## The Grammaticalization of the Newari Verb tǫl

Carol Genetti
University of Oregon

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with the different grammaticalized uses of the verb tǫl-[1] 'to put/keep' in Newari, a Tibeto-Burman language of Nepal.[2] This verb has developed three grammatical functions, as a benefactive/purpose marker, as a perfect, and as an evidential. As a perfect marker and evidential it contrasts with another grammaticalized verb, dhun(-k)- 'to finish'. All three uses will be shown to be consistent with the semantics encoded by the lexical uses of this verb.

## 2.0 PRELIMINARY NOTES ON NEWARI GRAMMAR

## 2.1 The Tense/Aspect System

The Newari tense/aspect system consists of a set of inflected verb forms and several auxiliaries. The most common finite verb forms are those referred to as past and non-past conjunct and disjunct (glossed as PC/PD/NPC/NPD).[3] The past versus non-past distinction is probably better considered past perfective versus future. The past forms clearly contrast with the two categories of the imperfective -- the progressive and the stative/habitual. Thus all uses of this morpheme are not only past, but also perfective. However, a simple form of a verb with a non-past suffix can refer either to one event or to iteration of the event, as in the following example:

---

[1]The symbol ǫ represents the mid, back, lax vowel [ɔ] . A ~ over a vowel represents nasalization.

[3]There are some other stative and imperative forms, which this paper will not be concerned with.

(1) wọ ji-gu thae chš-š wo-i.
    he I-GEN place house-LOC come-NPD.
    He will come to our house (once or often).

Thus the non-past forms are neutral with respect to perfectivity,
and simply code future tense.
    The conjunct/disjunct pairs at first appear to be agreement
with first versus non-first person:

(2) jī-ɪ duku syan-a.
    I-ERG goat kill-PC.
    I killed the goat.

(3) chǒ-ǧ/wǒ-ǧ duku syat-ọ.
    you-ERG/he-ERG goat kill- PD.
    You/he killed the goat.

However, the disjunct form can occur with first person,
indicating a lack of volition on the part of the agent (cf. Hale
1980):

(4) jī-ɪ baltin tunthi-i kur-k-a.
    I-ERG bucket well-LOC drop-CAUS-PC.
    I dropped the bucket in the well (deliberately).

(5) jī-ɪ baltin tunthi-i kur-kọl-ọ.
    I-ERG bucket well-LOC drop-CAUS-PD.
    I dropped the bucket in the well (accidentally).

(6) jī-ɪ kutu won-a.
    I-ERG  fall go-PC.
    I fell (deliberately).

(7) ji kutu won-ọ.
    I  fall go-PD.
    I fell (accidentally).

The conjunct also occurs with non-first persons in various
circumstances, including second person direct questions,
and indirect quotes (Hale 1980).
    Therefore a simple explanation of person agreement is
insufficient.  Similar systems have been reported for some
dialects of Tibetan (Schottelndreyer 1980, DeLancey 1985a).
In Lhasa Tibetan the conjunct/disjunct distinction is meshed
with a system of obligatory evidential marking which codes
whether the speaker's evidence of the event reported was
direct perception, indirect inference or hearsay.  The conjuct
form fits nicely into this schema as a further extension

on the end of direct perception, since it codes direct evidence
of volition, the ultimate cause of an event (DeLancey 1985a).
    The Newari system outlined above is not nearly as complex
as that found in Lhasa, and thus does not furnish the same
direct evidence for the fundamentally evidential nature
of the conjunct/disjunct contrast. However, considering
the close cultural and geographic ties between the two language
groups, and the fact that such a distinction is exceedingly
rare cross-linguistically, one would like to propose the
same account for both of them. Thus it is intriguing to
find, as we will in section 3.4, an evidential contrast
in Newari which parallels the Lhasa system.

2.2 The Aspectual Auxiliaries cwon- and dhun(-k)-

    The other parts of the tense aspect system which will
be of concern in the following discusion are the auxiliaries
cwŏn-, which marks the progressive, and dhun(-k)- , which
is a perfect marker. Both of these are lexical verbs in
their own right. cwon- means 'sit' or 'stay', dhun-k-
is formed from the verb dhun- 'to finish', and -k-, the
causative suffix. The non-suffixed form of the verb is
only found with first person agents, and only with the disjunct
form. It contrasts semantically with the causative form,
indicating less volition on the part of the agent:

(8) jĩ-ĩ phǫlphul nǫ-e dhun-ǫ.
    I-ERG fruit    eat-INF finish-PD.
    I finished eating the fruit.

(9) jĩ-ĩ phǫlphul nǫ-e dhun-k-a.
    I-ERG fruit eat-INF finish-CAUS-PC.
    I finished eating the fruit.

My informant says that the second sentence implies that
the fruit was eaten rapidly, in order to be finished by
a particular point of time, for a particular purpose. The
difference in volition is mirrored by the inability of the
non-causative alternant to co-occur with the conjunct suffixes.
    When cwon- and dhun(-k)- function grammatically as
auxiliaries, they follow a non-finite form of the verb,
and primarily mark the grammatical categories of progressive
and perfect, although they can be roughly translated with
their lexical meanings. Thus the following sentences are
translated by my informant in two ways:

(10) wɔ̃-ɠ sǫphu bwon-a cwon-ǫ.
     he-ERG book read-PART stay-PD.
     He was reading a book. OR  He stayed reading a book.

(11) wɔ̃-ɠ sǫphu bwon-e dhun-kǫl-ǫ
     he-ERG book read-INF finish-CAUS-PD.
     He has read the book. OR  He finished reading the
     book.

That both translations are possible shows that the gram-
matical function has not diverged significantly from the
lexical sense.  This suggests that the process of grammati-
calization is in the beginning stages, compared to, for
example, the causative morpheme, which no longer carries
its own lexical meaning.  These are thus the Newari analogue
of 'versatile verbs' as defined by Matisoff (1969).

2.3  Clause Chaining and Grammaticalization

     Newari is a clause chaining language. Clause chains can
be identified by final verbs with finite marking, and non-final
verbs in a participle form with a lengthened final vowel
(here glossed NF for non-final):[4]

(12) jɪ-ɪ pǫsǫl-e won-a-a sǫphu miy-a.
     I-ERG store-LOC go-PART-NF book buy-PC.
     I went to the store and bought a book.

This construction is often functionally equivalent to English
conjunction with sequential ordering of events, as the translation
of the above sentence indicates.  Thus in texts, there occur
sentences such as the following:

(13) ǫthe juy-a-a          wǫ-yagu lha tuti nɔ̃ than-a-a
     thus happen-PART-NF he-GEN hand leg also stick-PART-NF
     This happening, his hands and legs also stuck,

     wɔ̃-ɠ    chũye    ya-e    mǫ-phuy-a-a       tǫskɔ̃he
     he-ERG nothing do-INF NEG-able-PART-NF very
     he could do nothing, and cried out very

_____

[4]Clause chains are often more complicated than this, since
they can contain a number of types of nominalized, subordinate
or complement clauses which are not directly relevant here.

```
        hal-a      hǫl-ǫ.
        cry-PART bring-PD.
        loudly.
```

When two or more clauses share the same arguments, these may be deleted in all but the first clause, leading to a chain of non-final verbs followed by a final verb in finite form:

```
(14) chɔ̃-ɔ̃ sǫphu kay-a-a      nyan-a-a    won-ǫ.
     you-ERG book take-PART-NF buy-PART-NF go-PD.
     You took the book, bought it, and left.
```

Such verb chains are analogous to the 'nonce concatenation' constructions found in eastern Tibeto-Burman languages (Matisoff 1969, 1973) and clearly constitute the precondition for the development of grammaticalized verbs (cf. DeLancey 1985b).
    The clearest cases of grammaticalization in Newari are verbs which have developed an aspectual, directional or causative function. These constructions are characterized by a non-final verb which is in either the infinitive or the participle form. However, the latter lack the lengthened vowel which indicates the non-final participle form found in clause chains:

```
(15) ji-mi kija pyakɔ̃ lhuy-a cwon-ǫ.
     I-GEN brother dance dance-PART stay-PD.
     My brother is dancing.
```

```
(16) jhɔ̃gǫ bway-a wǫn-ǫ.
     bird fly-PART come-PD.
     The bird flew this way.
```

```
(17) jĩ-ĩ wǫ-yatǫ wo-e-k-a.
     I-ERG he-DAT go-INF-CAUS-PC.
     I made him go.
```

```
(18) wɔ̃-ɔ̃ ja nǫ-e dhun-kǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG rice eat-INF finish-CAUS-PD.
     He finished eating the rice.
```

The reduction in form parallels a change of meaning. If sentences (15), (16), and (18) had the main verb in the long participle form of a clause chain, the sentences would

translate differently:[5]

(15) Having danced, my brother stayed.
(16) The bird flew around, then came.
(18) He ate the rice, then finished (something besides eating).

In general, the syntactic reduction of the non-final verb form, which is present in all cases of grammaticalized verbs in Newari, correlates with a tighter semantic binding of the events coded by the respective verbs.


## 3.0  tǫl-

### 3.1  Lexical Meaning

The verb tǫl- 'to put' or 'to keep' has the following forms:

| | |
|---|---|
| tǫy-a | PART or PC |
| tǫl-ǫ | PD |
| tǫ-e | INF or NPC |
| tǫ-i | NPD or reduced form of tǫy-a |

The normal meaning of this verb in simple sentences is 'to put'. Unlike English 'put', this verb does not require an overt syntactic reference to the locative goal. Thus in many instances it is best translated as 'put away':

(19) Ram-ǥ dhewa tebǫl-e tǫl-ǫ.
Ram-ERG money table-LOC put-PD.
Ram put the money on the table.

(20) Ram-ǫ dhewa tǫl-ǫ.
Ram-ERG money put-PD.
Ram put (away) the money.

In these sentences the verb can also be translated as durative 'keep' although 'put' is the preferred reading. This verb can be progressivized with cwon-, or with a partially redupli- cated form to indicate simultaneity with the action of the final clause:

---

[5]The causative morpheme kǫl- has grammaticalized to the point of having no independent lexical meaning, and has become syntactically a suffix. Thus it can never be separated from a main verb in a clause chain.

(21) wǫ-ǫ tisa tǫy-a cwon-a-a....
he-ERG jewelry put-PART stay-PART-NF...
He was putting (away) the jewelry...

(22) wǫ-ǫ tisa tǫ-tǫ wǫ-ǫ dhal-ǫ...
he-ERG jewelry put-put he-ERG say-PD...
While he was putting (away) the jewelry he said...

Both of these sentences can only be translated as 'put'; these progressive constructions do not permit the lexical meaning of 'keep'.

In English there are two related semantic distinctions between 'put' and 'keep'. First, where 'put' is a telic event, 'keep' is inherently stative and atelic. Related to this are the case relations of the verbs, such that 'put' requires a goal, whereas 'keep' requires a location, although this is not reflected in the syntactic coding. Both these distinctions suggest that 'put' denotes the entrance into the state coded by 'keep'. In Newari, the progressive <u>cwon-</u> does not occur with verbs denoting states, but only events. Thus the impossibility of the translation 'keep' in the above sentences.

One important point to stress is that while in English the event 'put' and the state 'keep' are coded as separate verbs, in Newari these are the same lexical unit, and the division between the two meanings is not as clear. The English translations tend to dichotomize the difference, while my Newari informant is more comfortable talking about the relative length of time of the event and/or resultant state. While I will be opposing 'put' and 'keep' in the translation, this point should be kept in mind.

There are two constructions which require the 'keep' translation. The first is when an adverbial is added that denotes an extended period of time:

(23) jǐ-ǐ tisa dǫchi tǫkkǫ tǫy-a.
I-ERG jewelry year up to keep-PC.
I kept the jewelry for a year.

Without the adverbial this would simply mean 'I put the jewelry (away)'. The other is to use this verb grammatically.

3.2 <u>tǫl</u> as 'keep'.

<u>tǫl</u> is a grammaticalized verb, as defined in 2.3, above. It follows a main verb in the short participle form, and the resulting meaning differs from the same sentence with a clause chain.

   To code the meaning of 'keep', tǫl- can occur once in the participle form, then be repeated with a grammatical use. Thus the following sentences form a minimal pair:

(24) wǒ-ǒ sǫphu ch8-8 tǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG book house-LOC put-PD.
     He put the book in the house.

(25) wǒ-ǒ sǫphu ch8-8 tǫy-a tǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG book house-LOC put-PART put-PD.
     He kept the book in the house.

The same contrast exists in the progressive, where the event verb is progressivized with cwon- , and the durative verb is again marked with the grammaticalized tǫl-:

(26) jǐ-ɪ tisa tǫy-a cwon-a-bǫle...
     I-ERG jewelry put-PART stay-PART-when...
     When I was putting the jewelry (somewhere)...

(27) jǐ-ɪ tisa tǫy-a tǫ-i-bǫle...[6]
     I-ERG jewelry put-PART put-PART-when
     When I was keeping the jewelry...

   In examples (25) and (27), the final tǫl- serves to code a different aspectual meaning, by extending the resultant state of the event coded by the first verb. When following 'put' the extension of the resultant state leads to the lexical meaning of 'keep'.
   The functions of tǫl with other lexical verbs varies with semantic and pragmatic factors. One of the functions of tǫl- when used with other verbs is simply to code the lexical meaning of 'keep', when the object of both verbs is co-referential:

(28) jǐ-ɪ ji-gu lǒ khun-a tǫy-a.
     I-ERG I-GEN clothes tear-PART keep-PART.
     I'll tear my clothes and keep them (for you to take tomorow).

(29) jǐ-ɪ wǫ-yatǫ sǫphu nyan-a tǫy-a.
     I-ERG he-DAT book buy-PART keep-PC.
     I bought a book and kept it for him.

_____

   [6]Before -bǫle 'when', the participle form tǫya is phonologically reduced to tǫí.

Note that while there is no benefactive specified in the first of these examples, there is an implied benefactive or purpose which is often associated with this use of the verb. This is likely because if a person keeps something, and tells someone about it, there is a particular reason why it is kept. The same process is seen in the following example, where 'make a chair and keep it' implies a benefactive or purpose. This contrasts with the simple 'make a chair' where keeping the chair for oneself is the unmarked and assumed interpretation:

(30) wɔ̃-ɔ̃ mec dek-a tɔl-ǫ.
     he-ERG chair make-PART keep-PD.
     He made a chair and kept it (for someone).

Note that although the first verb in the sentence is in the short participle form, without the lengthening of the vowel which indicates a clause chain, the two events can be viewed separately, even as occuring in sequence, as the translations suggest. These examples could be interpreted as having a less grammatical function than those (below) for which such an interpretation is not possible.

While I noted before that tɔl- following other verbs could mean 'keep' providing the objects are co-referential, I was purposely vague with reference to the subjects of the two clauses, which it turns out can refer to different participants. Normally in a clause chain if the second clause has a different subject than the first, then the second subject must be specified:

(31) Ashis khwoy-a-a pyã won-ǫ.
     Ashis cry-PART-NF out go-PD.
     Ashis cried and left.

(32) Ashis khwoy-a-a ji pyã won-a.
     Ashis cry-PART-NF I out go-PC.
     Ashis cried and I left.

However in constructions with tɔl- this is often not the case. Thus compare the following two examples:

(33) jĩ-ĩ wǫ-yake sǫphu tya kǫy-a tǫy-a.
     I-ERG he-ASSO book loan take-PART keep-PC.
     I borrowed the book from him and still have it (although I'll give it back to him).

(34) jɪ-ɪ wǫ-yatǫ sǫphu tya biy-a tǫy-a.[7]
     I-ERG he-DAT book loan give-PART keep-PC.
     I lent him the book (and he is still keeping it).

Whereas in the first example the subject is co-referential,
in the second example this is clearly not the case, although
the translation as 'keep' works perfectly well. This is
yet another indication of the grammaticalized status of
this verb, and begins to suggest the semantic functions
associated with the process.

3.3 tǫl- grammaticalized as a marker of the perfect

    In example (34) above, the event of lending the book
occured prior to the time of speech. The meaning of this
sentence differs from (35):

(35) jɪ-ɪ wǫ-yatǫ sǫphu tya biy-a.
     I-ERG he-DAT book loan give-PC.
     I lent him the book.

Here 'give' has the simple PC form, with no auxiliaries.
(34) specifies that the state that the event led up to -
- possession of the book by the third party -- still holds,
thus emphasizing the gap in time between the event and the
time of speech. Furthermore, the fact that the book is
still with the borrower is obviously important information,
or else it would not be emphasized by the tǫl- construction.
Thus the news is also currently relevant. This fact is
also suggested by the implied purpose discussed above.
These two senses constitute the standard definition of perfect
aspect. The compatibility of this function with the lexical
meaning of 'keep' can be seen quite clearly in some of the
examples above, such as (29):

(29) jɪ-ɪ wǫ-yatǫ sǫphu nyan-a tǫy-a.
     I-ERG he-DAT book buy-PART keep-PC.
     I bought a book and kept it for him.

_____

    [7]I cannot help noting the phonological similarities
between this tya and the verb I'm chiefly concerned with,
tǫl- (tǫy-a-a PART-NF form). It seems possible that this
could be a phonologically reduced form of this verb, most
likely of the NF participle form, such that the stem vowel
would be deleted, as opposed to the long vowel at the end.

which could easily be translated as 'I have bought a book
for him', which in English implies that that the the book
is not yet given. Similarly, it is not surprising to find
constructions such as the following, which my informant
translates into English with 'have', for the perfect, but
also with 'already', which emphasizes both the gap in time
and the current relevance:

(36) jĩ-ĩ wǫ-yatǫ dhay-a tǫy-a.
     I-ERG he-DAT say-PART keep-PD.
     I have already told him (about you).

(37) chŏ-ŏ wǫ-yatǫ sǫphu nyan-a biy-a tǫl-ǫ.
     you-ERG he-DAT book buy-PART give-PART put-PD.
     You already bought a book for him.

(38) jĩ-ĩ chǫn-gu chŏ miy-a tǫy-a.
     I-ERG you-GEN house buy-PART keep-PD.
     I've already sold your house (for you or some other
     purpose).

The use of this verb as a marker of perfect is actually
more complicated. The first of these three examples, (36),
could not be used in any context, but must imply lasting
consequence of the event. Thus the context supplied by
my informant is one where 'he' is a potential employer,
and 'you' a hopeful employee. The other implication of
this sentence is that the event of telling occured a considerable
length of time before the scheduled interview. If this
were not implied, the sentence would have instead the more
common marker of the perfect, dhun(-k)-.
The semantics of the verb 'finish' emphasize the time
gap between the event and the time of reference of the discourse,
thus it is fairly common to find it developing to a perfect
marker cross-linguistically (Comrie 1976). In Newari, the
distinction between the causative and non-causative forms
is retained in the grammaticalized use of this verb. Consider
again sentences (8) and (9):

(8) jĩ-ĩ phǫlphul nǫ-e dhun-ǫ.
    I-ERG fruit    eat-INF finish-PD.
    I finished eating the fruit.

(9) jĩ-ĩ phǫlphul nǫ-e dhun-k-a.
    I-ERG fruit eat-INF finish-CAUS-PC.
    I finished eating the fruit.

These could both be translated 'I have eaten the fruit' with the contrast in degree of volition discussed in 2.2.

The contrast between dhun(-k)- and tǫl- seems to be, at least in some cases, one of the length of time in the gap in question. This matches up nicely with the semantics of the verbs, since dhun(-k)- emphasizes the end point of the event, whereas tǫl- denotes the resultant state. Thus sentence (38) above contrasts with the same sentence with dhun(-k)-, which implies that the selling of the house was recently completed:

(38) jī-ī chǫn-gu chě miy-a tǫy-a.
     I-ERG you-GEN house buy-PART keep-PD.
     I've already sold your house (quite a while ago).

(39) jī-ī chǫn-gu chě mi-i dhun-k-a.
     I-ERG you-GEN house sell-INF finish-CAUS-PC.
     I've sold your house (quite recently).

The same distinction exists in the future:

(40) jī-ī chǫn-gu chě miy-a tǫ-e.
     I-ERG you-GEN house sell-PART keep-NPC.
     I'll have sold your house (long before your return).

(41) jī-ī chǫn-gu chě mi-i dhun-k-e.
     I-ERG you-GEN house sell-INF finish-CAUS-NPC.
     I'll have sold your house (by the time you get back).[8]

3.4 tǫl and dhun(-k)- as evidential markers

There is yet another semantic distinction between the two perfects which is quite different in some senses, but when examined in conjunction with the original lexical meaning of the verbs in question, seems a natural semantic extension.
A connection between the perfect and evidentiality has been observed in a number of languages (cf. Comrie 1976, DeLancey 1981, 1982, Slobin and Aksu 1982). In Newari, the two perfect markers again contrast to form an evidential system. tǫl- can mark direct evidence, whereas dhun(-k)-

-------

[8]While my informant was initially quite sure of this distinction in our first two discussions of this verb, during the third session he wavered to some extent on this point, saying that the house could be sold at the same time for either sentence, both in the future and the past tenses. (My impression was that he was confused at that point).

marks inference. Consider again the lexical semantics
of 'keep'.

When a *person keeps* something, it remains in that person's
possession, so that he or she at any point has access to
it. Thus example (30):

(30) wǒ-ǒ mec deka tǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG chair make-PART keep-PD.
     He made a chair and kept it (for someone).

implies that the chair is completed, but not yet given to
the person for whom it is intended, so it is possible to
see the chair and thus vouch for the truth of the statement. This
is one semantic property of the verb tǫl- which allows for
its grammatical extension as a marker of evidentiality.
Thus there are sentences like the following:

(42) wǒ-ǒ chě sapha yan-a tǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG house clean do-PART keep-PD.
     He has cleaned the house.

(43) wǒ-ǒ jhya tǫchan-a tǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG window break-PART keep-PD.
     He has broken the window.

   Both of these sentences could be interpreted as meaning
that the house, or the window, was purposely kept in the
condition brought about by the event. Thus the benefactive/pur-
pose feature of this verb is relevant in these examples.
These sentences also imply that the speaker directly witnessed
the state which was deliberately prolonged. However, the
speaker did not witness the event itself. Thus there is
a reading based on perception of the resultant state, which
here combines with the benefactive/purpose use, although
this combination is not always necessary, dependent on the
semantics of the sentence, as in the following example:

(44) mǫste-sǒ mhitǫy-a tǫl-ǫ.
     children-ERG play-PART keep-PD.
     The children have played (I can tell because the room
     is all messed up.)

Here a reading of intent to keep the room messy is clearly
inappropriate. Rather, the speaker asserts the truth of
the statement by using a verb which indicates direct evidence
of the result.

   The other semantic feature of the verb tǫl- which con-
tributes to its use as an evidential is that of the anteriority

coded by the perfect, as discussed above. If an event has been completed, then the resulting state is available as evidence. Thus the sentence:

(45) wǯ-ǯ ja nǫy-a tǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG rice eat-PART keep-PD.
     He's already eaten the rice.

codes the perfect, and in addition would be used when, upon returning home one finds the empty rice pot. Direct evidence of the resulting state is obligatory here, although the event itself must not have been seen. Also, this sentence strongly implies that the absence of the rice will somehow affect the speaker. Either he was planning to eat the rice himself, or the person who ate the rice did the speaker a favor by eating it. Thus the benefactive/purpose meaning, the perfect and the evidential cannot be separated in this example. I have no examples where perfectivity and evidentiality could be separated, since all sentences which are marked for evidentiality are intrinsically completed, and currently relevant.

The evidential contrast between tǫl- and dhun(-k)- can be seen in the following pairs of sentences. In all cases the actual event was not witnessed by the speaker:

(46) wǯ-ǯ swama piy-a tǫl-ǫ.
     he-ERG flower plant-PART keep-PD.
     He has planted flowers (they're blooming).

(47) wǯ-ǯ swama pi-i dhun-k-ǫlǫ.
     he-ERG flower plant-INF finish-CAUS-PD.
     He's planted flowers (but they're not up yet).

(47) mǫnu-te-sǯ duku-tǫ syan-a tǫl-ǫ.
     person-PL-ERG goat-DAT kill-PART keep-PD.
     The people have killed the goat (I saw the dead goat lying there).

(49) mǫnu-te-sǫ duku-tǫ sya-e dhun-k-ǫlǫ.
     person-PL-ERG goat-DAT kill-INF finish-CAUS-PD.
     The people have killed the goat (I didn't see it but I can infer it.

In these examples, if the speaker had witnessed the events directly, the simple past disjunct form would have been used. Thus there is a three way evidential contrast.

The use of tǫl- as a marker of direct evidence is appropriate providing that evidence is possible. Thus while tǫl- cannot

be used with won- 'go' or si- 'die', it can co-occur with 'jump' and 'kill', as in the following:

(50) mǫnu-nɔ̃ pǫkha tinhuy-a tǫl-ǫ.
     man-ERG wall jump-PART keep-PD.
     The man jumped (over) the wall (I can tell from his footprints in the mud).

(51) Ram-yatǫ syan-a tǫl-ǫ.
     Ram-DAT kill-PART keep-PD.
     Ram was killed (I saw his corpse).

However, the effect on the patient does not have to be visible. Thus tǫl- can be used with 'meet', but the possible interpretations become complicated:

(52) chɔ̃-ɔ̃ mǫnu-yatǫ napǫlǫn-a tǫy-a.
     you-ERG man-DAT meet-PART keep-PD.
     You've met the man.

This sentence either implies that you've met the man a while ago and still know him, thus the interpretation of the grammaticalized verb as perfect; or you've just met him and you're still in conversation with him, thus both perfect and evidential use of the morpheme; or you've met him and he's a valuable buisness contact, thus the benefactive/purpose interpretation is valid. Clearly in this case the three cannot be separated. However this does show that there does not need to be physical evidence for the verb to apply.
     There is yet a further development in the use of tǫl, so that it can be used to express extreme certainty based on inference, presumably implying that the speaker is as certain as if he'd had direct perception:

(53) wǫ birami mǫ-ju-gu-sa wɔ̃-ɔ̃ sidhek-a tǫ-i.
     he sick NEG-happen-NOM-if he-ERG finish-PART keep-NPD.
     If he hadn't been sick, he would've finished (the work).

(54) wǫ birami mǫ-ju-gu-sa wɔ̃-ɔ̃ sidhek-e dhun-k-i.
     he sick NEG-happen-NOM-if he-ERG finish-INF finish-CAUS-NPD.
     idem.

The sentence with tǫl- implies greater certainty on the part of the speaker than that with dhun(-k)-i. However since the event is in the future, there is no possibility of direct evidence, particularly in a conditional.

## 4.0 Conclusions

The Newari verb tol- has three grammatical uses all stemming from the lexical meaning of 'put/keep'. These are the benefactive/purpose, the perfect and the evidential. Although I have no diachronic evidence to suggest the stages in the evolution of these functions, the semantics suggest the following:

(1) tol- means 'put', and 'keep' which denotes long periods of time. Implied benefactive or purpose.
(2) tol- used in clause chains with co-referential objects, and still retains 'keep' meaning.
(3) The long period of time denoted by 'keep' grammaticalizes to a marker of anteriority, contrasting with dhun-k- by length of time. Perhaps this step corresponded to the loss of the NF marker on the preceding verb.
(4) The perfect is extended to include direct evidence, again tol- contrasts with dhun(-k)-. This is the current state of affairs.
(5) Direct evidence of resultant state extended to inference.

Newari thus can be seen as developing an evidential system which is somewhat similar to that of Lhasa Tibetan (DeLancey 1985a).

| Newari conjunct/disjunct | evidence witnessed event | Lhasa sδδ |
|---|---|---|
| -tọl | direct perception of resultant state | -saa |
| dhun(-k)- | inference | -p -ree |

It is clear that these systems do not match up on a one-to-one basis. The Newari system is still very new compared to that rigidly grammaticalized in Lhasa, where one of the three forms must be chosen for every perfective final verb. However it is interesting that they both have three term systems, with the third term being that of perception of the resultant state. In both languages the marker for the category of direct evidence derives from the verb 'put', although as the Newari and Tibetan forms are not apparently cognate, these must represent at least partly independent (though very likely mutually influenced) developments.
Remember also that both Lhasa and Newari have the conjunct/disjunct distinction. This strongly suggests that

the conjunct/disjunct distinction and evidence on the basis
of perception of the resulting state are indeed related,
and this supports the applicability of DeLancey's (1985a)
analysis of Lhasa to Newari. Considering the extreme sensitivity
of the ergative system to volitionality, it is clear that
in this language the effect of semantics on syntax is very
great. The process of grammaticalization of evidentiality
in Newari indicates a trend toward increasing syntacticization
of these semantic parameters, and suggests possible movement
towards a rigidly syntacticized system, such as that found
in Lhasa.

## REFERENCES

Comrie, B. (1976) <u>Aspect</u>  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, S. (1981) 'An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns'. LG.57.626-57.

_____. (1982) 'Aspect, transitivity and viewpoint'. In P. Hopper, ed. <u>Tense Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics</u>. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

_____. (1985a) 'Lhasa Tibetan evidentials and the semantics of causation'. BLS.11.

_____. (1985b) 'The analysis-synthesis-lexis cycle in Tibeto-Burman: A case study in motivated change'. In J. Haiman, ed. <u>Iconicity in Syntax</u>. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Givon, T. (1979) <u>On Understanding Grammar</u>  New York: Academic Press.

Hale, A. (1980) 'Person markers, finite conjunct and disjunct forms in Newari'. In R. Trail, ed. <u>Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics</u> 7. Camberra, Austrailian National University.

Matisoff, J. (1969) 'Verb concatenation in Lahu: The syntax and semantics of "simple" juxtaposition'. ALH.12.2.171-206.

_____. (1973) <u>The Grammar of Lahu</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schottelndreyer, Burkhard. (1980) 'Person markers in Sherpa'. In R. Trail, ed. <u>Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics</u> 7. Camberra: Australian National University.

Slobin, D. and A. Aksu. (1982) 'Tense, Aspect and Modality in the use of the Turkish evidential'. In P. Hopper, ed. <u>Tense Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics</u>. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.