

Final Particle =o in Old Tibetan: Morphosyntax, Semantics, and Grammaticalisation¹

Shao Mingyuan

(Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou)

1. Introduction

The particle =Co is widely distributed from Old Tibetan (OT)² of the 7th century to modern Written Tibetan. It is habitually called *rdzogs.tshig*, *slar.bsdu*, or *zla.sdud* by the indigenous Tibetan grammatical tradition. Among these terms, *rdzogs.tshig*, meaning ‘end-particle’ (*rdzogs* = to be completed; *tshig* = word, morpheme), is much more prevalent. In contrast to the former terms, modern linguists usually label it as a sentence-final particle, clause-final particle, statement particle, assertion particle, or as the indicative mood. It has ten allomorphs [-’o, -bo, -do, -go, -mo, -no, -ngo, -so, -lo, -ro], spelled with a reduplicated last letter of the preceding syllable+vowel -o (’o after vowels), which are conditioned variants of the same phoneme, as shown by the following table.

coda	མ	ན	ང	བ	ད	ག	ར	ལ	ས	-Cṡ	-VØ
	-m	-n	-ng	-b	-d	-g	-r	-l	-s	-Cd	VØ
variant	-mo	-no	-ngo	-bo	-do	-go	-ro	-lo	-so	-to	-’o

However, the prescriptive principle established by indigenous Tibetan grammars is not always in line with the textual corpora of OT,

¹ This article is a reworked version of a paper presented at the *50th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics*, held at the Chinese Academy of Social Science, Beijing, China, on November 26–28, 2017. I would like to thank Qianzi Tian 田仟子 and other participants of the symposium for their suggestions. I’m also grateful to the anonymous reviewers of *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* for constructive comments on an earlier version of the article. The writing of this article was supported by the grant No. 16CYY057 “A Study of Evidentiality in Tibetic languages” by the National Social Science Fund of China.

² A complete list of abbreviations is given at the end of the article. The Wylie transliteration system for Tibetan records is adopted in this article.

for =*o* can be appended indiscriminately to any final consonant, as in (1).

(1) (མོ་)ཅི་ལ་བཏབ་གུང་བཟང་སབ་འོ།།

(mo) *ci=la* *btab* *kyangbzang* *rab='o//*
 (divination) whatever=ALLdo.PASTalso good auspicious=FP
 Whatever divined is very auspicious. (IOL Tib J 738, l. 23. Zheng
 Binglin and Huang Weizhong 2011a: 45)³

In (1), =*o* is appended to the predicate *rab* ended by consonant *-b* in a matrix sentence, which is contrary to traditional grammar. By contrast, in line 21 of the same document, IOL Tib J 738, =*bo* occurs in the same context with the host *rab*. This phenomenon is widespread throughout OT, which may suggest that =*o* in OT has not been completely grammaticised and still retains a certain degree of independence (see also Section 3 of the present article).

FP =*o* has existed in Written Tibetan since Tibetan script appeared in the 7th century, yet it has completely disappeared in modern Tibetic branches. It has attracted the attention of many Tibetan indigenous grammarians for more than a thousand years; their descriptions of this particle, however, are rather simplistic. Even though its semantic, morphological, syntactical and grammaticalisation processes have been studied extensively by modern linguists, descriptions are still inadequate and this has led to several controversies. Therefore, a comprehensive study of the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and grammaticalisation aspects of FP =*o* is needed. Based on the perspective of historical linguistics, this article tries to make a comprehensive study of the above issues.

The structure of this article is as follows: A brief introduction of the topic will be given in Section 1. The background and controversies about FP =*o* will be illustrated in Section 2. The relevant syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties of FP =*o* will be discussed in Section 3. The grammaticalisation process of FP =*o* will be presented in Section 4. Evidence from cross-linguistic perspectives supporting the grammaticalisation process of FP =*o* will be demonstrated in Section 5. Discussion and conclusions will be presented in Section 6.

³ The Leipzig Glossing Rules are adopted to annotate the corpus in this article, according to which the two symbols most often used are as follows: '=': clitic; '-': affix. Moreover, sometimes ellipsis dots are used to express the words omitted in order to save space (since Tibetan is a clause-chain language). In addition, '.' is inserted into polysyllabic words to distinguish different syllables.

2. Background

Although indigenous Tibetan grammar literature has always paid close attention to the FP =o phenomenon, description and explanation of its morphology, syntax, and semantics has obviously been rudimentary. The oldest grammar in Tibetan history, the *Sum cu pa*, written by Thon mi Sam bho ʒa who lived in the Tibetan imperial period around the 7th century CE, adopted the concept *slar.bsdu* to describe it. However, he only presented its orthographic spelling in four verses, without any further description of its semantics and functions in detail. The grammar *Smra sgo mtshon cha*, written by Indian scholar Dran pa'i ye shes grags pa in the 10th century, used the term *zla.sdud* to describe it. Just like *Sum cu pa*, the *Smra sgo mtshon cha*'s description of semantics and syntax is inadequate.⁴ The grammar *Karma situ'i sum rtags 'grel chen*, written by Karma situ (1700–1774), not only describes the orthographic spelling of FP =o, but also tries to distinguish the different functions of the three terms *rdzogs.tshig*, *slar.bsdu*, and *zla.sdud* from the semantic coherence of the clause where FP =o occurs and their semantic relationship with the subsequent clause. Moreover, there FP =o is only regarded as a component without any semantics that brings to an end a section of a narrative or conversation.⁵ Unfortunately, the criteria adopted by Tibetan grammarians are not transparent enough and fail to comprehend the core function of FP =o in syntax and semantics.

Modern Tibetan scholars Bskal bzang 'gyur med and Bskal bzang dbyangs can insist that FP =o mainly occurs in OT: it is appended to the end of a declarative sentence, rather than an exclamation, command, or interrogative sentence, to express the end of the sentence, or the end of a paragraph without any structural connection to the subsequent clause.⁶ This opinion is obviously in line with traditional grammars and clearly has the same defects in terms of the accuracy and detail of its description of FP =o. In addition, due to the insufficiency of historical perspectives regarding language evolution in indigenous Tibetan grammar, FP =o has not garnered much attention until now.

Modern scholars have made further research into the morphology and syntax of FP =o based on the theory of modern linguistics that has resulted in great progress compared to traditional grammars, but the views of such scholars are not completely consistent. So far, the most comprehensive research has been done by Yamaguchi, in which he criticises traditional descriptive approach of FP =o, and innovatively

⁴ Dran pa'i ye shes grags pa 1999: 10 and 66.

⁵ Karma situ 2003: 45–48.

⁶ Bskal bzang 'gyur med and Bskal bzang dbyangs can 2004: 173.

describes its semantics, syntax, and grammaticalisation.⁷ Yamaguchi disapproves of the view held by the Tibetan scholar Karma situ, insisting that $FP=o$ has no necessary relationship to the end of a clause or sentence; it is rather semantically adopted to strengthen the agreement between the subject and predicate, just like the morpheme '*dearu / desu*' in Japanese.⁸ Historically, Yamaguchi adds, it mostly occurred in OT in the 7th–10th centuries, and then decreased greatly after the 10th century in Written Tibetan, and probably disappeared in spoken languages some time in the 14th century. Though Yamaguchi appropriately points out the problems of traditional grammar relating to $FP=o$ and gives many new arguments, his classification and explanation are cumbersome. In addition, he reconstructs the etymology of $FP=o$ as **bo* and insists it has a homologous relationship with the nominalisation markers *bo/po*, and *ba/pa*.⁹ In modern Amdo Tibetan, one of the definite pronouns and nominalisation markers is /wo/, which is one of the most powerful pieces of evidence to support the reconstruction above.¹⁰ Unfortunately, Yamaguchi does not associate it with demonstrative pronouns, which, in fact, are the etymological evolution of nominalisation markers.

Beyer defines $FP=o$ as a syntactically optional statement particle.¹¹ Particularly, he argues that when the particle occurs in a text that normally omits it, the particle carries extra information: firstly, it may be read as emphasising the assertive character of a performance; secondly, it may be read as concluding a thought unit such as a philosophical argument, a narrative paragraph, or side comment; or, finally, it may be read as marking the end of a sentence which has been embedded as a direct quote within another. Although the illustration above is not completely accurate, it implicates the core of the semantics of $FP=o$, that is, to strengthen emphasis or mark focus. Unfortunately, the source of these functions is not explained from the perspective of historical grammaticalisation of demonstrative pronouns. In this context, Denwood observes that in pre-classical texts there is a tendency to use $FP=o$ more as a 'paragraph-final' particle more than a 'sentence-final' particle.¹² However, Denwood does not present enough evidence on the distribution characteristics of OT and CT. Moreover, the two terms 'paragraph' and 'sentence' are easy to misunderstand and

⁷ Yamaguchi 1986: 697–736; Yamaguchi 1998: 496–507.

⁸ Note the term 'agreement' here is not the same as that which linguists adopted in the general morphosyntactic meaning, in fact, the author wants to indicate the semantic feature of information structure encoded by $FP=o$.

⁹ Yamaguchi 1986: 723–24.

¹⁰ Bskal bzang 'gyur med and Bskal bzang dbyangs can 2002: 221–22.

¹¹ Beyer 1992: 352–53.

¹² Denwood 1999: 249–50.

have not essential distinction in connotation.

One of the central debates in the literature on FP =*o* concerns its etymological analysis: Yamaguchi argues that it derives from the nominal marker **bo*.¹³ Simon is evidently the first one to relate it to the demonstrative pronoun *o* in OT.¹⁴ Moreover, he suggests that semantically it is probable that FP =*o* refers to the subject.¹⁵ Hahn also holds the same view.¹⁶ DeLancey relates it to the copular root **way* in Proto-Tibeto-Burman and interprets it as an obligatory final particle which does nothing but mark the end of a sentence.¹⁷ Furthermore, regarding its loss in Modern Tibetan, he argues that **way* persisted into CT as the sentence final particle, and subsequently abandoned its function as a copula. The arguments above reverse the order of the grammaticalisation processes (see Section 4 of the present article) and, just as DeLancey states, this etymon has no other reflex in modern varieties of Tibetan.¹⁸ According to Benedict, based on a cross-linguistic survey of Tibeto-Burman languages, FP =*o* and the copular verb **way* both derive from the demonstrative pronoun **o*.¹⁹

3. *Syntax and the Semantics of the Final Particle -o in Old Tibetan*

In this section, I will focus on the description of the semantics, syntax, and pragmatics of FP =*o* in OT, which is often very brief in the existing research. Four aspects will be discussed as follows: 1. the restriction between declarative and non-declarative sentences; 2. the classification of the host appended between verbal predicates and non-verbal predicate components; 3. the distinction between completed and non-completed aspects; 4. the possibility of optionality or obligatory with regard to pragmatics; and 5. whether it is a paragraph-final particle or a sentence-final particle, grammatically.

3.1. *Declarative vs. Non-Declarative*

Three basic sentence types (declarative, interrogative, and imperative) are traditionally distinguished according to language typology. In OT,

¹³ Yamaguchi: 723–24.

¹⁴ Simon 1942: 969.

¹⁵ Note that the notion of subject is problematic in Tibetan. According to morphosyntactic alignment, Tibetan is an ergative-absolutive language, it syntactically has no subject relating to nominative–accusative language.

¹⁶ Hahn 1996: 47.

¹⁷ DeLancey 2011: 352–54.

¹⁸ DeLancey 2011: 9.

¹⁹ Benedict 1983: 85–86.

the markers of sentence-type are mainly formal particles. Declarative sentences, primarily used for speech acts such as asserting, claiming, and stating, are the most frequent sentence type in any language.

FP =*o*, for the most part, occurs in declarative sentences in OT and CT, which can also be confirmed from the terms adopted by previous scholars such as statement particle, assertion particle, or indicative mood. In Tibetan, the predicate is always in a final position, but verbs, as well as noun phrases, can be predicative, as in (2)–(5).

(2) ཞང་སྤང་གློ་བ་རིང་ས་ནས། བཏུན་ཕབ་ནས་བཀུམོ།

[zhang].snang glo.ba rings=nas/ bkyon phab=nas
 PN lung revolt=CONV punish fall.PAST=CONV
 bkumo/
 kill.PAST.FP

Zhang snang revolted, (he) was punished and killed.
 (PT 1288, ll. 3–4. Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 3)

(3) ལུ་བ་རེ་མལ་རེ་འཕོའའོ།

nub re mal re 'pho='o/
 night DIP residence DIP move.NONP=FP

(He) changes residence every night. (PT 1287, l. 167. Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 29)

(4) ལུ་ན་རེ། རོང་གྱི་ཚོང་ཆེས་གཞུང། ལུ་ན་རེ། ཚོག་ཤེས་པས་ཚོང་གཞུངོ།

nu na.re/ nor=gyi drod chi=s gzung/
 younger.brother.ABL say treasure=GENheat what=E hold.FUT
 phu na.re// chog shes=pas drod gzungo//
 elder.brother.ABLsay satisfied know=CONV heat hold.FUT.FP

The younger brother asked: how should I treat the treasure? The elder brother answered: (you should) hold wealth knowing contentment. (PT 1283, ll. 408–409; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 407)

(5) དབའས་དབྱི་ཚབ་དང། ཚེས་པོང་ནག་སེང་གཉིས་ནི། བཅོན་པོའི་སྤྱན་འབྲིན་ནོ།

dba's.dbyl.tshab dang/ tshes.pong.nag.seng gnyis ni/
 PN CONN PN two TOP
 btsan.po='i spyan.'dren=no/
 btsanpo=gen guide=FP

Dbā's Dbyl tshab and Tshes pong Nag seng are the *btsan po*'s guide.
 (PT 1287, ll. 181–82; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 29)

In both examples (2) and (3), it is obvious that FP =o is directly appended to the predicate in declarative sentences. What is interesting is case (4), in which =ngo only occurs after a declarative sentence spoken by the older brother; by contrast, the interrogative sentence said by the younger brother ends with a bare verb, despite both sentences ending with the same verb.

However, occasionally, FP=o can occur in imperative sentences in OT and CT, as in (6) and in (9) respectively.

(6) ལ་མས་.....སྐད་རྗེན་པོས་གསོལ་ལོ་མཚོན་ཅིག་ལྷ་སྐྱམ་དགོན་མཚོག་གསུམ།

a.ma=s skad chen-po=s gsol=lo mchod=cig
 mother=ERG voice big-NMLZ=ERG pray=FP sacrifice=CMD
dkon.mchog.gsum/

Triratna

Mother shout aloud: pray and sacrifice to the Triratna! (Rus pa'i rgyan can 1979: 29)

The comparison between 'lo' and 'cig' in the juxtaposition 'gsol=lo mchod=cig' expressing imperative mood is very interesting. Such distribution is extremely rare both in OT and CT, for imperative-verb inflection or the command particle 'cig' as shown in (6) 'mchod=cig' are usually adopted to construct the imperative sentence.

From reader's standpoint, the text presents only a pure objective description of the world, lacking specific context, as does the statement in its core function. But from the perspective of discourse or conversation, specific mood meaning can be manifested. This continuum may be the basis to explain the function extension (marking declarative sentences > marking imperative sentences) and the low-frequency of FP=o in OT and CT.

3.2. Predicative vs. Non-Predicative

FP =o most frequently is used after a bare verb or a verb phrase (note adjectives are a subclass to verbs in Classical Tibetan and Old Tibetan) and sometimes after nominalised verbs, such as V-pa-'o. Occasionally, it is found directly after a noun, pronoun, or numeral, and sometimes even after a case marker, a phenomenon which has also been observed by Denwood.²⁰ Although not many cases have been attested to in the documentation, they are still worthy of attention.

²⁰ Denwood 1999: 249.

(7) དེ་ནས་ལྷུང་འགོར་ཐང་ཤང་སྤུལ་ཏོ།

de=nas lha='I dkor tham.shad stsal=to/
 dem=ABL god=GEN storehouse whole give.H.PAST=FP
 After that, (the *btsan po*) gave all the (treasures) in his storehouse
 to him. (PT 1287, l. 12; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 23)

(8) ཚོས་བཟང་སྲིད་མཐོ་སྤྱི་ཡོངས་ཀྱིས་སྤྲིད་དོ།

chos bzang srId mtho=ste/ myI yongs=kyis
 law good politic height =CONV person whole=ERG
skyid=do/
 comfortable=FP
 The law is good and politics is powerful: all people are happy.
 (PT 1287, l. 451; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 39)

(9) གཞིག་ནི། རོན་ཐོན་གྱི། རོ་འཕྲལ་ཚོལ་པའོ།། གཉིས་ནི། རོན་ཐོན་གྱི་ལྷུགས་སྤུལ་པའོ།།

gchig ni// ngon.thon=gyi/ ngon.'phral tshol-pa='o//
 one TOP diligent=GEN face.touch do.CMD-NOM=FP
gnyis ni/ ngon.thon=gyi phyugs spel-pa='o//
 two TOP diligent=GEN livestock foster-NOM=FP
 Firstly, in order to have an audience with the king, work hard, and
 secondly, foster livestock earnestly. (PT 1283, ll. 430–31; Wang Yao
 and Chen Jian 2008: 407)

In examples (7) and (8), FP=*o* is attached directly to the bare verb, while in (9) it is attached to nominalisation clauses. Both of them can be seen in OT documents, but the former is the most common, while the latter has a less frequent distribution. Semantically, there is no difference between the V-*pa-o* and V-*o* construction.

(10) རོར་སྤྱད་ཉེས་ན་ནི། དགའོ།

nor spyad nyes na ni// dgra='o/
 treasure use err CONJ TOP enemy=FP
 Wealth misused is an enemy. (PT 1283, l. 55; Wang Yao and Chen
 Jian 2008: 408)

(11) འཇོངས་ཀྱང་། རྗེ་དེ་ཙམ་མོ།

'dzangs kyang/ nI de.tsam=mo/
 wise also TOP such=FP
 [His] wiseness is as great. (PT 1287, ll. 82–83; Wang Yao and Chen
 Jian 2008: 26)

(12) ཡོངས་གྲང་། ཉེས་བྱེད་བྱེད་དེ་ལེགས་པ་ནི།། བརྒྱའ་ལ་གཞིགོ།། ལེགས་བྱེད་བྱེད་ལེགས་པ་ནི། ཀུན་ནོ།།

yongs gyang/ nyes byed~byed=de legs-pa ni//
 whole also crime do.PRS~ RED =CONV good-NOM TOP
brgya'=la gchigo// legs byed~byed legs.pa ni//
 hundred=ALL one.FP good do.PRS~RED good TOP
kun=no//
 whole=FP

Whenever one does evil, he can only get one percent of good things, while when he does good deeds, he will get all the benefits. (PT 1283, ll. 77–78; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 396)

In the above three cases, FP =o is placed after the non-verbal component, which in (10) is a general noun, in (11) is a pronoun, and in (12) is a numeral and pronoun respectively; these phenomena are not rare in OT documentation.

‘Nominalisation clause+o’ and ‘NP+o’ are syntactically parallel when forming a proposition as predicate. Beyer mentions that sometimes the statement particle -o can mark the close of a proposition from which the equative verb has been omitted, e.g., *gzugs stong-pao* ‘form (is) empty’.²¹ As for the phenomenon of FP =o, it, in fact represents a pro-verb. Hu Shujin also holds a similar view.²²

In addition, sometimes FP =o can succeed the case marker, as in (13).

(13) སངས་རྒྱལ་ལ་ཐུག་འཚལ་ཉེ་ཐམས་ཅད་མཁྲིན་པ་ལ་འོ།།

sangs.rgyas=la phyag.'tsal=te thams.cad mkhnyen-pa=la='o//
 Buddha=ALL prostrate =CONV total know.HNOM=ALL=FP
 Prostrate to the Buddha and expect all wisdom. (PT 16+IOL Tib J 751, l. 40r3.²³)

At present, only the ‘allative case+o’ construction has been found in OT. However, in classical and modern Written Tibetan the ‘other case marker+o’ pattern can be found, as in (14). Indigenous Tibetan grammars call this phenomenon *snga.ma.sdud.pa* ‘restrict the former’.

²¹ Beyer 1992: 353.

²² Hu Shujin 2000: 126.

²³ The transliteration has been taken from the database of OTDO (Old Tibetan Documents Online), whose website is as follows: <https://otdo.aa-ken.jp/>.

(14) མྱོན་དུ་བྱུང་པ་ལས་བཤད་ཅེས་པ་ནི། གཞན་དག་གི་འོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་སོ།།

sngon=du byas-pa=las bshad=ces-pa
 front=TERM do.PAST-NOM=ABL speak=QUOT-NOM
ni/ gzhan=dag=gi='o=zhes gsungs=so/
 TOP other=PL=GEN=FP=QUOT speak.H=FP

(He) said that speaking of previous theories, it refers to other works.' (Bu ston Rin chen grub 1988: 154)

3.3. Completed vs. Uncompleted Aspect

Occurring in a declarative sentence, FP =o has no restriction on aspect, completed and uncompleted aspect both occur in OT, which also has been observed by Denwood.²⁴ Therefore, it is certain that the aspect category has nothing to do with the distribution of FP =o, as shown below.

(15) ཡུལ་ངས་པོ་ལས། འཕན་ཡུལ་དུ་སྒྲིང་སྒྲོས་སོ།

yul.ngas.po=las/ 'phan.yul=du myIng spos=so/
 PLN=ABL PLN=TERM name change.PAST=FP

The place name Yul ngas po was changed to 'Phan yul. (PT 1287, ll. 184–85. Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 29)

(16) རྩ་ཕྱ་བ་ནི་རྩལ་ཟེལ།

rta snga.ba ni rtswa=la za='o/
 horse.ABS front TOP grass=ALL eat.PRS=FP

The horse is grazing ahead. (IOL Tib J 731-r, l. 65; Zheng Binglin and Huang Weizhong 2011b: 8)

(17) ལྱིད་ཟེར་བ་བཞིན་བྱུང།

khyed zer-ba bzhin bya='o
 2SG.ABS say-NOM follow do.FUT=FP

Follow what you said to do. (PT 1287, l. 159; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 28)

The verb inflection (past in (15), present in (16), and future in (17)) in the above cases reflect the different aspect categories in essence, indicating that FP =o tends to be not selective with aspect.

²⁴ Denwood 1999: 249.

and was written as a formal document. (*The Rkong po Bde mo sa inscription*, line 11. Iwao Kazushi 2009: 16)

(20) གཏན་པ་ཆིས་ཀ་ཡི་མཛོ་རྒྱན་དང་། དེ་མཚེང་ལ་བཅས་ཏེ་སྲུག་རྒྱས་བཏབ།

gtan.pa chis.ka im.dzi.h'an dang/ den.tsheng.la
witness PN PN CONN PN

bcas=te sug rgyas.btab/
have=CONV [limb do.PAST]

Witnesses Chis ka, Im dzi h'an, and Den tsheng la were finger-printed. (PT 1203, ll. 10–12; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 181)

The three examples above all correspond to the end of a text, and there are no other syntactic components after them. However, FP=*o* is added to the final position of the first example, while in the last two, it is not. This makes it very clear that FP=*o* is not obligatory but optional in this context.

In (21) and (22), the semantic connection between the first and second clauses is relatively loose; FP =*o* could theoretically have been attached to the first clause, but it is not in practice.

(21) ངའི་ཚབ་སྲིད་འདོན་ཅིང་། ཞོ་ག་ཚེན་པོ་འབྲུལ་འབྲུལ་བ། གཙུག་ལྷན་མ་གནང་བའི་མོ་།

[nga'i chab.srid 'don cing/ zho.sha chen-po
1SG=GEN regime promoteCONN thought big-NOM
*'bul~'bul-ba/]*₁ *[gtsIgs snga.ma gnang-ba'I.....]*₂
dedicate~RED-NOM treaty previously do.H-NOM

(He) promoted my regime and dedicated himself to it with deep will. When the treaty was signed previously... (*East inscription at Zhwa'i lha khang*, ll. 4–6. Iwao Kazushi 2009: 20)

(22) གཞན་གྱིས་སྲིད་པོ་ལོང་ཏ་བདག་སྲིད་གཞན་ན་ཉི་མེད་དང་བཟང་ངན་སྲི་བརྗེ་བར་གནང་ངོ།།

*[gzhan=gyis myi-dbrog]*₁ *[khong.ta bdag myi-dga'=na*
other=ERG NEG-rob 3SG.ABS 1SG.ABS NEG-love=SUB
*nye.ring dang bzang.ngan myl-brje-ba=r gnang=ngo/ /]*₂
far.near CONN good.bad NEG-change-NOM=TERM do=FP

No one else is allowed to rob him (of his slaves, land, pasture, and so on.). If he does not want them anymore, a close or distant relative, whether he be wise or stupid should be given the property without any change. (*The Zhol inscription*, ll. n53-n55. Iwao Kazushi 2009: 9)

Between the clauses above, the topic has obviously been changed, and the first clause tends to be self-sufficient in semantics and syntax. FP=*o* is usually added in this context, but it is not the case here; on the contrary, the main clause ends with a nominalised verb (see 21) or bare verb stem (see 22).

The following example (21) may be more representative to explain this phenomenon.

(23) གནམ་ནི་པའོ་ས་ནི་མའོ། ཉི་མ་ནི་བྱོ། ལྷ་བ་ནི་རུང་མའོ། འཇུག་པ་ནི། གཡས་སོ། ལྷོ་ཕྱོགས་ནི་ཕྱིའོ།

<i>gnam</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>pha='o/</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ma'o/</i>	<i>nyi.ma</i>	<i>ni</i>
sky	TOP	father=FP	ground	TOP	mother.FP	sun	TOP
<i>khyo/</i>	<i>zla.ba</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>chung.ma='o/</i>	<i>shar.phyogs</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>g.yas=so/</i>	
husband	moon	TOP	wife=FP	east	TOP	right=FP	
<i>lho.phyogs</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>phyi'o/</i>					
south	TOP	outside.FP					

Sky is the father, and earth is the mother. Sun is the husband, and moon is the wife. East is the right, and south is the outside. (PT 1284, ll. 55–56; Zheng Binglin and Huang Weizhong 2011b: 215)

If FP =*o* was obligatory in practice, it should not be omitted after the word *khyo* in (23). One of the anonymous reviewers of this article queried, could example (23) be explained by the fact that the FP =*o* is fused with the homorganic vowel by the host *khyo* ending with the vowel *o*?²⁸ This possibility really cannot be ruled out, but even so, the above examples (19)–(22) are enough to prove that FP=*o* is optional rather than obligatory.

3.5. 'Paragraph-Final' Particle vs. 'Sentence-Final' Particle

Denwood argues that in many pre-classical texts (OT) there is a tendency to use this particle more as a 'paragraph-final' than a 'sentence-final' particle.²⁹ That is, it may be omitted from clauses which are not regarded as bringing a section of narrative or conversation to a close; other main-clauses end in a bare verb stem. However, discriminating the two terms may bring some confusion, for generally the end of a paragraph is also the end of a sentence (= the end of the last sentence that makes up the paragraph), what is more, 'paragraph' is not a lin-

²⁸ A similar question can also be seen in the following example (25).

²⁹ Denwood 1999: 249–50.

guistic term widely accepted; for example, it is not included in the linguistic dictionary edited by Crystal,³⁰ and I think it is difficult to define it syntactically and semantically.

However, the distribution of FP =*o* in OT observed by the author is very enlightening. In some sentence combinations that have semantic coherence, which alternatively can be expressed by the clause-chaining construction or coordinate construction, FP =*o* is added after each sentence. This phenomenon is more common in OT and significantly reduced in CT, as in (24)–(27).

(24) མཁར་ཡུ་སྐ་ནི་ཡབ་བོ། དགུ་གྲི་ཟེང་པོ་རྗེ་ནི་བརྒྱུག་གོ། མང་རྗེ་སུམ་བུ་ནི་དུ་གུ་ཡུལ་དུ་བོས་སོ།

[*mkhar yu.sna nI phab=bo*]₁/ [*dgu.grI.zing.po.rje nI*
town PLN TOP capture.PAST=FP PN TOP
brlag=go]₂/ [*mang.rje.sum.bu nI dru.gu yul=du*
annihilate=FP PN TOP Turkestan place=TERM
bros=so]₃/
flee.PAST=FP

Yu sna town was captured, Dgu grI Zing po rje was annihilated, and Mang rje Sum bu fled to Turkey. (PT 1287, l. 183; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 29)

(25) མྱི་མང་གི་སྒོན་བཏབ། ཡུལ་ཆེ་འོ་ནི་འདབ་བསྐྱེད་དོ།

[*myi.mang=gI snon btab*]₁/ [*yul che='I ni*
people=GEN [increase.PRS do.PAST] place big=GEN TOP
'dab bskyed-do]₂/
size expanded=FP

The people were conquered. The land expanded. (PT 1287, l. 345–46; Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 35)

(26) བྱ་འོ་མོ་མིང་དེ་སོང་དོ། ལྷ་འོ་དེ་རིང་མོ་འོ་ལྷོར་སྐྱར་གྱི་ལྷུད་དུ་བཅུག་སྟེ་བཏང་དོ། ཉ་ལྷ་གཉིས་ཀྱིས་བཅན་པོ་འོ་སྐྱར་བཅུང་

དོ། ལྷུང་ཉོ་སྒྲ་ འབྲུབས་གྱི་མགུར་དུ་བང་སོ་བཅིག་སོ།

[*bya='I bu.mo khrid=de song=ngo*]₁/ [*klu*
bird=GEN girl lead=CONV go.PAST=FP dragon
'o.de.ring.mo='i ltor spur=gyI klud=du bcug=ste
PN=GEN abode corpse=GEN substitute=TERM make.PAST=CONV
btang=ngo]₂/ [*nya lha gnyIs=kyis btsan.po='i spur*
do.PAST=FP PN prince two=ERG Tsanpo=GEN corpse

³⁰ Crystal 2008.

(28) ཇེ་འུ་མ་ལོ་འདི་ལྷ་གཞི་གཙུག་ཅན་བཏབ་པ།

je'u.hwo.'do='i sug.yig tsad.btab-pha/
 PN=GEN fingerprint do.PAST-NMLZ

Je'u Hwo 'do took his finger-print. (PT 2127, l. 11. Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 185)

4. Grammaticalisation of Final Particle -o

As mentioned in Section 2, Simon first confirmed the relationship between $FP=o$ and the demonstrative pronoun *o*.³³ Although it is a pity that he did not make a detailed analysis of its syntax and semantics in OT literature, it is still an inspiring discovery nonetheless. Tracing the etymology of $FP=o$ to the demonstrative pronoun can also unify the views of Yamaguchi and DeLancey.³⁴ The former holds $FP=o$ is derived from the nominalisation marker **bo*, while the latter insists it is derived from the Proto-Tibeto-Burman copular verb **wəy*: both of them (**bo* and **wəy*), as Benedict suggests, are in fact the result of different grammaticalisation paths of the demonstrative pronoun *o*.³⁵ Simon also argues that $FP=o$ has the function of nominalisation.³⁶ Benedict, based on the analysis of Tibeto-Burmese languages, reconstructs the etymology of the demonstrative pronoun in Proto-Tibeto-Burman **(h)əw^A*, and further shows that it evolves to become the demonstrative pronoun 'o ~u' meaning 'that' in Written Tibetan.³⁷ Moreover, he explains that the copular verb **wəy* reconstructed by Thurgood in Proto-Tibeto-Burman is actually the result of grammaticalisation of the demonstrative pronoun **(h)əw^A*.³⁸ In addition, he also shows that there is a grammaticalisation of **(h)əw^A* as a sentence-final particle in the declarative mood in some Tibeto-Burmese languages. Although he does not clearly indicate that $FP=o$ in OT has undergone the same grammaticalisation resembling the above, this theory is self-evident.

In short, according to Simon and Benedict, it can be concluded that as well as the syntactic and semantic features of $FP=o$ represented in section 3 above, $FP=o$ originates from the grammaticalisation of the demonstrative pronoun *o*, which is very old, and probably has a directional relationship with the evolution of the Proto-Tibeto-Burman

³³ Simon 1942: 969.

³⁴ Yamaguchi 1986: 723–26; Yamaguchi 1998: 496–507; and DeLancey 2011: 352–54.

³⁵ Benedict 1983: 85–86.

³⁶ Simon 1942: 970. Moreover, note $FP=o$ and nominaliser are the different paths of the grammaticalisation of the demonstrative pronoun **bo*.

³⁷ Benedict 1983: 75.

³⁸ Thurgood 1982: 65–82.

demonstrative pronoun $*(h)\text{əw}^A$. In Tibetan, the demonstrative pronoun 'o~u' ($<*(h)\text{əw}^A$) usually is attached in the final position of the sentence to express emphasis under the discourse-pragmatic functions of anaphora, and gradually evolves to become a mood particle, which is explained in detail in the next section.

4.1. The Demonstrative Pronoun

The demonstrative pronoun 'o~u' meaning 'that' not only occurs in OT but also in some modern Tibetan dialects. It should be noted that 'o~u' tends to have an extremely low frequency at any time period. 'O~u' occurs in OT as shown in examples (29)–(31).

(29) ཁ་འོ་དེ་ནི་དམར་སོ་འོ་རིང་ནི་དགས།

kha 'o.de ni dmar so 'o ring ni dgar/

mouth DEM TOP red teeth DEM long TOP expose

That (open) mouth is bloody, and the long teeth are exposed. (IOL Tib J 734, ch.85.ix.4, *The age of decline*, l. 215. Zheng Binglin and Huang Weizhong 2011b: 65)

(30) ཇི་སྐྱིན་འབངས་ཀྱིས་བསལ་བ་ལུག་ལས་འགལ་ལུར་སྤྱི་ནང་གིས་རྒྱལ་བྱས་འོ་སྤོམས།

rje.skyin 'bangs=kyis bsab-pa lugs=las 'gal/

throne subject=ERG replace.FUT-NOM rule=ABL violate

pur.myi nang=gis rgyal byas 'o

servant inside=ERG king do.PAST DEM.ABL

myi-snyoms/

NEG-proportionate.PRS

A subject replacing the throne is against / contradicts the rules, and that servant being the king is against custom. (IOL Tib J 737D, ll. 334–35; Chen Jian and Wang Yao 1983: 174)

(31) ལུ་ནི་བརླུ་བའི་རི་དགས་ཡིན་བས།

'u ni bzlu-ba='I ri.dags yin=bas/

DEM TOP cheat-NOM=GEN beast COP=CONV

As for that beast cheating people... (IOL Tib J 737A, *Rāmāyana stories*, l. 145. Chen Jian and Wang Yao 1983: 158)

In (29), the etymon *'o* and *de*, which have the same meaning, compose a compound demonstrative pronoun to encode *'that'*.³⁹ These are also pervasive in Tibetan dialects such as Mdungnag Tibetan in Gansu Province in China.⁴⁰ In (29) *o* serves as an adnominal demonstrative succeeding the head noun, while in (30) and (31) it functions as a pronominal demonstrative.

The demonstrative pronoun *o~u* can also be found in modern Tibetan, as in (32) and (33).

(32) ལུ་ལས་ཀ་དེ་བཏང་ཐལ།

y_l^H $l^Lk^H\partial^H$ $d\partial^L$ $t^H\partial^L=t^Hl^L$
DEM work DEM finish=VIS

That work has been done.'

(Bdechen Tibetan, in Yunnan Province, China, provided by Wang Lan 汪嵐, private conversation, 05/2018)

(33) ཡུལ་གླ་གིས་དབྱུག་པ་བོ་ལངས་བཏང་ནས། ལག་པ་འ་བརྟེན་ནས་ཕྱི་འགྲུང་བཞག་ཟེག།

$j\partial t^v=g\partial$ $^Hj\partial kpa-w\partial$ lan $tan=n\partial$, $lakpa$:
earth.god =ERG stick-DEF take.PAST AUX=CONV hand.ALL
 $^Htan=n\partial$ $\partial^{w\partial}$: $p\partial$ $t\partial k=z\partial k$.
lean on=CONV outside.ALL go.PAST AUX=INFR

The god of earth took the stick and put it in his hand, and then went out.' (Mdungnag Tibetan, in Gansu Province, China. Independent investigation, 07-08/2014)

In (33), the demonstrative pronoun */w\partial/* is attached to the noun *^Hj\partial kpa/* 'stick' to strengthen definiteness. The phonetic value of the demonstrative pronoun in the two dialects above are a semivowel and voiced fricative consonant, respectively, which indicates that it should be reconstructed in Proto-Tibetan as **bo* or **bu*. The resulting form *'u* and *'o* have probably undergone a weakening process in OT.

The demonstrative pronoun meaning *'that'* and containing the vowel *'o~u'* is pervasive in Tibeto-Burman Languages, which has been explained comprehensively by Benedict.⁴¹ As for some newly discovered languages, the same law can also be seen, e.g., in Songlin (松林),

³⁹ At present, the functional difference between *o* and *de* in OT is not very clear; it is very likely that *o* was used in deeper layers than *de*, for in the context of OT, the latter is obviously far more frequently used than the former.

⁴⁰ In Mdungnag Tibetan, *okan* 'that'=*o+kan*, e.g., */okan-g\partial at\partial y\partial re. /* [3SG-GEN old.sister COP] (She) is her/his older sister.'

⁴¹ Benedict 1983: 75–77.

in the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China, the morphemes ‘a³¹⁻’ and ‘o³¹⁻’ constitute system opposition as follows, ‘o³¹mi⁵⁵’ (that; that person) versus ‘a³¹mi⁵⁵’ (this; this person) and ‘o³¹nda⁵⁵’ (there) versus ‘a³¹nda⁵⁵’ (here). In addition, the third person singular is ‘pu²⁴’, while the third person plural is ‘pə³¹se⁵⁵’.⁴²

4.2. Anaphora and Emphasis

Anaphoric reference is a rhetorical device marking the identity between what is being expressed and what has already been expressed.⁴³ Within the process of the demonstrative pronoun o> FP =o, the backwards-referring function of anaphora plays a key role. Pragmatically and semantically, FP=o is used to focus the hearer’s attention on entities in the preceding context; that is the reason why it tends to be optional rather than obligatory. Some scholars’ analyses of the semantics of FP=o has actually partially revealed this; e.g., Yamaguchi argues that the function of FP=o is to strengthen the agreement between subject and predicate.⁴⁴ Furthermore, one of the functions concluded by Beyer is that FP=o may be read as emphasising the assertive character of the performance;⁴⁵ this view is consistent with the above opinion.

The antecedent of the anaphor could not only be a concrete entity or property, as is *yig* in (34) and *rkong.po dkar.po* in (35), but also a preposition or comment, that is, the reference could be a nominal clause or a clause ending with a bare verb, as is *rtswa=la za* in (36).

(34) བྱང་ཕྱོགས་ན་རྒྱལ་པོ་དུ་བཞུགས་པའི་རྗེ་རབས་གྲི་ཡིག་འོ།

<i>byang.phyogs=na</i>	<i>rgyal.po=du</i>	<i>bzhugs-pa='i</i>
northern=LOC	king=TERM	reside-NOM=GEN
<i>rje.rabs=gyi</i>	<i>yig='o/</i>	
royal.genealog=GEN	record=FP	

Royal genealogies residing in the northern region. (PT 1283, ll. 1–2. Chen Jian and Wang Yao 1983: 279)

⁴² Song Cheng et al. 2019: 323–24. Note that the numbers on these words refer to tone. In particular, it should be pointed out that Songlin in fact is a pitch-accent language rather than a tone language; however, the prosodic system is inaccurately deemed to be the latter by those authors.

⁴³ Crystal 2008: 25.

⁴⁴ Yamaguchi 1986: 723–26; Yamaguchi 1998: 496–507.

⁴⁵ Beyer 1992: 353.

(35) ཉི་མྱི་ནི་རྫོང་པོ་དཀར་པོའོ།

nyi.khyi ni rkong.po dkar.po='o/
 PN TOP PLN PN=FP

Nyi khyi is the king of Rkong po Dkar po. (Wang Yao and Chen Jian 2008: 25, PT 1287, ll. 50–51)

(36) ར་མ་བཞི་རྩལ་ཟེའོ། གཡག་འཕྱི་བཞི་རྩལ་འཕྱི་ལོ།

rta snga.ba ni rtswa=la za='o/
 horse front TOP grass=ALL eat.PRS=FP
g.yag 'pyi.ba ni chu 'thung shig//
 yak back TOP water drink IND

The horse is eating the grass in front, and the yak is drinking water behind. (IOL Tib J 731, l. 65. Zheng Binglin and Huang Weizhong 2011b: 8)

The distribution of FP=*o* discussed above attracts the attention of Simon who asserts:

The final '*o*', while in its original sphere in nominal sentences only, may have encroached on the verbal sentences. Or, when occurring in verbal sentences, it may at first have been added when it properly belonged not to the final verb, to which it was appended, but to a verb of saying, thinking, believing, hoping, etc., which followed immediately after it, in a similar manner as the English 'conjunction' that originally belonged to the preceding verb as its object. Or, the addition of '*o*' may appear justified, or at least facilitated by the well-known nominal nature of the Tibetan verb.⁴⁶

Finally, he adds, "I content myself with mentioning several possible explanations for the occurrence of the demonstrative pronoun '*o*' at the end of a verbal sentence, without committing myself to any of them".⁴⁷ Simon obviously has realised the important role of the nominalisation mechanism in the grammaticalisation of FP=*o*.

DeLancey argues nominalisation has long been recognised as one of the driving processes of Tibeto-Burman syntax and syntactic change; Tibetan languages repeatedly innovate new, marked clausal constructions with a nominalised verb and finite copula.⁴⁸ The grammaticalisation of 'demonstrative pronoun > emphasis particle' reflects the process above.

⁴⁶ Simon 1942: 969–70.

⁴⁷ Simon 1942: 970.

⁴⁸ DeLancey 2011: 10.

Similar evidence from Purik tends to be more attractive. Zemp points out that, in Purik, the two demonstratives (-)de and (-)e may not only be used adnominally but also in the two clause-final positions, to wit, instead of or after the predicate.⁴⁹ The clause-final proximate *de* anaphorically points to information situated before the speech act participants. Its obviate correspondence *e* anaphorically points to information, the identification of which allows the addressee to follow the perspective of the speaker. Clause-final (-)de and (-)e clearly derive from the pre- and pronominal anaphoric demonstratives *de* ‘that’ and *e* ‘the other’. Moreover Zemp identifies the clause-final use of demonstratives as a feature of Common Tibetan.⁵⁰

4.3. Final Mood Particle

As Denwood notes, in many pre-classical texts (that is OT), there is a tendency to use FP =o more as a ‘paragraph-final’ than a ‘sentence-final’ particle, that is, it may be omitted from clauses that are not regarded as bringing a section of narrative or conversation to a close with other main-clauses ending in a bare verb stem.⁵¹ Although the terms ‘paragraph-final’ and ‘sentence-final’ are ambiguous and easy to misunderstand, the observation is insightful.

After OT, FP=o tends to occur more and more at the end of a combination of sentences having semantic coherence and a clause-chaining construction. Previous studies such as Beyer’s have also shown that it appears frequently in the archaic manuscripts from Central Asia, and occurs only infrequently in the biography of *Mi la ras pa* written by *Gtsang Smyon He ru ka*.⁵² Although rigorous statistical analysis based on the frequency of the distribution of FP=o in OT has not been carried out at present, one who has read the OT and CT literature probably would agree with this opinion. This change may reflect the process of desemantisation and decategorisation of FP=o as an emphasis particle, behaving more and more like a declarative mood particle with the erosion of the semantics of a pronoun. Note that given the ambiguities of different categories it remains unclear where the boundary between final mood particle and demonstrative pronoun is.

In addition, the process mentioned above can be found from some distribution, as the following cleft sentence shows.

⁴⁹ Zemp 2018: 689–94.

⁵⁰ Zemp’s thesis shows that he has written and submitted a paper on this topic, entitled “Clause-final demonstrative in Tibetan”; however, I have not read this paper at the date of this article going to press.

⁵¹ Denwood 1999: 249–50.

⁵² Beyer 1992: 353.

(37) གདོན་ཆེད་པོ་ཞིག་ཁྱིམ་ལུང་ལོད་པས། བྱ་དགུར་ཡང་སྟོན་གྲུབ། བ་དེ་ཡིན་འོ།

gdon ched-po=zhig khyIm.phugs jod=pas/
ghost big-NOM=INDF house exist=CONV
bya.dgu=r yang myI-grub/-pa de yIn='o//
anything=TERM also NEG-complete.PAST-NOM DEM COP=FP

The fact is that a giant ghost was in the house, and nothing could be done. (IOL Tib J 738, ll. 39–40. Zheng Binglin and Huang Weizhong 2011a: 47)

In (37), the demonstrative pronoun *de* is the focus of the cleft sentence, and the copular verb *yIn* is the main verb. The *yIn* itself has a lower frequency in OT and, in general, is always employed to indicate emphasis from ancient times to the present.⁵³ Therefore, the co-occurrence of *de*, *yIn*, and *'o* is semantically redundant. Moreover, FP=*o* invariably occupies the final position of a paragraph or a sentence, where the mood particle most naturally occurs. In general, the particle used in declarative sentences is there to strengthen the indicative mood, and usually takes the whole sentence as its scope. Along with the weakening of its emphasis function, it becomes more and more like a pure mood particle with empty semantics.

Indigenous Tibetan grammars habitually called the FP=*o* *rdzogs.tshig* 'particle indicating the sentence end', which may also reflect a grammaticalisation change, for traditional grammars are established based on CT and subsequent literature, in which FP=*o* tends to be less frequent than in OT. This phenomenon is even more typical if we consult the literature in the style of the ancients written by modern Tibetan scholars. Yamaguchi deduces that, in the spoken language around the 14th century, FP=*o* may have disappeared and become a fossil component in written style.⁵⁴ Although it is difficult to determine the specific time of its disappearance in colloquial style, it is an indisputable fact that it appears less and less after OT.

It is necessary to note that, when FP=*o* is attached to NP (e.g., NP phrase or normalisation clause), it behaves like a copular verb, and indeed in some Tibeto-Burman languages the demonstrative pronoun has a homological relationship with the Tibetan FP=*o*, having undergone an evolution of grammaticalisation under the same circumstances.⁵⁵ However, *o* in Tibetan has not undergone that process.

⁵³ The semantics feature embodied in the copula verb not only can be found in OT, but can also be found in many Tibeto-Burman Languages, as shown in Shao Mingyuan 2016.

⁵⁴ Yamaguchi 1998: 496–507.

⁵⁵ Benedict 1983: 85.

In short, FP=o in Tibetan has undergone the following grammaticalisation process: 'demonstrative pronoun > emphasis particle > mood particle', which is pervasive in human languages (see Section 5).

5. Evidence from Modern Tibetan Dialects / Tibetic Languages and a Cross-Linguistic Perspective

It is common cross-linguistically that demonstratives develop into focus/emphasis markers and mood particles through the function of anaphora. In the following section, from a cross-linguistic and typological perspective, I will show a similar path occurring in Lhasa Tibetan, Dayang Pumi, Old Chinese, and Xiaohua Hmong to provide more evidence for the study of FP=o in OT.

5.1. Lhasa Languages

Here I consider modern Tibetic data to constitute cross-language evidence since they have undergone great evolution compared with OT. Demonstrative pronouns attached to the end of a clause to convey the meaning of emphasis is widespread in modern Tibetic languages; this is one of the most powerful pieces of evidence to support the claim that FP=o originates from demonstrative pronouns in OT. Meanwhile, it also reflects the parallel grammaticalisation of the demonstratives between Old and Modern Tibetan.

Denwood regards *da*, *ga* and *nga* postponed to verb phrases in Lhasa Tibetan as emphatic markers, and argues they are essentially mood particles,⁵⁶ as in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2 Indicative and emphatic form in Lhasa Tibetan

Glossary	be:EG O	be:FAC T	ex- ist:EGO	ex- ist:MIR	come:EG O	befall:EGO	go:PAST:VI S
Indicative	<i>yin</i>	<i>red</i>	<i>yod</i>	<i>'dug</i>	<i>yong</i>	<i>byung</i>	<i>song</i>
Emphatic	<i>yin=d a</i>	<i>red=da</i>	<i>yod=d a</i>	<i>'dug=g a</i>	<i>yong=nga</i>	<i>byung=ng a</i>	<i>song=nga</i>

⁵⁶ Denwood 1999: 129–30.

- (38) *khong=la* *mang-po* *yog.red=da*.
 3sg=LOC many-NOM exist.FACT=EMPH
 She certainly has a lot.

However, he does not point out whether these morphemes have a homologous relationship, and also does not give any opinion on their etymology. In terms of distribution, *da*, *ga* and *nga* are obviously complementary (see Table 1.2 after rearrangement), which implies they are variants of the same word. Under the same circumstance, Amdo Tibetan adopts nothing but *da* to convey the same meaning.⁵⁷ Benedict contends that in some Tibeto-Burman languages, the emphasis marker *da* deriving from the demonstrative pronoun *da* is employed to strengthen the sentence mood.⁵⁸ To sum up, the emphasis marker *da* occurring in Lhasa and Amdo Tibetan show a similar function as FP=*o* in OT.

Furthermore, the table above shows that *da* occurs after an evidential marker, occupying the position of the modal particle. Denwood especially argues that *da* generally has a falling pitch in Lhasa Tibetan, which is generally consistent with the pitch declarative sentence used to express emphasis. In addition, it is optional rather than pragmatically obligatory. All these properties are similar to FP=*o* in OT.

Of course, the emphatic particle *da* in Lhasa Tibetan also shows a few differences in distribution and grammatical function when compared to OT FP=*o*, which need to be studied further in the future.

5.2. *Dayang Pumi*

Dayang Pumi (大羊普米語) is a language sub-grouped to the Qiangic branch of the Tibeto-Burman group. It is used in Dayang village, Hexi Township, Lanping Bai and Pumi Autonomous County, Yunnan Province. The proximal demonstrative pronoun *də*³¹ and the distant demonstrative prefix *o* in Dayang Pumi obviously are paronym with demonstrative pronouns *'di* and *o* in Written Tibetan, respectively. Interestingly, Jiang Ying claims that *də*³¹ has undergone grammaticalisation to express emphasis in declarative sentences as a copula, as in (39)–(40).⁵⁹

⁵⁷ For instance *di.mo.zig red-ya-da*. [of.that.kind COP-MP-FP] 'It is of that kind indeed.'

⁵⁸ Benedict 1983: 82.

⁵⁹ Jiang Ying 2015: 73–74 and 144–45.

- (39) $m\partial^{24}$ gui^{55} $t\check{s}^h u\eta^{55}$ qa^{31} $\underline{d\partial}^{24/31}$.
 sky rain fall be.going.to COP
 It is certainly going to rain.

- (40) $t\partial^{55} gu^{55}$ $gu^{55} ma\eta^{24}$ $ti^{24/55}$ $\underline{d\partial}^{24/31}$.
 3SG teacher INDF COP
 He is certainly a good teacher.

As a copula, besides the basic function of linking subject and predicate, $\underline{d\partial}^{24/31}$ can also be used to strengthen the emphasis of an assertion. In linguistic typology, one of the main sources for copula are demonstrative pronouns. Copula and final particles represent two differengrammaticalization paths of the demonstrative pronoun, but in any case, they must undergo the stage of emphasis based on anaphora, which Benedict also noticed.⁶⁰

5.3. Old Chinese

There are lots of examples of demonstratives that developed into sentence-final assertive particles in Old Chinese, such as 'ye' (也), 'yi' (矣), 'er' (爾), and 'yan' (焉).⁶¹ Such is the example of 'er' (尔) given by Guo Xiliang below.

- (41) 郁陶，思君爾。
 $yutao$ si jun er
 sad miss you ASRT
 I'm sad because I miss you. (*Mencius*, chapter *Wangzhang* 孟子·萬章)

In example (41), Guo Xiliang states that *er* is a polysemic morpheme with the function of a demonstrative pronoun and modal particle. Its primary semantic value is emphasis, that is, to draw the hearer's attention to the content of the utterance. Since it occurs at the end of the sentence, the meaning of reference is weaker than that of declarative modality, which causes many scholars to regard it as a pure modal particle.

Another interesting example is 'er' (而), which is also placed at the end of a sentence in Old Chinese, and traditionally is regarded by Chi-

⁶⁰ Benedict 1983: 93.

⁶¹ These are advocated for in Benedict 1983 and Guo Lixiang 1989.

nese scholars as a pure modal particle to denote mood. However, Simon defines 'er' in Old Chinese as a 'resumptive pronoun'.⁶² Although he does not explicitly prove whether the sentence-final particle 'er' has anaphoric function, other researchers, such as Shen Jiaxuan and Xu Liqun explicitly state that it does.⁶³ According to them, this particle is used to refer to and emphasise a state, and is a cognate with the demonstrative pronoun. Because it occurs at the end of sentence with a relatively weak referential meaning, many scholars mistake it for a pure modal particle, as in (42)–(43).

(42) 豈不爾思，室是遠而。

qi bu er si shi shi yuan er
Q NEG you miss house DEM far.away ASRT

Don't I miss you? It's just that the place where I live is too far away.

(*Analects of Confucius: Zihan* 論語·子罕)

(43) 已而，已而，今之從政者殆而。

yi er yi er jin zhi cong.zheng.zhe
give.up ASRT give.up ASRT now GEN politician

dai er
dangerous ASRT

Forget it! Forget it! People in politics these days are dangerous! (*Analects of Confucius, Weizi* 論語·微子)

5.4. Xiaohua Hmong

Xiaohua Hmong 小花苗语, affiliated with the Hmong-Mien family, is mainly spoken in Xingfa Miao-Yi Xiang Minority Village (Hezhang County, Bijie City, Guizhou Province). According to Li Yunbing and Luo Jun, its demonstrative pronoun *i*⁵⁵ 'that', occurring only in assertive propositions, has evolved into a sentence-final modal particle conveying emphasis function, as in (44)–(45).⁶⁴

(44) du³³ na⁵⁵ ʒo⁴⁴, du³³ i⁵⁵ tɕʔ⁴⁴ ʒo⁴⁴.
CL DEM.this good CL DEM.that NEG good
This one is good, that one is bad.

⁶² Simon 1951: 46–67.

⁶³ Shen Jiaxuan and Xu Liqun 2016: 3.

⁶⁴ Li Yunbing and Luo Jun Forthcoming.

- (45) *ku*⁵⁵ *du*³³ *na*³³ *zɔ*³³ *a⁴⁴nu³³gi³¹* *da*³¹ *i*⁵⁵.
 me GEN uncle is yesterday come ASRT
 It was yesterday that my uncle came.

In (44), *i*⁵⁵ is a demonstrative pronoun, while in (45), it has become a modal particle after the sentence-final verb to express emphasis. In this process, subjectivisation gradually increases along with the demonstrative pronoun undergoing decategorisation.

In general, the evolution from demonstrative pronoun to emphatic and modal particle in the four languages above can hardly be accidental; it must be the result of parallel grammaticalisation under the common cognitive mechanism, which reflects the universality of human languages. For more discussion on this process one can refer to Heine and Kuteva.⁶⁵

6. Summary and Conclusion

This article deals with the syntax, semantics, and grammaticalisation of FP =*o* in Tibetan, which is one of the issues that indigenous Tibetan grammars have always been concerned with and have been discussing for more than one thousand years. Modern scholars have also studied it from different perspectives and have drawn many valuable conclusions. However, there is no consensus on its syntactic and semantic features, and the existing research tends to be neither comprehensive nor systematic. Of course, ascertaining the relationship between FP =*o* and the demonstrative pronoun *o* and interpreting its semantic emphasis are the two greatest contributions of our predecessors to the issue, which has laid the foundation for this study.

Based mainly on OT (7th–10th century), this article comprehensively and systematically discusses the distribution, syntax, semantics and pragmatics of FP =*o*, in which I agree with Simon and Benedict's argument that the origin of FP =*o* is from the demonstrative pronoun *o* meaning 'that'.⁶⁶ On the basis of previous studies, I attempt to prove that, when FP =*o* is appended to the end of a clause, it was originally used to emphasise the component (word or phrase) involved in the sentence, that is, to convey what the speaker thinks is important to interlocutors. Within the process, anaphora—the pragmatics function contained in demonstrative pronouns—plays a key role.

The distribution of FP =*o* in OT, compared with CT, is more diverse and complex. FP =*o* is more frequent in OT than in CT. However, on

⁶⁵ Heine and Kuteva 2002: 108 and 111.

⁶⁶ Simon 1942: 968–69; and Benedict 1983: 75–76.

the other hand, the cases where FP =*o* occurs at the end of a combination of sentences and clause-chaining constructions is more common in CT than in OT, which is an important distinction. This may imply that FP =*o* still retains more emphasis functions in OT as a demonstrative pronoun but, in CT, it has become more and more empty semantically and the function of presenting emphasis is weakening, as it strengthens the subjectivity of expressing declarative mood, behaving more and more like a mood particle.

According to a cross-linguistic comparison, the grammaticalisation path of 'demonstrative pronoun > emphasis particle > modal particle' is very common in linguistic typology. Chapter 5 of this article provides more reference for the same evolutionary process based on the analysis of several languages in East Asia that may or may not be related to Tibetan. This implies that the similarity and coincidence of the grammaticalisation of the demonstrative pronoun between different languages is not occasional, but lies in cognitive function and linguistic typology.

Abbreviations

ABL	ABLATIVE
ABS	ABSOLUTIVE
ALL	ALLATIVE
ASRT	ASSERTIVE PARTICLE
AUX	AUXILIARY
CL	CLASSIFIER
CMD	COMMAND (VERB INFLECTION)
CONN	CONNECTIVE
CONV	CONVERB
COP	COPULA
CPL	COMPLETED (ASPECT)
CT	CLASSICAL TIBETAN
DEM	DEMONSTRATIVE
DIP	DISTRIBUTIVE PRONOUNS
EGO	EGOPHORIC
ELA	ELATIVE
EP	EMPHATIC PARTICLE
ERG	ERGATIVE
FACT	FACTUAL
FP	FINAL PARTICLE
FUT	FUTURE (VERB INFLECTION)
GEN	GENITIVE
H	HONORIFIC

IND	INDEFINITE MARKER
INF	INFERENTIAL
LOC	LOCATIVE
MP	MODAL PARTICLE
NDEM	NEUTRAL DEMONSTRATIVE
NMLZ	NOMINALISER
NONP	NON-PAST FORM (VERB INFLECTION)
OT	OLD TIBETAN
NEG	NEGATION
PAST	PAST FORM (VERB INFLECTION)
PERF	PERFECT
PL	PLURAL
PLN	PLACE NAME
PN	PERSON NAME
PRES	PRESENT
PRON	PROPER NOUN
Q	QUESTION PARTICLE
QUOT	QUOTATIVE
RED	REDUPLICATE
SG	SINGULAR
TERM	TERMINATIVE
TOP	TOPIC MARKER
UNC	UNCOMPLETED (ASPECT)

Bibliography

Benedict, Paul K. 1983.
 “<This> and <that> in TB/ST”, in *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman area* 7(2), 75-98.

Beyer, Stephan. 1992.
The Classical Tibetan Language. New York: State University of New York.

Bskal bzang 'gyur med and Bskal bzang dbyangs can. 2002.
Zangyu fangyan gailun 藏語方言概論 [An Introduction to Tibetan Dialects]. Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Bskal bzang 'gyur med and Bskal bzang dbyangs can. 2004.
Shiyong zangwen wenfa jiaocheng 實用藏文文法教程 [A Basic Grammar of Written Tibetan-A Practical Handbook]. Chengdu: Sichuan Nationalities Publishing House.

Bu ston Rin chen grub. 1988.

Bu ston chos 'byung gsung grab rin po che'i mdzod. Xining: Qinghai Nationalities Publishing House.

Chen Jian 陳踐 and Wang Yao 王堯. 1983.

Tun hong nas thon pa'i gna 'bo'i bod yig shog dril. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing Press.

Crystal, David. 2008.

A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (Sixth edition). London: Blackwell.

Das, Sarat Chandra. 1902.

A Tibetan-English Dictionary. Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot.

DeLancey, Scott. 2011.

"Finite structures from clausal nominalization in Tibeto-Burman", in Yap, Foongha, Grunow-Härsta, Karen and Wrona, Janick (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Denwood, Philip. 1999.

Tibetan. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dran pa'i ye shes grags pa. 1999.

Smra ba'i sgo mtsho cha lta bu zhes bya ba. Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Guo Xiliang 郭錫良. 1989.

"Xianqin yuqici xintan 先秦語氣詞新探 (二) [A new study of modal particles in Pre-Qin Period (b)]", in *Gu hanyu yanjiu 古漢語研究 [Research in Ancient Chinese Language]* 1, 74–81.

Hahn, Michael. 1996.

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

Heine, Bernd and Kuteva, Tania. 2002.

World Lexicon of Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoshi, Izumi 星泉. 2016.

古典チベット語文法『王統明鏡史』(14世紀)に基づいて [A Grammar

of Classical Tibetan based on the Clear Mirror of Royal Genealogies (the 14th century)]. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Hu Shujin 胡書津. 2000.

Jianming zangwen wenfa 簡明藏文文法 [A Brief Introduction to Tibetan Grammar]. Kunming: Yunnan Nationalities Publishing House.

Iwao, Kazushi et al. 2009.

Old Tibetan Inscriptions. Old Tibetan Documents Online Series, vol. 2. Tokyo: Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Jiang Ying 蔣穎. 2015.

Dayang Pumiyu cankao yufa 大羊普米語參考語法 [Reference grammar of Dayang Pumi]. Beijing: China Social Science Press.

Karma Situ. 2003.

Karma Situ'i sum rtags 'grel chen. Xining: Qinghai Nationalities Publishing House.

Kelly, Barbara. 2004.

"A grammar and glossary of the Sherpa language", in Genetti, Carol (ed.), in *Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal: Manange and Sherpa*, 193–321.

Li Yunbing 李雲兵 and Luo Jun 羅軍. Forthcoming.

Lun xiaohua miaoyu de zhishi ci 論小花苗語的指示詞 [Demonstrative pronoun in Xiaohua Hmong].

Rus pa'i rgyan can. 1979.

Rnal 'byor gyi dbang phyug chen po mi la ras pa'i rnam mgur. Lhasa: Tibet People's Publishing House.

Sa skya Bsod nams Rgyal mtshan. 1981.

Rgyal rabs gsal ba'i me long [Records of Tibetan Royal Lineage]. Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Shao Mingyuan 邵明園. 2016.

"The grammaticalization of the copula verb *red* in Tibetic Languages", in *Language and Linguistics* 17(5), 679–715.

Shen Jiaxuan 沈家煊 and Xu Liqun 許立群. 2016.

"Cong 'liushuiju' de texing kan xianqin 'ming er dong' jiegou 從'流水

句'的特性看先秦'名而動'結構 [Reanalysis of the Pre-Qin 'N er V' Construction from the Perspective of Run-on Sentences]", in *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies* 6, 1–11.

Simon, Walter. 1942.

"Tibetan *tang, cing, kyin, yin, and 'am'*", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10(4), 954-75.

Simon, Walter. 1951.

"*Der erl jiann (得而見) and der jiann (得見)* in Luenyeu (論語), VII, 25", in *Asia Major* 2(1), 46–67.

Song Cheng 宋成 et al. 2019.

Xizang chayu songlin yu 西藏察隅松林語 [A Grammar of Songlin distributing in Tibetan Zayü County]. Beijing: Commercial Press.

Thurgood, Graham. 1982.

"The Sino-Tibetan copula *wəy", in *Cahiers de linguistique asie orientale* 11(1), 65–82.

Wang Yao 王堯 and Chen Jian 陳踐. 2008.

Dunhuang gu zangwen wenxian tansuo ji 敦煌古藏文文獻探索集 [A Collection of Old Tibetan Documents of Dunhuang]. Shanghai: Shanghai Rarebooks Publishing House.

Yamaguchi, Zuihō 山口瑞鳳. 1986.

"*Rdzogs tshig no hataraki to youhou no henshen/rdzogs tshig* の働きと用法の変遷 [A historical Account of the Functions of *rdzogs tshig*]", in Yamaguchi, Zuihō 山口瑞鳳, (ed.), *Tibetto no bukkyō to syakai* チベットの仏教と社会 [Buddhism and Society in Tibet], 697–736. Tokyo: Shunjusha.

Yamaguchi, Zuihō 山口瑞鳳. 1998.

Chibettogo Bungo Bunpō チベット語文語文法 [A Grammar of Written-Tibetan]. Tokyo: Shunjusha.

Zemp, Marius. 2018.

A Grammar of Purik Tibetan. Leiden: Brill.

Zemp, Marius. Forthcoming.

"Clause-final demonstrative in Tibetan", in *Linguistics of the Tibeto Burman Area*.

Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林 and Huang Weizhong 黃維忠 (eds). 2011a. *Dunhuang Tufanwenxian xuanji: wenhua juan* 敦煌吐蕃文獻選集:文化卷 [A Selection of Tibetan Manuscripts from Dunhuang: Culture]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing Press.

Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林 and Huang Weizhong 黃維忠 (eds). 2011b. *Dunhuang Tufan wenxian xuanji: wenxue juan* 敦煌吐蕃文獻選集:文學卷 [A Selection of Tibetan Manuscripts from Dunhuang: Literature]. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing Press.

