TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS OF THE SOUTH MUNDA[1] VERBAL SYSTEM

Norman H. Zide and Gregory D. S. Anderson
University of Chicago

1 Introduction

One of the vexing issues in the comparative analysis of the Austroasiatic group of languages is the obvious typological difference between the complex (polysynthetic, agglutinative) Munda verb and the seemingly isolating structure preferred by the bulk of Mon-Khmer languages.[2] In this paper we examine the South Munda group of languages, working towards a reconstruction of the Proto-South Munda verbal system. Following a careful comparison of the various South Munda subgroups and the corresponding resultant intermediate proto-languages, the Proto-South Munda verbal system is now beginning to become clearer. When stripping away the various systems of progressive and perfective marking which seem to be innovations within the history of individual languages or subgroups, predominantly calqued on areal models (Hook 1991), one is still left with a large component of truly Munda features, frequently lacking analogs in other surrounding languages of the Indian subcontinent. The only previous analysis of South Munda verb structure (Pinnow 1966) lacks sufficient data from Gutob-Remo-Gta? and Gorum,[3] languages which, it turns out, are extremely important to our understanding of the ancestral verb structure. In the present study we discuss the following categories morphologically indexed in the Proto-South Munda verb: person, tense, mood and negation,[4] offering parallels with other Austroasiatic languages when warranted.

2 Person

Correspondences among the various South Munda languages suggest that both subject [SUBJ] and object [OBJ] were marked affixally in the South Munda verb. SUBJ markers were probably prefixal and OBJ markers suffixal in the proto-language. This is preserved in both Juang and Gorum, while Gta? has preserved the SUBJ agreement prefixes and Sora, in part, the OBJ suffixes. Various languages have only suffixal or enclitic person agreement with the SUBJ alone (Kharia, Gutob, Remo); in these instances this likely reflects a later encliticization of the pronominal forms following areal norms.[5] In Sora, on the other hand, there seems to have been a genuine shift in interpretation of the role of the person indexed by the agreement suffixes from OBJ to SUBJ in particular verb classes.[6] PSJG lost the PSM duals and the inclusive/exclusive contrast for first person; the other daughters of PSM preserved this. North Munda subject clitic- and object-marking phenomena are theoretically challenging (see Sadock (1991) on

243

marking phenomena are theoretically challenging (see Sadock (1991) on Santali, or G. Anderson (1995-ms.) for more on NM in general). While Proto-Munda probably had both SUBJ prefixes and OBJ suffixes, the issues are complicated and beyond the scope of the present study. For a list of person markers in SM languages, see Table-I.

SUBJ

	1	1DLi	1DLe	1PLi	1PLe	2
Kharia	-ñ/ŋ	-naŋ	-jar	-niŋ	-le	-m
Juang	-V₁-	ba-			nV₍₁₎-	mV₍₁₎-
Sora	-ay			-be	ə-..-ay	*
Gorum	ne-				le-	mo-
Gutob	-niŋ				-nei	-nom
Remo	-(n)iŋ	-naŋ			-nay	-no
Gta?	N̥-	ni-		næ/ne-	næ?/ne?	na-

	2DL	2PL	3	3DL	3PL
Kharia	-bar	-pe	--	-ki-yaɪ	-ki
Juang	ha-	V₁-	--	-ki-a	-ki
Sora		ə-..-ε	--		-ji
Gorum		bo-	--		-gi
Gutob		-pen	--		-nen
Remo	-pa	-pe	--		
Gta?	pa-	pe-	--		-har-

OBJ

	1	1DL	1PL	2	2DL
Juang	-(ni)ñ	-ñ-ba	-nen-iñ	-(n)(ɔ)m	-pa
Sora	-iñ	-ay	-lεn/ŋ	-əm	
Gorum	-iŋ		-ileŋ	-om	

	2PL	3	3DL	3PL
Juang	-pe	--	(-ki-a)	(-ki)
Sora	-bεn	-e		-ji
Gorum	-ibeŋ			(-gi)

Table-I South Munda Person Markers

(1) <u>Juang</u> (Matson 1964, Pinnow 1960-ms.)
mɛ-jɔ-ki-ñ   *n-ɔn-ɖe*   *ba-sɔŋ-a*
[2-'see'-PRES.II-1]   [1PL-'go'-PRES.I]   [1DL-'buy'-FUT.II]
'you see me'   'we go'   'we 2 will buy'

jɔ:-k-ɔm   *tele-ɔ-ñ*   *te-me-le-niñ*
['see'.1-PRES.II-2]   ['push'-PAST.II-1]   ['push'-3FUT-'push'-1]
'I see you'   'he pushed me'   'he will push me'

<u>Sora</u>   (Ramamurti 1931)   <u>Gorum</u> (Aze 1973)
uruŋ-l-iñ   *mo-taʔy-iŋ*
['take'-PAST-1]   [2-'give'-1]
'(you) took me'   'you gave me (money)'

an-uruŋ-l-am   *ne-aʔy-t-om*
[NEG-'take'-PAST-2]   [1'splash'-NPAST-2]
'(I) didn't take you'   'I will splash you'

<u>Remo</u> (Fernandez 1968)
way-t-iŋ way-oʔ-niŋ   *i-g-niŋ*   *sum-oʔ-no-ki*
['call'-NPAST-1]['call'-PAST.II-1]   ['return'-PAST.I-1]   ['eat'-PAST.I-Q]
'I call'   'I called'   'I returned'   'did you eat?'

<u>Gutob</u> (N. Zide 1997, field notes)
suŋ-to-niŋ   *suŋ-oʔ-nom*
['throw'-CUST-1]   ['throw'-PAST.II-2]
'I throw'   'you threw'

<u>Gtaʔ</u> (K. Mahapatra et al. 1989)
N̥-coŋ-ke   *N̥-coŋ-ge*
[1-'eat'-**ke**]   [1-'eat'-PAST]
'I ate'   'I ate'

Note that prefixal agreement markers for subject are not unique to Munda among Austroasiatic languages. They are found, for example, in such Aslian languages as Temiar:

(2) Temiar (Carey 1961)
kəʔan kəʔa-sɛhluh   *ʔi-səluh ñam ʔim-rec*
['you.2'] [2DL-'blow.pipe']   [1-'shoot'] ['animal'] [1-'eat']
'you 2 are blow-piping'   'I shot an animal to eat'

tɔʔ ha-reñrec sec mɛjmɛj naʔ
[NEG] [2-'eat'] ['meat'] ['excellent'] ['that']
'(why) didn't you eat that excellent meat'

Certain other Mon-Khmer languages, exhibit an interesting use of a resumptive pronoun in immediately preverbal position, as well as a lexically restricted bound pronominal allomorph. This may be viewed as a kind of incipient prefixal agreement system:

(3) Pacŏh (Watson 1964)
a-ám anhi acân ŋai pôc   *ŋép u-lúh*
['fathers'] ['uncles'] [FUT] [3PL 'go']   [non-sing] [3-'run']
'fathers and uncles will go'   'they all ran away'

Pronominal doubling is found in other Mon-Khmer languages as well, e.g. Katu.

(4) Katu (Wallace 1966)
dó dâh dó gamak   *yi 'bóðr pe jaal yi chô*
['he']['quickly']['he'   'become.big']   ['we']['2']['3']['times']['we' 'return']
['return']
'he quickly became big'   'we returned two or three times'

3 Tense-Aspect

One of the basic distinctions in the tense-aspect systems of the Munda languages is between past [PAST] and nonpast [NPAST] ('present-future'), both realized affixally; in NM the same basic distinction holds, but only past is marked.[7] PKJ, and, independently and differently, Gutob and Gtaʔ, each have developed future tenses, but there is no reason to reconstruct these for PSM.

Of the morphological aspectual forms, PKJ had a perfective, but this looks like an innovation. The Remo perfect, on the other hand, might be old, see below.[8] The reduplicated infinitival present in Gutob (functioning as a finite habitual aspect form) is found elsewhere in Munda, and in Mon-Khmer. For a summary of the tense-aspect markers in SM see Table-II.

	Kharia	Juang	Gutob	Remo
PAST.I	-ki	-an	-gu. -gi	-gi, -ga
PAST.II	-og/ʔ	-ɔ	-ɔʔ	-ɔʔ
NPAST.I[9]	-ta	-de	-to [CUST]	-te ~ -ta
NPAST.II	-te	-ke	-to [CUST]	-to
FUT.I	-na	-na	-loŋ	
FUT.II	-e	-e	-tu	

	Gtaʔ	Sora	Gorum
PAST.I	-ge/-ke	-le	-rV
PAST.II	-ge/-ke	-le	-rV
NPAST.I	(-ke)	-te (~ -tɛ)	-tV
NPAST.II	(-ke)	-te (~ -tɛ)	-tV
FUT	+e		

Table-II South Munda Tense-Aspect Markers

In Proto-South Munda, two series of tense markers seem to have been used, contrasting class-I (Intransitive) and class-II (Transitive). For the PAST, this formal opposition is straighforwardly attributable to Proto-South Munda. The PAST marker used with transitives/class-II verbs was *-og/ʔ,[10] while the corresponding marker for intransitives/class-I was *-g/kE. Kharia, Gutob and Remo preserve this system directly. Juang lacks the latter affix, Gtaʔ the former, and both were lost during the formation of Proto-Sora-Gorum, which has *-le instead.[11] In PGRG, there were the following forms: *-gi PAST.I and *-ɔʔ PAST.II. Gtaʔ has restructured this completely: the two past forms (the -ge PAST and the -ke PAST) both have a complex range of functions, some quite restricted, not directly corresponding to the transitive/intransitive contrasts of Gutob, Remo, and PGRG. Note that the Hill Gtaʔ form corresponding to the loosely imperfective -ke of Plains Gtaʔ is -ti.[12] This suggests that the Gtaʔ -ke/-ti PAST reflects something of the Proto-South-Munda NPAST; it probably also reflects something of the ancestor of the more obscure Hill Remo -ki, see below.

(7) Kharia (Malhotra 1982, Biligiri 1965a)
ob-ñoʔ-oʔ   *gitag-ki-moy*   *kui-ki*
[CAUS-'eat'-PAST-PL] ['sleep'-PAST.I-3PL]   ['find'-PAST.I]
'she fed'   'they slept'   'was found'[13]

Juang   (B. Mahapatra 1976)   Gta? (K. Mahapatra et al. 1989)
keɖab-ɔ   *gitu-an*   *N̥-coŋ-ge*   *N̥-coŋ-ke*
['bite'-PAST.II]   ['sing'-PAST.I]   [1-'eat'-PAST]   [1-'eat'-**ke**]
'he bit'   'she sang'   'I ate'   'I ate'

Gutob   (N. Zide, field notes)   Remo (Bhattacharya 1968)
ser-gu   *som-oʔ*   *gay-g-niŋ*   *baɖ-oʔ-niŋ*
['sing'-PAST]   ['eat'-PAST]   ['enter'-PAST-1]   ['slap'-PAST-1]
's/he sang'   's/he ate'   'I entered'   'I slapped'

Correspondences between Kharia and Sora-Gorum are suggestive that class-I and class-II NPAST were formally distinguished in PSM as well. These were marked by a -*t*-initial suffix, with differing vocalism for the two classes. The NPAST was either present or future in meaning. It is possible that Juang -*de* is cognate with Kharia -*te* and is thus an old marker, otherwise the marker seems to have been lost in this language. Proto Gutob-Remo had *-*tV* NPAST.I and NPAST.II, which was also probably differentiated by the quality of the vowel. Plains Gta? has lost any -*t*-initial NPAST marker, but it was probably (partially) preserved in the Hill/Riverside Gta? -*ti*. In Plains Gta?, all functions of Hill Gta? -*ti* < PSM *-*tV* have been replaced by -*ke*, possibly aspectual in origin. In Gutob, PGR(G) *tV- has been preserved, but specialized in the function of a customary present *(-to)* [CUST]; this affix may also be the historical source for the Gutob FUT.II in -*tu*. Remo *(-ta/-te, -to)* may have maintained the PGRG (PSM) vowel opposition in the NPAST, or at least reflect this contrast.

(8) Sora (Ramamurti 1931, Starosta 1967, Biligiri 1965b)

kuŋ-bəb-t-ɛ   *kuŋ-bəb-te-n*
['shave'-'head'-NPAST]   ['shave'-'head'-NPAST-I]
'you shave (s.o.'s) head'   'you shave your head'
ə-gi-j-t-iñ   *anin iɛr-tɛ*
[2PL-'see'-NPAST-1]   ['s/he'] ['go'-NPAST]
'y'all will see me'   's/he is going'

Gorum   (A. Zide field notes, Aze 1973)
miŋ ne-i-tuʔ   *mo-taʔy-t-iŋ*   *ne-laʔ-tuʔ*
['I'] [1-'go'-NPAST] [2SUBJ-'give'-NPAST-1OBJ] [1-'hit'-NPAST]
'I'll go'   'you will give (it) to me' 'I'll hit (myself)'

Remo (Bhattacharya 1968)
bɔp-t-iŋ   *goy-ta*
['head'-NPAST-1]   ['die'-NPAST.I]
'I shall make him head (of a village)'   's/he will die'

Gutob (N. Zide, field notes)
seser   *ser-loŋ*   *ser-to*
[R.'sing']   ['sing'-FUT]   ['sing'-CUST]
'sings'   'will sing'   'sings'

Kharia (Malhotra 1982, Biligiri 1965a)
gitag-na   *gitag-ta-ñ*   *um-yoʔ-ta*
['sleep'-FUT.I]   ['sleep'-PRES.I-1]   [NEG-'see'-PRES.I]
'she will sleep'   'I sleep'   'are not seen'

The future [FUT] is clearly secondary in South Munda languages. In Proto-Kharia-Juang, a future series was innovated for class-I (*-na*) and class-II (*-e*). Both are probably modal in origin: *-na* < the PSM imperative.I marker *-la*, and *-e* corresponds to the MOD *-e* affix in Remo and the OPT in Gutob. Note that the PKJ FUT.II in *-e* is not cognate with the Gtaʔ FUT marker +*e*, (e.g. *n-coŋ+e* [1-'eat'+FUT] 'I will eat'); this latter form is rather probably cognate with the Gutob present participle +*el*. The Gutob future transitive morpheme *-tu* is likely to have come from an earlier NPAST, but no source for the intransitive *-loŋ* has been found.

Remo, unlike the closely related Gutob and most other South Munda languages, does not directly borrow (or calque) an auxiliary construction to make present perfect and past perfect verb forms. Instead these consist of two tense/aspect markers following the verb stem, e.g. *bad-ɔʔ-t-iŋ* ['slap'-PAST.II-NPAST-1] 'I have slapped' vs. *bad-ɔʔ-ki-niŋ* ['slap'-PAST.II-PERF-1] 'I had slapped', with the otherwise non-occuring *-ki* perfect [PERF] marker. Do we reconstruct a Hill-Remo like perfective for PSM? Maybe; however, no relatable morphology or syntax in the other SM languages has been noted. It is possible that the Gtaʔ PAST marker in *-ke* may be cognate with the Hill Remo PERF *-ki,* and/or the Juang PRES.II in *-ke*. Plains Gtaʔ *-ke* may carry a present tense meaning, as well as an imperfect(ive) one, e.g. *na-coŋ-ke* [2-'eat'-ke] 'you eat, you ate'. Another function, probably quite old, is one of focus. A fuller picture of the various functions of *-ke* (and its opposition to *-ge*) in Gtaʔ must await further research.

4 Imperatives (and Other Modals)

Imperative forms in Proto-South-Munda may have also been divided into two formal classes, transitives and intransitives. This categorical opposition could be realized in a variety of ways, i) through the presence of a suffix with one class and its lack with the other, or ii) the possibility of a verb indexing a single referent or two referents, or iii) the possiblity of taking OBJ marking, in the case of Sora. Rather than being marked by a prefix as in the indicative, the SUBJ markers were suffixed in Proto-South-Munda, following the OBJ markers. This is preserved in Sora, and without the OBJ marking in Kharia; note that this has parallels in North Munda as well. Proto-Gutob-Remo kept the PSM formal opposition of intransitive imperatives marked by the affix *-(l)a vs. unmarked transitive imperatives. Gta? preserves this in a direct way only in a certain subset of intransitive verbs (of positioning and motion) that take -la. Kharia-Juang preserved the imperative as *-na and innovated an overt IMP.II in *-e from an originally optative/modal meaning.[14] This latter modal suffix was preserved in PGR and its modern attested daughter languages.

(9) Kharia (Malhotra 1982, Biligiri 1965a)

ñog-e-(m)	doko-na-(m)	ñog-e-bar
['eat'-FUT.II-(2)]	['sit'-FUT.I-(2)]	['eat'-FUT.II-2DL]
'eat (it)!'	'sit!'	'Please eat!'

Juang (Mahapatra & Matson 1962-ms)   Sora (Biligiri 1965b)

diñ-i-ñ	diñ-e-neniñ	gij-iñ-ba
['give'-FUT-1]	['give'-FUT-1DL]	['see'-1-2PL]
'give me'	'give (it) to us 2'	'(y'all) see me!'

Gta? (K. Mahapatra et al. 1989)

coŋ	coŋ-pa	coŋ-pe	coŋ-le?	ko-la
['eat']	['eat'-2DL]	['eat'-2PL]	['eat'-HORT]	['sit'-IMP]
'eat!'	'eat you 2!'	'eat y'all!'	'let him eat'	'sit!'

Remo (Bhattacharya 1968, Fernandez 1968)

bɔ?-ba	bug-e	ɔ-gɔi
['head'-IMP]	['beat'-MOD]	[CAUS-'die']
'become a head'	'he should beat (you)'	'kill'

kuma-la	sum-le	sum-niŋ
['bathe.self'-IMP]	['eat'-MOD]	['eat'-1]
'have a bath'	'(you) should eat'	'let me eat'

Gutob (N. Zide, field notes)

ser-a   ser-e
['sing'-IMP]   ['sing'-OPT]
'sing!'   'let sing!, may sing!'

5 Negation

There are two negative [NEG] prefixes or particles that were apparently used in the PSM verb system. These appeared with finite declarative, non-declarative, and non-finite verbs. One of these NEG markers is *a(r)- and the other *a/u(m)(bO).

Both negative markers are used in Gorum and Juang, while Sora and the GRG languages reflect *a(r)- only. Kharia also shows both etymological negative markers, with the *a(r)- used only in the prohibitive and the *a/um- only in finite clauses. Whether this is an old pattern or an innovation remains an open question. Note that negative copulae (such as *jena* in Juang) are used in some formations. In Sora, the NEG prefix may also appear suffixed in certain (non-tense-marked) past forms, in a doubly-marked construction (10).

(10) Sora (Starosta 1967, Ramaurti 1931, Biligiri 1965b)

ədn-ed-l-ε   a-gij-lə-be
[NEG-'scratch'-PAST(-3)]   [NEG-'see'-PAST-1inclPL]
'he didn't scratch'   'we (incl) didn't see him'[15]

aḍ-jum-aḍ   əʔ-ti-əʔ   əʔ-ñaŋ-əʔ
[NEG-'eat'-NEG]   [NEG-'give'-NEG]   [NEG-'take'-NEG]
'you, (s)he did not eat' 'didn't give'   'didn't take'

Gorum (Aze 1973) *ar-, or-*
ar-
ar-samaʔn-n-iʔŋ
[NEG-'recognize'-I-1.OBJ]
'it was not recognized by me'

or-
buboŋ-di or-orʔiŋ-tuʔ   or-alam
['baby'-FOC] [NEG-'walk'-I]   [NEG-'touch']
'the baby can't walk'   'don't touch'

ambu alam   'don't touch'

<u>Kharia</u>[16] (Biligiri 1965a, Malhotra 1982)

abu co-na-(m)   ag-bar co-na   ag-pe ñog-e
[PHB.2] ['go'-FUT.I-(2)]   [PHB-2DL] ['go'-FUT.I]   [PHB-2PL] ['eat'-FUT.II]
'don't go!'   'don't go, you 2!'   'don't eat, y'all!'

um-iñ co-na   um ñok'-og   um karay-kon
[NEG-1] ['go'-FUT.I]   [NEG] ['eat'-PAST.T]   [NEG] ['do'-NF]
'I will not go'   'he did not eat'   'not having done'

um-em co-na   um co-na-m
[NEG-2] ['go'-FUT.I]   [NEG] ['go'-FUT.I-2]
'you will not go'   'you will not go'

umbo colcol   umbo ño?ño?
['no'] [Rdpl. 'go']   ['no'] [R. 'eat']
'I cannot go'   'I cannot eat'

<u>Juang</u> (Mahapatra & Matson 1962-ms, Matson 1964, Pinnow 1960-ms.)

añ koŋkoŋ jena   ba-ama-gito-ke jena   ar-aitog-ki-ki jena
['I'] [R.'know'] [NEG]   [1DL-NEG-'sing'-   [NEG-'scratch'-
                              PRES.II] [NEG]   PRES.II-PL][NEG]
'I don't know'   'we 2 don't know'   'they   aren't/won't
                                                          be scratching'

Negative marking in the GRG languages presents a more complicated picture. First, main and subordinate clauses are differentiatied by the negative prefix used. In main clauses *ar- was found in PGRG (< PSM *ar-), while in subordinate clauses *mɔr- was used (cf. Gta? mɔ-Gutob mɔr-, < pre-PGRG *mV-ar, possibly < PSM *(a)mV-ar, i.e. a doubly-marked negative). The prohibitive in PGRG consisted of the NEG prefix combined with the use of a *PAST* tense morpheme, e.g. *ar-X-gi or *ar-X-ɔ?. This is preserved in Gutob and Remo, but in Gta?, only the etymological PGRG PAST.I form in *-gi is used (since PGRG (and PSM) *-ɔ? was lost in pre-Gta?). In addition, the negative forms of *past* tenses in PGRG seem to have used *NPAST* suffixes, e.g. *ar-X-tV.[17] PGRG *ar-X-tV was preserved as Gutob ar-X-to, Hill Gta? a?-X-ti, (and following the developments mentioned above in pre-Gta?) Plains Gta? a(r)-X-ke (-r- appearing before V-initial stems, e.g. ones starting with the causative a?-). In P(roto-) Remo, the PAST.II marker was added to the opaque PGRG form, *ar-X-tV yielding PRemo *a(r)-X-tV-ɔ?.[18] This was preserved in Hill Remo (a-X-tV-ɔ?), but Plains Remo lost the *-tV-, yielding a-X-ɔ?. Some negative forms, e.g. the Gutob negative customary and negative habitual,

252

are marked not with the prefix, but with a negative copula and a reduplicated infinitive (verbal noun).

(11) <u>Gutob</u> (N. Zide field notes)
ar-ser-gu   *seser ar-ḍu-gu*   *seser aṛ u/ik-e*
[NEG-'sing'-PAST.I]   [R.'sing'] [NEG-AUX-   [R.'sing'] [NEG-
                                  PAST.I]   AUX-OPT]
'don't sing'   'don't be singing' 'no singing'

seser uraʔ/oroj   *ar-ser-a*   *ar-ser-to*
[R.'sing'] [NEG]   [NEG-'sing'-NEG.FUT]   [NEG-'sing'-
                                             NEG.PAST]
'doesn't sing'   'won't sing'   'didn't sing'

ar-ser-e   *ser-gu nu/ḍu uraʔ/oroj*   *seser ar-ḍu-to*
[NEG-'sing'-OPT]   ['sing'-PAST.I] [AUX]   [R.'sing'][NEG-
AUX-   [NEG]   CUST]
'may not sing'   'has not sung'   'had not sung'

seser uraʔ/oroj ḍu-gu *seser uraʔ/oroj ḍu-loŋ* *seser ar-ḍuk-a*
[R.'sing'] [NEG]   [R.'sing'] [NEG]   [R.'sing'] [NEG-AUX-
     [AUX-PAST.I]   [AUX-FUT.I]   IMP]
'was not singing' 'will not be singing'   'don't be singing'

<u>Remo</u> (Bhattacharya 1968)
a-o-goi-oʔ   *a-kuma-ga*
[NEG-CAUS-'die'-PAST.II]   [NEG-'bathe.self'-PAST.I]
'don't kill!'   'don't bathe!'

<u>Gtaʔ</u> (Mahapatra et al. 1989)
a-coŋ-ge   *a-coŋ-le*
[NEG-'eat'-PAST]   [NEG-'eat'-HORT]
'don't eat!'   'don't let him eat, may s/he not eat'

Ṇ-á-coŋ-ke[19]   *c-coŋ Ṇ-á-ḍiŋ-ge*   *coŋ Ṇ-á-læʔ-ke*
[1-NEG-'eat'-**ke**] [R.'eat'] [1-NEG-AUX-PAST] ['eat'] [1-NEG-AUX-**ke**]
'I didn't eat'   'I wasn't eating'   'I hadn't eaten'

c-coŋ Ṇ-á-miaʔ-ke   *coŋ Ṇ-á-ḍiŋ-ke*   *coŋ Ṇ-á-læʔ*
[R.'eat'] [1-NEG-AUX-**ke**] ['eat'] [1-NEG-AUX-**ke**] ['eat'] [1-NEG-AUX]
'I don't eat'   'I am not eating' 'I have not eaten'

Ṇ-ár-aʔ-coŋ-ke   Ṇ-á-coŋ   c-coŋ Ṇ-á-ḍiŋ
[1-NEG-CAUS-'eat'-**ke**] [1-NEG-'eat']   [R.'eat'][1-NEG-AUX]
'I didn't feed (s.o.)' 'I won't/wouldn't eat' 'I won't be eating'

     While direct cognates of the Munda NEG prefix are (as of yet) unknown elsewhere in Mon-Khmer, Bahnar does have a prefixal NEG marker, e.g. <u>Bahnar</u> (Banker 1964: 117) *ĭnh kobăt* ['I'] [NEG-'know'] 'I don't know' (also *ĭnh uh kobăt* ['I'] ['not'] [NEG-'know']).

6 Conclusions

     Thus, it has been seen that verbal affixation processes in Proto-South Munda probably included prefixation, infixation, suffixation, and possibly ambifixation as well (for the Gtaʔ reciprocal). Certain correspondences between PNM and PSM are likely to be features of Proto-Munda (person marking, some kind of tense/aspect/mood marking, etc.), despite the fact that North Munda verb morphology is largely suffixal and probably largely innovated. The common assumption about (Proto-) Austroasiatic is that it lacked inflectional morphology.[20] This assumption needs to be demonstrated. There is no question that Munda syntax--which favors SOV constituent order, with possible vestiges of SVO in SM--is very different from Mon-Khmer syntax--where SVO is the rule. This is not an insurmountable problem, as shifts in sentential constituent order to reflect areal norms is well-known in the history of many languages. However, before we can begin to formulate a more exact understanding of comparative Austroasiatic morphosyntax, careful and precise low-level comparisons of individual Mon-Khmer subgroups will be necessary to ultimately arrive at a Proto-Mon-Khmer morphosyntax. Only then will there be the possiblity of having a basis for comparison with our emerging picture of Proto-Munda morphosyntax. We hope that the present study constitutes the first step down this long-road to a comparative Austroasiatic morphosyntax.

Abbreviations Used:

AUX	Auxiliary	BEN	Benefactive	CAUS	Causative
CL	Cislocative	CMPL	Completive	CONT	Continuative
CUST	Customary	DESID	Desiderative	DL	Dual
e	exclusive	i	inclusive	I	Intransitive
MOD	Modal	Ṇ	syllabic nasal	NEG	Negative
NF	Non-Finite	NPAST	Non-past	OBJ	Object
OPT	Optative	PASS	Passive	PERF	Perfect(ive)

PHB	Prohibitive	PL	Plural	POSS	Possessive
PRES	Present	Q	Interrogative	R.	Reduplicated
RECIP	Reciprocal	RFLXV	Reflexive	TLOC	Translocative
1	first person	2	second person	3	third person

Notes

---

[1] There are nine South Munda languages spoken by fewer than a million total people in eastern India in the state of Orissa and adjacent parts of neighboring states. The three subgroups of the South Munda languages consist of Kharia-Juang (made up of Kharia and Juang) , Gutob-Remo-Gtaʔ (Gutob (Gadaba), Remo (Bon~d~a), Plains Gtaʔ (D~id~ayi, D~id~ei) and Hill Gtaʔ) and Sora-(Juray)-Gorum (Sora (Saora), Juray and Gorum (Pareng(i/a)).

[2] For example, <u>Kharia</u> (Malhotra 1982) *d~od~-kay-t~u-d~om-bhaʔ-god~-na-m* ['carry'-BEN-TLOC-PASS-'quickly'-COMPLT-FUT-2] 'get yourself there for me quickly', *kol-kui-bhaʔ-god~-ki-kiyar* [RECIP-'find'-'quickly'-COMPLT-PAST.I-DL] 'both of them found each other quickly'; <u>Sora</u> (Ramamurti 1931) *ji-lo:'-je⊥t-am* ['stick'-'mud'-'leg'-NPAST-2] 'mud will stick to your leg', *pa⊥ti-dar-iñ-te:n* ['bring'-'give'-'cooked.rice'-1-3.PAST] 'he brought and gave me cooked rice'; <u>Remo</u> (Fernandez 1983) *gɘ-gay-d~usoʔ-kɘ-ga* [R.'enter'-'DESID-ke-PAST] 'he wanted to enter', *bad~-oʔ-su⊥oʔ-niˈ* ['slap'-PAST-COMPLT-PAST-1] 'I finished slapping'. Note that polymorphemic words are attested in certain Mon-Khmer languages however, e.g. <u>Katu</u> (Costello 1966) *tapachariat* [RECIP-CAUS-'cold'] 'make e.o.'s rice cold', *tapagluh* [RECIP-CAUS-'go.outside'] 'make e.o.go outside', *tapasaruum* [RECIP-CAUS-'fall'] 'cause e.o. to fall' or <u>Bahnar</u> (Banker 1964) *jo'po'lôch* [PERF-CAUS-'die'] 'to have killed', *jo'to'yaih* [PERF-PASS-'untie'] 'to have been untied'.

[3] Pinnow's (1966) thorough treatment of the Munda verb written almost forty years ago has comparatively little we can use here since only one of the SM subfamilies (Kharia-Juang) was adequately described (largely by Pinnow himself) at the time he wrote. For only one other SM language, Sora, was there then any good data, and Pinnow was forced to see SM as rather like Sora--which it isn't--and Kharia-Juang. Pinnow's analyses and his general conclusions, e.g. on tense/aspect, are quite relevant, but to a broader, more complete analysis of the Munda verb than we can give here.

[4] This doesn't exhaust the morphologically marked verbal categories in the SM languages, for example, the conjunctive clausal clitic, cf. PGRG *-či(ʔ) Juang *-jɔ* or the causative in *Vˈb-, *-(V)ˈb-; space does not allow us to address these here.

[5] Compare Gtaʔ *n-coŋ-ke* [1-'eat'-PAST] and Gutob *som-oʔ-niŋ* ['eat'-PAST.II-1], both meaning 'I ate'.

[6] Note for for the most part, Sora does not mark subject on the verb form itself at all, but rather syntactically with independent pronouns, which themselves are often omitted and contextually understood.

[7] The NPAST forms in NM have a finitizing 'predicator' suffix (-*a* in Kherwarian, -*bà/-ò* in Korku) suffixed to a non-finite verbal noun.

[8] The SM languages as a whole are short on auxiliary verb constructions, which generally perform aspectual functions. Most of those found (including the perfective and progressive forms central to the verb systems of some SM languages) are fairly recent borrowings (or calques). For example, the richer systems of North Munda auxiliaries are borrowed from or calqued on the basis of Hindi, with its elaborate set of auxiliary verbs. This contrasts with the less developed auxiliary verb system of the GRG languages that have borrowed auxiliary formations from Desia Oriya, with its more restricted range of auxiliaries.

[9] Glossed as the PRES.I and PRES.II in Kharia and Juang.

[10] The PSM Transitive PAST.II in *-ɔʔ* looks to be cognate with the NM transitive past in -*èʔ/--ɛʔ/-ɛd*. The PNM *ɛ : PSM *ɔ correspondence is well-known, e.g. PNM **mɛd* PSM **mɔd ~ *mad* 'eye'. A formal opposition of intransitive and transitive imperatives is also found in NM as well. Space does not permit us to adequately address the implications of our PSM reconstructions to comparative NM data.

[11] Note that [PAST] can be Ø-marked in Juray and Gorum in as of yet unknown circumstances, e.g. Juray (A. Zide 1983) *jom-ɛn-gi* ['eat'-I-PL] 'they ate', Gorum *guloŋ-iŋ* ['call'-1] 'he called me'. On the other hand, double-marking of [PAST] is the rule in Gorum AUX constructions: Gorum *miŋ ne-adaʔ-ruʔ ne-k-ruʔ* ['I'] [1-'thirst'-PAST] [1-AUX-PAST] 'I was thirsty'; this is paralleled in Gutob and Remo: Gutob (Hook 1991: 185) *bobrig-oʔ beṛ-oʔ* ['enter'.CAUS-PAST.II] [AUX-PAST.II] 'made enter'; Remo (Hook 1991: 187) *len-oʔ sun-oʔ sit* ['thresh'-PAST.II] [AUX-PAST.II] [Conjunctive.Particle] 'having threshed'. Also, according to Starosta (1967: 141) and Ramamurti (1931) Sora has an alternative [3.PAST] form in -*eteːn/-eteːd,* e.g. *jer-eːten* ['go'-3.PAST] 's/he went' *jer-aːi-teːn* ['go'-CL-3.PAST] 's/he came'. This is apparently the unmarked form for [PAST] in the villages of Gumna (-*eteːn*) and Serango (-*eteːd*).

[12] For example, Plains Gtaʔ *N̩-coŋ-ke* [1-'eat'-ke] vs. Hill Gtaʔ *N̩-coŋ-ti* [1-'eat'-**ti**] both meaning 'I ate' or 'I eat'.

[13] Note the 'passivizing' or 'detransitivizing' effect of the use of the class-I (or 'intransitive') affixes with a semantically bi-valent verb that is typical of Kharia and Juang.

[14] It is also possible that Proto-Kharia-Juang reflects a very old feature here, with transitive verbs lacking a pronominal object marked by an inanimate object marker in *-e. This pattern was seen in Proto-North Munda as well. Of course, PKJ *-e could reflect both the modal *-e and the inanimate *-e.

[15] Note that the combination of the [NEG] prefix with the pronominal prefix for first or second plural is realized as a- in Sora.

[16] The enclisis of the SUBJ marker to the PHB particle (or NEG particles in general) in Kharia may be a very old feature, or may reflect contact with North Munda at a more recent date.

[17] Thus, negative forms of PGRG apparently used affixes in meanings differing from their meaning in the positive. NM lacks parallels, so the question is probably whether this is an innovation in PGRG or goes back to the PSM level, lost in the other two daughters PKJ and PSJG. It is possible, if not likely, that the presence of past tense markers in the semantically non-past prohibitive triggered a re-analysis of all NEG forms during the history of PGR(G), further extended during the history of Gutob itself. Note that the more marked positive inflectional categories do not show this shift to a different marker in the negative in Gutob, e.g. ser-e ['sing'-OPT] 'may s/he sing' vs. ar-ser-e [NEG-'sing'-OPT] 'may s/he not sing'.

[18] Note that Hill Remo perfective forms might etymologically consist of a PAST and NPAST morphemes (or a PAST and an aspectual affix of some type) in the same word, but in a different order than the NEG.PAST.II.

[19] Note Ņ-á-coŋ-ke [1-NEG-'eat'-ke] 'I didn't eat' vs. na-cóŋ-ke [2-'eat'-ke] 'you eat'.

[20] This excludes derivational (nominalizing) processes like *-n- infixation found in both Munda and Mon-Khmer languages.

References

Anderson, G. D. S. 1995-ms. Towards the Proto-North Munda Verb System. Unpublished ms.: Chicago.

Aze, (F.) R. 1973. Clause Patterns in Parengi-Gorum. In R. L. Trail (ed.) *Patterns in clause, sentence, discourse in selected languages of India and Nepal* 1: 235-312.

Banker, E. 1964. Bahnar Affixation. *Mon-Khmer Studies I*: 99-118.

Bhattacharya, S. 1968. *A Bonda Dictionary*. Poona: Deccan College.

Biligiri, H. S. 1965a. *Kharia: Phonology, grammar, vocabulary*. Poona: Deccan College.

_____ 1965b. The Sora verb, a restricted study. In G.B. Milner and E. J. A. Henderson (eds.) *Indo-Pacific Linguistic Studies, II*: 231-250. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Carey, I. 1961. *Tengleq kui serok: A study of the Temiar language with an ethnographical summary.* Kuala Lumpur.

Costello, N. 1966. Affixes in Katu. *Mon-Khmer Studies II:* 63-86.

Das Gupta, D. 1978. *Linguistic Studies in Juang, Kharia Thar, Lodha, Mal-Pahariya, Ghatoali, Pahariya.* Anthropological Survey of India, Calcutta, 1-90.

Dryer, M. 1986. Primary Objects, Secondary Objects, and Antidative. *Language* 62.4: 808-45.

Fernandez, F. 1968. *A grammatical sketch of Remo: A Munda language.* University of North Carolina Ph.D. dissertation.

_____ 1983. The morphology of the Remo (Bonda) verb. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 12/1: 15-45.

Hook, P. E. 1991. The compound verb in Munda: An areal overview. *Language Sciences* 13.2: 181-95.

Jenner, P. N., L. C. Thompson and S. Starosta. 1976. *Austroasiatic Studies II.* Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 13. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Kullu, P. 1981. *Kharia Vyakaraṇa.* (In Hindi). Ranchi.

Mahapatra. B. P. 1976. Comparative notes on Juang and Kharia finite verbs. In Jenner, P.N., et al (eds.) *Austroasiatic Studies II:* 801-14. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Mahapatra, B. and D. Matson. 1962-ms. Brief Description of Juang. Unpublished-ms.: Puri.

Mahapatra, K. (with Dobek Pujari and P. K. Panda). 1989. *Ḍiḍayi* (In Oriya). Academy of Tribal Dialects and Culture, Government of Orissa, Bhubaneshwar.

Malhotra, V. 1982. *The structure of Kharia: A study in linguistic typology and change.* J Nehru Univ. PhD dissertation.

Matson, D. 1964. *A grammatical sketch of Juang.* University of Wisconsin Ph.D. dissertation.

Pinnow, H-J. 1960-ms. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Juang-Sprache.* Unpublished-ms. Berlin.

_____ 1966. A comparative study of the verb in the Munda languages. In N. Zide (ed.) *Studies in Comparative Austroasiatic Linguistics,* 96-193. The Hague: Mouton.

Ramamurti, G. V. 1931. *A manual of the So:ra language.* Madras: Govt. Press.

Sadock, J. 1991. *Autolexical Syntax.* Chicago: UC Press.

Starosta, S. 1967. *Sora syntax: A generative approach to a Munda language.* University of Wisconsin PhD dissertation.

Wallace, J. M. 1966. Katu Pronouns. *Mon-Khmer Studies II:* 19-28.

Watson, S. K. 1964. Personal Pronouns in Pocoh. *Mon-Khmer Studies I:* 81-98.

Zide, A. 1983. The Story of Two Girls (excerpt from a Juray text). *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 12/1: 109-11

_____. n. d. Field notes on Gorum. Munda Language Project, Chicago.

_____. 1997. Gutob pronominal clitics and related phenomena elsewhere in Gutob-Remo-Gta?. In A. Abbi (ed.) *Languages of Tribal and Indigenous Peoples of India*, 307-34. Delhi: Montilal Banarsidass.