

Mood and Modality in Lohorung

Diwas Rai¹

< diwaslohorung11@gmail.com >

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.3126/kp.v5i5.95210>

ABSTRACT

This study examines the mood and modality of Lohorung, a Rai Kirati language of the Tibeto-Burman language family spoken in the Sangkhuwasabha District, the eastern part of Nepal. Lohorung expresses mood and modality through morphological marking, although particles also play a vital role in conveying and refining semantic distinctions. The study examines four moods: (viz., indicative, imperative, interrogative, and optative). The indicative mood is examined as *realis*, where the particle <-n> states factuality, while copular verbs such as *hɔ* and *ʈsu:k* also indicate factual events, with <-n> reinforcing degrees of certainty. The imperative mood is categorized as *irrealis* and is morphologically marked by <-ɛ> that functions as a portmanteau marker, encoding both imperative force with second-person singular agreement. Interrogatives are distributed into two types (viz., polar (Yes/No) and *Wh*). Yes/No interrogatives are marked by the marker <-ɛ> with falling intonation and <-ɛ̃> with rising intonation and are regarded as *realis*, whereas lexical *Wh*-interrogatives are evaluated as *irrealis*. The optative mood, expressing wishes and desires, is characterized as *irrealis* and is marked by <-r>, <-g>, <-ru> and <-ni>. Modality is divided into two types (viz., epistemic and evaluative types). The epistemic modality comprises probability, certainty, evidentiality, and negation, while the evaluative modality encompasses ability and obligation. The marker <-ru> indicates probability, and the particle <-n> hints certainty. Negation is morphologically expressed through prefixes (viz. <ma->, <men-> in past contexts; <a-> in imperatives) and the suffix <-ni> in non-past contexts. The verb *he:* denotes ability (realized as *hi* in serial verb construction), while *le:k* expresses obligation. The findings prove the complicated interaction between morphology and particles in encoding mood and modality in Lohorung.

Keywords: Lohorung, mood, modality, *realis*, *irrealis*

INTRODUCTION

This study analyzed the mood and modality in Lohorung, a Kirati language that falls within the Sino-Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman, Western Tibeto-Burman, Himalayis, Eastern language group (Eppelle et al., 2012), from the perspective of a formal and functional approach (cf. Givón, 2001a, 2001b). The Lohorung language is also referred to by several alternative names (viz., *lohorung*, *lohorong*, *lohrung*, *Lohrung Khanawa*, *lorung*, *uttari lorung* (Eppelle et al. 2012, Rai, 205). However, Lohorung people themselves prefer the endonyms *Yakkhaba khap* (Rai 1015) and *enny khap* (2082).

The Lohorung language is closely related to Mewahang [emg, raf], Yamphu [ybi], and Southern Yamphu [Irr] (Rutgers, 1998). Since Lohorung is also a Rai Kirat language. Thus, it is natural that it shows lexical similarity with all Kirati Rai languages. Its lexical similarity with Mewahang and Yamphu appears relatively closer, while it is somewhat

¹ Mr. Rai earned his MPhil degree and is currently pursuing his PhD at the Central Department of Linguistics, Tribhuvan University.

more distant from the others Kirati languages. According to Hanßon (1991) notes that the Lohorung has a Biksit dialect spoken near the upper Sabhakhola region; however, Hanßon himself acknowledges that the available data are insufficient to substantiate this claim. However, the Lohorung people claim that there is no existence of any dialect in the Lohorung language. Mitchell and Hilty (2012, p. 21) compare the lexical similarities among Pangma, Angla and Dhupu, reporting that Pangma and Dhupu share about 90% of their vocabulary, while Pangma and Angla, as well as Dhupu, and Angla, share approximately 88%. The total population of Lohorung people, categorized under cast and ethnicity, is reported as 2,598. In contrast, the number of reported native speakers of the lohorung language is 3,884, while an additional 622 individuals are identified as a second-language speakers (NSO, 2023). Furthermore, the population of 4,925 is reported to regard the Lohorung language as their ancestral language (NSO 2023).

In spite of some previous studies, research on the Lohorung language still remains limited. Hardman (2001) conducts an ethnographic study of Lohorung people rather than language, although she does transcribe some ritual texts without any linguistic analysis. Rai (1015) investigates Lohorung verb morphology with affixes. Regmi (2072) discussed Lohorung phonology and its word classes. Rai and Rai (2076) studied the historical connection of the language with the land and environment and presented some cultural objects and myths related to the Lohorung origin. Rai (2021) explored the Lohorung morphosyntax from a functional-typological perspective. Rai (2024 [2080]) conducted an anthropological analysis of Lohorung myths, arguing that Lohorung people first settled in the Arun Valley. Rai (2025 [2081]) studied how Lohorung verbs agree with the subject and object on the basis of clusivity and transitivity. Lohorung (2025 [2082]) discusses the genealogical lineages of a Dekhim cline within Lohorung and examines Mundhumi words by breaking them into morphemes and toponyms (place names). Rai (2025 [2082]) explored grammatical relations in Lohorung, describing Lohorung as an ergative-absolutive alignment with a peripheral split-ergative pattern on the basis of its overt coding properties, behavior-and-control properties, Equi-NP deletion, and other grammatical relation tests. Rai and Rai (2026) discussed the tense and aspect in Lohorung.

However, no prior study has systematically analyzed mood and modality in Lohorung, although several researchers have contributed to the study of the Lohorung language. Thus, the present research focused on mood and modality from the perspective of a formal and functional approach.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study analyzed the mood and modality in Lohorung from the perspective of a formal and functional approach (cf. Givón, 2001a, and 2001b) and employed a mixed-methods linguistic fieldwork design to investigate mood and modality. Data were collected from primary sources and the elicitation method. Primary data were collected through structured elicitation sessions with native speakers (viz. Namlunghang (age 71), Hanglemba (age 67), Rewahang (age 74), Hangmaya (age 87), and Peṭṣeṭwa (age 89)) from Kharduwa, Pangm, Simle and Malingar of Khandbari Municipality, Sankhuwasabha District, eastern part of Nepal. All consultants are very fluent in speaking Lohorung. The researcher, as a native speaker, relied on his intuitions for minor confirmation and to clarify an ambiguous situation. Structure and semi-structured elicitation tasks is involved in data collection,

Examples (1a-d) exemplify the declarative mood in Lohorong. Those examples state the factual events. The verb *ʃsu:k* 'exist' in the example (1a) states the factual event in the non-past tense. The copula verb *hɔ*, in the examples (1b) and (1c), state the factual event in the non-past and the verb *kʰara* 'went' means occurred in the example (1d) encodes the factual event in the past tense. All verbs from the given examples contrast with the hypothetical events. Thus, all those examples exemplify the declarative or indicative mood in Lohorong.

Imperative

Notionally, Imperative is closely associated with deontic modality. It is directive in nature and usually portrayed as indicating a command (Palmer 2001, p. 80). Imperative in Lohorong is discussed as in example (2).

(2)

- a. *ana ʃsam ʃsaʔε*
 ana ʃsam ʃsaʔ-ε
 2SG rice eat-2SG.IMP
 'You eat rice.'
- b. *jompək lɛ:si kʰarε*
 jompək lɛ:-si kʰar-ε
 work do-NMLZ go-INS-2SG.IMP
 'Go to work.'
- c. *ha:ʃabanʃke kekek in-tɛ-t-ε.*
 ha:ʃa-banʃke kekek in-tɛ-t-ε.
 Bazaar-ABL maize buy-bring-INS-IMP
 'Bring maize form the bazaar.'
- d. *anaε igɔ jompək lɛ:ma lɛ:kuna*
 ana-ε igɔ jompək lɛ:-ma lɛ:k-u-na
 2SG-ERG this work do-INF must-3SG-2SG
 'You must do this work.'
- e. *wenɖa kʰãɖbari kʰarε*
 wenɖa kʰãɖbari kʰa-r-ε
 tomorrow Khandbari go-INS-IMP.2SG
 'Tomorrow go to Khandbari.'

In the examples (2a-e), the marker <ε> designates the imperative mood. Thus, the imperative marker <ε> occurs morphologically in Lohorong. In example (2d), however, the morpheme *lɛ:* occurs twice. One morpheme *lɛ:* means 'do' functions as the main verb, taking the infinitive marker <-ma>. The other *lɛ:* 'must' functions as a model verb, indicating an obligatory imperative. The imperative examples in (2a-e) express an irrealis situation in Lohorong.

Interrogative

The Lohorong language encompasses two types of interrogatives (viz., polar Yes/No and Wh-), and yes/no type interrogative are morphologically marked with the markers <ε>, <-ɛ> and <rɔu> and intonation is used (Rai 2021, p. 59). However, the marker <-rɔu> in Rai

(2021) was incorrect. Thus, it is corrected as <-rou>. Interrogative in Lohorung is discussed as in example (3).

(3)

- a. ana tularammi pasa hɛ?
 ana tularam-mi pasa he
 2SG Tularam-GEN kid COP
 'Are you Tularam's child?'
- b. pɛtʂɛʔwæ jan pitʂerou?
 Pɛtʂɛʔwa-ɛ jan pi-t-t-ɛ-rou
 Pɛtʂɛʔwa-erg money give-INS-PST-3SG.3SG.PRT
 'Did Pɛtʂɛʔwa give you money?'
- c. mu:mimpa kekek tʂa:kne?
 mu:-mimpa kekek tʂa:-k-n-ɛ?
 roast-ADJVZR corn eat-NPST-2SG-PRT
 'Do you eat roasted corn?'
- d. mu:mimpa kekek tʂa:kne?
 mu:-mimpa kekek tʂa:-k-n-ɛ
 roast-ADJZ corn eat-NPST-2SG-PRT
 'Do you eat roasted corn?'
- e. anʂinae le:ksi tʂa:kʂuna?
 anʂina-ɛ le:ksi tʂa:-k-tʂ-u-nɔ
 2DL-ERG mango eat-NPST-EXCL-3SG-2DL
 'Do you (two) eat mango?'
- f. kʰo hampi kʰaijanɔ?
 kʰo hampi kʰa-i-jan-d-ɛ?
 3SG where go-INS-send-PFV-PRT
 'Where has he gone?'

Examples (3a-d) exemplify yes/no interrogatives marked as realis. Examples (3a) and (3c) exemplify yes/no interrogatives that are morphologically marked by the question marker <-ɛ> and prosodically accompanied by falling intonation, which gives sense of previous information about the event and asked to be sure. In contrast, in example (3d), the question marker is morphologically marked by the breathy vowel <-ɛ> and prosodically accompanied by rising intonation, which doesn't give the previous information about the event. It means the question is asked directly to get information about whether yes or no. This example designates a request expressed in a very polite manner. Example (3b) exhibits the particle <-rou>. Thus, such particles can also be used for yes/no interrogatives. Example (3e) deals with the suprasegmental feature through the addition of a breathy sound on the vowel [a], and is accompanied prosodically by rising intonation. Example (3f) illustrates the lexical level yes/no interrogative. The word *hampi* 'where' functions as a lexical interrogative in Lohorung, which is shown in example (3f). The lexical level interrogative usually remains neutral. Other lexical level interrogatives in Lohorung are shown in Table 1.

Table 1:*Lexical level interrogatives in Lohorung*

SN	Lexical	English
1	<i>maŋ</i>	What
2	<i>hampi / habi</i>	Where
3	<i>hanam</i>	When
4	<i>hampɛ</i>	Which
5	<i>ɛʔwa</i>	How much
6	<i>asa</i>	Who / whom
7	<i>asam/asami</i>	Whose
8	<i>mantʰa</i>	Why
9	<i>mantʃkma</i>	What kind of

Note. The lexical-level interrogatives are adapted from (Rai, 2021) and supplemented with additional examples.

All those lexical level interrogatives just asked about events to know the truth. Thus, lexical level interrogatives presented above express irrealis situations in Lohorung. The proto-forms of lexical level interrogatives are similar in Lohorung, showing similarities to those of other kirati languages spoken in Nepal.

Optative

Lohorung morphologically encodes the optative mood (Rai 2021). However, like other Kirati languages (Rai, 2014, 2015, 2017) and (Khatiwada, 2016), Lohorung also uses particles to express optative mood, as in example (4).

(4)

- a. *pa:ma:mi niŋ juŋk^huba li:manɛ.*
 pa:ma:-mi niŋ juŋ-k^huba li:-ma-n-ɛ.
 parents-GEN name keep-NMLZ be-INF-2SG-OPT
 'May you be great which makes your parents great.'
- b. *pappaɛnɔ lo:surɔ.*
 pappa-ɛ-nɔ lo:-s-u-rɔ.
 grandfather-ERG-EMPH say-INS-3SG-OPT
 'May grandfather indeed say (it).'
- c. *wendagɔ wari ʈa:ɛru*
 wendɔ-gɔ wari ʈa:-ɛ-ru
 tomorrow-PRT rain come-FUT-PRT.OPT
 'Will it rain tomorrow?'
- d. *ajugɔ nam ŋi:mani*
 aju-gɔ nam ŋi:-ma-ni
 today-PRT sun shine-INF-OPT
 'I wish it would be sunny today.'

- e. *ʈsa:ʈsa ja: ʈa:kgɔ hune*
 ʈsa:ʈsa ja: ʈa:-k-gɔ hune
 baby mouth come-NPST-PRT be-OTP
 'I wish the child would speak.'

Examples (4a-e) exemplify the optative mood in Lohorung. In Lohorung, the optative mood is morphologically marked by the markers <-rɔ>, <-gɔ>, <-ru> and <-ni> (Rai 2021, p. 61). These markers convey the meaning of the speaker's wish. However, among these markers, <-ru> is a particle used to denote an optative mood, which expresses possibility. Additionally, the marker <-ɛ> is a newly identified marker, which is also morphologically encoded. The optative mood in Lohorung expresses wishes, hopes, or desires rather than actual events; thus, the optative mood is irrealis. In the example (4c), the particle <-ru> conveys the possible condition. However, example (4a) represents wish (bless) and examples (4b), (4d) and (4e) signify wish.

Modality

Modality is defined in term of epistemic judgment (viz. truth, probability, certainty, belief, evidence) and Evaluative (deontic) judgment (viz., desirability, preference, intent ability, obligation, manipulation (Givón 2001a, p.300). The Lohorung modality is also analyzed based on this two-way distinction proposed by Givón. However, the evaluative section discusses only ability and obligation.

Epistemic modality

Lohorung epistemic modalities are discussed based on truth, probability, certainty, belief, and evidence.

Probability

The Lohorung implies the particle <-ru> with a verb which indicates the probability, and the modal verb *he:* 'can' is also used to denote the same modality (Rai 2021, p. 62). However, the Lohorung modal verb *he:* 'can', changes its morphological form to *hi:* after the other man verbs, such as *le:* 'do', *ʈsa:* 'eat', *pɔk* 'break' etc. as shown in example (5).

(5)

- a. *masigɔ nam ɲi:ɛru*
 masi-gɔ nam ɲi:-ɛ-ru
 later-PRT sun shine-3SG-PRT
 'It will probably be sunny later.'
- b. *namakgɔ uŋ pasa ʈa:ma he:ku*
 namak-gɔ uŋ-pasa ʈa:-ma he:-k-u
 next year-PRT 1SG.POSS-SON come-INF can-NPST-3SG
 'Next year my son may come.'
- c. *kʰosɛ igɔ liŋkɔʔwa pɔkhi:ku.*
 kʰos-ɛ igɔ liŋkɔʔwa pɔkhi:ku.
 3SG-ERG this stone break-can-NPST-3SG.3SG
 'He can break this stone.'

- d. *anaε tsa:hikuna*
 ana-ε tsa:-hi-k-u-na
 2SG-ERG eat-can-NPST-3SG-2SG
 'You can eat.'

Examples (5a-d) exemplify the probability (irrealis) in Lohorung. In the example (5a) the particle <-ru> indicates the probability of an action. Example (5b) implies the verb *he*: means 'able/can' after the verb *ta:ma* 'to come'. In this situation, the verb *he*: 'can' designates probability. In the examples (5c-d), the same verb *he*: occurs in serial verb construction with the verbs *ɲək* 'break' and *tsa:* 'eat'. In these cases, it undergoes a phonological change from *he*: to *hi*:

Certainty

Certainty is the realis modality which tells the readers the truth. The Lohorung implies the marker <nɔ> (Rai 2021, p. 63). However, this is a particle rather than a marker, which helps to make sure that the action is true as in example (6).

(6)

- a. *ana wendɑ tɑ:kna*
 ana wendɑ tɑ:-k-na
 2SG tomorrow come-NPST-2SG
 'You will come tomorrow.'
- b. *k^ho wendɑ tɑ:kno*
 k^ho wendɑ tɑ:-k-no
 3SG tomorrow come-NPST.3SG-EMPH
 'He will come tomorrow indeed.'
- c. *kaŋaε tsaibanɔ k^haŋkna*
 kaŋa-ε tsaiba-nɔ k^haŋ-k-na
 1SG-ERG really-EMPH look after-NPST-1SG.2SG
 'I will certainly look after you.'
- d. *k^ho wendɑ tɑ:me paik.*
 k^ho wendɑ tɑ:-me pai-k.
 3SG tomorrow come-PROG move-NPST.3SG
 'He is coming tomorrow.'

Examples (6a-c) demonstrate the certainty in Lohorung. Example (6a), the particle <nɔ> isn't used, yet the clause still conveys certainty. In the other examples, the particle <nɔ> is implied to serve to reinforce the speaker's certainty further. Thus, the particle <nɔ> makes the statement surer to the audience. In the example (6c), the adverb *tsabanɔ* 'really' is used to make action surer. Thus, Lohorung implies some adverbs to indicate certainty. Lohorung implies the verb with its progressive form and adds another verb, copula *paik* 'be' that the action will surely happen in the future, as in example (6d).

Evidentiality

Aikhenvald (2006, P. 320) discussed how the speakers find out information about a possible event. Lohorung evidentiality is discussed in (7).

(7)

- a. *asen ki:wa ta:da:da. akiu pilai paila tsua.*
 asen ki:wa ta:-da:-da. akiu paila-i paila tsua.
 yesterdaytiger come-PFV-INFER there footprint-EMPH footprint be.PST
 'The tiger apparently came yesterday, because there were footprints.'
- b. *anaε k^ho jaʔlɔɛbanɔ nentʂakune.*
 ana-ε k^ho jaʔlɔ-ε-ba-nɔ nentʂa-k-u-n-ε.
 2SG-ERG 3SG before- ADJZ-EMPH like-NPST-3SG-2SG-?
 'You have liked him from very beginning.'
- c. *aju wari ta:kjo. nanʂururjma ja ka:mesi:k.*
 aju wari ta:-k-jo. nanʂururjma ja ka:-mesi:-k.
 today rain come-NPST-PRT thunder mouth roar-PROG-NPST.3SG
 'It will rain today, you know. It's thundering.'

Examples (7a-e) illustrate evidentiality in Lohorong, providing proof of evidence to support the occurrence of events to make more truth. In the example (7a), *akiu pilai paila tsua* 'there were footprints' is evidence for *asen ki:wa ta:da:da* 'yesterday tiger had come'. In the example (7b) *jaʔlɔɛbanɔ nentʂakune* 'you have liked him from the very beginning' is a source of information that you like him from the very beginning, so you still like him. In the example (7c) *aju wari ta:k* 'Its rains today' is supported to make more truth by the second source of information *nanʂururjma ja ka:mesi:k* 'its thunderng.'

Negation

Negation is a morphosyntactic operation whereby a lexical element functions to deny or reverse the meaning of another lexical item or an entire syntactic construction. Lohorong encodes negations through morphological processes as in (8).

(8)

- a. *kaŋa tsam tsɑ:ŋani*
 kaŋa tsam tsɑ:ŋani
 1SG rice eat-1SG-NEG.NPST
 'I don't eat rice.'
- b. *ana jompɔk jiknani*
 ana jompɔk jiknani
 2SG work do-2SG-NEG.NPST
 'You don't work.'
- c. *k^ho asen maʔaʔa*
 k^ho asen ma-ʔa-ʔ-a
 3SG yesterday NEG-come-INS-3SG.PST
 'He didn't come yesterday.'
- d. *meʔ^huwaε g^hã:sa menʂaʔu*
 meʔ^huwa-ε g^hã:sa men-ʂa-ʔ-u
 goat-ERG grass NEG-eat-INS-3SG.PST
 'Goat didn't eat grass.'
- e. *wenɖa ha:ʔa ak^hare*
 wenɖa ha:ʔa ak^hare
 tomorrow bazar NEG-go-INS-3SG.IMP

'Tomorrow, don't go to the bazaar.'

Examples (8a-e) illustrate the negation in Lohorong. In Lohorong, some negation markers are morphologically encoded. When an action is expressed in the past tense, the negation marker <ma-/men> as in example (8c-d) and the negation marker <a-> in imperative as in example (8e) occur as a prefix. In contrast, when an event is expressed in the non-past, the negation marker <-ni> as in example (8a-b) occurs as a suffix.

Evaluative (deontic) Modalities

Evaluative (deontic) modality encodes the speaker's judgment concerning obligation, necessity, permission, or desirability, expressing what should occur rather than what is factually the case (Givón 2001a). Evaluative modality designates the internal or external capacity of a volitional agent to realize the predicate situation and may co-occur with various tense aspect markers. In Lohorong, agent-oriented (deontic) modalities are expressed through modal verbs.

Ability

Ability is both the physical and mental capacity of the agent/subject to perform any action. Lohorong contracts with the modal verb *he:ma* 'able/can' and this modal verb occurs with other verbs (Rai 2021, p. 65) as a verb serial as in example (9).

(9)

- a. *anae he:kuna*
 ana-ε he:-k-u-na
 2SG-ERG can-NPST-3SG-2SG
 'You can.'
- b. *k^hose le:ma he:ku*
 k^hos-ε le:-ma he:-k-u
 3SG-ERG do-INF can-NPST-3SG.3SG
 'He can do (it).'
- c. *kaŋaε tsa:hikuŋ*
 kaŋa-ε tsa:-hi-k-u-ŋ
 1SG-ERG eat-can-NPST-3SG-1SG
 'I can eat (it).'
- d. *anae t^heʔhikuna*
 ana-ε t^heʔ-hi-k-u-na
 2SG-ERG lift-can-NPST-3SG-2SG
 'You can lift (it).'
- e. *kkaŋaε ki:wa laphikuŋ*
 kaŋa-ε ki:wa lap-hi-k-u-ŋ
 1SG-ERG tiger catch-can/able-NPST-3SG-1SG
 'I can catch the tiger.'

Examples (9a-e) illustrate the expression of the ability in Lohorong. The verb *he:* 'can/able' conveys the meaning of ability or capability of the subject. The verb *he:* 'can' also occurs as a verb serial construction with other verbs as <-hi-> as in examples (9c) and (9d).

Obligation

Obligation refers to linguistic expressions that indicate a speaker's judgment about what is required, necessary, permitted, or forbidden according to social, moral or authoritative norms (Givón, 2001a). Regmi (2072 BS, p. 120) explains that the Lohorong helping verb *le?* conveys the meaning 'must'. However, Rai (2021, p. 65) corrects this form to *le:k* 'must/should', which functions to indicate obligation in Lohorong as in (10).

(10)

- a. *ana iskul k^he?ma le:kna*
 ana iskul k^he?-ma le:-k-na
 2SG school go-INF should-NPST-2SG
 'You should go to school.'
- b. *pa:ma: pasatsie k^haŋma le:k*
 pa:ma: pasa-tsi-ε k^haŋma le:k
 parents child-PL-ERG lookafter-INF should
 'Sons and daughters should take care of their parents.'
- c. *tenbi toŋtsama le:k*
 ten-bi toŋ-tsa-ma le:k
 village-LOC adjust-eat-INF should
 '(People) should live together in harmony in the village.'
- d. *jaŋaŋpano ʈi:ma le:k*
 jaŋaŋpa-nɔ ʈi:-ma le:k
 shaman-EMPZ put-INF should.
 'It is mandatory to appoint shaman.'
- e. *anaεno mu:ma le:k*
 ana-ε-nɔ mu:-ma le:k
 2SG-ERG-EMPH do-INF must
 'You have to do (it).'
- f. *anaε mu:manɔ le:kuna*
 ana-ε mu:ma-nɔ le:k
 2sg-erg do-inf-emph must
 'You absolutely have to do (it).'
- g. *anaε mu:ma le:kno*
 ana-ε mu:-ma le:k-nɔ
 2sg-erg do-inf must-emph
 'You really have to do (it).'

Examples (10a-g) illustrate the expression of obligation (deontic) modality in Lohorong. The verb *le:k* functions as a modal auxiliary meaning 'must/should', thereby encoding a sense of obligation in the clause. In the examples (10d-g), the emphasized marker <nɔ> strengthens the obligation of the statement. In examples (10d-e), the subjects *jaŋaŋpa* 'shaman' and *ana* 'you' are emphasized. However, example (10f) emphasizes the action. Example (10g) shows that the emphasis marker <nɔ> is used with the modal verb *le:k* 'must' but the meaning conveys the same as the example. (10f).

CONCLUSION

This study has examined the mood and modality in Lohorung. In Lohorung, mood and modality are primarily expressed through morphological marking; however, particles also play a vital role in conveying and refining the distinction of mood and modality. This study discusses four moods (viz., indicative/declarative, imperative, interrogative, and optative) in Lohorung. Indicative/declarative mood is discussed as a realis mood, in which the particle <nɔ> is used to assert the factuality of the event. Other copular verbs <hɔ> and <tsu:k> are implied to indicate the factual event; however, the particle <nɔ> makes the event more real. An imperative mood is discussed as the irrealis mood in Lohorung and is morphologically marked by the marker <ɛ>. However, the marker <ɛ> functions as a portmanteau. Simultaneously encoding imperative and second-person singular numbers. Imperative is analyzed by classifying into two types (viz., polar Yes/No and Wh (lexical level)). The polar Yes/no interrogative is also morphologically marked by the markers <ɛ> (with falling intonation) and <ɛ̃> (with raising intonation) and is considered as realis. This study discusses nine lexical-level interrogatives which is considered as irrealis. The optative mood in Lohorung expresses wishes, hopes, or desires rather than actual events; thus, the optative mood is irrealis. Optative mood is also morphologically marked by the markers <-rɔ>, <gɔ>, <ru> and <-ni>. Modality is analyzed by dividing it into two types (viz., epistemic and evaluative (deontic)). Within the epistemic category, the study examines probability certainty, evidentially as realis, and negation as irrealis, while within the evaluative category, it discusses ability and obligation as irrealis. The marker <-ru> indicates probability. The particle <nɔ> is used to indicate certainty and more factual. The negation markers <ma-/men-> occur as prefixes in past event expressions, while <a-> occurs as a prefix in the imperative. In contrast, the negation marker <-ni> occurs as a suffix in the non-past event expression. The verb *he* denotes ability and change to *hi* when it occurs in verb serial construction, while the verb *le:k* denotes the obligation. The verb *le:k* in Lohorung is contextual. However, it functions as a main verb and a modal verb, as well. *Le:k* as a main verb means 'he does' and, on the other hand, as a modal verb means 'must'.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to the individuals and organizations whose contributions made this work possible. Especially my sincere thanks go to the informants (viz. Namlunghang, Hanglemba, Rewahang, Hangmaya, and Pɛtʂɛʔwa) for their precious data, guidance and expertise.

Conflict of interest

The author declares that no financial support, commercial affiliations, or personal interests exist that could have influenced the research authorship or publication of this manuscript.

Abbreviations

INFER = inferential	NPST = non-past tense	PFV = perfective
1 = first person	PST = past tense	NMLZ = nominalizer
2 = second person	INF = infinitive	GEN = genitive
3 = third person	LOC = locative	PRT = particle
SG = singular	ERG = ergative	ADVZ = adjectivizer
PL = plural	IMP = imperative	EXCL = exclusive
PRT = particle	COP = copula	OPT = optative
INS = insertion	EMPH = emphasize	FUT = future
PROG = progressive	NEG = negative	

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2006). *Evidentially in Grammar*. La Trobe University.
- Givón, T. (2001a). *Syntax: An introduction* (Vol. 1). John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (2001b). *Syntax: An introduction* (Vol.2). John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (2010). The adaptive approach to grammar. In B. Heine, & H. Narrog (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* [pp.27-49]. Oxford University Press.
- Hanson, G. (1991). The Rai of Eastern Nepal: Ethnic and linguistic grouping. In W. Winter (Ed.), *Linguistic Survey of Nepal*. CNAS.
- Hardman, C. E. (2000). *The other world: Notions of self and emotion among the Lohorung Rai*. Berg.
- Khatiwada, K. (2016). *Dhimal morphosyntax* (Doctoral dissertation, Tribhuvan University).
- Lohorung Rai Society. (2012 [2069 B.S.]). *Kirat Rai Lohorung matribhāṣā varṇa nirdhāraṇ tathā lekhan nirdeshikā* [Orthography and writing guidelines of Kirat Rai Lohorung mother tongue]. Author.
- Rai D (2025). Grammatical relations in Lohorung. *Journal of Nepalese Studies*, 17, 119-138. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jns.v17i1.88184>
- Rai, B. L. (2015). *Lohorung–Nepali–English dictionary*. Lohorung Rai Society.
- Rai, D. (2021). *Lohorung morphosyntax* (Master’s thesis, Tribhuvan University).
- Rai, D. (2025). Exploring the verb agreement system in the Lohorung language. *JiKaP*, 1, 96–114. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jikap.v1i1.82476>
- Rai, D. (2080 B.S.). Arun upatyakako Lohorung mithak: Manabbhasasastrīya bislesan [Lohorung myths of Arun Valley: A linguistic anthropological analysis]. *Kirat Pragya*, 3(1), 49–61.
- Rai, M. (2015). *Lohorung verb morphology* (Master’s thesis, Tribhuvan University).

- Rai, T. M. (2014). Tense, aspect, and modality (TAM) in Koyee. *Journal of the University Grants Commission*, 3(1), 43–62.
- Rai, T. M. (2015). *A grammar of Koyee* (Doctoral dissertation, Tribhuvan University).
- Rai, T. M. (2017). Agreement pattern in the Koyee verb. *Nepalese Linguistics*, 32, 74–79.
- Rai, T. M. (2024). Unraveling the relationship among the Kirati languages. *Nepalese Linguistics*, 38(1), 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nl.v38i1.71561>
- Rai, T. M. (2025). Autonyms of the Kirat Rai Linguistic Communities: Decoding roots, Meanings, and Identity. *Kirat Pragya*, 4(1), 157–169. <https://doi.org/10.3126/kp.v4i1.79051>
- Rai, T. M., & Rai, D. (2019 [2076 B.S.]). *Lohorung bhāsāko itihās lekhan [A history of the Lohorung language]*. Unpublished manuscript, Language Commission.
- Rai, T. M., & Rai, D. (2025). Tense and Aspect in Lohorung: A Functional-Typological Perspective. *DMC Journal*, 10(9), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3126/dmcj.v10i9.90568>
- Regmi, B. N. (2015 [2072 B.S.]). *Lohorung byākaranako rūprekha [A sketch grammar of Lohorung]*. Unpublished manuscript, Nepal Academy.
- Rutgers, R. L. (1998). *Yamphu grammar, text, and lexicon*. CNWS.
- Lohorung, C. (2025). *Kirat Lohorung Dekhim pachha/tharko Bangsawali [A genealogy of the Kirat Lohorung Dekhim pachha/thar]*. Sopan Press.