

REDUPLICATION AND CASE COPYING: THE CASE OF LEXICAL ANAPHORS IN MANIPURI AND TELUGU*

Th. Sarju Devi and Karumuri Venkata Subbarao

University of Delhi and ILCAA, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to highlight the significant role the phenomena of reduplication and Case Copying play in syntax, taking into consideration the formation of lexical anaphors in Manipuri, a Tibeto-Burman language, and Telugu, a Dravidian language. We argue that the syntactic exploitation of these phenomena in two languages that belong to different language families points towards universal principles of the mental organization of language. We shall first present a description of the formation of lexical anaphors in Manipuri, and discuss briefly their syntactic behavior in the Government and Binding framework. We then go on to discuss the nature of lexical anaphors in Telugu, and argue that in spite of belonging to two different language families, both Manipuri and Telugu share much in common, not only with regard to the syntactic behavior of lexical anaphors (reflexives and reciprocals), but also in the complex morphology and syntax involved in the formation of reduplicated polymorphemic anaphors and Case Copying.

2 TYPOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF MANIPURI AND TELUGU

Both Manipuri and Telugu are verb-final languages. Manipuri is spoken in the state of Manipur and also in the adjoining northeastern states of India. It borders Myanmar to the East, Mizoram to the South, Nagaland to the North, and Assam to the West and Northwest. Telugu is a South Central Dravidian language with the largest number of speakers in the Dravidian family.

* This is a radically revised version of the paper presented at the Fourth Himalayan Languages Symposium, Poona, India. This paper will also appear in Ritva Laury, Gerald McMenamin, Shigeko Okamoto, Vida Samiian and Karumuri V. Subbarao (Eds.), *Papers in Honor of P.J. Mistry*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Language Studies. We are thankful to the Indian Institute of Language Studies for having given us permission to publish this paper in *LTBA*.

Both Manipuri and Telugu are nominative-accusative languages, though Manipuri has a nominative lexical case marker **-na** and Telugu lacks one. Both have postpositions, with the genitive preceding the governing noun and the comparative marker following the standard of comparison. The indirect object precedes the direct object in the unmarked word order and time adverbials precede place adverbials. As in most verb-final languages, time and place adverbials occur in descending order (Subbarao 1984). The final complementizer (COMP) which is a form of the verb *say* (quotative) occurs to the right of the embedded clause. Manipuri has an initial COMP as well, that occurs to the left of the embedded clause, while Telugu has no such complementizer. While in Telugu the adjective always precedes the head noun, in Manipuri the adjective can precede as well as follow the head noun in a phrase, though in a sentence the adjective can only follow and not precede the head noun. (Subbarao 1999). In Telugu and Manipuri the adjective does not agree with the head noun; Telugu exhibits subject-verb agreement and Manipuri does not. In Telugu the determiner precedes the head noun while Manipuri has split determiners where the determiner can precede as well as follow the head noun. While Telugu has relative-correlative as well as participial relative clauses, Manipuri has only participial (gap strategy) relative clauses. Manipuri has externally headed as well as internally headed relative clauses, and the externally headed relative clause can occur either to the right or left of the head noun (Geeta Devi 2000). Telugu lacks internally headed relative clauses. Just as with verbs, the negative in Telugu exhibits agreement with the subject; however, the negative in Manipuri, as one would expect, does not, since the language lacks subject-verb agreement. Question words occur *in situ* and there is no obligatory *wh*-movement. Both Telugu and Manipuri are pro-drop languages, and Manipuri permits pro drop in spite of not having subject-verb agreement (Subbarao 2000). Neither language has the expletive construction for *weather* expressions. Both Manipuri and Telugu have a nominal as well as a verbal device as lexical anaphors. While the occurrence of both the reflexive and reciprocal verbal anaphor is obligatory in Telugu under specific syntactic conditions, the occurrence of the verbal anaphor clitic in Manipuri is optional while the occurrence of the verbal reciprocal clitic is obligatory.

3 NATURE AND CHARACTERIZATION OF ANAPHORS IN MANIPURI

3.1 Nominal anaphors in Manipuri

In terms of the occurrence of lexical anaphors, the world's languages can be divided into two types: those having only a nominal or a verbal device, and

those with both a nominal and a verbal device. Languages such as Hindi, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Malayalam, Angami, Korean, Thai, Arabic, English, and Japanese have only the nominal device, while languages like Telugu, Tamil, Kannada, Mizo, Manipuri and Hmar have both nominal and verbal devices. The overt occurrence of nominal and verbal forms of the anaphor may be optional or obligatory, and this is language specific. In Telugu, for example, the occurrence of the verbal anaphor is obligatory, although the nominal anaphor is optional when it occurs in a subcategorized position (Subbarao & Lalitha Murthy 2000). In Manipuri the verbal reflexive is optional while the verbal reciprocal is obligatory.

Before proceeding further we shall explain the terminology that is essential for the characterization of the anaphors in both languages. This includes the terms *reduplicated* and *non-reduplicated anaphors*.

In a reduplicated anaphor a form X is repeated, thus yielding the form X-X. In such formations lexical case markers occur to the right of X. All reduplicated forms are polymorphemic in nature. We present in Table I the set of pronouns in Manipuri, to enable the reader to see the role that pronouns play in the formation of lexical anaphors.

PERSON	SINGULAR	PLURAL
First person	<i>ai</i> / <i>aihak</i> 'I'	<i>aikhoi</i> 'we'
Second person	<i>nung/ nahak</i> / <i>adom</i> 'you'	<i>nakhoi</i> 'you'
Third person	<i>ma</i> / <i>mahak</i> 'he / she'	<i>makhoi</i> 'they'

Table I. Pronouns in Manipuri

Manipuri has a set of non-reduplicated anaphors: ***i-sa*** 'myself', ***na-sa*** 'yourself', ***ma-sa*** 'herself/himself', consisting of the pronominal clitics ***i-*** 'I' and ***na-*** 'you' and the personal pronoun ***ma*** 'he/she', followed by the morpheme ***sa*** which means 'self.'

3.1.1 Reduplicated anaphor in direct object position.

In a reduplicated form the anaphor is repeated, as shown in Table II. Lexical case markers (in bold in Table II) occur to the right of the anaphor.

PERSON	SINGULAR		PLURAL
I	<i>i-sa-na</i> I-self-NOM 'myself'	<i>i-sa-bu</i> I-self-ACC	<i>aikhoi-na i-sa-bu</i> we-NOM I-self-ACC 'ourselves'
II	<i>na-sa-na</i> you-self-NOM 'yourself'	<i>na-sa-bu</i> you-self-ACC	<i>nakhoi-na na-sa-bu</i> you-NOM you-self-ACC 'yourselves'
III	<i>ma-sa-na</i> he/she-self-NOM 'herself/himself'	<i>ma-sa-bu</i> he/she-self-ACC	<i>makhoi-na ma-sa-bu</i> they-NOM he/she-self-ACC 'themselves'

Table II. Reduplicated forms of an anaphor in direct object position

The following examples are illustrative:

1.

ai-na caobi-bu thagat-li
I-NOM Chaobi-ACC praise-NF

'I praised Chaobi'

2.

ai-na isa-na isa-bu thagat-ce-i
I-NOM myself-NOM myself-ACC praise-VR-NF

'I praised myself.'

3.

nung-na nasa-na nasa-bu thagat-ce-i
you-NOM yourself-NOM yourself-ACC praise-VR-NF

'You praised yourself.'

4.

caoba-na masa-na masa-bu thagat-ce-i
Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-ACC praise-VR-NF

'Chaoba praised himself.'

Note that the nominative case marker *-na* occurs with the subject, and the accusative case marker *-bu* occurs with the direct object in sentences (1)-(4). The anaphor is in the reduplicated form in (2)-(4). It is important to note that in the plural the first part of the anaphor does not contain the morpheme *sa* 'self.' Our claim is that it is the lexical nominative case marker of the subject that is

copied onto the first part of the reduplicated structure of the anaphor. We shall label this phenomenon as Case Copying. The second part also consists of the anaphor for *self* in (2)-(4), and carries the accusative case marker *-bu* in direct object position. Thus, the structure of the lexical anaphors in (2)-(4) is schematically given in (5).

5.

pronominal clitic + self - NOM pronominal clitic + self - ACC
--

Our claim concerning Case Copying is supported by evidence from the occurrence of the lexical anaphor in the indirect object position. The indirect object marker is *da* in Manipuri. We give in Table III the reduplicated form of the anaphor in first, second and third persons in indirect object position.

3.1.2 Anaphor in indirect object position.

PERSON	SINGULAR	PLURAL
I	<i>i-sa-na</i> <i>i-sa-da</i> I-self-NOM I-self-DAT '(to) myself'	<i>ai-khoi-na</i> <i>i-sa-da</i> we-NOM I-self-DAT '(to) ourselves'
II	<i>na-sa-na</i> <i>na-sa-da</i> you-self-NOM you-self-DAT '(to) yourself'	<i>na-khoi-na</i> <i>na-sa-da</i> you -NOM you self DAT '(to) yourselves'
III	<i>ma-sa-na</i> <i>ma-sa-da</i> he/she-self-NOM he/she-self-DAT '(to) herself/(to) himself'	<i>makhoi-na</i> <i>ma-sa-da</i> they-NOM he/she-self-DAT '(to) themselves'

Table III. Reduplicated forms of an anaphor in indirect object position.

The following examples are illustrative:

6.

ai-na *caoba-da* *khudolpot-ama* *pi-illi*
I-NOM Chaoba -DAT gift-one give-NF
'I gave Chaoba a gift.'

7.

ai-na *isa-na* *isa-da* *khudolpot-ama* *pi-je-i*
I -NOM myself-NOM myself-DAT gift-one give-VR-NF
'I gave myself a gift.'

8.

nung-na nasa_i-na nasa_i-da khudolpot-ama pi-je_i-i
 you-NOM yourself-NOM yourself-DAT gift-one give-VR-NF
 'You gave yourself a gift.'

9.

caoba_i-na masa_i-na masa_i-da khudolpot-ama pi-je_i-i
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-DAT gift-one give-VR-NF
 'Chaoba gave himself a gift.'

Note that the nominative case marker *-na* occurs with the subject and the lexical dative case marker *-da* occurs with the indirect object in sentences (6)-(9). The anaphor is in the reduplicated form in (7) -(9). The reduplicated anaphor has a bipartite structure. The first part, e.g., in (7) consists of the complex anaphor for *self* in first person singular, *i-sa* 'myself', followed by the nominative case marker. It is the nominative case marker of the subject that is copied onto the first part of the reduplicated structure. The second part also consists of the anaphor for *self* in (7)-(9), and it carries the dative marker *-da* in indirect object position. Thus, the structure of the lexical anaphor in (7)-(9) is schematically given in (10).

10.

pronominal clitic + self - NOM pronominal clitic + self - DAT
--

3.2 Verbal reflexive

We shall now turn to the verbal reflexive clitic (VR) in Manipuri. It has four forms *ja*, *je*, *ca* and *ce*. While *ja* and *je* are in free variation, as are *ca* and *ce*, the [j-] ~ [c-] alternation is phonologically conditioned. If the verb stem ends in a voiced consonant, the form of the verbal reflexive is *-ja/-je*; if it ends in a voiceless consonant, the form is *-ca/-ce*. The verbal reflexive occurs to the right of the verb and to the left of the tense marker. The occurrence of the reflexive marker is optional when the nominal form is overtly present. Thus, as we have seen, the polymorphemic reduplicated form and the verbal reflexive can occur together, as in sentence (11a) below. The anaphor occurs in the direct object position which is a subcategorized position.

11a.

caoba_i-na *masa_i-na* *masa_i-bu* *thagat- ce_i-i*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself -ACC praise-VR-NF

‘Chaoba praised himself.’

The verbal reflexive can optionally be deleted as shown in (11b):

11b.

caoba_i-na *masa_i-na* *masa_i-bu* *thagat-Ø-li*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-ACC praise-VR-NF

‘Chaoba praised himself.’

Note that the first part of the reduplicated anaphor can optionally be deleted as shown in (11c):

11c.

caoba_i-na Ø *masa_i-bu* *thagat-ce-i*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-ACC praise-VR-NF

‘Chaoba praised himself.’

The entire polymorphemic reduplicated form cannot be dropped even if the verbal reflexive is overtly present as shown in (11d):

11d.

**caoba_i-na* Ø Ø *thagat ce-i*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-ACC praise-VR-NF

‘Chaoba praised himself.’

Thus, the presence of the nominal form is obligatory while the occurrence of the verbal form is optional.

The polymorphemic form and the verbal reflexive occur together in Manipuri when an anaphor occurs in the indirect object position as in (12a):

12a.

caoba_i-na *masa_i-na* *masa_i-da* *khudolpot-ama* *pi-je-i*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-DAT gift-one give-VR-NF

‘Chaoba gave a gift to himself.’

Note that the first part of the reduplicated anaphor can be deleted as shown in (12b):

12b.

caoba_i-na \emptyset *masa_i-da* *khudolpot-ama* *pi-je-i*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-DAT gift-one give-VR-NF
 ‘Chaoba gave a gift to himself.’

The verbal reflexive can optionally be dropped as shown in (12c):

12c.

caoba_i-na *masa_i-na* *masa_i-da* *khudolpot-ama* *pi- \emptyset -i*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-DAT gift-one give-VR-NF
 ‘Chaoba gave a gift to himself.’

The polymorphemic form cannot be dropped even if the verbal reflexive is overtly present as shown in (12d):

12d.

**caoba_i-na* \emptyset \emptyset *khudolpot-ama* *pi-je-i*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-ACC gift-one give-VR-NF
 ‘Chaoba gave a gift to himself.’

We have seen that the polymorphemic reduplicated form and the verbal reflexive occur together in direct and indirect object positions, both of which are subcategorized positions.

3.3 Psychological predicates

We shall now discuss the occurrence of anaphors in constructions involving psychological predicates. Psychological predicates subcategorize for a dative postpositional phrase in Manipuri, and since the locative PP occurs in a subcategorized position, both the polymorphemic reduplicated anaphor and a verbal reflexive occur, as one would occur. The following examples are illustrative:

Dative (Oblique Object).

The predicate *sao* ‘angry’ subcategorizes for a dative postpositional phrase as its subcategorized argument, as in (13).

13.

caoba_i-na *caobi-da* *sao- \emptyset -rammi*
 Chaoba-NOM Chaobi-alone-DAT angry-VR-PST
 ‘Chaoba got angry at Chaobi.’

Note that in (13) the experiencer and the patient are not identical, and hence neither the polymorphemic form nor the verbal reflexive occurs. In (14a) the polymorphemic form of the anaphor is coindexed with the antecedent *caoba* 'Chaoba' and the verbal reflexive also occurs, since it is a subcategorized position:

14a.

caoba_i-na ***masa-mathanta-da*** *sao- ja_i-rammi*

Chaoba-NOM himself-alone-DAT angry-VR-PST

'Chaoba got angry at himself.'

Note that in (14a) Case Copying does not take place; and hence the first part of the polymorphemic anaphor *masa* 'self' does not carry the nominative marker *na* to its right. If it does carry the nominative marker, the sentence is ungrammatical, as in (14b):

14b.

caoba-na* *masa-na-mathanta-da*** *sao-ja-rammi*

Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM-alone-DAT angry-VR-PST

'Chaoba got angry at himself.'

We do not have any explanation for its nonoccurrence in this environment.

Note that the first part of the reduplicated anaphor can optionally be dropped, as in (14c):

14c.

caoba-na ***Ø-mathanta-da*** *sao-ja-rammi*

Chaoba-NOM himself-alone-DAT angry-VR-PST

'Chaoba got angry at himself.'

The verbal reflexive can optionally be dropped as shown in (14d):

14d.

caoba-na ***masa-mathanta-da*** *sao-Ø-rammi*

Chaoba-NOM himself-alone-DAT angry-VR-PST

'Chaoba got angry at himself.'

The polymorphemic form cannot be dropped even if the verbal reflexive is overtly present as shown in (14e):

14e.

**caoba-na* \emptyset - \emptyset *sao-ja-rammi*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-alone-DAT angry-VR-PST
 'Chaoba got angry at himself.'

Another crucial point is that nothing can occur between the constituent parts of the polymorphemic anaphor, since the anaphor is treated as a single unit. Thus 15 and 16 are ungrammatical:

15.

**caoba_i-na* *masa_i -na* *asum* *masa_i-bu* *thagat-e-i*
 Chaoba -NOM himself-NOM always himself-ACC praise-VR-NF
 'Chaoba always praised himself.'

16.

**caoba-na* *masa- asum-mathanta-da* *sao-ja-rammi*
 Chaoba-NOM himself-always-alone-DAT angry-VR-PST
 'Chaoba always got angry at himself.'

In a nonsubcategorized position a polymorphemic anaphor is not permitted, but only a nonreduplicated form, as in (17), just as in most South Asian languages (Lust *et al.* 1999):

17a.

tombi-na *masa -gi* *phurit-ama* *lei-je-i*
 Tombi-NOM self-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'Tombi bought a shirt for herself.'

A reduplicated form is not permitted.

17b.

**tombi-na* *masa* *masa-gi* *phurit-ama* *lei-je-i*
 Tombi-NOM herself herself-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'Tombi bought a shirt for herself.'

To summarize the above discussion: (i) a polymorphemic form of the anaphor and the verbal reflexive occur when an anaphor occurs in a subcategorized position; (ii) the first part of the polymorphemic form carries the *case copy* of the subject except in the case of psychological predicates; (iii) the occurrence of the nominal anaphor either in full or in part (the second part) is obligatory; (iv) the occurrence of the verbal reflexive is optional; and (v) the entire nominal polymorphemic form cannot be dropped. That is, the occurrence

of the verbal reflexive without the co-occurrence of the nominal form is not permitted in Manipuri.

3.4 Functions of the verbal reflexive

In South Asian languages the verbal reflexive performs a variety of functions (Lust *et al.* 2000). Besides imparting anaphoric interpretation as a verbal reflexive or a reciprocal, the marker functions as *self-benefactive/self-affective*, e.g. in Telugu (Subbarao & Lalitha Murthy 2000), Mizo (Lalitha Murthy & Subbarao 2000) and Hmar (Mukherjee *et al.* 2000); as *inchoative*, e.g. in Telugu, Mizo, Kannada (Amritavalli 2000); and as a grammaticalized element in the formation of specific lexical items; e.g. in Mizo (Lalitha Murthy & Subbarao 2000) and Hmar (Mukherjee *et al.* 2000). In Manipuri the verbal reflexive performs only the function of a self-benefactive, as we shall see below.

Verbal reflexive as self-benefactive

isa-gi 'self-GEN' in (18) is a possessive reflexive anaphor bound to its antecedent *aihak* '1st person', and the occurrence of the *je* indicates that the effect of the action accrues to the agent of the sentence.

18.

aihak-na isa -gi phurit-ama lei-je-i
 I-NOM self-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'I bought a shirt for myself.'

When the self-benefactive *je* is overtly present, the occurrence of the possessive anaphor is optional, as in (19a).

19a.

aihak-na Ø phurit-ama lei-je-i
 I-NOM myself-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'I bought a shirt for myself.'

When the self-benefactive is not overtly present, the occurrence of the possessive reflexive is obligatory, as in (19b).

19b.

aihak-na isa-gi phurit-ama lei-Ø-i
 I-NOM self-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'I bought a shirt for myself.'

Some further examples are illustrative:

20a.

tomba-na masa-gi phurit-ama lei-je-i
 Tomba-NOM myself-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'Tomba bought a shirt for himself.'

20b.

tomba-na Ø phurit-ama lei-je-i
 Tomba-NOM myself-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'Tomba bought a shirt for himself.'

20c.

tomba-na masa-gi phurit-ama lei-Ø-i
 Tomba-NOM myself-GEN shirt-one buy-SB-NF
 'Tomba bought a shirt for himself.'

21.

aihak-na isa-gi caak thong-(je)-i
 I-NOM myself-GEN rice cook-VR-NF
 'I cooked food for myself.'

22.

aihak-na isa-ithanta-gi caak thong-(je)-i
 I-NOM myself-alone-GEN rice cook-VR-NF
 'I cooked food for myself (and not for others).'

23.

mahak-na masa-gi phurit-ama tu-(je)-i
 she-NOM herself-GEN shirt-one sew-VR-NF
 'She sewed a shirt for herself (and not for others).'

In Dravidian languages and in some Tibeto-Burman languages such as Mizo and Hmar, the verbal reflexive functions as an inchoative marker that detransitivizes the verb. However, in Manipuri the verbal reflexive does not function as an inchoative marker. We give below groups of sentences containing verbs such as *boil*, *melt*, *open*, *close* which have both a transitive and an intransitive form. Note that the intransitive verb does not carry the verbal reflexive as it does in other languages where the reflexive functions as an inchoative marker.

24a.

ising-adu sao re

water-DET boiled

'The water boiled.'

24b.

**sing-adu sao-je-re*

water-DET boil-VR-NF

'The water boiled.'

24c.

aihak-na ising-adu sao-han-bani

I-NOM water-DET boil-CAUS-NF

'I boiled the water.'

25a.

un-adu tum-me

ice-DET melted

'The ice melted.'

25b.

**un-adu tum-je-me*

ice-DET melted VR-NF

'The ice melted.'

25c.

aihak-na un tum-hal-le

I-NOM ice melt-CAUS-NF

'I melted the ice.'

26a.

thong-adu haang-nge

door-DET opened

'The door opened.'

26b.

**thong-adu haang-je-nge*

door-DET open-VR-NF

'The door opened.'

26c.

thong-adu aihak-na hang-bani

door-DET I-NOM open-NF

'I opened the door.'

27a.

thong-adu thing nge

door-DET closed

'The door closed.'

27b.

**thong-adu thing -je-nge*

door-DET close-VR-NF

'The door closed.'

27c.

thong-adu aihak-na thing-nge

door-DET I-NOM closed

'I closed the door.'

As we shall see in section 6, the verbal reflexive functions as an inchoative marker.

4 RECIPROCALLS

We shall now discuss the nature of reciprocal anaphors in Manipuri. Manipuri has a nominal as well as a verbal reciprocal (VRC) anaphor. Just as in most of the languages of the world, the nominal reciprocal is polymorphemic. The conditions under which the verbal and nominal reciprocals occur in Manipuri are the same as the conditions under which the reflexive anaphor occurs, with one crucial difference. While the occurrence of the verbal reflexive is optional, the occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory. The verbal reflexive is *celje* or *calja* and the verbal reciprocal is *ne*.

The nominal reciprocal has three forms in Manipuri, to wit:

- (i) *ama-NOM+ ama-ACC*
- (ii) *ama ga ama ga*
- (iii) *makhoi masel-(da)*

4.1 Direct object.

We shall first discuss the reciprocal in which the nominative marker and the accusative case marker co-occur, as in 28a:

28a.

makhoi-na ama-na ama-bu thagat-na-rammi
 they-NOM one-NOM one-ACC praise-VRC-PST

'They each praised the other.'

The nominative case marker *na* is copied onto the first part of the reciprocal and the second part carries the case marker *bu*.

Note that the nominal reciprocal cannot be dropped even if the verbal reciprocal is present, hence the ungrammaticality of 28b:

b.

**makhoi-na Ø Ø thagat-na-rammi*
 they-NOM one-NOM one-ACC praise-VRC-PST

'They each praised the other.'

The second form of the nominal reciprocal *ama ga ama ga* 'each other' does not carry the nominative marker, nor does it carry an accusative case marker.

29a.

makhoi-na ama-ga ama-ga thagat-na-rammi
 they-NOM one-and one-and praise-VRC-PST

'They praised one another.'

The occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory. (29b) is ungrammatical, since it does not carry the VRC *na*:

29b.

**makhoi-na ama-ga ama-ga thagat- Ø -rammi*
 they-NOM one-and one-and praise-VRC-PST

'They praised one another.'

The third form of the nominal reciprocal, *makhoi masel* 'each other', also does not carry either the nominative or the accusative marker. The nominal reciprocal form *makhoi masel* has a distributive interpretation as in (30a) below:

30a.

makhoi-na makhoi-masel thagat-na-rammi
 they-NOM they-each other praise-VRC-PST

'They each praised the other.'

The antecedent *makhoi* 'they' along with the nominative marker *na* can optionally be dropped, provided the nominal reciprocal and the verbal reciprocal are present, as in (30b):

30b.

Ø *makhoi-masel* *thagat-na-rammi*
 they-NOM they-each other praise-VRC-PST
 'They each praised the other.'

4.2 Indirect object

When the nominal reciprocal occurs in the indirect object position, the occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory. In the nominal reciprocal form *ama-na ama-da* 'each other', the first part of the reciprocal contains a Case Copy of the subject and the second part contains the dative marker *da*, as in (31a):

31a

makhoi-na ama-na ama-da khudolpot pi-na-rammi
 they-NOM one-NOM one-DAT gift give-VRC-NF
 'They gave gifts to one another.'

The nominal anaphor can optionally be dropped, as in (31b):

31b.

makhoi-na Ø Ø khudolpot pi-na-rammi
 they-NOM one-NOM one-DAT gift give-VRC-NF
 'They gave gifts to one another.'

The occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory in this environment. The absence of the VRC results in an ungrammatical sentence like (31c):

31c.

**makhoi-na ama-ga ama-ga khudolpot pi-Ø-rammi*
 they-NOM one-and one-and gift give-VRC-NF
 'They gave gifts to one another.'

In the third form of the reciprocal, the occurrence of the dative case marker is optional, as in (32a):

32a.

makhoi-na makhoi-masel-(da) khudolpot pi-ne-i
 they-NOM they-each other-DAT gift give-VRC-NF

'They gave gifts to one another.'

When the dative case marker is overtly present, the subject cannot be dropped:

32b.

* \emptyset *makhoi-masel-da khudolpot pi-ne-i*
 they-NOM they-each other-DAT gift give-VRC-NF

The presence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory. Thus (32c) is ungrammatical:

32c.

* \emptyset *makhoi-masel- \emptyset khudolpot pi- \emptyset -i*
 they-NOM they-each other-DAT gift give-VRC-NF

'They gave gifts to each other.'

Manipuri has another nominal reciprocal form *ama-na ama-da* in which the first part of the bipartite structure of the reciprocal contains a Case Copy of the subject, and the second part contains the dative case marker *da*, as in (33a):

33a.

makhoi-na ama-na ama-da khudolpot pi-na-rammi
 they-NOM one-NOM one-DAT gift give-VRC-NF

'They gave gifts to one another.'

The nominal anaphor can optionally be dropped, as in (33b):

33b.

makhoi-na \emptyset \emptyset khudolpot pi-na-rammi
 they-NOM one-NOM one-DAT gift give-VRC-NF

'They gave gifts to one another.'

The occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory. The absence of the verbal reciprocal results in an ungrammatical sentence like (33c):

33c.

<i>*makhoi-na</i>	<i>ama-ga</i>	<i>ama-ga</i>	<i>khudolpot</i>	<i>pi- Ø -rammi</i>
they-NOM	one-and	one-and	gift	give-VRC-NF

‘They gave gifts to one another.’

5 ANAPHOR BINDING IN MANIPURI

In this section we discuss the nature of anaphor binding in terms of the binding principles proposed in Chomsky (1981) in the Government and Binding framework.

Binding Theory

Binding theory is concerned with the interpretation of nominal expressions *in language*. The relationship of anaphors, pronouns and names is based on the fundamental notion of governing category (GC), which Chomsky (1981:188) has characterized as follows:

A is the governing category for B if and only if A is the minimal governing category containing B and a governor of B, where A = NP or S.

The Binding Theory (BT) put forward by Chomsky (1981) consists of three principles:

Principle A

An anaphor must be bound by an antecedent in its governing category.

Principle B

A pronoun must be free in its governing category.

Principle C

An R-expression must be free.

The term anaphor is used here to cover both reflexive and reciprocal expressions. R-expressions are noun phrases (NPs) that are not pronouns (i.e., names and descriptions).

Principle A of the Binding Theory states that an anaphor is bound in its governing category. An anaphor is C-commanded by its antecedent. The antecedent is generally the subject of the sentence. An anaphor occurs in a subcategorized position in a non-subject position in Manipuri and it is bound in its governing category. As in most of the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages, in Manipuri too the antecedent and the anaphor can be scrambled, as in (34b).

Normal word order

34a.

aihak-na isa-na isa-bu nungsi-je-i
 I-NOM myself-NOM myself-ACC love-VR-NF

'I love myself.'

Subject-DO scrambled

34b.

isa-na isa-bu aihak-na nungsi-je-i
 myself-NOM myself-ACC I-NOM love-VR-NF

'I love myself.'

Even if the first part of the reduplicated anaphor is dropped, scrambling is still permitted, as in (34c):

Subject-DO scrambled

34c.

isa-bu aihak-na nungsi-je-i
 myself-ACC I-NOM love-VR-NF

'I love myself.'

Manipuri strictly adheres to Principle A. As the anaphors in Manipuri are polymorphemic in nature, they do not allow long-distance binding, as in (35) and (36):

35.

caobi-na caoba-da masa_{ij}-gi ca-lon na ba hai-khi
 Chaobi-NOM (FEM) Chaoba-DAT(MASC) himself-GEN tea-to make-tell-PST
 'Chaobi told Chaoba to make tea for himself/*herself.'

36.

caobi-na caoba-da masa_{ij}-gi phurit-ama lei na ba hai-khi
 Chaobi-NOM (FEM) Chaoba-DAT(MASC) himself-GEN shirt-one-buy-to tell-PST
 'Chaobi told Chaoba to buy a shirt for himself/*herself.'

We shall now briefly discuss Principle B which concerns the interpretation of pronouns. The set of personal pronouns in Manipuri is given in Table IV, repeated from Table II:

PERSON	SINGULAR	PLURAL
First Person	<i>ai / aihak</i> 'I'	<i>aikhoi</i> 'we'
Second Person	<i>nung / nahak / adom</i> 'you'	<i>nakhoi</i> 'you (pl)'
Third Person	<i>ma / mahak</i> 'she / he'	<i>makhoi</i> 'they'

Table IV. Pronouns in Manipuri

The second person singular pronoun *nung* is used when addressing a person of the younger generation, a close friend, or a relative. Both *nung* and *nahak* are used when speaking to a person with whom one has an informal relationship. *adom* 'you' is an extra-polite form used by speakers of the younger generation when they talk to those belonging to the older generation or to a person with whom one has a formal relationship.

Principle B of the Binding Theory states that pronouns must be free in their governing category, i.e. pronouns cannot have a C-commanding antecedent in the same clause. See sentences (36) and (37):

37.

angang-sing_i-na makhoi_{i,j}-bu mateng paang-bi-rammi
 child-PL-NOM they-ACC help offer-OTHER BEN-PST
 'The children helped them.'

38.

caobi-na mahak_{i,j}-pu nungsi
 Chaobi-NOM he/she-ACC love
 'Chaobi loves her/him.'

Considering the fact that the 'local domain' is the same for anaphors and pronouns, there is complementarity between pronouns and anaphors in terms of their occurrence as a universal principle, and such complementarity is found in Manipuri too.

Principle C of the Binding Theory that deals with referential expressions states that an R-expression must be free. In (39) the R-expression is coindexed with an antecedent, and hence the sentence is ungrammatical:

39.

**aikhoi-na angang-sing_i-bu mateng-paang-ba-adu makhoi-na ningsingi*
 we-NOM child-PL-ACC help-offer-INF-DET they-NOM remember
 'They_i remember that we helped the children_i.'

6 A BRIEF COMPARISON OF LEXICAL ANAPHORS IN MANIPURI AND TELUGU

In this section we provide a brief description of anaphors, pronouns and R-expressions in Telugu, and then compare the formation and nature of lexical anaphors in Manipuri and Telugu.

Just like Manipuri, Telugu also has a verbal as well as a nominal anaphor. The nominal anaphor is polymorphemic and reduplicated. The set of pronouns and anaphors in Telugu is presented in Table V.

PERSON	SINGULAR	PLURAL
First Person	<i>neenu</i> 'I'	<i>meemu</i> 'we (excl)' <i>manamu</i> 'we(incl)'
Second Person	<i>nuwwu</i> 'you (familiar)'	<i>miiru</i> 'you (pl)'
Third Person	<i>aame</i> / <i>waaDu/adi</i> 'she / he / it'	<i>waaLLU</i> 'they'

Table V. Pronouns in Telugu

6.1 Anaphors in Telugu

PERSON	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
I	<i>nannu</i> I-ACC 'myself'	<i>neenu</i> I-NOM	<i>mammal-ni</i> we-ACC 'ourselves (excl)' <i>mammal-ni</i> we-ACC 'ourselves (incl)'	<i>meemu</i> we <i>manam</i> we
II	<i>ninnu</i> you-ACC 'yourself'	<i>nuwwu</i> you-NOM	<i>mimmalni</i> you-ACC 'yourselves'	<i>miiru</i> you-PL-NOM
III	<i>tana-ni</i> he/she-ACC 'himself/herself'	<i>tanu</i> he/she-NOM	<i>tama-ni</i> they-ACC 'themselves'	<i>taamu</i> they-NOM

Table VI. Reduplicated anaphors in Direct Object position.

Just as in Manipuri there is **Case Copying** of the lexical case marker of the subject onto the anaphor, but with a difference. The nominative case marker of the subject is null in Telugu and it is the null case marker that is copied onto the second part of the anaphor, while the second part carries an overt case marker. Recall that in Manipuri it is the first part of the anaphor that carries the nominative marker which is case copied from the subject.

The following examples from Telugu are illustrative:

40.

neenu-Ø caobi-ni pogiDeenu
I -NOM Chaobi-ACC praised

'I praised Chaobi.'

41.

neenu-Ø nannu neenu poguDu-konn-aanu
I -NOM I-ACC I-NOM praised-VR-AGR

'I praised myself.'

42.

nuwwu ninnu nuwwu poguDu-konn-aawu
you-NOM yourself-NOM yourself-ACC praised-VR-AGR

'You praised yourself.'

43.

caoba-Ø tana-ni tanu poguDu-konn-aaDunu
Chaoba-NOM himself-NOM himself-ACC praised-VR-AGR

'Chaoba praised himself.'

The verbal reflexive cannot be dropped in sentences like (44) and (45), while the nominal form can optionally be dropped, as in (46).

44.

**neenu-Ø nannu neenu poguDee-Ø-nu*
I -NOM I-ACC I-NOM praised-VR-AGR

'I praised myself.'

45.

**nuwwu-Ø ninnu nuwwu poguD-Ø-eewu*
you-NOM yourself-ACC yourself-NOM praised-VR-AGR

'You praised yourself.'

46.

caoba-Ø Ø poguDu-konn-aaDu
Chaoba-NOM himself-ACC himself-NOM praised-VR-AGR

'Chaoba praised himself.'

Just as in Manipuri, in a nonsubcategorized position only a non-reduplicated form of the anaphor is permitted, and the occurrence of the verbal reflexive or reciprocal is prohibited:

47.

maadhuri tana koosam silk ciira konu-kkon-di/kon-di

Madhuri self-for silk saree buy-self BEN-AGR/buy-AGR

'Madhuri bought a silk saree for herself.'

kon in (47) functions as a self-benefactive/self-affective and can optionally be dropped if the theme involves a non-bodypart.

However, if the theme is a bodypart or a kinship term, *kon* cannot be dropped, as in (48) and (50):

48.

maadhuri tana naalika karucu- kon-di

Madhuri self's tongue bite-VR-AGR

'Madhuri bit her tongue.'

49.

**maadhuri tana naalika karicin-Ø-di*

Madhuri self's tongue bite-VR-AGR

'Madhuri bit her tongue.'

50.

praaviNya tana bhaarya ni baagaa cuusu- kon- TaaDu

Pravinya self's wife ACC well see VR PRES-AGR

'Pravinya takes good care of his wife.'

51.

praaviNya tana bhaarya ni baagaa cuus- Ø- taaDu

Pravinya self's wife ACC well see VR PRES-AGR

'Pravinya takes good care of his wife.'

The following points are crucial to note concerning the occurrence of anaphors in Telugu:

- (i) The nominative case marker Ø of the subject is copied onto the second part of the bipartite structure.
- (ii) The occurrence of the verbal reflexive in Telugu is obligatory when the anaphor occurs in the direct or indirect object position, or locative object position subcategorized by the predicate.

- (iii) The entire nominal anaphor or the second part of the anaphor can be optionally deleted.

Evidence in support of Case Copying comes from the Dative Subject construction (cf. Subbarao & Lalitha Murthy 2000). The dative case marker *ki* that occurs with the subject is copied onto the second part of the reduplicated structure, as in 52:

52.

Maadhurya-ki tana miida tana-ki koopam waccindi
 Madhurya-DAT self-on self-DAT anger came
 'Madhurya got angry at herself.'

6.2 Reciprocals in Telugu

In Telugu the reciprocal anaphor is also bipartite in structure and there is case copying of the nominative marker onto the second part of the reciprocal expression. The occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory, while the occurrence of the nominal expression is optional:

53.

mantrula-Ø (okaLLa-ni okaLLu- Ø) poguDU konn-aaru
 Ministers one (pl)-ACC one-NOM praise VRC-AGR
 'The ministers praised each other.'

Once again it is the dative subject construction that provides evidence in support of case copying. (54) contains a psychological predicate *koopam wacc* 'become angry' that requires a dative case-marked subject:

54.

mantrula-ki okaLLa-miida okaLLa-ki koopam waccin-Ø-di/
 Ministers one-on one-DAT anger-came-VRC-AGR
 'The ministers got angry at each other.'

Note that in (54) the dative marker *ki* is copied onto the second part of the polymorphemic structure of the reciprocal, and the first part carries the locative case marker *miida* 'on.' The occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is prohibited in the dative subject construction. Thus (55) is ungrammatical:

55.

**mantrula-ki okaLLa-miida okaLLa-ki koopam waccu-kon-di/*
 Ministers one-on one-DAT anger came-VRC-AGR

In contrast, recall that in Manipuri:

- (i) The nominal reflexive anaphor cannot be dropped, although the nominal reciprocal may be. The occurrence of the verbal reflexive is optional and the occurrence of the verbal reciprocal is obligatory.
- (ii) In Manipuri psychological predicates permit a verbal reflexive or reciprocal, since the subject is in the nominative case in such constructions.

7 CONCLUSIONS

As far as the functions of the verbal reflexive are concerned, both Manipuri and Telugu share the feature *self-benefactive*. The Telugu verbal reflexive in addition performs the function of an inchoative marker.

Manipuri strictly obeys Principles A, B and C of the Binding Theory while Telugu obeys Principle A and B and there are some exceptions to Principle C. (See Subbarao & Lalitha Murthy 2000 for further details.)

We also observe that in both Manipuri and Telugu reduplication is productively used to create a morphological complex that refers to an anaphor, and it is the Case Copying and case marker assignment that are used in the constituent parts of the bipartite anaphor. There is however a minor difference. While Case Copying of the subject takes place on the first part of the reduplicated anaphor in Manipuri, it is on the second part of the reduplicated structure that Case Copying takes place in Telugu. Case Copying is a phenomenon that belongs to syntax, and reduplication is a process that belongs to compound-formation strategies of language. It is the interaction of these two phenomena that results in the formation of anaphors in these two genetically unrelated languages.

Thus, we notice that there are many similarities in the compound formation strategies and syntactic nature of lexical anaphors in Manipuri and Telugu which transcend genetic boundaries. This, in our opinion, points toward the universal principles involved in the mental organization of language. (See Subbarao 2000 for some other instances.)

REFERENCES

- AMRITAVALLI, R. 2000. "Lexical anaphors and pronouns in Kannada". In Lust, *et al.*
- CHOMSKY, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Holland and Cinnaminson, N.J.: Foris Publications.
- LALITHA MURTHY, B. and Subbarao, K.V. 2000. "Lexical Anaphors and Pronouns in Mizo". In Lust, *et al.*
- LUST, B.C., J.W. GAIR, K. WALI, and K.V. SUBBARAO. 2000. *Lexical Anaphors and Pronouns in Selected South Asian Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MUKHERJEE, S.N., SUBBARAO, K.V., and WALIA, D. 2000. "Lexical anaphors and blocking effects in Hmar". In T. Kansakar and M. Turin, eds., *Themes in Himalayan Languages and Linguistics*. Tribhuvan University and University of Heidelberg.
- SUBBARAO, K.V. 1984. *Complementation in Hindi Syntax*. Delhi: Academic Publications.
- . 1999. *Agreement and Relative Clauses in Tibeto-Burman*. Tokyo: ILCAA, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- . 2000. "Syntactic typology and South Asian languages". In Rajendra Singh, ed: *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*. New Delhi and Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- SUBBARAO, K.V. and LALITHA MURTHY, B. 2000. 'Lexical anaphors and pronouns in Telugu'. In Lust, *et al.*