

Traces of Clause-Final Demonstratives in Old Tibetan¹

Marius Zemp

(University of Bern, Switzerland)

1. Introduction

The Purik member of the Tibetic language family is spoken in the western periphery of the Tibetic linguistic area. In Purik, two demonstratives, *de* ‘that’ and *e* ‘the other’, occur not only pre- and pronominally, but also post- and proverbially, in which case they take scope over the sentence they terminate. The proverbial *de*, occurring instead of an existential predicate, locates an entity or property in the topical situation (which typically corresponds to the interlocutors’ current one). The postverbal *de*, occurring after a full-fledged sentence, has the effect of laying out the information conveyed by this sentence, inviting the addressee to retrace it, and implying that it should be clear. By contrast, pro- and postverbal *e* points to information that requires a shift of attention.

The present paper demonstrates that Old Tibetan (OT) *ga re* ‘where is (X)?’, clause-linking *(s)te ~ de*, and *V-ta re* ‘lest (it) will V’, and other phenomena found in written and spoken Tibetic varieties, are best understood if analysed as traces of the mentioned clause-final demonstratives. The comparative study of spoken Tibetic varieties thus not only contributes to our understanding of particular OT texts, but also sheds light on the development and dispersion of Tibetic during the Imperial Period (7th–9th centuries CE).

Purik is a phonologically archaic Tibetic variety spoken in the Purik area of Kargil district which, on 31 October 2019, came under the Union Territory of Ladakh, India. In Purik, two demonstratives, *de* ‘that’ and *e* ‘the other’, respectively refer to primary and secondary topics (see §2.1) not only pre- and pronominally, but also pro- and postverbally.

The distinction between Purik *de* and *e* is a prime example of what

¹ This paper is dedicated to the loving memory of Prof. Takeuchi Tsuguhito. It was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant numbers 159046 and 189281). I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for helpful comments on an earlier version.

Evans, Bergqvist, and San Roque proposed to call “engagement systems”.² These systems “encode the relative accessibility of an entity or state of affairs to the speaker and addressee”.³ Naturally, demonstratives play a prominent role in many such systems, and Evans et al. write that:

After a long period when the typology of demonstrative systems was dominated by their spatial properties (...), the field is unveiling a growing number of cases where demonstratives can best be understood as grammatical devices for bringing one’s interlocutor’s attention into line with one’s own (cf. Janssen, 2002).⁴

However, Janssen takes into consideration only “adnominal, pronominal, and local” demonstratives,⁵ but not demonstratives which take scope over entire clauses. As clause-scope demonstratives appear to generally be left unconsidered in the most well-known work on demonstratives,⁶ and the grammaticalization paths leading from demonstratives to copulas,⁷ and to complementizers,⁸ the degree to which the present study may draw from this literature is rather limited.

Nevertheless, for most of the Tibetic phenomena described in Sections 2 and 3 of this article, striking parallels have been identified (and will be discussed after the respective Tibetic phenomena) in Abui, an entirely unrelated language spoken on Alor Island in Eastern Indonesia.⁹

The present article is structured as follows: Section §2 discusses demonstratives in Purik, showing that from among those which occur pronominally (§2.1), *de* ‘that’ has left traces also in other positions of NPs in Purik and other Tibetic varieties (§2.2), while both *de* ‘that’ and *e* ‘the other’ are also employed post- and proverbially (§2.3). Section §3

² Evans et al. 2018.

³ Evans et al. 2018.

⁴ Evans et al. 2018: 123.

⁵ Janssen 2002: 162–63.

⁶ See for instance Himmelmann 1996; Fillmore 1997; Diessel 1999.

⁷ Stassen 1997: 76–91; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 108–09.

⁸ Hopper and Traugott 2003 [1985]: 190–94; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 106–07. Walleser, like the author of the present article, tried to show that Written Tibetan (*s)te* ~ *de* derives from demonstrative *de*; Walleser 1935. However, as he was unaware of the clause-final uses of this demonstrative in modern dialects such as Purik, his diachronic account has little in common with the one proposed here.

⁹ Kratochvil 2007; Kratochvil 2011. Note that clause-level demonstratives are also described for other Timor-Alor-Pantar languages in Schapper and San Roque 2011.

identifies traces of the clause-final demonstratives in OT and other Tibetic varieties, arguing that postverbal *-de* (§3.1) is reflected in the OT subordinator *(s)te ~ de* and OT V *ta re* 'lest (it) will V'; proverbal *de* in adjectives like *ts^hante* 'hot', which are widespread in dialects west of Lhasa; proverbal *e* (§3.2) in OT *ga re* 'where is ...?', from where it further developed into the preverbal *e* of early Written Tibetan (WT) and modern eastern Tibetic varieties on the one hand and the polar interrogative *(-):e* of Central Tibetic on the other. Section §4 concludes this paper by giving a unified diachronic account of how clause-final *de* and *e* developed in different varieties of the Tibetic language family.

2. Demonstratives in Purik Tibetan

2.1. Prenominal Demonstratives

Purik has six demonstratives which occur pre- and pronominally, and which may refer to two related dimensions, namely a spatial and a textual (or discourse-deictic) one. Proximal *di* 'this' and distal *a(re)* 'that' primarily refer to the spatial dimension.¹⁰ The most important demonstrative of the textual dimension is anaphoric *de* 'that', which, as described for anaphoric markers in other languages, "refers to the referent of the antecedent expression with which it is correlated".¹¹ It occurs in its adjectival form *de* before nouns and before locative *-ka*, as in (1) and (2), but in its nominal form *d-o*—with the definite article *-o*, which has the form *-po* after consonants, see *las-po* in (1)—before dative *-a*, as in the second line of (2). The emphatic anaphoric *dja* 'that exact, that same'¹² may be used as in (3), and *ode* 'that very' refers to a newly identified topic as in (4). Note that *ode* may also be applied to the spatial dimension, namely when it refers to an entity which is situated next to the addressee and is therefore most readily identified by that addressee, as in (5).¹³

- (1) *k^ho-s na bo-s-p-in, de las-po mi ba zer-e*
 s/he-ERG oathput-PST-INF-EQ that work-DEF NEG do say-CNJ
 He's sworn to never do **that** (which we've talked about) again.

¹⁰ For a detailed discussion of pre- and pronominal demonstratives in Purik, see Zemp 2018: 212–48.

¹¹ Lyons 1977: 660.

¹² Purik *dja* likely reflects a fusion of *de* and the focus marker *-pa*, Zemp 2018: 241.

¹³ That the spatial use of *ode* derives from its discourse-deictic function (rather than the other way round) is suggested by the fact that *o* is used as an affirmative particle in most if not all spoken and written varieties of Tibetan, see Hahn 1996: 47.

- (2) *skambo fiŋ sum ʒbʒi de-ka taŋ-se ʃerpa tʃik*
 dry wood three four that-LOC give-CNJ wet one
taŋ-ma-na d-o-a ʃtsam-ba zer-tʃ-in
 give-INF-CND that-DEF-DAT make.warm-INF say-INF2-EQ
 After putting three, four pieces of wood **there** (into the fire), when (you) put a wet one (there as well), **that's** called *ʃtsamba* ('to make dry').
- (3) *kʰo-s ʃtsaŋ-kʰan-po-la ʃmul rgj-ek taŋ-se-na*
 (s)he-ERG raise-NLZR-DEF-DAT rupee100-INDEF give-CNJ-CND
dʒa-o ʒot-en-dug-et
 that.exact-DEF brag-SIM-stay-FCT
 After (s)he gave a beggar 100 rupees, (s)he's been bragging about **this** all the time.
- (4) *le-a hoʃel-tʃi min-dug-a ode*
 Leh-DAT restaurant-INDEF NEG-EX.DIREV-Q that.very
tʃʰan-po-a bomw-ek min-duk-p-in-a
 side-DEF-DAT girl-INDEF NEG-EX.DIREV-INF-EQ-Q
 You remember the restaurant in Leh? And (do you remember) the girl that was (working) next to **that** (restaurant)?
- (5) *ŋa daŋ-tʃik ba-se-na*
 I moment-INDEF do-CNJ-CND
ode hoʃel-la joŋ-ed-hei
 that.very restaurant-DAT come-FCT-ok?
 I will come to **your** hotel after a little while, okay?

While *de* 'that' consistently refers to the most activated antecedent of the ongoing discourse, *e* 'the other' draws attention to what may be called a 'secondary topic', which is activated together with the primary topic but warrants a shift of attention.¹⁴ In (6), for example, *e* refers to the far end of a rope; in (7), the other half of a month; in (8), the opposite side of a valley; in (9), the one of three protagonists in a story who was not just mentioned; in (10), someone other than the speaker of the reported sentence; in (11), everyone around the subject of the sentence; in (12), away from the interlocutors' current location; and in (13), the next occasion on which speaker and addressee eat together.

¹⁴ Note that this notion of 'secondary topic' is not incompatible with the 'secondary (clausal) topic' used by scholars such as Givón 1979 and Nikolaeva 2001.

- (6) *no, dj-u len e-ka t^homs*
 here.you.go this-DEF take the.other-LOC hold\IMP
 Here! Grab a hold of this (rope) on the other end!
- (7) *ldzot tʃoʒa tʃik-pw-e-ka t^hoŋ-tʃ-in, e tʃoʒa*
 moon15 one-DEF-G-LOC be.visible-INF2-EQ the.other15
tʃik-pw-e-ka zat-tʃ-in, ts^har-e tʃ^ha-tʃ-in
 one-DEF-G-LOC wear.out-INF2-EQ be.finished-CNJ go-INF2-EQ
 The moon is seen during the first fifteen days; during the second fifteen it wanes.
- (8) *e ŋos-i p^harka grib in,*
 the.other side-GEN side.of.valley shade EQ
ɲima gor-e ʃar-ba-t
 sun be.late-CNJ rise-INF-FCT
 The other side of the valley is in the shade; the sun rises late (there).
- (9) *p^hono sum jot-p-in-suk, p^hono ɲis-pw-e ama*
 brother three EX-NR-EQ-INFR brother two-DEF-GEN mother
tʃik-tʃik, e p^hono tʃik-tʃik-pw-e ama
 one-one the.other brother one-one-DEF-GEN mother
loχso in-suk
 different EQ-INFR
 There were three brothers. Two brothers had the same mother, the third brother had a different mother.
- (10) *e tʃik-po ma t^har-na*
 the.other one-DEF NEG climb-CND
ŋa-a laqtʃu t^homs zer-tʃ-in
 I-DAT hand hold\IMP say-INF2-EQ
 If the other person isn't able to get on top, (we) say "grab my hand!".
- (11) *e-en roza-a duk-tsa-na*
 the.other-PL fasting-DAT stay-SIM-CND
zba-se t^huŋ-ma rgo-f-in
 hide-CNJ drink-INF need-INF2-EQ
 While the others are fasting (you) need to drink secretly.
- (12) *ts^haχtsik e-tsa-ar-ik nur*

a.little the.other-LIM-AUG-INDEF move.aside
 Move a little to the side!

- (13) *dja-res-i-ka* *k^hje-s* *tozar* *toŋ*,
 that-turn-G-LOC you-ERG lunch give\IMP
e-res-i-ka *ŋa-s* *k^hjaŋ-a* *taŋ-et*,
 the.other-turn-G-LOC I-ERG you-DAT give-FCT
 This time you pay for the food, next time I will pay for you.

2.2. *Demonstratives in other Positions of Noun and Adverbial Phrases*

Before turning to the functions which Purik *de* and *e* serve in clause-final positions, the present section serves to show that *de* ‘that’ (and to a lesser degree ‘*di*’ ‘this’, where WT <’ > indicates prenasalization) left traces also in a number of other positions within NPs. Let us first look at the comparative evidence from other Tibetic varieties.

While demonstratives always precede the noun they determine in the westernmost Tibetic dialects Balti, Purik, and Ladakhi,¹⁵ they follow that noun in Written (including Old) Tibetan except in some fixed expressions such as *di skad du* ‘with these words’.¹⁶ Only the postnominal position is described for *ni* ‘this’ and *thi* ‘that’ in Shigatse Tibetan,¹⁷ and for enclitic *-ndə* ‘this’ and *-tə* ‘that’ in the Themchen dialect of Amdo Tibetan.¹⁸ In many other modern varieties of Tibetan, at least some of the demonstratives are found both before and after a noun, often both within the same NP, as in Southern Mustang,¹⁹ Dingri,²⁰ Nangchenpa,²¹ and Dongwang.²² In Kyirong, proximal *dī* and distal *q:* both occur before nouns that are often followed by enclitic *-de*. Even if this enclitic according to Huber serves as a determiner and never as a demonstrative,²³ it is without a doubt cognate with the demonstrative *de* found throughout Tibetic.

Many Tibetic dialects also exhibit forms consisting of two demonstratives. For Kyirong, Huber documents proximal *dedē* and distal *q:ḏī*

¹⁵ Bielmeier 1985: 79.

¹⁶ Beyer 1992: 206f.; Hahn 1996: 43.

¹⁷ Haller 2000: 51–52.

¹⁸ Haller 2004: 51–52.

¹⁹ Kretschmar 1995: 65.

²⁰ Herrmann 1989: 46.

²¹ Causemann 1989: 79.

²² Bartee 2007: 252.

²³ Huber 2005: 71–72.

as emphatic variants of simple *di* and *o*:²⁴ Bielmeier et al. list similar forms for a few more dialects, namely Tabo *hot̄e*, Gergye *wur̄i*, and Nubri *auti* ‘that’.²⁵

Whereas Purik shows no traces of demonstratives occurring immediately after a noun, there is broad evidence for anaphoric *de* being used after spatial-deictic *a* ‘that’, *e* ‘the other’, and after the particle *o*. Modern Purik *ode* ‘that very’, for instance, which was described above as referring to a newly identified topic, clearly consists of the affirmative *o* found in perhaps all written and spoken Tibetic varieties and textual-anaphoric *de*. Accordingly, one may also translate *ode* as ‘yes, that one, the one we have just identified’.

At an earlier stage of Purik, *de* also regularly occurred after *a* ‘that (pointing, distal)’ and *e* ‘the other’, as witnessed by their forms *are* (< **a de*) and *ere* (< **e de*), which are highly preferred over *a* and *e* in the attributive position before a noun, compare (14) and (15).

- (14) *ribja a-ka-na p^hur, a-ka baps*
 wild.hen that-LOC-ABL fly that-LOC go.down
 A wild hen flew (up) from **over there** and came down **over there**.

- (15) *are nor-un skrot, rgjap-se ton*
 that sheep-PL drive.away\IMP hit-CNJ give\IMP
 Drive those sheep **over there** away!

The assumption that *are* and *ere* respectively derive from **a de* and **e de* is supported by the modern occurrence of an elongated *aa*—accompanied by pointing gestures—in front of another demonstrative, as illustrated in (16) and (17).

- (16) *k^ho-e nan-po aa a-o in*
 (s)he-GEN house-DEF that that-DEF EQ
 His house is **over there** (pointing at it).

- (17) *k^ho-e nan-po aa e luŋb-e-aŋ-nuk jot*
 (s)he-GEN house-DEF that the.other valley-G-INE-TERM EX.F

²⁴ Huber 2005: 71–73. While the distal Kyirong *o*:(*di*) as well as *o*rā‘we’ may indeed, as suggested by Huber 2005: 69, be related with the archaic determiner *o* ~ *u* discussed by Beyer 1992: 214, the *o*- in Purik *ode*, which refers to a newly identified topic (see §2.1), is more likely to be cognate with the affirmative WT *o*- preserved in interjections such as *o-na* ‘well, now, but’, *on-kyang* ‘nevertheless’, and *on-te* ‘on the other hand’, see Beyer 1992: 214, n. 15.

²⁵ Bielmeier et al. 2018.

His house is **over there** in **that** valley (**behind** the mountain ridge pointed to).

Furthermore, Purik *di* ‘this’ commonly occurs after genitive NPs, as illustrated in (18)–(21).

- (18) *ŋj-i di zu-u p^{hit}-de, ŋj-i dj-u p^{hit}*
 I-GEN this finger-DEF get.frostbite-TOP I-GEN this-DEF get.fb
This my finger has got frostbitten, you see, **this here** got frost-bitten.

- (19) *p^hru-i di-aŋ la fut-suk*
 child-GEN this-INE spirit fit.in-INFR
The child’s grazed **here** (the speaker, the father of the child, is pointing to the skin folds on his own arm).

- (20) *k^hir-i di faŋ-p-e-aŋ-nuk struŋ-fik,*
 you-GEN this consciousness-DEF-G-INE-TERM guard-OPT
k^hje-s dunjaat rilja taŋ-tfa duk
 you-ERG world down give-INF EX.DIREV
 With **this** wit **of yours**—beware! (Or) you will throw the world down the hill.

- (21) *k^hint-i di-tsoχs qaktar-un ŋatf-i*
 you.PL-GEN this-like doctor-PL we.PE-GEN
stranbu-n-i-aŋ k^hjams-e jot
 path-PL-G-INE wander.about-CNJ EX.F
 We have people like your doctors strolling around in our back-yard.

Locative and inessive adverbials such as *k^hint-i-re-aŋ* ‘in your home’ contain an element *-re-* (glossed as ‘associative’) which may be assumed to derive from a demonstrative *de* that occurred in the same position as *di* in (19). Further examples of such adverbials include *ŋatf-i-re-r* (we.PE-GEN-ASSOC-TERM) ‘at our place’ < **ŋatf-i de-r* ‘at our there’ (we.PE-GEN that-TERM), *abbas jot-s-i-re-ka* ‘at Abbas’ place’ < **jot-sa-i de-ka* (EX-place-GEN that-LOC) ‘where Abbas is, there’, *ŋisk-i-re-r* ‘at the place of these two’, and *e mi-in-i-r-er* ‘at the place of the other people’. In some contexts, we also find *-re-* (< *de* ‘that’) contrasting with *-ri-* (< *di* ‘this’) pointing to or towards the speaker’s present location. For in-

stance, while *ɲj-i-re-ka* 'at my place' is used by someone who is currently not at home, as in (22), *ɲatʃi-ri-ka* 'here at our place' is used by someone who is, as in (23). Similarly, the *-ri-* formant may point to the side which is closer to the present location of the speaker, as in *tʃʰumik-i-ri-ka* 'on this side of the water source' and *zamb-e-ri-ka* 'on this side of the bridge'.

(22) *kʰjeran ɲj-i-re-ka branʃa-a duk,*
 you I-GEN-ASSOC-LOC hospice-DAT stay
 (You) stay at my place over night!

(23) *kʰjeran ɲatʃi-ri-ka branʃa-a duk*
 you we.PE-G-ASSOC-LOC hospice-DAT stay
 (You) stay at our place here over night!

A final parallel for both rhotacized postvocalic *de* and the sequencing of demonstratives is provided by the temporal demonstrative *da* 'now' fossilized in the partially synonymous Purik *dare* and *daχsan* 'now' as well as *da(r)an* 'still'. That this temporal demonstrative ceased to be productive in an ancestor of modern Purik is suggested by the fact that WT (and Central Tibetan) *dā-lo* "this year, in this year"²⁶ has been replaced in Purik by *ditʃik* 'this year' < *'this one'. Nevertheless, Purik *dare* 'now' clearly derives from *da-dé* "Glr. and C. now",²⁷ which consists of a temporal-deictic *da* 'now' and a textual-anaphoric *de* 'that'. Finally, both rhotacized and non-rhotacized forms are also found in WT of the word *da-dúng* ~ *da-rúng* "still, still more".²⁸

In summary, the evidence discussed in the present section suggests that in Proto-Tibetan (PT²⁹), demonstrative *de* could occur in various positions of noun and adverbial phrases. This lends support to the assumptions made in §2.3 that the same *de* came to also take scope over entire clauses, occurring after or instead of the predicate, and that a second demonstrative, *e* 'the other', also came to be employed in these clause-final positions.³⁰ Having provided strong evidence, furthermore, suggesting that *-de* in conventionalized postvocalic positions turned into *-re* (for example after spatial-deictic *a* 'that', *e* 'the other',

²⁶ Jäschke 1881: 247a.

²⁷ Jäschke 1881: 247a.

²⁸ Jäschke 1881: 247a.

²⁹ PT stands for Proto-Tibetan when it is not followed by a number, but for Pelliot tibétain when it is.

³⁰ A reviewer of the present article drew attention to the fact that sentence-final particles such as *la* and *dang* are similarly employed on the levels of both noun phrases and clauses, see Tournadre 2010. For further transcategorial morphemes, see Zemp 2018: 12–27.

and genitive *-i*), I will argue in §3.1 that this also happened to clause-final *de*.

Excursus: Parallels from Abui (1)

Given that Abui, an entirely unrelated language spoken in Eastern Indonesia, exhibits striking parallels to the clause-final demonstratives and the clause-subordinator which developed from *de* in spoken and written Tibetic varieties (discussed in §3.1 below), the present section draws attention to a few parallels that exist between demonstratives occurring in the adnominal position.

First, example (24) from Kratochvil illustrates that Abui *do* may occur either before or after the noun.³¹ According to Kratochvil, “those demonstratives that precede the head noun indicate its spatial location; they are deictic demonstratives (DEICT). The demonstratives that follow the head noun indicate its discourse location; they are anaphoric demonstratives (DEM)”.³²

- (24) a. *do fala*
 PRX house
 this house (located by me)
- b. *fala do*
 house PRX
 this house (I talk about)

Second, Kratochvil shows that the deictic and the anaphoric demonstratives may co-occur within the same NP;³³ two of the numerous possible combinations are illustrated in (25).³⁴

- (25) a. *o bataa nuku do*
 MD wood one PRX
 the tree there
- b. *ò de-feela do*
 MD.L 3I.AL-friend PRX
 his own friend below

And third, given that *oro*, illustrated in (26) from Kratochvil, is the only demonstrative which is not monosyllabic,³⁵ it appears safe to assume that this *oro* derives from **o do*, just like Purik *are* derives from **a de*.

- (26) *oro fala*
 DST house

³¹ Kratochvil 2007: 162.

³² Note that the two Abui demonstratives *do* and *yo* according to Kratochvil 2007: 162, 163 form parts of deictic and anaphoric paradigms that seem somewhat more elaborated than those of their Tibetic correspondences *de* and *e*.

³³ Kratochvil 2007: 163.

³⁴ The deictic *o* has the variants *ó* pointing to something more elevated than the deictic *origo* and *ò* to something less elevated, for example Kratochvil 2007: 162.

³⁵ Kratochvil 2007: 110–11.

that house over there (far from us)

2.3. Sentence-Final Demonstratives

In Purik, from among the six demonstratives that are used pre- and pronominally (see §2.1), two are also used sentence-finally, namely anaphoric *de* 'that' and *e* 'the other'.³⁶ In this position, both *de* and *e* may occur either after or instead of the (sentence-final) predicate, in other words post- or proverbially. While *de* and *e* thus seem to contrast in Purik, comparative evidence from other Tibetan varieties (see §3) suggests that this was barely the case in PT, where sentence-final *de* must have mainly been used postverbally in statements, but *e* proverbially after interrogative pronominal adverbs such as *ga-r* 'where'.

The present section in turn discusses post- and proverbal *de* and then *e* in the same two positions.

2.3.1. Postverbal *-de*

As shown in §2.1, on the NP-level, demonstratives such as *de* and *e* serve to track participants in the preceding discourse and re-introduce them in the current utterance. In doing so, *de* and *e* appear to respectively refer to the most activated antecedent and an antecedent whose activation warrants a shift of attention. When the same demonstratives occur in the postverbal position, two things are different: First, their antecedent is an entire sentence (or proposition); and second, the postverbal demonstratives are adjacent to their antecedent. Under these particular circumstances, postverbal *de* appears to lay out in front of the interlocutors the information conveyed by the immediately preceding sentence, inviting the addressee to retrace it, and implying that it should be clear (hence, postverbal *de* may often be translated as 'of course'). A bunch of examples taken from two stories told by the late Syed Abbas from Gongma Kargil illustrate the function of postverbal *-de* (which is like proverbal *de* glossed as 'TOP', because it points to topical information).

In (27), the addressee uses *-de* after enumerating the people which had to share a single stack of brushwood and concluding that they add up to five people. Here, the sentence-final *-de* displays the addition in

³⁶ While I generally use the term 'clause-final' in this article, I prefer to use 'sentence-final' here in order to make clear that the sentence terminated by Purik *-de* and *-e* is fully autonomous.

front of the interlocutors, inviting the addressee to retrace it and implying that it should be clear.

- (27) *de-ka-na kʰoŋ ta-na dii, pʰono nis-ka, ane nis,*
 that-LOC-ABL they now-CND this brother two-all
 wife two
ʒbʒi, ama-na ka soŋ-de, kʰoŋ ʁ-e
 four mother-ADD five went-TOP they five-GEN
bar-la zbraχs tʃik-tʃik-tʃaa ldan-suk
 between-DAT stack.of.wood one-one-LIM become-INFR
 Then they, I mean, these two brothers, (their) two wives, (these) four, with the (brother’s) mother that’s five, **right?**—between the five of them, they only had one stack of brushwood (stored on the roof). (A story of three brothers, line 3³⁷)

In (28), the speaker uses *-de* at the end of a sentence in order to point to a state (which was induced by the addressees themselves) that is not only visible right in front of the addressees but also makes the speaker’s plan seem entirely reasonable.

- (28) *wa ŋataŋ ttoχs-et, kʰintaŋ soŋ, ŋataŋ-a*
 hey we.INCL be.hungry.CRT you.PL go\IMP we.INCL-DAT
zan-tʃi kʰjoŋ-ma ŋa-na di-aŋ, kʰint-es zer
 food-INDEF bring-INF I-CNTR this-INE you.PL-ERG nail
taŋ-et-de, ŋa di-ka dug-et, jaa zer-aŋ,
 give-FCT-TOP I this-LOC stay-FCT yes say-ADD
 Hey, we are hungry, you guys go and get something to eat for us while I will [stay] here (in the coffin)—you guys put nails (to lock me in it), **remember?**—I will stay here, just say OK! (A story of three brothers, lines 47–48³⁸)

In (29), the information conveyed by the sentence preceding *-de* evidently follows from the given circumstances.

- (29) *de-ka-na e-aŋ tɛb-a-na ama-z*
 that-LOC-ABL the.other-INE arrive-INF-CND mother-ERG
joŋ zer-e karpar ba-se ja tʃʰu-i-aŋ
 come\IMP say-CND flailing do-CNJ HES water-G-INE
kʰjer-ba-na pʰiŋ-ma joŋ zer-s-de,

³⁷ Zemp 2018: 918–19.

³⁸ Zemp 2018: 922–23.

take.away-INF-CND take.out-INF come\IMP say-PST-TOP

tsʰaŋka tʰu-s kʰe(r)-suk.

all water-ERG take.away-INFR

When they arrived there, their mother said “come!”, flailing her arms because the river was ripping her away, “come and save me!” she said, **naturally**, so the river took all of them. (A story of three brothers, lines 47–48³⁹)

The following examples are from another story about three brothers, one of which left home to do business but was killed and robbed by people offering him to stay at their home over night. The murderers were then lured into the home of the victim’s two brothers, who planned to kill them there. In (30), the narrator signals by means of *-de* that the information conveyed by the clause it terminates may have previously not been made clear enough, and implies that this information is crucial for the understanding of the story.

- (30) *kʰo tʰot-pa-na, wa mana ma tɛp pʰono,*
 s/he finish-NR-CND hey very NEG arrive brother
e pʰono nis-po, ta nis-po kʰaŋma-a jod-de,
 the.other brother two-DEF now two-DEF home-DAT EX-TOP
de nis-ka-s pʰono ma tɛp
 that two-all-DEF brother NEG arrive

After he had died, “Hey, he never came back, (our) brother!” (said) the other two brothers—now these two were at home, **of course!**—the two (said) “(our) brother did not come back!” (2:42)

Half a minute after saying that the protagonist’s horse is special in that it shits money (hidden in regular dung), the first use of *-de* in (31) implies that horses typically defecate around dawn, but the consecutive use repairs the first use, saying that this had to happen for the sake of the story (*rgos* ‘had to’, whose *-s* is voiced by a following *-de*, is also elsewhere used with this implication). The third instance of *-de* in (31), finally, reflects the narrator’s expectation that the addressee knows what horse dung looks like, and that the size of horse dung represents world knowledge.

- (31) *ot zuks-tʰig-a-na sta-a-s filan*
 light enter-guess-DAT-CNTR horse-DEF-ERG dung

³⁹ Zemp 2018: 922–23.

taŋ-z-de, filaŋ taŋ-ma rgoz-de, filaŋ taŋ-s,
 give-PST-TOP dung give-INF need-TOP dung give-PST
filaŋ taŋ-ma-na, de ūt-ei filaŋ dj-u-ts-ig
 dung give-NR-CND that horse-GEN dung this-DEF-LIM-INDEF
jod-de, do-o-n-e-aŋ kʰo-s tʃand-e-aŋ-na
 EX.F-TOPthat-DEF-PL-GEN-INE s/he-ERG pocket-G-INE-ABL
pʰiŋ-se de-aŋ ūmul-tʃik taŋ-se di-ka ʒaŋ-s
 take.out-CNJ that-INE money-INDEF give-CNJ this-LOC put-PST
 When it dawned, the horse shit, **of course**; it had to shit (this was part of the plan!), **of course**; so it shit, and having shit, its dung was about this big, **of course** (as regular horse dung is about this big); (but) in this (dung) he had taken some money out of his pocket, put it in (the dung) and left it there. (4:26)

In (32) and (33), an informal explanation of (32), the speaker again signals by *-de* that the information just conveyed may have previously not been made clear enough, and implies that this information is crucial for the understanding of the story.

(32) *kʰo-s sna-a nor-tʃik sat-e ... nor-i loŋka*
 s/he-ERG first-DAT sheep-one kill-CNJ sheep-GEN intestine
ane-i skje-a taŋ-se-na, ane nalts-e-aŋ
 wife-GEN neck-DAT attach-CNJ-CND wife bed-G-INE
nal-e jod-de, kʰo nal, di-ka loŋs
 sleep-CNJ EX.F-TOP s/he sleep this-LOC rise\IMP
zer-s-pa, ma laŋs ane
 say-PST-FOC NEG rise wife
 He had first killed a sheep, and having put the sheep’s intestine around his wife’s neck—his wife was lying on her bed (**just pretending** to be dead)!—she slept, and (when her husband said) “Get up now!”, she didn’t get up. (8:27)

(33) *fi ma fi-a jod-de*
 die NEG die-INF EX.F-TOP
Of course, (she) hadn’t died (but only pretended to be dead).

Hence, by pointing back to the sentence just uttered, postverbal *-de* lays out this proposition in front of the interlocutors, invites the addressee to retrace it, and implies that it should be as clear to the addressee as it is to the speaker.

2.3.2. *Proverbal de*

While postverbal *-de* occurs after full-fledged sentences ending with a predicate, *proverbal de* itself functions as the predicate of the sentences it terminates. Accordingly, the information conveyed by the latter type of sentences is generally simpler than that conveyed by the former type. *Proverbal de* may either locate an entity in a topical situation, as in (34) and (35), or attribute a property to a topical situation, as in (36). The topical situation often corresponds to the present situation of the speaker, but (35) shows that it doesn't have to. In (35), it is clear that *de* indicates the location of the speaker when the picture was taken, not in the situation in which he utters (35). Hence, we may conclude that *de* locates an entity or property in a topical situation.

- (34) *kulik-po di-ka p^hjal-la de*
key-DEF this-LOC hanging-DAT TOP

The key's hanging here (right in front of your eyes).

- (35) *ŋa k^hatful-la de*
I Kashmir-DAT TOP

I was in Kashmir here (on this picture, as you can see).

- (36) *bi-a-na tan^htan t^ha-tf-in, dare dj-u ts^hetts^het de*
fall.out-INF-CNDbleak go-INF2-EQ now this-DEF bristly TOP

When (the hair) falls out, (the head) will become bald; now, this is (still) bristly (as you can see).

2.3.3. *Postverbal -e*

The meaning of postverbal *-e* is more easily grasped than that of *-de*. As illustrated in (37)–(39), *-e*—which may be elongated to *-ei*, as in (39)—signals that the addressee needs to follow the look of the speaker in order to retrace the information conveyed by the sentence it terminates. Like pre- and pronominal *e* (see §2.1), post- and *proverbal (-e)* may thus be said to point to a secondary topic (hence the gloss 'TOP2').

- (37) *are jul-po donmo in-sug-e,*
that village-DEF warm EQ-INFR-TOP2
zbjarpa warpa dug-e
willow etc. EX.DIREV-TOP2

That village over there appears to have a warm climate; there

are willows and all, **look!**

- (38) *kʰo leb-e*
 (s)he arrive-TOP2
 (S)he’s arrived, **look!**
- (39) *are-ka-na pʰru-ik but-e joŋ-z-ei*
 that-LOC-ABL child-INDF fall-CNJ come-PST-TOP2
 A child fell down over there, **look!**

2.3.4. Proverbal *e*

Like postverbal *-e*, proverbal *e* points to information which the addressee may retrace following the look of the speaker. As with post- and proverbal (*-de*), the information denoted by proverbal *e* is simpler than that denoted by the full-fledged sentences preceding postverbal *-e*. Hence, proverbal *e* in (40) and (41) locates an entity, and in (42) attributes a property to where the speaker draws attention to.

- (40) *tʃuli ma za-a jot, are-ka e*
 apricot NEG eat-INF EX.F that.distal-LOC TOP2
 (We) haven’t eaten (all) the apricots, they’re over there.
- (41) *saspol e*
 Saspol TOP2
 That’s Saspol over there!
- (42) *squntfoqtfoq e*
 deep.green TOP2
 Look, how green it is over there!

A slightly different function of proverbal *e* is found after the interrogative pronominal adverb *ga-r* ‘where’. While *e* in (40) and (41) above points to an entity to which the addressee has yet to attend, *e* after *ga-r* in (43) below asks the addressee to point out an entity to the speaker. (Note also that A in her answer—while acting in the desired way, pointing out the entity—uses *de* to signal joint attention to that entity.) Hence, proverbal *e* may be said to point to information which one of the interlocutors is yet to attend to—in statements, this person is the addressee, and in questions, that is, after an interrogative pronoun, this person is the speaker.

(43) A: *ŋj-i fite-a p^huʈw-ig jot*
 I-GEN side-DAT photo-INDF EX.F
 I have a photo with me.

B: *ga-r e*
 which-term TOP2
 Where is it?

A: *di-ka de*
 this-LOC TOP
 Here it is.

Excursus: Parallels from Abui (2)

In Abui as well, some of the demonstratives that occur on the NP-level are also regularly employed on the sentence-level. As such, they are always attached to the end of the sentence-final predicate.⁴⁰

The function of postverbal Abui *do* appears to be identical with that of Purik *de*. According to Kratochvil, *do* “stresses the urgency of the command” in (44).⁴¹ From what we find in Purik, we could hypothesize that Abui *do* has the mentioned effect also because it points back to the proposition conveyed the preceding sentence, lays it out in front of the addressee, and implies that it should be as clear to the addressee as it is to the speaker.

(44) *ko e-neng ru-fal ri-melang yaa do!*
 FUT 2S.AL-MAN 2P.REC-separate 2P.AL-village go PRX
 you will go with your husband to your village!

Another example of a postverbal *do* is (45). According to Kratochvil, *do* in this example serves an evidential function and “indicates the speaker’s immediate experience”.⁴² In my view, however, demonstrative *do* in (45) does not indicate how the speaker obtained the information conveyed but points to the evidence which attests to the speaker’s statement: the food that could not be swallowed.

(45) *na nala nee=ti beek-a do*

⁴⁰ I could only find postverbal, but no proverbal uses of these demonstratives in Kratochvil 2007; Kratochvil 2011.

⁴¹ Kratochvil 2011: 781.

⁴² Kratochvil 2011: 777.

1S something eat=PHSL.C bad-DUR PRX
 I couldn't eat up (swallow) anything.

While *do* thus points to information which both speaker and addressee may easily access at the moment of speaking, *yo* appears to point to information to which access is currently being provided. In a question, such as the first part of (46), the speaker asks the addressee to provide this access, and in a statement, such as (47), the speaker provides this access. (The addressee expected the subject of (47) to still be tied up, see Kratochvil.⁴³) Hence, the viewpoint switches from that of the speaker in statements to that of the addressee in questions, just like with Purik *e*.

(46) A: *mangmat,# ma e-ya yo?*
 foster.child be.PRX 2S.AL-mother MD.AD
 child, what about your mother?

B: *ni-ya ha-rik to!*
 1PE.AL-mother 3II.PAT-hurt PRX.AD
 my mother is sick (as you could see).

(47) *do-tik-i kaan-r-i yo,# hen*
 {3I.REC-stretch-PFV good.CPL-reach-PFV} MD.AD then
di awering do ha-b-i ya mara
 3A ladder PRX 3II.PAT-join-PFV SEQ go.up.CNT
fala=ng mara
 house=look go.up.CNT
 after he actually untied himself, he put up the ladder and climbed into the house.

This postverbal function of Abui *yo* corresponds to the function it serves postnominally, as illustrated by (48) and (49) from Kratochvil.⁴⁴

(48) *karong yo tirei=si taka kang*
 bag MD.AD inspect=PHSL.I be.empty be.good
 he looked into the bag (you heard about) and it was really empty.

(49) *he-kariang yo nala nee taka*

⁴³ Kratochvil 2011: 775.

⁴⁴ Kratochvil 2007: 115.

3II.AL-work MD.AD what eat be.empty
 he does nothing but eat (lit.: 'his work is actually only eating').

3. *Traces of Clause-Final Demonstratives
 in Old Tibetan and other Tibetic Varieties*

3.1 *Proto-Tibetan de*

3.1.1. *OT Postverbal (s)te ~de*

The most prominent trace of a clause-final demonstrative in OT is the *(s)te ~ de* (henceforth *STe*⁴⁵) which serves to link the clause or verb preceding it (= C1) with that following it (= C2).⁴⁶ While C1 and C2 may exhibit a temporal, causal, adversative, modal, or coordinating relationship (as described by Hahn for WT⁴⁷), *STe* must not be analysed as *encoding* any such relationship.⁴⁸ More adequately, we may say that whenever *STe* links two clauses, C1 denotes a premise of C2. This may be illustrated by four instances of *STe* found in the OT Chronicle. In (50), Zu tse had to cut off (*bchad*) the head of Mar mun (C1) in order to be able to give (*pul*) Mar mun's land to the emperor (C2). Hence, C1 did not cause or entail, but facilitated C2, so that C2 could not have taken place without C1 having taken place before. Similarly, turning to the second instance of *STe* in (50), by giving (*pul*) this land to the Emperor (C1), Zu tse proved to be loyal (*nye'o*) to the emperor. Again, C1 does not cause or entail C2, but facilitates it.

(50) *rtsang bod-kyi rjo bo mar mun mgo bchad-de //*

⁴⁵ In WT, the form *ste* occurs after *-g*, *-ng*, *-ba*, *-m*, and vocalic finals, *te* after *-n*, *-r*, *-l*, and *-s*, and *de* after *-d*, Hahn 1996: 148. In OT, there is still considerable variation in terms of spelling: instead of *bchad de* in example (50) from the Chronicle, fused forms like *bcade*, *sprade*, and *mdzade* are common in the *Annals* (IOL Tib J750), and instead of *pul te* in (50), we find forms like *'tsal de* and *bsgyur de* in PT 1101, contract 26 in Takeuchi 1995: 221.

⁴⁶ As this paper focuses on clause-final and—in the present section—postverbal uses of demonstratives, we will disregard the 'introductory' WT *(s)te* discussed by Beyer 1992: 279–81 and Hahn 1996: 151, which typically occurs after nouns, and which certainly derives from demonstrative *de* as well.

⁴⁷ Hahn 1996: 148–50.

⁴⁸ Compare the WT instance of *STe* which Hahn 1996: 149 analyses as causal: *'og na bu mchis par ma tshor te bu gum mo* 'Because [I] did not realize that there was a child beneath [the blanket on which I sat], the child died.' However, the child did not die (C2) because the speaker *did not realize* that it was beneath the blanket (C1), but because the speaker *sat on this blanket*. Accordingly, C1 in this example should be analysed as facilitating rather than causing C2.

Rtsang Bod-GEN lord Mar mun head cut-*STe*
rtsang bod khyim nyi gri // btsan po-'i
 Rtsang Bod household 20,000 Emperor-GEN
pyag-du pul-te / zu tse glo ba nye-'o
 hand-TERM give-*STe* Zu tse lung near-AFF
 “[Khyung po Spung sad (Zu tse)] cut off the head of Mar
 mun, the lord of Rtsang Bod, and gave twenty thousand fami-
 lies of Rtsang Bod into the hands of the emperor; [by doing
 so] Zu tse was loyal.”⁴⁹

In (51), the Emperor had to set out (C1) in order to lead his army (C2), and hence, C1 made C2 possible. The latter clause (*chaste drangs so*) in itself contains two verbs linked by *STe*, where C1 (*chaste* ‘moving’) denotes the mode of C2 (*drangs so* ‘led’). While it is very common for two verbs linked by *STe* to exhibit such a modal relationship, it is actually more typical for the motion verb to occur *after* *STe* (as in *khrid de 'ongs* ‘came leading’ in A 96 of the OT Rāmāyaṇa⁵⁰).

(51) *btsan po khri slon btsan-gyis / zhabs-kyIs btsugs-te /*
 Emperor Khri Slon btsan-ERG foot-ERG plant-*STe*
dmag khrI dang cha-ste drangs-so
 army 10,000 with go-*STe* lead-AFF
 “The Emperor Khri Slon btsan set out and led with an army of
 ten thousand.”⁵¹

The uses of *STe* observed in the Chronicle correspond to those found in most other OT and WT texts: The clause preceding *STe* (C1) denotes a premise (or, in what may be viewed as a subtype: a mode or manner) of the one following *STe* (C2). Now, the goal of the present section is to show that this clause-linking *STe* developed from a sentence-final *de* that worked as described for modern Purik in §2.3. Table 1 compares the OT construction (right column) with its assumed source (left column, where S stands for sentence).

	Purik	Old Tibetan
Construction	S- <i>de</i>	C1- <i>STe</i> C2
Meaning	S is laid out, should be clear to both interlocutors	C1 is a premise of C2

⁴⁹ Beckwith 1977: 208.

⁵⁰ de Jong 1989: 107.

⁵¹ Beckwith 1977: 205–06.

Domain of interpretation	discourse, <i>de dicto</i> —relevant for understanding the current context	real world, <i>de re</i> —a premise of the event
--------------------------	--	--

Table 1: Comparing Purik *S-de* and OT C1-*STe* C2

We could assume then that *-de* was used after full-fledged sentences in PT—as in modern Purik—to lay out the information conveyed by this sentence in order to ensure that it is clear to the addressee. That this information must be highly relevant in the current context may be presupposed by the addressee, as it would be a severe violation of communicative standards shared by most humans to draw attention to information that is irrelevant in the current context. Hence, whenever the speaker's turn continued in PT, the following sentence would of course tie in with the current context and accordingly also with *S-de*, and in this constellation, *S-de* came to be understood as being highly relevant for the understanding of the following sentence. While this constellation became more and more conventional, the pause between *S-de* and the following sentence became shorter, and the sentence preceding *-de* was reanalysed as subordinate to the sentence following it. At the same time, the construction ceased to be interpreted in what Frajzyngier calls the domain of discourse (*de dicto*)⁵²—*S* is relevant for the understanding of the current context—while the real world (*de re*) interpretation—C1 denotes a premise of the event denoted by C2—was conventionalized.⁵³

As far as the formal aspects of the postulated change are concerned, the documented OT and WT forms of *STe* (see footnote 45) suggest that clause-final *de* was regularly preceded by the *-s*, from whose restriction to telic verb stems we know that it originally had a resultative-stative meaning.⁵⁴ They further suggest that this *-s* suffix developed into a *-d* after *-r*, *-l*, and *-n*, that the *-s* and *-d* variants became conventional also after atelic verb stems before *-de*, and, in turn, ceased to be meaningful, so that the *-s* was eventually reanalysed as part of the *-de*, whose dental stop was devoiced by both *-s* and *-d* (which suggests that the latter was itself voiceless).

The diachronic account postulated here is supported by evidence from OT: In the OT Rāmāyāna, as presently illustrated by means of

⁵² Frajzyngier 1991.

⁵³ The discussed change is thus an instance of hypoanalysis in the sense of Croft 2000: 126–27: “the listener reanalyses a contextual semantic/functional property as an inherent property of the syntactic unit. In the reanalysis, the inherent property of the context ... is then attributed to the syntactic unit, and so the syntactic unit in question gains a new meaning or function”.

⁵⁴ For details, see Zemp 2016.

three passages taken from de Jong's edition,⁵⁵ *STe* is not only used in the clause-linking function common throughout OT and WT, but sometimes also in what is assumed here to be its original function, that is, drawing attention to the preceding sentence in order to ensure that the information conveyed there is clear to the addressee. Typical for such uses is that the clause preceding *STe* does not denote a *premise* of the event denoted by the clause following *STe* (*de re*), but instead appears to be crucial for its *understanding* (*de dicto*). This often allows us to recognize that *STe* indeed has the same pragmatic effect that was described in §2.3 for Purik *-de*.

In passage (52) from the OT Rāmāyāna, for instance, while *brgyan te* 'having adorned' in line 96 denotes a premise of *khrid* 'lead', and *khrid de* 'leading' denotes the mode of 'ongs 'came', *de las bzang ba myede* 'there is no one better than him' (C1) in 94–95 seems to denote neither premise nor mode of what follows (*sbyibs legs la / mdog sdug* 'to a beautiful form, (he adds) a charming appearance', C2), which, conversely, may be seen as a premise of C1. In any event, the alternative to analysing C1 as subordinate to C2 is to analyse *de las bzang ba myede* as denoting information that should be clear to the interlocutors, and this latter interpretation turns out to be perfectly appropriate. The postverbal *de* here is owed to the fact that the farmers, which had sought in ten directions for a suitable companion of Rolrñedma, all agree that Hanumān, standing before them, is the perfect match.

OT Rāmāyāna, version A (IOL Tib J 737.1), lines 94–96:⁵⁶

- (52) *phyogs bcur btsal pa las // ra ma na dang prad de bltas na / 'jlg rten du skyes pa la / de las [95] bzang ba myede [nas del.] / sbyibs legs la / mdog sdug / bkrag che la / mdzes pa zhig nas // [96] rogs su rung bar dpyad de / bu mo cha byad kyis brgyan te / khrid de 'ongs nas // ra ma [la del.] na la gsol ba /* "They sought in the ten directions and came upon Ramana. They looked at him and concluded: 'Among human beings in the world [95] there is none more beautiful than he. His form is beautiful, his appearance charming, he is brilliant and graceful. [96] He is suitable to be Rolrñedma's companion.' They adorned the girl with [beautiful] clothing and took her with them. They said to Ramana:"

Accordingly, *ra ma na ma btub ste* 'Ramana was unable (to accept)' (C1) in (53) does not denote the premise of *srong bya bar dam bcas pas* 'having made a vow to live as a Seer' (C2) but vice versa, and again, this sug-

⁵⁵ de Jong 1989.

⁵⁶ de Jong 1989: 107 (OT text) and 18 (translation, following de Jong's orthography of proper names).

gests that C1 may be more adequately analysed as pointing to information that should be evident to the audience. This latter analysis again turns out to be perfectly appropriate, as the narrator previously told the audience about Ramana's vow. Accordingly, I suggest to translate *ra ma na ma btub ste* as 'Ramana was unable (to accept), of course (as you well know, since I told you about his vow).'

- OT Rāmāyāna, version E (Pelliot tibétain PT 981), lines 111–16:⁵⁷
 (53) *de nas lag sha [112] nas pho bo la rgyal srid brtaps pa las // ra ma na ma btub ste drang srong bya bar dam bcas pas [113] myI 'dod ce zer ba dang //* "Thereupon Lagśana [112] offered the reign to his elder brother. Ramana was unwilling [to accept it], and said: 'I made a vow to live as a Seer and [113] I do not desire it.'"

Another passage whose understanding benefits from analysing *STe* as sentence-final rather than clause-subordinating is given in (54). If we analyse the *ste* in *srIn pos bsad par 'ong ste / gob shig* as making something clear to the addressee, this renders Queen Sītā's benevolent warning to Hanumān, who has snuck into her prison cell in order to give her a letter, much more urgent: 'I'm sure the demon has already come to kill you; hide!'

- OT Rāmāyāna, A 256–58:⁵⁸
 (54) *da nas lha mo 'i zhal nas / spre 'u [257] las gthogs 'dod che myed kyis / srIn pos bsad par 'ong ste / gob shig ches bsgo ba dang /* "Thereupon the queen said: 'There is no greater meddler than a monkey. You will be killed by the demon. Hide yourself!'"

Hence, in the OT Rāmāyāna, *STe* is not only used in the clause-linking function common in OT and WT but also in its original function, pointing to information that should be clear to the addressee. That the pragmatically rich sentence-final and the pragmatically poorer clause-linking function of *STe* may coexist in one and the same language is supported by evidence from Kyirong Tibetan, where *-te/-de* is used both sentence-finally and as a clause-linker, with a C1 denoting a premise or a mode of C2.⁵⁹

In many other dialects, we find traces of either the sentence-final

⁵⁷ de Jong 1989: 106 and 18.

⁵⁸ de Jong 1989: 125 and 34.

⁵⁹ See Huber 2005: 119–20, 172, 167. While Huber 2005: 120 writes that the sentence-final *-te/-de* "is probably related to the non-final particle *-te*" (which also has a variant *-de*), the parallels of OT and western dialects discussed in the present paper suggest that we may safely drop the word "probably" in her statement.

or the clause-linking use: In Ladakhi, the allomorphs of a clause-linking *STe* according to Koshal have the same distribution as in WT, except that verb stems ending in *-n*, *-r*, and *-l* “may take either *-ste* or *-te*”.⁶⁰ As the *-s* in a common ancestor of OT and Ladakhi had turned into *-d* in these environments, Koshal’s observation suggests that the form *-ste* (with the *-s*) tends to be generalized in modern Ladakhi. In more eastern dialects, the *-s* seems to have been lost after having devoiced the following *-de*. In Western-Drokpa,⁶¹ Lhasa,⁶² and Derge,⁶³ furthermore, *-te* has been restricted to adversative contexts, while ablative *nas* came to be used whenever C1 and C2 exhibit a consecutive or causal relationship.⁶⁴

Excursus: Parallels from Abui (3)

A subset of Abui demonstratives occur in subordinate clauses which according to Kratochvil refer to the “relative time of the event described in the main clause” and “are followed by a pause”.⁶⁵ This clause-linking function is illustrated for *do* in (55) and (56). If we take the pause after *do* to suggest that the clause preceding it was—as in the case of PT *de*—once an autonomous sentence, it is interesting to note that Kratochvil still observes a pause after those Abui clauses which he analyses as subordinate. It appears safe to assume that sentence-final OT *STe* was originally also followed by a pause. As it became more and more common for the sentence terminated by *STe* to be re-analysed as subordinate to the following clause, this pause must have become shorter and shorter.

- (55) *na ha-tak do, # a he-roa*
 {1S 3II.PAT-shoot} PRX 2S 3II.LOC-watch.CNT

⁶⁰ Koshal 1979: 270.

⁶¹ Causemann 1989: 125.

⁶² Tournadre 1996: 204–05. A reviewer of the present article pointed out that this adversative *-de* in Lhasa Tibetan has “a very specific prosody (raising intonation, pause between the two clauses)” and that “it is clearly aspirated and it is the only “connective particle” that follows a verb fully marked for TAME”.

⁶³ Häsler 1999: 255.

⁶⁴ See Zeisler 2004: 277. Note that the clause-linking *-(s)e* found in Purik and Balti (*-e* after *-r*, *-l*, *-n*, and *-t*; *-se* everywhere else), given the complete absence of *-t*, is more likely to derive from the adverbial *-e* discussed in Uray (1953), which is widespread west of Lhasa in often deverbal adjectivals such as Purik *galagule* ‘agitated’ or *k^hjabak^hjobe* ‘staggering’, see §3.1.3.2 and Appendix B.1 in Zemp 2018: 146–49 and 924–27.

⁶⁵ Kratochvil 2011: 23.

when I shoot (with the bow), you watch it.

- (56) *di ya do he-taki-a bang mi*
 {3A water PRX 3II.LOC-loosen-DUR carry.on.shoulder take
sei buuk-buuk do, di moku do
 come.down.CNT red[consume]} PRX 3A kid PRX
ha-yar-i
 3II.PAT-give.birth.CPL-PFV
 she was continuously bringing water (and) drinking it, when
 she gave birth to her children.

3.1.2. OT/WT *V-ta re 'Lest (It) Will V'*

A second OT trace of postverbal *de* is found in the construction *V ta re* 'lest (it) will V', where the stop of *de* was rhotacized in the intervocalic position following 'imaginative' *ta* (discussed presently), and which is consistently used as in example (57) from the *Tripitaka*.

Tripitaka:⁶⁶

- (57) *dge slong dag khyed de bzhin gshegs pa la tshe dang ldan pa zhes ma
 rjod cig / khyed la yun ring por mi phan pa dang gnod pa dang / mi
 bde bar gyur ta re* "Do not address the Tathāgata with āyusmant
lest it result in harm, disadvantage, and unhappiness for you
 for a long time."

Simon, in trying to identify the meaning of the particle *re*, discusses a number of WT passages in which that particle sentence-finally follows *-a* to convey the meaning 'lest'.⁶⁷ However, I argue that the basic form of the construction Simon discusses is in fact *-ta-re*. In the majority of examples he cites, it occurs after *gyur*, as in *mi-bde-bar gyur-ta-re* 'lest it result in unhappiness'.⁶⁸ The fact that *gyur* is elsewhere regularly followed by a *-d* (the so-called *da drag*) devoicing following consonants in OT has lead Simon and other scholars before him to analyse the *-t-* of *-ta-re* as belonging to the preceding verb stem. At the same time, Simon, along with many scholars and native grammarians before him, interprets *skye-sta-re* and *skyes-ta-re* 'lest you be reborn' and *byung-ta-re* 'lest (it) will appear' as corrupted forms of *skyes-sa-re* and *byung-nga-re*.⁶⁹ If we assume, conversely, that the *-t-* is original, we are left with -

⁶⁶ Simon 1967: 120.

⁶⁷ Simon 1967.

⁶⁸ Simon 1967: 120.

⁶⁹ Simon 1967: 120, 123.

ta-re throughout the WT passages discussed by Simon (apart from *nor-ra-re*, *mchis-sa-re*, and *phog-la-re*, whose interpretation Simon himself finds problematic⁷⁰).⁷¹

The analysis proposed here builds on the fact that Purik and other modern Tibetic varieties have a *ta* whose meaning perfectly fits that of WT *ta re*. According to Simon, WT sentences ending in (*t*)*a re* warn the addressee “of the consequences which are bound to arise if he were to ignore the command or the prohibition” previously expressed.⁷² Purik *ta* is likewise commonly used after imperatives, as in (58) and (59), and indeed, *ta* reinforces the preceding imperative by implying that the neglect of the order will have consequences.

(58) *soŋ-ta*
 go \ IMP-IMA
 Go now (or else...)!

(59) *joŋ-aŋ-ta* *tʃʰa-a*, *gor-suk*
 come-ADD-IMA go-INF become.late-INFR
 Come on now, let’s go! We’re late!

Purik *ta* is not only used in orders, but also in statements, as in (60). That *ta* derives from the root *da* ‘now’, as assumed by Jäschke (1881: 246b) for the same particle in Ladakhi, appears likely given that the speaker by means of ‘imaginative’ *ta*⁷³ projects past or future situations into the present in order to assess their consequences.⁷⁴

(60) *de-war-la* *ŋa-s-aŋ* *lt-et-de* *ta*
 that-time-DAT I-ERG-ADD look-FCT-TOP IMA
kʰjaŋ *ŋj-i-ka* *re-n-dug-a* *mi-nduk*
 you I-G-LOC depend-SIM-EX.DIREV-Q NEG-EX.DIREV

⁷⁰ Simon 1967: 117, 124.

⁷¹ Even if Bacot, Thomas, and Toussaint 1940: 157, n. 4 are unable to make full sense of line 418 in the OT Chronicle, we understand enough of that passage to see that *-ta-re* was used in the meaning ‘lest’ already in OT: *sang pyi ni gnangs slad na sram gyis ni tshal ta re // nya mo ni mthong rgol zhig* “Demain, après-demain, le mangera la loutre. Sitôt vu le poisson, attaquez!” (“Tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, the otter will eat it. As soon as you see the fish, attack!”).

⁷² Simon 1967: 121.

⁷³ See Zemp 2018: §4.5.10 for more examples.

⁷⁴ Second generation emigrants from Dingri in Kathmandu use *-ta* in a similar fashion after infinitives, for example in *qo-je: ta qo-gi-jiē*, which literally means: ‘As far as (my) going is concerned, I’m going (there).’ Further uses of *da* in Lhasa are discussed by Roux 2011: 32–37, 57–59, which was kindly brought to my awareness by the reviewer of the present article.

[The speaker is disappointed by the addressee's not helping him.] Next time I will see whether you need my help or not!

The reconstruction of an 'imaginative' *da* for PT is supported by the corresponding use of this particle in OT, as illustrated in (61):

- Li yul lung bstan pa:
 (61) *bdag ni nad 'dī las myI 'tsho ste da 'gum na | bdag gi bran dang nor phyugs rnam s li dkon mchog gsum la ma gum bar 'bul bar ci gnang zhes gsol nas* "[the Kong-co asks the king] 'If I do not recover from this disease and die now, would you permit that I give my bondservants and cattle to the Triratna before I die?'" (translation of Tsuguhito Takeuchi)

In sum, the OT evidence of V-*ta-re* suggests that, at an earlier stage of this variety, speakers not only used imaginative *da* (or devoiced *ta*) to envisage the consequences of certain events, but they also regularly added demonstrative *de* when these consequences seemed inevitable.⁷⁵ The *de* reflected in V-*ta-re*, therefore, served exactly the function which postverbal *de* serves in Purik.

3.1.3. Western Tibetic Adjectives Ending in *-nte*

The only trace of proverbial *de* which I have been able to identify outside of Purik is the adjectival ending *-(n)te/-(n)te*, which is common in dialects from Purik in the west up to Shigatse in the east. Perhaps the most common instances are listed for Purik and Kyirong⁷⁶ in Table 2.

	Purik	Kyirong	
'hot'	<i>ts^hante</i>	<i>ts^hānde</i>	'hot'
'heavy'	<i>tʃinte</i>	<i>tʃinde</i>	'heavy'
'thick (fluid), turbid'	<i>skante</i>		
'fluid'		<i>lānde</i>	'fluid'
'bitter'	<i>χante</i>		
		<i>k^hānde</i>	'strong (taste)'
'firm'	<i>sante ~ šante</i>	<i>sānde</i>	'firm'

⁷⁵ Another rhotacized OT instance of PT *de* is found in *na re*, which is used to introduce direct speech as discussed by Simon 1968: 555–58 and thereby takes scope over the NP referring to its author, followed by contrastive *-na*, for which see Zemp 2019: slides 48–53.

⁷⁶ Huber 2005: 77.

		<i>nānde</i>	'ill'
--	--	--------------	-------

Table 2: Adjectives ending in *-nte* in Purik and *-nde* in Kyirong

Strikingly, these adjectives do not only have the same (or a similar) ending, they are also semantically similar in that they all relate to properties that typically cannot be asserted visually. This has to do with the fact that they are all derived from *-d* or *-n* nominalizations⁷⁷ of atelic verb roots, which do not have a salient result but may be more or less characteristic of an entity. Accordingly, it appears to have been common in early Western Tibetic varieties to use proverbial *de* after these nominalizations in order to attribute the denoted property to the situation the interlocutors were dealing with. Hence, **tsha-t/n-de* must have originally been an autonomous utterance meaning something like '(The thing you were/are about to touch) is hot!', **lci-t-de* '(The thing we are going to lift) is heavy!', and **kha-t-de* '(The tea I was served) is very sweet!', etc.

3.2 Proto-Tibetan *e*

3.2.1. OT *ga re* 'Where Is (X)?'

It was the finding of an OT instance of *ga re* evidently meaning the same as Purik *ga-r e* 'where is (X)?' which first suggested to me that clause-final demonstratives may reconstruct back to PT. Four further clear examples of an accordingly construed OT *ga re* substantiated that suspicion. Hence, it is argued here that the identical meaning of the OT and Purik constructions suggests that the demonstrative *e* was used as a predicate after the interrogative pronominal adverb *ga-r* in a common ancestor of the two varieties.

The clearest example of *ga re* 'where is (X)?' is found in version E of the Rāmāyaṇa found in Dunhuang,⁷⁸ see (62), which corresponds to *ga re* also in version B⁷⁹ but to *gar song* 'where did they go?' in D.⁸⁰ It is clear from the context that the only surviving demon in Langkapura,

⁷⁷ Purik provides evidence for a formerly productive *-d* or *-t* nominalization, Zemp 2018: §3.1.11 as well as for the nasalization of this *-d/t* before *m*, Zemp 2018: 91 and, more importantly, before *t(s)*; cf. WT *sbud pa* 'to light, kindle ...' Jäschke 1881: 404b, Purik *zbutpa* 'bellows', *zbut* 'dram. close door', but *zbuntse* 'wood chip(s)' (used to kindle a fire); and *k^hintan* 'you (pl.)' < **khyed-dang*. In any case, the diachronic account of *ts^hante* < **tsha-d/n-de* etc. proposed here works regardless of whether the involved nominalizations ended in *-d/t* or *-n*, cf. also Zeisler 2004: 278.

⁷⁸ de Jong 1989: 90.

⁷⁹ de Jong 1989: 90.

⁸⁰ de Jong 1989: 89.

the speaker of (62), is looking for his parents and other relatives.

Rāmāyaṇa, version E:⁸¹

- (62) *pha ma dang gnyen gdun ga re*
 father.mother and relatives.near where.is/are
 My parents and my nearest relatives, where are they?

That *ga re* is found in two versions but replaced by *gar song* in a third version suggests that *ga re* was common in the language of the time, but that speakers were unable to analyse it as consisting of the interrogative pronominal adverb *ga-r* 'where' and demonstrative *e*. That *ga-r* was common in the same language (and therefore not the problem) is made clear by *gar song* in version D. Accordingly, the scribes of the OT Rāmāyaṇa either transliterated *ga-r e* as consisting of two CV-syllables, thus avoiding the elsewhere unattested form *e*, or replaced it by a nearly synonymous construction which contained words regularly occurring elsewhere in the language, in other words, as *gar song* 'where did X go?'. That *ga re* (= *ga-r e*) 'where is X?' was regularly used in Tibetan at the time is supported by four further instances of OT *ga re*, which all clearly mean 'where is X?'.⁸²

Old Tibetan Chronicle (PT 1287), line 29:

- (63) *pha yod-na nga-'i pha ga re zhes zer-to*
 father EX-CND I-GEN father where.is thus say-AFF
 "If (I) have a father, where is my father?" he said.

PT 1096 (Judicial document regarding a missing horse), r16:

- (64) *nga-'i rta ga re zhes rmas-pa*
 I-GEN horse where.is thus said-INF
 "Where is my horse?" he said.

IOL Tib J 731 (End of the Good Age and tragedy of the horse and yak), v42–43:

- (65) *bo mo tseng 'gi rba ga ga re*
 girl Tseng gi rba ga where.is
 "Where is daughter Tseng gi Rba ga?"⁸²

IOL Tib J 731 is transliterated and translated by Thomas.⁸³ The subject occurring before *ga re*, *bo mo* 'the girl' *Tseng 'gi Rba ga*, is one of the protagonists of the story, and her name is mentioned in several other

⁸¹ de Jong 1989: 90.

⁸² Thomas 1957: 18.

⁸³ Thomas 1957: 1–39.

passages. I do not see any reason to doubt Thomas' interpretation of *ga re* as 'where is X?' and suggest to thus again analyse it as *ga-r e*.

In addition to the five clear OT instances of *ga re* in the Rāmāyaṇa (twice), PT 1287, PT 1096, and IOL Tib J, there is a less clear passage containing *ga re* in IOL Tib J 739, which deals with dice divination and is transliterated and discussed by Thomas.⁸⁴

IOL Tib J 739, 8v7/8:

(66) *kyi gnam srin ni zhal ga re*
 dog heavenworm EMPH mouth where.is

Where is the mouth of the Dog Heaven Worm?

Even if this last passage might be less clear, the evidence from five different documents strongly suggests that OT *ga re* means 'where is X?'. Hence, since Purik *ga-r e* has the exact same meaning, and since no alternative analysis is available for OT *ga re*, I propose to analyse it as *ga-r e*, that is, as consisting of an interrogative adverbial *ga-r* 'where' and demonstrative *e*.

3.2.2. WT e-V 'Where Is (Indication for) V?'

The firm evidence for proverbial *e* in PT allows us to account for a number of other phenomena encountered in Tibetic varieties. One of these is the construction *e-V*, which Hoshi⁸⁵ documents for WT texts from the 14th (*Rgyal rab gsal ba'i me long*, GSM) and 15th centuries (*Mi la ras pa'i rnam mgur*, MR, and *Deb ther sngon po*, DTN).⁸⁶

In both examples adduced by Hoshi⁸⁷ to illustrate *e-V* in the GSM, (67) and (68), *V* is instantiated by the existential copula *yod*, which makes the following diachronic account seem likely: from *ga-r e* 'where is (it)?', *e* must have become extended to contexts such as **thabs e* 'where is (your) plan?', whose interrogative force solely depended on *e*, and which presupposed that this force had become associated with *e*. Somewhat later, however, questions of this type came to be perceived as lacking a verb, and as they were about locating an entity, *yod* was added after *e*. Accordingly, the two examples from the GSM may still be analysed as respectively meaning 'where is your plan?' and 'where is your monk now?'.
'where is your monk now?'

⁸⁴ Thomas 1957: 141ff.

⁸⁵ Hoshi 2012.

⁸⁶ Whereas *e-V* according to Hoshi 2012: 77 "cannot be found in Old Tibetan".

⁸⁷ Hoshi 2012: 73.

- Rgyal rab gsal ba'i me long:*⁸⁸
- (67) *khyed rang rig pa can yin pas thabs e⁸⁹ yod*
 you learned.person EQ-NR-ERG plan DUB-EX
 As you are a learned person, **do you have** any good idea?
- (68) *rab tu byung ba da lta e yod*
 ordained.monk now DUB-EX
Is there an ordained monk now?

In the MR from the 15th century, see (69) and (70), we find full verbs occurring after *e*. Accordingly, *e*-V has ceased to be only about locating entities, but may be analysed as meaning 'where is (indication for) V?'.⁹¹

- Mi la ras pa'i rnam mgur:*⁹⁰
- (69) *e bden ltos shig*
 DUB-be.true look\IMP
 See **whether it is true** or not!⁹¹
- (70) *nga yun ring e sdod mi shes pas*
 I long.time DUB-stay NEG know-INF-ERG
 As I don't know **whether I will stay** long.

According to Hoshi, *e*-V in the MR regularly had a 'dubitative' meaning,⁹² which means that the speaker had doubts as to whether something was true. The DTN from the same century went a step further in that a negative inference appears to have become conventional, see (71) and (72) from Hoshi.⁹³

- Deb ther sngon po:*⁹⁴
- (71) *lung pa 'di na nga rang las*
 country this-LOC I-self-ABL
drag pa e yod dgongs pa byung
 superior DUB-EX thought arise
I don't think there is a better person than me in this country.

⁸⁸ Hoshi 2012: 73.

⁸⁹ I have replaced Hoshi's (2012) notation of < ^e > by < e >.

⁹⁰ Hoshi 2012: 77.

⁹¹ Note that Hoshi 2012: 77 translates this example as a statement, not an imperative. Unfortunately, Hoshi nowhere indicates where exactly the examples occurred in the WT texts referred to.

⁹² Hoshi 2012: 77.

⁹³ Hoshi 2012: 78.

⁹⁴ Hoshi 2012: 78.

- (72) *da nga yang yul du e sleb*
 now I-too country-TERM DUB-arrive
 (me too) **I don't think I will find** back home.

As this type of questions in which the main verb of the sentence is preceded by a vocalic particle (*e*, *a*, or *a*) is only found in eastern dialects, from Amdo and Kham up to Lhasa,⁹⁵ the discussed evidence confirms Hoshi's conclusion that this construction in WT emanates from eastern dialects.⁹⁶

3.2.3. Central Tibetic Polar Interrogative (-)ε(:)

Another reflex of the interrogative *e* drawn from *ga-r e* is found in Central Tibetic dialects such as those of Southern Mustang and Lhasa, where the *e* came to be used as a polar interrogative particle. As such, it may immediately follow the direct evidential copula *du(g)*, as in Lhasa *du-g-ε* 'is (it/s/he) there?',⁹⁷ or, as illustrated by (73) from Southern Mustang,⁹⁸ *V-s* (which may thus be identified as the original Simple Past, to which interrogative *-e* was suffixed directly, before direct evidential *-song* grammaticalized⁹⁹).

- (73) *k'o-la āle tōr-s-e*
 he-DAT money lose-PST-Q
 Did he lose money?

It is also common to use ε: without a (preceding) predicate, as in (74) from Standard Tibetan¹⁰⁰ and (75), which I recorded among Tibetans living in Kathmandu.

⁹⁵ See Hoshi 2012: 74–79. For further evidence not mentioned by Hoshi 2012, cf. Shigatse *ā-V*, Haller 2000: 114, Themchen-Amdo *a-V*, Haller 2004: 84, 156–57, Dege-Kham *ē-V*, Häslér 1999: 216–17, Dongwang *ā-V* Bartee 2007: 412–18, and the *a ~ b ~ ε-V* documented by Li 2015: 304 for the Qiangic language Guiqiong, suggesting that the construction was even diffused across language boundaries.

⁹⁶ Hoshi 2012.

⁹⁷ Tournadre and Sanga Dorje 2003: 85.

⁹⁸ Kretschmar 1995: 170.

⁹⁹ According to Kretschmar 1995: 170, the form employing *-song* is possible for *ñe-song-e* 'have (you) found it?', even if *ñe-s-e* 'have (you) found it?' is more common. I suspect that the *-song* variant is only possible when the addressee may be expected to have direct evidence for a past event, and that the variant without *-song* is preferred here and in (73) because losing something is typically not witnessed.

¹⁰⁰ Tournadre and Sanga Dorje 2003: 324.

(74) A: $\epsilon\epsilon:b\bar{a}r$ $l\bar{\epsilon}p-s\bar{o}$ $p^h\bar{\epsilon}:-ro-n\bar{a}$
 phone.call(h) arrive-DIREV come-help-give(h)
 There's a phone call, come!

B: su $\eta\bar{a}$ $\bar{\epsilon}:$
 who I Q
 Who? Me?

(75) A: $na\eta m\bar{i}$ $k^h\bar{a}ts\bar{\epsilon}:$ $j\bar{o}:re$
 family.members how.many EX.F.ALLO
 How many family members are there?

B: $\eta\bar{a}nts\bar{o}$ $na\eta-la$ $\bar{\epsilon}:$
 we:GEN home-DAT Q
 (Do you mean) in *our* home?

While Lhasa *du(g)* is directly followed by interrogative *-e*, a *-b-* intervenes between the other copulas and *-e*, as in *jin-b-ε*, *j̄b-b-ε*, and *r̄ε-b-ε*.¹⁰¹ Given that *-e* originally meant 'where is (it)?', it appears likely that the *-b-* preceding it derives from the nominalizer *-pa* (originally a focus marker)¹⁰², which conceptualized the preceding sentence as an entity which *-e* could then ask the addressee to point out.¹⁰³

4. Diachronic Account

Hence, the reconstruction of *ga-r e* 'where is (it)?' for PT is not only borne out by the retention of this exact expression in OT and Purik but also by three different local features that can be neatly explained as having derived from the proverbial *e* coined in *ga-r e*: Whereas both Eastern Tibetic *e-V* and Central Tibetic *(-)ε(:)* appear to have originally meant 'where is (indication for) ...?', clause-final *e* in Purik has an affirmative meaning everywhere except in *ga-r e*. Hence, in an ancestor of modern Purik, when the *e* in *ga-r e* became employed in other clause-

¹⁰¹ Tournadre and Sanga Dorje 2003: 85. The occasional *-w-* found before interrogative *-e* in Southern Mustang, Kretschmar 1995: 171, as in *mā-tso-(w)e* 'was it not sold?' and *mā-t^ho-(w)e* 'did (you) not see (it)?', likely reflects the same *-pa*.

¹⁰² See Bickel 1999 and Zemp 2018: 14–16.

¹⁰³ As pointed out by a reviewer, rather than assuming that this *-pa* occurred after some (e.g. *yin*, *yod*) but not other (e.g. 'dug, song) sentence-final auxiliaries, it is also possible that its labial stop was fully assimilated to the preceding velar in **dug-p-e* > *dug-e* (as in WT *nag po* 'black' > Lhasa *nako*).

final positions, the interrogative force must have been entirely attributed to *ga-r* (which indeed still means ‘where’ in modern Purik), whereas *e* was analysed as doing the pointing. This affirmative use of pro- and postverbal *e* (see §2.3) not only re-strengthened the old link to the adnominal *e* ‘the other’ (which seems to have been lost in most other varieties), but also established paradigmatic symmetry between *de* and *e* in post- and proverbal positions.

While traces of clause-final *de* and *e* identified in OT as well as other written and spoken Tibetic varieties thus make clear that both *de* and *e* were used clause-finally in PT, they also suggest that the two clause-final demonstratives were much less contrasted in PT than they are in modern Purik. Unlike in Purik (see §2.3), where *de* and *e* both occur post- as well as proverbially, comparative evidence suggests that in PT, while *e* was conventional only in the proverbial position after interrogative pronominal adverbs such as *ga-r* ‘where’, *de* appears to have been more commonly used in postverbal position.

We saw in §2.3 that *de* has two clearly distinct functions in the post- and the proverbial position. Occurring after a full-fledged sentence, postverbal *-de* points back to this sentence, lays out the information conveyed by it, invites the addressee to retrace it, and implies that it should be as clear to the addressee as it is to the speaker. Occurring instead of a predicate, proverbial *de* locates an entity or a property in a topical situation (which typically corresponds to the interlocutors’ situation at the moment of speaking).

While the postverbal *de* has left traces in the form of a subordinator in OT/WT as well as modern dialects from Amdo and Kham in the east to Ladakhi in the west, whereas Purik and Kyirong have retained its pragmatically rich sentence-final use (and Purik and Balti employed adverbial *-e* as a subordinator instead, see footnote 64 above), evidence for the proverbial *de* is only found in western dialects, namely fossilized in adjectives like *ts’hante* ‘hot’, and in the form of the copular Purik *de* illustrated in examples (34)–(36). In the absence of traces of proverbial *de* in OT or eastern dialects (—future research may well be able to identify such traces—), it appears that *de* was mainly used postverbally in late PT, while the proverbial use conventionalized only in western dialects.

By the time of the Tibetan Empire, with whose expansion in the 7th–9th centuries CE Tibetic was spread across much of Central Asia, postverbal *de* had developed into the clause-subordinator *STe* (having fused with the *-s* that had preceded it in a major proportion of contexts). It is left to future research to assess whether the original, pragmatically rich function of *STe* identified in the OT Rāmayāna (see §3.1) is also found in other OT texts, and whether this feature could have been characteristic of a particular geographic region already in OT

times. What seems clear is that Purik (and Balti), where sentence-final *de* never developed into a subordinator but retained the pragmatically vivid implication that the information conveyed by the sentence it terminates should be clear to the addressee, does not derive from the variety or varieties which most strongly influenced OT, but must have split off before *de* changed into a subordinator there. This scenario thus suggests that the Tibetic varieties presently spoken in Purik and Baltistan stem from those Tibetic speakers who came to the region when it was conquered in the second half of the 7th and the first half of the 8th century CE.¹⁰⁴ In any event, the present paper shows not only that the consideration of comparative evidence may increase our understanding of particular OT features, but also that generating diachronic scenarios in order to account for the evidence may shed light on the development and diffusion of these features as well as the Tibetic varieties they characterize. The identification of further traces of the PT clause-final demonstratives may well allow us to refine the diachronic scenario reconstructed here.

Abbreviations

- 3A - third person actor
- 3I - third person co-referential with actor
- 3II - third person other than actor
- ABL - ablative
- ADD - additive
- AFF - affirmative
- AL - alienable
- ASSOC - associative
- ASSUM - assumptive
- AUG - augmentative
- CND - conditional
- CNJ - conjunctive
- CNT - continuative stem
- CNTR - contrastive
- CPL - completive stem
- DAT - dative
- DEF - definite article
- DST - distal
- DUB - dubitative
- DUR - durative
- EQ - equative copula

¹⁰⁴ Denwood 2008: 149–54.

ERG - ergative
 EX.DIREV - direct evidential existential copula
 EX.F - factual existential copula
 EX.F.ALLO - allophoric factual existential copula
 FCT - factual
 FOC - focus marker
 FUT - future
 G(EN) - genitive
 IMA - imaginative
 IMP - imperative
 INCL - inclusive
 INDEF - indefinite article
 INE - inessive
 INF - infinitive (-*pa*)
 INF2 - (prospective) infinitive (-*tfa*)
 INFR - inferential
 LIM - limitive
 LOC - Tibetic: locative / Abui: location-type undergoer
 MD - medial
 MD.AD - addressee-based medial
 MD.L - medial low
 NEG - negation
 NLZR - nominalizer (-*kʰan*)
 OPT - optative
 P(L) - plural
 PAT - patient-type undergoer
 PE - plural exclusive
 PFV - perfective
 PHSL.C - phasal completive
 PHSL.I - phasal inceptive
 PRX - proximal
 PRX.AD - addressee-based proximal
 PST - past tense
 Q - question marker
 REC - recipient-type undergoer
 S - singular
 SIM - simultaneous
 TERM - terminative (case)
 TOP - topic
 TOP2 - secondary topic

Bibliography

Bacot, Jacques, Thomas, Frederick and Toussaint, Charles. 1940.
Documents de Touen-Houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet. Paris: Librairie

Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Bartee, Ellen. 2007.

Dongwang Tibetan. PhD Thesis. Santa Barbara: UC Santa Barbara.

Bartee, Ellen. 2011.

"The role of animacy in the verbal morphology of Dongwang Tibetan", in Turin, Mark and Zeisler, Bettina (eds.), *Himalayan Languages and Linguistics: Studies in Phonology, Semantics, Morphology and Syntax*, 133–82. Leiden: Brill.

Beckwith, Christopher. 1977.

A study of the early medieval Chinese, Latin, and Tibetan historical sources on medieval Tibet. PhD Thesis. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Beyer, Stephan. 1992.

The Classical Tibetan language. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bickel, Balthasar. 1999.

"Nominalization and focus constructions in some Kiranti languages", in Yadava, Yogendra P. and Glover, Warren G. (eds.), *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*, 271–96. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.

Bielmeier, Roland. 1985.

Das Märchen vom Prinzen Cobzan. Eine tibetische Erzählung aus Baltistan. Text, Übersetzung und westtibetisch vergleichendes Glossar. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Bielmeier, Roland, Häslér, Katrin, Haller, Chungda et al. 2018.

Comparative Dictionary of Tibetan Dialects, Volume 2: Verbs. Berlin: Mouton.

Causemann, Margret. 1989.

Dialekt und Erzählungen der Nangchenpas. Bonn: Vereinigung für Geisteswissenschaften Hochasiens Wissenschaftsverlag.

Clark, Herbert and Brennan, Susan. 1991.

"Grounding in communication", in Resnick, Lauren, Levine, John and Teasley, Stephanie (eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*, 127–49. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Croft, William. 2000.

Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach. London: Longman.

Denwood, Philip. 2008.

"The Tibetans in the West (Parts I and II)", in *Journal of the Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 3, 7–21; 4, 149–60.

Diessel, Holger. 1999.

"The morphosyntax of demonstratives in synchrony and diachrony", in *Linguistic Typology* 3, 1–49.

Evans, Nicholas, Bergqvist, Henrik and San Roque, Lila. 2018.

"The grammar of engagement I: Framework and initial exemplification / II: Typology and diachrony", in *Language and Cognition* 10(1), 110–70.

Fillmore, Charles. 1997.

Lectures on deixis. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1991.

"The *de dicto* domain in language", in Closs Traugott, Elizabeth and Heine, Bernd (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization: Volume I. Theoretical and methodological issues*, 219–51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1979.

On understanding grammar. New York: Academic Press.

Hahn, Michael. 1996.

Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Haller, Felix. 2000.

Dialekt und Erzählungen von Shigatse. Bonn: Vereinigung für Geisteswissenschaften Hochasiens Wissenschaftsverlag.

Haller, Felix. 2004.

Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen: sprachwissenschaftliche Beschreibung eines Nomadendialekts aus Nord-Amdo. Bonn: Vereinigung für Geisteswissenschaften Hochasiens Wissenschaftsverlag.

Häsler, Katrin. 1999.

A Grammar of the Tibetan Dege Dialect. PhD Thesis. Zürich: University of Bern.

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002.

World Lexicon of Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herrmann, Silke. 1989.

Erzählungen und Dialekt von Dinri. Bonn: Vereinigung für Geisteswissenschaften Hochasiens Wissenschaftsverlag.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1996.

"Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses", in Fox, Barbara (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, 205–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hopper, Paul and Closs Traugott, Elizabeth. 2003 [1985].

Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoshi, Izumi. 2012.

"The Flow of Eastern Colloquial [^]e into Middle Tibetan", in Takeuchi, Tsuguhito and Hayashi, Norihiko (eds.), *Historical development of the Tibetan languages*, 71–83. Kobe: Research Institute of Foreign Studies, Kobe City University of Foreign Studies.

Huber, Brigitte. 2005.

The Tibetan dialect of Lende (Kyirong): A grammatical description with historical annotations. Bonn: Vereinigung für Geisteswissenschaften Hochasiens Wissenschaftsverlag.

Janssen, Theo. 2002.

"Deictic principles of pronominals, demonstratives and tenses", in Brisard, Frank (ed.), *Grounding: the epistemic footing of deixis and reference*, 151–93. Berlin: Mouton.

Jäschke, Heinrich A. 1881.

A Tibetan-English dictionary. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

de Jong, Jan W. 1989.

The story of Rāma in Tibet: Text and translation of the Tun-huang manuscripts. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

- Koshal, Sanyukta. 1979.
Ladakhi Grammar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Kratochvíl, František. 2007.
A grammar of Abui: a Papuan language of Alor. Utrecht: LOT.
- Kratochvíl, František. 2011.
Demonstratives as markers of stance: evidence from Abui. Unpublished manuscript.
- Kretschmar, Monika. 1995.
Erzählungen und Dialekt aus Südmustang. Band 1: Untersuchung zur Grammatik des Südmustang-Dialekts. Bonn: Vereinigung für Geisteswissenschaften Hochasiens Wissenschaftsverlag.
- Li Jiang. 2015.
A Grammar of Guiqiong: A language of Sichuan. Leiden: Brill.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 2001.
“Secondary topic as a relation in information structure”, in *Linguistics* 39(1), 1–49.
- Roux, Vanessa. 2011.
Typologie des particularités de l’oral en tibétain standard à partir d’une analyse de corpus. M2 Master’s Thesis. Aix-en-Provence: University of Aix-Marseille.
- Schapper, Antoinette and San Roque, Lila. 2011.
“Demonstratives and non-embedded nominalisations in three Papuan languages of the Timor-Alor-Pantar family”, in *Studies in Language* 35, 380–408.
- Simon, Walter. 1967.
“The Tibetan Particle *re*”, in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 30(1), 117–26.
- Simon, Walter. 1968.
“Tibetan *re* in its wider context”, in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 31(3), 555–62.
- Stassen, Leon. 1997.
Intransitive predication. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito. 1995.
Old Tibetan contracts from Central Asia. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan.
- Thomas, Frederick W. 1957.
Ancient folk-literature from north-eastern Tibet. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 1996.
L'ergativité en tibétain : Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée. Paris, Leuven: Peeters.
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 2010.
"The Classical Tibetan cases and their transcategoriality: From sacred grammar to modern linguistics", in *Himalayan Linguistics* 9(2), 87–125.
- Tournadre, Nicolas and Sangda Dorje. 2003.
Manual of Standard Tibetan. Language and Civilization. Ithaca, New York, Boulder: Snow Lion.
- Uray, Géza. 1953.
"The suffix *-e* in Tibetan", in *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 3, 229–44.
- Walleser, Max. 1935.
"Subordinate clauses in Tibetan", in *Indian Linguistics* 5, 26–35.
- Widmer, Manuel. 2017.
A grammar of Bunan. Berlin: Mouton.
- Zeisler, Bettina. 2004.
Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Languages. Berlin: Mouton.
- Zemp, Marius. 2016.
"A functional reconstruction of the Proto-Tibetan verbal system", in *Himalayan Linguistics* 15(2), 88–135.
- Zemp, Marius. 2018. *A Grammar of Purik Tibetan*. Leiden: Brill.
- Zemp, Marius. 2019.
Traces of sentence-final demonstratives in Old Tibetan. Presentation at the 15th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, in the panel 'OT Studies VI'. https://www.academia.edu/40066618/Traces_of_sentence_final_demonstratives_in_Old_Tibetan_IATS_2019

