Applying popular arguments for and against an independent egophoric grammatical category to Thewo Tibetan

Abe Powell
Lanzhou University

Thewo Tibetan's egophoric markers are restricted to volitional acts the speaker has done, is doing, and will do. This is unique amongst the reported Tibetan speech varieties given that usually first, second, and third person speech act participants (SAPs) can all use egophoric markers assuming they appear in the right communicative situation. As such, Thewo Tibetan provides a unique dataset to explore the relationship between egophoricity and evidentiality. To explore this relationship, I chose six influential scholars who have been active in discussing the question of whether egophoricity constitutes an independent grammatical category. Aikhenvald (2004; 2015; 2018; 2021) and DeLancey (2018) argue that because of different semantic functions and distribution, egophoric markers and evidential markers each belong to their own independent grammatical category. Tournadre & LaPolla (2014) and Gawne & Hill (2017) argue that given shared semantic motivations and a simpler analysis, egophorics and evidentials should belong to the same category. Next, I describe Thewo Tibetan's evidential and egophoric markers. Thewo Tibetan is also unique in having a large inventory of egophoric markers which includes three types of past markers, two present markers, and two future markers. I apply the arguments for and against an independent egophoric category to Thewo Tibetan. Given (1) common semantic motivations underlying both the evidential and egophoric systems, and (2), the simplicity of an evidential analysis of the egophoric markers, I find it best to analyze Thewo Tibetan's egophoric markers as part of the evidential system.

Keywords: evidentiality, egophoric, volition, inner processes, observability

https://doi.org/10.1075/lali.00257.pow | Published online: 27 January 2026
Language and Linguistics 27:2 (2026), pp. 257–301. ISSN 1606-822X | E-ISSN 2309-5067

1. Introduction

In recent years there has been a lively debate about whether egophoric markers constitute an independent grammatical category or belong to the category of evidentiality. These discussions include Sun (1993; 2018), Aikhenvald (2004; 2015; 2018; 2021), Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), Gawne & Hill (2017), DeLancey (2018), Floyd et al. (2018), Hyslop (2018), Hill (2020), Widmer (2020), Sandman & Grzech (2022) etc., to name but a few. This paper explores this debate by summarizing and applying commonly used arguments for and against an independent egophoric grammatical category to Thewo Tibetan (ISO 639-3: cda). Thewo Tibetan is uniquely suited for this endeavor given that its egophoric markers are restricted to volitional acts the speaker has done, is doing, and will do. This is unique amongst the reported Tibetan speech varieties since first, second, and third person speech act participants (SAPs) can usually all use egophoric markers in the right communicative situation (Gawne & Hill 2017: 15, 18; Hill 2020: 6). This study finds that the primary argument given for egophoricity as an independent grammatical category is that egophoric and evidential markers have distinct semantic functions. The primary arguments for egophoric markers belonging to the evidential system are based on the fact that egophoric and evidential markers share the same semantic and pragmatic motivations; it is also argued that this analysis offers a simpler explanation of the relationship between egophoric markers and evidentiality. When these arguments are applied to Thewo Tibetan, it is clear that both analyses can adequately explain the linguistic phenomena; however, the explanations are not equal. Viewing egophoric markers as part of the evidential system allows for a more concise analysis while giving due attention to the shared linguistic and pragmatic motivations which govern the use of the egophoric and evidential markers.

To explore this relationship I chose six influential scholars who have been active in this debate: Aikhenvald (2004; 2015; 2018; 2021), Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), Gawne & Hill (2017), and DeLancey (2018). Given Aikhenvald's broad and deep typological research in evidentiality, it was important to include her in this discussion. The remaining five specialists were chosen because of their participation and influence in this discussion, their different views on this question, and their expertise in Tibetan and/or Tibeto-Burman languages. The papers and books written by these authors, and which are explored in this paper, have all received significant attention and become foundational pieces in this linguistic debate.

Thewo Tibetan is spoken on the upper reaches of the Bailong River in Sichuan and Gansu Province, China. The data in this paper is primarily drawn from villages on the Sichuan side of the border: [In Thewo Tibetan] ŋa^{33}wa^{55}

kʰɯ⁵⁵ ndzo³³ge⁵⁵ ndzõ³³ tʰe³³wo⁵⁵ ndõ³³ne⁵⁵ xʰɯ⁵⁵ dɛ³³kɔ⁵⁵ ru⁵⁵ de³³ma⁵⁵ (Rnga.ba Khul Mdzod.dge Rdzong The.bo Drong.rdal Gdong.sne Sde.ba.gong.ma Dang sde.ba.'gab.ma) or [In Chinese] 阿壩藏族羌族自治州若爾蓋縣凍列鄉上供瑪村和下供瑪村 (Aba Zangzu Qiangzu Zizhi Zhou Ruoergai Xian Donglie Xiang Shanggongma Cun he Xiagongma Cun).[1]

There is a growing body of research on Thewo Tibetan. Renzeng Wangmu (2010) wrote a paper on syllable assimilation in Thewo Tibetan and also a book (2013) which introduces the phonology and basic grammar of three varieties of Thewo Tibetan spoken in Gansu Province (Thewo-stod, Thewo-bar, and Thewo-smad). Lin (2014) wrote a phonology of Thewo Tibetan. Powell (2016) is a sociolinguistic study of language use and language attitudes in the Thewo Tibetan speaking region. Sangsrgyas Tshering (2020) made a significant contribution to Tibetan language studies with a paper describing how voiceless obstruents in Old Tibetan (OT) have become voiced in Thewo Tibetan. Powell (2022a) contributes a wordlist documenting close to two hundred lexical items in 37 different Thewo-Tibetan speaking villages in Diebu County, Gansu Province. Powell (2022b) analyzes whether the geographical distribution of phonetic differences between different varieties of Thewo Tibetan can be mapped to the watersheds in Diebu County, Gansu Province. Sangsrgyas Tshering (2023) provides an analysis of an evidential and egophoric system located in a near-by river valley to the villages whose speech variety is represented in this paper. There are notable differences, however, between the egophoric/evidential markers Sangsrgyas Tshering (2023) describes, and the ones described here in this paper. Powell (2024) provides an analysis of two Thewo Tibetan evidential suffixes and their relationship with verbal semantics and temporal space. Finally, Yang et al. (2024) analyses Thewo Tibetan's verbal inflection.

2. Differing definitions and theories

This summary of the major arguments for and against a grammatically independent egophoric category seeks to focus on the interpretation, rather than the data, presented by these scholars. The reason is that the data can be and is indeed the same in some instances, but it is the interpretation of the data which varies. In this way, the following summaries will be brief and will not offer the examples which were the foundation of the interpretation; rather, it will try to cut right to the heart

1. The place name in Thewo Tibetan is written in International Phonetic Alphabet. Following it, in parentheses, is the Romanized (Wylie) Written Tibetan. After this appears Chinese with Chinese Romanization (pinyin) in parentheses.

of each scholar's argument. Aikhenvald is certainly afforded more space than the others, but this is necessitated both by her significant influence in the discussion, and also by certain abnormalities in her arguments.

2.1 Aikhenvald (2004; 2015; 2018; 2021)

Aikhenvald (2004: xi, 1) offers one of the most concise and influential definitions of evidentiality: "it represents the grammatical means of expressing information source." In her introduction to the *Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, Aikhenvald (2018: 4) reiterates this basic definition while adding more explanation: "Information source can be manifested in a variety of ways. One of these — the main topic of this handbook — is a closed system of grammatical forms whose primary meaning is information source, which cover a recurrent and limited set of semantic parameters." Although concise, the word "source" seems open to interpretation. Can source include oneself, a volitional first person agent? Aikhenvald (2018: 24–25) clearly answers this question saying that: "A confusion between access to information (egophoricity) and information source (evidentiality) has resulted in the creation of quasi-evidential terms such as 'participatory' or 'performative' evidential referring to one's 'own' access to information (Loughnane 2009; San Roque & Loughnane 2012a; see also Faller 2002: 46)." But why does Aikhenvald divide access to information (egophoricty) and information source (evidentiality) into two different categories?

Ironically, there does not seem to be a straightforward answer to this fundamental question. Her answers can be divided into three streams of thought: (1) the relationship between conjunct disjunct systems (egophoricity) and evidentiality; (2) languages without conjunct-disjunct systems and their use of evidential markers with first person volitional and non-volitional agents; and (3) new arguments which appear in her book: *The web of knowledge: Evidentiality at the crossroads* (Aikhenvald 2021).

In order to explore these three streams of thought, it is necessary here to digress for a moment and talk about several key terms to this discussion: conjunct-disjunct, egophoric, and egophoricity. These three terms each represent efforts to describe the same phenomena. The term conjunct-disjunct was first used by Hale (1971; 1980) and was later popularized by DeLancey (1986; 1990; 1992). However, it is important to note that the pattern Hale observed and called conduct-disjunct had already been accurately described by others (Bendix 1974; Yukawa 1966) before Hale introduced his interpretation. Conjunct-disjunct refers to a syntactic pattern in which "first person declaratives and second person interrogatives are marked the same way, in contrast to first person interrogatives, second person declaratives and all third person forms" (Gawne & Hill 2017: 8–9).

Lamenting the choice of conjunct-disjunct as a term (given it is a syntactic analysis trying to describe a semantic phenomenon), Hargreaves (2005) explains that at the heart of the conjunct-disjunct system is how actions (verbs) volitionally done by the speaker are marked differently than other actions (verbs). Tournadre (1991; 2008) and Tournadre & Sangda Dorje (2003), noting the inherent semantic pragmatic motivation for this phenomenon, reject the concept of conjunct-disjunct and instead use(s) the word egophoric. Tournadre's clearest articulation of egophoric is found in Tournadre & Sangda Dorje (2003: 93):

> Certain auxiliary verbs are associated only with the first person (singular or plural), irrespective of the function of that person in the sentence, i.e., as subject, object or complement. The use of an "egophoric" auxiliary expresses the speaker's knowledge or personal intention, often directly implied in the event that is being described.

Gawne & Hill (2017: 15) also offer what might be thought of as a definition for egophoric (specific to Lhasa Tibetan): "The personal (egophoric) is used with Lhasa Tibetan if the speaker of a declarative sentence draws on her own personal information about something closely associated with her or her intentions." Turning to the term egophoricity, it was coined by Post (2013: 107) and it combines Tournadre's term (albeit a variation of it) with what appears to be the old analysis of conjunct-disjunct. Like Post, Aikhenvald (2018; 2021) also equates egophoricity with conjunct-disjunct. This paper now turns its focus back on the three streams of Aikhenvald's thoughts regarding why egophoric markers cannot be considered evidential.

The first stream of thought is that conjunct-disjunct systems are not evidential because other scholars have not analyzed them as evidential: "Conjunct-disjunct person-marking systems are not evidential in nature (see DeLancey 1986: 206–210 and Caughley 1982: 84–85 for Chepang, also Tibeto-Burman)" (Aikhenvald 2004: 127). This very short and rather abrupt treatment of an important question is made all the more interesting when one looks at the two sources she cites for this statement. DeLancey (1986) only shows two different patterns involving the perfective system of Lhasa Tibetan and another system he refers to as old/new knowledge. DeLancey (1986) does demonstrate a fairly clear contrast between evidentiality in the perfective system and what he titles old/knew knowledge, but DeLancey offers no explanation of why one belongs to the evidential system and the other does not. Caughley (1982: 84–85) likewise only outlines a general pattern which fits conjunct-disjunct's syntactic distribution but does not explain why this pattern should not be considered evidential.

The second stream of Aikhenvald's (2004) thought is that evidential markers which are used to communicate the volitionality or non-volitionality of a first

person speaker are evidential in nature, and conjunct-disjunct markers which are used to communicate the volitionality or non-volitionality of a first person speaker are not evidential. Aikhenvald (2015: 257) repeats her earlier analysis. Ironically, she repeated this analysis right after talking about an evidential in the language Kashaya which is restricted to the first person actions (Aikhenvald 2015: 257):

> In Kashaya, the performative evidential is used only with 1st person. Its meaning is described as follows: 'speaker knows of what he speaks because he is performing the act himself or has just performed it'. (Oswalt 1986: 34–42)

Conjunct-disjunct systems, on the other hand, mark actions (verbs) done by volitional speakers (first person agents). According to Aikhenvald, these systems form an evidential strategy and do not refer to source of information in a strict sense. But in her brief example of Kashaya, she describes a performative evidential which can only be used with first person agents who know what they are doing or know what they did. If the Kashaya performative evidential is restricted to first person volitional speakers (conjunct), why is it evidential and not an evidential strategy? But if on the other hand the Kashaya evidential is restricted to actions the speaker did unintentionally (disjunct), then why is it an evidential when disjunct markers are not evidential? Or if this performative evidential does not differentiate between volition and non-volition, why are conjunct-disjunct markings not evidential? There are no answers to these questions.

A similar inconsistency belonging to this second stream of thought appears in Aikhenvald (2004). In Jarawara, Yukaghir, and Archi the use of a firsthand evidential with a first person speaker indicates the speaker's volitional role in the action (Aikhenvald 2004: § 7.5). She views this as evidential. However, conjunct markers, which mark the speaker's volitional involvement in the action are an evidential strategy and do not count as evidential. There is no explanation given for why. It forces the reader to make a hypothesis to fill in the gap in argumentation.

It seems the basic logic found here is as such: When a firsthand or non-firsthand evidential marker has portmanteau like qualities, where it can also be used to express volition, or non-volition when combined with a first person 'subject', it retains its evidential function; however, when: (1) A marker is only used to express volitional engagement in the action of the verb by the first person speaker, or (2) A marker expresses the non-volition of either a first person speaker or that an action was done by a second or third person, this does not constitute an evidential function because the markers do not have additional uses as evidential markers (i.e. marking firsthand or non-firsthand information). However, this still does not answer the question of why the second type of marker cannot be analyzed as evidential.

Regarding the third stream, Aikhenvald (2021) puts forward the following eight additional reasons for why evidentiality and egophoricity are different grammatical categories:

1. Evidentials can have just a clause within its scope, rather than the whole sentence; whereas egophoric markers cannot (Aikhenvald 2021: 13). Citing evidence from Jarawara (an Arawa language), Estonian, Bulgarian, and Macedonia, Aikhenvald (2021: 13) asserts that dependent clauses can take evidential markers different from those of the main clause.
2. Evidential scope can go beyond a sentence, whereas egophoric scope has not been reported to do so (Aikhenvald 2021: 15). Using evidence from Eastern Pomo, Baniwa, and Quechua, etc., Aikhenvald states that sometimes the evidential value of one sentence can be applied to the following sentences, i.e. it works like pro-drop where after an evidential specification has been given, it remains until the speaker designates a new evidential specification.
3. Evidentials can be linked to NPs, whereas egophoric markers always have the whole sentence within their scope (Aikhenvald 2021: 18).
4. Evidential markers can allow for double marking of information source, whereas egophoric markers have not been reported to do this (Aikhenvald 2021: 19). It should be noted here that the examples given all include reported or quotative evidentials.
5. Evidentials can have independent time reference, whereas egophoric markers cannot (Aikhenvald 2021: 20). The word independent refers to the fact that the evidential time reference can be different from the time reference of the main event in the clause.
6. Evidentials can be negated independently of the evidential. Egophoric markers cannot be (Aikhenvald 2021: 21). Although Aikhenvald puts this idea forward, she does explain that there is only one language where this is reported to happen in: Akha.
7. Evidentials can be questioned separately from the predicate, whereas egophoric markers cannot be. Despite her assertion, out of the five examples she gives, only one (Japanese) includes a question with an evidential (Aikhenvald 2021: 22–23).
8. Evidentials are intimately connected with cultural practices and attitudes in a way that egophoric markers are not (Aikhenvald 2021: 23). This is a significant statement and there is little evidence given to support it. What evidence is given includes: (1) evidentials being used for specific semantic genres, i.e. shamanic attacks, generational stories, etc.; (2) using evidentials for new types of experiences, like video calls, etc.; and (3) the social necessity many cultures ascribe to using evidentials correctly.

Aikhevald (2021) does not present these differences as exhaustive tests for identifying egophoric and evidential suffixes. Nor does she present them as exhaustive evidence that these two markers each belong to independent grammatical categories; however, she does offer them as evidence which in part can distinguish evidentiality from egophoricity.

To summarize, Aikhenvald makes an argument for egophoricity being an independent grammatical category, and this argument is based on others' observations that egophorics and evidentials have different distribution patterns and different semantic meanings. While this is a notable observation, it is also shared by those who believe egophoric markers are evidential in nature.

2.2 Tournadre (2008) and Tournadre & LaPolla (2014)

Tournadre (2008) offers a refutation of the conjunct-disjunct system introduced by Hale (1980) and popularized by DeLancey (1986; 1990; 1992). Tournadre (2008) notes that at the heart of the conjunct-disjunct system is the idea of volition (see also Tournadre's (2008: 289) quotation from Hargreaves (2005: 5)). If an agent volitionally does an action, then the verb is marked with the conjunct form. If the speaker asks a question about whether someone else did an action, they use the conjunct form in their question (this is what Tournadre (2008: 20) calls the "rule of anticipation" and what Hill (2020: 201) calls "conversational presumption"). And in situations which were not volitional or which the speaker does not know whether they were volitional or not, the disjunct form is used. This highlights that conjunct-disjunct, a structural/syntactic description, is being used to describe a semantic-pragmatic system. Given that disjunct can appear with first, second, and third persons it is meaningless as a person marker. But if it is used to describe a semantic pragmatic function, i.e. the action was observed (whether it be of a self-person observing an action they are accidentally doing, or of a second or third person doing an action) then it is telling the listener how the speaker knows about this event. And this seems closely linked to the idea of evidentiality. Additionally, many who first used conjunct-disjunct to describe this semantic-pragmatic phenomena now believe this system belongs to the category of evidentiality. This includes DeLancey (Tournadre 2008: 284) and Hale (Gawne & Hill 2017: 11).

Tournadre (2008: 298) lists four key parts of the Standard Tibetan evidential system: "source of information, access to information, time of acquisition and volitionality." Or put another way, the distinctions within the evidential system do not just include knowledge related to whether the action of the verb was observed or the results of the action of the verb were observed, but also the volition of the speaker, and the time knowledge was acquired.

Building on Tournadre's (2008) work, Tournadre & LaPolla (2014: 2) see that Aikhenvald's (2004) definition of evidentiality does not include all the phenomena typically associated with evidential markers and therefore put forward a new definition of evidentiality: "the representation of source and access to information according to the speaker's perspective and strategy." Tournadre and LaPolla's (2014) argument is centered on Standard Tibetan, but includes insights from languages as diverse as Persian, Qiang, Kham Tibetan, Western Tibetic, and Amerindian languages like Tucano, Anoke, and Cora, as well as languages spoken in Eurasia like Bulgarian, Estonian, Russian, Turkish, etc.

The arguments within Tournadre & LaPolla (2014) regarding why egophorics belong to the category of evidentiality are less a direct refutation of Aikhenvald's definition and more of a presentation on why categories like egophoric can be viewed as belonging to the evidential system. Or put another way, Tournadre & LaPolla, while acknowledging and observing the distinctions which have led some scholars to separate egophorics and evidentials into two categories, show how analyzing egophorics, evidentials as evidential in nature offers a more concise and natural analysis than breaking them into separate groups given their shared semantic and pragmatic motivations.

2.3 DeLancey (2018)

Although DeLancey (1986; 1990; 1992) popularized the idea of conjunct-disjunct, he eventually rejected it. However, DeLancey does believe egophoricity constitutes its own independent category. DeLancey (2018) argues that Tibetic languages usually classify knowledge in one of three grammatical ways: egophoric (expressing personal knowledge), evidential (expressing contingent knowledge), or factual (presenting assumed knowledge). DeLancey shows that: (1) internal processes take evidential markers usually used for 2nd and 3rd person sentences; (2) non-volitional actions by the speaker take evidential markers usually used for 2nd and 3rd person sentences; (3) volitional actions performed by the speaker and talked about by the speaker take a special set of markers which cannot be used for the third person. Given this, he points out that there is a clear distinction between egophoric and evidential functions. Speaking about this distinction, DeLancey (2018: 584) says: "rather than an evidential category, Egophoric is a category to which evidentiality is not applicable." Although DeLancey says at the beginning of his paper that he works inductively from the data to the analysis, he does not explain how the data shows that egophoricity is an independent grammatical category and not part of the evidential system — the data he presents in this paper and his analysis all seem to show that evidential and egophoric markers have a different semantic distribution, though they have the same semantic motivations.

2.4 Gawne & Hill (2017)

Gawne & Hill, while discussing the contribution of Lhasa Tibetan to the study of evidentiality in Tibetan languages, offer an extensive and detailed overview of the discussion of the relationship between conjunct-disjunct (and egophoricity) and evidentiality. Here they argue for an evidential interpretation of egophoric markers (personal evidentiality), given that the data used to justify egophoricity as non-evidential depends on a misanalysis of the data, and that the majority of the specialists in the field prefer an evidential analysis of egophoric markers. Regarding the data, they show how in Lhasa Tibetan, egophoric marking is not restricted by person, but rather deeply connected to knowledge the speaker knows because of its connection with his or her intentions (Gawne & Hill 2017: 15). This shows that egophoricity cannot be equated with conjunct-disjunct, nor vice versa. If egophoric markers are not person marking, then what are they? Gawne & Hill (2017: 13) note how many scholars reject this non-evidential analysis of egophoric markers. Intriguingly, Gawne & Hill (2017: 17) note that many other languages show similar patterns and motivations as Lhasa Tibetan. I also have noted surprising similarities between the usage of egophoric markers in the Tibetan languages and in Papua New Guinean languages (San Roque & Loughnne 2012), Caribbean languages such as Trio and Wayana (Carlin 2018), and Nakh-Daghstanan languages (Creissels 2008; Forker 2018). These authors also adopt an evidential analysis of these markers given the shared semantic and pragmatic motivations which underlie the system.

2.5 Focus of this paper

The arguments described above can be summarized as follows. Aikhenvald (2004; 2015; 2018; 2021) and DeLancey (2018) argue for an independent egophoric grammatical category because of the differing syntactic patterns and semantic functions of evidential and egophoric markers. Tournadre (2008), Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), and Gawne & Hill (2017) observe the same differences, but see the same semantic and pragmatic motivations as underlying the use of both sets of markers. Therefore, they argue that evidential and egophoric markers both belong to the category of evidentiality.

This paper's goal is to apply these arguments to Thewo Tibetan. The general research question guiding this study is: what light does Thewo Tibetan's egophoric and evidential system shed on this debate? Specific questions include, but are not limited to: (1) Do Thewo Tibetan's evidential and egophoric markers share the same syntactic distribution? (2) Do Thewo Tibetan's egophoric and evidential system share the same semantic functions? (3) Do the same semantic and

pragmatic motivations underlie the usage of both evidentials and egophorics in Thewo Tibetan? (4) Which descriptive model best fits Thewo Tibetan?

In order to answer these questions, this paper analyzes seven verbs ('sell', 'write', 'cough', 'decide', 'consider', 'think', 'hurt') in distinct contexts in which they were used. These verbs include both volitional and non-volitional actions, observable, and non-observable actions, and a non-observable state.

3. Data and methodology

The linguistic data used in this paper is from texts and elicitation. I have been working for several years on producing a dictionary of Thewo Tibetan, as well as gathering data and analyzing it for a planned reference grammar. Thousands of examples have been collected and analyzed, some of which appear here.

The elicitations were done using a careful process whereby the participants of the discussion talked about different experiences that had been observed or experienced in the past and then recreated the dialogue for those situations. These dialogues and the insights gained from them were then shared with other native speakers to test for accuracy. Finally, the results of these elicitations were compared to that of data gained through text collection. No discrepancies were found.

This paper does not include a discussion of copulas and existential verbs. In addition, several suffixes used to express stative situations are not addressed in this paper. The reason is that semantically copulas, existential verbs, and stative suffixes are different from non-stative, non-existential, and non-copular semantics. I believe this is a separate topic which will be better served by a separate paper.

4. An introduction and analysis of Thewo Tibetan's egophoric and evidential suffixes

Thewo Tibetan has seven egophoric markers (1–7 below) and one egophoric verbal stem that has the function of marking actions the speaker intends to do in the future. The markers numbered 7–13 are evidential markers. All evidential suffixes can be used in first person sentences where they depict that the action in question was observed rather than intentionally done.

1. /nɔ^{33}/: the egophoric knowledge evidential 1 (PST.EGO1)
2. /ji^{33}/: the egophoric knowledge evidential 2 (PST.EGO2)
3. /de^{33}/: the past progressive egophoric knowledge evidential (PST.PROG.EGO)

4. /dɔ^{33}/: the present egophoric knowledge evidential1 (PRS.EGO1)
5. /diɔ^{33}/: the present egophoric knowledge evidential2 (PRS.EGO2)
6. /tɔ^{33}/: the immediate future egophoric knowledge evidential (IM.FUT.EGO)
7. /ɹa^{33}/~/nda^{33}/: the intimate knowledge evidential (IN.EV)[2]
8. /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̥^{33}/: the inferential knowledge evidential (INFR.EV)
9. /ta^{33}/: the already acquired knowledge evidential (AA.EV)
10. /nə^{33}/: the current perception knowledge evidential (CP.EV)
11. /ji^{55}/ (/x^{h}ɯ̥^{33}/ in negative constructions): the stative realis knowledge evidential (SR.EV)
12. /le^{55}/: the future knowledge evidential (FUT.EV)
13. /s^{h}ɯ̥^{33}ki^{55}/: the reported knowledge evidential (RPT.EV)[3]

Thewo Tibetan's evidential and egophoric markers are sensitive to volition, person (a two-way distinction between first person and other person), the time of the action in relation to the time of the speech event, and the observability of the action. Intrinsic to these features are the markers' sensitivity to the semantics of the verb. As such, the following subsections are organized around observability (observable vs. non-observable), speaker's volition (volitional vs. non-volitional), and the verb's semantic quality (volitional or non-volitional). Inside this framework I also talk about the other categories: person and time. Examples are ordered around the linguistic context in which the suffix was used.

4.1 A brief overview of the Thewo Tibetan verbal system

Thewo Tibetan verbs not only distinguish between valence (transitivity), but also volition. Verbs appearing sentence final almost always have a suffix added; however, one imperative form and an egophoric future form are not suffixed, i.e. [sɔ^{51}] '(I) will eat' and [so^{55}] 'Eat!' Each of these two words in the form which appears above can constitute a full sentence (one complete idea).

Table 1 shows the thirteen suffixes mentioned above with four verbs. There are two controllable verbs (both transitive) and two non-controllable verbs (one intransitive and one transitive). Their Old Tibetan verbal stems have been included as well as the corresponding Wylie Romanization. As can be seen from

2. Given that native speakers believe /ɹa^{33}/ and /nda^{55}/ mean the same thing, and that I have been unable to find any instance in which the function or meaning of these two different pronunciations differ, I analyze this as one suffix with two separate pronunciations. It should be noted that certain verbs do not accept /nda^{33}/ and can only use /ɹa^{33}/.

3. The reported knowledge evidential is made up of the verb [s^{h}ɯ̥] སྐད་ 'speak' and the stative realis knowledge evidential. It could be analyzed as a verb + evidential structure which can be added after other evidential makers.

Table 1, there is a high degree of morphophonemic variation which takes place. Part of this variation seems to be induced by the addition of the suffix, however, exactly how much remains of the Old Tibetan four stem verbal system is not yet fully known (note that two of the below verbs only have one form in Old Tibetan). Complicating this picture is Thewo Tibetan's tendency for syllable reduction, with the second syllable in a bisyllabic word often being absorbed into the first syllable (see Rengzeng Wangmu (2010) for more on this topic). It is possible that some of the variation seen below is related to syllable reduction. Research into this morphophonemic variation is ongoing.

Table 1. Thewo Tibetan controllable and non-controllable verbal paradigm

Suffix	**Controllable verb**		**Non-controllable verb**	
Verb type	Transitive	Transitive	Intransitive	Transitive
Gloss	'wait' (non-telic) སྒུག sgug, བསྡུགས། bsgugs, བསྒུག bsgug, སྒུགས། sgugs	'buy' (telic) ཉོ། nyo, ཉོས། nyos, ཉོ། nyo, ཉོས། nyos	'bloom' (non-telic) བཞད། bzhad	'see' (telic) མཐོང་། mthong
/nɔ^{33}/ (PST.EGO1)	gu^{51}nɔ^{33}	ŋ̊e^{55}nɔ^{33}	*	*
/ji^{33}/ (PST.EGO2)	gua^{55}ji^{33}	ŋ̊ea^{55}ji^{33}	*	*
/de^{33}/ (PST.PROG.EGO)	gu^{51}de^{33}	*	*	*
/dɔ^{33}/ (PRS.EGO1)	gu^{51}dɔ^{33}	ŋ̊o^{55}dɔ^{33}	*	*
/diɔ^{33}/ (PRS.EGO2)	gu^{51}diɔ^{33}	*	*	*
/tɔ^{33}/ (IM.FUT.EGO)	gu^{51}tɔ^{33}	ŋ̊e^{55}tɔ^{33}	*	*
/ɹa^{33}/~/nda^{33}/ (IN.EV)	gua^{51}ɹa^{33}/guɯ^{55}nda^{33}	ŋ̊eɔ^{55}ɹa^{33}/nda^{33}	keɔ^{55}ɹa^{33}/ nda^{33}	t^{h}õa^{55}ɹa^{33}/ t^{h}õa^{55}/ nda^{33}
/jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̥^{33}/ (INFR.EV)	gõ^{51}ts^{h}ɯ̥^{33}	ŋ̊eɔ̃^{55}ts^{h}ɯ^{33}	ke^{55}jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ^{33}	t^{h}õ^{55}s^{h}ɯ̥^{33}
/ta^{33}/ (AA.EV)	gu^{51}ta^{33}	ŋ̊ea^{55}ta^{33}	kea^{55}ta^{33}	t^{h}õa^{55}ta^{33}
/nə^{33}/ (CP.EV)	gu^{51}nə^{33}	ŋ̊ea^{55}nə^{33}	kea^{55}nə^{33}	t^{h}õa^{55}nə^{33}
/ji^{55}/(SR.EV)	gɯ^{33}ki^{55}	ŋ̊o^{33}ji^{55}	ŋge^{33}ki^{55}	*
/le^{55}/ (FUT.EV)	gɯ^{33}le^{55}	ŋ̊o^{33}le^{55}	ŋge^{33}le^{55}	*
/s^{h}ɯ̥^{33}ki^{55}/ (RPT.EV)	guɯ^{51}s^{h}ɯ̥^{33}ki^{55}	ŋ̊ɔ^{55}s^{h}ɯ̥^{33} ki^{55}	*	*

The transitive, telic verb [ŋ̊e^{55}] 'buy' cannot appear with the past progressive egophoric knowledge evidential /de^{33}/ or the present egophoric knowledge evidential /diɔ^{33}/. The reason ostensibly is because 'buy' is a telic verb. The verb itself does not semantically fit well with progressive meaning. Most telic verbs in Thewo Tibetan cannot add /de^{33}/ or /diɔ^{33}/.

The verb [ke^{55}] 'bloom' shows empty spaces for each of the egophoric forms. This is because in Thewo Tibetan egophoric forms can only appear when the speaker intentionally does an action. In the case of 'bloom', the speaker cannot volitionally make the flowers bloom.

The verb for 'see' also shows several empty spaces for egophoric markers. This is because it is a non-controllable verb. Although it is a non-controllable verb, it is transitive. See Example (2).

Finally, Example (1) below shows a sentence with a transitive verb and Example (2) shows a sentence with an intransitive verb. In Example (1), the decision to wait for the friend was made by the speaker herself. In Example (2), the energy behind the flower blooming comes from nature.

(1) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} ŋɯ^{55} ɻu^{33}pə^{55} gu^{51}-dɔ^{33}*
1.ERG-ERG 1.GEN friend wait-PRS.EGO1
'I am waiting for my friend.'

(2) *ŋɛ^{55} ts^{h}e^{51} ŋ̊i^{51} t^{h}õ^{55}-ɻa^{33}*
1.ERG 2 eye see-IN.EV
'I saw you.'

4.2 Observable, volitional and non-volitional actions with volitional verbs

The first story which illustrates the use of the suffixes under consideration is about a mother who is in Diebu County selling meat and how her daughter and son help her.

4.2.1 Declarative sentences

One morning a tourist staying at the hotel asks the lady at the counter (the woman's daughter) where he might be able to buy local meat. The girl directs him to the street market and mentions how her mother is there selling free range pork. The tourist thanks her and tells her he will go to the market now. The daughter calls her mother to tell her that the tourist is coming to buy some meat. The mother responds with the sentence in Example (3) using /nɔ^{33}/. Alternatively, /ji^{33}/ could also be used; both of these suffixes express a past action the speaker intentionally did. The difference between the choice of /nɔ^{33}/ and /ji^{33}/ is that the

former talks about the action from the perspective of when the action was done, while the latter talks about the action from the perspective of the speech event.

(3) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} dzõ^{55}-nɔ^{33} / dzõa^{55}-ji^{33}*
1SG.ERG-ERG pork 3SG-RECIP sell-PST.EGO1 sell-PST.EGO2
'I sold him pork.'

The daughter replies by saying that it cannot be the same tourist, as the tourist she is referring to just left the hotel. The mother says not to worry because she will sell him the meat when he comes. To express this, she uses the sentence in Example (4). Alternatively, she could have used the sentence in Example (5). The difference between the two sentences is that the suffix /tɔ^{33}/ usually refers to a time that is in the immediate future, whereas the non-suffixed verbal stem found in Example (4) is used for future events and does not include any information about the proximity of the future action to the speech event. A few minutes later the daughter calls again. The mother answers with the sentence in Example (6), saying that she was selling it to the gentleman in question at that very moment. Alternatively, the mother could have used the sentence in Example (7) with no change of meaning. Both refer to an action which is ongoing at the moment of the speech event. The suffix /diɔ^{33}/, found in the above list of egophoric suffixes, cannot be used here because the verb 'sell' is a telic verb and /diɔ^{33}/ is not used with telic verbs.

(4) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} dzõə^{55}*
1SG.ERG-ERG pork 3SG-RECIP sell.EGO.FUT
'I will sell him pork.'

(5) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} dzõ^{55}-tɔ^{33}*
1SG.ERG-ERG pork 3SG-RECIP sell-IM.FUT.EGO
'I will sell him the pork.'

(6) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} dzɯ^{55}-ŋgɯ^{55}-dɔ^{33}*
1SG.ERG-ERG pork 3SG-RECIP sell-PROG-PRS.EGO1
'I am selling him the pork.'

(7) *ŋɛ^{55}x^{h}ɯ^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} dzõ^{55}-dɔ^{33}*
1SG.ERG-ERG pork 3SG-RECIP sell.PRS.EGO1
'I am selling him the pork.'

The next day, as the mother was selling meat, she started to feel ill. She called her son to come and sell the pork for her. He came and took her place. It was very busy. After a time, his mother called and told him that the bag of meat beside the table had already been bought and was for a neighbor lady in their village. He says he understands and gets back to work, forgetting all about his mother's comments. After a while, the son's friend Sönam (*Bsod.nams*) came to buy some meat.

Sönam noticed a bag set aside with a nice piece of meat in it and asked if he could buy it. The son said yes and sold him the piece of meat. Later, after all the meat was sold, the son was walking home and sees Sönam in front of him carrying that bag, and at that instant, two things happen. First, he remembers what his mother said and realizes he should not have sold Sönam that piece of meat. Second, his mother calls and tells him that the lady who originally had bought the meat in the bag was at the market looking for him. He responds in part by using the sentence in Example (8) to answer. The use of the /nə^{33}/ with a first person speaker indicates that the speaker in question did not do the action intentionally. The use of /nə^{33}/, regardless of a first person speaker or a second or third person speaker, also indicates that the speaker in question has sensory evidence at the time of the speech event of the action in question (if a non-telic verb) or of the results of an action at the time of the speech event (if a telic verb).

(8) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} sɔ^{33}nɔ^{55}-x^{h}e^{33} dzõa^{55}-nə^{33}*
1SG.ERG-ERG pork Sönam-RECIP sell-CP.EV
'I sold Sönam the pork (on accident).'

The son rushed back to the market to explain to the woman the situation and to offer her a better cut of meat that was still at home. When he found the woman, he could say the sentence in Example (9). The reason is that this knowledge has already been acquired.

However, despite Example (9) being a possible choice in this situation, it is more likely the speaker will respond with the sentence in Example (10). The reason for this is that the use of the sentence in Example (9) would imply that although the action was not volitionally done, the speaker was aware of it at the time it happened. The sentence in Example (10) implies that the speaker became aware of this action later by sensorial evidence from which the speaker makes an inference. The suffix /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ʮ^{33}/, from which [ts^{h}ʮ^{33}] is derived from, indicates that the speaker is inferring an action from evidence the speaker obtained after the incident happened — thus when used with a first person agent, it implies the agent did not volitionally do the action in question.

(9) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} ts^{h}ɯ^{55} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} sɔ^{33}nɔ^{55}-x^{h}e^{33} dzõa^{55}-ta^{33}*
1SG.ERG-ERG 2SG.GEN pork Sönam-RECIP sell-AA.EV
'I sold your pork to Sönam (on accident).'

(10) *ŋɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} ts^{h}ɯ^{55} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} dzõa^{55}-ts^{h}ʮ^{33}*
1SG.ERG-ERG 2SG.GEN pork sell-INFR.EV
'I sold your pork (and was unaware of it).'

The next day, a few friends of the mother's son asked what he was doing the day before. He answers with the sentence in Example (11). The suffix /de^{33}/ comes

from the Old Tibetan word *bsdad.pa* བསྡད་པ། meaning 'sit'. Although Thewo Tibetan still has this same verb and it still means 'sit', when used as a suffix with the speaker referring to himself or herself, it refers to a past action from the perspective of when that action was being done. This use is restricted to a first person talking about a previous action which they were in the process of doing.

(11) *ŋɛ*^{55}*-x*^{h}*ɯ*^{33} *p*^{h}*ə*^{33}*x*^{h}*ə*^{55} *dzɯ*^{55}*-ŋgɯ*^{55}*-de*^{33}
1SG.ERG-ERG pork sell-PROG-PST.PROG.EGO
'I was selling pork.'

His friends laugh and show him a video they had taken of him selling meat to Sönam the previous day. The son, watching the video, laughs and says the sentence in Example (12). He then explains his mistake to the friends. Continuing to talk about it, the son mentions again his mistake in selling Sönam the meat and here he uses the sentence in Example (13). The addition of the progressive marker in Example (12) to the suffix /nə^{33}/ implies that the speaker in question is doing an unintentional action at the moment of speaking. The fact that the speaker is conscious of an action at the moment of speech, and that the action is not volitional, means this combination is not frequently used. For this particular story, the speaker seeing a video of himself or herself, was the only scenario we could think of which would be a natural use of this structure. Likewise in Example (13), the use of the suffix /ta^{33}/ with the progressive marker, is usually reserved for moments when the speaker just saw something and believes it is still going on even though at the moment of speech the speaker no longer has sensorial evidence of the action in question. In the usage in Example (13), it is as if the speaker is talking of the video being ongoing, although he does not see the video at the time he speaks this sentence.

(12) *ŋɛ*^{55}*-x*^{h}*ɯ*^{33} *p*^{h}*ə*^{33}*x*^{h}*ə*^{55} *k*^{h}*u*^{33}*ɹi*^{51}*-x*^{h}*e*^{33} *dzu*^{33}*-ŋgu*^{55}*-nə*^{33}
1SG.ERG-ERG pork 3SG-RECIP sell-PROG-CP.EV
'I am selling him pork (on accident).'

(13) *ŋɛ*^{55}*-x*^{h}*ɯ*^{33} *p*^{h}*ə*^{33}*x*^{h}*ə*^{55} *k*^{h}*u*^{33}*ɹi*^{51}*-x*^{h}*e*^{33} *dzu*^{55}*-ŋgu*^{55}*-ta*^{33}
1SG.ERG-ERG pork 3SG-RECIP sell-PROG-AA.EV
'I was selling him pork (on accident).'

In each of these examples, the speaker is also the agent. The suffixes /nɔ^{33}/, /ji^{33}/, /de^{33}/, /dɔ^{33}/, /diɔ^{33}/, /tɔ^{33}/, and the non-suffixed egophoric stem, are all restricted to use with a volitional first person agent. To date, I have not found a sentence where these suffixes can be used with second or third person agents or even first person experiencers. Each of them expresses that the action in question originated in the will of the agent and that this same agent is the speaker.

However, the suffixes /nə^{33}/, /ta^{33}/, /ɹa^{33}/,[4] and /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̥^{33}/ can be used with first person, second person, and third person agents, as well as with non-volitional verbs like /ke^{55}/ 'blossom' *bzhad.pa* བཞད་པ། where there is no agent. Whether these suffixes are used with verbs done by a first, second, or a third person agent, etc. they all indicate that the action did not originate in the will of the speaker, but rather that the speaker observed the action or the results of the action. Thus, these four suffixes offer a categorization for different types of observation. Many following examples in this paper will show how these suffixes combine with verbs to mark different types of observation for third person agents.

There was a boy in junior high school who had started to let his studies slip. His parents began to be stricter with him and monitor his homework. One day both the mother and father were out at different places and both knew they would be coming back late. The mother called the boy's older sister to check and see if the boy had done his homework. The girl stood up, looked at the table where she thought she had seen the boy's homework notebook. It was indeed the boy's homework notebook, and the homework had been written on it with that day's date. She responds to her mother saying that her brother had finished his homework (Example (14)). This emphasizes that she had sensorial access to information at the time of the speech event.

(14) *(k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}ɯ^{33}) ɣi^{33}ɣe^{55} ʈ̺ea^{55}-nə^{33}*
3SG-ERG homework write-CP.EV
'(He) did his homework.'

The daughter gets up and goes over to the neighbor's house. Her father calls her while she is there, asking the same question as the mother. She answers saying that her brother has finished the homework (Example (15)). The use of /ta^{33}/ here is to express that this is knowledge the girl already had, as opposed to something she is recently learning or had sensorial access to at the moment of the speech act.

(15) *(k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}ɯ^{33}) ɣi^{33}ɣe^{55} ʈ̺ea^{55}-ta^{33}*
3SG-ERG homework write-AA.EV
'(He) did his homework.'

If the story is changed a bit and the daughter had been there while the boy had done his homework, and he had shown his sister the finished homework before going out with friends, the daughter could answer by using /ɹa^{33}/ (Example (16)).

4. The combination of the verb 'sell' and the suffix /ɹa^{33}/ make it very unnatural to be used in this particular story. Were the suffix /ɹa^{33}/ to be put in Example (9) in place of /ta^{33}/, it would imply the speaker had a deep and intimate awareness of selling the meat to Sönam.

This would imply that the daughter had intimate knowledge of the action in question — in this case she observed it firsthand.

(16) *(kʰu^{33}ʁi^{51}-xʰɯ^{33}) ɣi^{33}ɣe^{55} ʈʂiɔ^{55}-ʁa^{33}*
3SG-ERG homework write-IN.EV
'(He) did his homework.'

But if the sister had not been there at the time of his doing the homework, but rather saw all the homework note books stacked neatly up on her brother's desk, and everything neatly arranged with homework that looked like it had been just written, she might answer a parent calling about the state of her brother's homework by using /jõ^{55}tsʰɯ̟^{33}/ (Example (17)). The choice of this suffix implies that the girl is making an inference about a past action based on evidence she has seen, or otherwise had sensorial access to in the past.

(17) *(kʰu^{33}ʁi^{51}-xʰɯ^{33}) ɣi^{33}ɣe^{55} ʈʂiɔ̃^{55}tsʰɯ̟^{33}*
3SG-ERG homework write.INFR.EV
'(He) did his homework.'

It can be seen that Thewo Tibetan differentiates between actions rooted in the will and actions which are observed. The former take the suffixes /nɔ^{33}/, /ji^{33}/, /de^{33}/, /dɔ^{33}/, /diɔ^{33}/, /tɔ^{33}/, and the future egophoric verbal stem. These egophoric suffixes make distinctions based on the time of the action in relation to the speech event, but all communicate that the speaker knows of the action because it originated in his or her will.

In contrast to this, the suffixes /nə^{33}/, /ta^{33}/, /ʁa^{33}/, and /jõ^{55}tsʰɯ̟^{33}/ are not restricted to first person sentences, but they are restricted to events which the speaker observed, or is observing (in the case of /nə^{33}/). These events can be divided into two general categories: (1) actions the speaker non-volitionally did or is doing; (2) actions which the speaker is observing, has observed, or has observed evidence of. The four suffixes make distinctions based on the time of the action in relation to the speech event, whether the action was observed or merely the results of the action, and whether or not the action is inferred from evidence the action leaves behind.

The egophoric and evidential markers are sensitive to person, volition, time, and the semantics of the verb they are paired with. All the markers can be used with first person and hence express a kind of priviliged knowledge; however, not all the markers can appear with second or third person agents: /nɔ^{33}/, /ji^{33}/, /de^{33}/, /dɔ^{33}/, /diɔ^{33}/, /tɔ^{33}/, and the future, egophoric verbal stem. And the use of /nə^{33}/, /ta^{33}/, /ʁa^{33}/, and /jõ^{55}tsʰɯ̟^{33}/ with first person agents in the above examples is limited to actions the speaker did not intentionally do.

4.2.2 Interogative sentences

When the neighbors of the woman selling pork came to the market to pick up the pork they bought and saw that the woman was not there, they called her to ask where she was. In response, the woman called her son. Her son explained that he had sold the pork to Sönam. Wanting to be sure of what she heard, the mother responds to this by asking if he sold the pork to Sönam. She used the question in Example (18) to ask this. The son answers by saying the sentence in Example (19). If the son had not sold pork to Sönam or to anyone else, he might say "ma^{33}dzõ^{55}" which literally means 'not sell', but which in the context of the original question, could be translated as 'I did not sell him pork'.

(18) *ts^{h}e^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} ɯ^{55}-dzõ^{33}*
2SG-ERG 3SG-RECIP pork Q-sell
'Did you sell pork to him?'

(19) *dzõ^{55}-nɔ^{33} / ji^{33}*
sell-PST.EGO1 PST.EGO2
'(I) sold (him pork).'

The pattern changes slightly when a question is asked about a third person. Here, the verb is marked with the intimate knowledge evidential marker. In this case, the husband of the woman was beside her when she called her son. He could hear part of the conversation. When the woman hung up, her husband asked her if he (his son) had sold the pork to Sönam (Example (20)). The woman responds by saying the sentence in Example (21). The use of the reported knowledge evidential is not determined by any syntactic or lexical rule, but rather because of the pragmatic demands and communicative goals of the situation. It also would have been possible for the woman to use another evidential suffix depending on her communicative goals and the communicative situation. In this position, /ɹa^{33}/ is often used, but /ta^{33}/, /nə^{33}/, and /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ʮ^{33}/ are all possibilities. If put in the negative, then the most likely response to the question would be ma^{33}dzõ^{55}ɹa^{33} '(he did) not sell (him pork)'.

(20) *kɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} sɔ^{33}nɔ^{55}-x^{h}e^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} kɛ^{55} ɯ^{55}-dzõ^{55}-ɹa^{33}*
3SG-ERG Sönam-RECIP pork that Q-sell-IN.EV
'Did he sell that pork to Sönam?'

(21) *dzõ^{55}-nɔ^{33}-s^{h}ʮ^{33}ki^{55}*
sell-PST.EGO1-RPT.EV
'(He) said he sold (the pork).'

If the daughter had called her mother to ask if she was selling pork at that moment to the gentleman from the hotel, she could have used the sentence in Example (22)

to ask. If the mother was selling him pork at that moment, then the mother could have used the sentence in Example (23) to answer the question. If she was not selling the gentleman any pork at that moment, she could have answered with "dzõ^{33}mɯ^{55}do^{33}" with the [do^{33}] being a verbalizer (*gtong* གཏོང་) meaning 'do'.

(22) *ts^{h}e^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɻi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} dzõ^{33}-ɯ^{55}-dɔ^{33}*
2SG-ERG 3SG-RECIP pork sell-Q-PRS.EGO1
'Are you selling him pork?'

(23) *dzɯ^{33}-ŋgɯ^{55}-dɔ^{33}*
sell-PROG-PRS.EGO1
'(I) am selling (him pork now).'

If the daughter had called another friend of hers to ask if her mother was selling pork to that gentleman at that very moment, she could have used the sentence in Example (24) to ask. Example (25) presents a potential affirmative and potential negative response to this friend.

(24) *kɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɻi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} dzõ^{33}-ɯ^{55}-do^{33}-ji^{55}*
3SG-ERG 3SG-RECIP pork sell-Q-do-SR.EV
'Is she selling pork to him now?'

(25) *dzɯ^{33}-ŋgɯ^{55}-nə^{33} / dzõ^{55}-mɯ^{33}-do^{33}x^{h}ɯ̥^{33}*
sell-PROG-CP.EV sell-Q-do-SR.EV
'(She) is selling (pork to him).'/'(She) is not selling (pork to him).'

Turning to non-realis examples, if the daughter wanted to ask her mother whether she would sell the gentleman pork, she could ask this using the sentence in Example (26). The suffix [nɔ^{55}] is a variant of the future knowledge evidential /le^{33}/. For instance, in Example (27) a man is asking his friend how many days their planned pilgrimage to Taktsang Lhamo Monastery will take. He asks this using a form of the future knowledge evidential /le^{33}/. His friend answers using the same suffix, as can be seen in Example (28).

If the woman wanted to respond to her daughter's question as asked in Example (26), she might respond with either the affirmative or negative answer found Example (29). If the daughter had asked her brother if their mother would sell the pork to the gentleman, she might have used the sentence in Example (30) to ask. The son could have responded in the affirmative or negative as seen in Example (31).

(26) *ts^{h}e^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɻi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} ɯ^{55}-dzõ^{33}-nɔ^{55}*
2SG-ERG 3SG-RECIP pork Q-sell-FUT.EV
'Will you sell him pork?'

(27) *xə^{33}tɕ^{h}e^{55} ɳɔ^{55} kõ^{55} ŋa^{33} go^{33}-lõ^{55}*
approximately days how.much more.or.less need-FUT.EV
'Approximately how many days, more or less, will we need?'

(28) *xə^{33}tɕ^{h}e^{55} kɔ^{33}t^{h}ɔ^{55} s^{h}õ^{55}-nə^{33} xə^{33}tɕ^{h}e^{55} ɳɔ^{55} ɳi^{55} ŋa^{33}*
approximately by.foot walking-CONJ approximately day two approximately
go^{33}-le^{55} ɻe^{33}
need-FUT.EV COP
'Approximately, going by foot that is, we will need more or less two days.'

(29) *dzõə^{55} / mɯ^{33}-dzõ^{55}*
sell.EGO.FUT NEG-sell
'(I) will sell (the pork to him).'/'(I) will not sell (the pork to him).'

(30) *kɛ^{55}x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}u^{33}ɻi^{51}-x^{h}e^{33} p^{h}ə^{33}x^{h}ə^{55} ɯ^{55}-dzõ^{33}-nɔ^{55}*
3SG-ERG 3SG-RECIP pork Q-sell-FUT.EV
'Will she sell him pork?'

(31) *dzõ^{33}ne^{55} / dzõ^{33}-ne^{55}-ma^{33}*
sell.FUT.EV sell-FUT.EV-NEG
'(She) will sell (the pork to him).'/'(She) will not sell (the pork to him).'

In the above questions and answers with the verb for 'sell', only Examples (22) and (23) exhibit the so called conjunct disjunct system used by many to argue for an independent egophoricity category. In this question-and-answer pair, the same egophoric marker is used in both the question and the answer. The other five questions and five answers with the verb 'sell' do not use egophoric markers, even the second person past and future Examples of (18) and (26) do not use egophorics. The past, second person question in Example (18) does not use a suffix, and in Example (26), the future, second person question uses the future knowledge evidential — giving evidence that the speaker does not need to use the rule of anticipation.

The third person questions all use evidential markers (Examples (20), (24), and (30)). The past, third person question (Example (20)) uses the intimate knowledge evidential in the question, and while one can respond to the question using the intimate knowledge evidential, it is also possible, depending on the specific situation and the speaker's communicative goal, to use the other past tense evidential markers, including /ta^{33}/, /nə^{33}/, and /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̟^{33}/. In the present and future third person questions, the number of evidential markers is more limited given there are fewer evidential markers for current and future situations.

So, although the same conjunct-disjunct pattern so common in Tibeto-Burman is found in Thewo Tibetan, it is not obligatory in all tenses. In addition, the evidentials exhibit a similar pattern as described for conjunct disjunct markers,

with each third person question and response containing an evidential marker, albeit not always the same marker as might be expected. Gawne (2017:66) describes how evidential markers used in questions are often repeated back in the response. This phenomenon is therefore not limited to egophoric markings, but is also found with evidential markings.

Finally, the use of egophorics and evidentials in the above questions (and answers) largely follow the patterns found in §4.2.1. The one difference is found in Example (24) where the stative realis knowledge evidential /ji^{55}/ is used when asking about a third person ongoing action. In §4.2.1, the suffix /ji^{55}/ was not observed being used in this context. However, this is not an uncommon usage of /ji^{55}/.

4.3 Observable, non-volitional verbs

The situation when looking at observable, non-volitional verbs is much different than that for observable, volitional verbs. In this section, we will look at the verb 'cough.'

4.3.1 Declarative sentences

One day a woman calls up her friend and asks how she is doing. The friend tells her she has been coughing (Example (32)). The suffix used in Example (32), the stative realis knowledge evidential /ji^{55}/, is a suffix commonly found when expressing certain states. Combined with the verb 'cough,' the structure here expresses that the friend is coughing or currently has a cough. The woman next asks her friend if she was coughing the day before. The friend answers with the sentence in Example (33). The use of /ɹa^{33}/ here expresses that the action happened in the past and that the speaker has intimate knowledge of the action (in this case experiencing it herself), and did not volitionally do the action. But given that 'cough' is not a volitional action, we (the language consultants and I) could not find any examples where the suffixes /nɔ^{33}/, /ji^{33}/, /de^{33}/, /dɔ^{33}/, /diɔ^{33}/, /tɔ^{33}/, and the future, egophoric verbal stem could be used with a first person experiencer.

(32) *ŋə^{55} lu^{33}-ɣi^{55}*
1SG cough-SR.EV
'I am coughing.'/'I have a cough.'

(33) *kʰə^{33}tsɔ^{55} ŋə^{55} leo^{55}-ɹa^{33}*
yesterday 1SG cough-IN.EV
'I coughed yesterday.'

The verb 'cough' can appear with the suffixes /ta^{33}/ and /nə^{33}/ if the speaker of the sentence is not the one coughing. The context for Examples (34)–(35) is a situation where a heavy-smoking father had a seat he would always sit in at home. Next to the seat was a cloth he kept for his coughing fits which came once every few days. One day the man's daughter arrived home, and the mother gave her a call and asked how her father was. She said she just got back and her father was not there. Her mother said, "oh, then you don't know whether he has been coughing or not." The daughter said "no" but went over to see if the cloth was there. The mother had washed the cloth that morning but there was already blood on it. So, the daughter could use the sentence in Example (34) to tell her mother that her father had been coughing. The use of /nə^{33}/ here implies that the speaker is viewing evidence for his or her claim at the time of the speech event. She could also use /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̥^{33}/ if she was not viewing the evidence at the time of the speech act and wanted to emphasize that her knowledge was inferred. If the daughter was asked the same question a little later by a different relative, she would probably answer with the sentence in Example (35) but could also choose to use /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̥^{33}/. The use of /ta^{33}/ in Example (35) explains that the action has past, that the evidence is no longer currently in front of the speaker, and that the speaker has known about it for a period of time.

(34) *k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51} luu^{33}-ɣuu^{55}-nə^{33}*
3SG cough-PROG-CP.EV
'He was coughing.'

(35) *k^{h}u^{33}ɹi^{51} lea^{55}-ta^{33}*
3SG cough-AA.EV
'He was coughing.'/'He coughed.'

Regarding expressing that one believes he or she himself or herself will cough in the future, the egophoric /tɔ^{33}/ and the future, egophoric verbal stem cannot be used. Instead, a suffix (/le^{55}/) expressing a future action not rooted in the will, i.e. commonly used with second and third person agents, is used (Example (36)). The context for Example (36) is a man with a lung condition whose doctor had urged to go outside to walk more. The man responded by telling the doctor that he would cough if he did this.

(36) *ŋə^{55} luu^{33}-le^{55}*
1SG cough-FUT.EV
'I will cough.'

When expressing that one oneself was coughing hard at a certain time, or that another person was coughing hard at a certain time, the suffix /ɹa^{33}/ is used: Examples (37)–(38). The use of /ɹa^{33}/ in Examples (37) and (38) implies that the

speaker witnessed this action first-hand. The reason that /ta^{33}/ is not allowable in Example (38) is because of the intensifier ŋ̊ɔ^{33}ɹe^{55} 'very' being used. When extra details describing the manner or intensity, or even other factors, are given, it is commonly assumed that the speaker has intimate knowledge of the situation and thus the intimate knowledge marker /ɹa^{33}/ should be used.

(37) *tə^{33}ti^{55} ŋə^{55} ŋ̊ɔ^{33}ɹe^{55} leo^{55}-nda^{33}/ɹa^{33}*
that.time 1SG very cough-IN.EV
'I was coughing hard at that time.'

(38) *tə^{33}ti^{55} sɔ^{33}nɔ^{55} ŋ̊ɔ^{33}ɹe^{55} leo^{55}-nda^{33}/ɹa^{33}*
that.time Sönam very cough-IN.EV
'Sönam was coughing hard at that time.'

In the examples above, the non-volitional verb 'cough' cannot appear with any of the egophoric suffixes: /nɔ^{33}/, /ji^{33}/, /de^{33}/, /dɔ^{33}/, /diɔ^{33}/, /tɔ^{33}/, and the future, egophoric verbal stem. In addition, the suffixes /ta^{33}/, /nə^{33}/, and /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̊^{33}/ do not appear after the verb 'cough' with first person subjects. In addition, the verb 'cough,' when used by the speaker to express that he or she is coughing, uses the suffix /ji^{55}/.

4.3.2 Interrogative sentences

The pattern found with an observable, non-volitional verb is different than what is described in § 4.2.2. The language consultants could not think of a natural sentence for asking if a second or third person was coughing at the time of the speech act. I suspect this might be related to the fact that usually if someone is coughing in front of the speaker, the speaker does not need to ask what they are doing. The speaker knows. And, if the speaker asks about a third person, usually the speaker is asking about the state of whether they have a cough, not whether they are coughing at that given moment.

Given that coughing is a non-volitional action, no egophorics were found with this verb, whether in questions or in their responses. The distribution of evidentials here is very similar to that found in declarative sentences with the same verb.

In Example (39), the woman asks her friend if she was coughing. She uses the intimate knowledge evidential in the question. The friend responds in Example (40) with the verb and the intimate knowledge evidential. The woman can respond in the affirmative or the negative with the same intimate knowledge evidential used in the question, emphasizing that the action was not volitional and that the speaker has intimate knowledge of her experience.

(39) *tsʰe*^{51} *ɯ*^{55}*-li*^{55}*-ɹa*^{33}
2SG Q-cough-IN.EV
'Did you cough?'

(40) *leo*^{55}*-nda*^{33} / *ma*^{33}*-li*^{55}*-ɹa*^{33}
cough-IN.EV NEG-cough-IN.EV
'(I) coughed.'/'(I) did not cough.'

If another friend asked the woman if their mutual friend had coughed, this friend could use the sentence in Example (41) to ask this. Likewise, if the woman answered, she would most likely use the sentence in Example (42) to answer.

(41) *kɛ*^{55} *ɯ*^{55}*-li*^{55}*-ɹa*^{33}
3SG Q-cough-IN.EV
'Did she cough?'

(42) *lia*^{55}*-ta*^{33} / *ma*^{33}*-li*^{55}*-ɹa*^{33}
cough-AA.EV NEG-cough-IN.EV
'(She) coughed.'/'(She) did not cough.'

Both second person and third person, future tense questions and answers (Examples (43–44)) with the verb 'cough' use the future knowledge evidential. If the woman asked her friend if she would cough, or if another friend of the woman asked the woman if their mutual friend was going to cough, both questions would look like the sentence in Example (43). If the question were answered directly in the affirmative or negative, the answers would look like the sentences in Example (44).

(43) *tsʰe*^{51} / *kɛ*^{55} *ɯ*^{33}*-lɯ*^{55}*-lõ*^{33}
2SG 3SG Q-cough-EGO.FUT
'Will (you/he/she) cough?'

(44) *lɯ*^{33}*-le*^{55} / *lɯ*^{33}*-le*^{55}*-ma*^{33}
cough-EGO.FUT cough-EGO.FUT-NEG
'(I/he/she) will cough.'/'(I/he/she) will not cough.'

Given that the verb 'cough' is non-volitional, the fact that no egophoric markers appear in this section is not surprising. What is interesting to note is that with the exceptions of Example (41) and (42), the evidential markers used in this section all follow the pattern described by some as conjunct-disjunct, and by others as the rule of anticipation, or conversational presumption.

4.4 Internal process, volitional actions and non-volitional actions with volitional verb

The next set of examples are with a volitional verb which denotes an internal process.

4.4.1 Declarative sentences

The first set of examples in this section all use the verb for 'decide' /dʑe^{51}/. A local girl did an amazing job on her College Entrance Exam (Gaokao). Her score was high enough for both Beijing University and also Qinghua University. She applied at both and was accepted in both places. All her friends and family were curious where she would choose to go. Two of her friends from her local village walked over to see her. They asked her if she had decided. She answered by saying she had decided (Example (45)).

(45) *ŋɛ^{55} tʰə^{51} dʑe^{51}-nɔ^{33} / dʑe^{55}-ji^{33}*
1SG.ERG decision decide-PST.EGO1 decide-PST.EGO2
'I have decided.'

In this example both the /nɔ^{33}/ (looking at the action of deciding from the moment the decision was made) and the /ji^{33}/ (looking at the action of deciding from the moment of the speech event) are acceptable. The difference between them does not affect the general meaning the girl wishes to express.

My teachers tell me that use of the suffix /dɔ^{33}/, the present egophoric knowledge evidential, with the verb 'decide' /dʑe^{51}/ does not sound natural. Thus, in this situation, if the daughter were making her decision at a certain moment, she could not express this by adding /dɔ^{33}/ to this verb. My hypothesis is that the verb 'decide' in Thewo Tibetan is unlike the English verb for 'decide.' In English, this verb can refer to an ongoing action, but my hypothesis is that in Thewo Tibetan the ongoing action is thinking and the decision itself is so fast that there is no present progressive suffixation for it.

If when the two friends came, the girl wanted to express that she was still thinking and would make her decision that afternoon, then she would use Example (46). But if she said she would make her decision tomorrow, then she would use the sentence in Example (47). My teachers explained that the suffix /tɔ^{33}/ does not attach to the verb for 'decide' /dʑe^{51}/. I currently have no hypothesis for this.

(46) *ŋɛ^{55} sɯ^{33}ɻo^{55} tʰə^{51} tɕeo^{51}*
1SG.ERG afternoon decision decide.EGO.FUT
'I will decide this afternoon.'

(47) *ŋɛ*^{55} *tʰə*^{33}*ɻe*^{55} *tʰə*^{51} *tɕeo*^{51}
1SG.ERG tomorrow decision decide.EGO.FUT
'I will decide tomorrow.'

The girls went home after hearing the news from their friend (Example (45)), where she said she had already decided). On the way they bumped into other friends. These other friends asked if the girl had decided. The friends answered with the sentence in Example (48). The use of /ta^{33}/ here means the girls already had knowledge of their friend's decision. Alternatively, the friends could have answered using a reported speech evidential (Example (49)). The use of /nɔ^{33}/ here is not strange. The use of /nɔ^{33}/ with /sʰu̥ɪ^{33}ki^{55}/ indicates that the speaker heard from the person who performed the action and implies a direct quote of sorts.

(48) *kʰu*^{33}*ɻi*^{51} *tʰə*^{51} *dʐea*^{51}-*ta*^{33}
3SG.ERG decision decide-AA.EV
'She decided.'

(49) *kʰu*^{33}*ɻi*^{51} *tʰə*^{51} *dʐe*^{51}-*nɔ*^{33}-*sʰu̥ɪ*^{33}*ki*^{55}
3SG.ERG decision decide-PST.EGO1-RPT.EV
'She decided (quoting their friend).'

Later that day, the mother returns home. She starts rebuilding the fire to cook. While cleaning out the ash she finds the materials from Beijing University — but on the table there were still the materials from Qinghua. The father came in and asked if the daughter had decided. The mother answers with the sentence in Example (50).

(50) *kʰu*^{33}*ɻi*^{51} *tʰə*^{51} *dʐea*^{51}-*nə*^{33}
3SG.ERG decision decide-CP.EV
'She decided.'

The use of /nə^{33}/ here means that the mother had current, sensorial access to information which the action of the verb (indirectly) left behind.

The second set of examples relate to several students going to their teacher asking him to consider helping a classmate of theirs who was struggling. The teacher said he would consider this matter using the sentence in Example (51). The use of /tɔ^{33}/ here implies that he will give it thought very soon. Again, if he had used the sentence in Example (52), it does not necessarily mean he would not think about it in the near future, but rather the approximate time of the thinking is left unspecified.

(51) *ŋɛ*^{55} *to*^{33}*nda*^{55} *nde*^{55} *so*^{33}*lo*^{55} *tɔ̃ə*^{55}
1SG.ERG matter this think consider.EGO.FUT
'I will consider this matter.'

(52) *ŋɛ*^{55} *to*^{33}*nda*^{55} *nde*^{55} *so*^{33}*lo*^{55} *dɔ*^{55}*-tɔ*^{33}
1SG.ERG matter this think consider-IM.FUT.EGO
'I will consider this matter.'

After the students left, several other friends of the distressed student came to ask the teacher the same question. They bumped into the first batch of students who told them that the teacher was considering the matter: Example (53). Had they not bumped into their classmates, and seen the teacher instead, the teacher would likely have told them the sentence in Example (54).

(53) *kʰu*^{33}*ɹi*^{51} *to*^{33}*nda*^{55} *nde*^{55} *so*^{33}*lo*^{55} *tɯ*^{33}*-ŋgɯ*^{55}*-nə*^{33}
3SG.ERG matter this think consider-PROG-CP.EV
'He is considering this matter.'

(54) *ŋɛ*^{55} *to*^{33}*nda*^{55} *nde*^{55} *so*^{33}*lo*^{55} *tɯ*^{33}*-ŋgɯ*^{55}*-dɔ*^{33}
1SG.ERG matter this think consider-PROG-PRS.EGO1
'I am considering this matter.'

After thinking about the matter, the teacher contacted the students. To express his answer, he used the sentence in Example (55) (emphasizing the time of the speech act over and above the time when he had considered the matter). If he had wanted to emphasize the time when he had considered rather than the time of the speech act, he would have used the sentence in Example (56). To express that one was considering something in the past, emphasizing an ongoing past action, the sentence in Example (57) shows how this is communicated in Thewo Tibetan. The suffix /ɹa^{33}/ cannot be used in this situation with a first person thinker because the verb is volitional (and it is hard to non-volitionally consider a problem). In addition, /ɹa^{33}/ cannot be used with a second or third person thinker because the action being depicted is an internal action.

(55) *ŋɛ*^{55} *to*^{33}*nda*^{55} *nde*^{55} *so*^{33}*lo*^{55} *dɔa*^{55}*-ji*^{33}
1SG.ERG matter this think consider-PST.EGO2
'I considered this matter.'

(56) *ŋɛ*^{55} *to*^{33}*nda*^{55} *nde*^{55} *so*^{33}*lo*^{55} *dɔ*^{55}*-nɔ*^{33}
1SG.ERG matter this think consider-PST.EGO1
'I considered this matter.'

(57) *ŋɛ*^{55} *to*^{33}*nda*^{55} *nde*^{55} *pa*^{55}*pa*^{33} *so*^{33}*lo*^{55} *tɯ*^{33}*-ŋgɯ*^{55}*-de*^{33}
1SG.ERG matter this sometimes think consider-PROG-PST.PROG.EGO
'I was sometimes thinking about this matter.'

After the student got word from the teacher, he told his classmates that the teacher had considered their request. He started with the sentence in Example (58). However, if his classmates had not been nearby and he had relayed the information another few minutes or so later (maybe more or less depending on the speaker and how they interpret the situation) it is more likely he would have used /ta^{33}/: Example (59).

(58) *kʰu^{33}ɻi^{51} to^{33}nda^{55} nde^{55} so^{33}lo^{55} dɔ^{55}-nə^{33}*
3SG.ERG matter this think consider-CP.EV
'He considered this matter.'

(59) *kʰu^{33}ɻi^{51} to^{33}nda^{55} nde^{55} so^{33}lo^{55} dɔ^{55}-ta^{33}*
3SG.ERG matter this think consider-AA.EV
'He considered this matter.'

In summary, here again egophoric suffixes are used with volitional verbs whose action is done by a volitional first person actor. I did not find an example of a first person accidentally or non-volitionally doing an internal action expressed by a volitional verb. It could be that such an example does not exist. It could also be that I have merely not found one yet.

4.4.2 Interogative sentences

The pattern observed in interrogative sentences with the verb for 'consider' is almost identical with the pattern found with the verb for 'sell.' As such, this section will focus on the one difference which exists. The one difference from the data in § 4.2.2 is that when asking a second person about a future action, the unmarked egophoric future form is used both in the question, and in the answer. Example (60) shows the students asking the teacher whether he would consider this matter. Example (61) shows the teacher's answer.

(60) *tsʰe^{55} to^{33}nda^{55} nde^{55} so^{33}lo^{55} ɯ^{55}-tõə^{33}*
2SG matter this think Q-consider.EGO.FUT
'Will you think about this matter?'

(61) *so^{33}lo^{55} tõə^{33}*
think consider.EGO.FUT
'(I) will think (about this matter).'

It is yet unknown why the question here is asked without the future knowledge egophoric marker when this marker is used for the verb 'sell' (Example (26)). However, this is another example of an egophoric marker being restricted to knowledge rooted in the will.

4.5 Internal process, non-volitional verbs

The next set of examples use verbs which denote internal, non-volitional processes.

4.5.1 Declarative sentences

Internal processes and states where the speaker is the doer or experiencer of a past event only use the suffix /ɹa^{33}/, and none of the egophoric suffixes appear. This seems to be because of the grammatical function of /ɹa^{33}/ and the nature of internal processes and states. The suffix /ɹa^{33}/ expresses that the speaker has intimate knowledge through observation of a specific action or state. If the action or state is one that happens inside of you (thinking, hunger, etc.) then only the speaker can observe it, and therefore only the speaker has intimate knowledge of it. Let us consider several examples.

One day Dorje fell ill. The illness was severe enough that his wife wanted him to see a doctor. They decided to call their son and ask him to come and take his father to the hospital. There was a problem, however, as heavy rainfall had caused flooding and washed out the fastest route between where their son lived in Mdzod.dge and where they lived in Gdong.sne Village of Tiebu Township. This flooding necessitated drivers taking National Route 345 which is longer. His wife called their son who was in Mdzod.dge and asked him to come and pick up his father and bring him to see a doctor. The son said he would come right away and said he would be there in about four hours. After getting off the phone, the husband asked the wife if their son knew about the road through Re'er (the fastest route) being closed due to flooding. She said the sentence in Example (62) in response. Her reason for using /nə^{33}/ was based on the fact that her son said it would take four hours, the amount of time necessary to go from Mdzod.dge to Gdong.sne Village via National Route 345 — suggesting that the son likely had thought of that given his reference to four hours rather than the shorter time (two hours) which it would have taken to come through Re'er. Later when a neighbor asked the wife if her son was coming and if the son knew about the road through Re'er being washed out, she answered with the sentence in Example (63). This reflects that she knew (and had known for at least a period of time) that her son knew about the road situation.

(62) *kʰu^{33}ɹi^{51} to^{33}nda^{55} te^{55} sʰẽ^{55} xʰa^{55}-nə^{33}*
3SG.ERG matter this heart think-CP.EV
'He thought of this matter.'

(63) *kʰu³³ɹi⁵¹ to³³nda⁵⁵ te⁵⁵ sʰẽ⁵⁵ xʰa⁵⁵-ta³³*
3SG.ERG matter this heart think-AA.EV
'He thought of this matter.'

(64) *ŋɛ⁵⁵ to³³nda⁵⁵ te⁵⁵ sʰẽ⁵⁵ xʰa⁵⁵-ɹa³³*
1SG.ERG matter this heart think-IN.EV
'I thought of this matter.'

If the father and mother had mentioned to the son directly that the road through Re'er had been washed out, the son might have answered with the sentence in Example (64). The combination here of /xʰa⁵⁵/ with /ɹa³³/ almost certainly means that the person who 'thought' of this matter is the speaker himself or herself. Thus, even with little linguistic context and a dropped pronoun, a listener could probably identify who did the thinking (the speaker). It indicates that the speaker did not volitionally consider the problem, but rather had a thought pop into her or his mind.

The next verb we will look at is the verb for expressing 'pain'. This verb expresses an internal state. A father comes home one day and sees his child with her head in her hands. He asks her what is wrong. She answers with the sentence in Example (65). The combination of the first person subject, stative verb for 'hurt' and the suffix /ji⁵⁵/ indicates that the speaker's head hurts at the moment of the speech event. If the suffix were changed to /ɹa³³/ or /nda⁵⁵/the meaning changes to the speaker's head hurting at some point in the past. This is indeed what the girl told the mother later in the day when her mother asked her if she had been okay earlier in the day (Example (66)).

If the speaker, knowing how loud music can cause her head to ache, wants to express that she will get a headache as her friends pull her into KTV, then she can say the sentence found in Example (67).

(65) *ŋɯ⁵⁵ ŋgo⁵⁵ kʰu³³-ji⁵⁵*
1SG.GEN head hurt-SR.EV
'My head hurts.'

(66) *ŋɯ⁵⁵ ŋgo⁵⁵ kʰuə⁵⁵-ɹa³³/nda³³*
1SG.GEN head hurt-IN.EV
'My head hurt.'

(67) *ŋɯ⁵⁵ ŋgo⁵⁵ kʰu³³-le⁵⁵*
1SG.GEN head hurt-FUT.EV
'My head will hurt.'

When the brother comes home from the fields, he asks why his sister was not helping. His mother explains that her head hurt using the sentence in Example (68). The use of /ta³³/ does not necessarily mean that her headache is gone. But it does

mean that the knowledge of the headache was acquired sometime in the past. If the [kʰuɯ] was used instead of [ku^{55}], then the speaker would be signifying that this was a past situation and that the person's head is no longer hurting or likely no longer hurting (see Example (69)). The morphology found in [kʰuɯ] is reserved for non-telic verbs and typically refers to the change of state — i.e. [kʰuɯ] emphasizes going from a state of no pain to having pain. With the suffix /ta^{33}/ added, in English equivalent might be something to the effect of: 'her head started to hurt.' If the speaker had evidence at the moment of the speech event of this pain, then they would likely use the sentence in Example (70).

(68) *kʰu^{33}ɹi^{51} ŋgo^{55} kʰu^{55}-ta^{33}*
3SG.GEN head hurt-AA.EV
'Her head hurt/s.'

(69) *kʰu^{33}ɹi^{51} ŋgo^{55} kʰuɯ^{55}-ta^{33}*
3SG.GEN head hurt-AA.EV
'Her head hurt.'

(70) *kʰu^{33}ɹi^{51} ŋgo^{55} kʰu^{55}-nə^{33}*
3SG.GEN head hurt-CP.EV
'Her head hurts.'

Like with observable, non-volitional actions, I could not find or think of any examples where a first person experiencer of pain could use the egophoric suffixes /nɔ^{33}/, /ji^{33}/, /de^{33}/, /dɔ^{33}/, /diɔ^{33}/, /tɔ^{33}/, and the future, egophoric verbal stem. In addition, I could not find or think of any examples where a first person experiencer of pain could use the suffixes /ta^{33}/, /nə^{33}/, or /jõ^{55}tsʰɯ̥^{33}/. However, unlike observable, non-volitional verbs, the suffixes /ta^{33}/, /nə^{33}/, and /jõ^{55}tsʰɯ̥^{33}/ are not frequently used with first person subjects. Instead, the suffix /ɹa^{33}/ is often used in these settings when talking about past events given that it communicates the speaker's intimate knowledge about the action in question. In this case, intimate knowledge of an internal process is often likely restricted to the person in which this action/state takes place. Here too, suffixes which denote an intentional action are restricted to volitional verbs.

4.5.2 Interogative sentences

The pattern observed in interrogative sentences with the verb for 'hurt' is almost identical with what is found with the verb for 'cough'. As such, this section will focus on the one difference which exists: we have examples for present, second and third person questions for the verb 'hurt', whereas we do not have these examples for the verb 'cough'. For the verb 'hurt', both the question for a second person and that for a third person use the stative realis knowledge evidential. In

Example (71), we see both the second and third person question for whether or not someone's head hurts at the time of the speech act. The second person form found in Example (71) is the question the father asked his daughter to find out if her head hurt. If the father had seen his daughter holding her head but asked her mother instead, he could have used the third person form found in Example (71) to ask this question. The daughter's answer is recorded in Example (65) above.

(71) *ts^{h}u^{33} / kɛ^{55}-x^{h}u^{55} ŋgo^{55} u^{55}-k^{h}u^{33}-ji^{55}*
2.GEN 3-GEN think Q-hurt-SR.EV
'Does your/her head hurt?'

The use the stative realis knowledge evidential with the second person question in Example (71), and in the answer in Example (65), show the questioner's assumption that the speaker cannot control the feeling of pain, and the listener's affirmation that they cannot control the pain. These examples also form a pair where the distribution of the suffix /ji/ is found in a second person question (Example (71)) and in the first person answer (Example (65)).

4.6 Interogative content questions

Content questions asked to a second person about past actions take the egophoric marker which fits the situation being asked about. In the sentence found in Example (72), one friend asks another what they were doing the day before. Because the question is asking about a past ongoing action, the friend asking the question chose to use the past progressive egophoric evidential /de^{33}/. The listener responded with the sentence in Example (73). The listener certainly could have answered using a different egophoric marker, but it would not have been a direct answer to the original question. Instead, they answer the question directly and use the egophoric marker /de^{33}/.

(72) *ts^{h}e^{55} k^{h}ə^{33}tsɔ^{55} kɔ^{55} jə^{33}-ɣu^{55}-de^{33}*
2SG yesterday what do-PROG-PST.PROG.EGO
'What were you doing yesterday?'

(73) *k^{h}ə^{33}tsɔ^{55} ŋə^{55} ma^{33}xe^{55}-de^{33}*
yesterday 1SG rest-PST.PROG.EGO
'I was resting yesterday.'

Questions about past actions to a third person usually use the /ra^{33}/, /ta^{33}/, or /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̥^{33}/ evidential markers. The suffix /nə^{33}/ implies a current knowledge on the part of the person who observed the action and is thus not frequently used, as its use would be limited to times when the questioner assumes the listener has

current access to evidence of a past action. In Examples (74)–(76), we see three different ways to ask the question: "What did he eat yesterday?". In Example (74), the speaker's choice of /jõ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̟^{33}/ suggests they believe the listener can infer what the third person ate the day before. But in Example (75), the use of /ɹa^{33}/ suggests that the speaker believes the listener has intimate knowledge of the event. The use of /ta^{33}/ in Example (76) suggests the speaker is assuming that the listener's knowledge about this topic has already been acquired, as opposed to being acquired at the moment of the speech act, etc.

(74) *kɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}ə^{33}tsɔ^{55} kɔ^{55} se^{33}-jɔ^{55}ts^{h}ɯ̟^{33}*
3SG-ERG yesterday what eat-INFR.EV
'What did he eat yesterday?'

(75) *kɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}ə^{33}tsɔ^{55} kɔ^{55} seɔ^{55}-ɹa^{33}*
3SG-ERG yesterday what eat-IN.EV
'What did he eat yesterday?'

(76) *kɛ^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{55} k^{h}ə^{33}tsɔ^{55} kɔ^{55} sea^{55}-ta^{33}*
3SG-ERG yesterday what eat-AA.EV
'What did he eat yesterday?'

Questions about ongoing second person actions also use egophoric markers. A friend called another friend and asked what he was doing. The friend answered saying that he was eating. The friend making the call then responded by asking what his friend was eating (Example (77)). The friend responded with the sentence in Example (78).

(77) *kɔ^{55} sə^{33}-ɯ^{55}-dɔ^{33}*
what eating-PROG-PRS.EGO1
'What are you eating?'

(78) *x^{h}ə^{33}pa^{55} ɹo^{33} ŋo^{33}ma^{55}pa^{33} x^{h}o^{55}də^{33} tɕ^{h}ə^{55}ji^{33} sɔ^{33}*
meat.dishes CONJ vegetables.dishes come together eat.IMP
'Meat dishes and vegetable dishes. Come and let's eat together.'

Questions about ongoing third person actions or states often use the egophoric suffix /nə^{33}/. This is not surprising considering that declarative sentences talking about a third person action use /nə^{33}/ or a combination of /nə^{33}/ and the PROG marker for telic verbs. The question found in Example (79) and the answer found in Example (80) happen in the context of a man asking his friend what his friend and the friend's sister were doing for work. The friend had just told the man that his sister was a student. The man follows up by asking what his friend's sister is hoping to do in the future (Example (79)). The friend answers saying she wants to become a doctor (Example (80)). The use of current perception knowledge

evidential /nə^{33}/ in the question suggests that the speaker is considering the ongoing nature of one's hopes or aspirations. The use of the already acquired knowledge evidential /ta^{33}/ in the response suggests that the friend is answering about something which he has known about for a while.

(79) *nə^{55} kʰo^{55} ndi^{33} sʰõa^{55} kɔ^{55} jɔ^{33} sɔ^{55}-nə^{33}*
now 3SG.REFL this in.the.future what do.FUT think-CP.EV
'What does she herself want to do in the future?'

(80) *kʰo^{55} sʰõa^{55} mɛ^{33}mbə^{55} tɕɔ^{55} sɔ^{55}-ta^{33}*
3.REFL in.the.future doctor do.FUT think-AA.EV
'She wants to be a doctor in the future.'

Questions asked to a second person about the future also take egophoric markers. In Example (81), a man asks his friend where his friend is going. The friend responds by saying he is going to the Diebu County seat (Example (82)).

(81) *tsʰe^{55} ko^{55} ndzɔ^{33}*
2SG where go.EGO.FUT
'Where will you go?'

(82) *ŋə^{55} wa^{33}ndo^{55}kʰa^{33} ndzɔ^{33}*
1SG Diebu go.EGO.FUT
'I will go to Diebu.'

5. Comparison with other Tibetan varieties and beyond

Thewo Tibetan egophorics and evidentials have many similarities with those found in other Tibetan varieties, as well as other non-Tibetan languages. One of the similarities is the appearance of evidential markers with first person agents who did not volitionally do the action: see Sun (1993; 2018), Haller (2000), Tournadre & Sangda Dorje (2003), and Gawne (2017) etc. for examples of this. However, this is shared broadly by languages with evidential systems and can be seen in languages in Nepal (Hargreaves 2005), languages in Papua New Guinea (San Roque & Loughnane 2012), languages in the Caucasus (Forker 2018), and in Cariban languages (Carlin 2018). Another similarity is how questions to a second person tend to use the egophoric marker, or the evidential marker the questioner expects the second person to respond with. Like with Thewo Tibetan, however, it is not always a strict rule and speakers are free to choose what they deem as an appropriate egophoric or evidential marker: see Garrett & Bateman (2007) for a discussion of this in relation to Tibetan. This can also be seen in the Rgyalrongic language Japhug (Jacques 2019).

Despite the similarities, there remain many differences. One of the differences which is relevant to the current discussion is the idea that the usage of egophoric markers can fall into two categories (Gawne 2017: 65): Tournadre (2008) uses the terms "broad" and "narrow" to categorize this difference while Garrett (2001) uses "strong" and "weak" for this phenomenon. Tournadre's (2008) "broad" and Garrett's (2001) "strong" refer to instances when the egophoric marker can appear in a sentence where the first person is not the subject. None of the Thewo Tibetan egophoric markers have been observed in such a situation and thus would be analyzed as "narrow" or "weak" egophoric markers. The flexibility of some egophoric markers to be used with both first person and also non-first person subjects, and the ability of evidential markers to appear with both first person and other person subjects (depending on the volitionality of the action), strongly suggests that these markers are not marking person, but are rather marking types of knowledge. This argument seems to be furthered by the fact that some languages, like the Rgyalrongic Japhug, have both egophoric markers and person indexation (Jacques 2019).

6. Do Thewo Tibetan's egophoric markers belong to the category of evidentiality?

In the data presented above, there is a clear distinction between the suffixes /nɔ^{33}/, /ji^{33}/, /de^{33}/, /dɔ^{33}/, /diɔ^{33}/, /tɔ^{33}/, the future, egophoric verbal stem and the suffixes /ta^{33}/, /nə^{33}/, /ɹa^{33}/, /jõ^{55}tsʰɯ̥^{33}/, /ji^{55}/, and /le^{55}/. Although they occupy the same syntactic position, their semantic meaning and pragmatic functions differ. The former only appear when the action in question is expressed as originating in the will. The latter only appear when the speaker communicates that the action in question is observed. This category of observation can further be broken down into two situations:

1. Observing oneself do an action (non-volitional) or feel a state (non-volitional); and
2. Observing a second or third person(s) do an action or appear to belong to a certain state.

Both the egophoric markers and the evidential system show sensitivity to:

1. Time. Distinctions between the evidential markers and distinctions between the egophoric markers include time differences. Also note the similarity between the use of /nɔ^{33}/ and /ji^{33}/ on the one hand, and /ta^{33}/ and /nə^{33}/ on the other. The egophoric markers /nɔ^{33}/ and /ji^{33}/ distinguish between

whether the speaker is emphasizing the time of the speech act or the time of the action of the verb, while the evidential suffixes /ta^{33}/, /nə^{33}/ emphasize whether the speaker has current access to the evidence the action of the verb left behind (in the case of telic verbs) or the speaker no longer has current access to this evidence. Additionally, both /ta^{33}/ and /nə^{33}/ can be used to speak of a previous time when the knowledge was current, i.e. the speaker had current access to the results of the action of the verb (again in the case of telic verbs) or when the knowledge had already been assimilated (in the case of /ta^{33}/).

2. Volition and observation. As is stated above, the main difference between the egophoric and evidential markers is that the former are used to mark that the action originated in the will of the speaker while the latter are used to note that the speaker observed the action in question.
3. Observability. Non-volitional endopathic states previously felt by a first person speaker are marked with /ɹa^{33}/ instead of /ta^{33}/ or /nə^{33}/.
4. Verbal semantics. This relates to time (telic vs. non-telic verbs), volition (volitional vs. non-volitional verbs), and observability (verbs which denote observable processes vs. non-observable processes). But it is likely bigger than any one of these single components because it can include multiple ones at the same time, i.e. thinking as a non-telic, non-observable, durative, volitional act.

Given these clear similarities and differences, is it best to analyze the egophoric markers as forming their own independent grammatical category? Or are they best analyzed as a category within the evidential system? To answer this question, I return to the definitions and analyses I have already summarized.

7. Discussion

If we apply Aikhenvald's (2004; 2015; 2018; 2021) and DeLancey's (2018) arguments to the Thewo Tibetan grammatical markers in question, we see a close match. Thewo Tibetan's egophoric suffixes are restricted to use with the first person and thus have a distinct semantic meaning from the evidential suffixes which can appear with first, second, and third person. In Thewo Tibetan, there are no examples which would suggest that the egophoric and evidential suffixes do not carry differences in semantic meaning.

When looking at the eight additional differences which Aikhenvald (2021) identifies between egophoric markers and evidential markers, the following correspondences and discrepancies exist in Thewo Tibetan:

Table 2. Aikhenvald's assertions (2021) vs. the situation in Thewo Tibetan

Aikhenvald's assertion	The Thewo Tibetan situation
Evidentials can have just a clause within its scope, rather than the whole sentence; whereas egophoric markers cannot (Aikhenvald 2021: 13).	This is not strictly true in Thewo Tibetan. The reason for this is that the reported knowledge evidential marker is also a verb + evidential structure. It can be added after a verb + egophoric or a verb + evidential structure. See Example (83), where /nɔ^{33}/ belongs to the clause which has 'ate' as its predicate.
Evidential scope can go beyond a sentence, whereas egophoric scope has not been reported to do so (Aikhenvald 2021: 15).	In Thewo Tibetan, neither evidentials nor egophoric markers have been observed having their meanings extend beyond the sentence in which they are found.
Evidentials can be linked to NPs, whereas egophoric markers always have the whole sentence within their scope (Aikhenvald 2021: 18).	Neither evidentials nor egophoric markers can be linked to NPs in Thewo Tibetan.
Evidential markers can allow for double marking of information source, whereas egophoric markers have not been reported to do this (Aikhenvald 2021: 19).	This is possible in Thewo Tibetan if one of the markers is the reported knowledge evidential; however, the irony here is that if egophorics are considered evidential in nature, then this cannot act as criteria for the evidential-egophoric contrast. In addition, Example (83) shows that this is true for egophorics too.
Evidentials can have independent time reference, whereas egophoric markers cannot (Aikhenvald 2021: 20).	In Thewo Tibetan, the egophoric markers and evidential markers are capable of expressing various times and states. If, as is mentioned above, the reported knowledge evidential is analyzed as both an evidential and also a verb, then both evidentials and egophoric markers are capable of having their own independent time reference: see Examples (84) and (85).
Evidentials can be negated independently of the evidential. Egophoric markers cannot be. (Aikhenvald 2021: 21).	In Thewo Tibetan, neither the egophoric marker nor the evidential marker can be negated directly.
Evidentials can be questioned separately from the predicate, whereas egophoric markers cannot be. (Aikhenvald 2021: 21–22).	Using the criteria and examples that Aikhenvald provides to guide the analysis of Thewo Tibetan, it is perfectly possible for evidentials and egophorics to be questioned separately from the predicate. See Example (22).
Evidentials are intimately connected with cultural practices and attitudes in a way that egophoric markers are not (Aikhenvald 2021: 23).	Both evidential markers and egophoric markers are inseparably connected to the way in which the Thewo Tibetan people see the world. This is reflected in the common semantic-pragmatic motivations which underly their usage.

(83) *ʔa^{33}dza^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} se^{55}-nɔ^{33}-s^{h}u̥^{33}ki^{55}*
father-ERG ate-PST.EGO1-RPT.EV
'Father ate.'/'Father said that he himself had eaten.'

(84) *ʔa^{33}dza^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} t^{h}ə^{33}ɻe^{55} le^{33}kə^{55} leo^{55}-s^{h}u̥^{33}ki^{55}*
father-ERG tomorrow work work-RPT.EV
'Father said he would work tomorrow.'/'Father will work tomorrow.'

(85) *ʔa^{33}dza^{55}-x^{h}ɯ^{33} t^{h}ə^{33}ɻe^{55} sə^{33}mə^{55} nde^{55} sə^{33}lɛ̃^{55}-s^{h}u̥^{33}ki^{55}*
father-ERG tomorrow food this eat.FUTK-RPT.EV
'It has been said that father will eat this food tomorrow.'

But if we apply Tournadre (2008), Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), and Gawne & Hill's (2017) arguments to Thewo Tibetan, we see that the egophoric markings and evidential markings share the same semantic motivations, i.e. marking the type of knowledge being expressed (albeit different types of knowledge). The argumentation put forward by Tournadre, LaPolla, Gawne, and Hill allows for differences between egophoric markers and non-egophoric evidential markers. They are, after all, communicating different types of knowledge.

In the debate of whether or not egophoricity is its own independent grammatical category, no one argues that egophoric markers and evidential markers are exactly the same (although there is a very broad range of terms used to describe them (Gawne 2017: 61)). There is a clear distinction between them as is exemplified by their distribution. But the fact that this difference exists does not necessarily mean that they belong to different grammatical categories. Take for example DeLancey's claim (2018: 582) that the evidential category can be bifurcated into "direct" and "indirect" evidentials. Does this difference necessarily mean that "direct" and "indirect" each constitute their own independent grammatical category? It is likely that no one would argue for this because researchers recognize the shared semantic motivations which join them into the same category.

Both arguments can be applied to Thewo Tibetan and both can adequately explain the differences between the egophoric markers and the evidential markers. But by separating egophorcity into an independent grammatical category in Thewo Tibetan, the analysis would deemphasize the common semantic and pragmatic motivations shared between these two types of grammatical markers. But it would emphasize the differences between these two types of markers. In addition, it would add another independent grammatical category. This obscures the unity found between Thewo Tibetan's egophoric and evidential markers.

Tournadre (2008), Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), and Gawne & Hill's (2017) arguments, however, also seem to adequately explain the commonalities between Thewo Tibetan's egophoric and evidential suffixes. Given that Tournadre, LaPolla, Gawne, and Hill also see a different semantic meaning between these two different types of markers, there is no difficulty in using their analysis to explain why Thewo Tibetan's egophoric markers are different than their evidential counterparts. This allows for a more streamlined explanation which highlights the common semantic and pragmatic motivations behind these two different types of markers.

8. Conclusion

The results of this study show that Aikhenvald (2004; 2015; 2018; 2021) and DeLancey's (2018) arguments for egophoricity as an independent grammatical category seem based on the fact that egophoric (or conjunct-disjunct) suffixes and evidential suffixes are used to communicate different semantic meanings. Based on these different semantic meanings, they postulate two unique grammatical categories. In contrast, Tournadre (2008), Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), and Gawne & Hill (2017) see a unity in semantic and pragmatic motivations which underly the use of egophoric suffixes and evidential suffixes. Based upon these common semantic-pragmatic motivations, they argue that an evidential analysis of egophoric suffixes provides a simpler and more accurate description.

Finally, looking at Thewo Tibetan, based upon the data and analysis in §4, and also studying how the nomenclature developed and is used for similar phenomena in other languages, I conclude that it is best to view Thewo Tibetan's egophoric markers as part of the evidential system. There are several reasons for this. First, both the egophoric and evidential categories are sensitive to categories like time, person, volition, observation, and verbal semantics, suggesting there are similar semantic-cognitive factors in their use. Second, following a common practice in scientific studies, if two hypotheses offer equally comprehensive explanations for a particular phenomenon, there is typically a preference for the simpler of the two. In this case, including egophorics as part of the evidential system allows us to postulate only one independent grammatical category rather than two. This simplifies the analysis. However, transcending both of these reasons to a degree, I analyze Thewo Tibetan egophorics as belonging to evidentiality because that is the way they present themselves: as one system which categorizes the knowledge the speaker asserts of particular actions, states, etc.

List of abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
AA	already acquired knowledge
ALL	allative
CONJ	conjunction
COP	copula
CP	current perception knowledge
EGO	egophoric
EGO1	egophoric (from the perspective of the time of the action)
EGO2	egophoric (from the perspective of the time of the speech act)
ERG	ergative
EV	evidential
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
IM	immediate
IMP	imperative
IN	intimate knowledge
INFR	inferential
OT	Old Tibetan
PROG	progressive aspect
PRS	present
PST	past
Q	question particle
RECIP	recipient
REFL	reflexive
RPT	reported knowledge
SAP	speech act participant
SG	singular
SR	stative realis knowledge

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2015. Evidentials: Their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2). 239–277.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.). 2018. *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2021. *The web of knowledge: Evidentiality at the cross-roads*. Leiden: Brill.

Bendix, Edward H. 1974. Indo-Aryan and Tibeto-Burman contact as seen through Nepali and Newari verb tenses. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* (3)1. 42–59.

Carlin, Eithne B. 2018. Evidentiality and the Cariban languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 315–332. New York: Oxford University Press.

Caughley, Ross Charles. 1982. *The syntax and morphology of the verb in Chepang*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Creissels, Denis. 2008. Remarks on so-called "conjunct/disjunct" systems. (Paper presented at the Syntax of the World's Languages III, Berlin, 25–28 September 2008.)

DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In Chafe, Wallace L. & Nicholas, Johanna (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, 203–213. Norwood: Ablex.

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

DeLancey, Scott. 1992. The historical status of the conjunct/disjunct pattern in Tibeto-Burman. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 25(1). 39–62.

DeLancey, Scott. 2018. Evidentiality in Tibetic. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 580–594. New York: Oxford University Press.

Faller, Martina T. 2002. *Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Stanford: Stanford University. (Doctoral dissertation.)

Floyd, Simeon & Norcliffe, Elisabeth & San Roque, Lila (eds.). 2018. *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Forker, Diana. 2018. Evidentiality in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 490–509. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garrett, Edward John. 2001. *Evidentiality and assertion in Tibetan*. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles. (Doctoral dissertation).

Garrett, Edward & Bateman, Leah. 2007. Symbiosis between documentary linguistics and linguistic pragmatics. In Austin, Peter K. & Bond, Oliver & Nathan, David (eds.), *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory*, 83–93. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Gawne, Lauren. 2017. Egophoric evidentiality in Bodish languages. In Gawne, Lauren & Hill, Nathan W. (eds.), *Evidential systems in Tibetan languages*, 61–94. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Gawne, Lauren & Hill, Nathan W. (eds.). 2017. *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hale, Austin. 1971. Person markers: Conjunct and disjunct forms (Topics in Newari Grammar I). 1–12. (Manuscript.)

Hale, Austin. 1980. Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari. In Wurm, S.A. (ed.), *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics*, vol. 7, 95–106. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Haller, Felix. 2000. Verbal categories of Shigatse Tibetan and Themchen Tibetan. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23(2). 175–191.

Hargreaves, David. 2005. Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar. *Himalayan Linguistics* 5. 1–48.

Hill, Nathan W. 2020. Simeon Floyd, Elisabeth Norcliffe, and Lila San Roque: Egophoricity. *Linguistic Typology* 24(1). 201–208.

Hyslop, Gwendolyn. 2018. Evidentiality in Bodic languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 595–609. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2019. Egophoric marking and person indexation in Japhug. *Language and Linguistics* 20(4). 515–534.

Lin, You-Jing. 2014. Thebo. In Sun, Jackson T.-S. (ed.), *Phonological profiles of little-studied Tibetic varieties*, 215–267. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.

Loughnane, Robyn. 2009. *A grammar of Oksapmin*. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne. (Doctoral dissertation.)

Oswalt, Robert L. 1986. The evidential system of Kashaya. In Chafe, L. Wallace & Nichols, Johanna (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, 29–45. Norwood: Ablex Publication Cooperation.

Post, Mark W. 2013. Person-sensitive TAME marking in Galo: Historical origins and functional motivation. In Thornes, Tim & Andvik, Erik & Hyslop, Gwendolyn & Jansen, Joana (eds.), *Functional-historical approaches to explanation: In honor of Scott Delancey*, 107–130. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Powell, Abe. 2016. Diebu Zangzu de yuyan renzhi he yuyan baohu. In Luo, Ji & Yu, Jinzhi (eds.), *Zhongguo shaoshu minzu yuyan baohu diaocha yanjiu*, 127–140. Beijing: Science Press.

Powell, Abe. 2022a. 185 Thewo Tibetan lexical items from 37 Thewo villages. (Data set.) (https://zenodo.org/records/6376466) (Accessed 2025-09-08.)

Powell, Abe. 2022b. Mapping the spatial relationship between sub-basins and language variation in Thewo Tibetan. *Himalayan Linguistics* 21(1). 40–63.

Powell, Abe. 2024. Thewo Tibetan's /ta^{33}/ and /nə^{33}/: A narrative exploration of how temporal space and verbal semantics interact with evidentiality. *Language and Linguistics* 25(4). 673–709.

Renzeng Wangmu. 2010. On syllable assimilation of Diebu Tibetan language and its linkage effects — On similar phonological changes of surrounding dialects. *Xibei Minzu Daxue Xuebao (Zhexue Shehui Kexue Ban)* 2010(6). 83–89.

Renzeng Wangmu. 2013. *Diebu Zangyu yanjiu*. Beijing: China Minzu University Press.

Sandman, Erika & Grzech, Karolina. 2022. Egophoricity and evidentiality: Different categories, similar discourse functions. Insights on conversational data from the Tibetan Plateau and the Amazonian Foothills. *Interactional Linguistics* 2(1). 79–109.

Sangsrgyas Tshering. 2020. The voicing of unvoiced obstruents in Thebo Tibetan. *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 49(1). 1–20.

Sangsrgyas Tshering. 2023. Egophoricity and evidentiality in Thebo Tibetan. *Himalayan Linguistics* 22(3). 34–56.

San Roque, Lila & Loughnane, Robyn. 2012. The New Guinea Highlands evidentiality area. *Linguistic Typology* 16(1). 111–167.

Sun, Jackson T.-S. 1993. Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 63(4). 945–1001.

Sun, Jackson T.-S. 2018. Evidentials and person. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 47–64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1991. The rhetorical use of the Tibetan ergative. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 14(1). 93–107.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2008. Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct'/'disjunct' in Tibetan. In Huber, Brigitte & Volkart, Marianne & Widmer, Paul (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65 Geburtstag*, vol. 1, 281–308. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.

Tournadre, Nicolas & LaPolla, Randy J. 2014. Towards a new approach to evidentiality: Issues and directions for research. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37(2). 240–263.

Tournadre, Nicolas & Sangda Dorje. 2003. *Manual of standard Tibetan: Language and civilization*. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications.

Widmer, Manuel. 2020. Same same but different: On the relationship between egophoricity and evidentiality. In Bergqvist, Henrik & Kittilä, Seppo (eds.), *Evidentiality, egophoricity, and engagement*, 263–287. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Yang, Daxue & Sangsrgyas Tshering & Gates, Jesse P. 2024. A voicing rule for non-continuant obstruents in Thebo Tibetan. *Language and Linguistics* 25(4). 710–746.

Yukawa, Yasutoshi. 1966. The meaning of Tibetan duu. *Gengo Kenkyu* 49. 77–84.

Address for correspondence

Abe Powell
School of Foreign Languages and Literature
Lanzhou University
222 South Tianshui Road
Lanzhou 730000, Gansu Province
China

abe.w.powell@gmail.com

Publication history

Date received: 18 June 2024
Date accepted: 16 January 2025
Published online: 27 January 2026