Gutob

Arlo Griffiths

Gutob

0 Introduction

Gutob (Gad[a]ba) is a South Munda language spoken in Orissa and Andhra Pradesh (and among migrant workers in northern West-Bengal and Assam), by an unknown but probably rather limited number of speakers.*

0.1 Name of the Language

The name of the language, Gutob, as used by its speakers when speaking it, is identical with their self-designation as a social group (*pace* Parkin 1991: 31), and may be cognate with the ethnonym and language name Gtaʔ (chapter **???**).[1] To my knowledge, Ramamurti

---

[1]Although the meaning of the name appears to be no longer transparent to the speakers who use it, it can be understood as a compound *gu-tob* 'creature of the earth', with *gV-* (see §2.10.2) prefixed to *tob*, presumably a combining form

(1938) was the first among linguists to refer to this language as 'Gutob'.

Previous work (by Indian authors: Mahānti 1956, Bhaskara Rao 1969, Gauṛa 1991, Subba Rao 1992) has tended to prefer the (Desia) Oriya name 'Gadaba' (/gadba/ ∼ /godba/, ⟨gādabā⟩). This practise seems less appropriate not only on the grounds that it is preferable to employ a community's own name for its language, but also because in this particular case, the name 'Gadaba' is potentially confusing (Parkin 1991: 31): it has been used in the literature (Burrow & Bhattacharya 1962–63, Bhaskara Rao 1980, Bhaskara Rao 1998) also to refer to an unrelated Dravidian language spoken by a community called Ollar in Koraput. In view of the likely Munda etymology of the name Gutob, application of the term 'Gadaba' — which to all appearances is derived from the former — to this Dravidian language and its speakers would appear to be secondary. According to Bhattacharya (1956: 2), the word 'Ollar' "is usually [?] derived from the Gadba (*i.e.* Gutob) word *ola* [/olag/ AG], meaning 'leaf', and this derivation which may be taken to be an example of the linguistic phenomenon called 'folk etymology',[2] is associated with a belief that Ollar women previously used to put on leaves instead of clothes". Burrow & Bhattacharya (1962–63: 46)

(see §2.10.4) of *tubog* 'earth' (cf. *tom* in *guj-tom* 'to wash the face' :: *tumog* 'face'). The combining form *tob* also appears to be found in *toʔḍur* 'white ant', whose Remo cognate (cf. Bhattacharya 1968 #1497) is *tobḍur*, and in Kharia *tobḍaʔ* 'mud' = 'earth-water'. Hence, the meaning of *gu-tob* in this analysis exactly parallels the meaning of Desia *maṭia* 'earth-people', an important self-defining concept of Gutob-Gadba society discussed by Peter Berger (2007: 100, 105f.). On these grounds, I strongly prefer the given etymology above derivation from the word for 'egg' (*utob*), as proposed to me by Norman Zide (personal communication, with reference to origin myths among speakers of North Munda languages). For a derivation from a word for 'stream, river', see Ramadas 1931.

[2]The frequently quoted association of the name Gad(a)ba with the Godāvarī river (e.g. Parkin 1991: 31, Berger 2007a: 183–189) seems likely to be another such case. Considering the etymological explanation of the name Gutob given above (n. 1), and the likelihood of folk-etymological speculations on a name no-longer understood, the historical value of indigenous traditions on the Gutob-Gadbas' having come 'originally' from the Godāvarī river is not to be overestimated.

add: "The name used by the [Dravidian speaking] Gadbas near Salur of themselves is Koṇḍekor, which means 'mountaineers'."

0.2 Speakers of the Language

Members of the numerous other communities (Berger 2002) sharing the living space of the speakers of Gutob (hereafter: the Gutob-Gadbas) refer indiscriminately to them and speakers of Ollari as 'Gadbas'. Even though there are no practical restrictions on inter-marriage (Berger 2002: 70, n. 13, *pace* Pfeffer 2001a: 104), there is an ideal of endogamy, and the two groups are clearly separate, inhabiting different villages. While the latter group has been described ethnographically by Thusu & Jha (1972), information on the Gutob-Gadbas remained scattered (e.g. von Fürer-Haimendorf 1943, Izikowitz 1969) until the German ethnologist Georg Pfeffer started a series of field trips in the 1980s, resulting in a number of important publications (1991, 1997, 1999, 2001a, 2001b). His student Peter Berger has spent 21 months doing ethnographic fieldwork among the Gutob-Gadbas from 1999 to 2001: with the publication of Berger's PhD thesis on their ritual and society (2004, published 2007), along with his previously published works, a relative abundance of ethnographic information is now available.

The only drawback (from our point of view) of the ethnographic work to date, notably that of Pfeffer and Berger, is that it has relied indirectly, via interpreters (Pfeffer), or directly (Berger) on the Desia language for collection of ethnographic data in general, and in particular for information on oral traditions. Berger makes some important socio-linguistic remarks (2007a: 24, n. 18): "im Bereich der Rituale (z.B. der Invokationen) ist das Desia die dominante Sprache (was bereits von Fürer-Haimendorf in Bezug auf den Bondo [the speakers of Remo, A.G.] bemerkte, 1943b: 168, Fn. 1)". Although invocations of gods, spirits, and demons are only rarely done in Gutob, preliminary investigations by myself, partly undertaken in fruitful cooperation with Berger, have revealed rather extensive oral literature (stories, songs) in Gutob, especially among the older generations. In everyday situations, all but the youngest

generation still appears comfortable with this language, but the number of children who no longer learn Gutob (whether as second language or at all) seems to be increasing rapidly.

Bilingualism in the local lingua franca, the Desia dialect of Oriya (Gustafsson 1973a/b, Dasgupta & Bhattacharya 1975, Mahapatra 1985, Gustafsson 1989) is universal among the Gutob-Gadbas, as among all the local 'tribal' and 'scheduled-caste' communities (Pfeffer 2001b: 779). The primary direction of language-shift is, and presumably has been for a considerable amount of time, towards Desia, while those (mostly male) members of the younger generations who have enjoyed some level of education have also come in contact with the language of schooling, which is standard Oriya.[3]

0.3   Location of Speakers

Speakers of Gutob inhabit villages scattered over the Southern parts of Orissa and the adjoining Northern districts of Andhra Pradesh. The highest concentration of Gutob-Gadbas is — according to the 1995 redrawing of Orissa District boundaries — found in the Lamtaput block of Koraput District. This appears to be the core area of Gutob-Gadba settlement. From this core area, speakers of the language appear in recent centuries to have migrated to the plains of Andhra Pradesh (Patnaik 1992: 4f., also Burrow & Bhattacharya 1962–63: 46), and also to Rayagada District, where anthropologist Roland Hardenberg and I have seen them living amidst the Kondhs in a village near the market place Majiguda, not far from Kalyansinghpur.

---

[3]Telugu is the dominant among the Gutob-Gadabas who have descended into the plains of Andhra Pradesh. Sarma (2001: 9) remarks about the use of Gutob in this habitat: "neither the older generation speak it among themselves, nor do they make use of it with the younger generation, making the language progressively defunct." See §0.3.

0.4   Number of speakers

Due to the confusion about whom the name 'Gadaba' refers to (§0.1–0.2, see also Thusu & Jha 1972: 1ff.), it is nearly impossible to get reliable data on the number of speakers. The 1961 census, according to Manoharan (2001) the most reliable census to date for linguistic-demographic data, clearly states: "Though lately work on a section of Gadaba has been reported to have revealed Dravidian affiliations yet for want of a comprehensive work on Gadaba language, it has been decided ... to conform to the Linguistic Survey of India Classification. Gadaba has therefore been included here in the Munda Branch of the Austro-Asiatic Sub-Family" (Mitra 1964: clxxxi). This means that its figure of 40,193 'Gadaba' speakers conflates (at least) two entirely unrelated languages. According to Manoharan (2001: 129), the most recent available Census (1991), lists ca. 28,000 'Gadaba' speakers, again conflating (at least) two linguistic communities.

There are no data on the relative strengths of the Gutob- and Ollar-Gadba populations, nor — more importantly — on the level of retention of the native languages among these two communities, as opposed to a switch towards Desia Oriya, or Telugu in Andhra Pradesh. Basing myself on the above figures, and on my impression (developed during an extensive field trip through large tracts of the southern part of Koraput District) that Ollar-Gadbas are relatively more numerous than Gutob-Gadbas, I had come to the estimate that there are ca. 10,000–15,000 speakers of Gutob.[4] But after these words had been written, the following even more pessimistic estimate came to my attention (Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 1f.):

> Gadabas are concentrated mainly in the Koraput District of Orissa. The total population of all Gadaba in Orissa is 56,911

---

[4]In a personal communication (27 August 2002), Peter Berger confirmed this estimate: "The Ollar are definitely much more numerous than the Gutob. The latter inhabit only a small stretch from Deptahanjar to Ongel, Onmail, Kangrapada etc. To the South are the Parenga, to the North the Ollar. I have not yet tried to make an estimate from my village surveys, but if we say there are 50 Gutob villages (probably there are less) in the Lamptaput/Onukadilli area with an average of 200–300 people you get your numbers."

according to the 1981 census of India. The recent survey of
the Asha Kiran Society (1998) puts Gutob as 5,000. This low
number is because of two major hydroelectric power projects in
the district. As a result of these hydroelectric projects many
Gadaba people were evacuated and resettled at different places
in Koraput. Thus they became a minority, and the gradualy
shifted to the Indo-Aryan Desia language. Only forty villages
in Lamtaput still maintain their Gutob-Gadaba language.[5]

0.5   Classification/Taxonomic Issues

Gutob's nearest relative is Remo, spoken in the immediate vicinity
of the core Gutob area by the Bonda or Remo tribe (see chapter
???): the similarities with Remo in every field of grammar are great.
In fact, Bhattacharya (1968: xxx) affirms: "In the beginning we were
of the view that Gutob and Bonda [= Remo] are two dialects of the
same language. But we were convinced later that they are different
enough to be treated as two languages". Bhattacharya's judgment
has found general acceptance among linguists. On the relation-
ships of Gutob further afield in the Munda language family, see
now Anderson 2001, who emphasizes some previously unrecognized
grammatical similarities with Kharia (chapter ???).

---

[5]It is not entirely clear how one is to bring this estimate in line with the
following statement, published by the same authors earlier in the same year
(2001a: 9 — quotation exactly as printed):

> According to the 1981 census of India, the total Gadaba population is
> 56,913 in undivided Koraput district (Malkangiri, Rayagada, Koraput and
> Nowrangpur) Orissa. It is inclusive of Ollar Gadabas and Gotop Gadabas.
> In 1995 a Socio – linguistic survey done by Asha Kiran Society puts the
> number of speakers of Gutop – Gadaba in undivided Koraput Orissa, at
> 15,000 – 20,000. Majority og Gutop Gadabsas live in Lamtaput block of
> Koraput District.

Without indication of any source, the most recent (15th) edition of the *Ethno-
logue* (<www.ethnologue.com/show_language.asp?code=gbj>, accessed 4
May 2007) mentions 8,000 speakers, for the year 2000.

0.6 Known Dialect Divisions

It can be stated with some confidence that at least two dialects of Gutob exist: I shall call these 'Koraput Gutob' and 'Andhra Gutob', and shall assume the former to represent a 'standard' form of the language. Some phonological differences *within* Koraput Gutob (/boɖoŋ/ :: /buɖoŋ/ 'with', /uigi/ :: /uizi/ 'went', /uiloŋ/ :: /iloŋ/ 'will go', /oʔn/ :: /oʔon/ 'child') may with further research turn out to correspond with a two (or three) way division of the core area of Gutob in Koraput: East of the Kolab reservoir (villages Tikrapada, Deptahanjar), West of the Kolab reservoir (Kangrapada, Guneipada, Jalahanjar, Pipalput, Alangpada, Raipada etc.). Perhaps dialectically distinguishable from the previous two is the somewhat removed Onkadili area (Gadbapada), not yet — to my knowledge — visited by any linguist interested in Gutob.[6]

The level of mutual intelligibility of Andhra Gutob with Koraput Gutob is uncertain. The Andhra dialect differs from the latter in phonology (see Bhaskara Rao 1969), having undergone strong influence from the locally dominant Dravidian language Telugu. Data on other fields of grammar are much less reliable, being available only in the linguistically somewhat naive study by Subba Rao (1992). Differences with Koraput Gutob are especially striking in the lexicon, where besides influence from Telugu, one notices conservatism e.g. in the retention of native numerals. Evidence, below this last stratum of loan vocabulary, for a layer of Indo-Aryan (presumably Desia Oriya) loans, notably "/lokune:n/" 'people' (Subba Rao 1992: 19), confirms the assumption made on non-linguistic grounds that the Gutob-Gadbas in Andhra Pradesh form an offshoot from the core habitat in Koraput.

---

[6]Rajan & Rajan (2001b: 5), speak of four dialects within their 'Gutob-Gadaba', i.e. our 'Koraput Gutob': Kinda Raji, Lamtaput dialect, Koraput dialect and Birong Raji. I do not know the meaning of the word *raji* (presumably not Desia *raji* 'agreement'), nor whether the division into *kinɖaʔ* 'river' and *biroŋ* 'jungle' dialects corresponds to an indigenous classification. The data for the Rajan & Rajan 'write-up' "was collected from the Kinda Raji dialect spoken by the people of Tikkorpoda Panchayat, Lamtaput Block, Koraput District, Orissa." Cf. also Zide 1965: 49 n. 13.

Whether the language of Gutob-Gadbas in other areas, such as Rayagada District, belongs dialectally with one of the above groups, or whether one or more additional dialect groups exist, remains an open question.

0.7 Literary Status

No indigenous written literature exists. Virtually none of the Gutob-Gadbas in Orissa are literate. With attitudes toward the value of education, especially of women, being rather negative among the Gutob-Gadbas, and with the actual educational facilities offered by the State government being extremely poor, only few have pursued their educational career long enough to have learnt the written form of Oriya and its script. According to the *Ethnologue*, the 'literacy rate in second language', i.e. (standard) Oriya, perhaps more properly called 'third language', was 6.53% in 1977. Oriya script would lend itself well for rendering Gutob, with the exception of the glottal stop /ʔ/, for which the Oriya 'visarga' sign ⟨ḥ⟩ might be adopted. For previous attempts to render Gutob in Oriya script, see Mahānti (1956), Gauṛa (1991) and the *Gutob-Gadaba Language Learner's Guide* published by the Asha Kiran Society in 2001.[7]

0.8 History of Research, Prospects

Although the existence of the language has been known since the middle of the nineteenth century, and although this was along with Sora the only Munda language of Southern Orissa to be included in the *Linguistic Survey of India* (Konow 1906: 229–238),[8] Gutob is still a relatively poorly known language. The small booklet in Oriya by Mahānti (1956) gives some idea of the nominal and verbal

---

[7]See n. 9 below.

[8]Cf. the comment by Zide (1978: 50): "Note the (previously recognized) confusion between Gorum (Parengi) and Gutob in the LSI. The numerals given in the lexical tables at the back of the Munda Section of Vol. IV include under Gadba (Bastar) what are Gadba (Gutob) forms. In parentheses following these are Gorum (Parengi) forms which are called Gadba (Vizagapatam)."

morphology, and some classified lexical data, but is presented in an inconsistent and imprecise Oriya transcription. The work by Gauṛa (1991) was done with the collaboration of one native speaker and — as is clear from their name Khemdu (the name of the Bear clan, which has no members among the Gutob-Gadbas) — two non-native speakers. Although it is basically written in Oriya, it has the advantage (for linguists not conversant with Oriya) of using both IPA and Oriya transcriptions, but does not distinguish native and borrowed morphology, and especially phonology/lexicon. The work contains a small collection of texts (in Oriya script only).

The most serious work has been done from the 1960s onwards under the auspices of the Chicago *Munda Languages Project.* This has resulted in quite extensive typed text-collections (Zide & Das 1965, DeArmond 196?), regrettably without a (good) translation or grammatical analysis. These texts have been kindly put at my disposal for use in this chapter by Zide and DeArmond. Besides these texts, there are numerous grammatical, and especially comparative studies by Zide and his students (e.g. DeArmond nḍ., 1976), which however give little insight into the overall grammatical system of the language, and its lexicon. The same problem holds true for the comparative studies by Bhattacharya (1975), relying on his own field-data for Gutob.

Sarma (2001) presents some socio-linguistic information on the Andhra Pradesh Gutob-Gadbas. A Tamil couple of the local (Christian) Asha Kiran Society, just south of Lamptaput, Jamuna and Herold Rajan, have been working in the Lamptaput area since 1996; Peter Berger kindly provided me with their publications 2001a and 2001b.[9]

In the following, I refer to my database — work in progress — which has taken as its starting point the texts recorded and

---

[9]The publisher's address is Asha Kiran Society, Lamtaput – 764 081, Koraput, Orissa, India. Along with these publications aimed at a linguistic audience, a "Gutob – Gadaba Language Learner's Guide" has also been published, with basic sentences in Gutob (in Oriya script and romanization), in Oriya, and in English. Further language learning materials published later by the same society were brought to my attention by Felix Rau in 2005, but I have not yet found time to go through them attentively.

transcribed by Norman Zide and Richard DeArmond for the mentioned *Munda Languages Project* at the University of Chicago in the 1960s.[10] References with the structure "4.5" refer to Zide's texts, and those with the structure "C.5" to DeArmond's. I hereby gratefully acknowledge both scholars' generosity in placing their material at my disposal. The data are interpreted here in accordance with my own results reached during three (brief) periods of fieldwork in the village Jalahanjar in 2001, 2002 and 2004. It may be noted that word and morpheme boundaries follow the transcriptions in the Zide and DeArmond texts: no attempt is made to distinguish suffixes, clitics, and postpositions.

1   Phonology

Unfortunately, a clear picture does not emerge from the several publications which have been devoted to Gutob phonology by earlier researchers (Zide 1965: 44, 1972: 512; Gauṛa 1991: 3–15). Rajan & Rajan (2001a) present a sketch of their interpretation of the phonology, which offers a clearer picture, although I do not agree with their analysis in all respects. My own fieldwork up to this time has not concentrated on phonological issues. The following paragraphs are, therefore, rather tentative, and several points will most likely need to be revised and supplemented in the light of future fieldwork.

1.1   Vowel Inventory

The vowel inventory of Gutob is as follows. The phonemes are given along with their most common allophones.

(1)   i [i,ɪ]   u [u]
       e [e,ɛ]   o [o,ɔ]
                   a [ɑ,ʌ,a]

---

[10]An electronic (searchable) form of the database is accessible online at <http://hin.osaka-gaidai.ac.jp/~griffithsa/>. Other texts, including those recorded by myself, are to be added in due course.

The following two minimal pairs will suffice as evidence for contrast between /i, e/ and /u, o/:

(2) /piɖ/ 'to remove thatch/tiles' vs. /peɖ/ 'to blow'

(3) /suŋ/ 'to throw' vs. /soŋ/ 'to sell'

Rajan & Rajan (2001a) assume contrast between /a/ and /ʌ/, but their examples in my analysis all contain the single phoneme /a/.[11] Only loan vocabulary causes some problems for the above picture, with such (semi-)minimal pairs as:

(4) /laz/ [laːʤ] (De.) 'shame' vs. /laj/ [lac̚] (Gu.) 'who?' (cf. Desia /niman/ [nimaːn] 'good' etc.)

(5) /dos/ [dɔs] (De.) '10' vs. /dos/ [dos] (De.) 'sin'

The vowels may appear combined in the following diphthongs, those appearing only in loan vocabulary being given in parentheses:

(6)

	Vi	iV	Vu	uV	Vo?
a	/ai/	/ia/	(/au/)	—	/ao/?
o	/oi/	/io/	(/ou/)	—	—
e	/ei/	/ie/	(/eu/)	—	—

The only known example of the combination /uV/ in native vocabulary does not seem to be monosyllabic, and is therefore not treated as diphthong here: *ui* 'to go' is a non-reduplicating, therefore bisyllabic root (see DeArmond 1976: 215 and §3.6.1). Given the limited knowledge about Gutob phonemics and phonetics, I am hesitant to make further statements about the language's diphthongs. It may be more appropriate to treat the close vowels in these diphthongs as approximants (/y, w/).

---

[11]Their ostensible evidence for contrast is: /lʌy/ 'rice', /lay/ 'for', /sʌy/ 'street', /nayʔ/ 'we (incl.)', /layʔ/ 'who'. I transcribe these words: /lai/, /lai/, /sai/, /naj/, /laj/, respectively — there is one homonym in my analysis, viz. /lai/ 'cooked rice' or 'for, OBJ'.

1.2   Suprasegmental Phenomena (Tone, Register)

These phenomena have not yet been investigated in a detailed and systematic manner. Tone is known not to be phonemic, as is vowel length. Nasalization of vowels can occur under certain morphophonological conditions (see §1.6), and can in rare cases become phonologically distinctive: contrast [rĩã] 'bring!' with *lia* (De.) 'puffed rice', and *sĩ* 'sun' with *siŋ* 'to wind'. Note also the word *mĩõʔ* 'again', which is morphologically opaque. The language seems to show (remnants of) a system of glottalized vowels (cf. Zide 1965: 49–53). I have noted the words *laʔŋ* 'tongue', *gaʔŋ* '?', *guʔŋ* 'hunt', *naʔŋ* 'last year', *uʔŋ* 'to swell', *oʔn* 'child', *uʔn* 'four' (obsolete), *aʔl* 'bamboo', *soʔl* 'oil', *paʔr* 'to dawn', *tiʔr* 'to sprout'. The phenomenon needs further study: attribution of the glottal stop to the vowel rather than to the coda is somewhat arbitrary for the time being.

1.3   Consonant Inventory

The following table shows the inventory of obstruents in Gutob, along with their most common allophones. Phonemes that seem to be restricted to loan vocabulary are given in parentheses.

(7)

	voiceless	voiced
labial	p [p,p˺]	b [b,p˺]
dental	t [t,ʔ]	(d)
retroflex	(ʈ)	ḍ [ḍ,ɽ,ʔ]
palatal	—	j [j,is,c˺]
velar	k [k,k˺]	g [g,∅,k˺]
dento-alveolar	s [s,ts,tʃ]	z [dz,ʥ]
glottal stop	ʔ	—
glottal fricative	h	—

Note that the allophones of the phonemes /s/ and /z/ are probably in free variation, and that /z/ occurs only once in a word that cannot readily be identified as a borrowing from another language,

namely *zu* 'to see'. /p/ is often fricativized, i.e. nearing [ɸ] or [f], in initial position.

In final position, only unreleased plosives are permitted, which means the distinction voiced/voiceless is neutralized here.[12] /ɖ/, in native vocabulary, here merges with /ʔ/. From the structural point of view, it seems that /j/, the unreleased palatal stop which occurs only in final position, belongs together with /s/, which occurs only in initial position, in native vocabulary.

In intervocalic position, labials → [b], /ɖ/ → [ɽ], /j/ → [is], and velars → /g/ (optionally ∅: /sala(g)-oʔ/).

The status of /h/ is marginal in Gutob, as it is in Desia.[13] In Gutob, it seems to be found — besides in such rare loanwords as *honu* [ɔnu,hɔnu] 'monkey' or *hunɖi* 'village shrine' — only in distal deictic demonstratives: *hu(nu)* 'that (over) there' (§2.7) and in interjections like *hũ, ãhã*.

The following sonorants are found in Gutob:

(8)   nasals | m, n, ɲ, ŋ
        approximants | r, l

The language shows a number of clear cases of free *n/l* variation. E.g., the root *non* 'to chase' has a variant *lon.*

/ŋ/ is dropped in intervocalic position with concomitant nasalization of the bordering vowels, e.g., *riŋ-oʔ* [rĩõʔ] 'brought' (contrast *riŋ-gi* [riŋgi] 'took').[14]

---

[12]Previous work has tended to call unreleased plosives in final position "checked" (Bhattacharya 1965–66) or "preglottalized". E.g., Zide 1965: 52 speaks of "the — phonetically preglottalised in final position — weakly voiced stops /b, ɖ, j g/". The same author (1972: 512), claims: "Gutob *guj-tom-* 'to wash the mouth', but *gui-moɖ-* 'to wash the eyes'. The preglottalised *j* of the former is kept since no other post-vocalic glottalised consonant follows it in the stem, whereas the glottalisation is lost in *gui-moɖ* since the *j-* preceded preglottalised (postvocalic) *-ɖ* in the same verbstem". I have no data to confirm the phenomenon described by Zide, and transcribe the first element of both words *guj-*.

[13]In the analysis of Das Gupta & Bhattacharya 1975: 11, and Mahapatra (1985), /h/ is entirely absent, but Gustafsson (1989) does record a very small number of words with initial /h/.

[14]This is not a hard and fast rule: the nasal consonant seems to be preserved in disyllables, e.g., [ɖuruŋ-oʔ] 'he sank (tr.)', [riŋ-riŋ-oʔ-nen] 'they are

1.4 Syllable Structure and Phonotactics

The vast majority of the language's syllables have the structure C_1VC_2, in which either C_1 or C_2, or both, may be $\emptyset$. Very rarely do we find syllable-initial clusters in native vocabulary, e.g. *sin.droŋ* 'medicine': in such $C_1C_2VC_3$ syllables, C_2 is always /r/. The special case of $C_1V\text{ʔ}C_2$ words has been discussed in §1.2. Syllable-initial and final clusters are only slightly more common in loan words, e.g. *ɖruka* 'tiger', *bund* 'part of a plant stem'. Rajan & Rajan (2001a: 26–35) give some further details.

1.5 Intonation/Stress

Zide (1965: 44) remarks: "Any syllable of CVC shape, and any morpheme-final syllable in a non-affixal morpheme is — by definition — stressed." I have no data on intonation or stress to confirm or contradict this statement. Cf. Bhattacharya 1968: xxi and xxiii on the closely related Remo language.

1.6 Morphophonology

Both the middle and the active past tense suffixes (see §3.3) involve certain morphophonological changes. The quality of the vowel in the former (-*gu* or -*gi*) depends on the shape of the verb root. The MID-PST -*gV* takes the shape -*gi* after root-final /j/ (*goj-gi* 'died', *buj-gi* 'lost'),[15] and after the roots *piŋ* 'to come', *riŋ* 'to take' (but cf. *a-ri(ŋ)-gu-nu* 'who has not been taken', i.e. 'spinster') and *ui*[16] 'to go'. Apparently, the allomorph -*gu* occurs in all other cases (*guj-ti-gu* 'washed his hands', *ɖu-gu* 'was', *log-gu* 'fell', *bil-gu* 'got drunk').

Roots ending in -*a* show elision of the vowel of the active past tense suffix -*oʔ*: *eta* (De.) 'to think', PST *eta-ʔ* 'thought'; the same

---

bringing/have brought' (ex. 65 below).

[15]The status of seeming exceptions *abaj-gu* 'played' (5.354) and *amroj-gu* 'smeared' (C.28) needs to be checked.

[16]The suffix -*gi* tends to be pronounced as [ʤi] in the case of this verb.

would seem to hold true (optionally) of borrowed roots which normally end in *-ei* (see p. 62).[17]

Vowel harmony in word-formation is a productive process in this language (see §§2.10.1, 2.10.2, and cf. Zide 1965: 46f.). It seems to be this process which governs the distribution of the allomorphs /ɖei/ and /ɖoi/ of the 3rd sg. inalienable possessive marker (§2.3): the second form seems to occur only after words with /o/. Vowel harmony triggered by the OPT suffix is encountered in the most important irregular verb, viz. *ɖu(k)* 'to be (located)' (§3.3). The presence of the final consonant *-k* in that same root is subject to further morphophonological rules:

- *ɖu* before consonants and before *-oʔ*, in CAUS *ob-ɖu-oʔ* 'made stay'

- *ɖuk* in IMP before *-a*: *ɖuk-a*, *ɖik* in OPT before *-e*: *ɖik-e*

Another important irregular verb is *ɖem* 'to become/to make':

- *ɖem* before HAB, ACT-NPST (*ɖem-to* 'makes' *ɖem-tu* 'will make') and vowel-initial suffixes, e.g., *ɖem-oʔ* 'made'

- *ɖeŋ/ɖen* before the stem in reduplication and before MID-PST: *ɖenɖem* 'to make/become', *ɖeŋgu* 'became'

- *ɖe* before MID-NPST *-loŋ*, *ɖeloŋ* 'will become'

Loss of the root-final nasal is also seen before the MID-NPST suffix in roots with final /ŋ/: *riŋ* 'to take' *ri-loŋ* 'will take', *piŋ* 'to come' *pi-loŋ* 'will come'. Whether it is lost in the same way in all such roots is not yet known.

Two roots are known where a velar alternates with /ks/ before vowel-initial suffix, viz. *pig* and *log* (e.g. *piks-oʔ* 'broke in half' and *obloks-oʔ* 'caused to fall').

---

[17]If in such a case the transcribed texts also happened to miss the presumably intended/underlying glottal stop, and the suffix hence appears to vanish entirely, ostensible problems of grammatical analysis may emerge, such as the one hinted at by Hook 1991: 192, n. 10.

2 Nominal Morphology

2.1 Number

Gutob has two grammatical numbers: singular (unmarked) and plural, marked by the suffix *-nen* (PL). The explicit marking of plural number seems in many cases to be optional. A noteworthy usage of *-nen* is to form elliptic plurals: e.g., *ioŋ-nen* 'mother and those with her'. Different from other South Asian languages, Gutob does not employ number to express honorific status, a category which seems to be irrelevant in this language (*pace* Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 45).

2.2 Case

According to the tentative analysis adopted here, case suffixes are always attached directly to the bare nominal, and are in this way distinguished from postpositions (§2.9), which can take the genitive case. There are three morphological cases in Gutob

1. Subject case: unmarked.

2. Genitive/Possessive/Attributive case: marked with *-nu.* Postpositions (except *(pu)lai*: see §2.9) seem to take the genitive case of animate nouns and the unmarked object case of inanimate nouns.

3. Object case: unmarked, or marked with a suffix *-(pu)lai* (formally a postposition, though it very rarely occurs with *-nu*)[18] on nominals and pronouns, and a prefix *o-* on pronouns. The same affixes are used to distinguish the indirect (or more human/animate) from the direct object.

The following example contains a combination of OBJ-case markers:

---

[18]In fact the available data yield no compelling examples of *pulai* combined with the GEN and just one example of *-nu lai.*

(9) *o-niŋ oʔ zana, oḍuoʔn-lai zana uraʔ,*
OBJ-1s EMPH known boy-OBJ known NEG

gikiŋ-pulai zana uraʔ, o-laj zana uraʔ.
wife's.elder.brother-OBJ known NEG OBJ-who known NEG

Only I know, the boy doesn't know, [my] brother in law doesn't know, nobody [but me] knows. [2.248]

The next example shows the direct object (*onob*) twice unmarked, both in indefinite and in definite use; it shows the two postpositional OBJ markers used in constructions parallel to the reduplicated infinitive (§3.4):

(10) *D: monoʔ onob ḍeʔna, tunoʔ moḍ-gu*
   where girl QUOT there get up-MID.PST

ui-loŋ-niŋ. M: onob loṭei-lai oʔ. … ki maŋ paiṭi
go-MID.NPST-1s girl fuck-OBJ EMPH or what work

ḍen-ḍem? D: onob loṭei-pulai oʔ uraʔ mĩõʔ maŋ paiṭi
RED-do girl fuck-OBJ EMPH not else what work

ḍen-ḍem?
RED-do

D: Noticing a girl somewhere, I will get up and go there. M: To fuck the girl, that is. Or to do what? D: Just to fuck the girl, what else would I do? [C.113–119]

Direct and indirect object can be differentiated by marking the latter (according to Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 14 only if both are animate):

(11) *niŋ ramu-lai gusoʔ beḍ-oʔ-niŋ*
1s R.-OBJ dog give-ACT.PST-1s

I gave the/a dog to Ramu. [Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 14]

2.3 Person

For the third person, Gutob can mark inalienable possession on kinship terms (though importantly, not on body parts). The suffix involved is *-ḍei/-ḍoi* (see §1.6).

(12) *utu pap-nu lagire remol-ɖei-lai   moʔ*
that sin-GEN due.to husband-3POSS-OBJ eye
kana-gu   ui-gi,   kimboj-ɖei
go.blind-MID.PST AUX(go)-MID.PST wife-3POSS
boiri-gu   ui-gi.
goɖeaf-MID.PST AUX(go)-MID.PST

Due to that sin, her husband's eyes became blind, his wife became deaf. [12.2]

(13) *nom maŋ roza-nu oɖuoʔn-ɖoi-ki, ɖieʔ tu   onob*
2s   Q   king-GEN son-3POSS-Q   QUOT that girl
sala-ʔ.
ask-ACT.PST

Are you the king's son, perhaps, the girl asked. [15.108]

2.4 Definiteness

There seem to be no markers for definiteness in Gutob other than the optional (?) OBJ marking of definite objects (see ex. 19, and §2.2). Reference to unspecified, non-definite nouns is made by means of *muiroʔ* or *ek*, respectively the native and the borrowed word for 'one' (see §2.8), or by means of indefinite pronominals (see §2.6.2).

(14) *maj muiroʔ gamsa monoʔ-nu-ki tor-oʔ-su*
3s   one   towel   where-GEN-Q search-ACT.PST-CONJ
riŋ-oʔ   ekdom   barogaʈia
AUX(bring)-ACT.PST immediately 12.knots
dem-oʔ-su   oɖiʔ-gu   ɖu-tu.
make-ACT.PST-CONJ wear-MID.PST AUX(be)-PRS
After he had found himself a towel from somewhere, and immediately had made 12 knots, he wore it. [10.6]

(15) *muiroʔ oɖug ɖiʔto goj-gi   ui-gi-su*
one   boy   QUOT die-MID.PST AUX(go)-MID.PST-CONJ
ɖuba ɖeŋ-gu.
ghost become-MID.PST

A boy, they say, died and became a ghost. [7.1]

2.5   Class/Gender

Bhattacharya states (1976: 190):[19]

> It is usually believed that Munda gender is a two-group inflec-
> tional and concordant type based on the concepts of animacy
> and inanimacy. The rigid pattern which is found in Sa[ntali] is
> considered to be the original Munda gender-type. But this pat-
> tern of animate and inanimate gender is not found in the five
> South Munda languages, Saoṛa, Parengi, Gutob, Bonḍa and
> Ḍiḍeyi, and it has become very dim in the Central Munda lan-
> guages, Juang and Khaṛia.

It is possible, however, that a distinction between animate and
inanimate nouns does play a marginal role in Gutob morphosyntax,
e.g. in the selection between the allomorphs *ḍig* and *ḍiʔke* 'from'
(§2.9).

Bhattacharya (1976: 195) distinguishes 'compounded sex-based
gender' and 'inflected sex-based gender'.[20] The former are combina-
tions of sex-linked words with sexually indeterminate nouns. Thus,
when distinction between male and female is to be made clear in
Gutob, it can be expressed by using the (Desia) words *anḍra* 'male',
gaḍra 'ram, male animal', *mai* 'female': e.g. *anḍra girem* 'tom cat',
anḍra kirtag 'stallion', *gaḍra gimeʔ* 'billy goat', *gaḍra menḍa* 'ram',
mai gusoʔ 'bitch', *mai kirtag* 'mare'. Cf. also *poḍru-taŋ* 'male calf'.
Or it can be expressed morphologically, with suffixes (-*a* mascu-
line, -*i* feminine), in Desia borrowings: *puḍra/puḍri* 'male/female
buffalo calf', *buḍa/buḍi* 'old man/woman'.

---

[19]Cf. this author's broad definition of 'gender' as a "classification of nouns or
other parts of speech on the basis of inflections or other grammatical features"
(*ibid.*).

[20]The latter, Bhattacharya claims, is found only with reference to humans,
but this claim is false: see *puḍra/puḍri* cited below.

2.6   Pronouns (personal, interrogative, etc.)

2.6.1   Personal pronouns

The following table shows the personal pronouns of Gutob:

(16)

	sg.	pl.
1	niŋ	nei/naj
2	nom	pen
3	maj	majnen

These forms are identical with the pronominal enclitics marked on verbs, except that the third person singular is there unmarked (or ∅-marked), and the third person plural is marked only by the plural morpheme *-nen* (§2.1). That this morpheme is simply a marker of number, not a person marker, is made clear from collocations with 1p and 2p pronominals:

(17)   *pen eran ḍem-oʔ-na   ḍem-nen, niŋ-nu lioŋ*
       2p   how do-ACT.PST-CVB do-PL   1s-GEN wet.rice.field
       sui-tu-niŋ.
       plow-ACT.NPST-1s

       You do whatever you do, I shall plow my wet rice field. [B.6]

Comparative evidence from Gtaʔ (Zide 1968: 349) confirms that pronominals *nei* and *naj* were originally used to mark the distinction between inclusive and exclusive 1p. In the field, I have occasionally felt it would be possible to prove that traces of this distribution still persist, but the database does not provide any clear evidence. It does, however, provide evidence for their merger:

(18)   *uraʔ, kebe naj ar-omtur-nei.*
       no   when 1p NEG-leave-1p

       No, we will never leave it! [B.13]

The two forms seem to have developed a new distribution, where use of *-naj* is largely restricted to hortative function, in combination with imperative verb-forms, and *-nei* is used elsewhere. Cf. the following instructive examples:

(19) *nei pi-piŋ+el   niŋ-nu bobreñ-nen boiragi-lai bug-naj*
1p RED-come+time 1s-GEN brother-PL   sadhu-OBJ beat-1p

ḍieʔsu non-oʔ   ri-riŋ-nen   ḍu-gu.
QUOT   chase-ACT.PST RED-AUX(take)-PL AUX(be)-PST

At the time of our coming [when we came], my brothers were chasing after [him], saying "Let's beat the sadhu". [15.166]

(20) *ḍo,   i-a-naj   nei-nu boʔ.*
come.on go-IMP-1p 1p-GEN LOC

Come on, let's go to our place. [10.148]

Still, there are cases where *naj* is used outside such a hortative context:

(21) *uraʔ ni ḍisel, o-naj-sa   kete boros ḍeŋ-gu*
no   *ni* friend OBJ-1p-also some year   become-MID.PST

saʔmel kaṭei-oʔ   beḍ-oʔ,   keroŋ
millet   be.wasted-ACT.PST AUX(give)-ACT.PST paddy

ar-bulu-to,   taire . . .
NEG-ripen-NEG.PST so

No, friend. It's been a number of years now that our millet got wasted, the paddy did not get ripe, so . . . [D.53]

2.6.2 Interrogative, relative and indefinite pronouns

In native vocabulary, we find six basic interrogative forms, which can all function as relative pronominals; loans from Desia provide all other interrogatives.

1. *maŋ* 'what?', whence *maŋḍem* 'why?'

2. *monoʔ* 'where?'

3. *umboʔ* 'in what direction?', whence *umboʔ-ḍiʔke* 'from where, from what direction?'

4. *unḍoi* 'when, which day?', from which, apparently, *ar-unḍoi* NEG-which day 'next year' (= 'not any day soon'?)

  5. *eran/aren/emran* 'how?'

  6. *laj* 'who?'

maŋ can be used both as a substantive and as an adjective:

  (22) *uloŋ   riŋ-oʔ-na   maŋ ḍem-to-pen?*
        straw bring-ACT.PST-CVB what do-HAB-2p

        What do you do when you get the straw? [1.85]

  (23) *maŋ din-e   pen puza ḍem-oʔʔ*
        what day-LOC 2p   puja do-ACT.PST

        On what day did you do the puja? [2.271]

Note further the use of this word to introduce questions (cf. the identical use of Hindi *kyā*, Oriya *kaaṇa*):

  (24) *maŋ ser-gu+meʔḍiŋ-gu-su   loṭei-to-pen?*
        Q   sing-MID.PST+dance-MID.PST-CONJ fuck-HAB-2p?

        Do you sing, dance, and then fuck? [C.85]

In a common usage corresponding to Desia *kis-ṭa* 'what?', *maŋ* is found combined with *-ṭa*, seemingly the Oriya 'article' discussed at some length by Neukom & Patnaik (2003: 22ff.):[21]

  (25) *nom maŋṭa seb-tu,   o-niŋ   ar-kupei-a*
        2s   what   slaughter-ACT.NPST OBJ-1s NEG-cut-NEG.NPST
        ṭeŋgia.
        axe

        What will you slaughter, the axe will not cut me. [B.76]

Indefinites are derived from these by adding the morphemes *-sa* 'too', *-ki* Q:

  (26) *umboʔ-sa umboʔ-naj moḍ-gu   i-a.*
        where-and where-1p   get.up-MID.PST AUX(go)-IMP

        Let's get up and go somewhere! [5.392]

---

[21]Especially p. 26 on the obligatory usage of *-ṭa* after interrogative and other pronouns "in case of non-attributive use".

(27) *laj-sa tenu konɖek goi-oʔ beɖ-oʔ-na*
      who-and that a.bit   cut-PST AUX(give)-PST-CVB
      goi-tu-niŋ   iaŋ-su ɖieʔ sun-oʔ-niŋ.
      cut-ACT.NPST-1s IRR-CONJ QUOT say-ACT.PST-1s
      If anyone cuts that little piece [of land], I should cut it,
      that's what I said. [5.23]

An example of the use of *-ki* has been given above in §2.4 (ex. 14).
Here is another one:

(28) *maŋ-ki ɖeʔ sun-oʔ-nom, u   samo sun.*
      what-Q QUOT say-ACT.PST-2s that story tell
      Whatever you said, tell that story. [5.24]

But interrogatives can also function as indefinite pronouns without
such an addition:

(29) *laj-nu   imi gibir bai, laj-nu   imi gusoʔ bai,*
      who-GEN name pig   brother who-GEN name dog   brother
      ..., tu   lok-nen   sobu kimboj riŋ-oʔ-nen.
          those people-PL all   wife   bring-ACT.PST-PL
      Someone's name was Pig Brother, someone's name was Dog
      Brother, ..., those people all brought a wife.[22] [11.15]

Negative indefinite pronouns ('nobody', 'never', etc.) are simply
formed by the combination of interrogative pronoun and a negation,
just as in Oriya (see Neukom & Patnaik 2003: 100–104). Cf. ex. (9)
under §2.2, and:

(30) *maŋʈa sasta uraʔ.*
      what   cheap NEG
      Nothing is cheap. [A.64]

The only proper indefinite pronoun is the Desia borrowing *kisi*
(Oriya *kichi*) which corresponds in the following example with
Gutob *maŋʈa*:

---

[22]The pairing of *laj* with *tu* could also be interpreted as a relative/correlative
pairing, but the context seems to suggest otherwise.

(31) *goj-gi   ui-gi-na   tu oʔn-lai*
      die-MID.PST AUX(go)-MID.PST-CVB that daughter-OBJ

      kisi   milei   uraʔ — oron+bostor.
      anything be.available NEG   meal+clothes

      When they had died, that daughter didn't have anything, food or clothes. [10.4]

2.7   Demonstratives and other Deictics

In the analysis adopted here, Gutob has a three way demonstrative system (Zide 1991: 353f.):[23]

(32)

	proximate	intermediate	remote
main bases	e-	u-	tu-
derived	eke		utu/otu
expressive			ha-/hu-

(33)   (About the beginning of time:)

      eke zu-oʔ-na   uraʔ, otu zu-oʔ-na   uraʔ.
      here see-ACT.PST-CVB NEG   there see-ACT.PST-CVB NEG

      If you looked here: no(thing).   If you looked there: no(thing). [6.2]

To the three main bases, which can occur as free-standing forms, additional morphemes can be added.

  -toŋ-: the semantic specifics are unclear, but this suffix seems to be added primarily to deictic bases with reference to humans (cf. Zide 1972: 509). E.g., *e-toŋ-nen, u-toŋ-nen, tu-toŋ-nen* (also to the third person marker: *o-maj-toŋ-nen*) — 'these, those, those there, they'.

---

[23]As to the 'expressive' category, cf. Zide (1991: 363): "A final word — on *h* in Munda demonstratives . . . . The recorded Gutob lexicon shows just one morpheme with *h*, *ha-* 'yonder'. All forms with *ha* take a peculiar intonation, and the *a* is often expressively lengthened; thus, *haaanoʔ*, 'waaay out there'." Note that Rajan & Rajan (2001b: 16) posit a four way system, but do not record the form with *h-*.

-*noʔ*-: indicates place, e.g., *e-noʔ*, *u-noʔ*, *tu-noʔ*. This is presumably the same morpheme as in *monoʔ* 'where?', and one might presume — in view of the other known cases of /l/ ~ /n/ interchange (§1.3) — that there is a connection with *elo(ʔ)*, *ulo(ʔ)*, *tulo(ʔ)* '(come) here, there, yonder', *hulo* '(look) there'. Rajan & Rajan (2001b: 16), on the other hand, interpret -*loʔ* as 'generic' and -*noʔ* as 'specific' marker. Anderson (p.c.) derives the second part of *monoʔ* and *umboʔ* from -*n(u)-boʔ* (GEN-LOC).

-*nu*-: meaning unclear, *e-nu*, *u-nu*, *tu-nu*, 'this, that, that there'. Zide (1991: 353) calls this a "nominalizer postbase", which suggests that he may have thought of a connection with the -*nu* suffix, one of whose main uses is in nominalization.

I am not yet sure where to place in this system the forms *aloʔ* '?', *teloʔ* 'there (?)', and *utun* 'this' or 'that' (?). The second occurs, e.g., in:

(34) *kaligai-nu   ig-taŋ   riŋ-oʔ-su*
      black.cow-GEN dung-cow bring-ACT.PST-CONJ
      ispor+mapru-lai teloʔ   riŋ-oʔ-niŋ.
      Shiva-lord-OBJ   there(?) bring-ACT.PST-1s

      Having brought the dung of the Black Cow, I brought it there for the Lord Shiva. [6.8]

2.8 Numerals (including Cardinal, Ordinal, Distributive, Collective and Classifiers)

Except for the numeral *mui(roʔ)* 'one', and possible vestiges of the inherited word for 'two' such as in *bumuiaŋ* 'two brothers' (from *buiaŋ* 'brother'), numerals borrowed from Desia have completely ousted native numerals in present-day Gutob. In the 1930s, Ramamurti was still able to record the following native numerals (1938: xviii–xx):[24]

---

[24]Forms in parentheses are retranscribed following Zide 1978: 51.

1	muiroʔ	7	giːl
2	umbar, mar, umbar, ummar	8	tam-gi
3	igen (iʔgen, iʔgen-roʔ)	9	tim-gi
4	uʔuːn (uʔn)	10	gol
5	mallai	11	gol-mui
6	tiːr	12	gol-mbaːr

However, in his letter from Koraput to F.B.J. Kuiper of 31 October 1951, Izikowitz already claims that he could find only the numerals 1–3: "Funny enough they can only count to 3 in their own language, the rest goes in Oriya. 1,2,3 is *múiro*, *m̆bār* and *'igen*. ' is the glottal stop". Norman Zide's fieldwork in the 1960s still yielded these same three numerals (Zide 1978: 51). Subba Rao 1992: 17 states for Andhra Gutob: "Gadaba language has numerals only up to five. Counting above five is done by way of addition and multiplication". He records: one = /muːỹu/, two = /mbaːru/, three = /iggeːnu/, four /uːnu/ (or /puːnja/, see below), five = /moley/ — these five items confirm Ramamurti's data.

Beyond the above mentioned word for 'twelve' we have no information on native counting up to 20 (and onwards).[25] As for Desia, we need not recount the whole list of numerals (for which, see Gustafsson 1989: 1007ff.), but may point out only the following expressions, *goṭek* 'one unit = one' (next to *ek*), *zoḍek* 'one pair' (next to *di/dui* 'two'), *punzek* 'one heap = four' (next to *sar*, see Zide 1978: 51) and *di-punza* 'two heaps = eight' (next to *aṭ*), which nicely exemplify the same system that is also pervasive for higher numbers, namely the use of multiples of *koḍi* 'score'.

As to ordinals, *aʔtu/agtu* 'early, ahead, in front' can be used in the meaning 'first'. At present, I have no information about strategies for making higher ordinals — the addition of *-oː* to the cardinal as described by Subba Rao (1992: 19) for Andhra Gutob

---

[25]The mere existence of the forms recorded by Ramamurti shows that a radical change has occurred either on the Koraput, or on the Andhra side. Regarding the latter, Subba Rao (1992: 17) states: "For counting numbers from six to eleven, five is taken as the base. Mode of counting above five is based on additions to five. ... Numbers higher than nine are made up both by multiplication and addition".

resembles nothing known to me from Koraput. Information is also not available on distributives and collectives.

The language does not have an extensive set of numeral classifiers, and those words which do seem to function in such a way tend to be borrowings from Desia:

humans: *-ḍan*, as in *muĩḍan* 'alone', 'one man' (apparently only with 'one')

humans: *lok* (De.)

young people: *rasi* (De. *rasi* 'herd'?)

cattle ('a head of cattle'): *munḍ* (De.)

A frequently heard element after numerals, numeral adverbs like *ketek* 'how many?' (De.), or classifiers is the suffix *-laka* (which I tentatively gloss here with EMPH, not pretending that this throws any light on the morpheme's function):

(35) *muiroʔ ḍuma-pulai umar-laka boŋtel tol-to-nen,*
one ghost-OBJ two-EMPH buffalo fasten-HAB-PL
mui-laka buḍa ḍor-to-nen, mui-laka ḍuma-pulai.
one-EMPH cattle kill-HAB-PL one-EMPH ghost-OBJ

For one ghost, they tie up two water-buffaloes; they kill one head of cattle for one ghost. [F.3]

(36) *dinke ketek-laka beḍ-beḍ-nen ḍu-gu?*
perḍay how.much-EMPH RED-give-PL AUX(be)-MID.PST

How much did they give per day? [18.7]

(37) *koḍe-ṭa ḍuma ḍeŋ-gu-na salis munḍ-laka*
twenty-ART ghost become-MID.PST-CVB forty head-EMPH
boŋtel tol-to-nen.
buffalo fasten-HAB-PL

If there are 20 ghosts, they tie 40 buffaloes. [F.4]

2.9   Adpositions

Gutob has a considerable number of postpositions, and no native
prepositions. Postpositions differ from case markers in that they
can be added to the nominal marked for genitive case. The dis-
tribution of cases where GEN suffix -*nu* does and does not inter-
vene has not yet been worked out, but may depend on animacy
(§2.2). Below, I list the most important postpositions in roughly
(roman) alphabetical order. I have attempted to illustrate their
meanings using examples both with GEN-marking (where available
in the database), and without.

ali 'near':

(38) *anḍei-gu   piŋ-gi   tu onob-nu ali   tu*
      return-MID.PST AUX(come)-MID.PST that girl-GEN near that
      oʔn-lai   salag-oʔ: "umboʔ-nom ui-nom?"
      child-OBJ ask-ACT.PST whither-2s   go-2s

      When he had come back near that girl, she asked that boy:
      "where are you going?"

aluŋ 'inside':

(39) *tubog aluŋ ḍu-to   ki tobnaŋ ḍu-to?*
      earth inside be-HAB or above   be-HAB
      Is it in the earth, or above? [2.367]

buḍoŋ/boḍoŋ 'with':

(40) (A man talking about problems after having sex:)

      kosṭe   toʔ-gu-niŋ,   soʔl+siʔl buḍoŋ
      withdifficulty pull.out-MID.PST-1s oil+ECHO with
      amroj-gu-niŋ   suŋ-oʔ.
      smear-MID.PST-1s AUX(throw)-ACT.PST-1s

      I pulled it out with difficulty. I smeared it with oil etc. [C.28]

(41) *aʔ niŋ amrika saibo-nu   buḍoŋ nondpur niŋ ḍu-tu,*
      now 1s America saheb-GEN with   Nandpur 1s be-NPST
      aʔ "puri i-a-naj"   ḍieʔ sun-oʔ-nen-ni.
      now Puri go-IMP-1p QUOT say-ACT.PST-PL-*ni*

Now I am with the America gentlemen [in] Nandpur, now they are saying: "Let's go to Puri". [E.6]

boʔ 'at, in, to → LOC' and *ɖiʔke* 'from':

(42) *niŋ ui-gi-niŋ   ɖien boʔ sonek,   su   tu   ɖiʔke*
     1s   go-MID.PST-1s house LOC a.moment CONJ that from
     mĩõʔ niŋ piŋ-gi-niŋ.
     again 1s   come-MID.PST-1s

     I went home for a while, and then I came [back] from there again. [4.5]

(43) *muiroʔ ioŋ-nu   ɖiʔke, muiroʔ apoŋ-nu   ɖiʔke*
     one   mother-GEN from   muiroʔ father-GEN from
     zonom+zat naj ɖem-oʔ-naj   ɖu-tu   ze, nom
     birth+ECHO 1p do-ACT.PST-1pi be-ACT.NPST so, 2s
     goj-gi-na   niŋ maŋ ɖu-gu-nu   leka,   niŋ
     die-MID.PST-CVB 1s   what AUX(be)-MID.PST-GEN account 1s
     goj-gi-na   nom maŋ ɖu-gu-nu   leka?
     die-MID.PST-CVB 2s   what AUX(be)-MID.PST-GEN account

     From one mother, from one father we have been born, so if you die, what is to become of me, and if I die, what is to become of you? [5.361]

For the latter postposition, we also find *ɖig*, perhaps limited to inanimate nouns (§2.5):

(44) *maj obsei-oʔ   sun-oʔ-nu   sãdi   ɖalni ɖig*
     3s   show-ACT.PST say-ACT.PST-GEN ancestral acre   from
     ɖiʔto mala+ʈoila ɖiʔto koɖok+kuɖuk   kaʈ+kuʈ
     QUOT wood+ECHO QUOT hoe.work+ECHO cutting+ECHO
     gornɖei+girnɖei ɖem-oʔ   suŋ-oʔ   ɖiʔto.
     trimming+ECHO do-ACT.PST AUX(throw)-ACT.PST QUOT

     He got the hoe-work, the cutting, the trimming done on the wood from the ancestral acre which had been shown [and] mentioned. [5.34]

kuruŋ 'towards'/'at', cf. ex. (74), and:

(45) *giʔḍaŋ-siŋ kuruŋ oŋ-oʔ   ḍu-gu   dieʔna tu*
      back-house at   listen-ACT.PST AUX(be)-PST QUOT   that

      ḍiʔke tur-gu   piŋ-gi   ḍiʔto.
      from   leave-MID.PST AUX(come)-MID.PST QUOT

      When he had heard it at the back of the house, he came out
      from there. [5.155]

   lagire 'due to': ex. (12)

   munaŋ 'like, by way of':

(46) *gaṭioʔ tur-to   . . . niŋ-sa pi-loŋ-niŋ*
      a.lot   come.out-HAB   1s-too come-MID.NPST-1s

      zu-oʔ-nu   munaŋ muson.
      see-ACT.PST-GEN like   oneḍay

      A lot is displayed. I too will come one day for seeing. [A.41]

   oʔḍon 'near':[26]

(47) *tu   gikil-nu oʔḍon barogaṭia ui-gi.*
      that tiger-GEN near   B.   go-MID.PST

      Barogatia went near that tiger. [10.53]

   orbon 'near':

(48) *niŋ maj-nu orbon piŋ-gi-niŋ*
      1s   3s-GEN near   come-MID.PST-1s

      I came close to him. [N. Zide / B.P. Das, field data (note-
      book N. morphology)]

   pulai 'in order to, for, OBJ', cf. §2.2, and:[27]

(49) *niŋ sun-tu-niŋ   onob-rasi-pulai.*
      1s   say-ACT.NPST-1s girl-CL-OBJ

      I will tell the girls. [A.129]

---

[26]Cf. also *o-pen oʔḍon ḍu-tu ki?* OBJ-2p near be-ACT.NPST Q 'Is it near you?'
[A.73], where *oʔḍon* governs an objective case form.

[27]As noted in §2.2 above, the status of this marker as a postposition seems
uncertain, because clear cases of its combination with a GEN suffix are not
available in the database.

sumoŋ 'in front of':

(50) *ḍieʔsu, tu   oʔn odorpoḍ ḍeŋ-gu,*
      QUOT   that child *odorpoḍ* become-MID.PST

      ioŋ-ḍei-nen-nu   sumoŋ boroʔ ḍu-tu.
      mother-3POSS-PL-GEN in.front cry   AUX(be)-PRS

      And so, that child became *odorpoḍ*, and is crying in front
      of its mother and the rest. [15.62]

tobnaŋ 'above': see ex. (39)

2.10   Derivation

The most common means in Gutob to derive nouns from nouns
or other parts of speech is the use of the nominalizing suffix *-kaŋ*,
glossed NMLZ in this description (after Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 2f.
[§3.1.5] and 17 [§3.2.5.3]).

(51) *buron-kaŋ riŋ-to-pen   ki usor-kaŋ?*
      live-NMLZ   bring-HAB-2p or beḍry-NMLZ

      Do you bring green or dry wood? [A.11]

(52) *lok,   maŋ lok   runḍei-loŋ-nen?   uŋgom-kaŋ to?*
      people Q   people gather-MID.NPST-PL village-NMLZ DISCP

      People, will people gather? Villagers you mean? [2.280]

There are several other native processes of nominal derivation
clearly evident in the lexicon, though none of them seems to be
productive in the current form of the language (this needs to be
verified).

2.10.1   Deverbatives/Nominalizers (*-Vn-*)

There are many examples of the infix *-Vn-*, which is used to derive
nouns from verb roots.[28] It is infixed before the initial or only
vowel of such roots. The quality of the vowel is determined by

---

[28]Cf. Peterson's discussion of the cognate Kharia formation in this volume
(p. **???**) for a possible phonological explanation for the use of this infix.

vowel harmony: the infix takes the shape *-in-* before front vowel
and *-un-* before central or back vowel. In vowel-initial roots, the
infix becomes in effect a prefix, but here the form *an-* occurs before
/a/ in the root. The following list contains all examples I have
found thus far.

(53)   *an-ab* 'husk' (*ab* 'to husk'); *b-in-iʔtir* 'saliva' (*biʔtir* 'to
       spit'); *b-un-aj* 'writing, arithmetic, embroidery' (*baj* 'to
       decorate'; *b-un-oʔ* 'ladder' (*bok/boʔ* 'ʔ'); *g-in-ir* 'fishing-
       net' (*gir* 'to fish'); *g-in-iraʔ* 'spindle' (*giraʔ* 'to spin'); *g-
       un-ug* 'hatchet' (*gug* 'to peck'); *in-iŋ* 'rope' (*iŋ* 'to hang');
       z-un-uŋ 'clothesline' (*zuŋ* 'to suspend'); *p-in-eḍ* 'flute' (*peḍ*
       'to blow'); *r-un-aŋ* 'medicine' (*raŋ* 'to concoct[?]'); *r-un-ug*
       'doorway' (*rug* 'to open'); *s-in-iḍ* 'bird lime, gum' (*siḍ* 'to
       lime birds'); *s-un-ag* 'loan' (*sag* 'to tear'); *s-un-ar* 'comb'
       (*sar* 'to comb'); *s-un-og* 'broom' (*sog* 'to brush'); *t-in-el*
       'threshing floor' (*tel* 'ʔ');[29] *t-un-ol(+boʔ)* '(head-)band' (*tol*
       'to tie'); *s-un-oi* 'plow share' (*sui* 'to plow')[30]

I find one case of a derivation which also seems to involve redupli-
cation (cf. Peterson on Kharia in this volume, p. **???**): *s-in-iŋ-siŋ*
'spool' from *siŋ*) 'to wind'. A possible example of the common
Austroasiatic *-Vm-* infix may be *gumul* 'borer (insect)' from *gul* 'to
bore'.

2.10.2   The animacy marker *gV-*

There is a sizeable set of words (comprising mainly animal names)
formed with a prefix *gV-*, where the quality of the vowel again
depends on that of the underlying root. The following is a list of

---

[29]I do not know a root *tel* from which this verb could be derived. May
we assume a connection with *boŋtel* 'buffalo', animal used for threshing grains
underfoot on the *tinel*, or with *soʔtil* 'to glean grains fallen on the ground'?

[30]The vowel /o/ in the last example (*sunoi*) remains unexplained. In addi-
tion, the words *munaŋ* 'manner' and *tunom* 'boiling' may derive from verbs.
The word *ninoŋ* 'yoke' does not show the expected vowel harmony, nor does a
root *noŋ* 'to yoke' seem to be attested.

all animal names belonging to this formation currently known to me:

(54) *gi-bir*/*gi-big* 'pig'; *gi-kil* 'tiger'; *gi-liʔ* 'rabbit'; *gi-meʔ* 'goat'; *gi-si* 'louse'; *gi-siŋ* 'chicken'; *gu-gaʔ* 'crow'; *gu-bon* 'bear'; *gu-laj* 'bull, ox'; *gu-saʔ* 'monkey'; *gu-soʔ* 'dog'

The basic lexical element, forming the second syllable, can be encountered in other combinations in compounds (§2.10.4), but cannot occur as free-standing form: we may therefore assume that derivation with the *gV*- prefix was necessary at a stage of the language where the phonological system did not allow monosyllabic words. My explanation of the name Gutob as *gu-tob* (from *tubog* 'earth') has been given above in §0.1. It does not seem impossible that also *guloŋ* 'stranger, member of the Rona caste' is derived with the same prefix from *suloŋ* 'far away'. If these words have been correctly analysed, it would mean that the semantic contribution of the prefix is wider than merely the denotation of animal names, and includes also humans: in other words, it may be taken as a marker of animacy. Depending on comparative linguistic evidence which is not available to me, such kinship terms as *gikiŋ* 'wife's elder brother (?)' may also turn out to belong to this formation.

2.10.3   A prefix *sV*-?

Not having access to any evidence which would disprove or confirm such a hypothesis, I also add here a list of words which may be taken to have been formed with a prefix *sV*-, again showing vowel harmony between first and second syllable. The meaning of this prefix is not entirely clear.

(55) *silen* (only in *silen-ḍaʔ* 'sweat'); *silej* 'long'; *silim* '?'; *simin* 'day-time, day';[31] *sisaŋ* 'bone';[32] *subul* 'sweet'; *sukug* 'gourd'; *suŋmol* 'seed/pit'; *suloŋ* 'far away'; *sumol* 'pure';

---

[31]I know one example of a possible -*Vm*- infix (*gumul* cited above, §2.10.1), so *simin* could perhaps be derived from *sĩ* (from *sin?) 'sun'.

[32]The first syllable does not show the expected vowel, so this derivation is doubtful.

suram 'antelope'; suloj 'stomach'; sulob 'tree'; sumoŋ 'in front of'; susuŋ 'leg'

2.10.4   Nominal combining forms

This section must be read in conjunction with §3.7, for the processes involved in deriving nominal combining forms for incorporation into nominal compounds are the same as those for incorporation into verbs. Although one may describe most combining forms as reduced monosyllabic counterparts of full free-standing forms, historical arguments in some cases suggest rather that the free-standing forms are expanded versions of roots (= combining forms); there are also cases where an etymological connection between full and combining form is not evident at all.[33]

(56)   raj-saŋ 'cremation ground' ← raj '?', si-saŋ 'bone'; ig-li 'ear-wax' ← ig 'excrement', litir 'ear'; utob-siŋ 'chicken egg' ← utob 'egg, ball', gi-siŋ 'chicken'; iʔ-taŋ 'cow-dung' ← ig 'excrement', kitaŋ 'cow'; giʔḍaŋ-siŋ 'back of the house', with siŋ CF of ḍien 'house'

2.11   Adjectives

The language does not seem to have a separate part of speech 'adjective'. Many lexical items used for nominal attribution can take verbal morphology, and can on that criterion be treated as verbs (Zide 1985: 97).

According to my field-data, comparatives and superlatives are expressed in typical South-Asian fashion by means of the 'ablatival' postposition ḍiʔke (§2.9): X ḍiʔke ADJ 'ADJ-er than X' and sobu ḍiʔke ADJ 'the ADJ-est of all'. The data at my disposal, however, contain no example sentences with this construction.

---

[33]It is interesting to note that the order of elements in these compounds is the reverse of what one might expect in what is (currently) a 'modifier–head' language.

2.12 Adverb(ial)s

Rajan & Rajan (2001b: 19 [§3.3]) distinguish "two types of adverbs, the first one occurs as a single word and the other occurs as an onomatopoeic word and it can occur more then [*sic*] once in the VP." The following are their two examples:

(57) *sida   ui-gi*
      straight go-MID.PST

      He went straight ahead. [Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 19]

(58) *maj ka ka ka ɖeŋ-gu-su   maj laɖu som-oʔ*
      3s   ka ka ka become-MID.PST-CONJ 3s   ladu eat-ACT.PST

      It (the crow) cried *ka ka ka* and ate the ladu. [Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 19]

3 Verbal Morphology

As in other Munda languages, the distinction between nouns and verbs is not very strict in Gutob. Take the following example, where the borrowed word corresponding to the Oriya noun *mahājana* 'important man' is inflected as a verb:

(59) *mazon-gu-nom*
      important.man-MID.PST-2s

      you became an important man [10.159]

The morphology of the Gutob verb can be described with the help of a few simple canonical shapes:

Positive finite verb forms

- (CAUS-)root-suffix(tense/voice/aspect/mood)-PRON
- RED-root-PRON

Converbs

- General converb: root-PST
- Conditional converb: (NEG)-root-PST-CVB

3.1   Subject

Subject is marked by (clitic) pronominals generally placed in the verb phrase; the rules for the exact placement of the pronominal seem to be quite free, or if they are not, they have as yet defied attempts at analysis (Zide 1997: 308ff.). These pronominals have the same shape as personal pronouns (§2.6.1), except that the 3rd person is ∅-marked.

(60)

	sg.	pl.
1	niŋ	nei/naj
2	nom	pen
3	∅	∅-nen

I have the impression that repeated subject marking is a feature of expressive discourse:

(61)   *niŋ ta   sobu paiʈi niŋ ɖem-oʔ-niŋ   beɖ-beɖ-niŋ*
       1s DISCP all   work 1s   do-ACT.PST-1s RED-AUX(give)-1s

       I am doing all the work for you. [5.57]

3.2   Object types

Encoding of objects pronominally in the verb, such as is seen in various other Munda languages, plays no role in Gutob.

3.3   Tense, Aspect, Mood, Voice

In Gutob, the meanings of the same TAM-morphemes are different in negative verb forms from their meanings in the corresponding positive forms. As Zide & Anderson (2001: 537, n. 4) have observed, "[t]he negative in Gutob is quite complex. Very few categories use the same markers in the negative as the positive. Thus, in the positive, *-to* marks a customary present [here called 'habitual', A.G.], but in the negative it marks past tense: *ser-to* sing-CUSTOMARY.PRESENT 'sings' vs *ar-ser-to* NEG-sing-NEGATIVE.PAST 'didn't sing' (N. Zide field notes)." The following

table shows the usages of the various morphemes:[34]

(62)

	POSITIVE		NEGATIVE	
	Middle	Active	Middle	Active
NPST	-loŋ	-tu	-a	-∅
PST	-gV	-oʔ	-to	
IMP	-a	-∅	-gV	-oʔ
HAB	-to		—	
OPT	-e		-e	

The basic auxiliary is *ɖu(k)* 'to be', which has the following rather irregular positive paradigm:

(63)

ɖu-tu	PRS	'is'
ɖu-loŋ	FUT	'will be'
ɖu-gu	PST	'was'
ɖuk-a	IMP	'be!'
ɖu-to	HAB	'is'
ɖik-e	OPT	'may be'
ɖu	INF	'(to) be'

Note also the following negative forms: *uraʔ* 'is not', *arɖuto* 'was not', *arɖuka* 'will not be', *arɖike* 'may not be'. With the above suffixes, and these forms of the auxiliary, we can now build a paradigmatic overview. Shown here are all the possible finite forms of the intransitive root *ser* 'to sing' and the transitive root *som* 'to eat'.

---

[34]Zide (1985: 101) states: "the negative uses the same morphemes but redistributed arbitrarily, i.e. I can find no logic to the 'redistributed system'."

(64)

		POSITIVE		NEGATIVE	
		Middle	Active	Middle	Active
1	INF	seser	somsom	seser uraʔ	somsom u.
2	NPST	serloŋ	somtu	arsera	arsom
3	PST	sergu	somoʔ	arserto	arsomto
4	HAB	serto	somto	seser uraʔ	somsom u.
5	IMP	sera	som	arsergu	arsomoʔ
6	OPT	sere	some	arsere	arsome
7	PRS PFT	sergu ɖutu	somoʔ ɖ.	sergunu / sergu ɖu uraʔ	somoʔnu / somoʔ ɖu u.
8	PST PFT	sergu ɖugu	somoʔ ɖ.	sergunu / sergu ɖu uraʔ, seser arɖuto	somoʔnu / somoʔ ɖu u., somsom arɖ.
9	FUT PFT	sergu ɖuloŋ	somoʔ ɖ.	?	?
10	HAB PFT	sergu ɖuto	somoʔ ɖ.	?	?
11	PRS PROG$_1$	seser ɖutu	somsom ɖ.	seser uraʔ	somsom u.
12	PST PROG	seser ɖugu	somsom ɖ.	seser uraʔ ɖugu	somsom u. ɖ.
13	FUT PROG	seser ɖuloŋ	somsom ɖ.	seser uraʔ ɖuloŋ / arɖuka	somsom u. ɖ. / arɖ.
14	HAB PROG	seser ɖuto	somsom ɖ.	seser uraʔ	somsom u.
15	IMP PROG	seser ɖuka	somsom ɖ.	seser arɖugu	somsom arɖ.
16	OPT PROG	seser ɖike	somsom ɖ.	seser arɖike	somsom arɖ.
17	PRS PROG$_2$	serguni	somoʔni	seser uraʔ	somsom u.

A construction with the pattern RED-root-PST-PRON is of uncertain status. In my fieldnotes I have written *zuzuoʔnen = zuzunen ɖutu* (3rd pl. PRS PROG$_1$) 'they are looking'. Examples in Norman Zide's text collection, however, suggest rather a preterite (perfect) meaning:

(65) *asam ui-gi-nu   lok, maŋʈa sun-tu-nom*
      Assam go-MID.PST-GEN people what   say-ACT.NPST-2s
      luga+paʈa   … o … ʈaŋka+ʈusa ɖieʔ-nu   munaŋ
      clothes+ECHO,   oh,   money+ECHO QUOT-GEN like
      riŋ-riŋ-oʔ-nen   kaɲ asam ui-gi-nu   lok
      RED-bring-ACT.PST-PL *kaɲ* Assam go-MID.PST-GEN people
      riŋ-oʔ-nen.
      bring-ACT.PST-PL

      The people who went to Assam, what will you say, clothes,
      …, oh, … things like money they have brought, the people
      who went to Assam, they brought. [18.16]

The negative forms of the FUT.PFT and the HAB.PFT are not yet known (due to gaps in field data). In the following paragraphs, the

positive forms are taken as the basis of discussion; for examples of negative forms, see §3.5 below.

3.3.1 Tense

Gutob has two basic tense categories, 'non-past' and 'past', the former being morphologically divided into a 'present' and a 'future' only in the case of the verb *ɖu(k)* 'to be' (see just above). For an example of the NPST, see ex. (67) just below. Examples of the PST are strewn throughout this sketch, and I add here:

(66) *niŋ ramu-lai gusoʔ beɖ-oʔ-niŋ*
      1s R.-OBJ dog give-ACT.PST-1s

      I gave the/a dog to Ramu. [Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 14]

3.3.2 Aspect

Among the simple verb forms in the table (rows 1–6), the reduplicated root dubbed 'infinitival present' (with a roughly 'continuous' meaning) and the form in *-to*, dubbed 'habitual', express aspectual values. The other aspect categories 'perfective' and 'progressive' are expressed with complex constructions. A selection of forms is exemplified below. First contrast 'infinitival present' with 'non-past':

(67) *A: maŋɖem mĩõʔ nom piŋ-gi   beʔ? B: niŋ ta*
         why   again 2s   come-MID.PST POL   1s   DISCP
      sobu paiʈi niŋ ɖem-oʔ-niŋ   beɖ-beɖ-niŋ.   A: nom
         all   work 1s   do-ACT.PST-1s   RED-AUX(give)-1s   2s
      maŋɖem piŋ-gi-nom?   B: niŋ to   zaiʈa   nom mon
         why   come-MID.PST-2s   1s   DISCP whatever 2s   mind
      ɖem-oʔ-na,   unu niŋ ɖem-oʔ   beɖ-tu.
         make-ACT.PST-CVB that 1s   do-ACT.PST AUX(give)-ACT.NPST

      A: Why have you come again? B: I am doing all the work for you. A: Why have you come? B: Whatever you have in mind, I will do it for you. [5.56–59]

Past forms followed by the auxiliary 'to be' (see p. 37) yield perfectives. Here are examples of a 'habitual perfective' and a 'present perfective' form:

(68) *simra-gu*   *oʔ*   *ḍu-to-nen,*   *ḍisel.*
      become.silent-MID.PST EMPH AUX(be)-HAB-PL friend

      [Such women] really keep silent, friend. [A.119]

(69) *kinḍaʔ tol-oʔ-nen*   *ḍu-tu,*   *eran ḍem-oʔʔ*
      river   dam-ACT.PST-PL AUX(be)-PRS how do-ACT.PST

      They have dammed the river, how so? [A.85]

Reduplicated forms followed by the same auxiliary 'to be' yield progressives:

(70) *uraʔ, naik+barik*   *sobu su-sun-nen ḍu-tu.*
      no   headman+messenger all   RED-say-PL AUX(be)-PRS

      No, the headman and the messenger, they are all saying so. [B.24]

(71) *so din boʔ dos ṭaŋka, uraʔ-na agar ṭaŋka-laka*
      6   day LOC 10 rupee NEG-CVB 11   rupee-EMPH

      riŋ-riŋ-nei ḍu-gu,   ranḍe,   tubog oʔ
      RED-take-1p AUX(be)-PST you.know earth   EMPH

      ob-tur   terepete.
      CAUS-emerge withḍifficulty

      In six days we were taking ten rupees, if not eleven rupees, you know, digging up earth with difficulty. [18.8]

The language also has an alternative construction for the 'present progressive' (calqued on the Desia construction described by Mahapatra 1985: 75), making use of a borrowed morpheme *-ni*: root-PST(-PRON)-*ni* (table, row 17). E.g., *sun-oʔ-nen-ni* in ex. (41) above, and *ob-gu-ni* 'is biting' in (78) just below.

3.3.3   Mood

Two of the simple forms (rows 5 and 6) express modality, here dubbed 'imperative' and 'optative', respectively:

(72) *muiroʔ kui naj to-oʔ-su   tu   kui boʔ*
1   well 1p   dig.out-ACT.PST-CONJ that well LOC

     ɖuɖuŋ-gu   goj-gi   i-a-naj
     drown-MID.PST die-MID.PST AUX(go)-IMP-1p

     Let's dig out a well, drown ourselves in it, and die! [9.8]

(73) *nor zonom ɖem-e-nen*
     man birth   do-OPT-PL

     May men be born! [6.14]

The (clitic?) particle *iaŋ* (IRR) marks counterfactuality:

(74) *niŋ-nu kuruŋ ɖaʔ   ɖu-gu-na,   niŋ ɖaʔ   iʔ-tu-niŋ*
     I-GEN way   water be-PST-CVB I   water drink-ACT.NPST-1s

     iaŋ
     IRR

     If I had water, I would drink water. [DeArmond nɖ.: 9]

The precise function of the (clitic?) particles *ɖoŋ* and *ɖej* has to be worked out with further field-data. The currently available text collection provides no clarity, but it seems their grammatical behavior and function fall within the domain of modality:

(75) *maj mĩõʔ bin-kaŋ   beɖ-tu   ɖej.*
     3s   again other-NMLZ give-ACT.NPST ɖej

     He might (?) give something else. [1.178]

(76) *itoʔ ɖeʔna pi-loŋ-niŋ   ɖoŋ.*
     thus QUOT come-MID.NPST-1s ɖoŋ

     In that case I can (?) come. [A.103]

3.3.4   Orientation/Directionality

These concepts seem to play no morphological role in the grammar of Gutob, their expression being achieved through compound verb constructions as discussed in §3.8.1 below.

3.3.5 Valence/Voice

Through a double set of TAM-markers, Gutob morphologically distinguishes two 'voice' classes, called 'active' and 'middle' in this description; these two classes correspond rather closely with semantic transitivity and intransitivity, respectively.

It is noteworthy that semantically transitive verbs, which in other contexts take ACT inflection, take MID endings when reflexively combined with body parts of the speaker as object(s). Cf. ex. (40) above, and:

(77) *kunḍig-sa raʔ-gu   majki uraʔ ze.*
vagina-and tear-MID.PST wife   not   that

And my wife₁ had torn her₁ vagina, indeed. [C.36]

(78) *maj aŋṭi-lai   ob-gu-ni.*
3s   finger-OBJ bite-MID.PST-*ni*

He₁'s biting his₁ finger. [Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 17]

The connection of MID inflection with semantically transitive verbs is not limited to reflexivity, but is also found in the case of reciprocals, which explains why the CAUS-marking in the following example does not trigger ACT inflection (*pace* Zide 1985: 98):

(79) *imi   ob-oŋ-gu-nen*
name CAUS-hear-MID.PST-PL

They made each other hear names. [11.14]

3.4   (Non-)Finiteness

The language does not seem to enforce a very strict distinction between finite and non-finite verb forms, at least there are no positively marked non-finite forms. In a non-third person context, the absence of pronominal marking can be used as a criterion for non-finiteness, but even the '(conditional) converb' marked with *-na* (§5.7), which would seem to be one of the most clearly non-finite categories, fails this criterion in a rare case like the following (a partial repetition from ex. 67), where the *-na* phrase is marked with pronominal *nom* (though not as suffix):

(80) *niŋ to   zaiʈa   nom mon ḍem-oʔ-na,   unu niŋ*
1s   DISCP whatever 2s   mind make-ACT.PST-CVB that 1s

ḍem-oʔ   beḍ-tu.
do-ACT.PST AUX(give)-ACT.NPST

Whatever you have in mind, I will do it for you. [5.59]

The negative copula has a form *uraʔ-gu* (the precise difference in usage from *arḍuto* still needs to be worked out), that seems to be found only in direct, or nearly direct combination with *-na*:

(81) *niŋ uraʔ-gu   ḍeʔ-na-sori   o-nom sob-oʔ*
I   not.be-PST QUOT-CVB-*sori* OBJ-2s carry.away-ACT.PST

ui-loŋ   iaŋ be ḍieʔ ḍiʔto
AUX(go)-MID.NPST IRR POL QUOT QUOT

Had I not been there, he would have carried you away. [5.374]

(82) *aʔ ḍaʔ uraʔ-gu-na   monoʔ-nu keroŋ*
now water not be-PST-CVB where-GEN paddy

ḍe-loŋ?
become-MID.NPST

If there is no water now, from where will the paddy come? [D.29]

Using the above criterion of absent person marking, the 'general converb' (formally identical with a 3rd person singular PST, see p. 35), is the only other certain non-finite category known to me at present. Cf. the general converb *ḍuḍuŋgu* in ex. (72) above, and:

(83) *su,   niŋ majnen boḍoŋ ḍu-gu   ui-gi-niŋ.*
CONJ 1s 3p   with   be-MID.PST go-MID.PST-1s

Then, I went after having stayed with them. [3.9]

(84) *ʈeŋgia riŋ-oʔ   seb-tu-niŋ.*
axe   take-ACT.PST slaughter-ACT.NPST-1s

I will take an axe and slaughter [you]. [B.79]

The bare or reduplicated form of the verb (§3.6.1) serves, among other functions, to derive a form of the verb here called 'infinitive': see exx. (19) and (71).

3.5   Negation

Gutob makes use of the following negative copulae and negative
prefixes:

(85)

	'not'	'not yet'
copula	uraʔ	oroj
prefix	ar-	mor-

The copula *uraʔ* can at least partially be inflected as a verb (*uraʔgu*
'was not'), but this inflected form seems to occur only in non-finite
constructions (see exx. 81, 82). For *oroj,* of which no inflected forms
occur in my data, cf.:[35]

(86)   ... *ebke   anḍei   aka   niŋ oroj*
        up.to.now come.back EMPH 1s   not.yet

        ... up to now, I haven't come back yet / am not coming
        back yet (?). [D.78]

It seems likely that *mor-* has a fuller semantic load than *ar-* (per-
haps: 'not yet, not even'), compare:

(87)   (After repeated promises:)

        oŋ   mama,   nom beʔ-tu-nom   ki uraʔ, nom-nu
        listen father.in.law you   give-ACT.NPST-2s or not   you-GEN

        onooʔn-pulai? nom mor-beḍ-beʔ munaŋ ḍeʔna o-nom
        daughter-OBJ   you NEG-RED-give like   QUOT OBJ-2s

        ṭia   gilei-tu-niŋ   ...
        standing swallow-ACT.NPST-1s

        Listen, father-in-law, will you give her or not, your daugh-
        ter? If you say that you will not yet/still not give her, I will
        swallow you right away ... [5.71–72]

(88)   *itoʔ   emran ḍu-loŋ, gujḍaʔ-gu*
        this.way how   be-FUT wash.in.water-MID.PST

        mor-suŋ-oʔ-na?
        NEG-AUX(throw)-ACT.PST-CVB

---

[35]The tense-aspectual interpretation in these and several of the following
examples of negated verb forms is uncertain.

How can it be like this, if you don't even wash it? [C.53]

(89) *oŋ, apaŋ-nu samo **mor**-sob-oʔ-na mĩõʔ*
listen father-GEN words NEG-carry-ACT.PST-CVB then

laj-nu samo sob-tu, aʔ uŋgom bitre muiroʔ?
who-GEN words carry-ACT.NPST now village inside one

naik ɖu-loŋ, naik boɖ+san-nu samo
headman be-FUT headman big+small-GEN words

***ar**-sob-oʔ-na laj-nu samo sob-tu-nen?*
NEG-carry-ACT.PST-CVB who-GEN words carry-ACT.NPST-PL

Listen, if he does **not even** accept father's words, then whose words will he accept? Now there will be one headman within the village, if the headmen (?) do **not** accept the words of [the villagers] big and small, whose words will they accept? [2.257]

The following is an example of a negative 'infinitival present' (table row 1) or present progressive (11/17) — there is a possible interpretation as negative perfective (cf. also ex. 86):

(90) *D: minɖiŋ ɖaʔ emran ɖeŋ-gu, ɖisel, nei-nu*
this.year water how become-MID.PST friend we-GEN

kuruŋ mulke pi-piŋ uraʔ. M: mulke pi-piŋ uraʔ,
path totally RED-come NEG totally RED-come NEG

ɖisel, minɖiŋ ziuna pulai boɖe kosto ɖeŋ-gu
friend this year living for very difficult become-MID.PST

ui-gi.
AUX(go)-MID.PST

D: How was the rain this year, friend? On our side, nothing at all has come / is coming. M: Nothing has come / is coming at all, friend, it has become very hard to live this year. [D.3–4]

(91) *sĩ tu-tur oroj.*
sun RED-come.out not.yet

The sun has not risen yet / is not rising yet. [AG fieldnotes]

Negative non-past (2):

(92) *itoʔ-kaŋ-nen   ḍeʔna niŋ pi-loŋ,   uraʔ-na,*
      this.way-NMLZ-PL QUOT 1s   come-NPST not be-CVB

      loŋ-loŋ-nu-nen   ḍeʔna niŋ ar-piŋ-a.
      RED-curse-GEN-PL QUOT 1s   NEG-come-NEG.NPST

      If they are of such type, I will come, if not, if they are [of
      the type] that curse, I won't come. [A.120]

Negative past (3):

(93) *lej-gi-nen-su-sori   utu oʔn ḍiʔto "eke*
      sit-MID.PST-PL-CONJ-*sori* that child QUOT here

      pi-loŋ-niŋ,   aba   pi-loŋ-niŋ   aba" ḍieʔsu
      come-MID.NPST-1s father come-MID.NPST-1s father QUOT

      maj-nu ioŋ   oḍuoʔn-ḍei-lai ḍiʔto ar-baɲ-to.
      he-GEN mother son-POSS-OBJ   QUOT NEG-send-NEG.PST

      ar-baɲ-to-su   maj ioŋ-ḍei   boḍoŋ itoʔ
      NEG-send-NEG.PST-CONJ 3s   mother-POSS with   like.this

      ḍien boʔ ḍu-gu.
      house LOC be-MID.PST

      They sat there and that child said "I will come here to father,
      I will come to father", but his mother did not allow her son
      to go. She did not allow [him] to go and in this way he
      stayed at home, with his mother. [5.66–67]

Negative habitual (4):[36]

(94) *dek-te   gonḍaʔ-nen uraʔ.*
      watch-CVB urinate-PL   NEG

      [Women] do not urinate while [someone] is watching. [2.563]

Negative imperative (5):

(95) *nom mator o-niŋ maŋ ar-ḍem-oʔ   ḍieʔsu ḍiʔto*
      you just OBJ-1s what NEG-do-(NEG)ACT.IMP QUOT   QUOT

      maj sun-oʔ.
      3s   say-ACT.PST

      Just don't do anything to me, he said. [5.76]

---

[36]Cf. Mahapatra 1985: 68 on the Desia 'adverbial durative' non-finite verbal
suffix *-te*, here glossed as CVB.

(96) *ãhã ar-beḍ-oʔ-naj   e   mama.   tirgig sata*
      yes NEG-give-NEG.ACT.IMP-1p hey father.in.law later   truth

      beḍ-tu-nom   be ḍieʔ ḍiʔto-su   tur-gu
      give-ACT.NPST-2s POL QUOT QUOT-CONJ leave-MID.PST

      ui-gi   ḍiʔto.
      AUX(go)-MID.PST QUOT

      Yes, let's not do [any] giving now, father-in-law. Honestly,
      you will give [her] later, he said and took off. [5.139]

3.6   Derivation

There are two productive processes of verbal derivation in Gutob,
viz. reduplication and causative pre-/infixation.

3.6.1   Reduplication

Reduplication is found only with monosyllabic roots/stems (see
pp. 35 and 43 above) and can be full or partial.[37] The precise
constraints governing reduplication have not yet been sorted out,
but the place of articulation of the root-final consonant does seem
to play a role (root-final consonants that are found in both fully
and partially reduplicating roots are printed in bold-face):

> Polysyllabic roots/stems: no RED
> C_1VC_2 roots (a): RED = root   [C_2 can be **b**, ḍ, **g**, **l**, m, n, ɲ, ŋ]
> C_1VC_2 roots (b): RED = C_1V [C_2 can be: **b**, **g**, j, r, **l**, ʔ]
> CV roots: RED = root
> VC roots: RED = root
> CV_1V_2 roots: RED = CV_1
> V_1V_2 roots: RED = root

---

[37]Stems derived by CAUS-derivation (§3.6.2) are polysyllabic by definition,
and therefore do not reduplicate, cf. ex. (71).

3.6.2   Causative pre-/infix

Causative stems are derived from simple verb roots by means of the
CAUS morpheme *ob-/-ob-*. In the case of certain (all?)[38] disyllabic
roots with vowel /u/ in the first syllable (and some with /i/), it is
infixed into the root, replacing the /u/ (or /i/). Examples:

buriʔ 'to be full'	*b-ob-riʔ* 'to fill'
buron 'to live'	*b-ob-ron* 'to cause to live'
butoŋ 'to be scared'	*b-ob-toŋ* 'to scare'
bulu 'to be ripe, ripen (intr.)'	*b-ob-lu* 'to make ripe'
puḍal 'to break (intr.)'	*p-ob-ḍal* 'to break (tr.)'
tunon 'to stand'	*t-ob-non* 'to erect'
ḍuḍig 'to sleep'	*ḍobḍig* 'to put to sleep'
birim 'to bow'	*b-ob-rim* 'to cause to bow'

In all other cases, the same morpheme *ob-* is prefixed to the un-
changed simple root, occasionally with assimilation of its /b/ to
the root-initial consonant. Examples:

gir 'to learn'	*ob-gir* 'to teach'
som 'to eat'	*ob-som* 'to feed'
sarda 'to be joyful/pleased'	*o-sarda* 'to make joyful, to please'
moḍ 'to get up (itr.)'	*o-moḍ* 'to get up (tr.)'

Sometimes, an apparently underlying simple root does not seem to
exist, e.g. *ob-sej* 'to show, to guide' ← *sej 'to see (?)'.

3.7   Noun Incorporation

Noun incorporation is not a productive process in Gutob, but there
are many examples which show that it must have been in a former
stage of the language. Nouns incorporated in verb stems appear in

---

[38]Cf. Zide's statement (1985: 94) concerning Kharia, but implicitly valid for
South Munda languages more generally: "Roughly (. . .) monosyllabic stems
take B^{px} as (probably) do bimorphemic stems and borrowed stems.   The
remainder — disyllabic monomorphemic stems — take (the great majority
of them) B^{ix}" (where B^{px} and B^{ix} stand for the causative prefix and infix,
respectively).

their combining form (§2.10.4) and can assume the role of object, instrument or sometimes intransitive subject. Examples are:

> *sog-til* 'to glean grain fallen on the ground' ← *sog* 'to sweep', *t-in-il* 'threshing floor'; *iʔ-dom* 'to defecate' ← *iʔ* 'excrement', *dom* 'ʔ'; *gui-tom* 'to wash the mouth' ← *gui* 'to wash', *tumog* 'mouth'

3.8 Auxiliary Verb Constructions

Under this heading, I treat two constructions:

– general converb + inflected AUX

– infinitive + inflected form of *goŋ/ḍem*

3.8.1 general converb + inflected AUX

Auxiliary verb constructions of this type are structurally parallel to sequences of a general converb with a finite verb form (§3.4),[39] but auxiliary constructions are characterized by extensive semantic bleaching of the second, the fully inflected member of the complex construction. The following is a list of the verbs that figure as auxiliaries in this construction. Note that several auxiliaries are functionally somewhat diverse:

(97)

verb	lexical meaning	functions as auxiliary verb
suŋ	'throw'	sudden motion, completive
riŋ	'take', 'bring'	self-benefactive
ui	'go'	motion away from speaker, completive
piŋ	'come'	motion towards speaker
beḍ	'give'	benefactive, completive
sarei	'finish'	telicizer
lagei	'apply'	inceptive

---

[39]If my analysis of ex. (14) is correct, we have evidence that the compound can be interrupted by the CONJ marker (§5.7).

suŋ: cf. example (88), and

(98) *uraʔ, ar-kupei-a   o-niŋ, ţeŋgia pulai pigs-oʔ*
      no   NEG-cut-NEG.NPST OBJ-1s axe   OBJ   split-ACT.PST
      suŋ-tu-niŋ.
      AUX(throw)-ACT.NPST-1s

      No, it will not cut me: I will break the axe in two. [B.80]

riŋ: according to Hook (1991: 186f.), "[n]o auxiliary plays the role
played by *le* (homophonous with 'take') in Hindi." This statement,
made with specific regard to Gtaʔ, but apparently intended also to
hold for Gutob, is certainly false. Consider the following counter-
examples:

(99) *o-niŋ   mastor ai-oʔ   riŋ-oʔ.*
      OBJ-1s master call-ACT.PST AUX(take)-ACT.PST

      A master₁ called me to him₁. [3.1]

(100) *moḍo+moḍo gisiŋ   naj sob-oʔ   riŋ-∅,*
      big+big   chicken we buy-ACT.PST AUX(take)-ACT.IMP
      gimeʔ naj sob-oʔ   riŋ-∅,   zatra ḍen-ḍem
      goat   we buy-ACT.PST AUX(take)-ACT.IMP festival RED-do
      lai ḍieʔ sarloŋ-gu-su,   zar   gor-ke   ta-ke
      for QUOT talk-MID.PST-CONJ whose house-OBJ that-OBJ
      tur-gu   ui-to-nen.
      go out-MID.PST AUX(go)-HAB-PL

      "Let's buy a really big chicken, let's buy a goat, for hold-
      ing the festival", in this way they discuss, and appear at
      whoever's house. [8.4]⁴⁰

ui: see the preceding example, and

(101) *muiroʔ oḍug ḍiʔto goj-gi   ui-gi-su*
      one   boy   QUOT die-MID.PST AUX(go)-MID.PST-CONJ
      ḍũba ḍeŋ-gu.
      ghost become-MID.PST

      A boy, they say, died and became a ghost. [7.1]

---

⁴⁰The words *zar gorke take* in this example are Desia.

(102) *nom zu-oʔ-na   kaba-gu*
you   see-ACT.PST-CVB become.amazed-MID.PST
ui-loŋ-nom,   ḍisel.
AUX(go)-MID.NPST-2s friend

When you see it, you will become astonished, friend. [A.92]

piŋ:

(103) *ui-gi-na   ãḍei-gu   pi-piŋ*
go-MID.PST-CVB return-MID.PST RED-AUX(come)
ḍe-loŋ?
become-MID.NPST

If we go, will it be possible to get back? [A.77]

beḍ: cf. example (67), and

(104) *maj sun-oʔ-su-sori   tirgig   mĩõʔ tu noj+el*
he   say-ACT.PST-CONJ-*sori* afterwards again that night+time
iḍ-oʔ-nen,   som-oʔ-nen,   iḍ-oʔ-nen,   mĩõʔ
drink-ACT.PST-PL eat-ACT.PST-PL drink-ACT.PST-PL again
ḍuḍiʔ-gu   beḍ-oʔ-nen.
sleep-MID.PST AUX(give)-ACT.PST-PL

He said [this], and after that, they drank again during
that night, they ate, they drank, and they went to sleep
again. [5.46]

(105) *ḍaʔ riŋ-oʔ-su   ispor+parboti-lai ḍiʔto*
water bring-ACT.PST-CONJ Shiva+Parvati-OBJ QUOT
ai-oʔ   "elo,   riŋ-oʔ   niŋ beḍ-oʔ"
call-ACT.PST come here bring-ACT.PST 1s   AUX(give)-ACT.PST
ḍieʔ ḍiʔto.
QUOT QUOT

Having brought water, he called to Shiva and Parvati:
"Come here, I've brought [it] for you". [6.11]

The verbs *lagei* and *sarei*, finally, are both borrowings from Desia:

(106) *maŋṭa lai nom piŋ-gi   lagei-gu-nom*
what   for 2s   come-MID.PST AUX(apply)-MID.PST-2s
ḍu-tu   nom unḍam lok,   mama,   ḍieʔ ḍiʔto.
AUX(be)-PRS 2s   old.man person father.in.law QUOT QUOT

For what reason have you started coming? You're an old man, father-in-law. [5.111]

(107) *lai ḍoñ-oʔ   sarei-gu-na   gisiŋ*
       rice cook-ACT.PST AUX(finish)-MID.PST-CVB chicken
       goʔ-to-nen.
       cut.up-HAB-PL

       When they have finished boiling the rice, they cut up the chicken. [8.12]

3.8.2 | infinitive + inflected form of *goŋ*/*ḍem* |

The modal verb *goŋ* 'to be able' differs from the above in that it can be combined rather with (infinitival) reduplicated forms, in the same way as the auxiliary *ḍu(k)* 'to be' (§3.3), although it can also be combined with general converbs (110).

(108) *niŋ kolikata ui-gi   ḍeʔna pi-piŋ   ar-goŋ-a*
       1s Calcutta go-MID.PST QUOT RED-come NEG-can-NEG.NPST
       niŋ etai-bar-nen ḍu-tu.
       1s worry-INF-PL AUX(be)-PRS

       If I go to Calcutta, they worry I will not be able to come back. [D.46]

(109) *zu-zu   niŋ goŋ-uraʔ.*
       RED-see 1s   can-NEG.

       I can't see. [AG fieldnotes]

(110) *boiragi tiŋ-oʔ   ar-goŋ-to.*
       hermit   shoot-ACT.PST NEG-can-NEG.PST

       The hermit was not able to shoot at [it]. [10.39]

The construction with (infinitival) reduplicated form is also found for the verb *ḍem* 'to become'. See example (103) and:

(111) *usor tubog mĩõʔ suñ-suñ   ḍe-loŋ?*
       dry   earth then RED-build become-MID.NPST

       Then will dry earth allow [for a house] to be built? [1.100]

4 Expressives

Gutob does not show a system of expressives in the sense of a separate part of speech, not derived from another morphological class (Diffloth 2001: 263ff.). The rare 'expressive' use of the sound [h] has been mentioned in §2.7 (n. 23). I treat here the echo formations which are a pervasive feature of the language. The following is a good example:

(112)   *laj o-maj-toŋ-nen saka uraʔ-su, majnen ḍoŋgor+par*
        who OBJ-3s-*toŋ*-PL   aid   not-CONJ 3p   hill+mountain
        koḍok+kuḍuk ḍem-oʔ-su   buron-nen ḍu-tu
        hoe+ECHO   do-ACT.PST-CONJ live-PL   AUX(be)-PRS
        aʔso-nen ḍu-tu.
        live-PL   AUX(be)-PRS

        As nobody helped them, they were living by doing hoe-work[41] on the hills. [5.5]

The example illustrates three predominant patterns: (1) echo proper: repetition of the first word with phonological changes (*koḍok+kuḍuk*); (2) pairing of two native words with identical or related meaning (*buron+aʔso*); (3) pairing of two borrowed words with identical or related meaning (*ḍoŋgor+par*). The following example illustrates (4) pairing of a native with a borrowed word with identical or related meaning (*luḍo+bokrei*):

(113)   *u   ḍiʔke piŋ-gi-su   kete lok   boḍoŋ*
        there from   come-MID.PST-CONJ some people with
        luḍo+bokrei ui-gi-su,   anond
        joke+banter go-MID.PST-CONJ joy
        ḍeŋ-gu-su-nei,   ḍu-gu-nei.
        become-MID.PST-CONJ-1p stay-MID.PST-1p

        After we had come from there, and had gone around cutting jokes with several people, and had become happy, we stayed [home?]. [4.3]

---

[41]The interpretation of the echo formation *koḍok+kuḍuk* is not entirely certain, but it seems most likely that it is connected with the Desia words *koḍokbar* 'to work a field with a hoe' (cf. Gustafsson 1989: 135) and *koḍki* 'hoe'.

5   Syntax

5.1   Syntax of the Simple Sentence

5.1.1   Typological Features

Constituent order in Gutob is generally SOV. Adjectives, numerals, demonstratives and quantifiers precede the head noun, adverbs precede the head they modify. The internal structure of noun phrases can be represented as follows (after Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 28):

Noun phrase → (QF)/(DEM) (ADJ1) (ADJ2) NOUN

There is evidence from the (frozen) system of nominal composition that constituent order was different in an earlier stage of the development of this language (§2.10.4).

5.1.2   Alignment

Alignment in Gutob is of the 'nominative–accusative' type.

(114)   *niŋ o-maj-toŋ-nen ob-gir-oʔ-niŋ-su,*   *majnen*
         1s   OBJ-3s-*toŋ*-PL   CAUS-learn-ACT.PST-1s-CONJ 3p
         gir-gu-nen
         learn-MID.PST-PL

         I taught them and they learned. [3.3]

5.2   Complex Sentence Structure

Mention may be made here of a kind of participle that can be formed by compounding *el* 'time' with another word. See exx. 19 (*nei pipiŋ+el*), 104 (*noj+el*), and the following:

(115)   … *utu keroŋ bulu-gu-nu-el*   *ɖiʔto*
         … that rice   ripen-MID.PST-GEN-time QUOT
         ois-oʔ-nen   *ɖiqto*
         harvest-ACT.PST-PL QUOT

         …when that rice had ripened, they harvested. [5.289]

5.3 Coordination

Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 29 list several examples of asyndetic coordination (cf. our ex. 44 above). In addition, Gutob seems to show several particles of coordinate conjunction, notably *-sa, mĩõʔ* and *ɖoŋ*, but the exact syntactic status of each of them needs further investigation. Cf. also the conjunctive marker *-su* glossed CONJ in this sketch (§5.7).

(116)   *zona aɖo-sa*   *nei-nu oʔ,* *lioŋ-sa*   *nei-nu*
       corn orchard-and 1p-GEN EMPH wet.rice.field-and 1p-GEN
       oʔ, *lamgo-sa*   *nei-nu oʔ.*
       EMPH dry.field-and 1p-GEN EMPH
       The corn orchard is ours, and the wet field is ours, and the dry field is ours. [B.35]

(117)   *memor*   *mĩõʔ niŋ mĩõʔ sonia aɖsali boʔ*
       ward.member again 1s   again Sonia Adsali LOC
       log-gu-nei   *beɖ-oʔ.*
       fall-MID.PST-1p AUX(give)-ACT.PST
       The ward member, I and Sonia fell down to Adsali. [Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 19]

(118)   *maŋ ɖem-tu-niŋ*   *naparla lok*   *ɖieʔsu tu*
       what do-ACT.NPST-1s unable   person QUOT that
       onooʔn-ɖoi-lai   *ɖoŋ oɖuoʔn-ɖoi-lai sun-oʔ.*
       daughter-3POSS-OBJ and son-3POSS-OBJ say-ACT.PST
       What shall I do, for I am an incapable person, she said to her daughter and to her son. [5.219]

Disjunction is marked with the word *ki.* Cf. exx. (10), (51) and:

(119)   *oʔɖon kinɖaʔ ki suloŋ?*
       close   river   or far
       [Is] the river close or far? [A.25]

5.4 Complement Clauses

Complement clauses are built with the quotative *ɖieʔ* (derived from *ɖi* 'to speak'), or its extensions *ɖ(i)eʔna* and *ɖieʔsu.* Verbs of

'speaking' are often repeated around the complement clause.

(120) *lokon   sun-oʔ   nom-nu agia ɖeʔna ispor+mapru*
       Lakshmana say-ACT.PST 2s-GEN   order QUOT Shiva+lord
       niŋ ui-loŋ   andari bon   boʔ kaligai-nu   iʔtaŋ
       1s   go-MID.NPST dark   forest LOC black.cow-GEN dung
       riŋ-tu-niŋ   ɖieʔ mapru sun-oʔ.
       bring-ACT.NPST-1s QUOT lord   say-ACT.PST

       Lakshmana then said: "Because it is your order, o Lord
       Shiva, I will go to the Dark Forest. I will bring the dung of
       the Black Cow", said the Lord. [6.6]

(121) *saukar   zu-oʔ-su   umboʔ-nom ui barogaṭia ɖieʔ*
       merchant see-ACT.PST-CONJ whither-2s   go B.   QUOT
       salag-oʔ.
       ask-ACT.PST

       The merchant saw him and asked: "Where are you going,
       Barogatia?". [10.30]

(122) *monoʔ   onob ɖeʔna, tunoʔ moɖ-gu*
       somewhere girl   QUOT   thither get.up-MID.PST
       ui-loŋ-niŋ.
       go-MID.NPST-1s

       Noticing a girl somewhere, I will get up and go there. [C.113]

(123) *kaligai   sun-oʔ,   enoʔ lok   uraʔ, bak uraʔ niŋ*
       black.cow say-ACT.PST here   people not.be men not.be 1s
       aŋte eran ɖeŋ-gu   ɖu-loŋ-niŋ ɖieʔsu kaligai
       alone how become-MID.PST be-FUT-1s   QUOT   black.cow
       sun-oʔ.
       say-ACT.PST

       The black cow said: "There are no people here, no men:
       how shall I stay alone?", spoke the Black Cow. [11.4]

Another complementizer-like quotative (*ɖito*) is treated under §6.2.
There are rare examples of complement clauses entirely lacking a
complementizer: cf. exx. (108, before *etaibarnen ɖutu*) and (136).

5.5   Relative-type Clauses

Gutob shows two types of relative clauses. The first, making use of the GEN marker, seems to be inherited, while the other constructions, whether they use borrowed pronouns or native ones, make the impression of being calques on Indo-Aryan constructions. I refer back to the examples (28), (80) and (100), and add the following (see also sentence 27 in the sample text below):

(124)   *nei purbe dine ɖiʔke ɖen-ɖem-nu lioŋ.*
        1p olden day from RED-do-GEN wet.field

        It is a wet field which we work on from of old. [B.11]

(125)   *mor-ui-gi-nu   lok   kuɖu, o-maj lioŋ*
        NEG-go-MID.PST-GEN person hunger OBJ-3s wet.field
        milei   uraʔ.
        be.available NEG

        The man who has not gone is hungry, he does not have wet land. [18.25]

(126)   *uraʔ nei-nu dadi on-oʔ-nu   tunu.*
        no   1p-GEN uncle plant-ACT.PST-GEN that

        No, it is the one that our uncle planted. [B.38]

(127)   *laj mara+mari ɖeŋ-gu-nen   o-maj razi*
        who beat+DIS   become-MID.PST-PL OBJ-3s agreed
        ɖem-to.
        make-HAB

        He makes those who have fought with each other settle their dispute. [I.4]

5.6   Subordinate Clauses

These types of clauses are formed in various ways, making use of the quotative constructions exemplified above (§5.4), and by the markers *-su* and *-na* that are discussed just below in §5.7.

5.7   The markers *-su* and *-na*

It has been claimed in a recent article that Gutob has a switch-reference system (Anderson & Boyle 2002: 39–54):

> In Gutob . . . , the same subject marker *-su* attaches to a past form of the verb, but one lacking person inflection, in line with the generally redundant nature of subject person inflection in switch reference systems. . . . The different subject marker in Gutob is *-na*. It also attaches to a past tense form of the verb, similarly lacking person inflection.

There are numerous exceptions to the claims made by Anderson & Boyle. These exceptions do not necessarily invalidate their generalizations entirely, but viewing the markers *-su* and *-na* primarily as opposite poles in one switch-reference system does not seem to me to be the most fruitful approach. In this sketch, I take *-su* as a marker of conjunction ('and'), while I take *-na* to mark predominantly conditional converbs.[42] The main difference between the two markers seems to me to lie in the association of *-na* with conditional clauses, an association not shared by *-su*. Against ostensible lack of person inflection before *-su*, see examples 93 (*lej-gi-nen-su-sori*), 114 (*ob-gir-oʔ-niŋ-su*), and further:

(128)   *niŋ piŋ-gi-na   pen[-nu] uŋgom rati   konḍek*
        1s   come-MID.PST-CVB 2p[-GEN] village night a.bit
        ḍuk-a-naj-su,   arko dine maskunḍ i-a-naj.
        be-IMP-1p-CONJ next day   Machkund go-IMP-1p
        When I come, let's stay a while in your village at night, and
        then go to Machkund the next day. [A.107]

Although the texts show a clear tendency for *-su* with same subject reference (examples *passim* in the sketch), it is not limited to this. It can connect clauses both with and without switch of subject. The following examples illustrate different subject reference:

---

[42]It is to some extent parallel in function (and form!) to the "conditional converb" in *-ile* of Oriya (Neukom & Patnaik 2003: 251), based on the PST suffix *-il-*.

(129) *niŋ o-maj-toŋ-nen ob-gir-oʔ-niŋ-su,   majnen*
1s   OBJ-3s-*toŋ*-PL   CAUS-learn-ACT.PST-1s-CONJ 3p

gir-gu-nen
learn-MID.PST-PL

After I taught them, they learned. [3.3]

(130) *ḍu-gu-nei-su   majnen ḍien-boʔ moḍ-gu*
be-PST-1p-CONJ 3p   house-LOC get.up-MID.PST

piŋ-gi-nen.
come-MID.PST-3p

After we stayed [a while], they got up and came home. [4.4]

(131) *niŋ piŋ-gi-niŋ-su   o-niŋ saa+paa*
1s   come-MID.PST-1s-CONJ OBJ-1s tea-ECHO

beḍ-oʔ-su   ob-lei-oʔ-nen.
give-ACT.PST-CONJ CAUS-sit-ACT.PST-PL

After I had come, they gave me tea etc. and made me sit. [4.6]

Counter-examples against the claimed limitation of *-na* to different subject reference, on the other hand, are so numerous that one cannot even speak of a tendency. See ex. (107) and:

(132) *piŋ-gi   zu-oʔ-na   babu-nei, boḍoŋ-nei*
come-MID.PST see-ACT.PST-CVB babu-1p   with-1p

minḍi   aṭ   boʔ algu+al-gu-su,   sobuṭa
yesterday market LOC RED+roam-MID.PST-CONJ everything

zu-oʔ-nei,   sobuṭa   som-oʔ-nei
see-ACT.PST-1p everything eat-ACT.PST.1p

When we came and saw, we, we went around in yesterday's market with the Babus, and saw everything, ate everything. [4.2]

(133) *lai   ḍoŋ-oʔ   sarei-gu-na   gisiŋ*
cooked.rice cook-MID.PST finish-MID.PST-CVB chicken

goʔ-to-nen
cut.up-HAB-PL

When they have finished boiling the rice, they cut up the chicken. [8.12]

(134)   *ɖien boʔ lej-gi   ɖu-gu-na   mĩõʔ laj*
        house LOC sit down-MID.PST AUX(be)-MID.PST-CVB again who
        zu-tu-nen?
        see-ACT.NPST-3p

        If they keep sitting at home, whom else will they see? [18.23]

The function of morphemes found in combination with *-su* and *-na*, such as *(-na)-ro*, *(-na)-sina*, *(-su/-na)-sori*, has yet to be determined.

6   Semantics/Discourse

6.1   Semantics

Two topics that might be selected for treatment under this heading are 'color terms' and 'kinship terms'. I must be very brief about both. Gutob has the cross-linguistically common basic set of three color terms, the commonly used terms being those borrowed from Desia: *dob* 'white' (Gutob *pileʔ*), *roŋ* 'red' (Gutob equivalent unknown), *kala* 'black' (Gutob *iɖej*). Regarding the topic of kinship terminology, I refer to Zide & Zide 1991, Pfeffer 1999, Berger 2007.

6.2   Discourse

Besides the quotative markers discussed in §5.4, there is another particle, of related derivation, viz. *ɖiʔto*, presumably in origin meaning 'it is said', here also glossed QUOT, for lack of precise understanding of its function. It is very common in Gutob narrative.

(135)   *oŋzir+el,   iɖaʔ ɖiʔto iɖ-oʔ,   lai*
        morning+time gruel QUOT drink-ACT.PST cooked.rice
        som-oʔ,   maʔ som-oʔ,   kond   boʔ ʈeŋgia ɖiʔto
        eat-ACT.PST curry eat-ACT.PST shoulder LOC axe   QUOT
        ɖon-oʔ,   mĩõʔ tur-gu   ui-gi   ɖiʔto
        carry-ACT.PST again leave-MID.PST AUX(go)-MID.PST QUOT

> *tu   maj-nu mala boʔ.*
> that 3s-GEN patch LOC
> In the morning, he drank gruel, he ate rice, he ate curry, he carried his axe on his shoulder, and took off again, to that patch of wood of his. [5.52]

There is a very common marker of emphasis, the particle *oʔ* (cf. Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 40); see examples (9), (10), (68), (71), (116) above. The marker *laka* is used "to emphasize measurement" (Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 40), see examples (35), (36), (37), (71). Perhaps related to *-laka* is the particle *aka*, also used to emphasize the preceding word. All three markers are here glossed EMPH. For *aka*, see example (86), and further:

(136) *niŋ ta   ripoṭ ḍem-tu   aka   ḍi-ḍiʔ-niŋ*
       I   DISCP report make-ACT.NPST EMPH RED-say-1s
       ḍu-tu.
       AUX(be)-PRS

       I am saying that I *will* register a report. [B.30]

A striking feature of Gutob discourse is the very frequent occurrence of the particle *be*: cf. examples (67), (81), (96). Rajan & Rajan 2001b: 3 (§3.2.1) interpret it as a politeness marker, and this interpretation is tentatively followed here. Several other particles are borrowed from Indo-Aryan, such as the adversative or topicalizing particle *to/ta* (Hindi *to*, Oriya *ta* /tɔ/; here glossed as DISCP) found in exx. (52) and (67).

7   Lexicon

As stated above (§0.2), bilingualism is universal among the tribals of Koraput, and one may doubt whether nowadays Gutob is the first language of any speaker. Code switching from Gutob into Desia and back was an extremely common phenomenon already in the 1960s, as the following example of mixed Desia-Gutob phrases illustrates (the bold elements are Desia):

(137) **noro-r   murti naĩ**, **dek-ba-ke   sundor naĩ**,
       man-GEN shape   NEG watch-INF-OBJ beautiful NEG
       kai-ba-ke mundur naĩ ḍeŋ-gu   ui
       eat-INF-OBJ sweet   NEG become-MID.PST AUX(go)
       ḍem-to,   pen ui-gi   ḍeʔna ḍien-nu   paiṭi
       AUX(become)-HAB 2p   go-MID.PST QUOT house-GEN work
       kimboj+remol pulai-sina zana.
       wife+husband to-only   known

       There's not the shape of a man, it's not beautiful to watch,
       there's nothing sweet to eat. If you go, only the man and
       wife know the household work. [2.219]

Desia and Gutob morphology can be quite freely intermingled.
Cf. example (108) above, where the Desia infinitive marker *-bar*
takes the place of the Gutob reduplication to form the present pro-
gressive *etai-bar-nen ḍu-tu* 'they are worrying' (the interlocutor an-
swers with a more 'Gutob' form *eta-nen ḍu-tu*, meaning the same).
Cf. also the following example:

(138) **surjo-r sañ**   uraʔ-ki, **goso-r sitla**   uraʔ.
       sun-GEN sunset NEG-or   tree-GEN coolness NEG

       The sun's setting was not there, nor was the tree's coolness
       there. [6.3]

Given such a sociolinguistic situation, it may come as no surprise
that various fields of the inherited lexicon have been replaced whole-
sale by, or survive only marginally next to, borrowings from Desia.
Cf. the following statement of Zide (1985: 97f.) concerning borrow-
ings from Indo-Aryan:[43]

   Gutob (like Kharia and Gorum) has borrowed a great deal of
   vocabulary — including a great percentage of its verb stock —
   from IA (which, for Gorum and Gutob, means Desia). Of these
   borrowings, the great majority (but not adjectives or statives)

---

[43]Zide's 1991 paper looks at possible grammatical influence from Dravidian.
No evidence for direct lexical influence from Dravidian languages on Gutob
is known to me, although there is considerable evidence for such influence on
Gutob via Desia.

takes the suffixes *-ei* and *-a*. At least thirty percent (of a not particularly conservative dialect) of the verb lexicon consisted of EI/A-taking verbs.

8 Text: the Goʔter Ritual

The following text was recorded in the 1960s by Richard DeArmond (it is labeled 'F' in my database). Thanks are due to Peter Berger for his help in translating the text. For anthropological accounts of the ritual, see Izikowitz 1969, Pfeffer 1991, 2001a, Berger 2007: 284–308. Berger's forthcoming article listed in the bibliography contains the most detailed account, as well as some remarks on the possible meaning (and linguistic derivation) of the word *goʔter*.

1. *godba-nen-nu kam-nu samo.*
   Gadba-PL-GEN ritual-GEN story

   A story about the ritual of the Gadbas.

2. *majnen-nu dadi,   ani+puni, bai,   ioŋ,*
   3p-GEN   grandfather ancestor brother mother
   goj-gi-na,   goʔter togri-to-nen.
   die-MID.PST-CVB G.   unroll-HAB-PL

   When their grandfather, ancestor, brother, mother has died, they perform the Goʔter.

3. *muiroʔ ḍuma pulai umar-laka boŋtel tol-to-nen,*
   one   ghost for   two-EMPH buffalo tie.up-HAB-PL
   mui-laka buḍa ḍor-to-nen, mui-laka ḍuma pulai.
   one-EMPH cattle kill-HAB-PL one-EMPH ghost for

   For one ghost, they tie up two water-buffaloes; they kill one [head of] cattle for one ghost.

4. *koḍeṭa ḍuma ḍeŋ-gu-na   salis munḍ-laka boŋtel*
   twenty ghost become-MID.PST-CVB forty head-EMPH buffalo
   tol-to-nen.
   tie.up-HAB-PL

   If there are 20 ghosts, they tie up 40 buffaloes.

5. *sari banda-laka rukug   ḍem-to-nen.*
   four *banda*-EMPH uncooked.rice make-HAB-PL

   They provide 4 *banda* of uncooked rice.

6. *ozar, ḍeḍozar ṭaŋka korso   ḍem-to-nen.*
   1000 1500   rupee expense make-HAB-PL

   They make an expense of 1000, 1500 rupees.

7. *boŋtel sob-oʔ-su,   munḍa boʔ tol-to-nen.*
   buffalo buy-ACT.PST-CONJ platform LOC tie.up-HAB-PL

   When they have bought the buffaloes, they tie them at the
   platform.

8. *tebe goʔter baza   baza-to-nen.*
   then G.   rhythm drum-HAB-PL

   Then they beat the Goʔter rhythm.

9. *baza-ʔ-su   meʔḍiŋ-to-nen.*
   drum-ACT.PST-CONJ dance-HAB-PL

   And drumming, they dance.

10. *ḍaŋ+ṭeŋ, ṭaŋgi+ṭeŋgia, kanḍa sob-oʔ-su,   goʔter*
    stick-ECHO ECHO-axe   sword carry-ACT.PST-CONJ G.
    laŋboʔ boʔ tur-to-nen.
    field   LOC leave-HAB-PL

    They leave for the Goʔter field, carrying wooden sticks etc.,
    hatchets etc., swords.

11. *penḍom+ili iḍ-oʔ-su,   suloŋ+suloŋ-nu lok*
    beer+wine   drink-ACT.PST-CONJ far+far-GEN   people
    piŋ-to-nen   goʔter zu-zu.
    come-HAB-PL G.   RED-see

    People from very far off drink beer and wine, and come to
    see the Goʔter.

12. *rana, gouḍu, mali,   kumar, goren, sobu jati*
    R.,   cowherd, gardener, potter, G.,   all   community
    runḍei-to-nen.
    gather-HAB-PL

    Ronas, Cowherds, Gardeners, Potters, Gorens (Harijans),
    all communities meet.

13. *besi mara+mari, puza+ana ḍeŋ-gu*
    much fight+DIS murder+ECHO become-MID.PST
    ui-to-nen, bil-gu-su.
    AUX(go)-HAB-PL get.drunk-MID.PST-CONJ

    Being drunk, they get into a lot of fighting, murdering.

14. *polis-sa piŋ-gi ḍu-to.*
    police-and come-MID.PST AUX(be)-HAB

    The police is also there.

15. *polis-nu samo manei-nen uraʔ, bil-gu-su.*
    police-GEN words respect-PL NEG get.drunk-MID.PST-CONJ

    Being drunk, they do not pay heed to the words of the
    police.

16. *laj-nu samo mana+mani uraʔ, goʔter laŋbo boʔ boŋtel*
    who-GEN words respect-DIS NEG G. field LOC buffalo
    tol-oʔ-su.
    tie.up-ACT.PST-CONJ

    Nobody's words are heeded, after the buffalo has been tied
    on the Goʔter field.

17. *goʔter baza baza-ʔ-su meʔḍiŋ-to-nen,*
    G. rhythm drum-ACT.PST-CONJ dance-HAB-PL
    panzia-nen keḍu maṭi sol-gu-su.
    P.-PL lime earth smear-MID.PST-CONJ

    The Panzias smear [one another/themselves] with lime-soil,
    and dance while drumming the Goʔter rhythm.

18. *goʔter laŋbo boʔ dui ojar, tin ojar lok runḍei-to-nen.*
    G. field LOC two 1000 three 1000 people gather-HAB-PL

    Two to three 1000 people gather on the Goʔter field.

19. *goʔter sarei-gu-na, panzia boŋtel sob-oʔ*
    G. finish-MID.PST-CVB P. buffalo carry-ACT.PST
    ui-to.
    AUX(go)-HAB

    When the Goʔter is finished, the Panzias take away the
    buffaloes.

20. *runḍei-gu-nu   lok   sobu moḍ-gu   ui-to-nen.*
    gather-MID.PST-GEN people all   rise-MID.PST go-HAB-PL

    All the people who had gathered get up and go.

21. *kilom lok   arko dine potek ḍu-to-nen.*
    guest people next day   until be-HAB-PL

    The guests remain until the next day.

22. *dui din bozi som-oʔ-su   laj-nu   ḍien boʔ maj*
    two day feast eat-ACT.PST-CONJ who-GEN house LOC 3s

    ui-to-nen.
    go-HAB-PL

    While eating feasts for two days, they go to anybody's
    house. [?][44]

23. *sar so   ṭaŋka-nu paṭai sarei-to.*
    four hundred rupee-GEN cloth finish-HAB

    400 rupees' worth of cloth is used.

24. *salis puṭi rukug   sarei-to.*
    forty *puṭi* uncooked.rice finish-HAB

    40 *puṭi*s of uncooked rice are used.

25. *pondro puṭi saʔmel sarei-to.*
    fifteen *puṭi* ragi   finish-HAB

    15 *puṭi*s of ragi (finger millet) are used.

26. *koḍe   munḍ ki tiris munḍ boŋtel laŋbo boʔ*
    one.score head   or thirty head   buffalo field   LOC

    seb-oʔ-su   zurei-to-nen.
    slice-ACT.PST-CONJ tear-HAB-PL

    They slice open 20 or 30 buffaloes in the field, and tear them
    open.

27. *suloj   zurei-oʔ-su   laj parla maj sob-oʔ*
    stomach tear-ACT.PST-CONJ who could 3s   carry-ACT.PST

    ui-to-nen.
    AUX(go)-HAB-PL

---

[44]One wonders whether the text is correctly transcribed here. If *laj*
means 'own', the CONJ marker *-su* can receive its usual translation 'after …'.

Those who are able to tear [out] the stomach, they take it away.

28. *majnen seli riŋ-gi ɖoɲ-oʔ, pila maizi buɖoŋ*
    3p   meat take-MID.PST cook-ACT.PST child wife   with
    som-to-nen.
    eat-HAB-PL

    They take the meat, cook it, and eat it together with children and wife.

29. *zar ɖu-gu-nu boŋtel zetki, panzia sobu*
    whose be-MID.PST-GEN buffalo how.many P.   all
    sob-oʔ ui-to.
    carry-ACT.PST AUX(go)-HAB

    The Panzias take away all buffaloes, however many [they may be], and to whomever they might have belonged.

30. *maj muiroʔ goʔter togri-oʔ-nu lok pulai*
    3s   one   G.   unroll-ACT.PST-GEN person to
    beɖ-to.
    give-HAB

    They give it to a man who has performed the Goʔter.

31. *muiroʔ buɖa ɖor-oʔ-su pans puʈi rukug*
    one   cattle kill-ACT.PST-CONJ five   *puʈi* uncooked.rice
    ɖoɲ-oʔ-su sobu lok pulai bozi beɖ-to.
    cook-ACT.PST-CONJ all   people to   feast give-HAB

    He kills one [head of] cattle, cooks 5 *puʈi*s of rice, and offers a feast to all the people.

32. *goʔter baza baza-ʔ-su panzia ui-to.*
    G.   rhythm drum-ACT.PST-CONJ P.   go-HAB

    When the Goʔter rhythms have been drummed, the Panjias go.

33. *bozi som-oʔ sobu lok arko dine ui-to-nen.*
    feast eat-ACT.PST all   people next day go-HAB-PL

    When they have partaken of the feast all people go, the next day.

34. *penḍom iḍ-oʔ   ili   iḍ-oʔ-su*
    beer   drink-ACT.PST wine drink-ACT.PST-CONJ
    bil-gu   ui-to-nen.
    get drunk-MID.PST AUX(go)-HAB-PL

    Having drunk beer, having drunk wine, they get drunk.

35. *itoʔ ḍem-oʔ   gaṭi ṭaŋka+poisa, keroŋ,*
    thus do-ACT.PST much rupee-money, paddy,
    irik+saʔmel   sobu korsu   ḍem-oʔ
    irik+finger.millet, all   expense make-ACT.PST
    suŋ-suŋ-nen,   gadba zati-nu   lok.
    RED-AUX(throw)-PL G.   community-GEN people

    In this way, the people of the Gadba community come to
    make a lot of expense of all kinds: money, paddy, *irik* millet
    (*panicum miliare*) and finger millet.

9   References[45]

Anderson, Gregory D.S. 2001. A New Classification of South
    Munda: Evidence from Comparative Verb Morphology.
    Indian Linguistics 62, 21–36.

Anderson, Gregory D.S. & John P. Boyle 2002. Switch-Reference
    in South Munda. In Marlys A. Macken (ed.), *Papers from
    the 10th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics
    Society*, 39–54. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University,
    South East Asian Studies Program, Monograph Series Press.

Berger, Peter 2000. Gesellschaft, Ritual und Ideologie. Eine re-
    lationale Betrachtung der Gadaba des Koraput Distriktes,
    Orissa. *Mitteilungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthro-
    pologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte* 21, 15–28.

Berger, Peter 2001–02. Feeding the Dead: Rituals of Transfor-
    mation among the Gadaba of Koraput. *ADIVASI* 40–41

---

[45]A complete survey of colonial (19th century) sources, some containing short
word-lists, is available in Pinnow 1959: 464f. These outdated sources are not
repeated here.

(Bhubaneswar: Tribal & Harijan Research-cum-Training Institute), 35–50.

Berger, Peter 2002. The Gadaba and the 'non-ST' Desia of Koraput, Orissa. In G. Pfeffer & D.K. Behera (eds) *Contemporary Society: Tribal Studies*. Vol. V: The Concept of Tribal Society: 57–90. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Berger, Peter 2007a. *Füttern, Speisen und Verschlingen. Ritual und Gesellschaft im Hochland von Orissa, Indien.* Berlin: LIT.

Berger, Peter 2007b. Sacrificial Food, the Person and the Gadaba Ritual System. In G. Pfeffer (ed.) *Periphery and Centre. Studies in Orissan History, Religion and Anthropology*: 199–221. New Delhi: Manohar.

Berger, Peter forthcoming. "Who are you, brother and sister?" The theme of 'own' and 'other' in the go'ter ritual of the Gadaba. In P. Berger, R. Hardenberg, E. Kattner and M. Prager (eds) *An Anthropology of Values. Essays in Honor of Georg Pfeffer.* New Delhi: Longman.

Bhaskara Rao, Peri 1969. Gadaba Phonology. *Linguistic Survey Bulletin* 14, 5–8.

Bhaskara Rao, Peri 1980. *Koṇekor Gadaba. A Dravidian Language.* Pune: Deccan College.

Bhaskara Rao, Peri 1998. Gadaba. In Sanford B. Steever (ed.) *The Dravidian Languages*: 328–355. London and New York: Routledge.

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhushan 1956. *Ollari. A Dravidian Speech.* Delhi: Govt. of India, Dept. of Anthropology.

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhushan 1965–66. Glottal stop and checked consonants in Bonda. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 9, 69–71.

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

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhushan 1975. *Studies in Comparative Munda Linguistics.* Simla: Indian Institute for Advanced Study.

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhushan 1976. Gender in the Munda languages. In P.N. Jenner, L.C. Thompson, S. Starosta (eds) *Austroasiatic Studies* Part 1: 189–211. Honolulu: University

Press of Hawaii.

Burrow, T. & S. Bhattacharya 1962–63. Gadba Supplement. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 6, 45–51.

Dasgupta, Dipankar & Shyamsundar Bhattacharya 1975. The Desiya of Koraput. *Indian Journal of Linguistics* 2, 1–24.

DeArmond, Richard C. 196?. A collection of Gutob texts typed and mimeographed under the heading "DeArmond's Texts". Unpublished.

DeArmond, Richard C. 1976. Proto-Gutob-Remo-Gtaq Stressed Monosyllabic Vowels and Initial Consonants. In P.N. Jenner, L.C. Thompson, S. Starosta (eds) *Austroasiatic Studies* Part 1: 213–227. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

DeArmond, Richard C. nḍ. [no title: paper on the verb in Gutob]. Mimeographed.

Diffloth, Gérard 2001. Les expressifs de Surin, et où cela conduit. *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 88, 261–269.

Fürer-Haimendorf, Christoph von 1943. Megalithic Ritual among the Gadabas and Bondos of Orissa. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* 9, 149–178.

Gauṛa, Duḥkhīśyāma 1991. *Gādabā (vyākaraṇa, racanāvalī, śabda-koṣa)*. Bhubaneswar: Academy of Tribal Dialects & Culture.

Ghosh, Arun 2003. Linguistic Sketch of Gutob. In Arun Ghosh, *An Ethnolinguistic Profile of Eastern India. A case of South Orissa*: 107–131. Burdwan: University of Burdwan.

Gustafsson, Uwe 1973a. Clause Patterns in Kotia Oriya. In Ronald L. Trail (ed.) *Patterns in Clause, Sentence and Discourse in selected langauges of India and Nepal* II, 191–254. Norman, OK: SIL / Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University Press.

Gustafsson, Uwe 1973b. Kotia Oriya Texts. In Ronald L. Trail (ed.) *Patterns in Clause, Sentence and Discourse in selected languages of India and Nepal* III: 111–212. Norman, OK: SIL / Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University Press.

Gustafsson, Uwe 1989. *An Adiwasi Oriya-Telugu-English Dictionary*. Mysore: CIIL.

Hook, Peter Edwin 1991. The Compound Verb in Munda: An Areal and Typological Overview. *Language Sciences* 13, 181–195.

Izikowitz, Karl Gustav 1951. Letter to F.B.J. Kuiper from Koraput, Orissa. Copy kept at the Kern Institute, Leiden.

Izikowitz, Karl Gustav 1969. The Gotr Ceremony of the Boro Gadaba. In Stanley Diamond (ed.) *Primitive Views of the World*: 129–150. New York: Columbia University Press.

Konow, Sten 1906. *Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. IV. Muṇḍā and Dravidian Languages*. Reprint 1967, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Kornel, Das 1999. *Tribal Cultural Heritage and Cult. The Gutob Gadaba of Orissa*. Bhubaneswar: Modern Book Depot.

Mahānti, Gopinātha 1956. *Gādabā Bhāṣā*. Kaṭaka: Akhiḷa Bhārata Sarbasebā Saṅgha (Grāmasebaka Samabāẏa Pres).

Mahapatra, Khageswar 1985. *Desia. A Tribal Oriya Dialect of Koraput Orissa*. [= *ADIBASI* 25 (Nos. 1–4)]. Bhubaneswar: Tribal & Harijan Research-cum-Training Institute.

Manoharan, S. 2001. Indian Languages in Censuses — A Study. *Indian Linguistics* 62, 117–140.

Mitra, A. 1964. *Census of India 1961. Volume 1. India. Part II-C (ii) - Language Tables*. Delhi: Manager of Publications.

Mukherjee, Sibasis 2002. Gadaba (Gutob). In *Linguistic Survey of India. Special Studies. Orissa*: 299–314. Kolkata: Language Division, Office of the Registrar General.

Neukom, Lukas & Manideepa Patnaik 2003. *A grammar of Oriya*. ASAS [Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft] Nr. 17, Universität Zürich.

Parkin, Robert 1991. *A Guide to Austroasiatic Speakers and Their Languages*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Patnaik, Radha Krishna 1992. The Gadabas. In V. Subba Rao, & R. Patnaik *Gadaba. The Language and the People*. Amaravathi: Sri Papayaradhya Sahiti Kendram.

Pfeffer, Georg 1991. Der intra-agnatische 'Seelentausch' der Gadaba beim großen Lineageritual. In M. Laubscher (ed.) *Beiträge zur Ethnologie Mittel- und Südindiens*: 59–92. München: Anacon.

Pfeffer, Georg 1997. The Scheduled Tribes of Middle India as a Unit: Problems of Internal and External Comparison. In

G. Pfeffer & D.K. Behera (eds) *Contemporary Society: Tribal Studies. Professor Satya Narayana Ratha Felicitation Volumes*, Vol. I: Structure and Process: 3–27. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Pfeffer, Georg 1999. Gadaba and the Bondo Kinship Vocabularies versus Marriage, Descent and Production. In D.K. Behera & G. Pfeffer (eds), Contemporary Society Tribal Studies. Vol. IV: Social Realities: 17–46. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Pfeffer, Georg 2001a. A Ritual of Revival among the Gadaba of Koraput. In B. Schnepel & H. Kulke (eds) *Jagannath Revisited: Studying Society, Religion and the State in Orissa*: 123–148. Delhi: Manohar.

Pfeffer, Georg 2001b. Sprache und Religion bei den Stämmen Mittelindiens. In Dirk W. Lönne (ed.) *Tohfa-e-Dil. Festschrift Helmut Nespital. Band II: Kulturwissenschaften*: 769–782. Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen.

Pinnow, Heinz-Jürgen 1959. *Versuch einer historischen Lautlehre der Kharia-Sprache.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rajan, F. Herold & Jamuna Rajan. 2001a. *Gutob-Gadaba Phonemic Summary.* Asha Kiran Society: Lamptaput, Orissa.

Rajan, Jamuna & Harold Rajan. 2001b. *Grammar Write-up of Gutob-Gadaba.* Asha Kiran Society: Lamtaput, Orissa.

Ramadas, G. 1931. The Gadabas. *Man in India* 11, 160–173.

Ramamurti, G.V. 1938. *Sora-English Dictionary.* Madras: Government Press.

Sarma, C.R.S. 2001. Gutob Gadba: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal. Unpublished MS. distributed at the National Seminar on Tribal Languages in India (Hyderabad: Osmania University), February 16–17, 2001.

Subba Rao, Vavilala 1992. A Grammatical analysis of a tribal language, Gadaba, As spoken in the village 'Rajacheruvy Valasa', A Hamlet of Bobbili in Vijayanagaram District of Andhra Pradesh. In V. Subba Rao, & R. Patnaik *Gadaba. The Language and the People.* Amaravathi: Sri Papayaradhya Sahiti Kendram.

Thusu, Kidar Nath & Makhan Jha 1972. *Ollar Gadba of Koraput.* Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India.

Zide, Norman 1965. Gutob-Remo vocalism and glottalized vowels in Proto-Munda. In Milner et al. (eds.) *Indo-Pacific Linguistic Studies* (= Lingua 14), 43–53.

Zide, Norman 1968. Some comparative notes on Gataʔ Pronouns. In J.C. Heesterman, G.H. Schokker, V.I. Subramoniam (eds) *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to F.B.J. Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday*: 348–358. The Hague: Mouton.

Zide, Norman 1972. Review of S. Bhattacharya, A Boṇḍa Dictionary. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92, 506–513.

Zide, Norman 1978. *Studies in the Munda Numerals.* Mysore: CIIL.

Zide, Norman 1985. Notes mostly historical on some participant roles in some Munda languages. In A.R.K. Zide, D. Magier, E. Schiller (eds) *Proceedings of the Conference on Participant Roles: South-Asia and Adjacent Areas*: 92–103. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana Univ. Linguistics Club.

Zide, Norman 1991. Possible Dravidian Sources of some Munda Demonstrative Bases. In B. Lakshmi Bai & B. Ramakrishna Reddy (eds), *Studies in Dravidian and General Linguistics: A festschrift for Bh. Krishnamurti*: 349–364. Hyderabad: Osmania University.

Zide, Norman 1997. Gutob pronominal clitics and related phenomena elsewhere in Gutob-Remo-Gtaʔ. In A. Abbi (ed.) *Languages of Tribal and Indigenous Peoples of India: the Ethnic Space*: 307–334. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Zide, Norman 1999. A Note on a Rhetorical-Stylistic Device in Gutob (Gadaba). In Kh. Mahapatra (ed.) *Banaja-1999: Adibasi Exhibition Souvenir*, 44.

Zide, N. & G.D.S. Anderson 2001. The Proto-Munda Verb and Some Connections with Mon-Khmer. In P. Bhaskara Rao and K.V. Subbarao (eds.) *Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*: 519–540. Delhi: Sage Press.

Zide, Norman & B.P. Das 1963. Gutob Verb Lexicon. Unpublished.

Zide, Norman & B.P. Das 1965. Gutob Texts. Unpublished.

Zide, N. & A.R.K. Zide 1991. A linguistic analysis of some South Munda kinship terms, I. In J.H.C.S. Davidson (ed.) *Austroasiatic Languages: Essays in honour of H. L. Shorto*: 43–59. London: SOAS.

Abbreviations

3POSS 3rd person inalienable possessive; ACT active; ADJ adjective; ART article; AUX auxiliary verb; CAUS causative; CL classifier; CF combining form; CONJ conjunction, conjunctive; CVB conditional converb; DEM demonstrative; DISCP discourse particle; DIS distributive reduplication (Neukom & Patnaik 2003: 132); ECHO echo word; EMPH emphatic marker; FUT future; GEN genitive; HAB habitual; IMP imperative; IRR irrealis; MID middle; NPST non-past; NMLZ nominalizer; OBJ object(ive); OPT optative; PFT perfect(ive); PL plural; POL politeness; PROG progressive; PRON (subject) pronominal; PST past; Q interrogative marker; QF quantifier; QUOT quotative; RED reduplication