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Introduction

Evidentiality is a grammatical category with source of information as its primary meaning—whether the speaker saw the event happen, did not see it but heard it, made an inference based on general knowledge or visual traces, or was told about it. Languages may distinguish firsthand and nonfirsthand information or have a special marker just for reported evidentiality. In larger evidential systems, firsthand or visual evidential may contrast with nonvisual, inferred, assumed, and reported. Evidentiality is a verbal category in its own right. It does not bear any straightforward relationship to the expression of the speaker’s responsibility or attitude toward the statement. Neither is evidentiality a subcategory of modality or a tense. Nonevidential categories, including perfect aspect, past tense, conditional, and other modalities and complementation devices, can develop meanings related to information source. French linguists employ the term “mediative.” Scholars of Quechua use the term “validational” or “verificational.”

Monographs

The notion of evidentiality was introduced into general linguistics by Jakobson 1957. Aikhenvald 2004 is the only monograph to date dealing exclusively with the category of evidentiality. There are numerous articles dealing with various meanings of evidentials. A number of monographs address epistemic and other modalities and pragmatic notions involving responsibility, control, and authority, with marginal relevance to evidentiality.


A comprehensive overview of grammatical evidentiality in a cross-linguistic perspective based on the author’s own fieldwork and on examination of grammars of more than five hundred languages. Deals with the expression, semantics, and pragmatics of evidential systems across the world; their correlations with other categories, including mirativity; their origins and decay; and child language acquisition. Paperback edition with revisions published 2006 (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press).


Introduces the general notion of evidentiality as a cover term for grammaticalized marking of information source.

Articles

Franz Boas was the first scholar explicitly to pinpoint the existence of a grammatical category reflecting the information source of a speaker, based on his work on North
American Indian languages (Boas 1938). Roman Jakobson was the first scholar to use the term “evidential” and to provide the classical definition (Jakobson 1957, cited under Monographs). Comrie 2000 (cited under Meanings) offers a brief survey of small evidential systems found in Eurasia. Willett 1988 and Kozintseva 1994 provide some cross-linguistic information on evidentiality, now outdated. Aikhenvald 2004 and Joseph 2003 formulate cross-linguistic foundations for typology of evidentiality. Some cross-linguistic information is in de Haan 2005.


A cross-linguistic account of systems of evidentials, with special focus on languages that mark information source more than once in a clause.


A discussion of various means of grammatical and lexical expression of information source, including grammatical evidentials, modal verbs, parentheticals, and lexical items.


A pioneering work explicitly formulating the notion of obligatory marking of information source in North American Indian languages.


A somewhat limited summary of the way evidentiality is expressed in some languages. This is based on an artificially limited sample and should be used with caution.


This paper discusses the possibilities of expressing information source with means other than grammatical evidentials, focusing on evidential-like distinctions in Indo-European languages (also see Further Indo-European Languages).

An early but insightful analysis of evidential systems, with a special focus on reported and visual/nonvisual distinctions found in the languages of Eurasia.


A concise account of the lexical expressions of information source and the ways grammatical means, such as modalities, moods, and modal verbs, can be extended to cover evidential-like meanings, arguing for the lack of categorical distinction between lexical and grammatical evidentiality.


The first attempt at a cross-linguistic analysis of grammatical systems of evidentiality, offering generalizations based on limited data. Some have since then been proved wrong. In general, this is outdated. Among inconsistencies one finds are the differences between Willett’s own analysis of Cora in this source and in Willett 1991 (cited under Mesoamerican Languages).

Edited Collections

Chafe and Nichols 1986 covers a selection of North American, South American, and Tibeto-Burman languages. Guentchéva 1996 contains twenty papers addressing small systems in Indo-European, Turkish, and Uralic and also modality in a variety of languages. Johanson and Utas 2000 (cited under Turkic Languages) contains seven papers on small evidentiality systems in Turkic languages, five on Iranian languages, and a further eight on small evidential systems and semantically related modal marking in Tibeto-Burman, Caucasian, and Uralic languages (see Tibeto-Burman Languages, Languages of the Caucasus, Uralic Languages). Aikhenvald and Dixon 2003 includes analysis of evidential systems of different types and sizes from Eurasia, South America, North America, and the Tibeto-Burman family. Guentchéva 2007 contains eighteen papers discussing fourteen languages from South America and Mesoamerica and four from the Caucasus. Aikhenvald 2007 contains analytic papers on evidentials and mirativity in six Tibeto-Burman languages, with an introduction by the editor detailing advances in the typology of evidentials. Peterson and Sauerland 2010 focuses on evidentials and other verbal categories related to information source in a selection of languages, including Japanese, English, and Tagalog. Wiemer and Stathi 2010 outlines foundations for the analysis of information source marking in selected European languages. Aikhenvald and Dixon 2014 offers a linguistic and an anthropological perspective
on evidentiality and information source in a cross-linguistic perspective, with special focus on twelve focal languages.


A collection of six papers focusing on newly discovered systems of evidentials in Tibeto-Burman languages, with a typological introduction.


A collection of fourteen chapters on a variety of evidential systems in twelve languages cast in a common framework (including Abkhaz, Western Apache, Eastern Pomo, Tariana, Jarawara, Macedonian and Albanian, Yukaghir, Turkic, and West Greenlandic), with a typological survey by Aikhenvald and a conclusion by Brian D. Joseph (see Joseph 2003, cited under Articles).


A collection of thirteen chapters, starting with Aikhenvald’s update of the typology of evidentials and their relations with information source, followed by chapters on evidentials and the expression of knowledge in twelve languages (covering Tibeto-Burman, Arawak, West Chadic, Australian, Mongolic, Turkic, Formosan, Jivaroan, Tima-Katla, and Lower Sepik).


A pioneering, influential collection of eighteen chapters covering evidential systems in North and South American languages, in the Balkan languages, in Tibeto-Burman languages (Sherpa, Akha, and Tibetan), and in Japanese, with an additional focus on epistemic meanings in English and other languages.


A collection of five papers on epistemic markers and their extension into expressing information source, based on data from European languages.

First of an important series of two volumes, this contains twenty papers addressing small systems in Indo-European, North American, and Turkish languages, with a further comprehensive survey of Uralic and also addressing the expression of modality in a variety of languages.


Second in an important series of two volumes. This contains eighteen papers discussing evidentials and semantically similar categories in fourteen languages from South America and Mesoamerica and four from the Caucasus.


A selection of papers discussing epistemic modalities, polarity, the pragmatics of evidentials, and the use of other verbal categories related to information source in a selection of languages, including Japanese, Yoruba, English, and Tagalog.


Papers in this collection focus on the ways information source can be expressed through lexical and grammatical means, especially in European languages.


A collection of seven papers with a focus on creation of a database of the expression of evidential-like meanings in European languages and modal meanings that can overlap with information source.

**Extensions of Nonevidential Categories**

A verbal form with no primary evidential meaning can be used to refer to the way information was acquired as an “evidentiality strategy.” These forms include conditional mood, participles, nominalizations, perfects, and perfectives (Dendale 1993, Dendale and Van Bogaert 2007, Tasmovski and Dendale 1994, Liddicoat 1997, Merlan 1981) focuses on irrealis in speech reports. Infinitives and participles are discussed in Wälchli 2000 and Wiemer 1998. Typical meanings cover information acquired through inference or speech report, with overtones of uncertainty and disbelief, as addressed in some detail in Aikhenvald 2004 (cited under Monographs); see also Tatevosov 2001a and Tatevosov 2001b, cited under
Languages of the Caucasus. Lexical items and modal verbs can also be used to express information source (Squartini 2007, Aikhenvald 2007, both cited under Articles).


Semantic and pragmatic analysis of the uses of the conditional in French to refer to information one does not vouch for.


Analysis of lexical means used for various information sources in French.


A concise analysis of evidential overtones of the French conditional, used for inferences and reported information one does not vouch for.


A pioneering study addressing evidential-like meaning of irrealis, among other issues.


Discussion of a modal verb in French that can be used to refer to uncertain and unreliable information.


Infinitive as a predicate in a number of genetically unrelated languages of the Baltic area may develop overtones to do with inference and unreliable information. This is a pioneering attempt at an areal study of an evidentiality strategy.
A discussion of the ways a participle in Lithuanian can be used to express inference and may be considered to be on its way toward developing into an evidential.

**Meanings**

The exact meaning of each evidential varies depending on the system. A visual evidential may refer to something seen, while a nonvisual one typically refers to hearing, smelling, touching, or feeling something. A general nonfirsthand evidential covers all kinds of information sources available to the speaker. These issues are also addressed in chapter 5 of Aikhenvald 2004 (cited under Monographs). Comrie 2000 and Hagège 1995 offer general analyses of the semantics of small systems. de Haan 2001 and De Haan 2005 discuss individual terms. Curnow 2003 surveys meaning overtones (see also Tasmovski and Dendale 1994, cited under Extensions of Nonevidential Categories). Aikhenvald and Storch 2013 discusses the meanings of evidentials as contrasted to the meanings of verbs of perception.


An overview of meanings of evidentials across the languages of the world and their comparison with meanings of verbs of perception and cognition.


A brief introduction to small evidentiality systems and their correlations with other categories, especially perfect aspect, based on languages of Eurasia.


Account of semantic overtones of nonvisual, inferential, and reported evidential to do with lack of control and nonvolitionality on the part of the speaker.

de Haan, Ferdinand. 2001. The cognitive basis of visual evidentials. In *Conceptual and discourse factors in linguistic structure*. Edited by Alan Cienki, Barbara J.

An overview of the semantic grounds a visual evidential may cover (from vision to general knowledge), based on a limited number of languages.


A partial summary of meaning distinctions within evidential and epistemic systems, based on a limited number of languages. Contains factual errors and does not take into account much of the existing literature.


A brief survey of meanings of reported and inferred evidentials in the context of extensions of nonevidential categories to cover some meanings related to information source and of modal categories.


A survey of meanings and use of indirect evidentials, covering reported and inferential evidentials.

**Tense, Aspect, and Mood**

Evidentials interrelate with tense, aspect, and mood. The reported evidential tends to be the only one found in imperatives (Aikhenvald 2010). The inferential evidential tends to be associated with past tense, perfective aspect, and perfect in general. Most evidentials tend to be distinguished in past tense and declarative mood (Aikhenvald and Dixon 1998, Bhat 1999). Also see chapter 8 of Aikhenvald 2004 (cited under Monographs).


Section 4.2.4 of chapter 4 provides an exhaustive overview of evidentials’ use in commands.

Dependencies in the cross-linguistic expression of evidentials, negation, aspect, tense, mood, and person. Evidentiality and other distinctions may get neutralized in negative clauses.


This book contains some discussion of how evidential distinctions can be expressed depending on tense and aspect of the clause in some languages of India.

**Epistemic Modality**

Meanings of inference and assumption are common to evidentials and to modalities discussed in Boye 2010. The existence of epistemic extensions of evidentials (which is far from universal) has led some scholars (see, e.g., Palmer 1986 and van der Auwera and Plungian 1998) to mix together evidentiality and epistemic modality. De Haan 1997 and de Haan 1999 draw boundaries between evidentiality and modality. Also see chapter 8 of Aikhenvald 2004 (cited under Monographs) and other sources in Chafe and Nichols 1986 and Aikhenvald and Dixon 2003 (both cited under Edited Collections). Modal extensions of evidentials are also linked to notions of responsibility and authority in Fox 2001, are linked with relevance in Ifantidou 2001, and are connected with epistemological stance and viewpoint in Mushin 2001. Evidentiality-related modal meanings in Japanese are addressed in Narrog 2009.


A survey of the epistemic meanings (based primarily on European languages) and discussion of their overlap with evidential meanings of inference and assumption.


A detailed study of the interrelation between negation and modality, with a discussion of epistemic meanings that involve speaker’s attitude to the information source.


This seminal paper conclusively demonstrates that evidentiality is different from epistemic and other modalities in its semantics and use.

A discussion of the expression of responsibility and authority in American English. The author links these concepts to the notion of evidentiality, adopting a broad view of evidentiality as a category linked to epistemic modality.


Evidentiality is understood as encompassing modality and numerous unrelated pragmatic notions, including relevance (which is not defined). The focus of the study is means of expressing reported information in Modern Greek and their epistemic overtones of unreliability.


A misguided approach to evidentiality as part of epistemic modality, based on limited work with partial speakers of Serbian and Croatian in Melbourne, Australia, and limited data on Japanese, with little attention to the literature.


Analysis of epistemic meanings in Japanese and their overlap with inference and assumption (typical evidential categories).


A comprehensive though somewhat outdated overview of mood and various modalities.


A useful, though somewhat outdated, survey of modal meanings, based primarily on European languages.

**Person Marking**
Evidentiality often reflects the information source of the speaker. If a nonvisual, inferential, or reported evidential is used with a first-person subject, this may imply an involuntary or uncontrolled event (Curnow 2003, cited under Meanings; see also chapters 4 and 7 of Aikhenvald 2004, cited under Monographs). Conjunct-disjunct person marking (found in Barbacoan and some Tibeto-Burman languages [see Tibeto-Burman Languages]) may extend to cover evidential-like meanings of inference associated with unexpected information and mirativity (Curnow 2002a, Curnow 2002b, Dickinson 2000, deLancey 1992; compare deLancey 1997 and Aikhenvald 2012, cited under Mirativity). Bickel 2000 addresses evidential choices for different persons in Himalayan languages. Guentchéva, et al. 1994 focuses on person overtones in small systems of evidentials. Special meanings of first person with nonfirsthand and reported evidentials are addressed in Aikhenvald and Dixon 2014 (cited under Edited Collections).


A state-of-the-art survey of correlations among person of the speaker, evidentiality, and epistemic meanings in a selection of Himalayan languages.


A comprehensive description of conjunct-disjunct person marking in a previously undescribed Barbacoan language from Colombia. The same marker is used for first person in statements and second person in questions. The use of person markers correlates with inference and unexpected information, “mirativity” (see Mirativity).


A comprehensive overview of conjunct-disjunct person marking systems in Barbacoan languages and their extensions to cover evidential-type meanings.


An in-depth, state-of-the-art discussion of semantic overtones of lack of control and volitionality for nonvisual, nonfirsthand, and reported evidentials with first-person subjects.

A classic in the field. Accounts for the semantics and history of conjunct-disjunct marking in Tibeto-Burman languages (see Tibeto-Burman Languages).


A comprehensive fieldwork-based account of evidentiality, mirativity (see Mirativity), and conjunct-disjunct marking in Tsafiki, a Barbacoan language from Ecuador. Conjunct-disjunct person marking is reminiscent of that described in deLancey 1992 and has mirative and inferential overtones.


An overview of interactions between person of the speaker and evidentials in small evidentiality systems, with a focus on languages of Europe and Asia.

**Meanings in Complementation**

The choice of a complement clause marker or of complementation strategy may correlate with the way information was acquired, for instance, through a speech report (*I heard that France beat Argentina*) or through hearing (*I heard France beating Argentina*), discussed in Barentsen 1996 for Russian, Akatsuka 1978 for Japanese, Dixon 1995 and Kirsner and Thompson 1978 for English, Frajzyngier and Jasperson 1991 for English and Chadic languages, and Givón and Kimenyi 1974 for Kinyarwanda (a summary is in chapter 4 of Aikhenvald 2004, cited under Monographs).


The choice of a complementizer in Japanese depends on the speaker’s attitude toward information and on the information source.


The choice of a complementizer with verbs of perception in Russian depends on the information source of the speaker.

Examines the choice between a *that* complement clause and complementation strategies in English; the choice is linked to the source of information of the speaker.


An account of marking of complementation and its correlation to information source, based primarily on English.


A study of expression of epistemic meanings, including assumption and belief, in Kinyarwanda, a Bantu language, with a special focus on correlations between the choice of complementizer and the information source.


An investigation of complements of sensory verbs in English, with a discussion of how they may distinguish various information sources.

**Reported Speech and Information Source**

Speech reports (that is, something someone else has said that is being repeated) are discussed in Coulmas 1986, Güldemann and von Roncador 2002, and Janssen and van der Wurff 1996. They can be manipulated to express attitude toward information and correlate with marking of information source (that is, a reported or a quotative evidential). Grammaticalization of report verbs is discussed in Klamer 2000 and Saxena 1988 and further extensions in Munro 1978. Reported speech in interactional perspective is addressed in Nuckolls and Michael 2014 (cited under Information Sources and Cultural Stereotypes).


A useful collection of papers dealing with speech reports and reported speech in general in a variety of languages from Europe, Asia, Africa, and North America.

A collection of papers addressing varied perspectives on reported discourse and speech reports and their marking, semantics, and pragmatics, dealing with languages from Europe, Asia, and Africa.


A collection of papers focusing on the form of the verb in reported speech and its overtones, including the use of modal verb forms to express a speech report (as is the case in German).


A detailed investigation of grammaticalization of speech report verbs in Western Austronesian languages and their development into quotative evidentials and complementizers.


A classic study of speech reports and quotative and reported markers in Uto-Aztecan languages.


A seminal investigation of the development of reported and quotative patterns based on the verb of speech in Tibeto-Burman languages in a genetic and areal perspective.

**Mirativity**

Mirativity, defined as grammaticalized surprise and “unprepared mind,” was introduced by Scott deLancey (deLancey 1997, deLancey 2001); see also Lazard 1999, Lazard 2001 (cited under Historical Development), and chapter 6 of Aikhenvald 2004 (cited under Monographs). Evidentials often have mirative overtones (DeLancey 1990; Gronemeyer 1997, cited under Further Indo-European
Languages). In many languages mirativity and evidentiality are independent categories (Hein 2007, Grunow-Hårsta 2007, Peterson 2000; Hyslop 2011, cited under Tibeto-Burman Languages; see also Adelaar 1997 and Adelaar 2013, both cited under Quechua; Watters 2002, cited under Tibeto-Burman Languages; Miller and Gilley 2007 and König 2013, cited under African Languages). Mirativity may correlate with person marking (see Dickinson 2000, cited under Person Marking) and with special pronominal forms (Storch 1999). Reassessment of mirativity is in Aikhenvald 2012 and deLancey 2012.


A detailed analysis of mirativity across the languages of the world, in terms of their expression and semantics, with additional focus on mirative extensions of meanings for evidentials, especially in first-person contexts.


A pioneering description of mirative overtones of an inferred evidential in Hare, an Athabaskan language.


This classic paper provides a definition of mirativity as a new grammatical category and outlines its possible correlations with other categories, including evidentiality.


A classic paper containing further elaboration of mirativity and its expression through means such as evidentials and person markers.


A reappraisal of the category of mirativity as a cross-linguistic category, using the data from Kham and Hare, and showing how mirativity differs from indirect evidentiality, in addition to a discussion of the place of mirativity in the verbal system of Tibetan languages.

An in-depth description of evidentiality as a category independent of mirativity in Magar, a Tibeto-Burman language.


An in-depth analysis of mirative as an independent grammatical category in a Tibetan dialect and how evidentials can acquire mirative overtones.


This seminal paper addresses the ways of distinguishing evidentiality in its varied guises from mirativity as an independent category.


A comprehensive analysis of the semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Nepali and the expression of mirativity.


Hone, a Jukunoid language from Nigeria, has a highly unusual system of mirative pronouns that express speaker’s unprepared mind and can be linked to inference as information source.

**Historical Development**


A pioneering discussion of the origin of an inferential and reported evidential in Lega, a Bantu language (also see Botne 2003, cited under African Languages).

A comprehensive historical-comparative analysis of the development of the reported evidential in Estonian, based on a reinterpretation of a complement clause.


This seminal paper addresses the grammaticalization and development of evidentiality and its varied extensions, including mirativity (see Mirativity).


A historical and comparative analysis of the development of the unusual evidential system in Akha, a Tibeto-Burman language, from a variety of sources.

**Contact-Induced Change**


Detailed discussion of mechanisms of development of evidentials in Tariana, an Arawak language, under the influence of East Tucanoan languages.


This seminal paper addresses the ways contact languages, such as the English spoken by the Yavapai and Southern Paiute, acquire evidential-like markers to reflect the categories present in the Indian languages.

The present perfect form in Spanish spoken in Quito, Ecuador, is developing evidential meanings under the influence of Quechua.


An exhaustive study of defining features of the Caucasus as a linguistic area, with a special focus on small evidential systems as a salient feature.


Discussion of the development of evidentials in Hup, a Makú language spoken in the multilingual linguistic area of the Vaupés River basin, under the influence of East Tucanoan languages.


A comprehensive study of how Spanish varieties in contact with Quechua in South America develop evidential distinctions similar to those in Quechua out of their own resources.


A pioneering study of the influence of Turkish evidentials on Balkan Slavic languages.


A detailed analysis of the influence of Turkish on the emergence of evidential distinctions in Bulgarian.

A comprehensive and succinct survey of the role of language contact in the
development of the inferential, or indirect, evidential in Turkic.

Grammaticalization of a Quotative Marker in Spanish Varieties

In a number of varieties of South American Spanish and of Portuguese, a quotative
expression *dizque* or *dice(n) que*, “they say that,” is on its way to becoming a
reported or an inferential evidential: see Andrade Ciudad 2007 on Peruvian Spanish,
Babel 2009 on Ecuadorian Spanish, Olbertz 2005 on Mexican Spanish, and Travis
2006 on Colombian Spanish. Kany 1944 is a pioneering study of this development.
Also see chapter 4 of Aikhenvald 2004 (cited under Monographs) and Aikhenvald
2002 (cited under Lowland Amazonian Languages).

Andrade Ciudad, Luis F. 2007. Usos de *dice* en castellano andino. MA thesis,
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

A master’s thesis investigating the uses of the particle *dice* in Peruvian Spanish as
an incipient marker of reported evidentiality.


Analysis of an incipient reportative marker in a variety of Bolivian Spanish under
the influence of Aymara.

Kany, Charles. 1944. Impersonal *dizque* and its variants in American Spanish.

A pioneering paper dealing with the distribution of the reportative marker in
South American Spanish.

innovador. In *Encuentros y conflictos: Bilingüismo y contacto de lenguas en el
mundo andino*. Edited by Hella Olbertz and Pieter Muysken, 77–94. Madrid:
Iberoamericana.

An in-depth account of the use and spread of the reportative marker in Ecuadorian
Spanish.

Olbertz, Hella. 2007. *Dizque* in Mexican Spanish: The subjectification of reportative

Deals with the semantic developments and usage of the reportative marker in
Mexican Spanish.

This seminal paper contains a corpus-based analysis of the reportative marker in Colombian Spanish, its status, and its pragmatic overtones.

Areal Features

Evidentiality systems are considered features of numerous linguistic areas and regions. Aikhenvald 2006 puts forward principles and motivations for contact-induced distribution of evidentials. Evidentials as areal features within the Balkan area are discussed in Friedman 2000. Johanson 2002 analyzes evidentials in the contact history of Turkic. Johanson and Utas 2000 focuses on areality of evidentials in Turkic, Uralic, and a few other languages. Indirect evidentiality as a Eurasian feature is discussed in Haarmann 1970. Areality in evidentiality in the Baltic area is addressed in Stolz 1991. See also Balkan Languages, Uralic Languages, North American Indian Languages, and Lowland Amazonian Languages.


This introductory chapter discusses, inter alia, evidentials as features of numerous linguistic areas, including the Vaupés River basin.


Account of areal distribution of evidential systems in lowland Amazonia.


A comprehensive discussion of evidentials as an areal feature of the Balkans.


A pioneering though distinctly obsolete account of inferential evidentiality as a feature spread across Eurasia. Contains interesting data, especially about ancient languages of Europe and Asia.

Comprehensive analysis of Turkic languages in contact, with a special focus on evidentiality as a diffusional feature.


An important collection of papers focusing on evidentials in Turkic, Iranian, and Uralic languages and the role of language contact in the emergence of evidentiality.


A comprehensive analysis of the Baltic linguistic area, with a special focus on the development of shared evidential patterns.

**Child Language Acquisition**

Little has been published so far on the ways children acquire evidentials. Aksu-Koç 1988, Aksu-Koç 2000, and Aksu-Koç and Slobin 1986 address child language acquisition of evidentials in Turkish in the context of other verbal categories. Courtney 1999 is a pioneering discussion of acquisition of the Quechua direct evidential. Fitneva and Matsui 2009 contains studies on child language acquisition of evidentials, and other markers of information source. Also see the appendix to chapter 11 of Aikhenvald 2004 (cited under Monographs).


A seminal work dealing with the acquisition of aspects in Turkish, with special attention to the acquisition of the inferential past.


Further work on the acquisition of the inferential evidential in Turkish.

A summary of acquisition of the inferential evidential in Turkish and its pragmatics.


A preliminary investigation of child language acquisition of the visual, or “affirmative,” evidential in the Cuzco-Collao variety of Quechua.


This collection of seven papers addresses the issues of child language acquisition of evidentials in Turkish and in Tibetan, in addition to an overview of evidentials, children’s use of evidentials in reliability judgments (based on Bulgarian), and relationships between evidentiality and suggestibility (based on Turkish).

**Evidentiality and Cognition**

A number of recent studies on evidentiality and cognition are closely linked to how children acquire evidentiality and expression of information source. Papafragou, et al. 2007 focuses specifically on children’s reasoning with regard to information acquisition. Tosun, et al. 2013 focuses on correlations between the expression information source and its memory retention.


A fundamental investigation of the interactions between linguistic and conceptual representation of information source, through the analysis of the acquisition of evidentiality and its relation to children’s evidential reasoning.


A pioneering investigation of the ways in which obligatory linguistic marking of information source may affect memory retention of it. Turkish speakers showed better recognition and source memory for assertions coded with firsthand than
nonfirsthand markers. English monolingual speakers showed no difference in
recognition or source memory for source type, but demonstrated better memory
than Turkish speakers for nonfirsthand sources.

**Information Sources and Cultural Stereotypes**

The ways speakers use evidentials in discourse reflect attitudes toward knowledge
and cultural stereotypes. These are addressed in most sources on evidentials in
individual languages, among them Weber 1989 (cited under Quechua), Aikhenvald
2002 (cited under Lowland Amazonian Languages), Dixon 2003 (cited under Small
Language Families and Isolates), Fleck 2007 (cited under Panoan Languages), and
Schieffelin 1996 (cited under Pacific Languages); also see chapter 11 of Aikhenvald
2004 (cited under Monographs). Evidentiality is linked to responsibility in Hill and
Irvine 1992. Lee 1944 and Lee 1950 relate traditional Wintu evidential use to
behavioral patterns. Duranti 2008 relates cultural inhibitions against talking about
other peoples’ thoughts to the requirement to be precise about one’s information
source. Nuckolls and Michael 2014 addresses various issues to do with evidentiality
in interaction and sociocultural context.

Duranti, Alessandro. 2008. Further reflections on reading other minds. In *Special

An introduction by a leading linguistic anthropologist to a special issue of
*Anthropological Quarterly, Opacity of Other People’s Minds*, focusing on
conventions in reporting other people’s speech and emotional states in a number
of languages of New Guinea, with and without evidentials.

discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

A useful collection of papers dealing with pragmatics of evidentials and the
presentation of evidence in discourse in a number of languages from across the
world.


A seminal paper dealing with cultural conventions of evidentials’ use among the
Wintu of North America.

*Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 45:538–543.

Further investigation of the use of evidentials and attitude toward knowledge
among the Wintu.

A collection of seven papers (originally published in 2012, in *Pragmatics and Society*) dealing with evidentiality in social interaction, sociocultural context of evidentiality use and discourse, with focus on Quechua, Nanti, and Albanian.

**Individual Areas, Languages, and Families**

Evidential systems are found in about one-quarter of the world’s languages. Small evidential systems have been described, in varying amount of detail, for Balkan languages, other Indo-European languages, Turkic languages, Finno-Ugric languages, and Caucasian languages. Larger evidential systems have been described for Tibeto-Burman languages, South American languages (covering the Andes and lowland Amazonia), and North American languages. There are just a few descriptions available for small evidential systems in languages of Africa, Australia, and the Pacific. Evidential systems are an areal feature within Eurasia (a comprehensive treatment is in Johanson and Utas 2000, cited under Areal Features). There are no unequivocal descriptions of evidential systems in sign languages.

**Balkan Languages**

Evidentiality (typically two-term systems, with a distinction between eyewitness and noneyewitness terms, also known as confirmative versus nonconfirmative) is known to be an areal feature of the Balkans as a linguistic area. Victor A. Friedman (Friedman 1986, Friedman 2003, Friedman 2006) offers the most-authoritative sources on evidentiality in the Balkans. Aronson 1967 is a pioneering account of evidentiality and related categories in Bulgarian.


A pioneering essay on evidentiality and related categories in Bulgarian.


The first concise summary of evidentiality in three focal languages of the Balkans.

A comprehensive analysis of evidentiality across the whole Balkans as a linguistic area, with new linguistic data and additional information on correlations between evidentials and other meanings, including mirativity.


This article addresses evidentiality in the context of other areal phenomena in the Balkans, with special attention to previously undescribed Macedonian varieties.

**Further Indo-European Languages**

Lazard 1985, Windfuhr 1982, and Nazarova 1998 argue for small evidentiality systems in Indo-Iranian languages. Evidentials in Dardic are addressed in Bashir 1988; in Armenian in Donabédian 2001; and in Baltic, Scandinavian, and Romance in Haugen 1972, Timberlake 1982, and Squartini 2007, respectively. Gronemeyer 1997 discusses evidentials in Lithuanian (with special mention of their mirative extensions; see Mirativity). Many Indo-European languages distinguish just a reported or an inferential evidential, while others have a two-term opposition between witnessed and unwitnessed information source. Inferential meanings are often associated with perfect aspect, and an inferential evidential may develop out of reinterpretation of the perfect (see Aikhenvald 2004, cited under Monographs). Joseph 2003 poses the question of the existence of evidentials in Proto-Indo-European. The role of areal diffusion in the development of evidentials in Baltic languages is addressed in Stolz 1991 (cited under Areal Features). Johanson and Utas 2000 (cited under Areal Features) contains descriptions of small evidential systems in five Iranian languages and in Armenian.


A seminal paper accounting for the existence of witnessed versus nonwitnessed evidentiality distinctions in two previously undescribed Dardic languages.


A comprehensive account of the meanings of inferential, or noneyewitness, evidential in Armenian, based on discourse uses.

A discussion of an inferential evidential and a reported evidential in Lithuanian, and its mirative connotations when used with first-person subject.


Analysis of evidential meaning of inference encoded in the perfect forms in Scandinavian languages.


Pioneering attempt at inquiring whether ancient Indo-European languages had grammaticalized evidentiality.


Discussion of the expression of inferential meanings through distant past in Modern Persian and whether this can be considered an evidential in its own right.


Detailed analysis of the way perfect forms can be used to mark reported and inferred information in Ishkashim, a previously undescribed Iranian language from the Pamir region, in comparison with Badakhan Tajik.


Comprehensive and accessible analysis of the ways reported and inferential evidential meanings can be expressed in the two Romance languages.

The article focuses on evidential distinctions expressed through the use of impersonal passive in Lithuanian.


Discussion of inferential meanings of verbal tenses in Persian.

**Turkic Languages**

Lars Johanson (Johanson 2000, Johanson 2003) is the major authority on evidentials in Turkic languages (alternatively termed “indirectives”). Evidentials in Turkic languages (e.g., Salar, Khalaj, Gagauz) have also been addressed in contributions to Johanson and Utas 2000. This volume and Johanson 2002 also address the role of language contact in the emergence of evidentials in Turkic. Slobin and Aksu-Koç 1982 discusses Turkish evidentials within the tense-aspect-mood system.


A seminal article dealing with semantics and expression of evidentials across Turkic languages.


Comprehensive analysis of Turkic languages in contact, with a special focus on evidentiality as a diffusional feature.


A detailed analysis of evidentials, their correlations with other categories, and pragmatic and semantic overtones across the family.


An important collection of papers focusing on evidentials in Turkic, Iranian, and Uralic languages and the role of language contact in the emergence of evidentiality.

A detailed analysis of how the semantics of evidentials in Turkish correlates with other verbal categories.

**Uralic Languages**


A state-of-the-art collection of grammar sketches of Uralic languages, with individual chapters addressing evidentiality distinctions (Estonian by Tiit-Rein Viitso, Mordva by Gábor Zaicz, Mari by Eeva Kangasmaa-Minn, Permian by Timothy Riese, Udmurt by Sándor Csúcs, Komi by Anu-Reet Hausenberg, Khanty by Daniel Abondolo, Mansi by László Keresztes, Nganasan and Selkup by Eugene Helimski, Nenets by Tapani Salminen).


A useful discussion of reported evidential in Estonian (traditionally termed *kaudne kõneviis*, or oblique mode) and its correlates in Saami and Finnish that have no grammatical evidentials.


Concise discussion of a small evidentiality system in Enets, a Samoyedic language.

Detailed analysis of evidential meanings in Komi Zyryan in the context of neighboring languages.


Detailed analysis of the origins and meanings of the reported evidential in South Estonian dialects.


Analysis of the historical development of a reported evidential out of a participle in Estonian and Latvian, two unrelated languages in contact with each other.


Comprehensive account of semantics and use of a two-term evidential system in an Ugric language.


Detailed analysis of the inferential-reported evidential in Nenets, a Samoyedic language.


Comprehensive analysis of the meanings of noneyewitness evidentiality in Mansi, an Ob-Ugric language.

Languages of the Caucasus

Languages of the Caucasus belong to three genetically unrelated groups: South Caucasian, or Kartvelian (Boeder 2000), Northeast Caucasian (Kibrik 1977, Maisak and Merdanova 2002, Maisak and Tatevosov 2001, Tatevosov 2001a; Tatevosov 2001b), and Northwest Caucasian (Chirikba 2003, Hewitt 1979). Each of these has a small system of evidentials, typically an eyewitness versus noneyewitness opposition or a marker with the meaning of reported evidentiality or inference. Chirikba 2008 (cited in Contact-Induced Change) considers evidentiality an areal feature of the Caucasus as a linguistic area.

A seminal paper on reported evidential in Georgian, a South Caucasian language.


An exhaustive analysis of inferred evidential in Abkhaz, based on an extensive corpus of texts, in the context of other Northwest Caucasian languages (including Abaza and Ubykh) and as part of the Caucasus as a linguistic area.


This pioneering paper is the first attempt to analyze evidentiality in Abkhaz, a Northwest Caucasian language.


This first comprehensive grammar of a Northeast Caucasian language, Archi. Provides an incisive analysis of eyewitness versus noneyewitness evidentials, with special attention to their semantics and use in discourse.


A comprehensive description of evidentiality in Agul, a poorly documented Northeast Caucasian language.


A chapter in a multiauthored grammar of Bagvalal, a Northeast Caucasian language. This is the first in-depth study of the eyewitness form of verbs in this language.

A comparative study of reported and noneyewitness evidentials in Nakh-Daghestanian (Northeast Caucasian) languages, based on reanalysis of erstwhile perfect forms.


A chapter in a multiauthored grammar of Bagvalal, a Northeast Caucasian language. This is a comprehensive study of the noneyewitness (“oblique”) form of verbs in this language.

**Tibeto-Burman Languages**

Tibeto-Burman languages show considerable diversity in their evidential systems, summarized in Aikhenvald and LaPolla 2007. Many of them have large and complex systems of evidentials, where evidentiality interacts with tense, aspect, mirativity, and person marking (see Egerod 1985 on Akha, Lidz 2007 on Yongning Na, Watters 2002 on Kham, and Hyslop 2011 on Kurtöp; see also Grunow-Hårsta 2007 and deLancey 2001, both cited under Mirativity). The exact nature of evidentiality and person marking (see Person Marking) in some languages, such as Tibetan, as presented in deLancey 1985, remains a matter of debate. Garrett 2001 links this to assertion in declarative clauses. Evidentials linked to the personal domain in Amdo-Tibetan are discussed in Sun 1993. Multisource origins of evidentials are discussed in Saxena 1997 and Thurgood 1981.


A summary of newly discovered systems of evidentials in Tibeto-Burman languages, with up to five evidential distinctions: Rgyalthang Tibetan, Darma, nDrapa, Magar and Tabo (reviewing Grunow-Hårsta 2007 and Hein 2007, cited under Mirativity), and Yongning Na (Mosuo) (Lidz 2007).


A seminal paper dealing with the expression of eyewitness versus noneyewitness evidentials in Lhasa Tibetan and its correlations with other verbal categories.


A seminal study of typologically unusual evidential distinctions in Akha.


A comprehensive analysis of discourse functions of evidentials in Tibetan and their correlations with statements and assertions.


A comprehensive grammar of a previously undescribed Bodish language of Bhutan with an intricate system of evidentials and mirative markers (described by the author as referring to the “expectation of knowledge”).


A detailed study of an unusual evidential system in a previously undescribed Tibeto-Burman language spoken in Yunnan Province in China, with a fivefold system of evidential distinctions: direct/visual evidence is formally unmarked, while grammaticalized particles indicate reported, quotative, inferential, and common knowledge.


An account of correlations between evidentials and aspects in Lhasa Tibetan.


A major contribution to the study of evidentials in a Tibetan dialect, with special attention to the correlations between the semantics of the verb and that of an evidential and the so-called exophoric systems.


Analysis of the origin of the unusual system of Akha evidentials.

A comprehensive, in-depth grammar of a previously undescribed Tibeto-Burman language of Nepal, with an especially incisive analysis of reported evidentiality and mirativity as an independent category.

**North American Indian Languages**

The study of evidentiality as a category was started by Boas 1911 and Boas 1938 (cited under Articles) and was primarily based on American Indian languages. These display intricate systems of evidentials. A survey is in Mithun 1999. A number of papers in Chafe and Nichols 1986 (cited under Edited Collections) focus on North America. Silver and Miller 1997 provides a survey of various features of American Indian languages, including evidentiality.


A pioneering and detailed study of an evidentiality system in a North American Indian language. Some evidentials, such as one for “dreams,” are unique.


A comprehensive survey of the languages of Native North America, with a potted description of every language and every family. A remarkably comprehensive resource for categories such as evidentials.


A general introduction to the languages of the Americas, with special focus on evidentiality as their major feature.

**Individual Studies**

Muskogean languages have a complex system of information source and the expression of self, discussed in Broadwell 2006. A small system in Western Apache is presented in de Reuse 2003, and one in Dena’ina in Holton and Lovick 2008. Jacobsen 1986 focuses on the history of the notion of evidentiality and evidentials in Wakashan. Evidentials in Algonquian languages are in Drapeau 1996 and James, et al. 2001. Whether or not West Greenlandic has an evidential system is discussed in Fortescue 2003. The expression of information source and its double marking in
Pomoan languages are addressed in McLendon 2003. Peterson 2010 focuses on pragmatics of evidentiality in Gitksan.


This comprehensive grammar of Chocktaw, a Muskogean language, discusses evidentiality in some detail.


A comprehensive description of evidentiality and evidential extensions of nonevidential categories in an Athabaskan language.


A detailed, discourse-based study of the use of evidentials in an Algonquian language.


A detailed study of various means of expressing evidentiality in West Greenlandic.


A comprehensive analysis of a small evidential system in a Northern Athabaskan language.


A comprehensive analysis of a heterogenous system of evidentials in Makah, a Wakashan language, accompanied by a history of recognition and naming of evidentiality as a category.

A detailed analysis of inferential evidentials in three Algonquian languages.


An in-depth, fieldwork-based description of evidentials in Eastern Pomo and other Pomoan languages. The most comprehensive source dealing with a Pomoan language.


An in-depth analysis of evidentials, their use, and their interrelations with epistemic modality in Gitskan, a Tsimshianic language from Canada.

**Mesoamerican Languages**

A few grammatical descriptions of Mesoamerican languages address evidentials. They appear to be a salient feature of Uto-Aztecan languages, as described in Casad 1984, Casad 1992, and Willett 1991. Evidentials in other families in Mesoamerica require further investigation.


A concise grammar of a Uto-Aztecan language, with a detailed discussion of a small evidential system.


An in-depth analysis of semantics and usage of the Cora inferential evidential.

This reference grammar addresses an unusually large system of evidentials in this Uto-Aztecan language. The number and kinds of evidentials are different from those described in Willett 1988 (cited under Articles). This casts doubt on his analysis of the language.

Languages of the Andes

Quechua and Aymara (see Quechua and Aymara), the major language groups of the Andean part of South America, have three-term systems of evidentials. Adelaar 2004 provides a comprehensive account of these and other language groups in the Andean area and can be used as a highly reliable resource on various grammatical issues, including evidentials. Aikhenvald 2007 provides an overview of languages of the Pacific Coast of South America, covering their evidential systems.


A detailed and comprehensive account of languages of the Andean area and neighboring regions. A most reliable resource for evidentials in languages of these areas.


A brief survey of languages of the Pacific Coast of South America (including Mochica, Barbacoan, Chocoan, and others), with an overview of their evidential systems.

Aymara

Evidentials in Aymara have been discussed almost exclusively in Hardman 1981 in their pragmatic and social context and in Hardman 1986 in terms of their use and place in the tense system.


A collection of essays dealing with Aymara grammar and culture, with the editor’s introductory essay specifically focusing on the evidential system.

A detailed study of evidentiality and its cultural correlates in Aymara and related languages.

Quechua


An incisive analysis of the semantics of evidentiality and its expressive use.


A pioneering analysis of the “sudden discovery” tense in Quechua (with mirative meanings to do with surprise and unprepared mind) in the context of evidentiality, using the materials of Tarma Quechua.


A cognitive linguistic analysis of evidentials in one Quechua variety.


A detailed investigation of epistemic and further pragmatic overtones of the visual, or direct, evidential in Wanka Quechua.


A detailed analysis of the category of reported evidential in Wanka Quechua.

The most comprehensive and detailed investigation of evidentials in any Quechua variety to date (2011).


A detailed and comprehensive discussion of tense and aspect in a Quechua variety, addressing evidentials and their correlations with other categories.


An in-depth investigation of epistemic extension of the visual, or direct, evidential in Quechua.


One of the most comprehensive grammars of a Quechua language to date (2011). It contains a comprehensive, detailed, and insightful analysis of evidentials and their cultural correlates.

**Lowland Amazonian Languages**

Many lowland Amazonian languages have complex evidential systems, in particular Arawak, Tucanoan, and Panoan. A number of general survey articles in Dixon and Aikhenvald 1999 address these. Most grammars of Amazonian languages include a lengthy discussion of evidentials. Development of evidentials through language contact is addressed in Aikhenvald 2002; see also Aikhenvald 2003 and Epps 2005 (both cited under Contact-Induced Change). Evidentials as an areal phenomenon in Amazonia are briefly discussed in Aikhenvald and Dixon 1998 (cited under Tense, Aspect, and Mood), and in more detail in Aikhenvald 2012.


This monograph focuses on language contact in northwest Amazonia and contains a brief description of evidential systems in this area (covering Tucanoan, Arawak, and some Makú languages).

An account of grammar of 350 languages of Lowland Amazonia: Chapter 9, “How to Know Things: Evidentials in Amazonia,” focuses on different types of evidentials in Amazonian languages, their functions, genetic and areal distribution, and also their fate in language obsolescence.


A state-of-the-art collection of chapters on individual language families and areas. Contributions by D. C. Derbyshire on Carib, Janet Barnes on Tucanoan, Eugene Loos on Panoan, Ivan Lowe on Nambiquara, and Mary Ruth Wise on small languages and isolates of Peru deal specifically with complex evidential systems.

Arawak Languages

Most Arawak languages have evidentials with varied degrees of complexity. Tariana, from northwestern Brazil (Aikhenvald 2003), has a five-term system developed recently. Nanti, from southeastern Peru, has three (Michael 2008).


A comprehensive grammar of an Arawak language with a five-term system of evidentials.


A detailed account of the use of evidentials in Nanti, a Campa (Arawak) language, in the light of attitudes toward knowledge and their social correlates (accompanied by a brief sketch of the grammar).

Carib Languages

Carib languages tend to have small evidential systems marked through particles, as in Hixkaryana (Derbyshire 1985). Basso 2008 describes them as part of epistemic deixis. Hoff 1986 links them to expression of personal stance. Newly developed evidentials in Trio and other North Carib languages reflect attitude toward knowledge, according to Carlin 2002.

A discussion of evidentials and their epistemic extensions in a South Carib language.


An overview of evidentials and their cultural correlates in Carib languages, with a focus on Trio, a North Carib language.


A pioneering grammar of a Carib language, which has become a classic. Addresses a complex system of evidential particles.


A comprehensive analysis of evidentials and their semantics in a Carib language.

**Panoan Languages**

Many Panoan languages have elaborate evidential systems. Matses distinguishes evidentials in all tenses, including future (Fleck 2007). Valenzuela 2003 offers a comparative perspective on the family.


A fundamental piece of work addressing an unusual evidential system in a Panoan language and how information source can be marked twice on the verb.


A detailed discussion of evidentials in a Panoan language and their use in the changing social environment.

**Tucanoan Languages**

Tucanoan languages have four-term or five-term systems of evidentials. Barnes 1984 was the first to discuss these systems. Malone 1988 reinterprets the markers in historical perspective. Their correlations with epistemic meanings are the focus of Stenzel 2008.

A pioneering description of a five-term evidentiality system in an East Tucanoan language from northwest Amazonia, which has become a standard reference in the field.


A seminal paper and a classic in the field. A comprehensive account of the history and development of evidentials in Tuyuca, an East Tucanoan language, in the context of other East Tucanoan languages.


A study of evidentials and their correlations with modal meanings in an East Tucanoan language.

**Tupí-Guaraní Languages**

Evidential systems in Tupí-Guaraní languages vary from just reported evidentiality, as addressed in Floyd 2005 and Kracke 2010, to large systems with double marking (Seki 2000). Seki 2000 also stresses the importance of natural discourse in the work on evidentials.


Addresses the discourse role of evidentiality in Nheengatú, a Tupí-Guaraní language.


An in-depth discussion of the use of the inferential evidential in Parintin, a Tupí-Guaraní language, with a special focus on talking about dreams.


The most comprehensive grammar of a Tupí-Guaraní language to date (2011), with an in-depth, discourse-based account of an intricate evidential system.
Evidentials are a robust feature of Jarawara, from the Arawá family in Brazil, described in Dixon 2003. A comparative perspective is in Dixon 2004. Nambiquara languages, among them Mamaindê (Eberhard 2009), have at least four evidentials. Hup, a Makú language, developed five evidentials under Tucano influence, as discussed in Epps 2008. Urarina, an isolate from northeastern Peru, has three obligatory evidentials (Olawsky 2006). Chorote, a Mataguayo language from Argentina, has evidentiality distinctions in determiners (Carol 2011).


Chorote belongs to a small Mataguayan family (spoken mainly in Argentina). A typical feature of languages of this family is a set of demonstrative modifiers that combine reference to distance with reference to information source. This is an instance of nonpropositional evidentiality.


A comprehensive analysis of a small evidentiality system in an Arawá language from southern Amazonia.


A comprehensive grammar of Jarawara, an Arawá language from southern Amazonia, with a special focus on its small evidential system, its origins, and its usage in verbs and noun phrases.


A comprehensive grammar of a Northern Nambiquara language with a complex system of six evidentials.


A comprehensive grammar of a Makú language with a five-term evidentiality system developed as a result of areal diffusion from East Tucanoan languages.

A comprehensive grammar of a linguistic isolate, with a detailed analysis of a threefold evidentiality system.

**African Languages**

Very few African languages have so far been described as having evidentials. The systems described are relatively simple. Sissala (Gur; Blass 1989) and Lega (Bantu; Botne 2003) have just one evidential referring to reported or inferred information, while Luwo (Nilotic) has a nonewitness evidential in perfect aspect (Storch 2006 and Storch 2013), and Shilluk (also Nilotic) adds to this a reported evidential, as outlined in Miller and Gilley 2007. König 2013 addresses a firsthand versus nonfirsthand evidentiality system in !Xun (Northern Khoisan). In all likelihood, evidentiality will be found in further African languages, as can be seen from recently published grammars (e.g., Fur, a Nilo-Saharan language, with a reported evidential, in Waag 2010). Dimmendaal 2001 suggests that many African languages have further evidential distinctions.


A description of an evidential marker referring to inference and to reported speech in a Gur language from Upper Volta.


A description of a reported evidential marker in a Bantu language from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.


A uniquely comprehensive discussion of nongrammatical ways of expressing information source in a variety of African languages.


A pioneering analysis of a two-term (firsthand-nonfirsthand) evidentiality in a North Khoisan language, and of the ways in which evidentiality interacts with an exponent of counterexpectation and a further exponent of mirativity (grammaticalized surprise).

The first description of a so-far-unique three-term evidential system in a Nilotic language. Shilluk also has a special marker for mirativity (see Mirativity).


A pioneering paper dealing with an eyewitness/noneyewitness evidential distinction in perfect aspect in Luwo, a Nilotic language. Prior to this, evidentials were considered nonexistent in Nilotic languages.


A detailed analysis of ways of marking information source in Luwo, a Western Nilotic language of South Sudan, by means of a firsthand versus nonfirsthand evidential distinction expressed within the system of perfective aspect, and also through verbs of perception and cognition.


A comprehensive grammar of a Nilo-Saharan language that includes a detailed discourse-based discussion of a reported evidential.

Australian Aboriginal Languages

Small evidential systems have been described for two critically endangered Australian Aboriginal languages, Diyari (Austin 1981) and Ngiyambaa (Donaldson 1980). Wilkins 1989, Laughren 1982, and Goddard 1985 discuss reported evidential in Aranda, Warlpiri, and varieties of the Western Desert Language (e.g., Yankunytjatjara and Pitjanjatjara), respectively. The evidential is used in statements and in commands.

A grammar of a language formerly spoken in New South Wales, containing a superficial and scantily illustrated description of a typologically unusual system consisting of a reported and a sensory evidential.


A masterly grammar of a language formerly spoken in New South Wales, with a detailed discussion of a system of a reported evidential with epistemic overtones of uncertainty and a sensory evidential that may refer to information acquired through vision, hearing, or touch.


A detailed grammar of a variety of the Western Desert Language with a reported evidential, richly illustrated in its various contexts of use. Originally Goddard’s 1983 PhD dissertation, “A semantically-oriented grammar of the Yankunytjatjara dialect of the Western Desert language,” Australian National University, Canberra.


A sketch of various particles in Warlpiri, among them a reported evidential.


A comprehensive grammar of a variety of Arrernte, with some discussion of the reported evidential in various contexts, including commands.

**Pacific Languages**

The survey in Aikhenvald and Stebbins 2007 discusses evidentials in languages of the Pacific. Mangap-Mbula (Bugenhagen 1995) and a few Philippine languages (Ballard 1974) are among the few Austronesian languages with evidentials. Evidentiality is a prominent feature of a number of languages in the highlands of Papua New Guinea and especially languages of the Kutubuan family, analyzed first in May and Loeweke 1980 and then in San Roque 2008, Schieffelin 1996, and San Roque and Loughnane 2012. An unusually small system is in Tauya, from Madang Province, in MacDonald 1990. Lawrence 1987 argues for an unusual category of
viewpoint in the isolate Oksapmin, distinct from evidentiality in this language. Yang 2000 and Pan 2014 address evidentiality systems in Formosan languages.


A survey article on languages of New Guinea, with a brief summary of evidentiality systems and reference.


A brief discussion of a reported evidential in a selection of Philippine languages.


A grammar of an Oceanic language with a distinction between visual and nonvisual evidentials (not found anywhere else in this group of languages).


A tantalizing discussion of a three-term evidentiality system (visual, nonvisual, and reported) in a language isolate from Sandaun Province of Papua New Guinea.


A brief discussion of an evidential referring to reported and inferred information in a language from the Madang Adalbert Range, Papua New Guinea.


An outline grammar of a Kutubuan language from the highlands of Papua New Guinea with a complex system of evidentiality.

A detailed description of reported evidentiality and other means of expressing knowledge (including epistemic meanings) in Saaroa, an endangered Formosan (Austronesian) language of Taiwan, based on an extensive corpus, with a mention of other evidential systems in Formosan languages.


A detailed grammar of a Kutubuan language, with a lengthy discussion of a complex system of evidentials.


A useful survey of a number of types of evidentiality systems in a selection of languages of different families spoken in the highlands of New Guinea, including Duna-Bogaya, Engan, Oksapmin, Kutubuan, and Bosavi, with somewhat exotic view of semantics of evidentials.


A pioneering study of evidential and modal markers in Bosavi, a Kutubuan language, and their extensions to new means of acquiring information, such as writing.


A detailed discussion of the meanings of the reported evidential in Tsou, a Formosan (Austronesian) language of Taiwan that can have an evidential meaning or an epistemic meaning, depending on its position in a clause.

**Siberian Languages**

Among Paleo-Siberian isolates, Yukaghir has a two-term evidential system, distinguishing visually acquired information from information acquired through other means (Maslova 2003). Nivkh, also an isolate, appears to have had a distinction between visually and nonvisually acquired information only in imperatives, discussed in Krejnovich 1934. Jacquesson 1996 is a concise account of small evidentiality systems in languages of eastern Siberia.

A concise summary of small evidential systems and their development in languages of eastern Siberia, including isolates.


A pioneering grammar of Nivkh (Gilyak), with a detailed discussion of visual-nonvisual distinctions in commands.


A detailed discussion of a small evidential system in an isolate, focusing on its use in discourse.

**Japanese**

Whether or not Japanese has an evidentiality system or an evidentiality strategy is a matter of debate. Aoki 1986 argues for the existence of an evidential system in Japanese. Mushin 2001 focuses on reported evidentiality as a major term. Watanabe 1984 investigates the status of evidentiality within the verbal system.


A seminal study of various options for expressing information source in Japanese.


A rather-restricted discussion of reported evidential in Japanese based on a limited corpus; does not make any clear distinction between epistemic modality and evidentiality.

One of the first studies addressing the expression of reported evidentiality in Japanese and its correlations with other categories.

**Korean**

Whether Korean has a noneyewitness evidential or just a noneyewitness extension of one of the terms in its mood or modality system remains an open issue. Chang 1996 and Sohn 1986 argue that the so-called retrospective mood in Korean is not primarily evidential; in other words, this is an example of an evidential strategy. Chun and Zubin 1990 discusses evidential extensions of experiential constructions. Kwon 2012 addresses the meaning of the inferential evidential.


A detailed analysis of the “retrospective” mood in Korean and its evidential extensions and overtones.


An attempt at analyzing various nonprimarily evidential constructions in Korean as having evidential extensions.


An account of meanings and uses of the inferential evidential -napo- in Korean, in terms of its relationship to the inductive logical processes, and also its mirative functions and the ways in which it is used to mitigate speaker’s assertion.


A comprehensive analysis of the Korean mood system, arguing for evidentiality as one of the extensions rather than the primary meaning of the “retrospective” mood.