii. *hiŋa-na talowa*
 dance-SS.CONJ sing dance-DS.CONJ sing
 ‘he_i danced and (he_i) sang’ ‘he_i danced and he_j sang’

(3) Usan [Papuan] (Haiman & Munro 1983: viii)

- i. *ye nam su-ab isomei* ii. *ye nam su-ine isorei*
 I tree cut-SS I.went.down I tree cut-DS it.went.down
 ‘I cut the tree and went down’ ‘I cut the tree and it went down’

(4) Lango [Nilotic] (Noonan 1992: 199)

- i. *rwòt ò-pòy-ò* *nr̂* *ὲ-cég-ò* *dɔ̀gɔ̀lâ*
 king 3-remember-PERF COMP 3SS-close-PERF door
 ‘the king_i remembered that he_i closed the door’
- ii. *rwòt ò-pòy-ò* *nr̂* *ò-cég-ò* *dɔ̀gɔ̀lâ*
 king 3-remember-PERF COMP 3-close-PERF door
 ‘the king_i remembered that s/he_j closed the door’

(5) Tuvan [Turkic] (Anderson & Harrison 1999: 85-6)

- i. *nom-nu nomča-aš ol kiži-niŋ čurttalga-zin šuptu-zun*
 book-ACC read-SS that person-GEN life-3.ACC all-3.ACC
 book-ACC read-SS that person-GEN life-3.ACC all-3.ACC

bil-ip al-dī-m

know-CV SBEN-PAST.II-1

‘I read the book and found out everything about his life’

- ii. *koža aal-ga ba-ar-im-ga, kiži čok bo-or-ga*

next village-DAT go-P/F-1-DAT (=DS), person NEG.COP AUX-P/F-DAT (=DS)

udu-vayn=daa čan-ip-kan men

sleep-NEG.CV=EMPH return-PERF-PAST 1

‘I went to the next village, noone was there, so I returned home without spending the night’

From the brief survey above, it is clear that formal means of marking switch-reference are found in languages from all over the world and therefore switch-reference systems can no

longer be considered as rare/weird as they were once believed to be (Haiman 1983: 105).

In the following sections, we argue that a system of switch reference is in fact an archaic feature of complex sentence structure in South Munda connected discourse, with possible parallels in North Munda languages as well, suggesting that this particular means of tracking subject (dis)continuity may be an ancient feature of the entire Munda language family.

1 Switch Reference in Gutob-Remo-Gta?

Of the three subgroups of South Munda, Kharia-Juang, Sora-Gorum, and Gutob-Remo-Gta? (Anderson 1999), it is in the last mentioned subgroup that the system of switch reference is most salient. In fact, cognate elements marking both same subject and different subject can be straightforwardly reconstructed back to the Proto-Gutob-Remo-Gta? ancestor language. We now briefly examine the systems of switch reference in each of the three languages of this subgroup.

1.1 Gutob

In Gutob (a.k.a. Gad(a)ba), the same subject marker *-su* attaches to a past form of the verb, but one lacking person inflection, in line with the generally redundant nature of subject person inflection in switch reference systems; see (6) for examples of the use of the same subject marker.

(6) Same Subject (Zide n.d.)

i. *mui-roʔ oʔug ɖiʔ-to goj-gi ui-gi-su ɖuba ɖe--gu*
 one-CL young.man say-CUST die-PAST.I AUX-PAST.I-SS ghost become-PAST.I
 ‘(they say that) a young man died and became a ghost’

ii. *uraʔ uraʔ niŋ ui-loŋ-niŋ, Jom-lai bu-oʔ-su pi-loŋ-niŋ*
 well I go-FUT.I-1 Jom-DAT beat-PAST.II-SS come-FUT.I-1
 ‘well I will go, I will beat up Jom and come (back)’

The different subject marker in Gutob is *-na*.² It also attaches to a past tense form of the verb, similarly lacking person inflection. See examples in (7).

(7) Different Subject (Zide n.d.)

- i. *burol-ḍu-gu-na kunig-u-ḍam goj-gi ui-gi-nen*
 live-AUX-PAST.I-DS old.man-old.woman die-PAST.I AUX-PAST.I-PL
 ‘they (the three of them) lived (like that) and (then) the old man and woman died’

- ii. *goj-gi ui-gi-na tu oʔn-lai kisi*
 die-PAST.I AUX-PAST.I-DS³ that child-DAT something

- milei uraʔ oron+bostor*
 to.get (<DESIA) NEG.COP food+clothing
 ‘they died and nothing was available to the boy, clothes, food’

- iii. *ui-ḍu-gu-na mui-roʔ saukar ḍiʔto ḍu-gu*
 go-AUX-PAST.I-DS one-CL rich.man ‘they.say’ be-PAST.I
 ‘he (the boy) went along and a rich man (it seems) appeared’

1.2 Remo

In the closely related language Remo (a.k.a. Bonda) [Bhattacharya 1968], the corresponding markers are *seʔta* for same subject and *-na* for different subject.⁴ Like Gutob, these attach to a tense-marked form of the verb, but one lacking subject marking. See examples in (8) for same subject and (9) for different subject.

(8) Same Subject

- i. *ḍokri ḍokran-bɔ ui-seʔta mayn lɔge tɔŋ-gɔ*
 Woman man-LOC go-SS 3sg-GEN side stand-PAST
 ‘the woman went up to and stood by her husband’

- ii. *nɔ ɡɔsig-seʔta biri-bɔ i-ya*
 you wear.cloth(by.men)-SS forest-LOC go-IMP
 ‘dress like a man and go to the forest’

- iii. *kukusag gine gijɔḍ-lɔ=seʔta kirime ɔtur-ɔʔ atin*
 tiger teeth gnash-while-SS claw take.out-PAST.II that.far.off

gu naŋlili? sugɔ dem-ɔ? sa, kɔŋn gu-lɔna kirime
 boy embracing like do-PAST.II and.then this boy-also nail

ɔtur-ɔ?=seʔta gijɔd-lɔ=seʔta a-kukusag naŋlili? sugɔ dem-ɔ?
 take.out-PAST.II-SS gnash-while-SS⁵ OBJ/OBLQ-tiger emb. like do-PAST.II

‘the tiger then grated his teeth and bringing out his claws moved as if to embrace the boy, at which the boy also exposed his fingernails ground his teeth and moved as if to embrace the tiger’

(9) Different Subject

‘a-niŋ daʔtɔr a-beʔ-tɔ-nɔ-ki’ daʔ-na nɔn baʔagari
 OBJ-I milk NEG-give-FUT.II-2-Q say-DS he distributed.property

ɔaktɔr ruis-ɔ sum
 milk milk-PAST.II drink(eat)

‘(I say), “will you give me milk or not” and he says ‘milk your side of the partitioned property and drink (it)’

The regular formal and functional correspondence between the elements used as same and different subject markers in Gutob and Remo suggest that both of these elements need to be reconstructed for Proto-Gutob-Remo. These probably would have been of the following shape:

(10) Proto-Gutob-Remo

*-sɪ(?) ‘same subject’

*-na ‘different subject’

1.3 *Gtaʔ*

In the divergent *Gtaʔ* language (Mahapatra and Zide, n.d.)--which differs in many ways from Gutob and Remo,⁶ --the switch reference system of Proto-Gutob-Remo has direct and obvious cognates. The same subject marker is *-ce(ʔ)*⁷ and the different subject marker *-la*. Examples of their use can be found in (11) and (12).

(11) Same Subject

i. *ɔukri hoʔ-ru=hoʔ-ria-ce swa e-rʔro-raŋ-ce haŋɔ-Nɔx-ne*
 old.woman weep=ECHO-SS fire go-REDPL.carry-bring-SS husband-3.REF-GEN

<i>moŋ-ke</i>	<i>cwar-ce</i>	<i>aʔ-nswar-bo-ke</i>
corpse-OBLQ	dry-SS	CAUS-dry-keep-PAST

‘the old woman wept a lot and then made a fire, dried up her husband’s corpse and preserved it’

<i>ŋku</i>	<i>gnag-hwaʔ</i>	<i>toʔ-ce</i>	<i>ga-ge</i>
tiger	door-rope	open-SS	enter-PAST

‘the tiger opened the door(-rope) and entered’

As is apparent from the examples above, all but the last of a series of verbs with the same subject take the same subject marker, the last verb appearing with finite inflection. This pattern is one of the defining characteristics of switch-reference systems.

The *Gtaʔ* different reference marker is *-la*. It is cognate in form and function with the Proto-Gutob-Remo different subject marker **-na*.

(12) Different Subject

i. <i>hriŋ</i>	<i>oʔri=mwa</i>	<i>sgwa</i>	<i>we-la</i>	<i>ɖokra</i>	<i>gweʔ=we-ge</i>
later.on	how.much=year	like	go-DS	old.man	die=AUX-PAST

‘later on, after like several years passed, the man died’

ii. p.32

<i>ljo</i>	<i>haboʔ-bo-la</i>	<i>huŋ-ɖæ-ke</i>	<i>bæ-ke</i>
field	forget-AUX-DS	child-3.RFLXV-OBLQ	send-PAST

‘it (the jug) was forgotten on the field, (so) he sent his child’

iii.p.33

<i>a-mane-la</i>	<i>barmmwij</i>	<i>ŋgir=boeʔ</i>	<i>huŋ-ɖæ-ke</i>	<i>bæ-ke</i>
NEG-agree-DS	another	male	child-3.RFLXV-OBLQ	send-PAST

‘she did not agree and he sent another male child’

In (13) through (17) we have offered five consecutive lines from a text. They demonstrate a number of interesting points germane to the present discussion. The first sentence (13) exhibits a straightforward use of the same subject marker.

(13) Some connected text samples p. 47 lines 10-14

dæt dak-ce knwe? hanḁa wiŋ=ha?-har-ke
 like.that say-SS wife husband quarrel-PL-PAST
 ‘speaking like that, the wife and husband quarreled’

The second sentence (14) starts with a resumption of the preceding sentence’s finite verb--a common narrative device in the South Asian linguistic area. However, this is not a rote repetition of the preceding verb in a particular, non-finite morphological form, as is found, for example, in certain Aryanized Juang texts, but rather, this resumptive connective element is marked for whether it has the same or a different subject as the following clause. In this instance, the subjects are different, the husband and wife together vs. the wife alone and the form is accordingly found with the different subject marker. Similarly, the initial verb form in (16) is a resumptive form marked for different subject as well.

(14) *wiŋ=ha?-la me?-swa-ne knwe?-ṛæ ḁiḁile hli? sambo? we-ke*
 quarrel-DS one-day-DEF wife-RFLXV PRTCL shoot plant go-PAST
 ‘they quarreled and one day the wife went to the bamboo-plant place’

In the beginning of the sentence (15) we find this so-called resumptive use with the same subject marker. This sentence also has a fascinating example of an unconscious speaker correction with regards both to the use of the appropriate case inflection and to the switch reference marker. At first the speaker uses a verb in the different subject form and a nominal complement in the adessive case, realizes he misspoke and “corrects” himself to use the oblique object case marker on the noun and the same subject marker on the verb. This sentence constitutes a clear and strong confirmation of our hypothesis about the switch reference system of Gta?

(15) *hli? sambo? we-ce poga ḁiḁile hli?-nnia cu-bi?-la*
 shoot plant go-SS tobacco PRTCL shoot-near smear-AUX-DS

<i>tæn hli?-ke</i>	<i>cu-bi?-ce</i>	<i>wig-ke</i>
that shoot-OBLQ	smear-AUX-SS	go-PAST

‘she went to the bamboo-plant place, smeared tobacco on the shoots and returned home’

(16) *wig-la hriŋ haŋdaN-de paŋ=li? we-ke*
go-DS afterwards husband-RFLXV break=shoots go-PAST
she went and afterwards, the husband went to break [bamboo] shoots’

The final sentence (17) begins with a same subject marker on the first of two consecutive actions by the husband, the second of which is marked different subject, as the final predicate of the sentence refers to the shoots tasting bitter, not the husband.

(17) *hli? paŋ-ce coŋke-la poga sgwa bsæ? læ?-ke*
shoot break-SS taste-DS tobacco like bitter AUX-PAST
‘he broke the shoots and tasted them, they were bitter like tobacco’

The formal and functional correspondences between the purported same and different subject markers in Gta? and Proto-Gutob-Remo (and modern Gutob and Remo as well) suggest the following reconstruction for the switch reference markers for Proto-Gutob-Remo-Gta? [PGRG] (18).

(18) Switch Reference in Proto-Gutob-Remo-Gta?

Language	Same Subject	Different Subject
Gta?	-ce(?)=[ka]	-la
Remo	-se?ta, -se?, -sa	-na
Gutob	=su	=na
Proto-GRG	*=ci(?)	*-/=na

2 Switch-Reference in Other Munda Languages

Although, switch reference is most developed and closest to a canonical switch reference system in Gutob-Remo-Gta?, is not limited to this subgroup of the South Munda languages. A

possibly cognate same subject marker may be found in Juang, while Kharia has a switch reference marker that is functionally similar to the PGRG (and Juang) formant, but one which is formally non-cognate.

2.1 Switch-Reference in Juang

In certain, less Aryanized Juang narratives, there appears to be an element =*jɔ* that is functionally similar to the PGRG form and historically related phonologically. See a representative example in (19).⁸

(19)

eta airi tɔŋɔn-an-jɔ baba-rɔ-bɔ ɔn-ɔ

then that.one stand-PAST.I-SS father-his-DAT/LOC go-PAST.II

‘then he got up and went to his father’ (Pinnow 1960-ms: 150)

2.2 Switch-Reference in Kharia

Kharia also appears to have a switch reference system, but one which is not formally the same as that of PGRG (and Juang). In terms of regular, systematic usage, Kharia seems only to have same subject formally marked, using *-kon*, which is obviously non-cognate with either PGRG or the more closely related Juang;⁹ see examples in (20).

(20)

i. *hukum ter-o? “gil-kon obgoj goɾ-e-pe”*

order give-PAST hit-SS kill INTSV-IMP-2PL

‘she ordered, beat and kill him (i.e. beat to death)’ (Pinnow 1965: 34)

ii. *ip am-a? lebu hoe-kon jo am-a? dʰaŋrin hek-ip*

I you-GEN person be-SS also you-GEN servant COP-1

‘I am you wife and also I am your servant’ (Pinnow 1965: 55)

Leaving problems with Kharia aside, the same subject functions of Juang *-jɔ* and its cognacy with our reconstructed PGRG same subject marker suggest that (at the least) a formal same subject clitic has been present in the South Munda languages dating all the way back to the Proto-South Munda [PSM] level (*=*jə/i*).¹⁰ The fact that Kharia appears to have a

same subject marker, albeit one not formally cognate with the ostensible PSM, is not to be overlooked, as it implies that this particular means of tracking subject (dis)continuity across clauses in a complex sentence is a pervasive and relatively stable feature of SM discourse, even when the formal elements originally participating in this system have been lost in a given daughter language.

2.3 Switch-Reference in North Munda

Because switch reference seems to have been a feature of Proto-South Munda complex sentence formation, the question arises as to whether any formally or functionally cognate system can be found in North Munda languages as well. As it turns out, there appears to be an element that is both formally and functionally cognate to the PGRG and PSM same subject marker in the Kherwarian language Mundari.

(21) i. Mundari (Osada 1992: 108)

<i>lum-ja-n-ci</i>	<i>manda nam-ja-ʔ-ñ-a</i>
get.wet-ASP-INTR-SS	cold get-ASP-TRANS-1-FIN

‘as I got wet, I caught a cold’

ii. Mundari (Hoffmann 1950: 841)

<i>jom-ke-d-ci-ko</i>	<i>seno-ja-n-a</i>
eat-ASP-TRANS-SS=PL	go-ASP-INTR-FIN

‘they went away as soon as they had eaten’

Note that the subject clitic *-ko* in the Mundari form in (21ii) above phonologically belongs to the word bearing the same subject marker, but morphologically belongs to the following verb. This is a regular and characteristic feature of Kherwarian verb morphology: The subject clitics appear preferentially on the word immediately preceding the verb (22), less commonly at the very end of the verb word following the finite suffix (in clauses consisting of only a single verb, this is, naturally, the only option available). This typologically unusual pattern arose from the reanalysis of original subject

prefixes;¹¹ see Anderson and Zide (forthcoming) and Zide and Anderson (1999) for further details.

(22) Mundari (Osada 1992: 93)

maṇḍi seta-ko-ñ om-a-d-ko-a

food dog-PL-1 give-BEN-TRANS-PL-FIN

‘I gave the food to the dogs’

When referentially or semantically identical ‘direct’ (or regular, unmarked) subject and ‘indirect’ or experiencer subjects are conjoined in a complex sentence, same subject markers are not permitted in Mundari; see (23). The expression is thus considered ungrammatical with the same subject marker. Interestingly, a similar restriction is found in Tuvan as well. For further details see Anderson and Harrison (1999: 85-6).

(23) Mundari (Osada 1992: 107)

en jagar ayum-ke-d-ci suku-le-n-a-ñ

that talk hear-ASP-TRANS-SS be.happy-ASP-ITR-FIN-1

**en jagar ayum-ke-d-ci suku-li-ʔ-ñ-a*

that talk hear-ASP-TRANS-SS be.happy-ASP-TRANS-1-FIN

‘I heard that talk and had become happy’

As in South Munda, there appears to be a system of referent tracking in the North Munda language Korku that is functionally similar to the Mundari (and PSM) system, but, like Kharia, is not formally cognate with the Mundari element. Note the following sentences from Korku (where the same subject marker appears to be etymologically the same as the ablative case marker).

(24) Korku (Nagaraja 1998: 276)

sa:na ro:jo ɖongr-en cakha:n ma:-ten haʈi-n

old.man daily forest-DAT/LOC firewood cut-SS market-DAT/LOC

muḍi kiji-ten ... ga:w-en

bundle sell-SS ... village-DAT/LOC

heje-ɖa:n

come-INDEF.PAST

‘the old man would cut firewood in the forest, sell the bundle in the market and return to the village’

The PSM-Mundari correspondences are suggestive that the same subject element may be very old in the Munda language family, possibly going back to the Proto-Munda ancestor language itself. The fact that other formal elements may enter into the switch reference system, acquiring, in particular, same subject functions, following the loss of the ancestral element in different subgroups of Munda (e.g. in both Korku [North Munda], and in Kharia (and also Sora-Gorum [South Munda], not discussed here for considerations of space), further supports the hypothesis that the switch reference system is quite archaic in the Munda family.

3 Conclusions

In this paper we have argued that there is a system of ‘switch reference’--the use of special morphology to indicate whether the subject of a preceding clause is the same (or not) as the subject of the following clause-- in various South Munda languages. With cognate markers in cognate functions for both same subject and different subject, we believe that the system needs to be reconstructed for an intermediate proto-language level, viz. Proto-Gutob-Remo-Gta?. Further, it is likely that the purported PGRG same subject clitic is cognate with a clausal subject-identity clitic in Juang, suggesting a switch reference system may have been present in Proto-South Munda, at least a same subject marker in $*=jə/i$. If Mundari $=ci$ and PGRG $*=ci(?)$ (and PSM $*=ji/ə$) are cognate (as they appear to be), the same subject marker may in fact go back all the way to Proto-Munda! However, further research is required to elucidate issues in the development and history of the different subject marker.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

ACC	Accusative	AOR	Aorist
ASP	Aspect	AUX	Auxiliary
CAUS	Causative	CL	Classifier
COMP	Complementizer	CONJ	Conjunctive
COP	Copula	CUST	Customary

CV	Converb	DAT	Dative
DECL	Declarative	DEF	Definite
DET	Determiner	DS	Different Subject
FIN	Finitizer	GEN	Genitive
<i>IMP</i>	<i>Imperative</i>	<i>INCH</i>	<i>Inchoative</i>
INDEF	Indefinite	INF	Infinitive
INTR	Intransitive	INTSV	Intensive
LOC	Locative	NE	Narrative Ending
NEG	Negative	OBJ	Object
OBLQ	Oblique	PERF	Perfect(ive)
P/F	Present-Future	PL	Plural
PRES	Present	PRTCL	Particle
REDPL	Reduplication	RFLXV	Reflexive
SBEN	Self-Benefactive	SS	Same Subject
TRANS	Transitive	3	Third Person
1	First person	2	2 ND person

Notes

¹ South Munda languages are primarily spoken in the Indian state of Orissa, with small numbers of speakers in northern Andhra Pradesh. Groups of Kharia speakers are to be found in Bihar as well as small numbers of speakers in diaspora communities as far as Nepal.

² Note that while in narrative texts, the same and different subject markers are frequently used in switch reference functions, with other functions appearing less frequently, in conversational texts in Gutob, the different subject marker is more commonly used to mark 'when' and 'if' clauses, even when there is subject co-reference between the two clauses.

³ Note the areally common repetition in (7ii) of the preceding sentence's finite verb (7i), but here nevertheless marked different subject, as this verb does not share the subject with the following clause; cf. the Gta? discussion in 1.3 below.

⁴ The *-ta* element in Remo is probably some kind of emphatic. It may be cognate with Gta? *-ka* (see below) usually glossed 'only'. The shorter variant *se?* occurs in the three texts in Bhattacharya (1968) only with a plural (same) subject. Whether this apparent distribution is meaningful and

non-random requires further research. Note also the possible relation of the same subject marker to the clausal connective *-sa* ‘and then’ in Remo.

⁵ Note that in the examples in this sentence, the switch reference marker attaches not to a stem marked with a past tense (or ‘participle’) marker, but rather with the simultaneous action marker *-lə* glossed ‘while’ in the interlinear analysis.

⁶ For example, Gta?, but not Gutob-Remo, preserves the Proto-South Munda (/Proto-Munda) subject prefixes, has completely reorganized the system of tense-aspect (having lost, for example the PAST.II (transitive past), and makes much greater use of short, combining forms of nouns, etc.

⁷ The allomorph with a final glottal stop occurs in the texts generally only preceding the enclitic *=ka* meaning either ‘only’ or simply adding emphasis. The glottal stop allomorph in Remo may also possibly (at least originally) be phonologically conditioned by the presence of a following clitic, as appears to be the case in Gta?. Again, we hope that further analysis will clarify this issue.

⁸ In other more Aryanized Juang texts, the switch reference functions seem to have broken down, and several overlapping patterns of use can be observed.

⁹ There are certain uses of an element *-na* in Kharia (a potential cognate for the PGRG different subject marker) that are reminiscent of different subject type functions. See (i)

(i) *taŋ col-kon hokaŋ-a? čamŋa-te akeɖ-na surui-o?, muda keluŋ-a?*
čamŋa moŋʔo hoe-na

now go-SS he-GEN skin-OBLQ bite-INF INCH-PAST but elephant-GEN
 skin thick be-AOR/DS

boŋ akeɖ-na muskil hoe-ki
 through bite-INF difficult be-PAST

‘going, he began to bite his skin, but an elephant’s hide is thick and difficult to bite through’

However, *-na* is multi-functional in Kharia. Its most common functions are to mark future (or non-past aoristic) tense with intransitive verbs, as well as to mark infinitives, though in the latter instance we may be dealing with a recent loan from Hindi which has a formally and functionally identical

infinitive marker in *-na*. In the example in (i) above, if the verbal predicate were transitive, then a different subject analysis would be appropriate; however, as the verbal element belongs to the intransitive class, it is possible, if not quite likely, that this is a chance correspondence in a relatively isolated example, and not a true cognate after all. Another Kharia element, *laʔ*, appears primarily in different subject contexts and is usually (often superfluously) glossed 'then'. Establishing whether this is cognate with the PGRG different subject marker, rather than the *-na* aorist/'future', must await further research.

¹⁰ Note also the probable cognacy of the Juang and PSM/PGRG same subject markers with Kharia *jo* 'also'.

¹¹ That is, through a boundary reanalysis caused by a mismatch between the phonological and morphological words.

References

- Anderson, G. D. S. 1999. A new classification of the Munda Languages: Evidence from comparative verb morphology. Paper presented at 209th meeting of the American Oriental Society, Baltimore.
- Anderson, G. D. S. and N. H. Zide. (forthcoming). Recent Advances in the Reconstruction of the Proto-Munda (Austroasiatic) Verb. To appear in L. Brinton [ed.] Historical Linguistics 1999. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Anderson, G. D. S. & K. D. Harrison 1999. Tyvan. LW/M 257. München: LINCOM-EUROPA.
- Austin, P. 1981. Switch-Reference in Australia. *Language* vol. 57 no.2: 309-334.
- Bhattacharya, S. 1968. A Bonda Dictionary. Poona: Deccan College.
- Boyle, John P. (forthcoming) Hidatsa Clause Structure. In Proceedings from the 1999 Mid-America Linguistics Conference.
- Foley, W. A. 1986. The Papuan Languages of New Guinea. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Haiman, J. 1983. On Some Origins of Switch Reference Marking. In Haiman & Munro [eds.], pp. 105-28.
- Haiman, J. and P. Munro 1983. Switch Reference and Universal Grammar. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hoffmann, J. 1950. Encyclopedia Mundarica. Patna: Government Superintendent Printing.
- Jacobsen, W. H. 1967 Switch-Reference in Hokan-

-
- Coahuiltecan. In D. H. Hymes and W. E. Bittle [eds.] *Southwestern Ethnolinguistics*, pp. 238-63. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Macauley, M. 1996. *A Grammar of Chalcatango Mixtec*. University of California Studies in Linguistics 127. Berkeley: UC Press.
- Mahapatra, K. P. and N. H. Zide. n.d. *Gta? Texts*. Unpublished-ms.
- Munro, P. 1983. When 'Same' is not 'Not Different'. In Haiman and Munro [eds.], pp. 223-243.
- Nagaraja, K. S. 1999. *Korku Grammar with Texts*. Tokyo:Tokyo Univesity of Foreign Studies. ILCAA
- Noonan, M. 1992. *Lango*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Osada, T. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Mundari*. Tokyo:Tokyo Univesity of Foreign Studies. ILCAA
- Pinnow, H.-J. (with J. Kullu and P. Kerketta). 1965. *Der Wertiger und andere Texte*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 9/1: 32-68.
- Zide, N. H. n.d. *Gutob Texts*. Unpublished-ms.
- Zide, N. H. and G. D. S. Anderson. 1999. *The Proto-Munda Verb and Some Connections with Mon-Khmer*. 1999. In B. Rao (ed.) *Working Papers International Symposium on South Asian Languages Contact and Convergence, and Typology*. Tokyo, 401-21.