

Linguistic Society of America

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald

Reviewed work(s):

Gramtica do Kamaiur, lngua Tup-Guaran do Alto Xingu by Lucy Seki

Source: *Language*, Vol. 78, No. 2 (Jun., 2002), pp. 316-319

Published by: Linguistic Society of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3086561>

Accessed: 26/03/2009 16:59

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=lsa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Linguistic Society of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Language*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

unknown in linguistic pragmatics; it is not a synonym of 'implication'. The verb *pōvēn* 'I will go' is misspelled (59). *RGST* claims (82) a sentence may have only one finite verb, but common, everyday sentences refute this claim (Steever 1988). In John Austin's classification, the verb *sollu* 'say' would be a constative, not a performative, verb (113). Discussion of *wh*-interrogatives + *ō* 'some' (158) omits the common *ēnō* lit. 'somewhy', i.e. 'for some reason or other', perhaps because English lacks a similar form. In emphatic reduplication (172), it is not the infinitive that is used but a form homophonous with it; the negative auxiliaries *māTT-* 'will not' and *il-* 'not be' have emphatic forms but no infinitive. *RGST* says (192) Tamil lacks emphatic stress: This is because there is no phonemic stress in the language (it is quantitative); there is, however, a qualitative correlate: emphatic lengthening of vowels. Limitations of space prevent further listing of the remaining problems, which are available on request via email. Many of these 220 additional problems involve muddled treatments of basic, substantive issues; the descriptions of verb classes, aspect and syntax, in particular, require much space to set right. The presence of such defects, and so many, fails to do justice to ST and cannot but undermine students' confidence in the book and hinder their attempts to gain a useful command over the spoken language.

The sheer weight of its flaws, and the inaccurate description of ST they give rise to, renders *RGST* unsuitable for pedagogical or scholarly use in its present form. While the publisher should accept some responsibility for the careless vetting, editing, and proofreading of this book, it is regrettable that during the 20-year interim between the two versions of the book, S neither explored further sources of the spoken language nor exploited more seriously the results of the specialist literature on Tamil, much of which appears in his bibliography, to clarify and improve on *RGST*'s description of ST. With the dearth of resources currently dedicated to the study of Tamil, the publication of this volume represents something of a lost opportunity to contribute to the meager store of dependable Tamil teaching and research materials. As that store is slowly stocked, students and linguists alike may profitably consult Asher 1985, which specifically treats the spoken language, and Lehmann 1989, which provides an excellent description of the modern language.

REFERENCES

- ANNAMALAI, E. 1981. The dynamics of verbal extension in Tamil. Trivandrum: Dravidian Linguistics Association.
- ASHER, RONALD E. 1985. Tamil (Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars). London: Routledge.
- DALE, IAN. 1975. Tamil auxiliary verbs. London: School of African and Oriental Studies dissertation.
- LEHMANN, THOMAS. 1989. A grammar of modern Tamil. Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.
- PARAMASIVAM, KUMARASWAMI PILLAI. 1979. Effectivity and causativity in Tamil. Trivandrum: Dravidian Linguistic Association.
- SCHIFFMAN, HAROLD F. 1979. A grammar of spoken Tamil. Madras: The Christian Literature Society.
- STEEVER, SANFORD. 1983. A study in auxiliaries: The grammar of the indicative auxiliary verb system of Tamil. Chicago: University of Chicago dissertation.
- . 1988. The serial verb formation in the Dravidian languages. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

[sbsteever@worldnet.att.net]

Gramática do Kamaiurá, língua Tupí-Guaraní do Alto Xingu. (A grammar of Kamaiurá, a Tupí-Guaraní language from Upper Xingu). By LUCY SEKI. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2000. Pp. 482.

Reviewed by ALEXANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD, *La Trobe University*

The Amazon basin—an area of great linguistic diversity—is linguistically one of the least known regions of the world. It comprises around 300 languages grouped into over 15 language families and a fair number of isolates. Amazonian languages display dauntingly complicated

grammatical structures, providing exceptions to numerous universal statements. These include unusual patterns of split ergativity and complex evidential systems. The vast majority of Amazonian languages are endangered, and many have already become extinct.

Over half of the indigenous languages of Amazonia are spoken in Brazil (see Rodrigues 1986), which covers about half the area of South America and comprises about half its population. About 170 languages are still spoken in Brazil, of which 115 have less than 1000 speakers. Documentation and analysis of these is the matter of urgent priority. And yet there are almost no full, book-length, grammars of indigenous languages published by Brazilian scholars. It is not an exaggeration to say that Lucy Seki's *Gramática do Kamaiurá* is the first comprehensive reference grammar published in Portuguese by a Brazilian linguist since J. Anchieta's (1595) grammar of Tupínambá, a Tupí-Guaraní language once spoken all along the Brazilian coast but now extinct.

Some language families and subgroups are luckier than others. The Tupí-Guaraní branch of the Tupí family is perhaps the best-known and the best-documented. There is hardly any doubt as to its limits and internal classification; a fair amount of its phonology and morphology has been reconstructed (see the summary by Jensen 1999). Kamaiurá, spoken in the Upper Xingu area by about 300 people, constitutes a separate subgroup within the Tupí-Guaraní branch. The Kamaiurá are among the oldest inhabitants of the Upper Xingu, now a place of remarkable linguistic diversity, with 17 distinct indigenous groups (Seki 1999). Whether the Upper Xingu is a linguistic area or not remains an open question—more in-depth studies of individual languages spoken there, especially from Carib and Arawak families, are needed.

This grammar, based on 30-plus years of field research, consists of 22 chapters organized in five parts. The first part contains a detailed overview of linguistic and cultural aspects of the Upper Xingu based on oral accounts and on the few available written sources. Part 2, 'Syntax', has an overview of word classes and constituent structure, clause structure, direct and indirect speech, questions, commands, coordination, parataxis, anaphora, possession, negation, and so on. Part 3, 'Functions and forms', presents an analysis of nominal and verbal morphology; and Part 4 gives a detailed analysis of the lexicon. The last part is on phonology. Appendices contain 16 pages of fully analyzed texts, a list of lexical items in the examples (c.640), and a list of 83 affixes and clitics with reference to parts of grammar where they are discussed. The list of references is followed by 32 color photos depicting the landscape, traditional activities of the Kamaiurá, S's fieldwork, and a literacy course. In its overall structure, this book reminds one of Dixon's (1972) renowned grammar of Dyirbal—which, presumably, served S as an inspiration, a purely Brazilian tradition of grammar-writing being almost nonexistent.

This new grammar incorporates previous work on Tupí-Guaraní languages as its background and builds upon it. The book is typologically oriented, cast in terms of basic linguistic theory (without any reference to transient formalisms). This allows S's grammar to be read and understood by linguists of any persuasion. And this is why it will remain an accessible model of linguistic argumentation and a source of data and inductive generalizations for many years to come.

For every statement, S provides ample argumentation and exemplification—the total number of examples, from all kinds of textual and conversational data, is over 1500. A methodologically important point implicitly made throughout the grammar concerns the data employed. No doubt, a certain amount of careful elicitation is necessary to check generalizations and fill in gaps in paradigms. Recording and analyzing texts and conversations, should, however, be the basis for a reliable grammar. The danger of basing a grammar exclusively on grammatical elicitation—asking for translation from a lingua franca into the native language—and on sentences taken out of their context leads to getting only a small part of the grammatical structure right. Out of context, sentences come out (as S remarks) as 'something artificial, sterile, deprived of colour' (347, my translation). Fully contextualized, Kamaiurá comes alive in S's grammar.

This grammar has a wealth of typologically unusual characteristics alongside examples of fine argumentation (often based on cross-linguistic evidence). I will mention just a few of these. Similar to all other Tupí-Guaraní languages, Kamaiurá has a set of person-marking possessive prefixes, with three persons and a reflexive (meaning 'one's own'). It has an additional opposition

of two third-person prefixes: one for a specific possessor and the other for a nonspecific one. This distinction—unusual for a Tupí-Guaraní language—is reminiscent of Arawak languages (with some of which Kamaiurá could have been in prolonged contact).

Unlike most other Tupí-Guaraní languages, Kamaiurá uses an array of particles which mark evidentiality—these appear in every connected sentence but may be omitted in an isolated utterance. They fall into two subsystems: source of information, with two members, and type of evidence, with four. Particles which mark source of information are *je* ‘reported’ and *rak* ‘attested’. They have clear cognates in past tense markers in other Tupí-Guaraní languages: The ‘attested’ evidential goes back to a recent past marker and the ‘reported’ to a remote past marker. The correlation between evidentiality and past tense, or perfective aspect, has been documented cross-linguistically (see numerous examples in Aikhenvald forthcoming); however, the ways in which past markers have developed different evidentiality values requires further investigation. Furthermore, evidence can be direct and indirect. Direct evidence can be visual (marker *ehelhe*) or previously existent and now gone (marker *heme*). Indirect evidence (or inference) can be based on visible traces of an event (*inip*) or on the speaker’s opinion or deduction (*a’aj*). Markers of source of information and of type of evidence can co-occur. For instance, if the speaker saw a snake bite a man but the snake had already gone when they reported the event, a combination of *rak* ‘attested evidential’ and *heme* ‘previously existent direct evidence’ would be appropriate.

Similarly to most Tupí-Guaraní languages, adjectival concepts are expressed with descriptive verbs which, similarly to other verbs, can occur as predicates and can only be used as copula complements if nominalized. Unlike other verbs, they take the same set of personal prefixes as nouns; but, unlike nouns, they cannot take case markers. And, unlike other word classes, they can modify both verbs and nouns. Besides adjectival concepts, descriptive verbs cover meanings such as ‘forget’, ‘sign’, ‘snore’ (this is discussed in detail in Seki 1990). An alternative analysis would be to consider descriptives as a separate word class.

Kamaiurá has fewer cases than other Tupí-Guaraní languages (Jensen 1999: 148–9). The nuclear case marks subjects, objects, arguments of postpositions, and copula complements; the stem unmarked for case is employed as a vocative, as a nominal predicate, and as a citation form, and also to mark dislocated constituents. There is just one locative case. The attributive case ‘as, in the quality of’ marks adjuncts and transitory states. Kamaiurá does not have inflectional tense marking on verbs; past tense is marked on nouns to refer to a previous state of a nominal referent, and the attributive case is employed to mark its future state, e.g. *i-’irü-het* (3-husband-NOMINAL.PAST) ‘her ex-husband’; *i-’irü-ram* (3-husband-ATTRIBUTIVE.CASE) ‘her future husband’.

Bound pronouns in Kamaiurá operate on a split ergative basis: Intransitive verbs divide into active verbs, whose subject (S_a) is cross-referenced in the same way as the subject of a transitive verb, and stative verbs, whose subject (S_o) is cross-referenced with the same set of prefixes as the object of a transitive verb. For transitive verbs, either the subject (A) or the subject (O) can be cross-referenced. The choice is determined by the person hierarchy (1st > 2nd > 3rd); there are also portmanteau prefixes marking first person A acting on second person O. If both A and O are third person, then A takes precedence over O ($A > O$).

Kamaiurá has a fascinating system of causatives. One prefix, *mo-*, marks a simple causative (e.g. ‘I made the boy run’); and another one, *ero-*, marks causative with a ‘comitative’ meaning, implying participation of the causer in the action (e.g. ‘I made the boy run with me’). Causative of transitive verbs is formed with the suffix *-ukat*. The underlying subject of the causativized verb is then marked with a dative postposition. Kamaiurá marks reciprocal and reflexive with verbal prefixes. The reflexive prefix also marks identity of arguments between conjoined clauses. The reciprocal can occur on verbs and on postpositions, e.g. ‘to each other’. Of the two passive constructions, one tends to be impersonal while the other requires an overt agent.

S convincingly shows that what the Tupí-Guaraní linguistic tradition treats as ‘serial verbs’ are in fact gerund constructions composed of two predicates, one of which is marked as a dependent verb. This phenomenon is in fact quite different from verb serialization where several verbs are put together to form one predicate without any markers of coordination or subordination.

Objects of transitive verbs can be incorporated. If a possessed noun gets incorporated, the possessor becomes the object (this is known as 'possessor raising'); the verb remains transitive; and the A, O, or portmanteau cross-referencing prefixes are used. If the possessor is coreferential with subject, the verb becomes active intransitive, and the possessor is cross-referenced as S_a . But when a possessed noun is incorporated into an active intransitive verb, the verb becomes stative, and the possessor is cross-referenced as S_o .

This grammar provides a set of parameters for analyzing Tupí-Guaraní languages and sets a fine example for linguists in Brazil and elsewhere to follow. It is already being used by young fieldworkers—many of whom are S's students—as a template. I do hope that this standard will be kept up—especially in Brazil, with its wealth of dauntingly difficult and typologically unusual languages in need of urgent description and analysis.

The book is written in Portuguese, and is thus of somewhat limited accessibility to many linguists. It would be good to see this excellent grammar translated into English.

REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. Forthcoming. Evidentiality.
 ANCHIETA, J. DE. 1595. *Arte de gramática da língua mais usada na costa do Brasil*. Coimbra: Antônio Mariz.
 DIXON, R. M. W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 JENSEN, CHERYL. 1999. Tupí-Guaraní. The Amazonian languages, ed. by R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 125–64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 RODRIGUES, ARYON DALL'IGNA. 1986. *Línguas Brasileiras. Para o conhecimento das línguas indígenas*. São Paulo: Ed. Loyola.
 SEKI, LUCY. 1990. Kamaiurá (Tupí-Guaraní) as an active-stative language. Amazonian linguistics. Studies in lowland South American Indian languages, ed. by Doris L. Payne, 367–92. Austin: University of Texas Press.
 ——. 1999. The Upper Xingu as an incipient linguistic area. The Amazonian languages, ed. by R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 417–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Research Centre for Linguistic Typology
 Institute for Advanced Study
 La Trobe University
 Bundoora, VIC 3086
 Australia
 [a.aikhenvald@latrobe.edu.au]

Discontinuous syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek. By A. M. DEVINE and LAURENCE D. STEPHENS. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. ix, 348.

Reviewed by MILES C. BECKWITH, *Montclair State University*

Discontinuous syntax is the most recent offering from A. M. Devine and Laurence Stephens which, like their previous works, uses modern theoretical methods to describe Ancient Greek. The book has two possible target audiences. On the one hand, the book may serve to give Classical scholars a more modern perspective on the unusual syntactic problems of Greek while, on the other hand, it may introduce theoretical linguists to a language which shows some remarkable syntactic structures. Unfortunately, the book may not reach these audiences. Classicists are likely to find the theoretical analyses tough going, and linguists untrained in Classical languages will be put off by the pages of examples in Greek. This is unfortunate because the data are truly fascinating. Moreover, the authors present a number of aids to help in parsing the material. English translations of all numbered examples are provided at the bottom of each page, and transliterations and morpheme glosses are given in an appendix. Unfortunately, unnumbered examples and forms in the text are not transliterated or even translated, and many examples presuppose a knowledge of Greek. I note in passing that D&S use a limited Greek transliteration