Knowing, Experiencing, and Reporting: Grammar and Participant Roles in a Tibetan Woman's Oral History

Shannon M. Ward^a

^a*Department of Anthropology, New York University, 25 Waverly Place, New York, NY 10003, United States*

I. Introduction

Oral histories serve both to construct a community's social memory, and to preserve personal histories for a wider audience. And yet, it is through language, unfolding in specific interactive contexts, that the construction of oral histories begins. Using theories from linguistic anthropology about the co-constitution of interaction and grammar, this article provokes the reader to question the role of multi-lingual talk in creating oral histories. Generic conventions govern oral histories, which often begin with an interview between an oral historian and an interviewee—the oral history's subject. During the interview and in the grooming of a final product distributed to publics through archives, online collections, and museums, the subject's words undergo multilayered processes of revelation and reconstruction, across ideologies of history, memory, authority, and, frequently, across languages.

This article is based on a case study of one Tibetan woman's oral history, conducted through the private organization Tibet Oral History Project (TOHP). Specifically, I address the holistic interactive and linguistic construction of oral histories by examining the grammatical realization of participant roles in the oral history interview of Cho Lhamo. One of six interviews undertaken as a pilot for TOHP in California in 2006, Cho Lhamo's interview was added to an archive of a total of 212 oral history interviews conducted through TOHP. Beginning from the premise that grammar co-constitutes the organization of social life (Ochs et. al. 1996), I look across three dimensions of talk—the relations among embodied participants, the parsing of discourse units,

and the translation of grammatical resources unique to Tibetan into English—in Cho Lhamo’s oral history interview. This analysis focuses on one step in the process of creating a published oral history that conforms to the aesthetics of the TOHP’s collection. As the project’s website states, ‘The goal of the Tibet Oral History Project is to document the life stories of Tibetan elders living in exile, and to disseminate that information through print, broadcast media, and the internet for the purposes of education and the preservation of the culture and history of Tibet.’¹ In order to achieve the dual goals of education and preservation, TOHP undertook a multilayered textual project involving several processes of recontextualization across languages and media forms. First, in the course of each interview, the oral history must achieve a linearity that facilitates entextualization, defined by Briggs and Bauman as the objectification of a discourse unit that allows it to be removed from its initial interactive setting (1990: 73). In this case, narrative units from the initial interviews are extracted, and come to serve as first-hand testimony as they are recontextualized through two other media forms employed by TOHP: complete written English summaries of the interviews, published on TOHP’s website and distributed to libraries, and excerpted video clips from the interviews, available on TOHP’s website and VIMEO. The video clips feature only the interviewee, divorced from the surrounding discourse that includes an interviewer and translator, and are subtitled in English. Here, I attend to the first stage of production, the oral history interview, which involves three primary participants: an interviewer speaking English, an interviewee speaking Tibetan, whose competence in English remains unacknowledged during the interview, and a translator speaking in both Tibetan and English.² The aesthetic grooming for later dissemination and translation across media begins even in this first stage, with attempts to distill multi-lingual and multi-party talk into monologic

¹ <http://www.tibetoralhistory.org/aboutus.html>

² ‘Translation and Transcription in the Tibet Oral History Project’ (Ward, in prep) examines later stages in the construction of Cho Lhamo’s oral history.

form. As the analysis reveals, shifts in the distribution of knowledge across participants are erased, specifically, by obscuring the role of the translator, and by losing testimonial information encoded in the grammar of Tibetan once Cho Lhamo's words are rendered in English. The local management of expression transforms complex multi-party talk into the interviewer's extraction of knowledge from Cho Lhamo. Cho Lhamo comes to serve as an authentic source of cultural history.

The background to TOHP reveals political and linguistic ideologies that guide the interview. Marcella Adamski, the founder and executive director, created the project at the behest of the Dalai Lama. While attending a meeting with the Dalai Lama to discuss findings from a human rights investigation that Adamski was carrying out with the NGO Tibet Justice Center, she asked the Dalai Lama 'what else we could do to help the people of Tibet.' He responded with a call to interview the oldest Tibetans. As Adamski recounts in an article about the meeting, the Dalai Lama 'wanted these stories preserved for the Tibetan people and for the next generation of Chinese who had no idea of what really happened to their Tibetan neighbors because of their government's control of information. He also suggested that these eyewitness accounts be put on the Internet so that the world community would understand the true history and plight of the Tibetan people.'³ Adamski portrays the Dalai Lama's call to action as an explicitly political act of preserving culture through the words of individual elders. Based upon the presupposition of a unified Tibetan community, with a shared history of trauma perpetrated by the Chinese, the Dalai Lama's statement presents oral histories as a form of first-hand testimony to be transmitted in English to an international audience. That is, the individual elder is treated as a unitary speaker

³ Marcella Adamski, December 2007, 'Survival of the Heart: Preserving the Tibetan Culture,' in *The San Francisco Psychologist*, p. 1, 8, 13: http://www.tibetoralhistory.org/Articles/Survival_of_the_Heart.pdf (accessed 7 September, 2015).

whose words bear witness to collective suffering, even when the medium of transmission has been transformed.

Linguistic anthropological concerns with voicing (Bakhtin 1981; Hill 1995; Keane 1999, 2011) and speaker relations in face-to-face interaction (Goffman 1974, 1981, 1983; Goodwin 2007; Ochs & Capps 2001), however, have demonstrated the work involved in producing authoritative, unitary speakers. As Bakhtin argued, 'Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated—overpopulated—with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and actions, is a difficult and complicated process' (1981: 294). While Bakhtin (1981) looked to the multiplicity of voices within an individual's speech, Goffman (1981) analyzed the distribution of voices across interactants (Keane 1999: 272). Goffman viewed interaction as an achievement of mutual orientation shaped by shared 'frames,' or social principles of organization (1974: 10-11). The frame governs the entire 'social situation,' or the lived relations among participants that unfold through and bear upon expressive management in talk. As further described below, however, several contradictory frames arise in the course of Cho Lhamo's interview, brought about by the relationship of the interviewee and translator, and by the different understandings of genre that the interviewer and interviewee espouse.

While Goffman's notion of 'frame' suggests an interactive order upheld through conventions in the organization of attention, the concept of genre sheds light on the role conventions in language (and associated sign systems) play in achieving mutual orientation. As Hanks argues, genres consist not only of groupings of formal elements, but also of the expectations and ideals through which they are produced and interpreted (1987: 671). In producing Cho Lhamo's oral history, the interactants mutually oriented to frames that cut across the boundaries of genres

espoused by different speech communities. Barnett (2010) identifies American-produced Tibetan oral histories as a genre of written and/or visual media primarily intended for consumption by Western, English-speaking audiences (especially those with the real or imagined capability to intervene in Tibet's fight for independence or the safe-guarding of refugees living abroad). A tradition with origins in the institutionally-supported documentation of the lives of marginalized peoples within America and Europe, American practices of oral history search 'for a narrative that explains itself more or less completely...for an almost literary text, a thing that stands alone and does not require rewriting by an editor or knowledge on the part of the reader' (2010: 79). In contrast to the pursuit of isolated monologues, Tibetan migrants have performed life histories—in both text and talk—as a means of forming social memory in exile (McGranahan 2001). The active formation of this social memory has privileged linear narratives of resistance and exile⁴ as collective 'Tibetan histories' (ibid: 54-58). And, both American techniques of testimony and documentation through interviews, and older, uniquely Tibetan historiographical practices including religious autobiographies written and/or told collaboratively by teachers and disciples, have influenced Tibetans' engagement with oral history projects (ibid: 60). McGranahan traces the appearance of testimony authored by exiled Tibetans to interviews published in *Yulchog Sosoï Sargyur Melong* ('Tibet Mirror'), the first Tibetan newspaper, which was created in Kalimpong in 1925 and continued through the Chinese liberation of 1959 until 1962 (2010: 71-72).⁵ And yet, practices of testimonial and religious oral history extend across exiled and non-exiled communities. Chinese presses, for example, have published Tibetan stories about rebirth and the transmigration of the soul, transcribed after a religious practice that

⁴ McGranahan notes the use of the word *grung*, or 'story,' to refer to narrative histories specifically among people from Eastern Tibet. Interestingly, Cho Lhamo and her daughter both employ this term in the course of the interview, and Cho Lhamo and her family grew up on the border of Central and Eastern Tibet.

⁵ http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/digital/collections/cul/texts/ldpd_6981643_000/index.html (accessed 8 August, 2015).

involves a lama interviewing individuals about their life experiences and ascertaining their connections to previous lives (tshul-khrims-blo-gros 2004). Also, the Tibetan literary tradition, *rnam thar*, a specific form of hagiography that combines the biographies of the lives of Buddhist saints with details of their meditative practices, demonstrates the persistence of biographical narrative since the 12th-13th centuries (Willis 2009; Quintman 2013: 56). And, contemporary writers have popularized English language translations and summaries of *rnam thar* texts online.⁶ In fact, the presence of English summaries may not function only as a means of disseminating texts to Euro-American audiences (cf. Barnett 2010), but also as a means of making them accessible to Tibetans living across continents who possess differing competencies in varieties of written and spoken Tibetan (McGranahan 2001: 55).

The interviewer, interviewee, and translator likely approached the interactive context with some common expectations of its genre. For example, McGranahan notes the significance of the Dalai Lama's call for Tibetans to tell their personal histories as testimony and as a contribution to the exile community's accumulation of historical and cultural knowledge (2001: 54-55). As described above, TOHP's founder's interaction with the Dalai Lama, in which he articulated this same call, provided the impetus for the project. And yet, uniquely Tibetan understandings of genre, including those influenced by its roots in religious history and the Tibetan language's grammatical marking of knowledge, remain inaccessible to the interviewer. As Briggs argued, interviewers' detachment from such culturally-specific frames can lead to an impasse, since their 'ability to banish the native communicative norms that operate in other environments is far from complete, and the natives' own discourse rules have an odd way of infiltrating the interview'

⁶ A notable example is *Treasury of Lives*, an online collection of English-language biographies of Tibetan and Himalayan historical figures (<http://treasuryoflives.org/>, accessed 1 August, 2015).

(1986: 39). In the following analysis, I look specifically to such concealed moments of rupture in communication.

II. Creating the Data

The key studies of Tibetan languages have demonstrated that communicative context of any Tibetan utterance vitally shapes its grammatical configuration (Agha 1993b). For example, Agha's analysis of Lhasa Tibetan honorifics (1993a) shows the importance of the local interaction as the site for enacting deference and renewing status roles, by linking conventional performances of deference to social identities that endure outside local contexts. And yet, within the local context, speakers do not enact a single status position. For example, speakers may employ the honorifics expected from an addressee's perspective with respect to a third-person referent. In conversation with Agha's work, DeLancey's (1990) model of the Tibetan evidential system suggests that, like honorifics, features of evidentiality provide a resource for interactive participants to establish their positions with respect to each other and to narrated events. In particular, DeLancey highlights the differentiation of "the notion of an act of volition" from "the ultimate cause of a volitional act" (ibid: 292), suggesting that Tibetan speakers emphasize particular relationships with regards to evidence and responsibility. Like Agha's study of honorifics, the below analysis demonstrates that grammatical features do not statically impose themselves upon interaction. Participants, rather, creatively navigate through the local context of interaction through the evidential system.

This paper therefore complements Agha and DeLancey's previous work, by moving the communicative context from elicited talk and shorter 'natural' speech segments to a generically crafted narrative. As described above, both genres and interactive frameworks co-constitute the grammatical resources employed in talk. And, translation from Tibetan to English, a unique

process of recontextualization, reveals the translator's underlying assumptions about *how* to extract meaning from the interviewee's speech. In order to trace the layering of these grammatical resources and their recontextualization, I returned to the DVD of the oral history interview. I created a detailed transcript of both Tibetan and English speech, and added a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss of Tibetan segments.⁷ Following Schieffelin, I recorded all transcription sessions, and coded relevant metalinguistic talk to the transcript (1990: 30-32).

In the process of transcription and analysis, I attended, in particular, to configurations of evidentiality, ergativity, and egophoricity. I define evidentiality conventionally as the grammatical marking of information source (Aikhenvald 2006; Aikhenvald & Dixon 2014; Chafe & Nichols 1986). While Chafe and Nichols argue that evidentiality demonstrates a 'natural epistemology,' or a universal tendency towards recognizing the relativity of truth claims (1986: vii), Schieffelin offers, instead, the description of evidentiality as a 'cultural epistemology' (1996: 443). According to Schieffelin, the grammatical marking of evidentiality, as it plays out in everyday talk, shapes norms and expectations surrounding the disclosure and display of knowledge (ibid). In the case of Tibetan, the evidential system seems to cue speakers specifically to the difference between acts of witnessing, and involuntary perception or reception of feeling states. Evidential marking is grammatically obligatory in most circumstances, and appears both in copulas and auxiliary verb configurations. Following Garrett (2001) and Tournadre (2008), I define the main categories of Tibetan evidentials as direct (including testimonial, inferential, and revelatory), indirect (including non-egophoric or quotative), and egophoric. All of these evidentials function as auxiliary verbs when suffixed to a root verb, and also carry tense-aspect meanings depending upon their combination with nominalizing particles.

⁷ I worked with two transcription assistants, Tenzin Choezom in Kathmandu, and Sonam Tsering in New York City.

In the absence of a root verb, the evidentials serve as copulas (Garrett 2001; Tournadre 2008). As copulas, each particle also possesses either an existential/locative or factive/essential meaning. The morpheme glosses in the following segments of transcription largely follow the Leipzig glossing rules.⁸ However, in order to highlight the evidential meanings at play in the interaction, I have marked evidentials as either auxiliaries (AUX) or copulas (COP) and specified their meaning according to the above categories in parentheses.⁹ Additionally, I have employed conventions in conversation analysis for marking pauses (.), rising tones (?), falling tones (.), and moments of interruption through latching (=) and overlap ([]).^{10 11}

In Tibetan, evidentials provide additional information not only about information source, but also about participants' relations to knowledge, especially through the intersections of evidentiality, split-ergativity and egophoricity. Linguists hold a general consensus that ergativity expresses an agent's maximal volition (Bavin & Stoll 2013; DeLancey 1981, 1990; Ochs 1986). Languages, such as Tibetan, that show differentially distributed ergative markers, are termed 'split-ergative' languages. In Tibetan, ergative marking is not obligatory, and can only occur with a class of volitional verbs.¹² In canonical-egophoric systems, an egophoric particle expresses personal knowledge or intention on the part of the speaker in declarative sentences. In

⁸ <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php> (accessed 7 September, 2015).

⁹ Additional abbreviations particular to Tibetan include quotative clitic (QC) and confirmation-seeking question particle (CFSQ) (as developed in Lempert 2012). Auxiliary configurations that function as epistemic mode have also been marked accordingly.

¹⁰ I have omitted certain excerpts for brevity, and marked these passages with ellipses ((...)).

¹¹ I initially transcribed speech in Tibetan script. For the excerpts provided in the paper, I have chosen to follow the Wylie (1959) transliteration system. Each line is followed by a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss. Also, I have chosen to follow the spelling rules of literary Tibetan in transcribing verb roots that are phonetically identical but orthographically distinct across tense-aspect forms. While the inflection of Tibetan verb roots can be syllable-internal (often involving a vowel change), or external, involving affixes, in Standard Tibetan, only certain cases of syllable-internal changes render tense-aspect forms phonetically distinct. An English translation of each complete move is then provided below the gloss. Parentheses in the English translation indicate an element that is covertly marked in the Tibetan gloss. In the transcript, Tibetan words are italicized, and Hindi loan-words are underlined.

¹² Varieties of Tibetan differ, however, in the distribution of the ergative. Amdo Tibetan, for example, requires more ergative marking than Central Tibetan (Sun 1997). Some have observed that the ergative in Central Tibetan is grammatically obligatory only on volitional verbs in the perfective aspect.

direct questions, the speaker marks the interrogative subject with the same egophoric particle associated with personal knowledge, in anticipation of the hearer's response (Hale 1980, San Roque et. al. 2015: 16-20, Tournadre 2008).¹³ Egophoricity thus encodes the distribution of knowledge across speakers in an interactive context. And yet the question remains as to whether, cross-linguistically, egophoric markers should be viewed as evidentials, person-markers, or something else (San Roque et al. 2015: 18).

Communicative norms of researchers and subjects, co-constituted by grammatical forms and genres of speaking, intersect in interview settings (Briggs 1986; Koven 2014). I therefore approached the interview as an example of locally managed multi-party talk. Goffman disaggregates three units of participation within such social situations: the collective 'participation framework,' the 'participation status' of individual speakers and hearers within the framework, and the 'production format,' or the roles through which speakers move. The production format, then, encompasses the 'animator' (the physical sounding box), the 'author' (the person[s] whose sentiments are being expressed), and the 'principal' (the person[s] whose position is being established through talk). Goffman argues that the 'self' emerges as a stable persona through the recurrent management of expression and comportment enacted within participation frameworks. However, the self is a cumulative effort, not a fixed entity, since interactants' inhabitation of participant roles shifts throughout talk and its subsequent circulation and recall.

Previous case studies have demonstrated that participants' relation to knowledge remains a key factor structuring their interactive roles (Hill & Irvine 1992). In Tibetan, however, the intersection of evidentiality, ergativity, and egophoricity prevents person-marking from clearly

¹³ While in certain languages, egophoricity corresponds to a conjunct/disjunct system, Tournadre (2008) argues that the form of quotatives and epistemic auxiliaries refute the relevance of the 'conjunct'/'disjunct' distinction to Tibetan languages.

mapping onto a self/other—or even author/animator—distinction, and therefore complicates the direct application of Goffman’s participant roles. In the course of Cho Lhamo’s oral history interview, Goffman’s animator, author, and principal interact with but do not map onto the grammatically encoded roles of knower, experiencer, and reporter. And, as Cho Lhamo’s words are recontextualized across languages and media, she drifts from a first-person narrator to a ‘figure,’ which Goffman defines as ‘someone, after all, who belongs to the world that is spoken about, not the world in which the speaking occurs’ (1981: 147). It is Cho Lhamo’s figure, rather than herself as first-person author or animator of her own life history, that endures throughout successive recontextualizations. I therefore take the knower, the experiencer, and the reporter as the three primary roles inhabited by the interactants in the oral history interview as they produce the figure of Cho Lhamo. And, I will demonstrate that the TOHP’s finished products aim to discover an authentic source of cultural history in Cho Lhamo’s speech, which results in a conflation of the knower, experiencer, and reporter in the figure of Cho Lhamo.

III. Establishing the Participation Framework

As described above, the interview itself involved three primary participants: Cho Lhamo (C), Marcella Adamski, referred to throughout the paper in her capacity as interviewer (I), and Cho Lhamo’s daughter, Tashi Chodon, who served as a translator (T).¹⁴ The interview proceeded through a series of semi-structured questions, initiated by the interviewer and then reiterated to Cho Lhamo through Tashi Chodon. The interviewer developed the questioning series ahead of time. As the project expanded, a group of trained interviewers (from TOHP) and translators (born and raised in Tibetan exile communities in India) moved through the same question series

¹⁴ A videographer was also on scene but not featured, and focused the camera on Cho Lhamo’s face, very rarely moving the frame to include Adamski or Tashi Chodon

in all interviews. The interview methodology nonetheless aimed to provide opportunities for interviewees to interject or redirect the line of questioning.¹⁵

In Cho Lhamo's interview, every instance of Tashi Chodron's repetitions of the interviewer's questions involved the use of a quotative clitic *zer* [s], which marks the preceding speech as a direct quotation.¹⁶ As demonstrated below, along with the series of structured questions, the quotative clitic builds a template for turn-taking that both the interviewer and translator seek to uphold:

1 I: I'd like to begin by asking you, where were you born?

2 T: *khyed.rang ga.pa-la skyes-pa.red-zer*
you where-LOC born-AUX (non-egophoric perfective)-QC
'Where were you born?'

The linguistic and interactive form of this questioning sequence was sustained throughout the entire interview; the interviewer initiates all questions, which are then relayed through Tashi Chodron to Cho Lhamo with the quotative clitic. Initially, each interlocutor retains the possibility of adjusting the content to her own interpretation of the prompts. For example, in response to this question, Cho Lhamo launched into an extensive family history, and maintained important distinctions between her mother's and father's kin groups and their social statuses. At this moment, however, Tashi Chodron insists upon more routinized question-answer sequences, with more predictable responses. By quoting both the interviewer's previous turns and Cho Lhamo's potential responses, Tashi Chodron establishes the form and content of appropriate responses. Rather than translating her mother's answer to the interviewer, she asserts,

1 T: ((to C)) *cirtshong bsod.nam rin.chen 'dra.mi.'dra ma-lab-dang*
Chirtsong Sonam Rinchen different NEG-say-IMP/HON
Please don't talk about Chirtsong Sonam Rinchen and all that.

¹⁵ TOHP, 2007, 'Background and Methods'.

¹⁶ The quotative clitic is a grammaticalized form of the verb 'to say.' Since the quotative clitic lacks a standard written form, I have rendered it as the full word *zer* ('to say') (as in Liberman 2004: 105).

2 T: ((to I)) Ok, it's not-she's talking too far and it's uh not working well.

3 T: *ama nga skad.cha-bzhad-dus khyed.rang dus.tshod lab-yag yod<ma>red-da*
mother I talk-VZR-when you time say-NZR COP<NEG>(existential)-EMP

4 *ha.go- 'dug-ga*
understand-AUX(testimonial)-CFSQ

5 *yin.na khyed.rang ga.pa-r skyes lab-dus red-pa*
but you where-LOC born say-while COP(factive)-CFSQ

6 *family-gi rgyud pura ma-lab-dang*
family-GEN lineage all NEG-say-IMP/HON

7 *de dang.po khyed.rang ga.pa-r skyes-zer lab-dus*
DEM first you where-LOC born-QC say-while

8 *kongpo-la skyes-pa,red-zer lab-na*
Kongpo-LOC born-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-QC say-COND

9 *'grig-gi.red*
okay-AUX(non-egophoric imperfective)

Mom, when I'm talking, it's not your time to talk. Understand? But, when (she) asks where you were born, don't give the whole family's lineage. First, when (she) says, 'where were you born,' it's okay to say, '(I) was born in Kongpo.'

10 C: *a.las*
EXCL
Oh

11 T: ((inaudible)) *gzhug.gor rjes-la*
((inaudible)) beginning after-LOC

12 *nang.mi-gi rigs.rgyud lab-dang lab-dus*
family-GEN genealogy say-IMP/HON say-while

13 *de-tsho sgrung pura khag.khag yod.red-pa*
DEM-PL story all different COP(existential)-CFSQ

14 *sgrung de.'dra lab*
story DEM-like say/IMP

15 *ngas-gis cig lab-tshar-pa.red-pa*
1-ERG-ERG* ART say-finish-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-CFSQ

16 *de.'dra-s lab*
DEM-like-ADVZR say/IMP

17 *ngas-gis lag.pa e.'dra byed.dus khyod e.'dra-s bsdad-a*
1-ERG-ERG* hand DEM-like do-while you DEM-like-ADVZR stay-IMP

After the beginning, when (she) asks you to say the family's genealogy, there are all different stories. Say the stories like this. After I finish talking, say like this. While I have my hand up, you stay like this (i.e. without talking).

18 T: ((to I)) let's go all the way in because I'm telling her that she,

19 she cannot talk in between when I'm talking and I cannot when she's talking=

20 I: =when she's talking=

21 T: =When I do this she should stop because I cannot, you know.

22 I: You know what, I'll start with the birthday because I just figured out how old your mother is.

23 She's-she was born in 41.

24 So, Amma-la, welcome to the oral history project.

25 How old are you today?

26 T: *ama-lags khyed.rang lo ga.tshod red-zer*
mother-HON you year how many COP(factive)-QC
'Amma-la how old are you?'

27 C: *lo drug.cu.re.nga*
year 65
65

28 T: 65

29 I: 65? And what year were you born?

30 T: *khyod skyes-dus ani lo.rtags ci red-zer*
you born-while and Tibetan birth year what COP(factive)-QC
'And what year was it when you were born?'

31 C: *nga-i skyes-kyi lo 'brug red 'brug*
1-GEN born-GEN year dragon COP(factive) dragon
My birth-year was the year of the dragon.

32 T: I was born in dragon year.

33 I: Dragon year. That sounds like it was 1941.

34 T: *da de.nas 1941-les skyes-yin.sa.red-zer*
EMP then 1941-ABL born-AUX(epistemic probability)-QC
'And then (you) were probably born in 1941.'

35 C: *red*
COP(factive)
Yes.

In this opening segment, authority over the content of talk circulates among interviewer, interviewee, and translator. The interviewer's questioning first provides an opportunity for Cho Lhamo to direct the content of talk towards an extensive family history. Tashi Chodon's

corrections of Cho Lhamo, however, move the talk towards a specific form that she deems appropriate. The interviewer also responds to Tashi Chodon's frustration, using the subsequent question to elicit pre-identified information, Cho Lhamo's birthdate, again in a specific form, a year in the Western calendar.

In Goffmanian terms, throughout interview's production format, the roles of author and animator drift between Cho Lhamo, Tashi Chodron, and the interviewer. Ironically, however, while Cho Lhamo serves as the ultimate source of memory, in her control over questioning, the interviewer retains the role of principal, or the social party whose position is established through talk. As Tashi Chodon directs the content and timing of her mother's responses, she constructs an ideal conversational and narrative trajectory in line with her understandings of the expectations of the interviewer (and, by extension, of the genre of oral history). Absent in the other versions of the oral history, including the complete written English summary, Tashi Chodon's stage-like directions for managing the incoming linguistic inputs from Cho Lhamo (lines 3-8), are hidden from the oral history's audience. The explicit goals of the oral history project emphasize the interviewee's first-hand knowledge and experience. And yet, since the interviewer's questions lead the talk, and the translator directs the interviewee towards specific responses, the conversation's architecture most clearly establishes the perspective of the interviewer. The interviewer, in fact, shapes the interviewee's knowledge. In order to maintain the authenticity of Cho Lhamo's voice, however, the TOHP aesthetically altered the conversation in its subsequent forms, casting her responses as spontaneous and monologic.

Furthermore, through the linguistic form of Tashi Chodon's translation, she effaces her own role as animator, of both Cho Lhamo's and the interviewer's voices. While she, in fact, actively shapes Cho Lhamo's responses, she casts herself only as a direct reporter of Cho

Lhamo's speech. Tibetan offers a quotative particle, *zer* [s], along with various verba dicendi, as mechanisms for describing previous speech. The configuration of the quotative clitic and verba dicendi, along with non-obligatory ergative person-marking, demonstrates greater or lesser emphasis upon the original act of speaking. The question-answer architecture of the talk works with Tashi Chodron's linguistic mechanisms for animation to erase the role of the translator. The interviewer directs her initial questions directly to Cho Lhamo as "Amma-la," addressing Tashi Chodron only when Tashi Chodron first addresses her (lines 18-23). Tashi Chodron's use of the quotative *zer* further contributes to this effacement of translation. When translating the interviewer's words, she employs the quotative clitic *zer* without pronouns or matrix verbs, directly reporting speech in a manner that lacks explicit reference to the speaker or act of speaking (lines 2, 26, 30, and 34).^{17 18} In contrast, her inclusion of verba dicendi and temporal adverbs, when instructing Cho Lhamo about how to respond to these questions (in lines 5-9), portrays the ideal, hypothetical acts of speaking that she wishes her mother to emulate. That is, Tashi Chodon includes verba dicendi along with the quotative clitic to highlight acts of speaking. The isolated quotative clitic thus iconizes the interviewer's questions, in a manner that dissociates them from the translator's own act of speaking. Tashi Chodon similarly iconizes Cho Lhamo's responses when translating them for the interviewer in English. Rather than employing a quotative construction, Tashi Chodon speaks with the first person pronoun, which

¹⁷ As Tournadre notes, this speech pattern requires a specific prosody, allowing the animator to differentiate reported speech from other talk without indicating person or the act of speaking (2008: 300 n. 45).

¹⁸ Lempert notes a similar dynamic in Tibetan monastic debate. Drawing from material collected in Ithaca, New York, and South India, Lempert found that the use of verba dicendi demonstrated greater responsibility for the act of uttering reported speech. Monastic debate involves a challenger, who questions and scrutinizes the answers of a defendant, who responds by reporting supporting evidence for claims from Buddhist texts. The defendant employs a quotative clitic, in the same form as Tashi Chodron, so that he 'seems to merge his voice with the impersonal voice of tradition' (2007: 263). The challenger first repeats the defendant's lines with quotative clitic framing, challenging only the invocation of the doctrines from which the defendant builds his argument (2012: 67). As the debate intensifies, the challenger uses the verba dicendi *byas*, which 'spotlights the defendant's act of reporting: this is what the defendant claims tradition says' (2012: 67).

here refers to Cho Lhamo. She animates Cho Lhamo's words as their author, assimilating their voices to one. At the same time, she imposes an authority structure marked by her continued other-initiated repair of her mother's words.

Later on, the interviewer's explicit questioning about acts of political violence further demonstrates the grammatical realization of participant roles in the knower, experiencer, and reporter.

- 1 I: Ah, ok.
 2 Well, thank you both—so, maybe what we'll do with the time now is talk about what happens
 3 next in your life.
 4 And one question I had is what did you, when did you first realize that your life was changing
 5 because the Chinese—because of the Chinese.

After receiving the translation from Tashi Chodon, Cho Lhamo describes how the Chinese initially tried to present themselves positively to the Tibetan people. Without translating her mother's words, Tashi Chodon asks the interviewer,

- 6 T: Ok. You know? Should I tell her to answer when, and then and um,
 7 because she's telling the whole story of when she first, when the Chinese first,
 8 do you have another question?]
 9 I: [No, that's fine. No, it's fine.
 10 If she just, I'm just trying to get at that issue so however she tells it. What did she say?
 11 T: Ask the question again.
 12 I: Ok, oh ((giggles)) Ok, well.
 13 When did you first notice something was changing because of the Chinese?

- 14 T: *de.nas khyed.rang dang.po rgya babs-nas khyod-kyis ma.'dra-nyan*
 DEM you first Chinese come.down\ PST-ABL 2-ERG dissimilar-NZR
 15 *'dra.po khyed.rang-gi mi.tshe de 'gro-stangs ma.'dra-nyan zhig*
 like 2-GEN life DEM go-NZR dissimilar-NZR ART
 16 *'gro-gi-yod.sa.red*
 happen-AUX(imperfective epistemic mode)
 17 *bsams-yag de ga.dus-tsam-nas ha.go-song-zer*
 feel-NZR DEM when-about-ABL understand-AUX(testimonial perfective)-QC
So, 'when the Chinese first arrived, things changed, like, your way of life probably changed. About what time did you notice this?'

- 18 C: *da rgya.mi-s dang.po yag.po-byas-red-pa*
DEM chinese-ERG first good-VZR-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-CFSQ
- 19 *gzhug-la togtsam dam.drag-btang*
CAUS-LOC some restrictions-VZR\PST
- 20 *de lung.bstan nang-la-ang yod.red-da*
DEM prophecy in-LOC-also COP(non-egophoric existential)-EMP
- 21 *rgya.mi lo de.'dra-la rgya.mi slebs-yong-yag*
chinese year DEM-LOC Chinese arrive-come-NZR
- 22 *lo de.'dra zhig sdug.po-gtong-gi.yod.red zer-nas*
year DEM ART bad-VZR-AUX(non-egophoric imperfective) say-ABL
- 23 *apha ama apha yi.ge-i nang-la lung.bstan gu.ru.rin.po.che-i lung.bstan nang-la*
father mother father letter-GEN in-LOC prophecy Padmasambhava-GEN prophecy in-LOC
- 24 *'don-gi.yod.red-pa*
come out-AUX(non-egophoric imperfective)-CFSQ
- 25 *de.'dra lab-bsdad-kyi.yod.red*
DEM tell-stay-AUX(non-egophoric imperfective)
- 26 *de gzhug-la rgya.mi babs-byas-nas*
DEM CAUS-LOC chinese come down-VZR-ABL
- 27 *da sdug.po re-gi.yod.red-zer*
DEM bad become-AUX(non-egophoric imperfective)-QC
- 28 *chos pura bstan.pa snyubs-'gro-gi.yod.red zer-nas*
religion all religious teachings destroy\RES-go-AUX(non-egophoric imperfective) say-ABL
- 29 *apha ama-s bshad-kyi.yod.red red-pa*
father mother-ERG speak-AUX(non-egophoric imperfective) COP(factive)-EMP
- 29 *da rgya.mi-de-s ga.'dra zhig byed-kyi.yod.na*
DEM chinese-DEM-ERG how ART do-COND(imperfective)
- 30 *tog.stam bsam-gyi.'dug*
little think-AUX(imperfective testimonial)
- 31 *lo.chung.chung red-pa*
young COP(factive)-CFSQ
- 32 *zhe.drag bsam-thub-kyi<mi>'dug*
really think-able-AUX(testimonial imperfective)<NEG>
- 33 *ga.'dra 'dra zhig re-gi.yod-na bsams-song red-pa*
how like ART become-COND think-AUX(testimonial perfective) COP(factive)-CFSQ
- 34 *ani gzhug-la rgya.mi-gis nga-tsho grong chung.chung red-pa*
so CAUS-ABL chinese-ERG 1-PL village small COP(factive)-CFSQ

When the Chinese first came, they were good. Later, they made some restrictions. It also says in Guru Rinpoche's prophecy that in a certain year, the Chinese will come and do bad things. In my parents' letters, it talked about Guru Rinpoche's prophecy. They kept saying that when the Chinese arrived, they would make things bad. They would destroy our religion. (My) parents would say this. But, about how the Chinese would do this, I could only think a little. I was young, so I didn't think much. I thought about what it would become like. But, I was small when the Chinese came to our village.

((...))

35 T: But, you know, in, I remember my parents telling that, in the Guru Rinponche's *lung.bstan*
 36 which means it's like a prediction.
 37 Um, that, the, when the Chinese come then they will, the Tibetan people will face a lot of
 38 unfortunate, you know, time ((...))
 39 You know, but, you know, but, my parents would quietly tell us
 40 'well, this is now the bad time of the Tibetan history is happening, because there is this,
 41 you know, prediction in the Guru Rinpoche's *lung.bstan*, that you know, during the Chinese,
 42 you know, time in Tibet there's all these mishaps ((...))

In this segment, the interviewer frames Cho Lhamo as the knower, experiencer, and reporter.

The content of her question deals specifically with Cho Lhamo's experiential knowledge—her realization of Chinese involvement in her life. In both the content and grammar of Cho Lhamo's response, however, she portrays herself only as the reporter. In lines 30-32, Cho Lhamo explains that she only thought about the consequences of Chinese intervention “a little.” She employs the non-egophoric testimonial *'dug*, which highlights the speaker's involuntary emotional, perceptive, and sensory responses. Rather than a straightforward reporting of knowledge, then, Cho Lhamo shares her sense of a *lack* of conscious understanding.

Instead, Cho Lhamo presents herself as a secondary reporter of cosmic knowledge. This knowledge, articulated here with a non-egophoric existential evidential in lines 20, 22-25, and 27-28, arose spontaneously from Guru Rinpoche's reading of the oracle. While she directly quotes the oracle, with the quotative clitic that indicates direct reported speech (line 27), it was her parents who told her of the oracle's prediction. Cho Lhamo highlights her parents' act of speaking rather than their speech, itself. Rather than employing the quotative clitic to iconically animate her parents' speech, she uses a non-egophoric evidential auxiliary following the verb *bshad* (“to speak”) to indicate an ongoing state of affairs (line 29). While Cho Lhamo undermines the authority of her own experiences of change resulting from Chinese intervention, she reports the authentic prediction of the oracle, as well as her parents' habitual narration. She

integrates the collective history of the Tibetan people's political plight, articulated in the oracle, into her personal history, articulated in her parents' narration.

The interviewer proceeds, asking Cho Lhamo "Amma-la, why do you think the Chinese came to Tibet?" With the same evidential configuration as the above segments (non-egophoric testimonial), Cho Lhamo asserts, again, that she did not notice the Chinese presence because she was quite young. The interviewer responds, nearly reiterating her previous question. This reiteration suggests that Cho Lhamo's previous responses were not aligned with the interviewer's expectations. In the coming turns, however, continued questioning prompts Cho Lhamo to report personal knowledge of acts of political violence. The interviewer asks,

- 1 I: Uh-huh. And so, when the, when the, after the Chinese started to come,
2 what changed in your life?

Cho Lhamo responds, through Tashi Chodon, with a description of how Chinese officials targeted wealthy people in her village. In addition to torturing these individuals, the officials encouraged poor workers to publicly beat the wealthy families who employed them. The interviewer prompts Cho Lhamo to specify her relationship to these events, asking,

- 3 I: Did you know any of these wealthy families that were arrested, tortured beaten.
4 Did you know any personally?

Through Tashi Chodon's animation, Cho Lhamo lists the family names of those she knew who were targeted. The interviewer then prompts her towards a testimony of witnessing, asking,

- 5 I: Ok. Did you see them getting tortured?

- 6 T: *de.nas khong-tsho-r nyes.pa-btang-ba-de*
then 3-PL-OBL punish-VZR-NZR-DEM
7 *khyod-kyis mthong-song-ngas-zer*
2-ERG see-AUX(testimonial perfective)-Q-QC
8 C: *nga-s mthong-byung*
1-ERG see-AUX(non-volitional egophoric perfective)

In her translation of the interviewer's question, Tashi Chodon highlights Cho Lhamo's potential agency in seeing, with an ergative marker on the second-person pronoun in line 7. Additionally, in the same line, she employs the non-egophoric testimonial evidential marking. In her response in line 8, Cho Lhamo mirrors Tashi Chodon in her use of ergative marking. However, she uses an egophoric form with the same tense-aspect sense as Tashi Chodon's non-egophoric testimonial. Cho Lhamo paradoxically seems to assert both an act of seeing (with the ergative) and a non-volitional experience of seeing (with the non-volitional egophoric perfective). But, since the ergative is configured here with a non-volitional evidential, it highlights personal receptive experience, rather than personal action. In this single sentence, Cho Lhamo aligns the knower, experiencer, and reporter in her own voice, but only when repeatedly prompted by the interviewer.

This section has demonstrated both interactional work (continued prompting) and linguistic work (first-person animation, iconization of reported speech, evidentiality, and egophoricity) involved in aligning the experiencer, knower, and reporter. This work solidifies the interviewer's role as principal. And, it effaces the translator, relegating her speech to the 'backstage'. As Goffman explains, in the context of producing radio talk, multiple parties communicate backstage, as their remarks are not transmitted to audience members. Nonetheless, backstage communication, which includes directions about how the program should proceed, is essential to portraying the broadcaster's speech as spontaneous and fluent (1981: 234-236). Goffman therefore describes the selective editing of ongoing talk as part of an aesthetic transformation, which renders speech appropriate for a specific audience. In the oral history interview, both discourse structure and language form conspire in distilling the knower, experiencer, and reporter into a single figure—Cho Lhamo—for a public audience.

IV. The building blocks of narrative

The segmentation of narration further demonstrates how Tashi Chodon performs the roles of knower and reporter. In the written English translation, Tashi Chodon is credited for her work as “interpreter.” Her relationship to Cho Lhamo is recognized only in the course of the interaction in the interview, first in her address to Cho Lhamo as ‘mother.’ Their relationship is not referenced in subsequent forms of the oral history, or in TOHP’s descriptions of their methodology. And yet, as Cho Lhamo’s daughter, Tashi Chodon occupies a unique relationship to the interviewee, and to the narrated events. As the interview proceeds and Cho Lhamo begins to recount the events surrounding her migration out of Tibet, the initial turn-taking structure yields to Cho Lhamo’s previous tellings of these events to her daughter. The talk becomes a more explicit collaboration between mother and daughter, as both begin to offer narrative units, revealing Tashi Chodon’s previous knowledge of her mother’s life story. Ochs and Capps describe narrative as not only dialogic, but also inherently multi-dimensional (2001: 24-56). Specifically, the circumstances of telling, including the extent to which multiple speakers animate narrative units, interact with features of discourse structure including its embeddedness in ongoing talk and linearity. The following passage demonstrates that Cho Lhamo’s narrative is, in fact, tightly embedded in affectively-charged backstage talk with her daughter. Further, both mother and daughter co-construct the narrative through segments of discourse. And yet, the process of translation obscures this co-construction. The interviewer asks,

1 I: Can you tell me more about your experience escaping. You were about 15? 16? How old?

Cho Lhamo proceeds to explain that, around age 17, she and her family left her village and followed a trail to India. They reached a mountain, Taglung Ziglun, where a number of Tibetan men had gathered to join a resistance army against the Chinese. In addition, they met up with a

high lama, Khawang Tulku, and his retinue of monks, who were also escaping to India. As Tashi Chodon translates, she asks for additional details from Cho Lhamo that she did not initially state. This prompting reveals that Tashi Chodon, in fact, has prior knowledge of the life story Cho Lhamo presents to TOHP. The interview continues,

2 T: Then the Chinese would actually come from the valley down the hill and
3 you know, we were just almost to the top of the mountain

4 ((to Cho)) *de.nas ri- 'di ming ci zer-red*
then mountain-DEM name what say-AUX(non-egophoric)
So what was the name of the mountain?

5 C: *da.lta nga-tsho lung.pa de-la stag.lung.gzig.lung lab-pa.red*
now 1-PL place DEM-LOC Taglung Ziglun call-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)
Now we were at the place called Taglung Ziglun.

6 T: ((to interviewer)) Taglung Ziglun

7 ((to Cho)) *de-la ri dmag bsdad-sa 'di bod.pa-tsho*
DEM-LOC mountain army stay-NZR DEM Tibetan-PL
The mountain where the army was staying, the Tibetan army?

8 C: *dmag bsdad-sa-la rnyo.song-la lab-pa.red=*
army stay-NZR-LOC Nyosong-Mountain.Pass call-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)
The place where the army was staying was called Nyosong La

9 T: =Nyosong [La is the name of the hill where all the men are there to resist,

10 C: [*rnyo.song.la lab-yag ri 'dzeg-dgos-red*]
Nyosong La call-NZR mountain climb-AUX(need)-AUX(non-egophoric)
(We) had to climb Nyosong La.

11 T: where the men are there to [resist]

12 C: [*goms.pa mang.po 'gro-dgos-red*]
walk many VZR-AUX(need)-AUX(non-egophoric)
(We) had to walk a lot.

13 T: the invasion and from there we have to go on to, you know, to try to escape =

14 C: =*ri-la de.'dra mang.po 'gro-na*
mountain-LOC DEM-like many go-COND
15 *chu.tshod lnga.tsam 'gro-dgos-kyi.yod.kyi.red*
hour about 5 go-AUX(need)-AUX(habitual epistemic)

To get to the mountain, (we) had to go far. Maybe about 5 hours.

16 T: Maybe about 5 hours to just keep going.

17 And then my father joined with the team to resist the Chinese invasion with all the,

18 with the other men and we had to go on. And ((begins crying))

Lines 4-14, demonstrate what Goffman termed ‘subordinate communication,’ or communication among some subset of ratified participants (1981: 133-134). The rigid template of turn-taking that Tashi Chodon had advocated for earlier in the interview breaks down, and the conversation ceases to flow without interruption from the interviewer to the interviewee and back through the translator’s animation. Before Tashi Chodon’s expression of emotion in line 18 when she begins crying, she subtly demonstrates her knowledge of unstated narrative details by prompting her mother to recall them. That is, Tashi Chodon demonstrates a tacit knowledge of the narrated events through her interaction with her mother that is inaccessible to English-speaking audiences. This subordinate communication, in fact, cuts through the ideal aesthetic structure of interaction, revealing the participants’ underlying relations to the narrated events and to each other. While the TOHP imagines the genre of oral history as monologic, Cho Lhamo’s oral history begins as a co-constructed narrative before its recontextualization in new language and media forms.

In line 18, Tashi Chodon’s emotional expression leads to a further breakdown in the flow of turn-taking, which clarifies these underlying relations.

19 C: ((to T)) *nga mig.chu-ma-shor-pa-la khyod mig.chu-shor-kyi. ‘dug*
1 tear-NEG-CAUS-NZR-OBL you tear-CAUS-AUX(testimonial imperfective)

20 *apha khas.len bar bdsad-pa.red*
father promise during stay-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)

I’m not crying, but you’re crying. (My) father was killed in the midst of his promise.

21 T: ((to interviewer)) Mom’s teasing me.

22 C: *kho khas.len-byed-dus lab-pa.red*
he promise-VZR-while say-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)

23 *nga-tsho-la lab-ma-byung*
1-PL-OBL tell-NEG-AUX(non-volitional egophoric perfective)
He made a promise, but he didn't tell us.

24 T: So my father=

25 C: =*'dzing-ma-thub-na ma-'dzing*
fight-NEG-able-COND NEG-fight/IMP
26 *'dzing-thub-na lab.na ga.par yong-dgos-red*
fight-able-COND means where come-need-AUX(non-egophoric)
27 *da nga sems.pa dpe sdug-nas ngu-gin.ngu.gin 'gro-red-pa*
EMP 1 heart very sad-ABL cry-continuous go-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-CFSQ
28 *dpe sems.pa skyid.po gcig.kyang mi-'dug red-pa ((pause))*
very heart happy any NEG-COP(existential testimonial) COP(factive)-CFSQ
If (you're) not able to fight, don't fight. If (you're) able to fight, come where you need to.
So, I was crying and crying because I was so sad. I really didn't feel any happiness.

29 T: ((whispering to I)) See that's why I'm telling you I should be ((inaudible)) So,

30 C: ((inaudible)) ((laughing)) ((takes tissue))

31 T: So my father voluntarily joined the team to resist the Chinese invasion
32 but he never told us that he was going to do that.
33 So he stayed back [from us].
34 And I knew deep inside I was very very sad ((pause))

35 C: ((to Tashi Chodon)) *ani lab-shog*
and tell-IMP

Come on, tell.

36 T: But I moved on along with my mom and my other younger brother.

37 C: ((inaudible)) ((laughing))

38 I: It's sad. It's very sad? to remember this time in your family's life.
39 Very sad. Tibetan women are allowed to cry.
40 I'm glad to see that. But they don't like to cry.

41 T: *de.nas khyod-tsho bros-dus ga.'dra red-zer =*
then 2-PL run-while how COP(factive)-QC
So, 'how was it when you were running?'

42 C: *de.nas=*
then

43 T: ((to I))=This part is the hardest part.

44 I swear, I can't take it. Because, I've heard this story before and each time=

45 I: =it breaks your heart.

46 C: *sems-yag shugs.chen.po-brgayb-yag mi-'dug* 'di ga.re dgos
feel-NZR strong-VZR-NZR NEG-COP(testimonial imperfective) this what need
You're not being strong! What is this?

47 T: ((laughing)) she's telling me you should be strong, you shouldn't be crying.

49 C: ((redirecting talk))
de.nas lung.pa stag.lung.gzig.lung slebs-tshar-red-pa
then place Taglung Zigung arrive-finish-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-CFSQ
50 *lung.pa stag.lung.gzig.lung=*
place Taglung Zigung
Then, (we) arrived at the place called *Stag lung gzig lung*

51 T: =*de.nas bros-dus lab-dang*
then run-while say-IMP
Then tell about when (you) were running.

In this excerpt, the participants shift to managing not only the segmentation of narrative units, but also their emotional responses evoked by remembering and retelling. This affective management occurs explicitly, with moral overtones, as Cho Lhamo directs her daughter not to cry. However, Cho Lhamo also demonstrates a deeply emotional response to the narrated events in the grammar of her responses. In line 27, for example, Cho Lhamo describes her ongoing act of crying, through a habitual aspect. And, in line 28, she expresses her complete absence of happiness, with the testimonial copula '*dug*. As an auxiliary, '*dug* expresses an imperfective aspect. In line 19, for example, Cho Lhamo points out her daughter's tears with the '*dug* as an testimonial imperfective auxiliary. She repeats this construction with another nominalizer in line 46, remarking that Tashi Chodon is not "being strong." In its perfect aspect configuration, the evidential '*dug* therefore bridges both internal feeling states and external sensory or testimonial experiences, in past and present times. That the testimonial form occurs in both the past and present bridges the narrated and narrative events. Along with her overt statement in line 19,

contrasting her lack of tears with her daughter's response, she seems to be comparing her sadness to the present situation; although she had been drained of happiness by the narrated events, she holds back her tears in the interview.

In contrast, in line 23, Cho Lhamo employs the non-volitional egophoric perfective evidential marker, *byung*, to explain how her father left without telling them (Tashi Chodon does not translate this until the next segment). Since it expresses a perfective aspect, *byung* differentiates a narrated event—Cho Lhamo's lack of knowledge of her father's secret plan—from the narrative context. Overall, Cho Lhamo's grammatical marking of evidentiality and aspect highlights involuntary internal states, including emotional responses and the reception of unexpected knowledge. While in this context, these evidentials suggest intensely negative affect, they contradict Cho Lhamo's outward demeanor. While also holding back tears, Cho Lhamo laughs rather than cries. The interviewer, however, also intervenes, affirming Cho Lhamo and Tashi Chodon's sadness in lines 38-40. In this moment, the interviewer seems to accept over emotional expression as a valid part of the public performance of the oral history.

The discourse structure, however, obscures these emotional expressions, since Cho Lhamo and Tashi Chodon attempt to rehabilitate the pre-established structure of turn-taking. In addition to Cho Lhamo's "teasing" of Tashi Chodon, in line 35, she explicitly directs her to "tell." Tashi Chodon responds with a sentence that describes the events, but does not directly correspond to Cho Lhamo's preceding turns. When Cho Lhamo interrupts her telling, Tashi Chodon reiterates the interviewer's previous question, again through direct quotation with the quotative clitic. Tashi Chodon then interrupts Cho Lhamo's response in lines 43-44, asserting that she has "heard the story many times before." In this moment alone Tashi Chodon reveals her both personal knowledge of the narrative events, and her co-tellership, to the interviewer.

Tashi Chodon's prompting therefore represents not only a reiteration of the interviewer's questioning. Rather, it demonstrates that mother and daughter together parse previously narrated events into segments and offer them as building blocks for the oral history interview. Active co-tellership, which underlines the very structure of the narrated events and the participant roles, remains subscribed within Tibetan interaction between Cho Lhamo and Tashi Chodon.

This unacknowledged narrative co-construction displaces several key assumptions surrounding interviewing practices. Koven (2014) identifies major ideologies that tend to guide interviewing practices: the belief that interviewee's responses 'reflect' their 'mental contents,' and 'authentic selves,' and that interviews function as public performances. As described in the introduction TOHP explicitly espouses all three ideologies, which pressures the roles of knower, experiencer, and reporter to converge in Cho Lhamo's figure.

Tashi Chodon and Cho Lhamo's affective management through subordinate communication, and their rejection of the interviewer's affirmation of emotional expression, demonstrates an impasse in understandings of the framing of talk during the interview. For the interviewer, overt emotional expression may demonstrate authenticity to a public audience. But, Cho Lhamo seeks to contain her displays of affect within the grammar of her responses, where she intertwines the involuntary nature of emotions and of key events. How, then, does the Tibetan grammar of affect translate into English?

V. Translating affect

When Cho Lhamo speaks, she wields Tibetan's evidential system to mark nuances of knowledge and experience. As described above, speakers combine evidentials with ergative and aspectual markers which articulate differences between types of subjective states. Cho Lhamo's evidential use becomes particularly varied in her discussion of an intense interaction with Chinese officers.

After realizing that her father had decided to stay behind with other resistance fighters at Taglung Ziglung, she deliberated about whether to stay with him or continue to travel onwards with her other family members. Cho Lhamo consulted with the lama in their retinue, who performed a divination. She decided to move on past Taglung Ziglung. However, she and her family were captured by the Chinese military before they reached Pema Kol, the region bordering India. When narrating these events, she describes a range of internal experiences, explaining,

C: ((...))

- 1 *nga-tsho mar yong-dus 'di-r slebs-red-pa*
1-PL down come-while DEM-LOC arrive-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-CFSQ
- 2 *brag.phug yong-dus thang yar-nas nga-tsho bod.pa mi zhig slebs-nas*
cave come-while plain above-ABL 1-PL Tibetan person ART arrive-ABL
- 3 *brag.phug-la 'gro-song*
cave-LOC go-AUX(testimonial perfective)
- 4 *nga-tsho ri 'di-r slebs-tshar-red*
1-PL mountain DEM-LOC arrive-finish-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)
- 5 *a dga' che*
EXCL joy big
- 6 *da nga bod.pa zhig yin-na dga' che lab-red*
DEM 1 Tibetan ART COP-COND joy big say-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)
- 7 *de.nas mar-mar slebs-red*
then below-RED arrive-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)
- ((...))
- 8 *a'o ata rgya.mi yod-sa.red bsams-song*
EXCL brother Chinese COP(epistemic probability) think-AUX(testimonial perfective)
- 9 *ani nga nga-tsho de.nas tshur brag.phug slebs-tshar-red-pa*
then 1 1-PL then toward cave arrive-finish-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-CFSQ
- 10 *'di-nas mar chu i.'dra yod.red*
DEM-ABL below water DEM-like COP(existential)
- 11 *rgya.mtsho mar yod.red*
lake below COP(existential)
- 12 *rgya.mtsho-nas babs-red-pa*
lake-ABL came down-AUX(non-egophoric perfective)-CFSQ
- 13 *rgya.mtsho 'gram-nas 'gro-red-pa*
lake bank-ABL go-AUX(FCT)-CFSQ
- 14 *rgya.mi mi slebs-'dug-yag*
Chinese person arrive-AUX(testimonial perfect)-NZR
- 15 *rgya.mi mi-s mthong-song*
Chinese person-ERG see-AUX(testimonial perfective)

- 16 *rgya.mi slebs-song-nga*
Chinese arrive-COP(testimonial perfective)-CFSQ
- 17 *thag ring.po-nas da sod sod zer-nas me.mda' red-pa*
distance far-ABL EMP kill/IMP kill/IMP say-ABL gun COP(factive)-CFSQ
- 18 *sa-la bstugs-song*
ground-LOC plant-AUX(testimonial perfective)
- 19 *nga-s bsad-na bsad bsams-byung*
1-ERG kill-COND kill thought-AUX(non-volitional egophoric perfective)
- 20 *a'u thug-song*
EXCL desperate-AUX(testimonial perfective)
- 21 *yar-lang-nas bsdad-yin ((...))*
get up-ABL stay-AUX(egophoric perfective)
- 22 *nga-s ci dran-yag mi-'dug*
1-ERG what think-NZR NEG-COP(existential testimonial)
- 23 *bsad-na bsad bsams-nas yar-lang bsdad*
kill-COND kill think-ABL get up stay
We arrived there. There was a plain, and a cave. While we were coming down, we arrived there. While we were coming to the cave, on the plain above us a Tibetan person arrived and went into the cave. We finished arriving at this mountain. Oh, we felt so joyful! If there is another Tibetan person, (we) said (we) would be so joyful. Then we arrived down there. Oh, my older brother thought there were probably Chinese. And I-we then returned back towards the cave. From there, water flowed downward, like this. There is a lake below and (the water) falls into it, it goes from the bank of the river. There, a Chinese person arrived. A Chinese person saw (us). The Chinese arrived from far away, and while saying “kill, kill” they pointed their guns to the ground. I really thought if they will kill me, then let it be. I was desperate. I stayed standing straight up. ((...)) There was nothing I could think of. Thinking let them kill me if they want to, I stayed standing straight.
- 24 T: Then we saw this-there was this person kind of coming out of the cave
- 25 And we felt like ‘oh, thank goodness there is some Tibetan’ and we felt kind of relief
- 26 And as we were going down ((...))
- 27 And then we kind of felt that, I-I-I felt that, ‘oh I don’t think it’s Tibetan, it’s Chinese’
- 28 and kind of got very scared.
- 29 But were still walking down toward the Tshangpo river, which is a very, very strong river.
- 30 We were walking down towards that side
- 31 And all of a sudden, no wonder, it was Chinese and they saw us
- 32 They right away came charging toward us.
- 33 And at that time I was very, very sad being separated from my father.
- 34 And then, you know, I was kind of under shock
- 35 I didn’t really have any reaction
- 36 I was really, really shocked, you know.
- 37 And at that time I heard the Chinese just coming down with the guns
- 38 and saying ‘kill kill kill’((...))
- 39 And then-but I did not get scared
- 40 I was-maybe I was shocked
- 41 I just stood there and-and the Chinese man started putting the gun on me saying

42 ((sounds as if she is holding back tears)) ‘kill, kill’...

In this passage, Cho Lhamo once again marks intense affective states through evidential and aspectual configurations. However, she brings these configurations to bear not only on feeling states, but also on reported thought. In lines 5-6, Cho Lhamo describes her emotional state upon encountering a man she thought was Tibetan, and characterizes her brother’s sense that the man was, in fact, Chinese in line 8. The verb that Cho Lhamo chooses to describe this sense, *bsams*, can mean both “to think” and “to feel.” In line 8, thinking figures as non-volitional experience, marked with the evidential testimonial perfective. She further marks the embedded clause (‘(he’s) probably Chinese’), with an intonation pattern characteristic of direct reported speech. Also, through the egophoric, Cho Lhamo differentiates her own agentive performance of specific actions from feeling states. For example, she describes her posture upon encountering the Chinese with the egophoric perfective auxiliary accompanied by a volitional verb *bsdad* (‘to stay’) (line 21). In contrast, Cho Lhamo describes her internal state with *byung*, the egophoric form used for non-volitional verbs in line 19. With this construction, Cho Lhamo asserts experience, but not knowledge. In line 22, Cho Lhamo highlights her inability to think clearly, asserting ‘there was nothing I could think of.’ In this line, however, she marks the first-person pronoun with the ergative particle, highlighting the volitionality of thinking. The knower, experiencer, and reporter are one. In earlier segments, when the interviewer questioned Cho Lhamo about her early life, she had emphasized that she did not remember much and narrated events using non-egophoric, imperfective forms. In this excerpt, however, Cho Lhamo prefers configurations that emphasize action and volition, which may correlate with heightened affective attachment.

Translating the talk to English, Tashi Chodon articulates feeling states as passive constructions, such as (not) “getting” scared (lines 28 and 39), being shocked or “under” shock (lines 34-36 and 40), and “having” a reaction (line 33). In these examples, Cho Lhamo’s conflation of thought and feeling, and her differentiation of volitional acts (including of perception) and non-volitional internal states seems lost in translation. Tashi Chodon, however, innovates when translating reported thought from Tibetan. Specifically, Tashi Chodon employs quotative markers associated with feelings states in English. In lines 25 and 27, Tashi Chodon, however, includes the conjunctions “that” and “like” before embedded direct quotations of reported thought. In both lines, she links a first-person pronoun and a direct quotation of reported thought through a conjunction. And, she glosses the verb *bsams* not as “to think,” but “to feel.” Lines 24 and 27 therefore demonstrate both an innovation in the use of a conjunction before direct reported thought, and a seeming preference for describing feeling rather than thought. And, this innovation seems to respond directly to syntactic and semantic factors in Tibetan. In addition to the conflation of thinking and feeling in the Tibetan verb *bsams*, reported speech in Tibetan frequently takes a “hybrid” direct/indirect form, in which speakers avoid co-referential pronouns by omitting the matrix verb. In such cases, prosody marks the boundaries of quotation (Tournadre 2008: 300-301). In fact, Cho Lhamo employs such prosody in the embedded clause in line 8. And, other researchers have noted that the use of the English “be+like” as a quotative marker characterizes heightened affect or moralizing statements (Buchstaller & van Alphan 2012; Jones & Schieffelin 2009). *Be+ like* collapses the distinction between thought and feeling, providing a clear resource for glossing the Tibetan verb’s overlap of thought and feeling. Therefore, Tashi Chodon’s translation seems to respond both to cross-linguistic structural challenges, and to conventions for marking stance and affect in the English

quotation system. Through the use of the ergative, however, Cho Lhamo clearly differentiated the experience of feeling states—or experience—from volitional thinking—or knowing. Tashi Chodon, in contrast, conflates reported thought and feeling states throughout the translation of the entire speech segment. The grammatical transformation of Tibetan evidentials therefore reconfigures the reporters' continually evolving relations to the narrated events. Cho Lhamo's narration and its subsequent recontextualization in English, demonstrate the grammatical convergence and divergence of a speaker's relation to narrated events.

VI. Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated that participant roles emerge both through discourse structure and through grammar. Previous scholars have undertaken similar explorations in other languages. Kockelman (2004) studied the distinction of principals from animators in Q'eqchi'-Maya. And, Silverstein (2008) examined a Kiksht narrative text dictated to Sapir, finding that a speaker marked two specific modes of consciousness relating to different deictic centers (the speaker's present self, and the speaker's past narrated self) (12-13). Along with this paper, these works demonstrate that participant roles extend to and co-constitute grammatical marking. Speakers' relationships in the context of interactive narration, as well as in their positioning in narrated events, are not only projected from social roles and discourse structure into grammar; they can also be traced from grammatical markings. The TOHP's meticulous and admiral preservation of multiple renditions of Cho Lhamo's oral history has allowed for the recuperation of these relationships and the processes through which they are established.

Furthermore, previous scholarship has emphasized the significance of recontextualization to oral history projects. Rapport and Hartill have argued that Holocaust survivors' testimony 'is both social interaction and social history,' that allows survivors to turn 'narratives of suffering to

narratives of witnessing' (2010: 22). Their argument falls in line with psychological anthropological understandings of narrative (Ochs & Capps 1996, 2001), which advocate for narration as a means of integrating past experiences into present social circumstances and self-understandings. And yet, the practice of narration through oral history interviews also presents a form of communicative hegemony (Briggs 1986: 4). By explicitly framing the interview as a means of extracting an individual's testimony to preserve an authentic cultural history, the interviewee's alternative understandings of what it means to tell a life history are silenced. In Cho Lhamo's oral history, this framing led to continued attempts, amongst interviewer, interviewee, and translator to produce a finished product in line with the metacommunicative norms of the interviewer. The participants disguised slippage between the interviewee's and interviewer's understandings of genre.

That is, with specific attention to the practice of collecting and creating Tibetan oral histories, this analysis demonstrates the distillation of elders' expression of personal and collective history, into the construction of static figures for consumption by outside audiences. The TOHP overlooks the cultural significance of knowing, experiencing, and reporting as distinct activities and internal states, distilling these three grammatical roles through successive recontextualizations. This article suggests that the second-generation of Tibetan exiles play a key role these processes of recontextualization. And yet, the curation of the stories from first-generation migrants, according to the aesthetic norms that govern Euro-American expectations of the genre of oral history—actively write out the second-generation's relationships to these narratives.

Acknowledgements: This paper was prepared with the support of a number of scholars and organizations. I wish to thank the Tibet Oral History Project (TOHP) for granting me permissions to their materials, and for sharing with me details of their methodology. Tenzin Choezom and Sonam Tsering made this paper possible with their generous guidance through the transcription process. Frans Gergersen and his colleagues at the Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Language Change in Real Time provided the intellectual community where this undertaking could flourish. Lauran Hartley first introduced me to the TOHP's materials at Columbia University's C.V. Starr East Asian Library. Sonia Das provided important insights on an early draft. And, my dissertation chair, Bambi Schieffelin walked with me through multiple versions of the paper. Research and write-up was supported by a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship, and a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Opportunities Worldwide (GROW) grant.

References

- Agha, Asif. 1993a. 'Grammatical and Indexical Convention in Honorific Discourse.' *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 3:131-163
- 1993b. *Structural Form and Utterance Context in Lhasa Tibetan: Grammar and Indexicality in a Non-configurational Language*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., and R. M. W. Dixon, eds. 2014. *The Grammar of Knowledge: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford University Press.
- Arcy, Alexandra D'. 2015. 'Quotation and Advances in Understanding Syntactic Systems.' *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 43–61.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by M. Holquist. Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barnett, Robert. 2010. 'Understated Legacies: Uses of Oral History and Tibetan Studies.' *Inner Asia* 12 (1): 63–93.
- Bauman, Richard, and Charles L. Briggs. 1990. 'Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59–88.
- Bavin, Edith L., and Sabine Stoll, eds. 2013. *The Acquisition of Ergativity*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Briggs, Charles. 1986. *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle, and Ingrid van Alphen. 2012. *Quotatives: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Chafe, Wallace, and Johanna Nichols, eds. 1986. *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood [NJ]: Ablex.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1981. 'An Interpretation of Split Ergativity and Related Patterns.' *Language* 57 (3): 626–57.
- . 1990. 'Ergativity and the Cognitive Model of Event Structure in Lhasa Tibetan.' *Cognitive Linguistics* 1-3: 289–321.
- Garrett, Edward. 2001. 'Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan.' PhD dissertation, Los Angeles: University of California.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- . 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 1983. 'The Interaction Order: American Sociological Association, 1982 Presidential Address.' *American Sociological Review* 48 (1): 1–17.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. 'Interactive Footing.' In *Reporting Talk*, edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanks, William F. 1987. 'Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice.' *American Ethnologist* 14 (4): 668–92.
- . 1993. 'Metalinguage and Pragmatics of Deixis.' In *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, edited by John Lucy. Cambridge England ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Jane H. and Judith T. Irvine. 1992. *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hill, Jane H. 1995. 'The Voices of Don Gabriel: Responsibility and Self in a Modern Mexican Narrative.' In *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture*, edited by Dennis Tedlock and Bruce Mannheim. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Jones, Graham, and Bambi Schieffelin. 2009. 'Enquoting Voices, Accomplishing Talk: Uses of Be like in Instant Messaging.' *Language and Communication* 29 (1): 77–113.
- Keane, Webb. 1999. 'Voice.' *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9 (1-2): 271–73.
- . 2011. 'Indexing Voice: A Morality Tale.' *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21 (2): 166–78.
- Kockelman, Paul. 2004. 'Stance and Subjectivity.' *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14 (2): 127–50.
- Koven, Michèle. 2001. 'Comparing Bilinguals' Quoted Performances of Self and Others in Tellings of the Same Experience in Two Languages.' *Language in Society* 30 (4): 513–58.
- . 2014. 'Interviewing: Practice, Ideology, Genre, and Intertextuality.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 43: 499–520.
- Lempert, Michael. 2007. 'Conspicuously Past: Distressed Discourse and Diagrammatic Embedding in a Tibetan Represented Speech Style.' *Language & Communication* 27 (3): 258–71.
- . 2012. *Discipline and Debate: The Language of Violence in a Tibetan Buddhist Monastery*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liberman, Kenneth. 2004. *Dialectical Practice in Tibetan Philosophical Culture: An Ethnomethodological Inquiry into Formal Reasoning*. New York: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers.
- McGranahan, Carole. 2001. 'Arrested Histories: Between Empire and Exile in 20th Century Tibet.' Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- . 2010. *Arrested Histories: Tibet, the CIA, and Memories of a Forgotten War*. Durham [NC]: Duke University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1986. 'Variation and Error: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Language Acquisition in Samoa.' In *The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition*, edited by Dan Slobin. Volume 1: 783–838. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Lisa Capps. 1996. 'Narrating the Self.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25: 19–43.
- Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra Thompson, eds. 1996. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quintman, Andrew. 2013. *The Yogin and the Madman: Reading the Biographical Corpus of Tibet's Great Saint Milarepa*. Columbia University Press.
- Rapport, Frances, and Graham Hartill. 2010. 'Poetics of Memory: In Defence of Literary Experimentation with Holocaust Survivor Testimony.' *Anthropology and Humanism* 35 (1): 20–37.
- San Roque, Lila, Simeon Floyd, and Elisabeth Norcliffe. 2015. 'Evidentiality and Interrogativity.' *Lingua* in press. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.11.003>.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B. 1990. *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. CUP Archive.
- . 1996. 'Creating Evidence: Making Sense of Written Words in Bosavi.' *Pragmatics* 5 (2): 225–43.
- . 2007. 'Found in Translating.' In *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2008. 'The Multiple Linguistic and Cultural Contextualizations of Language Change.' In *Analyzing Change: Linguistic and Cultural Models*. Wenner-Gren Foundation Workshop: New York City.

- Sun, Jackson T.S. 1993. 'Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan.' *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology*. Taipei, Taiwan: Academia Sinica.
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 2008. 'Arguments against the Concept of 'Conjunct'/'Disjunct' in Tibetan.' In *Festschrift Fur Roland Bielmeier*, edited by Chomolangma, Demawend, and Kasbek, 281–308. Salle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.
- tshul-khrims-blo-gros. 2004. *Skya Ba Sna Phyi'i Rnam Gzag Srid Pa Gsal Ba'i Me Lon Zes Bya Ba Bzugs so*. Xianggang: zan-kan-then-ma dpe skrun khan.
- Willis, J.D. 2009. 'On the Nature of rNam-Thar: Early dGe-Lugs-Pa Siddha Biographies.' In *Soundings in Tibetan Civilization*, edited by B.A. Aziz and M. Kapstein, 304–19. Kathmandu.