

The Origins of Iqtā', Islam al-Abhath (A. U. B.) June 1969, pp. 3—22.

Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd edit. articles:

- 1) „Baghdād“
- 2) „Anbar“
- 3) „Daskara“
- 4) Dair Al-Jāthaliq
- 5) „Diwān (caliphate)“
- 6) „Āmil“
- 7) „Amīr“.

BULLETIN CRITIQUE

Amin-Madani, Lutz, *Persische Grammatik*, Heidelberg 1972. Lulius Gross Verlag. S. 517.

In den letzten Jahren erschienen mehrere gute Grammatiken und Handbücher der persischen Sprache. Nennen wir wenigstens: Boyle J. A., *Grammar of Modern Persian*, Wiesbaden 1966; Lambton A. K. S., *Persian Grammar*, Cambridge 1961; Lazard G., *Grammaire du Persan Contemporain*, Paris 1957; Alavi B. und Lorenz M., *Lehrbuch der persischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1967; Sobhani, F., *Persisches Lehr- und Lesebuch für die Umgangssprache*, Berlin 1962; Shaki Mansour, *Moderní perská frazeologie a konverzace. A Modern Persian Phrase-Book*, Praha 1963, etc.

Eine jede genannter Grammatiken und Handbücher hilft den Studenten die Anfänge der modernen persischen Sprache zu beherrschen. Diejenigen aber welche eine gründlichere Kenntniss von der literarischen persischen Sprache (*ketābi*) zu erreichen möchten, sollen die *Persische Grammatik* von Amin-Madani und Lutz in die Hand nehmen.

Alle Aspekte des heutigen *ketābi*-Persisch (Lautung, Schreibweise, die Wortarten, ihre Formen und ihr Gebrauch, der Satz, seine Formen und Konstituenten, die stylistische Leistung des Verbs in seinen Formen und Aussageweisen) sind ausführlich und klar dargestellt. Die sorgfältige Umschrift in lateinische Buchstaben erleichtert wohl die richtige Aussprache des heutigen Persisch zu erlernen.

Franciszek Machalski

Vernon Daykin, *Technical Arabic. A language reader incorporating technical and scientific terms*. Lund Humphries London. First edition 1972, pp. 131.

This well conceived book is principally directed to the European students going to an Arab country to take part in some technical project. It contains fifty five passages in English and Arabic languages showing a specific, technical vocabulary, unknown to the normal student studying the Arab philology.

A short Arabic-English vocabulary of the main technical terms has been added. It is arranged not as usually in the root order but in the alphabetical one. It also includes alternative Arabic spelling of words of foreign origin which is a very useful initiative indeed.

Franciszek Machalski

Ġamšīd Gyūnašvili, *Bānūvān-e īranšenās-e Gorġi* (Ladies orientologists of Georgia), Tbilisi 1972, pp. 39.

This booklet written in Persian by Ġamšīd Gyūnāšvili a well known iranologist at the Tbilisi University presents the reader twelve silhouettes of Georgian ladies orientologists. We find there short biographies and full lists of the scientific works of M. Andronikašvili, O. Tedeyeva, L. Tušišvili, T. Čavcavadze, T. Okheidze, E. Aleksidze, M. Modebadze (philologists), E. Metreveli, M. Mamatsašvili, M. Čačava, L. Guynašvili (literature specialists) and L. Sengelia (historian).

The named paper edited by the Friendship and Culture Society between Georgia and Foreign Countries helps the reader to gain a better and deeper insight into the vivid and ample oriental studies in Georgia.

Franciszek Machalski

Jan Reychman, *Podróznicy polscy na Bliskim Wschodzie w XIX w.* [Polish travellers in the Near East in the XIXth century]. Warszawa 1972, pp. 344.

Jan Reychman, professor at the Warsaw University, is the author of several books and articles on the relations between Poland and Oriental countries through the past ages. His present book deals with Polish travellers in the Near East, especially in Turkey, Arab countries, Iraq and Kurdistan, the Caucasus territories and Persia during the nineteenth century.

The reader of the book is shown a large galaxy of Polish tourists, scholars, dealers, diplomats, scientists, poets etc., the naturalists, archeologists and explorers being given the priority. All of them faci-

tated the closer cultural and political contacts of Poland with Oriental nations and countries. As the sources for the discussed book Professor Reychman availed himself of itineraries, relations, accounts, reports and letters of Polish travellers in the Near East.

The comprehensive list of authorities, bibliographical notes, a small vocabulary of Oriental words, personal and geographical indexes make the reading of this laborious and praiseworthy work easier.

Franciszek Machalski

Wolfgang Morgenroth, *Lehrbuch des Sanskrit*, VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, Leipzig 1973.

Seit langer Zeit erwartet, erschien in diesem Jahr das neue Lehrbuch der Sanskritsprache. Der Verfasser verfügt über eine grosse Lehrerfahrung, die er in Berlin und Greifswald erworben hat. Das Buch erfüllt einen didaktischen Zweck und daher bringt es im allgemeinen keine neuen Tatsachen, und doch kopiert es auch kein früheres Modell, sondern hat ein eigenes Gepräge. Es besteht aus einer systematischen Grammatik, 36 Lektionen mit Sanskrittexten und einem Glossar. Die Texte bringen 5 erste Lieder der Geschichte über Nala und Damayanti, einige Stücke aus Pañcatantra, Śukasaptati, Daśakumāracarita, Manurechtsbuch, sowie 7 Rigveda-Hymnen. Sowohl der grammatische Teil, als auch die Texte und das Glossar sind in Devanāgarī-Schrift und in Umschrift dargeboten. Die Darstellung des grammatischen Materials ist klar und verständlich. Das Lehrbuch hat keinen besonderen Abschnitt über Satzlehre, aber der Leser findet manche syntaktische Belehrung in der Formenlehre. Dennoch wäre eine Zusammenfassung des syntaktischen Materials in einem besonderen Kapitel von Nutzen.

Die Zeichen für Devanāgarī-Ligaturen sind teils im Druck, teils handschriftlich dargestellt, was ein uneinheitliches Bild bietet. Wären die Zeichen von einem Graphiker geschrieben, so würden sie ein mehr einheitliches Gepräge gewinnen. Der Mangel an Zeichen für vokalische Funktion (*ṛ, ṝ, ṛ̃, ṛ̂*) zwang die Druckerei zum Gebrauch von Symbolen *ṛ, ṝ, ṛ̃, ṛ̂*, die aber auch in anderer Funktion erscheinen. Der Terminus *Bukkal* (Nicht-Vokal) wird nicht allgemein gebraucht und scheint in einem didaktischen Buch nicht so notwendig. Die Behandlung des zerebralen Nasals *ṇ* als einer phonologischen Variante des dentalen Lautes ist nicht allgemein anerkannt, da der Laut manchmal auch Bedeutungsunterschiede zum Ausdruck bringt.

Mehrere Sanskritbeispiele im grammatischen Teil sind unübersetzt gelassen und das erschwert deren Verständnis, da diese Wörter

auch im Glossar nicht zu finden sind. Die Verben im Sanskrit haben einen weiten Bedeutungsumfang, aber aus didaktischen Gründen ist es geboten im grammatischen Teil nur eine Bedeutung zu wählen und an allen Stellen zu gebrauchen. Beispiele von verschiedener Bedeutungsangabe: *tud-* 'spalten', 'stossen', 'quälen'; *lup-* 'zerbrechen', 'plündern'; *smṛ-* 'lehren', 'sich erinnern'; *tan-* 'dehnen', 'anspannen'.

Es haben sich auch manche Korrektur- und Druckfehler in den Text eingeschlichen, wie:

- | | | |
|--------------|--|--|
| S. 57 | <i>ayami</i> anstatt <i>ayāni</i> | |
| S. 124 | <i>diš-</i> (2) anstatt <i>diš-</i> (6) | |
| S. 135 | <i>kurumaḥ</i> anstatt <i>kurmah</i> | |
| S. 137 | <i>kuruyāt</i> anstatt <i>kuryāt</i> | |
| S. 140 | Imp. <i>rodih</i> , <i>rodit</i> anstatt Impf. <i>arodih</i> , <i>arodit</i> | |
| S. 141 | Imp. 3. Sg. <i>staviti</i> anstatt <i>stavitu</i> | |
| S. 143 | Imp. Du. 1. <i>sva</i> anstatt <i>asāva</i> | |
| | Pl. 1. <i>sma</i> „ <i>asāma</i> | |
| S. 158 | <i>yu- yuti</i> „ <i>yauti</i> | |
| S. 162 | <i>i-</i> 'gehen', unregelmässige Desiderativbildung <i>jigamiṣati</i> , <i>jigamsate</i> anstatt <i>gam-</i> 'gehen'. | |
| S. 197 | <i>hu-</i> 'opfern', <i>juhvant</i> anstatt <i>juhvāt</i> | |
| | IV <i>tud-</i> „ VI <i>tud-</i> | |
| | VI <i>paš-</i> „ IV <i>paš-</i> | |
| S. 200 | <i>li-</i> 'aussagen' „ 'sich anschmiegen' | |
| S. 213 | <i>akṣa-</i> 'Auge' „ <i>akṣan-</i> | |
| Druckfehler: | | |
| S. 56 | ताल्लीकान् „ ताल्लीकान् | |
| S. 60 | Anmerkung § 74 e „ § 74 c | |
| S. 63 | अभसि „ अभसि | |
| | <i>abhāsata</i> „ <i>abhāsata</i> | |
| S. 67 | वाभि: „ वाभि: | |
| S. 68 | भिषट् „ भिषट् | |

Tadeusz Pobożniak

Jacques Grand'Henry, *Le parler arabe de Cherchell (Algérie)*, Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 5, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1972, pp. XXX + 219.

The literature concerning Arabic dialects has been enriched by a recent publication of a prominent Belgian arabist Mr. J. Grand'Henry. It is a monograph on an Algerian-Arabic contemporary urban dialect

spoken in Cherchell, a small coastal town, situated some 100 km westward from Alger, just on the demarcation line dividing Algeria into its Eastern and Western parts. The Algerian dialects have long drawn the interest of the outstanding arabists, such as J. Cantineau, W. and Ph. Marçais, and many others. Also J. Grand'Henry devoted his two papers to the subject, viz.: *La géographie linguistique arabe en Algérie. État de la question et orientation bibliographique*, in *Revue d'Histoire et de Civilisation du Maghreb*, Faculté des Lettres d'Alger, no 6/7, 1969, pp. 35—37, and *Observations sur la phonétique des parlers arabes de Ténès (Algérie Occidentale)* in *Orbis, Bulletin Internationale de Documentation Linguistique*, Tome XX, No 1, Louvain, 1971, pp. 99—101. But somehow, the urban dialects have been left apart, and, up till now, only three of them became a subject of minute studies¹. Therefore, we welcome Grand'Henry's monograph with great and due interest.

The book under review contains detailed phonetical and morphological descriptions of the dialect in question, both from synchronic and diachronic points of view. The grammatical considerations as well as the conclusions of the author are illustrated with texts inserted at the end of the book, mostly of historical, ethnographical and anecdotal contents. The introductory part of the book comprises acknowledgements, a presentation of the genesis of the work, as well as some geographical, historical and linguistic data concerning Cherchell and its dialect. The monograph has been provided with a rich bibliography and an index of Arabic dialectal words.

As the description shows, the dialect of Cherchell appears worth attention. Because of the autonomy of ancient 'u', the presence of 'n' as the preformative of the 1-st Pers. Imperf. Sg and Pl., the use of the suffix '-u' as a desinence of Imperf. Pl., etc., it fits into the general scheme of Maghrebian dialects. Besides, the affrication of 't' to 'tʃ', the pronunciation of 'j' as 'z', the velar pronunciation of 'k' (ق) as well as the syllabic economy, typical for the towns of Central and Western Algeria, make it urban. But the dialect of Cherchell bears also certain marks which distinguish it from other Algerian dialects. Some of these marks approach it, either to the Jewish-Arabic dialects of Algérie and Tunisia (e.g. the forms of personal pronouns: *ənʔūmān*, *hūmān*) or to the Andalusian-Arabic as well as to the dialect of one of the oriental nomadic tribes (the form '-āh' of the suffixed personal pronoun of the 3-rd Pers. F. Sg.). Other features prove it to be very archaic, (the avoiding of the use of indefinite article and of the analytic form of *idāfa*, the lack of preverbs, a. s. o.). According to the author's

¹ W. Marçais, *Le dialecte arabe parlé à Tlemcen*, Paris, 1902; Ph. Marçais, *Le parler arabe de Djidjelli*, Paris, 1953; M. Cohen, *Le parler arabe des Juifs d'Alger*, Paris, 1912.

opinion, these characteristic features typical only for the dialect of Chercell are partly due to a certain isolation in which this dialect was developing. Thus, the Arabic dialectology owes to Mr. Grand'Henry a very important and instructive study.

There are but few details in it which awake certain reservations. It is for instance a pity that the author confined the description of the Chercell verb to its synthetic forms and says nothing, either positively or negatively, about the eventual existence of the analytic ones. We observe in the course of the development of most of the languages of the world a commonly known phenomenon, when the state of grammatical information does not change and the lexico-semantic one grows, while their formal representation is subjected to reduction. The reduction consequently causes the elimination of certain grammatical information, and the growth of the lexico-semantic one demands adaption of the existing means to its needs, or creation of new ones or usually both. To match this situation, there appears a richer phonic substance (mostly in the form of analytic structures, at least at the beginning,) as bearer of those informations. This phenomenon is attested by certain verb forms (like those serving the renewal of the indicative, or modal and „aktionsart” forms) in most of the modern Arabic dialects, the Algerian among them², or even such as Cypriot³ and Bukhara⁴ dialects which evolved in incomparably greater isolation than the dialect of Chercell. Since we observe in this last one, like in the others, the reduction of phonic substance (comp. e.g. Chercell: *kṭeb* : Class. Ar.: *katab-a*, Chercell: *kṭəb* : Class. Ar.: *katab-ta* [*katab-tu*, Chercell: *yəḵṭəb* : Class. Ar.: *yaktub-u* [-a [-O, or Chercell: *uḵṭətu* : Class. Ar.: *wakaftum* [*wakaftunna*), we presume that, like in other dialects, also here a new formal representation should have developed in order both to reconstitute the information eliminated by the reduction and to convey the new lexico-semantic one.

Another detail that evokes certain doubts is the term „regular verbs” (le verbe régulier), by which the author means the verbs with three strong consonants in the stem. We would rather substitute this term by „sound verb” (*fī'lun sālimun*), since „regular” suggests the existence of „irregular”, and „irregular” means, something that does not conform to the fundamental rules, (in our case, to the rules which govern the verb), and therefore has an exceptional character, and no such verbs are represented in the description of the Chercell dialect.

² W. Marçais, *op. cit.*, and *Le dialecte des Ulād Brāhim de Saïda*, Paris, 1908.

³ M. Tsiapera, *A Descriptive Analysis of Cypriot Maronite Arabic* Hague—Paris, 1969.

⁴ W. Fischer, *Die Sprache der arabischen Sprachinsel in Uzbekistan*, „Der Islam”, Bd 36, 1960—1961, pp. 232—263.

The adjectives: geminate, hamzated, hollow, weak, a. s. o. with which Arabic verbs are classified do not form an opposition to „regular”, they only define different types of verbs which differ from each other only on the morphonological plane and not on the morphological one. Those morphonological differences are, by their turn, subject to constant rules what makes them „regular” within their types, while the morphological structure is everywhere the same.

Finally, the last though maybe not least, problem. It seems that texts containing free, „overheard” conversations are more appropriated to serve as a basis for linguistic description of a dialect than the narrative ones or with *a priori* suggested contents. The former of them promise to offer a more true and adequate picture of a given dialect than it is the case with the latter.

Closing our short review, we should like to declare that none of the critical remarks inserted above is in state, even in the least, to diminish the value and importance of Mr. Grand'Henry's book. They are simply suggestions to muse on. We hope that the author will soon let us hear from him again.

A. Czapkiewicz

Gerard Janssens, *Stress in Arabic and Word Structure in the Modern Arabic Dialects*, Leuven 1972, pp. 166, Orientalia Gandensia V, Uitgeverij Peeters.

The book consists of three parts. In the first one (pp. 9—64) the author presents his reconstruction of stress rules in „Old” Arabic based on the comparison and reconstruction of separate words (not on the comparison of stress rules) with their stress in modern colloquials. The results are summarized (pp. 35—36, § 34, and pp. 51—52 § 68) in the following way: „1. The final syllable of the word was deprived of stress. Even there is no reason to assume that the imperative was stressed on the final syllable: **uqtul* only becomes *qtul* in those dialects, where **abyadu* > *byād*. This stress (*byād*) is without any doubt secondary. Dialects that have the original accentuation **abyadu* have also **uqtul*. So **uqtul* was Old Arabic. However, it is possible that **uqtul* was a variant with a sentence stress, proper to volitive sentences. 2. Apart from the final syllable, the stress was on the last syllable with a long vowel: *qitālun*, *qātilun*, *qātilatun*. From the last example it appears that Old Arabic had no *Dreisilbengesetz*. When two long vowels are in one word, it is the second that was stressed: *mafātīhu*. A long

vowel in the penultima was stressed, even when it was followed by ' or y: *samā'un*, the nisbe-ending *-iyun*. 3. Apart from the final syllable, the stress was on the last closed syllable: *qātlun*, *qatāla*, *qālatun*, *yāqtulu*, *māqīlatun*. From the last example it appears, that Old Arabic had no *Dreisilbengesetz*. If the closed syllable was initial and started with ' -, then the same rule was valid: *'ābyadu*, *'ākbaru*, *'ūqtul*. An exception was the 7th and the 8th stem: (*i*)*nqātala*, (*i*)*qtātala*, *yanqātīlu*, *yaqtātīlu*. When the word had no long syllable (apart from the final one) the first syllable was stressed: *qātala*, *qātalu*, *qātālāt*, *qātālatun*. From the last example it appears that Old Arabic had no *Dreisilbengesetz*. 5. Forms having a suffixed pronoun are treated as single word: *qatālātika*. 6. It cannot be examined whether the pause forms had deviating rules". According to the author (p. 53, § 70) every long syllable has a stress, a main stress or secondary stress.

Part B (pp. 65—124) deals with the syllabic structure of the word in modern Arabic dialects which originated, according to the author, from a common Arabic spoken koinē. The development of this structure through vowel elision is explained as dependent not on the quantity but on the stress though the latter is automatic i.e. predictable on the basis of the former. Part C (pp. 125—151) deals with the syllabic structure of forms with personal suffixes. There are also three supplements: on the Arabic dialects of the Mediterranean in the 13th—14th centuries (pp. 152—155), on the evolution of the nomadic dialects (pp. 156—157) and on the Arabic of Spain (pp. 158—159). All these supplements concentrate on the stress and its influence on the syllabic structure of the word.

The final results of the reconstruction of the Arabic stress do not differ substantially from what has already been known from the traditional European grammars of Arabic which did not, however, provide any explicit explanation of the validity of the stress rules for the older, unrecorded stages. It must be emphasised that we still lack studies of stress as actually functioning in Modern Literary Arabic throughout the Arab world¹ — in spite of the interference with the Colloquials the present state is not without significance for the study of diachronic aspects. Two recent studies on the subject remained unknown to author: D. A. Abdo, *On Stress and Arabic Phonology: A Generative Approach*, Beirut 1969 (cf. reviews by F. S. Anshen, *Language* 47, fasc. 4, 1971, pp. 955—957, and by C. Killeen, *Journal of Linguistics*, 8, fasc. 2, 1971) and S. H. Al-Ani, *Arabic Phonology*, The Hague, 1970. *Dreisilbengesetz* has been relegated by the author from „Old” Arabic

¹ Cf. however stress rules (including *Dreisilbengesetz*!) in the valuable handbook by E. C. McCarus and Raji Rammuny, *A Programmed Course in Modern Literary Arabic Phonology and Script*, Ann Arbor 1970, pp. 10—14 and p. 33.

though there is still, in my opinion, a possibility that dialects (including literary to a large extent) in which this rule occurs, continue a very ancient dialect division. As a matter of fact, we are by no means obliged to assume that the accentuation in Classical or in „Old” Arabic was uniform. The emergence of the literary and spoken koinē could not result in any total uniformization or standardization of the spoken language — such an assumption would be contrary to all that we know about the dialect division and dialect interference in all languages. It is still possible to state the stress rules in the following way: the stress was on the last long syllable with the exception of ultima which remained always unstressed, all other accentuations being prosodic variants probably with different dialect distribution, so that both *māmlakatun* and *mamlakatun* were possible. There is no doubt that pause forms played an important part in the development of these forms. There is also an interesting problem of stress in status constructus that should be investigated from a diachronic point of view.

Andrzej Zaborski

R. Barthes, F. Bovon, F. J. Leenhardt, R. Martin-Achard, J. Starobinski, *Analyse structurale et exégèse biblique — essais d'interprétation*, Neuchâtel (Suisse) 1972, pp. 121, Delachaux et Niestlé.

The volume contains two papers by R. Barthes (*La lutte avec l'ange: analyse textuelle de Genèse 32. 23—33*, pp. 27—40) and by J. Starobinski (*Le démoniaque de Gérasa: analyse littéraire de Marc 5. 1—20*, pp. 63—94) presented at Geneva University in February 1971 during two sessions on the problems of structural analysis and its applications to Biblical studies. To these two papers by R. Martin-Achard (*Un exégète devant Genèse 5. 1—20*, pp. 41—62) and by F. J. Leenhardt (*Essai exégétique: Marc 5. 1—20*, pp. 95—121) have been added as a traditional counterpart or counterpoint together with a general introduction on French structuralism by F. Bovon (*Structuralisme français et exégèse biblique*, pp. 9—26; this is an amplified and ameliorated version of the same author's article entitled *Strukturalismus und biblische Exegese*, *Wissenschaft und Praxis in Kirche und Gesellschaft* 60, 1971, pp. 16—26).

The idea of publishing such a volume which may enable a comparison of structural and traditional methods must be really welcomed. Structural (in the broadest sense) methods and technics have found, unfortunately, only a very limited application in Biblical studies and there is certainly a need for establishing normal contacts with scholars

working in closely related disciplines, i.e. in the first place with specialists on general poetics, linguistics, semiotics etc. etc. Certainly there are obvious difficulties inherent in such a comparison. First of all it must be emphasised that the opponents or better say conservatives may demand that the presentation of structural methods should reveal at once all their merits and a failure to do it will be interpreted as a failure of „structuralism” in general. This demand may, however, remain unfulfilled to a considerable degree. It would be naively optimistic to expect instantaneous effects of the application of structural methods to the study of Biblical literature. Such effects may be attained in the domain of linguistics and its applications but the situation is not as simple in the domain of literary research which is less developed. Time is needed in order to introduce Biblical scholars to structural methods in all their variety, to educate real specialists in literary research and to develop a large scale research which is necessary if we want really valid, fundamental effects. In the meantime we are limited to sample studies of short and not very important texts. We have also to rely on specialists from other branches whose approach to Biblical literature may be genuinely refreshing. Both cases are exemplified by papers included in the book under review. Another difficulty has its source in the fact that structural methods and technics are already highly sophisticated (though certainly not omnipotent), encoded in different metalanguages and immensely diversified so that it is extremely difficult and in many cases really impossible to introduce to them non-specialists through a short and condensed text so that all the depth of the structural insight become visible and appreciated. Both difficulties have been surmounted by the authors (the last two papers have practically nothing in common with structural methods and I am not able to deal with them) of this volume only to a limited extent.

The introduction by F. Bovon deals only (this was the author's intention) with the so-called French structuralism. It presents an outline of the analysis of myth and kinship terminology by C. Lévi-Strauss as well as „analyse des récits” by R. Barthes following the principles formulated by the latter in Communication 8, 1966, 1—27, and in *S/Z*, Paris 1970. This limitation to two French structuralists is not a very lucky one. It may only strengthen the opinion that structural methods are a French invention and that French structuralists are a dominating group. As a matter of fact structuralist ideas reached France on a larger scale rather late and both Lévi-Strauss and Barthes have been strongly influenced by the foreign, classical (American, Prague, Russian and Danish) structuralist schools. Bovon describes Lévi-Strauss as „the father of structuralism” and R. Barthes as „enfant terrible” of it but both designations are misleading. Of course all this does not mean that both these and other French scholars did not make

or are not making very important contributions. The French culture is still very influential and the French mode on structuralism spread into other countries in which many journalists, intellectuals and even scholars take „structuralism” as a French invention and neglect other structuralist schools and trends.

Bovon provides also two samples of structural analysis *à la* Barthes: at first he presents a summary of Barthes' paper „*L'analyse structurale de récit — à propos d'Actes X—XI*, Recherches de Sciences Religieuses 58, 1970, 17—37, and then he presents his own analysis of John 1. 35—51. Both sketches concentrate on the analysis of the levels (*niveau des fonctions, niveau des actants, niveau de la narration*). The establishing of the levels is, however, rather random and most of the features attributed to these levels are banal, e.g. on the level of „actants” it is said that „*l'action principe des personnage est de parler*” or on the level of functions „*Le seule mention de ces villes montre que le récit est fait de distances constatées puis franchies avant d'être dépassées vers un autre lieu*” (pp. 22-21). The separate treatment of the levels has proven fallacious and fruitless both in linguistics and in poetics.

It must be said that both texts (and especially John 1. 35—51) are structured rather not enough to be considered as really literary pieces and I wonder whether an especially sophisticated method to analyse them is actually necessary. Their meaning is quite well and openly manifested and I wonder whether any analysis can detect more than is overtly said in a quite comprehensible way. Only the visions by Cornelius and by Peter may be interpreted as literary manifestations of the feeling about the necessity of a contact and the necessity to comprise all the peoples, to put into practice the universal ideas of the new religion. There are very few traits of a literary transformation. This is a non-literary or in the best case less-literary communication and the results of any attempt to uncover through a literary analysis some hidden meanings may be only mystical. The explanatory power of both analyses is very small.

In the Conclusion Bovon says that there may be two gains resulting from the application of structural methods to Biblical exegesis: 1. Too long concentrated on the diachronic studies the exegesis will turn to synchronic aspects. 2. „Structuralism” will provide a sort of counter-balance to the existential analysis. It must be emphasised that structural methods should not be equated with synchronic considerations neglecting diachrony. Only some schools neglected the diachronic studies to some extent but this was by no means a total neglect. Since a few years we witness a revival of diachronic studies in linguistics and as it is well known, the impact of linguistics on poetics and semiotics is tremendous. There is certainly an urgent need for synchronic analyses of the Biblical literature but diachronic structural studies should not be neglected if we do not want to fall into another extreme.

In a sense „structuralism” may provide a counterbalance to existentialism in the countries in which the latter has been and still continues to be an influential trend, i.e. the research may not concentrate so much on existentialist approaches (these should not be underestimated but judged on their merits) but a variety of methods will be applied. But existentialism and „structuralism” differ well enough so that a direct confrontation of them is not an easy task if necessary at all.

Roland Barthes, one of the best known French structural literary critics, explains his task in the following way: „*Je me contenterai d'analyser le texte de Genèse 32 (dit traditionnellement „Lutte de Jacob avec l'Ange”), comme si je me trouvais dans le premier temps d'une recherche (c'est bien le cas): ce n'est pas un „résultat” que j'expose, ni même une „méthode” (ce serait trop ambitieux et impliquerait une vue „scientifique” du texte qui n'est pas la mienne) mais simplement une „manière de procéder”* (pp. 28—29). He characterizes his task as follows: „*L'analyse textuelle („textuel” est dit ici par référence à la théorie actuelle du texte, qui doit être entendu comme production de signifiante et pas du tout comme objet philologique, détenteur de la Lettre); cette analyse textuelle cherche à „voir” le texte dans sa différence... (elle — A. Z.) cherche à dire, non plus d'où vient le texte (critique historique), ni même comment il est fait (analyse structurale), mais comment il se défait, explose, dissémine: selon quelles avenues codées il s'an va*” (p. 28). It is rather unfortunate that Barthes employs the word „structural” in an idiosyncratic and... non structuralist sense. His usage of the word is influenced evidently by the Russian formalist school. It may result only in a misunderstanding of what „structuré” means and in a rather vain terminological discussions.

Barthes attempts to present several approaches to the chosen text. At first he presents „analyse séquentielle” which he briefly describes in the following way: „*procéder à l'inventaire et au classement des actions: c'est le plan des verbes; ces actions narratives s'organisent, on le sait, en séquences, en suites apparemment ordonnées selon un schéma pseudo-logique (il s'agit d'une logique purement empirique, culturelle, issue de l'expérience, fut-elle ancestrale, non du raisonnement)*” (p. 29). The analysis presents in an essay style only elements of the structure at a rather low level, which pertain essentially to the surface and not to the deep structure. I am rather pessimistic about the reception of this „sequential analysis” without a more detailed and explicit presentation of the theoretical principles. Most of the Biblical scholars will expect some well defined results but these are rather lacking.

There is also a serious contradiction between the author's program and its realization, notably in his approach to the meaning. In addition to what has already been quoted above about „production de signifiante”, we read: „*Nous avons essayé, on l'a vu, de toujours rester au niveau de la structure, c'est-à-dire de la corrélation systématique des termes dénotant*

une action (cf. my remarks on his usage of the word „structure” — A. Z.); *s'il nous est arrivé de faire mention de certains sens possible, cela n'a pas été pour discuter de la probabilité de ces sens, mais plutôt pour montrer comment la structure „dissémine” des contenues — que chaque lecture peut prendre à son compte. Notre objet n'est pas le document philologique ou historique, détenteur d'une vérité à trouver, mais le volume, la signifiante du texte*” (p. 36). Actually the author does not analyse the meanings of the text and his approach is not really semantic.

„Analyse actantielle” as developed by A. J. Greimas is presented by R. Barthes only in a very general outline. In practice only some „actants” have been simply labeled and there is no real analysis. The results are, naturally enough, rather vague and unconvincing.

The third type of the analysis performed by R. Barthes goes back to the principles of the analysis of fable elaborated by Propp whose work in this field is a real classic and has influenced structural poetics („analyse actantielle” by Greimas included) to a very considerable extent. Unfortunately the results must be characterized as most unconvincing. Barthes acts, as a matter of fact, against the basic principles of structural analysis: he compares elements of Gen. 32. 23—33 deprived of their context with some of the functions working in the type of fable which has been analysed by Propp — actually he takes these functions out of the whole. He does it on the basis of their quite superficial resemblance without taking into account their actual function i.e. their working in relation or in opposition to all other elements in order to produce the particular meaning (or meanings) of the given whole — this is against his own intention to analyse „la corrélation systématique des termes dénotant une action”. He takes functions no 15—19 of the fable type analysed by Propp as if they constituted a whole — as a matter of fact, they are placed, roughly speaking, in the middle of the structure and taken out of it they are deprived of their original character since the oppositions with other functions (nos 1—14 and 20—31 — it is irrelevant that some of them are optional or phaculative) cease to exist. E.g. the fact of Jacob being „marked” through the sprain of his leg is only superficially similar to the marking of the hero in a fable since it does not reappear, e.g. it does not help to recognize a hero when he is put to a test. Its generative capacity is quite different — it provides only an „explanation” for a religious taboo. The crossing of the river and coming to Sichem is also only superficially similar to function no 19, i.e. liquidation of the obstacle. Apart from a trivial but still significant fact that Jacob had already crossed the river before he fought with the unspecified adversary and came back once again on his own will, it must be emphasised that function no 19 is in correlation or in opposition directly with the function no 8 which works in the introductory part of the fable but which has no counterpart in Gen. 32. The benediction given to Jacob can only

hardly be considered as parallel to function no 14, i.e. obtaining a magic object. It is also quite impossible to pretend (on structural or in Propp's terminology morphological grounds) that God plays a part of the adversary („mechant”) analogous to that which acts in Propp's fables. Barthes' strong assertion that Gen. 32. 23—33 is a real „*conte de fées*” is most astonishing. It must be emphasised that Propp's analysis of invariants refers only to the particular type of fable i.e. the type with a „donor” and not to fable in general. The same pattern cannot be applied automatically to other types of fable and, naturally enough, to other „genres”.

The failure of these analyses has several sources. First of all it must be emphasised very strongly that Gen. 32. 23—33 is not a quite cohesive text. Barthes himself refers to this fact several times. Actually we do not know who was fighting with Jacob and why he did so — this problem bothered the exegetes and this was not due e.g. to their neglect of structural methods or to any other deficiency. The text is indeed not quite comprehensible (in a sense different from „incomprehensible” as applied sometimes to modern literature — it is quite improbable that in Gen. 32. 23—33 the lack of cohesion resulting in a realtive „incomprehensibility” would be applied consciously to attain a particular expression) not speaking about the fact that it is literary only in a rather restricted measure. It is very possible that this is due to some faulty oral or written transmission. Of course it is possible to study incoherent textes but I think that it would have been better to select a group of relatively „simpler”, more patterned texts in which it would be possible to detect structural invariants.

In the intentionally traditional counterpart to Barthes' analysis R. Martin-Achard also points out that this text is in some way defective. His traditional, i.e. philological and historical study is quite refreshing — he presents facts in a sober manner, formulates clear and concrete statements. His study may be considered as a proof that conflicting philology and „structuralism” (or any other newly developed methods) is indeed unrealistic and in a sense naive. Both tradition and modern trends cannot work without each other.

I am afraid that my criticism of these samples of structural analyses may be, quite contrary to my intention, considered as a criticism or even a refutation of structural methods in general. The slips and failures of some very short and as a matter of fact preliminary pioneer attempts cannot provide an argument against the application of structural methods to Biblical studies. „*Analyse structurale*” in spite of its shortcomings which are to a great extent typical of and inevitable in a process of the accomodation of new trends, will certainly help to promote the new methods. Such books are necessary.

Andrzej Zaborski

Wolfgang Richter, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft — Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie*, Göttingen 1971, pp. 211, Vandenhoeck-Ruprecht.

Since H. Gunkel relatively little progress has been made in the literary study of the OT literature especially as far as the method is concerned. In effect of a peculiar isolationist approach Biblical scholars kept aloof or remained quite unaware of the most important developments in general linguistics and in the theory of literature developing (to a very limited extent) their own linguistics and poetics. The study of the literary genres has been from its very beginnings seriously hampered by the lack of an adequate theoretical basis and by underestimation or even a total lack of any scientific method of literary research. The study of literature has not yet evolved into a separate branch of Biblical studies as it is still dominated by purely philological, historical and other considerations. It must be, however admitted that the same situation exists in most branches of the so-called Oriental studies in which traditional philological and historical approach is still prevailing. It is quite symptomatic that during an international (in practice rather regional) conference on the theoretical problems of Oriental literatures (Warsaw—Cracow, May 1972) at which about forty papers were presented, there was almost no paper on the theory of literature nor any serious discussion of this very subject.

The author of the book under review is well aware of this situation (cf. e.g. pp. 22—23, 25). His attempt to introduce modern, really literary methods based on modern linguistics must be most welcomed indeed. Studies of this kind are badly needed and as a matter of fact necessary if we want to make a substantial progress. The author's assumption that „*Bibelwissenschaft ist somit ein kleiner Zweig der Literaturwissenschaften; sie ist Literaturwissenschaft*” (p. 12) may sound a bit extremist to many scholars but he is certainly right when he ascribes to the literary study a central position within Biblical studies (p. 22). Judged from within, i.e. from the viewpoint of Biblical studies or against its background, W. Richter's book must be highly appreciated as it will greatly contribute to the promotion of the really literary studies of the OT and to the development of the OT „*Literaturwissenschaft*” into an autonomous discipline.

An evaluation from the point of view of general poetics and linguistics cannot be, however, equally optimistic. It happens frequently that in the process of adaptation of the theoretical and methodological lore of one discipline by another one, the latter becomes acquainted at first with the traditional, well known and more or less outdated model of the former. It is also frequently observed that what has already been superseded or become obsolete in one discipline sur-

vives for a long time in another one which is related to or influenced by the former. The author of the book under review is certainly much better acquainted with the contemporary theory of literature and with linguistics than most of the Biblical scholars dealing with the literary study of the OT. Consequently his theory and methodology (the book was written at the end of the sixties) is superior to most of the others. Although marking a considerable progress in the history of OT studies, nevertheless it is not quite satisfactory. The main shortcomings are due to a formalist and descriptivist approach which results first of all in a neglect or underestimation of the semantic study of the texts. It is true that „*Die traditionsgeschichtliche Forschung am Alten Testament leidet an einer methodischen Schwäche: ihrem inhaltlichen Ansatz*” p. 156. It cannot be denied that the traditional approach concentrating almost exclusively on the meaning of the texts or even their social and historical impact was one-sided and in most cases limited to a non-literary paraphrase¹ of the original text. The author's criticism of the misuses of the traditional semantic analysis of the OT (it was, indeed, impressionistic and unsatisfactory) is essentially right (see p. 174 ff.). Yet one can hardly agree with his reintroduction of the old dichotomy form versus meaning and of the claim that the study of „form” must precede the study of meaning (cf. pp. 28—29, 32—33, 46, 78, 16,, 178). These two slogans are quite old-fashioned and discredited both in poetics and in linguistics. Embracing the vague and in the long run fruitless opposition of form and meaning with the descriptivist claim to study the language without a recourse to semantics i.e. taking into consideration only the so-called contrastive meaning and the distribution of items), the author repeats the old, well known mistakes of the formalists and descriptivists. He is influenced by the formalist theory rather in its standard, popular version widely scattered in different handbooks (the footnotes are full of quotations from them — in general there are too many unnecessary quotations from rather not very original and relevant studies in the footnotes) and not e.g. by the Russian formalists whose impact on the modern poetics has been tremendous. Though quoting Chomsky, Bierwisch and some other leading linguists, he is also influenced mainly by the American descriptive (or better say distributional) school which has become surpassed since over fifteen years so that many of the fundamental assumptions of this (otherwise most important from the historical point of view) school have been rejected, e.g. the abstention from the study of semantics. Yet the author considers the meaning or the content (*Inhalt* and *Gehalt* — both terms are used not very precisely and rather ambiguously, e.g. on p. 178 we read „Zum Inhalt gehören Motiv, Stoff, Fabel, Thema, Sitz im Leben. Zum Gehalt gehören Begriff, Problem, Idee”. This is a rather idiosyncratic usage.) as vital only at a well

¹ Cf. R. Fowler, *The Languages of Literature*, New York 1971.

advanced or even final stage¹, e.g. when analysing *Sitz im Leben* (p. 146). *Inhalt* is absent in his sample analyses — as a matter of fact *Inhalt* and *Gehalt* disappear in the book, being practically neglected. The author's „*textimamente Exegese*” (p. 179 ff.) deals mainly with syntactic phenomena and only marginally with semantics in a narrow sense.

The vague term of „Form” is used also in a number of different meanings. The author is acquainted with some works by Jakobson but he is not acquainted with Jakobson's approach to formalism and with his already classical analysis of communication and speech which, though certainly not ultimate, proves that these are far too complicated to be accounted by such a vague and overtly simplifying dichotomy of form and meaning or contents.

It is impossible to repeat here all the criticism of both formalism and descriptivism. Since almost ten years we witness an outburst and a very promising development of semantics both in linguistics and in poetics (cf. the newly founded Journal of Literary Semantics) and it is not possible to underestimate the study of meaning in any ways. If Biblical literary research falls from one extreme (i.e. the almost exclusive study of meaning) into another one (i.e. the study of „forms”), it will continue to be backward, the progress being only relative.

The claim that „levels of description” should be dealt with separately has been discredited as well as „item and arrangement” (cf. pp. 28, 35, 82 ff.). What we have, however, is a very atomized picture and not an analysis of a functioning structure. By the way, it must be also mentioned that the author's usage of „structure” and its derivatives is also ambiguous and sometimes idiosyncratic, e.g. we find (p. 82) „strukturelle Form”. The sample analyses present a typically atomized account of rather random levels and elements without an analysis of their interdependence which determines that what is composed of them is indeed a working, meaningful text. We are not actually said how the texts work.

On the author's interpretation of syntax (p. 92) it must be remarked that it is no more accepted that sentence is built directly of words — word is a rather „law” constituent. His syntax (and stylistics!) is also atomistic — we read only about sentences and words. It is not enough to analyse sentences — there are higher and multi-level constituents of higher order through which the given meaning

¹ Cf. T. Todorov, *Quelques concepts du formalisme russe*, Revue d'Esthétique, 24, 1971, 129—43, on the problem of form and contents which were considered by the Russian formalists equally important. Cf. also C. Greenberg, *Necessity of „Formalism”*, New Literary History, 3, 1971, 171—5. For another standpoint cf. F. Jameson, *The Prison of Languages — A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism*, 1972.

of the whole text is generated from its deep to surface structure. The author's „Innere Form” is not to be equated with the deep structure first of all because he does not say anything about the surface structure and about the semantic interpretation (e.g. p. 104 ff.).

All the same criticism pertains to his definitions of literary genres (pp. 141 ff.). He is right when he says that no explicit criteria have ever been formulated for OT genres. Yet he himself is rather far from providing explicit and not ambiguous formulations. E.g. on p. 144 he describes as „Gattungen” (cf. his general definition on pp. 131—132) what may be called only stylistic figures. A definition like „*Es ist das Verbalsubstantiv „Erzählung” vorgeschlagen worden, weil das Struktur-muster offensichtlich dazu dient, einen einzelnen Stoff spannend Hörern/Lesern darzustellen*” is certainly too general. The definition of poetry on p. 81, n. 25 is also hardly satisfactory.

The author is aware of the fact that not all the OT texts are really literary (cf. p. 25). He is not, however, quite consistent. For example he is bothered with defining lists of names (pp. 143—144) as „literary genres”. He deals also with problems which belong rather to philology (to avoid any misunderstanding: by philology I mean the work on decoding, critical establishing and editing the text), e.g. his „*Literarkritik*” (this is not literary criticism) and „*Traditionskritik*” (pp. 158 ff.) are certainly related to and important for the literary analysis but they belong to a rather separate though to some extent overlapping discipline.

The author's exclusion of comparison with texts outside the OT sphere (p. 22) is rather justified. Comparative approaches brought too many premature hypotheses of borrowing and interference of other types. I do not think, however, that we should exclude considerations of the universals of literature — of course these universals are to be discovered. The author's suggestion (p. 24) about „*Wanderungen der Gattungen, Motive, Stoffe*” have, however, rather a diffusionist tinge.

I am convinced that Biblical studies may make in the future a contribution of their own to general poetics. The OT contains peculiar texts the interpretation of which poses special problems. At present we must rely on the theoretical and methodological apparatus elaborated elsewhere. It may be better to concentrate, in the meantime, rather on problems peculiar to the OT and on the application of already existing methods to the particular texts leaving the study of general foundations to general poetics or to other „philologies” with longer traditions of genuinely literary studies. In spite of all the shortcomings, W. Richter's book raises many important problems, stimulates and propagates many sound ideas. Even this formalist and distributional approach marks considerable progress, an important stage in the development of the literary OT studies.

Andrzej Zaborski

G. M. Meredith-Owens, *Meşâ'ir üş-şu'arâ* or *Tezkere* of 'Âşık Çelebi. E. J. W. Gibb Memorial New Series, XXIV, London 1971, pp. xxv + 66 + 299a.

Terminée en 1568/9 et offerte au sultan Selīm II, l'oeuvre connue du fameux Pîr Mehemmed 'Âşık Çelebi (1520—1572), intitulée *Meşâ'ir üş-şu'arâ*, c.-à.-d. „Les sens des poètes”, est la quatrième dans la ligne des grandes *tezkeres* turques du XVI^e siècle. Les trois *tezkeres* précédentes ce sont *Heşt Bihişt* (1538) de Sehi Bey, *Tezkere* (1546/7) de Latîfi et *Gülşen üş-şu'arâ* (1563) de 'Ahdi. Les *tezkeres* — une sorte des dictionnaires biographiques qui contenaient les indications sur les poètes ainsi que les exemples de leurs poésies, sont considérées comme une source particulièrement importante pour les recherches sur la littérature turque. La *tezkere* de 'Âşık Çelebi, dont M. G. M. Meredith-Owens a publié le texte en *facsimile*, appartient aux chef-d'oeuvres de ce genre. Cette édition a été basée sur le manuscrit N° Or 6434 de British Museum avec les variantes des manuscrits d'Istanbul et Upsala. Le manuscrit de British Museum, 299 folios, c'est une copie de 1569/70 faite par Mehemmed b. Murād en *nesħi* bien lisible. Nous y trouvons 424 notices sur les poètes turques. Le texte en *facsimile* a été précédé par une introduction qui en prouvant l'érudition profonde de son auteur constitue l'exemple d'un travail philologique excellent. En voici le plan. D'abord la préface qui contient les indications précises sur: 1. l'auteur, 2. son style en prose et en vers, 3. son *Tezkere*, 4. ses travaux et 5. les sources des manuscrits (M. Meredith-Owens en présente 19 q compris celui de British Museum). Après cela nous retrouvons la liste des notices poétiques (en accord à l'ordre dans lequel elles apparaissent dans le texte), les variantes et les notes textuelles, et enfin les index, notamment celui des noms des personnes, des dynasties et des peuples, celui des titres des travaux et celui des places. Cette magnifique édition de l'oeuvre de 'Âşık Çelebi que nous devons à M. G. M. Meredith-Owens en étant l'objet de désir de chaque turcologue est une commémoration digne de la grandeur de E. J. W. Gibb auquel elle a été consacrée comme le XXIV^e tome des séries nouvelles de „The E. J. W. Gibb Memorial”.

Jan Ciopiński

Ed. Louis Ligeti, *Mongolian studies*, Akadémiai Kiado, Budapest 1970, s. 590 i 2 nlb.

Mongolian Studies ont paru comme le volume XIV de la série „Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica”. Ce vaste, de 35 feuilles, imprimées, volume comprend 33 dissertations des 34 orientalistes européens, américains et japonais.

Ce recueil, publié grâce à l'initiative et par les soins de mongolisant hongrois professeur Ligeti, est dédié au II Congrès International des Mongolisants, de même qu'à ses organisateurs: l'Académie des Sciences de Hongrie et les savants mongols.

Etant le résultat d'une coopération internationale conçue sur un plan très large, il témoigne d'agilité et d'esprit d'entreprise de cet éminent savant qui n'épargne pas ses forces pour gagner la réputation honorable dans le domaine de la linguistique orientale.

Les travaux y publiés sont écrits en trois langues: anglaise (15), allemande (13) et française (5). Les plus nombreux, à savoir 8 dissertations, sont les travaux des savants hongrois proches collaborateurs de l'auteur du centre mongolisant à Budapest. La deuxième place avec 6 dissertations occupent les savants russes, ensuite avec le même nombre des travaux viennent les mongolisants allemands, puis les Américains avec 4 travaux. Les savants français et japonais sont représentés par 2 travaux, les mongolisants anglais, tchèques, danois, finnois et polonais y publient une dissertation chacun.

La diversité des sujets est grande. Le volume contient études, dissertations et suppléments consacrés aux recherches linguistiques aussi bien qu'à l'histoire de la littérature du moyen mongol et de ses monuments, plusieurs traitent du folklore et de l'éthnographie de l'ancienne Mongolie. Ligeti ne cherche pas de classer les matériaux d'après leurs sujets. Il accepte pour principe du rangement l'ordre alphabétique des noms des auteurs.

Il en résulte une publication qui doit intéresser les mongolisants de diverses spécialités et quoiqu'on peut supposer, que certains de travaux y publiés puissent provoquer des réserves et des contradictions qui ne sont pas à éviter chez les linguistes, les qualités du tout font de ce livre la matière pour les études mongolises d'une grande importance.

Wiktor Frantz

I. *Histoire secrète des Mongols*. 1971, s. 265.

II. *Monuments préclassiques*. 1. XIII^e et XIV^e siècles. 1972, s. 294.

III. *Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa. Pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise*. 1972, s. 170.

Louis Ligeti, *Indices verborum linguae Mongolicae monumentis traditorum*. Akadémiai Kiado, Budapest.

I. *Monuments préclassiques*. 1. XIII^e et XIV^e siècles, 1970, s. 169.

II. *Monuments préclassiques*. 1. XIII^e et XIV^e siècles. Deuxième partie. 1972, s. 382.

Louis Ligeti, *Monumenta linguae Mongolicae collecta*. Akadémiai Kiado, Budapest.

Ces cinq livres en solides couvertures de toile édités bien soigneusement bien qu'au moyen de la technique de l'offset, témoignent que l'Hongrie est devenue le centre le plus vital des études en philologie mongole ancienne. C'est à Budapest que développe ses activités infatigable Professeur Ligeti qui prend toujours l'initiative dans le domaine des études altaïques.

Il a conçu le projet, qu'il réalise avec conséquence, de réunir tous les monuments linguistiques mongols connus jusque là et plus ou moins étudiés dont les informations sont dissipées dans des nombreuses, vieilles et souvent difficilement accessibles publications périodiques.

Il a commencé son travail par des publications provisoires, hors commerce, qui portaient le titre hongrois de *Mongol Nyelvemléktár* (*Recueil des monuments de la langue mongole*). Au moment où l'Académie des Sciences de Hongrie s'est chargée de les rééditer, ils ont paru sous une forme nouvelle intitulée *Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta*. Cette nouvelle édition présente les textes corrigés, complètes et précédés de préfaces en langue française.

Ligeti a divisé le moyen mongol (dit le mongol préclassique) en deux phases: comme première phase il comprend le XIII^e et XIV^e siècles dont il donne tous les monuments connus jusque là; comme deuxième phase — les XV^e, XVI^e et le début du XVII^e siècles, dont il présente les documents les plus caractéristiques de cette époque. Plusieurs monuments sont publiés dans ce recueil pour la première fois.

Tous les textes des monuments sont reproduits d'après le système de transcription élaboré par M. Ligeti qui s'efforce de rendre toutes les particularités orthographiques des documents, rédigés au cours de siècles en différentes écritures: ouïgoure, chinoise, carrée (*phags-pa*) et arabe. Ligeti est d'avis que sa méthode permet sans la moindre équivoque de rétablir la graphie originale; malheureusement il n'y arrive pas et cela n'est pas de sa faute. La transcription elle-même n'inspire pas des objections et on peut supposer, que s'il s'agit des textes imprimés, elle sera utile; mais s'il s'agit de la paléographie, il n'est pas possible de remplacer l'original ou sa photocopie par transcription ou translittération quelles qu'elles soient. Il suffit de rappeler l'histoire du monument mongol le plus ancien, cette pierre fameuse de Tchinguiz-Khan découverte au début du XIX^e siècle, qui était plusieurs fois déchiffrée par les mongolisants les plus célèbres, de Schmidt commençant, par Banzarov jusqu'à Klukin, et qui donnaient chacun à son tour une traduction toute différente et bien contradictoire.

Est-ce que donc le chercheur successif (si un tel se trouvera encore) pourrait se servir de transcription de Ligeti qui acceptait pour sa publication la méthode de Klukin, jusqu'à présent la plus réussie?

C'est pourquoi, je pense, il sera utile de compléter *Monumenta linguae mongolica collecta* de volume supplémentaire contenant les reproductions des monuments paléographiques les plus contradictoires.

Simultanément M. Ligeti publie la série *Indices verborum linguae mongolicae monumentis traditorum* constituant un registre lexicologique de tous les mots contenus dans les textes insérés dans *Monumenta*, sans donner leur signification, mais discutant leurs formes et les connexions grammaticales.

Cette lexicographie soigneusement élaborée servira de base pour *Dictionnaire du moyen mongol* projeté par Ligeti pour le prochain avenir. D'après l'intention de l'auteur le dictionnaire ne devra pas répéter les indexes détaillés mais il apportera quelques remarques complémentaires et la signification des mots en français. Faisant part de ses projets Ligeti annonce qu'il saura gré de toute suggestion à propos de son dictionnaire. Cela permet de souffler à l'auteur que la signification des mots soit doublée en deuxième langue, en anglais par exemple. Le dictionnaire de Kovalski était aussi mongol-russe-français.

Wiktor Frantz

Ferenc Tökei, *Genre Theory in China in the 3rd—6th Centuries*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1971, pp. 177.

Dès leurs débuts les études de la littérature chinoise sont fortement marquées par des méthodes philologiques, sans lesquelles d'ailleurs aucune connaissance approfondie de la littérature chinoise classique n'est pas possible. Il est cependant hors de doute que l'esprit d'analyse propre à toute recherche philologique n'inspire pas les tentatives de synthèse qui conduiraient à une théorie de la littérature chinoise. Or, la théorie de la littérature chinoise se trouve encore à ses commencements.

Pour arriver à une théorie de la littérature chinoise il faut donc libérer la recherche de l'esprit philologique. Il faut aussi se livrer à une étude approfondie des théories littéraires chinoises et de leur évolution à travers les siècles.

C'est à l'étude des théories littéraires chinoises qu'est consacré le nouveau livre de M. F. Tökei qui — il y a treize ans — commença

ses recherches par une étude de l'élegie chinoise, publiée en 1959 en hongrois (*A Kínai elégia születése, K'iu Jüan és kora*, Akadémiai Kiadó) et traduite en français (*Naissance de l'élegie chinoise*, Gallimard).

Genre Theory in China in 3rd—6th Centuries apparut comme le 15ème volume de la *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica*. Ce livre consiste en trois parties intitulées: 1. *Introduction* (pp. 9—39), 2. *Beginnings of the Chinese genre theory* (pp. 40—80) et 3. *Liu Hsieh's theory on literary genres* (pp. 81—177). Cette dernière partie se divise en quatre chapitres qui sont: 1. *The epoch of Liu Hsieh* (pp. 81—98), 2. *Preface on Wen-hsün tiao-lung* (pp. 98—105), 3. *Liu Hsieh on the history of poetical genres* (pp. 105—135) et 4. *Principle of t'ung-pien* (pp. 135—177).

Dans l'introduction, l'auteur expose largement son point de vue sur la théorie de la littérature chinoise. Ses opinions prennent la théorie marxiste développée par G. Lucacs comme point de départ. Suit une discussion sur la relation entre le contenu et la forme selon les écoles philosophiques de l'antiquité chinoise. Les opinions de l'école de Mo Ti et celle de Siun-tseu et autres sont longuement critiquées. Le rôle de K'iu Yuan et celui de la *Grande préface au Canon des poèmes* sont présentés dans la seconde partie de l'introduction. Les débuts de la théorie chinoise des genres littéraires sont étudiés dans la seconde partie du livre. Le *T'ien-louen louen-wen* de Ts'ao P'i (187—226), le *Tchong-louen* de Siu Kan (171—218) et le *Wen-fou* de Lou Ki (261—303) ainsi que des opinions des nombreux poètes (p. ex. Ts'ao Tche, P'ei Wei) sont présentées.

La partie essentielle du livre est consacré à l'étude de Liu Hie (465—522) et de son *Wen-sin tiao-long*. Le premier chapitre de cette partie est consacré à Liu Hie et à son époque. C'est avec le second chapitre que commence une analyse détaillée des opinions de Liu Hie exprimées sommairement dans sa préface à *Wen-sin tiao-long*. Ses opinions sur l'évolution des genres poétiques sont analysées dans le troisième chapitre de cette partie. La dernière partie est consacrée à une discussion exhaustive de la notion *t'ong-pien*, notion qui semble fondamentale pour toute théorie littéraire de Liu Hie.

Genre Theory in China... marque une étape nouvelle dans l'évolution de la théorie de la littérature chinoise. Ce livre abonde en idées inspiratrices qui seront certainement très utiles dans toute recherche future. C'est aussi un livre qui peut beaucoup apprendre, mais cela ne veut pas dire qu'on puisse l'apprendre facilement. C'est avec regret que je dois reprocher à l'auteur certains défauts qui ont rendu son livre peu maniable. En effet, il n'a pas de bibliographie, ce qui force le lecteur à fouiller constamment dans des notes et le laisse toujours incertain de ses remarques. Je crois aussi qu'un tel livre devrait avoir au moins deux index: l'un des noms propres et l'autre des termes.

Pour finir j'avoue que j'ai voulu reprocher à l'auteur de ne pas

avoir pris en considération l'intéressant article de M. L. Lanciotti sur les opinions littéraires de Wang Tch'ong (*Considerazioni sull'estetica letteraria nella Cina antica: Wang Ch'ung ed il sorgere dell'autonomia delle lettere*, Rome, IsMEO 1965) et des remarques qu'a fait à ce propos M. T. Pokora (voir son compte-rendu dans *Archiv Orientalní* 34, 1966). Mais, c'est à la fin du livre critiqué que j'ai trouvé la remarque indiquant qu'il fut achevé au début de l'année 1964. M. Tōkei a donc dû attendre sept ans pour que son livre soit enfin publié. Ce n'est pas pour la première fois qu'on remarque — non sans une angoisse croissante — que les publications sinologiques sont partout dans le monde imprimées avec des délais de plus en plus longs. Le fait que j'ai connaissance des livres (évidemment sinologiques) qui ont été imprimés en plus de temps encore que celui de M. Tōkei n'atténue pas l'amertume de cette remarque.

Mieczysław Jerzy Künstler

Olov Bertil Anderson, *A Companion Volume to R. H. Mathews' Chinese-English Dictionary*, Studentlitteratur, Lund 1972, 210 pp.

Mr. O. B. Anderson, whose another book has already been reviewed in FO¹, published a new volume recently. The Author is certainly right considering R. H. Mathews' *Chinese-English Dictionary* (from now on abbreviated M) as still useful, although it should be pointed out that in many countries (esp. in Slavic ones) students beginning Moderne Chinese have a much more indispensable tool in I. M. Oshanin's *Chinese-Russian Dictionary*. It is also out of question that in many cases the pronunciation given by M is not quite correct. This is obviously very annoying for a beginner who either learns Chinese with a wrong pronunciation, or is forced to check it with other dictionaries.

In order to facilitate the student's work Mr. O. B. Anderson compiled *A Companion Volume to R. H. Mathews' Chinese-English Dictionary* (hereafter called CV). CV consists of two essential parts preceded by a *Foreword* (pp. 7—12). The first part contains what the Author calls *A Scrutiny of Mathews' Chinese-English Dictionary* (pp. 13—174). In this part we find the M pronunciation compared with the readings given by the two Chinese dictionaries: 1. *Han-yü tz'u-tien* (according to the Hong Kong edition of 1967) and 2. *Tz'u-hui* (published in T'ai-pei

¹ Cf. my review of *A Concordance to Five Systems of Transcription for Standard Chinese* in FO, 13, 1971, pp. 349—350.

in 1965). The column containing the M reading of a character gives first its number in M. The columns giving pronunciations according to *Han-yü tz'u-tien* (abbr. H) and *Tz'u-hui* (abbr. T) indicate also pages in these dictionaries. In all the three columns the pronunciation is given only in the Simplified Wade System invented by the Author. There is an additional column containing classification symbols explained on p. 177. Thus, for instance, A means that the M pronunciation is corroborated by both H and T; B indicates that the M reading is corroborated by H only; C points to the cases when M is corroborated by T only; D means that the M pronunciation is neither corroborated by H nor by T; E indicates that the character given by M is not to be found in either H or T. Groups B and C comprise two sub-groups each. Group D has four different subgroups.

The second part of the reviewed book *A Few Conclusions to Be Drawn* (pp. 177—210) contains the material arranged in groups A—E. In this part, only M numbers of characters are given.

The essential conclusion (pp. 177—8) is as follows: M has 9101 different characters (arranged in 7773 entries). In 5406 cases (i.e. group A enumerated on pp. 179—187), the M reading of a character is corroborated by both H and T. In 867 cases (group E enumerated on pp. 207—210), the characters do not appear in H and T. Thus, in 6273 cases the pronunciation given by M is either correct or cannot be verified by using H and/or T (i.e. using Mr Anderson's CV). In 886 cases (groups B and C enumerated on pp. 188—198), the M reading is corroborated by either H or T (and CV does not indicate which pronunciation should be taken as the right one). Thus, in 7159 cases (making up about 79% of the material in M) the use of CV does not give any answer. Only in 1942 cases (i.e. in little more than 21%) the readings given by M differ from those in both H and T (group D enumerated on pp. 199—206). In 1399 of these 1942 cases (sub-group D1), the reading found in H and T is the same, and therefore it should be regarded as the correct one. Briefly, about 21% readings in M are doubtful. CV allows to correct about 15% of them.

It is out of question that Mr. O. B. Anderson has executed an extremely time-consuming work. It seems, however, that the reviewer is obliged to put the question what really are the results of the Author's labour. Does CV really make the student's work much easier? Is really CV a necessary tool for him?

Without CV a student who finds an unknown character in M must verify its reading in a Chinese dictionary. Knowing the radical and the number of strokes (which is the only way to find a character in M) he finds easily the same character in other dictionaries, as for instance in the above-mentioned H or T. The sole difficulty for him is to compare the Wade-Giles transcription given in M with other transcriptions used in Chinese dictionaries. Using CV the student who finds

a character in M reads its number and verifies its pronunciation with CV. In a way it is really a simplification of the student's work.

It seems quite clear, however, that as quick as possible the student should learn how to handle the various systems of transcription (to which Mr. Anderson has added himself one more) and how to search characters in Chinese dictionaries to find not only their reading, but also their meaning. The everyday use of various dictionaries is certainly the best way to attain routine in this field. Without routine no serious work on advanced level is possible. If so, the use of CV seems rather unadvisable, for the beginner at least, since it makes much longer his way to Chinese dictionaries and reference books.

On the other hand, it seems that today no course in Modern Chinese for beginners should start with characters i.e. with written texts. The best way to teach Chinese is certainly to begin with an audio-visual training. Therefore at first the student learns the phonetic shape of a word (and not of a character which is obviously not the same) and its meaning in a given context. Subsequently, after a lapse of time, he is taught its written form. Thus, the verification of pronunciation is certainly secondary for him and he will rarely need CV.

Mieczysław Jerzy Künstler

A. A. Bykov, *O khazarском čekane VIII—IX vv.* in: Trudy Gosudarstvennogo Ermitaža, vol. XII, Numizmatika IV, Leningrad 1971 g., pp. 26—36 (1 table + figures).

The present work by Bykov, a well-known Soviet numismatist is devoted to the problem of provenance of 86 Arabic coins which belong to a silver-hoard from Devica (distr. Voronež) found in 1939. The hoard consisted of 299 + 24 numismates, mainly 'Abbāsid dirhams, 1 fingerring with carnelian and several ornaments. The oldest coin in the hoard is a drachm of Khosraw I (551 A. D.), while the youngest — an Arabic dirham minted in 223 A. H. = 837/8 A. D. i.e. in the time of al-Mu'tašim's reign.

The cause of the author's special interest in these coins are their peculiarities which according to his opinion, distinguish them from the specimens commonly known as belonging to the Arabic official emission. At his first contact with the coins at issue, Bykov, sharing Vasmer's viewpoint exposed in *Zavališinskiy klad*¹ assigned them

¹ R. R. Vasmer, *Zavališinskiy klad kufičeskich monet VIII—IX v.*, Leningrad, 1931, p. 10.

to the emission of the so-called „unofficial mints”². But after he came across several copper falsifications, belonging to the numismatic collection of Ermitaž some of them silver-plated, some gilded, which bear the same inscriptions as certain specimens from among the 86 coins he decided to submit these coins to a closer and more detailed study.

First of all, Bykov divided the numismatic material under discussion into twelve types, taking the resemblances occurring among the coins at issue as a criterion for his division. These types are represented by a different number of specimens, and so e.g. type XI contains 38 coins, type IV — 30, type II — 8, while the remaining ones including type I which appears in two variants 'a' and 'b' — 1 coin each. Next, he has observed that the Obvs of the coins belonging to the types III and IV (31 specimens altogether) as well as the Revs of the coins belonging to the types IV and XI (68 specimens) were struck with the same dies. This would suggest that 69 from among 86 coins can originate from the same mint. These observations are very precious, but we do not know why the author confined them to the mentioned types only while they seem possible also in the case of other ones. Judging e.g. from the illustrations of coins inserted in Bykov's article, the Revs of the specimens belonging to the types II and X as well as to VIII and XII (s. p. 27) were too struck with the same dies.

According to Bykov, the 86 coins from the Devica hoard whose minting dates cover the time-span 136—205 A. H. = 754—820/1 A. D. are very much like 'Abbāsid dirhams but there are certain details which distinguish them from the 'Abbasid specimens. These details are:

- a) omission or shifting of letters in the words which enter into the composition of legends (s.e.g. *المدى* al-Madī instead of *المهدى* al-Mahdī, Bykov, type II, fig. 2; *امحمدية* a-Muḥammadiyya instead of *المحمدية* al-Muḥammadiyya, type VIII, fig. 3; *سرقند* Sarḳand instead of *سمرقند* Samarkand, type II, fig. 2 or *ماٲان* maṭān instead of *ٲان* ṭamān, type II, fig. 2);
- b) the incongruity between the minting-date and the mint on one hand, as well as between these two data and the name of the caliph on the other. This is the case with coins of the types Ia and Ib on whose Obvs there appear, respectively, the dates 103 A. H. and 104 A. H. and Madinat as-Salām, which did not exist at the time, as the name of their mint, while, the name of the ruler which occurs on their Revs is that of al-Ma'mūn who, as we know, reigned between 198—202 A. H.;
- c) the sign *ﻻ'* which appears beneath the area either of Obv. or Rev. on 42 specimens belonging to the types VIII—XII.

² A. A. Bykov, *Novaya nachodka kufičeskich monet*, K. S. I. I. M. K., Moskva 1941 vol. XIV, p. 119.

أرض الخزر [d al-Ḥ...r (?) which Vasmer has proposed to read أرض الخزر 'Arḍ al-Ḥazar⁴. Vasmer's lection has been accepted by Pakhomow⁵ who consequently regards these coins as Khazarian. According to Bykov's conviction these coins ought to serve as an ultimate proof of the existence of Khazarian emission, and together with the three imitations and 86 coins from Devica hoard they represent its three stages.

Bykov's arguments for the Khazarian provenance of the 86 coins from Devica have, like Zambaur's, not sufficiently convincing strength and can easily be countered by as many speaking against this conception. Until now the oriental numismatics disposes of no material which would prove beyond any doubt that the Khazars ever minted their own coins. The economy of the Khazars based on the collecting of tributes, taxes and high custom-fees secured them the constant affluence both of money and wares what considerably reduced the necessity of undertaking the emission of their own. Besides, they had

⁵ E. A. Pakhomov, *Monety Azerbayğana*, vp. II, Baku, 1963, pp. 129—132.

⁶ E. v. Zambaur, *Orientalische Münzen in Nord- und Osteuropa*, in: „Monatsblatt der Numismatischen Gesellschaft in Wien“, Bd. V, 1902, p. 371; Die Münzen der Khazaren, „Monatsblatt der Numismatischen Gesellschaft in Wien“, Bd. VIII, 1911, pp. 313—315.

The misspellings of which Bykov speaks are not peculiar only to the coins at issue. We can find them on the specimens whose provenance never evoked any reservations, s. e. g. the Catalogues of Tiesenhäusen⁸, Nützel⁹, or al-Uşš¹⁰. Therefore these misspellings not only fail in proving the Khazarian origin of the coins on which they occur but they cannot even suggest that these coins belong to any other „illegal” mintage.

As for the enigmatic mint name 'arṣ al-ḥar [d al-Ḥ...r (?) deciphered by Vasmer and after him by Pakhomov and Bykov 'arṣ al-ḫazar nothing definite can be said. We may only observe that the form in which this name occurs on the coins suggest also other lections different from that proposed by Vasmer and more simple, though equally hypothetical, and that no locality known by that name has been handed down to us by any source.

⁷ D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1954, pp. 198, 222, 228, 232—233; s. also G. Vernadsky, *The Origins of Russia*, Oxford, 1959, pp. 94—95.

¹⁰ Muhammad Abū'l-Farağ al-'Ušš, *Kanz 'Umm Ḥağara'l-fiddi*, Dimašk, 1972.

¹¹ Indeed, the Khazars imported most of their objects of material culture including the pottery. This also concerns the mentioned vessel from Sarkel, s. B. A. Šelkovnikov, *Polivnaya keramika Sarkela-Beloy Veži*, Materialy i issledovaniya po archeologii SSSR No 75, Trudy volgo-donskoy archeologičeskoy ekspedicii, II, Moskva, 1959, p. 306.

provenance of the coins at issue appears to us less complicated than it did to Bykov. The style and fabric of the specimens belonging to the types II—XII are in no detail inferior to those of the 'Abbasid official dirhams. Therefore, we do not see any obstacles which would prevent us from assigning these coins to the 'Abbāsid emission. Concerning the sign which occurs on some of them, it is known that 'Abbāsid dirhams had signs of different form and shape¹² including the sign almost identical with that on the coins from Devica hoard like e.g. on the dirham from Kūfa¹³. Only the specimens of the types Ia and Ib offer certain difficulties. They seem to be imitations in spite of the higher degree of legibility of their inscriptions in comparison with other coins of similar kind. Therefore, it is impossible to assign them to any concrete emission and for the time being the problem of their provenance has to remain unsolved.

Such is our standpoint in the matter of 86 coins from the Devica hoard and such it will remain unless Bykov's new work „Deneznoye obraščeniye Khazaryi v VIII i IX vv.”, Vostočnye istočniki po istorii narodov Yugo-vostočnoy i Centralnoy Evropy, vol. III, now in print, throws more light on the problem, and brings an acceptable solution.

Maria Czapkiewicz

V. Karageorghis, *Annual Report of the Director of the Department of Antiquities for the year 1971*, Nicosia 1972, Printed at the Printing Office of the Republic of Cyprus, 8°, pp. 31, 64 illus. on 25 pls., 1 map. Price: 300 mills.

In the first lines of the Report we read that the international interest in the archaeology of Cyprus continues. The number of foreign archaeological missions excavating on the island is continually increasing. More and more scholars choose the archaeology of the island as a subject of their research. Cypriot antiquities are popularized by special exhibitions in different countries. We can mention the especially famous exhibition „Treasures of Cyprus”, which was shown in many countries

¹² G. Miles, *The Numismatic History of Rayy*, New York, 1938; V. G. Tizengauzen, *op. cit.*; H. Nützel, *op. cit.*

¹³ V. G. Tizengauzen, *op. cit.* p. 152, No 1363.

of Europe. But since its origins the main problem of Cyprus archaeology has been how to protect the cultural heritage of the island and how to stop the pillage of tombs and illicit export of antiquities. Let us cite the beginning of the first fascicle of the „Annual Report of the Curator of Antiquities, 1914” (Nicosia 1916, p. 3): „The object of this report is to give a brief account of the work done during the year in connection with the preservation of antiquities throughout the Island, and of the steps taken to restrict as much as possible illicit digging and the smuggling of antiquities out of the Island”. Does it mean that nothing has changed in Cyprus for nearly 60 years? No! With V. Karageorghis as Director, the Department of Antiquities has been working more energetically and effectively than ever before. Thanks to the Government of the Republic, thanks to V. Karageorghis and his staff, we can observe important achievements of the Department in large scale excavations, restoration and conservation of monuments, maintenance of museums, publication of scientific reports etc., etc. If there is still so much trouble with illicit diggings and smuggling of antiquities out of Cyprus, this is because of anomalous political conditions and... the tradition. A bad tradition, we have to add. Maybe international agreements will protect Cypriot antiquities from commercial exploitation. This problem has been so drastic recently, that the International Committee of I. C. O. M. held its annual meeting in Nicosia in 1972 (cf. Cyprus Bulletin vol. 9, n° 35, 1972, pp. 1, 4).

In the Report under review we find the list of senior staff of the Department (p. 2), the 1971 report proper (pp. 3—8), and four appendices. The first deals with the protection of ancient monuments in particular districts (pp. 9—14). It is mainly concerned with architecture since the antiquity. Among medieval and modern monuments, besides the Byzantine churches, chiefly with wall-paintings, we can note the reparations or restoration of three Muslim religious buildings: the Selimiye Mosque in Nicosia, the Lala Mustafa Mosque in Famagusta and Hala Sultan Tekke („Tomb of Umm Haram”). N. B. the first two of these are former Gothic cathedrals.

The second appendix to the Report (pp. 14—26) is devoted to archaeological research and discoveries. The French and British missions are working on Neolithic sites in Cape Andreas and Ayios Epiktitos, respectively. Five foreign groups and two missions of the Cypriot Department of Antiquities are digging on Bronze Age sites: at Phlaimoudhi (American), at Ayia Irini (Italian), at Morphou (American), at Athienou (Israeli), at Enkomi (French), at Kition (Cypriot), at Kazaphani (Cypriot). The new Palestine Bichrome vases (Ayia Irini and Morphou), cylinder seals, scarabs, carved ivory (Athienou and Morphou) offer additional material concerning the relations of Cyprus with the East mainly during the Late Bronze age and in connection with the export of copper. Apropos, the twin temples of the 12th cen-

tury B. C. from Kition, where Cypriots worshipped the male and female deities protecting their copper, we should mention the recently found Bronze age temple of Hathor from Timna Valley near the Gulf of Akaba. (Cf. B. Rothenberg, *Timna*, London 1972). V. Karageorghis points out the association between Aphrodite, who is always Cypriot in Greek mythology, with Hephaestus, the god of metallurgy.

From the numerous Iron age sites we should like to mention the Department's excavations in Kition including the monumental Phoenician temple of 9th—4th centuries B. C. and of an archaic tomb built at Patriki, and the German explorations at Tamassos (tomb of a warrior of the 7th century B. C.). Both mentioned tombs compared with the discoveries at the famous necropolis in Salamis show the universality of burial customs in archaic Cyprus.

Many expeditions are working on the capitals of archaic and classical kingdoms of Cyprus and in the hellenistic and Roman cities. The Greeks are digging at ancient Golgoi (Athienou), Germans at Palaepaphos (Kouklia), Canadians at Soloi, Americans at Idalion, Cypriots at Kourion. One of the most excavated areas is Kato Paphos (ancient Nea Paphos), where the Department of Antiquities and a Polish mission are uncovering the Hellenistic-Roman city. Two sites, Salamis (Constantia) and Yialousa, bring materials from the Christian era and the end of antiquity. The excavations carried out by a French mission from Lyon University and the Department of Antiquities respectively, throw more light on the period of Arab invasions and later (till the 10th century A. D.).

Of the minor excavations we can mention Kazaphani (Late Bronze Age necropolis), Amathus (tombs mostly of the Cypro-Achaic and Cypro-Classical periods) and 5 other sites (cf. p. 25). The principal acquisitions by the Cyprus Museum and the districts' museums are listed on p. 26.

Appendixes III and IV cover expenditure and revenue and the antiquities found (cf. pp. 27—31). 64 photos on 25 plates provide valuable illustrative material. On a map, showing the activities of the Department of Antiquities and foreign missions, which comes after p. 16, we can find all sites mentioned in the Report.

The *Annual Reports* of which the 1971 volume we are reviewing, have been appearing since 1949, with the same arrangement of material, the same size and under similar covers. It is necessary to stress that the *Annual Report* is the only Cypriot archaeological journal which will soon celebrate its 25th anniversary and which, if we take into account the „Annual Reports of the Curator of Antiquities” from the years 1914—1916 of M. Markides, and the „Cyprus Museum Annual Report” for 1933 of P. Dikaïos, has a tradition of over sixty years. „Annual Report” started under British rule on the island thanks to the efforts of A. H. S. Megaw, but it developed the excellent idea of

these two Cypriots to document the current works of the Department of Antiquities. Existing by the side of the „Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus” which collects more complete preliminary reports, the „Annual Reports” have a profile of their own and give a fuller picture of the work of the Department of Antiquities. What is more important, the „Annual Reports” are published very quickly, in the spring after the year they deal with. They come out earlier than the „Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre...” (published by V. Karageorghis since 1959 in the „Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique”), which have recently appeared with 2 years' delay.

We congratulate the Cypriot Department of Antiquities on the continuation of the „Annual Reports” and having them still in English (N. B. a parallel Greek „Chronicle” has been prepared in the „Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus” since 1970). We wish the Editors of the journal a considerable extension of the „Annual Reports” particularly in view of the reduction in size of the „Chroniques...” recently announced by Louis Robert (Cf. CRAIBL 1971, p. 526). The „Annual Reports” ought to retain their outstanding function of a source of useful information on the current work in Cypriot archaeology.

Zdzisław J. Kapera

Ino Nicolaou, *Cypriot Inscribed Stones*, Nicosia 1971, Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, 4^o, pp. 2 + V + 37, pls. I—XLVIII (= Picture Book No. 6).

Ino Michaelidou-Nicolaou, the author of the album under review is the Assistant Curator Records in the Cyprus Museum, Nicosia, and an eminent Cypriot epigraphist. She has been publishing a catalogue („Inscriptiones Cypriae Alphabeticae”) of all alphabetic inscriptions discovered in Cyprus every year since 1960 (cf. *Berytus* 14, 1963, pp. 129—141 for the years 1960 and 1961, and *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*, for following years).

Her recent book is of a more general character. It begins with a brief look at the history of Cypriot sources inscribed in stone (or clay) from the Late Bronze Age till the Arab invasion in A. D. 647 (cf. *Introduction*, pp. 1—5). This is followed by a selected bibliography and abbreviations (pp. 7 f) and by a description of plates (pp. 9—37).

Then come almost 60 excellent photographs with Cypro-Minoan, Eteocypriot, syllabic, Greek and Latin inscriptions. Only 2 of them reproduce Phoenician inscriptions (cf. pls. XI, XIII: the bilingual inscription from Idalion, and the digraphic inscription from Tamassos in Phoenician and in the Cypriot syllabary). One plate (No III) is connected with Assyria (The Larnaka stele of the Sargon II). This is not too much considering the fact that Cyprus was a bridge between East and West in the era covered by the book. Phoenician inscriptions are found in Cyprus quite frequently and they give much information about the history of the island in the I millennium B.C. O. Masson and M. Szynger have recently prepared a catalogue of such inscriptions: „Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre”, Genève — Paris 1972.

It is hard to agree with the Author's opinion that there is an „almost complete absence of the inscribed documents in ... the whole... Cypro-Geometric period 1050 — 700 B. C.”. Inscriptions are streaming in from new excavations, and some of them have already been published (cf. the Phoenician inscription from the years 850 — 800 B. C.: A. Dupont-Sommer, *Une inscription phénicienne archaïque récemment trouvée à Kition (Chypre)*, Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 1970, pp. 9—28; the Paphian inscription from the years 850 — 700 B. C.: O. Masson, *Kypriaka. IV. La plus ancienne inscription paphienne*, BCH 92, 1968, pp. 375—379 etc.).

While reading the book I noticed some printer's errors: p. 1, Pamboula for Bamboula; p. 10, line 11 from the top: pp. 73—102 for 73—95; p. 10, line 6 from below: C. J. Cadd, for Gadd. The bibliography cited by the Author on p. 7, might be extended by the books of T. B. Mitford, *Studies in the Signaries of South-Western Cyprus*, London 1961 and *The Inscriptions of Kourion*, Philadelphia 1971 and by the book of O. Masson and M. Szynger cited above. *Nota bene* in the bibliography in the description of pl. III it is necessary to add the first monograph of the stele of Sargon II from Larnaka: E. Schrader, *Die Sargonsstele des Berliner Museums*, Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, philosophisch-historische Klasse 1881/VI, Berlin 1882.

The reviewed book is the 6th volume of the popular „Picture Book” series published by the Department of Antiquities of the Republic of Cyprus for tourists especially, but not only for them. It can also be used with great profit by the specialist. Plates with Cypriot inscriptions are excellent and the commentary, as well as selective bibliography, is well prepared. We congratulate the Author on her newest important publication, and we are pleased to inform the readers that another of Her books, on the Salamine inscriptions, is being prepared.

Zdzisław J. Kapera

Maria Kowalska, *Średniowieczna arabska literatura podróżnicza (Medieval Arabic Travel Literature)*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Prace Historycznoliterackie”, Zeszyt 25, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa—Kraków 1973, 152 pp.

Anything that is connected with Arab geographic and travel writings is of interest to the historian of the Slavs. It is enough to mention the names of al-Mas'ūdī, Ibn Faḍlān, Ibrāhīm Ibn Ya'kūb, Ibn Battūta and others to realize the importance of the Arab reports for the history of the Slavs and other European and Asiatic peoples. Main stress in Maria Kowalska's study is placed on the word „literature”. Not all geographic records interest the author. Her study does not cover such scientific treatises as al-Mas'ūdī, Ibn Ḥawḳal, al-Muḳadasi and others. She is interested in writings in which the literary element prevails over the element of scientific study and description. Thus, the form and manner of treatment of the material are the decisive factor. Maria Kowalska's work covers the entire range of writings belonging to the genre of travel literature, from factual relations to fiction and novel. The author is right in stating that „as long as literary analysis is not made, one cannot distinguish authentic reports from fiction in a really critical way, or estimate the degree of reliability of information that has partly been transformed” (p. 6). It must be stressed that „medieval Arab travel writings are of preeminently documentary nature and tell almost exclusively about real travels” (p. 9). There are only a few instances of totally fictitious travel stories. These are as a rule outstanding works, attractive also for the modern reader, such as the voyages of Sindbad the Sailor.

Utilizing the criteria worked out for travel writings by Z. Klatik (Ueber die Poetik der Reisebeschreibungen, in: *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich*, vol. 11, 2, Łódź 1969) *, the author begins by setting the basic terminology to be used in her study. She emphasizes the fact that „in a travel description the extralinguistic reality described is the principal element”; it follows from this that the primary function of such descriptions is their „function as source of information” (p. 11). That lends the value of an authentic document to a travel description, in spite of its literary nature. The author of such a relation is not its central figure, but his personality certainly makes it a source of informa-

* There is an important work on the subject by a Polish scholar: Cz. Niedzielski, *O teoretyczno-literackich tradycjach prozy dokumentarnej (podróż — powieść — reportaż)* („Documentary prose in the tradition of theory of literature (travel — novel — report)”), Toruń 1966.

tion and a work of art. The opinion that „describing a travel always is a creative process in the course of which reality is subjectively transformed through the medium of the writer's personality, and expressed in a unique linguistic shape" (p. 12) merits special attention.

Mere fragments of the oldest travel reports from the 8th and 9th centuries have come down to us, and that only in an indirect way; they mainly concern Asia Minor. A real outburst of interest in the world surrounding the Arabs occurred in the 10th century. That is the classic period of travel literature. Such writers as Hārūn Ibn Yahyā, Aḥmed Ibn Faḍlān, Abū Dulaf, Ibrāhīm Ibn Ya'qūb and al-Uswānī come to the fore. Most of them were both writers and travellers. Only in the case of Ibrāhīm Ibn Ya'qūb the author considers the possibility of his having been the narrator of a story which was recorded by someone else; however, this does not seem to me to be a justified supposition. The period of documentary writings led on to literature containing more fiction and fantasy; the tales of Sindbad the Sailor can be mentioned as an example of this kind. During the early centuries of travel literature writers from Asia Minor held the dominating position, but already in the 12th century the centre of literary production was transferred to the countries of Maghreb and to Spain. The 13th and 14th centuries mark the origin of the classic genre of travel literature, the writings named „riḥla". Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (1304—1368 or 1377), who toured and described all of Near East and got as far as Bengal and West Africa (the kingdom of Mali among other places), is the most outstanding representative of this kind of literature. The last great traveller and writer of the Arab world was Leo the African (1485—1554), to whom we owe valuable relations on North and Central Africa.

In the conclusion of her work Maria Kowalska gives a brief appraisal of the travel literature of the Arabs. She ranks the relations of Ibn Faḍlān as the best from the point of view of both information content and artistic value, but regards Ibn Baṭṭūṭa as the most eminent representative of the literary genre she describes. The history of the Slavic countries, including Poland, was not the object of special interest of Arab travellers and writers, but in order to establish the reliability and documentary value of the passages devoted to things Slavic one has to acquaint oneself with all Arab travel literature.

Gerard Labuda

Iran Society. *Silver Jubilee Souvenir* (1944—1969), Calcutta 1970, pp. 397.

This voluminous book has been edited by the Iranian Society of Calcutta to commemorate the silver jubilee of its foundation. It contains a collection of twenty five articles on Persian lore by eminent iranologists of the world.

The material of the book is divided into two parts: 1. English section, and 2. Persian and Arabic section. The Contents of the volume runs as follows: (English section) *A Portrait of Ibrahim Adil Shah II by Farrukh beg*, by Prof. Nazir Ahmad; *A Jewish Persian Munazare*, by Prof. Jes P. Asmussen, *Iranian Armenians in India*, by (Mrs.) Annie Basil; *The Golden Link of Mysticism*, by Prof. Firoz C. Davar; *Contribution of Bengal to Arabic and Persian Literature in the Turko-Afghan Period* (A. D. 1203—1538); by Dr. Chinmoy Dutt; *Ganj-i Ma'ani of Muti'i*, Dr. Z. A. Desai; *The New Persian Type Kirdar, 'Work, Action' — A Semasiological Problem*, by Prof. dr. Wilhelm Eilers; *Muhammad 'Arif Shaida*, by Dr. M. A. H. Farooqi; *The Arabic Language in Khurasan*, by Prof. Richard N. Frye; *An Indian Prince and the French Revolution*, by Prof. Mohibbul Hasan; *Rudaki, the Father of Neo-Persian Poetry*, by dr. M. Ishaque; *James Morier and his Hajji Baba of Ispahan*, by Dr. Hasan Javadi; *The Concept of an ideal priest according to Manuschekhihr Goshnjaman*, by Prof. M. F. Kanga; *Glimpses of extinct Pahlavi Literature*, by Ervad Jamshid Cawasji Katrak; *The Iranian Constitutional Revolution of 1905—1911. A Brief Assessment*, by Prof. Nikki R. Keddie; *A Chapter on Ancien Persia in an Eleventh Century Hispano-Arabic work*, by Dr. M. S. Khan; *Muhammad Taqi Bahar as a Painter of Nature*, by Prof. Franciszek Machalski; *On the Sanscrit writings of Parsis*, by Dr. H. K. Mirza; *One more spurious manuscript of Rudaki's verses*, by Prof. Abdul-Ghani Mirzoev; *Persian Poets of Indian origin*, by Maulana Syed Sabahuddin Abdur Rahman; *The Iranian Bronze Plough Model from Marlik*, by Prof. Dr. Armas; *Salonen A Stone Tablet of Old Persian Cuneiform*, by Rev. Ralph Norman Sharp; *Some Cultural Aspects of the Qutb Shahi Kingdom on the eve of its dissolution*; by Prof. H. K. Sherwani. (Persian and Arabic Section): *Maliku'sh-Shu'ara Bahar*, by prof. Sha Islam Sha Mohammadof;