

be overestimated. „Kāveh“ in a high degree helps the uninitiated persons to understand better the Iranian culture and its role in the present world. We realize how true were Goethe's words:

*Wer den Dichter will verstehen,
Muss in Dichters Lande gehen.*

We wish the editor staff of „Kāveh“ further success in their work.

Olov Bertil Anderson, *A Concordance to Five Systems of Transcription for Standard Chinese*, Studentlitteratur, Lund 1970, 228 pp.

Different kinds of concordances to transcriptions of Standard Chinese are published with rather increasing a frequency; not to speak of the older ones (like the one included in Mr. P. Demiéville's work published in 1953¹ or that included in Mr. I. N. Galtsev's book of 1962)², it would certainly be sufficient to mention only the concordance compiled by Mr. A. Rygaloff³ (comparing the eight following systems of transcription: Pinyin, Gwoyeu Romatzyh, English, French, German, Russian and Chinese Phonetic Symbols) or the two of the recently published by Mr. G. P. Serdyutchenko⁴ (comparing the following seven systems: Russian, Pinyin, English, French, German, Chinese Phonetic Symbols and the I. P. A.) and by Mr. S. A. Matsaev and Mr. V. G. Orlov⁵ (comparing the following five systems: English, Russian, French, German and Pinyin). All these concordances are published to make the student's work easier.

Mr. Olov Bertil Anderson's book lies strictly in the same line: it was also prepared to give the student a possibility of easy applying various systems of transcriptions which are so numerous and incoherent at the same time.

The first version of the reviewed book was published in 1966 with explanations in Swedish and contained only the four following systems of transcription: Wade, Simplified Wade, Gwoyeu Romatzyh and Pinyin. In the present English version the Yale transcription is added. A short Preface (p. 5—6) explains the aims and the arrangement of the concordance. A review of The Characteristic Traits of the Wade Transcription (p. 7—8) precedes Part 1 (pp. 9—53) where all the syllables of Modern Standard Chinese are arranged according to the alphabetical order of the Wade transcription with correspondences in other four systems. The explanations concerning The Simplified Wade Transcription (p. 54—56) precede Part 2 (pp. 57—101), where syllables are arranged according the Simplified Wade system. The Characteristics

¹ *Matériaux pour l'enseignement élémentaire du chinois*, Adrien Maisonneuve, Paris 1953.

² *Введение в изучение кутайского чзыка*, Moskov 1962.

³ *Tables de concordance pour l'alphabet phonétique chinois*, Mouton et &, La Haye — Paris 1967.

⁴ *Русская транскрипция для языков зарубежного востока*, Nauka, Moscow 1967.

⁵ *Пособие по транскрипции и правописанию китайских слов*, Nauka, Moscow 1968.

of the Romatzyh Transcription (pp. 102—103) precede Part 3 (pp. 104—135) with syllables in the Romatzyh system. The principles of The Pinyin Transcription (pp. 136—7) precede Part 4 (pp. 138—182) which gives syllables in the Pinyin transcription. The Characteristic of the Yale Transcription (pp. 183—4) precede Part 5 (pp. 185—228) with syllables arranged according to the latter system. In all the parts the correspondences are given in the other four systems.

Mr. O. B. Anderson, who had been teaching Chinese for twenty years now, is the Author of the Simplified Wade system of transcription the essential point of which is the fact that no diacritic signs are used. His system is in a way a compromise between the Wade transcription, which the Author considers inconvenient because of its diacritic signs, and the Gwoyeu Romatzyh system, which is too much irregular, though not containing any diacritic sign. The Simplified Wade system is based on the Wade transcription, but like in Gwoyeu Romatzyh the tones are marked by additional letters (tone 1 having no mark, other three tones are marked respectively by the letters -v, -x and -z at the end of a syllable). Thus, the space above the vowels can be used for marking the stress. In the Simplified Wade system „the aspiration is always marked by h, even after ch“ (p. 55). Other important traits of this system are: 1. Wade's circumflex over e is left out; 2. the apical vowels are always written with y instead of Wade's -ih or -u; 3. Wade's final -h is left out; 4. voiced initial sh is rendered by r- (like in Gwoyeu Romatzyh and in Pinyin). It is allowed to apply the letter -ü, which may be used („if you can use“, according to the Author, p. 55), or replaced by yu (with Wade's yu written at the same time as you) or simply by -u-, after the initial hs- which is preserved.

There is no doubt that the Simplified Wade system of transcription has many advantages in comparison with the many other systems, for it is certainly a very convenient, simple and as rigid as possible one according to the Author's ends. It is only the -ü question which might have been solved without introducing too much optional choice.

It is obviously quite another question whether the problem of transcription of the Standard Chinese may really be solved by multiplying systems instead of admitting an existing one which — better or worse — would be the only system used on a common basis. I am afraid, in the present state of affairs, we are not only very far from a general solution of this annoying question, but also we are approaching rapidly the creation of quite an esoteric branch of sinology: the specialisation in transcriptional systems. Yet, the creation of such a new branch of sinologic studies would obviously be unadvisable, since it would no doubt cause an increasing wave of new systems of transcription of Standard Chinese.

Mieczysław J. Künstler

Robert Hetzron, *The Verbal System of Southern Agaw*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969, pp. X + 123, University of California Publications — Near Eastern Studies 12.

Agaw languages which are classified as a Central subgrouping within the Cushitic group of Hamito-Semitic are now in a process of extinction. They consist of several small islands with a population which is already bilingual in its majority and shifts rapidly to Amharic or to Tigrinya. These islands have been isolated for a considerable span of time and the different units of Agaw are mutually unintelligible. The present dissertation deals with the languages of the southernmost island of Agaw, situated in the provinces of Agawmädär and of Mä-täkkäl. This language is spoken by at least 50 000 persons and it has usually been referred to as „Awiya“ but Hetzron explains that this term is inadequate since“ (a) awiya means „Agaw man“, lit. „son of Agaw“... derived from the generic term awi „Agaw“. The name of the language is awñi with the derivative -ñi used for languages“ (p. 2). There are minor dialectal differences between the two provinces, which do not affect mutual understanding. The present study is based on the idiolect of an informant from a village in Agawmädär province and also on supplementary material gathered by the author in the same village from other informants.

Though Agaw languages have been considered since a long time by the Ethiopists as the main substratum of Amharic and Tigrinya (this hypothesis based to a large extent on tradition seems to be questioned recently and it must be admitted that it was not based on a sufficient knowledge of Agaw and a study of interference) and thus described as very important from the scientific point of view, nevertheless little has been done to record and analyse them. This is even more surprising if we take into consideration the fact that linguistic materials on Agaw (word lists and some texts) were collected already in the 18th century by James Bruce. As far as Southern Agaw is concerned, we had, apart from the materials gathered by Bruce and C. T. Beke, only a lengthy article by C. Conti Rossini (GSAI, 18, 1905, 103—194) which „despite ... all mistakes, and inaccurate transcription, ... remains an important work in this neglected field“ (p. 3) and the valuable article by F. R. Palmer which also dealt with „The Verb Classes of Agaw (Awiya)“ (MIO, 7, 1959, 270—297). One of the merits of Palmer's analysis was the discovery of the structurally relevant tone in this language. As Hetzron himself states (p. 3), Palmer's results have been extensively used throughout his study, although his classification of verb does not follow the same criteria. The treatment of „tense“ and „aspect“ differs rather substantially (cf. MIO, 7, 1959, p. 275). Hetzron's study is thus a genuine contribution and a continuation of the study of verbal system of Southern Agaw. It must be welcomed since it provides a considerable amount of new data being

based on a much longer experience with the language (Palmer, *op. cit.* p. 270, n. 1, says: „The time available for investigation was severely limited and there was no opportunity for comparing the informant's speech with that of other speakers“) and it presents a very detailed and scrupulous analysis which greatly enriches our knowledge of Agaw.

The Introduction (pp. 1—9) contains information on the circumstances of the research, remarks on the position of Southern Agaw, a review of the older studies of this language, a concise but very clear presentation of the phonemic system with the special attention paid to suprasegmentals and the discussion of some morphophonemic rules. Part I is entitled „The Verbal Forms“ (pp. 11—34) and it deals with the morphological structure and syntactic behavior of the verb. The Agaw verbal system is indeed extremely rich in forms and it is very interesting. The author presents paradigms with the discussion of the meaning of different grammatical categories involved in the verbal system and with examples (shorter and longer ones) of the functioning of different forms. Part II is entitled „The Verb Classes“ (pp. 35—70) and it presents different types of stems and stem allomorphs as well as the combinations of stem with inflectional and with derivative suffixes. This is the most important part of the book since the system presents complex interrelation of morphological variation involving both segmentals and suprasegmentals. How interesting the system is, may be well illustrated by an example of maximum verbal complex: „desəŋəónáyənəy anašnúyà we had been accustoming (him) for you“, composed of des (stem „to study“ + ŋ-c (Reciprocal-Causative Derivative) + na (Compound Pl. 1) + yc (Intention „for you“ sg. or pl.) + na (Compound Pl. 1) + ya (Anteriority) + na (Compound Pl. 1) + š (Durative) + núyà (Perfect Definite Pl. 1). The subject (Pl. 1) is expressed in this complex four times, after every added element. Tense is expressed once by the last element; the form of the preceding elements is conditioned by the subsequent ones“ (p. 35). Part III contains „Historical Notes“ (pp. 71—74) which are of interest to all specialists on Cushitic languages and Ethiopists. It is remarkable that the author uses the method of internal reconstruction — this is also almost a pioneer attempt (though implicitly or quite unconsciously this method was applied by some older comparativists) in an extremely neglected field of comparative Cushitic studies. These notes pertain mainly to some verbal suffixes and to the history of the phonemic system of Agaw. Part IV contains an illustrative text with translation and with the vocabulary which lists verbal forms with the explanation of their morphological structure and syntax (pp. 75—90). Appendixes contain the presentation of deverbal nouns (pp. 91—92), a table and a lengthy explanation of compatibilities of different groups and types (pp. 93—95) and a list of nearly 550 verbs arranged in the form of Agaw-English (pp. 95—106) and English-Agaw (pp. 106—117) voca-

bularies. This is the first modern vocabulary of Southern Agaw which will be of interest for comparative studies but Palmer's list contains some items not included here. The book is closed with tables presenting samples of conjugation (pp. 118—121) and bibliography (p. 123).

There is no doubt that Hetzron's study is a genuine and valuable contribution. There may be alternative interpretations of some parts of morphology depending on the method but I dare criticizing only one minor point — it is a pity that there is no vocabulary of non-verbal lexemes. This with some notes on the rest of the system would facilitate the use of the illustrative text and of the longer examples. We may only hope that the author will have a chance to continue his research and then we may expect equally important achievements.

Andrzej Zaborski

Herrmann Jungraithmayr, *Die Ron-Sprachen — tschadohamitische Studien in Nordnigerien*, Verlag J. J. Augustin, Glückstadt 1970, pp. XVIII + 429, Afrikanistische Forschungen III.

The book under review contains descriptions of five Chadic (the author calls them Chado-Hamitic) languages which have been unknown so far. These are Fyer, Bokkos, Daffo-Butura, Scha (Sya) and Kulere which are spoken by small groups inhabiting the southwestern border of Jos-Plateau in Northern Nigeria. The administrative center is in Pankshin. The name Ron which had been used rather vaguely by some earlier writers (e.g. Migeod, Meek, Gunn and Greenberg) is common only among Kulere in the form Run and the Bokkos are also called Ron by the neighbouring Sura. The author follows the opinion that the name Baron quoted as an equivalent for Ron by some authors may come from a class language which has been spoken by a population inhabiting this territory before the coming of the peoples of Hamito-Semitic origin. Hausa and some other neighbouring peoples (e.g. Angas) use the name Chala (from calà „greeting“, Hausa šanú). This study is a good example of linguistic salvage activity. In a not very far future these languages may become extinct as the number of speakers is very small (Fyer — 1500) and more and more the people shift to Hausa or to English.

In the Foreword (pp. V—VII) the author presents the history of his work on Ron languages and lists his acknowledgements. The Introduction (pp. 1—7) brings the explanation of the name „Ron“,

notes on geographical conditions and on the history of the peoples inhabiting the territory under consideration, a short review of the history of the classification of the respective languages and of their closest „relatives“, a general characteristics of the work and an inner classification of Ron Languages. This classification which is based on both geographical and linguistic divisions comprises the following groupes: Northern i.e. Fyer with Tambas dialect, Central i.e. Bokkos and Daffo-Butura, and Southern i.e. Scha and Kulere. In the latest classification by C. Hoffmann (Provisional Check List of Chadic Languages, Chadic Newsletter, January 1971, p. 3) Karfa and Nafunfia are added. There are maps indicating the position of „Chado-Hamitic“ languages of Northern Nigeria and of the villages on the Ron area (pp. 8—11). Part I of the book consists of five subdivisions dealing with Fyer (Fyèr) for which the most detailed information has been available (pp. 15—96), Bokos (pp. 97—154), Daffo and Butura which differ only in a few minor points (pp. 155—230), Scha (pp. 231—294), and Kulere (pp. 295—360). Within each division there is a short introduction with information on linguistic geography, the speakers of the language, dialect (if any) differences and the informants. Next follows an account of the morphology of the respective language in which a special attention is paid to nominal root and nominal derivation, gender, noun plural, genitive, pronouns, numerals, verbal root, verb classes and tense-aspect system. There are also some short illustrative texts and sentences as well as Ron-German and German-Ron (separate for each language) vocabularies. The author concentrated his research on the morphology and there is a special treatment of phonology only for Fyer. Throughout the book the tones which play an important part on both lexical and grammatical level are treated very carefully. Most of the phenomena are illustrated with a considerable number of examples so that we have not only samples but an ample source of data. Part II (pp. 363—408) presents an attempt at a comparative study of Ron languages. First we have a synopsis of the morphology, and next there is a comparative lexicon. In the latter the author compares 170 lexemes which have been specially chosen for comparative purposes on the basis of his own experience (and not e.g. on Swadesh). At first they are all put together in tables and then every semantic group (e.g. numerals, parts of the body, kinship terminology etc.) is analysed separately, i.e. there are tables indicating the cognates and sound correspondences. Part III (pp. 411—429) is devoted to the discussion of the position of Ron within the „Chado-Hamitic“ group. The main morphological traits and some lexemes of Ron are compared with data on most of the better known Chadic languages (Hausa, Sura, Angas, Jegu, Margi, Logone, Kotoko, Musgu, Mubi, Sokoro, Somrai). The results show that these languages are not very distantly interrelated. On the position of Ron, the author

says: „Somit stellen sich uns die Ron Sprachen als ein vielschichtiger sudanhamitosemitischer Sprachtypus dar, der durch den betonten Rückzugscharakter seiner Umgebung im äussersten Südwesten des hamito-semitischen Sprachraumes sprachgeschichtliche Alt- und Frühformen bewahrt hat“ (p. 429). In conclusion the author expresses the opinion that the classification into Chado-Hamitic and Chadic (adopted e.g. in Handbook of African Languages) should be rechecked bringing perhaps Ron into Chado-Hamitic and Angas into Chadic. He also repeats the warning against taking Hausa as a representative of Chado-Hamitic as a whole — this mistake is still committed by specialists from other branches of Hamito-Semitic. Only if all „Chado-Hamitic“ languages are taken together, we shall have an idea of what has become with Hamito-Semitic in the Central Sudan.

The author who is the leading authority on Chadic has given us a very valuable source of data on unknown languages which are very important not only for Chadic but for the Hamito-Semitic family as a whole. Only quite minor points may be subject of some controversy. E.g. I should not perhaps care about calculating the percentage of different words or morphemes and presenting numeric proportions. If we take into account the fact that these percentages or proportions are drawn from totals which are quite small or even insignificant from the statistical point of view (e.g. p. 24, 145 nouns; p. 21, 275 words; pp. 60—61, only 10 stems; cf. also pp. 98, 103, 116, 236, 299, 302), it is clear that the results need not be conclusive. Moreover such a simple count does not properly take into consideration the hierarchy of different elements, of their different function within the structure which is not necessarily correlated with frequency. It must be, however, emphasised, that the author himself by no means overestimates his calculations. I think it would be better to retain the name „Chadic“ for the whole West African group of Hamito-Semitic and to coin new names in order to replace „Chado-Hamitic“. It must be emphasised once again that the author uses the word „Hamitic“ quite conventionally as a part of the compound without associating any special linguistic or racial meaning with it. It is, however, a well known fact that old and even erroneous terms are difficult to extirpate and I myself still use Hamito-Semitic, though Afroasiatic is better and Erythraic may be indeed the best label.

Closing my very general remarks I wish to say that we are very obliged to the author for his extremely important contribution to the study of this neglected field. This is one of the most important books on Hamito-Semitic and even in the so called „African studies“ in the last period.

Andrzej Zaborski

Paul Newman, *A Grammar of Tera*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1970, pp. VIII + 263, University of California Publications — Linguistics 57.

This is the first account of the structure of the Chadic language known as Tera which has been almost completely unknown so far. The only source of data on Tera before the publication of the present volume consisted exclusively of a short word list in the pioneer collection by Meek, of a translation of the Gospel of John made in 1930 and of two publications by Paul Newman himself, i.e. of a collection of texts and another word list. Tera is spoken by nearly 50 000 people in Bauchi and Bornu Provinces, North-Eastern Nigeria; with Jara, Hona and Ga'anda (Gabin) it forms a cluster which has been classified by Newman and Ma within the Biu-Mandara branch of the Chadic group. According to the author there are three mutually intelligible dialects (cf. the map of Tera towns and villages on p. VIII and the information on p. 1) and this grammar deals with only one but the largest dialect spoken in the area between Gombe and Wuyo by the Yamaltu (who call themselves Nyimaši) and which is called Tera proper or simply Tera. Within Tera itself there are also minor local variations and since it is possible to predict Zambok dialect pronunciation directly from a Wuyo dialect form, the author has used Wuyo pronunciation as the basis of transcription. Phonology of Tera is dealt with briefly in charts with some commentary on pp. 2—4 of the Introduction which contains primarily the author's methodological remarks with the explanation of some fundamental concepts and symbolisations of transformational generative grammar. In Chapter I (pp. 15—41) base rules are presented and Chapter II (pp. 42—140) contains transformational rules. Chapter III (pp. 141—156) contains a sketch and a suggestive discussion of lexicon (the lexicon in Chomskian sense, i.e. a list of lexical formatives subdivided into categories taking into account syntactic features, and an indication of phonological representation of each item) and Chapter IV presents selected morphonemic rules (pp. 158—168). Appendix I contains a sample text (pp. 169—176) with interlinear (morph by morph) and „free“ translations as well as with some commentary; Appendix II lists base rules (pp. 177—191) and transformational rules which have been already presented but which appear now, for ease of comparison, without an exegesis. This is a useful synopsis which clearly shows how much of the structure of language can be revealed in a neat and concise way reaching a considerable depth of analysis through the adoption of transformational generative method. Part II of the book (pp. 200—255) contains twelve Tera texts of different length (mostly fables and folk-tales but also some descriptions of Tera customs) with English translations preceded (pp. 195—198) by a short introduction on transcription and editorial problems.

The book is closed by a vocabulary of grammatical formatives (pp. 256—260) and a bibliography (pp. 261—263).

This is one of the as yet rather not very numerous transformational generative grammars of African languages (one of very few on a Hamito-Semitic language) and one of the still more limited number of grammars which apply the later model developed by Chomsky. As far as the method is concerned, it is based on Chomsky's Aspects of the Theory of Syntax (with minor deviations) but the author is also acquainted with Lamb's stratificational theory. The author is quite right in his solution of the problem (cf. p. 5) of whether a field (the author adds also „anthropological“) linguists should be acquainted and should write transformational generative grammars.

His arguments for a positive answer are quite convincing but, I should add, transformational generative theory has not yet developed a procedure for analysing an unknown language comparable to that of the already „traditional“ Bloomfieldian, i.e. distributional descriptive school and it made almost all of its experiments on languages which had been already described in some way or known at least intuitively. Newman does not say much about his technique of data obtaining or how he has learnt the language. It can be indeed assumed that he had already some knowledge of the language and certainly used some grammar discovery procedures before he started his transformational generative account of Tera. I do not think that it is any drawback at all. I wish only to say that apart from the crude prejudice based on ignorance and lack of open-mindedness which usually accompany all confrontations of past and new in general, one of the reasons for the existing conservatism is that American descriptivism whose development was in a very essential way influenced by the problems of dealing with unknown „exotic“ languages has provided a rather easy technique for describing these languages (though not even now all Africanists are acquainted with it) in an almost step by step manner. Transformational generative grammar programmatically paid rather little attention to such problems. This is of course not an argument against writing TG grammars but a call for the study of a rather unexplored field. It would be most interesting to investigate the problem whether and how transformational generative method can be applied to the study of an unknown language starting with the first contacts with the informant. I am myself rather optimistic about the possibility and the usefulness of a straight transformational generative approach but still I think that a number of descriptivist techniques cannot be replaced. I think that the author must be congratulated for providing the base and transformational rules with a plain and ample commentary written in „natural“ language i.e. without symbolisations. There are also examples for each rule. The book may be thus used as a good introduction to transformational generative

grammars for linguists not acquainted yet with the theory who may be discouraged by symbolisations and all methalinguistic idiosyncrasies of the new school. Though much is yet to be done in the theory of semantics, I think that a genuinely modelled and strictly conducted study of semantics of unknown languages will be possible and will facilitate the study of both deep and surface structure against the old descriptivist doctrinal limitation to „differential meaning“. It is astonishing to read Newman's statement that „Grammar is best formulated as a self-contained study independent of semantics“ but any attack against this negation of the revival and progress of semantics is well stopped by his frank confession in footnote No. 5 on page 6. Though I do not think that this position is tenable, I cannot help respecting his conviction as I know that he is too well acquainted with general linguistics and that this is his deliberate choice. It is also, I dare say, a small debt paid by him to the descriptivist tradition without which modern linguistic theory would be non-existent.

Apart from the methodological innovatory approach the author presents a lot of data on an interesting and unknown language which is in danger of disappearing in several generations. The author had a rather prolonged experience with Tera on the spot (his research was carried on intermittently from January 1962 to June 1968) and taking into account his knowledge of linguistics we may be sure that he gave us a true and faithful evidence. In short, this is a genuine and valuable work.

Andrzej Zaborski

Y. K. Ščeglov, *Očerki grammatiki yazika hausa*, Moskva 1970, pp. 288.

Hausa belongs to the best known languages of Africa since a long time. This is true, however, only in relative terms and we lack a lot of studies of both detailed and general, synthetic nature. The book under review is an attempt at synthesis and it is intended to be a referential grammar for „Africanists“, Hamito-Semitists (Ščeglov, p. 3, says Semito-Hamitologists) and for specialists in general linguistics. It is not, however, a popular account for specialist from other branches but a very detailed study of Hausa structure presenting a great wealth of data and information. It is also a genuine attempt and not a compilation of the results attained by other linguists. Taking into consideration its scope, originality and method, this „Outline of

Hausa Grammar“ must be characterized at the very beginning as one of the most important achievements in the history of the study of Hausa language.

The author of this grammar has made himself previously known by his articles on the logical subject and predicate and on the formation of nominal plural in Hausa¹. He has also made very valuable and most promising contributions to generative poetics.

In the Preface (p. 3) the author explains that he has attempted to provide a systematic grammatical description of contemporary standard Hausa language in its written form. Accordingly the „Outline“ is based mainly on texts which represent a variety ranging from the press and radio news to folklore literature. Standard orthography is used but in the parts dealing with morphology and word formation it was necessary to take into account also other phonological (mainly tonal) factors. In such cases the author relied on Abraham's transcriptions.

The Introduction gives a summary of some widely spread phonological (phonology, the author says, does not fall within the scope of his study) and morphonological rules (p. 4—5), definitions (pp. 5—14) of the parts of speech (the author follows to some extent Parsons and Koršunova and Uspienskiy but presents also a number of his own ideas) and general information on grammatical number and gender in Hausa (14—20) which does not differ substantially from the account given by Parsons or Schachter (the particle ne/ce) in its main statements. The main body of the book consists of Part 1 which deals with morphology (pp. 21—117), Part 2 which deals with syntax (pp. 118—250, and Part 3 devoted to word formation (pp. 253—284). As far as the part on morphology is concerned (morphology being discussed in close connection with the syntactic phenomena), the most important is the detailed study of plural, the semantic analysis of pronouns and the discussion of the so called „tenses“. Syntax is presented in terms of subordination and of traditional system of parts of the sentence. It must be, however, emphasized at the very beginning that Ščeglov's approach is strictly structural (not in the narrow sense which is connected with this word by Chomsky and some other linguists who tend sometimes to equate „structuralism“ with American i.e. Bloomfieldian descriptivism). The model of simple substantival group (cf. table on p. 127) is, however, only linear indicating the positions of the different parts to the left and to the right of the head noun without manifesting the structure of the constituents. This does not mean that I postulate the traditional and criticized immediate constituents

¹ Logičeskiye subiekt i predikat i sposoby ih vydeleniya v yazike hausa, in: ed. N. V. Okhotina, *Afrikanskaya filologiya*, Moskva 1965, pp. 103—116; *Iz morfologii yazika hausa (obrazovaniye formy množestvennogo čisla imen, Narodi Azii i Afriki*, No 3, 1965.

analysis as an alternative. There is an interesting discussion of groups like *wani mutum ne mai fuska* or *ina so in yi magana ce gajeruwa* (pp. 135—136) in which the group is divided into two parts of which only the first is inverted, negative etc. but this restructuring or the enclitic standing between both parts pertains to the meaning of the whole sentence. Chapter 5 contains a new (though preliminary) classification of Hausa verb based primarily on syntactic and semantic criteria; there is also the discussion of transitive and intransitive verbs in which the author emphasizes the value of Parson's analysis but adds some examples of deviation from the rules which have been discovered so far. The main part of this chapter (pp. 148—177) contains a very important analysis of subordinate clauses with a special attention paid to the rules governing the selection of different „tenses“. Chapter 6 entitled „The Word Order“ deals primarily with the logical subject and predicate on which the position of other parts of the sentence depends in Hausa. The author develops his presentation of the problem already published in the article mentioned above. The theoretical discussion (pp. 180—187) is very interesting from the point of view of general linguistics. E.g. the author proposes the following definition of the logical predicate (LP): „LP is a part of the sentence for which, when the sentence is transformed into a question, an interrogative is substituted“. The concept of transformation is applied here and in other places (pp. 25, 121, 153 note, 181, 162, 199, 232, 241, 252, 275) not in Chomskian sense but rather as originally developed by Harris i.e. broadly speaking as a relation between two sentences. There is also a very detailed study of particles in Chapter 7. The particle *ne/ce* is presented separately (pp. 208—210). The author makes a general reference to Parson's and Schachter's studies which he considers valuable and interesting though in his opinion sometimes controversial as far as the gender concord is concerned. Chapter 8 contains the analysis of different types of interrogative sentences (pp. 212—223) which also merits a special mention. The analysis of word formation presented in Part 3 must be appreciated as a genuine contribution to what we already know thanks to Osnickaya, Parsons and Abraham. This is due to a new approach to the problem — the author follows namely (though without references) the most promising recent trends whose representatives pay a special attention to the study of paraphrase or „inner translation“. He not only presents word-formation rules but investigates the new formations in a strict relation with the synonymous constructions (sentences, phrases etc.) which underlie them. The bibliography on pp. 285—286 is selective and it lists only the studies of Hausa grammar which in the author's opinion merit attention. It mentions only the works which appeared prior to 1967 and for further references the reader is advised to consult a review of the history of Hausa studies by Z. L. Pugač (Trudy Instituta Etnografii, 76, 1963,

pp. 200—221). It seems that the author had no access to the study of Hausa syntax by Kraft published in 1963 (he mentions only Kraft's article published in JAL in 1964 and to the articles by Gouffé and Zima. Nevertheless this is not a very serious drawback at all since, as it has already been said, Ščeglov relied above all on his own very detailed and universal investigation and only secondarily on the existing studies by other specialists², thus giving us an original work.

As I have already pointed out, Ščeglov's method is thoroughly structural and this is particularly well manifested in his constant reference to the whole of the system when discussing particular problems and in his strict adherence to the principle of the unity of both syntactic and semantic component. This is a „meaning oriented“ grammar in the good sense of the word. This approach makes him and other linguists and semantists revive certain ideas of the logical syntax of Bally and Jespersen (cf. references on pp. 180, 184 and 200) and we find a reference even to H. Paul (p. 200, n. 7) but of course not in connexion with any typical neogrammarian idea. This renewal of interest in „traditional“ linguistic theory and method is in fact characteristic of many of the contemporary linguistic schools. Ščeglov's grammar looks traditional in many respects but this is a superficial trait in most cases due rather to his manner of presenting his analysis. He gives an ample proof of being well acquainted with the developments in general linguistics in the last years but he follows his own path so that it would be difficult to characterize his method by ranging him within one of the best known schools. He is quite moderate in his application of transformations (as it has been already said, not in Chomskian sense) as well as in his analysis of paraphrase in which he follows some principles of „semantic synthesis“ developed by Mielčuk and Žolkovski. He makes also (p. 107) a reference to the deep and surface structures but he takes them into consideration in other places rather implicitly. This moderate approach to modern linguistic theories and the use of makes the book more accessible to a number of linguists. The „Outline“ must be considered indeed as an important counterpart to the studies by Parsons and Kraft not only because of the method but thanks to its original traits and synthetic character.

This quasi-traditional approach has only one deficiency: the use of long sentences and very condensed paragraphs does not facilitate the reading. Sometimes it makes also the exposition unnecessarily

² As there is no index, I think that it may be useful to give the list of references which I have compiled reading the „Outline“. There are references to Parsons on pp. 6 n. 1, 7 n. 3, 16 n. 6, 17, n. 8, 25, 37 n. 8, 71 n. 4, 77, 94 n. 10, 125, 131, 143, 144, 146, 163, 210 n. 1, 240, 280, 282; to Schachter's work on pp. 16 n. 6 and 210 n. 1; to Abraham on pp. 69, 65, 69, 67, 73, 76, 253, 263; to Hodge and Umaru on p. 51.

complicated and, quite against the author's general principle and intention, rather atomized. There is too little spacing and paragraphing, the examples are given in the text and in a not well contrasted print (or sometimes in the same one) and all this makes reading rather cumbersome. The author uses symbols rather sparingly but in view of the complexity of the traditional „literary“ presentation it would be better, perhaps, to utilize them to a larger extent. A synopsis of the structure and an index would be helpful. There are, however, cross-references in the text itself.

This criticism concerns only quite minor points. The most important fact remains clear: before we had no book on Hausa grammar of a comparable scope and scrutiny of structural insight. The author himself points out several issues which require better elucidation but his book will remain one of the most important studies which no specialist on Hausa will be able to neglect.

Andrzej Zaborski

Salman H. al-Ani, *Arabic Phonology — An Acoustical and Physiological Investigation*. The Hague 1970, pp. 104, Mouton, Janua Linguarum — Series Practica 61.

Traditional Arabic studies in Europe neglected phonetics and phonology to a considerable extent concentrating on written language and on traditional Arabic grammar. Instrumental studies of Arabic phonetics have been a rather rare phenomenon though the names of such linguists as Panconcelli-Calzia, Meinhof, Worrel, Jones, and Margais must be mentioned here. Methods of structural linguistics have been applied to the phonology of Arabic earlier and more frequently than to morphology and syntax. It was J. Cantineau who introduced not only Arabists but Semitists in general to the methods of the Prague school of linguistics (references to Arabic were made already by Trubetzkoy himself) and very important contributions have been done, as far as literary Arabic is concerned, by R. Jakobson, C. A. Ferguson, N. Blanc, A. Martinet, H. Birkeland and some other scholars. Apart from a phonetic treatment by W. H. T. Gairdner we have only one phonological account of the whole system by J. Cantineau, i.e. his *Esquisse d'une phonologie de l'arabe classique*. We lack also phonological studies of Contemporary Literary Arabic as it is actually spoken in different Arab countries. The book under review has for its objective

„to present a systematic study of the phonology of Contemporary Standard Arabic as used in Iraq“ (p. 18). In comparison with Cantineau's study al-Ani's work brings an important novelty being based primarily on the data obtained by the author through acoustical and not only physiological methods. We know that already R. Jakobson made use of spectrographic analysis in his studies of Arabic phonemes (cf. e.g. *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis*, Cambridge Mass. 1952, p. 50) but we may only welcome al-Ani's study since it pertains to the whole system and makes use of different spectrograph techniques and X-ray sound films. Approximately 2000 spectrograms have been utilized. The author himself was the main informant but there were several other informants from different regions of Iraq and two other from Jordan who provided data for „emphatic“ consonants only. The book contains (apart from acknowledgements, tables of symbols, and a list of illustrations) an Introduction (pp. 17—18) with some basic information on Arabic language in the past and in the modern times, as well as a short note on the aim and the origin of the present study. Chapter I gives an account of acoustical and physiological procedures and presents the informants (pp. 19—21). Chapter II deals with the vowels (pp. 22—28), Chapter III with a part of consonant system (pp. 29—43), Chapter IV (pp. 44—58) with the pharyngealized consonants (i.e. traditionally called „emphatics“), Chapter V with pharyngeals and glottals (pp. 59—74), Chapter VI with duration (vowel and consonant length), gemination and consonant clusters (pp. 75—85), Chapter VII with syllable and stress (pp. 86—88) and Chapter VIII with intonation (pp. 89—95). At the end there is a bibliography and a subject index. There are numerous spectrograms and tracings founded on X-ray films revealing some most important contrasts. We have also some diagrams and charts (e.g. charts indicating possibilities of medial and final consonant clusters on pp. 80—81).

The method applied by the author is distributional. The phonemes are discussed according to their manner and place of articulation with the enumeration and characteristics of their main allophones. First the most common allophone is described and then the others which appear less frequently. Special emphasis is put on the interpretation of spectrograms of the respective allophones. This is the first complete „item and arrangement“ study (though there were some accounts for didactic purposes in some modern handbooks) of Modern Literary Arabic and I consider this very thorough acoustical study of the allophones as extremely important. Nevertheless one cannot resist the feeling that this already traditional „item and arrangement“ approach leaves much of the structure actually unrevealed. The author does not refer to Cantineau or to Jakobson, he presents his descriptions of spectrograms and does not indulge in discussing theoretical problems of phonological interpretation. He did his work between 1963 and 1966,

i.e. at the time when important changes in the phonological theory were taking place and he could be still not informed about some of them. Important trends in theoretical phonology of the last years must be taken into account and a generative phonology of Arabic remains to be worked out though there is already a study by D. A. Abdo, *On Stress and Arabic Phonology — A Generative Approach*, Beirut 1969. Al-Ani's book though valuable for the great wealth of facts it brings, does not replace the classical account by Cantineau and every future work must refer directly to Jakobson's studies. This is now even more manifest as we are aware of all drawbacks of the „item and arrangement“ approach. We lack sometimes details of the phonological interpretation. E.g. following Jakobson al-Ani interprets „emphatics“ not as velarized but as pharyngealized consonants. He does not, however, quote Jakobson's arguments and he does not explain this interpretation in detail. We should also like more details about the physiological and auditory aspects of „emphasis“ since the comparison of plain consonants with the pharyngealized ones is made mostly on acoustic level. Al-Ani's interpretation differs from earlier studies in some other points and this results to some extent from his method. E.g. his interpretation of 'ayn differs from all previous standpoints: „after a thorough acoustical analysis, the author has found that the most common allophone of /ε/ is actually a voiceless stop and not a voiced fricative. This, of course, is not completely conclusive as there is much room for further research both on the acoustical and physiological levels“ (p. 62). Without discussing the problem of distinctive features of 'ayn, I wish to indicate that the tracings presented by the author on pp. 72—74 show 'ayn versus /h/ as a fricative and not as a stop. Cf. also P. Delattre's statement and figures showing the articulation of Arabic 'ayn in *Phonetica*, 19, 1969, pp. 70 and 72—73. The study of intonation has been given more attention in some handbooks than in strictly scientific studies. Al-Ani's short chapter on it is a welcomed contribution but as he says himself, „This analysis, by all means, is not an exhaustive treatment of intonation but rather it is a modest representation of the main aspects that operate in the language“ (p. 89). The treatment of stress is also quite general and much remains to be done in this field (cf. C. A. Ferguson, *Language*, 32, 1956, p. 387).

The bibliography is very extensive, but we do not find such works as A. Denz, *Die phonetische Beschaffenheit der Laryngale im Arabischen und ihre phonologische Systematisierung*, ZDMG, 114, 1964, pp. 223—238; R. T. Nasr, *Phonemic Velarization in Literary Arabic*, Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Linguists, The Hague 1964, pp. 453—455; A. Martinet, *La palatalisation „spontanée“ de g en arabe*, BSLP, 54, 1959, pp. 90—102; H. Fleisch, *Études de phonétique arabe*, Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph, 28, 1949—1950, pp. 227—285;

Cf. also his articles on Arabic phonemes published successively in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*; K. Petraček, *Zur Artikulation des sogenannten emphatischen l im Arabischen*, Ar. Or., 20, 1952, pp. 509—523.

In spite of all this criticism, al-Ani's book is an important and valuable contribution. All future studies will have to refer to it.

Andrzej Zaborski

Türkische Gewänder und osmanische Gesellschaft im achtzehnten Jahrhundert. Facsimile-Ausgabe des Codex „Les Portraits des differens habillements qui sont en usage à Constantinople et dans tout la Turquie“ aus dem Besitz des Deutschen Archäologischen Institutes in Istanbul. Vorwort von Rudolf Naumann. Herausgegeben und eingeführt von Klaus Tuchelt. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Istanbul. Graz (Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt) 1966. VIII + 120 pp. with 208 facsimiles in colour.

The interest in the history and culture of the Ottoman Empire, far from being weakened, is constantly expanding. Scholarly attention is recurrently directed to the distant days of the Ottoman sultanate and caliphate, the Western world continuing to be attracted by the Oriental wisdom and art. The journey into the Turkish past has been greatly facilitated by the spread of mass media, by the achievements of the modern printing trade, by sound recording and other technical devices. The knowledge of the East long since has ceased to be dull and colourless.

The German-speaking countries have largely contributed to the promotion of Turkish studies. Now, as a result of a co-operation between two German scholars from Istanbul and an ambitious Austrian publishing house, a new monumental work has been published on Turkey of the Ottoman sultans, a work remarkable for its insight and originality as well as for its dimensions and the high standard of its printing.

The codex published in the book belongs to the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Istanbul, which bought it in 1929 from a German association of Turkish literature lovers in that city. How the association had come by it, is now impossible to establish. Professor R. Naumann, the author of a short „Vorwort“ (pp. VII—VIII) upon studying the notice on the title-page of the codex has come to the conclusion that the codex once belonged to a member of the noble Austrian family Kappus von Pichelstein: we shall discuss this question later. Professor Naumann goes on to state (and this is very relevant) that

the codex comes from the second part of the eighteenth century, and that its contents, a collection of 208 pictures painted in distemper and representing a gallery of Turkish types and costumes from the Padshah down to the dervishes, artisans and common rabble, surpasses any other work on the subject.

The frame which Dr Tuchelt has supplied to this splendid work is equally remarkable. In the codex, the pictures had been arranged without much logical order. Dr Tuchelt grouped them according to thematic content: first, the Padshah and the highest officials of the Empire (Tables 1—5); second, Court officials and the harem inmates (6—20); third, the inside servants of the seraglio (21—38); fourth, its outside servants (39—69); fifth, officials and functionaries of the Sublime Porte (70—92); sixth, the Army and the Navy (93—125); seventh, the clergy and dervishes (126—160); eighth, the arts and crafts and folk types (161—208). The pictures in the codex have been supplemented by a reproduction of a work by A. I. Melling, a German artist of the late eighteenth century, representing a festive exit of the sultan from the seraglio. The hand-written French legend at the bottom of every picture has been repeated in print on the back of the foregoing reproduction (thus facing it), and preceded with a German legend which, however, does not always conform strictly to the original one. The material of the codex thus rearranged is preceded by an „Einführung“ with a description of the codex itself and reflections on the time of its creation, on the person of its author (whose name is never mentioned) as well as on the author of the French legends and the oddities of their spelling, and, finally, on the pictures themselves. This is followed by remarks on the pictures, or, more accurately, on Turkish costumes in the eighteenth century. The author then goes on to discuss group by group the respective costumes providing ample information on each social class as well as on the Court and on the hierarchy of central offices in Ottoman Turkey, on the organization of its army, on the religious and cultural activities, in brief — a concise but highly pertinent picture of the Turkish society in the 18th century (pp. 16—97). The lucid way in which the chapters have been arranged, the tracing of the changes which had affected the different social groups in Turkey, the solid bibliographical basis on which the work has been founded, will make of Dr Tuchelt's work an important aid to all Ottoman scholars, not just to those who are concerned with the 18th-cent. Turkey. Indices, a list of literature (over 90 items), and, finally, the convergence between the pages of the codex and the printed tables enhance still further the value of this fine publication.

Our great appreciation of the work will not suffer from the few remarks which the duty of a reviewer makes it incumbent upon us to mention. In the bibliography where the Author has cited also several Turkish dictionaries, we miss the mention of the excellent *Türkisch-*

arabisch-persisches Handwörterbuch by his compatriot J. Th. Zenker. Another title in the bibliography which would be appropriate to refer to in connection with the paragraph on the Oriental cloth-made envelopes (p. 54) is the work by A. Geiher, C. J. Lamm, *Orientalische Briefumschläge in schwedischem Besitz*, Stockholm 1944. — There are spelling mistakes in Turkish words. Thus, *âlây* should be always replaced by *alay*, and *vilayet* by *vilâyet*; instead of *kâdı* and *sakkâ* the text should read, respectively, *kadı* and *sakka* or *saka*. — Instead of *Izmit* (p. 17) and *muşahib* (pp. 25, 26) the text should read *İzmit* and *musahib*. — The Turkish word for 'expenses' is *masraf*, not *masref* (p. 45). — Turkish spelling and grammar disagree with *Et meidan* (p. 63) instead of *Et meydanı*. — The „reich bestriekte Schabracke“ was not called *saçaklı esp* (p. 55) but *saçaklı* ('tasselled'); *esp* meaning 'horse' in Persian, *saçaklı esp* means 'a horse adorned with a richly tasselled caparison'. Cf. Pakalın, III 75 s. v. *Saçaklı esp*. — The author is right in stating that the name *mahfili şerif* instead of *mahmili* ş. is not correct (p. 84); still, it was in common use, cf. Zenker 824 s. v. *mahfil*.

The Author has taken rather great liberties with some of the French legends at the bottom of the pictures. Tables 13—18 are commented upon in a general and uniform way: „Eine musizierende Hofdame“, when in the codex each picture specifies the musical instrument on which the lady in question is playing (these are discussed on p. 29). — „Agiuse“ in Table 157 is perhaps not „Eine Mekkapilgerin — Hâcî kadın“: *acıze* till the present day meaning 'old woman' with a pejorative shade (Zenker 263 s. v. 'acüz translates 'acıze as 'altes Weib, Vettel, scheinheilige Kupplerin'). — „Danseur... en habit de femme“ in Table 183 is not „karı“ (Turkish 'woman'): the Turks were against the public appearances of women, thence this is a man dressed as a woman. — „Kolumbara“ in Table 187 has been commented upon inadequately (p. 95); this is a misspelt Ar.-Pers. noun *gulâm-pare* 'sodomite, pédéraste/Knabenschänder' (Zenker 649; another similar form, *kulâmbara*, has been attested by him).

Very interesting is the Turkish inscription on the sheet of paper held by the reisülküttab in Table 71. The transcription of the text and its translation (pp. 53—54) call for some correcting. It should read: *Devletlî, inayetlî, saadetlî* (in the picture: *saade-detlî*!)... *fercam iblâğla inha ve ilâm olunur ki... Baki hemîşe müstedam ve ber devam bad*. The word *bad*, as is shown by its position in the sentence, is the predicate; this is the Pers. „Imperat. v. *bûden* — *olsun*... es sei, lass sein“ (Zenker 158), not Pers. *bad* 'Wind'. The content proper is lacking (there being in particular no recommendation for the messenger who will deliver the letter, as we read in the book). There are only the preliminary courtesies: 'Happy, merciful, fortunate', and after the words 'after transmitting... it is reported and declared', the final

wishes: 'and further let it be always constant and not transient' — probably the good luck of the addressee, of the reisülküttab, or of the grand-vizier.

Here we are faced with an important question: what is the connection between the authorship of this Turkish inscription and the authorship of the pictures? First and foremost it should be emphatically stated that this Turkish text was written by the man whose hand also had written the French legends in the codex. It must be noted that the French of the legends is not altogether perfect, and that in the transcription of Turkish words there are some peculiarities typical of Italian spelling, which made Dr Tuchelt conclude that the author of the legends was a Levantine settled in Istanbul. On the other hand, he was perplexed by the frequent transcription of Turkish *ş, ç, c* by *sz, cz, dz*, unknown either to French or to Italian (p. 5). Now, this is how these sounds should be transcribed in Polish (Turkish *c* having an equivalent, to be accurate, in *dz*). Further, the word „Jatmuznik“ on Table 83 is a Polish equivalent of the French „Aumonier“ (*jałmużnik*; in print „Jatmuznik“; no reference to the word in the Index). There are, however, good grounds to state that the author of these legends was not a Pole, but an Italian born at Naples, who had come to Turkey as a young physician, and was called Francesco Crescenzo Giuliani. The Polish connotations in his writing should be attributed to the fact that since 1730 he had been attached as an interpreter to the Polish legacies to the Sublime Porte. In 1739—1742 he stayed in Warsaw and Dresden. Since 1756 he lived (with a short interval) in Warsaw and was dragoman at the Royal Court until his dismissal in 1765. He died in Warsaw on 30th May 1765. Cf. his biography in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (Polish Biographical Dictionary), vol. VIII (1959—1960), pp. 11—13 written by the present reviewer upon studying the papers left after him, including a great number of his autographs both in Turkish and in European languages, kept at the Czartoryski Library in Cracow.

Thus we have learnt the *terminus ad quem* of the codex: 1765. The brown ink in Giuliani's legends and in the Turkish inscription in this codex indicates that the texts were written in Poland (when in Istanbul, he used the Turkish black ink). In his papers there is no trace of his artistic activities, but nevertheless I would risk stating that it was Giuliani himself who painted the pictures. He was a poor man who could hardly have afforded to pay a painter; on the other hand he was a real „Tausendkünstler“... Now, the Warsaw University Library has a two-volume album of Turkish costumes, coming from the collection of the last King of Poland. Its content is slightly different, the inscriptions are made by A. Crutta (who succeeded Giuliani to the position of Royal dragoman), and the pictures are of higher artistic quality — yet they are clearly copies of the codex of Istanbul.

I am inclined to suppose that Giuliani's widow, who was a Greek from the district Pera in Istanbul and who returned there after her husband's death, might have sold to the King, along with other papers, this „improved“ edition of her husband's album, taking the first version with the autographs of her husband, with her to Turkey. As we see, however, she (or her children) was compelled to sell also this token.

The notice: „De la Bibliothèque (*sic!*) de Kappus Pichelstein mp.“ on the title-page of the codex shows that it was purchased by Stanisław de Kappus Pichelstein (son of an Austrian member of the gentry — as Professor Naumann rightly assumed — and a baptized Polish Jewess), the Polish interpreter at the Porte during the second half of the 18th century. Upon examining his autographs in the Czartoryski Library we have been able to establish that it was also by his hand that the inscription „Les Portraits...“ on the title-page of the codex of Istanbul was made. On St. Pichelstein see J. Reychman, *Znajomość i nauczanie języków orientalnych w Polsce XVIII w.*, Wrocław 1950, p. 57.

The existence of the two versions of the album can account for certain differences observed by Dr Tuchelt in the technique of the pictures in his codex. These — and many other — particulars call for further study.

Having found incontestable Polish connotations of the codex of Istanbul it is a pleasure to acknowledge that it has been handled by experts — both scholars and printers — of the very first order. Their magnificent book is indispensable in every centre of research on the history and civilization of Ottoman Turkey and will be regarded as a highly valuable ornament of any library fortunate enough to possess it.

Zygmunt Abrahamowicz