

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.) (2014) *The Grammar of Knowledge. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Explorations in Linguistic Typology 7. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 284.

Reviewed by Erika Sandman

Evidentiality refers to grammatical marking of information source (Aikhenvald, p. 1). The source of information can be, for example, direct sensory evidence, inference or hearsay and it is often expressed by means of verbal suffixes or independent particles. In addition to grammaticalized evidentials that have the information source as their primary meaning, non-evidential categories (such as conditionals and other non-declarative moods, perfective aspect, complement clauses and nominalizations) can acquire evidential overtones; these are referred as evidential strategies (Aikhenvald, p. 19). Evidential meanings are also expressed by means of open lexical classes, such as verbs, adverbs and adjectives (Aikhenvald, p. 22). *The Grammar of Knowledge* is a collection of articles that explores linguistic encoding of information source in a number of genealogically and typologically diverse languages from all around the world. The articles of the book are based on presentations given in the International Workshop 'The grammar of knowledge' held at the Language and Culture Research Center, James Cook University, 16–21 July 2012. The book continues the series of books on evidentiality (Chafe & Nichols 1986; Guentchéva 1996; Johanson & Utas 2000; Aikhenvald & Dixon 2003; Aikhenvald 2004; Diewald & Smirnova 2010; Peterson & Sauerland 2010) published during the last four decades.

As the title suggests, *The Grammar of Knowledge* takes a holistic perspective to the expression of information source. The articles of the book not only deal with grammaticalized evidentials, but special emphasis is also put on the description of evidential strategies and open lexical classes that express evidential meanings. In addition to chapters on languages that have grammaticalized evidentials, there are several chapters on languages that lack grammatical evidentials altogether, but have rich systems of evidential strategies and lexical expressions of evidentiality. In this respect, the current volume differs from several other volumes on the topic (e.g. Aikhenvald & Dixon 2003), whose main focus is on grammaticalized evidentiality. The languages considered in *The Grammar*

of Knowledge are relatively little documented and in most cases endangered, and every contribution is based on the author's long-term fieldwork among the speech community. The data considered in the chapters is drawn primarily from participant observation and a variety of text genres, and supplemented by careful elicitation based on similar examples found in the naturally occurring data. This approach is essential for the study of subtle category like evidentiality that can be fully understood only by observing its use in different text genres and conversational contexts.

The volume starts with Alexandra Aikhenvald's (pp. 1–51) typological introduction to the marking of information source. Aikhenvald discusses several aspects relevant to the study of the topic, such as types of evidentiality systems in world's languages, other ways of marking the information source, geographical distribution of evidentials, relationship to non-evidential grammatical categories, evidentials and cultural conventions and the use of evidentials in discourse. The introductory chapter provides a typological framework for other chapters of the book that deal with evidentiality in individual languages. A small deficit in the introductory chapter is that it does not mention the concept of egophoricity, which refers to a grammatical marking of the speaker's personal involvement in the event or privileged access to the instigation of the event. Egophoricity is an essential part of the knowledge system in many Tibeto-Burman languages, e.g. Kurtöp discussed by Gwendolyn Hyslop in the present volume, and a brief introduction to the concept would have made some of the chapters in the volume more accessible for a reader not familiar with the concept. Nevertheless, the introductory chapter is very useful because it provides the reader with a greater context for the rest of the chapters in the book and elaborates most of the key concepts. The introduction also contains brief summaries of other contributions.

After the introductory chapter the volume first turns into languages with grammaticalized evidentials and then proceeds to the languages that lack grammaticalized evidentials, but have rich systems of evidentiality strategies and lexical expressions of evidentiality instead. The first three chapters all focus on languages with small evidentiality systems. Diana Forker (pp. 52–68) discusses evidentiality in Hinuq, a Nakh-Daghestanian language of Daghestan, Russia. Hinuq distinguishes unwitnessed past ('non-firsthand') from neutral past ('everything else'). In addition, there is a reportative and a quotative enclitic. Teija Greed's contribution (pp. 69–88) deals with evidentiality in a Turkic language Tatar. Like Hinuq, Tatar

has past tense suffixes that distinguish witnessed events from non-witnessed events. In addition, there are three evidential particles for reported, quotative and assumed information. Both Forker and Greed discuss the relationship between evidentials and cultural conventions, such as the use of evidentials in new media and evidentials as tokens of genre. For example, Tatar non-firsthand evidential is used for information acquired through radio, television or Internet because the speaker did not witness the event directly (Greed, p. 81). Chia-jung Pan (pp. 89–107) describes the use of reported evidential, reported speech constructions and verbal markers expressing evidential-like meanings in Saaroa, a moribund Austronesian language spoken in Taiwan. His paper contains important insights to the study of evidentiality in a highly endangered language. The paper also highlights the division of labor between the reported evidential and reported speech: While the reported evidential only shows that the source of information is based on someone else's report, reported speech constructions specify the exact author of the information (Pan, p. 102). By examining the interplay between grammaticalized evidentiality and evidential strategies, the author shows that both grammaticalized evidentials and other ways of expressing evidential meanings must be taken into account to get a full understanding on how the expression of information source in an individual language works.

The contributions of Gwendolyn Hyslop (pp. 108–131), Sihon Zhang (pp. 132–147) and Elena Skribnik and Olga Seesing (pp. 148–170) look at languages with large evidentiality systems. Hyslop analyzes the evidentiality system of Kurtöp, a Tibeto-Burman language of Bhutan. The Kurtöp system comprises a complex set of knowledge-related grammatical forms that interact with tense-aspect and encode various evidential, epistemic, egophoric and mirative meanings. Zhang's theme is the expression of information source in Ersu, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in south-west China. Ersu makes a grammatical distinction between visual, inferred and reported evidentials. In addition, information source can be conveyed by other means, including the experiential aspect marker and various open lexical classes and idioms. A very interesting type of evidentiality strategy that has not received much attention in typological literature is the system of demonstratives and directional terms, which combines reference to both spatial distance and visibility of the noun they modify (Zhang, pp. 143–144). Ersu demonstrative system, for example, has three terms that express the meanings 'this', visible and near the speaker, 'that', visible or invisible and not near the speaker and 'that remote',

invisible and often in speaker's memory. Skribnik's and Seesing's contribution focuses on evidentiality in Kalmyk, an endangered Mongolic language spoken in lower Volga region of Russia. Kalmyk has a rich system of evidentials that interact with tense-aspect system. In addition to their primary meaning as markers of information source, they can express various epistemic overtones, such as uncertainty and mirativity. An interesting detail in Kalmyk evidentiality system is that the language has a special evidential construction for common knowledge, which is not very commonly attested information source from a cross-linguistic perspective (Skribnik & Seesing, p. 163).

In most of the earlier literature, evidentiality has been described as primarily verbal category. The fascinating contribution by R.M.W. Dixon (pp. 171–189) discusses a much less documented phenomenon, namely the coding of information source just within a noun phrase. A Dyirbal language of north-east Australia has a set of grammatical markers accompanying nouns that express whether the referent of a noun is 'there and visible', 'here and visible' or 'not visible'. The Dyirbal system resembles the demonstrative system in Ersu described by Sihong Zhang. The reader may conclude that demonstrative and directional terms expressing both spatial and evidential meanings might be more common in world's languages than previously thought and that the topic needs further study from a cross-linguistic perspective.

Anne Storch and Jules Jacques Coly (pp. 190–208) focus on the rich system of knowledge-related morphology in Maaka, a Western Chadic (Afroasiatic) language of north-eastern Nigeria. Maaka knowledge system comprises a complex set of noun and verb suffixes, complementizers, independent verbs as well as a reported speech marker and an adverbial, which all express meanings related to information source, speaker's certainty in truth and control over knowledge. For example, the complementizer *kóŋ* expresses that while other participants of the speech act have some knowledge about the discussed event or referent, only the speaker knows that their information is outdated (Storch & Coly, p. 200). In their insightful discussion, Storch and Coly show how the constructions coding knowledge and truth in Maaka are related to group identity and conceptualization of power. This explains why the language has retained its unique knowledge system in a multilingual setting where the Maaka people are under a constant social and economic pressure from dominant groups. The protection of their unique knowledge system guarantees their identity as Maaka and it is perceived as an advantage over possible competitors.

A common theme in contributions by Elena Mihás (pp. 209–226) and Simon E. Overall (pp. 227–244) are languages that lack grammaticalized evidentials, but make an extensive use of evidential strategies in the expression of information source. Mihás discusses evidential extensions of modality markers, as well as independent lexical classes expressing evidentiality in Ashéninka Perené, an endangered South Arawak language of Peru. Overall analyzes the use of nominalization as an evidential strategy in Aguaruna, a Jivaroan language that is also spoken in Peru.

Gerrit J. Dimmendaal (pp. 245–259) discusses the coding of information source in Tima, a Niger-Congo language of Sudan. In Tima, there are four grammatical subsystems that are related to the grammar of knowledge: TAM marking, locative constructions, logophoric pronouns and ideophones. For example, locative markers express whether the speaker was the witness of the event described (Dimmendaal, p. 251) and ideophonic adverbs used with perception verbs indicate that the speaker shares his or her experiential knowledge with the hearer (Dimmendaal, p. 257). The article describes a somewhat non-canonical evidentiality system with respect to Aikhenvald's (2004, 2014) typology of evidentiality. It illustrates how a complex, grammaticalized evidentiality system can be construction-based rather than being coded morphologically by verbal paradigms.

Finally, the volume concludes with Borut Telban's (pp. 260–277) brilliant discussion on the verbs of saying, hearing, seeing and knowing in a Papuan language Karawari. Based on more than twenty years of experience on working with the language community, the author shows how ways of speaking and perception are related to creation of knowledge in the community. For example, speaking in Karawari society is considered as a creative act, not just communication. Gossiping is conceptualized as something that 'touches' one's name and therefore a rumor attached to one's name makes people angry. The concept of talking behind someone's back as a creative act that 'touches' people is reflected in the creation of serial verb constructions so that the verb 'gossip' is used together with the verb 'beat, strike, hit' (Telban, p. 264).

The Grammar of Knowledge offers many novel perspectives to the study of evidential meanings in language. In addition to discussion of grammaticalized evidentials, the current volume offers detailed descriptions of evidential strategies and open lexical classes expressing evidential meanings in all the languages studied, and it emphasizes the interplay between the different strategies in grammar. Several contributions

in the volume (notably Zhang, Dixon, Storch & Coly and Dimmendaal) discuss grammatical means of expressing knowledge-related functions that have not received much attention in typological literature, including demonstratives, directional and locational terms, noun suffixes, logophoric pronouns and ideophones. Many of these strategies are found in the two African languages (Maaka and Tima) described in the volume. While evidentiality has been thought to be a very rare phenomenon in Africa, it might be the case that evidentiality in African languages is expressed by means of constructions that are somewhat non-canonical in the light of previous studies on the topic and evidential systems in the region might be more common than previously expected. In addition to focusing on grammatical and lexical means by which evidentiality is expressed, the book also offers new insights into the relationship between knowledge-related grammar, cultural conventions and social structures of the speech communities. The rich data on little documented and endangered languages based on first-hand fieldwork is of high value in its own right.

Written in an engaging and accessible manner, *The Grammar of Knowledge* is essential reading for anyone interested in knowledge-related grammatical categories, linguistic typology and the study of lesser-documented languages.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004) *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R.M.W. (eds.) (2003) *Studies in Evidentiality*. Typological Studies in Language 54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chafe, Wallace & Nichols, Johanna (eds.) (1986) *Evidentiality: the Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood NJ: Ablex.
- Diewald, Gabriele & Smirnova, Elena (eds.) (2010) *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka (ed.) (1996) *L'énonciation médiatisée*. Bibliothèque de l'Information Grammaticale 35. Louvain: Peeters.
- Johanson, Lars & Utas, Bo (eds.) (2000) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Peterson, Tyler & Sauerland, Uli (eds.) (2010) *Evidence from Evidentials*. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol 28. Vancouver, Canada.

Contact information:

Erika Sandman
Department of Modern Languages, General Linguistics
P.O. Box 24
00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
e-mail: erika(dot)sandman(at)helsinki(dot)fi