

## International Workshop 25.-26.04.2024 Tübingen

### *Ego-Evidentiality and the right(s) to know (better)*

Convener: Bettina Zeisler

\*\*\*\*\*

### **The grammatical expressions of access to personal knowledge and personal experience. *An illustration of the flexibility of the Tibetic evidential systems.***

*Nicolas Tournadre\* and Dickey Tsang Tsering Wangdue\*\**

\*Emeritus Professor, Aix-Marseille University,

senior member of the Academic Institute of France

\*\* Lecturer of Tibetan at the Inalco, Paris.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Evidentiality and The Indian parable of the blind men and an elephant* (ལྷན་ཆེན་དང་  
ལོང་བ་བཞི།). So I will probably give only a partial description the Evidentiality Elephant...

\*\*\*\*\*

### Plan of the talk

- a) Cognitive notions of (verbal) source and access
- b) Grammatical and lexical factors in the use of evidential markers:
- c) Compatibility of evidentials with first person(s) “subject(s)” in Common Tibetan
- d) first person(s) “subject(s)” with egophoric and endopathic in Common Tibetan
- e) first person(s) “subject(s)” with egophoric and endopathic in tag questions in Common Tibetan
- f) Evidential categories used with the first person(s) “subject(s)” in some other Tibetic languages: Purik, Lhoke, Dolpo.
- g) Conclusions

\*\*\*\*\*

My approach of evidentiality is **cognitive semantics**. The speakers’ interaction, shared knowledge, epistemic authority and other pragmatic factors also plays a role in the evidential system, but the core function can be described in terms of cognitive semantics.



## 2. Grammatical and lexical factors in the use of evidential markers:

The evidential markers vary (both formally and in their cognitive-semantic functions) according to grammatical factors (mainly **person, tenses-aspects and illocutionary force**: declarative and interrogative sentences) and lexical factors (**controllability, observability**). (see Tournadre & Suzuki, 2023).

Systems with 15 core evidential forms depending on the various tenses and aspects:

tenses-aspects:

Tense/ aspect	Aux. Ego/ personal (for 1 <sup>st</sup> pers. 'Subject')	Aux. Sensory	Aux. Factual
Future	<i>gi.yin</i>		<i>gi.red</i>
Pres. Habitual	<i>gi.yod</i>	<i>gi.'dug</i>	<i>gi.yod.red</i>
Pres. Prog	<i>#bzhin.yod</i>	<i>#bzhin.'dug</i>	<i>#bzhin.yod (pa) red.</i>
Past (completed)	<i>pa.yin / byung intent./ receptive</i>	<i>song</i>	<i>pa.red</i>
Perf.	<i>yod</i>	<i>bzhag/ 'dug inferential</i>	<i>yod.red.</i>

Person and illocutionary force:

Anticipation rule and perspective shift.

	1 <sup>st</sup> person "subject"	2 <sup>nd</sup> person "subject".
<i>Egophoric</i>		
declarative	V- <i>gi.yod</i>	
interrogative		V- <i>gi.yod-pas</i>
<i>Endopathic sens.</i>		
declarative	V- <i>gi.'dug</i>	
Interrogative		V- <i>gi.'dug-gas</i>
<i>External sens.</i>		
Declarative		V- <i>gi.'dug</i>
Interrogative	V- <i>gi.'dug-gas</i>	
<i>Factual</i>		
Declarative		V- <i>gi.yod.red</i>
Interrogative	V- <i>gi.yod.red-pas</i>	

For some authors, the concept of ‘egophoric’ is defined by its correlation with the first person “subjects” (Agent, Recipient, Experiencer) in declarative sentences and with second person “subjects” in interrogative sentences:

“Egophoricity refers to the grammaticalised encoding of **personal knowledge or involvement of a conscious self in a represented event or situation**. Most typically, a marker that is egophoric is found **with first person subjects in declarative sentences and with second person subjects in interrogative sentences**. This person sensitivity reflects the fact that speakers generally know most about their own affairs, while in questions this epistemic authority typically shifts to the addressee.” (Floyd et al. 2018)

There are three major problems with the above definition of ‘egophoric’:

- a) egophoric is not the only marker to have this strong correlation between “first person “subject” and declarative sentences”: as shown in the table above, ‘endopathic’ (inner sensation) sensory markers also follow this pattern.
- b) The correlation with second person subjects in interrogative sentences is not restricted to egophoric and also found with endopathic sensory.
- c) The perspective shift related to the anticipation strategy is not specific of these two markers (egophoric and sensory). It occurs with all the evidential markers (egophoric, sensory, endopathic sensory, factual, etc.).

**So it is clear that the notion of egophoric as defined by these authors is not valid (at least for the languages which have first described the egophoric categories: the Tibetic languages).**

Controllability, observability:

We may illustrate the various types of lexical verbs with the following verbs:

- [+contr, +obs] *bshad* ‘to talk, tell’, *bzo* ‘to make’;
- [+contr, -obs] *bsam.blo btang* ‘to reflect upon’,
- [-contr, +obs] *zag* ‘to fall’, *dred.rdab shor* ‘to slip’,
- [-contr, -obs] *khyag* ‘to freeze’, *ltogs* ‘be hungry’.

### 3. *Compatibility of evidentials with first person(s) “subject(s)”*

The evidential markers compatible **with the first person(s)** include the core markers of the paradigm: **egophoric, endopathic sensory, external sensory, factual**, and all these are compatible with **hearsay**; in the examples below with *khyag* ‘to be cold’ [contr, -obs] and *lab* ‘to talk’ [+contr, +obs], the auxiliaries **in green** are quite **frequent** whereas those in **yellow** need a **special context**, but they are all possible, thus exhibiting an amazing flexibility.

/

**Pres.:** *'khyag-gi yod* (EGO) / *gi. 'dug* (SENS. ENDO) / *gi.yod.red* (FACT)

*'khyag-gi yod* (EGO)-*za* (HS) / *gi. 'dug* (SENS. ENDO)-*za* (HS)

/ *gi.yod.red* (fact)- *za* (HS)

'I am cold' (direct or reported)

**Past:** *'khyag- byung*(EGO) / *song* (SENS. ENDO) / *pa.red* (FACT)

*'khyag- byung*(EGO)- *za* (HS) / *song* (SENS. ENDO)- *za* (HS) / *pa.red* (FACT)- *za* (HS)

'I was cold' (direct or reported)

**Pres:** *lab-kyi yod* (EGO) / *kyi. 'dug* (SENS) / *kyi.yod.red* (FACT)

*lab-kyi yod* (EGO)- *za* (HS) / *kyi. 'dug* (SENS)-*za* (HS) / *kyi.yod.red- za* (HS)

'I am telling' (direct or reported)

**Past:** *lab-pa.yin* (EGOINT) / *song* (SENS.) / *pa.red* (FACT)

*lab-pa.yin* (EGOINT)-*za* (HS) / *song* (SENS.)-*za* (HS) / *pa.red* (FACT)-*za* (HS)

'I told'. (direct or reported).

Thus we can see that two evidentials are commonly related to the first person: **egophoric** and **endopathic sensory** (with non-controllable and non-observable verbs). In addition, both egophoric and endopathic are compatible with reported speech and may be followed by **the hearsay –za**.

**However, in special contexts, usually less common, the first person may occur with other evidentials** such as (external) **sensory, sensory inferential** and **factual**.

a) Sensory with dreams (movies, altered states of consciousness, etc.)

(4) *Mdang dgong nga 'i gnyid lam nang la nga dbyin ji 'i skad thog nas skad.cha bshad-kyi. 'dug* (SENS.)

མདང་དགོང་ངའི་གཉིད་ལམ་ནང་ལ་ང་དབྱིན་ཇིའི་སྐད་ཐོག་ནས་སྐད་ཆ་བཤད་ཀྱི་འདུག།

'Yesterday I dreamt that I talked in English'

(5) *Mdang dgong nga 'i gnyid lam nang la nga jomo glang.mai' ri.rtse la 'dzegs-song* (SENS.)

མདང་དགོང་ངའི་གཉིད་ལམ་ནང་ལ་ང་ཚོ་སྐད་མའི་རི་རྩེ་ལ་འཛོགས་སོང་།

'Yesterday I dreamt that I climbed the Everest'

(6) *Mdang dgong nga 'i gnyid lam nang la nga jomo glang.mai' ri.rtse la dzegs-bzhag* (SENS+INF)

'Yesterday I dreamt that I had climbed the Everest'

b) Sensory in reported speech

(7) *Khyed rang-gis za.khang-gi sbyin.bdag-la nga kha.lag yag.po bzo-gi. 'dug-ze lab-rogs byed-dang*

ཁྱེད་རང་གིས་ཟ་ཁང་གླིན་བདག་ལ་ང་ཁ་ལག་ཡག་པོ་བཟོ་གི་འདུག་ཟེར་ལབ་རྟགས་བྱེད་དང་།

'please tell to the restaurant's boss that I cook well'.

**The egophoric here is not grammatical.**

c) Factual in reported speech:

(8) *Khyed rang-gis za.khang-gi sbyin.bdag-la nga kha.lag yag.po bzo-gi.yod.red-ze lab-rogs byed-dang*

ཁྱེད་རང་གིས་ཟ་ཁང་གླིན་བདག་ལ་ང་ཁ་ལག་ཡག་པོ་བཟོ་གི་ཡོད་ཟེར་ལབ་རྟགས་བྱེད་དང་།

'please tell to the restaurant's boss that I cook well'.

d) Factual in declarative sentences are not ruled out:

(9) *Nga chang mangpo 'thung-gi.yod.ma.red – mi tshang.ma-s ha go-gi.red*  
ང་ཚང་མང་པོ་འཐུང་གི་ཡོད་མ་ཟེད་ མི་ཚང་མ་ཉ་གོ་གི་ཟེད།

'I don't drink a lot of chang. People know that here'.

• **Egophoric and factual do not differ in terms of epistemic authority.**

In case of dispute and polemics, both the egophoric and the factual may be used. For example, in case of a conflict between a child and his/her father.

(10) ང་རང་གི་ཙམ་པ་ཡིན།  
nga rang-gi a.pa yin (ego) [based on personal experiential knowledge]

a) I am your father [I consider that I am your father, on the basis of my experiential knowledge]

ང་རང་གི་ཙམ་པ་ཟེད་  
nga rang-gi a.pa red (fact)

b) I am your father [presented as a fact.]

(11) ཁྱེད་རང་ངའི་ཙམ་པ་མེན་  
a) khyed.rang nga'i a.pa min (NEG+ego) [based on experiential knowledge]  
you are not my father [I don't consider you as my father (from now on)]  
ཁྱེད་རང་ངའི་ཙམ་པ་མ་ཟེད་

- b) khyed.rang nga'i a.pa **ma.red** (NEG+ego) [factual knowledge, answer to the step father] you are not my father [it is a fact]

#### 4. *first person(s) “subjects” with egophoric and endopathic.*

But the first person “subject” (Agent/Experiencer/Recipient) is most tightly linked with two functions: the **egophoric and the endopathic sensory**.

#### **Egophoric (personal experiential knowledge)**

Egophoric is used for states of affairs involving the speaker or an entity close to them. It indicates a type of access to information acquired through their own *experiential knowledge, intention or immediate awareness*.

“Egophoric markers encode that the speaker can access through their own experiential knowledge a state of affairs which involves them or an entity close to them” (Mélac et alii, forthcoming). “The egophoric markers may serve to indicate a type of access (as in (1)) such as “self-awareness”, however, more broadly, the function of the egophoric marker is to indicate personal knowledge.” (Tournadre & LaPolla, 2014: 243, see also Tournadre & Suzuki, 2023: 417).

In Common Tibetan (also called Standard Tibetan), there are three major egophoric auxiliaries: yin, yod and byung.(see chart above). But additional markers dgos and yong, and myong also convey egophoric meanings.

From a functional and cognitive point of view, one must distinguish between:

- e) intentional egophoric compatible with controllable verbs (*pa.yin, gi.yin, gi.yod*),
- f) habitual egophoric (*gi.yod*) and receptive egophoric (*byung*) with non-controllable verbs

#### **Endopathic (inner sensations and emotions)**

Endopathic refers to “internal sensations or experiences such as hunger, thirst, inner cold, headache, dream, psychological and emotional states or feelings etc. [that] are not directly observable and may be perceived only by the experiencer”. Tournadre & Suzuki, 2023)

In endopathic contexts, both the egophoric and the sensory are acceptable if the situation is habitual:

- (12) ང་རྒྱག་པར་འབྱུག་གི་ཡོད། *nga rtag.par 'khyag-gi.yod*  
‘I am always cold’ [I know] (personal repeated experience)
- (13) ང་རྒྱག་པར་འབྱུག་གི་འདུག། *nga rtag.par 'khyag-gi.'dug*

‘I am always cold’ [I feel...] repeated inner sensation)

(14) ང་རྟག་པར་ རྩོད་ལོག་སྟོགས་ཀྱི་ཡོད། *nga rtag.par grod.khog ltogs-kyi.yod*

‘I am always hungry’ (personal repeated experience)

(15) ང་རྟག་པར་ རྩོད་ལོག་སྟོགས་ཀྱི་འདུག། *nga rtag.par grod.khog ltogs-kyi. 'dug*

‘I am always hungry’ (repeated inner sensation)

however :

(16) ང་ད་ལྟ་འབྲུག་ཀྱི་འདུག། *nga da.lta 'khyag-gi. 'dug* (sensory)

‘I am cold, right now’.

(17) ང་ད་ལྟ་ རྩོད་ལོག་སྟོགས་ཀྱི་འདུག། *nga da.lta grod.khog ltogs-kyi. 'dug* (sensory) ‘I am

hungry, right now’

(18) ?\* ང་ད་ལྟ་འབྲུག་ཀྱི་ཡོད། *nga da.lta 'khyag-gi.yod* (habitual egophoric)

(19) ‘I am cold, right now’.

?\* ང་ད་ལྟ་ རྩོད་ལོག་སྟོགས་ཀྱི་ཡོད། *nga da.lta grod.khog ltogs-kyi.yod* (hab. egophoric) ‘I am

hungry, right now’

### 5. first person(s) with egophoric and endopathic in tag questions

(20) A: རྩེད་རང་གི་ལ་པར་འདི་ངའ་ཉོག་ཙམ་ཞིག་གཡམ་ན་འགྲིག་གི་རེད་པས།

*khyed.rang gi kha.par 'di nga-la tog.tsam g.yar-na 'grig-gi.red-pas*

could you lend me your phone for a minute?

(21) B1: ང་ད་ལྟ་སྐད་ཆ་བཤད་ཀྱི་ཡོད་པ། ཉོག་ཙམ་སྐྱུག་དང་། ཟེལ་བ་མ་བྱེད་དང་། །

*nga da.lta skad.cha bshad-kyi.yod.pa*

talk-UNCMP+EGO-TAG

I am talking (on the phone), right? (as you might know, *no perspective shift*). So Please wait a little!

(22) B2: ང་ད་ལྟ་སྐད་ཆ་བཤད་ཀྱི་འདུག་ག། རྩེད་རང་གིས་མཐོང་སོང་ད།

*nga da.lta skad.cha bshad-kyi. 'dug.ga khyed.rang-gis mthong-song-nga*

talk-UNCMP+SENS-TAG



I am talking (on the phone), right? (as you see, don't you?). Please wait a little! [the addressee is called as a witness, *perspective shift*]

(23) ར་ད་ལྟ་འབྲུག་གི་འདུག་གའ་ ར་ཅིག་སྲུང་དང་།

*nga da.lta 'khyag-kyi.'dug.ga ja cig sprad –dang*

(be) cold-UNCMP+ENDOSENS-TAG

'I am cold, right? (/ aren't I ? *no perspective shift*) Please give me some tea'.

tags are used for seeking confirmation or agreement but also imply a **justification of the subsequent sentence**.

(24) ར་ཆང་མང་པོ་འཇུང་གི་ཡོད་མ་ཟེད་ལུ་

*Nga chang mangpo 'thung-gi.yod.ma.red-pA*

drink-UNCMP+FACT-TAG

'I don't drink a lot of chang, right? (everybody knows).The addressee is invited to confirm the statement, *perspective shift*].

As we can see, some **evidentials (sensory and factual)** trigger a **perspective shift related the anticipation strategy**, whereas as **other evidentials (egophoric and endopathic sensory)** do not imply any perspective shift.

## 6. Evidential categories used with the first person(s) “subjects” in other Tibetic languages.

As we will see, the flexibility in the use of evidentials with the first person is not restricted to Common Tibetan and is attested in most other Tibetic languages. We will illustrate it here the case of inner sensations and emotions (endopathic) with three languages: Purik (in Ladakh), Denjongke (Sikkim) and Dolpo (Nepal).

### 6.1 Purik

*The evidential contrast between the two existential copulas, testimonial duk (WT 'dug) and factual jot (WT yod), permeates the grammar of Purik (Zemp, 2008: 531).*

Here we must note that Zemp's **factual** corresponds to both the *egophoric* and *factual* in Common Tibetan (Purik lacks egophoric markers). The term 'testimonial' is used instead our 'sensory' but has a similar meaning.

“ [...] In describing sensations, V-*en-duk* contrasts with V-*et*, [...] while the factual V-*et* is the **default form to describe a sensation** that may only be **directly perceived by the informant** [...]” (*ibid*, p 599).

However, **the testimonial [or sensory] is well attested** as shown by the same author:

(25) དེའི་འདྲི་མཚུགས་ལོ་ཅང་ཚོར་བ་མེད་

ŋ-ji di zuu k<sup>h</sup>o tʃaŋ ts<sup>h</sup>or-**ba-met**

I-GEN this finger s/he at.all feel-**INF-NEG** [FACT]

‘This finger of mine, I can’t feel it at all.[lit. I **don’t feel** [it]’ (Zemp, 2008: 437, ex. 200)

(26) ལག་པ་ལྷུག་པ་ན་ཅང་ཚོར་བ་མི་འདུག་

laqpa t<sup>h</sup>uk-pa-na tʃaŋ ts<sup>h</sup>or-ba-**mi-nduk**

hand meet-inf-cnd at.all feel-**INF-NEG-EX.T** [SENS]

‘when (I) touch it with (my) hand, I **don’t feel** anything.’ (Zemp, 2008: 437, ex. 200)

‘In both the **factual** ts<sup>h</sup>or-ba-met and the **testimonial** ts<sup>h</sup>or-ba-mi-nduk, [translate in the same way in English]’ (Zemp: 437).

Here are other examples:

(27) ལྔ་ཀ་ཉི་ཚོ་སྐྱེས་པ་མེད་དྲ་

tʃ<sup>h</sup>u-kato skoms-**pa-met-a**

water-[some] be.thirsty-**INF-NEG:EX-Q** [FACT]

‘Aren’t you thirsty?’ (ibid, p. 635, ex. 1098)

(28) རི་ཆ་ན་ལྔ་ཀ་ཉི་ཚོ་སྐྱེས་པ་མི་འདུག་ག་

ri-a tʃ<sup>h</sup>a-a-na,

tʃ<sup>h</sup>u skoms-**pa-mi-ndug-a**

you mountain-DAT GO-**INF-CND**, water be.thirsty-**INF-NEG-EX.T-Q** [SENS]

‘Aren’t you thirsty from walking up into the mountains?’ ((ibid, p. 635, ex. 1099)

(29) དེའི་འདྲི་རྒྱུ་མའི་སོ་མངས་པའི་ཀ་ཐོགས་མེད་

ŋj-i di kaŋm-i somaŋs-pw-i-ka t<sup>h</sup>oɣs-**et**

/I-gen this foot-gen instep-def-g-loc be.hurt-**CRT** [FACT]

‘The instep of my foot hurts (from scraping).’ (ibid: 601 ex. 937)

(30) དེའི་རྒྱུ་མ་ཕོག་མཁན་པོ་ལ་ཐོགས་མེད་འདུག་

ŋj-i kaŋma p<sup>h</sup>oq-k<sup>h</sup>an-po-la t<sup>h</sup>oɣs-**en-duk**

I-gen leg hit-nlzl-def-dat be.hurt-**SIM-EX.T** [SENS]

‘My leg hurts where it was hit before.’ (ibid: 601, ex. 938)

So what is the cognitive semantic distinction between the two forms?

According to Zemp’s analysis, in the context of inner sensations (endopathic), the factual /-et/ indicates that “the attestation is beyond doubt” (ibid, p 635), and that “only the informant has direct access to them [the sensations]”. We agree with both propositions but they are also true for the testimonial [or sensory] /- nduk/.

The author proposes that “by using V-*en-duk* [endopathic sensory], the informant assumes a more objective perspective by **focusing on the stimulus.**’ (ibid, p 599) [...]. In another comment, he adds:

“In contrast, *mi-nduk* [negative endopathic sensory] indicates that the assertion is only **based on a momentary** (direct) **testimony**” (*ibid* p 635) [or indicates] “a ‘feeling’ or a ‘sensation’ (such as ‘thirst’) at the moment the speaker checks on it”.

In other words, we can say that the sensory marker focuses on the perception **at the moment of utterance**. Thus the use of the endopathic sensory in Purik seems superficially similar to its use in Common Tibetan. However, it is not the case since **the factual –et** (derived from CT *yod*) is **the default option in endopathic contexts**, whereas in Common Tibetan the **default option** is the **sensory ‘dug**.

Thus in Purik, the factual indicate **the perception or awareness** of an inner sensation or emotion, whereas the sensory (or testimonial) focuses on the **immediate sensation at the moment of utterance**.

## 6.2 Denjonke (or Lhoke), Sikkim.

“Personal forms [egophoric] and evidentially non-committed (neutral) [factual] forms ending in *be?* [...] **are typically used for expressing inner sensations**. **Sensorial [sensory] forms are possible** when the speaker for some reason takes **an outsider’s perspective on their own sensations**, for instance to underline suddenness or surprise”. (Yliniemi 2022)

(31) ང་མགོ་ན་དོ་(ཞིན།)

*ŋà*                      *go*                      *nà<sup>1</sup>-do?*  
1sg    head    be.ill-ipfv            equ.personal [egophoric]

‘I have a headache’

(32) ང་(ལོ་)མགོ་ན་བཞིན་ཡོད།

*ŋà(=lo)*                *go*                      *nà-zê:jø?*  
1sg(=dat)    head    be.ill-ipfv            equ.per

‘I have a headache’ [I am having a headache]

(33) ང་མགོ་ན་དོ་སྣང།

*ŋà*                      *go*                      *nà<sup>2</sup>-dobe?*  
1sg    head    be.ill-ipfv            equ.neutral (factual).

‘I have a headache’ [the precise context is not provided by the author].

<sup>1</sup> *gosùk kjap*

<sup>2</sup> *gosùk kjap*

**Sensory markers are also possible:**

(34) ང་མགོ་ཟུག་རྒྱབས་ཅེན་[བཞིན་]འདུག

*jà? ηà go sùk kjap-**zen** du?*

‘Oh, I have headache.’

Unlike what has been claimed above, it can not be ‘**an outsider’s perspective**’ on their own **sensations** (since endopathic sensations can not be perceived from outside).

(35) ང་ལེབ་གྲུངས་བཞིན་འདུག

*ηà lɛp k’jǎ:-**zen** du?*

‘I’m very cold./I’m freezing.’

In any case, the egophoric seems to be the default marking, but the sensory insists on the inner sensation (and may be used in sudden realization but not only). According to Yliniemi, the neutral (factual) is also possible.

### 6.3 Dolpo (Nepal)

The same flexibility is found in Dolpo in the south western Himalayas. The data are from a fieldwork with Zuzana Vokurkova in October 2022 and are listed in a forthcoming article. Vokurková and Tournadre, forthcoming).

(36) ང་མགོ་ནའིན་གྲག་

Nga	Go	nä-n- <b>qak</b>
I	Head	hurt-PRS-NVIS

‘Oh, I have a headache.’

This is used for the first occurrence of the pain. However, the sensory marker /duk/ or its allomorph /gyik/ is usually preferred afterwards:

(37) ང་མགོ་ནའིན་འདྲུག་

Nga	Go	nä-n- <b>duk</b>
I	head	hurt-PRS-DS

‘I have a headache.’

In addition, it is also possible to use the egophoric to indicate experiential knowledge in the case of chronic diseases.

(38) ང་མགོ་ནའིན་འོད་

nga go nä-n-o’

I head hurt-PRES-EGO

‘I (often, usually) have a headache’

Here are other examples of the various markers in endopathic contexts:

(39) ང་ལྷུང་གྱི་གསལ་ / གྱིག་ / གྱི་འོད་  
 Nga k'yar-**gyidak/ gyik /gyo?**  
 I feel cold-PRS+NVIS / SENS/ EGO  
 'I am afraid.'

(40) ང་འབྲུགས་གྱི་གསལ་ / གྱིག་ / གྱི་འོད་  
 Nga k'yak-**gyidak/ gyik / gyio?**  
 I feel cold-PRS+NVIS / SENS/ EGO  
 'I am cold.'

#### 6.4 comparison of the evidential markers in endopathic contexts.

We will see that some Tibetic languages have grammaticalized ‘sensation’ *versus* ‘perception-awareness’ versus ‘experiential knowledge’.

**Table: Evidentials in present endopathic contexts**

Cognitive interpretation	Purik	Lad.	Dolpo	Com. Tib	Denjongke
Immediate inner sensation	'dug <b>Sensory</b>	rak (grag) <b>non-vis. sensory</b>	ʃak (grag) <b>non-vis. sensory</b>	'dug <b>sensory</b>	'dug <b>sensory</b>
Perception / awareness of the inner sensation	et (yod) <b>factual</b>	rak (grag) <b>non-vis. sensory</b>	'dug <b>sensory</b>	'dug <b>sensory</b>	yod / in (yin) <b>egophoric</b>
Personal experiential knowledge of the inner sensation	et (yod) <b>factual</b>	et (yod) <b>habitual egophoric</b>	oʔ (yod) <b>habitual egophoric</b>	yod <b>habitual egophoric</b>	yod / in (yin) <b>egophoric</b>

### 7. Conclusions

- **INNER SENSATION and EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE**

Two evidentials are commonly related to the first person “subject(s)”: **egophoric** and **endopathic sensory**. In addition, both egophoric and endopathic are compatible with reported speech and may be followed by the **hearsay** –za. In the Tibetic languages, the egophoric category is fundamentally evidential in nature and indicates various types of **personal experiential access**. Thus there is no such thing as an independent category ‘egophoricity’ distinct from ‘evidentiality’.

- **FLEXIBILITY**  
The evidential-epistemic system is in essence very flexible and in special contexts, usually less common, the first person “subject” may occur not only with egophoric and endopathic but also with other evidentials such as (external) sensory, sensory inferential and factual.
- **TAGS and PERSPECTIVE SHIFT**  
The perspective shift (or its absence) in tag questions involving first persons “subjects” depends on the evidentials: external sensory and factual allow a perspective shift whereas endopathic sensory and egophoric don’t.
- **DEFAULT EVIDENTIALS FOR ENDOPATHIC PERCEPTION**  
The default category for ‘endopathic perception’ vary in the various Tibetic languages: They include **non-visual** (in Ladakhi and Spiti), **sensory** (in Common Tibetan and Dolpo), **egophoric** (in Denjongke) and **factual** (in Purik).
- **ACCESS TO INFORMATION.** Even more than the notion of (verbal) source, **the notion of access to information is central for the Tibetic evidential-epistemic systems.** However, many implicatures and secondary meanings linked to the use of evidentials have yet to be discovered.

\*\*\*\*\*

## References:

- Floyd, Simeon, Lila San Roque, and Elisabeth Norcliffe. "Egophoricity." (2018): 1-513.
- Hill, N.W. 2020. Simeon Floyd, Elisabeth Norcliffe, and Lila San Roque: Egophoricity. (review).
- Hill, N.W. and Gawne, L., 2017. The contribution of Tibetan languages to the study of evidentiality. *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*, 302, pp.1-38.
- Oisel, G., 2017. Re-evaluation of the evidential system of Lhasa Tibetan and its atypical functions. *Himalayan linguistics*, 16(2).
- Tournadre, N., 2023. Evidential strategies and hierarchies in Ladakhi: the case of sensory perceptions. In *Evidentiality and epistemic modality: conceptual and descriptive issues* (pp. 113-136). Peter Lang Suiza.
- Tournadre & Suzuki 2023 *The Tibetic Languages: an introduction to the family of languages derived from Old Tibetan*. Lacito (CNRS) online open access.
- Tournadre & Dorje (1998, 2003, 2009, 2024) Manuel de tibétain standard. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. with Tsering Wangdue. Asiathèque.
- Tournadre, Nicolas, and Randy J. LaPolla. "Towards a new approach to evidentiality: Issues and directions for research." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman area* 37.2 (2014): 240-263.
- Vokurkova & Tournadre, forthcoming Preliminary study of the evidential system of Dolpo, a Tibetic language of Nepal
- Yliniemi Juha, Expressing inner sensations: a comparison of Denjongke, Common Tibetan and some other Tibetic languages, 25 February 2022. Workshop Typology of evidential systems. Paris, Inalco. Organized by E. Mélac, N. Tournadre and F. Robin.
- Zeisler, B., 2017. Don’t believe in a paradigm that you haven’t manipulated yourself! Evidentiality, speaker attitude, and admirativity in Ladakhi. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 15(2), pp.515-539.