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A. Introduction

Ever since the notion of evidentiality became known to a broader linguistic audience, two tendencies of appropriation can be observed: one is, of course, quite fruitful, application to the Tibetic languages, the other is the attempt apply the concept to the Standard European languages. It should be clear that the latter attempt necessarily goes along with a redefinition of the concept that would treat evidentiality if not even identical with, then at best as a mere sub-domain of, epistemic modality. The Tibetic languages, however, display a system that is evidently different from epistemic modality in the Standard European language. What this system exactly represents is another question. The questionnaire presented here is thought to facilitate answers to that question.

In many, if not all, Tibetic languages, the system is highly flexible. While we have a fairly good knowledge about the more common distribution of the various ’evidential’ auxiliaries in the Tibetic languages, we have little knowledge about the more special usages that may deviate from, or even contradict, the ’system’ derived from the common usages. This questionnaire is thus also an attempt to collect all special usages or the contexts that may give rise to it. This may serve to establish the different cut-off points in the different languages and dialects.

This questionnaire has been developed primarily for the Tibetic languages, and is, in its initial stage, biased towards the Ladakhi dialects. In order to make it more universally applicable to Tibetic-type systems I should greatly welcome input from researchers around the world. The questionnaire will present the contexts in which the standard and non-standard usages of the ’evidential’ and evaluative auxiliaries and morphemes in question show up.

Before starting with the questionnaire in section B, I should like to give some definitions of evidentiality and the related concepts (1.1) as well as a brief description of the basic traits of the Tibetic system (1.2).

1.1 Epistemic mode, speakers’ attitude, evidentiality, and mirativity: some definitions

Everywhere in the world, speakers tend to evaluate or hedge the validity of a statement in various ways. In many languages this happens on a more semantic level with particles or constructions that are added only if necessary. (In some genres, such as academic writing, such modifications tend to become obligatory.) The set of such particles or constructions would be open or relatively large with only subtle differences in meaning between the different elements, many of which might have multiple functions.

Other languages have grammaticalised such modifications to the extent that a speaker always has to choose between a limited set of forms. In the Standard European languages some such modifications tend to be grammaticalised as mode: subjunctive, conjunctive etc. Where other modifications are grammaticalised, this tends to be captured under the notion of ‘evidential’, and this notion is now often extended to non-obligatory and non-grammaticalised modifications.

As with many linguistic concepts, the concept of ‘evidentiality’ overlaps with other concepts, such as ‘epistemic marking’ or ‘mode’ and ‘speaker’s attitude’ or ‘stance’. The common function, all such markers share is that they hedge the validity of a statement. They do so, however, in different ways, focusing on different aspects. As hardly any language marks each of these aspects separately, most of these forms have a basic and an extended application. It is the latter extended applications that lead to confusion in
the discussion and to a constant redefinition of the functions in question. It is therefore necessary to define the basic application of these concepts, if not for a general cross-linguistic application, so still for the purpose of the present discussion.

- **Epistemic** modes basically deal with hypothetical or even counterfactual situations, in contrast to the attested situations in the real world. They may describe different degrees of likelihood and in an extended usage they may indicate that the speaker merely makes an inference. To a certain extent such expressions may also express different degrees of desirability, which may lead to extended usages, where speakers evaluate their attitude towards a real-world situation.

- **Speaker’s attitude or stance** basically deals with the relation between the speaker and the content of the utterance and between the speaker and the addressee. The speaker conveys a judgement about the reliability of the content of his or her own statement or that of other persons. In the first case, this may indicate that the speaker merely makes a guess or an inference or, by contrast, that s/he wants to warrant the content by all means. In the second case, this may also contain judgements about the likelihood that the content is true.

- A particular case of speaker’s attitude is **admirativity**, where the speaker conveys a strong notion of non-commitment: surprise, disbelief, embarrassment or, in an extended usage, also other, more positive types of emotional involvement, such as compassion or joy.

- The concept of admirativity has been narrowed down to **mirativity** as a mere expression of surprise by Delancey (1997), followed by Aichenvald (2004). It is important to note that the notion of surprise essentially belongs to the moment where the particular situation became known, not necessarily to the time of the utterance, where the situation may no longer constitute a surprise for the speaker, particularly if s/he has retold the situation again and again. A mirative (or admirative) statement is thus also a statement about the likelihood or desirability of a situation in a particular causal or social context.

- **Evidentiality**, finally, deals with the different types or sources of evidence for the content of an utterance and its evaluation. In the cross-linguistic discussion, the basic types are a) personal experience or direct knowledge, b) hearsay, and c) inference, the latter two usually subsumed under indirect knowledge. In an extended usage all three types may be used to express a speaker’s attitude. That is, type a) expressions may convey a notion of authority or commitment, whereas type b) and type c) expressions may convey a notion of doubt or non-commitment. Type a) and c) may also convey different degrees of probability.

The Tibetic languages would suggest a fourth type of knowledge, namely intimate or fully assimilated knowledge that presents itself to the main speech act participant (MSAP) or what Creissels (2008) calls ‘asserter’, that is, the speaker in assertions, but the addressee in questions, as self-evident, with the source no longer being important or apparent. This type of knowledge stands in sharp contrast to knowledge based on mere sense perception.

---

1 See here Friedman (1986 and again 2012).
One can observe that the Tibetic system does not fully match the general conceptualisation of evidentiality, because it would oppose two types of ‘direct’ knowledge: direct knowledge as derived from sense perception and the MSAP’s knowledge most intimate or assimilated knowledge. This opposition shifts sense perception somewhat towards ‘indirect’ knowledge.

Table 1  Evidential languages in comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidentiality in general</th>
<th>own activities</th>
<th>observed situations</th>
<th>inference</th>
<th>2nd hand information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tibetic type</td>
<td>own / controlled activities</td>
<td>observed situations</td>
<td>inference</td>
<td>2nd hand information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*mirative connotations)</td>
<td>(*mirative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

authoritative non-authoritative

1.2 Many descriptions for a complex feature; the evidential opposition in Tibetan

Fully grammaticalised evidentiality is a relatively recent phenomenon in Tibetan; it is not found in Old Tibetan (mid 7th – end of 10th c.) and early Classical Tibetan. We do not know when and where the first evidential systems developed, but the feature must have spread fast across almost all Tibetan languages. By the 15th c., Central Tibetan varieties certainly had something like the modern evidential systems, as can be observed in the ‘biography’ of Tibet’s greatest yogi Milaraspa. The, to my knowledge, only Tibetan language that did not develop an evidential system of the common Tibetan type is Balti, the western-most branch, and here possibly only the more western dialects.

The basic distinction in the Tibetic language can be seen as a binary opposition between two sets of markers, one for non-assimilated knowledge or knowledge based on immediate perception (in the following: Set 2) and one for knowledge that is not based on immediate perception or already assimilated (in the following: Set 1). This opposition may also be conceived of in various terms, see Table 2 below. The markers of these two sets consist of attributive and existential linking verbs, which are also used as auxiliaries in many or all TMA constructions, in some languages also of light verbs and/or other morphological material.

Evaluative markers constitute a third set, but they are usual linked to the markers for non-perceptual knowledge. With respect to the Tibetan languages, it may thus be useful to distinguish between evaluative marking and evidential marking in a more narrow sense. Marking of hearsay is often not fully grammaticalised, and it is superimposed to both the evidential distinction in the narrower sense and evaluative marking.

The first author, to my knowledge, to describe ‘evidentiality’ in a Tibetic language in a consistent manner, without, however, using the term ‘evidentiality’ explicitly, is Sanyukta Koshal (1979: 193ff., 207ff. and passim). She uses the terms ‘reportative’ (for the Set 1 markers), ‘observed’ (for visual perception), and ‘experiential’ (for non-visual perceptions and feelings) for the opposition of yod, ḡdug, and ḡgrag in Ladakhi. She further describes several evaluative (inferential and estimation) markers. Koshal does not, however, discuss the fact that the markers switch between the speaker and the addressee in questions. And she overlooks the quotation marker lo.

At almost the same time, the opposition was described in terms of ‘conjunct’ vs. ‘disjunct’ (Hale 1980) for Newari, in order to account for the switch in questions and for
the principle of semi-indirect quotation. However, these notions cannot explain the complexity and flexibility of the system (cf. Tournadre 2008 for a critique), but they are unfortunately still in use (cf. Bartee 2011 with further references). On the base of Tournadre’s work (1996a/b, 2008, etc.), it has become quite common to discuss the opposition in terms of egophoricity or ego-involvement. Many authors, including the present writer, have taken recourse to multiple functions. The various different functional descriptions of this opposition are listed in the following table:

Table 2: Functional descriptions of the basic opposition in Tibetic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General categories</th>
<th>Set 1 [–evaluative]</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>junction</td>
<td>conjunct</td>
<td>disjunct</td>
<td>DL, Ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech act participant indexing</td>
<td>self-person</td>
<td>other-person</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaker/ addressee</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>Ag, AgT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional illocutionary focus</td>
<td>for other: on speaker/ addressee’s involvement</td>
<td>for speaker/ addressee: on thematic participant</td>
<td>AgT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viewpoint, perspective</td>
<td>personal, speaker- (/addressee-) based</td>
<td>impersonal, fact- or object-based</td>
<td>Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>De</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subjective</td>
<td>objective, detached</td>
<td>Ze, (Ag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong empathy³</td>
<td>weak empathy³</td>
<td>Hä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ego-involvement</td>
<td>egophoric</td>
<td>constative, assertive</td>
<td>Tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volitionality</td>
<td>volitional</td>
<td>non-volitional</td>
<td>Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker’s attitude, stance</td>
<td>certain, definite</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(commitment)</td>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>mirative</td>
<td>Za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>warranted</td>
<td>non-warranted</td>
<td>Ag, Ze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authoritative</td>
<td>non-authoritative</td>
<td>Ze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>novelty/ recency</td>
<td>(relatively) old</td>
<td>(relatively) new</td>
<td>DL, Dr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assimilated</td>
<td>non-assimilated</td>
<td>Bi, Hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assimilated (old)</td>
<td>newly acquired</td>
<td>Tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specificity/ common ground</td>
<td>non-specific, general, commonly known</td>
<td>specific, not commonly known⁴</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source/ access⁵</td>
<td>‘reportative’⁷</td>
<td>observed, experiential</td>
<td>Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-experiential</td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td>Ze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>testimonial/testimonial</td>
<td>Tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>testimonial vs. factual</td>
<td>Hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumptive</td>
<td>sensorial</td>
<td>Oi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


³ In correlation with the speech-act participant empathy hierarchy.

⁴ This is mentioned with respect to the linking verbs only.

⁵ Goldstein also lists first hand knowledge for the use of ḡdug. But this is somewhat problematic, as the authoritative knowledge of the speaker or addressee about his or her own controlled actions is certainly first hand knowledge, cf. also the classification as ‘personal’ by Hill (2013).

⁶ Tournadre (1996b) discriminates between the modes of access: direct observation (“constatif” or also “testimonial”), inferences, indirect knowledge, endopathic perceptions, and different types of information: volitive, gnomic, and admoritative. This would rather correspond to a differentiation between evidentiality and speaker’s stance.
Except for the notion of person marking and a strict conjunct/disjunct distinction, all these factors play a certain role, and some of them may be more prominent in one language or dialect, other factors in another, while each researcher might be biased by his or her preconceptions or by his or her chosen starting point.

Set 1 typically contains the modern forms of the classical linking verbs yin ‘be (a certain item, of a certain property)’, the copula = Ic and yod ‘exist (in some location)’ = Ie.

Set 2 contains the modern forms of the verb ḥdug ‘sit, stay, live’ = IIexp (or IIv when in contrast to an auxiliary for nonvisual perception = Iinv), in cluding its nasal form /nụ/ or an extremely shortened form /ki/. Equivalents are Amdo /yajokà/ ~ /yòkà/ (Haller 2002) and /kâjodìkàl ~ /kôdìkàl/ (Sun 1999) and a few other auxiliaries such as a form of snaŋ in East Balti, Nubra, Pangi, Dongwang (Bartee 2011), and Gagatang (Suzuki 2012) or a form of gdùh (Tournadre & Konchok Jiatso 2001). In the central and eastern varieties, Set 2 also contains as a counterpart only of yin the auxiliaries of unknown origin: red or /piel (≠ pas). For the simple past (or ‘perfective’), the mere verb stem, or various auxiliary verbs, such as sony and byuŋ in Central Tibetan belong to Set 2. Further auxiliaries, such as bɔd̪ag may be used for the present perfect (or ‘perfective’).

Table 3 The basic dichotomy of ‘evidentials’ (schematic overview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>domain</th>
<th>Set 1: (controlled by) MSAP/ not directly observed</th>
<th>Set 2: OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>yin</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copula</td>
<td>yin</td>
<td>ḥdug[^8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>yin</td>
<td>stem II or light verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential</td>
<td>yod</td>
<td>ḥdug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>yod (/ yin)</td>
<td>ḥdug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>yod (/ yin)</td>
<td>ḥdug or light verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospective</td>
<td>yod (/ yin)</td>
<td>ḥdug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>domain</th>
<th>Set 1: OTHER (and MSAP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all verbs, all tenses</td>
<td>yin, yod &amp; …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotation and/ or hearsay MSAP &amp; OTHER</td>
<td>verba dicendi (zer, lo, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roughly speaking, the auxiliaries of Set 1 indicate four types of situations:

a) The situation discussed is familiar to, or controlled by, the MSAP. This may include predictions, based on familiar knowledge.

[^7] Not to be confounded with reported speech. Koshal obviously refers to a neutral presentation or ‘report’ of facts.

[^8] The attributive functions of the copula have been in part taken over by the existential linking verbs yod, ḥdug, and, if available, bgrag or red. Most probably, this happened via an existential construction x-du ḥdug/yod ‘exist as x’, as attested in Classical Tibetan, and a subsequent loss of the case marker for the relation ‘as x’.

[^9] It is common now, to include Lhasa Tibetan /yoûre/ yog.red (alternatively also analysed as yod.pa.red) under the heading ‘constative’. According to several descriptions, however, the form has (also) the value of indirect knowledge, either through inference or hearsay, and may also refer to generally known facts (cf. Hongladarum 1994: 674 for the inferential value, Denwood 1999: 122 for general knowledge, hearsay and judgemental mode). The form should thus be treated as an evaluative marker.
b) emphatic usages: immediate danger, anger, possibly mirative; the latter usage so far described only for Ladakhi

c) The situation is immediately perceived by speaker and addressee together; so far observed only for Balti and western Sham; expected for Purik.

d) Well known habitual events and generic facts; so far described only for Ladakhi.

Or, in combination with further evaluative morphemes (e.g., yog.red):

d) Well known habitual events and generic facts.

e) The situation is somewhat unexpected and/or of questionable trustworthiness (mirative function), or irrelevant for the present situation (narrative function).

f) The situation is inferred or generally known (shared knowledge).

‘Familiar’ means, that the knowledge of the situation is not derived from immediate perception or inference. This condition is often captured by the notions of ‘old’ or ‘assimilated knowledge’.

When the linking verbs are used as TMA auxiliaries, function a) also implies that the MSAP has, had, or is supposed to have control over the situation referred to. Set 1 auxiliaries not followed by inferential markers are thus typically restricted to [+control] verbs and the MSAP’s actions, while Set 2 auxiliaries (or inferential markers) have to be used when describing events not controlled by the MSAP, that is, other person’s actions and inadvertent movements, perceptions, states, etc. of all persons.

Most auxiliaries of Set 2 indicate that the knowledge is based on some kind of immediate perception. red, however, is described as being used used for factual statements without referring to any specific source of knowledge. West Tibetan varieties have a special auxiliary ḥgrag for non-visual perceptive knowledge.

The auxiliaries of Set 2 are functionally marked and are restricted to finite clauses, so that in non-finite (chained or subordinated) clauses usually only Set 1 auxiliaries appear.¹⁰ The Central Tibetan varieties seem to allow some exceptions to this rule,¹¹ whereas Ladakhi follows this rule strictly. Finite verb forms in embedded propositions may be treated like any other finite forms, but in Ladakhi, e.g., they can only take Set 1 auxiliaries in Ladakhi. Set 2 auxiliaries, except red, are also not compatible with subse-

---

¹⁰ Indirectly, this is also indicated by Sun (1993: 950) for the Ndzorge dialect of Amdo, as he states that evidential markers follow the tense and ‘aspect’ morphemes. All his examples deal only with finite verbs. On p. 951, n. 10, he mentions the neutralisation of the opposition between jan (yin) and re (red) in non-finite clauses, but he remains silent with respect to the other markers. However, in the context of the quote marker -se, Sun states that “we would expect it to be impossible for a subordinate clause to have evidential marking independent of the main clause” (1983: 992 with reference to Foley and Van Valin 1984: 218–220).

¹¹ In Lhasa Tibetan, ḥdug appears in conditional clauses, but not in other non-finite clauses, such as the justifying subordinator -tsay /-tsad/ ‘since, because’, while red and yogred can only appear in non-subordinate clauses (Chang & Chang 1964: 106f., 135) for Lhasa Tibetan. See also Tournadre (1996: 199), who states that the evidential markers (‘les paradigmes médiatifs’) appear almost always (‘presque toujours’) after the last verb of an independent proposition, but may, rather infrequently, also appear after a subordinated verb. According to Kalsang et al. (2013: 548), however, ḥdug would lose its evidential character in conditional clauses in Lhasa Tibetan.

In Kyirong, evidential ḥdug can appear before the causal subordinator -pe: (< pas), but not in conditional or purposive clauses (Huber 2008: 165–172).
quent morphemes of probability, estimation, or inference, but they may follow such markers.

In addition to the basic binary set, many (if not all) Tibetic languages have developed a set of evaluative markers for inference and/or probability. These markers may be independent forms or based on the Set 1 marker(s).

Apart from these, most (if not all) varieties have a marker for hearsay information, which is superposed on the evidential and/or evaluative markers (Lhasa /-s/, Themchen (Amdo) /zi/, Mdzorge (Amdo) /se/ < CT zer ‘say’, Balti, Ladakhi, and some Western Tibetan varieties /lo/ or /lo lo ‘say’, a defective verb, derived from a noun lo ‘report’).

In most varieties, the quotation is semi-indirect, that is, the ‘subject’ of the reported proposition is referred to by his or her name or by a third person pronoun, while the evidential, inferential, and evaluative markers in the reported speech correspond to the markers used in the original speech.

The individual Tibetic varieties show a certain variation on this general theme, such as a different choice of auxiliaries, different usage of additional light verbs, a different functional distribution and hence a different markedness pattern, or a different grade of flexibility or rigidity of the system.

The individual systems, as we can derive them from the usually not very in-depth grammatical descriptions, seem to be fairly straightforward. But apart from possible differences between the use of the linking verbs and their grammaticalised use in different TM(A) constructions, I would also expect, based on my experience with Ladakhi, some further complications in actual usage.

We already know that there is a certain flexibility in the use of the verbs or auxiliaries, allowing the MSAP to indicate with Set 1 auxiliaries that s/he is in some sense involved in a situation concerning other persons, that is, s/he may be responsible for the situation, as a host for a guest in his/her house, s/he may be in the possession of one of the items in question (cf. Tournadre 1996a: 245 no. 7.78l), s/he may have authoritative control over the action of another person, e.g., in the case of boss and employee or teacher and student (cf. Haller 2000a: 75), s/he may have intimate knowledge of a person and his/her habits or intentions, as in the case of one’s close relatives (Haller 2000a: 180, no. 6b). Furthermore, Set 1 auxiliaries can be used for situations the MSAP remembers well (Agha 1993: 178f., 181). The MSAP may further present [-control] events as if under his or her control, cf. also Haller (2000b: 183–184, nos. 18 to 21).

Conversely, the MSAP may use Set 2 auxiliaries with [+control] verbs or as linking verb to defocus from his/her intentions and to focus on some outer conditions (Agha 1993: 198f. no 33c) or to indicate his or her lack of genuine intentionality (Haller 2000a: 76).

B. The questionnaire

The following sections lists the contexts in which standard and non-standard usages appear. I am aware that all Tibetic varieties and of course all those non-Tibetic languages that show a similar system may have different ‘sensitivities’ or cut-off points. I can give here only those usages that I have observed myself in Ladakhi or that I found sufficiently described in the literature. I hope that the questionnaire will be expanded with the input of interested scholars. The auxiliaries will be given in their most common (classical) form: yin, yod, ḥdug, etc.

The questionnaire starts with the linking verb usages. It will first describe the contexts for the use of the copula yin and its potential counterparts (1), then the contexts...
for the use of the existential linking verb *yod* and its counterparts (2). This will be followed by the tense constructions that are based on auxiliaries, that is, present tense and imperfect (3), present perfect (4), and prospective (5). These typically show a fully developed system. Complications are found in past tense and future tense constructions, which are often less developed. Habitual and generic situations are treated separately (6). The verb forms that do not fully fit into the system are described in section 7, namely past tense (7.1) and future tense (7.2). Section 8 will provisionally deal with the specific evaluative markers in Ladakhi, but their functions and defining contexts have yet to be established more precisely. Quotation and/ or second hand information is described in section 9, while section 10 introduces to some pragmatic factors.

One or two, in the non-standard cases also more Ladakhi examples, will be given to illustrate the context. These are arbitrarily selected from my database and cannot be taken as representing the respective dialect fully.

1 Copular constructions

*Table 4 Distribution of copular verbs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSAP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-experiential</td>
<td><em>yin</em></td>
<td><em>yin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, visual</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>yin ?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, non-visual</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>yin ?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td><em>yin &amp; marker</em></td>
<td><em>yin &amp; marker</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-experiential</td>
<td>*yin /. <em>yod</em></td>
<td><em>yod ?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, visual</td>
<td><em>hdug ?</em></td>
<td><em>hdug</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, non-visual</td>
<td><em>hgrag</em></td>
<td><em>hgrag</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td><em>yin &amp; marker</em></td>
<td><em>yod, (yin) &amp; marker</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Identification without further qualification, Set 1 *yin*: MSAP and OTHER.

Only the copula *yin* (or an evaluative form of it) can be used for non-qualified identifications, that is, when identifying persons, animals, or things, or when talking about gender, familiar, ethnic, national, or functionary and professional identities (king, minister, teacher, carpenter, etc.). When it comes to negatively evaluate identities, such as thief, robber, murderer, etc., these are treated like properties or qualified identities (see section 1.7 below). In the Ladakhi dialects, only the copula *yin* can be used, both for the MSAP and OTHER.

(1) DOM

\[\eta a \ ladakspa \ in.\]

*I Ladakhi be=Ic

‘I am a Ladakhi.’

(2) DOM

\[kho \ ladakspa \ in. \]

*s/he Ladakhi be=Ic

‘S/he is a Ladakhi.’ Cf. Bielmeier (2000: 93, no. 51 and 52), who gives a similar pair: *ηa/ kho tshonpa* in. ‘I am /S/he is a trader.’
1.2 Identification without further qualification, Set 2 red: OTHER?

1.3 Identification without further qualification, Set 2 red: MSAP?

1.4 Identification without further qualification, Set 2 yin: OTHER?

1.5 Performative usage?
this car is for you / him (speaker controls the situation or act as representative for one who controls)

use of polite forms?
your name is X (will rimpoches do it that way?)

Check continuations such as
Your books are on the table, but I didn’t put them there.

1.6 Specification of spatial relations and likeness

1.6.1 Specification, Set 1 yin: assertive stance, reference to OTHER, general knowledge or personal involvement of the MSAP

(3) GYA

fi bate karok hin? – fi bate fama hin.
this bus-DF what-LOC be=lc this bus-DF Sham-ALL be=lc
‘Where is this bus [bound] for? – This bus is [bound] for Sham.’ (The information may be given by the driver, who exerts the control over the bus, and any passenger or bystander.)

(4) DOM

bas nambar sumpa domkhar-la in.
bus number third Domkhar-ALL be=lc
‘Bus number three is for Domkhar (as according to the turn).’ (The speaker assigns the destinations turn by turn without any inference on his or her part.)

1.6.2 Specification, Set 1 yod: assertive stance, reference to OTHER, general knowledge or personal involvement of the MSAP

(5) DOM

η-i bas gar jot? – bas nambar sumpa domkhar-la jot.
I-GEN bus where be=le bus number third Domkhar-ALL be=le
‘Where is my bus [going] to? (Have you made a decision?) – Bus number three is for Domkhar [as I have decided].’ (A bus driver is asking at the office for his actual schedule. The official is supposed to know, as he was the one who assigned the goals.)
1.6.3 Specification, Set 2 ḥdug: visual perception, reference to OTHER

(6) DOM

\[ŋi \, bas \, gar \, duk? \, – \, bas \, nambar \, sumpa \, domkhar-la \, duk.\]

I-GEN bus where be=Ilv bus number third Domkhar-ALL be=Ilv
‘Where is my bus [going] to? (Can you have a look?) – Bus number three is for Domkhar [according to the list].’ (A bus driver is asking at the office for his actual schedule. The official has to look at the list.)

1.6.4 Specification, Set 2 ḥgrag: non-visual perception, reference to OTHER

While the direct identification of persons is not possible with the auxiliary for non-visual perception ḥgrag, some dialects may allow its use for the identification of somebody’s voice. Otherwise, yin.ḥgrag must be used.

(7) GYA

\[ɦi \, (^kat-(te)) \, Aŋm-e \, kat \, rak.\]

this (voice-(DF)) Aŋmo-GEN voice be=IInv
‘This (voice) is Aŋmo’s voice.’

ḥgrag, however, is possible, when one ascribes the ‘property’ of being like something on the basis of hearing, touching, smelling, or tasting.

(8) DOM

\[d-u \, Aŋm-e \, skat-po-tshok-fik \, drak.\]

this-DF Aŋmo-GEN voice-DF-like-LQ be=IInv
‘This sounds like Aŋmo’s voice.’

(9) DOM

\[d-u \, lena-tsoks \, drak.\]

this-DF pashmina-like be=IInv
‘This feels like pashmina.’

1.7 Attributive usages and qualified identifications

For the attribution of properties as well as for qualified identifications (X is a good teacher, a bad person), including criminal identities (X is a thief, robber, murderer), the copula yin as well as the existential linking verbs yod, ḥdug, and ḥgrag are used.

1.7.1 Attributive, Set 1 yin: reference to MSAP: actual situation

(10) Nurla (Bielmeier 2000: 97, no. 53)

\[ŋa \, diriŋ \, dalmo \, in.\]

I today at.leisure be=Ic
‘I am free/ at leisure today.’

1.7.2 Attributive, Set 1 yin: reference to OTHER: general situation

(11) DOM

\[ŋi \, dzamo \, ma(;) \, noro \, in.\]

I-GEN friend.fem very good be=Ic
‘My (female) friend is very good.’ (The speaker knows that the friend has done many good things to many people. – We are classmates, don’t know from child-
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hood. – Only we know about quality, other’s don’t. – Everybody says she is good; she helps others also."

(12) DOM

ladakspa-naŋ ʧbirgyalp-ε thims soso in. / in-tsok.
Ladakh.people-COM foreigner.GEN custom different be=lc be=lc-IM
‘The customs of the Ladakhi people and the foreigners are different.’ (The speaker makes an authoritative statement. / The speaker introduces or shares the information.)

1.7.3 Attributive, Set 1 yod: situation familiar to MSAP, reference to OTHER: general situation
The use of yod in such cases indicates a more limited knowledge or acquaintance, whereas yin indicates a more detailed or more thorough knowledge.

(13) DOM

ŋi dzamo ma(ː) noro jot.
I-GEN friend.fem very good be=le
‘My (female) friend is very good.’ (The speaker knows, because the friend has done something good to him/her. – We are friends since childhood, the friend has often helped me.)

1.7.4 Attributive, Set 1 yod: situation familiar to MSAP, reference to OTHER in distant situations

(14) DOM

goma kho mi r̥tsokp ek jot-pin.
first s/he person bad-LQ be=le-RM
‘First, s/he had been quite a bad person [speaker knows or remembers well]. Now s/he apparently became quite a good person.’ (Note the difference between the markers for the well-known past and the inferred present situation.)

(15) KHAL

dene a ʧhuynun-rig-[is] jaŋ rga(internal) po-a dri-khantsok:
then that young-LQ-ERG again old-ALL ask.PA-DST
«gandr-ik jot-pin, meme, de phoŋ-po?» zer-et-sok.
what.like-LQ be=le-RM grandfather that rock-DF say-le=PRS-IM
«phoŋ-po dutskok fik jot-pin.» ⋯ zer-khantsok.
rock-DF this.like-LQ be=le-RM say.PA-DST
‘Then the youngsters would always ask the elders: «How was it, grandfather, that stone?», they would be saying. «That stone had been like this [namely out of copper].», ⋯ [the elders] would say.’
1.7.5 Attributive, Set 1 yod: situation familiar to MSAP, reference to MSAP in non-actual or distant situations

(16) KHAL
tshundus-la ɲalbaʃan jot-pin. turo, zgoʃhux met-pin.
small.time-ALL poor be=le-RM animal cattle NG.have=le
ta ʒiŋ rama rilug-ay ɲuntse mene met-pin.
now field goat sheep-FM few except NG.have=le
‘At the time when [I] was small, [we] were poor. [We] did not have any animals, no cattle. [We] had only a few fields and a few goats and sheep.’

(17) KHAL
ɲermo ɲaʃi jot, daksə.
‘The place (over there) called Ñermo is ours, now.’

The Set 1 existential verb is often used for the MSAP, if speaker and addressee are spatially distant, e.g., when writing a letter or when talking on the phone over a long distance.

(18) GYA
ɲeraŋ khamzaŋ ɦor-a le? – ŋa khamzaŋ ɦod_ _le.
hon.you healthy be=le-QM HM I healthy be=le HM
‘Are you fine (over there)? – I am fine (over here).’ (Interaction on the phone between Leh and Delhi.)

1.7.6 Attributive, Set 1 yod: conveying a message or information about OTHER
This can be seen as a neutral or ‘factual’ usage. So far this has been observed only for Balti.

(19) TUR
khoŋ-i phru doŋ tshuntse jot.
they-GEN child still small be=le
‘Their child is still small.’ (The child might be close by, distant or out of view.)

1.7.7 Attributive, Set 2 ḥdug: visually perceived, reference to OTHER

(20) DOM
kho ta ma(ː) gjalba duk,
s/he now very good be=IIv
tʃiba zer-na, khos de ʒak-fik ɲa(ː) phantoks ʃos.
why say-LOC:CD s/he-ERG that day-LQ 1-ALL benefit do.PA=II
‘S/he is, indeed, very good. Because that time, s/he did me a great favour.’

The experiential linking verb ḥdug would be further used on just seeing the person for the first time. But the question of how much time elapsed is not really relevant. The main difference between the use of yod and ḥdug is, whether the first impression was reinforced in such a way that it became intimate knowledge.
1.7.8 Attributive, Set 2 ḥdug: self-perception MSAP through medium
Koshal (1979: 186) gives an example for the use of ḥdug with the MSAP:

(21) LEH (Koshal 1979: 186)

ŋa rdemo duk.
I beautiful be=IIv
‘I am beautiful (seeing myself in the mirror).’

1.7.9 Attributive, Set 2 ḥgrag: non-visually perceived, reference to MSAP or OTHER
While situations of visual self-perception are not very frequent, and comments about them even less, expressions of non-visual self-perception are very common and obligatory when referring to the various states of one’s body or mind, such as feeling hungry, tired, cold, or sad (or the opposite).

(22) TYA

ɦi bakston-i trhims ʧbirgilp-e trhims-basaj
this wedding-GEN custom foreign-GEN custom-CNTR
ma(ː) jamtshan rak.
very strange be=Iinv
‘This wedding custom is quite strange in relation to the foreign customs (as I feel/ think).’

(23) GYA

na̱nïŋ ŋa̱ traŋmu rak-pen.
last.year I cold be=IInv-RM
ʧia zer-na, kełak dronmo kon-de-ŋ, taŋmu rak-pen.
what-ALL say-LOC:CD dress warm dress-LB-FM cold be=IInv-RM
‘Last year I had been feeling cold (subjective feeling in contradiction to objective facts). That is, even though I wore warm closes, I felt cold.’

(24) GYA

na̱nïŋ ŋa(ː) namlo kîtpo rak-pen, tało me-rak.
last.year I AES weather pleasant be=IInv-RM this.year NG1-be
‘Last year the weather was pleasant (as I could feel), this year [it] isn’t.’

1.7.10 Attributive, Set 2 ḥdug: default experiential usage in the Balti dialect of Turtuk (+??) and the Purik dialect of Kargil (+??)
Non-visual perceptions of outward properties are expressed with Set 2 marker ḥdug, internal states, however, are expressed with Set 1 marker yod in these dialects.

(25) TUR

gii zan-pu zimbo naŋ, / jot.
this food-DF tasty be=IIexp be=Ie
‘This food is tasty.’ (Statement made while eating, / Assertion made without eating: za(ː)-māfos, tḥik zerte.)

1.7.11 Attributive, Set 1 yod: default endopathic usage in the Balti dialect of Turtuk (+??) and the Purik dialect of Kargil (+??)
Examples and contexts to be supplied

2 Existential and possessive constructions

Tibetan does not have a verb for ‘have’. The notion of possession is expressed, quite like in Latin, with an existential verb and an experiencer subject in the aesthetive (that is, allative) case.

Table 5  Distribution of existential linking verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSAP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>existential (local)</td>
<td>yod</td>
<td>yod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-experiential</td>
<td>yod</td>
<td>yod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, visual</td>
<td>$\text{ḥdug}$</td>
<td>$\text{ḥdug}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, non-visual</td>
<td>$\text{ḥgrag}$</td>
<td>$\text{ḥgrag}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td>yod &amp; marker</td>
<td>yod &amp; marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Existential constructions

2.1.1 Existence, Set 1 yod: situation familiar to MSAP, reference to MSAP or OTHER, situations out of view (spatial and/or temporal distance)

(26) KHAL

«$\text{gar}$ jot, $\text{kheraŋ, ŋa-(c) du}$ zer-khan-ʧik?» zer-e

where exist=Ie you I-ALL this-DF say-NLZ-LQ say-LB

‘Where are [you], you, [who] is telling me this?’ [He] said and…’

(27) DOM

tshas-eaŋna mendok maŋbo jot.
garden-PPOS:ABL/LOC flower many exist=Ie

‘There are many flowers in the garden.’ (The speaker knows well, e.g., because s/he has grown them there.)

(28) GYA

naniŋ phai tshe-sebane mentok demožik fiot.
last.year over.there-GEN garden-PPOS:ABL/LOC flower nice-LQ exist=le

talo mi-nuk.
this.year NG-exist=IIv

‘Last year, there were beautiful flowers in the garden over there. This year, there are apparently none.’
2.1.2 Existence, Set 2 ḫdug: situation visually perceived, reference to OTHER

(29) TUR

ʧbu aliŋ nay.
water much exist=IIexp
‘[There] is a lot of water.’

(30) DOM

duʧik ladaks-la tūris manbo duk.
this.year Ladakh-ALL tourist many exist=IIv
‘This year, there are many tourists in Ladakh.’

2.1.3 Existence, Set 2 ḫdug: situation visually perceived, reference to MSAP: surprising situation

In Central Tibetan, the use of the evidential existential for the MSAP could be licensed in a situation where the MSAP finds him- or herself accidentally at a place, where s/he did not intend to go or where s/he passes by incidentally on his or her journey (Nicholas Tournadre, p.c.), but it seems that in such cases, Ladakhi speakers prefer to use the Set 1 existential in combination with an evaluative marker (cf. Koshal 1979: 223, no. 2 for a present tense construction).

2.1.4 Existence, Set 2 ḫgrag: situation non-visually perceived, reference to OTHER

(31) DOM

philog-a skjontse mi-tshuks-pok.
outside-ALL oil.lamp NG-stay.alive-FIM
ʧiba zer-na, luŋspo manbo drak.
why say-LOC:CD wind much exist=IInv
‘The lamp will not stay burning outside, because there is (too) much wind (as I can feel).’

(32) LEH

ʈharmos-inan nga tʃa daruy raŋ-a mi-rak?
thermos.flask-PPOS tea still exist=IIv-QM NG-exist=IIInv
‘Is there still [some] tea in the thermos flask or not?’

While uttering this sentence, the speaker might take up the flask and shake it to feel whether there is some liquid left. S/he might also expect the addressee to do so or to have done so a moment before. If s/he would take out the cork and peep through the opening or if s/he expects the addressee to do so, s/he would use the existential verb for visual experience ḫdug.

2.1.5 Embedded questions

A similar distribution is found in embedded or rhetorical questions, which are used for ‘whether’ clauses. In the first case, the policemen have no clue about the people in question and are ready to draw or revise their final conclusion upon the result of the visual inspection. In the second case, the policemen are already suspicious and/ or afraid.
(33) DOM
pulus-is khoŋ-i naŋ-po, 〈stanʃiks dug-a?〉 lhtas-e, ldzoŋs.
police-ERG they-GEN house-DF terrorist exist=IIv-QM look-LB search.PA=II
‘The police searched their house, looking ‘whether [there] were terrorists.’

(34) DOM
pulus-is khoŋ-i naŋ-po, 〈stanʃiks jot-a?〉 sams-e, ldzoŋs.
police-ERG they-GEN house-DF terrorist exist=Ie-QM think-LB search.PA=II
‘The police searched their house, asking themselves (lit: thinking) ‘whether [there] were terrorists.’

2.2 Possessive constructions

2.2.1 Possession, Set 1: situation familiar to MSAP, reference to MSAP or OTHER

(35) TUR
jaŋ-la phru tsam jo?
h.you-AES child how.much have=Ie
‘How many children do you have?’

(36) TUR
kho-a nor aliŋ jot.
he-AES wealth much have=Ie
‘He has a lot of sheep and goats.’ (The speaker knows it well.)

(37) DOM
ŋaʧa ˖ (ː) kol-ʧas-i dzo ˖ LQ NG.have=Ie
‘We don’t have an employable dzo (hybrid of yak and cow).’

(38) DOM
kho-a pene maŋbo jot.
s/he-AES money much have=Ie
‘S/he has a lot of money.’ (The speaker knows it for sure, and may have played a certain role in the bringing about of the situation.)

2.2.2 Possession, Set 2 ḥdug: visually perceived, reference to OTHER

(39) TUR
kho-a / turtukpa maŋmo-a nor aliŋ naŋ.
he-AES Turtuk.person many-AES wealth much have=IIexp
‘He has / The people of Turtuk have a lot of sheep and goats.’

2.2.3 Possession, Set 2 ḥdug: visually perceived, reference to MSAP: uncertain and surprising facts
The Set 2 auxiliary may also be used, when the speaker is less sure about the fact. This may be the case, when talking about the property of the forefathers. The use of ḥdug may imply that one had taken a look at the property register, but also that one has heard about it from family members, while the use of an inferential construction would indicate that one infers the fact from some evidence or has heard about the fact. The
Set 2 auxiliary may also have a mirative function and indicate that the situation is somewhat against the expectations (TYA, GYA), e.g., the speaker belongs to a family that settled long time ago and thus should have fields, but they don’t have any. One would have to use the Set 2 auxiliary when asking about the reasons for having that much or that little property, independently of how well one is acquainted with the property. The use of Set 1 auxiliary yod would not allow any further question, as it would indicate that one has knowledge also of the background situation (DOM).

(40) TYA

ŋaʧa˖(ː) ʒiŋ pat mi-nuk.
we.excl-AES field intsf NG1-have=Ilv
daksa-ŋ met, sŋon-la-ŋ mi-nuk-(pin).
now-FOC NG.have=Ie early-ALL-FOC NG1-have=Ilv-(RM)
‘We never ever had any field. We don’t have any now. And we didn’t have any in earlier times.’ (DOM comments: One knows well that the family never had any fields, but one lacks background information (and does not have much interest in collecting it).)

(41) DOM

ŋaʧ i apimeme-basanŋ meme-a
we.excl-GEN grandmother.grandfather-CNTR grandfather-AES
ʒiŋ ʧhenm ˖ duk-pin. / jot-pin.
field big-LQ have=Ilv-RM have=Ie-RM
‘Our great-great-grandfather (lit: the grandparents’ grandfather) (apparently) had a big field.’ (jot: more sure, I know that the fields are cultivated by another person, but they are still in our possession (we gave the fields on lease). duk: we might still have it, but I don’t know what happened to it and which field it is exactly.)

(42) DOM

ŋaʧa-(:) ʒiŋ maybo mi-nuk. / *met.
we.incl-AES field many NG-have=Iiv *NG.have=Ie
tiba in be? kheraŋ-a pata jot-a?
why be=Ic intj fam.you-AES knowledge have=Ie-QM
‘We do not (seem to) have many fields. Why is that so? Do you know?’

(43) GYA

lo ʒipʧu ŋəpʧu ŋōn-la ŋaʔa-(:) ʒiŋ ʧhenm-ek diŋse mi-nuk-pen.
year 40 50 early-ALL we.excl-AES field big-LQ ever NG-have=Ilv-RM
‘40 or 59 years ago we (apparently) did not have any big fields.’

(44) GYA

ŋaʔa troŋɲiŋ bɪn-a-ŋ, ʒiŋ mi-nuk.
we.excl household.old be=Ic-LOC:CD-FOC field NG-have=Ilv
‘Although we are an old-[settled] family, we do not have fields.’
In the context of the story, the speaker is certainly familiar with the fact. One could thus expect the use of the Set 1 linking verb yod. The use of the experiential form instead has an inferential or mirative connotation: here, the speaker does not approve the situation and he challenges his uncles and claims his share of land and possessions. The sentence immediately follows example (48).

2.2.4 Possession, Set 2 ḥgrag: non-visualy perceived, reference to OTHER
Possessor constructions with the perception verb ḥgrag, are somewhat restricted. In principle, one cannot directly feel or hear the possessions of another person. One can only make an inference on the base of an auditory perception. The use of the non-visual perception verb, therefore, has almost always an inferential connotation. Similarly, since one is usually well aware of what one possesses or not, the use of the perception verb for one’s own possessions, has a mirative connotation, such as surprise or disapproval.

(46) NUR (Bielmeier 2000: 97, no. 71)

*kho-a khi rak.*
s/he-AES dog have=IInv
‘S/he (evidently) has a dog /has dogs (as I can hear).’

2.2.5 Possession, Set 2 ḥgrag: non-visualy perceived, reference to MSAP: heightened subjectivity and surprising situations
The non-visual experiential marker may also be used when the speaker wants to express that his or her statement about his or her possession is based on some subjective feeling not on some objective assessment. E.g., the speaker might have actually enough money to buy new clothes, but blames him- or herself or complains to others not to have enough (as in the case of perceived poverty):

(47) TYA

*ŋa(ː) duʧik gonlak po-a pene mayb-ek mi-rak.*
I-AES this.year dress buy-NLZ money much-LQ NG-have=IInv
‘(I think) I don’t have much money this year for buying clothes.’

(48) STOK (Kesar epic)

*ŋa(ː) tʧig-ek mane mi-rak.*
I-AES one-LQ ever NG-have=IInv
‘I (evidently) do not possess a single thing (on my body), at all!’

As in example (45) above, the speaker certainly is familiar with the fact. Therefore, the use of the experiential form instead of the Set 1 form yod, has a mirative connotation: the speaker does not approve the situation and he challenges his uncles and claims his share of land and possessions. The sentence immediately precedes example (45). While example (45) refers to landholding, the use of the non-visual form in this example indicates that the speaker refers to items he could carry close to his body, such as dresses, jewellery, weapons, or silver.
3 PRESENT tense and IMPERFECT constructions

Table 6 Distribution of TMA auxiliaries (PRESENT TENSE and IMPERFECT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSAP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-experiential</td>
<td>[+ctr] yod</td>
<td>yod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, visual</td>
<td>−ctr] hbug</td>
<td>hbug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, non-visual</td>
<td>−ctr] hgrag</td>
<td>hgrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td>yod &amp; marker</td>
<td>yod &amp; marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSAP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-experiential</td>
<td>[+ctr] yod</td>
<td>yod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, visual</td>
<td>−/ (hbug)</td>
<td>hbug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, non-visual</td>
<td>hgrag</td>
<td>hgrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td>yod, (yin) &amp; marker</td>
<td>yod, yin &amp; marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Set 1 yod: MSAP’s [+ctr] present and (imminent) future actions

(49) HRD

haskje ɲa khjan-la pene ṭan-et.
‘Tomorrow I’ll give you the/ some money.’

(50) TYA

kheran nga-na, naf sa dug-et!
‘Are you going? Well, we shall stay!’ (Lit.: ‘If you go, we’ll stay/ we are staying.’
Said jokingly, when one happens to have the door shut with a big bang.)

3.2 Set 1 yin, yod: MSAP, marked progressive

The use of yin is so far only sparsely attested. It seems to be preferred for immediately ongoing activities and cannot be used if the activity is already going on for a while, in which case yod has to be used.

(51) DOM

ɲa-s daksa las ṭfo-in-in. / ṭfo-in-jot.
I-ERG present work do-CNT-Ic=PRG.PRS do-CNT-Ie=PRG.PRS
‘I am presently working.’

(52) DOM

recent-PPPOS I-ERG work *do-CNT-Ic=PRG.PRS / do-CNT-Ie=PRG.PRS
‘I have been working for a while/ since some time ago.’

The auxiliary yin can also be used when the addressee is supposed to have some knowledge of the activity reported, independent of whether this activity happened at the actual place or not. The auxiliary yin serves thus as a reminder. If the addressee is supposed to have no prior knowledge, only the auxiliary yod can be used.
(53) DOM
de-tsana ŋa-s le-a / dʒamu-a sil-en-in-bin.
that-when I-ERG Leh-ALL Jammu-ALL study-CNT-ic-RM=PRG.IMPF
/ sil-en-jot-pin.
study-CNT-ic-RM=PRG.IMPF
‘At that time, I was studying in Leh / in Jammu (as you may know / as you probably don’t know).’ (Speaker and addressee are presently in Leh).

3.3 Set 1 yod: OTHER, events in the sphere and under the control of the MSAP
A set 1 marker can be used for the activity of an OTHER, when the MSAP and/or his/her close associates have ordered the work and this relates to his/her personal sphere:

(54) TYA
ʃiŋkhan-po-s ŋaʧ ˖ i naŋ-iaŋ karkuŋ ʒog-et.
carpenter-DF-ERG we.excl-GEN house-PPOS window carve-le=PRS.
‘The carpenter is shaping the window [frames] in our house.’

For some speakers, the use of Set 1 marker yod in such situations is only possible when the speaker relates this situation over the phone or when the situation is fully observable. Otherwise evaluative forms have to be used.

(55) GYA
lām- ˖ e ta̱ksa saŋ sal-at.
lama-ERG now purification.ritual give-le=PRS
‘The lama(s) is/ are performing the purification ritual now.’

3.4 Set 1 yod: OTHER, propositional content (formal neutralisation)
Even though formally not embedded, propositional content is in Ladakhi typically treated as if it was embedded under the respective overt proposition verb, that is, the marked verb forms, particularly those for immediate sense perception, cannot be used. Only the formally neutral forms, that is Set 1 auxiliaries or the mere past stem (Set 2) can be used. This is in striking contrast to direct and semi-indirect quotations. See, however, Garret 2001, for a different situation in Lhasa Tibetan.

(56) DOM
kho-s ʧi ʧo-et, ŋa-ː) pata met.
s/he-ERG what do-le=PRS I-AES knowledge NG.have=Ie
‘I don’t know what s/he is doing/ is going to do.’

(57) DOM
r̥kunma-s ʧi ŋku-se-jot, ŋa-ː) pata met.
thief-ERG what steal-LB-le=PERF I-AES knowledge NG.have=Ie
‘I don’t know what the thief has stolen.’ (The speaker assumes that the thief has stolen something.)

Sentence questions appear with a verb of thinking in the case of expectations or guessing:
Evidentiality, inferentiality, and speaker’s attitude – Questionnaire

(58) DOM

<zurmo log-kyab-et-aʔ> sam-se, ya-s nnum-a kha ŋis-pin.

illness back-drive-Ie=PRS-QM think-1B I-ERG oil-ALL mouth tie.up.PA-RM=I

‘Thinking whether I should /could not (try and) drive back the illness, I restricted my diet with respect to (lit: against) oily (food).’

Inferential markers may be used, when the speaker is seeking an answer from the addressee.

(59) DOM

ŋa ˖ (ː) pata met: kho-s sil-et-sog-a-met-sok?

I-AES knowledge NG.have=Ie s/he-ERG study-Ie-IM-QM-NG.Ie-IM

‘I don’t know whether s/he might be /is studying (now).’ (The speaker indirectly asks for an answer.)

3.5 Set 1 yod: OTHER, predictable events, immediate danger

Set 1 markers may also be used for events predicted with great certainty, due to one’s long lasting experience. There may be also a connotation of immediate danger, and the Set 1 markers are often used when warning other people or pushing them into action.

(60) DOM

kha ʒu-in-uk he. layor [l[ay]or] kha phoŋ!

snow melt-CNT-IIV=PRS Intj quick quick snow throw.IMP

ʧaŋthi joŋ-et.

dripping come-Ie=PRS

‘The snow is melting, throw it quickly [from the roof]! [Otherwise] [the water] will drip [through the roof].’

In this case, the melting of the snow is immediately perceived. But the expectation concerning the dripping of the water is based on previous experience and the knowledge about the condition of the roof. At the same time there is some immediate danger, if the snow is not removed.

(61) DOM

de phrugu kbi-a droks-et.

that child dog-ALL fear-Ie=PRS

‘That child is afraid of dogs! /the dog! [So take that dog away].’

(62) DOM

ŋa-ː (de kbi-a) droks-et. thon-ŋa-mi-nug-aʔ then-ay, gyokspa!

I-AES (that dog-ALL) fear-Ie=PRS see-NLZ-NG-IIV-QM draw.IMP-DM quick

‘I am afraid (of that dog)! Don’t you see? Take [it] away, quickly!’ (Here, the normal forms would be /droksenak/ or for a more general fear: /drokspat/.)
3.6 Set 1 yod: OTHER, emphatic usages and rhetorical questions: blaming and doubt

(63) DOM

\[
ab\text{-e} \ pene \ ỹku\text{-sena}, \ \text{sonam-is} \ \text{rdøŋ} \ \text{stan-et-a}, \ \text{dug-et}?
\]

father-GEN money steal-LB&Sonam-ERG face show-le=PRS-QM stay-le=PRS-QM

<\text{khos} \ \text{rdøŋ} \ \text{stammyen}> \ \text{met}.

<s/he-ERG face show.remedy> NG.exist=le

‘Having stolen (his/her) father’s money, will Sonam face [his/her father], or will s/he stay (away)? – There is no way that s/he shows up his/her face again.’

(64) DOM

\[
tsam\text{-fik} \ \text{zer-gos-et}? \ \text{ta} \ \text{gos-ay}!
\]

how.much-LQ say-need=le=PRS now understand.IMP-DM

‘How often do [I] have to say [it]? Now, try to understand!’

The Set 1 auxiliaries may also have a mirative value of surprise and/or embarrassment. Often the predictive and the mirative function functions combine in scolding or statements of surprise:

(65) DOM

\[
\text{phrugu-a} \ \text{draŋmo} \ ʧh. \ ʧhu-a \ ʧi \ ʧuk \ ʃesh-et!
\]

child-AES cold go-Ie=PRS water-ALL what insert-LB&Ic=PERF

‘The baby is going to get cold! Why are you bathing him/her?’

(66) DOM

\[
\text{aŋmo-s} \ ʧa \ \text{thun-et},
\]

Aŋmo-ERG tea drink=le=PRS

\[
\\eta\text{ʧa}(\text{c}) \ \text{dugloŋ} / \ \text{ʧin} \ \text{t\text{c}ŋloŋ} \ \text{khoŋ} \ \text{ma-jon}s!
\]

we.excl-AES sit.time urine give.time s/he/it.self NG-come.PA=II

‘Aŋmo is drinking tea, and we do not even have time to sit down / to pee!’ (The speaker is angry about Aŋmo’s apparent lazyness.)

(67) DOM

\[
\text{mi-fes} \ \text{rgu-fes} \ \text{kbo-a} \ \text{fes-et}!
\]

NG-know ‘9’-know s/he-AES know-le=PRS

‘S/he knows everybody and who not!’

In a similar mirative function, Set 1 markers can also be used for expressions of doubt, especially also in rhetorical questions concerning future events addressed to the speaker him/herself or to another person (cf. also section 7.2.2, examples (148)–(150)):

(68) TYA

\[
\text{o} \ \text{ŋa}(\text{s}) \ \text{pene} \ \text{duk-mi-nuk}.
\]

Intj 1-AES money have=IIv-NG-have=IIv

\[
\text{ŋo-a}(\text{s}) \ ʧi \ ŋo-et?
\]

buy=NLZ-ALL what buy-le=PRS

‘Oh (I see) I have no money with me, at all. [So] how can I buy anything?’
Evidentiality, inferentiality, and speaker’s attitude – Questionnaire

(69) DOM

\begin{align*}
\text{pen} & \text{e ski-se-khjoŋ-gas-po-z-ba-se} & \text{kh} \text{o } \text{g} \text{ bu} \text{k} \text{s}. \\
\text{money} & \text{bor} \text{row-LB-bring-GRD-DF-INSTR-do-LB } \text{s/he } \text{be.blunder.PA} \\
g\text{iba } \text{zer-na, } \text{kh} \text{o-}a \text{ j} \text{onga } \text{j} \text{od-met!} \\
\text{why} & \text{say-LOC:CD } \text{s/he-AES income } \text{have-NG.have=Ie} \\
g\text{a-na } \text{ldzok-pa-nan-et?} \\
\text{what-ABL give.back-NLZ-be.able-Ie=PRS} \\
\text{‘S/he made a blunder by borrowing money. Because s/he has no income at all! [So] how (lit: whence) will s/he pay [it] back?’}
\end{align*}

(70) DOM (Data collected by Tharcin)

\begin{align*}
\text{ta } & \text{si-se-bor-ba } \text{rgjal.} \\
\text{now} & \text{save-LB-keep-NLZ be.good.PRS} \\
\text{ja } & \text{nataŋ-a } \text{naymona } \text{yen-tet-a } \text{met-ay?} \\
\text{Intj} & \text{we.incl-AES next.time find-PRS } \text{NG.exist-Ie-PM} \\
\text{‘We should better save [it]./ Let’s better keep [it]. [We don’t know whether] we will get [it] later or not.’}
\end{align*}

In the Ladakhi hide-and seek game, the winner, that is the child that has not been found (in time) comes forth saying:

(71) DOM

\begin{align*}
\text{iptse } & \text{pipi } \text{zar-e } \text{thon-ba-met!} \\
\text{iptse } & \text{pipi be.blind-LB see-NLZ-NG.exist=Ie=PRS} \\
\text{‘Iptse-pipi (that is, the searcher) is blind and doesn’t see!’}
\end{align*}

The Set 1 auxiliary is also used in riddles.

3.7 Set 1 yod: OTHER, conveying a message
In Turtuk, Set 1 auxiliary yod is also used when the speaker conveys a message or information to the addressee (lon tajna).

3.8 Set 1 yod: OTHER, shared observations
As Jones (2009) observed for a non-defined dialect (most probably Kharmang), and as I could observe for Turtuk and Hardass as well, the Set 1 auxiliary yod is used when both the speaker and the addressee observe the situation together. As the Turtuk speaker confirmed, the situation may have been expected or quite surprising.

The Set 2 auxiliary, in that case snaŋ, by contrast indicates that the speaker alone has observed the situation. S/he might be drawing the attention of the addressee to this situation or simply narrate a personal experience.

A similar usage has been attested in the Sham dialects. I first came across the use of Set 1 auxiliary yod for shared observations of surprising facts. This usage has been confirmed by speakers from Domkhar, Teya, and Saspol. Speakers of Gya, however, would only use the Set 2 auxiliary ḥdug. While the use for unsurprising shared observations has been confirmed by a Teya speaker, it was rejected by a Saspol speaker: the use of Set 1 auxiliary yod is restricted to surprising observations, otherwise Set 2 auxiliary ḥdug must be used.

Examples to be supplied
(72) TUR
e-a mo go-et.
that-LOC she go-le=PRS
‘There she goes./ She is going over there.’

(73) TUR5
e-a [xlanpoʧ(h)o] drul-et.
that-LOC elephant walk-le=PRS
‘An elephant is walking over there!’

(74) DOM
are kana laypoʧhe ʧh et, d-o-a!
over.there-PPOS:ABL elephant go-le=PRS that-DF-LOC
‘Wow, [look] at that, over there, there is an elephant walking!’

(75) TYA
l̥tos-āŋ! Aŋmo joŋ-et.
look.IMP-DM Aŋmo come-le=PRS
‘Look! Aŋmo is coming.’ (Aŋmo had been expected to come at this time.)

GYA
look.IMP-DM now.only s/he sheep kill-le-MIR kill-IIv=PRS
‘Look! Right now, s/he is killing a sheep! / is killing a sheep (neutral observation).’

3.9 Set 2 ḥdug: mostly visually perceived, reference to OTHER

(76) TUR
khon tshaŋma-(si) las ba-ŋ.
they all-(ERG) work do-IIexp=PRS
‘They are all working.’

(77) CEM
«çaŋku fioŋ-duk!» zer-te,
wolf come-IIv=PRS say-LB
khimtsepa-yun-la meme-se çan bul.
neighbour-PL-ALL grandfather-ERG attention exhort.PA=II
‘The old man warned the neighbours, shouting: «A wolf is coming!/ A wolf is about to come!»

(78) TYA
peraŋ-a a ifu thoŋ-dug-a?
hon.you-AES that.over.there small.bird see-IIv=PRS-QM
‘Do you see the bird over there?’

3.10 Set 2 ḥdug: dominance of visual channel over other channels
Even when dealing with situations or properties that belong to the non-visual sphere, such as the purring of a cat or the sound of an instrument, the auxiliary for visual experience ḥdug may be used instead of the auxiliary for non-visual experience ḥgrag, if the visual perception of the situation dominates.
Even when dealing with situations or properties that belong to the non-visual sphere, such as the purring of a cat or the sound of an instrument, the auxiliary for visual experience ḥdug may be used instead of the auxiliary for non-visual experience ḥgrag, if the visual perception of the situation dominates, cf. also (186) g below, where the speaker refers to a local oral tradition.

(79) DOM

*bila-s mane ton-en-*uk. / *ton-en-ak.*
cat-ERG prayer utter-CNT-IIv=PRS utter-CNT-IInv=PRS
‘The cat is murmuring prayers [i.e. is purring] (as I see=IIv / as I hear=IInv). / 
Cats in general murmur prayers (IIv).’ (The auxiliary for visual experience (/-uk/) is used for generic situations and for individual situations, when the cat is immediately visible, i.e., when it sits directly in front of you or on your lap. The auxiliary for non-visual experience is used, when the cat is out of view, i.e. when it sits in some distance to the side.)

The choice of the auxiliaries may also be contextually conditioned. In the following example, the choice of the auxiliary for the verbum dicendi is triggered by the initial exclamation *l̥tosaŋ* ‘look!’, introducing the whole situation as one that is visually perceived. If the situation would have been introduced by the exclamation *ɲonaŋ* ‘listen!’, the auxiliary for non-visual perception (*zerarak*) would have been used.

(80) TYA

*aba-s ṭhugu-a zes: «ṭhugu, ḋuŋu, spiŋ taŋ-se sil!»*
father-ERG child-ALL say.PA=II child please heart give-LB read/study.IMP
dey(ː)kana ṭhugu-s zes:
that-PPOS:ABL child-ERG say.PA=II
«*l̥tos-aŋ! ṇa(ː) spiŋ taŋ-se sil!* zer-duk.»
look.IMP-DIR I-ALL heart give-LB read/study-IMP say-IIv=PRS
aba khoran-yi migra taŋ-se sil-duk!*
father s/he.self-ERG glasses give-LB read-IIv=PRS
‘A father said to his child: «My child, please study with concentration (lit. by giving your heart)!» Then the child said: «Look! [He] is telling me ‹to study with concentration›. [But] the father himself is reading with glasses (lit. having put on glasses)!»)

The choice of the auxiliaries may also be contextually conditioned. In the following example, the choice of the auxiliary for the verbum dicendi is triggered by the initial exclamation *l̥tosaŋ* ‘look!’, introducing the whole situation as one that is visually perceived. If the situation would have been introduced by the exclamation *ɲonaŋ* ‘listen!’, the auxiliary for non-visual perception (*zerarak*) would have been used.
(81) TYA

\[
aba\text{-ERG} \text{thugu-a zes: } \langle \text{thugu, } \text{ŋa}, \text{ŋa} \rangle \text{ tay-se sil!}
\]
father-ERG child-ALL say.PA-II child please heart give-LB read/study.IMP

\[
de-(c)kana \text{ thugu-s zes:}
\]
that-PPOS:ABL child-ERG say.PA-II

\[
\langle \text{itos-aŋ! } \text{ŋa-(c) } \text{ŋa} \rangle \text{ tay-se sil!} \text{ zer-duk.}
\]
look.IMP-DIR I-ALL heart give-LB read/study-IMP say-PRs

\[
aba \text{ khoray-is migra tay-se sil-duk!}
\]
father s/he.self-ERG glasses give-LB read-IIv=PRS

‘A father said to his child: «My child, please study with concentration (lit. by giving your heart)!» Then the child said: «Look! [He] is telling me ‹to study with concentration›. [But] the father himself is reading with glasses (lit. having put on glasses)!»’

The auxiliary for visual experience is also used neutrally for non-visual perceptions when talking about habitual or generic noises or speech acts, e.g., when describing what people usually say in a certain situation or when defining the meaning of a word.

(82) DOM

\[
\text{nati karathal, stotpa-s ta porotse zer-en.uk.}
\]
we.incl.GEN sheaf.layer highlander-ERG now sheaf.layer say-CNT-IIv=PRS

‘Our karathal (layered sheaves), now the people further east (lit: higher up) are saying ‘porotse’ [for that].’

3.11 Set 2 hgrag: non-visually perceived, reference to OTHER (including [-ctr] mental states and estimations of the MSAP)

hgrag is used for individual newly perceived situations where a visual channel is not available (or at least not dominant). hgrag can have an infernetial character and is quite often used to express the MSAP’s subjective estimation of a situation: I think that, I feel that.

(83) DOM

\[
\text{luypo rgjuk-pa-mi-nak.}
\]
wind blow-NLZ-NG-IInv=PRS

‘The wind is not/ no (longer) blowing (as I can feel).’

(84) DOM

\[
kho-s \text{ ŋataŋ-a (spera) ʂug-en.ak.}
\]
s/he-ERG we.incl-ALL (speech) stir-CNT-IIv=PRS

‘[I] feel/ think s/he is [trying to] incite us/ rile us up.’

(85) ARA

\[
\text{ŋe sem zod-a-me-nak.}
\]
I-GEN mind be.controlled-NLZ-NG-IInv=PRS

‘I am impatient.’ (Lit: ‘My mind is uncontrolled.’)

3.12 Set 1 yod: OTHER, only partly observed situations

As the Set 2 auxiliary hdg typically conveys the connotation that the event takes place before the MSAP’s eyes, the Set 1 auxiliary yod is frequently used for situations that are out of sight, even if the MSAP had seen the beginning of the event.
(86) SHEY

\[
\text{daŋ ŋa khaŋpa}^{\cdot} \text{leb-zane,} \\
\text{yesterday I home-ALL arrive-when} \\
\text{ŋ-e aba-le}^{\cdot} \text{lu tay-in-jot-pin.} \\
\text{I-GEN father-HM-ERG song give-CNT-le-RM=PRG.IMPF}
\]

‘Yesterday, when I arrived at home my father was already singing.’ (The activity was still going on when the speaker left again, after a while. The speaker refers to a moment when s/he was again spatially dislocated and indicates that s/he does not know whether or when the activity came to an end.)

(87) DOM

\[
\text{lo banʧig-isŋanla lopʈuk banʧigis r̥ʧup eaŋ nakel fur-en-4k-pin.} \\
\text{year many-PPOS pupil many-ERG 10th-PPOS copying copy-cnt-Ilv-RM=IMPF} \\
/ \text{ khoŋis-nik fur-en-jot-pin. ŋa-nik joŋs-teaŋs-pin.} \\
\text{they-ERG-TOP copy-CNT-le-RM=PRS I-TOP come.PA-give.PA-RM=I}
\]

‘Quite some years ago, quite a few pupils were cheating in the tenth [class exam]. / They, on their part, were cheating. [But] I, for my part, just went home (before the end of the examination).’ (The experiential imperfect indicates that the speaker has seen part of the event, particularly not the end, but also that the speaker has remained on the spot. The non-experiential Imperfect is used when the speaker had been locally dissociated from part of the event. Either s/he went out of the room inbetween or at the end.)

(88) DOM

\[
lhtos-aŋ! bras-po tram-et. \\
\text{look.IMP-DIR rice-DF get.scattered-le=PRS}
\]

‘Look!, the rice is getting scattered.’ (The non-experiential form 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.)

Not all speakers agree (fully) with this analysis. Some claim that the non-experiential form could be used only when one wants to warn the person. But this again is possible only when one sees the situation only partially! In the Gya dialect, however, the non-experiential form is not possible in such contexts.

3.13 Set 1 yod: internal states of OTHER, default usage in the Balti dialect of Turtuk (+??) and the Purik dialect of Kargil (+??)

In Turtuk, this usage includes inferred (observable) internal states of OTHER.

(89) TUR

\[
\text{mo-a namkin ŋa hute go-a-met-ŋ (} \sim \text{mer-ŋ)} \\
\text{she-AES salt tea good perceive-NLZ-le-Ilvexp=PRS}
\]

‘She (apparently) does not like the butter tea.’

As the informant stated, the form metŋ would be used when the person spoken about is present, whereas the inferential form metsuk would be used when the person spoken about is absent.
3.14 Set 1 *yod*: default endopathic usage for MSAP in the Balti dialect of Turtuk (+??) and the Purik dialect of Kargil (+??)

(90) TUR

ηα graχmo / tshatpa go-et.
I   cold     hot   go-le=PRS
‘I am getting cold / hot.’

(91) TUR

ηα(,:) toks-et. za-tfa-fi min!
I.AES be.hungry-Le=PRS eat-GRD.-IQ give.IMP
‘I am (getting) hungry. Give [me] (something) to eat!’

4 PERFECT constructions

**Table 7** Distribution of TMA auxiliaries (PERFECT constructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>resultative PERFECT</th>
<th>continuative PERFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>result concerning MSAP</td>
<td>result concerning OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-experiential</td>
<td><em>yin / yod</em></td>
<td><em>yin / yod</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, visual</td>
<td>— ?</td>
<td><em>ḥdag / ḏzag</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential, non-visual</td>
<td><em>ḥgrag</em></td>
<td><em>ḥgrag</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td><em>yin &amp; marker</em></td>
<td><em>yin / yod &amp; marker</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERFECT constructions specify a state that typically still holds at the time of the utterance, but results from a transition or transformation in the past.

The evidential markers of Set 2 focus only on the resulting state of an event. That is, they are used when the result is immediately perceived, either visually (*ḥdag*) or through other perceptive channels (*ḥgrag*).

The Set 1 markers *yin* and *yod* are used when the result is not immediately perceived, that is, when the MSAP had been involved in bringing about the result and/or when the result is out of view. The distribution of *yin* and *yod* is still unclear.

The Set 2 auxiliaries often have an inferential connotation. They convey the connotation that the knowledge about the resulting state is quite new, and this may also go along with a notion of surprise.

With non-telic durative verbs, a perfect construction can also refer to an ongoing situation, which is the result of an initial change of state (or position) or activity. That is, *sitting* can be seen as the result of *having sat down*, *working* as the result of *having begun to work*, etc.

Note that in non-finite (chained or subordinated) clauses based on the perfect construction only Set 1 auxiliaries can be used, cf. example. (92).
Evidentiality, inferentiality, and speaker’s attitude – Questionnaire

4.1 Set 1 yin: results produced by MSAP or affecting MSAP

(92) DOM

*rigo* tshaŋma(:) *kha* gon-e-jot-pasan,
mountain.top all-ALL snow be.covered-LB-Ie=PERF-NLZ&
tshanla draŋmo joŋ-a-rak.
night-ALL cold come-NLZ-Inv=PRS
‘It is getting cold at night, /I am feeling cold at night, because the mountain tops are all /have all got covered with snow.’

4.2 Set 1 yin: results without involvement of MSAP

(93) GYA

«ʃi-saŋ ŋōn-a ʒiŋ tshaŋma trūgu-ɦun-a ger-e-in. / ger-e-jot.»
die-CNTR early-ALL field all child-PL-ALL divide-LB-Ic=PERF divide-LB-Ie=PERF
zer-de, abi-se ye mīk.
say-LB grandmother-ERG certain plan.PA
‘Saying «before dying I [shall] have divided all fields among the children», the grandmother made a plan.’

12 The noun *abise* ‘grandmother-ERG’ has been shifted from the sentence initial position.

(94) NYO

di khjøraŋ ɲø˖ re-in!
this you.fam buy-LB-Ic=PERF
‘You have brought this onto yourself! (Lit. This one, *you* have bought it.)’

(95) DOM

duʧik kho someg-is gjet-e-in.
this.year s/he/it new-ERG cultivate-LB-Ic=PERF
‘This year, it [the field] has been cultivated by a new [farmer].’

(96) DOM

khoŋ ɲisk-eaŋ spera soŋ-se-in. / soŋ-se-jot.
they both-PPPOS speech happen-LB-Ic=PERF happen-LB-Ie=PERF
‘Some agreement has come in place between the two.’ (The speaker is a friend of at least one of the parties. In the case of soŋsein, they have told the speaker already earlier about their plans, and the speaker knows exactly all details. In the case of soŋse yot, the speaker only knows about the end phase of making an agreement.)
4.3 Set 1 yin: confirmation-seeking and rhetorical questions concerning OTHER

(97) DOM

me bar-e, mesat galdi kher-en-uk.
fire burn-LB fire.extinguish vehicle take.along-CNT-IIv

garua bar-bin he?, garua kher-e-in he?
where burn.PA-RM Intj where take.along-LB-Ic=PERF Intj
‘As it burns, a fire engine is rushing (lit. is being taken) [to the spot]. – Hey, where did it burn? Where did [it] go to?’

An inferential form would indicate that one does not expect to be affected by the situation. The use of the copula, by contrast, would indicate that one has great tensions or fear and that one wants to know the exact details. The corresponding answer, however, would usually not be with the copula alone, but with an inferential form. However the copula would be used in a statement that one doesn’t know:

(98) DOM

ʧiʃe,13 / ʧi pata, garua bar-bin? garua kher-e-in?
what.know what knowledge where burn.PA-RM where take.along-LB-Ic=PERF
‘What do I know, where it burned, where [it] went?!’

4.4 Set 1 yod: results produced by, or affecting, MSAP

The Set 1 marker yod may be used for visible results which the MSAP brought about before his or her utterance.

(99) TUR

gar duk-se-jot?
where stay-LB-Ie=PERF
‘Where do you stay?’

With respect to reflexive actions, the marker implies a longer duration of the state, whereas the copula yin is possible only when a short duration is implied:

(100) TYA

ŋa lakpa ⱱtap-se-jot. / ⱱtap-se-duk-se-jot.
I hand/arm fold-LB-Ie=PERF fold-LB-stay-LB-Ie=PERF
‘I have crossed my arms (and am staying so [not doing anything]).’

(101) TYA

ŋa tsapikʃikphia lakpa ⱱtapsein.
I a.bit-LQ-PPOS hand/arm fold-PERF=Ic
‘I have crossed my arms just for a moment.’

The context of the following example is that the researcher had left a thermos flask in the kitchen to be filled before she would come back from town. When she came back, she found the flask at the same place and thought that it had not yet been filled. She was just about to set up water on the hearth, when the houseowner came in and told her that he had already prepared the water. The existential verb yod is used here, because the water is already in the thermos flask, thus, in a way distanced from the location

13 This is a contracted form of ʧiʃe.
of boiling. The copula *yin* could have been used, if the water were still in the pot on the hearth (TYA).

(102) LEH

\[ \text{ʧu skol-te-jot. } \text{daksaray skol-te-jot.} \]

water boil(trs)-LB-Ie=PERF just.now boil(trs)-LB-Ie=PERF

‘The water has already been boiled. [I] have boiled it just now.’

More commonly, *yod* is used for temporally or spatially distant results.

(103) DOM

\[ \text{ŋi gonlak tshaŋma ʧhat-e-jot.} \]

I-GEN dress all be.torn-LB-Ie=PERF

‘My clothes are (=have got) torn.’

According the informant, the auxiliary *yod* is used here, because the speaker knows when and where the deplorable state came about. The sentence may be uttered already a short time after the accident, but the focus is on the resulting state, as when one apologises to other persons or asks them not to look at that particular spot. Otherwise one could also use the simple past /ʧhat/ *chad*. The auxiliary *ḥdug* is used when one freshly observes the result without knowing when and where it happened. There may be thus a connotation of surprise. Later on, one might either use an inferential form, such as the inferential past /ʧhatsok/ *chad.sog*, or if one pretends to know well, also the above described form /ʧhatejot/ *chad.de.yod*.

4.5 Set 1 *yod*: results without involvement of MSAP

(104) DOM

\[ \text{bom jas-tsana, kho ʧba-tshar-e-met-pin.} \]

bomb explode-when s/he go-end.up-LB-not.exist-Ie=PERF-RM

‘When the bomb exploded, s/he had already left.’

(105) ARA

\[ \text{dagdar-ze taŋ-kan-i ʧman-bo-ze trhu:-zak skjob-ze-jot.} \]

doctor-ERG give-NLZ-GEN medicine-DF-ERG child-PL protect-LB-Ie=PERF

‘The medicine given by the physician has protected/ cured all the children.’

4.6 Set 1 *yod*: conveying a message or information concerning OTHER

This can be seen as neutral or ‘factual’ usage. It has been so far only observed in Balti. [Purik?].

(106) TUR

\[ \text{phirolpa dose lok-se-oys-et.} \]

foreigner now return-LB-come.PA-Ie=PERF

‘The foreigner has come back.’ (The speaker informs the addressee.)
4.7 Set 1 *yod*: result produced by *other* but observed by both speaker and addressee.

(107) TUR

\[ \text{phirolpa dose lok-se-ons-et.} \]

foreigner now return-LB-come.PA-le=PERF

‘The foreigner has come back.’ (Both speaker and addresse have observed the situation together.)

4.8 Set 2 *ḥdug*: visual observation of result produced by *other* (and MSAP)

With the perfect construction, the marker for visual experience *ḥdug* can have an inferential meaning. The marker can be used for results affecting the MSAP, if this result is freshly perceived, as in the case of receiving a present. It can also be used for results produced by the MSAP, if the event has taken place quite some time ago, and if the MSAP does no longer remember or only vaguely remembers the event, and discovers his/her actornship upon seeing the result or if the MSAP identifies the result as being brought about by him/her upon seeing it. This may go along with a mirative connotation.

(108) WAK

\[ \text{gelon-le-s } ŋa(ː) \text{suka skur-e-duk.} \]

monk-HM-ERG I-ALL talisman hon.send-LB-IIv=PERF

‘The monk has sent me a protective talisman.’

(109) SAS

\[ \text{aŋmo-s tshiriŋ dron-la bo-se-duk.} \]

Aŋmo-ERG Tshiriŋ feast-ALL invite-LB-IIv=PERF

‘Aŋmo apparently invited Tshiriŋ to the feast.’ (The speaker sees Tshiriŋ at the feast.)

(110) ARA

\[ \text{kbo jö-a rdget-s-ay.} \]

s/he come-NLZ forget-LB-IIv=PERF

‘S/he apparently forgot to come.’ (The speaker sees that the person is missing.)

4.9 Set 2 *ḥgrag*: non-visual observation of result produced by *other* or *MSAP*

With the perfect construction, the marker for non-visual observation *ḥgrag* often has an inferential connotation.

(111) TIR

\[ \text{day tshanphet-naphala ḡbāze } ŋa ḡbol-ts-ak.} \]

yesterday night.middle-from.onwards chan-INSTR I talk.nonsense-lb-IIv=PERF

‘Yesterday, from the middle of the night onwards, I must have been talking /I heard myself talking nonsense because of [too much] chan (the local beer).’

4.10 Set 2 *ḥgrag*: inferences and judgements by the MSAP about *other*

The non-visual perfect can also be used for situations of *other*, if the MSAP has an opinion or judgement about them. In that case, the marker for non-visual evidence refers to a mental act of the MSAP, even if s/he talks about a result that belongs to *other*. In such cases the dominant input may be by any non-visual channel. However, this construction stands in competition with the use of inferential markers, such as *yin.nag* and *yin.sug*. 
Evidentiality, inferentiality, and speaker’s attitude – Questionnaire

(112) DOM

di sper-eṣu su gal-e-drak?
this matter-PPOS who do.wrong-PERF=IInv
‘Who, do you think, is wrong /has done wrong in this matter?’ (The idea is that the addressee had been hearing about the case, typically because the speaker had just explained the situation orally.)

4.11 Set 1 yin: ongoing activities of MSAP

(113) DOM

glasses what-PPOS give-LB-Ic=PERF a.bit get.blind-LB-Ic=PERF
‘Why do [you] wear (lit. have you given) glasses? – [I] am (lit. have become) a bit blind.’

4.12 Set 1 yod: ongoing activities of OTHER

(114) DOM

kho-naŋ kbo khon-e-jot.
s/he-COM s/he bear.a.grudge-LB-Ie=PERF
‘They (lit. s/he and s/he) bear a grudge (against each other). They are not /have not been talking (to each other).’

4.13 Set 2 ḥdug: ongoing activities of OTHER and internal states of OTHER, accessed through the visual channel

(115) TYA

aŋmo-s ige dri-se-duk.
Aŋmo-ERG letter write-LB-IIv=PERF
‘Aŋmo is / has been writing a / the letter.’

(116) ARA

kho kḥjag-z-aŋ.
s/he freeze-LB-IIv=PERF
‘S/he is freezing.’ (The speaker might have seen the person wrapping his/herself faster into a blanket, crouching close to the hearth, rubbing his/her hands, etc.)

4.14 Set 2 ḥgrag: ongoing inner states of the MSAP and internal states of OTHER, accessed through a non-visual channel

(117) ARA

ŋa kḥjag-z-ak.
I freeze-LB-IIv=PERF
‘I am freezing.’

(118) DOM

kbo kḥjak-se-drak.
s/he freeze-LB-IIv=PERF
‘S/he is freezing (as I can feel).’ (The speaker verifies the state of the person upon touching several parts of the person’s body.)
5 Prospective constructions

5.1 Expectations and plans of MSAP

(119) GYA
«ʃi-saŋ ŋōna ʒiŋ tshaŋma trūgu-ɦun-a ge-ʒe-in. / ge-ʒe-ɦiọt.»
die-CNTR earlier field all child-PL-ALL divide-GRD-Ic=PROSP divide-GRD-Ie=PROSP
zer-de, abise ye mīk.
say-LB grandmother-ERG certain plan.PA
‘Saying «before dying I will divide all fields among the children», the grandmother made a plan.’14 (ɦin is used for fields nearby (or in view), ɦot is used for fields further away (or out of view)).

(120) DOM
khoa ta nalwe-ŋ tʃha-(ː) sʃit-ʧa-jot. /
deserve-NLZ-IIv=PROSP deserve-NLZ-IInv=PROSP deserve-NLZ-Ie=PROSP-IM
tʃiba zer-na, di mitshe-(ː)ka raluk semʃan maŋbo sats.
why say-LOC:CD this human.life PPOS goat.sheep animal many kill.PA
‘S/he would deserve to go to hell, because in this life [s/he] had killed many goats and sheep and [other] animals.’

According to the informant, yod would be used when the person had been acting badly for a very long time, from the very beginning; ḥdug would be used when we observe the bad deeds for the first time, ḥkrag would be used when we hear about the person or when we hear that bad shouting; the inferential form with yod sug would be used if we heard about the bad deeds only a long time after they happened or after the person had died, yin and its inferential form yin sug would not be used.

(121) GYA
Aŋmo de kıtap-te metkhamet sil-ge-ɦiọt. /
Aŋmo-ERG that book-DF necessarily read-need-NLZ-Ie=PROSP
sil-ge-ɦiọt-duŋ. / sil-ge-ɦiọt-rak.
read-need-NLZ-IIv=PROSP read-need-NLZ-IInv=PROSP
‘Aŋmo must definitely read this book. / It seems that Aŋmo must definitely read this book. / I think that Aŋmo must definitely read this book.’

According to the informant, yod is used when the speaker is involved: e.g., a close friend, a gi ɦokan (somebody who knows), who was reading together with Aŋmo, but not the teacher; ḥdug is used, when the book is not important for the speaker, as when a teacher makes a suggestion; ḥkrag is used, when the book is also important for the speaker, e.g., s/he is a classmate and both have to read the book, but the speaker has no time, it gives the connotation of “I think so”; the inferential marker yod kag would be used if book is important for Aŋmo, but speaker is not much interested; the probability marker yod ɦgro would signal that the book is not so important for Aŋmo.

---

14 The noun abise ‘grandmother-ERG’ has been shifted from the sentence initial position.
More contexts to be added!

6 Habits and generic facts and states

The Western Shamskat dialects have a particular present or past habitual construction with the morpheme /-bat/ -bad ~ /-pat/ -pad as Set 1 form. The other dialects use the non-continuous present or imperfect /-at/ -ad. Past habits that are no longer continued at the time of the utterance, receive the remotness marker pin invariably for all persons.

For statements mainly based on visual perception, all speakers use an evidential present tense or imperfect construction. Speakers of Western Sham dialects only use the continuous form, whereas speakers of the Eastern Sham dialects use the non-continuous form, so that there is again a contrast between individual and concrete events (continuous form), on the one hand, and habits and generic facts (unmarked form), on the other.

In all dialects, the Set 1 form is used for habits of the MSAP, for habits of the MSAP’s family members (intimate knowledge), and for otherwise well-known habits or generic states of OTHER within the MSAP’s cultural sphere.

The Set 2 form for visual perception is used for situations involving OTHER, including the MSAP’s family members, when the MSAP wants to emphasise that his or her knowledge is mainly based on perception and/ or inference, or that s/he is not really well acquainted with the facts. The Set 2 form can also be used when one talks about a well known custom, but does not want to be associated with it for whatever reason.

The use of Set 2 marker ḥdug for non-authoritative descriptions of OTHERs’ habits and generic facts, stands in competition with the DEFINITE FUTURE II and the use of an inferential marker.

A crucial distinction is that Set 1 markers can only be used for a limited set of items, say, all cats of the village, while Set 2 markers must be used, when talking about an unlimited set, say all cats in the world, because in the latter case, one is not expected and does not feel licensed to make an authoritative statement. However, in a situation where one can assume authority, e.g., when uttering a warning, beware, all cats are monsters!, or the like, the Set 1 marker would be used.

6.1 Set 1 auxiliary yod, knowledge not based on immediate perception, reference to MSAP and the MSAP’s family members

(122) DOM

\[ \text{phurgu-tsana, } \eta-s \text{ om-e } kha \text{ ḡak-pat-pin, } rku-se. \]

child-when 1-ERG curd-GEN mouth break-NLZ.Ie=RM=PA.HAB steal-LB

‘When [I was] a child, I used to take off the first bit from the [fresh] curd, secretly.’

(123) DOM

\[ \etaaf'i \text{ naya ab-e wany drul-bat. } \]

we.excl-GEN house-ALL father-GEN power work-NLZ.Ie=PRS.HAB

‘In our house, [our] father is the boss. (Lit: In our house, it is father’s power that applies.)’
6.2 Set 1 auxiliary yod, knowledge not based on immediate perception, reference to other and generic facts (own cultural sphere)

(125) GYA

\[
\text{ŋa̱} ˖ \text{ʒe} \ pāχfo \ tshaŋma \ meme-se \ tāŋse \ ɲē-at.
\]

we.excl-gen skin all grandfather-erg always tan-le=prs

‘As for our hides, [our] grandfather always tans them.’

6.3 Set 2 auxiliary ḥdug: non-assertive, reference to other, including MSAP’s family members

(127) DOM

\[
rbul \ ldɔɾ-la \ drul-duk.
\]

snake flatness-all go-llv=prs

‘Snakes (seem to /apparently) creep on the belly.’

(128) GYA

\[
khi \ \text{khor-zane}, \ am-e \ tāŋse \ ɲe \ si-ɦuk.
\]

threshing turn-when mother-erg always barley winnow-llv=prs

‘During threshing, [our] mother always winnows the barley.’ (This is actually a situation, quite familiar to the informant. But the speaker does not do this work and also does not want to do it.)

(129) GYA

\[
ladaγ-ɛ \ ama \ tshaŋma \ tāŋse \ piŋmo \ tsūk-te-da ruk.
\]

Ladakh-gen mother all always knee plant-LB-sit-llv=prs

‘Ladakhi women always sit /kneel with one knee up and the other touching the ground.’ (This is, of course, a generic fact, every Ladakhi knows. But the speaker does not want to be part of this tradition anymore and distantiates him/herself from this custom.)

The experiential marker can also be used when the speaker refers to action of his family in which s/he was not fully involved or from which s/he wishes to distance him/herself.
(129) a. DOM

ŋaʧa tshaŋma-s / ŋaʧi  nayntshans-po-s mane-tsana ʧhanthuk ʧan-en uk.
we.excl all-ERG we-GEN family-DF-ERG mane-when chanthuk give-CNT-IIv

‘When there was the [great] mane-recitation, we [=the Domkhar people] / our family used to give barley soup [to the gathered people].’ (The speaker was not really involved, as s/he was too small at that time or the speaker does not participate in this habit any more and does not appreciate it anymore.)

(129) b. DOM

daksaraŋ ŋaʧi  nayntshans-po-s ʧhanthuk ʧan-en uk.
now.only we.excl-GEN family-DF-ERG chanthuk give-CNT-IIv

‘Right now, our family is giving chanthuk.’ (The speaker does not participate, although s/he may have been involved in the decision making and the preparation, but is hindered now, because of an accident.)

6.4 Set 2 auxiliary ḥgrag, knowledge based exclusively on non-visual perception

(130) TYA

Ladaks-la skamlak bar-tsana, drug-is şantr ek bos-en ak.
Ladakh-ALL lightning burn-when thunder-ERG very-LQ call-CNT-IInv

‘During a thunderstorm in Ladakh, there is (always) quite heavy thundering (to be heard).’

(131) GYA

ʒaktaŋ ŋāmo ʈu̱k-nephala
every.day morning six-PPOS

trūg-i kūco tāŋ-ʧe go zug-a rak.
child-ERG noise give-GER begin start-NLZ-Iinv

‘Every day in the morning from six onwards, the children’s crying starts.’ (This implies that the speaker hears the crying every day, but from another room or even from another house.)

By contrast, the Set 2 auxiliary ḥdug (zuuk) could be used when the speaker observes the situation regularly directly (that is, visually), but talks about the children more generally, e.g., because all children behave differently, some start crying early, some rather late. The focus may also lie on the fact that you have to go and look, whenever they cry, rather than on the regularity itself. The Set 1 auxiliary yod (zuat) could be used, when the speaker wants to indicate that s/he knows it well, namely the situation or the regularity of a limited set of performers (the phrases in italics are based on the informant’s descriptions).

6.5 Habitual results (combination with yoŋ)

Context and examples to be specified!

7 Verb forms that do not fully fit into the system

Not all verbal forms, however, fit fully into the system. Some forms lack a direct evidential counterpart. That is, even if there are formal counterparts, they do have somewhat different TMA functions. In some cases, the forms violate the conjunct-disjunct
distinction, where the MSAP is the speaker in assertions (including negations), but the addressee in questions.

Table 8 Other TMA constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMA-construction function</th>
<th>auxiliary</th>
<th>MSPA</th>
<th>non-MSPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ctr</td>
<td>−ctr</td>
<td>observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMPLE PAST</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>+(Sham)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKED PAST</td>
<td>pin (payin)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remoteness marker, other usages</td>
<td>pin (payin)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMPLE PRESENT FUTURE</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITE FUTURE I</td>
<td>yin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITE FUTURE II</td>
<td>yin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1 Past tense

The SIMPLE PAST (plain ‘past’ stem) is used mainly for Set 2 functions, that is for [−control] events related to the MSAP and all kinds of situations related to OTHER. The general connotation is that the situation was observed by the MSAP. However, for some speakers, it may also be used for well established facts that one has not observed personally. The plain past stem is functionally unmarked. It may combine with all sorts of inferential or distance markers, and in the Sham dialects, the SIMPLE PAST is also used instead of the MARKED PAST with Set 1 function for the MSAP’s recent [+control] actions. The use of the MARKED PAST for recent actions would then indicate some sort of mental remoteness, as when the speaker wants to emphasise that, contrary to the expectation of the addressee, the action is already or finally fully performed.

The MARKED PAST (‘past’ stem plus remoteness marker pin < pa.yin) mainly represents Set 1 functions. The remoteness marker pin is, however, also used for [−control] events related to the MSAP, as well as events related to OTHER, indicating in this case, that the situation happened a long time ago, but the MSAP remembers the situation well.

On the other hand, in combination with present tense and perfect constructions, the remoteness marker pin is used for all persons and all types of events with the connotation that the event was observed by the MSAP and is remembered clearly.

7.1.1 Set I MARKED PAST: past [+ctr] actions of the MSAP and his/her family

(132) TIR

ŋa-ze trhu’u ʧun-pin.
I-ERG child rebuke.PA-RM=I
‘I reprimanded the child.’

(133) TYA

kberaŋ kha ʧiba ma-dals-pin?
fam,you mouth why NG2-keep.unemployed.PA-RM=I
‘Why didn’t you keep silent /shut up?’

The MARKED PAST also indicates that the MSAP was involved in a collective activity, especially of one’s own family. The SIMPLE PAST, by contrast indicates that the MSAP was
not involved in the activity. When used for one’s family’s activities, it expresses thus a
certain distance, either spatial or emotional.

(134) GYA
\[
\eta₃જ \text{ e} \quad \text{kamba-ne}
\]
we.excl-GEN house-ABL

\[
\text{khimtsep-e afi nāma-(:) nāmbu-ʒik tā-fen.}
\]
neighbour-GEN elder.sister wife-ALL woollen.cloth-LQ give.PA-RM=I

‘From our household the [newly]-wed elder daughter of the neighbours was
given a woollen cloth.’

According to the informant, the MARKED PAST indicates that the speaker is still part of
her parent’s household. If she is no longer part of the house hold, because she has mar-
ried into another family, she would use the SIMPLE PAST.

Interestingly enough, several informants stated that the MARKED PAST should not be
used with an inclusive plural. The remoteness marker \textit{pin} stresses the asymmetry be-
tween speaker and hearer with respect to the control over or the knowledge about the
event. This is ok, when the hearer was not participating in the event (1P sg or 1P pl
excl.), but it is presumptuous to use this form with respect to persons who had been
participating in the event and thus have (had) as much knowledge or control (DOMa).
This does not seem to be a fast rule, however.

7.1.2 Set I MARKED PAST: past situations of OTHER, involvement of MSAP, statement as
witness

(135) DOM
\[
\text{[d]i r̥kunma tshaŋma-s r̥ta tshaŋma trols-pin.}
\]
this thief all-ERG horse all untie.PA-RM=I

‘All these thieves (who are present) had untied the horses.’ (The speaker had wit-
nessed the situation.)

7.1.3 Set I MARKED PAST: past situations of OTHER, particularly [–ctr] events related to
the MSAP, that happened in great temporal distance, but are well remembered

In most cases, the informants stated that the event happened a long time ago, but that
they have a clear memory of the situation.

(136) SKI
\[
gergan-is dezuk zes-pasay, dene ŋa spiŋ rd̥̂ges-pin.
\]
teacher-ERG that.way speak.PA-NLZ& then I heart feel.pity.PA-RM=I

‘When the teacher had spoken thus, I felt pity.’ (The speaker has a clear and
vivid memory.)

(137) GYA
\[
lō khaʃig-eyona alfĩ-a
\]
year some-PPOS Alci-ALL

\[
gorkha ni-se gelon ni tūŋ. / tūŋ-pen.
\]
Gorkha two-ERG monk two hon.kill.PA=II hon.kill.PA-RM=I

‘Some years ago in Alci, two Nepalese men killed two monks (as everybody
knows). / (as everybody knows and I remember well).’
As the informant stated, the SIMPLE PAST can be used here, even though one did not observed the event oneself, because it is an established fact and everybody had been 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.

7.1.4 Set I MARKED PAST: past situations of OTHER, emphatic usage, confirmation seeking

(138) GYA
zaktan kh-e fiige kjal-at. terin mä-kyal.

every.day s/he-ERG letter deliver-le today NG2-deliver.PA=II

kbo-a ti soyen? s/he-AES what happen.PA-RM=I
‘Every day, s/he delivers the letters, but today [s/he] did not deliver [them]. /did not bring [them] in order to deliver [them]. What happened to him/her?!’

According to the informant, the MARKED PAST conveys the idea that there was a certain problem. The addressee is not expected to have a particular visual knowledge of the situation. But the speaker might invite addressee to enquire more closely. The simple past would shift the attention to the ‘subject’ and would convey the notion of putting the blame on that person.

(139) LEH2
kho-a ti sit-pin he?
s/he-AES what have.to.bear. PA-RM=I intj
‘What the hell has come over him/her?!’ (This may be said, when somebody did something bad.)

7.1.5 Set II SIMPLE PAST: past situations of OTHER, observed or experienced by the MSAP

(140) GYA
day na khamba(-) tsha-ze-a tshom-pen. fin'ay bad ma-thop.
yesterday I home-ALL go-NLZ-ALL get.ready.PA-RM=I but bus NG2-get.PA=II
‘Yesterday, I was prepared to go home, but [then] I did not get a bus.’

(141) ARA
day bia(-ze) mane ton.
yesterday cat(-ERG) prayer utter.PA
‘Yesterday, the cat was purring (lit. murmuring prayers).’

7.1.6 Set II simple past: neutral use for the MSAP’s recent actions (only Shamskat)
In the Sham dialects, the SIMPLE PAST is also used instead of the MARKED PAST with Set 1 function for the MSAP’s recent [+control] actions. The use of the MARKED PAST for recent actions would indicate some sort of mental remoteness, as when the speaker wants to emphasise that, contrary to the expectation of the addressee, the action is already or finally fully performed, cf. example (142). What about Nubra? Purik? Balti?
The notion of a recent past is, of course, quite elastic: what is counted as recent depends on the activity itself. When it comes to writing a letter, the recent past may compr- isee the present day, perhaps also the day before, but when building a house (which typically happens in phases and takes many years), it may well comprise a full year.

(142) a. DOM

\[
\text{daŋ ŋa-s kho-a ige-k kals.}
\]

yesterday I-ERG s/he-ALL letter-LQ send.PA=II

‘I sent him/her a letter yesterday.’

(142) b. DOM

\[
\text{daŋ ŋa-s ige-k kals-pin.}
\]

yesterday I-ERG letter-LQ send-RM=I

‘I sent a letter already yesterday. /I eventually sent a letter yesterday.’ (The letter was urgent and/ or the speaker was supposed to send it a week before.)

(142) c. DOM

\[
naniŋ ŋa-s kho-a ige-k kals-pin.\]

last.year I-ERG s/he-ALL letter-LQ send-RM=I

‘I sent him/her a letter last year.’

7.1.7 Set II simple past: neutral use for non-observed events of other in the case of well-established facts and narrations

Example (137) has shown, the SIMPLE PAST may also be used for well established facts that one has not observed personally. It may also be used for ‘appropriated’ narratives, cf. example (80), and it may appear instead of, or side-by-side with evaluative markers in narrations.

The exact motivations for such usage are not yet known.

7.2 Future tense and presumptive constructions

7.2.1 Stem I & yin and negated bare stem I, use for MSAP

The DEFINITE-FUTURE I (present stem & yin) is used mainly for the speaker’s [+control] actions in assertions. For negation, the SIMPLE PRESENT-FUTURE must be used.

(143) GYA

\[
kheraŋ ʧhom-aŋ! – tə ʧhom-in, ʧhom-in.\]

fam.you get.ready.IMP-DM now get.ready-Ic=DFUT.I get.ready-Ic=DFUT.I

‘Get ready, please! – I’ll be ready, now, I’ll be ready.’

The SIMPLE PRESENT-FUTURE (the bare ‘present’ stem or stem I) as used for the MSAP’s future [+control] actions is restricted to negated statements with the negation marker mi (as counterpart of the DEFINITE FUTURE I), to polarity questions with the negation marker mi or ma (the answer is typically a command or a cohortative). Less frequently, it appears also with word questions, when a command or advice is expected.

(145) DOM

\[
\text{ŋas jul-iphia ʃrok mi-skjal.}
\]

I-ERG country-PPOS live NG-risk.PRS

‘I won’t risk my life for the country.’
7.2.2 Stem I & yin and bare stem I in questions, use for OTHER
In double-polarity questions expressing doubt, the SIMPLE PRESENT FUTURE is regularly used for a third person’s future actions and for [-control] events relating to the MSAP. In such future-oriented contexts of doubt, the non-experiential PRESENT TENSE construction might be used for OTHER, as well, cf. section 3.5. The connotation of doubt could be interpreted as a mirative usage.

(148) KHAL

thoras kho le-a ʧha-ː-mi-ʧha he?
tomorrow s/he Leh-ALL go.PRS-QM1-go.PRS Intj
‘Will s/he go to Leh tomorrow or not?/ S/he might perhaps go to Leh tomorrow.’ (The speaker does not really know.)

(149) DOM

naŋmolo-a ɲa-ː-ɲ gal di-k r̥ɲet-mi-rɲet-a he?
next.year-ALL I-AES-FM car-LEQ get.PRS-QM1-get.PRS-QM Intj
‘Next year, I will get a car, too, won’t I?/ I, too, might perhaps get a car.’

(150) GYA

ŋe tshode-ːzik tsūg-in. tshor-en-a-me̱-tshod?
I-ERG riddle-LQ pose-Ic=DFUT.I solve-Ic=DFUT.I-QM1-solve=SPRS
‘I’ll ask [you] a riddle. Will [you] be able to solve it or not?’

The DEFINITE FUTURE I and the SIMPLE PRESENT-FUTURE appear also in word questions about OTHER (including the speaker). Such questions are typically rhetorical and may be emotionally marked, which would correspond to a mirative usage:

(151) TYA

pene jot-khan-bo rdzoks. ta ʧi ʧo-in?
money have=Ie-DF finish.PA now what do-Ic=DFUT.I
‘[All] the money [I] had is spent (lit. finished). Now what shall I do?’
7.2.3 Stem I & yin and negated bare stem I in wishes, predictions or warnings concerning OTHER

Infrequently, the DEFINITE-FUTURE I is also used in predictions, wishes, or warnings for OTHER, and/or for [−control] events. Hence, the construction does likewise not match the general distribution between MSAP and OTHER.

(153) DOM

rdzun-fik t'any-ba-baŋ kho ʃi:n.
lie-LQ give-NLZ-CNTR s/he die-Ic-DFUT.I
‘Rather than lying, s/he would be dying.’

(154) SAS

gjel-in he!
fall-lc-DFUT.I Intj
[It] is /[you] are likely to fall! (Uttered as a warning: Be careful not to let [it] fall! /not to fall!)

(155) TYA

ʒak-ʃik kheraŋ-is (go-a) ʃtso gon-in he!
day-LQ hon.you-ERG (head-ALL) ʃtso wear-Ic-DFUT.I Intj
‘One day you will be wearing ʃtsto on (your head), really!’ (Uttered as a curse. This has an extremely disgusting connotation, since ʃtsto refers to the contents of the stomach of a dead, esp. of a slaughtered, animal.)

(156) TIR

kho-ze khuri ʃiŋm-eþiŋa i spedep tshaŋma ʃaŋsk-e ka rik.
s/he-ERG s/he.self.GEN sister-PPOS this book all shelf-PPOS arrange.PA=II

ʧi-a zer-na, kho-e ʃiŋmo-a spedep tshaŋma l̥ao-napo thow-en.
what-ALL say-LOC:CD s/he-GEN sister-AES book all easy-PPOS find-DFUT.I
‘He arranged all these books on the shelf for his sister, because his sister shall find the books with ease.’

7.2.4 Bare stem I in modal constructions, use for OTHER

The SIMPLE PRESENT-FUTURE is also used in several modal constructions: it appears in cohortatives and prohibitions. It is further quite common in assertions with several [−control] modal and state verbs, where it may have a generic notion, e.g., in the case of the modal verb /r)gos/ ~ /gel/ ~ /gi/ < CT dgos ‘need, must’ or in the result clause (apodosis) of a conditional construction. This latter usage could perhaps be subsumed under authoritative speech, but it seems that the SIMPLE PRESENT-FUTURE is just used neutrally.
The *simple present-future* is a relict of the earlier Old Tibetan TMA system, and this may be the reason why it is neutral with respect to evidentiality and why it definitely violates the general distribution between MSAP and OTHER.

(157) GYA
ta dro-a? - ja, dro, dro.
now go=Ic=DFUT.I-QM Intj go.PRS go.PRS
‘Shall we go? – Yes, let’s go.’

(158) DOM
ʒaktoŋ las ma-ʧo! ʒak-ʃik ta khom!
every.day work NG-do.PRS=PRHB day-LQ though rest.IMP
‘Do not work every day! One day, at least, you should take some rest.’

(159) DOM
mi-ŋun ske-pa, tshaŋma ʃi-rgos.
people-PL be.born-NLZ all die-need.PRS
‘All people have to die, because they have been born.’

(160) GYA
jul-ephia ʂok kjāl-gi.
country-PPOS life sacrifice-need.PRS
‘One must sacrifice one’s life for the country.’

(161) GYA
bu ɦod-na, kharzi mi-ʃim.
worm have=Ie-LOC:CD food NG1-be.absorbed.PRS
‘If [one] has worms, the food will not be fully absorbed [i.e. one will not stay healthy].’

7.2.5 *Gerundive* & *yin*, used with all persons
The *definite-future II* (*gerundive* & *yin*, contracted /-ʧen/ in Kenhat, /-ʧan/ in Shamskat), on the other hand, is used neutrally for all kinds of events and for all persons in assertions, questions, and negations alike. The events is expected to happen with great certainty. The construction is quite frequently used in the Shamskat dialects for generic facts, as well as for generally known customs of the past, cf. also (186) g to (186) i below. The construction seems to be somewhat less commonly used in the Kenhat dialects, where an inferential future construction seems to be preferred, at least by the Gya informants. In the dialect of Gyaik, it cannot be used for past habits or generic facts.

(162) GYA
ʧhu-inãa tsha thim-ʧen.
water-PPOS salt dissolve-GRD.Ic=DFUT.II
‘Salt dissolves in water.’

7.2.6 *Gerundive* & *rag*, used with OTHER
The evidential auxiliaries do not generate direct evidential counterparts with the same temporal values for this construction. Most notably, the gerundive & *ḥgrag* is frequently used to refer to a present perception or feeling, less frequently it refers to a ha-
bitual mental state or to a future state that might be accessed by non-visual perception. In some cases, it has an inferential connotation.

(163) GYA

kh-ε kamba muk-γε-rak.
s/he-GEN foot smell-GRD-IIv=PRS
‘His/Her feet are smelling (as I can perceive).’

(164) GYA

fi ɣa kho-a ŋar-γε-rak. / ŋar-γε-duk.
this s/he-AES become.sweet-GRD-IIv become.sweet-GRD-IIv
‘This tea is/ must be too sweet for him/ her, as I can taste. / as I can see [i.e., I read in his/ her face].’

(165) GYA

taksa ɣe-ban-e daal phitok-tshukpa ʧi̱k-γε-rak.
now do-NLZ-GEN lentil evening-PPOS get.spoiled-GRD-IIv
‘The lentils prepared just now will get spoiled until evening.’

(166) GYA

ŋ e̱ po̱mo ma̱ŋbo ŋi̱-na, ŋa̱ (ː) tsherha ɦoŋ-γε-rak.
I-GEN daughter much cry-LOC:CD I AES sorrow come-GRD-IIv
‘When my daughter cries a lot, I am (usually) worried. / If my daughter cries a lot, I will be worried.’ (The informant opted here for future time reference.)

7.2.7 Gerundive & yod and hʌdug

Quite similarly, the combination of the gerundive with the auxiliaries yod and hʌdug typically refers to a present situation, more or less out of view in the case of yod, and more or less in view in the case of hʌdug, see section 5 Prospective constructions above.

8 Evaluative markers in Ladakhi

In addition to the above-described system, the Ladakhi dialects have several markers to encode estimation, probability, inference, or mirativity (or mental distance) for events that the MSAP has not observed or does not want to warrant.

The notion of mirativity was first introduced for the Balkan languages, to describe grammatical markers that indicate that the speaker distanciates him or herself from the content of his or her utterance. The reason for this utterance could have been surprise, but also disbelief and embarrassment (e.g. in view of socially inadequate behaviour), cf. Friedmann (1986) for Albanian.

It seems that mirativity is now more commonly understood to express only surprise, and even more narrowly, surprise at the time of the utterance. This would rule out the use of mirative markers in narrative contexts. However, in the same way as evidential markers refer to the relation between the speaker and the means of his or her coming to know basically at the time of coming to know, mirative markers in Ladakhi refer to the emotional attitude of the speaker at the time of coming to know, and, in the case of narrations, to the timeless unexpectedness of the situation as such.

Unexpected situations or the positive or negative emotional involvement of the speaker are encoded in Ladakhi on various levels, it may affect the choice of the temporal construction as well as case marking. The basic idea is that a mismatch between
the expected and the actually used construction reflects a mismatch between the expected and the actually perceived situation. Apart from this iconic encoding, Ladakhi speakers make use of a set of distance markers that indicate that the speaker does not commit him or herself fully to the content of his or her utterance, either because the content is in some way unexpected or because it is not personally observed, not well remembered, only inferred, or for reasons of politeness.

Note, what is called “inferential” in the following is called so for lack of a better term. While one of the functions of the “inferential” forms is, in fact, to indicate an inference or induction, they are often used more neutrally for reasons of politeness. They typically indicate that the speaker did not personally observe the related fact, but in an extended usage they also indicate that the speaker does not want to claim that knowledge for him- or herself, but that the facts are, or could be, generally known. They may thus also be used in dedicated and polite speech as an invitation to share the knowledge with the speaker. I do not want to call these forms “indirect”, as this term would usually comprise hearsay evidence, and I don’t think they match the forms called “factive” or “constative” in the Central Tibetan varieties.

Table 9  Evaluative markers in Ladakhi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>domain</th>
<th>markers</th>
<th>Sham</th>
<th>Nubra</th>
<th>Kenhat, Leh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST TENSE</td>
<td>probability estimation</td>
<td>stem &amp; -anj</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>stem &amp; anj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inferential distance</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stem &amp; tsug</td>
<td>stem &amp; sug</td>
<td>stem &amp; tog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stem &amp; kha(i)ntsug</td>
<td>stem &amp; kansug/ kanag</td>
<td>stem &amp; ka(na)g, kyag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linking verbs,</td>
<td>probability estimation</td>
<td>(aux &amp; c) anj / hgro</td>
<td>no data (hgro)</td>
<td>(aux &amp; c) anj / hgro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFECT,</td>
<td>estimation</td>
<td>stem &amp; thig &amp; aux</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>stem &amp; thig &amp; aux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT TENSE</td>
<td>inferential distance</td>
<td>gerundive &amp; hdu</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>gerundive &amp; hdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aux &amp; tsug, hog</td>
<td>aux &amp; kansug/ kanag</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aux &amp; kha(i)ntsug</td>
<td></td>
<td>aux &amp; ka(na)g/ tsug, kyag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE, modal,</td>
<td>probability estimation</td>
<td>aux &amp; hgro</td>
<td>no data (hgro)</td>
<td>aux &amp; hgro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generic facts</td>
<td>estimation</td>
<td>gerundive &amp; hdu</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>gerundive &amp; hdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inferential distance</td>
<td>stem &amp; bog, hanog</td>
<td>stem &amp; hanog</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>no data (—)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1 Probability markers
The probability marker *anj* follows the SIMPLE PAST (stem II), the simple present future (stem I) in the case of certain adjectivals and modal verbs, the Set 1 auxiliary /-et/ or /-yot/ of the PRESENT TENSE and PROSPECTIVE constructions, and the auxiliary /-in/ of the PRESENT PERFECT, whereas /dol/ ~ /tol/ hgro ‘go’ follows the auxiliary of the PRESENT TENSE and PERFECT constructions, and, depending on the speaker or dialect, also the DEFINITE FUTURE I. Both morphemes indicate that something is likely to happen or to have happened, but the speaker is not very sure about it. The /-anj/ construction has a stronger connotation of guessing (GYA). The best translation into English might be with the adverb *maybe* or with the modal verbs *might, could*, and *should* or with the modal constructions *sollte, müßte, könnte*, and *wird* plus wohl in German.

(167) GYA

\[\text{te eksiden-enãa mi ŋhēnm-e lak hō(t)-to.}\]
this accident-PPOS person big-GEN hand exist=le-PM

‘Some bigwig might have had his hand in this accident.’

---

Evidentiality, inferentiality, and speaker’s attitude – questionnaire & examples – draft version – 12.06.2016
Evidentiality, inferentiality, and speaker’s attitude – Questionnaire

8.2 Estimation markers

The estimation marker /thik/ ‘ruler, line, measurement’ follows directly the present or past stem or the auxiliary yin of a perfect construction and is followed again by any of the three experiential auxiliaries yod, ḥdug, ḥgrag, with past time reference also by son ‘gone, happened’. The marker seems to be common now in Shamskat. About a hundred years ago, Shamskat speakers used another noun /tshot/ tshod ‘measure’ in the same manner. Both constructions indicate that the speaker had somehow examined and evaluated the situation. An appropriate translation might be it seems that or as I would think.

(169) DOM

ŋaʧi bila nakpo bila karpek-na thuks-e-in-thik-duk.
we.excl-GEN cat black cat white-COM mate-PERF=Ic-ESTM-IIv

ʧiba zer-na, kbo-a biphruk ṭhasuk-ʧik ske-se-duk.
why say-LOC:CD s/he-AES kitten piebald-LQ get.born-IIv=PERF

‘Our black cat seems to have mated with a white cat, because it has given birth to some piebald kittens.’

Competing with this construction is an experiential gerundive construction with the Set 2 markers ḥdug and ḥrag, cf. the first part of example (164) above. In a more complex construction, consisting of either a prospective plus a prospective or a perfect plus a prospective, the Set 1 markers yin and yod are used in the first part and are followed by the Set 2 markers in the second part. The use of a gerundive in the first part of the construction would shift the inferred event a bit into the future, whereas the use of a perfect construction locates the situation in the present.

(170) DOM

s/he-AES I-GEN hand-ABL head itch-GRD-Ic-GRD-IIv itch-LB-Ic=PERF-GRD-IIv

‘S/he seems to want me to hit him/her up. / S/he seems to be looking for a fight.’
(Lit. ‘S/he seems to be going to feel/to have felt itchy from my hand.’)

(171) DOM

kboŋi dzo kḥiol-en uk. ʧiba zer-na,
they-GEN dzo limp-CNT-IIv=PRS why say-LOC:CD

kbo-ei talmo-a phok-se-jot-tʃa-duk. /
s/he-GEN loin-ALL be.hit-LB-IIv=PERF-GRD-IIv

kboei talmo but-e-in-tʃa-duk.
s/he-GEN loin fall-LB-Ic=PERF-GRD-IIv

‘Their dzo is limping. That is, its hip joint seems to be hurt. / it’s hip joint seems to be dislocated.’

According to one of the Domkhar informants, the form -yin.ca.ḥdug is used when observing the situation from close by, -yod.ca.ḥdug when observing the situation from far.
8.3 Inferential markers

8.3.1 Inferential future and general knowledge

The inferential markers for future time reference /-buk/ ~ /-bok/ bog (< bahog) in western Shamskat, /anok/ hanog in eastern Shamskat and Leh, and /kak/ kag or /kanak/ kanag in Kenhat follow directly the present stem. More precisely, it seems that an element /-ak/ or /-ok/ of unknown origin follows a nominaliser /-ba/ or /-a/ < ba in Shamskat and Leh and a morpheme {ka(n)} ?< mkban in Kenhat – possibly with insertion of the copula yin or a similar morpheme. The markers have a predictive force, but are also often used to signal generic facts, in which case the construction may alternate with the DEFINITE FUTURE II. Both forms could be compared to the deontic use of the future in German (das wird (wohl) so sein ‘this might be so’), although the latter usage appears to be more marked. According to Koshal (1979: 209–211), the use of the marker /-ok/ implies that one has some concrete knowledge from which the inference is drawn, but that actually holds for most of the other evaluative constructions, as well.

8.3.2 Inferential perfect constructions

The speaker infers this through touching the hands, which are cold, without further verifying or upon hearing the teeth chatter or hearing the person ask for one more blanket. If the input for the inference is dominantly visual yin.sug should be used.
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(177) DOM

khoŋ khjak-se-in tṣok.

s/he freeze.PA-LB-Ic=PERF-IM

‘S/he is freezing (as I can infer through visual input).’

If the visual input is dominant, the visual perfect khyag.se.hdug can also be used. Similarly, if the speaker verifies the state of the person upon touching several parts of the person’s body, the non-visual perfect khyag.se.hgrag is to be used.

8.3.3 Inferential and distance markers (for present and past time reference)

The inferential markers /tok/ tog in Kenhat and /suk/ ~ /sok sug in Shamskat simply indicate that knowledge about the situation described is not based on personal experience or authority, but on some kind of inference, sometimes also secondhand knowledge. The markers follow directly the past stem and, in the Shamskat dialects, the Set 1 auxiliary yod of the PERFECT and PRESENT TENSE. In the Gya dialect, the marker /tok/ assimilates to or merges with the preceding final, so that it is often realised as /-dok/, /-rok/, or even /-ok/.

(178) DOM

han, ta ɲaʃa-{:} tshures khor-tshar-tṣok.

intj now we.excl-AES water.turn be.over-finish.PA-IM

it-u-aŋ ma.mb’a-{:} duks ok.

mind-LOC-FM NG2-do-NLZ-stay.PA-IM

‘Oh, our turn for watering the fields is already over now. [I] had totally forgotten about it (lit. did not even think about it).’

The admirative or distance markers /kha(i)ntsuk/ ~ /kha(i)ntsok/ kha.yin.sug in Shamskat, /kjak/ kyag in Leh, and /kak/ kag, or /kanak/ ka.nag, infrequently also /t)suk/ tsug in Kenhat follow directly the past stem and the Set 1 auxiliary yod of the PERFECT and PRESENT TENSE. These markers indicate that the speaker distances him- or herself from the content for various reasons. One reason is that the knowledge about the situation described is not based on personal experience, but on some kind of inference or second-hand information. The markers are thus commonly used in place of the inferential markers described above (in the Kenhat dialects they are the only inferential markers for present tense and perfect constructions).

But the speaker may also distance him- or herself, because s/he is surprised or embarrassed by the situation, and does not trust his or her eyes (mirative function). S/he may also emphasise that the situation described is merely a story, thus neither relevant for the audience nor supposed to be true, at all (narrative function). The markers are thus commonly used in narrations, sometimes after every finite verb, sometimes only at the end of an episode, as to the personal style of the narrator.

Finally, Shamskat speakers may use the distance marker politely also as an invitation to share knowledge, or as one informant had put it: it is used “also if you know and you want to tell others; it is just the ‘historical mood’, transmitted knowledge” (DOM).

(179) DOM

ne khoŋ ma{:} takpo żuks-e-jot-khantsok.

then hon.s/he very powerful hon.be-LB-Ie=PERF-DST

‘Then he [the king] was /must have been very powerful.’
When the inferential and distance markers are used side-by-side, as in the Shamskat dialects, the distance marker tends to refer to situations in the more remote past, while the inferential marker tends to refer to events in the more recent past or even in the present. Alternatively the distance marker may refer to events known from hearsay in contrast to an inference made by seeing the traces of the event (DOM).

(180) DOM

`daŋ rinboʧhe-s kaʧhos sal-tsok. / sal-kʰantsok.`
yesterday rinboche religious.teaching give.PA-IM / give.PA-DST

‘Yesterday, the rinboche must have given a preaching.’ (With sug: the speaker came to the place after the event was over. With kha.yin.sug: the speaker has heard about the event from other persons or in the radio.)

(181) DOM

`Tshetan-i go-ekana ʈʰak dzar-en-uk. ʂantre phok-kʰantsok.`

Tshetan-GEN head-PPOS:ABL blood drip-CNT-IIv=PRS very hit.PA-DST

‘Blood is dripping down from Tshetan’s head. [S/he] must be hit severely.’ (Visual input and reasoning.)

A similar difference can be observed between the inferential marker tog and the distance marker kag ~ ka.nag in Gya.

(182) GYA

`daŋ aba tshaŋm ˖ e ʧhorten-gun-a kūar zi-rok. /
 y.day father all-ERG chörten-PL-ALL h.whitewash hum.apply.PA-IM zi-ɦanak.`

hum.apply.PA-DST

‘Yesterday all the elderly men (lit. fathers) whitewashed all chörten.’ (tog: inferred from the observed result. / ka.nag: inferred through general knowledge as there is a special day for applying the whitewash.)

There is further a similar difference between the marker kag ~ ka.nag and the less common marker sug in Gya: according to the informant, the information referred to with the marker kag ~ ka.nag is more assimilated, while the marker sug indicates that the speaker found out just now or that s/he is a bit more guessing. The marker also conveys a connotation of surprise (mirativity):

(183) GYA

`ŋānm-e ti-zane, khamba mɛh-zane,
 early-GEN time-when house NG.exist-le-when,
 Kārse-(:) ʈonha-raŋ ɲaʃa pēk-e
 Kārse-GEN family-COM we.excl both-ERG
 bao ʈhemno-zik Kārse-(:) ri-(:) ʈhed-la ti-ɦanak.
 cave big-LQ Kārse-GEN hill-GEN slope-LOC dig.PA-DST

‘In earlier times, when there were no houses, the Kārse family and our [family] both dug /must have dug a big cave into the slope of the Kārse mountain.’
The non-evidential function of the Distance Markers is also dominant in the following example, where the speaker is embarrassed by his or her own behaviour:

(185) GYA

dan ꜱ e ne-raŋ-eduna
yesterday I-ERG/GEN hon.you-PPOS:LOC
ane şhondrol-a şante māt-pen.
aunt Chondrol-LOC very talk.bad=PA-RM
han ꜱ e şhon-la ne-raŋ-a zer-hanak.
intj I-ERG/GEN vain-LOC hon.you-LOC say=PA-DSTM
kho tōt-ʃe-ʒik duk, sokpo mi.nuk. juzu he,
s/he laud-NLZ-LQ be:S2v bad NG1-be:S2v please intj
krę pēra zer-han tshaŋma sem-a ma-ʃkur!
I-ERG/GEN speech say-NLZ all mind-LOC NG2-carry=PRHB
‘Yesterday, I said something very negative about aunt Chondrol in your presence. Sorry! I told (lit: must have told) you [this] without any reason! S/he is [only] to be lauded, she is not bad at all. Please, forget about all that I have said!’

The use of the distance marker kha.nag indicates the speaker’s embarrassment, not so much about the fact that s/he had said something bad, but that s/he did that without any reason.

The following example demonstrates the alternating use of the inferential/apparentative marker and the distance marker in connected discourse of a Sham-skat speaker:
(186) bz

dene Khalatse gau z thaks-khantsok?
then Khalatse how come.into.being.PA-DST
‘So then, how did Khalatse come into being?’

(186) a. KHAL
Khalatse zer-khan-i jul-po s yang-la Brokpa zer-e,
Khalatse say-NLZ-GEN village DF earlier Brokpa say-LB
ozuga pat jot-pasayma,
that.way totally exist=le-NLZ&
khorany ... ana joys-khantsok zer-in-duk,
s/he.self [pause] that-ABL come.PA-DST say-CNT-IIv=PRS
Gilgitsoks mup phoks-na le.
Gilgit.like north.direction-ABL HM
‘It is said that the village called Khalatse was originally a Brokpa (Dardic) [vil-
lage], and as it is exactly so..., [they] are (obviously) saying that they must have
come from there, from the north, from somewhere like Gilgit.’

(186) b.
de-na joy-s[en]a, phark-eka, thhu jot-suk,
that-ABL come-LB& other.side-PPOS river exist=le-IM
Singe rtsangs-po, de-tsana.
Lion river-DF that-time
‘Coming from there, on the other side [that is, from Lamayuru], [there] was the
river, the Lion River (Indus), at that time.’

(186) c.
dene Singe rtsangs-po thama zune mindra nis joys-pa,
then Lion river bank along people two come-NLZ
a phark-e khus tapsa zer-glan brak-g[ī]k le,
that other.side-GEN khus tapsa say-GRD.Ic=DFUT.II rock-LQ HM
de brak-p-ika lep-se, lta-se-duks-pa,
that rock-DF-PPOS arrive-LB look-LB-stay.PA-NLZ
ayos-p-ian du thyang-gik thyon-et-sok le.
that.side-DF-PPOS plain-LQ see-le=PRS-IM HM
‘Then, two men came along the bank of the Indus – [on] that side over there [is]
a rock, it is called khus tapsa ‘the place of shouting’ –, [they] arrived at that
rock, and as [they] were looking around, [they] see a plateau over there [across
the river].’

(186) d.
thyang-gik thyon-et-sok. de thyang-p-ika bu d-r ek thyon-et-sok.
plain-LQ see-le=PRS-IM that plain-DF-PPOS tree-LQ see-le=PRS-IM
‘[They] see a plateau. On that plateau, [they] see a tree.’
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(186) e.

dene khoŋ, ʧikpo-s «a budra ɲ-i hai» zer-khantsok.
then they, one-ERG that tree I-GEN is(Urdu) say.PA-DST
‘Then they..., one [of them] said: «This trees is mine.»’

(186) f.

«de-a ɲataŋ di ʧhu-la ʧi ba-se ʧhen?» zers-pa,
that-ALL we.incl this river-ALL what do-LB go-DUT.I say.PA-NLZ
ʧbu-la ʧkal-ba-(ː) khaspa jot-sok-p[a],
river-ALL swim-NLZ-ALL knowledgeable be=le-IM-emp
khoŋ ʧbu-la ʧkal-e, biŋ-s-e-joŋs-pa,
they river-ALL swim-LB get.out-LB-come.PA-NLZ
de-ka starg-ek jot-sok lo.
that-PPOS walnut-LQ exist=le-IM QOM
‘They said: «How shall we get there [across] the river?» [But] they obviously
knew how to swim across the river. They swam across the river, and when
[they] reached (lit. got out to) the other side, there was a walnut tree, it is said.’

(186) g.

er-ʧan le. Šerap-i starga, syon-la jot-khantsok lo.
say-GRD.Ic=DFUT.II HM Šerapa-GEN walnut early-ALL exist=le-DST QOM
zer-b-i spera duk.
say-NLZ-GEN speech exist=IIv
‘[The people] would say (so). The walnut tree of the Šerapa family, [it] was there
before [they came], it is said. [This] is what [people] say.’

(186) h.

dene de-ka Khalatse-a duk-se,
then that-PPOS Khalatse-ALL stay-LB
a Skini-ː roŋ-say-a sakjat ʧo-se-[j]on-ʧan.
that Skini[an]-GEN ravine-PL-ALL site do-LB-come-GRD.Ic=DFUT.II
‘Then [they] stayed there in Khalatse, and in the ravines of Skiniaŋ [they] would
make [agricultural] sites.’

(186) i.

ne di-na, thanp-i ka sakjat, a-na ʧbu rgjaŋ-se kbjoŋ-se,
then this-ABL plateau-PPOS site that-ABL water fill-LB bring-LB
khalatse tsus-khantsok lo. zer-b-i spera [j]on-ʧan le.
Khalatse plant.PA-DST QOM say-NLZ-GEN speech come-GRD.Ic=DFUT.II HM
‘Then from here..., [to] the sites on the plateau, [they] brought the water in [ca-
nals] from over there, and established (lit. planted) Khalatse, it is said. [This
kind of] talk can be heard (lit. would be coming).’

(186) j.

Brokpa-s «Brokrgjut in-tsok» zer-e-in-tsok. o le.
Brokpa-ERG Brok.lineage be=lc-IM say-LB-Ic=PERF-IM that HM
‘The Brokpas (Dards) have (always) been saying that [they] are of the Brok [that
is, Gilgit] lineage. That [is how it is].’
The combination of the copula with the inferential markers sug and ḥog – ḥag has developed into a marker of its own right: /intsuk/ or /intsok/ yin.sug in Shamskat, and /inok/ or /inak/ yin.ḥog in Kenhat. The marker is used for all kinds of information, whether generally known, observed, heard (or read), or inferred. Its main function is to introduce information to somebody who doesn’t know in a non-authoritative manner or to convey information that is generally known. The form conveys an invitation to share one’s knowledge. It can also have a connotation of modestly seeking confirmation: Am I not right?, without explicitly putting this question. In Teya and Nurla, the form inok may be used to introduce oneself: 

(187) NUR

ηα tshonpa in-ok.
I trader be=lc=IM
‘I am a trader.’ (Bielmeier 2000: 95, no. 65)

The marker often combines with a perfect construction to describe resulting states. This construction is quite common in the radio news or other radio programs. This inferential perfect has likewise been overgeneralised so that one may occasionally also find double perfect constructions for facts that are well known:

(188) TYA

tea-naŋ tiŋmozgan thud-e-jod-e-in-ok.
Teya-COM Tiŋmozgan border-LB=PERF-LB=PERF-IM
‘Teya and Tiŋmozgan [two neighbouring villages] border upon each other (since long).’

More examples and more context to be added.

8.3.4 Irrealis: imagined situations
The Shamskat inferential marker sug and the Kenhat distance markers sug and kag – ka.nag are used as a kind of irrealis construction in several Sham and Kenhat dialects (no data for Leh available). It may be used for imagined play roles (similar to the French imparfait préludique) or also when giving an imagined example:

(189) GYA

khjoraŋ giapo in-tsuk. khjoraŋ trhi-seha dar-a-ɦot-suk.
fam.you king be-DST fam.you throne-PPOS sit-NLZ-1e=PRS-DST
ηα lònpo in-tsuk. seha dar-a-ɦot-suk.
I minister be-DST ground.PPOS sit-NLZ-1e=PRS-DST
‘You’ll be the king. You’ll sit on the throne. I’ll be the minister. [I]’ll sit on the earth.’

15 Not all informants agree in which contexts it can be used. One of the Domkhar informants and the informants from Gya and Gyaik strictly disputed that it could be used when talking about oneself or facts belonging to one’s personal sphere.
TYA

(190) yoŋ! ṅataŋ hjapspa ʧo-in.
come.IMP we.incl fun do-Ic=DFUT.I
kheraŋ gjapo ʧo-tsuk. ṅa ʧaməo ʧo-tsuk.
fam.you king be-IM I queen be-IM
‘Come! We will play. You’ll be the king, I’ll be the queen.’

When explaining the function of the form ɦottʃedukpen, the speaker from Gyaik gave the following example. She only uses the distance marker kag ~ ka.nag.

GHK

9 Quotation / hearsay information

Hearsay information is encoded quite straightforwardly by adding the defective verb /lo/ lo ‘say’ to the statement with all evidenti al or inferential markers in place. Pronouns, however, are usually shifted from the quoted person’s perspective to the quoting speaker’s perspective:

(192) a. GYA

ŋa(ː) kʰihtpo rak.
I-AES happy be/have=Iinv
‘I (=MSAP) am happy/ in happy conditions.’

becomes:

(192) b. GYA

kho-a kʰihtpo rak lo.
s/he-AES happy be/have=IInv QOM
‘[S/he] says, that s/he is happy/ in happy conditions.’ (The experiencer ‘subject’ khoa ‘s/he’ is identical with the MSAP of the reported speech content ŋa(ː) ‘I’ in direct speech.)
(193) a. GYA

\[
\text{kho-} a \ \text{kītpo} \ \text{duk}.
\]
\[
\text{s/he-AES happy be/have=IIv}
\]

‘S/he is happy/ in happy conditions.’

becomes:

(193) b. GYA

\[
\text{ŋa-} (i) / \text{kho-} a \ \text{kītpo} \ \text{duk} \ \text{lo}.
\]
\[
\text{I-AES / s/he-AES happy be/have=IIv QOM}
\]

‘[S/he] says, that I am / s/he is happy/ in happy conditions.’ (The experiencer subject \text{khoa} ‘s/he’ of the original direct speech could be identical with a third person or with the speaker who reports the utterance.)

In accordance with the shift of pronouns, honorific markers will be added (or subtracted) according to the relative rank of the person who reports the speech:

(194) a. DOM

\[
\text{khoŋ} \ \text{rims-e-nak} \ \text{lo}.
\]
\[
\text{hon.s/he hon.get.hungry-LB-IInv=PERF QOM}
\]

‘[S/he] says she is hungry.’

The original speech would have been:

(194) b. (DOM)

\[
\text{ŋa} \ \text{l̥toks-e-nak}.
\]
\[
\text{I get.hungry-LB-IInv=PERF}
\]

‘I am hungry.’

Similarly, as far as pragmatically conditioned case marking is concerned, the reporting speaker may feel licensed to add or decrease emotional flavours by freely choosing a neutral or a more emphatic case marking pattern, independent of the original choice. One may also scale down the use of emphatic case marking patterns in the presence of the person quoted for reasons of politeness.

(195) DOM

\[
\text{āŋmo-s:} \quad \text{«ŋa tshantsere zangi-s zos.»}
\]
\[
\text{Āŋmo-ERG I-ABS night.all zangi-ERG bite.pa}
\]

\[
\text{āŋme} \ \text{aba-s:} \quad \text{«āŋmo-a tshantsere zangi-s zos lo.}
\]
\[
\text{Āŋmo-GEN father-ERG Āŋmo-AES night.all zangi-ERG bite.PA QOM}
\]

\[
\text{skut} \ \text{soŋ!} \quad \text{‹khandrag-a ma-chal!} \quad \text{ze:s-pa, soŋ.”}
\]
\[
\text{deserving go.PA roof.top-ALL NG2-go=PRHB say.PA-NLZ go.PA}
\]

‘Āŋmo: «I was biten by the zangi (a small biting insect) all night long.» Āŋmo’s father: Oh the poor Āŋmo says [she] was biten by the zangi all night long! Serves [her] right! She went on the roof [to sleep], although I told her not to go.’ (The father speaks sarcastically and with \text{schadenfreude} in the first part, hence scaling up the original absolutive into an aesthetive construction.)
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(196) DOM

memele-s: «ŋa(ː) tshantsere zaŋgi-s zos!»
hon.priest-erg I-AES night.all zaŋgi-ERG eat.PA

dronpo sapkhan-is: “memele tshantsere zaŋgi-s zos
host-ERG h.priest-ABS night.all zaŋgi-ERG eat.PA

mol-en-ak. han, ta ʧi b en?
h.speak-CNT-Inv=PRS Intj now what do-Ic=DFUT.I

r̥tsugumar-ʧik sku-a kher-na?»
apricot.kernel.oil-LQ rub.in-NLZ carry-LOC:CD

'The priest [complaining]: «I really suffered from insect bites all night long!»
The host: «The priest said ‹he was bitten by zaŋgi all night long.› Oh my, what can we do? What about bringing him some apricot kernel oil?»'

For one of the Gya informants, by contrast, up- and downgrading does not depend on one’s own emotional involvement, but rather on whether the person is close by and in view (downgrading or retaining the original neutral representation with the absolutive) or out of view and distant (upgrading or retaining the original emphatic representation with the aesthetive).

Directional expressions, however, are not adjusted. E.g. a lady in Leh asked me to tell her son to bring the cow hither (khyoŋ) to a certain field, which was close to where we were talking, while her son and the cow where further up the road in or at the house. I should have used the same verb khyoŋ! lo, even though for the son it would have been taking the cow over there (kher).

While the evidential markers are semantically opaque and their evidential force cannot be challenged or negated, the quotation marker is semantically transparent, behaves almost like an ordinary verbum dicendi, and can be challenged: X dug_ _lo ‘[S/he, they] said there was X (as [s/he, they] saw].’ – loa? ‘Did [s/he, they] say so?’ – malo! ‘No, [s/he, they] did not say so!’ – sus ~ sui lo? ‘Who-ERG said so?’, and there are further free usages, such as: ʧi lo le? ‘What did [you] say (hon)?’, ʧiaŋ malo! ‘I didn’t say anything!’, or ʧi lo? ‘How do/ should [I] say?’, ‘How is it called?’, etc., cf. also the full verb usage with past time reference in the following example:

(197) TYA

standzin-is ɖolkar-la, skare, spera lo.
Standzin-ERG Dolkar-ALL corner-LB speech say.PA

‘Standzin talked aggressively to / forced a confession out of Dolkar.’

The quotation marker also appears when the quoted speech had been introduced by a lexical verbum dicendi:

(198) GYA

day putsa sokpo-ʒig-e zer-hanak: «day ŋa-raŋ pomo-ʒik drel» lo,
y.day boy evil-LQ-ERG say.PA-DST y.day I-COM girl-LQ unite.PA QOM

‘Yesterday an evil boy boasted: «I had sex with a girl yesterday.»’

As could be expected, the quote marker is not commonly used for a self-citation. A possible marked context for a self-citation with lo is when one has made a mistake. The quotation marker can be replaced at any time by a functional verbum dicendi plus the evidential marker for non-visual perception or even for visual perception. This will
happen particularly when one wants to be more specific about who said something (199) or when the auditory transmission is indirect, example (199) first part, or even merely narrated (200). When the person quoted is of high status the use of the honorific *verbūm dicendi* *mol* is clearly preferred.

(199) KHAL

«... *gendun-i žuŋ-na <manja phul-e mene ma-taŋ!*»

monk-GEN assembly-ABL tea.offer hum.offer-LL except NG2-give=PRHB

*mol-en-ak.»* zers-pasayna

hon.speak-CNT-INV=PRS say.PA-NLZ &

‘... [This] has been issued from [the office of] the congregation (and I have heard it): ‘Do not hand out [the religious books] before a tea offering has been given!’ [the caretaker] said and ...’ (The Khalatse people wanted to obtain the *Kaŋgiur* from the Lamayuru monastery for the annual reading ritual and had sent the speaker, but the caretaker refused to give him the books.)

(200) KHAL

«*minda tsam-a kharʒi ʧo-ʧen?*» zes-pasana,

people how.many-ALL food do-DFUT.II say.PA-NLZ &

«*ona mindra detseg-a ʧo-ʧen ...*» zer-et-sok-pa le.

well people that.many-ALL do-DFUT.II ... say-IM-EMP hon

«*dona bras detsek khjoŋ! bakphe detsek khjoŋ! ...*» zes-pasana,

well rice that.much bring.IE flour that.much bring.IE ... say.PA-NLZ &

aɭa tʰɪŋna drandra ʧh-en uɡ_ _lo.

later afterwards equal go-CNT-INV=PRS QOM

ja[| ma-ldan-ba mi-lus.

Intj NG2-be.enough-NLZ NG1-be.left.PRS

‘For how many people shall I prepare food?’ When [he, the narrator’s son, a cook] had said [this], [the superiors] would say: «Well, [you]’ll have to do [it] for that many people; ...» «Then, bring that much rice! Bring that much flour! ...» When [he] had said [so], then afterwards it would always come out even, [he] says. And there would be nothing that was not enough (lit: nothing is left that is not enough).’

(201) GYA

rimboʧhe-se hizuk mōl-a-rak.

rimboche-ERG this.way speak-NLZ-INV=PRS

‘The rimboche says/ said the following.’

While the quote marker *lo* signals that one quotes the information directly from an individual source and is thus preferred for information derived from face-to-face communication, the *verbūm dicendi* and even ordinary verbs combined with the auxiliary for non-visual perception are preferred over the quote marker *lo* when reporting speech that one has heard over some distance. This could be a conversation on the phone, something one has heard on the radio, or some people talking to each other.

In such cases, it is likewise common to use semi-indirect speech, but one could also first mention the author of the speech act (in the ergative) and then convey the content of the speech either directly with the original personal pronoun *ŋa* ‘I’ or half-indirectly.
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with the shifted index kho ‘s/he’, or by deleting the pronoun. Thus when telling the police that one has just overheard a young man saying he would enter a particular house for a burglary, one could say

(202) a. GYA

\[
\text{taks}a \ \text{put}sa-\text{zi}g-e \ «\text{a}m \ e \ \text{khampa}(\cdot) \ \text{zug-in}» \ \text{zer-a-rak.}
\]

\[\text{now boy-LQ-ERG I Aŋmo-GEN house-ALL enter-lc=DFUT.I say-NLZ-Inv=PRS}\]

(202) b. GYA

\[
\text{taks}a \ \text{put}sa-\text{zi}g-e \ «\text{ko} \ a\text{m} \ e \ \text{khampa}(\cdot) \ \text{zug-in}» \ \text{zer-a-rak.}
\]

\[\text{now boy-LQ-ERG s/he Aŋmo-GEN house-ALL enter-lc=DFUT.I say-NLZ-Inv=PRS}\]

(202) c. GYA

\[
\text{taks}a \ \text{put}sa-\text{zi}g-e \ «\emptyset \ a\text{m} \ e \ \text{khampa}(\cdot) \ \text{zug-in}» \ \text{zer-a-rak.}
\]

\[\text{now boy-LQ-ERG } \emptyset \ \text{Aŋmo-GEN house-ALL enter-lc=DFUT.I say-NLZ-Inv=PRS}\]

(202) d. GYA

\[
\text{taks}a \ \emptyset \ «\text{put}sa-\text{zi}k \ a\text{m} \ e \ \text{khampa}(\cdot) \ \text{zug-in}» \ \text{zer-a-rak.}
\]

\[\text{now } \emptyset \ \text{boy-LQ Aŋmo-GEN house-ALL enter-lc=DFUT.I say-NLZ-Inv=PRS}\]

'I just heard a young man saying (a) “I’ll enter Aŋmo’s house.” / (b–c) that he would enter Aŋmo’s house. / (d) I just heard that a young man wants to enter Aŋmo’s house, according to his words.’

The non-finite form \text{zere} of the unspecific \text{verbum dicendi} \text{zer} ‘say’ is commonly used to replace an embedded (nominalised) proposition with a clause chaining construction, and is thus in the process to grammaticalise as a marker for (embedded) propositions. The use of a full verb likewise leads to a shift of the pronoun, according to the reporting person’s perspective:

(203) a. DOM

\[
\text{ʧakpa-s, } «\text{ya-s pene ma-taŋ-na, sad-et» zere-e, zdam.}
\]

\[\text{robber-ERG I-ERG money NG2-give-LOC:CD kill-le=PRS say-LB threaten.PA}\]

‘The robber threatened [me], saying that if I would not give [him] (the) money, [he] would kill [me].’

The original threat would have been:

(203) b. (DOM)

\[
\text{kheraŋ-is pene ma-taŋ-na, sad-et.}
\]

\[\text{fam.you-ERG money NG2-give-LOC:CD kill-le=PRS}\]

‘[I]’ll kill [you], if you don’t give [me] (the) money.’

In such cases, the unspecific \text{verbum dicendi} \text{zer} ‘say’ can also follow:

(204) GYA

\[
\text{gergan-e Aŋm-e miŋ tön.}
\]

\[\text{teacher-ERG Aŋmo-GEN name announce.PA}\]

\[
\text{Aŋm-o-a } «\text{lū tön!» zerde zer.}
\]

\[\text{Aŋm-ALL song pronounce.IMP say-NF say.PA}\]

‘The teacher announced Aŋmo’s name. [S/he] told Aŋmo to sing a song.’ Lit. ‘[S/he] said to Aŋmo, saying «Sing a song!»’
Infrequently, the speech is represented in its original form without shift of the pronoun, as long as the speaker is explicitly identified:

(205) DOM

\begin{align*}
\text{phrugu-s} & \quad \text{«ŋa pıkʧar-la ʧḥasǹin drak.» lo-pa,} \\
& \quad \text{child-ERG I cinema-LOC go.wish exist=IInv say-NLZ} \\
\text{aba-s} & \quad \text{«goma (kheray.a) zurmo rgjol-առ!,} \\
& \quad \text{father-ERG first (you.fam-AES) illness heal.IMP-DIR} \\
\text{ne ŋataŋ ʧha} & \quad \text{lo.} \\
& \quad \text{then we.incl go.PRS-NLZ=HORT say} \\
\end{align*}

‘When the child said: «I want to go to the cinema», [his/her] father said: «First you recover!, then let us go.»

In such cases, the evidential markers indicate whether a first person pronoun is coreferential with the original speaker or with the reporting person. According to one of the Domkhar speakers, the use of a fully lexical \textit{verbum dicendi}, specified as being immediately perceived: \textit{zerenak} ‘is saying (as I hear)’, might be preferable to the use of the quote marker \textit{lo}, when the information is about oneself.

(206) a. (DOM)

\begin{align*}
\text{ŋa}_ {-} & \quad \text{rgjalba men.} \\
& \quad I \quad \text{good NG2.be=Ic} \\
\end{align*}

‘I am not good.’

becomes:

(206) b. DOM

\begin{align*}
\text{kho-s} & \quad \text{«ŋa_ rgjalba men» zeron-ak.} \\
& \quad \text{s/he-ERG I good NG2.be=Ic say-CNT-IInv=PRS} \\
\end{align*}

‘S/he said/ (I) heard him/her say: «I am not good.» (Direct speech)

(207) a. (DOM)

\begin{align*}
\text{kheray} & \quad \text{_rgyalba men-tsok.} \\
& \quad \text{fam.you good NG2.be=Ic-INFM} \\
\end{align*}

‘You are not good (as it seems).’

becomes:

(207) b. DOM

\begin{align*}
\text{kho-s} & \quad \text{«ŋa_ rgyalba men-tsok» zerenak.} \\
& \quad \text{s/he-ERG I good NG2.be=Ic-INFM say-CNT-IInv=PRS} \\
\end{align*}

‘S/he said /(I) heard him/her say that I am not good (as it seems).’ (Mixed indirect speech).

Both, the quotation marker and the full verb are used neutrally for hearsay information that passed through several transmission stages.
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(208) GYAa13

naŋdak-te-a dronpo-⁷nun tu-renāa tshup lo.
house.owner-DEF-AES guest-PL smoke-PPOS get.suffocated.PA QOM

‘It happened to the house owner that the guests (nearly) got suffocated in the smoke, as [s/he/ they] said.’ (That is, the houseowner tells us that the guests had complained about their discomfort.)

If somebody really wants to specify that his or her hearsay informant got his or her information through hearsay as well, a full verb and a quotation marker can be combined, either way: quote marker plus *verbum dicendi* or *verbum dicendi* plus quote marker. Speakers may prefer the second option, which corresponds to Sun’s (1993: 986) observation that the full appears after the inner quote and the bleached verb or quote marker after the outer quote. However, the first construction is preferable or even necessary, when the outer quote is from a person of high status, example.

(209) a. DOM

«aŋmo-s dolkar-la ‹kho le-a ⁹gha-(-met) zer-en-ak» lo.
Aŋmo-ERG Dolkar-ALL s/he Leh-ALL go-NLZ-NG.Le=PRS say-CNT-IInv=PRS QOM

‘Aŋmo told Dolkar that she would not go to Leh, said [Dolkar].’

(209) b. DOM

rimboʧhe-s «‹aŋmo le-a ⁹gha-(-met) lo” mol-en-ak.
rimboche-ERG Aŋmo Leh-ALL go-NLZ-NG.Le=PRS QOM h.say-CNT-IInv=PRS

‘The rimboche told [us/ me] that Aŋmo had said that she would not go to Leh.’

In natural speech, sometimes both markers may appear in succession, one being replaced by the other, as if in an afterthought:

(210) DOM

ode skufok-riki deandra-⁷
that.very high.lama-lq that.like-all
zarbu-nay phin-ʧan lo, zer-en-ak.
zarbu-COM take.out-GRD-lc=DFUT.II QOM say-CNT-IInv=HAB.PRS

‘For that particular high-ranking priests and the like, [one] takes out [the butter] with a zarbu (a wooden ladle), it is said, they are saying.’

10 Pragmatic factors

Leaving aside all occasions where I accidentally happened to chose the correct existential verb, and which I therefore do not remember, I have made the strange experience that when I ask a shopkeeper with a Set 1 auxiliary whether s/he has a certain item, s/he might answer with a Set 2 auxiliary, but the next day, when I try the Set 2 auxiliary with the same or another person, I might get an answer with a Set 1 auxiliary. This is particularly irritating, as people tend to use the same markers in the answer as used in the question, and as the resulting MSAP-perspective obliges one to using the same evidential markers in one’s question as the addressee could be expected to use in his or her answer. So why am I wrong with my expectations so often?

It does not seem to be a question of whether the shopkeeper has to search for the item or not. The shops are usually quite small, and the things I am asking for are not particularly hidden. My impression is rather that in the first case, the question with a
Set 1 auxiliary, although formally correct, is perhaps a bit too straightforward, and the addressee thus tries to boil down my expectations towards his or her control or responsibility. On the other hand, if I am more modest in my speech act by using a Set 2 auxiliary, the addressee might be more ready to assert his or her control over, and responsibility for, the stock.

Koshal (1982: 18) gives an example for a present tense construction with \( \text{ḥdug} \) for a MSAP, which is similarly connected to a commercial transaction:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{LEH} & \quad \text{nomō, usu \ tsama \ salduk?} & \quad \text{younger.sister \ coriander \ how.much-ALL \ hon.give-IIv=PRS} \\
\text{ŋe \ kilo \ k’irmo \ suma \ phulduk.} & \quad \text{I-ERG \ kilo \ rupee \ 3-ALL \ hum.offer-IIv=PRS} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Young lady, for how much do/ will [you] give the coriander? – I (will) offer [one] kilo for three rupees.’ (Adapted from Koshal 1982: 18)

Here, the experiential marker \( \text{ḥdug} \) is used for the MSAP, both in the question and in the answer. This has nothing to do with immediate observation or novelty, perhaps not even with politeness. But if the forms based on \( \text{yod} \) indicate an authoritative statement that cannot be questioned, the use of \( \text{ḥdug} \), obviously, allows such questioning and thus leaves room for a small bargaining.

Inferential markers are very frequent in the radio, not only because the speakers or editors deal with second hand material. According to Bielmeier (2000: 99), the inferential form \( \text{ḥinnog} \) may also be used for reasons of modesty or politeness or in situations of uncertainty.

In fact, I realised that I get least corrected when I use this or the corresponding Shamskat marker, whether for situations outside my sphere of control or for myself. It seems that I am always on the safe side with these markers, and I have practically discontinued the use of Set 1 and Set 2 auxiliaries or, at least, I have discontinued to agonise over the ‘correct’ decision, using the inferential marker whenever feeling uncertain. While my feeling of uncertainty is related mostly to the correct linguistic usage, other Ladakhi speakers often feel uncertain or uncomfortable in the presence of people of authority, and this will certainly influence the choice of an evidential or evaluative marker. The use of an evaluative marker may serve as a disclaimer and may be triggered by considerations of modesty and politeness, cf. also the following examples, where the inferential markers clearly do not denote any kind of inference:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DOM} & \quad \text{diriŋ \ ŋa(ː) milak-ʧig-a \ mi-khom-bog-a?} & \quad \text{today \ I-ALL \ man.hand-LQ-ALL \ NG-be.free.FIM-QM} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Are [you] free today to come to me for some help?’ Lit: ‘[You] would not be free today to [give] me a helping hand, would you?’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NUR} & \quad \text{ŋa \ tshɔppa \ in-ok.} & \quad \text{I \ trader \ be=lc-FIM} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘I am a trader.’ (Bielmeier 2000: 95, no. 65)
(213) LEH
i pene-bo theba in-ok.
this money-DF excessive be=Ic-FIM
‘This is too much money!’ (Bielmeier 2001: 105, no. 96)

(214) LEH
i-bo ŋi in-ok? – de-bo tsi gu in-ok.
this-DF what be=Ic-IM that-DF almond be=Ic-FIM
gjala in-ok. don!
good be=Ic-FIM hon.eat-IMP
‘What is this? – ‘These are almonds [of apricots]. They are good. Have [some]!
(Norman 2001: 33).

But the inferential markers yin.ḥog or yin.sug are also used among equals or even when speaking to children, and in such cases they rather refer to the set of shared knowledge. Like in the polite usage, the speaker thus refrains from posing as the sole authority. The markers may also serve as an invitation to the addressee to share the knowledge of the speaker, and this is particularly the case when adults speak to minors in a dedicated manner:

(215) LEH
su inok?
who be-IM
‘Who is [this aunty]? / Who might [this aunty] be?’ (Said by a mother to her 15 months old child, pointing to the researcher, who stays in her parents’ house and whom the child has already seen many times.)
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1. Languages and dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language/Dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARA</td>
<td>Aranu (Northern Nubra, Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Classical Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>Domkhar (western Sham, Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GYA</td>
<td>Gya-Miru (Upper Ladakh): Mengyor Tshomo, Jigmet Yangdol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAR</td>
<td>Kargil (Purik, Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHAL</td>
<td>Khalatse (western Sham, Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHYU</td>
<td>Khyungrong (Central Nubra, Ladakh): Tshering Chakdor (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEH</td>
<td>Leh (Upper Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>Lhasa (Central Tibet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>Nurla (eastern Sham, Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYO</td>
<td>Nyoma (Changthang, Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Saspol (eastern Sham, Ladakh): Phuntsok Dolma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHI</td>
<td>Shigatse (Central Tibet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEY</td>
<td>Shey (Central Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOK</td>
<td>Stok (Upper Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIR</td>
<td>Tirit (Central Nubra, Ladakh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR</td>
<td>Turtuk (Balti, Ladakh): Abdul Hamid (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYA</td>
<td>Teya (eastern Sham): Tshering Dolkar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Grammatical and lexical markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x_ _y</td>
<td>Assimilation features across word boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES</td>
<td>Aesthetive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±ctr</td>
<td>[±control]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>Continuative form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTR</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Definiteness marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFUT.I</td>
<td>DEFINITE FUTURE I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFUT.II</td>
<td>DEFINITE FUTURE II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>Directive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emp</td>
<td>Emphatic marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTM</td>
<td>Estimation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excl</td>
<td>Exclusive plural (addressee not included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Focus marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIM</td>
<td>Future inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRD</td>
<td>Gerundive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>Honorific marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hon</td>
<td>Honorific form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMPERATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>IMPERFECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl</td>
<td>Inclusive plural (addressee included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intj</td>
<td>Interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>lhag.bcas (clause chaining marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ</td>
<td>Limiting quantifier (a, some)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>MARKED PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAP</td>
<td>Main speech act participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Negation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLZ</td>
<td>Nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>PERFECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Probability marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPOS</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRG</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS.HAB</td>
<td>PRESENT HABITUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRHB</td>
<td>Prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Question marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QOM</td>
<td>Quotation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Remoteness marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRS</td>
<td>SIMPLE PRESENT-FUTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>Topic marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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