

COMPTE — RENDUS

Andrzej Czapkiewicz, *The Verb in Modern Arabic Dialects as an Exponent of the Development Processes Occurring in Them*, Wrocław—Warszawa—Kraków—Gdańsk 1975, Ossolineum, 250 pp. Price: 55 zł. [Polska Akademia Nauk — Oddział w Krakowie. Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej, Nr 11].

Since Jean Cantineau (1955) and Anton Spitaler (1961) reviewed the situation of the study of Arabic dialects, the literature has considerably increased, especially in the form of descriptions of separate local dialects and articles on special subjects. A few monographs have a geographically wider scope, providing us with typologically pertinent information on previously little known dialect areas. Such works are T. M. Johnstone's *Eastern Arabian Dialect Studies*, Werner Diem's *Skizzen jemenitischer Dialekte*, and Haim Blanc's *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*, all of which deliberately concentrate upon the salient features of the dialects described, Blanc's monograph also being a valuable contribution to the sociolinguistic background of the Mesopotamian dialect area.

Although our knowledge of Arabic dialects during the last two decades has increased to a noticeable degree, there still are great lacunae, the largest ones in the dialect map of Peninsular Arabic. The material published thus far has, however, in spite of its insufficiency in many respects, already reached an extent where many details worthy of consideration may remain unnoticed due to a lack of some kind of systematic coordination of the data. Here comparative works such as *Die demonstrativen Bildungen der neuarabischen Dialekte* by Wolf-dietrich Fischer and *Neuarabische Fragewörter* by Hans-Rudolf Singer are invaluable; more recently a gap in the phonetic and prosodic fields has been filled by Gerard Janssens' *Stress in Arabic and Word Structure in the Modern Arabic Dialects*.

The subject chosen by Andrzej Czapkiewicz for the study now discussed is undoubtedly very important, not only for Arabic dialectology but also for the understanding of the character of the whole Semitic verbal system. It is, however, also evident that the task is extremely difficult, due to the extent and heterogeneity of the material, the lack of complete documentation in many sources, and the intricacy of the theoretical problems involved.

The primary aim of the study is to discover the patterns of development in the verbal system of the modern Arabic dialects. In order to observe the diachronic process, the author compares two synchronic

levels of Arabic. He makes a detailed morphological inventory of different verbal stems and morphemes attested in the sources constituting the corpus of the study. In addition to the finite verbal forms, participles and *maṣḍars* are also included in the descriptive survey. All along the line, the dialectal forms are compared with their Classical Arabic counterparts, but, as pointed out by the author, without implying any direct genetic connection between the dialectal and Classical forms. In the comparison the Classical forms represent a well-attested structure deviating from that of the dialects and, in addition, an older stage in the development of Arabic. In order to support the diachronic relevancy of the comparison, the author begins his study with a 15-page comparison of the Ugaritic and Classical Arabic verbal morphology and comes to the conclusion that the Classical Arabic verbal system is not only different from that of the modern dialects, but that it also represents an earlier stage presumably not much unlike those passed by all Arabic dialects in the course of their development.

Czapkiewicz does not try to base the synchronic analysis of the verb in modern Arabic dialects on all available material; instead he prefers the method of random sampling, in this case perhaps the only applicable one, because the following diachronic analysis is to a considerable degree founded on statistical observations. With this starting point, the author has selected thirty-two dialects representing rather well the different cultural types and geographical areas. To be sure, the greatest difficulty cannot have been whether to include a certain dialect in the study or not, but rather the heterogeneity of the sources, which is a serious impediment in a study using statistical methods.

In the beginning of the survey the author makes an inventory of all different forms of verbal stems attested in the perfect, which the author, in order to avoid misleading functional implications, calls the „suffixal conjugation”; for the same reason, the traditional „imperfect” is replaced by the „pre- and suffixal conjugation”. Even though most instances and references included in the original typewritten Polish version have been left out, the inventory takes more than 60 pages (pp. 32—95). The almost total absence of the instances used does not, of course, in itself affect the argumentation or the conclusions, but the reader often feels rather bewildered when he is faced by a jungle of effective but very troublesome symbols instead of illustrative instances. This may, for primarily economic reasons, be a matter of necessity in a study of this nature, but it also makes great demands on the reader who wants to be assured of the relevance of the data upon which the argumentation is based.

A fact which renders it very difficult for the reader to get a general view of the features described is the striking abundance of morphological variants given in the analysis. In the majority of cases this is undoubtedly borne out of the actual situation. Yet it seems to me that the

diversity has been exaggerated to some extent. For instance, it is difficult to see why 1.1.a. ( $C_1V/C_1\bar{V}$ ), according to the author attested in the dialects of Waday (Chad) and Kfar ‘Abīda (North Lebanon), and 1.1.b. ( $C_1V/C_1/C_1\bar{V}$ ), attested in seven dialects included in the survey, are described as two different „stem variants”. To be sure, the dialects of Waday and Kfar ‘Abīda, too, have forms where the personal morpheme is directly attached to  $C_1$ , e.g. Waday *djat*, *djō*; Kfar ‘Abīda *žu*; cf. Carbou, p. 114, and Feghali, p. 160. This kind of inconsistency may be regarded as insignificant. The reader is actually much more perplexed by sporadic cases where the supposed morphological correspondence between Classical Arabic and the dialects is questionable or even non-existent. Such an instance is, e.g., 1.2.d. (p. 34), according to which the pattern  $C_1V_1/C_1V_2C_2/C_1/C_1V_1C_2$  in Cypriot Maronite Arabic is the equivalent of the Classical Form IV pattern  $'v_1C_1C_2\bar{V}/'v_1C_1C_2/'v_1C_1C_2V_2C_3$ . The verbs behind the symbols are *da* and *'a'fā* ‘to give’. The comparison, of course, lacks all relevance in a morphological analysis, because the verbs in question are synonyms without any genetic connection (for *da*/'adda/'idda, cf., e.g., Dozy I, p. 15; Barthélemy, s. v. *'dy*; Spiro, p. 401; Diem, p. 43).

On pp. 95—99 the author makes an inventory of all the different personal morphemes attested in the perfect. In this case the documentation in the sources is sufficient for a statistical study, and the list of morphemes is short enough to give a general picture, even if much of the seeming diversity can be attributed to a certain disparity of transcription in the sources, a difficulty faced by all students of comparative Arabic dialectology (cf. Fischer, p. 34). By using the symbol /v/ the author has avoided some problems caused by the disparity and thus has been able to reduce the number of different forms to 43, viz.:

- sing. 3. m. - $\emptyset$ 
  - 3. f. -*vt*/-*t*, -*vt*/-*ṭ*
  - 2. m. -*t*, -*ṭ*, -*ta*, -*ṭt*, -*vt*
  - 2. f. -*ṭi*, -*ṭi*, -*tei*, -*ṭi*
  - 1. c. -*t*, -*ṭ*, -*ta*, -*ṭt*, -*vt*, -*tu*, -*et*
- plur. 3. m. -*u*, -*ū*, -*ow*, -*ām*, -*aw*, -*o*, -*ō*'
  - 3. f. -*vn*, -*vnn*, -*ayn*
  - 2. m. -*tu*, -*ṭu*, -*tū*, -*tow*, -*tām*, -*tām*, -*to*
  - 2. f. -*tvn*, -*tvnn*, -*tayn*
  - 1. c. -*na*, -*nā*, -*nā*, -*ne*.

It would be very tempting to simplify the picture by presenting the attested forms in groups of different morpheme types, even if it must be admitted that such a grouping in many respects may be arbitrary and that it disregards the fact that slight phonetic differences often reflect incipient morphological differentiations. It is, however, interesting to see that in addition to sing. 3. m. (- $\emptyset$  in all dialects) also sing. 3. f.

actually has only one morpheme type, viz. *-t* (*-at/-et/-it* etc. and the allomorph *-t* after a vowel). Morphologically, the forms *-v/-t* given for Tlemcen represent exactly the same type<sup>1</sup>. Among the five different morphemes given for sing. 2. m., actually only two represent morphologically different types, viz. *-t* (the great majority of dialects) and *-ta* (Omdurman). In most cases the vowel preceding *-t* is optional. Now and then, however, it tends to play a morphologically distinctive role, e.g. in *fəst* I entered (Ferguson, p. 568; cf. Cantineau, Word 12, p. 122), but *-t* can in this case be defined as an allomorph of *-t*. In sing. 2. f., all the given instances can be regarded as representing one morpheme type, the same as the older *-ti*. Sing. 1. c. actually has three different types: *-t* (most dialects), *-tu* (Mesopotamian *qəttu*), and *-ta* (Omdurman), i.e., in addition to the preserved older *-tu*, one reduced form (*-t*) and one analogous to sing. 2. m. (*-ta*).

The different morpheme types in plur. 3. m. are somewhat problematic, but they could plausibly be divided into three groups: (1) those reflecting the older *-ū*, (2) those having a diphthong (most likely due to morphological analogy, either with the verbs *C<sub>3</sub>y*, cf. *ramaw*, or, if the morpheme turns out to be very old, with the Old Arabic *-a* morpheme of sing. 3. m.; cf. Cantineau, Nomades II, p. 186: *ktōbaw* < *kataba* + *ū*, *kātābtaw*/*kātābto* < *katabta* + *ū*; Schreiber, p. 14), and (3) those modelled in analogy with plur. 2. m. Here it should be pointed out that the morpheme (or, better, allomorph) *-ām* optionally occurring in some North Arabian dialects is also attested outside this dialect area, e.g. in Cairo (Tomiche, p. 123: *gom/egom/egu* they came). As to the seven forms given for plur. 2. m., they represent two distinct groups: (1) *-tu* (including *-tu*, *-tū*, *-to*, possibly also *-tow*), the form modelled in analogy with plur. 3. m. and (2) *-tām/-tām*, a morpheme type continuing the older *-tum*. The feminine plural forms seem to continue older *\*-in(n)* and *\*-tin(n)/-tun(n)*; only the Yemenite forms *-ayn*, *-tayn* (San'a) represent another type. In plur. 1. c., all the forms quoted belong to one morphological family (*-na*)<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In this connection it might be of some interest to note that the Šammari dialects of North Arabia, not included in Czapkiewicz' survey, have the allomorphs *-at* and *-ih*, the last-mentioned being the result of the weakening of the feminine *-t* in final position, a phenomenon parallel to the Old Arabic pausal weakening of the nominal feminine suffix: *-at* > *-ah* (> *-a*). In the Šammari dialects this also occurs in fem. plur. where *-āy* is the allomorph used prepausally or before a word beginning with a consonant, *-āt* in other positions (Aboud, pp. 11 and 18).

<sup>2</sup> The picture would have changed substantially if the summary description of several Yemenite local dialects by Diem had been published a couple of years earlier and could have been included in the

A typological grouping of the morphemes leads us to the conclusion that a great majority of the modern Arabic dialects actually display a considerable homogeneity in this respect. Among the forms quoted by Czapkiewicz only a few deviate distinctly from the commonest patterns. It is worthwhile noticing that all the divergent types are attested in the eastern dialect group: plur. 3. m. *-ām* (optional variant in the nomadic dialects of North Arabia studied by Cantineau), plur. 2. m. *-tām/-tām* (*ibid.* and in most Mesopotamian dialects), plur. 3. f. and 2. f. *-ayn* and *-tayn* respectively (San'a), sing. 2. m. and 1. c. *-ta* (Omdurman), sing. 1. c. *-tu* (Mesopotamian *qəttu*). The western group actually has only one morphological pattern, with the exception that in some dialects, especially those spoken in Western Algeria, the contrast masc. vs. fem. in sing. 2. has been neutralized, and the feminine has lost its marker. In some Moroccan dialects the development has led to the elimination of the earlier masc. form, the neutralized morpheme for sing. 2. c. being *-ti* (Harrell, p. 41).

The personal morphemes of the imperfect (pp. 120—126), if grouped in a similar manner, also show a relatively great homogeneity. The most important morpheme types in the dialects surveyed are: sing. 3. m. *y---ø*, 3. f. *t---ø*, 2. m. *t---ø*, 2. f. *t---i*, *t---in*, 1. c. *'-v-(/ø)---ø*, *n---ø*; plur. 3. m. *y---u*, *y---ūn*, 3. f. *y---en*, *y---ayn*, 2. m. *t---u*, *t---ūn*, 2. f. *t---en*, *t---ayn*, 1. c. *n---ø*, *n---u*. The most characteristic typological differences concern (1) the feminine plural forms, which are missing in most sedentary dialects, (2) the forms of sing. 2. f., plur. 3. m. and 2. m., which in the *qəttu* dialects of the Mesopotamian dialect area and in most dialects of nomadic type of the eastern dialect group have the forms *t---in*, *y---ūn* and *t---ūn* respectively, and (3) the sing. and plur. 1. persons, where the western dialect group displays the typologically important innovations, *n---ø* and *n---u* respectively.

The most interesting chapter of Czapkiewicz' study is no doubt VIII Closing Remarks (pp. 179—236). Here the author advances from the detailed analysis to a synthesis, and using a statistical approach draws conclusions about the general trend of development in the verbal system of the Arabic dialects. The first important result is that the dialects on the one hand have a tendency toward morphological reductions: the number of older morphological categories is reduced,

survey. Thus, e.g., sing 3. f. has the morpheme *-ah* in Qafr and Gíblah, sing. 2. m. *-k* in al-Hadíyeh, al-Mahall, al-'Udayn, and Gíblah, sing. 2. f. *-š* in al-Mahall and Qafr, *-ki* in al-'Udayn and Gíblah, sing. 1. c. *-k* in al-Hadíyeh, al-Mahall and Gíblah, *-ku* in al-'Udayn, and *-tu* in Ĥugaríyeh. In plural forms, the most substantial additions would be plur. 2. m. *-kum* (Gíblah and al-Hadíyeh), plur. 2. f. *-kan* (Gíblah), *-kun* (al-Mahall), *-kin* (Qafr), *-tinna* (most dialects of the Northern plateau), and plur. 3. f. *-na* (*ibid.*); see Diem, *passim*.



the morphemes become shorter, and the number of contrasts decreases. On the other hand, the dialects show a tendency toward morphological innovation: new categories develop and new contrasts are generated. Subsequently, the other important result of the study is that although many developments undoubtedly lead toward a more analytical structure, some others give evidence of a synthesizing tendency. Characteristic of this development is, for instance, the grammaticization of many earlier auxiliaries used as verbal modifiers. In the light of the results of the comparative analysis, Czapkiewicz launches a theory of a „pulsatory” development of the verbal system (p. 211). According to the theory, the development process is conditioned by two main factors, viz. the laws of economy and the permanently growing information resources. The morphological reductions would result from the interaction of the need of transmitting the permanently growing information on the one hand, and the economy in the use of time on the other, i.e., the reduction of earlier morphological categories and the phonetic shortening of morphemes would be conditioned by the need for efficiency. This tendency would be counteracted by the „self-defence” of the system, which protects the intelligibility by generating new relevant distinctions instead of those blurred or lost as a result of the above-mentioned reducing tendency.

The development is illustrated by Czapkiewicz in two diagrams, one of which shows the degree of morphological reduction in different modern Arabic dialects compared with Classical Arabic (p. 197). The other shows the extent of morphological innovations (p. 210). From the first diagram it appears that the degree of morphological reduction is highest in the geographical peripheries of the arabophone area. In broad outlines this may be true, at least of the urban western dialects, but in consideration of the data on which the diagram is based, the results cannot be regarded as fully conclusive. The fact is that many pertinent reductions are omitted in the analysis. Thus, the Cypriot Maronite Arabic is, from the morphological point of view, looked upon as a very conservative dialect, but at closer inspection it appears that this dialect would, according to the analysis, still have preserved the older moods. The same holds good of Tlemcen and the nomadic dialects studied by Cantineau. This is naturally not the case. To be sure, defects of this kind detract from the relevancy of the results of the comparison, but they do not necessarily deprive the discussion and the viewpoints of their importance.

As to the diagram showing the extent of morphological innovations in the dialects discussed (p. 210), the author cautiously abstains from drawing far-going conclusions. His general impression is that the eastern dialect group generally speaking displays a greater extent of innovations than the western one. It is actually very difficult to interpret the diagram, largely due to the method used by the author, who states

(p. 129) that the phenomena discussed are only „selected examples” which „give a certain survey of the inventory of these forms in modern dialects”. Consequently, it is somewhat surprising that the selected examples nevertheless are treated as a corpus for this kind of statistical study. To be sure, the author has faced a very hard methodological problem in the analysis of a vast and heterogeneous comparative material. In some cases the choice is not too difficult; thus, new morphemes such as *b-*, *ha-*, *da-*, *ka-*, and *qa-* are undoubtedly pertinent to the subject of the study, but it is often difficult to decide where to draw the limit between morphology and lexicon. Many of the features described in Chapter IV might, however, preferably have been overlooked in a morphological analysis of the verbal system, e.g. *‘ād* + verb (even if *‘ād* often has become an invariable particle, possibly even a verbal modifier, cf. Malaika, p. 44), *zall* + verb, imperf. + *šāf* + participle (Baghdad), verb + *batān* (Waday), perf./imperf. + *barra* („ventive”!, Lebanon), *dūn* + pers. suff. + imperf. (Tripoli in Libya), *duwēn* + *kān* + *ha-* + imperf. (Oman, Zanzibar), perf. + *fī* + obj. (*anā sma’t fi’lkelām* „habitative preterite”!, Benghazi), *elšān*, *‘ašān*, *min šān* + imperf. (Ḥadramawt), *grīb* + imperf. (Benghazi), *mā* + imperf. (prohibitive, Ḥadramawt). In addition, many of these constructions are attested in several other dialects, which by all means should be mentioned if a statistical method of comparison is used.

In spite of certain shortcomings both in the morphological analysis and in the comparison of the extent of innovations in different dialects, the diachronic idea about the character of the development in general is, in my opinion, fundamentally sound. The earlier synthetical categories decrease for different, both phonetical and morphological reasons, and new analytical constructions arise to denote new distinctions. But it is worth noticing that the course of development does not necessarily always follow the pattern synthetical > analytical structure. The fact is, as pointed out by Czapkiewicz, that some new constructions in the course of time and due to structural chain reactions contribute to a partial resynthetization of the grammatical structure.

One of the developments most characteristic of the process is the tendency to regenerate the indicative mood, lost as a result of the neutralization of the contrasts between the older moods. Thus, the earlier contrasts *yaktubu* vs. *yaktub* and *yaktubu* vs. *yaktuba* are replaced by e.g. *byaktob* vs. *yaktob*, a contrast which in Syrian Arabic is essentially of modal value (indicative vs. subjunctive-jussive); temporally, *byaktob* contrasts with *katab*: non-past vs. past. The morphologically corresponding contrasts *dayiktib* vs. *yiktib* (Baghdad *gelet*) and *byekteb* vs. *yekteb* (Cairo) also have a modal value, but the temporal functions of *dayiktib* and *byekteb* are more specific than that of *byaktob* in Syrian Arabic. Compared with more conservative verbal systems, e.g. that of the dialect of Kawayriš (in Lower Iraq, Denz,



pp. 102 f. and 129), this development seems to reflect a trend toward a more marked temporal system, or, as Czapkiewicz puts it: The fact that „the renovation of the Indicative in modern Arabic dialects is often or even chiefly realized by the temporalized forms seems to point to the fact that modern dialects evolve toward a temporal opposition ... Hence, seeing in this renovation and especially in its mechanism certain support for Rundgren's conception seems totally justified” (p. 222; cf. Rundgren, *Erneuerung*, pp. 66 and passim). Czapkiewicz also justifiably states that this process has not yet been accomplished.

Andrzej Czapkiewicz has endeavoured to make a general survey of the verbal system of the modern Arabic dialects, and using an original statistical method attempted to shed more light on the patterns of its development. The greatest advantage of the study is the praiseworthy effort by the author to base the investigation on an extensive and abundant material. Yet this turns out to have both advantages and disadvantages: on the one hand, subordination to the material is the best remedy for theoretical bias, but, on the other, the heterogeneity of the material easily distorts the general picture. In spite of the difficulties involved, it is to be hoped that the Arabic dialectology will soon be enriched by further comparative studies.

Heikki Palva

Gothenburg

#### REFERENCES:

- Abboud, Peter Fouad, *The Syntax of Najdi Arabic*, Diss. Texas, Austin 1964.
- Barthélemy, A., *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français. Dialectes de Syrie: Alep, Damas, Liban, Jérusalem*, Paris 1935—55 (Fasc. 4—5 publ. par H. Fleisch).
- Blanc, Haim, *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*, Cambridge, Mass., 1964. [Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs, 10].
- Cantineau, Jean, *Études sur quelques parlers de nomades arabes d'Orient*, AIEO 2 (1936), pp. 1—118; 3 (1937), pp. 119—237.
- id., *La dialectologie arabe*, Orbis IV, 1 (1955), pp. 149—169.
- id., *The Phonetic System of Damascus Arabic*, Word 12, 1 (1956), pp. 116—124.
- Carbou, Henri, *Méthode pratique pour l'étude de l'arabe parlé au Ouaday et à l'est du Tchad*, Paris 1913.
- Denz, Adolf, *Die Verbalsyntax des neuarabischen Dialektes von Kwayriš (Irak), mit einer einleitenden allgemeinen Tempus- und Aspektlehre*, Wiesbaden 1971 [= AKM 40, 1].
- Diem, Werner, *Skizzen jemenitischer Dialekte*, Beirut 1973 [BTS 13].
- Dozy, R., *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, I—II, Leyde 1881.
- Feghali, Michel T., *Le parler de Kfar'abida (Liban—Syrie)*, Paris 1919.

- Ferguson, Charles A., Review of *Manuel élémentaire d'arabe orientale (parler de Damas)* by Jean Cantineau and Youssef Helbaoui [in:] *Language* 30, 4 (1954), pp. 564—570.
- Fischer, Wolfdietrich, *Die demonstrativen Bildungen der neuarabischen Dialekte. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik des Arabischen*, 's-Gravenhage 1959.
- Harrell, Richard S., *A Short Reference Grammar of Moroccan Arabic*, Washington, D. C., 1962. [Georgetown University Arabic Series No. 1].
- Janssens, Gerard, *Stress in Arabic and Word Structure in the Modern Arabic Dialects*, Leuven 1972. [Orientalia Gandensia 5].
- Johnstone, T. M., *Eastern Arabian Dialect Studies*. London 1967. [= London Oriental Series, Vol. 17].
- Rundgren, Frithiof, *Erneuerung des Verbalaspekts im Semitischen. Funktionell-diachronische Studien zur semitischen Verblehre*, Uppsala 1963. [= *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Acta Societatis Linguisticae Upsaliensis*, Nova series 1:3; pp. 49—108].
- Schreiber, Giseler, *Der arabische Dialekt von Mekka. Abriss der Grammatik mit Texten und Glossar*, Diss. Münster 1970.
- Singer, Hans-Rudolf, *Neuarabische Frageörter*, Diss. Erlangen 1958.
- Spiro, Socrates, *An Arabic-English Dictionary of the Colloquial Arabic of Egypt*, Cairo 1895.
- Spitaler, Anton, Arabisch [in:] *Linguistica semitica: presente e futuro*, Roma 1961, pp. 115—138, [Studi semitici 4].
- Tomiche, Nada, *Le parler arabe du Caire*, Paris 1964.

Heikki Palva, *Studies in the Arabic Dialect of the Semi-Nomadic el-'Ağārma Tribe (al-Balqā' District, Jordan)*, Stockholm 1976, 8° pp. 109. [Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Orientalia Gothoburgensia 2].

The Cleveland's classification for the Arabic dialects of Jordan<sup>1</sup> divides this arabophone area into four dialectal groups:

I *yigūl*, the bedu group in use in the eastern and southern deserts of the Kingdom of Jordan and also among the recently settled nomads in Kerak District;

II *begūl* group, in use among the rural folk in southern Palestine, the Jordan Valley, the settled region lying east to the valley and among the most of the nomads outside group I;

III *bakūl* group, in use among the village people around Jerusalem, and northward in Central Palestine, and

<sup>1</sup> Ray, L. Cleveland, *A Classification for the Arabic Dialects of Jordan*, BASOR No 171 (Oct. 1963), p. 56—63.

IV *ba'ul* group, in use among the city dwellers of Jordan.

These dialects differ from each other most distinctly by the pronunciation of certain consonantal phonemes and also in other respects, like lexicon, morphology and syntax. However these dialectal groups have not yet been sufficiently and equally recognized, and therefore each new publication in this field is to be welcomed with due interest.

The Arabic dialect whose description we owe to the recent publication of Heikki Palva is in use among the *el-'Ağārma*, one of the largest group of small tribes called *el-Balgawiya* living in the district in the northeastern corner of the Dead Sea, between the sea and the village of Na'ūr, on the main road, 15 km southwest of 'Ammān. The main characteristics of this dialect are:

a) in the field of phonetics and phonemics:

- 1) the preservation of the interdentals *d*, *t* and *ḏ*,
- 2) the Literary Arabic *ǧ* remains unchanged,
- 3) the Literary Arabic *k* has changed into *g* or *ǧ* (in this latter case in the contiguity of front vowels, and then it merges with the phoneme *ǧ*),
- 4) the Literary Arabic *k* has remained *k* or changed to *č* in the contiguity of front vowels, but *č* seems also to have reached the status of an independent phoneme as it is testified by the contrastive pairs, like: 'abūk — your father (m. sg.): 'abūč — your father (f. sg.), or *kān* — he was: *čān* — if,
- 5) the older *a* is preserved in open unstressed syllables in the contiguity of glottals, velars and emphatics, in other cases in open syllables it is centralized to *ə* except in the sequences: CVCVCV which tends to become: CCVCV,
- 6) the older *i* and *u* in open unstressed syllables are centralized to *ə* a freely variant with zero,
- 7) the lack of 'imāla, both of -ā and -a,
- 8) the older diphthongs -aw- and -ay- are monophthongized partially after glottals, pharyngals, velars and emphatics, and totally after the remaining consonants into *ō* and *ē* respectively, though contrasts: *ō* : *ū* and *ē* : *ī* have not yet been firmly established,
- 9) the stress patterns approach those of the sedentary Syro-Palestinian dialects with the exception of the structure CCVCV̄ instead of CVCVCV̄, the *gahawa syndrome* (see below) and the stressed article in some lexemes with a short initial syllable,
- 10) the *gahawa syndrome*, the term used for the first time by Blanc<sup>2</sup> with which he defined the phenomenon of -aXC ⇒ XaC (X = *h*,

<sup>2</sup> Haim Blanc, *The Arabic Dialect of the Negev Bedouins*, Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities IV, 7 (Jerusalem 1970), p. 12—150.

*h*, ' , *h g*); this phenomenon occurs in the dialect of *el-'Ağārma* commonly but not regularly,

- 11) the dialect of *el-'Ağārma* being an atrochaic dialect, i.e. avoiding the sequences: — ∪ ∪ drops the older inflectional vowel *a* (ancient Acc.) and *a* of the feminine morpheme in an open unstressed syllable, between a long syllable and a pronominal suffix, like e.g.: *bēne* — our house (Acc.) or *nāgti* — my she-camel.

b) In the field of grammar:

- 1) the preservation of the opposition M : F in the 2-nd and 3-rd persons of personal pronouns, pronominal suffixes and verbs,
- 2) two variants of the personal pronoun for the 1-st person c. g. Pl.: *hanna* and 'ahna,
- 3) the pronominal suffixes for sing. 3 masc. are: -o || -o<sup>h</sup> || -v<sup>h</sup> and -ha for fem.
- 4) the demonstrative pronouns are emphatic if *ḏ* is not followed by *i*: *hāda*, *hadāk* but *hadīč*,
- 5) two variants of the relative pronoun: 'alli and 'alli,
- 6) the interrogative pronoun for who? is *mən*, and for what? is *wəš*, but also *min*, 'əš || 'əš, *šu* || *šū* which are the recent loans from the sedentary dialects, can be heard,
- 7) the adverbs characteristic for the dialect are: *hān* — here, *hanāk* — there, *gād* — overthere, yonder, *hič* — thus, *wəšlōn* — how? *hassā'* — now, *bāčēr* — tomorrow, *wēn* — where?, *liḥ* — why? *ǧaddēš* — how much?, *kūd* — hardly, except; beside these there are some others borrowed from the sedentary dialects, like e.g.: *hēk* — thus, *kēf* — how?, *lēš* — why?, also certain loans from the literary language occur: *dāyman* — always, 'ādatan — usually, *xəfyatan* — secretly, *tagriban* — about, *matālan* — for instance,
- 9) the preposition *fī* is used only in *fī* || *fī<sup>h</sup>* — there is,
- 9) the preverb *b-* is not used except sporadically in short expressions like: *ma ba'ref'ēš* — I don't know what, borrowed from the sedentary dialects,
- 10) the basic forms of the verb I are: *ketal* || *katal* and *ketel*, the latter form being probably due to the influence of the neighbouring sedentary dialects and replaces the earlier nomadic pattern *əktel* while the native form *katal* is the equivalent of *ketal* in stems with C<sub>1</sub> = glottal, velar or emphatic, or with C<sub>2</sub> = l, n, r,
- 11) the personal morphemes of the second pers. fem. sg. and 2-nd and 3-rd pers. pl. imperf., are respectively: *t* — *i*, *t* — *u* and *y* — *u*,
- 12) only several verbs occur in the form IV,
- 13) the forms V and VI have respectively the patterns: *təḵattal* and not (')*ətkattal* and *təḵātal* and not (')*ətkātal*,
- 14) the negative suffix -š is not used, however there are signs of its incipient infiltration into the dialect,

- 15) the verbs P. w have a short prefixed vowel in the imperfect, e.g.: *wared* — *yared* — to go to the watering place, to come down, to fall upon,
- 16) the partic. act. of form I of the verbs M. G. is  $C_1$  a  $C_2C_2$  and in pausa  $C_1$  a  $C_2$  e  $C_2$ ,
- 17) the verbs M. w || y have a short or long vowel in the 2-nd pers. sg. of the imperat. of form I, like e.g.: *gəl* || *gūl* or *ǧəb* || *ǧīb*,
- 18) the verb to take is: *ḥada* — *yāḥed*. *ḥed* (imperat.), partic. act.: *māḥed*, to eat — *kala* — *yākel*, *kəl* (imperat.), partic. act.: *mākel*, and to come — *ǧā* || *ǧa* — *yəǧi*,
- 19) the most usual conditional conjunctions are: *čān*, *lən*, *lən čān*, *ʿala*,
- 20) the commonest temporal conjunction is *yōm* — when.

c) In the lexicon:

- 1) the words hand — *ʿid* and water — *mayya* follow the patterns known from the Syro-Palestinian sedentary dialects, as well as from the dialects of the Syro-Mesopotamian small-cattle nomads,
- 2) the basic lexicon of the ʿAḡārma dialect is typically nomadic, its characteristic and commonest examples are: *gowṭar* — to go, to travel, *nəkas* — to return, *ləfa* — to arrive, *ṭabb* — to arrive *lād* — to enter, *gadab* — to catch, *nəṣad* — to ask, *maṭabb* — place, settlement, *mʿazzeb* — host, *ʿal-bel* — cammel(s), *ṭour* — cave.

Palva's grammatical description gives a clear picture of the ʿAḡārma dialect, except perhaps for few details.

While discussing the form IV of the verbs M. w || y (p. 34) and stating that the neutralization of the morphological contrast in the imperfect and imperative between form IV and form I must have neutralized also the semantic contrast between them, at least partially, what led to the increase of use of the form II morphologically distinct from them, it would have been perhaps worth mentioning whether there were not the cases with the verbs M. w in the ʿAḡārma dialect, when the earlier form IV ceded form I and not form II, preserving the semantic and morphological contrast between these two forms with the help of the opposition between the stem-vocalism in the above-mentioned grammatical categories: *ū* (for form I): *ī* (for form IV). This phenomenon is fairly commonly known in Arabic dialects both western and eastern, like e.g.: *gām* — *yigām*: L. Ar.: *kāma* — *ya-kūmu* — to get up, to stand and *gām* — *yigīm*: L. Ar.: *ʿakāma* — *yukimu* — to stay (form IV) in the Ḥaḍramī dialect<sup>3</sup> or *dār* — *yḏōr*: L. Ar.: *dāra* — to turn around (intrans.) and *dār* — *yḏir*: L. Ar.: *ʿadāra* — *yudīru* — to turn (trans., form IV) in the dialect of Ūlād

<sup>3</sup> C. de Landberg, *Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabic méridionale*, vol. X, *Ḥaḍramūt*, Leide 1901.

Brāhīm a semi-nomadic tribe between Saida and Frenda in Algeria<sup>4</sup>, but this of course is a small and insignificant detail.

Palva on p. 46—49 draws the attention of the reader to the classicizing, koineizing and bedouinizing tendencies he has discovered in the ʿAḡārma dialect, and which manifest themselves in the dialectal text inserted in the monograph under discussion. According to the author the classicizing tendency is rather insignificant and almost exclusively restricted to lexical loans, like the adverbs with *-an*: *ʿādatan* — usually, *matalan* — for instance, *ṣəfyatan* — secretly *tagriban* — about, *dāyman* — always, or such loans as: *ʿala kəllen* — by all means, in every respect, *b-ət-tšādef* — accidentally, by chance, *wəǧhat ən-na-ḍar* — public opinion, *əngalāb* — coup-d'état, *ṣəyyarāt* — cars, *ṭay-yarāt* — aeroplanes, *ʿakīd* — sure (genuine ʿAḡārma: *məʿaččed*), *ʿəda* — if, *fa* — and, and then, *mā* — which?, *kalām* — speech (genuine ʿAḡārma: *ḥači*), *təkallam* — he spoke (genuine ʿAḡārma *ḥača*), *wa-s-salāmu ʿalēkom*. Also phonetic levellings like: *ka-ʿənno*, or *ka-nno* — as if he, because he, let us say that he, belong here. Palva adds that some of these loans are already felt by many speakers as genuinely dialectal.

The koineizing tendency, more important in the opinion of Palva appears in the following categories:

- 1) isolated lexemes, like: *ḥēk* — thus, *mīn* — who?, *ʿēš* || *ʿəš* || *šū* — what?, *lēš* — why?, *kwayyes* — good, *bāʿəd ma* — after (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *əǧəm ma*), *lamma* — when, *bəddha* — she wants, *bəddna* — we shall, *yaʿni* — it means,
- 2) forms usually borrowed as whole nominal or verbal phrases implying grammatical interference: *ma fišš* — there is not, *məš kwayyes* — not good, *w-ma baʿref ʿēš* — and I don't know what, *ma bagdar* — I cannot, *ma btəgdar* — you cannot, *barādi* — I wish, *nəḥār mn-əl-əyyām* — one day,
- 3) phonemic levelling, like: *kēf* — how?, *əḥkāya* — incident (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *əḥčāya*), *ṭarīg* — way (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *ṭarīǧ*), *mən šān* — for, because of (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *məššān*), *baramu* — they retraced their steps (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *əbrāmu*), *əl-baraka* — blessing (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *əl-ebrəka*), *kemān* — also (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *čəmān*), *gaddēš* — how much (genuinely ʿAḡārma: *ǧad-dēš*), *garya* — village (ʿAḡārma: *ǧarya*).

Palva mentions the tanwīn in *məṭṭaǧǧlən mənno* — having been ashamed of it and *ǧān* — they came as stylistic interference from the nomadic dialects of the inner desert. Beside this, also forms *ḥənna* — we and *ʿalli* — who, which, can be regarded as bedouin. In the lexicon, the substitution of the genuine ʿAḡārma *baʿārīn* by *ʿal-bel* — camel(s)

<sup>4</sup> W. Marçais, *Le dialecte arabe des Ūlād Brāhīm de Saïda*, Paris 1906.



(coll.) and the word *dalwān* — now, are the only manifestations of the bedouinizing tendency.

Since the texts on which Palva has based his description of the dialect contain poetic passages, he rightly points to the necessity of keeping apart the prosaic and poetic passages in the study of a dialect and discusses the divergencies from the prosaic 'Ağārma occurring in the poetic passages, caused by the demands of poetics on one hand and the influence of the neighbouring dialects, as well as the use of traditional poetic features no longer traceable to a one specific local dialect on the other (p. 27—28). Among these divergencies, Palva names: *i* = old Ar.: *ay*: 'Ağ.: *ey* || *ē* || *ē*, -ah the pronominal suffix for sing. 3 masc.: 'Ağ. -o || -o<sup>h</sup> || -h, tanwīn in words like: *matnašəlhen* — with the sleeves behind the neck (or back), *səbten* — shoe, *ğewīyen* — strong, *šārben* — having drunk, *lāyden* — having taken refuge, *sāčmenen* — living, dwelling, 'astren — difficult, while tanwīn is used in 'Ağ. sporadically and only adverbially, and finally, one lexical item: 'ayda — also.

Palva classifies the dialect of el-'Ağārma as a dialect sharing on one hand the main characteristics of the Northern Arabian dialect group, distinguished by Cantineau<sup>5</sup>, and particularly the pre-'Anazi, the small-cattle nomads from the Syro-Mesopotamian area and on the other, those of the neighbouring sedentary dialects. Among the most important of those nomadic characteristics Palva counts the preservation of the Literary Arabic *ğ*, the realization of the Literary Arabic *k* as *g* || *ğ*, and of *k* as *k* || *č*, the lack of tendency to weaken the final consonants, especially of: *t*, *m*, *n*, *l*, *r* and *y*, the atrochaity. The most striking characteristics which show the influence of the neighbouring sedentary dialects is the lack of -n in the imperf., 2-nd pers. f. sg., 2-nd pers. m. pl. and 3-rd pers. m. pl.

Looking at the 'Ağārma dialect in the light of Cleveland's classification, one can see that it is most closely related to the I i.e. to those of the *yigūl* group of the dialects. The main characteristic features common both to the 'Ağārma and the *yigūl* dialects are:

- 1) the preservation of the Literary Arabic *ğ*,
- 2) the preservation of the interdental *t*, *d*, and *ḏ*,
- 3) the change of the Literary Arabic *k* into *g*,
- 4) the preservation of the Literary Arabic *k*, which in the contiguity of front vowels becomes *č*,
- 5) the use of simple imperfect form of the verb without the preformative *b*-,
- 6) the lack of use of the -š suffix with the negative verb.

<sup>5</sup> Jean Cantineau, *Études sur quelques parlers de nomades arabes d'Orient*, AIEO 2 (1936), p. 1—118; 3 (1937), s. 109—237.

The most distinct differences between the 'Ağārma and *yigūl* group of dialects of Jordan are:

- 1) the palatalization of *g* = *k* = *ğ* in contiguity of front vowels in 'Ağārma,
- 2) the appearance of *č* in 'Ağārma as an independent phoneme,
- 3) the possibility of introduction of possessive pronouns with the help of the word *ğey*- or *ğiy*- in the *yigūl* dialect of Jordan.

As to the last difference, Palva says nothing positive or negative in this matter. Judging from the text inserted in the monograph under discussion and from the type, the el-'Ağārma dialect, according to Palva's description represents, no such words occur in it. Nevertheless, the situation would have been more clear, if Palva, while discussing the pronominal suffixes (p. 27—28) had paid his attention also to this detail. The more so, that on one hand, he mentions other negative details, like the lack of the suffix -š at the negative verbs or the lack of the preverb *b*-, and on the other that in all those dialects in which such auxiliary words introducing the possessive pronouns occur, these pronouns may also be suffixed immediately to the words of which they are attributes. Thus, nothing definite can be deduced in this regard without clear statement.

One of the interesting characteristics of the 'Ağārma dialect is the use of prepositions *b(i)*- and *ma'* with the locative meaning. Palva (p. 40) explains that according to what he has learned from the informants *ma'* is applied in such cases to implicate the movement and adduces the following examples: *ma' tāni məcān* — in another place; *ma' en-naxīl* — in the palm grove; *ma' ha-š-šōk* — in the thorns; *ma' al-bādyā* — in(to) the desert. Some other examples found in the inserted text and illustrating the use of *b(i)*- and *ma'* are:

- 1) *lamma g'adu b-məcān hān* — when they were sitting in this place,
- 2) *yōm sārlo b-məcān* — when he came to a place,
- 3) *b-nağəd hādi* — it is in Nağd,
- 4) *w-rādāni dahab əb-barāšəghen* — and golden revolvers in their cases,
- 5) *yəğī mgarreb əb-tarīgo* — he took his way westward,
- 6) *u-gadīna hənna wīyāh nəmreh əb-ha-t-four* — maybe we can spend the night together tonight in this cave,
- 7) *thetto b-'eyn əl-mizān* — you must put in the pan of the scale,
- 8) *'əğədb b-ido* — he caught it with his hand,
- 9) *yəğī mgarreb ma' ət-tarīg* — he took the way westward. If we complete the phrases from which the examples adduced above by Palva have been taken, we obtain the following picture:
- 10) *w-təl'at ma' en-naxīl* — she went to the palm grove,
- 11) *w-ənn 'abdalla ma' tāni məcān* — and that 'Abd 'Allāh was in another place,

- 12) *w-ana šarreġ ma' al-bādya ma' 'al-bel* — and I shall go with the camels into the desert.

Closer inspection of the above-adduced examples seems to suggest that both prepositions *b(i)-* and *ma'* can be used with the implication of movement, though not of the movement in general but speaking more strictly, in connection with the verbs of coming and going (away), viz. the preposition *b(i)* with the first and *ma'* with the latter ones. This seems to be proved by the examples, Nos: 2, 7, for *b(i)-* and 9, 10, 12 (*ma' al-bādya*) for *ma'*. However this use appears inconsistent. See e.g. the examples Nos 5 and 10, two almost identical phrases in which, according to the just exposed rule, in both cases the preposition *b(i)-* should have been used.

The really static locative meaning of *b(i)-* is testified by the examples Nos: 1, 3, 4, 6, but *ma'* may also have such meaning, see example No 11.

Beside the above presented application of the prepositions *b(i)-* and *ma'*, *b(i)-* may also perform its normal instrumental function, s. above the example No 8, and *ma'* may appear as conjunction, s. above. the example No 12 (*ma' 'al-bel*).

Thus, on the basis of the instances illustrated by the examples Nos: 2, 7, 9, 10, 12, it seems that the contrast between *b(i)-* and *ma'* is there rather deictic like between come: go but with the implication of dynamism in both cases.

The grammatical sketch of the 'Aġārma dialect occupying the pages 9—55 has been compiled on the basis of texts which Palva has recorded during his visit to Jordan in 1970. The text which has been inserted in Palva's monograph in question is the story of the founder of the Northern-Arabian dynasty of 'Ibn Rašid (1834—1921). It has been chosen for publication because, according to Palva, it illustrates the intricate linguistic situation better than the remaining texts. Palva's translation of the text is very adequate, though certain omissions and mistakes can be sporadically met, like e.g.: p. 60, 9/3 *er-rašid gəlāl šwayya* — The Raxiṣ clan was quite small in number (Palva) it should be: — in the text — *er-raxiṣ gəlāl šwayya* — in the translation — The Raxiṣ clan was somewhat small in number; 9/6 — *marr mən 'andna* — He passed by us (Palva), should be — he went away from us; on p. 66, 23/3 *u-rədāni dahab ab-barāšēghen* — and golden revolvers in their cases (omitted in Palva's translation), etc. The annex to the text containing the explanations concerning the persons of the narrative is very useful.

The glossary at the end of the book under discussion contains

<sup>6</sup> The first number refers to the section into which the text has been divided by Palva, the second to the line in the section.

a set of words occurring in the inserted text. It is however sometimes difficult to define the criteria according to which this glossary has been compiled, since we can find in it such commonly known words like e.g.: *təhaġġal* — to feel ashamed, embarrassed, while you can look without success for a word like *ġerm* — mass, body from the phrase ... *b-ġerm ad-darmak* — among the reeds (p. 88). Also e.g. *rāh* — to go can be found but not dialectal *šāf* — to see, though *rāh* does not seem to be less known than *šāf*.

In the Introduction (p. 5—8), Palva gives the following main purposes set before his monograph: 1) to single out the main characteristics of the dialect with special reference to typologically distinctive features; 2) to give a continuous text where these characteristics occur; 3) to illustrate some linguistic phenomena typical of a relatively small semi-nomadic group. All three have been successfully attained.

Andrzej Czapkiewicz

*Türk Dünyası El Kitabı* (Handbuch der türkischen Welt). Ankara 1976. 1452 SS. Karte.

Das am 20. Oktober 1961 gegründete Institut zur Erforschung der türkischen Kultur in Ankara hat als sein Ziel allseitige Studien über Probleme der türkischen Welt gestellt. Als Hauptthemen sind Geschichte, Ethnologie, Sprache, Kunst, soziale Fragen, Geographie und Wirtschaft sowie Aufklärung der türkischen Völker ausgewählt.

Das Institut entfaltet rege Tätigkeit, was in kurzer Zeit anhand von Veröffentlichungen sichtbar wurde. Als Erfolg ist die Monatschrift in türkischer Sprache „Türk Kültürü“ (bisher 184 Hefte) erschienen. In westeuropäischen Sprachen wurde „Cultura Turcica“ herausgegeben. Nächste Publikation war „Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları“ (Studien der türkischen Kultur). Als besondere Serie sind Abhandlungen u. a. L. Rásonyi: Tarihte Türklük (Die Türken in der Geschichte), M. Ülküsal: Dobruca ve Türkler (Dobrukscha und die Türken) veröffentlicht.

Zum Andenken der 50. Wiederkehr der Türkischen Republik beabsichtigte das Institut eine Publikation herauszugeben, die ein Kompendium der Gesamtkunde über türkische Welt sein sollte. Vor uns liegt ein dicker Band mit 1452 Seiten u. T. Türk Dünyası El Kitabı.

Das ist eine Enzyklopädie, die allseitige Bearbeitung der Kunde über die Türkvölker im Verlaufe der Geschichte bringt. Erster Abschnitt ist der Geographie der türkischen Völker gewidmet. Er enthält die Studien von A. Ardel über allgemeine Geographie der Gebiete, welche die türkischen Völker bewohnen. Y. Dönmez gibt eine Über-

sicht der humanen und wirtschaftlichen Geographie der türkischen Welt. A. Ardel und T. Yücel setzen in Kenntnis über Demographie und Ökonomik der Balkanhalbinsel, Syrien, Irak und Zypern.

Der zweite Abschnitt behandelt die Grundlagen der türkischen Kultur. Er bringt Kunde über türkische Sprache. Anschliessend wird die uralaltaische und altaische Sprachtheorie dargestellt. Später kommt die Charakteristik der einzelnen türkischen Sprachen und Dialekte und zwar alttürkischen, altanatolischen, altosmanischen und gegenwärtigen türkischen Sprache, osttürkischen (tschagataischen) und nördlichen türkischen Dialekte. Ebenso wurde die Klassifikation der Türksprachen aufgenommen. Wir finden hier auch die Angaben über von den Türken verwendeten Schriftarten und Alphabete. Die Verfasser dieser Aufsätze sind die besten Sachkenner: R. Arat, M. Ergin, Ş. Tekin, T. Tekin, A. Temir und F. Timurtaş.

Der Abschnitt über Literatur bringt Informationen über Destanen, Schrifttum der islamischen Türken, Schaffen in der Zeit Karachaniden-dynastie, über literarische Tätigkeit der Türken, Aserbajdschaner, Tschagataier, Tataren und Baschkiren. Diese Bearbeitungen gehören solchen Spezialisten wie K. Akyüz, A. Caferoğlu, S. Çagatay, Ş. Elgin, A. Inan, A. Temir, F. Timurtaş. Das gründliche Studium über türkische Kunst hat O. Aslanapa geschrieben. M. Cumbur stellt den Beitrag über Vergoldungs- und Buchbindereikunst vor.

Der umfangreiche dritte Abschnitt behandelt die Geschichte der Türkvölker. Wir finden hier Angaben über den Namen, Herkunft, Heimat und Verbreitung der Türken. Umständlich ist die Geschichte der türkischen Staaten in Asien geschildert und zwar Hunnen, Tabgatsch, Göktürken, Uiguren, Kirgisen, Türgeschen, Qarluquen, Oghusen. Besonders wurden die Staatseinrichtungen der türkischen Völker in Osteuropa samt deren Kultur und Organisation berücksichtigt. Wir erhalten auch das Bild der Türken unter den Abbassiden, Karachaniden und Ghasnewiden. Viel Aufmerksamkeit hat man den Seldschuken gewidmet. Ebenso wurden auch andere türkische Staaten in Anatolien, Iran, Syrien und Ägypten behandelt. Ein wertvoller Zusatz ist der Beitrag über Kultur und Institute der islamischen Einrichtungen. Ein besonderer Abschnitt schildert die türkischen Staaten in Mittelasien und in der kiptschakischen Steppen. Hier ist die Geschichte der Goldenen Horde und der Chanate von Kasan, Astrachan, Kasim, Krim, Nogajerhorde und Sibirien berücksichtigt. Der Aufsatz über das Osmanische Reich stellt seine Kultur und Organisation, politische Geschichte und Erneuerungstendenzen des Staates vor. Kurz ist die Entwicklung der Türkischen Republik besprochen. Die Aufsätze gehören den Federn von I. Kafesoğlu, A. N. Kurat, A. Temir, H. Inalcık, C. Orhonlu und E. Kuran.

Der fünfte Abschnitt enthält die gegenwärtigen Probleme der türkischen Welt. Von den politischen Angelegenheiten ist der Stand der

Türkvölker in UdSSR und die Rolle des Islam berührt. Von den sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Fragen sind beachtungswert die Angaben über die Entwicklung des Gesetzes in der Türkei, ökonomische Geographie dieses Landes und die wirtschaftliche Stellung des Wolgagebietes geschildert. Die Aufsätze zu diesem Abschnitt haben A. N. Kurat, A. Temir, S. Özgelik, T. Yücel und M. Eröz vorbereitet.

Als kulturelle Probleme treten die Fragen der Sprache und Alphabete bei den gegenwärtigen türkischen Völkern, das religiöse Leben der türkischen Gesellschaft und die Notwendigkeit der Erhaltung und Entwicklung der türkischen Kultur auf.

Die beigelegte Karte schildert den Bereich der Besiedlung der türkischen Völker. Der umfangreiche Index erleichtert die Benutzung so inhaltsvolles Werkes.

Es ist sehr verständlich, dass bei solchen Veröffentlichungen unmöglich einige Ungenauigkeiten zu vermeiden ist. Deshalb sei es mir gestattet einige davon zu zeigen. Bei der Schilderung der heutigen Besiedlung der Türkvölker wurden kleine Kolonien der Tataren in Polen, Litauen und Weissrutenien sowie der Karaimen in der Krim, Litauen, Ukraine und Polen nicht berücksichtigt. Diese Kolonien kommen auch nicht auf der Karte der Besiedlung der türkischen Völker vor. Es ist zu bemerken, dass die Krimtataren heute einige Ortschaften von Özbekistan bewohnen. Ebenso kleine Gruppen von Gagausen befinden sich in Kasachstan (Kreis Aktjubinsk, Semipalatsinsk und Südkasachischer), in Kirgisien (Kreis Frunse) und in Özbekistan (Kreis Taschkent).

Als Ergänzung ist auf S. 308 — 1941 J. für Todesdatum von Bogoroditski zu stellen.

Trotz voller Anerkennung der neuesten Literatur, wären doch einige bibliographische Ergänzungen wünschenswert und zwar:

- S. 389 A. S. Orłow: *Kazachskij geroičeskij epos*.  
W. M. Žirmunskij, Ch. T. Zarifow: *Uzbekskij narodnyj epos*.  
*Kirgizskij geroičeskij epos „Manas“*.  
W. M. Žirmunskij: *Tjurkskij geroičeskij epos*.  
M. H. Tähmasib: *Azərbaydzan calg dastany*.
- S. 483 *Azərbaydzan edebijaty tarichi*, I—III.
- S. 501 J. Eckmann: *Die tschagataische Literatur* — PhTF II.  
Ch. G. Kor-Ogly: *Uzbekskaja literatura*.
- S. 504 A. Zajaczkowski: *Stownik arabsko-kipeczacki z okresu Państwa Mameluckiego*, I—II.  
B. Atalay: *Ettuhfet-üz-zekiyye fil-lugat-it-türkiyye*.  
A. Zajaczkowski: *Le traite arabe Mukaddima d'Abou-l-Lait as-Samarqandi en version mamelouk-kiptchak*.  
A. Zajaczkowski: *Najstarsza wersja turecka Husrav u Širîn Qutba*, I—III.



- N. Hacıeminoğlu: *Kutb'un Husrev ü Şirin'i ve Dil husûsiyetleri*.
- A. Bodrogligeti: A Fourtent Century Turkic Translation Sa'di's Gulistân (Sayfi Sarayî's Gulistân bi't-Turki).
- A. Tietze: *The Koman Riddles and Turkic Folklore*.
- T. I. Grunin: *Dokumenty na polowieckom jazykie XVI w.*
- E. Tryjarski: *Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak d'après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises*, I/1—4.
- S. 521 *Boryngy Tatar Ädäbijaty*.
- S. 532 P. N. Boratav: *Le „Tekerleme“*.  
G. Jacob: *Das türkische Schattentheater*.  
F. Luschan: *Das türkische Schattenspiel*.  
N. Martinovitch: *The Turkish Theatre*.
- S. 790 M. I. Artamonow: *Istorija chazar*.  
G. W. Jusupow: *Wwedenije w bulgaro-tatarskuju epigrafiku*.
- S. 909 Wł. Gordlewski: *Gosudarstwo Seldżukidow Małej Aziji*.  
T. Talbot-Rice: *The Seldjuks in Asia Minor*.
- S. 937 M. A. Usmanow: *Tatarskije istoričeskie istočniki 17—18 ww.*
- S. 954 Ö. Gökbilgin: *1532—1577 yılları arasında Kırım Hanlığının siyasî durumu*.  
Ö. Gökbilgin: *Şahib Giray Hân*.  
A. Zajaczkowski: *La chronique des steppes Kiptchak Tevârih-i Deşt-i Qipčaq*.
- S. 1120 G. Doerfer: *Halacça — Orta İran'da Arkaik Bir Türk Dili*.  
T. Kowalski: *Sir Aurel Stein's Sprachaufzeichnungen im Äinattu-Dialekt aus Südpersien*.
- S. 1124 A. I. Karajewa: *Očerki istorii karačajewskoj literatury. Russko-karačajewo-balkarskij slovar'. Nogajsko-russkij slovar'*.
- S. 1271 S. I. Rudenko: *Baškiry*.
- S. 1399 H. Duda: *Die neue Lateinschrift in der Türkei*. — OLZ 32, 33.  
A. N. Kononow: *Reforma alfawita w Turciji. Trzydziestolecie reformy alfabetu w Turcji*. „Przegląd Orientalystyczny” 1959.

Diese Ergänzungen können keinesfalls den Wert des besprochenen Werkes vermindern. Sie sind nur der Ausdruck des Interesses und der Anerkennung für den Fleiss und Sorgfalt bei der Bearbeitung so vorzüglicher Veröffentlichung, die mit voller Verantwortlichkeit Encyclopaedia Turcica nennen kann. Türk Dünyası El Kitabı soll unbedingt in die Hände aller Turkologen treffen.

Włodzimierz Zajaczkowski

Hans-Jürgen Kornrumpf, *Osmanische Bibliographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Türkei in Europa* [Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung. Ergänzungsband VIII], Leiden/Köln 1973, E. J. Brill, 1378 SS. 290 hol. Guld.

Das wissenschaftliche Schaffen nimmt mit jedem Tag immer grösseren Aufschwung. Das ist auf dem Gebiete der Veröffentlichungsproduktion ausdrücklich sichtbar. Deshalb wird ein dringender Bedarf an Bibliographien und sonstigen Informationsausgaben spürbar.

Im Bereich der Turkologie liegen bereits einige Arbeiten vor, die nützliche Angaben bringen und auch die Türkei betreffen. Hier sind zu nennen: J. Benzing, Einführung in das Studium der altaischen Philologie und Turkologie (Wiesbaden 1953), B. Spuler & L. Forrer, Der Vordere Orient in islamischer Zeit (Bern 1954), R. Loewenthal, The Turkic Language and Literatures of Central Asia. A Bibliography (Haag 1957). Auch J. D. Pearson's Index Islamicus (ab 1958) kommt hier in Frage. Aber bisherige diesbezügliche Ausgaben bringen ziemlich knappe Daten über die Türkei. Seit längerer Zeit fühlt man den Mangel an einer echt bibliographischen Arbeit, die eine Übersicht des Schaffens auf dem Gebiete der türkischen Geschichte und Kultur geben würde.

Das vorliegende Werk entspricht im ganzen allen diesen Ansprüchen. Der Verfasser hat zum Ziel die Bearbeitung möglichst vieler Periodika, Festschriften und anderer Sammlungsbänden mit den Angaben über die Türkei und die Länder Südosteuropas gestellt. Die Bibliographie enthält 2 Teile: Alphabetischen Teil und systematischen Teil. Im alphabetischen Teil ist die ganze Veröffentlichungsproduktion betreffs der Türkei und Südosteuropas für den Zeitraum 1945—1970 zusammengestellt. In dem systematischen Teil sind 14 Abteilungen berücksichtigt: Allgemeines, Geschichte, Historische Hilfswissenschaften, Pressewesen, Philosophie, Religion, Recht, Geographie, Soziales, Kunst, Erziehungswesen, Sprachen, Literatur und Naturwissenschaften.

Diese Teilung ist ganz zweckmässig und gibt jedem Nutzniesser die Möglichkeit schnell und leicht die ihn interessierenden Werke zu finden. Dank ungewöhnlichem Fleiss und Akribie des Verfassers haben wir ein wertvolles Werk erhalten, für welches wir alle dankbar sind.

Als Ausdruck meiner Anerkennung sei es mir gestattet einige kleine Berichtigungen einzusetzen.

Zu S. 571 richtiger Familienname ist SOKOLNICKI.

Zu S. 717 Bei dem Titel: Polonya ile Türkiye ... kültür münasebetleri muss man als Verfasser anstatt Włodzimierz — Ananiasz angeben. Ebenso zu S. 1154 bei demselben Titel anstatt W. muss A. sein.

Zu S. 719 Bei dem Titel: Między traktatem andruszowskim ...

muss man umstellen: WÓJCIK Zbigniew. Ebenso zu S. 1120.

Zu S. 1117 Bei Smirnov, Rossija i Turcija ... ist Bd. I—II zusetzen.  
Zu S. 1328 Es muss PETROSJAN lesen.

Diese Berichtigungen können keinesfalls den Wert so nützlicher Arbeit vermindern.

Włodzimierz Zajaczkowski

Eduard von Zambaur, *Die Münzprägungen des Islams zeitlich und örtlich geordnet*. I Band. *Der Westen und Osten bis zum Indus mit synoptischen Tabellen*. Herausgegeben von Peter Jaeckel, Wiesbaden, 1968, 4°, F. Steiner Verlag pp. 286 + 26 tables + Hinweise zur Benutzung von Peter Jaeckel.

The name of Eduard von Zambaur is well known to the orientalists, both numismatists and historians, not only from his numismatic works but first of all thanks to his fundamental publication: *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam*, Hannover 1927. Therefore the interest with which the fact of publication of the I volume of the work under discussion has been received is only very well justified. This is the first exhaustive numismatic inventory of Islamic mints long expected by the orientalists-numismatists. To be sure, there appeared several publications of similar kind<sup>1</sup>, but they are mostly incomplete and somewhat oldfashioned. A special gratitude is then to be expressed here to P. Jaeckel, Ph. D. thanks to whom this important publication could see the daylight, and who provided the work with an annex containing the elementary clues enabling the readers interested in the problem but unacquainted with the Arabic language, to make use of the book in question. Of course, the work of E. v. Zambaur does not represent an ideal, nevertheless it is so far the most complete publication of this type, and the fact that certain mints do not occur in the inventory has been caused by the time-span which separates the moment of the preparation of the work under discussion for print in 1942 and its publication in 1968. Hence, this inventory cannot contain these mints whose activities have been brought to light by new numismatic finds discovered in the meantime<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> O. Codrington, *A Manuel of Musulman Numismatics*, London, 1904; O. G. Tychem, *Introductio in rem numariam muhammedanorum*, Rostock, 1794.

<sup>2</sup> G. C. Miles, *Excavation Coins from the Persepolis Region*, New York, 1959, p. 66; idem, *Trésor de dirhems du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Extrait des Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran, t. XXXVII, Paris, 1960,

The main part of the book includes: 1) the list of dynasties p. (9—14) together with symbols consisting of letters, with the help of which the author refers to a given dynasty in each particular item concerning a given mint; 2) bibliography (p. 14—28) represented by four kinds of publications: a) general, b) numismatic, c) geographical, d) historical, all provided with special symbols consisting either of letters (in the case of general, geographical and historical publications) or of numbers (in the case of the numismatic ones), serving the references; 3) the inventory of mints (p. 28—275) preceded by short introductory notes in which the earlier publications of similar kind as well as the arrangement of the inventory are discussed. The inventory itself includes 970 mints arranged alphabetically according to the order of Arabic alphabet. Each particular item concerning a given mint consists of the Arabic version of its name with eventual variants together with its Latin transcription, the localization and identification of the mint and often the date of its foundation, the chronologically arranged list of dynasties which struck the coins in this mint together with the years of the emissions, the list of Arabic and European sources in which a given mint is mentioned, and finally the list of catalogues and inventories with the relevant pages in the case of the first ones, or relevant numbers in the case of the latter, as well as a minting date of a given specimen, all concerning a given mint. It is to be explained that the catalogue or inventory data mentioned here refer only to the specimens typologically different from the rest of coins of a given emission. In some cases, the footnotes which, if necessary, explain or complete the informations included in the item are added; 4) the list of mints which, either appear for the first time only in this publication, or were not identified till now (p. 275).

The work is closed by 26 synoptic tables preceded by a short explanation of their arrangement as well as of the way of making use of them. The tables contain the lists of mints arranged in quarters of a century, beginning from the dawn of Islam down to 1349 H = 1939 A. D. Each of the tables contains also the data concerning the catalogues and the informations about the coins struck in a given mint a given year. The very useful indexes of place-names are inserted at the end of Zambaur's work while the whole book is preceded by an Introduction of B. Spuler.

This what makes the use of the undeniably precious work of Zambaur somewhat difficult is that the author gives in this part of an item which contains the numismatic bibliography only these publications in which the non-typical specimens of the emissions of a given

p. 113, No. 585; Muhammad Abū-l-Faraj al-'Uṣṣ, *Rare Islamic Coins: Additions*, [in:] *Studies in Honor of G. C. Miles*, American University of Beirut, 1971, p. 193, 194, 196—198.

dynasty occur. The reader is then forced to a permanent and annoying quest after a full documentation in the numismatic bibliography inserted together with the list of dynasties. Giving the complete survey of publications concerning the emissions of each particular dynasty in a given mint immediately side by side with a given dynasty who minted the coins in it, without resigning from the applied pointing to the non-typical specimens would, in our opinion, greatly enhance the efficiency of Zambaur's inventory and in consequence considerably facilitate the use of it. Besides, this would prevent from drawing hasty but probable conclusions as to the incompleteness of the documentation quoted by the Author.

It is commonly known that up to the 'Abd 'al-Malik's reform, the Arabs, while minting their coins, did this after the old local patterns, i.e. they used to issue the coins of the Byzantine type in former Byzantine mints or of the Sassanian type in former Sassanian mints. Incomprehensible therefore it seems that Zambaur notes this fact in the case of certain mints, like e.g.: ar-Ruhā (p. 128), Ḥalab (p. 106), Dimišk (p. 118), etc., while he makes no mention of it in the case of other ones, like e.g.: Baṣra, Kirmān, Darabğird, Marw, Balh, Buhārā, Herāt a. o.<sup>3</sup>

It is also a pity that Zambaur while mentioning the mints of Transoxiana did not count among their emissions the so-called „black dirhams”, i.e. the ġitrifi, musayyabī and muḥammadi specimens which played such an important role on that territory as we learn about it from the medieval Arabic sources<sup>4</sup> as well as from the European publications compiled on the basis of monetary finds from the recent years<sup>5</sup>.

It is not quite clear, why the Author inserts in the case of at-Taymura (p. 94) the following variant of spelling of this name: التيمرا instead of التيمرة in which this mint appears not only on the coins known to me but also on those published in the Catalogues of Nützel

<sup>3</sup> J. Walker, *A Catalogue of the Muhammadan Coins in the British Museum*, vol. I, 2-nd ed. London, 1967, vol. II, 1-st. ed. London, 1956; H. Nützel, *Katalog der orientalischen Münzen*, Königliche Museen zu Berlin, Bd. I, Berlin, 1898.

<sup>4</sup> 'al-Mukaddasī, *BGA*, vol. II, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Leyde, 1877, p. 339—340; 'Ibn Ḥurdābeh, *BGA*, vol. VI, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Leyde, 1889, p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> P. I. Lerkh, *Monety Bukhar-Khudatov*, S. Peterburg, 1909; M. E. Masson, *K voprosu o „černykh dirhemakh” museyyabī*, Trudy Instituta Istorii i Arkheologii, vyp. 7, Taškent, 1955, p. 175—196; E. A. Davidović, *Deneznoe obraščenie v Maverannahre pri Samanidakh*, N. E., vol. VI, Moskva, 1966, p. 103—134.

(p. 75, Nos. 356, 357; p. 110, No 601) and of Tiesenhausen (cf. V. Tizengausen, *Monety vostočnago chalifata*, Sanktpeterburg 1873, p. 39, No. 338; p. 40, Nos. 359, 367; p. 43, No. 402 a. s. o.) to which Zambaur refers as to the evidence of activities of this mint. The preservation of the spelling testified by the numismatic material seems, in our opinion, necessary in order to avoid possible mistakes, and in case of eventual variants met by author he should draw the attention of the reader to this fact.

It seems that the mint name Bazmḳubād بزمقباد (p. 72) ought to be read correctly Bīramḳubād and be identified with Rāmḳubād mentioned by Ṭabarī, I, 887—888 who identifies this locality with 'Arrağān. Why Zambaur connects it with 'Abazḳubād which appears in Yākūt's Mu'ğam, I, 90, 605 remains unexplained, since Yākūt does not insert any variant of this name with ʿ in its spelling. Perhaps, a certain explanation of this fact may be the existence of several localities with the name 'Abarkubād || 'Abazḳubād on this territory in close distance from each other which are mentioned by Yākūt and other Arabic sources quoted by this geographer<sup>6</sup> and in our time by Walker and others<sup>7</sup>, what probably could have induced Zambaur to the identification of the locality Bīramḳubād whose name he read as Bazmḳubād with one of them.

In the item devoted to 'al-'Abbāsiyya (p. 175), the emphasis with which Zambaur points to the year 150 H. as the date of its foundation with the simultaneous ascription of this fact to 'Ibrāhīm 'ibn 'al-'Ağlab is somewhat puzzling. There occurs serious and evident discrepancy between this date and the time in which 'Ibrāhīm was the gouvernor of 'Ifrikiyya and could possibly be the founder of the locality in question, and which, according to the data included in the sources falls within the years 184—197 H. 'Al-Balāḍurī informs us about the existence of three localities with the name 'al-'Abbāsiyya in 'Ifrikiyya. The first of them founded by 'Umar 'ibn Hafṣ, the gouvernor of 'Ifrikiyya in 151—154 H.<sup>8</sup>, probably on the ruins of ancient Tibna or Tobna<sup>9</sup>. The second was built up by the above-mentioned 'Ibrāhīm 'ibn 'al-'Ağlab in the distance of 2 miles from Ḳayruwan, also known as White Castle<sup>10</sup>. The period in which this gouvernor hold his office definitely leaves beyond any doubt that this locality could not exist before the year 184 H. The third of them is a city near Tahert founded

<sup>6</sup> Yākūt, *op. cit.*, p. 90—91.

<sup>7</sup> J. Walker, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. cxiii — cxvi; G. C. Miles, *Excavation Coins...*, p. 64—65.

<sup>8</sup> al-Balāḍurī, *Futūḥ*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Lugduni Batavorum, 1866, p. 232.

<sup>9</sup> E. I., vol. I, p. 15—16.

<sup>10</sup> al-Balāḍurī, *op. cit.*, p. 234.



in 239 H. by 'Ibrāhīm's son Muḥammad<sup>11</sup>. The numismatic material adduced by Zambaur as representing the coins of this mint covers the time-span enclosed within the years 150—285 H. Because of the lack of any other data, this might speak for that these coins could be issued by all three mentioned localities. The identification presented by Zambaur suggests the contamination of at least two from the three mentioned localities with the name 'al-'Abbāsiyya, viz. of that founded by 'Umar 'ibn Hafs, to what points the date 150 H. inserted by Zambaur and of the second founded tens of years later by 'Ibrāhīm 'ibn 'al-'Aḡlab whose name Zambaur unjustifiably connects with the date 150 H. what, as we have shown above, stands in contradiction with the data of Arabic sources. Hence, according to our conviction, in Zambaur's inventory there ought to be at least two items devoted to two mints with the name 'al-'Abbāsiyya and the relevant numismatic material adduced by this Author ought to be divided into two respective groups.

All these above-mentioned small and unimportant defects in no way decrease the value of the work under discussion as well as of the merits of its Author whose scrupulous minuteness in presenting the numismatic material is astounding and the great usefulness of his work is beyond any doubt. The great caution with which Zambaur has compiled his work deserves a special attention. An example of this is that in the face of the lack of sufficient data, he abstains from any suggestions as to the lection and identification of the mint 'Arḍ 'al-Ḥayr considered by some numismatists as Khazaran and whose name they read therefore 'Arḍ 'al-Ḥazar, though Zambaur himself admitted the Khazaran mintage.

Of great value are the synoptic tables inserted at the end of the inventory in question which show us not only the connections of each particular mint with the relevant literature but also the course of their activities in each particular year of their work. Also the list of Moslem dynasties mentioned at the beginning of the present review contains rich and highly useful informations on the dynasties which emitted the coins, as well as on the territories and time of their rules together with the bibliography of historical sources and numismatic publications dealing with these dynasties, all in a short and compact form.

Therefore, once again our thankfulness ought to be expressed here to P. Jaekel, the Editor of the work under discussion for his efforts undertaken and fruitfully brought to an end, and his announced preparation and edition of the 2-nd volume containing the mints of India and neighbouring regions awaited with impatience and due interest.

Maria Czapkiewicz

<sup>11</sup> al-Balāḍurī, *op. cit.*, l. c.

L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 16), Leiden 1975, J. Brill, 8°, pp. XII+170. Price: 64 Gld.

The study of Jewish religious law, the halakhah, makes it possible to identify the social group which created a given body of legal texts, because both the method and the content of the law depended on the specific living conditions of the group and on the general historical situation. The main purpose of Schiffman's study, which represents the major part of his Brandeis University dissertation (1974), is to establish the relation of the Qumran sect to other Jewish groups on the basis of the sect's halakhah.

The book is composed of three chapters, preceded by a general introduction. The introduction (pp. 1—21) discusses the existing studies of the Qumran halakhah, the sources of the Qumran halakhah (the Zadokite Fragments, *Megillat Ha-Serakhim*, the War Scroll, the Temple Scroll), the comparative sources (the Bible, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Philo Judaeus, Josephus, Rabbinic literature, other Jewish sects), and takes up some points of the relation of the Qumran halakhah to the history of Jewish law.

In Chapter One (pp. 22—76) the author analyses the halakhic terminology at Qumran: *nigleh* and *nistar*; *meduqdaq*, *nimṣa*, *perush*; *mishpat*, *miṣwah*; *yissurim*; *drš*, *midrash*; *serekh*; *moshab ha-rabbim*. On the basis of a thorough investigation he concludes that the Dead Sea sect did not recognize oral transmission of the Law and that biblical exegesis was the main source of the halakhah. The Torah was very frequently referred to as *nigleh* („revealed”). The *niglot* are those laws which require no commentary because their meaning is obvious. The sect also recognized laws the meaning of which was hidden (*nistarot*) and which were known only to its members, owing to a „correct” interpretation. The crucial terms for exegesis were *perush* and *midrash*. *Perush* refers to an exegesis of the text which does not involve the citation of corroborative material from elsewhere in Scripture. The *midrash* is an exegetical form in which a passage is interpreted in light of a second passage (p. 76). Both forms of exegesis were committed to writing in sessions of the *moshab ha-rabbim*.

Chapter Two (pp. 77—83) is a brief introduction to the Qumran Sabbath Code, which is found in the Zadokite Fragments (10: 14—11: 18). Chapter Three (pp. 84—133) contains the translation of the individual precepts of the law, together with a detailed commentary. The following points are included: the addition of the last part of Friday to the Sabbath (the *tosefet melakhah*), discussion of business, walking in the field, a one thousand cubit Sabbath limit, preparation of food before the Sabbath, eating and drinking within the camp, drinking and washing on a journey, performance of Sabbath work by a non-Jew,

the cleanliness of Sabbath garments, entering a partnership, pasturing animals, carrying from domain to domain, opening a sealed vessel, wearing of perfume bottles, handling rocks and earth, carrying infants, encouraging a servant to labor, caring for domesticated animals, spending the Sabbath among gentiles, violation of the Sabbath for the sake of wealth, saving of life, and sacrifices. In commenting on the particular points the author brings in comparative material to show affinities between Qumran Law and the legal codes of other groups. The conclusion is that the study of the laws of the Sabbath does not make any definite identification possible. However, there existed some historical connections between the Qumran sect and the Karaites, as shown in the attitude to the Bible and in the rejection of oral Law.

It is possible that Schiffman's investigation of the Qumran halakhah failed to identify the Qumran sect with the Essenes because his field of study was confined to exegetical terminology and the Sabbath laws, while many other aspects of the halakhah, like the laws of the calendar, organization of the sect or ritual purity were overlooked. In a fuller study some attention should also be paid to the historical changes in the laws, such as those revealed by the successive versions of the *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, as shown by J. Murphy-O'Connor in his article *La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté* (Revue biblique 76, 1969, 528—549). A study of this sort might elucidate the affinities, between the Qumran sect and the group of proto-Pharisees. Schiffman's work ends with a very extensive bibliography, an index of citations, index of Hebrew and Aramaic terms explained and a general index. As a whole, Schiffman's study is a valuable contribution to Qumranology.

Stanisław Mędala

Joachim Śliwa, *Studies in Ancient Egyptian Handicraft. Woodworking*, Kraków—Warszawa 1975, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, S. 82, Abb. 32. [Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, t. CCCIV; Prace Archeologiczne, z. 21; Studia z Archeologii Śródziemnomorskiej, z. 4].

Das Studium von Joachim Śliwa ist die erste polnische Monographie betr. die Holzverarbeitung im alten Ägypten — ein Thema, welches sehr oft und vielseitig — obwohl immer nur als Teil eines grösseren Ganzen in der bisherigen wissenschaftlichen Literatur behandelt wurde (d. h. in Abhandlungen über Technologie und Technik, über Kunstgeschichte im breitesten Sinne und über den Alltag der Menschen im Altertum). Das ausführlichste Studium zum Holz enthält die Arbeit

*Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, von A. Lucas (London 1962)<sup>4</sup>.

Im ersten Kapitel bespricht J. Śliwa die Rohstoffe, die in diesem Handwerkszweig benutzt wurden (S. 9—20), sowohl einheimische, wie auch Importhölzer aus dem Libanon, Kleinasien und Afrika. Beachtenswert sind hier diese Holzarten, die in der wissenschaftlichen Literatur bisher unbekannt waren, und welche ägyptische Handwerker verwendeten, u. a. die aus *Dalbergia retusa* und *Microberlinia bisulcata* Brazzavillensis hergestellten Gegenstände jetzt befindlich im National-Museum von Kraków (S. 17).

Im weiteren Verlauf des Kapitels behandelt der Verfasser die Verwendung verschiedener Baumteile, die für die Produktion von minderem Wert waren, wie beispielsweise: Äste, Zweige, Baumrinde und Blätter (S. 18—19), wobei er darauf hinweist, dass die Ägypter zu voller Verwertung des gefällten Baumes strebten (S. 18). Danach wird kurz die Anwendung von Fossilholz, sowie Holzkohle, die bei vielen Handwerkszweigen notwendig waren, erörtert. Der Leser vermisst jedoch im weiteren Verlauf des Kapitels eine Behandlung von Halbfabrikaten, z. B. Bretter.

Im nächsten Kapitel (S. 21—43) werden die Werkzeuge, wie auch die Werkstatt des ägyptischen Zimmermanns und Tischlers besprochen, wobei der Verfasser die deutliche Trennung der Arbeit innerhalb der Handwerkergruppen (Spezialisierung) betont.

Das neue Kapitel: „Principal working techniques and main fields of production“ (S. 45—64) stellt die hauptsächlichsten Techniken der Produktion dar. Da ist zuerst die Vorbereitung des Materials und seine Anfangsbehandlung. Der Überblick über die Vorarbeiten bei der Bearbeitung des Holzes (S. 45—49) schliesst mit der Besprechung der verschiedenen Methoden, welche es erlaubten, die erwünschten Formen der Gegenstände zu erzielen. Das nächste Thema dieses Kapitels behandelt Konstruktionstypen und Holzverbindungen (S. 49—55).

Dann wird über den Schiffsbau gesprochen (S. 55—59), wobei viele damit verbundenen Probleme durch das Auffinden des Sonnenschiffs des Cheops gelöst wurden, dessen Konstruktionselemente und verschiedene Arten der Holzverbindung der Verfasser bespricht. Hier werden auch die Bootskonstruktionen aus der Zeit des Sesostri III., die in Dahschur gefunden wurden, dargestellt.

Weiter wird die Böttcherei besprochen (S. 59—60), die wie man bisher annahm, in Ägypten sehr spät auftrat und aus dem Norden stammte (aus Mitteleuropa über Rom). Dagegen kann man in Ägypten, nach Ansicht von J. Śliwa, schon 3000 Jahre v. Chr. von Böttchereien sprechen (S. 60).

Die letzten in diesem Kapitel dargestellten Handwerkszweige, sind die Stellmacherei und der Bau von Streitwagen (S. 60—63). Ihre Entwicklung erfolgte im NR.

Zum Kapitelschluss bespricht der Verfasser die Verzierungen der hölzernen Gegenstände (S. 63—64). Besonders aufmerksam wurden die verzierten Möbelbeine betrachtet. Weiter macht er mit den Techniken bekannt, die diesem Ziele dienten, wie: Inkrustation, Furnier, Intarsia. Wie es scheint, sollte auch die Bedeutung des Bemalens der Holzgegenstände nicht vergessen werden. Die Ägypter wussten die Gegenstände aus Ebenholz hoch zu schätzen und deshalb benutzten sie Ebenholz Furnier oder bemalten Ebanholzartig.

Im letzten Kapitel behandelt J. Šliwa Fragen der Arbeitsorganisation und der sozialen Stellung der Handwerker (S. 65—71). Nach Ansicht des Verfassers kann von einem Fortschritt in der Technik oder Organisation des ägyptischen Handwerks sensu stricto nicht die Rede sein, da es sich nur um einzelne Verbesserungen in Technik und Organisation handelt, die innerhalb einer langen Zeitspanne eingeführt wurden. Dagegen ist eine deutliche Arbeitsteilung innerhalb der sich mit der Holzbearbeitung befassenden Handwerksgruppen schon im AR erkennbar. Es zeugt hiervon z. B. ein reicher Wortschatz, der zur Bezeichnung dabei ausgeübter Tätigkeiten und Berufe diente. Nach Ansicht des Verfassers gab es schon zur Zeit der IV.—V. Dynastie spezialisierte Handwerkergruppen, vor allem in der Hauptstadt, in lokalen Verwaltungs- und Kultzentren; grosse Werkstätten waren schon im AR bekannt; ähnliche sind auch aus späteren Zeiten bekannt. Meines Erachtens wäre die Information des Verfassers hinsichtlich der Werften zu ergänzen. Wir kennen sie schon aus dem AR, wo sie im Süden Ägyptens, in der Gegend der I. Katarakte lagen (dort baute Weni Schiffe; Urk. I, 108). Nach den in der Biographie des Piopi-nacht enthaltenen Informationen ist auch das Bestehen von Werften ausserhalb von Ägypten, z. B. an der asiatischen Küste möglich. Höchstwahrscheinlich gab es zur Zeit des AR private Werften, die im Besitz der Würdenträger waren. Davon zeugen Grabreliefs, die den Schiffsbau darstellen. Man darf hier ausserdem nachweisen, dass einfache Wirtschaftsgeräte, z. B. die Pflüghacken und Hacken für den Gebrauch der Tempel- und der königlichen Wirtschaften in der Tischlerei gefertigt wurden. Aus Holz wurden auch Waffen (u. a. Bogen und Pfeile) angefertigt. Besonders oft werden Szenen der Herstellung von Waffen in Gräbern des NR angetroffen (z. B. PM I, 1<sup>2</sup>, 73 und 177, 5), was meiner Meinung nach, von dem Bestehen einer besonderen Handwerkergruppe, die sich mit diesem Handwerkszweig beruflich befasste, zeugt (Die ersten sind aus der Zeit des AR aus Zawijet el-Metin bekannt (LD II, Taf. 108); die nächsten aus der Zeit MR aus Beni Hassan (B. H. I, 11; II, 7 und 13)). Es ist dies verständlich im Zusammenhang mit der Zunahme der Bedeutung der Armee im politischen Leben Ägyptens des MR und NR. Ein Gebiet, welches meines Erachtens, ebenfalls ausführlicher besprochen werden sollte (in einem Abschnitt ähnlich wie beim Schiffsbau), ist die Möbelherstellung, ein der

wichtigsten Zweige des Tischlerhandwerks, welchen der Verfasser nur kurz vermerkt.

Die Handwerkstraditionen gingen, nach Ansicht des Verfassers, vom Vater auf den Sohn über, vielleicht gab es auch ein „Lehrhandbuch“. Weiterhin bespricht J. Šliwa die Lage der Handwerker und ihre gesellschaftliche Stellung. Verhältnismässig wenig beachtet er die soziale Lage der Zimmerleute und Tischler. Diesem Zustand liegt die Objectivität zu grunde. Es fehlen schriftliche Unterlagen, die über die Organisation oder Aktivität der Untertanen Auskunft geben. Das Zitieren des einseitigen Textes der Lehren von Cheti in dieser Hinsicht, erschöpft meines Erachtens, nicht das Thema. Viele Schlüsse kann man beim Studium der Szenen auf den Grabreliefs ziehen, die die Arbeit der Handwerker darstellen. Hauptsächlich können sie als Schlüsse in Bezug auf ihre gesellschaftliche Lage wie auch ihre ethnologische Herkunft betrachtet werden. Nicht immer waren Ägypter die Handwerker. Das betrifft hauptsächlich das NR, als eine grosse Anzahl von Fremden in der Wirtschaft beschäftigt war. Das Problem der gesellschaftlichen Stellung der Handwerker erfordert jedoch besonderer Studien (wie z. B. für die Landwirtschaft das Studium von O. D. Bérlev: *Trudovoë naselenië Ėgipta v Ėpochu Srědněgo Carstva*, Moskva 1972), die die Rahmen dieser Arbeit überschreiten.

Im letzten Teil des Studiums befinden sich Illustrationen, die sich auf die vom Verfasser besprochenen Probleme beziehen.

Zusammenfassend, muss gesagt werden, dass das Studium die berührten Fragen sehr oberflächlich behandelt und in vielen Punkten nicht erschöpft; es sind gewisse Probleme nicht berücksichtigt worden, z. B. die Herstellung von hölzernen Werkzeugen u. a. Der Verfasser benutzt nicht die ägyptischen schriftlichen Quellen und die Anzahl der ikonographischen Darstellungen, welche er vorführt, ist sehr bescheiden im Gegensatz zu ihrem Reichtum (siehe PM I—VII).

Andererseits muss die Bündigkeit und Klarheit des Vortrages unterstrichen werden. Die Arbeit bereichert um viele neue Feststellungen unser Wissen über Holzverarbeitung und erweitert grundsätzlich die Liste von Holzarten, die den alten Ägyptern bekannt waren.

*Hieronim Kaczmarek*

Franz Georg Maier, *Archäologie und Geschichte. Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos*, Konstanz 1973, Universitätsverlag GmbH, 8<sup>o</sup>, pp. 71, 31 fig. (including 2 maps, 8 pls. in colour, 2 plans etc.) [Konstanzer Universitätsreden 7].

Professor F. G. Maier of Zurich University is very well known to all those interested in the history and archaeology of Cyprus. He started his work in archaeology as a member of the Kouklia (Old



Paphos) expedition organized by the Liverpool Museums and the University of St. Andrews in 1950—1955. He then summed up the results of his research in a brief communication which appeared in the periodical „Historia” (*Zur Stadtgeschichte von Alt-Paphos*, Historia 3, 1954—1955, pp. 121—125). Since 1966 Prof. Maier has been the head of the expedition organized by the German Archaeological Institute in cooperation first with the University of Constance, West Germany (until 1971), and subsequently with the University of Zurich. His reports on the excavations have appeared in a number of periodicals [for full bibliography, cf.: P. Åström, *Who Is Who in Cypriote Archaeology. Biographical and Bibliographical Notes*, Göteborg 1971, (SIMA 23), pp. 51—52 and Addenda, p. 86].

Cypriot history and archaeology are not the sole subject of F. G. Maier's scholarly interest. He is also deeply involved in the study of the theoretical and methodological problems of history. It is a successful combination of these interests that gave rise to the work under review. The original version of the text was presented as a public lecture at the University of Constance on December 13, 1967. Chapters III and IV were later supplemented with the results of successive excavation campaigns at Kouklia.

The work is composed of two parts. The first (Ch. I, pp. 5—10) includes the author's reflections on the theoretical connections between history and archaeology and on their mutual relations.

F. G. Maier first discusses the persistent schematic views which treat history as a branch of learning employing hermeneutic methods and contrast it with the social sciences, which regard themselves as primarily systematic sciences employing empirical methods. He next demonstrates that history in fact has a variety of methods at its disposal which are suitable for dealing with the rich variety of historical sources. In the case of ancient history, strictly empirical methods are used by field archaeology, which has greatly broadened the historical scene by discovering more and more traces of extinct cultures. It is the author's feeling that the utilization of archaeological sources by the historian requires closer cooperation between the two fields. Let us add that such cooperation should be mutually complementary.

Pointing out the differences between the historical and the archaeological methods F. G. Maier indicates that within the historical hermeneutic method (common in the humanities) it is impossible for facts essentially to modify a priori concepts, because the concepts are employed already at the stage of formulating statements about facts. The indeterminacy of statements of facts distinguishes history from archaeology, which uses empirical methods in the strict sense. In archaeology, the crucial role in making statements of fact is played by the various techniques by which facts can be discovered, measured and described.

The author concludes by stressing the special part of archaeology in the study of historical facts.

In the second part (Ch. II—IV) F. G. Maier undertakes to show the theoretical connection between history and archaeology on the examples of 1966—1971 Kouklia excavations carried out under his own direction.

The ruins of Old Paphos were identified in the nineteenth century under the contemporary Greek-Turkish village of Kouklia, situated on the south-western coast of Cyprus. The area in which fragments of the ancient buildings have been found is over 1 km<sup>2</sup>.

Despite the importance of Old Paphos in the Greek and Roman times as a centre of cult of more than just local significance, the history of the city is poorly known, chiefly because of the scarcity of written sources. The gaps must be filled by archaeology. But even from the point of view of archaeology, Old Paphos was for a long time eclipsed by other centres of worship.

Excavations were first undertaken in 1888 by the Cyprus Exploration Fund, represented by E. A. Gardner and D. G. Hogarth. Their main objective was to uncover the sanctuary of Aphrodite. Systematic excavations at Kouklia did not take place until sixty years later (1950—1955), when a British expedition sponsored by the scholarly institutions of Liverpool and St. Andrews and directed by J. H. Iliffe and T. B. Mitford worked in the area. The principal aim of the programme was to examine the history of Old Paphos: its topography, development and ancient occupation. Since 1966 the work has been continued in regular annual campaigns directed by F. G. Maier, who presents his aims as follows: „The programme includes systematic collection and mapping of topographic data and earlier discoveries from the entire area of the city, and a very detailed study of three groups of objects: the cemeteries and other traces of human occupation (now open space over the eastern part of the ancient city) for the Late Bronze Age, the north-east section of the city walls for the Archaic and Classical periods, and the vicinity of the temple for the Hellenistic and Roman times” (p. 12). The first and the second of these projects have been concluded, while work around the Aphrodite temple continues.

The excavations to date have shown an uninterrupted period of occupation in the site from the Late Bronze Age till the decline of the Roman Empire. They have also evidenced the existence of a Chalcolithic settlement and yielded much important material for the history of the city in the Middle Ages.

The Late Bronze settlement at Old Paphos was founded about the 16th century B. C. and in the 13th and 12th centuries B. C. it was an important centre. The area of that settlement largely coincides with the modern village. The first Achaean settlers appeared in the

town at the end of 1200 B. C. The end of the Late Bronze Age did not mark a gap in the occupation of the city. At the end of the 8th century B. C. the town expanded towards the east. The Archaic period (700-475 B. C.) brought it great prosperity, which was due to the renown of the temple of Aphrodite, copper smelting, trade with the neighbouring countries and agriculture. The beginning of the Hellenistic period brought about a decisive turn in the city's development, which now concentrated in the western section. The total inhabited area diminished as a result. This regression can be explained as a consequence of the founding of New Paphos, which took over as the economic and administrative centre of the region, while Old Paphos retained its role as a place of worship. During the Byzantine times the town was reduced to the state of a small village, which briefly regained some importance under the Franconian kings (12th and 13th c. A. D.).

After the synthetic presentation of the history of Old Paphos in Chapter II, F. G. Maier proceeds to show the rôle of archeology in the reconstruction of the historical process by means of two examples. His starting points were: Herodotus' account of the Ionian uprising in Cyprus against Persia, and the legends of the founding of Old Paphos.

The information of the siege of Paphos can be derived only indirectly from Herodotus' statement that all the towns in Cyprus except the Cyprian Salamis were besieged by the Persians during the revolt. Thus F. G. Maier is right in stressing that „the history of the siege of Old Paphos is preserved not in a book but in the ground” (p. 19).

The key point of the fortification system was on the hill called Marcello (Site A). It consisted of the north-east gate and the city wall, strengthened by two projecting rectangular towers. Outside the gate and the wall there was a trench of 3.70 metres' width (Fig. 8). Opposite the wall was a huge mound, which the excavations have shown to have been raised by the Persians during the siege and continuous fighting. The material for the mound was obtained from the *débris* of a temple which lay outside the walls and was destroyed by the Persian army. The defenders dug three tunnels under their own wall, which led to the Persian siegemound. As the earth was removed, the tunnels were supported by timbers. Then some combustible materials (oil, tar) were loaded into bronze cauldrons, placed under the mound and fired. The wooden supports were charred and the mound subsided as a result. Yet the defenders' efforts were not crowned with success, for the finds discovered by the gate (various kinds of weapons, stone missiles, charred human bones) indicate that the last act of the siege took place precisely there. The Persians forced the gate and stormed the city, which once again, for 150 years, became part of the empire of the Achaemenids.

The second historical process picked out by the author was the coming of Achaean colonists to Old Paphos, which was so important

to the town's history. Chapter IV of F. G. Maier's work (pp. 22—31) tells us to what extent the problem can be solved by archaeology.

The Greek migration to Cyprus was reflected in the ancient legends, which attributed the founding of some towns to some Greek heroes. The legends may be a reflection of historical facts, but their value as historical evidence varies considerably (cf. the critical discussion of the legends [in: E. Gjerstad, *The Colonisation of Cyprus in Greek Legend*, *Opuscula Archaeologica* III, Lund 1944, pp. 107 ff.; E. Gjerstad, *The Cypro-Geometric. Cypro-Achaic and Cypro-Classical Periods*, *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, Vol. 4, Part 2, Stockholm 1947, pp. 428 ff.; K. Nikolaou, *La fondation de villes de Chypre dans la légende grecque*, *Stasinus II* (1964—196), Nicosia 1965, pp. 37—42). In view of the lack of literary sources that would make a critical evaluation of the legends possible, archaeology has a very special part to play here.

One of the legends of Arcadian colonisation, written down by Strabo (Geography XIV, 6, 3), mentions Agapenor. According to the story, the hero's ships were driven by a storm to the vicinity of Paphos when he was returning from Troy. Pausanias (VIII, 5, 3) says that Agapenor built a temple for Aphrodite in Paphos. This account is opposed by another tradition, which regards Kinyras, a non-Greek king, as the founder of the Paphos dynasty and the builder of the temple.

It has been possible to verify the legends owing to the latest archaeological discoveries. Excavations carried out in various localities in Cyprus have shown beyond all doubt that the first wave of Achaean settlers came to the island shortly after 1200 B. C. Their stay is confirmed by Late Helladic IIIC: 1 pottery. The discoveries in the eastern part of Old Paphos so far have yielded 125 completely or partly preserved vessels of this type and the sherds of at least 223 more vessels (p. 25). The analysis of the material carried out by the author with reference to three categories of finds (tomb finds, finds in habitations and chance findings) shows uncontrovertibly that the first Achaean settlers, driven out of continental Greece by the oncoming Dorians, reached Old Paphos during the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1200 B. C.).

The excavations have also made it possible to establish the approximate route of the colonists. A special rôle was played by Maa, a settlement situated on the small peninsula of Palaiokastros, seven miles to the north of New Paphos. The settlement was inhabited only for a short time (ca. 1220—1190 B. C.). Its inhabitants used Late Helladic IIIC: 1 pottery, which points to Argolis as the land of their origin. Maa was merely a transit point from which the colonists spread all over the island. It may be supposed that the flourishing Old Paphos was among the first targets of their expansion. This is suggested by the similarity of the pottery found at Maa and at Kouklia, but that evidence is not sufficient, since similar conclusions might be drawn from the

comparison of the Maa pottery with, say, that found at Enkomi. Much more convincing are the finds unique to Maa and Kouklia, such as hand-made, unpainted pythoi (p. 30). These data indicate with a high degree of probability that the Achaeans who came to Paphos first set foot on Cypriot soil at Maa.

It is not so clear where the settlers came from more exactly, i.e., from which area of continental Greece, and what were the causes (political, social?) of the migration. F. G. Maier leaves these questions unanswered and notes that they are extremely complex and require long and thorough investigation. The difficulty is increased by the lack of reliable literary sources and the scarcity of archaeological data.

Without attempting a definite solution let us make the following observations. One of the legends cited by Prof. Maier points to the Arcadian Greeks. For Pausanias (VII, 5, 3), their leader Agapenor was the founder of New Paphos and the builder of Aphrodite's temple at Old Paphos. His daughter, Laodike, sent a peplos as a gift to the temple of Athena Alea (Arcadia). The epigram on the peplos indicated that the gift came from the sacred island of Cyprus. According to the same legend; Laodike founded a sanctuary for the Paphian Aphrodite in Tegea.

Some light can be shed on the Arcadian presence in Cyprus by linguistic research. Let us merely note that the Arcadian dialect was closely related to the dialect of the geographically distant Cyprus. It is also nearly certain that both were relics of the Mycenaean dialect used throughout Peloponnesus prior to the coming of the Dorians (see J. Chadwick, *The Decipherment of Linear B*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1970, p. 12). In this connection the migration of Arcadians to Cyprus and Old Paphos appears to be a plausible hypothesis. On the other hand, some doubts arise. Must it have been the Arcadians who brought to Cyprus the knowledge of the language then used throughout continental Greece? Any answer that is given would have to be solidly justified.

There are two other literary sources frequently quoted in reference to the legendary origins of Old Paphos: a mention in Homer (*Il.* XI, 17 ff.) with later commentary by Eustathius, and the account of Apollodorus (Epitome, III, 9), which speak about the relations between Agamemnon, the king of Argos, and Kinyras. Without going into details [which are discussed by Z. Kapera, *Remarks on the Early History of the Paphos Kingdom* (in:) Proceedings of the 1st International Congress of Cypriot Studies, Nicosia April 14—19, 1969; Nicosia 1972, Vol. 1: pp. 191—199] let us note that the relations were friendly at the beginning, which is evidenced by Kinyras' gift of a rich cuirass to Agamemnon. The situation changed when Kinyras broke his promise to aid the Achaeans in the war against Troy, whereupon Agamemnon drove him out of Paphos to Amathus.

The accounts stands out in full colour when we consider the discoveries of Maa (pp. 29—30); it turns out that the settlers there used pottery characteristic of Argos.

Here is, then, another Greek people that might have taken part in the colonisation of Cyprus. The hypothesis is supported by the Maa pottery, and it is not unreasonable to expect that the Argives would have brought their native language to the island, where it continued to be used for a very long time.

Whether the answer is in favour of the Arcadians or of the Argives, it must remain a mere hypothesis. We can make conjectures, and these could even lead to a compromise solution admitting the coexistence of both elements at Old Paphos.

By way of conclusion let us note the double character of F. G. Maier's study. In the first place, it is a very valuable methodological guide demonstrating the use of archaeological evidence in historical reconstruction. Secondly, it is a very lively account of the excavations directed by the author. A rich and illustrative selection of photographs of particular finds (both colour and black-and-white), plans and sketches is another merit of the book.

Adam Konderak