

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS PUBLICATIONS

IN

LINGUISTICS AND RELATED FIELDS

PUBLICATION NUMBER 41

(Part II, Clause)

EDITOR

Irvine Davis

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Alan C. Wares      Iris M. Wares

CONSULTING EDITORS

Doris Bartholomew      William R. Merrifield

Robert E. Longacre

Eugene Loos      Kenneth L. Pike

PUBLISHER

Benjamin F. Elson

# Patterns In Clause, Sentence, and Discourse

## in selected languages of India and Nepal

Part II, Clause

Ronald L. Trail  
Summer Institute of Linguistics  
Institute of Nepal and Asiatic Studies  
Tribhuvan University  
Kathmandu, Nepal

(The research reported herein was performed under the project direction of Kenneth L. Pike pursuant to contract No. OEC-0-9-097721-2778 (014) with the Institute of International Studies, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and constitutes the final report of research carried out under that contract.)

A Publication of the  
SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS  
of the  
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
Norman

1973

Complete Set	ISBN 0-88312-047-X
Part II	ISBN 0-88312-049-6

***Produced by University Press***  
**Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu.**

## Acknowledgments

These volumes are unique in that they are the fruit of cooperation with two institutions--Andhra University in India and Tribhuvan University in Nepal. The Summer Institute of Linguistics was invited by Andhra University to conduct a linguistic workshop on its campus in January and February of 1972. This was the formal beginning of this four-phase report. The Andhra University campus was especially convenient since several of the languages under study were located in or near Andhra Pradesh.

We wish therefore to express our sincere appreciation to the Vice Chancellor, Mr. L. Bullayya, the Registrar, Mr. M. Gopalakrishna Reddy, and the Syndicate of Andhra University for their encouragement and cooperation in making this research possible.

Subsequent to the two months at Andhra University, the research teams travelled to Nepal where they worked on further analysis and composition under the kind auspices of Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu. We are deeply grateful to the Vice Chancellor, Dr. T. N. Upraity and to Dr. P. R. Sharma, Dean of the Institute of Nepal and Asiatic Studies, for their part in making this further work possible.

Dr. Kenneth L. Pike, Project Director, and his wife Evelyn were with us for both the India and Nepal phases of the work and we are deeply indebted to them for providing the original stimulus, as well as continued encouragement and oversight as the work progressed.

Recognition is also due to the author of each paper--Kent Gordon, Norman and Helen McNair, Uwe Gustafsson, Ray and Elizabeth Christmas, and Jennifer Williams--all of whom did their own analysis and write-up with but a modicum of consultant and editorial assistance.

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of my colleague Kent Gordon, who in addition to writing his own clause paper on Dhangar-Kurux, served as a consultant on Kolami, Kotia Oriya, and occasionally on Maithili.

Hearty thanks is due to Madeline Troyer for the tedious and painstaking work of typing these papers in photo-ready form. The artwork for these papers was under the able hand of Roma Mathieson while Gail Trail shouldered the main responsibility for the proofreading.

We express our genuine appreciation to Deccan College in Poona, India, under whose auspices general research was carried out in Kotia Oriya and Kupia prior to this workshop. Without this the present analyses would not have been as far along as they are.

Finally, we all wish to express our appreciation to the Institute of International Studies, U.S. Office of Education, for making it possible for Dr. and Mrs. Pike and other members of the research team to attend the workshop.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments . . . . .	v
Introduction. . . . .	1
Toward the Systematization of Display Grammar Austin Hale. . . . .	3
Clause Patterns in Dhangar-Kurux Kent H. Gordon . . . . .	37
Clause Patterns in Kolami Norman and Helen McNair. . . . .	123
Clause Patterns in Kotia Oriya Uwe Gustafsson . . . . .	191
Clause Patterns in Kupia R. B. and J. E. Christmas. . . . .	257
Clause Patterns in Maithili Jennifer Williams. . . . .	345
References. . . . .	453

## Introduction

We present in this volume the clause analyses of five languages of India-Nepal--Dhangar-Kurux, Kolami, Kotia Oriya, Kupia, and Maithili. Of these, three are Indo-Aryan (Kotia Oriya, Kupia, and Maithili); and two are Dravidian (Dhangar-Kurux and Kolami). Dhangar-Kurux and Maithili are spoken in Nepal; Kolami, Kotia Oriya, and Kupia are spoken in India.

We focus in these papers on clause as a verb-centered construction surrounded by certain nuclear constituents which serve to strictly subcategorize it. We are not focuseing on sentence in the traditional sense of the term which would include clause and certain larger constructions of clause combination traditionally known as compound and complex sentences.

Each analysis is presented as a complete unit with the exception that a Combined References section is given at the end of the volume uniting references for individual articles. An Index to the contents is included at the end of each paper (the paper by Austin Hale is an exception to this). The format for all of the Clause Pattern papers is relatively uniform. The clause analysis of Parengi, a Munda language of Central India (actually an integral part of this volume) has been included in Volume I of this report merely to cut down on the size of this volume.

The theory and format for these papers have been worked out by Austin Hale in collaboration with Kenneth L. Pike and form a synthesis of sorts between two divergent models of linguistics--transformational generative and structural (Tagmemics). Hale's system is based on the assumptions that it is, "...possible to enumerate for all languages the possible range of sememic functions on the clause level and this inventory should provide a principled basis for the selection of feature values for box 4"; and that it is, "...possible to relate each box 4 entry in a clause to all other possible entries in such a way as to show its place in a coherent closed system and to make clear the range of phenomena covered by each possible entry." (Hale, p. 7). What he means by "box 4" and by "sememic functions on clause level," is made

clear in the first article of this volume which he has kindly permitted us to use as an introduction to this compilation. His paper, "Toward the Systematization of Display Grammar," is included here just as it was published in Hale 1973, Vol. I. The reader is therefore alerted to the fact that his references to papers elsewhere in the volume refer to Hale's volume, not to ours. We would like to express our deep indebtedness to Austin Hale for the major role he has played in making our volume possible.

Briefly, from the technician's point of view, what Hale has done in his full transitivity system (Figure 1) is to give us a systematic means of eliciting, contrasting, and categorizing the major clause patterns of a language. Although some have found, and Hale recognizes, that the terminal nodes of the tree or cells of the matrix do not include all that there is to say about the clause patterns of a language (in that there can be subtypes of these patterns), the fact remains that the system does function to give us the major patterns. The average number of patterns for five of the papers presented was 10.4 per language (not counting subtypes). Dhargar-Kurux was not included in the count because only inherent clause patterns from the Event half of the matrix are handled in that paper.

	<u>Und + Sit</u>	<u>Und</u>	<u>Sit</u>	
<u>Event</u>	Actor	Ditransitive	Transitive	SemiTransitive
		DiReceptive	Receptive	SemiReceptive
<u>State</u>	Actor	DiStative	Stative	SemiStative
		DiAttributive	Attributive	SemiAttributive
				Intransitive
				Eventive
				Descriptive
				Circumstantial

Figure 1. Full Transitivity Matrix.

The fact that no one went beyond Hale's original 16 witnesses to the comprehensiveness of the model and its ability to provide a basic framework from which the technician can begin to operate in a language. The fact that many languages had to posit subtypes of the major patterns seems to indicate that the model may be inadequate at these points. It may, however, be one of the drawbacks inherent in any binary system of language which exhausts its own universe of meaning. Perhaps this is as far as we can expect to go in systematizing natural language. Perhaps on the other hand, with more research on these points at which subtypes are needed, it will be found that there are more regular features which can be brought into the system thus cutting down on the need for subtypes.