



HAL
open science

Evidential modalities in Salar. The development of a Tibetan-like egophoric category

Camille Simon

► **To cite this version:**

Camille Simon. Evidential modalities in Salar. The development of a Tibetan-like egophoric category. Turkic languages, 2018. hal-03427689

HAL Id: hal-03427689

<https://hal.science/hal-03427689v1>

Submitted on 14 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Evidential modalities in Salar. The development of a Tibetan-like egophoric category

Camille Simon

Simon, Camille 2018. Evidential modalities in Salar. The development of a Tibetan-like egophoric category. *Turkic Languages* 22: 3–35.

Spoken in the extreme northeastern part of the Tibetan plateau, Salar shares a long history of contact with the neighbouring Tibetic, Sinitic and Mongolic varieties (see e.g. Dwyer 1995, Janhunen 2007). Together with western Sarīgh Yugur/Yellow Uighur, it is the only Turkic language where subject indexation on the verb phrase is impossible (Johanson & Csató 1998: 52–53). Parallel to this loss, new, semantic-pragmatic oriented categories of evidentiality have developed, under the influence of Tibetan evidential categories. Comparison with the Tibetic language varieties spoken in the Salar speaking area shows that the Tibetan category of egophoricity is necessary for the description of a subset of evidential markers in Salar. This paper aims to highlight the coexistence of a direct vs. indirect opposition with an egophoric-heterophoric opposition in Salar, together with the extension of evidentiality to non-perfective aspects in this language.

Keywords: Salar, Tibetan, language contact, evidentiality, egophoricity.

Camille Simon 1 rue Marguerite Chapon, 94800 Villejuif, France. E-mail: camille.simon2@gmail.com

1. Introduction: Descriptions of evidential categories in Salar and Amdo-Tibetan

1.1. Evidentiality in the Amdo linguistic area

The broader Amdo region, located in the northeastern part of Tibet, forms a linguistic area or *Sprachbund*, with ca. 15 languages belonging to four linguistic groups: Sinitic, Tibetic, Mongolic and Turkic (Janhunen 2007).¹ Among them, the Salar language is one of the two representatives of the Turkic family, the other being western Sarīgh Yugur. This linguistic area can be characterised by the following set of features, proposed by Dwyer (2013):

1 I am grateful to the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions for improvement. All remaining mistakes are my own.

Table 1. Shared features in the Amdo-Sprachbund (Dwyer 2013: 265)²

	Feature	Possible source
1.	OV constituent order, including head-final typology (postpositions, suffixing/cliticising)	Bodic/Turko-Mongol
2.	Case marking (even in Chinese)	Bodic/Turko-Mongol
3.	Comitative case (usually formed with the Mongolic clitic = <i>la</i>)	Mongolic
4.	Consonant spirantisation and vowel devoicing	Areal, origin unknown
5.	Verb serialisation—clause chaining	Turko-Mongol
6.	Grammaticalisation of directional auxiliaries (originally motion verbs) into aspect/actional markers	Turkic?
7.	Lexical quotative markers	Turko-Mongol
8.	Perspective/evidential (particles; verb suffixes; binary perspective distinction)	Bodic
9.	Shared utterance-final pragmatic particles	Sinitic/Bodic/unknown
10.	Person marked by PNs rather than verbal agreement	Impact of Bodic/Sinitic on Turko-Mongolic

Far from being restricted to the Salar-Tibetan contact situation in Amdo, the grammaticalisation of a Tibetic-type of evidential categories (feature n^o9) is, thus, a common phenomenon, (see also Sandman & Simon 2016 for Wutun (Sinitic) and Fried 2010 for Baoan (Mongolic)).

With respect to the Salar language, several attempts have been made to describe the verbal-ending suffixes system, from a conjugation-oriented description (Tenišev

2 Certain features mentioned by Dwyer deserve a few comments:

Feature 3, comitative case, is found in the Turkic and Tibetic languages outside Amdo, but their morpho-phonological form and etymological origin differs. For instance, in Lhasa Tibetan and Ladakhi, the form is ཅན *dang* (from the conjunction ‘and’, Zeisler 2007, Tournadre 2010), whereas in Amdo, it is generally *-ra* (origin unknown). Interestingly, in the varieties studied here, an allomorph *-la* is also attested. A comitative postposition is also attested in several Turkic languages, mostly grammaticalised from *bi(r)le* or *ile* (Clauson 1972: 364–365, Johanson & Csató 1998).

Feature 5, verb serialisation, is also attested in the Tibetic and Sinitic languages outside the contact area (see e.g. DeLancey 1991).

Feature 6 is also attested in other Tibetic languages, such as Lhasa and Standard (exile) and is typologically common (see e.g. DeLancey 1991, Heine & Kuteva 2002)

1976: 138–157), to an—obviously more accurate—description in terms of evidentiality (Dwyer 2000). However, even the latter description fails to precisely describe the core functions and morphosyntactic characteristics of the evidential markers in Salar language. Ma (2013) has provided the most accurate and precise descriptions of the evidential categories to date, however, he does not clearly highlight the asymmetry of the evidential system in perfective vs. non-perfective aspects. In this respect, the Salar language differs from other Turkic languages. In the Turkic languages, the grammaticalisation of evidentiality is in fact mostly limited to the copula and the perfective/post-terminal verb endings: “The coding of indirectivity in Turkic is scattered, i.e. morphologically realised by two types of markers. One type consists of postterminals that tend to vacillate between evidential and non-evidential readings. The other type consists of copular particles that are stable markers of evidentiality” (Johanson 2016: 512). By contrast, in Salar, the system is systematically extended to non-perfective verb endings. However, in the following, I will show that in non-perfective, the semantic-pragmatic function of the evidential categories are not exactly similar to those attested in perfective.

In Section 1, I will present and discuss the previous descriptions of the evidential system of Salar language. Then, evidence for the morphosyntactic and functional similarities of the evidential markers in Amdo-Tibetan and in Salar will be provided.

The data presented in this paper are extracted from a parallel Tibetan/Salar corpus of accounts and narrations collected between 2012 and 2017, mainly in the Xunhua Salar autonomous district and Hualong Hui Autonomous district of Qinghai Province, and marginally in other areas of the broader Amdo region. For the Salar data, this corpus is enriched by the transcription of the dialogue in a Chinese movie which has been dubbed in Salar. Each example is presented with basic metadata: gender and age of the speaker, followed by the place of recording. Toponyms are indicated in the local form, and the official name in pinyin transliteration is added in brackets, if different.

1.2. Previous descriptions of evidentiality in Salar

The recent descriptions of the system of copulas and verb inflexion in Salar (Liu & Lin 1980, Dwyer 2000, Mehmet 2012, Ma 2013 & 2014, Vaillant 2016) are all based on a distinction between “direct/definite” and “indirect/indefinite” evidential suffixes, which is the common terminology for Turkic languages. The only notable exception is Ma (2013), who distinguishes between self- vs. other-centred access to information. However, this shift in terminology has no particular effect in the classification proposed by this author: there is a straightforward correspondence between “self-centred” and “direct/definite” labels on the one hand, and “other-centered” and “indirect/indefinite” labels on the other. The following table synthesises the distribution of “direct” and “indirect” suffixes according to the different authors.

Table 2. Copula and TAM suffixes according to Liu & Lin (1980), Dwyer (2000), Mehmet (2012) and Ma (2014)

		Direct/Definite	Indirect/Indefinite
Equative copula	Affirmative	<i>e-dər</i>	<i>edir-a / er-a</i>
	Negative	<i>emes-tər</i>	<i>emes-a</i>
Existential copula	Affirmative	<i>var</i>	<i>var-a</i>
	Negative	<i>jox-tər</i>	<i>joxw-a</i>
Imperfective	Affirmative	$-bA(r)^3$	$-ba(r)$
	Negative	<i>-bər⁴</i>	<i>-joxw-a</i>
Perfective	Affirmative	<i>-dʒi</i>	<i>-mæɛ</i>
	Negative	<i>-ma-dʒi</i>	<i>-ma-mæɛ</i>
Experiential perfective	Affirmative	<i>-GAn var</i>	<i>-GAn var-a</i>
	Negative	<i>-GAn jox-tər</i>	<i>-GAn joxw-a</i>
Future	Affirmative	$-Gu(r) / -Ga(r)^5$	$-GA(r)$
	Negative	$-maGu(r) / -maGa(r) / -Gu(r) jox(wa) / -Ga(r) jox(wa)^7$	

First, the main discrepancy between the four analyses dealt with here, concerns the affirmative form in imperfective and future. Dwyer (2000) and Mehmet (2012) only mention one suffix, neutral in terms of “(in)directness”, while Liu & Lin (1980) and Ma (2014) mention two distinct forms. The phonological form mentioned by Dwyer (2000) and Mehmet (2014), with an underspecified vowel and the optional final *r* could correspond either to the direct or the indirect suffix identified by Liu & Lin (1980) and Ma (2013, 2014). In my own data—presented below—two forms are clearly distinguished by their functionally complementary distribution. At this point in my research, I cannot say whether this discrepancy is due to a mistake in the analysis of the data or a dialectal difference between the varieties studied.

3 According to Dwyer (2000: 47) and Mehmet (2014: 137–138).

4 According to Liu & Lin (1980: 27–28) and Ma (2013, 2014).

5 According to Dwyer (2000: footnote n°3), and Mehmet (2012: 141–142)

6 According to Liu & Lin (1980: 27) and Ma (2014).

7 According to Mehmet (2012: 143). Other researchers do not indicate any form for the future negative.

The second point concerns the definition of “direct” and “indirect” categories. In fact, these categories, as defined by Dwyer, mix notions of evidentiality, epistemicity, and discourse modality, as well as other pragmatic and sociolinguistic elements:

“The source of information may be direct (‘I see/hear/taste/smell/feel/do’) or indirect (‘I hear it reported / I infer / I discover; it happened), may be more or less certain, or may rank subjectively higher or lower in reliability. How this evaluation is grammatically articulated is in turn affected by discourse pragmatic factors (degree of politeness, register/genre, foregrounding, and intentionality). If the hearer challenges evidence presented, or if the speaker anticipates such a response, speakers may choose indirect/less certain means of coding this information even though the evidence is direct/more certain.” (Dwyer 2000: 45)

It is indeed true that the two sets of verbal suffixes can be used in utterances that entangle several of the dimensions mentioned by Dwyer, and that these dimensions interact in a complex way. In particular, Dwyer supposes a strong correlation between evidential categories and the degree of certainty of the speaker regarding the truth of her utterance: “In historical narratives, *where the events related are [+realis] for the speaker*, *-dʒi* and *-GAn* mark assertions within the speaker’s direct experience, while *-miš* marks those events experienced indirectly by the speaker ...” (Dwyer 2000: 47, emphasis added) However, as clearly demonstrated by Ma (2013: 136), this relationship between certainty and the “direct” marker on the one hand, and uncertainty and the “indirect” marker is not valid.

More inconveniently, we observe that the two categories “direct” and “indirect” also have a different (and sometimes contradictory) extension depending on the tense-aspect. For instance, according to Dwyer’s description, “indirective” should be understood as “irrealis / doubtful / inferred” information in perfective, while it merely corresponds to the backgrounding of the speaker’s subjectivity in imperfective. Thus, the labels “direct/indirect” fail to precisely identify the basic meaning of each set of suffixes. The terminology used by Ma (2013), self- vs. other-centred access to information, is certainly more accurate for describing the function of the markers in non-perfective, as opposed to perfective tense-aspect. In the following, I will argue that the grammar of Salar follows a different system in perfective and in non-perfective tense-aspects. Thus, using a distinct terminology in both tense-aspects has the advantage of highlighting this difference. Moreover, I will show that the egophoric category, as described for the Tibetic languages, offers a fruitful theoretical frame for a more precise and exact description of the Salar data in the imperfective and future.

1.3. Main characteristics of evidentiality in Amdo-Tibetan

The way evidential moods are grammaticalised in the Tibetic languages largely differs from the evidential categories of the Turkic languages. Such grammatical categories have been extensively described, e.g. by Sun (1993) and Tournadre (1996,

2008), Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), Gawne & Hill (2017). This section will introduce the main characteristics of evidential marking in the Tibetic languages, insofar as they will prove useful in describing the Salar data.

First, grammaticalisation of evidentiality is not limited to the perfective aspects. Evidentiality is also more complex, with several subcategories.

1.3.1. Multiplicity of evidential categories in Amdo-Tibetan

According to Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), a binary distinction between “direct” and “indirect” evidentials is not sufficient to understand the distribution of evidential markers in the Tibetic languages:

“The speaker’s access may be “direct” through sensory perceptions (and self-awareness) ... or “indirect” through various types of inferences (inferences based on sensory perceptions or hearsay). The speaker may also base her statement on her encyclopaedic knowledge or specific “stored experience” directly available to her.” (Tournadre & LaPolla 2014: 247)

Thus, “direct” access to knowledge can be subdivided into sensory perception and self-awareness or personal knowledge, which corresponds to different sets of markers in Amdo-Tibetan, “egophoric” (1a) and “sensory” markers (1b) respectively:

- (1) a. M44. Sogdzong (Henan)
 [རས་] ཐུབ་ རིམ་ ལས་ཕྱིར་ལ།
 [Di] ^f*cawa* *təmo* *li^mnoŋ-a*.
 [1ERG] work like.that do-EXP-EGO
 ‘[I] have done that kind of work.’
- b. F66. Hualong, Chumar
 ཇི་ [...] རིམ་ ཕྱིར་ ལལ་རེས་ ཕྱིན་བཏང་ཐལ།
Ta se ^f*e^hər* ⁿ*k^hor-ri* ^f*ɕən-taŋ-t^ha*.
 now DEM.ERG direction turn-CONV give.PV-PV-PV.SENS
 ‘Now, this one turned and gave [pears to the boy].’

Similarly, “indirect” may correspond to a sensory (here: visual) inference (2a), a logical inference (2b), or factual or general knowledge (2c), which corresponds to a different marker in Amdo-Tibetan:

- (2) a. M41. Xunhua
 ལྗང་ལོ་ ཉ་ནི་ར་ ལྷས་ལོ་ ཉན་སྤོང་བུག།
Zoŋlo hane-ra ⁿ*kampo* *nen-s^hoŋ-sək*.
 leave all-COM dry become-PV-PERF.SENS.INFER
 ‘All the leaves have become dry too.’

b. M41. Xunhua
 ཡང་ཡུལ་ ད་རུང་ ཚོས་ཡོད་ནི་མ་རེད།
Janjy taroŋ ts^hi-jonəmare.
 potatoes yet mature-NEG.PERF.LOGIC.INFER
 ‘[Now, it is only August], the potatoes have not matured yet.’

c. M82. Hualong, Gandu
 ཧ་ནེས་ གཞུང་ ཟ་ལར་ ལྷངས་འདྲེད་ནི་རེད།
Hane ^vzəŋ salər ^vlaŋ-taŋ-nəre.
 all.ERG completely Salar take.PV-PV-FACT
 ‘They all took Salar [wives].’

Finally, as shown in Tournadre (2008) and Tournadre & LaPolla (2014: 247–248), the hearsay and quotative markers can be freely combined with any of the evidential markers.

“Until now, information access and source have often not been clearly distinguished. It seems very important in Tibetic languages since all the evidentials may be followed by a quotation marker. For example, in the past one can oppose in Standard Tibetan V+*song* “sensory”; V+*bzhag* “(sensory) inferential”; V+*pa.red* “factual” which all refer to the *information access* of the speaker S0, and : V+*song-za* “sensory”-“quotative”; V+*bzhag-za* “inferential”-“quotative”; V+*pa.red-za* “factual”-“quotative”, which refer to *information access* of a distinct source: the quoted speaker (S1).” (Tournadre 2008: 298)

This phenomenon, documented by Tournadre for Standard Tibetan, is also observed in Salar (Ma 2013: 138) and in Amdo-Tibetan. Thus, such markers do not belong to the same paradigm as the previously mentioned evidential markers, and cannot simply be considered as a particular occurrence of indirective in these languages⁸.

The following table synthesises the main evidential forms attested in Amdo-Tibetan for each tense-aspect.

Thus, evidentiality in Amdo-Tibetan cannot be reduced to a simple opposition between two terms. Even though Salar is similar to other Turkic languages insofar as it only distinguishes two evidential markers for each tense-aspect, in the second part of this paper we will show that the category of egophoric evidentiality is crucial for the description.

8 Outside the Tibetic languages, Hengeveld & Dall’Agli Hattner (2015) also consider that reportativity belongs to a specific level, distinct from the sensory vs. factual level.

Table 3. Copula and TAM suffixes according in Amdo-Tibetan

		Egophoric	Sensory	Factual	Other ⁹
Equative copula	Aff.	ཡིན། <i>jən</i>	ཡིན་ཟུག། <i>jənsək</i>	རེད། <i>re</i>	ཡིན་ནི་རེད། <i>jinəre</i>
	Neg.	མིན། <i>mən</i>	[unattested in my corpus]	མ་རེད། <i>marə</i>	ཡིན་ནི་མ་རེད། <i>jinəmarə</i>
	Interr.	ཞེ་ཡིན། <i>ejən</i>	[unattested in my corpus]	ཞེ་རེད། <i>ere</i>	ཡིན་ནི་ཞེ་རེད། <i>jenəere</i>
Existential copula	Aff.	ཡོད། <i>jo</i>	ཡོད་གི། <i>jokə</i>	ཡོད་ནི་རེད། <i>jonəre</i>	
	Neg.	མེད། <i>me</i>	མེད་གི། <i>mekə</i>	ཡོད་ནི་མ་རེད། <i>jonəmarə</i>	
	Interr.	ཞེ་ཡོད། <i>ejo</i>	ཞེ་ཡོད་གི། <i>ejokə</i>	ཡོད་ནི་ཞེ་རེད། <i>jonere</i>	
Imperfective	Aff.	V+ གི་ཡོད། V+ <i>ko</i>	V+ གི་ཡོད་གི། V+ <i>kogə</i>	V+ གི་ཡོད་ནི་རེད། V+ <i>konəre</i>	
	Neg.	V+ གི་མེད། V+ <i>kəme</i>	V+ གི་མེད་གི། V+ <i>kəmekə</i>	V+ གི་ཡོད་ནི་མ་རེད། V+ <i>konəmarə</i>	
	Interr.	V+ གི་ཞེ་ཡོད། V+ <i>kəejo</i>	V+ གི་ཞེ་ཡོད་གི། V+ <i>kəejogə</i>	V+ གི་ཡོད་ནི་ཞེ་རེད། V+ <i>konəere</i>	
Future	Aff.	V+ ལྟོ་ཡིན། V+ <i>ʹdʒəjən</i>	/	V+ ལྟོ་རེད། V+ <i>ʹdʒəre</i>	
	Neg.	མི་ + V <i>mə + V</i>	/	V+ ལྟོ་མ་རེད། V+ <i>ʹdʒəmarə</i>	
	Interr.	V+ ལྟོ་ཞེ་ཡིན། V+ <i>ʹdʒəejən</i>	/	V+ ལྟོ་ཞེ་རེད། V+ <i>ʹdʒəere</i>	

9 Corresponding respectively to an “explicative” form for the equative copula (i.e. a form used when the speaker expects that the addressee has no knowledge about the given information) and sensory resultative for the perfect form. In addition to the form presented in Table 3, the Tibetic languages also possess a rich inventory of forms that convey evidential and epistemic functions (Tournadre 2017, Tribur 2017).

	Egophoric	Sensory	Factual	Other	
Past perfective	V+ AUX1 ¹⁰ -ཡིན།	V+ AUX1-ཐལ།	V+ AUX1-ནི་རེད།		
	Aff.	V+ AUX1-འ། V+ AUX1- <i>nəjən</i> V+ AUX1- <i>a</i>	V+ AUX1- <i>l^ha</i>	V+ AUX1- <i>nəre</i>	
	Neg.	མ' + V <i>ma</i> + V	མ' + V + ཐལ། <i>ma</i> + V + <i>l^ha</i>	V+ ནི་མ'་རེད། V+ <i>nəmarə</i>	
	Interr.	V+ ནི་ཞེ་ཡིན། ཞེ' + V V+ <i>nəjən</i> <i>e</i> + V	ཞེ' + V + ཐལ། <i>e</i> + V + <i>l^ha</i>	V+ ནི་ཞེ་རེད། V+ <i>nəre</i>	
	Perfect	Aff.	V+ AUX2-ཡོད། V+ AUX2- <i>jo</i>	V+ AUX2-ཡོད་ནི། V+ AUX2- <i>jogə</i>	V+ AUX2-ཡོད་ནི་རེད། V+ AUX2- <i>jonəre</i>
Neg.		V+ མེད། V+ <i>me</i>	V+ མེད་ནི། V+ <i>megə</i>	V+ ཡོད་ནི་མ'་རེད། V+ <i>jonamarə</i>	
Interr.		V+ ཞེ་ཡོད། V+ <i>ejo</i>	V+ AUX2-ཞེ་ཡོད་ནི། V+ AUX2- <i>ejogə</i>	V+ AUX2-ཡོད་ནི་ཞེ་རེད། V+ AUX2- <i>jonəre</i>	V+ AUX1-ཟུག། V+ AUX1- <i>sək</i> ¹¹ མ' + V + ཟུག། <i>ma</i> + V + <i>sək</i>

1.3.2. Neutralisation in non-finite clauses

Apart from the complexity—due to its greater number of subcategories—of the evidential system in Amdo Tibetan, as compared with Turkic, two other specific features deserve to be mentioned, since they play an important role in the description of evidentiality in Salar.

The first concerns the morphosyntactic distribution of the evidential markers. In Amdo-Tibetan, evidential distinctions are in fact neutralised in a number of contexts, for instance in subordinate clauses, and the neutral form is formally similar to the egophoric marker (see also Tribur 2017: 379). The following examples illustrate this neutralisation of the egophoric imperfective suffix. Example (3a) corresponds to the use of the suffix *-go* as an evidential marker signalling personal access to the information and full awareness of the event on the part of the speaker. Examples (3b) and (3c) illustrate the neutral value of the same suffix, in a subordinate clause, before a nominaliser and before a converb respectively.

10 In past perfective and perfect, the verb is optionally followed by an auxiliary verb. AUX1 stands for the perfective-directional auxiliaries *taj* འཇོན་ (< ‘to send’) and *soj* མོན་ (< ‘to go’) and AUX2 stands for the resultative auxiliary བཞག་ *zak* (< ‘to put’). The latter usually phonologically merges with the following verb suffixes *jo*, *jogə* and *jonəre*: *zak-jo* → *zok*; *zak-jogə* → *zokə* and *zak-jonəre* → *zoknəre*.

11 The initial consonant of this verb suffix is voiced in most Amdo-dialects, but it is voiceless in the varieties presented here.

- (3) a. M44. Sogdzong (Henan)
 བྱ་མཁོ་འདྲི་ལྟོ་དེ་ལྟོ་ལྟོ་ལྟོ་
*f*əwa tshajma ŋaraŋ-kə ta ⁿgen ^hkər-go.
 work all 1SG-ERG TOP responsibility take-IPV.EGO
 ‘Concerning all the work, it is me assuming all the responsibility.’

- b. M41. Xunhua
 སིལ་ཉེག་ཟ་གི་ཡིད་ནི་བོ་དག་ལ་
S^hithok sa-go-no ga-l^ha.
 fruit eat.IPV-IPV.NT-NML.DEF be.happy-PERF.SENS
 ‘The ones eating fruit became happy.’

- c. M41. Xunhua
 དེ་ནས་ད་ལྷག་སྒོ་འཁོ་གི་ཡིད་དུས་དེ།
Tenita k^həga ^hgo ⁿɬo-go-ti ta.
 then 3SG door.DAT go.IPV-IPV.NT-when TOP
 ‘Then, while she is going outside...’

1.3.3. Anticipation in interrogative

The second distinct feature of evidential marking in the Tibetic languages is related to the pragmatic and deictic nature of this linguistic category (De Haan 2005) and is described by Tournadre & LaPolla (2014: 245) as follows:

“Another rare and specific phenomenon related to the evidential systems of the Tibetic family is the so called “anticipation rule”. Although this behaviour is cross-linguistically rare, it tells us a lot about the complex functioning of evidential systems. The anticipation rule states that *whenever the speaker asks a direct question of the hearer, she should anticipate the access/source available to the hearer and select the evidential auxiliary/copula accordingly*. The hearer will often answer using the same auxiliary/copula as in the question but he is not obliged to. Thus for example when asking the hearer about his intentional or deliberate activity the question should contain the egophoric marker because the speaker has to anticipate that it is the access/source that will be used by the hearer.” (Emphasis added)

Although this behaviour turns out to be more common than mentioned by Tournadre & LaPolla (2014),¹² it is not documented in the Turkic languages outside Amdo. Thus, in the Tibetic languages, when she asks a question about information directly concerning the addressee, the speaker will use an egophoric marker, as in examples (4a) and (4b).

12 “Changing from the speaker as the perspective-holder in statements to the addressee in questions is the most common pattern for evidentials cross-linguistically.” (San Roque, Floyd & Noreliffe 2017: 128)

- (4) a. M82. Hualong, Gandu
 A: — ལྷོད་ ཞང་ཞང་གི་ ཡིན་ནིས།
T^ho faŋfaŋ-kə jən-ni?
 2SG Z.-GEN EQU.EGO-INT
 ‘Are you from Zhangzhang?’
 B: — འོ་ ཞང་ཞང་གི་ ཡིན།
Oŋ faŋfaŋ-kə jən.
 yes Z.-GEN EQU.EGO
 ‘Yes, I am from Zhangzhang.’
- b. M35. Hualong, Khargang (Kaligang)
 A: — རྩར་རྩུ་ བཀོག་གི་ འགྲོ་གི་ཡོད་ལ།
^ʔJartsa kok-kə ⁿḏo-go-la.
 cordyceps.sinensis pick-CONV go.IPV-IPV.EGO-INT
 ‘Do you (usually) go to collect cordyceps sinensis?’¹³
 B: — རྗོལ་ལོ་འ་ མ་སོད།
Tots^hək-a ma-s^hoŋ.
 this.year-DAT NEG-go.PV.EGO
 ‘I did not go this year.’

But anticipation is also required when the speaker presupposes that the addressee has another type of access to the information asked about. For instance, in example (5a), the speaker asks the addressee specifically about her own perception of the situation, while in example (5b) the speaker asks in more general terms.

- (5) a. M35. Hualong, Khargang (Kaligang)
 རྗོ་ ཏ་ རྗོན་ཀླ་ ལལ་སྤང་ན་ ཨོ་བལ་གི་
Te ta ^htonka k^he-s^hoŋ-na e-wa-gə?
 DEM TOP autumn fall-PV-COND INT-be.correct-STAT.SENS¹⁴
 ‘Do you perceive it as a good thing when it [Ramadan] falls in Autumn?’
- b. M82. Hualong, Gandu
 རྗོལ་ བཤད་ན་ འགྲིག་ནི་ཨོ་འདོད།
Təce ^fce-na ⁿdək-nəere?
 like.that speak-COND be.correct.IPV-FACT.INT
 ‘Is it (generally speaking) correct if I speak like that?’

13 A kind of parasitic fungus growing in the high pastures, highly prized in Chinese medicine. Its collection and sale constitute an important source of incomes.
 14 Contrary to Tribur (2017: 396), in my corpus, the use of the morpheme *-gə* ‘stative, imperfective’ seems to be systematically correlated to sensory access to information, as opposed to the morpheme *-nəre* ‘factual’. Contrary to the former, the latter may be suffixed to dynamic verbs as well.

2. Evidential system in Salar

Following this brief description of evidentiality in Amdo-Tibetan, I will now address the question of the basic functions of evidential markers in Salar. In the following sections, I will first show that the evidential category of egophoricity has been copied from Amdo-Tibetan into Salar for the future and imperfective. Moreover, not only the semantic features have been transferred, but also the specificities of its morphosyntactic and pragmatic distribution, mentioned in 1.3. In section 3, I will then distinguish between evidential categories grammaticalised in perfective and in imperfective. I will thus show that behind the apparently binary opposition of the evidential markers in Salar, one should, in fact, distinguish more than two evidential categories.

2.1. Egophoric vs. heterophoric¹⁵ distinction

2.1.1. Functional distribution of the TAM markers in Salar

In this section, I will show that the distinction between direct and indirect markers assumed by (Liu & Lin 1980, Dwyer 2000, Mehmet 2012, Ma 2014) corresponds, in fact, to a distinction between egophoric and heterophoric access to the information in imperfective and future, and for the equative and existential copulas. According to my data, the functional distribution of the copula and TAM markers reads as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Copula and TAM markers in Salar in the “non-perfect(ive)” domains

		Egophoric	Heterophoric
Equative copula	Affirmative	<i>e-dər / -dər</i>	<i>er-a / -a</i>
	Negative	<i>emes-dər</i>	<i>emes-a</i>
Existential copula	Affirmative	<i>var</i>	<i>var-a</i>
	Negative	<i>joχ-dər</i>	<i>joχ-wa</i>
Imperfective	Affirmative	<i>-bər</i>	<i>-ba / -bər-a</i>
	Negative	<i>-joχ-dər</i>	<i>-joχ-wa</i>
Future	Affirmative	<i>-Gur</i>	<i>-GA(r)</i>
	Negative	<i>-mEs</i>	<i>-mi-GA(r)</i>

15 Heterophoric is used as a cover-term for a marker used in non-egophoric situations. It is not used in Amdo-Tibetan since such situations correspond to different grammatical sub-categories. The alternative terms “allophoric” or “non-egophoric” are also found in the literature to refer to the grammatical category opposed to egophoric.

First, one notes that the phonological form of some markers differs slightly from the form proposed by the authors cited. Such differences could well be due to dialectal differences. More crucially, my data clearly distinguish two forms in imperfective and future, contrary to Dwyer (2000) and Mehmet (2014). Moreover, my data show that a suppletive form, formally similar to the aorist,¹⁶ is used to express the egophoric negative in future.

I will now review each of these forms and present examples to show that their opposition indeed corresponds to an egophoric/heterophoric distinction. This opposition is defined as follows by Widmer & Zúñiga (2017: 419): “a binary opposition between an egophoric form that denotes privileged access and an allophoric (or non-egophoric) form that denotes general, or non-privileged, access”. Thus, the heterophoric forms, in column 2, are used to speak about events outside the speaker’s sphere, both when she has sensory or encyclopaedic access to the information.

(6) Equative copula

a. Movie

Re ayir-a be!
very heavy-EQU.HET EXCL

(Trying to raise a big box) ‘It is very heavy!’

b. M70. Xining

Bu Suliman axun da axun er-a.
DEM S. imam big imam EQU-HET

(Narrating the legendary history of the Salar people): ‘This Imam Suliman, he was a big Imam.’

(7) Existential copula

a. M50 - Xunhua

Ananda dʒado-ʃək oj bər var-a.
DEM.LOC big-FOC house INDEF EXIST-HET

(Narrating what he saw in a dream): ‘Over there, there was a big house.’

b. M70. Xining

Muŋa gel-ganə er kici beɕ miŋ var-a.
DEM.DAT venir-NML male person five thousand EXIST-HET

(Narrating the legendary history of the Salar people): ‘There were five thousand men coming here.’

16 The distribution of aorist suffixes (affirmative: *-ər*, negative: *-mEs* or *-mər*) will not be treated in this paper. The affirmative aorist marker seems to be evidentially neutral and the negative form is not frequent enough in my corpus to allow a precise analysis.

(8) Imperfective

a. M47. Xunhua

Gudər axsə-ba.

a.bit limp-IPV.HET

(Watching a movie): '[The boy] is limping a bit.'

b. Movie

Mi idži-m mi kama-s-or vax-i-nda

1SG.GEN grandmother-1POSS 1SG.GEN size-3POSS-INDEF time-3POSS-LOC

đʒaŋ bu daɛye iɛ-da oxuɛ oq-ba.

DISC DEM university inside-LOC study study-IPV.HET

'When my grandmother was my age, she was studying at this university.'

(9) Future,¹⁷ Movie*Danba senigi ee-iŋ-ni bər đʒarə-ya.*

chief 2SG.GEN donkey-2POSS-ACC one borrow-FUT.HET

'The chief will borrow your donkey, for a bit.'

Conversely, the egophoric forms, in the first column of the table, are used to convey information falling within the personal sphere of the speaker, which often corresponds to a first person participant in the syntactic position of first argument.

(10) Equative copula

a. Movie

Men ʒə đɛju elin-di-yi daɛ kumur-di-gi e-dir ja!

1SG TOP DISC there-LOC-REL stone bridge-LOC-REL EQU-EGO EXCL

'I am from there, from [the village of] Stone-bridge!'

b. Movie

Men da diril-dir!

1SG COORD alive-EQU.EGO

'I am alive too!'

(11) Existential copula, M47. Xunhua

*Manja da oj-im-da iɛ eh-ku-sə var ja!*1SG.DAT¹⁸COORD house-1POSS-LOC work LIGHTV-NML-3POSS EXIST.EGO EXCL

'I still have work to do at home!'

¹⁷ By definition, no sensory access is possible for a future event.

¹⁸ Although Ma (2013: 142) proposes an example of the predicative possession with the possessor marked in locative, in my corpus, only the dative case is attested for this function (Simon 2016: 439). Mehmet (2012: 88) describes the same dative-case marking attributed to the possessor in the predicative possession.

- (12) Imperfective, Movie
Bu kumur ite-in-de i sixle-bir.
 DEM bridge on-3POSS-LOC 1PL guard-IPV.EGO
 ‘We are guarding, on this bridge.’

- (13) Future, M47. Xunhua
Ebi-si va-gor!
 1PL-3POSS go-FUT.EGO
 ‘We will go!’

2.1.2. Speaker’s sphere as a broader domain

However, the domain of use of egophoric forms is larger, as described by Tournadre (2008: 295–296):

“‘Egophoric’ expresses personal knowledge or intention on the part of the actual speaker, ‘r, in the case of direct questions, expresses the next speaker’s (the addressee’s) personal knowledge or intention, as anticipated by the actual speaker. ... Egophoric auxiliaries are used with the first person occurring overtly, covertly or by anticipation, regardless of its function in a given clause (subject, object, indirect object, locative complement, etc.). ... The notion of egophoric is very similar to “personal knowledge” (van Driem 1998, DeLancey 1990), “self-person” (Sun 1993), “personal experience” (Huber 2002), “ego evidentiality” (Garrett 2001), “speaker’s involvement” (Hein 2007).”

Thus, egophoricity is to be understood as a way for the speaker to express one’s privileged access to information, i.e. one’s most intimate knowledge, knowledge of state of affairs of one’s own personal and cultural sphere, and events over which one exerts control or for which one is responsible.

My corpus does, in fact display a few examples of interesting parallel use of egophoric in Salar and Amdo-Tibetan, in situations where such a use is optional. For instance, when speaking about the local geography, speakers tend to use egophoric forms to highlight their connection with their homeland.

- (14) a. M29. Hualong, Gandu
Mānda morən bər var.
 DEM.LOC river one EXIST.EGO
 ‘Here, there is a river.’

- b. M82. Hualong, Gandu
 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰸 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰸 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰸 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰸 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰸
Ts^howa ʔteək^h ma^hə k^ha-na jo.
 clan one Yellow.River bank-LOC EXIST.EGO
 ‘One clan is located on the banks of the Yellow River.’

Similarly, egophoric form can be used when speaking about one's close relative.

(15) a. Movie

Andan arɔɔ-i-nə mi idɔi-m neni bu donbix-ni
 DEM.ABL behind-3POSS-DAT 1SG.GEN mother-1POSS again DEM story-ACC
maŋa jaɛ-bər.
 1SG.DAT speak-IPV.EGO
 'After that, my mother used to retell this story to me.'

b. F40. Machu (Maqu)

ཞེ་མོ་ འབྲིང་བོ་ བར་གྱི་ བོད་ zangzhong¹⁹ ནང་འ
fəmo "dɔŋ-o har-gə wo tɕaŋdɔŋ naŋ-a
 daughter middle-DEF there-GEN Tibet tibetan.middle inside-DAT
 འདྲན་གྱི་ཡིད།
"don-go.
 study-IPV.EGO
 '[My] second daughter is studying at the Tibetan middle [school] over there.'

More generally, in such contexts, a speaker of Salar or Amdo-Tibetan can choose between a statement that is neutral with regard to her personal involvement, with a factual (in Amdo-Tibetan) or heterophoric (in Salar) marker, or one that uses an egophoric marker to emphasise her involvement in the statement. Hence, example (16a) is a neutral utterance and can be said by anyone, Salar or not, while example (16b) can only be said by a Salar.

(16) M47. Xunhua, Elicited

a. *Salər bala-lar tɛo-sə eyexiao-da ɣadə getɛa orgyn-ba.*
 Salar child-PL PL-3POSS primary.school-LOC china speech study-IPV.HET
 'Salar children learn Chinese in primary school.'

b. *Salər bala-lar tɛo-sə eyexiao-da ɣadə getɛa orgyn-bər.*
 Salar child-PL PL-3POSS primary.school-LOC China speech study-IPV.EGO
 '[Our] Salar children learn Chinese in primary school.'

Such a possibility of choice corresponds to what Tournadre & LaPolla (2014: 241) describe as "the subjective strategy or perspective of the speaker in representing a

19 Copy of the Chinese 藏中. Although such copies are very common in spoken Amdo-Tibetan, no standard orthography exists, since an official Tibetan translation exists (བོད་རྒྱ་སྐད་ལྟོས་འབྲིང་) and is used in written documents. Instead of trying to create a Tibetan orthography for this word, I choose to render it in pinyin transliteration in order to make its etymology clear.

particular state of affairs.” They give several examples of such variability in several Tibetic languages and explicate this possibility as follows:

“Another pragmatic aspect of the situation that can influence the use of the evidential markers is the *speaker’s strategy in choosing one evidential or another*, which is linked to her degree of commitment to a proposition, or to her perspective, or possibly to the intention to lie about her access to the information.” (Tournadre & LaPolla 2014 : 258, emphasis added)

Examples (6) to (16) have shown that the functions of the so-called “direct” forms of copula, imperfective and future are similar to the functions of egophoric forms in Amdo-Tibetan, while indirect forms cover the functions of both sensory and evidential markers in Amdo-Tibetan. Thus, I propose the label egophoric vs. heterophoric to describe the two sets of forms in Salar.

2.1.3. Morphosyntactic and pragmatic specificities of egophoric maker in Salar

In this sub-section, I will show that Salar language displays the same distinctive morphosyntactic and pragmatic features as Amdo-Tibetan, regarding neutralisation in non-finite clauses and anticipation in interrogative. These similarities are a strong argument in favour of the influence of Amdo-Tibetan as the model language in the development of egophoricity in Salar.

In Salar, like in Amdo-Tibetan, the tense-aspect marker can be—and often is—omitted in subordinate clauses. However, when included (i.e. when the speaker needs to clearly specify the tense-aspect of the subordinate clause), it is always the egophoric form. Thus, the neutralisation of evidentiality in subordinate clauses goes together with a formal similarity between the neutral and the egophoric forms. Even though neutralisation of evidentiality is cross-linguistically common, the parallel use of the egophoric form as a neutral form in this context supports the hypothesis of a contact-induced development of egophoricity in Salar. This would, indeed, be a case of a selective copy of the morphosyntactic properties of the grammatical category (Johanson 1992). Examples (17a) and (17b) show this neutralisation in indirect interrogatives for the existential copula and the imperfective respectively. Examples (17c) and (17d) illustrate this neutralisation before converbs in future and in imperfective.

- (17) a. F42. Hualong, Gandu
lɛ-i-nda naŋ var mə al-mie de.
 inside-3POSS-LOC what EXIST.NT DISJ take-PERF.IND COORD
 ‘[She] takes what is inside, and...’

b. F38. Xunhua

Bu bala-sə iɛgi-si-nə naŋ orgyt-bir mu orgyt-ba be.
 DEM child-3POSS two-3POSS-ACC what teach-IPV.NT DISJ teach-IPV.HET PHAT
 This one, he teaches something teachable to his two children, doesn't he?

c. M47. Xunhua

Endži Marijen ojni-me va-gor de-mie²⁰ daɛ-ə-na
 Now M play-NML go-FUT.EGO say-PV.IND outside-3POSS-DAT

ojni-me va-gor-sa.

play-NML go-FUT.NT-COND

‘Then, Marijen was about to go to play, outside. When [she] was about to go to play ...’

d. M47. Xunhua

Gedže-sin-dan dʒik-ba-bir-dʒane ...
 night-3POSS-ABL go.outside-go-IPV-CONV

‘While [she] was going outside during the night...’

Finally, in interrogative constructions, Salar displays the same pattern of anticipation as attested in Tibetan. In (18a) the speaker presupposes that the addressee has generic knowledge about the content of the question, and consequently, she uses a heterophoric marker in the question. Conversely, in (18b), the speaker presupposes that the addressee has personal access to the information asked about and uses an egophoric marker accordingly.

(18) a. M70. Xining

Döji ji-genə naŋ-a. Ji-genə tɛöb-a.
 camel eat-NML what-EQU.HET eat-NML grass-EQU.HET
 ‘What is a camel’s food?’ ‘Its food is grass.’

b. M47. Xunhua

Naŋ iɛ-dir e?
 what work-EQU.EGO INT
 ‘What is [your] work?’

The same pattern of anticipation of heterophoric or egophoric access to information is observed for the existential copula, as illustrated by example (19).

(19) a. Movie

Sen tuinjan qiry-in-ya ueər
 2SG everywhere edge-3POSS-DAT look.IMP

20 This structure, with the verb ‘to say’, is copied from Mongolic and corresponds to a future tense (here, anterior future, due to the presence of the perfective suffix *-mie*). See Simon (2016 : 226–228).

dyɛman var-a mu joxwa?
 enemy EXIST.HET DISJ NEG.EXIST.HET
 ‘You! Look everywhere around! Are there enemies or not?’

b. Movie
Selar-ni/ munda xoyər var mo?
 2PL-GEN DEM.LOC beauties EXIST.EGO DISJ
 ‘Do you have beauties [in] your ... here?’

Finally, examples (20) and (21) also illustrate the anticipation rule in imperfective and future respectively: when the question directly concerns the addressee, as in examples (20b) and (21b), the speaker uses the egophoric form, whereas when she expects the addressee to have only a generic or sensory access to the information asked she uses the heterophoric form, as in examples (20a) and (21a).

(20) a. Movie
Bu eɛək izi niteək va-ba re?
 DEM donkey itself how go-IPV.HET INT
 ‘How is it that this donkey is going by itself?’

b. M47. Xunhua
Wor! sen muŋa na'-h-me gej-bir ja!
 EXCL 2SG DEM.DAT what-do-NML come-IPV.EGO EXCL
 ‘Oh! What do you come to do here?!’

(21) a. M50. Xunhua
Bu endgi jer niŋək wo-ya
 DEM now place how become-FUT.HET
 ‘What will this very place be like [in fifty years]?’

b. Movie
Sen qala va-gur re?
 2SG where.DAT go-FUT.EGO INT
 ‘Where are you going?’

In this section, I have provided examples to show that the distribution and function of the two forms of the copulas and of the imperfective and future markers in Salar correspond closely to the distinction between egophoric and non-egophoric markers in Amdo-Tibetan. In the next section, I will continue the description of the egophoric category in Salar by demonstrating that similar semantic and pragmatic correlates to egophoricity exist in Salar and in Amdo-Tibetan.

2.2. Semantic and pragmatic correlates of egophoric marking

Schematically, egophoricity in Salar and Amdo-Tibetan correlates with three types of semantic-pragmatic features, namely intentionality (or volition), involvement of the speaker, and internal access to information about events directly concerning the speaker herself. In this section, I will show that in specific contexts—i.e. contexts that specifically contradict one, or more, of these features—the use of egophoric markers is excluded. This phenomenon is well known in the Tibetic languages (Oisel 2006, 2017, Tournadre 2008: 303) and I will highlight the parallel behaviour of Salar egophoric markers.

2.2.1. Intentionality

First, in Tibetic languages, egophoricity is related to the notion of the intentionality and controllability of the event.²¹ Thus, egophoric markers may also convey a specific value of intentionality,²² and, thus, might be only compatible with verbs expressing controlled events. Such correlations have long been described in the Tibetic languages, e.g. by Sun (1993: 960), in the variety of Amdo-Tibetan spoken in ⁿDzorge: “Evidentiality in self-person sentences hinges critically on whether the predicate is volitional [i.e. intentional] or non-volitional [i.e. unintentional]”.

But this is also the case for other varieties: “The notion of conscious control or volition is essential in Tibetan (Chang & Shefts 1980, DeLancey 1985, Tournadre 1990, 1996 a, b; Bielmeier 1998).” (Tournadre & Konchok Jiatso 2001: 54) More recently, the same remark has been made by Zeisler (2004: 26–27) and Tribur (2017: 395).

In Amdo-Tibetan, egophoric markers are not only egophoric, but also convey intentionality: the speaker did/will consciously and intentionally perform the action described. Consequently, such markers are not attested with verbs referring to uncontrollable events. By definition, this restriction is limited to the egophoric morphemes combined with lexical verbs, and does not concern the equative and existential copula. In this paragraph, I will focus on future egophoric marker, where a parallel exists between Amdo-Tibetan and Salar.

The following two pairs of examples show the impossible use of an egophoric future marker in Amdo-Tibetan and Salar with verbs such ‘to know’ and ‘to be thirsty’.

21 Dwyer (2000: 51) does mention this parameter, but the example she provides does not correspond to “intentionality” as described here. Rather, it corresponds to the “speaker’s subjective distance” and involvement in the event—a context treated in the second part of this section.

22 Amdo-Tibetan does not possess an equivalent to the Lhasa-Tibetan perceptive, ego-receptive marker ལྟོགས་ལྡན་པ་ལྟོགས་ལྡན་པ་, which conveys unintentionality on the part of the speaker.

- (22) a. F20, Elicited, Xining
 * དྲ ར་སྐ བཤད་ཤེས་ལྷོ་མིན།
 * *Ta ηi ʃe-e-ʃ dʒəmin*
 now 1SG.ERG say-know-NEG.FUT.EGO
- b. F19, Xunhua
 དྲ ར་སྐ བཤད་ཤེས་ལྷོ་མ་རེད།
ta ηi ʃe-e-ʃ dʒəmare.
 now 1SG.ERG say-know-NEG.FUT.HET
 ‘Here, I will not be able to say...’
- (23) a. M47, Elicited, Xunhua
 * *Men susa-Gor.*
 1SG be.thirsty-FUT.EGO
 ‘I will be thirsty.’
- b. M47, Elicited, Xunhua
 * *Men susa-Ga.*
 1SG be.thirsty-FUT.HET

However, this correlation between intentionality and egophoricity should not be seen as a strict system of morphosyntactic (in)compatibility between lexical verbs and egophoric morphemes. As Sun (1993: 962–963) emphasises:

“There is, however, some fluidity in how volitionality conditions evidential morpho-syntax in certain specific circumstances. On the one hand, a subcategory of non-volitional verbs can allow either volitional or non-volition evidential marking, depending on the degree of control perceived in the reported act. ... On the other hand, the examples below illustrate the volitional and non-volition uses of the same predicate.”

Similarly, in Salar, the speaker can choose not to use an egophoric marker in order to emphasise that the performance of the action does not depend on her own intention. This is exemplified in (24).

- (24) M70, Xining
- A: — *Bu ʂə χuda-nige minlin-dir.*
 DEM TOP God-GEN order-EQU.EGO
 Xuda-nige dinla-yanə sen muja var.
 God-GEN listen-NML 2SG DEM.DAT go.IMP
 ‘— This is [our] God’s order. Listen to God’s [order], and go here!’
- B: — *Ja ja ja men va-ya.*
 okay okay okay 1SG go-FUT.HET
 ‘— Okay, okay, okay, I will go.’

This dialogue in example (24), is an excerpt from the founding narrative of the Salar people. The next example belongs to the same narrative and shows an interesting case of anticipation of this feature in questions: the speaker asks a question about her own future actions. However, she presupposes that the addressee (an Imam, expressing God’s order through his mouth) has personal access to and control over her future actions. Accordingly, the speaker uses the egophoric suffix in her question.

(25) M70. Xining

A: — *Qala va-gor re?*
 where.DAT go-FUT.EGO INT
 ‘— Where will I go? (i.e. ‘Where do you want me to go?’)’

B: — *Suini difaŋ.*
 China place
 ‘— China.’

Generally speaking, non-egophoric forms are used when the speaker expresses her own intention but emphasises the fact that she cannot fully guarantee that she will be able to realise it.

(26) a. F18. Sogdzong (Henan)

ལྷོ་ལྷོ་བྱེད་ཅི་རྒྱུ་རྒྱུ་
L^homdʒoŋ je-^lɕəre.
 study LIGHTV-FUT.HET
 ‘I will study.’

b. M50. Xunhua

Aŋa men küni al-be-ga.
 3SG.DAT 1SG wife take-BEN-FUT.HET
 ‘I will take a wife for him [my son].’

This relationship between intentionality and egophoricity is also partially true in the imperfective, but is less systematic and evident. In imperfective, egophoric is generally not used when the speaker describes unintentional actions performed by herself. Non-egophoric markers seem to be preferred,²³ as in examples (27).

(27) a. M50. Xunhua

ལྷོ་ལྷོ་བྱེད་ཅི་རྒྱུ་རྒྱུ་
ʔnəlam maŋa-sək ʔnə-kə.
 dream a.lot-INDEF dream-STAT.SENS
 ‘I dream a lot.’

b. M50. Xunhua

Aŋa jür-sa andə bidʒi ɣorɣ-ba.
 DEM.DAT walk-COND DEM.LOC a.bit be.afraid-IPV.HET
 ‘When I was walking there, I was a bit afraid, there.’

Still, an egophoric marker occasionally occurs with verbs expressing non-intentional events, when speaking about a very regular event like in (27) or when the speaker

23 In Salar, elicitation shows that egophoric markers can be combined with verbs referring to unintentional and uncontrolled events, such as *men susa-bər* [1SG be.thirsty-IMP.EGO] ‘I am thirsty’. Nevertheless, due to the very method of elicitation, the context of such utterance remains unclear. Moreover, my corpus of natural speech shows a strong preference for heterophoric markers with lexical verbs referring to events unintentionally performed by the speaker.

wants to foreground her action and contradict the lexical semantics of the verb, as in (28).

- (28) a. M50. Xunhua
 ཇི་ རས་ ལྷན་ལྷན་གིས་ ལྷི་ལམ་ ལྷི་གི་ བསྐྱད་གི་ཡོད།
Tə ɲi ʰdʌnden-kə ʰɲalam ʰɲə-kə da-go.
 DEM 1SG.ERG habit-ADV dream dream-CONV DUR-IPV.EGO
 ‘I always dream of that.’

- b. Movie
Xar kici biət-or ɣorɣə-joxtur.
 old person louse-INDEF be.afraid-NEG.IPV.EGO
 ‘An old man [like me] is not afraid of a louse!’

It remains unclear whether the conditions that trigger the use of an imperfective egophoric morpheme with verbs referring to an uncontrolled event are the same in Salar and in Tibetan. However, these examples show that intentionality and egophoricity are somehow linked, in the imperfective as well as the future.

2.2.2. Speaker’s involvement in the content of the utterance

As mentioned in 2.1., egophoricity is related to a high degree of involvement of the speaker in the event she describes. Consequently, the speaker can choose to use the factual (in Amdo-Tibetan) or heterophoric (in Salar) marker in order to generalise her own experience and present it as an objective or observable fact.²⁴ This strategy is particularly common when describing one’s regular activities. Thus, in (29), the speaker minimises her personal implication in her activities and presents the information in a more neutral perspective.

- (29) a. F69. Rebkong (Tongren)
 ང་ ཏ་ ཉིན་ཚགས་ལ་ ལུག་ བཞི་ ལྷོད་གི་ཡོད་ནི་རེད།
Da ta ɲantsʰək-a tʰən fʌə ʰteo-konəre.
 1SG TOP every.day-DAT time four practise-IPV.FACT
 ‘[When I was in retreat] I was practising four times a day.’

- b. M50. Xunhua
Men beski ʈwanɲüe.ɣoɖün ejim daljaŋ-ʈək elige et-joɣwa.
 1SG like.this activity self.1POSS alone-FOC like.that LIGHTV-IPV.HET
 ‘I don’t do such an activity alone, like that.’

24 See also Dwyer (2000: 51–52).

c. M29. Hualong, Gandu
Səliɑŋ-a ebisi va-ba.
 Xining-DAT 1PL go-IPV.HET
 ‘We go to Xining.’

Secondarily, this strategy can convey an attitude of humility, since the speaker withdraws her subjectivity from the utterance. This might also explain—at least partially—the following observation made by Dwyer (2000: 57): “The frequency of direct forms may be correlated with gender. Female speakers of Salar tend to use more indirect forms”.

2.2.3. External access to one’s own actions

A final type of context requires the use of a non-egophoric marker to describe an action performed by the speaker herself. In fact, this is the case where the speaker has external access to events concerning her directly.

For instance, in the following Amdo-Tibetan example, the speaker explains that every evening, he looks back on his day to examine his actions. He asks himself a question using a sensory marker. In self-addressed question about intentionally performed events, an egophoric marker would have been expected. However, the use of a sensory marker implies that the speaker will answer by observing himself with distance.

(30) M44. Sogdzong (Henan)
 རེ་རིང་གི་ བྱ་བ་ རྣམ་ལུ་ བྱ་བ་ བཟང་ལོ་ མི་ཟེག་ ལམ་ལུ་
Terɑŋ-gə ʃɛawa naŋ-ni ʃɛawa ʃzaŋo ʃʰəzək li-tʰa.
 today-GEN action inside-ABL action good what do-PV.SENS
 ‘Among today’s actions, what good actions did I do?’

A parallel example can be found in (31). When speaking about his childhood, the speaker may have no clear, personal memory of the events (e.g. he has been retold the events by his parents). Even if he does have personal memory of what happened, she might see himself retrospectively, and assert a distance between his present identity and his past behaviour.

- (31) M50. Xunhua
Ohol-de men de kəf-a
 before-LOC 1SG too small-EQU.HET
naŋ-wo-sə-nə bil-joχwa ra olal-joχwa ra...
 whatever-ACC know-NEG.IPV.HET DISC understand-NEG.IPV.HET DISC
Men va-gor de-mie de zen-a ohol-da.
 1SG go-FUT.EGO say-CONV COORD stubborn-EQU.HET before-LOC
 ‘At that time, I was too small, [I] did not know anything, [I] was not understanding.
 When I said “[I] will go”, [I] was stubborn, at that time.’

Tournadre (1996, 2014) has shown even more clearly that dream narration is a typical case where the use of an egophoric marker is strictly precluded. In fact, when narrating a dream, the Tibetan speakers conceptualise this experience as if they had been seeing themselves performing actions—i.e. they have external, sensory access to their own deeds. The use of a non-egophoric TAM marker in this context, both in Amdo-Tibetan and in Salar, is illustrated by examples (32a) and (32b).

- (32) a. M50. Machu (Maqu)
 ལྷོ་ལམ་ ཟླ་བ་ རྒྱུ་བུ་ རྣམ་
ʹNəlam-zək ʹja-tʰa ra
 dream-INDEF dream-PV.SENS COORD
 རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ ཟླ་བ་འོ་ རྣམ་ བཞིགས་བསྐྱད་ཡོད་གི་ མར་ལ། ...
rinpoɣʰe zawe naŋ-na ʹzək-da-jokʰə mar-a
 Rinpoche moon.GEN inside-LOC look.H-DUR-PERF.TEST down-DAT
 རལ་ རྗེ་ཚེད་གི་མི་དག་གི་ ... རལ་ བ་གིས་ གཤམ་ཞུན་
ŋi ʹdzafʰo-kəmekʰə ŋi wagə ʹjakʰgen-a.
 1SG.ERG catch.up-NEG.IPV.SENS 1SG.ERG very yak-DAT
 དྲུགས་ལྷགས་ཟླ་བ་ རྒྱུ་བུ་གི་ཡོད་གི་
ʹteəkʰak-zək je-kogə.
 whip-INDEF LIGHTV-IPV.SENS
 ‘I had a dream: Inside the moon, Rinpoche was looking, down ...I could not catch up [with him]. I was whipping my yak a lot.’

- b. M50. Xunhua
Men asmən-ə ʸak-bara ra bæ-ʸək ʸak-bara.
 1SG sky-DAT climb-IPV.HET DISC head-FOC climb-IPV.HET
 [In that dream] ‘I was climbing to the sky, [I] was climbing upwards.’

Tournadre (2008: 303) presents the following summary of the use of non-egophoric markers to describe actions performed by the speaker, according to a specific context.

- (a) ... sensory markers, the case of self-observation (dreams, mirrors, movies, etc.) or intentionality out of focus (see Oisel, [2006: 35-38]), co-observation by the hearer (and search of a consensus by the speaker), etc.;
- (b) ... factual markers, statements about distant past or future, polemic statements, etc.;
- (c) ... sensory inferential, possible contexts include lack of intention, unawareness, etc.

In this section, I have shown that such contexts systematically trigger a heterophoric marker in Salar too, in the imperfective or future, or with the copula. Thus, notwithstanding the difference in the number of evidential categories grammaticalised in Amdo-Tibetan and Salar, we observe a similar distribution of the egophoric marker in both languages.

3. Evidential categories in perfective/post-terminal

Whereas in Amdo-Tibetan the evidential categories can be described within a similar frame in perfective and in non-perfective aspects, this is not the case for Salar. This last section will provide arguments in favour of a distinct analysis of evidential categories in the Salar language. In fact, in perfective constructions, Salar has, to a large extent, preserved the common evidential system of the Turkic languages. Thus, according to my analysis, Salar possesses an asymmetric evidential system, mixing Tibetan-type egophoricity in imperfective and future, and a Turkic-type indirect-marking in perfective, which is consistent with the description provided in Johanson (2000, 2016).

First, for the two perfective markers, in my data I find suffixes similar to those described by the previous authors.

Table 5. Morphology of the Salar perfective evidential markers

		direct / neutral	indirect
Perfective	Affirmative	<i>-dʒi</i> ²⁵	<i>-miε</i>
	Negative	<i>-ma-dʒi</i>	<i>-ma-miε</i>

Furthermore, their distribution corresponds to that given in the various descriptions for the Turkic languages, as summarised by Comrie (2000: 3): “[I]n Turkic languages, the basic contrast is between a marked evidential (with a number of more particular interpretations, such as reported information, inferred information, perceived information) and a form that is unmarked with respect to evidentiality”.

25 In slow pronunciation, the form *-di* is also attested.

Thus, when compared to the definitions proposed by Dwyer (2000) and the descriptions of Amdo-Tibetan evidential categories, the equivalences between the two systems can be summarised as follows:

The indirect marker corresponds to either a source distinct from the speaker (reported speech or hearsay), or an inference (this inference may be based on a mental operation, on sensory access to the resulting state, or on encyclopaedic knowledge);

The direct or neutral marker corresponds either to sensory evidence or to privileged (personal) access (i.e. egophoric).

The following pair of examples illustrates the use of the suffix *-dʒi* to describe both an event for which the speaker has privileged (personal) access (32) and an event for which she has sensory access (33).

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| (33) a. Movie | b. Movie |
| <i>Men gel-dʒi.</i> | <i>Palteək.kiε ægira-təək jaεa-dʒi.</i> |
| 1SG come-PV.DIR | statue distinct-FOC speak-PV.DIR |
| ‘I came.’ | ‘The statue spoke clearly!’ |

Conversely, the examples in (34) show the use of the suffix *-mie* to express inferences of various kinds. Example (34a), illustrates its use for a logical inference, based on a calculation, whereas in example (34b), the speaker infers that the wind has risen, because she feels a new sensation on her skin.

- | |
|---|
| (34) a. M29. Hualong, Gandu |
| <i>ʒu oku-dʒa ʒə bu naŋ eεe on/ on jəl o-mie.</i> |
| book read-CONV TOP DEM what HES ten ten year become-PV.IND |
| ‘Since I have studied, hmmm, what, ten, ten years have passed.’ |
|
 |
| b. Movie |
| <i>Əsə jel vur-mie ja!</i> |
| warm wind LIGHTV-PV.IND EXCL |
| ‘A warm wind has risen!’ |

Example (35) illustrates another case of inference. The woman speaking explains that she has thrown away her jacket earlier, involuntarily and without being fully conscious of her action. Only at the time of speaking does she become conscious that she does not have her jacket any more, and deduces that she threw it away earlier.

- (35) Movie
U vaq-da men jiguo gilin-mie de
 DEM time-LOC 1SG all be.busy-PV.IND COORD
eeax-nige souy-a ie-i-nde teoj-gij-mie ba.
 donkey-GEN stable-3POSS inside-3POSS-LOC throw-come-PV.IND PHAT
 ‘At that time, I was very busy and I have thrown [it] in the donkey’s stable.’

This suffix is also used as a resultative marker, when the speaker wants to focus on the new state of affairs, at a reference point consecutive to a previous event. This is illustrated by the following example, where the use of *-mie* does not correspond to any inference.

- (36) M70. Xining
Xynxwa-ya gel-se nene mongol kici jidgij jeh-mie.
 X.-DAT come-COND again M. person already reach-PV.IND
 ‘When they came to Xunhua, again, the Mongols had already reached [this place].’

Encyclopaedic or factual knowledge, such as historical accounts, are systematically expressed with an indirect marker in my data.

- (37) M29. Hualong, Gandu
Manda qoj qut-mie ohol-de.
 DEM.LOC sheep graze-PV.IND before-LOC
 ‘Here, [they] grazed sheep, previously.’

Dwyer (2000: 48) establishes a link between the use of an indirect suffix and irrealis in narratives: “In fictional narratives, events are assumed to be [-realis] and completely outside of the realm of the speaker’s experience; predictably, the default markers are indirective *-miş* and *a*”.

In my data, such a value of *-mie* is not attested, and, in accordance with the description provided by Johanson (2000), the suffix *-mie* has no epistemic value at all. In fact, the speaker reports an historical fact in example (36) and does not express doubt concerning the truth of her statement.

Thus, the examples presented in this section show that the distribution of the two perfective suffixes in Salar does not follow the egophoric vs. non-egophoric principle identified for imperfective and future markers.

4. Conclusions

Our analysis shows a clear asymmetry among evidential categories in Salar: in perfective aspect, the Turkic evidential categories are largely preserved, whereas in imperfective aspect and future, we observe a copy of the Tibetic egophoric category. This leads to an asymmetric system in Salar, represented in Table 6.

Authors like Widmer (to appear) consider egophoricity as a grammatical category by itself, independent from evidentiality. In this perspective, the Salar language would follow two different systems in the perfective and imperfective. Conversely, other researchers (summarised in Widmer, to appear) include egophoric in a hierarchy of evidential categories from direct to indirect access to information, broadly summarised as follows:

Egophoric (personal, participatory) > Sensory > Inferential > Reported

According to this later analysis, only the location of the dividing line between the use of one or the other form is different in perfective and in non-perfective. It is beyond the scope of this paper to decide between these two alternative analyses. However, it should be stressed that both analyses have different theoretical implications for the description of the Salar data. In fact, the first analysis suggests that the development of egophoricity in Salar is essentially an innovation triggered by its contact with Amdo-Tibetan.

Conversely, following the second analysis leads us to consider the Salar data merely as an extension of the evidential categories to non-perfective aspects, together with a reinterpretation of these evidential categories, influenced by the Tibetan model.

Table 6. Functional domains of evidentiality grammaticalised in Salar depending on the nature of the predicate and the tense-aspect

Equative & existential copula; imperfective; future	Egophoric	Heterophoric	
Perfective	Direct	Indirect	

Evidentiality in Salar in non-perfective constructions and for the copula is clearly modelled on the Amdo-Tibetan system. However, the copy is partial (Johanson 1992). First, it does not pertain to the perfective aspect. Second, it is much simpler than the Tibetan pattern: it results in a binary opposition between egophoric and heterophoric in Salar, while Amdo-Tibetan further distinguishes between—at least—factual and sensory categories.²⁶ The similarities between Salar and Tibetan concern both the semantic-pragmatic and the morphosyntactic levels.

This observation leads to the following questions: First, what prevents the development of an egophoric category in perfective aspect? Most probably, the already existing system of another, Turkic type, of evidential marking has been an obstacle

²⁶ In the perfect, a resultative-inferential category is also found. Reportative is not mentioned here since it does not belong to the same paradigm in the Tibetic languages. Indeed, it combines with all the mentioned evidential categories.

to the further grammaticalisation of egophoricity. In imperfective and future, the egophoric category is merely a simple innovation, and developed in a “virgin field”, without the need to substitute or combine with pre-existing evidential categories. In contrast, its expansion to the perfective would have implied either a combination with the existing evidential categories, or a reinterpretation of these categories, prior to the development of the new egophoric category.

Second, why was egophoricity, rather than sensory evidentiality, copied into Salar? The answer to this question may lie in the relationship between the egophoric category and control and intention, described in 2.2.1, features that are especially salient in future tense. In fact, future tense is, cross-linguistically, closely related to modalities such as intention on the part of the speaker. Thus, we may assume that the development of an egophoric category in Salar originally began in future tense and was then extended to the imperfective. Control and intention can be assumed to be less salient features in the perfective, and this, together with the prior existence of another evidential system, may have prevented the further grammaticalisation of egophoricity in perfective. Interestingly enough, in Japhug, a Rgyalrongic language in contact with Tibetan, egophoric marking also developed only in the imperfective (Jacques, to appear in 2018). This could confirm that egophoricity is more salient, and thus, more easily copied in the imperfective.

Abbreviations

1:	first person	FUT:	future
2:	second person	GEN:	genitive
3:	third person	HES:	hesitation
ABL:	ablative	HET:	heterophoric
ACC:	accusative	IMP:	imperative
ADV:	adverbialiser	IND:	indirect
AOR:	aorist	INDEF:	indefinite
BEN:	benefactive (voice)	INDIR:	indirect (evidential)
COM:	comitative (case)	INFER:	inferential
COND:	conditional	INT:	interrogative
CONV:	converb	IPV:	imperfective
COORD:	coordination marker	LIGHTV:	light verb
DAT:	dative	LOC:	locative
DEF:	definite	LOGIC.INFER:	logical inferential
DEM:	demonstrative	NEG:	negative
DIR:	direct (evidential)	NML:	nominaliser
DISC:	discourse marker	NT:	neutral
DISJ:	disjunctive particle	PERF:	perfect
DUR:	durative	PHAT:	phatic
EGO:	egophoric	PL:	plural

EQU:	equative copula	POSS:	possessive
ERG:	ergative	PV:	perfective
EXCL:	exclamative	REL:	relator
EXIST:	existential copula	SENS:	sensory
EXP:	experiential	SG:	singular
FACT:	factual	STAT:	stative
FOC:	focalisation marker	TOP:	topicaliser

References

- Bielmeier, Roland 1998. *Comparative dictionary of Tibetan dialects*. Bern: University of Bern. Preprint.
- Chang, Kun & Sheft, Betty Chang 1980. Ergativity in spoken Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philosophy* 51: 1, 15–32.
- Clauson, Gerard 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Comrie, Bernard 2000. Evidentials: Semantics and history. In: Utas, Bo & Johanson, Lars (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1–14
- De Haan, Ferdinand 2005. Encoding speaker perspective: Evidentials. In: Frajzyngier, Zigmunt & Hodges, Adam & Rood, David S. (eds.) *Linguistic diversity and language theories*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins. 379–390.
- DeLancey, Scott 1985. On active typology and the nature of agentivity. In: Plank, Frans (ed.) *Relational typology* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 28.) New York: Mouton Publishers. 47–60.
- DeLancey, Scott 1990. Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1–3, 289–321.
- DeLancey, Scott 1991. The origins of verb serialization in Modern Tibetan. *Studies in Language* 15: 1, 1–23.
- Dwyer, Arianne 1995. From the Northwest China Sprachbund: Xúnhuà Chinese dialect data. *Yuen Ren Society Treasury of Chinese Dialect Data* 1, 143–182.
- Dwyer, Arianne 2000. Direct and indirect expression in Salar. In: Utas, Bo & Johanson, Lars (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 45–60.
- Dwyer, Arianne 2013. Tibetan as dominant Sprachbund language: Its interactions with neighbouring languages. In: *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on the Tibetan Language*. New York: Trace Foundation. 258–280.
- Fried, Robert W. 2010. *A grammar of Bao'an Tu, a Mongolic language of Northwest China*. [PhD dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo].
- Garrett, Edward 2001. *Evidentiality and assertion in Tibetan*. [PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles].
- Gawne, Lauren & Hill, Nathan W. (eds.) 2017. *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hein, Veronika 2007. The mirative and its interplay with evidentiality in the Tibetan dialect of Tabo (Spiti). *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30: 2, 195–214.

- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees & Dall’Aglia Hattner, Marize Mattos 2015. Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil. *Linguistics* 53: 3, 479–524.
- Huber, Brigitte 2002. *The Lende subdialect of Kyirong Tibetan: A grammatical description with historical annotations*. [Inauguraldissertation der Philosophisch-historischen Fakultät. Universität Bern.] Self-publication.
- Jacques, Guillaume To appear in 2018. Egophoric marking and person indexation in Japhug. *Language and linguistics*.
- Janhunen, Juha 2007. Typological interaction in the Qinghai linguistic complex. *Studia Orientalia* 101, 85–103.
- Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.
- Johanson, Lars 2000. Turkic indirectives. In: Utas, Bo & Johanson, Lars (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 61–88.
- Johanson, Lars 2016. Turkic indirectivity. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 510–524
- Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Ágnes (eds.) 1998. *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Liu, Zhaoxiong & Lin, Lianyun 1980. Bao'anyu he salayu de queding yu feiqueding yuqi. *Minzu yuwen* 1, 23–28.
- Ma, Wei 2013. 撒拉语动词传据范畴研究sa la yu dong ci chuan ju fan chou yan qiong In: Yakup et al. (eds.) *Aertai yuxi yuyan chuanju fanchou yanjiu 2*. [Evidentiality in Altaic languages 2.]. Beijing: China Minzu University Press. 135–144.
- Ma, Wei 2014. Salar: A Turkic language in the Qinghai-Tibet area. [Paper given at the CETOBAC monthly seminar, Paris, Collège de France, March 2014.]
- Mehmet, Gülsün 2012. *Çinghai Salarcasının tasvirî grameri: Ses bilgisi, şekil bilgisi, cümle bilgisi*. Ankara: Kurgan Edebiyat.
- Oisel, Guillaume 2006. *Emplois particuliers des suffixes médiatifs non-égophoriques dans le tibétain parlé de Lhassa*. [Master dissertation, Université Paris 8 Vincennes-Saint-Denis, Paris].
- Oisel, Guillaume 2013. Morphosyntaxe et sémantique des auxiliaires et des connecteurs du tibétain littéraire. Etude diachronique et synchronique. [PhD dissertation, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3, Paris].
- Oisel, Guillaume 2017. Re-evaluation of the evidential system of Lhasa Tibetan and its specific function, *Himalayan Linguistics* 16: 2, 90–128.
- Sandman, Erika & Simon, Camille 2016. Tibetan as a “model language” in the Amdo-Sprachbund: Evidence from Salar and Wutun. *Journal of South Asian Languages and Linguistics* 3: 1, 85–122.
- San Roque, Lila, Floyd, Simeon, & Norcliffé, Elisabeth 2017. Evidentiality and interrogativity, *Lingua* 186–187, 120–143.
- Simon, Camille 2016. Morphosyntaxe et sémantique grammaticale du salar et du tibétain de l’Amdo : analyse d’un contact de langues. [PhD dissertation, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3, Paris].
- Sun, Jackson Tianshin 1993. Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 63–4, 143–188.

- Tenišev, Ėdham. R. 1976. *Stroj salarskogo jazyka* [The structure of the Salar language]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tournadre, Nicolas 1990. Présentation de la grammaire traditionnelle et des cas du tibétain (approche traditionnelle et analyse classique). In: Meyer, Fernand (ed.) *Tibet : Civilisation et société*. Paris: Fondation Singer-Polignac. 189–198.
- Tournadre, Nicolas 1996. Comparaison des systèmes médiatifs de quatre dialectes tibétains (tibétain central, ladakhi, dzongkha et amdo). In: Guentchéva, Zlatka (ed.) *L'énonciation médiatisée*. Leuven: Peeters. 195–213.
- Tournadre, Nicolas 2008. Arguments against the Concept of “Conjunct”/“Disjunct” in Tibetan. In: Huber, Brigitte & Volkart, Marianne & Widmer, Paul & Schwieger, Peter (eds.) *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* 1. 281–308
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 2010. The Classical Tibetan cases and their transcategoriality, from sacred grammar to modern linguistics. *Himalayan Linguistics* 9: 2, 87–125.
- Tournadre, Nicolas & LaPolla, Randy 2014. Toward a new approach to evidentiality: Issues and directions for research. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37: 2, 240–263.
- Tournadre, Nicolas 2017. A typological sketch of evidential/epistemic categories in the Tibetic languages In: Gawne & Hill 2017: 95–130.
- Tournadre, Nicolas & Konchok Jiatso 2001. Final auxiliary verbs in literary Tibetan and in the dialects. *Person and evidence in Himalayan languages. Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area. Special issue*. Berkeley. 49–110.
- Tribur, Zoe 2017. Observations on factors affecting the distributional properties of evidential markers in Amdo Tibetan. In: Gawne & Hill 2017: 367–421.
- Vaillant, Adrien 2016. *Une langue en voie de disparition: le salar au sein de la turcophonie*. [PhD dissertation, Inalco: Paris].
- van Driem, George 1998. *Dzongkha* [Languages of the greater Himalayan Region 1.] Leiden: Brill.
- Widmer, Manuel, to appear. Same same but different: on the relationship between egophoricity and evidentiality. In: Kittilä, Seppo & Bergqvist, Henrik (eds.) *Evidentiality, egophoricity, and engagement*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Widmer & Zúñiga 2017. Egophoricity, involvement, and semantic roles in Tibeto-Burman languages. *Person and knowledge: from participant-role to epistemic marking. Special issue of Open Linguistics* 3, 419–441.
- Zeisler, Bettina 2007. Sentence patterns and pattern variation in Ladakhi: A field report. In: Bielmeier, Roland & Haller, Felix (eds.) *Trends in linguistics. Linguistics of the Himalayas and beyond*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 399–425.