

The Grammaticalisation of Evidentiality: a contrastive analysis of English and Tibetan

In the light of Lehmann's (1995) paradigmatic and syntagmatic parameters of grammaticalisation, this paper aims to investigate to what extent so-called "evidential languages", such as Tibetan, present a system of evidentiality that is more grammaticalised than the system of "non-evidential" languages, such as English (*see also* Squartini 2007, Cornillie 2007). The study is based on a 10-hour contrastive corpus that was specifically collected for the study (Cambridge Student Corpus and Tibet Student Corpus – CSC and TSC), and acceptability questionnaires that native speakers of Tibetan and English answered.

It can be argued that the Tibetan evidential system has reached the ultimate stage of grammaticalisation since it mainly functions with obligatory verbal inflections and enclitics (the direct present suffix *-gi. 'dug*, the direct past suffix *-song*, the inferential perfect suffix *-bzhaq* and the hearsay enclitic *-ze*) appearing in a closed paradigm and showing very advanced signs of phonological and semantic integrity (DeLancey 1986, Tournadre 1996, Mélac 2014).

The English evidential system is undoubtedly more morphologically scattered, but it is clearly not entirely lexical. The English modal *must* and *should* belong to a closed paradigm with little syntagmatic variability. Perception copulas (*look, sound, feel...*) form another closed paradigm with a wide propositional scope. Moreover, when sentence-initial *Looks like* and *Sounds like* get reduced (pronoun dropping), they undergo at the same time a semantic shift towards inferential evidentiality (*see also* López-Couso & Méndez-Naya 2014). Finally, constructional theticals (*see* Kaltenböck et al 2011), such as *I guess* or *I suppose*, combine paradigmatic and syntagmatic features that show a certain degree of grammaticalisation as well.

This paper will provide several corpus-based examples (from the CSC, the COCA, the COHA, and the BNC) which indicate that the grammaticalisation of evidentiality is observable in both English and Tibetan, but is more or less manifest depending on the criteria selected.

- Cornillie, B. (2007). The continuum between lexical and grammatical evidentiality: a functional analysis of Spanish parecer. *Italian journal of linguistics*, 19(1), pp.109-128.
- DeLancey, S. (1986). Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. *Evidentiality: the linguistic encoding of epistemology* (Chafe and Nichols, Eds., 203-213).
- Kaltenböck, G., Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. (2011). On thetical grammar. *Studies in language*, 35(4), pp.852-897.
- Lehmann, C. (1995). Thoughts on grammaticalization. Unterschleissheim: LINCOM Europa (LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics, 1).
- López-Couso, M.J. and Méndez-Naya, B. (2014). From clause to pragmatic marker: A study of the development of like-parentheticals in American English. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 15(1), pp.36-61.
- Mélaç, É. (2014). *L'évidentialité en anglais-approche contrastive à partir d'un corpus anglais-tibétain* (Doctoral dissertation, Paris 3).
- Squartini, M. (2007). Investigating a grammatical category and its lexical correlates. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 19(1) (Ed. Squartini, M.), 1-6.
- Tournadre, N. (1996). *L'ergativité en tibétain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue*. Éditions Peeters Louvain – Paris