UC Santa Barbara
Himalayan Linguistics

Title
Darai verb agreement

Permalink

Journal

Author
Dhakal, Dubi Nanda

Publication Date
2015

DOI

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

himalayan linguistics

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

Himalayan Linguistics

Darai verb agreement

Dubi Nanda Dhakal

Tribhuvan University

ABSTRACT

Darai, an Indo-Aryan language of Nepal, displays interactions of person, number, gender, honorifics, and case in its verb agreement system. Darai verbs not only agree with the subject in person, number, gender and case but also with the subject and objects simultaneously in transitive and ditransitive verbs. Moreover, like some other Indo-Aryan languages, such as Maithili (Yadav 1997; Yadava 1999), and Rajbanshi (Wilde 2008), Darai shows agreement with the genitive modifier rather than the head noun. Furthermore, the verbs also agree with the dative subject. In addition to the above patterns, verb agreement is complex and is also controlled by the pragmatic status of information. Thus, the selection of agreement markers is triggered not only by certain syntactic constructions but also by pragmatic factors. Darai shares a number of agreement patterns with its Indo-Aryan neighbors, whereas other patterns are specific to Darai. The agreement patterns discussed in this article will be useful in analyses of agreement in other Indo-Aryan languages.

KEYWORDS

verb agreement, single agreement, double agreement, dative subject agreement

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

Darai verb agreement

Dubi Nanda Dhakal
Tribhuvan University

1 Introduction

Darai is an Indo-Aryan (IA) language of Indo-European language family spoken mainly in the Chitwan, Tanahun and Nawalparasi districts of central and western Nepal. As recorded in the previous census (CBS, 2012) the total population of the Darai community is 16,789, but only 11,677 people speak their ancestral language. This fact suggests that mother tongue retention is only 69.5 percent. Most of these speakers are also bilingual in Nepali, the language of wider communication in Nepal. The language was formerly unclassified but Dhakal (2011, 2012) proposed that Darai makes use of a large number of features evidenced in eastern IA languages. Darai is therefore classified as an 'eastern' IA language and is closely related to Maithili, Bhojpuri and Majhi.[1] The agreement pattern discussed in this article is based on the variety spoken in Chitwan, but comparison is made in some places to show that there are minor variations in verb agreement in two different varieties spoken in Tanahun and Chitwan.

There are some previous references related to verb agreement in Darai. Hodgson (1857) mentioned some sentences which help us to discuss the data on verb agreement. Kotapish and Kotapish (1973: 141-144) first outlined the agreement patterns of Darai based on the data from Tanahun. In addition to verb agreement in intransitive verbs and dative subjects, they also provided an elaborate paradigm of the ditransitive verb agreement *de* 'give' in the non-past tense. They also summarized possessor agreement and the role of pronominal possessive suffixes (PPS). Paudyal (2008) has added some further verbs to illustrate the case for possessor agreement with the verb *bhok lag* 'feel hungry' in non-past tense.[2] Moreover, he outlined the hierarchical features in verb agreement citing examples from a number of languages of South Asia and beyond. The ditrasitive verb paradigms used by Kotapish and Kotapish (1975) have been cited in a number of other studies, such as van Driem (2001), Wilde (2008) and Paudyal (2008).

---

[1] The corpus used for this article consists of about 2700 sentences from a wide variety of genres, such as narratives (personal, historical) and, procedural texts from different speakers. Some texts used in article have also been included in Dhakal (2013).

[2] There are some issues with Paudyal's claims (2008). First, the possessor agreement is also evidenced in other languages, such as Majhi (Dhakal 2014). Second, the possessor agreement is found not only in elicited examples, but also in texts in the variety of Darai found in Chitwan (see Dhakal 2012, 2013). Third, dative subject agreement is found in a number of IA languages (cf. Hook 1990) including languages of Nepal, such as Maithili, Rajbanshi and Majhi. Paudyal (2008) notes that the coding of subject and object simultaneously is found only in ditransitive verbs in the variety of Darai spoken in Tanahun, but this paper demonstrates that the simultaneous coding of subject and object agreement is not only limited to ditransitive verbs but also to transitive verbs in the variety of Darai spoken in Chitwan.

2 Pronouns and pronominal possessive suffixes

Darai distinguishes first, second and third person pronouns. They inflect for number (singular and plural) and also inflect for four cases: nominative (NOM), accusative/dative (ACC/DAT), genitive (GEN) and ablative/comitative (ABL/COM) and ergative(see Table 1). Some nouns also host the indefinite suffix. The suffix *–hun* is mainly attached to the verb to encode the 'hearsay' but when it is attached to the noun or pronouns, it is used to yield indefinite meaning.

(1)   *kolhəu tshə̃uḍihun əili*
        kolhəu   tshə̃uḍi-**hun**   a-l-i
        any   girl-INDEF   come-PST-F

        'Any girl came.'

(2)   *əse pəisahun khəninei*
        əse   pəisa-**hun**   khən-inei
        and.then   money-also   dig-MIR

        'And then (they) dug some money!' (DAF.CND.048)

The suffix *–hun* is attached to the noun *tshə̃uḍi* 'girl' in (1) and with the *pəisa* 'money' in (2). As Lyons (1999:90) noted, the indefinite meaning are equivalent to 'some, any, or other'.[3]

The second person pronouns in Darai are characterized by three levels of honorificity. When an honorific pronoun is used for the referent, the verb is likewise marked. The third person pronouns are related to remote demonstratives *u* 'that' and *unhen* 'they'. The honorific forms *inhen* 'he/she.H', *inhensəb* 'they.H' and *unhen* 'he/she.H' and *unhensəb* 'they.H' are used for honorific proximal and distal demonstratives respectively. The third person pronouns are characterized by two levels of honorificity as illustrated in (Table 1).

Darai is a split ergative language in which the appearance of the ergativity is conditioned by a nominal hierarchy (cf. Dhakal 2011). The transitive clauses are marked with the ergative case only if the subject is the third person pronouns or other noun phrases. In other words, if the subjects are not the third person pronouns, or other noun phrases, the subjects do not take the ergative case in the transitive clauses.

Pronominal possessive suffixes are attached to possessed nouns in the genitive construction, and indefinite markers are also affixed to nouns. In example (3), the pronominal possessive suffix (PPS suffix)-*k* agrees with the third person singular similar to an elicited example (4). Similarly, example (5) shows the PPS *–m* agreeing with the first person singular.

---

[3] Since this morpheme is close to indefinite meaning, this has been glossed likewise in this article. Moreover, it also yields emphatic meaning as shown in (2). Further investigation is needed for this.

(3)   *dulhak morlə*
      dulha-**k**   mor-lə
      husband-**3SG.POSS**   die-PST

      'Her husband died.' (IMM.UN.001)

(4)   *ukhrə bhaik dzəilə*
      u-rə   bhai-**k**   dza-lə
      he-[OBL]GEN   brother-**3SG.POSS**   go-PST

      'Her brother went.'

(5)   *herte gorum tə ledzi dehalek*
      her-te   goru-**m**   tə   ledz-i   de-hale-k
      look-SIM   bull-**1SG.POSS**   PART   take-ABS   give-PST-3SG

      'While looking at it, (he said) it is they who took away my oxen. (BF.SLD.138)

(6)   *merə goru bhaglə*
      məi-rə   goru   bhag-**lə**
      I-[OBL]GEN   ox   run away-**PST**

      'My ox ran away.'[4]

It is relevant to mention that the pronominal possessive suffixes are suffixed to kinship terms, body parts, and personal belongings. The pronominal possessive suffixes in examples (3-4) are attached to mark kinship terms whereas the pronominal suffix in (5) is used to indicate personal belongings. We see that the PPS is attached to the possessed item in (3, 4, 5) compared with (6) in which the PPS is absent. Examples (3-4) also bear the pronominal possessive suffixes. Example (6) shows that the pronominal possessive suffixes are optional in Darai. Personal pronouns and their inflections for genitive and dative case as well as the pronominal possessive suffixes are summarized in Table 1.

---

[4] The past tense marker is *-lə*. However, if the past tense is followed by agreement suffixes, it is realized as *-hale* or *-le*.

3

	Pronouns	**Genitive**	**Accusative-Dative**	**Pronominal possessive suffixes**
1SG	məi	merə	merake	-m
1PL	hame	hamrə	hamrake	-Ø
2 SG	təi	terə	terake	-r
2 SG.HON	tohẽ	teurə	teurake	-u
2 PL	təisəb	terasəbkə	terasəbke	-Ø
3SG	u	ukhrə	ukhrake	-k
3SG.HON	unhen	unhenkə	unhenke	-kan
3 PL	usbəb	usbəbkə	usbəbke	-Ø

Table 1. Pronominal possessive suffixes in Darai

When the pronouns inflect for these cases, they have oblique forms. Darai possesses an identical case marker for the accusative and dative case, which is common in South Asian languages.[5] We also see the pronominal possessive suffixes in this table. These pronominal possessive suffixes are attached to the head nouns as illustrated in (3-5). For example, the PPS-*k* is attached to the noun 'husband' in (3) and *bhai* 'brother' in (4). Similarly, the PPS-*m* is attached to the noun *goru* 'ox' in (5). The pronominal possessive suffixes not only appear with head nouns in genitive construction but also as agreement suffixes as one of the sets of agreement markers in verb agreement (see section 3.1.3). It should be noted that the pronominal possessive suffixes differ in two varieties. For example, the first person plural PPS is reported to be *–hi* in Tanahun (cf. Kotapish and Kotapish 1975), but this is absent in the variety spoken in Chitwan.

Typologically, such pronominal possessive suffixes are evidenced not only in Darai but also in Majhi, an Indo-Aryan language spoken to the east of Darai territory. It should also be noted that in Darai these suffixes are not only limited to nominal inflection, but also play roles in verb agreement. Corbett (2003:110) notes that such affixes have higher referentiality and descriptive content than agreement markers. Their role in verb agreement will be discussed in (§3.1.3).

Darai verbs exhibit a contrast of past and non-past tenses. Tense markers are suffixed to Darai verbs, followed by agreement markers in both tenses. Some morphologically marked aspects are habitual, progressive, imminent and perfect. Similarly, some morphologically marked moods are possibility, frustrative, mirative and inference among others.

3 Agreement patterns

Some ditransitive verbs code both subject and indirect object, whereas the verb agrees with the only with the subject in intransitive verbs. The preliminary distinction is, therefore, single agreement and double agreement. We will look at the single agreement pattern first and then move to double agreement.

---

[5] Although the accusative and dative case marker are identical, they are glossed differently in this article.

3.1 Intransitive

Finite verbs in Darai show agreement with the person, number, gender and honorific level of the subject. The verb agrees with a single argument that occurs with the intransitive clause. However, the case role is crucial in hosting different sets of agreement markers. The agreement of person, number, gender, and honorificity is common across IA languages (Kellog 1876, Saksena 1981). Aside from this, the agreement is also triggered by case roles of the subject.

3.1.1 Person, number, gender and honorificity

The verb agrees with the subject in number and person but the gender is not indexed in the non-past tense. Table 2 shows the intransitive verb *bosike* 'to sit' in the non-past tense. Person and number markers follow the tense markers except in the third person singular (singular) non-past tense where the person marker precedes the tense marker, a type of morpheme metathesis.

	Singular	**Plural**
1	bos-tə-m	bos-ta-hĩ
	sit-NPST-1SG	sit-NPST-1PL
2 NH	bos-tə-s	bos-tahə-səb
	sit-NPST-2SG	sit-NPST-PL
2 H	bos-ta-u (hau)	bos-taha-u (hau)-səb
	sit-NPST-2SG.H	sit-NPST-2SG.H-PL
2 HH	bos-ike bhə-i-t	bos-ike bhə-i-t
	sit-INF become-2.SG.HH-NPST	sit-INF become-2.SG.HH-NPST
3 NH	bos-i-t	bos-tahə-səb
	sit-3SG-NPST	sit-NPST-PL
3 H	bos-ta-t (hat)	bos-ta-t (hat)-(səb)
	sit-NPST-3SG.H	sit-NPST-3SG.H-PL

Table 2. Intransitive verb agreement[6]

We see that the position of the verb stem and agreement marker is *Verb stem + Tense marker + Agreement suffix* in all cases in Table 2 except in the third person singular in which the order is *Verb stem + Agreement suffix + Tense marker.* This is thus a segment and morpheme metathesis. The suffix *–i* is a third person singular agreement marker appearing not only with the lexical verbs but also with copulas. Let's consider the following example in which the copula hosts the third person singular agreement marker *–i*.

---

[6] The agreement with the second person high honorific is formed periphrastically in Darai. The verb *bhə* 'become' which follows the infinitive in periphrastic construction takes the suffix *–i*, which is also the suffix appearing with the third person singular non-honorific subject.

(7)   *pause merə dzəbbəḍ kam bạṭəi*
        pau-se   məi-rə   dzəbbəḍ   kam   bạtə-**i**
        you-with   I- [OBL]GEN   big   work   be.NPST-**3SG**

        'I have urgent work with you.' (BF.SLD.169)

We see that the agreement marker *–i* appears word-finally in this copular verb when it agrees with the third person singular subject. The agreement marker also occurs word-finally in other copulas, such as *rəhə-i* 'be.PST.-3SG', and as *həkhə-i* 'be.NPST.-3SG'. However, when it occurs with the lexical verb, the positions of two segments are interchanged. We see this when we look at the positions of the tense and agreement suffixes. Darai employs a regular kind of metathesis when the subject is the third person singular in the non-past tense as shown in (8).

(8)   *phar lagit*
        phar   lag-**i**-t
        blade   hit-**3SG**-NPST

        'The blade (of plough) will hit (you)' (BF.SLD.113)

The agreement marker precedes the tense marker, or it occurs between the verb stem and the tense marker as shown in (8). It is a regular metathesis in Darai. As noted in Kotapish and Kotapish (1975: 136) the third person singular agreement marker *–i* metathesizes with the tense marker. So, instead of the *bostai 'sit-NPST-3SG', the agreement marker precedes the tense marker resulting in *bos–i–t* 'sit-3SG-NPST'.

      Table 2 also shows that with an honorific subject (pronoun), the verb inflection differs.[7] The second person singular neutral marker *-s* is substituted by the honorific marker *-u (-hau)*. These suffixes can be interchangeably used and differ in cases where the speaker utters the verbs in slow and careful speech. The plural suffix *-səb* also marks the second person plural verb. The high honorific subject does not code any morphological agreement occurring rather in a periphrastic construction. With the third person singular subject, the person suffix *–i* is directly attached to the verb stem preceding the tense marker. The third person plural also has an identical agreement marker as the second person plural non-honorific subject. The suffix *-t* which generally appears with the third person singular also appears with the third person plural subject in addition to the plural suffix *-səb*. We see that the plural marker *-səb* appears with the second and third person plural subject. Darai does not make a gender distinction in pronoun forms. However, grammatical gender agreement is evidenced in some verb forms.

      The coding of honorificity is also demonstrated in Table 2 and is illustrated in (9-10).We see that the second person singular non-honorific is marked by the suffix *-s* whereas the second person singular honorific agreement marker is *-hau*.

---

[7] When we compare the verb agreement given in Table 2 with Kotapish and Kotapish (1975), we find some differences. They noted that the first person plural agreement suffix is *-ir* (1PL), and the second person plural is *-u* (2PL).

(9) *toi dzəitəs*

   toi   dza-tə-**s**
   you   go-NPST-**2SG**

   'You (SG.NH) go.'

(10) *tohe dzəitahau*

   tohe   dza-ta-**hau**
   you.H   go-NPST-**2SG.H**

   'You (SG.H) go.'

Table 2 also illustrates the verb agreement triggered by honorificity. Darai verbs in the non-past tense are characterized by three levels of honorificity. In the same way *-u/-hau* is used to index the second person singular pronoun *-u/-hausəb* is used with the second person plural pronoun. Second person high honorific agreement is formed periphrastically, viz. *-ke bhə-i-t* 'INF become-3SG-NPST' as shown in Table 1.

There are inconsistencies in the use of the third person plural suffix *-tat* in the texts.[8] We find *–tat* marking two functions. Firstly, it is used to mark the third person singular honorific as illustrated in (11) whereas this is also used to mark the third person plural as shown in (12-13). We find this in both elicited examples and examples obtained from discourse. Examples in (12-13) show the agreement with the third person plural, taken from discourse data.

(11) *unhen dzəitahat*

   unhen   dza-ta-**hat**
   he.H   go-NPST-**3SG.H**

   'He (H) goes.'

(12) *kehati bhə̃ḍija leikun dzəitahat*

   kehati   bhə̃ḍija   le-ikun   dza-ta-**hat**
   something   pot   bring-SEQ   go-NPST-**3PL**

   '…having taken the pot, (they) go.' (BF.SLD.171)

(13) *manuseĩ ghər lippot səpha sughghər tsokho nisṭo bənatahat*

   manus-ĩ   ghər   lippot   səpha   sughghər
   man-ERG   house   smearing   clean   clean
   tsokho nisṭo   bəna-ta-**hat**
   pure   pure   make-NPST-**3PL**

   'People make the home neat, clean and pure.' (MTU.SD.018)

---

[8] Some language consultants Som Lal Darai (SLD) and Cham Narayan Darai (CND) use *-tahəsəb* and *-hat* interchangeably for the second person honorific and the third person plural.

As illustrated in (11), the suffix *-hat* indexes honorificity in the third person singular pronoun but the same suffix indexes plurality as illustrated in (12-13). It is to be noted, however, that the plural is also coded by *-həsəb* in (14-15). We may compare examples (12-13) with (14-15) in which the second and the third person plural in the non-past tense is marked by the suffix *-həsəb*'2PL/3PL'.

(14)   *toisəb dzəitahəsəb*
    toisəb dza-ta-**həsəb**
    you.PL go-NPST-**2PL**

    'You (PL) go.'

(15)   *usəb dzatahəsəb*
    usəb   dza-ta-**həsəb**
    they   go-NPST-**3PL**

    'They go.'

3.1.2 Plural marker and gender

Unlike the present tense where the verb encodes the plurality regularly, number is not usually marked in the past tense. Consultants say that when the plural suffix is appended to the past tense suffix it indicates 'emphasis'[9] (16-17).

(16)   *dzəiləsəb ghər*
    dza-lə-**səb**   ghər
    go-PST-**PL**   house
    '(They) went home.' (BF.SLD.026)

(17)   *sutləsəb*
    sut-lə-**səb**
    sleep-PST-**PL**
    '(They) slept.' (BF.SLD.031)

Examples (16-17) are from a text entitled 'Bhothi Fish' which contains more than 125 utterances in the past tense. Example (16) is preceded by *kəhə-lə* 'tell-PST' and also is followed by a sentence with the verb *sut-lə* 'sleep-PST', even when the subjects are the third person plural.

Darai has a grammatical gender. Two genders, viz. masculine and feminine are differentiated in Darai. A distinction is determined by the sex of the animate nouns. Darai has a large number of pairs of words to shows the distinction of biological gender, such as *dulha* 'husband' and *dulhi* 'wife' etc. The grammatical gender is found between modifier and modified, such as *əlgə tshə̃uḍ* 'tall boy', *əlgi tshə̃uḍi* 'tall girl' (cf. Dhakal 2014:29). The verb agrees with the gender of the subject. The past

---

[9] By "emphasis" speakers mean that the subject must be plural, as opposed to singular. We have found only seven tokens in which the plural suffix *-səb* is attached to the verb in the past tense in our corpus. Among these forms, the subjects are dropped in six cases.

tense marker *–lə* inflects as *–l–i* 'PST-F' for feminine subject. The examples in (18-19) show agreement with feminine gender.

(18) *hamrə sahukə bhə̃isi bijaili*
      hame-rə   sahu-kə   bhə̃isi   bijai-l-**i**
      we-[OBL]GEN master-GEN   buffalo   give birth to-PST-**F**

      'Our master's buffalo gave birth to a young buffalo.' (EI.CND.038)

(19) *toi tə nidzə dzəili*
      toi   tə   nidzə   dza-l-**i**
      you(F) PART   NEG   go-PST-**F**

      'You did not die (lit. go).' (IMM.SU.034)

Gender is coded in the verb in some TAM verb forms, such as prospective form, perfective form, and past tense. The prospective form is illustrated in (20-21). The verb agrees with the gender of the head nouns.

(20) *kam kərlarə tshə̃uḍ*
      kam   kər-**larə**   tshə̃uḍ
      work   do-**PROS**   boy

      'The boy who works'

(21) *kam kərlari chə̃uḍi*
      kam   kər-**lari**   tshə̃uḍi
      work   do-**PROS.F**   girl

      'The girl who works'

Similarly, the verb agrees with the feminine gender in the perfect aspect as shown in (22-23).

(22) *bẹtaəilə ạtəi*
      bẹta   a-**lə**   ạtə-i
      boy   come-**PRF**   be.NPST-3SG

      'The boy has come.'

(23) *bẹtiəili ạtəi*
      bẹti   a-l-**i**   ạtə-**i**
      girl   come-PRF-**F** be.NPST-**3SG**

      'The girl has come.'

The verb also agrees with the feminine gender in the past tense (24-25).

(24) *dzethi tə nidzəmorli kantshi tə morli*

      dzethi   tə   nidzə   mor-l-**i**   kantshi   tə   mor-l-**i**

      elder   PART NEG   die-PST-**F**   younger   PART   die-PST-**F**

      'The elder (wife) did not die but the younger one died.' [GS.UN.22]

(25) *toitə nidzədzəili*

      toi   tə   nidzə   dza-l-**i**

      you   PART NEG   go-PST-**F**

      'You did not die (lit. go).' [GS.UN.34]

The gender agreement is evidenced not only with human nouns but also with the non-human nouns (18, 26). We see that the subject is *bhə̃isi* 'buffalo' in (18) and *tsiŋni* 'hen' in (26). Example (26) can be contrasted with example (27) in which the *tsiŋna* 'rooster' does not take the feminine marker. Similarly, we can compare example (26) with (27). While *tsiŋni* 'hen' takes the feminine past tense marker *–i*, *tsiŋna* 'hen' takes the default (masculine) past tense marker *–lə*.

(26) *tumbajə̃ ḍhukli tsiŋni*

      tumba-jə̃   ḍhuk-l-i   tsiŋni

      pot-LOC   wait-PST-**F**   hen

      'The hen waited in the pot.' [JaH.SLD.049]

(27) *tsiŋna baslə*

      tsiŋna   bas-lə

      rooster   cry-PST

      'The rooster cried.' [BF.SLD.060]

The verb does not agree with the feminine subject in the non-past tense. We see that the gender agreement is not evidenced in the present tense (28-29).

(28) *beṭaait*

      beṭa   a-i-t

      boy   come-**3SG**-NPST

      'The boy comes.'

(29) *beṭiait*

      beṭi   a-i-t

      girl   come-**3SG**-NPST

      'The girl comes.'

In sum, we see that the grammatical gender is not marked in the non-past tense but is coded in the past tense, perfect aspect and prospective verb forms.

3.1.3 Case roles

Case inflection is also responsible for triggering agreement in Darai. We see two distinct means of marking two kinds of case roles. Nominative and ergative case markings index one kind of agreement suffixes whereas genitive and dative cases make use of a different set of suffixes. Table 3 presents nominative and ergative marking with what we term ("Set 1 suffixes") and genitive and dative markings are coded with the second set ("Set 2 suffixes"). Both of these agreement markers share common suffix forms, such as the first person singular -*m*, the second person singular honorific -*u*, the second person plural -*həsəb*, and the third person plural -*kan(səb)*. Despite these similarities, there are different agreement suffixes, viz. the first person plural suffix, second person singular, the third person singular and the third person plural.

	Set 1 suffixes	**Set 2 suffixes**
	Nominative and ergative	**Genitive and dative**
1SG	-m	-m
1PL	-hĩ	-Ø
2SG	-s	-r
2SG.H	-u	-u
2PL	-həsəb	-həsəb
3SG	-i	-k
3SG.H	-t	-kan
3PL	-kan(səb)	-kan(səb)

Table 3. Agreement markers and pronominal suffixes[10]

It should be noted that the suffixes belonging to Set 1 appear only in verb agreement whereas those in Set two occur both with nominal heads in possessive constructions and in verb agreement. This is further illustrated in the following subsections.

3.1.3.1 Genitive agreement

As noted, verb agreement in Darai is also triggered by the genitive modifier (cf. Corbett 2006:61) rather than the head noun encoding nominative and ergative suffixes (Set 2 suffixes). The genitive modifier of a NP triggers the verb agreement. This may be illustrated for the first, second, and the third person singular subjects which take Set 1 suffixes.

(30) *məi ghərəjə̃ rəhəm*
       məi   ghərə-jə̃   rəhə-**m**
       I   house- LOC   be.COP-**1SG**

       'I am at home.'

---

[10] We follow Wali and Koul (1997) for distinguishing agreement suffixes and pronominal suffixes. Corbett (2003:181) also points out that pronominal affixes fall between agreement affixes and free pronouns. Corbett also mentions that such 'pronominal affixes' share 'syntactic behavior with pronouns' and 'morphological behavior with agreement affixes'.

(31)   *toi ghərəjə̃ rəhəs*
       toi   ghərə-jə̃   rəhə-**s**
       you   house- LOC   be.COP-**2SG**

       'You (SG) are at home.'

(32)   *u ghərəjə̃ rəhəi*
       u   ghərə-jə̃   rəhə-**i**
       he   house- LOC   be.COP-**3SG**

       'He is at home.'

The copular verb inflections in (30-32) are straightforward as they take the agreement suffixes just as in lexical verbs. The copular verbs in these examples take the agreement suffix *-m*, *-r*, and *–i* for the first, second and third person respectively. These agreement suffixes take the nominative-ergative agreement suffixes (Set1).

By contrast, if the NP is modified by the genitive case-marked modifier, the agreement pattern changes. The verb agreement in this case is triggered by the genitive modifier rather than the head noun. This is illustrated in the following examples (33-36).

(33)   *bhaighərəjə̃ aṭəi*
       bhai   ghər-jə̃   aṭə-**i**
       brother   house-LOC   be.COP-**3SG**

       'Brother is at home.'

(34)   *merə bhai ghərəjə̃ aṭim*
       məi-rə   bhai   ghər-jə̃   aṭi-**m**
       I-[OBL]GEN   brother   house-LOC   be.COP-**1SG**

       'My brother is at home.'

(35)   *terə bhai ghərəjə̃ aṭir*
       toi-rə   bhai   ghər-jə̃   aṭi-**r**
       you-[OBL]GEN   brother   house- LOC   be.COP-**2SG**

       'Your brother is at home.'

(36)   *ukhrə bhai ghərəjə̃ aṭik*
       toi-rə   bhai   ghər-jə̃   aṭi-**k**
       you-[OBL]GEN   brother   house- LOC   be.COP-**3SG**

       'Your brother is at home.'

We see that the agreement marker is Set one *–i* in (33)because the agreement in this example is triggered by the head noun *bhai* 'brother'. The agreement pattern differs when we look at the sentences in which the head noun is modified by the genitive modifier. The head of the NP is *bhai*

'brother' in (34-36) but instead of agreeing the head (33), the copular verbs agree with the genitive modifier *merə* 'my' in (34), *terə* 'your' in (35), *ukhrə* 'his' in (36). So, they take set 2 suffixes. Some additional examples follow where the suffixes agree with the possessive pronouns (37-39).

(37) *u merə dadzu həkhim*
 u   məi-rə   dadzu   həkhi-**m**
 he   I-[OBL]GEN brother be.NPST-**1SG**

'He is my elder brother.' (KAQ.SLD.122)

(38) *u terə dadzu həkhir*
 u   toi-rə   dadzu   həkhi-**r**
 he   you-[OBL]GEN brother be.NPST-**2SG**

'He is your elder brother.'

(39) *terə dukhə aṭir*
 toi-rə   dukhə   aṭi-**r**
 you-[OBL]GEN hardship be.NPST-**2SG**

'You have hardships (lit. Your hardships exist).' (KAQ.SLD.122)

In other words, the pronominal suffix does not agree with the head of the NP *dadzu* 'brother' but with *merə* 'my' indicating that the genitive-marked dependents control the verb agreement by possessor NP, not the head of the NP.

It was mentioned earlier that Darai nouns also host the pronominal possessive suffixes. Thus, sometimes it is not clear whether the verb agrees with the genitive modifier or with the head noun itself. This analysis is further complicated when the possessive suffix appears in the noun phrases. This is illustrated with copular verbs clauses in (40-41).

(40) *u merə bhaim həkhəm*
 u   məi-rə   bhai-**m**   həkhə-**m**
 he   I-[OBL]GEN younger brother-**POSS.1SG** be.NPST-**1SG**

'He is my younger brother.'

(41) *u terə bhair həkhir*
 u   toi-rə   bhai-**r**   həkhi-**r**
 he   you-[OBL]GEN younger brother-**POSS.2SG** be.NPST-**2SG**

'He is your younger brother.'

Examples (40-41) pose some challenges to the conclusion we reached before. As mentioned earlier, the verb agrees with the genitive modifier rather than the head noun. It is not obvious whether the verb agreement is controlled by the genitive modifier or the PPS.[11] In fact,

---

[11]Cf. (Comrie 2003:321).

either is possible in this context. However, it is to be noted that pronominal possessive suffixes are optional in Darai, not obligatory. For example, the agreement marker *–r* in (41) not only agrees with the possessive pronoun *terə* 'your' but also with the head noun *bhair* 'your brother'. Similarly, the agreement marker *-m* agrees not only with the first person possessive pronoun *merə* 'my' but also with the PPS *-m* that occurs with the head noun, viz. *bhaim* 'my bother' in (40). In all other cases, they (agreement suffixes) are present even if they (pronominal possessive suffixes) are absent.

In addition to copular verbs, main verbs also agree with the genitive (possessor) subject (42). The second person singular suffix *-r* is used instead of the second person singular suffix *–s* to agree with the possessor subject. Thus, there is preference by the speakers for Set 2 suffix triggered by the genitive modifier (cf. Stump and Yadav 1988).

(42)   *bijatair dui*
          bija-tai-**r**   dui
          give birth to-NPST-**2**   two

          'Both of (your wives) will give birth (to children).' (KAQ.SLD.025)[12]

Example (42) is a typical instance where the verb codes the second set of suffixes (the suffix *-r*) instead of the suffix which appears with Set 1 suffixes, viz. *-s*. In order to explain this example, it is relevant to consider the discourse context. The story goes like this. A young man goes to a wise hermit to consult and confirm whether his wives will give birth to. In reply, the hermit says that his wives will give birth. In example (42) the subject is not expressed lexically and is obtained from the discourse context. In the discourse context, the hermit is the speaker (I) and the young man to whom the hermit is speaking is the second person singular (you/your). The implied but the unexpressed head noun *dulhirsəb* 'wives' is the head noun and the *terə* 'your' is the modifier. Thus, the suffix *-r* agrees with the second person singular modifier (*merə* 'my'). It is noted that the head of the nouns obtained from the discourse context is 'your wives' but the agreement suffix agrees with the second person singular subject employing the suffix *-r*. The agreement is controlled by the overt possessor rather than the complete noun phrase. This sort of verb agreement is more obvious when we explain the example in (43).

(43)   *toi merə səwari sikhar kərike bhəitəm*
          toi   məi-rə   səwari   sikhar   kər-ike   bhəi-tə-**m**
          you   I-[OBL]GEN travel   hunting   do-INF   become-NPST-**1SG**

          'You become my travel means for hunting.' (KAQ.SLD.069)

Which constituent has controlled the verb agreement in this case? Again we see that the verb has encoded the suffix *-r(ə)* as explained before. As expected, instead of verb agreement triggered by the second person singular nominative subject, verb agreement is triggered by the modifier of the NP *merə səwari sikhar* 'my travel means' in (43). Thus, in many cases like this we encounter the possessor agreement in Darai.

This kind of agreement deserves further analysis. As noted above, the genitive modifier rather than the head NP controls the verb agreement. The story can further be expanded with

---

[12]The suffix *-r* typically appears as the pronominal possessive suffix in the second person singular pronoun.

pronominal suffixes and the agreement suffixes to the verb. For example in (44), we see slight differences from what is explained in examples (42-43). This example illustrates a case where the genitive agreement not only agrees with the modifier (viz. second person singular) but also with the head of the NP. Corbett (2006) describes such cases as 'alliterative agreement'. The alliteration is not possible with all possessed nouns as they do not take a PPS. We find similar examples in (40-41).

(44) *terə duhəi dulhir bijatair*
       toi-rə   duhəi   dulhi-**r**   bija-ta-**ir**
       you-[OBL]GEN   both   wife-**2**   give birth to-NPST-**2SG**

       'Both of your wives will give birth (to children).'

Example (44) raises the question as to whether the verb agrees with the head of the NP or with its modifiers, or both. The controller of the agreement system is the modifier rather than the head NP. This is evidenced by the fact that not all nouns in genitive constructions take the pronominal possessive suffixes. While some kinship terms, and some belongings also index PPS, others do not.

3.1.3.2 Dative subject agreement

As mentioned, in Darai, the subject triggers verb agreement. Verb agreement is also triggered by dative subject which take Set 2 suffixes. It is exemplified in (45-47). The dative subject agreement of the verb *tsah-* 'want', *həkhə-* 'be.NPST' and are presented in Appendix A. Examples follow.

(45) *merəke ris uṭhilem*
       məi-ke   ris   uṭhi-le-**m**
       I-[OBL]DAT   anger   stand-PST-**1SG**

       'I was angry.'

(46) *terəke ris uṭhiler*
       toi-ke   ris   uṭhi-le-**r**
       you-[OBL]DAT   anger   stand-PST-**2SG**

       'You were angry.'

(47) *teurake ris uṭhileu*
       tohẽ-ke   ris   uṭhi-le-**u**
       you.H-[OBL]DAT   anger   stand-PST-**2SG.H**

       'You (H) were angry.'

In (45) through (47), the verbs agree with the dative-marked subjects. Hook (1990) reports that 'dative agreement' is a feature of Shina. We see the agreement with the dative subject in some languages, such as Majhi (Dhakal 2014) and Rajbanshi (Wilde 2008). In comparison to elicitation, in our corpus, verb agreeing with the dative subjects are less frequent in occurrence. However, at least one example was found and is presented here.

(48) *səti terake nidzə lekhlə rəhir*

səti	toi-ke	nidzə	lekh-lə	rəhi-**r**
immolation	you-[OBL]DAT	NEG	write-PRF	COP.PST-**2SG**

'You are not destined (lit. written) for immolation.' (GS.UN.031)

I will interpret the discourse context which determines the suffix *–s* or *–r* in section 3.2.

3.1.3.3 *Agreement in possibility mood*

As explained earlier (section 2), Darai makes a binary contrast between past and non-past tense. The non-past tense is *–t* as shown in Table 2. The non-past tense refers to both the present and future events in Darai. The present and future tenses are differentiated if required by making use of the time adverbials. The non-past tense marker has co-occurred with the adverbial *kalu* 'tomorrow' which refers to the future time in (49-50).

(49) *kalu martahĩ matshə*

kalu	mar-**ta**-hĩ	matshə
tomorrow	kill-**NPST**-1PL	fish

'We will kill (catch) fish tomorrow.' (BF.SLD.051)

(50) *məi kalu behanə əitəm*

məi	kalu	behanə	a-**tə**-m
I	tomorrow	morning	come-**NPST**-1SG

'I will come tomorrow morning.' (KK.SLD.026)

The non-past tense also refers to regular, or punctual activities as in (51) or the action taking place in the present time (52). Example (51) is taken from a discourse where the speaker describes the regular or punctual action. Similarly, example (52) shows the action taking place regularly.

(51) *adzu uttər lestəm*

adzu	uttər	les-**tə**-m
today	north	take-**NPST**-1SG

'(I) take (the cows) to the north today.' (HP.BLD.17)

(52) *bahunke pəisa deikun bidai kərtahĩ*

bahun-ke	pəisa	de-ikun	bida	kər-**ta**-hĩ
Brahmin-DAT	money	give-SEQ	farewell	do-**NPST**-1PL

'(We) give the priest a farewell giving him some money and gift.' (MTU.SD.34)

We see that examples (49-50) truly indicate the future time reference whereas examples (51-52) refer to the present time. We also see that the agreement markers in (51-52) belong to Set 1 suffixes.

The agreement pattern in the possibility mood differs from the non-past tense in Darai. While the non-past tense is coded by the suffix *-t*, the possibility mood is coded by *-b* in Darai. By possibility mood we mean 'the proposition is possibly true' (Bybee et al. 1994: 320). While the non-past tense takes Set 1 suffixes, the verbs in the possibility mood and the past tense take the Set (2) suffixes given in Table 3. Examples are provided in (53-54).

(53) *abe əibəkan kiti kərike kiti nakərike*
      abe   a-**bə**-kan   kiti   kər-ike   kiti   na-kər-ike
      now   come-**POSB**-3SG.H   what   do-INF   what   NEG-do-INF

      '(He) may come, what to do (or) what not to do.' (BF.SLD.210)

(54) *ḍhilo anikun tsaraikun ḍhukaikun sutbək*
      ḍhilo   an-ikun   tsara-ikun   ḍhuka-ikun   sut-**bə**-k
      slow   bring-SEQ   graze-SEQ   wait-SEQ   sleep-**POSB**-3SG

      'Having brought (it) late and grazed (it and) waited, he might sleep.' (OK.JD.011)

It is to be noted that the *-b* future is a feature is some eastern IA languages (Grierson 1903). However, this marks the possibility mood in Darai. The examples given in (53-54) can be contrasted with example (49-52). We see that the suffix *-kan* is used with the third person singular honorific subject and it belongs to Set 2 suffix (53). Similarly, the agreement suffix *-k* again belongs to Set 2 suffix and it is used to encode the third person singular subject. Paradigm of inflections of the verb in the possibility mood can be seen in Appendix A.

3.1.3.4 Agreement in the past tense

Like the possibility mood, the suffixes belonging to the second set (non-nominative/ergative suffixes) are employed in the past tense. Consider the intransitive sentence in (55).

(55) *itshi boshalem tə*
      itshi   bos-hale-**m**   tə
      here   sit-PST-**1SG**   PART

      'I sat here.' (IMM.UN.108)

We see the agreement marker *-m* in (55). Similarly, we encounter sentences taking set 2 suffixes in (56-57).

17

(56) *toi boshaler*
  toi bos-hale-**r**
  you sit-PST-**2SG**
  'You sat.'

(57) *u boshalek*
  u   bos-hale-**k**
  he   sit-PST-**3SG**
  'He sat.'

The agreement markers are rarely seen in the past tense and are primarily encountered in intransitive clauses the verb *dza* 'go', *a* 'come', and *bəs* 'sit'. There are dozens of examples of these verbs being used without the agreement markers in the past tense. It seems that the agreement in the past tense is a marked construction. Again consider an example obtained from the corpus (58).

(58) *əilem dzəilem tato pina khəilem*
  a-le-**m**   dza-le-**m**   tato pina   kha-le-**m**
  come-PST-**1SG** go-PST-**1SG** hot oil-cake eat- PST-**1SG**
  'I came, I went and I ate oil-cake.'[13] (IMM.SU.055)

Agreement in the past tense with intransitive verbs is straightforward compared to transitive and ditransitive verbs as they encode only an argument. The case is more complicated with transitive verbs take only one agreement marker, such as *khəilem* 'eat-PST-1SG' in (58).

Like in intransitive clauses, the suffixes belonging to the second set (non-nominative/ergative suffixes) are employed in the past tense with transitive verbs. An example follows.

(59) *uhĩbəḍkə tsidz paulə*
  u-hĩ bəḍkə tsidz pa-lə
  he-ERG big   thing find-PST
  'He found a big thing.'

We find many examples like in (59) in which the verb does not code person and number agreement in the past tense. However, there are cases in which the Set 2 suffixes are used with the verbs. Examples follow.

---

[13] Since this is a proverb, it actually means 'I was indecisive'.

(60)   *bəḍkə tsidz pahalem*
      bəḍkə   tsidz   pa-hale-**m**
      big   thing   find-PST-**1SG**

      'I found a big thing.' (DAF.CND.66)

(61)   *toi bəḍkə tsidz pahaler*
      toi   bəḍkə   tsidz   pa-hale-**r**
      you   big   thing   find-PST-**2SG**

      'You found a big thing.'

(62)   *uhibəḍkə tsidz pahalek*
      u–hĩ   bəḍkə   tsidz   pa-hale-**k**
      he-ERG big   thing find-PST-**3SG**

      'He found a big thing.'

Although the subject is dropped in (60), we see that the verb takes the agreement suffix *-m*. Similarly, the agreement suffix *-r* and *-k* belonging to Set 2 suffixes are used in (61) and (62) respectively. This pattern differs slightly from the verb agreement pattern discussed in Table 4. [14] An example follows in (63).

(63)   *pani khəilek hat dhoulek*
      pani   kha-le-**k**   hat   dho-le-**k**
      water eat-PST-**3SG**   hand wash-PST-**3SG**

      'He drank water (and) washed hands.' (BF.SLD.108)

We find the agreement in the past tense both inintransitive verb (55-58), but also in the transitive verbs as shown in (60-63).[15]

---

[14] In addition, language consultants say that the agreement in the past tense also yields an emphatic reading. Sentence (60) can be read as "I found a big thing as opposed to other people', or the translation of this sentence could be 'It is I who found a big thing'. The same reading may go for examples (61-62). If we take this view, example (59) is pragmatically neutral in the sense that it does not contain any topicalized element. By contrast, in examples (60-62), we see the agreement suffixes in the past tense. So these examples have some topic worthiness. The transitive and ditransitive verbs are capable of taking both the subject and object agreement markers simultaneously. By contrast, the transitive verbs given in (60-62) host only the Set 2 suffixes. Informants also note that this kind of marked construction is gradually absent in the speakers of young generation of Darai.

[15] Empathy-based approach of verb agreement in Maithili is pointed out by Bickel et al. (1999:503). However, referential agreement or focus agreement would be an appropriate term for Darai to describe this agreement phenomenon.

3.2   Transitive and ditransitive verbs

Darai irregularly encodes the subject and object via agreement in transitive clauses. Similarly, the subject and indirect object are coded in the ditransitive verbs. The agreement marker referring to the direct object is not present in the verb inflection. Although all ditransitive verbs agree with the subject (agent) in person and number, they sometimes encode object (patient).[16] Coding of object in transitive verb is not consistent and is an irregular phenomenon in the discourse data. For instance, the verb *de-* 'give' agrees only with the subject in most cases as in (64) but a few examples are found in our corpus where transitive verbs index both the subject and the object simultaneously as in (64). In this example, the verb *an-* 'bring' is followed by the tense marker which in turn is followed by the subject and object agreement markers in that order. When the subject and object are coded in the verb, the subject agreement marker precedes the object agreement marker (64).In other words, the subject (or agent) is locationally closer to the verb compared to object (or patient) if both the subject and object are marked on verbs.

(64)   *anhalmis*
         an-hal-**mi-s**
         bring-NPST-**1SG-2SG**

         'I brought you (here).' (PTP.CND.057)

Thus, the verb *anhalmis* has *an-* 'bring', *hal-* 'PST,' *-mi* '1SG' and *-s* '2SG' in (64). Similarly, the same verb inflects without coding the subject and object as can be seen in (79-80). Coding of both the subject and object is an infrequent but a typologically interesting feature in Darai.

Since both the subject and object are 'dropped' in (64), an example obtained from the discourse data it is relevant to discuss the context when the speaker utters this sentence. An aged elder brother is narrating his life history passing through hardships. He is occasionally referring (and indicating) to his younger brother who is also present in the scene. Thus, he is referring to the addressee and telling him that the speaker brought the addressee to the current location. So, although overt subject and object are dropped, the verb codes both the subject and object. A similar case, with first person and third person encoding, is in (65).

(65)   *rəŋgin luga dzhula gone lagai detahĭkansəb*
         rəŋgin   luga   dzhula gone   lagai   de-ta-**hĭ-kan-səb**
         colourful   clothes   blouse blouse make wear-CAUS-ABS give-NPST-**1PL-3.H-PL**

         '(We) give them colorful clothes such as blouses.' (DR.CND.37)

We see that both the subject and object are encoded in (65). Although the subject is dropped in (65) the discourse context tells us that the subject is the first person plural. Similarly, the object is the 'priest' (third person singular honorific) in the discourse. So, the speaker is using the third person honorific plural in the object position.

The agreement suffixes in Darai are summarized in Table 4.

---

[16] Masica (1991:261) notes that in some NIA languages agreement with "more than one sentence elements at once". He also provides examples of double agreement in Kashmiri, Marathi etc. (1991:343).

Subject agreement		Object agreement								
		1SG	1PL	2SG	2SG.H	2PL	3SG	3SG.H	3PL	3PL.H
	1SG	-	-	-mi-r/s	-mi-u	Only S marked	-mi-k	-mi-kan	Only S marked	-mi-kan-səb
	1PL	-	-	Only S marked			-hi-k	-hi-kan		-hi-kan-səb
	2SG	Only S marked		-	-	-	-si-k	-si-kan		-si-kan-səb
	2SG.H	Only S marked		-	-	-	-u-k	-u-kan		-u-kan-səb
	2PL	Only S marked		-	-	-	Only S marked			Only S marked
	3SG	Only S marked		-ir/s	-u	Only S marked	-ik	-ikan		-ikan-səb
	3PL	Only S marked		-ir/s	-u-səb		-ik	-ikan		-ikan-səb

Table 4. Verb agreement in transitive verbs

Table 4 shows the inflection pattern for typical transitive and ditransitive verbs in Darai. The subject pronouns are listed vertically on the leftmost side. The objects are listed horizontally on the top. The combination of suffixes to code subject and object agreement is shown Table 4. This table demonstrates that verbs can encode two referents. This table can be contrasted with the table given in Appendix C which is mainly based on Kotapish and Kotapish (1975:140-141) and slightly adapted from Wilde (2008:171). The signal with (-) shows that reflexives are not included in the table. The places where only subjects are coded are indicated in this table

Based on the elicited data, the agreement pattern in transitive/ditransitive verbs in Darai shows three patterns, viz. (a) Both the subjects and objects are coded, (b) Only the subjects are coded, and (c) Only the objects are coded. We discuss these patterns in the following sections.

First, we present the situation in which both the subjects and objects are coded in the verbs. We examine the suffixes which appear to encode agreement differently in transitive and ditransitive verbs. They are given in (66a), and (66b) respectively. Appendix B includes the inflection of the verb *de* 'give' in past and non-past tense.

(66a)	SUBJECT IN TRANSITIVE		(66b)	OBJECT IN TRANSITIVE	
	-mi	'1SG'		-s	'2SG.NH'
	-hĩ	'1PL'		-r	'2SG.NH'
	-si	'2SG'		-u	'2SG.H'
	-u	'2SG.H'		-k	'3SG'
				-kan	'3SG.H'
				-kansəb	'3PL.H'

In fact, the suffixes mentioned in (66a) appear in the subject position in the intransitive verb paradigm. The agreement suffixes to mark the subject of the third person singular and plural are not

straightforward. We will come to this point later. Similarly, different agreement suffixes are used to code the object as shown in (66b). The first person agreement markers *-mi* and *-hĩ* are not coded as objects. By contrast, all other agreement suffixes appear when they are coded as objects.

As shown in Table 4, there are some combinatory possibilities of these suffixes. When the subject is the first person singular, there is the possibility that the object may be the second person singular (non-honorific and honorific), third person singular (both non-honorific and honorific) and the third person plural honorific.

As shown earlier, most of the suffixes given in (67-69) also appear in the intransitive verb paradigm. It is to be noted that the plural suffix *-səb* with *-kan* occurs only when the objects are the third person plural. Examples follow.

(67) *məi ukhrake bhat dehalmik*
      məi   u-ke   bhat   de-hal-**mi-k**
      I   he-[OBL]DAT   rice   give-PST-**1SG-3SG**

      'I gave him rice.'

(68) *məi terake bhat dehalmiu*
      məi   toi-ke   bhat   de-hal-**mi-u**
      I   you-[OBL]DAT rice   give-PST-**1SG-2SG.H**

      'I gave you (H) rice.'

(69) *toi ukhrake ṭaŋgi detasik*
      toi   u-ke   ṭaŋgi   de-ta-**si-k**
      I   he-[OBL]DAT   axe   give-NPST-**1SG-2SG.H**

      'You give him the axe.'

As explained earlier, the transitive and ditransitive verbs host only the subject and object agreement suffixes in Darai. The subject is the first person and the objects are the third person singular and the second person honorific singular in (66) and (67) respectively. Similarly, we see that the second person singular subject and the third person singular object are coded in (68). When the first person acts on the second person and when the second person and third person act on the third person, the coding of the subject and object is straightforward. Both the subjects and objects are mostly coded in this case.

A look at the corpus further illustrates this pattern in Darai. The suffixes which code both the subject and object are very rare as evidenced in the corpus data. There are only five tokens in which the verbs code both the subject and object. The two verbs to code both the subject and object are the verbs *de* 'give' and *an* 'bring'. Of these two, the former codes both the subject and object four times in the text corpus whereas the later verb codes both the subject and object simultaneously only once in the text. It seems that all of these examples have animate and volitional subject and the direct objects in transitive and indirect objects in ditransitive objects are animate. We will give possible explanation why the simultaneous subject and object is not consistent in the text corpus towards the end of this section.

Secondly, we examine the case where only the subjects are coded in the transitive and ditransitive paradigm. Note that the second person plural is not coded as subject in the transitive verb paradigm. In order to simplify the presentation, the cases where the only subjects are coded are shown in (70). While the pronouns given in the left column act as the subjects, the pronouns in the second column act as objects.

(70) | SUBJECTS | | OBJECTS |
|---|---|---|
| 1PL | → | 2SG, 2SG.H, 2PL |
| 2SG | → | 1SG, 1PL |
| 2SG.H | → | 1SG, 1PL |
| 2PL | → | Ø |
| 3SG | → | 1SG, 1PL, 2PL |
| 3SG | → | 3PL |

Some examples follow (71-72).

(71) *toi merake ṭaŋgi detəs*
     toi   məĩ-ke   ṭaŋgi   de-tə-s
     I   I-[OBL]DAT   axe   give-NPST-**2SG**

     'You give me an axe.'

(72) *uhĩ hamrake bhat deit*
     u-hĩ   hame-ke   bhat   de-**i**-t
     he-ERG   you-[OBL]DAT   rice   give-**3SG**-NPST

     'He gives us an axe.'

The cases in which only the subjects are coded in the transitive and intransitive verbs are illustrated in (71-72).

Thirdly, we have another problematic case in Darai. There are cases where only the objects are coded without realizing the subject in transitive and ditransitive paradigm. This is summarized in (73).

	SUBJECTS		OBJECTS
(73)	3SG	→	2SG, 2SG.H
	3SG	→	3SG, 3SG.H
	3SG	→	3H.PL
	3PL	→	2SG, 2SG.H, 3SG
	3PL	→	1SG, 1PL, 2PL
	3SG	→	3PL, 3H.PL

As can be seen in (73), the verbs do not code the subject morphosyntactically when the third person singular subject acts on the second and the first person objects. It seems that the 'animacy hierarchy' is responsible for this. Croft (1990:115) discussesthe role of animacy in grammatical consequences.

23

This tendency is more obvious when the third person pronouns are the subjects and the first and the second person pronouns are the objects. Examples follow.

(74) *uhĩ terake bhat detair*

u-hĩ	toi-ke	bhat	de-ta-**ir**
he-ERG	you-[OBL]DAT	rice	give-NPST-**2SG**

'He gives you rice.'

(75) *uhĩ teurake bhat detau*

u-hĩ	tou-ke	bhat	de-ta-**u**
he-ERG	you-[OBL]DAT	rice	give-NPST-**2SG.H**

'He gives you (H) rice.'

We see that the subject agreement markers do not appear in the sentences (74-75).[17] Instead, we see only the object being coded.

One intriguing occurrence in the table is *–i*. On the one hand, it is an agreement suffix as seen in Table 4. It occurs at the end of a copula, such as *baṭə-i* 'COP.NPST-3SG', *həkhəi* 'OP.NPST-3SG', *rəhəi* 'COP.PST-3SG'. On the other hand, in other instances, the sound *–i* also occurs between tense and agreement marker with the third person singular pronouns, involving in metathesis (cf. 3.1.1). Unlike in the copular verbs, which occurs in the final position, it occurs word-medially with the rest of the verbs agreeing with the third person singular pronoun. But also, as noted in Kotapish and Kotapish (1975: 141), in still other instances, the sound *i* is an ephenthetic sound occuring between the verb stem and the third person singular pronouns. The sound *i* occurs with nearly all verbs except when the second person singular honorific is the subject and object. This suggests that the sound *i* is the epenthetic sound and not the agreement suffix. An example, obtained from the discourse data, further illustrates this (76).

(76) *khũdikun martaik kəhikun kəhələ*

khũd-ikun	mar-ta-**ik**	kəh-ikun	kəhə-lə
trample-SEQ	kill-NPST-**3SG**	say-SEQ	say-PST

'(The king said), '(it) will kill him by trampling.' (BF.SLD.185)

There are cases where the ditransitive and transitive verbs take only one agreement marker because of hierarchy relations between the subject and the object. The verbs which are found with the agreement restriction of this kind are: *kəhə* 'say', *an* 'bring', *de* 'give', *kha* 'eat', *mar* 'kill', *niska*

---

[17] Paudyal (2008:200) explains this in terms of hierarchy in agreement, viz. 1›2, 1›3, 2›3. However, he further notes that in the semantic reverse 2›1, 3›1, 3›2, the verb agrees with only the highest-ranking semantic non-first person. Since Darai does not permit the word-final consonant cluster, the sound seems like an epenthetic vowel in some cases, such as 1›2, 1›2H, 1›3 . This rule applies partly because the sound *i* also occurs with the context where the epenthetic vowel does not require if the subjects are the first and second person pronouns, such as example (68).

'take.out', *pa* 'find', *dhər* 'hold', *basa* 'make.sit', *hera* 'lose', *dzit* 'defeat', *tsin* 'recognize'. An example with a transitive verb is here.

(77)   *lə ihəi dzithalek*

        lə   i-həi   dzit-hal-**ik**

        part   this-EMPH   defeat-PST-**3SG**

        '(The king said), 'this (the man) defeated(me).' (OK.JD.066)

We see that although the examples (76-77) are transitive verbs and they are capable of taking both a subject and object, only one argument is coded in the verbs. We noted this before because of the agreement restrictions shown in (73).

    Moving to the discourse data, we see variations in verb agreement patterns. Unlike examples (67-69), the intransitive verbs in (78-79) do not code either the subject and object. Although the subjects are dropped in these examples, the subject is the third person singular pronouns, in them as obtained from the discourse context.

(78)   *pheri anlə pəɳḍit*

        pheri   an-lə   pəɳḍit

        again   bring-PST   priest

        'Again (he) brought the priest.' (KAQ.SLD.024)

(79)   *əse anlə bhaudzuheke*

        əse   an-lə   bhaudzuhe-ke

        again   bring-PST   sister-in-law-ACC

        'Then (he) again brought the sister-in-law.' (KAQ.SLD.128)

When we see the discourse data, both subject and object are even more infrequently encoded. Let's examine some statistical preferences of object encoding in Darai. The transitive verb *de* 'give' occurs about 80 times in the text (of 200 verbs overall) corpus and 40 tokens were counted with the finite verbs. This verb codes both the subject and object only in 3 places. Similarly another transitive verb *an* 'bring' occurs about 40 times in the text corpus but agrees with only subject and object only in two places. Another transitive verb *ledz* 'take' does not have a single token with the subject and object agreement. The verb *kəhə-*'tell'encodes both of the arguments.The transitive verb *mar* 'kill' codes both subject and object only in two occurrences in (80-81). This is illustrated in (80-81).

(80)   *məi ukhrə bhat dehalmik*

        məi   u-rə   bhat   de-hal-**mi-k**

        I   he-[OBL]DAT rice   give-PST-**1SG-3SG**

        'I gave him rice.'

(81) *məi teurake bhat dehalmiu*
      məi   tohe-kə   bhat   de-hal-**mi-u**
      I   you-[OBL]DAT   rice   give-PST-**1SG-2SG.H**

      'I gave you (H) rice.'

There are some 'transitive (as well as ditransitive') verbs which in elicited structures can code both subject and object simultaneously in Darai. However, when they appear in texts, they only code the subject. The transitive verbs which occur in the corpus but do not agree with both the subject and object simultaneously include*bhęt* 'meet', *kər* 'do', *dekh* 'see', *səllah kər* 'make consultation', *pa* 'find/get', *rakh* 'keep', *dzot* 'plough', *ban* 'tie', *puga* 'make reach', *sək* 'finish', *loka* 'hide', *pạtha* 'send', *khawa* 'fed', *putsh* 'ask', *kaṭ* 'slaughter', *tshaḍ* 'leave', *ụtha* 'lift', *pəile* 'get/find', *khos* 'search', *dzəta* 'strike with hand', *misa* 'mix', *her* 'care', *hela kər* 'hate', *kots* 'keep (sth) tight', *bana* 'make', *dzit* 'defeat', *pạtha* 'send', *dzhik* 'take out', *bọṭe* 'collect'. Despite the fact that these verbs do not code the subject and object simultaneously in the discourse data, these verbs are capable of coding the subject and object in elicited examples. Examples with *dzit* 'defeat' follow (82-83).

(82) *məi terake dzittamis*
      məi   toi-kə   dzit-ta-**m-is**
      I   you-[OBL]ACC   defeat-NPST-**1SG-2SG**

      'I defeat you.'

(83) *məi ukhrake dzittamik*
      məi   u-ke   dzit-ta-**m-ik**
      I   he-[OBL]ACC   defeat-NPST-**1SG-3SG**

      'I defeat him.'

The verbs listed in the preceding paragraphs were tested using the same frame of sentences as given in (82-83). Darai thus shows that the transitive verbs are capable of encoding the subject and object simultaneously even though this does not happen often in connected speech. This double agreement is unlike in Hindi in which "subject of a transitive verb is marked with an overt ergative case marker, the verb agrees with the direct object which is a bare NP in the clause" (Das 2006:41).[18] In addition to the verbs listed above, there are some verbs which generally take inanimate objects. These verbs were checked to see whether they are capable of encoding the object. These verbs include *odh* 'take out water from a place', *dho* 'wash', *rin* 'cook', *agi lag* 'burn'. These verbs are also capable of encoding the subject and object simultaneously as shown in (84).

---

[18] Saksena (1981:469) notes, "(the) Agent will fail to control if this NP is marked by (a) phonologically overt c.m. (case marker)."

(84)   *məi bhat rintamik*
    məi   bhat   rin-ta-**m**-**ik**
    I   rice   cook-NPST-**1SG**-**3SG**

    'I cook rice.'

We see similar variation in the coding of subjects and objects in the corpus. We will come to this point towards the end of this section. One reason behind this may be because of some 'transitivity'. The coding of subject and object is found only with the verb *de* 'give', *mar* 'kill', and *an* 'bring' in the corpus. It is natural that the first of these is a ditransitive verb and the verb *mar* 'kill' is higher in the transitivity scale (cf. Hopper and Thompson 1985; Kittilaä 2002) compared to other verbs. Such verbs occupy a higher position in transitivity.

    As shown in Table 4, it is relevant to note that the second person singular may be coded with the agreement marker *–s* or the pronominal suffix *–r* in transitive or ditransitive clauses.[19] In order to contrast this, let's again see an elicited sentence as in (85).

(85)   *məi terake bhara detamis*
    məi   toi-ake   bhara   de-ta-**mi**-**s**
    I   you-[OBL]DAT bus.fare   give-NPST-**1SG**-**2SG**

    'I will give you bus fare.'

    By contrast, we find a sentence in (86) in which the second person singular is encoded with the agreement marker *–r* belonging to the second set of affix (non-nominative/ergative).

(86)   *terake məi bhara detamir*
    toi-ke   məi   bhara   de-ta-**mi**-**r**
    you-[OBL]DAT I   bus.fare   give-NPST-**1SG**-**2SG**

    'I will give you bus fare.' (OK.JD.036)

    We see that there is a different word order pattern between (85) and (86), specifically in the position of the indirect object. We hypothesize that some discourse prominence is responsible for triggering the verb agreement with the suffix *–r* in this case, but this needs further investigation.[20]
    Levin and Hovav (2005:171) note, "the subject is ranked highest in the thematic hierarchy". They further note, "when a lower-ranked role is chosen as subject or object, the choice is accompanied by special verb morphology…." Givón (2001:416) notes for Amharic that, "Object agreement is controlled by topicalization in fronting…. In the unmarked SOV word order, object agreement is not used. But when an object is fronted, and thus topicalized, object agreement becomes obligatory." This is similar to Navajo, where change in word order also alters the verb

---

[19]Comrie (2003:317) notes that when the same suffix codes 'agent' and 'undergoer' this may be termed 'trigger-happy agreement'.

[20] The language informant prefers to have *–r* when the indirect object is fronted instead of *–s* as in (86) in most of the cases. However, he also accepts *–r*.

morphology in agreement (Lockwood and Mackaulay 2012: 435). This change in word-order might also trigger different patterns in verb agreement in Navajo.

It seems that the selection of an agreement feature is also triggered by syntactic-pragmatic features. When the accusative-marked object (which is syncretic to dative case) is fronted, we also have the same result in selecting the agreement marker (and PPS) *-r* instead of the suffix *-s*.

(87)   *lə terake khəitair abe dzogiĩ*

lə	toi-ke	kha-tai-**r**	abe	dzogi-ĩ
PART	you-[OBL]DAT	eat-NPST-**2SG**	now	hermit-ERG

'(The heads said), "Now, the hermit will eat you.' (KAQ.SLD.178)

Example (87) is obtained from the discourse data. As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, the selection of the agreement marker is controlled by the accusative-marked object fronted in (86-87). The verb forms for the sentence (86) and (87) are *detamis* 'give-NPST-1SG-2SG' and *khəitəs* 'eat-NPST-2SG' respectively in the typical word order.

Agreement of auxiliaries also follows the same patterns. The pronominal suffix in (87) is *-r* but the subject of the clause is *dzogi* 'hermit'. In this case, the verb does not agree with the subject but with the accusative-marked object. Siewierska (2004:156) notes, "There is a preference for person agreement with NPs which are definite or at least specific as opposed to non-specific or non-referential NPs." Examples (88-89) further illustrate this.

(88)   *lə terake kəhələ ạtir*

lə	toi-ke	kəhə-lə	ạti-**r**
PART	you-[OBL]DAT	tell-PFV	be.NPST-**2SG**

'Okay, (I) have told you (the story).' (KAQ.SLD.178)

(89)   *lə ukhrake kətha məĩ kəhələ ạtik*

lə	u-ke	məĩ	kətha	kəhə-lə	ạti-**k**
PART	he-[OBL]DAT	I	story	tell-PFV	be.NPST-**3SG**

'Okay, I have told him the story.'

The elicited sentence (89) also follows the same pattern as we find in (88). The auxiliary *ạti* 'be' in (89) is marked with the third person singular pronoun *-k* because the accusative-marked third person singular is fronted in this sentence. It is to be noted that if the sentence (89) would have typical word order for Darai, the agreement pattern would also differ. The verb form would be *kəhə-lə ạti-m* 'say-PRF be.NPST-1SG' in this case. It is far from simple to explain example (88) because the subject that can be obtained from the discourse context is the first person singular 'I'. The direct object in the discourse context is *kətha* 'story' which is 'dropped' in the discourse context. The question to be resolved is why the verb agrees with the recipient rather than the agent.

Let's now turn to the question as to why the simultaneous coding of subject and object is not consistent in the corpus data. We don't have much historical evidence to justify why this phenomenon is not regular in Darai. Kotapish and Kotapish (1975) reported this as a regular

linguistic feature in the Tanahun dialect.[21] The logical source of this solution is to examine the languages spoken nearby to investigate whether they feature the same kind of agreement pattern. It seems that the double agreement was a consistent and regular phenomenon in the past.

One possible explanation for the irregularities in the verb agreement is because of the language contact. Tharu and Nepali are the closest geographic neighbors in Chitwan. Darai is also genetically related with these two languages. Most Darai speakers are bilingual in Nepali. And Nepali does not code object agreement markers in its verbs (see Bickel and Yadava 2000; Acharya 1991). The next language which is in immediate contact with Darai in Chitwan is Chitwania Tharu. Chitwania Tharu shows agreement based on number, gender, and honorificity (Paudyal 2013: 227). Paudyal has also noted that Chitonia Tharu does not involve any "multiple agreement system". The verb morpheme hosts only the subject agreement suffix in the verb. Nepali and Chitonia Tharu are the Indo-Aryan languages which the speakers are familiar with in the Darai speaking areas. Although Bote and Kumal are also spoken in the surrounding areas, these two languages do not have a double agreement system (van Driem 2001). It is obvious from this typological setting that Darai has been gradually losing its double agreement system.

Darai is a small community, displaying double-agreement, surrounded by speakers of languages without double-agreement pattern. The language which is in contact with Darai in Tanahun is Magar. Magar does not have a double agreement system either (Grunow-Hårsta 2008). It is likely that Darai speakers have been gradually losing the double agreement (simultaneous coding of subject and object) the natural discourse in contact with surrounding languages which do not have this system.

Likewise, this irregular coding of subject and object in Darai cannot be attributed to a recent contact innovation. There are no such neighboring languages which give pressure to Darai for the innovation as they lack this double agreement pattern. Thus, it is likely that rather than gaining this system, Darai is losing double agreement which might have been more robust in the past. This can be taken as a kind of morphological decay, perhaps due to pressure from these neighboring languages.

4 Verb agreement in Darai in typological setting

In this section, I present a brief summary to show that the simultaneous subject and object agreement including other agreement patterns in Darai is an areal feature of some Indo-Aryan languages of this region. In addition, the evidence from some neighboring languages show that the agreement patterns described in the preceding sections are characterized in a number of IA languages.[22] We will illustrate the agreement features of some IA languages of the region, viz. Maithili, Majhi, Rajbanshi, and Magahi.

The question now is whether double agreement is an areal feature of some IA languages. Firstly, immediate neighbors of Darai, such as Bote, Kumal and Chitonia Tharu do not exhibit any

---

[21] The double agreement system in Darai occurs very rarely in the corpus. When the verb paradigm was elicited, the language informant claimed that the double agreement does not occur in Darai. He added that, "The elders still use the double agreement patterns but the young speakers do not use them." He also added, "People of different age groups speak differently regarding the double agreement of Darai". The double agreement marker is not only irregular in the Chitwan dialect, but also in the Tanahun dialect (personal communication Indresh Thakur.

[22] van Driem (2001:1170) mentions that the pattern of pronominal references in the Darai verb has been attributed to a Tibeto-Burman or Austro-Asiatic substrata.

trace of such agreement patterns except person, number, and gender agreement. They do not possess the features to code both the subject and object agreement simultaneously. Bhojpuri does not show the 'objects agreement' feature at all (Verma 1991). However, a number of TB languages which are spoken in the eastern part of Nepal also contain this feature ((DeLancey 1989, van Driem 1993).

There is not any evidence to show that the Darai language was in contact with Munda, nor is there corroborative evidence to suggest a link with Kiranti languages. I will therefore strongly argue that the subject and object agreement which is robustly found in Munda and Kiranti languages is an areal feature of some 'eastern' IA languages spoken in the eastern territory of Darai speaking area. I will refer to the agreement features reported in some languages spoken to the east of Darai speaking territory.

Maithiliis an IA language with 3092530 speakers in Nepal (CBS 2012). And it is spoken in the eastern territory of Darai. Geographically, Maithili and Darai are mediated by Bhojpuri. Although Darai does not have direct contact with Maithili at present, a number of agreement features characterized in Darai are also evidenced in Maithili. For example, dative subject agreement, double and triple agreement in verbs are reported in Maithili. Examples (90-91) show that both the subject and object are simultaneously coded in Maithili. Examples are from Yadav (1997: 173).[23]

(90)   *hʌm tora dekhʌliʌuk*
         hʌm   to-ra   dekh-ʌl-iʌuk
         I   you (NH)-ACC/DAT   see-PST-1›2NH

         'I saw you (NH).'

(91)   *hʌm okra dekhʌliʌik*
         hʌm   ok-ra   dekh-ʌl-iʌik
         I   he (NH)-ACC/DAT   see-PST-1›3NH

         'I saw him (NH).'

As noted in Bickel and Yadava (2000: 348) "A dative S (subject)-argument triggers 'non-nominative' agreement, while a nominal S-argument controls 'nominative' agreement (the glosses have been slightly modified).

(92)   *hunkaḍʌr laglainh*
         hunka   ḍʌr   lag-l-ainh   (*ḍʌr-l-aith)
         3h.REM.DAT   fear   be.afraid-PST-3HN

         'He was afraid.'

---

[23] The glosses and the transcription convention from various sources have been slightly modified in order to maintain consistancy in this section.

(93) *oḍərlaith*

    o   ḍər-l-aith   (*laglainh)

    3h.REM.NOM   be.afraid-PST-3hN

    'He(H.REM) was afraid.'   [Bickel and Yadava 2000:350]

Yadav (1997 [1996]:150) mentions the controllers may be "the head of NP orits modifier or both, depending on their status in the honorific status" in Maithili.

(94)   o   to-ra   dekh-əl-thunh

      he (H)   you (NH)-ACC/DAT   see-PST-3H›2NH

      'He (N) saw you (NH).'

(95)   o   tora   dekh-əl-thunh

      he (H)   you (NH)-ACC/DAT   see-PST-3H›2NH

      'He (N) saw you (NH).'

Triple verb agreement is also reported in Kashmiri (Raina 1994). The pattern of triple agreement described in Yadava (1999:150) is not evidenced in Darai. Yadava mentions the triple agreement in Maithili in which the verb agrees with three referents (149) as shown in (96).

(96) *həm tohər babudzike dekhəliaunh*

    həm   tohər   babudzi-ke   dekh-əl-i-au-nh

    1NOM   2MH.GEN father-3H.ACC see-PST-1-2MH-3H

    'I saw your father.'

Majhi is spoken in further eastin comparison to Darai, mainly in the hilly areas. Majhi is an Indo-Aryan language with 23151 speakers (CBS 2012). A comprehensive treatment of Majhi has not been carried out yet. Like Darai, Majhi exhibits split ergative case marking based on nominal hierarchy in nouns, marking only the third person and other noun phrases with the transitive clauses. Pronominal suffixes are also found in Majhi. In the transitive and ditransitive clauses, the verb agreement is controlled both by subject and object simultaneously (Dhakal 2014).

(97) *muĩ hoilai dzal ditshin*

    muĩ   hoi-lai   dzal   di-tsh-in

    I   he-DAT   dzal   give-NPST-1SG›3SG

    'I give him the net.'

(98)   *muĩ holəkai dzal ditshai*

    muĩ   holə-lai   dzal   di-tsh-ai

    I   they-DAT   net   give-NPST-1SG›3PL

    'I give them the net.'

Note that the non-past tense marker is *–tsh* in Majhi. When the first person subject acts on the third person singular object, it hosts the suffix *-in*. Thus, the suffix *–in* is a portmanteau morpheme for combining the first person subject (agent) and the third person singular object (recipient). Moreover, the portmanteau morpheme *-ai* is the combination of the first person singular subject (agent) and the third person plural object (recipient). We find the use of the portmanteau morpheme in transitive and ditransitive clauses in the past tense as well. Majhi, thus, codes both the subject and object in the ditransitive verbs by making use of the portmanteau suffixes.

      The dative subject is not consistently found in Darai, it is consistent in Majhi as shown in (99-100). We see that the morpheme *-əi* agrees with the first person singular dative subject whereas *-jas* agrees with the the second person singular dative subject.

(99)   *milai bhok lagtshəi*

    muĩ-lai   bhok   lag-tsh-əi

    I-DAT   hunger   feel-NPST-1SG.DAT

    'I am hungry.'

(100)   *tuilai bhok lagtshjas*

    tui-lai   bhok   lag-tsh-jas

    you-DAT   hunger   feel-NPST-2SG.DAT

    'You are hungry.'

      Rajbanshi is spoken further east to Maithili. Rajbanshi is an IA language with 122214 speakers in Nepal (CBS 2012). Unlike in Darai and Majhi, Rajbanshi does not have pronominal possessive suffixes. Dative subject agreement found in Darai has also been reported in Rajbanshi (Wilde 2008: 149). Moreover, agreement with the possessor of the noun phrase has also been reported in Rajbanshi (Wilde 2008: 153). Wilde (2008:158) discusses the contexts where primary and secondary agreement markers are coded in the verbs. He (2007:159) mentions that the verb agrees with the recipient in ditransitive clauses in Rajbanshi as illustrated in (101).

(101)   *tor dadaɖʌ tok eᶄta khissa kʌhʌlku*

    to-r   dada-ɖʌ   to-k   ek-ṭa   khissa

    2SG[OBL]GEN elder.brother-CLF   2SG[OBL]-DAT one-CLF   story

    kʌhʌ-l-ku

    tell-PST-SA2SG

    'Your elder brother told you [RECIPIENT] a story [PATIENT].'

Magahi as reported in Verma (1991) also reports the double agreement system. Magahi is an IA language with 35614 speakers in Nepal. He mentions that Magahi has elaborate agreement systems (1991:125). The levels of honorificity of the objects are also coded in the verbs. He further notes that there is an "existence of an addressee component as a parameter of agreement and a complex set conditions on the alignment as well as the suspension of agreement."

The comparison demonstrates that double agreement is pretty much absent in other closely located IA languages, such as Bote, Kumal and Chitwania Tharu. Darai has a double agreement system but it is subject to variation and different generations maintain it to different degrees. In TB languages of the region, there is more of a presence of double agreement, and some TB languages have even more complex systems. These TB languages are spoken in the further east.

5 Conclusion

This article has discussed the complexities of verb agreement in Darai. The verbs agree with number, person, gender and honorificity in Darai. The discussion also shows that there might be some dialectal variations in verb agreement between the varieties spoken in Tanahun (Kotapishand Kotapish 1975) and the variety spoken in Chitwan. The verbs agree with dative subjects in Darai. There are two sets of suffixes appearing in two sorts of agreement patterns. The nominative and ergative subjects take one sort of agreement whereas the dative and genitive host another pattern of agreement suffixes. The ditransitive and transitive verbs agree both with the subject and object simultaneously. A number of agreement features evidenced in Darai are also characterized in a number of neighboring languages, such as Maithili, Majhi and Rajbanshi, which are mainly spoken in the eastern territory of Nepal. The agreement system is subject to inter-speaker variation, and also variation in elicited versus discourse contexts. The complexity of agreement is more robust in older speakers and is being lost in younger generations. Comparison with other IA and TB languages in the region suggest that this loss is tempered by contact mainly with IA languages of the region which lack this system.

Abbreviations

1	first person	LOC	locative
2	second person	MH	medium honorific
3	third person	MIR	mirativity
A	agent	NEG	negative
ABS	absolutive	NH	non-honorific
ABL	ablative	NN	non-nominative
CLF	classifier	NPST	non-past
COP	copula	OBL	oblique form
DAT	dative	PART	particle
ERG	ergative	POSB	possibility
EMPH	emphatic	PL	plural
F	feminine	PRF	perfect
GEN	genitive	PROS	prospective

H	honorific	PST	past
HH	high honorific	POSS	pronomimal possessive suffix
HS	hearsay	REM	remote
IMP	imperative	SG	singular
INDEF	indefinite	SEQ	sequential converb
INF	infinitive	SIM	simultaneous converb

REFERENCES

Acharya, Jayaraj. 1991. *A descriptive study of Nepali and an analyzed corpus*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bickel, Balthazar; Bisang, Walter; and Yadava, Yogendra P. 1999. "Face vs. empathy: The social foundation of Maithili verb agreement". *Linguistics* 37.3: 481-511.

Bickel, Balthazar; Yadava; and Yadava, Yogendra P. 2000. "A fresh look at grammatical relations in Indo-Aryan". *Lingua* 110: 343-373.

Bybee, Joan; Perkins, Revere; and Pegliuca, William. 1994. *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

CBS. 2012. *National population and housing Census 2001 (Vol 1)*. Kathmandu: Central Bureau of Statistics.

Comrie, Bernard. 2003. "When agreement triggers happy". *Transaction of Philological Society* 101.2: 313-337.

Corbett, Grevilla G. 2003. "Agreement: The range of the phenomenon and the principles of the surrey database of agreement". *Transaction of Philological Society* 101.2: 155-202.

Corbett, Grevilla G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William. 1990. *Typology and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Das, Pradip Kumar. 2006. *Grammatical agreement in Hindi-Urdu and its major varieties*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

DeLancey, Scott. 1989. "Verb agreement in Proto-Tibeto Burman". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 52.2: 315-33.

Dhakal, Dubi Nanda. 2011. *The Darai language*. PhD Diss, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu.

Dhakal, Dubi Nanda. 2012. *Darai grammar*. Munchen: Lincom Europa.

Dhakal, Dubi Nanda. 2013. *Darai texts*. Munchen: Lincom Europa.

Dhakal, Dubi Nanda. 2014. *A Grammar of Majhi*. Munchen: Lincom Europa.

van Driem, George. 1993. "The Proto-Tibeto-Burman agreement system". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Societies, University of London* 56.2: 292-334.

van Driem, George.2001. *Languages of the Himalayas*, Vol. II. Leiden: Brill.

Givón, T. 2001. *Syntax: An introduction*, Vol I. Armsterdom: John Benjamins.

Grierson, G. A. 1903. *Linguistic survey of India*, Vol.V. Part I. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Grunow-Hårsta, K.A. (2008). *A Descriptive grammar of two Magar dialects of Nepal: Tahanun and Syanja Magar*. PhD Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Hodgson, B.H. 1857. "Comparative vocabularies of the languages of the Broken tribes in Nepal". *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 26: 317–349.

Hook, Peter Edwin. 1990. "A note on expressions of involuntary experience in the Shina of Skardu". *Journal of School of Oriental and African Studies* 53.1:77-82.

Hopper, Paul J.; and Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. "Transitivity in grammar and discourse". *Language* 56: 251-299.

Kellogg, S.H.1876. *A grammar of the Hindi language.* London: Trubner and Company.

Kittilä, Seppo. 2002. "Remarks on the basic transitive sentence". *Language Sciences* 24: 107-130.

Kotapish, Carl; and Kotapish, Sharon. 1973. *Darai English glossary.* Kathmandu: SIL, Tribhuvan University.

Kotapish, Carl; and Kotapish, Sharon. 1975. *Darai phonemic summary.* Kathmandu: SIL, Tribhuvan University.

Levin, Beth; and Hovav, Malka Rappaport. 2005. *Argument realization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lockwood, Hunter T.; and Macauley, Monica. 2012. "Prominence hierarchies". *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6.7: 431-446.

Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Masica, Colin P. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paudyal, Netra Prasad. 2008. "Agreement patterns in Darai: Typological study". *Nepalese Linguistics* 23: 168-187.

Paudyal, Krishna Prasad. 2013. *A grammar of Chitonia Tharu.* PhD Dissertation, Tribhuvan University, Nepal.

Raina, Achla Misri. 1994. "Dual and Triple Verbal Agreement in Kashmiri". *South Asian Language Review* 1: 89-102.

Saksena, Anuradha. 1981. "Verb agreement in Hindi". *Linguistics* 19: 467-474.

Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stump, Gregory; and Yadav; Ramawatar. 1988. "Maithili verb agreement and control agreement principles". *Language Sciences* 13.2: 125-143.

Verma, Manindra K. 1991. "Exploring the parameters of agreement: The case of Magahi". *Language Sciences* 13.2: 125-143.

Wali, Kashi; and Koul, Omkar N. 1997. *Kashmiri: A cognitive-descriptive grammar.* London and New York: Routledge.

Wilde, Christopher P. 2008. *A sketch of the phonology and grammar of Rajbanshi.* Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Yadav, Ramawatar. 1997. *A reference grammar of Maithili.* New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Yadava, Yogendra P. 1999. "The complexity of verb agreement in Maithili". In: Singh, Rajendra (ed.), *The yearbook of South Asian languages and linguistics*, 139-154. New Delhi, Thousand Oaks and London: Sage.

Dubi Nanda Dhakal
dubidhakal@yahoo.com

Appendix A

Inflection of verbs for nominative/ergative and genitive/dative:

Verb	Agreement types	1SG	1PL	2SG	2SG.H	2PL	2PL.H	3SG	3SG.H	3PL/3PL.H
possibility	-	kər-bo-m	kər-bo-i	kər-bo-r	kər-bo-u	kər-bo-səb	kərbo-u-səb	kər-bo-k	kərbo-kan	kərbo-kan-səb
tsah- 'want'	nom/erg (npst)	tsaha-ti-m	tsa-hi-t	tsaha-ti-r	tsaha-ti-u	tsaha-ti-u-səb	tsaha-ti-u-səb	tsaha-ti-k	tsaha-ti-kan	tsaha-ti-kan
	dat/gen (npst)	tsahi-le-m	tsaha-lə	tsahi-le-r	tsahi-le-u	tsahi-le-u-səb	tsahi-le-u	tsahi-le-kan	tsahi-le-kansəb	tsahi-le-kan-səb
həkhə- 'be.npst'	nom/erg	həkhə-m	həkhi-hĩ	həkhə-s	həkhə-u	həkhə-səb	həkhə-i	həkhə-i	həkhə-səb	həkhə-t-səb
	dat/gen	həkhə-m	həkhi-hĩ	həkhi-r	həkhi-u	həkhə-səb	həkhi-u-səb	həkhi-k	həkhi-kan	həkhə-t-səb
ạtə- 'be.npst'	nom/erg	ạtə-m	ạtə-i	ạtə-s	ạtə-u	ạtə-səb	ạtə-u-səb	ạtə-i	ạtə-t	ạtə-səb
	dat/gen	ạtə-m	ạti-hĩ	ạti-r	ạti-u	ạtə-səb	ạti-u-səb	ạti-k	ạti-kan	ạti-kan-səb
rəhə- 'be.npst'	nom/erg	rəhə-m	rəhə-i	rəhə-s	rəhə-u	rəhə-səb	rəhə-u-səb	rəhə-i	rəhə-t	rəhə-səb
	dat/gen	rəhi-m	rəhə-i	rəhi-r	rəhi-u	rəhə-səb	rəhi-u-səb	rəhi-k	rəhi-kan	rəhi-kan

Appendix B

Inflections of verb *de-* 'give' in past and non-past:

		1SG	1PL	2SG	2SG.H	2PL	3SG	3SG.H	3PL	3PL.H
Object agreement										
1SG	NPST	-	-	de-ta-mi-s/r	de-ta-mi-u	-	de-ta-mi-k	de-ta-mi-kan	-	de-ta-mi-kan-səb
	PST	-	-	de-hal-mi-s/r	de-hal-mi-u	-	de-hal-mi-k	de-hal-mi-kan	-	de-hal-mi-kan-səb
1PL	NPST	-	-	-	-	-	de-ta-hi-k	de-ta-hi-kan	-	de-ta-hi-kan-səb
	PST	-	-	-	-	-	de-hal-hi-k	de-hal-hi-kan	-	de-hal-hi-kan-səb
2SG	NPST	-	-	-	-	-	de-ta-si-k	de-ta-si-kan	-	de-ta-si-kan-səb
	PST	-	-	-	-	-	de-hal-si-k	de-hal-si-kan	-	de-hal-si-kan-səb
2SG.H	NPST	-	-	-	-	-	de-ta-u-k	de-ta-u-kan	-	de-ta-u-kan-səb
	PST	-	-	-	-	-	de-hal-u-k	de-hal-u-kan	-	de-hal-u-kan-səb
2PL	NPST	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PST	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3SG	NPST	-	-	de-ta-ir/s	de-ta-u	-	de-ta-ik	de-ta-ikan	-	de-ta-ikan-səb
	PST	-	-	de-hal-ir/s	de-hal-u	-	de-hal-ik	de-hal-ikan	-	de-hal-ikan-səb
3PL	NPST	-	-	de-ta-ir/s	de-ta-u-səb	-	de-ta-ik	de-ta-ikan	-	de-ta-ikan-səb
	PST	-	-	de-hal-ir/s	de-hal-u-səb	-	de-hal-ik	de-hal-ikan	-	de-hal-ikan-səb

(The leftmost column is labeled vertically: **subject agreement**)

Reflexives are not included in the table. In addition, the blank slots show that the verbs agree only with the subject.

Appendix C

Verb agreement in ditransitive verbs (Kotapish and Kotapish 1975: 140-141)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td colspan="6">'Receptor referents'</td></tr>
<tr><td>1SG</td><td>1PL</td><td>2SG</td><td>2PL</td><td>3SG</td><td>3PL</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="6">Subject referent</td><td>1SG</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-mi-s</td><td>-mi-u</td><td>-mi-k</td><td>-mi-kan</td></tr>
<tr><td>1PL</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>Only subject agreement</td></tr>
<tr><td>2SG</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-si-k</td><td>-si-kan</td></tr>
<tr><td>2PL</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-uø-k</td><td>-uø-kan</td></tr>
<tr><td>3SG</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>-is</td><td>-ø-iu</td><td>-iø-k</td><td>-iø-kan</td></tr>
<tr><td>3PL</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>Only subject agreement</td><td>-ø-is</td><td>-ø-iu</td><td>-iø-k</td><td>-iø-kan</td></tr>
</table>