

# Advances in Munda Linguistics



# Advances in Munda Linguistics

Edited by

Shailendra Mohan

**Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing**



Advances in Munda Linguistics

Edited by Shailendra Mohan

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2021 by Shailendra Mohan and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6829-6

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6829-7

DEDICATED TO GREAT PIONEERS  
IN MUNDA LINGUISTICS  
AND TO MOTI, ARYENDRA, AND MY PARENTS



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations .....	ix
List of Tables .....	x
Acknowledgements .....	xi
Foreword .....	xiii
Gérard Diffloth	
Editor's Preface .....	xiv
Introduction .....	1
Munda Languages: An Overview	
Shailendra Mohan and Masato Kobayashi	
Chapter One.....	22
On the Role of Areal and Genetic Factors in the Development of the Word-Structure and Morphosyntax of the Munda Languages	
Gregory D.S. Anderson	
Chapter Two .....	78
Infixation in Munda and its Austroasiatic Legacy	
Arun Ghosh	
Chapter Three .....	108
Agreement Reversal in Munda Languages: An Interplay of Functional/ Thematic and Syntactic Criteria	
K.V. Subbarao and Martin Everaert	
Chapter Four .....	131
Performance in Elicitation: Methodological Considerations in the Study of Mundari Expressives	
Nathan Badenoeh, Nishant Choksi, Toshiki Osada, and Madhu Purti	

Chapter Five .....	142
The Past Suffixes of Hill Korwa	
Masato Kobayashi	
Chapter Six .....	151
Typologically Quirky Characteristics of Past and Perfective Forms	
in Kherwarian	
Bikram Jora and Gregory D. S. Anderson	
Chapter Seven.....	170
Phrasal Affixes as Clitics in the Munda Languages	
Anish Koshy	
Chapter Eight.....	199
Phonetic Comparison of Orissa Sora and Assam Sora	
Luke Horo and Priyankoo Sarmah	
Chapter Nine.....	217
Noun Morphology in Korcu	
Shailendra Mohan	
Contributors.....	228
Index .....	231



## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure i-1 Map of Munda languages .....	2
Figure i-2 Austroasiatic languages by Pinnow (1959).....	14
Figure i-3 Sidwell (2009) model of Austroasiatic .....	14
Figure i-4 The Munda languages and Nihali according to Pinnow (1959).....	16
Figure i-5 The Munda languages according to Zide (1969) .....	17
Figure i-6 Munda language relationship by Bhattacharya (1975) .....	18
Figure i-7 The Munda languages according to Anderson (1999), cited in Anderson (2007, 2008) .....	18
Figure i-8 Classification of Munda Languages by Anderson (this volume).....	19
Figure 1-1 Classification of Austroasiatic (Sidwell 2015a).....	24
Figure 1-2 Classification of the Munda languages using lexical and grammatical data (Anderson 2016ms).....	24
Figure 6-1 One Possible Classification of Kherwarian Lects.....	152
Figure 8-1 Assam Soravowel plot (Koilamari).....	205
Figure 8-2 Assam Sora vowel plot (Lamabari) .....	205
Figure 8-3 Orissa Soravowel plot (Raiguda).....	206
Figure 8-4 Average vowel duration Assam Sora (Koilamari).....	207
Figure 8-5 Average vowel duration Assam Sora (Lamabari).....	207
Figure 8-6 Average vowel duration Orissa Sora (Raiguda).....	208
Figure 8-7 Average F0 Assam Sora (Koilamari).....	209
Figure 8-8 Average F0 Assam Sora (Lamabari).....	209
Figure 8-9 Average F0 Orissa Sora (Raiguda) .....	210
Figure 8-10 Average vowel intensity Assam Sora (Koilamari).....	210
Figure 8-11 Average vowel intensity Assam Sora (Lamabari).....	211
Figure 8-12 Average vowel intensity Orissa Sora (Raiguda) .....	211
Figure 8-13 VOT Assam Sora stops (Koilamari) .....	212
Figure 8-14 VOT of Assam Sora stops (Lamabari).....	213
Figure 8-15 VOT of Orissa Sora stops (Raiguda) .....	213

## LIST OF TABLES

Table i-1 Munda Languages in Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India .....	3
Table i-2 Munda Languages according to 1961 Census of India.....	3-5
Table i-3 Munda Languages according to 2011 Census of India.....	5-6
Table i-4 The Comparative Growth of Munda Languages .....	7
Table i-5 Munda Languages according to Ethnologue 2017 .....	8-12
Table i-6 Munda and Austroasiatic (Donegan & Stampe 2002).....	15
Table 1-1 Selected Munda Noun correspondence sets .....	31
Table 1-2: Word formation processes in Table 1.....	31
Table 1-3: NP-internal syntax in Austroasiatic languages.....	41
Table 5-1 Tense-Aspect markers of Kherwarian Languages.....	148
Table 7-1 Subject enclitic/suffix forms in Remo .....	175
Table 8-1 Comparing Orissa Sora vowel data with Assam Sora.....	204

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It gives me great pleasure to place before the scholar this edited volume containing the proceedings of the International Seminar on Munda Linguistics organized by the Department of Linguistics, Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute, Pune in collaboration with the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi and Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore.

I want to thank all the contributors for accepting my request and contributing their papers for this volume. I hope this volume would be useful to teachers, students, and researchers of linguistics, especially those working on Munda Linguistics.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sense of gratitude to the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi for its financial support to organise this seminar. I also thank ICSSR, New Delhi for the Joint Research project on 'Establishment of International Munda Studies Network' through ICSSR (India)-JSPS (Japan) Joint Research Programme in the field of Social Sciences. I also thank the Central Institute of Indian languages, Mysore for providing financial support.

I am highly obliged to my University, Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute, Pune, India, for allowing me to organise this seminar. I am behold to the management committee of Deccan College, University's Vice-Chancellor Professor V.S. Shinde, Professor Jayashree Sathe (Pro-Vice-Chancellor), and C.V. Joshi (Registrar) for their encouragement and cooperation in organising the seminar.

My colleagues Sonal Kulkarni-Joshi, Rahul Mhaiskar, Shubhangi Kardile, Megna Carvalho, and Khusboo Parghi have helped me in one way or another in organising the seminar. I also thank Sambhaji Jadhav, Satish Bangar, Sanjay Hargude, and Mandar for their help during the seminar. I am thankful to all of them. Special thanks to Sanjay Hargude for harmonising the formatting of papers included in this volume.

My family-wife Moti, son Aryendra and my parents-have have been of great help during the seminar and also during the editing part of this volume.

Our special thanks are due to Cambridge Scholars Publishing, United Kingdom, and its anonymous reviewers for the support received during the publication process. Special thanks to Adam Rummens, Victoria Carruthers,

and Sophie Edminson for their patience and encouragement while the volume was in preparation. Last but not the least; I thank Prof. Claus Peter Zoller for his valuable suggestions.

Thank you all.

Shailendra Mohan

## FOREWORD

Under the re-assuring blanket called the “Indian Linguistic Area”, the Munda languages harbour a wealth of unique phenomena, which will surely appear to anyone who cares to look into their particulars.

In the past, there have been abundant descriptions; grammars, dictionaries, even encyclopedias dedicated to the main Munda languages, e.g. Santali, Mundari, Sora, and also careful studies of the smaller ones. But the flow of published information on the Munda branch of Austroasiatic languages seems to have abated, compared to what it used to be. It is not that the languages are moribund or forgotten, by any means large amounts of data are being collected and preserved out of the public eye, in India and elsewhere. But the publishing of books, with their secure and easily accessible form, seems, unfortunately, to have hit a dry patch, at least for the moment.

This makes the publication of the current volume of Munda Linguistics a valuable sort of re-awakening. The expected linguistic data is there, and it occupies its rightful place, and then some of the more pointed and innovative fields of study in Linguistics are also well-represented in all their variety: experimental phonetics, semantic descriptions, even historical claims, and the more theoretically inclined.

Not only should that, but the variety of origins of the authors also be noticed: from India, as is legitimate, and from the West as is traditional, but also from the East, a welcome novelty. Among the Indian authors, one must also remark the discreet presence of some speakers of Munda languages; this is very valuable as they offer not only native knowledge in all its vast extent and subtlety of detail but also, and just as importantly, because of their own mastery of scientific argumentation.

And then, this is a tangible, printed book that readers can cherish and annotate at will, not an electronically erasable sequence of zero's and one's; a BOOK, with pages that can be turned back and forth in many ways with great ease, and with a hard, or a pleasing cover.

Gérard Diffloth  
Siem Reap, Feb.2021

## EDITOR'S PREFACE

The contribution in this book draws upon the empirical richness of the Munda languages spoken in India. This collection of papers makes an important contribution in terms of analysing and demonstrating key issues such as Proto-Munda reconstruction, migration of Munda language speakers, and synchronic linguistic issues in Munda languages spoken in India. This book would potentially be the first volume on Munda language and linguistics in which several indigenous Munda language speakers would contribute to the scholarship. The contributions will reflect the diverse range of scholarship on Munda languages, which combine empirical and theoretical discussion on issues related to Munda languages.

The first article "On the Role of Areal and Genetic Factors in the Development of the Word-Structure and Morphosyntax of the Munda languages" is from Gregory D.S. Anderson, who begins with a brief assessment of the current state of Munda language classification in India and contributes to the understanding of the role of contact vs. inheritance in the historical analysis of the Munda languages in India. He argues that there are features of Munda which might reflect pre-Aryan-Dravidian contact strata in the history of Munda, or otherwise lacks analogues in other Austroasiatic groups and in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages, but are reminiscent of features found in the periphery of South Asia now, in Munda, Tibeto-Burman (Trans-Himalayan), and in the isolate language Burushaski, which might reflect an earlier pre-Aryan-Dravidian profile of South Asia attested in Munda as well. The same contact strata also contributed to archaic retentions, contact-driven restructuring, and internal developments all separately manifested in Munda Grammar.

The second article in this volume "Infixation in Munda and its Austroasiatic Legacy" by Arun Ghosh presents the comparative study of infixation—a class-changing device in Munda and other Austroasiatic languages. According to him, infixation is an essential morphological process operated in both nominal and verbal derivations in Munda. In adjectival constructions too, infixation sometimes plays an important role. According to him, the infixation processes can be grouped into four parts namely, one, those which have developed in the individual languages like Santali, Korku, Sora, and Remo; two, there are some infixes like <-p-> which are shared by the major languages of the north Munda like Santali,

Mundari, Ho, and Korku; three, there are two infixes like <-t-> and <-m-> shared by some (not all) languages of both branches, north and south, like Santali, Mundari, Ho, Gutob, and Sora; and, four, there is one infix, <-n->, which is shared by all the languages of Munda and more than ten languages of the Mon-Khmer group. According to him, it may be assumed that the infixes developed in the individual languages well after the individual languages grew. <-p-> which is commonly shared among the North Munda languages may be postulated in the proto-North Munda. Similarly, \*<-t-> may be postulated in the proto-Munda stage as some languages of both the groups share it. <-m-> as shared by some languages of both North and South Munda and most importantly by Khmer may be postulated in the proto stage of both the groups. The most common infix in both Munda and Mon-Khmer is <-n-> which with utmost certainty can be proved to be belonging to the proto-stage of both the groups.

The next paper “Agreement Reversal in Munda Languages: An Interplay of Functional/ Thematic and Syntactic Criteria” is authored by K.V. Subbarao, and Martin Everaert. In this paper, Subbarao and Everaert discuss the agreement reversal in North Munda languages (Santali, Ho, and Mundari) in which the Subject Agreement Marker (SAM) in oblique object constructions occurs not in its own canonical position, but in the position earmarked for an object, despite the fact that the predicate may be [-transitive]. They have argued that such a reversal takes place, not due to the syntactic principles governing the agreement, but due to thematic/functional criteria because of which the nature of the predicate in a non-nominative subject construction triggers such reversal and they conclude that agreement in the North Munda languages can be accounted for by invoking syntactic as well as thematic/functional criteria.

The fourth article “Performance in Elicitation: Methodological Considerations in the Study of Mundari Expressives” is authored by Nathan Badenoch, Nishant Choksi, Toshiki Osada, and Madhu Purti. In this paper, the authors present the methodological aspects of eliciting expressives in the Mundari language. According to the authors, expressives as a linguistic device in languages has not received attention because the semantics of expressives are complex as they deal with multi-sensory depictions that are situated in a speaker’s direct experience. The authors conclude that the elicitation of expressives is notoriously difficult, but using a combination of story-telling and speaker enactments, a better idea of the semantic domains and pragmatic nuances of expressives can be obtained. This understanding can provide a deeper view of the grammar of the language but can also provide new perspectives on how language is embedded in cultural practices and world-views.

Masato Kobayashi presents the next paper on “The Past Suffixes of Hill Korwa”. In the paper, the author presents the verb morphology of Korwa and concludes that the verb morphology of Korwa looks unique. Due to the sound changes and grammaticalization, and through a closer comparison with other Kherwarian verbs, it can be said that Korwa has a set of past suffixes similar to Ho, even though their distribution is more limited. Korwa verb morphology is characterized by the loss of the transitivity contrast by *-q/-n*. Instead, *-q* and *-n* are incorporated in tense and aspect suffixes in Korwa. The transitive-intransitive contrast is reduced, and only the originally transitive marker *-q/-r* occurs in limited contexts.

In a joint paper, Bikram Jora and Gregory D.S. Anderson present the “Typologically Quirky Characteristics of Past and Perfective Forms in Kherwarian”. According to the authors, Kherwarian Munda languages show a range of quirky features in their past or perfective forms. In past copula formations, in either existential/locational or possessive functions and constructions, the animate participant or referent is encoded as subjects in the past but as objects in the present, in negative and positive forms alike. While most Kherwarian languages show elaborate morphology in virtually all verbs, polyvalent negative aorist forms in Birhor show a subtractive pattern where all the morphology on the verb itself is suppressed, only subject clitics that appear on the negative scope operator before the bare verb stem are used. They also observe that in various Kherwarian languages a positive vs. negative opposition is emerging in the use of TAM markers in positive and negative constructions, such that the now general negative past/perfective marker *le-* may lose the anterior or pluperfect meaning it typically conveys in positive formations. Some of these features have analogues in other Munda languages like Sora or Korku and thus likely reflect retentions of earlier features.

The seventh article “Phrasal Affixes as Clitics in the Munda Languages” is written by Anish Koshy. In this paper, the author presents examples from different Munda languages of attachment of different bound elements that must be treated as phrasal affixation, that is, as clitics. The paper argues that a large number of clitics in the Munda languages are not just the agreement clitics that choose their hosts indiscriminately, as in Mundari and Santali. In many Kherwarian languages, like Mahali, Karmali, Turi, and Bhumij, the subject enclitics may appear only at the end of the verb complex yet are to be analysed as clitics due to their status as phrasal affixes.

The eighth chapter “Phonetic Comparison of Orissa Sora and Assam Sora” is jointly authored by Luke Horo and Priyankoo Sarmah. In this



paper, the authors attempt to compare and contrast two synchronic varieties of Sora, a South Munda language of the Austroasiatic language family, as it is spoken in Orissa, in eastern India, and Assam in northeastern India. This paper concludes that synchronically the Sora of Orissa and Assam have similar phonetic properties, the phonetic features of transplanted Sora, spoken in Assam, are preserved in a different linguistic region, even after hundreds of years of migration. This is a significant finding because it has been argued that transplanted varieties of a language become simplified by losing their idiosyncratic features after they are transplanted to a new sociolinguistic environment.

Shailendra Mohan presents the last article in this volume on "Noun Morphology in Korku". The article presents the number, gender, and case encodings in the Korku language. It also presents the noun derivation system, numerals, postpositions, and interrogatives in Korku. The description will help to fill the gap that exists about the knowledge of this language as well as to provide data for the comparative study of the other South Asian languages.

I sincerely hope teachers, students, and researchers of linguistics, especially South Asian Linguistics, will find this volume useful.

Editor  
Shailendra Mohan



# INTRODUCTION

## MUNDA LANGUAGES: AN OVERVIEW<sup>1</sup>

SHAILENDRA MOHAN  
AND MASATO KOBAYASHI

### 1.0 Introduction

Munda languages constitute the western branch of the Austro-Asiatic linguistic phylum. There are over 10 million speakers of Munda languages in India, living in an area stretching from the western part of the country, i.e. from Maharashtra to the Northeast of India. Munda speaking people live mainly in the states of Orissa and Jharkhand; significant Munda language speaking groups are also found in the states of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, and Chhattisgarh and through migration to virtually all areas of India. Santhali is the only Munda language that has official status in India. It is included in the VIIIth Schedule of the Indian Constitution. Other Munda languages have no official status.

Munda languages have interacted with most of the other major language groups of India over several millennia and have logically both influenced and been influenced by various other families of languages of South Asia, e.g., Dravidian (Bhattacharya 1975a, Anderson 2003). Further, the Munda languages have their linguistic cousins to the east, so they also have features reflecting their shared history with various language groups of Southeast Asia from an earlier historical period. (Anderson 2014).



**Figure i-1: Map of the Munda languages**

(Anderson 2007:7, reprinted with kind permission of the author)

## 2.0 Munda Languages and its distribution

Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India is one of the earliest documents to provide information on Munda languages. On the whole, Grierson (1967) identifies 14 Munda languages. The whole Munda branch has been divided into a group of dialects. Grierson claims that "Kherwari is the principal Munda language, its dialects having been returned by full 88% of all the speakers of Munda tongues" (Grierson 1967:21). According to him, Kherwari is also the only Munda form of speech that has remained comparatively free from the influence of neighbouring languages. 'Kherwari' is a hypothetical language incorporating most of the northern Munda dialects. The names of 14 Munda dialects are as follows:

Sl.No.	Name of the Munda Dialect	Census of 1901
1	Santālī	1,795,113
2.	Muṇḍārī	400,744
3.	Bhumij	111,304
4.	Birhār	526
5.	Koḍā	23,878
6.	Hō	371,860
7.	Tūrī	3,880
8.	Asurī	4,894
9.	Korwā	16,442
10.	Kūr kū	87,657
11.	Khaṛiā	82,506
12.	Juāng	10,853
13.	Savara	157,136
14.	Gadabā	37,230
	Total	3,164,036

**Table i-1 Munda Languages in Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India**

According to the 1961 Census report, 58 mother tongues have been found as belonging to the Munda Branch. The name of a language and its dialects are presented below:

Sl.No.	Mother tongues of Munda Languages	Grouping	Speakers
1.	Kherwari		647
2.	Santhali		3,130,829
3.	Grouped under Santhali	Gayari	16
4.		Gora	1
5.		Har	9
6.		Kamari-Santhali	903
7.		Karmali	90,849
8.		Kisan-Santhali	41
9.		Lohari-Santhali	130
10.		Mahili	19,697
11.		Manjhi	2,296
12.		Paharia	2,287
13.	Mundari		736,524
14.	Grouped under 'Mundari'	Mura	513

15.	Bhumij		1,31,258
16.	Grouped under 'Bhumij'	Bhuiya/Bhuyan	10
17.		Kisan-Bhumij	
18.		Kurmi	351
19.		Larka	32
20.		Parsi-Bhumij	4,754
21.		Rahiya	1,029
22.	Birhor		590
23.	Koda/Kora		13,277
24.	Grouped under 'Koda/Kora'	Khaira	18,325
25.		Mirdha-Koda/kora	76
26.		Udangmudia	46
27.	Ho		648,066
28.		Lohara	293
29.	Turi		1,562
30.	Asuri		4,540
31.	Agaria		98
32.	Birjia/Brijia/Binjhia		2,391
33.	Grouped under Birjia/Brijia/Binjhia	Pahrai-Birjia/Brijia/Binjhia	4
34.	Korwa		16,286
35.	Grouped under 'Korwa'	Jangali-Korwa	35
36.		Koraku	53
37.		Majhi-Korwa	1,339
38.		Singli	7
39.	Korku		208,165
40.	Grouped under 'Korku'	Mankari	1,081
41.		Muwasi	9,829
42.		Nihali	1,167
43.	Kharia		171,269
44.	Grouped under 'Kharia'	Baiti	5
45.		Dhelki	58
46.		Lodha	5
47.		Mirdha-Kharia	5,822
48.	Juang		15,795
49.	Savara		265,721
50.	Gadaba		40,193
51.	Munda-Unspecified		167,159
52.		Adibhasha Munda	13,140
53.		Kol	64,465

54.		Lohari-Munda	123
55.		Mahto	7
56.		Parenga	767
57.		Parhaiya	397
58.		Thar	15,595

**Table i-2 Munda Languages according to 1961 Census of India**

In the 1961 Census, ‘Kherwari’ was attested as a separate language because 647 speakers reported it as a mother tongue. In the 1971 Census report, 60 mother tongues have been found as belonging to the Munda Branch. Ten (10) mother tongues of the 1961 list failed to reappear in 1971 while 12 new mother tongues were reported in 1971 the census report (Mahapatra 1991:333). According to him, “the problem basically is to distribute these mother tongues into the language grid of the Munda group”. After the 1971 Census, the artificial ceiling of less than 10,000 was applied, i.e. language speakers whose numbers are less than 10,000 were referred to in a separate tabulation. This criterion has wiped out many tribal languages, including the Munda languages whose population is less than 10,000. Those who returned less than 10,000 speakers each at an all India level were included in “Others”. The Munda languages in the Census of 2011 are listed below:

Sl.No.	Name of the Munda Language	Languages included	No. of speakers
1.	Santhali		7,368,192
		Karmali	358,579
		Mahili	26,399
		Santali	6,973,345
		Others	9,869
2.	Bhumij		27,506
		Bhumij	10,190
		Others	17,316
3.	Gadaba		40,976
		Gadaba	40,965
		Others	11
4.	Ho		1,421,418

		Ho	1,410,996
		Lohara	10,422
5.	Juang		30,378
		Juang	30,378
6.	Kharia		297,614
		Kharia	293,665
		Others	3,949
7.	Koda/Kora		47,268
		Koda/Kora	47,181
		Others	87
8.	Korku		727,133
		Korku	688,053
		Muwasi	35,827
		Others	3,253
9.	Korwa		28,453
		Koraku	16,154
		Others	12,299
10.	Munda		505,922
		Kol	19,868
		Munda	464,817
		Others	21,237
11.	Mundari		1128,228
		Mundari	1128,050
		others	178
12.	Savara		409,549
		Savara	409,481
		Others	68

**Table i-3 Munda Languages according to 2011 Census of India**

The comparative growth of Munda Languages is listed below:



**Comparative growth of Munda languages of India 1971, 1981, 1991 and 2001**  
(Census of India, Statement 8)

Sl. No.	Name of the Language	1971	1981	1991	2001	Decadal Percentage		
						1971-1981	1981-1991	1991-2001
1	Bhumij	51,651	50,384	45,302	47,443	-2.45	-10.09	4.73
2	Gadaba	20,420	28,027	28,158	26,262	37.25	0.47	-6.73
3	Ho	751,389	783,301	949,216	1,042,724	4.25	21.18	9.85
4	Juang	12,172	19,038	16,858	23,708	56.41	-11.45	40.63
5	Kharia	191,421	212,605	225,556	239,608	11.07	6.09	6.23
6	Koda/Kora	14,333	23,113	28,200	43,030	61.26	22.01	52.59
7	Korku	307,434	347,661	466,073	574,481	13.08	34.06	23.26
8	Korwa	15,097	48,079	27,485	34,586	218.47	-42.83	25.84
9	Munda	309,293	377,492	413,894	469,357	22.05	9.64	13.40
10	Mundari	771,253	742,739	861,378	1,061,352	-3.70	15.97	23.22
11	Santali	3,786,899	4,332,511	5,216,325	6,469,600	14.41	20.40	24.03
12	Savara	222,018	209,092	273,168	252,519	-5.82	30.64	-7.56

**Table i-4. The Comparative growth of Munda Languages**

**Munda languages according to Ethnologue 2017<sup>2</sup>**

	Language	Alternate Names	Population	Location
1.	Agariya	Agaria, Agharia, Agoria	72,000 (2007)	Chhattisgarh state: Bilaspur district; Madhya Pradesh state: Mandla and Rewa districts, Maikal hills; Uttar Pradesh state: Agra, Mathura, and Mirzapur districts.
2.	Bijori	Binjhia, Birijia, Birjia, Brijia, Burja	25,000 (1998 GRN)	Jharkhand state: Cowerdaga, and Ranchi districts; Madhya Pradesh and Odisha states; West Bengal state: Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri districts.
3.	Kodaku	Koraku, Korwa	15,700 (1991 census)	Chhattisgarh state: Surguja district; Jharkhand state: Garhwa and Palamau districts; Uttar Pradesh state: Sonbhadra district.
4.	Asuri	Ashree, Assur, Asura, Maleta	7,000 (Van Driem 2007)	Chhattisgarh state: Raigarh district, Jashpur area; Jharkhand state: Gumla, Lohardaga, southern Palamau, and northern Ranchi districts of Chotanagpur Plateau; Maharashtra state; Odisha state: Sambalpur district; West Bengal state.
5.	Birhor	Birhor, Birhar, Birhore, Birhul, Mankidi, Mankidia, Mankiria	2,000 (Van Driem 2007)	Chhattisgarh state: Raigarh district; Jharkhand state: southern Hazaribag, southern Palamau, Ranchi, and Singhbhum districts; Maharashtra state; Odisha state: Kalahandi, Keonjhar, Mayurbhanj, Sambalpur, and Sundargarh districts; West Bengal state: Puruliya district.

6.	Ho	Bihar Ho, Lanka Kol	1,040,000 (2001 census)	Jharkhand state: PurbiSinghbhum district, Kolhan, Seraikella; East Singhbhum district, Dhalbhum sub-district; Odisha state: Koenjhar and Mayurbhanj districts; West Bengal state.
7.	Koda	Kaora, Kora, Korali, Korati, Kore, Mudi, Mudikora	43,000 (2001 census)	West Bengal state: Bankura and Bardhaman districts.
8.	Kol	Hor	1,660 (2012 SIL)	Rajshahi district: Godagari subdistrict.
9.	Korwa	Ernga, Singli	34,600 (2001 census)	Chhattisgarh state: Bilaspur, Jashpur, Korba, Raigarh, and Surguja districts; Jharkhand state: Gumla, Garhwa, and Palamau districts; Odisha state: Mayurbhanj and Sundargarh districts; Uttar Pradesh state: Mirzapur district; Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, and West Bengal states
10.	Munda	Heriki, Killi	469,000 (2001 census)	Odisha and Jharkhand states; possibly Bihar and West Bengal.
11.	Mundari	Colh, Horo, Kolh, Mandari, Mondari, Munari	1,110,000 (2001 census)	Jharkhand state: Ranchi district, south, and west; Andaman and Nicobar Islands union territory, Assam, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Tripura, and West Bengal states.

12.	Mahali	Mahili, Mahle, Mahli	33,000 (2007)	Assam state: tea estates; Jharkhand state: Dhanbad, Gumla, Hazaribagh, Pargana, Ranchi, Santal Lohardaga, Saraikela Kharsawan, East Singhbhum, and West Singhbhum districts in Chota Nagpur area; Odisha state: Balasore, Keonjhar, and Mayurbhanj districts; West Bengal state: Jalpaiguri and West Medinipur districts.
13.	Santhali	Har, Hor, Samtali, Sandal, Sangtal, Santal, Santali, Santhiali, Satar, Sentali, Sonthal	5,940,000 (2001 census)	Bihar state: Bhagalpur and Munger districts; Jharkhand state: Hazaribagh and Manbhum districts; Odisha state: Balasore district; West Bengal state: Bankura and Birbhum districts; Assam, Mizoram, and Tripura states.
14.	Turi		2,000 (2007)	Chhattisgarh state: Raigarh district, and scattered throughout; Jharkhand state: Gumla, Lohardaga, and Ranchi districts, Chotanagpur area; Odisha state: Sambalpur and Sundargarh districts; West Bengal state: Bankura, Birbhum, Murshidabad, and Nadia districts.
15.	Korku	Bondeya, Bopchi, Korki, Kuri, Kurku, Kurku- Ruma, Ramekhera	574,000 (2001 census)	Madhya Pradesh state: Betul district, Betul city area and north; Hoshangabad and East Nimar (Khandwa) districts; Maharashtra state: Akola, Amravati, and Buldana districts.

16.	Juang	Juango, Patra-Saara, Patua, Puttooas	23,700 (2001 census)	Odisha state: north Angul, east Dhenkanal, south Keonjhar districts.
17.	Kharia	Haria, Khadia, Khariya, Kharvi, Khatrria, Kheria	240,000 (2001 census)	Jharkhand state: Ranchi district, Khunti sub-district, Kolebira and Thethaitangar Anchal; Simdega sub- district; Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, Durg, Jashpur, Raigarh, Raipur, East Singhbhum, and West Singhbhum districts; Odisha state: Mayurbhanj, Sambalpur, and Sundargarh districts; Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Assam, Tripura, West Bengal states. Dhelki dialect mainly in northwest Gangpur (Raigarh), Jashpur, and Sundargarh; Dudh dialect in south Gangpur (Raigarh) Ranchi, and western Sambalpur.
18.	Gata'	Didayi, Didei, Dire, Gataq, Geta', Getaq, GtaAsa, Gta'	3 06 (1991 census)	Andhra Pradesh state: east Godavari district; Odisha state: Koraput and Malkangiri districts, Kudumulgumma and Chitrakonda sub-districts south of Bondo Hills; some in Khairput sub-district. 47 villages.
19.	Bondo	Bhonda Bhasha, Bonda, Bondo- Poraja, NanqaPoroj a, Poraja Katha, Remo, Remosum	9,000 (2002 SIL)	Odisha state: Malkangiri district, Khoirput sub- district, Bondo Hills.

20.	Gadaba, Bodo	BoiGadaba, Gadba, Gadwa, Godwa, Gudwa, Gutob, Gutop	8,000 (2000 IICCC)	Andhra Pradesh state: Visakhapatnam district; Odisha state: Koraput district, Lamtaput sub- district, 40 villages; Malkangiri district, Khoirput sub-district.
21.	Parenga	Gadaba, Gorum, Gorum Sama, Pareng, Parenga Parja, Parengi, Parengji, Poroja	12,600 (2001 census)	Odisha state: Mayurbhanj district.
22.	Juray		801,000 (2000)	Odisha state.
23.	Sora	Sabar, Sabara, Saonras, Saora, Saura, Savara, Sawaria, Shabari, Soura, Swara	253,000 (2001 census)	Andhra Pradesh state: Srikakulam district; Assam state: Plains division; Odisha state: Ganjam, Koraput, and Phulbani districts; Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, and West Bengal states.

**Table i-5. Munda languages according to Ethnologue 2017**

### **3.0. Munda and Austroasiatic**

Munda languages represent the westernmost branch of the Austroasiatic linguistic phylum. Austroasiatic (AA) languages are geographically widespread from Central India to Southeast Asia occurring in discontinuous pockets of the speech communities. Vietnamese and Khmer are the national languages of Vietnam and Cambodia, respectively. Santali is the language listed in the Schedule VIII of the Indian Constitution, and Khasi has official status in the state of Meghalaya, India. The other Austroasiatic languages have no official status. It was Wilhelm Schmidt in 1906 who established the existence of the Austroasiatic group. According to Jenny, Weber, and Weymuth (2015:13):