A NOTE ON GTA? ECHO FORMS

Norman H. Zide
University of Chicago

Dr. Mahapatra has asked me to comment on his paper "Echo Formation in Gta?" since much of the wo on Gta? - including the early reconnaissance on ech forms - was done by both of us in collaboration. I provide a small amount of historical-comparative da for Koraput Munda, including some material on Gutob

Data on echo words for the Munda languages - particularly for the South Munda languages - were lacking when Emeneau wrote surveying such constructions for the Indian linguistic area. In areal perspective, K. Mahapatra's observation that the Gt and South Munda phonologically derived echo words a derived by vowel alteration with no consonantal mod fications is important. His data on Desia (an Indo Aryan language, a dialect of Oriya on which he wrote a dissertation) showing similar and for Indo-Aryan unexpected echo derivations is noteworthy. The a. (1) and c. (3) Desia sets seem to be the likeliest cases of possible influence. With regard to K. Mahapatra's a. (2), vowel change where the second (derived) form differs only by a modified vowel, $'V^{orig}{>}\bar{u}$, is not unknown in Indo-Aryan (e.g. certain (Braj) dialects of Hindi which have khānā + khūnā 'to eat, etc.').

Desia and other Indo-Aryan verbal derivatives V_1a+V_1i - commonly verbal nouns used (in Desia) wit

'to do' and o- 'to be', e.g. mara+mari kor-/o-
not uncommon (the complications of different in-
sitive, transitive or causative stem forms are
red here), and that they owe anything to South
a is questionable. Similarly for the b. pattern,
h looks like Hindi (Braj) V_1+V_2a, where the second
er of the pair looks like (but may not be actu-
or historically otherwise related to) a causa-
derivative of the first (e.g. Braj khānā +
ānā).

Additional data on Koraput Munda languages:
K. Zide, who has worked extensively on Gorum,
ides the following emendations to Mahapatra's
s on Gorum echo forms. (Final d in Gorum is
lottalised.) uri?d should be uri?; bubu? should
ubud, poṛi-d should be poṛid; and abyir should be
(preglottalised b) yir.[1]

The Gutob[2] forms are much like the Remo forms in
there is only a single echo derivative for each
, and the selection from the two possibilities
nds on the stressed (final) vowel of the baseword.
e it is a, the echo has i, and where it is any-
g else the echo commonly[3] has a. Where the
heme is dissyllabic--and this also applies to
ain bimorphemic morphemes--the first echo vowel
he 'automatic vowel': u where the (stressed)
vowel is a, and i where it is i. I have no
ledge of partial echoes and what morphosyntactic
traints would condition their occurrence. Tag
s are more common than echoes in my material, and
to work much as they do in Remo and Gta?.

As to what could be reconstructed for Proto-
b-Remo-Gta? (GRG), and for Koraput Munda, a

conservative guess would be a single echo form in either (V^{aut})-a, or (V^{aut})-i, the choice depending the baseform stressed (i.e. final) vowel. The Gta? a-a (i.e. V^{aut}-a) versus u-a distinction could have resulted from a split--originally dialectal (one dialect reflecting more or less the situation now found in Remo, the other the present day Gutob situation)--of a single V^{aut}-a pattern. The a-a and i-i alternatives where both are possible might have resulted from a widened and confused application of echo rules after the various vowel shifts occurred Gta?. This leaves the initial-vowel-only echo derivations--i.e. V^{x}-V^{y}>V(a)-V^{y}, and V^{x}-V^{y}>V(i)-V^{y} (Mahapatra's 5 and 6) to be accounted for. These could have resulted from a generalization of the partial echo derivations, a generalization from mon morphemic dissyllabic morphemes to polymorphemic dissyllabic words. All of this of course is quite hypothetical, and one would like to have fuller dat from Gutob, Remo, Gorum and Kharia-Juang. But it seems quite possible that fuller elicitation and analysis of materials from these languages would no change the picture. The semantics of the various Gta? echo derivations does not bar a single echo fo interpretation, but it also does not rule out inter pretations positing two or more echo derivations in GRG (and KM), derivations which have been collapsed in all the languages but Gta?. Considering the com plicated set of vowel and consonant shifts that Gta has undergone fairly recently however (see Mahapatr and Zide, op. cit.), it seems unlikely that Gta? pr served several such distinct derivational rules, rules acting on vowels only.[4] The 'gross' a and th 'tender' i that Mahapatra observes in the Gta? data

of course universally attested 'phonetic
phors', not clearly paralleled in Gta? demonstra-
s but explicit in Gutob (and perhaps GRG and
ier Munda protos): Gutob e- (and ite, i.e.
-t-e) 'near', (t-)u- 'middle distance' and a-
'.

The echo forms in Gta? are phonologically inter-
ng and support our analysis of the diphthongs,
e they show that the diphthongal vowel nuclei act
ingle units, e.g. wi has the echo a, not wa, and
he echo i, although wa and wi occur as diphthongs
he language,[5] e.g. nswa+nsi.

Note that there are no first-vowel diphthongs in
yllabic morphemes. The 'breaking' of vowel rules
y to final (stressed) vowels, not to the initial
; thus pre-Gta? *torla>torla, not twarla, al-
gh the monosyllabic combining form is -t(w)ar,
*-tor. In bimorphemic dissyllabic words with
thongal first-vowel nuclei, there is reduction of
diphthong to a monophthong for certain vowels and
certain compositional structures: sia?+pia?>
-pia? (both sia?- and pia?- are verbstems, pia?
ticularizing the general verbal action, sia?- 'to
k'); ne-bog from næ-bog in some idiolects, where
s a pronominal subject-marking prefix, 'we
ral, exclusive)' and bog means 'to beat'.

As to the echo-derivations themselves, the table
twenty-five V^1-V^2 sequences found in dissyllabic
hemes that Mahapatra presents and the echo rules
apply to these seems exhaustive and authorita-
e. There is nothing comparable for any of the
er Munda languages.[6] K. Mahapatra lists the
ironments permitting or blocking the operation of
various echo-deriving rules. I think a more

integrated treatment of all these is possible, but cannot as yet come up with an adequate one. I hope to do so in the future. This would have obvious us in working out the comparatively obscure developmen of initial vowels in dissyllabic words from GRG and pre-Gta? to Gta?.

With regard to the polymorphemic dissyllabic words, K. Mahapatra's observations seem to be supported. The best example is the dissyllabic one huŋ-be; the trisyllabic ones could be questioned. Whether or not all Noun-Noun compounds, whatever their structure, are 'partly echoable' (i.e. the morphemes (=syllables) can derive echoes independently of the other word syllable (or syllables)) i not clear. The two common general Noun-Noun types are N_1-N_2 derived from N_2-genitive-N_1 (ig-tia 'cowdung') and the Modifier-Modified (uli-so 'mango wood'); presumably huŋ-be is an example of one subtype of the latter variety, although this is not clearly the case.

Trisyllabic morphemes, as K. Mahapatra says, a rare, and two of his examples are polymorphemic (an probably present significant stress differences as well as compositional differences): onoro, a nominalization of the verb oro, and n-go-mar-(r)e. The number of compositional possibilities for polymorphemic trisyllabic words is much too high to be exhaustively handled in this context.

As to the semantics of the echo forms, I think Mahapatra underestimates the generality and consistency of system of the differences in meaning holdi between the different echo derivatives that he describes. He seems to make a good case for such semantic features as size (roughly the same as the

word referent vs. smaller), value (same vs.
rior), and other or different. It is true that
full range of echo forms, or even a set of at
t three, say, is available only to non-monosyl-
c morphemes whose final vowel is neither a nor i,
that this includes a sizeable amount of the basic
bulary for which tagwords are available.
patra also writes that the i forms are always
erred in women's speech. It is not clear whether
women don't use a- echoes at all and have, max-
ly, a three-term system of contrasts distinguish-
Mahapatra's 2, 4, and 6, or whether in certain
exts the full set of contrasts (presumably not
lations but representing somebody's speech) are
ralized somehow. If the latter is the case, it
nknown what semantic values are collapsed or
ganized under what conditions. I would assume,
n the glosses for the echo derivatives of kitoŋ,
and bole, that there is a consistent set of
ings for the various echo derivations, and that
e perhaps change in a regular way in i- prefer-
e context and where the vocalism of the baseword
ces the set of regular echo derivative possibil-
es.[7]

The semantic differences noted by Mahapatra
ween echo[8] and tagwords are important. Roughly,
echo derivatives all seem to be non-specific
gue), and thus cannot occur in past tense affir-
ives and imperatives, whereas the tagwords are
cific even when they have no denotation indepen-
t of their basewords. His example, oleŋ is a nice
in that neither the echo (in his example iliŋ)
the tag (dalia) occurs outside echo or tag con-
uctions. It would be interesting to know what

other differences and relations a deeper analysis of Gta? grammar would show.

The questions of what words, morphemes and morpheme combinations can or cannot take echoes remain to be investigated. Thus verb tense suffixes (see Mahapatra's examples) presumably do not echo, nor would, I assume, connectives or interjections.[9] The heuristic value of echo formations (and related derivations: tag derivation--both of these dvaṇdva formations--and reduplication and repetition) in examining a variety of Indian languages (almost all of which have all of these) would be considerable. One would expect different deeper and more general properties of different Indian languages to tie in differently with overt echo-form grammar. The difference between the finite and non-finite verbal categories, for example, is obviously related to echo derivation, etc.

---

[1]Note that Sora, the fifth Koraput Munda language, seems to have very few or no echo forms of this sort. Although Sora is conservative in preserving many archaic features of South Munda and Proto-Munda, it is also fairly thorough in dropping and wiping out traces of others, e.g. pronominal prefixes and dual and inclusive-exclusive distinctions in the pronouns.

[2]The Gutob forms are from work on Gutob done by B.P. Das and me, mostly in 1966-67. The particular notes on echo forms are not now easily accessible to me, so that I must rely on my limited knowledge of the language and on a perusal of a large number of transcribed texts, all with very low echo word frequency. Since very little work has been done with women informants (only a small number of short texts was collected from women in a brief visit to Tikrapara village), perhaps the data is less representative of Gutob than I had thought.

[3]The data is sufficiently tentative, since a thorough elicitation (using the chief--male--

rmants) on echoes was not made. Thus there may for some vowels, alternative echo derivations, possibly these would have distinctive semantic erties.

[4]An elaborate and in some ways similar system in , one of which perhaps provided a model for the truction of the various echo derivation rules, is of the demonstratives (Zide and Mahapatra, Gta? nstratives, ms.).

[5]A few of the echo-derived forms require notes heir transcription: thus for miã+miĩ the overt ought to be transcribed mĩ, which then, like final CV's, is lengthened by 'doubling' the vowel. that syllabic nasal vowels take no different l echoes, i.e. nswa+nsi, not *+isi or *+ĩsĩ or hing else.

[6]As I noted earlier, syllabic nasals do not echo in any case all words with initial syllabic nasal polymorphemic, since the nasal is a separate mor- e. If, as seems to be the case, dissyllabic hemes with final diphthongs such as K. patra's ɛ (i.e. ai), ia, wa, we, and wi always 'reduced' initial vowels (or, by another inter- ation, no initial vowels, e.g. b-lɛ 'roof') and r have full ones, this should be made explicit.

[7]The earlier work by myself and Mahapatra on derivations, including echo derivation, did not up a variety of echo derivatives that he dis- s in this paper. Partly this was due to our y reliance on our excellent chief informant, k Pujari, and his own usage for these forms. in the earlier work neither Dobek nor any other speakers could or would gloss in sufficient and iciently precise semantic detail such differences hose later clarified by K. Mahapatra, e.g. be- n echoes 1, 2 and 7. The elucidation of the ntic distinctions obtaining between the more nu- us partial echo derivatives would be even more icult, although one has a rough idea of what to ct.

[8]The one word that Mahapatra finds that looks a case of echo with consonant modification ch is found elsewhere in Munda, and in India) he e rightly calls a tagword, presumably because e are no other examples of $C^{1}>c$, and because it ves like a tagword (e.g. occurring in non- rrogative past tense forms, etc.). The tagword be reconstructed for GRG as *kuX(-)man+coXl(-)man ob kiman+solman). The *coXl is presumably the

word 'to rub oil into, massage'.

[9]The items in the V^1-V^2 table are all nouns; whether dissyllabic verbstems (which would function as infinitives in their bare stem forms) take all these echo-derivatives as well isn't clear.

Much of the research for this paper was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation.