

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDITED BY THE FINNISH ORIENTAL SOCIETY
55:26

BOOK REVIEWS

HELSINKI 1984

R e v i e w e d b o o k s

BEHRENS & STEIBLÉ: Glossar zu den altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften	5
KIENAST: Die altbabylonischen Briefe und Urkunden aus Kisurra I-II	7
KIRFEL: Kleine Schriften	22
KLEIN-FRANKE: Die klassische Antike in der Tradition des Islam	13
MIYAZAKI: China's examination hell	27
MOTI CHANDRA: Trade and trade routes in Ancient India	21
MÜLLER: Ich bin Labīd und das ist mein Ziel	15
NESPITAL: Das Futursystem im Hindi und Urdu	24
PRASAD: Foreign trade and commerce in Ancient India	21
Qumran. Hrsg. von K. E. Grözinger & al.	12
[aṣ-ṢAFADĪ] Das biographische Lexikon des Ṣalāḥaddīn Ḥalīl Ibn Aibak aṣ-Ṣafadī, 10	14
SHAPIRO & SCHIFFMAN: Language and society in South Asia	18
STEIBLÉ & BEHRENS: Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften I-II	3

Horst STEIBLE (unter Mitarbeit von Hermann BEHRENS): Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften I-II (Freiburger Altorientalische Studien, Band 5). Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1982. Pt. I, xiv + 371 pp.; Pt. II, vi + 347 pp., 6 pls.

After several 'decades of dearth' during which Old Sumerian royal inscriptions could be studied only through cuneiform copies and incomplete, outdated, scattered or otherwise inadequate editions, Horst Steible has given us an up-to-date edition of the corpus, whose quality is commensurate with the importance of the material. The two volumes under review present in annotated transliteration and translation all currently known early royal and private inscriptions from Mesopotamia down to the beginning of the Sargonic period (ca. 2350 B.C.), with the exception of seal legends and the Semitic inscriptions from Mari. The total number of published inscriptions (577) more than doubles the number of texts included in earlier editions.

This is an excellent book, which makes the task of the reviewer an easy one. It is based on painstakingly careful preliminary work, which includes computerization and complete indexing of the whole corpus, collation of every accessible inscription, thorough evaluation of all previous work on the subject, and consultation of Sumerologists all over the world in the interpretation of difficult passages. One could say that no stone has been left unturned in an effort to ensure the best possible result; in consequence, we now have an edition that is sure to satisfy even the most critical reader and has placed the study of these inscriptions on a new level.

The texts are presented in geographical order; volume one gives the inscriptions of the rulers of Lagash, which constitute the bulk of the material, volume two those from other sites (Adab, Aġrab, Ešnunna, Fāra, Hāfāġi, Kiš etc., in alphabetic order; why, parenthetically, Fāra and Hāfāġi, not Šuruppak and Tutub, if Bismaya and Tell Asmar are given as Adab and Ešnunna?). Within each site, the arrangement is chronological and by ruler. Each text is headed by a bibliographical section listing all relevant details about the original (museum number, description, copies, photos, and previous editions). The text is then very conveniently presented in line-under-line transliteration and translation ar-

ranged in two parallel columns. Virtually every text has been provided with a commentary. In the case of the Lagashite inscriptions, these are for practical reasons presented collectively in Pt.II (pp.1-184); otherwise they immediately follow the texts concerned.

The principles followed in the organization of the material and the transliterations, translations and commentary are explained in the introduction to Pt.I. Generally, maximum clarity and reliability were striven for, and in pursuit of these goals the author has exercised a great deal of critical self-restraint. Thus, no uncertain restorations appear in the transliterations, and passages not properly understood are often simply left untranslated; in compensation, possible conjectures are discussed (often at length) in the commentary. In principle, this certainly is the only reasonable way to proceed. However, as the book will be widely used in teaching and doubtless also consulted by nonspecialists (only interested in the translations), one wonders whether the rigor by which the principle has been applied could not have been mitigated a little, e.g. in the rendering of the 'Stele of Vultures' (Ean.1). Including the most probable conjectural restorations in the translation would not have detracted from the scientific value of the edition but would have made the fragmentary story easier to follow.

Thinking specifically of students, I also find it regrettable that such a central graphemic feature as the bí : bé opposition is not adequately rendered in the transliterations. The author states (I p.12) that the system of transliteration used only aims at an unambiguous rendering of the cuneiform graphemes, and that the grammatical theory calling for the transliteration bé e.g. in verbal prefixes instead of bi is not yet sufficiently well established. The latter point is incorrect, for the bí - bé alternation in verbal prefixes follows exactly same rules as the incontestable ì - e alternation. As to the former, transliterating bé simply as bi of course suffices for the identification of the grapheme; however, why then transliterate ki-bé gi₄ (passim) and not simply ki-bi gi₄, or ubur-zi-da-né (Ean. 1,4:28) and not simply ubur-zi-da-ni?

Such minor questions of principle should not obscure the fact

that the book on the whole offers very little room for criticism. The transliterations, translations and commentaries are up-to-date and frequently improve on earlier interpretations, and even the camera-ready manuscript from which the book has been produced is impeccable.

If the author and his collaborators have every reason to be proud of their achievement, the publisher too has earned thanks for pricing the book so reasonably. In the time of exorbitantly high book prices, getting this important publication for only DM 98,- can be considered a bargain.

Simo Parpola

Hermann BEHRENS und Horst STEIBLE: Glossar zu den altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften (Freiburger Altorientalische Studien, Band 6). Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1983. xxii + 424 pp.

This important glossary makes available the entire vocabulary of the Old-Sumerian inscription corpus recently edited by the authors (cf. just above) as well as indices of all the names occurring in these texts. It has been compiled with the help of computer-generated keyword concordances, which guarantees the inclusion of every occurrence of each word, and also makes the book handy to use as all readings, translations, abbreviations and other conventions accurately follow the edition.

In the arrangement and organization of the material, the book rather closely resembles the glossary to Falkenstein's Neusumerische Gerichtsurkunden but also contains features apparently taken over from the CAD. This innovation is a welcome one. It is gratifying for once to have all references cited in full translation and with sufficient context, and presented in a semantically meaningful arrangement. Like the CAD, each entry has a 'lexical section' giving the pertinent Akkadian equivalents and, in the case of verbs, also a section listing the attested inflectional forms.

In setting up entry words, the authors largely follow in Falkenstein's footsteps, which among other things means that numerous verbal idioms are interpreted as 'derived verbs' and presented as

separate entries outside the relevant simple verbal stems. While there is no question that many verbal idioms like *sag--rig₇* "to present" do represent compound lexemes, it seems to me that the authors have occasionally established 'derived verbs' too liberally. What sense does it make to present an idiomatic expression like *sag--íl* as a separate lemma? The fact that the meaning of the expression is not the sum of its components is of no relevance here; how would one react to entries like *rěša našû* or *uzna šakānu* in the CAD? Admittedly there are borderline cases where the decision whether a verb is compound or simple must remain subjective, but at least the entries *a šà-ga šu--du₁₁*, *al--dù*, *gaba šu--ús*, *gal--zu*, *gù--dé* (cf. Akk. *rigma nadû*), *ki-bé--gí₄*, *maš--pà*, *šu-dagal--du₁₁*, *šu--ús*, *šu--zi*, *TÜN.ŠĔ--sè* and *u₄--zal* seem unnecessary to me. It is also a nuisance to find *hamtu* and *marû* forms (like *du₁₁* and *e*, *gar* and *gá-gá*) listed under different lemmas. Thanks to plentiful cross-references, the matter is of little or no practical significance in the present case but would, in my opinion, present a undeniable drawback in a full-size dictionary.

The entry words are overwhelmingly cited by their 'short' forms (i.e., *e* I "Graben" not *ég*, *è* not *éd*, *kù* not *kug*, etc.). This of course helps locating the relevant glossary entries, since the words in question are consistently transliterated in like manner in the edition, but would it not have been lexicographically more justified to give the full forms at least within parentheses, as indeed occasionally done (e.g., *kur-šà(-g)*, *niga(-n)*, *pà(-d)*)? The authors are not at all consistent in this respect, and unnecessarily perpetuate the tradition of lexical underdifferentiation already started by Akkadian scribes.

The above critical remarks pertain to trivialities and stand in no proportion to the merits of this glossary. It has been prepared with the same uncanny care and diligence as the text edition and represents a major contribution in the field of Sumerian lexicography. Many lexical and grammatical features of Pre-Sargonic Sumerian, e.g. the distribution of the so-called conjugation prefixes, now stand out more clearly than before and would actually call for separate comment, but that is unfortunately not possible within the confines of the present review. One must con-

clude with the hope that the authors will find time and energy to speedily complete their projected edition of the Neo-Sumerian inscriptions in a similar exemplary fashion.

Simo Parpola

Burkhart KIENAST: Die altbabylonischen Briefe und Urkunden aus Kisurra I-II (Freiburger Altorientalische Studien, Band 2). Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1978. Pt. I, xii + 135 pp., 97 pls.; Pt. II, 258 pp.

In 1903, the German expedition excavating in Fara/Šuruppak found time for brief soundings in the nearby Tell Abu Hatab, the site of ancient Kisurra. The book under review presents an editio princeps(!) of the ca. 270 tablets and fragments discovered in these soundings, which despite the relatively encouraging results have remained the only scientific excavations carried out at the site.

The title of the book is slightly misleading insofar as 'Urkunden' not letters constitute a clear majority of the texts published: various documents (mostly promissory notes) make up more than 82 % of the lot, while the letters, 31 in number, account for less than 15 % of it. Also, the texts do not exclusively consist of letters and documents but include a few other types of texts as well (two writing exercises, two mathematical tables, four lexical prism fragments, and a copy of an Edubba dialogue); and while the bulk of them are Old Babylonian (as indicated in the title), four at least date from the Ur III period.

The texts do not derive from a single spot but are of mixed origin. Of the ten trenches cut in the tell, five produced tablets, even if some only a few. Many of the findspots clearly represent private archives; in two cases, however, the excavators appear to have hit upon governmental offices, at least one of which (c/1) was directly connected with the administration of Kisurra. The importance of this findspot is borne out by the fact that it alone yielded over 40 % of all the tablets found in the city. Many administrative records and 14 letters of administrative

content, all addressed to an individual named Šamaš-rē'ûm, were found on the spot; they date from the time of Sumu-El of Larsam, and indicate that c/1 at that time was the seat of an important state official, perhaps the prefect of the city. The findspot c/2 yielded administrative records and letters addressed to yet another official named Ahīma, who was a contemporary of Šamaš-rē'ûm and appears to have headed the 'cattle department' of the same establishment. Both Šamaš-rē'ûm and Ahīma were subordinate to a man named Ibni-šadûm, who authored most of the letters to them and whom I would not hesitate identifying with the homonymous ruler of Kisurra known from local date formulae. For evidence showing that this ruler was a contemporary of Sumu-El see now Kingsbury, *BiOr* 37 (1980) 64f.

In judging the significance of this tablet find, one has to keep in mind that the texts on hand probably represent only a scrap of the textual evidence that remains buried in the mound. By early Old Babylonian standards, Kisurra was a relatively large and powerful city; systematic excavations at the site would thus in all likelihood bring to light larger and more important archives, which could literally dwarf the information furnished by the present sample and settle many of the problems it leaves open. This possibility becomes particularly tantalizing when one considers the texts from the viewpoint of a historian. The information they provide about the language, ethnic structure,¹ and social and economic conditions of Kisurra is sufficiently explicit and abundant to be readily evaluated, and of course invaluable since absolutely nothing was known about these matters before the

1 About 10 % of all the personal names in the texts are Sumerian; there are also a few interesting hybrid names like A-ab-ba-tà-bu-um and ^dIg-alim-ba-ni. Persons with Sumerian names regularly have Sumerian patronymics but often sons with Semitic names. "Sumerians" tend to appear in groups and generally seem to be well-off both socially and economically (they rank high in witness lists, appear as moneylenders, priests, scribes etc.). These facts suggest that 100 years after the fall of Ur, a rapidly diminishing and probably bilingual, but still distinctly Sumerian linguistic minority may well have existed in Kisurra.

publication of the present texts. On the other hand, the historical information that can be extracted from the texts (mainly in the form of year names) is rather disappointing. We now have the names of a few local rulers and scattered references to their achievements (mainly completed building and construction projects), but this information remains largely meaningless as long as the available bits of evidence cannot be firmly dated and ordered chronologically. More texts are needed to eliminate this problem. Moreover, the evidence is chronologically limited as the bulk of the texts apparently date from a relatively short period of about 50 years (ca. 1910-1860 by the chronology placing Hammurapi at 1792-1750). Thus, they shed very little if any light on the city's early and late fortunes, and on such crucial questions as the date of its founding, the reasons for its abandonment, and the implications of the very name Kisurra "border".²

As a text edition, the book leaves little to desire. All the texts are presented in copy (Pt.I), and all except the most fragmentary ones in transliteration and annotated translation (II 1-187). Complete name indices (II 189-208), glossaries (II 209-258) and concordances (I 120-135) facilitate the control of the material. Pt. I presents detailed and well-documented studies on the history (pp. 13-39) and 'Pantheon' of Kisurra (40-45) and the legal aspects of the texts (46-108). The archaeological and archival backgrounds of the tablets are dealt with in the introduction (I 1-9). One could quibble about unessentials (such as the order in which the texts are presented), and there is certainly room for progress in the analysis and interpretation of the texts. However, the book unquestionably furnishes a solid and

2 Kisurra lies on the borderline of Adams's "Southern Enclave" (Heartland of Cities [1981] 90ff) which seems to have been determined by the geography of the region and as such could have coincided with the northern extremity of Uruk's sphere of influence in the early periods. The available evidence indicates that the place grew into a city only in the Ur III period, but it could have existed earlier as a fort. Its abandonment after the OB period probably resulted from a drying-up of the branch of the Euphrates on which the city was situated.

satisfactory edition of the Kisurra texts. Any future work on this material will build on and profit from the work of the author, who can be sure of the gratitude of his colleagues.

The only point in the book which I find in need of serious criticism is the great number of wrong diacritics marring the transliterations and indices. I refrain from giving a list of the cases I have noticed, because this would exceed the limits of this already lengthy review. In view of the considerable labor and time invested in the manuscript, one cannot help wondering at the reasons behind the inadequate handling of proofs.

The following textual details caught my attention (I naturally omit points already taken up in earlier reviews):

- 1:9 kù-babbar a-šà-gi-me-en: contrary to the commentary on p. 4, (where -gi-me-en is interpreted as standing for -gin₇), the parallel passages in 4A:9, 63:3 and 142:4 show that gi-me-en (also in 5B:3) is a corrupt syllabic spelling for igi(=gi₈)-ne-ne-(du₈, cf. § 109).
- 1:16 The obscure i-la-du-a is probably to be read i-la-bé!-a, cf. the parallel al-la-bé-a cited on p.4, and note that <du> has a completely different form elsewhere in this tablet.
- 2:2 Read according to the copy [n+]1!.1!.3! še gur.
- 28:7 Nu-úr-i-a: cf. Nu-úr-ri-ia 178:10, Nu-úr-é-a 117:10. Space forbids discussing the matter properly here, but it does seem to me that the so-called "hypocoristica in -ia" in fact largely are theophoric names ending in the DN Ea. Note OA E-a-šar // I-a-šar (Hirsch, AfO Bh.13 16b); Ur III Na-ra-am-é-a // Na-ra-am-è-a // Na-ra-me-a (MAD 3 p.231) and I-ti-é-a // I-din-é-a // I-ti-ne-a (ibid. 199); MA Zi-qa-IM-ia // Zi-qa-IM-^dia (Saporetti, OMA I 518 [sic!]); further in Kisurra, Awīl-é-a 91:23 // A-wi-li-ia 75A:17 // A-bi-li-ia 61:3'; l̄r-é-a 187:12 // l̄r-di-ia 74A:6 // Wa-ar-di-ia 5A:9 etc.; U-bar-i-a 84:10 // Ur III U-bar-é-a UET 3 1195:1. For the spellings with <i>, cf. nu-ub-bi-i-a {nu+b+e+àm} 85:14. Taking the final -ia for Ea may not be feasible in all names of all periods, but it does fit most cases and in addition provides an explanation for such difficult hypocoristica as Ibbīja (cf. OB I-bi-é-a), Išmīja (cf. OB Iš-me-é-a), Izqup-īja etc., where -ia is attached to a finite verbal form.

- For an exhaustive list of Ea-names (including ones ending in -e-a) see H. Galter, *Der Gott Enki/Ea in akkadischer Überlieferung* (diss. Graz 1983), 217ff.
- 54:1 še-KUR-ra is probably simply cursive for še-ur₅-ra.
- 71A:3 The spelling Ma-ší-ì-lí (also in 113:4) shows that ZI in fact was used for /šì/ in Kisurra too, pace JNES 42, 224f.
- 73:3 Better sám!-la-til!-ni-šè with inverted sign order.
- 86A:6 Read Um-mi-ṭà-ba-at and cancel 'Hepat' in the DN index.
- 123:10 The reading of the DN as 'Tešub' is not warranted by the copy; cancel the relevant entry in the DN index.
- 151:17f The long vowels spelled out in a-ka-sú-u-šū and e-ri-i-su indicate question ("soll ich ihn verpflichten...?").
- 153:6 Read with copy li-ib-ti!-ia-at.
- 154:8 Note the spelling UD-5-KAM-mi for /hamšit ūmī/.
- 162:20 Possibly ni-qí-am "Opfer".
- 166:15 GU₄(acc.) ša-ni-im: cf. GU₄ MU.1 167:7, in perfectly identical context. The conclusion seems inevitable that both expressions mean "one-year-old ox" and that ša-ni-im is the masculine form of šattum "year", otherwise only attested in ša-lu-uš-ša-ni (AbB 1 125:10, cf. AHW. 1153a) and rabūšeni (AHW. 940); cf. also Hebr. šānīm. Even if ša-ni-im is taken as acc. of šanium "another" (which seems impossible since i+a > ê does not occur outside Mari), the spelling GU₄ MU.1 would imply the existence of *šanum "year" since it would then have to be interpreted as a rebus for "another".
- 168:7 A-pil-ku-bi: In view of the shift w > b attested for awīlum in the PN Awīl-Ea (A-bi-li-ia, cf. above 28:7), one wonders whether this and the numerous other OB 'A-pil-DN' names actually should not be read A-bil-DN and taken as variants of the common name type Awīl-DN. Note that the intervocalic shift w > b is well attested in Ur III names (MAD 2 123f.)
- 174:16 For the 'abnormal' lengthening of the final vowel in ku-bu-ta-a-am see now Kraus, *Symbolae Böhl* (1973) 253ff.
- 208:2 si-i-íb: better si-i-tum, see Gelb MAD 3 262.
- 212:7 Read še!-rum!-ì-lí and cancel 'Bunene' in the index.

Simo Parpola

QUMRAN. Herausgegeben von Karl Erich Grözinger, Norbert Ilg, Hermann Lichtenberger, Gerhard-Wilhelm Nebe, Hartmut Pabst. (Wege der Forschung, Bd. CDX.) Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1981. 398 pp.

This collection consists of fourteen articles which have all been previously published. Those written in German are published as they originally appeared, while the others have been translated into German. Those articles selected were:

- H. H. Rowley, Die Geschichte der Qumransekte (1966/67)
- J. T. Milik, Die Geschichte der Essener (1957/59)
- D. Flusser, Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum (1970)
- Y. Yadin, Pescher Nahum (4Q pNahum) erneut untersucht (1971)
- G. Vermes, Die Schriftauslegung in Qumran in ihrem historischen Rahmen (1969/75)
- A. Dupont-Sommer, Das Problem der Fremdeinflüsse auf die jüdische Qumransekte (1955)
- J. Maier, Zum Begriff מִן in den Texten von Qumran (1960)
- C. - H. Hunzinger, Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Disziplinarordnung der Gemeinde von Qumran (1963)
- A. Dupont-Sommer, Schuld und Reinigungsriten in der jüdischen Sekte von Qumran (1965)
- J. Licht, Die Lehre des Hymnenbuches (1956)
- J. Carmignac, Die Theologie des Leidens in den Hymnen von Qumran (1961/62)
- K. Schubert, Die Messiaslehre in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran (1957)
- F. M. Cross Jr., Der Beitrag der Qumranfunde zur Erforschung des Bibeltextes (1966)
- J. A. Fitzmyer, Qumran und der eingefügte Abschnitt 2 Kor 6,14 - 7,1 (1961).

As the years of original publication (given above in brackets) indicate, the most recent article — that of Yadin — was ten years old when it appeared in this collection. In order to bring the book up to date the editors have compiled an introduction in which some of the more recent literature has been mentioned. Certain fields of research (e.g. palaeography, linguistics, Aramaic texts, pseudepigrapha) have been intentionally (and regrettably!) excluded because of the lack of space.

The editors consider that it may not be too early to attempt to find a "Zwischenbilanz" of 30 years of Qumran studies in a compact form of this kind, and they hope with their present publication to have produced a study book (Arbeitsbuch) which would serve as a convenient introduction both to the texts of Qumran and to the research devoted to them (pp. 1-2).

Since this has been the target, the choice of articles should have been directed at it with greater precision. A guidebook to the "Stand der Forschung" through the high seas of Qumran bibliography — as difficult as it might be — is a completely different task than a review of the history of research. While

many of these articles belong to the hard nucleus of Qumran studies (e.g. Milik, Vermes, Schubert), others represent controversial views, e.g. Rowley *vs.* Flusser concerning the time of the "Wicked Priest" as well as that of the "Teacher of Righteousness", Cross, Fitzmyer, in addition to which even outdated views make their appearance, e.g. Dupont-Sommer with his inverted *nūns*. As a consequence the innocent reader will encounter statements of varying reliability when looking for the safe trial balance which was promised him in the beginning of the book.

Although the collection is a handy tool for a careful student, commercial and scholarly viewpoints may have been in competition when the positive decision on the publication was made.

Tapani Harviainen

Felix KLEIN-FRANKE: *Die klassische Antike in der Tradition des Islam.* (Erträge der Forschung, Bd. 136.) Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1980. ix + 181 pp.

To put this in most respects excellent book on the shelf beside Franz Rosenthal's *Das Fortleben der Antike im Islam* would be to misplace it. The intention of the author is not, as the title might suggest, to trace the Classical tradition in Islam but to give a chronologically arranged review of Western ideas of the Muslims as transmitters of this tradition from the 15th century up till the 1970s.

This study of Western thought is presented in three main chapters: I. (pp. 17-52) dealing with the 15th and 16th centuries, II. (pp. 53-108) with the 17th and 18th, and III. (pp. 109-149) with the 19th and 20th. In addition there are the "Einleitung" (pp. 5-16) and "Schlussbetrachtung und Ausblick" (pp. 150-155) as well as a copious "Bibliographie" (pp. 157-173) and a "Namenverzeichnis" (pp. 175-181).

Professor Klein-Franke has succeeded in condensing seven centuries of Western images into a readable account with appropriate and revealing quotations. Perhaps the background (i.e. the 12th century translations-movement) could have been given a more nuanced presentation. Since the publication of Prof. Klein-Franke's book there has appeared an interesting article which could be consulted as a supplementary to the book: Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, "Translations and Translators" (in: R. L. Benson & G. Constable with C. D. Lanham, eds., *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Oxford 1982, pp. 421-462).

The book definitely deserves to be placed on the shelf beside Johann Fück's *Die arabischen Studien in Europa*, which rather surprisingly is mentioned only once.

Kaj Öhrnberg

Das biographische Lexikon des Ṣalāḥaddīn Ḥalīl Ibn Aibak aṣ-ṢAFADĪ. Teil 10: Aidamur bis Tābit. Hrsg. von Ali Amara und Jacqueline Sublet. (Bibliotheca Islamica 6j.) Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1980. 515 S. arabischer Text.

Why write more than a mere bibliographical announcement of a *Fortsetzungswerk* of some thirty manuscript volumes, of which parts 1-9, 12, 15, and now part 10 have already been published (first undertaken in 1931 by H. Ritter), part 17 was promised for 1981, and parts 11, 13, 14 and 16 are being worked on? One reason could be the discrepancy the present reviewer feels to exist between the prospectus and recent research done on al-Ṣafadī and his work by Donald P. Little and Josef van Ess.

The prospectus tells us of al-Ṣafadī's biographical dictionary that "der größte Teil seines Materials stammt aus unedierten und verlorenen Quellen. Daher seine Bedeutung." Now, in fact, the Mamlūk era of Islamic history is the period in Arabic historiography for which the richest amount of literary sources is known to have been written as well as preserved. But, as Donald P. Little has recently noticed, there have been few attempts to classify the chronicles and biographical dictionaries in terms of originality and to determine which were dependent on and derivative from others. That is why "the sources for the early Mamlūk period which were published up until 1960 are just those, with few exceptions, which are dependent on earlier, unedited and unpublished sources!"¹

al-Ṣafadī's (1297-1363) *al-Wāfī bil-wafayāt* belongs to this category of sources published, as it now seems, at random. It could, of course, be argued that a biographical dictionary must be judged differently from a chronicle with regard to originality; but as al-Ṣafadī with his almost 14 000 biographies covers much the same ground as many compilers before him and with a

1 D. P. Little, "Al-Ṣafadī as biographer of his contemporaries", in: D. P. Little (ed.), *Essays on Islamic civilization presented to Niyazi Berkes*, Leiden 1976, p. 191

few pre-Islamic exceptions, commencing with the Prophet and his Companions, it would have been advantageous to give more attention to him as a historian of contemporary events and personalities. It has been well known, largely on al-Ṣafadī's own authority, that his other biographical dictionary entitled *A^cyān al-^caṣr wa-^cwān al-naṣr*, which contains information on his contemporaries, consisted of extracts from the *al-Wāfī* with additional biographies (according to Prof. Little the *A^cyān* contains possibly twice as many contemporary biographies as *al-Wāfī*). The importance of *A^cyān* as an independent original source is thus clear and its publication a desideratum. "Indeed, given the lack of proof that the non-contemporary biographies in *al-Wāfī* contain any information not accessible in earlier sources, one might legitimately question the decision to publish *al-Wāfī* before and in preference to the work which is obviously of greater value as a source for the time in which al-Ṣafadī lived!"¹ The opinion given in the above quotation differs considerably from the prospectus with regard to *al-Wāfī*'s significance as a source. But this is of course to a large extent hindsight.

As *al-Wāfī* will be printed *in toto* in the near(?) future, it should be put to good use; its sheer hugeness makes it most useful for quantitative approaches. Professor J. van Ess' suggestion that it should be used as a starting-point for onomastic studies² is surely only one, even if a very interesting, approach.

The editing as well as printing of the tenth part are well and carefully done; printer's errors seem to add up to a few misplaced *nuqaṭ*.

Kaj Öhrnberg

Gottfried MÜLLER: Ich bin Labīd und das ist mein Ziel. Zum Problem der Selbstbehauptung in der altarabischen Qaside. (Berliner Islamstudien, Bd. 1.) Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1981, xv + 244 pp.

This book, a somewhat surprising starter for a new series intended to focus on the modern history of geographical Syria and North Africa, is a "leicht überarbeitete Niederschrift einer Dissertation" (1978) at the Free University of Berlin.

1 Ibid. p. 199.

2 J. van Ess, "Ṣafadī-Splitter. Teil II", *Der Islam* 54 (1977), p. 107.

Previous studies concerned with Arabic poetry have been, according to the author, conducted either in a "romantisch-philologischer" spirit (as by von Hammer-Purgstall and Rückert), or using the poetry mainly as historical documents (as by von Kremer, Goldziher and Nöldeke), or using an aesthetic and "literaturimmanente" approach (as by, for example, von Grunebaum and Renate Jacobi). The author "vertritt einmal den Standpunkt, daß große Leistungen der Geistesgeschichte vornehmlich aus der Auseinandersetzung mit der gesellschaftlichen Umwelt entstanden sind, und ist deshalb bemüht, die Qaside in ihrer literarischen Faktenhaftigkeit oder in ihrer scheinbar autonomen Wesenheit in den geschichtlichen Zusammenhang zurückzuholen und ereignishaft als Zeugnis einer geschichtlichen Situation nämlich des Beduinentums der Arabischen Halbinsel im letzten Jahrhundert vor dem Islam, vorzustellen und zu werten." Labīd ibn Rabīʿa's poetry, and especially his *muʿallaqa* as most representative of pre-Islamic poetry, forms the basis of this study together with Paul Tillich's thoughts.

The book consists of three parts, **Teil A:** Die Gesellschaft und der Dichter: Labīd ibn Rabīʿa und sein Stamm (pp. 1-20), **Teil B:** Die Enthüllung des Selbst im Sprechen und Handeln: Der Aufbau der Qaside (pp. 21-110), and **Teil C:** Die Brechung des ursprungsmythischen Bewußtseins: Die Deutung der Qaside (pp. 111-140). Apart from these there are the **Einleitung:** Abriß der Qasidenforschung (pp. xi-xv), **Exkurs A:** Zum Problem des integrativen Zusammenhangs periodisch stattfindender Märkte auf der Arabischen Halbinsel im Jahrhundert vor dem Islam (pp. 141-153), **Exkurs B:** Der Gegensatz zwischen *nafs* ("Seele") und *amr* ("Intentionalität") in der altarabischen Qaside + Arabic text of Labīd's *muʿallaqa* (pp. 154-156 + 157-162), copious **Anmerkungen** (pp. 163-235), some of which are more or less like excursuses, and a bibliography (pp. 237-244) with some disturbing omissions. The often original thoughts expressed in the notes could have been made more easily available to the reader by furnishing the book with an index. All in all, though written in cumbersome language, the study is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of pre-Islamic poetry and the society where it thrived in the century or so before the rise of Islam.

When an author gives his book a provocative and promising title like *Ich bin Labīd und das ist mein Ziel* (a reminder of another befitting formulation, that of Andras Hamori's chapter-heading "The Pre-Islamic *Qaṣīda*: The Poet as Hero" in his book *On the Art of Medieval Arabic Literature*) it should go without saying that the "hero", in this case Labīd, would get fair treatment. Unfortunately the author has dodged most of the issues in connection with

Labīd's life and chronology by accepting without criticism the information provided by Arab sources. It is not just a question of differing opinions when William R. Polk writes that "like all great figures of pre-Islamic literature, the poet Labid Ibn Rabiah emerges, blurred and distorted, from a shimmering mirage of legend and anecdote. Very little is in fact known of him — his very existence has been questioned — and that little is of almost no value in attempting to understand his poetry. It would little profit the reader to repeat the dubious and unhelpful stories recorded by later Muslim scholars", and when Müller (p. xiv) considers Labīd to be a poet "über dessen Leben wir verhältnismäßig gut Bescheid wissen". That so many of the pre-Islamic poets are depicted as centenarians (and indeed up to 120 and 150 years old) should awaken the critical instinct in a scholar, especially considering the harsh living conditions that have made "old age" in bedouin-society a more or less interpretable concept, at least until the first half of this century. The early Islamic scholars had their reasons for including Labīd among the *mukhaḍramūn*-poets.

One or two points of detail may be raised. Concerning the author's main thesis it should not be forgotten that the *qaṣīda* is a product of a long development; it cannot be considered as a result of the political and economic conditions in the Arabian peninsula at the end of the sixth century. Also the rise of Mecca to commercial predominance in the middle of the sixth century seems to have been a more enigmatic and complex process than **Exkurs A** suggests, especially when bearing in mind that the city most probably was not on the incense route from south Arabia to the shores of the Mediterranean.

The author would certainly have benefited from the following studies:

- R. W. Bulliet, *The Camel and the Wheel* (1975), for the domestication of the camel
- *The Golden Ode* by Labid Ibn Rabiah. Tr. with an introd. and comm. by W. R. Polk + photographs by W. J. Mares (1974), for a consistent view of Labīd and his *muḥallaqa*
- J. T. Monroe, "Oral composition in pre-Islamic poetry", *Journal of Arabic Literature* III (1972), pp. 1-53, for among other things the "Methuselaean" solution to the problem of major pre-Islamic poets not knowing Islam by attributing improbably long lives to them
- K. Abu-Deeb, "Towards structural analysis of pre-Islamic poetry", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 6 (1975), pp. 148-184, for another experiment using Labīd's *muḥallaqa* as a "key poem".

Then there are two more recent studies that could be consulted as supplementary to the book under review:

- M. M. Badawi, "From primary to secondary qaṣīdas", *Journal of Arabic Literature* XI (1980), pp. 1-31
- Renate Jacobi, "The camel-section of the panegyric ode", *Journal of Arabic Literature* XIII (1982), pp. 1-22.

Kaj Öhrnberg

Michael C. SHAPIRO & Harold F. SCHIFFMAN: *Language and Society in South Asia*. (MLBD Series in Linguistics 1.) Delhi 1981.

This book has been so very interesting to read that I cannot restrain myself from writing on it at some length, even though I am no sociolinguist myself. But perhaps the opinion of a philologist could help to make it known in a wider circle, because this is what the book deserves. Actually I think that it should be read by every scholar and student interested in some aspect of ancient or modern South Asian languages, literatures and culture(s). I doubt that it would be useless in any case. The book is simply crowded with interesting and useful examples and theoretical discussions, and everything is dealt with in what seems to me to be a competent and critical way. After the introduction and two chapters summarizing in a condensed but informative way the theoretical background of linguistic and especially sociolinguistic research on South Asian languages and the traditional taxonomies of South Asian languages, the authors proceed to their main plan. In chapters 4-8 they give a critical discussion of the most important sociolinguistic studies on South Asian languages and various linguistic phenomena. The headings are "South Asia as a Linguistic Area", "Social Dialectology" (on caste dialects etc.), "Bi- and Multilingualism in South Asia", "Pidginization, Creolization, and South Asian English", and "Ethnographic Semantics and the Ethnography of Speaking" (on kinship terminology, terms of address, etc.). Most of the studies referred to deal with the modern linguistic situation but there is also discussion of the adaptation of sociolinguistical methods to comparative and historical linguistics. Very interesting to a Sanskrit scholar are e.g. the section on the history and genesis of the South Asian linguistic area (pp. 141-148) and the whole chapter on social dialectology. Such notions as linguistic convergence, bilingualism, pidginization and creolization could be very useful also in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan studies.

The greatest drawback of the book lies in the fact that there is as yet so very little work done on sociolinguistics and linguistics in general from the South Asian point of view. The authors point out many areas where further

(and in many cases pioneering) study would be very profitable, both for our knowledge of the South Asian linguistic situation and sociolinguistic theory. Still I would like to make some remarks that I think could be interesting in this connection, without bothering to list the relatively few misprints and errors (although the list of only three errata given at the end is by no means complete).

There are many discussions on the history of South Asian linguistics in the book and I am afraid that the authors are sometimes a little lacking in historical perspective. It is always easy to tell how imperfect old studies were in comparison with those of our own time. But a more valid comparison would be with even older studies. Thus it has recently become fashionable to speak with contempt of the neogrammarian school. One should read a little pre-neogrammarian comparative philology (e.g. A. F. Pott, Th. Benfey or A. Kuhn) and notice their very unmethodical etymology. The neogrammarians with their strict methods are then seen in a different light, even if they are now quite antiquated. Another fashionable culprit is the *Stammbaum* diagram. Of course the stammbaums very often contain a lingering bias on genetic relations, but actually the relations thus visualized need not necessarily be genetic. I think the authors have overlooked the fact that a stammbaum is the only handy way to visualize diachronic relations between languages. They even inadvertently give two examples of modernized stammbaums. One is by Zvelebil (fig. 36) and gives non-genetic relations with broken lines. The other, also on South Dravidian, is a really interesting diagram by Emeneau (fig. 35). The traditional direction of representation is discarded here and the diachronic (genetic) relations are shown in a centrifugal, the synchronic in a circular direction. But it is still a kind of stammbaum.

The recent overflow of reprints has given rise to the irritating habit of quoting old sources only with the year of a reprint. This can be very misleading, as in the extreme example of a modern scholar who reproached Horace Hayman Wilson (1786-1860) for not noticing the existence of the Harappan civilization! So it is a pleasure to notice that our authors always try to give the year of first publication in their bibliography.

Still indispensable in many respects in South Asian linguistics is the foundation laid by George Abraham Grierson (1851-1941). The work of this great Irish scholar is duly noticed by our authors in many places, but there is still much more to say on him. As to his predilection for Bihari, noted without explanation by the authors, I think it could simply arise from the fact

that he lived his first 25 years in India in Bihar and made his first studies on Bihari ethnography and linguistics. We must also note that in his *magnum opus* he was very keen on the kind of facts nowadays studied by sociolinguists. A mere reading of his introductions and analyses can give interesting notions of neglected areas of study. If the selection of studies presented by the authors is in any measure representative there seems to be much virgin soil, e.g. in Bengali. After having read some examples given by Grierson one cannot but wonder that there is so little on Bengali in the chapters on social dialectology (only one study by Dimock, p. 168f.) and bilingualism. On pages 172 and 174f. the authors notice two South Asian cases of women's languages (in Telugu and Toda), but according to Grierson Bengali would be a very instructive case. Another neglected field seems to be the North-East where — according to Grierson — one could probably find interesting cases of bi- and multilingualism, as well as something that seems to have been totally neglected, partly overlapping systems of bilingualism between several different languages. Let us hope that change in that area has not been too radical since the days of the compilation of the *Linguistic Survey of India*.

The taxonomic survey in chapter 3 is so instructive and so full that one is tempted to ask for still more. The omission of the Divehi (Maldivian) language is common to most writers, now it is at least noted in figures 28 and 29A. (Actually I think that we should always include the Maldives in South Asia where they at least linguistically and historically belong.) On p. 83 is given the traditional (Griersonian) division of Pahari into East, West and Central division, but perhaps there should also be some notice of the Himachali studies of H. Hendriksen, who denies any genetic relation between these divisions. In vain one awaits even a mention of the problem of the Nahali. A reference to the studies of Kuiper and others would have been helpful. The supposed connections between the Munda and the Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas are not mentioned.

On page 98 the authors refer to new ideas on the Dravidian taxonomy proposed by Krishnamurti in a review in 1976. Actually the same scholar has later presented his opinion in another context which has escaped the attention of the authors, either because it is too recent or because it is written in Telugu (*History of the Telugu Language / Telugu bhāṣā caritra*, Hyderabad 1979).

When reviewing Pandit's studies on the Saurāṣṭrī the authors state that the language is rarely written because the Tamil alphabet is very inadequate for

an Indo-Aryan language (p. 191). But it seems that Saurāṣṭrī has been written down at least in the beginning of this century both in Telugu and Devanāgarī characters. There was even a Saurāshtra Literary Society in Madras (see H. N. Randle's papers in *BSOAS* 11, 1943 and in *JRAS* 1944).

In chapter 7 the authors refer to the Indo-Portuguese studies of S. R. Dalgado (p. 205). They suppose that the use of non-italics among the italics (or vice versa) as a sign of retroflexion, as well as the terms Gaurian for Indo-Aryan and Turanian for Dravidian are in some way peculiar to Dalgado or to the Portuguese in general. In fact these features are all derived from Max Müller and (Gaurian) Hoernle, and were really rather commonly used in Europe a hundred years ago and a little later. One of the most important studies of Dalgado, the *Glossário Luso-asiático* (1-2, Coimbra 1919-1921) is left unnoticed.

When dealing with the Vedda Creole the authors rely solely on a study by K. N. O. Dharmadasa. M. W. Sugathapala De Silva is mentioned, but his important *Vedda Language of Ceylon* (München 1972) is not used. Why? It is published in as well-known a series as *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* (Beiheft 7). One interesting field of further study could be the other kind of Vedda Creole mentioned by Sugathapala De Silva with Tamil in the place of Sinhala.

Let us hope that there will some day be a second, revised edition covering these and other omissions and discussing the more recent studies already published after finishing the work for this edition (that seems to be ca. 1979). Motilal Banarsidass also deserves our thanks for the quality of printing, which is really excellent by Indian standards.

Klaus Karttunen

Prakash Charan PRASAD: *Foreign Trade and Commerce in Ancient India*. Delhi 1977.

MOTI CHANDRA: *Trade and Trade Routes in Ancient India*. Delhi 1977.

Here we have two studies on the same topic. That of Prasad is a new one, that of Moti Chandra was published in Hindī (with the title *Sārthavāha*) as early as 1953, and has been revised for the English edition by the author just before his much regretted death (1974). The prize still goes to the older study, written by a well-known and competent scholar. Prasad's book is a new example of nationalistic fantasies applied to history. There is no need to speak much of such ideas as the derivation of the Phoenicians from the Vedic *paṇis*,

Baal from *vala*, Sumer from *śambhara* (the author writes Sambhar), Assyria from *asura* or Chaldaea from *coladeśa*. Much of this kind has been published earlier, and the author believes that a Harappan origin for the whole Mesopotamian culture is completely proved. When he is dealing with purely Indian matters, his ideas may be interesting, but the greater part of his book is wholly worthless to a serious student. As it seems that the author is not totally incapable of serious research we must regret that he has not had the necessary critical attitude needed in historical studies.

The study of Moti Chandra was inspiring reading, especially after Prasad's book. Here everything is stated as it is, e.g. we meet the *paṇis* in their due place and read that there is no reason to think of the Phoenicians in connection with them. The main idea of the book is "to reconstruct the route systems of ancient India" and give light on traders and trade articles. This is done in chronological order, beginning from protohistoric and Vedic periods and advancing up to the 11th century A.D. The emphasis is duly laid on India, but foreign trade also gets some treatment. Everything is presented competently, there is no need to tackle the few errors inevitably met in a study like this. Moti Chandra's book is a good example of what a study should be, Prasad's of the kind that should never be written.

Klaus Karttunen

W. KIRFEL: Kleine Schriften. Hrsg. von R. Birwé. (Glasenapp-Stiftung, 11.) Wiesbaden 1976.

The chair of Sanskrit at the University of Bonn has been connected with some of the great names of Indology. It was held successively by August Wilhelm von Schlegel 1818-40, Christian Lassen 1840-76, Theodor Aufrecht 1876-89 and Hermann Jacobi 1889-1922. In the years 1922-53 the chair was occupied by Willibald Kirfel (1885-1964) who was no unworthy successor to his predecessors. Already in his early years as a scholar he won lasting renown with his *Die Kosmographie der Inder* (Bonn 1920) and his later Purāṇic studies¹ gave a solid foundation to all successive studies. Kirfel's *Kleine Schriften*, published now as well as the bibliography added to the beginning, show him as a scholar of many interests. The headings of the bibliography vary from liter-

¹ Beginning from *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa. Versuch einer Textgeschichte*. Bonn 1927.

ary history (6 items, all published here), history and cultural history (22 items, 11 publ. here) and the history of religion (3, 1 publ.) to the history of medicine (5, 4 publ.). Under the heading "Allgemeines" (11, 5 publ.) most papers deal with the history of Sanskrit studies (as do the 14 obituary notices and biographical notices listed but not published here), e.g. the interesting "Die Anfänge des Sanskrit-Druckes in Europa" on a much neglected subject.¹ The bibliography concludes with reviews (59 items), "Verschiedenes" (9) and "Herausgegebene und mitherausgegebene Publikationen" (11) of which nothing is re-published now. It seems to be rather comprehensive, and I can add only one short biographical notice, that on Peter von Bradke published in *Neue deutsche Biographie* 2 (1955), p. 505f.

The whole is a convincing sample of the many-sided interests and knowledge of the great Purāṇic scholar. Of course there are parts that are antiquated or that even in their time were rather superficial accounts written for a larger public. Sometimes a careful reader can even find clear faults.² But this is unavoidable in a collection like this written over fifty years³ and by a scholar willing to give a report of his studies beyond the limited circle of specialists. Yet the bulk of Kirfel's writings is still interesting and inspiring reading. Our scholar is at his best when giving Purāṇic light on some special topic such as the young Kṛṣṇa, birth of Budha (Mercury), the cult of stones or embryology. The long paper on the early history of property in ancient India shows him well versed in early dharma literature, and we must not forget the iconographical and symbolic studies of his older days. His reflections on the western contacts of ancient India and the short surveys on the history of Indology are perhaps less useful as studies but nevertheless interesting reading. The whole concludes with 15 pages of additions and corrections to *Die Kosmographie der Inder* collected from the author's own reference copy of the book by the editor.

We must express our great gratitude to the Glasenapp-Stiftung for publishing this as well as the whole of the important series, already much increased af-

1 Who would give us a comprehensive study on e.g. the Roman undertakings of the 18th century mentioned by Kirfel in the beginning of his paper?

2 I cannot restrain from noticing one curious misprint naturally due to the original version. On p. 315, note 27, we read "Atharva-Veda-Saṃhitā transl. by W. D. Larman...".

3 Of the total of 28 papers, ten are published between 1915-1944 and eighteen between 1945-1966.

ter the volume reviewed here. I confess that I have personally found it rather exciting to wait for what (or who) will be the next choice.

Klaus Karttunen

Helmut NESPITAL: Das Futursystem im Hindi und Urdu. Ein Beitrag zur semantischen Analyse der Kategorien Tempus, Aspekt und Modus und ihrer Grammeme. (Schriftenreihe der Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 29.) Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1981. xviii + 340 pp.

This monograph, which is a revised and enlarged version of the author's *Habilitationsschrift* ("Dissertation B", Humboldt-Universität, 1977), is doubtless one of the most significant recent contributions in the field of New Indo-Aryan linguistics. Nespital's work represents the first really exhaustive and methodologically up-to-date structural treatment of any class of tense(-aspect) forms in a modern Indo-Aryan language. Though specifically concerned with the system of the future tense and its exponents, Nespital also provides an explicit general linguistic framework for the detailed analysis of the complex categories or systems tense, aspect and mood (+ modality) in Hindi and Urdu (which are treated as one language at this level). The theoretical discussion and actual descriptions are furthermore deepened by penetrating comparisons with other Indo-Aryan and Indo-European languages, esp. Slavonic and German.

The method of descriptive analysis adopted by Nespital is compositional and basically contrastive-structural, with an explicit distinction between *langue* and *parole*. The central concept in the theoretical analysis is the grammeme, which is defined on the level of *langue* as a categorial subsystem consisting of morphologically marked grammatical formal classes, each possessing a specific complex semantic potential or complete system of inventories of semes, i.e. minimal meaningful (potentially) contrastive/distinctive features. Hence, a temporal grammeme, for example, can be analyzed in terms of the three complete inventories of its variously marked temporal-actional, aspectual and modal semes. In these semic inventories, containing dozens of semes along different parameters, each seme has for each grammeme its own specific and partly contextually-formally conditioned markedness value (i.e. positively *vs.* negatively marked, almost positively marked, neutral, limited, conditioned by form and context, conditioned by neutralization in a certain context). This contributes to the multiple polysemy and complex contrastive potential of all grammemes belonging to the same general system. — What is especially impres-

sive is that the author so well succeeds in accounting for the numerous actual specific temporal, aspectual and modal meanings (*sememes*) of the future grammemes as represented on the level of *parole* by actual lexical items (with specific inherent form-bound features), in actual morpho-syntactic and stylistic contexts, in actual communicative situations.

Something of the intricacy of the total system of oppositions involved can be appreciated when we consider that what with Vincenc Pořízka's discovery of perfective *vs.* imperfective aspect as a grammatical categorial opposition in the New Indo-Aryan languages in general, the number of different indicative tense-aspect grammemes recognized by Nespital in Hindi and Urdu amounts to no less than 39. Of these 12 are positively marked for future time reference, contrasting along a number of other temporal-actional, aspectual and modal parameters (e.g. as to the relation between point of event and temporal reference point, temporal dimensions of the point of event, actuality of event, progressivity, completion, localizability, iteration; "wholeness", totality, actional limitations; reality, probability, potentiality, optativeness, volition, cohortation, etc. etc.). In addition there are a number of syntactic formations that often tend to refer to the future, while non-indicative modal grammemes may also for example implicitly have future time reference, as briefly discussed by Nespital.

It is true that what used to be called "intensive verb forms", based on so-called "intensive or modifying auxiliaries" (e.g. *jānā* 'to go', *denā* 'to give', *lenā* 'to take', *paṛnā* 'to fall', *uṭhnā* 'to rise', etc.), added to the zero absolutive form of the verb, should now rather be viewed as differently nuanced exponents of the perfective aspect. As also known from e.g. Slavonic linguistics, perfective forms typically represent the verbal process as an undivided, complete or complex whole with emphasis on realization, resultativeness or "factuality" *vs.* an actionally open, unlimited or unbound situation with emphasis on attendant or qualifying components of the event. (Compare also the concept of "boundness" recently introduced in Finnish linguistics by Pentti Leino, and defined in terms of compatibility with a limiting object or limiting measure phrase of duration or distance, etc. Cf. **Hän luki kirjan kaksi päivää* = **vah kitāb do dīn (tak) paṛh gayā.*) Now, since the temporal-actional features or semes must be compatible with the aspectual and modal features in the specific grammemes, it would no longer seem legitimate to speak quite generally of tenses like the Future I *vs.* Future II *vs.* Future III etc. Sooner or later one has to specify whether the grammeme is perfective or

imperfective. For example, as Nespital points out, there can be no Actual Future tense ("present in future") of a modified verbal expression (= "perfective verb"), since e.g. 'actuality of event' or 'implicit duration of the point of event' are features that are incompatible with the implications of perfective aspect.

Perhaps a more disputable case is the status of the so-called habitual tense-aspect grammemes. In a way, they would seem to be just subclasses of the category of *Aktionsarten*, i.e. secondary aspectual classes of actional dimension, like e.g. the durative-iterative and frequentative forms, with which they do not seem to combine freely: ? *vah ātā hotā rahtā hai/rahegā*, *vah ātā hotā huā kartā hai/karegā*, etc. Nespital regards the five future habitual grammemes as primary tense-aspect grammemes, but neither the discussion nor the actual descriptions appear to be as thorough as they could be.

Of special interest is the so-called presumptive modal value of many future grammemes or specific lexemes. Nespital argues that even when the sense of presumptivity is a basic modal meaning of some forms, this is never a primary function of these future grammemes, as has been rather commonly assumed for long. But it must then be noted that in any case the context alone will finally decide whether a marked presumptive reading is intended or not. In a "minimal context", an expression like *vah āyā hogā* (Fut. III of an imperf. verb) would certainly not be interpreted as meaning primarily 'He will have come (by a certain time)', rather than 'He must have come'. The problem is to "explain" the synchronic and diachronic relations between the marked presumptive and non-presumptive value of these future grammemes or forms. Now, Nespital thinks that the marked presumptive sense derives secondarily by way of contextually conditioned transposition of a future grammeme to refer to the present. With the neutralization of the feature 'future' (= time of event after time of speech), all potentially available modal semes become invalid except that of 'presumption' or 'inference', which belongs to the highly polysemic modal potential of all future grammemes anyhow. On the other hand, it seems that when the said future forms in Hindi and Urdu are transposed to express an event overlapping with the point of speech, this happens for the sole purpose of expressing a mere presumption or inference. Hence a step-by-step derivation of the markedly presumptive modality is not a psychologically perspicuous explanation, and one may even ask which is the cause and which is the result. Ultimately one could just as well accept that the said marked presumptive sense is another basic inherited function of all future grammemes

or forms containing the Fut. I of the auxiliary *honā*, i.e. *hogā* (cf. Skt. *bhaviṣyati*), which by itself means either "will be" or "will (now) according to my inference be". If analogy works, it should make no difference whether *hogā* is copulative or non-copulative. The marked presumptive sense of *socnā* and *samañhnā* in some contexts can be explained without presupposing temporal transposition. The problem remains open, however.

Nespital concentrates on semantics, studying specific constituent meanings of the future forms first in isolation, then in conjunction, but in a final chapter about the syntactic use of the future grammemes he relates the level of semantics to the level of syntax. — For all its exemplary method and meticulous scholarship, Nespital's work is not, however, very easy to use for quick and handy reference. Different (sub)sections of the text are far too often joined together almost seamlessly without properly marked subheadings. All the numerous specific temporal, aspectual and modal meanings (sememes) are simply termed "Bedeutung (1-)", independently of the level of analysis/synthesis, while exemplification often appear too late in the discussion. Because of the categorial dismissal of larger emic classes like the Fut. I vs. Fut. II, etc., the description becomes at times inadvertently repetitive. Finally, in view of the somewhat lacking general good command of German among linguists and students in the field of New Indo-Aryan languages, it is, of course, to be hoped that an English translation of this important book — preferably with the above technical/typographical improvements — will soon emerge.

Bertil Tikkanen

Ichisada MIYAZAKI: China's examination hell. The civil service examinations of Imperial China. Translated from the Japanese by Conrad Schirokauer. Yale University Press, New Haven & London 1981 (paperbound edition; first English edition published in 1976). 144 pp.

This short but very informative book was originally published in Japanese in 1963. The present translation — and an excellent one — renders the whole book with a useful introduction by the translator Prof. Conrad Schirokauer, who has also provided an appendix giving suggestions for further reading. A glossary-index is added to enhance the usefulness of the book.

Prof. Ichisada Miyazaki, who is professor emeritus of Oriental history at Kyoto University, has written his book for a general audience as an intro-

duction for the non-specialist to this labyrinthine examination system which supplied imperial China with its bureaucrats for the past thousand years. It is not a history of the examination system, with its beginnings in the short-lived Sui dynasty (581-618) — albeit its prehistory can be traced to the Han dynasty (206 B.C. - 220 A.D.) — ; its high point, also for Miyazaki, in the Sung period (960-1279), when the literati-bureaucrats replaced the hereditary aristocracy in government; but it is an analysis of the ways the system functioned in its final phase, when it had reached its most complex form under the Ch'ing dynasty (1644-1911) until it was abolished in 1905.

In the ten chapters of the book, Prof. Miyazaki traces "the ladder of success" from the district examination up to the palace examination with a general evaluation of the examination system. It was a happy decision to draw upon material from the learned Ch'ing novelists — mainly from Wu Ching-tzu's *Ju-lin wai-shih* ("The Scholars") — to enliven the narrative.

Some doubtful and sweeping generalizations might have been withheld. Even if the examination system concentrated on the Chinese classics it is not possible (at least not after Joseph Needham's stupendous volumes *Science and civilisation in China*) to maintain that "mathematics could be left to merchants, while science and technology were relegated to the working class". In fact, K. A. Wittfogel had already demonstrated in his *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Chinas* (1931) that studies in astronomy and mathematics were encouraged because they aided the agro-hydraulic policies of the rulers.

As Prof. Miyazaki cites in his evaluation of the examination system a gloomy story by Lu Hsün depicting a victim of the examination system as it was abolished, it might be an idea to conclude this appreciatory review of an informative and entertaining book with a more positive depiction. John Blofeld in his most charming book of reminiscences *City of lingering splendour* (of which a reprint is urgently needed) described the literati he met in Peking in the 1930s in the following manner: "If my knowledge of literary Chinese had been deeper, I should have loved to sit at the feet of those elderly scholars who, after receiving a purely classical Chinese education, had passed high in the public examinations which in those days had formed the gateway to rank, riches and honour. I admired these old gentlemen with their unflinching courtesy, impressive manners, marvellously graceful gestures, deep learning and keen sense of humour — I admired them perhaps more than any class of human beings encountered before or since those days." Be it as it may, and there are usually two sides to a coin, the book is most welcome.

Kaj Öhrnberg