1 General information

1.1 The ‘Ladakhi’ dialects

‘Ladakhi’ is spoken in Ladakh, a former independent kingdom, now constituting two districts (tehsils) of Jammu & Kashmir, India. As the quotes indicate, the name and its spelling is a misnomer and so is the designation for the language and its dialects. The self-designation Ladaks (or perhaps only Lata) originally referred to Leh and its surroundings. Via a Purik pronunciation as Ladax it yielded the Urdu spelling and hence the English spelling Ladakh. The dialects fall into two groups: Shamskat, the dialects of Lower Ladakh (Sham), Ldumra (a.k.a. Nubra), and Purig, and Kenhat, the dialects of Central Ladakh, Upper Indus (with the side-valley of Gya-Mīru), Lalok (‘behind the pass’), Zanskar, and the Tibetan border region. The Balti dialects may be loosely associated with the Shamskat group.

These two groups differ not only on the phonological level (most of the Kenhat dialects being tonal, the Shamskat dialects being rich in initial clusters), but more fundamentally in their grammar. While the Shamskat dialects differentiate between an agent and a possessor (/kho/ ~ /khoel/ ‘s/he-ERG’ vs. /kho/ ~ /kh’eil/ ‘s/he-GEN’), the Kenhat dialects do not (/kho/ ~ /khe/ ‘s/he-GEN/ERG’). The two dialect groups also differ in their choice of evaluative markers and in minor issues, but these differences are usually rather gradual, that is, certain eastern Sham dialects use some evaluative markers of the Kenhat dialects. Some dialects sandwiched between the two groups may double their markers.

1.2 ‘Evidential’ markers in the Ladakhi dialects

The crosslinguistic concept of ‘evidentiality’ or sources of knowledge (see again recently Aikhenvald 2015: 239) discriminates between ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ sources of knowledge, or sense perception vs. hearsay and inferences.

I find this notion of ‘indirect knowledge’ extremely problematic. It is derived from languages where hearsay and inferences are treated alike and were both are associated with a weaker epistemic force. However, hearsay, report, or second-hand information first of all refers to a source of knowledge other than the speaker him/herself. Inferences, guesses, and the like are made by the speaker based on his/her personal knowledge state, which again can have quite different inputs, hearsay being one of them.

It is also not self-understanding that inferences yield less certain knowledge than singular sense perceptions. Al-Ghazali and Descartes were certainly of the opposite opinion, when they pointed to the fact that the perceived moon appears to have only the size of a shilling, but the mathematical, i.e., inferential, operation shows us that it is of a very different dimension.

The Ladakhi quote marker, on the other hand, is quite similar to markers of ‘direct’ evidence as it presents the content as immediately perceived, without judging the truth values or the social adequacy of the reported content, while inferential can have a slight connotation of uncertainty, although usually not of hedging. Even more important, in Ladakhi and Tibetan, quote markers scope over all other ‘evidential’ and evaluative markers, as well as over illocutionary force.

Hence, one should better differentiate between sources of information (first-vs. second-hand) and different access channels (visual vs. non-visual vs. inferences), cf. Oisel (2013: 31f.), at least in those cases where the language has a separate quote or hearsay marker.

The traditional and still current evidential distinctions always omit one important base of knowledge, namely knowledge about what I, the speaker, know about myself plus possibly what I know about all that belongs to my personal (or cultural) sphere. This lived self-experience, which has also been described in terms of ‘privileged access’ (see here also Garrett 2001: 16) or less suitably as ‘epogorificity’, differs considerably from other observations and is, of course, the most direct knowledge one could ever have. One could argue with Wittgenstein that this kind of immediate ‘knowing’ is not knowledge, belief, or certainty in any meaningful (philosophical or psychological) sense, not even the absence of doubt, just because it does not come with the connotation that there might be a possibility of doubt or the necessity of justification by reasoning or experiments (I draw this from Malcolm (1991), who refers to Wittgenstein’s essay On certainty). The content from such ‘knowing’ is beyond doubt or simply not at issue or perhaps better with this marvelous German word: unhintergebar.

The attitude of having such not-at-issue knowledge, however, can be challenged. Any interlocuter can hark back: How do you know? or How can you dare to claim authority or privileged access? No other attitude can be challenged in this way. The attitude that goes along with the presentation of facts as merely perceived, and especially as being merely inferred or guessed is not at issue, just because it is an attitude of non-commitment. Inferences and guesses cannot be challenged as such, even though their reported content might be objectively wrong. It does not make much sense to say: You didn’t infer or guessed it (that way). One could only challenge the inherent logic. The only way to challenge perceptions is to challenge the presumed presence in the situation: You didn’t see or hear it, because you were not there. This simply amounts to telling the person that she is a liar, a challenge that is independent of the presentation mode, hence it does not challenge the speaker’s attitude. Such challenges would be rare, anyway, because the opponent’s absence from the reported situation is, in most cases, difficult to establish. What is more likely to be challenged is the private character of perceptions: How can you pretend that only you saw it, I was there, as well.

In my opinion, these two attitudes: content not at issue and content at issue form the fundamental opposition of what is usually described as an evidential system in the Tibetic languages, at least so in Ladakhi. I would thus argue that the auxiliary system in Ladakhi, and possibly also more generally in Tibetan (and similar languages), is not so much, or not only, about access channels, but also, or
perhaps dominantly, about the speaker’s attitude of personal commitment (not-at-issue-ness) or non-commitment (at-issue-ness). The traditional evidential and epistemic categories are then sub-categories of the non-committed stance.

Visual and non-visual perceptions are usually not discriminated in the Tibetic languages, but the latter receive a special marker, ḍug in all Ladakhi dialects, except western Purik. It may be the case, however, that ḍug and ḍug do not primarily discriminate different sensory channels, but rather between the most immediate and less immediate perceptions. The Ladakhi dialects have a large set of additional ‘evaluative markers’ (EM) for general (i.e., shared and shareable or non-personal) knowledge, inferences, estimations, and/or probabilities, and for mental distance, with no, little, and strong hedging epistemic functions.

Quotation and second-hand information is expressed with the semi-grammati-calised marker lo, which shows a restricted verbal behaviour. Like other Tibetic quote markers, lo is added to an utterance which keeps the ‘evidential’ or evaluative markers as well as the interlocutionary force and the local deixis as in direct speech, while pronouns may be shifted, the honorific grade adapted, and intensifiers manipulated as in indirect speech (for the shift of pronouns and honorific grade, cf. also Tournadre 2008: 301, Zemp 2013: 602). If lexical verba dicendi are used instead (e.g., when not having been directly addressed by the reported speaker or when reporting the words of a high ranking person), the same rules apply.

Since one’s statements are necessarily based on one’s particular knowledge and framed by one’s relevant attitude, questions naturally have to take into account the knowledge base and possible attitude of the addressee: what do you know, have seen, have heard, think is the case? Does John look like he is sick? This speech act related perspectivising can also be observed in English modes, e.g., Shall you attend the meeting? – Yes, I shall (British English of the 1950s) or also Might you go to the party? – I might (go) (cf. Berqvist & Kittilä 2017: 21). That is, questions naturally target “the addressee’s assessment […] not the speaker’s” (ibid.).

This perspective shift leads to a by and large equal treatment of the speaker in statements and the addressee in questions. Here, both discourse roles shall be comprised under the common term “main speech act participant” (MSAP). The counterpart of the MSAP shall here be termed other. These two discourse roles should be understood as flexible vantage points but not as grammaticalised person categories.4 Since

Table 1: The unmarked distribution of Ladakhi auxiliaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbal domain</th>
<th>Set 1: MSAP</th>
<th>Set 2: OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identifying</td>
<td>yin</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>yin, zero</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributive</td>
<td>yin / yod ḍug</td>
<td>ḍug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential</td>
<td>yod ḍug</td>
<td>ḍug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simultaneous</td>
<td>yod / yin ḍug</td>
<td>ḍug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect / resultative</td>
<td>yod / yin ḍug</td>
<td>ḍug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospective</td>
<td>yod / yin ḍug</td>
<td>ḍug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past / anterior</td>
<td>pa.yin ḍug</td>
<td>zero, (son), (byun))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Prototypical and marked (=shaded cells) use of the auxiliaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>domain</th>
<th>Set 1: yin / yod</th>
<th>Set 2: ḍug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identificatory copula</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past / anterior</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributive copula</td>
<td>MSAP OTHER OTHER</td>
<td>(MSAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential, possession</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>OTHER MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present / simultaneous</td>
<td>MSAP OTHER OTHER</td>
<td>(MSAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect / resultative</td>
<td>MSAP OTHER OTHER</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospective</td>
<td>MSAP OTHER OTHER</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of the bleached verbs son and byun and the marker for nonvisual perception ḍug, the auxiliaries and constructions subsumed by MSAP can be used for the MSAP in almost all temporal domains and vice versa, see Table

2 I am likewise aware that the term ‘evaluative’ is already in use as a cover term for diminutive, pejorative, and intensifying expressions. Simon & Hill (2015) would even include honorifics under this notion. However, while these ‘evaluative’ expressions rather qualify a situation, the evaluative markers indicate an evaluation of the content of the proposition or of one’s knowledge base in several respects.


4 It is somewhat unfortunate that the earlier descriptions of the Tibetic system in terms of ‘conjunct-disjunct’ or even in terms of ‘egophoricity’ are often understood as person categories. There are, in fact, a few languages that show a strict grammatical opposition between forms used for the speaker in statements and for the addressee in questions, on the one hand, vs. any other (non-)participant, on the other. See here the recent volume on ‘egophoricity’ by Floyd, Norcliffe, & San Roque (2018). The use of the so-called

‘egophoric’ markers in the Tibetic languages, by contrast, is highly flexible and driven by pragmatic considerations, and any person-related terminology should be reserved for the aforementioned languages.

5 Typical contexts are the self-perception through various media, including dreams. Logically, as well as psychologically, such mediated self-perceptions are not different form outsider perceptions of OTHER. They are listed here in brackets only for reasons of completeness.

6 Apart from self-perception through media, there is a particular use in the casual polite question What are you (folk) doing?, confined to the more central Ladakhi dialects.
2. Such usages are, however, pragmatically conditioned and highly marked. When using Set 1 markers for OTHER, one claims authority and/or responsibility for the situation and the other person and/or personal involvement. Conversely, when using Set 2 or evaluative markers for the MSAP, one declines authority and/or responsibility and/or personal involvement for various reasons, none the least politeness.

1.3 ‘Evidentiality’ and the use of inok and its dialectal counterparts

Standard Spoken Tibetan and other Tibetic languages are usually described as displaying a further slot for the auxiliary red and the compound form yod.red. These two forms would be, according to available descriptions, neutral with respect to evidentiality. If that description is correct, Ladakhi does not seem to have any functional counterpart. However, many, if not most, instances of the use of red, and possibly also some usages of yod.red, can be directly translated by the compound auxiliary inok of the Central Ladakhi dialects and its siblings hinak, hindak, hindak, ja.me, and intsuk ~ intsok elsewhere.

The opposite, however, is not necessarily true. Furthermore, while in some of their usages “it does not matter whether one has seen it or not” as one informant put it, inok & Cie. do not present events neutrally. As their second element is an inferential marker or, as in the case of inak, a somewhat broader marker of non-commitment, they are still used for inferences, see examples (1) to (4) in § 2.1. They are especially used when identifying an object or a person through vision or immediate perception in correspondence with a different marker when the identification is through less immediate perceptions, examples (5) to (7) in § 2.2. It seems, however, that both markers are related, compare the forms in Table 3 as are the markers for immediate (visual) perception bho.yu and the marker for less immediate (non-visual) perception rag (cf. Zeisler 2017: 287–290!)

The perhaps most common usage of inok & Cie. is to indicate shared or shareable knowledge, when explaining something to somebody who doesn’t know, or when talking to persons about things or general facts they actually know well, examples (8) and (9) in § 2.3. In contrast to the markers for sense perception or the markers for non-experiential authoritative knowledge, inok & Cie. signal that one does not (want to) claim exclusive personal knowledge (even if one has). inok & Cie. are thus common in polite speech and questions. In contrast to the markers for non-experiential authoritative knowledge, they may signal that one is (or expects the addressee to be) open for discussion, see particularly the contrast in (10). But they may also indicate one’s inferior status and feeling of shame, examples (15)–(18) in § 2.5, and it may be the only choice for counterexpectations, (19)–(25) in § 2.6, or, with only the second element of the Shamskat marker, for surprising situations in general. inok & Cie. are furthermore used for counterfactual imaginations, examples (26) and (27) in § 2.7.

Far from being neutral, inok & Cie. express a speaker’s attitude towards the content or the addressee (or the expected attitude of the addressee in questions), which may vary according to the context. How important this attitude is in the social interplay will be shown in § 2.8 with example (31). Much more sweet is the use of inok & Cie. in gentle speech to children § 2.9 example (32).

---

For the time being, I shall call inok & Cie. a GENERALISED EVALUATIVE MARKER (GEM) and the non-visual counterpart a SPECIALISED EVALUTATIVE MARKER (SEM). In a less elaborate system than Ladakhi one might call the GEM or its particular counterpart a marker for de-personalised knowledge. However, I shall reserve the latter term for a special application of the GEM in the Kenhat dialects, see § 2.10.

Table 3 lists the various forms of the GEM that I have so far come across, Table 4 summarises the negated forms.

---

7 Paldar is an enclave in the Kishwar district of J & K. The dialect is of the Zanskar type.
8 Pangi is a district (tehsil) in Himachal Pradesh. The language, spoken in a few hamlets is a strange mixture of Balti and Zanskar features, plus features of an – as yet – unidentified Tibetan language. My guess would be a Kham dialect. Strangely enough, Pangi is sandwiched between Paldar and Zanskar.
11 Hein (2007) mentions the form, without, however, describing its precise function.
Note the partial formal overlapping of the GEM and the SEM!

Table 4 The negated forms of the GEM, SEM and non-visual marker (simplified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEM</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>non-visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intsuk – mentsuk</td>
<td>mdjak – mendjak</td>
<td>drak – mindak ~ minak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inok – menok ~ manok</td>
<td>[h]inak – menak ~ manak</td>
<td>rak –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hindak – mandak</td>
<td>hmirak – mantrak</td>
<td>mirak ~ minak ~ merak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hindak – manak</td>
<td>hindarak ~ mandarak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jindak – mandak ~ mak</td>
<td>jintak – [man]tjak</td>
<td>ta’ – meta’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jinne – menne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The various uses of the Ladakhi GEM

2.1 The use of the GEM for inferences

The Ladakhi inferential markers are used when one has not personally observed a past situation, but has some kind of perceptual, typically visual, input. The past tense inferential marker is tok (with or without assimilation) or tuk (with assimilation) in the Kenhat dialects, while the Shamskat dialects use the less specific inferential-cum-distance marker suk ~ sok. Both markers are derived from a perfect construction involving the auxiliary hduk with its original adverbial function (Zeisler 2017) and follow the verb stem.

When the input is more indirect, distance markers, or in the case of the Shamskat dialects: more complex distance markers are used, which likewise follow the verb stem.

The Shamskat inferential-cum-distance marker suk ~ sok combines with the copula yin to form the GEM, but also with the linking verb yod, and thus also with the non-continuative present tense forms. The Shamskat GEM is thus clearly ambiguous, allowing the function of an inferential marker, a distance marker, or a more neutral de-personalised marker for attributes and identities, perfect constructions and continuative present tense constructions.

The element -ok ~ -ak ~ -dk ~ -dak of the Kenhat GEM is more restricted. It can only follow the copula yin. In the Kenhat dialects only the respective distance marker or probability markers can be used with the non-continuative present tense constructions. However, the GEM may be used with the present perfect as in (1) and (2), with the continuative present tense construction as in (3) and with the prospective construction as in (4). The GEM further appears in another Kenhat construction, which once was a future inferential, but has bleached out to a comparatively neutral depersonalised generic construction (see § 2.10). Most probably the element -ok ~ -ak is likewise derived from the auxiliary hduk with its original adverbial function.

2.2 Identifications through sense perceptions

Unlike attributes, identities are somewhat abstract and cannot immediately be perceived. Some kind of inference is involved when perceiving something as something. For most people, this inference goes unnoticed when a visual perception is involved, but the Ladakhi speakers are more sensitive and use the GEM instead of the marker for visual perception. When other perceptions are involved (and vision is excluded) one might be more aware of the mental process or one might feel less sure about the identification. Hence the Ladakhi speakers use another marker, the SEM, which is derived from the auxiliary for non-visual perception rag. See again

---

12 Hengeveld & Hattner (2015: 486) have chosen the rather misleading term ‘deduction’ for this, reserving the term ‘inference’ for mental reasoning. The latter is termed ‘assumption’ by Aikhenvald (2014: 9) in contrast to ‘inference’ based on perceptual evidence.
Table 3 for the two forms (and their obvious relation) and Table 4 for their negated forms.

(5) Ciktan 2016

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{du tḥan} & \quad \text{intsuk} \quad / \quad \text{indak}. \\
\text{this-DF chang} & \quad \text{GEM} & \quad \text{SEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(This is \textit{chang} (the local beer) (as I can see / as I can taste).)

(6) Shachkul (2016)

\[
\begin{align*}
i \text{ magmal hindak.} & \quad / \quad \text{hiinrak}. \\
\text{this velvet} & \quad \text{GEM} & \quad \text{SEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(This is/ looks like velvet (identified through vision). / This is/ feels like velvet (identified through touching).)

(7) Lingshed (2016)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d-u tḥan inok.} & \quad / \quad \text{d-u ṇaṭi tḥan indak}. \\
\text{this-DF chan} & \quad \text{GEM} & \quad \text{this-DF we.incl.GEN chan SEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(This is/ looks like \textit{chay} (the local beer, upon judging the colour). / This is/ tastes like our \textit{chay} (tasting it blindfolded).)

The translation alternatives given in (6) and (7): ‘looks like’ and ‘tastes like’ should not be taken too literally. They have only been chosen to show the senses involved. Other than the English translation, the constructions with the GEM and the SEM do not convey a connotation of uncertainty or hedging. This latter sense is conveyed by the construction ‘is like’ with the corresponding auxiliaries: \textit{ts(b)ok-fik duk / rak}.

2.3 The explanatory mood: shared and shareable knowledge

In most dialects, the GEM is used in explanations, concerning both private and generally accessible situations. The speaker assumes that either the addressee already knows the fact or does not know it yet. In the first case, the GEM indicates that the speaker does not claim exclusive personal knowledge, while in the latter case, it functions as a friendly invitation to share this knowledge. In such cases, the facts are simply presented as generally knowable, and, as the Sumur informant stated, it does not matter how the speaker came to know the facts. Far from being neutral, the GEM signals that the speaker is open for further discussion or ready to give more details. As the same Sumur informant stated, as a listener, she would be more likely to ask back when the facts are presented with the GEM than when they are presented as personal knowledge or even authoritative personal knowledge. In a similar vein, the Rumbak informant stated that she would use the Set 1 markers to avoid further discussion. Accordingly, questions with the GEM indicate one’s friendly or also casual curiosity, in contrast to authoritative inquiries with the set 1 markers (see also § 2.10, for an even more discussion-friendly construction).

(8) Domkrar (2011)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{watsa khitsoks-i} & \quad \text{semjen-i} \quad \text{riks intsok}. \\
\text{fox dog.like-GEN} & \quad \text{animal-GEN} & \quad \text{class GEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(The fox is a dog-like animal.’ (Fact expected to be, or presented as, generally known or presented in an explanatory mood to somebody who does or might not know.)

(9) Khalatse Village history 2006

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Brokpa-s} & \quad \text{«Brokrgnut intsok» zer-e-intsok.} \\
\text{Brokpa-ERG} & \quad \text{Brok.lineage GEM} & \quad \text{say-LEG=GEM=PERF}
\end{align*}
\]

(‘The Brokpas (Dards) have (always been saying [explaining to me, BZ, who did not know this] that [they] are (as everybody knows) of the Brok [that is, Gilgit] lineage. That is how it is.’)

(10) Stok Kesar 1996

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{«abi tʂaŋ inok.} & \quad \text{phats-enaŋa gul-kan-zik duk-pa?} \\
\text{grandmother} & \quad \text{what GEM} & \quad \text{sack=PPOS move-GRD-LQ VIS.exist-emph}
\end{align*}
\]

(‘Grandmother, what could this be, (I see) in the sack there is something that moves?’ [he] said. «Oh my king, please, (I can assure you), there is [only] something breakable [inside], there is not anything moving (I can assure you).» [she] said.’

(11) Turtuk 2017

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{giu mobail in.} & \quad / \quad \text{apo, giu mobail innay.} \\
\text{this-DF mobile.phone GEM} & \quad \text{ass.be} & \quad \text{father this-DF mobile.phone GEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(‘This is a mobile phone (neutral). / Grandpa, this is a mobile phone (talking nicely or polite). This is for making phone calls (neutral / talking nicely or polite).’

One of the speakers who do not use the GEM for themselves in order to indicate their shyness or even shame (see § 2.5) explained that he can use the GEM for himself, as soon as he gives more information, as when first denying an assumed identity or profession (with the simple copula) and then going on to state what he really is. He would use the GEM also more generally when contradicting false assumptions.

(12) a. Kharnak 2018

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kbjo’ gergen jin-a?} & \quad / \quad \text{ŋa gergen man.} \\
\text{fam.you teacher ASL=Q-GEN} & \quad \text{I teacher NG.GEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(‘Are you a teacher (expecting assertion)? – No, I’m not a teacher (assertive), I’m a tourist guide GEM)

b. Kharnak 2018

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kbjo’ jäği jin-a?} & \quad / \quad \text{ŋa jäği man.} \\
\text{fam.you yak herder ASL=Q-GEN} & \quad \text{I yak herder NG.GEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(‘Are you a yak herder (expecting assertion)? – No, I’m not a yak herder (assertive), I’m a teacher (as you might want to know).’

(13) Kharnak 2018

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{khjo’ gergen jin-a?} & \quad / \quad \text{ŋa gergen man.} \\
\text{fam.you teacher ASL=Q-GEN} & \quad \text{I teacher NG.GEM}
\end{align*}
\]

(‘Are you a teacher (expecting assertion)? – No, I’m not a teacher (you might want to correct your error).’}
In the Ciktan dialect, the usage differs somewhat. According to the informant, the GEM is only used when the speaker expects the addressee to already know, whereas the Set 1 markers are used when the speaker expects the addressee not to know.

(13) Ciktan 2016
tʃiktan-la ʒi(k)-khan-i khar-po jot-e-intsuk. / jot.
Ciktan-ALL ruin-NLS-GEN castle-DF exist-LB-GEM=PERF ASS.exist

‘In Ciktan, there is a ruined castle (as you know / you might not know).’

2.4 Shared observations

Some speakers may use the GEM even in place of an existential linking verb for visual perception when looking at a photograph together with the addressee. The GEM then indicates that the speaker is aware of the fact that the addressee shares his/her observation, whereas the marker for visual perception is used to draw the attention of the addressee to the item observed, cf. (14).

(14) Ciktan 2017
dun-p˖ika roaʈ-po duk. / dun-po roaʈ intsuk.
front-DF˖PPOS road- DF VIS.exist front- DF road GEM

‘In the front is a road (the addressee is not looking / speaker and addressee are looking together).’

2.5 The use of the GEM to express shyness or shame

Roland Bielmeier (2000) mentioned the use of inok for what he thought was politeness, (15). However, all informants with whom I discussed this usage have either rejected it or described it as an utterance of shyness or shame. In the case of example (15) the speaker would be shy because being a merchant is not such a great thing, one becomes trader only when one does not have other options. This usage is attested around the ancient royal centres in Leh and Shey, but is absent in the periphery.

(15) Nurla
ŋa ʦhoŋpa inok.
I merchant GEM

‘I am (only) a merchant.’ (Adapted from Bielmeier 2000: 95, no. 65)

(16) Stok Kesar 1996
ŋa(-) donτaŋ phul-tʃe met. abi gatmo-zik inok.»
I-ERG meal offer-GRD ASS.have grandmother old-LQ GEM

‘I don’t have any food to offer [you] (I can assure you). [I am only an old grandmother (and I feel shame)].’

(17) Chushul 2016
ŋa taraŋ lọptuk-zik hinak-pa, thel-te fi-a-rak.
I still student-LQ GEM-emp be.ashamed-LB die-NLS-NVIS=PRS

‘I am (unfortunately) still a student. I’m so ashamed, I’m going to die.’

2.6 Use of the GEM (and shamskar suk ~ sok) for counterexpectations

In the context of counterexpectations, the Shamskat inferential-cum-distance marker suk ~ sok also appears in some of the Kenhat dialects. In the Central Ladakhi dialect of Rumbak, e.g., the ordinary distance marker is kjak, like in Leh, but for the notion of counterexpectation, sok (here with epenthetic t) is used, (20). Similarly, in the Shara dialect, the ordinary distance marker is ka(na)k, but in the context of counterexpectation of surprise suk is used, (21). The Shamskat marker is then also used in the present tense constructions, (22).

(18) Shara (2016)
ŋa ʒara hinak.
I blind GEM

(19) Lingshed 2016
ŋa-s sam-et-pin naksǝr-kila dorʤe in.  inaŋ ŋaraŋ inok.
I-ERG think-ASS-RM=IMPF picture-POS Dorje ASS.be but I.self GEM

‘I had thought the one in the middle of the picture was Dorje, but it is me.’

(20) Rumbak 2017
ŋ˖e kho rardzi in-kjak sam. kho gergan-ʤik in-tsok.
I˖ERG she goatherd be-DST think s/he teacher- LQ be-DST

‘I thought s/he is/ was [only] a goatherd. [But] s/he is/ was a teacher.’

(21) Shara 2016
ŋ˖e sam kho swiɖen-enãa ɦot-(kanak) sam.
I˖ERG think s/he Sweden- PPOS exist-( DST) think= PA=II

‘I thought s/he was in Sweden, but now s/he is in Leh!’

(22) Shara 2016
ŋ˖e khjoraŋ gergan tʃe-ʃen.
I-ERG fam.you teacher do-RM=ASS.PA

‘I thought she was in Sweden, but now s/he is in Leh!’
Some Kenhat speakers use the normal, that is, dialect-specific GEM both for the wrong assumption and the surprise realisation, the only difference then being the emphatic intonation for the latter. However, for some speakers, the Shamskat GEM may also appear in the specific context of identifying a surprise guest or recognising oneself on a photograph. The form then indicates that some reasoning is involved.

In the case of play roles, some Kenhat speakers again use the Shamskat inferential-cum-distance marker **su** (combines with the existential linking verb/auxiliary *yod*).

There are two contexts for this usage: children’s play roles and explanations. Not all of the informants had played role games and of those who did not all would use the GEM. For the role assignment, both the plain copula and the copula plus a distance marker have been observed as alternative strategies. Distance markers indicate a certain mental distance to the situation talked about combined with an epistemic connotation of lower certainty. This epistemic connotation may be due to the fact that the situation happened a long time ago or that it cannot be inferred but indirectly. Distance markers can also appear in irrealis contexts. The function of the distance markers overlaps to a certain degree with that of the inferential markers, but they usually reinforce the notion of non-commitment.

For example, the distance marker was likewise given spontaneously in order to explain the use of *su* in expressions ‘seems to have been’. So I am likewise grateful to the informant. The use of a distance marker for imagined situations in explanations is extremely common, but as examples (29) and (30) show, the GEM can also be used. This demonstrates again that the GEM is not simply a neutral form.
2.8 A question of status and authority

Despite its base on the copula, the GEM can appear to express locations and possessions, most particularly the shared possession of knowledge: we all know that … In some dialects the GEM is almost obligatory in this context, and some addresses may not be amused when the assertive existential verb *yod* is used instead. When I came across this usage, and when we had discussed it in detail, I developed a small dramolett with the informant. I gave her the outlines in English and she translated it sentence by sentence. When we finished she commented “this happens every day”. In (31), I summarise the context.

2.9 Use of the GEM in gentle speech to small children

When talking to small children, the GEM is commonly used in a rather playful manner. A very common usage is to ask the child about the identity of a person supposed to meet at ten, but nobody came on time. “Following yesterday’s meeting, all of us knew it well (authoritative): today [we were supposed] to meet at ten, but nobody came on time.”

As one can assume, the knowledge state of all three persons is the same. All have been in the meeting and were involved in the decision making, if only as witness. The student speaks with *not-at-issue* authority, legitimised by the decision. But the lady rejects this authority on the pretense of his or her age-related low status. She would have preferred the student to use the less authoritative *at-issue* form *giju hindak* with the GEM. Of course, the lady simply does not accept being criticised. She has to accept, however, the authority of the village head, *qua his position*.

2.10 The Kenhat marker for de-personalised general knowledge - *anok* – *anak*

When talking of generic facts in the explanatory mood, speakers of the Kenhat dialects prefer the construction *verb stem I & nominaliser & GEM*, contracted to -*anok* or -*anak* with the negated forms -*a-manok* and -*a-manak* (in some dialects...
also contracted to -amak), see also Table 4 for the negated forms of the GEM. My late host always used to ask me and I was supposed to answer accordingly:

(34) Leh dialog

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{nyerane} & \quad \text{ju}-\text{la} \quad \text{tfi} \quad \text{joŋ-anok}\?
\end{align*} \]

\[ \text{hon,you-GEN} \quad \text{country-ALL} \quad \text{what} \quad \text{come-NLS,GEM} \]

\[ \text{nas} \quad \text{joŋ-anag-a} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{joŋ-anag-a} \quad - \]

\[ \text{barley} \quad \text{come-NLS,GEM-QM} \quad \text{what} \quad \text{come-NLS,GEM-QM} \]

\[ \text{nəʒi} \quad \text{ju}-\text{la} \quad \text{nas}-\text{ay} \quad \text{joŋ-anok} \quad \text{to-ay} \quad \text{joŋ-anok}. \]

\[ \text{we.excl.GEN} \quad \text{country-ALL} \quad \text{barley-FM} \quad \text{come-NLS,GEM} \quad \text{wheat-FM} \quad \text{come-NLS,GEM} \]

\[ \text{inaŋ} \quad \text{das} \quad \text{joŋ-a-manok}. \]

but rice come-NLS,NG,GEM

‘What [kind of crops] are growing (lit. coming) in your country? Do you have (lit. does come) barley? Do you have wheat? – In our country we have barley as well as wheat. But we don’t grow rice.’

This marker is the most neutral form, except that it cannot be used neutrally for individual facts. With individual facts, this construction betrays its origin from an inferential marker for presumptions and predictions.

(35) Shara 2016

\[ \text{kbjore} \quad \text{ko}-\text{ba} \quad \text{pēne} \quad \text{nuun-zik} \quad \text{mane} \quad \text{mā-taŋ-na}, \]

\[ \text{you.self-ERG} \quad \text{s/he-ALL} \quad \text{money few-LQ} \quad \text{except} \quad \text{NG-give-CD} \]

\[ \text{kb} \quad \text{le} \quad \text{tfi-a-manak}. \quad \text{tfi-tfe-man}. \]

\[ \text{s/he-ERG} \quad \text{work} \quad \text{do-NLS,NG,GEM} \quad \text{do-GRD-NG,ASS,be} \]

’S/he won’t work (inference / we know), if you give only a small amount of money.’

(36) Rumbak 2017

\[ \text{na} \quad \text{thore} \quad \text{koat-la} \quad \text{tfi-et}. \quad \text{tene} \quad \text{tasil} \quad \text{ofis-la} \quad \text{tfi-et}. \]

\[ \text{I tomorrow court-ALL} \quad \text{go-ASS=PRS} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{tehsil office-ALL} \quad \text{go-ASS=PRS} \]

\[ \text{testimpe} \quad \text{boad-ofis-la} \quad \text{tfi-et}. \quad \text{sukul-a} \quad \text{soy-te} \]

\[ \text{thereafter board office-ALL} \quad \text{go-ASS=PRS} \quad \text{school-ALL} \quad \text{go,PA-LB} \]

\[ \text{maigreʃen} \quad \text{setifket-po} \quad \text{kbjon-et}. \quad \text{tene} \quad \text{tshan} \quad \text{gba-anok}. \]

\[ \text{migration certificate-DF} \quad \text{bring-ASS=PRS} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{night go-NLS,FM} \quad \text{go-NLS,GEM} \]

\[ \text{Tomorrow I’ll go to the court. Then I’ll go to the tehsil office. Thereafter, I’ll go to the } \]

\[ \text{[education] board office. [Then] when I’ve been to the school, I’ll get (lit. bring) the migra} \]

\[ \text{tion certificate. Then, most probably, it is going to be night.’} \]

(37) Lingshed 2016

\[ \text{tfiba} \quad \text{ʧhugu} \quad \text{ʧhu} \quad \text{tramn-enaŋa} \quad \text{duŋ-ʧhug-et?} \]

\[ \text{why child water cold-PPOS stay-let-ASS=PRS} \]

\[ \text{kbo-a} \quad \text{tramno} \quad \text{ʧba-(s)noŋ-pa!} \quad \text{ʧh-et-pa!!} \quad \text{ʧh-et-pa!!} \]

\[ \text{s/he-AES} \quad \text{cold} \quad \text{go-NLS,GEM-emp} \quad \text{go-ASS=PRS-emp} \quad \text{go-Ass-PRS-emp} \]

’Why do you let/ make the child stay in the cold water? S/he is going to get cold!’ (The first alternative is more neutral. / The second alternative is more alarmed.)

3 Discussion

The Ladakhi GENERALISED EVALUATIVE MARKER comes in many forms and with as many different functions. While not all functions are attested in all dialects or accepted by all speakers, it is clear that it cannot be described as an evidentially neutral form. In the system of the Ladakhi evidential-attitudinal markers it has its place in the main slot for the non-committed attitude. There are both knowledge-based and socio-pragmatic reasons for its usage.

The knowledge-based reasons are: the situation does not belong to the MSAP’s personal sphere and s/he has not immediately observed the situation, so there is also a reasoning process involved, as in the case of identifications.

The socio-pragmatic reasons include notions of politeness or humbleness: one does not want to, or does not dare to, or is not allowed to present a certain fact as if it were personal knowledge, whether intimate personal knowledge, personal observation, or personal inference (even if it is). This attitude holds especially for generic knowledge that is shared with the whole speech community or knowledge that is shared between speaker and addressee, but this attitude is also found in most dialect regions when the speaker shares knowledge with the addressee who did not know.

Apart from this, the GEM also has epistemic values, when used in irrealis situations or for counterexpectations. Both situations fall out of the MSAP’s personal sphere, because of being imaginative, on the one hand, or unexpected, on the other.

One might argue that the multiple functions of the GEM would neutralise its evidential value. Against this I would hold that even as a non-evidential marker it would still have a strong attitudinal value that makes it the obligatory counterpart to the Set 1, Set 2, and other evaluative markers. One cannot tease apart the evidential and the attitudinal values of the whole system or one misses the reason for its deeply rooted pragmatic flexibility.

I am not quite sure that I understand what the authors mean when they use ‘factual’ or ‘factitive’ for describing the seemingly non-evidential usage of Central and East Tibetan red (and yog.red). I would expect that a non-evidential factitive marker represents what the Standard European languages represent with the neutral, non-modal verb forms. These are, of course, also used for the speaker’s most personal knowledge. The Ladakhi GEM would therefore certainly not be correctly translated with a neutral English verb form, even though the modal forms are usually too strong, especially with their hedging connotations. The Standard European language lack the intermediate tones. Since the Ladakhi GEM would translate many (if not all) usages of Central and East Tibetan red, I wonder thus how ‘neutral’ or ‘factual’ the latter auxiliary actually is, and whether it could or should be translated with a factual verb form of English.

Therefore, I presented the various functions of the Ladakhi GEM or inok & Cie in order to enable speakers and researchers of the Central and East Tibetan and also other Tibetic varieties to compare these usages with the actual usages of red (or its equivalent) and acquire a better understanding of its position in the evidential, epistemic, and attitudinal system of these varieties. red (or any of its regional counterparts) will certainly not translate all usages of the GEM. But I expect similar pragmatic reasons behind its usage, notably reasons that have to do with ‘engagement’ or the assumed knowledge state of the addressee or the whole speech community.
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Selected abbreviations:
“=” means “is” (it is not a clitic marker!)
+- _ _ indicates assimilation or fusion across the word boundary
* is used for fused/unsegmentable morphemes
AES: aesthetive (transitive experiencer marking);
ASS: assertive (not at issue);
AUX: neutral auxiliary;
coll: collective;
DST: distance marker (showing mental distance);
EM: evaluative marker (cover term for inferential, probability, and distance markers);
emp: emphatic particle;
FM: focus marker;
GEM: GENERALISED EVALUATIVE MARKER;
GRD: gerundive;
INFDST: inferential-cum-distance marker;
LB: lhag.bcas morpheme aka ‘Semifinalpartikel’ (for clause chaining);
LQ: limiting quantifier (‘a’, ‘some’);
MSAP: main speech act participant;
NVIS: non-visual (or less immediate perception);
PPOS: postposition;
RM: remoteness marker (1. derives imperfect from present, 2. assertive past marker, 3. distant but well remembered situations of OTHER!);
SEM: SPECIALISED EVALUATIVE MARKER;
VIS: visual (or most immediate perception)