Research Paper

Agreement Patterns in Sakachep Language

H.Kapginlian
Research Scholar
Department of Linguistics
North Eastern Hill University, Shillong-793022

Dr. Saralin A. Lyngdoh
Assistant Professor
Department of Linguistics
North Eastern Hill University, Shillong-793022

ABSTRACT:
This paper is the extract of the dissertation work of Master of Arts, Department of Lingusitics, North Eastern Hill University, Shillong. In this paper, attempt has been made to discuss agreement patterns in Sakachep language. The Sakachep people living in Dima Hasao district are also known as the 'Khelma' and hence, will be used interchangeably in this paper. Agreement patterns found in the simple sentences, complex sentences and agreement in person, gender and number will be the main focus of this paper.
KEYWORDS: Sakachep, khelma, agreement, verbal agreement, ergativity.

I. HISTORY AND CULTURE OF THE SAKACHEP

1.1 Introduction

The Sakachep is one of the ethnic groups in the Kuki-Chin community in North East India. Sakachep is alternatively known as "Khelma", a term given by the British during their encounter with them when they administered North Cachar Hills, Cachar and Karbi Anglong districts of Assam.(Thang, 2019). Khamu and Langstieh (2009) asserted that the name Khelma is recognized only in the Dima Hasao district of Assam. In other districts of Assam and the neighbouring states of Manipur, Mizoram, Meghalaya, Nagaland, and Tripura, the community is known as the Sakachep community. The Sakachep were also named "Hadem" by the Pnar, aterm translated as "backward people", but the term "Halam" (Ha-earth; lam-road) was referred to Sakachep to refer to a group of South Kukis in Tripura.

1.2 Land and People

According to SIL ethnologue (2003) the total population of this community is 25,000(approximately) in the entire region. Ethnologue reports the following locations for Sakachep. Karbi Anglong district, Dima Hasao district (formerly North Cachar Hills district), and Cachar district of Assam , Khelma village, Kohima district, Nagaland; Saithsama, Rumphung, and Mongor villages of Jaintia Hills district, Meghalaya, Tripura, Mizoram and Manipur.

Concerning occupation, Bhattacharya and Dutta (2017) states that most of the Sakachep are engaged in agriculture. They practiced both settled and shifting forms of cultivation. Settled cultivation refers to permanent forms of cultivation which includes both dry and wet terrace cultivation. It is believed that more than 60% of the Sakachep is presently involved in agriculture. The agricultural produce includes rice, maize, millets and vegetables, mainly ginger. According to part from agricultural practices, coal is their main source of income and some of Sakachep are engaged in the government sector and some opted for small-scale business, carpentry, poultry and cattle rearing.

1.3 Genetic classification:

Dr. Sethi Antwi Ofori (2014) asserted that "genetic' is not associated with genes or genealogy. In fact, the term "genetic" is associated with "genesis" or "origin". When languages are known to have developed from a common ancestral language, they are said to be genetically related. Genetical relationship refers to the linguistics characteristics that are inherited by one generation of speakers from another

Matisoff (1972, 2009) made four main divisions of the Kuki-Naga languages namely Central Kuki (incl. Lushei, Lai or Haka, Lakher), Northern Kuki (incl. Thado and Siyin), Old Kuki (which will include Sakachep as per the language classification) and Southern Kuki (incl. Sho, Yawdwin, Chinbok, Khami). In Matisoff's language grouping, *Sakachep* is not listed but in this study the language is grouped under Old-Kuki looking into its typological characteristics and close linguistic affiliations with Biate, Rangkhol and other languages which also belong to Old-Kuki Chin sub grouping.

Grierson (1904) classifies Kuki-Chin languages into two main groups: Meithei and Kuki-Chin languages proper. The Kuki-Chin proper is further divided into four groups –

(i) Northern group (Thado, Sokte, Siyin, Ralte, Paite)

(ii) Central group (Tashon, Lai, Lakher, Lushei, Banjogi, Pankhu)

(iii) Old Kuki (Rangkhol, Bete, Halam(**Sakachep**), Langrong, Aimol, Anal, Chiru, Kolren, Kom, Purum, Mhar, Cha)

(iv) Southern group (Chinme, Welaung, Chinbok, Yindu, Chinbon, Khyang or Sho, Khami).

According to Lewis (2009) Sakachep belongs to the sub-groups of Kuki-Chin-Naga under the Tibeto-Burman language family. In a much narrow classification, Sakachep belongs to the Northern Kuki-Chin language of the Tibeto Burman language family. The figure may be presented as below:

Sino-Tibetan

Tibeto-Burman

Kuki-Chin-Naga

Kuki-Chin

Central	Northern	Southern
Chin, Bawm	Aimol	Khumi
Chin, Haka	Anal	Chin, Khumi
Chin, Ngawn	Biete	Chin, Mara
Chin, Senthang	Chin, Paite	Chin, Chinbow
Chin, Tawn	Chin, Siyin	Shendu
Chin, Zoutung	Chiru	Chin, Daai
Darlong	Gangte	Chin, Mera
Hmar	Hrangkhol	Chin, Mao
Mizo	Kom	Nga la
Ralte	Ranglong	Welaung

Sakachep

Simte

Thadou

Zou

Figure 1: Lewis (2009) classification of Kuki-Chin languages.

1.4 Methodology: The fieldwork was conducted among the Sakachep community in Dorbinship village in Dima Hasao District of Assam. This fieldwork was undertaken by the 3rd semester of Master of Arts, Department of Linguistics, North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya.This village is a compact settlement of the the Sakachep speakers housing around 30 members. Data was collected through in-depth interviews of key-informants, open-ended questions and narration. It was collected for three days, precisely 7th November 2019-9th November 2019. Significantly, the informants, namely Ngirsuanthoi Nistri and Lallienthang Saithuvai are the translators of the Sakachep Bible.

II.   II.LITERATURE REVIEW ON AGREEMENT PATTERN

2.1Definition of agreement

Crystal (2003) claims that agreement is a grammatical theory that refers to a formal relationship between elements whereby form of one word requires a corresponding form of the other word. In generative linguistics, agreement in person, gender and number plays an important role especially in binding theory and case theory.

Corbett (2006: 1) vividly claims "agreement occurs when grammatical information appears on a word which is not the source of that information". For example, in the word "She runs", the form *runs* is singular agreeing in number with *she*. Patterns of agreement vary dramatically cross-linguistically, with great diversity and types of variations found. Interestingly, comparing examples from different languages, with different agreement systems explains agreement at work in variety of constructions. It also shows how agreement is influenced by the conflicting effects of sentence structure and meaning, and highlights the oddities of agreement in English.

2.2 Main agreement features ('Phi features')

Corbett (2006) asserted that there are three indisputable features. They are gender, number and person. They are called Phi-features in Government and Binding (GB) theory. These main agreement features may be discussed as below:

2.2.1 Gender:

The term "Gender" in Lyons (1968) is derived from the Latin general word meaning 'class' or 'kind'. The three genders of Greek and Latin were the three main noun-classes recognized in the grammar. The traditional names for the three genders found in the classical Indo-European languages are 'masculine', 'feminine' and 'neutral'. Gender plays a vital role in the grammar of English by comparison with its role in many other languages. There is gender concord; and the reference of the pronouns he, she, and it is very largely determined by natural gender. This depends upon the classification of persons and objects as male, female or inanimate.

Corbett (1991) provides a detail explanation on gender agreement. He explains the form and elements showing agreement. The common means of gender agreement is affixation which is inflectional affixes. In all the languages, the gender agreement markers do not show uniformity in its occurrence. Agreement markers occur before stem in Bantu languages whereas in Indo-European languages agreement comes after the stem. The least usual form of agreement is infixed agreement.

2.2.2 Number:

Lyons (1968) claimed that the most common manifestation of the category of number is the distinction between singular and plural. Number has singular-singular and plural. Singular means 'one' and plural means 'more than one'. The verb must agree with its subject in number and gender. That is, the verb must have the same number and person as its subject. Subject-verb agreement generally means that the third person singular verb form must be used with a third person subject in the simple present tense.

Croft (1990) explains number in a hierarchical form and divides the number system into singular-dual-plural system. He further claims that there is a structural evidence of the dual form. Structurally, the dual forms are frequently marked with a non-zero morpheme, just the plural is. Dual form consists of a morpheme added to the plural form, which in turn consists of a morpheme added to zero-marked singular form. One such example who uses dual-plural form is Kharia. Kharia animate nouns have plural in –ki and dual in –ki-yar.

Corbett (1991) asserted that number is a lexical feature of some nouns: those which are only singular (like English *health)* or only plural (like *trousers)* impose this feature on their modifiers. However, a considerable proportion of the nouns of a given language can be associated with both (or all) numbers.

Russian

Nov- ye   korabl-i
New-PLU   ships-PLU
'New ships'

Here the number feature appears to relate primarily to the noun; the property denoted by the adjective is not affected by the change in number.

2.2.3 Person:

Lyons (1968) defines person with reference to the notion of participant roles: the 'first person' is used by the speaker to refer to himself as a subject of discourse; the 'second person' is used to refer to persons or things other than the speaker and hearer. And the "third person" is to be distinguished from the 'first' and 'second' person in several respects. The category of third person may combine with other categories as 'definite' or 'indefinite' and 'proximate' or 'remote'. Pronouns of the first and second person are definite, whereas pronoun of the third person pronouns may be either definite or indefinite. In addition, Pronouns of first and second person necessary refers to human beings while pronouns of the third person may refer to human beings, to animals and to things.

Ching (2017) who did her extensive research on Teddim-Chin grammar,a Kuki-Chin language, asserted that person agreement markers can occur in the sentence final position. These are 'ing' (first person, realized), and 'ning' (first person, irrealis); 'Teh' (second person) has two variants depending on the preceding numbers. 'inteh is a singular number and 'unteh' gives proposition or supposed meaning for the respective numbers.

Persons	Singular	Plural
First Person	Ing (realised)	Ung (Exclusive)
	Ning (Irrealised)	Ing (inclusive)
Second person	Teh	Uhteh (Exclusive)
	Inteh	Unteh (Inclusive)

2.2.4 Notion of verbal agreement

Bareh and War (2014) asserted that verbal agreement is one of the common features of Tibeto-Burman languages. Surprsingly, verbal agreement has disappeared in Chinese, Tibetan, Laloo-Burmese and most other branches but is still exists in the Kiranti languages of Nepal. Previously, most people have mistaken the agreement morphemes for full pronouns, leading to rather unusual interpretations. Traditionally, they were labelled as 'pronominal prefixes and suffixes'. Bareh and War (2014) further asserted that Kuki-Chin , a Tibeto-Burman language, is known for its rich verbal agreement but the confusion towards whether reconstruction for Proto-Tibeto Burman should be considered or not has been going on since the mid-1970s. Two opinions sprung up in this regards; one opinion is that the phenomenon of verb agreement in the family is secondary development and the other is that ancient suffixal verb agreement be reconstructed for Proto-Tibeto-Burman; several languages of the family still retain this feature whereas man languages lack it. Delancey (2010) one of the leading exponents of this view states that substantial number of TB languages has verb agreement, and a substantial number of languages lack it. He further claims that agreement can be quickly and easily lost in TB languages as a result of intense language contact or through replacement of older finite structures by innovative new constructions based on clausal nominalization.

III.   AGREEMENT PATTERNS IN SAKACHEP

3.1 Pronominals

Sakachep language exhibits consonant deletion (phonological process) from the first person singular to plural. Here, in the singular "kei", the first consonant "k" is deleted in the plural form. Hence, *kei* is changed into "*ei*". *keima* changes into e*ini* with deletion of the first consonant *k* and *ma* and addition of *ni*. *kata* is changed into *eita* with the deletion of "*ka*" and addition of *ei*.

The 2nd Person also witnesses certain phonological changes: ni is added to the word 'naŋ' in 2nd person nominative pronoun. The last sound *ma* is deleted in singular pronoun and *ni* is added to the word naŋ in accusative pronoun. Notably, both the singular and plural possessive pronouns are identical. And the 3rd person singular in Sakachep language is 'amahpa/amahnu', while 'anni' is used for 3rd person plural.

3.2 Data Analysis

Like other Tibeto-Burman languages, Sakachep is a pro-drop language. The pro-drop along with its agreement may be discussed as below:

3.2.1Intransitive verb

Example (1) and (2) is a pro-drop language where the pronoun is not overtly presented but covertly (syntactically) active. Both "*kei-*" and "*na-*" serves as 1st person and 2nd person agreement marker to the covert subject "*pro*". However, in example (3) the prefix "a-", which is attached with the verb "la:m", is the agreement to the subject "amah".

        (1) Pro   kei-   la:m

1st AGR	dance

'I dance'

(2)Pro   na-   la:m

      2nd AGR   dance

      'You dance'

(3) amah-   ha   a   -la:m

     He/She   ABSL   **3rd AGR**   dance

    'He /she dances'.

3.2.2 Transitive verb

In example (4-6) the pronoun "*ka-"* is attached to the verb "*sak*" and "*na-*" attaches to the verb "*sak*" and '*a*' is attaches to the verb '*sak*'. Informatively, the prounoun "*ka*" and "*na*" and "*a"* serves as a 1st person agreement marker , 2nd person agreement marker and 3rd person agreement marker respectively.

(4)   kei-in   tʰeihai ka-   sa:k

     I   ERG   mango   **1st AGR** eat

     'I eat mango'

(5) naŋ -in   tʰeihai na-   sa:k

    You   ERG   mango **2nd AGR**   eat

    'You eat mango'

(6)   jɔn -in   tʰeihai   a   -sa:k

    John   ERG   Mango   **3rd AGR**   eat

    'John eats mango'.

3.2.3 Di-Transitive verb

In Di-transitive sentence, the pronoun is dropped in the first person and second person as found in example (7) and (8). But both the pronouns "ka" and "na" is attached to the verb "pek". Somehow similar to example (4) and (5), both the pronouns serve as 1st person agreement and 2nd person agreement respectively. However, in example (09), "*a-*" is marked as the 3rd person agreement to the subject John. To avoid confusion between the agreement marker, "*a-*" is co-indexed with the word John using bold letter "*i*"

(7) Pro lehkʰabu -hah   mary   ke-   pek   joi

    Book   ABSL   Mary   **1st AGR** give   PST

    'I gave the book to Mary'

(8)Pro lehkʰabu   -hah   mary   ne-   pek   joi

    Book   ABSL   Mary   **2nd AGR**   give   PST

    'You gave the book to Mary'

(9) lehkʰabu   -hah   jɔnᵢ-   in   mary   kɔma   aᵢ-   pek

  Book   ABSL   John   ERG   Mary   to   **3rd AGR** give

    joi

    PST

    'John gave the book to Mary'.

3.2.4 1st person Agreement marker- [1st person K(v)+ Verb:]

Agreement can also be analyzed on the phonetic point of view. Here, the first person *"-Ka (my), ke-(my), koi-(I), ki- (I)* are employed. Surprisingly, the phonetic sound especially the vowel sound follows the succeeding vowel sound resulting in the harmony of the vowel sound (Ka+ Vowel) along the succeeding vowel sound. In addition, the vowel sound of the succeeding word influence the pronoun so much resulting in the change of the sound of the personal pronoun.

(10) ma   hei   ka   sarnu   ŋei

  These PLR MKR   LOC   my   sister   PLR MKR

    'These are my sisters'

(11) ma   ŋei   so ke   lehkʰabu ŋei

  These   PLR MKR   LOC my   book   PLR MKR

    'These are my books'

(12) assam   reŋa   ko-   hɔŋ

    Assam   from   I   come

  'I come from Assam'

(13) Pro lehkʰa   ki-   mijiek

    Letter   **1st AGR** write

    'I write a letter'.

ka+   sarnu =   kasarnu
[K(vowel) + Noun]
       kei +   lehk^{h}abu=   kelehk^{h}abu
   [K(vowel)+ Noun]
      ka + hɔŋ=   Kohɔŋ
      [K(vowel) + Verb]
      ka +   mijiek=   kimijiek
    [K(vowel)+ Verb]

3.2.5Variations in ergative marking:

Dixon (1994) asserted that ergative characteristic is evident in a language when the intransitive subject is treated in the same manner as transitive object and differently from transitive subject. Under Kuki-Chin languages there are various markers for ergative case. According to Kharlukhi and Lyngdoh (2014:224), Halam and Biete, a sub-branches of Kuki-Chin languages, possess ergative case marking. The ergative case marking in Halam is marked by "-in", while Biate is marked by a variations "-an, -in or –n".

Almost similar to Biate, Sakachep also possess an ergative case and it is marked variedly. Like the variants of ergative case marking in Biate, we also witness that there is no uniformity in the use of ergative markings -"-in, –han" in Sakachep language. The variants in the ergative marking may be attributed to the language contact and borrowing from Hrangkhol, also a Kuki-Chin language, who lives closely with the Sakachep. Though different variants of ergative case- marking, the agreement marker "a-" is identical in the ergative sentences. The ergative case in Sakachep is marked by "-in" and "-han" . Examples maybe mention in the following:

(14) jɔn -han   to ʔmɔl   le   naipaŋ   a-   zep
       John ERG stick   INST   boy   **3rdAGR**   hit
     'John hits the boy with a stick'.
        (15) khu:m -in   mɔi   a- luŋkham
            khum ERG moi   **3rd AGR** loves
                'Khum loves Moi"

3.2.6 .Agreement is simple sentences:
3.2.6.1 **Agreement in reflexive pronoun:**
Here, in reflexive pronoun, the agreement marker for third person is both marked by "a-" and "an-".
(16)   amahnu   athethenin   a-   sam   chep
She   herself   **3rd AGR** hair   cut
       'She cuts hair by herself'
(17)   amahpa   athenthein   an-   at
           He   himself   **3rd AGR**   cut
       'He cuts himself"

3.2.6.2Agreement in reciprocal sentences:
Agreement marker is also present in reciprocal sentences. Sakachep employs the agreement marker "in-" to both the 1st person plural and 3rd person plural respectively.
(18)   eini   in-   luŋkham
           We   1st PLU AGR   love
       'We love each other'
(19)   An   in-   dit
           They   3rd PLU AGR   like
       'They liked each other'.

3.2.6.3Agreement in relative pronoun
In example 20 and 21, the agreement "a-" is marked to satisfy the requirement of the relative 3rd person pronoun "Who". In other words, "a-" is an agreement marker for the relative pronoun "who".
        (20) tu -mɔ   ka   saldɔŋ   a-   mɔruk
            Who Q.MKR   my   umbrella   **3rd AGR**   stole
                'Who stole my umbrella?
 (21) tu   mɔ   liten koi   a- K^{h}oibɔi   amah
   Who   Q.MKR   glass   Kept **3rd AGR** broke   that

Naipang   kɔirɔʔ?
           boy   call
'Call the boy who broke my glass'

3.2.6.4 Agreement in Demonstrative pronoun

In example 22, the 3rd person agreement "a-" agrees to the subject "boy".

(22) ma   naipang var   hi   insietna ink ^hatna

That boy   brilliant   is   competition   first

a-   chang
3rd AGR stood

'That brilliant boy stood first in the competition'.

3.2.6.5 Agreement in Interrogative pronoun:

In example 23, the 3rd person "a-" agrees to the subject "John" . But in example 24, the agreement "I" agrees the object "Nangla".

(23)tu   mɔ   Jɔn   pencil   a- pek?
    Who   Q.MKR   John   Pencil   **3rd AGR**   gave
    'Who gave pencil to John?
(24)naŋla   I-   dam   mɔ
    You   **2nd AGR**   Fine/well   Q.MKR?
            'How are you?'

3.2.6.6 Agreement in complex sentences:

Example 25 is a complex sentences whereby "a-" is an agreement marker for "vok". And in example 30 there are two agreement marker "a-" for the subject "amah". However both the agreement markers are co-index to indicate that they points to the same subject.

(25) vɔk   t^hata a-   um   jɔn   ata   ani
Pig   killed   **3rd AGR** Presence John   belongs   PERF
            'The pig that was killed belongs to John'.

(26) amah$_i$ han a$_i$-   luŋk^ham dɔŋmate   ha   lehk^habu
    He   ERG **3rd AGR** love   girl   ABSL   book
        a$_i$ -pek   jɔi
    3rd AGR give PST
'He gave the book to the girl who he loves'

3.7 NUMERALS:

There are two number systems in Sakachep language. They are singular and plural. There is no single marker in Sakachep but plural was marked by the suffix "-ŋei"

(27) Pa
            ' Father'
    (28) pa   ŋei
        Father   PLU. MKR
        'Fathers'
    (29) ŋa
        'Fish'
    (30) ŋa   ŋei
        Fish   PLU MKR
            'Fishes'
Agreement in number is also found in demonstrative pronoun. In both the sentences, the agreement marker "-ŋei" is employed

(31)   ma   ŋei   hei ka   sarnu   ŋei
        These PLU MKR are   my   sister   NUM. AGR
            'These are my sisters'
(32)   ma   ŋei   so   ke   lehkhabu   ŋei
        Those PLU MKR   are   my   book   NUM. AGR

'Those are my books'

3.8 Agreement in Gender:

Sakachep exhibits a masculine and feminine gender agreement marker. In regards to gender, the suffix "-Pa" for male and "-nu" for female. A slight variation when it comes to grandfather and grandmother. For grandfather "pu" is employed; grandmother "pi" is employed. This same word used to refer to the in-laws namely, "tarpu" means father-in-law; "tarpi" means "mother in law". From example 33 and 34 we find that Sakachep language gender marker "pa" and "nu" does not imply only to human beings, but also to non-human beings (animals).

(33) ŋa   pasal   ank^{h}at
          Fish   Male   one
          'One male fish'

(34) ŋa anupaŋ   ank^{h}at
          Fish female   one
          'One female fish'

3.9 Agreement in Passive sentences

In Sakachep, Past tense is marked by "alei", and the agreement is marked by "a-" to the Passive NP.

(35) Mary   in   John   alei   a-   luŋkham
     Mary   ERG   John   PST   **3rd AGR**   love
          'Mary is loved by John'.

(36) Naipang   hah   Mary   in   alei   a-   pom
     The baby ERG   Mary   ERG   past **3rd AGR** hug
          'The baby was hugged by Mary'.

IV.   CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS

A phonological change on the 1st person singular "ka, ki, ko" are analyzed and it is found that the pronoun are greatly influenced by the succeeding vowel sounds. The agreement pattern in Sakachep is quite complex. In most cases, agreement marker is mostly attaches to the verb. Though agreement is marked for the 1st person and 2nd person singular, the most common agreement marker is found in the 3rd person Singular. And in Sakachep, a pro-drop language, the agreement is attaches to the verb. Though the pronoun is not overtly present in the subject, it is covertly active syntactically.

ABBREVIATIONS

1st AGR	First Person Agreement
2nd AGR	Second Person Agreement
3rd AGR	3rd Person Agreement
1st SG	First Person Singular
3rd SG	Third Person Singular
1st PLU	First Person Plural
3rd PLU	Third Person Plural
1 SG.PRES	First person Singular Present tense
2SG.PRES	Second Person Singular Present Tense
ABSL	Absolutive marker
COMP	Comparative
ERG	Ergative marker
FUT	Future
GEN	Genitive
INST	Instrumental case
LOC	Locative case
NEG	Negation
NUM AGR	Number Agreement
OBJ	Object
PERF	Perfective
PLU	Plural
PLU.MKR	Plural Marker
PST	Past Tense
Q.MKR	Question Marker

REFRENCES:

1. Primary sources

[1]. Nistri, Ngirsuanthoi. (2019, November 8). Personal communication [personal interview]

[2]. Saithuvai, Lallienthang. (2019, November 9). Personal communication [personal interview]

2. Secondary sources

[3]. Bareh, Curiously and J.War (2014). Verbal agreement in Monsang. In J. War.S.K.Singh & S.A Lyngdoh (eds.) *Tibeto-Burman Linguistics of North East India*. (PP120-135). Guwahati:EBH Publishers.

[4]. Bhattacharyya, Pushpa Renu and Barshapriya Dutta. (2017*). Khelma Chong Anchuna Lehkhabu.* Tezpur University Press

[5]. Ching, Zam ngaih. (2017*). A descriptive grammar on Tiddim Chin.* [Ph.D Thesis, Department of Linguistics]. North Eastern Hill University.

[6]. Corbett, Greville G. (1991). *Gender.* Cambridge University Press

[7]. Corbett, Greville G. (2006*). Agreement.* Cambridge University Press.

[8]. Croft, William. (1990). *Typology and Universals*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[9]. Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* U.K: Blackwell Publishing   Limited.

[10]. Delancey, Scott. (2010). *Towards a History of Verbal Agreement in Tibeto Burman*. Himalayan Linguistics 9:1-39

[11]. Dixon, Robert M.W. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge University Press.

[12]. Dr.Sethi Antwari ofori,Genetic classification of languages

[13]. http:// acasearch.files.worldpress.com

[14]. Gierson,G.A. (1904). *Linguistics Survey of India.* Vol.3. Part 3. Delhi. Motilal Banarsiders.

[15]. Khamu, Sezolu and Langstieh, Brinda. (2009). *Tradition and adaptation: The case of the Sakachep in Meghalya, India.* [MA Dissertation, Department of Anthropology].North Eastern Hill University

[16]. Kharlukhi, C. And S.A. Lyngdoh. (2014). Ergative-Absolutive in Halam and Biate. In J. War, .S.K.Singh & S.A Lyngdoh (eds.) .*Tibeto-Burman Linguistics of North East India*. (pp. 223-224).Guwahati:EBH Publishers

[17]. Lewis, M.Paul (ed.). (2009). *Ethnologue. : Language of the world, sixteen edition.* SIL   International.

[18]. Lyons, John. (1968*). Introduction to theoretical linguistics.* Cambridge university press.

[19]. Matisoff, James A. (2003) . *Handbook of Proto-Tibeto Burman.* University of California