

The verb ‘to see’ as a source of new postpositions: evidence from Kumaoni and other Himalayan languages

Evgeniya Renkovskaya

(Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences)

The verb ‘to see’ in a typological perspective is often grammaticalized in different ways, inter alia it becomes a source of adpositions. According to [Heine and Kuteva 2002: 269-270] mostly allative markers as well as markers of mental direction (‘towards’) can arise following this grammaticalization pattern. This study is based on the field linguistic research on the Kumaoni language (2010-2017). The paper deals with the Kumaoni postposition grammaticalized from the conjunctive participle (converb) of the verb *dekhno* ‘to see’ and functioning as a marker of a stimulus in the constructions of emotional state (hereinafter STIM). These constructions are formed by predicates expressing emotional states like ‘to be afraid’, ‘to be glad’, ‘to be angry’, ‘to feel shy’ etc. This postposition is attested in many dialects of Kumaoni and has never been studied (before it was considered only as a converb), cf:

- (1) *mẽ ye kukur dekh-bhaṭin ne ḍar-nũ*
I this.OBL dog STIM (=see-CVB) NEG fear-NEGPRS.1SG
I’m not afraid of this dog (Soryali dialect, Pithoragarh)
- (2) *mi-ke dikh-ber nārāj jan he*
I-ACC/DAT STIM (=see-CVB) angry NEGIMP be.IMP.SG
Don’t be angry with me (Khasparjiya dialect, Someshwar)
- (3) *mẽ u dekha khussī ho ra-yũ*
I he STIM happy be stay-PST.1SG
He made me happy (Soryali dialect, Bajethi)

The formation of the converb in Kumaoni is verbal stem + *-i* + (*-ber*), where *-i* goes back to the form of the converb in Old Indo-Aryan ([Zograf 1976: 218], [Masica 1991: 323]) and *-ber* is presumably derived from OIA *vēlā* ‘time’ (cf. Nepali *ber* ‘time’). The element *-i* can be elided in some dialectal varieties and enclitic *-ber* can also be dropped in stylistic or idiomatic variations ([Sharma 1987: 125]), forming hereby full and short forms of the converb. Also, in many modern Kumaoni dialects the enclitic *-ber* tends to be substituted by ablative postpositions (*baṭi*, *bhaṭi* etc). So, the set of STIM-postpositions in Kumaoni consists of many areal variants, these are: *dekhⁱber* / *dikhber* / *dekhⁱbhaṭi* / *dekhⁱbhaṭin* / *dehber* / *deber* (derived from the full form of the converb)¹ and *dekhi* / *dekhya* / *dekhe* / *dekha* / *dikha* (going back to the short one).

These postpositions can be treated as completely grammaticalized items on the following grounds:

- phonetic changes typical for postpositions in Kumaoni (*-i* -> *-(i)ya* -> *-ε/-a*; *kh* -> *h*);
- more frequent use of the short form of the converb;
- omission of accusative-dative postposition (ACC/DAT) after a NP. A converb from

¹ A superscript indicates the vowel which can be elided.

Documentation of the Kullui language: problems, results, prospects¹

Anastasia Krylova (Institute of Oriental studies, Russian Academy of Sciences)

Evgeniya Renkovskaya (Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences)

The project on documentation of the Indo-Aryan languages of Northern India is carried out at the Institute of linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, since 2014. For today, three linguistic fieldwork trips have already taken place (2014, 2016, 2017). The starting point of our research is the Kullui language. Kullui is one of the Himachali languages spoken in the Kullu district (Himachal Pradesh). Himachal Pradesh is an interesting area from linguistic point of view. The Indo-Aryan languages of the state belong to the genetic group Himachali Pahari (also known as Western Pahari). This group is a dialectal continuum with a significant differences between geographically remote idioms. Himachali Pahari group according to different estimates includes 30 to 60 idioms with no official status. The goal of our current project is a state-of-the-art documentation of the Kullui language, including a grammar description, a modern digital dictionary, and a corpus of glossed texts with audio and video materials. All these specific linguistic objectives are directly connected to sociolinguistic and dialectological ones.

A number of works on Kullui were written more than a hundred years ago, including [Diack 1896], [Bailey 1908], and [Grierson 1916]; there are a few more recent studies (see e.g. [Thakur 1975], [Ranganatha 1981], [Sharma 2014]), however none of the above can be viewed as a comprehensive and systematic description of the language. According to the Census of India 2001, the number of speakers of Kullui is about 170,000. In order to study the sociolinguistic situation in Kullui-speaking area we interviewed the speakers of all age groups. We have also investigated the functional distribution of language use and the degree of preservation of the Kullui language. Our research demonstrates that the main function of Kullui is oral communication in the family and with the neighbours from the same

¹ The article is financially supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project № 16-34-01040 “Grammar description and lexicon of Kullui language”.

villages. Besides, Kullui plays a significant role in maintaining cultural heritage as a language of folk songs and tales and of gurs' (shamans') rituals. The preliminary results of the small-scale sociolinguistic enquiry among the schoolchildren show that they speak Kullui with their grandparents only, but not with parents or friends. This means that the next generation might have no need in using Kullui, so the language shift is quite possible.

The data gathered in the course of the fieldwork trips also help to identify the geographical borders of Kullui in the dialectal continuum of Himachali languages. Using special questionnaire on linguistic features of Himachali region we have interviewed people from remote villages. The questionnaires from speakers of several tehsils (Kullu, Manali, Banjar, Sainj, Ani) show substantial phonetical and grammatical differences. For now, we can affirm that the approximate territory of the Kullui language (with some dialectal variation) spreads along Beas river from Bhuntar in the south to Manali in the north.

The main objective of our research is linguistic description of the Kullui. Multiple gaps in grammar description have been filled: for the first time some grammar phenomena have been described. Here we have to mention some features presenting interest from typological point of view in comparison to the other languages of Himalayas:

- Two types of demonstrative pronouns. Animate and inanimate demonstrative pronouns (*ei* and *ūi*) were first mentioned in [Thakur 1975: 258], and according to this grammar description animate nouns must be substituted only by animate pronouns, and inanimate nouns must be substituted only by inanimate pronouns. However, our fieldwork data show that the choice of the pronoun depends also on the type of the antecedent and, more interesting, on postposition. The preferable positions of the animate demonstratives is without postpositions or with ACC/DAT postposition, while inanimate pronouns are mostly used in combinations with other postpositions, cf.:

(1)	<i>le</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>pen</i>	<i>ui</i>	<i>senge</i>	<i>likh</i>
	take.IMP	3SG.AN	pen	3SG.INAN	INSTR	write.IMP
	<i>tebe</i>	<i>ei</i>	<i>mumbe</i>	<i>vapas</i>	<i>de-i</i>	
	then	3SG.AN.OBL	I.ACC/DAT	back	give-IMP.FUT	

Take this pen, write with it, then give it back to me

- Two systems of cardinal numerals (see more in [Krylova 2017]). New Indo-Aryan languages typically have both decimal and vigesimal systems of numerals. In decimal systems, numerals from 1 to 100 are independent lexemes originating from the ancient Indian decimal system. Numbers greater than 10, ending with 9, are denoted with a word derivated from the next numeral. Vigesimal system used in village dialects includes non-derivative cardinals from 1 to 10 and 20, and other cardinals are derived using following models: $n*20\pm m$ or $\pm m+n*20$ (m and n are numbers from 1 to 10). Vigesimal systems are supposed to be substrate-based and it is not mentioned in the most of grammatical descriptions of NIA languages. At the same time, systems of cardinals of Kullui are described differently in [Thakur 1975, Ranganatha 1981, Sharma 2014]. Our field research presents both a full picture of the decimal system of Kullui cardinals and its vigesimal system, different from previous descriptions and derivated by the model $n*20+m$ (m is a number from 1 to 20). Two hypotheses are possible: either Kullui has more than one vigesimal cardinal systems or the vigesimal system of Kullui in the process of disintegration and replacement by the decimal one has developed a lot of varieties in different idiolects.

- The genitive marking of arguments which is different from standard genitivus possessivus in NIA (New Indo-Aryan) languages, where genitive postposition / case affix agrees with the possessed NP in gender, number and case (if there are any) like an adjective. Genitive marker in Kullui that does not mark genitivus possessivus has only one form: OBL.M = $r\epsilon$ and it has no agreement with any NP. It can mark subject in inabilitive and involitive constructions (this type of marking in other Himachali languages has been described in details in [Zoller 2009]), and external possessor:

(2) *fohru-rε* *fo^hl-i* *təre* *nei* *bef-i-d-a*
 boy-GEN.OBL.M good-F way(F) NEG sit-PASS-PTCP-M.SG
 The boy is not able to sit properly

(3) *d^hũ-ε* *laija* *meri* *ɔtʃtʃ^hi duk^h-i*
 smoke-INSTR INSTR I.GEN.DIR.F eye(F) ache-PFV.F
 My eyes ache from the smoke

- (4) *merc* *d^hũ-ε* *laija* *ɔtʃi^hi duk^h-i*
 I.GEN.OBL.M smoke-INSTR INSTR eye(F) ache-PFV.F
 I have an ache in my eyes because of smoke

• Prohibitive and preventive constructions. There are two types of imperative: simple imperative and future (or delayed) imperative are relatively frequent for Indo-Aryan languages of the Himalayan area. Prohibitive and preventive constructions (the negative forms of the imperative) in Kullui are more interesting, they do not include imperative forms with added negative particle, but have a special structure. These constructions form by adding of a special prohibitive particle (*mɔt* or *heri*) added to participles showing agreement with the subject in gender and number. The earlier indeclinable particle *mɔt* (related to Sanskrit *mā*, Hindi *mat*) is reinterpreted in Kullui as imperative of a non-existent prohibitive verb **mɔtna* and can be represented in all possible imperative forms: *mɔt* (IMP 2SG) / *mɔta*=*mɔtat* (IMP 2PL) / *mɔti* (IMP.FUT 2SG) / *mɔtit* (IMP.FUT 2PL). The particle *heri* is developed by the grammaticalization of the future imperative form of the verb *herna* ‘to see’ that is also shows agreement with the subject in number – *heri* (IMP.FUT 2SG) / *herit* (IMP.FUT 2PL). Cf.:

- (5) *bhau ron-d-a* *mɔt*
 baby cry-PTCP-M.SG PROH.SG
 Baby, do not cry

- (6) *mu pitse mɔta en-d-ε*
 I.OBL after PROH.PL come-PTCP-PL
 Do not follow me

- (7) *bɔn-a be keɛ mɔti jan-d-a*
 forest-OBL ACC/DAT alone PREV.SG go- PTCP-M.SG
 Do not go to the forest alone

- (8) *ei saĩ kadi heri keɛ-d-a*

He.OBL EQ when PREV.SG do- PTCP-M.SG
Never do it like him

Grammaticalization of the imperative form of the verb ‘to see’ into the prohibitive particle is also attested in some Mandeali dialects.

- The negative mirative construction in Kullui (see more in [Renkovskaya in print]). It is stated in [Peterson 2000: 13] that mirativity is typical for Himalayan languages, including Dardic (see [Bashir 2010]) and Tibeto-Burman (see [DeLancey 1997]). Still the data on the Indo-Aryan languages of the region are rare, mirativity is described in details only for Nepali [Peterson 2000]. The mirative construction in Kullui may be an argument that mirativity is one of the areal characteristics of the Himalayan region, so we may suppose that it is presented in the Indo-Aryan languages of the Western Himalayas as much as in Dardic and Tibeto-Burman. See:

(9) *mer-a g^hɔr ɔk^hɛ nə nei her-i-d-a*
my-M.SG house here ABL NEG see-PASS-PTCP-M.SG
My house is not seen from here

(10) *mer-a g^hɔr ɔk^hɛ nə nisi her-u-i*
my-M.SG house here ABL NEG.MIR see-PASS-MIR
My house is not seen from here (though it has to be seen)

Besides grammatical data, a lexicon (about 2000 lexical units) has been collected in the course of the fieldwork, including grammatical information, examples and sound recording. Also a number of texts (folk tales, legends, songs, stories, conversations) has been recorded and glossed. On the base of our fieldwork data, a website, www.pahari-languages.ru, has been created. It contains regularly updated data on the Kullui language in Russian, English, and Hindi such as general information on the Kullui language, a preliminary version of the Kullui-Russian-English dictionary, and a number of glossed texts. We hope the website will become a valuable information source on Kullui and, in future, other Pahari languages and help popularize minor languages among local people in an attempt to revert the trend of their

functional limitation and endangerment.

References

- Bailey T. G. 1908. The Languages of the northern Himalayas, being studied in the grammar of twenty-six Himalayan dialects. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Bashir E. 2010. Traces of mirativity in Shina. *Himalayan Linguistics* 9(2). Pp 1-55.
<http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/HimalayanLinguistics/>
- DeLancey S. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. // *Linguistic Typology* 1.Pp 33-52.
- Diack A.H. 1896. The Kulu Dialect of Hindi: Some notes of its Grammatical Structure, with Specimens of the Songs current amongst People, and a Glossary. Lahore: The Civil and Military Gazette Press.
- Grierson G.A. 1916. Kulu Group. In: *Linguistic Survey of India*. Vol.IX. Part IV. Delhi – Varanasi – Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Krylova A.S. 2017. Cardinal numerals of Kullui language [Kolichestvennyye chislitel'nye jazyka kullui] In: *Problemy jazyka: Sbornik nauchnyh statej po materialam Pjatoj konferencii-shkoly «Problemy jazyka: vzgljad molodyh uchenyh»*. M.: Institut jazykoznanija RAN, Kancler, 2017. Pp. 217-225
- Ranganatha M. R. 1980. Survey of Mandeali and Kului in Himachal Pradesh. *Census of India*. 1971.
- Renkovskaya E.A., Krylova A.S. 2015. Prohibitive constructions in Kullui [Prohibitivnye konstrukcii v jazyke kullui]. In: *Dvenadcataja konferencija po tipologii i grammatike dlja molodyh issledovatelej (tezisy dokladov)*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2015, Pp. 81–83.
- Renkovskaya E.A. 2017. Imperative in Kullui [Imperativ v jazyke kullui]. In: *Problemy obshhej i vostokovednoj lingvistiki 2016. Trudy vserossijskoj nauchnoj konferencii «Vostokovednye chtenija 2016. Jazyki Juzhnoj i Jugo-Vostochnoj Azii»*. Moscow, IV RAN. Pp. 168-173.
- Renkovskaya E.A. In print. Negative construction with predicate *nisi* in Kullui [Otricatel'naja konstrukcija s predikatom nisi v jazyke kullui] In: *Problemy jazyka: Sbornik nauchnyh statej po materialam Shestoj konferencii-shkoly «Problemy jazyka: vzgljad molodyh uchenyh»*

Sharma D. (Saaraswat) 2014. Kuluti-Hindi vyakaran. Ek tulnatmak adhyayan. New Delhi: Lekhni.

Thakur M. R. 1975. Pahari bhasha kului ke vishesh sandarbh men. Dehli: Sanmarg Prakashan.

Zoller, C. P. 2009. Genitive Marking of Subjects in West Pahari. In: Acta Orientalia 2008:69, 121-151.

Glosses

ABL – ablative postposition; ACC/DAT – accusative-dative postposition; AN – animate pronoun; DIR – direct case; EQ – equative postposition; F – feminine; FUT – future tense; GEN – genitive postposition; IMP – imperative mood; IMP.FUT – future imperative; INAN – inanimate pronoun; INSTR – instrumental postposition; IPFV – imperfective; LOC – locative postposition; M – masculine; MIR – mirative; NEG – negative particle; OBL – oblique case; PASS – passive; PFV – perfective; PREV – preventive particle; PROH – prohibitive particle; PTCP – participle; SG – singular.