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Abstract

The Lyngngam speech form (spoken in the northwest of the Khasi Hills of Meghalaya) is considered a dialect of Khasi. However, recently Hamlet Bareh, a Khasi speaker, observed that it may not be appropriate to treat it as a dialect of Khasi. In this light the present study has been undertaken to ascertain the position of Lyngngam in relation to Khasi (standard).

First, around forty percent of Lyngngam's vocabulary seems to be unrelated to Khasi. There are some sound correspondences, but there are many problem areas as well. The process of contraction is not extensive. There is no concordial agreement such as is found in Khasi; also there is no adjective marker and no general number and gender elements. Case markers except for ha, are different from Khasi. Infixation seems to be more commonly employed. Suffixes are employed to some extent. Except for the first person sg., and 2nd person (personal) pronouns, the pronouns are different from Khasi. Lack of pronominal markers has eliminated interesting aspects of sex symbolism. However, this has resulted in compound constructions. Present and past tense markers are placed after the verb; future tense marker is placed before the verb. Aspect markers precede the verb like in Khasi. Interestingly, verbs (some at least) have full and contracted forms; the full form is employed in present and future tense, while the contracted form is employed elsewhere.

The Lyngngam speech form is spoken in the northwestern parts of the Khasi hills in Meghalaya state of India. Since Grierson's work (1904), Lyngngam has been considered as one of the dialects of Khasi. Only recently, that is in the late eighties, one scholar named Hamlet Bareh, a Khasi speaker, doubted the appropriateness of this classification. In his work Bareh has provided a few lexical items to make his point. After that, so far no work has discussed this issue. In the direction of filling this gap some data was collected by the present author in 1988 on this speech variety. Though this data is not sufficient for a detailed comparative study, it is still hoped that the various aspects of this speech variety presented below will show many interesting features about Lyngngam and (standard) Khasi.
1. Phonology

Tentative phonology of Lyngngam:

Vowels: i, (ii), e, œ, i, o, a, (ar), u.

Consonants: p, ph, b, t, th, d, c, ch, j, k, kh, g, ?, m, n, n, s, h, r, l, w, and y.

(i). Vowel length is phonemic in Khasi, but it appears that it is not so here. Instead only two vowels i and a seem to have long counterparts. (ii). Barred i [i] is more frequent in this variety, and has wider distribution than in Khasi. (iii). The consonantal system is more symmetrical here than in Khasi, in the presence of voiceless and voiced palatal series. (iv). The aspirated stop series seems to be found only voiceless; a voiced series seems to be absent. (Even in Khasi voiced aspirates have very limited distribution). (v). Among the fricatives Khasi has both s and ç phonemes, whereas this variety has only s. (More detailed study is needed in this area).

2. Vocabulary

Nearly 40 percent of Lyngngam’s vocabulary is unrelated to that of Khasi. Elsewhere, though similarities may be found in some words, sound correspondences are not very regular. Some such forms are listed below:

Nouns:

Related forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lyngngam</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>(Standard) Khasi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>snie?</td>
<td>‘a bark (of a tree)’</td>
<td>ka snep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>øsim</td>
<td>‘bird’</td>
<td>ka sim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snam</td>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td>ka snam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khmat</td>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>ka khmat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pilim</td>
<td>‘egg’</td>
<td>ka pilen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c?en?</td>
<td>‘bone’</td>
<td>ka c?en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tøsim</td>
<td>‘claw’</td>
<td>ka tøsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l?o?</td>
<td>‘cloud’</td>
<td>u l?o?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksu</td>
<td>‘dog’</td>
<td>u kseu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l?okur</td>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>ka çkot (De-clusterization by insertion of vowel a; l &lt; ç, u &lt; o)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some problematic cases:

kmyøn | ‘earth’ | ka khindeu (?)
biøinj | ‘name’ | ka kirten (?)
domba | ‘mountain’ | u lum
Unrelated forms:

əpau  ‘ashes’     u dpei
lawba  ‘belly’     ka kpo?
əŋkrin  ‘breast’  ka çadem
ənot  ‘heart’     u kloŋnam
yenmoryən  ‘knee’   ka kho?sieu
khillai  ‘liver’   u do?nuɔd
əmim  ‘meat’     ka do?
əgəp  ‘mouth’    ka ktiɛn
əŋi  ‘neck’     u rindəŋ
sonnu  ‘night’   ka mieŋt
əhot  ‘root’     ka tinrai
khoitlyən  ‘seed’   u simbai
inthək  ‘smoke’   ka tdem
yaurei  ‘sun’     ka səŋ
əmoim  ‘tooth’   u bniat
raukmaru  ‘woman’ ka khinthei
bmya  ‘cheek’    ka ŋab
da-pam  ‘axe’     u sdiɛ
kawa  ‘crow’     u tiŋaːb

In a list of 58 nouns in the data (not all are listed above), 38 seem to be related; 18 unrelated, and two doubtful cases. The various types of changes involved will be discussed later.

Verbs:

Related forms:

dei  ‘drink’     diʔ
thinnəŋ  ‘burn’    thanŋ
niŋnap/ŋap  ‘die’     yap
ɲəŋ  ‘stand’     iɛŋ
binnəŋ/bam  ‘eat’     bam
innai  ‘give’     ai
innon/or  ‘say’     ɔŋ
sŋu/səŋgʊ  ‘hear’    ʂŋap
p/phinnap  ‘kill’   pɨnŋap
thiloi  ‘lie’     thok
tonkoʔ  ‘limp’    dkoʔ

Unrelated forms:

kindei  ‘fly’     her
heʔkən  ‘know’    tip
di/dinni  ‘walk’   yatid
kindur  ‘want’     kuaʔ
khom/khənном  ‘bind’  teʔ
sirpai  ‘rub’     taʔ
hat ʔincoŋ 'clean' khuid
imphak 'blossom' phuʔ
imbœi 'blow' put, etc.

Problematic cases:

ŋinnai 'swim' jŋgi
thom/thinnom 'take' čim

Out of 58 verbs, 21 are unrelated, 35 related, and two problematic.

Adjectives:

Related forms:

innuŋ 'black' ba-yoŋ
ryœŋkhon 'dry' ba-rkhyanŋ
in-dap 'full' ba-dep
æŋju 'sour' ba-jeu
əlliʔ 'white' ba-lieʔ
sintim 'yellow' ba-stem
obon 'many' či-bum
koræŋ 'male' činraŋ, etc.

Unrelated forms:

praksop 'all' ba-roʔ
mœryeŋ 'good' ba-bha
æmmir 'fat' ba-sjaid
binsir 'cold' ba-khryat
əllup 'hot' ba-khluit
kcaʔ 'bad' ba-snjeu
kinsan 'hard' ba-eʔ
kirrip 'breadth' ba-yar

Problematic cases:

jimbaiit 'wet' ba-jhieʔ
conŋne 'permanent' ba-neʔ
khînnaʔ 'heavy' ba-khyaʔ

Out of 27 adjectives, 11 are unrelated, three are problematic and the rest are related.

Interrogatives: both are different.

ormat 'what' -ei
bœyæt 'who' -no
Numerals:

On the whole, lower numerals agree. The following is a problematic case:

\[\text{ilyan} \quad \text{‘first’} \quad \text{niŋkoŋ}\]

Some of the regular changes between these are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khasi</th>
<th>Lyngngam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ç- &gt; c-</td>
<td>çenŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conŋ</td>
<td>‘sit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çad</td>
<td>‘dance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çipheu</td>
<td>‘10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çispaŋ</td>
<td>‘100’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ç?yap</td>
<td>‘sand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çkoŋ</td>
<td>‘ear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ç- &gt; s-</td>
<td>çniuŋ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çnyaŋ</td>
<td>‘chisel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y- &gt; n</td>
<td>yoŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yap</td>
<td>‘die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u- &gt; -o-</td>
<td>khum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lum</td>
<td>‘hill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suʔot</td>
<td>‘dysentery’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A diphthong becomes a simple vowel:

\[-asi > -i : \quad bnaŋi \quad ‘month’ \quad bni\]
\[-kwari \quad ‘betelnut’ \quad kwí\]
\[-əu/eu > -u : \quad ksəu \quad ‘dog’ \quad \text{ksu}\]
\[-jeu \quad ‘sour’ \quad ju\]
\[-ie- > -o- : \quad miet \quad ‘night’ \quad mot\]
\[-ie- > -i- : \quad sdieŋ? \quad ‘fry’ \quad sindiŋ?\]
\[-ie- > -u- : \quad hinŋieu \quad ‘seven’ \quad hinŋuroŋ\]
\[-ei > -o : \quad hinrei \quad ‘six’ \quad hriŋ\]

\[-ro is sort of a suffix, used with other lower numerals when used in isolation.\]

Some of the irregular changes:

\[-m > -ŋ : \quad baŋm \quad ‘eat’ \quad baŋ\]
\[-l- > d- : \quad lum \quad ‘hill’ \quad dom\]
\[-k- > g- : \quad kulai \quad ‘horse’ \quad gulai, etc.\]
Some of the important morphological features in which Lyngngam differs from Khasi are the following:

3. General word order

The word order is similar to that of Khasi at the sentential level: S-V-O.

(L1) kinsai ju əŋ-laʔ oyən
Kynsai '3msg' build-pt obj house 'Kynsai built a house'

(L2) bəu ju phnyap-laʔ sa- bəsən
man '3msg' kill-pt obj snake '(the) man killed a snake'

(L3) nə dənni diʔ .
I go fut 'I will go'

(L4) gju binənə nən
she eat con.asp 'she is eating'

Though the above order is the same as that of Khasi at the S-V-O level, there is some difference in the verbal complex. In Lyngngam the tense marker occurs after the verb (laʔ/diʔ, nən), instead of preceding it as in Khasi.

(K1) u kinsai u la čna ya ka yen
prn. kynsai prn pt build obj house 'Kynsai built a house'

(K2) u brieu u la pinyap ya u bəsən
prn man prn pt kill obj snake '(the) man killed a snake'

(K3) nən leit
I-fut go 'I will go'

(K4) ka dən leit
she con-asg go 'she is going'

By comparing the above pairs, we can see some of the other differences between them.

4. Pronoun marking

The pronominal and agreement markers (u/ka/ki) which are found in Khasi (K1, 2) are not found in Lyngngam.

When a noun is used as subject in both Khasi and Lyngngam, then an appropriate third person pronoun is used immediately after the noun. If the noun is plural, then the third person plural pronoun is used. Examples K1, 2 and L1, 2 and L5, 6 illustrate this.
Example L5 contains a feminine noun, as the pronoun is feminine. However, instead of full form gdu, the contracted form -du, (dropping the initial consonant) is used here. L6 contains a plural noun, as the pronoun is plural. (Here the initial consonant of the pronoun is not dropped; this may be due to the fact that the preceding noun ends in a vowel (this needs checking).

In Khasi this feature occurs with all nouns, even when a noun occurs as an object (see K1, K2) except when they occur as part of a compound. However, in Lyngngam it is restricted to human nouns only (note L7), and that only when they occur as subject of a sentence. So this feature is highly restricted in Lyngngam.

5. Verb constructions

Both Khasi and Lyngngam have the same three tense distinctions, present, past and future. However, their placement in the verbal complex differs.

'present tense'  ø in both
'past tense'  la in Khasi, placed before the verb
la? in Lyngngam, placed after the verb
'future tense'  in in Khasi, placed before the verb
di? in Lyngngam, placed after the verb
'present cont.'  dan in Khasi, placed before the verb
næn in Lyngngam, placed after the verb

Since in Lyngngam the future marker occurs after the verb, the phonetic merging of the pronominal marker (u/ka/ki) and the future marker (see K3) that is found in Khasi is not found here. The same holds good in the case of the negative marker as well.

In Khasi verbs are invariable, while in Lyngngam some verbs have two forms, a full form and a short form. The full form has an infix (or prefix) Vn(n) in it. The short form is used in the past tense only, while the full form is used elsewhere.

(L8) নো  ডেনি  ‘I go’
I go
Consonant-initial verbs are infixed: kap/kinnap ‘bite’, than/thinnan ‘burn’, nwp/ninnap ‘die’, ban/binnan ‘eat’. Vowel-initial verbs are prefixed: ai/innai ‘give’, opr/innan ‘say’, etc. Though this type of variation is found mostly in verbs, some similar forms are found in other form classes as well, but their function is not clear (this needs further investigation).

Similarly, the change of order within a verbal complex is very interesting. However, in some data, the change is not maintained. (Is it due to the influence of Khasi, which most of the educated Lyngngams know?).

In L14, the mood marker sa? occurs preceding the verb, as in Khasi; but in L15 ɲeq ‘habitual’ marker occurs after the verb, the usual Lyngngam construction. Similarly in L16.

6. Word-formation

Here only one feature will be mentioned. Lyngngam uses infixation more commonly than the Khasi. Verbs are derived from nouns by infixing -Vn(n)- to the nouns in this variety, whereas it is the reverse in Khasi. However, this affixation type is not currently productive.
L.: គំនុង  ‘a village’  : សំណាក  ‘to dwell’
K.: ំនុង  ‘to dwell, live’  : គំនុង  ‘village, dwelling’

In the last Lyngngam example, though the unaffixed noun form គំនុង looks like the affixed Khasi form គំនុង, it seems not to function like an affixed form.

Some other very limited nominalizations:

(L18) L.: ពលែ/ប៊ូសែ  ‘to sweep, clean’  : ំបូសែ  ‘a broom’
K.: សៀម  ‘to sweep, clean’  : សៀម  ‘a broom’;
L.: ំស្រែ  ‘to urinate’  : ដំស្រែ  ‘a urinary bladder’
K.: យៅ  ‘to urinate’  : យៅ  ‘a urinary bladder’

The productive Lyngngam verbalizing system prefixes an infinitive marker hat-.

(L19) គឺសែ  ‘a fold’  : គឺ-គឺសែ  ‘to fold’,
នូវតូ  ‘clean’  : គឺ-នូវតូ  ‘to clean’, etc.

Whether all verbs have this kind of prefixation needs to be ascertained.

Compounding and contraction seem to be similar in both Khasi and Lyngngam, though contraction seems to be restricted in Lyngngam.

7. Negation

In all the tenses only the short form of the verb is used in negative constructions.

(L20) គឺ រា ទឹោះ ំនុង  ‘he is not going’
គឺ ទឹោះ ំនុង  ‘she did not go’
គឺ ទឹោះ ំនុង  ‘the boy does not eat’

Compare that with the negative formation in Khasi.

(K20) គឺ រា ទឹោះ ំនុង  ‘he is not going’
គឺ រា ទឹោះ ំនុង  ‘she did not go’ (khlem is a neg. particle used only in past tense)
គឺ រា ទឹោះ ំនុង  ‘the boy does not eat’

MKS 26:37-50 (c)1996  See archives.sealang.net/mks/copyright.htm for terms of use.
Though Khasi has *im, khlem, wat* as negative markers, the first one is used more commonly, except in past tense where the second form also can be used. Usually the first one occurs immediately after the subject, and becomes part of it formally. In contrast to this situation, in Lyngngam the negative marker is *əŋjį*, and occurs finally.

8. Interrogatives

The Lyngngam interrogative markers are quite different from those of Khasi. The Lyngngam prefix *a*- is used with nouns (in the illustrations here only pronouns). And a particle *mət/yət* or *minat* is placed at the end of the sentence as well: *yət* asks who, *mət* asks what or why, *minat* asks when (these need further study). So interrogation is marked in two places simultaneously in Lyngngam, but only in one place in Khasi.

(L21) akudu  rəumət  di?
int-they  do-int.  pt
‘what did they do?’

arjutu  laɾsmət
int-he  come-int.
‘why did he come?’

artu  laɾ  saʔ  minat
int-he  come  fut  int.
‘when will he come?’

aqju  laɾ  minat
int-she  come  int.
‘when did she come?’

ami/aphe  on  syət
int-you (m/f)  call  obj-int.
‘whom did you call?’ (s- obj. marker)

aqni  əkot  əmbi  yət
int-it  book  pos.  int.
‘whose book is it?’

ama  gu  bəŋ  smət
int-I  eat  int.
‘why should I eat?’

Compare these with the Khasi forms:

(K21) lano  un  wan
when?-fut  he-fut  come
‘when will he come?’

minno  ka (la)  wan
when?-pt  she (pt)  come
‘when did she come?’

yano  phi  la  khot
obj-int.  you  pt  call
‘whom did you call?’

ka  dei  ka  khot  jónŋo
prn  be  prn  book  pos-int.
‘whose book is it?’
balei ṇanbam
why? I-fut eat ‘why should I eat?’

In Khasi the interrogative formation is quite complex because of the presence of two bound forms -no and -ei. They take various forms for their occurrence. It has other interrogative forms as well. They occur mainly at the beginning of a sentence; but can occur elsewhere as well in some cases.

Another interesting difference between them is in the yes/no question constructions. Lyngngam uses the prefix a-, plus a particle e? finally, but in Khasi interrogation is expressed only by intonation.


Khasi: ṇa la bam I pt eat ‘did I eat?’

9. Pronouns and possessives

The Lyngngam personal pronominal system is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ist person:</td>
<td>yau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person:  mi (masc.) mami (masc. pl.) [phyau prok ‘pl’]</td>
<td>phe (fem.) mapee (fem. pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person:</td>
<td>tu, ju, jutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine:</td>
<td>gdu, gju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Khasi personal pronouns are the following: ṇa, ṇi: pha/me, phi: u, ka, ki.

The Lyngngam and Khasi demonstrative pronouns are not very different. L. (g)ni and (g)ta vs. K. (u/ka/ki)-ne and (u/ka/ki)-ta, etc.

The Lyngngam possessive marker is əm-; while in Khasi it is jɔŋ:

(23) L. khon əm-na? ‘my son’ vs. K. u khuŋ jɔŋŋa
L. rɔt trei əṃju ‘his servant’ vs. K. Sakri jɔŋ-u

However, when two nouns are used, no possessive marker is used:

(24) L. dɔŋksu ‘dog’s tail’ vs. K. u tđɔŋksəu
L. sladyəŋ ‘tree leaf’ vs. K. ka sladiəŋ, etc.
10. Number

Surprisingly the Lyngngam data does not show clear number distinctions; it appears that there are no formal markers of plurality. But in Khasi u/ka and ki are singular and plural markers, respectively. It appears that quantifiers are used in Lyngngam with the nouns to make number distinctions. Lyngngam uses classifiers like the ones found in Khasi. In Khasi the number markers precede the nouns; while in Lyngngam the quantifiers also occur after the nouns. (In Khasi the adjectives also occur after the nouns).

(25) L. khon jimma 'sons/many sons' vs. K. ki khun son many pl. son
L. kon indαŋ 'a son'
L. son alone

(26) L. khon arngut 'two son(s)' vs. K. arngut ki khun son two pl. son

(27) L. gulai tɛ?wau 'a horse' vs. K. u kulay horse sɡ.

(28) L. gulai tɑ?arɛ 'two horse(s)' vs. K. arngut ki kulay two pl. horse

(29) L. gulai abon 'horse(s)/many horse(s)' vs. K. kulay / pl. horse ki khindyat many

(30) L. san tilli 'five thing(s)' K. san tilli five clas.
      five

11. Gender

No general gender marker is employed in Lyngngam, unlike in Khasi, where u is masculine, and ka is feminine. Only adjectives like konthau/rʊkmau 'female/woman', koran 'male' are employed for this purpose. The first one seems to be restricted to non-human nouns.

Observe the following forms:

[L31] **Feminine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lyngngam</th>
<th>Khasi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erenba (&lt; er-rena)</td>
<td>fowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baibu rʊkmau</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khillot</td>
<td>young person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bɛ rʊkmau</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konthau (ba)</td>
<td>spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sɛ-konthau</td>
<td>cow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lyngngam</th>
<th>Khasi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erkonthau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baibu khonkoran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khoran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bɛ koran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koran (ba)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sɛ-koran</td>
<td>'bullock'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L32)</td>
<td>Generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cow’</td>
<td>masə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘dog’</td>
<td>ksu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tiger’</td>
<td>khla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘donkey’</td>
<td>kəda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interesting sex-symbolism found in Khasi is not found in Lyngngam. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khasi:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u bilor</td>
<td>ka yit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u prek</td>
<td>ka raçi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u līŋka</td>
<td>ka kurat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u nār rot</td>
<td>ka nār</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Case distinctions

Nominative case is unmarked in both Khasi and Lyngngam. In accusative case while the Lyngngam has two forms, sa and o, Khasi has ya only. sa is used with animate nouns while o is restricted to inanimate nouns.

(33) (a) L. brə phnyap-la? sa bāsen       ‘(the) man killed a snake’
(K. u briew u la pinyap ya u bsep)

(b) L. kinsai əŋ-la? o yen         ‘Kynsai built a house’, etc.
(K. u kinsai u la dep ya ka iyen)

The instrumental case marker in Lyngngam is baʔ, while in Khasi it is bad.

(L34) baʔ baru     ‘with a stick’

The dative and locative case markers are the same in Lyngngam and Khasi.

The ablative case marker in Lyngngam is- am, while in Khasi it is na.

(35) L. am cinoŋ    ‘from the village’ (K. na ka çnoŋ)

The associative case marker is nəm in Lyngngam, while bad in Khasi.

(36) L. sinj judi-la? nəm g(o)ju       ‘Singh went with her’
(K. u çiŋ u la leit bad ka)

Even some adverbial prepositions show some differences.

(37)  ‘near’     L. jingan/jəŋən (K. hajan),
‘above’   L. tnom     (K. halor),
‘outside’ L. təbər    (K. habər), etc.
Conclusion:

The foregoing statements show clearly that the Lyngngam speech form is quite distinct from that of (Standard) Khasi. However, the question of whether this form should be considered as a dialect of Khasi or as a related language is a complicated one. Here, instead of arguing in either way, an attempt has been made to compare them and to highlight the similarities and differences between them. Further interpretation will be for the future.
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