EVIDENTIALITY IN RGYALTHANG TIBETAN[*]

Krisadawan Hongladarom
Chulalongkorn University
hkesang@yahoo.com

This article analyses the evidential system in Rgyalthang, a Kham Tibetan dialect spoken in Shangri-la (Zhongdian) County, Diqin Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Yunnan Province, China. Like Central Tibetan, evidentiality in this dialect is marked by two types of verbs: copulas and auxiliaries. These verbs also function as markers of tense-aspect and participant perspective. Rgyalthang Tibetan shows a system of four-way evidentiality contrasts, namely visual, non-visual, reported and quotative. Generally, the non-visual evidential is used as the unmarked form indicating assumed knowledge. There is no special inferred evidential in this dialect. To indicate inferred evidence, speakers resort to modality as one of the evidential strategies. Like many other Kham Tibetan dialects, Rgyalthang marks mirativity by means of a special existential verb, which is not attested in Central Tibetan. The article also discusses data from Rgyalthang narratives, which are mainly evidentiality free. In addition, it examines some evidential contrasts in other Kham Tibetan dialects, particularly Bathang Tibetan. The paper concludes with a discussion of the development of evidentials and miratives in various dialects of Tibetan.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tibetan presents an interesting case for the study of evidentials. Many modern dialects have developed evidential systems, even though evidentials are not attested in Old Tibetan (ca. 650-950 A.D.)[1]. The literature so far has dealt mainly with Lhasa Tibetan and other Central Tibetan dialects (Agha 1993; DeLancey 1986, 1997, 2001; Garrett 2001; Hongladarom 1993, 1997; Huber 2000; Saxena 1997; Tournadre 1996). An exception is, for example, Sun (1993), which analyses evidential system in the nDzorge dialect of Amdo Tibetan. Yet, hardly any work considers evidentiality in Kham Tibetan, despite the fact that Kham is a historically important region of Tibet and contains a large number of dialects that mark evidentiality. The terms 'Amdo Tibetan' and 'Kham Tibetan' are generic names for a conglomerate of dialects spoken in eastern Tibet's two traditional provinces: Amdo or its northeastern area and Kham, its southeastern part. The Kham Tibetan speakers call themselves *Khampa*.

The paper analyses evidential contrasts in Rgyalthang, a southern dialect of Kham Tibetan spoken in Shangri-la (Zhongdian) county, Diqin Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture (TAP), Yunnan Province, China. The estimated number of Rgyalthang speakers is 60,000 (out of 100,000 of those classified as having Tibetan nationality living in Diqin TAP and the 1,000,000 Khampa speakers in China). The data for this paper is taken from my fieldwork in the Zhongdian county conducted in April-May for the period of 6 years consecutively (1995-2000). It consists of elicitations, folktales, personal narratives and conversations. In this paper I have also examined evidential data from the Bathang dialect of Kham Tibetan. Bathang is spoken in Batang County in the Ganzi Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture in the Sichuan Province[2].

---

[1] According to Zeisler (2000: 40), evidentiality is attested neither in Old Tibetan nor in Classical Tibetan (11th-19th century).

[2] The term "Central Tibetan" used in this paper refers to a variety of Tibetan known as "Standard Spoken Tibetan" (Tournadre and Sangda Dorje 2003). It is spoken widely among educated speakers in Tibet. In addition, it serves as a lingua

Rgyalthang Tibetan exhibits agglutinative morphology with negative prefixes, nominalisation and topicalisation suffixes, conjunctive suffixes, and aspect marking suffixes. Like other Tibetan dialects, particularly those classified as Kham Tibetan, Rgyalthang has developed a system of secondary verbs, one of which functions as a causative marker, deontic markers, directional markers and aspectual markers. In addition, it contains a complex system of copulas and 'sentence-final' auxiliaries indicating aspect, participant perspective (i.e. conjunct vs. disjunct) marking, evidentiality and mirativity. Although these auxiliaries are labeled 'sentence-final,' they can in fact be suffixed by attitudinal particles and discourse markers. Old Tibetan marks tense in the verbal paradigms, but many Kham Tibetan dialects, including Rgyalthang, predominantly mark aspect rather than tense. Among the aspect distinctions are perfective, perfect, progressive, inchoative and prospective marking.

2. DEFINITION OF EVIDENTIALITY

The definition of evidentiality adopted in this paper is taken from Aikhenvald (2004: 3): "a linguistic category whose primary meaning is source of information." Evidentiality is a distinct category from modality, though its meaning may be extended to the latter domain and gives rise to epistemic meaning. It is also a distinct category from mirativity, the marking of new or unexpected information. Generally, the mirative marker carries a pragmatic meaning of surprise and is often connected with evidentiality. For example, the Turkish inferred evidential *miş* is associated with mirative meaning (Aksu-koç and Slobin 1986).

According to Aikhenvald (2004: 195), the non-firsthand evidential or the inferred evidential may develop mirative overtones. A reported evidential may occasionally acquire a mirative meaning, but a firsthand evidential hardly ever does. Although the visual evidential *ţụu* (Written Tibetan *'dug*) in Central Tibetan has a mirative extension, it still

---

franca in Tibetan refugee communities. It is not exactly the same entity as the dialect spoken in present-day Lhasa city, Tibet Autonomous Region, though it is sometimes called "Lhasa Tibetan".

conforms to this pattern. It is possible only when the subject is first person (i.e. egophoric context)[3]. In a non-egophoric statement the mirative sense is conveyed by the combination of this evidential with the inferred marker[4]. That is, the inferred evidential still plays a role in the mirative extension of the evidential marker. Many Kham Tibetan dialects, including Rgyalthang and Bathang, have a separate mirative marker developed from the Written Tibetan verb *snang* (phonetically realised as *n̥āŋ* in Rgyalthang and *n̥ò* in Bathang) 'to appear'. As the primary function of this verb is mirative, it is clear that a mirative distinction can exist independently of an evidential system (DeLancey 2001; Aikhenvald 2004).

3. EVIDENTIALITY IN RGYALTHANG TIBETAN

The evidential system in Rgyalthang Tibetan has four terms: visual (equational *nā̠*, existential *ndô rê*, perfective *thi* or *-tɕi thi*), non-visual (equational *rê*, existential *jŷ rê*, perfective *-tɕi rê*), reported (existential *jŷ tɕâ*, perfective *tɕâ*), and quotative (suffix *-sə* attached to other types of evidentials except the reported). Mirativity is indicated by the existential verb *n̥āŋ* .

As information source is crucial for reporting an event involving someone else's action, it is hardly surprising that first person reports in

---

[3] Abbreviations used in this paper: 1s first person singular pronoun, 2s second person singular pronoun pronoun, 3s third person singular pronoun, 3pc third person plural collective; ABS absolutive case; ANIM animate entity; AUX auxiliary verb; CON conjunctive suffix; DAT dative case; DET determiner; ERG ergative case; EQUA equational copula; EXCL exclamation marker; EXIST existential copula; GEN genitive case; INANIM inanimate entity; IMP imperative; IMPF imperfective aspect; INST instrumental case; LOC locative case; MIR mirative; NEG negative marker; NONVIS non-visual evidential; OTHER other person or non-egophoric marker; PF perfective aspect; PL plural marker; PN proper name; QUO quotative evidential; REP reported evidential; SELF self person or egophoric marker; TOP topic marker; UFP utterance final particle; V(intr) intransitive verb; VIS visual evidential; WT Written Tibetan.

[4] LaPolla (2003: 69-70) found that the visual evidential in Qiang can occur together with the inferential if visual information was used to confirm the statement made on the basis of an inference. It seems that the visual evidential in Qiang does not have mirative extension.

Rgyalthang as well as other Tibetan dialects are evidentiality neutral. In Central Tibetan, utterances in first person reports end with egophoric copulas or auxiliaries; in many dialects of Kham Tibetan they generally end with egophoric copulas or main verbs. Auxiliaries are optional. In the Dzachukha dialect (spoken in Shiqu County, Ganzi TAP) egophoric endings (existential *jö* in this case) can be omitted entirely: *ŋa ta maŋ* (I horse many) 'I have many horses'.

In Rgyalthang as well as other Tibetan dialects, evidentials occur in declarative positive and negative main clauses and in interrogative clauses but not in subordinate or imperative clauses[5]. In the latter case, egophoric endings, which mark neither evidentiality nor participant perspective, are obligatory. In a question, the questioner generally has to anticipate the state of knowledge the listener may have. To use the direct evidential in a question means the speaker thinks the listener has witnessed an event.

3.1 Copulas

Evidentiality in Rgyalthang Tibetan is marked by two types of verbs: copulas and aspectual auxiliaries. The term 'copula' refers to both equational and existential verbs (DeLancey 2001). These copulas also function as imperfective auxiliaries when they are attached to the main verb and imperfective (progressive or prospective) suffix. In the perfective system, evidentiality is marked by another set of verbs (see §3.2). Apart from indicating aspect and evidentiality, these copulas and auxiliaries participate in the grammatical system of participant marking and are associated with the semantic categories of volitionality and control.

Rgyalthang has a rich repertoire of copulas as shown in Table 1. *jî*, *rô* and *ɕāŋ* appear only in exclamations or intensifying statements.

---

[5] The following example shows an imperative pattern in which the main verb is followed by an imperative marker, in this case, *-tɕi.*

şŭ	ɲɔ̌	pū-*tɕi*
morning	fire	blow-IMP

'Please make the morning fire' (lit. 'please blow the morning fire').

Copulas	*SELF*	*OTHER*
Equational 'be'	zīn	rê, nō̄, jî, rô, ɕāŋ
Existential 'have; there is'	ndô, jŷ	ndô rê, jŷ rê, ŋ̊āŋ

Table 1. Rgyalthang copulas

These copulas contrast in participant perspective marking. There is evidence suggesting that egophoric morphemes (equational *zīn* and existential *jŷ*) are older than their non-egophoric counterparts, because they are the default forms in dependent clauses, songs, proverbs and folktales, in which participant perspective (as well as evidentiality) is neutralised. The existential *ndô* (WT *'dug*) conveying egophoric perspective is an innovation in Rgyalthang; its cognates in other dialects such as Bathang and Dege are normally used in non-egophoric contexts.

(1) ɲĭwāŋ   dăwā   nēika   tăŋmō   tɕō̄sā   tɕì
     sun   moon   the.two   former   birthplace   one
     zīn
     EQUA:SELF
     'The sun and the moon are of the same birthplace.'

In this example, which is taken from a song, *zīn* is used, despite the fact that the subject is not first person. In everyday language we would expect the non-egophoric *rê* to appear in this particular context instead.

3.1.1 Equational copulas

Examples (2)-(3) illustrate basic equational sentences with *zīn* marking first person and *rê* non-first.

(2) ŋă   dʑīathāŋ   tĭmbă   zīn
     1s   PN   highlander   EQUA:SELF
     'I'm a Rgyalthangwa.'

(3) khūə   gīgēn   rê
     3s   teacher EQUA:OTHER
     'He is a teacher.'[6]

rê typically conveys the meaning that the statement in question is general and commonly known. When it is used as a non-visual evidential, it contrasts with *nə̄*, which indicates visually acquired knowledge. Examples (4)-(6) demonstrate the use of these copulas with predicate adjectives and their evidentiality contrasts.

(4) tshə̰-ji   pə̄   rĭŋdē   rê
     dog-GEN   hair   long[7] EQUA:OTHER[8]
     'The dog's hair is long (general statement)'

(5) tshə̰-ji   pə̄   rĭŋdē   nə̄
     dog-GEN   hair   long   EQUA:OTHER;VIS
     'The dog's hair is long (I saw it)'

In (4) the speaker does not focus on the source of information; it is only a general statement. This is in contrast with the visual evidential function of *nə̄* in (5) above and in (6) below.

---

[6] The pronoun *khō* in Central Tibetan refers only to a singular third person male. The female form is *mō*. The deferential counterpart of both forms is *khōŋ*, which in this example might be more appropriate, as the person being talked about is a teacher. In Rgyalthang and other Kham dialects, the most common form of the third person singular pronoun is *khō*, which is neutral in gender and deference. *khōŋ* is used only when one talks about highly respected masters or *lamas*.

[7] *riŋde* derives from the stem *riŋ* and the derivational morpheme *de*. As the stem does not stand by itself, I do not present it as two separate glosses here.

[8] The notions 'egophoric' (SELF) and 'non-egophoric' (OTHER) are glossed only when necessary. Otherwise, the verbs are left unmarked. This is especially the case when the egophoric verb expresses a lack of volition and the non-egophoric indicates evidentiality. Inconsistency of glossing reflects the problem we face when dealing with multifunctional morphemes.

(6)   tɕì-gə-tə   ndʐə̄tʂhə̄   mūmū   nə̄-sə

      one-ERG-TOP   Yangtse river   red   EQUA-QUO

      tɕì-gə-tə   ndʐə̄tʂhə̄   hūəɕīŋ   nə̄-sə

      one-ERG-TOP   Yangtse river   blue   EQUA-QUO

      'One said that the Yangtse river was red, the other said it was
      blue (quoted visual report).'

In the folktale from which (6) is taken, two men are arguing over the
colour of the Yangtse river. One said that it was red and the other said it
was blue, with the narrator using *nə̄* to report both men's speech. Had
the protagonists opted to use *rê,* it would mean that they only made a
statement where the information contained in it was acquired indirectly.
By uttering a sentence with the evidential *nə̄,* the speaker asserts a
strong degree of certainty, derived from the fact that he has witnessed
the colour of the river. Because the utterances constitute quoted speech,
the quotative evidential -*sə* is used.

The following examples illustrate the use of *nə̄* as an imperfective
auxiliary (7A) and as copula (7B). Here *nə̄* indicates an immediate
situation. Although this situation is described from the viewpoint of
someone who has witnessed the event, evidentiality is not its focus.
Given the immediacy of the situation in (7), *rê,* which describes a
general situation, is inappropriate.

(7)   A: sə̄-ji   gŭa   dāŋ-de   nə̄
           who-INST   door   knock-IMPF   AUX:OTHER
           'Who is knocking at the door?'

      B: kāzāŋ nə̄
           PN   EQUA:OTHER
           'It is Kesang'

(7) presents the important fact that events described in the
imperfective aspect do not generally express evidential meanings. There
is no need for the speaker to justify ongoing events at all times. The

immediacy of the current situation, particularly when the speaker is involved in it either as a perceiver or actor, is enough to warrant the use of the evidential. In many languages of the world, overt marking of evidentiality is obligatory only when the reported events have already happened. One may argue that the copula in (7B) functions as a marker of visually acquired information. Yet, this need not be the case. In both Central Tibetan and Rgyalthang discourse, conversational partners tend to follow a kind of politeness principle: when the speaker talks about an event using one verb ending, the addressee usually picks up the same ending in his or her immediately following utterance. In such situations, the information source seems to be quite irrelevant to the conversationalists. For example, Central Tibetan speakers often use the tag *jɔɔ rḛwa* (existential/imperfective *jɔɔ rḛe* + nominaliser *wa*) 'isn't it' as a back-channeling cue when the conversational partner ends his or her utterance with *jɔɔ rḛe*. Hence, in (7), the use of *nə̄* in B's speech could simply be an imitation of the same verb form in A's question.

The other three non-egophoric copulas in Rgyalthang Tibetan, *jî*, *rô* and *ɕaŋ*, occur mainly in exclamations and intensifying statements. Unlike *nə̄* and *rê*, they cannot link two nouns; they occur with predicative adjectives with an intensifying function. *jî* and *rô* contrast in mirativity: *jî* expresses the speaker's unexpected knowledge about a certain state, whereas *rô* generally describes the speaker's reaction about a particular state. *rô* is derived from the equational *rê* describing unmarked statement and the exclamation particle *o*. However, since they occur only in exclamation statements, they do not function as miratives proper.

(8) tǎrīŋ   tɕhā   jî
     today   cold   EQUA:OTHER
     'It is very cold today (the speaker just found out about this and is surprised at it).'

(9) tɕhā   rò
     cold   EQUA:OTHER
     'It is very cold (the speaker is not surprised about the fact
     reported because they expected it to be cold)'

In my corpus, I found only a single instance of *jî* as a perfective auxiliary. Example (10) describes an event in a dream. Here *jî* indicates the speaker's new knowledge and surprise when he found himself having broken a glass in a dream. In Rgyalthang Tibetan the causative marker is required in non-volitional sentences.

(10) n�·sōŋ   ŋǎ   ɲīlāŋ-nə   kūū jȳ tʂà   tʂo
      last night   1s   dream-LOC   glass break cause
      jî   ɲi   ɕaŋ
      AUX:PF   dream AUX:SELF
     'Last night I dreamed that I broke a glass'

The auxiliary *jî* in (10) reports the speaker's surprise at having found himself having broken a glass in the dream. *ɕaŋ* indicates that the speaker is a recipient of an action.

3.1.2 Existential copulas

There are five existential copulas in Rgyalthang: *ndô*, *ndô rê*, *jŷ*, *jŷ rê* and *n̥āŋ*. The first four contrast in participant perspective marking, evidentiality and animacy of the entities possessed. *ndô* and *jŷ* occur with the first person in declarative and second person in interrogative; *ndô rê* and *jŷ rê* with the non-first person in declarative and interrogative. In term of information source, *ndô rê* marks directly acquired information; *jŷ rê* marks indirectly acquired information. *ndô* and *ndô rê* are used with animate possessed entities; *jŷ* and *jŷ rê* are used with inanimate entities. *ndô rê* and *jŷ rê* contrast with *n̥āŋ*, which marks the speaker's new and unexpected knowledge. In addition, *jŷ* can be followed by the reported auxiliary or the quotative suffix *-sə*. The dimensions of contrasts are summarised in Tables (2) and (3).

	ndô	*jŷ*	*ndô rê*	*jŷ rê*	*ŋ̊āŋ*
Participant Perspective	SELF	SELF	OTHER	OTHER	–
Animacy	ANIM	INANIM	ANIM	INANIM	–
Evidentiality	–	–	VIS	NONVIS	–
Mirativity	–	–	–	–	MIR

Table 2. Rgyalthang Existentials

Evidentiality	*ndô rê*	*jŷ rê*	***jŷ tɕâ***	***jŷsə***
Visual	x			
Nonvisual		x		
Reported			x	
Quotative				x

Table 3. Evidentiality Contrasts in Existentials

Example (11) illustrates the animacy distinction between two non-egophoric negative existentials *jŷ marê* (used with an inanimate entity) and *ndô marê* (with an animate entity).

(11) khūə-la   ŋə̄i   jŷ
     3s-DAT   money   EXIST:INANIM
     ma-rê
     NEG-EQUA:OTHER
     ɕǐ   ndô   ma-rê
     child   EXIST:ANIM   NEG-EQUA:OTHER
     'He has neither money nor children.'

The association between existentials and animacy is not attested in Old Tibetan, and is rarely found in other Tibetan dialects. It may be a novel feature in Rgyalthang due to some contact with other non-Tibetan

languages[9]. On the other hand, the mirative *n̥āŋ*, as in (12) and (13), does not make a distinction in regard to the animacy of the entities possessed.

(12) khūənata-la   tā   dʑēpa   n̥āŋ
     3pc-DAT   horse   many   EXIST:MIR
     'They have many horses (the speaker just found out).'

(13) khūə̰-la   ŋēi   dʑēpa   n̥āŋ
     3s-DAT   money   a lot   EXIST:MIR
     'He has a lot of money (the speaker just found out).'

When the speaker wants to stress that the knowledge about the existence of something or someone is obtained via secondary sources, they do so by adding the reported evidential *tɕà* to the existential verb *jŷ*.

(14) khūə-la   ŋēi   dʑēpa   jŷ   tɕà
     3s-DAT   money a lot   EXIST AUX:REP
     'He has a lot of money (I was told).'

(15) tʂhə̄   khȳ   ɲi   tɕà
     water   boil.(intr)   NEG.EXIST   AUX:REP
     'There's no boiled water (I was told).'

Example (16) conveys mirativity, and (17) is a general statement in which the information source is unstated.

---

[9] In her research on Dongwang Tibetan spoken in the same Diqin TAP, Bartee (2005) also found that animacy is a salient feature of the existential system in this language.

(16) tʂhɔ̄   khȳ   ɲi-n̥ā̄ŋ
     water   boil.(intr)   NEG-EXIST:MIR
     'There's no boiled water (I just found out).'

(17) tʂhɔ̄   khȳ   jŷ   ma-rê
     water   boil.(intr)   EXIST   NEG-EQUA
     'There's no boiled water (I have known about this; general
     statement).'

When we compare these existential copulas with those in Central
Tibetan, we find a major difference. In Central Tibetan there are only
three existential copulas: *jö̈ö* (cognate of *jŷ*), *tṳ̈ü* (cognate of *ndô*), and
jɔɔ rḙe (cognate of *jŷ rê*). They contrast in participant perspective and
evidentiality, but not animacy. The visual evidential also functions as a
mirative when the speaker wants to emphasise that the knowledge about
the event described is newly acquired.

	jö̈ö	*tṳ̈ü*	*jɔɔ rḙe*
Participant Perspective	SELF	OTHER	OTHER
Evidentiality	–	VIS	NONVIS
Mirativity	–	MIR	–

Table 4. Central Tibetan Existential Copulas

3.2 Aspectual Auxiliaries

Events in Rgyalthang Tibetan are broadly classified into two groups:
past and non-past. Non-past events consist of future tense and
imperfective (progressive and gnomic) aspects. Past events comprise
perfective and perfect aspects. As the system of marking events in the
past exhibits a special connection with evidentiality, I will deal mainly
with that.

Aspectual auxiliaries convey four evidentiality contrasts: visual,
non-visual, reported and quotative.

Evidentiality	thi	rê	tçà	sə
Visual	x			
Nonvisual		x		
Reported			x	
Quotative				x

Table 5. Rgyalthang Tibetan Perfective Evidentials

In §3.2.1 I analyse the visual evidential *thi* and discuss how it is used to mark evidentiality. In doing this, I also investigate the usage of the non-visual evidential *rê* and the egophoric verb *çaŋ* which exhibits an interesting interplay between volitionality and evidentiality. In §3.2.2 I examine the reported evidential *tçà* and its cognates in other Kham dialects which have come to be associated with the marking of non-visual experience.

3.2.1 Visual Evidential

The speaker's direct experience in Rgyalthang Tibetan is marked by the non-egophoric auxiliary *thi* (WT *thal* 'to cross'), attached to various aspect markers, such as the perfective suffix *-tçi* in (18) or the perfect auxiliary *thuin* (WT *thon* 'to complete') in (19).

(18) khȳə   ẓŷ   tçi   sè-tçi   thi
      3s.ERG   snake   DET.ABS   kill-PF   AUX:VIS
      'He killed a snake (I know because I saw it).'

(19) phiŋko   çi̲-gə   tṣhǎ   thŭin   thi
      apple.ABS child-ERG   eat   complete   AUX:VIS
      'As for the apple, the child has already eaten it (I know because I saw it).'

When the speaker does not emphasise that they have obtained the information through eyewitness knowledge, the equational copula *rê*

functioning as an auxiliary is used, as in (20) and (21). As mentioned earlier, statements with *rê* convey several meanings. They describe a general situation that is part of the common knowledge of the speaker and the hearer. In some cases they connote indirect source of information. When contrasted with new, unexpected information, they indicate old information, as in (20). This particular example in another context contrasts with (18), which stresses the speaker's visual evidence.

(20) khɣ̄ə   ʐŷ   tɕi   sè-tɕi   rê
      3s.ERG   snake   one.ABS   kill-PF   AUX
      'He killed a snake (I have known this for some time, and the
      knowledge comes from an unspecified source).'

(21) is taken from a folktale in which actions and events are generally presented in the quoted framework (with the quotative ending). But in this case the statement is unmarked for evidentiality.

(21) tsò   ʂè   nā   ʐâ̰   tshă   rê
      like that   say   vow   keep   finish   AUX
      'Saying like that, (they) have made the vow (information
      source unstated).'

Like the perfective auxiliary and direct evidential *sōŋ* in Central Tibetan, *thi* can occur in egophoric statement when there is no volition involved, as is shown in (22). Thus, the Rgyalthang dialect also exhibits an interaction between evidentiality and volitionality.

(22) ŋă   tʂă   phə̄   tʂo   thi
      1s   tea   spill   cause   AUX:VIS
      'I spilled tea (inadvertently).'

However, *thi* cannot be used for all the situations the speaker has no control over. To indicate that one is sick, the egophoric auxiliary *ɕaŋ*

must be used. This auxiliary often follows the perfective suffix -*tçi*, which connotes an immediate state, not a habitual or continuous one[10].

(23) ŋǎ   nǎ-tçi   çaŋ
      1s   sick-PF   AUX:SELF
      'I was sick.'

çaŋ is grammaticalised from WT *byung* 'to come out/emerge'. It usually occurs with the first person subject when the speaker is not a volitional actor, such as when indicating that they have dreamt about something, were sick, or cried.

(24) ŋɔ̌   ṣū-tçi   çaŋ
      cry   lose-PF   AUX:SELF
      '(I) cried.'

çaŋ can also occur in a non-egophoric statement when the action is oriented towards the speaker (hence, the notion of source), such as when indicating that they are a recipient of something, as in (25). Note that in this particular example there is no need to specify the information source, as the speaker is the direct beneficiary.

(25) khǒtshē   çȳithù   dʑēbā   ɲy̌ə   khǒ
      3p   fruit   a lot   buy   bring
      çaŋ
      AUX:SELF
      'They brought (us) a lot of fruit.'

The following example demonstrates another interesting use of this source-marking verb.

---

[10] Randy LaPolla (personal communication) made an important observation that the suffix -*tçi* could be a change of state marker. Such a marker is common in many Tibeto-Burman languages. It is possible that this perfective marker when appearing in non-control statements functions as an inchoative marker.

(26) adza   ndɔ̄   ɕǐṳ-kəiṇ-gə   kē   sāŋkè
       EXCL   this   bird-PL-GEN   language voice pleasant
       ɲē   ɕaŋ-la
       good   AUX-UFP
       'Oh! How beautiful the bird's song is!'

Although (26) is a depiction of something new and unexpected to the speaker and hence can be argued to indicate mirativity, *ɕaŋ* does not primarily function as a mirative marker. Its core meaning is to mark source, emphasising that it occurs in a direction towards the speaker (DeLancey 1996). The occurrence of *ɕaŋ* in an exclamation is rarely found in Central Tibetan.

The Bathang dialect is also similar to Rgyalthang Tibetan in this regard. The direct evidential *the* (WT thal) cannot be used to describe an illness one directly experiences.

(27) Bathang
      ŋǎ   nǎ   ndu   rɛ
      1s   sick   stay   AUX
      'I'm sick (present state).'

(28) Bathang
      ŋǎ   nǎ   ɕuŋ
      1s   sick   AUX
      'I was sick.'

(29) Bathang
      ŋǎ   nǎ   the
      1s   sick   AUX
      'I was sick.'

But for certain situations over which the speaker has no control and obtains their knowlege of the event through observing results of it, e.g. the experience of forgetting something, this direct evidential is used in both the Rgyalthang and Bathang dialects.

(30) Rgyalthang

ŋɛ	khūə̣-gi	ɲoŋ	dzɯ	tṣo	thi
1s.ERG	3s-GEN	name	forget	cause	AUX

'I forgot his name.'

(31) Bathang

ŋɛ	ky-ge	miŋ	je-ɣa	the
1s.ERG	3s.GEN-GEN[11]	name	forget-PF	AUX

'I forgot his name.'

Not all sentences in the perfective aspect are marked by evidentials. Sometimes the speaker chooses to report an event using the modality marker *minə*, as in (32) and (33); that is, they are more concerned with their attitudes towards the action indicated in the utterance, rather than with the source of information.

(32)
nə̆sōŋ	tṣhə̄wā	pò	minə̄
last night	rain	fall	MOD

'It probably rained last night.'

(33)
khūə-la	dēwā	zīn	minə̄
3s-DAT	intelligent	EQUA:SELF	MOD

'He seems to be intelligent.'

---

[11] *ky-ge* is an example of a double possessive, a common construction in many Kham Tibetan dialects.

Suppose the speaker is certain about the fact that the person referred to is intelligent, they would then use the copula *rê*. In this case, the information is presented as unchallenged fact.

(34) khūə-la   dēwā   rê
     3s-DAT   intelligent   EQUA:OTHER
     'He is intelligent (I have always known about this).'

If the speaker has just discovered the fact that the person referred to is intelligent, they would have to present the information as in (35).

(35) khūə-la   dēwā   n̥ūŋ
     3s-DAT   intelligent   MIR
     'He is intelligent (I just discovered it).'

The modal *minɔ̄* cannot co-occur with the mirative, but it can occur with the copula *zīn* (cf. example 33). Although the morpheme *zīn* usually appears in an egophoric statement, when it occurs with *minɔ̄*, it becomes neutral in terms of participant marking.

minə (*mi-* 'negative prefix' and *nə* 'visual evidential') also functions as a negative copula and a visual evidential marker, as in (36). This morpheme, combined into a single unit, is related to the modal *minɔ̄* mentioned above.

(36) ndɔ̄   kōpā   mi-nɔ̄
     this   dumb.person   NEG-EQUA:DIRECT
     '(They thought): This isn't a dumb man.'

Example (36) is taken from a folktale. The speakers are the guests who come to a party. When they hear an unexpected visitor, who they thought was a dumb man, say something intelligent, they changed their minds and exclaimed the above utterance.

3.3.2 Reported Evidential

Another common evidential auxiliary in the perfective aspect is *tɕà* (WT *grags* 'fame, report, rumor') functioning as a reported evidential. This marker often occurs with the perfective suffix -*tɕi* and thus reports a past event. When it is used, the author of the information is not usually stated[12].

(37) nɵ̆   tɕì   sè-tɕi   tɕà
      person   DET   kill-PF   AUX:REP
      'A person was killed (I was told).'

(38) pŭmɜ̄   phŭsɵ̆-gola   sīŋ-tɕi   tɕà
      girl   another person-DAT   give-PF   AUX:HS
      '(They) gave the girl to another guy (it was said).'

(38) is drawn from a folktale. Generally speaking, evidentials—whether they indicate direct or indirect knowledge—are not common in narratives and folktales. There is no need for the speaker to indicate the source of information at all times, particularly given the fact that the storyteller has traditionally been regarded as someone with authority, "the one who truly knows the story". The opening of a story with a phrase such as "It is said that there is/are..." (...*jŷsə*) prepares the reader for an imaginative universe of discourse about which the narrator gets their knowledge indirectly, i.e. via the information that has been passed down from generation to generation. This kind of indirect and often remote and anonymous source is marked by the quotative suffix -*sə*. In a narrative it has nothing to do with the source of information, except for characterising the speech as reported and framing the discourse into a story genre. In contrast, *tɕà* functions as an evidential. By uttering it, the

---

[12] When there is a need to state the source of the quotation, the construction *sē-pa rê* (*sē* 'say', -*pa* 'nominaliser', *rê* 'non-visual evidential') or *sē thî* (*sē* 'say', *thî* 'visual evidential') is often used. The quotative -*sə* is grammaticalised from the verb *sē*.

speaker emphasises that they do not have eyewitness knowledge about reported information.

In Dege and Bathang, two Kham Tibetan dialects spoken in Ganzi Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, the cognate of this verb *tɕà*, realised as *tʂaʔ*, not only functions as a reported evidential but also as an indirect marker of non-visual perceptions.

(39) Dege Tibetan (Häsler 1999: 176; phonetic transcription and
       gloss modified)

       khō̃   xĩ   tʂhā   tʂaʔ
       3s.ERG   wood   split   AUX:REP

       ŋa̠   ko̠   tʂa̠ʔ
       1s   hear   AUX:REP

       'He is splitting wood, I hear it (with evidential marker).'

In (39), which contains two utterances, the speaker emphasises the fact that he has obtained the information about someone's action of splitting wood by means of auditory perception. The expression 'I hear it' is an explicit statement about the information source. Compare this sentence with (40) in which the speaker simply describes his perception 'I heard him' in the second utterance.

(40) Dege Tibetan (Häsler 1999: 176; glosses my own)

       khō̃   xĩ   tʂhā   tʂa̠ʔ
       3s.ERG   wood   split   AUX:REP

       ŋa̠   ko̠   ɕũ̃
       1s   hear   AUX:SELF

       'He is splitting wood, I heard him (without evidential
       marker).'

(40) is different from (39) in that in (39) the reported evidential is used, whereas in (40) the speaker gives additional information to the hearer that they have heard the referred-to person splitting wood.

Examples (41)-(43) in Bathang Tibetan describe the information derived from auditory, olfactory and tactile perceptions respectively. All are conveyed by the reported evidential.

     Bathang Tibetan

(41) kesaŋ dawa tsè   õŋ   tʂâʔ
      PN   arrive come AUX:REP
      'Kesang Dawa arrived (I know because I heard her—her voice, her steps, etc.).'

(42) pö-ge   tʂhima   tʂho   õŋ   tʂâʔ
      incense-GEN smell   heat   come AUX:REP
      'I smelled the hot smell of incense (lit. The hot smell of incense came (to my nose)).'

(43) teka   jin   tʂâʔ
      walnut   EQUA[13]   AUX:REP
      'They are walnuts (I know because I felt them).'

3.3.3 Evidentiality in Rgyalthang Tibetan Narratives

Zero anaphora is common in Rgyatlhang narratives. The predicate is the only obligatory component of a clause. In a statement marked by an evidential, only the evidential verb need be present. This is why evidentiality has been described as an indexical category (Agha 1993). The following examples illustrates zero anaphora in a Rgyalthang narrative. (44a) contains a finite clause while (b-d) contain a chain of non-finite clauses. Both constructions are related to each other in that they share the same topicalised agent. In (44a) the agent—the person who tends cattle—is introduced. This topic, though missing, is carried through the series of clauses in (44b-d).

---

[13] Although the copula *jin* generally indicates egophoric perspective, in (43) this perspective is neutralised.

(44) (a)

çota	tshuə	nə-tə	seŋ	tçi	gyə
cattle	tend	person-TOP	mind	happy	must

re-wa
EQUA-UFP

'As for the person who tends cattle, he must be happy, right?'

(b)

te	ṣowa	haŋtça-tə	haŋmə	ʔɯ	laŋ
then	morning	early-TOP	early	up	get

'In the early morning (he) gets up.'

(c)

ṣowa	haŋtça	ʔɯ	laŋ-thuinrɛŋ-tə
morning	early	up	get-CON-TOP

'After getting up early in the morning,'

(d)

çota	ṣɯ	ro
cattle	downwards	gather

'(he) gathers cattle together.'

These utterances describe the speaker's own activities when he takes the cattle up to the herding area. Because he is the one who does all these activities, there is no need to use an evidential marker to justify the source of information. On the other hand, we would assume that a narrative describing activities done by other people would require evidential markers, but that does not seem to be the case. Most Rgyalthang narratives are evidential free; evidentials are used only when there is a need to emphasise the source of information, as illustrated in the following analysis dealing with folktales.

Folktale

This kind of narrative has the same pattern of evidential-marking as the one reporting the narrator's own experience. It is, in most cases,

evidential-free. Sentences are connected by connective particles, rather than by evidential morphemes. When the quotative suffix is used, it simply conveys the fact that the event reported is part of a direct quote. In the story of 93 clauses from which (45) is taken, each clause either ends with the connective suffixes such as *-thuinrɛn*, *-thuinrɛntə*, *-tə*, or with discourse particles such as *tsukhuthuinrɛn* and emphatic markers like *thi* and *ɛmɛnɛ*. There is only one instance of an evidential marker occurring toward the end of the story.

(45) pǔmə̄-tə   pǒ̌   lɛ̄mbā   thù-tça
     girl-TOP   boy   dull   get-AUX:REP
     'As for the girl, the dull boy got (her) (i.e. She became his bride).'

In this particular example the speaker wants to emphasise that what unfolded at the end—the fact that the hero succeeded in marrying the girl—was something that was told to him. Here we could also argue that the hearsay evidential is used in a text as a strategy to attract the listener's attention.

4. DEVELOPMENT OF EVIDENTIALS

In this section I discuss some developments of evidentials in Tibetan based on an investigation of Rgyalthang evidentials and a comparison with evidential systems in Central Tibetan and other Kham Tibetan dialects.

4.1 Equational Copulas

For certain Kham dialects, e.g. Rgyalthang, equational copulas show a clear evidential contrast: information obtained through direct experience vs. information obtained indirectly which is old knowledge. Equational copulas in the Central dialect do not have any convey evidential contrast.

4.2 Existential Copulas

In both the Rgyalthang and Bathang dialects of Kham Tibetan there is a distinction between first person and non-first person statements. At least four markers of evidentiality are found: direct evidential, indirect evidential, reported and quotative. The visual evidential is related to eyewitness knowledge and other types of direct experience. The non-visual evidential conveys a general statement. It is the unmarked form. The mirative marker in both dialects is grammaticalised from the verb *snang* 'appear, become visible'. In Central Tibetan, there is no special mirative marker; the existential *'dug* conveys both evidential and mirative meanings.

Volkart (2000) found out that *'dug* has opposite meanings in the imperfective and perfective aspects in different dialects of Central Tibetan. In the imperfective, it is used with an evidential meaning. In the perfective, it appears in some dialects with no evidential meaning. These opposite meanings are attested even within one dialect (Lhomi).

The Rgyalthang egophoric existential *ndô* is grammaticalised from the verb *'dug* meaning 'to sit/stay'. This verb is attested in late Old Tibetan with this meaning, as well as the meaning 'to have/possess'. It has already exhibited a tendency to become an existential verb, thus contrasting with the older existential *yod* (realised as *jŷ* in Rgyalthang and *jö* in Central Tibetan). The verb *ndô* has an interesting history of development in many dialects. For example, in the Bathang and Dege dialects it occupies the secondary verb position, marking imperfective aspect. In Rgyalthang it conveys an existential meaning and contrasts with *yod* in terms of animacy of the entities possessed. In the Central dialect it has developed into a non-egophoric existential verb. As it is associated with non-speaker statement, it is understandable why it also becomes a marker of direct experience. Its mirative function could be an extension from this meaning.

In my previous work (Hongladarom 1997), *'dug* is attested in late Old Tibetan with the meanings of 'to sit, stay' and 'to have, possess'. The verb has already exhibited a tendency to become an existential verb, thus contrasting with the older existential *yod*. This tendency is clearly seen in Classical Tibetan where more occurrences of *'dug* are found in existential constructions with the meaning of 'there is, there

are'. In Central Tibetan, the verb *'dug* contrasts with *yod* when participant perspective is taken into consideration. Otherwise, it contrasts with *yodpa red* and conveys both evidentiality and mirativity.

In several of the Kham dialects I have investigated, the function of *'dug* seems to be replaced by the morpheme *gi* which functions as a direct evidential or mirative marker in several dialects. When this morpheme combines with the copula verb, it usually conveys an inferential meaning. In Bathang and other Kham dialects such as Dege, *'dug* functions simply as a secondary verb marking imperfective aspect. In Rgyalthang it conveys an existential meaning and contrasts with *yod* in terms of animacy of the entities possessed.

4.3 Aspectual auxiliaries

Most evidentials functioning as perfective auxiliaries are grammaticalised from motion verbs. In the two dialects studied (as well as in one Amdo dialect mentioned in Sun 1993), the direct evidential is grammaticalised from the verb *thal* 'pass' (realised as *thi* in Rgyalthang, *the* in Bathang). In Central Tibetan, the same function is conveyed by the verb *soŋ* 'go'. This verb is used only in the imperative form in Rgyalthang. It does not convey evidential meaning. Also, it often appears in secondary verb position. In Rgyalthang and Bathang, *thal* also appears in egophoric statements when the subject has no volition or control. In all these dialects, it contrasts with the periphrastic forms containing the equational copula *red*.

Another interesting evidential in Kham Tibetan is the reported marker *grags*, which is grammaticalised from the noun 'fame, report, rumor'[14]. In Central Tibetan, the reported evidential is marked by a grammaticalised form of the verb *zer* 'say' (often reduced to a lengthened [s:]).

In conclusion, there are no evidentiality, mirativity or participant distinctions in Old Tibetan. But this situation differs in many modern dialects. There is a tendency for existentials to convey mirative contrasts while perfective auxiliaries convey evidential contrasts. Evidentials in the Kham dialects come from different lexical sources when compared

---

[14] However, in Dege another marker *tshug* performs this function.

with Central Tibetan. But what is obvious from these dialects is that the equational copula *red* usually conveys general information. In addition, it has also been found that complex sentences and narratives in Kham Tibetan in general require no evidential marking.

REFERENCES

AGHA, ASIF. 1993. *Structural form and utterance context in Lhasa Tibetan: Grammar and indexicality in a non-configurational language.* New York: Peter Lang.

AKSU-KOÇ, AYHAN and DAN SLOBIN. 1986. A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish. In *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology,* ed. by Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols, 159-167. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BARTEE, ELLEN. 2005. The role of animacy in the verbal morphology of Dongwang Tibetan. Paper presented at the 11th Himalayan Languages Symposium, December 6-8, 2005. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

__. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.3: 369-382.

__. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33-52.

DELANCEY, SCOTT. 1996. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In Evidentiality: *The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology,* ed. by Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols, 203-213. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

GARRETT, EDWARD J. 2001. *Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan.* PhD dissertation, UCLA.

HÄSLER, KATRIN L. 1999. *A grammar of the Tibetan Dege (Sde dge) Dialect.* PhD dissertation, University of Bern.

HONGLADAROM, KRISADAWAN. 1997. The historical development of the Tibetan evidential *tuu*. In *Southeast Asian Linguistic Studies in Honour of Vichin Panupong,* ed. by Arthur S. Abramson, 115-126. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.

__. 1993. Evidentials in Tibetan: *A dialogic study of the interplay between form and meaning.* PhD dissertation, Indiana University.

HUBER, BRIGITTE. 2000. Preliminary report on evidential categories in Lende Tibetan (Kyirong). *LTBA* 23.2: 155-174.

LAPOLLA, RANDY J. 2003. Evidentiality in Qiang. In *Studies in Evidentiality (Typological Studies in Language),* ed. by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon, 63-78. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

SAXENA, ANJU. 1997. Aspect and evidential morphology in Standard Lhasa Tibetan: A diachronic study. *Cashiers de Linguistique—Asie Orientale* 26: 281-306.

SUN, JACKSON T.S. 1993. Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 63.4: 945-1001.

TOURNADRE, NICOLAS. 1996. Comparison des systemes médiatifs de quatre dialects tibétains (tibétain central, ladakhi, dzongkha et amdo) [Comparison of the mediative systems of four Tibetan dialects (Central Tibetan, Ladakhi, Dzongkha and Amdo)]. In *L'énonciation médiatisée,* ed. by Zlatka Guentchéva, 195-213. Paris: Peeters.

__ and SANGDA DORJE. 2003. *Manual of Standard Tibetan: Language and Civilization*. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications.

VOKART, MARIANNE. 2000. The meaning of the auxiliary morpheme *'dug* in the aspect systems of some central Tibetan dialects. *LTBA* 23.2: 127-153.

ZEISLER, BETTINA. 2000. Narrative conventions in Tibetan languages: The issue of mirativity. *LTBA* 23.2: 39-77.