

# A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF SOME SOUTH MUNDA KINSHIP TERMS, I

Norman H. Zide & Arlene R. K. Zide

## *Part 1*

1. In this paper we present etymologies for a number of South Munda kinship terms.<sup>1</sup> South Munda (SM), one branch of Proto-Munda (PM), branches into Kharia-Juang (KJ) or Central Munda, and Koraput Munda (KM); KM branches into Sora-Juray-Gorum (SJG) and Gutob-Remo-Gta' (GRG). While we have not done anthropological analyses of the Munda kinship systems, we have made use of the anthropological sources in defining and relating kin terms and kin-term sets of the languages and proto-languages.

Our objective has been to provide a linguistic analysis of the SM kin-terms, with a view to reconstructing as much of the original (i.e. non-borrowed) terminology as possible, and to integrate the results into as coherent and plausible a system as we can. Since KM and SM noun morphology have not been analysed and described, we will present a description of SM noun morphology with particular reference to the derivational morphology of full forms (FF), and combining or compositional forms (CF) of Munda kin terms. This will come in the second paper in this series, along with the first full sets of kin-term etyma.

In the first section of this paper we take up and criticise the work of Bhattacharya (1970) and Parkin (1985) on Munda kin terms, and in the second section we discuss how relationship and reciprocity are shown in Munda kin terms.

We have taken our data, the SM kin terms and definitions, from a wide range of existing sources, and from our own fieldnotes. The anthropological sources are fuller in the coverage of the terms and their uses, but are poorer in linguistic transcription, and lack morphological analysis. The linguistic sources provide better linguistic data, but are incomplete and, for purposes of kinship term analysis, poorly organised. A few publications (e.g. Deeney, 1975, on Ho) are exceptional in presenting the kinship system and the kin terms fully and perspicuously in linguistically well-analysed form.

---

1. We use the following abbreviations in describing kin terms: M, 'mother'; F, 'father'; P, 'parent'; Br, 'brother'; Si, 'sister'; Sib, 'sibling'; Y, 'younger'; O, 'older'; Hu, 'husband'; Wi, 'wife'; Sp, 'spouse'; So, 'son'; Da, 'daughter'; Ch, 'child'.

The abbreviations for the modern language names are: Sa, 'Santali'; Mu, 'Mundari'; Kher, 'Kherwarian'; Kh, 'Kharia'; Ju, 'Juang'; So, 'Sora'; Go, 'Gorum'; Jr, 'Juray'; Gu, 'Gutob'; Re, 'Remo', and Ga, 'Gta?'. The more common ethnonyms for the KM languages are: Sora: Saora, Savara; Juray: Juray Sora; Gorum: Pareng, Parenga, Parengi; Gutob: Gad(a)ba, Gutob Gadba; Remo: Boṇḍa, Bondo; Gta?: Dīḍayi, Dīḍei, Dire.

There has been widespread borrowing of kinship terms into SM: from languages as diverse as the Dravidian Ollari Gadba, and Indo-Aryan Koṭia Oṛiya, standard Oṛiya, and standard and dialectal Hindi, Bhojpuri and Bengali, and English. Undoubtedly earlier borrowings, particularly from Dravidian, have been missed by us. We hope, for a later paper in this series, to collaborate with a Dravidianist on Dravidian borrowings, early and late, of both kinship behaviour and kinship words. This paper does not deal with kinship terms that are not genetically old in Munda, and that are not likely to have cognates in Mon-Khmer (MK). We propose to present the full set of Munda kin terms with Mon-Khmer (and, possibly, Austronesian) cognates in a later paper.

The only published general treatments of Munda kin terms are those of Bhattacharya (1970) and Parkin (1985), and the relevant sections of Pinnow's *Versuch* (1959), as updated by him in 1960 in his unpublished monograph on Juang. We show that Bhattacharya's weighting of semantic similarity at the expense of sound correspondences leads him to lump together forms that are semantically very close, but not cognate.<sup>2</sup> Parkin, an anthropologist who has written a dissertation on Austro-asiatic kinship, needs to use linguistic evidence. He makes use of Bhattacharya's material, but is sometimes misled by Bhattacharya's methods of analysis and presentation of data. Parkin also takes rough phonetic similarity as indication of genetic relationship, and uses the—usually spurious—'cognition' to support anthropological arguments about kinship. He sometimes ignores Bhattacharya's conclusions (e.g. about *bare* (Bhattacharya's Set 66. (1970: 455), *Ga bare*; ZZ \*bōHrē,<sup>3</sup> 'a woman's brother') and mistakenly connects reflexes of this \*bōHrē (e.g. *bo're*, *bok're*) with \*bōkō, YSib. By doing this he misses the importance of PM \*bōHrē and the existence in PM of terms restricted to male or female speakers, e.g. GRG \*bō(b)rē, 'a woman's brother', \*bVlon, 'a woman's sister', \*bVyan, 'a man's brother', and \*tonan, 'a man's sister'. We need the anthropologist to make kinship sense of the meanings of cognate sets where we cannot reconstruct a properly precise meaning for the PM term, much less account for the change in meaning in NM and SM and the modern languages. The example of Northern Munda (NM) \*hili, OBrWi, and KM \*hVli SpYBr will be discussed in some detail later in the paper. Bhattacharya has confused the issues by putting NM \*hili and KM \*hVli into different semantic-cognate sets because their meanings are not close enough.

We should note that anthropological studies of Munda kinship have flourished in the past fifteen years; we are thinking of the work of S. Bouez, Deeney, Parkin, Pfeffer and Vitebsky. However, most of these

2. He implies that they are sufficiently cognate for his purposes.

3. ZZ = Zide & Zide; our reconstructions, e.g. PM \*bōHrē, or, better, \*b<sup>(h)</sup>H(b)rē, differ in general reliability from proto to proto. SJG reconstructions are more solid than KJ reconstructions. In the \*bōHrē example, the first reconstruction can be considered to be an abbreviation for the second, which shows more questions and possible answers. Since the reconstructions given here will not be evaluated and justified, they should be considered abbreviations of a fuller treatment of the comparative phonology and lexicon.

analyses do not bear directly on the linguistic problems with which we are concerned, and no further reference will be made to most of these.

Bhattacharya's survey paper is very useful in that it presents and begins to organise his own rich field data. He is less thorough in abstracting the published literature. His analyses, his semantic-cognate sets, observations on borrowings, etc., are usually perceptive. In some cases he is more conservative than he needed to be, e.g. in putting Ho *haam*<sup>4</sup> 'old man, husband' in one set, and the reflexes of GRG \*hV-n-ɖam (e.g. Ga *handā*, etc.) in another. Had he noted Mundari *haram* (same meaning as the Ho and the GRG), he would have been compelled to put all these forms in one semantic-cognate set. In other etyma, particularly where he brings in possible cognates in Mon-Khmer, he is too indiscriminately accepting. (But then, he is the only Indian Munda scholar who has paid any attention to Mon-Khmer.) Bhattacharya knows several of the Munda languages, and he knows Indo-Aryan and some Dravidian. Parkin, when he disregards Bhattacharya, usually goes wrong.

Parkin is conscientious in examining long lists of kinship terms, and he turns up interesting forms not earlier appreciated (e.g., Remo *N-kwi*, YSi, which Bhattacharya also records). He can be perceptive about borrowings, e.g. noting that KM *mama*, MBr (in some languages SpF), is borrowed (along with kin behaviour) from Dravidian, and not directly from Indo-Aryan. But his use of rough phonetic similarity as evidence of cognation is self-defeating. We do not quarrel with Parkin's anthropology. It is true, as Parkin says (1985: 705) that the absence of studies of comparative Munda kinship constitutes 'a major gap in south Asian studies', and that Parkin has done a considerable amount of serious work in filling that gap. We give three examples of the sorts of things we object to:

- (1) his Table of 'Basic forms of typical NM and SM terminologies';
- (2) *boko* and *bare*; and
- (3) *ɛŋga*, 'mother'.

After this we take up the confused (mostly by Bhattacharya) case of Juang *ini-bo*, HuYBr.

In his Table, Parkin gives 'typical' NM and SM terminologies, and includes the terms for SpF, SpM, ChCh, same sex SibCh (of the same sex as Ego), and FSibCh of same sex as Ego, opposite sex SibCh (of opposite sex to Ego) and of PSibCh, BrWi, HuSib, SiHu and WiSib, etc. What is a 'typical' terminology, and how and why does one compare typical terminologies? 'Typical' would seem to mean 'well-described', or 'well-known'. The NM and SM forms given in the table are of little value. To a linguist, the forms to be compared would be the reconstructed NM and SM forms. These turn out to be closer to each other than Parkin's typical forms from typical modern languages—when they are cognate. NM

4. We have—without marking these forms—retranscribed some of Bhattacharya's transcriptions in order to indicate morpheme boundaries, and to prune dubious and excessive phonetic detail. We will give Bhattacharya's transcriptions and comment on them in the full data sets in later papers in this series. The form transcribed by us *haam* was transcribed *ham* by Bhattacharya, and *hām* by Deeney.

\*kankar and NM \*kinkar, SpM, are fairly similar whereas Parkin's Mu *hanar* and (KM ?) \*kinar are less so—perhaps because Korku, Kharia and Juang, which reserve PM \*k, are not typical enough. Parkin's *jai* 'grandchild' (in Mundari-Ho) was selected as the representative NM form because he wanted to connect it with *jia*, 'grandmother'. The connection is dubious. A better word for NM 'grandchild' than *jai*, found only in the Kherwarian branch of NM, would be *kVrar/kVrar*, found in both branches (Korku *kurar*, Santali *korar*). The data can be found in Bhattacharya.

2. Both in the table and elsewhere Parkin notes the important distinction between sibling terms where one must know whether the speaker is of the same or opposite sex to the kin-term referent. What seems important—to generalise the case—is not same or opposite sex, but whether the set of terms is sensitive to speaker's and referent's sex. That is, we have in KM a set of four terms where this feature is marked ('a woman's brother', 'a woman's sister', 'a man's brother', 'a man's sister'). This set contrasts with another set of terms where this feature is absent, but where we mark relative age of the speaker and referent, i.e. OBr, YBr, OSi, and YSi. Parkin's *boko* belongs to this second set (and perhaps should be defined not YBr, but YSib) and the others of the sibling terms in his table *tonan*, *bokre* (from \*bōHrē, Bhattacharya's *bare* set) and *misi* belong in the first set. It is possible (as the NM data suggest) that there were only two sex-sensitive terms in PM in this first set, and these were both opposite-marking terms, but this needs to be demonstrated. Parkin takes *bokre* as cognate with *boko*, and not with *bare*, \*bōHrē which leads him to miss the one cognate in PM of the sex-sensitive set. Since such terms go back to PM (however many may have to be reconstructed), we want to know what the distinctive functions of these two sets of sibling terms were—in earlier times and protos—and what they are now. None of the anthropologists we have read takes up this important problem.

If one wants to use linguistic evidence in kinship arguments, then it is necessary to be able to recognise the historical depth of an etymology. \*bōHrē can be reconstructed for PM; this is noteworthy. It is possible that \*bōHrē at some more distant level—perhaps PAA—can be shown to have a morpheme in common with \*bōkō, but good MK evidence of this would be needed to make such a case. One has to be able to recognise that \*Vʔ(g)-lɛñ is a good KM etymology for 'grandchild', but not a good SM or PM etymology.

3. Lastly, Parkin's treatment of 'mother'. Parkin writes that 'the standard NM and KM term for "mother" is *ɛnga*...'. *ɛnga* is only standard in one branch of NM, Kherwarian. If one wants an etymological formula for PM 'mother', it would be *V-ya-N*, *V-ɣɔ-N*. Korku has *ayom* in one dialect, the more archaic *ayan* in others; the reduced form of this before *-teʔ* is *an-*; Santali has *ɛnga* and *ayo/ayɔ*; Mundari-Ho has *ɛnga*, but



*e(y)aŋ* in the vocative (we do not find much morphological alternation of this sort in Munda); Juang has *bwi-N*, Kharia has *ayo/ayo-N*, Sora has *yaŋ*, Juray *ayaŋ* and *yoŋ*, Gorum has *yaŋ*, Remo *yoŋ*, and *iyon*, and Gta? *yaŋ*. The basic form is the *V-ya-N/V-yɔ-N*. The question is how to relate *enɡa* and *e(y)aŋ* (vocative) in Ho-Mundari. Deeney has anticipated us in pointing out (Bhattacharya and Pinnow have made partly similar observations) that the vocative *e(y)aŋ* resembles *enɡa-ñ/eya-ñ*, i.e. the non-vocative stem with the first person singular pronoun *-ñ*, i.e. 'my mother'. This suggests that most of the Munda forms for 'mother' were originally vocatives with first person pronominal enclitic (of possession) *-ñ/-ŋ*, and that *enɡa* represents (how accurately?) the basic form of 'mother'. How we get from *enɡa* to *eya/eña* where these forms precede the enclitic *-ñ/-ŋ* has just been shown in Deeney's data. One could suggest metathesis, common in Munda, but we have no (other) cases of *eyan/eyna*, *y/n*, metathesis. We reconstruct *V-ya* which becomes *V-ña* before final nasal in the vocative. To take *enɡa*, *ayo*, *eaŋ*, etc. as obviously cognate is risky (it was not wrong). In any case, '*enɡa* is not the standard form of "mother" in NM and KM'. The point of these criticisms is not that anthropologists should reconstruct linguistic proto-forms, but that they should be less free in identifying putative cognates, and using these—largely spurious—cognates to support other arguments.

*ini-bo* or *ini-bau/-bou*. Our first comment on Parkin's rejection of Bhattacharya's connecting *ini-bo* and *hVli* was that Bhattacharya's judgment on cognation was better than Parkin's, and whether the semantics agreed with Parkin or not, *ini* and *hVli* were almost certainly cognate. A re-examination of Bhattacharya's sets 81. and 83. (1970: 457) shows the situation to be more complicated. Bhattacharya misleads his readers by setting up two semantic-cognate sets, and putting NM \*hili in the second (with Juang *kuli*), and KM \*hVli in the first. (Bhattacharya does not think with or use reconstructed form; we have constructed 'Bhattacharya's reconstructions' for him.)

The facts are these: Bhattacharya has made two semantic-cognate sets, 81. and 83., these coming in his section of 'Terms for Brother, Sister, Brother-in-Law, Sister-in-law', one of his more complicated—and important—sets of terms. In 83. he puts Juang *kuli/kɔli*, OBrWi, and Kherwarian (there is no Korku cognate), \*hili, OBrWi. In 81. there are three sets of words:<sup>5</sup> (a) KM \*hVli(-bɔj) (ZZ reconstruction), *Vli-bɔi*, HuYSi, SpYSi; (b) KM \*Vrel/\*Vrer, HuYBr, SpYBr, and (c) NM \*erwel/\*Vrwel, HuYBr. Bhattacharya does not sort these into sets, so that it is not clear if he thinks Juang *ini-bo* goes in set (a), or with sets (b) and (c). The latter two sets clearly reconstruct to PM \*Vrwel.<sup>6</sup> The meanings of the 83. forms are fairly close: (a) HuYSi, SPYSi, and (b) – (c) HuYBr, SpYBr. *ini-bo* means HuYBr. Since 83. (a) is clearly cognate with 81. which includes Juang *kuli*, to relate *ini* to the augmented 83. we either have to disqualify and reject *kuli*, somehow to relate *kuli* and *ini*, or to connect *ini* with 81. Can we—as Bhattacharya's array of data suggests—

5. See the Appendix for fuller presentation of the data.

6. The ? in Gta? *wrwe?* requires some discussion.

show *ini* to be a cognate of PM \*Vr<sub>wel</sub>, HuBYr, SpYBr? We need to show that the sound correspondences are possible: that Juang *n* corresponds with *r* (or something like *r*): this is possible; that the first vowel *i* corresponds to *V*, where the following, stressed, vowel is \**e* and *i* in Juang: this is possible; the correspondence of Juang stressed *i* and PM \**e*: this is possible; and that a final consonant, Juang *l*, can be lost compound-medially: this also fits into the set of expectable, regular, correspondences. We accept, tentatively, *ini* as cognate with PM \*Vr<sub>wel</sub>, and rearrange Bhattacharya's sets as follows: 81. (*b*), (*c*) plus *ini*, HuYBr, SpYBr, and 83. plus 81 (*a*), \*kuli(-*bɔi*), OBrWi, HuYSi, SpYSi.

## Part II

This second section takes up:

- (1) (once more) the two different sets of sibling terms in a number of the Munda languages;
- (2) the old system of pronominal enclitics (Pro<sup>ip</sup>) marking inalienable possession. The kin terms of Kherwarian that do not take Pro<sup>ip</sup> are: (i) name-like kin terms, and (ii) conjoined pairs of terms whose referents are related to each other, not to the speaker or some other named or pronominally indicated person. The latter, paired reciprocal terms, are common in Munda, both north and south. Reciprocal infixes in kin terms (the infix is the same one found as the verbal reciprocal marker) are commonly used where each of the referents of a hypothetical pair refers to the other by the same kin term. The various meanings of this reciprocal infix, NM -*p*-, SM -*m*-, are examined in several Munda languages.
- (3) reciprocal (kinship) terms of address are examined in Santali, Juang and Sora.
- (4) Some kin-term affixes that look like but are not reciprocal -*p*-/-*m*- are described, and traced to PAA.

We noted earlier that in some Munda languages—Remo is the best example of one with two complete sets—there are two different sets of sibling terms, one marking relative age (e.g. 'younger brother', 'older sister'), and the other marking 'relative sex' of speaker and referent (i.e. 'a man's brother' versus 'a woman's brother'). Relative age is commonly marked in the Indian area; relative sex is not. So far as we know, none of the anthropologists who have worked on Munda groups with two (complete or incomplete) sets of sibling terms has described the distinctive functions of these sets. Parkin does note these terms, but in his table he distinguishes between same-sex (of speaker and referent) and opposite-sex terms, whereas we see the basic difference as between sex-marked (same or different sex) terms, and age-marked terms. The GRG languages have two full (four-term) sets, but it is not clear that cognate forms of the sex-marked set in Sora (e.g. GRG \*bVyan, So *boñan*, GRG \*tonan, So *tonan*, these meaning 'a man's brother' and 'a man's sister' respectively in GRG)

have the same meanings and sort into similar sets in Sora. In Kherwarian the sex-marked set has only two terms, both marking opposite sex kin. The history of these sex-marked terms is still largely obscure. But in any case the distinction is noteworthy, and an understanding of the functions of the two sets should be important to the anthropologist studying Munda kinship.

When studying the Munda languages that preserve the old system of pronominal enclitics for marking inalienable possession (e.g. Ho, Santali, Juang, Kharia), we find different definitions of grammatical inalienability. The minimal set of inalienably possessible nouns would be the kin terms, the next minimal set would add words for body parts. The pronominal enclitics, Pro<sup>ip</sup>, are required with almost all inalienably possessible nouns, with a few exceptions. The common exceptions are: (a) 'name-like' terms; and (b) paired reciprocal terms where the relationship obtains between the referents of the pair. These paired reciprocal kin terms are common in Munda.

One Mundari example from Hoffmann (1950: 1303) of a name-like term has to do with the speech of siblings (i.e. those who have a common referent for 'mother' and 'father'). In this context—siblings speaking to each other—one cannot say 'my mother' without the (erroneous and offensive) implication that she is not also 'your mother'. What is said—and is preferable to using a Pro<sup>ip</sup> for first person dual inclusive—is simply 'mother' (perhaps 'Mother' would better represent this), i.e. the form *enga* without a Pro<sup>ip</sup>.

Paired reciprocals of one form or another are characteristic of several of the Munda languages, North and South. The kinds of pairs found are:

- (i) the senior term occurs followed by the 'collective' suffix *-ya/-ea*; in Santali, e.g. *hili-ya* (*hili*, OBrWi); we discuss the meaning of such forms below;
- (ii) the senior term of the reciprocal relationship (if there is one) is mentioned followed by an echo word; in Santali, e.g. *hili + hali*; we discuss the meaning of these forms below;
- (iii) both members of the pair are mentioned, the senior one first; in Gta?, e.g. *nta? + æglæ* 'grandfather and grandchild'; this means (we, they etc.) are grandfather and grandchild. Whether, as for similar forms of Santali (i and ii above), the compound can also mean the relationship (in this case the grandfather–grandchild relationship) is questionable.
- (iv) the construction with *nu-* plus (usually junior) kin term in Remo; e.g. *nu-giriŋ* 'I and my wife's younger brother', and probably also 'we two are OSiHu and WiYBr';
- (v) where both members of the (hypothetical) pair would refer to each other by the same term, e.g. GRG \*bVyan, 'a man's brother'; in the GRG languages, e.g. GRG \*b-Vm-lon (\*bVlon, 'a woman's sister')

'each other's sisters', Gutob *bumulon*, Remo *bunlu*, Gta? *bumluŋ*.<sup>7</sup> The *-m-* infix (which becomes *-n-* in Remo) marks this relationship. There are two seemingly irregular cases in Remo: *t-un-una*, and *g-Vn-riŋ* (*/gindriŋ/*), where *tuna* is 'a man's sister' (younger sister according to Bhattacharya) and *giriŋ* is WiYBr. These have the same meanings as the forms *nu-tuna* and *nu-giriŋ*, i.e. 'I and my younger sister'; 'we are (older) brother and (younger) sister' and the *giriŋ* form with *-n-* would be glossed the way the *nu-* form was. These are reciprocal pairs, but unless Remo has a common term of reference (or of address?) for brother and sister, and for OSiHu and WiYBr, these are not terms for referents who refer to each other by a common kin term, and we conclude that Remo *-n-* has been extended to a few such pairs.

The first definition (in the third volume of Bodding's *Santal dictionary* (1935: 116)) of *hili + hali* is 'a man's wife and younger brothers', then (that) 'relationship', and then, more literally, 'a *hili* and those who call her so', i.e. her *erwel(s)*, HuYBr. That is, *hili + hali* means 'the *hili-erwel* relationship'; *hili-and-erwel*: the *erwel(s)* *hili*, and the *hili's erwel(s)*. Some echo words can be defined as 'what goes along with (the preceding N<sup>1</sup>, which the echo word echoes)' or N<sup>1</sup> 'and the like'. What goes with *hili*, OBrWi, here is its reciprocal. We find echo words of kin terms used comparatively infrequently in this way, but the synonymous construction with *-ya/-ea* (Bodding's 'collective') is more common. (*hili-ya*, according to Bodding, means exactly what *hili + hali* means.) Bodding in his *Materials* (1929: II 41-2) lists more than twenty such kin-term pairs (or collectives), most of them in common use.

So far as we know, such reciprocals are not common elsewhere in the Indian area. There are in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian pairs like Hindi *māā + baap* 'mother and father' (in more formal speech *maataa + pitaa*), and *bhaaii + bhaan*, 'brother and sister', but not twenty other pairs of kin-term reciprocals in common use.

The other examples of SM *-m-* are found in Juang, and of NM *\*-p-* in North Munda fairly widely (we discuss forms in Ho, Santali and Korku). Pinnow gives two Juang examples of *-m-*: *semelaŋ* (from *seleŋ*, 'grown-up girl'), 'young woman, woman', and *kəmŋger* (from *kŋger*, 'young man, youth'), 'master, lord, husband'. In the first case, the affixed form is slightly more general; in the second the infixed form is a kind of honorific. The only feature of the reciprocal evident in the second example is its use of plurality to mark the honorific, something quite common in the Indian area.

Ho—the third of Deeney's small 1975 dictionary that we sampled—has few examples of *-p-* in kin terms. It is interesting that the two we found have precisely the meanings of the Juang forms but are not cognate with

7 A common Indian areal construction repeats the noun (kin term) for this reciprocal—'distributive'—meaning. Thus, Hindi *ham bhaaii bhaaii hāt*. (*bhaaii*, 'brother') 'We are (like) brothers', 'buddy buddy'. Similar constructions have been noted in some of the Munda languages.

them: *h-Vp-anum* 'young woman' (there is no *hanum*), and *s-Vp-eed* (Mundari *sepered*) 'young man'. There is no free *seed*, but it occurs bound in the 'nephew' term *hon-seed* (NM \**kən-sered*, \**kən-serej*, FBrSo).

The Santali examples—we used as a sample the letter H in the third volume of Bodding's dictionary (1935: 1-184)—are *hapamūn*, *hapamū* 'grown-up girl' (there is no *hamūn* or *hamū*); *hapram-ko/haprum-ko* 'ancestors, forefathers, collection of old men' (*haram*, *harum* 'an old man'); *hepel*, along with *herel*, 'man, male' (no *el*); and *həpən* along with *hən*. He translates *həpən* 'offspring, young, child, son daughter'; adj. 'small, little', and *hən* 'a son, child', now used only in compounds.

For Korku, N. Zide recorded along with *kon*, *kon-jei*, *kurar*, *kosered/koserej* and some others, *kopon* (with the dual or plural), *koponjei*, *kup<sup>a</sup>rar*, *kopsered/kopserej*. The simple forms were much more common. It never became clear what the meanings of the dual and plural *-p-* infixed forms were. The meaning of *-p-* in NM is still obscure; the plural aspect of the 'reciprocal' (and its development into an honorific), and the notion of a set or collection can be seen in some of the infixed forms. The forms with *-m/-p-* for 'young girl' and 'young man' in Juang, Santali and Ho have been noted, but what the function of the reciprocal is here is unknown.

Of mutual appellatives (Bodding's term, i.e. reciprocal terms of address—in our examples, of persons not of the same generation), Parkin notes Santali *gəɽəm*, which Bodding translates 'namesake', used by grandfather and grandson as terms of address. Parkin also notes the existence of such forms in Juang. McDougal (1963: 141) writing of generation sets and the extension of kin terms, says that 'any male of an odd-numbered ascending or descending generation, regardless of kin type, may be addressed with the term for "father", and any female with the term for "mother"... Any male of Ego's own or any even-numbered generation may be addressed with the term for "brother", any female with the term of "sister"'. For example, a man may address his brother, father's father, and son's son with the term for "brother"...'. In Vitebsky's as yet unpublished notes on Sora kinship there are also examples of cross-generation kin addressing each other by the same term. The term *tata*, FBr, is used in address reciprocally, i.e. by YBrSo. Similarly *entalaij*, MOSi, can be used reciprocally in address by YoSiDa.

It is likely that more Munda languages have mutual appellatives, but that they have not been recorded.

There are two more possible infixes found with kin terms: the *-m-* in NM *k-Vm-ən* 'nephew, niece', from the simplex *kən*, 'child', also attested in SM: Sora *amən-sij* 'nephew', and *amən-sil*, 'niece'. This is the only example of this PM \*-m-. G. Diffloth tells us that there is a cognate affix, *-m-*, old but unproductive in Mon-Khmer, with cognate forms in a number of MK families (Khmer, Bahnaric) meaning 'child' for the simplex, and 'nephew/niece' for the infixed form.

The other case of a kin term that might be analysed as containing an infix is PM \**kin-* or *kin-*, found only in \**kinkar/kinkar* 'mother-in-law'

(and perhaps Juang *kan-dae*, 'old woman'), the *kin* having a cognate in MK meaning 'woman'. There is another kin term in Munda, *kimin*, 'SoWi, YBrWi', which might be related morphologically at an early stage to \**kin*. Diffloth informed us of an MK *-mp-* infix, that would account for this derivation. If we take the \**-mp-* as going to \**mh-* in PM, this helps clarify a previously baffling set of correspondences. We find \**kVmin* everywhere in Munda except in SJG, where the cognates—if they are cognates—are unexpected: Sora *kɔ'en*, (Vi: *koin*, *kaon*), Juray *kaun*, [*ka'un*], and Gorum *konun* for YBrWi. We reconstruct \**k-Vmh-in/k-Vmh-in*, and begin to understand how these SJG forms (and presumably others) developed.

It is difficult to say what in the Munda kinship (and kinship term) system comes from Austroasiatic and what does not. Of the topics we have discussed, those peculiar to Munda (in the Indian linguistic area) are: the sex-marked sibling terms; the use of cross-generational reciprocal terms of address with some frequency (fuller data on more Munda groups would probably show more evidence of this); the use of paired reciprocal terms commonly; and the various infixes and their uses. Indo-Aryan and Dravidian do have age-marked terms, as has Mon-Khmer. Munda has some, but a number of the distinctions and terms look like borrowings. It would take a closer examination of Munda and Mon-Khmer kinship to speak with authority on this. That age distinctions in kin terms are old in MK does not, of course, mean they are old in Proto-Austro-Asiatic. Munda is not the only language family to be influenced by its neighbours, although it may be true that it is easier to perceive areal influences on Munda than on Mon-Khmer. The usual assumption, that MK preserves much more of PAA than does Munda, is probably true, but what is and is not PAA needs to be demonstrated after sufficient MK and Munda evidence is in, examined, and evaluated, and the outlines of PAA are clearer than they are now.<sup>8</sup>

---

8. Some of the fieldwork reported in this paper was done under a grant from the National Science Foundation.

# APPENDIX<sup>9</sup>

\*kuli

Bhattacharya 83. (abridged) Juang *kɔli*, *kuli*, OBrWi; Kherwarian \*hili, OBrWi

We noted earlier that adding KM \*hVli makes the SM evidence more convincing. Pinnow in his Juang monograph also connected Juang *kuli* and Kher \*hili, but took the etymology no further. We note the form *kulaya-sini* (only in McDougal) which is, apparently, a derivative of *kuli-sini* (elsewhere *-sel*, *-sen*) is the combining form of (McD.) *kon-chalan* (Pi. *kɔn-selan*) ‘young woman’. *kulayasini* means HuYSi, and can be roughly glossed ‘*kuli*-junior’, i.e. the ‘junior’ of OBrWi is HuYSi. Note the use of *-sini* in the ‘grandchild’ terms *boko-lap* (McD.), ‘grandson’, and *boko-sini*, ‘granddaughter’. The grandchild terms probably derive from *boko-X-lab/sini*, the X perhaps being the *-du* found in Kharia (cognate with words for ‘child’ in Gorum (*aɖuɖ*), and for ‘young man’ in Gotub (*o-ɾug*)).

SM \*hVli(-boi), PM \*Vrwl, SM \*Vrel/\*Vrer, NM \*erwel

Bhattacharya 81. (abridged, rearranged, and provided with additional data, the latter in parenthesis)

Set (a). Ga *ili-boy* (MZ *hli-bwe*?), HuYSi; Re *liboi*, HuYSi; So *aliboi*, HuYSi (Vi. *aliboi*, HuYSi, WiYSi); ?? Ju *ini-bo* (McD. *ini-bou*, MM *ini-bo*), HuYBr. *-boi/-boy/-bɔj* mean ‘woman’ in these compounds; *-sij/sij* (full form in So *pasij*, ‘child’, in compounds with terms meaning nephew/niece *-sij* means ‘male person’. This *-sij* is probably cognate with the *-seɾej*, *-seɾej/-seɾed*, *-seɾed* mentioned earlier for NM and meaning ‘young man, nephew’. Bhattacharya seems to be suggesting that the *-bo* in *ini-bo* is a combining form of *boko*, YBr. We have no other examples of this—or anything else—as a combining form of *boko*.

Set (b). Ga *urüve*, HuYBr (MZ *wrwe*?); Re *ere* (ZZ *ere(l)*), HuYBr; Gu *erel*, HuYBr; Go *ilil*, HuYBr; So *ərer-sij-ən*, HuYBr, *erer-sij-ən*, WiBr (we take *ərer*, and *erer* to be the same), *erel-boi*, WiYSi (Vi *eri-sij*, WiYBr, HuYBr; Sur *erer-sij*, WiYBr, HuYBr; *ali-boy*, *arrel-boy*, WiYSi, HuYSi).

One complication in Sora that needs comment; we find in both Vitebsky’s and Suryanarayana’s data that along with *ali-boi* for SpYSi, we also find *eri-* (Vi.) and *arrel-*(Sur.)-*boi*. The *eri-* and *arrel-* are both from KM \*Vrel, although the *eri* looks like a portmanteau of *ali* and *Vrel*. Since the marking of *ali* as feminine, and of *Vrel* as masculine in Sora is being lost (this sex-marking role has been taken over by *-boi* and *-sij*) the meanings of *Vli* and *Vrel* have come closer. Vitebsky suggests that *eri-*

9. The data in the Appendix are, if not otherwise marked, from Bhattacharya. Words in parenthesis not further labelled are from Zide and Zide. The abbreviations refer to: FF, Fernandez; MM, Mahapatra and Matson; MZ, K. Mahapatra and N. Zide; McD., McDougal, Pi., Pinnow; Sur., Suryanarayana; Vi., Vitebsky; VU, Vidyarthi and Upadhyay; and ZZ, Zide and Zide.

means 'younger', i.e. 'younger SpSib', since it can now be used with either wife's younger sister (*eri-boy* along with *ali-boy*) or younger brother (*eri-sij*), and similarly for a female ego for HuYBr and HuYSi. For Vitebsky's Soras this would work, but not for Bhattacharya's. For Suryanarayana SpYBr is *erer-sij*; \*Vrel has been generalised, but then split into *arrel*, which commutes with *ali-*, i.e. goes with *-boy*. The other form \*Vrel has split into *erer-*, and this is used only with the masculine *-sij*.

We are grateful to R. J. Parkin for copies of his papers, and to Piers Vitebsky for his notes on Sora, and for copies of the extract from Suryanarayana's dissertation.

Set (c). Sa *erwel*, HuYBr (Bodding *era + el* ?); Mu *iril*, *irul*, *iriul*, HuYBr; Korwa *irvil*, HuYBr; Koku, *ilur*, HuYBr. (WiYBr in NM is \*teŷa (i.e. [tẽyã]).

For set (a)—putting aside *ini-bo* for the moment—we reconstruct \*hVli(-bɔʃ), HuYSi, SpYSi; using Bhattacharya's data only it would be \*Vli-boi. We find this to be cognate with Bhattacharya's 83., \*kuli/ \*kVli, OBrWi. The definition of the new PM \*kuli would be 'female affine of ego's generation' (i.e. English 'sister-in-law'), OBrWi, HuYSi, SpYSi. An alternative interpretation would reject Juang *kuli* as cognate with either NM \*hili or KM \*hVli, and include *ini* and NM \*hili and KM \*hVli in the reconstruction.

Bhattacharya presents sets of forms that are semantically similar. He would like these semantic sets to be cognate sets as well. But he wants his semantic-cognate sets to be closer in meaning—for him to accept them—than, we think, such cognate sets in PM will often be. It is true that some of these kin terms' semantic-cognate sets (e.g. Bhattacharya's *bare*, ZZ *bɔHre*) show forms that have remained remarkably close in meaning and in phonetic form in the modern languages. But given the chronological separation of the Munda languages (at least twenty-five hundred years), there is no reason to expect this degree of closeness. Just as we have no hesitation in calling Ga *swa* and So *ʌŋal*, both 'fire, firewood', cognates—because we can see how both developed regularly from KM \*sVŋʌHI—we should have no trouble in accepting NM \*hili and KM \*hVli as cognate despite the excessive (to Bhattacharya) difference between the meanings of the two forms. We need the anthropologist to reconstruct a more precise meaning for the proto of these, i.e.—if we accept Juang *kuli*—\*kVli, and to account for the changes in meaning between the PM form, and the forms in the modern languages.

From the forms in set (b) we reconstruct KM \*Vrel/\*Vrer, HuYBr, SpYBr. From this and NM \*erwel (reconstructed from the forms in set (c)), we reconstruct PM \*Vrwel/\*erwel, SpYBr, HuYBr.

It is possible, as Bhattacharya suggests, that \*Vrwel is bimorphemic, and that the second morpheme (of \*Vr( -)) is *-hVl(i)* or *-kVl(i)*, but we see no evidence of this.



*ini-bo*, *ini-bou/-bau*

What then of *ini-bo*? Since *bau/bou* is the reciprocal in Sora of KM \*hVli and KM \*Vrel derivatives, and a similar situation may obtain in Juang, let us look at Bhattacharya's Set 62., *bau/bou*.

PM \*bao/\*bau

Bhattacharya 62. (edited, and with additional material): So *bao-n*, 'brother-in-law', (Vi. *baon* OSiHu, Sur. *boung*, OSiHu, *kinar-boung* SpOBr); (ZZ Go *bao*, 'brother-in-law'); ZZ Gu *ũ-baŋ*, *m-baŋ*, OSiHu); Remo (Bhattacharya, 1968, 111) *m-baŋ*, OSiHu; (ZZ Ga *m-bia*, OSiHu); Kh *bau* HOBr, Roy *bao-tang*, WiOBr (VU *boutang*, WiOBr); Ju *bov-kar*, HuOBr (Pi. *bau/bɔu*, OSiHu, MM *bau*, SiHu, McD. *bou*, ESiHu, *bokar* (probably from *bau-kar*), HuOBr); NM: Ho *bavo*, OBr, SpOSiHu; *bau honjar*, SpOBr (Deeney *bau*, OBr or cousin; *bau honyar*, SpOBr); Mu *bau*, OBr (in address); *bau honjar*, SpOBr; Sa *bahõñ-har*, SpOBr; Korku *bao*, WiOBr, (Girard *bao*, WOBr). The final nasals in some of these words are frozen first person pronominal enclitics used in terms of address, i.e. literally, 'my OSiHu', etc.

To return to *ini-bo* (or *-bou*), we stated in the body of the paper that with regard to sound correspondences and semantics, a case can be made for *ini* being cognate with PM \*Vrwl, SpYBr, HuYBr, if not the strongest case. What of the *-bo* or *-bou*? *ini-bo* or *-bou* is an inalienably possessed noun in Juang. It is true that reciprocals—both terms and the relationship between them—are often maintained through many linguistic changes. But that a pair of reciprocals meaning (an inalienably possessible) HYoBr, this deriving from the usual paired reciprocal meanings, could have developed in Juang is, for semantic reasons, highly unlikely. *-bo*, although we have seen no (other) examples of it as a combining form of *boko* seems more likely. Why does *ini* need a second morpheme at all to have the meaning HYBr? As far as we can see, it does not. The spouses of both *kulayasini* and *inibo* are both some kind of *boko*: the *inibo*'s wife is (McD.) *boko-ray* (YSi), and *kulayasini*'s husband is *boko* (YBr). HYBr in McDougall is *boko-ger* (from *boko-ker*?); elsewhere he is just *boko*. Apparently *ini* too required a second morpheme. *-bo* from *boko* makes better sense than *bau/bɔu*.

*-kar*, 'in-law'

On *bou-kar* and the use of the affine-marking *-kar* in Kharia-Juang. The affinal *-kar*, 'in-law', is found in PM in \*kikar/\*kankar, SpM (or perhaps, SpM, WiOSi), and \*ku(X)nkar, SpF (or SpF, HuOBr). The *-kar* may be related to what has become the NM word for 'man, person, member of the community', *kɔrɔ*. The Kharia *-kar* marks the agent in forms like *rema-kar*, 'call-er', *rema-* 'to call' (Malhotra, 1982: 311). The *kar* is also used in forming singular pronominal stems from demonstrative

bases (e.g., *ho-*, *u-*), thus *ho-kar*, *u-kar*, ‘he, she’; i.e. *-kar* means ‘one’. In KJ we find the following forms: Juang keeps the term for ‘father-in-law’, *kuñkar*/*kwiñkar*/*kwiñkar*, and also has *bao-kar*, HuOBr, and *aji-kar*, SpOSi. Kharia keeps the old word for ‘mother-in-law’, *kinkar*, and has, in addition, *boker* (probably from *boko-ker*), SPYBr, and (Roy) *aichkar*, WiOSi. (We noted earlier that Juang has *boko-ger*—with the *ger* perhaps from *-ker* and not from *koN-ger*, ‘young man’.)

In some but not all cases the *-kar* can be translated simply as ‘in-law’, i.e. if X means YSi, then *X-kar* means YSi-in-law, i.e. SpYSi. This presupposes that X is not an affinal term. The examples of this in KJ are *aji*, ESi, and *boko*, YBr. One could, simplistically, try to derive the remaining terms from hypothetical simple terms, not in KJ, but in Kherwarian. Thus Ho *bau*, OBr, Juang *bau-kar*, HuOBr. This would miss the fact that Juang *bau/bou* is an affinal term, OSiHu, and that *kar* derivatives of affinal terms are different from derivatives of simplex terms. Where the *kar*-derivative is formed on an affinal term, the simplex refers to a sibling’s spouse, and the *kar*-derivative to a spouse’s sibling. The other example of this in KJ is (Roy) *aji*, OBrWi, and *aich-kar*, WiOSi. The Juang *boko-ger*, HuYBr, if regular, should come from *bok(V)-(k)er-ker*.

The term *bok-sel* in Kharia, SpYSi (*boker* is SPYBr) is probably to be derived from *bok-ker-sel*. And the Juang ‘grandchild’ terms, *boko-lab*, ‘grandson’, and *boko-sini*, ‘granddaughter’ are probably to be derived from *boko-X-lab/-sini*, the X perhaps being cognate with the *du?* found in Kharia in *bok-du?*, ‘grandchild’. The reduction of similar compounds in Sora from morphemes 1-2-3 to 1-3 was observed by N. Zide in regard to the Sora numerals.

The Kherwarian uses of *\*-kar* (which, if it were reduced the way it is in KJ would be *\*-har*): PM *\*kinkar*/*\*kankar* (Kher *\*hanhar*) and *\*ku(X)ñkar* (Kher *\*hōñhar*): these occur in compounds of the structure *X-hanhar/hōñyar*, which have the meaning *hanhar*’s or *hōñyar*’s X, i.e. *kaka-honyar* in Ho means *honyar*’s *kaka*, i.e. SpFYBr. For X as *aji* and *bau* this is not the case. The construction with *aji-hanar*, and *bau-honyar* in Ho, is like the construction in KJ with non-affinal simplex plus *-kar*. Note that (unlike KJ) *aji* in Ho is OSi, and *bau* is OBr; *aji-hanar* means SpOSi, and *bau-honyar* means SpOBr. Note that these are ‘spouse’s sibling’ terms, which, in KJ, are those derived from affinal simplex terms, not, as here, non-affinal simplex terms.

Santali is much like Ho in its SpF (*hōñhar*) and SpM (*hanhar*) terms: most of them have the *X-hanhar/hōñhar* construction where this means, e.g. *hanhar*’s X (where, for instance, X would be *gonggo*, OBr). For the two forms cognate with the two just distinguished in Ho, Santali *bahōñhar* and *ajhnar*, the meanings are parallel to those in Ho: SpOBr, and SpOSi. Note that *bahōñ* does not occur as a free form (as does the Ho cognate *bau*, OBr), but *aji*, OSi, does. Note the reduction of *hōñhar* to *-har* in the first form, and that of *hanhar* to *-hnar* in the second.

\*boko (NM \*bəkɔ)

It is not surprising that Parkin (with Bhattacharya's help) sees forms related to \*boko almost everywhere. He is right to connect Ga *tabo* (MZ *ta-bo*?) and Re *tabuk*, FYBr, MYSi, stepF (Bh. Set 31.) to *boko*. Cognate forms in Set 33. should also be included: Bh. *mbu*, (FF *mbu*?, Elwin *umbuk-boi*), MYSi, FYBrWi, stepM. Bhattacharya is probably wrong in bringing in *bobo* (he translates the Gta? form, wrongly, we think, as YBr). In KJ \*boko and possibly related forms cover a good deal of semantic territory: apart from the basic—YSib—meanings there is the Juang word for 'clan' (Pi. *bog*, McD. *bok*), the 'grandchild' terms we have talked about (Kh (Roy) *bok-du*(?), Juang (McD.) *bokolap* and *bokosini*). Pinnow records the Juang term '*bəkɔ-rad*, "Verwandschaft" (relation), Bedeutung und Form unklar'. The form found in Kherwarian, *bəkɔ*, is unexpected, since one would expect the intervocalic *k* to go to *h* before *ɔ*. Bhattacharya gives a form, Ho *boho*, which is not found in Deeney (but see the other forms in Bhattacharya's Set 64. (1970: 455)). There do seem to be related forms in Kherwarian with *h*, e.g., in Boddling's Santali Materials II (1929: 21) there are *bəkɔ boeha* and *bəhək bəhək boeha*, 'cousins any number of times removed, descendants in the male line'. One wants to know not only the nouns, the kin terms, but the rest of the kinship vocabulary—the verbs and the constructions. This sort of information can be found in Boddling and Vitebsky.

As to the rest of the terms with initial *b* that might be etymologically connected with *boko*, a better knowledge of MK cognates would help. For instance, we would tentatively connect the first piece (etymologically, presumably, a morpheme) of *bVyaŋ*, *boñañ*, 'brother, a man's brother' and GRG \*bVlon 'sister, a woman's sister', Sora (Vi.) *bui'-mai*, (*buj-mai* ? *bVñ-mai* ?), 'true sister, usually used by women'. Bhattacharya wants to connect *bVyaŋ* with Sora, YBr, *ubba-n-u(b)bəŋ*- (Vi. *u'ba-*). We think it is probably cognate with *boko*. To make a case for either—or, conceivably, both—considerably more synchronic phonological and morphological analysis needs to be done. For instance, by Bhattacharya's hypothesis, one would take *-bəŋ* as a combining form of *bVyaŋ*, odd but not impossible, but it does not fit in with assumption of a morpheme *bVñ-/bVl-* shared by \*bVlon and KM \*bVyaN. And we have other forms: Gorum *biŋ-ger*, 'bloodbrothers', Sora *birinda*, 'clan', i.e. (Vi.) 'exogamous agnatic localised virilocal kin group' (Vitebsky translates *bVyaŋ* as 'male member of own birinda'), and Sora FaYBr *kim-bom*, Vi. *kin-bom*, *kin-boŋ* that come into the picture. The sibling terms and related vocabulary will be taken up in a later paper, which will take MK cognates into consideration, and do more synchronic phonological and morphological evidence than we have done here.

# REFERENCES

- Bhattacharya, S. 1968. *A Bonda dictionary*. Poona: Deccan College & Post-Grad. Res. Inst.
- ..... 1970. Kinship terms in the Munda languages, *Anthropos* 65, 444-65.
- Biligiri, H. S. 1965. *Kharia phonology, grammar and vocabulary*. Poona: Deccan College & Post-Grad. Res. Inst.
- Bodding, P. O. 1929. *Materials for a Santali grammar II*. Dumka: Santal Mission of the Northern Churches.
- ..... 1934, 1935. *A Santal dictionary*, Vols. 2, 3. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad.
- Bouez, S. 1985. *Réciprocité et hiérarchie, L'alliance chez les Ho et les Santal de l'Inde*. Paris: Soc. Ethnographie.
- Deeney, J. 1975. *Ho grammar and vocabulary*. Chaibasa: Xavier Ho Publ.
- ..... 1978. *Ho-English dictionary*. Chaibasa: Xavier Ho Publ.
- Diffloth, G. 1986. Personal communications.
- Elwin, V. 1950. *Bondo highlander*. Bombay: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Fernandez, F 1968. A grammatical sketch of Remo: a Munda language. Unpubl. dissertation. Ann Arbor: Univ. Microfilms.
- ..... 1969. A critique of Verrier Elwin's anthropology. In *Anthropology and Archaeology, essays in commemoration of Verrier Elwin*. New Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Girard, B. n.d. *Korku-Hindi-English dictionary*. Ramkhepra, Dertalai: Central India Baptist Mission.
- Guha, U., Siddiqui, M. K. A. & Mathur, P. R. G. 1968. *The Didayi* (Memoir 23, Anthropolog. Survey of India). Delhi: Govt. India Publ.
- Hoffmann, J. & van Emelen, A. 1950. *Encyclopaedia Mundarica*, Vol. 2. Patna: Bihar Govt. Press.
- Karve, I. 1968-9. Kinship organization in India and place of Mundari-speaking people in it. *Adibasi* 10 (1), 1-25.
- Macphail, R. M. 1954. (ed.) *Campbell's English-Santali dictionary*. Benegaria: Santal Christian Council, 3rd ed.
- Mahapatra, B. P. & Matson, D. M. 1963. *Juang Vocabulary* (Mimeo.) Chicago. [Included in Matson, 1964.]
- Mahapatra, K. & Zide, N. 1970-2, 1978-9, 1982-3. *Gta?* field notes.
- Malhotra, V. B. 1982. *The structure of Kharia*. Delhi: Centre Ling. & Engl., Sch. Lang., Jawaharlal Nehru Univ.
- Matson, D. M. 1964. A grammatical sketch of Juang, a Munda language. Unpubl. dissertation, Ann Arbor: Univ. Microfilms.
- McDougal, C. W. 1963. *The social structure of the Hill Juang*. Unpubl. dissertation. Ann Arbor: Univ. Microfilms.
- Munda, R. D. 1965. Proto-Kherwarian phonology. Unpubl. M.A. thesis. (Mimeo.) Chicago.
- Parkin, R. J. 1985. Munda kinship terminologies, *Man* (N.S.) 20, 705-21.

- Pfeffer, G. 1982. *Status and affinity in Middle India* (Beiträge zur Südasiens-Forschung, Südasiens Institut, Univ. Heidelberg, 73). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Pinnow, H.-J. 1959. *Versuch einer historischen Lautlehre der Kharia-Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . . . . . 1960. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Juang-Sprache*. Unpubl. typescript.
- Roy, S. C. & 1937. *The Kharias*. Ranchi: 'Man in India' Office.
- Roy, R. C.
- Stampe, D. 1979. A compendium of Sora vocabularies, with data from H. S. Biligiri, P. Donegan, B. P. Mahapatra, R. Mahapatra, D. Stampe, and S. Starosta. (Printout.) Columbus.
- Suryanarayana, M. 1977. Marriage, family and kinship of the Saoras of Andhra Pradesh. Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis. Andhra Univ.
- Vidyarthi, L. P. & 1980. *The Kharia: then and now*. New Delhi: Concept Publ. Co.
- Upadhyay V. S.
- Vitebsky, P. 1979. Field notes on Sora kinship.
- Zide, A. R. K. 1968. A Gorum lexicon. (Unpubl. typescript.)
- . . . . . 1970-2, 1978-80, 1983. Field notes on Juray.
- . . . . . 1970. Field notes on Sora.
- . . . . . 1982. Reconstruction of Sora-Juray-Gorum phonology. Unpubl. dissertation, Ann Arbor: Univ. Microfilms.
- Zide, N. 1956-8. Field notes on Korku.
- . . . . . 1978. *Studies in the Munda numerals*. Mysore: Central Inst. Indian Langs.
- Zide, N., Das, B. P. 1962-4, 1966-7. Field notes on Gutob.
- &. DeArmond, R

