PERSON MARKERS:
FINITE CONJUNCT AND DISJUNCT VERB FORMS IN NEWARI¹

AUSTIN HALE

1. THE PROBLEM

Anyone who attempts to learn Newari soon becomes aware that in certain declarative clauses there is one form of the verb (the conjunct form) that normally occurs with first person actors and that there is another form of the verb (the disjunct form) that normally occurs with non-first person actors.² Thus, with the verb, wane 'to go', we get the following forms in the past tense:

1. Ji ana wana.  \( I \) went there (conjunct).
2. Cha ana wana.  \( You \) went there (disjunct).
3. Wa ana wana.  \( He/She \) went there (disjunct).

One might be tempted simply to consider wana to be the first person form except for the fact that in questions this is the normal second person form,

4. Cha ana wana la? \( Did \ you \) go there (conjunct)?

and for the fact that the conjunct form can be a normal third person form in certain embeddings, as, for example, in Sentence 5:

5. Waa wa ana wana dhaka la. \( He \) said that \( he \) went there (himself).³

In this context the disjunct form also occurs but with a different meaning:

6. Waa wa ana wana dhaka la. \( He \) said that \( he \) (someone else) went there.

Sentence 6 could in fact be an example of direct quotation where Sentence 5 could only be an indirect quotation.⁴ As a direct quotation Sentence 5 would have to be recast as follows:

7. Waa "Ji ana wana," dhaka la. \( He \) said, "\( I \) went there."
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To complicate matters still further, one soon discovers that there are impersonal verbs which have no finite conjunct forms at all.⁵

8. Дж ваха слиа.
Chēq ваха слиа.
Wēq ваха слиа.

I came to know that fact (disjunct).
You came to know that fact (disjunct).
He came to know that fact (disjunct).

9. Дж ваха таа таа.
Chēq ваха таа таа.
Wēq ваха таа таа.

I heard that noise (disjunct).
You heard that noise (disjunct).
He heard that noise (disjunct).

The problem to which this paper is addressed, then, is that of determining what it is that controls the use of finite conjunct and disjunct forms of the verb.

2. CONJUNCT, DISJUNCT, AND THE TRUE INSTIGATOR

The problem regarding impersonal verbs points up a very central fact about the conjunct-disjunct pattern in Newari. Finite conjunct forms are appropriate only where the actor of the clause is portrayed as a true instigator, one responsible for an intentional act. Even with personal verbs disjunct forms replace conjunct forms where the actor is not portrayed as true instigator. Thus the ceb pala in Example 10 is conjunct,

10. Дж ла пала.

whereas in Example 11 pala is disjunct:

11. Дж ла пала — чаба хана
mākhu ла?

I cut the meat (intentionally).
I cut the meat (quite by accident) —

you saw me didn't you?

The same distinction is made in questions. As shown in Example 4 a conjunct form will normally accompany a second person question which has a personal verb. Thus Sentence 12 has a conjunct verb as one would normally expect:

12. Чаба ла?

Did you get up (voluntarily)?

Thakurlal Manandhar has pointed out, however, that where the action is portrayed as involuntary and the actor for this reason does not figure as a true instigator, the disjunct form will occur, as it does in Example 13:

13. Чаба ла?

Did you get up (involuntarily)?

The reason that impersonal verbs have no finite conjunct forms is thus quite clear. They have no actors that qualify as true instigators. So, while ṭeye 'to hear' is impersonal and has no finite conjunct form, nene 'to listen' does have a finite conjunct form since it also can have a true instigator. Similarly, dune 'to collapse' is impersonal but thune 'to raise to the ground' is personal. Significantly, those
verbs which lack personal conjunct forms also lack normal imperatives. The few impersonal verbs, such as sīye 'to die' that do occasionally occur in the imperative have rather special semantic interpretations in this usage. They are not thought of as commands in the ordinary sense.

3. QUOTES, QUOTE FRAMES, AND CO-REFERENTIAL ACTORS

Consider again the following sentences:

1. Jī ana wāna. I went there.

5. Wāq wa ana wāna dhakā ḍhāla. He said that he went there (himself).

7. Wāq "Jī ana wāna" dhakā ḍhāla. He said "I went there."

Let us refer to the underlined clauses in Sentences 5 and 7 as quotes and to the non-underlined portions as quote frames. In 5 the actor of the quote frame, wāq 'he (agentive form)' refers to the same individual as the actor of the quote, wā 'he'. In Example 7 the actors wāq 'he' and jī 'I' both refer to the same person. In both 5 and 7 the verb of the quote, wāna 'went', is conjunct in form. This correlation suggests that the use of conjunct forms is not related to the person of the actor as such but is related rather to co-reference of actors. If the actor of the quote refers to the same individual as the actor of the quote frame, then the verb of the quote is conjunct in form.

Can this observation be extended to account for the conjunct forms in unembedded clauses such as Sentence 1? If we follow Saddock, 1974, in positing an abstract performative for all such sentences then there appears to be quite a natural extension of this observation which accounts for the conjunct form of wāna 'went' in Sentence 1 as well as for the disjunct form of dhāla 'said' in Sentences 5 and 7. From this general point of view we can look at Sentence 1 as a quote within a quote frame where the quote frame is a verbalisation of the speech act. For a declarative sentence such as Example 1 the quote frame could be supplied as follows:

1a. [Jī chīta] "Jī ana wāna" [I say to you] "I went there."

An implicit quote frame of this sort constitutes an abstract performative in Saddock's view. Once such a quote frame is supplied it is easy to see how the account of conjunct and disjunct forms that has been suggested above for the verbs of embedded quotes can be naturally extended to account for unembedded clauses as well. Sentence 1 has the conjunct form, wāna 'went', because its actor, Jī 'I', refers to the actor of the implicit quote frame. Sentences 5 and 7 have the disjunct
form, dhālā 'said', because in each case the actor, waq waq 'he', does not refer to the same individual as the actor of the implicit quote frame, namely the speaker. This also explains why the conjunct form is associated with first person actors in independent declarative clauses.

Direct quotes involve the same pattern of verb forms as unembedded clauses. Where the quote has a first person actor it also has a conjunct main verb regardless of the form of the quote frame subject.

14. Žu "I ana wana" dhakā I said "I went there."
   dhayā.
15. Chaq "I ana wana" dhakā You said "I went there."
   dhālā.
16. Waq "I ana wana" dhakā He said "I went there."
   dhālā.
17. Žu "Cha ana wana" dhakā I said "You went there."
   dhayā.
18. Chaq "Cha ana wana" dhakā You said "You went there."
   dhālā.
19. Waq "Cha ana wana" dhakā He said "You went there."
   dhālā.
20. Žu "Wa ana wana" dhakā I said "He went there."
   dhayā.
21. Chaq "Wa ana wana" dhakā You said "He went there."
   dhālā.
22. Waq "Wa ana wana" dhakā He said "He went there."
   dhālā.

In Sentences 14 through 22 the conjunct forms are underlined. For every conjunct form there is a first person actor. In 14, 15, and 16 the actor of the quote refers to the same individual as the actor of the quote frame. In 14, 17, and 20 the actor of the quote frame refers to the same individual as the actor of the implicit quote frame, namely the speaker.

4. QUESTIONS AND THE CO-REFERENCE RULE

Consider now Examples 2 and 4.

2. Cha ana wana. You went there (disjunct).
4. Cha ana wana Iā? Did you go there (conjunct)?

To this point we have seen that the disjunct form in Example 2 can be explained on the basis of the fact that even though cha 'you' is portrayed as true instigator it does not refer to the same individual as the actor of the implicit quote frame, namely the speaker. What explanation, then, can be offered for the fact that the verb in