Himalayan Linguistics

ḥdug as a testimonial marker in Classical and Old Tibetan

Nathan W. Hill

SOAS, University of London

ABSTRACT

DeLancey (1992) and Hongladarom (1994) suppose that *ḥdug* means 'sit' in Old and Classical Tibetan, and that these languages entirely lack the evidential use of this morpheme well known in 'Lhasa' Tibetan. In contrast, Denwood (1999) sees the Classical Tibetan use of *ḥdug* as broadly in keeping with its function in 'Lhasa' Tibetan. An examination of examples from Old and Classical Tibetan suggests that evidential uses of *ḥdug* emerged late in the Old Tibetan period and that the meaning 'sit' is idiosyncratic to the *Mdzaṅs blun*.

KEYWORDS

Old Tibetan, Classical Tibetan, evidentiality, mirativity, testimonial, copula

ḥdug as a testimonial marker in Classical and Old Tibetan[1]

Nathan W. Hill
SOAS, University of London

1 Introduction

The morpheme *ḥdug* and its role in the inflection of the "Lhasa"[2] Tibetan verbal system has received considerable attention (cf. Hill 2012 and citations therein). Following Tournadre (1996: 224-226, 2008: 295) the term 'testimonial' serves here to designate the meanings of *ḥdug* to indicate sensory evidence as information source. The use of *ḥdug* in literary sources has received less attention. Noting that the apparent cognate of *ḥdug* in Balti dialect means 'sit', Scott DeLancey writes that the "implied conclusion that *ḥdug* was a lexical verb 'sit' until well after the differentiation of Proto-Tibetan is also supported by philological evidence. Classical Tibetan *ḥdug* retains in earlier texts the sense of 'sit, dwell, reside, stay'" (1992: 52). DeLancey however neither provides this philological evidence nor cites these early texts. Krisadawan Hongladarom in agreement with DeLancey's view writes that the "original meaning is 'sit, stay, remain,'" (1994: 673) and concludes that "upon examining documents in OT [Old Tibetan], we see that *ḥdug* (and other verbs) do not develop evidential meaning until much later" (1994: 682). In contrast to DeLancey and Hongladarom, Philip Denwood remarks that in Classical Tibetan *ḥdug* "usually has strongly the sense of discovery that it retains in Lhasa Tibetan" (1999: 246). The disagreement between DeLancey and Hongladarom on the one hand, and Denwood on the other hand indicates the inadequacy of the five passages so far discussed to decide whether the testimonial meaning that *ḥdug* bears in Lhasa dialect is also present in Old and Classical Tibetan.

2 The place of *ḥdug* in the "Lhasa" Tibetan verbal system

Before turning to the function of *ḥdug* in Classical Tibetan a reprise on the function of *ḥdug* in the "Lhasa" Tibetan verbal system has its place. The analysis presented follows that proposed by Tournadre in a number of publications (e.g. Tournadre 1996, 2008, Tournarde and Dorje 2009). However, what is here called 'personal' Tournadre refers to as 'egophoric' and what is treated here as the perfect testimonial Tournadre classifies as a separate information source, namely 'inferential' (Tournadre and Dorje 2009: 140-144, 413). DeLancey (1992) inappropriately describes the "Lhasa"

---

2 Ideally one should draw a distinction among the language of the city of Lhasa itself, other dialects of Central Tibet, and the lingua franca of the Tibetan diaspora (Miller 1955, Róna-Tas 1985: 160-161). However, the literature does not maintain this disctinction.

Tibetan verbal system using the concepts 'mirativity' and 'conjunct-disjunct'. See Tournadre (2008) for arguments against 'conjunct-disjunct' and Hill (2012) for arguments against 'mirativity'.

"Lhasa" Tibetan exhibits a three-way paradigmatic evidential contrast within the forms of the verb 'to be' (cf. Table 1) and across affixes encoding tense categories;[3] the three evidential categories are 'personal', 'factual', and 'testimonial' (cf. Table 2). In non-finite clauses the difference among these three is often neutralized in favour of the personal (cf. Chang and Chang 1984: 607-608; DeLancey 1990: 298).

	Existential copula	Equational copula
Personal	*yod*	*yin*
Factual	*yod-pa-red*	*red*
Testimonial	*ḥdug*	*red-bźag*

Table 1. The "Lhasa" Tibetan copula system

The three existential copulas can all also function as equational copulas in circumstances that are poorly understood (Garrett 2001: 70, 91; Chonjore 2003: 207; Tournadre and Dorje 2009: 100-102). As a equational copula *ḥdug* is restricted to use with adjectival predicates (Garrett 2001: 68). For the topic at hand, it merits mention that the interrogative form of *red-bźag* is *red-ḥdug*, and it is negated as *red-mi-ḥdug* (cf. Tournadre andDorje 2009: 411).

	Future	Present	Past	Perfect
Personal	*V-gi-yin*	*V-gi-yod*	*V-pa-yin / byuṅ*[4]	*V-yod*
Factual	*V-gi-red*	*V-gi-yod-pa-red*	*V-pa-red*	*V-yod-pa-red*
Testimonial	-------	*V-gi-ḥdug*	*V-soṅ*	*V-bźag*

Table 1: "Lhasa"Tibetan verbal conjugation

The summary in Table 2 fails to capture the details that V-*ḥdug* is an alternative form of the perfect testimonial, and that V-*bźag* itself is negated as V-*mi-ḥdug* (Tournadre and Dorje 2009: 140). Thus, all told the morpheme *ḥdug* paradigmatically contrasts with *yod* and *yod-pa-red* in four

---

3   Aikhenvald (2004: 69 following DeLancey 1986) regards these affixes as auxiliary verbs. Since the entire verbal syntagma is treated phonetically as a single word, and these affixes occur in an obligatory and suppletive paradigm, they behave much more like the *-bat* in Latin *portābat* 'he was carrying' or the *-bit* in *portābit* 'he will carry' than they do like English auxiliaries such as 'do', and 'have'. The origin of these Latin affixes is *bhuH 'be, become' used as an auxilliary (Fortson 2010: 279), but researchers of Latin have had the wisdom to not confuse diachronic origin with synchronic explanation. More recent work of DeLancey's avoids this pitfall, using the term 'endings' (DeLancey 1992: 44).

4   The form *V-pa-yin* is used in volitional sentences whereas the form *V-byuṅ* is used in non-volitional sentences (cf. Tournadre 1996: 231-235).

constructions: the equational copula, the existential copula, the present auxiliary, and the perfect (for examples cf. Hill 2012: 391-395). In all of its uses *ḥdug* is a marker of the testimonial, but it is not the only such marker since *-soṅ* and *-bźag* also mark this category in the past and perfect respectively.

The testimonial encodes the fact that the speaker's information source is the experience of his own five senses. Most typically the source of information is visual, but the information source marked with *ḥdug* may be any of the five senses (Hill 2012: 406-407) or an 'internal sense' ('endopathic', cf. Hill 2012: 404).

Personal
(1) *ṅar   deb   de   yod*
     me-OBL   book that exist-PER

     'I have that book' (DeLancey 2001: 374).

Factual
(2) *btsoṅ-khaṅ   ḥdir   deb   yag-po   yod-pa-red*
     shop   this   book good   exist-FAC

     'This shop has good books.' (Speaker A says to speaker B, when neither can see the book before entering). (Yukawa 1966: 78)[5]

Testimonial
(3) a. *ḥdir   deb   yag-po   ḥdug*
        here-OBL book good   exist-TES

        'Here is a good book.' (Speaker A says after they have entered the shop while looking at the book). (Yukawa 1966: 78)[6]

     b. *ṅar   deb   de   ḥdug*
        me-OBL   book that exist-TES

        'I have that book.' (DeLancey 2001: 374, example 8)

Example (1) may be said "in answer to someone asking me whether I own a particular book" (DeLancey 2001: 374), whereas example (3b) is more appropriate if, believing I did not own the book, "I returned home and found it on my shelf" (DeLancey 2001: 374). The distinction is between whether the knowledge of the information conveyed by the sentence came to the speaker through personal involvement (personal) or through direct visual perception (testimonial).

---

5   For ease of presentation I have paraphrased Yukawa's translation of this and the following example. In fact he writes "A 氏が B 氏を案内して«この店にはいい本がある»という場合（その本はまだ見えていない。）"
6   Yukawa writes "その店にはいってその本を見ながら、«ここにいい本がある»という時".

3 Testimonal use of *ḥdug* in Classical Tibetan

As a term "Classical Tibetan" is used to refer to any writing in the Tibetan language from canonical Buddhist texts translated into Tibetan during the period of the Tibetan empire (7th -9th centuries) up until the annexation of Tibet to China in 1959. A thousand years of linguistic usage is never homogenous. The current state of research precludes the presentation of a summary of the syntactic constructions that involve *ḥdug* over this entire period. Schwieger (2006: 70-141) provides the most complete available discussion of the Classical Tibetan verbal system. (An appendix to this article classifies the examples cited here into broad syntactic categories.).

Without a full investigation of the copula and auxiliary constructions in Classical Tibetan it is not possible to say whether or in what period Classical Tibetan exhibits evidentiality as a formal category of its verbal system. Instead, here it suffices to provide evidence that (contra Delancey 1992) in Classical Tibetan *ḥdug* frequently indicates that the information source for an utterance is sensory evidence and that *ḥdug* does not always mean 'sit', i.e. that DeLancey's proposal of a sudden transition from a full verb *ḥdug* 'sit' in Classical Tibetan to a testimonial marker in "Lhasa" Tibetan is not accurate.

In narratives direct quotation is the only context in which the speaker and the witness of sensory evidence are the same person; direct quotations consequently provide the clearest evidence of *ḥdug* as a marker of information source and the investigation in this section is restricted to examples of *ḥdug* found in direct quotation.

The meaning of *ḥdug* to indicate visual evidence is present in renditions of the Gñaḥ-khri btsan-po myth spanning the 12th to the 16th century. This nuance I suggest by adding in parentheses a form of the verb 'behold'. In most versions the Tibetans appoint the foreigner as emperor immediately after meeting him and realizing (or misunderstanding) that he comes from the sky.

(4)   « *ḥdi   ni   gnam-las   byon-paḥi   btsan-po   ṅo-mtshar-can   źig **ḥdug**-pas/*
         this   TOP   sky-ABL   come-N-GEN   emperor   miracle-have   a ḥdug-N-AGN /
         ḥo-   rnams-kyi   jo-bo   byaḥo »   zer-te /
         we   PLR-GEN   lord   do-FIN »   say-CNV /

'Because (we behold that) he is a miraculous emperor descended from the heavens we shall make him our lord.' (*Ñaṅ-ral chos-ḥbyuṅ*, late 1100s, Ñaṅ ral 1988: 159)

(5)   « *ḥo-na   phyag-sor-daṅ   lce   ṅo-mtshar*
         oh   finger-ASS   tongue   marvel
         *che-ba   gcig   **ḥdug**-pas/*
         big-N   one   ḥdug-N-AGN /
         khyod-la   nus-mthu   ḥdra-ba   ci   yod? »   byas-pas/
         you   power   like   what   exist ? »   do-N-AGN /
         kho   na-re   « nus-mthu-daṅ   rdzu-ḥphrul   che
         he   said   « power-ASS   magic   big

drags-pos   bśugs-pa   yin »   zer/
strong-AGN   exile-N   be   say /
« *ḥo   ṅed-kyi   rje   bcol-lo »   byas-nas/*
« Oh   we-GEN   lord   appoint-FIN » do-CNV

'Oh, (we behold that) you are one with amazingly big fingers and tongue. What sort of power do you have?' He said, 'My powers are so strong that I was exiled', 'Oh, we will appoint you our lord.' (*Mkhas-pa Ldeḥu chos-ḥbyuṅ*, post 1261, Mkhas-pa-ldeḥu 1987: 226-227)

(6)   « *ḥdi   ni   namkhaḥ-nas   ḥoṅs-paḥi   lha-sras   yin-par   **ḥdug**-pas/*
        « this   TOP sky-ELA   go-N-GEN   god-son   be-N-TRM   ḥdug-N-AGN
        ḥo-cag   rnams-kyi   rje   ḥchol-lo »   zer-te/
        we   PLR-GEN   lord   appoint-FIN » say-CNV /

'Because (we behold that) he is a divine son come from the sky we shall appoint him our lord.' (*Rgyal-rabs gsal-baḥi me-loṅ*, 1368, Kutzenov 1966: 46)

(7)   « *ḥdi   lhaḥi   yul-nas   ḥoṅ-pa   **ḥdug** /*
        this   god-GEN   place-ELA   come-N   ḥdug
        ñe-raṅ-gi   rje   byaḥo »   źes /
        we   lord do-FIN   say

'(We behold that) he comes from the land of the gods; we shall make him our lord.' (*Bśad-mdzod yid-bźin nor-bu*, 1400s, Haarh 1969: 409)

(8)   « *lha-yul   gnam-nas   ḥoṅs-paḥi   btsan-por   **ḥdug** /*
        god-land   sky-ELA   come-N-GEN   emperor-TRM   ḥdug /
        ḥdi-la   bdag-cag   rje-bo   źu   dgos »   zer //
        this-ALL   we   lord   request   need » say

'Because (we behold that) he is an emperor come from the sky, the land of the gods, we should invite him to be our lord. (*Mkhas-paḥi dgaḥ-ston,* 1545, Haarh 1969: 175).'

The biography of Mi-la-ras-pa (*Mi-la-ras-paḥi rnam-thar*) by Gtsaṅ smyon He-ru-ka Rus-paḥi Rgyan-can (1452-1507) also provides examples of *ḥdug* as a testimonial marker.[7] On his deathbed Mi-la's father tells those around him that he does not expect to recover.

---

7 The *Mi-la-ras-paḥi rnam-thar* by Gtsaṅ Smyon He-ru-ka Rus-pa-ḥi Rgyan-can (1452-1507) is probably the best known work of literature in the Tibetan language. One should note (contra Tournadre 2010: 112 note 59), that de Jong's critical edition (1959) lacks a translation whether into English or another language. To the translations listed in Hill (2007: 227 note 2) one may now add Gtsaṅ Smyon He-ru-ka Rus-paḥi Rgyan-can (2010).

(9) *don-bsdu-la   ṅag-tu*
     meaning-collect-ALL word-TRM
     ṅa da lan-gyi nad   ḥdis   mi gtoṅ-ba **ḥdug***-ciṅ*
     I   now time-GEN illness this-AGN not send-N ḥdug-CVB

     'In sum, (I see that) this current disease will not release me.' (*Mi-la-ras-paḥi rnam-thar* 1488, de Jong 1959: 31, cf. Zadoks 2004)

Because the *Mi-la-ras-paḥi rnam-thar* is written as a first person narrative, for this text possible objection to the inclusion of examples of *ḥdug* in the frame narrative are not applicable. The narrator, Mi-la, frequently employs *ḥdug* to mark the visual source of his information.

(10) *a-ma   yug-cig brgyal-nas ḥgyel* **ḥdug***-paḥi   tshe /*
      mother moment fall-ELA   faint ḥdug-N-GEN when

      'My mother fainted in an instant, and when (I beheld that) she had fallen ...' (*Mi-la-ras-paḥi rnam-thar,* 1488, de Jong 1959: 36, cf. Zadoks 2004)

(11) *naṅ-du   phyin-pas   dam-chos* Dkon-mchog-brtsegs-pa *de*
      inside-TRM went-N-AGN religion *Ratnakūṭa*   that
      thigs-pa-daṅ sa   phuṅ-gis   brduṅs /
      droplets-ASS earth clump-AGN batter /
      bya-daṅ byi-baḥi   brun-daṅ tshaṅ-gdan byas **ḥdug***-ste /*
      bird-ASS rodent-GEN dung-ASS nest   do ḥdug-CVB /

      'When I went into [my childhood home, now abandoned], (I beheld that) the *Ratnakūṭa* scripture was battered with water droplets and mud clots, birds and rodents had made their nests and left their droppings [in it].' (*Mi-la-ras-paḥi rnam-thar,* 1488, de Jong 1959: 111, cf. Zadoks 2004)

(12) *daṅ-po klog slob-paḥi   slob-dpon-gyi sar   phyin-pas /*
      first read study-N-GEN teacher-GEN place-TRM went-N-AGN
      slob-dpon raṅ ni groṅs **ḥdug** */*
      teacher   self TOP die   ḥdug /

      'I went to the house of the teacher who had first taught me to read; (I beheld that) the teacher himself had died.' (*Mi-la-ras-paḥi rnam-thar* 1488, de Jong 1959: 113, cf. Zadoks 2004)

Linguistic studies of the text include the rather flawed Saxena (1989), together with Dempsey's rejoinder (1993), Hill (2007), and Haller (2009).

In the preceding nine examples *ḥdug* appears to exhibit a testimonial meaning, but perhaps this is fortuity. Another selection of examples of *ḥdug* might show the word in contexts incompatible with a testimonial meaning. In order to persuasively suggest that the testimonial is a structural category of Classical Tibetan grammar it is necessary to show contexts where *ḥdug* is used contrastingly with a verb such as *yin* or *yod* and it is clear that *ḥdug* indicates a testimonial value. Abel Zadoks draws attention to just such an example; unfortunately, his citation is not complete enough to allow for easy verification. The text is the *Padma bkaḥ-thaṅ* by O-rgyan gliṅ-pa (1323-??).

(13) *rkaṅ-gliṅ   yin » zer   mi-yi   rkaṅ-du   **ḥdug** /*
      leg-flute   be » say   person-GEN leg-TRM   ḥdug /
      « źiṅ   chen g.yaṅ-gźi yin » zer   mi-lpags   bkram /
      « field   big   ground   be » say   men-skin   stretch
      *« rakta   yin » zer gtor-mar   khrag blugs **ḥdug***
      « rakta   be » say offering-TRM blood pour ḥdug
      *« dkyil-ḥkhor yin » zer   khra-khra śig-śig **ḥdug***
      « maṇḍala   be » say   doodle   mere   ḥdug

      'They say "it is a leg flute" (I behold that) it is a human leg.
      They say "it is the ground of a vast field"—a human skin stretched out.
      They say "it is *rakta*" (I behold that) it is blood poured as an offering.
      They say "it is a maṇḍala" (I behold that) it is doodles.' (Zadoks 2004)

These ten examples of *ḥdug* in quotation or in first person narrative sufficiently show that *ḥdug* does bear a testimonial meaning in Classical Tibetan from the 12th through 16th centuries.

4 The use of *ḥdug* in the *Mdzaṅs blun*

In addition to the testimonial uses of *ḥdug* discussed in the preceding section, Schwieger (2006: 73, 110-114) assembles many more examples of *ḥdug* serving as a testimonial, which it would be cumbersome to discuss here; the evidence for a testimonial function of *ḥdug* in Classical Tibetan is overwhelming. Consequently, it is necessary to re-consider the evidence Hongladarom presents to show that *ḥdug* lacks a testimonial meaning in Classical Tibetan.

Hongladarom discusses two examples from the 'story of the householder Dbyug-pa-can' (*khyim-bdag Dbyug-pa-can*) in the *Mdzaṅs blun,* the first (14) to show that *ḥdug* does not have a testimonial meaning in Classical Tibetan, and the second (15) to show that *ḥdug* means 'sit'.

(14) *yul   de-na   Bram-ze Dbyug-pa-can źes   bya-ba   źig **ḥdug**-ste*
      region there-LOC Brahmin Dbyug-pa-can quote do-N   a   ḥdug-CVB

      'In a certain place there was a Brahmin called Dbyug-pa-can.' (*Mdzaṅs-blun*, Derge Kanjur LXXIV, 271a = Schmidt 1843: 272, ll. 4-5, cf. Hongladarom 1994: 676)

(15) *de-dag   rgyal-poḥi   rkaṅ-pa-la   mgo-bos   phyag-ḥtshal-te*
these   king-GEN   foot-N-ALL   head-AGN   prostrate-CVB

       *phyogs   gcig-tu   **ḥdug**-go*
direction   one-TRM   ḥdug-FIN

'They prostrated with their head at the king's feet and sat down in one direction.' (*Mdzaṅs-blun*, Derge Kanjur LXXIV, 272a = Schmidt 1843: 274, l. 1, cf. Hongladarom 1994: 676)

These two examples are not compatible with a testimonial reading. Although they may suffice to show that the testimonial use of *ḥdug* is lacking in the *Mdzaṅs blun*, they do not prove the absence of such a use in Classical Tibetan altogether.

    As to Hongladarom's claim that *ḥdug* means 'sit', although example (15) does not preclude that the petitioners remained standing, textual parallels such as (16), which employs a different verb for 'sit' in a similar syntactic context, weigh in favor of understanding *ḥdug* as 'sit' in example (15) also.

(16) *rgyal-po-daṅ /   btsun-mo-daṅ /*
king-ASS   queen-ASS

       dmag-pa-daṅ /   bu-mor   bcas-te /
soldier-ASS   girl-TRM   be.together-CVB

       bcom-ldan-ḥdas gaṅ-na-ba   der   phyin-pa-daṅ /
Bhagavan   whereabouts   there-TRM   went-N-ALL

       saṅs-rgyas-la   phyag-tshal-te   phyogs   gcig-tu   ḥkhod-do /
Buddha-ALL   prostrate-CVB   direction   one-TRM   sat-FIN

'The king, queen, soldier, and girl, together went to where the Bhagavan was and prostrated to the Buddha, and sat facing one direction'*(Mdzaṅs-blun*, Derge Kanjur LXXIV, 149b = Schmidt 1843: 40, ll. 12-13)

Other examples of *ḥdug* in the 'story of the householder Dbyug-pa-can' unambiguous mean 'sit' (cf. 17 and 18).

(17) *de   lus   ṅal-nas   chaṅ   tshoṅ-gi*
that   body   tired-CVB   beer   sell-GEN

       khyim-du   soṅ-ste   chaṅ   bslaṅs-nas /
home-TRM   go-CVB   beer   request-CVB

       chaṅ-tshoṅ-ma   de-la   bu-pho   źig   btsas-te /
barmaid   that-ALL   son   a   give.birth-CVB

       bu   gos-kyis   g.yogs bsñal-pa-las /
child cloth-AGN   wrap lay.to.rest-N-ABL

       *Dbyug-pa-can   deḥi   steṅ-du   **ḥdug**-pa-daṅ*
Dbyug-pa-can   that-GEN   above-TRM   ḥdug-N-ASS

khyeḥu	*de*	*srog-daṅ*	*bral-bar*	*gyur-to*
boy	that	life-ᴀss	be.bereft-ɴ-ᴛʀᴍ	become-ꜰɪɴ

'Then he was tired, went into a public house and ordered beer. The barmaid had born a child and laid it to rest wrapped in cloth. Dbyug-pa-can sat on top of it and that mortal was bereft of life.' (*Mdzaṅs-blun*, Derge Kanjur LXXIV, 271a = Schmidt 1843: 273, ll. 5-7)

(18)

gnas	*gźan*	*żig-na*	*śiṅ*	*Śa-ko-ta-ka-la*	*bya-rog*	*cig*	**ḥdug**-*pa*
place	other	a-ʟᴏᴄ	tree	Śa-ko-ta-ka-la	bird	a	ḥdug-ɴ

'At another place there was a crow sitting in a Śakotaka tree.' (*Mdzaṅs-blun*, Derge Kanjur LXXIV, 272a = Schmidt 1843: 273, l. 9-10)

Equally clear uses of *ḥdug* used to mean 'sit' (such as 19) occur elsewhere in the *Mdzaṅs-blun*,

(19)

Bram-ze	*de*	*stan*	*btiṅ-ba-la*	**ḥdug**-*nas*
Brahmin	that	cushion	spread-ᴀʟʟ	ḥdug-ᴄᴠʙ

'The Brahmin sat on the spread cushion' (*Mdzaṅs-blun*, Derge Kanjur LXXIV, 131a = Schmidt 1843: 4, ll. 7-8)

That *ḥdug* can mean 'sit' in the *Mdzaṅs-blun* is not in doubt, but it is unclear whether this usage also occurs in other documents. In his dictionary Jäschke (1880: 277) gives 'sit' as the first of four definitions of *ḥdug*; all of his examples of this meaning are taken from the *Mdzaṅs-blun*.[8] Thus, both Jäschke and Hongladarom's evidence that *ḥdug* means 'sit' hails exclusively from this one text.

The *Mdzaṅs-blun* is a problematic text as an exemplar of Classical Tibetan; it is a collection of tales found in the Tibetan Buddhist canon (*bkaḥ ḥgyur*), translated from Chinese into Tibetan by Chos grub 法成 in the ninth century.[9] This text was written during the Old Tibetan period and a copy exists among the Dunhuang texts (Terjék 1969). Either the early date of the text, or its non-native composition could account for idiosyncrasies in its grammar.

5 The use of *ḥdug* in Old Tibetan

Hongladarom cites two examples from the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287, Imaeda 2007: 200-229) to demonstrate that *ḥdug* did not have a testimonial meaning in the Old Tibetan period.

---

8 In contrast, his sources for the second, third, and fourth definitions ('to be' as an existential, copula, and auxiliary respectively), come from several texts. The second definition uses a Rgyal-rabs (presumably the *Rgyal-rabs gsal-baḥi me-loṅ*), the *Mdzaṅs-blun*, indigenous grammatical literature, and the *Mi la mgur ḥbum*. The third defiintion also uses the *Mi la mgur ḥbum* and Rgyal rabs, but also cites the Bstan 'gyur. The fourth definition cites only the *Mi la mgur ḥbum* and the Rgyal-rabs.

9 Studies include Schiefner (1852), Jäschke (1864), Takakusu (1901), Terjék (1969), Mair (1993), and Roesler (2007). More recently than Schiefner and Jäschke's use of the text in grammatical investigations is Anderson (1987). For more on Chos grub 法成 see Ueyama (1990: 84-246).

The first example is taken from the legend of Dri-gum-bstan-po. The child Ṅar-la-skyes has sought to recover the body of the deceased emperor from a Nāginī of the name Ḥo-de-bed-de-riṅ-mo, and asks under what conditions she will return it.

(20) « *gźan   ǰǐ   yaṅ   myǐ   ḥdod* /
     other   what still   not   want

     *myi-ḥǐ   myig bya   myǐg   ltar   **ḥdug**-pa   ḥog-nas*
     man-GEN eye   bird   eye   like   ḥdug-N   under-ELA

     ḥgebs-pa gchig ḥdod » *ces   zer-nas* //
     close-N   one   want   quote   say-CVB

     '"I want nothing else; I want one who has the eyes of men like the eyes of birds, closing from below." She said.' (PT 1287, ll. 37-38, Imaeda et al. 2007: 201, cf. Hongladarom 1994: 674)

Although example (20) is a direct quotation, neither the female serpent spirit nor the boy Ṅar-la-skyes to whom she speaks has seen the ornithomorphic child in question, so this occurrence of *ḥdug* cannot be understood as testimonial.

     In Hongladarom's second example from the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* the founder of Tibet's imperial lineage, Stag-bu sña gzĭgs, ascents to a conspiracy which two disgruntled vassals of Zĭṅ-po rje present to him.

(21) *btsan-po-ḥi   źal-nas* /
     emperor-GEN   mouth-ELA

     « *ṅa-ḥi   sriṅ-mo źig kyaṅ* /
     me-GEN   sister   a   even

     *Zĭṅ-po rje-ḥi   ga-na   **ḥdug**   mod-kyi* //
     Ziṅ-po lord-GEN where-LOC ḥdug   indeed-CVB

     khyed   zer-ba bźin bya-ḥo »
     you   say-N   like   do-FIN

     źes   bkaḥ   stsal-nas //
     quote   word   give-CVB

     'The emperor said, "Even though my own sister is with Zĭṅ-po rje, I shall do as you say."' (PT 1287, ll. 158-159, Imaeda et al. 2007: 206, cf. Hongladarom 1994: 674)

Whether Stag-bu-sña-gzigs knows that his sister is with Ziṅ-po rje because he saw her there is impossible to answer. However, the emphatic auxiliary *mod* suggests that Stag-bu sña gzĭgs uses *ḥdug* emphatically, evoking a connotation of *ḥdug* that lead Chang and Chang (1984) to see it as a marker of certainty in "Lhasa" Tibetan, what Aikhenvald (2004) would call an 'epistemic extension of an evidential'. Thus, there is no obstacle to understanding example (21) as a testimonial use of *ḥdug*, and it is unclear why Hongladarom sees it as evidence *against* the testimonial in Old Tibetan.

The *Old Tibetan Chronicle* offers two further occurrences of *ḥdug*. Neither exhibits a testimonial meaning of *ḥdug*.

(22) *lho   pyogs-kyĭ   smad-na*
      south   direction-GEN   lower-LOC
      Ḥjaṅ   dum   « Mywa   dkar-po »   źes   bya-ba-ḥi
      Ḥjaṅ   branch « Mywa   white »   quote   do-N-GEN
      *rgyal-po   sde   my cuṅ-ba   źig   **ḥdug**-pa //*
      king   section   not small   a   ḥdug-N

'In the lower part of the southern region is a not inconsiderable kingdom of a branch of the Ḥjaṅ people called the White Mywa' (*Old Tibetan Chronicle*, PT 1287, ll. 343-344, Imaeda et al. 2007: 214)

(23) *mtsho   ched-po-ḥi   naṅ-na /*
      lake   big-GEN   inside-LOC
      *chu-srĭn-rgyal-baḥ   **ḥdug**-na /*
      water-demon   ḥdug-CVB
      gnam-las che   phab-ste //
      sky-ABL   meteor   fall-CVB
      chu-srĭn-rgyal-ba   chu-ḥĭ   naṅ-du   bsad-do //
      water-demon   water-GEN   inside-TRM   kill-FIN

'When a water demon is within a great lake, a meteor falling from heaven kills the water demon within the waters.' (*Old Tibetan Chronicle*, PT 1287, ll. 517-518, Imaeda et al. 2007: 228)

In sum, the evidence of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* is ambiguous. Three examples do not appear compatible with a testimonial interpretation of *ḥdug*, but one occurrence is consistent with such an interpretation.

Implicitly disagreeing with DeLancey and Hongladarom, Denwood (1999: 246) cites a sentence from the *Sba bźed* to demonstrate that *ḥdug* has a testimonial meaning in Old Tibetan. Although it is clear that some version of this text does date back to the Old Tibetan period (van Schaik and Iwao 2009), because most of the witnesses are post 14th century and the textual transmission is not understood, it is best to avoid the *Sba bźed* when looking for strong evidence of linguistic phenomena in Old Tibetan.

The earliest records in the Tibetan language are the imperial stone inscriptions. Among these inscriptions the verb *ḥdug* also occurs four times: three in the inscription at the tomb of Khri lde sroṅ brtsan and one in the Sino-Tibetan treaty inscription of 821-822. In all four cases the verb is used as an existential copula, with no evidential overtones, to describe the physical location of one of Tibet's neighboring lands.

(24)　*śar　phyogs // 　rgyal-po chen-por　Rgya　**ḥdug**-pa-daṅ //*
　　　east　direction　king　　big-TRM　China　ḥdug-N-ASS

　　　'As great king [in] the east is China.' (Inscription at the tomb of Khri lde sroṅ brtsan, 815-817, a23-24, Iwao et al. 2009: 28)

(25)　*lho　　phyogs-kyi　　rgyal-por　Rgya-gar　**ḥdug**-pa yaṅ //*
　　　south　direction-GEN　king-TRM　India　　ḥdug-N　also

　　　'As king of the south is India.' (Inscription at the tomb of Khri lde sroṅ brtsan, 815-817, a29-30, Iwao et al. 2009: 28)

(26)　*…　phyogs　　…　Dru-gu　**ḥdug***
　　　　direction　　　Turk　ḥdug

　　　'… cardinal direction … is Türk.' (Inscription at the tomb of Khri lde sroṅ brtsan, 815-817, a39, Iwao et al. 2009: 28)

(27)　*śar　phyogs-na　　Rgya　**ḥdug**-pa //*
　　　east　direction-LOC　China　ḥdug-N

　　　'In the east is China.' (Sino-Tibetan treaty inscription of 821-822, East side, l. 18, Iwao et al. 2009: 36)

Such examples from the inscriptions are similar to example (22) from the *Old Tibetan Chronicle*. This evidence from the inscriptions supports DeLancey and Hongladarom's view that the testimonial is missing from early written monuments. The evidence of Old Tibetan however does not confirm a lexical meaning of 'sit', but instead shows *ḥdug* as an existential copula.

6 Conclusion

The Old Tibetan inscriptions entirely lack a testimonial function for *ḥdug*. The *Old Tibetan Chronicle* presents one example out of four which is consistent with a testimonial reading. In Classical Tibetan (12th-16th centuries) the testimonial use of *ḥdug* is common. This distribution tentatively suggests that the meaning of *ḥdug* as a testimonial emerged during the Old Tibetan period. DeLancey's perspective that "*ḥdug* was a lexical verb 'sit' until well after the differentiation of Proto-Tibetan" (1992: 52) must be refined in two respects. First, although the earliest Tibetan documents and some Tibetan dialects do not exhibit a testimonial use of *ḥdug*, the emergence of the testimonial use of *ḥdug* took place significantly before when DeLancey posits. Second, the use of *ḥdug* to mean 'sit' is as far as the evidence presented here can determine an idiosyncrasy of the *Mdzaṅs blun*.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL	ablative		LOC	locative
AGN	agentive		N	the nominalizer *pa*
ALL	allative		PER	personal
ASS	associative		PLR	plural
CNV	converb		TES	testimonial
ELA	elative		TOP	the topic marker *ni*
FIN	clitic *-o* that marks finite verbs		TRM	terminative
GEN	genitive			

Any noun phrase not specified for case should be construed as absolutive.

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chang, Kun; and Chang, Betty1984. "The certainty hierarchy among Spoken Tibetan verbs of being." *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 55.4: 603–635.

Chonjore, Tsetan. 2003. *Colloquial Tibetan: a textbook of the Lhasa dialect with reference grammar and exercises.* Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

DeLancey, Scott. 1986. "Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan." In Chafe, Wallace; and Nichols Johanna(eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology,*203-13. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp

DeLancey, Scott. 1990. "Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan." *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 289-321.

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

DeLancey, Scott. 2001. "The mirative and evidentiality." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369-382.

Dempsey, Jakob. 1993. "'Ergativity in Milarepa's Rnam.thar': Another viewpoint." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16.2: 113-20.

Denwood, Philip. 1999. *Tibetan*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fortson, Benjamin W.2010. *Indo-european language and culture: an introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Garrett, Edward. 2001. Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan. PhD thesis at University of California Los Angeles.

Gtsaṅ Smyon He-ru-ka Rus-paḥi Rgyan-can. 2010. *The life of Milarepa* (*M-la-ras-paḥi Rnam-thar*; English translation by Andrew Quintman). New York: Penguin Books.

Haarh, Erik. 1969. *The Yar-luṅ Dynasty*. Copenhagen: Gad.

Haller, Felix. 2009. "Switch-reference in Tibetan." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 32.2: 45-106.

Hill, Nathan W. 2007. "Personalpronomina in der Lebensbeschreibung des Mi la ras pa, Kapitel III." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 36: 277-287.

Hill, Nathan W. 2012. "'Mirativity' does not exist: ḥdug in "Lhasa" Tibetan and other suspects." *Linguistic Typology* 16.3: 389-433.

Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 1994. "Historical Development of the Tibetan Evidential tuu". In:

Hajime, Kitamura et al. (eds.), *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*, 673-684. Osaka: The Organizing Committee, the 26th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics.

Imaeda, Yoshiro et al. 2007. *Tibetan documents from Dunhuang*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Iwao, Kazushi et al. 2009. *Old Tibetan Inscriptions*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Jäschke, Heinrich August. 1864. "Brief des missionärs H. A. Jäschke an den akademiker A. Schiefner." *Mélanges asiatiques tirés du Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg* 5: 86-97.

de Jong, Jan Willem. 1959. *Mi la ras pa'i rnam thar: texte tibétain de la vie de Milarépa*. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton.

Kuznetsov, B. I., ed.1966. *Rgyal rabs gsal ba'i me long: the clear mirror of royal genealogies*. Leiden: Brill.

Laufer, Berthold.1911. *Der Roman einer tibetischen königin*. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz.

Mair, Victor H. 1993. "The linguistic and textual antecedents of The Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish." *Sino-Platonic Papers* 38.

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1955. "The independent status of Lhasa dialect within Central Tibetan." *Orbis* 4.1: 49-55.

Mkhas-pa-ldeḥu. 1987. *Rgya Bod-kyi chos-ḥbyuṅ rgyas-pa*. Lhasa: Bod ljoṅs mi dmaṅs dpe skrun khaṅ.

Ñaṅ ral Ñi maḥi Ḥo zer. 1988. C*hos-ḥbyuṅ me-tog sñiṅ-po sbraṅ rtsiḥi bcud*. Lhasa: Bod-ljoṅs bod yig dpe rñiṅ dpe skrun khaṅ.

Roesler, Ulrike. 2007. "Materialien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des mDzangs blun: Die Selbstaufopferung des Prinzen Sujāta." *Indica et Tibetica. Michael Hahn felicitation volume*. Konrad Klaus and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien. 405-422.

Róna-Tas, András. 1985. *Wiener Vorlesungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte Tibets*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

Saxena, Anju.1989. "Ergative in Mi=la=ras=pa' i rnam thar." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 12.2: 35-39.

van Schaik, Sam and Kazushi Iwao. 2009. "Fragments of the Testament of Ba from Dunhuang". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128.33: 477–487.

Schiefner, Anton. 1852. *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu Schmidt's Ausgabe des Dsanglun*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Schmidt, Isaak Jakob. 1843. *Dsanglun oder, Weise und der Thor*. St. Petersburg: Gräff.

Schwieger, Peter. 2006. *Handbuch zur Grammatik der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache*. Halle (Saale): International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.

Takakusu, Junjirō. 1901. "Tales of the Wise Man and the Fool, in Tibetan and Chinese." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (New Series) 33.3: 447-460.

Terjék, József. 1969. "Fragments of the Tibetan sutra of *The Wise and the Fool* from Tun-huang." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 22.3: 289-334.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en tibétain: approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée*. Paris: Peeters.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2008. "Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct'/'disjunct' in Tibetan." In :

Huber, Brigitte et al. (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, 281-308. Halle: International Institut for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.

Tournadre, Nicolas and Sangda Dorje. 2009. *Manuel de tibétain standard*. 3rd edition. Paris: L'asiathèque.

Ueyama Daishun 上山大峻. 1990. 敦煌佛教の研究 *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū* (Studies on Buddhism in Dunhuang). Kyoto: 法蔵館 Hōzōkan.

Yukawa Yasutosi 湯川泰敏. 1966. "チベット語の duu の意味 Chibettogo no duu no imi (*The meaning of Tibetan "duu"*)." 言語研究 *Gengo Kenkyū* 49: 77-84.

Zadoks, Abel. 2004. "Evidentials in Middle Tibetan texts". Paper presented at the 37th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. Lunds Universitet, Lund, Sweden

Nathan W. Hill
nh36@soas.ac.uk

Appendix: syntactic classification of examples

This is not the place for a thorough syntactic analysis of the Classical Tibetan verbal system. Nonetheless, because the divide among main verb, equational copula, and auxiliary verbs is easy to draw, the examples given throughout are here presented according to this division. The absence of *ḥdug* in auxiliary constructions in the inscriptions, the *Old Tibetan Chronicle*, and the *Mdzaṅs blun*, together with the presence of *ḥdug* in auxiliaries in Classical Tibetan, suggests that the grammaticalization of *ḥdug* began after the Old Tibetan period. However, this collection of examples is not representative and is complete only for the inscriptions and the *Old Tibetan Chronicle*; it is of anecdotal value only.

Classical Tibetan
    Equational copula: 4, 5, 8, 13
    Auxiliary verb: 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13
Mdzaṅs blun
    Main verb: 14, 15, 17, 18, 19
Old Tibetan Chronicle
    Main verb: 20, 21, 22, 23
Old Tibetan Inscriptions
    Main verb: 24, 25, 26, 27