

terminologischen Systems scheint mir überhaupt der größte Vorzug bei Prieto zu sein. Aus diesem Grunde wird man ihm auch die Berechtigung nicht abstreiten können, eigene Wege der Methode und Terminologie auf Gebieten zu gehen, die schon von anderen ertragreich beackert worden sind. Er erhält damit eine analytische Methode und eine Sprachtheorie aus einem Guß. Vor allem aber hat er durch die konsequente Anwendung der Zweiteilung des sprachlichen Zeichens in 'signifiant' und 'signifié' in allen Bereichen und durch die Betonung des Klassenbegriffs in beiden Ebenen sicher die ontologische Geltung der Begriffe von Spracheinheiten wesentlich über de Saussure und die Prager Schule hinaus präzisiert (das gilt auch für den Phonem- und Oppositionsbegriff in der Phonologie, worauf wir hier nicht näher eingehen konnten). Die Anwendung des Klassenbegriffs auch auf beide Seiten einer konkreten Sprachäußerung ermöglicht ihm die klare Erhellung der selektiven Rolle von Situationselementen in der Rede, wo man sich sonst mit Allgemeinheiten begnügte. Außerdem bringt er dadurch einiges Licht auch in das Verhältnis von (paradigmatischem) Sprachsystem und (syntagmatischer) Sprachäußerung. Seine Theorie bleibt immer auf dem Boden sprachlicher Gegebenheiten. Das ist ein Hauptvorzug dieses Buches, das ich für einen außerordentlich wichtigen und fruchtbaren Beitrag zur Sprachtheorie und streng methodischen Sprachanalyse halte.

München-Puchheim

BALDUR PANZER

P. A. M. VAN DER STAP, *Outline of Dani morphology*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde Vol. 48. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague 1966. vii, 195 pp. f 25.—.

It is gratifying to see that our knowledge of the languages spoken in the Central Highlands of West New Guinea is steadily, if slowly, increasing. As has been the case in other parts of this territory (and of the rest of the world for that matter), much of the pioneer work on that score has been and is being done by missionaries, both protestant and catholic. Only, unlike earlier days, these missionaries nowadays are mostly qualified linguists. After the studies of the Kapauku group (Kapauku proper or Ekari and Moni) by Fr. Drabbe

of the Catholic Missions, Miss Marion Doble and the Larsons of the American Christian and Missionary Alliance, it is now the turn of the large Dani group. First Mr. H. Myron Bromley of the C.A.M.A. published his 'Phonology of Lower Grand Valley Dani, a Comparative Study of Skewed Phonemic Patterns' (Verhand. Kon. Inst. v. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 34, 1961). And now Fr. Van der Stap follows with his *Outline of Dani Morphology*, the subject of the present review.

Fr. Van der Stap has worked among the Dani for some six years. Since the intermediary of interpreters and the use of a third language known in common were, as usual for these isolated Highland languages, out of the question, the method applied was direct and monolingual. Naturally this can only be successful if the fieldworker has ample time to learn *all* of the language in this manner and not only that part of it which is sufficient to make himself understood. But if such is the case, it is the best method since it is in fact comparable to the natural way of learning one's own language. And Van der Stap *did* have the advantage of being allowed all his time to the study of the language. The result is one of the best descriptions of a Papuan language which we possess.

The name 'Dani', originally the name of a clan in the Balim Valley, now denotes, says Van der Stap, 'a Highland people scattered over several valleys and along several rivers, roughly between 137° and 140° East. Long. and 3° and 5° South Lat.' Hence there is considerable dialectal variation, and the Dani dialect studied by Van der Stap is not the same as the 'Lower Grand Valley Dani' of Bromley's work, nor any of the other dialects whose phonemic patterns were surveyed by Bromley. Fr. Van der Stap's book deals with the Mugogo dialect, spoken in the center of the Balim Valley around the government post Wamena, to the North of the L.G.V. dialect. It is only concerned with morphology because, as the author points out, there was, after Bromley's expert description, no reason for further phonological treatment. Only a few specific Mugogo features are noted, while otherwise the author confines himself to listing the Mugogo phonemes in the usual schematic manner.

Unfortunately it is precisely on some of these Mugogo peculiarities that questions arise which are not answered quite satisfactorily. The writer 'feels entitled to ignore . . . (*gw* and *kw*) as separate phonemes' because they 'were found so sporadically and always beside *g* and *k*

resp.' On the other hand 'Mugogo Dani has a glottal stop, but its phonemic status as yet is uncertain . . . (although it is) in the present book . . . treated as a phoneme'. In a stencilled copy which I possess of a MS vocabulary of some 1000 words compiled at Wamena by the former civil service officer F. Veldkamp in 1958, the glottal stop is very frequent, whereas only once *kw* is found: *'eakwi* (vdStap *eakei* or *eaei*), plural of *'eak* (vdSt. *eak*), child; cf. *etuki* (vdSt. *etuky* or *etouky*), plural of *'etouk* (vdSt. *etouk*), friend of opposite sex. This seems to be in accordance with Van der Stap's statements. But there is one important difference: Van der Stap does not write the glottal stop as initial phoneme, whereas it is frequent in that position in Veldkamp's vocabulary: cf. the forementioned examples *'eak* = vdSt. *eak*, *'etouk* = vdSt. *etouk*. Thus we find Veldk. *apput*, river's mouth: *'apput* (vdSt. *aphut*), child. Now this point may be of morphological importance as well. For the person morphemes of § 111 and the possessive prefixes of § 112 (pp. 145-147) are characterized, according to Van der Stap, by *n* for the 1st p., *h* for the 2nd p., and *zero* for the 3rd p., but examples from Veldkamp's list like *najokko*, my help, *hajokko*, your help, *'ajokko*, his help, and *nəpit* (vdSt. *nəpyt* or *na'yt*), I will not '(my dislike)', *hapit*, you will not, *'apit* (v.d.St. *ə'yt*, *əpyt*), he will not, would lead to the conclusion that 3rd person is characterized not by *zero*, but by glottal stop. In fact, this same 3rd p. possessive seems to be inherent in the precited relation terms *'eak*, *'etouk* and *'apput*. Thus we are left in doubt not only on an item of phonology but also of morphology.

If, then, apart from the last mentioned point, the fact that Van der Stap's description does not include phonology probably is not very serious, the author himself seems to have felt the exclusion of syntax to be a handicap. He states as much in the introduction, and no wonder, for morphology has implications for syntax and vice versa, and interpenetration between the two is not rare in these complicated Papuan languages. But unlike Dr. Anceaux, whose recent book on the Nimboran language ¹⁾ served as his model, he does not promise us a volume on syntax to complete the description. Hence he had to use word class terms without further explanation,

¹⁾ J. C. Anceaux, *The Nimboran Language, Phonology and Morphology* (Verhandelingen van het Kon. Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, 44, 1965).

confining himself to 'a superficial description of the word-classes involved . . . valid only to the extent to which these word-classes enter the domain of the present morphological research'. Besides, many, if not most, sections on the various morphological categories are followed by a paragraph on the 'Use' of the categories concerned. Thus syntactic information is mixed with the morphological treatment, and the question may be put whether it would not have been preferable to combine these scattered paragraphs on 'Use' in an 'appendix' on syntax, just as a synopsis of Mugogo Dani phonemes is given in the introduction.

As I have said, Van der Stap's treatment of morphology follows the model of Anceaux's analysis of Nimboran. The author acknowledges this in a footnote, saying that Anceaux's 'terminology. . . suits a description of Dani satisfactorily'. This means that the description is based on 'morphological categories' and their oppositions, a morphological category being a group of words marked by formal features called 'morphemes', and having a common semantic element called 'categoric meaning'. The relations between the members of such a category cross those of a 'morphological set', which is a group of words marked by a formal feature named 'root-morpheme', and having a common semantic feature called 'lexical meaning'; these belong in the dictionary. A group of interrelated morphological categories of the same morphological set is called a 'morphological system'. The analysis thus follows strictly modern lines. However, the manner of treatment sometimes tends to be somewhat too explicit and longish in its explanations of the procedures for establishing the various categories, such as one would expect to find in a general textbook rather than in a description of a specific language. Fortunately the facts as such are recapitulated in paradigmatic lists at the end of the book.

From the point of view of terminology and arrangement, too, questions arise. Firstly, the use of the terms 'morpheme' and 'root-morpheme' in the sense meant here, may raise objections into which Van der Stap does not go, but which Anceaux had foreseen. For an explanation we must, therefore, turn to Anceaux's book and the literature mentioned there (pp. 51-52). For me objection still remains against the use of the terms 'morpheme' and 'root-morpheme' *as distinct from each other*: granted the meaning attached here to the term 'morpheme', it seems incompatible with the

notion of 'root' in the sense aimed at; or, inversely, granted the term 'root-morpheme', the term 'morpheme' is not sufficiently distinctive. The choice would seem to be between 'morpheme' as distinct from, simply, 'root', or, e.g., 'affix-morpheme' as distinct from 'root-morpheme'. Only in the latter case it would, perhaps, be too awkward to class 'zero' features as *affix-morphemes*.

Secondly, Van der Stap, in footnote 9 on p. 12, states that he 'attaches no special value to terms like 'tense' and 'aspect' when applied to morphological categories; here they merely serve as labels for distinguishing different categories; thus for the indefinite future tense category the term 'indefinite future aspect category' would have done as well'. Hence he speaks freely of 'aspect' not only when dealing with such categories as the progressive and the habitual, but also with the adhortative and the prohibitive, and of 'voice' not only when dealing with, e.g., the medial, but also with the object categories. Objections can be raised against a procedure which professes to attach no value to certain traditional terms, but yet needing them as distinctive 'labels', uses them indiscriminately without relation to their traditional meaning, nor with a clearly defined new meaning. This procedure has impaired the clarity of arrangement of the various categories. A logical solution would have been, in the frame of this method of description, to arrange the categories of the verb-system according to 'orders', an 'order' being a group of 'categories belonging to the same (morphological) system (which) show opposition and, therefore, are mutually exclusive within one word' ²⁾. In Van der Stap's scheme these 'orders' do not stand out very clearly. Thus, for instance, he could have combined his 'tense' – and 'aspect' – categories under one heading named, e.g., order of 'active', or, better perhaps, 'action' categories, as distinct from the orders of 'actor' categories and of 'objective' categories, then subdividing that order in categories of the future, the past, the habitual, the adhortative, etc., without using terms like 'tense' and 'aspect'. Instead, he combined the *two different* orders of the actor categories and *part* of his tense and aspect categories under *one* heading named 'Part A. Actor Forms', whereas another group of these tense and aspect categories, which do *not* constitute a different

²⁾ I cite Anceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 55, because Van der Stap, though using the term 'order', omitted it from his definitions on pp. 1–2.

order from the forementioned, is treated under a separate heading 'Part B. Actorless Forms' (mostly comparable to our participles), and the separate order of 'objective' (i.e. his 'voice') categories under a third of its own, 'Part C. Object Forms'. On the other hand the simple infinitive is – for practical reasons, as the author says – treated in the introduction instead of in 'Part B. Actorless Forms', whereas the infinitive containing an object morpheme is, as a 'voice' category, included in 'Part C. Object Forms'.

Similarly unclear is the notion of 'stem' which the author introduces more or less incidentally in § 17 on p. 43, when dealing with 'adhortative aspect categories in general'. 'Because', says Van der Stap, 'ik of *wetasik* ('let me roast') and *uk* of *wetathak* ('let me roast thoroughly') have only the formal element *k* in common, it seems legitimate to assign the double rôle of adhortative aspect-morpheme and actor-morpheme to this *k*, until proof to the contrary is found. The formal element *k*, however, follows not the root-morpheme, but root-morpheme-plus-*i* and root-morpheme-plus-*a* resp. These 'plus-*i*' and 'plus-*a*' are then not accounted for. Here a new entity must be introduced: the 'stem', by which is meant here: a root-morpheme, modified in such a way that while remaining recognizable as such it is phonologically adapted for affixation of other morphemes. The rôle of 'plus-*i*' and 'plus-*a*' in the forms given is, then: to adapt the root-morphemes *wetas* and *wetath* resp. for affixation of the actor/aspect-morpheme *k*'. Further 'reasons for assuming this entity' are, according to the writer, i.a. that the 'plus-*i*' and 'plus-*a*' 'can be dispensed with as potential aspect-morphemes', that 'some means is indispensable for adapting *k* to the root-morpheme as the consonant sequences *s-k* (or *t-k*) . . . do not occur', that the 'plus-*i*' at least is sometimes absent where a phonologically acceptable consonant sequence occurs, and that 'if these 'plus-*i*' and 'plus-*a*' in fact *were* adhortative aspect morphemes (the question would arise) why then there are two different morphemes for one semantic moment: namely that the action must be performed?'. The last point is more or less an argument *ex absurdo*, the former are not quite convincing. In my opinion these so-called 'plus-*i*' and 'plus-*a*' can simply be explained morphophonemically. And my doubts about Van der Stap's interpretation find some support in his own statement on p. 113 (§ 66) that 'with secondary adhortative forms the actor/aspect-morphemes are affixed not to the stem, but to the

object voice morphemes followed by *a'*. For it is stretching the notion of 'stem' too far here even to speak of a 'pseudo-stem' or a 'secondary stem' as the writer does. Only in the case of *composite* verbs there seems to be somewhat more reason for assuming a verb-stem (p. 76), although a different interpretation is as well possible. But this verb-stem, too, does not stand out very clearly.

On none of these points reference can be made to Anceaux's Nimboran model, unless it should be that it has, perhaps, been followed somewhat too literally in some details. For Anceaux makes a modest but normal use of traditional terms such as 'tense', the order of arrangement of his categories is consistent, and where he introduces the notion of 'stem' it is a clear-cut form of the root morpheme with a distinct functional element of its own, the verb stems in Nimboran being the Singular Stem and the Plural Stem (Anceaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 87 and 93). The point is that Dani morphology is not, in every detail, similar to Nimboran morphology.

Thus far this review has been somewhat critical, but this must not mislead the reader. For the criticized points do not detract from the general import of the work. I would even go so far as to say that it speaks for the qualities of the book under review as a whole, that these details came to the fore. This may sound contradictory, but in fact it often seems to be inevitable for a good book that the criticism on lesser points occupies relatively large space in proportion to the qualities of the whole. Fr. Van der Stap has performed an excellent piece of work, both in studying, mastering and describing such a complicated language as Mugogo Dani. The description stands up to high modern standards, even if some may not agree in details with the method followed. The contents give us a good and unequivocal picture of the structure of the language. We must be thankful to Fr. Van der Stap for presenting us with this volume; he has substantially contributed to the advancement of our linguistic knowledge of this part of the world.

Utrecht

H. K. J. COWAN