

6-2003

Review of: Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages

Edward J. Vajda

Western Washington University, edward.vajda@wwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://cedar.wwu.edu/mcl_facpubs



Part of the [Modern Languages Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vajda, Edward J., "Review of: Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages" (2003). *Modern & Classical Languages*. 36.
http://cedar.wwu.edu/mcl_facpubs/36

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Humanities at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Modern & Classical Languages by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

category schema based on Darrell Tryon's *Comparative Austronesian dictionary* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995), according to which each entry is represented by a numerical code (English and Indonesian glosses are also provided for each entry). It would be difficult for one to design a better method for collecting optimally enlightening lexical samples in a relatively short period of field-time.

The main part of the book comprises word lists of each language (between 700 and 1,400 entries per language, presented in two columns and including information on lexical variation within dialects where appropriate). The fruits of the later surveys are more copious. The wordlists for each language are indexed alphabetically for each language (including English and Indonesian). These indexes are then followed by cross-references to the Buck-based schema for each entry in the Sulawesi Umbrella Wordlist and other specialist wordlists from which H has drawn inspiration.

H has a great deal of highly useful information on several languages which have hitherto been very sketchily represented in the literature and has thereby enabled them to be integrated and used much more extensively within the picture of comparative Austronesian. His promised Tomini-Tolitoli text collection with structural information will be equally welcome. [ANTHONY P. GRANT, *University of Sheffield, UK.*]

Old French–English dictionary. Ed. by ALAN HINDLEY, FREDERICK W. LANGLEY, and BRIAN J. LEVY. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Pp. xv, 621. ISBN 0521345642. \$140.00.

This dictionary is intended for a broad range of English speakers who work with Old French. It began as a computer database at the University of Hull and includes about 60,000 entries drawn from both literary and nonliterary texts written before approximately 1350. In addition to the head word, which is generally in the oblique case but sometimes in both subject and object case, entries list the word's grammatical function and definition or definitions. Common locutions are also included. The introduction gives a brief history of and *raison d'être* for the dictionary project, an explanation of what it includes and how entries are structured, and help on using the dictionary, including a list of common spelling variants.

This work will be of particular interest to Anglophone readers who lack the French or German skills necessary to work with some of the other Old French dictionaries available, but its usefulness is certainly not limited to this group. It surpasses some earlier single-volume dictionaries in the number of words, including many dialectal forms, that are listed. It is

meticulously cross-referenced for both grammatical form and spelling, and this helps in tracking down the meaning of unrecognized forms. It is both portable and affordable, though it is probably still a bit too costly for students. Another nice feature is its select bibliography, which includes Old French dictionaries, grammars, histories, anthologies, readers, and articles on the original database project.

The linguist working with Old French will find that this work does have certain drawbacks. One is that it does not include etymologies, citations, sources, or dates. Furthermore, dialectal forms are not identified as such. These omissions are understandable; including them would have resulted in a work whose sheer enormity would have greatly reduced its utility. It should be noted that the COFREL database (Computerized Old French-English Lexicon) from which this dictionary arose contains much more information, including the text and type of text in which a word was cited; its location within the text; its grammatical function; and its dialect, date, and meaning. At this time, though, COFREL is not publicly available.

The linguist will find this dictionary a good tool to have but will want to supplement it with other works, including the multi-volume and single-volume dictionaries cited in the bibliography. At the same time, the number of entries, clarity and completeness of definitions, and compact form of this work make it an excellent resource for students, translators, historians, medievalists, or anyone whose primary goal is to read Old French texts. [KIRSTEN FUDEMAN, *Ithaca College.*]

Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages. Ed. by LARS JOHANSON and BO UTAS. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. Pp. ix, 499.

The 21 contributions to this volume pay as much attention to describing morphosyntax and discourse function as to issues of historical language contact and processes of grammaticalization. BERNARD COMRIE's introduction, 'Evidentials: Semantics and history' (1–12), highlights the varying semantic content of grammatical oppositions based on whether the speaker has actually witnessed the narrated event. Comrie perceptively observes that the role of borrowing in the development of Eurasian evidential systems is far from clear. For example, in Turkic the evidential (hearsay narration) is the marked form, whereas Balkan Slavic and Persian mark the confirmative (forms expressing events specifically experienced by the narrator). He further observes that in Eurasia evidentials often arise from resultative constructions, do not necessarily involve casting doubt

on the veracity of the narrated event, and lack explanation of the specific perceptual source of the information, an elaboration found in certain Native American languages. These remarks are borne out by the individual case studies.

The remaining 20 articles are arranged into three genetically-defined sections: 'Turkic languages', 'Iranian languages', and 'Other language areas'. Not surprisingly, considering that the category of 'evidential' first became known from Turkish and the neighboring Bulgarian, which presumably acquired it through areal contact, Turkic is the best represented, with seven articles. 'Some aspects of the acquisition of evidentials in Turkish' (15–28) by AYHAN AKSU-KOÇ deals with results from a study of child language acquisition. ÉVA ÁGNES CSATÓ's 'Turkish *MIŞ*- and *İMİŞ*- items: Dimensions of a functional analysis' (29–43) deals with the contextual functions of evidentials. 'Direct and indirect experience in Salar' (45–59) by ARIENNE DWYER discusses the category in a Turkic language of China, showing that evidential usage is greater in women's speech. 'Turkic indirectives' (61–87) by LARS JOHANSON introduces a new grammatical term for evidentials. Johanson assumes a diachronic vantage point to demonstrate how firmly rooted the evidential (i.e. indirective) opposition has become across the Turkic family as a whole. 'Reflections on *-miş* in Khalaj' (89–101) by FILİZ KIRAL examines evidentiality in a language of Central Iran. ASTRID MENZ, in 'Indirectivity in Gagauz' (103–14), employs Johanson's descriptive terminology to examine the language of a Turkic minority in Moldova. CHRISTOPH SCHROEDER's 'Between resultative, historical and inferential: Non-finite *-miş* forms in Turkish' (115–43) continues the functional study of verb forms used to convey hearsay information.

The section on Iranian languages contains five articles, all of which somehow touch on the issue of Turkic areal influence on this branch of Indo-Iranian. CHRISTIANE BULUT's 'Indirectivity in Kurmanji' (147–84) explores the grammaticalization of evidentiality in a language spoken by Turkey's Kurdish minority. 'Expressions of indirectivity in spoken Modern Persian' (185–207) by CARINA JAHANI investigates perfect verb forms and their relation to evidentiality. 'Le médiatif: Considerations théoriques et application à l'iranien' (209–28) by GILBERT LAZARD continues the discussion of terminology for expressing the oppositions under discussion. 'Epistemic verb forms in Persian of Iran, Afghanistan and Tajikistan' (229–57) by JOHN R. PERRY extends the discussion eastward to Iranian languages influenced by Central Asian Turkic; Perry also explores the notion of mirativity, the encoding of unexpected information. In 'Traces of evidentiality in classical New Persian' (259–71), BO UTAS attempts a deeper historical perspective of the process of grammaticalization

of the evidential distinction, tentatively concluding that the category is a relatively new innovation in Persian. Though well-conceived, all of the articles in this section leave open the question of the degree to which borrowing vs. language-internal development influenced the rise of Iranian evidentials.

The final section contains eight articles, most dealing with languages geographically contiguous with Turkic. These articles, too, are valuable from both a typological and a historical language-contact perspective. WINFRIED BOEDER's 'Evidentiality in Georgian' (275–328) discusses the interrelation of the Georgian perfect with grammaticalized expressions of hearsay narration. 'Confirmative/nonconfirmative in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian with additional observations on Turkish, Romani, Georgian, and Lak' (329–66) by VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN is the broadest typological investigation of the phenomenon, for which Friedman proposes yet another grammatical term. GUNILLA GREN-EKLUND's 'Evidentiality and typology: Grammatical functions of particles in Burmese and the early stages of Indo-European' (367–81) suggests, though with scant evidence, that certain particles found in Hittite and other early attested Indo-European languages may have expressed evidential-related meanings; her comparison with Burmese is purely typological. 'Expressions of evidentiality in two Semitic languages—Hebrew and Arabic' (383–99) by BO ISAKSSON explores and rejects the possibility that early Semitic may have had a grammaticalized evidential opposition. 'Perfect forms as a means of expressing evidentiality in Modern Eastern Armenian' (401–17) by NATALIA KOZINTSEVA is a diachronic investigation of the language spoken in the Republic of Armenia. 'Evidentiality in Komi Zyryan' (419–40) by MARJA LEINONEN extends the topic to Eastern Finno-Ugric, describing the category as 'virtually ubiquitous' (419) in this group. 'Perfect, evidentiality and related categories in Tungusic languages' (441–69) by ANDREJ L. MALCHUKOV investigates the development of evidentials in Even and several related North Asian languages, some of which experienced significant contact with the Turkic Yakut. Finally, ANJU SAXENA's 'Evidentiality in Kinnauri' (471–82) investigates the evidential system of a Tibeto-Burman language of India, adding additional typological perspective to the volume.

This collection represents an important contribution to the study of evidentials. It contains many descriptive advances and showcases the plurality of current views on evidentiality—something apparent even in the diverse terminology used by the individual contributors. Most important, the volume proposes new topics for future investigation, thereby offering much of real value to typologists, language contact specialists, and anyone interested in processes of grammatical change. [EDWARD J. VAJDA, *Western Washington University*.]