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Abstract
The aim of this paper is to show the conditions of licensing Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) in Mundari an Austro-Asiatic language. NPIs are subject to Principle–A of Standard Binding Theory. They must be bound to negation or a truth conditional operator in their governing category. The role of parameter cannot be ignored in licensing of NPIs.

Abbreviations:

I= Items  emp = Emphatic  +tr = Transitive
PP = post positions  -tr = Intransitive  Neg P= Negative
Particle
Ilsg = Second person  fm = Finite marker  Infl. = Inflection
Singular
Op = Operator  prog = Progressive,
ECP = Empty Category
1sg= first person singular  Principle

1. Introduction

This study examines syntactic dependencies between negation and Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) in Mundari. NPIs can occur only in the scope of negation. The NPI appears in the sentence, which is subordinated to a negation. The general rules for these quantifiers are that in negative sentences an element clearly showing negative value must have in their scope the NPIs and the verb. By occurring mostly in sentences with negative meaning, terms assumed negative value and became NPIs, no longer bound to a
A potential binder for NPI is an A’ polarity operator either negation or an empty polarity operator (OP) generated in complementizer (COMP) (Progovac 1994).

I have chosen an Austro-Asiatic language Mundari for present study. I have collected data of Mundari around Khunti, Ranchi (Jharkhand). According to Grierson (1906), Mundari is a main language of Kherwari group along with Santhali. There are similarities among Ho, Bhumij and Mundari languages, but whether these are separate languages or mere a dialects of one or other which is out of purview of this paper.

In this study, I argue that Syntax and Semantics both are needed to capture the licensing of NPIs in Mundari. There are some sentences in which NPIs are licensed by other than Neg P though it has negative value. Other licensors like conditional, questions and any sentences, which have COMP position in that, can license the NPIs. Below I discussed under several headings about the characteristics of NPIs licensing by negation or other licensor of it.

This paper is organized as follows. Section (2), I shall discuss the works done on NPIs in different languages. Section (3A), describes licensing of NPIs by clause mate negation at different case positions. Section (3B), describes licensing of NPIs by super-ordinate negation. Section (3C), describes the NPIs licensing in adversative predicates. Section (3D), describes conditional sentences. Section (3E), describes licensing of NPIs in comparative sentences. Section (3F), describes licensing of NPIs by questions and in section (3G), role of word order (parameter) in licensing NPIs. Section (4), concludes the findings.

2. Background

Much work has been done on this topic with reference to NPIs in various languages. In addition to the licensing conditions on NPIs, an issue that is closely associated with the questions of licensing conditions is the positions of the negative licensor in the clause structure. Most studies assume that position of negation to be higher than the position of NPIs (Lasnik 1975, Linebarger1980, Laka 1994, Progovac 1994 and Benmamoun 1997).
This assumption is clearly seen through one of the commonly agreed conditions on the licensing of NPIs: the negative licensor must c-command the NPIs.

There are some differences in the way of describing NPIs. Linguists like Jackendoff (1969), Lasnik (1975), Laka (1994) and, Progovac (1994) described it syntactically. They thought it is matter of syntax. Ladusaw (1979) described it semantically. According to him it is matter of semantics and syntax has nothing to do with NPIs. According to Linebarger (1980), it is combination of both syntax and semantics. In syntactic analysis of NPI licensing, the basic assumption in most of the studies on the licensing of NPIs (Lasnik 1972 and 1981, Laka 1989, Mahajan 1990 and Benmamoun 1997) is that NPIs require a c-commanding negative licensor.

The first study on negation within the framework of generative grammar can be found in Chomsky’s *Syntactic Structures*. Chomsky (1957) derives a negative sentence from its underlying positive one. Klima (1964) later provides a detailed study of the syntax of negation in *English*. His study also discusses the derivation of NPIs from positive polarity items. Carden (1967) and Lakoff (1969) present semantic analysis of negation. Jackendoff (1969) presents an interpretive analysis of negation. In his analysis negation is generated in its surface structure (s-structure) position then climbs up the tree by interpretive rules, and thus takes wider scope. Lasnik (1972) discusses the scope of negation and its interaction with quantifiers and NPIs. His study assumes s-structure licensing of NPIs. Assuming the notion of command and precedence, He assumes a negative (+negated) value to quantifiers. Later, Horn (1989) offers the most comprehensive syntactic analysis of negation.

Linebarger (1980) assumes that the licensing conditions on NPIs cannot be stated only in syntactic terms. She argues that the distribution of NPIs in *English* reflects an overlap of Syntax and Pragmatics. Her analyses of NPIs are licensed under the notion of c-command, and in the absence of an overt negation marker NPIs are licensed by implicature (pragmatic constraints). Ladusaw (1979) established what is now a well-known generalization in semantics, namely the NPIs are licensed within the scope of downward entailing apparatus. His is an attempt to reduce the licensing of NPIs to a purely semantic phenomenon, namely downward entailment and it suggests that negation is one of the sub-classes of downward entailing expression. Laka (1994) provides an analysis that assumes the precedence of a negative CP. She differs from Progovac (1994) in that she assumes, an operator in the CP is the licensor whereas Laka assumes that a negative CP is the licensor. Mahajan (1990) argues for an obligatory displacement of negation in *Hindi* at LF, offering upward LF movement of a negative licensor so that it will enter into a c-commanding relation with the NPIs. He argues that the negative licensor moves higher at LF, adjoins to the finite IP, and licenses the NPI, as it does not c-command the NPI at s-structure.
Kumar (2006) argue that in Hindi clause structure, a negation marker heads its own maximal projection Neg P, which is dominated by TP. Further he says that the negative markers c-command the NPIs in Hindi. He further added that Hindi does not involve any covert syntactic operations, such as LF movement (Mahajan 1990) or reconstruction (Chomsky 1995). Finally, it shows that there are two different types of NPIs. Strong NPIs require a clause mate c-commanding negative licensor, whereas weak NPIs are quantifiers and similar to the free choice ‘any’ in English.

3. Licensing of NPIs

A. Licensing of NPI by Clause mate Negation

A.i. Subject position

If an NPI comes at the subject position in a sentence then it means that its negative value has already fully developed and no other Neg P is strictly required before the verb. As in English:

e.g. (1) Anyone can read this book.

In above sentence anyone does not need any Neg P to license it because it is licensed by the verb. Let us see cases of Mundari.

e.g. (2) jetai -gi ne kitāb-(ke) paRāw -dari -a

   anyone  emp  this    book-acc    read  can  fm³

   ‘Anyone can read this book’.

Similarly, as in English, in Mundari too subject position is governed or licensed by verb. The construction of NPIs in Mundari is Item + emp = NPI.

A.ii. Indirect Object Position

In indirect object position a clause mate Neg P license NPIs through c-command.
A.iii. Direct Object

At direct object position too a clause mate Neg P licenses NPIs.

In sentence (5) direct object is structurally case assigned by verb *oma* ‘give’ because it is subcategorized part of verb and NPI is licensed by clause mate Neg P.

A.iv. Locative
In locative cases too a clause mate Neg. license NPI. For example:

eg. (6)  an   jetanā-re-o   ka-ň   dub   -ka   -n   -a
         I       anything-pp-emp      not-sit  -prog -tr -fm

‘I am not sitting on anything’.

A.v. Commutative

In commutative sentences too a clause mate Neg P license NPIs.

eg. (7)  an   jetai-lo"o-gi   ka-ň   huju   -ka   -n   -a
         I       anyone-pp-emp   not-come   prog -tr -fm

‘I am not coming with anyone’.

A.vi. Ablative

In ablative sentences too a clause mate Neg P license NPI through c-command.

eg. (8)  anm   jeta-lo"o   ka-m   huju   -ta   -n   -a
         you  anywhere-pp-emp   not-2sg  come  -prog -tr -fm

‘You are not coming from anywhere’.

A.vii. Instrumental
In instrumental case too NPI get licensed through c-command as both NPI and Neg P is in same clause.

eg. (9)  
\begin{tabular}{lllllll} 
  \textit{am} & \textit{ama} & \textit{sarsar} & \textit{jetan-āte-o} & \textit{ka-m} & \textit{had} & \textit{-am} & \textit{-a} \\
\end{tabular}  
\text{you your finger anything-pp-emp not-2sg cut IIsg fm}

‘You do not cut your finger with anything’.

A.viii. Genitive

In genitive case too NPI get licensed through precedence and c-command.

eg. (10)  
\begin{tabular}{lllllll} 
  \textit{nen-a} & \textit{jetanā-o} & \textit{ow?a} & \textit{ka} & \textit{tan} & \textit{-a} \\
\end{tabular}  
\text{this gen any-emp house not prog -fm}

‘This is nobody’s house’.

Thus we have seen that the clause mate negation is licensing the NPIs. Therefore, we can say that NPIs are subject to principle– A of Binding Theory. NPIs are subject to principle A. They must be bound to negation or a truth conditional operator in their governing category.

**Principle A:** An anaphor must be bound in its governing category.

The governing category for an anaphor is the smallest maximal projection containing the anaphor, the governor for the anaphor and a subject accessible to the anaphor. It is important to note that the notion of binding referred here is purely syntactic, intended to capture locality conditions between a NPIs and its licenser neg P. As we have seen in above sentences a clause mate negation can license NPIs through c-command and precedence except subject position. Subject position is problematic in syntactic analysis.

A.ix. Other NPIs of Mundari

Below I am presenting other NPIs of Mundari and their licensing condition with clause mate Neg P with regard to c-command and precedence.
NPIs in Mundari can be licensed by *bano‘without*. Therefore, we can say that any word, which has negative value, can license NPIs or NPIs can be licensed in monotonically decreasing value (Chierchia, 1990).

**B. Super Ordinate Negation**

Let us consider the following example of English sentence which involves long distance NPIs licensing, i.e. licensing by a super ordinate negation. For example:

(14). John does not say that Mary knows anyone.

In (14) the binder for the NPI ‘anyone’ is not within its governing category at s-structure, suppose that the NPI raises at LF, thus extending the domain. It has been established that
overt movement is subject to some constraints, for example: Island Constraints (Ross, 1967) and the Empty Category Principle (ECP) (Chomsky, 1981). Island constraints prohibit movement from islands (e.g. complex NPs, coordinate structures, wh-clauses, etc.). In addition, the ECP prohibits movement from the position, which is not properly governed. However, all these restrictions on movement seem far less obvious at LF.

Let us see case of Mundari:

(15) aň ka-ň kaji -ked -a ci jaano
    I  not–1sg say  pst   -fm  that  Jano

    jānā-ai  adana   -ń   -a
    anyone-emp  know  -1sg   fm

‘I did not say that Jano knows anyone’.

In sentence (15) Neg P is in main clause and NPI in subordinate clause so we can say that like English in Mundari too NPI raises at LF to license NPIs in subordinate clause through COMP.

(16) aň ka-ň kaji -ke -d -a ci jeta-?e
    I  not–1sg say  -pst  +tr  -fm  that  anyone-emp

    huju-a  -ka-n   -a
    come  pst , -tr   fm

‘I did not say that anyone come to me’.

In this respect, any resembles the so-called long-distance reflexives that have been attested in Agr-less language such as Chinese, Japanese and Korean. Such reflexives can
be bound across any number of clauses. As assumed by Peter Cole (1994), $X^0$ reflexives seem to take only Agr as their subject. Similarly, Neg P can move through COMP to license NPIs.

C. Adversative Predicate

A potential binder for polarity items is an A' polarity operator: either negation or an empty polarity operator (OP) generated in COMP. A null polarity operator appears in the COMP of all non-negative polarity clauses. Since the first potential antecedent for polarity items is negation in Infl (or Neg P). The governing category for these items cannot extend further than IP. Only those NPIs, which can raise at LF higher than IP can extend their domain and be bound to the operator. The following contrast illustrates the point for adversative predicates.

eg. (17) (a) I doubt \([_{CP\ OP}]\text{that John saw anyone}\]
   
   (b) *I doubt anyone.

The NPI is licensed in (17 a) because the complement of doubt is sentential, and therefore hosts a COMP position. On the other hand in (17 b) there is no COMP position for OP selection.

Let us see case of Mundari adversative predicate.

eg. aň orâ uru tan -e ci meri jeta e lel -ka -e
(18) I doubt prog ? that mary any pp- emp see pst fm

‘I doubt that Mary saw anyone’.

Like English, In Mundari too, we have COMP Ci, which hosts OP to license NPI.
D. Conditional

Like adversative predicate conditional sentences also host an empty polarity operator (OP) generated in COMP which license NPIs.

eg. (19). \[CP [C if OP [IP anyone comes]]] let me know\]

OP may be licensed in (19) by virtue of unfixed truth-values. In another word, an OP is licensing NPIs in a clause whose truth-value is negative.

Let us examine the case of Mundari

eg. (20)  
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{duke} & \textit{ieta -e} & \textit{bemain} \\
\textit{duke} & \textit{anyone-emp} & \textit{insult} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\textit{tai} & \textit{redo} & \textit{sajayo} & \textit{-tia} & \textit{-durkara} \\
pst. & cond & punish & be & should \\
\end{tabular}

‘If Duka insulted anyone he should be punished’.

In above sentence, we have OP generated at COMP position, which license NPI.

E. Comparatives

Let us see comparatives in English. In comparative sentences, there is COMP position in English, which can license NPIs in such sentences. OP generated in COMP licenses NPIs

eg. (21). [Mary is taller [C than OP [John]]]

Like other COMP here also we have OP, which license NPI. For example:
eg.  * bāmai jeta –te – o salaŋi -e
(22)  
  bamai anyone-with-emp tall fm

‘Bamai is taller than anyone’.

The sentence (22), is ungrammatical due to absence of COMP position or licensor of NPI. As we have seen above, in absence of Neg P, only OP that is present in the COMP position can license NPIs. Since Mundari does not have COMP in comparative sentences, therefore, the sentence is treated as ungrammatical.

As we can observe in SOV languages, in comparative sentences NPIs either becomes universal quantifier or free choice item. For example, consider the case of Hindi:

eg.  rām sab -se lamba hE
(23)  
  (b) Ram any with tall be

‘Ram is taller than all’.

(c)*  rām kisi-se-vii lamba hE
  
  Ram any with-emp tall be

‘Ram is taller than anyone’.

Similarly in Mundari too NPI is turned into universal quantifier in comparative sentences.

eg.  bāmai clās-ren saben -ko salaŋi -e
(4)  
  Bamai class-in all -pl tall fm

‘Bamai is taller than anyone in the class’.
So, we can say that word order of a language (parameter) plays role in licensing of NPIs.

**F. Wh-word or yes/no questions**

Questions also host COMP. As argued that any sentence which have COMP can license NPIs.

eg. (24). \[[CP [c Has \text{op} [IP anyone comes?]\\]]\\]

Thus we assume that to license NPIs in non-negative context, we need an OP generated at COMP position. For example:

\[
\text{eg.}\quad fā?ā\quad am\quad paiti\quad dai\quad -a(ci)\
\]

\[
\text{anywhere\quad you\quad work\quad can\quad fm(q)}
\]

‘Can you work anywhere?’

\[
\text{eg.}\quad aṅ\quad ta?a-re\quad miTs\quad poisa\quad mina\quad ci\quad ?
\]

\[
\text{I\quad posses\quad one\quad paisa\quad be\quad Q\quad word}
\]

‘Do I have any money?’

Like *English* in *Mundari* too wh-word can license NPIs. Thus, we found that either Neg P or OP at COMP position can license NPIs in *Mundari*.

**G. Role of Parameter in Licensing of NPIs**

Parametric differences also play an important role in licensing NPIs. In a language like *Hindi*, NPIs can be licensed even if it is hierarchically superior to negation at s-structure. Independent evidence show that sentence negation raises to adjoin to IP at LF in Hindi (Mahajan 1990). This proves that a c-commanding licenser can license the NPIs in *Hindi* at LF.
In (27) NPI is higher than its c-commending licenser $nahiiN$ at s-tracture. So, one can clearly maintain the position that NPIs are licensed differently according to word order (parametric variations) of the language. For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eg.} & \quad \text{ME} \quad \text{yahaaN} \quad t_i \quad nahiiN \quad jaantaa \quad kisii-ko_i \quad bhii \\
(27) & \quad \text{I} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{not} \quad \text{know} \quad \text{anyone-Acc} \quad \text{emp}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I do not know anyone here’.

Like Hindi, Mundari too has direction of government from right to left but the licenser of NPIs is higher than the NPIs. So, the role of a parameter or in another word parametric role in licensing of NPIs cannot be ignored. Not all NPIs, which is in the same clause licensed by Neg P (or A’-polarity) operator at s-structures. In such sentences, A’-operator raises to adjoin to IP at LF in SOV Languages that allow structural variation due to morphological reason.

Kumar (2006) has shown that in a tree diagram TP heads the Neg P and the subject will be inside the VP in verb internal subject hypothesis, thus Neg P is in c-commanding position of NPIs.

4. Conclusion

NPIs at subject position are problematic for syntactic analysis for most of the studies. Progovac (1994) has described it differently, she said that at subject position it is governed by the verb, therefore Neg P is not required in c-commanding position. Kumar (2006) has shown that in subject internal verb hypothesis Neg P is higher than the subject, thus c-commanding the NPIs in Hindi. As far as the case of Mundari is
concerned the item coming after the subject (right to the subject) is carrying subject agreement. Even Neg P is carrying subject agreement particle. Therefore, in Mundari Syntax Agr S comes just above the Neg P. Sometimes, Agr S may come in the end of the sentence. Thus the syntactic analysis done on Hindi does not work for Mundari due to morphological reason.

On the other hand in Mundari, bano ‘without’ can license NPIs, as it has shown in sentence (13). In my view, both Syntax and Semantics is required to capture or illustrate the licensing of NPIs in Mundari. As has been noted by Chierchia (Chierchia 1990) that NPIs can be licensed in monotonically decreasing value. Other important point to be mentioned that there is no distinction of strong and weak NPIs in Mundari like Hindi and some other languages that allow NPIs to occur without its licensor.

Notes

2. Grierson in Linguistic Survey of India volume four mentioned that in Kherwarian there are two languages, namely Santhali and Mundari. Ho & Bhumi are close dialect of Mundari.

3. In Linguistic Survey of India, Grierson (1906) called it categorical. Osada (1992) in his Reference Grammar of Mundari, called it declarative marker, but in my view, it is a finite marker. A categorical is not clear to me, but it cannot be a declarative marker, as it occurs with negative sentences too.
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Abstract

The aim of this paper is to show the conditions of agreement marking in Mundari, an Austro-Asiatic language. Pronominal clitic is suffixed as an agreement marker either in the verb or in the preverbal word. The agreement morpheme allows Subject, Object or both to be dropped. There is no inflectional agreement marker in Mundari. The agglutinating nature of the morpheme makes Munda languages in general and Mundari in particular, morphologically very rich. Negation too, can host agreement clitic. The function of these clitic is two fold; one is to carry the load of the NP and another is to allow that NP to be dropped.

Abbreviations:

pres = present tense                  emp = Emphatic                  poss = possesive
PP = post positions                   +tr = Transitive                 Dat = dative case
1sg= First person singular            -tr = Intransitive                 Neg = Negative
2sg = Second person                  fm = Finite marker                 Infl. = Inflection
      singular                         prog = Progressive,               pst = past tense
3pl = Third person plural            pl = plural

1. Introduction

Mundari language is very rich in agreement. It shows that lexical case marking blocks the agreement between the NP and the verb. However, according to Subbarao (2001), a noun phrase whether lexically case marked or not, agrees with the verb if the
functional head agreement is “active”. Agreement is not morphologically manifested and is “covert” if the functional head agreement is “weak”.

This paper is an attempt to define the term Agreement and it deals with the types of agreement with subject, object and possessor of an object in Mundari. This paper also discusses the pro-drop parameter to show that there are languages such as Mundari in particular and North-Munda languages in general, where the first constituent (subject) agrees with the object or if there is no object at all, and then it agrees with the verb. A subject may or may not be overtly realised.

2. Definition of Agreement

Many attempts have been made to define the term “Agreement”. According to Crystal’s first dictionary of linguistics and phonetics (1995:13), agreement is “the formal relationship between elements whereby a form of one word requires a corresponding form of another”. Steel (1978:610) also defines agreement as “the term agreement commonly refers to some systematic covariance between a semantic or formal property of one element and a formal property of another, for example, adjectives may take some formal indication of the number and gender of the noun they modify”. Other such as Keenan (1978), Lehman (1982) and Haegeman (1994) have also tried to define the term “Agreement”. Haegeman (1994) defines agreement as “a formal requirement for indicating specific syntactic properties between constituents”. She also states that “agreement” plays a major role in “Binding and Case Theory”, which are components of Government and Binding Framework proposed by Chomsky (1981).

All definitions, in fact, focus on one important point, that is, the covariance of matching of features between separate elements, such as a subject NP and a Verb, or a Noun and an Adjective. The term “Concord” has been used as synonymous with agreement, with no clear distinction between the two. Nevertheless, it seems that in recent generative linguistics, “Agreement” has resurfaced with a new range of applicability.

In the 1990s, agreement has become the focal point of study. Linguists have proposed different ways of examining “agreement” with a keen interest to find out the
universal principles, which govern agreement patterns with reference to parametric variations. More recently agreement became the focal point in *Minimalist Program*. Chomsky (1981) treats agreement with superscripts in part because it fails to serve as an antecedent for the Binding Theory. Chomsky (1995a) has explored the idea that functional categories C and I are regular in terms of X-bar theory and constitute heads of phrases. The subject NP emerges from this analysis as the specifier of IP. Koopman (1987) posits that all agreement relations are SPEC-HEAD agreement. This proposal certainly makes sense for subject-verb agreement.

3. Subject-Verb Agreement

The Agreement is overtly realized between an NP and V, and the most frequent pattern of this type is Subject-Verb agreement. The verb changes its form according to number, gender and person presented in the Subject. Some of these features may not be exhibited in all languages. In *Mundari* also there are no such morphological modifications, but since *Mundari* is an agglutinating language, its agreement feature occurs as a suffix to the verbal root, though the place of occurrence of agreement is not fixed. There are also languages, where agreement is realized even in the absence of a lexically realized subject. These are pro-drop languages.

1.

aň  uli- ŋ  jom- ke- d- a

I mango 1sg eat pst +tr fm

‘I ate a mango’.

In the above sentence subject pronoun is *aň*. The object NP *uli* agrees with the subject NP and the subject pronominal clitic –ŋ occurs to the right of the object NP *uli*.

2.

pro,  uli- ŋ,  jom- ke- d- a

mango 1sg eat pst +tr fm
The subject can be pro-dropped as in (2)

Some further examples of subject pro-drops are given below.

3.

\[(am), \ mādī- \ m, \ jom- \ ke- \ d- \ a\]

you meal 2sg eat pst pst fm

‘You have eaten meals’/ ‘You ate meals’

4.

\[(ini), \ lad- \ ai, \ jom- \ a\]

he bread 3sg eat fm

‘He eats bread.’

5.

\[(inku), \ lad- \ ko, \ jom- \ ye- \ a\]

they bread pl eat pst fm

‘They eat bread.’

6. \[(ako), \ kām- \ ko, \ nām \ ke \ -d \ -a\]

they work 3pl get pst +tr fm

‘They got a job.’

In sentences (3) - (6), subject pronouns can be dropped; because of the subject agreement marker is coded on the object NP. For example, in sentence (6), ako ‘they’, an NP, is
subject of the sentence and it can be dropped, because of the agreement markers presence with object NP *kām*.

4. Person Agreement and Honorific Agreement

Both Lyons (1968:725) and Crystal (1997:256) define person as a category that has to be defined with reference to participant-roles for which there is usually a three-way contrast, i.e., the first person (the speaker), the second person (the listener) and the third person (who is being referred to). There is also a fact about person plural agreement that some languages might have. There is a distinction of inclusive or exclusive pronoun, where inclusive means that the hearer is included and exclusive, excludes the hearer. Some other languages have different forms of pronouns for honorific and non-honorific persons. *Mundari* is a good case in point.

7.

ako, laD -ko, jom -ye -a

they bread pl eat pst fm

‘They eat bread.’

In sentence (7), *ako* is third person non-honorific plural pronoun and it agrees with the verb. In sentence (5), we have *in ku*, which is honorific third person plural pronoun. Thus there is distinction in pronouns in third person plural, but there is no difference in agreement marker. Even in third person singular pronouns we have a distinction in *Mundari*. For example:

8.

ini(NH) seno -ja -n -a

he go pst -tr fm

‘He had gone’.
9.

in-kin(H) seno ja -n -a

he go pst -tr fm

‘He had gone.’

In example (8) ini is non-honorific in Mundari, but in-kin has also been used as an honorific marker along with of dual marker. However, the verb does not exhibit any agreement. In Maithili honorificity plays a major role in agreement [for details see (Singh 1979)].

In Mundari there also exists an exclusive and inclusive distinction in first person pronouns. In sentence (10) ale is inclusive pronoun and in sentence (11) abe is exclusive pronoun of first person plural. For example:

10.

ale aň -mente vōta -ke -d -a

we I for vote pst +tr fm

(inclu) ‘*We voted for me.’ (Literal meaning)

11.

abe aň -le sālā -kii -a

we I to elect pst fm

(exclu) ‘We elected me’. (Literal meaning)

5. Number Agreement

Agreement with the number corresponds to the number of real entities, which are referred to in a sentence by an agreement marker. Mundari is a language, which has singular, dual and plural number system. As we have shown above there are separate
agreement markers for each pronoun. We have given details of pronouns and their agreement suffixes in the chapter on Anaphors in *Mundari* in Choudhary (2005).

### 6. Gender Agreement

In this type of agreement, the verb agrees with the gender of the subject NP. There is no gender agreement in *Mundari*. *Mundari* is not a gender sensitive language like *Hindi*. For example:

12. 

rām ini -e hinsatiai -tan -a

Ram he poss criticise pres fm

‘Ram criticises him’

13. 

sītā ini -e hinsatiai -tan -a

Sita he poss criticise pres fm

‘Sita criticises him’

14. 

ini sita -ke hinsatiai -tan -a

he Sita Acc criticise pres fm

‘He criticises Sita.’

Hence, we can say that there is no gender agreement in *Mundari*.

### 7. Subject-verb agreement in [-transitive] verbs

In *Mundari*, if the verb is [-transitive] it carries subject agreement provided there is no other constituent. For example:
8. Subject-Verb agreement in [+transitive] verbs

According to Chomsky (1995) in the Nominative-Accusative type of languages with a transitive verb, the AGRs (the subject verb agreement) is “active” in which the subject of a [+transitive] verb agrees with the functional head AGRs of the INFL. Consider (16) from Mundari.

16.

kovāi -hon kitāb -aii paRāw -tan -a
boy man book 3sg read pres fm

‘A boy reads a book’.

17.

inii laDj -aii jom -a
he bread 3sg eat fm

‘He eats bread.’

In sentences (16) and (17), subject controls the agreement. Hence we can drop subject, but we cannot drop object. Since objects are not only carrying subject agreement markers, but also there is no object agreement in the verb. The object is in the third person.

9. Dative subject construction in relation to agreement
It is a common phenomenon in most of the Indo-Aryan languages that predicates expressing psychological feeling: possession and duty etc. mark their subject with a dative or genitive case marker. In a set of languages of South-Asia verb agrees with the object. The manifestation of subject agreement is blocked in such cases and the dative marker on the indirect object of a di-transitive verb in perfective aspect along with the presence of an ergative marker on the subject necessitates the verb to agree with its direct object in languages such as Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi etc. In Mundari, however there is no ergative marker. The subject agreement marker does not occur on the Io if it is case marked dative.

18.

rām sītā -ke kitāb umā -jan -a

Ram Sita Dat book give pst fm

‘Ram gave a book to Sita.’

19.

añ am -ke miad’ uli uma -le -d -a

I you Dat one mango give pst +tr fm

‘I gave a mango to you.’

In sentences (18) and (19), there is no subject agreement either on subject or on verb, because of the presence of the lexical case marker on the object, which blocks agreement with the verb. In Mundari there are some sentences, which exhibit agreement when an NP is lexically case-marked.

10. Object-Verb Agreement

In Mundari subject agreement marker generally occurs to the right of the preverbal word and object agreement marker occurs either to the left of the tense marker or to the right of the tense marker.
11. Agreement in Small Clause and ECM constructions

Radford (1998) has defined Small Clause as a clause which neither has finite verb nor an infinitival too. It is usually abbreviated as SC and its structure can be elaborated as “NP
XP / XP NP” where XP can be AP or NP etc. Let us see the agreements in such cases in Mundari.

24.

aň atkarain -min -a [aň sugrā]

I believe be fm I good

‘[I believe [myself to be good]]’

25.

ini [āyā-ge-āyā sugarā] atkarain ke -d -a

he he-emp-he good believe pst +tr fm

‘He believed [himself to be smart]’

In sentences (24) and (25), there is no agreement marker either on matrix verb or embedded verb.

12. Adjective Agreement

Adjectives are used in connection with a noun or pronoun to produce a description about the person, thing or group referred to. Adjectives may either be used predicatively or attributively. The adjective “beautiful” in “a beautiful girl” is used attributively because it is placed in front of the noun it qualifies. The same adjective in “the girl is beautiful” is used as predicate because it is placed after a linking verb. Adjectives used in this way are called the complements of the linking verb. In Mundari there is no agreement with adjectives.

26.

en dhaŋrā bugin -min -a

that boy good be fm

‘That boy is good’.
27.

bugin  dhaŋrā

good  boy

‘Good boy’.

In sentences (26) and (27), there is no agreement on the NP dhangra and adjective bugin in either case. Hence, there is no adjective agreement in Mundari.

13. Demonstrative Agreement

Demonstratives are generally used to refer to people or things in a definite way. There is no agreement with demonstratives in Mundari as the above (26) illustrates the point.

14. Possessive Agreement

In some languages such as Maithili, Hmar and Kurmali there is a possessor agreement. In Mundari too there is possessor agreement as in example (28) and (29) below:

28.

sōmā (amā)  tīyī  ābuŋ  -ke  -d  -m  -a

Soma  your  hand  wash  pst  +tr  2sg  fm

‘Soma washed your hands.’

29.

sōmā (aňā)  tīyī  abuŋ  ki  -di-a-ň.

Soma  my  hand  wash  pst  +tr-fm-1sg.

‘Soma washed my hands’.

Maithili.

30.
sītā hamī-ar hāth dho -l -akī
Sita I gen hand wash pst 1sg

‘Sita washed my hands’.

In (30), verb agrees with the possessor hamar, thus we have an example of possessive agreement in Maithili.

15. Long-Distance Agreement

There are instances of long distance agreement in some South-Asian languages such as Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Maithili, Mizo, Hmar and Telugu (Subbarao). Let us consider the case of Mundari.

31.

sōmā ituan -tan -a [S₂ cilkā sāikal -ko haraya -e]
Soma know pres fm how bicycle Acc drive 3sg

‘Soma knows [how to ride a bicycle.]’

32.

sōmā sanaŋ -tan -a [S₂ am gupuī -im -e]
Soma wants pres fm you fight 2sg 3sg

‘Soma wants [you to fight.]’ (Literally: Soma wants that I you fight)

33.

sōmā sanaŋ -tan -a [S₂ aŋ čiTī -ŋ ol -e]
Soma want pres fm I letter 1sg write 3sg

‘Soma wants [me to write a letter.]’ (Literally Soma wants that I write a letter)

In sentences (31) - (33), we have evidence of long distance agreement. Soma is in 3rd person and it is the matrix subject. The third person agreement marker -e occurs with embedded verb. Hence, we can say that Mundari too has long-distance agreement.
16. Agreement in Relative clauses

*Mundari* has a relative-correlative construction as well as externally headed relative clauses such as in English. It has no internally headed relative clause.

34.

\[
\text{en uli } [S_2 \text{okona aṅā gāṭī jom -ke -d -a}]
\]

that mango which my friend eat pst +tr fm

\[
\text{ena soyā -ka -n -a}
\]

that useless pst -tr fm

‘[That mango [which my friend had eaten] was useless.]’

35.

\[
\text{en tebal maraŋ- gi a } [S_2 \text{okonā- re am jom- am}]
\]

that table big emp fm which on you eat 2sg

\[
\text{doho liy- a]}
\]

keep pst fm

‘The table [on which you have kept the food] is big.’

In sentence (34), we have a relative-correlative construction and in (35), the embedded relative occurs to the right of the matrix VP just as in English construction. The difference between the two is also found in its agreement. In (35), we have the second person agreement marker –*am* in the preverbal constituent of the embedded sentence, whereas there is no agreement marker in (34).
17. Agreement and the role of [± Animate]

*Mundari* is very much sensitive with regard to the feature [±Animate]. The inanimate NP has the object agreement marker –e/-i in the verb in [-past] tense. The 3\textsuperscript{rd} plural marker –ko is used as an agreement marker with inanimate plural nouns.

36.

\[
\text{pro uri iñ kumbu i tan a}
\]

\[
\text{cow 1sg steal 3sg pres fm}
\]

‘I steal the cow’.

37.

\[
\text{āye am a setā ko i tām ki? ko e}
\]

\[
\text{he you poss dog pl 3sg hit pst pl 3sg}
\]

‘He hit your dogs’.

When tense is [-past], [+animate] direct object agreement marker occurs to the left of the tense marker as in (36), but when tense is [+past] DO agreement appear after the tense marker. We find the same distinction with regard to [±human]. The occurrence of subject agreement marker to the right of the subject depends on the feature [±human]. However, in DO agreement cases, there is no distinction between the two as shown in example (37) above.

18. Agreement in di-transitive verbs

Example (38), below exhibits marked order, where IO occurs initially. Native speaker prefer this order than to the unmarked order.
38.

aň -mente am kuRi -ko₂ -m kul ked -ko₁ -a

I for you girl pl 2sg send pst pl fm

‘You sent girls to me’.

39.

aň am -ke mĩad uli uma -led -a

I you Dat one mango give pst fm

‘I had given a mango to you’.

Thus in example (38), subject is scrambled to the right of the Indirect-Object (IO). In (38), the IO, is lexically case marked and hence, cannot trigger any agreement. However, subject and the Direct-Object (DO) can trigger agreement in the verb as in (38).

19. Agreement Hierarchy

Direct object and Indirect object agreement cannot occur together in Mundari. There seems to be a grammatical hierarchy in agreement among the subject, direct object and indirect object.

Sub Agr>IO Agr> DO Agr

40.

am aňā -nātin kuRi -ko -m kul -led -ko -a

you me for girl pl 2sg send pst pl fm

‘You sent girls to me.’
41.
ram inī -tā?re banduk -e jōgāw -ke -d a
Ram he near gun 3sg put pst +tr fm
‘Ram put the gun near him.’

42.
apui am -ke aña -lāgīd umād -mi -a
my father you Acc me for give 2sg fm
‘My father gave me to you.’

If the IO is lexically case marked, it cannot occur as an agreement marker anywhere in the sentence. Hence, only the subject agreement marker and DO agreement marker can occur as in example (40). In example (41), only subject agreement marker can occur and in (42), only IO agreement marker occurs with the verb even though IO is lexically case-marked.

20. Conclusion

Mundari is a nominative/accusative type of language in terms of verb agreement. The verb obligatorily agrees with the subject NP in terms of person and number. The subject is marked by the clitic pronominal in the verb phrase which is freely standing after the verb or with the word preceding it. The pronominal have the same shape as personal pronouns, except that the third person is marked by -e, -kin and -ko respectively in the singular, dual and plural; when an animate noun stands as the subject NP, it agrees with the verb by its clitic form.

The marking of pronominal object plays an important role in Mundari. The animate objects are marked in the verb in the form of infixed clitic pronominal. Direct object marked by clitic pronominal in infixed form; and the indirect, marked by an applicative.

The Mundari language developed a strict distribution of position to distinguish between Subject and Object suffixes, and in this way managed to use the suffixes for both Subject
and Object. The syntactic function and position of these person affixes is not constant throughout the Munda family. Basically, the function and position of these person affixes differs strongly throughout the Munda family. As far as the function is concerned, the suffixes either mark for Subject or for Object (or for both). As far the position, the suffixes either occur suffixes to the main predicate or to the immediately preverbal word. Lexical case marker blocks the agreement as it is shown in example (39) above but not in (42). It is not constant throughout the Mundari language.

Notes

2. In Government and Binding Theory, developed by Chomsky (1981), Binding and Case theory are two modules of the six theory discussed.
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