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

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 are derived by vowel alteration with no consonantal modifications 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<sup>orig</sup>-<u>u</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 V₁<sub>a</sub>+V₁<sub>i</sub> - commonly verbal nouns used (in Desia) with
'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) \( V_1+V_2 \), where the second
or the pair looks like (but may not be actu-
ally 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
on Gorum echo forms. (Final d in Gorum is
lottalised.) ur?d should be ur?; bubu? should
ubud, po?i-d should be po?i-d; and aby?r should be
(preglottalised b) y?r.

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
traits 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-
\( \text{b-Remo-Gta?} \) (GRG), and for Koraput Munda, a
conservative guess would be a single echo form in either (Vaut)-a, or (Vaut)-i, the choice depending on the baseform stressed (i.e. final) vowel. The Gta? a-a (i.e. Vaut-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 Vaut-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. Vx-Vy>V(a)-Vy, and Vx-Vy>V(i)-Vy (Mahapatra's 5 and 6) to be accounted for. These could have resulted from a generalization of the partial echo derivations, a generalization from monomorphemic disyllabic morphemes to polymorphemic disyllabic words. All of this of course is quite hypothetical, and one would like to have fuller data from Gutob, Remo, Gorum and Kharia-Juang. But it seems quite possible that fuller elicitation and analysis of materials from these languages would not change the picture. The semantics of the various Gta? echo derivations does not bar a single echo form interpretation, but it also does not rule out interpretations positing two or more echo derivations in GRG (and KM), derivations which have been collapsed in all the languages but Gta?. Considering the complicated set of vowel and consonant shifts that Gta? has undergone fairly recently however (see Mahapatra and Zide, op. cit.), it seems unlikely that Gta? preserved several such distinct derivational rules, rules acting on vowels only. The 'gross' a and the '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-
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, e.g. _swa+nsI.

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

As to the echo-derivations themselves, the table
twenty-five V^1-V^2 sequences found in disyllabic
emes that Mahapatra presents and the echo rules
y apply to these seems exhaustive and authorita-
e. There is nothing comparable for any of the
er Munda languages. K. Mahapatra lists the
ironments permitting or blocking the operation of
arious 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 development 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)) is not clear. The two common general Noun-Noun types are $N_1-N_2$ derived from $N_2$-genitive-$N_1$ ('cowdung') and the Modifier-Modified (u-li-so 'mango wood'); presumably huŋ-be is an example of one sub-type of the latter variety, although this is not clearly the case.

Trisyllabic morphemes, as K. Mahapatra says, are rare, and two of his examples are polymorphemic (and probably present significant stress differences as well as compositional differences): onorọ, 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 holding 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. prior), and other or different. It is true that full range of echo forms, or even a set of at least three, say, is available only to non-monosyllabic morphemes whose final vowel is neither a nor l, that this includes a sizeable amount of the basic bulary for which tagwords are available.

Pathra also writes that the l forms are always preferred 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 texts the full set of contrasts (presumably not dis-
lations but representing somebody's speech) are realized somehow. If the latter is the case, it is unknown what semantic values are collapsed or organiza-

ized under what conditions. I would assume, in the glosses for the echo derivatives of kito, u and bole, that there is a consistent set of meanings for the various echo derivations, and that these perhaps change in a regular way in l-prefer-

e context and where the vocalism of the baseword produces the set of regular echo derivative possibil-

ites.

The semantic differences noted by Mahapatra between echo and tagwords are important. Roughly, echo derivatives all seem to be non-specific (tongue), and thus cannot occur in past tense affairs and imperatives, whereas the tagwords are specific even when they have no denotation indepen-

dent of their basewords. His example, o|elope is a nice in that neither the echo (in his example l|ling) nor the tag (dalia) occurs outside echo or tag con-

usions. 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 mor-
pheme 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 dvandva
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 dif-
ference 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 lan-
guage, seems to have very few or no echo forms of
this sort. Although Sora is conservative in preserv-
ing 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 pre-
fixes 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 fre-
quency. 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 repre-
sentative 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 properties.

4 An elaborate and in some ways similar system in, one of which perhaps provided a model for the construction 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 on their transcription: thus for mĩa+miĩ the overt ought to be transcribed mĩ, which then, like final CV's, is lengthened by 'doubling' the vowel, so that syllabic nasal vowels take no different echoes, i.e. _nswa+nsĩ, not *+ĩsi or *+ĩsĩ or anything else.

6 As I noted earlier, syllabic nasals do not echo in any case all words with initial syllabic nasal polymorphic, since the nasal is a separate mor-
e. If, as seems to be the case, disyllabic themes with final diphthongs such as K. patra's e (i.e. ai), ia, wa, we, and wi always 'reduce' initial vowels (or, by another interpretation, no initial vowels, e.g. b-le '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 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 incisive detail such distinctions as later clarified by K. Mahapatra, e.g. be-
non echoes 1, 2 and 7. The elucidation of the tinct distinctions obtaining between the more nu-
ous partial echo derivatives would be even more difficult, although one has a rough idea of what to expect.

8 The one word that Mahapatra finds that looks a case of echo with consonant modification is found elsewhere in Munda, and in India) he rightly calls a tagword, presumably because there are no other examples of C→c, and because it gives like a tagword (e.g. occurring in non-narrative 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'.

9The 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.
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