

inventory of references relevant to the structure, history, and dialectology of Slovene. [MARK J. ELSON, *University of Virginia.*]

L'Énonciation médiatisée. Ed. by
ZLATKA GUENTCHÉVA Louvain-Paris:
Editions Peeters, 1996. Pp. 322.

Like *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology* (ed. by Johanna Nichols and Wallace Chafe, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1986), to which the editor refers in her introduction, the present volume is a collection of papers that grew out of a conference on the ways various languages grammatically or lexically encode the speaker's subjective relation to the source, certainty, and/or veracity of the information being communicated. Like Nichols and Chafe, this volume contains articles treating Albanian (REMZI PERNASKA, 31–46); Bulgarian (ZLATKA GUENTCHÉVA, 47–70); JACK FEUILLET, 71–86, who also gives Turkish, Latvian, and German examples); Quechua (GERALD TAYLOR, 259–69); Tibetan (four dialects); NICOLAS TOURNADRE, 195–214); and Turkish (MÉTIYÉ MEYDAN, 125–44; MEHMET BASTÜRK, LAURENT DANON-BOILEAU, and MARY-ANNICK MOREL, 145–54). Whereas the other articles in Nichols & Chafe 1986 focus on Akha, Chinese Pidgin Russian, Japanese, English, Jaqi languages, Kashaya, Macedonian, Makah, Maricopa, Northern Iroquoian, Patwin, Sherpa, and Wintu, the other languages in G's volume are Western Armenian (ANAÏD DONABÉDIAN, 87–108); Nepali (BOYD MICHAILOVSKI, 109–24); Persian and Tadjik (GILBERT LAZARD, 21–30); Nenets (JEAN PERROT, 157–68); Estonian, Finnish, and Saami (M. M. JOCELYNE FERNANDEZ-VIEST, 169–82); Korean (IN-BONG CHANG, 183–94); Inuit (PHILIPPE MENNECIER and BERNADETTE ROBBE, 233–48); Squamish (PETER JACOBS, 249–58); Caxinauá (ELIANE CAMARGO, 271–84); Russian (EKATERINA V. RAKHILINA, 299–304); French (PATRICK DENDALE and WALTER DE MULDER, 305–18); Chukchi, Koryak, and Itelmen (FRANÇOIS JACQUESSON, 215–32); and thirty-one languages from the EURO-TYP project discussed by PAOLO RAMAT (287–98). Both volumes are divided into three sections, but whereas the division in Nichols & Chafe 1986 is basically geographic—(1) North and South America, (2) Europe and Asia, and (3) English and general—G's division is grammatical in that mediative marking (to use the more inclusive term coined by Lazard, see below) may employ: (1) perfect-related forms (21–154); (2) auxiliaries, suffixes, and particles (157–284); and (3) adverbs and modals (287–318). Nonetheless, it is worth noting that geographic groupings also emerge: The languages with mediative forms related to perfects are from South-eastern Europe and West or Central Asia; those in

group 2 are from North and South America together with Northern Eurasia and East Asia, while group 3 (leaving to one side mention of languages belonging to the previous groups) draws mainly on Romance, Germanic, and North Slavic languages, which can be construed as West and Central Europe (taking Central in opposition to North and South rather than the usual East and West). The book also contains a useful introduction by G (11–18) and an index of authors cited (319–22).

This grammatical category, first identified (for Turkish) by Mahmūd al-Kāšğarī in the eleventh century CE as an opposition of the type witnessed/unwitnessed, continues to provide fertile ground for a wealth of terminological proposals. In 1911 Boas (*Handbook of American Indian languages, Part 1*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office) published descriptions that led to the coining of the term 'evidential', popularized by Roman Jakobson ('Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb', Cambridge, MA: Harvard Russian Language Project, 1957; reprinted in his *Selected Writings, vol. 2*, 130–47, The Hague: Mouton) originally with reference to Bulgarian, the language treated by G herself (and also Feuillet) in this collection. As G points out in her introduction (13), this term focuses on only one aspect of the category. The French *médiatif*, first proposed by Gilbert Lazard in 1956 (*Caractères distinctifs de la langue Tadjik, Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique: 52/1:117–86*, Paris) in connection with Tadjik, attempts to capture the notion that the speaker somehow 'mediates' the information being conveyed. This mediation can involve what Horace Lunt called 'distance' in 1952 (*A grammar of the Macedonian literary language*, Skopje: Državno Knigoizdatelstvo), that is, such meanings as 'unwitnessed', 'reported', 'inferred', 'irony', 'surprise', 'nonconfirmative', etc., in all of which the speaker is somehow attenuating a sense of responsibility for the truth of the statement (including here the notion 'unexpected'). Such mediatives are often descended from perfects—G's group 1—or quotative particles—part of G's group 2. However, a mediative can also involve the speaker's strengthened vouching for the truth of the statement, that is, witnessed, perceived by some sense in addition to or other than sight, confirmative, etc. (some authors, e.g. Michailovsky [120], include surprise here although the form used to express it generally belongs with the other category). In either case, in languages in which the category is grammaticalized, it is usually the speaker's attitude that either determines or at least influences the choice of form.

This volume is quite unlike various synoptic and superficial surveys which are mere collections of information from secondary sources without any depth of analysis. G has provided an important collection of first-hand analyses and data which guarantee that

the material will be of use to any linguist interested in this subject. The pragmatic or discourse-bound nature of this category emerges clearly from many of the articles. At the same time, it is clear that where the category is grammaticalized it cannot be subsumed under any ordinary understanding of tense-aspect-mood, although these can and do interact with it. Ramat's article, the only one that is limited to questionnaire data and does not use naturally occurring examples, shows that those languages with grammatical means of expressing mediation can also employ lexical items such as 'allegedly', but the data and their French translations in the first two sections demonstrate that the subtleties of grammaticalized mediatives ('evidentials') cannot be conveyed lexically. The Turkish anecdote cited by Donabédian (94) about a misunderstanding in a French-Turkish bilingual family is especially striking in this respect.

The collection has very few errors although the extremely helpful interlinear glosses occasionally need some spacing adjustments. The only other errors I noticed were that [Grace] Fiedler should be Fielder (48, 51, 65, 66, 68, 320), [Sandra] Chang should be Chung (15, 17, 48, 58, 68, 319), *yaratti* should be *yaratti* (76), in example 40b *mendilinizi* should be *mendilimi* (85), and example i is not a Turkish *di*-past (297).

All in all, this is an excellent addition to the literature represented by Nichols and Chafe and to Lars Johanson and Bo Utas's more recent edited collection (*Evidentials in Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000). G's collection constitutes a significant contribution to the advancement of our understanding of this important and distinct verbal category. [VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN, *University of Chicago*.]

Linguistic fieldwork. Ed. by PAUL NEWMAN and MARTHA RATLIFF. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. xii, 288.

This elegant and impressive volume provides dramatic proof that after a long period of neglect, field linguistics is back in. The book contains a substantive introduction by the editors (1–14) and twelve essays describing the personal and methodological approaches to fieldwork by a number of distinguished linguists: LARRY M. HYMAN, MARIANNE MITHUN, GERRIT J. DIMMENDAAL, the late KEN HALE, DAVID GIL, NANCY C. DORIAN, SHOBBHANA L. CHELLIAH, DANIEL L. EVERETT, FIONA McLAUGHLIN, THIerno SEYDOU SALL, IAN MADDIESON, KEREN RICE, and NICHOLAS EVANS. This is not a how-to/discovery-procedure manual about elicitation techniques or the analysis and processing of collected data. Rather, the focus is on general and personal issues about the delights and difficulties of carrying out linguistic research in the field.

I shall first touch on two important themes and then comment on but three of these excellent offerings in accordance with my background and interests. This decision in no way implies that the remaining articles are unworthy of careful scrutiny; I have found all the offerings to be outstanding contributions.

Whether one calls an 'informant' an 'informant' or uses one of the common alternatives ('consultant', 'speaker', 'teacher', 'interlocutor', 'source', 'subject', or 'assistant'), fieldwork involves working in some capacity with one or more of them. Newman and Ratliff remind us that 'informant' is the traditional term for this individual in linguistics and anthropology, but because of the negative association of this designation with 'informer', it was frowned upon by researchers who did not wish any stereotyping to engender negative profiling of the 'natives'. Only two of the essays, probably for the aforementioned reason, retain the long-standing term 'informant'. Both, coincidentally, happen to be by Africanists: Gerrit J. Dimmendaal, well-known for his work on Turkana, and Larry M. Hyman, a Bantu specialist.

Let me now take up the matter of learning to speak the language under investigation. There can be little doubt that learning to speak the language being studied enhances the fieldwork experience and its published end product(s) by improving the linguist's acceptance within the given speech community and by leading him or her to a deeper penetration of the structure of the language. N, working on a Chadic language, Tera, elicited data through the medium of Hausa, but he observes with 20-20 hindsight: 'the linguistic research *per se* would have been much more effective and insightful if I had put serious effort into learning Tera from the very beginning' (5). This is also the viewpoint of Daniel L. Everett's 'Monolingual field research' (166–88), which provides numerous reasons, a major one being that the linguist's intuition is more quickly sharpened. However, Fiona McLaughlin's Pulaar informant, Thierno Seydou Sall, coauthor of 'The give and take of fieldwork: Noun classes and other concerns in Fatick, Senegal' (189–210), describes an experience in which Sall's uncle criticized him for his poor teaching ability since McLaughlin was not learning to speak his language properly (205–6). (Sall's contribution is particularly rewarding since his is the only description of fieldwork written from the perspective of an informant/consultant [204–10].)

Turning to the essays themselves, Larry M. Hyman's 'Fieldwork as a state of mind' (15–33) makes a solid case that the fieldworker's state of mind can 'appreciate the "puzzle"' without translating the discussion into formal theoretical terms' (29). Hyman's personal experience as a fieldworker in Nigeria and Cameroon contributed to his astute observation that the field linguist, in struggling to find out the burning issues of his or her language, should study related