NARRATIVE CONVENTIONS IN TIBETAN LANGUAGES: THE ISSUE OF MIRATIVITY[1]

Bettina Zeisler

Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte

In quite a few languages, not only the order of events and their localization in time, the manner and phases of realization, or their quantity and quality are lexically or grammatically encoded. Additionally, information may be encoded about a) the means by which the knowledge of the event described was acquired by the speaker (evidentiality), and b) the status of this knowledge as old and assimilated vs. new and unexpected (mirativity). In the past fifteen years, both phenomena have been addressed in several papers (see DeLancey 1997 for references).

Typically, self-evident and old knowledge is not coded and is left unmarked, whereas knowledge that is derived by inference or hearsay or through immediate perception is marked. Likewise, expected events are typically not marked, while unexpected events may be marked. On the basis of the Turkish –mlş perfect, and similar features in Hare, Sunwar, Tibetan, and Korean, DeLancey (1997) claims that the concept of evidentiality, or at least the marking of inferred knowledge, is to be subsumed under the concept of mirativity. He shows that in Hare and Sunwar, the combination of the mirative/inferential marker with present tense, simultaneity, or imperfective forms expresses surprise, whereas the combination with perfect constructions expresses inference.

If we take a closer look at the Tibetan languages, however, and especially if we compare different varieties, we will find that the opposition between old

---

assimilated vs. new unexpected knowledge is no more basic than the evidential distinction between knowledge that is based on direct perception and knowledge that is not. In the following, I want to show that for the Tibetan languages, evidentiality and mirativity are separate concepts which may or may not overlap, and that there are different strategies to express that an event or the manner of its realization was not expected. The Tibetan example will also show that it might be necessary to distinguish between the concept of old vs. new knowledge (novelty) and the concept of expected and/or acceptable vs. unexpected and/or unacceptable events (mirativity). The concept of novelty crosscuts the concepts of both evidentiality and mirativity, and could be the motivation for occasional or regular overlap or fusion of the two.

1. EXPRESSIONS OF EVIDENTIALITY (AND NOVELTY) IN TIBETAN

Evidentiality as well as novelty are not grammatically encoded in Old Tibetan (mid 7th - end of 10th century A.D.) or Classical Tibetan (11th - 19th century), but evidentiality is, at least partially, grammatically encoded in all modern Tibetan vernaculars (see Agha 1993:155-234; Tournadre 1996:219-241 for "Lhasa" Tibetan and the Central as well as Exile Tibetan *koiné*; van Driem, same volume, for South-East Tibetan, Dzongkha; Sun 1993 for Amdo Ndzorge; Haller, in progress, for Amdo-Themchen). Grammatical encoding of evidentiality and novelty appears to be most complex in Ladakhi (West Tibetan, cf. Koshal 1979: 193-225; Zeisler, forthcoming) and least complex in Nangchenpa (Eastern Kham Tibetan, cf. Causemann 1989).

Apparently, the basic distinction in Tibetan languages is between knowledge based on immediate visual perception (new knowledge) and knowledge (old as well as new) that is not based on immediate perception. Generally, the speaker's own controlled actions are treated as self-evident. Events over which the speaker has no control, i.e. actions controlled by other persons, as well as events that are not controlled by an intentional agent (speaker or other) are either immediately perceived, derived from hearsay or inference, or belong to generic facts known by the whole speech community. There are thus five different values of evidentiality, but not all of them are necessarily marked, and in the different Modern Tibetan languages, various combinations are possible. In Nangchenpa, we find only a binary distinction, with the immediate perception of the speaker marked by the final particles /da/ and /thi/, leaving all other means of knowledge unmarked. Both the marked as well as the unmarked forms may be used in mirative contexts. Inference is not grammatically marked, and there seem to be no special forms for quotation or hearsay knowledge .

In "Lhasa" Tibetan, evidentiality is a complex system of basically three terms: knowledge based on immediate perception (new);   self-evident and

generic knowledge, not based on immediate perception, inference, or hearsay (old/assimilated); knowledge based on hearsay (new). Knowledge based on immediate perception is marked with the auxiliaries /tuː/ *'dug* (present tense and unmarked perfect constructions); /reː/ *red* (future and unmarked past constructions); and /soŋ/ *soṅ* (past constructions), with the latter marked additionally by /cuŋ/ *byuṅ*, if the action is directed towards the speaker. Self-evident knowledge is expressed with the auxiliaries /yöː/ *yod* (present tense and unmarked perfect constructions) and /yin/ *yin* (future and unmarked past constructions); generic knowledge is distinguished from self-evident knowledge by the complex auxiliary /yoːreː/ *yod·pa-red*. Knowledge by hearsay is presented as direct speech with the appropriate evidential markers followed by the quotative marker /-s/ < *zer* 'to say'. Inferred knowledge is expressed with the auxiliary /šaː/ *bžag*, but is found as a perfect construction only. As can be seen, inferred knowledge is treated neither as old/assimilated nor as new knowledge. Additionally, "Lhasa" Tibetan has a set of several probability markers.

Dzongkha shows a quite similar pattern. The basic ternary distinction is between knowledge based on immediate perception (new); self-evident and generic knowledge, not based on immediate perception, inference, or hearsay (old/assimilated); knowledge based on hearsay (new). Self-evident or personal knowledge is marked either by the choice of the auxiliary /yö/ *yod* (in contrast to the auxiliary /dû/ *'dug* of immediate perception) or is left unmarked if other auxiliaries (e.g. /ˀiñ/ *yin*) or the bare verb stem is used. The markers for generic knowledge are, according to van Driem, derived "from the allegro forms of the assimilated, personal knowledge form". Knowledge based on immediate perception can be subdivided into visual vs. sensual perception, a feature also found in Ladakhi. Immediate visual perception is marked either by the auxiliary /dû/ or by the particle /bä~wä/ *pas/bas* if certain auxiliaries (e.g. /ˀiñ/), or the bare verb stem is used; immediate sensual perception by the particle /mä/ *mas* (both replacing the "Lhasa" Tibetan auxiliary /reː/). Inferred knowledge about past events is marked with the particle /nu/ *nug*, which is commonly found as a narrative (mirative?) marker in narrations, again a common feature in Ladakhi as well. Past events that have been witnessed by the speaker are, in contrast, marked by the particles /yi/ *yi* or /ci/ *ci*.

Eastern Amdo and West Tibetan show a somewhat different set of oppositions. In Themchen, the ternary opposition is based on the binary distinction of knowledge based on immediate perception (new) vs. self-evident and generic knowledge, not based on immediate perception (old/ assimilated or new). Knowledge based on immediate perception is marked with the auxiliaries /yokə/ *yod·ʔgis* (replacing the "Lhasa" Tibetan auxiliary /tuː/ in present tense

and unmarked perfect constructions), and /re/ *red* (future and unmarked past constructions). Knowledge not based on immediate perception is expressed with the auxiliaries /yo/ *yod* (present tense and unmarked perfect constructions) and /yən/ *yin* (future and unmarked past constructions). Inferred knowledge is subsumed under knowledge not based on immediate perception and is additionally marked with the particle /zəɤ/ **zig*. According to Felix Haller (personal communication), the quotation marker /zi/ is found only at the end of direct speech. As in the Nangchenpa data, there is no evidence of marking hearsay knowledge in the Themchen data. In the Ndzorge dialect of Amdo, however, the quotation marker /se/ "signifies that the assertion is based on verbal reports made by others" (Sun 1993:952).

In Ladakhi, the main opposition is, again, between knowledge based on immediate perception and knowledge that is not. Knowledge based on immediate perception is subdivided into visual perception (auxiliary /duk/ *'dug*) and non-visual perception (/rak/, in Sham and Purik also /nak/ or /ɖak/, LLV *drag* < CT *reg* 'to reach' or *rag* 'to obtain'). Self-evident knowledge is indicated by the use of the auxiliaries /-at ~ -et/ < *ba + yod*. Generic knowledge is in most dialects not distinguished from self-evident knowledge, but the dialects of Purik, Western and Southern Sham show a special marking for habitual events /-bat/ < *ba + yod* which seems to be closer to the original form. The auxiliary /in/ *yin* is neutral and does not have any evidential value. It seems that more often than not it is associated with self-evident or generic knowledge, but as past marker /pin/ *pa + yin* it refers to personal experience. As in Themchen, inferential knowledge is treated as not based on immediate perception. The Inferential Markers /tsuk~tsok/, LLV *tshug*, and /k(y)ak/ (<?) follow the auxiliary /-at ~ -et/. The Inferential Marker /-ok/, LLV *Xog* (<?) most often follows the neutral auxiliary /in/[2] or the verb stem; the perhaps related Inferential Marker /tok/, LLV *tog* (<?) follows the past stem. The Inferential Marker /inok/, however, may also represent generic knowledge. Knowledge by hearsay is presented as direct speech with the appropriate evidential markers followed by the quote marker /lo/ *lo*, obviously a defective verb "to say". Additionally, probability of present or future events may be marked with the auxiliary /inɖo/ *yin·'gro* 'maybe'.

The following chart shows the distribution of evidential markers in several Modern Tibetan languages. It should become clear that mirativity, and with the possible exception of Nangchenpa, novelty (that is mirativity in the wider sense, as defined by DeLancey 1997) are not grammatically encoded in Tibetan. The basic opposition between immediate perception and other means of knowledge is represented with a double line.

---

2   /inok/ might also be seen as substitute for the missing "Lhasa" Tibetan auxiliary /rɛ̀/.

Nangchenpa	immediate perception (new)	other knowledge (old/new)		
	/da/, /thiː/	ø		?

"Lhasa"	immediate perception (new)	other knowledge (old)		inferred (new)	hearsay (new)
		self-evident	generic		
non-past	/tuː/, /reː/	/yöː/, /yin/	/yoːreː/		-s
past/perfect	(/reː/), /tuː/, /son/, /cun/			/šaː/	

Dzongkha	immediate perception (new)		other knowledge (old)		inferred (new)	
	visual	feeling	self-evident	generic		?
	/dû/		/yö/			
	+ /bä~wä/	+ /mä/	/ʔin/, ø	/bi~wi/		
past	/yi/, /ci/		ø		/nu/	

Themchen	immediate perception (new)	other knowledge (old / new)		(hearsay) quotation
		not-inferred	inferred	
	/yokə/, /re/	/yo/, /yən/	+ /zaχ/	/zi/

Ladakhi	immediate perception (new)		other knowledge (old / new)			hearsay (new)
	visual	non-visual	self-evident	habitual	inferred	
evidential	/duk/	/rak/	/at~et/	(/bat/)	+ /tsuk/, /kyak/	/lo/
neutral	/in/, /pin/				/inok/	

Table 1. Evidential markers in Modern Tibetan languages

2. EXPRESSIONS OF MIRATIVITY

As Mirativity is not grammatically encoded, Tibetan languages have at least two devices to mark unexpected and/or unacceptable events. Surprise may be expressed with evidential markers, either with the immediate-perception marker for events related to the speaker (cf. DeLancey 1997:44) or with the inferential marker (if available) in the case of events related to other persons. Both markers have the connotation of novelty. The use of these markers can thus be understood as an extension of their standard evidential function. On the other hand, mirativity may be expressed by temporal metaphors. In general, present tense forms (including the present perfect) are used in past time context to express that the event described was somehow unexpected, not quite usual, or even inadequate. It is quite obvious that present tense forms, at least when applied to persons other than the speaker, have the connotation of novelty. The temporal shift to a fictive present can likewise be understood as an extension of the standard function of present tense forms. In both cases the extension is based on the connotation of novelty. It is, therefore, not surprising if both metaphors are combined.

The first device is perhaps more typical for conversation (comment, description, justification), and can with some persuasion be elicited, whereas the second is commonly found in narrations where it is conventionally used but cannot be elicited, and this could be the reason that it has been overlooked. In the following I want to present some typical narrative conventions in Old and Classical Tibetan, "Lhasa" Tibetan, Eastern Kham Tibetan (Nangchenpa), and West Tibetan (Balti and Ladakhi). In all varieties, temporal metaphors, i.e. continuative or non-continuative present tense forms, are employed in non-continuative past time contexts (Narrative Present). In West Tibetan, we find imperfect/present and present perfect forms (Narrative Imperfect and Narrative Perfect) which are combined with the Inferential Markers /tsuk/ and /kyak/.

2.1 Old and Classical Tibetan

Events that are actually ongoing at the present moment or at any other reference point are expressed by several periphrastic forms which can be subsumed under the label Compound Present/Future (CPRS/FUT). In contrast, even though at first glance it seems to contradict the general and somewhat superficial understanding of aspect and tense, the mere present stem or Simple Present/Future (SPRS/FUT) never presents events as (still) ongoing at the present moment or as uncompleted, but presents complete events in their totality. The Simple Present/Future, like in English, is used for habitual events, but unlike English, also in the past. And like the Perfective Present in Slavic languages, it is

used mostly with future time reference. Quite often it is used in performative contexts, when the utterance is identical with the event (the event is thus not ongoing beyond the utterance). It may also be used in present or past time contexts when the emphasis lies on the fact or the modalities of the event itself rather than on its being ongoing. Non-habitual and non-continuative events in the present or future may also be expressed by the neutral Compound Present/Future.

2.1.1 Emotional emphasis

Even though it is, psychologically, not impossible to imagine actual events in their totality, it seems to be more natural to imagine them in their course or as being in a stage before completion. The use of the Compound Present/Future in present time contexts is thus informationally unmarked, whereas the use of the Simple Present/Future in a present time context is highly marked. Such marking may be justified, e.g., in utterances of distress as in example (1), where Sita, being abducted by Ravana, bitterly complains that there is nobody to help her (the expected or desired event does not take place), or in questions about the circumstances of an action which seems to be surprising, as in (2a). Compare also the unmarked Compound Present/Future in the unmarked question (2b):

(1)   «...mthu·ltan [!=ldan] gaṅ·daṅ bdag·la **myI·brtse·'am** ||...»
      *powerful every I.D/L **care.NG.SPRS/FUT***

«...All the powerful [men], **don't** they **help** [lit. care for] me?...» [free translation: Isn't there anybody among those powerful men to help me?] (**OT-RAMA**:118/E187).

(2)   «...ñid 'ded·pa ni ci khyer·nas **'ded**» |
a   *hon-you pursue.VN θ what carry-away.LC **pursue.SPRS/FUT***

«...As to your pursuing: what did [he] take away that you **pursue** [him]?» (**CT-GZER**:503/80b2).

b   «...ñid 'ded·pa ni ci·phyir **'ded pa-lags**» |
      *hon-you pursue.VNprs) θ why **pursue.CPRS/FUT***

«...As to your pursuing: why *are* you **pursuing** [him]?» (**CT-BTSU**:60.6).

Present tense forms are commonly found in past time contexts expressing either habitual events (Simple Present/Future) or events ongoing at the reference time (Compound Present/Future). But present tense constructions are also used

in contexts where habituality and continuation are excluded. The Simple Present/Future is often used in past time contexts with verbs of positive or negative emotion. Such a Narrative Present has a pragmatic function: projecting the events into the present moment of the utterance not only renders a narration more vivid, but even more, it highlights the emotional content and directly appeals to the emotions of the listener or reader. Insofar as this Narrative Present has an appealing character, the internal dynamics of the events do not play any role, rather the events are seen as non-analyzable wholes. This is nicely exemplified in a letter that Ramana sends to his kidnapped wife Sita. Ramana compels pity from her. As in (1) above, the demand for pity has Simple Present/Future and not the Compound Present/Future, since it is the event of having or not having pity that is emphasized, not its being ongoing or not. Rama then describes how he was shocked when he found out that Sita was no longer there. Here a "non-finite" present tense form is used (as is evident from the Negation Particle *mi*) because Ramana still sees the situation before his inner eye, or because he at least wants to make Sita believe so. For the same reason, his long search for her is presented with the Simple Present/Future although it has come to an end and Sita is found. This example shows also that the Narrative Present is not limited to strictly narrative contexts, but may be found in conversational contexts as well.

(3)   thugs·kyi grwa·nas | breṅ-breṅ **myi·brtse·'am** |
      heart.GEN corner.ABL; a-little-bit care.NG.SPRS/FUT.QF

      bdag nI bslu·ba·'i ri·dags de bgum slar mchis·na ‖
      I θ ensnare.VN.GEN deer that kill.ST.PTT!.NF back come.ST.PTT.NF

      sa·gži bchasu bzaṅ·mo **myi·bžugs·nas** ‖
      fire evil mind.D/L suffer.VN.GEN

      mye ṅan yId·la gduṅs·pa·'I
      ground together-with fair stay.NG.ST.NTR-NF

      lus mdog ni |
      body colour θ

      lo·'dab lhags·pas gduṅs·pa·'I 'jon·šiṅ bžin ‖
      leaf cold-wind suffer.(VN).GEN copper-tree like

      mdzes·sdug šel·mdog 'dra'·ba·'I than·grogs de myed·nas ‖
      beautiful crystal-colour be-similar.(VN).GEN firm-consort that be.NG.NF

ṅur·pa bžin·du pyogs 'tshams kun·du **tshol** ‖
duck like direction border all.L/P search.SPRS/FUT!

Don't [you] **feel** a little bit of **pity** [for me], [at least] in a corner of [your] heart? When I returned after having killed that ensnaring deer, the ground together with [my] fair one **is no longer there**. Thus, the body of who suffers from an evil fire in the mind, is [fading] like a tree [that has already] turned red suffering from the cold wind [on] its leaves. Without my firm consort that is beautiful and light-coloured like a crystal, like the duck [I] **search** in all directions and at all borders (**OT-RAMA**: 124/A248-251).

In narrations, the Narrative Present is rather conventionally used with expressions of emotions such as joy, sorrow, fear, or rage, as in (4) and (5). If the duration or repetition of the events is stressed, the Compound Present/Future may be used as well, but the Compound Present/Future seems then to underline the acuteness of the event, as in (4). Besides the emotional content, the Narrative Present indicates that the event is somewhat unforeseen and unexpected or even bewildering, examples (5) and (6).

(4)   «tshig šes·sam don šes» zer ǀ
      word know.SPRS/FUT.Q meaning know.SPRS/FUT say.ST.NTR

      «tshig šes» gsuṅs·pas ǀ
      word know.SPRS/FUT speak.VN

      mo dga'·nas **rgod·ciṅ 'phag** ǀ
      she happy laugh.ST.NTR.CC joke.SPRS/FUT

      mkhar·ba nam·mkhar bteg·nas gar **byed·ciṅ·'dug** ǀ [...]
      stick sky.L/P lift.ST.PTT.NF dance do.EPRS

      «ṅas don yaṅ šes» gsuṅs·pa'i ǀ
      I.ERG meaning also know.SPRS/FUT speak.VN

      mo ma·dga'·ba **ṅu·žiṅ** lus **sprug**
      she Ng-happy cry.ST.PRS.CC body shake.SPRS/FUT

      mkhar·ba sa·la **rdebs·šiṅ·'dug·pa·las** ǀ
      stick earth.D/L throw-down. EPRS/VN

When [the old woman] asked him: «Do [you] understand the word or do [you] understand the meaning?», [Nāropa] answered: «[I] understand the word». Thereupon happily she **laughs and jokes**. Holding up her stick into the sky, she **is** [even] **dancing**. [...] «I understand also the meaning», when he had said this, being unhappy she **cries and shakes** her body.

Since with a clash she **is** [even] **throwing** the stick to the earth... (**CT-NARO**:60-61/19a2-3.)

For similar emphatic marking in the case of expressions of joy or grief cf. also CT-BTSU:59.11, CT-GZER:502/80a1f, 514/87a2f, 539/ 100b2, and OT-RAMA:97/C1-2).

(5) btsun·mos bsams·pa «šin·tu sñiṅ na·nas |
queen.ERG think.VN very heart ill.ABL

slob·dpon khyod kyaṅ
teacher-master you also

'jig·rten mi·yul 'dir |
world human-country here

ṅa·yis bstan·pa snub·kyi» zer·nas·su |
I.ERG teach.VN destroy.SPRS/FUT.EMP say.ST.NTR.NF

tshig ṅan smras·te khyim·du *log·nas-soṅ* |
word bad speak.LC hon-house.L/P return.PTT

lha·babs skad zer
god-possessed speech say.ST.NTR

'dre·babs·nas zer **smyo** |
*demon-possessed.ABL say.ST.NTR **rage.SPRS/FUT***

The queen thought: «[My] heart suffers [lit. is very ill]. Therefore, in this world, in this land of man, [I] will, certainly, destroy the doctrine as well as you, the master!», saying this she *returned* home uttering imprecations. Shouting like someone possessed by a god or someone possessed by a demon, (**indeed**), she **rages** (**CT-BTSU**:52.9-12).

This variation of the tale of Joseph and Potiphar is found in a Bonpo (GZER) as well as in a Buddhist version (BTSU). The queen's advances have been disappointed by the royal priest. The furious behaviour of the queen might perhaps be accepted as typical for women by a male writer and reader, but is nevertheless, bewildering and inadequate for a queen, and of course not acceptable at all when concerning a holy priest. Later when the queen undergoes exorcism and vomits a black spider of the size of a boot, her husband and her son are quite terrified. Not being able to bear the sight of the spider, they are about to run away, and again present tense forms are used (CT-BTSU:72.19-73.1, CT-GZER:517/89a4-5). The Narrative Present marks both the emotion as

well as the non-appropriate behaviour of the king and his son which is contrary to what could be expected from self-controlled men of their rank and dignity.

But it is not necessarily a verb of emotion that is marked by the Narrative Present. In example (6) from the story of *Dbyigpacan*, in an episode varying the tale of King Solomon's judgments, the unexpected behaviour of the real mother is marked: contrary to unreflecting expectation, she does *not* use all her force to pull her child to her side to decide the case in her favour. In fact, the present tense form does not express that she only tries to pull the child to her side, nor that she pulls or tries to pull the child several times. It is likewise not the duration of the activity which is focused upon. Rather the fact is stressed that this behaviour is unexpected, but crucial for the plot. The decision of the king will be based exactly on this evidence of maternal love.

(6)   bu'i ma ma·yin·pa des ni
      boy.GEN mother be.NG.VN that.ERG θ

      bu·la sñiṅ·rje med·pas
      boy.D/L compassion exist.NG.VN.CC

      snad·kyis mi·dogs·te mthu ci yod·pas **draṅs·so** |
      *hurt.INSTR fear.NG.LC force what have.VN.CC **pull.PTT.F***

      bu'i ma gaṅ yin·pa des ni bu·la byams·pas
      boy.GEN mother who be.VN that.ERG θ boy.D/L love.INSTR

      snad·kyis dogs·te stobs·kyis thub·kyaṅ
      hurt.INSTR fear.LC strength.INSTR be-equal.ST.NTR-although

      drag·tu **mi·'dren·no** |
      *strongly **tear.NG.SPRS/FUT.F***

      She [who] was not the mother of the boy was without any compassion for the boy and, therefore, not fearing to hurt him **pulled** [him] with all her force. [But] she who was the mother of the boy, because of her love for the boy, feared to hurt him, and although equal in strength, [she] **does not, (surprisingly,) pull** with strength (**CT**: Hahn 1985: 214.25-27).

In this example the Narrative Present also has contrastive function. The behaviour of the real mother is contrasted to that of the pretended mother. Another example of the contrastive use of the Simple Present/Future in past time context can be found in OT-DTH:99.21-24 where the behaviour of the younger son of the murdered king Drigum Btsanpo is contrasted to that of the elder one.

2.1.2 Narrative conventions: looking into a scene

Other uses of present tense forms in past time contexts are less marked and seem to be used rather conventionally. Typically, the Compound Present/Future is used, and the ongoing nature of the situation is emphasized. This form can also be found at the end of a story or episode when everything has finally turned out well and will remain so (for ever). Quite often, the Compound Present/Future describes a situation as if the speaker/writer or the protagonist and with him (or her) the listener/reader would look through a **window** into the already ongoing scene, as in (7). The disappointed queen fears the revenge and accusation of the priest and thus she pretends on her part that the priest has attempted to rape her. She plays the upset and desperate victim and sends for her husband. Upon entering, he sees the scene his wife is performing for him. In English, this **"window effect"** is likewise achieved by the use of the continuative expanded form (Nehls 1978:89f).

(7)   rgyal·po šin·tu ma·dgyes khab·tu byon |
      king very Ng.HON-glad spouse.L/P hon-come.PTT

      btsun·mo de ni kha bub ṅu·žiṅ-'dug |
      queen that θ face be-turned-over.ST.PTT.NF cry.EPRS

      rgyal·pos btsun·mo·la ni 'di·skad gsuṅs |
      king.ERG queen.D/L θ this-speech hon-speak.PTT

      (When) the king, not exactly enthusiastic [about it], returned to his spouse the queen, lying on her face, **is, (indeed), crying**. The king spoke to the queen the following words (**CT-BTSU:53.1-2**).

A short while later, still in the same story, the rumour of the priest's alleged offence has spread everywhere and even the animals which have always come to greet the priest have disappeared. The priest is startled, and when he looks around he catches sight of the animals crying and rolling on the ground in despair. In this case, since the whole clause is the object of the verb of perception *gzigs* 'to see, look at (HON)' a nominalized form of the Compound Present/Future is used. Note that in (8) as well as in (7), it is again the expressions of emotion that are marked.

(8)   slob·dpon [...] slar log
teacher-master back return.ST.NTR

Brag·dmar G.ya'·ma lung·du gšegs |
Bragdmar Gyama valley.L/P go.ST.NTR

gnas·su ma·tshugs slar yaṅ sgor byuṅ·nas |
place.L/P enter.NG.ST.PTT.NF back also door.L/P come-out.ST.PTT.CC

byol·soṅ rig·pa yod·pas bsur 'oṅ·ba |
animal knowledge exist.VN.CC greet.ST.PRS.NF come.VN

pha·rir **ṅu·žiṅ**
beyond-mountain.L/P cry.ST.PRS.CC

'gre·žiṅ·'dug·pa gzigs |
***roll-on-the-ground. E̊PRS** hon-see.ST.NTR*

šin·tu ma·dga'·ba·yis sems 'khrugs·so |
very Ng-happy.INSTR mind be-disturbed.PTT.F

The master [...] returned and went back to the valley Bragdmar Gyama (red
rocks of slates). But he did not stay [lit. enter] in his place and when he
stepped out of his door again, he saw that the animals that [otherwise] out
of understanding [used to] come to greet [him] **were crying and rolling**
on the ground [out of despair] on the mountains at the other side [of the
valley]. [His] soul was struck with great unhappiness (**CT-BTSU:54.3-7**).

2.1.3 Narrative conventions: the coming onto the scene

The Narrative Present is used quite commonly with verbs of motion when a
new character enters the scene ("newcomer-effect"). This effect is the mirror
image of the "window-effect". But contrary to intuition, it is not the ongoing
situation that is marked by the present tense form, but the sudden and perhaps
unforeseen event of arrival, as well as the fact that the person(s) is/are still
unknown. The present tense form appears to slow down the progress of the
narration and signals that something is going to happen that is important for the
unfolding of the story. Often this incipient event is connected with some other
crucial fact. In the following example it is the fact that the person coming out of
the water carries the axe in his mouth, not in his hands. The fact that the
carpenter carries the axe in his mouth when crossing the river is perhaps not very
unexpected, but it is crucial for the story: when the carpenter answers
Dbyigpacan's question, the axe falls into the water, is lost, and another law-suit
has emerged, example (9). Interestingly enough, the later judgment of the king
in favour of Dbyigpacan is again based on the fact that the carpenter did not

carry the axe in his hand, as normal people would be expected to do in ordinary situations.

(9)　lam·gyi-bar de·na chu·bo gtiṅ·zab·pa žig yod·de |
　　　road-intermediate that.LOC river deep a exist.LC

　　　chu de‘i-naṅ·nas tshur šiṅ·mkhan žig
　　　river this-out hither carpenter one

　　　ste‘u kha·nas khyer·te ‘oṅ·ṅo || de·la Dbyig·pa·can·gyis
　　　axe mouth with carry.LC come.SPRS/FUT.F that.D/L Dbyigpacan.ERG

　　　«chu‘i gtiṅ ci·tsam» žes dris·pa·daṅ | «chu gtiṅ·zab·bo»
　　　water.GEN bottom how-much such ask.VN.CC; water deep.F

　　　žes smras·pa·daṅ | ste‘u chur lhuṅ·ste |
　　　such speak.VN; axe water.L/P fall.LC

On the way there was a deep river and out of the river there **comes** a carpenter, <u>carrying the axe with his mouth</u>. When Dbyigpacan asked him: «How deep is the water?», he answered; «The water is deep», and the axe fell into the water... (**CT**: Hahn 1985:213.2-4)

2.2 Narrative Present and narrative conventions in "Lhasa" Tibetan

As in Old and Classical Tibetan, the Narrative Present is used to foreground the situation and raise the tension of the listener. In all cases, the generic auxiliary /-yo̱ːreː/ (*yod·pa-red*) which is not marked for continuation is used (Generic Present (GENRPRS). The event is presented as a whole and is emotionally marked.

In a variant of the tale of the beauty and the beast, the heroine is on visit with her family. She has to return to her husband before the sun sets, otherwise he would be changed back into an unbearable ugly monster. However, her jealous sisters have covered the windows, have lit lights inside and are trying to distract her so that she might be too late. But the girl gets nervous and opens the windows and sees that the sun is about to set (**CHA**:233.8-234.4). This is perhaps another example of the "window-effect", but on the other hand, the story obviously has reached a dramatic point. The setting of the sun is expressed with present tense forms, and to make it even more exciting, the crucial fact of the threatening sunset is repeated over and over again to assure the listener that there is really no chance left.

In the following examples the present tense forms mark the perhaps somewhat unexpected result. In (10), the Narrative Present emphasizes the

unexpected fact that the royal treasuries are filled up again by magic, obviously without anybody doing anything about it. In (11), the astrologers make a prediction, which is summed up as the result of their calculations.

(10) kyä:pö: phaṅtsö:-khi sēr
king-of treasury of gold
rgyal·po'i baṅ·mdzod-gi gser

ṅä:ma[:] tōṅpa chä:-tä:pa
before empty become.VN
sṅon·ma stoṅ·pa chags-bsdad·pa

ṭitsu ē khaṅkalo: *tshūr khaṅ̀;*
these again altogether back be-full.ST.ntr-nf
'di·tsho *yaṅ gaṅ·ga·logs *tshur kheṅs*

ṭintṣä: *chiki-yo:re:*
this-like do.GENRPRS
'di·gras *byed·gi·yog·red*

The gold-treasuries of the king that had become empty before *had all filled up again*; it **(just) happens** like this (**CHA**:193.1-4).

(11) «...»-s chä:cä: tsī: naṅlä: **thüṅki-yo:re:**
*... (quote) do.ST.PTT.NF calculation out-of **come-out.GENRPRS***
«...» zer byas·byas rtsis naṅ·las **thon·gi·yog·red**

«...» [this] **comes out** of the (astrological) calculation (**CHA**:243.14-15).

2.2.1 Narrative conventions: Coming onto the scene

As in Old and Classical Tibetan, the Narrative Present is conventionally used when a new character enters the scene ("newcomer-effect"). Again this arrival is often connected with some other crucial fact.

(12) chūṅa ṭinä:-yar thē:tü:-tsānä:
little this ABL up go-on.ST.NTR-time-while
chuṅ·pa 'di·nas-yar thal·dus-tsa·nas

lū: pho̱mo ñiṅ-ce̱po šipu-chi
nāga-of girl beautiful much-a

klu'i bu·mo sñiṅ-rje·po že·po-gcig

šīnto꞉ reṭsuṁ-chi khyīr
fruit piece a carry.ST.NTR.NF
šiṅ·tog ?sgral·ba·dkrum-gcig (')khyer

ṅuki[꞉] ṅuki[꞉] ṅuki[꞉] *yuṅki-yo꞉re꞉*
cry.ST.PRS.NF[3x]) come.*GENRPRS*
ṅu·gi ṅu·gi ṅu·gi yoṅ·gi-yog ꞉red

While the youngest [brother] was proceeding upwards from there,
(**suddenly**), a beautiful *nāga*-girl **comes**, all alone, carrying a piece of
fruit, and cries, cries, and cries (**CHA**:25.15-26.1, cf. also the more
conversation-like version 11.10-15).

The *nāga*-girl appears unexpectedly. She cries because she is destined to be
devoured by a demon. The boy then will go in place of her and will tame three
demons. Interestingly enough, the coming of those demons, though they are
terrifying, is not emphasized since their coming is expected: the unmarked past
tense form *yoṅ·pa-red* is used (CHA:26.20, resp. 12.17., 13.5, 13.11).

In the following example, the person that comes onto the scene, uncle Tönpa,
is not unknown, but his appearance at that point is, after all, quite unexpected.
The man that repeatedly becomes uncle Tönpa's victim had been searching for
him already for several days:

(13) tha ṭinä꞉ khō yaṅ ɫä꞉sä:-naṅla
now this.ABL he again Lhasa-in
da 'di·nas kho yaṅ Lha('i)·sa'i-naṅ·la,

tshā꞉ tshā꞉ tshā꞉-chepä꞉-khuṭü꞉
search.ST.NTR search.ST.NTR search-do.VN-occasion
btsal btsal btsal-byed·pa'i-go[=skabs]·dus

ñima cī꞉ [...]
day one ...
ñi·ma gcig [...]

āku lakpa ter cor-chi khyīrcä꞉ ṭṣuki-yo꞉re꞉
there uncle hand there hoe a carry.PTT.NF go.GENRPRS
a·khu lag·pa 'dir 'jor gcig khyer·byas **'gro·gi-yog·red**

Now, after this, when he was again searching, searching, and searching in Lhasa, one day [...] the uncle **(finally)** **comes** **along** <u>carrying a hoe in his hand</u> (**CHA**:106.2-7).

Here, as well as in the last example, the focus seems to lie not only on the coming itself, but also on the circumstances of that coming, which are again, crucial for the development of the story and may be additionally marked for their emotional content (the crying girl). In (12), the girl is crying because she is to be devoured by a demon, and the hero, feeling pity, departs for his adventure. In (13), emphasis lies on the fact that uncle Tönpa is finally found, but equally on the fact that he carries a hoe (no emotional content): uncle Tönpa pretends that he has to take off the paving stones of a monastery with that hoe. The point is that subsequently the stupid man takes over that work and gets beaten up by the monks' police.

2.2.2 Narrative conventions: More than two persons speaking

In "Lhasa" Tibetan, the Generic Present is used to express that many (more than two) people say something (repeatedly), gossip about somebody, call somebody, etc., as in (14) and (15). While other actions with more than two actors may or may not be presented with present tense forms, it seems to be a sort of convention always to use the Generic Present with verbs of speaking for a plurality of speakers, as can be seen in the story of the monkeys and the birds (**CHA**:302-329). There is a strict opposition between the past tense forms used for one or two speakers and the Generic Present used for more than two speakers, see example (16). In this case, the present tense form does not express mirativity, rather the repetition of the event of speaking is marked according to the quantificational value of the Generic Present.

(14) phö̱ː-chīnpa-taṅ ya̱rnäː ma̱r āni āni ti̱tsüː
flee.VN up.ABL down then nun this.PL.ERG
bros-phyin·pa-daṅ yar·nas mar *de·nas a·ni 'di·tshos

«āku<ː> āku<ː>» ši̱ ka̱ːː-ti **tȧ̱ṅki-yo̱ːreː**
uncle uncle such shout this give(GenPrs)
«a·khu a·khu»-šes skad 'di **btaṅ·gi-yog·red**

As soon as he fled down from above, the nuns (**all**) **shout (again and again)**: «Uuuncle, uuuncle!» (**CHA**:100.6-9).

(15) tä̱ːpä̱:-khu̱tüː
stay.VN-occasion/ time
bsdad·pa'i-go[=skabs]·dus

luṅpä: mi ṭitsu khaṅkaloː-khi[ː]
country people that.PL altogether.GEN[=ERG]
luṅ·pa'i mi 'di·tsho gaṅ·ga·logs-gi[s]

«tha kyäː pö: ṭṣäː mo n<ī>
now king- GEN daughter θ
«da rgyal·po'i sras·mo ni

tsaño thīː ṭṣoː-chiqiː» **siki-yoːreː**
love-lunatic ?become.CPRS/FUT say.GENRPRS
rtsa·smyo ?mthil-'gro-byed·gi-'dug» **zer·gi·yog·red**

When they were staying [like this], those people of the country
altogether **talk (a lot)** [among themselves]: «As for the king's
daughter, [she] is going to be obsessed with sex» (**CHA**:195.18-
196.2)

(16) pīu-khi tsōː tiː kä: mo-chi kä: [!] ni «...» **chäːpa-reː**
a   *monkey.GEN chief this.ERG laughter-a laugh.ST.NTR θ ... say.PTT*
      spre'u-gi gtso·bo 'dis bgad·mo-gcig bgad ni «...» **byas·pa-red**

      The chief of the monkeys laughed loudly and **said** [lit. did]: «...»
      (**CHA**:304.5-15).

b   khūñiː-khi[ː] pīu-khi-tsä<ː>la chīṅ ni «...»-s **lapa-reː**
      s/he-two.GEN[=ERG] monkey-near go.ST.PTT.NF θ ... (quote) say.PTT
      kho·gñis-gi[s] spre'u-gi-rtsa·la phyin ni «...»-zer **lab·pa-red**

      The two [birds] went to the monkeys and **said**: «...» (**CHA**:303.15-304.4).

c   pīu khāšäː-khi[ː] «...» **siki-yoːreː**
      monkey some.GEN[=ERG] ... say.GENRPRS
      spre'u kha·šas-gi[s] «...» **zer·gi·yog·red**

      Some monkeys said: «...» (**CHA**:314.2-4).

In contrast to this use of the Generic Present, the usual or less marked
present tense form, the Common Present/Future is conventionally used for the
verb of speaking when another person is quoted, regardless of how far this
speech event lies in the past. This use in colloquial language corresponds
nicely to our academic convention of citing other persons' statements with present tense
forms of the verbs of speaking. Apparently the quoted information is new and
of current relevance for the hearer in a standard context of quotation, and it
seems that in "Lhasa" Tibetan, the convention is so strong that it is applied even

in narrative contexts. Besides the different aspectual values that are associated with the Common Present/Future and the Generic Present, the choice of the Generic Present as the Narrative Present seems to reduce the notion of novelty associated with the experientially marked auxiliary /tṳ̀/ of the Common Present/Future for third persons. In contrast to quotation, narrated events are really not of current relevance for the hearer, and this may be the reason why the notion of novelty that is conveyed by the present tense form is moderated through the marker for generic, i.e. old and assimilated knowledge.

2.3 Nangchenpa: Narrative Present and the arrival onto the scene

In past time context, only the non-expanded and, therefore, non-continuative present tense forms, here the Simple and Marked Present/Future (SPRS/FUT, MPRS/FUT), are used as Narrative Present. These expressions are all emphatically marked. As in Old and Classical Tibetan, the Narrative Present can also appear in non-narrative contexts, i.e. in ordinary discourse. In the following example a man has killed his daughter. Subsequently, his son thus reproaches him:

(17) pʰu-kˆɨ «cheʔ-kˆɨ chɨla ʔsoʔ-žoʔʔ ʔsoʔ-žoʔ goce meʔ,
       son.ERG you.ERG why kill.SPRS/FUT kill.ST.PRS necessity Ng-exist
       bu-gis «khyed-gi ci·la **gsod-'jog** | gsod-'jog dgos·*ce med

       gorun meʔ! chɨla ʔsoʔ-žoʔʔ [...]» dze;
       reason Ng-exist why kill.SPRS/FUT say.PTT
       dgos·don med ci·la **gsod-'jog** *brjod

       The son said: «Why **do** you **kill/have to kill** [her]? There is no necessity, no reason to kill [her]. Why **do** you **kill/have to kill** [her]? [...]» (**NANG**:154/II.52).

The non-continuative present tense forms are often used in past time context for habitual events. But used as a Narrative Present, they may also indicate that the plot sets in after a presentation of the general scene. In the following example, first the habitual behaviour of the two protagonists is described with the Marked and the Simple Present/Future, then the single decision of staying together with which the plot starts is described with the Simple Present/Future. In contrast, the subsequent events, that are likewise non-recurring, are presented in the unmarked Narrative Past:

(18) khoʔñi pe: mɨsepa cˆampo tˆeruʔ ˆöleʔ
       s/he-two very endless in-love such exist.MPRS/FUT
       kho·gñis dpe mi·*zad·pa byams·po *de·tsug yod·le·red

kho⁷ñi ⁷ñan-la tsäik **nḍo,**
s/he-two together a go.SPRS/FUT
kho·gñis mñam-la gcig **'gro,**

⁷ñan-la **ndu⁷,** t⌃u⁷ **we⁷-nɨ...**
together stay.SPRS/FUT such do.ST.PRS.NF
mñam-la **'dug,** *de·tsug **byed·*nas...**

⁷o: t⌃ene kho⁷ñi ⁷mɨtse ⁷ñandu cöju *s⌃e⁷,*
oh then s/he-two man-life together decide.VN do.SPRS/FUT
'o de·nas kho·gñis mi·tshe mñam·du gcod·rgyu **byed**

kho⁷ñi tampa **ža⁷,** t⌃a:-la ndipa **jap,**
s/he-two oath put.ST.PTT.NF silk.D/L knot make.ST.PTT.NF
kho·gñis gtam·pa **bžag** dar-la mdud·pa **brgyab,**

t⌃u⁷ wäle⁷. [...]
such do.PTT ...
de·tsug **byas·?le·red** [...]

The two were tremendously loving. They **(always) walked** together, they **(always) stayed** together, they **(always) acted** like this... Oh then, they *decide* to stay together for the [whole] life. They **took** an oath, they **knotted** a silk [scarf], they **did** it that way. (**NANG**:134/I.3-7).

On the other hand, the expanded present tense forms that signal the continuation of the event may be used in past time context without continuative meaning when a person that is somehow important for the narrative appears (again) on the scene ("newcomer-effect"). In the following passage, the girl has stayed overnight in her lover's tent. In the morning she comes back to her home and meets her sister-in-law, her mother, her brother, and her father, who are all, except for the brother, very angry with her and beat her up. The first arrival onto the scene, that of the sister-in-law, is presented with the unmarked past tense form. The next arrival, that of the mother, is presented in the Narrative Expanded Present, which signals the escalation of the situation: the mother beats up the girl again, the brother warns her that the father will kill her and the father hurries back to fetch the axe.

(19) p⌃omo sɨnanmo säin-⌃ɔṅdü
      girl next-morning come.ST.NTR-time
      bu·mo phyin·naṅ·mo phyin-'oṅ·dus

      ⁷o: khu⁷ tshaṅ ⁷nama chu len säin-⌃uṅne⁷ [...]
      oh s/he-self family daughter-in-law water take.ST.PRS come.MPRS/FUT
      'o kho tshaṅ mna'·ma chu len phyin-'oṅ·le·red [...]

jap jap jap dɔṅ dɔṅ dɔṅ dɔṅ
hit.ST.NTR.(3x) beat.ST.NTR.(4x)
rgyab rgyab rgyab rduṅ rduṅ rduṅ rduṅ

chuzun maca²-k^ɔrdu jable²
water-tub break-until hit.PTT
chu·zom ma·bcag-*bar·du rgyab·le·red

²o: t^ene pha: suṅne².
oh then thither go.PTT
'o de·nas phar soṅ·le·red

²o: ma re mbɨ žo-na **sain-^uṅkɨ-^öle²** [...]
oh mother the 'bri milk.ST.PRS.NF come.EPRS ...
'o ma re 'bri bžo-la **phyin-'oṅ·gi-yod·le·red** [...]

jap jap jap jap dɔṅ dɔṅ dɔṅ
hit.ST.NTR.(4x) beat.ST.NTR..NF(3x)
rgyab rgyab rgyab rgyab rduṅ rduṅ rduṅ

žozo maca²-k^ɔrdu jable²
water-tub break-until hit.PTT
bžo·zom ma·bcag-*bar·du rgyab·le·red

²o: t^ene ^a: ^ɔṅdü p^u tshur **säin-ɔṅkɨ-^öle²** [...]
oh then upwards come.ST.NTR.NF-time son downwards come.EPRS
'o de·nas yar 'oṅ·dus bu tshur **phyin-'oṅ·gi-yod·le·red** [...]

²o: t^ene phargen sɨr **nḍɔ²-^ɔṅkɨ-^öle²** [...]
oh then father-old back hurry.EPRS ...
'o de·nas pha·rgan phyir **?'drog-'oṅ·gi-yod·le·red** [...]

tare ²lä-la-sale² [...] t^e phargen-kɨ p^omo ²sä²-ža²le²
axe swing.PTT that father-old.ERG girl kill.PTT
sta·ri ??-le·red [...] de pha·rgan bu·mo bsad-bžag·le·red

When the girl came [back] the next morning, the daughter-in-law [of] the
family came to fetch water. [...] Hitting, hitting, [she] hit [her], beating,
beating, beating, [she] beat [her], [she] hit her until the water tub broke.
Oh, then [the girl] went further. Oh, the mother **is coming** to milk the *'bri*
[hybrid of yak and cow]. [...] Hitting, hitting, hitting, [she] hit [her],
beating, beating, [she] beat [her], [she] hit her until the milk tub broke. Oh,
then, when she went upwards, the son **is coming** downwards. [...] Oh,
then the old father **is hurrying** back. [...] He swung the axe. [...] that old
father killed the girl (**NANG**:150/II.24-152/II.43).

2.4 Ladakhi and Balti

The West Tibetan varieties show the combination of the two strategies for marking mirativity. On the one hand, temporal metaphors are used, on the other hand, the Inferential Markers are employed with present tense and present perfect constructions.

One of the many innovations found in these varieties is the use of past markers. With the help of the past marker /pa/ in Balti and /pin/ (< *pa yin*) and alternatively with the help of the Inferential Markers /kyak/ and /tsuk~tsok/ in Ladakhi, /tsuk/ in Purik (which occurs as a marker of mirativity also in Balti), imperfect constructions can be derived from the present tense constructions. However, in the case of the Inferential Markers /kyak/ and /tsuk/, I am quite convinced that in emphatically marked contexts, i.e. in contexts of surprise, they can also refer to the actual present time. In this case, the use of the Inferential Markers could be interpreted as a sort of reservation or distance on the part of the speaker.

In narrative context, the notion of distance or reservation associated with the Inferential Markers has perhaps the same function as the choice of the Generic Present in "Lhasa" Tibetan associated with old or assimilated knowledge, in contrast to the use of the Common Present/Future associated with new knowledge, based on immediate perception. Interestingly enough, we find the same quotation convention in the LLV as in "Lhasa" Tibetan. Thus while the information quoted is marked through the Common Present/Future as being new and of current relevance for the hearer (even in narrations), the narrated event as such is of no relevance for the hearer, and thus the notion of novelty that would be conveyed by the use of the auxiliary /duk/ of Common Present/Future is moderated by the use of the Inferential Markers that always combine with the auxiliary /at ~ et/ associated with old or assimilated knowledge.

Even though the Inferential Markers convey the connotation of some sort of modal distance, it appears to me that the use of the Narrative Imperfect still has to do with the negation of temporal distance through projection into a fictive present. Events that have happened in a remote past and that are presented as such are not very compelling to a hearer, whereas the notion of modal distance conveyed by the Inferential Markers does not necessarily indicate remoteness, but is merely the restriction that the speaker himself did not really witness or expect these events.

Since the temporal status of the inferential Imperfect somehow depends on the context, the term "imperfect" is perhaps not justified. But I will still use the term "imperfect" instead of "present", because the standard temporal value of the inferential imperfect forms is indeed, except in mirative contexts, past tense.

Nevertheless in the translation I will use present tense forms, in accordance with the conventions found in the other Tibetan languages.

Depending on the personal style of the narrator, the opposition between the Simple Past (SPTT) and the non-inferential Imperfect (IMPF) can be neutralized in narrations, and the non-inferential Imperfect can be used as the unmarked narrational construction (Narrational Imperfect (NRL-IMPF), alternating with the Simple Past as in the Balti story of *Rgyalu Cobzañ* (Bielmeier 1985). Other narrators choose the Simple Past as the unmarked narrational construction, again others prefer to join the Inferential Markers to the past stem.

2.4.1 Narrative Imperfect (Narrative Present)

Even when the narrator has chosen the non-inferential Imperfect as the standard or alternative narrational construction, the opposition between Simple Past and inferential, i.e., Narrative Imperfect does hold good. Nevertheless, since the narrator is free enough to tell the story as if s/he has witnessed it personally, the particles /kyak/ and /tsuk/ are not used primarily to indicate that the event is inferred. In many cases, the Inferential Markers thus indicate that the event is somewhat unexpected, unusual, improper, or otherwise emphatically marked as important for the plot. In the translation this might be best expressed by the insertion of "indeed" or any equivalent. The contrast is of course strongest when the narrational construction itself is left without the Inferential Markers, as in the LLV.

The following episode shows the use of the Narrative Imperfect in a conative context. In the first part the Narrative Imperfect is due to the "window-effect", that is, the situation is observed by the acting character. The second part is marked with the Narrative Imperfect since the behaviour of the smith's child is quite unconventional and causes a roar of laughter - also probably in the audience of the narrator. It is not the conative situation, but the narrative context that triggers the imperfect construction.

(20) de·nas yañ mgar·phrug [...]
a   *then again smith-child ...*

     mi'i khro·la lta·la yoñs | [...]
     people.GEN crowd.D/L look.ST.PRS.NF come.SPTT ...

     de·nas mi tshañ·ma rta'i-kha **žon·nad·tshug·pa** |
     *then man all horse-upon **mount.NIMPF.VN***

     mi su-re 'ob·chen gñis·si-kha bsleb |
     man some stirrup second-upon reach.SPTT

mi su-re ʻobˑchen gsumˑmiˑba[=kha] bsleb ǀ
man some stirrup third-upon reach.SPTT

su gcigˑgi-kha bsleb ǀ
some first-upon reach.SPTT

Then again, the smith's child came to the crowd of people to <u>have a look</u>. […] Then, **indeed, as** all men **are mounting[=trying to mount]** the [mighty] horse, some men reached the second stirrup, some men reached the third stirrup, some reached [only] the first stirrup (**LLV** VII:283.1-7).

b   kho sonˑste rgyabˑna **žonˑnadˑtshugˑpa** ǀ
      *he go.LC behind.LOC **mount.NIMPF.VN***

mi tshanˑmas habˑrgod btan�s ǀ
people all.ERG laughter burst.SPTT

deˑnas kho mdunˑla sonˑste ǀ
then he front.LOC go.LC

rnamˑchogˑla ʻthamˑste **žonˑnadˑtshug** ǀ
*ear.D/L hold-on.LC **mount.NIMPF***

deˑnas aˑbā sonˑste «khyod bu nan khyoˑran
then father go.LC you boy nasty you-self

da-tshugˑpa rtaˑla žon-miˑšesˑmkhan-žig yinˑna ǀ
now-until^ horse.D/L ride-know.NG.VN-a be.QF

ʻdiˑphyogsˑna žon» zerˑte-bslabsˑpa ǀ
this-side.LOC mount.IMPtell.VN

deˑnas kho sribˑcigˑla žonˑte ǀ
then he moment.D/L mount.LC

It [the smith's child] went [there] and **when** [it] **is, truly, mounting [=trying to mount]** from behind, all people burst into laughter. Then it went to the front and holding on to the ears it **is, truly, mounting [=trying to mount]**. Thereupon the father went [there]: «You nasty boy!, do you still not know [at all] how to mount? Mount this side!», being told [so], then he mounted in no time [lit. in a moment], and … (**LLV** VII:283.11-15).

In the following episode the Narrative Imperfect indicates that the activity is repeated, but likewise it marks the situation as unconventional and quite dramatic: Kesar hides in the house of a demon. The demon comes back and eventually falls asleep. The following lines emphasize the terrifying volume and

power of the demon - and, indeed, the mere sight of the demon causes Kesar, the hero of heroes, to tremble:

(21) de·nas [g]ñid·di-skyil·la soṅ·ste |
then sleep-amidst come.LC

dbugs naṅ·du 'then·za·na | sa rdo·ba ci yod·khan
breath inside draw.ST.PRS-when earth stone what exist.VN

tshaṅ·ma sna·khuṅ-naṅ·la **'khyer·rad·thsug** |
all nose-hole-inside take-away.NIMPF

dbugs phi·sta·la phiṅ·tsa·na |
breath outside throw-out.ST.PRS-when

yaṅ tshaṅ·ma **phiṅ·ste-khyoṅ·ṅad·tshug** ‖ [...]
also all throw-out-hither.NIMPF ...

Ke·sar·la bdud mthoṅ·ste 'jigs·te **'dar·rad·tshug·pa** |
Kesar.D/L demon see.LC fear.LC tremble.NIMPF.VN

And then, [the demon] was sound asleep, **and lo!** when(ever) it drew the breath in, earth, stones, and whatever was [around], everything, **is taken away** into his nostril! **And lo!** when(ever) he drew the breath out, then, again, everything **is thrown out!** [...] As soon as Kesar caught sight of the demon he was afraid, and **as he is, indeed, trembling (all over)**... (LLV IV:186.13-19).

The Narrative Imperfect can have a retarding effect and may indicate that the situation described becomes crucial for the whole plot. In the following episode, the main character has already won a goddess (or princess) as his wife, everybody is on the way back home, and everything appears to be well settled. But then they pass an old woman who is gathering wood in a broken basket in the middle of the road. The sentence is marked for these concomitant circumstances since they represent the inevitable fate of the prince. He cannot but jostle her, since she is in the way, and the wood collected with effort cannot but fall down, since the basket is broken. This is a very common motive in fairy tales (in other tales, the young man even acts intentionally), and usually the old woman utters a spell in revenge that makes the young man search for the most beautiful girl. Accordingly, in our story, as the prince happens to jostle the grandmother, she takes her revenge by sending him out for yet an even more beautiful goddess. And only then does the true adventure start.

(22) Brayulinnu łaño Brañana ţşese
      Brayul-in goddess Braña.INSTR together
      Bra·yul·li-naṅ·du lha·mo Bra·ña·naṅ 'dre·se

      khoṅ baxston hesap-ketapkun soṅse [...]
      they marriage matter.PL settle ...
      khoṅ bag·ston [ḥisāb-kitāb]-kun soṅ·ste [...]

      khoṅ dere loxse [...]
      they now return.LC ...
      khoṅ da·re log·ste [...]

      rgyalu Cobzaṅ dunpiṅ oṅetpa.
      ... prince Cobzaṅ ahead come.NRL-IMPF
      rgyal·bu Co·bzaṅ mdun·pa'i-naṅ 'oṅ·ñad·pa

      oṅmi walla apicivisi <u>lamciɣiṅnu</u>
      come.VN.GEN while grandmother-a.ERG <u>road-a-inside</u>
      'oṅ·ba'i [*waqt*]-la a·pi·cig·gis <u>lam·cig·gi-naṅdu</u>

      <u>chaqpo coroṅciɣiṅnu</u> munšulci khure,
      <u>*broken basket-inside*</u> *firewood carry.LC*
      chag·po [*coroṅ*]-cig·gi-naṅ·du [*munšul*]-cig khur·re

      yaṅla-žu-byasnare, šiṅ culuk **thwen-yotsuk.**
      with-permission wood little-piece-of-wood **collect.NIMPF**
      khyed·raṅla-žu-byas·na·re šiṅ [*curuk*] **thu·'in-yod·tshug**

      yotpaciñambo
      exist.VN
      yod·pa·cig·mñam·bo

      rgyalu Cobzaṅi de rte tseptse phoxse
      prince Cobzaṅ.GEN that horse.GEN hoof hit.LC
      rgyal·bu Co·bzaṅ·gi de rta'i ?theb·tse phog·se

      api coroṅi šiṅpo bose-soṅ.
      grandmother.GEN basket.GEN wood pour-out.PTT
      a·pi'i [*coroṅ*]-ñi šiṅ·po 'bo·ste-soṅ

      bose-gwañambo apisi zer: «ya-le rgyalu Cobzaṅ,
      pour-out.VN grandmother.ERG say.SPTT oh prince Cobzaṅ
      'bo·ste-'gro·ba·mñam·bo a·pis zer «ya-le rgyal·bu Co·bzaṅ

      łaño Braña thopphika khyaṅ ditse soṅnare,
      goddess Braña obtain.VN-for you as-much go.CC
      lha·mo Bra·ña thob·pha'i-kha khyed·raṅ 'di·tsam soṅ·na·re

łano Yutoq thopna, khiri luxpo ci yot?!»
goddess Yutoq obtain.CC your condition what exist
lha·mo G.yu·tog thob·na khyed·ran·gi lugs·po ci yod»

Together with the goddess Brano they settled all the matters of the
marriage, [...] then they returned, [...] and prince Cobzan went ahead.
While [he] was going, a grandmother carrying firewood in a broken basket
is, indeed, - with your permission - **collecting** little pieces of wood in the
middle of the road. As she was [in the way] she was hit by the hoof of
prince Cobzan's horse, and the wood poured out of the grandmother's
basket. As it poured out, the grandmother said: «Oh, prince Cobzan, if you
have gone so far to obtain the goddess Brana, what will be your condition
if you have [only] found the goddess Yutoq?» (**RGYA**:31.6,9-6,18).

2.4.2 Narrative conventions: looking into a scene

The Narrative Imperfect is especially used for ongoing events that a character
immediately perceives as if s/he was looking through a window ("window-
effect"), and the narrator as well as the audience are looking through the eyes of
the character. This might be indicated explicitly by the verb *blta* | *bltas* | *ltos* 'to
look' (23), indirectly by the verb *bsleb* 'to arrive' (24), or it might be implicit
from the context.

(23) de kamere limikpo phes łtacinambo
      that room key-def open look.VN
      de [kam(a)ra]-'i lde·mig phes blta·ba·cig·mnam·bo

      barbanci ayapci yotsuk. kho barbanciɣiphari łta.
      window-a many-a exist-NM he window-a-through look.SPTT
      [barban]-cig [ajap]-cig yod·tshug kho [barban]-cig·gi·phyir bltas

      łtana, yulciɣin kha nara-byase **tanetsuk.**
      look.ST.PRS.NF country-a-in snow heavily fall.NIMPF
      blta·na yul·cig·gi·nan kha [nara]-bya·ste **btan·nad·tshug**

      do thon. barbanciɣiphari łtana,
      this-def see.SPTT window-a-through look.ST.PRS.NF
      'di·bo mthon [barban]-cig·gi·phyir blta·na

      yulciɣinnu coq culi mentoq **yasetsuk.**
      country-a-in all apricot-tree flower bloom.NIMPF
      yul·cig·gi·nan·du cog [culi] me·tog **yas·sad·tshug**

      barbanciɣiphari łtana
      window-a-through look.ST.PRS.NF
      [barban]-cig·gi·phyir blta·na

coq ṁartsa khuyu **ranetsuk**
*all harvest threshing **be-time.**NIMPF*
cog ṁa·?rtsa kho·g.yu **ran·nad·tshug**

barbanciɣiphari ɫtana,
window-a-through <u>look.ST.PRS.NF</u>
[*barban*]-cig·gi-phyir <u>blta·na</u>

khuri Rgyayuliṅ ɫteɣnare,
Rgyayul-inside <u>look.FUT.NF</u>
kho·raṅ·ṅi Rgya·yul·li-naṅ <u>blta·rug·na·re</u>

ya batša metpi yuli
oh ruler exist.NG.VN.GEN
ya [*pādešāh*] med·pa'i yul·li

min lezina šargo-ɣarip soṅse,
country.GEN people.PL exceedingly needy-greedy become.LC
mi·kun [*lezina*] ?ša·rgos-[ġarib] soṅ·ste

ɫaṅo Braṅa renthaq renthaq tsalba **khoretsuk.**
*goddess Braṅa water-mill water-mill searching **go-round.**NIMPF*
lha·mo ?Bra·ṅa ran·thag ran·thag btsal·ba **'khor·rad·tshug**

[He] opened that room [with] the key and <u>as he looked around</u>, there were
many windows. He <u>looked</u> through one window. <u>As he looked</u>, in one
country it **is, indeed,** heavily **snowing.** This [he] <u>saw.</u> <u>As</u> he <u>looked</u>
through an[other] window, in an[other] country all the apricot trees **are,**
indeed, blooming. <u>As</u> he <u>looked</u> through an[other] window, in an[other]
country everything **is, indeed, ready** for harvesting and threshing. <u>As</u> he
<u>looked</u> through [yet] an[other] window, it was as if he were looking into
his own [village] Rgyayul, and, alas, all the people of the country that was
without ruler had become exceedingly needy-greedy, and [even] the
goddess Braṅa **is, indeed, wandering about** [from] water mill [to] water
mill searching [for some grain] (**RGYA**: 36/13,19-13,25).

(24) de·zug·gis dpa'·bo tshaṅ·ma yod·sa·ru bsleb·soṅ ‖
     such hero all exist-place.L/P arrive.PTT

<u>der bsleb·za·na</u> | mkhar žiṅ tshaṅ·ma **sgo'ad·tshug** |
<u>*there arrive.ST.NTR-when;* </u>*castle field all **divide.**NIMPF*

Thus [he] arrived at the place were all the heroes lived [lit. were]. <u>When</u>
<u>[he] arrived there,</u> **and lo!** [they] **are (already) dividing** the castle, the
fields, every thing [among themselves] (**LLV** III:88.9-11).

2.4.3 Narrative conventions: coming onto the scene

While in the above case of looking into an ongoing situation, both the expanded continuative as well as the non-expanded non-continuative imperfect constructions may be used (the difference is not marked in the glosses), only the non-expanded form is used when a new character enters the scene. In (25), one of the eighteen heroes appears, and since this is a good opportunity for young Kesar to play one of his quite nasty tricks, the suddenness of that appearance is marked by the Narrative Imperfect. Likewise in (26), Kesar, who has obtained only a ford as his heritage, is only waiting for the opportunity to take his revenge, and when finally one of the eighteen heroes appears, his coming along is again marked by the Narrative Imperfect.

(25) khos mi·la mi·šes·ces bco·ste |
he.ERG people.D/L know.NG.VN transform.LC

grub·pa žig bco·ste soṅ |
hermit a make.LC go.SPTT

a·gu Dpal·le de lam·na rta žig·la **žon·te-cha'ad·tshug** |
uncle Pale that way.LOC horse a.D/L ride.NIMPF

khos a·gu·la zers |
he.ERG uncle.D/L say.SPTT

«a·gu·le | ñe·raṅ rta·la žon·te-'dug |
uncle.HON; hon-you horse.D/L ride(Perf)

ṅa 'grul·te ṅal·ces-rag» zers·pa |
I walk.LC be-tired.EXPPRS/FUT say.VN

a·gus | «khyo·raṅ ṅal·na |
uncle.ERG; you be-tired.CC

ṅa'i-rgyab·la rta'i-kha žon» zer·te
I-behind horse-on mount.IMP say.LC

kho rtam·'phoṅs·la btaṅs |
he horse-croup.D/L put.SPTT

de·nas phru·gu des šig khri·tsho gcig phiṅ·ste
then child that.ERG louse ten-thousand one take-out.LC

a·gu'i gzugs·po'i-kha btaṅs·pa |
uncle.GEN body-on place.VN

a·gu de·la šig·gis zos·te smyon·pa-mtshogs soṅ·ste
uncle that.D/L louse.ERG eat.LC lunatic-like become.LC

Transforming [himself] not to be recognized by the people, he made
[himself] a hermit and went on. On the way, **all of a sudden** uncle Pale **is
riding** on a horse. He spoke to the uncle: «Honourable uncle, you are
riding on a horse. [But] I am tired of walking.» Having said [this], the
uncle said: «If you are tired, mount on the horse behind me!», and let him
sit on the horse behind him. Then that child [i.e. hermit] took out one ten
thousand of lice and having placed them on the uncle's body, that [poor]
uncle was [almost] eaten up by the lice and became like a lunatic... (**LLV
III:88.1-7**).

(26) de·zug mo ṅan[·ni] sroṅ·phrug·la tshor·te |
such mother low-[Gen] beggar-child.D/L hear.LC

sro yoṅ·ste |
angry get.LC

Sbi·chu rabs·la soṅ·ste sruṅ·ste-ʼdugs·pa |
Sbichu ford.D/L go.LC wait.VN

žag cig
day a

a·gu Khraʻi-thuṅ rta žig·la **žon·te-yoṅ·ṅad·tshug** |
*uncle Ṭhethuṅ horse a.D/L **ride-hither.NIMPF***

a·gu chuʻi-dkyil·la bsleb·pa·daṅ |
uncle river-middle.D/L reach.VN.NF

kho mgyogs·pa soṅ·ste rgoṅ-rtsa·nas zum·ste |
he quick go.LC collar-at.ABL seize.LC

rta-thog·nas phab·ste | chuʻi-dkyil·la gnan·te |
horse-on.ABL tear-down.LC; water-amidst press.LC

maṅ·po rduṅs | de·nas tha·ma·la biṅ·ste |
many beat.SPTT; then bank:D/L come-out.LC

«ṅaʻi a·gu Khraʻi-thuṅ yin·nog |
I.GEN uncle Ṭhethuṅ be-InfM

ṅa·la ma·šes» zer·riṅ·žig
I.D/L recognize.NG.SPTT exclaim.ST.PRS.CC

ṅu-rdzun-btaṅs | a·gus zers |
cry-pretend.SPTT; uncle.ERG say.SPTT

«khyod·la ma·šes·na khag·med»
you.D/L recognize.NG-CC) blame-without

When the low caste beggar child heard this it got angry, went to the ford
Sbichu, and as [it] waited there, one day, (**finally**) uncle Thethuṅ **is
riding along** on a horse. The uncle had just reached the middle of the
river, when it went there quickly, seized [him] by the collar, tore [him]
down from the horse, pressed [him] under the water, and beat [him] a lot.
Then, when [they] came out on the shore, it exclaimed: «You are my uncle
Thethuṅ! I didn't recognize [you]!», and pretended to cry. The uncle said:
«If you didn't recognize [me], you are not to blame» (**LLV** III:89.8-14).

2.3.4 Narrative Perfect

In narrations, the inferential present perfect constructions are likewise used
in an emphatic manner. The **Narrative Perfect** (NPERF), indicates that an event
has happened in an unexpected manner or had an unforeseen outcome. It
appears especially with supernatural or magical events. Quite often these events
or their resulting states are perceived by a character who has come to inspect the
situation and who is taken aback ("window-effect"), as in (27) and (28). But
the Narrative Perfect is likewise used for the unexpected arrival of a new
character on the scene ("newcomer-effect"), as in (29).

(27) tene yaṅ žak žik ta lda cik-tsok žigna tene
then again day a now month one-like a.LOC then
de·nas yaṅ žag žig da zla·ba gcig-mtshogs žig·na de·nas

«ta dole yoddo
now shoot exist-maybe
«da ?'dol·le yod·'gro

kheraṅ <u>sta soṅ</u>» molzane,
you <u>look.VN go.IMP</u> hon-speak.ST.PRS-sim)
khyed·raṅ <u>blta·[ba]·la soṅ</u>» mol·za·nas

tene caṅ žiṅ tsaṅma dole met,
then whatever field all.D/L shoot Ng-exist
de·nas caṅ žiṅ tshaṅma·la ?'dol·le med

žiṅ cikciga ljaṅpa cikcik **skyese-yotkyak**.
*field single stalk single **grow.NPERF***
žiṅ gcig·cig·la ljaṅ·pa gcig·cig **skye·ste-yod·kyag**

Then again one day, now [after] as much as one month, then when he
spoke: «Now the shoots might have come out [lit. might be (there)]. <u>Go
and look</u>!», then [when the servant looked] **lo and behold!** none of the

fields whatsoever had shoots, [only] on one single field one single stalk
has grown (STOK Kesar; cf.   LLV I:1.10-11 *ljaṅ·pa gcig·cig men·pa
skye·ste-med·tshug* 'only one stalk had grown').

(28) lampa Rbalu[] [...] ta tsalen soṅse,
      guardian Dwarf ... now search.ST.PRS.CC go.LC
      lam·pa Sba·lu[] [...] da btsal·lin soṅ·ste

      soṅse soṅse, inna-in,
      go.LC go.LC be(cc)-be
      soṅ·ste soṅ·ste yin·na-yin

      łaṅo Yutoq oṅmi oṅi ṭhuli ḍẓuciɣiga
      goddess Yutoq come.VN.GEN milk.GEN pond.GEN corner-a-at
      lha·mo G.yu·tog 'oṅ·ba'i 'o·ma'i [*ṭhul*]-li gru·cig·gi-kha

      kho tshikse, xsolba **soṅse-yotsuk.**
      *he be-burnt.LC charcoal **turn.NPERF***
      kho tshig·ste gsol·ba·la **soṅ·ste-yod·tshug**

      Now the guardian "Dwarf" [...] went out searching, went and went, and be
      it as it be, at a corner of the pond of milk [to which] the goddess Yutoq
      used to come, **lo and behold!** he [i.e. the prince] is burnt and **has turned
      (completely) into charcoal (RGYA**:34/10,17-10,20).

(29) de·nas gnam-laṅ·ste bltas·pa |
      then dawn.LC look.VN

      bya·rdzes mi·rdzes ci·yaṅ med·tshug |
      bird-trace man-trace whatever Ng-exist-NM

      Srar·gyi la de mā mthon·po žig yod·pas
      Ṣar.GEN pass that very high a exist.VN

      Ke·sar·gyis a·ne Bkur·dman·mo·la stod·glu žig btaṅs |
      Kesar.ERG aunt Kurmanmo.D/L praise-song a sing.SPTT

      «...» de·zug zers·pa |
      ... such speak.VN

      Ke·sar·gyi-mdun·po·la wa·tse žig **yoṅ·ste-yod·tshug** |
      *Kesar-before fox a **come.NPERF***

Ke·sar·gyis wa·tse·la 'ded·de-khyers·pa·saṅ |
Kesar.ERG fox.D/L pursue-along.VN

wa·tse 'khor·rin·žig-soṅ·ba |
fox go-around.VN

Ke·sar yaṅ rtiṅ raṅ žugs·te-soṅ·ba
Kesar again after merely enter.VN

la de mgyogs·pa 'khyel·soṅ |
pass that quick be-able-to-cross.PTT

Then, it dawned and when [he] looked around, there was not any trace of birds nor any trace of men. Because the pass of Ṣar was so high, Kesar sang a song of praise to aunt Kurmanmo. «...», having spoken such, **all of a sudden**, a fox **has appeared** [lit. has come]. When Kesar pursued the fox, the fox went round and round, and as Kesar again merely kept [lit. entered] behind, he could cross the pass quickly (**LLV** VII:258.1-18).

Like the Narrative Present in other languages, the Narrative Imperfect as well as the Narrative Perfect shift the event or situation out of the emotionally rather neutral context of a temporally and spatially distant story into an emotionally much more touching context of a fictive present. The narrator is allowed to comment on a situation **as if** it were visible to him/her as well as to the audience. The function of the Narrative Imperfect can thus be compared to that of a Narrative Present. However, in contrast to Old and Classical "Lhasa", and Eastern Kham Tibetan, the narrative constructions in West Tibetan show a differentiation in the presentation of events as ongoing at the imaginary present moment (Narrative Imperfect) or as having a resulting state at the imaginary present moment (Narrative Perfect).

3. CONCLUSION

It is quite evident that in the Tibetan languages, mirativity is not grammatically encoded, but is metaphorically integrated into the temporal system. The development of a Narrative Perfect in West Tibetan shows clearly that it is not the aspectual connotation of the present tense forms, presenting an event as still ongoing or incomplete, that is decisive for their use in emphatically marked contexts, but the projection of the events as they are into a fictive present situation and/or as having a fictive current relevance. It is thus the negation of temporal distance that signals the special emphasis on the emotional content.

Quite often this projection is triggered through verbs of emotion, such as *cry, laugh, feel sorrow, be happy*, etc. This might be due to the fact that in Tibetan societies, as in other Asian societies, emotions are a very intimate matter and

should not be openly displayed. Emotional behaviour in public is always somewhat unexpected, and it is perhaps also somewhat improper to talk about other person's emotions, even in a narration.

Besides this marking of emotions, the Narrative Present (or Imperfect) is rather conventionally used for two situations: for looking into an already ongoing scene ("window-effect") and for the unexpected arrival of a new character ("newcomer-effect"). In the first case, the reason for the temporal shift is quite obvious: the narrator and audience are looking through the eyes of the character into a situation that is of current or future relevance for the character. The use of present tense forms thus corresponds in a way to the presentation of thought in direct speech. Perhaps the "newcomer-effect" may be explained along the same lines: the character is presented as if, for the moment, reduced to inactivity and as if s/he could only passively look into the changing situation over which s/he has no control. What is perceived in both cases is either quite unexpected and unusual or turns out to be crucial for the further decisions and actions of the character. The temporal shift has the side effect of slowing down the speed and thus raising the tension of the narration. Thanks to this effect, the temporal shift could also be understood as a direct signal to the audience that the story has come to some crucial point, as well as a means to attract the attention of the audience.

In West Tibetan, especially in Ladakhi, the temporal metaphor of the imperfect (present tense) and present perfect forms is combined with the evidential metaphor of inference or modal distance. But the Inferential Marker alone is not sufficient to express the unexpected fact. It is basically the temporal metaphor that marks an event as unexpected. And in fact, the evidential value of the Inferential Markers is cancelled in mirative contexts. The function of the Inferential Markers in narrative contexts as well as that of the Generic Present in "Lhasa" Tibetan is to moderate the obviously too strong notion of novelty or perhaps only to exclude the notion of personal experience that is conveyed by the auxiliary *'dug* of the normal present tense form (Common Present/Future).

It is interesting in this connection that in West Tibetan, the Inferential Markers do not show a functional split between past/perfective and present/simultaneous/imperfective use. In contrast to Hare and Sunwar, the Inferential Markers have their inferential function not only when joined to the perfect constructions but also when joined to the present tense constructions, and in the latter case, the whole expression, due to the semantics of inference, automatically refers to the past (inferential Imperfect). In mirative contexts, however, both the perfect as well as the imperfect constructions lose the evidential value of inference.

It should not be overlooked that the marking of inference itself does not fit into a conceptual opposition of old/assimilated knowledge vs. new/unexpected knowledge. As stated above, the basic opposition, as it becomes visible in the distribution of the auxiliaries, is between knowledge based on immediate visual perception (marked) and knowledge that is not (unmarked), i.e. self-evident or personal and generic or shared knowledge. Knowledge based on inference is either not coded at all (Nangchenpa), coded separately and restricted to the domain of past time reference ("Lhasa" Tibetan, Dzongkha), or is subsumed under knowledge that is not based on direct perception (Themchen, Ladakhi). In the last case, if novelty were grammatically encoded through the auxiliaries, even though inferred knowledge is new and may be unexpected, it would be marked as old and assimilated, which would be an obvious contradiction. This shows that the concept of novelty is not unambiguously encoded in Modern Tibetan languages. Rather "old" or "new" are naturally associated with the various means of knowledge.

When unexpected events are marked with evidential metaphors, as in "Lhasa" Tibetan or in Ladakhi, then it is evident that in these cases mirativity is subsumed under evidentiality, and not, as DeLancey (1997) claims, the other way round. And since both the knowledge based on direct perception and that based on inference are associated with novelty, both markers may be used metaphorically to express mirativity. But the concept of mirativity itself is not merely a subconcept of novelty (expected and unexpected events are both "new") and, more important, it is independent from the concept of evidentiality. This is most evident in the case of Old and Classical Tibetan where evidentiality and novelty are not coded at all.

This is, however, not a very unexpected outcome, since it appears to be self-evident that the question about the various sources of knowledge is quite different from the question of whether a perceived event was expected and acceptable or not (the question of the source of knowledge and at the same time the question of novelty being obsolete or already answered). While the source of knowledge is pragmatically quite important for successful communication, being concerned with truth, objectivity, and probability, the question whether or not an event was expected seems to be quite a relative and subjective matter, much more interesting for the speaker than for the hearer. The speaker may, however, use the emotional content connected with the marking of mirativity to appeal for empathy or, at least, to attract the attention of the hearer. The expression of mirativity is thus much more a stylistic matter, and it needs grammatical encoding to a much lesser extent than evidentiality. Novelty, on the other hand, seems to depend on the means of knowledge and, therefore, when evidentiality is coded, it does not need separate grammatical encoding at all.

ABBREVIATIONS

Tibetan languages:
CT   Classical Tibetan (11th-19th century A.D.);
OT   Old Tibetan (7th-10th century A.D.);

Tibetan texts:
BTSU   *Btsun·mo Bka'i-thaṅ·yig*, Laufer (1911), CT;
CHA   *Spoken Tibetan texts, IV*, Chang et al. (1981), "Lhasa" Tibetan;
DTH   *Documents de Touen-Houang*, Bacot et al. (1946), OT;
GZER   *Gzer·mig*, Francke (1924-30), CT;
LLV   *Lower Ladakhi Version*, Francke (1905-41), West Tibetan, Ladakhi;
NANG   *Dialekt und Erzählungen der Nangchenpas*, Causemann (1989), Eastern Kham Tibetan, Nangchenpa;
NARO   *Die Legenden des Nāropa*, Grünwedel (1933), CT;
RAMA   *The story of Rāma in Tibet*, de Jong (1989), OT;
RGYA   *Rgyalu Cobzaṅ*, Bielmeier (1985), West Tibetan, Balti;
STOK   fragment of the Kesar Saga recorded 1996 in Stok, near Leh, West Tibetan, Ladakhi.

Grammatical terms[3] :

ABL   Ablative Particle;
CC   conjunctive case particle
CPRS/FUT   Compound (OT/CT) or Common ("Lhasa" and West Tibetan) Present/Future (neutral form with continuative and non-continuative function in all four Tibetan languages, negatively marked as non-habitual in OT and CT, but neutral with respect to habituality in "Lhasa" and West-Tibetan);
D/L   Dative/Locative Particle;
EMP   emphatic particle;
EPRS   Expanded Present (marked form with continuative function, no habitual function);
ERG   Ergative Particle;
EXPPRS/FUT   Experiential Present/Future (Ladakhi);

---

[3]   Particular names of definite terms are written with initial capitals in contrast to general or non-grammaticalized terms. Capitalization of the abbreviations depends on the importance of the term as well as on readability

F	Final Marker;
FUT	Future;
GEN	Genitive Particle;
GENRPRS	Generic Present ("Lhasa" Tibetan);
HON	honorific;
IMP	Imperative;
IMPF	Imperfect (West Tibetan);
INFM	Inferential Marker (West Tibetan);
INSTR	Instrumental Particle;
INTPRS/FUT	Intensified Present/Future (Nangchenpa);
LC	*lhag·bcas*, clause chaining conjunction;
LOC	Locative Particle;
L/P	Locative/Purposive Particle;
MPRS/FUT	Marked Present/Future (Nangchenpa);
NIMPF	Narra<u>tive</u> Imperfect (West Tibetan);
NPERF	Narra<u>tive</u> Perfect (West Tibetan);
NF	"non-finite", (ø-) conjunction;
NG	Negation Particle;
NRL-IMPF	Narra<u>tional</u> Imperfect (West Tibetan);
NTR	neutral (verb stem not inflecting);
PL	plural marker;
PRS	present;
PTT	preterite/past;
QF, Q	Question (Final) Marker;
SPRS/FUT	Simple Present/Future (?perfective form, negatively marked as non-continuous, neutral with respect to habituality);
SPTT	Simple Past;
ST.	stem;
θ	Theme/Topic Marker;
VN	verbal noun, participle;
« », ‹ ›	indicate (quoted) direct, indirect speech, or thoughts, etc. in narrations or in examples of conversations, independently of the use of quotes by the authors, not to be confounded with the quotation marks: " ", ' ';
!	after stem designation indicates "irregular" stem form;
?	etymology unclear, no written Tibetan equivalent;
*	hypothetical reconstruction of written Tibetan;
< >	non-phonematic features due to sentence intonation.

REFERENCES

AGHA, Asif. 1993. *Structural Form and Utterance Context in Lhasa Tibetan. Grammar and Indexicality in a Non-Configurational Language.* (Monographs in Linguistics and the Philosophy of Language, 2.) New York: Peter Lang.

BACOT, Jacques, Frederick William THOMAS and Gustave Charles TOUSSAINT. 1940. *Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet.* Paris.

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

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

CHANG Kun, Betty SHEFTS, NORNANG NGAWANG, and KARSIP LHADON. 1981. *Spoken Tibetan Texts.* Vol. IV. (Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Special Publications, 74.) Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.

DE JONG, Jan Willem. 1989. *The Story of Rāma in Tibet. Text and Translation of the Tun-huang Manuscripts.* (Tibetan and Indo-Tibetan Studies, 1.) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

DELANCEY, Scott. 1997. "Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information." *Linguistic Typology* 1:33-52.

DRIEM, George van. Forthcoming. "Epistemic verbal categories in Dzongkha."

FRANCKE, August Hermann. 1905-41. *Gšam·yul·na bšad·pa'i Ke·sar·gyi sgrungs bžugs.* A Lower Ladakhi Version of the Kesar Saga. (Bibliotheca Indica, Work, 168.), Calcutta 1905-1909 (Fasc. 1-4), 1941 (Fasc. 5): Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. [Reprint 1981: The Epic of

Gesar. Ed. by Kunzang Tobgyel and Mani Dorje, Vol. 29. Thimphu, Bhutan: Druk Sherig Press.]

_____. 1924-30. "Gzer-myig, a book of the Tibetan Bonpos. Tibetan text according to the Berlin-manuscript." *Asia Major* 1 (1924):243-346 (chapter I-III), *Asia Major 3* (1926):321-339 (chapter IV), *Asia Major 4.2/3* (1927):161-239 (chapter V), *Asia Major 4.4* (1928):481-540 (chapter VI), *Asia Major 5* (1928):1-40 (chapter VI, translation), *Asia Major 6* (1930):299-314) (chapter VII).

GRÜNWEDEL, Albert. 1933. *Die Legenden des Nāropa, des Hauptvertreters des Nekromanten und Hexentums. Nach einer alten tibetischen Handschrift als Beweis für die Beeinflussung des nördlichen Buddhismus durch die Geheimlehre der Manichäer.* Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

HAHN, Michael. 1985. *Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache.* (Indica et Tibetica: Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indo-tibetischen Kulturraumes, 10.) Bonn: Indica et Tibetica.

HALLER, Felix. In progress. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen.*

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

LAUFER, Berthold. 1911. *Btsun·mo bka'i thaṅ·yig. Der Roman einer tibetischen Königin. Tibetischer Text und Übersetzung.* Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

NEHLS, Dietrich. 1978. *Semantik und Syntax des englishen Verbs. Teil I: Tempus und Aspekt.* Heidelberg: Groos.

SUN, Jackson T.-S. 1993. "Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan." *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* (Taipei) 63.4: 945-1001.

TOURNADRE, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en tibétain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée.* [Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale] Paris, Louvain: Peeters.

ZEISLER, Bettina. Forthcoming. *Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Languages: a Comparative Study.*