Lauren Gawne, Nathan W. Hill (Eds.)
Evidential Systems of Tibetan Languages

Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs

Volume 302

Evidential Systems of Tibetan Languages

Edited by
Lauren Gawne
Nathan W. Hill

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

ISBN 978-3-11-046018-6
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-047374-2
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-047187-8
ISSN 1861-4302

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet http://dnb.dnb.de.

Typesetting: Compuscript Ltd., Shannon, Ireland
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Nathan W. Hill and Lauren Gawne

1 The contribution of Tibetan languages to the study of evidentiality

In his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* the great Sanskrit grammarian Pāṇini cryptically notes the grammatical encoding of information source with the words *parokṣe liṭ* 'one uses the perfect tense in reference to past action not linked to the present day and not witnessed' (Hock 2012: 93–101); so began the study of evidentiality.[1] Although Tibetan grammatical studies, like all domains of traditional Tibetan high culture, build upon Indian models, the Tibetan grammarians did not inherit an explicit awareness of evidentiality.

Alexandra Aikhenvald's 2004 monograph *Evidentiality* is the most thorough typological treatment of evidentiality to date, drawing on grammatical descriptions of over 500 languages (Aikhenvald 2004: xii). While Aikhenvald concedes that "evidentiality in Tibetan varieties was hardly mentioned" (Aikhenvald 2012: 467, Note 20) in her study, she does make reference to four Tibetan varieties, viz. Ladhaki, Amdo, Sherpa, and Lhasa. The World Atlas of Language Structures' (WALS) survey of evidentiality[2] draws on three of the same four Tibetan languages, omitting Lhasa, on the basis of the same secondary literature as Aikhenvald. There is scope both for increased documentation of Tibetan evidential systems and for typological work on evidentiality to make more ample use of the Tibetan data already available. Such work will deepen the understanding of specific Tibetan varieties and improve typological theorizing on evidentiality (cf. Hill 2013a: 51–52; Tournadre, this volume). By making the results of research on Tibetan evidential systems more conveniently accessible, the work in the reader's hands aids in filling these lacunae.

The title of this work and this introduction refer to the varieties of Tibetan spoken today as Tibetan languages (we discuss this terminology in §5 below). We follow Tournadre in drawing together this "well-defined family of languages derived from Old Tibetan" (Tournadre 2014: 107). As all families do, these languages demonstrate phonetically regular reflexes of historic forms, share a core vocabulary, and retain many elements of inherited grammar. As this volume

---

1 Boas (1911: 43) often mistakenly receives credit for the earliest discussion of grammatical marking of information souce (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004: 12–13, 2014: 4).
2 http://wals.info/feature/77A#2/16.6/148.7

Note: A list of abbreviations appears at the end of this chapter. Where possible, glosses in citations from other authors have been regularized to the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

DOI 10.1515/9783110473742-001

demonstrates, despite their common features, these languages encode evidentiality in different ways, demonstrating the outcome of historical developments (see §4). Just as there is variation in how Tibetan languages have grammaticalised evidentiality, the speakers of these languages do not necessarily consider themselves as belonging to a single unified group. Tibetan language speakers reside in Tibet, other parts of China, India, Nepal, Bhutan, and Pakistan. Many Tibetan language speakers will not refer to themselves as Tibetan, but consider themselves to be a member of a specific cultural group, such as Sherpa, or Bhutia. In addition, not all Tibetan language speakers share the same Buddhist culture, e.g. the Purik and the Balti are predominantly Muslim (Zemp, this volume), and many Buddhist groups like the Yolmo have a synchronous indigenous tradition (Desjarlais 1992). This volume attempts to give some illustration of the diversity of Tibetan languages, with contributions on varieties from China, Nepal, India and Bhutan.

Lhasa Tibetan is far and away the best described Tibetan variety. Consequently, to the extent typologists make reference to Tibetan at all, they rely primarily on Lhasa Tibetan and traditions of its analysis, in particular 'conjunct-disjunct' and 'egophoric'. The three evidential categories of Lhasa Tibetan (called 'personal', 'experiential', and 'factual' in this introduction) serve as the point of departure in the exploration of other Tibetan varieties and in the study of the development of evidentials throughout Tibet's long literary history. This introduction describes in turn, the history of the study of Lhasa Tibetan evidentiality (§1), the use of Lhasa Tibetan in typological discussions (§2), the study of other Tibetan varieties (§3), and research on the historical development of Tibetan evidentials (§4). The contributions to this volume correspondingly present research on Lhasa Tibetan, typology, other Tibetan varieties, and the historical emergence of Tibetan evidentiality and we refer to these contributions throughout this introduction. In §5 we discuss the conventions and nomenclature of the volume overall. Throughout this introduction we offer a standardized terminology (personal, factual, and experiential) as equivalences to the terminology of specific authors, in order to facilitate comparison among authors and Tibetan varieties.

While we have given a definition of Tibetan, we have not given a definition of evidentiality. Aikhenvald's definition of evidentiality as "a grammatical expression of information source" (2015: 239) has a simplicity, and certainly has popularity. This rather narrow definition has perhaps led her to miss the nature of evidentiality in languages like Tibetan, which we discuss below. Tournadre and LaPolla (2014) also believe that Aikhenvald's definition is too narrow. After a survey of some Tibetan varieties, and beyond, they give a definition of "the representation of source and access to information according to the speaker's perspective and strategy" (Tournadre and LaPolla 2014: 240). The inclusion of 'access to information' and 'speaker's perspective' is intended to tease out some of the subtleties of personal evidentiality, which we discuss below. Attempting to find one definition of evidentiality that applies to all languages may prove elusive. As can be seen in this volume, even closely related languages may use cognate forms in very different ways. Similarly, linguists from different theoretical backgrounds may approach the question of evidentiality in different ways. We have not constrained our authors by asking them to employ a particular definition of evidentiality in their analyses.

As a related issue, attempting to articulate the relationship between evidentiality and other grammatical features, particularly those contextually-dependent features related to speaker stance, is unlikely to be a successful endeavor at the cross-linguistic level. Our authors expand on the interaction of evidentiality with other grammatical features as they see fit for a particular language. For many of our authors an understanding of modality, speaker perspective, and interrogativity within a particular language are vital to an understanding of evidentiality. For example, for Hyslop and Tshering (this volume) evidentiality is entirely subsumed within the epistemic system. In order to keep this introduction to a containable size, we focus on the grammatical categories of evidentiality specifically, but we also acknowledge that within a single language these cannot be understood in isolation from other features of the language.

1.1 The study of Lhasa Tibetan evidentiality

Research on Lhasa Tibetan evidentiality divides into three groups: 1. early pedagogical grammars, where evidentiality is treated more or less as a form of person agreement, 2. linguistic research where the three-term Lhasa system is analysed as reflecting binary settings of interacting features, 3. linguistic research where the three semantic categories encoded by the evidential system are described as isomorphic with the three morphosyntactic categories used to encode them. These three approaches broadly correspond with chronologically distinct stages in research on Tibetan evidentiality, and reflect an overarching movement away from *a priori* commitments to person and toward characterizations that are both structurally verifiable and motivated by usage in discourse. However, there are striking exceptions to the chronological pattern. While Yukawa Yasutoshi already championed the third approach in 1966, some typologists continue today to rely on outdated treatments of Tibetan evidential systems in discussions of person agreement (see Bickel and Nichols 2007: 223–224; Aikhenvald 2015: 257). Although a useful heuristic, the division of researchers among these three groups is somewhat arbitrary. No researcher unambiguously equates the Lhasa system with person agreement of the Indo-European type, to do so would be foolish. Concomitantly, until recently few researchers vehemently disavowed grammatical person.

As terms for the basic meanings that the Lhasa categories express, 'mood' or 'modality' (Takeuchi 1978; Tournadre 1996: 217; Denwood 1999: 119), 'evidentiality' (DeLancey 1992: 45; Tournadre 1996: 217; Denwood 1999: 119), and 'deixis' (Tournadre 1992; Beckwith 1992; Bartee 1996) have all enjoyed popularity. It would be meaningless to attempt to adjudicate among these terms, as no single rubric will ever capture the subtleties of the Lhasa Tibetan evidential system. In the current volume, most authors prefer the terminology of 'evidentiality', but as the reader will see, Tibetan varieties fail to support the claim that evidentiality "does not bear any straightforward relationship to truth, the validity of a statement or the speaker's responsibility" (Aikhenvald 2014: 44).

1.1.1 Early pedagogical grammarians

Early pedagogical grammars of spoken Lhasa or Central Tibetan attempt to describe the language's three evidential categories as person agreement. Authors themselves acknowledge the imperfect fit. Writing that personal *yod* "is more commonly used with the 1st person" (1894: 46), Graham Sandberg pointedly avoids the direct identification of this category with first person agreement. Vincent Henderson habitually translates the personal verb suffixes *-yin* and *-yod* as first person and the suffixes *-red* and *-ḥdug* as both second and third person, but he includes caveats along the lines that sometimes "*yin* is also heard with 2nd and 3rd persons" (1903: 33). Charles Bell continues to suggest that these suffixes indicate person agreement by offering paradigms such as *ṅas blug-gi-yod* 'I pour' (personal) and *khos blug-gi-ḥdug* 'He pours' (experiential) (1905: 37). Nonetheless, when writing about the use of the relevant forms as existential verbs rather than as tense suffixes, he also draws attention to the importance of evidence. He writes that as

> a general rule it may be said that *yod* [personal] means 'it is there, I saw it there and know that it is still there'; *ḥdug* [experiential] means 'I saw it there but I am not sure whether it is still there or not'; *yod-pa-red* [factual] means, 'I did not see it, but have heard that it is there'. (1905: 40)

Unfortunately, Bell's observations on the evidential meanings of the existential verbs languished for some time.[3]

3 Writing more than 50 years after Bell, Roerich and Phuntshok remain exactly where Sandberg and Henderson left matters. They caution that the apparent association of certain suffixes with grammatical person is "rather irregular" (1957: 48) and underline that in the Tibetan verbal system "the persons are not distinguished" (1957: 48). Nonetheless, they identify the choice of evidential category with person agreement, noting that personal *yod* is used "for the first person singular and plural, and [experiential] *ḥdug* in the second and third persons" (1957: 49–50).

Like Bell, Chang and Shefts continue to treat the tense suffixes as marking person (1964: 25), while singling out the existential verbs for alternative treatment. Unlike Bell, they distinguish the latter in terms of certainty (1964: 18) rather than evidence. Also in keeping with the precedence of Bell, Goldstein and Nornang speak of person when describing the verbal suffixes (1970: 408–409) but in their discussion of existential verbs they distinguish experiential *ḥdug* "actual visual knowledge" from factual *yod-pa-red* "hearsay and knowledge other than visual" (1970: 23). Thus, altogether early pedagogical grammars never abandoned the attempt to characterize the Lhasa Tibetan verbal system in terms of person agreement, through time the importance of information source gradually emerged. In assessing the accuracy of these pedagogical treatments, one must bear in mind the classroom context, where a comprehensible oversimplification often commends itself.

1.1.2 Interacting binary features

A ramification of the early pedagogical treatments' identification of the Lhasa personal evidential category with first person agreement is the bifurcation of the three term Lhasa system into a two way opposition of personal (associated with first person) versus factual and experiential taken together (both associated with both second and third person). Such a tack precipitates the need to subsequently bifurcate factual and experiential without recourse to person agreement. Thus, it is no coincidence that to the limited extent Goldstein and Nornang (1970: 408/409) invoke source of knowledge they do so to distinguish between factual and experiential.

Whether out of deference to this pedagogical heritage or under the influence of a Jakobsonian penchant for binary features, many of the linguists who studied the Lhasa Tibetan verbal system in the latter part of the 20th century upheld this analysis of double bifurcation. Thus, Takeuchi Tsuguhito divides Lhasa Tibetan 'modus' into 内的 'inner' (personal) and 外的 'outer', with the latter subsuming 直接認識 'direct recognition' and 間接認識 'indirect recognition' (1978). Independently of Takeuchi and of each other, in 1992 a further three scholars describe the three Lhasa Tibetan evidential categories in terms of two binary contrasts. Scott DeLancey distinguishes "conjunct" (personal) and "disjunct", dividing the disjunct into "mirative" (experiential) and "non-mirative" (factual) (1992: 45). Nicolas Tournadre distinguishes between "égophoriques" (personal) and "hétérophoriques" auxiliaries (1992: 197), dividing the latter between "constatif" (experiential) and "assertif" (factual) (1992: 207).[4] Less clearly, Christopher

4 Since they have been influential outside of the study of Tibetan varieties, we return to DeLancey's 'conjunct-disjunct' (§2.1) and Tournadre's 'egophoric' (§2.2) in greater detail below.

Beckwith posits a primary distinction of ‘personal deictic class’ of “first versus second and third persons” (1992: 2) but recognizes “evidentials” (1992: 11) within the latter class. Ellen Bartee (1996) repeats DeLancey’s account, as does Krisadawan Hongladarom, although she notes that his classification is “not wholly adequate” (1992: 1151). Philip Denwood’s description of the Lhasa Tibetan three term evidential system as resulting from binary interactions of up to four independent factors ‘person’, ‘evidentiality’, ‘viewpoint’, and ‘generality’ (1999: 150) represents the apogee of a Jacobsonian binary approach. This machinery allows him to explain the use of the relevant morphemes in a wide array of contexts, but using a descriptive apparatus of 16 possible settings to account for three paradigmatically contrasting categories is excessive.

1.1.3 Three contrasting forms means three contrasting functions

The earliest published dedicated study of Tibetan evidentiality we are aware of is Yukawa Yasutoshi’s 1966 article on *ḥdug*, a revised version of his 1964 master’s thesis. He followed this study with overall treatments of Tibetan predicates in 1971 and 1975. Yukawa’s approach is to treat each morphological suffix in turn in all of the syntactic positions in which it occurs, with a sensitivity to the interactional context. In the third of these publications he says the personal “話し手〈疑問文の場合は話し相手〉にとって身近に感じられる状麓をあらわし [denotes a state with which the speaker (or the listener in interrogative sentences) feels familiar]” the factual “ある状態であるととを客観的に断定する objectively asserts a certain state]” and the experiential is “ある状態を話し手（疑問文の場合は話し相手）の感覚で直接にとらえ[. . .]場合に用いられる[used when the speaker (or the listener in interrogative sentences) directly perceives a certain state through the senses]” (1975: 4, p. 189 this volume). In addition, Yukawa notes that while in most constructions ‘familiarity’ is sufficient to warrant the use of the egophoric, the past suffix *-pa-yin* “このの場合は、自分の子供であっても、このいい方をすることはできず，自分「または自分を含む集団」の行為についてだけ、こういえるのである [can only denote the speaker’s own actions (or those of a group to which she belongs) and cannot be used, for example, to refer to the speaker’s own child]” (1971: 194). With this observation Yukawa describes what many years later Garrett refers to as ‘weak ego’ versus ‘strong ego’ (2001: 178–205) and Tournadre refers to as ‘wide scope’ versus ‘narrow scope’ egophoric (2008: 296). Similarly, Yukawa shows an awareness of the distribution of evidential forms in questions over a decade before DeLancey’s conjunct-disjunct account. Yukawa’s contributions have long been overlooked in the English-language literature on Tibetan. To rectify this neglect Yukawa’s 1975 article is here republished in English translation for the first time.

In Japan, Kitamura Hajime continues the third tradition, describing the personal as encoding what is "psycholinguistically nearer to the speaker" (1977: 25), the experiential as "psycholinguistically remote from the speaker" and "which the speaker or hearer has ascertained or is ascertaining by his experience" (1977: 26), and the factual as "generally known facts" (1977: 27).

Some researchers who had described Tibetan evidentials using person agreement or binary feature approaches move towards the three-way morphosyntactic contrast as a guide to describing contrasting evidential functions. Twenty years after the publication of their textbook, Chang and Chang return to the Lhasa Tibetan evidential system with an audience of linguists rather than students in mind. Although they do not explicitly characterize the Tibetan system as 'evidential', their discussion of the personal as "the habitual or customary basis of knowledge which has been personally acquired" (1984: 605), the experiential as "witness" (1984: 619), and the factual as "hearsay" (1984: 605) makes clear that these morphemes encode three types of information source. Similarly, Hongladarom moves from a binary 'conjunct-disjunct' description to describing Tibetan as having:

> a three way evidential distinction among *yöö* [personal], *tuu*, [experiential] and *yôôree* [factual] indicating the speaker's self knowledge, direct experience, and indirect source of information respectively. (1993: 52, emphasis in original).

Garrett arrives at the same analysis positing three "evidential categories in Lhasa Tibetan—ego [personal], direct [experiential], and indirect [factual]" (2001: x et passim). Schwieger (2002: 183) explicitly rejects the association of these evidential categories with agreement. Recent pedagogical grammars also stress that the Tibetan system encodes information source and not person agreement (Tournadre and Dorje 2003; Chonjore 2003).

The preoccupation of this discussion has been the general characterization of evidentiality in Lhasa Tibetan and an emphasis on the fact that Lhasa has a three term evidential system. This structure is most clear in the parallelism between the existential verbs *yod* (personal), *ḥdug* (experiential), and *yod-pa-red* (factual) and the present tense suffixes *-gi-yod* (personal), *-gi-ḥdug* (experiential), and *-gi-yod-pa-red* (factual). Probably one factor that impeded description of this system is the opacity of the system's symmetry in other parts of the verbal system. In particular, the placement of the suffixes *-yoṅ*, *-myoṅ*, and *-byuṅ* into the overall verbal paradigm requires further study. In their contributions to this volume both Hill and Caplow recommend that *bźag* be analyzed as a perfect experiential rather than a separate inferential evidential (as in DeLancey 1985: 65–67, 2003: 279; Tournadre 1992: 198, 207, 1996: 236–238; Tournadre and Dorje 2009: 140–144, 410, 413); Hill additionally suggests that the analysis of the semantics of inference as a combination of direct evidentiality with perfect tense is a useful framework for understanding phenomena in other languages.

Linguistic meaning is an emergent social practice, which no abstract characterization will fully succeed at capturing. Consequently, the task of describing the Lhasa evidential system does not end at realizing the inadequacy of approaches making reference to person or binary features. Instead, the contextual use of evidentials in conversation and narration is available for study at any level of granularity. Hongladarom (1993) offers a nuanced account of the contrasting use of *ḥdug* and *yod-pa-red* in conversation.

1.2 The use of Lhasa Tibetan in typological discussions

The wider typological literature fails to take note of the great majority of the research discussed in the previous section. Aikhenvald (2004) cites only works by DeLancey and one article by Tournadre (1994). Her lopsided attentiveness is characteristic of the citation of Tibetan research articles in the later decades of the 20th century and early 21st century; Google Scholar registers 141 citations of DeLancey (1986) and 81 citations of Tournadre and Dorje (2003)[5] as opposed to 15 for Hongladarom (1993) and none for Yukawa (1966).[6] Because of their influence, in the context of Tibetan's impact on the typological literature DeLancey's 'conjunct-disjunct' (§2.1) and Tournadre's 'egophoric' (§2.2) require treatment in detail.

1.2.1 Lhasa Tibetan as a conjunct-disjunct system

The discourse of 'conjunct-disjunct' began with an unpublished paper by Austin Hale (1971). In the decade before the publication of an updated version (Hale 1980) his framework was already influential among missionaries associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics and scholars of Newar (Strahm 1975; Sresthacharya et al. 1971; Sresthacarya 1976); the published version (Hale 1980) became the *locus classicus* for this terminology. In this article Hale proposes conjunct-disjunct nomenclature for a patterning of verbal suffixes in Kathmandu Newar whereby first person declaratives and second person interrogatives are marked the same way, in contrast to first person interrogatives, second person declaratives and all

5 Combining the count for the English and French editions.
6 Google Scholar www.scholar.google.com accessed 29 December 2015.

third person forms. In (1) the first person verb is differentiated from the second and third person forms with a lengthening of the vowel.[7]

(1) a. *ji ana* ***wanā***
'I went there.' (conjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 1)
b. *cha ana* ***wana***
'You went there.' (disjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 2)
c. *wa* ***wana***
'He went there.' (disjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 3)

Hale's description of the system involves three major features. The first is that clauses with first person declarative subjects occur with the same form of the verb as clauses with second person subjects in question constructions (Hale 1980: 95) (cf. (2)).

(2) *cha ana* ***wanā*** *lā*
'Did you go there?' (conjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 4)

The second is that this pattern only holds when the subject is the 'true instigator' of the action. Impersonal verbs, which the subject has no control over, are never marked with a conjunct form (cf. (3)), not even for first person or interrogatives. That the 'disjunct' is not actually contrasting against anything in this context is one of the reasons this terminology is unhelpful.

(3) a. *jįį wa saa* ***tāla***
'I heard that noise.' (disjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 9)
b. *chąą wa saa* ***tāla***
'You heard that noise.' (disjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 9)
c. *wąą wa saa* ***tāla***
'He heard that noise.' (disjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 9)

This dimension of 'instigator-hood' means that for verbs other than the impersonal set (where they are always marked disjunct regardless of person) it is possible

7 In citations from Hale (1980) the emphasis is ours.

to make a distinction for first person between actions that were done voluntarily (cf. (4a)) and those done involuntarily (cf. (4b)) (Hale 1980: 96). This distinction is possible because the conjunct form is used exclusively for voluntary actions, as discussed above.

(4) a. *jįį lā* ***palā***
'I cut the meat (intentionally).' (conjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 10)
b. *jįį lā* ***pala***
'I cut the meat (quite by accident).' (disjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 11)

The third important feature of Hale's conjunct-disjunct is the way it interacts with indirect quote frames. The two examples below translate the same in English, but use different verb forms in Newar and have different co-referential relations. In (5) we give Hale's gloss and also include subscript referent notation.

(5) a. *wąą wa ana* ***wanā*** *dhakāā dhāla*
'He_i said that he_i went there (himself).' (conjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 5)
b. *wąą wa ana* ***wana*** *dhakāā dhāla*
'He_i said he_j (someone else) went there.' (disjunct)
(Hale 1980: ex. 6)

The first utterance involves the person saying he went, while the second utterance is a person reporting on another person who went. Hale does not discuss how the choice of conjunct versus disjunct forms in these constructions intersect with impersonal verbs (cf. (3)), or with non-volitional acts (cf. (4)), but in a later treatment Hargreaves (2005: 17) demonstrates that the conjunct-disjunct pattern does not hold in such conditions, instead all forms are disjunct.

Six year prior to the publication of Hale's 1980 study Bendix wrote that (what would later be called) the conjunct expresses "the evidential category of intentional action" (Bendix 1974: 54) and emphasizes it "is evidential and not a first-person verb ending: it may occur with any person" (1974: 49). In 1980 Hale cites, but makes little use of Bendix' work. In contrast to Bendix, Hale frames his discussion of conjunct-disjunct marking in syntactic terms. Nonetheless, his description of the system's special treatment of the subject as 'true instigator' on the one hand and the treatment of impersonal verbs on the other hand, make clear that the choice of these suffixes is semantically motivated. Although Hale's 'conjunct' and 'disjunct' terminology persists in the treatment of Kathmandu Newar, the definition of these terms now takes its cue from Bendix. Hargreaves says that conjunct "suffixes will occur whenever the action is construed as intentional, and the actor/agent is also the evidential source reporting the action" (2003: 376) whereas disjunct "suffixes occur in all other finite environments" (2003: 376, also cf. Hargreaves 2005). Hale's recent work employs an *in extenso* quotation from Hargreaves as his definition of conjunct and disjunct; the quotation itself cites Bendix on the evidential nature of the system (Hale and Shreshta 2006: 55/56). Although originally framing his argument around person agreement, Hale now appears to agree that the Newar pattern is motivated by evidential semantics.

It is worth discussing Aikhenvald's perspective on the Newar verbal system, as she analyses both it and Lhasa Tibetan as conjunct-disjunct. Aikhenvald describes Newar as having an evidential system of three or more terms (2004: 291), but 87 pages earlier describes it as displaying "conjunct and disjunct person marking" (2004: 204, also see p. 124), a view she repeats in 2012 (p. 471). To say that Newar has a conjunct-disjunct system that expresses evidentiality poses no contradiction for Hale and Hargreaves, but Aikhenvald rejects the consensus view that Newar conjunct-disjunct is evidential marking by another name. Instead, she offers a purely syntactic definition of conjunct-disjunct marking[8] and contends that "[c]onjunct-disjunct person-marking systems are not evidential in nature" (2004: 127), a view she reiterates in 2015 with the words "[c]onjunct-disjunct systems do not mark information source" (2015: 257), in direct contrast with the views of both Hargreaves and Hale.

Citing Hale's 1980 article, DeLancey first mentions the possibility of considering Newar conjunct-disjunct marking in connection with the Tibetan verbal system (1985: 66, Note 5).[9] It was in 1990 that DeLancey first explicitly describes Tibetan as exhibiting a conjunct-disjunct system. He offers examples (6a–d) to show both that first person declaratives and second person interrogatives are marked the same way and that second person declaratives and first person interrogatives are marked the same way (corresponding to Hale's first feature).[10]

8 She defines conjunct-disjunct marking as "person-marking on the verb whereby first person subject in statements is expressed in the same way as second person in questions, and all other persons are marked in a different way (also used to describe cross clausal co-reference)" (2004: 391). More recently she concedes that person marking "may correlate with speaker's control in conjunct-disjunct […] person-marking systems" (2015: 257, Note 17), i.e. in her view we paradoxically see here a person-marking system that does not mark person.

9 In an article published the following year (1986) he does not reiterate this observation, making no mention of 'conjunct-disjunct'; puzzlingly, it is this 1986 paper that Aikhenvald cites to claim that conjunct-disjunct agreement has nothing to do with evidentiality (2004: 127, 2015: 257).

10 DeLancey was by no means the first scholar to note the patterning of first person declaratives with second person interrogatives in Tibetan; this pattern was known at least as early as Yukawa (1966: 77).

(6) a. *ṅa bod-pa yin*
I Tibetan be.PER
'I am a Tibetan.'
b. *kho bod-pa red*
He Tibetan be.FAC
'He is Tibetan.'
c. *khyed-raṅ bod-pa yin-pas*
You Tibetan be.PER.INTERR
'Are you a Tibetan?'
d. *ṅa rgya-mi red-pas*
1SG Chinese be.FAC.INTERR
'Am I Chinese?'
(DeLancey 1990: 295)

DeLancey also points to the Tibetan distinction between first person actions done voluntarily (cf. (7a)) and those done involuntarily (cf. (7b)). Thus, the Tibetan evidentials also satisfy Hale's second feature.

(7) a. *ṅas dkar-yol bcag-pa-yin*
1SG cup broke.PST.PER
'I broke the cup (intentionally).'
b. *ṅas dkar-yol bcag-soṅ*
1SG cup broke.PST.TES
'I broke the cup (unintentionally).'
(DeLancey 1990: 300)

He offers examples (8a–d) to show the way that interactions with indirect quote frames parallel those of Newar as in Hale's third feature.

(8) a. *khos kho bod-pa yin*
3SG.M.ERG 3SG.M Tibetan be.PER
'He is Tibetan.'
b. *khos kho bod-pa* yin *zer-gyis*
3SG.M.ERG 3SG.M Tibetan be.PER say.IPFV
'He$_i$ says 3SG.M$_i$ is Tibetan.'
c. *khos kho bod-pa red zer-gyis*
3SG.M.ERG 3SG.M Tibetan be.FAC say.IPFV
'He$_i$ says he$_j$ is Tibetan.'
d. *khos ṅa bod-pa red zer-gyis*
3SG.M.ERG 1SG Tibetan be.FAC say.IPFV
'He says I am Tibetan.'
(DeLancey 1990: 295/296)

Although DeLancey has not distanced himself from Hale's 1980 presentation of conjunct-disjunct as explicitly as Hale himself has, DeLancey's approach to describing Tibetan with 'conjunct-disjunct' terminology has changed over time. First, DeLancey never committed himself to Aikhenvald's assertion that conjunct-disjunct is person agreement and categorically not evidential marking. Most explicitly in 2003 he rejects her account by referring to conjunct-disjunct as a "particular evidential pattern" (2003: 278). Earlier he referred to the Lhasa Tibetan verbal system as an "evidential system" (1990: 304) and "problematic as an example of verb agreement" (1992: 43). Second, he has begun to use Tournadre's 'egophoric' terminology in addition to Hale's 'conjunct-disjunct'. Citing personal communication with DeLancey in 2003, Tournadre claims that with regard to Tibetan DeLancey had been "convinced that the notion of 'egophoric' [...] was more appropriate than the opposition conjunct/disjunct" (2008: 284, Note 6). In print DeLancey has not embraced 'egophoric' in favour of 'conjunct-disjunct', but recently he treats the two frameworks as interchangeable, writing of "'conjunct-disjunct' or 'egophoric' systems" (2012: 550, 2015: 64).

The framework of 'conjunct-disjunct' is not popular among other researchers on Tibetan. Sun refers to the terms as "utterly unrevealing" (1993: 995). Garrett sees their use in reference to Lhasa Tibetan as "regrettable" pointing out that "for a language like Tibetan, in which the evidential opposition is ternary [...] rather than binary, as in Newari, two terms do not suffice" (2001: 209, Note 66). Tournadre (2008) devotes an entire study to rejecting 'conjunct-disjunct'; he notes his argument's "implications for typological studies" (2008: 284), and sketches the ramifications of such a rejection on Aikhenvald's evidential typology. In his contribution to this volume Tournadre elaborates that Aikhenvald

> has set up conjunct/disjunct marking and evidentiality as categorically different in nature whereas at least for the Tibetic languages, 'conjunct/disjunct' was just a provisional and inappropriate description of evidential phenomena. (Tournadre, p. 118 this volume).

Tournadre's remarks provide a convenient juncture for the exploration of Aikhenvald's treatment of Lhasa Tibetan.

Paradoxically Aikhenvald describes Lhasa Tibetan *ḥdug* (experiential) as both a "disjunct copula" (2004: 127) and a morpheme that "marks 'actual visual knowledge'" (2004: 284). If as she contends, "[c]onjunct-disjunct person-marking systems are not evidential in nature" (2004: 127, cf. 12, 146, 276), then a single morpheme cannot be both disjunct and evidential. Her inconsistent treatment of *ḥdug* reflects an ambivalence as to whether Lhasa Tibetan exhibits evidential marking (2004: 14, 28, 69) or conjunct-disjunct agreement (2004: 127, 134). This ambivalence persists into 2012, but perhaps with her inclining in favor of person. She hesitantly finds Tibetan evidentiality plausible.

> The case for *ḥdug* as a marker of information source appears to be likely [...] However, to make it fully convincing, it needs to be placed within the context of a full grammar of a language. (2012: 467)

She expresses dissatisfaction with Denwood's (1999) treatment, but does not draw on the full grammars of Kitamura (1977), M. Hoshi (1988), Chonjore (2003), nor Garrett's (2001) thesis etc., which all discuss the evidential nature of the Tibetan system. Her skepticism regarding *ḥdug* is curious, given that very few of the languages treated in her 2004 monograph are as well researched as Tibetan.[11] Most recently, in 2015, she reiterates both the view that Tibetan has conjunct-disjunct person marking (2015b: 257, Note 17) and the view that "[c]onjunct-disjunct systems do not mark information source" (2015b: 257)", but remains silent on Tibetan evidentiality.

In addition to Newar and Lhasa Tibetan, the terminology of conjunct-disjunct has appeared in the description of the Jirel (Strahm 1975), Sherpa (Schöttelndreyer 1980; Woodbury 1986; Kelly 2004), and Lhomi (Vesalainen and Vesalainen 1980) varieties of Tibetan, as well as Awa Pit and other Barbacoan languages (Curnow 2002a, 2002b),[12] Kaike (Watters 2006), Duna (San Roque 2008: 425), and Yongning Na languages (Lidz 2010: 14, 373–381). How closely an author draws comparison to Hale's description of Newar, and whether he or she characterizes 'conjunct-disjunct' in a particular language as syntactic agreement or semantically based evidential choices, of course, varies case to case. In general, as in the case of Newar, earlier descriptions (e.g. Schöttelndreyer 1980) are syntactic in approach, but more recent descriptions, such as Watters' of Kaike emphasize that "'person' is not the primary motivating factor behind the system, but rather, 'volitionality' and 'locus of knowledge'" (2006: 300). It is likely that the authors of the older more syntactic descriptions would now reformulate their presentation in light of more recent research. Even among the older descriptions, a definition of the conjunct as meaning that there is "an experiencer [...] who has been closely involved with the event of the main verb" (Vesalainen and Vesalainen 1980: 27) is more similar to Tournadre's description of the egophoric than to any type of person agreement.

11 In the same 2012 article in which she holds high the bar for Lhasa's *ḥdug* as a marker of information source, Aikhenvald posits *le* as a mirative marker in Balti Tibetan on the basis of Bashir's (2010) treatment of a mere two examples.

12 Dickinson's (2000) description of Tsafiki essentially uses the 'conjunct-disjunct' approach, although she uses the terminology 'congruent' and 'noncongruent'.

1.2.2 Lhasa Tibetan egophoric evidentiality

DeLancey's current identification of 'conjunct-disjunct' with 'egophoric' makes good sense in the context of Tournadre's initial coining of the term 'egophoric'. In 1992, Tournadre contrasts the "égophoriques" (personal) and "hétérophoriques" (experiential-factual) auxiliaries (1992: 197), dividing the latter between "constatif" (experiential) and "assertif" (factual) (1992: 207).[13] In subsequent publications "hétérophoriques" became "hétérophorique ou neutre" (1994: 151), and "neutres" (1996: 220). By 2001 he had cast off the binary perspective, describing "egophoric", "sensorial", and "assertive" as equal evidential categories (Tournadre and Jiatso 2001: 72). From then on DeLancey's 'conjunct' and Tournadre's 'egophoric' parted ways. For Tournadre 'egophoric' refers to a specific evidential category in Lhasa Tibetan, a category that this introduction refers to as 'personal' (as in Hill 2012, 2013a) and others call 'participant specific' (Agha 1993: 157) or 'self-centered' (Denwood 1999). See Gawne (this volume) for further discussion of egophoric/personal in Lhasa Tibetan as well as other Tibetan varieties.

The personal (egophoric) is used in Lhasa Tibetan if the speaker of a declarative sentence draws on her own personal information about something closely associated with her or her intentions. The following examples (9a–f) contrast the semantics of the personal with the factual (cf. (10a+b)) and experiential (cf. (10c–f)).[14]

(9) a.

ṅa	*rdo-rje*	*yin*
I, me	Dorje	be-PER

'I'm Dorje.' (introducing oneself to a stranger)

b.

kho	*ṅaḥi*	*bu*	*yin*
he	I, me-GEN	son, child	be-PER

'He is my son.' (emphasizing his relationship to me, e.g. answering 'whose son is he?')

c.

ṅar	*deb*	*ḥdi*	*yod*
I, me-DAT	book	this	be-PER

'I own this book.' (seeing the book on a friend's table)

13 Tournadre's use of 'egophoric' differs profoundly from its meaning for Hagège (1982) or Dahl (2000).

14 These examples are adapted from Hongladarom (1993: 112), Schwieger (2002) and Hill (2013a). One could equally offer experiential equivalents of 10a-b, viz. *ḥdi ṅa red-bźag* '(I now see that) this is me' and *kho ṅaḥi bu red-bźag* '(I now see that) he is my son.'

d. *kha-lag ḥdi źim-po yod*
food this tasty be-PER
'This food is tasty.' (I find that it tastes good)

e. *ṅa na-gi-yod*
me sick-PRS-PER
'I'm (chronically) sick.'

f. *ṅa-tsho yar ḥgro-gi-yod*
we yonder go-PRS-PER
'We are going over there.'

g. *dge-rgan-gyis bod-yig bslab gnaṅ-gi-yod*
teacher-AGN Tibetan script teach do-PRS-PER
'The teacher teaches (me) Tibetan script.'

(10) a. *ḥdi ṅa red*
this me be-FAC
'This is me.' (presenting a group picture indicating one's place in a crowd)

b. *kho ṅaḥi bu red*
he I, me-GEN son, child be-FAC
'He is my son.' (emphasizing his correct identification, e.g. answering 'who is he'?)

c. *ṅar deb gcig ḥdug*
I, me-DAT book this be-TES
'(Oh,) there is a book for me.' (looking in an office pigeonhole)

c. *kha lag ḥdi źim-po ḥdug*
food this tasty be-TES
'This food is tasty.' (I know, because I am tasting it)

d. *ṅa na-gi-ḥdug*
me sick-PRS-TES
'I'm sick (at the moment).'

e. *ṅa-tsho yar ḥgro-gi-ḥdug*
we yonder go-PRS-TES
'(In my dream) we were going over there'.

f. *ṅa bod-yig slob-sbyoṅ byed-gi-ḥdug*
me Tibetan script study do-PRS-TES
'(In this scene of the home movie) I am studying the Tibetan script.'

These examples make abundantly clear that person agreement or its adaptation as 'conjunt-disjunct' has no explanatory value. The personal is perfectly compatible with third person (examples (9a, d, g)) and the first person is perfectly compatible with the experiential (examples (10a, c, d, e, f)). The supposed correlation of the personal evidence (egophoric) with first person subject is simply specious. Thus, “the coreference concepts of conjunct and disjunct are not appropriate” and instead the “semantic and pragmatic notion of ‘egophoric’ related to ‘personal knowledge’ [...] is better suited to interpret the linguistic facts” (Tournadre 2008: 304).

The Lhasa Tibetan personal evidential category has echoes in categories described for languages from other parts of the world (Loughnane 2009: 249–253; San Roque and Loughnane 2012: 157/158), some of which also passed through a phase of misidentification as person agreement or ‘conjunct’ marking. For example, W. M. Rule describes that when he and his wife

> first analysed the Foe language [of Papua New Ginea], we had this 1st [participatory] aspect classified as a 1st pers. subject-verb agreement [...] It was not until later, when we came across numbers of examples of sentences wherein the 1st aspect was used for actions which a 3rd person/s were doing [...] that I realised that the basic relationship was not between subject & the verb, but between the speaker & the verb. (Rule 1977: 71).

With the Lhasa and Foe cases in mind, it is clear that intensive language documentation needs to consider the interactional uses of grammatical forms in a range of interactional contexts.[15] In addition, whereas a contextualized example of evidential usage found in natural discourse is a fact to reckon with, grammaticality judgments are fallible opinions. For example, misled by the artificiality of elicitation, DeLancey (1990: 300) and Bartee (2011: 143) report that example (9e) (above) is ungrammatical.[16] Their example stands as a warning that readers must “feel entitled to explicitly doubt a direct statement about a language by someone who actually knows something about it” (DeLancey 2012: 538).

Aikhenvald does not discuss a category of personal (egophoric) evidentiality. Remarking that “complex evidentiality systems may involve further terms” (2004: 60), she mentions several of the relevant categories including the Foe “participatory” and the Kashaya “performative” (2004: 60–62), but these languages do not influence her typology (2004: 65) nor does she draw parallels between these categories and evidential usage in Newar and Lhasa Tibetan.[17]

15 One is entitled to wonder whether more intensive language documentation and comprehensive study will disprove observations such as that the “conjunct” of Awa Pit is “entirely person-based” (Curnow 2002a: 616) or that in sentences marked with the Kashaya “performative” the subject “is always the first person” (Oswalt 1986: 34). Subtle evidential nuances are hard to elicit.
16 Tournadre (1992: 203) appears to be the first to have reported example 9e.
17 Her more recent work (2012: 471, 2015: 257, Note 17) merely reiterates her long held opinions and reveals a lack of awareness of relevant work such as Tournadre (2008) and Loughnane (2009: 249–253).

In other quarters Tournadre's rejection of 'conjunct-disjunct' terminology has garnered attention and egophoric terminology is now proliferating among younger scholars (Post 2013; Daudey 2014a, 2014b; Knuchel 2015).[18] Nonetheless, closer scrutiny reveals Tournadre's insights have attracted fewer adherents than his terminology. In particular, the old analysis lives on in the *-ity* of 'egophoricity', a term Mark Post coined (2013: 107, 119, 127). He explicitly identifies the old outlook with the new term, referring to "person-sensitive T[ense]A[spect]M[ood] E[videntiality] marking in Lhasa Tibetan – 'a.k.a conjunct-disjunct marking' or 'egophoricity'" (2013: 107), unaware that the Lhasa personal (egophoric) is insensitive to person. Daudey reveals an unambiguous misunderstanding of Tournadre's position by referring to "evidentiality versus egophoricity" (2014a: 344) and incorrectly claiming that the "term egophoricity is used by Tournadre (2008)" (2014a: 358, Note 349). Knuchel likewise contradicts Tournadre's perspective at the same time as adopting his terminology.

> I opt for using Tournadre's (1991; 1996) term *egophoric*, with the contrasting *non-egophoric* where applicable. *Egophoricity* serves as the generic term for the category and *egophoric contrast* is used to include both values, egophoric and nonegophoric. (Knuchel 2015: 2 emphasis in original).

In an attempt to communicate ambivalence between the 'conjunct-disjunct' and 'egophoric' outlooks, San Roque et al. point out both that some have "proposed that egophoric markers are a special evidential category of 'ego' evidentiality" (2017: 137) and that by others "an 'information source' interpretation has been explicitly rejected" (2017: 137/138). Their formulation of "the phenomenon of egophoricity (conjunct/disjunct marking)" as "a typological category that has been closely linked to evidentiality" (2017: 122) reveals that they reject Tournadre's perspective. They identify 'conjunct/disjunct' and 'egophoricity' whereas Tournadre (2008) rejects this identification. Furthermore, if the personal (egophoric) is an evidential category, then to say that it is 'linked' to evidentiality is as confused as saying the House of Representatives maintains links to the US Government. In their efforts to weigh the merits of the two schools of thought San Roque et al. again betray a proclivity for Aikhenvald's perspective by not considering egophoric evidentiality to be on the same footing as 'classic' evidential morphemes.

> the view that egophoricity is a type of evidentiality is especially compelling for languages where EGO markers contrast paradigmatically with 'classic' evidential morphemes such as visual and

18 In a clear case, Post previously described Galo as having "a conjunct/disjunct system" (2007: 611), but later concludes that "it would seem appropriate to adopt Tournadre's terminology" (2013: 111).

> other sensory markers … However, for some egophoric languages there is less motivation for an evidential interpretation, as information source is not (otherwise) grammaticalised. (San Roque et al. 2017: 138, emphasis in original)

In claiming that egophoric marking which fails to contrast with ‘classic’ evidential morphemes provides less motivation for an evidential interpretation, they cling too firmly to existing typologies that fail to mention personal (egophoric) evidentiality.[19] If it is sensible to analyze some languages as exhibiting personal evidentiality, then the personal merits to stand among other evidential categories with cross-linguistic evidence of reoccurring semantics. The field of evidential typology has too long overlooked personal evidence. This volume provides ample evidence of this category, and its variation in a group of related languages.

The overall pattern of defining ‘egophoric(ity)’ in relation to Hale’s (1980) definition of ‘conjunct-disjunct’ and then providing qualifications (Post 2013; Daudey 2014a, 2014b) repeatedly breathes fresh air into a defunct outlook and fulfills Tournadre’s prophecy that “the phantom concept of conjunct/disjunct will haunt linguistic articles for a long time” (Tournadre 2008: 304). In his contribution to the current volume, Tournadre attempts to rectify the misunderstandings of his work, by again rejecting the view that egophoric and non-egophoric are contrasting members of a single category:

> the term ‘egophoric’ … never referred to a *system* but to a specific category of the Evidential/Epistemic system, used with many other categories. (Tournadre, p. 116 this volume, emphasis in original)

The application of the term ‘egophoricity’ and references to ‘egophoric systems’ is a hindrance to the understanding of the specific evidential forms in Tibetan varieties and analogous phenomena in other languages. In sum, those whom Tournadre convinced to drop ‘conjunct-disjunct’ should abstain from putting *-ity* on the egophoric.

Perhaps Tournadre’s term ‘egophoric’ is partly to blame for engendering the misunderstandings of his perspective. The term has several disadvantages. First, it has been used for other purposes (by Hagège 1982 and Dahl 2000). Second, its derivative ‘egophoricity’ has become identical with ‘conjunct-disjunct’ (by Post 2013, Daudey 2014a, 2014b, Knuchel 2015, and San Roque et al. 2017). Third, as it contains the word ‘ego’, the first person singular subject pronoun of Greek and Latin, it will always imply first person. For these reasons this introduction prefers ‘personal’.

19 To speak of ‘egophoric languages’ is odd, since one does not speak of ‘aorist languages’ or ‘imperfective languages’ but rather ‘tense languages’ and ‘aspect languages’.

1.3 The study of other Tibetan varieties

As far as we are able to determine all Tibetan varieties exhibit grammaticalized evidentiality. In contrast to the extensive literature on Lhasa Tibetan evidentiality, comparatively little work has been done on other varieties. Some of this work appears in broader descriptive grammars, and may only obliquely make reference to the evidential categories of a particular language. However, specific studies of evidential systems are increasingly appearing (e.g. Sun 1993; Shao 2014). In this section we summarize the existing literature on evidentiality in Tibetan varieties beyond Lhasa, for this purpose it is convenient to treat languages in a rough geographic sweep from west to east. There is no reason to think that the geographic divisions correspond to stemmatic clades. We have attempted to be as comprehensive as possible in terms of the languages covered in this section, however with regards to each language we have not indicated the complete range of references available. This is particularly the case in regard to languages that have chapters in this book. We direct the reader to each chapter for a more detailed background on the literature regarding that language. The contributions of this volume are mentioned in turn under the appropriate geographic heading. In addition, two of our contributors offer cross-variety studies. Gawne compares the expression of personal evidentiality ("egophoric") in a suite of Tibetan varieties. Ebihara, taking her departure from form rather than meaning, explores the uses of cognates of *snaṅ* across varieties.

1.3.1 Western varieties

Balti is one of the first Tibetan varieties for which evidentiality was described. Read underlines the evidential opposition between *yodpa* and *yodsuk* as respectively "hearsay" and "seen by the speaker" (1934: 41). He also highlights evidential uses of the copula verbs when used with adjectives: *yod* "suggests personal experience" whereas *in* lacks this connotation (1934: 36). Read also describes *in* as an auxiliary verb in the formation of the perfect as used with the first person "on most occasions" (1934: 45), a description redolent of personal evidentiality. With this early account of Read's in mind, it is surprising that Tournadre and LaPolla (2014: 254, Note 27) cite Bielmeier (2000) as saying that Balti dialect does not mark evidentiality. Although Bielmeier does not use the term 'evidentiality' in his article, his treatment of 'semantic-pragmatic effects' is clearly about evidentiality. For example, his description of *jot* [*yod*] as indicating "subjective definite knowledge, acquired through previous personal experience" (2001: 56), refers very clearly to personal evidentiality. In his earlier monograph Bielmeier (1985) presents a number of paired verb tenses in which one of the two indicates visual information source (e.g. Imperfekt v. Beobachtetes Imperfekt, Duratives Präteritum v. Beobachtetes duratives Präteritum, Nezessitatives Präteritum v. Beobachtetes nezessitatives Präteritum). In all cases, the addition of a suffix -*suk* marks the 'Beobachtetes' ['observed'] member of the pair. Jones (2009) devotes a study to the experiential suffixes -*suk* and -*naŋ*. In the current volume Ebihara discusses evidential uses of *snaṅ* in Balti Tibetan among other varieties.

In Ladakhi, Francke (1901) presents most of those affixes which later authors regard as evidential, but rarely draws attention to their evidential meaning. However, he does remark that -*rag* "can only be used with verbs which denote a perception of the senses (with the exception of sight) or an action of the intellect" (1901: 29). Like other authors of his time period, he frequently sees evidentiality through the lens of grammatical person, e.g. remarking that -*pin* "is very much used in lively conversation, rather more for the first and second persons than for the third" (1901: 30), and noting an association of the third person with the suffixes -*song* and -*tog* (1901: 30/31). Koshal offers a complex presentation of the Ladakhi verbal system. In this account the Ladakhi verbal template is composed of a verb stem, an optional modal suffix, and is completed with a 'tense-aspect-orientation' suffix (1979: 193), in which 'orientation' may be understood as equivalent to evidential. The paradigm of 'tense-aspect-orientation' markers includes 33 forms (1979: 295–313). Koshal does not organize these 33 forms into subcategories.[20] In a pedagogical grammar, Norman (2001: 52/53) describes seven evidential or modal settings for the present tense (-*at* already known to the speaker, -*duk* seen, -*rak* felt or sensed, -*anok* general, -*at-ḍo* probably, -*at-kyak* inferred, and -*chen* indefinite)

20 Koshal's terminology for individual forms, e.g. "observed present continuous" (1979: 195) generally implies a categorization of the 33 forms into large categories, but this categorization is not seen through explicitly. In a typological work, Bhat, relying entirely on Koshal, describes Ladakhi as having six epistemic moods, viz. reported, observed, experienced, inferred, probable, and generic (1999: 72), four inference distinctions, and two narrative suffixes (1999: 73). Relying on Koshal (1979) and Bhat (1999), Aikhenvald describes Ladakhi as exhibiting "four evidentiality specifications", namely reported, observed, experienced (e.g. by feeling), and inferred (2004: 211). One is left to infer that Aikhenvald's radical simplification is based on Bhat's comment regarding the epistemic moods that "the first four suffixes are primarily evidential in nature and only the last two can be regarded as involving judgment" (1999: 72). Thus, rather than empirically consulting Ladakhi to formulate her typology, Aikhenvald makes her assumption that "expressing an appropriate information source and choosing the correct marking for it, has nothing to do with one's 'epistemic stance', point of view, or personal reliability" (2004: 5) a Procrustean bed in which she makes Ladakhi lie. One may also note that for Koshal the 'reportive' past is "based on direct and definite knowledge" (1979: 197). Thus, Bhat and Aikhenvald have radically misreported Koshal's description, distracted by a specious resemblance of terminology.

and four for the past tense (*-pin* performed by speaker, -Ø seen, *-tok* unseen, and *-kyak* inferred). In the Jakobsonian tradition, Zeisler describes a binary contrast between 'non-experiential knowledge' marked with *yot* and 'experiential knowledge' marked by *duk*, but proceeds to draw a further distinction within 'experiential knowledge' between visual evidence marked by *duk* and other sense evidence marked by *rak* (2004: 650). She places additional 'inferential markers' (*-ok*) and 'distance markers' (*-suk*, *-kyak*) outside of this system (2004: 653).

In contrast to the cases of Balti and Ladakhi, researchers have been slow to recognize evidentiality in Purik. Bailey's (1920) Purik sketch grammar makes no reference to evidentially or person agreement. In their function as auxiliaries of durative aspect Rangan describes *jot* and *duk* as respectively indexing first person and second/third person (1979: 87/88). This description of Purik evidentiality as person persists into the 21st century. According to Bielmeier (2000) the existential *jot* "occurs in statements where the speaker plays a role as participant [...] but not as subject" (2000: 87) and *duk* is used "in sentences where the speaker does not play a syntactico-semantic role as participant" (2000: 89). Sharma (2004) effectively repeats Rangan's description of *jot* and *duk* as auxiliaries, using the terminology "first person" and "non-first person" (2004: 94) but he adds the caveat that this distribution is "not adhered to strictly" (2004: 94/95). In this context, where the sophistication of analysis lags far behind that of descriptions of other Tibetan varieties, Zemp's detailed discussion of Purik evidentiality in the current volume is trail blazing.

1.3.2 Central varieties

Using Hale's (1971) 'conjunct-disjunct' paradigm, missionaries associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics described the evidential systems of several Central Tibetan varieties spoken in Nepal, viz. Jirel (Strahm 1975), Sherpa (Schöttelndreyer 1980), and Lhomi (Vesalainen and Vesalainen 1980). As mentioned earlier, these early descriptions (e.g. Schöttelndreyer 1980) are generally syntactic in approach, but even among these older descriptions, a definition of the conjunct as meaning that there is "an experiencer ... who has been closely involved with the event of the main verb" (Vesalainen and Vesalainen 1980: 27) reflects personal evidentiality much more than any type of person agreement.

Sherpa received further attention in an article by Woodbury (1986), exploring the interaction of evidentiality and tense in lexical verb marking. He provides a very different account to the binary-focused conjunct-disjunct analysis presented in Schöttelndreyer (1980). Woodbury argues that the Sherpa form *nok* is used as a visual sensory evidential in the present tense (glossing with 'I see, have seen...') and an inferential evidential in the past (glossing with 'I hear, I infer...'). In the past, the form *suŋ* instead has sensory semantics. These two uses of *nok* can be attributed to it being used for 'immediate evidence', either evidence of the event itself taking place in the present, or the evidence of the aftermath of an event that allows the speaker to make an inferential claim. Woodbury also discusses *nok* as a future inferential, and *wi* as a 'gnomic', glossed with 'It is known'. Kelly (2004) draws on both traditions, outlining the semantics of each specific Sherpa evidential form, while also noting how it would be distributed in a conjunct/disjunct analysis. She discusses the *ĩ* verb suffix as a 'first-person conjunct' marking "a volitionally instigated event as having been directly experienced by a speaker" (Kelly 2004: 250). The form *suŋ* is a 'disjunct' used to "mark an event as having been directly witnessed by a speaker" (Kelly 2004: 250). Like Woodbury, Kelly (2004: 251/252) notes that *nok* can be used either as a visual sensory or inferential, but argues that instead of a tense-based distinction it is aspectual, with the sensory function in imperfective contexts and the inferential function in the perfective. Finally Kelly gives *wi* as gnomic (2004: 253), marking accepted ideas of how things happen. Tournadre et al. organize the evidential suffixes of Sherpa into paradigms. In their analysis in Sherpa "as in other Tibetic languages, there are three main types of evidentials: *factual* i.e., general or factual information, *sensory* [experiential] i.e., testimonial information (whereby the speaker is a witness), and *egophoric* [personal] i.e., based on the speaker's personal information" (Tournadre et al. 2009: 271 emphasis in original).

Kretschmar gives a very detailed description of the Tibetan dialect of South Mustang, but because she does not present an overview of the verbal paradigm it is difficult to gain an overall impression of the system. Her most clear description of evidentiality is in discussion of the copula verbs, which, as in all other Tibetan varieties, also serve as affixes in the verbal system. In her description the copulas distinguish only two evidential categories. The essential copulas *rak* has "einen stärker konstatierenden Charakter [a strong reporting character]" (1995: 109) whereas with *jin* "ein stärkeres persönliches Engagement zum Ausdruck kommt [a stronger personal committement is expressed]" (1995: 109). The existential copulas *ö* and its equivalent *öka rak* express "persönliche Überzeugung [personal conviction]" whereas *duk* and its equivalent *öta rak* express "perönlich bezeugtes Wissen [personally certain knowledge]" (1995: 109).

In Melamchi Valley Yolmo, Hari presents the copula verbs in a table with a basic two-way distinction between "old or general knowledge" and "mirative/inferential forms" (2010: 63). She breaks down old or general knowledge further with *'yihn* being used for "truth, emphasized" and *'yeh* considered "neutral" (2010: 73). It is possible that the 'truth' that is being invoked in Hari's description is driven by a speaker's personal knowledge. Gawne (2014) argues that *ye* and *yin* (*yìmba* in the Lamjung variety) are egophoric (personal), although without the restriction on speaker relationship to subject that the Lhasa personal sometimes involves. The morpheme *dù* (Hari's 'mirative/inferential') is more prototypically a sensory evidential like its Lhasa Tibetan cognate. Hari (2010: 51) and Gawne (2014) also note that Yolmo has a general fact *òŋge*, which is not attested in other Tibetan varieties.

Central Tibetan varieties spoken inside of Tibet have received somewhat less attention than those of Nepal. Kretschmar (1986) describes the Drokpa dialect spoken in South West Tibet. She recognizes the same three evidential categories, personal, experiential, and factual, now familiar to the reader. In her account *yin* /ji̱n/ (personal) "drückt das persönliche Engagement, die innere Regung des Sprechers aus [expresses a personal commitment to the inner emotion of the speaker]" (1986: 65) and *ḥdug* /tu̱k/ (experiential) expresses "die persönliche Kenntnis eines Geschehens [the personal knowledge of an event]" (1986: 65). The five suffixes /ö'/, /re'/, /ö:re'/, /te:/, /ö:te:/ "dienen zur Kennzeichnung einer allgemeinen Feststellung und zu distanzierter Beschreibung und werden ohne Unterschied gebraucht [are used to identify a general statement and distanced description and are used indiscriminately]" (1986: 65). It is surprising to see /ö'/ (presumably *yod*) among the factual suffixes. In addition, from a structural perspective the description of five suffixes with identical value is not possible. Hermann (1989) describes the Dingri dialect without making explicit reference to evidentiality. Her reference to grammatical person necessitates a 'conjunt-disjunct' style of presentation, although she shows no awareness of this tradition. The many details of its verbal system that resembles Lhasa, e.g. the formation of the present with *-ri ö̜:* (*ki-yod*) and *-ki-tu̱k* (*-ki-ḥdug*) and a "beobachtendes Präteritum [witnessing preterite]" formed with *-tšhuṅ (byuṅ)* and *soṅ* (*soṅ*) (1989: 72) succor an impression that this variety does encode evidential distinctions in its verbal system. Unfortunately, it is precisely in those aspects where the system least resembles Lhasa that the evidential components of its verbal system are most unclear. Haller (2000: 89) describes Shigatse as exhibiting three evidential categories, viz. volitional evidential, non-volitional evidential, and non-evidential, respectively cognate with the Lhasa personal, experiential, and factual.[21] Huber offers a description of Kyirong evidentiality (2005) in the tradition of binary feature opposition. Citing DeLancey (1986), she bifurcates the evidential settings into old and new knowledge (2005: 98).[22] Under 'old knowledge' she includes

21 Note that this three-way contrast and the terminology for it he exactly repeats in his description of the Themchen dialect of Amdo (Haller 2004: 137).

22 By describing 'old knowledge' and 'new knowledge' under the general rubric of 'evidentiality' (2005: 97), Huber makes clear that she disagrees with DeLancey's subsequent writings in which he sets up 'mirativity' in opposition to 'evidentiality' (1997, also cf. Hill 2012).

'generic knowledge' and 'personal experience'; under 'new information' she includes 'direct sensory evidence' and 'inference'. Huber does not justify the grouping together of these four evidential categories under the 'old' and 'new' rubrics on morphosyntactic grounds. A simpler and equally accurate account would flatten the description to four evidential categories of the same level. In general all four evidential options are available in each tense,[23] e.g. the imperfective distinguishes *-kẽ̄:* (generic knowledge), *-ko-jø:* (personal experience), *-ko-nu:* (direct sensory evidence), and *-kojobajimbɛ* (indirect evidence). The functional correspondence of the first three evidentials to the Lhasa factual, personal, and experiential is clear. However, the 'indirect' category is particular to Kyirong.

Denjongke, the Tibetan variety of Sikkim, has received very little study. Both in their use as present and future auxiliaries and in their use as copula verbs, Sandberg associates *'in* with first person and *be'*/*du'* with second and third (1888: 19–21, 1895: 40–44). In the current volume, Yliniemi gives the first comprehensive treatment of Denjongke copulas and their evidential values.

Among the Tibetan varieties spoken in Bhutan, only Dzongkha is relatively well described. The early description of Dzongkha by Byrne (1909) is not currently available to us. In a much more recent work on Dzongkha, van Driem contrasts two evidential values, viz. "old, ingrained background knowledge which is or has become a firmly integrated part of one's conception of reality" typical of the equative copula *'ing* and the existential copula *yö*, versus "knowledge which has been newly acquired" (1998: 127), typical of the equative copula *'immä* and the existential copula *dû*. To identify this distinction with DeLancey's 'mirativity' (1997, 2001) would misunderstand van Driem profoundly (see van Driem 2015: 8/9). Van Driem describes the structural meaning of a language-internal contrast, whereas DeLancey imagines a typological category of crosslinguistic validity, and one distinct from evidentiality. In the current volume, Hyslop and Tshering further illustrate the evidential contrasts of Dzongkha. Although their analysis is fundamentally compatible with van Driem's they seek a terminology more in keeping with the Zeitgeist of functional and typological linguistics. Another Tibetan variety spoken in Bhutan, Chochangacha, has received almost no study. The recent article of Tournadre and Rigzin (2015) distinguishes three verbal categories that express experiential evidentiality, personal evidentiality and possibility. Atypically, Chochangacha uses *yö̱t* for the experiential existential copula and *yö̱t-pi* for the personal (Tournadre and Rigzin 2015: 64).

23 In the aorist and future tenses she calls this evidential setting 'volitional' rather than 'personal experience' (2005: 98 et passim).

1.3.3 Eastern varieties

It is convenient to discuss eastern varieties according to division in terms of Tibet's traditional provinces of Amdo and Kham.

The three phased description of the study of Lhasa evidentiality employed above serves equally well for describing the history of research on the evidential systems of Amdo dialects. In the first phase, George de Roerich (1958) describes the Reb-gong dialect of Amdo (specifically the speech of the famous intellectual Dge-ḥdun chos-ḥphel, 1902–1951, cf. Stoddard 1985) in terms of verb agreement. For example, he gives *ṅa ǰ'o ɣo̊-jol'* (*ṅa ḥgro-gyin-yod*) 'je vais' [I go], *č''o ǰ'o ɣo̊-ďïɣ* (*khyod ḥgro-gyin-ḥdug*) 'tu vas' [you go], etc. for *le present simple* (1958: 43) and *ṅa joṅ-nō̊-jin* (*ṅa yoṅ-ni-yin*) 'je suis venu' [I came], *č''o joṅ-nō̊-rel' (khyod yoṅ-ni-red*) 'tu est venu' [you came], etc. for one of three ways to conjugate *le passé accompli* (1958: 45). However, like the early researchers on Lhasa Tibetan, he makes clear that he is aware that what is at play here is not European style person agreement. For example, he notes that "[l]a conjugaison tibétaine – sauf quelques exceptions – ne connaît ni distinction de personne, ni distinction de nombre [Tibetan conjugation – with some exceptions – knows neither person distinctions nor number distinctions]" (1958: 43) and points out that "[e]xceptionnellement la forme *jin* s'étend aussi à la deuxième et troisième personne [exceptionally the *jin* form also extends to the second and third person]" giving the example *č''o joṅ-nō̊-jin (khyod yoṅ-ni-yin*) 'tu est venu' [you came] (1958: 45). A particular weakness of de Roerich's account of the Amdo verbal system is his failure to offer any semantic distinctions among the three ways of forming the *passé accompli*, which respectively exhibit *rel'*, zïɣ, and *t'a* as their exponents (1958: 45/46). Thus, Sun is justified in his criticism that in de Roerich's work the "evidential morphology is buried unanalyzed in his section on 'morphologie'" (Sun 1993: 948, Note 6).

Despite his criticism of de Roerich, Sun does not himself shake off reference to person. He recognizes a distinction between 'self person' and 'other person', which he equates with 'conjunct'/'disjunct' person marking.[24] His use of this distinction is however inconsistent. At times he appears to use 'self person' as a name for a morphological category, for example writing that "the volitional self-person forms (the default marking) represent direct knowledge of the volition" (1993: 961), but at other times 'self person' in his usage refers to a type of sentence regardless of how it is marked morphologically, for example he writes that

24 Despite this equation of 'self person' and 'other person' with 'conjunct' and 'disjunct' respectively, Aikhenvald (2004: 45, 160, et passim), although she consulted Sun (1993), does not count Amdo Tibetan among those languages with conjunct-disjunct systems.

"[s]elf-person sentences containing such verbs are usually marked with the direct evidential" (1993: 692). From Sun's claim that "no particular evidential marking is employed for volitional self-person sentences" (1993: 958) one may surmise, along with Tribur (this volume), that the personal is zero-marked in Mdzo-dge Amdo.[25] Adding the 'personal', which he avoids describing as evidential, and omitting the 'quotative', which he includes although it does not pattern with the other evidentials,[26] the system he describes equates to three evidential settings in the past tense, 'personal' (unmarked), 'direct' (*t*ʰ*æ*), and 'indirect' (*zəg*), and two evidential settings in the present tense 'personal' (unmarked), and 'immediate' (ʰ*kə*). This updated version of Sun's description, with two evidential settings in the present and three in the past closely corresponds to Wang's (1995) account. Taking the binary approach, Wang contrasts first person and third person forms in the future (respectively *-rgyu-yin* and *rgyu-red*) and present (respectively *-gi-yod* and *-ko-gi*), but offers three options for the past, viz. a first person (*-btaṅ-ṅa*), third person (*-btaṅ-gzig*) and an additional third person form that is used if "the speaker has witnessed the action occurred" (1995: 61). As befits a pedagogical grammar Wang avoids the opaque terminology of 'conjunct-disjunct', but his 'first person' includes second person interrogatives (1995: 59/60 et passim), so his description is in keeping with the conjunct-disjunct tradition. Sung and Rgyal describe the future and present contrast as 'subjective' (*-a* or *-yin*) versus 'objective' (*-gi* or *-red*) (2005: 168). The more complex options available in the past they enumerate as 'subjective' (*-a*), 'objective' (*-zig*), 'witnessed' (*-thal*), and 'focused', with the fourth setting again offering 'subjective' (*-ni-yin*) and 'objective' (*-ni-red*) alternatives (2005: 205/206). Shao, in his description of the A-rig dialect, also takes a binary approach. He analyses the affixes into eight 'personal' (自我中心) and 12 'non-personal' (非自我中心) affixes (2014: 49/50). Among the 'non-personal' he further distinguishes some forms as 'witnessed' (亲见) and 'assertive/factual' (断言/事实) (2014: 49/50).

25 Nonetheless, Sun's comment that as "in other Tibetan dialects, the equative copulas *jən* [*yin*] and *re* [*red*]... carry inherent epistemological values: *jən* indicates that the reported situation is well-known to the speaker, otherwise *re* is used" (Sun 1993: 951, Note 10) suggests that personal evidentiality is sometimes explicitly morphologically indexed.

26 Although the "quotative morpheme *se* is, on both categorical and distributional counts, at variance with the other three evidential markers" (1993: 991), Sun lists it with the others because "it is quite common for evidentials not to constitute a unitary morphological category in a given language" (1993: 992). Such an analysis is unjustified, and his reliance upon the authority of others shows how one unjustified analysis may beget another. The cognates of *se*, decedents of Written Tibetan *zer*, are not normally considered evidential suffixes.

Ebihara's (2011) description is again similar, but she does not pursue person across all tenses but instead regards some tenses as encoding person and others as encoding evidentiality. She describes ten auxiliaries in Amdo, six of these forms she sets off in pairs of 'conjunct' and 'disjunct' forms across the three tenses 'future', 'progressive' and 'explanation' (2011: 58). Three of the four remaining suffixes she describes as evidential in value, two of which she identifies as 'past' (2011: 68). An odd facet of her analysis is that the evidential she describes as "used to express the event that the speaker performed, made somebody to perform, or is familiar with" (2011: 68) she does not identify with the 'conjunct'.

A step away from a binary account, Haller describes three distinct evidential categories across six tenses in the Themchen dialect (2004: 137). This description comes close to a structural account, but his terminological choices 'volitional evidentiell', 'nicht-volitional evidentiell', and 'nicht-evidentiell' are still cast in terms of binary contrasts. Making use of original fieldwork on the Mgo-log dialect, Zoe Tribur (this volume), discusses in detail the previous research of Sun, Haller, and Ebihara. She emancipates herself from the specters of both person agreement and binary classificatory schemes, using the terminology 'egophoric', 'direct' and 'indirect'.

The similarity of the Amdo evidential system to Lhasa Tibetan is a point of controversy. Sun (1993) emphasizes the ways in which the Amdo evidential system differ from that of Lhasa, pointing out that the evidential exponents in the two languages are not cognate and suggesting that the Mdzo-dge system is less pragmatically flexible than the Lhasa system. The dissimilarity is however not as obvious as he presents it. The Mdzo-dge system corresponds very closely to the Themchen, but Haller (2004: 137/138) describes Themchen with the same labels he uses for the three categories of Shigatse cognate to the Lhasa personal, experiential, and factual (*vide supra*). Likewise, Tribur judges that the Amdo evidential categories "appears to correspond closely to the Standard Tibetan system" (p. 416 this volume).

The evidential systems of Kham dialects have so far received very little attention. In her description of the Nangchen dialect of Kham, Causemann (1989) does not clearly organize the verbal inflections into paradigms and does not describe the function of each affix individually. Nonetheless, for all tenses she distinguishes a witnessed (beobachtete) from a neutral form, and within the neutral forms distinguishing a typically first person from a typically third person form (1989: 104–108). The morphological material is often what one expects from Lhasa dialect (*-yin*, *-yod,* and *-red* as auxiliary verbs) and the system is also often parallel. The auxiliary verbs *^äin* (*yin*) and *re* (*red*) are used in the formation of the future (in the suffixes *dži-^äin* and *dži-re*), with the former associated with first person or third person if the speaker feels responsibility for the verbal action (1989: 88) and the latter used for second and third persons or impersonal verbs in the first person (1989: 88). The durative present distinguishes what could easily be called the personal *-kɨ-^o'* (*ki-yod*), factual *-ki-re*, and experiential *ki-da* and the past distinguishes personal *-le-^äin*, factual *-le-re*, and experiential *-thi:*. Causemann's description leaves many questions open, e.g. the difference between the formation of the past with V-*thi:* and V-*pa-thi:* (1989: 108). Schwieger describes the verbal system of Brag-g.yab Tibetan without making explicit reference to evidentiality. He describes the present tense as marked with the three suffixes /jö̱:/, /jö̱: re̱:/, and /ṅgi̱/; the first is used "in Verbindung mit der ersten Person [in connection with the first person]", the second "hat allgemeineren Charakter [has more general character]" and the third expresses "die persönliche Wahrnehmung der Handlung [the personal perception of the action]" (1989: 34). Thus, the present tense of this variety exactly parallels Lhasa Tibetan. His presentation of the other tenses is less clear, perhaps in part because of the adverse circumstances under which his fieldwork was carried out (1989: 7/8). Suzuki (this volume) offers a preliminary treatment of the evidential system of Zhollam Tibetan. His discussion is based entirely on elicited data and does not organize the affixes into paradigms. The evidential systems of Nangchen, Brag-g.yab, Zhollam, and other Kham varieties certainly merit further research.

The Baima language, which is not traditionally regarded as either an Amdo or Kham variety, serves as a fitting variety to conclude our discussion of research on Tibetan evidential systems aside from Lhasa. The evidential system of Baima, spoken at the border of Sichuan and Gansu, has received treatment in only one short article (Chirkova 2008). The author of that study, Katia Chirkova, returns in the current volume to the same topic, with much more detail provided by fresh fieldwork.

1.4 The historical development of Tibetan evidentials

According to many authorities the evidentials in Tibetan varieties arose independently in the recent past. According to Beckwith "there is not the slightest evidence for the existence of personal deictic class in the Old Tibetan verbal system" (1992: 9). DeLancey concurs that Lhasa Tibetan evidential marking "is a recent innovation" (1992: 49). In Hongladarom's words "there are no attested evidential contrasts [...] in the classical language" (1993: 52). Tournadre holds that "[l]'opposition égophorique/neutre n'existe pas dans la langue littéraire [the egophoric/neutral opposition does not exist in the literary language]" (1996: 220, Note 9). These authors overlook Takeuchi's observation that in Old Tibetan *yin*, an antecedent of the Lhasa Tibetan personal, is used to "話し手の判断，意志を強調している [emphasize the speaker's judgment and will]" (1990: 12); one may hope that the recent translation of Takeuchi's article into English will precipitate the careful examination of his evidence (2014: 410). Similarly, Denwood remarks that in Classical Tibetan *ḥdug* "usually has strongly the sense of discovery that it retains in Lhasa Tibetan" as a marker of the experiential (1999: 246). Hill confirms Denwood's observation in texts from the 13th century onward (2013b). From an investigation of *yod* and *ḥdug* in the 14th century *Rgyal-rabs gsal-baḥi me-loṅ*. Hoshi concludes that in its basic components the Lhasa system was already in place at that time (2010). In the context of a detailed description of the verbal system of the 15th century *Mi la ras paḥi rnam thar*, among many other insights Oisel (2013: 81) identifies the contrast between the copula verbs *yin* (personal in Lhasa) and *red* (factual in Lhasa). His contribution to the current volume traces the development of this 15th century evidential system into Modern Literary Tibetan and Lhasa. The continued exploration of evidential values across the history of Tibetan literature will no doubt remain a fruitful domain of research.

1.5 Notation and nomenclature

The authors who have contributed to this volume work in a diverse range of languages and approaches. We have exercised restraint in imposing an artificial univocality on the volume. In this section we discuss some of the notation and nomenclature that the reader will encounter. Although we have our own preferences, in general we have allowed the naturally arising heterogeneity to persist. In particular regard to evidentiality we have not constrained authors in terms of the names they give the evidential categories present in any language. As we mentioned in §1 the terminology in discussions of Tibetan evidentials has never been consistent, and authors from different research traditions have different preferences. Nonetheless, we have asked authors to avoid the term 'egophoricity' precisely to eschew the resulting confusion described in §2.2.

For transcription each author employs his or her own phonemic orthography for the specific variety in question. Transliteration of Written Tibetan follows Wylie, de Nebesky-Wojkowitz, or Library of Congress conventions. With regard to interlinear glossing, where conventions exist in the Leipzig Glossing Rules (LGR) (Comrie et al. 2008), authors attempt to conform to these standards. The conventions of the LGR offer little guidance for glossing evidentiality. Authors in this volume have their own glossing conventions, depending on what terminology they use and categories they identify.

With regard to identifying the different Tibetan varieties as languages, dialects or some other nomenclature, different terms relate to different perspectives. In this chapter we have used the term ‘Lhasa Tibetan’; other researchers refer to Standard Tibetan. Although there are some differences between the two varieties (Róna-Tas 1985: 160/161), some researchers use these terms interchangeably. As mentioned earlier in this introduction, the title of this work and this introduction refer to the varieties of Tibetan spoken today as Tibetan languages. Other possible formulations include ‘Tibetan dialects’ and ‘Tibetic languages’. Tournadre (2014) argues for the term ‘Tibetic’ because the diversity of languages descending from Old Tibetan parallels the Germanic languages or Romance languages, i.e. Tibetic is a language family. Tournadre’s characterization of the diversity of this family is not in doubt, however, the term ‘dialect’ serves to designate the ‘Chinese dialects’ (also called Sinitic languages) and the ‘Arabic dialects’, which are also both language families of considerable age, size, and diversity. As the distinction between ‘dialect’ and ‘language’ is political rather than scientific, it is perhaps most legitimate to defer to the sense that Tibetans have of sharing a single language. It is for similar reasons of political solidarity that speakers of Arabic and speakers of Chinese respectively regard themselves as speaking but one language. Some would want to draw the line between languages and dialects such that two mutually intelligible forms of speech are refereed to as ‘dialects’. Such an effort is not possible given the current state of knowledge on Tibetan varieties. Based as it is on the monolithic and sociolinguistically naïve notion of mutual intelligibility, such a division, even if possible, would still do violence to the full picture of Tibetan linguistic diversity. Even if one accepts the description of members of the family as ‘languages’ rather than as ‘dialects’, there is no *a priori* need for -ic rather than -an. It is true that many Indo-European subbranches end in -ic (Celtic, Germanic, Slavic, etc.) but others end in -an (Tokharian, Anatolian, Indo-Iranian). The difference between -ic and -an is of no significance in Europe and there is no need to make an issue of it in Asia. Thus, the choice among ‘Tibetan dialect’, ‘Tibetan language’ and ‘Tibetic language’ in this volume is left to the authors; the reader should merely note that these three designations refer to the same notion.

Abbreviations

1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, ABL ablative, AUX auxiliary, COP copula, DEM demonstrative, DIR direct, EGO egophoric, ERG ergative, EXPER experience, F female, FUT future, GEN genitive, HON honorific, IND indirect,

INT intentional, INTER interrogative, IPFV imperfective, LOC locative, LQ limiting quantifier, M male, NUTRAL neutral, PE perceptual evidential, PFV perfective, PRS present tense, PROX proximal, PST past tense, REC receptive, SG singular, VIS visible evidential, Q question, QOM quote marker.

References

Agha, Asif. 1993. *Structural form and utterance context in Lhasa Tibetan: grammar and indexicality in a non-configurational language*. New York: Peter Lang.
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). 435–85.
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2014. The grammar of knowledge: a cross-linguistic view of evidentials and the expression of information source. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *The Grammar of Knowledge: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 1–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2015. Evidentials: Their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2). 239–277.
Bailey, T. Grahame. 1920. *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
Bartee, Ellen. 1996. Deixis and spatiotemporal relations in Lhasa Tibetan. Arlington: The University of Texas MA thesis.
Bartee, Ellen. 2011. The role of animacy in the verbal morphology of Dongwang Tibetan. In Mark Turin and Bettina Zeisler (eds.), *Himalayan Languages and Linguistics: Studies in Phonology, Semantics, Morphology and Syntax*, 133–182. Leiden: Brill.
Bashir, Elena. 2010. Traces of mirativity in Shina. *Himalayan Linguistics* 9(2). 1–55.
Beckwith, Christopher I. 1992. Deictic class marking in Tibetan and Burmese. In M. Ratliff and E. Schiller (eds.), *Papers from the First Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, 1–14. Tempe: Arizona State University, Program for Southeast Asian Studies.
Bell, Charles. 1905. *Manual of Colloquial Tibetan*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
Bendix, Edward. 1974. Indo-Aryan and Tibeto-Burman contact as seen through Nepali and Newari verb tenses. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 3.1, 42–59.
Bhat, D. N. S. 1999. *The Prominence of Tense, Aspect and Mood*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Bickel, Balthazar and Johanna Nichols. 2007. Inflectional morphology. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, 169–240. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Revised second edition).
Bielmeier, Roland. 1985. *Das Märchen von Prinzen Čobzaṅ*. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
Bielmeier, Roland. 2000. Syntactic, semantic and pragmatic-epistemic functions of auxiliaries in Western Tibetan. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23(2). 79–125.
Boas, Franz. 1911. Introduction. In F. Boas (ed.), *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, 5–83. Part i. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution.
Byrne, St. Quentin. 1909. *A Colloquial Grammar of the Bhutanese Language*. Allahabad: Pioneer Press.
Caplow, Nancy. This volume. Inference and deferred evidence in Tibetan. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.) *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 225–257. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Causemann, Margret (1989). *Dialekt und Erzählungen der Nangchenpas*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Chang, Kun & Betty Shefts. 1964. *A Manual of Spoken Tibetan* (*Lhasa Dialec*t). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Chang, Kun & Betty Chang. 1984. The certainty hierarchy among Spoken Tibetan verbs of being. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 55. 603–635.

Chirkova, Katia 2008. 白马语示证范畴及其与藏语方言的比较 baimayu shizheng fanchou ji qi yu Zangyu fangyan de bijiao [Evidentials in Baima and Tibetan dialects compared] 民族语文 *Minzu yuwen* 3. 36–43.

Chirkova, Katia. This volume. Evidentials in Pingwu Baima. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 445–459. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Comrie, Bernard, Haspelmath, Martin, & Bickel, Balthasar. 2008. Leipzig glossing rules. *http: //www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php* Retrieved 2015-06-07

Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 2002a. Conjunct/disjunct marking in Awa Pit. *Linguistics* 40(3). 611–627.

Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 2002b. Conjunct/disjunct systems in Barbacoan languages. In Jeanie Castillo (ed.), *Proceedings from the fourth Workshop on American Indigenous Languages*, 3–12. (Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 11). Santa Barbara: UCSB Department of Linguistics.

Dahl, Östen. 2000. Egophoricity in discourse and syntax. *Functions of Language* 7(1). 37–77.

Daudey, Henriëtte. 2014a. A grammar of Wadu Pumi. Melbourne: La Trobe University dissertation.

Daudey, Henriëtte. 2014b. Volition and control in Wǎdū Pǔmǐ. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37(1). 75–103.

DeLancey, Scott. 1985. Lhasa Tibetan evidentials and the semantics of causation. *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.* 65–72.

DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In Wallace L. Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*, 203–213. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp.

DeLancey, Scott. 1990. Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1(3). 289–321.

DeLancey, Scott. 1992. The historical origin of the conjunct-disjunct pattern in Tibeto-Burman. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 25. 289–321.

DeLancey, Scott 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 33–52.

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

DeLancey, Scott. 2003. Lhasa Tibetan. In Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*, 255–269. London: Routledge.

Delancey, Scott. 2012. Still mirative after all these years. *Linguistic Typology* 16 (3). 529–564.

DeLancey, Scott. 2015. The Historical Dynamics of Morphological Complexity in Trans-Himalayan. *Linguistic Discovery* 13(2), 60–79.

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

Desjarlais, Robert R. 1992. *Body and emotion: the aesthetics of illness and healing in the Nepal Himalayas*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dickinson, Connie. 2000. Mirativity in Tsafiki. *Studies in Language* 24(2). 379–421.

van Driem, George. 1998. *Dzongkha*. Leiden: Research CNWS, School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies.
van Driem, George. 2015. Synoptic grammar of the Bumthang language: A language of the central Bhutan highlands. *Himalayan Linguistics Archive* 6. 1–77.
Ebihara Shiho. 2011. Amdo Tibetan. In Yasuhiro Yamakoshi (ed.), *Grammatical Sketches from the Field*, 41–78. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
Ebihara, Shiho. This volume. Evidentiality of the Tibetan Verb snang. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 41–59. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
Francke, August Hermann. 1901. A Sketch of Ladakhi Grammar. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Part 1-History, Literature, etc.) 70(1), extra No. 2. 1–63.
Garrett, Edward John. 2001. Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan. Los Angeles: University of California dissertation.
Gawne, Lauren. 2014. Evidentiality in Lamjung Yolmo. *Journal of the South East Asian Linguistics Society* 7. 76–96.
Gawne, Lauren. This volume. Egophoric evidentiality in Bodish languages. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*, 61–94. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
Goldstein, Melvyn C. and Nawang Nornang. 1970. *Modern spoken Tibetan: Lhasa dialect*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
Hagège, Claude. 1982. *La structure des langues, Que sais-je?* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Hale, Austin. 1971. Person markers: conjunct and disjunct forms. Topics in Newari Grammar l. 1–12. SIL.
Hale, Austin. 1980. Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari. In R. L. Trail (ed.), *Papers in South-East Asian linguistics*, Vol. 7, 95–106. Canberra: Australian National University.
Hale, Austin & Kedār P. Shrestha. 2006. *Newār (Nepāl Bhāsā)*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
Haller, Felix (2000). *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Shigatse*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
Haller, Felix (2004). *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen: sprachwissenschaftliche Beschreibung eines Nomadendialektes aus Nord-Amdo*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
Hargreaves, David. 2003. Kathmandu Newar (Nepal Bhāśā). In Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, 371–384. London: Routledge.
Hargreaves, David. 2005. Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar. *Himalayan Linguistics* 5. 1–48.
Hari, Anna Maria. 2010. *Yohlmo Sketch Grammar*. Kathmandu: Ekta books.
Henderson, Vincent C. 1903. *Tibetan manual*. Calcutta: Inspector General of Chinese imperial maritime customs.
Hermann, Silke. 1989. *Erzählungen und Dialekt von Diṅri*. Bonn: VGH wissenschaftsverlag.
Hill, Nathan W. 2012. 'Mirativity' does not exist: ḥdug in 'Lhasa' Tibetan and other suspects. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). 389–433.
Hill, Nathan W. 2013a. Contextual semantics of 'Lhasa' Tibetan evidentials. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(3). 47–54.
Hill, Nathan W. 2013b. ḥdug as a testimonial marker in Classical and Old Tibetan. *Himalayan Linguistics* 12(1). 1–16.
Hill, Nathan W. This volume. Testimonial perfect constructions: the inferential semantics of direct evidence. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 131–159. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 2012. Sanskrit and Pāṇini–Core and Periphery. *Saṃskṛtavimarśaḥ* 6: 85–102.
Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 1992. Semantic peculiarities of Tibetan verbs of being. In S. Luksaneeyanawin (ed.), *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics, Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Language and Linguistics*, Vol. III. 1151–1162.
Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 1993. Evidentials in Tibetan: A dialogic study of the interplay between form and meaning. Bloomington: Indiana University dissertation.
Hoshi Izumi (星泉). 2010. 14 世紀チベット語文献『王統明示鏡』における存在動詞. 14 Seiki Chibetto-go bunken "ōtō meiji-kyō" ni okeru sonzaidōshi. [Existential verbs in the Rgyal rabs gsal ba'i me long, a 14th century Tibetan narrative]. 東京大学言語学論集 *Tōkyōdaigaku gengo-gaku ronshū* / *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 29(3). 29–68.
Hoshi Michiyo (星 実千代). 1988. 現代チベット語文法（ラサ方言）. *Gendai Chibetto-go bunpō (Rasahōgen*). [Modern Tibetan grammar (Lhasa Dialect)]. Tokyo: ユネスコ東アジア文化研究センター Yunesuko Higashi Ajia Bunka Kenkyū Sentā.
Huber, Brigitte. 2005. *The Tibetan dialect of Lende (Kyirong)*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
Hyslop, Gwendolyn & Karma Tshering. This volume. An overview of some epistemic categories in Dzongkha. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 351–365. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
Jones, Eunice. 2009. Evidentiality and Mirativity in Balti. London: SOAS, University of London MA thesis.
Kelly, Barbara F. 2004. A grammar of Sherpa. In C. Genetti (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal: Manange and Sherpa*, 232–440. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
Kitamura Hajime. 1977. *Tibetan* (*Lhasa dialect*). Tokyo: Ajia Afurika gengo bunka kenkyūjo.
Koshal, Sanyukta. 1979. *Ladakhi Grammar*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Knuchel, Dominique. 2015. A comparative study of egophoric marking: Investigating its relation to person and epistemic marking in three language families. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet MA thesis.
Kretschmar, Monika. 1986. *Erzählungen und Dialekt der Drokpas aus Südwest-Tibet*. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
Kretschmar, Monika. 1995. *Erzählungen und Dialekt aus Südmustang*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
Lidz, Liberty A. 2010. *A Descriptive Grammar of Yongning Na (Mosuo)*. Austin: University of Texas dissertation.
Loughnane, Robyn. 2009. A Grammar of Oksapmin. Melbourne: University of Melbourne dissertation.
Norman, Rebecca. 2001. *Getting Started in Ladakhi*. (2nd edition). Leh: Melong Publications.
Oisel, Guillaume. 2013. Morphosyntaxe et sémantique des auxiliaires et des connecteurs du Tibétain Littéraire. Paris: Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3 dissertation.
Oisel, Guillaume. This volume. On the origin of the Lhasa Tibetan evidentials *song* and *byung*. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 161–183. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
Oswalt, Robert L. 1986. The evidential system of Kashaya. In Wallace L. Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*, 29–45. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp.
Post, Mark W. 2007. *A Grammar of Galo*. Melbourne: La Trobe University dissertation.
Post, Mark W. 2013. Person-sensitive TAME marking in Galo: Historical origins and functional motivation. In T. Thornes, E. Andvik, G. Hyslop & J. Jansen (eds.), *Functional-Historical Approaches to Explanation*, 107–130. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rangan, K. 1979. *Purik Grammar*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
Read, Alfred F. C. 1934. *Balti Grammar*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
de Roerich, George. 1958. *Le parler de l'Amdo: étude d'un dialecte archaïque du Tibet*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
Roerich, George & Lopsang Phuntshok. 1957. *Textbook of colloquial Tibetan: dialect of central Tibet*. Calcutta: Govt. of West Bengal, Education Dept., Education Bureau.
Róna-Tas, András. 1985. *Wiener Vorlesungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte Tibets*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
Rule, W. M. 1977. *A comparative study of the Foe, Huli and Pole languages of Papua New Guinea.* Sydney: University of Sydney.
San Roque, Lila. 2008. *An introduction to Duna grammar*. Canberre: The Australian National University dissertation.
San Roque, Lila, Floyd, Simeon, & Norcliffe, Elisabeth. 2017. Evidentiality and interrogativity. *Lingua*. 120–143.
San Roque, Lila & Robin Loughnane. 2012. The New Guinea Highlands evidentiality area. *Linguistic Typology* 16(1). 111–167.
Sandberg, Graham. 1894. *Hand-book of colloquial Tibetan*. A practical guide to the language of Central Tibet. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and co.
Sandberg, Graham. 1888. *Manual of the Sikkim Bhutia Language or Dénjong Ké*. Calcutta: Oxford Mission Press.
Sandberg, Graham. 1895. *Manual of the Sikkim Bhutia Language or Dénjong Ké* (second and enlarged edition). London: Archibald Constable & Co.
Schwieger, Peter. 1989. *Tibetisches Erzählgut aus Brag-g.yab: Texte mit Übersetzungen, grammatischem Abriss und Glossar*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
Schwieger, Peter. 2002. Zur Funktion der verbalen Kongruenz im Lhasa-Tibetischen. In D. Dimitrov, U. Roesler, and R. Steiner (eds.), 175–184. *Sikhisamuccayah: Indian and Tibetan Studies*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
Schöttelndreyer, Burkhard. 1980. Person Markers in Sherpa. In S. A. Wurm (ed.), *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics No.7*, 125–130. Canberra: The Australian National University.
Shao, Mingyuan (邵明園). 2014. 安多藏语阿柔话的示证范畴 Anduo zangyu arou hua de shizheng fanchou [Evidentiality in A-rig Dialect of Amdo Tibetan]. Nankai: Nankai University dissertation.
Sharma, D. D. 2004. *Tribal Languages of Ladakh*. Part III. *A Descriptive Grammar of Purki and Balti*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications.
Sresthacharya, Iswaranand, Jagan Nath Maskey & Austin Hale. 1971. *Conversational Newari*. Kathmandu: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Institute for Nepal Studies, Tribhuvan University.
Sresthacarya, Iswaranda. 1976. Some types of reduplication in the Newari verb phrase. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 3(1). 117–127.
Stoddard, Heather. 1985. *Le mendiant de l'Amdo*. Paris: Société d'ethnographie.
Strahm, Esther. 1975. Clause Patterns in Jirel. In Austin Hale (ed.), *Collected Papers on Sherpa, Jirel*, 73–146. Kirtipur: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
Sun, Jackson T.-S. 1993. Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 63(4). 143–188.
Suzuki, Hiroyuki. This volume. The evidential system of Zhollam Tibetan. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 423–444. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sung, Kuo-ming & Lha Byams Rgyal. 2005. *Colloquial Amdo Tibetan: A Complete Course for Adult English Speakers*. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House.
Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (武内紹人). 1978. 現代チベット語における文の構造. *Gendai Chibetto-go ni okeru bun no kōzō* [The structure of the sentence in modern Tibetan]. Kyoto: Kyoto University MA thesis.
Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (武内紹人). 1990. チベット語の述部における助動詞の機能とその発達過程 Chibetto-go no jutsubu ni okeru jodōshi no kinō to sono hattatsu katei / The semantic Function of Auxiliary verbs in Tibetan and their historical development. In Osamu Sakiyama and Akihiro Sato (eds.), *Asian Languages and General Linguistics*, 6–16. Tokyo: Sanseido.
Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (武内紹人). 2014. The function of auxiliary verbs in Tibetan predicates and their historical development. *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 31. 401–415. (Translation of Takeuchi 1990).
Tournadre, Nicolas. 1992. La déixis en tibétain: quelques faits remarquables. In Morel M.-A. et Danon-Boileau L. (ed.), *La Deixis*, 197–208. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Tournadre, Nicolas. 1994. Personne et médiatifs en tibétain. *Faits de langues* 3. 149–158.
Tournadre, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en tibétain: approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée*. Louvain: Peeters.
Tournadre, Nicolas. 2008. Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct'/'disjunct' in Tibetan. In B. Huber, M. Volkart & P. Widmer (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek, Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier*, 281–308. Saale: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.
Tournadre Nicolas. 2014. The Tibetic languages and their classification. In Nathan W. Hill and Thomas Owen-Smith (eds.), *Trans-Himalayan linguistics, historical and descriptive linguistics of the Himalayan area*, 105–130. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Tournadre, Nicolas. This volume. A typological sketch of evidential/epistemic categories in the Tibetic language. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 95–129. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
Tournadre, Nicolas & Sangda Dorje. 2003. *Manual of standard Tibetan: Language and civilisation*. Ithaca: Snowlion Publications.
Tournadre, Nicolas & Sangda Dorje. 2009. *Manuel de tibétain standard: langue et civilisation*. Paris: Langues & mondes, L'Asiathèque.
Tournadre, Nicolas & Konchok Jiatso. 2001. Final auxiliary verbs in literary Tibetan and in the dialects. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23(3). 49–111.
Tournadre, Nicolas & 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.
Tournadre, Nicolas & Karma Rigzin. 2015. Outline of Chocha-Ngacha. *Himalayan Linguistics* 14(2). 49–87.
Tournadre, Nicolas, Lhakpa Norbu Sherpa, Gyurme Chodrak & Guillaume Oisel. 2009. *Sherpa-English and English-Sherpa dictionary*. Kathmandu: Vajra Publication.
Tribur, Zoe. This volume. Observations on factors affecting the distributional properties of evidential markers in Amdo Tibetan. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 367–421. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
Vesalainen, Olavi & Marja Vesalainen. 1980. *Clause Patterns in Lhomi*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Australian National University.
Wang, Qingshan (王青山). 1995. *A Grammar of Spoken Amdo Tibetan*. Chengdu: Sichuan Nationality Publishing House.

Watters, David E. 2006. The conjunct-disjunct distinction in Kaike. *Nepalese Linguistics* 22. 300–319.
Woodbury, Anthony C. 1986. Interactions of tense and evidentiality: a study of Sherpa and English. In Wallace L. Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, 188–202. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Yliniemi, Juha. This volume. Copulas in Denjongke or Sikkimese Bhutia. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 297–349. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
Yukawa Yasutoshi (湯川恭敏). 1966. チベット語のduuの意味 Chibettogo no duu no imi [The meaning of Tibetan duu]. 言語研究 *Gengo Kenkyū* 49. 77–84.
Yukawa Yasutoshi (湯川恭敏). 1971. チベット語の述部の輪郭 Chibettogo no jutsubu no rinkaku [Outline of Tibetan Predicates]. 言語学の基本問題 *Gengogaku no kihon mondai / Basic problems in linguistics*. Tokyo: 大修館書店 Taishūkan Shoten. 178–204.
Yukawa Yasutoshi (湯川恭敏). 1975. チベット語の述語 Chibettogo no jutsugo [The Predicates of Tibetan] アジア・アフリカ文法研究 *Ajia Afurika bunpō kenkyū / Asian & African Linguistics* 4. 1–14. Tokyo: ILCAA.
Yukawa Yasutoshi (湯川恭敏). This volume. Lhasa Tibetan Predicates. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*, 187–224. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter. (Translation of Yukawa 1975).
Zeisler, Bettina. 2004. *Relative tense and aspectual values in Tibetan languages: A comparative study*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Zemp, Marius. This volume. Evidentiality in Purik Tibetan. In L. Gawne & N.W. Hill (eds.), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages,* 261–296. Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.