

dle class life as well as the problems of the poor exploited by the rich. For example, *Nirupamā* is a jolly satire on the rich Bengali community. The author makes fun of the fall of one young Brahmin's social status. Life forced him to do the job of a shoe cleaner. In *Kullībhāṭ* some autobiographical themes can be found, especially those connected with Nirālā's wedding and his younger years.

Nirālā's essays on literature and socio-political subjects were published in four volumes: *Prabandh padmā* (*A composition of lotus*, 1934), *Prabandh pratibhā* (*A composition of light*, 1940), *Cābuk* (*Whip*, 1942), *Cayan* (*Selection*, 1957).

Nirālā is also the author of three plays: *Samāj* (*Society*), *Śakuntalā* (*Śakuntala*) and *Uṣā Aniruddha*. (*Usha and Aniruddha*). They have never appeared in print.

He also wrote a few biographies, among others: of Rāṇā Pratāp, Rāmakṛṣṇa Parāmahaṇsa, Vivekānanda and Dhruvā. He is also the author of a commentary to Tulsīdās's *Rāmcaritmānas*, a part of which he translated into *Khaṛī-bolī*. A concise version of *Mahābhārata*, a few translations from Vedic literature, a translation of Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* from Sanskrit and a translation of Vivekānada's *Rājayoga* from Bengali also are to be included in Nirālā's literary output.

The outcome of Nirālā's literary life was collected and published in eight volumes under the title of *Nirālā racnāvalī* (*Nirala's work*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Bandopadhyāy M., 1994, *Lives and Works of Great Hindi Poets*, Delhi.
 Handa R. L., 1974, *History of Hindi Language and Literature*, Bombay.
 Kowalska-Soni A., 1968 I, *Nowe drogi w poezji hindi po roku 1947*, "Przegląd Orientalistyczny", № 3(67), Warszawa, pp. 215-227.
 Kowalska-Soni A., 1968 II, *Współczesna poezja hindi a rodzima tradycja literacka*, "Przegląd Orientalistyczny", № 1(65), Warszawa, pp. 25-35.
 Māheśvar S., 1991, *Pragativād, prayogvād, naī kavītā*, Dillī.
 Nagendra /ed./, 1997, *Hindī sāhitya kā itihās*, Dillī.
 Pandey I. P., 1975, *Hindi Literature, Trends and Traits*, Calcutta.
 Rubin D., 1971-72, *Nirala and the Renaissance of Hindi Poetry*, "The Journal of Asian Studies", vol. I, pp. 111-126.
 Rutkowska T., Stasik D., 1992, *Zarys historii literatury hindi*, Warszawa.
 Śarmā R., 1996, *Nirālā*, Dillī.
 Śarmā R., 1969, *Nirālā kī sāhitya sādhnā*, Dillī.
 Śrīvāstav P., 1997, *Nirālā, Sāhitya Akādemi*, Dillī.
 Śukl R., 1961, *Hindī sāhitya kā itihās*, Vārāṇasī.
 Varmā D., 1986, *Hindī Sāhitya Koś*, Vārāṇasī.

TOMASZ GACEK

DIACRITICS IN THE ANALYSIS OF THE MIDDLE PERSIAN BOOK SCRIPT

1. Introduction

Probably no one would take a risk of building a complete description of a phonological system today without the useful tool of the analysis of distinctive features.

However, I do believe, such an analysis is desirable not only in the field of phonology. I think it has excellent prospects in some other spheres, in which that possibility has been rather neglected.

I would like to discuss one possible implementation of the method of description based on analysis of diacritics in the field of writing systems and more precisely in the deciphering of the Middle Persian Book Script.¹

The need for systematic and coherent method of description is best felt, when the matter is really complicated and, as a consequence, when not acting in a well organised way one soon gets trapped in insoluble paradoxes and the description gets unpredictably complicated.

2. Distinctiveness in the field of script

Elements of a system of signs, the complexity of which goes beyond the level of traffic lights usually may be divided into smaller (and this time indivisible) units, that is diacritics (gr. *diakrítēs*), which although do not possess their own meaning, differentiate signs of the system.²

e.g.: - where any of partly visible letters may be both 'D' and 'B'. What renders possible the recognition of these signs is the upper part - here not visible.

¹ Called also (though rather improperly): Book Pahlavi. The last term is well established in the literature on the subject, as well as its abbreviation 'BP', which I adopt, too.

² A. Weinsberg, *Językoznawstwo ogólne*, Warszawa 1983, p. 31.

The position of diacritics is also important ( is not a letter of the Latin alphabet, while 'B' certainly is. The letters 'b' and 'p' are differentiated only by a position of the vertical bar).

The diacritics have two important functions: the distinctive and the constitutive one.³

3. The need of analysis of the diacritics of the BP script

The traditional approach to the analysis of the BP script is in a way 'diachronically orientated'. I mean that it tells us much more about how the BP letters originated from the Aramaic writing system and what their counterparts in the related systems are, than on the practical side of recognising letters in a Middle Persian text and establishing real relationship between the signs.⁴

Methods of analysis of the BP script deserve an approach similar to MacKenzie's and Henning's critics of the 'traditional' transcription of Middle Persian (used by Bartholomae, Pagliaro, Bailey, Nyberg). Despite the fact that reconstruction of the pronunciation of the Arsacid period has an immense scientific value, it is utterly absurd to transcribe a text, exempli gratia, from the tenth century in a manner in which it would have been pronounced, had it been composed in the third century BC.⁵ To be consistent we should say, that it is improper to transliterate Middle Persian books, as if they had been written using the script of the Middle Persian inscriptions. One may argue that  should be transliterated in three different ways: <d/g/y>, as these values are sometimes differentiated by the diacritical marks.⁶ There is, however, no reason for maintaining any difference in the transliteration of  (traditionally differentiated as: <w/r/n/'/ >). There is even a lot of graphic forms which are truly ambiguous, due to the problems of interpretation of this letter, e.g.:

-  which may stand either for: *pad* 'in, at, etc.', written with an ideogram traditionally transliterated as <PWN>, or for *pen* 'mean, miserly,

³ A. Weinsberg, *op. cit.*, p. 31-32.

⁴ Cf. Henrik Samuel Nyberg, *A Manual of Pahlavi*, Wiesbaden 1974, part I, p. 129; D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*, London, 1971, p. xi; V. S. Rastorgueva, *Sredneper-sidskij jazyk*, Moskva, 1966, pp. 21-22.

⁵ D. N. MacKenzie, *Notes on the Transcriptions of Pahlavi*, BSOAS XXX, part I - 1967, pp. 17 - 18; W. B. Henning, *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Abt. I, IV, Bd. Iranistik, p. 123.

⁶ The term 'diacritical mark' is used here, unlike elsewhere in this article, in the traditional, narrow sense.

niggardly' transliterated usually as <pn> (written also  <pyn>).⁷

-  read either *dēn* <dyn> or *jīw* <yyw>, the former meaning 'religion' and the latter '(consecrated) milk'.⁸

In these cases there is not a slightest difference in the way of writing the letter , depending on whether we would like to transliterate <w>, <n> or <'>.

To make the analysis of the BP script more efficient, we should rather follow the way of diacritics analysis. The present paper is only an example of applying this method to a particular problem of the BP orthography. It was certainly not intended to be a complete study of the matter. However, before I move on to the main point, I would like to make a remark of more general nature.

If we take the Middle Persian word  *kirm* 'worm, serpent',⁹ we notice in its graphic form the sign , transliterated as <m>. The problem is that there is also another graphic form, traditionally considered to be a simple letter (i.e. not a ligature), written  and usually transliterated as <H> or <E>.¹⁰ The only difference between the two forms is a vertical stroke at the left side of the <H>. Thus, saying that  is 'a letter' is not the neatest way of describing its position in the system, just as saying that the English word 'jug' is singular. It is much better from the formal point of view to state that 'jug-Ø' is a singular form, as opposed to 'jug-s'. Similarly, Ø←+¹¹ is

⁷ D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise...*, London 1971, pp. 159; 68; 161.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 203, 26; 47.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 51.

¹⁰ Cf. H. S. Nyberg, *op. cit.*, part I, p. 129; D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise...*, pp. 159; 68; 161.

¹¹ An arrow to the left is used to indicate the direction, which follows the direction of writing in the BP script.

the letter transliterated <m>, while  =  +  is the letter <H>¹².

So,  itself is not a letter, but just a diacritic.¹³

The conclusion of this observation is that we should be careful about using terms like separate/simple letter/sign/form and be ready to change our views where the principle of consistence of our method requires that.

4. The 'dotted letter ending' as a diacritic of the BP scrip.

There is a form written  in the BP script. And there is also another sign,¹⁴ written , which differs from the previous one only by possessing a dotted line ending in the right upper part of its form. As this detail alone differentiates these two forms, we should consider it to be one of the diacritics of the BP writing system.¹⁵

Moreover, the same opposition is used in different cases:

'a dotted form'	transliteration		a form without the 'dot'	transliteration
	g/d/y ¹⁶ +→ 'h			'h + 'h
	g/d/y +→ c			p
	g/d/y +→ p.			'h +→ p

¹² H. S. Nyberg, op. cit., part. I, pp. 130 (point 4), 132 (point 8); The matter is however even more complicated as  may also be 'a letter' (represented in various ways in transliteration depending on reading: <n/r/w/'/'), and consequently  may turn out to be a ligature of <m> and the latter form. We find even pairs like az¹ <'NH> 'I'  <> : xwamn 'sleep, dream'  <hwmn> (NB. the final stroke  <> is often omitted, possibly also in  which would leave both of the graphical forms without any difference).

¹³ A similar case is the relationship between the letters v and w in the Latin alphabet.

¹⁴ The question whether it is a simple letter or a ligature goes far beyond the subject of this article.

¹⁵ We have to remember, however, that this is not so in the Indian manuscripts, where both forms usually possess the 'dotted line ending'. Cf. H. S. Nyberg, The Manual of Pahlavi, part I, p. 130.

Examples:

•  : ; Cf.  <d'hm> *dahm* 'virtuous, pious; &c.' :  <š'm> *šâm* 'evening meal, supper'.¹⁷

•  : ; Cf.  <gc'k> *gazâg* 'biting' :  <p'k> *pâk* 'clean, pure, holy'.¹⁸

•  : ; Cf.  <dpl> / <gpl> *dabr* '1. sinner, 2. *dark-coloured' /

gabr 'hollow, cavity, womb' :  <'pl> *abar* '1. up, on, over, 2. superior' / *abr* 'cloud' / *appar* 'robbery, theft'.¹⁹

There are, however, instances when the same element does not possess any distinctive power (and therefore should not be considered to be a diacritic!). Let us consider the case of the letter <g/d/y> Both forms (with the 'dot' and without it - , ) are frequent and the presence or absence of the 'dotted line ending' does not change anything.

On the other hand, the form  may stand either for <g/d/y + g/d/y> or the letter <s> (Cf.  - which may be read either *âsn* <'sn>: ~ *xrad* 'innate wisdom' or *êg*¹ <'DYN> 'then, thereupon'²⁰). Moreover, another form of the ligature <g/d/y + g/d/y>, namely , coincides with the variant form of the letter <s>, too!²¹ (Cf.  which may stand either for

¹⁶ The letter  is probably the most ambiguous one of the BP script, if we are to follow comparative or historical approach, cf. Nyberg, op. cit., part I, pp. 134-135; D.N. MacKenzie, *A Concise...*, p. xiii; There are, however, situations when the 'diacritical signs' in the narrow, traditional sense were used. We shall not deal with these cases here.

¹⁷ D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise...*, pp. 24, 206; 79, 151.

¹⁸ D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise...*, pp. 194, 36; 162, 64.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 23, 34; 213, 1, 4, 10.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 233, 12; 30.

²¹ H. S. Nyberg, op. cit., part I, p. 130; All in all, there are three basic forms considered to be variants of this ligature. The two being indistinguishable from <s> (again, from the point of view of the comparative method of analysis of the BP script), and the third one coincides

with <'h> (cf. *griyistan*  <BK̄YWN-stn>, where <K̄> is a form of <k> coalescing with <g/d/y>).

dēbahr <dyp'hl> 'anger', either for *spihr* <spyyhl> 'sphere, firmament, etc.' or *spaxr* <sp'hl> 'merrymaking, revelry'²²). Not only does the 'dot' not play the role of a diacritic here, but there is also no other feature which could help us to distinguish them. Thus, from the point of view of the writing system alone, there is in fact one sign -  and a separate one , which, of course, can be ambiguous in the light of comparison with some other related script, but this is not the case.

Quite a reverse problem is to be found in the Latin alphabet. We have the letters <u> and <v> which are historically just variant forms of the same letter, without any difference in 'meaning' between them. Despite their common origin nobody considers them any more to be one letter, as the differences in what they denote were introduced in most of the orthographies based on the Latin alphabet.

5. Let us systematise our conclusions now:

- In the case of some pairs of BP letters the 'dotted line ending' has the distinctive power and thus, has to be considered a diacritic. It usually differentiates the letter  from some other sign.
- On some occasions the same element is not used as a diacritic, and - if no other method is applied - some traditionally distinguished signs possess in fact the same graphical form. Thus, certain signs, which are traditionally treated separately, are not differentiated in any way, and so should not be classified as separate letter forms in a synchronic analysis.
- On the whole, the traditional attitude towards the BP script calls for revision, especially at the theoretical level.

²² D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise...*, pp. 164, 26; 76.

JAN-PETER HARTUNG

A CONTRIBUTION OF ISLAMIC 'REVIVALISTS' TO MODERNITY: THE *Ġamā'at-i islāmī*¹ AS A PRACTICAL APPROACH FOR THE REALIZATION OF AN ISLAMIC CONCEPT OF HISTORY

In the years after the collapse of the major representatives of the socialist bloc, the phenomenon of 'fundamentalism' has become increasingly a subject of investigation for the social sciences. The dominating motive to which all others can be understood as subordinate seems to be the incompatibility of the normatives set by Western tradition and some non-Western models of explanation competing for universal validity. As a reaction to the theories on the basis of the European Enlightenment, „... man's emergence from his self-imposed immaturity, which is to use one's understanding without guidance from another [...]”², are religiously founded concepts, which only now are considered as serious competitors.

The crisis of Western Modernity has been revealed by the failure of the most radical attempt so far to implement such a theory, which puts itself explicitly in the tradition of intellectual Modernity and which even understands itself as the culmination of every social theory based on the epistemological paradigms of occidental natural sciences.³ The existential confrontation of today with other complex systems of explanation which do not tend to an unlimited optimism concerning human understanding under the premise of the Cartesian „cogito ergo sum” has created different patterns of explanation within Modernity. Some of them are derived from the Hegelian philosophy of history, for example FUKUYAMA's theory of *Global Liberalization*⁴. Others underline, based on a reception of Nietzsche's theory of *Power*, the antagonism of differently founded concepts like HUNTINGTON's theory of *Cultural Confrontation*⁵. Nevertheless, all those schemes have one thing in common: they are entirely constituted by the normative ideas of Modernity.

We must now examine to what extent these ideas are applicable in ana-