

Evidentiality 2.0

**Integrating egophoricity, focusing on
equipollent contrasts, and re-examining
visual evidentials**

University of Bern/online
September 5–6, 2021

Organized by Marius Zemp, Benjamin Brosig and Fernando
Zúñiga

as part of the SNSF-project
100015_189281

“Evidentiality in Time and Space”

Program

Day 1: September 5

Session 1: Evidential contrasts in the Himalayas

13:30 – 14:10	Marius ZEMP	Introduction
14:10 – 14:50	Manuel WIDMER	From aspect to evidentiality and person to egophoricity
14:50 – 15:30	Anette HELGESTAD TOMBLESON	Evidentiality in Tawang Monpa, with a focus on the copula system

Session 2: Zooming in on some Tibetic evidentials

16:00 – 16:40	Patrick MUÑOZ	The puzzle of performative egophors
16:40 – 17:20	ZHUANG Lingzi	Subevent egophoric evidentiality: revisiting Lhasa Tibetan <i>byung</i>
17:20 – 18:00	Bettina ZEISLER	Integrating egophoricity into evidentiality or rather: Integrating evidentiality into speaker attitude?

Teaser to Session 4: Evidentiality elsewhere in the world

18:30 – 19:10	Marianne MITHUN	Emergent egophoricity in indigenous California evidentiality
---------------	-----------------	--

Day 2: September 6

Session 3: Evidentiality and egophoricity around the Himalayas

08:30 – 09:10	Yankee MODI & Mark POST	Authority over information as an unmarked value: Seeking the roots of “egophoricity” in Milang and other Macro-Tani languages
09:10 – 09:50	SHIRAI Satoko	Egophoricity in nDrapa: Position and split
09:50 – 10:30	Erika SANDMAN	Interactional functions of evidentials in Wutun: implications to the typology of evidentiality and egophoricity

Session 4: Evidentiality elsewhere in the world

11:00 – 11:40	KIM Soung-u	Egophoric and evidential marking in Jejuan
11:40 – 12:20	Zaira KHALILOVA	Evidentials in Tsezic and beyond
12:20 – 13:00	Lila SAN ROQUE & Carl BODNARUK	Can you see Lhasa from Lake Kopyago? Evidential systems in New Guinea

Session 5: Concluding session

14:00 – 14:40	Henrik BERGQVIST & Karolina GRZECH	The grammaticalization of verbs of perception into direct evidentials: setting the record straight
14:40 – 15:40	Plenary discussion	

**The grammaticalization of verbs of perception into direct evidentials:
Setting the record straight**

Henrik BERGQVIST & Karolina GRZECH
Stockholm University & University of Valencia

The semantic core of grammaticalized evidentials has been argued to consist of the speaker's "source of information" for a proposition (Aikhenvald 2014). This definition targets the speaker's sensory and cognitive access to events and has become a reference point for analyses of evidential forms. In this talk, we discuss direct evidentials, which purportedly signal the speaker's unmitigated sensory access to an event, and argue that some persistent claims regarding the grammaticalization of direct evidentials from verbs of perception are misconceived. Instead of encoding the speaker's sensory access to an event, direct evidentials encode the speaker's epistemic authority over an event. We find support for our argument in the literature on how evidentials grammaticalize and the contextualized use of evidentials.

Matlock (1989) claims that direct evidentials originate with perception verbs and that they result from the metaphor *knowing is seeing*. Aikhenvald (2018) echoes this claim. However, the diachronic origin of direct evidentials with verbs of perception is typologically rare and the metaphorical transfer suggested by Matlock (1989) does not support an analysis of direct evidentials as encoding the speaker's direct sensory access. By definition, lexico-semantic content (e.g. seeing) gives way to functional meaning (an evidential value) as part of the process of grammaticalization (e.g. Bybee et al. 1994). The lexical meaning of a perception verb is therefore not expected to be semantically preserved in the grammaticalization of direct evidentials. Thus, 'seeing' cannot be what grammaticalized direct evidentials mean, because this mode of (sensory) access constitutes the source domain and not the target domain in this suggested metaphorical transfer. The target domain is knowing, not seeing. This means that an evidential that has developed from a verb for seeing, as the result of a metaphorical transfer, by definition cannot denote visual access to an event. If this was the case, no metaphorical transfer would have taken place and the grammaticalization of the form in question would have produced no change in meaning. Such a scenario runs counter to what we expect from the grammaticalization process and what we know about metaphors. In this paper, we argue that direct evidentials – rather than encoding visual access to events – signal the speaker's epistemic authority. We also show that epistemic authority – unlike visual access – may be metaphorically connected to seeing and knowing as source domain concepts.

We find additional support for our claim that direct evidentials encode the speaker's epistemic authority in Barnes' (1984) account of direct evidentials in Tuyuca. The "visual evidential", *-wi* can also be used with propositions denoting the speaker's own actions, as well as verified facts that the speaker can vouch for, and which are within the realm of the speaker's experience (Barnes 1984: 259). If we take these uses at face value, we can only conclude that the meaning of *-wi* is impossible to define in terms of direct sensory access alone, in contradiction to Barnes' (1984) proposal. Similar discrepancies between proposed definitions and the use of evidential forms are common place in descriptions of evidentials. However, such discrepancies have mostly been placed at the periphery of analysis. We think this is a serious analytical flaw.

Direct evidentials target the speaker's direct perception, the speaker's own actions, and the speaker's integrated knowledge of verified facts (cf. Curnow 2003; Sun 2018). From an epistemic point of view, these different kinds of access fall under the speaker's epistemic authority (cf. Kamio 1997). If we are willing to let go of the preconceived definition of evidentials as encoding information source and expand our analyses of direct evidentials to include claims of knowledge based on other parameters than the speaker's sensory access, we may rid our analyses of discrepancies such as the one observed for Tuyuca.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2014. The grammar of knowledge: a cross-linguistic view of evidentials and the expression of information source. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *The Grammar of Knowledge*, 1–51, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.). 2018. *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality* (Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics). First edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnes, Janet. 1984. Evidentials in the Tuyuca Verb. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 50, 255–271.
- Bybee, Joan L., Revere D. Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cornillie, Bert. 2010. An interactional approach to evidential and epistemic adverbs in Spanish conversation. In: Gabrielle Diewald & Elena Smirnova (eds.), *The linguistic realization of evidentiality in European Languages*, 309–330, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Curnow, Timothy. 2003. Nonvolitionality expressed through evidentials. *Studies in Language* 27:1, 39–59.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka (ed.). 2018. *Epistemic modalities and evidentiality in cross-linguistic perspective* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology volume 59). Berlin ; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kamio, Akio. 1997. *Territories of Information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Matlock, Teenie. 1989. Metaphor and the Grammaticalization of Evidentials. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the BLS, 215–225, Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Sun, Jackson T-S. 2018. Evidentiality and person. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, 47–70, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Viberg, Åke. 1983. The verbs of perception: A typological study. *Linguistics* 21, 123–162.

Evidentials in Tsezic and beyond

Zaira KHALILOVA

Institute of Linguistics RAS, Moscow

The system of evidentiality in the Tsezic languages (which belong to the Nakh-Daghestanian languages) shows the contrast between witnessed and unwitnessed events expressed only in the past tense (Forker 2018; Khalilova 2011). In the West Tsezic languages, there is an equipollent evidential contrast between Past witnessed and Past unwitnessed forms, as in (1). In the East Tsezic languages, the contrast is based on the distinction between a morphologically simple past tense, Preterite, and the Perfect, which is a compound tense based on the Perfective converb and the Present tense copula, as in (2).

(1) Khwarshi

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------|------------|
| a. | obu-t'e-s | obu | c'ali:d-a | žik'wa | Ø-ejč-a |
| | father- OBL-GEN1 | father(I) | study- PTC.PST | man(I) | I-be-PST.W |
| | 'My father's father was an educated man.' | | | | |
| b. | hed hoboža-ž'o | mik ^w a-ha | b-eča-na | | χalq'i |
| | then now- SUP | be.hungry- PRS | HPL-be-PST.UNWIT | | people |
| | 'At that time people were hungry.' | | | | |

(2) Bezhta

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------|--------|--|--|
| a. | kaḱaj | j-o ⁿ q'o-jo | | | |
| | letter(IV) | IV-come-PST | | | |
| | 'The letter arrived.' (the speaker saw this) | | | | |
| b. | kaḱaj | j-o ⁿ q'o-na | gej | | |
| | letter(IV) | IV-come-PF.CVB | be.PRS | | |
| | 'The letter has arrived.' (the speaker did not see this) | | | | |

The witnessed/unwitnessed contrast is based on a visual and non-visual source of information (additionally, auditory perception may also be marked with witnessed forms).

In addition to these basic functions, the opposition of witnessed and unwitnessed forms has extended uses, first mentioned in Comrie & Polinsky for Tsez [2007:344]: "<...> the contrast is used to report direct/indirect access to emotions, sensations, or beliefs. In this usage, Past Witnessed is normally associated with first person, because it is the speaker who has direct access to his/her own feelings or knowledge. Past Unwitnessed is used otherwise. The second usage <...> is functionally similar to that of the historic present". This usage is found in narratives, where Past witnessed regularly refers to events, which the narrator did not witness.

The paper will discuss main and extended uses of evidentials in the Tsezic languages as well as in some other Daghestanian languages.

Abbreviations

HPL – human plural, OBL – oblique, PF.CVB – perfective converb, PST.W – past witnessed, PST.UNWIT – past unwitnessed, SUP – sup-essive case. Roman numerals indicate genders.

References

- Comrie, Bernard and Maria Polinsky. 2007. Evidentials in Tsez. In: *Le traitement épistémologique de l'information: illustrations amérindiennes et caucasiennes*, ed. by Zlatka Guentchéva & Jon Landaburu, pp. 335-350. Louvain etc.: Peeters.
- Forker, Diana. 2018. Evidentiality in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, ed. by Alexandra Aikhenvald, pp. 490-509. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Khalilova, Zaira. 2011. Evidentiality in Tsezic Languages. *Linguistic Discovery*, 9(2), 30-48.

Egophoric and evidential marking in Jejuan

KIM Soung-U

SOAS University of London

In this talk I examine the relationship between egophoric (Floyd et al. 2018) and evidential (Aikhenvald 2004, Willett 1988) marking in Jejuan (Koreanic, South Korea), which differs from Korean (cf. Jeong H.-G. 2020) in its combination of Middle Korean traces (Ko Y.-G. 2013) and language-internal innovations. Below I focus on the Jejuan evidential suffix *-ə* (cf. Yang et al. 2020) and the egophoric suffixes *-no/-k^wa* and *-ti* (cf. Lee 1978, Hyun and Kang 2011).

- (1) First-hand, sensory evidential (fieldwork data)

jəŋhiika *teilimtak* *teitəə(-ms^h)-ə-la*
 Yeongheui:NOM rice_cake fry-PROG-EV-DECL

‘[I saw] Yeongheui frying rice cake.’

- (2) Inferential (from Yang et al. 2020: 151, analysis and glossing mine)

halipaŋ *miŋaŋ* *əntəua-s^h-ə-la*
 old_man tangerine gather-PST-EV-DECL

‘[looking at the full basket] It seemed to me the old man had picked some tangerines.’

- (3) Inferential (from Hyun and Kang 2011: 297, analysis and glossing mine)

ki *s^halim* *k^weki* *teal* *naŋ-i-k^h-i-la-la*
 that person meat well fish-EP-IRR-EP-EV-DECL

‘[I concluded that] That person could be very good at fishing.’

Note that *-ə* has the allomorph *-a*, which is presumably due to the historic presence of vowel harmony, and that the *-la* allomorph has been suggested to stem from the evidential form of the copula *i-*, which was involved in the grammaticalisation of the *-k^h-irrealis* suffix (see Kim J.-H. 2014: 186). By default (or when occurring with progressive aspect as in (1)), *-ə* indicates the reporting of first-hand, sensory information. With past tense (2) or irrealis suffixes (3), the interpretation shifts from direct evidential to inferential (Yang et al. 2020, Kim J.-H. 2014). A shift from the speaker’s information source to that of the addressee between declarative and interrogative utterances is commonly observed (*-ə* in (4)).

- (4) Fieldwork data

[ki nal *oa-s^h-taŋ* *mək-i-k^wa-l-en]* *ilimp^hio*
 that day come-PST-CVB eat-EP-EGO.PF-DECL-QUOT name:tag
tola-s^h-ə-nia?

hang-PST-EV-Q.PLR

‘Did [the mosquito] leave a name tag saying ‘I came and ate your blood today?’’

Jejuan *-no/-k^wa* and *-ti* suffixes behave similarly to egophoric phenomena described in other languages (Floyd et al. 2018).

- (5) Fieldwork data

na (**uli olepi*) *ni=ne* *teip-i* *o-k^wa-la.*
 1SG 1PL brother 2SG=ASSOC house-LOC come-EGO.PF-DECL
oa-s^h-i-nti, *ni=n* *əti* *ka-n-ti?*
 come-PST-EP-CVB 2SG=TOP where go-PF-Q.CONT.EGO?

‘I (*my younger brother) arrived at yours, but where did you go?’

The suffixes *-no/-k^wa* show an imperfective-perfective aspectual opposition and can only be used in declarative utterances with speaker reference (5). *-ti* can only be used in second-person, interrogative utterances (5). Even though the suffixes *-no/-k^wa* and *-ti* together cover the canonically egophoric 1DECL-2INT contexts, it is not as yet sure whether they can be regarded as part of the same paradigm.

These suffixes cannot occur in any other context (as exemplified by the impossibility of a third-person form in (5)), unless achieved through perspective shift in quotative constructions (as in ex. (4)) above. Some speakers identify a sense of volition with *-no/-k^{wa}* suffixes. While this distribution is fairly rigid, some rare cases involving a high degree of affectedness of a speaker appear to override the canonical IDECL reference of *-no/-k^{wa}* suffixes.

Jejuan egophoricity and evidentiality show interactions in three areas. The first is the morphological distribution of the *-ə* and *-no/-k^{wa}* suffixes in the same pre-final verb slot. Secondly, the *-ə* suffix normally does not refer to first-person subjects (as in (1)), yet such marking is preferred with verbs describing internal sensory experience such as physical pain or emotions (ex. (6) below; for some speakers, this does not preclude the use of *-no/-k^{wa}* suffixes per se), or when a speaker reports a realisation about themselves (cf. Song J.-M. 2005, H.-S. Lee 2015 for Korean).

(6) from Lee (1978: 90, adaptation and glossing mine)

<i>ul-i-nan</i>	<i>nun</i>	<i>ap^h-a-la</i>
cry-EV-CVB.RS	eye	hurt-EV-DECL
‘[I could feel that] my eyes hurt after crying.’		

Thirdly, since by default *-ə* refers to non-speaker subjects and *-no/-k^{wa}* to speaker subjects, these suffixes can help to distinguish speech participants when quoting speech (except for the case of internal state predicates), a linguistic resource that is not available to Korean speakers in this context.

These interactions notwithstanding, evidential and egophoric marking in Jejuan differ in a number of respects: in questions, evidential *-ə* appears in the same pre-final verb slot as in declaratives (ex. (4)), but egophoric *-ti* appears verb-finally. The evidential suffix is combinable with other tense-aspect-mood suffixes, while egophoric expressions are more heterogeneous: *-no/-k^{wa}* show an inherent aspectual distinction, whereas *-ti* can be combined with the perfective/imperfective suffixes *-n/-m*. Furthermore, *-no/-k^{wa}* are identified by some speakers as having a volitional meaning component, whereas evidential marking has no volitional semantics.

Thus, adding to existing discussions such as Floyd et al. (2018: 53ff.), I show how evidentiality and egophoricity in Jejuan is manifested across several heterogeneous constructions which partially interact. At the same time, however, the interaction between evidentiality and egophoricity depends on individual constructions and is not consistent throughout the language, and it is not clear whether egophoric expressions indeed express evidential meaning at all times.

Abbreviations

1=first person, 2=second person, ASSOC=associative, CVB=converb, DECL=declarative, EGO=egophoric, EP=epenthetic, EV=evidential, (I)PF=(im)perfective, INT=interrogative, LOC=locative, NOM=nominative, RS=reason, PL=plural, PROG=progressive aspect, PST=past tense, Q.CONT=content question, Q.PLR=polar question, QUOT=quotative, SG=singular, TOP=topic

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Floyd, Simeon, Elisabeth Norcliffe and Lila San Roque. 2018. Egophoricity: An introduction. In Floyd, Simeon, Elisabeth Norcliffe and Lila San Roque (eds.), *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1-78.
- Hyun, Pyeong-Hyo and Young-Bong Kang. 2011. *Jejueo Josa, Eomi Sajeon* [A Dictionary of Jejuan Suffixes and Particles]. Jeju City: Gak/National Institute of Korean Language, Jeju National University.
- Jeong, Hae-Gwon. 2020. Hangugeo jahyangseong-e taehan tamsaegjeog yeongu [An Exploratory Study on Egophoricity in Korean]. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 45-2. 351-372.
- Kim, Jee-Hong. 2014. *Jejubangeoneui Tongsa Gisulgwa Seolmyeong: Gibongumuneui Gineungbeomju Bunseok* [A Description and Explication of Jejuan Syntax: analysing categories and functions within a basic clause]. Seoul: Kyungjin.

- Ko, Younggeun. 2013. *Pyojun Jungse Gugeo Munbeobron*. [The grammar of Standard Middle Korean]. Seoul: Jipmoondang.
- Lee, Hyo-Sang. 2015. Modality. In Lucien Brown & Jaehoon Yeon (eds.), *The Handbook of Korean Linguistics*, 249-268. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lee, Sung-Ryeong. 1978. *Jejudo Bangeoneui Hyeongtaeronjeog yeongu*. [Morphological study of Jeju dialect]. Seoul: Thap.
- Song, Jae-Mog. 2005. A typological analysis of the Korean evidential marker ‘-te’. In Yeon, Jaehoon (ed.), *Studies in Korean Morpho-Syntax: a functional-typological perspective*, 119-133. London: Saffron Books.
- Willet, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.
- Yang, Chang-Yong, Yang, Sejung & William O’Grady. 2020. *Jejueo: The Language of Korea’s Jeju Island*. Hawai’i: University of Hawai’i Press.

Emergent Egophoricity in Indigenous California Evidentiality

Marianne MITHUN

University of California, Santa Barbara

Languages of the Pomoan family, indigenous to Northern California, are known for their evidential systems. Most of the Pomoan distinctions are of types that tend to occur cross-linguistically; hearsay/quotative, inferential, and direct experience markers can be reconstructed for their common ancestor, Proto-Pomoan. Beyond these, however, the languages differ in their inventories of markers, or at least those languages with sufficient documentation to provide evidence of them. The family consists of seven mutually unintelligible languages: Eastern Pomo, Southeastern Pomo, Northeastern Pomo, Northern Pomo, Southern Pomo, Kashaya (Southwestern) Pomo, and Central Pomo. Subgrouping within the family is not firmly established, but it is generally agreed that at least the last three, Southern Pomo, Kashaya, and Central Pomo comprise a subgroup. Eastern and Southeastern are considered the most divergent.

Central Pomo has developed two markers that could be considered egophoric. The suffix *-la* indicates that the speaker has firsthand knowledge of the situation because s/he carried it out as an agent: *Čhléy-la* '(I/we) won'; *Lóq'ṭʰúl sqʰátʰ-la* '(I/we) ripped up my old shirt (to make rags)' The suffix *-wiya* indicates that the speaker was not in control but significantly affected: *Ščéw-wiya* '(I/we) got caught'; *Mmála qaqóč-wiya* 'Fleas are biting (me/us)'. Neither is obligatory; each could be replaced with the direct evidence marker *-ya* or simply omitted. Neither is a pronoun: pronouns are independent words in Central Pomo which normally precede the verb and follow an agent/patient pattern, rather than accusative or ergative. Unlike the other evidentials, however, these two markers never co-occur with pronouns.

It is not possible to trace the diachronic development of the markers, but they appear to represent innovations within Central Pomo, since they are not documented in the other languages. (It should be noted that records of spontaneous conversation in the other languages are sparse.) There are, however, some faint clues to their histories. Kashaya, a close relative of Central Pomo, contains two markers not found in the other languages, which Oswalt (1961) lists as *-(w)ela* 'imperfective performative' and *-mela* 'perfective performative'. These would appear to be related to the Central Pomo agent evidential *-la*, which occurs with both perfectives and imperfectives. (Central Pomo lost most vowels in initial syllables, often with erosion of the initial consonant.) The two more divergent members of the family, Eastern Pomo and Southeastern Pomo, which each constitute a separate branch, contain possible relatives of the Central Pomo patient evidential *-wiya* in their first person patient pronouns: Eastern *wi* and Southeastern *wi-t*. The second syllable *ya* of the Central Pomo *-wiya* could be the direct experience marker still found in all of the languages.

References

- McLendon, Sally. 2003. Evidentials in Eastern Pomo with a comparative survey of the category in other Pomoan languages. *Studies in Evidentiality*, Alexandra Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), 101-130. Benjamins.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2020. Context and consciousness: Documenting evidentials. *Knowing in interaction: Empirical approaches to epistemicity and intersubjectivity in language. Folia Linguistica* 2020. 54.2. Karolina Brzech, Eva Schultze-Berndt, and Henrik Bergqvist, eds. 317-342. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2020-2045>.
- Moshinsky, Julius. 19794. *A Grammar of Southeastern Pomo*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 72. Berkelyy: University of California Press.
- O'Connor, Mary Catherine. 1992. *Topics in Northern Pomo Grammar*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Oswalt, Robert L. 1961. *A Kashaya Grammar (Southwestern Pomo)*. Ph.D. diss, University of California, Berkeley.
- Walker, Neil Alexander. 2020. *A Grammar of Southern Pomo*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Walker, Neil Alexander ms. Pne database.

**Authority over information as an unmarked value:
Seeking the roots of “egophoricity” in Milang and other Macro-Tani languages**

Yankee MODI & Mark W. POST

University of Sydney and Centre for Cultural-Linguistic Diversity

“Egophoricity” in Trans-Himalayan languages has become an increasingly vexed and vexing topic. Despite a proliferation of books and articles within the past several years (Gawne and Hill 2017, Floyd, Norcliffe et al. 2018, Bergqvist and Kittilä 2020, among many others), several of the most basic claims we would like to make regarding “egophoricity” seem to remain out of reach.

As was insightfully discussed by Widmer (2017, 2020), this seems at least partly due to cross-linguistic (or perhaps cross-branch, and/or cross-typological-profile) variation within the family. “Egophoricity” marking in Tibetic languages seems to be integrated into a broader system whose existential predicators also mark tense/aspect and evidentiality. Accordingly, authors such as Tournadre and LaPolla (2014) have proposed to subsume Tibetic “egophoricity” within a broader category “evidentiality” – a view that is at odds with standard approaches to evidentiality following Aikhenvald (2004, Aikhenvald and Dixon 2014). Other languages, such as Kathmandu Newar, Bunan and Galo, show at least some grammatical subsystems that have been described within the rubric of “egophoricity”, yet seem both structurally and to some extent also functionally different from Tibetic egophoricity/evidentiality systems. The question thus naturally arises as to whether or not we are talking about “the same thing”.

If there is a common core to “egophoricity” systems, it seems to have to do with “personal/privileged knowledge” – a representation that is made by a speaker that they have some sort of personal or otherwise privileged relationship to the information that is conveyed in a declarative utterance; or, in at least some systems, it can represent a speaker’s assumption that the addressee has this same relationship to the information conveyed by an interrogative utterance. Analyses differ as to whether additional parameters are necessarily involved, such as source of knowledge (e.g. from direct participation, or from personal/internal experience), degree of volition or control, etc., however the association of “egophoricity” systems with *personal authority over information* on the part of the speaker would appear to be constant.

In this presentation, we will discuss what we believe may be a related phenomenon in the Macro-Tani branch of Trans-Himalayan. In this account, we will argue that a Macro-Tani finite, inflected, declarative clause must always (unless it is marked otherwise) entail an assertion on the part of the speaker that they have *authority* over the information that the clause conveys. Although information could derive from a speaker’s personal experience, or could be a general fact about the world which is also known to others, it is in any case understood as information over which the speaker asserts their *authority* and right to speak about. Speaker authority over information, in this sense, constitutes the *unmarked case* in the organization of Macro-Tani grammars.

When a speaker does not wish to make such a representation – for example, when a speaker is representing knowledge they have obtained through hearsay, inference or deduction, or when a speaker wishes to ask a question or express some doubt – Macro-Tani languages offer a rich array of devices for modifying a clause, centred on two main strategies: marking the clause focus via one of a wide array of *focus particles*, and/or neutralization of clause finiteness through predicate *nominalization*. Such modified clauses can express a wide range of epistemic (including evidential), stance, and illocutionary force values, which are therefore all considered marked relative to the “authoritative” value. We will illustrate this phenomenon primarily by means of our field data from the Macro-Tani languages Milang, Adi, and Galo. We will also show how differently clauses may be structured – reflecting the principles discussed above – in face-to-face conversation, as compared with more formal contexts such as newspaper writing, public signage and translations of the Christian Bible. We will also discuss the possible source of authoritative force in Macro-Tani declarative clauses in terms of the origin of the Macro-Tani inflectional system in a set of Tibetic-like clause-final existential predicators.

Through this presentation, we hope to work toward an understanding of Trans-Himalayan languages as being structured in part through a pervasive concern for the relationships that obtain

between speech act participants and the information contents of speech, a concern that can manifest itself in fairly basic areas of the grammar, such as main declarative clauses in Macro-Tani languages, as well as perhaps in more highly specified, more restricted, and more often polysemous morphological categories such as the “egophoric/allophoric”-style oppositions found in Newar, Galo and Bunan, as well as in Tibetic copula/existential predicators. A great deal of work will still need to be done to determine how such more grammaticalized “egophoric” systems ultimately arise.

Examples (Modi 2017)

- (1) *joon bozar yi-tu.*
John bozar(<Asm) go-PFV
'John went to the market.' (Milang) (speaker asserts authority over information)
- (2) *joon bozar yi-tu-**ni** bo*
John bozar(<Asm) go-PFV-NZR:SUBJ PQ.CLAR
'Did John go to the market?' (Milang) (nominalization neutralises speaker authority, particle marks stance)
- (3) *joon bozar yi-tu-**ni** la*
John bozar(<Asm) go-PFV-NZR:SUBJ HSAY
'(I heard) John went to the market.' (Milang) (nominalization neutralises speaker authority, particle marks stance)

Principal Macro-Tani inflections and their existential-predicator sources (Post 2006)

Form (Adi)	Meaning	Source (PTani)	Meaning
- <i>duŋ</i>	'IPFV'	* <i>duŋ</i>	'sit > exist'
- <i>do(ŋ)</i>	'STAT'	* <i>doŋ</i>	'lie down > exist'
- <i>dak</i>	'COS'	* <i>dak</i>	'stand > exist'
- <i>to</i>	'PFV'	* <i>to</i>	'have/exist/be associated'
- <i>tuŋ</i>	'EXPR'	* <i>tuŋ</i>	'???'
- <i>ka-i</i>	'PF'	* <i>ka-i</i>	'have/exist-PCL'
- <i>ye</i>	'IRR'	* <i>rjə</i>	'live/exist'

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R. M. W. Dixon, Eds. (2014). *The Grammar of Knowledge: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bergqvist, Henrik and Seppo Kittilä, Eds. (2020). *Evidentiality, Egophoricty and Engagement*. Studies in Diversity Linguistics 30. Berlin, Language Science Press.
- Floyd, Simeon, Elisabeth Norcliffe and Lila San Roque, Eds. (2018). *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Gawne, Lauren and Nathan W. Hill, Eds. (2017). *Evidential Systems of Tibetan Languages*. Berlin, de Gruyter Mouton.
- Modi, Yankee (2017). *A Grammar of Milang*. PhD Thesis, Universität Bern.
- Post, Mark W. (2006). "Compounding and the structure of the Tani lexicon." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 29(1): 41-60.
- Tournadre, Nicolas and Randy J. LaPolla (2014). "Towards a new approach to evidentiality: Issues and directions for research." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37(2): 240-263.
- Widmer, Manuel (2017). "Review of Gawne, Lauren & Nathan W. Hill (eds.). 2016. Evidential systems of Tibetan languages. Berlin, de Gruyter. vi + 472 pp. ISBN 978-3-11-047374-2." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 40(2): 285-303.
- Widmer, Manuel (2020). "Same same but different: On the relationship between egophoricity and evidentiality." In Henrik Bergqvist and Seppo Kittilä, Eds. *Evidentiality, Egophoricty and Engagement*. Berlin, Language Science Press: 263-287.

The puzzle of performative egophors

Patrick MUÑOZ
University of Chicago

Ü-Tsang / ‘Standard’ Tibetan egophors can occur in performative-like constructions (Austin 1962), whereby the evidential origo (the speaker, in indicative matrix clauses) apparently makes a proposition true by uttering it with egophoric marking, while an utterance of the same proposition with non-egophoric marking only relays a fact, as in (1)-(2).¹

(1) འདི་ཁྱེད་རང་གི་ཇ་ རྟེན་ / རེད།

<i>‘di</i>	<i>khyed.rang</i>	<i>gi</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>(yin / red)</i>
this	2	GEN	tea	EGO / N-EGO

‘This is your tea.’ (→ [...I’m giving it to you.] / → [...As a matter of fact.])

[adapted from Tournadre & Dorje 2003: 94]

(2) ཁྱེད་རང་གི་མིང་དྲི་རྟེན་ལྟལ་ རྟེན་ / རེད།

<i>khyed.rang</i>	<i>gi</i>	<i>ming</i>	<i>rdo.rje</i>	<i>rnam.rgyal</i>	<i>(yin / red)</i>
2	GEN	name	Dorje	Namgyal	EGO / N-EGO

‘Your name is Dorje Namgyal.’ (→ [...I’m naming you.] / → [...As a matter of fact.])

[adapted from Garrett 2001: 141, ex. 33]

Garret (2001: §4.2.3) holds that these uses show that there is an intrinsic link between (Tibetan) egophoricity and performativity.

Against this view, I argue that there is no special performative element to these constructions, but rather that they arise out of two independently attested features of Tibetan egophors: (1) they are not freely useable to indicate just that the evidential origo has personal knowledge of an eventuality, but rather must further identify the origo with one of the thematic roles of the eventuality; and (2) in the absence of thematic roles projected by the verb to identify with the origo (e.g. in the absence of first-person marking), the latter can be interpreted as the **causer** of the eventuality (cf. the comments in DeLancey 1986: 205-206), as seen in (3)-(4).

(3) བཀ་ཤིས་ལ་པ་སང་གི་དེབ་ཡོད།

<i>bkra.shis</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>pa.sang</i>	<i>gi</i>	<i>deb</i>	<i>yod</i>
Trashy	OBL	Pasang	GEN	book	EGO

‘Trashy has Pasang’s books.’ → [...because I gave them to him.]

[reglossed from Garrett 2001: 185, ex. 96]

(4) ལ་ལག་འདི་ཞི་པོ་ཡོད།

<i>kha.lag</i>	<i>‘di</i>	<i>zhim</i>	<i>po</i>	<i>yod</i>
food	this	delicious	POS	EGO

‘This food is delicious.’ → [...trust me, I made it.]

(1) and (2) thus get their performative flavor from the fact that the egophoric marking identifies the origo with the causer of the possession of the tea or the name of the child: the speaker must therefore have assigned possession of the tea or named the child.

Tibetan ‘strong ego’ constructions (Garrett 2001: §4.4), which include past perfective and future verb forms, are restrictive in requiring the origo to be identified with one of the arguments to the verb,

¹ Performative egophors have also been reported in Wutun (Sandman 2018: 183 ex. 15b), though their wider cross-linguistic prevalence is unknown to me.

and not with a peripheral role like a causer above – they further do not allow for performative readings. I explain this phenomenon in the above terms.

Cross-linguistically, a number of egophoric forms encode more specifically which thematic role the origo is to occupy: agentive egophors appear e.g. in Kathmandu Newari (Hargreaves 2005), and patientive egophors occur e.g. in Awa Pit (Curnow 2002), specifying that the origo must learn of the eventuality by participating as an individual with sufficient proto-agent or proto-patient properties, respectively. In Tibetan, ‘strong’ forms contain egophoric markers like *gi yin* and *byung*, which are agentive and patientive, respectively: the origo thus cannot occupy the role of causer, as the grammatical marker requires it to occupy some more restricted suitably agentive or patientive role projected by the verb instead. As a result, apparent performativity in these constructions is ruled out.

(5) *སང་ཉིན་ཁོང་གི་ནང་ལ་ཡོང་གི་ཡིན།

sang.nyin khong khyed.rang gi nang la yong gi yin
tomorrow 3 2 GEN in OBL come IPFV EGO.FUT

Intended: *‘Tomorrow he’ll come to your place.’ → [...I’m effectively ordering him to be there.]
[adapted from Oisel 2017: 103, ex. 27]

I discuss some typological implications for performative egophors in these terms: this is a site of micro-variation, as performatives analogous to (5) are apparently possible in Dege Tibetan (Häsler 2001: 14, ex. 34).

Abbreviations

2 = second-person pronoun; 3 = third-person pronoun; EGO = egophoric; FUT = future; GEN = genitive; IPFV = imperfective; N-EGO = non-egophoric; OBL = oblique; POS = positive degree.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Curnow, T. J. (2002). Conjunct/disjunct marking in Awa Pit. *Linguistics* 40(3): 611-627.
- DeLancey, S. (1986). Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In W. Chafe & J. Nichols, eds., *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Encoding of Epistemology*, 203-213. Ablex Publishing.
- Garrett, E. J. (2001). Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan. Ph.D. thesis, University of California Los Angeles.
- Hargreaves, D. (2005). Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar. *Himalayan Linguistics* 5: 1-48.
- Häsler, K. (2001). An empathy-based approach to the description of the verb system of the Dege dialect of Tibetan. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24(1): 1-34.
- Oisel, G. (2017). Re-evaluation of the evidential system of Lhasa Tibetan and its atypical functions. *Himalayan Linguistics* 16(2): 90-128.
- Sandman, E. (2018). Egophoricity in Wutun. In S. Floyd, E. Norcliffe, & L. San Roque, eds., *Egophoricity*, 173-196. John Benjamins. 173-196.
- Tournadre, N. & S. Dorje (2003). *Manual of Standard Tibetan: Language and Civilization*. Snow Lion.

Can you see Lhasa from Lake Kapiago? Evidential systems in New Guinea

Lila SAN ROQUE & Carl BODNARUK

University of Sydney

Languages spoken in the central region of Papua New Guinea (crossing over 3-4 provincial boundaries) include some of the most complex evidential systems that we are aware of today, and include grammaticalization of meanings to do with personal knowledge or involvement (egophoricity,) and epistemic alignment or ‘engagement’ between speaker and addressee (San Roque & Loughane 2012; Floyd et al. 2018; Evans et al 2019). Many features of certain New Guinea languages show (sometimes startling) similarities to other languages where evidentiality and related categories have arisen, such as those of the Tran-Himalayan region (e.g., Loughane 2009). In this talk we look at some of the characteristics that may have conspired to bring these similarities about (Aikhenvald & Dixon 1998, Enfield 2003), as well as identifying areas of difference. We focus on the semantics of direct evidential markers, including the sometimes elusive contrast between visual and non-visual sensory experience, and start to explore the representation of information source in dependent or co-subordinate constructions (with reference to Evans 2007).

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. and R.M.W. Dixon. 1998. Evidentials and areal typology: a case study from Amazonia. *Language Sciences* 20.241–57.
- Enfield, N. J. 2003. *Linguistic epidemiology: Semantics and grammar of language contact in mainland Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Evans, N. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In I. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: theoretical and empirical foundations*, pp. 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, N., H. Bergqvist and L. San Roque. 2018. The grammar of engagement II: Typology and diachrony. *Language and Cognition* 10: 141-170.
- Floyd, S., E. Norcliffe and L. San Roque (eds.). 2018. *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Loughane, R. 2009. *A grammar of Oksapmin*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne doctoral dissertation.
- San Roque, L. and R. Loughane. 2012. The New Guinea Highlands evidentiality area. *Linguistic Typology* 16: 111-167.

**Interactional functions of evidentials in Wutun:
Implications to the typology of evidentiality and egophoricity**

Erika SANDMAN
University of Helsinki

Wutun is a mixed language spoken by ca. 4000 people in Qinghai Province, Northwest China. While Wutun basic vocabulary and most of its grammatical morphemes are mainly based on the local variety of Northwest Mandarin, its morphosyntax is heavily influenced by the local lingua franca Amdo Tibetan (Chen 1986, Sandman 2016). Wutun has an elaborate Tibetan-type evidential system in which egophoric marker *-yek* forms a contrast with two evidential markers, sensory-inferential *-li* and factual *re*. In addition, all these three markers can be used in a combination with the reported evidential *sho*. In my earlier work (Sandman 2016, 2018), I have mainly approached the Wutun evidential system from the perspective from high vs. low degree of personal involvement. According to this analysis, the egophoric marker *-yek* represents high degree of personal involvement and it predominantly occurs when the speaker is the subject or has control over the subject, while sensory-inferential marker *-li* and factual marker *re* represent low degree of personal involvement and predominantly occur when the speaker is not the subject. However, in conversational data it is common to find examples of evidential use that are difficult to account (exclusively) in terms on high vs. low degree of speaker involvement. For, example, egophoric marker *-yek* often occurs in contexts where the speaker is not the subject and has no control over the subject. Consider:

- 1) 01 D: *ya da ni qhi*
 ok now 2SG go
 02 *quandi quan-she-ma*
 clothes put_on-RES.AO-COORD
 03 *rai~rai-de ze-she*
 warm~warm-NMLZ do-RES.AO
 ‘Ok, you go now. Put some clothes (on her) so it will be warm.’
 04 Z: *ya*
 ok
 05 D: *nanqhan lai-gu-yek*
 flu come-COMPL-EGO
 ‘(Otherwise she) will get a flu.’

Example 1) is uttered in a context in which adults are talking about dressing a child. The egophoric marker in line 05 occurs in a warning, which is uttered as a response to weak agreement *ya*, ‘ok’ in line 04. The speaker using egophoric marker is not the subject, and has no real control over the subject getting sick; he is rather treating the speaker Z’s response *ya*, ‘ok’ as too weak agreement to his advice of dressing the child properly, and he is using the egophoric marker to seek more vigorous alignment to his statement from the part of speaker Z.

I suggest that in addition to speaker involvement, epistemic stance (that is, positioning oneself as knowledgeable or ignorant, see Stivers, Mondada & Steensig; Heritage 2012) plays an important role in conditioning evidential marking in Wutun. Speakers use evidentials to negotiate their epistemic rights in conversation and to upgrade or downgrade their statements. In my talk, I will investigate interactional functions of Wutun evidentials in naturally occurring conversational data by using methods from Conversation Analysis (CA) and Interactional Linguistics. In addition, I will discuss the possible implications of these interactional functions to the typology of evidentiality and egophoricity, as well as problems of integrating conversation analytic approach with typological approach in studying evidentials.

References

- Chen, Naixiong. 1986. Guanyu Wutunhua 关于五屯话 [An outline of Wutun linguistic structure]. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 31. 33–52.
- Heritage, John. 2012. Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45(1). 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684>.
- Sandman, Erika. 2016. *A Grammar of Wutun*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki PhD dissertation.
- Sandman, Erika. 2018. Egophoricity in Wutun. In Lila San Roque, Elisabeth Norcliffe & Simeon Floyd (eds.) *Egophoricity*. Typological Studies in Language 118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 173–196.
- Stivers, Tanya, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig. 2011. Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, 3–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Egophoricity in nDrapa: Position and split

SHIRAI Satoko
University of Tokyo

This study describes and analyzes evidentiality in nDrapa (ISO 639-3 zhb), focusing on egophoricity marking. Previous studies including Shirai (2007) followed a narrow definition of evidentiality (Aikhenvald 2004 among others) and excluded egophoricity from the discussion on evidentiality. This study, in contrast, regards egophoricity as a part of evidentiality, based on a broad definition of evidentiality provided by Tournadre & LaPolla (2014).

First, I will survey the evidential system in nDrapa to indicate the position of egophoricity. nDrapa has several sorts of evidentiality including a verbal source of information (reported or direct), nonverbal access to information (inferred, sensory, etc.), and egophoricity. Based on the morphosyntactic positions of evidentiality markers, I will conclude that there are two main types of evidential marking: those marked by verbal suffixes or auxiliaries and those marked by sentence-final particles or a nominalized construction. The former slot is allotted to egophoricity and inner sensation, whereas the latter slot is to hearsay, inference, memory-activation, and factual (Table 1).

Table 1: *Slots of evidentiality in nDrapa (revised from Shirai 2021: 107)*

Types of nDrapa evidentiality				Forms	Slots
Direct source	Direct access	Sensory	Inner sensory	<i>ɸyi-ε</i>	Predicate-final (suffixes/auxiliaries)
		Self-awareness	Egophoric	∅ (no suffix)	
		Factual		<i>-a / -ε</i>	
		Neutral		<i>rε</i>	Sentence-final (particles/nominals)
		Memory activation		∅ (no particle)	
				<i>mo</i>	
Indirect Source	Indirect access	Inference		<i>pa;</i> <i>nkhei</i> ^H + COP	
	Reported			<i>te</i>	

The egophoric is indicated by the lack of a verbal suffix, *-a* or *-ε*, which is attached to the factual (or non-egophoric) predicate in the perfective or imperfective, respectively. Shirai (2004, 2021) analyzed that the verbal suffixes *-a* and *-ε* primarily indicate aspect. However, parallel to Zemp's (2021) discussion, we can analyze that the primary function of both suffixes has been shifted to the factual, while the aspectual value is rather indicated by a verbal prefix. Such verbal prefixes are a set of directional or orientational prefixes, which primarily indicate the direction of motion (upward [UPW], downward [DWN], inward [INW], outward [OUT] and neutral [NTL] directions) but also correlated with the perfective (cf. Shirai 2018).

When analyzed in detail, the two factual suffixes (*-a* and *-ε*) show different properties. The behavior of the suffix *-a* is less likely to be restricted by the person of the subject, whereas the suffix *-ε* appears to have stronger person restriction. For example, on one hand, when the speaker is the recipient in a sentence which describes a realized event, the predicate without the factual-perfective suffix *-a* (i.e., the egophoric form) is used, e.g., (1a), while addition of *-a* is judged wrong (1b). On the other hand, when the speaker is the recipient in a sentence of an unrealized event, the predicate has the factual-imperfective suffix as in *-ε* as in (2a) while lacking it is judged wrong (2b).

- (1) a. $\{a\epsilon i^R$ $antha^H$ $\eta a=n\epsilon n\eta i^L$ $a-\epsilon j\epsilon^R$ wu^F
 PSN just.now 1SG=toward DWN-speak PFT
 ‘Tashi told me a while ago.’

- b. *tæi^R antha^H ŋa=nɛŋi^L a-ɛjɛ^R wu-a^F
 PSN just.now 1SG=toward DWN-speak PFT-FAC.PFV
- (2) a. somuŋi^R tshomba^H ŋa=wu^R taja-ngo^R khe=t-ɛ^R mo^R
 tomorrow shopmaster 1SG=ACDT money-DIM give=IPFV-FAC.IPFV CFM
 ‘The boss will give me some money tomorrow, right?’
- b. *somuŋi^R tshomba^H ŋa=wu^R taja-ngo^R khe=t^Λ^R mo^R
 tomorrow shopmaster 1SG=ACDT money-DIM give=IPFV CFM

However, predicates in the egophoric form (lacking the factual-imperfective suffix -ɛ) may also be used with third-person actors and unrealized situations. See example (3a). In this case, the speaker puts her daughter’s future action as her family’s plan so she chooses the egophoric form. If the speaker puts it as a third person’s action, she can also choose the non-egophoric form with the suffix -ɛ as in (3b).

- (3) a. ami^R ŋa=r^Λ^R zAntɛi^R lei^R mɔ^H t^Λ^R
 tonight 1SG=GEN daughter baozi make IPFV
 ‘My daughter will make baozis tonight.’ (Family plan, which may be decided by the speaker [and others])
- b. ami^R ŋa=r^Λ^R zAntɛi^R lei^R mɔ^H t-ɛ^R
 tonight 1SG=GEN daughter baozi make IPFV-FAC.IPFV
 ‘My daughter will make baozis tonight.’ (Third person’s unrealized action)

These examples suggest that the condition for using the egophoric is the speaker’s involvement, but that dimension of involvement differs between realized and unrealized events. In the case of realized events, the speaker must have experienced the process of the event and perceive it as her/his affair. In the case of unrealized events, the speaker should have been involved in the decision-making process to make the future event realize.

The critical importance of personal involvement can be seen from the examples of non-volitional sentences. For example, the process of forgetting someone usually happens without notice. Therefore, it is natural to use the factual-perfective suffix -a in (4). In contrast, the speaker experiences the process of losing a game as completely self-involved. Thus, the speaker chooses the egophoric form for their losing a game as in (5) but does choose the factual form for others’ game result as in (6).

- (4) ŋa^H ŋoro=per^Λ^H to-mɔ^H wu-a^F
 1SG 3SG=NSUB NTL-forget PFT-FAC.PFV
 ‘I’ve forgotten him.’ (unconsciously)
- (5) ŋjɛ^H a-mpho^R
 1PL DWN-lose.out
 ‘We lose (the game).’
- (6) ŋoro^H a-mpho-a^R
 3SG DWN-lose.out-FAC.PFV
 He lose (the game).

We conclude that the nDrapa egophoric form is marked by the absence of aspectual/factual suffixes -a and -ɛ in the main predicate and that nDrapa egophoric indicates the speaker’s involvement in the process. The critical phases of the event process differ between realized and unrealized events.

Abbreviations

DWN – downward directive; FAC – factual; GEN – genitive; IPFV – imperfective; NSUB – non-subject; NTL – neutral directive; PFV – perfective; PFT – perfect; PL – plural; SG – singular.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Shirai, Satoko 2007. Evidentials and evidential-like categories in nDrapa. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30(2): 125–150.
- Shirai, Satoko. 2018. An analysis of the aspect-marking function of directional prefixes in nDrapa. In: Tooru Hayasi, Tomoyuki Kubo, Setsu Fujishiro, Noriko Ohasaki, Yasuhiro Kishida, and Mutsumi Sugahara (eds.) *Diversity and Dynamics of Eurasian Languages: The 20th Commemorative Volume*, pp. 405–420. Kobe: Consortium of Studies of Eurasian Languages. Contribution to the Studies for Eurasian Languages Series Vol. 20.
- Shirai, Satoko [白井聡子] 2021. ダパ語における広義の証拠性について. 『言語の類型的特点対照研究会論集』 3: 93–110.
- Tournadre, Nicolas and Randy J. LaPolla. 2014. Towards a new approach to evidentiality. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37(2): 240–262.
- Zemp, Marius 2021. On the development of evidential contrasts in the Greater Himalayan Region. Paper presented at the International Conference on Historical Linguistics (March 4–5 2021, Rio de Janeiro)

Evidentiality in Tawang Monpa, with a focus on the copula system

Anette Helgestad TOMBLESON
SIL International

The copula system of Tawang Monpa, an East Bodish language spoken in Arunachal Pradesh in India, and in Trashigang in Bhutan, shows a three way evidentiality contrast for the existential copula, and a two way contrast for the equative copula. This system is quite similar to what is described by Tournadre and LaPolla (2014) for Standard Tibetan. In a 2020 article in *Languages of the Tibeto Burman Area*, *The Copula System of Tawang Monpa*, this system is described in detail, as shown in the table below:

	Existential			Equative	
	Personal	Testimonial	Neutral	Personal	Neutral
Positive	<i>nou</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>num</i>	<i>jin</i>	<i>jim</i>
Negative	<i>monou</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>munum</i>	<i>men</i>	<i>menum</i>

The existential personal copula *nou* is used both for possession, location and attribution, when what is being spoken of has a clear personal connection to the speaker. In some literature this is described as “egophoric”, which seems like a term that matches the uses of this copula in Tawang Monpa. Some examples are:²

1. *je=ɕ^he ɕ^hi nou*
1.SG-DAT dog COP.EX.PERS
'I have a dog.'
2. *ɕokpu canada nou*
son Canada COP.EX.PERS
'(My) son is in Canada.'
3. *je remba nou*
1.SG good COP.EX.PERS
'I'm good.'

The existential testimonial copula *ni* is used when the speaker has directly perceived with one of their senses what is being talked about. Below are some examples:

4. *ɲok lemin tsokpa ni*
1.SG.POSS foot dirty COP.EX.TEST
'My feet are dirty.'
5. *india lumpa t^hem ni*
India country big COP.EX.TEST
'India is a big country.'

Example 5 above could be said either by someone who had travelled in India, themselves experienced how large the country is, or by someone looking at a map.

The existential neutral copula is *num*. This copula is used either when the personal nature of knowledge is unimportant, when there has been no direct perception, or when the speaker does not want to reveal how s/he obtained the information conveyed. This is the most common copula, and especially in narrative it is frequently used. A speaker can also choose to use this copula to signal an emotional distance to the topic spoken about. Some examples of this copula follow:

² All examples are from Tombleson, 2020.

6. na gep galwamp je t^{hi} num
before king Galwamp said one COP.EX.NEUT
'There once was a king named Galwamp.'
7. ɛ^homu=k unu ɛ^hop-nei num
daughter-POSS children boy-two COP.EX.NEUT
'The daughter's kids are two boys.'

In the table above distinct negative copulas are mentioned for each of the three categories of existential copulas. As mentioned in the 2020 article, I have very few examples of especially the negative personal copula.

There are two equative copulas, personal *jin* and neutral *jim*, with the corresponding negative forms *men* and *menum*. The personal equative copula is used in similar circumstances as its existential counterpart and could as well be termed egophoric. The neutral equative copula is used in much the same way as the existential neutral copula *num*. Below are some examples:

8. ɲok meŋ pema jin
1.SG.POSS name Pema COP.EQ.PERS
'My name is Pema.'
9. be ɲok adz men
3.SG 1.SG.POSS older brother COP.EQ.PERS
'He is not my older brother.'
10. i=k meŋ sonam jim
2.SG-POSS name Sonam COP.EQ.NEUT
'Your name is Sonam.'
11. be doctor menum
3.SG doctor COP.NEG.EQ.NEUT
'He is not a doctor.'

In the other parts of the verb system we see this same three-way distinction in the evidentiality system. There are several verb suffixes ending in *-u* that seem to be egophoric in nature, several suffixes ending in *-um* that seem to be neutral, and one ending in *-dur*, which seems to be testimonial. These endings have not yet been fully analysed, but it is worth mentioning that the three-way distinction found in the copula system is most likely reflected in the verb system overall, although I have not yet been able to identify a full three-way set. Below are examples of three suffixes, in 12 is a progressive egophoric suffix, in 13 a neutral suffix, and in 14 a progressive testimonial suffix.

12. data ɲai toptɛ^{he} rot-ja k^{hi}-ɛ^{he} bi-du
now 1.SG.ERG food bring-CC dog=DAT give=EGO.PROGR
'Now I am bringing food and giving it to the dog.' [ELICITED]
13. ɛ^hintar zom t^{hi}-tɛ^{hit} raŋ kⁱamp nou
still girl one-TOP only poor EXIST.EGO.COP
je-ja sem jør t^{ha} kⁱø-dum
say-CC heart much happy happy-NEUT
'Still one sister didn't mind being poor, and she was happy.'
14. data je=ɛ^{he} ʂokpu=si tɛ^{hi}-dur [ELICITED]
now 1.SG=-DAT ant=ERG bite-PROGR.TEST
'Now the ant is biting me.'

References

- Tomblason, Anette. 2020. The copula system of Tawang Monpa. *Linguistics of the Tibeto Burman Area* 43:1, 37-54
- Tournadre, Nicolas and Randy J. LaPolla. 2014. Towards a new approach to evidentiality: issues and directions for research. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*. 37 (2): 240-263

From aspect to evidentiality and person to egophoricity

Manuel WIDMER
University of Zurich

The epistemic verbal categories “evidentiality” and “egophoricity” play an important role in the verbal systems of many Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas. In the course of the past decades, our synchronic understanding of these grammatical categories has been considerably enhanced by numerous descriptive studies. However, little is still known about the diachronic processes that give rise to evidentiality and egophoricity. The article addresses this gap by discussing evidence from Bunan, a Tibeto-Burman language for whose past tense system the development of evidentiality and egophoricity can be reconstructed in detail.

In a first part, the development of evidential marking in Bunan will be reconstructed based on language-internal evidence. It will be argued that evidential marking emerged in the past tense domain when a former periphrastic perfect construction developed into a synthetic past tense with an inferential connotation (Widmer 2017b). This innovative inferential past tense then came to stand in opposition to an old past tense, which originally did not express any evidential / epistemic categories, but subsequently acquired a direct evidential construal in consequence of a generalized conversational implicature (cf. Atlas & Levinson 1981). In a second part, the further development of this dichotomic evidential system will be investigated. It will be shown that Bunan reanalyzed a former person distinction as an egophoric opposition (Widmer 2017a; Widmer & Zemp 2017). This diachronic process led to a fundamental restructuring of the past tense domain, which eventually gave rise to the modern Bunan verbal system, which distinguishes between an egophoric past tense, a direct evidential past tense, and an inferential past tense.

The talk will thus offer new insights into the hitherto poorly understood diachronic mechanisms that have given rise to complex epistemic systems in Tibeto-Burman languages of the Greater Himalayan region. At the same time, it provides evidence for egophoricity and evidentiality as closely intertwined yet distinct grammatical categories (Widmer 2017c, 2020).

References:

- Atlas, Jay D. & Stephen C. Levinson. 1981. *It*-clefts, informativeness, and logical form: Radical pragmatics (revised standard version). In Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*, 1–61. New York: Academic Press.
- Widmer, Manuel & Marius Zemp. 2017. The epistemization of person markers in reported speech. *Studies in Languages* 41(4), 33–75.
- Widmer, Manuel. 2017a. *A grammar of Bunan* (Mouton Grammar Library 71). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Widmer, Manuel. 2017b. The evolution of egophoricity and evidentiality in the Himalayas: the case of Bunan. *The rise and development of evidential and epistemic markers*, special issue of *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 7(1-2), 246–275.
- Widmer, Manuel. 2017c. Review of Lauren Gawne & Nathan W. Hill. (eds.). 2016. Evidential systems of Tibetan languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 40(2), 285–303.
- Widmer, Manuel. 2020. Same same but different: On the relationship between egophoricity and evidentiality. In Henrik Bergqvist & Seppo Kittilä (eds.), *Evidentiality, egophoricity, and engagement*, 263–287. Berlin: Language Science Press.

**Integrating egophoricity into evidentiality or rather:
Integrating evidentiality into speaker attitude?**

Bettina ZEISLER
Universität Tübingen

‘Evidentiality’ is often not only about *sources* or *types* of knowledge, but *also* about *how a speaker relates him/herself* towards this knowledge and its content and how s/he may try to manipulate the addressee’s attitude towards the same, cf. Chernela (2012), DeLancey (2018:593f.). This speaker attitude, also described as ‘empathy’ (Häsler 2001), plays a prominent role in the Tibetic dialects of Ladakh. Taking up the questions of the workshop call,

- i. **X** (privileged access: *yin* ‘be’, *yod* ‘exist’) can be defined against: **Y**, **Z**, and a fuzzy set of inferential, epistemic, and discourse-pragmatic hedging markers.
- ii. Unlike person categories, **X** vs. **Y/Z** reflect the *origo*’s perspective, implying a perspective flip in information-seeking questions – answers, however, can be formulated independently according to one’s own stance, (1).
- iii. **Y** (*hdug*) and **Z** (*rag*), commonly classified as markers of visual and non-visual perception (note: **Z** can not be applied when (part of) the situation is *also* visually perceived), (2), may also express inferences, (3)-(5). Data from a blind speaker, (2b), (6), and indiosyncratic use of **Y** for non-visual perceptions, (7), indicate that the opposition is between more immediate/ intense and less immediate/ intense input, (9).
- iv. **X** is frequently based on sensory perceptions, provided that these perceptions are of great number, (8), whereas **Y** and **Z** signal a limited number of perceptions. **X-Z** thus connote different grades of acquaintance, cf. (9).
- v. Generally, **X** occurs when the situation belongs to one’s personal sphere, when one is actively involved in, is responsible for, has the pragmatic authority to represent as personal, the communicated situation, (10), or takes an (indignant) authoritative stance, (11)-(12).
- vi. Not just exceptionally, **X** *does not occur* when one does not have the authority to represent a situation as personal, as with shared or shareable knowledge; further when one lacks responsibility, (13), and when one rejects any closer identification even for situations in one’s personal sphere, (14)-(15).
- vii. Contrastive (‘comparative’) constructions focus on one’s *attitude towards the contrastee*, hence inversion can lead to a different marker, although the knowledge types concerning the two members remain exactly the same (16).
- viii. Reduced forms of **Y** became markers of epistemic modality (Zeisler 2017).
- ix. The opposition between **X** and **Y** developed on the base of their temporal values: generally applicable (*yod* ‘exist’) vs. limited duration (*hdug* ‘stay’) > unrestricted truth (*yod*) vs. limited validity (*hdug*). These values were inherited by the auxiliaries for present tense/ imperfect and perfect constructions, leading to a proto-evidential system (Zeisler 2018). I thus disagree with Zemp (2017), who sees the evolution of the contrast only in the perfect construction.
- x. Aspect is not a valid category for Tibetic languages. Past and future tense constructions developed similar oppositions much later, with lesser distinctions and a greater residue of neutral applications. Future tense, by definition, lacks the category of sensory perception, Ladakhi past tense lacks the opposition visual vs. non-visual.

Because in Ladakhi, the *origo*’s perspective and the socio-pragmatic restrictions are overarching principles, speaker attitude cannot be integrated *into* ‘evidentiality’. It is not a question of whether one has privileged access, but whether one has the authority to present the situation as personal knowledge. The semantic space of speaker attitude is divided into a part where one assumes personal authority, and another part where one cannot do so. The latter is divided into fields of evidentiality, epistemic modality, and socio-pragmatic values. Cf. Widmer (2020) for a similar layered structure.

- (1) a. Repeated personal experience, Leh bazaar
 BZ: *mar jod-a le?* – Shopkeeper: *duk, duk.*
 butter exist(X)-QM hon – exist(Y) exist(Y)
 BZ: ‘Do you have butter? <X: I expect you to know, I take you to be responsible.>’ –
 Shopkeeper: ‘Yes, there is. <Y: But why do you call upon my responsibility?>’
- b. Repeated personal experience, same shop, same shopkeeper
 BZ: *mar dug-a le?* – Shopkeeper: *jot, jot.*
 butter exist(Y)-QM hon – exist(X) exist(X)
 BZ: ‘Do you by chance have butter? <Y: I’m just asking, not claiming your responsibility>’ –
 Shopkeeper: ‘Yes, of course we have butter. <X: No need to be shy. I know well, it’s my shop
 after all.>’ – *da capo al infinito* ... – Not a matter of looking or not looking!
- (2) a. Domkharpa (FD 2012)
bila-s mane ton-en-(n)uk. / *ton-en-(n)ak.*
 cat-ERG mane utter-CONT-Y=PRS utter-CONT-Z=PRS
 ‘The cat is murmuring *mane* [prayers] = is purring (Y: as I see: the cat is in view / Z: as I hear:
 the cat is out of view).’ – note: Z cannot be applied if there is also visual input.
- b. Sharapa (FD 2016)
taksa pila mane tōn-duk. / *tōn-a-rak.*
 now cat prayer utter-Y=PRS utter-NLS-Z=PRS
 ‘The cat is purring now.’ (According to the blind speaker, Y: “The cat is close enough that I can feel
 or touch her.” / Z: The cat is behind, out of reach, or even outside the room.)
- (3) Tagmacikpa (FD 2019)
deriŋ qaŋmo qaŋ. / *duk.*
 today cold be(Z) be(Y)
 ‘Today I feel cold [independent of the weather]. / Today it is cold (I can see the clouds).’ (With
 respect to the second alternative, the informant comments that without the clouds one would
 not be able to *see* that it is cold. Whereas when one *sees* the sun, it is clear that it is warm outside.
 In both cases, the temperature is merely inferred, based on visual input.)
- (4) Shachukulpa (FD 2016)
tūu taŋmu duk. *fīa zer-na, kho* ⁿ*da.ruk.*
 child cold be(Y) why say-CD s/he tremble-Y=PRS
 ‘The child is/ has cold. That is, s/he is shivering.’ (The speaker can only infer that the child has
 cold, upon observing his/her behaviour or looks.)
- (5) Ciktanpa (FD 2017)
di-a armi kemp-ŋfik qaŋ.
 this-ALL army camp-LQ exist(Z)
 ‘Here is an army camp (as I can hear [the dogs]).’ (In Ciktan, people do not hold dogs, but dogs
 are fed at army camps, so upon hearing the dogs, one can infer that there is a camp.)
- (6) a. Sharapa (2016, the blind speaker talking about climbing the Stok glacier)
tene bat maŋpo fioŋ-duk.
 then rockslide many come-Y=PRS
 ‘Then many [little] rockslides were coming down.’ (As the speaker explained: hearing them,
 feeling them, that is, being hit, “they came towards me, in front of me”).
- b. Sharapa (2016, the blind speaker talking about climbing the Stok glacier)
thet maŋpo rak.
 slope many exist(Z)
 ‘There were a lot of [steep] slopes.’ (Less directly experienced through the speaker’s climbing [not
 coming towards her]).
- (7) Kharnakpa (FD 2018)
ŋa.(:) teānqa-naŋ pēni du? / *ta?*
 I.AES pocket-PPOS money have(Y) have(Z)
 ‘I have [some] money in my pocket (Y: touching the money when groping inside the pocket
 without looking, which is a bit more sure than / Z: only feeling from outside).’

(8) Khardongpa (FD 2016)

tiri jul-a mē rgatp·ek jot.
Tiri village-ALL grandfather old-LQ exist(X)

‘There is an old grandfather in the Tiri village [far away from Khardong].’ (The informant comments: “I am not a Tiripa, but I go there quite often.”)

(9) Construct Mai 2021, based on data from speakers of various dialects and own experience

su-aŋ met. / mi-nuk. / mi-rak.
who-FM NG.exist(X) NG-exist(Y) NG-exist(Z)

‘Nobody is here/ there.’ (X: I know from beforehand, as I am involved, or I have observed many times. / Y: I have looked everywhere. / Z: I called and didn’t get any response.)

(10) Gya-Mīrupa (FD 2013)

palaŋ-a petse fiot.
cow-AES calf have(X)

‘The cow is with a calf.’ (The cow is the *origo*’s, who already knows or is responsible.)

(11) Shachukulpa (FD 2016)

ɛfi pēra tā·at, ŋa·(:) tsōlosa pāploŋ ma·hoŋ!!
elder.sister speech give·X=PRS I·AES anus.place put.down.time NG-come

‘[Right now,] the elder sister is [calmly] talking [on her phone], and I [even] have no time to shit!!’ (Working together on the fields, but one person shuns the work.)

(12) Lingshetpa (FD 2016)

kher de khi! t̥hugu d̥jiks-ek, / d̥jiks-et, thoŋ-ma-thoŋ?!
take.way.IMP that dog child be.afraid-Y=PRS be.afraid-X=PRS see-NG-see

‘Take that dog away! Don’t you see (lit. You did not see at all) that the child is afraid?!’ ([Could be said about an unrelated child, seen crying; Y would be used neutrally,] assuming authority with X makes it more urgent.)

(13) a. Lingshetpa (FD 2016)

*skara gonpa·(:) guru rimpoŋhe·(:) sku *(zaŋ-se)-duk.*
Skara monastery-ALL Guru Rimpoche·GEN hon.statue hon.erec-CV-Y=PERF

‘In the Skara monastery, is a statue of Guru Rimpoche (Padma Sambhava).’ (The speaker, [who does not feel related to the monastery, as he is from a different, far-off village], was not involved in setting up the statue.)

b. Lingshetpa (FD 2016)

*skara gonpa·(:) kargjut seŋhiŋ *(zaŋ-se)-jot.*
Skara monastery-ALL Bkaŋ.brgyud lineage hon.erec-CV-X=PERF

‘In the Skara monastery, is the *Bkaŋ.brgyud* lineage.’ (The speaker was involved as painter.)

Pragmatics of politeness generally make a perfect construction with a honorific full verb preferable to the plain existential, even when simply talking just about what is there in the monastery; some speakers, like this one, would not use the plain existential, at all.

(14) Ciktanpa (FD 2017)

mamani-tsana julpa-s zan maŋmo khjoŋ-ma·t.
mamani-when villager-ERG food much bring-NLS·X=HAB
dutsek zan khjoŋ-en-duk ki mi-sak qaŋ-se,
this.much food bring-CNT-Y=PRS that people-PL be.full-CV
torobalaŋ-sag-a taŋ-ma-rgos-en-duk,
cattle.cow-PL-ALL give-NLS-need-CNT-Y=PRS
d̥zap ki zan qamti [=qimati] in.
when that food precious be(X)

mamani-tsana rgos-p·i zan-t̥fi fi(ŋ)-na, t̥hik duk.
mamani-when need-NLS·GEN food-LQ take.out-CD ok be(Y)

‘At the *mamani* festival, people use to bring a lot of food. [But] they bring so much food that everybody is full, and one has to give [the rest] to the cattle, even though the food is precious. It would be better, if [one] takes out [only as much] food as needed (lit. if [one] takes ..., it is ok) at the *mamani* festival.’ [X is used neutrally for a well-known habit. / Y is used for a critical or distanced view of the habit. Here the speaker opposes the fact that so much precious food is

thrown away. In the second part, **X** is used for an objective fact (food IS precious),] <while **Y** indicates a more subjective evaluation and wish.>

(15) Gya-Mīrupa (FD 2008)

khi khor-zane, am·e tāñse ne si·huk.
 threshing turn-when mother·ERG always barley winnow·Y=PRS
 ‘During threshing, [our] mother always winnows the barley.’ (A situation, quite familiar to the informant. But the speaker no longer does this work and also does not want to do it.)

(16) Tagmacigpa (FD 2019)

domkhar-i gonpa-basañ tagmañfig-i gonpa rñiñ-ba in.
 Domkhar-GEN monastery-CNTR Tagmacik-GEN monastery be.old-NLS be(**X**)
tagmañfig-i gonpa-basañ domkhar-i gonpa soma intsok.
 Tagmacik-GEN monastery-CNTR Domkhar-GEN monastery new be(GEM~‘factual’)
 ‘The monastery of Tagmacik [that is, ours,] is older than the monastery of Domkhar. The monastery of Domkhar [that is, theirs,] is newer than the monastery of Tagmacik.’

The generalised evaluative marker (GEM) has many functions; here, it indicates that the speaker has certain (and shared) knowledge (Domkhar is just on the other side of the river; people of both villages have mutual relationships), but does not belong there, whereas the copula emphasises her belonging and identification.

Abbreviations

“=”: ‘equals’ (not a clitic marker!) AES: aesthetive (experiencer subject); ALL: allative; CD: conditional; CNT: continuative (obligatory in non-*origo* present/ imperfect tenses in Western Sham and Purik, thus leading to neutral present/imperfect tenses); CNTR: contrast; CV: converb marker; ERG: ergative; FM: focus marker; GEM: generalised evaluative marker; GEN: genitive; HAB: habitual; **hon**: honorific; IMP: imperative; LQ: limiting quantifier (‘a’, ‘some’); NG: negation; NLS: nominaliser; PA: past (stem); PERF: perfect; PL: plural; PPOS: postposition; PRS: present (stem); QM: question marker; TOP: topic marker. Angled brackets with italics indicate my interpretation – which is based on discussions with informants and logical reasoning, but not confirmed by the respective speaker. Square brackets and no italics are used for explanations given by the respective informant with other, similar examples.

References

- Chernela, J. 2012. Mascarading the voice. Texts of the self in the Brazilian Northwest Amazon. In: J.L. Rodríguez and A.K. Webster (eds.), *Ordeals of language: Essays in honor of Ellen B. Basso*. Special issue of *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 68.3: 315–338.
- DeLancey, S. 2018. Evidentiality in Tibetic. In: Aikhenvald, A.Y. (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 580–594.
- Häsler, K.L. 2001. An empathy-based approach to the description of the verb system of the Dege dialect of Tibetan. In B. Bickel, ed., *Person and evidence in Himalayan languages*. Part II. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 24.1: 1–34.
- Widmer, M. 2020. Same same but different: On the relationship between egophoricity and evidentiality. In: H. Bergsqvist and S. Kittilä (eds.), *Evidentiality, egophoricity, and engagement*. Berlin: Language Science Press, 263–287.
- Zeisler, B. 2017. The emergence of the Ladakhi inferential and experiential markers from a marker for admirativity (non-commitment): the case of *h̥dug* and *snan̥*. *Journal of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, 4.2: 259–307.
- Zeisler, B. 2018. Evidence for the development of ‘evidentiality’ as a grammatical category in the Tibetic languages. In: A. Foolen, H. de Hoop, G. Mulder (eds.), *Evidence for Evidentiality*. Special volume of *Human Cognitive Processing* (HCP) 61. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 227–256.
- Zemp, M. 2017. The origin and evolution of the opposition between testimonial and factual evidentials in Purik and other varieties of Tibetan. *Open Linguistics*, 3: 613–637.

Subevent egophoric evidentiality: Revisiting Lhasa Tibetan *-byung*

ZHUANG Lingzi
Cornell University

Main point. Some evidentials can have *subevent scope*—marking evidence specifically for a temporal part of the whole event. Lhasa Tibetan *-byung* is best analyzed as encoding *subevent-level egophoric* evidence. This analysis captures two pragmatic effects of *-byung*, and yields a more transparent division of the V-EVID forms (V-*byung*/-*bzhag*/-'dug vs. V-*yod*/-*song*) in the evidential-aspectual paradigm of Lhasa Tibetan.

Background. 1. Canonical definitions of evidentiality (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004, Willet 1988) often assume that evidentials mark that the speaker has a certain type of evidence for the entire event being described. 2. Previous works agree that *-byung* is egophoric in terms of evidence type, but disagree on how best to characterize *-byung*'s apparent thematic restriction and aspectual value. Two directions have been taken: one appeals to a metaphorical notion of an event as being oriented towards the speaker (“*receptive* egophoric past-tense” [Tournadre & Sangda Dorje 2003, Vokurková 2008], “*cislocative* perfective” [Oisel 2017]); the other specifies a role or scope restriction (“perfective, *speaker as Goal/Experiencer*” [DeLancey 2003], “*VP-level* ego” [Garrett 2001]). However, in every case, such characterizations are both notionally and paradigmatically ad-hoc, and it is unclear how “speaker orientation” and role/scope restrictions are to be unified.

Proposal. I adopt a well-established compositional analysis of events (Dowty 1979 et seq.) in terms of two subevent primitives. A CAUSE subevent encompasses the Agent's active involvement, from the onset of the intention (if a volitional/+control event), to the Agent's action to bring about the event up to its endpoint. A BECOME subevent encompasses the Patient/Undergoer's transition from its pre-event original state up to the result-state, which obtains at the culmination point. Thus, for example, an intransitive inchoative event consists of a single BECOME subevent (with 0 or positive in-event duration), whereas a transitive accomplishment event consists of a CAUSE subevent by the Agent (with positive in-event duration), plus a logically and temporally linked BECOME subevent on the Patient (with 0 or positive in-event duration, depending on whether the nature of the effect on the Patient occurs gradually or punctually).

Crucially: an evidential may convey that the speaker has *x* type of evidence just over *part* of this temporal structure. Specifically, in the case of *-byung*: it encodes that **the speaker has egophoric evidence about the BECOME subevent**.

Explaining pragmatic effects. (i) *-byung* can appear with a first-person Agent (1), but with an obligatory mirative and/or remorseful interpretation. This follows straightforwardly from the subevent-evidential analysis: in asserting a transitive event but marking only egophoric evidence on BECOME, the speaker indicates that s/he has a different, and non-immediate (thus delayed), type of evidence for the CAUSE subevent, hence the mirative/remorseful effect.

- (1) *nga.rang=gis* *nga* *na-pa* *bzos-byung*
 I.myself=ERG I be.ill-NM make-BYUNG
 ‘I had made myself sick (it turns out! What a shame.).’ (Own fieldwork)

(ii) Negation of *-byung* can sometimes implicate that the speaker *unsuccessfully tried* to do something (2). This is a Maxim of Quantity-based conversational implicature that also follows directly from the above analysis: in contexts where a logically related (even if not lexically encoded) CAUSE subevent is salient, the speaker can implicate, by negating only the BECOME subevent on egophoric evidence, that the CAUSE counterpart is true.

- (2) *nga* *dran* *ma-byung.*
 I remember NEG-BYUNG
 ‘I didn’t remember (*implicated*: though I tried).’ (Denwood 1999:145, *emphasis* mine)

Paradigmatic extension. V-*byung* belongs to the part of the Lhasa Tibetan evidential-aspectual paradigm that takes the morphological form V-EVID (where EVID=-*yod*, -*byung*, -*song*, -*'dug*, -*bzhag*). Subevent-scope evidentiality yields a clearer division of this part of the paradigm: V-*byung* and V-*bzhag*/'*dug* encode, respectively, egophoric and direct evidence over just the BECOME subevent, while V-*yod* and V-*song* encode, respectively, egophoric and direct evidence over the entire event. I discuss potential connections and divergences between this synchronic picture and the diachronic development of Lhasa verb roots from the erstwhile perfective stems of Old/Classical Tibetan.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. I. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press.
- Caplow, N. J. (2017). Inference and deferred evidence in Tibetan. In L. Gawne and N. Hill (eds.) *Evidential Systems of Tibetan Languages* (pp. 225-258). De Gruyter Mouton.
- DeLancey, S. (2003). Lhasa Tibetan. In G. Thurgood and R. LaPolla (eds.) *The Sino-Tibetan Languages* (pp. 270-288). Routledge.
- Denwood, P. (1999). *Tibetan* (Vol. 3). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dowty, D. (1979). Word meaning and Montague Grammar. *Dordrecht: Reidel*, 6(7), 8.
- Garrett, E. J. (2001). *Evidentiality and assertion in Tibetan*. [Doctoral dissertation, UCLA].
- Oisel, G. (2017). On the origin of the Lhasa Tibetan evidentials *song* and *byung*. In L. Gawne and N. Hill (eds.) *Evidential systems of Tibetan Languages* (pp. 161-182).
- Reichenbach, H., 1947, *Elements of Symbolic Logic*, New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- San Roque, L., Floyd, S., & Norcliffe, E. (2018). Egophoricity: an introduction. *Egophoricity*, 1, 78.
- Tournadre, N., & Dorje, S. (2003). *Manual of Standard Tibetan*. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications.
- Vokurková, Z. (2008). *Epistemic modalities in spoken Standard Tibetan*. [Doctoral dissertation, Charles University].
- Willet, T. L. 1988. A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticalization of Evidentiality. *Studies in Language*, 12-51.
- Zemp, M. (2021). On the development of evidential contrasts in the Greater Himalayan Region'. Presentation at ICHL.