

A Sociolinguistic Study of Sundargarh Sadri

Asmita Padhan
Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi
asmita94_llh@jnu.ac.in

Abstract

This study explores the sociolinguistic dynamics of Sadri, a lingua franca among diverse tribal populations in Sundargarh, Odisha. Sadri, an Indo-Aryan language, coexists with Sambalpuri (Indo-Aryan), Oraon and Kurukh (Dravidian), and Mundari (Austro-Asiatic), forming a complex multilingual setting that fosters language contact phenomena such as code-switching, lexical borrowing, and structural convergence.

The paper focuses on the alienable/inalienable possession distinction in Sadri, particularly examining the usage of the enclitic marker *-har*. Preliminary findings indicate that its use is inconsistent among adult speakers and almost absent in children's speech. This decline may point to a broader grammatical shift toward simplifying the possessive system, potentially reducing the alienable/inalienable distinction. Such a shift could lead to a more neutral possessive structure, aligning Sadri with other regional languages that do not maintain this distinction.

Phonological and morphological convergence also emerges as a significant feature in Sundargarh Sadri. Vowel shifts, such as [ʌ] > [a] (e.g., *lagin* → *lagin*), and consonantal modifications in borrowed lexemes (e.g., *rək* → *ɔʃik*) demonstrate phonological adaptation.

This study highlights the need for more extensive, comparative research to map linguistic variation across Sadri-speaking regions and to identify factors driving these emerging structural changes.

Keywords: Language Contact, Language Variation, Multilingualism, Alienable/Inalienable Possession, Sadri.

1. Introduction

India boasts one of the most diverse linguistic landscapes in the world, with 456 languages spread across six different language families (Ethnologue, 2024). Given this linguistic richness, it is unsurprising that most Indians are multilingual. In such a context, the use of lingua francas i.e., link languages that facilitate communication, becomes quite common and often region-specific. For example, Hindi functions as a lingua franca for many states in North India.

This study focuses on a particular lingua franca, which, although not as widespread as the official language, plays a significant role in its region. Sadri is an East Indo-Aryan language predominantly spoken in the states of Jharkhand, Odisha, and Chhattisgarh. It serves as a lingua franca for the large tribal populations residing in these areas. Beyond these states, many ethnic communities in Assam, West Bengal, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Bhutan also use Sadri. Outside India, the language is often called ‘Sadani’.

1.1 Linguistic Background

According to Ethnologue (Eberhard et al., 2019), Sadri has about 12.13 million speakers in India, with 5.13 million L1 speakers and 7 million L2 speakers. Over 58% are L2 speakers, leading to significant linguistic variation influenced by native languages. Its role as an inter-group communication tool has caused contact-induced changes, especially where Sadri coexists with Sambalpuri, Hindi, and tribal languages (Ravindranath, 2015). Studies (Peterson & Baraik, 2022) note phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical differences among Sadri ethnic groups, shaped by regional, social, and historical factors.

Despite its widespread use, Sadri is not officially recognized in Jharkhand, Odisha, or Chhattisgarh. While Jharkhand law permits its use in early education, implementation has been lacking (Odisha Review, 2010). Nevertheless, Sadri continues to flourish through literature, folk traditions, music, and digital content, helping maintain its linguistic resilience despite Hindi's dominance.

1.2 Geographical Background

Sundargarh, located in northwestern Odisha, is the state's second-largest district by area and shares borders with Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh. Over 50% of its population comprises Adivasi communities, making it one of Odisha's most tribal-dominated regions. These communities speak various tribal languages, including Oraon (Kurukh) and Kisan from the Dravidian family, and Mundari and Kharia from the Austroasiatic family.

In this linguistically diverse setting, Sadri has emerged as the primary lingua franca, facilitating communication among different tribal and non-tribal groups. Its widespread use is attributed to historical migration, economic exchanges, and social interactions. Over time, Sadri has incorporated elements from regional languages, giving it a distinct identity in Sundargarh. In urban centres like Rourkela and Sundargarh town, linguistic interactions are dynamic, with frequent mixing between Sadri, Sambalpuri, and Hindi. Conversely, in

rural and tribal areas, Sadri is used more consistently in its traditional form for inter-community communication.

2. Aims and Objectives

The study aims to document the structural features of inalienable possession in Sundargarh Sadri, including its morphosyntactic form, distribution, and function in natural discourse. A comparative approach will be employed to analyze whether the inalienable possession marker observed in Sundargarh Sadri is an innovation or retention when compared to other Sadri dialects and related Indo-Aryan languages. It also seeks to investigate the linguistic variations within Sadri as spoken in Sundargarh, examining phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical aspects that deviate from standardized forms.

The research further explores sociolinguistic variation in the use of this marker across different age groups (younger vs. older speakers). It will also investigate key factors driving linguistic change, particularly the role of language contact with other Indo-Aryan languages like Odia, Sambalpuri, and Hindi. The study aims to contribute to broader theoretical discussions in possession typology, language shift, and the concept of India as a Linguistic Area.

2.1 Research Questions

- a. How does Sundargarh Sadri differ from the Jharkhand variety, particularly in its use of inalienable possession, and what are the motivations behind these variations?
- b. How does the use of inalienable possession markers vary across social groups in Sundargarh, and what sociolinguistic factors drive this variation?
- c. What are the phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical variations in Sundargarh Sadri, and how do these features deviate from the standardized variety?

2.2 Research Methodology

The most effective and appropriate method for studying language variation due to contact is through a diachronic analysis, drawing on historical texts. However, in most cases, such data are either unavailable or insufficient for conclusive reconstruction. Although some historical data on Sadri exist, they primarily focus on the Jharkhand variety, which is considered the standard form. Literary works by Sadri speakers from Odisha, particularly from Sundargarh, are scarce. As a result, this study will adopt a synchronic approach, relying on contemporary linguistic evidence to examine linguistic transfer. While lexical borrowing is relatively easy to identify, the replication of grammatical meaning is more complex and often subject to debate.

2.2.1 Sampling Method

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to ensure that all participants were native speakers of Sadri. Selection criteria included long-term residence in Sundargarh and self-identification as Sadri speakers. This method ensured linguistic authenticity and contextual relevance in data collection.

2.2.2 Participant Selection and Grouping

A total of 40 participants were selected for the study, divided into two age-based groups to examine sociolinguistic variation across generations

- 20 children (under 15 years of age)
 - 20 adults (25 years and above)
- All participants were permanent residents of Sundargarh town.

2.2.3 Data Collection

Data were collected using a pre-designed questionnaire specifically constructed to elicit responses containing the inalienable possession marker *-har*. The questionnaire also included items targeting variation in phonology, morphosyntax, and lexicon. Given practical constraints and limited access to naturalistic speech settings, data collection took place primarily through

- Targeted individual interviews
 - Telephonic interviews
- These methods, while limiting the opportunity for spontaneous language use, allowed for controlled and consistent elicitation of relevant linguistic structures.

2.2.4 Supplementary Sources

In instances where direct input from speakers of the Chotanagpuri Sadri variety (Jharkhand) was unavailable, the study consulted authoritative secondary sources. Notably, *A Grammar of Chotanagpuri Sadri An Indo-Aryan Lingua Franca of Eastern Central India* by John Peterson and Sunil Baraik (2022) was used for comparative analysis.

While lexical borrowing could be relatively easily identified in the collected data, tracing grammatical replication (such as the spread of inalienable possession constructions) required more nuanced analysis. The study acknowledges that the replication of grammatical meaning remains contentious and is often harder to prove conclusively than lexical transfer. Nevertheless, the synchronic approach, supported by carefully selected participants and methodical data collection, provided a reliable foundation for examining current patterns of linguistic variation in Sundargarh Sadri.

3. Literature Review

Language contact significantly influences linguistic structures, often resulting in changes to lexicon, phonology, syntax, and discourse. Thomason, (2001: 62) defines contact-induced change as any shift more likely to occur due to language contact, categorizing it as either *system-preserving* (e.g., lexical borrowing) or *system-altering* (e.g., grammatical restructuring). Winford (2003) identifies three contact scenarios—language maintenance, shift, and creation—with *maintenance* particularly relevant where a minority language adapts under the influence of a dominant one.

Contact-induced language change occurs when linguistic shifts arise as a result of interaction between languages. Particularly, when changes would have been unlikely outside the contact situation. Contact can also accelerate or support changes that might otherwise emerge independently. To establish whether a given linguistic feature has arisen due to contact requires evaluating the historical relationship between languages and the extent of exposure among speaker communities.

The two most important factors that scholars must take into consideration while studying contact and variation are identifying evidence of transfer and assessing whether the change could have occurred independently. Since historical linguistic data is often unavailable, comparative evidence is crucial. If a language exhibits structural properties absent in its genetic relatives but present in a neighboring contact language, transfer becomes a plausible explanation. However, certain grammatical features, like the emergence of articles, occur naturally in many languages without contact influence, necessitating additional evidence to establish causality.

Sociolinguistic factors also play a role in grammatical replication. Language contact is often more pronounced among urban speakers, younger generations, and male speakers, as they tend to have greater exposure to linguistic influences. Patterns of variation across demographic groups may thus indicate stages of contact-induced change.

Ultimately, the strength of any claim about contact-induced grammatical replication depends on the accumulation of linguistic, historical, and social evidence. The more converging indicators there are, the more convincingly contact influence can be established.

Sadri was historically classified as a dialect of Bhojpuri (Grierson 1903; Tiwari 1960; Jordan-Horstmann 1969). However, recent scholarship disputes this view. Linguistic evidence shows that Sadri shares a closer genetic relationship with Khortha, Kurmali, and Panchparganiya. They form a distinct subgroup known as the Sadani languages (Yadav 2012; Peterson & Baraik, in press). These languages exhibit internal structural similarities and diverge significantly from Bhojpuri, Magahi, and Maithili.

Sadri serves as a lingua franca in western and central Jharkhand, especially among tribal groups from Munda (e.g., Kharia, Mundari, Bhumij) and Dravidian (e.g., Kurukh, Gondi) language families. Many members of these groups now speak Sadri as their first language,

having shifted away from their heritage languages (Peterson & Baraik, in press). As a result, second-language speakers now comprise approximately 58% of the total Sadri-speaking population in India and abroad.

This extensive use as a lingua franca has led to noticeable linguistic influences. Sadri/Nagpuri has been significantly shaped by contact with Munda and Dravidian languages, especially in phonology, syntax, and lexicon. Despite its role as a recipient of influence, Sadri has also provided loanwords to neighboring languages, often in core semantic domains such as kinship, body parts, and numerals (Abbi, 1997).

Morphologically, Sadri/Nagpuri differs from other Sadani languages by lacking ergativity. Except for a few experiential predicates, it follows a nominative-accusative alignment, where the subject of both transitive and intransitive verbs appears in the unmarked (direct) case, while the object takes the oblique marker =ke when definite or human. This contrasts with the ergative constructions still preserved in Khortha, Kurmali, and Panchparganiya, suggesting that Sadri may have lost ergativity under the influence of non-ergative Munda and Dravidian languages. A particularly unique feature of Sadri/Nagpuri is its morphosyntactic distinction between alienable and inalienable possession—a trait rare in Indo-Aryan languages but common in Munda languages.

4. Alienable and Inalienable possession

4.1 Inalienable Possession

Inalienable possession refers to relationships between a possessor and a possessum that are considered intrinsic, inherent, or permanent. These possessums are typically not subject to transfer or separation. Common semantic domains for inalienable possession include

- Kinship terms (e.g., mother, brother, daughter)
- Body parts (e.g., hand, heart, eye)
- Part-whole relationships (e.g., roof of a house)
- Personal attributes or names

In many languages, inalienably possessed nouns are obligatorily marked for a possessor, often using special morphological markers. These constructions may lack a genitive construction entirely and often rely on a close syntactic bond between the noun and the possessor (e.g., no use of a possessive marker, or special agreement morphology). In some languages, these nouns cannot stand alone and must appear with a possessor.

For example, in some Oceanic and American indigenous languages, body parts and kin terms require direct possessive marking (e.g., his eye, not just eye), as they are viewed as fundamentally “owned.”

4.2 Alienable Possession

Alienable possession, by contrast, refers to non-intrinsic relationships between a possessor and possessum—ones that are more contingent, temporary, or socially constructed. This includes

- Objects (e.g., book, car, clothes)
- Property (e.g., house, money)
- Animals
- Abstract possessions (e.g., rights, ideas)

These nouns are usually not required to appear with a possessor and can often be referred to independently. In languages that distinguish between alienable and inalienable possession, alienable possession typically involves more explicit or “fuller” possessive constructions—such as possessive pronouns or genitive case markers—because the relationship must be overtly stated.

For instance, while my hand (inalienable) might be expressed with a possessive suffix, my book (alienable) may require a genitive phrase or a different construction altogether.

4.3 Structural Marking Differences

Haspelmath emphasizes that many languages around the world mark this distinction grammatically—often through

- Different possessive pronouns or affixes
- Different constructions (e.g., juxtaposition vs. genitive particles)
- Obligatoriness of possessive marking for in-alienables

However, not all languages mark this distinction. In languages like English, for example, the same possessive construction (my book, my hand) is used for both types, though the semantic difference is still intuitively understood.

4.4 Possession in Sadri

Sadri overtly marks inalienable possession through *-har*, especially with kinship terms and body parts (Nowrangi 1956 161; *Language Dynamics and Change* 12, 2022 240). In such constructions, the possessum (head noun) bears the *-har* marker, while the possessor may optionally appear as a genitive-marked NP. For example,

ghar janana-har puch-l-ak

‘He returned home and his wife asked ...’

hã pardip = kar aba-har

‘Yes, Pradip’s dad.’ (Peterson, 2022, p. 240)

In contrast, alienable possession uses only a genitive-marked possessor, and the possessum reflects only number and case, without *-har*

u = maŋ = ʌk jʌmin jaydad = ke bāt-ek = hʌe

‘One should divide up their wealth (lit. land [and] belongings of those should be divided).’ (Peterson, 2022, p. 240)

4.4.1 Origin and Typological Comparison

Definiteness—or more precisely, specificity—has also been marked in many eastern Indo-Aryan languages through classifiers attached directly to nouns, typically a feature of numeral modification (Neukom & Patnaik 2003 24ff.). Sadri shows this mechanism as well. For instance,

u = kaʀ bad dhan = maŋ = ke laʀki = go

‘After that, the girl boiled the rice paddy, dried [it] ...’ (Neukom & Patnaik, 2003, p. 24)

Here, the classifier =go on *laʀki* (‘girl’) marks her as previously mentioned and referential.

The enclitic *-har* in Sadri likely derives from such a classifier, initially used to signal specificity or definiteness, and later grammaticalized into a marker of inalienable possession. This diachronic pathway is further supported by parallels in Chhattisgarhi, where a cognate form of *-har* appears to function as a definiteness marker (Tiwari, 1960), suggesting a broader areal pattern across the eastern Indo-Aryan region.

Notably, first- and second-person possessors in Sadri already use genitive constructions that convey definiteness inherently, making *-har* functionally redundant in these contexts. Thus, *-har* became restricted to third-person possessors, where such disambiguation remained salient.

4.5 Possession in Sundargarh Sadri

The primary objective of this preliminary study is to investigate whether Sadri speakers in Sundargarh maintain the alienable possession feature. A previous pilot study indicated that certain speakers refrain from using the inalienable possession marker, which sparked the motivation for this research. Detailed data, findings, and analysis are presented in the following section.

5. Findings and Analysis

5.1 Adult Participants (Ages 25 and above)

The distribution of the enclitic *-har* among the participants shows variation. This indicates that its use is not uniform across speakers. Of the twenty adult participants in the study, eleven (55%) did not employ *-har* at all. The remaining nine participants (45%) made use of *-har* to varying degrees. Among these, six participants (30%) used it exclusively in

contexts involving human possessors, pointing to a possible semantic restriction wherein *-har* is associated with human referents. In contrast, three participants (15%) applied *-har* in both human and non-human possessive constructions, indicating a broader and a more general usage. This distributional pattern suggests that the use of *-har* is subject to variation not only in terms of frequency but also in terms of semantic scope. Examples-

a. Group 1 – Used enclitic for +human possessors only

- i. u-kar dʒani-har iskol-me kam korela
he.3S-GEN wife.3S-POSS school-LOC work work.HAB.3S
His wife works at the school.

- ii. rahul-ker goṭ-har tʃoṭ dʒahe
rahul.3S-GEN leg.3S-POSS break be.PRF.3S
Rahul's leg is broken.

- iii. kukur-ker puṭʃ^hri-Ø keriya ahe
dog.3S-GEN tail.3S-POSS black be.PRES.3S
The dog's tail is black.

(No enclitic used for non-human possessor)

b. Group 2 – Used enclitic for both +human and -human possessors

- iv. u-man-ker saṅ-har dilli-me rəhela
they-3PI-GEN friend.3S-POSS delhi.LOC live.HAB.3S
Their friend lives in Delhi.

- v. kukur-ker puṭʃ^hri-har keriya ahe
dog.3S-GEN tail.3S-POSS black be.PRES.3S
The dog's tail is black.

c. Group 3 – Did not use enclitic at all

- vi. u-kar kēs-Ø ləmba or keriya ahe
she.3S-GEN Hair long and black be.PRES.3S
Her hair is long and black.

- vii. praḍip-ker aba-Ø bemaṛ ahe
praḍip.3S-GEN father.3S-POSS sick be.PRES.3S
Pradip's father is sick.

Table 1: Summary of Adult Participants

Group	Number of Participants	Percentage
Did not use <i>-har</i> at all	11 / 20	55%
Used <i>-har</i> only for +human possessors	6 / 20	30%
Used <i>-har</i> for +human & -human	3 / 20	15%

5.2 Child Participants (Under 15 Years)

In the parallel group consisting of child participants, the use of the enclitic *-har* was further limited. Out of twenty children, only four (20%) used the marker in their speech, a much lower rate compared to the adult group. Notably, none of the children used *-har* in contexts involving non-human possessors. This suggests a more restricted usage of the form. Examples-

a. Group 1 – Did not use the enclitic at all

viii. u-kar pətni-Ø iskol-me kam korela
he.3S-GEN wife.3S-POSS school-LOC work work.HAB.3S
His wife works at the school.

ix. rahul-ker goṛ-Ø tuiṭ dzahe
rahul.3S-GEN leg.3S-POSS break be.PRF.3S
Rahul's leg is broken.

x. kukur-ker keriya pũṭʰri-Ø ahe
dog.3S-GEN Black tail.3S-POSS be.PRES.3S
The dog's tail is black.

b. Group 2 – Used the enclitic for only +human possessors

xi. pərdip-ker aba-har bemar ahe
pradip.3S-GEN father.3S-POSS sick be.PRES.3S
Pradip's father is sick.

xii. kukur-ker pũṭʰri-Ø keriya ahe
dog.3S-GEN tail.3S-POSS black be.PRES.3S
The dog's tail is black.

- xiii. rahul-ker goṭ-har tuiṭ dʒahe
 rahul.3S-GEN leg.3S-POSS break be.PRF.3S
 Rahul’s leg is broken.

Table 2: Summary of Child Participants

Group	Number of Participants	Percentage
Did not use <i>-har</i> at all	16 / 20	80%
Used <i>-har</i> only for +human possessors	4 / 20	20%
Used <i>-har</i> for -human possessors	0 / 20	0%

5.3 Findings & Discussion

The use of the enclitic marker among adults is inconsistent, while it is almost entirely absent in children speech. This pattern points toward a potential generational decline in the productive use of *-har*, particularly in its extended functions. This may be indicative of an ongoing grammatical shift or reanalysis in the language. Sundargarh Sadri may be undergoing a simplification in its possessive system, possibly alleviating the alienable/inalienable distinction.

One possible explanation for the inconsistent use of the alienable possession marker *-har* in Sadri is the influence of contact languages like Sambalpuri and Odia, which do not distinguish between alienable and inalienable possession. This lack of distinction may contribute to the marker’s variable use among Sadri speakers in Odisha. However, a contact-based explanation alone may be insufficient. Sadri in Jharkhand is also in contact with Hindi and Khortha, languages that similarly lack this distinction, yet *-har* usage still varies across regions. This suggests additional sociolinguistic or internal grammatical factors may be at play.

Nevertheless, this study is based on a small, regionally limited sample. While the trends are significant, they cannot be generalized to all Sadri speakers. Broader, comparative, and longitudinal research is needed to map the extent of variation, identify consistent patterns, and determine the sociolinguistic or grammatical factors behind this shift. This preliminary study highlights the need for further investigation into Sadri’s evolving structure and its interaction with neighboring languages.

6. Further Findings

Beyond the use of the possessive enclitic, this study also identified several other linguistic variations in Sadri that can be attributed to language contact. The practise of code-switching and code-mixing is common, which is unsurprising considering the extent of

multilingualism. Lexical variation is also expected under such conditions. However, notable phonological and morphological variations point to deeper patterns of contact-induced change.

One prominent area of variation is lexical borrowing, particularly of verbs. Borrowed verbs are frequently adapted to align with Sadri’s phonological rules. For instance, the English verb *stop* undergoes cluster reduction in Sadri. In the Sundargarh variety, this results in the form *ɔʃik*, where an epenthetic vowel *i* is inserted to break the consonant cluster, followed by apocope (deletion) of the final vowel. Other verbs show signs of metathesis, where phonemes are reordered without addition or deletion, reflecting a strategy for phonological compatibility. Importantly, Sadri generally avoids word-final vowels. This pattern suggests a case of phonological integration, wherein loanwords undergo adaptation to conform to the accepted phonological patterns of the recipient language. In such instances, the word-final vowel ‘i’ shifts to the word-medial position, goes through vowel shortening, and forms a diphthong.

Table 3: Phonological Integration in Sundargarh Sadri

English Gloss	Jharkhand Sadri	Sundargarh Sadri	Sambalpuri
stop	rək	ɔʃik	ɔʃka
lan	lan	am	ani
fill	b ^h in	b ^h ɔɾ	b ^h ɔri
enter	hɛl	d ^h uik	d ^h uki

More examples of phonological variations

Table 4: Vowel Shift (e -> i)

English Gloss	Jharkhand Sadri	Sundargarh Sadri	Sambalpuri
1st person pronoun	mōe	mōi	muĩ
2nd person pronoun	tōe	tōi	tui

The close-mid front unrounded vowel [e] changes into the close front unrounded vowel [i] as exemplified by the 1st and 2nd person pronouns.

Table 5: Vowel Shift (ʌ -> ɑ)

English Gloss	Jharkhand Sadri	Sundargarh Sadri	Sambalpuri
for	lʌgin	lagin	lagi

and	Λur	aur	au
you (hon)	rΛure	raure	tome

The open-mid back unrounded vowel [Λ] changes into [a], the open back unrounded vowel. In the first two instances, the phonological changes can plausibly be linked to Sambalpuri influence. However, in the case of the second-person honorific pronoun, the observed variation cannot be directly associated with Sambalpuri. This particular instance might serve as evidence of synchronic variation, indicating a consistent sound change occurring within the language. An analogous phonological variation can be identified in the case of the third-person singular past morpheme. A similar shift is evident in the third-person singular past morpheme, which appears as /Λk/ in Jharkhand Sadri and as /ak/ in Sundargarh Sadri, as seen in the following sentence pairs

xiv. u gir ge-l-Λk
s/he-3SG-NOM fall-V1 go-V2-PST-3SG
He fell down.
(Jharkhand Sadri)

xv. u gir ge-l-ak
s/he-3SG-NOM fall-V1 go-V2-PST-3SG
He fell down.
(Sundargarh Sadri)

Together, these phonological and morphological changes indicate a complex interplay of language contact and internal evolution within Sadri.

7. Conclusion

This sociolinguistic investigation of Sundargarh offers valuable insights into the complex and dynamic linguistic landscape of a region that remains relatively underexplored in scholarly research. By examining variables such as possessive markers, the study reveals significant intra-linguistic variation within comparable linguistic ecologies. Data collected from diverse social groups demonstrate that while Sadri continues to serve as a vital marker of cultural identity, it is increasingly subject to the influence of dominant regional languages, resulting in patterns of code-switching, lexical borrowing, and gradual language shift.

The findings emphasize the urgency of documenting and analyzing underrepresented languages like Sadri, both to enrich the understanding of linguistic diversity and to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. As language change unfolds under sociolinguistic pressures, particularly in multilingual settings, ongoing research is essential to uncover

how grammatical features such as possession evolve and what these shifts reveal about speaker identity and community dynamics.

In conclusion, this study contributes meaningfully to the broader field of sociolinguistics by foregrounding the lived realities of linguistic variation and contact. Acknowledging the inherent value of Sadri can inform future efforts toward its preservation and revitalization, ensuring that its rich linguistic and cultural traditions endure within an ever-changing socio-linguistic landscape.

8. List of Abbreviations

1SG – First person singular
2SG – Second person singular
3SG – Third person singular
3PL – Third person plural
GEN – Genitive
LOC – Locative
NOM – Nominative
POSS – Possessive
PST – Past
PRES – Present
PRF – Perfect
HAB – Habitual
IPA – International Phonetic Alphabet
L1 – First language
L2 – Second language

References

- Ethnologue. 2024. *Languages of India*. Dallas: SIL International.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. Syntactic universals and usage frequency. Leipzig Spring School on Linguistic Diversity, March.
- Odisha Review. 2010. *Linguistic diversity in Odisha*. Bhubaneswar: Governments of Odisha.
- Winford, Don. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Winford, Don. 2010. Contact and borrowing. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The handbook of language contact*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 170–187.