SYNTACTIC, SEMANTIC, AND PRAGMATIC-EPISTEMIC FUNCTIONS OF AUXILIARIES IN WESTERN TIBETAN[1]

Roland Bielmeier
University of Berne

There are two basic auxiliary verbs for 'to be' which seem to be used in all Tibetan varieties including, of course, Written Tibetan (WT). In terms of WT, one *yin* and the other is *yod*. In a sentence they occur either as finite verb forms (usually in final position), or enter as auxiliary morphemes into complex predicate structures. In this paper, only the first usage will be exemplified.[2]

Syntactically, in most spoken varieties the (etymological) correspondences of WT *yin* seem to be mainly used to link a subject, usually in first position, with a predicative complement, usually in second position, both marked by absolutive case on the syntactic level. Both the subject and the predicative complement are usually either a noun or a pronoun, but adjectives also occur sporadically as predicative complements. On the syntactic level, therefore, the correspondence of WT *yin* in a given spoken variety may be called a "linking auxiliary verb."

Semantically, in the spoken varieties the correspondences of WT *yin* often denote the identity of the subject[3] or else an intrinsic and unchangeable quality of the subject, with the predicative complement describing the subject in its totality or giving a definition of the subject. This is the reason why we find mainly nouns or pronouns as predicative complements on the syntactic level. This linking function is called "equative" on the semantic level.[4] On the syntactico-semantic level, we may speak of a "linking equative function" and concisely refer to a correspondence of WT *yin* as an "equative auxiliary verb."

With the (etymological) correspondences of WT *yod* in the spoken varieties we find various syntactic constructions. The basic syntactic pattern is that of a

---

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the third meeting of the European Cooperation Project on Himalayan Languages in Heidelberg (4 - 6 June 1998).

[2] The material of the discussed dialect varieties has not been collected with special regard to the topic of this paper. Therefore, it is possible that there are gaps in this respect. Only after more field research will it become possible to recheck some results. For the same reason, it is not possible at present to discuss the usages of these auxiliaries in questions or in embedded speech.

[3] Properly speaking, in the discussed dialect varieties, the first argument on the semantic level is the patient, but for the sake of convenience, I will hear use the syntactic notion "subject" on the syntactico-semantic level.

[4] Compare van Driem 1998: 125, 135 and Brigitte Huber's paper in this volume and her note 6 for further references.

subject marked in the absolute case followed by a correspondence of WT *yod*. This basic sentence can be extended by adding a locative or a dative argument in first or second position. In such cases we cannot speak of a "linking function."

Semantically, the basic pattern denotes existence, as e.g., in English 'there is water.' This can be extended to express location by adding a locative argument, e.g., 'there is water in the milk,' or possession by adding a dative argument, e.g., 'there is water with me,' in the sense of 'I have water'. In the last case, the dative argument often takes the first position. Since these functions are based on denoting existence they are called "existential" on the semantic level. On the syntactico-semantic level, we may concisely label a correspondence of WT *yod* as an "existential auxiliary verb."

In all dialects considered so far, the correspondences of WT *yod* are used in existential functions. However, in most dialects they may also be used quite similarly to the correspondences of WT *yin*, by extending the basic syntactic pattern with a second absolute argument, thus linking a subject, usually in first position, with a predicative complement, usually in second position. In this case, the speaker uses the correspondence of WT *yod* to ascribe a particular quality, expressed through the predicative complement, to the subject. This is the reason why we find usually only adjectives as predicative complements on the syntactic level. This linking function is called "attributive" on the semantic level.[5] On the syntactico-semantic level, we may speak of a "linking attributive function."

Sometimes it is difficult to make a clear-cut distinction purely on the semantic level between the equative and linking attributive function. On the syntactic level, as already mentioned, with the equative function expressing identity a noun or pronoun is used as the predicative complement, but to express an intrinsic quality an adjective is used as the predicative complement. In the same way, the attributive function expressing a particular quality also uses an adjective as predicative complement. Therefore, in the case of an adjective as predicative complement we have to decide on the semantic level whether we are dealing with the equative or with the attributive function. According to the available material, there are only very few examples with a correspondence of WT *yin* used in the attributive linking function. On the other hand, again according to the available material, we do not find correspondences of WT *yod* in the equative function using nouns or pronouns as predicative complements.[6] However, we have to consider further auxiliaries occurring in the various spoken varieties with regard to their equative, existential and attributive functions on the syntactico-semantic level.

---

[5]   Compare van Driem 1998:135 and Brigitte Huber's paper in this volume.

[6]   But compare example (11) of Brigitte Huber's paper in this volume on Lende Tibetan (Kyirong) where *jø:* is used with a noun as predicative complement.

BALTI[7]

Excluding derivations, *in* (WT *yin*) and *jot* (WT *yod*) are the only auxiliaries used in Balti Tibetan,[8] the westernmost Tibetan dialect, situated in northern Pakistan and belonging to Western Archaic Tibetan (WAT).[9]

For Balti *in*, compare the following examples:

(1) *kʰjaŋ*   *su*   *in?*
     you.ABS   who.ABS   be
     'Who are you?' (R. 15, GHL 41)

(2) *ŋa*   *ahmat*   *in*
     I.ABS   Ahmad.ABS   be
     'I am Ahmad.'

(3) *ladax*   *ŋati*   *pʰajul*   *in*
     Ladakh.ABS   we.INCL.GEN   fatherland.ABS   be
     'Ladakh is our fatherland.' (GHL 38)

(4) *kʰo*   *legi*   *rixmet*   *in*
     he.ABS   very   of.low.status.ABS   be
     'He is of very low status.'

(5) *ŋa*   *antʃan*   *men*
     I.ABS   strong.ABS   NEG.be
     'I am not strong.' (R. 78)

---

[7]   The examples are taken from Read 1934 (= R.), Lobsang 1995 (= GHL) and from the story in my book (= RC = Bielmeier 1985: 28ff.). The transcriptions have been adapted and the glosses are mine. For all remaining material I am gratefully indebted to the late Wezir Ghulam Mehdi, to Mohammad Abbas Abdul Karim, and to S. Bahadur Ali Salik.

[8]   In all spoken varieties there are inferential, modal and different tense forms morphologically derived from the simple auxiliaries, which cannot be dealt with here systematically. Compare for example the inferential derivations *insuk* and *jotsuk* in Balti. A further auxiliary is Balti *naŋ* 'apparently is, seems to be' with its negative correspondence *medaŋ* and the affirmative past *naŋpa* 'was' (cf. R. 61f.); cf. e.g., *di gonmo ljaxmo naŋ* 'This garment appears to be nice.' (R. 62), *de tʰaŋpikʰa stayʒi tʃik saŋ medaŋ* 'There is apparently not a single tree on that plain.' (R. 62). In the following examples we can see the gradual transformation of *duk* towards an auxiliary, which, however, unlike *jot*, is still conjugated like an ordinary verb:
kʰosi ŋana broŋen duget   'He keeps on (lit. "remains" R.B.) annoying me.' (R. 65)
de rila ridaq oŋen jot   'Ibex are coming (continually) on that mountain.' (R. 39)

[9]   For the classification and the linguistic geography of the Tibetan dialects see Bielmeier et al. 1998.

On the syntactic level, *in* is exclusively used as a linking auxiliary verb, with the subject usually in first position and the predicative complement in the second position, both in the absolutive case.

Sometimes the predicative complement may be marked by a case other than the absolutive. Compare the following example with the predicative complement in the genitive:

(6)   *dju*   *ɲi*   *in*
       this.ABS   I.GEN   be
       'This is mine.' (R. 15).

This sentence is apparently abbreviated from a structure like

(7)   *dju*   *ɲi*   *karol*   *in*
       this.ABS   I.GEN   cup.ABS   be
       'This is my cup.' (R. 36).

A further syntactic exception is the possibility of ellipses (subject deletion) in cases like:

(8)   *diriŋ*   *tʃʰoɣo*   *ʒaq*   *in*
       today   great   day.ABS   be
       'Today is a great day.' (R. 81),

(9)   *mentax*   *in*
       true.ABS   be
       '(It) is true.' (RC 2,10)

(10)   *su*   *in*   *ŋa*   *in*
       who.ABS   be   I.ABS   be
       'Who is (it)?   I am (it is I)' (R. 36).

But compare:

(11)   *dju*   *su*   *in*
       this.ABS   who.ABS   be
       'Who is this?' (R. 53)

(12)   *dju*   *tʃi*   *in?*   *dju*   *ʃoɣbu*   *in*
       this.ABS   what.ABS   be   this.ABS   book.ABS   be
       'What is this?   This is a book.' (R. 36)

On the semantic level, in the above sentences *in* is used to denote identity between subject and predicative complement, or else the predicative complement

renders an intrinsic and unchanging quality of the subject. We may conclude that on the syntactico-semantic level *in* has a linking equative function, i.e. is an equative auxiliary verb. This usage of *in* applies to statements regardless of whether or not the speaker is involved as participant on the syntactico-semantic level, as subject, experiencer or possessor.

On the syntactico-semantic level, Balti *jot* usually denotes existence, i.e. 'to be (present, situated, etc.)', and together with the oblique case expresses location, i.e. 'to be (situated at, etc.)', or possession 'to have'. Being used as an existential auxiliary verb to express existence, location or possession, *jot* presents no problem, as in the following examples:

(13) *ŋa   dikʰa   jot-pa*
      I.ABS   here   be-PAST
      'I was here.' (R. 75)

(14) *di   omi-ŋnu   tʃʰu   jot*
      this.ABS milk.GEN-in.POSTP   water.ABS   be
      'There is water in this milk.' (R. 78)

(15) *ŋa-la   naŋ-tʃik   jot*
      I-DAT   house-a.ABS   be
      'I have a house.' (R. 37)

(16) *ŋi-ʃida   polo-tʃik   jot*
      I.GEN-with.POSTP ball-a.ABS be
      'I have a ball.' (R. 37)

Whereas *in* is never used to denote existence, location or possession, *jot* may occur, similarly to *in*, in a linking function on the syntactic level[10]:

(17) *sa   ma   juntse   jot*
      earth.ABS   very   little.ABS   be
      'There is very little earth.' (R. 80, lit. 'The earth is very little.')

---

10 Read (1934: 36) says: "*inma* must never be used in place of *jotpa*, when the latter means 'to exist'. *jotpa* can, however, sometimes replace *inma* without being a mistake." Further (p. 35) he states: "*jotpa* gives the meaning of 'to exist' and 'to be present' and is much more definite than *inma*...The expression in English 'there is' is translated by this *jotpa*." The forms *inma* and *jotpa* quoted by Read are the verbal nouns or infinitives of *in* and *jot*; *jotpa* may also denote the past tense of *jot*. Of course, Read's notion "definite" is different from what for the time being I am calling "definite (knowledge)", cf. the characterization of my notion "definite knowledge" towards the end of the section on Balti.

(18) *lam*   *doxmo*   *jot*
     path.ABS   narrow.ABS   be
     'The path is narrow.' (R. 78)

(19) *kʰo*   *legi*   *kʰaspa*   *jot*
     he.ABS   very   skillful.ABS   be
     'He is very skillful.'

(20) *kʰo*   *xlotʃan*   *jot*
     he.ABS   intelligent.ABS   be
     'He is intelligent.'

(21) *kʰo*   *skjutpo*   *jot*
     he.ABS   rich.ABS   be
     'He is rich.'

(22) *diriŋ*   *ma*   *graxmo*   *jot*
     today   very   cold.ABS   be
     'Today (it) is very cold.' (R. 81)

(23) *di*   *kuʃu*   *ljaxmo*   *met*
     this   apple.ABS   good.ABS   NEG.be
     'This apple is not good.' (R. 80)

Since *jot* may be used in a linking function similar to *in*, the distinction between *in* and *jot* has to be further clarified, cf. contrastive sentences like:

(2)   *ŋa ahmat in*   'I am Ahmad.'
(11)   *dju su in*   'Who is this?'
(5)   *ŋa antʃan men*   'I am not strong.'

(19)   *kʰo legi kʰaspa jot*   'He is very skillful.'
(20)   *kʰo xlotʃan jot*   'He is intelligent.'
(21)   *kʰo skjutpo jot*   'He is rich.'

As we can see, on the syntactic level the predicative complement in Balti sentences with *in* consists of a noun or a pronoun, rarely of an adjective. With *jot* only adjectives occur in the role of the predicative complement. Semantically this may be interpreted in the sense that *jot* has a (linking) attributive function ascribing a particular quality to the subject through the predicative complement, as opposed to the (linking) equative function of *in* denoting an intrinsic quality. A further difference may consist in the fact that with *in* speaker subjects often occur. With *jot*, on the other hand, speaker subjects do not occur. This

becomes understandable when we keep in mind that the speaker, by using *jot* in the attributive function, with himself as subject expressing previous personal experience, would in fact be making a statement about a quality of himself of which he had learnt only some time ago. This case may occur, but is rare.[11]

Now the question remains whether there is also a difference between *in* used in its equative function and *jot* used in its attributive function on the pragmatic-epistemic level.

Read (1934: 36) demonstrates this difference with the following two sentences:

(24) *di   sman-po   ljaxmo   in*
      this   medicine-DET.ABS good.ABS   be
      'This medicine is good.'

(25) *di   sman-po   ljaxmo   jot*
      this   medicine-DET.ABS good.ABS   be
      'This medicine is good.'

He explains: "...if we were to say *di smanpo ljaxmo in* we should suggest that the ingredients and the quality of the medicine are good, but that its value as a curative has not been proved...*jot* 'is' implies that the speaker has knowledge of the thing in question...This points to the healing property and suggests personal experience, i.e. 'I have used this medicine and it is good'."

On the pragmatic-epistemic level, by using *in* the speaker refers to the quality or nature of his knowledge, expressing that he has longstanding assimilated knowledge of the fact expressed in his statement, i.e., knowledge that is well established in his mind. Since the source of knowledge here lies inside the speaker, it may be considered as "subjective knowledge." Talking about himself the speaker usually has longstanding assimilated knowledge, e.g. in example (2). In examples (3) or (24) the speaker's knowledge is based on generally known and accepted knowledge ("world knowledge"). Thus, the ultimate source of this knowledge lies outside the speaker, and might be considered "objective knowledge." But having internalized this kind of world knowledge, the speaker, in both cases, expresses assimilated subjective knowledge. At the same time, the speaker also assures the hearer of the correctness of his statement on the basis of his longstanding assimilated knowledge or of his internalized world knowledge. And being very sure about his statement the speaker also confirms the communicated fact. Therefore, *in*

---

[11]   An example of this constellation in Lende Tibetan (Kyirong), but with a slightly different pragmatic-epistemic value, is example (17) in Brigitte Huber's paper in this volume, in contrast to her example (16).

also expresses the speaker's attitude toward his knowledge and statement, which, for the time being I will call "definite knowledge"; depending on the context, the speaker may focus on the type of his knowledge as either "assimilated" or "definite" knowledge. In sum, Balti *in* denotes "assimilated subjective definite knowledge."

On the pragmatic-epistemic level, by using *jot* in its attributive function the speaker, on the one hand, refers to the quality or nature of his knowledge, expressing the fact that his statement is based on acquired knowledge due to his previous personal experience, as in example (25). As the source of knowledge lies inside the speaker, it may also be considered "subjective knowledge." On the other hand, the speaker is also referring to his attitude toward his knowledge, expressing his involvement in assuring the hearer of the correctness of his statement on the basis of his previous personal experience. Therefore, *jot* also denotes definite knowledge and, depending on the context, the speaker may focus either on the type of knowledge as acquired by previous personal experience or on his attitude that his knowledge is definite. In sum, in its attributive function Balti *jot* denotes "subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal experience."

As Balti *in* is never used to denote existence, location or possession, the Balti speaker has no choice in these cases. He has to use *jot*, irrespective of pragmatic-epistemic factors. This shows the basic priority of the syntactico-semantic level in comparison with the pragmatic-epistemic level.

In terms of old and new knowledge, *in* definitely relates to old assimilated knowledge and *jot* relates to knowledge that has been more recently acquired by personal experience and is "newer" than *in*. However, both types of knowledge were acquired by the speaker previous to the time of speaking. Thus both are usually to be considered old knowledge in those dialects where auxiliaries are used, e.g. correspondences of WT *'dug*, which relate new knowledge or information acquired by the speaker more or less simultaneously with his statement about an ongoing action or event, or about a present state. Hence, the distinction between old and new knowledge does not (yet) play a role in the epistemic pattern of the Balti auxiliaries.

PURIK

In the linguistically and geographically neighbouring Purik varieties, also belonging to WAT, we find, besides *in* and *jot*, also *duk* for 'to be'. The following examples are taken from the Western Purik variety of Tshangra, a

village in the Muslim area of Lower Ladakh in India, situated in the Suru valley south of Kargil towards the Nun-Kun massif.[12]

On the syntactico-semantic level, *in* is basically used in the same way as in Balti. It has only the linking equative function with a noun, pronoun or adjective as the predicative complement:

(26) *kʰo   ŋatʃi   pʰaspun   in*
      he.ABS   we.EXCL.GEN   relative.ABS be
      'He is our relative.'

(27) *kʰo   ŋi   zdo   in*
      he.ABS I.GEN   partner.ABS be
      'He is my partner.'

(28) *dju   kʰwe   ʂɲoqs   in*
      this.ABS he.GEN   habit.ABS   be
      'This is his habit.'

(29) *kʰo   ʒerba   in*
      he.ABS blind.ABS   be
      'He is blind.'

On the syntactic level we may occasionally find an oblique predicative complement:

(30) *kʰo   getbat   ba-kʰan-i   naŋ-na in*
      he.ABS   cultivation.ABS make-AG.VN-GEN   family-ABL   be
      'He is from a cultivator family',

or an abbreviated sentence (subject deletion) as in Balti:

(31) *ʒanmi   ʃoɣbu   in*
      other.GEN   book.ABS   be
      '(It) is the book of others.'

On the syntactico-semantic level, *jot* is also used basically in the same way as in Balti. We find the same existential functions and the attributive function together with an adjective as the predicative complement. *jot* occurs in statements where the speaker plays a role as participant, as, e.g., in (37), but not as subject. Consider the following:

---

12 I owe the linguistic information used here to Mr. Mohd. Jaffar Akhoon, Block Medical Officer and native from Tshangra. I am grateful to him for assuming the burden of coming to Leh several times in the years 1992-94 in order to work with me.

jot with existential functions:

(32) ʒon   jot-a   met
      milk.ABS   be-QUESTNEG.   be
      'Is there milk (this year)?' (idiom.)

(33) kʰo   tʰur-la   jot
      he.ABS   down-LOC   be
      'He is staying down there.'

(34) le-a   tutpa   tsam   jot
      Leh-LOC   smoke.ABS   how.much   be
      'How many housholds are there in Leh?'

(35) kʰeraŋ-a   sakʰjat   tsamtsek   jot
      you-DAT   land.ABS   how.much   be
      'How much land do you have?'

(36) ŋa-a   kʰoqpa   ŋirim   jot
      I-DAT   inner.body.ABS   twice.ABS   be
      'I am pregnant.'

jot with linking attributive function:

(37) ŋatʃi   jokpo   mana   ʂtanpo   jot
      we.EXCL.GEN   servant.ABS   very   reliable.ABS   be
      'Our servant is very reliable.'

(38) kʰo   mana   jontantʃan   jot
      he.ABS   very   careful.ABS   be
      'He is very careful.'

(39) kʰo   zgrom   pʰe-a   kʰaspa   jot
      he.ABS   box.ABS   to.open-VN   skillful.ABS   be
      'He is skillful in opening the box.'

On the syntactico-semantic level, the additional auxiliary verb *duk* may under certain conditions replace *jot* in its existential and linking attributive functions. Therefore, it also may be called an "existential auxiliary verb", which may also be used in the linking attributive function with an adjective as the predicative complement. Semantically, the replacement is easily understandable on the basis of the comparatively close lexical meanings of *jot* 'to exist, to be present' and of the full verb *duk* 'to sit (down), to stay, to remain, to be situated' (WT *'dug*), of

which the auxiliary *duk* is, in contrast to *in* and *jot*, a specialized usage. It is interesting to note that *duk* seems to occur only in sentences where the speaker does not play a syntactico-semantic role as participant. This is different from *jot*, where the speaker at least may occur in a role different from the subject. However, my material is not sufficient for a final evaluation at present. Compare the following examples, which use *duk* in the various functions:

duk with existential functions:

(40) *kʰo*   *tʰur-la*   *duk*
      he.ABS   down-LOC   be
      'He is staying down there.'

(41) *kʰo-a*   *kʰoqpa*   *ɲirim*   *duk*
      she-DAT inner.body.ABS   twice.ABS   be
      'She is pregnant.'

(42) *kʰo-a*   *ldʒit*   *maŋmo*   *duk*
      he-DAT   weight.ABS   much.ABS   be
      'He is very heavy (lit. to him the weight is much).'

(43) *kʰwe*   *rdoŋ-pi-ka*   *s̩taqs*   *duk*
      he.GEN   face-DET.GEN-on.POSTP   mark.ABS   be
      'There is/He has a mark on his face.'

(44) *kʰiri*   *dun-po-a*   *ʃoqsoq*   *maŋmo*   *duk*
      you.GEN front-DET-LOC   paper.ABS   much.ABS   be
      'There is lot of paper in front of you.'

duk with linking attributive function:

(45) *kʰo*   *traqpo*   *duk*
      he.ABS   strong.ABS   be
      'He is strong.'

(46) *oɲa*   *ŋarmo*   *duk*
      milk.ABS   sweet.ABS   be
      'The milk is sweet.'

(47) *kʰo*   *mana*   *s̩tsoqpo*   *duk*
      he.ABS   very   bad.ABS   be
      'He is very bad.'

(48)   *diriŋ   graŋmo   duk*
        today   cold.ABS   be
        '(It) is cold today.'

There is some evidence that *duk* may also be used in the linking equative function to replace *in*:

(49)   *ali   mana   zdikpek   duk*
        Ali.ABS   very   bad.one.ABS   be
        'Ali is a very lonely/poor man.'

(50)   *jeraŋ   mana   ṣaŋṣaŋ-tʃik   duk*
        you (hon).ABS   very   useless-one.ABS be
        'You (hon) are a very useless/stupid person.'

In these examples the predicative complement is a noun derived from an adjective by the enclitic indefinite article *-(tʃ)ik* 'a, one.' A noun as predicative complement is unusual with *jot*, since such nouns usually only occur with *in* in linking equative function. Whether we may speak of a "linking equative function" of *duk* in these few marginal examples remains open for further investigation.[13]

In contrast to Balti, where the speaker has to use *jot* in sentences expressing existential functions, the Purik speaker can in certain cases choose between *jot* and *duk*. Compare for example:

(36)   *ŋa-a   kʰoqpa   ŋirim   jot*
        I-DAT   inner.body.ABS   twice.ABS   be
        'I am pregnant.'

(41)   *kʰo-a   kʰoqpa   ŋirim   duk*
        she-DAT inner.body.ABS   twice.ABS   be
        'She is pregnant.'

(33)   *kʰo   tʰur-la   jot*
        he.ABS   down-LOC   be
        'He is staying down there.'

---

13 Rangan (1979: 136ff.) captures the syntactico-semantic difference, stating that "the form *in* occurs whenever the noun phrase (NP) is the predicate of the sentence. If the adjective precedes, then the form will be *duk*." He illustrates this statement by examples like *kʰo rama in* 'He is Rama' vs. *kʰo rdamo duk* 'She is beautiful'. Unfortunately, he does not give an example with a speaker subject.

(40) *kʰo*   *tʰur-la*   *duk*
      he.ABS   down-LOC   be
      'He is staying down there.'

As mentioned earlier, *duk* is not used in sentences where the speaker plays a syntactico-semantic role. Thus in example (36), the speaker has to use *jot*. But in sentences where the speaker is not involved in such a role, he can choose between *jot* and *duk*. This difference lies on the pragmatic-epistemic level.

In the same way the speaker may choose between *jot* and *duk* in their linking attributive function referring to the pragmatic-epistemic level. Compare for example:

(38) *kʰo*   *mana*   *jontantʃan*   *jot*
      he.ABS   very   careful.ABS   be
      'He is very careful.'

(45) *kʰo*   *traqpo*   *duk*
      he.ABS   strong.ABS   be
      'He is strong.'

On the pragmatic-epistemic level, *in* is used in the same way as in Balti. Therefore, the statements in examples (28) and (29) express the speaker's "assimilated subjective definite knowledge," based on generally known and accepted knowledge. In examples (26) and (27) this knowledge may be based on his own longstanding assimilated knowledge. As in Balti, the speaker may focus in these examples on the quality or nature of his knowledge as assimilated knowledge or on his attitude toward his knowledge as definite knowledge.

Also the pragmatic-epistemic usage of *jot* is close to its usage in Balti. The statements with *jot* in its linking attributive function in examples (37), (38) and (39) express the speaker's assimilated subjective definite knowledge, based on the speaker's previous personal experience, and the speaker may focus either on his knowledge as acquired by previous personal experience, or on his attitude toward his knowledge as definite. Consequently, used in its linking attributive function, *jot* denotes "subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal experience," as in Balti.

But in contrast to Balti, the Purik speaker has the additional option of using *duk* in existential or linking attributive function to express, on the pragmatic-epistemic level, recent visual perception of the fact he is relating. Considering the lexical meaning of the full verb *duk* 'to be situated', we may understand the connotation of visual perception in the sense of 'to be situated before the speaker's eyes'. This interpretation may also account for the fact that *duk* is usually not used with the speaker in a syntactico-semantic role in the sentence, as

Bielmeier

the speaker cannot be situated before his own eyes, excluding "mirative" usages
as, e.g. in example (89) from Central Ladakhi given below. Therefore, used in
their existential functions, *jot* is the "natural" or "unmarked" usage in (36), as
is *duk* in (41). As for the contrastive examples (33) and (40), which use *jot* and
duk in their linking attributive function, the speaker has previous personal
experience of the position of the subject in (33) and he sees the subject in his
position in (40). Similarly, in (38), by using *jot* the speaker describes a
particular quality, viz. a particular character trait of the subject, which he cannot
see, but of which he has previous personal experience. On the other side, the
speaker can see the physical appearance of the subject and uses *duk*. It is
difficult to decide which one of these two auxiliaries is more commonly used in
Purik. But since *duk* has a connotation of visual perception, *jot* may still be the
"unmarked" usage, as in Balti, where it is the only possibility. But can the
speaker always "see" that, as in (48), 'it is cold today'? Therefore, it seems
appropriate to characterize the knowledge which the speaker claims by using *duk*
with a broader term than "attested visual knowledge",[14] i.e. as objective
knowledge, since the source of this kind of knowledge lies outside the speaker.
As the speaker has acquired his knowledge either recently or else more or less
simultaneously with the moment of speaking, we may call this "new
knowledge." By using grammatical tenses the speaker may then transpose this
simultaneity into the past or even anticipate it for the future. Since this is not
assimilated knowledge, well established in the speaker's mind, it is not definite in
the sense explained above.[15] Taking these pragmatic-epistemic phenomena
together we may state that by using the existential auxiliary *duk* the speaker
expresses his "new objective non-definite knowledge, usually based on recent
visual perception."

By denoting the knowledge carried by *duk* as "new" we are now entitled to
denote the knowledge carried by *in* and *jot* as "old." Therefore, *in* is used to
relate "old assimilated subjective definite knowledge," and *jot* is used to relate
"old subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal
experience."

---

[14] Compare for example Willett 1988: 57.

[15] This is supported by the functions of *jot* and *duk* as auxiliary morphemes, of which,
according to my informant, *jot* expresses the more "definite" form:
ŋa ɬtoxse jot ~ ɬtoxset   'I am hungry.'
kʰo ɬtoxsen jot   'He is hungry.' (speaker has definite knowledge)
kʰo *ɬtoxsen duk > ɬtoxsenuk 'He is hungry.' (speaker has less definite knowledge)
This seems completely plausible, as the speaker in the subject role also uses *jot*. There is no
doubt that the speaker has the most definite knowledge here about himself. It also shows that
recent visual evidence implied by *duk* does not constitute more definite knowledge in
comparison with that knowledge due to the speaker's previous personal experience.

LADAKHI OF LOWER LADAKH (NURLA)[16]

Leaving the area of the Purik varieties and going further eastward we come to "linguistic Ladakh," which begins with the varieties of Lower and Central Sham in Lower Ladakh, traditionally at Lamayuru along the road from Shrinagar to Leh beyond the Namika La. These varieties still belong to WAT. Again we find here an additional verb for 'to be', *rak*, lit. 'to perceive by feeling or hearing'[17], and etymologically related to WT *rag* 'to catch hold of' and *reg* 'to get into touch', as well as to late WT *red*.[18]

However, there is still a further possibility by which 'to be' may be expressed, viz. by the morphological derivation *in-ok*, which is basically an indirect inferential form. It is an important extension and has to be included here to better understand the whole auxiliary system.

The examples used to illustrate the usage of all these auxiliaries will be taken from the dialect of Nurla, a Ladakhi variety of Central Sham, situated some 12 km east of Khalatse along the road. Unfortunately my Nurla material on the usages of the various auxiliaries is not exhaustive at present, but it might still be sufficient to sketch the main characteristics of the auxiliary system.

On the syntactico-semantic level, the auxiliary verb *in* occurs mainly in the equative function and with speaker as well as non-speaker subjects. But in (53), and perhaps also in (54), *in* is used in an attributive function with an adjective as the predicative complement which denotes a particular quality rather than an intrinsic one. The reason for this usage seems to be related to the pragmatic-epistemic level. Compare for example:

(51) *ŋa*   *tsʰoŋpa*   *in*
      I.ABS   trader.ABS   be
      'I am a trader.'

(52) *kʰo*   *tsʰoŋpa*   *in*
      he.ABS   trader.ABS   be
      'He is a trader.'

---

[16] For all information on the dialect of Nurla I am indebted to my friend Ngawang Tsering from Nurla, who for a couple of years lived in Germany and worked in our research project at the University of Berne in Switzerland.

[17] The full verb with approximately the same meaning as *rak* in Nurla is *tsʰor* 'to perceive, to hear', cf. e.g., *ŋa-a di las-po rgjalba tsʰorenak* (< *tsʰorba-in-rak*) 'I feel this work is good for me'; *kʰo-a spera tsʰor-duk* 'He hears the talk.'

[18] For more details see notes 28 and 32.

(53)   *ŋa*   *diriŋ*   *dalmo*   *in*
       I.ABS   today   free.ABS be
       'I am free today.'

(54)   *di*   *tʃoktse*   *tʰeba*   *in*
       this   table.ABS   superfluous.ABS   be
       'This table is superfluous.'

With regard to *jot* my material is limited to examples expressing possession on the syntactico-semantic level. It does not contain examples for the linking attributive function.[19]   The speaker may occur in a role different from the subject. Compare the following examples:

(55)   *ŋa-a*   *loŋ*   *jot*
       I.DAT   leisure.ABS   be
       'I am at leisure.'

(56)   *dotʃik*   *kʰoŋ-a*   *ʒon*   *dʒakpo*   *jot*
       this.year   they-DAT   milk   good.ABS   be
       'This year they have good milk.'

With *duk* the expression of existence (57) as well as the linking attributive function (58, 59) occur on the syntactico-semantic level. But in example (60) a noun is used as the predicative complement, identifying the subject as a "liar." Therefore, *duk* may also occur in the linking equative function. In none of these functions do we find the speaker in a syntactico-semantic role:

(57)   *kʰo-a*   *mana*   *ṣtakspa*   *mi-nuk*
       he-DAT   very   relying.ABS   NEG-be
       'There is no relying on him.'

(58)   *kʰo*   *remba*   *duk*
       he.ABS   strong.ABS   be
       'He is strong.'

(59)   *kʰo*   *sambatʃan*   *duk*
       he.ABS   intelligent.ABS   be
       'He is intelligent.'

---

[19]   This may be simply due to the limited material. However, in the Conservative Amdo Nomad dialect of Themchen, for example, the correspondence of WT *yod* seems never to be used with an attributive function. For more details on this dialect cf. Felix Haller's paper in this volume. The marginally occurring attributive function of *in* in the variety of Nurla, however, seems extraordinary and has to be investigated further.

(60) kʰo   ʃobo   duk
      he.ABS liar.ABS be
      'He is a liar.'

On the syntactico-semantic level, with *rak* both the linking equative function (61) and the existential function (62) have been found with non-speaker subjects, and in examples (63, 64) *rak* is used in the linking attributive function with a speaker as well as a non-speaker subject.[20] Compare for example:

(61) kʰardʒi   ʠotmet-tʃik   rak
      food.ABS   tasteless-one.ABS   be
      'The food is (a) tasteless (one).'

(62) diaŋ   tʃik   rak
      here   one.ABS be
      '(I feel) there is something here.'

(63) diriŋ   ŋa   mana   galgal   rak
      today   I.ABS   very   tired.ABS   be
      'I feel very tired today.'

(64) di   ɬu   ma   ʃnanpo   rak
      this   song.ABS   very   pleasant.ABS be
      'This song is very pleasant (speaker hears it).'

With the morphological derivation *in-ok*, basically an indirect inferential form, only the linking equative function (65, 66) with speaker as well as non-speaker subjects, and the linking attributive function (67, 68) occur on the syntactico-semantic level:

(65) ŋa   tsʰoŋpa   in-ok
      I.ABS   trader.ABS   be-INFER
      'I am a trader.'

(66) kʰo   tsʰoŋpa   in-ok
      he.ABS trader.ABS   be-INFER
      'He is a trader.'

---

[20] So far I have found the use of *rak* as an auxiliary morpheme even in Eastern Purik varieties. The westernmost area of its occurrence as an independent auxiliary verb, perhaps alternating with *ʠak*, is Khalatse in Lower Sham, situated right at the spot where the road from Shrinagar to Leh crosses the Indus River. Compare the following example from the variety of Khalatse: *tʃʰu ʈaŋmo rak* 'The water is cold (speaker feels it).'

(67)   *kʰwe   spera   ʈaŋbo   in-ok*
        he.GEN   speech.ABS   true.ABS   be-INFER
        'His words are true.'

(68)   *di   sakjat-po   janba   in-ok*
        this   land-DET.ABS fallow.ABS   be-INFER
        'This land is (left) fallow.'

As we can see, with non-speaker subjects it is possible to express the equative function with four different auxiliaries: *in, duk, rak* and *inok*. Differences in their usage reside only on the pragmatic-epistemic level:

(52)   *kʰo   tsʰoŋpa   in*
        he.ABS   trader.ABS   be
        'He is a trader.'

(60)   *kʰo   ʃobo   duk*
        he.ABS   liar.ABS be
        'He is a liar.'

(61)   *kʰardʒi   qotmet-tʃik   rak*
        food.ABS   tasteless-one.ABS be
        'The food is (a) tasteless (one).'

(66)   *kʰo   tsʰoŋpa   in-ok*
        he.ABS   trader.ABS   be-INFER
        'He is a trader.'

As mentioned above, *duk* never occurs with the speaker in a syntactico-semantic role, and *inok* usually occurs only with non-speaker subjects. For *rak* we have at present no example with a speaker subject. Thus it is mainly *in* that seems to be used to express the equative function with speaker subjects, although *inok* may occur with speaker subjects under certain conditions. In these cases the differences again reside only on the pragmatic-epistemic level:

(51)   *ŋa   tsʰoŋpa   in*
        I.ABS   trader.ABS   be
        'I am a trader.'

(65)   *ŋa   tsʰoŋpa   in-ok*
        I.ABS   trader.ABS   be-INFER
        'I am a trader.'

With non-speaker subjects, the attributive function can, like the equative function, be expressed by the same four auxiliaries: *in*, *duk*, *rak* and *inok*. Once again, differences in their usage rest only on the pragmatic-epistemic level:

(54) *di   tʃoktse   tʰeba   in*
      this   table.ABS   superfluous.ABS   be
      'This table is superfluous.'

(58) *kʰo   remba   duk*
      he.ABS   strong.ABS be
      'He is strong.'

(64) *di   ɬu   ma   sɲanpo   rak*
      this   song.ABS   very   pleasant.ABS   be
      'This song is very pleasant (speaker hears it).'

(67) *kʰwe   spera   ʈaŋbo   in-ok*
      he.GEN   speech.ABS   true.ABS   be-INFER
      'His words are true.'

With speaker subjects, however, usually only *in* and *rak* are used, with pragmatic-epistemic reasons for their selection:

(53) *ŋa   diriŋ   dalmo in*
      I.ABS   today   free.ABS be
      'I am free today.'

(63) *diriŋ   ŋa   mana   galgal   rak*
      today   I.ABS   very   tired.ABS   be
      'I feel very tired today.'

In sentences where the speaker does not play a syntactico-semantic role it is possible to express possession by three different underived auxiliaries (excluding *in*). The resulting sentences can be distinguished only on the pragmatic-epistemic level. A sentence like 'he has a dog,' lit. 'to him (there) is a dog,' may thus be expressed in three distinct ways:[21]

(69) *kʰo-a kʰi jot*   (speaker has previous personal experience)
(70) *kʰo-a kʰi duk*   (speaker sees the dog)
(71) *kʰo-a kʰi rak*   (speaker hears the dog barking)

---

[21] A fourth modal possibility may be added for illustration. If the speaker is voicing a mere supposition, he may say: *kʰo-a kʰi jot-tʃas-duk* 'He has a dog.'

In sentences where the speaker does play a syntactico-semantic role, usually only *jot* is used. Compare for example:

(55) *ŋa-a*   *loŋ*   *jot*
      I.DAT   leisure.ABS   be
      'I am at leisure.'

In Nurla, on the pragmatic-epistemic level, *in* expresses "old assimilated subjective definite knowledge," as in Purik. Example (51) fits well into this pattern. However, a statement like (53) is difficult to understand as being based on assimilated knowledge. It seems more appropriate to interpret it as definite knowledge. As in Balti and Purik, the speaker may be focusing on the quality or nature of his knowledge as assimilated, or on his attitude toward his knowledge as definite. With this notion of definite knowledge we can also easily understand examples (52) and (54).

Due to the scarcity of the material it is difficult to make a conclusive statement for *jot* on the pragmatic-epistemic level. At any rate, in examples (56) and (69) the speaker refers to his "old subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal experience." In example (55) the speaker also expresses his subjective definite knowledge, based on his personal experience, though it is difficult to interpret this sentence as reporting old knowledge. However, being involved in a syntactico-semantic role, the speaker has no other choice than to use *jot*, irrespective of the pragmatic-epistemic level. As in Balti and Purik, due to syntactico-semantic reasons *in* is never used to express existential functions.

An attempt to interpret *duk* on the pragmatic-epistemic level as "new objective non-definite knowledge, usually based on recent visual perception" faces the same problem as in Purik. Can the speaker always "see" that 'he is a liar'? Using *duk* in example (58) he may see the particular quality, but in examples (59, 60) it seems more appropriate to interpret the speaker's statement as focusing on his new objective non-definite knowledge. This interpretation accounts well for the fact that together with *duk* the speaker never occurs in a syntactico-semantic role.

On the pragmatic-epistemic level, *rak*, based on its original lexical meaning, expresses recent sensory perception other than visual. This also means subjective knowledge. If we contrast *rak* with *duk* (characterized as new objective non-definite knowledge, usually based on recent visual perception), we can characterize *rak* as "new subjective non-definite knowledge, based on some recent sensory perception other than visual." In example (61) the speaker

experiences the communicated fact through tasting, in examples (62, 63) he has a feeling of it, and in example (64) he hears it.

Using the inferential form *inok*, the speaker bases his statement on inference. In example (66), for instance, he sees the person trading, etc. On the pragmatic-epistemic level, the speaker expresses his indirect inferential knowledge. As the source of the knowledge here lies outside the speaker, it is objective, and as it is not assimilated, we have to consider it as non-definite knowledge. It is not specified as either old or new knowledge. On the pragmatic-epistemic level, *inok* can thus be characterized as rendering "objective non-definite knowledge, based on inference."

Considering sentences with speaker subjects we find a contrast between *in* and *inok* for the linking equative function, and a contrast between *in* and *rak* for the linking attributive function:

(51) *ŋa*   *tsʰoŋpa*   *in*
      I.ABS   trader.ABS   be
      'I am a trader.'

(65) *ŋa*   *tsʰoŋpa*   *in-ok*
      I.ABS   trader.ABS   be-INFER
      'I am a trader.'

(53) *ŋa*   *diriŋ*   *dalmo*   *in*
      I.ABS   today   free.ABS be
      'I am free today.'

(63) *diriŋ*   *ŋa*   *mana*   *galgal*   *rak*
      today   I.ABS   very   tired.ABS   be
      'I feel very tired today.'

As to the first contrast, the speaker identifies himself in both cases. In example (51) he does so on the basis of his own old assimilated subjective definite knowledge, which is definitely the normal or unmarked case here. But by using *inok* he distances himself from his own statement for various possible reasons: non-definiteness, uncertainty, modesty, politeness, etc. In example (65) the speaker, being polite with regard to the hearer, plays down his profession.

As to the second contrast, the speaker is describing one of his own particular qualities. This can naturally be based either on his own old assimilated subjective definite knowledge by using *in*, or on his own recent sensory perception other than visual by using *rak*. What is unexpected here, however, is the usage of *in*, which is rarely used in the linking attributive function. The "unmarked" case is, therefore, to use *rak*.

Considering sentences with non-speaker subjects, we find a fourfold contrast for both the equative and the attributive function:

(52)   *kʰo   tsʰoŋpa   in*
        he.ABS   trader.ABS   be
        'He is a trader.'

(66)   *kʰo   tsʰoŋpa   in-ok*
        he.ABS   trader.ABS   be-INFER
        'He is a trader.'

(60)   *kʰo   ʃobo   duk*
        he.ABS   liar.ABS be
        'He is a liar.'

(61)   *kʰardʒi   ɖotmet-tʃik   rak*
        food.ABS tasteless-one.ABS be
        'The food is (a) tasteless (one).'

(54)   *di   tʃoktse   tʰeba   in*
        this   table.ABS   superfluous.ABS   be
        'This table is superfluous.'

(67)   *kʰwe   spera   ʈaŋbo   in-ok*
        he.GEN   speech.ABS   true.ABS   be-INFER
        'His words are true.'

(58)   *kʰo   remba   duk*
        he.ABS   strong.ABS   be
        'He is strong.'

(64)   *di   ɬu   ma   sɲanpo   rak*
        this   song.ABS   very   pleasant.ABS   be
        'This song is very pleasant (speaker hears it).'

As a first fourfold contrast, the speaker identifies the subject as being different from himself, and qualifies his knowledge by the choice of a certain auxiliary, of which only *in* denotes old assimilated subjective definite knowledge. The other three auxiliaries all denote new non-definite knowledge based on sensory perception or on inference, so that inferential knowledge seems to come into play most frequently. Therefore, the use of *inok* seems to be the "unmarked" case in sentences with non-speaker subjects, where *inok* has a linking equative function, at least in relation to *in*.

As a second fourfold contrast, the speaker ascribes a particular quality to a non-speaker subject and qualifies his own knowledge by the choice of the same four auxiliaries as described above. Here the use of *in* is very rare, because it is usually restricted to the linking equative function. Among the remaining three auxiliaries it seems difficult to judge their relative "markedness". All three are fairly "normal." The main difference between *duk* and *rak* on the one hand, and *inok* on the other, is between direct vs. indirect perception.

The clearest distinction between *jot*, *duk* and *rak* on the pragmatic-epistemic level can be found in their existential functions in sentences with non-speaker subjects, where *jot* relates to previous personal experience, *duk* to visual and *rak* to other types of sensory perception. In sentences with speaker subjects, the pragmatic-epistemic level is not significant, because, as we have seen, only *jot* can be used here.

LADAKHI OF CENTRAL LADAKH

The four auxiliary verbs *in*, *jot*, *duk*, *rak*, and the derived form *inok*, which have been found in Nurla, are also described by Koshal (1979 and 1982) for the language of Central Ladakh, and are further confirmed by my own material on the variety of Leh. According to Koshal's findings *in* "is used to make simple statements with no implications" (Koshal 1979: 185ff.). Compare her examples (transcription and glosses here and *passim* adapted):

(72) *ŋa*   *magmi*   *in*
      I.ABS   soldier.ABS   be
      'I am a soldier.'

(73) *i-bo*   *ŋe*   *pumo*   *in*
      this-DET.ABS   I.GEN   daughter.ABS   be
      'This (one) is my daughter.'

On the syntactico-semantic level *in* is used in her examples in the equative function, with a tendency to be used preferably in sentences where the speaker is involved, often as subject or in another syntactico-semantic role. But the speaker's occurrence in a syntactico-semantic role is only a tendency and not obligatory, as the following example shows:[22]

(74) *i*   *mi-bo*   *ʒep-kan-bo*   *in*
      this   person-DET.ABS   handle-AG.VN-DET.ABS   be
      'This is the person who handles the exchanges.'

---

[22] For all the material from the Leh dialect I am gratefully indebted to my friend Noney P. Wangchuk from Leh, who runs the Ladakh Public School in Leh. I have been in contact with him since 1986.

The linking equative function may also be seen from a proverb given by Francke (1901: 58), who is describing an apparently close Ladakhi variety (transcription adapted, glosses mine):

(75)   *lak-ʃes*   *kun-gji*   *jokpo*   *in,*
       hand-know.ABS   all-GEN   servant.ABS   be,
       stam-ʃes   *kun-gji*   *sponbo*   *in*
       speech-know.ABS all-GEN   master.ABS   be
       'Who is clever with his hand, is servant of all; who is clever with his speech, is master of all.'[23]

According to Koshal *jot* is used "to express the meaning of 'to be' when the speaker talks about something on the basis of his definite knowledge" or "to report a phenomenon of which the speaker has a definite knowledge (directly or indirectly)" (Koshal 1979: 186, 189). Compare her examples:

(76)   *kʰoŋ-i ṣta*   *nakpo*   *jot*
       he-GEN horse.ABS   black.ABS   be
       'His (hon) horse is black (based on direct knowledge).'

(77)   *pumo*   *aru*   *jot*
       girl.ABS   there   be
       'The girl is there (the speaker having seen her there earlier himself).'

(78)   *kʰoŋ-a*   *pene*   *jot*
       he-DAT   money.ABS   be
       'He has money (based on definite knowledge).'

On the syntactico-semantic level we can see from (76) that *jot* occurs in the attributive function, and from (77) and (78) that *jot* is also used to express location and possession. All examples have non-speaker subjects. But compare a further example from my Leh material, where the speaker is at least involved holding another syntactico-semantic role:

(79)   *ŋa-a naŋ-a*   *tʃʰatʃes*   *ospa*   *jot*
       I-DAT inside-LOC   to.go.VN   legitimation.ABS be
       'I have the legitimation to go inside.'

Koshal (1979: 186f.) adds: "For reporting on the basis of indirect knowledge obtained from books, writing, narration, radio, etc. *jot* is used. However, if the

---

[23]   The language of this example seems more likely to be literary rather than spoken, as may be seen, e.g., from the formation of the genitive case.

speaker does not feel absolutely certain about the veracity of his knowledge, *duk* may be used." She illustrates this statement with two examples:

(80) *ɫontʃʰen*   *le-a*   *jot*   *zerste*   *tsʰakpar-i*   *naŋ-a* *duk*
      Prime Minist.ABS Leh-LOC be   it.is.said   newspaper-GEN   in.LOC   be
      'It is said in the newspaper that the Prime Minister is in Leh (lit. having
      said in the newspaper Prime Minister is in Leh).'

(81) *daŋ-diriŋ*   *tʃʰuʃul-i*   *naŋ-a* *kʰa* *maŋpo*   *duk*
      these.days   Chushul-GEN   in-LOC   snow   much.ABS   be
      zerste   *jige*   *ɫeps*
      it.is.said   letter.ABS   reached
      'A letter (which has) reached, says (that) Chushul has a lot of snow
      these days (the speaker is not certain about it, as it is based only on
      indirect information).'

In my opinion, the indirect knowledge expressed in these sentences is due to
their character as quotations expressed by *zerste* 'it is said', rather than by *jot* or
duk. The usage of *jot* in (80) indicates that the writer is referring to an
informant who has previous personal experience of the fact, while *duk* shows
that the speaker has read the information in the newspaper himself. In (81) it is
not the speaker who uses *duk* on the pragmatic-epistemic level, but rather he is
quoting from a letter in which the writer states that he has seen the fact that
Chushul has a lot of snow these days. Therefore, we may dismiss Koshal's
characterization of these cases as expressing indirect knowledge.

    According to Koshal *duk* is used "when a statement is made on the basis of
seeing the phenomenon more or less concurrently" (Koshal 1979: 185, 189).
Compare her examples:

(82) *pumo*   *rdemo*   *duk*
      girl.ABS   beautiful.ABS   be
      'The girl is beautiful (based on the speaker seeing the girl).'

(83) *ɫtʃaŋma*   *sŋonpo*   *duk*
      tree.ABS   green.ABS   be
      'The tree is green (on the basis of seeing it).'

These examples clearly illustrate the attributive function of *duk*, which occurs
frequently also in my Leh material:

(84)   diriŋ   kʰo   ma   tʰatpo   duk
        today   he.ABS   very   happy.ABS   be
        'He is very happy today.'

(85)   a   mi   ɲalbatʃan   duk
        that   man.ABS   poor.ABS   be
        'That man is poor.'

But *duk* occurs also as existential auxiliary verb expressing location and possession, as in the following example from my Leh material and two others from Koshal:

(86)   kʰo   ʒuŋ-skil-a   duk
        he.ABS   centre-middle-LOC   be
        'He is in the very middle.'

(87)   kʰo-e   ʈotpa-a   zurmo   duk
        he-GEN   stomach-LOC   pain.ABSbe
        'He has a stomach-ache.' (Koshal 1979: 188)

(88)   a   nomo-a   duk
        that   lady-DAT   be
        'That lady has.' (Koshal 1982: 16f.)

It is remarkable that in all these sentences that use *duk* we never have a speaker subject, or the speaker in another syntactico-semantic role. This coincides with the findings in the other dialects. As Koshal (1979: 186) says: "Usually *duk* is used only with 2nd and 3rd person subjects as one cannot see himself but can see only others. However, *duk* can be used with 1st person subjects if one is seeing oneself in a mirror or in a dream and referring to it, e.g.,

(89)   ŋa   rdemo   duk
        I.ABS   beautiful.ABS   be
        'I am beautiful (on the basis of seeing os. in the mirror etc.).'"

We could label this kind of phenomenon "unexpected information" or "mirativity", but due to the limited scope of this paper I do not want to exemplify it here in more detail. ,

    For *rak* Koshal (1979: 187ff.) states: "When a personal experience or feeling has to be expressed, the verb form *rak* is used." Compare her examples:

(90)   ŋe   go-a   zurmo   rak
        I.GEN   head-LOC pain.ABSbe
        'I have a headache.'

(91)   i   kuʃu   ŋarmo   mi-rak
        this   apple.ABS   sweet.ABS   NEG-be
        'This apple is not sweet.'

In my Leh material the situation is quite similar:

(92) *tʃʰaŋ*   *karba*   *rak*
      chang.ABS   strong.ABS   be
      'The *chang* is strong. (speaker feels it when tasting)'

(93) *diriŋ*   *ʈaŋmo*   *rak*
      today   cold.ABS   be
      'Today it is cold. (speaker feels it)'[24]

On the syntactico-semantic level, *rak* is used to express location (90) and occurs in the attributive function (91, 92, 93), where the speaker does not play a syntactico-semantic role.

According to Koshal (1979: 188f.) *inok* "is used for 'to be' for general statements, statements of universal application, historical truth etc." Compare her example rendering "universal truth" and two further examples taken from my material on the Leh dialect:

(94) *dʒikʂten*   *rilril*   *in-ok*
      world.ABS   round.ABS   be-INFER
      'The world is round.' (Koshal 1979: 188)

(95) *a*   *mi-bo*   *gut-tʃik*   *in-ok*
      that   man-DET.ABS   deaf-one.ABS   be-INFER
      'That man is (a) deaf (one).'

(96) *i*   *pene-bo*   *tʰeba*   *in-ok*
      this   money-DET.ABS   excessive.ABS   be-INFER
      'This is too much money.'

On the syntactico-semantic level, *inok* is used in the linking equative function in example (95) and in the linking attributive function in examples (94) and (96). The speaker does not play a syntactico-semantic role.[25]

As we can see from the examples, to express the equative function two auxiliaries may occur, *in* and *inok*:

---

[24] Cf. *ʈaŋmo joŋ-a rak* '(I am) getting cold (speaker feels it).' (< ipfv. verbal noun)
kʰo ʈaŋmo joŋ-duk 'He is getting cold (speaker sees it).' (< ipfv. verbal stem)
Here, *duk* is used with the non-speaker subject, as the speaker cannot feel the non-speaker's sensation of being cold. On the other hand, he can see it, which he usually cannot with regard to himself.

[25] Francke (1901: 28) says: "In Central Ladakh the ending *ok* is only used with the auxiliary *in*, to be, almost only in the third person. Example: *ri niŋ tʰonpo inok* 'the hill is high'. In Lower Ladakh it is also used sometimes with other verbs."

(72) ŋa   magmi   in
      I.ABS   soldier.ABS   be
      'I am a soldier.'

(74) i   mi-bo   ʒep-kan-bo   in
      this   person-DET.ABS   handle-AG.VN-DET.ABS   be
      'This is the person who handles the exchanges.'

(95) a   mi-bo   gut-tʃik   in-ok
      that   man-DET.ABS   deaf-one.ABS   be-INFER
      'That man is (a) deaf (one).'

In sentences with speaker subjects, only *in* is documented. But this does not
perhaps exclude the possibility that *inok* may also occur in such sentences. In
sentences with non-speaker subjects both auxiliaries have been found, with their
different usages motivated on the pragmatic-epistemic level.

To express the linking attributive function four auxiliaries occur: *jot*, *duk*,
rak, and *inok*:

(76) kʰoŋ-i   ṣta   nakpo   jot
      he-GEN   horse.ABS   black.ABS   be
      'His (hon.) horse is black (based on direct knowledge).'

(83) ɬtʃaŋma   sŋonpo   duk
      tree.ABS   green.ABS   be
      'The tree is green (on the basis of seeing it).'

(92) tʃʰaŋ   karba   rak
      chang.ABS   strong.ABS   be
      'The *chang* is strong.' (speaker feels it, e.g. when tasting)

(96) i   pene-bo   tʰeba   in-ok
      this   money-DET.ABS   excessive.ABS   be-INFER
      'This is too much money.'

In all four sentences the speaker does not play a syntactico-semantic role.
Unfortunately there are, at present, no examples with speaker subjects. The
difference from the variety of Nurla lies in the usage of *jot* in Leh as against *in*
in Nurla.

To express the existential function in sentences where the speaker does not
play a syntactico-semantic role, the auxiliaries *jot* and *duk* occur:

(78) kʰoŋ-a   pene   jot
      he-DAT   money.ABS   be
      'He has money (based on definite knowledge).'

(87) kʰo-e   ʈotpa-a   zurmo   duk
      he-GEN   stomach-LOC   pain.ABS   be
      'He has a stomach-ache.' (Koshal 1979: 188)

In sentences where the speaker does play a syntactico-semantic role, usually *jot* is used, as in Nurla, although *rak* may also occur:

(79) ŋa-a   naŋ-a   tʃʰatʃes   ospa   jot
      I-DAT   inside-LOC   to.go.VN   legitimation.ABS be
      'I have the legitimation to go inside.'

(91) ŋe   go-a   zurmo   rak
      I.GEN   head-LOC   pain.ABS   be
      'I have a headache.'

On the pragmatic-epistemic level, in my opinion all five auxiliaries express the same kind of knowledge as their correspondences in the dialect of Nurla. By using *in* in (72) and (73) the speaker expresses his old assimilated subjective definite knowledge, based in the proverb (75) on generally known and accepted knowledge. In (74) the speaker perhaps focuses more on his definite knowledge. Koshal's characterization of *in* "to make simple statements with no implications" fits into this pattern. She only gives sentences where the speaker is involved in a syntactico-semantic role. In these cases the use of *in* is "unmarked" as in Nurla; compare examples (51) and (72).

As for *jot*, characterized as denoting old subjective definite knowledge acquired through previous personal experience, Koshal unfortunately does not explain how we should understand her notion of "definite knowledge." At any rate, her notion must be kept apart from the notion "definite knowledge" used in this paper. From (77) we can only conclude that the speaker has previous personal experience including visual evidence.

In this paper, *duk* has been characterized as denoting new objective non-definite knowledge, usually based on recent visual perception. This is in keeping with Koshal's statement that *duk* is used when seeing the phenomenon more or less concurrently. In most examples given for the linking attributive, as well as for the existential functions, the connotation of recent visual perception creates no problem. On the other hand, it may be a bit more difficult to understand how the speaker is able to "see" the stomach-ache of the other person in (87). Therefore, as in Purik and Lower Ladakhi, it seems more appropriate to characterize the speaker's knowledge expressed by using *duk* as focusing on his new objective non-definite knowledge. This would again well account for the fact that we do not find the speaker in a syntactico-semantic role together with *duk*.

Similarly to *duk*, *rak* denotes new subjective non-definite knowledge, based on some recent sensory perception other than visual, a characterization also quite close to Koshal's statement that *rak* is used when a personal experience or feeling has to be expressed. Koshal (1979) uses "personal experience" to characterize the kind of knowledge expressed by *rak* in Central Ladakhi, and

Read (1934) uses the same term to characterize the knowledge expressed by *jot* in Balti. The difference is, of course, that *jot*, with the exception of Balti and WT, relates to old personal experience, while *rak* relates to new personal experience. In Balti, as has been shown above, "old" does not make sense, since there are no auxiliaries like *duk* or *rak* conveying "new" knowledge. So far, in the linking attributive function *rak* has only been recorded in sentences with non-speaker subjects. But as in Nurla, in further data it might also turn up in this function in sentences with speaker subjects.

As in Nurla, *inok* refers to objective non-definite knowledge, based on inference. In her description of *inok* Koshal does not mention the obvious inferential character of *inok*, used "for general statements, statements of universal application, historical truth etc." This is understandable because *inok* in its equative function in sentences with non-speaker subjects is the "unmarked" case for general statements, etc., in comparison to *in*, cf. (66) and (95). In sentences with non-speaker subjects, where *inok* has the attributive function, the speaker can also use *duk*, *rak* or *jot*. But as *duk* and *rak* imply visual or other sensory perception, *jot* and *inok* seem to be less marked. However, since they are distinguished by the fact that they denote definite vs. non-definite knowledge resepctively, we may suppose that *inok* is more commonly used in this situation. This is supported by the fact that even world knowledge may be expressed by *inok*. However, there is a pragmatic-epistemic difference between world knowledge expressed by *inok*, based on the speaker's inferential objective non-definite knowledge, as in (94),

(94)   *dʒikṣten*   *rilril*   *in-ok*
       world.ABS   round.ABS   be-INFER
       'The world is round.'

and world knowledge expressed by *in*, based on the speaker's assimilated subjective definite knowledge, as in Balti, where it is the only possibility, as in (3):

(3)   *ladax*   *ŋati*   *pʰajul*   *in*
       Ladakh.ABS   we.INCL.GEN   fatherland.ABS   be
       'Ladakh is our fatherland.' (GHL 38).

DIALECT OF TABO (SPITI)

Tabo is situated in the Lahul and Spiti district of Himachal Pradesh in India. The Tibetan dialect spoken here belongs to Western Innovative Tibetan (WIT).

As in the Ladakhi varieties, we find the same four underived auxiliaries *jin, jøʔ, duk, ṭak*[26] and the derived auxiliary *jinuk*.[27]

With *jin* we find the linking equative function together with a noun as predicative complement, with a strong tendency to be used with speaker subjects, or at least with the speaker in a syntactico-semantic role other than the subject:

(97) ŋa   lāmā   jin
   I.ABS Lama.ABS be
   'I am a Lama.'

(98) ʔī   ŋi   dimīk   jin
   this.ABS   I.GEN key.ABS be
   'This is my key.'

But *jin* also occurs with adjectives as predicative complements. In (99) this may either be interpreted as attributive (cf. *in* in this function in Nurla), or more probably as equative, describing an intrinsic quality of the subject:

(99) ŋa   mepō   jin
   I.ABS poor.ABS be
   'I am poor.'

With *jøʔ* we find the existential as well as the attributive function. Expressing location or possession, the speaker may appear in a syntactico-semantic role different from the subject. There is no example at hand with *jøʔ* in the attributive function where the speaker plays the role of the subject. The speaker occurs only in a syntactico-semantic role different from the subject:

(100) ŋa-la tā   ɲī: jøʔ
    I.DAT horse two.ABS be
    'I have two horses.'

(101) ŋi   āmā   khāŋpā-la jøʔ
    I.GEN mother.ABS house-LOC be
    'My mother is in my house.'

(102) ŋi   puŋ   minām   jakpō   jøʔ
    I.GEN donkey.ABS very   good.ABS be
    'My donkey is very good.'

---

[26] The etymological relation between the auxiliary *ṭak* and the morpheme *-rak* contained in *-arak* etc., is not yet fully clear to me. For a possible alternation between *ḍak* and *rak* in Khalatse cf. note 20. There is a high level register tone (ā) phonemically opposed to a low level register tone (a̱). For all examples from this dialect I am indebted to Veronika Hein. For more information on this dialect see her paper in this volume.

[27] Other derived auxiliaries like *jøkak* are not systematically exemplified here. To express world knowledge, the speaker uses *jøkak*. Compare for example: *sāz̤ā te girgir jøkak* 'The earth is round.'

With *duk* we find the existential as well as the attributive function. But unlike *jøʔ* it does not occur with speaker subjects or with the speaker in another syntactico-semantic role:

(103) *kʰōŋ*   *pʰīna* *duk*
        he (hon).ABS   there   be
        'He is there.'

(104) *bas*   *naŋ-la*   *sī:t*   *tɕīktɕāŋ*   *mi-nduk*
        bus.ABS   in.POSTP-LOC   seat.ABS   at all   NEG-be
        'There is no seat in the bus at all.'

(105) *dordzē-la*   *tā*   *ɲī:*   *duk*
        Dorje-DAT   horse   two.ABS   be
        'Dorje has two horses.'

(106) *kʰōāɟa-i*   *tēnmō*   *jamtsēn*   *duk*
        they-GEN   programme-ABS   fascinating-ABS   be
        'Their programme is fascinating.'

With *ṭak* we find only the attributive function, usually with speaker subjects. But it may occur also with non-speaker subjects.

(107) *ŋa*   *ɲōjē*   *ṭak*
        I.ABS   mad.ABS   be
        'I seem to be getting mad.'

(108) *ŋa*   *ṭaŋmō*   *ṭak*
        I.ABS   cold.ABS   be
        'I am cold.'

(109) *kʰō*   *ṭaŋmō*   *ṭak*
        she.ABS   cold.ABS   be
        'She is cold (speaker feels it).'

(110) *tirīŋ*   *namlā*   *ŋarā*   *ṭak*
        today   weather.ABS   excited.ABS   be
        'Today the weather is rough (speaker feels it).'

(111) *ʔī*   *minām*   *karwā*   *ṭak*
        this.ABS   very   strong.ABS   be
        'This (tea) is very strong.'

With *jinuk* we find the equative function identifying the subject in examples (112, 113) and describing an intrinsic quality of the subject in examples (114, 115). As with *duk*, it seems not to occur with speaker subjects or with the speaker in another syntactico-semantic role:

(112) kʰōŋ ɟimī̱   ɟinuk
      he.ABS Chinese.ABS   be
      'He is Chinese.'

(113) ʔī̱   ɕimā̱   ɟinuk
      this.ABS   tasty.one.ABS   be
      'This (tea) is the tasty one.'

(114) kʰōŋ mi̱   ɕawōk   ɟinuk
      he.ABS person.ABS crippled.ABS   be
      'He is a cripple.'

(115) kʰōŋ øntō   ɟinuk
      he.ABS deaf.ABS   be
      'He is deaf.'

On the pragmatic-epistemic level, in Veronika Hein's terminology (this volume), *ɟin* and *ɟøʔ* could probably be described as focusing on the speaker's involvement. In the terminology I use here, I have labeled the speaker's involvement in assuring the hearer of the correctness of his statement, expressed by *in* and *jot* in WAT, as "definite knowledge." By using *in* in WAT, the speaker may focus on the source of his knowledge as "longstanding assimilated"; by using *jot* he characterizes his knowledge as having been acquired by previous personal experience. But in both cases the speaker may also focus on the quality of his knowledge as definite. This latter focus seems to have become the dominant one in Tabo. This may imply that *ɟin* and *ɟøʔ* cannot be distinguished on the pragmatic-epistemic level.

In Veronika Hein's terminology both *duk* and *ʈak* could probably be described as focusing on the speaker's perception. The difference is that *duk* refers to the speaker's recent visual perception of the fact he is relating, while *ʈak* refers to any other recent sensory perception, usually feeling or hearing. This shows that on the pragmatic-epistemic level, these two auxiliaries denote more or less the same kind of knowledge as *duk* and *rak* in Ladakhi.

Veronika Hein does not discuss *ɟinuk* in her paper in this volume, though it seems clear that its function on the pragmatic-epistemic level is quite close to that of Ladakhi *inok*. It seems to have a similar inferential basis and may even be etymologically related. Therefore, we may suppose that it denotes objective non-definite knowledge, based on inference.

As we can see from the following examples, the linking equative function is expressed by *ɟin* if the speaker is the subject or plays another syntactico-semantic role in the sentence. If the speaker is not involved in a syntactico-semantic role, *ɟinuk* is used:

(97)   ŋạ   lāmā   jịn
       I.ABS   Lama.ABS   be
       'I am a Lama.'

(98)   ʔī   ŋị   dịmīk   jịn
       this.ABS   I.GEN   key.ABS   be
       'This is my key.'

(112) kʰōŋ   ʄịmī   jịnuk
       he.ABS Chinese.ABS   be
       'He is Chinese.'

In Tabo the speaker seems no longer to be completely free to choose between *jịn* and *jịnuk* on pragmatic-epistemic grounds, independently of whether the speaker is involved in a syntactico-semantic role or not, as is the case in Nurla. Although the two corresponding cases, (51) and (66), in Nurla are the "unmarked" ones, the choice in Tabo seems to depend more on the question of whether or not the speaker is involved on the syntactico-semantic level. In Nurla we can observe the same tendency, but the speaker here has more liberty to choose whether or not his involvement on the syntactico-semantic level changes the pragmatic-epistemic content of the statement; compare (51) and (65) with speaker subjects, and (52) and (66) without speaker subjects.

   The linking attributive function is expressed by *ṭak*, perhaps also by *jịn*, if the speaker is the subject of the sentence. If the speaker plays another syntactico-semantic role, *jøʔ* may also occur. If the speaker is not involved in a syntactico-semantic role, *dụk*, *ṭak* or *jịnuk* are used:

(108) ŋạ   ṭaŋmō   ṭak
       I.ABS   cold.ABS   be
       'I am cold.'

(99)   ŋạ   mẹpō   jịn
       I.ABS   poor.ABS   be
       'I am poor.'

(102) ŋị   pụŋ   mịnām   jakpō   jøʔ
       I.GEN   donkey.ABS   very   good.ABS   be
       'My donkey is very good.'

(106) kʰōāɟa-i   tēnmō   ɟamtsēn   dʉk
      they-GEN   programme-ABS fascinating-ABS be
      'Their programme is fascinating.'

(109) kʰō   ṭaŋmō   ṭak
      she.ABS cold.ABS   be
      'She is cold (speaker feels it).'

(115) kʰōŋ   øntō   ɟinuk
      he.ABS deaf.ABS   be
      'He is deaf.'

The picture again resembles the situation in Nurla to some extent. In Nurla, if the speaker is involved in a syntactico-semantic role, he may use *in* or *ṭak*. The occurrence of *in* in attributive function with the speaker as subject, as in (53), is known only for Nurla so far. In Southern Mustang, the usage of *ɟin* in attributive function is only documented for sentences where the speaker is not involved in a syntactico-semantic role. If we accept the attributive function of *ɟin* also for Tabo in (99), this may be interpreted on the pragmatic-epistemic level as denoting the speaker's involvement or his definite knowledge. If the speaker is not involved in a syntactico-semantic role, the speaker has the same choice as in Nurla, except that the use of *ɟin* has not been documented for Tabo.

DIALECT OF SOUTHERN MUSTANG

In the Central Tibetan dialect of Southern Mustang, spoken in Baragaon in North-Western Nepal and comprehensively described by Kretschmar (1995), we find the same set of four underived auxiliary verbs for 'to be' as in Ladakh and Tabo, i.e. *ɟin, ø, dʉk, ṛak*, complemented by two compound forms *øka ṛak* and *øta ṛak*, which will not be analysed here.[28] In some villages of the area *ṛak* is replaced by *nak* (Kretschmar 1995/1: 108).

In the dialect of Southern Mustang the auxiliary *ɟin* seems to be used mainly in the linking equative function. The speaker may or may not occur as subject or in another syntactico-semantic role. Compare the following examples:[29]

---

[28] In Southern Mustang there is no trace of an etymological correspondence to *inok* in Ladakh or to *ɟinuk* in Tabo. This is understandable since to a great extent the functional correspondence to these auxiliaries is *ṛak*, with its interrogative forms *ṛe ~ ṛai ~ ṛao* in Southern Mustang or *ṛe:* in Lhasa etc. See note 32. For the two compound forms compare Marianne Volkart's paper in this volume. The tonal system is basically the same as in the dialect of Tabo, cf. note 26. In the dialect of Southern Mustang non-first syllables are not characterized by tone. They are either high or toneless.

[29] The English translations of the following German original translations are mine. Where the author has given a pragmatic-epistemic characterization of the example it is added in double quotation marks and translated into English. The examples from the grammar (Volume 1) are quoted as Kretschmar 1995/1 plus page reference. The examples from the transcribed stories

(116) ŋạ   cẹwo   jịn
       I.ABS   king.ABS   be
       'I am king.'
       'Ich bin König.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "stärker emotional gefärbte Feststellung" ("more strongly emotionally
       tinged statement")

(117) tị   ŋị   kʰāŋpa   jịn
       this.ABS   I.GEN   house.ABS   be
       'This is my house.'
       'Das ist mein Haus.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "stärkeres persönliches Engagement" ("stronger personal engagement")

(118) kʰo   ŋạ   jịn   tọktok   tʃịtik
       he.ABS I.ABS   be   pretending   make.
       'He pretends to be me.'
       'Er gibt vor, ich zu sein.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 336)

(119) ŋạ   dzạr-ne   jịn
       I.ABS   Dzar-ABL   be
       'I am from Dzar.'
       'Ich bin aus Dzar.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "leicht emphatisch" ("slightly emphatic")

(120) kʰō   lāma   jịn
       he.ABS Lama.ABS   be
       'He is a Lama.'
       'Er ist ein Lama.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 25, 165)

But *jịn* seems also to occur in the linking attributive function in the following
two examples, where it is used with adjectives as predicative complements.
Examples where the speaker occurs in a syntactico-semantic role are not known:

(121) tị   tẹmpa-tse   jịn
       this.ABS   true.ABS-indeed   be
       'This is true indeed.'
       'Das ist tatsächlich wahr.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 62, 80)

(122) cʰə̄-tse   mạ-takpa.   jịn
       you.ABS-indeed NEG-innocent.ABS   be
       'It is your own fault.'
       'Du bist selbst schuld daran.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 66, 14)

It may even occur as an existential auxiliary verb. This is quite exceptional, and
among the discussed dialects is only known for the dialect of Southern
Mustang:

(Volume 2) are quoted as Kretschmar 1995/2 followed by the numbers of the story and the
sentence. In these cases, the German translation is taken from Volume 3.

(123) *araŋ*   *sūmpo-la*   *tōŋpa*   *jin*
    we.ABS   three (collect.)-DAT   empty.ABS   be
    'We three have empty (hands).'
    'Wir drei haben leere (Hände).' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 45, 4)

(124) *ṭāŋka*   *tēr-tse-ko*   *tu̱ru*   *jin*
    money.ABS   giving-indeed-the.ABS   here   be
    '(He) used to always spend (his) money only here.'
    '(Sein) Geld gab (er) immer nur hier aus.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 76, 23)

The auxiliary *ø* does occur in the attributive function (125), but far more often as an existential auxiliary verb (126 - 130). Compare the following examples:

(125) *kʰāŋpa*   *sø*   *tʃōk*   *ø*
    house.ABS   to.build.VN   ready.ABS   be
    'Everything is ready to construct the house.'
    'Es ist alles bereit zum Hausbau.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 110)
    "persönliche Überzeugung" ("personal conviction")

(126) *chākje*   *ø*
    cold.ABS   be
    '(I) am cold.'
    '(Mir) ist kalt.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 2, 40)

(127) *kʰāŋpi*   *naŋ-la*   *ka̱m*   *ʃīk*   *ø* (= *øka ra̱k*)
    house.GEN   in.POSTP-LOC   box   a.ABS   be
    'There is a box in the house.'
    'Im Haus befindet sich eine Kiste.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
    "persönliche Überzeugung" ("personal conviction")

(128) *ŋa̱-la*   *kʰāŋpa*   *ʃīk*   *ø*
    I-DAT   house   a.ABS   be
    'I have a house.'
    'Ich habe ein Haus.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 107)

(129) *kʰō-la*   *cī*   *ʃīk*   *ø* (= *øka ra̱k*)
    he-DAT   dog   a.ABS   be
    'He has a dog.'
    'Er hat einen Hund.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
    "persönliche Überzeugung" ("personal conviction")

(130) *ŋa̱-la*   *āle*   *me̱t-a*   *u̱ tu̱(j)ik*
    I-DAT   money.ABS   NEG.be-CONJ   be.in.despair
    'When I have no money, I am in despair.'
    'Ohne Geld zu haben, bin ich in einer ausweglosen Lage.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 374)

The auxiliary *du̱k* occurs in the linking attributive function (131) and as an existential auxiliary verb (132 - 134). It never occurs with speaker subjects nor with the speaker in another syntactico-semantic role. Compare the following examples:

(131) *kʰāŋpa*   *sø*   *tʃōk*   *dṳk* (= *øta rạk*)
       house.ABS   to.build.VN   ready.ABS   be
       'Everything is ready to construct the house.'
       'Es ist alles bereit zum Hausbau.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 110)
       "persönlich bezeugtes Wissen" ("personally attested knowledge")

(132) *kʰāŋpi*   *naŋ-la*   *kạm*   *ʃīk*   *dṳk* (= *øta rạk*)
       house.GEN   in.POSTP-LOC   box   a.ABS   be
       'There is a box in the house.'
       'Im Haus befindet sich eine Kiste.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "persönlich bezeugtes Wissen" ("personally attested knowledge")

(133) *tṳru*   *kājel*   *dṳk*
       here   cup.ABS   be
       'Here is a cup/there is a cup here.'
       'Hier ist/befindet sich eine Tasse.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)

(134) *kʰō-la*   *cī*   *ʃīk*   *dṳk* (= *øta rạk*)
       he-DAT   dog   a.ABS   be
       'He has a dog.'
       'Er hat einen Hund.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "persönlich bezeugtes Wissen" ("personally attested knowledge")

The auxiliary *rạk* occurs mainly in the linking equative function. The speaker may or may not occur as subject or in another syntactico-semantic role. Compare the following examples:

(135) *ŋạ*   *cẹwo*   *rạk*
       I.ABS   king.ABS   be
       'I am king.'
       'Ich bin König.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "allgemeingültige Feststellung" ("generally valid statement")

(136) *tị*   *ŋị*   *kʰāŋpa*   *rạk*
       this.ABS   I.GEN   house.ABS   be
       'This is my house.'
       'Das ist mein Haus.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)

(137) *ŋạ*   *dzạr-ne*   *rạk*
       I.ABS   Dzar-ABL   be
       'I am from Dzar.'
       'Ich bin aus Dzar.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "neutrale Feststellung" ("neutral statement")

(138) *tị*   *kājel*   *rạk*
       this.ABS   cup.ABS   be
       'This is a cup.'
       'Das ist eine Tasse.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)

I have only found one example in which the auxiliary *rak* seems to be used in the attributive function. But the predicative complement may also refer to an intrinsic quality. *The speaker is not involved in a syntactico-semantic role:*

(139) *ti mi ti*   *kʰām sāŋe*   *rak*
      this.person.ABS   healthy.ABS   be
      'This person is healthy.'
      'Dieser Mann ist gesund.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 198)

As we can see from the above examples, we find all four auxiliaries *jin*, *ø*, *duk* and *rak* in the linking attributive function if the speaker is not involved in a syntactico-semantic role. Therefore, the use of the four auxiliaries cannot be distinguished on the syntactico-semantic level. The differences among their usages lie on the pragmatic-epistemic level:

(121) *ti*   *tempa-tse*   *jin*
      this.ABS   true.ABS-indeed   be
      'This is true indeed.'
      'Das ist tatsächlich wahr.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 62, 80)

(125) *kʰāŋpa*   *sø*   *tʃōk*   *ø*
      house.ABS   to.build.VN   ready.ABS   be
      'Everything is ready to construct the house.'
      'Es ist alles bereit zum Hausbau.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 110)
      "persönliche Überzeugung" ("personal conviction")

(131) *kʰāŋpa*   *sø*   *tʃōk*   *duk (= øta rak)*
      house.ABS   to.build.VN   ready.ABS   be
      'Everything is ready to construct the house.'
      'Es ist alles bereit zum Hausbau.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 110)
      "persönlich bezeugtes Wissen" ("personally attested knowledge")

(139) *ti mi ti*   *kʰām sāŋe*   *rak*
      this.person.ABS   healthy.ABS   be
      'This person is healthy.'
      'Dieser Mann ist gesund.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 198)

With the existential functions we find the three auxiliaries *jin*, *ø* and *duk* if the speaker is not involved in a syntactico-semantic role. If he is involved in a syntactico-semantic role different from the subject, only *jin* and *ø* occur. The differences among their usages lie again on the pragmatic-epistemic level:

(124) *ʈāŋka*   *tēr-tse-ko*   *turu*   *jin*
      money.ABS   giving-indeed-the.ABS   here   be
      '(He) used to always spend (his) money only here.'
      '(Sein) Geld gab (er) immer nur hier aus.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 76, 23)

(129) *kʰō-la   cī   ʃīk   ø* (= *øka r̥ak*)
      he-DAT   dog   a.ABS   be
      'He has a dog.'
      'Er hat einen Hund.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
      "persönliche Überzeugung" ("personal conviction")

(134) *kʰō-la   cī   ʃīk   duk* (= *øta r̥ak*)
      he-DAT   dog   a.ABS   be
      'He has a dog.'
      'Er hat einen Hund.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
      "persönlich bezeugtes Wissen" ("personally attested knowledge")

(123) *ar̥aŋ   sūmpo-la   tōŋpa   jin*
      we.ABS   three (collect.)-DAT   empty.ABS   be
      'We three have empty (hands).'
      'Wir drei haben leere (Hände).' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 45, 4)

(128) *ŋa-la   kʰāŋpa   ʃīk   ø*
      I-DAT   house   a.ABS   be
      'I have a house.'
      'Ich habe ein Haus.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 107)

Kretschmar (1995/1: 109) characterizes the difference between *ø* and *duk* as follows: "Die Verben *ø* und *øka r̥ak* bzw. *øka n̥ak* werden im Sinne einer überzeugten Behauptung gebraucht, die allerdings nicht notwendigerweise auf persönlicher Beobachtung beruhen muss. Mit der Verwendung von *duk* und *øta r̥ak* bzw. *øta n̥ak* wird demgegenüber eine persönliche Kenntnis des angegebenen Tatbestandes zum Ausdruck gebracht."

Despite the different German terminology it seems acceptable to connect "personal conviction" ("persönliche Überzeugung") - expressed by *ø* as "convinced assertion" ("überzeugte Behauptung") that is not necessarily based on the speaker's visual knowledge ("persönliche Beobachtung") - with "personal experience" and with "definite knowledge," and "personally attested knowledge" expressed by *duk* with "visual perception."

As we have also seen from the above examples, *jin*, apart from its marginal existential functions, and *r̥ak* are both mainly used in the linking equative function. Therefore, *jin* and *r̥ak* are distinguished only on the pragmatic-epistemic level:

(116) *ŋa   cewo   jin*
      I.ABS   king.ABS   be
      'I am king.'
      'Ich bin König.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
      "stärker emotional gefärbte Feststellung" ("more strongly emotionally tinged statement")

(135) ŋa   cewo   rak
       I.ABS   king.ABS   be
       'I am king.'
       'Ich bin König.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "allgemeingültige Feststellung" ("generally valid statement")

(119) ŋa   dzarne   jin
       I.ABS   Dzar.ABL   be
       'I am from Dzar.'
       'Ich bin aus Dzar.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "leicht emphatisch" ("slightly emphatic")

(137) ŋa   dzarne   rak
       I.ABS   Dzar.ABL   be
       'I am from Dzar.'
       'Ich bin aus Dzar.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "neutrale Feststellung" ("neutral statement")

(117) ti   ŋi   kʰāŋpa   jin
       this.ABS   I.GEN   house.ABS   be
       'This is my house.'
       'Das ist mein Haus.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "stärkeres   persönliches   Engagement"   ("stronger   personal
       engagement")

(136) ti   ŋi   kʰāŋpa   rak
       this.ABS   I.GEN   house.ABS   be
       'This is my house.'
       'Das ist mein Haus.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)

(120) kʰō   lāma   jin
       he.ABS   Lama.ABS   be
       'He is a Lama.'
       'Er ist ein Lama.' (Kretschmar 1995/2: 25, 165)

(138) ti   kājel   rak
       this.ABS   cup.ABS   be
       'This is a cup.'
       'Das ist eine Tasse.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)

Kretschmar (1995/1: 109) characterizes the difference as follows: "*rak* bzw. *nak* haben laut Aussage der Informanten einen stärker konstatierenden Charakter, wohingegen *jin* eher in emotionalem oder emphatischem Sinn gebraucht wird."

   Kretschmar's characterization of *rak* as having more of a character of a declaration ("stärker konstatierender Charakter") and being used to make a "neutral statement" ("neutrale Feststellung") or a "generally valid statement" ("allgemeingültige Feststellung") may be summarized under the label "neutral statement."

   This kind of statement with *rak* has to be distinguished from those with *jin*, being used in more strongly emotionally tinged statements ("stärker emotional

gefärbte Feststellung"), in slightly emphatic ("leicht emphatisch") statements, in statements expressing a stronger personal engagement ("stärkeres persönliches Engagement") or relating to more emotionally or more emphatically uttered statements ("eher in emotionalem oder emphatischem Sinn").[30] In this pragmatic-epistemic context we can understand *jin* in (121) and (122) regardless of its interpretation as being used in attributive or equative function.

As mentioned above, *jin* in the dialect of Tabo has been described as focusing on the speaker's involvement. It was compared with *in* in WAT, expressing definite knowledge. It seems that the pragmatic-epistemic value of *jin* in the dialect of Southern Mustang is not very different. It seems especially close to that of *jin* in the dialect of Tabo.

On the other hand, the usage of *rak* in Southern Mustang differs considerably from that of *rak* in Ladakh and of *ṭak* in Tabo. On the syntactico-semantic level, we have seen that in Lower and Central Ladakh *rak* is used in the attributive function and also as an existential auxiliary verb. In Tabo we have seen that *ṭak* only has the attributive function. In the dialect of Southern Mustang, *rak* has lost its lexical semantic value 'to feel, to hear'[31] in favour of a higher degree of grammaticalization and is used mainly as a linking equative auxiliary verb for 'to be', replacing *jin* in its equative function to a certain extent. On the pragmatic-epistemic level, *rak* in Lower and Central Ladakh and *ṭak* in Tabo still express sensory perception other than visual, which again is lost in Southern Mustang, where the usages of *rak* have been summarized as expressing "neutral statements."

There is no doubt that the pragmatic-epistemic difference between the usage of *jin* and *rak* in the dialect of Southern Mustang, e.g.,

(116)   ŋa   cewo   *jin*
        I.ABS   king.ABS   be
        'I am king.'
        'Ich bin König.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
        "stärker emotional gefärbte Feststellung" ("more strongly emotionally
        tinged statement")

---

[30] Kretschmar, l.c. This pragmatic-epistemic value also works with more complex verb forms, cf. e.g., *lo ontse ḍowa jin* 'so viele Jahre sind nun schon vergangen' ('so many years have already elapsed'): damit "wird eine starke persönliche Anteilnahme am Geschehen zum Ausdruck gebracht" ("expressing strong personal sympathy with the event") (Kretschmar 1995/1: 157).

[31] The full verb is, as in Nurla, *tsʰōr* 'fühlen, spüren, wahrnehmen', cf. *kʰoki kūmuk kȳken ŋi tsʰōrsuŋ* 'ich habe es wahrgenommen, dass er stahl' and *kø* 'über, von etwas hören', cf. *kʰo mala ḍoa rak nēri, ŋala køsuŋ* 'ich habe jemanden sagen hören, dass er runtergehe,' *kʰo mala ḍoa rak nāken, ŋala køsuŋ* 'ich habe ihn sagen hören, dass er runtergehen werde.'

(135) ŋạ   cẹwo   rạk
       I.ABS king.ABS   be
       'I am king.'
       'Ich bin König.' (Kretschmar 1995/1: 109)
       "allgemeingültige Feststellung" ("generally valid statement"),

bridges over to usages known from other Central Tibetan and even Eastern Tibetan dialects. Felix Haller has given the label "volitionality" to the corresponding value on the pragmatic-epistemic level in Shigatse and Themchen, classifying, e.g., Shigatse *jī* as "volitional" and *piẹ* as "non-volitional."[32]

I have found a very similar usage with a speaker[33] from the Western Drokpas, who speak a Central Tibetan dialect also comprehensively described by Kretschmar (1986):

(140) ŋạ ţokpa jī: 'I am a Drokpa.' ("volitional" statement)
(141) ŋạ ţokpā rẹʔ   'id.' (without taking full responsibility, polite statement)

The same or a similar usage is described for Lhomi, a Central Tibetan dialect spoken in Nepal (O. and M. Vesalainen 1980: 33, transcription adapted):

(142) ŋạ pēmpu hịn   'I am the headman (conj., exp.)[34]
(143) ŋạ pēmpu pẹt   'I am the headman (disj.)'

(144) ŋẹ tōtō pēmpu hịn   'My elder brother is the headman. (conj., exp.)'
(145) ŋẹ tōtō pēmpu pẹt   'My elder brother is the headman. (disj.)'

---

[32] For more details see his paper in this volume, especially his examples (30) and (34). In my opinion, *piẹ* is etymologically related to the WT present tense stem *byed*, while the form *rẹ:*, current in Lhasa and elsewhere (e.g. Kham, Amdo), is etymologically related to Ladakhi *rak*, to the auxiliary morpheme *-rạk* and the auxiliary verb *ţak* in Tabo (cf. note 26) and to *rạk* in Southern Mustang, which are, as already mentioned above, etymologically related to WT *rag* 'to catch hold of' and *reg* 'to get into touch', and also to late WT *red*, cf. Marianne Volkart's paper in this volume. The etymologically unjustified orthography WT *red* was probably based on an Eastern Tibetan spoken form *reʔ* < WT *reg* < WT *rag*. According to Takeuchi 1990: 13, *red* was reflected on paper for the first time in an 18th century sermon written in an Amdo dialect. For this as well as other reasons he thinks that *red* first emerged in the Amdo region and gradually spread towards the central and Kham regions. The form *rel*, occasionally occurring in Amdo varieties beside *re*, seems to me to be a literary form. Forms related to WT *byed* are also current, e.g., the Lhomi auxiliary verb *pẹt* or the Lende (Kyirong) auxiliary morpheme *-bɛ:*, also contained in the auxiliary verb *jịmbɛ:* (< *yin byed*). For Lende see Brigitte Huber's paper in this volume, especially Tables 1 and 2.

[33] The informant was my old and dear friend Sherab Lhawang Sok-Chökhorpa (Lama) from Tradün north of Mustang.

[34] For a short discussion of the "conjunct-disjunct concept" going back to A. Hale, see Katrin Häsler's paper in this volume, and for an analogical pair of sentences in the Eastern Kham Tibetan dialect of De(r)ge see her examples (18) and (19). In the variety of Nurla in Lower Ladakh we find the following corresponding sentences *ŋa tsʰoŋpa in* 'I am a trader', (51) above, and *ŋa tsʰoŋpa in-ok* 'I am a trader' (polite statement), example (65) above.

An analogical pair based on complex verb forms is given by Shefts/Chang (1980: 17, transcription adapted) for the dialect of Lhasa:[35]

(146) ŋɛ: ɬɛ̄:sā: tɕʰī́pa jī̀:   'I went to Lhasa.'
(147) ŋa̠ ɬɛ̄:sā: tɕʰī́pa rɛ̣:   'I went to Lhasa (e.g., when I was small, i.e. I was taken there).'

Summarizing table of the pragmatic-epistemic values

Balti

in   assimilated subjective definite knowledge
jot   subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal experience

Purik

in   old assimilated subjective definite knowledge
jot   old subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal experience
duk   new objective non-definite knowledge, usually based on recent visual evidence

Ladakhi of Lower Ladakh (Nurla) and Central Ladakh

in   old assimilated subjective definite knowledge
jot   old subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal experience
duk   new objective non-definite knowledge, usually based on recent visual evidence
rak   new subjective non-definite knowledge, based on some recent sensory evidence other than visual
inok   objective non-definite knowledge, based on inference

Tabo

jin   focusing on the speaker's involvement (definite knowledge)
jøʔ   focusing on the speaker's involvement (definite knowledge)
duk   focusing on the speaker's recent visual perception
ţak   focusing on any other recent sensory perception (usually feeling or hearing) of the speaker
jinuk objective non-definite knowledge, based on inference

Southern Mustang

jin	more emotionally or more emphatically uttered statements
ø	personal conviction or convinced assertion, not necessarily based on the speaker's visual knowledge
duk	personally attested knowledge
rak	neutral statement

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL	ablative
ABS	absolutive
AG.VN	agentive verbal noun
CONJ	conjunction
conj.	conjunct
DAT	dative
DET	determination
disj.	disjunct
ERG	ergative
EXCL	exclusive
exp.	experiencer
GHL	Lobsang 1995
GEN	genitive
INFER	inferential
hon	honorific
INCL	inclusive
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
QUEST	question
R.	Read 1934
RC	Bielmeier 1985
VN	verbal noun
WAT	Western Archaic Tibetan
WIT	Western Innovative Tibetan

REFERENCES

BIELMEIER, Roland. 1985. *Das Mʌrchen vom Prinzen çıobzañ.* Eine tibetische Erzählung aus Baltistan. Text, Übersetzung, Grammatik und westtibetisch vergleichendes Glossar. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag. (= Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung, Bd. 6.)

_____. et al. 1998. Comparative Dictionary of Tibetan Dialects. University of Berne. Preprint.

van DRIEM, George. 1998. *Dzongkha.* Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, Vol. 1. Leiden: Research School CNWS.

FRANCKE, August Hermann. 1901. "Sketch of Ladakhi Grammar." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 70, Part I. Extra No. 2. Calcutta.

HALLER, Felix. 2000. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Shigatse.* Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag. (= Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung, Bd. 13.)

KOSHAL, Sanyukta. 1979. *Ladakhi Grammar.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

_____. 1982. *Conversational Ladakhi.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

KRETSCHMAR, Monika. 1986. *Erzählungen und Dialekt der Drokpas aus Südwest-Tibet.* Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag. (= Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung, Bd. 8)

_____. Monika. 1995. *Erzählungen und Dialekt aus Südmustang.* Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag. (= Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung, Bd.12/1. Untersuchung zur Grammatik des Südmustang-Dialekts. Bd.12/2. Die Verschriftung der mündlich überlieferten Texte. Bd. 12/3. Deutsche Übersetzung der verschrifteten Texte. Bd. 12/4. Wörterbuch zum Südmustang-Dialekt).

LOBSANG, Ghulam Hassan. 1995. *Short Sketch of Balti Grammar. A Tibetan Dialect Spoken in Northern Baltistan.* Universität Bern. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. Arbeitspapier 34. Bern, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

RANGAN, K. 1979. *Purki Grammar.* CIIL Grammar Series - 5. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

READ, A. F. C. 1934. *Balti Grammar.* London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

SHEFTS CHANG, Betty and Kun CHANG 1980. "Ergativity in spoken Tibetan." *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 51.1: 15-32. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

TAKEUCHI, Tsuguhito. 1990. "The semantic functions of auxiliaries in Tibetan and their historical development." In Sakiyama Osamu and Sato Akihiro, eds., *Ajia no shogengo to ippan gengogaku* (Asian Languages and General Linguistics) 6-16. Tokyo: Sanseido.

TOURNADRE, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en Tibétain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée.* Louvain/Paris: Peeters.

VESALAINEN, Olavi & Marja Vesalainen. 1980. *Clause Patterns in Lhomi.* Pacific Linguistics. Series B - No. 53. Department of Linguistics. Research School of Pacific Studies. The Australian National University.

WILLETT, Thomas. 1988. "A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality." *Studies in Language* 12-1: 51-97.