

Ergative marking in Monsang

Sh. Francis Monsang

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai

Rajesh Kumar

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai

Abstract

This paper investigates the morphological ergative marking in Monsang, an endangered Northwestern language of the South-Central branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family, spoken in Chandel district of Manipur, India. The paper shows that the A arguments of transitive verbs are obligatorily marked by the ergative marker *-ij* in some contexts and in others only optionally. Factors determining ergative marking include animacy hierarchy, discourse-pragmatic focus and high agency verbs. We also observed that S arguments of unergative verbs can take optional ergative marking when the subordinate clause has the adverbial marker *lè* ‘while/when’. The ergative marker is used for various reasons, such as, to give a reading of agency to inanimate subjects, to place focus on the agent in a discourse, to emphasize the agency of the agent. The results of the study contribute to the description of optional ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman languages in general and South-Central Tibeto-Burman languages in particular.

Keywords: Monsang, Tibeto-Burman, optional ergative, animacy, discourse-pragmatic

1 Introduction

In the past few decades, studies on some Tibeto-Burman languages have shown that there is optional morphological ergativity on the agent of a transitive verb (LaPolla 1995; Chelliah 1997; Chelliah & Hyslop 2011; DeLancey 2011; Coupe 2011; Willis 2011 among others). However, unlike other ergative-absolutive languages where ergative marking is determined by various factors, such as agency, transitivity, tense and aspect, optional ergative marking in some Tibeto-Burman languages is said to be determined by semantic and discourse-pragmatic factors. For instance, LaPolla (1995;

2004) maintains that ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman languages serves for disambiguating semantic roles and is used only when pragmatic factors make it necessary. Coupe (2011) also mentions that ergative marking is motivated by the need to disambiguate agents from patients and pragmatic factors. DeLancey (2011) shows that, while the ergative marking can be split into obligatory and optional, only the latter one is determined by semantic-pragmatic factors. Similar ideas are maintained in the study of Tibeto-Burman languages by Chang & Chang (1980), Tournadre (1991), McGregor (2009), Hyslop (2010), Willis (2011), Vollmann (2014), Chelliah (2017), Lu et al. (2019), among others. This presence or absence of ergative marking which is motivated by discourse-pragmatic factors has been called *optional ergative marking* or *focal ergative marking* or *pragmatic ergative marking* (McGregor 2006; 2009; Hyslop 2010; DeLancey 2011; Chelliah 2017).

Having said this, it is not surprising to find optional morphological ergative marking in Monsang, a Northwestern language of the South-Central branch of the Tibeto-Burman family spoken in Chandel district of Manipur, Northeast India (Konnerth 2018). In this paper, we describe the facts of morphological ergative marking in Monsang.

In Monsang, the A arguments of transitive clauses are sometimes obligatorily marked with the ergative marker *-iy* in some constructions, while in others the marking is only optional.¹ Hence, the main goal of the paper is to examine the factors determining ergative marking and the functions of ergative marking. In this paper, we show that (i) the inanimate (lowest in the animacy hierarchy) transitive subjects take obligatory ergative marking, (ii) human and non-human animate transitive subjects take conditioned ergative marking with less transitive verbs, such as *see*, *eat*, *read*, etc. depending on discourse-pragmatic factors, (iii) third-person subjects, such as the human noun phrase and non-human animate transitive subjects of high agency verbs, such as *kill*, *hit*, *beat*, *kick*, etc. are obligatorily marked with ergative morphology. Hence, we suggest that the ergative morphology in Monsang is multifunctional, such as, to give a reading of agency to inanimate subjects, to place focus on the agent in discourse when the pragmatic context makes

¹ We have used *A, S, P, R* terminology. We borrowed the terms *A, S, P* from Payne (1997) and *R* from Haspelmath (2005) (i.e., *A* for the more active or agent-like argument associated with transitive clause; *S* for the single argument associated with intransitive clause; *P* for the more patient-like argument associated with transitive clause and *R* for the recipient-like argument in a ditransitive event).

it necessary and to emphasize the agency of the agent. By *focus*, we mean a contrastive focus highlighting one argument over another in the discourse, as found in Khumi (Peterson 2011), Mongsen Ao (Coupe 2011), and Tujia (Lu et al. 2019).

We also looked at intransitive verbs (both unaccusative and unergative) and observed that S arguments of intransitive verbs are not marked with ergative marking in a clause. However, we observed that S arguments of unergative verbs can take ergative marking when a subordinate clause has the adverbial marker *lè* ‘while/when’, while S arguments of unaccusative verbs cannot take ergative marking.

2 Background

2.1 The speakers

Monsang is one of the minority tribes of Manipur, Northeast India. The Monsangs inhabit the Southeastern part of Manipur, particularly the Chandel district of Manipur. They are found in six villages close to each other, viz., Monsang Pantha, Japhou, Liwa Sarei, Liwa Khullen, Changnhe and Liwachangning. The Monsang speakers are around 2600 only, thus, Monsang is one of the endangered languages in Northeast India. Monsang is in its initial stage as regard to its literature. There is no written literature like grammar, dictionary, text-book or primer which can be introduced into formal education. Literature remains oral till date.

2.2 Methodology

The data presented here were collected on two field trips (December–January 2018–2019 and June 2019) by direct elicitation or by recording natural discourse. The first author is also a native speaker of Monsang and conducted a further focus group discussion with five selected speakers from Monsang Pantha village. In addition, he used his own intuition for generating examples where the distribution of ergative could not be inferred from natural data. In these cases, no data source is given.

2.3 Language

Monsang is spoken by the Monsang, who call their language *sirti ʈoŋ*. Its earlier classification as a Kuki-Chin Naga language (cf. Bradley 1997) is based on the Monsang people's own identification with the Naga; later research (DeLancey et al. 2015; Simons & Fenning 2017) has shown that it belongs linguistically rather to the Northwestern branch of the Kuki-Chin languages along with Aimol, Anal, Moyon, Lamkang, Koireng, Kom, Tarao, Chothe, Maring, Purum, Kharam, etc. Due to the Monsangs' own identification with the Naga, some (e.g. Konnerth 2018) speak about their language in more neutral terms as a Northwestern language within the South-Central branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family.

Some of the central typological features of Monsang are SOV word order, a rich person indexation marking system (see Konnerth & Wanglar 2019) and heavy pro-drop. The A argument is recoverable from the morphologically marked person indexation marker on the verb. The pro-drop A argument is put within parentheses in (1) and (2). The optional ergative is also put within parentheses.

- (1) (*kə* (-iŋ)) *hənóʔ ké-sà*
 (I (-ERG)) mango 1SG-eat
 'I eat/ate mango.'
- (2) (*kə* (-iŋ)) *náŋ ké-ŋ^u-ʈǎ*
 (I (-ERG)) you 1SG-see-2SG.DO
 'I saw you.'

In ditransitive constructions, the order is flexible, S-IO-DO or S-DO-IO, but with the verb in the final position, as in (3). The P argument is unmarked and the R argument is overtly marked with a dative marker *-ŋiŋná*.

- (3) a. *kə* (-iŋ) *titi-ŋiŋná rə ké-píʔ*
 I (-ERG) Titi-TOWARD.LOC flower 1SG-give
 'I gave a book to Titi.'
- b. *kə* (-iŋ) *rə titi-ŋiŋná ké-píʔ*
 I (-ERG) flower Titi-TOWARD.LOC 1SG-give
 'I gave a book to Titi.'

3 Conditioned ergative marking

Monsang exhibits ergative case marking in which the A argument is morphologically marked with an ergative marker *-iŋ*, while the P argument of a transitive verb and the S argument of an intransitive verb is morphologically null (absolutive; on ergative-absolutive alignment, see Dixon 1994: 1). Thus in (4), the A argument receives morphological ergative marking *-iŋ* and the P argument of the transitive verb is morphologically not marked for case, and in (5), the S argument of the intransitive verb is also morphologically not marked for case.

- (4) *momo-iŋ úti kʰà á-tʰé? kà²*
 MOMO-ERG dog DEF 3SG-kill COP

‘Momo killed the dog.’ [Elicited]

- (5) *úti é-tʰó kè*
 dog NMLZ-die COP

‘The dog died.’ [Elicited]

With the alignment in (4) and (5), one would presume that Monsang truly conforms to the traditional ergative-absolutive case marking system as found in Comrie (1978), Dixon (1994), and Black (2004) among others. But the fact is that, as mentioned earlier, the A argument of a transitive verb in Monsang is optional in some constructions and obligatory in others. Consider the following two transitive sentences in (6) and (7).

- (6) *úti-iŋ momo á-sí kà*
 dog-ERG Momo 3SG-bite COP

‘The dog bit Momo.’

- (7) *ká (-iŋ) titi ké-ŋwù kè*
 I (-ERG) Titi 1SG-see COP

‘I saw Titi.’

In (6) ergative marking is obligatory, while in (7) it is optional. Hence Monsang exhibits a conditioned ergative case marker. We shall see in detail

² Monsang has three allomorphs of affirmative equational copula, *k* ~ *ka* ~ *ke*. The vowelless *k* occurs with vowel initial person index while the *ka* ~ *ke* occur at the end of sentences (also see Konnerth & Wanglar 2019).

the ergative case marking in § 4 when we discuss factors determining ergative marking in Monsang.

Then, as found in some other Tibeto-Burman languages, the ergative marker *-iŋ* of Monsang is identical to the instrumental marker *-iŋ* and adverbial marker *-iŋ*, as given in (8) and (9) respectively.

(8) *ká yím-iŋ p^húŋ kə-é? kə*
 I knife-INSTR grass 3SG-cut COP
 ‘I cut the grass with a knife.’

(9) *é-t^há-iŋ béf^hú-ró?*
 NMLZ-good-ADV.MKR hold-IMP.SG
 ‘Hold it properly.’ [Conversation]

4 Factors determining morphological ergative marking and its functions

4.1 Animacy hierarchy

The first factor that determines the use of ergative marking in Monsang is related to the animacy hierarchy. Usually, the animacy hierarchy is established as:

1P/2P > 3P > human > non-human animate > inanimate (see Silverstein 1976; DeLancey 1981; Dixon 1994)

The use of ergative marking on inanimate subjects has been attested by Silverstein (1976), DeLancey (1981), McGregor (2006) and Verstraete (2010) among others. The animacy hierarchy plays a vital role in determining ergative marking in Monsang, too. In Monsang, inanimate (lowest in the animacy hierarchy) transitive subjects take obligatory ergative marking both with animate and inanimate direct objects, whereas animate transitive subjects take conditioned ergative marking. In principle, inanimates cannot be agents of action; however, they can be said to have some effect on another entity, be it with or without human assistance (Verstraete 2010). Consequently, when an inanimate transitive subject takes the ergative marker, it signals the effect it has on another entity. For instance in (10), *wind*, *fire* and *bus* affect their objects irrespective of whether the object is animate or inanimate. Thus, while *wind* (10a) and *fire* (10b) affect their objects without human assistance, the *bus* (10c) is said to have some human control to affect the object. In all these

examples, we suggest that the ergative marker is used to create a reading of agency on the inanimate subjects.

- (10) a. *tʰə-íj í:n kʰà á-rén-pé*
 wind-ERG house DEF 3SG-blow-PFV
 ‘The wind has blown the house.’
- b. *ŋí-íj é-béʰú-vá-tè vâ-ŋsì:n-má:-ró?*
 fire-ERG INV-burn-FUT-AUX go-move.closer-NEG-IMP.SG
 ‘The fire will burn you don’t move closer.’
- c. *bàs-íj é-ɾə-vá-tè kè*
 bus-ERG INV-carry-FUT-AUX COP
 ‘The bus will take us.’

4.2 Discourse-pragmatic focus

The second factor determining the use of morphological ergative marking is focus or emphasis on the agent of transitive verbs. In Monsang as well as in some other languages (cf. DeLancey 1981; 2011; Tournadre 1991; LaPolla 1995; 2004; McGregor 2010; Coupe 2011) the A arguments of transitive verbs are ergative-marked, if they are focused and if certain discourse-pragmatic factors apply. More precisely, human and non-human animate transitive subjects take ergative marking with less transitive verbs, such as *see, eat, read*, etc. depending on discourse-pragmatic factors. The A argument receives ergative marking if any information or statement is conveyed with focus or emphasis on the agent. Discourse-pragmatic factors determine, if the focus is strong enough to trigger the ergative marking. This explains why there is ergative marking on human and non-human animate A arguments even with less transitive verbs. This conditionality in the use of ergative marking results in minimal pair sentences.³ In examples (11) to (15), we provide minimal pair sentences with and without ergative marking on the A argument. The non-use of ergative marking defocuses the transitive subject and indicates a low agentivity and expectedness of the action (McGregor 2010).

³ The idea of minimal pair in the use or non-use of ergative marking is borrowed from Willis (2011).

- (11) a. *kə vátì kʰà ké-ŋʷù kè*
I bird DEF 1SG-see COP
'I saw the bird.' [Elicited]
- b. *kə-íŋ vátì kʰà ké-ŋʷù kè*
I-ERG bird DEF 1SG-see COP
'I saw the bird.' [Conversation]
- (12) a. *náŋ bʷú ná-sʷùŋ-nàdʒè kè*
you rice 2SG-cook-PROG COP
'You were cooking.' [Conversation]
- b. *náŋ-íŋ bʷú ná-sʷùŋ-nàdʒè kè*
you-ERG rice 2SG-cook-PROG COP
'You were cooking.' [Elicited]
- (13) a. *móʔ bʷú á-sà-pé*
brother rice 3SG-eat-PFV
'The brother has eaten rice.' [Conversation]
- b. *móʔ-íŋ bʷú á-sà-pé*
brother-ERG rice 3SG-eat-PFV
'The brother has eaten rice.' [Elicited]
- (14) a. *úti bʷú á-sà-nà*
dog rice 3SG-eat-REAL
'A dog is eating rice.' [Elicited]
- b. *úti-íŋ bʷú á-sà-nà*
dog-ERG rice 3SG-eat-REAL
'A dog is eating rice.' [Elicited]
- (15) a. *à:r bʷútʰə á-sà-pé*
chicken rice.grain 3SG-eat-PFV
'A chicken has eaten grain.' [Elicited]
- b. *à:r-íŋ bʷútʰə á-sà-pé*
chicken-ERG rice.grain 3SG-eat-PFV
'A chicken has eaten grain.' [Elicited]

In the examples (11–15), both the (a) (non-use of ergative) and the (b) clauses (use of ergative) are grammatically correct but they differ in the context in which they are used, that is, they differ in their discourse-pragmatic interpretations. The (a) examples (the non-use of ergative marking) would be used when a speaker makes a statement without focus or emphasis on the agent, whereas the (b) examples (the use of ergative marking) would be used when a speaker wants to focus or emphasize the agent in the discourse. For instance, example (11a) would be used when a speaker makes a statement *I saw the bird* without focus or emphasis on himself. But example (11b) would be used when a speaker wants to focus or emphasize himself as *I* in *I saw the bird*.

Hence, we suggest that in the examples above the ergative does not mark the subject as the agent, but carries a pragmatic meaning by giving focus or emphasis on the agent in the discourse. It singles out one single constituent, i. e. the A argument, and thus indicates a definite agent of an action in the discourse.

The ergative marker also indicates that the agent is unexpected in the sense that the action carried out by the agent is an unexpected action. For example, in (13b) the brother was not supposed to eat the food which he nevertheless ate.

Another context, attested in many languages, is that of using ergative morphology for marking focus in question-answer sequences (Verstraete 2010; Donohue & Donohue 2016; Lu et al. 2019). In Monsang, the A argument will necessarily take ergative marking in a response to a question where an ergative-marked interrogative pronoun inquires about the identity of the A argument. For instance, the A argument in (16b) – already presented in (11b) – will obligatorily take ergative marking as a response to a question with ergative marking on the interrogative pronoun that seeks the identity of the A argument in (16a). Such a sentence becomes ungrammatical if it is not marked with ergative case, as in (16c). Note that the same example would be grammatical if it was a statement as in (11a). We suggest that the function of the ergative marker here is to focus on the identity of the agent.

- (16) a. *áy^{vú}-íŋ vátì k^{bà} á-ŋ^{vù} kà*
 who-ERG bird DEF 3SG-see COP
 ‘Who saw the bird?’
- b. *ká-íŋ vátì k^{bà} ké-ŋ^{vù} kè*
 I-ERG bird DEF 1SG-see COP
 ‘I saw the bird.’

- c. *kǎ vátì kʰà ké-ŋʷù kè
 I bird DEF 1SG-see COP
 ‘I saw the bird.’

4.3 High agency verbs

The third factor that determines the use or non-use of ergative marking in Monsang is high agency verbs (or highly transitive verbs). There are several languages known to typologists where agents of high agency verbs such as *kill* or *bite* are obligatorily marked with an ergative marker, while the agents of lower agency verbs such as *eat*, *see*, are optionally marked (see McGregor 2010; Lu et al. 2019). In Monsang, third-person subjects, such as the human noun phrase and non-human animate transitive subjects, are obligatorily marked with an ergative marker when they are agents of high agency verbs such as *kill*, *hit*, *beat*, *kick*, etc., as shown in (17a–d), while the first and second person will be ergative-marked only when discourse-pragmatic factors demand it, as shown in (18) and (19).

- (17) a. ámá-íy áŋʷúrɲà ñ-míntʰú:m kǎ
 he-ERG at.first INV-kick COP
 ‘He kicked me first.’ [Conversation]
- b. mǒʔ-íy kǎ ñ-súʔ kǎ
 brother-ERG me INV-hit COP
 ‘Brother hit me.’ [Conversation]
- c. úti-íy é-sí vá-tè
 dog-ERG NMLZ-bite FUT-AUX
 ‘The dog will bite you.’ [Conversation]
- d. úti-íy à:r á-tʰéʔ kè
 dog-ERG chicken 3SG-kill COP
 ‘A dog killed a chicken.’ [Elicited]
- (18) a. kǎ úti ké-tʰéʔ kè
 I dog 1SG-kill COP
 ‘I killed a dog.’

- b. *kə (-iŋ) úti ké-tʰé? kə*
 I (-ERG) dog 1SG-kill COP
 ‘I killed a dog.’ [Elicited]
- (19) a. *náy titi ná-bín kà*
 you Titi 2SG-beat COP
 ‘You beat Titi.’
- b. *náy (-iŋ) titi ná-bín kà*
 you (-ERG) Titi 2SG-beat COP
 ‘You beat Titi.’ [Elicited]

We suggest that the function of the ergative marker with the agent of high agency verbs is also to focus or to highlight the agency in the agent. For instance, in (17a) the speaker uses the ergative marker to intensify the agency in the agent. The ergative marker also indicates volitional or controlled or deliberate action by the agent.

5 Intransitive verbs

The S arguments of intransitive verbs (both unaccusative and unergative) are not marked with the ergative marker and resemble the P arguments of transitive clauses. The intransitive verbs are also not inflected for person. When the S arguments of intransitive verbs are marked with the ergative marker *-iŋ*, the examples become ungrammatical as in (b) below.

unaccusative

- (20) a. *i:ŋkʰà:r ñ-ŋóŋ-nè*
 door INV-open-REAL
 ‘The door is open.’ [Conversation]
- b. **i:ŋkʰà:r-iŋ ñ-ŋóŋ-nè*
 door-ERG INV-open-REAL
 (‘The door is open.’)
- (21) a. *úti é-tʰó kə*
 dog NMLZ-die COP
 ‘The dog is dead.’ [Conversation]

- b. *úti-íŋ é-tʰə̀ kè
 dog-ERG NMLZ-die COP
 ('The dog is dead.')

unergative

- (22) a. náŋn^{wú} ñnà-nè
 your.mother laugh-REAL
 'Your mother is laughing.' [Conversation]
- b. *náŋn^{wú}-íŋ ñnà-nè
 your.mother-ERG laugh-REAL
 ('Your mother is laughing.')
- (23) a. kóʔ é-k^{hwú}ŋ kà
 brother NMLZ-jump COP
 'Brother is jumping.' [Conversation]
- b. *kóʔ-íŋ é-k^{hwú}ŋ kà
 brother-ERG NMLZ-jump COP
 ('Brother is jumping.')

However, when a subordinate clause has the adverbial marker *lè* 'while/when', the S arguments of unergative verbs can take ergative case marking, as shown in (24b) and (25b).

- (24) a. momo á-tén-lè titi-íŋ á-ŋ^{wú} kà
 Momo 3SG-run-ADV.MKR Titi-ERG 3SG-see COP
 'While Momo ran, Titi saw him.' [Elicited]
- b. momo-íŋ á-tén-lè titi-íŋ á-ŋ^{wú} kà
 Momo-ERG 3SG-run-ADV.MKR Titi-ERG 3SG-see COP
 'While Momo ran, Titi saw him.' [Elicited]
- (25) a. titi á-là:m-lè momo é-tʰèŋ kè
 Titi 3SG-dance-ADV.MKR Momo NMLZ-come COP
 'While Titi was dancing, Momo came.' [Elicited]
- b. titi -íŋ á-là:m-lè momo é-tʰèŋ kè
 Titi -ERG 3SG-dance-ADV.MKR Momo NMLZ-come COP
 'While Titi was dancing, Momo came.' [Elicited]

That being said, the S arguments of unaccusative verbs are never ergative-marked, even if the subordinate clause has the adverbial marker *lè* ‘while/when’. The ergative marking on the S arguments of unaccusative verbs results in ungrammatical sentences, as shown in (26a–b).

- (26) a. **f: nkʰà:r-íŋ á-ŋóŋ-lè úti é-váŋʷú kà*
 door-ERG 3SG-open-ADV.MKR dog NMLZ-enter COP
 ‘While the door opened, the dog entered.’
- b. **úti-íŋ á-tʰí:-lè momo-íŋ á-ŋʷù kà*
 dog-ERG 3SG-die-ADV.MKR Momo-ERG 3SG-see COP
 ‘While the dog died, Momo saw it.’

We suggest that even in the *lè*-clauses, the ergative marking serves to focus on the subject.

That the S argument of intransitive clauses occasionally receives ergative marking has been observed in some languages of the world, for instance by McGregor (2007) for Warrwa, by Mohanan (1994) for Hindi, by Coupe (2011) for Chang, among others. However, the presence of ergative marking on the S arguments of unergative verbs when the subordinate clause has a particular adverbial marker is a phenomenon which has not been mentioned as far as we are aware. Finally, we also suggest that the ergative marking on S arguments of unergative verbs should be included as a subtype of the typological theory of ergative marking.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have examined the morphological ergative marking in Monsang and seen how it can be conditioned by syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features, which in sum produce a highly complex system: First, when a third-person human noun phrase or a non-human animate is the agent of a high agency verb, it is obligatorily ergative-marked, while first and second person agents only receive conditioned marking, pertaining to other functions of the ergative marker. Second, S arguments of intransitive verbs (both unaccusative and unergative) are not marked with the ergative marker. However, S arguments of unergative verbs take ergative marking when a subordinate clause has the adverbial marker *lè* ‘while/when’. Third, the function of an ergative marker is not only to mark the agent of an action, for (i) it also gives a reading of agency to inanimate subjects and (ii) places

focus or emphasis on the agent of an action when pragmatically motivated (in which case the agent has to be a transitive subject of a less transitive verb and either human or animate). In other words, it indicates a definite agent of an action. On the other hand, the non-use of ergative marking on a transitive subject defocuses the subject and shows that it is low in agentivity. (iii) The ergative marker emphasizes or intensifies the agency of an agent with third person human noun phrases and non-human animate subjects of high agency verbs. It also indicates volitional, controlled or deliberate action by the agent. (iv) Finally, the ergative marker is also used with subjects of unergative verbs to place focus on the subject. In short, we can consider the ergative marker in Monsang as a focal ergative, i. e., an ergative marker which focuses the agent of an action, rather than as an agent marker.

Our attention was directed exclusively to ergative marking on A arguments of transitive verbs and S arguments of unergative verbs in subordinate clauses that have the adverbial marker *lè* ‘while/when’, ignoring other possible contexts in which ergative marking could be employed. Further research should be directed at ergative marking in other contexts. The present study will contribute to the study of optional ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman languages in general and South-Central Tibeto-Burman languages in particular.

Acknowledgements

This paper was first presented at the 11th International Conference of the North East Indian Linguistics Society (NEILS 11) held from 7th–9th February 2020, at the Central Institute of Technology, Kokrajhar, Assam, India. We are very grateful to Prof. Scott DeLancey for his insightful comments during the presentation. We are also grateful to the participants for their comments. We are also indebted to Prof. Karumuri V. Subbarao for reading and commenting on various drafts of this paper. We would like to sincerely thank the two anonymous reviewers of *SKY JoL* and the editors for their valuable comments and suggestions. Without their illuminating comments and suggestions, this paper would not have been possible. All errors and shortcomings are our own.

Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|-----------------------------|
| 1SG | first person singular |
| 1PL | first person plural |
| 1P | first person |
| 2P | second person |
| 2SG | second person singular |
| 2SG.DO | second person direct object |
| 3P | third person |
| 3SG | third person singular |
| ABS | absolutive |
| ADV.MKR | adverbial marker |
| AUX | auxiliary |
| COP | copula |
| DEF | definitive |
| ERG | ergative |
| EXCL | exclusive |
| FUT | future |
| HAB | habitual |
| INSTR | instrument |
| INV | inverse marker |
| LOC | locative |
| NMLZ | nominalizer |
| PFV | perfective |
| PROG | progressive |
| REAL | realis |

References

- Black, Barry J. 2004. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bradley, David. 1997. Tibeto-Burman languages and classification. In Bradley, David (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas*, 1–72. (Pacific Linguistics, Series A 86). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Chang, Betty Shefts & Chang, Kun. 1980. Ergativity in spoken Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 51(1). 15–32.
- Chelliah, Shobhana L. 1997. *A grammar of Meithei*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- 2017. Ergativity in Tibeto-Burman. In Coon, Jessica & Massam, Diane & Travis, Lisa deMena (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of ergativity*, 924–947. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chelliah, Shobhana L. & Hyslop, Gwendolyn. 2011. Introduction to special issue on optional case marking in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 34(2). 1–7.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In Lehmann, W. P. (ed.), *Syntactic typology: Studies in the phenomenology of language*, 329–374. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Coupe, Alexander R. 2011. On core case marking patterns in two Tibeto-Burman languages of Nagaland. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 34(2). 21–47.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1981. An interpretation of split ergativity. *Language* 57(3). 626–657.
- 2011. “Optional” “ergativity” in Tibeto-Burman languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 34(2). 9–20.
- DeLancey, Scott & Boro, Khrisna & Konnerth, Linda & Teo, Amos. 2015. Tibeto-Burman languages of the Indo-Myanmar borderland. (Paper presented at the 31st South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable, 14 May 2015).
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donohue, Cathryn & Donohue, Mark. 2016. On ergativity in Bumthang. *Language* 92(1). 179–188.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2005. Argument marking in ditransitive alignment types. *Linguistic Discovery* 3(1). 1–21.
- Hyslop, Gwendolyn. 2010. Kurtop case: The pragmatic ergativity and beyond. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 33(1). 1–40.
- 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.
- Konnerth, Linda & Wanglar, Koninglee. 2019. Person indexation in Monsang from a diachronic perspective. *Himalayan Linguistics* 18(1). 54–77.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1995. ‘Ergative’ marking in Tibeto-Burman. In Nishi, Yoshio & Matisoff, James & Nagano, Yasuhiko (eds.), *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax*, 189–228. (Senri Ethnological Studies 41). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- 2004. On nominal relational morphology in Tibeto-Burman. In Lin, Ying-chin & Hsu, Fang-min & Lee, Chun-chih & Sun, Jackson T.-S. & Yang, Hsiu-fang & Ho, Dah-an (eds.), *Studies on Sino-Tibetan languages: Papers in honor of professor Hwang-cherng Gong on his seventieth birthday*, 43–73. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Lu, Man & van de Weijer, Jeroen & Sinha, Chris & Liu, Zhengguang. 2019. Optional ergative marking in Tujia. *Lingua* 223. 46–66.
- McGregor, William B. 2006. Focal and optional ergative marking in Warrwa (Kimberley, Western Australia). *Lingua* 116(4). 393–423.

- 2007. Ergative marking of intransitive subjects in Warrwa. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 27. 201–229.
 - 2009. Typology of ergativity. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3. 480–508.
 - 2010. Optional ergative case marking systems in a typological-semiotic perspective. *Lingua* 120(7). 1610–1636.
- Mohanan, Tara. 1994. *Argument structure in Hindi*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peterson, David A. 2011. Core participant marking in Khumi. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 34(2). 73–100.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In Dixon, R. M. W. (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, 112–171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Simons, Gary F. & Fenning, Charles D. (eds.). 2017. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Dallas: SIL International.
(<https://www.ethnologue.com/subgroups/tibeto-burman>). (Accessed 2019-01-27).
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 1991. The rhetorical use of the Tibetan ergative. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 14(1). 93–107.
- Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2010. Animacy and information structure in the system of ergative marking in Umpithamu. *Lingua* 120(7). 1637–1651.
- Vollmann, Ralf. 2014. Optional ergative case marking in Tibetan. (Unpublished manuscript).
(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237223944_Optional_ergative_case_marking_in_Tibetan). (Accessed 2019-03-14).
- Willis, Christina M. 2011. Optional case marking in Darma (Tibeto-Burman). *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 34(2). 101–131.

Contact information:

Sh. Francis Monsang
 Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
 Indian Institute of Technology Madras
 Chennai – 600 036
 Tamil Nadu, India
 e-mail: kingdommonsang(at)gmail(dot)com

Rajesh Kumar
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Madras
Chennai – 600 036
Tamil Nadu, India
e-mail: thisisrajkumar(at)gmail(dot)com