

UC Santa Barbara

Himalayan Linguistics

Title

Person indexation in Monsang from a diachronic perspective

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5rq7r3nk>

Journal

Himalayan Linguistics, 18(1)

Authors

Konnerth, Linda
Wanglar, Koninglee

Publication Date

2019

DOI

10.5070/H918142775

License

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> 4.0

Peer reviewed

himalayan linguistics

A free refereed web journal and archive devoted to the study of the
languages of the Himalayas

Himalayan Linguistics

Person indexation in Monsang from a diachronic perspective

Linda Konnerth

Hebrew University of Jerusalem and University of Oregon

Koninglee Wanglar

Independent Scholar

ABSTRACT

Person indexation in Monsang (Northwestern South-Central or “Kuki-Chin”) consists of a set of prefixes as well as a basic set of postverbal person markers with three variants. Based on which of these sets are used, this study finds four types of intransitive and four types of transitive paradigms of verbal person indexation. As for the three variants of postverbal person markers, a diachronic order is proposed: one set is clearly conservative; one set is clearly innovative and represents a fusion with a reconstructed palatal copula; and a third hybrid set appears to represent analogical change in the inclusive form. Finally, out of the four intransitive and four transitive types of person indexation, three of each closely match. In the case of the divergent intransitive type and transitive type, it is argued that the transitive type represents an innovative nominalization construction while the intransitive type did not undergo the same type of nominalization.

KEYWORDS

South-Central, “Kuki-Chin”, person indexation, verb agreement, speech-act participants, diachronic morphosyntax

This is a contribution from *Himalayan Linguistics*, Vol. 18(1): 54–77.

ISSN 1544-7502

© 2019. All rights reserved.

This Portable Document Format (PDF) file may not be altered in any way.

Tables of contents, abstracts, and submission guidelines are available at
escholarship.org/uc/himalayanlinguistics

Person indexation in Monsang from a diachronic perspective¹

Linda Konnerth

Hebrew University of Jerusalem and University of Oregon

Koninglee Wanglar

Independent Scholar

1 Introduction

This article discusses person indexation in Monsang. It offers a descriptive account and examines diachronic perspectives wherever possible in order to trace the evolution of particular morphemes and larger constructions.

Monsang belongs to the Northwestern group (formerly referred to as “Old Kuki”) of the South-Central or “Kuki-Chin” branch of Trans-Himalayan or Tibeto-Burman languages. There are two tones in the language, a low tone and a high tone. Bare stems of verbs have their tone neutralized to a low tone. Thus, ‘to beat’ can be elicited as *bin*, and ‘to go’ as *sì*. When the nominalizing prefix *i-* is added, the underlying tone surfaces: *i-bin* ‘NMLZ-beat’ can now be recognized as a low tone verb, whereas *i-sì* ‘NMLZ-go’ turns out to be a high tone verb.

Unlike other languages of the same branch, Monsang does not have what DeLancey (2015) refers to as ‘agreement words’: the phenomenon that verbal person markers represent independent phonological words. Evidence that Monsang person markers are phonologically bound comes from the fact that their tone depends on the tone of the stem they are attached to. This is briefly shown in §3.1.

The data in this study mostly come from the second author based on his native speaker knowledge of Monsang, while unclear forms were double-checked with other native speakers. The second author was born and lives in Liwachangning village, Chandel District, Manipur. For data that were produced in elicitation, no data source is given. Several examples show a data source, and these examples come from a corpus that is currently being developed as part of a project to produce a descriptive grammar of Monsang.

The organization of this paper is based on the particular forms and constructions of Monsang. Section §2 goes over the forms of (a) the independent personal pronouns; (b) the possessive prefixes, (c) the prefixal indexation markers; as well as, (d) the three variants of the basic postverbal indexation paradigm of Monsang. Keeping in mind the prefixal indexation marker set and the three variants of

¹ This research has been funded by grant # BCS-1360632 of the National Science Foundation of the United States to Scott DeLancey (PI), University of Oregon, and more recently been made possible by the Martin Buber Society of Fellows, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. We would also like to express our deep gratitude to all Monsang people who have been supporting and contributing to this project, in particular including the people of Liwa Changning.

the postverbal marker paradigm, §3 gives an overview of the intransitive paradigms, grouped by indexation marker set. Likewise, §4 discusses four types of transitive paradigm based on which indexation marker set the A and O markers come from. In §5, the basic principle of person indexation on ditransitive verbs is shown. Section §6 concludes the paper with a comparison of intransitive and transitive paradigms. Full intransitive paradigms are provided in §§3.1-0, while full transitive paradigms are found in the Appendix.

2 Person markers

2.1 Personal pronouns and possessive prefixes

The independent personal pronouns of Monsang are provided in Table 1. There are basic singular and plural forms. Dual forms can be derived but are part of a more general ‘pronoun enumerating’ construction that may involve numerals other than ‘two’ for larger numbers of participants (see Table 3 below).

Monsang has a distinct inclusive pronoun (for dual or plural inclusive), which patterns with plural pronouns, as seen in Table 1. There are thus four different non-singular pronouns, of which two have an apparent plural marker *n^wu* (1PL.EXCL and 2PL) and the other two the apparent plural marker *n₉* (INCL and 3PL).

The *n₉* form may derive from the numeral *ñṅó* ‘two’ and therefore more specifically a ‘dual’ form, cognate to *ni* dual and plural markers across South-Central.² This would make particular sense for the INCL form, which could originally be a dual form ‘you and me’.³ Note, however, that the two forms with *n₉* actually have variants in *n^wu* that can be found in the text corpus (cf. footnotes 3 and 4).

The *n^wu* form, in turn, looks like a fusion of *n₉* with the widespread South-Central plural marker *u*, which appears to be a Proto-SC innovation (DeLancey 2013: 6). The first syllable in all plural forms is the respective possessive prefix (see below). There is apparently free variation in the tone patterns on both third person forms. The 2PL form is usually pronounced as *níṅn^wú* but an innovative form *nín^wú*, analogous to the 1PL.EXCL form, is also occasionally heard. Note, finally, that the elicited INCL form has low tones unlike all the other forms in the paradigm of independent pronouns although in the text corpus this form too is typically produced with high tones, cf. footnote 3.

² The Monsang -*9* rhyme regularly derives from PSC -*i?* (PSC **ni?* ≠ **hni?* ‘two’ in VanBik 2009: 215).

³ Note that the INCL form is always dual in Anal (Ozerov, *Himalayan Linguistics* 18(1): 26-53).

	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	<i>kɔ́</i>	<i>kínn^wú</i>
INCL	<i>ìnɔ̃⁴</i>	
2	<i>náŋ</i>	<i>níŋn^wú (~nín^wú)</i>
3	<i>ámá~ámà</i>	<i>ŋménɔ̃~ŋménɔ̃⁵</i>

Table 1. Monsang personal pronouns

Table 2 gives an overview of the paradigm of possessive prefixes. The singular forms represent the familiar South-Central set although the 1SG form has a different vowel (cf. Thurgood’s (1985) reconstruction of *ka-). As for plural forms, all (except for the INCL, which anyway does not have a regular plural status as it may be dual or plural) end in a velar nasal. However, in both the 1EXCL and the 3PL forms, this is a homorganic nasal that assimilates its place of articulation to the following consonant. If the next morpheme begins with a vowel, the velar nasal occurs, which is why this is treated here as the underlying form. Note that this is not fully the case with the 2PL. While some speakers assimilate the 2PL form to *nin-* before alveolar consonants, the bilabial form *nim-* does not appear to occur. Moreover, many speakers use *niŋ-* invariably. (Note also the difference between the forms of the 1PL.EXCL and 2PL independent pronouns in Table 1 above). This suggests that the 1PL.EXCL *kiŋ-* and the 2PL *niŋ-* have different histories. We can assume that the 1PL.EXCL is a sequence of the 1SG *kí~ké-* plus the same plural marker *ŋ- ~ ń-* that indicates 3PL in this prefixal paradigm as a syllabic nasal. As for the *niŋ-*, however, this form should best be considered monomorphemic and cognate to other forms both within South-Central and beyond. For example, Daai Chin (Southern SC, So-Hartmann 2009: 239) has a preverbal *ni:ng* second person O index, and Hakha Lai (Central SC, Peterson 2003: 415) has a 1SG cohortative verbal suffix *-niŋ*.

Besides the allomorphy of the homorganic nasal in the plural forms, we also find variation between *kí~ké-* for 1SG and between *ì~è-* for the INCL. In both cases, the variation is not regular allomorphy. There are no consistent phonological or morphosyntactic conditioning environments. It appears as though the variation is determined by an interplay of factors such as speaker, phonological environment, and morphosyntactic context. For both morphemes, the variant with the high vowel /i/ is more frequent than the one with /e/.

	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	<i>kí- (~ké-)</i>	<i>kiŋ- (~kín- ~kím-)</i>
INCL	<i>ì- (~è-)</i>	
2	<i>ná-</i>	<i>níŋ- (~nín-)</i>
3	<i>á-</i>	<i>ŋ- (~ń- ~ŋ-)</i>

Table 2. Monsang possessive prefixes

⁴ While elicitation resulted in this form with low tones, the text corpus reveals that the high tone variant *ínɔ̃* is more commonly used. In addition, in a small number of instances, *ín^wú* (and once also *ìn^wú*) are used.

⁵ Other variants in use as 3PL pronouns are *ŋn^wu~ŋnú* and even *ín^wú*, which is otherwise also used as an inclusive form.

While Monsang does not have dedicated dual forms in any person marker paradigm, there is a way to combine either possessive prefixes or independent pronouns with numerals in order to derive what we may call ‘enumerated pronouns’. This yields forms that are more or less equivalent to the English expression ‘the two of us’, ‘the three of us’, etc. Table 3 shows the two types of enumerated pronouns. Type A consists of possessive prefixes that attach to the numeral root, in this case the numeral *ńńś* ‘two’.⁶ Type B is a compound of the full form of the independent pronoun and the numeral. Note that there is only one form of the INCL enumerated form, which matches the Type B pattern, but can have either functional interpretation.

	TYPE A (‘prefixal’)	TYPE B (‘compound’)
1(EXCL)	<i>kíŋ-í:ńńś</i>	<i>kínn^{wù}-ńńś</i>
INCL	<i>ínǎ-ńńś</i>	
2	<i>níŋ-í:ńńś</i>	<i>níŋn^{wù}-ńńś</i>
3	<i>ń-í:ńńś</i>	<i>ńménś-ńńś</i>

Table 3. Monsang enumerated non-singular personal pronouns with numeral *ńńś* ‘two’

The functional difference between the two types is as follows. The Type A construction views the referenced group of participants as a single unit. The Type B construction conveys a distributive meaning, and the grouping may be more loosely construed.

As mentioned above, these two constructions are not limited to the numeral *ńńś* ‘two’ to render dual forms. The equivalent 1PL.EXCL forms with *ńt^hùm* ‘three’ can be regularly formed as *kíŋ-í:ńt^hùm* (Type A) and *kínn^{wù}-ńt^hùm* (Type B). However, the Type A construction is indeed most common with *ńńś* ‘two’, suggesting that there are small traces of a special ‘dual’ category. Either type of construction becomes more and more odd for native speakers to use with numerals higher than *rónà* ‘five’.

2.2 Prefixal indexation marker set

The prefixal indexation marker set derives from a reanalysis of the nominal possessive prefixes. This reanalysis occurred in the course of the finitization of nominalized verbs. The paradigm of the prefixal indexation markers is identical to that of the possessive prefixes, with the sole exception that there is an 1PL.EXCL variant *gé-*, which is commonly used with the future auxiliary *té* (see §3.4). Table 4 nearly exactly matches Table 2 above.

⁶ For yet unclear reasons, in case the numeral starts with a syllabic nasal (i.e., *ńńś* ‘two’ and *ńt^hùm* ‘three’), an extra lengthened vowel /i:/ is inserted between the possessive prefixes for 1PL.EXCL, 2PL and 3PL and the numeral in the Type A pattern.

	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	<i>kí-</i> (~ <i>ké-</i> ~ <i>gé-</i>)	<i>kíŋ-</i> (~ <i>kín-</i> ~ <i>kím-</i>)
INCL	<i>i-</i> (~ <i>è-</i>)	
2	<i>ná-</i>	<i>níŋ-</i> (~ <i>nín-</i>)
3	<i>á-</i>	<i>ǰ-</i> (~ <i>ǰ́-</i> ~ <i>ǰ̀-</i>)

Table 4. Monsang prefixal indexation marker set

As we will see in the discussion of the future paradigms of both intransitive and transitive verbs (§3.4; §4.4), not exactly the same set of prefixal indexes occur in these paradigms as shown in Table 4. Specifically, the third person forms occur without *á-* or *ǰ-*; and in addition, there is no paradigmatic INCL form in the future paradigms since hortative forms are used instead.

Finally, note that the 3PL index *ǰ-* (~ *ǰ́-* ~ *ǰ̀-*) is not consistently used as a closer look at natural data reveals. A common pattern is that instead of the syllabic nasal prefix, speakers will use *á-* as a generic third person index and additionally use the plural marker *-he* to mark plurality (see §4.1).

2.3 Postverbal indexation marker sets

Most of the postverbal person markers are archaic forms that have cognates all across Trans-Himalayan (TH) and can be reconstructed to Proto-TH. We can distinguish between three sets of postverbal indexation markers in Monsang. The differences in form between the three sets are very small as we are dealing with three variations on the same basic set. Although the differences are small, they are important as they provide evidence for diachronic stratification, which will be discussed at the end of the article in §6.1. I will discuss the three sets starting with the one that occurs across a wide range of morphosyntactic contexts. The other two sets only occur with a single paradigm each, namely the imperfective affirmative and the future negative, respectively.

Table 5 shows what is labeled as ‘Set I’. We see familiar forms: The 1SG and 1PL.EXCL forms end in *-ŋ*, a reflex of Proto-Trans-Himalayan (PTH) or Proto-Tibeto-Burman **ŋ(a)* (see Bauman 1975; DeLancey 1989; among others). The INCL is considered a reflex of a more widespread plural marker *m-* by DeLancey (2015). The second person *tʃV-* is convincingly argued to be a descendant of a second person PTH prefix *#t-* by DeLancey (2014). In 2PL, we find *-tʃ^wu* where the *-^wu* is a reflex of a plural marker *u* of Proto-SC provenance (DeLancey 2013: 6). The same reflex *-^wu*, also with labialization on the preceding consonant, is found in other verb forms. It is currently still unclear why the vowel in 1PL.EXCL *-uŋ* does not co-occur with labialization of the preceding consonant, and therefore unclear whether or how to connect it to the same South-Central plural *u*. Finally, the 3PL *-he([-])*, which may also occur on NP’s and therefore appears to be a recent recruitment into the postverbal paradigm, is also found in many South-Central languages (DeLancey 2015). Note that the position of 3PL *-he([-])* is variable in that it can occur before or after the tense/aspect/mood (TAM) marker or copula. This is indicated by the notation with a following hyphen in square brackets and parentheses (the reason why extra parentheses are added will become apparent further below). All the other forms exclusively occur following the TAM marker or copula.

Postverbal Set I	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	-iŋ	-uŋ
INCL	-mə	
2	-tʃə	-tʃ ^w u
3	---	-he([-])

Table 5. Monsang postverbal person marker set I

A slight variation of the same indexation paradigm, labeled Set II, is shown in Table 6. The only difference is in the INCL form. It has a different vowel, /e/ instead of /ə/, and it precedes the TAM marker rather than following it, as is the case in Set I. This is indicated in the table by the following hyphen in square brackets. This Set II therefore clarifies the cognacy with the PTH *m*-plural, which is prefixal.

Postverbal Set II	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	-iŋ	-uŋ
INCL	-me[-]	
2	-tʃə	-tʃ ^w u
3	---	-he([-])

Table 6. Monsang postverbal person marker set II

Finally, Set III is shown in Table 7. Again, the difference is small. The INCL form is the same as in Set II. In addition, now, the second person forms also occur preceding the TAM marker. Here as well, then, the cognacy with the prefixal second person PTH #*tV*- is particularly obvious.

Postverbal Set III	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	-iŋ	-uŋ
INCL	-me[-]	
2	-te[-]	-te[-]... ^(w) -u
3	---	-he([-])

Table 7. Monsang postverbal person marker set III

3 Intransitive paradigms

Intransitive paradigms fall into four types in terms of which set of person indexes are employed. That is, all three variations of the postverbal set occur among intransitive paradigms, as does the preverbal set. Only the postverbal Set I occurs across a number of paradigms, and is discussed first. Postverbal Sets II and III and the preverbal Set each only occur with a single paradigm, and are discussed in this order.

3.1 Postverbal Set I: Equational copula, non-future negative, perfective, nominalized, and non-final paradigms

Set I of the postverbal indexation markers occurs the most widely among the intransitive paradigms. It is the set in which all indexes except for 3PL occur following the TAM marker or copula, including the INCL form *-mə* and the second person forms *-tʃ* and *-tʃ^wu*. As an example, consider the full affirmative paradigm of the equational copula in Table 8. Note that while this paradigm is considered the prescriptively correct one and is used in the speech of two of the six Monsang villages, in Liwachangning village, where data for this study come from, the common pronunciation actually has voiced /g/ instead of voiceless /k/.

Affirmative equational copula	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	=k=iŋ	=k=uŋ
INCL	(=)ke=mə	
2	(=)ke=tʃ	(=)ke=tʃ ^w u
3	=ka	(=)he=ka ~ (=)ke=he

Table 8. Affirmative equational copula paradigm

All person indexation markers occur after the copula with the exception of the 3PL form, where the order can be both ways, with no apparent difference in meaning. Note the three allomorphs of the equational copula, *k-ke-ka*. Each allomorph has a clear distribution. The vowel-less form *k* occurs with a following vowel-initial person index; the form *ke* occurs with a following consonant-initial person index; and *ka* is found at the end of the word. While the simple phonological conditioning of *k* does not require further explanation, the alternation between *ke* and *ka* is not simply phonological. Presumably one of the forms, and possibly though not likely both, is a fusion of two morphemes: the copula *k* plus another morpheme whose form here is only the vowel, *e* or *a*, respectively. What exactly needs to be reconstructed remains a question for future research.

The forms of the equational copula in Table 8 are written as clitics without tone marks. Monosyllabic forms appear to always be clitics, whereas disyllabic forms may or may not phonologically attach to a preceding element. The reason for treating the monosyllabic forms as clitics is that the tone of the copula form is determined by the noun it attaches to. This is illustrated by (1) and (2). Following the low tone noun root *bàʔ* ‘bat’, the tone on the copula form is high; following the high tone noun root *mí* ‘person, human being’, the tone on the copula form is low. Taking the opposite tone of the root appears to be a common pattern in the tone assignment on grammatical morphemes not only in Monsang but also in other South-Central languages, such as Myebon Sumtu Chin and Anal (Watkins 2013; Ozerov 2018).

- (1) *bàʔ*=k=iŋ
bat=COP=1SG
‘I am a bat’
- (2) *mí*=k=iŋ
person=COP=1SG
‘I am a person’

In disyllabic forms, such as the 2SG forms, the tone of the noun does not influence the tone pattern of the copula form, which in both cases stays high-low, as shown in (3) and (4). It appears as though the copula form is not bound to the noun with which it forms a predicate.

(3) *bà:* *ké=ɬɕ*
bat COP=2SG
'you are a bat'

(4) *mí* *ké=ɬɕ*
person COP=2SG
'you are a person'

The negative forms in (5) and (6) finally illustrate the fact that a disyllabic copula form may take a low-low tone pattern if it attaches to a high tone morpheme, in this case the negative marker *má?*.

(5) *bà:* *má:=kè=ɬɕ*
bat NEG=COP=2SG
'you are not a bat'

(6) *mí* *má:=kè=ɬɕ*
person NEG=COP=2SG
'you are not a person'

The equational copula paradigm is also found in the verbal system. As illustrated in (7) and (8), Monsang has a nominalization construction of a type that is common both cross-linguistically, as well as specifically within the Trans-Himalayan family (DeLancey 2011). This construction consists of a verb (here *sí* 'go') with a nominalizer (here the prefix *i-*), followed by an inflected copula, which renders the construction as a whole finite.

(7) *i-sí=k=iŋ*
NMLZ-go=COP=1SG
'I am going / I go'

(8) *i-sí=má:=k=iŋ*
NMLZ-go=NEG=COP=1SG
'I am not going / I don't go'

In addition to the equational copula, the postverbal indexes from Set I are also found in the non-future negative paradigm of intransitive verbs. This paradigm is shown in Table 9 with *sí* 'go'. Note that the vowel of 1SG *-iŋ* drops out while its high tone is preserved in a low-high contour tone on the vowel of the negative *-ma?*.⁷

⁷ Glottal stop codas generally only surface phrase-finally and are otherwise replaced by vowel length. This can be seen, for example, in *bà?* 'bat' and also in the negative marker (*-ma?*).

Non-future negative	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	<i>sì-mǎ:-ŋ</i>	<i>sì-mà-ùŋ</i>
INCL	<i>sì-mà:-mǎ</i>	
2	<i>sì-mà:-tʃǎ</i>	<i>sì-mà:-tʃwù</i>
3	<i>sì-màʔ</i>	<i>sì-mà:-hé</i>

Table 9. Non-future negative intransitive paradigm

Furthermore, we find the same Set I of postverbal indexes in the perfective paradigms, both affirmative and negative. The perfective marker is *-se*. Examples (9) to (12) show the crucial INCL and second person forms of both the affirmative and negative perfective paradigms. In all cases, the person indexes follow the perfective marker.

- (9) *sí-sé-mǎ* ‘we (INCL) have gone’
 (10) *sì-mà:-sé-mǎ* ‘we (INCL) haven’t gone’
 (11) *sí-sé-tʃǎ* ‘you have gone’
 (12) *sì-mà:-sé-tʃǎ* ‘you haven’t gone’

Finally, non-final verbs also carry person indexes, which come from the postverbal Set I, too. This is exemplified with a 2SG form in (13) and with an INCL form in (14).

- (13) *dʒwùŋ-tʃǎ-gè*
 come.down-2SG-NF
 ‘you came down (and)...’ (MolW Tingtingtingpa 074)
- (14) *á:-nrá=kʰá* *íʃ:-mǎ-gè*
 3-fruit=DM pluck.for.use-INCL-NF
 ‘we pick its fruit (and)...’ (Two Trees 017)

3.2 Postverbal Set II: Imperfective affirmative

The only intransitive paradigm whose person indexes come from the postverbal Set II is the affirmative imperfective. This set of person indexes is different from Set I in that the INCL takes the form *-me[-]* and precedes the TAM marker (in this case, *-ne~-nǎ* ‘imperfective’). It is different from Set III in that the second person forms have the palatalized affricate form and follow rather than precede the TAM marker. This can be seen in the paradigm for *sí* ‘go’ in Table 10.

Imperfective affirmative	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	<i>sí-n-ìŋ</i>	<i>sí-n-ùŋ</i>
INCL	<i>sí-mé-nǎ</i>	
2	<i>sí-né-tʃǎ</i>	<i>sí-né-tʃwù</i>
3	<i>sí-nè</i>	<i>sí-hé-né ~ sí-né-hè</i>

Table 10. Imperfective affirmative intransitive paradigm

3.3 Postverbal Set III: Future negative

Table 11 provides the intransitive future negative paradigm of *sí* ‘go’. The TAM marker in this paradigm is obviously cognate with the ‘imperfective’ marker in the affirmative paradigm given in Table 10 despite some vowel differences. In particular the form with the central vowel /ə/ suggests that this marker is a reflex of the pan-South Central copula *ni* (cf. DeLancey 2015) because /-ə/ is the regular reflex of the Proto-South-Central open rhyme **-i(i)* in Monsang (Konnerth 2018). The person indexes in the future negative come from Set III as the second person forms have the alveolar stop as the initial consonant and precede the TAM marker.

Future negative	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	<i>sì-mà:-n-íŋ</i>	<i>sì-mà:-n-úŋ</i>
INCL	<i>sì-mà:-mé-nś</i>	
2	<i>sì-mà:-té-nś</i>	<i>sì-mà:-té-n^w-ú</i>
3	<i>sì-mà:-nś</i>	<i>sì-mà:-hé-nś ~ sì-mà:-né-hé</i>

Table 11. Future negative intransitive paradigm

3.4 Preverbal person indexation: Future affirmative

Finally, the future affirmative paradigm of intransitive verbs takes preverbal person indexes. The forms of *sí* ‘go’ are given in Table 12. (While the 1SG and 1PL.EXCL forms in Table 12 are considered prescriptively correct, their more common pronunciation among Monsang native speakers of Liwa Changning are *sí-váŋ=gè-tè* and *sí-váŋ=gìn-tè*, where the /k/ is replaced with /g/ and where the 1SG form also has the vowel /e/ rather than /i/. This change, which still appears to be ongoing in the community, represents a process of phonological fusion through assimilation, whereby the forms are becoming more opaque.)

Future affirmative	SG	PL
1(EXCL)	<i>sí-váŋ=kì-tè</i>	<i>sí-váŋ=kìn-tè (~kínŋte)</i>
INCL	<i>sí-vá-té(-r^w-ù)</i>	
2	<i>sí-váŋ=nà-tè</i>	<i>sí-váŋ=nín-tè (~nínŋte)</i>
3	<i>sí-vá-tè</i>	<i>sí-vá-tè-hè</i>

Table 12. Present affirmative intransitive paradigm

The future affirmative verb forms that index SAP’s except the INCL represent the following schematic structure: [VERB.ROOT]-[FUT]=[PREVERBAL.PERSON.INDEX]-[FUT.AUX]. The equal sign connects the two diachronic parts of the forms: the lexical verb marked by the future marker *-váŋ*, and the auxiliary verb with the preverbal person index. The third person forms are more opaque. It is possible that the form *sí-vá-tè* ‘he will go’ represents a phonological fusion of a form analogous to the SAP forms, which would be **sí-váŋ=à-tè* but is not used. Nonetheless, there is supporting evidence from a nominalized third person form *sí-vá-tè=gà* with the equational copula, which is

indeed in alternation with *si-váŋ=à-tè-gà*. Finally, for the INCL, there is no form that fits the paradigm, apparently due to the interactional nature of any INCL future utterance. Thus, the elicitation of an INCL future form typically results in a future hortative, such as *si-vá-té(-r^w-ù)* ‘let’s go (soon)!’.⁸ Another option is the same kind of a nominalized form with a copula mentioned above, which for INCL is *si-váŋ=i-tè-gà*.

The origins of this innovative future construction probably lie in a reported speech construction. The best candidate for the lexical source of the auxiliary verb *te* is the verb *té* ‘say, call’. This is also the grammaticalized auxiliary in the desiderative construction of Monsang, which is in fact built on a reported speech construction (Konnerth to appear). In the future affirmative paradigm, the exact source construction is still unclear. In particular, the origins of what should synchronically be considered a future suffix on the lexical verb, *-vaŋ*, are still unclear. However, the grammaticalization pathway from a reported speech construction to marking future is attested cross-linguistically in Papua New Guinea and Africa (Reesink 1993; Aaron 1996; Botne 1998).

3.5 Summary: Intransitive paradigms

Most intransitive paradigms take person indexes from the postverbal Set I. Postverbal Sets II and III are limited to the imperfective affirmative and future negative paradigms, both of which contain what must be the same etymological TAM marker *-ne~-nɔ~-n*. The future affirmative paradigm represents an innovative complex construction that includes both a future suffix on the lexical verb *-vaŋ* as well as a future auxiliary *te* inflected with preverbal person markers. These findings are summarized in Table 13.

Paradigm(s)	Person marking	TAM marking
COP, NON-FUT NEG, PFV, NMLZ, NF	postverbal-I	None or <i>-se~-s</i> ‘PFV’
IPFV AFF	postverbal-II	<i>-ne~-n</i> ‘IPFV’
FUT NEG	postverbal-III	<i>-ne~-nɔ~-n</i> ‘IPFV’
FUT AFF	preverbal	<i>-vaŋ</i> ‘FUT’ + <i>te</i> ‘FUT.AUX’

Table 13. Summary: Intransitive paradigms

4 Transitive paradigms

As is the case with the intransitive paradigms, transitive paradigms can be grouped into four types by examining which person indexation sets are found in the verb forms. However, the transitive categories are distinct from the intransitive ones. There is no occurrence of person indexation with markers from the postverbal Set II.

Table 14 illustrates the general pattern of person indexation that is found in all transitive paradigms. The area highlighted in gray is the one where inverse marking occurs. This includes the scenarios of 2→1 and 3→SAP. Besides the inverse marker, these scenarios also display A person indexation; however, these indexes mostly come from one of the postverbal sets where no third person index exists. The only exception is the future affirmative paradigm, where, however, there also is not

⁸ Interestingly, the INCL future negative form does fit into the paradigm, see §3.3.

a clear third person index. The non-inverse scenarios, which we can refer to as ‘direct’, carry double indexation. Both A and O are indexed although here it is the O marker that always comes from one of the postverbal sets and therefore is lacking in the case of third person. The absence of explicit third person marking for A in the inverse and O in the direct (including 3→3) is indicated by parentheses in Table 14. In other words, the parentheses in Table 14 indicate those arguments, which are merely implicitly cross-referenced by paradigmatic zero morphemes.⁹

A	O	1	2	3
1		-----	A+O	A(+O)
2		INVERSE + A	-----	A(+O)
3		INVERSE (+A)		A(+O)

Table 14. Person and inverse markers in the Monsang transitive paradigms

4.1 Non-future affirmative and nominalized paradigms

The imperfective and perfective affirmative paradigms occur with the same person indexes and are here referred to as the ‘non-future’ affirmative paradigms. They together with both the affirmative and negative nominalized paradigms form one category with respect to person indexation.

In order to discuss the person indexation patterns of this category of paradigms, we will go over forms from the imperfective affirmative paradigm. All of these forms take the imperfective marker *-naʔ~na:*. This marker would be replaced by *-pe* ‘completive’ in the completive affirmative paradigm; by *-se* ‘perfective’ in the perfective affirmative paradigm; and by the equational copula *ka~ke~k* (cf. §3.1) in the nominalized paradigm.

Examples (15) and (16) illustrate inverse forms. They include the inverse marker, which is a homorganic syllabic nasal prefix¹⁰ with a salient low-high tone pattern that extends over the prefix and the verb root. The second person A argument in (15) is overtly indexed by postverbal *-tʃ* from Set I/II. Postverbal indexation does not include a third person marker, which is why the third person A argument in (16) is not explicitly marked but only cross-references third person paradigmatically.

- (15) *ṇ-bín-ná:-tʃ* ‘you are beating me’ (2SG→1SG)
 (16) *ṇ-bín-náʔ* ‘he is beating me/you/us’ (3SG→SAP)

⁹ We are leaving out here a discussion about the marking of 3PL via *-he* ([-]) in the postverbal indexation sets. It may be possible to argue that this means that third person is generally indexed in the case of the inverse A argument and the direct O argument, and that it is just 3SG but not third person in general that is unmarked or zero-marked. However, this discussion will also require a closer look at the degree to which number (specifically, plural marking) is a fused component of person indexation in Monsang. Preliminary observations suggest that number tends to be separately encoded from the four basic person categories: first person (singular); inclusive; second person (singular); third person.

¹⁰ The assimilation of the nasal inverse prefix to the place of articulation of the following consonant can be seen in forms such as *ṇ-sí* ‘INV-bite’ or *ṇ-káʔ* ‘INV-shoot’ of the verbs *sí* ‘bite’ and *káʔ* ‘shoot’. Before vowel-initial roots such as *idʃʔ* ‘love, want’, the velar nasal occurs and is also copied as an onset on the initial vowel of the root: *ṇ-ṇidʃʔ* ‘INV-love’.

While the O argument is generally not indexed in the inverse portion of this paradigm, plurality of the O argument may be reflected in the form. Consider (17), where *-tʃʷú* may not only mark the expected 2PL:A argument but may also be used when there is a 2SG:A argument acting on a 1PL.EXCL:O argument thus reflecting the plurality of the O argument.

- (17) *ṁ-bín-ná:-tʃʷú* ‘you (PL) are beating me’ (2PL→1SG)
 ‘you (SG) are beating us’ (2SG→1PL.EXCL)

Four direct forms are given in (18) through (21). The A argument is indexed by prefixal forms. The prefixal forms are all high tone and trigger high tone on the verb root, except for the INCL, which is low tone and also triggers low tone on the verb root, see (20). The O argument of direct forms, which is only either second or third person (because first person O belongs to the inverse portion of the paradigm), are marked by postverbal indexes. Since only second and (unmarked) third person O forms occur, all we can say is that the O markers come from Set I/II. The difference between Set I and Set II lies in the form of the INCL marker, which as a first person form is not part of O indexation in the direct portion of transitive paradigms.

- (18) *kí-bín-ná:-tʃʷ* ‘I’m beating you’ (1SG→2SG)
 (19) *kí-bín-ná?* ‘I’m beating him’ (1SG→3SG)
 (20) *ì-bín-ná?* ‘we (INCL) are beating him’ (INCL→3SG)
 (21) *kí-bín-ná:-hè* ‘I’m beating them’ (1SG→3PL)

Third person plural A arguments may be indexed by a homorganic syllabic nasal prefix as shown with the elicited form in (22).

- (22) *ṁ-bín-ná?* ‘they are beating him’ (3PL→3SG)

However, text data show that the more common form for 3PL→3(SG/PL) consists of using *á-* as a general third person A prefix and combining it with the plural marker *-hè*, as seen in (23).

- (23) *nèpáŋhĩŋ* *ábúmná:hè*
 nèpáŋ-hs-ĩŋ *á-búm-ná?-hé*
 child-PROX-ERG 3-help-IPFV:TR-PL
 ‘the children are helping him’ (RW pear story 037)

The category of paradigms discussed in this section is different from the other categories discussed in the following three sections. The two major differences are as follows. First, the inverse marker is a homorganic syllabic nasal prefix, whereas the form of the inverse marker is different in the paradigm types to be discussed. Second, the forms of the paradigm that have a third person (singular) O argument (‘3:O’) are different from the paradigm of S indexation of intransitive verbs. The result is that this category of paradigms only exists for transitive verbs. Since this category of paradigms employs prefixal indexation, we assume that this category of paradigms represents an innovative construction based on nominalization.

4.2 Non-future negative

The non-future negative paradigm involves the negative suffix *-maʔ~ma:*. The inverse marker is *i'-*, which comes with a low-high tone pattern that extends onto the following verb root, as was the case with the nasal prefix discussed in the previous section. The inverse marker is illustrated in (24) and (25). The A argument is indexed by postverbal person markers: third person is regularly unmarked, and the form of the second person *-tʃ* means that this is Set I or Set II.

- (24) *i-bin-má:-tʃ* ‘you don’t/didn’t beat me’ (2SG→1SG)
 (25) *i-bin-máʔ* ‘he doesn’t/didn’t beat me/you/us’ (3SG→SAP)

Analogous to what we saw in §4.1, plurality of the O argument may be reflected in the 2→1 form given in (26).

- (26) *i-bin-má:-tʃ^{vú}* ‘you (PL) don’t/didn’t beat me’ (2PL→1SG) or
 ‘you don’t/didn’t beat us’ (2SG→1PL.EXCL)

The direct portion of this paradigm is illustrated in (27) to (30). The A argument is indexed by person markers from the postverbal Set I. For the O argument, we can only determine that the *-tʃ* for second person and the unmarked third person mean that this is postverbal Set I or II. The 3SG:O forms in (28) and (29) are identical to intransitive non-future negative forms.

- (27) *bin-má:-ŋ-tʃ* ‘I don’t/didn’t beat you’ (1SG→2SG)
 (28) *bin-má:-ŋ* ‘I don’t/didn’t beat him’ (1SG→3SG)
 (29) *bin-má:-mś* ‘we (INCL) don’t/didn’t beat him’ (INCL→3SG)
 (30) *bin-má:-hé-ŋ* ‘I don’t/didn’t beat them’ (1SG→3PL)

Example (30) shows an unexpected ordering of the plural marker *-he([-])* before the 1SG index *-ŋ* for the A argument. There is no obvious explanation for this; all that is clear at this point is that the position of *-he([-])* is variable in general.

4.3 Future negative

Examples (31) and (32) of the future negative paradigm show the *i'-* prefix inverse marker. The 2SG:A index in (31) comes from the postverbal Set III, analogous to the 2SG:S index in the future negative intransitive paradigm. Otherwise, these forms contain the negative *-maʔ~ma:* and the future marker *-nə~n*.

- (31) *i-bin-má:-té-nś* ‘you won’t beat me’ (2SG→1SG)
 (32) *i-bin-má:-nś* ‘he won’t beat me/you/us’ (3SG→SAP)

Direct forms are illustrated in (33) to (36). The A person markers are from the postverbal Set III, while the 2SG:O index *-tʃ* in (33) is from postverbal Set I/II. The fact that 2:O is indexed with a form from postverbal Set I/II means that this special marking of a speech-act participant object represents an innovation that postdates the older (in fact, oldest) type of subject indexation via

postverbal Set III. The 3SG:O forms in (34) and (35) are again identical to intransitive forms of the future negative paradigm.

- (33) *bin-má:-n-íη-tʃə* ‘I won’t beat you’ (1SG→2SG)
 (34) *bin-má:-n-íη* ‘I won’t beat him’ (1SG→3SG)
 (35) *bin-má:-mé-nʃ* ‘we (INCL) won’t beat him’ (INCL→3SG)
 (36) *bin-má:-hé-n-íη* ‘I won’t beat them’ (1SG→3PL)

4.4 Future affirmative

In the future affirmative, the inverse marker is also the *i-'* prefix with the same low-high tone pattern, as seen in (37) and (38). The other elements are the verb root *bin* ‘beat’, the future marker *váη-va*, as well as what is historically an inflected future auxiliary that takes preverbal person markers to index the A argument; except for the inverse prefix, this is analogous to the intransitive future affirmative paradigm (§0).

- (37) *i-bin-váη=nà-tè* ‘you will beat me’ (2SG→1SG)
 (38) *i-bin-vá-tè* ‘he will beat me/you/us’ (3SG→SAP)

For the direct local scenario of 1SG→2SG, the commonly used form is given in (39). In Liwachangning village, the form will be pronounced with a /g/ rather than a /k/, so *bin-váη=gè-tʃə*. The person marking component *kè-tʃə~gè-tʃə* form at first appears to be the 2SG form of the copula (cf. §3.1, examples (3)-(6)).

- (39) *bin-váη=kè-tʃə* ‘I will beat you’ (1SG→2SG)

However, this would be surprising since the direct scenarios and especially 1SG→2SG were shown to generally feature double-indexation in the preceding sections. As it turns out, there is another, longer form for the same scenario, given in (40). The function of this form has to do with greater emphasis, apparently with respect of the intentionality of the agent.

- (40) *bin-váη=kì-tè=kè-tʃə*
 beat-FUT=1SG-FUT.AUX=COP-2SG
 ‘I will (definitely) beat you’ (1SG→2SG); emphasis on agent / certainty

The person marking part *kì-tè=kè-tʃə* (or *gè-tè=gè-tʃə*) is a concatenation of the 1SG inflected future auxiliary followed by the 2SG of the copula. Thus, the form in (40) indexes both 1SG:A and 2SG:O. Of course, whether the more commonly used, shorter form in (39) also indexes both arguments is a different question. There is, however, evidence from analogous 1PL.EXCL→2SG forms that suggests that indeed both arguments are indexed even in (39). Consider (41) and (42), which are typically pronounced with /g/ instead of /k/ as *bin-váη=gìn-tʃə* and *bin-váη=gìn-tè=gè-tʃə* in Liwa Changning.

- (41) *bìn-váŋ=kìn-tʃ* ‘we will beat you’ (1PL.EXCL→2SG)
 (42) *bìn-váŋ=kìn-tè=kè-tʃ* ‘we will (definitely) beat you’ (1PL.EXCL→2SG); emphasis on agent / certainty

Since the short form in (41) includes both the 1PL.EXCL preverbal marker and the 2SG Set I/II postverbal marker in direct sequence, this suggests that likewise in (39), the *kè-tʃ* part reflects a sequence of preverbal 1SG:A and postverbal 2SG:O. The history of this unlikely sequence must be a contraction of the respective longer forms in (40) and (42).

Direct forms with a 3SG:O argument are indistinguishable from intransitive forms in the future affirmative. Examples are shown in (43) (usually *bìn-váŋ=gè-tè* in Liwa Changning) and (44), which is the same hortative form we saw in the intransitive paradigm.

- (43) *bìn-váŋ=kì-tè* ‘I will beat him’ (1SG→3SG)
 (44) *bìn-vá-tè(-r^mù)* ‘let’s beat him’ (INCL→3SG)

If the third person O argument is plural, the plural marker occurs between the verb root and the future marker *váŋ*, as seen in (45).

- (45) *bìn-hé-váŋ=kì-tè* ‘I will beat them’ (1SG→3PL)

In regular, more hypoarticulated speech in Liwa Changning, this form is often rendered as *bìn-hé-áŋ=gè-tè* or *bìn-hé-ŋ=gè-tè*, where the future suffix becomes reduced to just *-ŋ*.

4.5 Summary: Transitive paradigms

In sum, there are two ways of categorizing the transitive paradigms of Monsang. Table 15 provides the overview. At the more detailed level of which sets of person markers are employed, we find four different types of transitive paradigms: the four types that have been discussed in §§4.1-4.4. The first two columns show which person indexation set the respective A and O markers in the inverse and direct portions of the paradigms come from. Note that the O argument in the inverse is generally not cross-referenced although plurality may be reflected in the two non-future types of paradigms (see examples (17) and (26)).

Paradigms	INVERSE		DIRECT		INVERSE MARKER	3SG:O = S
	A	O	A	O		
NON-FUT AFF AND NMLZ	post-I/II	--	pre	post-I/II	<i>ŋ-</i>	no
NON-FUT NEG	post-I/II	--	post-I	post-I/II	<i>i-</i>	yes
FUT NEG	post-III	--	post-III	post-I/II	<i>i-</i>	yes
FUT AFF	pre	--	pre	post-I/II	<i>i-</i>	yes

Table 15. Overview of transitive paradigms

At a larger level, we see that the first type (i.e., non-future affirmative and nominalized paradigms) is different from the remaining three types in two ways. First, we find a difference in the form of the inverse marker: either the syllabic nasal prefix or the *i'*- prefix, although both come with the same low-high tone pattern. Second, consider transitivity. For three of the four types of paradigms, the 3SG:O forms are identical to intransitive forms. As an example, we can compare two low tone verb roots, intransitive *kàr* 'climb' and transitive *bín* 'beat'. In the non-future negative, transitive 3SG:O *bín-má:-ŋ* 'I didn't beat him' and intransitive *kàr-má:-ŋ* 'I didn't climb' are the same forms. This is different for the first type of paradigms. In the imperfective affirmative, for example, transitive 3SG:O *kí-bín ná?* 'I'm beating him' is different from intransitive *kàr-n-íŋ* 'I'm climbing'.

5 Ditransitive person indexation

Ditransitive person indexation has only been investigated on a preliminary basis. The topic deserves more extensive study as the limited findings so far suggest that different verbs behave differently. At the present state of research two different person indexation systems have been found to occur. Apparently the more common system is hierarchical, and will be discussed first. This system is found with the verb *pe-piʔ-pi*: 'give' as well as with causativized transitive verbs, such as *mím-bín* 'CAUS-beat' or 'make somebody beat somebody', and the lexicalized (historically causativized) *mìnt^hs* 'show (somebody to somebody)'. The second system is syntactic rather than hierarchical, and is based on a direct-indirect object distinction. It has only been found with a single verb *tʃʃr* 'send (somebody to somebody)'. In both person indexation systems, only two arguments are indexed. That is, in both cases, ditransitive verb stems take the same set of person indexation forms that we have encountered above with transitive verbs. Among the three ditransitive arguments A, R, and T, the A argument is indexed the way the A argument of transitive verbs is indexed. With respect to the indexation of R and T, the two systems differ.

In the case of hierarchical ditransitive person indexation, what matters is whether either R or T or both are a speech-act participant or third person. We can see this in Table 16, which summarizes the six forms that are distinguished in a simplified singular-only paradigm of ditransitive scenarios.¹¹ Again, the available ditransitive forms are identical to transitive forms. This is shown both in the 'Transitive indexation' column of Table 16, as well as with Table 17, which uses the familiar tabular format of transitive paradigms (cf. Table 14 above) and includes small Roman numbers for Monsang transitive forms that correspond to the first column in Table 16. The last column in Table 16 gives singular examples of the nominalized paradigm of *pe-piʔ-pi*: 'give'.

¹¹ While we limit ourselves to singular forms here, it is worth pointing out that the INCL does not function in any different or special way. If either the R or the T is INCL (and logically the A is 3rd person), then the same 3→SAP form (ii) is used. If the A is INCL (and R and T are 3rd person), then the respective preverbal person indexation form is used, *i-pi:-ká*.

FORM	DITRANSITIVE SCENARIO			TRANSITIVE INDEXATION	EXAMPLE (SG)
	A	R	T		
(i)	2	1	3	2→1 (inverse)	<i>m-pí:-ké-tʃ</i> ‘you give me to her/him’ ‘you give her/him to me’
	2	3	1		
(ii)	3	SAP	3	3→SAP (inverse)	<i>m-pí:-ká</i> ‘s/he gives me/you to her/him’ ‘s/he gives her/him to me/you’ ‘s/he gives me/you to me/you’
	3	3	SAP		
	3	SAP	SAP		
(iii)	1	2	3	1→2 (direct)	<i>kí-pí:-ké-tʃ</i> ‘I give you to her/him’ ‘I give her/him to you’
	1	3	2		
(iv)	1	3	3	1→3 (direct)	<i>kí-pí:-ká</i> ‘I give to her/him’
(v)	2	3	3	2→3 (direct)	<i>ná-pí:-ká</i> ‘you give to her/him’
(vi)	3	3	3	3→3 (direct)	<i>á-pí:-ká</i> ‘s/he gives to her/him’

Table 16. Mapping of ditransitive scenarios onto transitive person indexation forms (singular only)

A	O	1SG	2SG	3SG
1SG		-----	(iii)	(iv)
2SG		(i)	-----	(v)
3SG		(ii)		(vi)

Table 17. Person indexation forms in the singular Monsang transitive paradigms

As we can see in the first line of Table 16, two ditransitive scenarios map onto the single transitive scenario 2→1. The two ditransitive scenarios both have a second person A argument, but differ in whether the first person is the R or the T argument. Thus, it is irrelevant whether the first is the R or the T argument, what matters and is indexed on the verb is the fact that there is a non-A first person involved. This is a hierarchical rather than a syntactic system of ditransitive person indexation.

For the second case of ditransitive person indexation with the verb *tʃr* ‘send (somebody to somebody)’, let us only consider the following two examples (46) and (47).

- (46) *[kʰ=tʃwù]_T* *[á-níŋ-tè]_R* *n-dʒè:-tʃr-ná?*
 1SG=DM 3SG-TOWARDS-ALL INV-ACROSS:DIST-send-IMPF
 ‘she sends **me** (across a plain area) to him’

- (47) *[ámá=tʃwù]_T* *[kí-níŋ-tè]_R* *á-dʒè:-tʃr-ná?*
 3SG=DM 1SG-TOWARDS-ALL 3SG-ACROSS:DIST-send-IMPF
 ‘she sends **him** (across a plain area) to me’

In both examples, the A is third person, but the remaining two arguments have reversed roles. In (46), the T is first person and the R is third person, and what is indexed on the verb is 3→SAP. This matches the ditransitive indexation pattern we have seen above. However, in (47), where the T is third person and the R is first person, the indexed scenario on the verb is 3→3. This means that what is indexed with the verb *tʃʁ* ‘send (somebody to somebody)’ is consistently A→T, irrespective of the person of the R argument. Comparing ditransitive A→T with transitive A→O further gives us an O/T grouping that we can standardly refer to as the direct object, in opposition to the indirect object, which is the R argument.

6 Conclusion

This study has found four types of intransitive paradigms and four types of transitive paradigms in Monsang. A preliminary investigation of ditransitive verbs has presented evidence that there are at least two types of ditransitive person indexation, hierarchical and direct/indirect.

Leaving aside the explorations into the ditransitive domain, we want to conclude by exploring the diachronic developments of two fundamental aspects of the data presented in this paper. One concerns the three sets of postverbal indexation markers, which are slightly different and obviously closely related. The other is about the differences and similarities between person indexation on intransitive and transitive verbs.

6.1 Diachrony of the postverbal indexation marker sets

The three variants of the postverbal indexes are similar enough that it should be possible to reconstruct their histories. Table 18 summarizes the differences between the three sets, which depend on the forms of the second person markers (the table only shows singular forms but the same holds for plural forms) and the INCL marker.

	2SG	INCL
Postverbal Set I	-tʃʁ	-mʁ
Postverbal Set II	-tʃʁ	-me[-]
Postverbal Set III	-te[-]	-me[-]

Table 18. 2SG and INCL forms in postverbal person marker sets

If the INCL and the second person forms derive from the prefixal forms of (ultimately PTH) *mV-* and *#V-*, then the postverbal Set III with INCL *-me[-]* and the second person *-te[-]* forms has to be the most original set. These person markers precede the TAM marker, that is, the original finite verb.

Moving on to Set I, here we find clear innovations. The second person forms apparently represent fusions with a palatal copula (DeLancey 2014), which would explain palatal /tʃ/ in place of /t/. While the *-tʃʁ* and *-tʃ^u* second person forms of Sets I/II synchronically follow the TAM marker, they still need to be reconstructed as preverbal markers as they had to precede the reconstructed copula that triggered the palatalization from /t/ to /tʃ/. Similarly, the postverbal INCL marker *-mʁ* of

Set I must be reconstructed as being a fusion of preverbal $-m(e)[-]$ with the same palatal copula that gave rise to the $/tʃ/$ -initial second person forms. Evidence for this consists in the presence of the same central vowel $/ə/$ in the case of both the 2SG marker $-tʃə$ and the INCL marker $-mə$. Thus, Set I can be reconstructed as a fusion of the original Set III forms with the putative palatal copula.

The diachrony of Set II, which is a hybrid between Set I and Set III, is still speculative at this point. This set only occurs with the imperfective affirmative paradigm. It is worth comparing the two paradigms where the postverbal Sets II and III occur, see Table 19.

	Imperfective affirmative (Set II)	Future negative (Set III)
1SG	$[sɪ]-n-ɪŋ$	$[sì-mà:] -n-ɪŋ$
1PL.EXCL	$[sɪ]-n-ùŋ$	$[sì-mà:] -n-ùŋ$
INCL	$[sɪ]-m-é-n-ə̀$	$[sì-mà:] -m-é-n-ə̀$
2SG	$[sɪ]-n-é-tʃə̀$	$[sì-mà:] -t-é-n-ə̀$
2PL	$[sɪ]-n-é-tʃ-ù$	$[sì-mà:] -t-é-n-ù$
3SG	$[sɪ]-n-è$	$[sì-mà:] -n-ə̀$
3PL	$[sɪ]-h-é-n-é \sim sɪ-n-é-h-è$	$[sì-mà:] -h-é-n-ə̀ \sim sì-mà: -n-é-h-è$

Table 19. Postverbal Sets II and III in comparison (verb stems in square brackets)

Within the imperfective affirmative paradigm, the INCL form is different from all other forms in that the form of the TAM marker is $-nə$ rather than $-ne$. Based on this, we can propose that Set II is a variant of Set I in which the INCL form changed in analogy to Set III. As we can see in Table 19, this could have happened because Sets II and III occur with paradigms that make use of what must be etymologically the same TAM marker. As a result, the inflectional portion of the 1SG and 1PL.EXCL forms is identical between the two paradigms, which could motivate the analogical change of a historically prior $*sɪ-ne-mə$ for the imperfective affirmative INCL form to the attested $sɪ-m-é-n-ə̀$, parallel to the future negative $sì-mà: -m-é-n-ə̀$.

6.2 Person indexation and transitivity: On the innovative imperfective affirmative

Let us also take a closer look at the difference between intransitive and transitive paradigms. Although four types of intransitive paradigms and four types of transitive paradigms were found, these types do not all correspond. More specifically, three types mostly correspond (i.e., (a) non-future negative (also including a few other particular paradigms in the case of intransitives); (b) future negative; and (c) future affirmative), while one does not (i.e., non-future/imperfective affirmative, also including the nominalization paradigm in the case of transitives). What is meant by ‘corresponding’ is that we are dealing with essentially the same construction, which employs the same TAM marker, although transitive forms include inverse marking and double person indexation, both of which are absent in intransitive forms. In these corresponding paradigms, the transitive 3SG: O forms are identical to intransitive forms.

The three corresponding paradigms have in common that they are all irrealis: the non-future negative, the future negative, and the future affirmative. First consider the two future paradigms, whose intransitive and transitive forms correspond though for quite different reasons. On the one hand, the future affirmative paradigms of both intransitive and transitive verbs is an innovative construction that is apparently based on a reported speech construction (see §0). On the other hand,

the future negative paradigms correspond, and this is a particularly conservative construction which preserves postverbal Set III forms, specifically the non-palatalized second person form *te-* (see §2.3). Finally, the intransitive and transitive non-future negative forms also correspond. These forms involve only the negative marker and postverbal person indexation.

The forms that do not correspond between intransitive and transitive verbs are the non-future affirmative and nominalized paradigms. Consider the difference between the imperfective affirmative forms: intransitive *si-n-ij* ‘go-IPFV:ITR-1SG’ (‘I go’) vis-à-vis transitive *ki-bin-ná?* ‘1SG-beat-IPFV:TR’ (‘I beat him’). The TAM markers are different with *-ne~-n* in the intransitive and *-na?~na:* in the transitive paradigm. The intransitive suffix is likely to be a reflex of the *ni* etymon, a common verbal marker among South-Central languages which goes back to a copula (DeLancey 2015: 134ff.). The transitive suffix must be cognate with *naak/na*, a South-Central nominalizer (Hartmann 2001), and thus related to a productive nominalizer *-na* in Monsang. If the transitive affirmative forms contain a nominalizer, this can explain why this paradigm contains preverbal person markers, which are reanalysed possessive prefixes (§2.2). It is not clear yet why the innovative, nominalization-based imperfective affirmative construction was dedicated specifically just to transitive verbs. However, the general pattern of deriving a new finite construction from clausal nominalization is a typical Trans-Himalayan feature (DeLancey 2011).

ABBREVIATIONS

AFF	Affirmative	IPFV	Imperfective
CAUS	Causative	ITR	Intransitive
COMPL	Completive	NEG	Negative
DU	Dual	PFV	Perfective
EXCL	Exclusive	PL	Plural
FUT	Future	SG	Singular
INCL	Inclusive	TR	Transitive

REFERENCES

- Aaron, Uche E. 1996. “Grammaticization of the Verb ‘say’ to Future Tense in Obolo”. *Journal of West African Languages* 26 (2): 87–93.
- Bauman, James. 1975. *Pronouns and Pronominal Morphology in Tibeto-Burman*. Ph.D. dissertation, Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley.
- Botne, Robert. 1998. “The Evolution of Future Tenses from Serial ‘Say’ Constructions in Central Eastern Bantu”. *Diachronica* 15 (2): 207–30.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1989. “Verb Agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 52 (02): 315–33.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2011. “Finite Structures from Clausal Nominalization in Tibeto-Burman.” In *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, edited by Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Härsta, and Janick Wrona, 343–59. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- DeLancey, Scott. 2013. “The History of Postverbal Agreement in Kuki-Chin”. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, no. 6: 1–17.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2014. “Second Person Verb Forms in Tibeto-Burman”. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37 (1): 3–33.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2015. “Morphological Evidence for a Central Branch of Trans-Himalayan (Sino-Tibetan)”. *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 44 (2): 122–49.
- Hartmann, Helga. 2001. “Function of Naak/Na in Daai Chin with Examples from Other Chin Languages”. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24 (2): 143–56.
- Konnerth, Linda. to appear. “Recycling through Perspective Persistence in Monsang (Trans-Himalayan): Reconstructing the Desiderative from a Reported Intentionality Construction”. *Functions of Language*.
- Konnerth, Linda. 2018. “The Historical Phonology of Monsang (Northwestern South-Central/‘Kuki-Chin’): A Case of Reduction in Phonological Complexity”. *Himalayan Linguistics* 17 (1): 19–49.
- Ozerov, Pavel. 2018. “Grammatical Tone in Anal”. *Studies in Language* 42 (3): 708–33.
- Peterson, David A. 2003. “Hakha Lai”. In *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, edited by Graham Thurgood and LaPolla, Randy J., 409–26. RoutledgeCurzon.
- Reesink, Ger P. 1993. “‘Inner Speech’ in Papuan Languages”. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24 (2): 217–25.
- So-Hartmann, Helga. 2009. *A Descriptive Grammar of Daai Chin*. STEDT Monograph Series 7. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Thurgood, Graham. 1985. “Pronouns, Verb Agreement Systems, and the Subgrouping of Tibeto-Burman”. In *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan Area: The State of the Art*, edited by Graham Thurgood, James A. Matisoff, and David Bradley, 376–400. Series C 87. Canberra, Australian National University: Pacific Linguistics.
- VanBik, Kenneth. 2009. *Proto-Kuki-Chin: A Reconstructed Ancestor of the Kuki-Chin Languages*. STEDT Monograph Series 8. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Watkins, Justin. 2013. “A First Account of Tone in Myebon Sumtu Chin”. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 36 (2): 97–127.

Linda Konnerth

linda.konnerth@mail.huji.ac.il

APPENDIX: MONSANG TRANSITIVE PARADIGMS

IPFV AFF		1 st person		INCL	2 nd person		3 rd person	
		SG	PL.EXCL		SG	PL	SG	PL
1	SG				<i>kí-bin-ná:-tʃə</i>	<i>kí-bin-ná:-tʃʷú</i>	<i>kí-bin-ná?</i>	<i>kí-bin-ná:-hè</i>
	PL.EXCL				<i>kím-bin-ná:-tʃə</i>	<i>kím-bin-ná:-tʃʷú</i>	<i>kím-bin-ná?</i>	<i>kím-bin-ná:-hè</i>
INCL							<i>ì-bin-ná?</i>	<i>ì-bin-ná:-hè</i>
2	SG	<i>ḡ-bin-ná:-tʃə</i>	<i>ḡ-bin ná:-tʃʷú</i>				<i>ná-bin-ná?</i>	<i>ná-bin-ná:-hè</i>
	PL	<i>ḡ-bin ná:-tʃʷú</i>					<i>níḡ-bin-ná?</i>	<i>níḡ-bin-ná:-hè</i>
3	SG	<i>ḡ-bin-ná?</i>			<i>á-bin-ná?</i>	<i>á-bin-ná:-hè</i>		
	PL	<i>ḡ-bin-ná:-hè</i>			<i>ḡ-bin-ná?</i>	<i>ḡ-bin-ná:-hè</i>	<i>(~á-bin-ná:-hè)</i>	<i>(~á-bin-ná:-hè)</i>

Table 20. Imperfective affirmative paradigm of *bin* ‘beat’

NON-FUT NEG		1 st person		INCL	2 nd person		3 rd person	
		SG	PL.EXCL		SG	PL	SG	PL
1	SG				<i>bìn-má:-ḡ-tʃə</i>	<i>bìn-má:-ḡ-tʃʷú</i>	<i>bìn-má:-ḡ</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé-ḡ</i>
	PL.EXCL				<i>bìn-má:-úḡ-tʃə</i>	<i>bìn-má:-úḡ-tʃʷú</i>	<i>bìn-má:-úḡ</i>	<i>bìn-má:-h-úḡ</i>
INCL							<i>bìn-má:-mś</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé-mś</i> <i>(?bìn-má:-mé-hś)</i>
2	SG	<i>ì-bin-má:-tʃə</i>	<i>ì-bin-má:-tʃʷú</i>				<i>bìn-má:-tʃə</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé-tʃə</i>
	PL	<i>ì-bin-má:-tʃʷú</i>					<i>bìn-má:-tʃʷú</i>	<i>bìn-má:-(-hé)-tʃʷú</i>
3	SG	<i>ì-bin-má?</i>			<i>bìn-má?</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé</i>		
	PL	<i>ì-bin-má:-hé</i>			<i>bìn-má:-hé</i>			

Table 21. Non-future negative paradigm of *bin* ‘beat’

FUT AFF		1 st person		INCL	2 nd person		3 rd person	
		SG	PL.EXCL		SG	PL	SG	PL
1	SG				<i>bìn-váŋ=kè-tʃə</i>	<i>bìn-váŋ=kè-tʃ^{wú}</i>	<i>bìn-váŋ=kì-tè</i>	<i>bìn-hé-ŋ=kì-tè</i> (~ <i>bìn-hé-váŋ=kì-tè</i>)
	PL.EXCL				<i>bìn-váŋ=kìn-tʃə</i> ~ <i>bìn-váŋ=kìn-tʃ^{wú}</i>	<i>bìn-váŋ=kìn-tʃ^{wú}</i>	<i>bìn-váŋ=kìn-tè</i>	<i>bìn-hé-ŋ=kìn-tè</i> (~ <i>bìn-hé-váŋ=kìn-tè</i>)
INCL						<i>bìn-vá-tè</i> (<i>bìn-váŋ=i-tè-ká</i>)	<i>bìn-hé-ŋ=i-tè-ká</i> ~ <i>bìn-hé-váŋ=i-tè-ká</i> <i>bìn-vá-tè-r-^{wú}</i>	
2	SG	<i>ì-bìn-váŋ=nà-tè</i>					<i>bìn-váŋ=nà-tè</i>	<i>bìn-hé-ŋ=nà-tè</i> (~ <i>bìn-hé-váŋ=nà-tè</i>)
	PL	<i>ì-bìn-váŋ=nìn-tè ~</i> <i>=niŋ-tè</i>					<i>bìn-váŋ=nìn-tè ~ =niŋ-te</i>	<i>bìn-hé-ŋ=nìŋ-tè</i> (~ <i>bìn-hé-váŋ=nìŋ-tè</i>)
3	SG			<i>ì-bìn-vá-tè</i>		<i>bìn-vá-tè</i>	<i>bìn-hé-vá-tè ~ bìn-hé-tè</i>	
	PL			<i>ì-bìn-vá-tè-hè ~ ì-bìn-hé-tè</i>		<i>bìn-vá-tè-hè ~ bìn-hé-tè</i>		

Table 22. Future affirmative paradigm of *bìn* ‘beat’

FUT AFF		1 st person		INCL	2 nd person		3 rd person	
		SG	PL.EXCL		SG	PL	SG	PL
1	SG				<i>bìn-má:-n-íŋ-tʃə</i>	<i>bìn má: níŋ-tʃ^{wú}</i>	<i>bìn-má- n-íŋ</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé-n-íŋ</i>
	PL.EXCL				<i>bìn-má:-n-úŋ-tʃə</i>	<i>bìn má: níŋ-tʃ^{wú}</i>	<i>bìn-má- n-úŋ</i>	<i>bìn-má:- (hé-)n-úŋ</i>
INCL						<i>bìn-má:-mé-nə</i>	<i>bìn-má:- (hé-)mé-nə</i>	
2	SG	<i>ì-bìn-má:-té-nə</i>					<i>bìn-má:-té-nə</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé-té-nə</i>
	PL	<i>ì-bìn-má:-té-n-^{wú}</i>					<i>bìn-má:-té-n-^{wú}</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé-té-n-^{wú}</i>
3	SG			<i>ì-bìn-má:-nə</i>		<i>bìn-má:-nə</i>	<i>bìn-má:-hé-nə</i>	
	PL			<i>ì-bìn-má:-hé-nə</i>		<i>bìn-má:-hé-nə</i>		

Table 23. Future negative paradigm of *bìn* ‘beat’