Bettina Zeisler: Beyond evidentiality, the case of Ladakhi *inok* & Cie.

1 General information

1.1 The 'Ladakhi' dialects

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

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

1.2 'Evidentiality' markers in the Ladakhi dialects

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

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

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

The Ladakhi quote marker, on the other hand, is quite similar to markers of 'direct' evidence as it presents the content as immediately perceived, without judging the truth values or the social adequacy of the reported content, while inferen-

tials can have a slight connotation of uncertainty, although usually not of hedging. Even more important, in Ladakhi and Tibetan, quote markers scope over all other 'evidential' and evaluative markers, as well as over illocutionary force.

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

The traditional and still current evidential distinctions always omit one important base of knowledge, nameley knowledge about what I, the speaker, know about myself plus possibly what I know about all that belongs to my personal (or cultural) sphere. This lived self-experience, which has also been described in terms of 'privileged access' (see here also Garrett 2001: 16) or less suitably as 'egophoricity', differs considerably from other observations and is, of course, the most direct knowledge one could ever have. One could argue with Wittgenstein that this kind of immediate 'knowing' is not knowledge, belief, or certainty in any meaningful (philosophical or psychological) sense, not even the absence of doubt, just because it does not come with the connotation that there might be a possibility of doubt or the necessity of justification by reasoning or experiments (I draw this from Malcom (1991), who refers to Wittgenstein's essay *On certainty*). The content from such 'knowing' is beyond doubt or simply *not at issue* or perhaps better with this marvelous German word: *unhintergehbar*.[1]

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

In my oppinion, these two attitudes: *content not at issue* and *content at issue* form the fundamental opposition of what is usually described as an evidential system in the Tibetic languages, at least so in Ladakhi. I would thus argue that the auxiliary system in Ladakhi, and possibly also more generally in Tibetan (and similar languages), is not so much, or not only, about access channels, but also, or

---

[1] I am aware that the term 'not-at-issue' is already used in the linguistic discussion for presupposed background or also common ground knowledge. But there is no better description for this subjective perspective of a statement *not being at issue for further discussions*.

perhaps dominantly, about the speaker's attitude of personal commitment (not-at-issue-ness) or non-commitment (at-issue-ness). The traditional evidential and epistemic categories are then sub-categories of the non-committed stance.

Visual and non-visual perceptions are usually not discriminated in the Tibetic languages, but the latter receive a special marker, *rag* in all Ladakhi dialects, except western Purik. It may be the case, however, that *ḥdug* and *rag* do not primarily discriminate different sensual channals, but rather between the most immediate and less immediate perceptions. The Ladakhi dialects have a large set of additional 'evaluative markers'[2] (EM) for general (i.e., shared and shareable or non-personal) knowledge, inferences, estimations, and/ or probabilities, and for mental distance, with no, little, and strong hedging epistemic functions.

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

Since one's statements are necessarily based on one's particular knowledge and framed by one's relevant attitude, questions naturally have to take into account the knowledge base and possible attitude of the addressee: *what do you know, have seen, have heard, think is the case? Does John look like he is sick*? This speech act related perspectivising can also be observed in English modals, e.g. *Shall you attend the meating? – Yes, I shall* (British English of the 1950s)[3] or also *Might you go to the party? – I might (go)* (cf. Berqvist & Kittilä 2017: 21). That is, questions naturally target "the addressee's assessment […] not the speaker's" (ibid.).

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

in the Tibetic languages the msap-related Set 1 markers can only be applied to controllable situations, the category of other includes not only all situations pertaining to 2P and 3P in statements and 1P and 3P in questions, but also all non-controllable and non-controlled situations relating to 1P in statements and 2P in questions.

Table 1 The unmarked distribution of Ladakhi auxiliaries

verbal domain	Set 1: MSAP authoritative	Set 2: OTHER directly observed	
identifying	*yin*	—	
future	*yin*, zero	—	
attributive	*yin / yod*	*ḥdug*	*rag*
existential	*yod*	*ḥdug*	rag
simultaneous	*yod / yin*	*ḥdug*	rag
perfect/ resultative	*yod / yin*	*ḥdug*	rag
prospective	*yod / yin*	*ḥdug*	rag
past/ anterior	*pa.yin*	zero, (*soŋ*, (*byuŋ*))	—
all verbal domains		evaluative markers: *yin, yod* & EM	
		quotation: *lo*	

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

domain	Set 1: *yin / yod*		Set 2: *ḥdug*	
identificatory copula	MSAP	OTHER	—	
future	MSAP	OTHER	—	
past/ anterior	MSAP	OTHER	—	
attributive copula	MSAP	OTHER	OTHER	(MSAP)[5]
existential, possession	MSAP	OTHER	OTHER	MSAP
present/ simultaneous	MSAP	OTHER	OTHER	(MSAP)[6]
perfect/ resultative	MSAP	OTHER	OTHER	MSAP
prospective	MSAP	OTHER	OTHER	—
evaluative markers (EM)	OTHER		MSAP	
quotation/ hearsay	MSAP & OTHER			

With the exception of the bleached verbs *soŋ* and *byuŋ* and the marker for non-visual perception rag, the auxiliaries and constructions subsumed under OTHER can be used for the MSAP in almost all temporal domains and vice versa, see Table

---

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

3   Ernest N. McCarus in a reply to a query by Mike Maxwell, posted on the Linguist List 04 Jun 1999. https://linguistlist.org/issues/10/10-856.html (retrieved on 16.03.2017).

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

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

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

6   Apart from self-perception through media, there is a particular use in the casual polite question *What are you (folk) doing?*, confined to the more central Ladakhi dialects.

2. Such usages are, however, pragmatically conditioned and highly marked. When using Set 1 markers for OTHER, one claims authority and/ or responsibility for the situation and the other person and/ or personal involvement. Conversely, when using Set 2 or evaluative markers for the MSAP, one declines authority and/ or responsibility and/ or personal involvement for various reasons, none the least politeness.

1.3 'Evidentiality' and the use of *inok* and its dialectal counterparts

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 3 GEM, SEM, and the marker for non-visual sense perception

dialect	dialect region	GEM	SEM	non-visual
Turtuk	eastern Balti	*inmaŋ*	=GEM	—
Sumur	central Ldumra	*intsuk*	*inak*	*rak, -ak*
Ciktan	western Purik	*intsuk*	*inɖak*	*ɖak*
Mulbek	western Purik	*intsuk*	n.d. *[inɖak]*	*ɖak*
Domkhar	western Sham	*intsuk*	*inak*	*ɖak, -nak*
Teya	eastern Sham	*inok*	*inak*	*ɖak, rak, -nak*
Lingshed	southern Sham	*inok*	*inak*	*ɖak, rak, -nak, -ak*
Kardong	Ldumra border	*inok*	*inak*	*rak*
Leh	central Ladakh	*inok*	n.d. *[inak]*	*rak*
Leh 2nd gen.		*inok*	*indarak~inɖak*	*rak*
Rumbak	central Ladakh	*inok*	*inɖak*	*rak*
Shachukul	Lalok	*ɦindak*	*ɦinrak*	*rak*
Kargyam	Lalok	*ɦindak*	*ɦinrak*	*rak*
Merak	Lalok	*jinak~jindak*	*jindak~jinrak*	*rak, ʈak* (possess.)
Shara,Gyaik	Upper-Indus	*jinak*	*jindarak*	*rak*
Gya-Mīru	Upper-Indus	*ɦinak*	*ɦindarak*	*rak*
Kuyul	Tibetan border	*ɦindak*	*ɦinɖak*	*ɖak*
Kharnak	Himachal border	*jinɖaʾ*	*jinʈaʾ*	*ʈaʾ*
Faδum	Central Zanskar	*ɦinoʾ*	*ɦinɖaʾ*	*raʾ*
Paldar[7]	mixed enclave	*ɦinoʾ*	*ɦinderaʾ*	*raʾ*
Pangi[8]	Zanskar enclave	*jinnɛ*	=GEM	—
Spiti[9]	Himachal	*jinuk*	*(jindarak)* ?[11]	*ʈak*
Smustang[10]		*rak ~ nak*	—	—

---

[7] Paldar is an enclave in the Kishtwar district of J & K. The dialect is of the Zanskari type.

[8] Pangi is a district (*tehsil*) in Himachal Pradesh. The language, spoken in a few hamlets is a strange mixture of Balti and Zanskari features, plus features of an – as yet – unidentified Tibetan language. My guess would be a Kham dialect. Strangely enough, Pangi is sandwiched between Paldar and Zanskar.

[9] Bielmeier (2002: 109–113).

[10] Bielmeier (2002: 113, 116, 118–121).

[11] Hein (2007) mentions the form, without, however, describing its precise function.

Note the partial formal overlapping of the GEM and the SEM!

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

GEM	SEM	non-visual
intsuk – mentsuk	inḍak – menḍak	ḍrak – minḍak ~ minak
inok – menok ~ manok	(h̃)inak – menak ~ manak	rak –
h̃indak – mandak	h̃inrak – manrak	mirak ~ minak ~ merak
h̃inak – manak	h̃indarak – mandarak	
jinḍak – manḍak ~ maḳ	jinṭak – [manṭak]	ṭaˀ – meṭaˀ
jinnε – mennε		

2 The various uses of the Ladakhi GEM

2.1   The use of the GEM for inferences

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

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

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

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

Given the inferential function of the morphemes involved, it is not at all surprising that the combination with the copula may still have an inferential value. I should argue that this inferential value is a subfunction of an original admirative function of non-commitment of the auxiliary *ḥdug*, not just an effect of the evidential neutral character of the GEM, as Oisel (2017: 96) would argue for the 'factual' markers *red* and *yod.red*.

(1)   Ciktan 2016
ŋ+i   zosta   ṛtsokpo   soŋ-se-intsuk.
I+GEN   appearance   bad/dirty   go.PA-LB-GEM=PERF
'I must look ugly. (Lit. My appearance must have become ugly.)' (Inference, e.g., because somebody stares at me in a strange way.)

(2)   Domkhar 2014
kho   khjaks-e-**intsok**.
s/he   freeze-LB-GEM=PERF
'S/he is freezing (as I can infer through visual input).'

(3)   Gya-Mīru 2015
Drukʧhen   rinboʧhe-se   gonba   ɲīŋba   tshaŋma-(:)
Drukchen   rinboche-ERG   monastery   old   all-ALL
ʒikso   ʧē-ʒe   thug-a   goŋ-en-**inak**.
repair   do-GRD   hon.heart-ALL   hon.consider-CNT-GEM=CNT.PRS
'The Drukchen rinboche is apparently thinking of repairing the old monasteries.' (The speaker infers this indirectly from frequent utterances of the rinboche about the desolate state of the buildings.)

(4)   Lingshed 2016
kho-a   snambu   maŋbo   jot-sok.
s/he-AES   *snambu*   many   have-INF/DST
*di   snambu tshaŋma tshoŋ-na, pene   maŋbo   thop-ʧa+**nok**.*
this   *snambu* all   sell-CD   money   much   get-GRD+GEM
'S/he must have many *snambu* (traditional woolen cloth). If [s/he] sells all these *snambu*, then [s/he]'ll get a lot of money.'

The first sentence of (4) contains an inference based on sense perception:[12] we have seen that these people have many sheep, hence a lot of wool, hence a lot of *snambu*. The second sentence contains a predictive inference based on reasoning concerning a future situation, based on this fact. The form *-ʧanok* contains the gerundive *ʧa* and the contracted form of the GEM *inok*.

2.2   Identifications through sense perceptions

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

---

[12]   Hengeveld & Hattnher (2015: 486) have chosen the rather misleading term 'deduction' for this, reserving the term 'inference' for mental reasoning. The latter is termed 'assumption' by Aikhenvald (2014: 9) in contrast to 'inference' based on perceptual evidence.

Table 3 for the two forms (and their obvious relation) and Table 4 for their negated forms.

(5)   Ciktan 2016
*du   tʃhaŋ   **intsuk.**   /   indak.*
this+DF   chang   GEM   SEM
'This is *chang* (the local beer) (as I can see / as I can taste).'

(6)   Shachukul (2016)
*i   maɡmal   **ɦindak.**   /   ɦinrak.*
this velvet   GEM   SEM
'This **is/ looks** like velvet (**identified through vision**). / This is/ feels like velvet (identified through touching).'

(7)   Lingshed (2016)
*d·u   tʃhaŋ   **inok.**   /   d·u   ŋati   tʃhaŋ   inak.*
this+DF *chang*   GEM   this+DF we.incl.GEN *chang*   SEM
'This **is/ looks** like *chaŋ* (the lokal beer, upon **judging the colour**). / This is/ tastes like our *chaŋ* (tasting it blindfolded.)'

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

2.3   The explanatory mood: shared and shareable knowledge

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

(8)   Domkhar (2011)
*watse   khitsoks-i   semʃen-i   riks   **intsok.***
fox   dog.like-GEN   animal-GEN   class   GEM
'The fox is a dog-like animal.' (Fact expected to be, or presented as, **generally known** or presented in an **explanatory mood** to somebody who does or might not know.)

(9)   Khalatse *Village history* 2006
*Brokpa-s   «Brokrgjut   intsok»   zer-e-**intsok.**   o   le.*
Brokpa-ERG   Brok.lineage   GEM   say-LB-GEM=PERF   that hon
'The Brokpas (Dards) have (always) been saying [explaining to me, BZ, who did not know this] that [they] are (as everybody knows) of the Brok [that is, Gilgit] lineage. That [is how it is].'

(10)   Stok *Kesar* 1996
«abi   tʃi_   _inok,   phats+enaŋa   gul-kan-ʒik   duk-pa?»
grandmother   what GEM   sack+PPOS   move-NLS-LQ   VIS.exist-emph
*zers-pa   «ta   gjapo   khen,   tʃhak-tʃe-ʒik   **jot***
say.PA-NLS   now   king   please   break-GRD-LQ   ASS.exist
*gul-tʃe-ʒik   tʃi-aŋ   **med-le»**   zers-pa*
move-GRD-LQ   what-FM   NG.ASS.exist-hon   say.PA-NLS
'«Grandmother, what could this be, (I see) in the sack there is something that moves?» [he] said. «Oh my king, please, (I can assure you), there is [only] something breakable [inside], there is not anything moving (I can assure you).» [she] said.'

(11)   Turtuk 2017
*gi+u   mobail   in.   /   apo,   gi+u   mobail   **inmaŋ.***
this+DF mobile.phone   ASS.be   grandfather this+DF mobile.phone   GEM
*gi+u   fo:n   taŋ-m+ephia   in.   /   **inmaŋ.***
this+DF phone   give-NLS+PPOS ASS.be   GEM
'This is a mobile phone (neutral). / Grandpa, this is a mobile phone (talking nicely or polite). This is for making phone calls (neutral / talking nicely or polite).'

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

(12)   a.Kharnak 2018
*khjø'   gergen jin-a?   – ŋa gergen man.   ŋa ʈuris gait   **jinḍa'.***
fam.you teacher ASS.be-QM   I teacher NG.ASS.be I tourist guide   GEM
'Are you a teacher (expecting assertion)? – No, I'm not a teacher (assertive), I'm a tourist guide (as you might want to know).'

b.Kharnak 2018
*khjø'   jāgzi   jin-a?   – ŋa jāgzi   man.   ŋa gergen   **jinḍa'.***
fam.you yakherd ASS.be-QM   – I yakherd NG.ASS.be I teacher   GEM
'Are you a yak herder (expecting assertion)? – No, I'm not a yak herder (assertive), I'm a teacher (as you might want to know).'

c.   Kharnak 2018
*khjø'   gergen jin-a?   – ŋa gergen   **maṇḍa'***
fam.you teacher ass.be-QM   I teacher   NG.GEM
'Are you a teacher (expecting assertion)? – No, I'm not a teacher (you might want to correct your error).'

In the Ciktan dialect, the usage differs somewhat. According to the informant, the GEM is only used when the speaker expects the addressee to already know, whereas the Set 1 markers are used when the speaker expects the addressee not to know.

(13) Ciktan 2016

tʃiktan-la   ʒi(k)-khan-i   khar-po jot-e-intsuk.   / jot.
Ciktan-ALL   ruin-NLS-GEN   castle-DF exist-LB-GEM=PERF   ASS.exist
'In Ciktan, there is a ruined castle (as you know / you might not know).'

2.4 Shared observations

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

(14) Ciktan 2017

dun-p₊ika   roaʈ-po   duk.   / dun-po   roaʈ   intsuk.
front-DF₊PPOS   road-DF   VIS.exist   front-DF   road   GEM
'In the front is a road (the addressee is not looking / speaker and addressee are looking together).'

2.5 The use of the GEM to express shyness or shame

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

(15) Nurla

*ŋa   tshoŋpa   **inok.***
I   merchant   GEM
'I am (**only**) a merchant.' (Adapted from Bielmeier 2000: 95, no. 65)

(16) Stok *Kesar* 1996

*«ŋa₊(:) dontaŋ   phul-tʃe   **met.**   abi   gatmo-ʒik   inok.»*
I₊AES   meal   offer-GRD   ASS.have   grandmother   old-LQ   GEM
'«I don't have any food to offer [you] (I can assure you). [I] am only an old grandmother (and I feel shame).»'

(17) Chushul 2016

*ŋa   taruaŋ   lōpʈuk-ʃik   **hinak-**pa,   ʈhel-te   ʃi-a-rak.*
I   still   student-LQ   GEM-emp   be.ashamed-LB   die-NLS-NVIS=PRS
'I am (unfortunately) still a student. I'm so ashamed, I'm going to die.'

(18) Shara (2016)

*ŋa̱   ʒara   **ḫinak.***
I   blind   GEM

ŋ₊e̱   dzamo-aŋ   ʒara   ḫinak.
I₊gen   friend.fem-too   blind   GEM

kho dʒarmani-ne   ḫinak.
s/he   Germany-ABL   GEM
'(**Embarrassingly**,) I am blind (as you must know). My friend is also blind (you might not know). She is from Germany (you might not know).' (The speaker does not know that I actually know her friend.)

In the last example, there might be two motivations for the use of the GEM in the first part. Of course, everybody who has seen the speaker will know that she is blind, it is thus not exclusive personal knowledge. The speaker, however, confirmed in 2017 that the GEM can be used in her dialect to express one's sense of inferiority, e.g. to say that one is a person without education, whereas the GEM could not be used when one introduces oneself as a teacher.

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

(19) Lingshed 2016

*ŋa-s   sam-et-pin   nakʃ₊er̥kila dordʒe in.   inaŋ ŋaraŋ   **inok.***
I-ERG   think-ASS-RM=IMPF picture₊PPOS Dorje   ASS.be but   I.self   GEM
'I had thought the one in the middle of the picture was Dorje, but it is me.'

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

(20) Rumbak 2017

*ŋ₊e   kho rardzi   in-kjak   sam. kho gergan-dʒik in-**tsok.***
I₊ERG   she goatherd   be-DST   think s/he   teacher-LQ   be-DST
'I thought s/he is/ was [only] a goatherd. [But] s/he is/ was a teacher.'

(21) Shara 2016

ŋ₊e   sam kho   swiḍen-enãa   ḫot-(kanak)   sam.
I₊ERG   think s/he   Sweden-PPOS   exist-(DST)   think=PA=II

*ḫinaŋ ʈaksa kho lē-ne   ḫot-**suk!***
but   now   s/he Leh-ABL/LOC   exist-DST
'I thought s/he was in Sweden, but now s/he is in Leh!'

(22) Shara 2016

ŋ₊e   khjoraŋ   gergan   tʃē₊fen.
I₊ERG   fam.you   teacher   do₊RM=ASS.PA

*ḫinaŋ khjoraŋ endʒio ʃrul-at-**suk**-pa,   ma̱(:)   heran   soŋ!*
but   fam.you NGO   run-AUX=PRS-DST-emp   very   surprising   become.PA

'I thought you were a teacher (lit. I did you teacher). But you are running an NGO, this is a big surprise!'

Some Kenhat speakers use the normal, that is, dialect-specific GEM both for the wrong assumption and the surprise realisation, the only difference then being the emphatic intonation for the latter. However, for some speakers, the Shamskat GEM may also appear in the specific context of identifying a surprise guest or recognising onself on a photograph. The form then indicates that some reasoning is involved.

(23) Liktse 2018
*ŋ+e̱-ne   sam khjøraŋ lugzi   **ji̱nak**   sam,   ṭīṭʃar   **ji̱nak!***
I+ERG-TOP think fam.you shepherd GEM   think teacher GEM
'I thought you were a shepherd, [but] you are a teacher!'

(24) Liktse 2018
au   rinṭʃen jin-tsuk-pa! / ji̱nak-pa!   –
uncle(FB) Rincen be-DST-emp   GEM-emp
ma̱n   ŋa au   rinṭʃen ma̱n,   au   dorje jin,   ṭʃī   zer-hak?!
NG.ASS.be I uncle(FB) Rincen NG.ASS.be uncle Dorje ASS.be what say-DST
'[Oh] you are uncle (i.e., father's brother) Rincen (sudden recognition involving thinking / direct recognition)! – No, I am not uncle Rincen (assertive), I am uncle Dorje (assertive), what are you saying?!'

(25) a. Liktse 2018
o   ŋ+e̱-ne   i(:)žuŋa ɦo-kan-de   no̱   ji̱nak   sam.
intj I+ERG-TOP this+PPOS exist-NLS-DF younger.brother GEM   think
ma̱n-tsuk   ŋa̱raŋ jin-tsuk.
NG.be-DST   I.self be-DST
'Oh, I thought the one in the middle [of the photograph] was [my] younger brother. [But] it isn't him, it's me!' (Sudden realisation: the speaker had misidentified himself.)

b. Liktse 2018
i(:)ʒuŋa ɦo-kan-de   no̱   ma̱nak-pa   ŋa̱raŋ ji̱nak.
this+PPOS exist-NLS-DF younger.brother NG.GEM-emp I.self   GEM
'The one in the middle [of the photograph] is not my brother (as you said), it is me (as you might want to know).' (Explanatory mood: somebody else had misidentified the person on the photograph.)

2.7 Use of the GEM besides other markers for imagined situations

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

(26) Lingshed 2016
*ŋa gjapo_ **_inok**,   ŋa ṭhi+(:)ka   dug-et.*
I   king   GEM   I   throne+PPOS   sit-ASS=PRS
*kheraŋ jokpo_ **_inok**   s+eka   duk!*
you   servant GEM   ground+PPOS sit.IMP
'I'll be the king. I'll sit on the throne. You'll be the servant. Sit on the ground!'

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

(27) Gya-Mīru-(b) 2015
khjoraŋ   gjafo ɦin-tsuk. khjoraŋ ṭhi-seha   dar+a-ɦot-suk.
fam.you   king   be-DST   fam.you   throne-PPOS sit+NLS-AUX=PRS-DST
ŋa̱   lōnpo   ɦin-tsuk. s+eha   dar+a-ɦot-suk.
I   minister   be-DST   ground+PPOS sit+NLS-AUX=PRS-DST
'You'll be the king. You'll sit on the throne. I'll be the minister. [I]'ll sit on the earth.'

I am particularly grateful to the second Gya-Mīru informant for drawing my attention upon this usage, which nicely parallels the French *imparfait préludique*.

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

(28) Gyaik 2016
*pērna,   ŋa̱ kh+e   khimtsepa   **ji̱n-kak.***
give.example-LOC:CD I   s/he+GEN   neighbour   be-DST
*ji̱naŋ ji̱t+u   **me̱-kak** :   te-zane   kho tɕhukpo ɦod-a-met.*
but   mind+LOC NG.exist-DST that-when she rich   ASS.be-QM-NG.ASS.be
*ŋa̱+(:) te-re   ji̱+tu   **ɦo+kak***
I+AES   that-DF   mind+LOC exist+DST
kho-a   khampa ɦot-pen,   kho-a   galḍi   ɦot-pen.
s/he-AES   house   ASS.have-RM s/he-AES car   ASS.have-RM
te+(:)ɦa   kho te-zane-aŋ   tɕhukpo ɦot-tɕē-duk-pen,   zer-at.
that+PPOS s/he that-when-FM rich   be-GRD-VIS-RM   say-ASS=PRS
'For example, I might be his/her neighbour, but would not remember whether s/he was rich or not [in the past]. [But] I would know this: s/he had a house [and] s/he had a car. Therefore I will say s/he seems to have been rich also at that time.'

(29) Lingshed 2016
*ṛperna ŋa gowa   **inok**.   kheraŋ julpa   **inok**.*
e.g.   I village.head GEM   you   villager   GEM
ŋa-s   kheraŋ-a las   ma̱ŋbo taŋ-et ...
I-ERG   you-ALL   work much   give-ASS=PRS
'For example, I am/ **might be** the village head. You are/ **might be** a villager. I give you a lot of work …'

(30) Tagmacik 2019

r̥pek   bor-na,   kheraŋ gaiḍ   **intsok.**
example put-CD   fam.you guide   GEM
'For example you are/ **might be** the guide.' (Instruction setting)

2.8 A question of status and authority

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

(31) Shachukul 2016

A student belonging to the village was expected to make an important list together with the other villagers. In the meeting, the village head had told everybody to come on time next morning at 10 o'clock, but nobody came in time, some people did not come, at all. The student was quite frustrated and went to search the villagers, telling them:

«daŋ   ṭap   tʃõ-ɦan-naŋʒin   oyo   tshaŋma+(:) **gju**   **ɦot:**
yesterday meeting do-NLS-according   we.incl all+AES   knowledge ASS.have
teriŋ   gaṛi   tʃū-ika   dzom-tʃi,   ɦinaŋ   su-aŋ   tu-ika   mā-lep.»
today   clock 10-PPOS meet-GRD   but   who-FM time-PPOS NG-arrive
'«Following yesterday's meeting, all of us **know it well** (**authoritative**): today [we were supposed] to meet at ten, but nobody came on time.»'

tene tʃe   ãa-ʒig-a   ṣo   ɦoŋ-de,   «khjoraŋ   su_   _ɦin,
then   mother-LQ-AES anger come-LB   fam.you.self who ASS.be
‹ŋɛt   tshaŋma+(:) **gju**   **ɦot›**   zer-kan?!
we.excl.coll all+ALL   knowledge ASS.have say-NLS
khjoraŋ   toruŋ datpa ma-tsho-a-ɦindak!
fam.you.self still brain NG-ripe-NLS-GEM=PERF
ɲɛ-ᵃ   terek zer-tʃi tʃi_   _in?!
we.excl-ALL such say-GRD what   ASS.be
gow+e   terek zer-na+ŋ ḍik.   ɦinaŋ khjot   su_   _in?!»
village.head+ERG such say-CD+FM be.ok but   fam.you who   ASS.be
'Then one lady (lit. mother) became angry [and said]: « *Who are you* to tell us ‹that we all **know it well** (**authoritative**)›?! You are, as it appears, still wet behind the ears! *What [kind of manner] is this, talking to us in this way?! If the village head speaks like this, it is ok. But who, [do you think], are you?!*»'

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

«daŋ   ṭap   tʃõ-ɦan-naŋʒin   oyo   tshaŋma+(:) **gju**   **ɦot:**
yesterday meeting do-NLS-according   we.incl all+AES   knowledge ASS.have
teriŋ   gaṛi   tʃū-ika   dzom-tʃi   tʃõ-re,
today   clock 10-PPOS meet-GRD   do-LB
khjoraŋ   tʃīphia tu-ika   mā-lep?
fam.you.self why   time-PPOS NG-arrive
jaŋ   tʃīphia ṭū-a   ɲɛt   ṭu-pen?»
again   why   youngster-ALL blame dig-RM=ASS.PA
tene ãa   kha   daŋ-de-lu.
then mother mouth gape-LB-be.left
'«Following yesterday's meeting, all of us **know it well** (**authoritative**): it was agreed to meet at ten today, so why didn't you come on time? And why did you wrongly scold the youngster?» Then that lady couldn't say anything any more (lit. was left with the mouth open wide).'

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

2.9 Use of the GEM in gentle speech to small children

When talking to small children, the GEM is commonly used in a rather playful manner. A very common usage is to ask the child about the identity of a person that is coming for a visit or just entering the room. Several times, I have been the object of that question, but I also observed one aunt asking her niece about herself. The usage has so far been attested in all Ladakhi dialects. Some informants commented that the speaker assumes that the child may perhaps not know. But the child always answers in the same tone, even when referring to his or her close relative.

(32) Sumur 2016

kho / ŋa su **intsuk.** –
s/he I   who GEM
kho / ø atʃe   niki   **intsuk.** matʃuŋ   **intsuk.**
s/he   elder.sister Niki GEM   aunt(MYS)   GEM
'Who might this / I be? – She is / [You] are elder sister Niki, mother's younger sister.'

(33) Faδum 2019 with 8ys niece (living in the same household)

ŋa su_   _ino?, ʃe-ðe?   – ʃe,   aʒaŋ   ino?.
I who GEM   know-QM   know uncle(MB)   GEM
'Who might I be? Do you know? – I know, [you] are [my] uncle (mother's brother).'

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

When talking of generic facts in the explanatory mood, speakers of the Kenhat dialects prefer the construction verb stem I & nominaliser & GEM, contracted to -anok or -anak with the negated forms -a-manok and -a-manak (in some dialects

also contracted to -*amak*), see also Table 4 for the negated forms of the GEM. My late host always used to ask me and I was supposed to answer accordingly:

(34) Leh dialog
ŋeraŋe   jul-a   ʧi   joŋ-anok?
hon.you-GEN   country-ALL what   come-NLS.GEM
nas   joŋ-anog-a?   ʈo   joŋ-anog-a? –
barley come-NLS.GEM-QM   wheat   come-NLS.GEM-QM
ŋaʧi   jul-a   nas-aŋ   joŋ-anok,   ʈo-aŋ   joŋ-anok.
we.excl.GEN country-ALL barley-FM come-NLS.GEM wheat-FM come-NLS.GEM
inaŋ   ɖas   joŋ-a-manok.
but   rice come-NLS-NG.GEM
'What [kind of crops] are growing (lit. coming) in your country? Do you have (lit. does come) barley? Do you have wheat? – In our country we have barley as well as wheat. But we don't grow rice.'

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

(35) Shara 2016
khjore   kho-a   pēne   ɲuun-ʒik   mane   mā-taŋ-na,
you.self.ERG s/he-ALL   money   few-LQ   except   NG-give-CD
kh+e   le   ʧē-a-manak.   /   ʧē-ʧe-man.
s/he+ERG work do-NLS-NG.GEM   do-GRD-NG.ASS.be
'S/he won't work (inference / we know), if you give only a small amount of money.'

(36) Rumbak 2017
ŋa thore   koaʈ-la   ʧh+et.   tene tasil ofisla   ʧh+et.
I tomorrow   court-ALL go+ASS=PRS   then tehsil office-ALL go+ASS=PRS
testiŋne   boaɖ ofis-la   ʧh+et.   sukul-a   soŋ-te
thereafter board office-ALL go+ASS=PRS school-ALL go.PA-LB
maigreʃen seʈifiket-po   khjoŋ-et.   tene tshan ʧha-anok.
migration certificate-DF bring-ASS=PRS   then night go-NLS.GEM
'Tomorrow I'll go to the court. Then I'll go to the tehsil office. Thereafter, I'll go to the [education] board office. [Then] when I've been to the school, I'll get (lit. bring) the migration certificate. Then, most probably, it is going to be night.'

(37) Lingshed 2016
ʧiba ʈhugu ʧhu   traŋm+enaŋ   duk-ʧug-et?
why child   water cold+PPOS   stay-let-ASS=PRS
kho-a   traŋmo ʧha+(:)nok-pa!   /   ʧh+et-pa!!
s/he-AES cold   go+NLS.GEM-emp   go+ASS=PRS-emp
'Why do you let/ make the child stay in the cold water? S/he is going to get cold!' (The first alternative is more neutral. / The second alternative is more alarmed.)

3 Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore, I presented the various functions of the Ladakhi GEM or *inok* & Cie in order to enable speakers and researches of the Central and East Tibetan and also other Tibetic varieties to compare these usages with the actual usages of *red* (or its equivalent) and acquire a better understanding of its position in the evidential, epistemic, and attitudinal system of these varieties. *red* (or any of its regional counterparts) will certainly not translate all usages of the GEM. But I expect similar pragmatic reasons behind its usage, notably reasons that have to do with 'engagement' or the assumed knowledge state of the addressee or the whole speech community.

Informants:

Cikṭan (Shamskat, Purik): Sarfraz Ahmed; Domkhar (Shamskat, Western Sham):
Tshering Diskit, & others;
Faδum (Kenhat, Zanskar): Sonam Tundup;
Gyaik (Kenhat, Upper Indus): Jigmet Angmo;
Gya-Mīru (Kenhat, Upper Indus): Mengyur Tshomo and Jigmet Yangdrol;
Kārgyam (Kenhat, Lalok): ChambaTsetan;
Khardong (Shamskat, Ldumra-border): Tshewang Rigdzin;
Kharnak (Kenhat border to Himachal): Tsering Angtrak;
Kụyul (Kenhat border to China): Jigmet Tandar;
Lingshed (Shamskat, Southern Sham): Tundrup Namgyal;
Paldar (Kenhat, Himachal): Tenzin Yangdu;
Pangi (Kenhat, Himachal): Tenzen Dolkar;
Rumbak (Kenhat, Stok range): Kunzang Dolma;
Shachukul (Kenhat, Lalok): Tsering Kundzes;
Shara (Kenhat, Upper Indus): Thugje Dolma;
Sumur (Shamskat, Ldumra): Stanzin Yangskit aka Niki;
Tagmacik (Shamskat, Western Sham): Phuntsok Dolma;
Teya (Shamskat, Eastern Sham): Tshering Dolkar;

Selected abbreviations:

"=" means "is" (it is not a clitic marker!)
x_ _y indicates assimilation or fusion across the word boundary
+ is used for fused/unsegmentable morphemes
AES: aesthetive (transitive experiencer marking);
ASS: assertive (not at issue);
AUX: neutral auxiliary;
coll: collective;
DST: distance marker (showing mental distance);
EM: evaluative marker (cover term for inferential, probability, and distance markers);
emp: emphatic particle;
FM: focus marker;
GEM: GENERALISED EVALUATIVE MARKER;
GRD: gerundive;
INF/DST: inferential-*cum*-distance marker;
LB: *lhag.bcas* morpheme aka 'Semifinalpartikel' (for clause chaining);
LQ: limiting quantifier ('a', 'some');
MSAP: main speech act participant;
NVIS: non-visual (or less imediate perceprion);
PPOS: postposition;
RM: remoteness marker (1. derives imperfect from present, 2. assertive past marker;
3. distant but well remembered situations of OTHER!);
SEM: SPECIALISED EVALUATIVE MARKER;
VIS: visual (or most immediate perception)

References:

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna. 2014. The grammar of knowledge: a cross-linguistic view of evidentials, and the expression of information source. In: Alexandra Yurievna Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *The grammar of knowledge. A cross-linguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–51.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna. 2015. Evidentials: their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19.2: 239–277.

Berqvist, Henrik and Seppo Kittilä. 2017. Person and knowledge: introduction. *Open Linguistics* 3: 18–30. doi 10.1515/opli-2017-0002, accessed 21.03.2017.

Bielmeier, Roland. (2000). Syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic-epistemic functions of auxiliaries in Western Tibetan. In: Balthasar Bickel (Ed.), *Person and evidence in Himalayan languages*, Part I. Special issue of *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23.2 79–125.

Floyd, Simeon, Elisabeth Norcliffe, and Lila San Roque (Eds.), *Egophoricity*. (Typological Studies in Language, 118.) Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins. doi 10.1075/tsl.118.

Garrett, Edward John. 2001. *Evidentiality and assertion in Tibetan*. PhD dissertation, University of California.

Hein, Veronika. 2007. The mirative and its interplay with evidentiality in the Tibetan dialect of Tabo (Spiti). *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30.2: 195–214.

Hengeveld, Kees and Marize Mattos Dall'Aglio Hattnher. 2015. Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil. *Linguistics* 53.3: 479–524. doi 10.1515/ling-2015-0010, accessed 31.10.2016.

Malcolm, Norman. 1991. The relation of language to instinctive behaviour. In: John Hyman (ed.), *Investigating psychology. Sciences of the mind after Wittgenstein*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 27–47.

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.

Oisel, Guillaume. 2017. Re-evaluation of the evidential system of Lhasa Tibetan and its atypical functions. *Himalayan Linguistics* 16.2: 90-128. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9v08z3b4, accessed 28.03.2017.

Simon, Camille and Nathan W. Hill. 2015. Tibetan. In: Nicola Grandi and Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 381-388.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2008. "Arguments against the Concept of 'Conjunct'/'Disjunct' in Tibetan". In: Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart, and Paul Widmer (Eds.) *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag. Band I: Chomolangma*. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, pp. 281–308.

Zeisler, Bettina. 2017. The emergence of the Ladakhi inferential and experiential markers out of a marker for admirativity (non-commitment): the case of ḥdug and snaŋ. *Journal of South Asian Languages and Linguistics* 4.2: 259–307.

Zemp, Marius. 2013. A historical grammar of the Tibetan dialect spoken in Kargil (Purik). PhD-thesis, University of Berne.