CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter a review of available materials on the language will be done. Since the thrust of the study is on the noun phrase in Khasi, the review will necessarily be of those areas having a direct relevance to the topic. It is felt that such a review will be helpful in pointing out which other areas have not already been touched upon.

Except Lily Rabel\(^1\) in her *Khasi, A Language of Assam* (1961), Jayaraman\(^2\) in his *A Contrastive Grammar of the Complex Sentence Structures in Khasi and English* (1984) and K.S. Nagaraja\(^3\) in his *Khasi, A Descriptive Analysis*, almost all materials written on the language show that writers have looked at it from the traditional point of view. The language was divided into parts of speech which are eight namely, nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. Those who

---


did not write in as great detail as the Revs. William Pryse (1855) and Hugh Roberts (1891) also wrote from the traditional point of view. They possibly could not do otherwise since they wrote at the time traditional grammar was at its prime. The Rev. Alexander Lish (1838) presumably the first to write about the Khasi language wrote a brief note which contains important observations. He wrote that the language

... is simple in its construction and idioms; monosyllabic in its roots and has no intonations. Its verbs and nouns suffer no inflexion by the change of tense, number, person or case. The distinctions where there are any, are known by prefixes and affixes. (Lish 1838:142-143).

That the language is monosyllabic is an opinion shared by other writers like Robinson⁴, Oldham⁵ and Grierson⁶. The Rev. Hugh Roberts did not share this

---


view. In his comment on the linguistic development of the language, he wrote that Khāsi is not so absolutely monosyllabic. The polysyllabic words which are neither compound nor borrowed such as byrhuin (red as flame), jylleng (abdomen), kohlyngkai (rhinoceros horn bill), tyngam (jawbone) support Robert's view above. But Namita C. Shadap Sen⁷ (1981) interestingly observed the following –

The Khāsi language appears to be in the course of evolution from a monosyllabic to a polysyllabic inflected stage. The numerous apparently polysyllabic words are in fact in most cases compounds of easily recognisable monosyllabic root words, the only exceptions being a few syllables which are rarely if ever used except as prefixes modifying the meaning of other syllables; among these are the generic prefixes /logo and ka, the plural prefix ki and the nominal prefix jing. (Shadap Sen, N.C. 1981:52).

This observation particularly about evolution from a monosyllabic to a polysyllabic stage is without question not acceptable since the scholar has not documented it with specimens from the language. Besides,

---

the second part of the observation contradicts the first part for, if the apparently poly-syllabic words are in actuality compound words of easily recognisable monosyllabic roots then how can the polysyllabic inflected stage be found in the language?

Lish's contention that Khasi has no intonations is, however, not clear. If by intonation is meant the distinctive use of patterns of pitch or melody which also functions as a signal of grammatical structure, the marking of sentences, classes and other boundaries, the contrast between questions and statements then surely Khasi does have its own intonation patterns. Regarding this, Robinson wrote

The language ... abounds with those intonations that form so striking a feature in the languages allied to the Chinese. The short, abrupt sound at the termination of a word or syllable, is especially frequent (Robinson 1849:336).

Oldham also agreed with Robinson that Khasi used intonation frequently. He wrote

... the very varied and remarkable intonations of voice used frequently by the Khasis and the unceasing tendency to the juxtaposition and composition (partly) of words in order to express complex ideas, render this language a peculiarly expressive one, although being without any literature, and without even any written form, it is necessarily a difficult task to render it a medium of communication, or of instruction, excepting orally. (Oldham 1854:161).
If by intonation Lish meant the tones usually encountered in tone languages then Khasi which is not a tone language indeed does not have intonation.

There is much truth in Lish’s observation that nouns and verbs have no inflections for tense, number and person. That changes which in other languages are effected through inflections are effected in Khasi through the relevant particles is a principle adopted in order to convey different shades of meaning or difference in time, quality, quantity or any other relations. Oldham (ibid. liii) wrote that the only instance of any approach to inflection is the personal pronouns which change for person, gender and number as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>ngi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>me (masc.)</td>
<td>phi (com.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pha (fem.)</td>
<td>phi (com.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u (masc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>ka (fem.)</td>
<td>ki (com.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i (com.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of these personal pronouns given by Nagaraja (op.cit) is that the segment \( n \) denotes first person, and \( k \) denotes third person feminine while \( a \) denotes singular and \( i \) plural. Then he postulates \( ph \) as marking the second person, This he did on the grounds that \( phi \) is used both for singular and plural numbers, and since \( pha \) and \( me \) are according to him obsolete and even taboo terms, the forms are best ignored. It may be noted however that these forms are very much in use particularly within the family circle by parents, uncles and aunts to their children, nieces and nephews. \( pha \) and \( me \) are terms used between equals to show familiarity and intimacy. They are also used by seniors to juniors particularly when the seniors feel strongly against anything the juniors did. Though \( pha \) and \( me \) are grammatical markers of singularity, yet when angry, they are used to refer to plural nouns, the plurality of which is marked not by \( pha \) or \( me \) but by a reciprocal marker \( ia \) as in the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pha} & \quad \text{ia} & \quad \text{wan} & \quad \text{shaei}\? \\
\text{II PSP Rec} & \quad \text{V} & \quad \text{Adv}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{thou} \quad \text{reci-} \quad \text{come} \quad \text{where}?
\]

\[
\text{pro-} \quad \text{cal}
\]

(where didst thou all cometh from?/
where did you all come from?)
pha a marker of female sex is sometimes used to address a male or males particularly when the speaker is very angry with the addressee or addressees. This particular use also shows the speaker's contempt towards the addressee or addressees.

The difference of pha/me marking intimacy from the same forms marking anger lies only in intonation. A soft intoned pha/me marks familiarity, intimacy and acceptance whereas a harsh tone accompanying them shows anger and contempt.

Further, Nagaraja's analysis of third person personal pronouns that k denotes third person feminine is not acceptable since k is used not only for the feminine singular form ke but also the plural ki which does not mark gender.

It is interesting to note that Oldham should mention that the names of objects which in other languages would be considered neuter are in Khasi preceded
occasionally by the prefix *ki* to mark singular number. He added that this use appears to indicate a collective sense used especially with words borrowed from Bengali or Hindustani. But it is really difficult to come by such use. The use of *ki* in the singular sense is found only when used as a term of respect to those in high position such as *ki syiem* (the king), *ki Blei* (the God). In this sense, *ki* may be treated as an honorific marker (Hon).

In this work, personal pronouns will be marked

* nga* - First Person Singular (IPS)
* ngi* - First Person Plural (IPP)
* me* - Second Person Singular Masculine (IIIPSM)
* pha* - Second Person Singular Feminine (IIIPSF)
* phi* - Second Person Singular/Plural (IIIPS/P)
* u* - Third Person Singular Masculine (IIIPSM)
* ka* - Third Person Singular Feminine (IIIPSF)
* i* - Third Person Singular (IIIPS)
* ki* - Third Person Plural (IIIPP)

Of the above personal pronouns, the third person *u/ka/i/ki* are the ones that pose most problems because they also function as number and/or gender markers in addition to being personal pronouns. These personal
pronouns/number and/or gender markers are sometimes referred to as 'Particles'. Before proceeding any further, it is important to clarify the meaning of the term 'Particle' since the term is used differently by Robinson and by Oldham. The former used it to refer to ba, u, haba, kumta, la, lah etc which are grammatical words in their own right and the use of which he wrote as follows:

... it will be observed that the Khassias make use of a large number of insignificant particles, most of which are merely euphonical. (Robinson 1349:340).

It is interesting to note that Oldham refuted the above view as erroneous. According to him, the particles appear to be used in all cases for a definite purpose particularly to convey different shades of meaning or slight differences in time or other relations. But he used the term 'Particle' to refer to all words in the language. He did not see the need to differentiate lexical morphemes from grammatical morphemes because according to him most root words are being used indifferently as adjectives, as adverbs, conjunctions etc., according to the structure of the sentence. This observation is true to a certain extent. Words like ksiar (gold) and sati (ring) are both nouns when written independently but if
placed one after the other as in \textit{Ka sati ksiar, ksiar} (gold) is adjectival, meaning that the ring is of gold. This observation is true not only of Khasi but also of English. e.g., Independently \textit{gold} is a noun, and so is \textit{ring}, but if one says \textit{a gold ring}, \textit{gold} is no longer a noun of the same function as \textit{ring}, but is a noun functioning as an adjective.

It is felt that the ground given, namely, that the same words are used for different functions could not be justification enough to lump together lexical morphemes and grammatical morphemes under one name, namely 'Particles'. The term 'Particle' according to Allerton\(^8\) (1979:213) refers to the free morphemes that constitute grammatical words in their own right. One of the definitions of the term Particle given by Crystal\(^9\),

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
reproduced below ties in with Allerton's view above:

A term used in GRAMMATICAL description to refer to an INVARIABLE ITEM with grammatical FUNCTION, especially one which does not readily fit into a standard classification of PARTS OF SPEECH. (Crystal 1980:258).

A close examination reveals that morphemes in Khasi as in apparently all languages, fall under two major categories, (i) those with primary lexical value and (ii) those with grammatical value for which the term Particle may be used. That there are grammatical words in Khasi is supportible by the fact that words such as ba, ia, jong, la, ha etc., can be used only as modifiers. As modifiers such words are a closed set as opposed to the lexical morphemes which are an open set.

It may further be pointed out that meaning in Khasi is effected to a large extent by the context in which these modifiers are juxtaposed in the sentences. A comparison of the following examples will justify the point.

(1) Junom ha ka leit jong u
Adv Prep SE H Poss IIIPSM

Forever in love of he
(Forever in his love)
In (1) *ieit* (love) functions as a noun because of the possessive marker *jong* (of) which usually follows noun words as in *u khulom jong nga* (my pen). If a word which is seemingly verbal is followed by *jong*, it will be found that that verbal lexeme ceases to function as a verb. On the contrary, it will necessarily function as a noun referring to the manner how that particular act is done. In (3) *bam(eat)* is a verb, but it functions as a noun.

In (2) *ieit* is a verb. The particle *ia* occurring before a noun indicates that the particular noun or pronoun is the recipient of the action of the verb. This is true whether *ia* immediately occurs after a verb as in (2) above or occurs in sentence initial position when the object of the verb is proposed for purpose of emphasis as

---

10. *SE* means Subject Enclitic. A subject enclitic is a necessary repetition of the number and gender of the subject word. An SE therefore arises out of the subject.
The sentences above not only proved the point made earlier that meaning are affected by juxtaposition of grammatical morphemes such as *long* and *ia* but also the fact that Khasi makes extensive use of these grammatical particles to accomplish changes which in most inflectional languages is done by inflexions. Khasi is an uninflected language. In view of this it may be concluded that while Robinson was right in classifying *ba, ia, la*, etc as particles, his view that Khasi make use of a large number of insignificant particles is definitely erroneous. Oldham's views that all words in Khasi are particles has also been proved to be completely wrong.

It is mentioned earlier that the personal pronouns *u/ka/i/ki* pose problems by virtue of their having more than one function - functions which differ according to their place of occurrence. The term *particle* which is sometimes used to refer to them is too inclusive to pinpoint the different functions they
have. It is therefore proposed that functions of
\textit{u/ka/i/ki} be spelt out properly in order to arrive at
a term or terms with which they can be called.

A study of available and related materials
reveals that all writings on the Khasi language have
necessarily discussed the use of \textit{u/ka/i/ki} along with
noun words because of their occurrence before such.
However, there is no consensus among writers as to what
they should be called. While some called them articles
others called them pronominals. Oldham raised the issue
that in Khasi there is no true article in the sense of
the definite and indefinite article in English. But
\textit{u/ka/i/ki} may be treated as definite articles in so far
as these mark the number and gender of nouns. Sten called
them determiners and noted that their definiteness lies
in the fact that, as mentioned already, they indeed mark
the number and/or gender of nouns.

Roberts was of the opinion that \textit{u/ka/i/ki} are
originally and strictly definite because when used
without a noun they have the force of a demonstrative
and a personal pronoun, and that they are omitted when
indefiniteness is to be expressed. War\textsuperscript{11} (1986) also saw

\textsuperscript{11} J. War. "Problems relating to \textit{u, ka,i, ki} in Khasi"
in \textit{Ka Shlem} Vol II, No 2, March 1986. Khasi-
Literary Society, NEHU, Shillong.
that at least one function of $u/ka/i/ki$ is as definite articles. She went a step ahead of Roberts and noted that the use of $u/ka/i/ki$ with cataphoric specification of the noun or pronoun marks definiteness in Khasi. Without cataphoric specification definiteness is marked by demonstratives and third person pronouns. Both Roberts and War agreed that indefiniteness is marked in Khasi by the use of $u/ka/i/ki$ prefixed to the numerical quantifier *wej* (one) as referential. Lily Rabel-Heymann\textsuperscript{12} also viewed $u/ka/i/ki$ along similar lines. She wrote,

> Every Khasi noun is preceded by a gender indicator commonly known as an "article" a term borrowed for reasons of convenience from the grammar of Indo-European. This gender indicator is repeated before the verb, and is then known as a pronominal verbal prefix. A morpheme identical with the nominal article and the verbal pronominal prefix functions in free form as a personal pronoun. It might therefore be said that the Khasi pronoun occurs as a free morpheme by itself and as a bound form before nouns and verbs. In any cases the pronominal and preverbal form always agree with respect to number and gender. (Rabel 1977:247).

While some have called u/ka/i/ki articles, determiners, gender indicator and pronominal markers, in the present work I shall call u/ka/i/ki occurring before nouns **Number and/or Gender Markers** (NGMs) individually marked as follows:

- **u** - Singular Masculine (SM)
- **ka** - Singular Feminine (SF)
- **i** - Singular (S)
- **ki** - Plural (P)

The occurrence of an NGM before a noun word is an obligatory rule in Khasi. All writers have agreed on the point that the occurrence of an NGM before a noun marks specifically the number and/or gender of the noun following. Mondon Bareh\[^3\] (1929) in his book *Khasi-English Course and Grammar for Schools and Colleges* extensively classified the nouns according to their gender. Incidentally, it should be mentioned here that Khasi has only two genders -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td><strong>u</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td><strong>ka</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In case of Plural Nouns gender is shown by the word shynrang (male) or kynthei (female) put immediately after the noun. There is no neuter gender as erroneously claimed by Blah\textsuperscript{14} (1964) and Pugh\textsuperscript{15} (1982). Inanimate things are either masculine or feminine in Khasi. Though Mondon Bareh and Lili Rabel-\textsuperscript{Heymann} tried to faithfully indicate which kind of noun goes with which gender, it is found that their work is still wanting. Mondon Bareh rightly pointed out that Ka nongbylla is a woman labourer because of the NGM ka. But it may used to refer to a male labourer particularly if the speaker, because of some reason, holds the labourer in contempt. The contempt, it may be noted may not necessarily be because of social differences. To fully understand whether ka nongbylla is a male or female labourer one has to take recourse to the contextual situation in which the remark is made.

Rabel-\textsuperscript{Heymann} wrote that all species of fish appear to be masculine whether they have a special name

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
of their own or they are compounded with kha (fish). But this is not the whole truth. There are species of fish that take the feminine gender e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ka khashki</th>
<th>Ka khablang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka khakoi</td>
<td>Ka kha-elisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka khabasa</td>
<td>Ka khashitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka shalynnai</td>
<td>Ka kharoin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka khaputhia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classifying the body parts, Rabel wrote that most soft internal organs of the human body are masculine. But she also wrote,

I have no explanation for the circumstance that Ka snier is not M (Rabel-Heymann 1977:256). I take the liberty to underline the Khasi NP.

By way of clarification, it may be pointed out that the soft internal organs like the heart, kidneys, lungs or the uvula, which though soft are neatly put in defined places and are somewhat steady which is why they are masculine. The intestine, on the other hand, is so carelessly left to lie flat. The shape of that lying cannot be defined, it just seems not steady at all. This
look and the fact that it is feminine gender ties in with what Pugh wrote that those nouns that take the feminine gender are somewhat flat, bigger in size and have an ungathered or spread-out look. Pugh wrote

\[ ... \text{kha kynthei, lut\textsubscript{a} kynthei, maw kynthei, phiang kynthei pliang kynthei ki long lyngknap bad kham heh lyngdaid ha ka dur.} (Pugh 1965 rpt. 1982:83). \]

In this connection, Nagaraja observed that when either \textit{u} or \textit{ka} can occur with the same noun the gender number marker indicates certain other contrasts in addition to marking the class of the noun. One such contrast is big versus small where a big size is masculine and a small one feminine. So he noted that \textit{u dohkha} is big fish and \textit{ka dohkha} is small fish. This differentiation actually is not against what is big versus small, but rather what is tall or long versus what is flat and broad. Examples from the language e.g., \textit{ka khabah khasan} (a huge fish), \textit{ka kharit} (small fish) discredits Nagaraja's distinction. Both \textit{khabah khasan} and \textit{kharit} take \textit{ka} because both are somewhat flattish in shape. \textit{U khabah} (big fish) and \textit{u kharit} (small fish) will necessarily refer to species of fish that are longish in
shape. From this, it can be concluded that Pugh's observation above seems more credible than that of Nagaraja's.

Apart from serving as number and/or gender marker, the question that arises is whether u/ka/i/ki have other functions. Their occurrence before a verb which was why Rabel called them preverbal prefixes gives rise to a question as to what exactly is their function when they occur before a verb or an adjective. War (op.cit) and Shangpliang\(^\text{16}\) (1987) are of the opinion that the NGMs also mark the number and gender of verbs and adjectives. Shangpliang wrote,

\[ \ldots \text{ka kyi} \text{tien Number kam thmu eh tang ia ka Noun ne Pronoun hynrei ka don ka jingladei} \]
\[ \text{bad ka Verb bad Adjective ruh. Ngi don ki Verb ne Adjective kiba long Singular kumba} \]
\[ \text{ngi don ruh kita kiba long plural. Kane ka} \]
\[ \text{shong kat kum ka Number jong u 'Agent' ne ka 'Subject'. Namarkata na ka shynrong kti} \]
\[ \text{en Khasi ngin shem ba ka Verb bad ka Adjective} \]
\[ \text{kin nap iamir bad ka Subject ym tang ha ki Gender bad Person hynrei ruh na ki Number.} \]
\[ \text{(Shangpliang 1987:8)}. \]

I translate the above as follows:

... the word number does not refer only to a Noun or Pronoun. It bears a relation with Verbs and Adjectives which are singular just as we have those that are plural. This depends on the number of the agent or subject in the sentence. From the sentence structure in Khasi we will find that the verb and the adjective are in concord with the subject not only in gender and person but also in number.

Shangpliang seems more concerned with establishing a theory that in Khasi there are singular as well as plural verbs or adjectives and that the singularity or plurality is marked by the NGM occurring immediately before that verb or adjective.

But this theory may be refuted on the ground that verbs or adjectives in Khasi are neither singular nor plural. If they are, there should be some morphological change in them as it is in English. Singularity or plurality in Khasi is basically of nouns. The occurrence of NGM before verbs or adjectives is merely to emphasize the fact that the actor(s) of the verb or the actor(s) being described by the adjective is singular or plural. The seeming concord of adjectivals with verbs also is
actually being marked by Subject Enclitics. e.g.,

(4) u briew u ba bha u wan
SM H SE Adjl SE V

a man who good he come

(A man who is good is coming).

In a chapter on Determiners Sten\textsuperscript{17} wrote,

\textit{Ka determiner ka paw ha khmat ka Noun ka Verb bad ka Adjective (Sten. 1987:49)}:

(The determiner occurs before a noun, a verb and an adjective).

It may be noted that Sten's list of determiners includes all forms of personal pronouns with or without the future marker \textit{m} or the negative -\textit{m} suffixed to them. It also includes \textit{shi} (one) followed by a noun. But since as pointed out by Rabel, the personal pronouns are identical with the determiners (e.g., personal pronoun \textit{u} identical with the \textit{NGM} \textit{u}), Sten takes care to differentiate the personal pronouns from the NIMs or determiners by specifying whether or not the form stands for a noun. If

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
it stands for a noun if it is not a pronoun, it is a determiner. His specimen sentence indicating this is -

(5) Nga nga la siew dep ho:
IPS Det Past V Adv Interjection
I deter- past pay complete o.k. miner ly

(I have paid off the dues ok).

The example given however does not state whether the second nga marked as determiner determines the verb following it or refers back to the personal pronoun nga in the sentence initial position.

Another related point arising out of the specimen sentence above is whether nga marked as determiner is not a reduplication of the personal pronoun nga. This point will be discussed later in connection with other personal pronouns.

Leaving aside the alternative problem arising out of the above sentence, it seems that Sten is convinced that the determiners are to do with nouns
rather than with verbs or adjectives. He wrote,

Ia ka jingiadei jong kawei ka noun
bad kawei pat lanu bad ka pronoun
ha ka sentence la kdw da ka determiner
(Sten ibid:5).

(The relation of one noun with another
noun or with a pronoun in the sentence
is indicated by a determiner). The
translation is mine.

Sten's remark above ties in with Crystal's
definition of the term determiner which runs as follows:

A term used in some models of GRAMMATICAL
description, referring to a class of
ITEMS whose main role is to CO-OCCUR with
Nouns to express a wide range of SEMANTIC
contrasts such as: QUANTITY or NUMBER.
(Crystal 1980:10).

If the definition above is accepted then the
presence of the so-called NGM occurring before a verb or
adjective needs to be redefined.

As already mentioned earlier, the NGMs occurring
before verbs or adjectives are obligatory repetition of
NGMs occurring before nouns. If u/ka/i/ki function as
personal pronouns, their repetition before a verb or
adjective is also obligatory. This obligatory repetition
of NGM before verbs or adjectives is not so much because they mark the verb or adjective but because they reaffirm the number and gender of the noun which is the actor of the verb or who is being described by the adjective. This being the case it is proposed that NGMs occurring before verbs or adjectives be termed Subject Enclitic (SE) as they indeed arise from the number and gender of the subject in the sentence.

In writing about the nouns, Pryse simply defined the term with the help of examples. Roberts, on the other hand classified noun into three classes viz. Common, Proper and Abstract. Job Solomon \(^{18}\) (1931) and Sten (1987) divided the nouns in exactly the way Roberts did. But Nissor Singh \(^{19}\) (1900), Blah (1964) and Pugh (1965) have five classes. They added two other classes; collective and material nouns to the list. With regard to this classification, it may be said that that of Roberts and those following him seems to be more realistic than the one by Nissor Singh, Blah and Pugh. Collective nouns and material nouns are in fact common nouns. There does not


seem to be the need to sub-classify common nouns. Indeed if one goes by such fine distinctions as to include collective and material nouns as separate classes, one will need to add to the list many more classes such as countable, uncountable nouns, concrete and mass nouns etc.

Mondon Bareh (1929) distinguished two classes viz., common or class nouns and verbal nouns on an entirely different basis. The common nouns are pure names applied to persons, animals and things in general. Verbal nouns are so called because they refer to pure verbs as nouns and compound verbal nouns. Abstract nouns which form a separate class to some writers are verbal nouns to Mondon Bareh because even though they refer to qualities rather than names they are formed by adding the prefix jing to verbs. The verbal nouns with jing are two: one refers to qualities which other writers call abstract nouns e.g. jingsuk (peace) and another refers to nouns showing instrumentality e.g. jingkhang (door).

Rabel (1961) on the other hand classified nouns into (i) proper nouns which include kinship terms, personal names and geographical designations; (ii) noun words which are preceded by one of the relevant NGM or are preceded by a preposition. Noun words are also those words which may
enter into compounds and which may be followed by an attribute; (iii) measures and (iv) numerals and indefinite numerals. This classification of nouns is a complete one. However, the numerals which writers like Pryse and Roberts classified as adjectives are classified by Rabel as nouns. Whether measures and numerals should be treated as nouns will be taken up when quantifiers are discussed. Nagaraja, put the numerals in a separate class which is neither nominal nor adjectival.

Nagaraja's classification of nouns is similar to what Rabel did. Nouns are classified with pronouns and demonstratives on the basis of their being preceded by NGM and preposition. He noted that a noun word without an NGM before it is not possible in Khasi and he treated NGM + Noun as a noun phrase.

We will now pass on to the cases of nouns and pronouns. It has already been mentioned that case relations are indicated by prepositions. In order to show the capabilities of the Khasi prepositions to exhibit the case relations, Pryse presented this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Ka shnong, a village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Jong ka shnong, to a village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dat:  Ia ka shnong, to a village
Acc:  Ha, ia etc ka shnong, in, to etc.
a village
Voc:  Ko ka shnong, O village
Abl:  Na, da etc. ka shnong, from, by a
village
(Pryse: op cit:15).

Roberts listed eight cases. To Pryse's list he added the Instrumental and the Locative cases marked by da (by) for the former and by ha (in/at) or sha (to) for the latter. Sten on the other hand did not include the accusative; his dative includes ha and ia marked by Pryse as marking the accusative. Then like Roberts he puts the Instrumental case marked by da. Habel and Nagaraja did not mention the cases. Instead they described the use of prepositions marking case relations in separate chapters. This approach describes the language better. But it may be pointed out that the Complex Prepositions I which Rabel described as compounds of direct prepositions with demonstrative bases, nouns of location and verbs of location e.g., hani (here), hatu (there), hatei (upthere) are dialectal. They do not occur in standard Khasi.
Nagaraja's examples of the use of preposition ia as in *nga shoh ia ka lade hi (I hit myself) is not acceptable in Khasi. For it to be acceptable the ka from before lade should be omitted. Ka lade is a possible phrase when used to refer to the self or ego of a person; it is not used in the sense of himself. Again, the example u thiah ia lade hi to mean he slept himself is not possible in Khasi. The unacceptability of the sentence is due to the fact that the structure V + ia lade hi always means to inflict some hurt upon oneself. Now, the verb thiah (sleep) by what it means cannot be treated as an infliction on the person who sleeps, therefore the verb thiah cannot occur in this structure. In Khasi he slept himself is conveyed by either u thiah hi or u thiah marwei (lit. he slept alone).

The preposition da described by most writers as instrumental is so when followed by nouns or pronouns. When followed by the Reflexive lade as in the example given by Nagaraja (op cit. 51) u la wan da lade hi (he came by himself) the meaning is not just instrumental. It shows some kind of compelling concern on the part of the person who came. But the implication of da lade in ma u da lade (hi) u long uba bha (he is good by himself) is that the
person concerned is originally good, but at the time of speaking he is not good anymore probably because of an influence on him. In this sense da lade (hi) is an equivalent of the adverb personally in English.

In passive constructions it has been indicated by Nagaraja that the subject takes the instrumental marker but the specimen sentences quoted below which have been used to prove this point are non sentences. The sentences are reproduced here in ordinary spelling.

(i) Ka mrad ka la wad da ki (the animal was chased by them)
(ii) ia ki la iakynroi da u (they were abused by him)
(iii) ia ka syiar ka la beh da u ksew (the hen was chased by the dog)

The acceptable forms of the above are

(ia) ia ka mrad la wad da ki
(iiia) ia ki la kyrroi da u
(iiiia) ia ka syiar la to da u ksew

The corrected sentences given above are in agreement with Hugh Turco's formulation of the Passive

construction. In *Learn Khasi in Ten Days*, Turco formulated the passive as follows:

Passive: \( \text{la object acted upon la Verb da agent} \)

\[ \text{la kane (this)ka MUKUM(Order) la ai.(give)} \]

\[ \text{Da u Syiem} \]

(This order has been given by the King)

What is wrong about the sentences given by Nagaraja (for passive construction) is this. The occurrence of \( \text{ka} \) after \( \text{mrad} \) (animal) in (i), and after \( \text{siyar} \) (hen) in (iii) and the occurrence of \( \text{ia} \) before \( \text{kynroi} \) (abused) in (ii) is what makes them non sentences. The obligatory rule that the NGM appearing before a subject noun should repeat its occurrence after the noun or immediately before a verb phrase is applicable only in simple or active sentences, but not in passive constructions. Secondly, the use of \( \text{ia} \) as a preverbal particle which indicates a reciprocal relation among the doers of the action implies that the subject should be in the plural number. In the specimen sentence (ii) above, the doer is clearly one (singular) indicated by the personal pronoun \( u \) (3rd person sing), therefore the question of using \( \text{ia} \) before the verb \( \text{kynroi} \) is not called for.
It may further be pointed out that expressions na u bneng (from the heaven) and sha u bneng (to heaven) used by Nagaraja to demonstrate the use of na and sha as prepositions are not acceptable ones. In Khasi bneng (heaven) is feminine. Nissor Singh confirms this. In his dictionary he marked it thus:

bneng, ka, n, the heaven, the sky,
same as bynerg (Singh N. 1906 rpt. 1987:18)

With regard to the use of preposition jong (of) it should be pointed out that it is dropped most of the time. Thus instead of saying u khulom u don halor jong ka miej (the pen is on the table) it will be u khulom u don halor miej. In the latter sentence, we notice that the preposition jong and NGM ka are dropped. More examples of this feature are given below.

(6) U shong halor tnum jong ka ing

Cf(6a) U shong halor tnum ing

(He is sitting on the roof of the house)
(7) U thiah ha khrum \textit{jong ka} kali

Cf(7a) U thiah ha khrum kali

(He is lying underneath the vehicle).

It may be mentioned that the forms without \textit{jong ka} as in (6a-7a) are more commonly used than those with them. The existing grammars have not discussed the relationship of the two noun words e.g. \textit{tnum} (roof) and \textit{ing} (house) occurring one after the other in the same sentence as in (6a). This point will be discussed later when \textit{jong} is discussed in connection with genitive clauses occurring as constituents in an NP.

We will now look at the preposition \textit{ia}. The preposition \textit{ia} is not the same \textit{ia} marking reciprocity occurring before a verb. e.g.

(8) \begin{tabular}{lccc}
\textit{Ki} & \textit{la} & \textit{ia} & \textit{wan} \\
IIIPP  & Past  & Rec  & V \\
they    & past  & recipro- & come \\
         &       & cal     & \\
\end{tabular}

(They have come together)
The _ia_ that is marked preposition always occurs before an NP marking the objective case of that NP. The occurrence of _ia_ before an NP is significant because it marks that the NP is specifically the recipient of the action of the verb. The significance of _ia_ in this position is further enhanced by the fact that an NP may also occur in object position without _ia_. But the absence of _ia_ does bring about a change in meaning. Examine the following sentences:

(9) U siat ia ki sim

IIIPSM V Prep P H

he shoot to birds

(He shoots the birds)

Cf (10) U siat sim

(He is bird-shooting)

(11) U sai: ia ki jain

IIIPSM V Prep P H

He wash to clothes

(He washes clothes)
Cf (12)  

(He is clothes-washing)

Sentences (10) and (12) are without ia and number marker before the noun word sim (bird) and jain (cloth). From the English translation of the sentences it is obvious that the focus on the recipient of the action of the verb is absent. On the other hand, it may be said that siat sim (bird-shooting) and sait jain (cloth-washing) are activities which are made distinct by the presence of noun words after verbs. This particular shade of meaning caused by not using ia before noun words is a fact in the language which has not been noted by earlier writers.

It is also interesting to note that nobody among the writers pointed out that the preposition ia cannot be dropped from before personal pronouns, kinship terms and geographical designations. Compare the following:

(13)  

(He beats him)
Cf (13a)* U shoh u

(14) U ai pisa la I Mei

IIIPSM V N Prep S H

he give money to mother

(He gives money to mother; mother = kinship term)

Cf (14a)* U ai pisa i Mei

(15) U pynkhuid ia ka Shillong

IIIPSM V Prep SF H

he cleans to Shillong

(He cleans Shillong; Shillong: geographical destination)

Cf(15a)* U pynkhuid ka Shillong

The compulsory use of the preposition ia in (13-15) is mainly due to the fact that the personal pronouns, proper nouns, kinship terms and geographical designations are specific recipients of the actions of the verbs, and being recipients they need be marked by ia.
Attention is now drawn to pronouns. John Roberts in his Khasi Second Reader, a book meant for teaching, wrote the definition of a pronoun as follows:

Ka Pronoun ka long ka ktien ia kaba la pyndonkam ha ka kyrten lane Noun, khnang ba'n ym iai pyndonkam bunsien ia ka kajuh-pa-kajuh ka kyrten.

(A Pronoun is a word used in place of a noun so as to avoid repetition of the same word over and over again).

The translation is mine.

Writers like Basaiawmoit and Sten who like John Roberts wrote for teaching purposes defined pronoun in a similar way. Others simply classified pronouns into Personal, Emphatic Relative, Interrogative, Demonstrative, Indefinite and Reflexive.


Of all the pronouns mentioned above, the relative pronoun is one that poses problems. We may ask whether or not Khasi has relative pronouns. There are two views in this regard. The first one is that the relative pronoun is in fact what distinguishes Khasi from other non-Aryan languages of India. This is what Grierson wrote,

The possession of a relative pronoun distinguishes the Khasi dialects from most of the non-Aryan languages of India, a peculiarity which it shares with the Cambodian and Anamese languages (as well as with those of the Tai family), but not with Mon. (Grierson, 1973:5).

In his comments on the non-Aryan languages of India, Brandreth like Grierson wrote that the presence of a relative pronoun is what distinguishes Khasi from other non-Aryan languages. This was what he wrote.

The Khasi again differs from the groups before mentioned, in having a relative pronoun which expresses the relative clause as completely as any Aryan language. This relative is ka which takes the usual gender prefixes, thus: Ka - kyathel ka- ba shong ha ka - ta ka - ing 'the woman who lives in that house' where

Ka - ba is the relative agreeing in number and gender with ka kynthei 'the woman', and the order of the words is exactly as in the English.

But Mondon Bareh held a different view. According to him Khasi does not have relative pronouns. He wrote,

Strictly speaking, we have no relative pronouns in Khasi. Ideas of relation are indicated by affixing the third personal Pronoun u, ka and ki to the word ba which shows condition or state of being and which is also affixed to verbs to form adjectives (vide chapter on adjectives). The compounds so made cannot properly be regarded as pure pronouns but are half relatives and half adjectives (Bareh 1929:38).

The two views above arose as a result of ba occurring in a sentence position which some consider adjectival while others consider relative.

According to Bareh's view above uba etc are not relative pronouns because ba, a suffix to u/ka/i/ki, is a particle used as prefix to verbs to form adjectives. Traditionally, words such as bakhain (strong) bapang (sickly) are treated as adjectives. But as Bareh himself pointed out the words khlain and pang independently are verbs with attributes. Simon24 (1987) a pioneer linguist

among the Khasis called them attributive verbs; a term first used by Rabel concerning Khasi adjectives. According to him those words traditionally considered as adjectives are functionally verbs and like verbs they can be preceded by other aspectual and temporal markers such as ju (habitual), ia (reciprocal), iai (iterative), ia (past), n (future) and pyn (causative). It may be pointed out that ba does not make the attributive verbs with which it is prefixed any more attributive or adjectival than what they actually are. What ba does is simply to relate the attribute to the preceding noun. In relating the attribute sometimes ba is suffixed to u/ka/i/ki according to the number and gender of the noun, but sometimes it occurs independently. In (16) below, ba is suffixed to u while in (16a) it occurs alone. In (16b) neither u nor ba occurs.

(16) U phlang uba jyrngam u pynitynnad

a grass that green it beautify

Prep SF H
to a field

(Green grass beautifies the field)
(16a)  u phlang ba jyrngam u pynitynnad ia ka madan

(16b)  u phlang jyrngam u pynitynnad ia ka madan.

(Green grass beautifies the field)

The meaning of sentences (16) and (16a) is identical. There is a slight difference of meaning in (16b) with both ٍ and ba suppressed. The phrase phlang jyrngam refers to a type of grass but semantically, u phlang jyrngam still means u phlang ٍ ba jyrngam (a grass that's green) to any native speaker. The identical meaning of (16) and (16a) above indicates that ba is a relative marker whether it occurs independently or as a suffix to any NGM.

What has been discussed so far is about ba occurring after NGM or before attributive verbs. If ba is treated as an adjectival marker, its prefixation to non-attributive verbs should also make them attributive. But as native speakers of Khasi we know that this is not the case. On the other hand it may be pointed out that ba is used obligatorily before non-attributive verbs and its function there is to relate in subordination the activity
of the verb to the noun preceding it e.g.,

\[(17) \text{ u khyannah u ba mareh u ur}\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{SM} & \text{H} & \text{SE} & \text{REL} & \text{V} & \text{SE V} \\
\end{array}
\]

a boy who run he fall

(The boy who ran fell down)

Cf \[(17a) \text{ u khyannah u mareh u ur}\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{SM} & \text{H} & \text{SE} & \text{V} & \text{SE V} \\
\end{array}
\]

a boy run he fall

(The boy ran and fell down)

The absence of \text{ba} before \text{mareh} in (17a) changes the function of \text{mareh} from that of an adjectival subordinated to \text{khyannah} to a verb. \text{mareh} (run) and \text{ur} (fall) are two sequences of activities.

Two more examples are given below to support the claim that \text{ba} does not make a non attributive verb
attributive.

\[
(18) \text{U khynnah u ba trei ha jing}
\]

\[\text{MS H SE Rel V Prep H}\]

a boy who work in house
(The boy who works in the house)

\[
\text{Cf(18a) U khynnah u trei ha jing}
\]

\[\text{MS H SE V Prep H}\]

a boy work in house
(A boy works in the house)

Here too, the absence of \text{ba} before \text{trei} changes \text{trei} from an adjectival to a verb. The use of \text{ba} before \text{trei} in (18) does not make \text{ba trei} an adjective. It is only adjectival in function.

Shangpliang\textsuperscript{25} (1987) held a different view. According to him, only when \text{ba} is suffixed to NGM thus \text{uba},

\[
\]
kaba, iba, kiba that the forms are relative pronouns. He wrote that if *ba* is not suffixed to NGM, then it should be suffixed to verbs to make them adjectives. To illustrate this point he wrote these two sentences:

(19) u briew u bashlur u iap tang shisien  
(20) u briew uba shlur u iap tang shisien  

(A brave man dies only once)

According to Shargpliang in (19) *bashlur* is an adjective and in (20) *uba* is a relative pronoun. Inspite of this differentiation, semantically the sentences are identical. Being identical means that the hypothesis above does not stand. If it should, the different junctural marking should cause a change in meaning.

The juncture which is marked above in (19) *u bashlur* is possible only in written form. In connected speech it is a forced juncture. That marked in (20) *uba shlur* is also forced. *u* and *ba* are separate morphemes which equally should occur independent of each other. In marking *bashlur* (brave) an adjective, Shargpliang was only following traditionalists like Pugh whose system
was also followed by Sten in his *Ka Grammar* (1987).

Following on the junctural marking *uba* shlur, Sten in his observation on Shangpliang's paper remarked that if bashlur is an adjective and *uba* a relative pronoun then shlur can hardly be taken as an adjective because a relative pronoun is usually followed only by a verb. But as discussed earlier, there is no doubt that shlur is a verb because like any other verb it may be preceded by any preverbal particles which are temporal or aspectual and that *ba* which occurs before the verb shlur is a relative particle whether it is suffixed to an NGM or the NGM is suppressed. Therefore it should be written independent of shlur thus: *ba shlur* or *uba ba shlur* (who is brave).

In my unpublished dissertation (1984) *ba* is treated as a relative marker and a clause subordinator equivalent to the English who/which/that. This view is re-echoed in Sten's paper *The function of Ba etc* (1987). He wrote that *ba* either independently or as a suffix to NGM answers to *who* in English.

---

A related question of whether or not Khasi has adjectives will be discussed later.

Apart from the relative pronoun, another class of pronouns which deserves our attention is Reflexive Pronoun marked by lade. Nagaraja (1987:101) marked la occurring before a noun also reflexive. But la and lade are not equivalents. la is a genitive marker referring always to possessions of the person concerned while lade always refers to the person himself.

lade as reflexive pronoun differs markedly from its English counterparts which need to agree in person and number with the preceding nouns or pronouns for which they are reflexing e.g. he - himself, she - herself. lade on the other hand remains the same no matter what the person or number of the preceding nouns or pronouns may be e.g.

U    da    lade

IIISM   Prep    Refl.

he    by    himself
lade obligatorily occurs after prepositions. The underlined words below are prepositions followed by lade.

(21) u ot ia lade (he cuts himself)
(22) u ot da lade (he cuts by himself)
(23) u shim she lade (he takes it to himself)
(24) u ai na lade (he gives from himself)
(25) u bat ha lade (he keeps to himself)

Cf * u ot lade
* u shim lade
* u ai lade
* u bat lade

It may be mentioned that these starred(*) samples above are sometimes heard in dialectal forms.

In Shangpliang's classification of pronouns there is a class which he called Emphatic Pronouns
expressed by lade and hi. It is interesting to note that he again classified these same markers as Reflexive Pronouns. He noted that lade and hi are emphatic when preceded by the preposition da (literally by). But lade and hi are emphatic even when preceded by prepositions other than da e.g., ia (to), or ha (at, in). In this regard, Sten refuted the idea of having another class of pronouns. According to him the Reflexive Pronouns convey the same meaning as the Emphatic Pronouns.

Though Shangpliang did not specify why he thought the preposition da makes lade emphatic it can be surmised that distinction is made on the ground that the phrase da lade (by oneself) precludes any other participant other than the actor himself and therefore when said

(26) U __ da lade u iathuh ia kane
IIISM Prep Refl. SE V Prep H
he by himself he tells to this
(He himself said this)

the sentence seems to have an emphatic tone. The emphatic note lies mainly with the preposition da preceding lade.
In fact it may be said that lade always occurs after prepositions and that nuances of meanings depend largely on which preposition is used. In Khasi, there is also another way of expressing the reflexive and that is by using hi after the verb.

It has been pointed out already that Shangpliang marked hi and lade as Reflexive Pronouns. They are indeed reflexive in so far as their occurrence is in situations where the doer is also the direct receiver or beneficiary of the action of the verb as in the following:

(27) Nga shet hi

IPS V Refl

I cook myself

In reply to a question: mano ba ot ia ka kti jong phi? (who cut your finger?), the addressee may reply

(28) Nga ot hi

IPS V Refl.

I cut myself

(I cut my finger myself).
In (27-28) hi is indeed reflexive. But hi and lađe are not equivalents. They are different from the point of view of occurrence. hi cannot like lađe occur after prepositions. Apart from this, hi simply emphasizes the verb or pronoun or adverb preceding it e.g.,

(29) u leh hi ia lađe

IIIISM V Emp Prep Refl

he do emphasis to himself

(He does it to himself)

(30) uto u ba kumto hi

Pron,Adj IIIISM Rel Adv Emp

that he who like that emphasis

(He is always like that)
(31) ma u hi un wan

Personal IIISM Emp SE+fut. V Pron.Emp

---

he (with emphasis) he will come

(He himself will come)

Sometimes hi means still as in

(32) u dang don hi shane

IIIISM Prog. V Emp Adv

he progressive is still here

(He is here still)

(33) u dang peit hi katta miet

IIIISM Prog. V Emp Pron.Adj Adv

he progressive awake still this late

(He is still awake this late)
Nagaraja termed hi an affirmative marker. But hi affirms or disaffirms according to whether the verb is positive or negative. Perhaps an emphasizer or an emphatic marker is a better term. This may be proved by the fact that hi may follow lade as in u long da lade hi (He said it himself). hi cannot proceed lade e.g., *u hi lade u ong.

For purpose of emphasis Khasi uses two other operators besides hi. These are (i) ma occurring before personal pronouns as in Ma u un wan (he will come), and (ii) personal pronouns reduplicated as in Phi phi long ka mluh ka pyrthei (You are the salt of the earth).

The emphatic form by prefixing ma to personal pronoun may occur in sentence initial position but it is worth noting that by simply prefixing ma to personal pronouns without reduplicating the personal pronouns, the structure does not make a complete sense. A simple ma + personal pronoun is acceptable only in a situation such as the following:

(34) Mana ba don hangto ? (Who is there)

ma nga (It's me)
But in a full sentence, the personal pronouns should be reduplicated if ma + personal pronoun starts a sentence, e.g.,

(35) Ma nga nga ong ia kata

Personal IPS IPS V Prep H

Pron. Empr.

personal pronoun I I say to that

emphasizer

I (with emphasis) say that

(36) ma phi phi kwah ia kana

Personal IIPS IIPS V Prep H

Pron. Empr.

personal pronoun you you want to this

emphasizer

you (with emphasis) want this

The function of personal pronouns that are second in word beginning from left to right will be discussed again in connection with Subject Enclitics in Chapter IV.
Ma + personal pronoun without personal pronouns reduplicated can occur in sentence final position. It follows a verb as in nga ong ma nga (It's me who said it). But matpersonal pronoun can never occur after any preposition e.g.,

*Ai ia ma nga (Give me);

*Bsa ia ma ki (Feed them).

The second way of marking emphasis in Khasi namely that of personal pronouns reduplicated is perhaps a controversial point. Sten marked the reduplicated pronoun a determiner. The following sentences are quoted from his work (Sten 1987:48).

(37) Me me la kular ban leit?
    (You, have you promised to go?)

(38) Pha pha long ka ba riéwspah.
    (You, you are rich)

The underlined personal pronouns occurring before the verb phrase are termed by Sten, Determiners,
because even though they look like pronouns, they do not stand for nouns. He wrote,

Ki paw kum ki pronoun hynrei kim ieng ban bujli ia ka noun (Sten 1987:48).

(They appear like pronouns but they do not stand in place of nouns). Translation is mine.

But if they are determiners as contended above, the question that arises is what these determiners do in this position. (Already it was stated that determiners are to do with nouns). It does not seem that they determine the verb in any sense. Besides if they do, their occurrence there must be obligatory, but since they can be omitted without changing the sense except of course the emphasis, it may be concluded that the reduplication of personal pronouns is actually a system used for purpose of emphasis. Their grammatical function is perhaps as Subject Enclitics.

It is interesting to mention that this reduplication of personal pronouns with the above semantic implication is not seen either by Relbel, Nagaraja, or
Avita Abbi\textsuperscript{27} in their studies of \textit{Reduplication in Khasi}. Sten\textsuperscript{28} (1988) did not mention this in his rejoinder to Nagaraja's statement that Khasi nouns are not reduplicated, perhaps because he was mainly concerned with showing that Nagaraja's view is an over-statement based perhaps on limited information about the language.

Next comes the question as to whether Khasi has adjectives or not. Already the idea that $\text{ba}$ is an adjective marker and that $\text{ba} + \text{verb}$ (e.g., bashkur) is adjective has been discussed and refuted as not convincing enough since $\text{ba} + \text{verb}$, particularly if that verb is non attributive, is not an adjective. It is only adjectivally used.

Having said all that about the traditional view of Khasi adjectives, the present writer does not mean to say that Khasi does not use adjectives. What she means is that Khasi does not have a separate class of words which may be strictly treated as adjectives but that the function of adjectives is expressed by means of using attributive verbs necessarily preceded by the morpheme $\text{ba}$ which in turn may or may not be suffixed to a subject enclitic. It


may be repeated here that the morpheme \textit{ba} simply related the concerned attribute to the noun(s) in question. Because of this, it is suggested that \textit{ba} when immediately followed by attribute verbs should not be written together e.g., \textit{basngaid} (fat) but separately thus: \textit{ba sngaid}. This view has already been proposed by Sten in his article \textit{The Functions of Ba} appearing in \textit{Khari Studies} (1987:72-73) even though in his \textit{Ka Grammar} which was published a few months before the article, the traditionally accepted system of writing \textit{basngaid} (fat) was followed. Words in Khari which may be called adjectives are the Pronominal Adjectives formed by \textit{u/ka/i/ki + ne/to/tai/tai/thie} and Quantitative Adjectives \textit{khyndiat} (some) \textit{bun} (many/much), \textit{shi bun} (many/much), \textit{baroh} (all), \textit{katto} (that much), \textit{katne} (this much) and \textit{katto katne} (some). These will be discussed in the third chapter.

About Adjectives Nagaraja wrote,

\textit{Adjectives can be derived from another adjective by using two derivational markers \textit{bir}- and \textit{lam}-, They are restricted in distribution, While both these can be used with colour terms, only the first marker can be used with 'taste' terms. (Nagaraja 1987:26).}
The observation contains only half the truth.
The prefixes bir- and lam- as in byrliet (whitish) and lam saw (reddish) are clearly adjectival when they are related to the noun concerned by ba either with or without an NGM before it. Their occurrence in such situations is as subordinate clauses. When they occur immediately after the SE they seem to function more like verbs than adjectives. Compare the following sentences,

(39) Ka um ka thnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the water boil

(The water boils)

(40) Ka ja ka lamjew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the rice sourish

(The rice is sourish)
(41) Ka um ka byrsaw

the water slightly reddish
(The water is slightly red)

In the two sentences above thnam and byrsaw occur in exactly the same position - the position of verbs. That words with lam- and bir- as lamsaw or byrsaw (reddish) are attributive verbs is particularly seen when they are preceded by the past time marker la and preposed as follows:

(42) V la byrsaw u sol

it past reddish fruit
(The fruit was reddish)
It may further be pointed out that both the prefixes *bir*- and *lam*- may be used with both 'colour' and 'taste' terms and not as wrongly claimed by Nagaraja that *lam*- cannot combine with taste terms. The examples below show the use of *lam*- with taste terms *thiang* (sweet).
and *jew* (sour).

(45) *Kata ka ja ka lamthing*

that rice sweetish

(That rice is sweetish)

(46) *Ku dud ka lamjew*

the milk sourish

(The milk is sourish)

But while both *bir*- and *lam*- can combine with colour and taste terms, only *lam*- can combine with other verbs e.g., *lamtieng* (somewhat afraid), e.g.,


Lam- and bir- can co-occur in an expression in this order: lam-bir-thiang. *bir-lam-thiang is not acceptable. The co-occurrence of lam- and bir- is usually found when reference to colour and taste terms is made. Nagaraja did not see this particular use in the language.

For comparison, in Khasi as in English there are three stages viz., positive, comparative and superlative. The positive has already been indicated. It is formed by ba + attributive verb. The comparative degree is marked by kham (more or -er in English) intervening ba and the attributive verb as in ba.kham rit (smaller). In comparison, sometimes speakers like to pointedly mention who or which of the nouns being compared is the higher/lower; bigger/smaller than the other in whatever the terms of comparison may be. When this is the case then the expression ba khan rit will be followed by ban (than) which again should be obligatorily followed by the preposition ia + NGM + Noun as in the following:

(47) U long upa kham rit ban ia u Mon

IIIIPSM V SE+Rel Comp. V Comp Prep SM H
Mon

he is he that more small than to Mon
(He is smaller than Mon)
(48) Kine ki kham rit ban ia kitai.


These they more/er than to those

(These are smaller than those)

It is noticed in sentence (48) above that the morpheme *ba*

is optional in a comparative sentence. When this is so,

kham rit functions as a verb and therefore is not

subordinated to the main clause as it is in the case

of (47) above.

In (47) and (48), we notice that *ia*

obligatorily occurs before *u Mon* and *kitai*. Its omission

makes the above sentences non-sentences.

* c.i., *u long uba kham rit ban u Mon
  *ki kham rit ban kitai.

But while *ia* is obligatory, *ban* is optional.

It can be dropped from the sentence indicating comparison

without affecting its meaning e.g.,

ki kham rit ia kitai (they are smaller than those)
We have shown above that kham, which is traditionally accepted as a marker of comparative adjectives, actually marks the comparison of both attributive and non-attributive verbs. In the following sentence we will see that the comparison is of the effort put into the running.

(49) Une u kham mareh ban ia utai


This he more run than to that
(This one runs more than that other boy)

The sentence above proves that kham in kham mareh (run more) does not make mareh (run) an adjective. From this point of view, it may be repeated, that this fact supports the earlier contention that the so-called adjectives are but attributive verbs.

The formation of comparative degree in Khasi has just been discussed. Now the formation of superlative degree in Khasi are tam or eh (most). Their occurrence in the superlative degree structure unlike kham follows the
verb as in ụba rit tam/ụba rit eh (the smallest). The markers tam and eh may combine in this order: tam eh (most) as in ụba rit tam eh (the smallest). It should be noted that tam or eh or tam eh are superlative markers only when they follow a verb. If they do not, they will themselves function as verbs. If tam occurs after a personal pronoun as in u tam bun (he has much/he is in much excess); and if eh also occurs after a personal pronoun as in u eh (he finds it difficult/something is hard) then both tam and eh are verbs. And if the combination tam eh or eh tam follows a personal pronoun as in ka tam eh/ka eh tam then the morphemes closest to the personal pronoun is a verb and the latter is a superlative degree marker. tam eh (literally means excess most) while eh tam means most hard or most difficult.

Looking into the earliest writings on the language and in particular, writings on comparison it is found that their observations are most erroneous. For example, Robinson wrote,

The language has no definite form for constructing a superlative degree of comparison. The usual mode of expressing it, is by the use of the word tam, much, in conjunction with kham, and placed after the adjective. (Robinson 1849:338).
In support of his view above he gave some specimen sentences one of which is,

*\textit{Ba khlain kham tam} (strongest). Klain is Robinson's spelling of khlain (strong).

It may be mentioned that no such combination as the above is possible in Khasi and therefore Robinson's description quoted above is erroneous which perhaps had been based on wrong or incomplete information. Oldham and Pryse and Roberts writing after Robinson made the same mistake. In fact they made one more mistake. Besides the above they gave another wrong alternative construction thus: \textit{ba khlain kham tam} or \textit{ba kham khlain tam} (strongest). Whether \textit{kham} and \textit{tam} are juxtaposed one after the other or they are interposed by an attributive verb, it must be mentioned that Khasi does not allow comparative and superlative markers to co-occur. If forced to co-occur as in the above examples, the co-occurrence simply does not form a meaningful unit. In spoken Khasi, sometimes one hears of such occurrences but these are taken to be slips. In standard written Khasi this occurrence is not possible at all.
While considering the adjectives, it is perhaps not out of place to discuss the demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative adjectives which Pryse termed Pronominal Adjectives. The Pronominal Adjectives are of the same form as the Demonstrative Pronouns even though their function is slightly different. These Pronominal Adjectives are formed by suffixing -ne, -to, -ta, -tai, -tei, -thie to the Third Person Personal Pronouns u/ka/i/ki as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{u} \\
\text{ka} \\
\text{i} \\
\text{ki} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ne, to, ta, tai, tei, thie.}
\end{array}
\]

The general meanings of the above are directional but their specific meanings may be specified as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{u/ka/i/ki} & \text{ (this, these) refers to} \\
& \text{things/persons which are immediately} \\
& \text{within the surroundings of the speaker;} \\
& \text{sometimes within touchable distance.}
\end{align*}
\]
Une hangne
this here
(this one, here)

ine hangne
this here
(this one, here)

kine hangne
these here
(these, here)

u/ka/i/ki + to: refers to things/persons within the surroundings of the speaker but closer in terms of distance to the hearer. These also may refer to things within touchable distance.

(50) Uto hangto hajen jong phi
Pron. Adj Adv Prep Poss. IIPS
that there close of you
(It's there close to you).
(51) uto u la ian dait ia phi
Pron. Adj III Past Adv V Prep IPS!
there he past about bite to you
(It's there close to you, he could have bitten you).

But u/ka/i/ki + ti may also refer to things/persons not within sight but known to both the speaker and hearer as in

(52) kito ki long ki ba r1ewsapan shisha
Pron. Adj. IIIPS V SE Rel V Adv
those they are they who rich truly

(Those are truly rich).

(53) nga ia leit bha bad kito
I recipro- love very with those
cal
[I am very friendly with those
(people)]
**u/ka/i/ki + ta** refers to things/persons not present or within sight of the speaker or hearer. The referents may or may not necessarily be known to both hearer and speaker. *e.g.*

(54) **Uta u la wan**

Pron. Adj IMPM Past V

that he past come

(That person referred to has come)

**Uta u la wan** may also be used to refer to a natural phenomenon like rain or hailstorm.

(55) **Uta u briew u la leit noh**

Pron. Adj. SM H SE Past V Adv

that man past go away

(That person referred to went away).

**u/ka/i/ki + tei** refers to things/persons which are upwards or northwards from the speaker's point of view. They may or may not be within sight; they may be
known or not known e.g.,

(56) *utei* u rangbah u dei

Pron. Adj. SM H SE V

that up gentleman is there

*u* nongkren u ba pnah

SM H SE Rel V

speaker who good

(That gentleman up there is a good speaker).

(57) *utei* hangtei

Pron. Adj Adv

that one up there

up there

(That one up there)

*u/ka/i/ki* + tai : refers to things/persons within sight of the speaker but at some distance as opposed
to *u/ka/i/ki* + *to* e.g.,

(58) *kitai* ki *lum*

Pron. Adj F H

those hills

(Those hills at a distance but within sight).

(59) *kitai* ki *don* hangtai

Pron. Adj III V Adv

those they are there

(Those (people/things) are there within sight).

*u/ka/i/ki* + *thie* : refers to things/persons which are southward from the speaker's point of view. The referent(s) may or may not be within sight of the speaker and may or may not be necessarily known either to the speaker or hearer. e.g.,

(60) *kithie* ki *la* wan

Pron. Adj IIIPP Past V

those they past come down there

(Those people down there have come)
(61) kithie kibriew kim don
Pron. Adj P H SE+ neg V
those people they are
down there
(Those people down there are not there).

(62) kithie kibriew ki don hangthie
Pron. Adj P H SE V Adv
those people are down there
(The people (down there) are down there)

R.K. Jayaraman in his article *On the Deictic Remote In Khasi AND what it Tells us about Khasi World View* called the above Pronominal Adjectives, Demonstrative Adjectives and characterized them as adjectives indicating,

1) + Visibility
2) + Vertical Orientation
3) + Ascent
4) + Proximate

But from the meanings indicated particularly by u/ka/i/ki + ne and u/ka/i/ki + to perhaps + touchability may be added as a fifth characteristic of the pronominal adjectives

1) + Visibility
2) + Vertical Orientation
3) + Ascent
4) + Proximate
5) + Touchability

Thus far, only meanings of the pronominal Adjectives along with examples have been given. It is mentioned earlier that these forms function sometimes like demonstrative adjectives and sometimes like demonstrative pronouns. The difference in function as Sten (1987:55) rightly pointed out depends on their place of occurrence in the sentence. If they occur before NGM + Noun as in (56) above their function is as Demonstrative Adjective, but if they occur without another NGM + Noun after it as in (57) above, the function is that of a Demonstrative Pronoun and therefore a head word in an NP.
Here it needs be mentioned that whatever the function of the forms may be, it is only those forms with -tai, -tei and -thie that admit part reduplication. The part reduplicated is the suffix, e.g., utai tai, utei tei, uthie thie. Both Nagaraja and Abbi in their attempt to classify words in Khasi that admit either complete or incomplete reduplication did not mention that these particular pronominal adjectives are reduplicable in $XXY$ form. (Here $X$ stands for base, $Y$ stands for the suffix.) Nissor Singh (1979:24) wrote that this form of reduplication particularly of these pronominal adjectives is pleonastic. The writer of this thesis, however, thinks that it is not so, because the forms $u/ka/i/ki+tai/tei/thie$ without $tai/tei/thie$ reduplicated refer to objects within sight, whereas, the reduplicated forms $u/ka/i/ki+taitai/teitei/thiethie$ definitely point to objects within sight but at a greater distance.

It must have been noticed that the review deals mainly with Nouns, Gender Number Markers, Pronouns, Prepositions and Adjectives which are thought to be directly relevant to the study of the Noun Phrase. From the review done, it would have been seen that each of the above class of words have been treated as independent
language items and not as group of words which could together be classed as Noun Phrase. It is a lack of such studies that actually calls for the present study of a noun phrase in Khasi and what its constituents may be.