Evidentiality, inferentiality, and speaker's attitude
Questionnaire or exemplary set

Bettina Zeisler
Universtät Tübingen
zeis@uni-tuebingen.de

Draft version I (June 2016)

**Apologies for length, incompleteness and partial disorder.
Please always confirm before citing!
The data is for the time being only from Ladakhi.
Comments and, more importantly, additional contexts for 'weird' distributions from
other Tibetic languages are warmely welcomed**

A. Introduction

Ever since the notion of evidentiality became known to a broader linguistic audience, two tendencies of appropriation can be observed: one is the, 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 faciliate 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 extend that a speaker always has to chose 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 'evidentiality', 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 appliction, 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:[1] 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 comitment, 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

	direct		**indirect (± mirative connotations)**	
Evidentiality in general	own activities	observed situations	inference	2nd hand information
Tibetic type	own / controlled activities	observed situations	inference	2nd hand information
		(± mirative connotations)		(–mirative)
	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*, *ḥdug*, and *ḥgrag* 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[2]

General categories	Set 1 [−evaluative]	Set 2	Author
junction	conjunct	disjunct	DL, Ba
speech act participant indexing,	self-person	other-person	Su
	speaker/ addressee	other	Ag, AgT
additional illocutionary focus (contrary to above)	for other: on speaker/ addressee's involvement	for speaker/ addressee: on rhematic participant	AgT
viewpoint, perspective	personal, speaker- (/addressee-) based	impersonal, fact- or object-based	Ch
	self	other	De
	subjective	objective, detached	Ze, (Ag)
	strong emphathy[3]	weak empathy[3]	Hä
ego-involvement	egophoric	constative, assertive	Tr
volitionality	volitional	non-volitional	Ha
speaker's attitude, stance (commitment)	certain, definite	uncertain	Ko
	assertive	mirative	Za
	warranted	non-warranted	Ag, Ze
	authoritative	non-authoritative	Ze
novelty/ recency	(relatively) old	(relatively) new	DL, Dr, Bi, Hu
	assimilated	non-assimilated	DL
	assimilated (old)	newly acquired	Tr
specifity/ common ground	non-specific, general, commonly known	specific, not commonly known[4]	Go
source/ access[6]	'reportative'[7]	observed, experiential	Ko
	personal	observed	Dr
	non-experiential	experiential	Ze
	personal	sensorial/testimonial	Tr
	personal	testimonial vs. factual	Hi
	assumptive	sensorial	Oi

---

[2] Ag= Agha (1993), AgT = Agha & Tseten Chonjou (1991), Ba = Bartee (2011), Bi = Bielmeier (2000), Ch= Tsetan Chonjore (2003), DL = DeLancey, De = Denwood (1999: 119ff.), Dr = Driem (1998), Go = Goldstein et al. (1991: 29–32), Ha = Haller (2000), Hä = Häsler (2001), Hi = Hill (2013), Hu = Huber (2002), Ko = Koshal (1979: 185–188, 193–199), Oi = Oisel (2013), Tr = Tournadre (1996a, 2008 with the addition of personal vs. sensorial and assimilated vs. newly acquired; 1996b with the distinction direct vs. constative/ testimonial for Ladakhi and Dzongkha), Su= Sun (1993), Za= Zadoks (2004), Ze= Zeisler (2004: experiential vs. non-experiential, 2012: warranted, authoritative vs. non-warranted, non-authoritative).

[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 *ḥdug*. 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 admirative. This would rather correspond to a differenciation 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 /nù̠/ or an extremely shortened form /kĩ̀/. Equivalents are Amdo /ɣəjokə/ ~ /ɣokə/ (Haller 2002) and /ʰkəjodʰkə/ ~ /ʰkodʰkə/ (Sun 1999) and a few other auxiliaris such as a form of *snaŋ* in East Balti, Nubra, Pangi, Dongwang (Bartee 2011), and Gagatang (Suzuki 2012) or a form of *gdaḥ* (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 /pie/ (?< *pas*). For the simple past (or 'perfective'), the mere verb stem, or various auxiliary verbs, such as *soŋ* and *byuŋ* in Central Tibetan belong to Set 2. Further auxiliaries, such as *bžag* may be used for the present perfect (or 'perfective').

Table 3 The basic dichotomy of 'evidentials' (schematic overview)

domain	Set 1: (controlled by) MSAP/ not directly observed	Set 2: OTHER	
		directly observed	'constative'
future	*yin*	--	*red*
copula	*yin*	*ḥdug*[8]	*red*
past	*yin*	stem II or light verbs	*red*
existential	*yod*	*ḥdug*	--[9]
present	*yod (/ yin)*	*ḥdug*	--[9]
perfect	*yod / yin*	*ḥdug* or light verb	--[9]
prospective	*yod / yin*	*ḥdug*	?
evaluative markers (inference, probability, and general knowledge)			
domain	Set 1: OTHER (and MSAP)		
all verbs, all tenses	*yin, yod* & …		
quotation and/ or hearsay MSAP & OTHER			
all forms &	*verba dicendi* (*zer*, *lo*, etc.)		[89]

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, *ḥgrag* 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 /yoˋreˋ/ *yog.red* (alternatively also ananlysed 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, heasay 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 auxilaries 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 *jən* (*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 *-tsaŋ* /-tsã:/ '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 *-pɛ:* (< *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 /lo̱/ *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 rigidness 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

	MSAP	OTHER
identification (without qualification)		
non-experiential	*yin*	*yin*
experiential, visual	—	*yin ?*
experiential, non-visual	—	*yin ?*
evaluative	*yin* & marker	*yin* & marker
attributive (plus qualified identifications)		
non-experiential	*yin / yod*	*yod ?*
experiential, visual	*ḥdug ?*	*ḥdug*
experiential, non-visual	*ḥgrag*	*ḥgrag*
evaluative	*yin* & marker	*yod*, (*yin*) & marker

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

> *ŋa   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: *ŋa/ kho tshoŋpa 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

ɦi	*bate*	*kạro*	*ɦin? –*	*ɦi*	*bate*	*ʃama*	*ɦin.*
this	bus-DF	what-LOC	be=Ic	this	bus-DF	Sham-ALL	be=Ic

'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=Ic

'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

ŋ·i	*bas*	*gar*	*jot? –*	*bas*	*nambar*	*sumpa*	*domkhar-la*	*jot.*
I·GEN	bus	where	be=Ie	bus	number	third	Domkhar-ALL	be=Ie

'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

    ŋ·i   bas   gar   duk? – bas   nambar sumpa domkhar-la   duk.
    I·GEN   bus   where   be=IIv   bus   number third   Domkhar-ALL   be=IIv
    '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 ac-
    tual 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 some-
body'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·ʃik   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-

hood. – Only we know about quality, other's don't. – Everybody says she is good; she helps others also.)

(12) DOM

ladakspa-naŋ   ʈhirgyalpˑe   ʈhims   soso   in.   / in-tsok.
Ladakh.people-COM   foreignerˑGEN   custom   different   be=Ic   be=Ic-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 acquintance, whereas *yin* indicates a more detailed or more thorough knowledge.

(13) DOM

ŋi   dzamo   ma(:)   noro   jot.
I-GEN friend.fem   very   good   be=Ie
'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   r̥tsokpˑek   jot-pin.
first s/he person bad+LQ   be=Ie-RM

ta   daksa   kho mi   norˑek   dot-sok.
now presently s/he person good+LQ   become-PA-IM
'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   ʈhuŋun-rig-[is] jaŋ   rgatpo-a dri-khantsok:
then   that young-LQ-ERG   again   old-ALL   ask.PA-DST

«gandrˑik   jot-pin,   meme,   de   phoŋ-po?» zer-et-sok.
what.like+LQ   be=Ie-RM   grandfather   that rock-DF   say-Ie=PRS-IM

«phoŋ-po dutsok-ʃik   jot-pin.»   ···   zer-khantsok.
rock-DF   this.like-LQ   be=Ie-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

tshuŋdus-la   ɲalbatʃan   jot-pin.   turo,   zgotʃhuks   met-pin.
small.time-ALL   poor   be=Ie-RM   animal   cattle   NG.have=Ie

ta   ʒiŋ   rama   rilug-aŋ   ɲuŋtse   mene   met-pin.
now   field   goat   goat.sheep-FM   few   except   NG.have=Ie
'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   ŋatʃ⸱i   jot,   daksa.
Ñermo   we.excl⸱GEN   be=Ie   now
'[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=Ie-QM   HM   I   healthy   be=Ie   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=Ie
'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(:)   gjalba   duk,
s/he   now   very   good   be=IIv

tʃiba   zer-na,   khos   de   ʒak-ʃik   ŋa⸱(:)   phantoks   tʃos.
why   say-LOC:CD   s/he-ERG   that   day-LQ   I⸱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   tʃhirgjalp⁺e   trhims-basaŋ*
> this   wedding-GEN   custom   foreign⁺GEN   custom-CNTR
>
> *ma(:)   jamtshan   rak.*
> very   strange   be=Iinv
> 'This wedding custom is quite strange in relation to the foreign customs (as I feel/ think).'

(23) GYA

> *nạniŋ   ŋạ trạŋmu   rak-pen.*
> last.year I   cold   be=IInv-RM
>
> *tʃĩa   zer-na,   kẹlak dronmo kọn-de-aŋ,   ṭạŋmu   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

> *nạniŋ   ŋạ⁺(:) nạmlo   kĩ̄tpo   rak-pen,   tạlo   mẹ-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

> *gji   zan-pu ʒimbo naŋ.   / jot.*
> this   food-DF tasty   be=IIexp   be=Ie
> 'This food is tasty.' (Statement made while eating. / Assertion made without eating: *za(:)-matʃos, ṭhik zerte.*)

1.7.11 Attributive, Set 1 *yod*: default endopathic usage in the Balti dialect of Turtuk (+??) and the Purik dialect of Kargil (+??)

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

	MSAP	OTHER
	existential (local)	
non-experiential	*yod*	*yod*
experiential, visual	(*ḥdug*)	*ḥdug*
experiential, non-visual	(*ḥgrag*)	*ḥgrag*
evaluative	*yod* & marker	*yod* & marker
	possession	
non-experiential	*yod*	*yod*
experiential, visual	*ḥdug*	*ḥdug*
experiential, non-visual	*ḥgrag*	*ḥgrag*
evaluative	*yod* & marker	*yod* & marker

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

«gar   jot,   kheraŋ,   ŋa₊(:) du   zer-khan-tʃik?»   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-sehane   mẹntok   demoʒik   ɦot.
last.year   over.there-GEN garden-PPOS:ABL/LOC flower   nice-LQ   exist=Ie

tạlo   mi̱₊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 *ḥdug*: situation visually perceived, reference to OTHER

(29)   TUR

> *ʧhu   aliŋ   naŋ.*
> water   much   exist=IIexp
> '[There] is a lot of water.'

(30)   DOM

> *duʧik   ladaks-la   ʈuris   maŋbo   duk.*
> this.year   Ladakh-ALL   tourist   many   exist=IIv
> 'This year, there are many tourists in Ladakh.'

2.1.3   Existence, Set 2 *ḥdug*: 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 *ḥgrag*: situation non-visually perceived, reference to OTHER

(31)   DOM

> *philog-a   skjoŋtse   mi-tshuks-pok.*
> outside-ALL   oil.lamp   NG-stay.alive-FIM

> *ʧiba zer-na,   l̥uŋspo maŋbo   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-inaŋa   ʧa   daruŋ rag-a   mi-rak?*
> thermos.flask-PPOS   tea   still   exist=IInv-QM   NG-exist=IInv
> '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 *ḥdug*.

2.1.5   Embedded questions

A similar distribution is found in embedded or rhethorical 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

ŋatʃa₊(:)   kol-tʃas-i   dzo₊ek   met.
we.excl₊AES   employ-GRD-GEN   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 auxilairy *yod* would not allow any further question, as it would indicate that one has knowledge also of the background situation (DOM).

(40) TYA

ŋaʈʂaˑ(:)   *ʒiŋ*   *pat*   *miˑnuk.*
we.excl-AES   field   intsf   NG1-have=IIv

daksaˑŋ   *met,*   *sŋon-la-ŋ*   *miˑnuk-(pin).*
now+FOC   NG.have=Ie early-ALL+FOC   NG1-have=IIv-(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

ŋaʈʂˑi   *apimeme-basaŋ*   *meme-a*
we-excl+GEN   grandmother.grandfather-CNTR   grandfather-AES

ʒiŋ   *ʈʂhenmˑek duk-pin.*   /   *jot-pin.*
field big+LQ   have=IIv-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

ŋaʈʂaˑ(:)   *ʒiŋ*   *maŋbo*   *miˑnuk.*   /   **met.*
we.incl+AES   field   many   NG+have = Iiv   *NG.have = Ie

ʈʂiba   *in*   *he?*   *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

lo̱   *ʒipʈʂu*   *ŋāpʈʂu*   *ŋōn-la*   *ŋaẕaˑ(:)*   *ʒiŋ*   *ʈʂhenmˑek diŋse mi̱ˑnuk-pen.*
year 40   50   early-ALL   we.excl+AES   field big+LQ   ever   NG+have = IIv-RM

'40 or 59 years ago we (apparently) did not have any big fields.'

(44) GYA

ŋaẕa   *troŋɲiŋ*   *ɦinˑaˑŋ,*   *ʒiŋ*   *mi̱ˑnuk.*
we.excl   houshold.old   be=Ic+LOC:CD+FOC   field   NG+have = IIv

'Although we are an old-[settled] family, we do not have fields.'

(45)   STOK

> *ŋaʒa⁺(:)*   *mane sakjat mane*   *mi⁺ruk.*
> we.excl⁺AES   ever   land   ever   NG-have=IIv
> 'We [mother and I] do not have land, at all (and this is a scandal)!'

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-visually 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-visually perceived, reference to MSAP: hightened
       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⁺(:)*   *duʧik*   *gonlak*   *ɲo-a*   *pene*   *maŋb⁺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(:)*   *ʧig-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)

	MSAP	OTHER
	PRESENT, IMPERFECT (NON-CONTINUOUS)	
non-experiential	[+ctr] *yod*	*yod*
experiential, visual	[–ctr] *ḥdug*	*ḥdug*
experiential, non-visual	[–ctr] *ḥgrag*	*ḥgrag*
evaluative	*yod* & marker	*yod* & marker
	PRESENT, IMPERFECT (CONTINUOUS)	
non-experiential	[+ctr] *yod* / (*yin*)	*yod*
experiential, visual	— / (*ḥdug*)	*ḥdug*
experiential, non-visual	*ḥgrag*	*ḥgrag*
evaluative	*yod*, (*yin*) & marker	*yod*, *yin* & marker

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

(49)   HRD

> *haskje   ŋa khjaŋ-la   pene   taŋ-et.*
> tomorrow   I   fam.you   money   give-Ie=PRS
> 'Tomorrow I'll give you the/ some money.'

(50)   TYA

> *kheraŋ   tʃha-na,   ŋatʃa   dug-et!*
> fam.you   go-LOC:CD   we.excl   stay-Ie=PRS
> '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

> *ŋa-s daksa   las   tʃo-in-in.   / tʃo-in-jot.*
> I-ERG present work   do-CNT-Ic=PRG.PRS   do-CNT-Ie=PRG.PRS
> 'I am presently working.'

(52)   DOM

> *dares-naphala ŋa-s   las   *tʃo-in-in.   / tʃo-in-jot.*
> recent-PPOS   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-Ie-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   ŋatʃ˖i   naŋ-iaŋ   karkuŋ   ʒog-et.*
> carpenter-DF-ERG   we.excl˖GEN   house-PPOS   window   carve-Ie=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 evalutative forms have to be used.

(55)   GYA

> *lām˖e   tạksa saŋ   sal-at.*
> lama˖ERG   now   purification.ritual give-Ie=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   tʃi   tʃo-et,   ŋa˖(:) pata   met.*
> s/he-ERG   what   do-Ie=PRS   I˖AES knowledge   NG.have=Ie

'I don't know what s/he is doing/ is going to do.'

(57)   DOM

> *r̥kunma-s   tʃi   r̥ku˖se-jot,   ŋa˖(:) pata   met.*
> thief-ERG   what   steal˖LB-Ie=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:

(58)   DOM

‹*zurmo   log-kyab-et-a?*›   *sam-se,   ŋa-s   snum-a   kha   ṣis-pin.*
illness   back-drive-Ie=PRS-QM   think-LB   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 seaking an answer from the addressee.

(59)   DOM

ŋa⸱(:)   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

tʃaŋthi   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   khi-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⸱(:)   (de   khi-a)   droks-et.   thoŋ-ba-mi⸱nug-a?   then-aŋ,   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 rhethorical questions: blaming and
        doubt

(63)   DOM

ab ̍e   pene   r̥ku-sena,   sonam-is   rdoŋ   stan-et-a,   dug-et? –
father ̍GEN   money steal-LB&   Sonam-ERG   face   show-Ie=PRS-QM   stay-Ie=PRS-QM

<khos   rdoŋ   stanr̥nen>   met.
<s/he-ERG   face   show.remedy>   NG.exist=Ie

'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-ʃik   zer ̍gos-et?   ta   gos-aŋ!
how.much-LQ   say ̍need-Ie=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 state-
ments of surprise:

(65)   DOM

phrugu-a   draŋmo   ʧh ̍et.   ʧhu-a   ʧi   ʧuk ̍se ̍n?
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

aŋmo-s   ʧa   thuŋ-et,
Aŋmo-ERG   tea   drink-Ie=PRS

ŋaʧa ̍(:)   duglon   /   l̥ʧin   t ͤaŋlon   khoraŋ   ma-joŋs!
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

mi-ʃes   rgu-ʃes   kho-a   ʃes-et!
NG-know   '9'-know   s/he-AES   know-Ie=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

o   ŋa ̍(:)   pene   duk-mi ̍nuk.
Intj I ̍AES   money   have=IIv-NG ̍have=IIv

ɲo-a ̍(:)   ʧi   ɲo-et?
buy-NLZ-ALL   what   buy-Ie=PRS

'Oh (I see) I have no money with me, at all. [So] how can I buy anything?'

(69) DOM

> *pene   ski-se-khjoŋ-tʃas-po-z-ba-se   kho   tʃhuks.*
> money borrow-LB-bring-GRD-DF-INSTR-do-LB s/he be.blunder.PA
>
> *tʃiba zer-na,   kho-a   joŋgo   jod-met!*
> why   say-LOC:CD s/he-AES income have-NG.have=Ie
>
> *ga-na   ldzok-pa-ɲan-et?*
> what-ABL give.back-NLZ-be.able-Ie=PRS
> '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?'

(70) DOM (Data collected by Tharcin)

> *ta   ṣi-se-bor-ba   rgjal.*
> now   save-LB-keep-NLZ   be.good.PRS
>
> *ja   ŋ̍ataŋ-a   naŋmona rɲet-et-a   met-aŋ?*
> Intj we.incl-AES   next.time find-Ie-QM NG.exist-Ie-PM
> 'We should better save [it]./ Let's better keep [it]. [We don't know whether] we will get [it] later or not.'

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

> *iptse pipi ʒar-e   thoŋ-ba-met!*
> iptse pipi be.blind-LB see-NLZ-NG.exist=Ie=PRS
> '*Iptse-pipi* (that is, the searcher) is blind and doesn't see!'

The Set 1 auxiliary is also used in riddles.

3.7   Set 1 *yod*: OTHER, conveying a message

In Turtuk, Set 1 auxilary *yod* is also used when the speaker conveys a message or information to the addressee (*lon taŋna*).

Examples to be supplied

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 addresse 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.

(72)   TUR

e-a   mo   go-et.
that-LOC   she   go-Ie=PRS
'There she goes./ She is going over there.'

(73)   TUR5

e-a   [xlaŋpoʧ(h)o]   drul-et.
that-LOC   elephant   walk-Ie=PRS
'An elephant is walking over there!'

(74)   DOM

are‧kana   laŋpoʧhe ʧh‧et,   d‧o-a!
over.there‧PPOS:ABL   elephant go‧Ie=PRS   that‧DF-LOC
'Wow, [look] at that, over there, there is an elephant walking!'

(75)   TYA

l̥tos-aŋ!   Aŋmo joŋ-et.
look.IMP-DM   Aŋmo come-Ie=PRS
'Look! Aŋmo is coming.' (Aŋmo had been expected to come at this time.)

   GYA

tēs-aŋ!   taksaraŋ kho luk   sa‧ra‧ra.   / sa‧ruk.
look.IMP-DM   now.only s/he sheep kill‧Ie‧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

khoŋ tshaŋma-(si) las   ba‧ŋ.
they all-(ERG)   work do‧IIexp=PRS
'They are all working.'

(77)   CEM

«çaŋku ɦoŋ-duk!» zer-te,
wolf   come-IIv=PRS say-LB

khimtsepa-yun-la   meme-se   çaŋ   hul.
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

ɲeraŋ-a   a   iʧu   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 *ḷtosaŋ* '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   ʈhugu-a   zeːs: «ʈhugu,   ʤuʤu,   sɲiŋ   taŋ-se   sil!»*
> father-ERG child-ALL   say.PA=II   child   please   heart   give-LB read/study.IMP

> *de‧(ː)kana   ʈhugu-s   zeːs:*
> that-PPOS:ABL   child-ERG   say.PA=II

> *«ḷtos-aŋ!   ŋa‧(ː)   ‹sɲiŋ   taŋ-se   sil!›   zer-duk.*
> look.IMP-DIR   I‧ALL   heart   give-LB read/study-IMP   say-IIv=PRS

> *aba   khoraŋ-is   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 *ḷtosaŋ* '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-s   ṭhugu-a   zeːs: «ṭhugu,   dʑudʑu,   sɲiŋ   taŋ-se   sil!»
father-ERG child-ALL   say.PA=II child   please   heart   give-LB read/study.IMP

de·(ː)kana   ṭhugu-s   zeːs:
that-PPOS:ABL child-ERG   say.PA=II

«l̥tos-aŋ!   ŋa·(ː) ‹sɲiŋ   taŋ-se sil!›   zer-duk.
look.IMP-DIR I·ALL   heart   give-LB read/study-IMP say-IIv=PRS

aba   khoraŋ-is   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 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

ŋati   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 *ḥgrag*: non-visually perceived, reference to OTHER (including [−ctr] mental states and estimations of the MSAP)

ḥgrag is used for individual newly perceived situations where a visual channel is not awailable (or at least not dominant). *ḥgrag* 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

l̥uŋpo   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   ŋataŋ-a   (spera)   ṣug-en·ak.
s/he-ERG we.incl-ALL   (speech)   stir-CNT·IInv=PRS
'[I] feel/ think s/he is [trying to] incite us/ rile us up.'

(85)   ARA

ŋ·e   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 *ḥdug* 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

> *daŋ   ŋa   khaŋpa˕(:)   leb-zane,*
> yesterday   I   home˖ALL   arrive-when
>
> *ŋ˕e   aba-le˕(:)   lu   taŋ-in-jot-pin.*
> I˖GEN father-HM˖ERG   song   give-CNT-Ie-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

> *lo   banʧig-isŋanla loptʂuk banʧigis   r̥ʧup˕eaŋ   nakel   ʃur-en˕uk-pin.*
> year many-PPOS   pupil   many-ERG   10th˖PPOS copying   copy-cnt˖IIv-RM=IMPF
>
> */   khoŋis-nik   ʃur-en-jot-pin.   ŋa-nik   joŋs-teaŋs-pin.*
>   they-ERG-TOP   copy-CNT-Ie-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.*
> look.IMP-DIR   rice-DF   get.scattered-Ie=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

> *mo-a   namkin ʧa   hute   go-a-met-aŋ (~ -mer˕aŋ).*
> she-AES salt   tea good   perceive-NLZ-Ie-IIexp=PRS
>
> 'She (apparently) does not like the butter tea.'

As the informant stated, the form *metaŋ* 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

ŋa   graxmo   / tshatpa   go-et.
I   cold   hot   go-Ie=PRS
'I am getting cold / hot.'

(91)   TUR

ŋa‧(:)   toks-et.   za-ʧa‧ʃi   min!
I‧AES   be.hungry-Ie=PRS   eat-GRD‧-LQ   give.IMP
'I am (getting) hungry. Give [me] (something) to eat!'

4   PERFECT constructions

Table 7 Distribution of TMA auxiliaries (PERFECT constructions)

	resultative PERFECT	
	result concerning MSAP	result concerning OTHER
non-experiential	*yin* / *yod*	*yin* / *yod*
experiential, visual	— ?	*ḥdug* / *bžag*
experiential, non-visual	*ḥgrag*	*ḥgrag*
evaluative	*yin* & marker	*yin* / *yod* & marker
	continuative PERFECT	
non-experiential	[+ctr] *yin*	*yod* ?
experiential, visual	— ?	*ḥdug*
experiential, non-visual	*ḥgrag*	*ḥgrag* ?
evaluative	*yin* & marker	*yin* / *yod* & marker

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 (*ḥdug*) 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).

(92) DOM

rigo   tshaŋma(:)   kha   gon-e-jot-pasaŋ,
mountain.top   all-ALL   snow   be.covered-LB-Ie=PERF-NLZ&

tshanla   draŋmo   joŋ-a-rak.
night-ALL   cold   come-NLZ-IInv=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.'

4.1   Set 1 *yin*: results produced by MSAP or affecting 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   ŋe̠   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] (*ɦin* is used for fields nearby (or in view), *ɦot* is used for fields far away (out of view)).

4.2   Set 1 *yin*: results without involvement of MSAP

(94) NYO

di   khjøraŋ   ɲø̠‧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‧PPOS 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.)

---

[12] The noun *abise* 'grandmother-ERG' has been shifted from the sentence initial position.

4.3   Set 1 *yin*: confirmation-seeking and rhethorical questions concerning OTHER

(97)   DOM

> *me bar-e,   mesat   galḍi   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 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

> *ʧise,[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   ḷtap-se-jot.   / ̥ḷtap-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   ̥ḷtapsein.*
> 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 distantiated from the location

---

[13] This is a contracted form of *ʧi ʃe*.

of boiling. The copula *yin* could have been used, if the water were still in the pot on the hearth (TYA).

(102)   LEH

> *ʧu   skol-te-jot.   daksaraŋ   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

> *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 particilar 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

> *bom   jas-tsana,   kho   ʧha-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

> *ḍagḍar-ze   taŋ-kan-i   ṛman-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 sofar only observed in Balti. [Purik?].

(106)   TUR

> *phirolpa dose lok-se-oŋs-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 result produced by O<small>THER</small> but observed by both speaker and addressee.

(107)   TUR

> *phirolpa   dose   lok-se-oŋs-et.*
> foreigner   now   return-LB-come.PA-Ie=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 O<small>THER</small> (and M<small>SAP</small>)

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

(108)   WAK

> *geloŋ-le-s   ŋa‧(:)   ṣuŋa   skur-e-duk.*
> monk-HM-ERG   I‧ALL   talisman   hon.send-LB-IIv=PERF
> 'The monk has sent me a protective talisman.'

(109)   SAS

> *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

> *kho   jõ-a   rdʑet-s‧aŋ.*
> 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 O<small>THER</small> or M<small>SAP</small>

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

(111)   TIR

> *daŋ   tshanphet-naphala   tʃhãze   ŋa   tʃhol‧ts‧ak.*
> yesterday   night.middle-from.onwards   chaŋ-INSTR   I   talk.nonsense‧lb‧IInv=PERF
> 'Yesterday, from the middle of the night onwards, I must have been talking /I heard myself talking nonsense because of [too much] *chaŋ* (the local beer).'

4.10   Set 2 *ḥgrag*: inferences and judgements by the M<small>SAP</small> about O<small>THER</small>

The non-visual perfect can also be used for situations of O<small>THER</small>, if the M<small>SAP</small> has an oppinion or judgement about them. In that case, the marker for non-visual evidence refers to a mental act of the M<small>SAP</small>, even if s/he talks about a result that belongs to O<small>THER</small>. 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*.

(112) DOM

> *di   sper-eaŋ   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

> *migra   ʧi-phia   tᵉaŋ-se-in?   –   tsapik   ʒarein.*
> 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   kho   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   khjag-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   khjag-z-ak.*
> I   freeze-LB-IInv=PERF
> 'I am freezing.'

(118) DOM

> *kho   khjak-se-drak.*
> s/he   freeze-LB-IInv=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-ɦot.»
die-CNTR	earlier	field	all	child-PL-ALL	divide-GRD-Ic=PROSP	divide-GRD-Ie=PROSP

zer-de,	abise	ŋe̱	mīk.
say-LB	grandmother-ERG	certain	plan.PA

'Saying «before dying I will divide all fields among the children», the grand-mother made a plan.'[14] (ɦin is used for fields nearby (or in view), ɦot is used for fields further away (or out of view)).

5.2   Expectations and plans concerning OTHER

(120)   DOM

khoa	ta	ɲalw‧eaŋ	ʧha‧(:)	ṣit-ʧa-jot.	/
s/he-AES	now	hell‧ppos	go‧NLZ-ALL	deserve-NLZ-Ie=PROSP	

ṣit-ʧa-duk.	/	ṣit-ʧa-ḍak.	/	ṣit-ʧa-jot-sok.
deserve-NLZ-IIv=PROSP		deserve-NLZ-IInv=PROSP		deserve-NLZ-Ie=PROSP-IM

ʧiba	zer-na,	di	mitshe‧(:)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, *ḥgrag* 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

Aŋm‧e	de	kītap-te	me̱tkhamet	sil-ge-ʃe-ɦot.	/
Aŋmo‧ERG	that	book-DF	necessarily	read-need-NLZ-Ie=PROSP	

sil-ge-ʃe-duk.	/	sil-ge-ʃe-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; *ḥgrag* 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.ḥgro* 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.

<p style="text-align:center; color:red">More contexts to be added!</p>

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-continuative 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

phurgu-tsana, ŋa-s   om·e   kha   ʈ͡ʂak-pat-pin,   ṛku-se.
child-when   I-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

ŋaʨ·i   naŋa   ab·e   waŋ   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.)'

(124) GYA

> *ŋaʒ·e*   *pāxfo*   *tshaŋma*   *m̥eme-se*   *tāŋse*   *ɲē-at.*
> we.excl·GEN   skin   all   grandfather-ERG   always   tan-Ie=PRS
> 'As for our hides, [our] grandfather always tans them.'

6.2   Set 1 auxiliary *yod*, knowledge not based on immediate perception, reference to OTHER and generic facts (own cultural sphere)

(125) GYA

> *tshiriŋ-daŋ*   *pādma ɲēka tāŋse*   *pēra/*   *samzo/*   *gowo zob-at.*
> Tshiriŋ-COM   Padma both always speech/   thinking/   height be.equal-Ie=PRS
> 'The two [old ladies] Tshiriŋ and Padma always have the same way of speaking/ way of thinking/ are of the same height.'

(126) GYA

> *ŋānmane*   *rimbotʃhe*   *hemi-a*   *tāŋse*   *dan*   *tʃhag-at.*
> earlier   *rinpoche*   Hemis-ALL   always   seat   hon.tread-Ie=PRS
> 'Earlier, the *rimboche* used to stay in Hemis permanently.' (As this statement includes all previous incarnations, the informant cannot know this by her own observation; s/he probably knows this from hearsay from within the family or village.)

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

(127) DOM

> *rbul*   *ldʒar-la*   *drul-duk.*
> snake   flatness-ALL   go-IIv=PRS
> 'Snakes (seem to /apparently) creep on the belly.'

(128) GYA

> *khi*   *khor-zane,*   *am·e*   *tāŋse*   *ne̥*   *si·ɦuk.*
> threshing   turn-when   mother·ERG   always   barley   winnow·IIv=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

> *lḁday·e*   *ama*   *tshaŋma tāŋse*   *pīŋmo*   *tsūk-te-da·ruk.*
> Ladakh·GEN   mother   all   always   knee   plant-LB-sit-IIv=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

ŋatʃa   tshaŋma-s / ŋatʃˑi   naŋtshaŋs-po-s mane-tsana tʃhanthuk tʰaŋ-enˑuk.
we.excl all-ERG   weˑGEN family-DF-ERG   mane-when *chanthuk* give-CNTˑIIv
'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 apreciate it anymore.)

(129) b. DOM

daksaraŋ ŋatʃˑi   naŋtshaŋs-po-s tʃhanthuk   tʰaŋ-enˑuk.
now.only we.exclˑGEN family-DF-ERG *chanthuk*   give-CNTˑIIv=PRS
'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   ṣantrˑek   bos-enˑak.
Ladakh-ALL   lightning burn-when thunder-ERG veryˑLQ   call-CNTˑIInv
'During a thunderstorm in Ladakh, there is (always) quite heavy thundering (to be heard).'

(131) GYA

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

trūgˑi   kūco   tāŋ-tʃe   go   zug-a-rak.
childˑERG   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

TMA-construction function	auxiliary	MSPA			non-MSPA		
		+ctr	−ctr	observed	not-obs.	generic	
SIMPLE PAST	ø	+(Sham)	+	+	+	−	−
MARKED PAST	*pin (payin)*	+	+	+	+	−	−
remoteness marker, other usages	*pin (payin)*	+	+	+	+	−	−
SIMPLE PRESENT FUTURE	ø	+	−			−	+
DEFINITE FUTURE I	*yin*	+	−			−	−
DEFINITE FUTURE II	*yin*	+	+			+	+

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 thhen 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 remotness 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   tʃun-pin.*
> I-ERG   child   rebuke.PA-RM=I
> 'I reprimanded the child.'

(133) TYA

> *kheraŋ   kha   tʃiba   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

ŋaʑ·e   khamba-ne
we.excl·GEN   house-ABL

khimtsep·e   atɕi   nāma·(:)   nāmbu-ʑik   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 married 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 *pin* stresses the asymmetry between 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

[d]i ṛkunma tshaŋma-s ṛta   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 witnessed 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 zeːs-pasaŋ,   dene ŋa sɲiŋ rʤes-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

lo̱ khatɕig-eŋona altɕi-a
year some-PPOS   Alci-ALL

gorkha ɲī-se   geloŋ ɲī ṭūŋ.   / ṭūŋ-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

ʒaktaŋ   khᵊe   ɦige   kjāl-at.   teriŋ   mā-kyal.
every.day   s/he+ERG   letter   deliver-Ie   today   NG2-deliver.PA=II

khoa   ʧĩ   soˌfen?
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   ʧi   ṣit-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

daŋ   ŋa̱ khamba⁺(:)   ʧha-ʒe-a   ʧhom-pen.   ɦin'aŋ bad ma̱-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

daŋ   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 comprise 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

> *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

> *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 tʃhom-aŋ!   – tạ   tʃhom-in,   tʃhom-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

> *ŋas   jul-iphia   ʃrok   mi-skjal.*
> I-ERG   country-PPOS   live   NG-risk.PRS
> 'I won't risk my life for the country.'

(146) DOM

«mane ʒaŋ-bin-a-mi-ʒaŋ?»   *zer-e,*
mani   hon.errect-NLZ‧Ic=DFUT.I-QM-NG1-errect.PRS   say-LB

Dorje-s   tsheʃu-aŋ   phros   phiŋs.
Dorje-ERG   day.tenth-PPOS   topic   take.out.PA=II
'Saying: «Shall we errect a [new] mani [wall] or not?» Dorje started the discussion at the 10th day festival.'

(147) DOM

ŋa-s   papa   tʃi-a   spak?   – papa   ɲerma‧(:)   spok!
I-ERG   *papa*   what-ALL   dip.PRS   papa   chilli‧ALL   dip.IMP
'Into what shall/ can I dip the *papa* (a kind of dry polenta)? – Dip it into the chilly [sauce]!'

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 contects 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   tʃha‧(:)-mi-tʃha   he?
tomorrow   s/he Leh-ALL   go.PRS‧QM-NG1-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   ŋa‧(:‧)ŋ   galɖi‧k   ɽɲet-mi-ɽɲet-a   he?
next.year-ALL   I‧AES‧FM   car‧LQ   get.PRS-NG1-get.PRS-QM   Intj
'Next year, I will get a car, too, won't I?/ I, too, might perhaps get a car.'

(150) GYA

ŋ‧e   tshode-ʒik   tsūg-in.   tshor-en-a-me-tshod?
I‧ERG   riddle-LQ   pose-Ic=DFUT.I   solve-Ic=DFUT.I-QM-NG-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   tʃi   tʃo-in?
money   have=Ie-NLZ-DF   finish.PA   now   what   do-Ic=DFUT.I
'[All] the money [I] had is spent (lit. finished). Now what shall I do?'

(152) DOM

haʈipa-s   ṣanma   r̥tsug˙iaŋ   spel-e-drak.
shopkeeper-ERG   pea   aprticot.kernel˙PPOS:LOC   mix-LB-IInv=PERF

de-na   ta   ʧi   mi-spel?
that-ABL   now   what   NG-mix.PRS
'The shopkeeper has mixed peas into the apricot kernels (as I can taste). Is there anything [s/he] would not mix in (next time)?'

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-ʃik   tʰeaŋ-ba-basaŋ   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-Ic-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)   l̥tso   gon-in   he!
day-LQ hon.you-ERG   (head-ALL) l̥tso   wear-Ic-DFUT.I   Intj
'One day you will be wearing *lhtso* on (your head), really!' (Uttered as a curse. This has an extremely disgusting connotation, since *lhtso* refers to the contents of the stomach of a dead, esp. of a slaughtered, animal.)

(156) TIR

kho-ze khuri   ṣiŋm˙epʰia   i   spedep tshaŋma l̥aŋsk˙eka   rik.
s/he-ERG s/he.self.GEN sister˙PPOS this book   all   shelf˙PPOS   arrange.PA=II

ʧi-a   zer-na,   kho-e   ṣiŋmo-a spedep tshaŋma l̥ão-ɲapo   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/ ~ /ge/ ~ /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

ta̱   dro·n-a?   – ja̱,   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-tʃo!   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

ju̱l·ephia   ṣok kjā̱l-gi.
country-PPOS   life sacrifice-need.PRS
'One must sacrifice one's life for the country.'

(161) GYA

bu   ɦod-na,   kharʒi mi̱-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 /-tʃen/ in Kenhat, /-tʃan/ 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

tʃhu-inã̱a   tsha thim-tʃen.
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꞉e   kamba   muk̯-ʧe-rak.
s/he·GEN foot   smell-GRD-IInv=PRS
'His/Her feet are smelling (as I can perceive).'

(164) GYA

ɦi   ʧa̱   kho-a   ŋār-ʃe-rak. /   ŋār-ʃe-duk.
this   tea   s/he-AES become.sweet-GRD-IInv 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

ta̱ksa   ʧē-han-e   da꞉l   phitok-tshukpa   ʧik-ʧe-rak.
now   do-NLZ-GEN lentil   evening-PPOS   get.spoiled-GRD-Iinv
'The lentils prepared just now will get spoiled until evening.'

(166) GYA

ŋ꞉e̱   po̱mo   ma̱ŋbo ŋi-na,   ŋa̱꞉(꞉)   tsherha   ɦoŋ-ʧe-rak.
I·GEN   daughter much cry-LOC:CD I·AES   sorrow   come-GRD-Iinv
'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 *ḥdug*

Quite similarly, the combination of the gerundive with the auxiliaries *yod* and *ḥdug* 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 *ḥdug*, 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 disbelieve and embarassment (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 expexted and the actually used construction reflects a mismatch between the ex-
pected 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 in-
ference 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 knowl-
edge 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 usu-
ally 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

domain	markers	Sham	Nubra	Kenhat, Leh
PAST TENSE	probability	stem & -aŋ	no data	stem & aŋ
	estimation	—	--	--
	inferential	stem & tsug	stem & sug	stem & tog
	distance	stem & kha(i)ntsug	stem & kansug/ kanag	stem & ka(na)g, kyag
linking verbs, PERFECT, PRESENT TENSE	probability	(aux &) aŋ / ḥgro	no data (ḥgro)	(aux &) aŋ / ḥgro
	estimation	stem & thig & aux	no data	stem & thig & aux
	estimation	gerundive & ḥdug	no data	gerundive & ḥdug
	inferential	aux & tsug, ḥog	aux & sug/ ḥog ~ ḥag	—
	distance	aux & kha(i)ntsug	aux & kansug/ kanag	aux & ka(na)g/ tsug, kyag
FUTURE, modal, generic facts	probability	aux & ḥgro	no data (ḥgro)	aux & ḥgro
	estimation	gerundive & ḥdug	no data	gerundive & ḥdug
	inferential	stem & bog, ḥanog	stem & ḥanog	stem & ḥak, ka(na)g, ḥanog
	distance	—	no data (—)	—

8.1   Probability markers

The probability marker *aŋ* 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 /ḍo/ ~ /ʈo/ *ḥgro* '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 /–aŋ/ 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

      te̯   ēksiḍen-enãa   mi̯   ʧhēnm৵e   la̯k   ɦo(t)-ʈo.
      this accident-PPOS person big৵GEN   hand   exist=Ie-PM
      'Some bigwig might have had his hand in this accident.'

(168) GYA

> *te̱   ēksiḏen-enãa mi̱   ʈhēnm-e la̱k   ɦor-aŋ,   ʈi   pāta?*
> this accident-PPOS person big-GEN   hand exist=Ie-PM what   knowledge
> 'Some bigwig might have had his hand in this accident, who knows?'

8.2   Estimation markers

The estimation marker /thik/ *thig* '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 *soŋ* '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

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

> *ʈiba zer-na,   kho-a   biphruk ʈhasuk-ʈik ske-se-duk.*
> why   say-LOC:CD s/he-AES kitten   piebald-LQ get.born-LB-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 *rag*, 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

> *kho-a   ŋ-i   lak-na   go   bun-ʈa-in-ʈa-duk. / bun-e-in-ʈa-duk.*
> 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

> *khoŋi   dzo khjol-en-uk.   ʈiba zer-na,*
> they-GEN dzo limp-CNT-IIv=PRS why   say-LOC:CD

> *kho-ei   talmo-a   phok-se-jot-ʈa-duk.   /*
> s/he-GEN loin-ALL   be.hit-LB-IIv=PERF-GRD-IIv

> *khoei   talmo   but-e-in-ʈa-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.

(172) GYA

> *ɦi　ʧūni-re　ɲot-duk.*　　　　*nailon　dre-re-ɦot-ʧe-duk.*
> this　*cuni*-DF　be.stretchy-IIv=PRS　nylon　mix-LB-Ie=PERF-GRD-IIv
> 'This *cuni* is stretchy; there seems to be nylon mixed into it.'

(173) GYA

> *tar-eka　jafa　se·fa,　tar　tre-re-ɦot-ʧe-rak.*
> ice-PPOS　amusement　play·NLZ　ice　get.warm-LB-Ie=PERF-GRD-IInv
>
> *ŋe　kāmba　hor.*
> I-GEN　foot　break.through.PA=II
> 'When I played on the ice, the ice must have warmed up and I broke through with my foot.'

8.3　Inferential markers

8.3.1　Inferential future and general knowledge

The inferential markers for future time reference /-buk/ ~ /-bok/ *bog* (< *baḥog*) in western Shamskat, /anok/ *ḥanog* 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)} ?< *mkhan* 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.

(174) GYA

> *teriŋ　sip·e　ma-i　santsam-a　tē-anak.*
> today　soldier·ERG　down-GEN　frontier-ALL　look-FIM
> 'Today, the soldiers must be watching /will probably watch the border down there.'

(175) DOM

> *d·u　iŋliʃ-iaŋ　mi·ŋgjur-bok.*
> this·DF　English-PPOS　NG1·translate[–ctr]-FIM
> 'This does not translate/ cannot be translated into English.'

8.3.2　Inferential perfect constructions

(176) DOM

> *kho　khjak-se-in·ak.*
> s/he　freeze.PA-LB-Ic=PERF·IM
> 'S/he is freezing (as I infer).'

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.

(177) DOM

> *kho   khjak-se-in‧tsok.*
> 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.ḥdug* 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.ḥgrag* is to be used.

8.3.3 Inferential and distance markers (for present and past time 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   ŋaʧa‧(:)   ʧhures   khor-tshar-tsok.*
> intj now we.excl‧AES   water.turn   be.over-finish.PA-IM
>
> *it‧u-aŋ   ma‧mba‧(:)-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(:) ṭakpo   ʒuks-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   riŋboʧhe-s katʃhos   sal-tsok.   /   sal-khaⁱntsok.*
> yesterday riŋboche   religious.teaching give.PA-IM   /   give.PA-DST
> 'Yesterday, the riŋboche 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.   ṣantre 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   ʒi-rok.   /*
> y.day father all꞉ERG   chörten-PL-ALL   h.whitewash hum.apply.PA-IM
>
> *ʒi-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   tī-zane,   khamba mẹd-zane,*
> early꞉GEN   time-when   house   NG.exist-Ie-when,
>
> *Kārse꞉(꞉)   ʈoŋba-raŋ   ŋaʒa   ɲēk꞉e*
> Kārse꞉GEN   family-COM   we.excl both꞉ERG
>
> *bao ʧhenmo-ʒik Kārse꞉(꞉)   ri꞉(꞉)   ʈhed-la   ʈi-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.'

(184) GYA

ŋ‑e̠	*ɲe̠raŋ*	*ʃam-a*	*ɦot-kan*	*ʧē-at-pen,*
I‑ERG	hon.you	Šam-ALL	exist=Ie-NLZ	do-Ie-RM=IMPF

ɦinaŋ	*ɲe̠raŋ*	*lē-a*	*ɦot-suk.*
but	hon.you	Leh-ALL	exist=Ie-DST

'I had been thinking you are in Šam, but (now) you are in Leh!'

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

daŋ	*ŋe̠*	*ɲe̠-raŋ-eduna*
yesterday	I-ERG/GEN	hon.you-PPOS:LOC

ane	*ʧhondrol-a*	*ṣanʈe*	*māt-pen.*
aunt	Chondrol-LOC	very	talk.bad=PA-RM

han!	*ŋ‑e̠*	*ʧhon-la*	*ɲe̠raŋ-a*	*zer-hanak.*
intj	I‑ERG/GEN	vain-LOC	hon.you-LOC	say=PA-DSTM

kho	*tōt-ʧe-ʒik*	*duk,*	*sokpo*	*mi‑nuk.*	*juʒu*	*he,*
s/he	laud-NLZ-LQ	be:S2v	bad	NG1‑be:S2v	please	intj

ŋ‑e̠	*pēra*	*zer-han*	*tshaŋma*	*sem-a*	*ma̠-khur!*
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 Shamskat speaker:

(186) bz

> *dene   Khalatse   gazuk   ʧhaks-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   sŋon-la   Brokpa   zer-e,*
> Khalatse   say-NLZ-GEN   village-DF   earlier   Brokpa   say-LB
>
> *ozuga   pat   jot-pasaŋna,*
> that.way   totally   exist=Ie-NLZ&
>
> *khoraŋ   ···   ana   joŋs-khantsok   zer-in-duk,*
> s/he.self   [pause]   that-ABL come.PA-DST   say-CNT-IIv=PRS
>
> *Gilgitsoks   nupʧhoks-na   le.*
> Gilgit.like   north.direction-ABL   HM
> 'It is said that the village called Khalatse was originally a Brokpa (Dardic) [village], 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   joŋ-s[en]a,   phark⁺eka,   ʧhu   jot-suk,*
> that-ABL   come-LB&   other.side⁺PPOS   river   exist=Ie-IM
>
> *siŋge   r̥tsaŋs-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   Siŋge   r̥tsaŋs-po   thama   ʒune   mindra   ɲis   joŋs-pa,*
> then   Lion   river   bank   along   people   two   come-NLZ
>
> *a   phark⁺e   khus   tapsa   zer-ʧan   brak-ʧi[k]   le,*
> that   other.side⁺GEN   *khus   tapsa* say-GRD.Ic=DFUT.II rock-LQ   HM
>
> *de   brak-p⁺ika   l̥ep-se,   l̥ta⁺se-duks-pa,*
> that   rock-DF⁺PPOS arive-LB   look⁺LB-stay.PA-NLZ
>
> *aŋos-p⁺iaŋdu   thaŋ-ʧik   thoŋ-et-sok   le.*
> that.side-DF⁺PPOS   plain-LQ   see-Ie=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.

> *thaŋ-ʧik   thoŋ-et-sok.   de   thaŋ-p⁺ika   budr⁺ek   thoŋ-et-sok.*
> plain-LQ   see-Ie=PRS-IM   that   plain-DF⁺PPOS   tree⁺LQ   see-Ie=PRS-IM
> '[They] see a plateau. On that plateau, [they] see a tree.'

(186) e.

> *dene   khoŋ,   ʧikpo-s   «a   budra   ŋ·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   ŋataŋ   di   ʧhu-la   ʧi   ba-se   ʧhen?»   zers-pa,*
> that-ALL   we.incl   this   river-ALL   what   do-LB   go-DFUT.I   say.PA-NLZ
>
> *ʧhu-la   ̥rkal-ba·(:)   khaspa   jot-sok-p[a],*
> river-ALL   swim-NLZ-ALL   knowledgeable   be=Ie-IM-emp
>
> *khoŋ   ʧhu-la   ̥rkjal-e,   biŋs-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=Ie-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.

> *zer-ʧan   le.   Šerap·i   starga,   sŋon-la   jot-khantsok   lo.*
> say-GRD.Ic=DFUT.II   HM   Šerapa·GEN   walnut   early-ALL   exist=Ie-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·(:)   roŋ-saγ-a   sakjat   ʧo·se-[j]oŋ-ʧan.*
> that   Skini[aŋ]-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,   thaŋp·ika   sakjat,   a-na   ʧhu   rgjaŋ-se   khjoŋ-se,*
> then   this-ABL   plateau·PPOS   site   that-ABL   water   fill-LB   bring-LB
>
> *khalatse   tsuks-khantsok   lo.   zer-b·i   spera   [j]oŋ-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 [canals] 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=Ic-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:[15]

(187) NUR

> *ŋa tshoŋpa in-ok.*
> I trader be=Ic-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 tiŋmozgaŋ thud-e-jod-e-in-ok.*
> Teya-COM Tiŋmozgaŋ border-LB-Ie=PERF-LB-Ic=PERF-IM
> 'Teya and Tiŋmozgaŋ [two neighbouring villages] border upon each other (since long).'

<p align="center">**More examples and more context to be added.**</p>

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 gjapo in-tsuk. khjoraŋ trhi-seha dar‧a-ḥot-suk.*
> fam.you king be-DST fam.you throne-PPOS sit‧NLZ-Ie=PRS-DST
>
> *ŋa̱ lönpo in-tsuk. seha dar‧a-ḥot-suk.*
> I minister be-DST ground.PPOS sit‧NLZ-Ie=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.

(190) TYA

yoŋ!   ŋataŋ   hjaŋspa   tʃo-in.
come.IMP   we.incl   fun   do-Ic=DFUT.I

kheraŋ   gjapo in-tsuk. ŋa   gjamo in-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 *ɦotʃedukpen*, the speaker from Gyaik gave the following example. She only uses the distance marker *kag ~ ka.nag*.

(191) GIK

pērna,   ŋa̱ kh·e   khimtsepa   jin-kak.
give.example-LOC:CD   I   s/he·GEN   neighbour   be=Ic-DST

jinaŋ jit·u   me̱-kak: tezane   kho   tʃhukpo   ɦod-a-met.
but   mind·LOC   ng.exist=Ie-DST   that.time   she   rich   be=Ie-QM-NG.be=Ie

ŋa: te̱-re   ji·tu   ɦo·kak:
I-AES   that-DF   mind·LOC   exist=Ie·DST

kho-a   khampa   ɦot-pen,   kho-a   galḍi   ɦot-pen.
s/he-AES   house   have=Ie-RM s/he-AES   car   have=Ie-RM

te·(:)ɦa   kho   tezane-aŋ   tʃhukpo   ɦot-tʃe-duk-pen,   zer-at.
that·PPOS   s/he   that.time-FM   rich   be=Ie-NLZ-exist=IIv-RM   say-Ie=PRS
'For example, if I was his/her neighbour, but would not remember whether s/he was rich or not. [But] I would know this: s/he had a house [and] s/he had a car. Therefore I will say s/he must have been rich also at that time.'

9   Quotation / hearsay information

Hearsay information is encoded quite straightforwardly by adding the defective verb /lo/ *lo* 'say' to the statement with all evidential or inferential markers in place. Pronouns, ho
wever, are usually shifted from the quoted person's perspective to the quoting speaker's perspective:

(192) a. GYA

ŋa·(:)   kʲītpo   rak.
I·AES   happy   be/have=Iinv
'I (=MSAP) am happy/ in happy conditions.'

becomes:

(192) b. GYA

kho-a   kʲītpo   rak   lo̱.
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(:)* 'I' in direct speech.)

(193) a. GYA

> *kho-a   kʲītpo   duk.*
> s/he-AES happy   be/have=IIv
> 'S/he is happy/ in happy conditions.'

becomes:

(193) b. GYA

> *ŋa₊(:) / kho-a   kʲītpo duk   lo̲.*
> 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 *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 sub-
tracted) according to the relative rank of the person who reports the speech:

(194) a. DOM

> *khoŋ   rims-e-nak   lo.*
> 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)

> *ŋa   l̥toks-e-nak.*
> 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

> *aŋmo-s:*   *«ŋa   tshantsere zaŋgi-s   zos.»*
> Aŋmo-ERG   I-ABS   night.all   zaŋgi-ERG bite.pa
>
> *aŋme   aba-s:*   *«aŋmo-a   tshantsere zaŋgi-s   zos   lo.*
> Aŋmo-GEN father-ERG   Aŋmo-AES   night.all   *zaŋgi*-ERG bite.PA   QOM
>
> *skut   soŋ!   ‹khandrag-a   ma-cha!›   ze:s-pa,   soŋ."*
> deserving go.PA   roof.top-ALL   NG2-go=PRHB   say.PA-NLZ   go.PA
> 'Aŋmo: «I was biten by the *zaŋgi* (a small biting insect) all night long.» Aŋmo's
> father: Oh the poor Aŋmo says [she] was biten by the *zaŋgi* 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 *schadenfreude* in the first part,
> hence scaling up the original absolutive into an aesthetive construction.)

(196) DOM

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

dronpo şapkhan-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-IInv=PRS	Intj	now	*what*	do˷Ic=DFUT.I

r̯tsugumar-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 can-
not be challenged or negated, the quotation marker is semantically transparent, be-
haves 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	*ḍolkar-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

daŋ	*pu̯tsa*	*sokpo-ʒig-e*	*zer-hanak:*	*«daŋ*	*ŋa˷raŋ*	*po̯mo-ʒik*	*drel»*	*lo̯.*
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 *verbum dicendi mol* is clearly preferred.

(199) KHAL

«… *gendun-i*	*ʒuŋ-na*	‹*maŋja* *phul-e*	*mene*	*ma-taŋ!*›
monk-GEN	assembly-ABL	tea.offer hum.offer-LB	except	NG2-give=PRHB

mol-en˞ak.»	*zers-pasaŋna*
hon.speak-CNT˞IInv=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 *Kaŋgjur* 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*	*tʃo-tʃen?*»	*ze:s-pasana,*
people	how.many-aLL	food	do-DFUT.II	say.PA-NLZ&

«*ona*	*mindra*	*detseg-a*	*tʃo-tʃen*	…»	*zer-et-sok-pa*	*le.*
well	people	that.many-ALL	do-DFUT.II	…	say-Ie=PRS-IM-EMP	hon

«*dona*	*bras*	*detsek*	*khjoŋ!*	*bakphe*	*detsek*	*khjoŋ!*	…»	*ze:s-pasana,*
well	rice	that.much	bring.IMP	flour	that.much	bring.IMP	…	say.PA-NLZ&

al̥ta	*r̥tiŋna*	*drandra*	*tʃh˞en˞ug_*	*_lo.*
later	afterwards	equal	go˞CNT˞IIv=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

rimbotʃhe-se	*ɦizuk*	*mōl-a-rak.*
rimboche-ERG	this.way	speak-NLZ-IInv=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 *verbum 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

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 burglery, one could say

(202) a. GYA

ta̱ksa	*pu̱tsa-ʒig-e*	*«ŋa*	*aŋm·e*	*khampa·(:)*	*ʒug-in»*	*zer-a-rak.*
now	boy-LQ-ERG	I	Aŋmo-GEN	house-ALL	enter-Ic=DFUT.I	say-NLZ-IInv=PRS

(202) b. GYA

ta̱ksa	*pu̱tsa-ʒig-e*	*«kho*	*aŋm·e*	*khampa·(:)*	*ʒug-in»*	*zer-a-rak.*
now	boy-LQ-ERG	s/he	Aŋmo-GEN	house-ALL	enter-Ic=DFUT.I	say-NLZ-IInv=PRS

(202) c. GYA

ta̱ksa	*pu̱tsa-ʒig-e*	*«ø*	*aŋm·e*	*khampa·(:)*	*ʒug-in»*	*zer-a-rak.*
now	boy-LQ-ERG	ø	Aŋmo-GEN	house-ALL	enter-Ic=DFUT.I	say-NLZ-IInv=PRS

(202) d. GYA

ta̱ksa	*ø*	*«pu̱tsa-ʒik*	*aŋm·e*	*khampa·(:)*	*ʒug-in»*	*zer-a-rak.*
now	ø	boy-LQ	Aŋmo-GEN	house-ALL	enter-Ic=DFUT.I	say-NLZ-IInv=PRS

'I just heard a joung man saying (a) «I'll enter Aŋmo's house." / (b-c) that he would enter Aŋmo's house. / (d) I just heard that a joung man wants to enter Aŋmo's house, according to his words.'

The non-finite form ཟེར་རེ་ *zere* of the unspecific *verbum dicendi* ཟེར་ *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

t͡ʃakpa-s,	*«ŋa-s*	*pene*	*ma-taŋ-na,*	*sad-et»*	*zer-e,*	*zdams.*
robber-ERG	I-ERG	money	NG2-give-LOC:CD	kill-Ie=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)

kheraŋ-is	*pene*	*ma-taŋ-na,*	*sad-et.*
fam.you-ERG	money	NG2-give-LOC:CD	kill-Ie=PRS

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

In such cases, the unspecific *verbum dicendi zer* 'say' can also follow:

(204) GYA

gergan-e	*Aŋm·e*	*miŋ*	*tōn.*
teacher-ERG	Aŋmo·GEN	name	announce.PA

Aŋmo-a	*«lū*	*tōŋ!»*	*zerde*	*zer.*
Aŋmo-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

phrugu-s «*ŋa piktʃar-la tʃhaṣṇin drak.*» *lo-pa,*
child-ERG   I   cinema-LOC   go.wish   exist=IInv   say-NLZ

aba-s   «*goma (kheraŋ.a) zurmo rgjol-aŋ!,*
father-ERG   first   (you.fam-AES)   illness   heal.IMP-DIR

ne ŋataŋ tʃha⁺(:)»   *lo.*
then   we.incl   go.PRS⁺NLZ=HORT   say
'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 co-referential with the original speaker or with the reporting person. According to one of the Domkhar speakers, the use of a fully lexical *verbum dicendi*, specified as being immediately perceived: *zerenak* 'is saying (as I hear)', might be preferable to the use of the quote marker *lo*, when the information is about oneself.

(206) a. (DOM)

ŋa_ _rgjalba men.
I   good   NG2.be=Ic
'I am not good.'

becomes:

(206) b. DOM

kho-s   «*ŋa_ _rgjalba men*»   *zer-en⁺ak.*
s/he-ERG   I   good   NG2.be=Ic   say-CNT-IInv=PRS
'S/heᵢ said/ (I) heard him/her say: «Iᵢ am not good.» (Direct speech)

(207) a. (DOM)

kheraŋ _rgyalba men-tsok.
fam.you   good   NG2.be=Ic-INFM
'You are not good (as it seems).'

becomes:

(207) b. DOM

kho-s   «*ŋa_ _rgyalba men-tsok*»   *zerenak.*
s/he-ERG   I   good   NG2.be=Ic-INFM   saysay-CNT-IInv=PRS
'S/he said /(Iᵢ) heard him/her say that Iᵢ 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.

(208) GYAa13

> *naŋdak-te-a   dronpo-ŋun   tuˍɾenãa   tshup   loˍ.*
> house.owner-DF-AES guest-PL   smokeˌPPOS 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   ɖolkar-la   ‹kho le-a   ʧhaˌ(:)-met›   zer-enˌak»   lo.*
> Aŋmo-ERG   Dolkar-ALL s/he Leh-ALL   go-NLZ-NG.Ie=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   ʧhaˌ(:)-met›   lo"   mol-enˌak.*
> rimboche-ERG Aŋmo   Leh-ALL   go-NLZ-NG.Ie=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   skuʃok-rik   deandraˌ(:)*
> that.very high.lama-lq   that.likeˌall
>
> *zarbu-naŋ   phiŋ-ʧan   lo,   zer-enˌuk.*
> zarbu-COM   take.out-GRD-Ic=DFUT.II QOM   say-CNT•IIv=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 *ḥdug* for a MSAP, which is similarly connected to a commercial transaction:

(211)　LEH

nomo,	*usu*	*tsama*	*salduk?*	–
younger.sister	coriander	how.much-ALL	hon.give-IIv=PRS	

ŋe	*kilo*	*kʲirmo*	*suma*	*phulduk.*
I-ERG	kilo	rupee	3-ALL	hum.offer-IIv=PRS

'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 *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 *yod* indicate an authoritative statement that cannot be questioned, the use of *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 *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:

(212)　DOM

diriŋ	*ŋaˑ(:)*	*milak-ʧig-a*	*mi-khom-bog-a?*
today	I‑ALL	man.hand-LQ-ALL	NG-be.free.FIM-QM

'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?'

(187)　NUR

ŋa	*tshoŋpa*	*in-ok.*
I	trader	be=Ic-FIM

'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   ʧi   in-ok?   – de-bo   tsigu   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 addresse 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 reseacher, who stays in her parents' house and whom the child has already seen many times.)

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

1. Languages and dialects

ARA	Aranu (Northern Nubra, Ladakh)	NYO	Nyoma (Changthang, Ladakh)
CT	Classical Tibetan	SAS	Saspol (eastern Sham, Ladakh): Phun-tsok Dolma
DOM	Domkhar (western Sham, Ladakh)		
GYA	Gya-Miru (Upper Ladakh): Mengyur Tshomo, Jigmet Yangdol	SHI	Shigatse (Central Tibet)
		SHEY	Shey (Central Ladakh)
KAR	Kargil (Purik, Ladakh)	STOK	Stok (Upper Ladakh)
KHAL	Khalatse (western Sham, Ladakh)	THM	Themchen (Amdo Tibet)
KHYU	Khyungrung (Central Nubra, Ladakh): Tshering Chakdor (1996)	TIR	Tirit (Central Nubra, Ladakh)
		TUR	Turtuk (Balti, Ladakh): Abdul Hamid (2015)
LEH	Leh (Upper Ladakh)		
LHS	Lhasa (Central Tibet)	TYA	Teya (eastern Sham): Tshering Dolkar
NUR	Nurla (eastern Sham, Ladakh)		

2. Grammatical and lexical markers

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

References

Agha, A. and Tseten Chonjou [=Tsetan Chonjore (Tshe.brtan Chos.ḥbyor)]. 1991. On the partial formal syncretism of categories of clause structure in Lhasa Tibetan. *Nepalese Linguistics* 5-8: 1–12.

——. 1993. *Structural form and utterance context in Lhasa Tibetan. Grammar and indexicality in a non-configurational language*. New York etc.: Peter Lang.

Bartee, E. 2011. The role of animacy in the verbal morphology of Dongwang Tibetan. In: M. Turin & B. Zeisler (eds.) *Himalayan Languages and Linguistics. Studies in Phonology, Semantics, Morphology and Syntax*. (Brill's Tibetan Studies Library, 5/12.) Leiden etc.: Brill: 133-182.

Bickel, B., ed. 2000. *Person and evidence in Himalayan languages*. Part I. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23.2.

——. 2001. *Person and evidence in Himalayan languages*. Part II. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24.1.

Bielmeier, R. 2000. Syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic-epistemic functions of auxiliaries in Western Tibetan. In Bickel 2000: 79–125.

Causemann, M. 1989. *Dialekt und Erzählungen der Nangchenpas.* (Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung, 11.) Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Creissels, D. 2008. Remarks on the so-called "conjunct/disjunct" systems. Paper given for Syntax of the world's languages III, Berlin, 25-28 September 2008.

DeLancey, S. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In: Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology.* Norwood, NJ: 203–213.

——. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33–52.

Denwood, Ph. 1999. *Tibetan.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Foley, W. and R.D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (cited after Sun 1993).

Goldstein M.C., Gelek Rimpoche and Lobsang Phuntshog. 1991. *Essentials of Modern Literary Tibetan: A Reading Course and Reference Grammar.* Berkeley, L.A.: University of California Press.

Häsler, K. 2001. An empathy-based approach to the description of the verb system of the Dege dialect of Tibetan. In Bickel 2001: 1-34.

Haller, F. 2000a. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Shigatse.* Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

——. 2000b. Verbal categories of Shigatse Tibetan and Themchen Tibetan. In Bickel 2000: 175–191.

——. 2004. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen.* Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Hein, V. 2001. The role of the speaker in the verbal system of the Tibetan dialect of Tabo/Spiti. In Bickel 2001: 35-47.

Kalsang, K., J. Garfield, P. Speas, and J. de Villiers. 2013. Direct evidentials, case, tense and aspect in Tibetan. *Natural Language Linguistic Theory* 31: 517–561. doi: 10.1007/s11049-013-9193-9 (accessed 30 June 2014).

Koshal, S. 1979. *Ladakhi Grammar.* Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.

Norman, R. 2001. *Getting started in Ladakhi.* Revised and expanded edition. Leh, Ladakh: Melong Publications.

Oisel, Guillaume. 2013. *Morphosyntaxe et sémantique des auxiliaires et des connecteurs du tibétain littéraire. Étude diachronique et synchronique.* Thèse de doctorat. Laboratoire du LACITO – CNRS.

Speas, P. 2012. Evidential situations. Invited speech, The Nature of Evidentiality Leiden 2012. http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/speas-peggy.pdf (last accessed 22 May 2015).

Sun, J.T. 1993. Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan. Bulletin of the Institute of Historiy and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, 63.4: 945-1001.

Suzuki, Hiroyuki. 2012. Multiple usages of the verb *snang* in Gagatang Tibetan (Weixi, Yunnan). *Himalayan Linguistics* 11.1: 1–16.

Tournadre, N. 1996a. *L'ergativité en tibétain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée.* Paris, Leuven: Peeters.

Tournadre, N. 1996b. Comparison des systèmes médiatifs de quatre dialectes tibétains (tibétain central, ladakhi, dzongkha et amdo). In: Z. Guentchéva (ed.), *L'ennonciation médiatisée.* Paris, Leuven: Peters.

Tournadre, N. and Konchok Jiatso. 2001. Final auxiliary verbs in Literary Tibetan and in the dialects. In Bickel 2001: 49-110.

Tsetan Chonjore (Tshe.brtan Chos.ḥbyor). 2003. Colloquial Tibetan. A textbook of the Lhasa dialect with reference grammar and exercises (a contextual approach). Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works & Archives.

Volkart, M. 2000. The meaning of the auxiliary morpheme *'dug* in the aspect systems of Central Tibetan dialects. In Bickel 2000: 127-153.

Zeisler, B. 2004. *Relative Tense and aspectual values in Tibetan languages. A comparative study.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.

——. 2011. Kenhat, the dialects of Upper Ladakh and Zanskar. In: M. Turin & B. Zeisler (eds.) *Himalayan Languages and Linguistics. Studies in Phonology, Semantics, Morphology and Syntax.* (Brill's Tibetan Studies Library, 5/12.) Leiden etc.: Brill: 235-301.

——. to appear a. Evidence for the development of 'evidentiality' as a grammatical category in Tibetan.

——. to appear b. The emergence of the Ladakhi inferential and experiential markers out of a marker for admirativity (non-commitment): the case of *ḥdug* and *snaŋ.*