Vive la parole! Evidential ‘freaks’ in Ladakhi

1. Introduction

With respect to the various so-called evidential markers and the (more) epistemic markers used in Ladakhi (and the other Tibetan languages), I would like to make the following distinction: Set 1 (yin, yod, the marked past with -pin), Set 2 (ḥdug, rag, the simple past or mere verb stem, soŋ, byun), ‘evaluative’ markers for inferences, estimations, and probabilities. Set 1 corresponds to what other scholars call ‘egophoric’ markers, marking the main speech act participant’s (speaker in statements, addressee in questions = MSAP) privileged access to, involvement in, responsibility for, and ‘right’ to speak with personal authority about, a situation. Set 2 is used mainly for immediate perceptive knowledge about ‘others’, ‘evaluative’ markers for knowledge that is either not based on privileged access or personal observations or is tuned down for various socio-pragmatic reasons.

All markers have a prototypical usage, corresponding to other Tibetan ‘evidential’ systems, but also various non-standard, marked usages, see Table 1, where the non-prototypical usages are marked by grey shading. The ‘evidential’ markers thus do not so much indicate access to knowledge, than a speaker’s attitude towards the situation and towards the addressee and, in questions, the speaker’s expectations about the addressee’s attitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Set 1: yin/yod</th>
<th>Set 2: Ḫdug/rag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identific. copula</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past/ anterior</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributive copula</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Other (MSAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present/simultan.</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect/resultative</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All domains</td>
<td>other markers</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative markers</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotation markers</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>MSAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the non-standard usages are rather unsystematic or ‘freaky’, sometimes even contradictory, and cannot even be explained by general assumptions about socio-pragmatic factors. I shall introduce some of the ‘evidential freaks’ I encountered in Ladakhi and shall discuss also a few more general problems in the description of the markers.

2. yin vs. yod

2.1. Intrinsic, but short-term, individual vs. accidental, but long-term, general

Unlike speakers of English, speakers of Tibetan originally made a clear distinction between being (something) and being (somewhere). In the modern languages this distinction has been blurred to a certain extent for attributes and in the auxiliary constructions. In these cases, the existential auxiliaries Ḫdug and rag can be used for merely perceived attributes, while yin and yod compete for the MSAP’s authoritative stance.

In Ladakhi, there is still a limit that cannot be crossed: (real) identities can only be expressed with the copula yin (or an evaluative marker based on the copula). However, if the identity is of a more accidental character or associated with positive or negative evaluations, such as being a thief or a very religious person, the same rules apply as for attributes.

One might thus say that yin refers to the ‘intrinsic and invariable’ (Bielmeier 2000: 79; cf. Zemp 2013: 615 for the characterisation as ‘intrinsic’) or ‘absolute’ (Takeuchi) character, yod to a more accidental, ‘ancillary’, ‘temporary’ (Zemp) or ‘relative’ (Takeuchi) character.

This is only partially true, and perhaps only for the evaluated identities. With respect to attributes or properties, the Ladakhi dialects differ significantly in the proportionality to which yin can be used. Some dialects (or some speakers) disallow the use of yin, except perhaps for such ‘intrinsic’ properties as being of a certain age. Others may restrict yin to properties one can be responsible for, e.g. being good, but not being beautiful (Kargyam), others again may use yin only in contrastive (vulgo comparative) constructions (Sumur).

Some speakers prefer yin with one property and yod with another, without there being a clear pattern behind the choice (Gya-Miru). The only common pattern I have seen among the dialects is the use of yin with the adjectives big or small when treating age and age differences and the use of yod when treating size or differences in size, cf. example (13) further below. Finally, there are speakers who use yin rather neutrally besides yod. In the latter case, yin would indicate a more objective property about which many people and the MSAP agree, yod a more subjective property (Ciktan, Domkhar, Shara), (2).

When identifying a certain past temporal reference frame, at least one speaker differentiated between a longer frame, such as a season, and a shorter frame, such as a festivity, using yin.pin for the former, yod.pin for the latter.

(1) Shara 2017

tene ṭe-te seba-eha ʁhu jok-fen.
then I-ERG threshold-POS water throw-POS=F<POS=I

te-zane gun-la fin-pen. seba(=) tər Ḫak-te-duk.
that-when winter-ALL be=LE-POS threshold-ALL ice appear-POS=L-IV=F<POS=ERF

te-zane paglen-duk fiat-pen.
that-when bride-taking-POS exist=LE-POS

tene mi tshamna raro-re thenk-ehane tret-soŋ.
‘So I threw water on the door step. It was winter. [So] ice formed on the door step. At that time there was a bride-taking ceremony. Then all the people, being drunk, slipped on the door step.’

But then, for many speakers yod indicates that one has a longer acquaintance with the item, while yin indicates a shorter acquaintance (Shara), (3). yod may also refer to a more general property (Shara), (4).

yin often signals that the item in question is in view or present, while yod is used for items out of view or for situations of the past (Shamskat, Gya-Miru). With past time refer-
ence, yod (plus remoteness marker pin) may refer to a more generally valid situation, while yin (plus remoteness marker pin) can only refer to an individual situation (Khardong).

Finally, the opposition in terms of ‘invariance’ or more ‘general applicability’ and ‘temporariness’ is completely inverted in the present tense and present perfect constructions: here yin always signals a shorter duration, while yod signals a longer duration or a more general situation.

(2) Shara 2016

\[ \text{ŋa gjal’a met. / man.} \]

I good NG.be=Ie NG.be=Ic

‘I am not good (yod: subjective perception / yin: objective: everybody says so).’

(3) Shara 2016

\[ \text{a.e p’e gjal’a hin. / hiot.} \]

elder.sister very good be=Ic be=Ie

‘The elder sister is very good (yin: not 100% sure, staying with the person for only a limited time / yod: 100% sure, staying with the person all time).’

(4) Shara 2016

\[ \text{thukpa zimpo rak. ladaye thukpa zimpo hiot.} \]

soup tasty be=IInv Ladakh-GEN soup tasty be=Ie

‘The soup is tasty.’

‘The Ladakh soup is (generally) tasty.’

A rather unexpected feature showed up in Gyere. The speaker mainly used yod for self-descriptions, but in a few cases also yin. The more surprising feature, however, was that an equative comparison ‘being like’ would trigger the copula yin, when one compares oneself directly with another being. The use of yod would not be nice (”demo man”). When ascribing oneself a particular property of the other being, however, yod must be used. yod must also be used when comparing one’s bodypart directly with that of the other being.

(5) a. Gyere 2018

\[ \text{ŋa l’apwche-tsok çukce-ien hiot.} \]

I elephant-like strong be=Ie I elephant-like be=Ic ?be=le

‘I am strong like an elephant.’

‘I am like an elephant [that is, strong].’

b. Gyere 2018

\[ \text{ŋa l’apwche-tsok jin. / t’hoet.} \]

I look-able be=Ie I look-able be=Ic be=le

‘I am a look-able thing.’

(6) a. Gyere 2018

\[ \text{ŋa l’apwche-tsok jin. / t’hoet.} \]

I look-able be=Ie I look-able be=Ic be=le

‘I am a look-able thing.’

b. Gyere 2018

\[ \text{ŋa l’apwche-tsok jin. / t’hoet.} \]

I look-able be=Ie I look-able be=Ic be=le

‘I am a look-able thing.’

(7) a. Gyere 2018

\[ \text{ŋa l’apwche-tsok jin. / t’hoet.} \]

I look-able be=Ie I look-able be=Ic be=le

‘I am a look-able thing.’

b. Gyere 2018

\[ \text{ŋa l’apwche-tsok jin. / t’hoet.} \]

I look-able be=Ie I look-able be=Ic be=le

‘I am a look-able thing.’

(8) a. Gyere 2018

\[ \text{ŋa l’apwche-tsok jin. / t’hoet.} \]

I look-able be=Ie I look-able be=Ic be=le

‘I am a look-able thing.’

Government employees are usually shifted about every three years to a different post. People thus frequently ask each other where they are presently posted. Since such postings are thought to be not permanent, the copula yin is commonly used.

(9) Gyamr-2013

\[ \text{ŋa / ŋ’e dipti taka karu fin?} \]

I I-GEN duty now Upsh-ALL be=Ic

‘Where are you presently [stationed]? / Where is your duty now? – I am presently [stationed] at Upshi. / My duty is in Upshi now.’

For the Teya speaker, however, the choice between yin and yod in this context depends a) on how much one is concerned, and b) whether or not the addressee is expected to be in the office, particularly when talking on the phone:
Estimation based on vision now where be=Ic have=Ie have=Ie-lb-GEM=PERF
going where be=Ic exist=Ie
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Table 2 Example of asymmetries in the Kenhat dialect of Gyere (Rong-Cangtang)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attributive</th>
<th>existential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'k'ukpo</td>
<td>tā maŋbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>jin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>jin-do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jin-tig-dak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jin-kak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jin-dak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jin-kak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hō-te-inkak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hōte-jindak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) a. Teya 2017

jni ɖipʈi garu jot? / niri ɖipʈi daks gaɾu in?

‘Where is your duty? (now)’ (The two persons have met somewhere on the road. yod is used for a neutral question, jin when one is more concerned, e.g. when meeting a former colleague.)

b. Teya 2017

jni ɖipʈi garna in? / joti? / niri ɖipʈi daks gaɾu in?

‘Where is your duty? (yin): the speaker calls the addressee on his/her mobile phone expecting him/her to be in the office or school. / yod: the speaker does not expect the addressee to be at the office or school. – The answer depends on where the person actually is, not on the question.)

c. Teya 2017

jni ɖipʈi garna in? – joti?

‘Where is your duty? – I am [posted] / My duty is in Nyoma, [but] now I am on leave.’ (Speaker and addressee have met in Leh.)

For the speaker of the tiny village of Gyaik, yin would be used for one’s present momentary location, yod for one’s posting, while one would use the verb ‘stay’ for one’s more permanent settlement.

While this usage of the copula yin is widely spread among the dialects of the Leh district, it is not possible in the Balti dialect of Turtuk, the Purik dialect of Ciktan, and the Pangi dialect. No data is yet available for the Zanskar dialects.

2.3. The asymmetry between the evaluative markers based on yin and yod

The combination of the copula yin and an inferential marker yields two markers with values of their own: a) the generalised evaluative marker, GEM, which in many aspects resembles Central and East Tibetan red and yod.red, but has also other functions, among them identifications based on mere visual perceptions, and b) the specialised evaluative marker, SEM, which is most commonly used for identifications based on non-visual perceptions. Combinations of the existential linking verb yod and the same inferential markers are either not at all possible (the case of the Kenhat marker -og – -ag). Or it yields a completely different function (the case of the Shamskat marker sug). In Western Sham, e.g., yod.sug is clearly inferential, and in Ciktan, yod.sug can only refer to a past situation, whereas yin.sug can refer to the present or to general situations. As a rough existential counterpart of the GEM, a perfect construction of yod with the GEM as auxiliary can be used, cf. (10), although not in all situations, where the GEM might be used.

(10) Ciktan 2016

ʧiktan-la zi(k)-khan-i khar-po jöt-e-ɪntsku. / jöt.

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

Gyere 2018

kungiam-esaŋ lɪktsea mj məŋ-a-rɪk hōt-na, Kungyam-CNTR Lɪktse-ALL person be Many-NLS-LQ exist=le-CD

‘There are more people [living] in Liktske than in Kungyam, and if there are more people [living] in Kungyam than in Gyere, then [it is clear that] there are more people [living] in Liktshe than in Gyere.’ (*hōte-jindak cannot be used, because it is a sure conclusion.)

Gyere 2018

kbo ʂukpo hō-te-jindak, kbo-a nor maŋbo hō-te-jindak.

‘She/He is rather rich, s/he has a lot of riches.’ (Inference upon seeing somebody staying in a big house.)

Gyere 2018

i tə dak-te giela jindak. / fo-te-jindak.

‘This thing/instrument is good. / is definitely good.’ (The first expression with the GEM copula is normal and neutral, the second one, with the GEM perfect is more like specifically more pointing to the item, making it more important.)

3. Contrasting A with B is not the same as contrasting B with A!

I would have expected that when comparing or rather contrasting two items the evidential status concerning the relation as such or one’s attitude towards the relation such would be the same, independent of which way round the relation would be viewed. That is, the status of the relation between A and B should have been the same, whether one contrasts A with B or B with A. However, this is obviously not the case. What counts is the speaker’s mental
relation with, or attitude towards, the ‘subject’ or comparee. When the speaker has a different attitude towards A and B, e.g., because A belongs to his/her personal or cultural sphere and B does not, then different markers will be used, depending on whether A or B is the comparee. Word order, on the other hand, does not matter.

(15) a. Khardong 2016

ŋa thu kbo-e thopa-gun-san thun-a jot. / *in.
I-gen child she-gen friend-pl-CNTR be.short-NLS be=le *be=lc

‘My child is shorter than his/her friends.’

b. Khardong 2016

ŋa thu kbo-e thopa-gun-san thun-aŋ in. / *jot.
I-gen child she-gen friend-pl-CNTR be.small/young-NLS be=lc *be=le

‘My child is younger than his/her friends.’

(16) a. Khardong 2016

dorje ŋa thu-isan riŋ-a & duk. / jot. / *inok.
Dorje I-gen child-CNTR be.tall-NLS &be=IIv be=le *be=GEM

‘Dorje is taller than my child (&immediate observation / assimilated knowledge as the child has grown up close to us).’

b. Khardong 2016

dorje ŋa thu-isan gbe-a & inok. / in.
Dorje I-gen child-CNTR be.big/old-NLS &be=GEM be=lc

‘Dorje is older than my child (&immediate observation / assimilated knowledge as the child has grown up close to us).’

(17) a. Shara 2016

ŋa=ke khampa khistse-sesay tsapik-cige w/lenmo hiin.
we.excl-gen house neighbour-(gen.)CNTR a.bit-LQ-INSTR big be=lc

‘Our house, in relation to the neighbour’s is a bit big. ’> Our house is a bit bigger than the neighbours’ house. (But the builder can say hot.)

b. Shara 2016

khistse-se khampa ŋa=esay w/um hiinak.
neighbour-gen house we.excl-(gen.)CNTR small be=GEM

‘The neighbours’ house, in relation to ours is small.’> The neighbour’s house is smaller than ours.

(18) a. Shara 2017

car-e gonpa le lakan som-esay w/ho-zaik hot.
Çara-gen monastery Leh temple new-CNTR small-NLS-LQ be=le

‘The Çara monastery is small in contrast to (> is smaller than) the New Temple of Leh.’

b. Shara 2017

le lakan soma ŋa=ke gonp-esay w/be-zaik duk.
Leh temple new we.excl-gen monastery-CNTR big-NLS-LQ be=Iv

‘The New Temple of Leh is large in contrast (> is larger than) our monastery.’ (The blind informant has experienced the extension of the New Temple through walking during a short time visit.)
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(19) a. Lingshed 2016

potal-e khar lekhar-asay ʤhenmo jot-ʧa-duk.
Potala-gen palace Leh, palace-CNTR big be=IC-GRD-IIv=PROSP

‘The Potala palace seems to be bigger than the Leh palace (estimation based on visual input).’ (The speaker has seen photographs of the Potala.)

b. Lingshed 2016

lekhar potal-e khar-asay tsunʦe duk. / in-ʧa-duk.
Leh, palace Potala-gen palace-CNTR small be=IV be=IC-GRD-IIv=PROSP

‘The Leh palace is / seems to be smaller than the Potala palace.’

(20) a. Ciktan 2016

ŋaf-i brak-sak-patsek
we.excl-gen mountain-pl-CNTR

Stok kaŋri ma(i) tbo-nmo jot lo. / jot. / jot-suk. / jot-e-in.
Stok glacier very high be=le QOM be=le be=le-TIV/DST be=le-LB-Ic=PERF

‘Stok kaŋri (a high mountain near Leh) is much higher than our mountains, they say. / as I heard about it. / as I have once seen. / may be much higher than our mountains, I haven’t seen it.’

b. Ciktan 2016

Stok kaŋri-batsek ŋaf-i brak-sak tbo-nmo met. / man.
Stok glacier-CNTR we.excl-gen mountain-pl high NG.be=le NG.be=lc

‘Compared to Stok kaŋri, our mountains are not (very) high (more subjective / more objective).

4. The simple past (or unmarked past stem) – a neutral category?

I recently had a discussion with Nicolas about the neutrality of the Ladakhi simple past, i.e., the past stem (or the bare stem in the Kenhat dialects) without any further morphology. As the past tense constructions lagged behind in the development of ‘evidential’ marking, it may have remained neutral. In my system, the simple past falls into the Set 2 category and is opposed to the marked past of Set 1: the past (or bare) stem plus remoteness marker ʧe. Among these count TV news – rather understandably: one has, in fact, seen the situation, if only through the lenses of somebody else. This use is rather common. The first, regular, exception concerns the dialects of Lower Ladakh and Purik, where the simple past is also used for the MSAP for situations belonging to the recent past (quite an elastic category, depending on the type of action: in the case of writing a letter, it typically refers to the present or past day, but in the case of house construction, it may be extended to the past year).

4.1. Not personally observed situations

The second type of exceptions is more of a freaky nature. Accordingly, they are handled quite differently by individual speakers. The simple past may, but need not, be used for situations of the OTHER, which the MSAP did not or even could not observe him- or herself. Among these count TV news – rather understandably: one has, in fact, seen the situation, if only through the lenses of somebody else. This use is rather common. Another common use is for one’s own distant [−ctrl] situations, such as having lost or forgotten something, fallen from a tree, etc. In such cases, the past inferential marker is no longer applicable as it typically indicates that one has found out about the fact only recently, cf. (30) b.

1 The form needs to be checked.

b. Shara 2017

le lakan soma ŋa=ke gonp-esay w/be-zaik duk.
Leh temple new we.excl-gen monastery-CNTR big-NLS-LQ be=Iv

‘The New Temple of Leh is large in contrast (> is larger than) our monastery.’ (The blind informant has experienced the extension of the New Temple through walking during a short time visit.)

b. Shara 2017
A situation similar to the TV news holds for exceptional situations concerning the community and being part of heated discussions or also situations repeatedly re-narrated. To the repeatedly re-narrated situations belong the circumstances of the MSAP’s own birth, although the present perfect with the Set 1 marker yin is preferred when giving official information. Markers for non-observation, that is, inferential or distance markers may be used for a non-standard situation of which one has heard only few times, e.g., an emergency birth in the hospital. Conversely, foreigners, like BZ, or the new generations in Ladakh, who are typically born in a hospital, could then use the simple past for the normal hospital situation, and an inferential or distance marker for an uncommon and critical situation at home.

Re-narrated situations otherwise typically concern supernatural behaviour of particular statues of particular monasteries. In such cases, typically only the people affiliated with the monastery or region will use the simple past. Some might even use the marked past. Both forms signal identification or affectedness and firm belief. If one doesn’t use these two forms, one shows one’s mental distance: scepticism, disbelief, or non-belonging.

(21) Domkhar 2005

api-a / ḃa sku-a sun ḍyons. / ḍyon-bin.
grandmother-AES this statue-AES hon.speech hon.be.expert.PA=II hon.be.expert-RM=PA=I

‘The grandmother had the auspicious experience that the statue could speak.’

The first informant stated that the marked past implies that the speaker has observed the event. Since this sounded strange, I asked another Domkhar informant many years later. She said that with both the simple and the marked past, the speaker may or may not have observed the situation personally, but because it was a very special or famous situation everybody believes it as if having witnessed it personally. According to her, the marked past further emphasises this belief.

In Lower Ladakh, there is a widely attested belief that the Avalokiteśvara statue of the Tingmozagam monastery had once spoken to an old man from Hanu (further down river). The village of Teya is immediately neighbouring upon Tingmozagam, and for the villagers the story is a historical fact. Interestingly enough, when mentioning the event without further details, just stating that the statue could speak, the informant from Teya only used the distance marker, which among other things, refers to a distant past and/or an oral tradition. However, the moment she gave more details, namely to whom the statue spoke, the informant preferred the simple past.

(22) a. Teya 2017

tin-moʒaŋ-i phakspa ḍenrasik sun *ḍyons(-pin). / ḍyons
Tingmozagam-GEN Noble Avalokiteśvara hon.speech *hon.be.expert.PA(-RM)
sun ḍyon-kantsok lo.
hon.speech hon.be.expert-DST QM

‘The [statue of] the Noble Avalokiteśvara was able to speak, [they say].’ (The situation is apparently too unspecific.)

b. Teya 2017

hanu-pa meme-sig-a
Hanu.person grandfather-LQ-AES

tin-moʒaŋ-i phakspa ḍenrasik sun ḍyon(-pin).
Tingmozagam-GEN Noble Avalokiteśvara hon.speech hon.be.expert.PA(-RM)

‘An old man from Hanu experienced it that the [statue of] the Noble Avalokiteśvara was able to speak.’ (‘I heard it from the grandparents, and we all believe it’.)

Exceptional situations, like the 2010 flood in Leh or the 2007 Alchi murder case, where two lamas had been killed by two Nepali workers, likewise allow the use of the simple past, if one feels involved enough, and with some temporal distance also the marked past. In such cases, one was typically emotionally strongly affected: worries, if not even grief about relatives and friends in the flood situation or religious excitement, bewilderment, irritation, and perhaps even hatred in the Alchi murder case. In the latter case, the situation was discussed hotly week after week, and many people suggested that all Nepali workers should be expelled. As a result, even a bystander who merely participated in these discussions, such as BZ, is allowed or perhaps even expected to use the simple past. On the other hand, students who were children at that time or who had been studying outside Ladakh or had been otherwise cut off from the news and heard about these situations only later, would typically not use the simple past, as they had not personally experienced the situation of excitement.

(23) Shara 2017

חבר lok hon-zane mì manpo çi. / *çi-soŋ. / *çi-fen.
flood come-when people many die=PA=II *die-lexc=PA *die-RM=PA=I

‘A lot of people died, when there was the flood.’ (The informant has not personally witnessed the event, but her brother is in the police and has told her, and everyone was talking about it; hence she knows it well “in the mind”.)


näɲɲ gorka mì se meme-le pə sat.
last.year Gorkha 2=ERG hon.Lama-hon 2 kill=PA=II

‘Last year, two Nepalis killed two lamas.’
As the informant stated, the simple past can be used here, even though one did not observe the event oneself; because it is an established fact and everybody was talking about it. The marked past then indicates that one remembers the fact well. The murder happened in 2007, and particularly the Buddhists were absolutely shocked, since killing a monk is beyond one’s imagination. For weeks, everybody was talking about the crime.

The choice of the simple and the marked past is very sensitive to various factors. 10 years after the Alci murder case, the Teya speaker could only use the marked past or a distant marker. She thought, however, that an Alci speaker might use the simple past, which means that she might have used it in a similar event in her village. (25) It seems that in such cases, the simple past conveys a notion of historicity. By contrast, with respect to the rape incident in the Shey boarding school, which had just happened a few days earlier, she said that she would not use the simple past, because it was ‘too early’. However, given the double hedging with the inferential-cum-distance marker sug and the quote marker, I assume that she simply was not affected enough. (26) When talking about the ferocious-dog incident in Saspol, which happened a year earlier, she used both the simple past and the marked past, the latter for emphasizing her feelings, (27) Both Saspol and Teya are villages of Lower Ladakh, west of Leh, whereas Shey belongs to Upper Ladakh, east of Leh. It is clear that people are more affected by events happening in their neighbourhood or sphere of identity than by those happening at some other place. The Alci murder case had a transregional effect, as it affected the Buddhist community and the belief system.

(25) Teya 2017

lo khaʧig-esŋonla alʧi-a
year some-PPOs Alci-ALL
gorkha nis-is lama nis *sats. / sat-kantsok. / sats-pin.
Nepali 2-ERG lama 2 *kill.PA kill-DST kill.PA-RM

‘A few years ago in Alci, two Nepalese killed two lamas.’ (The simple past sats is not used here, possibly because the event happened too long ago, although a speaker from Alci, according to the informant, might use it or rather she might use it when talking about an event in Teya). The distance marker is used rather neutrally for events in the distant past of which one knows from hearsay. The marked past, on the other hand, can be used, even when one was not involved, as it indicates that one remembers the situation well.)

(26) Teya 2017

zak khaʧig-esŋonla fe lamo-dna skul-a
day some-PPOs Shey Ladom school-ALL
wardan-is ‘祸ug-zag-a reip tsos-ok lo. / *tsos.
warden-ERG child-LQ-ALL rape do.PA-INF/DST QM *do.PA

‘A few days ago, the warden of the Shey Lamdon [boarding] school apparently raped a child, [they] say.’ (According to the speaker, the simple past could not be used, because the event is too new. It is also possible that the speaker was not particularly affected by these shocking news, because it happened in a region she does not identify with.)

Historical facts derived from written and oral sources can also be rendered with the simple past. In this case, however, the use of the simple past depends on how seriously (one thinks that) one has studied the sources. As some informants stated, an intensive occupation with the subject makes one feel as if one has observed the situation oneself. This use is much less frequently accepted. In this case, several motivations crosscut. One motivation for not using the simple past is that when talking about history, one typically enters the explanatory mood, whereas the markers for shared knowledge and/or personal distance or non-involvement are used. The opposite motivations for using the simple past are one’s own confidence and also interest in the situations reported. The students with whom I usually work would hardly ever use the simple past, indicating thus that they do not know enough about the situation or also that were not much interested in it. By contrast, an elderly man, who descended from a family of quite high status, freely used the simple past, even for situations that happened in distant past. He also used the Setl marker yod for much more situations than anybody else, so that I had a hard time to invent situations he could possibly not know enough about. With his grammatical choices he signalled that he was very well acquainted with the facts because he had a keen interest in the world around him and beyond. Cf. example (22) above from Teya.

Folk tales, including the Kesar epic are typically rendered with the distance markers, in some dialects even with a specific narrative distance marker. Nevertheless, some speakers may switch between this form and the simple past for two reasons. One is, in fact, a neutralisation effect when talking about repeated similar sequences, e.g., the fight between two yaks is described at three subsequent time points or three brothers, one after the other, have a discussion with their father. On the other hand, however, the simple past also indicates that the narrator gets more involved with the story, virtually seeing it before his or her eyes. The switch back to the distance markers always occurs when the narrator returns to background information between the individual episodes. A person who has no good recollection of the story, like most of my informants, will definitely employ only the narrative distance markers, but an expert narrator will invoke the situation before his or her eyes and will tell the story as if personally observed. In the Lower Ladakhi version, e.g., the narrative distance markers are reserved for background information and the highlighting of surprising facts.

Jokes, on the other hand, are often presented, particularly by Shamskat speakers, with the simple past. I would think that the main reason to do so is to present the story vividly and as relevant as if one had experienced the situation oneself.
As the Kārgyam informant stated, the simple past zer for the child is suitable, because everybody is expected to laugh. One could also say that the simple past brings the narrated event closer to the audience and makes it more relevant.

The Ladakhi simple past is thus not a neutral category in the sense that it can be used in place of the marked categories or that it is a kind of garbage bin for an undefinable rest. In the Kenhat dialects, the simple past is used only for the OTHER. It typically signals immediate perceptive observation of the situation or, in a more extended or perhaps metaphorical usage, a somewhat more indirect mental involvement in the situation either through affectiveness or deep interest, and thus a greater acquaintedness. Acquaintedness with the fact – but non-identification with the situation as being responsible for it – is also the reason for the use of the simple past for [-ctr] situations. All these functions hold true in the Shamskat dialects when referring to the OTHER. But when used for the MSAP, it signals the recentness of the situation.

Nevertheless, there seem to be peripheral dialects where the opposition between the simple and the marked past has not yet fully developed.

4.2. MSAP, tight-lipped marked past, talkative simple past

So far, only one speaker stated that she would generally use the simple past for her own actions, when in a mood to tell more. According to her, the marked past with the remoteness marker pin would function like saying ‘full stop’, signalling there is nothing more to say or also that there would have been more to say about the situation, but she just doesn’t want to. It is not clear how far this is an individual feature or how far it is typical for her village dialect or also other dialects. The Rumbak village at the foot of the Zankar range is somewhat cut off from the valley and thus has developed some idiosyncrasies and may lag behind in the development of the opposition between simple and marked past. Judged by the verbal forms, the dialect belongs to the Central Kenhat dialects, but there are also some influences from the Shamskat dialects (as perhaps also in other villages on the left side of the Indus river), particularly the initial clusters are more of the Shamskat than of the Leh type.

(29) Rumbak 2017

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na} & \text{ abi-le-naa} & \text{meme-le(ː)laga} & \text{duks.} \\
\text{I} & \text{grandmother-hon-COM} & \text{grandfather-hon-PPOS} & \text{stay-P(-I)} \\
\text{tene} & \text{lo} & \text{tuk} & \text{gshañ-kxon-ba-le-a} & \text{gos-te-tans,} \\
\text{then} & \text{year} & \text{6} & \text{go} & \text{about-father-hon-ALL-shall-1B-give-P(-I)} \\
\text{gshi} & \text{zer-na,} & \text{na} & \text{phet-tek} & \text{zara} & \text{son-P(-I),} & \text{khob-a} & \text{gos-a-mi-ruk-pin.} \\
\text{why say-C(D} & \text{I half-LQ} & \text{blind become-NLS} & \text{they- AES} & \text{need-NLS-NG-NL-RI-MP(-I)} \\
\text{tene} & \text{thagri-n-e} & \text{maññ-tek} & \text{in-pin; kbo-ela-ga} & \text{ka} & \text{nañ-mampo} & \text{duks.} \\
\text{then fur-GEN} & \text{aunt-LQ} & \text{be} & \text{lc-RM} & \text{she-PPOS} & \text{she-PPOS-COM} & \text{stay-P(-I)} \\
\text{inañ} & \text{tbo} & \text{kul-} & \text{in-pin.} \\
& \text{but she labourer} & \text{be} & \text{lc-RM}
\end{align*}
\]

\`I [first] stayed with [my] grandparents. When I was about to become six, [they] sent me back (lit: shared and sent) to [my] father. That is, they did not need me, when I became half-blind. Then there was a distant aunt [not a real aunt]. I stayed with her. But she was just a labourer. Therefore there was not enough money to give me a good education. [She] sent me to a government school. I studied until thenth [class]. But then I failed the thenth [class exam]. Then I went to the SECMOL summer camp. Then I met elder sister Becky and elder brother Aŋcuk. I stayed there a few months. I did some odd jobs [of the sort everybody in SECMOL has to do], and I also studied. Then, as it was my luck, I got closer to Becky and Aŋcuk. But after about two or three months, I went off to become a nun, I run away to Dharamsala [that is]. [The speaker continues upon a request: ] [Ok]. I stayed 13 years as a nun. I had hoped, though, that I would obtain the understanding of a Buddha, but I didn’t obtain it, and so I came back. [That’s it. There would have been more to say about the situation, but I don’t want to.]’
when the MSAP was somehow involved in, or responsible for, the situation, e.g., when having requested a certain action, (31).

Situations directed towards the MSAP are regularly presented with the simple past. The alternation between the simple past for events concerning or ‘reaching’ the MSAP and events that ‘move away’ from the MSAP (plus the alternation with the marked past for the MSAP’s own activities) is nicely demonstrated in example (32).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Usage for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-pin</td>
<td>jōkfen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gotpen</td>
<td>the narrated action of the MSAP and the members of her group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-jōkfen</td>
<td>the MSAP’s narrated action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-jōkfen</td>
<td>a question concerning the MSAP’s actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zen</td>
<td>the MSAP’s narrated action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zen</td>
<td>the MSAP’s narrated action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>an action directed towards the MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>an action directed towards the MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sonj</td>
<td>a narrated event concerning 3P (the guests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sonj</td>
<td>an action directed towards the MSAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concentric directional byuŋ is used only in dialects closer to the Tibetan border, but its usage appears to be less common than in Standard Spoken Tibetan. The simple past is often used neutrally. For the Gyere speaker the simple past is preferable for neutral statements and for statements in face-to-face communications, while the directional is more common when talking over the phone. Particularly the concentric directional byuŋ is in need of a note concerning the MSAP’s actions, that is, the msap should be affected. This may be the case when she receives a letter from a family member, but more often, when some negative event occurs.

(33) a. Gyere 2018

Once the children that were older than me told me: «Throw water on the door step!» So I threw water on the door step. It was winter. [So] ice formed on the door step. At that time there was a bride-taking ceremony. Then all the people, being drunk, slipped on the door step. And we children were all laughing. Then the people got angry and asked us, saying: «Who threw the water?» Then [I] said: «I threw it.» Then [they] said: «Why did you throw it?» Then I said: «[Because] the elder boys had told me [so].» Then [they] chased all the children away.

Vive la parole! Evidential ‘freaks’ in Ladakhi

Note the different linking verbs yin and yod for the temporal reference: yin.pin is used for the longer-lasting season, yod.pin for the short-term festivity!
5. Shared and shareable knowledge: the explanatory mood

It has been observed elsewhere (San Roque 2015: 206) that certain ‘evidential’ markers can be used to present a fact as potentially perceptible to everybody and particularly to the addressee. An ‘impersonal evidential’ “may encourage the addressee to share in co-appraisal of a thing or proposition with the speaker and thus reach a similar evaluative stance” San Roque (ibid.).

Many usages of the GENERALISED EVALUATIVE MARKER (GEM): inok / inak / jindak / jindak / intsuk or of a few other evidential markers correspond to this ‘impersonal’ function. In most Ladakhi dialects surveyed so far, these markers are used both when the addressee is expected to know the fact and when s/he is expected not to know. So far only in Ciktan Purik makes an exception. In this dialect, the Set 1 markers, indicating the speaker’s authoritative knowledge, are used when the addressee is expected not to know, cf. (10).

In all other dialects it is a matter of communicative politeness to tune down one’s – in relation to the addressee – privileged access when referring to situations that may be generally known. Even personal facts belonging to one’s privat sphere may be presented in the explanatory mood. When using markers for shared or shareable knowledge, the speaker invites the addressee to share the knowledge in case she does not yet have access to it. The markers also signal that the speaker is ready to give more details and also that s/he is open for discussion. As one informant stated, one would more likely ask for further details, when the facts are presented with the GEM, than when they are put straightforwardly on the table (FD Shachukul 2016, similarly Leh 2016). That is, the GEM presents a fact or situation as at issue.

Conversely, the GEM in questions signals friendly curiosity as opposed to an authoritative inquisition. My late landlord used to ask me repeatedly about which crops were growing in Germany, using the highly impersonal future/generic construction -anok (most probably < NLS & GEM -ba,yin,bog) – and, of course, expecting me to answer in the same tone.

Domkhar 2011

waʦe khitsoks-i semfən-i riks intsuk.
fox dog,like-GEN animal-GEN class be=GEM
‘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.)

Lingshed 2016

d-u fi inok, sjanla ma-thor-ba? –
this-DF what be=GEM earlier NG=see=NLS –

‘What is this, that we did not see earlier (seeking information)? – This is a mobile. One can talk through this (explaining to somebody who doesn’t know).’
A student belonging to the village was expected to make an important list together with the other villagers. In the meeting, the village head had told everybody to come on time next morning at 10 o’clock, but nobody came in time, some people did not come, at all. The student was quite frustrated and went to search the villagers, saying:

«Following yesterday’s meeting, all of us know it well (authoritative): it was agreed to meet at ten today, so why didn’t you come on time? And why did you wrongly scold the youngster?” Then that lady couldn’t say anything any more (lit. was left with the other villagers. In the meeting, the village head had told everybody to come on time next morning at 10 o’clock, but nobody came in time, some people did not come, at all. The student was quite frustrated and went to search the villagers, saying:

When the student complained to the village head, the latter was also not amused. He went to that lady and made a scene, himself:

As one can assume, the knowledge state of all three persons is the same. All have been in 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 giu 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.

6. Accessibilities

As Nicolas Tournadre has shown, privileged access tends to rank higher than access through sense perceptions, sense perception higher than inferences, vision higher than other senses and hearsay. The rest is somewhat more complicated and there are exceptions.

6.1. hudug vs. yod — non-privileged access: partial observation

One may say that a lower access is more specific than the next higher access. With the markers for sense perception, this means that one must have seen a crucial part of the situation in order to use hudug. That is, the crucial part of the situation must have taken place in one’s deictic sphere. If the situation moved out of one’s deictic sphere or if one moves out of the situation, hudug must be replaced by the next higher marker, yod. I have observed the effect of the speaker moving out so far in all dialects, except Turtuk Balti and Ciktan Purik. In Ciktan hudug must be replaced by yod.sug for past time reference, otherwise the rule is the same. The Turtuk speaker used yod.sug in both situations.

When one lady (lit. mother) became angry [and said]: «Who are you that we all know it well (authoritative)?! You are, as it appears, still wet behind the ears! What [kind of manner] is this, talking to us in this way?! If the village head speaks like this, it is ok. But who, [do you think], are you?!»

When I arrived at the monastery, the lamas were praying. When I returned, the lamas were still praying.”
Vive la parole! Evidential ‘freaks’ in Ladakhi

(44) Ciktan 2016

namny na khajna-(:) lep-tsana,

last, year 1 home- all arrive-when

ŋaʧi zanzos tshaman-s phjak be(:)-n-jot-suk / *be(:)-n-duk-pin.

we excl, GEN family all ERG prayer do-CNT-le-DST *do-CNT-IIv=RM=IMPF

dan na khajna-na bin-mana, khoŋ nyu-in-jot-pin.

yesterday 1 home-ABL go.out-NLS&S they cry-CNT-le-RM=IMPF

‘Last year, when I arrived home, all family members were just praying. Yesterday, when I left home, they were crying.’

Rather than being a question of evidence or assimilation, it is a question, along the lines proposed by Speas (2012 and Kalsang et al. 2013), of whether the observed situation (OS) comprises a relevant part of, that is, here: the end of – the event situation (ES) (> Set 2) or not (> Set 1):

— nye abale(ː)

‘my father was singing.’

(Speaker witnessed end of activity.)

— nye abale(ː)

‘my father was still singing.’

(Speaker did not witness end of activity.)

Some Shamskat speakers go even further. They would use yod, when seeing only part of the situation, e.g. when seeing a person from the front, who is carrying a leaking sack of grain.

(45) Domkhar 2009

l̥tos-aŋ! bras-po t˚am-en˚uk.

look, IMP-DM rice-DF get.scattered-CNT-IIv=PRS

‘Look!, the rice is getting scattered.’ (ḥdug is used when one sees the person from behind and thus can see the flowing going on. It is not necessary that the beginning or the end is observed.)

(46) Domkhar 2009

l̥tos-aŋ! bras-po t˚am-et.

look, IMP-DM rice-DF get.scattered-1e=PR5

‘Look!, the rice is getting scattered.’ (yod is used when one sees the person who carries the sack of rice from the front or when the person takes up the sack and the grain just starts to flow. In both cases, one does not really see the full flow.)

Again one can describe the difference between the two situations as the difference between observing the situation fully, that is, when the event situation lies – spatially – within the observed situation, ḥdug will be used, but when the observed situation is apparently only part of the event situation, yod will be used.

(45) braspo

‘the rice is getting scattered.’

(Speaker sees the rice flowing for some time, seeing the person from behind.)
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While these usages roughly correspond to the accessibility hierarchy, there are also instances, where a speaker will choose the Set 2 marker *rag* over *ḥdug* in violation of the hierarchy. This mainly happens with intensive, often negative, situations, where the feeling and emotional involvement of the speaker as a victim is more important than the concomitant visual observation of the situation. In such cases, the use of the auxiliary *ḥdug* would convey a feeling of disconnection with the body (Domkhar). In these contexts, Set 2 marker *rag* can also be used for a past situation, even when showing the visible traces of an attack.

(54) a. Domkhar 2018
dan kbo-s ṇa-(ː) tsher manybo rdun-en-ak-pin.
yesterday s/he-ERG I-ALL time many beat-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
‘Yesterday he beat me several times.’

b. Domkhar 2018
lṭos-an, kbo-s ṇa-(ː) rdun-en-ak-pin.
look.IMP-DM s/he-ERG I-ALL beat-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
fa tshayma sjonpo son-se saṅs.
flesh all blue go-LB swell=PA=II
‘Look! He has beaten me, I have blue spots and swellings all over my body.’

(55) a. Domkhar 2018
dʒuʤu kbi-a gīk thoms-an? ṇa-(ː) so tab-en-ak-pa.
please dog-ALL one hold.IMP-DM I-ALL tooth apply-CNT-Inv=PRS-emp
‘Please hold off the dog for a while! It’s biting me.’

b. Domkhar 2018
lṭos-an? kbi-s ṇa-(ː) so tab-en-ak-pin.
look.IMP-DM dog-ERG I-ALL tooth apply-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
rmaka khqasik phiy-se, dagdar-is hapso t’aŋs.
wound some bring.out-LB doctor-ERG stitches give.PA=II
‘Look! The dog has bitten me. It caused some wounds, and the doctor stitched them.’

This usage could be tested back to only a few other speakers, but appears to be commonly acceptable. However, *some*, but certainly not all, informants would again switch back to *ḥdug*, when 3rd person witnesses were involved. According to the Domkhar informant, *yod* should be used, if the witnesses did not observe the situation visually but only by other channels.

(56) a. DOMe18
dan ʧbhenmo-s ṇa-(ː) stot-en-ak-pin.
yesterday boss-ERG I-ALL laude-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
‘Yesterday the boss lauded me.’ (The speaker saw it and heard it, but was positively affected, feeling proud.)

b. DOMe18
dan ʧbhenmo-s ṇa-(ː) mi-nun-idunla stot-en-ak-pin. / *stot-en-ak-pin.
yesterday boss-ERG I-ALL people-PL-PPOS laude-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF laude-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
‘Yesterday the boss lauded me in front of all the people.’

6.4. *rag* vs. *lo* — the certainty of direct communication

According to the accessibility hierarchy proposed by Nicolas Tournadre non-visual perceptions are higher than quotations and second-hand information. Second-hand information would thus also be less certain than non-visual perception. In Ladakhi, this may be true for endophatic non-visual perceptions. However, with respect to information obtained through the auditory channel, the opposite is true.

The quote marker *lo* is used when one is directly informed, by preference in a face-to-face communication. I have observed it when people directly cited passages from a book, but otherwise information from written sources may be marked with the Set 2 marker *ḥdug* for visual perception. In a similar manner, in formation obtained by phone or via a third person may be expressed with the *ḥdug* (LING).

(57) a. Domkhar 2018
dan makpa-s ṇa-(ː) mi-(ː)dunla rdun-en-ak-pin, /
yesterday husband-ERG I-ALL people-PPOS beat-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
*rdun-en-ak-pin, su-s-an pato ma-ʧos.
*beat-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF who-ERG-FM help NG-do.PA
‘Yesterday [my] husband beat me in front of the people, [but] nobody helped me.’

b. Domkhar 2018
dan makpa-s ṇa-(ː), kuʧo t’an-en, rdun-en-jot-pin. /
yesterday husband-ERG I-ALL shouting give-CNT beat-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
*rdun-en-ak-pin. / *rdun-en-ak-pin.
*beat-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF *beat-CNT-Inv-RM=IMPF
khimsbespa-sag-a kuʧo tshor lo, rduŋskat tshor lo,
neighbour-PL-AES shouting hear QOM beating noise hear QOM
‘Yesterday he beat me several times.’

Obviously, for some speakers, not only the knowledge and observation of the addressee plays a role, but also the knowledge and observation type of other persons, bystanders to the narrated event.

(58) Lingshed 2016
«kbo nal-e-dak» zer-[en]-ak, / lo.
she be.tired-LB-Inv=PERF say-[CNT]-Inv=PRS QOM
‘*She is tired*, [s/he] said (over the phone or via a 3rd person / directly, face to face).’

(59) Lingshed 2016
kbo-s dizuk lo. / zer-duk. / zer-en-ak.
she this.way say/QOM say-Inv=PRS say-CNT-Inv=CNT-PRS
Not a question of accessibility: What are you doing?

When speakers of the central dialects meet on the road, the casual question *What are you doing?* takes the Set 2 marker *ḥdug* for the MSAP. Most speakers agree that there should be a plurality of addressees and that the honorific verb *mdzad* should be used. The addressees would then, however, answer with the Set 1 marker *yod*. Speakers from the more peripheral, especially western dialects typically reject this usage.

Example (61) from a radio play, has been judged to be a bit artificial. Usually people would simply state that they are there: *jot le* or *nikan jot le* (‘we are here’), and would not necessarily explain what they were doing (Rumbak). One speaker commented that when seeing the people doing some work, it would be odd to ask with the Set 1 marker *yod*; this sound would be as if the speaker were blind. However, when the people are resting and not doing anything, Set 1 marker *yod* is appropriate for an information-seeking question (Gyere).

6.6. (Dis)appearance of a ghost — idiosyncratic accessibility

In 2017, the Kuyul informant was about to leave, when I asked him whether he had taken a certain item, either his keys or his money. He groped for it inside the pocket of his jeans and said *duk, duk!* ‘Yes, I have it’. I was startled and asked him immediately why he would use the Set 2 marker *ḥdug* for visual perception and not the Set 2 marker *rag* for non-visual perceptions, thinking that in his border dialect the latter marker was perhaps not used. However, he demonstrated that if he searched the money from inside the pocket, he would use *ḥdug*, but when feeling item in the pocket from outside he would use *rag*. I was too amazed to write down the full sentence, but simply made a note for the next session. However, the informant was too busy and we did not meet again for linguistic questions.

When we resumed work in 2018, I asked the speaker to make a nice sentence with an appropriate item in the pocket. To my surprise, the speaker stated that he would only use *ḥdug* and could not believe that he should have said otherwise and should have even demonstrated the difference to me. He tried the different ways of searching inside and outside the pocket again, but insisted only *rag* would be possible in both cases. Was the 2017 incidence then a mere hallucination?

Not quite so. Of course I had immediately started asking other speakers about the possible use of the Set 2 marker *ḥdug* in situations where one gropes for something inside one’s pocket. Most speakers rejected such usage right away, one speaker even stating explicitly that *ḥdug* means seeing something, and therefore could not be used. However, a few informants did accept the usage. They explained that *ḥdug* could be used when feeling the item in question immediately upon the fingertips or also feeling that nothing is there at all.

Informants: Turtuk: ABDUL HAMID; Sumur: STANZIN YANGSKIT; Khardong: TSHEWANG RIDZIN; Ciktan: SARFRAZ AHMED; Lingshed: TUNDNAP NAMDAL; Domkhar: TSHERING DISKIT; Teya: TSHERING DOLKAR; Rumbak: KUNZANG DOLMA; Gya-Miru: MENGYUR TSHOMO; Shara: THUJGE DOLMA; Gyalk: JIGMET ANGMO; Gyere: SONAM DORJE; Shachukul: Tsering KunDzes; Kargyam: CHAMBA TSETAN; Kharak: Tsering Angtrak; Kuyul: JIGMET TANDAR; Pangi: TENZEN DOLKAR