Evidentiality is commonly described as the marking of the source of information (firsthand vs. non-firsthand) or also as the discrimination between direct knowledge through sense perception, on the one hand, and indirect knowledge, namely inference and hearsay, on the other. The complex of indirect knowledge has also been addressed in the French literature with the term ‘médiative’.

The modern Tibetic languages are known to have developed a particular type of ‘evidential’ marking. The basic principles have been described for quite a few of the Tibetic languages, see here the recent volume *Evidential Systems of Tibetan Languages*, ed. by Lauren Gawne and Nathan W. Hill. (*Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs [TiLSM] 302, De Gruyter Mouton, 2017*) as well as the earlier collection in *Person and evidence in Himalayan languages*, ed. by Balthasar Bickel. (*Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 23.1-2, 2000). One of the key features is the subjective involvement of the epistemic source or ‘ego’ (the speaker in statements and the addressee in questions) in the events reported. The ‘system’ is thus also known under the key terms of ‘egophoricity’ and ‘conjunct/disjunct’, both concepts often mistaken for a somewhat weird syntactic person category (ego vs. non-ego).

However, at a closer look, the ‘evidential system’ is far from being a ‘frozen’ grammatical system, but is extremely flexible, allowing, in principle, all forms for all persons, albeit in different frequencies and for different motivations. It further does not only deal with the source of information (first-hand vs. second-hand/hearsay) or the access channels (self-centred knowledge, perception, and inferences), but also or even predominantly with the subjective assessment of the situation and/or the socio-pragmatic situation.

In this workshop, we want to discuss the ‘unsystematic’ aspects of this ‘system’. A closer look into the genesis of these systems (Zemp, Widmer) and into the hierarchical structure of the markers (Tournadre) may help to explain the idiosyncrasies. The subjective involvement of the epistemic source and the pragmatic restrictions in the speech situation may define the attitude or Stance the speaker is willing or allowed, and the addressee in questions is expected, to take (Sandman, Oisel, Zeisler). This also includes the question of how much does the addressee already know and how does it matter (Simon, Zeisler). We will also look at languages at the periphery of the Tibeto-sphere, that is at languages that have been under the influence of Tibetic languages (Sandman, Widmer). The contrast with the closest ‘evidential’ neighbours, the Iranian languages (Pezechki), with their mediative system will help to improve our understanding of the specificness of the Tibetic system.
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‘Evidentiality’ in Tibetic languages and beyond
– a closer look –

International Workshop
16-17th of February 2019, Fürstenzimmer, Schloss Hohentübingen

Saturday, 16 February
09:30-18:00

09:30  Introduction.
Bettina Zeisler, Universität Tübingen

10:00  The genesis of evidentiality in Tibetan.
Marius Zemp, Universität Bern

11:30  Coffeephrake

11:45  The evolution of epistemic categories in Bunan.
Manuel Widmer, Universität Zürich

13:15  Lunchbreak

14:45  Evidential accessibility hierarchies.
Nicolas Tournadre, Université d'Aix-Marseille, Lacito/CNRS,
Institut Universitaire de France

16:15  Coffeebreak

16:30  Evidential categories in Iranian languages: The core categories of inferential and hearsay.
Homa Lessan Pezechki, Université d'Aix-Marseille

Sunday, 17 February
09:00-18:00

09:00  Ego evidential -yek as a stance marker in Wutun: evidence from conversational data.
Erika Sandman, Helsingin Yliopisto (University of Helsinki)

10:30  Negotiating the facts: interactional functions of factual evidential markers in Amdo-Tibetan.
Camille Simon, Lacito/CNRS, Universität Heidelberg

12:00  Coffeebreak

12:15  Evidential freaks in Lhasa Tibetan: Redefining evidentiality in Tibetic languages.
Guillaume Oisel, Universidad Nacional Intercultural de la Amazonia, Peru

13:15  Lunchbreak

15:00  Speaker attitude (Stance) and other ‘freaks’ in the Ladakhi ‘evidential’ system.
Bettina Zeisler, Universität Tübingen

16:15  Coffeebreak

16:30  Further discussion

Contact and organiser: Bettina Zeisler, Universität Tübingen; Email: zeis@uni-tuebingen.de

DFG-Project: Evidentiality, epistemic modality, and speaker attitude in Ladakhi:
Modality and the interface for semantics, pragmatics, and grammar.