4.1 Subject Enclitic

In the preceding chapter, ultimate constituents functioning as pre-modifiers have been examined. In this chapter, constituents functioning as post modifiers will be discussed. The skeletal NP, it has already been indicated, consists of an NGM + H + SE. The actual position of an SE is obligatory immediately before a verb phrase. This means that an SE obligatorily occurs in a position between the head word and the verb phrase if there are no intervening post modifying constituents, but if there are other post modifying constituents the SE is shifted from its position after the head word to immediately before a verb phrase. Examples of this particular feature have been given in 3.1, specimen sentences (72, 73, 74).

In the preceding chapter, it has been indicated that this obligatory SE has a demarcative function. Besides this, it serves as a constituent to which the negative and futurity operators -m and -n are appended.
Sentences (203) and (204) above show a striking difference of Khasi from English. In Khasi the negative and futurity operators form part of the NP while in English both negative and futurity are aspects of a VP. The negative -m and futurity -n are bound morphemes of either a subject enclitic or a personal pronoun in case the latter occur as head word of
an NP and there is no SE in between e.g.,

(205) ngan       leit
IPS+neg        v
I not          go
( I am not going )

(206) Ngan       leit
IPS+fut        go
I will         go
( I will go )

Sometimes the personal pronouns which occur as head words in an NP are reduplicated and when thus reduplicated the personal pronoun which is second in order takes the negative or futurity operators e.g.,

(207) u          um       leit
IIIIPSM       IIIIPSM+neg   v
he            he+not        go
( He will not go )
(208) Pha pham leit
IIIPSF IIIPSF+neg V
You You+not go
(You will not go)

(209) Ngi ngin leit
IPP IPP+fut V
we we+will go
(We will go)

(210) Ka kan leit
IIIPSF IIIPSF+fut V
she she+will go
(She will go)

It will be noticed that the second personal pronouns that take the negative or futurity operators have thus far been marked as personal pronouns plus negative or futurity elements. Though emphasis is always attributed as the reason for the reduplication of personal pronouns, it appears that the personal
pronouns have a grammatical function which is like that of an SE in addition to their semantic function. The grammatical function is particularly evident when the personal pronoun occurs immediately before a verb phrase and away from the head word i.e. when that head word is followed by post modifying constituents other than the SE e.g.,

(211) Phi i be nynckong phim leit?
    IIPS SE, Rel  Ord.num. SE+neg V
    you who first you+not go

(You who is first, will you not go)

Is not (211a) below the same as (211) above except for the Adjectival clause i banyngkong?

(211a) Phi phim leit
    (You, will you not go?)

If the marking of phim in (211) is accepted then phim in (211a) um, pham, nfin and kan (207-210) should also be marked SE+neg /SE+Fut instead of
IIPP+Neg, or IIIPSF+Neg, or IIIPS+F+Neg, or IPP+Fut or IIIPSF+Neg. This proposed alternative way of marking the second personal pronouns occurring after personal pronoun head words will not only differentiate the first Personal Pronoun from the second one but will also assign a grammatical function to the second personal pronoun.

It seemed that Sten (1987:49) also had this grammatical function in mind when he marked the second nga in Nga nga la siewdep ho: (I have paid off the dues O.K.) Determiner, SE indeed is a determiner in an anaphoric sense.

The SE occurring after personal pronouns as head words are optional in the absence of other post head modifiers. The negative and futurity operators may straightaway be affixed to personal pronoun functioning as head words in NPs. See (205 and 206).

The occurrence of Personal Pronoun+SE as in

(212) u u la leit
     IIIPSF SE, Past V,
      he     went
     (He went)
have been treated as unacceptable by Nagaraja (1987:87). According to him the acceptable forms are the following:

(214) ma u hi u la lei(t (he himself went)

(215) ma ka hi ka la lei(t (she herself went).

It may be pointed out that here Nagaraja made erroneous judgement on his data. The forms which he thought are acceptable alternatives are in fact parallel forms of (212) and (213). The difference of (212-213) from (214) and (215) lies in the presence of ma and hi. In most writings on the language ma is treated as a marker of emphasis. But more than emphasis it indicates participation which is exclusively that of the personal pronoun in question. It could therefore be marked Exclusive marker (Excl). hi is a reflexive marker. The difference of (212-213) from (214-215) may
be formalised as follows:

(212) and (213) are $-\text{Exclusive}$ $-\text{Reflexive}$

while (214) and (215) are $+\text{Exclusive}$ $+\text{Reflexive}$

The obligatory Subject Enclitic, as indicated in the preceding chapter, is a discontinuous constituent. Its discontinuous character is seen not only when there is an intervening post head modifier but also when the VP is transposed. When the VP in (216) below is transposed it will be as in (217).

```
S
   /
  /  
NP VP
```

(216) U Rang um wan (Rang will not come)
(217) Um wan u Rang (will not come, Rang)

SE+Neg V SM H
he not come Rang

Um or SE+Neg in (217) functions as grammatical subject of the verb wan (come). The transposition of VP usually takes place when the activity of the verb rather than the noun is focussed. This is because Khasi is one language in which the topic of the utterance is marked by word order.

With regard to SE, another related question that arises is how many times may it occur as post head modifier?

From our discussion above, it is evident that at least one SE should occur at the end of an NP or beginning of a VP. But a look at the following
sentence reveals that as many as four SEs occur after the head word.

\[(216) \text{u briew } u_1 \text{ ba sngaid, } u_2 \text{ ba heh } u_3 \text{ ba jrong } u_4 \text{ wan hangne.}\]

\[(A \text{ man who is fat, big and tall came here)}\]

In the above, it is seen that three SEs occur before the adjectival phrases marked by ba. Two of these SEs i.e., \(u_2\) and \(u_3\) are optional. They may therefore be dropped without any change in meaning or any adverse effect to the sentence. Examine the following:

\[(218) \text{u briew } u_1 \text{ ba sngaid, ba heh ba jrong } u_2 \text{ wan hangne.}\]

Cf (218b) \(u_1\) \text{ wan hangne}

\[(A \text{ man who is fat, big and tall came here)}\].
Sentence (218a) with \( u_1 \) immediately after \( \text{brie}\)w (H, man) is more acceptable than (218b). That is why a question mark (?) is placed before it. This shows that: (i) when there are three adjectival clauses, the preference is that at least the first clause should be marked by an SE and (ii) that the first SE \((u)_1\) governs all other following clauses. (218b) is a borderline case in speech but is quite common in rhymes. e.g.,

\[
\text{Nga don ki syiar'hisem ba iong, ba lieh, ba stem : (Catphoh 1939:18).}
\]

(I have hens a hen-houseful they are black, white and yellow)

I have underlined the clauses with \( \text{ba} \).

Occurrence of an SE before an adjectival clause is possible only in the pattern (218, 218a and 218c) below). Other orders of occurrence are not acceptable.

\[
(218\text{c}) \text{ U brie}\text{w }u_1 \text{ ba sngaid }u_2 \text{ ba heh, ba jrong }u_3 \text{ wan hangne.}
\]
(218d) * u briew ba sngaid, u ba jrong
       u baheh u wan hangne.

(218d) * u briew ba sngaid, u ba jrong,
       ba heh u wan hangne.

(218f) * u briew ba sngaid, ba jrong u ba
       heh u wan hangne.

In (215) the adjectival clauses are formed by
(=optional) SE + ba + attributive verbs. And because the
adjectivals are formed by the same type of verbs it is
found that the first SE governs the other two following
clauses. But if in a series of adjectival clauses some
of which are formed by ba + attributive verbs and some
by ba + active verbs as in (219 below), it will be seen
that each different clause needs to be marked by an SE.

(219) U khynnäh u ba sngaid u ba lehkai u ur
      Attri.V

      (A boy who is fat and who has been
      playing falls down)

sngaid (fat) is an attributive verb, and lehkai
(playing) is non attributive verb.
(219a) * U khynnah u ba sngaid, ba lehkai u ur

A series of Adjectivals formed by ba + non
attributive verbs are more often than not marked
individually by an SE. e.g.,

(220) U khynnah u₂ ba mareh, u₃ ba ur, u₄ ba
khein ka kjat u₄ don hangne
(The boy who ran, who fell down, who
broke his leg is here).

Cf(220a) U khynnah u ba mareh, ba ur, ba khein
ka kjat u don hangne.

Here in (220a) it may be said, the first SE
governs the other two following adjectivals. But it is
felt that (218a) does not have a lilt in the movement of
speech contours which (220) with SEs before each adjecti-
val clause has. (220a) would be considered sloppy by
Mondon Bareh.

In the examples (218-220) only three and two
adjectival clauses are given. Though no limits can be set
as to the number of clauses that may occur as post head
modifiers, comprehensibility, and perhaps style determines
that their number be not too many. The number of times
that SEs may occur is conditioned as follows:

(i) Once (optionally) with Personal Pronoun as head
    word e.g., Nga ngam leit.
(ii) twice (obligatorily) when there are post head
    modifiers. e.g., u khynnah _1 1 ba sngaid _2 wan bangne.
    (A fat boy comes here)
(iii) as many times as there are adjectivals formed by
    different kinds of verbs (attributive or active).

4.2 Adjectival Clause

After the Subject Enclitic, the adjectival
clause follows as another important post modifying
constituent of an NP. The adjectival clause is formed by
ba + Attributive Verb or ba + Active Verb. e.g.,

(i) ba stad (wise)
(ii) ba kmen (joyful)
(iii) ba shad (dancing)
(iv) ba thiah (sleeping)

The first two Verbs stad and kmen are
attributive or stative verbs; the last two shad and thiah
are active verbs. Both attributive and non-attributive verbs can be preceded by temporal, aspectual and causative pre-verbal particles. Traditionally, these verbs are called adjectives if ba is prefixed to them. The general practice of writing the so-called adjectives is: bastard, bakmen, bashad, bathiah. Mondon Bareh (1929) and Simon (1987) write them separately. Sten and Shangpliang are among present day Khasis who propounded that ba + Verb should be written together. But the practice of writing bastard (wise) should perhaps be discontinued and a revised opinion that ba and stad should be written separately (ba stad) should be adopted. The proposal arises out of the consideration that stad, kmen, shad, thiah are still verbs even though they have the force of adjectives when ba is affixed to them. Further, they are still verbs because even with ba the temporal and aspectual preverbal particles can still be used with them. e.g.,

(i) ba¹ pyn stad
   ? Causative V
   (which is caused to be wise)

(ii) ba iai pyn stad
    ? Iterative Causative V
    (which is iteratively caused to be wise)

₁ ba is marked relative marker elsewhere. The question mark (?) here is used to question the claim that ba is an adjective marker.
(iii) ba la stad
? Past V
(which is enlightened, educated)

(iv) ba dang pyen stad
? Progressive Causative V
(which is being educated)

In his observation on adjectives in Khasi, Simon expressly stated that the so-called adjectives in Khasi are in fact verbs. Taking ba rit (be small) and ba iong (be black) as examples of ba + verbs. This is what he wrote:

It may be noted that both rit and iong are functionally attributive verbs as will be seen in the sentence below thus performing the function that adjectives do in Indo European languages, for instance:

Mynta u snem u phan u rit - This year the potato crop (is) small.
Lada phi shah engi phi'n iong - If you expose (yourself) to the sun you will be dark/black (Simon 1987: 65).

He further wrote:

This view is strengthened by the fact that these words regarded by traditionalists as adjectives can, like, verbs be tagged on to temporal particles. (Simon: ibid).
If words like stad, kmen, shad and thiah are verbs which can be used adjectivally, what remains to be discussed is the ba that precedes them. In an article Some Observations on the Adjective in Khasi (1987) Simon wrote,

In my unpublished thesis - THE VERBAL PIECE IN KHASI - I have postulated the theory that "Ba" has an attributive function when it qualifies the noun to which the verb linked to it is in subordination. (Simon: ibid)

If the postulated theory above is to be accepted, then ba should by virtue of its having the attributive function make all verbs with which it co-occurs attributive. But if examined carefully, the attributive sense lies not in ba but in the stative verbs themselves. ba as remarked earlier (Chapter II) does not change a non-attributive or active verb into a stative or attributive verb. Examine the following:

(221) u briew u ba sngaid

SM H SE ? Attributive V

a man ? fat

(A fat man/a man who is fat)
In the above, it is obvious that *sngaid* refers to a state of being and *mareh* in spite of having been preceded by *ba* remains an active verb referring to an activity. But both *sngaid* and *mareh* are adjectival in that they describe in (221) the state and in (222) the activity of the noun and in that both *sngaid* and *mareh* have been related to the noun *briew* (man) by *ba*. This means that the definite function of *ba* is as a relater of a state of being or an activity defined by a particular verb in use. It does not have an attributive function nor is it an adjective marker. It appears that adjectivals in Khasi occur only in clausal relation having been related to the nouns by *ba* as relater. This implies that in Khasi adjectivals are of the form *A man who is fat* rather than *A fat man*. Hence *ba* could be marked a clause Subordinator or clause Relater (Rel). Since *ba* has a definite function of its own, *ba* should not be written
together with verbs. It should be written separately because it cannot possibly appear together as one word when the verb particularly is preceded by pre-verbal particles e.g., *halapynsuk (Relative past causative verb).

*balalahiaipyniasuk (Relative past perfective iterative causative reciprocal verb).

The argument put forward in favour of sngaid and maren as verbs and ba as relater of quality or activity to the noun has the following implications:

(i) That in Khasi verbs and adjectives belong to the same category. This further implies that there is no separate class of words which may be called adjectives except the closed set of words called the Pronominal Adjectives and the Quantitative Adjectives.

(ii) That in Khasi there are adjectivals only and that they occur only in clausal relation.

(iii) That adjectivals are formed by both stative and active verbs (ba + Y = Adjectival).

(iv) That the traditionally called adjectives such as ba shit (hot), ba mel (burning), ba jyrngam (green) are a combination of a relater and stative verb.
That ba is a relater, and not a bound morpheme of stative/active verbs.

However, the question relating to adjectives in Khasi does not end here. There are instances in the language which seem to defy the view that adjectivals occur in clausal relation. Expressions such as

(223) Ka lieng \textit{rit} (a small boat)
(224) Ka miaw \textit{tuh} (a stealing cat)
(225) Ka nnum \textit{saw} (a red roof)
(226) U khynnah \textit{jaituh} (a lazy boy)
(227) Ka jain \textit{jot} (a rag)
(228) U phan \textit{pyut} (a bad potato)
(229) Ka dieng \textit{bha} (a good quality wood)

are of the structure NGM+H+V. Here the underlined verbs are used adjectivally and directly without being related to the head words by \textit{ba}. This structure, however, is entirely different from the following which are NGM+H+SE+REL+V.

(223a) Ka lieng ka \textit{ba rit} (a boat that is small)
(224a) Ka miaw ka \textit{ba tuh} (a cat that steals)
(225a) Ka nnum ka \textit{ba saw} (a roof that is red)
(226a) U khynnah u \textit{ba jaituh} (a boy that is lazy)
(227a) Ka jain kā ba jōt (a cloth that is worn out)

(228a) U phan u ba pyūt (a potato that is rotten)

(229a) Ka dieng ka ba bha (a wood that is good)

Structurally (223-229) look like cases with ellipsis where the NGM and ba are dropped.

It is perhaps because of this consideration that Nissor Singh wrote that

An Adjective may be formed without any of the prefixes -ba, uba, kiba etc to make the noun it qualifies a kind of compound Noun. (Singh, N 1979:29).

Nissor Singh's observation may be divided into two parts -

(i) that adjectives are formed without either ba or u ba, ka ba, i ba, ki ba and

(ii) that the linguistic strategy to form compound nouns is by dropping ba/ u ba/ ka ba/ i ba/ ki ba.

Observation (i) is not well stated. It is not that adjectives are formed without ba etc. but
that verbs may straight away occur after nouns without being related by ba. Observation (ii) is a correct one. The strategy employed in forming compound nouns (i.e., nouns with quality/activity element) is achieved by dropping the SE and Relater occurring before verbs. The strategy is employed particularly when the speaker wants to indicate that the state or activity indicated by the verb is merged with the noun that it gives it a sort of inherent description. That the verb is merged with the noun is seen particularly from the fact that the connotation that these combinations give is that of single entities. Compound nouns of this type are also used to refer to nouns which are "types" e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ka} & \text{ ling mane} \\
\text{SE} & \text{H} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{a house} & \quad \text{worship} \\
&(\text{A Church})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ka} & \text{ ling shad} \\
\text{SE} & \text{H} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{a house} & \quad \text{dance} \\
&(\text{A dance club})
\end{align*}
\]
In discussing the semantic difference of (223-229) from (223a-229a), Mondon Bareh wrote the
But the adjective or descriptive word may follow immediately the noun qualified or described but with a different shade of meaning. We can say "U kulai long" instead of "U kulai uba long" or "u "kiewkhlain", instead of "u briew uba khlain"; but the meaning is not quite the same. And this may best be illustrated by examples:

"U shong ha u kulai uba saw". This only means that the horse of the rider is of red colour. But when we say, "u shong ha u kulai saw"; it may either mean that there is a reference to other horses of different colours, or that preference is made to the red horse by the rider.

When the adjective or the word having the force of an adjective immediately follows the noun it seems to indicate contrast, comparison or selection.

(Bareh, M. 1929:42-43).

The different shade of meaning of (223-229) from (223a-229a) is very slight. If asked, what the meaning of ka tnum saw (a red roof) is, native speakers would almost always say it means ka tnum ka ba saw (a roof of red colour/a roof that is red); but when they use the compound nouns, they intuitively are aware that the phrase reduction results in a difference in meaning the reference of which is to types. This awareness of a different shade of meaning qualifies the claim that ka tnum saw (NGM+H+Y) is slightly different from
ka tnum ka ba saw (NGM + H + SE + REL + V).

We have seen that adjectivals in Khasi are formed by subordinating both attributive and non-attributive verbs to the head word by means of the subordinator ba. It should be noted that besides verbs, adjectivals are also formed by ordinal numerals which are also linked to the head word being described by ba e.g.,

- ba nyngkong (first)
- ba ar (second)
- ba lai (third)
- ba saw (fourth)
- ba san (fifth)
- ba hynriew (sixth)
- ba hynniew (seventh)
- ba phra (eighth)
- ba khyndai (ninth)
- ba shiphew (tenth)

It may be noted that SEs which are, of course, optional may occur before the above adjectivals depending on the number and gender of the head word in use.
Of the ordinal numerals, only nyngkong (first) may occur immediately after the head word without an intervening SE or ba. The occurrence of nyngkong in this position, results in compound nouns. e.g.,

(a) Soh nyngkong
fruit first
(First fruit)

(b) Khun nyngkong
child first
(First child)

(c) Slap nyngkong
shower first
(First shower)

(d) lok nyngkong
wife/first husband
(First wife/husband)
(e) Sien nyngkong
   time first
   (First time)

Other ordinal numbers have to be linked to
the preceding noun by ba e.g.,

(231) u khun (u) ba ar
     H SE Rel Ord.num.
     son who second
     (The second son)

Cf(231a) * u khun (u) ar

(232) u khynnah u ba nyngkong u ba jrong bha
     SM H SE Rel Ord.num SE Rel Attr.V Adv
     a boy who first boy who tall very
     (A boy who is first, who is very tall...)

An NP contains adjectivals formed by ordinal
numerals is usually placed next to the head word. Other
adjectivals may occur after the ordinal numeral adjectival
e.g.,
Cf(233) U khynnah u ba jrong bha u ba nyngkong...
(A boy who is tall, who is first...)

Between (232) and (233) the former is more acceptable than the latter. In fact (233) is a border line case.

4.3 Relative Clause

The next important post modifying constituent in an NP is the Relative Clause. The relative or subordinate clause is subordinated to the main clause by the subordinator ba, the same ba that relates adjectival to nouns. A pertinent issue relating to the relative clause is the relative pronoun held traditionally to be formed by u/ka/i/ki + ba thus: u ba, ka ba, i ba, ki ba, which seem to be equivalents of the English who, which and that. There is no consensus among writers as to the writing of these forms. Some write u ba, kaba, i ba and kiba while others separate them thus: u ba, ka ba, i ba and ki ba. In this work the latter system will be followed for the reason that will be spelt out later.

In talking about relative clauses it must be clearly understood that any clause occurring after the
head word and subordinated or related by ba is a relative clause. A relative clause is that clause that occurs after the head word thereby giving the head word additional description. Relative clauses therefore include adjectivals and subordinate clauses subordinated to the head word or main clause by ba. Specimen sentences showing relative clauses in Khasi are:

(VIII)

(234) the man who came here is Bester

(The man who came here is Bester)
The relative clause here is adjectival in nature. It may be pointed out that the relative clause in Khasi cannot exist without *ba* (relater) unlike in English which allows formation of relative clauses without either the *wh*—relative pronouns or *that* e.g., *The boy we met* ... in which *whom* or *that* is dropped. In the next example we will see that the relative clause is in fact a sentence which is embedded to the main clause by *ba*.

(That cloth that she has finished sewing is here
lish

That cloth that she has finished sewing is here)
In the grammatical marking of sentence (234) it is clearly seen that \( \overline{u} \) occurring after \( \text{ba} \) is Subject Enclitic. Being subject enclitic \( \overline{u} \) has a definite grammatical function and is a free morpheme. We have already pointed out that \( \text{ba} \) is a relater of adjectivals and other relative clauses. This implies that the occurrence of \( \overline{u} \) followed by \( \text{ba} \) is the side by side occurrence of two separate morphemes. The side by side co-occurrence of \( \overline{u} \) and \( \text{ba} \) therefore does not warrant that the morphemes be written together. We have also seen that \( \text{ba} \) in both (234) and (235) is an obligatory relater of clauses. In (234) \( \overline{u} \) precedes it but in (235) there is zero \( \overline{u} \) which shows that in this situation \( \overline{u} \) is optional while \( \text{ba} \) is obligatory. Most authors of Khasi grammars are of the opinion that \( \overline{u} \) \( \text{ba} \) occurring as in (234) i.e., after a noun word is a relative pronoun. Using the sentence \( \text{Nga shong ha ka ing kaba saw} \), Shangpliang wrote

The sentence may look ambiguous, for a student translating such a sentence may write:
- I live in a red house
- I live in a house which is the fourth in a row
- I live in a house which is red
Kabn, to my opinion is a relative pronoun referring to the house. It may be taken by some to be an adjective marker, but if it is so, the particle ba should be prefixed to saw and leave ka alone as a determiner or marker (Shangpiliang 1987:59).

Regarding Shangpiliang's translation and view above it may be pointed out that the sentence yields the above translation or interpretation whether ka ba is written together or not. The recourse to avoid umambiguity lies only in the context of discourse. Secondly mere writing ka ba together does not make it relative pronoun referring to ing (house). In fact, whether ka is bound to ba or not, ka on its own and as SE refers back to the house anyway, while ba remains a relater of saw in the sense of either the house having red as its colour or the fourth house in a row. Without the use of ba before the word saw, saw will function as an attributive verb indicating that the house is red perhaps because of fire or colour.

The conventional system of marking u ba, ka ba, i ba and ki ba relative pronouns seems to have stemmed from translating the English relative pronouns
who/which/that in sentences such as

The man who came here
(U briew u ba wan hangne)

But if u ba occurs in sentence initial position
it will be seen that the translation will be he who
instead of just who, e.g.,

(235) u ba wan un ioh
IIIPSM Rel V SE+fut V
he who come he will get
(He who comes will get it).

It is felt that a word for word translation
of the two morphemes /u ba/ ka ba/ i ba and ki ba will
be as follows:

u ba = IIIPSM + Rel/SE+Rel (he who)
ka ba = IIIPSF + Rel/SE+Rel (she who/what)
i ba = IIIS + Rel/SE+Rel (that which)
ki ba = IIIP + Rel/SE+Rel (those which)
The above renderings of \( u/ka/i/k_i + ba \) clearly show that \( ba \) is the morpheme that is the actual equivalent of the English who/which/that. This is one minute detail in the language which earlier writers of Khasi grammar missed. It is felt that the functional description of \( u/ka/i/k_i \) occurring after head word as SE and \( ba \) as relative particle subordinating subordinated clauses to the main clause, solves two important issues namely (i), of treating \( u/ka/i/k_i \) and \( ba \) as bound morphemes of each other (ii), of realising that they are neither relative pronouns nor markers of adjectives. This description entails that \( u/ka/i/k_i \) are free morphemes independent of \( ba \) and vice versa. This further entails that in Khasi the function of relative pronouns is performed by the subject enclitic followed by the relative marker \( ba \).

This view, just like the other one, that Khasi has no adjectives, may jolt some traditional Khasi grammarians who strongly hold that \( uba, kaba, iba \) and \( kiba \) are relative pronouns. Those who hold this traditional view write \( uba \) etc together. They will perhaps hold that \( u/ba \) in (236) below is nothing but relative pronoun.
(236) u ba pan un ioh
IIIPS M Rel V SE+fut V
he who ask will get
(He who asks will get)

(237) u ba wa un ioh
IIIPS M Rel V SE+fut V
he who come he+will get
(He who comes will get it)

If u ba in (236 and 237) is conjoined thus : u ba, surely they look like one morpheme having the function of a relative pronoun functioning as subject of verbs pan (ask) and wan (come). But when examined from the point of view of meaning u ba contains a meaning which is the sum total of IIIPS M + Rel. The implication is that u ba written together is not a single morpheme. It is two morphemes having two separate identities and functions and cannot in any case be treated as one morpheme having one function that of a relative pronoun.

From the point of view of juncture and stress any native speaker knows that u ba are two separate
morphemes: for those who write them together it is a matter of two morphemes conjoined, but for this writer, it is a matter of two morphemes which should not be conjoined. That they should not be conjoined is based on a linguistic practice which treats any unit with minimal meaningfulness a separate morpheme. In speech, both \( u \) and \( ba \) are stressed, a phonological fact which shows that these units are not one.

There are two interpretations of (236) and (237). First, \( u \) \( ba \) \( pan \) and \( u \) \( ba \) \( wan \) may be treated as Nominal Relative Clauses which are preposed for purpose of topicalisation, preposition of clauses being a strategy which is used for focussing a part of a statement. Secondly, it may be said that if it were not for topicalisation, the \( u \) \( ba \) \( pan \) and \( u \) \( ba \) \( wan \) may appear in the structure below functioning as complements of the verb \( ioh \)

\[
(236a) \quad \text{Un} \quad \text{ioh} \quad u \quad ba \quad pan
\]

\[
\text{IIIIPSM} + \text{fut} \quad V \quad \text{SE Rel} \quad V
\]

\[
\text{he+will} \quad \text{get} \quad \text{he who} \quad \text{ask}
\]

(He will get he who asks for it).
(237a) \( \text{Un} \ \text{ioh} \ \text{u} \ \text{ba} \ \text{wen} \)

\[ \text{III} \text{PSM}+\text{fut} \ \text{V} \ \text{SE} \ \text{Rel} \ \text{V} \]

he+will get he who come

(He will get he who comes)

There are occurrence of \( u/ka/i/ki \) followed by \( ba \) followed by stative verbs such as:

- \( ki \text{ ba khraw} \) (nobles)
- \( ki \text{ ba duk} \) (the poor)
- \( ki \text{ ba poh} \) (the commoner)
- \( ki \text{ ba riewspah} \) (the rich)

The English renderings indicate that these are nouns. And as nouns what do they mean? Of course, the meanings of the above are a sum total of all the three morphemes. In all the above nouns the attribute depends on the verb which is related to the personal pronouns by \( ba \). Looking at these nouns in this way, it may be argued that the three morphemes must be written separately just as \( u \text{ ba pan} \) (he who asks) in (236). But because of a special use as nouns, perhaps it could be proposed that the above nouns be written together thus: \( kiba-khraw \).
kibaduk, kibapoh, kibariewspah. Between the system of writing these nouns either as kiba khraw or ki bakhraw the latter form where ki is NGM and bakhraw is H is preferable to the former.

So far only w/ka/i/ki as third person personal pronouns or third person SE followed by ba have been considered. It is worthwhile to look at how ba affects other personal pronouns.

We have seen that the Third Person Personal Pronouns may be followed by ba (i) when they occur as head word and (ii) when they function as SE. The first and Second Personal Pronouns on the other hand can be followed by ba only when they function as head word. e.g.,

(238) Nga ba duk ba la pynriewspah
    IPS Rel V Rel Past Cau+V
    I who poor who past enriched
(I who was poor but enriched)
(239) Ngi ba duk te vn leh kumno?
IPP Rel V Conj fut V question
We who poor then will do how
(We who are poor, how will we help it?)

(240) Me) Pha ba ierg hangto knang kato
Phi IIPSM Rel V Adv V Pron.
IIPSF Adv V Pron.
IIPS You who stand there close that
ka jingkheng

SF H
door'
(You who stand there, close that
door)

But the first and second personal pronouns
functioning as SE in

(241) Nga ngam leit
IPS SE+Neg V
I I+not go
(I'll not go)
cannot be followed by \textit{ba} e.g.,

* Nga nga \textit{ba duk}
* Phi phi \textit{ba duk}

Rule restriction in the language is that the SEs of the first and second personal pronouns before \textit{ba} is always either \textit{u/ka/i/ki} depending on (i) the number and gender of the speaker, and on (ii) the speaker's attitude toward the addressee.

Here the speaker may be male. But it also could be female. There are some female speakers of the language who refer to themselves as \textit{u} in this situation. But there
are female speakers who prefer to be accurate in this regard. These will always say

(244) Nga ka ba duk
IPSM SE Rel V
I I who poor
(I who is poor)

(245) Pha ka ba la poh sat
IIPSF SE Rel Past V Adv
you(female)you who past low very

(You who has been so low).

According to the marking above, pha is second Person Singular Feminine and therefore should refer to a female addressee. But sometimes in anger or disgust pha may be used to refer to a male addressee. And if in the above sentence the particle la (reciprocal) is inserted before the verb poh, the reference will be simply to second person plural. When this is so, the sex of the referents will not be known.
Regarding the restrictions that the first and second personal pronouns functioning as SE cannot be followed by ba Sten did not point out where exactly the first and second persons may not be followed by ba, it is assumed that he meant this position when he wrote that in Khasi "ngaba, phaba, ngiba" do not occur. (Sten 1987:22).

ba also takes the negative(-m) and futurity(-n) operators. When -m is attached the usual spelling is bym e.g.,

(246) Ki bym treh kin lekt noh
    IIIIP Rel+Neg V SE+fut V Adv
    those who+not will these+ go away
    ling will
    (Those who do not want to take the thing offered, let them go away)

(247) I ban r\cai i dei i para long nga
    IIIPS Rel+fut V SE V S H Prep IPS
    she who+will sing she is sister of I
    (She who will sing is my sister)
Up to this point the focus in the study has been mainly on *ba* as a (i) subordinator or relater of adjectivals and of other subordinate clauses; (ii) and as a free morphemes.

Now we will look at relative clauses in Khasi. There are two kinds of relative clauses. Those that may be considered as 'restrictive' relative clauses and those others which are 'non-restrictive' or appositive in nature. Examine the following sentences:

(248) **U briew u ba rga ia kren hymne u dei u Mo**  

a man who I recit-talk this he is Mo  

(The man who I talked to this morning is Mo).

(249) **U briew ba phin iohi ehibit u dei u Mo**  

a man who you will see later he is Mo  

(The man who you will see later in the day is Mo).
(250) _U briew ba kin leit kem _u dei _u Mo_
  \( \begin{array}{c}
  \text{SM} \\
  \text{H}
  \end{array} \)  
  Rel IIIPP+ V V SE V SM H,
  a man who they+ go arrest he is Mo will

(The man who they will arrest is Mo).

(251) _Ka Jainsem ba ai I Mei ka don ha iing_
  \( \begin{array}{c}
  \text{SF} \\
  \text{H},
  \text{Rel V S H SE V Prep H}
  \end{array} \)  
  a dress that give mother it is at home

(The dress that mother gave is at home).

The relative clauses are underlined in the word for word translation. Semantically the relative clauses in (248-250) form part of the description that serve to pick out the referent _u briew_ (a man). The description is restrictive in the sense that it is vital to the meaningfulness of the sentences. The essence of these clauses lie in the fact that if they are removed the NP+VP (_u briew _u + _dei _u Mo_) will result in a very rarely used sentence, the acceptability of which is marginal.

In this context of _u briew _u _dei _u Mo_ (the man is Mo) _u briew _u is redundant. It is more acceptably substituted for by the Third Person Singular Masculine _u_ as follows:
u briew u is redundant because it does not contribute much towards identifying Mo unless it is qualified by relative clauses as shown. It is in this sense that the relative clauses are restrictive.

Sentence (251) on the other hand has a non-restrictive relative clause. Here the relative clause is an added information serving as contrast: this Jainsem (dress) that mother gave as against other Jainsem (dresses). This relative clause is non-restrictive in the sense that the head word or main clause can stand by itself independent of the information contained in the relative clause. Judged it from this point of view, the non-restrictive relative clauses are appositive in nature.

The main difference of restrictive clauses from the non-relative clauses is that restrictive clauses
are vital information about the head word and are spoken without any pause after head words. The non-restrictive relative clauses are added information not vital to the meaning of the sentence and are spoken usually with a pause after head word and could actually be separated by commas. But since the writing system in Khasi is still not very systematic, non-restrictive relative clauses are found not marked by commas. But whatever the differences there are of 'restrictive' from 'non-restrictive' relative clauses, it could be said that the general function of both types of relative clauses is definitive of the main clause or head word in the main clause.

Relative clauses may be stacked one after the other. Theoretically, no limit is set for the number of relative clauses that can be stacked in one NP, but intelligibility or comprehensibility is a factor that really should decide their number e.g.,

(252) u briew u ba matlab, u ba ju tap tupia
1
saw u bym don kmie shuh, u ba iaid
2
nangne man la ka sugi, u laj iap.
3
(A man who was blind, who used to put on a red cap, who lost his mother, who used to walk from here every day was dead)
Perhaps four relative clauses are the maximum they can occur while three or just two of them seem more euphonic.

Cf(252a) u briew u ba matlah, u ba ju tap tupia
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{saw u bym don kmie shuh u lah iap}
\end{array}\]

(252b) u briew u ba matlah, u ba ju tap tupia
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{saw u lah iap}
\end{array}\]

Relative clauses may occur in sentence initial position functioning as subject NP e.g.,

(253) ba nga im ka long ba phylla
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{Rel IPS V IIIPSF V Rel V}
\end{array}\]

that I live it is that wonderful

Rel.Clause

(That I live is something wonderful).
In (254) we notice that the relative clause contains an adjectival *ba stad* (wise) within it. *ba stad* (wise, bright) may occur with other synonyms e.g., *ba shemphang* (enlightened), *ba tip* (knowledgeable) *ba nang* (skillful) etc. If this is the case, then the adjectivals will at least be two in number e.g.,

(255) *ba u long u ba nang u ba stad* baroh ki tip.

(That he is skillful and wise everybody knows)

A relative clause may serve as a complement of the verb in the sentence. e.g.,

(256) *u dei u ba nga ithuh bha*  
IIIIPSM V SE'Rel IPS V Adv  
he is he who I know well  
(He is somebody I know quite well)
4.4. Genitive Clause

The next important post modifying constituent in an NP is the Genitive clause marked by la, jong and lajong.

(257) ha la jing
Prep Gen H
in own house
(In one's own house)

(258) ha jing jong u John
Prep H Gen SM H
in house of John
(In John's house)

(259) ha ing lajong
Prep H Gen
in house own of
(In one's own house)

Besides the use of the three genitive markers, it may be said that the idea of possession may also be expressed by using the existential verb don (have). e.g.
I have two non human dogs
(I have two dogs)

But since this use of the verb don (have) does not fall within the direct purview of the noun phrase, no more will be said about it.

The three genitive markers behave differently. Their difference will be spelt out below.

la (see 257) occurs before the noun word which signifies the thing possessed. In terms of meaning it is somewhat like the English word own. It can be preposed to sentence initial position when focus on the thing possessed is felt needed e.g.,

(216) la ka ja ngan shet
Gen SF H IPS+fut V
own rice I+will cook
(My own rice I'll cook)
Cf(261a)Ngan shet, lâ ka la.
IPS+Put V Gen SF H.
I+will cook own rice
(I'll cook my rice)

lâ has a distributive note when reduplicated as in

(262) lâ lâ ki hot
Gen Gen P H
own own books
(yours respective books)

Looking at (257) and (258) we notice that both lâ and jîng occur in different situations: lâ precedes only one head word jîng (house) whereas jîng occurs in between two head words jîng (house) and ì John (John).
As already mentioned the noun word following lâ signifies the thing possessed but with regards to jîng the noun word following it signifies the possessor while that preceding it signifies the object possessed.

Standing in between two noun words one may ask to which noun word is jîng more closely related. To this
question there are two answers. One is a semantic answer that views,long as a link between the possessed and the possessor. Given this function,long may be said to be equally important to both head words and therefore is neither closer to one nor to the other. The second answer is structural in character. Structurally,long is more closely related to the noun representing the possessor (i.e., the noun word following it). This structural judgement is based on the grammatical test of insertion. e.g., The sentence ka iing long u John (The house of John) may be divided into two immediate constituents: ka iing (the house) and long u John (of John). The division clearly shows that long falls naturally with the NP u John; it cannot be made a part of ka iing as *ka iing long (the house of). But long can be inserted before ka iing thus: long ka iing (of the house). But this insertion results in a change in meaning. Here ka iing is no longer the thing possessed; instead, because of long before it, it has become the possessor.

Other characteristics of long are: it is optional in a situation where the NP signifying the possessor is a third person noun obligatorily marked by
an NGM e.g.,

\[(263) \text{Ka kali i Pa}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SP H} \\
\text{S H}
\end{array}
\]

a car father
(My father's car)

\[\text{Cf(263a) ka kali jong i Pa}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S H} \\
\text{GEN S H}
\end{array}
\]

a car of father
(My father's car)

It is optional in interrogative sentences also. e.g.,

\[(264) \text{Phi ki khun u Ram?}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IIPP P H} \\
\text{SM H}
\end{array}
\]

You children Ram
(Are you Ram's children?)

\text{jong could have occurred in between ki khun and u Ram thus: Phi ki khun jong u Ram?}

In interrogative sentences \text{jong is followed by no (who) thus: jong no (whose) when the possessor is not}
known to the speaker, but if the speaker could anticipate the possessor the name of that possessor will be used as in (264) above. But *jong* is obligatory before the noun word signifying possessor if that possessor is a third person personal pronoun e.g.,

\[(265) \ u \ khulom \ jong \ u \]
\[MS \ H, \ GEN \ IIIPSM \]
\[a \ pen \ of \ he \]
\[(His \ pen)\]

Cf(265a) * u khulom u
\[(His \ pen)\]

(265a) does not occur in standard Khasi. It occurs only in dialects.

Personal pronouns other than the third person personal pronouns of course may occur without *jong* preceding them, and when this is the case, the stress given to the personal pronoun indicates absolute ownership. e.g.,

\[(266) \ ki \ khun \ nya \]
\[P \ H, \ I\!\$S \]
\[children \ I \]
\[(My \ children\)
Cf(266a)  Ki  khun  jong nga  
(My children)  

(267)  Ki  masi  phi  
P_H  IIPS/P  
cows  your  
|  (Your cows)  

(267a)  Ki  masi  jong  phi  
P_H  Gen' IIPS/P  
cows  of  you  
(Your cows)  

Sometimes jong is preceded by a Subject Enclitic  
as in  

(268)  Ki  kot  ki  jong  nga  
P_H  SE,  Gen  IPS  
books  of  I  
(The books of mine).  

This structure is used particularly for the  
lilt and rhythm in poetic diction. The difference in  
meaning of 268 from 266-267a) is that the use of an SE
before /jong in (268) defers introduction of the possessor.

The idea of ownership is expressible through the use of lajong as in the phrase below

(269) U khulom lajong
       SM  H  Gen.
       pen own
       (Own pen)

Here lajong does not clearly state who the possessor is. This is because lajong by itself cannot point to a possessor. In cases where lajong is used the possessor is usually the subject of the sentence e.g.,

(270) u shong ha iing lajong
       IIIPSM V  Prep H  Gen.
       he live in house own
       (He lives in his own house)

(271) Nga don u khulom lajong
       IFS  V SM  H  Gen.
       I have a pen own
       (I have my own pen)
Sometimes lajong seems to mean my own in contexts such as the following:

(272) Speaker A: U khun jong no u/ka/i/ki jong

SM : H Gen Interrogative Pron. Adj
marker

a son whose that

(Whose son is that?)

(273) Speaker B: U lajong

IIIIPSM: Gen

he own

(He is my own)

The co-occurrence of la and jong is also seen in combinations la u/ka/i/ki jong, where u/ka/i/ki jong may be reduplicated.

e.g. la u jong u jong

| la ka jong ka jong | literally, respective
| la i jong i jong | possessions
| la ki Jong ki jong |
From sentences (274-275) it is obvious that the possessor is not explicitly mentioned. The English renderings of (274) *Take your respective books* and (275) *Stay in your respective places* whereby the owner is *you* is implied from the fact that both the sentences are instructions given to second person. But if to these sentences a subject word *ngi* (we) is used then the owner of books and place will naturally be *ngi* (us). Compare 273-274 with the following:

(27'4a) *Ngį shim la ki jong ki kot*

*(We take our own books)*
(275a) Ngi shong ha la ka jong ka jaka
(We stay in our own place)

The combination of la u/ka/i/ki jong without reduplication occurs in the following:

(276) Shim la u jong u khulom
V Gen. SM Gen. SM H
take own of pen

( Take your own pen )

In (276) the order of occurrence of genitive markers is la followed by jong with an intervening NGM. This is again followed by NGM + H ( u khulom). The order however may be changed in such a way as to allow the NGM + H ( u khulom) to come in between la and jong (la u khulom la jong). But when this changed order takes place, the NGM which originally occurs in between la and jong gets deleted. Its place is taken by the obligatory NGM preceding the head word. But of course, the omission of one NGM may also be interpreted as a restriction the language places on double occurrence of NGM at once. In Khesi therefore we may have

U khulom but not *u u khulom
SM H

a pen
With regard to the movement of NGM + H from sentence final position to sentence medial position, the problem does not end with deletion of one NGM. There is still another problem to be solved. This problem is this: when the word order of (276) is changed so as to accommodate the NGM + H medially in the sentence we will notice that jong gets transposed to sentence final position as follows:

(276a) * Shim la u khulom jong

(276a) is unacceptable because jong cannot occur in sentence final position. Of the three genitive markers only lajong can occur at the end of a sentence. For (276a) to be acceptable, therefore, there is the need to replace the morpheme jong by lajong as in (276b) below.

(276b) Shim la u khulom lajong.

The implication of the change of word order in (276) involves not only deletion of one NGM but also a replacement of jong by lajong.

The basic meaning difference of la u/ka/i/ki jong u/ka/i/ki jong as in (274-275) from la u/ka/i/ki jong as in (276) is that the former introduces an element of choosing one's own from a collection which may include not
only one's own articles but also of others. The latter does not have this element.

Within the framework of a Khasi NP, the genitive clause usually comes before the relative clause e.g.,

(277) U khun jong nga u ba irong
Main Cl. Gen.Cl. Rel.Cl.
son my who tall
(My son who is tall)

Cf(277a) U khun uba irong jong nga
Main Cl. Rel.Cl. Gen.Cl
son who tall my
(*son who is tall mine)

It is likely that sentences such as (277a) occur in speech. This may be due to pressures which accompany rapid speech, but in calculated speech and in written Khasi they are considered border line cases.

If speakers wish to topicalise the quality of the referent rather than the idea of possession, then the quality is made part of the noun, resulting in a
compound noun, by dropping both the Subject Enclitic and Relative Clause Subordinator ba e.g.,

(278)  u khun  u ba  bhabriew
       SM H SE Rel Attri.V
       son  who  handsome
       (The son who is handsome)

will become
(279)  u khun bhabriew
       (The handsome son)

to which a genitive clause may be added e.g.,

(280)  u khun bhabriew jong nga
       (My handsome son)

4.5 Quantifiers and Cardinal Numericals

After the genitive clause a quantifier baroh
(all) may follow which in turn may be followed by a cardinal number along with a relevant classifier e.g.,

(281)  ki khun jong phi  baroh lai nga
       P H,  Gen IIPS/ Qntfr Card. Clafr.
       P        num. hum.
       children of you  all three  human
       (Your three children)
The quantifier *baroh* has already been examined in Chapter III as a pre-modifying constituent in an NP. So also the cardinal numbers and classifiers. What needs to be mentioned here is that these items may occur both as pre-modifier and post modifier. In an NP, they may occur only once.

Quantifiers *bun* (*many/much*), *shi bun* (*many/much*), *khyndiat* (*some*), *katte* (*that much*), *katne* (*this much*), *katto katne* (*some*) may also occur after the genitive clause, but unlike *baroh* (*all*) they cannot be followed by cardinal numerals. But they may be followed by relevant classifiers e.g.,

\[(282)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Ki} & \text{nongpule} & \text{jong phi} & \text{bun} & \text{ngut} \\
\text{P} & \text{H} & \text{Gen IIPS/ Qntfr Clsfr.hum} & \text{P} \\
\end{array}
\]

students of you many human

(Many students of yours)

\[(283)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Ki} & \text{syntiew} & \text{jorg phi} & \text{shi bun} \\
\text{P} & \text{H} & \text{Gen. IIPS/P Qntfr} \\
\end{array}
\]

flowers of you many

(Many flowers of yours)
With regard to these quantifiers occurring after genitive clauses, it needs be mentioned that their occurrence as pre-modifiers is more common than as post modifiers.
Relative Clauses may then follow constructions such as 282-287 e.g.,

(288) **Ki tier jong nga katto katne ki ba poi na Calcutta**

\[P\ H,\ \text{Gen IPS}\ Qntfr\ SE\ Rel\ V\ Prep\ H\]

Articles of I some that come Calcutta from

(Some articles of mine that have come from Calcutta).

(289) **Ki tier jong nga katto katne ki babhha ki ba**

\[P\ H,\ \text{Gen IPS}\ Qntfr\ SE\ Rel\ V\ SE\ Rel\]

articles of I some that good that articles

\[poi\ na\ Calcutta\]

\[V\ Prep\ H\]

that come from Calcutta

(Some articles of mine which are good which have come from Calcutta)

4.6 **Prepositional Phrase**

The only other modifying constituent in an NP that needs to be examined is the Prepositional Phrase marked by prepositions *ha* (in), *halor* (on), *hapoh*
(inside), habar (outside), sha (to), shalor (to + on) shapoh (to + inside), shabar (to + outside), na (from) nalor (from + on), napoh (from + inside), nabar (from + outside), ia (to), and da (by) e.g.,

(290) u masi jon ng a ha sem
    SM H, Gen IPS Prep H
    a cow of I in shed
    (My cow in the shed)

(291) ki khynnah halor iing jon g nga
    P H  Prep H Gen IPS
    children on house of I
    (The children on the roof of my house)

(292) u briew hapoh iing
    SM H  Prep H
    a man inside house
    (A man inside the house)

(293) ka khlaw shabar shnong
    SF H  Prep H
    a bush outside village
    (A bush outside the village)

(294) u leit ia ia Mary
    IIIIPS V Prep SF H
    he love to Mary
    (He loves/d Mary)
The structure of a Prepositional Phrase generally speaking is \textit{Prep+NGM+H}. In the examples above, only sentences with prepositions \textit{ia} and \textit{da} have NGMs before headwords. This is so because as discussed in 3.1 specimen sentences 80ff, the NGM is optional, but the optionality is only when nouns following the prepositions are inanimate. Animate nouns it had already been shown, compulsorily take their appropriate NGMs with any preposition.

Prepositions \textit{ia} and \textit{da} occur only in an NP in the objective case and instrumental case whether
that is in a simple statement or question. The objective case in Khasi, it may be noted, may occur either in sentence initial or final position without any change in meaning except for a change in topicalisation e.g.,

(298) \text{Ki ai sha ia ki khynnah} \\
\text{IIIPP V H Prep H} \\
\text{they give tea to children} \\
(\text{They serve/d tea to the children}) \\
Cf(298a) ia ki khynnah ki ai sha \\
(\text{To the children they serve/d tea}) \\

(299) \text{u leit da ka bos} \\
\text{IIIPSM V Prep SF H} \\
\text{he go by bus} \\
(\text{He goes by bus}) \\
Cf(299a) da ka bos u leit \\
(\text{By bus he goes}) \\

Prepositional Phrases may co-occur with a Genitive clause as in (290-291) and with Relative Clauses as in the following:

(300) \text{ki khynnah ki ba rit hapoh pung} \\
\text{P H SE Rel V Prep H} \\
\text{children who small in lake} \\
(\text{Small children in the lake/Children who are small in the lake})
(301) U Ton, u para u Mon hapoh lling
SN H  SM H  SM H  Prep  H
Ton, brother Mon inside house.
(Ton, Mon's brother inside the house)

(302) U khulom u ba thymna halor mie; i
SM H  SE Rel V  Prep  H
a pen that new on the table
(A new pen on the table).