Sentence patterns and pattern variation in Ladakhi: A field report[1]

Bettina Zeisler

1. Starting point: Tibetan languages as ergative languages

Ergative languages seem to be devoid of the syntactic categories Subject and Object because the semantic or logical "subject" of a transitive sentence is treated differently from that of an intransitive sentence, which is treated like the semantic "object" of a transitive sentence. The transitive "subject" receives an oblique case marker (or marker of crossreference), while the "object" and the intransitive "subject" remain unmarked (Absolutive). Following this definition, Tibetan languages are generally described as ergative languages (with temporally or pragmatically conditioned split patterns), because the (mostly transitive) EFFECTING[2] AGENT receives the same case marker as the INSTRUMENT, while the (mostly intransitive) NON-EFFECTING AGENT or UNDERGOER and the PATIENT are in the Absolutive.

Grammars or descriptive studies of Tibetan varieties usually treat the function of the case markers in detail, but a systematic classification of sentence patterns is quite rare. Even the three classifications given below present only between four and six different sentence patterns, leaving aside most sentence patterns with arguments other than "subject" or "object", particularly sentences with a valency higher than 2.

On the other hand, these classifications are also meant to account for the semantic distinction of [±control] verbs: A [+control] verb presupposes an animate and intentional AGENT, which not only intends the action and its result but controls the action up to the point of transformation, a [-control] verb does not presuppose, it may even preclude such an AGENT. However, with the exception of Ladakhi and Balti, this distinction does not affect the basic case marking. The [±control] distinction thus leads to an unnecessary multiplication of sentence patterns (these doublets will be represented with shades in the following tables).

Table 1. Five basic sentence patterns LT/CT (Tournadre 1996: 214)[3]

valence	±volitif	type	[cas]	
1	-		Abs	
1	+		Abs	
1/2	-		(Erg +) Abs	[rather: Abs (+ Instr)]
2	-	benefactif	Obl + Abs	
2	-	affectif	Abs + Obl	
2	-	ergatif	Erg + Abs	
2	+	mixte	Erg + Obl	
2	+	ergatif	Erg + Abs	

Obl: Oblique = Dative/Locative

Table 2. Five (CT) or six (WT) basic sentence patterns (Zeisler 1999)[4]

	"subject"	goal	other	"object"	verb	(auxiliary)
intr(ansitive):	Abs		(Instr)		[-ctr]	1→3
intr.:	Abs/(Erg)				[+ctr]	1/3
trans(itive) affection:	Abs		D/L / Instr		[-ctr]	1→3
trans. experience:	$Instr^{CT}$ Aes^{WT}			Abs	[-ctr]	1→3
trans. directional:	Erg	D/L	(Instr)		[+ctr]	1/3
trans. 2 arguments:	Erg/(Abs)		(Instr)	Abs	[+ctr]	1/3
trans. > 2 arguments:	Erg	D/L	(Instr)	Abs	[+ctr]	1/3

Table 3. Four basic sentence patterns EAT/CtrT (Haller 2006: 65–67)

key	basic pattern	additional arguments
ncA	V ($patient_{absolutive}$)	(D, Com, E)
ncDA	V ($benefactive/recipient_{dative}$, $patient_{absolutive}$) prohibitive not possible	-
ncEA	V ($experiencer_{ergative}$, $patient_{absolutive}$) prohibitive possible	(D, Com, E)
cA	V ($agent_{absolutive}$)	(D, Com, E)
cED	V ($agent_{ergative}$, $patient_{dative}$)	-
cEA	V ($agent_{ergative}$, $patient_{absolutive}$)	(D, Com, E)

nc: [-ctr], c: [+ctr]; A: absolutive, D: dative, E: ergative (including instrumental), V: verb

Tournadre and Haller are probably on safer ground in avoiding a classification in terms of transitivity, but they do not explicitly state that a valency of 2 does not necessarily correspond to a transitive sentence. Sentences with an ergative first argument and a dative(/locative) second argu-

ment ("mixte", "transitive directional", "cED") as well as sentences with an absolutive first argument and a dative(/locative) second argument ("affectif", "transitive affection") are treated on the same level as transitive sentences of the prototypical ergative pattern. The classification thus does not differ substantially from that of Zeisler (1999). However, an alternative classification of the affective and directional patterns as extended intransitives in the sense of Dixon (1995: 122–123) might be more appropriate.[5]

Tournadre's seemingly ambivalent "1/2" verbs are basically [-control] verbs with a valency of 1, which do not admit an AGENT argument. It is, nevertheless, possible to add an additional, non-obligatory CAUSE argument that takes the Instrumental. If one allows for a rise in valency in this case, one should also treat movement verbs as ambivalent verbs, since they allow an optional GOAL or SOURCE argument (and sometimes both arguments appear, leading thus to a valency of 1/2/3). Most verbs would allow for an additional INSTRUMENT, CAUSE, or MEDIUM argument in the Instrumental as shown in the above charts from Zeisler (1999) and Haller (2006) and for additional LOCATION, BENEFICIARY, or PURPOSE arguments. It thus seems to be preferable to restrict the indication of valency to (obligatory or optional) core arguments, i.e. arguments that are licensed by the semantics of the particular verb (e.g. GOAL and SOURCE for movement verbs). Other optional arguments will be discussed in this paper only in so far as they exhibit an unpredictable case marking.

2. A closer look at Ladakhi sentence patterns

It turned out that none of the above classifications is sufficient and that the description of Ladakhi as an ergative language needs some qualification. This finding holds also for Tibetan in general, although Ladakhi exhibits some peculiarities that are probably due to intensive language contact with Indo-Iranian languages, e.g. the experiencer construction with the Aesthetive (dative/locative case marking).

2.1. Weak Subjects

Ladakhi shows evidence of a weak syntactic category of Subject. Each sentence provides a subject slot, which must be filled explicitly or implicitly. In the absence of an (explicit or implicit) animate EFFECTING AGENT or EXPERIENCER, the INSTRUMENT (usually taking the Comitative), will be

necessarily shifted to the EFFECTING AGENT or EXPERIENCER position, taking thus the Ergative (1) or Aesthetive (2). In contrast to accusative languages, the argument in the subject slot can take one of three case markers: Ergative, Aesthetive, or Absolutive.

(1) SAS
a. *rduŋma-s* *thokpo-ϕ* *khurenok.*
beam-Erg roof-df-Abs carry-Pr.GInf
INSTRUMENT
→EFFECTING AGENT PATIENT
Subject Non-Subject
'The beam carries the roof.'

b. *rduŋma-naŋ* *thokpo-ϕ* *rtsikpa-s* *khurenok.*
beam-Com roof-df-Abs wall-Erg carry-Pr.GInf
INSTRUMENT
INSTRUMENT PATIENT →EFFECTING AGENT
Non-Subject Non-Subject Subject
'With (the help of) a beam, the wall carries the roof.'

Note the little dialogue with the Saspol informant: B.Z.: Is it possible to say:

c. *rduŋma-naŋ* *thokpo-ϕ* *khurenok.*
beam-Com roof-df-Abs carry-Pr.GInf
INSTRUMENT PATIENT
Non-Subject Non-Subject
? 'The roof is carried with (the help of) a beam.'

SAS (spontaneously):

su-s?
who-Erg
EFFECTING AGENT
Subject
'By whom?'

(2) *thog-a* *trak-ø* *theakcasminuk.*
DOM roof-Aes truck-Abs be.able.to.carry-Ng.Ft
INSTRUMENT PATIENT
→EXPERIENCER
Subject Non-Subject
'The roof won't be able to carry the truck'. (Someone wanted to put a truck on the roof.)

Despite this apparent plurality of case marking in Tibetan, there are some syntactic restrictions for the subject slot: (a) The case marker for the subject slot (as well as for a few salient arguments, such as RECIPIENT and TARGET) cannot be substituted by a synonymous case marker or postposition, in contrast to case markers for less salient arguments (e.g. INSTRUMENT, BENEFICIARY, LOCATION, or SOURCE). (b) Only the subject slot allows pragmatic case neutralisations besides contrastive marking.[6] (c) The subject slot corresponds to the discourse topic or theme in neutral word order. (d) Shifts in position of the Subject depend on pragmatic motivations and are informationally marked in contrast to other arguments, which exchange their positions more freely. Together with other semantic-pragmatic criteria such as NP-accessibility, saliency hierarchy, etc., these features constitute a weak syntactic Subject. At least, the so-called "semantic" roles AGENT and PATIENT, introduced for the ergative languages, cannot be defined by purely semantic criteria; they also have syntactic properties.

Shamskat Ladakhi additionally shows a functional narrowing of the ancient ergative/instrumental case marker, which is no longer used for a typical INSTRUMENT, MEDIUM, or CAUSE argument, but only for the EFFECTING AGENT argument. The Instrumental as a peripheral argument marker is replaced by the Comitative, except for some rather marginal and obviously frozen patterns. In the Kenhat dialects, the EFFECTING AGENT argument is in the Genitive, and the Genitive is also found in the frozen patterns, but the INSTRUMENT is typically in the Comitative. The contrast of Subject and Non-Subject is thus quite evident in both Ladakhi varieties, while it is blurred by the formal identity of the case markers for the EFFECTING AGENT and the INSTRUMENT in other Tibetan languages.

It might be a promising approach to classify case markers according to their function, rather than their form when formal identity goes along with different syntactic behaviour for different functions. I will thus distinguish case markers according to their subject function ("Ergative", "Aesthetive") and non-subject function ("Instrumental", "Genitive", "Dative/Locative").[7]

2.2. An unexpected multitude of basic and marginal sentence patterns

The small set of standard sentence patterns, as used for the typological classification, usually accounts for less than half of the available verb frames of a given language. Due to my experiences with Ladakhi, I am not quite convinced that this is sufficient for the understanding of a particular language and that one can leave the greater "rest" of the more semantically motivated cases and prepositional or postpositional phrases for the lexical entries.

In the Domkhar dialect, verbs or readings with only one prototypical sentence pattern (01 or 08) make up merely 35% of all verbs and readings (41% with the ditransitive pattern 09), but many verbs allow pattern variation so that the respective patterns occur in 40% (52%) of all (1798) attested patterns.[8] There are eight additional main sentence patterns in Tibetan and Ladakhi, each of which is shared by several verbs (03-07, 10, 11) and/ or occurs with a certain frequency (02, 03, 06, 07). Patterns 03 and 07 have been mentioned in section 1. Pattern 06 is restricted to the expression of possession and some related verbs in most Tibetan varieties, but has been generalised in Ladakhi for all "transitive" [-control] verbs of perception, cognition, possession, change of possession, and modality.

The position of the comitative noun in pattern 11 is crucial. At the third position, it expresses a co-"object", but if the Comitative is shifted one position to the left, the second and third position collapse to a collective PATIENT. At the second position, the comitative argument expresses a co-"subject", but if the Comitative is shifted one position to the left, the first and second position collapse to a collective AGENT.

Table 4. Examples of clause types – main patterns

	1-place predicates			
01	change, movement	Abs	-	-
LLV	*kho-ø soŋ.* s/he-Abs went-Pa 'S/he went.'			
	2-place predicates			
02	predication, transformation	Abs	Abs	-
SAS	*kho-ø gergan-ø in / gyur.* s/he-Abs teacher-Abs is-Pr / become-Pa 'S/he is / became a teacher.'			

03	affection, goal oriented movement	Abs	~Loc	-
	(coming into) existence	~Loc	Abs	-
TIR	*kho-ø kušu-a thadet.* s/he-Abs apple-DatLoc like-Pr 'S/he likes apples/ the apple.'			
GYS	*(ɲoγ-e tshe)-a mentok-ø khyapteduk.* (we.incl-Gen garden)-DatLoc flower-Abs be.full-Perf 'Our garden is full of flowers.'			
04	get out, through, move away	Abs	Abl	-
ARA	*(di baspo)-ø la-na khelemiaŋ.* (this bus-df)-Abs pass-Abl be.able.to.cross-Ng.Perf 'This bus could not cross the pass.'			
05	contact, separation, atypical fill [-ctr]	Abs	Com[9]	-
SAS	*Tseriŋ-ø Aŋmo-naŋ ɾgyaŋsok.* Tsering-Abs Angmo-Com distance-Pa.Inf 'Tsering must have distanced himself from (lit. with) Angmo.'			
06	experience, possession, modality	Aes	Abs	-
SAS	*khi-a bila-ø thoŋse …* dog-Aes cat-Abs see-cc 'The dog saw a cat and …'			
07	directional activity	Erg	~Loc	-
SAS	*aba-s coktse-a ɾduŋs.* father-Erg table-DatLoc beat-Pa 'Father beat on the table.'			
08	non-directional activity, transformation	Erg	Abs	-
TIR	*kho-ze (di šruŋs-e kitap)-ø sil.* s/he-Erg (this story-Gen book)-Abs read-Pa 'S/he read this story book.'			
TIR	*kho-ze ɾalukšik-ø sat.* s/he-Erg goat.sheep-lq-Abs kill-Pa 'S/he killed some goats and sheep.'			
	3-place predicates			
09	bring-type, deposit[10]	Erg	~Loc	Abs
	transformation *(zgyur)*, division	Erg	Abs	~Loc
SAS	*gergan-is thruguŋun-la Iŋliš-ø ɬabanok.* teacher-Erg child-pl-DatLoc English-Abs teach-Pr.GInf 'The teacher teaches the children English.'			
SAS	*kho-s (luk tshaŋma)-ø pene-a zgyurs.* s/he-Erg (sheep all)-Abs money-DatLoc transform-Pa 'S/he made all the sheep into money.'			

10	take away-type			Erg	Abl‡	‡Abs
TIR	*łönpo-ze*	*miun-ikana*	*waŋmo-ϕ*	*kokstekher.*		
	minister-Erg	man-pl-PPosAbl	power-df-Abs	deprive.away-Pa		
	'The minister(s) deprived the men of their power.'					
11	connection, mixture, atypical fill [+ctr]			Erg	Abs	Com[9]
	compete with			Erg	Com	Abs
DOM	*kho-s*	*samar-ϕ*	*chu-naŋ*	*šresok.*		
	s/he-Erg	kerosene-Abs	water-Com	mix.PaInf		
	'S/he mixed kerosene with water.'					
GYS	*(Rigzin Palbar)-e*	*(Rigzin Jora)-raŋ*	*tshanrik-ϕ*	*thrap.*		
	(Rigzin Palbar)-Erg	(Rigzin Jora)-Com	science-Abs	compete-Pa		
	'Rigzin Palbar competed with Rigzin Jora in science.'					

There are thus as many as eleven main sentence patterns in Classical Tibetan and Ladakhi alike. In Domkhar Ladakhi they occur in 89% of all frames. The remaining 11% consist of about 40 additional marginal patterns. Some of them allow the same case to appear in several obligatory positions of three-place predicates, e.g. two or three times Absolutive (20, 21, 30) or two times Dative/Locative (25), something one would not expect on the basis of Classical Tibetan where only the instrumental case shows up twice in a sentence: as a Subject marker (Ergative) and for optional INSTRUMENT arguments (Instrumental). Double Absolutive is restricted to two-place predicates of predication sentences (02), case neutralisation (pragmatic ergative split, see note 6), and may perhaps be found in some derived verb constructions. Otherwise, doubling of cases for obligatory arguments seems to be avoided, something that cannot be said for Ladakhi.

Of special interest are patterns 12-14, where the sole argument of a one-place predicate receives an oblique case (Ablative, Aesthetive, and Ergative). Pattern 12 is attested so far only for a single impersonal expression, whereas pattern 13 is quite common as an alternative for the regular pattern 01 of (mental) state verbs, possibly indicating a greater affectedness. Pattern 14 again violates the definition of ergativity. It appears with the verbs *muk* 'bark' and *bos* 'howl' of dogs, wolves, and foxes, perhaps because these sounds are perceived as acts of communication or as affecting those who happen to perceive them.[11] Pattern 14 does not seem to be specific to Ladakhi, cf. LT *khyīː chāŋgiː* 'A dog-Erg is barking' (Goldstein and Narkyid 1984 sub 'bark') and LT *khōː ŋɥ̈ːsu* 'He-Erg cried' (Goldstein and Narkyid 1984 sub 'cry'). Communication verbs typically have a RECIPIENT argument (the addressee) as well as a CONTENT argument (the preceding or following speech). The CONTENT argument might even be filled with the

help of a *figura etymologica*. Rather infrequently, these verbs appear without any of these arguments as descriptions of intransitive activities. In such cases, the (still) EFFECTING AGENT remains in the Ergative. Thus one could think of 'barking' and 'howling' as communication verbs stripped of their RECIPIENT and CONTENT arguments. They would then correspond to the second meaning of *ɬta*, 1. 'look at', 2. 'have a look', which is likewise stripped of the TARGET argument, see (13c), section 3.2.1. 'Barking' and 'having a look' could perhaps be understood as intransitive derivations of basically transitive verbs, preserving the original case marking of the remaining argument.

Equally surprising is the use of the Genitive besides the expected Absolutive or Comitative (CT Instrumental) for the MEDIUM of [±ctr] 'fill' verbs (15 and 16 for [-ctr], 32 and 33 for [+ctr]) in Shamskat. The pattern is attested in principle for all inagentive and causative 'fill' verbs and verbs with related semantics, such as *skor* 'spread, scatter around' and *tram* 'distribute, spread'. No other Shamskat verb shows genitive case marking for any of its arguments, and the MEDIUM argument of other verbs, such as 'suffice' and 'repay' is always in the Instrumental.[12] The only explanation to me is that the construction must have been borrowed for the 'fill' verbs from the Kenhat dialects, where the distinction between Genitive and Instrumental is radically neutralised (if it were ever existent). Still, the elliptical combination of LOCATION and MEDIUM argument (patterns 16 and 33), signifying that every single spot of the particular CONTAINER has been filled, seems to be somewhat surprising and is not accepted by all informants equally for all verbs.[13]

Generally, one can observe an increase in dialectal or individual variation with the increase of marginality of the situation described. At the extreme end, expressions of exchange or barter cannot be said to show any pattern at all. This is due to the fact that the linear order of semantically symmetric arguments undergoing or performing the exchange is arbitrary. Symmetric arguments are thus preferentially represented by collective expressions (cf. section 3.3.2 below).

Table 5. Marginal patterns

	1-place predicates			
12	impersonal expression for have pain	Abl	-	-
DOM	*(ŋ-i trotp)-eaŋna zerekhyongenak.*			
	(I-Gen stomach)-PPosAbl ache.bring-Pr.Aud			
	'(It) aches/ burps out of my stomach.'			

13	states (with strong affection)	Aes	-	-
GYS	*(rinboche kundun)-a jaluga?* (chief.priest title)-Aes be.able.to.see.hon-Pr.Q 'Is the chief priest able to see?'			
14	some animal sounds, non-focussing use of sense organ (cf. example 13c)	Erg	-	-
TIR	*khi-ze muak.* dog-Erg bark-Pr.Aud 'A dog is barking.'			
	2-place predicates			
15	[-ctr] events and cause, media, etc.	Abs	Instr	-
	fill (with) [-ctr]	Abs	Gen	-
DOM	*kho-ø jigri-s šrante dar.* s/he-Abs fear-Instr very tremble-Pa 'S/he trembled badly with/ because of fear.'			
DOM	*dziŋ-ø chu-i gaŋseduk.* pond-Abs water-Gen fill-Perf 'The pond filled with water.'			
16	fill into (with) [-ctr]	~Loc	Gen	-
DOM	*daruŋaŋ zaŋzb-iaŋ chu-i maŋgaŋsok.* still pot-PPosLoc water-Gen fill-Ng.Pa.Inf '[Every single space] inside the pot is not yet filled with water.'			
	3-place predicates			
20	reflexive transformation *(co* 'do, make'*)*	Abs	Abs	Abs
SAS	*kho-ø khoraŋ-naŋ-khoraŋ-ø rgyapo-ø cos.* s/he-Abs s/he.self-Com-s/he.self-Abs king-Abs make-Pa 'He made himself king.'			
21	reflexive transformation *(zgyur)*	Abs	Abs	~Loc
SAS	*kho-ø khoraŋ-naŋ-khoraŋ-ø rgyapo-a zgyurs.* s/he-Abs s/he.self-Com-s/he.self-Abs king-DatLoc transform-Pa 'He transformed himself into a king.'			
25	labour-force exchange	Abs	~Loc	~Loc
TIR SAS	*khuis-ø skortsana, khõ-ø* *khuyu-ø skortsana, khoŋ-ø* threshing -Abs go.round-sim they-Abs *khimtsespaun-la balaŋ-iphia reaŋ.* *khimtsespaŋun-la balaŋ-a reruk.* neighbour-pl-DatLoc cow-PPos / -DatLoc depend-Pr 'At the time of threshing, they depend on their neighbours for the (exchange of) cows.'			

30	transformation *(co* 'do, make')	Erg	Abs	Abs
TIR	*gyapo-ze kho-ϕ yokpo-ϕ cos.* king-Erg s/he-Abs servant-Abs make-Pa 'The king made him (his) servant.'			
32	fill with [+ctr]	Erg	Abs	Gen
33	fill (into) with [+ctr]	Erg	~Loc	Gen
09	fill into	Erg	~Loc‡	‡Abs
DOM	*churpon-is rdziŋpo-ϕ ~ rdziŋp-iaŋ chu-i skileduk.* water.master-Erg pond-df-Abs ~ -PPosLoc water-Gen fill-Pr 'The overseer for the water filled (every single space inside) the pond with water.'			
SAS	*ŋa-s (zaŋsbu tshaŋm)-inaŋa chu-ϕ ~ -i skaŋspin.* I-Erg (pot all)-PPosLoc water-Abs ~ -Gen fill-Pa 'I filled water into all the pots / [the] inside [of] all the pots with water.'			
34	protect, chase away	Erg	~Loc‡	‡Abl
SAS	*šruŋmaŋun-is paŋdzotpo-a škunm-ekana šruŋs.* guardian-pl-Erg treasure-df-DatLoc thief-PPosAbl protect-Pa 'The guardians protected the treasure from thieves.'			

08	exchange, barter	Erg (collective)		Abs (collective)	
09		Erg (collective)		~Loc‡	‡Abs
11a		Erg (collective)		Abs	Com
11b		Erg	Com	Abs (collective)	
10		Erg	Abl	Abs (collective)	
40		Erg	Abl	~Loc‡	‡Abs
44		Erg	Com	~Loc‡	‡Abs
43		Erg	Com	Abs	Com

SAS *(Šama-naŋ Caŋpa)-s*
(Lowlander-Com Northener)-Erg
(culi-naŋ bal)-ϕ rjeps/ zdeps.
(apricot-Com wool)-Abs barter-Pa (08)
culi-a bal-ϕ rjeps/ zdeps.
apricot-DatLoc wool-Abs barter-Pa (09)
'The Sham people (Lowlanders) and Changthang people (Northerners) bartered apricots and wool / wool for apricots.'

SAS *Šama-s Caŋpa-na ~ -ekana*
Lowlander-Erg Northerner-Abl ~ PPosAbl
(culi-naŋ bal)-ϕ zdeps.
(apricot-Com wool)-Abs barter-Pa (10)
culi-a bal-ϕ zdeps.
apricot-DatLoc wool-Abs barter-Pa (40)
'The Sham people bartered with (lit. from) the Changthang people apricots and wool / wool for apricots.'

TIR	*Caŋtaŋpa-ze*	*Šama-ñampo*
	Changthang.people-Erg	Lowlander-PPosCom
	bal-ø	*naz-la ~ -nã*	*rjeb.*
	wool-Abs	barley-DatLoc ~ -Com	barter-Pa (44, 43)
	'The Changthang people bartered with the Sham people wool for ~ with barley.'		

Another surprise was the fact that additional INSTRUMENT arguments of [±control] sense perception may appear in the old Instrumental instead of the expected Comitative (the latter is attested only in the LLV and possibly in Domkhar[14]). The Ablative, however, seems to be more common, and not all perception verbs allow the Instrumental. Except for the instrumental arguments, the sentence patterns are not restricted to perception verbs and additional arguments, but may be found with other verbs and obligatory or optional core arguments: pattern 18 is attested so far only for the Classical Tibetan verb *rtsom* 'treat of', pattern 19 only for the Ladakhi verb *kan* 'press (while writing)', pattern 26 is quite common in Ladakhi, especially for experiencer derivations of patterns 03 and 06 (cf. section 3.3.5), pattern 27 is found with some verbs of [-ctr] acquisition. Note that the obligatory first argument is typically omitted in imperative constructions.

Table 6. Exotic additional arguments

18	use of sense organ, non-focussing	Erg	Abl	-
19		Erg	Com	-
47		(Erg)	Instr	-
SAS	*mig-is ~ -na*	*łtos!*	*lce-na*	*ñoŋ!*
	eye-Instr ~ -Abl	look-Imp	tongue-Abl	taste-Imp
	'Look by ~ from (the perspective of) your eyes! Taste from (the perspective of) your tongue!'			
LLV	*(lce·mo-ø*	*dar·gyi*	*mdud·pa)-daŋ*	*ma·myaŋ·ba*
	(tongue-Abs	silk-Gen	knot)-Com	taste-Ng.cc
	'Without taking a taste with the silk knot of the tongue …'			
26	sense perception through sense organ	Aes	~Loc	Abs
27		Aes	Abl	Abs
50		Aes	Instr	Abs
SAS	*kho-a*	*lc-eka*	*ŋarmo-ø*	*tshor.*
	s/he-Aes	tongue-PPosLoc	sweet-Abs	perceive-Pa
	'S/he perceived the sweet(ness) on the tongue.'			
SAS	*kho-a*	*mig-is ~ -na*	*micik-ø*	*thoŋanuk.*
	s/he-Aes	eye-Instr ~ -Abl	man-lq-Abs	see-Pr.GInf
	'S/he would see a man by ~ from (the perspective of) (his/her [own]) eyes.'			

3. Variation of sentence patterns

Variation of sentence patterns, particularly variation of focus and telicity (the spray/load type, see section 3.1.3 below) have been discussed in detail under various labels for Indo-European languages, but so far this phenomenon is rarely discussed for Tibetan languages, except for case neutralisations conditioned by discourse pragmatics (see note 6). Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed (1981: 46, 1992: 26–27) further mentions some semantically conditioned variations between patterns 07 and 08. Besides pragmatic case neutralisations and dialectal variance, Ladakhi shows several types of variation with and without semantic shift.

3.1. Variation without change of basic meaning

3.1.1. Variation motivated by (emotional) distance

Marked cases, in particular the Ergative might be replaced with the Absolutive in neutral statements. Although the replacement of the Ergative seems to follow a general tendency (cf. Bielmeier 1985: 141–143, also for the replacement of the Genitive), it occurred only from time to time and unpredictably in my interviews, without obvious semantic reason. Most often, the Absolutive was first used by the informants and the marked case was given then as alternative, spontaneously or on request. Sometimes the marked case was used first and then the Absolutive was given as alternative, spontaneously or on request. Quite frequently, however, the informants rejected an alternative with the Absolutive. Typically, the marked cases correspond to the classical pattern. As could also be observed, some speakers would show less variation, at least in the interviews.

This kind of variation is much more common in the Kenhat dialects (or at least in Gya-Sasoma). Here, the marked case indicates that the event is temporally or spatially distant, while the Absolutive is preferred when the event takes place in the present or a near past or close to the place of the speaker (and listener). This is especially true for the Ergative-Absolutive alternation, and as the second Domkhar informant admitted, this motivation might play a role for the Shamskat speakers as well, but unlike the Gya-Sasoma informant, none of the Shamskat informants described or conceptualised it on their own. In some cases, the marked case also indicates a kind of modal distance, namely some surprise or a stronger affectedness. The latter is especially true for the Absolutive-Aesthetive alternations.

(3) *butsa-ø ~ -s* *bumo-a* *zguks.*
SAS boy-Abs ~ -Erg girl-DatLoc wait-Pa
'The boy waited for the girl.'

(4) *(i* *naŋbo)-ø ~ -na* *gomse*
SAS (this house-df)-Abs ~ -Abl pass-cc
'Having passed this house …'

3.1.2. Variation depending on arguments

The use of the marked case, here the Comitative, corresponds to the classical pattern with the Instrumental for the MEDIUM of [±ctr] 'fill'. The older pattern was definitely rejected for *typical* media for the [-ctr] filling of pots, such as water, milk, curd, or grain, but appeared spontaneously with *less typical* media such as gold, pearls, or turquoise. Cf. also the example from the LLV with the [+ctr] verb and a likewise quite atypical MEDIUM of filling.

(5) a. *zaŋb-inãa* *chu-ø* *gaŋseduk.*
TIR pot-PPosLoc water-Abs get.filled-Perf
'The pot is filled with water (lit. into the pot water has filled).'
b. *zaŋbuo-ø* *ser-nã* *gaŋseduk.*
pot-df-Abs gold-Com get.filled-Perf
'The pot is filled with gold.'
LLV c. *(khyi·phrug* *de)-s* *(khyi·rkyag-daŋ* *khyi·lcin)-daŋ*
(puppy that)-Erg (dog.faeces-Com dog.urine)-Com
(naŋ *tshaŋ·ma)-ø* *bskaŋs·btaŋs /*
(house all)-Abs fill.give-Pa
'The puppy, with faeces and urine, filled up the whole house.'

3.1.3. Inversion, variation of focus, and additional arguments

(6) a. *kho-ø* *zdugzŋal-na* *drol.*
SAS s/he-Abs suffering-Abl get.free-Pa
'S/he succeeded to get free from suffering.'

b. *kho-a* *zdugzŋal-ϕ* *drol.*
s/he-Aes suffering-Abs get.free-Pa
'S/he happened to get free from suffering.'

(Informant's comment: the second event seems to be more accidental than the first. – With *tsonkhaŋ* 'prison', (6b) could only be used if the prison had collapsed.)

(7) a. *kho-ϕ* *kušu-a* *tshimseduk.*
SAS s/he-Abs apple-DatLoc be.satiated-Perf
'S/he has got/ eaten enough apples.'
b. *kho-a* *kušu-ϕ* *tshimseduk.*
s/he-Aes apple-Abs be.satiated-Perf
'S/he has got enough (of) apples.'

(Informant's comment: very difficult to differentiate, perhaps different importance on eater or apple.)

In my opinion, the difference lies in the degree of accidentalness, like in the preceding example. Note, however, that not all informants agreed to the second alternative for this verb.

(8) a. *garwa-s* *ser-la* *kagu-ϕ* *zos.*
SAS smith-Erg gold-DatLoc amulet-Abs produce-Pa
'The smith produced an amulet (working) on gold.'
b. *garwa-s* *ser-na* *kagu-ϕ* *zos.*
smith-Erg gold-Abl amulet-Abs produce-Pa
'The smith produced an amulet out of gold.'
c. *garwa-s* *ser-ϕ* *kagu-a* *zos.*
smith-Erg gold-Abs amulet-DatLoc produce-Pa
'The smith shaped the gold into an amulet.'

Verbs of the '(un)load' type[15] frequently show the following pattern:

(9) a. *khoŋ-is* *stakhur-ϕ* *poks.*
SAS they-Erg horse.burden-Abs unload-Pa
'They unloaded the horse burden.'
b. *khoŋ-is* *staŋun-ϕ* *poks.*
they-Erg horse-pl-Abs unload-Pa
'They unloaded the horses.'

c. *khoŋ-is* *st-ekana* *stakhur-ϕ* *poks.*
they-Erg horse-PPosAbl horse.burden-Abs unload-Pa
'They unloaded the burden from the horses.'

3.1.4. Variation in movement and direction

(10) a. *kho-s* *tri-ϕ* *rdoa-(:)* *truts.*
SAS s/he-Erg knife-Abs stone-DatLoc sharpen-Pa
'S/he sharpened the knife on a stone (moving the knife over a stone).'
b. *kho-s* *tri-a* *sakdar-ϕ* *truts.*
s/he-Erg knife-DatLoc rasp-Abs sharpen-Pa
'S/he sharpened the knife with a rasp (moving the rasp over the knife).'

(11) a. *chumaun-ϕ* *chu-a* *gor.*
TIR water.maid-pl-Abs water-DatLoc be.late-Pa
'The water maids were late *(to go/ start) for* the water.'
b. *chumaun-la* *chu-ϕ* *gor.*
water.maid-pl-Aes water-Abs be.late-Pa
'The water maids were late *(to come back) with* the water.'[16]

3.2. Variation for particular meanings

3.2.1. Polysemy and homonymy

(12) a. *Aŋmo-s* *Tseriŋ-a* *boseduk.*
SAS Angmo-Erg Tsering-DatLoc call-Perf
'Angmo has *called* Tsering.'
b. *Aŋmo-s* *Tseriŋ-ϕ* *dron-la* *boseduk.*
Angmo-Erg Tsering-Abs party-DatLoc call-Perf
'Angmo has *invited* Tsering for a party.'

With possible contrast of specific and unspecific TARGETs:

(13) a. *kho-s* *tiwi-a* *łtas.*
SAS s/he-Erg T.V.-DatLoc look-Pa
'S/he *watched* (the) T.V.'

b. *ŋa-s kitap-ϕ / Jammu-ϕ łtaspin.*
I-Erg book-Abs / Jammu-Abs look-Pa
'I *looked for* a book (in the shop) / went sightseeing in Jammu.'

c. *kho-s łtas.*
s/he-Erg look-Pa
'S/he *had a look*.'

3.2.2. [±control] variation

(14) a. *ŋa-(:) dzawo-ϕ thuk.*
SAS I-Aes friend-Abs meet-Pa [-ctr]
'I met my friend(s) (by accident).'

b. *ŋa-ϕ kho-naŋ thukpin.*
I-Abs s/he-Com meet-Pa [+ctr]
'I met with him/her (by appointment).'

3.2.3. TARGET "objectification"

The verb *rduŋ* 'beat, strike, hit (against, on)' expresses an activity directed towards a thing or animate being. Hence, the second argument, the TARGET, is in the Dative/Locative. In some derived verb constructions, such as 'to beat = play a drum' or 'to beat = knock at a door', the TARGET is semantically incorporated and treated as a PATIENT (15b and d). Neither [±animacy] nor [±definiteness] are responsible for the shift in case marking. If the Dative/Locative is applied on 'drum' or 'door', the original independent verb meaning reappears (15c and e).

(15) a. *žiŋbatpa-s buŋbu-a rduŋs.*
SAS farmer-Erg donkey-DatLoc beat-Pa
'The farmer *beat (on)* the donkey.'

b. *(de monbo)-s (draman soma)-ϕ rduŋs.*
(that mon-df)-Erg (drum new)-Abs beat-Pa
'That *mon* (musician) *played* a/ the new drum.'

c. *kho-s (ŋ-e draman)-la rduŋs.*
s/he-Erg (I-Gen drum)-DatLoc beat-Pa
'S/he *beat on/ hit against* my drum (accidentally or in order to make trouble).'

d. *kho-s* *zgo-ø* *rduŋs.*
s/he-Erg door-Abs beat-Pa
'S/he *knocked at* the door (in order to get in).'
e. *kho-s* *zgo-a* *rduŋs.*
s/he-Erg door-DatLoc beat-Pa
'S/he *hit against* the door (accidentally or in order to make trouble).'

3.3. Variation of valency

3.3.1. Ambitransitives

(16) a. *kho-ø* *skyuks.*
WAK s/he-Abs vomit-Pa
'S/he vomited [-ctr].'
b. *kho-s* *(culi* *maŋpo)-ø* *skyuks.*
s/he-Erg [!] (apricot many)-Abs vomit-Pa
'S/he vomited many apricots [-ctr].'

3.3.2. Reduction of symmetric arguments

Comitative arguments typically reflect a semantically symmetric relation with the subject (contact and exchange) or patient (connection and exchange) argument. The asymmetric case marking, however, shifts one of the arguments into the focus position. The choice depends on pragmatic features. In the neutral context of elicitation, the informants prefer a collective or enumerative expression, such as *khoŋ ñiska* 'they both' or (17b). Collective expressions are also typical of reciprocal events, and can be used in order to get rid of a second asymmetric argument (bearing a comitative or directional marker).

(17) a. *Tseriŋ-ø* *Aŋmo-naŋ* *rgyaŋs.*
SAS Tsering-Abs Angmo-Com distance-Pa
'Tsering distanced (himself) from Angmo.'
b. *(Tseriŋ-naŋ* *Aŋmo)-ø* *rgyaŋs.*
(Tsering-Com Angmo)-Abs distance-Pa
'Tsering and Angmo became distanced (from each other).'

3.3.3. Some reflexive actions

(18) a. *ã-ze* *gustiŋ-ϕ* *trhus.*
ARA mother-Erg clothes-Abs wash-Pa
'Mother washed the/ her clothes.'
b. *ŋa-ϕ* *lakpa-ϕ* *trhuspin.*
I-Abs hand-Abs wash-Pa
'I washed my hand.'

Reflexivity does not necessarily lead to an absolutive construction, and it is not yet clear when it does and when not.

3.3.4. Argument suppression (possessor constructions)

(19) a. *łönpo-ze* *miun-ikana* *waŋmo-ϕ*
TIR minister-Erg people-pl-PPosAbl power-Abs
koxsekher.
snatch.away-Pa
'The minister(s) snatched away the power from the people.'
b. *łönpo-ze* *(yülmi* *tshaŋm-e* *waŋmo)-ϕ*
minister-Erg (villager all-Gen power)-Abs
koxsekher.
snatch.away-Pa
'The minister(s) snatched away the villagers' power.'

(20) *kho-ei ~ kho-s* *papu-ϕ* *gons.*
SAS s/he-Gen ~ s/he-Erg woollen.shoe-Abs dress-Pa
'(S/he) put on his/her woollen shoes.'

Again, the informants often prefer the possessor construction, and in some cases, the more explicit construction seems to be blocked:

(21) a. *žiŋbatpas-s* *(lug-i* *bal)-ϕ* *draks.*
SAS farmer-Erg (sheep-Gen wool)-Abs shear-Pa
'The farmer sheared the wool of the sheep.'
b. *žiŋbatpas-s* *??lug-ikana* *bal-ϕ* *draks.*
farmer-Erg sheep-PPosAbl wool-Abs shear-Pa
'The farmer sheared the wool-Abs ??from the sheep.'

3.3.5. Experiencer derivation

Most [-control] verbs allow the addition of an EXPERIENCER argument. The construction expresses that something happened to a person without his or her control, although not necessarily without his or her intention. The experiencer construction can thus be used in place of an expression of ability. The closest equivalent seems to be German *gelingen*, as used both with a normal and a sarcastic undertone. The construction thus differs from Tournadre's (1996) ambivalent "1/2" verbs mentioned in section 1 above. I would take this construction as a sort of valency or argument raising derivation (in a few cases the valency remains the same), although the derivation is not marked on the verb. The alternative approach, namely to hold that the underlying verbs were ambivalent, faces the problem that there is no syntactic restriction for the derivation. In principle, the EXPERIENCER argument can be added to any verb of any valency. In the case of [+control] verbs, however, the derivation often needs stronger support from the context, and it might be semantically blocked, e.g. by the availability of a beneficiary reading. This is especially the case with verbs of higher valency.

(22) a. *(ŋ-i* *pakspa)-ϕ* *gokseyoŋenuk.*
DOM (I-Gen skin)-Abs peel.come-Pr
'My skin is peeling off.'
b. *kho-a* *(yaγ-i* *pakspa)-ϕ* *maŋgok.*
s/he-Aes (yak-Gen skin)-Abs peel-Ng.Pa
'S/he did/ could not get the skin of the yak peel off.'

Notes

1. Fieldwork in Ladakh is part of the research project on "Semantic roles, case relations, and cross-clausal reference in Tibetan" within the Special Research Program 441, supported by the DFG (see http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b11/). The purpose of the first field trip to Leh from July to September 2002 was to transcribe recordings of the Kesar epic with the help of Ladakhi informants. However, after only two weeks at 3.500 m above sea level, the electronic notebook showed severe symptoms of high altitude sickness and eventually broke down. I had thus to switch to unrecorded interviews about sentence patterns in Ladakhi, beginning with the transitive verbs of the LLV, a written version of the epic, and then going through the first quarter of Jäschke's ([1881] 1992) CT dictionary. The informants were

Phuntsok Dolma from Saspol in eastern Sham, Tundup Wanggyal from Tirit in central Nubra, Tsering Yudon from Aranuk in western Nubra, and Tsering Padma from Wakka in northern Purik. All these dialects can be subsumed under one group, which I would like to call "Shamskat" (dialects of Lower Ladakh). At the time of the first submission, all in all 362 or about 40% of the Ladakhi simple verbs (and their readings) were systematically tested.

Due to the quite unexpected results, the following field phases (2003-2007) were used for further exploration. With the help of the main informant Tshewang Tharchin, as well as Thrinlas Chosphel a (nearly) full set of 797 main entries (with 517 additional readings for 280 of the entries) could be established for the dialect of Domkhar in western Sham. It also turned out that the "Kenhat" dialects of Upper Ladakh differ quite substantially, not only in their phonetics, but also in their lexicon and grammar, thus the collection of data from Gya-Sasoma started in 2005, the informant being Tshomo Minggyur.

The paper focuses on simple verbs. Derived or light verb constructions as well as collocations behave in a quite unpredictable way, but have not yet been tested systematically.

The informants were asked not to delete obvious arguments (as they would do in natural speech) and to think of the verbs in question as stage plays, the actors of which have to be specified. Whenever it appeared promising, the sentence context was varied. In several cases, different types of arguments were tested. Doubtful cases and marginal patterns were discussed with as many informants and speakers as possible.

I would like to thank all informants for their patience, additionally also Rebecca Norman (SECMOL, Phe) for all the day- (and night-) long discussions on Ladakhi issues.

I would also like to thank the editors for providing an opportunity to present the fruits of our joint efforts to a greater public; I am particularly indebted to Felix Haller for working in all actualisations that occurred since the first submission.

2. As an approximation for the Tibetan term *thadadpa* (cf. Zeisler 2006: 65, n. 12 and note 5 below).

3. Abbreviations

1. Tibetan varieties and sources

ARA	Aranuk, western Nubra
CtrT	Central Tibetan
CT	Classical Tibetan
DOM	Domkhar, western Sham
EAT	Eastern Amdo Tibetan
GYS	Gya-Sasoma, Upper Ladakh
KHAL	Kesar story, recorded 1996 in Khalatse
LEH	Central Ladakhi, Leh standard

LLV	*Lower Ladakhi Version of the Kesar Epic* (Francke [1905–1941] 1981)
LT	"Lhasa" (Central and Exile) Tibetan
RGYA	*Das Märchen vom Prinzen Čobzaṅ* (Bielmeier 1985)
SAS	Saspol, eastern Sham
TIR	Tirit, central Nubra
WAK	Wakka, northern Purik
WT	Western Tibetan (Ladakhi and Balti)

2. Grammatical terms

Abl	Ablative (including postpositions in the tables)
Abs	Absolutive (zero)
Aes	Aesthetive (Dative/Locative as Subject case)
Aud	auditive knowledge
cc	clause chaining
Com	Comitative
ctr	control
DatLoc, D/L	Dative/Locative
df	definiteness marker
Erg	Ergative (Instrumental or Genitive as Subject case)
Ft	Future (unspecified)
Gen	Genitive
GInf	generic or inferred knowledge
Imp	Imperative
incl	inclusive plural
Inf	inferential knowledge
Instr	Instrumental
~Loc	locative case variable (including postpositions in the tables)
lq	limiting quantifier: 'one', 'some'
Ng	Negation
Pa	Past (unspecified)
Perf	Perfect (unspecified)
pl	Plural
PPos	Postposition
Pr	Present (unspecified)
Q	question final marker
sim	expression of simultaneity
( )	complex NPs on which a case marker operates as a whole
‡	preferred order, change of position possible

For the sake of simplicity, morphemes other than case will not be separated from the lexeme and the description will be kept as unspecific as possible.

Table 7. Realisation of case markers

	CT	Leh	Upper Indus	Sham/ Purik	Nubra
Instr, Erg	*kyis/ gis/ gyis/ -s*	*-e/ -i*	*-e ~ -se*	*-s/ -is ~ [ə]*	*-ze/ -tse*
Com	*daŋ*	*-naŋ (-ñampo)*	*-taŋ/ -daŋ/ -raŋ (-ñampo)*	*-na(ŋ) (-ñampo)*	*-nã (-ñampo)*
Gen	*-i/ kyi/ gi/ gyi*	*-e/ -i*	*-e ~ -se*	*-ei/ -i ~ [ə]*	*-ei/ -i*
D/L, Aes	*la*	*-a ~ (:)/ -la*	*-a ~ (:)/ -la*	*-a ~ (:)/ -la*	*-a ~ (:)/ -la*
Loc	*na*	-	*-ne (~ -nesu)*	(Purik: *-na*)	-
Loc./ Purposive	*tu/ du/ ru/ -r/ su*	*(-ru)*	*(-ru)*	*(-ru)*	*(-ru)*
PPosLoc	Gen + *naŋ + du, na, la*	Gen + *naŋa, ka*	*se*-Gen + *naŋa, ha*	Gen + *(n)aŋ(a), ka*	Gen + *(n)ãa, ka*
Abl	*nas, las*	*-ne*	*-ne ~ -nesu*	*-na*	*-na ~ -nas*
PPosAbl	Gen + *naŋ·nas*	Gen + *naŋne, kane*	*se*-Gen + *naŋne, hane*	Gen + *(n)aŋna, kana*	Gen + *(n)ã(n)a, kana*

4. A revised version with eleven basic patterns is given in Zeisler (2004: 254).
5. Cf. Zeisler (2004: 254; for further discussion of the directional pattern see also Zeisler 2006: 84–87). The modern Tibetan grammar describes the directional pattern as *thadadpa* 'with difference' referring to the traditional distinction of *bdag* 'self' (EFFECTING AGENT, INSTRUMENT) and *gžan* 'other' (PATIENT, TARGET). The term *thadadpa* is widely taken to mean 'transitive', but according to the Tibetan mainstream, inagentive transitive verbs, such as *perceive something*, are excluded (Zeisler 2006: 65, n. 12). Nevertheless, since the first argument of a *thadadpa* verb always takes the ergative marker, ergativity and "difference" or agentive transitivity are obviously defined in circular dependency. Whether seen as "transitive" or "intransitive", the directional pattern violates the standard definition of ergativity.

   It should be emphasised that the TARGET argument (i.e. the thing or person towards which an activity is directed) cannot be understood as a PATIENT that merely takes a somewhat idiosyncratic case marker. Even in that case, the directional pattern would not be the standard pattern for transitive sentences. LaPolla's claim (1992: 3–4) that Ladakhi and the dialect of Purik show primary object marking and thus generally (Balti only partly) dative/locative marking of the PATIENT in transitive, but absolutive marking in bitransitive sentences is contrary to evidence. The relevant data are already presented in Rangan (1979: 73–75) and Koshal (1979: 65). LaPolla seems to have mistaken Francke's ([1901] 1979: 12) and Bailey's (1920: 5)

rather superficial statements that "datives" might be found where they would have expected "accusatives" (i.e. Absolutives). For Balti see Read (1934: 7–8) and Bielmeier (1985: 138–140).

6. See e.g. Tournadre (1991) for the contrastive use of the Ergative for intransitive actors and the de-emphasising use of the Absolutive for transitive actors. Contrastive marking can also be found in the patient slot (cf. Tournadre 1994: 645; Zeisler 2006: 73–80).
7. I will not distinguish between the subject and non-subject functions of the absolutive, for the very reason that it is not a case marker in its own right, but a non-marker. The sign *'-ø'* will be added in the examples merely for the convenience of the reader. It does not represent any entity.
8. According to a counting in 2004 the latter number comes close to the total percentage of the corresponding frames in German (48% out of 17381 frames), but the distribution differs fundamentally: the monovalent intransitive pattern supplies 21% of all frames in Domkhar, but only 8% in German, the bivalent transitive pattern 19% in Domkhar, but 32% in German, and the trivalent pattern of the 'give' type 12% in Domkhar, 8% in German (the German data was derived from GermaNet with the help of Claudia Kunze, GermaNet).
9. Comitative arguments are often replaced by collective expressions, cf. 3.3.2.
10. The locational and the absolutive arguments of 'deposit' verbs may exchange their position freely, the second slot being reserved for the more specific and given argument.
11. The Tirit informant suggested that there could be some reason for barking (e.g. somebody is coming). He also suggested a directional and/ or communication reading: *khize* (Erg) *mia* / *khisaa* (DatLoc) *muak* 'The dog is barking at a man / the dogs'. Cf. the difference between English *'The dog is barking at me'* and *'The cow is mooing *at me'* (Sam Featherston, SFB 441, University of Tuebingen). The Domkhar informant would use this pattern only for a concrete event and a specific animal, not for statements about dogs or foxes in general. He would subsume under the verb *bos* also a particular kind of meowing, which sounds like the crying of a child and might be taken, particularly at night time, for the crying of a ghost: *jiks-mājiks! ŋaci bilas* (Erg) *boseinak* 'Don't be afraid! (It is only) our cat (that) cries'.
12. Cf. also Khapalu Balti *ta khwe*, *rgyalu Cobzaŋ*, *miγiŋ* (PPosLoc) *chuŋwe* (Gen) *cal skaŋseyotpa*. 'Now tears had been filled completely into his, prince Cobzang['s], eyes' RGYA (36/14, 4) besides *miγiŋ* (PPosLoc) *chuŋo* (Abs) *cal skaŋse* 'tears having been filled completely into [his] eyes' RGYA (36/14, 7–8). *cal* seems to be an intensifying and/ or onomatopoetic expression, indicating i.a. completeness or surprise. Most probably it can only be used with *skaŋ* and similar verbs (for similar collocations, cf. Zeisler to appear).
13. E.g., patterns 16 and 33 seem to be the preferred ones for the Saspol informant for the verbs *gaŋ* and *skaŋ;* she apparently also interpreted KHAL

luŋba (Abs) *še* (Gen) *skaŋs* (32) '(He) filled the valley with the flesh (of the animals)' as *luŋba:* (DatLoc) *še* (Gen) *skaŋs* (33). But the main Domkhar informant originally rejected pattern 33 totally for *skaŋ* and said that he would not use pattern 32 although it seemed correct. He also objected to the use of pattern 15 for *gaŋ* with the two arguments *zaŋsbu* 'pot' and *chu* 'water', but had no objection with respect to other combinations of CONTAINER and MEDIUM. By contrast, the second Domkhar informant accepted patterns 15 and 16 equally for the verbs *gaŋ* and *khil*, patterns 32 and 33 for the verb *skil* and *skaŋ*.

14. In Domkhar, the Comitative is typically realized as *-na*, only infrequently as *-naŋ*, merging thus with the Ablative and rare uses of the Locative. The informant opted for a comitative interpretation 'with, by means of', alternatively for a locative interpretation 'on', rather than for an ablative interpretation 'from (the perspective of)'.
15. A similar pattern is found with [-ctr] verbs as 'to be filled' or 'to be blocked'.
16. Informant's comment: "Chumas always go to the river and lose their time by playing etc. and then they are late". Shepherds, by contrast, could only be late to start with the goats, pattern (11a), but, according to a somewhat androcentric logic, they would not be late in bringing them home.

References

Bailey, Thomas Graham

1920 *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas. Being Studies in the Grammar of Fifteen Himalayan Dialects*. (Asiatic Society Monographs 18.) London: Royal Asiatic Society.

Bielmeier, Roland

1985 *Das Märchen vom Prinzen Čobzaṅ. Eine tibetische Erzählung aus Baltistan. Text, Übersetzung, Grammatik und westtibetisch vergleichendes Glossar*. (Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung 6.) St. Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Dixon, Robert M. W.

1995 *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Francke, August Hermann

1979 Reprint. *Ladakhi and Tibetan Grammar*. Original edition, Sketch of Ladakhi grammar, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 70: 1–63, 1901.

1981 Reprint. *The Epic of Gesar*. (ed. by Kunzang Tobgyel, and Mani Dorje) (Vol. 29.) Thimphu, Bhutan: Druk Sherig Press. Original edition, *Gšamyulna bšadpaḥi Kesargyi sgruŋs bžugs. A Lower Ladakhi Version of the Kesar Saga*. (Bibliotheca Indica 168.), Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1905–1909 (Fasc. 1–4), 1941 (Fasc. 5).

Goldstein, Melvin C., and Ngawangthondup Narkyid
1984 *English-Tibetan Dictionary of Modern Tibetan*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

Haller, Felix
2006 Verbal valence in Shigatse Tibetan and Themchen Tibetan. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 29 (2): 63–77.

Jäschke, Heinrich August
1992 Reprint. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary. With Special Reference to the Prevailing Dialects*. Original edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1881.

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

LaPolla, Randy J.
1992 Anti-ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15 (1): 1–9.

Rangan, Krishnasamy
1979 *Purki Grammar*. (Central Institute of Indian Languages Grammar Series 5.) Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Read, Alfred Frank Charles
1934 *Balti Grammar*. (James G. Forlong Fund 15.) London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed
1981 *Bodkyi brdasprod rigpaḥi khridrgyun rabgsal meloŋ* [The very clear mirror, a guide to the understanding of Tibetan grammar]. Khreŋtuḥu: Sikhron Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaŋ [Chengtu: Szechuan National Publishing House].
1992 *Bodkyi brdasprod rigpaḥi khridrgyun rabgsal meloŋ: Le clair miroir. Enseignement de la grammaire tibétaine*. (Traduit, adapté et commenté par Heather Stoddard et Nicolas Tournadre.) Arvillard: Editions Prajñā, Collection Tibétaine.

Tournadre, Nicolas
1991 The rhetorical use of the Tibetan ergative. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 14 (1): 93–107.
1994 Tibetan ergativity and the trajectory model. In *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*, Hajime Kitamura, Tatsuo Nishida, and Yasuhiko Nagano (eds.), 637–648. Osaka: The Organising Committee.
1996 *L'ergativité en tibétain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée*. (Bibliothèque de l'Information grammaticale 33.) Louvain/Paris: Peeters.

Zeisler, Bettina
1999 Verbalkonstruktion im Ladakhi. / Relative tense and aspectual values in Tibetan languages. A comparative study. Ph. D. diss., Freie Universität Berlin.

2004 *Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Languages. A Comparative Study.* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 150.) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

2006 The Tibetan understanding of *karman*: Some problems of Tibetan case marking. In *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages II (PIATS 2003: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Oxford 2003),* Christopher I. Beckwith (ed.), 57–101. (Brills Tibetan Studies Library 10.) Leiden/Boston: Brill.

to appear "Wenn du deine Mühle gemahlen hast, womit mahlst du dann dein Mehl?" – Idiomatische Wendungen im Ladakischen.