AN EMPATHY-BASED APPROACH TO THE DESCRIPTION OF THE VERB SYSTEM OF THE DEGE DIALECT OF TIBETAN[1]

Katrin Häsler
University of Berne, Switzerland

The Tibetan verb system has attracted the attention of several linguists, who all have their own views on which approach or which terminology best describes the usage of the different auxiliaries and other verb markers. In the first section I will give a brief overview of three different lines of description and will compare them to each other. In the second section I will present the copulas and auxiliary verbs used in the Dege dialect to form complex verb forms. I will also discuss how the three approaches introduced in section one can be applied to the different examples from the Dege dialect, and will point out some of the advantages and difficulties involved. In the third section I will propose a new, empathy-based approach, which while enhancing the other analyses proposed so far, offers a wider frame of description, since it can also account for the "special" cases which other approaches have to treat separately.

1. DIFFERENT DESCRIPTIVE APPROACHES TO THE TIBETAN EPISTEMIC VERB SYSTEM

There are, basically, three main avenues of description among the more recent studies of the Tibetan verb system. The first can be traced back to Hale (1980) and will here be called the CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT approach. The second, which as we will see is similar to the first, will be called the VOLITIONAL

---

approach. The third approach used in the description of the Tibetan verb system is based on the notion of OLD versus NEW KNOWLEDGE. There are also, of course, the autochthonic traditions of Tibetan grammar, a discussion of which lies beyond the scope of this overview.

1.1. The conjunct–disjunct approach

Hale introduced the terms CONJUNCT and DISJUNCT in an article on Newari (Hale 1980) . The terms were originally coined to refer to embedded clauses where the verb is marked, either with a CONJUNCT verb form when the referent of both clauses is identical, or with a DISJUNCT verb form when the two clauses have different referents. Then Hale expanded the meaning of the two terms. By means of using IMPLICIT QUOTE FRAMES (see examples 1 and 2), with simple sentences, he shifted the range of the description from the syntactic level describing the relation between the subject of the main clause and the subject of a subordinate clause, to a pragmatic level comparing the identity of the speaker with the syntactic subject of the sentence.

(1)   [I say to you] "I went there."   (CONJUNCT FORM)
(2)   [I say to you] "He went there."   (DISJUNCT FORM)

Hale's analysis of Newari has been applied to Tibetan by various authors, e.g. by Schöttelndreyer in his short article on Sherpa (Schöttelndreyer 1980). Later DeLancey used this approach in several articles on Lhasa Tibetan (1990, 1992), which will be used here to present the basic ideas of this line of research.

Lhasa dialect:

Examples with framed quotes:

(3)   khos   kho   bod=pa   **yin**   zer=gis
      he'ERG   he$_i$ Tibetan   be   say-IPFV/CONJUNCT[2]
      'He$_i$ says that he$_i$ is a Tibetan.'
      [The speaker refers to what a third person has said about himself]

(4)   khos   kho   bod=pa   **red**   zer=gis
      he'ERG$_i$ he$_j$ Tibetan   be   say-IPFV/DISJUNCT
      'He$_i$ says that he$_j$ is a Tibetan.'
      [The speaker refers to what a third person has said about someone else]

---

[2]   The original glosses have been slightly adapted for the sake of consistency with abbreviations used in this paper.

(5) khos   nga   bod=pa   **red**   zer=gis
     he'ERG I   Tibetan   be   say-IPFV/DISJUNCT
     'He says that I am a Tibetan.'
     [The speaker refers to what a third person has said about the speaker herself]

Examples with implicit quote frames:

(6) nga   bod=pa   **yin**
     I'ABS   Tibetan   be
     'I am a Tibetan.' [I say so]

(7) kho   bod=pa   **red**
     he'ABS Tibetan   be
     'He is a Tibetan.' [I say so]
     (All examples are taken from DeLancey 1990: 295–296)

The following examples show that the system can be extended to finite verb constructions which are built with a verb form plus a nominalizer followed by the respective auxiliary:

(8) ngas   byas-pa   **yin**.
     I'ERG   did'PERF   be/CONJUNCT
     'I did it.'

(9) khyed=rang-gis/khos   byas-pa   **red**.
     You yourself'ERG/He himself'ERG   did'PERF   be/DISJUNCT
     'You/He did it.' (DeLancey 1992: 44–45)

Here again the CONJUNCT form marks the identity between agent and speaker, whilst the DISJUNCT form expresses that agent and speaker are not identical. DeLancey further notices that the CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT system only functions with controllable[3] verbs (called "volitional" in his 1992 paper) while the finite forms of non-controllable verbs are constructed differently.[4]

---

[3] Control is here used as a semantic category of the verb. In sentences with a controllable verb as predicate, the subject of the sentence is a true actor, she instigates the action. Non-controllable verbs have patient subjects.

[4] In Lhasa with the auxiliary *song*.

This was already anticipated in Hale's paper:

> The problem regarding impersonal verbs [non-controllable in
> our terminology K.H.] points up a very central fact about the
> conjunct–disjunct pattern in Newari. *Finite conjunct forms*
> *are appropriate only where the actor of the clause is*
> *portrayed as a true instigator*, one responsible for an
> intentional act. Even with personal verbs *disjunct forms*
> *replace conjunct forms where the actor is not portrayed as*
> *true instigator.* Hale 1980: 96 (italics mine)

In his cognitive approach to event structure DeLancey formalized the different roles an actor can play in a proposition in the form of a table, represented below in a slightly rearranged form.

	direct knowledge			*no direct knowledge*
	AV	*event*	*resultant state*	
perfective	**-pa yin**	**-song**	**-zhag**	**-pa red**
imperfective	**=gi yod**	**=gis**		**=gi yod-pa red**
future	**=gi yin**			**=gi red**

Table 1.   Cognitive model of event structure with the respective verb forms as used in the Lhasa dialect (DeLancey 1990: 303). (AV = initial act of volition)

According to DeLancey the use of the auxiliary depends on the SPEAKER'S KNOWLEDGE about the act or event described in a sentence. If the actor has direct evidence of the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION, which she[5] can have only if the speaker herself is the actor/true instigator of the action, then a CONJUNCT form is used. If the actor has direct knowledge of the event itself but not of the initial act of volition, then a DISJUNCT form will be used. If the actor has knowledge only of the resultant state, an inferential form will be used. Thus, the verb system is reduced to a system of evidentiality where only the *knowledge* about the initial act of volition is considered relevant and not, as in the volitionality approach, the speaker's volition itself.

---

[5]   In this paper the speaker, actor, etc. is normally referred to as *she*, which stands here as an abbreviation for *he/she*. Only where it was explicit that the speaker was male is the form *he* used instead.

1.2. The volitional–evidential approach

Instead of incorporating volition into the system of evidentiality[6], like DeLancey (knowledge of the initial act of volition), Haller (1995) defines volitionality as an independent category denoting the influence a speaker has on the action performed, and it is located on a higher level of description then evidentiality. Volition is understood as a binary category and evidentiality is viewed as a subcategory of non-volition.

> A verb is marked 'volitional' if the event that it describes takes place with the intention of the speaker, and as 'non-volitional' if it does not. (Haller in this volume)

The act of will of the speaker is thus considered a separate factor and is differentiated from evidentiality, which only describes the way the speaker knows about an act of which she was not the true actor-instigator. By definition all volitional acts, i.e. all acts that were instigated by the speaker herself, are evidential. That is to say, whenever the speaker has instigated an action, she also has full knowledge or evidence of this action. The category "volitional" thus excludes the possibility of different evidential values. Only non-volitional actions can be differentiated for evidentiality, i.e. situations where the speaker can denote how she knows about a particular action of which she was not the instigator.

Haller further notices that :

> Kontrollierbare Verben können sowohl volitional als auch nicht-volitional verwendet werden, nicht-kontrollierbare Verben aber üblicherweise nur nicht-volitional. (Haller 2000: 88) (Controllable verbs can be used both volitionally and non-volitionally, non-controllable verbs are commonly used only non-volitionally.)

This is to be expected as, after all, non-controllable verbs do not have an actor-instigator (cf. Hale 1980: 96).

Below I will use some examples with equative verbs to illustrate this description. For a further description of the Shigatse auxiliary verb see Haller's paper in this volume.

---

6   Another example of a system of evidentiality is the one developed by Tournadre (1996) .

Shigatse dialect:

(10) tạ   tsʰōŋpā   jī́.
      I'ABS trader   be
      'I am a trader.' (The speaker chose this profession.) [30] [7]

(11) ŋạ   ạ̄tā-jiɛ   lāpt̠à   pi̠ɛ!
      I'ABS still   student   be
      'I am still a student!' (The speaker does not want to be a student any
      more.) (Haller 2000: 76) [8] [34]

Examples (10) and (11) are classified by Haller as volitional and non-volitional respectively. However, examples like (12) make the use of the term volitionality more difficult, since there the speaker cannot possibly have an influence on whether or not a book is new.[9] It might be argued that she has an influence on the fact that it is her own book by having bought it, but the newness of the book cannot be said to be "under her influence", except if we suppose that she herself has made it.

(12) tʰèp-ko   sāmpā   jī́.
      book'ABS   new   be
      'This book is new.' (The book belongs to the speaker.) (Haller 2000: 76)

In Shigatse, as in other Tibetan dialects, the existential and equative verbs are used as auxiliaries to form complex verb forms. Haller describes them as marking the difference between a volitional (*jī́*, *jœ*) and a non-volitional (*pi̠ɛ*, *nu̠*, *jo̠apiɛ*) verb form. In addition to the existential and equational auxiliaries there are a few others used in the building of complex verb forms, which, according to Haller, also differentiate between volitional and non-volitional actions/events. It is not possible to discuss all these forms here, but one particular example from Haller's data will be used to show that his approach is very similar to that of DeLancey, and hence gives rise to very similar questions.

---

[7] The numbers in square parentheses refer to the examples in Haller's paper in this volume.

[8] All the glosses for Haller's examples are my own. The examples are quoted from Haller's dissertation, but the English translations have, where possible, been taken from Haller's paper in this volume.

[9] Example 12 is also difficult to explain with the conjunct–disjunct approach.

Shigatse dialect:

(13)   *ŋiɛ̱*   *rā̱-ki*   *pà-ko*   *si̱ɛ-so.*
       I'ABS   your   *pa*   eat-PFV.II+evid.-vol. (disjunct)
       'I erroneously ate your *pa!*' (The speaker just discovers that the *pa*[10] he
       had just eaten was his friend's, and not his own.) (Haller 2000: 89) [9]

Such cases have already been discussed by Hale, who argues that a CONJUNCT form is replaced with a DISJUNCT form when the actor is not portrayed as the true instigator of an action. For the Lhasa dialect DeLancey describes *jin* as being used when the speaker has direct knowledge of the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION, and *song* when the speaker has no direct knowledge of the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION but only of the EVENT. Thus, if a speaker has done something unintentionally, DeLancey would say that she has no direct knowledge of the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION, but only of the event. Haller describes the same situation by simply saying that the speaker acted without volition.

Consider also the following two examples taken again from the Lhasa dialect[11]:

Lhasa dialect:

(14)   khos   dkaryol bcag-song
       he'ABS   cup   broke-PERF/EVID
       'He broke the cup.' (DeLancey 1990: 299)

(15)   ngas   dkaryol bcag-song
       I'ABS   cup   broke-PERF/EVID
       'I broke the cup (unintentionally).' (DeLancey 1990: 300)

In DeLancey's opinion both examples are based on direct observation (evidential) and express the fact that the speaker had no direct knowledge of the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION. In (14) this is so because somebody else was the actor of the event, in (15) because the speaker acted unintentionally.[12] In Haller's opinion, in both sentences the act was carried out without the volition of the speaker. The two authors' descriptions are thus essentially similar, differing only in the fact that Haller sees volition itself as the important factor, whereas in DeLancey's view it is the knowledge about the volition that plays the major role.

---

[10]   "Balls made out of Tsampa with liquids and sometimes other ingredients added to it." (Haller's paper in this volume.)
[11]   Very similar examples can be found in the Shigatse Dialect.
[12]   The *-song* perfective "marks both direct evidentiality in disjunct clauses, and the absence of intention in conjunct clauses" (DeLancey 1990: 300) .

1.3. The old versus new knowledge approach

Van Driem describes how the usage of the copulas and auxiliaries in Dzongkha (southern Tibetan) is governed by the distinction of OLD vs. NEW KNOWLEDGE, or in van Driem's terminology: assimilated vs. acquired knowledge.[13] In Dzongkha there are again two sets of auxiliaries:

	old knowledge	new knowledge
equative	'ing (in)[14]	'immä (in pas)
existential	jö (yod)	dû ('dug)

Table 2. Auxiliary verbs in Dzongkha (Van Driem 1998: 125-146)

The form *'ing* expresses "old, ingrained background knowledge which is or has become a firmly integrated part of one's conception of reality", the form *jö* marks "assimilated or personal knowledge", the form *'immä* marks "newly acquired knowledge" and the form *dû* is used to express newly acquired or objective knowledge. (Van Driem 1998: 127, 135) .

In this approach it is neither the KNOWLEDGE OF THE INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION nor the VOLITION itself which determines the choice of the copula/auxiliary used in a given sentence, but rather the question of whether or not the knowledge about the action/event itself is old or new to the speaker at the moment of the utterance of her statement.

2. THE EPISTEMIC VERB SYSTEM OF THE DEGE DIALECT

Following this short overview on different analytical approaches to the epistemic verb systems of different Tibetan dialects, I now want to discuss the system of the Dege dialect within each framework. First the auxiliary verbs are briefly introduced in their function as copulas,[15] along with their function as auxiliaries in complex verb forms. In the following discussion I have allocated more space to the equative auxiliaries than to the existential ones, because part three of this paper will mainly focus on the complex verb forms in the perfective

---

[13]   Such a distinction has also been proposed for the central dialects by DeLancey in his article on evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan (DeLancey 1986: 205) .

[14]   The transliterations of the Tibetan script as given in van Driem (1998) are shown in parentheses.

[15]   The copulas in the Dege dialect can also be modified to form complex copulas like *jø: tʰ̃ë:, jĩ: tʰ̃ë:, jø:-zĩ: rẹ:, jĩ: ọ̃:.* A discussion of these complex forms is beyond the scope of this paper.

aspect, where the equative auxiliary verbs are used. The existential auxiliary verbs are described only briefly to allow comparison with the other Tibetan dialects treated in this volume.

2.1. The auxiliary verbs

On the syntactico-semantic level the auxiliary verbs can be classified in two groups, the equative and the existential. When used as copulas, the equative auxiliary verbs can have two different functions: identification and attribution. The existential auxiliary verbs are used as copula in existential, locational and possessive statements. Like the equative auxiliary verbs, the existential auxiliaries are also used to mark attribution. The auxiliary verbs are further classifiable by their different evidential values (unmarked, visual, sensory [non-visual], inferential), as can be seen in Table (3).

Evidentiality:	unmarked	visual	sensory	inferential ?[16]
equative	jĩ: rẹ:	rẹ:ŋgē	jĩ:ʈṣā̄ʔ rẹ:ʈṣā̄ʔ	jĩ:sə rẹ:sə
existential	jø: jø:rē:	ŋgẹ	jø:ʈṣā̄ʔ	jø:sə

Table 3. The auxiliary verbs: overview

Below some of the different functions of the auxiliary verbs will be briefly described. First the identificational function of the equative auxiliary verb is treated. There follows a description of the different functions of the existential auxiliary verb (with the exception of attribution).[17]

2.1.1. Equative auxiliary verbs used as copula

There are two basic[18] equative auxiliary verbs: jĩ:, which is normally[19] used when the speaker is the subject of the sentence (16); and rẹ, normally used when another participant than the speaker is the subject of the sentence (17). Besides the two simple equative auxiliary verbs, rẹ:ŋgē is used to mark that the speaker has visual knowledge about the fact she is reporting. In the attributive function

---

[16] These forms often occur in stories, and are also used when the speaker is surprised by a fact she sees. Inferential is only a tentative label for these forms.

[17] A description of the attributive function of the auxiliary verbs is beyond the scope of this paper.

[18] Basic is here used for the auxiliary verbs which are not marked for evidential value.

[19] A precise description will be introduced below.

re:ŋgē is used, both when the subject is the speaker as well as when the subject is another person. For the identificational function *re:ŋgē* is used mainly, but not always, with non-speaker subjects (22). The equative auxiliaries *jī:ʈsāʔ* and *re:ʈsāʔ* indicate that the speaker has sensory evidence for her statement, while *jī:sə* and *re:sə* signal that the speaker has inferential knowledge for her statement.

(16) ŋa   xīlɛ̄:   çe: ɲə   jī:
      I'ABS   fieldwork   do   person   be
      'I am a farmhand.'

(17) kʰō   xīlɛ̄:   çe: ɲə   re:
      he'ABS   fieldwork   do   person   be
      'He is a farmhand.'

In Hale's terms *jī:* marks the CONJUNCT, denoting that the speaker and the subject of the sentence are identical, and *re:* marks the DISJUNCT, denoting that the speaker and the subject are not identical. Applying van Driem's approach we could also say that *jī:* marks OLD KNOWLEDGE while *re:* marks NEW KNOWLEDGE.

The next three examples are a bit more difficult to account for:

(18) ŋa-tsʰō   dʑamə̄   jī:.
      we'ABS   Chinese   be
      'We are Chinese.' (Kraft and Hu (1990): 2.13) [20]

(19) ŋa-tsʰō   dʑamə̄   re:
      we'ABS   Chinese   be
      'We are Chinese.' (*ibid.*)

(20) kʰō-tsʰō   pø:pā   re:
      we'ABS   Tibetan   be
      'They are Tibetans.' (*ibid.*)

In (18) as well as (19) the speaker and the subject of the sentence are identical, thus we expect a CONJUNCT verb form to be used in both sentences. However, in sentence (19) a DISJUNCT form is used. Following Hale's approach we would have to say that in sentence (19) the "actor" is not portrayed as a true instigator,

---

[20]   All the glosses of the examples from Kraft and Hu (1990) are mine. The first number refers to the page, the second to the number of the example.

which does not seem to apply well to this sentence. Also DeLancey's extension of the CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT model does not offer the conceptual tools for a better description, as it is very difficult to argue whether or not the speaker of sentences (18) and (19) did or did not have direct knowledge of the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION.

With the term VOLITIONALITY the description might be easier: we could say that the speaker of sentence (19) is Chinese only unwillingly[21], while the other speaker is willingly so. Using the distinction of OLD–NEW KNOWLEDGE we could propose that in sentence (19) the speaker marks the statement as being NEW KNOWLEDGE to him. Thus both interpretations are possible, and which is to be preferred depends on the context of the sentence.

Sentence (20) portrays the normal usage of the auxiliary verb *re:* and can be understood well, even in isolation. Sentence (19), on the other hand, illustrates a special usage of the auxiliary verb. It can have several valid interpretations depending on the context. This shows the difficulty of applying the different binary distinctions proposed (CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT, OLD–NEW KNOWLEDGE, VOLITIONAL–NON-VOLITIONAL) which all focus on one possible interpretation. The speaker is at liberty to choose between the two options for a copula, and the factor which determines her choice is deducible only from the context (both linguistic and extra-linguistic). It is not inherent in the auxiliary verbs. Perhaps the speaker wants to indicate that the fact that she is Chinese is new to her, or that she is Chinese unwillingly (NON-VOLITIONAL), or that she just wants to be polite[22] by not using the CONJUNCT form, thus making a more general statement. It is the situation and the context of the utterance that determines which of these different interpretations conveys the intended meaning.

The next two examples show the usage of the auxiliary verb *re:ŋgē*. Used with a non-speaker subject (21), *re:ŋgē* can be interpreted either as a DISJUNCT form or as a NON-VOLITIONAL form which marks that the speaker has visual knowledge about her statement. Both interpretations apply equally well to the example.

(21) *kʰō*   *xʰə̄*   *tʰē:*   *tə̄tā:*   *nd̥ʑe*   *re:ŋgē*
     he   die   AUX   now   ghost   be

    'He has died, now he has become a ghost.' (The speaker has seen it.)

---

[21] Does one have a choice as to one's nationality? Cf. example (11) for a similar sentence from the Shigatse dialect.

[22] By so doing he speaker does not put herself in the centre of her speech act, but distances herself from her own statement. Thus the statement is a general piece of information rather than an explanation about herself. A study of the usage of such statements in discourse would be most interesting.

Used with the speaker as subject (22), *rę:ŋgē* cannot be explained with the notion of DISJUNCT, since the sentence refers to the speaker and we would thus expect a CONJUNCT marking. The concept of VOLITIONALITY, however, can be easily applied to the sentence. The sentence would then be described as marking the speaker's existence as a ghost, something she did not intend to be and which she has realised when looking in a mirror.

(22) *ŋa   ndʐę rę:ŋgē*
     I   ghost be
     'I am a ghost.'

(The speaker has seen herself in the mirror.)

2.1.2.   Existential auxiliary verbs used as copula

The first function of the existential auxiliary verbs is to mark the existence of the subject or its localisation. Secondly, it is used to form possessive statements. These functions are described in this section.

The two simple existential auxiliaries used in the Dege dialect are *jø:* and *ŋgę*. *jø:* is normally used in statements where the subject is the speaker herself (23). *ŋgę* usually marks a statement where another person is the subject, showing visual knowledge of the speaker (24). *jø:rē:* is also used normally with another person as subject, and is not specified for evidentiality (25).

(23) *ŋa   ānā   jø:*
     I'ABS   here   be
     'I am here.'

(24) *ŋɛ: ʈsø̄:   gø: dzə pʰūrə̄-te   pʰānā   ŋgę*
     I'ERG   wash   will   REL cup-that'ABS   there   be
     'The cups that I am going wash are over there.' (The speaker sees them.)

(25) *āmā   kʰȭ:bā   nȭ:-le   jø:rē:*
     mother   house   in-DAT   be
     'Mother is in the house.'

Used as a copula *jø:* can be described, in Hale's terms, as marking the identity between the speaker and the subject (CONJUNCT), while *ŋgę* marks that they are DISJUNCT. Using the category VOLITIONALITY we could say that *jø:* marks a statement as VOLITIONAL, while *ŋgę* and *jø:rē:* mark it as NON–VOLITIONAL. Using the approach offered by van Driem we could also describe *jø:* as signalling OLD KNOWLEDGE, while *ŋgę* and *jø:rē:* mark NEW KNOWLEDGE.

There are a few examples in my data of the type given in (26) and (27), where the copula *jø:* is used differently from the usage illustrated above:

(26) *dạwā   tɕī:la   ɲimā   sʰū̃:tɕū jø:*
    month one-LOC   day   30   be

    'There are thirty days in a month.'

(27) *kʰō   ə̄nā   jø:*
    he'ABS here   be

    'He is here.'

Example (26) can be well described using the OLD versus NEW KNOWLEDGE distinction. It is a general statement and can be said to be marked as OLD KNOWLEDGE. The categories CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT as well as VOLITIONALITY are more difficult to apply. Example (27) was uttered as an answer to the question, "Is he there?". The speaker answering this question can be said to have OLD KNOWLEDGE about the fact that the person referred to is with her. Such a reply could, in a specific context, also indicate that the speaker has ordered the person to be there. In such a context the term VOLITIONALITY would be adequate to describe the function of the auxiliary, while the CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT contrast could not be applied.

2.2. Complex verb forms

2.2.1. Equative auxiliary verbs used as auxiliaries

(A) WITH CONTROLLABLE VERBS

In addition to being used as copulas, *jī:*, *re:*, and *re:ŋgē* function as auxiliaries. Together with a main verb and an aspectual nominalizer, they are used to produce two different aspect forms: imperfective (examples 28, 30 and 32) and perfective (examples 29, 31 and 33). *jī:* and *re:* have no specific evidential value, but *re:ŋgē* marks visual knowledge of the speaker about the facts reported. The normal usage for *jī:* with a controllable verb is in sentences with the speaker as agent. *re:* and *re:ŋgē* are normally used in sentences with a non-speaker as agent.

(28) *ŋɛ:*   *kʰō-la pētɕā-tɕʰi*   *ɣī:-le*   *jī:*'I'ERG   he-DAT
           book-one   give-IPFV   be
    'I will give him a book.'

(29) *ŋɛ:*   *kʰō-la pētɕā-tɕʰi*   *ɣī:-zī:*   *jī:*'I'ERG   he-DAT
           book-one   give-PFV   be
    'I gave him a book.'

(30) *kʰə̄:*   *kʰō-la pētɕā-tɕʰi*   *ɣ í̄:-le*   *rḛ:*
      he'ERG   he-DAT book-one   give-IPFV   be
      'He gives him a book.'

(31) *kʰə̄:*   *kʰō-la pētɕā-tɕʰi*   *ɣ í̱:-zī:*   *rḛ:*
      he'ERG   he-DAT book-one   give-PFV   be
      'He gave him a book.'

(32) *kʰə̄:*   *j i̱ɣē*   *ţ ṣ í̱:-le*   *rḛ:ŋgē*
      he'ERG   letter'ABS   write-IPFV   be
      'He is writing a letter.'

      (The speaker sees how he takes out paper and pen.)

(33) *kʰə̄:*   *j i̱ɣē*   *ţ ṣ í̱:-zī:*   *rḛ:ŋgē*
      he'ERG   letter'ABS   write-PFV   be
      'He wrote a letter.' (The speaker saw it.)

For these common phrases all the above-mentioned approaches offer a valid description. We can use either the CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT, the VOLITIONAL–NON-VOLITIONAL or the OLD–NEW KNOWLEDGE distinction to describe them. But, consider the next example (34) where the description is no longer so clear:

(34)

A: 'What work is he doing now?'

B: 'He is at home now and has no work.'

A: 'Well, if he has no work, tell him to come here and carry wood.'

B: *la̱so, la̱so. ŋḛ: kʰō-la sḛ: tsʰō. kʰō   ta̱tā   ə̄:-le   j í̄:*
     yes,   yes.   I'ERG he-DAT say will. he'ABS immediately come-IPFV be
     'Yes sir, yes sir! I'll tell him. He shall come immediately.'

     (Kraft and Hu (1990): 52.13)

In Hale's terms *j í̄:* is a CONJUNCT form. It is used when the speaker and the true instigator of the action are the same person. In example (34) this is not the case. The speaker (B) and the agent of the last clause ('he shall come immediately') are not identical, which is a prerequisite for the use of a CONJUNCT form.

Here, DeLancey's approach provides a better explanation for the use of the CONJUNCT form. Although a non-speaker agent is actually performing the action, the ultimate cause of the action, the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION lies with

the speaker. It is the speaker who will cause the other person to do the action. While Hale's approach is not detailed enough to explain this sentence, DeLancey's elaboration of the cognitive processes involved provides a solid basis for the description of such sentences. As to the category of VOLI-TIONALITY, we can say that the coming of the agent lies within the VOLITION of the speaker.

Using the distinction of OLD versus NEW KNOWLEDGE we would have to say that the sentence, 'He shall come immediately' is old, assimilated knowledge, which does not fit very well. We would need some further explanation stating that here the OLD KNOWLEDGE form expresses the speaker's conviction that the other person's coming is as certain as if he had known about it for a long time. Thus, once again, the context of the utterance determines its meaning.

Another example of the "special" usage of *jĩ:* with a non-speaker as actor is sentence (35).

(35) *kēkē̄:*   *+ō?tʂʰū?tsʰō-la* *jīkē*   *tʂị:-tɕvki*   *tǭ:la* *ǭ:-zĩ:*   *jĩ:*
     teacher'ABS students-DAT letters'ABS lead-NML-GEN reason come-IPFV be

    'The teacher has come to lead the students in their studies.'
    (Kraft and Hu (1990): 52.13)

According to my informants sentence (35) can be said only in special contexts, for example, if the speaker is the school director and is responsible for the teacher's coming (VOLITIONALITY), or if the speaker arrived together with the teacher and is thus very familiar with the fact that the teacher has come (OLD KNOWLEDGE). Which descriptive approach fits best depends again on the context. In sentences where *jĩ:* is used with another person actor it is not possible to omit the agent, because then the hearer would automatically understand that it was the speaker herself who performed the action reported.

The "special" usage of equative auxiliary verbs is, however, not restricted to the auxiliary *jĩ:*. The auxiliary *rẹ:* also occurs in sentences where we would not at first expect to find it, as in (36):

(36) *ŋạ*   *dēkē-le*   *ndʐọ-le*   *rẹ:*
     I   Dege-DAT   go-IPFV   be

    'I am going to Dege.' (The speaker talks about her dream.)

One context where *rẹ:* occurs as an auxiliary of a controllable verb in a sentence with the speaker as actor, is when the speaker talks about her dreams, as in example (36). The same sentence could also be used in indirect speech. The actions of the speaker in her dream, can probably be analysed as NON-VOLITIONAL, although this interpretation would not account for the usage of the

same form in indirect speech. We could also say that the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION is not known to the speaker, since she was asleep. An interpretation of the sentence as marking NEW KNOWLEDGE might also be possible for the report of a dream, but does not necessarily apply to the usage in indirect speech.

The usage of *re:*, instead of the normal *jī:*, indicates that the speaker is taking a distant perspective from which to describe an action of which she herself is the agent. Which of the different analyses accounts best for this fact is again dependent on the wider context of the utterance.

A similar example is sentence (37), where the speaker reports an action which she has done, but which she cannot really remember.

(37) *ŋɛ*   *kʰō*   *dō̞:-zī̃*   *re:*
     I-ERG   her-ABS   hit-PFV   be

'I hit her.' (The speaker cannot really remember having done so.)

The speaker can say a sentence like (37) after having lost her temper, to imply that she cannot remember what she has done in her rage. Such examples can be explained as marking the NON-VOLITIONAL character of the action of the speaker. If the speaker has been reminded by somebody of what she has done and then utters sentence (37), we could equally well say that the speaker marks her action as being new information to her (NEW KNOWLEDGE).

We have not found examples where *re:ŋgē* occurs as auxiliary of a controllable verb in a sentence where the speaker is the actor. Only in its function as an auxiliary verb can *re:ŋgē* occur with the speaker as subject (cf. example 22).

(B) WITH NON-CONTROLLABLE VERBS

The usage of *jī:* as auxiliary of a non-controllable verb is rare. In sentence (38) it carries the implication that the speaker "let" herself fall, e.g. because she was shot at.

(38) *ŋa*   *wa̧ʔ-zī:*   *jī̃:*
     I'ABS   fall-PFV   be

'I fell.' (Somebody shot at me.)

(39) *ŋa*   *te*   *tʰō̞:-na*   *ŋa*   *na̧-le*   *jī:*
     I'ABS   this'ABS   drink-if   I'ABS   sick-IPFV   be

'If I drink this, I will get sick.'

Sentence (39) can be said when the speaker knows that a certain drink will make her sick. The usage of *jī:* with a non-speaker subject is not attested for non-controllable verbs.

The auxiliary *re:* can be used together with a non-controllable verb, both with a non-speaker (40, 41) or with the speaker as subject (42, 43).

(40)   *kʰō:*   *waʔ-zī:*   *re:*
      he'ABS   fall-PFV   be
      'He fell.'

(41)   *kʰō*   *te*   *tʰō̃:-na*   *kʰō*   *na-le*   *re:*
      I'ABS   this'ABS   drink-if   I'ABS   sick-IPFV   be
      'If he drinks this, he will get sick.'

(42)   *ŋa*   *tsa:-zī:*   *re:*
      I'ABS   belch-PFV   be
      'I belched.'

(43)   *ŋa*   *waʔ-zī:*   *re:*
      I'ABS   fell-PFV   be
      'I fell.'

While sentences similar to (40) or (41) are frequently encountered, examples like (42) or (43) are rare. Sentence (42) can be used, e.g. when the speaker is giving a description of her early childhood. The statement thus represents an objective description of an event which happened to her in the past. Sentence (43) is another example of the usage of *re:* with the speaker as subject of an event in the past. In this case the speaker, by using *re:* rather than *çũ:* or *tʰē:*, distances herself from the event, indicating that she is no longer concerned about it and reports it as an objective fact.

A good example of the "special" usage of *re:* is (44), taken from the beginning of a narrative where the speaker is setting the scene for a story, relating the facts from a general point of view:

(44)   *ŋa*   *sʰā*   *ēndē*   *dõ:*   *dzi:*   *tsʰā-le*   *re:*
      I'ABS   place   this.one   with   be.familiar   V2-IPFV   be
      'I had already got used to this land.'

The auxiliary *re:ŋgē* with a non-controllable verb can be used in a sentence with a non-speaker subject:

(45) *kʰō   wạʔ-zī: rẹ:ŋgē*
      he'ABS   fall-PFV   be

'He fell.' (The speaker has seen his torn trousers.)

In sentence (45) the speaker has visual knowledge about the result of the event reported. The usage of *rẹ:ŋgē* with a non-controllable verb and the speaker as subject is not accepted by my informants.

2.2.2. *Existential auxiliary verbs used as auxiliaries*

(A) WITH CONTROLLABLE VERBS

    The simple existential auxiliaries *jø:* and *ŋgẹ* are used together with a controllable main verb and an aspectual nominalizer to form the continuous aspect. *jø:* normally occurs when the speaker is the actor of the sentence (46), *ŋgẹ* when a non-speaker is the actor (47).   While *jø:* is not marked for evidentiality, *ŋgẹ* conveys that the speaker actually sees the action taking place at the time of utterance. When the speaker does not see the action of another agent taking place, she will use the form *jø:rẹ:* (48) instead of *ŋgẹ*.

(46) *ŋɛ̣:   xʰī̃:   sē-si   jø:*
      I'ERG   wood'ABS   split-CONT be

'I am splitting wood.'

(47) *pʰāʔ-ke   sʰā   lūʔ-si   ŋgẹ*
      pig-ERG   ground'ABS turn.over-CONT be

'The pigs are turning the ground upside down.'

(The speaker is watching it.)

(48) *kʰø̄:   jiɣē   ʦi̠:-si   jø:rē:*
      he'ERG   letter'ABS   write-CONT   be

'He is writing a letter.'

(The speaker knows this, although she is not actually seeing it)

In (46), (47), and (48) the auxiliaries are used as expected. All the different approaches can be applied without difficulty to describe their usage either as CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT,   VOLITIONAL–NON-VOLITIONAL   or   OLD–NEW KNOWLEDGE. The next two examples (49) and (50) offer more scope for a discussion of which analysis is best:

(49) *kʰōnō:*   *sɛ:*   *ɬō:-ji*   *ndʐo-si*   *jø:*
      they'ABS   food   beg-NML   go-CONT   be

      'They are going to beg for food.'

      (The speaker has told them to do so.)

In sentence (49) the form *jø:* is used, which can be interpreted as marking a VOLITIONAL form. The OLD versus NEW KNOWLEDGE distinction could also be applied, because the speaker has told them to go begging, she has OLD KNOWLEDGE about their activities. Another possible interpretation of sentence (49) would be that the speaker is very familiar with their activities, because she lives in the same house with them. In this context the analysis as OLD KNOWLEDGE does fit very well, while a VOLITIONAL approach does not.

(50) *ŋɛ:*   *sʰēmō*   *sa-si*   *ŋge*
      I'ERG   fingernails'ABS   eat-CONT   be

      'I am eating my fingernails.'

In sentence (50) the speaker is eating her own fingernails. She does not do this on purpose (NON-VOLITIONAL) and only just realises it (NEW KNOWLEDGE). Thus, both examples (49) and (50) can be well described by using either the OLD versus NEW KNOWLEDGE distinction or the VOLITIONAL approach. If one wishes to decide which interpretation is most adequate, the specific contextual situation needs to be taken into account.

(B) WITH NON-CONTROLLABLE VERBS

All three forms are also used with non-controllable verbs (examples 51 to 53):

(51) *ŋa*   *ɲūpʰø:-si*   *jø:*
      I'ABS   be.stressed-CONT   be

      'I am stressed.'

(52) *kʰō*   *ɲūpʰø:-si*   *ŋge*
      he'ABS   be.stressed-CONT   be

      'He is stressed.' (The speaker sees him running around.)

(53) *kʰō*   *ɲūpʰȳ:-si*   *jø:rē:*
      he'ABS   be.stressed-CONT   be

      'He is stressed.' (The speaker knows that he has a lot to do.)

With a non-controllable verb there are a few "special" cases, where *ŋge* can also be used with the speaker as subject:

(54) *ŋạ*   *ndạ:-si*   *ŋgẹ̃*
      I'ABS   shake-CONT   be

      'I am shaking.'[23] (The speaker looks at herself.)

Sentences with the auxiliary *jø:* and a non-speaker subject are rejected by my informants. The same is true for sentences with an auxiliary *jø:rē:* and the speaker as subject.

2.2.3.   Movement verbs used as auxiliaries

The two movement verbs *tʰē:* 'to go' and *çũ:* 'to come, to appear' have been grammaticalized and are used as auxiliaries in the perfective past tense. Both are also used as main verbs, as can be seen from (55) and (56).

(55) *kʰō*   *kạnā*   *tʰē:*
      he'ABS   where   went

      'Where did he go?'

(56) *kʰō*   *ə̄nā*   *çũ:*
      he'ABS   here   came

      'He came here.'

When used as auxiliaries the two motion verbs carry different meanings, depending on the preceding main verb. In combination with a motion verb, their original deictic meaning is triggered, *tʰē:* being used with motions that are directed away from the speaker and *çũ:* with motions that are directed towards the speaker. When used with a telic main verb, *tʰē:* carries the meaning 'to disappear'; *çũ:* used with a stative main verb has the meaning 'to appear'.

2.2.3.1. The auxiliary *tʰē:*

(A) WITH CONTROLLABLE VERBS

Used with a controllable verb the auxiliary *tʰē:* usually occurs with a non-speaker agent, as in (57) and (59). Functionally *tʰē:* seems to correspond to the auxiliary *-song* as given by DeLancey for the Lhasa dialect (cf. examples 14 and 15). It could be termed either DISJUNCT or NON-VOLITIONAL. *tʰē:* is used only when the speaker has visual knowledge of the action she is describing.

---

[23] This sentence could also be said with the auxiliary *tsọʔ*, indicating that the speaker has sensory knowledge about the fact she is reporting.

(57) *kʰə̄:*   *pu̧mō-te*   *tɛ̄:*   *tʰē:*
     he'ERG   girl-that'ABS   look   AUX

'He looked at that girl.'

(58) *kʰə̄:*   *so̧ʔ-ke*   *kī-la*   *do̧*   *pʰə̧̄:*   *tʰē:*
     he'ERG   cattle-GEN   middle-LOC   stone   shot   AUX

'He threw the stone at the cattle.'

(59) *kʰō*   *ndz̧ə̄ʔ*   *tʰē:*
     he'ABS   sneak   AUX

'He sneaked (around).'

(60) *kʰō*   *ɬə̄sā-lə*   *jɑ̧:*   *tɕʰə̧̄:*   *tʰē:*
     he'ABS   Lhasa'LOC   up   wander   AUX

'He went up to Lhasa.'

In (57) the auxiliary does not carry an additional increment of meaning, but simply indicates that the speaker has seen the action happen. In (58) the main verb 'to shoot' triggers a directional meaning of the auxiliary. It is clear that the action had been directed away from the speaker. Also, in (59) and (60), where *tʰē:* is used with motion verbs, the deictic meaning of the auxiliary is triggered, indicating that the action was performed away from the speaker.

tʰē: also occurs in sentences with controllable verbs, where the speaker is the actor (examples 61 and 62):

(61)   *ŋɛ̄:*   *kə̄jȳ:*   *tɕə̄ʔ-tsʰā*   *tʰē:.*
       I'ERG   cup'ABS   break-V2.finish   AUX

'I broke the cup.' (It was by mistake.)

(62)   *ŋɛ̄:*   *kʰō-la*   *dz̧ȩ:*   *tʰē:.*
       I'ERG   he-DAT   hit   AUX

'I hit him.' (It was an accident.)

In sentence (61) the combination of the controllable verb 'to break' with the auxiliary *tʰē:* conveys the meaning that although the speaker has carried out the action she did not do it on purpose. This sentence can be described very well with the notion of VOLITIONALITY. Sentence (62) can be said when the speaker hit somebody because she did not see him. Again, an interpretation as NON-VOLITIONAL seems most adequate.

(B) WITH NON-CONTROLLABLE VERBS

When used with a non-controllable verb *tʰē:* can occur either with a non-speaker (63) or a speaker as subject, as in (64) and (65). It signals that the speaker has visual knowledge about the event referred to.

(63) *talō*   *kʰā:*   *tsā:mō*   *pạʔ*   *sọ:*   *tsā:mō* *xʰə̄*   *tʰē:*
      this.year   snow'ABS   very   fall   cattle'ABS   very   die   AUX

      'It snowed a lot this year, a lot of cattle died.'

(64) *ŋạ*   *xʰə̄*   *tʰēʔ*
      I   die   AUX

      'I died.' (When the speaker is a ghost.)

(65) *ŋạ*   *ɲūpʰə̄:*   *tʰēʔ*
      I   be.stressed   AUX

      'I was stressed.'

In (64) the usage of *tʰēʔ* emphasises the terminative character of the main verb. If the auxiliary *ɕū̃:* were used instead, then the sentence would have an inchoative stative meaning. Also, in (65) the auxiliary *tʰēʔ* could be replaced by *ɕū̃:*. When *tʰēʔ* is used in (65), the speaker has more distance from the facts referred to; *ɕū̃:* would mark a more subjective statement, focusing more on the speaker's direct involvement.

2.2.3.2. The auxiliary *ɕū̃:*

(A) WITH CONTROLLABLE VERBS

The auxiliary *ɕū̃:* occurs with controllable verbs normally when the actor is not the speaker. Thus it could be described, like *tʰē:*, as marking a DISJUNCT form, or a NON-VOLITIONAL form. The speaker of (66) has sensory knowledge of the action because she was affected by it herself, though she has no knowledge of the INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION. In (67) the speaker has not been directly affected by the action, but only has visual knowledge about it.

(66) *āpē*   *ŋạ*   *nʰāʔ*[24]   *ɕū̃:*
      father'ERG   I'ABS   hit   AUX

      'Father hit me.'

(67) *āpē*   *kʰō*   *nʰāʔ*   *tʰē:*
      father'ERG   he'ABS   hit   AUX

      'Father hit him.'

---

[24] The main meaning of this word is 'to knead'. It might etymologically belong to WT **sno**, although the rhyme of the Dege word does not fit well with that etymology.

Sentences (66) and (67) are good examples of the deictic opposition of the two auxiliaries. In (66) the action is directed towards the speaker and the speaker is affected by it; in (67) the action is not directed towards her and she is not affected by it either. The way in which the speaker is affected by an action is not specified in the sentence itself, but has to be deduced from the context of the utterance. In (66) the involvement of the speaker is very direct, she is the patient of the described action. But this is not necessarily so, and the degree of involvement can vary considerably (68, 69):

(68) *kʰō   ndzǫpā   tsē   çǖ:*
     he'ABS   fast   arrive   AUX

    'He has come fast in this direction.'

In (68), the use of *çǖ:* suggests only that the speaker is, in one way or another, involved in the action, the most common interpretation being that the actor has arrived at the place of the speaker; but other interpretations are also possible, e.g. that the speaker caused the actor to arrive.

(69) *(kʰə̄:)   sǫʔ   tǭ: çǖ:*
     (he'ERG) cattle   release   AUX

    'Somebody let the cattle out.'

In sentence (69) the speaker portrays herself as being affected by the action, and from the context of the utterance the hearer knows that it was the speaker's cattle that were let out. In a different context, a deictic interpretation of (69) would also be possible, viz. that the freed cattle were running towards the speaker. Therefore, the semantic role of the speaker in sentences where the auxiliary *çǖ:* is used can be either patient or goal.

    There is only one possible situation where the speaker can use *çǖ:* in a sentence where the speaker herself is the actor, and that is in reflexive clauses like (70):

(70) *ŋɛ: ŋarī ŋarī-lə   dzǫʔ   çǖ:*
     IERG   myself-DAT   hit   AUX

    'I hit myself.'

In (70) the speaker tells about about an action which she did not do on purpose, but which happened by accident. The action can be said to be NON-VOLITIONAL.

(B) WITH NON-CONTROLLABLE VERBS

The auxiliary *çũ:* is also used with non-controllable verbs. In this case, either the speaker (71) or a non-speaker (72 and 73) may occur as subject of the event described. As it does with a controllable main verb, *çũ:* here marks that the speaker was in some way affected by an event.

(71) *ndosō*   *tsʰḗ:*   *ndę*   *ŋạ*   *ṭsā:*   *çũ:*
      last.night   night   LOC   I'ABS   be.afraid   AUX

      'Last night I was afraid.'

In (71) the usage of *çũ:* in opposition to *tʰē:* (which is also possible), marks that the speaker portrays herself as affected by the event, and the event itself has an inchoative stative meaning.

(72) *kʰō*   *ṭsạ:*   *çũ:*
      he   belch   AUX

      'He belched.'

(73) *kʰō*   *wạʔ*   *çũ:*
      he fall   AUX

      'He fell.'

When used with a non-speaker subject (72 and 73), *çũ:* indicates either that the event was directed towards the speaker, or that the speaker was in some way affected by the event. Sentence (72) can, for example, be said when the speaker still has the foul smell of the other person's eructation in her nose.

In the following section I will propose a different approach to explain the usage of the auxiliaries *çũ:* and *tʰē:* as well as *jĩ:* and *rę:*. My analysis handles not only the "normal" usages, but also the various exceptional usages which, as we have seen, can only be described with some difficulty by the previous analyses applied to the auxiliary systems of other Tibetan dialects.

3. THE EMPATHY APPROACH

In the preceding discussion of the various examples taken from the Dege dialect, we have seen that in many utterances a speaker can choose an auxiliary other than the one normally expected. This leaves us with the difficulty of establishing rules that can explain not only the more frequent usages of the auxiliaries, but also these "special" cases.

All the frameworks discussed in § 1 of this paper can be applied to the "standard" sentences of the Dege dialect. As discussed above, they focus on different aspects of the system. In the CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT model the emphasis lies on the identity of the speaker with the agent or the subject of her

utterance. In the VOLITIONALITY approach the important factor is to mark whether or not an action was carried out according to the speaker's volition (will). In the OLD–NEW KNOWLEDGE analysis the emphasis is on whether or not the utterance represents new knowledge to the speaker. Using DeLancey's expansion of the CONJUNCT–DISJUNCT approach, we have to determine whether or not the speaker has knowledge of THE INITIAL ACT OF VOLITION, which is usually only the case if she performed the action herself.

Yet none of these approaches takes into full account that the speaker of an utterance has the liberty to choose which auxiliary she wants to use, and that she can actually override any of the above-mentioned categories. She can deliberately choose a different angle from which to look at an action/event, and thus she can decide to what degree she wants to "side" with the agent/subject of her utterance. This possibility of "taking sides", which allows the speaker to mark her position or her relation to the action/event reported, will be called EMPATHY[25]. It is the basic notion which lies behind all the "special" cases referred to above.

In § 2 we saw that many of the auxiliaries described can occur with either the speaker or a non-speaker as actor/subject. Considering that in Tibetan the agent, or the subject, is very often omitted, we have to address the question of how a hearer can know with whom (i.e. with which participant) the speaker EMPATHIZES when using a specific auxiliary. In order to answer this question I would like to use Kuno's concept of EMPATHY HIERARCHIES (Kuno 1987; Kuno and Etsuko 1977). With the help of his SPEECH-ACT PARTICIPANT EMPATHY HIERARCHY we can put a ranking on the different protagonists of the speech-act. The ranking reflects the protagonist with whom the speaker is most likely to EMPATHIZE.

Speech-act participant empathy hierarchy:

> "It is easiest for the speaker to empathize with himself; it is next easiest for him to empathize with the hearer; it is most difficult for him to express more empathy with third persons than with himself or with the hearer" (Kuno and Etsuko 1977: 652) .

While Kuno uses empathy hierarchies to predict which person (speaker, hearer or third person) is most likely to be empathized with and, thus to be used in

---

[25] Empathy is defined by Kuno as: "...the speaker's identification, which may vary in degree, with a person/thing that participates in the event or state that he describes in a sentence." (Kuno 1987) .

some special construction, I want to use his concept of empathy hierarchies in the reverse sense.

In Dege the speaker marks the degree of EMPATHY she wishes to express for a agent/subject by her usage of the different auxiliaries, but she does not mark which person (speaker or non-speaker) she EMPATHIZES with. Now the SPEECH-ACT PARTICIPANT EMPATHY HIERARCHY tells us that it is most likely for a speaker to empathize with herself. It follows, that when a speaker uses an auxiliary which marks a strong EMPATHY with the agent/subject of her utterance, then the agent/subject is most likely the speaker herself. When she uses an auxiliary which marks a weak EMPATHY or a DISSOCIATION, then the agent/subject is most likely a non-speaker.

aspect	empathy	speaker = agent	non-speaker = agent	evidentiality
perfective	strong	*-zĩ jĩ:*	*-zĩ jĩ:*	unmarked
	weak	*-zĩ rę:*	*-zĩ rę:*	unmarked
	weak	*çũ:*	*çũ:*	sensory
	weak	*tʰē:*	*tʰē:*	visual
imperfective	strong	*-le jĩ:*	*-le jĩ:*	unmarked
	weak	*-le rę:*	*-le rę:*	unmarked
continuous	strong	*-si jø:*	*-si jø:*	unmarked
	weak	*-si ŋge*	*-si ŋge*	visual

Table 4. Auxiliaries participating in empathy relations of controllable verbs.

In Table (4) the grey fields mark the forms which have been called "normal usage" in the descriptions of the different auxiliaries in §2. The white fields mark "special" usages of the contained forms.

As long as the speaker EMPATHIZES in the expected way according to the empathy hierarchy, the knowledge about the likelihood of a person (speaker, non-speaker) being associated with a certain empathy level and, thus, with a certain auxiliary, allows the hearer to identify the person the speaker is EMPATHIZING with. This is so even if that participant is not explicitly mentioned in an utterance.

But, as we have seen in §2, it is possible for the speaker to EMPATHIZE with a referent other than the one expected. In other words, she can use an auxiliary in a different way than the "default" usage. In these instances the speaker must make sure that the hearer can identify the intended referent with whom she is

EMPATHIZING, either by making it explicit in the utterance[26], or by insuring that the context of the utterance makes the referent clear enough so that the hearer cannot be mistaken.

The speaker's choice of a specific degree of empathy, when referring to the agent/subject of an action/event, can have different motivations. This is especially the case when her choice does not follow the default expectations according to the empathy hierarchy.

The choice can be motivated by deictic criteria (temporal distance, direction of an action towards or away from the speaker), personal closeness or personal involvement of the speaker in an action/event (even if this involvement is not a direct one and the speaker is not herself a participant in the utterance), evidential criteria which also express the position of the speaker in relation to an action/event, and discourse motivated criteria such as backgrounding or politeness.

It is important to see that because verb semantics and context put limitations on the applicability of each of these criteria, the reason why the speaker chooses a certain degree of empathy, or why a certain auxiliary cannot be used in a certain utterance, can be answered only in the context of each specific utterance. The auxiliaries themselves mark only the different degrees of empathy, but the question of why the speaker empathizes with a certain participant is not marked in the auxiliaries.[27]

Below I will give a short description of the possible semantic interpretations of the different auxiliaries when used to mark a strong empathy with a non-speaker or a weak empathy with the speaker. Again, the grey boxes stand for the normal usage of the different auxiliaries, the white ones for the "special" usage.

3.1. Perfective aspect -zĭ jĭ: versus -zĭ re: and tʰē: versus ɕṳ̃:

In the perfective aspect the auxiliaries *-zĭ jĭ:* mark a strong EMPATHY and *-zĭ re:* the corresponding weak EMPATHY. They are normally used with a speaker or a non-speaker actor/subject respectively.

---

[26] The omission of the agent in these instances is probably much less frequent than when the speaker is empathizing with a person in accordance with the empathy hierarchy.

[27] In this context a text-linguistical analysis might prove very fruitful. I hope to be able to conduct an extended study in this area as my work proceeds, but at the moment this has been done only rudimentarily.

-zĩ jĩ̱:	Aspect: perfective; Empathy: strong; Evidentiality: unmarked	
	with a controllable verb	with a non-controllable verb
speaker	(example 29)	·(example 38)
non-speaker	· Speaker is very familiar with the action. · Speaker initiated the action of the non-speaker. (example 35)	· Not attested.

Table 5. The usage of -zĩ jĩ̱: marking empathy

The speaker can use the auxiliary -zĩ jĩ̱:, which marks a strong empathy, not only in sentences which have the speaker as agent, but also with sentences that have a non-speaker as agent. By this choice the speaker expresses either that she is very familiar with the action described, or that it was she who originally motivated the non-speaker to perform the action (cf. example 35). For a non-controllable verb this usage is not attested (cf. Table 9).

-zĩ rę̱:	Aspect: perfective; Empathy: weak; Evidentiality: unmarked	
	controllable	non-controllable
speaker	· Speaker talks about something she has done, but which she cannot remember (example 37)	· Speaker gives an objective description of an event which has happened to her. · Speaker distances herself (examples 42 and 43).
non-speaker	(example 31)	(example 40)

Table 6. The usage of -zĩ rę̱: marking empathy

Using the auxiliary -zĩ rę̱: in a sentence that has the speaker as subject, and not (as is normally the case) a non-speaker, the speaker conveys that she is describing an action which she has executed (37) or an event which has happened to her (42 and 43) from a distant standpoint (cf. Table 10).

tʰē:	Aspect: perfective; Empathy: weak; Evidentiality: visual	
	controllable	non-controllable
speaker	· Speaker did something accidentally. · Visual knowledge of the action. · Action directed away from the speaker. (examples 61 and 62)	· Visual knowledge of the event. · Remote past. · Terminative notion. (examples 64 and 65)
non-speaker	(examples 57 to 60)	(example 63)

Table 7. The usage of tʰē: marking empathy

The auxiliary *tʰē:* normally occurs with a non-speaker agent/subject. It indicates that the speaker has actually seen the action/event reported. When used with the speaker as actor/subject of a sentence, it marks that the speaker distances herself from the action/event reported (64 and 65) or that she did it accidentally (61 and 62).

çū̃:	Aspect: perfective; Empathy: weak; Evidentiality: sensory	
	controllable	non-controllable
speaker	· Speaker did something accidentally. · Sensory knowledge of the action. · Action directed towards the speaker. (example 70)	(example 71)
non-speaker	(examples 66, 68 and 69)	· Sensory knowledge. · Close past. · Inchoative notion. · Focus on speakers direct involvement in the event. · Event directed towards the speaker. (examples 72 and 73)

Table 8. The usage of çū̃: marking empathy

çū̃: is normally used either with a non-speaker agent and a controllable verb, or with the speaker as subject of a non-controllable verb. It marks that the speaker has sensory knowledge of the action/event reported. When used with a controllable verb and the speaker as agent, it conveys that the speaker performed the action accidentally (70). When a non-speaker is the subject of a sentence marked with the auxilary *çū̃:* then the speaker wants to convey that she is specially concerned about the event (72). It can also show that the event which happened to a non-speaker subject was directed towards the speaker (73).

3.2. Imperfective aspect -le jī̃: versus -le rȩ:

The imperfective forms using the auxiliary *-le jī̃:* mark a strong EMPATHY and are normally used with the speaker as agent. The form *-le rȩ:* marks the DISSOCIATION of the speaker from the agent of the action, who is normally a non-speaker. In the two tables below the possible semantic interpretation of the usage of *-le jī̃:* with a non-speaker actor and of *-le rȩ:* with the speaker as actor are presented.

-le jĩ:	Aspect: imperfective; Empathy: strong; Evidentiality: unmarked	
	controllable	non-controllable
speaker	(example 28)	(example 39)
non-speaker	· Speaker causes the non-speaker to do the action. (example 34)	· Not attested.

Table 9. The usage of -le jĩ: marking empathy

The speaker can use the auxiliary -le jĩ:, which marks a strong empathy, not only in sentences which have the speaker as agent, but also with sentences that have a non-speaker as agent. By this choice the speaker expresses that it was she who originally motivated the non-speaker to perform the action (example 34). For a non-controllable verb this usage is not attested .

-le ṛẹ:	Aspect: imperfective; Empathy: weak; Evidentiality: unmarked	
	controllable	non-controllable
speaker	· Distance: speaker talks about her dream. (example 36)	· Speaker distances herself from the event. · Backgrounding. (example 44)
non-speaker	(example 30)	(example 41)

Table 10. The usage of -le ṛẹ: marking empathy

The auxiliary -zĩ ṛẹ: can be used in a sentence that has the speaker as subject and not, as is normally the case, a non-speaker. The speaker conveys that she is describing an event which has happened to her from a distant standpoint (44). Such sentences can be used in the setting up the scene for a story, marking the background information. When the same form is used with a controllable verb it also marks the distance of the speaker from the action described. It is used, especially, when the speaker talks about a dream.

3.3. Continuous aspect -si jǿ: versus -si ŋgẹ

In the continuous aspect the auxiliary -si jǿ: is used to mark a strong EMPATHY, and the agent is normally the speaker herself. The form -si ŋgẹ marks the DISSOCIATION of the speaker from the agent of the action, which is normally a non-speaker. The two following tables present the possible semantic interpretations of the usage of the two auxiliaries when used with other than the normally expected agent/subject.

-si jø:	Aspect: continuous; Empathy: strong; Evidentiality: unmarked	
	controllable	non-controllable
speaker	(example 46)	(example 51)
non-speaker	· Speaker causes the non-speaker to do the action. · Speaker is very familiar with the action. (example 49).	· Not attested.

Table 11. The usage of -si jø: marking empathy

To express that she is very familiar with an action of a non-speaker actor, or that she has actually caused that action to be done, the speaker can use the form *-si jø:* which has a strong empathy value (49). The usage of *-si jø:* with a non-controllable verb and a non-speaker subject is not attested.

-si ŋge	Aspect: continuous; Empathy: weak; Evidentiality: visual	
	controllable	non-controllable
speaker	· Speaker immediately realises what she is doing, she sees it. (example 50)	· Speaker immediately realises what is happening to her, she sees it. (example 54)
non-speaker	(example 47)	(example 52)

Table 12. The usage of -si ŋge marking empathy

With *-si ŋge* used in a sentence with a speaker as agent, the speaker expresses her surprise about what she is doing. When used with a non-controllable verb the speaker expresses her surprise about what she sees happening to her. The choice to use the auxiliary with the weak empathy value shows that the speaker is surprised about what she herself is doing or about what is happening to her.

It is interesting to notice that in the continuous aspect the auxiliary with the evidential value "visual" is used to mark weak EMPATHY (cf. Table 3). In all the other aspects a form unmarked for evidentiality is used. For an action/event which is taking place at the moment of the utterance and of which the speaker is the agent/subject, the speaker can distance herself only to a certain degree. Unlike in the perfective aspect, where the speaker can distance herself further from the action/event reported, she will always have to admit that she is seeing the action/event taking place at the moment of her utterance, since she herself is the actor/subject of it.

4. CONCLUSION

In the Dege dialect, part of the different auxiliaries are used to mark the degree of EMPATHY the speaker chooses to assume with the participants referred to in her utterance. Like the director of a movie, she can choose the point of view from which she wishes to portray a given scene. The SPEECH–ACT EMPATHY HIERARCHY suggests which person is most likely to correspond with each possible degree of EMPATHY. With a strong degree of EMPATHY, that is, when the speaker places the camera right into the hands of the agent, the agent is most likely to be the speaker herself. With a weak degree of EMPATHY, when the speaker looks at the action/event from a distance, thus gaining some overview of the situation, the agent of the sentence is most likely to be a non-speaker. This hierarchy helps the hearer to know with whom the speaker EMPATHIZES, either herself or a non-speaker. The speaker is, however, not bound by these correspondences between persons and the SPEECH–ACT EMPATHY HIERARCHY. Rather, she is free to EMPATHIZE with a different person, or with the same person but to a different degree. Thus, she can EMPATHIZE with a non-speaker, or she can choose to DISSOCIATE herself from the speaker-actor in her utterance. Yet the resulting semantically marked sentences do not express *why* the speaker chooses to EMPATHIZE in this uncommon way. The hearer has to deduce this from the pragmatic and/or linguistic context of the utterance.

By introducing the category of EMPATHY the different examples from the Dege dialect presented in this paper can be accounted for. The different categories introduced by other authors (conjunct-disjunct, volitionality, evidentiality) can be fitted into the analysis as sub-parameters which are used to explain why the speaker chooses to EMPATHIZE with a certain person.

In order to gain further insight into the range of possible applicability of this empathy approach, it will be necessary to watch for additional examples for the "special" cases.

ABBREVIATIONS

AV	initial act of volition
ABS	absolutive
AUX	auxiliary, used to gloss *tʰē:* and *çū:* when used as auxiliaries
CJ	conjunctive particle
CONJ	conjunct
CONT	continuous
DAT	dative
DISJ	disjunct
ERG	ergative
EVID	evidential
GEN	genitive
IPFV	imperfective
LOC	locative
MOD	modal
PERF	perfect
PFV	perfective
VOL	volitional

REFERENCES

DELANCEY, Scott. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, ed. by W. Chafe and J. Nichols. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

_____ . 1990. Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.3:289-321.

_____ . 1992. The historical status of the conjunct/disjunct pattern in Tibeto-Burman. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 25:39-62.

Van DRIEM, George, with the collaboration of Karma Tshering of Gaselô. 1998. *Dzongkha*. Vol. 1, *Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region*. Leiden: Research School CNWS.

GESANG, Jumian (skal bzang 'gyur med). 1964. *"Essentials of Tibetan dialects."* Beijing: Zhōngyáng mínzú xuéyuàn yǔwénxì.

HALE, Austin. 1980. Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari. *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics* 7: 95-106.

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

KRAFT, George C., and Tsering Hu Heng. 1990. *Tibetan-English Colloquial Primer. Kham Dialect*. Littleton, Colorado: OMF Books.

KUNO, Susumu. 1987. *Functional Syntax. Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy.* Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

_____ and KABURAKI Etsuko. 1977. Empathy and Syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.4:627-672.

MA Yuehua, and HU Shujin. 1987 . *Introductory Course to Tibetan: Kham Dialect.* 4 vols. Vol. 2. Chengdu: Xīnán mínzú xuéyuàn.

NIELSEN, Judith Rygaard. 1997. *Kham Tibetan–English Colloquial Phrase Book.* Hong Kong: Jensco Ltd.

SCHÖTTELNDREYER, Burkhard. 1980. Person markers in Sherpa. *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics*. 7:125-130.

TOURNADRE, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en Tibétain. Approche morpho-syntaxique de la langue parlée.* Éditions Peeters, *Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale.* Paris: Louvain.

WILLET, Thomas. 1988. "A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality." *Studies in Language* 12.1:51-97.