

REVIEWS

K. Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda. Eine synchronische Untersuchung*. Heidelberg. 1967. Carl Winter. Universitätsverlag. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, Dritte Reihe, Untersuchungen). 298 pages.

K. Hoffmann has chosen as an epigraph to his investigation the following words of Delbrück: "Wer die Injunctive des RV durchsieht, erhält den Eindruck, als habe er eine Sammlung der Schwierigkeiten des Veda vor sich." These words are relevant to the present state of the studies of the Injunctive as well. Taking notice of the fact, that all his predecessors treated the Inj. mainly from the glottogenic or from the comparative viewpoint, the author sets himself as an object a purely synchronic aim — to describe the position of the Inj. as of a grammatical category functioning in the Vedic verbal system. Such an aim can be reached only by means of a philological investigation of the text. Realizing all the difficulties of such an approach, Hoffmann sees the only reliable way to find out, what the ṛṣis had meant, when they used a certain grammatical category, the Inj. in particular, in an attempt to establish, whether the same contents could be expressed by means of other grammatical categories or not. In other words, the transformational analysis is taken here for the only safe criterion. These general methodological considerations are set forth by the author in a short foreword (Vorwort, 7-8). It is followed by a detailed table of contents of the book, which has rather acquired the shape of brief annotations of the chapters in German (Inhaltsübersicht, 9-17) and then in English (Summary of Contents, 18-26) and makes the book more accessible.

Chapter I "Introductory" (Einleitung, 27-42) contains the definition of the object and method of investigation, and gives a short account of the history of the problem. It is a theoretical chapter, upon which the whole investigation is based. The author is quite right in stressing, that the Inj. should be identified only by means of a formal criterion (it is a category characterized by the absence of augment and by the secondary endings). It should be treated as a whole grammatical category, not to be divided according to the meaning of forms into the indicative and modal Inj., as it has been done by the representatives of the German tradition (Brugmann, Delbrück, Wackernagel).

Stating, that the Inj. can be formed in the Vedas from three verbal stems — the Present (*kṛṇavam* — cp. Impf. *akṛṇavam*, the Aorist (*karam* — cp. Aor. *akaram*), and the Perfect one (*didet* — cp. Plusq. *adidet*), Hoffmann unfortunately does not mention the fact, that Inj. pr. and Inj. aor. are regular formations, while Inj. pf. are a few forms with an ambiguous morphological structure. As it has been shown by P. Thieme in his investigation of the Vedic Pluperfect, there exist no formal criteria able to identify each given form as belonging to the system of Perfect, to the reduplicative Aorist or to the Intensives.¹

¹ See *Das Plusquamperfektum im Veda* (Göttingen, 1929).

Two different meanings of the Inj. have been usually stated in the previous studies:² a non-modal and a modal one. The sphere of the non-modal meanings has been described either as indefinite present and indefinite past (Avery), or as indiscernible in certain contexts from that of Impf. indic. and Aor. indic., and capable in later hymns of playing the rôle of a Pr. indic. (Delbrück). The sphere of the modal meanings of the Inj. has been described as that of Subjunctive-Optative (Avery) or of Subjunctive-Optative-Imperative (Delbrück). The authors of modern studies of the Inj. stressed such a particular characteristic of this grammatical category as the absence of meaning of a certain tense or mood (Renou, Gonda), and marked its archaic character in the language of the R̥gveda. The rapid disappearance of the Inj. in the post-R̥gvedic language in all the functions, except in prohibitions with the particle *mā*, is explained by the process of development from the "primitive" mental structure (Gonda).

Hoffmann quite soundly rejects the possibility of explaining the function of the Inj. in the complicated and ramified verbal system of the RV from the diachronic viewpoint. One can describe the volume of the grammatical category of the Inj. in the synchronic system only by means of its oppositions to other tenses and moods functioning in the same system. It is only the language of the RV, where the Inj. is represented in all its functions, that can be used for such a synchronic study.

In his definitions of the function and of other general notions the author follows the views of E. Koschmieder.³ He considers it relevant for a linguistic description to apply the notion of noeme — the smallest unit of what can be meant (p. 37). According to the author, it is necessary for a linguistic description to establish the degree of relevance of separate noemes in a noematic category, i.e. in a function (p. 38).

Leaving aside the philosophic grounds of this book, one should mention an important view of Hoffman, that only philological methods should be applied to establish the functions of a category in a synchronic study. One can prove, that he has established the main function of a category, only by the impossibility of its interchange with the other categories in the same context (p. 39). Nevertheless the author is aware of the fact, that there is no possibility of such a control in many contexts of the RV, that is in such cases, when several noematic categories can be taken as relevant for one and the same form.

In chapter II the Inj. in prohibitive sentences is dealt with (Der Injunktiv im Prohibitivsatz, 43-106). Here and further on the meanings of the verbal forms are established with the help of a thorough philological analysis combined, where it is necessary, with the interpretation of a wide context, based on a deep knowledge of Vedic realities.

Two types of prohibitions are distinguished by the author, i.e. the Inhibitive, which is a prohibition of an action, taking place at the moment of prohibition, and the Preventive, which is a prohibition of a future action. Further the prohibitive sentences are classified according to the type of stem, from which the Inj. used with the particle *mā* are formed.

The Inj. with aoristic stems are the most frequent in prohibitive sentences (IIA. Der Aoristinjunktiv im Prohibitivsatz, 45-73). They are represented in the Vedas by the forms of all the three persons in the Sg., Du. and Pl., and are based on all the types of aoristic stems. The 1st person of the Inj. aor. with *mā* has a cupitive meaning, and in

² The author is well acquainted with a wide range of scientific publications, dealing with the problem of the Inj. from different viewpoints, including the last publications on the subject by I. Thomas-Freiberger, *Die Injunktiv-Konjunktiv-Formen im R̥gveda*, Diss. Göttingen, 1955 and J. Narten, *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda* (1964). The author seems not to be acquainted with the book written in Russian by the author of these lines T. Я. Елизаренкова, *Аорист в Р̥гведе* (Москва. 1960)

³ See *Beiträge zur allgemeinen Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1965).

this function can interchange with the 1st person Optative with the negative particle *na*. The author draws the conclusion, that the cupitive meaning of this form is characteristic only of the later Vedic hymns. The original meaning of *mā* in combination with the 1st person of the Inj. was that of appeal. The forms of the 2nd and 3rd persons, have a preventive meaning, e.g. RV X, 59, 4: *mó śú naḥ soma mṛtyāve pārā dāḥ* 'O Soma, do not give us away to death!' The inhibitive meaning is rare with the forms of the Inj. aor.

This interpretation is convincing in general. The only thing that can give rise to objections is the desire of the author to qualify each form of the Inj. as belonging either to the Aorist or to the Present system. As a result of it a number of ambiguous forms, which should be attributed rather to the Present-Aorist system as a whole (or in other words to the non-Perfect system,⁴ are qualified as belonging to the Aorist. If one accepts the existence of such forms, which are functioning in the RV as a relic of a more ancient state together with the differentiated and mutually opposed forms of the Present-system and of the Aorist, there would be no need to prove, that thematic forms like *karat* etc. are at times Subjunctives of a root-Present, while at others they are Inj.-s of a thematic Aorist.

The next section of this book deals with the functions of the present-stem Inj. in prohibitive sentences (II B. Der Präsensinjunctiv im Prohibitivsatz, 74-92). It is shown by Hoffmann, that the Inj. pr. combined with the particle *mā* has an inhibitive meaning, i.e. expresses the prohibition either of a durative or of an iterative action. This meaning of the Inj. is illustrated mostly by examples taken from the Vedic prose, where the situation behind the text is much clearer, than in the hymns. The inhibitive meaning of the Inj. pres. in the RV and AV in some cases might be evident as well, cf. for instance, AV X, 1, 26: *pārehi kṛtye mā tiṣṭhaḥ* 'Go away, o witchcraft! Stand not!' etc. Nevertheless in many cases the interpretation of a wide context is needed to prove the durative Aktionsart of the action, that is prohibited. The prohibition of an iterative action seems to be connected also with future, because it is implied, that the action will be repeated in future as well. Thus, for instance, it is difficult to draw a line between the inhibitive and the preventive character of the prohibition in such cases of the Inj. pres. as in RV X, 34, 13: *akṣāir mā divyaḥ kṛṣim it kṛṣasva* 'Mit den Würfeln spiele nicht (mehr), deinen Acker bestelle!' Is not the aim of this prohibition to prevent the future game of the gambler (no matter whether he is playing at the moment of prohibition or not)?

It seems to be more precise from the viewpoint of method that a consistent delimitation of tense (Present-Future), aspect (imperfect-perfect) and Aktionsart (durative, iterative etc.). should be carried out.

It is not by chance that a separate section, dealing with the Inj. formed from the Perfect stem, functioning in prohibitive sentences (which is the very type of sentences, where the Inj.-s are most frequent), is missing. The matter is, that in contradistinction to the Inj. pr. and Inj. aor. the Inj. pf. does not form an independent system.

In a small section of this Chapter (IIC. Imperativ, Konjunktiv, Optativ und Indikativ im Prohibitivsatz, 92-98) all the other moods, that are used in prohibitive sentences, are described. It is shown by the author, that only a few cases of the Imperative and the Optative can be found in these sentences in Vedic proper; as to the Subjunctive and Indicative, they are practically missing.

The description of the Inj. in prohibitive sentences is concluded by a section, where the results of the investigation are discussed (IID. Auswertung, 98-108). The fact, that in this type of sentences in Vedic only the Inj. can be used, and it is impossible to substitute it for any other mood, means, that the Inj. in prohibitions must have a function, which the other moods do not possess. One should keep in mind, that there are two elements used in prohibitions: the Inj. and the particle *mā*, a prohibitive negation;

⁴ Cf. *Аорист с Пузееде*, pp. 29-35.

so the function of the Inj. can be established only in contrast with the function of *mā*. The latter in its turn can be established from the opposition with the other particle of negation *na*, which is also used with the Inj. This second particle of negation, being combined with verbal forms (the Inj. among them) never expresses any modality. It is the negation of an action, expressing "resultative constataion". As for the negation *mā*, it can express prohibition not only in combination with the Inj., but also without any verbal form. That gives grounds for a conclusion, that the modality of the whole sentence depends on *mā*, which expresses the noeme *averting*, 'prohibition'. The Inj. in prohibitive sentences is allotted by the single remaining function, that of mentioning (Erwähnung) of the prohibited action, and of the person, executing this prohibition. That is why the modal meaning of the combinations with *mā* should not be attributed to the Inj.

The Inj. is opposed to the Indicative as "mentioning" to "narrating" (Erwähnung: Bericht). The forms of the Indicative express beside the noeme "narration" that of "tense" (Present: Imperfect, Aorist). The Inj. does not express tense gradation, it is "tenseless" (zeitstufenlos).

The difference of category between the Inj. with the Present-stem and the Inj. with the Aorist-stem lies in aspect, the Inj. pr. expressing the mentioning of an imperfect action, and the Inj. aor. that of a perfect one.

The third chapter deals with the functions of the Inj. in non-prohibitive sentences (III. Der Injunktiv in nicht-prohibitiven Sätzen, 107-204), where the Inj. is used without the prohibitive particle *mā*. The investigation is based upon the language of the RV, because already in the AV the Inj. without *mā* is comparatively rare, and it is almost completely extinct, as it was shown by Hoffmann, in the Vedic prose. It should be mentioned by the way, that although the conclusions, concerning the Vedic prose, are beyond any suspicion, the method of analysis, which is usually irreproachably strict, becomes sometimes less consistent, and in some cases the meaning of the Inj. is established only with the help of a semantic criterion, disregarding the formal one. Cp., for instance, the arguments on pp. 108-109, where a number of augmentless verbal forms are qualified as Imperfects, that have lost their augments, and not as Inj.-s, only because of their meaning.

The author is quite right in saying, that the rapid disappearance of the non-prohibitive Inj. after the RV was partly caused by morphological reasons — the Inj. was morphologically a too ambiguous form. Some forms mentioned by the author might be interpreted in a different way. E.g., forms with the aorist-stem, having primary and not secondary endings, like *kṛtha*, *bhūthaḥ* etc. might be interpreted not as a result of the tendency to differentiate the Inj. from the Iv., but as an archaism, going back to the period, when there was no clear differentiation inside the non-Perfect system into a separate Aorist and a separate Present.

In the next section the Inj. expressing a general state of things is dealt with (IIIA. Der Injunktiv in generellen Sachverhalten). The aim of the description is to find out, whether there is any difference in functions of the Inj. and of the Pres. indic., expressing the noeme "general", and whether there exists a function, in which they could interchange. The word "general" describes the situation which cannot be modeled by the category of tense. When the Inj. is used in such contexts, one can't be sure, whether it should be taken for a tenseless, past or modal form. Cf., e.g., I, 168, 8: *āva smayanta vidyūtaḥ prthivyaṁ / yādī ghṛtām marūtaḥ prṣṇuvānti* 'The lightnings are smiling (Inj. pr.) down, when the Maruts are sprinkling (Pr. indic.) with fat'. A clear and non-ambiguous translation of such contexts is merely a matter of taste.

The Inj. pr. in contexts, describing a usual state of things (III A1. Der Inj. Präsen in generellen Sachverhalten), is often used to express constant characteristics of gods (usual qualities and actions), for instance, in V, 11,2: *sā barhiṣi śīdan nī hōtā* 'He sits down as a hotar on the sacrificial straw'. It is not seldom that the Inj. pr. is used in the

same verses with the Pr. indic. They can interchange, but only in those contexts, where the Inj. pr. can be interpreted as an actual present — the meaning, which is the main function of the Pr. indic. Such general truths as phenomena of nature and characteristic actions of gods can also be expressed by the Inj. aor., and sometimes such Inj.-s can have the meaning of an iterative action, e.g. VI, 30, 2: *divé-dive sūryo darçato bhūt* 'Day after day the sun will be seen'.

The general Inj. can function in rather large parts of hymns, connected with mythological events, that can not be related to a definite time. The author successfully illustrates it by some examples from the RV: I, 68; VI, 39, 3-4; I, 173, 1-3.⁵

In a section, where the problem of the Inj. and the past tense is discussed (IIIB. Injunktiv und Vergangenheit, 145-235), first of all the question of the rôle of the augment in past tenses is put forward (IIIB 1. Augment und Augmenttempora, 145-160). As the use of the augment with past tenses is optional in the RV and AV, the augmentless forms are usually given the same status as the augmented ones. Therefore in a study of the preterital functions of the Inj. one should describe it in opposition to the corresponding augmented forms. The argumentation of the author is as follows. The Impf. (and the Plupf.) expresses in a historical narration a more remote past, while the Aor. expresses a proximate one, that is the augmented forms always express a past. As to the Inj., it may express a past tense, and may not, which means that the function of the obligatory expression of the past tense belongs to the augment. Further analysis of the contexts of the RV confirms this idea.

At first the functions of Impf. indic. and of Inj. pr. are compared, these being the forms with the same type of stem different only in the presence or absence of the augment (III B2. Injunktiv und fernere Vergangenheit, 160-213). After a thorough analysis of several contexts of the RV the author comes to the conclusion, that the main function of the Impf. indic. is to narrate about the historical events of the bygone times, arranging those events in time in a logical order, i.e. correlating them with the moment of speech as a coordinate. Narration as a method of description of reality is opposed to the method of mentioning of events, their unrestricted enumeration without any logical arrangement.

One of the strong points of Hoffmann's investigation is the stylistic stratification of hymns, which runs together with the linguistic analysis of the verbal forms. It is convincingly shown by the author, in what kind of hymns preference is given among the verbal forms to the Inj. Hymns of different style correspond to the opposition "narrative story" (berichtende Erzählung): "description by mentioning" (erwährende Beschreibung). The latter is mostly used in mythological scenes, where tense may be understood only from a wide context, or it may be irrelevant at all, for instance, in enumerations of constant characteristics of a deity (Beeigenschaftung) etc. This results in a conclusion, that if the category of tense is relevant for the Vedic augmented tenses, on the one hand, and irrelevant for the Inj., on the other, the former and the latter ones can not be functionally identical.

It is shown by a comparative study of the functions of the Inj. aor. and of the Aor. indic. (III B3. Inj. Aqr. und Ind. Aor., 214-235), that between the two forms a certain interchange is possible in the function of constatation. But the situation changes completely, when the Aor. indic. expresses an actual past tense: then it cannot be substituted for the Inj.

The study of the functions of the Impf. indic. and the Aor. indic., on the one hand, and of those of the Inj., on the other, brings the author to the conclusion, that the

⁵ By the way, the principles of translation of such portions of hymns, where the actions are transmitted exclusively or mainly by the Inj., were discussed in an article in Russian, Т. Я. Елизаренкова, "О лингвистическом аспекте перевода Ригведы" *История и культура древней Индии* (Москва, 1963).

usage of the augment in the language of the RV is not an optional, but a functional one.

The functions of the "modal" Inj. are established in comparison with those of the other moods (III C. Der "modale" Injunktiv, 236-264). It is shown by the author in a section about the Injunctive and the Subjunctive (III C1. Injunktiv und Konjunktiv, 236-255), that many verbs do not mark clearly the difference between the forms of these two moods (for instance, *bhuvat* etc. can be taken both for the Inj. of the stem *bhū-*, and Subj. of the stem *bhū-*.) In such cases one is forced to give up the morphological criterion, and to apply a semantic one, if this is possible at all. The analysis of the contexts of the RV shows that these two grammatical categories are interchangeable, only because the Subjunctive in its prospective function can acquire a tenseless meaning, and not because the Inj. possesses a special modal meaning. Such a neutralization of the modal meaning often takes place in interrogative sentences, and as to separate personal forms of the paradigm, it happens most frequently with the 1 sg., a form which is rather futural, than modal. Cf. e.g. X. 27. 2: *amā te tūmram vṛṣabhām paçāni / tivrām sutām pañcadaçām ni ṣiñcam* '... dann will ich dir daheim einen kräftigen Stier kochen und fünfzehn Tage lang scharfen Soma einschenken'.

Comparing the Inj. with the Imperative (IIIC2. Injunktiv und Imperativ, 255-264) the author draws attention to the fact, that only the 2nd and 3rd persons of the Injunctive are characterized by modality proper — they have a hortative meaning. This peculiarity of functioning corresponds to the morphological structure of the paradigms of the categories. A number of forms of both the paradigms coincide, and that explains the fact, why those forms of the Inj. and Imperative, which are morphologically differentiated, are functionally interdependent. It should be added, that the Imperatives with the aoristic stems are scarce.

In the last Chapter of the book (IV. Zusammenfassung und Auswertung, 265-279) Hoffmann discusses the general results of his investigation. It is clear from the study of mutual relations between the Inj. and the system of tenses and moods in the RV, that there is no complete interchange between the Inj. and any other grammatical category. Interchange is possible only in quite definite syntactical functions. All the functions of the Inj. have one feature in common — they have nothing to do with the expression of tense, which is peculiar to the forms of the Indicative (Present, Imperfect, Aorist; it is not by chance that the Perfect is not mentioned here by the author). Thus the peculiarity of the Inj. consists in its tenselessness (Zeitstufenlosigkeit). One can see from the analysis of the non-prohibitive sentences, that the Inj. does not "narrate" (berichtet), a given action, but "mentions" (erwähnt) it. So, the characteristic functions of the Inj. are tenselessness and non-narration (Nicht-Bericht).

One can see from the philological study of the "modal" Inj., that this meaning was fairly exaggerated, and only separate forms of the Inj. aor. (just those that should rather be treated from a synchronic viewpoint as the Imperative aor.) have an independent modal meaning.

The difference between the Inj. with the present-stem and that with the aorist-stem is in opposition of aspects.

To draw the conclusion, the Inj. expresses morphologically aspect (opposition of the type of stem), person, number and voice (opposition of the type of flexion). The function of the Inj. can be described as tenseless, non-modal and non-narrative. The Inj. is neutral towards the oppositions of tense and mood, but it is not neutral towards that of narration: non-narration. As a member of this opposition it is in contrast to the narrative tenses of the Present-Aorist system as a form, only mentioning an action. So the mentioning of action can be taken to be the main function of the Inj., and due to it the Inj. might be called Memorative. This is the most important conclusion of Hoffmann's investigation which is full of interesting ideas.

A number of indices are added which are useful and exact. There is an index of quotations from the RV and other texts (Stellenindex), that of the analysed verbal

forms (Verbalformenindex), that of the discussed words (Wortindex) and at last an index of notions (Sachindex).

Appreciating Hoffmann's conception in general for its being based on convincing philological analyses and on consistent application of strict methods of description, which brings the author to a new interpretation of the main function of the Inj., one should also make some critical remarks.

The interpretation of the Inj. as a Memorative does not give rise to objections from the synchronic viewpoint. Nevertheless this conception is modeling the Inj. in a somewhat incomplete manner because the volume of the functions of this grammeme is established not by all the oppositions, in which it takes part in the Vedic verbal system. The matter is that the author does not pay attention to the relation of the Inj., which is based on the Present-Aorist system, to the Perfect. It has been mentioned several times in the description of the morphological structure of the Inj., that its forms can be built on three types of verbal stems: Present, Aorist and Perfect, though it is well known to the author, that the whole body of the Inj.-s. is formed from the present and aorist stems (and it is just these two structural types of the Inj. that are actually analysed in the book), while there are only a few morphologically ambiguous Inj.-s, based upon the perfect stem. This important peculiarity of the Vedic verbal system is mentioned only in a reference on p. 276, where it is said, that one can practically disregard the Inj. pf., because the scarce forms of it are built by analogy with the Inj. pr., and have no independent function. If so, the Inj. should have been described in opposition to the Perfect as well, which should have inevitably brought the author to the necessity of a diachronic reconstruction of a state previous to that of the RV. The Inj. of this reconstructed system might be treated as a predecessor of the system of differentiated tenses and moods, and it would be opposed in this system to a pre-Perfect. This binary opposition might be interpreted as "action connected with an agent": "impersonal action, expressing state".⁶ Though the author of the book *Der Injunktiv im Veda* pursues a purely synchronic aim, and is not supposed to deal with reconstructions, nevertheless it would be highly desirable that in a synchronic description of the functions of the Inj. all the oppositions in which this grammeme takes part should be taken into consideration (the Perfect among them).

T. Elizarenkova

Satyavrat Śāstrī (*sic*), *Essays on Indology*. Delhi, Meharchand Lacchmandass, [1963]. ii, iii, 236 pp.

This work consists of thirteen essays, some unpublished, by an able Sanskritist of Delhi University. They range in length from four pages to fifty-four, and in subject from articles of general interest to the educated Indian reader to more specialized philosophical and literary studies.

The opening article "Sanskrit Language and Indian Culture" is of the first type, though it shows evidence of original thinking, as when the author suggests from linguistic evidence that wheat was very little eaten in classical India, even in those areas where now it is the staple crop (p. 7). Less valuable is the next essay "Sanskrit Semantics", which relies too much on traditional etymologies — for instance *vadānya* meaning "generous" is explained *vadati (dīyatām iti vadānyaḥ)*, without basis or reference (p. 15).

More specialized are the brief but interesting studies "On the words Kāhālā and Kirāṭa" (pp. 32-35), "Sanskrit Originals of a few Hindi and Panjabi Words" (pp. 36-41),

⁶ See *Аспект в Пузееде*, Chapter 3.

and "The Text of the Dik and Kāla-Samuddeśas of the Vākyapadiya and its Commentary" (pp. 42-45). "Indudūta of Vinaya Vijayagaṇi — a Textual Study" (pp. 46-56) contains suggestions for the emendation of this little known work. "The Story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā through the Ages" (pp. 57-69) compares various versions of the tale. "Poetry in the Vāmana Purāṇa" (pp. 70-81) draws our attention to the literary merits of some passages of this text.

Lengthier and more important is "A Critical Survey of Sanskrit Dūtakāvya" (pp. 82-138). This gives an account of the contents of over fifty *dūta* poems in Sanskrit from Kālidāsa's prototype to modern productions of a satirical character.

"The Anyoktis of the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa" (pp. 139-148) draws attention to some pleasant examples of this figure of speech in the poem, giving text and translation. The longest of the essays "Conception of Time in Post-Vedic Sanskrit Literature" consists of a rapid survey of the treatment of *Kāla* in a wide range of texts from the *Smṛtis* to the works of the *Sampradāyas* of later Vedānta. Students intending to embark on a deeper study of the subject may find this paper useful. The last two essays of the book, "Conception of Space (*Dik*) in the Vākyapadiya" (pp. 205-215) and "Conception of Daiva and Puruṣakāra in the Vālmiki and the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇas" (pp. 216-236), are interesting surveys on the subjects.

While the book contains little evidence of startling originality or very profound research, the essays are the work of a sensitive scholar with a wide range of interests and deep feeling for Sanskrit literature. Dr. Satyavrat's English prose, though occasionally unidiomatic, is generally readable and clear. Despite the unfortunate omission of a diacritic in the name of the author on the title page, transliteration is fairly accurate. It is unfortunate that a book which ranges so widely in the fields of Sanskrit literature, religion and philosophy should contain no index.

A. L. Basham

Franz Kielhorn, *Kleine Schriften mit einer Auswahl der epigraphischen Aufsätze*. Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Rau (= *Glasenapp Stiftung*, Band 3, 1 + Band 3, 2). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1969. 2 Teile, XXIX + 1105 pp. DM 92,—.

In 1965 the Franz Steiner Verlag reprinted Kielhorn's *Grammatik der Sanskrit-Sprache*¹ (see *III*, XI, 1968, p. 35). The *Kleine Schriften* contain all his articles with the exception of his editions of inscriptions, of which only those which are important for the history of Indian literature have been selected. Moreover, this collection reprints his *Kātyāyana and Patanjali* (Bombay, 1876), the introduction to the *Report on the Search for Sanskrit manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1880-81* (Bombay, 1881), the *Tafeln zur Berechnung der Jupiterjahre nach den Regeln des Sūrya-Siddhānta und des Jyotistattva* (Göttingen, 1889) and the *Bruchstücke indischer Schauspiele in Inschriften zu Ajmere* (Berlin, 1901).

The first volume contains a systematic bibliography which simultaneously serves as table of contents (pp. VII-XXIII). Kielhorn was mainly interested in the study of Indian grammarians, epigraphy, chronology and manuscripts. All these subjects are of a highly technical nature. His works, written in a severe style, do not make easy reading and they must be studied carefully. His publications fulfil the most exacting standards of scholarship.

As many of Kielhorn's articles were published in the *Epigraphica Indica* and the

¹ A reprint of the original English version has been announced by the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Indian Antiquary it has been necessary to reproduce them in a reduced size. It is a pity that one of the two volumes could not have been published in a larger size. It would have made it easier to read the articles reprinted from these two periodicals. However, the reproduction is very clear. Professor Rau, the editor of these two volumes, has added four indices (Indische Autoren, Indische Werke, Indische Wörter, Sachregister) and a concordance of the articles in the alphabetical order of the periodicals in which they were first published.

In view of the fact that these two volumes together with the indices will be extremely welcome to everyone interested in Kielhorn's work, it may seem ungrateful to express a desideratum. Kielhorn's articles mostly deal with specific topics and problems. Only the specialist will know the relevant literature in each case. One wonders whether it would not have been possible to ask specialists in Indian grammar, epigraphy, etc. to list briefly the publications which relate to the problems dealt with by Kielhorn. This could probably have been done in a limited number of pages and would have made these volumes of even greater use to the reader.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Helmuth von Glasenapp: Bibliographie. Bearbeitet von Zoltán Károlyi. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1968. xiv + 100 pp. Ln. DM. 24,—.

Helmuth von Glasenapp (1891-1963) was one of the most prolific scholars in the field of Indian studies. We learn from his biography that his motto was "nulla dies sine linea". Mr. Zoltán Károlyi's bibliography lists fifty-two publications in book-form and one hundred and eighty-seven articles. To this must be added newspaper articles, contributions to encyclopedias, etc. and reviews. Yet H. von Glasenapp was not a scholar who remained sitting in his study. He undertook many voyages and travelled in all five continents.

In his numerous publications he has dealt with many subjects, but his main interest has always been in Indian religion and philosophy. He had a gift for explaining clearly and concisely the most difficult problems.

His more popular books, which have been translated into many languages, reached a very wide public. Few scholars have contributed so much to the spread of a better knowledge of the Indian world.

The bibliography, which has been carefully compiled by Mr. Zoltán Károlyi, is a very fitting tribute to the memory of Helmuth von Glasenapp. It is divided into six sections: 1. Selbständige Veröffentlichungen; 2. Zeitschriften- und Festschriftenbeiträge; 3. Zeitungsaufsätze; 4. Beiträge in Nachschlagewerken; Tätigkeit als Mitarbeiter und Herausgeber; 5. Besprechungen; 6. Literatur über Helmuth von Glasenapp. The index consists of two parts. The first lists von Glasenapp's publications in alphabetical order. The second is an index of proper names. Each item of the bibliography contains a full description and, if necessary, explanatory notes and cross-references. The first section lists also the reviews of von Glasenapp's books. All items have been numbered consecutively. This will make it possible to refer henceforward to von Glasenapp's publications by quoting the relevant number of the bibliography. In nr. 500 "L'absolut" must be corrected into "L'absolu" and in nr. 664 "17th and 18th centuries" into "seventh and eighth centuries". Under nr. 164 we find a cross-reference to nr. 152. One must add a reference to nr. 191. Likewise references to nrs. 164 and 181 and to nrs. 152 and 164 should be added under nrs. 152 and 191. The curators of the Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung have rendered a very useful service to Indian studies

by publishing this excellent bibliography as volume two of the publications of the Stiftung.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

L. Boulnois et H. Millot, *Bibliographie du Népal*, Volume 1: *Sciences humaines. Références en langues européennes*. Paris, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1969. 289 pp. 55 Frs.

Comme l'explique dans l'introduction le professeur J. Millot, le responsable de la R.C.P. 65 (Recherche coopérative sur Programme ayant pour objet le Népal), un instrument de documentation fut considéré comme une tâche urgente. Ce premier volume, relatif aux sciences humaines, contient une bibliographie, classée par sujets, de publications en langues européennes. Un deuxième volume est prévu pour les publications en langues asiatiques.

L'introduction et les notes préliminaires (sources; bibliographies; à propos du classement par matières; notes pour l'utilisation de la bibliographie) renseignent sur les sources et le classement. Chaque notice porte un numéro. Les notices contiennent les détails bibliographiques, et, à l'occasion, de brèves annotations et des références aux comptes rendus. La bibliographie s'arrête au début de l'année 1968. L'ouvrage est divisé en dix-huit sections; I. Guides et ouvrages généraux; II. Voyages; III. Alpinisme himalayen; IV. Cartes; V. Climatologie et météorologie; VI. Géographie générale; VII. Histoire; VIII. Économie; IX. Instruction publique; X. Les hommes; XI. Métiers et techniques traditionnelles; XII. Religion et magie; XIII. Art; XIV. Jeux, musique et danse; XV. Mythes; XVI. Langues et littérature; XVII. Biographies; XVIII. De quelques organismes de recherches. L'ouvrage se termine par un index des anonymes, un index des auteurs, une liste des titres de périodiques cités dans la bibliographie et une table des matières.

Dans l'introduction M. Millot écrit: "Peu de tâches sont plus malaisées et plus ingrates que l'établissement d'une bibliographie satisfaisante: il y faut des connaissances étendues, un rare sens des langues, une ardeur au travail et une attention à toute épreuve. Aucune de ces qualités cependant ne saurait empêcher une bibliographie d'être vouée à l'imperfection. Mais il lui suffit, pour recevoir sa justification, de constituer un progrès sensible sur celles qui l'ont précédée: les services rendus font oublier toutes les peines de l'exécution." Le présent ouvrage constitue certainement un grand progrès sur ceux parus jusqu'à ce jour. Les imperfections inévitables sont mineures. Elles se limitent presque entièrement à des points de détail. Tout au plus, on peut attirer l'attention sur le fait que les titres sanskrits ne sont pas toujours corrects (cf. 4401, 4443, 4450). La sous-section "Manuscrits et inscriptions" (pp. 228-233) énumère des éditions de textes sanskrits basés sur des manuscrits népalais ou des travaux qui se rapportent à des manuscrits népalais de textes sanskrits. On a l'impression que le mot "népalais" dans le titre de l'article ou de l'ouvrage est à l'origine de ces notices. Ainsi on trouvera une mention de deux articles concernant le *Dharmasamuccaya* (4446, 4457) mais les travaux de Lin Li-kuang sont passés sous silence. On aurait mieux fait d'omettre entièrement ces notices et se borner à signaler des travaux sur des collections de manuscrits népalais de textes sanskrits.

Pour terminer quelques remarques de détail. L'ouvrage d'E. von Fürer-Haimendorf ne contient pas 152 pages mais 748 pages (p. 13, VII). A propos de la bibliographie de Minaev un article est signalé (p. 14, XXX). Une bibliographie beaucoup plus détaillée est donnée dans un ouvrage collectif: *Ivan Pavlovič Minaev* (Moskva, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1967, pp. 123-134). A. P. Barannikov a écrit une bonne étude sur Minaev:

"Biografija I. P. Minaeva (1840-1890)" dans I. P. Minaev, *Dnevnik putesestvij v Indiju i Birmu, 1880 i 1885-1886* (Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1955, pp. 17-32). La pagination des deux volumes de Minaev n'est pas indiquée (no. 142: Vol. I, V + 284 pp.; vol. II, 238 pp.). Le nom d'Edward Conze est écrit partout E. Conzé. No. 1775 ne mentionne pas l'édition originale de l'ouvrage de Beal sur le *Si-yu-ki* (London, 1884). L'ouvrage de Watters (no. 1882) a paru en un seul volume dans une édition photomécanique (Dehli, Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1961). Parmi les bibliographies périodiques (p. 15) il y aurait eu lieu de mentionner l'*Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology* (Leyden, Kern Institute) qui contient une section sur le Népal et le Tibet.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Ratnamayi Dikshit, *Women in Sanskrit Dramas*. Dehli, Meher Chand Lacchman Das, [1964]. iii, ii, 495 pp., xv plates.

The fact that this lengthy book should have been written is itself evidence of the growth of feminism in India, as is the title of the ninth and final chapter, "March of Women through the Ages". Throughout her work Dr. Dikshit, a lady Sanskritist of Delhi University, focusses most of her attention on the question of the social and legal status of her heroines, and psychological and cultural aspects (e.g. the still debated question of whether respectable ladies in ancient India appeared 'topless' in public) are less emphasized. Her general conclusion is unexceptionable — that the status of Indian women in society steadily worsened after the Gupta period, but has been improving in the last hundred years. To prove the later point she refers to certain modern Sanskrit plays, little known to the western Indologist, but evidently very interesting from many points of view. These are discussed in a lengthy chapter (VII) of seventy pages, and stimulate the reader's wish to study the plays themselves, because, though apparently still following all the rules of Sanskrit dramaturgy, some of them clearly reflect the social and political problems and tensions of near contemporary times.

The female characters in the *Bhaktasudarśanam* of Mathurā Prasāda Dīkṣita "definitely show the dawn of a new era" (p. 385). In the *Naladamayantiya* of Kālipāda Tarkācārya we see "man and woman on an equal status" (p. 390). The behaviour pattern of the women characters in the *Samyogitā Svayamvaram* of Mūlaśaṅkara Māṇikāla Yājñika "indicates the renaissance in the position of women during the present century" (p. 403). We might quote several similar examples of little known modern Sanskrit plays which appear to reflect contemporary problems. The curiosity of the social historian is stimulated, especially as the few quotations given in the footnotes show that the language of these plays is correct and enjoyable to read.

This book is mainly significant as a reflection of the way in which modern Indians approach their classical literature. This is not to say that it is unscholarly or dull — the author knows her subject well and writes interestingly. It is regrettable that so long a book does not contain a proper index, but only an index to the dramas referred to, which also serves as a bibliography. References to secondary works are very few indeed, and then are often misspelt (e.g. p. 214: Elliot and Dawson for Elliot and Dowson; pp. 27, 28: Camil Bulke for Camille Bulcke).

A. L. Basham

Ludwik Sternbach, *Cāṇakya-Nīti-Text-Tradition*, Volume II, Part I: Introduction; Part II: *Cāṇakya's Six Versions of Maxims: An attempt to reconstruct the Ur-text*; Part III: B. *Maxims of doubtful origin*; C. *Reconstructed fragmentary maxims* (= Vishveshvaranand Indological

Series, 29, 29a, 29b). Hoshiarpur, 1967 (Pt. II), 1968 (Pt. III), 1970 (Pt. I). XVI, 276 pp. (Pt. I); 1904 pp. (Pt II and III).¹

Dr. Sternbach's grand publication of the Cāṇakya-nīti-text-tradition (CNTT) has been brought to completion with this second volume consisting of three parts. The first part, which was the last to appear, contains a long Introduction and 108 tables while the second and third parts are assigned to the reconstructed text. The main points of the Introduction may be summarized under the following headings.

A. Manuscripts, editions of, and studies about, Cāṇakya's collections of aphorisms (pp. 23-35): a history of the Cāṇakya studies in modern times with an ample bibliography.

B. Cāṇakya's aphorisms in "Greater India" (pp. 35-67): on the spreading of Cāṇakya's sayings in Burma and adjacent countries (especially on Pāli Lokanīti), Java, Tibet (and Mongolia), the Nīti-literature in Tamil, Ceylon, etc. with bibliography and tables. Cf. L. Sternbach, *The spreading of Cāṇakya's aphorisms over "Greater India"* (Calcutta, 1969).

C. Versified *Cāṇakya-rāja-nīti* (pp. 68-70): the author's touching upon a much debated problem concerning a statement of the *Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra* itself that the work consists of 6000 ślokas (I.1.18) and Daṇḍin's reference to Viṣṇugupta's daṇḍanīti in 6000 ślokas written for Maurya (Daśak, pt. 2, ed. Peterson, Bombay 1891, p. 52.10-12). Without entering upon a detailed discussion Sternbach thus expresses his opinion on the coming into existence of the original collection of the so-called Cāṇakya's aphorisms with the following words: "This text containing 6000 ślokas, if it ever existed, could have been the ur-Cāṇakya text. Until the time when this text be discovered we must base ourself on the theory that the original first collection of the so-called Cāṇakya's aphorisms contained a choice of aphorisms from a treatise of polity attributed to Cāṇakya, to which at a later date other sayings were gradually added." (p. 69).² The present reviewer, however, does not believe in the metrical origin of the *Kauṭ. Arthaś.* and agrees with the view that sees in Daṇḍin's "6000 ślokas" a well-known way of fixing the extent of a prose work by using "śloka" as a unit of 32 syllables.³

D. Reconstruction (pp. 70-72): a section important for knowing what the author understands by ur-text. He tries to give "a probable ur-text of C.'s maxims, but not the ur-text of C.'s *nīti* work if it ever existed. The present reconstruction is much broader, since it deals with the reconstruction of all moral, ethical and political maxims attributed to C." (p. 70). Sternbach continues to clarify his ideas about the ur-text: "This so-called ur-text is based on the six basic versions, as they have been reconstructed in Vol. I and contains all maxims which were included in one or another place in these

¹ For Vol. I see *III*, 9 (1966), pp. 301-307 where the names of the six basic versions together with their abbreviations are mentioned.

² Similarly, *Cāṇakya-rāja-nīti* (Madras, 1963), pp. 17-19. Cf. Tsuji, *III*, 9 (1966). p. 305, n. 3, but I believe now that Daṇḍin referred to nothing else than the *Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra* — The Cāṇakya-Kauṭalya-problem should be considered in the light of T. Burrow's convincing argument that the author of the *Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra* is distinct from Cāṇakya, the minister of Candragupta Maurya (*ABORI*, 48/49, 1968, pp. 17-31). Cf. also Th. R. Trautmann, *Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra* (Leiden, 1971): The *Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra* in its present form is a composite work in which at least three hands are discernible; the age is approximately estimated at 150 A.D. At any rate there is little chance for surmising a versified Daṇḍanīti or Rājanīti as a source of the ur-Cāṇakya.

³ Cf. Th. R. Trautmann, "A metrical origin for the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra?", *JAOS*, 88 (1968), pp. 347-349.

six versions. This text is called 'ur-text' on the understanding that each verse, each aphorism is a separate entity and the question of an organized text does not arise in this volume." (*ibid.*). The result is a collection of all the stanzas of the six basic versions given in their original form and arranged in alphabetical order. The ur-text taken in this sense is quite different from the ultimate form of a certain text obtained by reconstruction as is familiar to us from Edgerton's 'Pancatantra Reconstructed'. On this point see further below.

E. New texts (pp. 72-77): First treated is the *Cāṇakya-saptati* edited by K. V. Sarma, Supplement to *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal*, III, 1 (Hoshiarpur, 1965). Sternbach denies the editor's opinion that this short text forms a separate version and recognizes it as a CN manuscript, for it is "a compilation of stanzas usually ascribed to C. and prevalent very often in the South" (p. 73). Next follow some remarks on the so-called notebook manuscripts (s. *CNTT*, I 1, p. XII) which look like notebooks of students in Sanskrit or those of school-children and some of which are divided into adhyāyas of equal or unequal length. Cf. Table LXIV-LXV (pp. 163-179).

F. Presentation of the text (pp. 77-78, cf. also Preface, pp. V-VI): important section as it contains the definition of Sections A (= *CNTT*, II, 2), B, and C (= II, 3). Section A (= aphorisms 1-1119, in reality 1122 stanzas, see p. 77, n. 73) comprises the ur-text (or original text) of the individual stanzas of the six basic versions arranged in alphabetical order, while Section B (= aphorisms 1120-2103, in reality 960 stanzas, see p. 78, n. 75) contains those aphorisms of doubtful authority not reconstructed before in the six basic versions but found in the texts and manuscripts which formed the basis for the reconstruction of these versions, and Section C (= aphorisms 2104-2235, in reality 133 stanzas, see p. 78, n. 76) contains those of a fragmentary character.

G. Metres used in the reconstructed text (pp. 78-92): Besides the śloka (1841 out of 2215 stanzas), twenty-five different metres are met with and, as expected, the greatest variety is observed in the version CR, some aphorisms of which are known for their refined language and style.

H. Presentation of the stanzas (pp. 92-93): explanation of references used in the critical apparatus under each stanza.

The rest of the book (p. 95 ff.) consists of tables of concordance (I-CVII) showing the correspondence between the one hundred and thirteen main texts used for the reconstruction and the text as it is given in *CNTT*, II, 2 and 3. The last table (CVIII) is assigned to the stanzas ascribed in secondary sources to Cāṇakya but not found in any Cāṇakya text.

Instead of discussing the appropriateness of the use of the term ur-text in the above mentioned sense, I would prefer to point out here the difficulty of reconstructing the ur-text of Cāṇakya's aphorisms in its ordinary meaning. One usual way for reaching an original state of a versified work consists in collecting the stanzas common to all or the majority of the versions or texts concerned. Unless I have overlooked something, I could find only one verse in Section A which is found in all the versions, that is, no. 212, though even here the version CL is represented by the stanza M of Group II (*CNTT*, I, 2, p. 45). When one excludes CL in view of the fact that CL and Cv can be regarded as one unit (see *III*, 9, p. 303), one obtains nine stanzas common to five versions, that is, nos. 174 (also in *Pañcatantra* textus simplicior, *Hitopadeśa*, 392 in *Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā*), 501, 527 (also in *Pañcatantra* textus ornatior, *Hitopadeśa*), 565, 646 (also in *Hitopadeśa*, 746, 886, 1002 (also in *Vetālapañcav*). Even if one contents oneself with the stanzas common to four versions, only thirty-five aphorisms come up to this standard, and not a few of them occur also in other Sanskrit works (e.g. *Mahābhārata*, *Manu*, *Pañcatantra*, *Hitopadeśa*, *Vetālapañcav*),

CV Cv CN CS

nos. 352, 355, 428, (for CN: Gr. II, B), 691, 714, 885, 959, 1058, 1076,

CV	Cv	CN		CR	nos. 87, 142, 159, 431, 477, 507 (for CR: Gr. II, B), 828, 860, 890.
CV	Cv		CS	CR	nos. 6 (for CR: Gr. II, S), 227, 257, 625, 686 (introductory stanza), 779, 914.
CV		CN	CS	CL	nos. 208, 269, 303, 610, (for CN: Gr. II, H), 678.
CV		CN		CL	CR no. 110.
	Cv	CN	CS	CR	nos. 149, 665, 963.
	Cv		CS	CL	CR no. 260 (for CL: Gr. II, E).

Under these circumstances no one would think of reconstructing the ur-Cāṇakya, that is, a collection of Cāṇakya's aphorisms conceived as the ultimate source from which all the known versions can be derived. Is it, however, at all possible to assume an organized collection of Cāṇakya's aphorisms in some form or other as the basis of later ramification? At first, I suppose, a mass of floating stanzas attributed to Cāṇakya, a famous politician of yore, were spreading orally among literary circles. With the lapse of time the number of such verses increased, and they were then gathered and compiled into various collections in different times and places probably under mutual influence. In such a case the hypothesis of an ur-Cāṇakya would be quite useless. Until a historical interrelation of the basic versions and the genesis and development of each version become more clearly known, one had better refrain from speaking of an ur-Cāṇakya in a strict sense.

Whether one may approve or not of Sternbach's designation, his collection of all the available Cāṇakyan aphorisms is certainly an outstanding achievement involving a tremendous amount of scholarly labour and acumen. It should be appreciated not only as the starting point of future study of Cāṇakya's compendia but also as an immense treasury of Sanskrit gnomic poetry in general.

Tokyo

N. Tsuji

Tsuji Naoshirō, *Genson Yajuru-vēda bunken — Kodai Indo no saishiki ni kansuru korpon shiryō no bunkengakuteki kenkyū* — (Existent Yajurveda-Literature - Philological Study of the Fundamental Sources of the Vedic Ritual -) (= *The Tōyō Bunko ronsō*, Series A, Vol. LII). Tōkyō, The Tōyō Bunko, 1970. xi + 211 pp. [1]

H. S. Ananthanarayana, *Verb Forms of the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa* (= *Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series*, 60). Poona, Deccan College, 1970. XV + 368 pp. Rs. 30/—. [2]

Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. Die Saṃhitā der Maitrāyaṇīya-Śākhā. Herausgegeben von Leopold von Schroeder. Erstes Buch. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1970. XLVI + 175 pp. DM 48.—; Zweites Buch. XII + 169 pp. DM 34.—. Ibid., 1971.

Kāṭhaka. Die Saṃhitā der Kāṭhaka-Śākhā. Herausgegeben von Leopold von Schroeder. Erstes Buch. XIV + 284 pp. DM 58.—; Zweites Buch. V + 193 pp. DM 34.—. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1970-1971. [4]

[1] With the publication of his book on the Yajurveda Literature Professor Tsuji, the doyen of Vedic studies in Japan, has rendered a great service to Indian studies. Tsuji's book is not an introduction to the *Yajurveda* but a philological guide to the extant *Yajurveda* texts. It contains a systematic survey of the *Yajurveda* schools and their literature. The author studies the traditions about the transmission and the authorship

of the texts, their divisions, the relations to other texts, their style and date. Particular attention is given to grammatical and lexicographical peculiarities. The author is mainly concerned with the Vedic ritual; the *Kalpasūtras* and especially the *Śrautasūtras* are carefully examined. As to the *Upaniṣads*, only philological problems are dealt with and no attempt has been made to study their content, their date and similar problems in any detail. The text of Tsuji's book occupies only 83 pages but it is followed by not less than 793 notes (pp. 85-200). As Tsuji explains in the preface, his book was originally written as a supplement to his doctoral thesis on *The Relation between Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras* which gained him the doctoral degree in 1943. His thesis was published in 1952 but without the supplement (*Brāhmaṇa to Śrautasūtra no kankei*, Tōkyō, The Tōyō Bunko, 1952; cf. L. Renou, *JA*, 1953, pp. 280-281). The supplement was based on lectures on Vedic literature, delivered at the University of Tokyo since 1935. In its original form it contained exhaustive references to the literature on the subject. The author has refrained from adding a complete bibliography of the publications which appeared during the last twenty-five years. However, nothing of importance has been overlooked.

One must regret the fact that the author, who has published several important studies on Vedic ritual in English (*On the relation between Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras*, Tokyo, 1952, English summary, pp. 181-247; "The marriage-section of the Āgṇiveśya-Grhyasūtra", *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, 19, 1960, pp. 43-77; "Notes on the Rājasūya-section (IX, 1) of the Mānava-Śrautasūtra", *ibid.*, 23, 1964, pp. 1-34; 25, 1967, pp. 121-143), has preferred to publish this book in Japanese. However, it must be pointed out that the book can be consulted with great benefit even by a person who has no knowledge of Japanese. In particular, the very detailed and valuable bibliographical references, given in the notes, will be extremely useful to non-Japanese readers. Tsuji has an extensive knowledge of the history of Vedic studies. Already in 1933 he compiled a bibliography of Caland's writings ("A Bibliography of the late Professor Willem Caland with special reference to Vedic studies", J. Rahder, *Levensbericht van Prof. Dr. Willem Caland*, Leiden, 1933, pp. 13-26). In 1939 he published a long article in Japanese on "Vedic studies, past and present" (*Bukkyō kenkyū*, III, 5, pp. 129-165; published in revised form in *Veda to Upaniṣad*, Tokyo, 1953); in 1948 also in Japanese "A Survey of extant Sāmaveda-Literature" (*Gogaku ronshō*, I, pp. 1-37). Recently, Tsuji published a systematic bibliography of Renou's publications (in Japanese: "A preliminary bibliography of important publications of the late Dr. Louis Renou", *Tōyō Gakuhō*, 49, 4, 1967, pp. 01-033). Of Tsuji's other publications in the field of Vedic studies one must mention his book on the Vedas and the Upaniṣads (*Veda to Upaniṣad*, Tokyo, 1953), which studies the philosophy of the Saṃhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, the philosophy of the *Upaniṣads* and the ethical doctrines of the *Veda*. An introduction to Vedic literature from his hand appeared in 1967 under the title "The Dawn of Indian civilization" (*Indo bunmei no akebono*).

It is not possible to mention here Tsuji's other publications which relate not only to Vedic literature but also to many other fields of Indian studies. A select bibliography of his writings, which Professor Tsuji has kindly sent to me at my request, lists a great number of books, articles, translations and reviews. Japanese readers must be considered fortunate to be able to read the works of such a distinguished scholar. A translation into English of his most important contributions to Vedic studies would be greatly welcomed by scholars in the West and in India.

[2] Dr. H. S. Ananthanarayana's *Index of the verb forms of the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa* consists of three parts. The first lists all forms by roots as in Whitney's *Roots*. In the second part all forms are given in alphabetical order with reference to their occurrence in the text; an asterisk indicates that the form occurs with a preverb and = indicates that the form occurs with a preverb, but detached from it. The third part contains

tables of the frequency of the verb forms, a list of alphabetically arranged verb forms with attached preverbs, a list of alphabetically arranged verb forms with more than one attached preverb, a list of alphabetically arranged verb forms with preverbs detached from them, references to the occurrence of frequently occurring forms: *āha*, *juhōti* and *bhavati*, a list of alphabetically arranged roots in each verbal system and finally a list of ten passages containing uncertain verb forms. The three editions used for the index are those published in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, the *Government Oriental Library Series* and the *Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series* (cf. M. B. Emeneau, *Union list*, nos. 207-209). One must be grateful to Dr. Ananthanarayana for having undertaken the laborious task of compiling this index. The University of Texas and the Deccan College deserve our gratitude, the first for having given a grant enabling the completion of this work, the second for having included it in the *Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series*.

[3, 4] Leopold von Schroeder's editions of the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* and the *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā* are indispensable tools for Vedic studies. Both works have been out of print for many years. One must be very grateful to the Franz Steiner Verlag for having undertaken a photomechanic reprint. According to the announcement of the publisher, the reprint of the *Kāṭhaka* will also include Richard Simon's index. Book one and two have already appeared and the third book and the index are due shortly. Of the four books of the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* the first and the second have so far been published. The publishers have rendered an eminent service to Vedic studies by bringing out this excellent reprint. Professor Klaus Janert has contributed a "Vorbemerkung" which is to be found in the beginning of each volume. Janert does not mention the critical remarks made by several scholars on von Schroeder's editions. In his above-mentioned book Tsuji remarks that there are many passages which have to be corrected (cf. notes 373 and 476). It would have been useful to have a list of all the emendations which have been suggested since the original publication of these two editions. The most important studies, which contain emendations of the text of the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* and the *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā*, are mentioned by Tsuji. One must hope that the reprint of von Schroeder's editions will prompt a scholar to undertake a critical study of the text of both *Saṃhitās*, taking into account the emendations already proposed by previous scholars.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Hymnes de Abhinavagupta. Traduits et commentés par Lilian Silburn (= *Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne*, fasc. 31). Paris, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 1970; Dépositaire exclusif: Edition E. de Bocard. 107 pp. 30 F.

M^{lle} Lilian Silburn a déjà consacré plusieurs travaux au Sivaïsme du Kaśmīr (*Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne*, fascicules 5, 8, 15, 19, 29). Cette fois-ci elle nous donne une traduction, abondamment annotée, de huit hymnes d'Abhinavagupta. Sept de ces hymnes furent publiés pour la première fois par M. K. C. Pandey en 1935. La *Bodhapañcadaśikā* fut publiée en 1918 dans le volume XIV (non XIII comme le dit p. 2, note 3) des *Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies*. Dans l'introduction M^{lle} Silburn étudie les idées philosophiques et mystiques d'Abhinavagupta. On y cherchera en vain une discussion de l'authenticité de l'attribution de ces hymnes à Abhinavagupta. Dans l'ouvrage de M. Pandey (*Abhinavagupta*, deuxième édition, Benares, 1963) on trouvera

seulement quelques indications. La *Bodhapañcadaśikā* est citée dans le *Mālinivijaya-vārtika* comme écrite par l'auteur même (Pandey, *op.cit.*, p. 33). Śobhākara Gupta qui a écrit un commentaire sur le *Bhairavastotra* l'attribue à Abhinavagupta (*ibid.*, p. 263; K. L. Janert und N. Narasimhan Poti, *Indische und Nepalische Handschriften*, Teil 2, Wiesbaden, 1970, p. 133). Deux autres hymnes, l'*Anuttarāṣṭikā* et la *Paramārthadvādaśikā*, sont cités respectivement par Jayaratha et Ramyadevācārya (Pandey, pp. 71-72), mais ces citations ne mentionnent pas le nom de l'auteur. En ce qui concerne l'*Anubhavanivedana* M. Pandey dit expressément qu'il l'attribue à Abhinavagupta en raison de la seule tradition (pp. 72-73). Les deux premières stances sont citées dans la *Haṭhayogapradīpikā*, et l'ouvrage semble plutôt se rattacher à l'école du Haṭhayoga qu'au Śivaïsme du Kāśmīr. Selon M. Pandey, Abhinavagupta cite souvent ses propres stotra (p. 28). Il serait donc possible de réunir ces citations pour voir lesquels de ces stotra qui lui sont attribués sont cités par Abhinavagupta. D'autre part, il faudrait étudier la terminologie de ces stotra, non seulement des points de vue philosophique et mystique mais aussi du point de vue philologique. On se demande si Abhinavagupta a une préférence pour certains mots que l'on peut retrouver aussi bien dans ses ouvrages philosophiques que dans ses hymnes. M^{lle} Silburn ne s'occupe guère de problèmes d'ordre philologique. Dans une note elle remarque à propos du mot *kalana*: "Doit-on comprendre *kalana* comme une activité subtile et *kriyā* comme l'activité ordinaire?" (p. 67, n.4). Ce même mot *kalana* se rencontre à deux autres endroits: *Anuttarāṣṭikā*, stance 6, *śaṅkāṭaṅkakaṭaṅkayuktikaṇāṭitaḥ*. M^{lle} Silburn traduit: "Reste par-delà l'imperfection propre aux angoisses du doute." Les mots *yukti* et *kalana* sont omis dans cette traduction. Dans stance 10 de la *Paramārthadvādaśikā* on trouve *pratiḥata-kalana* que M^{lle} Silburn rend par "sans imperfection". Ces traductions ne nous renseignent pas sur la valeur exacte du mot *kalana*. On aimerait bien savoir si ce mot se rencontre dans les ouvrages philosophiques d'Abhinavagupta et, si oui, dans quels contextes.

Dans l'introduction M^{lle} Silburn exprime sa profonde gratitude au Swāmi Lakshman Brahmācārīn avec lequel elle a lu et relu les hymnes d'Abhinavagupta. Sans aucun doute, la traduction de ces hymnes doit beaucoup à la tradition qui existe au Kāśmīr. Toutefois, il faut constater que l'interprétation, donnée par M^{lle} Silburn, ne convainc pas toujours. Par exemple la stance 9 du *Bhairavastava* dit: *tvāṃ priyam āpya sudarśanam ekaṃ durlabham anyajanaiḥ samayajñam*. M^{lle} Silburn traduit: "Dès qu'elle a pris possession de Toi, le Bien-aimé, l'accomplissement du sacrifice unique, celui de l'égalité, si ardu pour d'autres, lui est aisé." Cette traduction interprète *samayajña* comme *sama-yajña*, et non comme *samaya-jña*. Le commentaire n'explique pas cette interprétation surprenante. La stance 10 de la *Paramārthadvādaśikā* débute ainsi: *ye ye ke 'pi prakāśā mayi sati paramavyomni labdhāvakāśāḥ kāsā hy eteṣu*. M^{lle} Silburn traduit: "Quelles que soient les apparences manifestées à la Conscience, on les atteint en moi, suprême firmament; car ces rayons qui sont en elles (en leur spécificité)". M^{lle} Silburn interprète *kāśa* comme signifiant 'rayon' mais, dans une note, elle ajoute que ce mot a aussi le sens de brin d'herbe. On ne voit pas très bien comment, dans un même endroit, un mot peut signifier à la fois 'rayon' et 'brin d'herbe'. D'ailleurs, les dictionnaires n'ont pas enregistré un mot *kāśa*, signifiant 'rayon' (cf. PW et pw). M^{lle} Silburn n'explique pas ses raisons pour rejeter l'analyse de *kāśā* en *kā + āśā*. Il faut remarquer que les deux manuscrits, utilisés par M. Pandey, ont *kāśāmeteṣu* et *kāśāṇhyeteṣu*. La leçon *kāśā hy eteṣu* est une correction, faite par lui. On peut se demander s'il ne faut pas lire, avec un hiatus irrégulier, *kāśā eteṣu*.

L'Introduction et les commentaires, qui suivent les traductions de chaque hymne, montrent que M^{lle} Silburn s'est plongée profondément dans l'expérience mystique des penseurs sivaïtes. Son expérience est d'une grande valeur pour la compréhension de leur pensée. Toutefois, on ne peut pas perdre de vue les rigueurs des méthodes philologiques. L'ouvrage de M^{lle} Silburn laisse le philologue sur sa soif. Espérons que,

dans ses prochains travaux, elle tiendra davantage compte de ses désirs à l'égard de l'édition et de la traduction de textes.¹

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Veṇiṣaṃhāra. Drame sanskrit édité et traduit par Francine Bourgeois (= *Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne*, fasc. 33). Paris, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 1971 ; Dépositaire exclusif: Éditions E. de Boccard. 243 pp.

Le *Veṇiṣaṃhāra* a joui de la faveur des auteurs de traités dramaturgiques. Dans l'Inde il en existe plusieurs éditions et traductions mais il n'y a qu'une seule édition due à un savant occidental, celle de Julius Grill qui date de 1871.¹ M^{lle} Francine Bourgeois donne une traduction très réussie de ce drame dont le style *kāvya* n'est pas facile à rendre dans une langue occidentale. C'est un grand plaisir de lire cette version élégante qui suit d'assez près les tournures des longues périodes sanskrites. Comme il ressort de l'analyse serrée de la structure du drame et des notes de la traduction, M^{lle} Bourgeois prend un grand intérêt à montrer comment le *Veṇiṣaṃhāra* correspond aux exigences dramaturgiques. Elle réussit à faire ressortir l'importance de ce drame à cet égard.

Je n'ai pas pu comparer la traduction de M^{lle} Bourgeois avec d'autres traductions. A de rares endroits on ne peut pas accepter ses interprétations. Je signale les cas suivants: p. 124.4 *bāhubala*° — grandes armées; p. 138.11 *kusumido via tarū* — des abeilles couvrant un arbre; p. 150, st.14 *bodhayāmi* — pourrais-je te ranimer (160.29 *pratibodhayitum* — consoler); p. 154.3 °*ekaśeṣapravālo* — seule force qui subsiste; p. 184.20 °*nirākraṇḍa*° — silencieux. Malheureusement, l'édition du texte laisse beaucoup à désirer. Bien que le titre de ce livre indique que le texte a été édité, M^{lle} Bourgeois présente un texte sanskrit sans aucune indication de ses sources. La bibliographie mentionne quatre éditions, mais on ne sait pas si M^{lle} Bourgeois a suivi principalement une de ces éditions ou a emprunté des leçons à toutes les quatre. Puisqu'elle n'avait pas l'intention de donner une édition critique du texte comme le montre l'absence de notes textuelles, elle aurait pu se contenter de reproduire le texte d'une de ces quatre éditions et en faire mention dans l'introduction. J'ai noté un assez grand nombre de corrections à apporter au texte. P. 38 *chāyā* a. *nanyuṃ*—*manyuṃ*; p. 41, n. 3 *Yodhiṣṭhita*—*Yudhiṣṭhira*; p. 56, st. 2 *tāpāsasya*—*tāpāyasya*; p. 66 *chāyā* f. °*sacakam*—°*sūcakam*; p. 68 *chāyā* c. °*kanti*—°*kānti*°; p. 88 *chāyā* b. *praṇaṣṭhaṃ*—*praṇaṣṭam*; p. 94, st. 7 *dvādaśārka*—*dvādaśārka*, *śauryarāṣeḥ*—*sauryarāṣeḥ*; p. 104, st. 22 *snṛtiṃ*—*smṛtiṃ*, st. 24 *adyāśvatthāmā*—*adyāśvatthāmā*; p. 106, st. 25 *adhiṣṭam*—*abhiṣṭam*; p. 106.6 *kṛtaparikasya*—*kṛtaparikarasya*; p. 114, st. 39 *careṇa*—*caraṇa*; p. 116.16 °*pakṣapaty*—°*pakṣapāty*; p. 126.8 *duḥśasana*—*duḥśāsana*; p. 128.6 *akṣamaḥ*—*akṣamāḥ*; p. 130, st. 6 °*śya* *vinayaṃ*—°*śyavinayaṃ*; p. 132 *chāyā* 1. 1 *gāṭha*°—*gāḍha*°; p. 136.1 °*saṃghāṇa*°—°*saṃdhāṇa*° (de même dans la *chāyā*); p. 144 *chāyā* b. *samaratūryavarah*—*samaratūryaravaḥ*; p. 146, *chāyā* a. et c. °*jivā*—°*jyā*°; p. 148, st. 10 °*yauvananaramyaśobham*—*yauvanaramyaśobham*, *chāyā* b. °*kubaras*—°*kūbaras*; p. 150.22 *jayākāṇṣi*—*jayākāṅkṣi*, st. 13 *kṛtvānyonyam*—*kṛtvānyonyam*, *nivṛtau*—*nirvṛtau*; p. 156, st. 1 *dūran*—*dūrān*; p. 164, st. 11 *praviśata*—*praviśatā*; p. 170. 4 *aropya*—*āropya*; p. 170.6 *anyor*—*anayor*; p. 184.6 *sukhād*—*mukhād* (il faut corriger la traduction); p. 186.20 °*keśambara*°—°*keśāmbara*°; p. 202.21 °*kuñcara*—°*kuñjara*; st. 18 *mamānuko*—*mamānujo*; p. 222.14 *vairi*—*vairī*, st. 39 *nisaṇṇa*—

¹ Dans les textes sanskrits il faut corriger les fautes d'impression suivantes: p. 23, stance 4: *pratibimbatam*, lire *pratibimbitam*; p. 48, stance 3: *viśvagaye*, lire *viśvagatē*; p. 56, stance 4: *vittamadya*°, lire *vittamadya*°.

¹ Corriger p. 22: *Kritish mit Enleitung* en *Kritisch mit Einleitung*.

nisannā, yodhaḥ-yodhāḥ; p. 224.10 *anabhavatu-anubhavatu*; p. 226.25 °*vibramaḥ-°vibhramaḥ*.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan. Facsimiles with transcripts, translations and notes. Edited in conjunction with other scholars by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle. Vol. I, parts 1-2. St. Leonards, Ad Orientem Ltd.; Amsterdam, Philo Press, 1970. xxxvi + 412 pp., 22 plates. Dutch Guilders 84.—.

Hoernle's *Manuscript Remains*, published in Oxford in 1916, have been out of print for many years. The reprint, published jointly by Ad Orientem Ltd. and the Philo Press is extremely welcome. The *Manuscript Remains* contain a great number of texts in several languages. The Khotanese texts, edited by S. Konow (pp. 214-356) and Hoernle (pp. 400-402), have been edited again by H. W. Bailey (cf. the list of editions of Khotanese texts in L. G. Gercenberg's *Xotano-sakskij jazyk*, Moskva, 1965, pp. 16-29). At present, the *Manuscript Remains* are still of great importance for the Sanskrit fragments, edited by Hoernle (pp. 1-84), F. W. Thomas (pp. 85-138), H. Lüders (pp. 139-175) and F. E. Pargiter (pp. 176-195) and the Sanskrit vocabulary to the texts, which was compiled by Hoernle (pp. 196-212). Moreover, Konow's edition of the Khotanese version of the *Aparimitāyuh Sūtra* also contains the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation (for other editions of the Sanskrit text see Yamada Ryūjō, *Bongo butten no shobunken*, Kyōto, 1959, p. 157). Almost all Sanskrit fragments have been identified by the editors. One unidentified fragment (pp. 121-125, edited by Hoernle) has been identified as a fragment of the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* by Sylvain Lévi (cf. *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 610-611). Another fragment, also edited by Hoernle (pp. 166-175), corresponds to passages of the *Mahāvagga* and the *Aṅguttaranikāya* as pointed out by Hoernle. One can add to these Pāli texts *Theragāthā* 640-643. Passages, corresponding to the fragment are to be found in the Chinese versions of the *Madhyamāgama* (*Taishō*, Vol. I, pp. 612c-613a), the *Samyuktāgama* (*ibid.*, II, p. 62a-b) and the *Dharmaguptakavinaya* (*ibid.*, XXII, pp. 844c-845a). Hoernle has not tried to restore the missing passage in line four of the reverse: *kṣiṇajāti ...* (5) *smād-bhavaṃ prajānāti*. One must compare *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, ed. E. Waldschmidt, Teil II (Berlin, 1951), pp. 160-162: *kṣiṇā me jātir usitaṃ brahmacaryaṃ kṛtaṃ karaṇiyaṃ nāparaṃ asmād bhavaṃ prajānāmi*. The *Vinaya* fragments, edited by Hoernle (pp. 4-16), cannot be identified with passages from one of the *Vinayas*. However, Hirakawa Akira has shown that they are very similar to passages in *Vinaya* texts of the Sarvāstivāda (*Ritsuzō no kenkyū*, Tōkyō, 1960, pp. 76-85). As far as I know, the only text, which so far has not been identified at all, is a fragment of a Mahāyāna sūtra, edited by Hoernle (pp. 97-103). It is to be hoped that the publication of this excellent reprint will lead to further study of the texts which it contains.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Benjamin Bergmann, *Nomadische Streifereien unter den Kalmüken in den Jahren 1802 und 1803*. Erster Theil, Riga, 1804, 352 pp., 12 facs.; zweiter Theil, Riga, 1804, 352 pp.; dritter Theil, Riga, 1804, 302 pp.; vierter Theil, Riga, 1805, 356 pp. 12 × 19 cm. — Reprint. Mit einer Einführung von Siegbert Hummel. Oosterhout, Anthropological Publications; New York, Humanities Press, 1969. VIII + 342 pp. 22 × 33 cm. Dutch guilders 86,—.

Bergmann's *Nomadische Streifereien* belongs to the small group of books which are of lasting importance to Mongolian and Lamaist studies. Bergmann lived for more than a year among the Kalmyks. He was a very good observer without any prejudice. The second volume contains a detailed description of Kalmyk life and customs: "Die Kalmüken zwischen der Wolga und dem Don. Ein Sittengemälde" (pp. 1-322). Other ethnographical observations are to be found in the thirty-seven letters, written by Bergmann during his stay with the Kalmyks (vol. I, pp. 32-138; vol. IV, pp. 216-355). Some brief information on Kalmyk medicine, chronology and astrology is to be found in Vol. II (pp. 324-340). For the history of the return of the Torghuts from Russia to China in 1771 Bergmann's "Versuch zur Geschichte der Kalmükenflucht von der Wolga" (Vol. I, pp. 140-246) remains one of the important sources, because he was able to obtain many details from an eye-witness, M. S. Weseloff, who was carried off by the Torghuts as a prisoner.

Bergmann was very interested in the religion of the Kalmyks. The third volume contains a treatise on their religious rites: "Die Religionsdienst der Kalmüken" (pp. 72-184) and the "Ideen zu einer Darstellung des tibetanisch-mongolischen Lehrsystems" (pp. 22-70) in which Bergmann describes the Lamaist religious system. Bergmann realized that it was not possible to study the literature, the philosophy and the religion of the Kalmyks without a knowledge of Mongolian and Kalmyk. It is interesting to note that he was also well aware of the importance of a knowledge of Tibetan for the study of Lamaism: "Um das mongolische Religionssystem gehörig kennen zu lernen, wird nicht bloss erfordert, dass man die gewöhnlichen mongolischen Dialekte, und die mongolische Schriftsprache, sondern auch die tangutische oder tibetanische Sprache kennen lerne." (Vol. I, pp. 18-19). Bergmann's advice has too often been left unheeded by Mongolists in later times. Several important texts have been translated by Bergmann: thirteen stories of the *Siddhi kür* (Vol. I, pp. 248-351), Kalmyk anecdotes (Vol. II, pp. 342-352), the *Mirror of the World* (*Yertünčü-yin toli*, cf. W. Heissig, *Mongolische Handschriften, Blockdrucke, Landkarten*, Wiesbaden, 1961, Nr. 3) (Vol. III, pp. 186-230), two chapters of the Gesar epic (*ibid.*, pp. 232-284), the Mongolian version of the *Viśvantara Jātaka* (cf. Heissig, *op.cit.*, Nr. 159) (*ibid.*, pp. 286-302), the *Geü čikütü* (cf. Heissig, *op.cit.*, Nr. 158) (Vol. IV, pp. 14-180) and a chapter of the Kalmyk epic, the *Džangar* (*ibid.*, pp. 182-214).

Bergmann's book has for many years been a bibliographical rarity. We must be very grateful for the publication of this reprint. By reproducing four pages of the original edition on one page it has been possible to publish the four volumes of the original edition in one large-sized volume. An introduction by Siegfried Hummel has been added to the reprint (pp. V-VIII). Hummel's knowledge of Tibetan and Mongolian seems to be rather superficial. His etymologies of Mongolian words are surprising. *Yirtinčü* is explained as the Mongolian pronunciation of Tibetan 'Jig-rten-bcu "Zehn Behälter des Zerstörbaren, Die zehn Welten, eigentlich die zehn kosmischen Richtungen — Universum"; *oron* as the Mongolian pronunciation of Tibetan *grong* "Stadt".¹ The information, given by Hummel, is sometimes incorrect. For instance, the *Džangar* is said to have originated in the eighteenth century. The *Džangar* contains elements of different origin. Probably it obtained its present form only at the end of the eighteenth century but some parts must be much older (cf. Nikolaus Poppe, "Das mongolische Heldenepos", *Zentralasiatische Studien*, 2, Bonn, 1968, pp. 198-199). For the return of the Torghuts Hummel refers to Sven Hedin's *Jehol* but no mention is made of the recent study by C. D. Barkman ("The Return of the Torghuts from Russia to China", *Journal of Oriental Studies*, II, Hongkong, 1955, pp. 89-115). No information is given on Bergmann himself apart from the indication that he comes from Latvia and that his complete name is Benjamin Fürchtegott Balthasar von Bergmann. It

¹ For the etymology of *yertinčü* see F. W. Cleaves, *HJAS*, 17 (1954), pp. 89-90, n. 16.

would probably be possible to find more information about him in German libraries. The *Neue deutsche Biographie* (Vol. II, Berlin, 1953, p. 88) mentions in an article on Ernst Gustav Benjamin Bergmann his father Benjamin Fürchtegott Bergmann (1772-1856; Pastor in Rujen. Historiker und Sprachforscher). Probably this Bergmann is the author of the *Nomadische Streifereien*.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Franz Altheim und Ruth Stiehl, *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum*; Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1970; 811 S.; 10 Abb. (S. 755-764).

Eine Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum, wie im Titel verheißen, ist ein echtes Desiderat und bisher nie geschrieben worden. Wie gleich nachzuweisen, leider auch hier nicht. Voraussetzung wäre die geographische und historische Abgrenzung und die Periodisierung des Mittelasiensbegriffes mit nachfolgender einigermaßen adäquater Abdeckung des Gesamthabes, also ein Konzept mit Erfüllung. Die Gliederung in neun "Bücher" (1: *Zarathustra*; 2: *Ostiran bis auf Alexander den Großen*; 3: *Alexander der Große*; 4: *Alexanders Nachfolge im Osten*; 5: *Die Griechen in Ostiran und Nordwest-Indien*; 6: *Die Parther*; 7: *Ausgang der Griechen in Ostiran und Indien*; 8: *Die Kūšān und ihre Zeit*; 9: *Awesta. Zusammenfassung*) täuscht eine gewisse Abdeckung vor, aber die Lücken sind allenthalben erkennbar: so fehlen China (Kap. 20: "Serer und Phauner" ist kein Ersatz!) und die Sasaniden in Ostiran, um nur zwei größere zu nennen. Die einzelnen Kapitel wiederum decken den Inhalt der "Bücher" nicht ab, sind vielmehr zwar sehr geschickt gewählte und oft sehr geistreiche Abschnitte eklektizistischer Prägung, in keinem Falle aber sorgsam portionierte und in Hinblick auf das Ganze abgestimmte Teile. Was bleibt, ist ein äußerst buntes Mosaik von Beiträgen, deren Zusammenhang mit dem Haupttitel keineswegs immer klar erkennbar oder beweisbar ist. Niemand wird z.B. die Bedeutung Zarathustras in diesem Zusammenhange bestreiten, aber dieser und das Awesta nehmen unerhörterweise zwei von neun Büchern ein. Sinnigerweise sind sie getrennt (Buch 1 und 9), wie übrigens auch der von Buch 2 bis 7 gegebene und noch vertretbare Zusammenhang durch Buch 6 (Parther) getrennt ist. Wie immer läßt A. in diesem Werk gleichfalls verschiedene andere Autoren zu Wort kommen. Außer der nie im Detail definierbaren und sicher nicht geringen Leistung von St., deren Ungreifbarkeit die notwendige Kritik am Hauptverfasser erschwerte, finden sich Beiträge von János Harmatta, Dieter Harnack, Roch Knapowski, Franz F. Schwarz, Zuhair Shunnar, Oswald Szemerényi und (+) Erika Trautmann-Nehring (Bildteil), also klingende wie zunächst unbekannte Namen, auch diese gewiß nicht ohne Verdienst. Schwerlich haben sie von Anfang an gewußt, in welches Gesamtkonzept so ungleicher Formulierung sie später eingegliedert wurden. Auch dem Rez. ist es einst so ergangen. Im Vorwort begründet A. das Werk damit, seine 1947/48 erschienene *Weltgeschichte Asiens im griechischen Zeitalter* sei seit mehr als einem Jahrzehnt vergriffen und auch auf dem antiquarischen Büchermarkt nicht mehr zu haben. Indessen ist das Wiederaufwärmen älterer Beiträge und deren verschiedene Mischung in nur zum allergeringsten Teil wirklich "neuen" Werken seit Jahrzehnten das Charakteristikum des Hauptautors. Er hält es hierin mit der Witwe Bolte bei Wilhelm Busch. Die von E. Merkel verfaßte *Bibliographie Altheim'scher Schriften* gibt darüber zuverlässige Auskunft, wie A. einmal selbst lobte. Den Eingeweihten ist dies längst bekannt, dem Büchermarkt offenbar nicht.

Es ist unmöglich, bei so disparater Themenlage und angesichts eines mangelnden echten Konzeptes auch nur stichprobenweise pro Kapitel ins Detail zu gehen, wofür auch der Raum einer Besprechung nicht reichen würde. Dafür seien einige paradigmatische Notizen zur Arbeitsweise des Autors gebracht; Kap. 21: "Anfänge der

Parther", S. 453: dem Verf. sind sämtliche neueren Arbeiten zur parthischen Numismatik (A. und B. Simonetta, Le Rider, um nur drei der bedeutendsten zu nennen) völlig fremd. Sein letzter Gewährsmann ist W. Wroth (BMC Parthia) aus dem Jahre 1903 (sic!). Die Folgerungen über die Aufteilung der Münzen der ersten parthischen Könige, über die Abfolge der Königstitel etc. sind daher unbrauchbar. Besonders hübsch ist nebenher auch der "Radmantel" des Reiters (S. 455), ohne Zweifel eine über die Nachrichten Justins hinausgehende Bereicherung. Kap. 29: "Reges Tocharorum Asiani", S. 637ff. versucht A., aus Heraos (aus dem er einen aus den Münzlegenden nicht nachweisbaren Heraios macht) einen Sakauraker zu machen. Zu diesem Zweck schlägt er bei P. Gardner BMC, *Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India* nach, erschienen 1886, was der Reprint 1966 verschweigt, kennt nicht oder verschweigt z.B. Zograf's Arbeit über die Münzen der Heraos (1937) und die weitere neuere, meist sowjetische Literatur dazu, ignoriert den Emissionszusammenhang zwischen den Drachmen und den (epigraphisch und paläographisch hier allein gültigen) Tetradrachmen, macht aus der Legende *Canab* ein *Cakab*, um den Sakauraker zu erzwingen, und aus unbestrittenem, da unbestreitbarem *Koccanov* oder *Koppaov* ein *Koyyanov* oder *Koyyakov* (von P. Gardner 1886 irrig so gelesen), um den Kūšān wegzubekommen, der drin enthalten ist. Derlei geht einfach nicht und ist fern jeder Verantwortung. In Kap. 32: "Chronologie der Kūšān und der Hephthaliten" greift A. meinen numismatisch geführten und bisher unbestrittenen Nachweis von vier aufeinanderfolgenden Wellen iranischer Hunnen (Dokumente zur Geschichte der Iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1967) auf S. 690ff. vehement an, ohne indessen den Gegenbeweis führen zu können. Über die Behandlung der Numismatik s.o. Es wäre schwer entschuldigbar, würde ich diese Zeilen in eigener Sache benützen, aber: der Vorwurf, das Material z.B. sowjetischer Museen nicht benutzt zu haben, geht ins Leere. A. selbst hat dessen Nichtachtung (s.o. Heraos) bewiesen. Im übrigen kann man nur benützen, was geboten wird: die Bestände russischer Museen sind mit wenigen Ausnahmen nicht publiziert, in Innerasien überhaupt schwer zugänglich, auch R. Ghirshman, dem dies Buch sinnigerweise gewidmet ist, konnte in seiner einstigen Arbeit *Les Chionites-Hephthalites* (sic!) (Kairo 1948), die der nunmehr ersetzte Vorläufer der meinen war, obwohl selbst geborener Russe und mit Sprache und Literatur des Landes hinlänglich vertraut, keine anderen Ergebnisse für das sowjetische Gebiet Zentralasiens erbringen, wovon A. schweigt. Natürlich erneuert A. seine längst widerlegte Behauptung, die Hephthaliten seien dem Ursprung nach "Türken". (S. 697). Das hinterlassene große Hunnenwerk von O. (nicht E., so S. 693) Maenchen-Helfen, eben im Druck, wird Altheims Hunnentheorien endgültig zerstäuben und uns weiterer Mühen entheben. Dank für Erschließung neuer Quellen ist bei A. nicht zu finden, weder hinsichtlich meiner "Dokumente" noch sonst. Kritik wird liebevoll auch im Detail geübt: wir wollen gerne hinkünftig die Kūšān so und nicht, wie Altheim H. Humbach und mir ankreidet, Kūšān schreiben, wenn es ihn nicht stört, daß er selbst es bisher in zahlreichen Werken stereotyp so getan. Die historischen Auslassungen über das Datum des Kaniška werden darum nicht richtiger: Ohne sich der grundlegenden historischen Verschiedenheit bewußt zu werden, nimmt A. in Parallele zur Post-Yazdgard-Ära einen Beginn der Kaniška-Ära mit dem Tode des Königs an (statt mit dem Regierungsbeginn, wie doch die an die 50 indischen Inschriften ausweisen, deren erste sofort einem zweiten Kaniška zuzweisen wären, was das numismatische Material als Quelle glatt ausrangieren würde) und kommt (recht versteckt auf S. 701) auf sein Datum 219/20, obwohl er S. 687 sieht, daß mein Ansatz auf rund 230 n.Chr. durch die von mir als baktrisch erkannten Tochi-Inschriften über die Rechnung von J. Harmatta auf 232 n.Chr. als sicher erwiesen wird. Wenn A. sich auf eine Ausführung von Harmatta 1966 (S. 687, Fn. 13 belegt) stützt, dieser hätte auch sogleich gesehen, daß in keinem der Fälle bei den Tochi-Inschriften eine Bilinguis vorläge, so ist festzuhalten, daß Harmatta in *Acta Ant. Hung.* XVII/3-4 (1969) dies nicht bestritten hat (l.c. 368:

"... the dating (i.e. die Datenidentität) ... seems to be justified"), was A. entweder nicht weiß oder verschweigt. Harmatta benutzt die Gleichung übrigens l.c. 374. A. hätte die scharfsinnigen Arbeiten von Harmatta auch sonst besser auswerten können.

Mit diesen Proben aus der allgemeinen und aus der besonderen Verfahrensweise des Verf., die allen Regeln strenger historischer Disziplin Hohn spricht, ist leicht ein Bild davon erreichbar, woraus das ganze Werk besteht. Der Autor ist einst angetreten, im Gegensatz zum Wirken der "Ritter der vereinigten Bröselkrume" (Toynbee) ein weit-schauendes Bild der Antike entwickeln zu helfen. Er hat darin manche bewundernswerte Leistung erbracht, für die wir ihm auch jetzt noch Dank schulden und die nicht vergessen werden darf. Unberührt von jeder ernsten und sachlichen Kritik läßt sich auch einst Großes aber nicht in die Gegenwart ziehen. Forschen heißt, nach einer geistreichen Definition, sehen, was jeder sieht, und denken, was keiner denkt. Altheim hat ihr lange, wenn auch nicht ausschließlich, entsprochen. Sehen aber, was nicht ist, und nicht sehen wollen, was ist, ist in ihr nicht enthalten.

Universität Wien

Robert Göbl

Walther Hinz, *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen*; mit Beiträgen von Rykle Borger und Gerd Gropp. Quart. 272 Seiten (einschließlich 157 Tafeln, 34 Abbildungen, 1 Kartenskizze, 2 Farbtafeln). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969.

Äußere Grundlage dieser Publikation sind zwei Iranreisen des Vf. 1967 und 1968. In ihnen hat er nicht nur Bekanntes überprüft, sondern auch manches Neue gefunden oder für rasche Publikation gesichert und hier vorgestellt. Der Dank der Fachwelt gilt ihm hiefür von vornherein, denn es ist der Wille klar erkenntlich, durch Zusammenfassung des Verstreuten ebenso zu klären wie durch Anfertigung zahlreicher besserer und ganz neuer Fotos, auf denen endlich manche umstrittene Details besser ausgemacht werden können. Die zahlreichen Bildtafeln des Buches gehören daher auch zu dessen bestem Teil.

Die einzelnen Kapitel umspannen einen weiten Interessenbogen des Vf. und ergeben, wie hernach ersichtlich, zwei Schwerpunkte: einen elamischen und medisch-achämenidischen und einen sāsānidischen Teil. Von keinem Rez. kann unbedingt erwartet werden, daß er allen Abschnitten gleichermaßen gerecht wird. Auch dem Vf. ist nicht alles gleichmäßig gelungen. Abgesehen vom Methodischen, über das noch zu reden sein wird, ist klar ersichtlich, daß er im ersten Teil weit besser daheim ist als im zweiten, im Philologischen besser als im Archäologischen. Unter dem begreiflichen Wunsch, Gefundenes und Gesehenes möglichst rasch herauszubringen, hat die echte Durchdringung der Materie, für die eine wenn auch gute Kenntnis der Sekundärliteratur keineswegs ausreicht, haben Terminologie und Diktion sichtbar gelitten. Das ist bedauerlich und erschwert auch eine rechte Würdigung, weil gerade dort, wo etwas zu sagen ist, soviel zu sagen wäre, daß es den Rahmen einer Rezension bei weitem sprengen müßte. Einige dieser Themen werden denn auch — darunter eines vom Rez. — von Anderen erneut und voller aufgegriffen werden müssen.

Kap. I. Eine neugefundene altelamische Silbervase (S. 11-44).

Sie ist 1966 gefunden und das bisher einzige Objekt dieser Art. Den Rez., dem sie (nach Foto) auf den ersten Blick verdächtig war, was er hier — obschon bekanntlich kein Elamist — deponieren möchte, hat zu lesen beruhigt, daß die Echtheit der Vase schon bei der Vorlage auf dem V. Internationalen Kongreß für Iranische Kunst und Archäologie in Teheran 1968 in Zweifel gezogen worden ist. Ob der Rettungsversuch von R. Ghirshman (Art. Asiae 30/1968, 243 ff.), dessen Meriten ihn oft genug nicht vor Irrtümern bewahrt haben, hier zählt, bleibe dahingestellt. Schwerer wirkt das Urteil des Verf., der sich für die Echtheit entscheidet.

Wenn H. (S. 12) sagt: "kein Fälscher vermöchte eine derartige Inschrift zusammenzustellen — und wäre er selbst ein Elamist", so verlangt er damit Glauben in einem sehr weiten Ausmaß und wirft eine Grundfrage des modernen Fälscherbetriebes auf, die hier nicht angeschnitten oder beantwortet werden kann.

Festzuhalten sind indessen die hier weiter bekräftigten und unbestrittenen Verdienste des Vf. um die Entzifferung der elamischen Schrift, der er die entscheidenden Wendungen gegeben hat. Nach H. kennen wir heute etwa 55 annähernd gesicherte Zeichen, während in seiner Schätzung noch 50-60 fehlen. Wir sind also auf weitere Funde angewiesen.

Kap. II. Eine neue Xerxes-Inschrift aus Persepolis (S. 45-52)

Die im Jahre 1967 gefundene Inschrift ist — und darin enttäuschte sie — bloße Kopie eines Teiles der unteren Grabinschrift des Darius in Naqš-e Rostam (aber nach H. "offensichtlich von einer Urkunde der großköniglichen Kanzlei, möglicherweise von der ursprünglichen Niederschrift des Darius-Diktates"). Nur der Name des Xerxes ist eingesetzt und eine Schlußformel angefügt. Immerhin war es durch sie möglich, die meisten Textunklarheiten der an diesen Stellen beschädigten Darius-Inschrift auszuräumen.

Das "Epigonentum des Xerxes" — beurteilt nach der Vorstellung geistloser Kopie einer der aussagetragendsten Inschriften seines Vaters — scheint ein etwas zu abfälliges Urteil. Es fragt sich, da die Inschrift doch die Maximen der Herrscherqualität und -verantwortung in einmaliger Diktion enthält, ob nicht gerade die Absicht des Xerxes darin bestand, dieses selbstgeschaffene "Grundgesetz" zur Tradition zu machen und damit überdies eine dem Vater gleiche Größe zu beanspruchen. Was hätte man — bei intendiert gleichem Gedankeninhalt — nach einem kaum übertreffbaren Standardtext, der uns noch heute in voller Lebendigkeit anspricht und packt, wirklich Neues erwarten dürfen? Daß Xerxes uns hier keine neue achämenidische Inschrift beschert hat, ist wohl bedauerlich, aber ob das zu einem Verdikt ausreicht, ist mehr als fraglich, es so simplifiziert auszusprechen, bedenklich.

Kap. III. Die dreisprachige untere Grabinschrift des Darius (S. 53-62)

Dabei hat Rykle Borger (Direktor des Seminars für Keilschriftforschung an der Univ. Göttingen) die akkadische Version, Hinz die altpersische und die elamische Fassung bearbeitet. Damit sind — ein beachtliches Faktum — erstmals alle drei Versionen zusammen publiziert und kommentiert. Die Xerxes-Inschrift (s. Kap. II.) hat dabei ihren Nutzen erwiesen.

Kap. IV. Medisches und Elamisches am Achämenidenhof (S. 63-94)

Der Vf. stellt in Untersuchungen an den achämenidischen Reliefs, besonders an jenen in Persepolis, fest, daß Reiten, Fahren und Sitzen des Herrschers Sache eines medizinischen Hofmarschalls mit medischem Personal war, was m.E. durchaus überzeugend dargetan wird. In der Hoftracht glaubt der Vf. starken elamischen Einfluß feststellen zu können.

Hier ist er vielleicht manchmal zu weit gegangen. Daß z.B. der Streitwagen elamisch ist, ist kaum glaublich (so auch K. Schippmann in seiner Rez. des Werkes in OLZ 66/1971, Nr. 5/6, 235). Daß Elamer auf ihm fahren, ist noch kein Beweis, dem der Vf. übrigens ganze zehn Zeilen widmet. Zum Gestus des medizinischen Hofmarschalls auf dem südl. Schatzhausrelief in Persepolis (Tf. 19) fehlt S. 63, Anm. 4 jeder Hinweis auf die längeren Erörterungen, die ihm und dem Thema der Proskynesis etwa F. Altheim und F. Schachermeyr u.a. gewidmet haben.

Da hier Geräte des Feuerkults zwischen König und Marschall stehen, ist die Auffassung des Vf. in Fn. 4 (Schutz des Feuers vor Verunreinigung) und nicht im Haupttext (Schutz des Herrschers vor Belästigung durch den Atem!) richtig. Auch das haben

Andere vor dem Vf. gesehen, was festzustellen gewesen wäre.

Zu S. 73 (Tf. 23): daß alle Figuren der Tafeln 21, 22 und 23 stehend und nicht gehend gedacht sind, ist schon durch die rasch ausgreifende Schrittstellung des Pferdes auf Tf. 23 (Parallele auf Tf. 24) widerlegt.

Kap. V. Die Völkerschaften des Persepolis-Reliefs. (S. 95-114)

Bekanntlich sind dort 23 Völkerschaften abgebildet. Die beste Konfrontation der bisherigen, sehr divergierenden Ansichten findet sich bei G. Walser, *Die Völkerschaften auf dem Relief von Persepolis* (= Teheraner Forschungen 2, Berlin 1966). Nur rund die Hälfte der Völkerschaften ist als einhellig identifiziert anzusehen. Der Vf. verringert diese Zahl zwar durch Neuzuweisungen (12 = Ionier; 15 = Areier), ist aber sichtbar bemüht, Hypothesen durch Fakten aus dem Unsicherheitsbereich herauszuheben, sodaß seine Vorschläge ernstlich erwogen werden müssen, weil seine Methode gangbar erscheint.

Die folgenden vier Kapitel sind sāsānidischen Felsreliefs gewidmet und bilden den zweiten Schwerpunkt des Buches. In ihm engagiert sich der Vf. besonders, ohne daß erkennbare echte Ambition und Voraussetzungen miteinander immer Schritt hielten. Hauptanliegen des Vf. ist die Deutung und Identifikation der dargestellten Personen. Er hat zu diesem Zweck folgerichtig und systematisch bestmögliche Aufnahmen zu machen getrachtet und hierin liegt, wie schon eingangs betont, ein bleibendes und echtes Verdienst. Er kennt weiters die Sekundärliteratur gut, und vor allem sind die Angaben der *Res gestae divi Saporis*, also der Šāpūr-Inschrift in Naqš-e Rostam eine seiner wesentlichsten Stützen. Es ist unmöglich, auf alle Argumentationen im Detail einzugehen. Beachtliches und völlig Unannehmbares stehen in dichter Folge nebeneinander.

Kap. VI. Die Felsreliefs Ardashirs I. (S. 115-144) /

Der Vf. veröffentlicht — gewissermaßen als Beitrag zu einem Corpus, das er nicht liefern kann, wobei man sich fragt, ob sich nicht doch ein solches lohne und wirklich heute so schwer zu erstellen sei (was *kein* Einwand gegen den Vf. ist!) — sämtliche fünf Felsreliefs des Reichsgründers Ardašēr I. (224-241).

Über Methoden, Terminologie und Diktion usw. sei am Schluß die Rede. Hier nur einige Notizen: Relief I, S. 119 (zu Tf. 52/53 — Kampf mit Artaban V.): Der König trägt weder Krone noch Mitra, sondern nur die Lockenfrisur, wie sie die Münzen zeigen (R. Göbl, *Sasanidische Numismatik*, Braunschweig 1968, Tab. I, Av.-Typ V, 3. Krone). Sie wird nur wie im Zugwind des zu Pferd Dahinstürmenden nach hinten weggezogen und deformiert. Der König trägt ein Diadem, wofür der Vf. trotz Herzfelds, Erdmanns und des-Rez. Arbeiten über die sāsānidische Krone, die immerhin eine recht anerkannte Terminologie geschaffen haben, "Ring" setzt. Ähnlich verfährt der Vf. mit den auf den Hauben und Haubenkronen von Prinzen und Würdenträgern üblichen Tamgas, die der Vf. (auch später, bes. Kap. IX) "Wappen" nennt. Der Ausdruck Tamga ist ein zwar späterer, aber immer noch der treffendste Terminus für diese Würden- und Hoheitszeichen vornehmlich der iranischen Völker. Sie kommen zweifelsfrei aus dem nomadischen Bereich, waren ursprünglich Besitzmarken und werden erst über regierende Clans zu echten Hoheitszeichen. Da der hier eingeführte Begriff Schule machen könnte, muß eindrucklich festgestellt werden, daß der Ausdruck "Wappen" bekanntlich der europäischen Heraldik entstammt und auf anderem Hintergrund geprägt ist. Was der Vf. meint, läßt sich nach den strengen Regeln nur als "Schildfigur" bezeichnen, was es im Sāsānidischen aber eben nicht ist. Zu S. 127 (Tf. 68): Die Bedenken des Vf. können beseitigt werden: wie W. B. Henning im Hb. d. Orientalistik IV/40 nachgewiesen hat, gibt es von Artavazd *keine* Münzen. Die ihm zugeschriebenen Drachmen sind (BMC pl. 36, 14-15; Petrovicz Tf. 23, 12 u. 15) nach

der parthischen Rv.-Legende solche des Artaban V, was der Vf. übersehen hat. Interessant sind die Ausführungen über die "Puscheln", die an den Pferdeschabracken hängen. Die Vermutung von Renate Rolle (Göttingen) auf (ursprünglich) Skalp-Haare besiegt Feinde, eine zentralasiatische Sitte, die sie für die Scythen mit Herodot IV, 64 belegen kann, hat etwas für sich. Das Problem (der Vf. läßt die Deutung offen) müßte unter Heranziehung nachsāsānidischen Materials monographisch lösbar sein. Relief von Salmās: der Rez. bedauert, daß der Vf. mit keinem Wort seine lange und unbeantwortet gebliebene briefliche Stellungnahme zur ersten Publikation des Vf. in *Iranica Antiqua* 5/1965, 148-160 erwähnt, worin u.a. das Relief als mögliches Halbfabrikat bezeichnet wurde, was ganz andere Aspekte ergäbe. Im übrigen zeigt die Zeichnung von Ker Porter 1819 für das rechte Personenpaar die Überreichung eines Ringes (Kranzes), was folgerichtig auch für das linke Paar gilt. Von einer Kolāh kann keine Rede sein.

Kap. VII. Das sasanidische Felsrelief bei Dārāb (S. 145-172)

Kap. VIII. Die römischen Kaiser der Šāpuhr-Reliefs (S. 173-188)

Beide Kap. müssen in einem gesehen werden. Für Dārāb verdanken wir dem Vf. erstmals gut brauchbare Aufnahmen. Der Vf. will die These von MacDermot (*Roman Emperors in the Sassanian Reliefs*, JRSt 44/1954, 76ff.), der erstmals die Deutung der Personen auf den fünf Siegesreliefs des Šāpūr I. auf die drei Kaiser Gordianus III., Philippus I. Arabs und Valerianus I. (früher galt nur die kniende Hauptfigur als Valerian) dergestalt umstoßen, daß er überall Philippus I. für Valerianus I. *e vice versa* einsetzt.

Der Rez. bedauert, dem Vf. hier nicht folgen zu können. Er hat in einem Seminar in seinem Wiener Institut 1970/71 die Frage genau untersucht und muß grundsätzlich MacDermot (gegen eigene frühere Ablehnung) Recht geben, wozu von ihm eine Publikation unter Heranziehung aller, hier teilweise arg vernachlässigter Quellen zu erwarten ist. Vgl. auch die zusammenfassende Kritik nach Kap. IX.

Kap. IX. Kardērs Felsbildnisse (S. 189-228)

Zugrundeliegt ein — und der Rez. zweifelt nicht daran, daß er richtig ist — fundamentaler und folgenschwerer Schluß des Vf. Dieser identifiziert Kartēr über dessen Relief in Naqš-i Radjab auch auf dem Šāpūr-Relief in Naqš-i Rustam, kommt damit auf das Tamga des Kartēr, das er "Scherenwappen" nennt und vermag über dieses auf drei weitere Reliefs sicher den berühmten Großmōbad zu identifizieren, da feststeht, daß der Träger des Tamgas in allen Fällen eine und dieselbe Person sein muß.

Unverständlich ist, warum der Vf. Kartēr in Naqš-i Rustam erst beweisen zu müssen glaubt, der ähnlich wie in Naqš-i Radjab (dort fast neben) über seiner Inschrift steht. Entschieden muß aber gegen die naive Deutung des "Scheren"-Tamgas (vom Vf. wegen seiner Form in einer modernen Gedankenassoziation so genannt) Einspruch erhoben werden. Der Vf. erblickt in der Schere "einen sinnbildlichen Bezug auf Kardērs Entscheidungsbefugnisse: als höchster Richter besaß er die Macht zum "Durchschneiden" auch der schwierigsten Probleme" (S. 191). Dies ist eine Simplifizierung der Interpretation, gegen die das Durchhauen des gordischen Knotens noch ein recht kompliziertes Verfahren genannt werden muß. Mit solchen Scheren kann die Iranforschung ihre schwierigsten Probleme jedenfalls nicht durchschneiden! Was zugrundeliegt, ist nach Meinung des Rez. eher ein stilisierter Hase, wie das sāsānidische Siegelbilder und manche Teppichfiguren nahelegen, in denen der ausgezeichnete Persienkenner allerlei Verwandtes entdecken könnte, was hier unerwähnt bleiben muß. Ähnlichen Tierhintergrund haben das Tamga der Kūšān-Dynastie (Hirsch/frontal) und jenes der Alxon-Hunnen (Stier/frontal) u.a.m.

Die Zurückweisung der Deutung des Rez. (S. 194, Fn. 5) auf die Kronprinzen auf

dem Relief des Varhrān II. in Naqš-i Rostam ist nicht annehmbar, solange nur Meinung gegen Meinung gesetzt wird. Wenn die Figur neben dem König die Königin wäre, müßte sie die für sāsānidische Damen unabdingbaren Zöpfe tragen, die indessen nicht sichtbar sind.

Kap. X. Einige neuentdeckte Inschriften aus sasanidischer Zeit (S. 229-263)

Gerd Gropp (Deutsches Arch. Institut, Abt. Teheran) bearbeitet hier sehr verdienstvoll und gründlich neue Inschriften, auf die Hinz ihn hingewiesen hat. Unter ihnen sind besonders bemerkenswert eine kürzere Fassung der Haġgiābād-Inschrift von Naqš-i Rostam (Pfeilschuß Šāpūr I!) in Tang-i Burāq (sāsānidisches und parthisches Pehlevi), eine Inschrift aus Eqlid aus dem Jahre 6 des Yazdgard (vermutlich III.), die auch durch vertikale Zeilenführung bemerkenswert ist, ferner eine griechische Inschrift am Relief des Šāpūr I. in Naqš-i Rostam. Bei dieser ist unverständlich, daß Gropp die griechische Version der KbZ-Inschrift weder heranzieht noch erwähnt, bei der er für seine Ausföhrung der Gleichung mit Pahlāvik und Pārsik doch alle gewünschten Parallelen gefunden hätte. Warum er nur die (allerdings ausgezeichneten) Fotos nimmt und keine Abklatsche angefertigt hat, erfahren wir nicht.

Zu dem zweiten Teil des Buches scheinen einige Bemerkungen grundsätzlicher Art notwendig: Der Vf. geht in der Behandlung sāsānidischer Felsreliefs eigene Wege. Sein Identifizierungswille ist anerkennenswert (die Nennung zahlreicher Prinzen und Wördenträger in den Inschriften fordert diesen schließlich heraus), verleitet ihn aber offenbar und unverständlich zu methodischen Sünden. So etwa, wenn der Pariser Cameo mit der Gefangennahme Valerians überhaupt nicht herangezogen, ja nicht einmal dort genannt wird, wo dies unabdingbar ist, nämlich erstens S. 146 zum Relief von Dārāb (wo die ganze Erörterung der "Helmkappenkrone" in ein anderes Licht getreten wäre) und zweitens ebenfalls in Kap. VII und dann in Kap. VIII zur Identifizierungsfrage der drei Kaiser. Der Vf. müßte den Cameo ablehnen; weglassen kann er ihn nicht.

Es ist evident, daß auf diese Weise auch die Glaubwürdigkeit der zahlreichen gedankenvollen und erwägenswerten Anregungen und Interpretationen des Vf. ernstlich gefährdet wird. Grundeinstellung, zahlreiche Termini und Einzeldeutungen sind verfehlt. Der Vf. hängt gläubig am Wahrheitsgehalt der KbZ-Inschrift an allen Stellen, übersetzt (S. 179) beim Tod Gordians das ἐπανάρη mit "fiel", wo doch der Ausdruck intentionell farblos gehalten ist (= wurde dahingerafft), begnügt sich für die Version des Todes mit A. Maricq (S. 173/174: "Recherches" 1952) und erwähnt nicht die weit glaubhafteren römischen Nachrichten (wonach Philippus den jungen Gordian unter dramatischen Umständen ermorden ließ), so als ob es keine moderne kritische römische Geschichtsschreibung gäbe; für die Numismatik gilt bei ihm, was ähnlich O. Maenchen-Helfen einst für das Chinesische sagte, nämlich es würde nicht gelesen, aber mißbraucht. Statt einen ausgewiesenen numismatischen Fachmann zu konsultieren, was für die Triumphreliefs seit dem (eher abschreckenden) Beispiel von MacDermot unabdingbar ist, oder selbst die Reichsmünzen des Valerianus anzusehen, begnügt er sich mit dem (hinsichtlich des Ausdrucks Provinzprägungen) mißverständlichen Hinweis von H. von Gall, der selbst kein Numismatiker ist, auf R. Delbruecks Werk über die "Münzbildnisse von Maximinus bis Carinus" (S. 182) für Valerians Bart. S. 146, um nur wenig herauszugreifen, finden wir "Korymbosreif" statt Diadem, eine "Tunica" bei Šāpūr; wir sehen einen "Dolch oder Kurzschwert" herabhängen, indessen deutlich ein Dolch (mit Klinge innerhalb der Hose) steckt; wir vermissen die Benennung des in der Hand des Großkönigs befindlichen und S. 149 richtig gedeuteten flachen, rechteckigen Gegenstandes als natürlich einer "tessera"; S. 178 finden wir ein "Band der Herrschaft". Die Liste ließe sich beliebig verlängern. Sie zeugt von grenzenloser Unbekümmtheit, die übrigens auch in der teils in der heutigen Iranistik unüblichen, teils unhomogenen, teils auch inkongruenten Schreibweise sāsānidischer Namen sicht-

bar wird. Wenn dieser Stil der Forschung Mode wird, wird in Hinkunft in der deutschsprachigen Iranforschung vielleicht zwar mehr geschrieben, aber weniger gelesen werden können.

Der Rez. bedauert, daß er der Tatsache dieser ständigen Mischung von beachtlicher Belesenheit, Gelehrsamkeit und großer Sachkenntnis mit Unzulänglichkeit, von Ambition, redlicher Mühe und enormen Fleiß mit ausgesprochener Flüchtigkeit, an so ausgedehnten und so diffizilen Sachverhalten praktiziert, mit keinem anderen Ausdruck Rechnung zu tragen weiß. Das Werk ist ohne Zweifel ein echtes und trotz der zahlreichen Schwächen bedeutendes Stimulans der Forschung, aber auch eines ihrer Menetekel.

Robert Göbl

Muhammad Mokri, *Le Chasseur de Dieu et le Mythe du Roi-Aigle (Dawra-y Dāmyārī)*. Texte établi, traduit et commenté avec une étude sur la chasse mystique, le temps cyclique et des notes linguistiques. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1967. 161 pp. + 52 pp. Persian and Gūrānī text and 2 pp. plates. DM. 58.—

This book, dedicated to E. Benveniste, is the first volume of the *Beiträge zur Iranistik* edited by Professor Georges Redard of Bern. It contains the first Chapter of an exposition of the Creed of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq, written in Gūrānī, the sacred language of this sect. The edition is based on a recent copy of the *Kalām-i Khazāna* (also called *Kalām-i Perdīwārī*), made in 1934, but authorized by a member of the religious directorate of the sect. In Gūrānī opinion this is an important and authoritative work on the teachings of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq, which sect — “Men of God” (Minorsky); “Fidèles de la Vérité” (Mokri) — is widely spread among the Kurds of the province of Kirmanshah and also has its followers elsewhere in Iran, in Irak and in Turkey.

The Ahl-i Ḥaqq understand by *Kalām* a collection of sayings in poetic style spoken by God, the five Angels of His retinue and a few other prominent religious personalities when engaged in discussion at the time of their various incarnations in the seven epochs of world history, the culmination of which was reached in the fourth, the epoch of Sulṭān Sihāk in the eighth century of the Muslim era. This Sulṭān Sihāk is honoured as the founder of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq religion.

The *Kalām-i Khazāna* contains 26 *kalām*, the first of which, called *Dawra-y Dāmyārī*, “Epoch of the Hunt”, forms a separate whole comprising 221 strophes of 4 hemistichs. The structure of the *kalām* is this, that after an opening verse spoken by God again and again a number of angels — not always all of them nor always in the same order — begin to speak and utter one or more strophes. Except at the end, after strophe 204, the angels appear under the names which were theirs in the period of their incarnation in the eighth century A. H. The hunter (*dāmyār*) is the Angel Gabriel, here called Binyāmīn. Being created before all other creatures he is nearest to God and, therefore, in charge of attending to the observation of the pact concluded between God and the Angels to the effect that God pledged Himself to manifest Himself to the human race in the course of the centuries. Comparable to a hunter who with a net or a lasso (*dām*) in his hand follows the trail of the royal bird of prey (*shāhbāz*), Gabriel-Binyāmīn, who on account of his priority of creation is pre-eminently fit for this task, traces the theophanies in the various epochs of the history of mankind. This span of time, an interlude between pre-eternity (*azal*) and eternity (*abad*), is the period during which men and angels, passing through a thousand incarnations of an average of fifty years each, may attain the perfection they need to see God at the end of the world.

It is obvious that the teachings of this sect are alien to Islam as it is professed in Iran.

They bear a marked impress of gnosticism and testify to the continuity of autochthonous ideas as well as to the presence of notions that impart a syncretistic colouring. Therefore, the explanatory notes added to the translation of the text are far from superfluous; they elucidate much that otherwise would have remained an unsolved puzzle to the uninitiated reader.

The plan of Dr. Mokri's book is as follows. After an introductory chapter dealing with the manuscript and the text he provides us in the second chapter with copious data concerning the net or lasso; the hunter; the ever returning phrase *naynā tanāniš*, "in that place he spread it (his net)"; the following of the trail; the royal eagle and the myth of the King-Eagle, and other symbolic birds in Iranian folklore and literature. One will find here many things made known previously in papers read by the author at the International Congresses of Orientalists in München (1959) and Moskou (1963). In a third chapter the author finally deals with cyclic time and the different modalities of time to wit the exoteric aspect of history and its epochs, and the esoteric aspect of the timeless Reality vaulting it. The annotated translation of the text is followed by linguistic and grammatical notes; a glossary of substantives and one of proper names; a list of the places mentioned in the text; a detailed index, and finally a bibliography of works consulted, comprising no less than 60 titles, among which several manuscripts. The author's own publications in this field are mentioned separately on p. 2 of the Introduction. The work concludes with a short introduction in Persian and the Gūrānī text of the *Dawra-y Dāmyārī*, printed in Arabic character.

The author may be complimented with this important contribution to our knowledge of the religious ideas, the folklore and the sacred language of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq. He has supplied valuable new materials, and added a good deal of information to what was already known from other sources as, for instance, the publications of De Gobineau, Minorsky and Ivanow.

Noordwijk

G. W. J. Drewes

J.-P. de Menasce, *Feux et Fondations pieuses dans le droit sassanide*. Paris, Klincksieck, 1964, in-8°, 62 p.

L'unique ouvrage de droit existant en pehlevi. le *Mātigān i hazār Dātistān* "Livre des mille Jugements", n'a pas encore été édité; il doit l'être prochainement, en U.R.S.S., par Anahit Perikhanian. Le droit sassanide ne peut se comprendre à partir du droit romain, mais seulement du droit hellénistique.

Le P. de Menasce a extrait de ce texte difficile tout ce qui regarde les feux, en donnant une transcription et une traduction impeccables de tous les passages. Il y a ajouté la traduction d'extraits du *Dātistān i dēnik* et de la *Rivāyat d'Emēt* concernant les notions de *sardārih* familiale et de *stūrih*. Il procède ensuite, sur la base de ces documents, à l'étude de cinq questions: la nomenclature des feux, le personnel des feux, la *sardārih* des feux, la *stūrih* des feux et les fondations pour l'âme.

Il y a peu de fautes d'impression: p. 49, milieu, lire Maguān Andarzpat; p. 51, ligne 10 du bas, aux trois quarts; p. 52, ligne 29, on conclura; p. 62, ligne 14, un secours; note 33, ligne 4 du bas, *ruvānakān*.

Liège

J. Duchesne-Guillemin

A[n drás] Róna-Tas, *Tibeto-Mongolica: the Tibetan loanwords of Monguor and the development of the archaic Tibetan dialects* (= *Indo-Iranian monographs*, 7). 232 pp. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó; The Hague, Mouton, 1966.

The extraordinary importance of this monograph for the study of Tibetan historical phonology, as well as for the history of the Mongol languages, has already been brought to the attention of scholars concerned with these subjects in a number of reviews; in addition to my own notice in *Language*, 44 (1968), 147-68, the following reviews have come to my attention (and there may well have been others that have escaped me): M. I. Vorobjeva-Desjatovskaja, *Narody Azii i Afriki*, 1966, 5, 189-92; R. K. Sprigg, *BSOAS*, 30 (1967), 216-17, G. Kara, *Acta Orient. Hung.*, 20 (1967), 377b-81b. Furthermore, I have had the favor of a long personal communication from Professor Róna-Tas, dated Budapest 30th September, 1968, in which he has been good enough to comment at some length on a number of points that I raised in my review published in *Language*. It may, therefore, be appropriate to utilize this additional short notice of this important work in order to comment briefly upon some of the points raised in the reviews that have appeared, and also some of the items discussed by Professor Róna-Tas in his letter.

Mme Vorobjeva-Desjatovskaja's review aims more at introducing the Russian reader to the contents of the monograph than at a critical appraisal of its contents; hence she does not go deeply into any points of detail. Nevertheless, in the course of summarizing the contents of the monograph, she does focus attention on one important matter that I must confess had escaped my attention until I saw it stressed in her review. This is the passage (pp. 187 ff.) in which Róna-Tas deals with pitch and 'tone' in the modern Tibetan dialects. When he writes, "[Y. R.] Chao (*Love songs*, p. 27) and Miller (*Writing*, p. 2) distinguished the pitch as a phonemic quality from tone, the first of which is the level of intonation, the second the sinking-rising or the change of the relative level of intonation", I am afraid he does not give a completely accurate view of what I attempted to do in my treatment of the suprasegmentals of modern spoken Tibetan,¹ or, for that matter, an accurate account of what Y. R. Chao attempted to do in his pioneering study of the Lhasa language.²

Both of us were working in the same way, along what would now be generally considered hopelessly old-fashioned Bloomfield-Bloch-Trager lines of 'phonemics'; tone, pitch, movement up, movement down, anything that the voice did that 'was not 'obviously' a 'vowel' or a 'consonant' was a 'suprasegmental'; and we grouped these 'suprasegmentals' into distinctive 'tones', or 'tonemes', according to the same body of methodological assumptions by means of which we grouped two or more 'phones' into 'phonemes'. Whether what we were doing was 'right' or 'wrong', and whether it should continue to be done that way today, would involve questions of methodology and problems in linguistic theory rather far removed from the interests of this journal, and — in these post-Chomsky days — probably outside the competence of the reviewer. But for the sake of the student who may one day wish to re-open the investigation of such matters, the point should be made — and without the review of Mme Vorobjeva-Desjatovskaja the problem would most likely have continued to escape my attention — that, most regretfully, I find Róna-Tas' description of my attempts to 'phonemicize' the Tibetan suprasegmentals a little far from the mark. But I am sure that we would both agree that, in this point in the history of Tibetan studies, what we need above everything

¹ "Studies in Spoken Tibetan, I: Phonemics", *JAOS*, 75 (1955), 46-51.

² Y. R. Chao (Jaw Yuanren) and Yu Dawchuan, *Love songs of the sixth Dalai lama Tshangs-dbyangs-rgya-mtsho* (= *Academia Sinica, National Research Institute of History and Philology Monographs*, Series A, No. 5) (Peiping, 1930).

else is not additional theoretical or analytic work on the pitifully small amount of available data, but new field-work with native speakers, and the accumulation and publication of new linguistic data, covering every facet of the language, the tones (or 'pitches', or whatever) included.

The review by R. K. Sprigg is little more than a description of the contents of the monograph, and raises no interesting points. His insistence that "W(ritten) T(ibetan) *lh-* is and presumably always has been" a digraph for a voiceless [l] (p. 217b) is no doubt correct enough, and Róna-Tas' postulation of a shift O(ld) T(ibetan) *lh-* > *hl-* (p. 128) should probably be omitted from a history of Tibetan phonology, but the point is minor, and more a question of the symbols and notation we use for our formulations than it is a problem in the history of the language.

Interestingly enough, several of the points in Róna-Tas' monograph that I thought it worthwhile to comment upon in some detail in my 1968 review were also signaled out for special attention in the review by G. Kara that appeared the year earlier; it is perhaps needless to add that the two notices were, of course, prepared independently of each other.

Thus, Kara comments especially upon Róna-Tas' etymologies #26 and #29, both of which also attracted my attention (cf. my p. 163). What Kara has to say about #26 is important, and should be taken into consideration in any future study of the problems presented by this etymology; it still seems to me that the possible effect of a Chinese intermediary form on the history of the lexical items involved should be given further consideration. In the case of #29, I am afraid that honesty now compels me to say that neither my comments in my 1968 review, nor Kara's remarks, actually shed much light on this still vexing etymology.

Another item of fortuitous coincidence between our two reviews is to be found in the treatment of the developments of original Tibetan initial *ŋ-* (Róna-Tas, p. 123-4; Kara, p. 381a; Miller, p. 165). In this connection, I now wonder if, once again, an intermediate stage of linguistic history involving loans through and from Chinese might not with profit be invoked in order to throw some light on those Tibetan dialects in which original initial *ŋ-* appears to have shifted to initial zero (though, as I pointed out in my review, the Central Tibetan form for 'camel' is not one of these). Here I particularly have in mind the zero-initial forms of modern Mandarin. "This initial, in the majority-type pronunciation, does have a slight consonantal-type obstruction in the form of a frictionless velar or uvular voiced continuant... A (large) minority of speakers use a glottal stop or a pure vocalic beginning for all words with a zero initial. A very small minority of speakers begin such words with a consonantal *ng-*..."³ This is, of course, the feature of modern Chinese pronunciation that accounts for the 'continental Sinological' transcription of the syllables that are, for Wade-Giles, *an*, as *ngan* (*Tch'ang-ngan*, etc.). Middle Chinese had both initial glottal stop and initial *ŋ-*, as well as initial zero (what Karlgren calls 'smooth vocalic ingress'), but in the history of the forms involved, there has been much analogic shifting back and forth among these categories.⁴ Perhaps we have here to deal with an areal feature, borrowed from one language family into another language family, unrelated but contiguous; or perhaps it was simply the forms that were borrowed, and re-borrowed.

Finally, it is interesting to note that Róna-Tas' remarks on the semivowel *ɥ* attracted Kara's attention (pp. 380b-381a) as they did my own, and with good reason, since they are important, and deal with a critical feature in the historic phonology of Tibetan as well as of Mongol (I return to this point shortly below).

³ Yuen Ren Chao, *A grammar of spoken Chinese* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965), pp. 26-7.

⁴ Bernhard Karlgren, *Grammata Serica* (Stockholm, 1940), p. 49.

In his personal communication of 30th September, 1968, Róna-Tas was kind enough to comment in detail on several points that I had raised in my *Language* review; and while it will unfortunately not be possible to enter here upon a detailed treatment of all these, I would still like to take the opportunity of the present notice to comment briefly upon a few of these items.

Róna-Tas suggests in his letter that my remarks concerning his etymology #199 (cf. my review, p. 163) are somewhat wide of the mark; and at this point, while I still feel that a number of complex early Altaic connections between forms is involved here, I must agree with him that my own etymological suggestions, in my review, actually oversimplified this very difficult problem, and thus tended to obscure rather than to clarify the issue. In the case of Tibetan *gur* 'tent' and its kin, we are surely in the presence of an ancient Altaic *mot voyageur*, the peregrinations of which have embraced a range of time and space so vast that they will probably always remain beyond the grasp of our comparative grammar and its methodology.

In the case of #222, Róna-Tas agrees that "the preradical of *dpar* 'form, pattern, printing-block' could be theoretically something similar to *bskal-pa* or *bcag'-chin*" — in other words, nothing more than an orthographic flourish, and totally without importance for the history of the form in Tibetan. "But", he continues, "in this peculiar case I see in the dialectal reflexes /xuar/ an argument in favour of the *dp-* initial which gives regularly *xu-* while *p-* does not." Again, I am afraid the somewhat oversimplified presentation of my review (p. 162) tended to obscure rather than to clarify the history of this important word. It was an oversimplification to write, as I did, that there is no evidence for the *d-* of *dpar* in the Tibetan dialects. The dialects show evidence for an earlier initial consonant cluster in this word. But whether the elements were *d* and *p*, as the received orthography would have us believe, is another question. I continue to find it difficult to disassociate this Tibetan form from Middle Chinese **p'an* 'id.'. Even if the Chinese form was not borrowed directly into Tibetan (which is still what I believe happened), its shape may very well have influenced the configuration of the Tibetan form, as well as its eventual semantic extension — for I think that we must all agree that there are very few historical facts as well established as the fact that printing is a Chinese invention, not a Tibetan one! The final *-r* going with Chinese *-n* has excellent parallels in a number of Chinese loans into Old and late Old Japanese; details would take us too far afield, but the materials noted long ago by S. Yoshitake, *BSOS* 7 (1935), 940-41, come immediately to mind in this connection. In the case of the initial, of course, it would have been the combination of **p* followed by the labial semivowel — for **p'* is as much a consonant cluster as *dp* or *gp* or any other sequence of two non-vocalic segments — that was originally borrowed into some early Tibetan dialect; either in this dialect or in some other one closely related to it, the form was shifted to initial *x'*-; and later still, the orthographic combination *dp* was employed to write this initial of the Tibetan form, the form that of course directly underlies the Monguor forms *xuor* and *xuar* cited and studied by Róna-Tas. The point is worth making again, and I would hope here with more clarity than in my original review, if only to obviate any possibility of survival for Shafer's thesis that the initial *dp-* of Tibetan *dpar* is to be taken as an indication that the technique of wood-block printing originated not in China, but in Tibet. And of course the existence of WT *dpe* 'pattern, model, type, form, custom, example', that is borrowed as Monguor *xue* 'parable, comparison, story', cannot but have played an important role in the development of the Monguor and other non-Tibetan versions of this word.

About #464 (cf. my p. 153), Róna-Tas writes me, "the problem with *rëGul* 'winter' is the final *-l*, and it seems to me that this is due to a contamination with Mong. *egül*. If so, then *egül* has influenced an earlier Monguor **rëGun* and not a Tibetan *rgun*. Naturally the *Mahāvīyutpatti* form is of the highest importance and shows that the Monguor **rëGun* goes back to a Tibetan *rgun* which can be ascertained as early as the *Mahāvīyut-*

patti.” This is in response to my citing the form *rgun* from *Mhv.* 9282, a form that seemed to me to render unnecessary the hypothetical form **reGun* that Róna-Tas reconstructed to account for the shape of the initial in the Monguor form. To be sure, the final *-l* of the Monguor form does present a problem in associating the form with its Tibetan etymology, but I did not comment upon it because the problem seemed to me to be completely dealt with in Róna-Tas’ footnote 65 to his p. 77, where he helpfully reported that in response to his inquiry to ascertain whether or not the form in question might simply be a misprint (it can be cited from only a single passage in a single text, at least from among published materials), Professor Schröder had replied that this and all other examples of this word in his still unpublished materials “are in the genitive: *regunni*”. From this I concluded that the Monguor form to be considered here is not actually *rëGul* but *rëGun*, and that the form *rëGul* was nothing more than an ad hoc creation of an artificial isolation form by Schröder’s informant(s), either made up ad lib, or with the final *-l* indeed due to contamination with Mongol *egül*, but at any rate not appearing in the texts and hence not meriting further consideration. In the meantime, it is interesting to note that another citation of WT *rgun* ‘winter’ has now come to light, and that from an unexpected quarter. It is to be found in the Paris – Société asiatique Ms. (of K’ang-hsi date) of the *Hsi-fan-kuan i-yü*, now edited, published, and studied in detail by Nishida Tatsuo.⁵ The form is item #100 as numbered by Nishida, and appears on p. 85 of his publication; the Paris Ms. has *rgyun* in Tibetan script, but the transcription of the Tibetan pronunciation into Chinese characters makes it clear that a form [rgun] was intended, and as Nishida suggests, the *-y-* in the writing *rgyun* is surely nothing but an example of dittography, anticipated from WT *rgyun-du* ‘always’, which is #121 (on the same p. 85 in Nishida’s edition). Nishida, who certainly now knows more about these Ming-Ch’ing interpreters’ and translators’ vocabularies than any other scholar in the field, claims that the Paris Ms. represents a “15th century Literary Tibetan from the Amdo region”, the language that he calls his “Seibango A [i.e., Hsi-fan-yü A]”. The appearance of the form *rgun* in this source, where its pronunciation is attested by a (for once) unambiguous Chinese transcription, represents a valuable falling-together of several diverse sources of data.

In #560, my review questioned the proposed pattern of semantic development; Róna-Tas writes, “the semantic development ‘to make dry, lean, meagre’ > ‘to lose weight, to be meagre’ remains clear for me; to be meagre, thin is e.g. in the case of meat synonymous with dry, at least in some languages, among them in Hungarian.” His remark is valuable, but it shows again in rather sharp relief the insecure areas we all tread when we become involved in ‘patterns of semantic development’, for what will seem perfectly obvious to one person (most usually because of some relationship, actual or supposed, between forms in his own language) will never occur to another (whose own language may not have any parallel related forms). It is an area of linguistic speculation in which, most unfortunately, almost anything is equally possible, and almost anything becomes equally probable, if we think about it longer. This is what I intended to point out in my original review, nothing more; but I still think the point is worth stressing. And much the same still holds true for #772, which etymology Róna-Tas was also good enough to mention in his letter.

⁵ Nishida Tatsuo, *Seibankan yakugo no kenkyū, Chibetto gengogaku josetsu* (= Kaiyaku-gengo kenkyū sōsho, I) (Kyōto, 1970). This publication represents a continuation of Professor Nishida’s work with these materials, begun with the publication of his paper “Jūroku seiki ni okeru Seikōshō Chibettogo Tenzen hōgen ni tsuite — Kango-Chibettogo tangoshū iwaiyuru Heishūbon ‘Seibankan yakugo’ no kenkyū”, *Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Kiyō*, 7 (1963), 85-174. As late as my 1968 review of the Róna-Tas monograph, I was still misreading ‘Seibankan’ as ‘Saibankan’, as for example on p. 167 of that review, a long-standing error of mine that was finally pointed out to me by Professor Nishida when I last saw him in Kyōto, in the summer of 1969.

Finally, Róna-Tas' letter again directs my attention to a number of important problems, each too involved to be considered here in anything resembling a complete manner, but concerning which I would like to comment briefly as follows:

1. In connection with my remarks (pp. 154-5) on the possibility of influences by way of non-NE Tibetan loans, Róna-Tas writes as follows: "In Buddhist terminology learned borrowings and in everyday business life the Tibetan koiné had surely an important influence — not to speak about pilgrims. I was surprised, nevertheless, [to find in my study] that most of the Monguor forms showed neither literary nor Central Tibetan or Lhasa items as their immediate source." This is an important point, and very well-taken; and the remarks in my review (which still, I think, are of value) should certainly be read with this statement in mind.

2. In connection with my remarks (pp. 156-7) on the problems presented by the labial semivowel μ in Monguor loanwords from Tibetan, Róna-Tas expresses himself as remaining unconvinced by my arguments, and suggests that "we have here to do with an areal phenomenon". This seems to me a most important suggestion, and one that should be followed up by future students of the problem, though I still do not see why the development of a labialized velar phoneme from an earlier labial-plus-velar sequence should present any particular difficulties of interpretation.

3. In connection with my remarks (p. 158) on vowel-harmony assimilations in Tibetan forms underlying Monguor loans, Róna-Tas writes as follows: "The possibility of reflecting Tibetan vowel harmony features by Monguor forms is made difficult by the fact that vowel harmony is an essential part of the phonological system of any Mongolian language, so naturally also of Monguor. The so-called 'breaking' can also be taken into account in such cases as *araDaG*, *murGuō*, *šūro*, etc." The comments in my review should have paid more considered attention to the implications of the Mongol phonological canon than they did, and the point that Róna-Tas makes is of importance in any future consideration of these issues.

4. In connection with my remarks (p. 159) on the importance of the problem of morpheme-boundaries in Tibetan compounds, Róna-Tas points out that his etymology #285, Mgr. *lisGa* 'work, deed, custom' can only be explained in the light of a morpheme-division different from that of WT *las-dka*, var. *las-ka*, i.e., as *li-sGa* < **la(s)-ska*, an important example that had until now escaped my attention. But on my suggestion with regard to the morpheme-segmentation of WT *rdor-rje* 'vajra-sceptre', Róna-Tas writes, "I do not think that a segmentation *rdor-je* can be justified." Since the suggestion that the forms in the living Tibetan languages point in the direction of an earlier *rdor-je*, rather than toward the segmentation of the form in the received orthography, WT *rdor-rje*, is one that I have tentatively put forth in the literature several times since 1955 (references in my review, p. 159), a few additional lines here in support of such a view may not be out of order. The problem is, to be sure, essentially concerned with the internal morpheme boundaries of the form, in historical terms, but it does not stop there, since the initials of each of the two morphemes, and especially of the first, are equally critical in the problem. Briefly, the most important considerations that enter into the question are the following:

(a) If the Tibetan form that historically is responsible for Mgr. *DuorǾǾi*, var. *DorǾǾi* 'vajra-sceptre' is correctly represented by the received orthography of WT *rdor-rje*, either the initial of the first morpheme, or the initial of the second morpheme, must be anomalous in terms of its historical development. In the Monguor loans, original Tibetan *r-* before *-C-* either is retained as such, or otherwise appears in transparent guise as *š-* or *ś-*: if we center our attention solely on forms with original initial *rd-*, and *-o-* vocalism (and hence exactly parallel to the phonological configuration of the form at issue), we find WT *rd^o/o*, Mgr. *šD-* (Róna-Tas, p. 91), WT *rdor^o-bum*, Mgr. *rǾD-* (p. 77), WT *rdog*, Mgr. *arD-* (p. 40), WT *rdon^o-rgan*, Mgr. *rD-* (p. 75), and WT *ʼl^odor-mo*, Mgr. *šD-* (p. 91). This is why Róna-Tas writes, "OT *r--* [appears as]

... *r*- before every radical in every position ...; *ar*- in the first syllable [in a single form]; *ʃ*- before non-palatal or non-palatalized radicals in every position ...; [and] *ʃ*- before palatal or palatalized radicals ..." (p. 138). But the Monguor form for 'vajra-sceptre' has only initial *D(u)*-, not **rëD*-, or any other overt indication of an original *r*- before -*C*- in its representation of the initial of this form.

(b) Nor do any of the dialect forms that can be cited for 'vajra-sceptre' give any hint of an original *r*- before -*C*- in this word. Those forms that can be cited, and that usually are given (as for example, in Róna-Tas, p. 45, #93), are not dialect reflexes of the form 'vajra-sceptre'; they are dialect reflexes of the word for 'stone', e.g. Bal. *rdoah*, Pur. *rdoa*, Lad. *rdoa*, all 'stone'. They go, of course, with WT *rdo* 'id.'. The same is true, it is worth noting, of the fifteenth-century linguistic data represented by Nishida's 'Seibango A', where WT *rd*- before -*o*- is regularly and uniformly represented in the pronunciation-transcriptions into Chinese characters in the Paris - Société asiatique Ms. as [rd], with the single exception of the form 'vajra-sceptre', where we find anomalous [d]:

# and page in Nishida	WT	Pronunciation-transcription
#53, p. 83	<i>rdo</i>	[rdo]
#905, p. 118	<i>rdo(-mthiñ)</i>	[rdo]
#483, p. 100	<i>rdo (rin-po-che)</i>	[rdo]
#936, p. 120	<i>rdog(-cig)</i>	[rdo]
#283, p. 92	<i>rdo-rje</i>	[do-rd3e]

(c) On the basis of these data, either of two equally satisfactory conclusions is possible:

(α) the etymological identification of the first morpheme in the Tibetan word for 'vajra-sceptre' suggested by the received Tibetan orthography, by which this first morpheme is taken to be identical with the word for 'stone', is not, in historical fact, to be maintained; or,

(β) *rdo-rje* came into Monguor, and into the 'Seibango A' language, and so also into most (if not all) the modern Tibetan dialects (resp. languages), not as a regular genetic inheritance but rather as a loan from some earlier dialect, now otherwise apparently lost, in which the *r*- element in the initial *rC*- had been simplified to zero; but this would necessarily have been a dialect quite different historically from that responsible for the bulk of the Monguor loans.

(d) But in the meantime, and regardless of whether (α) or (β) above is elected, the phonological canons of the modern dialects known to me, and particularly of modern Central Tibetan and Lhasa, determine that a historical development from a *rdor-je* segmentation is regular, while a development from the received *rdo-rje* segmentation is anomalous.

(e) Even apart from all this, that a sequence *rdor* is something more than an abstraction arrived at solely on the basis of linguistic evidence, may easily be demonstrated by a consideration of the shape of the morpheme WT *rdor*, which appears as a combining-form for *rdo-rje*, as for example in *phyag-rdor* 'vajrapāṇi', the compendious equivalent of *Mhv.* 649, *phyag-na rdo-rje* 'id.'. Nor may it be suggested that this is a mere lexicographer's ghost; for in fact, Róna-Tas (pp. 45, 95) twice cites чадуръ 'id.' from the *Tangutsko-Tibetskaja okraina*, II, of G. N. Potanin (where it appears in text J, 'from an unnamed Tangut'). A simplification *phyag-na rdor-je* > *phyag-rdor* is regular; *phyag-na rdo-rje* > *phyag-rdor* is anomalous; hence, I opt for the former. This, incidentally, remains true whether we think in terms of an original *rdor-rje* > *rdor-je*, or an original *rdor-je* with no prior assimilation and simplification -*r-rj*- > -*r-j*-. And so both varieties of evidence, linguistic and philological, point in the direction of final -*r* in the prior morpheme, rather than an open-syllable in -*o* with initial *r*- in the next morpheme.

(f) Finally, on this important word, I would in addition be tempted to point out

that the *-u-* of Mgr. *DuorǾŹi*, otherwise unexplained, goes quite regularly with the **-v-* that I ventured to reconstruct in **rdva* 'stone' on the basis of totally independent evidence (*ZDMG*, 106 [1956], 351; cf. Róna-Tas, p. 45, n. 12), were it not for the fact that, with such an explanation, we would return full-circle to the traditional identification of the first morpheme in 'vajra-sceptre' with the word for 'stone', and at this stage at least I am not particularly anxious to support that identification, for the reasons set forth above. If such an identification is historically correct, then my 1956 reconstruction has obvious value in explaining the otherwise anomalous *-u-* of the Monguor form; but if it is not, then the coincidence of the forms is fortuitous.

5. In connection with my remarks (pp. 160-62) on problems in phonemic theory and terminology, Róna-Tas now points out to me in his letter something that I am sure both of us can only heartily agree upon — namely, that our field is now and probably always will be a long way from having a uniform phonological methodology for historical problems, reflected in a uniform terminology, and that if we wished to engage in the creation of new linguistic terms, the field of historical Tibetan phonology would provide if anything a too-rich area for such endeavors. Fortunately, I note that neither of us shows much inclination to indulge in such activities, both wishing to reserve our time and energies for more productive work. In commenting on my remarks relating to the phonemic role, within the original Tibetan orthography, of the graph generally transliterated *h*, Róna-Tas writes in his letter, that "... some reason has to be given for the fact that the Tibetan orthography — which was not phonemic — chose the same symbol for different phonemes". Much of this discussion clearly hinges upon what each of us means by 'phonemic' — and just as clearly, each of us means something rather different — but in terms of what 'phonemic' means to me (and that, I fear, is not very much different from what it meant to Bloomfield and Bloch, nor in any way 'advanced' over their views), the Tibetan orthography *was* phonemic, and, as I wrote in 1968, "the decision to lump together two phonetic entities in complementary distribution, one an initial voiced velar spirant, the other a homorganic nasal initial in consonant clusters, under a single phoneme, WT *h*, is a phonemic decision as old as the Tibetan script".

Ordinarily, I do not believe there is much point in multiple reviews of a single title by the same hand; but I have broken my own rule on this occasion in part because the kind offer of the editors of the *III* provided an opportunity to follow-up on at least a few of the many important problems treated in this monograph, particularly in the light of the other reviews, and especially in the light of my subsequent correspondence with Professor Róna-Tas himself. But mostly, I have been motivated by my high regard for this monograph, and my appreciation of its great scientific value for the entire field of Tibetan linguistic studies. One cannot but agree most heartily with Professor Kara's encomium, which I take the liberty of citing in conclusion, as representing most accurately my own views: "En fin de compte, on ne peut que souhaiter la naissance de nouveaux travaux pareils aux *Tibeto-Mongolica* dont l'importance est incontestable pour les recherches sur la linguistique comparative des dialectes tibétains, terre presque inculte auparavant. Il n'est pas douteux, le livre est un nouveau poteau indicateur à la frontière tibéto-mongole." (*Acta Orient. Hung.* 20 [1967], 281b).

Seattle

Roy Andrew Miller

M. Andronov, *A Standard Grammar of Modern and Classical Tamil*. Translated by the author from the original Russian (U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences – Institute of Oriental Studies). Foreworded by S. K. Chat-terji and T. P. Meenakshisundaran. Madras, 1969. xii, 342 pp. Rs. 15.00.

Unter den zahlreichen Werken, mit denen sich M. S. Andronov um die Dravidistik verdient gemacht hat, ragen *Dravidijskie jazyki (Jazyki Narodov Azii i Afriki.)* (Moskva, Akademija Nauk SSSR — Institut Narodov Azii, 1965) und *Grammatika Tamilskogo jazyka* (Moskva, Akademija Nauk SSSR — Institut Narodov Azii 1966) besonders hervor. Es ist ausserordentlich zu begrüßen, dass letzteres Buch jetzt durch eine gute englische Übersetzung einem grösseren Interessentenkreise zugänglich ist. Die englische Ausgabe hat darüber hinaus den Vorzug, dass durchweg die Original-Tamil-Schrift zusammen mit einer "breiten" phonetischen Umschrift, aus der man die phonemische Schreibung selbst unschwer ableiten kann, verwendet worden ist. Das Erscheinen einer modernen Tamil-Grammatik kommt einem echten Bedürfnis entgegen. Die älteren Arbeiten, wie die von A. H. Arden, *A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil* (Madras, 1934) und H. Beythan, *Praktische Grammatik der Tamilsprache* (Leipzig, 1943), reichen bei weitem nicht aus, so gut sie an sich sein mögen. Es handelt sich bei ihnen weniger um die zum Teil verständlicherweise veraltete Methode der Sprachbeschreibung als vielmehr darum, dass sie der verwirrenden Vielschichtigkeit des Tamil nicht gerecht werden. Das Tamil ist, ähnlich wie zahlreiche andere indische Sprachen, gewissermassen drei- oder sogar vierdimensional: Es sind nicht nur die verschiedenen Sprach-epochen (alt, mittel, modern) und räumlich gegliederte Dialekte zu unterscheiden, sondern eine immens grosse Rolle spielt auch der Unterschied zwischen Schrift- und Umgangssprache sowie der der einzelnen sozialen Schichten des Volkes (Brahmanendialekt usw.). Arden bringt nur "Common Tamil", Beythans Basis ist etwas umfangreicher; er führt auch die alten literarischen Formen (deutlich gekennzeichnet durch ≠) an; aber voll berücksichtigt diese Vielschichtigkeit erst Andronov in seiner trefflichen Grammatik. Gewiss liegen zur Zeit bereits verschiedene Sonderarbeiten über einzelne soziale und räumliche Dialekte, auch über die Besonderheiten der Sprache bestimmter alter Texte vor, aber es fehlte bislang eine übersichtliche Zusammenfassung in einer handlichen Grammatik.

Der Verfasser ist nicht den hypermodernen Methoden vieler jetziger Linguisten gefolgt, was kein Fehler sein dürfte. Die Hauptsache ist schliesslich die adäquate Beschreibung der Sprache, und die ist hier geleistet worden. Neben der Berücksichtigung der Vielschichtigkeit gruppiert und ordnet Andronov den Stoff zum Teil anders als seine Vorgänger, bringt zahlreiche neue Gesichtspunkte hinein und beleuchtet manche Einzelheit dieser interessanten Sprache erstmalig. Sehr begrüßenswert wird es der Leser finden, dass alle Daten durch Beispiele aus den verschiedensten literarischen Werken belegt werden; dadurch wird die Darstellung ungemein lebendig und die Lektüre des Buches zur Freude.

Im folgenden wollen wir verschiedene Punkte der Grammatik berühren und einige ergänzende Bemerkungen einflechten.

1. Bezüglich der Vokale folgt Andronov der Tradition sowie auch der Auffassung verschiedener moderner Dravidologen und setzt lange-Vokale (ā ī ū ē ō) gesondert an. Da aber Geminaten in der Sprache zahlreich sind (kk, tt usw.), wäre es günstig, auch bei den Vokalen Geminaten anzunehmen, wie es schon J. R. Firth (im Anhang bei Arden) tat: /aa ii uu ee oo/. Die Fuge muss dann gegebenenfalls bezeichnet werden: maraa-aṭi oder maraa'aṭi (p. 57). Als "speech-sounds" führt Andronov zusätzlich die nichtphonemischen retroflexen Vokale ɨ ɛ ɔ und überkurze Vokale ɪ ʊ (besser wäre die Schreibung ü) an. ɪ wird von Beythan nicht erwähnt.

2. Sehr eindrucksvoll ist das lückenlose System der Verschluss/Reibelaute mit je drei

Gliedern pro Phonem. Dazu kommt jeweils ein Nasal. Die Nasale sind ausser η phonemisch:

p	t	ʈ	ʈ	c	k
b	d	ɖ	ɖ	j	g
β	ð	ɾ	ɾ	s	x
m	n	ɳ	ɳ	ɲ	ɳ

[ɾ] für intervokalisches /t/ fehlt bei Beythan. Vielleicht handelt es sich hier um eine ganz junge Entwicklung, die aber nicht ausnahmslos eingetreten ist; es findet sich in dieser Position auch [ɖ]. Bei /k/ wären nicht nur die Allophonē [k g x] zu vermerken, sondern, wie Beythan angibt, noch zusätzlich das palatale [ç] und das stimmhafte [ɣ]; auch stimmhaftes [ŋ] kommt vor. Letzteres ist auch die gewöhnliche Aussprache für (Grantha-) h, das auf keinen Fall mit x transliteriert werden sollte (p. 9), weil x die passende Schreibung für aaytam ist, ein Graphem, das Beythan weniger gut durch k wiedergibt. — Als Transliteration schreibt Andronov für den alveolaren Verschluss/Reibelaut der Tradition folgend ɾ, als Phonem setzt er hingegen sehr richtig /t/ an (p. 32). Besser wäre in beiden Fällen die Schreibung mit ʈ. Vorzuschlagen wäre auch die Phonemansetzung /ɾ/ statt /z/ (und konsequenterweise dann [ð] statt [ɾ]). /n/ und /ɳ/ sind nach Andronov Phoneme, da intervokalisch beide Laute vorkommen, z.B. vallunaŋ 'starker Mann', paŋai 'Weinpalme', vgl. p. 20f. — So ergäbe sich ein ganz einheitliches Phonemsystem:

/i e a o u/	/p	t	ʈ	ʈ	c	k/
	/m	n	ɳ	ɳ	ɲ	/
	/	l	ɭ			/
	/v	r	ɾ	y		/

Dazu /aa/ usw. wie /tt/ usw., /ai au/ wie /nt/ usw.

3. Im Umgangs-Tamil fehlen die Phoneme ʈ, ɳ, z, ai, au. Dafür gibt es ə, æ, æ̃ und die nasalierten Laute ə̃, ã, ẽ, õ, ẽ̃, õ̃. Phonemisch sind nach Andronov nur æ, æ̃, ã, ẽ, õ, ẽ̃, õ̃. Doch scheint es, dass man ɾ aussondern kann und mit /m/ oder /n/ gleichsetzen, vgl. marəm (p. 25) = marẽ (p. 26) = marã (p. 28) 'Baum'; avən = avõ 'er'. Dann hätte das Umgangs-Tamil letztlich nur ein Phonem, das das literarische Tamil nicht kennt, nämlich /æ/ (da æ̃ = æə ist).

4. Sehr wichtig ist der Abschnitt über die Betonung, die Andronov genau untersucht hat. Sie ist im wesentlichen frei, lokalisiert, quantitativ-dynamisch.

5. Ebenfalls bedeutsam ist das Kapitel über Morpho- und Syntaktophonemik, von Andronov "Liaison" genannt. Trotz der meisterhaften Bearbeitung wird man nicht in allen Punkten dem Autor zustimmen. P. 44 z.B. wird angegeben: l + t = ɳt; l + t = ɳt; l + tt = tt; l + tt = tt (beim Verb). In anderen Fällen (p. 43) gilt aber l + t = tt; l + t = tt. Diese Doppelentwicklung anzunehmen ist unnötig, wenn man bei den Verben ansetzt l + nt = ɳt; l + nt = ɳt. Die betreffenden Verben gehören nicht zur Klasse I, wie Beythan und andere anführen, sondern zur Klasse II (vgl. Beythan p. 83), also z.B. kol 'töten', koŋteŋ 'ich tötete' aus kol-nt-eŋ, gebildet wie aŋi 'wissen', aŋiteŋ 'ich wusste' (aŋi-nt-eŋ).

6. "Euphonic sounds and syllables (increments)" werden p. 51 angegeben, nämlich a, att, am, aŋt, aŋ, u, tt, y, v und andere. Ausser u, y und v handelt es sich aber wohl um besondere ursprünglich bedeutungstragende Morpheme, für die die Benennung "Zwischenglieder" (Beythan) gut passt. Ausser u, y, v und vielleicht auch a sind sie sicher nicht eu-phonisch. Der Obliquus zu maram 'Baum', maratt- (p. 52), ebenso der zu naat(u) 'Land', naatt(u)- (p. 70) zeigt wohl kaum einen euphonen Zusatz -tt-, sondern eher ein ursprünglich demonstratives, artikelähnliches t(u), vgl. a-t(u) 'es'.

*m-t wurde dann über *n-t (vielleicht durch Stufenwechsel, der allerdings hier unklar bleibt), zu tt, *t-t zu tt: *maram-t(u) > *maran-t(u) und schliesslich maratt(u), ganz entsprechend der Entwicklung *naat-t(u) > naatt(u). Vortrefflich bei Andronov ist indes, dass die Zwischenglieder alle übersichtlich zusammengestellt worden sind. Sehr wertvoll sind ferner die Angaben über den Sandhi im Umgangs-Tamil.

7. Die Morphologie ist meisterhaft und sehr ausführlich behandelt. Andronov unterscheidet zehn Redeteile; neben den üblichen noch persönliche Nomina, imitative und Echo-Wörter. Beim Nomen bietet u.a. die Tabelle der Nominalbasen pp. 72-74 eine gute Übersicht. Die Anordnung der Deklination geschieht nach strukturellen Grundsätzen, nicht nach den herkömmlichen, die durch die Sanskrit-Grammatik beeinflusst sind. So wird zwischen Komitativ und Instrumental durchweg geschieden (p. 79), und die eigentlich syntaktischen Verbindungen mit uṭaiya, -iliruntu usw. sind nicht mit aufgenommen worden, was durchaus richtig ist. Einen Hinweis auf diese Formen hätte man allerdings gern gesehen.

8. Sehr charakteristisch für das Tamil sind die persönlichen Nomina (pp. 122ff.), im Tamil kuṭippuviṇai 'heimliches Verb' genannt, z.B. nallaal 'sie, die gut ist' oder 'eine gute Frau', teevariir 'ihr, die ihr (ähnlich) Götter(n) seid'. Beythan übersetzt diese Ausdrücke mit 'sie ist gut' bzw. 'ihr seid Gott' = 'du o Gott' (p. 123; p. 127). Es handelt sich um alte Wortsätze, wie sie auch in Mundasprachen vorkommen. Die persönlichen Nomina bilden das Bindeglied zu den Adjektiven, die ursprünglich Neutrum-Formen, 3. Person Pluralis von persönlichen Nomina waren, wie Andronov ausführt.

9. Beim Verbum geht Andronov in Übereinstimmung mit den einheimischen Grammatikern von der Form des Verbalnomens auf (t)tal aus. Dann unterscheidet er bei den Verben jeweils zwei Stämme, von denen der eine suffixlos ist, der andere k oder kk aufweist. Auf diese Weise können z.B. die von Beythan und anderen als (k)ki(n)ṭ angesetzten Präsenssuffixe in (k)k + i(n)ṭ aufgelöst werden. Auch auf die Einteilung der Verben in Klassen verzichtet Andronov auf Grund dieser Interpretation des Materials. Ob diese Auffassung sich durchsetzen und anerkannt werden wird, bleibt abzuwarten. Hilfreich für den Leser wäre es gewesen, wenn der Autor das Problem der Klasseneinteilung wenigstens kurz erörtert hätte. Durch die ausführlichen Konjugationsmuster pp. 215-243 wird man indes weitgehend entschädigt.

10. Von hervorragendem Wert ist das Kapitel über die Syntax. Die Quellenangabe bei den Beispielsätzen ist hier natürlich besonders nützlich.

11. Die Textübersetzungen sind sehr akkurat durchgeführt worden. Eine Ausnahme sei erwähnt: etirikaḷ aranmaṇai veelaikkaararilee cilarai vacamaakki 'his enemies, having won over the palace servants...' (p. 183). Besser: "Die Feinde, die einige der Palastdiener bestochen hatten".

Abschliessend sei betont: Wer sich jetzt mit dem Tamil beschäftigt, wird sicherlich zuerst zu Andronovs hervorragendem Werk greifen. Dem Autor gebührt unser aller Dank, dass er uns diese wichtige indische Sprache in ihrer Vielschichtigkeit nähergebracht hat.

Heinz-Jürgen Pinnow

Current Trends in Linguistics, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, Volume 5: *Linguistics in South Asia*. The Hague-Paris, Mouton, 1969. XVIII + 814 pp.

This fifth volume of the well-known series, dedicated to South Asia, shows once more the immense importance of *Current Trends in Linguistics*. That the master plan could be realized so far is largely due to the generous financial support of three U.S. federal agencies. The period covered by this survey is in general from about 1947 to 1966,

although a few references to publications of 1968 occur. The large majority of the contributors belong to the generation born in the twenties and the early thirties, the older generation being represented by Renou, Burrow, Clark and Emeneau only.

Although there naturally is an undeniable difference in quality and in general character between the various chapters, most of them are of a high standard. For future research this general survey of what has been done and is being done in the field, with frequent indications of the gaps in our knowledge and the most urgent problems that wait for a solution, will be indispensable as a starting point. The extensive bibliographical references will no doubt prove extremely useful. The circumstance that this book is the first to give a comprehensive account of the recent amazing development of Dravidian studies contributes much to its importance. Studies in the field of the Munda languages cannot compare with those in Dravidian because of their smaller number, their cultural background and the amount of work done (or, at least, published). Still, this work, too, has only started in the last few decades and the general survey here given is one of the first to appear in print.

The book is divided into four parts. Part One ("Indo-Aryan Languages") consists of fourteen chapters, Part Two ("Dravidian Languages") of six, Part Three ("Other Language Families") of three only, while Part Four ("Linguistics and Related Fields in South Asia") comprises as many as eleven chapters. Only a few of these thirty-four chapters can briefly be mentioned here.

In Part One Thomas Burrow, to whom the task of surveying the linguistic publications on Sanskrit was assigned, begins his contribution with the words "The progress of Sanskrit studies in the last twenty years is characterised by no striking new developments." He then gives an almost exhaustive and fair report on publications in the various departments of phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicography. The last category is perhaps treated somewhat more elaborately than might seem necessary in view of the exhaustive and detailed bibliography (pp. 19-35, as long as the article), which gives a most useful enumeration of all the publications in this field.

In "Comparative Indo-Aryan" Gordon H. Fairbanks gives in seven pages (pp. 36-45) a historical survey of the earlier stages of comparative studies in Middle and New Indo-Aryan languages, starting from Beames (1872-1879) via Jules Bloch (1933) to modern developments, but the function of this chapter in the general plan of this book is not sufficiently clear. Ernest Bender's account of Middle Indo-Aryan could be brief (about three pages, but with a "selected bibliography" of four pages). Out of the eleven chapters on the New Indo-Aryan languages an arbitrary choice must be made. Vladimir Miltner's chapter on Hindi (pp. 55-84) is particularly useful on account of its enumeration of the many Russian contributions, most of which are not easily accessible to scholars working outside the East European bloc. Besides it gives a reasoned account of the numerous Indian publications written in Hindi and other Indian as well as Western languages. In conclusion he quotes K. Ch. Bahl as saying that "the grammatical treatises on Hindi lack any scientific coherence". Kali Charan Bahl's article on Panjabi (pp. 153-200) contains a theoretical treatment of high standard of the verbal system. Incidentally he remarks (p. 175) that "the investigation of compound verbs seems to have reached a dead end" and (p. 181) that "there is no way to understand the nature of modification of the meaning of the main verb by means of a subsidiary verb without first knowing what the meaning of the main verb (i.e. the lexical content in our sense of the term) really is". In his conclusion (p. 195f.), he states that scholars "have never understood the difference between the colloquial and literary aspects of the language. Consequently the scientific investigation of Panjabi is beset with discussions on language vs. dialect, spoken vs. written language, colloquial vs. literary standards, linguistic descriptions vs. nonlinguistic or extralinguistic considerations, and so on... The grammars of the language describe it only superficially.

The dictionaries are not only unable to catch up with the numerous literary usages that are coming into the language every day, they have left out a whole lot of lexical stock of tadbhava origin. Historical and comparative studies are based on second hand sources, and dialect studies are almost nonexistent. A serious scientific investigation aiming at sufficiently deep and exhaustive description of the language in any one of these aspects, is yet to begin."

As regards M. W. Sugathapala de Silva's chapter on Sinhalese (pp. 235-248) special mention may be made of his account of Vedda and Rodiya. On p. 246f. he states that "Vedda and Rodiya are not dialects of Sinhalese. Vedda is a creole with much Sinhalese influence, and Rodiya is a secret language in which non-Sinhalese lexical items are used in Sinhalese structures. Any dialect survey of Sinhalese should treat these two speeches separately. Sufficient work has already been done on Vedda, but Rodiya needs further investigation. As most "secret" words used by the Rodiyas are very different from Sinhalese or Tamil, it would be interesting to search for the origin of such words." The same is true of Vedda, which according to de Silva is "a creole based on an older Vedda language with Sinhalese as the second contributing factor". Some additional data for Vedda are communicated by Hettiaratchi on p. 743. Both languages would seem particularly important for a correct linguistic analysis of the so-called Munda language Nihali (see below, and cf. Kuiper, *Nahali*, p. 114, where a paper by Wilhelm Geiger on a "Gaunersprache" in Ceylon is quoted as a parallel to Nahali).

Braj B. Kachru, in his very instructive survey of "Kashmiri and other Dardic languages" (pp. 284-306), states (p. 286) that "The question of the final affiliation of the Dardic family of languages has not yet been answered." In his opinion there is not "much authentic linguistic evidence" in support of the views of Grierson or Morgenstierne. This sceptical attitude of a scholar who is intimately acquainted with the material and the problems it raises should be a warning to all those who try, on the basis of the available material, to form an opinion on the historical relations of the Kafir languages to the Indo-Iranian family. As Morgenstierne was the first to point out (*NTS*, 13 [1945], p. 235) the question may be raised if not certain specific Kafir characteristics point to a very early separation of Kafir from the proto-Indo-Iranian group. [It should be observed that even the notion of a common Indo-Iranian period in Western Asia has been questioned. See Kaj Barr, *Illustreret Religionshistorie* (redigeret af J. A. Asmussen og J. Læssøe), p. 242, who assumes two successive waves of immigration from South Russia, first of the Proto-Indians and later of the Proto-Iranians. If, on the other hand, archaeologists like H. D. Sankalia are right in dating the arrival of the Aryans in India about 2000 B. C. (e.g., *Munshi Indol. Fel. Vol.*, p. 233) this would put the period of a common culture too far back to account for the many parallels in the poetic diction of the Rigvedic poets and Zarathustra (Bernfried Schlerath, *Awesta-Wörterbuch, Vorarbeiten*, II, p. 148ff.). See also Morgenstierne, *NTS*, 13, pp. 234-238.] As far as Kachru is concerned, it should be kept in mind that he is referring to "authentic linguistic evidence", which in his opinion is lacking, and that according to him "Morgenstierne's work ... leaves much to be desired" (p. 285 n. 2), a judgment that would probably not have surprised Morgenstierne himself in view of the very uncommon circumstances under which he at times had to collect his material. Anyway, Kachru's reservations deserve notice since several Indo-Europeanists have drawn far-going conclusions from some data communicated by Morgenstierne (see the references in *III*, 10, p. 103 n. 4). Kachru concludes his survey with the statement that "the research in Kashmiri and other Dardic languages has made practically no serious progress in the last two decades".

Part Two is devoted to the Dravidian Languages (pp. 309-408). Bhadriraju Krishnamurti reports on "Comparative Dravidian Studies" (pp. 309-333), an indispensable

survey for all Dravidologists. The Dravidian family is said to consist of "ca. 22 languages spoken by about 110 million people in South Asia". He arrives at this number in spite of the fact that he takes Ollari and Gadaba as different languages. In his historical survey a tribute is rightly paid to L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar. What this scholar has achieved, managing to remain in contact with what was being done outside India in spite of the relative isolation in which it was his fate to work, shows that he was an outstanding and original scholar. Krishnamurti's judgment of the work of that generation is reasonable and fair. He even finds something to praise in E. H. Tuttle's publications. In his excellent survey of recent publications (primarily those by Emeneau and Burrow) occurs his thought-provoking suggestion of reconstructing a Proto-Dravidian laryngeal (or *h*-type of sound) in the demonstrative and interrogative stems **iH-*, **uH-*, **aH-* and **ya-/eH-* to account for the unexpected vocalism in Kui, Kuvi and Brahui and for *h* in Kuvi. [As for the glottal stop in Kuvi, Kui (dialectally), Koṇḍa and Gondi (dialectally) Burrow and Bhattacharya, *III*, 6 (1962-63), p. 243, consider it to be "presumably of fairly recent origin", ancient Tamil having anticipated this development by its *āytam* which, accordingly, is not historically connected with the Central Dravidian developments.] Krishnamurti points to the forms *gī* for *i*, *gā* for *ā* and *gē* for *ē* in low class Telugu of Telangāṇa, for which he assumes **H* > *g*, parallel to Old Tamil *eHku* 'steel' > colloquial mod. Tamil *eggī* (p. 320). As his notation *eHku* shows, Krishnamurti identifies the Old Tamil *āytam* with his reconstructed PDr. phoneme /H/. He, however, overlooks the fact that the distribution of the OTa. *āytam* is entirely different from that of his reconstructed /H/. Mod.Ta. *eggī* with its curious intervocalic [g:] may be hard to explain in detail but there can be no doubt that it represents a particular development of /k/, which may or may not have been conditioned by the preceding *āytam*. Since the *āytam* must have disappeared from living speech at a very early period, it is not easy to imagine a straight-line development from OTa. *ehku* to *eggī*. The Tranquebar Dictionary gives *eku* by the side of *ehku* (instead of **ekku*, which would be the normal representation). However that may be, the colloquial form *eggī* ~~can~~ hardly prove anything in this connection, no matter how OTa. *ehku*, without cognates in Dravidian, can be explained. On the other hand, demonstrative pronouns in general constitute a particular category in that, as a result of their function, they are open to various kinds of emphatical reinforcements. Cf., e.g., Sanskrit *a* + *sau*, Latin **hod* + *ce* > *hoc*, Old French (*ecce* + *hoc* >) *ço*, mod. French *ce*, French *celui* > *celui-ci*, *celui-là*, Boer-Dutch *hier-die* 'this' (the old demonstrative *die* 'that' having taken over the function of the article *de*, itself a demonstrative in origin), etc. So far the theory of a Dravidian laryngeal (cf. L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar's article in *Indian Antiquary*, 59[1930], p. 197ff.) would not seem to rest on a solid foundation. With the *āytam*, which only occurs in long stops (cf. Ta. *ehku*- 'to pull with fingers (as cotton)': Ma. *ekkuka*- 'to card cotton', Ka. *ekku*- 'to dress cotton, card wool') it has certainly nothing to do. In the discussion of the personal pronouns Krishnamurti refers to his explanation of **ñām* as standing for *n* + *yām* 'you and we' (p. 321), which he has since elaborated in the *Emeneau-Festschrift*, p. 194. Such a *dvandva*-compound of two pronouns, however, would be a unique phenomenon in Dravidian word-composition.

In the sub-grouping of South-Dravidian Krishnamurti suggests an improvement on Emeneau's diagram in assuming that Koḍagu split off from the Tamil (-Malayalam) branch at a later date than Toda and Kota (p. 326). As for Malayalam, the traditional view that it has split off in the Middle Tamil period (a view still represented by Krishnamurti's diagram on p. 327) is only a very rough approximation of the real historical process. See A. Govindankutty, *III*, 14, pp. 52-60.

As for the genetic relationship of Dravidian with other language-families, Krishnamurti's criticisms of some arguments of Altaic scholars (p. 328) are fully justified. "At the same time", he adds on p. 329, "it must be admitted that there is a fairly large

amount of morphological and lexical evidence to show that there are good chances of some original relationship having existed between these two families." Although the exact purport of these words is not quite clear, since he here confounds Uralian, Altaic and Ural-Altaic, one may readily agree that, if it will be possible to demonstrate any relationship with another family, this will indeed most likely be with Uralian. [Incidentally, if a relationship can be proved, this is a relationship *tout court*, not an original one which has existed.] Attempts to connect Dravidian with Caucasian, Korean, Egyptian or Sumerian are rightly passed by in silence (p. 329).

The chapter on "The non-literary Dravidian languages" by Murray B. Emeneau (pp. 334-342) will remain of lasting historical interest because it describes in detail the various stages of a fascinating period in the development of Dravidian studies by a scholar who has himself taken a prominent part in the process of detecting and describing the so-called 'tribal languages'. Although the collection of data began as early as 1789 (for Malto), the epic period of exploration is exactly the one covered by this book, that is, the twenty years from 1947 onwards. As Emeneau points out, "The American blank period in which descriptive workers were ideologically opposed to comparative work, does not have its counterpart in Dravidian studies." So most of the recent work has been both descriptive and comparative. The full account of the effort to identify languages which were often known by more than one name is fascinating. A well-known instance is the Gadba tribe, the central section of which speaks the Munda language Gutob (= Gadaba in Grierson's *Linguistic Survey*), while the marginal section speaks a Dravidian language, now called Gadba (with the dialect Ollari). The story of the disentanglement of the intricate problem of Naiki (= Naiki, *LSI*) and Naikri (= "Bhili of Basim", *LSI*) is told on p. 340 (see also Krishnamurti, p. 309 n. 1). At the end Emeneau considers the question whether all the languages of South Dravidian have been discovered. Gérard Diffloth strikes Irula from the list, but thinks that the Beṭṭa Kurumba may possibly speak an independent language. [On the other hand Kamil Zvelebil has since claimed for Irula the status of a separate language.] Emeneau further points to D. N. Shankara Bhatt who, in the *Emeneau-Festschrift*, describes Koraga as "a new Dravidian language" [See also the same, *Linguistic Survey Bulletin*, 7, 8, 9]. It may be a long time yet before a general agreement on the exact number of Dravidian languages has been reached. Emeneau enumerates twenty-one as belonging "with certainty" to this family (p. 334) but more fieldwork is needed before in all cases the question "independent language or dialect?" will have been answered.

The first of the chapters on separate literary languages, naturally dedicated to Tamil, has been written by Kamil Zvelebil (pp. 343-371, including a bibliography of eight pages). He characterizes the years between 1946 and 1966 as "the era of Vorarbeiten" (p. 344f.). In this connection it may be observed that among the universities where attention is being paid to Tamil (pp. 344, 362) the Dutch ones might have been mentioned along with the German, Japanese and Polish ones. The phonemic inventory appears to range in the various descriptions from 11 to 44 consonant phonemes. Incidentally, in the diagram of Bright and Ramanujan's inventory (p. 349 n. 9) *ś* and *ṣ* have obviously changed places. In the survey of synchronic and diachronic studies Zvelebil suggests a new explanation for the still enigmatic present tense morpheme *kinr-* (p. 354 n. 24), viz. connection with *kil-* 'to be able'. The older theories are passed by in silence. Dialectology, Sociolinguistics, Syntax, Lexicology and Applied Linguistics are discussed under separate headings.

In Vadasery I. Subramoniam's account of Malayalam (pp. 372-381) the achievements (since 1947) in the field of lexicography are stressed. Work on the history of Malayalam has been dominated by the question as to whether Malayalam is a dialect of Tamil or an independent offshoot of proto-Dravidian — a question that could only be raised by non-linguists. Much important work on the dialects is buried in unpublished theses of Kerala University. On p. 377 Subramoniam states that "Malayalam is a collection

of dialects which are heterogeneous in nature". This is a problem that may perhaps be of great importance for our reconstruction of the history of the West Coast dialects but which still waits further exploration. One would have liked to hear somewhat more about the relation between the standard language and the dialects (Subramoniam refers on p. 377 to "the standard forms of Malayalam" but the question as to what exactly is a standard form does not seem to be hotly disputed), and particularly about "the tribal languages of Kerala, such as the language of the Kaaḍars of Cochin and the Muthuvans", mentioned as being different from the dialects (p. 378). This laconic statement raises questions which remain unanswered. In conclusion, Subramoniam states that "the inadequacy of existing theoretical models is occasionally felt when they are applied to Malayalam" and expresses the hope that the younger generation may be able "to formulate an independent and comprehensive model or an alteration of the existing models for language analysis".

At the end of a comparatively brief chapter on Telugu (pp. 382-393) George Kelley states that "relatively little of value on Telugu has appeared in recent years, except for the extensive work of Krishnamurti... Progress has been slow because few scholars are at work in the field." He gives a clear description of the three regional dialects and the problem of the social variants (formal and informal styles among educated speakers, educated and uneducated varieties of speech). *A Telugu dialect Dictionary of occupational terms* is mentioned as a unique kind of lexicography in India (but what about Grierson's pioneering work *Bihar Peasant Life*?). Still shorter is H. S. Biligiri's chapter on Kannada: about five pages text, with a bibliography of nine pages.

Part Three, "Other language Families" (pp. 411-477) deals with Austroasiatic, Tibeto-Burman and Iranian languages.

The chapter on "Munda and non-Munda Austroasiatic languages" by Norman H. Zide (pp. 411-430) deals with Munda, Nihali, Nicobar and Khasi. Since this is the first time (apart from Pinnow's older *Kharia-Sprache*) that a survey of the whole field (with references to recent, mostly unpublished papers) is given, it is especially to be regretted that the original version of this contribution was stolen in India. The present version was written without library facilities. One may marvel that the final result is still better than one might have expected. This is largely due to David Stampe's help in providing bibliographical references. Still it is disappointing that this first account of the Munda studies should be so unsatisfactory and defective. Sudhibhusan Bhattacharya's brief survey "The Munda Languages and South-East Asia" (*Bulletin, Indian Institute of Advanced Studies*, Simla, July 1970, pp. 23-31) does not complement it although it may be consulted alongside with it.

After giving a Stammbaum diagram (in which Central Munda is grouped with South Munda, see *Emeneau-Festschrift*, pp. 370-377) and referring to Pinnow's studies on the relationship with other Austroasiatic languages (which is now, at last, generally accepted), Zide gives a reconstruction of the proto-Munda consonant system. As for the PM. morphology, Proto-Munda is said to have had "predominantly monosyllabic morphemes". Much depends on the extent of "predominantly". There are so many disyllabic root morphemes which Munda has in common with other Austroasiatic and even Austronesian languages (some of which may be found in *Orientalia Neerlandica*, p. 376f.) that it might be preferable to ascribe the predominantly monosyllabic root structure to an earlier historical stage than proto-Munda.

The following sub-chapters deal exhaustively with phonology, morphology and syntax, lexicology (and semantics), etymology (with some well-founded criticisms of some explanations of Sanskrit words from Munda), vernacular literature and miscellaneous topics. In addition to the numerous unpublished American papers H. J. Pinnow's important monograph *Grundzüge einer Phonetik des Mundari*, Berlin, 1954 (cited in *Kharia-Sprache*, p. 460) should have been mentioned.

On p. 427 Zide devotes half a page to this reviewer's paper on "Consonant variation in Munda", which cannot be passed by without some comment. The passage begins with the words: "Kuiper's paper on consonant variation in Munda has a typological burden and follows up earlier work of his own and of other Dutch scholars, e.g. Gonda on Austronesian. He questions the applicability of the comparative method ... so that clean-cut reconstructions cannot be made, as they presumably can be made for Indo-European. Kuiper provides a large corpus of variant forms in Munda, and in discussing them rejects such standard explanations for the variation as dialect mixture. In my opinion the variants he cites probably come from a variety of sources: conditioned changes (e.g. consonant cluster simplification), dialect mixture, and expressive derivation..." With regard to this passage I should like to make the following comments: (1) the main object of the paper, which was presented to a Conference on Indo-Pacific linguistics, was simply to point out the existence of a problem that deserves to be studied because it constitutes a serious difficulty in comparative studies. The explanation of expressive deformation had been adopted (as was clearly stated) from Pinnow. Still, the main purport of the paper was not to propose an explanation but to present material, a point that Zide apparently missed. The limited value of material culled from dictionaries and second-rate grammars was obvious. (2) Whether or not one chooses to call the paper typological, anyway, it cannot be said to follow up earlier work of my own since I clearly dissociated myself from my earlier publications as far as the interpretation of the material was concerned. Nor am I aware of any connection between this paper and studies "of other Dutch scholars". The paper does definitely not reflect a national habit of advocating unorthodox views. (3) I did definitely *not* question the applicability of the comparative method in general. On the contrary, it was pointed out that for a large portion of the vocabulary this method does hold good but that only a certain sector of it had to be put apart, a fact that had been fully recognized by Pinnow, p. 21. (4) Zide's words to the effect that clear-cut reconstructions "presumably can be made for Indo-European" are only intelligible to me if they express a doubt on his part as to the applicability of the classical method of historical reconstruction even to Indo-European. It is true that, ever since the nineteenth century, some scholars have been aware of the fact that etymological word-studies in Indo-European often present more intricate problems of phonemic correspondences than might be guessed from the exposition of these correspondences in the current handbooks. (See, e.g., the discussion, with references, in *Mnemes charin, Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer*, I [1956], p. 222f.). The fact that Indo-European comparative linguistics has nevertheless become *the* model for comparative studies in general is probably to be attributed to the circumstance that the reconstructed proto-Indo-European was the language of a rigidly organized "Herrenschicht" and as such, for sociological reasons, different from the language of jungle tribes. G. Fortune's lecture on *Ideophones in Shona* (London, 1962) is revealing for the kind of transformation words can undergo in certain societies, and more particularly for the circumstances and the way in which this may happen. For these phenomena in the Austroasiatic area see, besides Pinnow, *Kharia-Sprache*, p. 20ff., also J. A. Gorgonjev, *Grammatika khmerskogo jazyka* (Moskva, 1966), p. 69ff. and David Stampe, *IJAL*, 32 (1966), p. 397. The term "expressive" is only a rough indication of this phenomenon. (5) On p. 414 Zide reports on Pinnow's listing "the regular and semi-regular correspondences", thereby implicitly accepting the inapplicability of the traditional comparative method to part of the lexical material — a fact which Pinnow had correctly noted. By accepting the existence of "semi-regular correspondences", however, one has returned to the nineteenth-century theory of sporadic sound-laws, which amounts to denying the possibility of a scientific treatment of the linguistic material. (6) In the paper under discussion it had been pointed out that an attempt to explain the "variation" by means of the "standard explanation" of dialect-mixture had led to the necessity of assuming an incredibly high number of strongly

divergent dialects with bizarre criss-cross borrowings in e.g. Santali for which so far no essential dialectal split has been reported. If one nevertheless prefers to stick to the "standard explanation" it should be noted that for such cases as Mu. Ho *buṭi* : So. *pudi* 'navel' such an explanation lacks any foundation in the facts. Consonant cluster simplification would presuppose for proto-Munda a word-structure entirely different from, e.g., the Austronesian type, for which I fail to see any indication. So there remains, for the present moment, as the most promising explanation the "expressive derivation", the very explanation proposed by Pinnow and accepted in the paper under discussion. I am afraid that Zide's report will fail to give the reader an insight into the real problem while creating false impressions about the extent to which dialect borrowing can be applied. On the other hand, his experience as a field-worker with the difficulty of distinguishing between *p* : *k* and *b* : *g* in Gutob is the very kind of information that we need.

The problem of Nihali (Kalṭo), discussed on pp. 427-428, is one of the most intriguing. After Konow and Grierson had incorrectly assigned it to Munda, Robert Shafer was the first to point out unidentifiable elements in it (1940: *Harv. J. As. Studies*, 5, pp. 346-371, cf. 1954: *Ethnography of Ancient India*, pp. 10-12). After the publication of fresh and more reliable material by Bhattacharya in 1957 (*Ind. Ling.*, 17, pp. 245-258), Burrow referred to Nahali in the next year as a remainder of pre-Dravidian and pre-Munda (1958: *Bull. Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture*, no. 19, p. 8). Pinnow, while making several attempts to explain it as a Munda language, was for a long time non-committal (1959: *Kharja-Sprache*, p. 1 n. 6 vs. p. 45 etc.; 1960a: published in *Studies in Comparative Austroasiatic Linguistics* [1966], pp. 187-191; 1960b: *IJL*, 4, p. 86 n. 23). In 1964, however, he was more outspoken in *Linguistic Comparison in South-East Asia and the Pacific* (p. 151: "It is at any rate not Munda"; p. 152: "We may perhaps come closest to the truth if we assume that Nahali possesses an isolated non-Austroasiatic substratum that has been partially replaced by an Austroasiatic stratum which has also provided Nahali with its inflection." These words were clearly written independently of this reviewer's monograph, published in 1962, consisting of an analysis of the grammatical system and the available lexicographical material (about 500 words!), in which he had tried to prove that Nahali probably was an *argot*, the two oldest layers of the vocabulary being an unidentifiable language (ca. 24 per cent of the vocabulary) and (in a few per cent) an Austroasiatic language which cannot, in the present state of our knowledge, with certainty be called Munda. In 1966 David Stampe reported in *IJAL*, 32, p. 395, on a Nihali lexicon by Aasha Kelkar Mundlay (still unpublished), comprising some 2000 items, of which sixty to seventy per cent are recent borrowings from Indo-Aryan or Korku. "Of the rest, a few have older Dravidian or Munda sources, but most are not identifiable." This more extensive material, accordingly, confirmed entirely the conclusions of the earlier monograph. The latter, however, failed to convince Pinnow, who in 1965 (*Indo-Pacific Linguistic Studies*, I = *Lingua*, 14) on the one hand characterized Nahali as "a language the status of which is still much disputed" (p. 4) but on the other hand concluded that "the personal pronouns of the disputed language Nahali can also be classified with those of the Austroasiatic family, even though they are rather markedly distinguished from the personal pronouns of the other groups", adding that Nahali and Nicobarese may possibly "be more closely connected than was hitherto thought to be the case" (p. 18). Finally, in 1966, he ended up a review of the monograph on Nahali with the conclusion: "Der grundlegend austroasiatische Charakter des Nahali schält sich so nach und nach immer mehr heraus" (*OLZ*, 61, col. 496). In the present state the central problem would seem to be that of the origin of the few Austroasiatic elements in the vocabulary. It is on their occurrence that Pinnow founds his right to attempt to connect the Nahali verbal (1960) and pronominal (1965) systems with those of Austroasiatic. My provisional attempt at an analysis of the case-endings and the pronouns did not confirm this

assumption of an Austroasiatic provenance. In that case the lexical elements can only be very early borrowings from a source whose nature it remains to determine more exactly: Old Munda or para-Munda? *Nih. te*(')- 'to eat', *tu*- 'to embrace' can, it is true, have been taken from a Munda language now lost, but isolated cases like Dhimal *unku* 'cauli, rice' (if correct, see *Nahali*, p. 51) are a warning against rash conclusions. In the present state of our knowledge it would seem essential to recognize that there *are* some questions which cannot be answered until much more material is available.

These facts have here been summarized because Zide, for the reason mentioned above, was unable to give a coherent account of this problem. Of the monograph of 1962 it is only said that the author "demonstrated that Nihali has borrowed heavily from Indo-Aryan and especially Dravidian, but he did not suggest that Nihali is Indo-Aryan or Dravidian". The last words are not singularly to the point because no one has ever thought of ascribing Nihali to either of these families. The only thing Zide could do was to state that he had long considered Nihali a Munda language but that he had changed his mind. His observations contain nothing new except the confirmation that Nihali is actually an *argot*, as had been suggested in 1962. There is obviously no point in criticizing Zide. His survey is a silent warning to all those who undertake a journey with a manuscript in their brief-case and omit to leave a carbon-typed or xeroxed copy back home.

Roy Andrew Miller wrote the chapter on "The Tibeto-Burman Languages of South Asia" (pp. 431-449) and D. N. Mackenzie that on "Iranian Languages" (pp. 450-477), the latter not limited to India as it also comprises Old Iranian and Middle Iranian. So much of this interesting account is somewhat out of place in this book.

In Part Four, "Linguistics and Related Fields in South Asia" (pp. 481-752), there is, first (pp. 481-498), Renou's masterly survey on Pāṇini ("who ... is less interested in describing than in characterizing and analyzing", p. 493) and J. F. Staal's contribution "Sanskrit Philosophy and Language" (pp. 499-531). Of general interest for every linguist is "General Linguistics in South Asia" by Ashok R. Kelkar (pp. 532-542), a fascinating picture of the present situation in India. To his final critical remarks (p. 538ff.) every linguist will no doubt subscribe. He ends up with the words: "We have a long way to go. We can begin (...) by acquiring what we have inherited — from our own past as well as from the rest of the world." It is encouraging to see that the generation of Kelkar, V. I. Subramoniam and others is well aware of "the Indian penchant for synthesis or desire to displease nobody" (which "often results in cheerful conflation of disparate or even conflicting elements"), of the "lackadaisical" editing of journals, and the difficulties arising from "the stratified power structure of the South Asian academic community" (p. 539f.).

"Toward a phonological Typology of the Indian linguistic area" by A. K. Ramanujan and Colin Masić (pp. 543-577) is the most thorough attempt so far to test the areal theory for the whole subcontinent. This important study, which contains nine maps of India with various isoglosses, leads to the conclusion that "there appears to be, thus, a number of multi-familial Sprachbunds in the Indian area" (p. 577). Some doubts, however, may be expressed regarding the idea that diffusion is due to the "prestige of one community over another as the chief social factor causing adoption of traits and bilingualism" (p. 543f.), even if "prestige" is broadly interpreted as "importance to the borrower". Some other factors must sometimes be involved in the process. If the theory of a prehistoric diffusion of Dravidian traits in proto-Indo-Aryan is correct, other possible factors instead of prestige must be taken into consideration (in addition to the assumption of a social stratification in the pre-Vedic society which is only very feebly and indirectly reflected in the priestly literature). The Malay loan-words formerly used in "colonial Dutch" are also an interesting example of linguistic reflexes of a social symbiosis where prestige is inadequate as an explanation,

On p. 620 Nur Yalman's criticisms of Dumont's views on kinship terminology should be noted. "Official Language Problems and Policies in South Asia" by Jyotirindra Das Gupta (pp. 578-596) will probably be of lasting importance as a detailed historical record of the development of language policy in India, of the conflicts between politics and linguistic realities and the defeat of Hindi as the national language. His conclusion is: "The complexity of the problem of official language in South Asia admits of no easy solution or judgment."

Of the other papers I only mention "English in South Asia" by Braj B. Kachru (pp. 627-678), a masterly synthesis of a fascinating subject. Some more illustrative material might have enlivened the exposition (e.g., "your worthy self" for the "polite diction", listed without examples on p. 651) but the author has rightly concentrated upon the theoretical aspects. The same subject has since been dealt with by H. J. Vermeer in a monograph.

The book ends with three chapters on linguistic studies in Pakistan, Ceylon I (Sinhalese) and Ceylon II (Tamil). D. E. Hettiratchi gives some additional information about the Vedda speech (p. 746f.). The last chapter is one of the weakest. Zvelebil's article on Ceylon Tamil of 1966 (*III*, 9, pp. 113-138), the most extensive study so far, was apparently not yet accessible to the author but in the sub-chapter "Tamil and Proto-Dravidian" some words should at least have been said about the intriguing problem of the historical relations between Ceylon Tamil and "West-Coast Tamil" (= the western Tamil dialects and Malayalam). Instead the author expatiates on his own theory of a relationship between Dravidian and Sumerian.

All in all, a book extremely rich in information on all fields of South Asian linguistics, and an indispensable tool for every linguist specializing in New Indo-Aryan or Non-Aryan languages. The number of misprints and misspellings is excusable in a book of this size and nature but higher than one would expect.

F. B. J. Kuiper