

## Egophoricity and Mirativity in Kaike\*

HONDA Isao

*Nagoya College*

### Summary

The purpose of this paper is to review Watters (2006), which describes a linguistic pattern called “conjunct-disjunct” (nowadays more widely known as egophoric/non-egophoric) and mirativity in Kaike (the Dolpa district, Nepal). Watters (2006) describes three sets of conjunct/disjunct suffixes and a set of conjunct/disjunct copulas; that is, perfective *-pa* and *-bo*, imperfective *-tse* and *-ŋə*, irrealis *-ŋi* and *-dara*, and the conjunct existential copula *ŋipa* and the disjunct existential copula *ŋya* (as well as their negative counterparts *mipa* and *mayā*). According to him, the existential copulas have three functions, “true existential, locative, and possessive”, and he recognizes a conjunct/disjunct distinction between *ŋipa* and *ŋya* only in his locative and possessive functions. He then asserts that in the two functions *ŋipa* and *ŋya* manifest a mirative/non-mirative distinction, which, he claims, is a feature of the conjunct/disjunct distinction.

The current paper points out that his imperfective *-tse* and *-ŋə* (*-cye* and *-ŋa* in my transcription) can be recognized as egophoric and non-egophoric respectively but not as forming an oppositional contrast because their tense-aspectual significations differ. His irrealis *-dara* (*-darā* in my transcription) is indeed non-egophoric and irrealis, but *-ŋi* (*-nyi* in my transcription) cannot be described as irrealis; it is used to express not only a future activity as he describes, but also a progressive and a habitual activity in the realis domain. The suffix cannot be described as egophoric either because in the case of habitual statements *-nyi* can occur with 3rd person when the verb is volitional.

Two existential copulas *ŋipa* and *ŋya* (*nyi-pā* and *nyā* in my description), as well as their negative counterparts *mipa* and *mayā* (*mi-pā* and *mayā* in my description), manifest a mirative/non-mirative distinction regardless of their functions, and they are irrelevant to egophoricity because they all can occur with any person.

Watters describes only one equational copula *dzeŋpa* (*jyaŋ-pā* in my description). There is, however, another equational copula *jyā*; and the two copulas manifest a mirative/non-mirative distinction (their negative counterparts *naŋ-pā* and *nā*: do the same). Again, those copulas are irrelevant to egophoricity.

**Key words:** Kaike, Nepal, egophoric/non-egophoric, conjunct/disjunct, mirative

---

\*This paper is a revised and extended version of my earlier paper presented at the 41 International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics held in University of London (September 19, 2008; Honda 2008b). The research for this paper was partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (No. 16102001, 21520463, 24520486, 18H05219) and a research grant from Nagoya College.

## 1. The language of Kaike

Kaike is a language spoken in an area called Tichyurong, the Dolpa district, Nepal. Kaike is spoken only in three villages. In other parts of Tichyurong, a Tibetan dialect, or a Tibetic language I call Tichyurongba is spoken. It should be noted that Kaike is not a Tibetic language. Watters (2006: 302) states, “Kaike, a language that appears to belong to the TGTh cluster, *does* have the conjunct-disjunct distinction, and, to my knowledge, is the first Tamangic language reported to demonstrate it”, but this is incorrect. Kaike is not a Tamangic language, either.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Overview of Watters (2006)

The term conjunct-disjunct is used in Hale and Watters (1973) and Hale (1980) to describe a morpho-syntactic pattern found in Kathmandu Newar, where one set of verbal suffixes (conjunct) occurs with first person actors in statements, second person actors in questions, and when the actors of the matrix and the subordinate clauses are coreferential; otherwise, another set of verbal suffixes (disjunct) is used. The distribution of the two sets cannot be explained as person agreement, but what is involved are functional-pragmatic factors, such as “epistemic source” and “privileged access to internal states” (Hargreaves 2005). Similar systems have been reported in other TB languages as well as non-TB languages, and those systems are also motivated by functional-pragmatic factors. For this reason, the term conjunct-disjunct is now rarely used; instead, other terms such as egophoric/non-egophoric, which is used in the current paper, are gaining ground.<sup>2</sup>

Watters (2006) reports that this kind of contrast exists in Kaike and describes three sets of conjunct disjunct suffixes and a set of conjunct/disjunct copulas in Kaike; that is, perfective *-pa* and *-bo*, imperfective *-tse* and *-ŋə*, irrealis *-ji* and *-dəra*, and the conjunct existential copula *jipa* and the disjunct existential copula *jya* (as well as their negative counterparts *mipa* and *mayā*).

<sup>1</sup> He also incorrectly asserted in his earlier literature including Watters (2002: 15) and Watters (2003) that Kaike is a member of the Tamangic group. For more details of the language, see Honda (2008a).

<sup>2</sup> For the issue of the terms, see, among others, Tournadre (2008, 2017), Hill and Gawne (2017), and Widmer (2017, 2020) and San Roque et al. (2018). Other terms now used include “egophoric/alterphoric” (Post 2013) and “egophoric/allophoric” (Widmer and Zúñiga 2017).

**Table 1** Summary of Watters (2006)

	Perfective	Imperfective	Irrealis
Conjunct	<i>-pa</i>	<i>-tse</i>	<i>-ni</i>
Disjunct	<i>-bo</i>	<i>-ŋə</i>	<i>-dara</i>
(Copulas)	Equational		Existential
	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative      Negative
Conjunct			<i>ɲipa</i> <i>mipa</i>
Disjunct	<i>dzeŋpa</i>		<i>ɲya</i> <i>mayã</i>

Although he used the term conjunct-disjunct, Watters correctly pointed out that ““person” is not the primary motivating factor” (Watters 2006: 300). Watters (ibid: 302) notes, “The conditions of use for conjunct forms in Kaike appears to be identical to the conditions of use for Newar” and cites from Hargreaves (2003: 376) the following conditions where the conjunct forms occur in Kathmandu Newar.

- 1) The verb is finite, *and*
- 2) the event is construed as involving an intentional action by the actor, *and*
- 3) the speech act is:
  - a. declarative with a first person subject, *or*
  - b. interrogative with a second person subject, *or*
  - c. reported speech where the main clause subject and the reported speech complement clause [subject] are coreferential.

To explain those conditions, Watters use the term “locus of knowledge”; that is, “First person is opposed to second and third persons for precisely the reason that first person is more reliable source of information than second and third persons” (Watters 2006: 300). He also recognizes “volitionality” as an important factor for governing the distribution of conjunct-disjunct forms, which is also the case in Kathmandu Newar (though the term “intentionality” is used in Hargreaves 2005).

In what follows, the sets of the egophoric/non-egophoric forms and the conditions of their use mentioned in Watters (ibid) will be examined in turn.

### 3. Perfective *-pā* and *-bo*

As far as the perfective *-pa* (in my transcription *-pā*) and *-bo* are concerned, I have no disagreement with Watters' description. The distinction manifested by the two suffixes are shown in the following examples in (1) and (2), both of which are from Watters (2006). They are examples with a transitive volitional verb. In declarative sentences (1), the conjunct or egophoric form *-pa* occurs with a first person actor, whereas the disjunct or non-egophoric form *-bo* is used with a non-first person actor.

- (1) Declarative (“past tense”/perfective; with a transitive volitional verb)<sup>3</sup>  
(Watters 2006: 302–303)

- a. *ŋə-i yim doŋ-pa*  
I-ERG house make-PFV.CJ  
‘I built a house.’
- b. *na-i yim doŋ-bo*  
you-ERG house make-PFV.DJ  
‘You built a house.’
- c. *nu-i yim doŋ-bo*  
he-ERG house make-PFV.DJ  
‘He built a house.’

In question sentences (2), on the other hand, *-pa* occurs with a second person actor, while *-bo* is used with a non-second person actor.

<sup>3</sup> While Watters glosses *-pa* and *-bo* as “PFV.CJ” and “PFV.DJ” respectively in most of the cases and occasionally call them “perfective” suffixes in the main text, he states that they are “past tense” suffixes on page 302 and lists an example with *-bo* glossed as “PST.DJ” as shown in (8c). What he meant is probably that past tense is one of the tenses in the realm of the perfective aspect. The same analysis is made in Regmi (2013: 73–75), where the suffixes are described as *-pa* “past conjunct” and *-bo* “past disjunct”, respectively. In this description, the perfective aspect includes “past tense”, “perfect” and “past progressive/durative”; thus, the past suffixes are abbreviated in the example sentences as “PFV.CJ” (i.e., perfective conjunct) and “PFV.DJ” (perfective disjunct), respectively.

## (2) Interrogative (past/perfective; with a transitive volitional verb)

(Watters 2006: 303)

- a. *ŋə-i yim doŋ-bo-yo*  
I-ERG house make-PFV.DJ-Q

‘Did I built a house?’

- b. *na-i yim doŋ-pə-o*  
you-ERG house make-PFV.CJ-Q

‘Did you built a house?’

- c. *nu-i yim doŋ-bo-yo*  
he-ERG house make-PFV.DJ-Q

‘Did he built a house?’

The following examples in (3) and (4) are from my fieldnote.

(3) Declarative (perfective; with a transitive volitional verb)<sup>4</sup>

- a. *thē: chān-jyai ŋə-i ra:ysi lai thuŋ-pā*  
yesterday night 1sg-ERG liquor much drink-PFV.EGO

‘I drank too much last night.’

- b. *thē: chān-jyai nā-i ra:ysi lai thuŋ-bo (na)*  
yesterday night 2sg-ERG liquor much drink-PFV.NEGO (PAT)

‘You drank too much last night(, didn’t you?).’

- c. *thē: chān-jyai nu-i ra:ysi lai thuŋ-bo*  
yesterday night 3sg-ERG liquor much drink-PFV.NEGO

‘S/he drank too much last night.’

## (4) Interrogative (perfective; with a transitive volitional verb)

- a. *thē: chān-jyai ŋə-i ra:ysi lai thuŋ-bo-yau*  
yesterday night 1sg-ERG liquor much drink-PFV.NEGO-Q

‘Did I drink too much last night?’

<sup>4</sup> Kaike is a tonal language. In this paper, however, tones are not indicated.

- b. *thē:*        *chān-jyai*   *nā-i*        *ra:ysi*        *lai*        *thuŋ-pā-u*  
 yesterday        night        2sg-ERG        liquor        much        drink-PFV.EGO-Q

‘Did you drink too much last night?’

- c. *thē:*        *chān-jyai*   *nu-i*        *ra:ysi*        *lai*        *thuŋ-bo-yau*  
 yesterday        night        3sg-ERG        liquor        much        drink-PFV.NEGO-Q

‘Did s/he drink too much last night?’

The same pattern is found with an intransitive volitional verb as shown in (5) and (6).

(5) Declarative (perfective; with an intransitive volitional verb)<sup>5</sup>

- a. *thiriŋ*        *ŋā(-i)*        *pālbo:*        *wai-pā*  
 last.year        1sg(-ERG)        Kathmandu.LOC        go-PFV.EGO

‘I went to Kathmandu last year.’

- b. *thiriŋ*        *nā(-i)*        *pālbo:*        *wai-bo*        *(na)*  
 last.year        2sg(-ERG)        Kathmandu.LOC        go-PFV.NEGO        (PAT)

‘You went to Kathmandu last year(, didn’t you?).’

- c. *thiriŋ*        *nu(-i)*        *pālbo:*        *wai-bo*  
 last.year        3sg(-ERG)        Kathmandu.LOC        go-PFV.NEGO

‘S/he went to Kathmandu last year.’

(6) Interrogative (perfective; with an intransitive volitional verb)

- a. *ŋā(-i)*        *pālbo:*        *wai-bo-yau*  
 1sg(-ERG)        Kathmandu.LOC        go-PFV.NEGO-Q

‘Did I go to Kathmandu?’

- b. *nā(-i)*        *pālbo:*        *wai-pā-u*  
 2sg(-ERG)        Kathmandu.LOC        go-PFV.EGO-Q

‘Did you go to Kathmandu?’

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted here that, in Kaiké, the ergative marking is slippery, which means that the judgment by my informant often fluctuates.

- c. *nu(-i)*      *pālbo:*      *wai-bo-yau*  
 3sg(-ERG)      Kathmandu.LOC      go-PFV.NEGO-Q

‘Did s/he go to Kathmandu?’

The next examples in (7) are reported speech with the hearsay marker *ru*. In examples (7a), the verb ‘drink’ is marked by the egophoric *-pā*. In this case, Syam himself is a source of this information. In other words, Syam himself clearly remember what he did and reported this information to the hearer. In (7b), where the verb is marked by the non-egophoric *-bo*, on the other hand, the source of information is somebody else.

(7) Reported speech (perfective; with an intransitive volitional verb)

- a. *syam-jyai*      *thē:*      *chān-jyai*      *ra:ysi*      *lai*      *thuŋ-pā*      *ru*  
 Syam-ERG      yesterday      night      liquor      much      drink-PFV.EGO      HS

‘(I) heard (from Syam<sub>i</sub>) that (he<sub>i</sub>) drank too much last night.’

- b. *syam-jyai*      *thē:*      *chān-jyai*      *ra:ysi*      *lai*      *thuŋ-bo*      *ru*  
 Syam-ERG      yesterday      night      liquor      much      drink-PFV.NEGO      HS

‘(I) heard (from somebody else, but not from Syam himself) that Syam drank too much last night.’

Not every verb exhibits the egophoric/non-egophoric distinction. With some verbs, which are called “non-volitional verbs” (Watters 2006), which refer to basically the same kind of verbs as what Hargreaves (2003: 376; 2005: 5) calls “non-control verbs”, only the non-egophoric *-bo* is used regardless of person. To show this point, Watters (2006: 305) lists the following examples.

(8) Declarative (past/perfective; with a non-volitional verb) (Watters 2006: 305)

- a. *ŋa*      *lwε*      *tāh-bo*  
 I      talk      hear-PFV:DJ

‘I heard talk.’

- b. *ŋa*      *lāi*      *them-bo*  
 I      tongue      bite.tongue-PFV:DJ

‘I bit my tongue.’

- c. *ŋə-nə*    *khortsa*    *mol-bo,*    *dop-po*  
 I-GEN    knife    lose-PST:DJ    find-PST:DJ

‘I lost my knife and found it.’

It should be noted that the verb *them-* in (8b) actually means ‘(sth) to be stuck between two objects’, and thus the 1sg pronoun *ŋa* should not be understood as the subject. In (8c) too, the subject of the sentence is not the 1sg pronoun *ŋa* but *ŋə-nə khortsa* ‘my knife’; thus, the sentence should be translated as ‘My knife disappeared (and) was found.’

The following are examples from my fieldnote, which are with the verb ‘arrive’, ‘see’, ‘be tired’, and ‘be afraid’.

(9) Declarative (perfective; with a non-volitional verb)

- a. *ŋā/nā/nu*    *yima*    *tap-po/\*-pā*  
 1sg/2sg/3sg    house.LOC    arrive-PFV.NEGO/-PFV.EGO

‘I/You/S/he arrived home.’

- b. *ŋā(-i)*    *nu*    *raŋ-bo*  
 1sg(-ERG)    3sg    see-PFV.NEGO

‘I saw her/him.’

- c. *ŋā*    *gop-po*  
 1sg    be.tired-PFV.NEGO

‘I’m tired.’

- d. *nu:*    *khyār-bo*  
 3sg.DAT    be.afraid-PFV.NEGO

‘(I) am afraid of her/him.’

The fact that the egophoric form is not used with those verbs can be explained by recognizing that the actions or events expressed by those verbs are not totally controlled by the actor or experiencer. In other words, they are not an actor’s volitional or intentional action.

The fact that the choice between the egophoric/non-egophoric is not syntactically motivated is also indicated by the following examples in (10), which are with what Watters (2006: 307) calls “ambi-volitional verb”.<sup>6</sup> In (10a), where the verb ‘sink’ is marked with the non-egophoric *-bo*, ‘I’ accidentally and unintentionally sank in the water, whereas in

<sup>6</sup> In Hargreaves (2003: 376; 2005: 14) this kind of verb is called “fluid verb”.



(10b), where it is marked with the egophoric *-pā*, the actor intentionally made himself sink in the water. The same type of contrast between volitional and non-volitional is also found in (10c) and (10d).

(10) With an “ambi-volitional verb” (Watters 2006: 307)

- a. *ŋa*      *cyũ*      *piŋ-bo*  
 1sg      water:IN      sink-PFV:DJ

‘I sank into the water.’

- b. *ŋa*      *cyũ*      *piŋ-pa*  
 1sg      water:IN      sink-PFV:CJ

‘I (made myself) sank in the water.’

- c. *ŋa*      *hoŋ-bo*  
 1sg      fall-PFV:DJ

‘I fell.’<sup>7</sup>

- d. *ŋa*      *hoŋ-pa*  
 1sg      fall-PFV:CJ

‘I (made myself) fall.’

In fact, quite a large number of verbs exhibit this kind of contrast. (11) shows some of the examples; (11a) and (11b) are examples with the verb *hon-* ‘mix’, and (11c) and (11d) are with the verb *jyār-* ‘touch’. Even verbs like *thuŋ-* ‘drink’ are marked with the non-egophoric suffix *-bo* with a first person actor when the actor does not remember what s/he did or s/he did it unintentionally. Compare (11e) with (3a).

(11) Volitional/intentional action vs non-volitional/non-intention action

- a. *ŋa-i*      *cā*      *ri*      *cyini*      *hon-pā*  
 1sg-ERG      salt      and      sugar      mix-PFV.EGO

‘I mixed salt and sugar (intentionally).’

<sup>7</sup> Actually, the verb *hoŋ-* does not mean ‘fall’ but ‘roll (down)’.

- b. *ŋa-i cā ri cyini hon-bo*  
 1sg-ERG salt and sugar mix-PFV.NEGO

‘I mixed salt and sugar (unintentionally, by mistake).’

- c. *ŋa-i an-na lū:-ga jyār-pā*  
 1sg-ERG this-GEN rice-LOC touch-PFV.EGO

‘I touched this rice (intentionally).’

- d. *ŋa-i an-na lū:-ga (nāwā me:-ga) jyār-bo*  
 1sg-ERG this-GEN rice-LOC intention NEG-LOC touch-PFV.NEGO

‘I touched this rice (unintentionally).’

- e. *thē: chān-jyai ŋa-i ra:ysi lai thuŋ-bo (ru)*  
 yesterday night 1sg-ERG liquor much drink-PFV.EGO HS

‘(It is said/I heard from somebody that) I drank too much last night (but I do not remember).’

As stated at the beginning of this section, I have no disagreement with Watters’ description on the conjunct/disjunct distinction manifested by the perfective *-pa* (*-pā* in my transcription) and *-bo*. This is indeed a binary distinction that can be described as egophoric/non-egophoric.

Two points should be noted on the egophoric/non-egophoric contrast in perfective. One is that, in Regmi (2013), there are found some sentence examples with *-ta* glossed as “PFV.CJ” or “PFV.DJ”; e.g., *sowa-ta* (come-PFV.CJ) and *nan-ta* (put-PFV.CJ) (p. 138), *sət-ta* (kill-PFV.CJ) (p. 163), and *bin-ta* (give-PFV.DJ) (p. 134). It is suspected that she describes those instances of *-ta* as morphophonological alternations of *-pa*; cf. a morphophonological rule /p/ → /t/ /n/t \_\_ (e.g., /bin-pa/ → [bin-ta] “give-PFV.CJ” (ibid: 30).<sup>8</sup> In my description, however, there is no such morphophonological alternation, and I suspect that the instances of what she describes as *-ta* are, in fact, those of another perfective suffix *-ta*, which she describes as *-tə* “perfect” (ibid: 73). The perfective *-ta* is, as she describes correctly, irrelevant to the egophoric/non-egophoric contrast.

The other point to be noted is that in narratives the use of the non-egophoric *-bo* is rare (except in reported speech), which means that third person’s volitional actions in the past are, as are first person’s ones, mostly described, not with *-bo*, but with *-pā* (or with another perfective *-ta*), as shown in (12) and (13). Those instances of *-pā* must be analyzed, not as the perfective egophoric suffix, but as a nominalizer, and the nominalized clauses must be understood as so-called “stand-alone nominalizations” or “free-standing nominalizations” (Watters 2008).

<sup>8</sup> Thus, the abbreviation “DJ” must be a simple mistake.

(12)

- a. *khyu thikko: nye can, ti: coŋ-lai bā-bā,*  
 3pl brothers two PN one c.-ABL separate-REDUP  
*de: surkā: wai-pā ..., surkā: ...*  
 far.there.LOC s.LOC go-NMLZ s.LOC

‘They, two brothers ..., one (came) from Cong (place name), having been separated (from the other brother) (and) went far there, to Surkāng (place name) ..., to Surkāng ...’

- b. *ti: tā:rā: soə-pā*  
 one t.-LOC come-NMLZ

‘(The other) one came to Tā:rang (place name).’

(13)

- a. *nyi-na pākyi, jumlā ..., syiŋjā-lai soə-pā*  
 1pl.excl-GEN forefather j. s.-ABL come-NMLZ

‘Our forefather came from Jumla ..., (from) Syiŋjā (of Jumla).’

- b. *soə-soə, larāi: khye-khye, birti: chyūŋ-pā*  
 come-REDUP war do-REDUP b.LOC stay-NMLZ

‘(A pregnant woman) came (from Syingja), (and a) war broke out (there, i.e., in Syiŋjā, and she) stayed (i.e., came to settle once) in Birti (a village in Dolpa, near Jupal).’

- c. *birti: chyūŋ-chyūŋ, yāŋ syā:-yaŋ larāi:*  
 b.LOC stay-REDUP again there.LOC-EMPH war  
*khye-ma: soə-soə, pasā can saʔ-pā*  
 do-PURP come-REDUP husband PN kill-NMLZ

‘(She) settled in Birti, (and soldiers) came to (Birti?) to fight (lit. do (a) war) there also, (and they) killed (her) husband.’

The following are examples from Regmi (2013: 153), which also describes those instances of *-pā* (in her transcription, *-pa*) as a nominalizer.

(14)

- a. *aləi pa pa rə-rə kətaŋ-pa*  
 then father father say-SEQ call-NMLZ

‘Then, the son called his father.’

- b. *aləi pa-i na ŋojo mipa rəwa-pa*  
 then father-ERG 2sg son NEG.have say-NMLZ

‘Then, father said, “You are not my son”.’

- c. *aləi ŋojo-nə palo pa pa jeŋpa rəwa-pa*  
 then son-GEN turn father father BE.EQU say-NMLZ

‘Then, the son in his turn, said, “Father, father, I am you son!”’

- d. *pa-nə palo na khisyai nə-khya rəwa-pa*  
 father-GEN turn 2sg lie NEG-do say-NMLZ

‘The father, in his turn, said, “Don’t tell me a lie”.’

- e. *aləi pa ŋa ŋojo jeŋ jeŋ jeŋpa*  
 then father 1sg son BE BE BE.EQU

‘Then, (he said), “Father, yes, yes, (I am you son)!”’

- f. *aləi rəwa-mi pa-nə palo jəla puŋ-pa*  
 then say-AFTER father-GEN turn door open-NMLZ

‘Then, after saying this, the father, in his turn, opened the door!’

- g. *aləi ŋojo jhiə rə-rə pa ma syaŋ-pa*  
 then son inside see-SEQ father mother be.glad-NMLZ

‘Then, the parents haing[sic] seen the son inside became very happy.’

- h. *aləi daci mucī khe-pa*  
 then cry sob do-NMLZ

‘Then, they went on crying and shedding[sic] tears.’

- i. *aləi pa-kko ma-kko ja-mə ru-mə khe-ke chuŋ-pa*  
 then father-GEN mother-GEN unite-NMLZ be.happy-NMLZ do-SEQ sit-NMLZ

‘Then, the father and mother lived together happily.’ (Regmi 2013: 153)

#### 4. “Imperfective” *-tse* and *-ŋə*

We will next review the suffixes *-tse* and *-ŋə*. As stated earlier, Watters (2006) describes them as forming a conjunct/disjunct distinction in the imperfective paradigm. To show the distinction, Watters (2006: 304–305) presents the following examples. The first five are examples with a volitional verb, and the last two are with a non-volitional verb.

(15) The suffixes *-tse* and *-ŋə* (Watters 2006: 304–305)

- a. *ŋa woi-tse*  
I go-IMPV:CJ  
‘I go.’
- b. *ŋa golan rii-tse*  
I cloth buy-IMPV:CJ  
‘I am buying cloth.’
- c. *na re woi-ŋə*  
you also go-IMPV:DJ  
‘You also go.’
- d. *nu re woi-ŋə*  
he also go-IMPV:DJ  
‘He also goes.’
- e. *na woi-tsyə-o*  
you go-IMPV:CJ-Q  
‘Do you go?/Are you going?’
- f. *ŋa səi dza-yen don-ŋə*  
I food eat-SUFF want-IMPV:DJ  
‘I want to eat food.’
- g. *ŋa golan twə-ŋə*  
I cloth need-IMPV:DJ  
‘I need cloth.’

As to the distribution of *-tse* and *-ŋə* (*-cye* and *-ŋa* in my transcription) with respect to person and volitionality, I agree with his description; nevertheless, I hesitate to recognize them as forming an opposition because their tense-aspectual significations differ.<sup>9</sup> The suffix *-ŋa* can be called “imperfective” because it can be used in imperfective situations such as progressive as shown in (16a, b, c, d) and habitual as shown in (16a, b, e) as well as future as shown in (16a, b).

(16) Examples with *-ŋa*

- a. *nā(-i)*      *chyoe:*      *toə-ŋa*      (*na*)  
 2sg(-ERG)      religious.book      read-IMPV.NEGO      (PAT)

‘You are/were reading (a) book(, aren’t/weren’t you?).’  
 or ‘You read (a) book (e.g., everyday)(, don’t you?).’  
 or ‘You will read (a) book(, won’t you?).’

- b. *nu(-i)*      *chyoe:*      *toə-ŋa*  
 3sg(-ERG)      religious.book      read-IMPV.NEGO

‘S/he is/was reading (a) book.’  
 or ‘S/he reads (a) book (e.g., everyday).’  
 or ‘S/he will read (a) book.’

- c. *nu*      *cō:*      *golan*      *thū:* (< *thu-* ‘wash’ + *-ŋa*)  
 3sg      now      clothes      wash.IMPV.NEGO

‘S/he is washing clothes now.’

- d. *nu*      *thē:-na*      *cho-rā*      *syi:*      *chyū:* (< *chyun-* + *-ŋa*)  
 3sg      yesterday-GEN      this.side      here.LOC      stay.IMPV.NEGO

‘S/he has been staying here since yesterday.’

- e. *nu*      *nāp-nāp*      *yokoro*      *syi:*      *soə-ŋa*  
 3sg      every.morning      always      here.LOC      come-IMPV.NEGO

‘S/he comes here (habitually) every morning.’

On the other hand, the suffix *-cye* is used to express a future activity as shown in (17a) but not to express a progressive or habitual one as shown in (17a, b).

<sup>9</sup> In Regmi (2013: 73–77), the suffixes are described as *-ce* “non-past conjunct” and *-ŋə* “non-past disjunct”, respectively (Note that non-past is described as belonging to the imperfective aspect; thus, the suffixes are glossed in the examples as “IMPV.CJ” and “IMPV.DJ”, respectively).

(17) Examples with *-cye*

- a. *ŋā chyoē: toə-cye*  
 1sg religious.book read-FUT.EGO  
 ‘I will/am about to read (a) book.’  
 but not ‘I am/was reading (a) book.’  
 but not ‘I read books (every day).’
- b. \**ŋā nāp-nāp yokoro syi: soə-cye*  
 1sg every.morning always here.LOC come-FUT.EGO  
 \*‘I come here (habitually) every morning.’

Since it is used only with a first person volitional actor in declarative, the egophoric *-cye* appear to have a sense of the speaker’s intention/volition (or willingness or commitment in his/her own activity in the future).

The following table summarizes my description. Compares it with the description in Watters (2006). It should be noted that this table does not represent all of the TAM suffixes. Egophoric (i.e., with a first person volitional actor in declarative) progressive/continuous statements and egophoric habitual statements can be expressed with another imperfective suffix, such as *-nyi* (which will be mentioned in the next section) and *-nān*, both of which do not participate in the egophoric/non-egophoric distinction.

**Table 2** Egophoric/non-egophoric (conjunct/disjunct) in imperfective (Summary)

Watters (2006)		This paper (Honda)	
	Imperfective	Imperfective	Future
Conjunct	<i>-tse</i>	Egophoric	<i>-cye</i>
Disjunct	<i>-ŋə</i>	Non-egophoric	<i>-ŋa</i>

As the table shows, the relation between *-cye* and *-ŋa* is not like the one between the perfective *-pā* and *-bo*. One may think that this looks odd, but probably we should not expect that the interaction between the egophoric/non-egophoric and TAM is always like the one between *-pā* and *-bo* because similar situations are found in other languages. For instance, Kathmandu Newar shows the following complex relationship between the conjunct/disjunct category and TAM.

**Table 3** Conjunct/disjunct suffixes in Kathmandu Newar (Hargreaves 2005: 5)

	Past	Non-past	
Conjunct	- <i>ā</i>	- <i>e</i>	
	Perfective	Imperfective	Non-past
Disjunct	- <i>a</i>	- <i>V</i> :	- <i>i</i>

## 5. “Irrealis” *-ñi* and *-dāra*

About *-ñi* and *-dāra*, Watters (2006: 313–314) does not give us much information but only states that they are conjunct and disjunct forms in the irrealis category. The following examples are listed to show the distinction.<sup>10</sup>

(18) Conjunct/disjunct in Irrealis (Watters 2006: 313–314)

- a. *ŋa naptse woi-ñi*  
 I tomorrow go-IRR:CJ  
 ‘I might go tomorrow.’
- b. *na/nu naptse woi-dāra*  
 you/he tomorrow go-IRR:DJ  
 ‘You/he might go tomorrow.’

It is true that the suffix *-dāra* (*-darā* in my transcription) does not seem to be compatible with first person actors when it is used with a volitional verb as shown in (19a), though it can be used with a first person actor (as well as a second or third person actor) when the verb is non-volitional as shown in (19b, c). Therefore, the suffix can be analyzed as non-egophoric. It is used to denote uncertainty or probability in the future, and thus I have no objection to describing it as an irrealis suffix.

<sup>10</sup> In Regmi (2013: 73, 81), the suffixes are described as *-ñi* “probability conjunct” (“IRR.CJ”, e.g., irrealis conjunct) and *-dāra* “probability disjunct” (“IRR.DJ”, e.g., irrealis disjunct), respectively (Note that probability is described as one of the epistemic modalities).



(19)

- a. ??*ḡā/nā/nu*    *nāpcye*    *syā:*    *wai-darā*    *lā(:)*  
 1sg/2sg/3sg    tomorrow    there.LOC    go-might    PAT

??‘I might go there tomorrow, you know?’

‘You/S/he might go there tomorrow, you know?’

- b. *uju*    *rā*    *nyi-na-tā:*    *ḡā/nā/nu*    *syi-darā*    *lā(:)*  
 like.this    become    be-COND-EMPH    1sg/2sg/3sg    die-might    PAT

‘If (things) goes like this, I/you/s/he might die, you know?’

- c. *ḡā/nā/nu*    *tyā*    *syā:*    *tāp-tarā*    *lā(:)*  
 1sg/2sg/3sg    today    there.LOC    arrive-might    PAT

‘I/You/S/he might arrive there today, you know?’

The suffix *-ḡi* (*-nyi* in my transcription), on the other hand, cannot be analyzed as an irrealis marker. It is more appropriate to describe it as an imperfective suffix because it is used to express not only a future activity as shown in (20a), but also a progressive (20b) and a habitual activity (20c). The suffix cannot be described as egophoric either because in the case of habitual statements *-nyi* can occur with 3rd person (as well as first person) when the verb is volitional, as shown in (20c).<sup>11</sup>

 (20) The usage of *-nyi*

- a. *nāpcye*    *ḡā/\*nu*    *pālbo:*    *wai-nyi*  
 tomorrow    1sg/3sg    Kathmandu.LOC    go-IMPFV

‘I will go to Kathmandu tomorrow.’

\*‘S/he will go to Kathmandu tomorrow.’

- b. *ḡā/\*nu*    *cō:*    *golan*    *thu-nyi*  
 1sg/3sg    now    clothes    wash-IMPFV

‘I am washing clothes now.’

\*‘S/he is washing clothes now.’

<sup>11</sup> It is most likely that *-nyi* is historically related to the existential copula *nyi-*. My informant clearly recognizes their relation. Watters (2006: 313, fn. 5) also suggests their relation by saying as follows: “The irrealis suffix *ḡi*, though homophonous with *ḡi* in the existential *ḡipa*, is probably unrelated. The verbs on which it occurs are not nominalized as one would expect. Indeed, it *is* related to the copula in certain forms where the preceding verb is nominalized (see, for example, the sentence in (19) [i.e., (30)]).”

- c. *ḡā/nu* *yokoro* *nāp-nāp* *golan* *thu-nyi*  
 1sg/3sg always every.morning clothes wash-IMPFV

‘I/S/he wash(es) clothes every morning.’

The following table summarizes my description and compares it with the description in Watters (2006).

**Table 4**

Watters (2006)		This paper (Honda)	
	Irrealis	‘might’ (probability in the future)	
Conjunct	<i>-ḡi</i>	Egophoric	
Disjunct	<i>-dāra</i>	Non-egophoric	<i>-darā</i>

Since *-darā* does not have its counterparts, the recognition of it as non-egophoric might be controversial, and its incompatibility with a volitional first person actor may require a different explanation.

## 6. Copulas and mirative

### 6.1. Existential copulas

Watters (2006) also recognizes a conjunct/disjunct distinction in existential constructions formed with an existential copula. He states as follows:

... though Kaike distinguishes equational *dzeḡpa* from existential *nipa*, only the latter has a conjunct-disjunct distinction, and that only in locative or possessive functions. As a true existential copula, *nipa* utilizes only conjunct forms. (Watters 2006: 306)

The examples of what he calls “true existential” are shown in (21), where, in his description, only the existential copula *nipa* can occur, and there is thus no conjunct/disjunct distinction in this function. In his locative and possessive functions, on the other hand, a conjunct/disjunct distinction is recognized between *nipa* and another existential copula *nya*, as shown in (22) and (23).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The same analysis is made in Regmi (2013: 85–86), where the copulas are described as *jeḡpa* “equational copula”, *nipa* “existential conjunct copula” (though often listed as *nipa*), and *nya* “existential disjunct copula”, respectively, and, following Watters (2006), the conjunct/disjunct distinction is only recognized in “locative” and “possessive” senses.

(21) “True existential” function (Watters 2006: 310)

- a. *ŋa nipa*  
 I be:exist  
 ‘I am.’ (‘There’s me’)
- b. *ŋə-nə pa re nipa*  
 I-GEN father also be:exist  
 ‘My father also is.’ (‘There’s also my father’)
- c. *ta na re nipa*  
 now you also be:exist  
 ‘Now you also are.’ (‘Now there’s also you’)

(22) “Locative” function (Watters 2006: 310)

- a. *ŋa yim-ə nipa*  
 I house-LOC be:CJ  
 ‘I am in the house’
- b. *kələm tebəl-gə nya*  
 pen table-LOC be:DJ  
 ‘The pen is on the table.’

(23) “Possessive” function (Watters 2006: 311)

- a. *ŋə-nə ŋozo ti nipa*  
 I-GEN son one exist:CJ  
 ‘I have one son.’
- b. *nu-nə tsəme ti nya*  
 he-GEN daughter one be:DJ  
 ‘He has one daughter.’

Watters (2006: 311) then points out that the two copulas manifest a mirative/non-mirative distinction.<sup>13</sup> He states as follows:

<sup>13</sup> In Regmi (2013), the mirative/non-mirative distinction on copulas is not mentioned in the main text.

It is precisely in locative and possessive context that one other semantic feature of the conjunct-disjunct distinction comes into play—the marking of newly apprehended knowledge, i.e., mirativity. First person statements of possession using conjunct existential as in (16a) [i.e., (23a)] imply the first hand knowledge. Thus in (17a) [i.e., (24a)] the speaker expresses first hand knowledge, while in the (17b) [i.e., (24b)] version he expresses surprise at just discovering it.<sup>14</sup>

- (24) Mirative/non-mirative distinction between *nīpa* and *nīya* (“Possessive” function)  
(Watters 2006: 311)<sup>15</sup>

- a. *ŋa rupəyā nīpa*  
I money exist:CJ  
‘I have money.’ (I know it)
- b. *ŋa rupəyā nīya*  
I money exist:DJ  
‘(Hey!) I have money!’ (I just discovered it)

Table 5 summarizes Watters’ description on existential copulas.

**Table 5** Conjunct/disjunct coded by existential copulas (Watters 2006)

<u>Equational</u>	<i>dzeŋpa</i>		
<u>Existential</u>	True existential	Locative	Possessive
Conjunct (Non-mirative)	<i>nīpa</i>	<i>nīpa</i>	<i>nīpa</i>
Disjunct (Mirative)		<i>nīya</i>	<i>nīya</i>

He is correct in saying that the two copulas manifest a mirative/non-mirative distinction, but in fact they are irrelevant to the egophoric/non-egophoric distinction (i.e., Watters’ conjunct/disjunct). This is shown by the fact that both *nīpa* (which is *nyī-* + the nominalizer *-pā* in my description, i.e., *nyī-pā*) and *nīya* (*nyā* in my transcription) can occur with any

<sup>14</sup> Watters’ examples with *nīya* in (22b), *kəlam tebəl-gə nīya*, and in (23b), *nu-nə tsəme ti nīya*, are also mirative statements, which should thus be translated into ‘The pen is on the table! (I just realized that)’ and ‘He has one daughter! (I just realized that)’, respectively.

<sup>15</sup> It should be noted that in (24a) and (24b) the possessor pronoun *ŋa* ‘I’ must actually be attached with a dative marker; in this case, where the pronoun (*ŋā* in my transcription) ends with a short vowel, the dative is *-:* (the vowel is lengthened); i.e., *ŋā:* (1sg.DAT), and that the sentences are literally translated into ‘There is money to me.’ In those examples, the subject is thus not ‘I’ but *rupəyā* ‘money’, a third person.

person regardless of its function.<sup>16</sup> Recall that the egophoric suffixes never occur with third person. This is the distribution in which we recognize the egophoric category. The following examples in (25) shows that the copula *nyi-pā* can be used with third person, and, therefore, it cannot be described as egophoric.

(25)

- a. *kalam*    *kāpcyoə-ga*    *nyi-pā*    (Watters’ “locative”; cf. (21b))  
      pen        table-LOC       be-NMLZ

‘The pen is on the table.’ (I know it)

cf.

- b. *kalam*    *kāpcyoə-ga*    *nyā*    cf. (22b)  
      pen        table-LOC       be-MIR

‘The pen is on the table.’ (I just recognized it)

- c. *nu*    *yim-a*    *nyi-pā*    cf. (22a)  
      3sg    house-LOC    be-NMLZ

‘S/he is in the house.’ (I know it)

cf.

- d. *nu*    *yim-a*    *nyā*    cf. (22a)  
      3sg    house-LOC    be-MIR

‘S/he is in the house.’ (I just recognized it)

- e. *nu-na*    *came:*    *ti:*    *nyi-pā*    (Watters’ “possessive”; cf. (23b))  
      3sg-GEN    daughter    one    be-NMLZ

‘Her/his daughter, there is one.’ (i.e., S/he has one daughter) (I know it)

- f. *tyu*    *nyi-pā*    (Watters’ “true existential”; cf. (21b))  
      water    be-NMLZ

‘There is water.’ (I know it)

The copula *nyā*, too, can occur with any person regardless of its function. The following examples in (26a) and (26b) are with third person and in his “true existential” function (cf. (21b), (25f)), and (26c) is with first person and in the “locative” function (cf. 22a).

<sup>16</sup> The copula *nyi-pā* cannot be one morpheme because *nyi-* can occur with no suffix, i.e., *nyi-∅*, and with one of the other suffixes such as the conditional marker *-na* as shown in (19b).

(26)

- a. *nu-na pā re(:) nyā* (Watters' "true existential"; cf. (21b))  
 3sg-GEN father also be.MIR

'There is also his/her father!' (I just realized that)

- b. *tyu nyā*  
 water be.MIR

'There is water!' (I just realized that)

- c. *ṇā totyā-na jyĩḥ nyā* (Watters' "Locative"; cf. (22a))  
 1sg hole-GEN inside.LOC be.MIR

'I'm in a hole!' (I just realized that)<sup>17</sup>

In sum, what the two copulas manifest is not an egophoric/non-egophoric distinction but a mirative/non-mirative distinction. The copula *nyi-pā* is not an egophoric copula but a non-mirative copula, and *nyā* is not a non-egophoric copula but a mirative copula. As far as this mirative/non-mirative contrast is concerned, the distinction between true existential from locative or possessive is not necessary.<sup>18</sup>

There are negative counterparts both for the non-mirative and the mirative copulas; the negative non-mirative existential is *mī-pā*, and the negative mirative existential is *mayā*. In Watters's description, they are *mīpa* and *mayā* as shown in (27).<sup>19</sup>

(27)

- a. *ṇa rupāyā mīpa*  
 I money NEG:exist:CJ

'I don't have any money.' (I know it)

<sup>17</sup> This utterance is possible when the speaker recognized, after fainting for a while, that s/he had fallen in a hole.

<sup>18</sup> As a matter of fact, syntactically, there is not much difference between what Watters calls "true existential" (21), "locative" (22) and "possessive" (23). The difference between the first two is simply whether there is a locative phrase or not, and the difference between the first one and the third one is just whether the person or thing that exists is modified by a genitive phrase or not. The examples in (23a) and (23b) are literally translated into 'My son, there is one.' (or 'There is one, my son.') and '(Her/his daughter, there is one.' (or 'There is one, his daughter.'), both of which have a third person argument (*ṇa-nə ŋozo* 'my son' in the former, and *nu-nə tsəme* 'his/her daughter' in the latter). What is shown in (23a) is thus that *mīpa* can be used with third person.

<sup>19</sup> In Regmi (2013), the negative copulas are not mentioned in the main text but are found in annotated texts (ANNEX A) as *mīpa* (occasionally also *mī:pa*) and *mayā*, respectively.

- b. *ŋa rupəyã mayã*  
 I money NEG:exist:DJ

‘I don’t have any money!’ (I thought I did)

(Watters 2006: 311)

The following are examples from my fieldnote.

(28)

- a. *syi: nu mi:-pā*  
 here.LOC 3sg NEG.be-NMLZ

‘S/he is not here.’ (I know it)

- b. *syi: nu mayā*  
 here.LOC 3sg NEG.be.MIR

‘S/he is not here!’ (I just realized that)

The existential copulas can also be used as auxiliaries in periphrastic constructions. The following are examples from Watters (2006: 314).

(29)<sup>20</sup>

- a. *ŋə-i sem-pa ŋi*  
 I-ERG see-NMLZ CJ

‘I have seen it.’

- b. *na-i re sem-pa ŋyā*  
 you-ERG also see-NMLZ DJ

‘You also have seen it.’

- c. *nu-i re sem-pa ŋyā*  
 he-ERG also see-NMLZ DJ

‘He also has seen it.’

(Watters 2006: 314)

What Watters tried to show in the above examples is that “As in locative and possessive uses of the copula (shown in (15) [i.e., (22)] and (16) [i.e., (23)]), the copular auxiliary manifests a conjunct-disjunct distinction” (ibid: 314). However, what is the matter is again

<sup>20</sup> What is described here as *sem-* ‘see’ is actually a volitional verb *syen-* ‘look’.





## 6.2. Equational copulas

As mentioned above in this section, Watters (2006) does not recognize the egophoric/non-egophoric distinction in existential copulas. To show the point, the following example is listed.

- (32) *ŋa/na/nu*      *dzeŋpa*  
I/you/he              be:equative

‘It’s me.’/‘It’s you.’/‘It’s him.’

(Watters 2006: 312)

While it is true that there is no egophoric/non-egophoric distinction in equational copulas (which is also the case in existential copulas as we have seen above), there is a mirative/non-mirative distinction as is in existential copulas. The non-mirative equational copula is *jyaŋ-pā* (*dzeŋpa* in Watters’ description), and the mirative equational copula is *jyā̃*.<sup>23</sup> Their negative equivalents are *naŋ-pā* and *nā̃*, respectively. As are existential copulas, those four copulas too can be used with any person, which shows that what is the matter is not the egophoric/non-egophoric distinction.

(33)

- a. *ŋā*      *nu-na*      *ti*              *jyaŋ-pā*  
1sg      3sg-GEN      elder.sister      be-NMLZ

‘I am his/her elder sister.’ (I know it)

- b. *ŋā*      *nu-na*      *santān*      *jyā̃*:  
1sg      3sg-GEN      descendant      be.MIR

‘I am his/her descendant!’ (I just realized that)

<sup>23</sup> As is the existential copula *nyi-pā*, *jyaŋ-pā* cannot be one morpheme because *jyaŋ-* can occur with no suffix, i.e., *jyaŋ-Ø*, and with one of the other suffixes such as the conditional marker *-na*.

It should also be noted that, as already stated above (fn. 13), in Regmi (2013), the mirative/non-mirative distinction on copulas is not mentioned in the main text, but, in annotated texts (ANNEX), there are found *je-dā* (COP-MIR) (pp. 161, 162, 165) and *jeē* (COP-MIR) (p. 112), both of which appear to be instances of what I describe as *jyā̃*. The gloss suggests that she analyzes the instances as the equational copula attached with the mirative suffix *-dā̃* (ibid: 82), which I describe as *-dā̃*: (Note that, in Kaike, mirativity can be coded either by a mirative copula (in copular constructions including periphrastic constructions with a lexical verb) or by the mirative suffix *-dā̃*: attached to the lexical verb). However, the analysis is, at least synchronically, untenable because the forms *je-dā̃* and *jeē* both cannot be explained from *jyā̃ŋ-* + *-dā̃*: by the morphophonological rule /ŋ-dā̃:/ → [ŋ-dā̃:] (e.g., *nu khaŋ-dā̃*: ‘S/he got sick (I just realized that)’).

- c. *an      ŋa/nu-na      yim      jyaŋ-pā*  
      this      1sg/3sg-GEN      house      be-NMLZ

‘This is my/his/her house.’ (I know it)

- d. *nu      nyoə-na      syimi      jyā:*  
      3sg      1pl.incl-GEN      person      be.MIR

‘S/he is our people (i.e., relative)!’ (I just realized that)

- e. *an      ŋa/nu-na      yim      naŋ-pā*  
      this      1sg/3sg-GEN      house      NEG.be-NMLZ

‘This is not my/his/her house.’ (I know it)

- f. *an      nyoə-na      khye      nā:*  
      this      1pl.incl-GEN      field      NEG.be.MIR

‘This is not our field!’ (I just realized that)

As are existential copulas, equational copulas can be used as auxiliaries in periphrastic constructions as shown in the following Watters’ example (34) on which he states, “With the equational copula, *dzeŋpa*, there is no conjunct-disjunct distinction, not even when a sentential complement is embedded to it”.

- (34) *nu-i      yim      doŋ-pa      dzeŋpa*  
      he-ERG      house      make-NMLZ      be:equational

‘(It’s so/It’s a fact) he built a house.’

(Watters 2006: 312)

As a matter of fact, this is a non-mirative statement ‘(I know for sure) it is the case that s/he built (a) house.’, and its mirative counterpart can be stated by the structure *V-pā jyā:* ‘It is the case that s/he built (a) house (I just realized).’ The following are examples from my fieldnote, which show the egophoric/non-egophoric distinction manifested by *V-pā jyaŋ-pā* and *V-pā jyā:*.

(35)

- a. *ālai nu-na pālau “jā:ma jā:ma-na thāū:-lai soə-pā*  
 then 3sg-GEN turn like.this like.this-GEN town-ABL come-NMLZ  
*jyaŋ-pā; nyi-na nām-ma jā:ma jā:ma ra-bo”*  
 be-NMLZ 1pl.excl-GEN village-LOC like.this like.this happen-PFV.NEGO

‘Then, (in) her turn (i.e., she said), “(I) came from such-and-such a place. In our village, such-and-such (an incident) happened.”’

- b. *ŋa-i ra:syi lai thuŋ-pā jyā:*  
 1sg-ERG liquor much drink-NMLZ be.MIR

‘I drank too much.’ (I just realized that)

- c. *nu(-i) pālbo: wai-pā jyā:*  
 3sg(-ERG) Kathmandu.LOC go-NMLZ be.MIR

‘S/he went to Kathmandu.’ (I just realized that)

The following table summarizes my description on the egophoric/non-egophoric distinction and mirativity coded by copulas and compares it with the description in Watters (2006).

**Table 6** Egophoric/non-egophoric (conjunct/disjunct) and mirativity coded by copulas

Description in Watters (2006)				
	Equational		Existential	
	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
Conjunct (Non-mirative)	<i>dzeŋpa</i>		<i>ɲipa</i>	<i>mipa</i>
Disjunct (Mirative)			(only in locative or possessive functions)	
			<i>ɲya</i>	<i>mayã</i>
Description in this article (Honda)				
	Equational		Existential	
	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
Non-Mirative	<i>jyaŋ-pā</i>	<i>naŋ-pā</i>	<i>nyi-pā</i>	<i>miː-pā</i>
Mirative	<i>jyãː</i>	<i>nãː</i>	<i>nyā</i>	<i>mayā</i>

## 8. Conclusion

The following table summarizes the points made in this paper and compares my description with the one in Watters (2006).

**Table 7** Egophoric/non-egophoric (conjunct/disjunct) and mirativity in Kaike (Summary)<sup>24</sup>

Description in Watters (2006)				
	Perfective	Imperfective	Irrealis	
Conjunct	<i>-pa</i>	<i>-tse</i>	<i>-ɲi</i>	
Disjunct	<i>-bo</i>	<i>-ŋə</i>	<i>-dərə</i>	
Copulas				
	Equational		Existential	
	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
Conjunct (Non-mirative)	<i>dzeŋpa</i>		<i>ɲipa</i>	<i>mipa</i>
Disjunct (Mirative)			(only in locative or possessive functions)	
			<i>ɲya</i>	<i>mayā</i>
Description in this article (Honda)				
	Perfective	Imperfective	Future	‘might’ (probability in the future)
Egophoric	<i>-pā</i>		<i>-cye</i>	
Non-egophoric	<i>-bo</i>	<i>-ŋa</i>		<i>-darā</i>
Copulas				
	Equational		Existential	
	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
Non-Mirative	<i>ɲyaŋ-pā</i>	<i>naŋ-pā</i>	<i>ɲi-pā</i>	<i>mi:-pā</i>
Mirative	<i>ɲyā:</i>	<i>nā:</i>	<i>nyā</i>	<i>mayā</i>

It is apparent that the Kaike egophoric/non-egophoric is similar to that of Kathmandu Newar in many ways. First, in both languages, the distinction is binary, which contrasts with a ternary distinction in, e.g., Lhasa Tibetan. Second, volitionality/intentionality (and thus controllability as well) is a key factor, which contrasts with systems in other languages where volitionality/intentionality seems irrelevant or less salient, such as Galo (Post 2013). Third, the distinction is coded by verb suffixes but not by copulas, which also contrasts

<sup>24</sup> The review in this article also applies to Regmi (2013) which, as far as conjunct/disjunct and mirativity are concerned, follows Watters’ description.

with the system in Lhasa Tibetan. Watters' recognition of the conjunct/disjunct distinction on copular verbs certainly caused confusion and misunderstanding of the Kaike system. The following statements in DeLancey (2012) and Post (2013) are such examples.

“In Newar system, intention/volitionality is the fundamental category involved (Hargreaves 2005). On the other hand, the opposition in Kaike is strongly mirative, and volitionality plays no evident role (D. Watters 2006)” (DeLancey 2012: 558)

“A similar concern with the speaker's knowledge state can be found in Lhasa Tibetan and certain Kaike copula/auxiliary constructions, in which volitionality no longer seems to be a factor at all. In both Tibetan and Kaike, use of the “conjunct” form in first person statements implies first-hand or fully-assimilated knowledge, while use of the “disjunct” form in the same contexts implies a sudden discovery – a mirative effect” (Post 2013: 110)

I hope that the description in this article will bring a better understanding of the egophoric/non-egophoric and mirativity in Kaike, which, I hope, can eventually be a better basis for typological comparison with similar systems in other languages.

## Abbreviations

1	first person	IRR	irrealis
2	second person	LOC	locative
3	third person	MIR	mirative
ABL	ablative	NEG	negative
CJ	conjunct	NEGO	non-egophoric
COND	conditional	NMLZ	nominalizer
DAT	dative	PAT	particle
DJ	disjunct	PFV	perfective
EGO	egophoric	PL	plural
EMPH	emphatic	pl	plural (used for pronouns)
ERG	ergative	PN	pronoun
EXP	expressive	PST	past
excl	exclusive (used for pronouns)	PURP	purposive
FUT	future	Q	question
GEN	genitive	REDUP	reduplicated
HS	hearsay	SEQ	sequential
IMPFV	imperfective	sg	singular (used for pronouns)
incl	inclusive (used for pronouns)	SUFF	suffix

## References

DeLancey, Scott

- 2012 “Still mirative after all these days”. *Linguistic Typology* 16: 529–564. DOI: 10.1515/lingty-2012-0020.

Hale, Austin

- 1980 “Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari”. In: Trail, Ronald L. (ed.), *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics 7 (Pacific Linguistics Series A-53)*, 95–106. Canberra: Australian National University.

Hale, Austin and David Watters

- 1973 “A survey of clause patterns”. In: Hale, Austin and David Watters (eds.), *Clause, sentence, and discourse patterns in selected languages of Nepal, part II*, 175–249. Norman, OK: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma. <http://www.sil.org/resources/archives/8939>.

Hargreaves, David

- 2003 “Kathmandu Newar (Nepāl Bāsā)”. In: Thurgood, Graham and Randy LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*, 371–384. London & New York: Routledge.
- 2005 “Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar”. *Himalayan Linguistics* 5: 1–48.

Hill, Nathan W. and Lauren Gawne

- 2017 “The contribution of Tibetan languages to the study of evidentiality”. In: Gawne, Lauren and Nathan W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*, 1–38. DOI: 10.1515/9783110473742-004

Honda, Isao

- 2008a “Some observations on the relationship between Kaike and Tamangic”. *Nepalese Linguistics* 23: 83–115.
- 2008b “The Kaike conjunct/disjunct revisited”. Paper presented at the 41th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics held in University of London, London, U.K.

Post, Mark W.

- 2013 “Person-sensitive TAME marking in Galo: Historical origins and functional motivation”. In: Thornes, Tim, Erik Andvik, Gwendolyn Hyslop and Joana Jansen (eds.), *Functional-historical approaches to explanation: in honor of Scott DeLancey (Typological Studies in Language 103)*, 107–130. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Regmi, Ambika

- 2013 *A Grammar of Magar Kaike. (Languages of the World/Materials, 496.)* Muenchen: LINCOM.

San Roque, Lila, Simeon Floyd and Elisabeth Norcliffe

- 2018 “Egophoricity: An introduction”. In: Floyd, Simeon, Elisabeth Norcliffe and Lila San Roque (eds.), *Egophoricity*, 1–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tournadre, Nicolas

- 2008 “Arguments against the concept of ‘conjunct’/‘disjunct’ in Tibetan”. In: Huber, Brigitte, Marianne Volkart and Paul Widmer (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, Band I: Chomolangma*, 281–308. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.
- 2017 “A typological sketch of evidential/epistemic categories in the Tibetic languages”. In: Gawne, Lauren and Nathan W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*, 95–129. DOI: 10.1515/9783110473742-004

Watters, David

- 2002 *A Grammar of Kham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 2003 “Some preliminary observations on the relationship between Kham, Magar, (and Chepang)”. Paper presented at the 36th International Conferences on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics held in La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.
  - 2006 “The conjunct-disjunct distinction in Kaike”. *Nepalese Linguistics* 22: 300–319.
  - 2008 “Nominalization in the Kiranti and Central Himalayish languages of Nepal”. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 31(2): 1–43.
- Widmer, Manuel
- 2017 “Review: Lauren Gawne & Nathan W. Hill (eds.). 2016. *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*”. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 40(2): 285–303. DOI: 10.1075/ltba.00002.wid
  - 2020 “Same same but different: On the relationship between egophoricity and evidentiality”. In: Bergqvist, Henrik and Seppo Kittilä (eds.), *Evidentiality, egophoricity, and engagement*, 263–287. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3975811
- Widmer, Manuel and Fernando Zúñiga
- 2017 “Egophoricity, involvement, and semantic roles in Tibeto-Burman languages”. *Open Linguistics* 3: 419–441. DOI: 10.1515/0pli-2017-0021