Book reviews

Reviewed books

Jeffrey Heath, From Code-Switching to Borrowing. A Case Study of Moroccan Arabic. (*Library of Arabic Linguistics*, Monograph Nº 9.) Kegan Paul International, London 1989. XV + 328 pp.

As an object of sociolinguistic study, Morocco is a particularly complicated area. In precolonial times the large, old cities of Fes, Meknes, Tangier, Tetouan, Marrakesh, and Rabat with the adjacent Salé, as well as a few smaller towns, were partly autonomous, and each had a local urban-type dialect (*mdini*) of its own, with different subdialects. On the other hand, the varying dialects of Arabic spoken in the countryside were of the Bedouin type (*ʿrubi*). The urban vs. rural dialect split goes back to the Arab conquest of North Africa: the urban dialects are heirs of the dialects of the early wave of Arab settlers in the first Islamic centuries, whereas the rural dialects are continuations of the speech of Arab Bedouin who invaded Morocco in several waves from the 11th and 12th centuries on and displaced Berber tribes in the neighbourhood of the largest cities and in some mountainous regions. A considerable part of the population has traditionally spoken dialects of three Berber languages as their mother tongue, but most of them are now bilingual and use Moroccan Colloquial Arabic (MCA) in interethnic communication. However, the interaction of Arabic and Berber languages have been left outside the scope of the study under review, since Berber languages, according to Heath, "do not appear any longer to be exercising any significant diffusional influence on MCA in the major population centres" (p. 5).

During and after the colonial period dramatic changes in the demography of the old cities have taken place as the result of mass immigration from rural areas. The old urban centres have retained their local dialects to some extent, but not without influence from certain rural features. Such features abound particularly in the colloquial of Casablanca, the largest city in the country, which in precolonial times was a minor town. They are also found in a more uniform national educated MCA.

As in other Arab countries, in Morocco, too, the linguistic situation can be characterized in terms of diglossia, in which MCA (in C.A. Ferguson's terms) is the low variety and Classical Arabic/Modern Standard Arabic the high variety. The population has naturally had its main contacts with the high variety in the spheres of religion, formal education, administration, and mass media.

The influence of foreign languages has been—and still is—powerful in Morocco. Until the beginning of the colonial period in 1912, Morocco was rather isolated. Since then, the influence of French increased successively until the 1970s, and in spite of a gradual Arabisation programme in different fields, its position is still very strong. In the northern protectorate, Spanish had approximately the same role, but by now its importance as a medium of communication is minimal except in the immediate vicinity of the Spanish border. In trade and tourism, French is by far the most important language; in the field of higher education it is the main language of mathematics and the natural sciences. Many Moroccans have got their higher education in French, either in Morocco or in France, whereas English only recently has become an important language in international communication in Morocco.

The Arabic language, on the other hand, is not only split into Classical (+Modern

Standard) and Colloquial Arabic, but it also has regional as well as urban vs. rural and Muslim vs. Jewish variants; in addition, there are adult/child, male/female, elegant/vulgar dimensions. Elegant and formal styles have always been achieved largely through the use of CA lexical and grammatical admixtures as well as phonetic "corrections" approaching CA.

It is in this sociolinguistic framework that Heath has done his case study on diglossic and foreign mixing in Moroccan Arabic. The study is based on his own fieldwork, the main part of which was carried out in 1979 and 1980 in Fes and Meknes. Some comparative data for Algerian dialects were collected in Berlin in 1981 and for the Jewish dialect of Casablanca in Paris the same year; a few items from the Jewish Tafilalt dialect were obtained in Jerusalem in 1980-81. The study has two main objectives: first, to contribute to the theory of language mixing, and second, to contribute to Arabic dialect studies in general and to studies of Moroccan dialects in particular. In order to achieve his first objective, the author has had to make his study intelligible even to linguists who don't have any specific background in the languages dealt with. This may sound almost unrealistic but does not need to be so if done strictly in keeping with a coherent linguistic framework of universal application. I believe that Heath has succeeded in this respect. His descriptions of Arabic are not only concise but also admirably exact: e.g., the six-page sketch of the most relevant features of the Fes/Meknes dialect is exemplary in its precision and relevance.

The interaction of different levels of Arabic as well as of Arabic and foreign languages has in recent years been dealt with in several studies on the linguistic situation in Morocco (Abbassi 1977, Gravel 1979, Forkel 1980) and other parts of North Africa (Lanly 1962, North Africa in common, mainly Algeria, Stevens 1974, Tunisia). All these are presented in brief; at the end of the presentation, Talmoudi (1986, verbs of Romance origin in Tunisia) is also mentioned, which would seem to imply that Heath's book is an updated version of his unpublished Ph.D. dissertation from 1983 (Harvard). However, he does not mention works such as A. Bentahila, Language Attitudes Among Arabic-French Bilinguals in Morocco (Clevedon, England, 1983), A. Bentahila & E. Davies, The Syntax of Arabic-French Code-Switching, Lingua 59:301-330, 1983, G. Grandguillaume, Arabisation et politique linguistique au Maghreb, Paris 1983 (the first chapter treats the linguistic situation in the Maghrib). J. Saib, Melange de codes au Maroc: revue retrospective et prospective (in La Linguistique au Maghreb/Maghreb Linguistics. Collection dirigée par J. Pleines. Rabat 1990; pp. 45-71, appeared after the book under review was published). These works would scarcely have affected Heath's study in any way: he keeps to his own material and occasionally cites texts published by L. Brunot & E. Malka, W. Marçais and G. Kampffmeyer between 1911 and 1952, as well as a few other works. Somewhat surprisingly, he totally overlooks M. Hadj-Sadok, Dialectes arabes et Francisation linguistique de l'Algérie ou "Mots français employés en arabe dialectal algérien" (Proceedings of the 22nd Congress of Orientalists held in Istanbul 1951, Vol. II Communications. Leiden 1957; pp. 146-171). In his paper Hadj-Sadok gives 350

examples from his list of 1665 French borrowings in Algerian Arabic, divided in 23 social spheres (garrison, school, administration, transport, politics, clothing, etc.), provided with inflection and in many cases with linguistic and background comments. For future studies in Romance loans in North African Arabic, some kind of appraisal of Hadj-Sadok would have been most welcome, all the more as Heath himself has regarded it useful to complement his case study with his own material from Algeria.

The principal concern of Heath's study is the gradual integration of lexical borrowings; code-switching is concerned insofar as it functions as an avenue for more complete integration. Code-switching means "a pattern of textual production in which a speaker alternates between continuous utterance segments in one language L_x and another language L_y with abrupt and clear-cut switching points, often at phrasal or clausal boundaries." By borrowing is meant "the adaptation of a lexical item P_y from L_y into L_x, becoming P_x (that is, a regular lexical item in L_x satisfying phonological, canonical-shape and morphological rules for this language)." (p. 23) As pointed out by Heath, both in Classical Arabic (CA)/Moroccan Colloquial Arabic (MCA) and MCA/French mixing there are many cases in which it is impossible to distinguish between code-switching and borrowing. For instance, French nouns beginning with a vowel will begin in MCA with /l-/ in both cases: fortuitous similarity between the definite markers of MCA and French has facilitated borrowings. Thus, l'ananas 'the pineapple' looks exactly like an MCA word without any further adjustment. The major problem in borrowing is actually "getting the foot in the door"; after assuming a fairly good MCA shape, a borrowed item can rather unproblematically generate further MCA inflectional or derivational forms.

It is typical of code-switching that it favours items and phrases which do not need to be inflected. Place names, locative adverbs, other adverbs of various kinds, numerals and other quantified expressions, and nouns used as technical terms are most fit for being used in code-switching; a French verb phrase is seldom inserted into an otherwise MCA utterance frame.

Adaptation of Classical borrowings into MCA is rather uncomplicated and follows comparatively predictable conversion rules. Examples of some basic phonemic conversions are the MCA *taqafa* 'culture' (/ṯ-/ > /t/, /ā/ > /a/), *ʾasatida* 'teachers' (/ā/ > /a/, /ḏ/ > /d/), *ḍuṛuf* 'conditions' (/ṭ/ > /ḍ/, /ū/ > /u/), *ža'iza* 'prize' (/j/ > /ž/, /ā/ > /a/). The borrowed noun forms are inflected like native MCA items. This is also true of verbal inflection: e.g., the root *sʾl* 'to ask'—which in most dialects occurs as a CA loan—has been borrowed from CA by MCA, in which it has a completely regular MCA inflection. In Appendix A, Heath lists 82 MCA verbs borrowed from CA, representing simple triradical and quadriradical verbs as well as all derived forms except Form IX. Because the internal passive voice is an inflectional category missing in MCA, such forms cannot, of course, function as prototypes for borrowing. Thus, the MCA form *twffa* 'to pass away' is based on the CA active form *tawaffā* rather than the normal CA passive *tuwuffiya*.

The two short texts used as examples of CA/MCA code-switching, both in

educated MCA with many CA intrusions, are very illustrative. The stylistic level of one of them—an excerpt from a ministerial interview—could, for instance, easily be labeled as *al-luġa al-wusṭā,* a comfortable but misleading term used so vaguely that it does not tell anything about the basic structure, or as Modern Standard Arabic, according to R.F.I. Hussein's terminology in his Jordanian triglossia model (The Case for Triglossia in Arabic. Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of New York at Buffalo, 1980), used in recognition tests for anything that is neither CA nor dialect. However, as pointed out by Heath, there is in this text a basic MCA core shown particularly by the MCA shape and inflection of verbs, the generally colloquial form of prepositions, and the systematic use of MCA elements like /ġadi/ (future tense marker), /dyal/ (genitive marker), relative /lli/, etc. In some passages the number of CA intrusions is so high that one cannot be sure about the MCA basis of the text; this uncertainty is due to a heavily nominal style which permits long strings of basically CA nominal forms. Long intervals between "diagnostic" forms which reveal the morphological frame make the identification of the language type difficult.

No list of lexical loans can be comprehensive, and certainly not any list of CA borrowings in Colloquial Arabic; what is more important in a study like this is the representativeness of such a list. In this respect Heath's list of CA borrowings in MCA (Appendix A) is excellent. It comprises 365 nouns and adjectives, 82 verbs, and 71 miscellaneous items, collected from a non-specified but carefully prepared "specific textual corpus with some supplementary elicitation".

Appendix B lists 188 verbs borrowed from European languages in MCA, collected from recordings made in Fes, Meknes and/or Marrakesh from Muslim informants during the fieldwork period. These are often compared with the author's data from various other locations, e.g. Algeria, Casablanca, Tetuan. Appendix C lists 828 other stems borrowed from European languages. The items are given in a transcribed MCA form and are provided with data on inflection, European source, synonyms, stylistic environments, note on commonness, etc. The analyses are in most cases more detailed than in earlier studies and made with great theoretical precision.

In Morocco the source of borrowings seems most often to be more apparent than in the Middle East, where European loan words from French, Spanish, Italian, and Greek have often wandered into Arabic via Turkish; only lately, English borrowings most often are direct. Since Heath's study deals with language borrowing in the colonial and post-colonial time, the possibility of this circuitous route can practically be ruled out. However, he points out that some contemporary Spanish loans have perhaps come into Arabic via Tarifiyt and that some early loans may have been brought via Ladino (p. 8). When commenting on early borrowings, Heath is not always wholly consistent. Thus, he mentions *ṭarif* 'price; price-list' as a loan from the French *tarif* and the Spanish *tarifa* without any comment on the Arabic origins of the word in these languages, whereas he adds this kind of note to *ankul, alkul* < French *alcool,* Spanish *alcohol;* cf. *diwana* "perhaps a cross of Sp *aduana* and recently restored CA *dīwān*".

To sum up, Heath's linguistic analyses are much more detailed than any earlier

studies in language borrowing in North Africa, and, as a matter of fact, in the whole arabophone area. Heath's study not only makes a major contribution to the theory of language borrowing and to Arabic sociolinguistics, but it also provides students of Arabic linguistics in general with useful examples of exact description of many different features of Arabic.

HEIKKI PALVA

Gregor Schoeler (Beschr.), Arabische Handschriften II. Unter Mitarbeit von H.-C. Graf von Bothmer, T. Duncker Gökçen und H. Jenni. (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XVII, Reihe B II) Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, Stuttgart 1990, xviii+451 pp. + 129 ill.

Concerning Arabic manuscripts, a considerable amount of work has been done during the almost two decades since Rudolf Sellheim published his state-of-the-art article "The cataloguing of Arabic manuscripts as a literary problem".[1] In this article Prof. Sellheim drew attention to the cataloguing project begun within the framework of the German Research Association programme, and in conjunction with the German Oriental Society, of Arabic manuscript holdings in Germany. The Arabic manuscripts were to form a part of the entire cataloguing programme of *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland* (*VOHD*), commenced already in 1957.

The German programme fit well with the unanimously accepted resolution at the 28. International Congress of Orientalists in Canberra (1971) where the need for cataloguing all Arabic manuscripts which have not yet been adequately listed and described was recognized. The year 1976 saw the publication of the first two volumes of *Arabische Handschriften*. In series A: *Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte* I by Rudolf Sellheim, and in series B: *Arabische Handschriften* I by Ewald Wagner. In 1987 we witnessed the publication of *Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte* II also by R. Sellheim in series A; in 1990 the book now under review , and we are promised volumes III and IV in series B as "in Vorbereitung".

When evaluating the results published in *VOHD*, volume 17, we have to bear in mind the goal aimed at and presented in the above mentioned article by Sellheim and the resolution of 1971. This goes for both series A and series B, although it applies especially to series A. A simple comparison with the monumental achievement of Wilhelm Ahlwardt, *Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften*, Bd. 1-10, Berlin 1887-99 is out of place, although both E. Wagner and G. Schoeler in their introductions stress the exemplary role of Ahlwardt's approach. Schoeler considers his catalogue, as well as the preceding one by E. Wagner, to be, in a way, a supplement to Ahlwardt (p. ix, xii). But one would wish that those responsible for the selection of manuscripts to be described in these catalogues would themselves be convinced of their criteria. Gregor Schoeler's "Einleitung" gives away an uneasiness that might also seize the users of the catalogue.

[1] *Oriens* 23-24(1974)306-311.

The catalogue now under review gives descriptions of 331 titles in a total of 104 manuscripts (compared with 533 titles in 362 manuscripts in the first volume). The majority were acquired during the first half of the 20th century. "Ich habe einen T e i l solcher Handschriften ausgesucht, die mir von wissenschaftlichen oder künstlerischen Wert zu sein schienen; [...] Auf der anderen Seite habe ich auch, [...], ganz bewußt eben nur einen T e i l des Materials, das wissenschaftlich und künstlerisch verheissungsvoll war, ausgewählt und ebenso gezielt eine große Zahl weniger gewichtiger Handschriften bearbeitet" (pp. xiif.). The above-mentioned uneasiness on the part of the describer was caused primarily by the decision to include three "Sammelhandschriften", that is altogether 116 titles (of 331), by the Ottoman scholar Ibn Kamāl Paša (d. 940/1533).

But there are several gems and unique manuscripts included among those chosen for description, although the oldest datable one is from no earlier than 438/1047 (so and correct in the *Register der datierten HSS* and in the description; "Einleitung" gives 1067). Schoeler himself has drawn our attention to several manuscripts in his "Einleitung" (xiii-xvii).

Almost all the manuscripts described in this handsomely produced volume invite further perusal. Several of the descriptions provided are really veritable mines of information and products of sound scholarship. Let us take this opportunity to consider one of them: Nr. 319, pp. 364-370, *At-Ta'rīḫ/Kitāb Aḫbār Miṣr* by Al-Waṣīfī/ Ibrāhīm ibn Waṣīf Šāh. It is fascinating to follow the research dialogue between Ulrich Haarmann, Michael Cook and Gregor Schoeler concerning this important manuscript, its history and contents, a dialogue that, in a way, is continued in Professor Haarmann's article "In quest of the spectacular: noble and learned visitors to the pyramids around 1200 A.D."[2]

In a work of this magnitude there must obviously be some missing letters, diacritical points etc. but, fortunately, not to a distracting degree. Some corrections could, however, be suggested:

— The author of Nr. 301 is, of course, Ibn Ẓafar aṣ-Ṣiqillī (p. 344, 430);

— The describer's suggestion concerning the manuscript of *Khabar al-aḥzāb* (Nr. 312, p. 357) in the legendary *maghāzī*-genre, that its author's name Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq al-Wāqidī most probably is a contamination of Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqidī, both well-known historians of the beginnings of Islam, might, of course, be quite acceptable. There is, however, also another Ibn Isḥāq who might be taken into consideration, Ibn Isḥāq al-Umawī, an author whose name is associated with several *futūḥ*-works of the more or less legendary variety. See, f.ex., MSS Ta'rīkh Taimūr 1058 and 2068 in Dār al-Kutub, Cairo; litographed ed., Cairo 1275 A.H.; V. Rosen, *Notices sommaires des manuscrits arabes du Musée Asiatique* I, St.-Petersburg 1881, pp. 91f.; Brockelmann, *GALS* I, p. 208.

— The person mentioned in the *isnād* of Nr. 320 (p. 371, 439) is Abū Qabīl Ḥuyaiy (Ḥayy) ibn Hāni' al-Maʿāfirī (35/656-128/745); see Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr*

[2] *Islamic studies presented to Charles J. Adams*. Ed. by Wael B. Hallaq and Donald P. Little. Leiden 1991, pp. 57-67.

wa-akhbāruhā; see also К. А. Бойко, *Арабская историческая литература в Египте VII-IX вв.*, Москва 1983, pp. 57-61;
— The title in Illustration Nr. 29 of al-Wahrānī's work should be *Tahḏīb šarḥ as-sabᶜ al-muᶜallaqāt* (correct in text).

In presenting this well researched and presented book the present writer may be forgiven for inserting additional material pertaining to Islamic manuscripts in general. The Al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation was established in 1988 by the Yamani Cultural Foundation. On November 30 and December 1, 1991, The Foundation's inaugural celebrations took place in London. As the Foundation's functions are of the greatest interest to all who are concerned about the future of Islamic manuscripts and the collections of them, the main objectives of the Foundation will be given here:
— To promote, sponsor and initiate research into the field of Islamic manuscripts.
— To assist in the preservation and restoration of Islamic manuscripts.
— To assist in cataloguing previously uncatalogued collections of Islamic manuscripts.
— To establish a record of the manuscripts and build up a library of these records at the Foundation's premises.
— To edit and publish Islamic manuscripts of particular significance.
— To hold academic seminars, conferences and lectures in order to stimulate discussions and action in the field.

In fact, Al-Furqan Foundation has all the prerequisites to become an *umm*-Foundation for the study and preservation of Islamic manuscripts in the world, as Professor George Makdisi so aptly pronounced in his paper at the inauguration of the Foundation.

The appropriate way to conclude this appreciative review of yet another important German contribution to the study of Arabic manuscripts is to quote Professor R. Stephen Humphreys' words about the privilege some of us can enjoy when we have the opportunity to work with Islamic manuscripts: "[...] medieval Islamic manuscripts are likely to be full of errors, written in barely legible scripts, and scattered in unlikely and inaccessible locations. That is all perfectly true; as historians we are clearly better off when we have our sources in a critical printed edition. But it is also true that manuscripts are alive in a way that printed texts can never be. Manuscripts put us in immediate contact with the men and women whom we study; through them we ourselves become participants in a living scholarly and literary tradition. For this privilege, mere inconvenience is a small price to pay."[3]

KAJ ÖHRNBERG

Wilhelm Eilers, Die Mundart von Sīvänd. Westiranische Mundarten aus der Sammlung Wilhelm Eilers, Band 3. Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden Gmbh. Stuttgart 1988. XXII + 376 pp. DM 184.

With his monograph on the Sīvändi dialect professor Eilers shortly before his death returned to his early collections of the 1930's. The book is the third volume in a series

[3] *Islamic history: a framework for inquiry*. Rev. ed. Princeton 1991, pp. 39f.

of Eilers' studies on West Iranian dialects; the projected fourth—and last—volume (on Anārak and Khūr dialects) will, it is hoped, be published posthumously.

This volume is, as Eilers' earlier books, a major contribution to the knowledge of West Iranian dialects and very welcome even though we now have another monograph on the same dialect, viz. Pierre Lecoq's *Le dialecte de Sivand*, Wiesbaden 1979. Eilers' work presents a concise grammar of the dialect (North West Iranian dialect deeply influenced by its South Western environment, e.g. *iẓāfat*), a selection of texts, most of which are popular tales, and a glossary to the texts (including some words from Lecoq's texts). It also contains, as is customary in Eilers' publications, a mass of valuable short notes on toponymy, historical and comparative linguistics and similar topics.

The core of the text material now published goes back to Eilers' field work in the 1930's, when he got acquainted with a young Sīvändi, ʿAlī-Murād, who later became Eilers' main informant and told him the fairy tales now published as Texts 2-18. In 1976, Eilers—many of whose notes, especially his lexical collections, had been destroyed during the War—returned to Sīvänd and met his earlier informant ʿAlī-Murād again and collected, again mainly from ʿAlī-Murād, new material (Texts 19ff.). Thus, most of the texts of WIrM III stem from but one informant, a fact to be kept in mind when using the book.—The informant's young age (16 when he told the fairy tales) accounts—as Eilers himself, p. 27, admits—for the rather childish and unprofessional, not to say disappointing way in which the tales are told (cf. e.g. the awkward end of Tale 10, especially § 52).

The grammatical part is very concise (pp. 35-137, but lavishly printed), sometimes (as in pp. 93-99 pronouns, prepositions etc.) consisting of not much more than lists of words with sparse comments, except for a few grammatical points discussed in extenso by the author (especially § 46 Zum Femininum, pp. 78-87). In the 'Lautlehre' and throughout the book in transliterations the clarity of expression is marred by the lack of distinction between phonemes and their allophones (cf. the Table in p. 35), a point in which, at least in the grammatical part, the transliteration could have been simplified and clarified. In the chapter of phonological changes, the book would have profited from more strict rules describing the changes; thus e.g. the notes (p. 67) on the development of *q* remain a somewhat confusing mass of examples, which could have been simplified by giving the contexts of the changes: q > γ/ (+voice) ___ {# or (+voice)}, with but few exceptions, and q > χ/ ___ (-voice).—Interestingly enough; Lecoq's description of Sīvändi phonology differs radically from Eilers' in this point: "/q/.... n'a jamais la prononciation spirante ou sonore du persan familier de Téhéran" (Lecoq, p. 18; Lecoq gives consistently e.g. vaqt for Eilers' vaχt)—is this due to Persian influence on Eilers' informant?

Despite these slight problems, Eilers' exposition of Sīvändi phonology as well as morphology is adequate. The syntax instead remains—as also in Lecoq's work—a selection of marginal notes to some syntactic points (less than four pages, pp. 132-135).

Most of the texts and the longest ones are popular tales, and notwithstanding the way they are told, a welcome addition to the corpus of Persian folkloristic texts. Eilers gives occasional reference to some other collections (especially Christensen and Lorimer-Lorimer), but one would have appreciated references to U. Marzolph's *Typologie des persischen Volksmärchens* (1984), which will remain the standard handbook in this field for many years to come. The transliteration of the text is clear (despite its non-phonemic character), and the translations excel in their clarity: every obscure point—as well as a score of self evident ones(!)—is explained in a footnote. On the other hand, there is much redundancy in the footnotes and the Glossary. When checking the crossreferences one often finds exactly the same information in both places.

In the Glossary, as well as in the grammar, the equivalents of Sīvändi words are given in German and also, for some reason, in Persian, which is often misleading when one does not know whether they are given as etymons or mere equivalents. Only in folkloristic, botanic etc. words, the Persian equivalents are of use. In the Glossary, as well as in some notes to the texts, Eilers' profound knowledge of Persian material culture is seen in full blossom.

The book contains regrettably many printer's errors (cf. below, and note also that the quotation marks in the texts are often missing or put in wrong places etc.), but this is in a way compensated by its being a most handsome and elegant volume, so that our special thanks go to Franz Steiner Verlag for producing a book which will illuminate the Iranist's somewhat dusty and grey bookshelves.

In the following there are some notes and corrections to individual points:

p. xi s.v. Āṣār-i-ʿAǧam: The end of the line—a nice example of what computers can do to a book!—should of course read Furṣat-i-Šīrāzī.

p. 35: The Table contains much that does not belong to the phoneme inventory of Sīvändi (γ, ʿ, ḥ etc.).

pp. 36-73: The author gives in several places a single example to illustrate two different phenomena. Thus, e.g. p. 38 zimīn (< zamīn) is given as an example of both assimilation and attenuation; and tufer, p. 56, as an example of both -b- > -f-, and -b > -f etc.

p. 51 gäddā: Probably an attraction to the faʿʿāl morpheme type of Arabic, and not due to phono logical factors.

p. 56 l. 4 mazze: read mäzze.

p. 56 (on b > f): For a reverse change, cf. nisb < nisf.

p. 72 mažbūr: Rather than a Sīvändi phenomenon, this change (-ǧb- > -žb-) may already have hap pened in Colloquial Arabic before the word was taken into Sīvändi. There seem also to be other parallels between Sīvändi and Colloquial Arabic, which make it probable that at least some of the Arabic loanwords in Sīvändi are of a rather modern date. Thus I would also be ready to take mätäl (see p. 86) as a Colloquial Arabic loanword (Literary Arabic gives mathal > Persian maṣal), not an Aramaism as professor Eilers suggests.—The Arabic word itself may in fact originally be a loan from Aramaic, see A. Bloch in Fs. Tschudi, p. 222.

p. 78 l. 1: For "weissen" read "schwarzen",

p. 96 l. 6: read barāy-i.

p. 117 l. 2: sĕt, read šĕt.

p. 132 l. 17: "zum Knie" read "zur Brust".

p. 142 § 5: niăs read niăš.

p. 143 § 9: hämämḿ read hämmämḿ.

p. 156 § 23: usŭr'doānī-s read usŭr'doānī-š.

p. 156 § 24: bắzī-š should probably be read bắžī-š (but cf. p. 159 § 42 bāz).

p. 156 § 27: dirſš-eš read dirſs-eš.
p. 156 § 28: gá'bū read ǧá'bū.
p. 157 § 29: Eilers gives in his transliteration ǧa'be (cf. also p. 159 § 44 'umr, and p. 166 § 7 šă 'Abbăs, but in other places the name is always given without 'ayn. On 'ayn, which he gives in the Table "Der Lautbestand des Sīvändi" (p. 35), Eilers comments only briefly (p. 72-73 § 39): "Arabisches 'Ain (Ajin) wird *gewöhnlich* <emphasis supplied> nicht gesprochen", which seems to imply that 'ayn is sometimes pronounced and that it belongs to the phoneme inventory of the dialect.—It seems possible that 'ayn is found in Sīvändi only in educated or semi-educated speech (note also that Eilers' informant 'Alī-Murād seems to have known foreign languages), not in pure uneducated dialect. In that case 'ayn should be deleted from the Table on p. 35 and given only as a foreign sound in a footnote.
p. 157 § 30: šıīr read šīr.
p. 158 § 35: One of the three consecutive Mälik Mä'ämäds should be deleted.
p. 158 § 35: igāzé read iǧāzé.
p. 161 § 2: lebsăs-i read lebăs-i.
p. 161 § 2: Only here kulfé. Should we correct it to kulfét, as everywhere else in the text?—Kulfét, as a matter of fact, is missing from the Glossary, as are several other words attested in the texts: e.g. haq(q), aɣd (< aqd), muddätī (mudăttī, p. 142 § 5, is probably a mistake, not a prosodic variant, cf. p. 145 § 3 mud(d)åti).
p. 162 § 8: usūr!bāzī read usūr'bāzī.
pp. 162-163: The three rhythmic formulae uttered by the wicked wife (§ 11, 14, 17) show strong Persian influence (e.g. § 17 múrɣ-e suχän'gŭ; cf. the true Sīvändi mēr in the same paragraph). Note also that the story teller 'Alī-Murād does not usually embellish his narration, so that we evidently have here memorized formulae of a Persian original.—The advice given by Xizr (§ 18) also shows Persian influence—or actually is in Persian, not Sīvändi—and as it seems to be the only instance in these texts where we find the preposition rū (twice) instead of the usual rī (< rū), the form should probably be deleted from the Glossary (p. 341) and the Grammar (p. 96, § 57) as belonging to a Persian quotation.—Neither the form rū nor rī are found as prepositions in Lecoq's work.
p. 166 § 10: Note taɣsīr (thrice) for taχsīr (the usual form in Sīvändi < taqṣīr). This paragraph is the only place where we find q > ɣ/ ___ (-voice).
p. 169 § 3: rắ neš-ā read rắneš-ā.—The blowing of the skin to ease the separating of fell as part of butchering is used as an erotic topos often in Persian literature, cf. one of Mahsatī's charming quatrains and the further references given by Meier in his edition of Mahsatī's quatrains, p. 126-128.
pp. 169-171: Text 14 is a veritable treasury of Near Eastern—Mediterranean popular comic stories, here patched together by mechanical links to form one longer story, a means that is often used also in artistic literature (cf. e.g. al-Hamadhānī's al-maqāma al-mawṣilīya which gives two anecdotes of a similar tenor as our story—two rogue-errants in the countryside—and incidentally contains a similar link at the episode boundary: insalalna ... ḥattā ataynā qaryatan; cf. § 12 šíne, rasḗne bä-yḗ dḗī).—The third trick (§ 15-16) is poorly and confusingly narrated by 'Alī-Murād: it is an age old and extremely popular comic story with attestations ranging at least from Ḥamza al-Iṣbahānī's (d. 351 A.H.) ad-Durra al-fākhira (vol. I, Dhakhā'ir al-'arab 46, p. 176) to a modern Iraqu (Tanzania) oral story.—The fourth and last trick (§ 17-19) resembles closely, especially at the end, a Portuguese story O deveador que se fingiu morto (Contos populares portugueses. Livros de bolso Europa-América, p. 62-63).
p. 172 § 1: Delete one of the kúrrū bérāne.
p. 177 § 14: yulām read ɣulām (as also p. 178 § 15 and 17).
p. 178 § 19: vắtes read vắteš.
p. 181 § 2: kurgér-äm read mīrgér-äm.
p. 181 § 4: Note the un-metathesized qasr which is found only here.
p. 182 § 9: Kūsḗ'häškī read Kūsḗ'käškī.
p. 184 § 9: In the end of the first line read žín-ā Siä Zäŋ gī instead of žín-ā Šäfī Gŭl-ī Zárd, as also in § 10 line 4.
p. 193: Delete the latter half of the second line from bottom (bégene ... hämā-n).
p. 194 § 3: hämī-rŭ read hämīr-ŭ.
p. 199 § 1: fắrdes read fắrdeš.
p. 199 § 2: Delete the first half of the second line from bottom (bääd ... owurd).

p. 259 § 3: As Eilers seems to have strived towards a literal translation, the vocative "Königssohn", which has no equivalent in the original, should be deleted.
p. 305 l. 9 from below: For béšilū read béčilū as the alphabetical order requires, and as in the text (14:10 ff.).—In several cases the alphabetical order of the Glossary is wrong, which encumbers the quick search for words. Thus e.g. p. 329 lämär comes only after lämíše, lamr, and läŋg.
p. 334 s.v. nähär: An Arabic etymology (< nahār) seems to me much more probable than an Iranian.
p. 340 s.v. qāzī: Correct the Persian word in Arabic characters: for §qlḍy§ read §q'ḍy§.
p. 375 'Zu p. 19': for pp. 469-465 read pp. 459-465.

JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA

Shukri B. Abed, Aristotelian Logic and the Arabic Language in Alfārābī. State University of New York Press 1991. 201 pp. $16.95.

The monograph of Sh. Abed discusses the linguistic philosophy of Alfārābī and studies the technical usage of Arabic in logical philosophy of Alfārābī, who consciously modified Arabic language in his writings to make it fit the Aristotelian system of logic and language based on Greek syntax; his most conspicuous innovation is the usage of the copula mawǧūd to translate Greek *estin* and Persian *hast*.

The monograph is a welcome contribution to the difficult field of logico-linguistic relations in Arab philosophical writings, and it is of interest to both philosophers and grammarians. For the latter, especially valuable is the last chapter in which the author has selected for discussion some basic questions of Alfārābī's linguistic philosophy (copula, present tense, non-verbal sentences etc.).

Somewhat disturbing is the laxity of the author in transliterating Arabic (and Persian) words. Especially unfortunate has been the fate of Ibn Fāris' aṣ-Ṣāḥibī which has not once been transliterated exactly right (p. 55 note 19; p. 157 note 1; p. 184), and is twice mistranslated in two *different* ways. That these mistakes come from the author, and not the printer, is in several cases obvious (e.g. p. 156 delete example 2, as the Qur'ānic word is *zabāniya*, not *zabānīya*).

JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA

Nağmaddīn aṭ-Ṭūfī al-Ḥanbalī, *ʿAlam al-ǧaḍal fī ʿilm al-ǧadal*. Das Banner der Fröhlichkeit über die Wissenschaft von Disput. Herausgegeben von Wolfhart Heinrichs. *Bibliotheca Islamica* 32, 1987. 30 pages German text + 282 pages Arabic text. DM 60.

The work reviewed here is an edition of aṭ-Ṭūfī's (d. 1316) tractate on the art of disputation (*ǧadal*) by which aṭ-Ṭūfī more or less means theological disputation. It consists of a German Introduction (pp. 9-30), an Arabic Introduction (p. ṭ-lḥ; largely overlapping with the German Introduction), the edited Arabic text (Arabic pp. 1-245) and Indices (pp. 247-283).

The German Introduction gives a description of the manuscripts, repeated in the Arabic Introduction to which is added a short biographical note on aṭ-Ṭūfī and his

works, a subject on which the editor is planning a separate work (cf. German text, p. 9).

An edition of the ʿAlam al-ǧaḏal is welcome as both the author and the genre (disputation manuals) have received little attention in scholarly publications (for ǧadal see now also M. Darabseh, Die Kritik der Prosa bei den Araben. *Islamkundl. Unters.* 141, 1990, pp. 188-190). The ʿAlam al-ǧaḏal has a tripartite structure: 1. Theoretical exposition of the ʿilm al-ǧadal (Chapters 1-4, pp. 7-91); 2. disputation passages in the Qur'ān and their analysis according to the principles laid down in the first part (p. 93-209); 3. a selection of anecdotes—many of which come from K. al-ǧalīs—on famous disputes in the early history of Islam (especially Ibn ʿAbbās).—The last part has earlier been dealt with by the editor (*ZDMG* Suppl. 3, 1977, pp. 463-473).

According to the author himself (p. 243), the main importance of the book lies in the second part, which is a rather mechanical excerption of the Qur'ān for ǧadal passages. The first part is in fact more interesting to us as it is a detailed exposition of the theory of disputation (note also the chapter Fī adab al-ǧadal, p. 13-18, which gives rules also of how *not* to dispute, giving thus a glimpse of less polite disputes of the epoch). The last part is the least interesting as it repeats anecdotes well known from other sources, and depends heavily on a single source, viz. Abū'l-Faraǧ al-Muʿāfā an-Nahrawandī's Kitāb al-ǧalīs.

Aṭ-Ṭūfī dictated the first four chapters in haste (see p. 243), which may explain the curious omission of iʿtirāḍāt 13-14 (pp. 66-67) from both manuscripts, if this is not a sign of textual corruption in an early phase of the manuscript tradition.—Cf. also p. 120 l. 12-14 which introduce a Qur'ānic passage without discussing it.—An interesting passage worth quoting as it sheds light on the person of aṭ-Ṭūfī, is the surprisingly individualistic and unorthodox comment on the nature of Jesus, p. 154 l. 6-7: wa-aḥsibu anna fī ʿĪsā kadhālika (commenting on Qur. 6:9) ǧarā wa-annahu malakun ẓahara fī ṣūrati raǧulin fa-ḍalla n-naṣārā fīhi wa-ttakhadhūhu ilāhan.—No wonder that some orthodox reader has expressed his stupefaction in a marginal note to the manuscript (p. 154 note 1)!

The work has been carefully edited and printed, though some printer's errors have been able to creep in. In the German Introduction there are several minor errors in Arabic quotations, but as they are correctly printed in the Arabic Introduction, they do not call for comment here. In the text, there are several minor mistakes:

p. 71 l. 17: For latter baʿḍahā read baʿḍan.
p. 82 l. 16: al-layl read bi'l-layl.
p. 84 l. 6: intiqā' read intifā'.
p. 113 l. 2: 'wḫh read awǧuh.
p. 115 l. 23: yuḫādilūnaka read yuǧādilūnaka.
p. 187 l. 17: yʿyn read yaʿnī.
p. 192 l. 18: flyzmkm read fa-yalzimukum.
p. 214 l. 18: add the dot of b in bi-mā.
p. 226 l. 1: yudarrīnī read yudrīnī (is there really a shadda on the *r* in the manuscripts?).
p. 229 l. 22: bi-mas'ala read bi-musālama.
p. 237 l. 7: fds-un read fa-dassa.
p. 239 l. 14: ʿabd li'l-masīḥ read ʿAbdalmasīḥ.

In the Arabic Introduction (p. y'), the editor, who uses MS-Nūr ʿUthmānīya 3/2720, refers to aṣ-Ṣafadī's al-Wāfī as containing an article on aṭ-Ṭūfī, but such an article is not to be found in the printed edition (vol. 15, 1979), which calls for an explanation.

As in so many other editions, also in this work the shaddas have a remarkable tendency to misplace themselves (e.g. p. 226 l. 18 ṭaharrahum for ṭahharahum). Some of the Qur'ānic quotations have been overlooked both in the text and in the Index (p. 197 l. 22 = Qur. 45:27, and p. 244 l. 1 = Qur. 12:76).

In the Indices, one wonders why in the personal names words like ibn, abū and the article al- (when preceded by ibn or abu) have been taken into account in the alphabetical order. Thus e.g. all the abū l- names come before Abū Bakr.

One misses an Index of verses which should be included in every text edition as the verse quotations facilitate the comparison of different texts for common sources and interdependance. Verses are found in the text on p. 14 l. 1 and 16; p. 16 l. 4, 6 and 8; p. 27 l. 19; p. 28 l. 2; p. 33 l. 9 and 11; p. 107 l. 13; p. 154 l. 18 (hemistich of sarīʿ, not recognized (!?) by the editor, or at least not marked as a verse by him); p. 172 l. 5; p. 179 l. 7 and 8; p. 206 l. 4-13; p. 212 l. 5-7; p. 214 l. 17-p. 215 l. 14; p. 221 l. 6-13; p. 222 l. 15 and 18; p. 225 l. 13-20; p. 228 l. 1-4 and 9-12; p. 232 l. 17 and 20; p. 233 l. 1-2 and 4-5.

With his edition of aṭ-Ṭūfī's ʿAlam, W. Heinrichs has given yet another proof of his sound scholarship and presented the learned world with an important and well edited book. Heinrichs merits our wholehearted thanks for his careful and valuable work.

JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA

Ewald Wagner (ed.), Der Dīwān des Abū Nuwās. Teil III. *Bibliotheca Islamica,* Bd. 20c, 1988. 10 S. deutscher Text, 458 S. arabischer Text. DM 84.-

The now published third volume of the Dīwān of Abū Nuwās contains the most important part of his literary production, the wine poems (khamrīyāt), a critical edition of which has been an urgent desideratum since the edition of Ahlwardt (1861), based on unsufficient manuscript material.

With this volume, the indispensable edition of Wagner (and Gr. Schoeler in vol. IV) has almost been completed. We are eagerly looking forward to seeing the fifth and last volume (to contain i.a. the muǧūn poems and miscellania). A sixth volume, detailed indices to the whole Dīwān, would also be a valuable gift to the scholarly world, and it would crown the excellent work done by Wagner in his edition.

The present volume gives as its main body the recension of Ḥamza pp. 1-382) with the variants of the other recensions in footnotes, and thereafter the poems which are only in the recension of aṣ-Ṣūlī (pp. 382-402) and Tūzūn (pp. 402-434). The book closes with a useful list of corrections to the three earlier volumes (pp. 439-458). The edition is careful—which is customary for Professor Wagner—and carefully printed—which is customary for the *Bibliotheca Islamica*.

The edition fulfills in every way our hopes, except for one thing: at least the present reviewer would have been grateful if more of the verse quotations in Abū Nuwās' poems would have been identified. These "kharǧaesque" allusions to the work of other poets—or to Abū Nuwās' own poems—are an important feature in the genre of wine poems and often crucial to a real understanding of the poem. Professor Wagner has identified some of these quotations in the footnotes, especially when there are textual variants between Abū Nuwās and the dīwān of the quoted poet, but the majority have been left unidentified even though there can be no question but that they were known to the learned editor: e.g. p. 223 l. 4 gives the famous verse of Abū Miḥǧan which is left unidentified in the notes etc.

A hunt for printer's errors has given a meagre result, viz.:

p. 6 l. 13 for arā'u read ārā'u.
p. 71 l. 12 read fa-ṭafauhā with a transitive ṭafā I as in modern dialects (e.g. Cairene dialect; not accepted nor attested in the major Classical dictionaries). This is also found elsewhere in the Dīwān, where II:94 l. 1 we should read ṭafā ḥarrahā, and cf. other Colloquial forms throughout the Dīwān, e.g. the dropping of the desinential flexion (III:350 l. 4), use of nominative (or indicative) instead of accusative (or subjunctive) in the roots tertiae infirmae (e.g. III:330 l. 13 and III:345 l. 1 etc.).
p. 114 l. 9 for fa-qulnā baʿda khubrin: innanā ... read fa-qulnā: baʿda khubrin! innanā ...
p. 115 l. 7 for qarīnati ammi d-dahri read ummi.
p. 128 l. 11 for abī l-badal read ay-i l-badal.
p. 147 l. 2 for ǧamru read ǧamrun.
p. 160 l. 9 It might be better to read mālī than mā lī.
p. 169 l. 11 for fatā read fatan.
p. 176 l. 2, l. 11, p. 181 l. 3 and elsewhere: Would it not be better to read isqi than asqi (the I stem is ascertained in contextual forms, e.g. the formula isqinī in saqaytanī ... e.g. p. 176 l. 2)?
p. 193 l. 4 for hāshimīyun read hāshimīyu.
p. 248 l. 9 for khanithun read khanathun to keep the internal rhyme intact.
p. 253 l. 9 for raddi read radda.
p. 260 l. 12 for awalih read uwalih.
№ 230 (pp. 264-25) contains two different fragments and should have been numbered separately.
p. 268 l. 13 read the last word al-ḥabāb—though the mistake is probably in the manuscript.
p. 284 l. 4 for kafayya read kaffayya.
p. 289 l. 1 ʿafā would look nicer if it were written with a normal alif, even though the manuscript may have it with alif maqṣūra.
p. 385 l. 12 for aṣwiratin read aṣwirati.

These few—and minor—points can not hide the fact that with the present book, an excellent edition of the khamrīyāt has been made available to Arabists, and with it the basic tools for the study of this genre. If the following years show an increased number of articles on the khamrīyāt, a part of the credit belongs to Professor Wagner to whom we remain grateful for the present edition.

JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA

Я. С. Ахметгалеева, Исследование тюркоязычного памятника «Кисекбаш китабы». Издательство «Наука», Москва 1979. 190 pp.

The present work deals with the medieval Shiite epic entitled *Kisekbaš kitabï* or *Dastān/Qïssa-i kisekbaš* ("The Book/Epic/Story of the Severed Head") consisting of 270 verses. It describes a heroic deed of ʿAlī, the cousin of the Prophet, the slaying of

a man-eating demon (*div*), which had devoured the body of a man leaving only his severed head to report of the misery. The *div* had also drowned the victim's wife in a well. In the fight ʿAlī is assisted by his horse Düldül, which is provided with the usual supernatural facilities so common in Inner Asian heroic epics. The *div* threatened to eradicate all Muslims from the world, but in the fight 300 such demons were killed by the hero. Taking heed of prayers, God has mercy on Kisekbaš and finally restores his body as well as the gnawed bones of his son.

Dr. Ahmetgaleeva's book is the first comprehensive description and philological analysis of the epic, the roots of which seem to be in the XIII–XIV century Golden Horde and its many Turkic-speaking peoples. Certain words and forms link it with the once widely spread literary language known as Chaghatay Turkic.

The book is divided into five chapters discussing (I) the known 19 manuscripts (pp. 12-32), (II) the literary and artistic values of the epic (pp. 33-57), (III) its graphic and phonetic [phonological] peculiarities (pp. 58-74), (IV) its morphology (pp. 75-103), and (V) its lexical features (pp. 104-118). A summary of the main results is given on pp. 119-121. The appendix (pp. 122-157) consists of a critical edition of the entire epic in Arabic script, of a transliterated text and a literal as well as a poetical translation (the latter by S. N. Ivanov). The necessary glossary follows on pp. 158-181. A short index of names and geographical terms (p. 182), two sample manuscript pages (pp. 183-184) and a bibliography (pp. 185-190) complete the work.

In the book there is much discussion of the poem's problematic authorship. Dr. Ahmetgaleeva says that among present-day Tatar scholars the opening lines are commonly interpreted as revealing the authors name to be ʿAlī. On p. 29 she herself considers this view probable, and accordingly gives examples of such (obviously defective) readings in certain manuscripts. On p. 16 the first line is written as:

(1) باشلا علی سوز بسم الله ایله — The translation "Начни, Али, речь с именем аллаха" ("Start, ʿAlī, the talk with a bismillāhi") is given without comments, although this is rather a copyist's folk-etymological mistake. The passage is translated correctly in other places. The critical text on p. 124 opens as follows:

باشلاعالی سوزی بسم الله ایله *ašlaʿalï sözi bismillä ilä*

Начнёмте-ка речь с именем аллаха "Let us start the word with a bismillāhi"

The verb form is rather written باشلاغالی *bašlaġalï* as in one manuscript described on p. 19. It represents an old voluntative (imperative-optative?) mood with *-ġalï*[4], which basically expresses a facility: 'to be able to...'. In Old Turkic it is usually followed by a modal auxiliary verb. On p. 22 there is another variant with the same meaning: باشلایالوم *bašlayalum* (p. 25 باشلیالوم).

The second line forms a parallel to the first:

(2) دوروشالم تون (و) کون الله ایله *durušalïm tün (ü) kün Allāh ilä*

[4] On p. 98 Ahmetgaleeva calls it "желательное наклонение". She thinks (pp. 29-30) that the name of ʿAlī was probably added to the first line in Asia Minor (where the epic became known in the 15th century) and this was later "corrected" at the Volga to the—in regard to the text—rare Chaghatay verb form.

и будем день и ночь с аллахом "so we can be day and night with God"
The verb form reads variously as دروشالم (p. 13), دورشالم (p. 13); دورش على (p. 17, *duruš‹alï* [*durušġalï*] "let us be...", the last instance in my opinion erroneously interpreted as *därviš ‹Alī* "дервиш Али / Dervish ‹Alī");
p. 30 درویشی علی کون تون الله ایله 'дервиш Али день и ночь с аллахом'.
Additional variants on p. 18 دورشا علی and p. 19 درویش علی.

In any case it seems impossible to think that a poem dedicated to the Muslim saint ‹Alī and his heroic deeds could open with the author's name — which in this case would even be identical with that of the hero.

The closing lines form a colophon. Here a name is really given, as one would expect. The name is written variously, but in the book there is no actual attempt to make a comparative analysis of the different forms. In the following they are given with translations by Dr. Ahmetgaleeva:

p. 13 مولانی شمسی تیدی یاری‌نا 'Мевляна назвал друга солнцем...'
p. 15 مولان شمس بیرزیارین 'Мевляна солнце [. . .] / завтра...'
p. 17 مولانا ش[م]سی تبریزی یادینه 'Мевляна, в память о Шемсе Тебризи...'
p. 30/135 مولانا شمس ترازی (ترازی، تبرزی) یادینه (یارینه، بارین)
p. 30/149 'Мевляна, в память о Шемсе Терази /Теразе...'

Separate literal translations of these more or less corrupt readings cannot give convincing results. The last word is unclear, but does not belong to the name. The epithet Mävlānā may be an attribute of the name Šäms(-i) Täbrīzī. Dr. Ahmetgaleeva discusses this form and its allograph Šäms Tarāzī on pp. 30-32. As a conclusion she states, that the anonymous codifier, living by the Volga River, was probably educated in Central Asia, because the above lines indicate that he dedicated the poem to his teacher Šäms, coming from the city of Taraz (Talas, Talaš). This is a useful beginning, but the colophons need a more thorough comparative textological analysis with a chronology of dependencies to yield more than just educated guesses.

The original author and the original language of the poem remain a mystery. Its lasting popularity is evident from the numerous printed editions known from the Volga region (e.g. 6 editions from Kazan, 1894-1903), Transcaucasia, and Asia Minor.

We must be grateful to Dr. Ahmetgaleeva for her critical edition of these rare manuscripts and her thorough grammatical analysis. It is to be hoped that still more manuscripts will be found to facilitate further discussion of this interesting topic.

HARRY HALÉN

Paul Kent Andersen, Studies in the Minor Rock Edicts of Aśoka, I. Critical Edition. Freiburg: Hedwig Falk, 1990. 184 p.

The ancient Prakrit inscriptions of the emperor Aśoka (reign ca. 268-231 B.C.) contitute the oldest known *written* specimens of an Indo-Aryan language; at the same time they represent the oldest native Indian sociocultural and historical documents.

The rediscovery of the numerous Aśokan inscriptions (in Brahmi and Kharoshthi scripts) scattered all over India started as late as in 1750, and it took nearly 90 years before the scripts were (re)deciphered and some of the messages could be interpreted by comparing the Aśokan Prakrit dialects with Old Indic/Sanskrit, Pali and the literary Prakrits. By the first quarter of the present century most of the inscriptions in their various local versions had been found and published with translation, but new important discoveries (not only in Prakrit but also in Greek and Aramaic) have been made even in recent decades. New editions and translations or analyses in various languages have been appearing over the years, but some of the inscriptions (inter alia, of the Minor Rock Edicts) have not yet been properly edited and analyzed, let alone compiled into a single complete edition.

While presenting a new critical edition of all the known versions of the two Minor Rock Edicts (MRE), Andersen addresses himself specifically to those ten versions of the latter that were discovered after Hultzsch's edition of the Aśokan inscriptions (1925).

The reasons for this new edition can hardly be better summarized than in the words of the author himself:

> "In Bloch's (1950) edition of the Aśokan inscriptions two additional versions of the Minor Rock Edicts have been incorporated into the corpus. But it was not until Sircar's (1979) book on the Aśokan inscriptions that all 17 known versions of the Minor Rock Edicts have been fully presented, although Sircar himself only discusses nine versions of the Minor Rock Edicts (actually these discussions are reprints of his articles) and merely gives a summary of all 17 versions. Unfortunately, there are a number of shortcomings involved with Sircar's edition of the Minor Rock Edicts that make a new critical edition of the Minor Rock Edicts even more pressing than before: we have no critical discussion of the various readings of the texts themselves that have been offered in the literature and the actual readings that have been offered leave much to be desired, i.e., there are numerous inconsistencies—Sircar presents us at times with up to three different readings for one and the same passage—and especially when it comes to newly discovered inscriptions Sircar's readings are incomplete and based upon photographs that are themselves deficient. Furthermore, we still do not have useful synoptic texts nor a concordance of the words found in the texts." (P. 13)

It is the author's professed purpose to remedy these defects. A critical edition of the 17 versions of the Minor Rock Edicts appear in Chapter 2 (pp. 15-109). Here we are presented with general information on the inscriptions and the sources, and as many as three 'editions' of the actual texts: 1) the '[transliterated] critical text' (with meticulous discussion of the problematic readings in the interlinear notes), 2) the 'analyzed [word by word] text' and 3) the 'reconstructed [and corrected word by word] text'.

A synoptic representation of the texts (in both editions) is given in Chapter 3 (pp. 111-133). This facilitates the detection of 'scribal errors' and other idiosyncracies of the specific versions.

In the final Chapter 4 'Dictionary and concordance' (pp. 135-179), all the words and word forms of the MREs are listed with glosses, references, and [Ṛg]Vedic/ Sanskrit and Pali comparisons and bibliographical references. The glosses and interpretations are, by and large, both succinct and apt. I have only one remark here:

The gerundive **vataviyā** (= **vataviyā/vattaviyā**) occurring at 1A in the Mysore versions [cf. Brahmagiri (2x): **suvaṁṇagirīte ayaputasa mahāmātāṇaṁ ca vacan[e]na isilasi mahāmātā ārogiyaṁ vataviyā hevaṁ ca vataviyā** ≈ 'By the word of the Prince and the Chief Ministers from Suvarṇagiri (Gold Mount) the Chief Ministers at Isila (Siddapura?) are to be wished/spoken good health and then spoken to as follows'] is interpreted as from **va-** < **vṛ-** 'to wish, choose'. It has usually (Bloch, Mookerji) been taken to derive from **vac-** 'to speak' (> **vak-tavya-** > **vattaviya-**), which would yield better sense at least for the latter occurrence.

The readings are mainly based on the best available photographs of the inscriptions, but all previous editions are also scrutinized. The work has not been easy. All of the inscriptions are damaged, several of them severely. Sporadic scribal errors and local, dialectal or idiosyncratic varieties render the interpretation an even more difficult task. In deciding the most likely readings and reconstructing the texts, the author manifests exemplary thoroughness and excellent judgement.

In the synoptic representations of the texts, the 17 versions are ordered non-alphabetically according to their recension and internal relations, as to be discussed by the author in his forthcoming *Studies in the Minor Rock Edicts II*. The second volume would also provide us with a final, detailed discussion of the more difficult words, translations of the texts, cultural history, etc. If the second volume is as solid and reliable a work as the first volume, we can only look forward to its prompt completion and publication.

BERTIL TIKKANEN

Thomas Malten, Reduplizierte Verbalstämme in Tamil. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1989. (*Beiträge zur Südasienforschung*, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Band 127.) ix + 283 p.

The present title is a doctoral dissertation prepared at the *Südasien-Institut* of the University of Heidelberg (1985). It deals with the rather universal phenomenon of reduplication, especially as observed in the formation of verb stems in modern spoken and written Tamil (South Dravidian).

Taken in the widest possible sense, reduplication, includes the doubling of any linguistic elements (phonemes, morphemes, words, clauses, etc.) in identical or modified form (p. 5). Some languages, like Tagalog and Sanskrit, utilize reduplication both in morphology (e.g. tense or aspect formation) and (e.g. distributive meaning, emphasis, etc.). Others, such as Tamil and Hindi, restrict it to syntax and word derivation (cf. Chapter 1).

Before embarking on his exhaustive treatment of reduplicated verb stems in Tamil (Chapters 5-6, pp. 47-256), the author briefly discusses reduplication in general (Chapters 1-2, pp. 3-12) and gives a survey and review of this phenomenon in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian (Chapter 3, pp. 13-21), in particular Tamil (Chapter 4, pp. 25-46). The author is well acquainted with most of the published and many of the un-

published studies on reduplication in Asian and European languages. He has, in addition, gone out of his way to compile a general bibliography of publications in English, French and Tamil relating to reduplication in all Indian languages (Chapter 9, pp. 263-283).

Unfortunately, however, Malten seems to have missed one of the more important cross-linguistic theoretical studies of reduplication, viz Edith A. Moravcsik's well-researched and insightful paper 'Reduplicative constructions' in *Universals of Human Language, Volume 3: Word Structure* (edited by Joseph H. Greenberg), Stanford University Press, 1978, pp. 297-334. I will have to reason to return to this study presently.

Malten classifies reduplicative constructions in terms of 1) *formal criteria* (full vs. partial reduplication with or without affixes or modification), and 2) *functional criteria*. The latter involve a basic distinction between a) grammatical function, i.e. syntactic vs. derivative function, and b) semantic function, which is subclassified as *expressive* (symbolic or non-descriptive, "Ausdrucksverstärkung") vs. *iterative* (> repetitive vs. frequentative vs. reciprocal) vs. *intensifying* (> qualitative vs. iterative), vs. *extensive-quantifying* (> distributive vs. pluralizing) function (p. 9-12). Malten stresses the fact that reduplicated words consisting of two parts, G_1 and G_2, need not presuppose the prior existence of part G_1. In other words, reduplicated words may be primary lexemes, as is, indeed, often the case in Tamil.

Since we are dealing with open systems and polysemy, Malten admits that the classification cannot be water-tight. For example, *syntactic* (phrase- or clause-forming) and *derivative* (word-forming) reduplication tend to overlap in onomatopoeia and iterative items, cf. Tamil **poyyi poyyi** '(mere/outright) lies', **curric curri** '(turning) around and around, repeatedly' (pp. 36-43).

Similarly, the semantic functions are somewhat fuzzy and most reduplicated items instance several meanings. I would go as far as to say that many of the different meanings established by Malten are mere artifacts, being largely determined by the word (sub)classes in question. This can be seen, e.g. in that the term *iterative* is used both as a hyperonym and hyponym (under the *intensive* function, e.g. Ta. **vimmi-vimmi aḻutāṉ** "heftig und wiederholt schluchzend weinte er", p. 12).

It would have been better to include the iterative function under the (distributive/indefinite) *quantifying* function, the interpretations of which largely depend on the word class and subcategories of the latter. E.g. 'frequentative iterative' denominal adverbs like **aṭikkaṭi** 'again and again' (lit. 'step [by] step', i.e. 'with each step') and 'repetitive iterative' denominal adverbials like **tiṉam tiṉam** 'day by day, every day' (≠ 'many days') correspond on a general semantic level to distributive pronouns like **avaravar** 'each and everyone' (cf. also, e.g. Hindi **kaun kaun** 'which ones?') and reciprocals like **oruvarukku oruvar** 'to one another'. (Reciprocals are often etymologically dual distributives.) 'Repetitive iterative' adverbs like **kīḻēkīḻē** 'deeper and deeper; very deeply' ('down-down, below-below'), on the other hand, could be classified with *intensive* reduplicated deverbal adverbials like **vimmivimmi** 'sobbing and sobbing, sobbing very much and all the time', the main difference being that they

represent (static/dynamic spatial) adverbs (cf. **etirēetirē** 'just in front of') rather than verbs or adjectives (e.g. **nallanalla** 'very good'); pp. 11-12.

This approach would reduce the basic meaning types to three: expressive, intensive and quantifying (> distributive/repetitive vs. pluralizing/indefinite). It may even be asked whether or not the expressive function is just a 'subjective' form of the intensive function?

In fact, Moravcsik goes as far as to subsume the intensifying meaning under the wider concept of "*increased quantity*". The latter can then be understood in terms of 1) increased "*quantity of referents/events*" (i.e. simple, indefinite or distributive [diversifying] plurality of referents or events [> repeated or continued occurrence]) or 2) increased "*amount of emphasis*" (i.e. intensification of event, size, effect or property, either by aggrandizement or diminution or attenuation, with possible subjective overtones, i.e. endearment, derogatoriness, etc.).

Even the so-called echo compounds (pp. 43-46) expressing generalized sets or hyperonymous concepts, might be understood in terms of the latter subfunction of intensification, viz. *attenuation* with or without subjective ('expressive') connotations = '[X and that which is] similar to X', e.g. Turkish **kitap mitap** 'books and such', Yiddish **book-shmook**, Tamil **mēcai kīcai** 'table and/or other furniture like that', **mēcai-mēl kīcai-mēl** 'on the table or something like that'.

But, of course, many of the meanings or functions associated with reduplication do not come within this macrofunction, e.g. adverbial or (in)transitive derivatives, perfective aspect, etc. (These meanings are not, however, represented by reduplication in Dravidian.)

After these useful introductory chapters, the author comes to the *reduplicated verb stems* of Tamil. These are defined as four-syllable primary or secondary stems of the canonical type $C_1V_1C_2V_2$-$C_1V_1C_2V_2$, where V is short and C simple (p. 47). Having originally been employed attributively, these stems have in the course of time acquired additional verbal suffixes. Forms of phonologically similar type include reduplicated interjections, imperatives, and nouns, as well as some plant and animal names.

Malten's material consists of 229 documented reduplicated verb stems (variously listed and analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6). The data have been culled from the available grammatical and lexicographic literature, the literary works of T. Jeyakanthan, and personal Tamil informants.

These stems are associated with 578 meaning types, classified under the three classical head categories (**icai** 'sounds', **kuṟippu** 'emotions', **paṇpu** 'external qualities'). Further categories are, e.g. 'human', 'animal', 'inanimate nature'; 'movement', 'external emotion', etc. Semantic transition may occur when an expressive meaning is reinterpreted in more abstract terms, e.g. the onomatopoeic expression **kalakala eṉṟu** signifying rapid movement has come to mean 'quickly' (p. 55).

Most of these stems occur with the adverbial/attributive 'suffix' **-eṉṟu/-eṉa** (verbal participle/infinitive of the quotative verb 'to say'), but in the Classical Tamil of the Sangam (Caṅkam) literature and Tolkāppiyam, this adverbial suffix is not yet found

with reduplicated verb stems (p. 58). The formations are characterized by both phonological and semantic lability. Dialectal and sociolectal variations are noticed. Primary reduplicated stems need not carry expressive function, but may be purely descriptive in meaning (p. 54).

The *phonotax* or *syllable structure* of reduplicated verb stems is presented and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively on pp. 59-87. This discussion is interesting not only from the point of view of future comparisons with other Dravidian languages, but also in view of Murray Emeneau's hypothesis that the pattern of this type of formation has spread to Indo-Aryan from Dravidian.

It appears that C_1 obeys the same restrictions as initial consonants in Tamil in general. But although there are no initial retroflexes in native Tamil words, there are reduplicated verb stems with initial retroflexes, like **ṭaṇaṭaṇa/ṭapaṭapa/ṭamaṭama** "dröhnen" (drum). It is therefore concluded that these are loanwords. But this conclusion is premature, inasmuch as reduplicative formations present an innovative and semantically rather specialized subclass of lexemes (e.g. onomatopoeia), not necessarily subject to the same phonotactic constraints as other lexemes.

Typically C_1 is an oral or nasal stop, with rather even distribution among velars, labials and dentals, while palatals are somewhat rarer: (**k** = 23.6%, **m** = 17.9 %, **p** = 12.6 %, **t** = 12.2 %, **n** = 10.9 %, **c** (**j**) = 10.0 %, **v** = 10.0 %, **ṭ** = 1.3 %, **j** = 1.3 %, **l** = 0.4 %).

Unfortunately, Malten has no control group to offer comparison with (i.e. statistics of initial consonants in other types of lexemes in Tamil). Whether the absence of **ñ** and **y**, generally rare as initials, is due to chance or reflects a real structural gap, cannot be determined, owing to the limited set of tokens.

C_2 can be any simple medial consonant, except the dental, palatal and velar nasals (**ṭ** = 14.0 %, **r̲** = 11.8 %, **r** = 10.9 %, **l̩** = 10.0 %, **t** = 9.6 %, **l** = 9.6 %, **c** = 8.7 %, **l̲** = 7.0 %, **ṇ** = 6.0 %, **k** = 4.0 %, **m** = 3.0 %, **p** = 2.6 %, **n̲** = 1.3 %, **v** = 0.9 %, **y** = 0.4 %).

One may now observe that the frequency of C_1 and C_2 are reversed as regards place and type of articulation. In other words, C_2 favours but C_1 avoids retroflexes, alveolars and liquids. On the other hand, C_1 favours but C_2 avoids labial and velar stops. Only dental and palatal stops are positionally rather neutral. This, together with the aforementioned observations on C_1 would suggest that there are some restrictions on the occurrence of specifically sonorant phonemes especially as initials in reduplicated verb stems. Perhaps this is because of the generally higher expressiveness of this type of formation?

The various possible syllable types occurring in reduplicated verb stems are presented in 7 tables on pages 62-68. It appears, among many other things, that while any vowel may occur as V_1 (**a** = 30.0 %, **o** = 28.4 %, **u** = 17.5 % [not after **ṭ**, **j**, **n**, **l**, **v**], **i** = 16.2 %, **e** = 7.9 % [not after **k**, **t**, **p**, i.e. non-retroflex/-palatal stops]), V_2 is canonically **a** (48.0%) or **u** (46.3 %). Reduplicated verb stems ending in **i** (4.4 % [with variants in **a** or **u**]) or **ai** (1.3 % [facultatively **a**]) constitute a rather marginal subclass of frequently secondary origin and irregular conjugation (e.g. **kulaikulai**

"zittern, erregt, verwirrt sein, sich fürchten" < **kulai-tal** (TL) 'to tremble, shudder, quiver, shiver' (p. 69f.).

Malten also shows that the second vowel tends to be determined by the first: 1) If V_1 = **a**, then V_2 = **a**, or facultatively/alternatively in some cases **u**. 2) If V_1 = **u**, then V_2 = **u**, or facultatively/alternatively in some cases **a**. 3) If V_1 = **i**, then V_2 = **u**, or facultatively/alternatively in some cases **a**, exceptionally **i**. 4) If V_1 = **o**, then V_2 = **a**, or facultatively/alternatively **u**. 5) If V_1 = **e**, then V_2 = **a/u**. (See pp. 71-73.) The simple conclusion I would draw from this, is that V_1 and V_2 tend to harmonize in respect of vowel height.

The vowels and consonants may vary, but not necessarily without some change of meaning, cf. **muṇamuṇa/muṇumuṇu** 'to mumble, mutter, whisper (etc.)', **kaca-kaca/kacukacu/nacanaca** 'wet, moist (etc.)', but **kaṭakaṭa** 'to rattle' ≠ **kaṭukaṭu** 'to show signs of anger' (pp. 73-86).

So far everything looks regular and tidy from a structural point of view, but Malten also points out (systematic and unsystematic) exceptions to the canonical forms, e.g. the alternation of the vowel in the second syllable, the doubling of medial consonant (C_2 = **l**) in both syllables, and the addition of a final increment (**r/l/l̲**) in both syllables, cf. **kacukucu** 'onom. whispering in the ear', **mollumollu** 'onom. expr. signifying noisy clamour' (cf. **molu**, **mollu**), **kumil̲kumil̲** 'to hide from others, hush [up]' (pp. 86-87). Among the irregular variants, the most interesting ones are represented by the 'echo word' type (**p-/m-** ± **-k[k]u/tu/ti**), e.g. **kacupicukkai** = **kacukacu** 'moist, sticky', **kar̲ukar̲u** = **kar̲umor̲u** 'signs of anger' (p. 119-127).

An interesting feature of the reduplicated verb stems in Tamil is that 60 % of them are primary formations, i.e. do not derive from simplex (unreduplicated) stems. This suggests that the whole category is a central and at least semi-productive part of the Tamil lexicon, which is furthermore corroborated by the fact that neither the secondary nor primary reduplicative verb stems are primarily onomatopoeic. On the other hand, the author stresses the difference between derivative reduplication and fully productive syntactic reduplication of the type **aṭi aṭi-** "einen Schlag schlagen" (*figura etymologica*).

A discussion with lists of all these formations including an etymological analysis according to their kind and suffixes appears on pp. 89-127. Partly due to insufficient documentation, the diachronic and synchronic rules of suffixation cannot be established.

The book seems to be quite free from printing mistakes and lapses, but on p. 90, three errata cluster in one and the same sentence: "Sekundär redupliziert ist ein reduplizierter Verbstämmme [*Verbstamm*] dann, wenn er mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit aus einer selbständigen viersilbigen [*zweisilbigen*] Verbwurzeln [*Verbwurzel*] gleicher Form abgeleitet werden kann und sich in deutlicher semantischer Übereinstimmung mit dieser Simplexform befindet."

The reduplicated verb stems can occasionally be used attributively or adverbially as such without a suffix in Old and Modern Tamil, e.g. **kar̲ukar̲u kūntal** "pech-

schwarzes Frauenhaar", **kuṟukuṟu naṭa** "wackelnd laufen" (Puṟanāṉūṟu 188). In these cases they are similar to reduplicated onomotapoeia or interjections. Normally they prefer a nominal or adverbial suffix, e.g. **kaḷakaḷa-m/-ppu** 'noise', **kaḷakaḷa-v-enṟu** 'noisily'.

As verbs they usually belong to the sixth (Graulian) conjugation (e.g. **kaḷakaḷa-ttal** 'to be noisy') and are capable of taking tense suffixes, infinitival suffixes and the adverbial formative suffix **-enṟu** (since this is etymologically an independent word 'having said, saying', I would prefer not to call it a 'suffix', but simply a free functional morpheme, phrase formative or complementizer). Relative and conditional participles as well as secondary finite stems are not found with these formations, which hence appear to be more restricted than other verb stems (p. 103).

Chapter 6 presents the whole material alphabetically (Tamil-wise), i.e. all the documented reduplicated verb stems with representative occurrences and translations (pp. 131-226), semantic indexes (pp. 227-243) and German meaning index (pp. 243-259).

The documentation, semantic analysis and field-specific indexes (3 major fields with 32 subclasses) are excellent and provide a good basis and model for further synchronic, diachronic and comparative research. Now, for example, one could also conceive of some kind of correlation between sound and meaning in some of these items. In some cases, such a correlation would be rather trivial, e.g. the presence of *nasals* in stems indicating speaking with a *nasal* twang. But the almost complete restriction of C_2 to tremulants or retroflexes in stems indicating human motion as against motion of liquids (showing no particular phonaesthetic predilections), is somewhat less obvious and hence more interesting. This type of issue is not addressed, although it must be admitted that it could, in fact, lead to rather fruitless speculations.

Chapter 7 (pp. 257-259) summarizes the major results of the study, and Chapter 8 gives an English résumé (pp. 261-262). The question whether this type of reduplicative structures in Indo-Aryan owes its origin to Dravidian sub- or adstratum influence is still left open, because of the lack of comparable studies for other Dravidian languages. Nevertheless, this thorough case-study contains a great deal of new data and insights, which will help in dealing with similar reduplicative structures in other languages, and thus in approaching the problem of their history in South Asia.

BERTIL TIKKANEN

Almuth Degener, Khotanische Suffixe. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1989. (*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* herausgegeben vom Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg, Band 39.) lii +349 pp.

This exhaustive study of nominal suffixes in Khotanese (Saka) continues in the spirit of Ronald E. Emmerick's *Saka Grammatical Studies* (London 1968). It is based on the whole Khotanese text corpus and lists and describes (on all linguistic levels, synchronically and diachronically) all the documented nominal suffixes, used to derive

nouns, adjectives or adverbs in this historically important Middle Iranian language of the eastern branch. To some extent it may thus be compared with Albert Debrunner's *Die Nominalsuffixe* (= Wackernagel & al., *Altindische Grammatik II, 2* [1954]).

The work starts with a summary of the results (pp. xxiii-lii). Here it appears that the author does not make any distinction between transparent ("durchsichtig") and productive ("produktiv", "lebendig") derivation (p. xxv). This is done at the cost of not correlating productiveness with frequency. Nevertheless, the necessary result of productiveness is frequency, while transparency is a morphological concept (relating to morphemic segmentation and agglutination), actually quite independent of productiveness (cf. e.g. the Sanskrit adjectival derivational suffix **-śa**, which is fully transparent, but yet not productive, as against e.g. **-ra**).

The difference between derivation and composition is treated on pp. xxvi-xxviii. The author claims that a word like **a-hotana-** 'incapable' ("ohnmächtig") is a *compound* composed of the members **a-** 'un-, in-' ("nicht") and **hotana-** 'capable' ("mächtig"), which is *derived* from **hot-** 'to be capable' ("mächtig sein") and the derivational suffix **-ana-**. But as the author is well aware, **a[n]-** is the inherited privative *prefix* (the negative particles being **ne** (**nä**), **na** and **ma**), and consequently the word is not a compound at all. (It is true that the native Indian grammarians classified this type of derived words as *tatpuruṣa* compounds, but their arguments for doing this are irrelevant.)

On p. xxviii it is said that in Khotanese a derivational suffix added to the last constituent of a phrase or of a string of coordinated constituents can refer or belong (elliptically) to all of the said constituents. This would be rather surprising in any language. But a closer look at the examples shows that they can all be interpreted as simple derivatives or coordinated compounds, with the second member appearing only with the last word (e.g. **ysāysa hīyāra chaka bāgara-hvāra** "Gras, Früchte, Sprosse, Blätter essend").

A survey of the transparent derivative suffixes and their history appears on pp. xxvix-xxxv. It may be observed that also some (primarily) inflectional suffixes, as for example the suffixes of the past participle and infinitive, are counted among the derivational suffixes. This is, of course, purely meritorious in a book of this scope. The peculiar form **pā-tave** 'to protect' (p. xxxi) is explained as an Indian loan, more precisely the dative of an action noun in **-tu-**, but there is no such noun ***pā-tu-** 'protecting'. Hence it must really be the Vedic/Pali type infinitive in **-tave**.

The various functions, specific meanings and combinations of these suffixes are also classified and discussed according to several parameters (pp. xxxv-lii).

The actual material is presented alphabetically (Khotanese-wise) on pages 1-322 according to the suffixes (55 in number), their various functions and stem types. Each entry contains not only meticulous morphological and semantic but also syntactic information, reconstructions, etymological comparisons, abundant examples from Old and Late Khotanese literature, translations, Sanskrit and Tibetan originals, etc. A Khotanese word index follows on pages 323-349, but an *index locorum* is lacking.

The expositon is very concise but sufficiently clear and extremely thorough. This

study will, no doubt, remain a reliable and useful tool not only for Iranists, but also for Indologists and Indo-Europeanists. As can be expected in a work of this size and complexity, certain details in etymology and interpretation will remain debatable. There is, for example, no reference to the rare 'gerundial/absolutive' suffix **-i** < **-ya**, mentioned by Konow (*Saka Studies*, 1932: 59).

The work is the author's prize-winning dissertation of 1986 (Seminar für Geschichte und Kultur des Vorderen Orients, Universität Hamburg). It contains some introductory comments by R. E. Emmerick.

BERTIL TIKKANEN

1) **Étienne Tiffou & Jurgen Pesot**, Contes du Yasin. Introduction au bourouchaski du Yasin avec grammaire et dictionnaire analytique. Études bourouchaski 1. Paris: Peeters/Selaf, 1989. (*Asie et Monde Insulindien* 16, SELAF n° 303.) 162 pp.
2) **Yves Charles Morin & Étienne Tiffou**, Dictionnaire complémentaire du bourouchaski du Yasin. Études bourouchaski 2. Paris: Peeters/Selaf, 1989. (*Asie et Monde Insulindien* 17, SELAF n° 304.) 58 pp.

Burushaski is a relic-like language isolate spoken by hardly 100,000 people in the mountain valleys of Yasin and Hunza-Nager in the western parts of the Karakoram range in northernmost Pakistan. The earliest western accounts of this mysterious language and its equally mysterious speakers go back no more than to the latter half of the 19th century (A. Cunningham, G. W. Hayward, G. W. Leitner and J. Biddulph).

Burushaksi is surrounded by languages belonging to three language groups, Indo-European, Sino-Tibetan and Turkic, but is unrelated to any of them. In fact, none of the many attempts to trace the roots of this unwritten language or link it genetically with some other language or language group of the world (e.g. with Dravidian, Austroasiatic, Austronesian, Yeniseian, Caucasian languages, Basque, Chukchi, etc.) has been crowned with success. At some time the language must have been spoken over a fairly homogeneous area along the Gilgit river and its tributaries, and perhaps in other mountain river valleys of the Hindukush-Karakoram-Pamir region. Ancient loanwords from and into Vedic Sanskrit point to rather intimate contacts already with the early Indo-Aryans. Also of fairly old standing are the contacts with West Tibetan, Pamir Iranian and "Altaic" languages. In spite of lexical borrowings, structurally Burushaski has held its own ground remarkably well against alien influence.

Owing to the gradual expansion and intervention of Indo-Iranian languages from the west, south and north, the more westerly Yasin dialect, also called by its Chitrali/Khowar name *Werchikwar* (**werśikwār**), has for several centuries been separated by the (Wakhi and Khowar-speaking) Ishkoman valley and (Shina-speaking) Punyal and Gilgit valleys from the eastern Hunza and Nager dialects. This isolation has spared the Yasin dialect from some innovations shared by the Hunza and Nager dialects, but also enabled it to go its own way in regard to certain phonological,

morphosyntactic and lexical features. Politically and culturally, Yasin has been dominated by Chitral (NE Hindukush) for several generations, and most adult male Yasins are therefore conversant with Indo-Aryan Khowar, many also with Shina. Shina is the language of Gilgit and lower Hunza, and has influenced and been influenced by Burushaski more than any other regional language.

Thanks to the pioneering work of some English (Biddulph 1880; Lorimer 1935-1938; 1962), Russian (e.g. Zarubin 1927), German (Berger 1974; MS.) and French (Fremont 1982) scholars, we have fairly good basic descriptions and text corpora of all the three major dialects. In addition to a handful of monographic descriptions, some twenty smaller publications have been dedicated to various aspects of Burushaski phonology, grammar, semantics, etymology and external relations.

Several of the most recent articles have been written by three distinguished Canadian linguists: Étienne Tiffou (Montreal), Yves Charles Morin (Montreal) and Jurgen Pesot (Rimouski). Accumulating their research, these scholars have now produced two monographs in French on the Yasin dialect: 1) a linguistic introduction with a collection of 18 annotated stories and accompanying translations and vocabulary (Tiffou & Pesot); 2) a complementary dictionary (Morin & Tiffou).

These works are of a high standard and will complement, though not supersede Hermann Berger's similar monograph, *Das Yasin-Burushaski (Werchikwar), Grammatik, Texte, Wörterbuch*, of 1974. In fact, neither of the new monographs is meant to be read without reference to Berger's generally more detailed grammatical description and vocabulary. (This may be felt as an inconvenience, but a closer study of Burushaski is in any case impossible without a good command of German.)

The original research underlying these monographs is based on two expeditions made by Tiffou and Morin in 1975 (June-August) and 1978 (March-August). Some points were verified during a third expedition by Tiffou in 1979. The stories were told by three local narrators and represent local or Chitrali folklore or legends (in two instances historically based ones) and a few folktales. Some of the stories can be identified with Berger's stories, although the authors neglect to mention which ones (4 = Berger VII; 14 = Berger XIII; 15 = Berger III; 16 ≈ Berger XII). In addition, some of the informants are shared. The vocabulary lists only the words occurring in these stories, but every particular word-form has been given and/or grammatically glossed. This is an advantage in comparison with Berger's vocabulary, because it facilitates the perusal of the texts as well as the study of a language whose morphology is singularly complex. On the other hand, unlike Berger, Tiffou & Pesot provide no reverse word index.

Neither Tiffou & Pesot nor Berger claim to have presented complete grammatical descriptions of the Yasin dialect. That would, indeed, be an impossible task to perform without more extensive field-work and space (cf. the much larger size of Berger's forthcoming grammar of the Hunza and Nager dialects). The new description by Tiffou & Pesot is still largely based on Berger's data, but differs from Berger's account in terms of the more formal method as well as new information or perspective on the vocalism, nominal flexion, aspect/tense system and especially syntax. The authors

acknowledge their indebtedness also to Morin for many of the new explanations relating to phonology and morphology. I will return to a more detailed examination of this monograph after saying a few words about the second work under review.

The dictionary by Morin & Tiffou is an indispensable, though not very extensive, complement to the lexicographic work by Zarubin, Lorimer and Berger. It contains a number of lexical or semantic additions, especially loanwords from Urdu (the national language of Pakistan), which are in the ascendant owing to increasing education and communications.

Perhaps more important than the new lexical items are the phonological corrections, which relate chiefly to vowel length, the phonematic status of which appeared dubious to Berger (see below).

Most of the new lexical items/corrections were collected by Tiffou during directed conversations with one (or, in the case of problematic items, several) informant(s) or from the stories. But in the case of many plant and bird names, exact definitions are still lacking.

Geographic dialectal differences seem to be minimal, much less than in Hunza and Nager Burushaski. Occasionally two variant pronunciations of a word have, nevertheless, been recorded.

Of special interest are the numerous, differently integrated loanwords from Khowar, Shina and Urdu/Persian. The etymology is mostly given, but in many cases it has been left out. E.g. **arabá, -mu** "roue de véhicule" is evidently connected with Arabic **ᶜaraba** 'carriage, vehicle, cart, coach' (not attested in Urdu or Persian, but in Turkish and Hunza Bu. **arabá** 'push cart'); **bās ét-** "se disputer" < Urdu **baḥaṣ** 'debate' < Ar.; **beaqú -.t-** "se moquer" < U. **bewaqūf** 'senseless, foolish' < Pe. + Ar.; **čuná** "chaux vive (x sg et pl), chaux éteinte (y pl)" < U. **cūnā** 'lime'; **gaṭbáṭ, -iŋ** 'confusion' < U. **gaṛbaṛ** 'id.'; **góbi, -mu** "chou, chou-fleur" < U. **gobhī** 'cauliflower'; **paitawá, -ŋ** "bande molletière", cf. U. **paitāvah** 'inner sole' < Pe.; **sadáf, -dáumiŋ** "perle précieuse" < U. **ṣadaf** 'oyster shell' < Ar.; **sālé, -tiŋ** "femme sérieuse, fidèle" < U. **ṣāleḥ** 'pious, virtuous' < Ar. In the Persian/Urdu loanword **anár, -išu** "mangue" one is struck by the semantic anomaly, since in Urdu this fruit means 'pomegranate', never 'mango'.

The authors make a point of listing intransitive and transitive verbs of the same root complex under a single entry, but in the case of **bal-´/-wál-/gía-** "tomber" and **bišá-/-waš-/gi-/gu-** "laisser tomber", etc. (p. 12) this solution is somewhat forced. For by the same logic we should also include **balű-/-wâlu-/-wâlja-** "être perdu" (p. 12) under the same entry.

As with Berger, the gender or class of nouns is usually not indicated explicitly, but only indirectly with the meaning of the word or with its plural ending, the last element of which tends to be indicative of class. Considering good lexicographic practice and the fact that not all users of a Burushaski dictionary will be conversant with Burushaski grammar, one would have expected the four classes (*hm, hf, x, y*) to have been listed in addition to the plural ending(s) with every noun (just as Lorimer did).

After this general presentation, I will proceed to examine the first-mentioned monograph *Contes du Yasin* in greater detail, also comparing it with Berger's *Das Yasin-Burushaski* and some other relevant publications. For the sake of interest, I will, at the same time, endeavour to present the facts so that the reader will be able to get some notion of the general structure of the various dialects of Burushaski. In the examples I have usually added morphological segmentation to facilitate decoding.

The first chapter is devoted to phonology (pp. 7-14). As observed by Berger, the system of five short vowels (**a i u e o**) tends to be reduced to three by neutralization or free variation of **i/e** and **u/o** especially in unaccented positions (typically resolved in favour of **e** and **u**, e.g. **khené/khiné** '(s)he, this (*hmf*)', cf. also **hen** 'one (*h*)' = Hunza **hin**; **cel** 'water' = Hunza **chil**).

Phonemically long vowels are shown to exist not only in some loanwords, as recognized by Berger, but also in native Yasini words. Frequently they arise because of the lengthening of the final vowel in the ergative case (-**e**): e.g. **hir** 'man' > **hur-í** 'men' > **hur-î** 'men (erg.)', **gus** 'woman' > **guš-íŋa** 'women' > **guš-íŋā** 'women (erg.)' (p. 7). Especially before and after accented syllables, long vowels tend to be neutralized, however, and in rapid speech they are not as clearly distinguished as in Hunza/Nageri.

The confused status of vowel length is reflected in the partly non-phonemic transcription, e.g. **ni/nī** 'having gone (3 sg hmxy)' (Berger: **ni**). Berger draws attention to the lack of distinctive vowel length in (most native items in) Khowar, but he does acknowledge long or double vowels in Yasini at least as the outcome of an accented and an unaccented vowel at morpheme boundary, e.g. **nê** "sein (Gen.)" < ***né-e** (cf. Hunza **iné-e**). Long vowels are also found in type II pronominal prefixes, but their status is left open by Berger (§ 136). Berger renders sequences ending with an accented vowel as short, e.g. **gus** "deine Frau" < ***gu-ús** (cf. Hunza **guús**). Tiffou & Pesot, on the other hand, admit that they perceived many accented long vowels as tonemically distinctive sequences of two vowels, either the first or second of which is accented, e.g. **áa** vs. **aá**, **ée** vs. **eé**, **íi** vs. **ií**, etc. Nevertheless, they write these vowels as **ā́**, **ḗ**, etc. (as against Hz./Ng. **aá** vs. **aá**, **ée** vs. **eé**, **íi** vs. **ií**, etc.). Accent on the latter mora is usually restricted to morpheme junctures of the type unaccented prefix + accented stem, e.g. **gu-úru** "ton ongle" vs. **gúuru** "le miroir" (etymological spelling).

Judging by the evidence, it would still seem possible to analyze and transcribe Yasini vowels in the same way as Hunza/Nageri vowels. A practical problem with having two different notations is that it would make the compilation of a joint dictionary for all the dialects rather awkward.

The consonant inventory (36/34) of Burushaski is conspicously complex with its seven points of articulation (labial, dental/alveolar, alveo-palatal [> retroflex], palatal, velar, uvular, laryngeal) and triple opposition between voiced and voiceless, and, among the latter, aspirated and unaspirated stops/affricates. Unfortunately, the authors choose to transcribe some of the phonemes differently from Berger, whose principles

conform with common practice in South Asian linguistics. The dental affricate, generally transcribed as **ċ** is simplified as **c** (normally interpreted as palatal in South Asian linguistics). The palatals are transribed as **č** and **š**, as against conventional **ć** and **ś**.

The consonant paradigm is almost identical in all dialects, although the Hunza and Nager dialects have retained the aspirated dental affricate **ċh**. The unique but secondary retroflex or dorso-palatal spirant **ɣ** (etymologically often < *-**ṭ**-/-**ḍ**-) does not occur in Yasini. In its place one seems to find either zero or **ç**.

It may here be observed that the uvular series connects Burushaski typologically with West Tibetan and Pamir Iranian more closely than with Dardic Indo-Aryan. In other respects the consonant systems are rather similar in the Karakoram-Hindukush-Pamir region, except, e.g. for the lack of the retroflex nasal in Burushaski and its neighbours.

Most phonemes are subject to contextually conditioned alternations and neutralizations, some of which processes are not shared by Hunza and Nager Burushaski. Many of these phenomena were noted by Berger, but others seem to appear only in this monograph (pp. 9-12).

Crossing the boundary between phonology and morphology, we re-encounter the rather complex system of distinctive stress accent (p. 12-14). The phonetic nature of the accent is described rather vaguely: "relief en mi-tonique mi-musicale d'une syllabe" (p. 12). Cf. Berger: "verstärkte Sprechintensität ... leichte Erhöhung der Tonhöhe ist damit verbunden" (§ 17).

Tiffou & Pesot distinguish between two types of morphemes in terms of accentual properties: (I) those that have and (II) those that lack a proper (lexical) accent. Only monosyllables can lack a proper accent. The authors show that the word accent is determined by a few accent sandhi rules, which are somewhat different for nouns and verbs.

The second chapter is devoted to morphology (pp. 15-51). A unique feature of Burushaski is the division of nouns into four prototypical 'classes' or 'genders', conventionally abbreviated as *hm*, *hf*, *x* and *y*: 1) human [*h*] masculines (*hm*), 2) human feminines (*hf*), 3) non-human countables or individually conceived entitites (*x*), and 4) inanimate uncountables or amorphic entitites (*y*). The classification is semantic, although there are numerous anomalies or idiosyncrasies (e.g. countables made of stone or wood are *x*, whereas countables made of skin, horn or metal [except when used as vessels], especially iron, are *y*, and certain parts of the body are *x*, while others are *y*).

The class distinction is reflected at all morphological levels: choice of plural ending for nouns and adjectives, form of demonstrative/personal and indefinite-interrogative pronoun, choice of and/or application of pronominal prefixes in the noun and verb, choice of personal ending in the verb, form of the lower numerals (1-3), and, in some instances, choice of suppletive verb root.

This system is thought to have evolved by way of a primary distinction between countables/individuals (*hx* = *h* + *x*) and uncountables/collectives/abstracts (*y*), as still observable among such suppletive verbs as 'to eat': -**ṣí**- (object = *hx sg*), -**ṣú**-

(object = *hx pl*), -**šé**- (object = *y*) (p. 15) or even the copula (**b**-/**d**-). Similarly, many of the plural endings apply equally to *h* and *x* nouns, while none of the endings for *y* nouns apply to both *h* and *x* nouns.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the pronouns do not distinguish *m* and *f* in Hunza and Nageri, and that in all dialects the lower numerals 1-3 has allomorphs for *h* vs. *xy* or *h* vs. *x* vs. *y* rather than *hx* vs. *y*. Similarly, three of the plural endings are confined to *h* nouns, while there are also some endings specific to *x* nouns. Moreover, some of the *x* endings are morphologically derived from *y* endings (e.g. -[V]**ŋ** + -**c** > -[V]**nc**). The fact that *x* is the unmarked class for unknown referents with the indefinite/interrogative pronoun requires no explanation, since [-human] is less marked than [+human], and *y* cannot refer to an individual.

On this evidence one could then conclude that the primary distinction was between human (*h* > *m*/*f*) and non-human (-*h* > *x*/*y*) nouns (as suggested already by Georg Morgenstierne). This would be further corroborated by the personal endings, which combine 1.-3. pl. *h* (-**en**, -**an**), but derive 3. pl. *x* (-[**i**]-**en**, -**i**-**e**[**n**]) from 3. sg. *mxy* = 3. pl. *y* (-**i**). Feminine nouns are most marked, in that they take a unique oblique/genitive ending (-**mo** ≠ ergative -**e**), a unique pronominal prefix (**mu**-) and a unique personal ending (-**u**, -**o**) in the singular. It is impossible to say whether the differentiation between *m* and *f* developed before the differentiation between *x* and *y*. The plural endings, which are numerous and distributionally/dialectically rather chaotic and partly facultative, may well have developed after the class system had already evolved.

Toporov (1971) has compared this system with the animacy-based four-member class system of Ket (of the small Yeniseian family), but the curious *x*/*y*-distinction of Burushaski, which allows numerous inanimate nouns to be grouped with animate non-human nouns is unparalleled in the Yeniseian languages.

Like Yeniseian, Mongolian and several other North Asian languages, Burushaski avails itself of an array of plural suffixes (pp. 17-19). There are more than 30 distinct plural endings (not counting the automatic variants), some of which are allomorphic extensions of the same morpheme. Roughly half of these endings are limited to just a few nouns. Since most of the endings are class-specific (*h*, *hx*, *x*, *y*), the class of a noun (or the reference of an adjective) is easily recognized on the basis of its plural ending and general meaning. On the other hand, not a few nouns allow alternative or semantically distinctive plural endings, some of which may have been 'collective' suffixes (especially those in -**ŋ** *y*, possible also -**tiŋ** *h*). The only fully productive endings are -**mu**/-**yu**/-**iśu** (*hx*), and -**iŋ** (*y*).

In loanwords, as well as some native *hx* words, the plural ending is dispensable. Some of the endings are added to a shortened or modified form of the stem, suggesting in some instances the presence of petrified singulative (or derivational) suffixes that have been omitted or dropped before the plural suffix (cf. Vogt 1947). However, only one singulative suffix is productive and recognized as such (p. 17). It is derived from the numeral 'one' and functions somewhat like an indefinite article (-**en** *h*, -**an**

xy, which in Hunza/Nageri have coalesced into -**an**). In the plural, the same numeral in its *z*-form provides a double plural or 'determinative'/'partitive' plural suffix (-**ek**, Hunza/Nageri -**ik**). Tiffou & Pesot provide no new data with regard to the formation of plurals in Yasini, but their exposition aims at explicating the structure of the various endings.

The general morphological method of Burushaski is agglutinative with extensive suffixation and prefixation, involving considerable morphophonological combinatory changes. Agglutination is manifested in the 'superdeclension' of nouns (pp. 20-25). The prolific case system comprises in all dialects 5 simple cases (absolutive -**ø**, ergative -**e**, genitive -**e** / f. -**mo**, dative -(**ɣ**)**a** [Hz./Ng. -**ar**], ablative -**um**) and some 15 composite cases (based on spatial concepts). For some reason, nobody has yet thought it necessary to name all these cases, although part of the necessary nomenclature could with some modification be borrowed from e.g. Hungarian linguistics.

Therefore I would like to suggest the following provisional new names/ adjustments (in italics) for the composite cases: inessive [better: *locative*] -**č-i** [< *-**t-i**] 'in, inside, at, by', *delative* -**č-um** 'from inside, from the direction of', *illative* -**č-a** [absent in Hz./Ng.] 'into'; locative [better: *inessive*] -**ul-e** [Hz./Ng. -**ul-o**] 'in, inside', *elative* -**ul-um** 'from inside'; adessive -**c-e** 'at, on', ablative -**c-um** 'from upon/near/the surface of', *allative* -**c-a** [Hz./Ng. -**c-ar**] 'to, onto (the surface of)'; *superessive-instrumental* -**yaṭ-e** 'upon, above; with, by the means of', *desuperlative* -**yaṭ-um** 'from upon/above', *supralative* -**yaṭ-a** [Hz./Ng. -**aṭ-ar**, etc.]) 'onto, upon, above'.

In addition, there are three semiproductive or petrified cases with idiomatic uses: comitative -**iŋa** [Hz. -**aŋe**] 'with', peressive/perlative -**gān** [Hz./Ng. -**kan-e**] 'by way of', instructive -**k/-ok** [Hz./Ng. -**k/-ak**] 'with (a tool or weapon)'.

The case system is amplified by a number of independently accented prefixed or unprefixed postpositions, which are adjoined to the absolutive, occasionally genitive case (p. 22f.). Unlike many non-Dardic Indo-Aryan languages, there is thus no generalized oblique case preceding postpositions. The only exception is the feminine singular genitive-oblique -**mo/-mu**, e.g. **gús-mo-ɣa** 'to the wife', cf. **hír-a** 'to the man'.

At a prehistorical period, it is surmised, the case system comprised a simple opposition between an unmarked or endingless ("absolutive") and a marked ("oblique") case. The unmarked case was used for the single actant/argument ('intransitive subject') of an intransitive verb and second actant/argument ("cible", i.e. 'target/goal', usually = 'object') of a transitive verb, while the marked case was used for the first complement/ argument (agent/actor or 'transitive subject') of a transitive verb, as well as for the possessor or local complement/argument (p. 20). But also the unmarked case may have local or possessive function, as pointed out by Berger (§ 93). The development of secondary local cases, has reduced the function of the marked case to ergative-genitive. The use of cases is elaborated on pages 54-58 in the chapter on syntax.

The numerals, which differ slightly in the different dialects, are presented on pages 25-27. The system is partly vigesimal (as elsewhere in Karakoram-Hindukush), the

base after 20 being 'twenty' **áltar**. Berger gives 'six' and 'eight' as **bišíndu** and **altámbu** (cf. Hz./Ng. **altámbo**), but Tiffou & Pesot write **bišíndo** (cf. Hz./Ng. **mišíndo**) and **altambó**, which are also the forms I received from a Yasini speaker in Gilgit in 1989. As mentioned earlier, the three lower numerals differentiate adjectivally between *hx* (or *h* vs. *x*) vs. *y*, and all numerals differentiate between *hxy* vs. *z*, where *z* (typically ending in **-e** or **-i**) indicates the unmarked, classless form of the numerals.

The pronouns (pp. 27-28) participate in the same four-member class system as the nouns, adjectives and numerals. The only exception is the personal pronoun, which distinguishes gender/class only in the third person. Like most South Asian and some Central Asian languages, Burushaski avails itself of demonstratives for the third person, which in the Yasini dialect has come to include a special feminine form (**mo**, **khomó**) in the singular. The three main dialects differ slightly as to the shape of several pronouns, especially the demonstratives and indefinites-interrogatives (which are also used as indefinite/generic relatives). It would appear that both Yasini and Nageri have innovated to a larger extent than Hunza Burushaski.

Connected with the personal pronouns are the pronominal prefixes (pp. 30-32), which are used with: (i) most nouns implying inalienable possession (relatives and parts or processes of the mind-body), (ii) some adjectives signifying mental or emotional states, (iii) most transitive/causative and some (non-active) intransitive verb stems (see below), and (iv) some adverbs, postpositions and adjectives indicating direction or position.

The system is formally complicated by the fact that each of the 7 pronominal prefixes may appear in four different prosodic forms as determined lexically or inflectionally (e.g. ***gu*-rén** 'your hand' [type I unaccented], ***gú*-skil** 'your face' [type I accented], ***gó*-i** 'your daughter' [type II short], ***gō*-skir** 'your father-in-law' [type II long, renamed by Berger as type III]). The problem is that Yasini frequently omits the unaccented pronominal *mxy* sg and *y* pl prefix **i**- before simple consonants, occasionally also the corresponding plural *mx* prefix **u**- (Berger §§ 118-119; § 142).

By far the most complex part of Burushaski morphology is the verb (pp. 32-51). Tiffou & Pesot recognize the following inflectional categories: 3 persons, 2 numbers and 4 classes (personal ending for the 'agent-subject', pronominal prefix for the 'patient/beneficiary/causee'); 2 voices (active, passive); 4 moods (indicative, imperative, volative or optative [several varieties], conditional (Berger: "Imperfekt in **ceq**")); 9 tenses (present, imperfect, aorist I (Berger: "Präteritum I"), aorist II (Berger: "Präteritum II"), reduplicated past [absent in Hz./Ng.], past in **-āsc-** [absent in Hz./Ng.], perfect, pluperfect, future); 5 nominal (non-finite) forms; 2 polarities (positive, negative).

In addition, there are intransitive/transitive and causative/benefactive derivatives.It is also possible to form 'plural stems' (**-ya-**, etc.) to indicate (redundantly) plurality of 'subject' or 'object' from several verbs.

Of the many tenses, only the aorists, future and past in **-āsc** are synthetic formations, the rest being formed periphrastically by adding the auxiliary **b(a)-/d(u)-**

'to be' to the so-called **m**-form ("static participle") of either the unmarked or marked (durative) verb stem. Tiffou & Pesot stress the different aspectual values of the tenses, which they compare with the tense/aspect system of Ancient Greek (p. 34):

tense	*aspect 1*	*aspect 2*	*aspect 3*
	(durative)	*(perfective)*	*(aorist)*
future	future		(aorist)
present	present	perfect	aorist
past	imperfect	pluperfect	aorist

The durative aspect is indicated by what has been called the (future-)present tense marker -**č**- (with allomorphs), cf. **é-č-a-m ba** 'I am doing [*it]' <—> **é-č-a-m** 'I (will) do [*it]'. (Berger also mentions the presumptive value of the future, § 184.) The durative contrasts with the perfective aspect, which expresses the completion or result of an action or activity. The aorist is considered aspectually unmarked and refers temporally mostly to the past. A present interpretation would be at hand in **šuá man-í** "s'est bien" (p. 35; but this is an idiom), while future implication is postulated for **ána cre-m ba? d-á-ya** "où vas-tu?"; "je reviens/je vais revenir" (but cf. also Urdu **maĩ [abhī] ā-y-ā** 'I [just] came = I'm [just] coming', where the preterite idiomatically implies immediate future).

Surprisingly, Tiffou & Pesot find no semantic difference between the short and long forms of the aorist (e.g. **ét-a** vs. **ét-a-m**, p. 34), which Berger (§ 183) took pains in distinguishing in aspectual-modal terms (cf. formally Hz./Ng. conative vs. indicative past). Similarly, the reduplicated past (e.g. **ét-et ba-m** 'I used to do', which has no counterpart in Hunza/Nageri, is said to have an iterative or durative-continuative value (Berger § 190), but according to Tiffou & Pesot it often simply replaces the durative imperfect (**é-č-a-m ba-m**). The past in -**āsc**- (Berger: -**asc**-/-**ast**-) is an unusual loan, for as already observed by Lorimer, this tense marker is the past stem of the Khowar copula. Berger (§ 187) distinguishes between a simple form, e.g. **ét-asc-im-i** 'he did', and a periphrastic form, e.g. **ét-um b-ásc-im-i** 'he did'. The authors agree with Berger (§ 189) that this tense implies (modal/evidential) vagueness, referring to something not personally witnessed by the speaker (p. 35).

The verb may take pronominal prefixes referring to nominal arguments (actants) of the clause in accordance with what the authors call the three different 'levels' (*niveaux*) of a particular verb (p. 35-38). A more general term would have been 'valency' or 'transitivity'. Level I: the verb admits only one argument and excludes the ergative (e.g. **kursí-mu cán-um b-i-én** 'the chairs [**kursí-mu**] are counted'); level II: the verb admits the ergative and at least one other argument (e.g. **ne hír-e mi mi-cán-i** 'the man [**hír-e**] counted us [**mi**]'); level III: the verb admits the ergative and takes on a causative or benefactive value [allowing one or two further arguments] (e.g. **ne hír-e mo gus do-mó-waqal kursí-mu mõ-can-i** 'the man [**hír-e**] made the woman [**gus**] count the chairs [**kursí-mu**]'; **jā gu-rén gõ-gal-a** "je t'ai cassé la

main", 'I [**jā** < ***ja-e**] broke your arm [**gu-rén**] for you'). Some verbs show suppletion rather than, or in addition to, prefixation (e.g. **wal-´** 'fall'; **-wáš-** 'fell'; for details, see Berger, §§ 138-140; 168-170).

As can be seen, the third level is usually characterized by a long pronominal prefix (type II, explained by Lorimer as being a combination of prefix I and a transitivizing/causativizing prefix **-a-**). The distinction between levels I and II is less clear, although ideally only level II should allow a prefix (type I or, if level I is prefixed, type II short). Occasionally level I is distinguished by means of a verbal prefix **d-** (± pronominal prefix), which, if facultative, may indicate a state resulting from voluntary activity. On the other hand, this prefix may be extended to all levels.

By a reasoning I am not entirely able to follow, it is deduced that levels I and II were not originally distinguished formally (p. 37). A transitivizing/causativizing verbal prefix **-s-** (placed after the pronominal prefix before the root) is used to allow a further argument, which is always indexed by means of a prefix of type II (e.g. **šílan gárc-i** 'the tail was cut'; **jā šílan é-s-karc-a** 'I cut its tail'). For morphological details, see Berger (pp. 29-33).

The *syntax* and *semantics* of the three verbal levels and the rules of prefixation are treated briefly (pp. 54-55 and 59-62) in the chapter on syntax. The most interesting observation is that the benefactive/affective indicated by the long pronominal prefixes, rather than the causative, is the original semantic basis for level III. It also provides the basis for expressions of non-volitional experience (cf. **kapál ā̆-ɣark-i** "la tête me fait mal" vs. **kapál-e a-ɣárk-i** "j'ai mal à la tête", p. 61).

In causative constructions, the pronominal prefix refers to the animate 'dependent agent' (causee) if the 'patient' is inanimate, but if the latter is animate, it may refer to it or to the 'beneficiary/affective' (p. 60f.), e.g. **ne hír-e dakṭár** [> **ḍakṭár**] **d-é-waqal é-i yé-ya** [> **yé-ɣa**] **mu-sálgin-i** "l'homme a fait fiancer au docteur son fils à sa propre fille" ('the man caused the doctor to engage his daughter [**é-i**] to his [= the man's own] son [**yé-ɣa**]'), **ne hír-e mo gus do-mó-waqal yē gaṭúnc ē̆-capan-i** "l'homme a fait repriser les habits de son fils à la femme [**é-i**]" ('the man caused the woman [**gus**] to darn his son's [**yē** = **yé-e**] clothes [**gaṭúnc**]').

Despite some new observations and approaches, Tiffou & Pesot fail to account for some of the most general principles underlying pronominal prefixation and the verbal prefixes **d-** and **-s-**. The description could have benefited from an insightful article by Bashir (1985).

Basing herself on Lorimer's and Berger's data and some of their ideas, Bashir argues that the pronominal as well as verbal prefixes can be explained with reference to the three parameters of: (i) 'active' (involving controlled/volitional physical action) vs. 'non-active' verbal semantics[5], (ii) 'affectedness' of the nominal participants of the predication, (iii) 'process/result/destination-orientation' vs. 'actor/origin-orientation' of the verbal conception.

The presence of the pronominal prefix in the verb is correlated with the capacity to

[5] As cutting through transitivity distinctions in accordance with the Klimovian 'active typology' of Burushaski.

be internally affected, or the sentience of the participant (nominal argument/actant). Hence, as already observed by Lorimer, it is most frequent with reference to *h* and animate *x* nouns (with *y* nouns the prefix occurs only when the verb has the derivational **d**- or -**s**-prefix or is transitive/causative). Syntactically the prefix should then refer to the participant which is *most affected* by the action/activity, i.e. usually the (frequently unexpressed) 'beneficiary/affective' or, in the absence of the former, 'patient' or 'causee', according to the semantics of the verb, the animacy distinctions of the participants and, to some extent, the speakers point of view or empathy.[6]

The prefix may, however, also occur with intransitive verbs, referring to a subject that is not volitionally involved in the action (non-active intransitives). This also accounts for 'quasi-causative experience' clauses lacking an ergative agent.[7]

Bashir, furthermore, shows that the transitive/causative -**s**-prefix occurs only in derivatives of *non-active* verbs (which often take the pronominal prefix), and that the semi-opaque derivational **d**-prefix tends to distinguish process/state/result/destination-oriented verbal conceptions from actor-oriented ones (cf -.**mas**- 'to reach out [the hand] vs. **d**-.**mas**- 'to give away, deliver, yield'). The fact that there are many active **d**-prefixed verbs is explained by their being transitives derived from intransitives. If, on the other hand, many **d**-prefixed verbs are intransitives, it may follow from the inchoative/stative meaning of **d**- (Bashir 1985: 20).

The finite conjugation is presented schematically on pp. 39-46. The Yasini periphrastic verb-forms are still quite transparent, the Nageri forms a little less so, while in Hunza complete contraction with considerable loss of segments has taken place in most persons (e.g. Ys. **é-č-um bá-i** 'he does', cf. Ng. **é-č-u bá-i**, but Hz. **é-č-á-i/é-č-ó-i**). Another archaism is the retention of the suppletive form **d**- of the copula (**b**-) in *y* singular in Yasini and Nageri. On p. 42, line 5 there is an obvious printing mistake: **étum bim** for **étum bum** ('she had done').

The nominal forms of the verb (more properly 'non-finite') are listed and briefly described on pp. 47-49. Not satisfied with the existing nomenclature, but—as it would seem—having nothing better to offer, the authors content themselves with calling the five different non-finite categories simply "les nominaux I-V".

In spite of the partial functional overlap of non-finite forms, this nomenclature can hardly be an improvement in descriptive, let alone pedagogical, terms. There can be no doubt that the non-finite forms I and III (-**č**-V**m**, -[V]**m**), used among other things in periphrastic verb forms, are participial by basic syntactic construction (Lorimer: "static participle", Berger: "einfache *m*-Partizip" and "präsentische *m*-Partizip"), although they are nominalizable, enabling them to function as declinable verbal nouns or infinitives in Yasini. Similarly, the fifth non-finite form (-**as**) is a verbal adjective, i.e.

[6] Cf. Hz. **á-u á-s-qan-ái** 'he has killed my father for me' ≠ **á-u é-s-qan-ái** 'he has killed my father.

[7] E.g. -**mán**- 'become (non-volitionally or passively)' vs. **man**-´ 'become (volitionally or externally)'; **čaṣ á-l-i** 'the thorn pricked me'; cf. Hz. **qhus góo-ć-ilá** 'you have a cough', lit. 'it causes cough to you'; cf. also Hz. -**móos ɟú**- 'come anger, i.e. become angry passively/non-volitionally' vs. -**móos (du)sú**- 'bring anger, i.e. become angry actively/volitionally', showing that prefixation may correspond to an intransitive non-active vs. transitive active verb of a conjunct verbal expression (Bashir 1985: 5).

an agent noun or relative participle (Berger: "Nomen agentis"), functioning especially in Hunza also as a declinable verbal noun or infinitive.

By contrast, form IV (**n**[V]- -- √ - -**en**[**e**]) is an adverbial or converbal form of the verb, to be functionally compared with the *conjunctive participle* of most South and Central Asian languages (Lorimer: "past participle active"; Berger: "Absolutiv"). Similarly, form II (-**č**-**a**[-**γa**]), which is the dative of the durative stem, is used either as a final infinitive or temporal anterior different-subject converb (Berger: "Finalform").

The non-finite forms containing the element -**č**- (with allomorphs) are durative, the others carry the aspectual value of the aorist. Curiously, no aspectual or temporal distinction is discerned between nominals III (-V-**m**) and V (-**as**) used as relative participles (cf. also p. 70). According to Berger (§ 205) the form in -**as** indicates "Gewohnheit oder berufsmäßige Tätigkeit" (cf. Hunza). Berger adds a non-finite infinitival form in -[**i**]**ṣ**, which, in the same way as in Hunza/Nageri, also does duty as an optative/volitive (the only function mentioned by Tiffou & Pesot).

The actual syntax of the non-finite forms is treated at diverse places in connection with complementation and complex sentences (pp. 62-70) in the chapter on syntax.

The final section in the chapter on morphology is devoted to negation, which is expressed mainly by prefixing **a**-´ or **aí**- (only in Yasini) before the verb root and any other prefixes it may have (p. 49f.). The negative prefix **a**-´ entails accenting the following syllable and causes a following lax stop to become tense. For emphatic denial, there is also an analytic expression (verb/predicative + **be** 'not'), mentioned in chapter IV, p. 73 (cf. Berger § 157).

The conjunctions (which are in the main borrowed from Urdu) and particles have not been considered worthy of a special section.

The third chapter on syntax (pp. 53-71) comprises remarks on agreement, the structure of the nominal syntagm, the use of nominal cases, expressions of coordination, the syntax of the verbal levels, passive constructions, complex sentences and word order. It may be recalled that Berger devoted only three pages (pp. 53-56) exclusively to syntax. On the other hand, his treatment is less clearly divided into morphology vs. syntax.

Special attention is given to the question of verbal agreement in cases of coordinate subjects, a problem neglected by Berger. An interesting discovery in this context is that class *x* is subject to a semantic distinction between animate and inanimate (p. 53).

The adjective or pronoun agrees with its nominal head in class and number, but not in case. On p. 54 it is said that the attributive adjective may or may not agree with its nominal head, but what is meant is obviously the *predicative* adjective.

An important typological issue is the function of the absolutive and ergative cases and their relation to verbal agreement and the syntactic categories of 'subject' and 'object' (which terms the authors avoid for theoretical reasons). They argue that since the *ergative* (agent) rather than the absolutive (patient) triggers agreement with the *obligatory* personal suffix on the verb, the constituent marked by the ergative is (morpho-syntactically) more intimately linked with the verb than the absolutive or

oblique constituent indexed by the pronominal prefix (p. 54f.). This, of course, connects the transitive agent with the intransitive subject in terms of verbal agreement. The absolutive may function either as (intransitive) 'subject', 'patient' or 'causee', depending on the transitivity of the clause.

To explain these phenomena, Berger (§ 226) concluded that the Burushaski verbal conception "stellt ... eine Kreuzung der passivischen (wie im Baskischen) mit der aktivischen (wie im Deutschen usw.) dar". Bashir considered these phenomena to be simply linked with ergative patterning/marking. Tiffou & Pesot render the verb nominal, when on p. 20 they etymologize the sentence **hír-e cigír é-sqa-i-um bá-i** as "il y action de tuer intéressant la chèvre à partir de l'homme" (≈ 'there is an action of killing relating to the goat on the part of the man'). I do not think this rendering gives justice to the non-circumstantial character of the nominal arguments (the similarity of the ergative and genitive endings may be accidental; cf. also feminine **-e** {erg.} vs. **-mo** {gen.}) and the verbal meaning and construction of the verb (cf. 'subject' and 'object' agreement).

It may now be asked why ergative languages mark off the 'transitive agent' rather than the 'patient'. Since also ergative languages may have the passive (as, e.g. Burushaski does) and various non-finite constructions, I do not think it can be explained in terms of a passive or nominal conception of the verb. Rather, it must be because the 'patient' is collocationally and often syntactically (e.g. by constituency and word order) more closely linked to the verb than the 'agent', which is often co[n]textually given, hence often redundant. Nominative 'subject-agents' may then arise by way of topicalization and/or semantic identification, since the 'agent' tends to be topical in relation to the 'patient' and semantically the intransitive subject is typically an 'agent' ('actor') rather than a 'patient' ('undergoer').

The Yasini passive is peculiar in that it does not allow a human 'patient' (with an inanimate agent). Moreover, an inanimate agent is in the ergative, while a human agent is in the ablative. The verb always agrees with the 'patient' (p. 61f.). A more detailed and somewhat different treatment of the passive was published in 1988 by Morin & Tiffou. In Hunza/Nager Burushaski the passive agent is mostly unexpressed.

Whereas the morphology and clausal syntax of Burushaski have remained rather intact, the syntax of complex sentences has been more susceptible to external influence. Clause linkage is, nevertheless, still primarily by means of non-finite structures and juxtaposition. The most ancient native conjunction is **ka** (Hz./Ng. **ke**) 'too, also, even; and; if, when', which coordinates phrases and coordinate or subordinate clauses. Berger, who presented all the functions of **ka** in a special section (p. 54-56), also mentions its use as an enclitic or clause-final inclusive/generalizing particle (§ 236). With Tiffou & Pesot this information appears only in a footnote to text 3.48.

According to Berger (§ 232), **ka** cannot be used to coordinate independent clauses with purely additive value. Tiffou & Pesot claim to have found examples of the latter phenomenon: **galí ka yéci** 'he went and saw' (p. 63). Here one would have expected the conjunctive participle **n-i** 'having gone (3 sg hmxy)' instead of a finite form. The particle/conjunction **ka** is nevertheless considered to be the oldest marker of hypotaxis,

since it mostly implies a circumstantial, temporal or conditional relationship and frequently involves a dependent future tense, durative aspect or marked mood of the verb: **[agár] díya ka yušán amáyam** 'if he comes, I'll be content'.

Occasionally **ka** is used instead of **ki** 'that' (< Urdu **ki/ke** < Persian) for complementation, in which case the verb of the first proposition can be repeated after the second proposition (e.g. **séni ka yušán amáyam séni** 'he said that he will be happy, he said', but not ***díya ka yušán díya** 'if he comes, I'll be happy, if he comes'; p. 66f.). Lorimer (1962: 146) noted the same usage of **ka**, but Berger (§ 236) dismisses it as a probable perceptual confusion with **ke** (Tiffou & Pesot **ki**), which may easily sound like **ka** in rapid unaccented pronunciation.

Clausal complements are often headed by a clause-final non-finite form of the quotative verb 'to say' (p. 64, 67). Curiously, in Yasini such embedded clauses may acquire circumstantial value, e.g. **ṣíçam ba *sía* phúken dal éti** '«I eat», *saying* he raised himself a little' => 'while he was eating, he raised himself a little' (cf. 74f.). It is also worth noticing that in Yasini direct quotations are frequently both introduced and finished by a finite form of the quotative verb, whereas in Hunza the quote-final marker is always non-finite.

The degree of nominalization in embedded structures can be seen in the choice of case, as discussed on p. 65: except for the conjunctive participle, all non-finite forms may, when heading nominalized clauses, take either an absolutive or genitive 'subject'. On line 5 from the bottom there is a printing mistake: read *nominal I* instead of nominal II.

Relativization (p. 69 f.) is said to be of three types: 1) by anaphora, 2) by nominalization, 3) by "mot Q" (interrogative cataphora ± anaphoric correlative). The first type is confined to rather short or loose constructions. As for types 2) and 3), no functional or semantic difference is perceived, cf. **ha dóium hir šuá bái / ha dóias hir šuá bái = ámen híre** (or **ámene**) **ha dóium bái šuá bái** "l'homme qui construit la maison est bon". One might have expected that as in many South Asian languages, type 3) is limited to the relativization of generic or indefinite referents or at least to restrictive relative clauses. But non-restrictive relative clauses of this type are also to be found in Hunza and Nager Burushaski.

Word order is discussed in a final section (p. 71 f.) in the chapter on syntax. Few problems have been sensed here, and Berger devoted only half a page (p. 54, § 228-230) to the matter. Burushaski is a fairly consistent 'SOV language', the general principle being that a modifier precedes its head, but may in its turn be preceded by a demonstrative. The frequent exceptions to the latter rule are noticed but not explained. Berger points to cases where an attributive adjective follows its head, but he explains this as a disguised predicative or quasi-relative construction (§ 229). The 'indirect object' ("cible marquée") precedes the 'direct object' ("cible non marquée") according to what I would recognize as a more general rule, viz. that oblique constituents and adverbials tend to precede non-oblique constituents (cf. also Berger § 228). As in any language, these rules are subject to thematic or stylistic alterations, which are quite

briefly touched upon. A fuller treatment would certainly reveal a number of complications.

A mini-chapter (IV: pp. 73-75) is devoted to the 'type of sentence', which deals with some aspects of the syntax of negation, interrogation and projection/locution ("niveaux d'énonciation"). As in many South Asian languages which have "learned" indirect discourse, direct and indirect discourse are not clearly distinguished formally: **séni jā néɣa imdāt éčam** 'he said: "I will help him" / he said, he will help him' (p. 74).

Word formation is discussed in the final chapter (V: pp. 77-80). Nominal compounds are either of the *dvandva* or *tatpurusha* type, neither of which is very productive. Derivation of nouns and adjectives is by denominal and deverbal suffixes or reduplication, among which processes the latter is now more productive. (Derivation by prefixation is recognized mainly in the verb.) Only some of the nominal suffixes mentioned by Berger (p. 52f.) are given and some of the explanations differ.

For example, the derivational morpheme **-kuc** occurring after *z*-form numerals to indicate a period of days (e.g. **iskí-kuc** '(for) three days', "(un groupe de) trois jours" is regarded as a *collective suffix* (as in **dén-kuc** "de tel âge", "(so und so) alt", but cf. also **dén-e-kus** 'id.' < **den** 'year'), rather than as a contraction of **gunc** 'day'.

This new explanation is very implausible in view of the following facts: 1) The morpheme **-kuc** may be omitted elliptically in coordinate expressions such as **altó ɣa iskí-kuc-an** 'after two or three days' (Berger, text IV.4). 2) The morpheme **-kuc** retains its accent in the expressions **bérum-kúc-an-a** 'after some days' and **áltar-kúc-e** 'of 20 days' (p. 83, text 1.11). 3) The synonymous word **bultú** 'day' occurs in the corresponding compounds '(for) one day' (**hékultu/híkultu** rather than ***hánbultu**, cf. **han gunc** 'one day') and '(for) two days' (**altúl** < ***altó-bultu**).

Nominal reduplication and echo-words, hardly touched upon by Berger (§ 219), are described in somewhat greater detail (p. 79).

The texts, notes and translations are given on pp. 83-127 and the analytic vocabulary on pp. 131-153. The translations tend to be rather free, but the grammatical comments are more copious than Berger's. In 4.16 there seems to be either a mishearing or anacoluthon: **jā áne or dā šēran ɣáščum áne**, freely translated as "où donc attraper un lion, où?", as if the durative participle **ɣáščum** 'capturing/capture' could function as an infinitival predicate or participial attribute of **áne** 'where'. Berger's text (VII.6) shows here a regular finite construction with **ɣárčam** (= **ɣáščam**) 'I shall capture': **amútuk ja áne šêr áne bóltum ɣárčam** 'now where (and) how will I capture a lion, where?' ("aber wie soll ich jetzt einen Löwen fangen?"). If the intended form is the finite '**ɣáščam**' 'I shall capture', the **u** can be explained through labialization under the influence of the following **m** (cf. Nageri [bom] for **bam** [bam] 'was').

Another ambiguous passage occurs in the following sentence 4.17 **haɣóra šēr ɣáščum bo muškíl**, translated as "pour un cheval attraper un lion est chose difficile". Berger (VII.7) renders the same clause as a question: "wie sollte es schwer sein, einen

Löwen zu fangen?" The interpretation depends solely on intonation.

In 4.20 there is an obvious lapsus in the translation of the quote: **báša ja šēr níya dáya ka go gultúmalči baríŋ éčam, séni** "quand il viendrait avec le lion, alors il lui glisserait un mot à l'oreille", for: "quand je...".

In the bibliography (pp. 155-158), which aims at being exhaustive, one is surprised by the absence of the names Elena Bashir and Džoj I. Èdel'man (mentioned only as a co-writer with Klimov). Bashir has analyzed Burushaski verb structure and semantics (1985) and touched upon substratal and areal features in Hindukush-Karakoram (1988). Edel'man has written several articles in Russian (1968, etc.) on substratal and areal features in the "Central Asian linguistic area" (Hindukush-Karakoram-Pamir-Himalaya).

There is also no hint at Berger's well-known forthcoming three-volume opus on the Hunza and Nager dialects (*Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza and Nager*). On p. 157 Toporov is misprinted as *Toropov*.

The number of active Burushaski researchers in the world is very limited and even the number of speakers is neither very impressive nor rapidly increasing. Apart from a handful of eccentric experiments, there has been no attempt among native speakers at actually writing Burushaski and thus increasing the 'accessible living data'. All serious Burushaski research hence depends on field work. Thanks to the Karakoram Highway and increasing tourism in the Northern Area, it has become easier to visit Hunza and Nager. The Yasin Valley, located a good hundred kilometres further west along a less traversable track in a region with scarcer accomodation facilities, will remain less accessible to foreign explorers.

Although these two new excellent monographs contribute permanent substance and many invaluable insights into the study of Yasin Burushaski, it is clear that a full understanding of the various dialects of this relic tongue require continued field research with the help of a larger muster of informants, and, eventually, trained native linguists.

A practical problem in this enterprise, as I foresee it, will be the high, though not unusual, requirements for secondary language command: because of the diverse languages employed in Burushaski studies, a successful Burushaski researcher would have to be conversant with German, French, English and Russian. While this circumstance will hardly deter westerners from trying their hand on this fascinatingly complex and beautiful language, it may have unfortunate effects on the recruitment of native researchers from among the Burusho, who possess a great potential, but are less exposed to other western languages than English.

References:

BASHIR, Elena, L. 1985. Towards a semantics of the Burushaski verb. In: Zide, A. & al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Conference on Participial Roles: South Asia and adjacent areas*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

— 1988. Topics in Kalasha syntax: An areal and typological perspective. University of Michigan Ph. D. dissertation. (University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor.).

BERGER, Hermann 1974. *Das Yasin-Burushaski (Werchikwar). Grammatik, Texte, Wörterbuch.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (Neuindische Studien, 3.)

— MS. (Forthcoming 1992?) Die Burushaski Sprache von Hunza und Nager. Teil I: Grammatik. Teil II: Texte mit Übersetzungen und Anmerkungen. Teil III: Hunza-Wörterbuch.

BIDDULPH, John 1880. *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh.* Lahore: Ijaz Ahmad Ali Kamran Publishers. Reprint 1986.

ÈDEL'MAN, Džoj I. 1968. *Osnovnye voprosy lingvističeskoj geografii na materiale indoiranskih jazykov.* Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut jazykoznanija.

— 1976. Strukturnye "anomalii" vostočnoiranskih jazykov i tipologija substrata. In: *Studien zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft Karl Ammer zum Gedanken,* Jena, 79-93.

— 1980. K substratnomu naslediju central'noaziatskogo jazykogo sojuza. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1980:V: 21-32.

— 1984. K substratnym javleniam v sintaksise iranskih jazykov. In:*Voprosy dialektologii i istorii jazyka,* Dušanbe, 34-41.

FREMONT, Anne 1982. Contribution à l'étude de Burushaski. Dix-neuf récits inédits de Raja Ali Ahmed Jan (Nagir) avec mot-à-mot, traduction, notes, commentaires et lexique. Thèse de Doctorat de Troisième Cycle. Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle. Paris III.

LORIMER, David Lockhart Robinson 1935-1938. *The Burushaski Language.* Vol. I: Introduction and grammar, 1935. Vol. II: Texts and translations, 1935. Vol. III: Vocabularies and index, 1938. (Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter 29:1-3.) Oslo: H. Ashehong & Co.

— 1962. *Werchikwar-English Vocabulary. (With a few Werchikwar Texts.)* (Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter 51.) Oslo.

MORIN, Yves-Charles & TIFFOU, Étienne 1988. Passive in Burushaski. In: M. Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and voice.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. (Typological Studies in Language, 16.) Pp. 493-524.

TOPOROV, V. N. 1971. Burushaski and Yeniseian languages: some parallels. *Travaux lingustiques de Prague* 4: 107-125.

VOGT, Hans 1947. The plural of nouns and adjectives in Burushaski. *Norsk Tidskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 14: 96-129.

ZARUBIN, I. I. 1927. Veršikskoe narečie kandžutskogo jazyka. *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov* 1927: II/2: 275-364. Leningrad: Nauka.

BERTIL TIKKANEN

Urdu letters of Mirza Asadu'llah Khan **Ghalib**. Translated and annotated by Daud Rahbar. Foreword by Annemarie Schimmel. State University of New York Press, Albany, 1987. 628 p.

This work is sponsored by the Asia Society of New York and the Department of Near Eastern Studies of Harvard University.

There is an elaborate foreword by Annemarie Schimmel in the beginning of the book. It underlines the fact that Ghalib had the gift of inserting expressions from the spoken language into poetic rhythm. The popularity of Ghalib's lines with regard to emotional expressions and day-to-day functional conversations is also highlighted here. This is followed by a preface which mentions the motivation and inspiration regarding the work.

The contents are divided into: Introduction, Translation of letters and Notes. In the introduction the author describes Ghalib's life and his financial constraints. The pride

and singularity of his character is emphasized. There is also an account of his main literary works, and then the importance of his personal letters is discussed. The author explains that Ghalib's letters are mainly in conversational style.

The translation of the letters forms the main contents. The selection of letters is based on Mihr's collections of Ghalib's letters. The selected letters present almost all the areas about which Ghalib wrote, being: problems in human relationship, problems of personal complexes and financial and other problems. There are also letters discussing history, poetics and linguistics. The author seems to have taken great pains in selecting representative letters. This fact is obvious when one realizes that the author had to select only one or two out of a number of letters written to a particular person, e.g., the author selected only two letters out of the 26 written to Chaudhari Abdul Ghafar Surur, which were available to him in Mihr's collections.

The author has tried to render the translation in the colloquial American style so as to maintain the vernacular Urdu. This can be illustrated by taking as an example from an idiomatic expression. In letter no. 129 *"caśm-i-bad dūr"* is appropriately translated as "May the evil eye stay away" (p. 228). It is a very difficult exercise to incorporate the style as it exists in the source language and to preserve the meaning also, but this has been the aim of the author. E.g. it has not been possible to translate *"---- sē mērā tāruf ismī hai"* in one sentence. So it has been expressed in two sentences: "I have never met ----, though I know of him." (p. 233, letter no. 134). The phrase *ismī tāruf* in the context of this letter does not mean "to know by name only". There are some examples where the author, despite his best efforts has not been able to retain the exact semantic area in the target language. The initial sentence of letter no. 65 could be considered in this regard. The original sentence reads as: *"tum kō pēnśan kī kyā jaldī hai?"*. It is translated as: "What is all this brouhaha about my pension?" (p. 114). In the original letter the context of pension is clear to both the writer and the reader, so it is not necessary to use the word: *"mērē"* before *"pēnśan"*. But it is considered essential in the translated sentence. We have the phrase "my pension" there. Moreover, the deletion of *"mērē"* is not incidental in the original letter, it is deliberate. The deletion conveys a kind of detachment which Ghalib might have developed at times in this connection. This semantic information is lost in the translated sentence.

Letter Nº 162 is very interesting. Ghalib has himself discussed loss of meaning in translations here. He has provided examples of translations from Urdu to Persian and vice versa. He observes that "Colloquial Hindi can't be rendered exactly in Persian anymore than colloquial Persian can be rendered exactly in Hindi" (p. 287). The original sentence being *"tarz-guftār Hindī kī Fārsī aur Fārsī kī Hindī kabhī nahĩ hō saktī"*.

With regard to terms of address the author has been liberal. He does not translate them always, but explains them in the notes. *Pīr-o-murśīd*, *Bandā parvar*, *Qiblā*, *Bhai*, *Miyā̃* are some of the examples. However, he has translated most of the greetings. Sometimes they are less than exact. *"Salām va niyāz pahūcē"* has been translated as "My servantly *salām*" (page 259, letter Nº 149).

There is an omission in letter Nº 169. Only a portion of the first sentence of this

letter has been rendered into English. *"Munśī Hīrā Singh kō duā pahūcē?"* is not translated. This omission has caused a change in the meaning of the original sentence.

Notes play a very important role in understanding the letters. These also introduce the person to whom the letter is addressed, which renders them more interesting. There are also socio-cultural explanations in the notes. This has resulted in the maintenance of meaning to a great extent. Additional information regarding some points of reference is also given in the notes.

On page 314 under note 24 the impression is created that Hindi is a Hindu dialect and Urdu a Muslim dialect of Hindustani. I think the position of Hindi and Urdu at the time of Ghalib could be better explained if we refer back to letter Nº 162 on page 286. Here Ghalib considers Hindi a colloquial form and Urdu the language of literature.

Page vi (contents) of the book says that the index is on page 629. But the book, which has been supplied to me has no page 629. The book ends at page 628.

The author has given the text as well as the translation of his poetic homage to Ghalib in the beginning. It helps in understanding this great poet. "You alone know the grace of sighing" is a true tribute to Mirza Ghalib.

Beautiful calligraphy done by the author himself has added to the gracefulness of the book. The book will serve as an interesting source of information for those wishing to know more about Ghalib and his time.

MOHAN LAL SAR

Willem Caland. Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Michael Witzel. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*, Band 27.) Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1990. XXXIII + 786 pp.

There is no need to introduce such a famous Indologist as Willem Caland (1859-1932). His massive work on Vedic studies is known to everybody interested in this subject. Now the majority of his articles—altogether 31 pieces and several reviews—have been collected in one volume. Until now, it has been rather vexing to consult, e.g., the long series "Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras" with its many and various subjects scattered in many volumes of the *ZDMG*, here they are all found together. Similarly among the the important "Mitteilungen über das Vādhūlasūtra" have been reprinted from early volumes of *Acta Orientalia*.

In the bibliography, Vedic studies form the second section (the first containing the long list of "selbständige Werke"). One section (III. Grammatisches und Altiranisches) mainly contains Caland's early articles on Avesta and Old Iranian. They belong outside the scope of the series and are consequently excluded with one exception. Instead, five later pieces on Vedic grammar are included. The fourth section contains the reviews, among them many written in Dutch. Only 13 pieces written in German are reprinted here. The nine pieces listed as "V. Sonstiges" are rather unimportant and nothing has been reprinted.

Our thanks are due to the Glasenapp Stiftung not just for another finely edited and printed volume of its valuable series, but also for its decision to publish the Dutchman

Caland's works in its collection of German Indologists. This has called for a restriction unknown in earlier volumes of the series (see, e.g., Stein pp. 99, 189, 325, 351 and 366, and Waldschmidt pp. 156, 180, 256, 290 etc.). What we have here, are the *Kleine deutsche Schriften* and as such the book was in fact announced, e.g., by Harrassowitz (Frühjahr 1989). Therefore Caland's contributions in Dutch and in English are omitted, which means that some important pieces are missing, especially from the last period of his life. Also his interest in the prehistory of Vedic studies in the West is wholly missing. And this has, however, in our opinion, little to do with "Kolonialnostalgie", the word with which it has been summarily dismissed by the editor. But while regretting this, we must keep in mind that the great majority of Caland's scholarly work was written in German (probably the reason for his inclusion in the series).

The editor has prefaced the book with an account of the life of Caland, which gives both the historical background to his work and his position in the Dutch academic world. Much light is also shed on his personality. But while the sad comments in the footnotes about the miserable fate of Indology in the hands of the profit-seeking government are quite understandable, even the uninitiated can notice the rivaly between the two major Dutch universities and is bound to ask, if a pure Leiden viewpont (*audiatur et altera pars*!) is really the right reward for an Utrecht professor.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Ernst Waldschmidt. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert und Petra Kieffer-Pülz. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*, Band 29.) Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1989. XLI + 464 pp.

The chair of Indology at Gottingen University has been famous since the days of Theodor Benfey (1809–1881), Franz Kielhorn (1840–1908) and Hermann Oldenberg (1854– 1920). As a result of the activity of Emil Sieg (1866–1951), and especially of his pupil Ernst Waldschmidt (1897–1985) it became one of Europe's major centres of the study of Buddhism and Central Asian manuscript fragments. The scholarly work of Ernst Waldschmidt began in 1925 and continued to an advanced age, until death put an end to it in 1985. In the light of the importance and influence of his studies, it is by no means superfluous that a second volume of *Kleine Schriften* is dedicated to him (the first being *Von Ceylon bis Turfan. Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraumes von Ernst Waldschmidt,* Göttingen 1967). Thus the intention is not that the present volume should give a cross section of his entire work. But although the bulk of it is dedicated to the last period of Waldschmidt's life, there are also some earlier articles included, which were for some reason omitted from the first collection. Among the subjects Buddhism and Central Asian Sanskrit fragments are naturally in the forefront, but there are also two lengthy studies about Indian art history, one of them in collaboration with his wife and helper, Rose-Leonore Waldschmidt (1895–1988), eight obituaries and an article on the influence of Buddhism in

German philosophy and poetry. No reviews are included. A full bibliography (with additions to the version published earlier) also gives the reviews written by others on Waldschmidt's studies.[8] Once again we have good reason to be grateful to the Glasenapp-Stiftung.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Napoli e l'India. Atti del Convegno Napoli-Ercolano, 2-3 giugno 1988, a cura di Antonio **Sorrentino** e Maurizio **Taddei**. Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimente di Studi Asiatici, *Series Minor* XXXIV. Napoli 1990. xvi, 403 pp. 13 plates and many text figures.

The history of Asian studies in Italy has lately been enriched by very important contributions coming from Naples. The large volumes *La conoscenza dell'Asia e dell'Africa in Italia nei secoli XVIII e XIX* (of which vol. III, with no less than 996 pages, was published in 1989)[9] has now been augmented by a volume dedicated purely to Indology. The volume contains 14 articles in Italian (with English summaries) and one in English. Their scope ranges from the history of Neapolitan Indology, Indian collections in Naples, and Neapolitans in India—missionaries, laymen and even an officer (Avitabile) serving in the army of Ranjit Singh—to Neapolitan attempts to establish an East India Company and to Indian exotism in Neapolitan art, music and theatre. While there are plenty of studies on how India was received in England, France and Germany, the present volume sometimes offers wholly new perspectives. It is to be hoped that the language offers not too great an obstacle, so that the book may also gain readers among non-Italian Indologists and others interested in this kind of study.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

V. K. Šohin, Drevnjaja Indija v kul'ture Rusi (XI – seredina XV v.). Istočnikovedčeskie problemy, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", Moskva 1988. 335 pp. (with English Summary 331–334).

While there is no shortage of studies about the classical knowledge and conception of India, the Mediaeval West has never got the same degree of attention. This partly depends of the fact that while classical antiquity had several occasions to gain primary information from the country itself (through Alexander's campaigns, Hellenistic

[8] Such list can hardly be complete. We can add Meillet in *BSL* 28, 1928, 100f., on Waldschmidt & Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, APAW 1926; C. Hentze in *Artibus Asiae* 4, 1930/32, 172f., on *Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien* Vol. VI; A. von Gabain in *JRAS* 1978, 83-85, on *Spätantike* VII (Reprint); Benveniste (a second review by him) in *BSL* 34, 1933, 45-47, on Waldschmidt & Lentz, *Manichäische Dogmatik*, SPAW 1933; E. Abegg in *AsSt* 5, 1951, 153–155 and P. Poucha in *Archiv Orientální* 20, 1952, 327f. on *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, ADAW 1949–50; and the perhaps most important, H. Berger, *GGA* 1956, 96–111, on Lüders & Waldschmidt, *Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanon*, ADAW 1952.

[9] This volume also contains several articles dealing with India.

ambassadors, direct trade contacts with Egypt, etc.), the Middle Ages often only had this classical information to transmit and embellish.

On the other hand, it is not wholly true that the Mediaeval conception of India contained nothing new. We can quote Christian contacts like the legends of the missions by Saint Thomas and Bartholomew, the travels of the Theban Scholasticus, the Christian geography of Cosmas, the legends of India as the immediate neighbour of the Garden of Eden. Indian legends and literary reached the West as we see in the new form of the unicorn legend, in the *Physiologus,* in the Western versions of the *Pañcatantra* and other story books. The old legends connected with Alexander's Indian campaign, especially his supposed meeting with the naked Brahmans, gained new elements. The second half of the Middle Ages once again saw Western travellers again reaching the shores of India, and new travel books, new fact and new fiction, often intertwined with the old, appeared.

With few exceptions the existing studies deal only with some particular aspect of this history, and the theme *India* is not necessarily the main point. Thus there are many studies on the various forms of the Alexander Romance, but the viewpoint is generally that of Western literary history. The emphasis is also mostly on the Latin West, and while the important rôle of Byzantium is also noted, other ramifications of its traditions are not often discussed.

Byzantium was also the agent, through which most of these traditions came to Russia. Various traditions about Alexander and the Brahmans, the legends of Barlaam and Joasaph and of the Apostle Thomas, the *Physiologus* and the *Pañcatantra* were also known in Russia. Here, as well as elsewhere in Europe, they have often been very popular. In the present volume their history is traced all the way from their Indian origins to Mediaeval Russia, and in many respects the author opens to us—who are not so familiar with Russian sources—wholly new perspectives. Therefore it is to be regretted that this book as well as its predecessors is published in Russian.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

A. K. Warder, Indian Kāvya Literature. Vol. V. The bold Style (Śaktibhadra to Dhanapāla). Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1988. xii, 891 pp.

After some delay due to difficulties in the press, the fifth volume of Professor Warder's monumental *Kāvya Literature* has appeared, and with every volume the number of pages is growing. The present volume covers the ninth and tenth centuries including such important, or even famous names as Śaktibhadra, Murāri, Jayavallabha (the Prākrit anthology), Ratnākara, Śivasvāmin, Bhallata, Rājaśekhara, Kṣemīśvara and Somadeva (*Yaśastilakacampū*). The importance of Jaina literature is enhanced by such names as Śīlaṅka, Svayaṁbhū, Puṣpadanta and Dhanapāla. The growing Apabhraṁśa literature is discussed very fully, but the beginnings of Kannaḍa Kāvya (*Pampa Rāmāyaṇa*) are treated rather briefly. One section deals with the spreading of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Central and South-East Asia. It seems that the growing number of

languages used for writing poetry in South Asia will give rise to some difficulties in future volumes, as not all of them can be read by one author with the same skill and fluency. But still the bulk of the material is written in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan (including the Apabhraṁśa), and Professor Warder has treated it with the same skill and learning as in the preceding volumes. It is gratifying to conclude by noting that according to the preface, the sixth volume was already completed at the time when the fifth was published, and it now has been announced that it will be published in the near future.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Lee Siegel, Laughing Matters. Comic Tradition in India. Chicago 1987; Indian edition: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1989. xxii, 498 pp.

Scholarship is often thought to be a very dry business, and generally one's own research is the most serious of all. Reading this book was an enjoyment not only of the scholarly kind. For this, however, the author is not to be blamed. What would be duller than to read a dry and scholarly book about humour which had no touch of it itself. *Such* books have also been written, not to mention those scholarly authors who just could not see anything funny in ancient Indian humour. I do not wish to underestimate the difficulties which cultural barriers impose especially in such field as humour, but these have sometimes been exaggerated. Although it is true that the humour of different ages and places is sometimes incomprehensible to us, the reading of such texts as the *Bhagavadajjukīya* or the *Mattavilāsa,* or, to take a parallel from the classical antiquity, which was by no means so close to us as we tend to think, Aristophanes or Martial, immediately shows that much of what was intended to make the hearers laugh has the same effect on us. There is something universal in laughing.

In the book under review, the author has escaped the dangers of excessive seriousness in two ways. The various forms of humour in classical India are traced and analyzed with much insight and wit as well as the exactness of a philologist. It is all accompanied by comparisons, personal memories and anecdotes, but also with fresh translations from Sanskrit, which reveal that Dr. Siegel has quite a talent in rendering the content and idea of difficult poems in a palatable way in English. The last chapter contains very personal recollections of author's rather frustrating search for the comic tradition in modern India. Everything is illustrated with pictures borrowed from the best Indian cartoonists. All in all, it is a rather strange and unconventional chick in the nest of the Indological tradition, but at the same time very stimulating reading. We end by quoting from the *Maṇḍūka Upaniṣad,* an "ancient" work seen in the best Indian tradition in a dream by Dr. Siegel's Indian friend, the supreme mantra: *oṁ haha huṁ hahaha phaṭ haha heehee hoho huṁ.*[10]

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

[10] Unfortunately this text is given only in some English extracts. On the other hand, it must be added as a more serious and scholarly afterthought that it is fortunate that Dr. Siegel's other references are to works transmitted in the ordinary way through manuscripts.

Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society. Editors Rahul Peter Das & Ronald Eric Emmerick. Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen. Vol. I (1990). 183 pp.

Study of the Āyurveda (ĀV) has a long tradition in the West going back to the pioneer age of Indology and even beyond.[11] In the 19th century Hessler[12] published a Latin translation of the *Suśrutasaṁhitā* in 1844–55. Other indologically minded physicians were Gustave Liétard and Palmyr Cordier.[13] Among Indologists, Roth studied the *Carakasaṁhitā,* while Jolly wrote the classic textbook on Indian medicine for the Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research (*Medicin* 1901). In a more recent period, Kirfel studied the ĀV, and, together with L. Hilgenberg, made one of the few scholarly translations of an Āyurvedic text (Vāgbhaṭa, *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṁhitā,* 1941). Jean Filliozat was originally a physician and devoted a great part of his extensive Indological work to medical questions.

In spite of all this, the ĀV has been a minor field more or less discarded by the majority of scholars in the West. Still it seems that only a few have realized, how extremely interesting ancient medical works can be as sources of Indian civilization in general. It is also interesting to see that the ĀV often represents a way of thinking more or less independent of the religious mainstreams. As examples, a method of dissection and the strong opposition to child marriages can be mentioned.

Recently, however, interest in the ĀV has been increasing, and nowadays several Western scholars are working on it. Most of them are also involved in the new journal: it is edited by R. P. Das and R. E. Emmerick, while R. P. Labbadie, G. J. Meulenbeld and A. Roşu constitute the editorial board, and D. Wujastyk and K. G. Zysk have contributed articles. As the ĀV is still a living tradition and thus likely to provoke much speculation even in the West, it is stressed that the purpose of the Society publishing the JEĀS is "to promote and co-ordinate the *scholarly* study of Indian medicine". On the other hand, the journal intends to cover, in addition to the ĀV proper, "all aspects of indigenous Indian Medicine, including non-Āyurvedic and ethno-medical systems and pharmacological research on indigenous plants and drugs utilised by such systems". Accordingly, the present volume contains, in addition to interesting collection of Āyurvedic studies, one article on the "State Policy Towards Indigenous Drugs in British Bengal".

The JEĀS will not be published regularly, but only when a sufficient amount of scholarly contributions have been submitted. This is probably a wise decision, although

[11] Although Garcia d'Orta cannot perhaps be styled as a precursor of ĀV studies, Hendrik Adriaan van Rheede tot Drakenstein (1635-91) enlisted Keralan scholars as helpers in order to have Indian nomenclature included in his monumental *Hortus Indicus Malabaricus* (1-12, 1678ff.).

[12] Franz Hessler (1799-1890) was a physician in Bavaria and wrote, in addition to the above-mentioned translation, several studies on the ĀV published in the *Abhandlungen* of the Bavarian Academy in the 1880s.

[13] On Liétard (1833–1904) and Cordier (1871–1914) see *Un demi-siécle des recherches āyurvédiques. Gustave Liétard et Palmyr Cordier: Travaux sur l'histoire de la médecine indienne.* Documents réunis et présentés par Arion Roşu. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne 56, Paris 1989, reviewed by Meulenbeld in the volume presently under review (177f.).

we eagerly await the appearance of the next volume.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Renate Syed, Die Flora Altindiens in Literatur und Kunst. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München. Renate Syed, München 1990. ix, 775 pp.

The question of plant names mentioned in ancient Indian literature (and lexicography) has attracted the minds of scholars ever since the days of Sir William Jones and William Roxburgh. The problems involved, however, are so great that since these pioneers nobody has attempted a broad synthesis. The present volume is an attempt in this direction, and despite some clear shortcomings, it will have an important place in future studies. As the study is originally a Munich dissertation, it seems that its scope would have been defined on a somewhat more restricted plane. This has saved it from much of the criticism, I have to present. Now it attempts a comprehensiveness it fails to attain.

The basic idea of the book is to ascertain if the identifications suggested to Jones and Roxburgh by their pandits and accepted in such indispensable tools of Indology as both the St. Petersburg dictionaries are correct. For this purpose a great amount of textual evidence as well as of works of art are studied. On p. IVf. the criteria for the identification of ancient plant names—modern names (to be used with caution); textual comparisons, synonyms and descriptions; works of art; and use in religion and cult in modern times—are stated. The general conclusion is affirmative: the tradition of plant names and their identifications is mostly correct.[14]

The number of plants involved is so great that some method of limiting the scope was evidently necessary. On p. IV it is stated that such names were discarded, whose identification is either impossible (e.g. *arundhatī*) or wholly confirmed (e.g. *aśvattha*, but *nyagrodha* is included), as well as plants mentioned only in medical texts and late introductions (e.g. *tulasī*) and plants in whose case the abundance of material would need a full monograph (e.g. *palāśa*). While these criteria, despite some arbitrariness, may be defended, they cannot explain all omissions. Why, for instance, were almost all grasses and cereals excluded?[15]

The bulk of the work is formed by lengthy discussions of 71 different plants arranged alphabetically according to their Sanskrit names (pp. 27–606). Some of these chapters grow to small monographs (see e.g. aśoka, jambu/jambū and nyagrodha/vaṭa). The various lotus plants (genera Nelumbo and Nymphaea) with their numerous names

[14] It is not my intention in this review to go into details, but I would like to make one point . Hendrik Adriaan van Rheede tot Drakenstein (1635–91; he was a Dutchman, not a Dane), whose *Hortus Indicus Malabaricus* is here (p. II) quoted only (without reference) from some secondary source, did actually give in his work also as many Indian names as he could ascertain from his Indian informants (who are even mentioned by name!). For me, too, these rare volumes are at present not available, but a look at them would certainly be rewarding.

[15] As regards them, see the short article by H. M. Johnson in *JAOS* 61, 1941, 167–171, and several studies in P. K. Gode's *Studies in Indian Cultural History* 1–3, 1961–69.

are given separate treatment (pp. 607–711). Each chapter is accompanied by a drawing of the plant. These drawings are generally very clear (although sometimes a picture of a whole tree would be useful in addition to the flowering or fruit-bearing branch), but unfortunately the same cannot always be said of the many illustrations of works of art. Two indices, of Sanskrit names and of scientific names, curiously given on pp. 21–26, before the text, include also various synonyms.

In her foreword, the author states rather clearly her dislike of medical literature. But while it is understandable that the present study could not include a full study of medical plants, there would have been much more general information to be culled from medical texts. One is also bound to ask why only Vogel was used for the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya*, and the complete German translation by Kirfel and Hilgenfeld was ignored. The *Mādhavanidāna* is not mentioned at all among text sources, although Meulenbeld's valuable translation is listed among secondary sources. But even outside the Āyurveda there are important sources, which have escaped notice. Thus for instance Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭiśalakāpuruṣacarita* and the *Somaśambhupaddhati* with respective translations (and important notes) by H. M. Johnson and H. Brunner-Lachaux would have greatly benefited the present study. For the modern names, in addition to Yule's and Burnell's *Hobson-Jobson* also Dalgado's *Glossario Luso-Asiatico,* now available also as a reprint, would have been useful.

Of course, it would be easy to heap up bibliographic additions, as the bulk of scholarly literature has grown so enormous that it is impossible for a single scholar to take everything into account.[16] Even at present, the list of sources, containing Indian texts (713–739), secondary sources in general (739–761) and a special list of sources on Indian art history (762–773) is quite long. It is satisfying to note that an attempt to denote reprints as such has been done.

A more serious reproach must be made with respect to botany. Although the list of sources contains a great amount of (partly antiquated) botanic literature, no attempt to ascertain the fundamental facts of modern taxonomy has been made.[17] Many names (even six, see p. 582) are listed here as synonyms. The situation was, it is true, somewhat chaotic, with many competing scientific names, and this caused much confusion for philologists attempting to gain some understanding of the matter. But as early as in the late 19th century a system, now generally accepted, was introduced, where the oldest botanically acceptable description of a species is accepted as the basis for current nomenclature. For higher plants the earliest authority is thus Linnaeus, but for Indian plants we need not often go beyond Roxburgh.[18] The competing names given by later botanists are thus secondary and can be quoted only in order to identify the references

[16] From my own special field I can note that although the bibliography includes the major classical accounts of India (unfortunately only McCrindle's translations and Iliff Robson, instead of Brunt's more recent work, for Arrianus), they have been used very sparingly. The best source for Indian plants in classical literature (but ignored by McCrindle) would be Theophrastus (see also H. Bretzl, *Botanische Forschungen des Alexanderzuges,* Leipzig 1903).

[17] I must here thank my brother Krister Karttunen, himself a taxonomist, for information and advice.

[18] However, this does not mean that we can accept Roxburgh's names as such. The primarity principle described above holds only at the level of species, and with the genera more recent modifications must be taken into account.

in earlier literature. It is unfortunate that this is often case with the names given in the St. Petersburger dictionaries.

I have perhaps been somewhat hard expecting something which this book was not intended to be. While a standard treatment of plants in Sanskrit sources still remains a desideratum, the present volume is a major contribution to the field and will make the final task much easier.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume. Surapālas Vṛkṣāyurveda, kritisch ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert von Rahul Peter **Das**. Mit einem Nachtrag von G. Jan **Meulenbeld** zu seinem Verzeichnis, Sanskrit Names of Plants and their Botanical Equivalents'. (*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 34.) Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1988. ix + 589 pp.

With the vastness of Sanskrit literature, the "minor sciences" (and even some major ones like the Āuyrveda) have long been more or less neglected subjects in the field of Indology, especially outside India. And yet, in addition to their special interest, they often contain valuable information about the cultural history of India. One of these neglected sciences is the Vṛkṣāyurveda, until now mainly known only from Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (ŚP) and some Purāṇic accounts. Thanks to the work under review, it is no more a *terra incognita*. The study of plants in ancient Indian literature has been enriched by a contribution of primary importance.[19]

Surapāla's *Vṛkṣāyurveda* is a manual of gardening in 13 (unnumbered) chapters and 325 verses. It deals with various kinds of trees and other plants, their characteristics (lucky and unlucky signs), sowing, planting, watering and fertilization, plant diseases and their cures, the creation of variations of growth and flowering, the creation of parks, finding the place for a well, and some prognostic qualities of various plants.

The task of editing the text has been very arduous indeed. It is known only in one not very good manuscript (in the Bodleian Library). As such it would of course be a wholly inadequate basis for a critical edition, but fortunately the great majority of Surapāla's verses are also found in other works, especially in the corresponding part of the ŚP, but also many others (a concordance is given in pp. 47–52). Dr. Das has taken a great deal of trouble to find them out (not to speak of the many texts he had to read without finding anything relevant). More than this, he has not been content with the existing (often very uncritical) editions but checked a great number of manuscripts in order to ascertain the most correct readings (see the list of manuscript sources, pp. 22–41).

The text, critical apparatus, translation and notes are given separately for each

[19] Thus, for instance, it is pity that Dr. Syed in her book on Sanskrit plant names reviewed above could not use it.

verse. The text offers many difficulties. It is full of *hapax legomena* and various problems of interpretation. It is often impossible to give a definite lection and accordingly a translation. This problem is met by the somewhat doubtful expedient of putting one possible version on top of the other. Sometimes it is rather difficult to understand what is actually meant (see e.g. verses 72, 173, 222, 266 and 295).

The notes are necessarily very important part of the work and also take up the major part of its content. Although they are sometimes reduced to mere lists of synonyms—and even these are often of great importance for instance in the interpretation of ancient plant names—many contain very interesting information and testify to the profound learning of the author (which is enhanced by his good command of Bengali sources). See e.g. pp. 87f. (*madhūka*), 95f. (*pippala/piṣpala*), 209 (*sapharī/ śapharī*), 216ff. (*tṛṇapādapa*), 247ff. (*dohada*), 284ff. (*pañcamūla*), and 393f. (*puṭabhedaka*).

The work concludes with several appendices which contain the texts of four other texts on Vṛkṣāyurveda. One further appendix comes from G. J. Meulenbeld, and contains additions to the list of plant names given in his *Mādhavanidāna*. The bibliography (523–542, see also pp. 4–16 and 22–46) is very full, and the indices contain a pāda index (543–557), an index of words discussed (558–570), an index of the scientific names of plants discussed (571–580), and a general index (581–589).

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Martin Mittwede. Textkritische Bemerkungen zur Kāṭhaka-Saṁhitā. (*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 37.) Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1989. 160 pp.

The present volume is a sequel to a similar volume on the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā* published in the same series (nr. 31) in 1986. In both volumes the author has with great patience collected and analyzed various notes and remarks concerning the works since their editions appeared before and after the turn of the 20th century (*MS* 1881–86, *KS* 1900–10, both by Leopold von Schroeder). It is probably not very inspiring to carry out such a work, but the result is useful for everybody using the Vedic texts, and the author therefore deserves our most sincere gratitude.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Arvind Sharma (ed.), Sati. Historical and Phenomenological Essays. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1988. xvii, 129 pp.

From a Western perspective, it can hardly be questioned that the sati[20] is one of the most tragic features of traditional Hindu society. During more than two thousand years

[20] Discarding the diacritic on *satī* is here used as a way of justifying the Indologically inexact use of the word, for signifying the act itself instead of the actress, without resorting to that ugly Anglo-Indianism *suttee*. The same principle is also given by Sharma (p. xv), but unfortunately the proofreading has failed to restore the diacritic even where it is needed.

it has both appalled and fascinated Western observers.

The volume under review is a collection twelve short essays, nine of them by the editor, discussing various aspects of sati, mostly from a historic perspective. At least part of them have been previously published in journals, which has resulted in some overlapping.

The first two chapters trace Western reactions and indigenous protest against sati before its abolition in British India, while the third traces inverted rôles to the issue: Western admiration, Indian condemnation. The historic viewpoint—concentrating on the pre-1829 period—also dominates next two chapters, dealing with the position of the Brahmans in the rite and with the history of the sati of Brahman widows. However, these interesting questions are not really examined, but just tackled in a few pages. Somewhat longer is the sixth chapter on the (real or supposed) Hindu scriptural sanction for sati. A philologist cannot but regret that nearly all texts are only quoted from secondary literature. A short chapter mentions a case from the *Harṣacarita,* where the wife (queen) committed sati even before her husband was actually dead.

The eighth chapter seeks for a parallel between the attitudes of Raja Rammohun Roy and Bal Gangadhar Tilak towards the British social legislation for India, and the eleventh, also by Sharma, discusses the passages of the *Bhagavadgītā* used by Roy in his polemics against sati. Two chapters by Ajit Ray (9. and 10.) deal with the pre-1829 opposition to sati among Bengalis and among Christian missionaries. The last chapter, by Alaka Hejib and Katherine K. Young, takes a wholly different viewpoint and presents a phenomenological attempt to understand the underlying mechanism of sati and widowhood.

The problem with the book is its compactness. A mere 129 pages are given to a difficult and complex question, and often we gain nothing more than hints and suggestions—certainly interesting—instead of results and conclusions. One is also disturbed by the marked historism. The authors seem to be conscious of the fact that although the Regulation in 1829 ended legal sati, illegal cases have occurred ever since. In the preface there is a reference even to the recent case of Roop Kanwar, but in the text the emphasis is solely on the early 19th century.[21]

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Sarva Daman Singh, Polyandry in Ancient India. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1978, Reprint 1988. xi, 212 pp.

Another remarkable feature of Indian social history is dealt with in Singh's study, originally published 13 years ago and now reprinted by Motilal Banarsidass. Before Singh, the question of polyandry in ancient India was mostly a matter of speculation, generally concentrated around the case of Draupadī and the Pāṇḍava brothers. Although Singh was perhaps somewhat overenthusiastic with his case, he succeeded in showing

[21] For an account combining earlier traditions with the present situation see Julia Leslie, "*Suttee* or *Satī:* Victim or Victor?" in Leslie (ed.), *Roles and Rituals for Hindu Women,* London 1991, 175–191.

that there is much more to be found in our sources, that polyandry is a definite feature of ancient India. While I tend to disagree with the conclusion that polyandry was originally a part of the orthodox Aryan society (there were also many unorthodox—Aryan and non-Aryan—elements in ancient India),[22] Singh's book is valuable as a full demonstration of the evidence, which also contains a lengthy introduction to the discussion about polyandry in anthropology.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Sukumar Dutt, Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India. Their History and their Contribution to Indian Culture. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1962, Reprint 1988. 397 pp.

Motilal Banarsidass has also reprinted Sukumar Dutt's *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries in India*. Although not as extensive as Lamotte's *Histoire de bouddhisme indien,* which has recently been published also in an English translation, for the early period, the present volume goes on through the whole length of Buddhism, and especially of the Buddhist Sangha with its institutions and edifices, in India up to 1200 A.D. There is no need to go into details with a well-known work. Publishers like Motilal Banarsidass deserve our thanks for making books, which are so often referred to, like the present volume, easily available to a new generations of scholars.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Silvia Freiin Ebner von Eschenbach, Die Entwicklung der Wasserwirtschaft im Südosten Chinas in der südlichen Sung-Zeit anhand einer Fallstudie: Das *"Ssu-ming T'o-shan Shui-li pei-lan"* des Wei Hsien. (*Münchener Ostasiatische Studien*, Bd. 43.) Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH. Stuttgart 1986. 246 pp.

It has been claimed that China's foremost concern through the millennia has been to keep floods and barbarians at bay. Since the publication of Arthur Waldron's fascinating study *The Great Wall of China: from history to myth* (Cambridge 1990), we might have to reconsider the barbarians, but the floods, as recent (summer 1991) events bear witness, are as virulent as ever.

Wei Hsien (1180-1250), an official in charge of the repair and dredging project of the T'o-shan dam in the Yin district of the Ming Prefecture (also called Ssu-ming; from 1381 Ning-po), compiled his *Ssu-ming T'o-shan shui-li pei-lan* in the 1240s. This rather short treatise consists of older texts by various authors on the subject together with Wei Hsien's own reflections. This work was published for the first time four centuries later, in 1641, by Ch'en Ch'ao-fu; a better edition with a commentary was published in 1854 by Hsü Shih-tung.

This treatise by Wen Hsien forms the kernel of Dr. von Eschenbach's learned

[22] See my *India in Early Greek Literature*, Studia Orientalia 65, Helsinki 1989, 205f.

study, originally written as a dissertation at the Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität in Munich. The translation (pp. 117-154 with notes pp. 168-176) is preceded by an informative discussion in two chapters of "Wasserwirtschaft" in Southeast China up to Wei Hsien's Southern Sung dynasty (1127-1279), followed by an analysis of the content of *Pei-lan*. The book is provided with useful glossary-indices (pp. 200-246).

Dr. von Eschenbach has produced a well-documented and informative study not only on "Wasserwirtschaft" (and "Bewässerungswirtschaft") but on Southern Sung society and administration in general. One only wishes that the author would have made the results of her "Fallstudie" bear upon even larger questions such as the Wittfogelian *hydraulic society* controversy.

KAJ ÖHRNBERG