

On the typology of TAM systems in the Munda languages

Munda languages have much to offer to our understanding of TAM systems. In this paper we cover several topics of wider interest that various Munda languages exhibit. We focus on three main topics: i) the variable treatment of TAM when under negative scope ii) including differences in the semantics of TAM markers between complex and simplex predicates; iii) the complex interaction between voice and valence and TAM selection and the related phenomena that TAM marking can shift the lexical meaning of specific stems, in other words an otherwise inflectional element can perform derivational/lexical functions. For example, with respect to the first two points, in various Munda languages specific TAM markers are incompatible with negative scope operators (1) or change their meaning when under negative scope (2). Certain Munda languages also show differences in the meaning of individual TAM markers in simplex and complex predicates under negation (3) or flip the indexing of TAM between lexical and auxiliary verbs. In addition, re: topic iii), several Munda languages have voice-or valence specific TAM specification such that active or transitive verbs require one set while middle or intransitive ones require a different set (4). Related to this is the complex system of TAM marking seen in different Kherwarian languages such as Mundari, Ho or Santali. On the one hand, taking a functional perspective, the same function may be encoded by unrelated TAM forms depending on whether the verb stem is specified as, or to be interpreted as, active/transitive or inactive/middle (5) and on the other hand, selection of a particular TAM marking may change the lexical meaning of the stem (6). All data come from authors' field notes unless indicated.

References

Anderson, G. D. S. and K. D. Harrison. Remo. In G. Anderson (ed) *The Munda Languages*. London: Routledge (Taylor & Francis). 557-632.
 Neukom, Lukas. 2000. *Santali*. München: LINCOM.

(1) i. Sora NPST

jen gaga-na-n	jaŋ-t-ai	oŋe	əʔ-jaŋ-ai
I ~eat-ITR/MDL-N.SFX	get-NPST-1ACT	or	NEG-get-1ACT

“‘will I get something to eat or will I not?’”

ii. Plains Gta? FUT

n-tʃoŋ=e	n-a-tʃoŋ
1-eat-FUT	1-NEG-eat
‘I will eat’	‘I won't eat’

ii. Hill Gta? FUT

kine	hãwe	a-na	m-bi?=we	kine	hãwe	a-na	n-a-bi?
this	bow	OBJ-you	1-give-FUT	this	bow	OBJ-you	1-NEG-give
‘I will give you this bow’				‘I will not give you this bow’			

(2) i. Gutob

ser-gu	ar-ser-gu	ser-to	ar-ser-to
sing-PST.ITR/MDL	NEG-sing-PHB	sing-NPST.ITR/MDL	NEG-sing-NEG.PST.ITR/MDL
‘sang’	‘don’t sing!’	‘sings’	‘didn’t sing’

ii. Hill Gta?

na-basoŋ=gɛ	na-á=basoŋ=gɛ	sela santa we=tə	gubug a-goi?=tə
2-tell-PST	2-NEG-tell-PHB	girl market go=PRS	pig NEG-die-NEG.PST

‘you have told (me)’ ‘don’t tell (me)!’ ‘the girl goes to the market’ ‘the pig didn’t die’

(3) i. Hill Gta?

ho(?)=barsoŋ

RCP=speak

‘are speaking to each other’

dij=tə

IPFV=RLS/PRS

ho(?)=barsoŋ

RCP=speak

‘are not speaking to each other’

a-rij=tə

NEG-IPFV=RLS/PRS

ii. Gutob

nij=nu

1SG-GEN

‘I had two houses’

dzorek dien

two

house

du-gu

AUX-PST

nij=nu

1SG-GEN

‘I did not have two houses’

dzorek dien]

two

house

æd-du-gu

NEG-AUX-PST

iii. Juray

gidz-le rabti-t-am

see-CV CAP-NPST-2SG.UND

‘(I) can see you’

rabti a-gidz-am

CAP NEG-see-2SG.UND

‘(I) can’t see you’

(4) Remo (Anderson and Harrison 2008)

PST

ITR/MDL

-gɪ

TR/ACT

oʔ

IPFV/NPST

ITR/MDL

-ta

TR/ACT

-to

(5) Ho

seno(?)-ja-n=a=m

go-PRF.ITR-ITR/MDL-IND=2SG.SUBJ

‘you went’

maŋdi dzom-ke-d-a=m

rice eat-PRF.TR-TR/ACT-IND=2SG.SUBJ

‘you ate the rice’

(6) Santali

mərɔm-e

goat-3SG

‘she killed some goats.’ (Neukom, 2001:104)

gɔf-ket-ko-a

kill-PST:ACT-3PL-IND

Turtə-i

Turta-3SG

‘Turta died.’ (Neukom, 2001:104)

gɔf-en-a

die-PST-MID-IND