

Thomas A SEBEEK (ed), *Current trends in linguistics*, Vol 5, *Linguistics in South Asia*, Assoc Editors M B. Emeneau, C A Ferguson, Assist Editors G B Kelly, N. H. Zide
The Hague-Paris, Mouton, 1969 814 + xviii pp / 140 -

The volume under review, dedicated to the memory of Louis Renou (d 1966) and J. K. Yamagiwa (d 1968), is undoubtedly of immense usefulness. However, it is in part already unavoidably antiquated and outdated. Also, the various contributions are very uneven in approach and quality. This unevenness in approach and elaboration is apparent and striking right in the first few papers. One can hardly find two more different articles than Burrow's 'Sanskrit' and the immediately following Fairbank's 'Comparative Indo-Aryan' in which the author, unlike Burrow, deals rather with problems than with achievements, with open questions and main issues in the field rather than with authors and their works. That is precisely why it reads better than Burrow's paper which tends to be a list of contributions as complete as possible but with almost no comment. Burrow goes on in his quiet, somber way, only rarely finding a word of praise (as when he says about Gonda's 'output during the last ten years' that it is 'remarkable both in quantity and quality') or of stronger disagreement and criticism. The names we meet most often in the paper dedicated to present Sanskrit studies are - apart from Burrow himself - those of Renou, Gonda, Kuiper, Mayrhofer, Katre, Bailey, Allen, Hoffmann, Tedesco, Thieme and Wust.

E. Bender deals with Middle Indo-Aryan, V. Miltner with Hindi studies. While Bender's paper is a very brief survey of recent work performed in the subject, Miltner's account is much more detailed and provocative. Both authors, though, regret that the techniques employed in work on Middle Indo-Aryan and Hindi 'have been those of philology rather than of structural linguistics' (Bender, p 47). Miltner even speaks of lack of 'methodological elegance of Hindi linguistic research', regretting the fact that even the newest treatises 'resemble the classical works written by the founders of Hindi studies so long ago' (p. 55). However, it is somewhat incongruent when he says, in one breath, that he 'could not get through the enormous number of linguistic studies' on Hindi, since this was beyond his power and 'would be of no use' (?), and that he would discuss therefore explicitly the most important ones. How can he know *which* are

the most important ones if he has not read through the lot? On p. 56, we find his ample criticism of the oversimplified and naive views of some Soviet scholars (like Čelyšev). There is sharp criticism of H. Bahri's 'purely orthodox' semantics of Hindi (p. 62) and of Hacker's and Lienhard's respective treatments of the problems of aspect, 'Aktionsarten', and verbal composition ('Both of them seem to be at their wits' end with the material they collected', p. 67). In conclusion Miltner agrees, probably rightly so, with Bahl, that 'the grammatical treatises of Hindi lack any scientific coherence'.

Čížikova's and Fergusons's 'Bibliographical review of Bengali studies' (pp. 85-98) represents one type of contributions to this volume, the one which centers almost exclusively on bibliography to the exclusion of almost any comment or evaluation of the work done in the field. Very different in approach and treatment is P. B. Pandit's account of Gujarati studies (pp. 105-21) which is critical and evaluative. Of all 'new' Indo-Aryan languages of India, it is Panjabi which received the most detailed and careful treatment thanks to the very interesting and thought-provoking paper by K. C. Bahl (pp. 153-200). Bahl discusses with passionate dedication and critical scholarship such difficult topics as the various uses of the term Panjabi, the problem of the acceptance of a standard language, the treatment of compound verbs in modern Indo-Aryan, Panjabi dialects, etc. His conclusion deserves to be quoted 'A serious scientific investigation aiming at sufficiently deep and exhaustive description of the language in any of these aspects, is yet to begin' (p. 196). A similar situation seems to prevail in the sphere of Oriya and Assamese studies. As D. P. Pattanayak tells us, 'linguistic studies in both Oriya and Assamese . . . are still rooted in the philological tradition, and are characterized by a lack of thrust in the direction of theoretical or methodological innovation' (p. 147). There are several interesting points in L. M. Khubchandani's treatment of Sindhi studies (pp. 201-34), the controversy over the script, an outline of the story of how the implosives were dealt with, the problems connected with the fact that Sindhi is typically a 'language in contact', the ancestry of Sindhi, etc. It is a well-proportioned contribution, with a good bibliography.

There is an interesting but somewhat colourless survey of the problems connected with the study of Sinhalese, Vedda and Rodiva (pp. 235-48) by M. W. Sugathapala de Silva, while T. W. Clark's

contribution on Nepali and Pahari stands somewhat apart: it is a very well written survey of many of the immensely complicated problems connected with the area of 'Himalayan dialects' and Nepali, constituting the languages which are spoken today 'in the Hill sectors of the country'.

M. I. Khan's 'Urdu' (pp 277-83) is intended to complement Miltner's chapter on Hindi. The first part of the survey is closed by B. B. Kachru's well documented and well-balanced account of Kashmiri and other Dardic studies. It again manifests the extreme difficulties connected with the study of this area, complicated by the fact that the languages spread over three political boundaries involving three countries (India, Pakistan, Afghanistan). The very fundamental questions are still open: the affinity of the Dardic group, the basic linguistic structure of the languages, even a full and reliable enumeration of them. The survey shows 'that the research in Kashmiri and other Dardic languages has made practically no serious progress in the last two decades', one reason being that the governments of the Dardic speaking areas have shown no initiative or even interest in encouraging language studies, neither has the University of Jammu and Kashmir.

Six complete papers are dedicated to Dravidian languages, the first to Dravidian in general, followed by a paper on the non-literary languages, followed by four papers each of them dealing with the four major languages which have been recognized in the constitution of India. Bh. Krishnamurti's excellent contribution deals with comparative Dravidian studies before and after 1947, listing some of the goals reached and pointing out the main problems and prospects in the fields of phonology, morphology, etymology, language contact, subgrouping, and affiliation. At least two important books were published in the phonological field since Krishnamurti's paper: Emeneau's brief but lucid *Dravidian comparative phonology - a sketch* (Annamalainagar, 1970), and Zvelebil's somewhat more detailed *Comparative Dravidian phonology* (Mouton, 1970). Though these two books taken together may be said to provide a solid basis for further phonological research, they will soon need revision, chiefly in the direction of a combined *historical* and genetic-comparative approach. The other single most important recent event in Dravidian phonology is N. Kumaraswami Raja's hypothesis on post-nasal voiceless plosives (Annamalainagar, 1969), which is, according to the review-

er's conviction, entirely erroneous, in spite of its elegance and suggestiveness. 'Compared to the progress made in the area of comparative phonology, work done in comparative morphology is frustratingly meagre and slow' (Krishnamurti, p. 318) This, too, is fortunately an obsolete statement *Dravidian verb morphology* by P. S. Subrahmanyam and *Dravidian nouns* by S. V. Shanmugam are the two recent works which provide an excellent point of departure for any future work on morphological problems. The present reviewer's first part of a *Comparative Dravidian morphology* will be published shortly by Mouton. A number of morphological papers were published since 1969, chiefly thanks to the seminars on Dravidian linguistics held regularly at the University of Annamalai.

Some advances were also made in the question of subgrouping of the Dravidian languages. After Emeneau's pathbreaking paper on South Dravidian (SDr) languages (*JAOS* 87, 365-413), two papers were specifically dedicated to these problems. Zvelebil's 'From Proto-South Dravidian to Malayalam', *Archiv Orientální* 38, 45-67, but especially P. S. Subrahmanyam's excellent 'The Central Dravidian languages' in *JAOS* 89, 739-50. The branching in SDr and Central Dravidian (CDr) now appears somewhat differently than in Krishnamurti p. 327. First of all, Tuḷu has obviously to be added to the SDr sub-family (cf. another excellent paper by P. S. Subrahmanyam, 'The position of Tuḷu in Dravidian', *IL* 29, 47-66). Nowadays, one would probably reformulate Krishnamurti's statement as follows: the first split in SDr occurs between Tuḷu and the rest. A subsequent branching opposed Kannaḍa with the other languages, and a further branching separates Kodagu from Tamil-Malayalam, Iruḷa, Toda and Kota. A further branching separates Tamil from Toda-Kota, and Tamil from Iruḷa, which is an off-shoot of Tamil about half a century earlier than its other off-shoot, Malayalam. However, not everyone would accept positing Iruḷa as an independent SDr speech, and not everyone would agree that Malayalam is a rather late off-shoot of Tamil. In fact, detailed research in the 'beginnings' of Malayalam may have some surprises for us yet, as well as further investigation of the exact position of Kodagu. Telugu has been definitely established as CDr. The subgrouping of CDr is, according to P. S. Subrahmanyam, different from that presented by Krishnamurti, too. For these and similar problems, cf. the forthcoming article on Dravidian languages by K. Zvelebil in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

In 1969, the monumental work by Emeneau and Burrow, *A Dravidian etymological dictionary (DED)*, was provided by an extremely important *Supplement*, which adds three languages and 889 new etymological clusters

Two other recent events, important for all Dravidianists, occurred in 1971: an international Dravidian Linguistic Association was formed in Trivandrum (resident, S K Chatterji, secretaries, R C Hiremath, K Mahadeva Sastri, V I. Subramoniam), and a new journal, dedicated exclusively to Dravidian linguistics, the *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics*, will begin publishing in January 1972. We hope that the two vigorously started ventures will not be shortlived.

Prof. Emeneau deals with the non-literary Dravidian languages in his informative survey on pp. 334-42. The most recent 'discoveries' in this field are Pengo, Manda, Konda, Naiki of Chanda, and Iruḷa. Pengo (discovered in 1957) was most ably described in the detailed monograph *The Pengo Language* by Burrow and Bhattacharya (1970, Oxford). It is a mine of data, just like Krishnamurti's equally, if not more detailed, *Konda or Kūbi* (Hyderabad, 1969). Manda was discovered in 1964, and, hopefully, the publication of the material will take place in the nearest future. In 1957-58, Naiki of Chanda was discovered, different from the Naiki so labelled in the *DED*, the *DED* Naiki is a dialect of Kolami, properly called Naikri. Iruḷa was, and by some scholars still is, considered a widely divergent Tamil dialect. It is the reviewer's opinion that it is a separate SDr language closely akin to Old Tamil (cf. 'Iruḷa Vowels' in *IJL* 13, 113-22), and that his forthcoming description of this language (the first ever to be published) will add Iruḷa to the SDr sub-family. Among the new descriptions of known languages, one has to mention specifically D. N. Shankara Bhat's *Descriptive analysis of Tuḷu* (Poona, 1967), P. S. Subrahmanyam's *A descriptive grammar of Gondi* (Annamalainagar, 1968), S. A. Tyler's *Koya: An outline grammar* (Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1969) and M. S. Andronov's *Jazyk braui* ('The Brahui Language', Moskva, 1971). Emeneau's monumental *Toda Songs* (Oxford, 1971) is of course not a strictly linguistic publication, but the original texts of 245 songs are an amazing treasury of the Toda language.

To Zvelebil's paper on Tamil (pp. 343-71) one must also add a number of contributions. The following should be named: M

One realizes the immensely intricate situation in these language-families, and is made aware of 'the lacks and weaknesses of the data available to us' (p. 342). R. Shafer is singled out as probably the most outstanding scholar in the field

D. N. MacKenzie has dealt with Iranian languages in a lengthy paper accompanied by a very rich bibliography. It is a good and fair survey of the work done in the fields of Old Iranian, Middle Iranian, Persian, Tajik, Pashto, Ossetic, Kurdish, and other related languages.

One of the most informative and carefully written contributions is N. H. Zide's paper on Munda and non-Munda Austroasiatic languages of India - in spite of the fact that the original version of the paper was stolen in India so that it had to be rewritten there without the benefit of full library facilities. Munda studies in the years taken up by Zide were indeed the domain of only a few scholars, not many names reappear. F. B. J. Kuiper, H. -J. Pinnow and N. H. Zide in the first place, Fodding, Stampe, A. R. K. Zide, and a handful of others. Zide's paper contains a wealth of data but not much evaluation and criticism. On the other hand, there is some very interesting discussion of Munda linguistic problems, such as areal features in the Munda phonological system. There is an interesting subchapter on the writing systems, and on Nihali; according to Zide, Nihali is not an Indo-Aryan, Dravidian or Munda language.

The fourth and last part of the big volume deals with 'linguistics and related fields in South Asia' and contains some of the most readable and most important contributions. Not all of them can be even briefly mentioned in this review. I shall therefore limit myself to a short discussion of those by L. Renou, J. F. Staal, A. R. Kelkar, Ramanujan-Masica, and J. J. Gumperz.

Renou's 'Pāṇini' is a gem of lucid scholarship. Its author died in 1966 shortly after he has finished it. It deals with writings dedicated to such problems as Pāṇini's predecessors, his relationship to the Prātiśākhya, his date (given again by Renou as 4th-5th cent. B.C.), the editions and translations of his work and the establishment of a critical edition, its commentaries, etc. Patañjali is dated in the 2nd-1st cent. A.D., Kātyāyana in the 2nd-3rd. We would have liked to hear more about non-Pāṇinian schools, briefly mentioned on pp. 489-91, since this might have some bearing on the other important ancient grammatical tradition in India, that of *Tolkāppiyam*. There can be no doubt that this Tamil grammar is indebted to Pāṇinian

thought; it is also clear that it contains much that is extra-Pāṇinean, both indigenous Tamil matter, as well as Sanskrit. To antedate *Tolkāppiyam* as a pre-Pāṇinean grammar is hopeless and silly. Probably the 3rd-2nd cent. B.C. would be the most reasonable date for its first two portions, the third part is undoubtedly later.

Paragraphs 14-23 of Renou's paper deal with various aspects of Pāṇinean studies, e.g. the structure of Pāṇini's dialectic. A few names of scholars reappear in rather positive appraisal by Renou. J. F. Staal, P. Thieme, R. Rocher, W. S. Allen, H. Scharfe, G. Cardona.

One of the authors just mentioned, J. F. Staal, contributed a most interesting though probably somewhat controversial paper on Sanskrit philosophy of language (pp. 499-531). He tries to apply the current generative rules-oriented linguistic thinking to Pāṇini and related grammarians. He deals with the methodological principles of Sanskrit grammarians, with syntax and semantics ('Pāṇini uncovered relations that are nowadays called transformational', p. 507, the *kāraṅka*-theory constitutes the analysis of the deep structure of sentences), with Mīmāṃsā theories of language, with Buddhist linguistic views, etc. On p. 518, Staal singles out as specially worth mentioning Bhartrhari's hypothesis that the faculty of speech is due to an inborn intuition or instinct (*pratibhā-*), 'for language is not learned'. I consider even more interesting Bhartrhari's theory of the three stages in the course of the manifestation of the speech-principle, since I find naturally accidental, and hence quite significant, parallels between the insights of the Indian grammarian and his *paśyantī* 'visionary' → *madhyamā* 'intermediate' → *vaikhari* 'articulated' stages of speech, and the (unidirectional) 'semantic structure' → 'surface plus underlying phonological structure' → 'phonetic output' of the recent model of language proposed by Wallace L. Chafe. On p. 519ff., Staal deals with Bhartrhari's theory of *sphoṭa*, rejecting correctly the earlier views which regarded it as a mysterious and mystical entity, and showing that the right approach to its correct interpretation has been indicated by Brough (1951) and Kunjunni Raja (1963), and that Bhartrhari's philosophy of language is best understood as a metaphysical superstructure to a *semantic* theory. Staal concludes that there is no single Sanskrit philosophy of language. He also quite correctly stresses the fact that the philosophy of language is one of those fields where India has 'at least as much to offer as the West'.

A Kelkar writes in a somewhat ornate style on general linguistics in modern India which, according to him, presents a rather depressing picture. He has the courage to mention specifically the author of *Tolkāppiyam*, 'founder of the Tamil grammatical tradition', as a most important 'collateral' of Pānini (p. 532). Also, I found rather refreshing his correct observation that the horizon of linguistic studies was 'exclusively Indo-European, if not Indo-Iranian, if not Indo-Aryan, if not limited to Sanskrit' upto ca. 1919 (p. 534). Kelkar's paper, though somewhat 'light' in style, tries to give a fair (and amusing) picture of the activities of Indian linguists, however, there is too much general information, and plenty of trivia, and practically no discussion of any concrete contribution by Indian scholars who have a 'desire to displease nobody' (p. 539), whereas some Americans behave 'as if there was no linguistics before Chomsky' (*ibid*). There is no bibliography appended.

Ramanujan's and Masica's lengthy paper is an excellent typological survey of the phonological systems of Indian languages, and one of the first major steps towards the mapping of phonological isoglosses on a map of India in terms of the theory of a linguistic area. There are nine clearly drawn maps.

John J. Gumperz gives a brief but lucid survey of sociolinguistic problems on pp. 597-606. Together with J. D. Gupta's article on official language problems and policies, and to some extent, with Kachru's paper on Indian English, the paper touches almost every political and social problem connected with the enormous linguistic complexity of Indian life, and with its modernization. B. B. Kachru's paper on English is so detailed and so important, so heavily documented and so interesting, that it would need a minute critical report which cannot be given here. It should be studied with much profit also by students of English and English language.

A. S. Dil's long and detailed paper on the linguistic studies in Pakistan, and two papers dealing with linguistics in Ceylon close the monumental volume (apart from biographical notes on the authors, and the two indexes, of languages, and of personal names).

The reader of this volume - any reader - will realize once more and with force that India is indeed an immense museum of languages, both diachronically and synchronically, as well as the cradle of linguistic science (p. 532). It is also a huge language laboratory, inviting the attention of scholars to most urgent questions. The

present volume is a good introduction for anyone who is prepared to accept the challenge

Instituut voor Oosterse Talen,
Nobelstraat 2,
Utrecht, The Netherlands.

K. V. ZVELEBIL

Margaret LANGDON, *A grammar of Diegueño, the Mesa Grande dialect* University of California Publications in Linguistics 66. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970. 200 pp Price \$4.00

Langdon's grammar of Diegueño, a revision of her Ph.D. dissertation (U.C. Berkeley, 1966), is the most complete published description of any Yuman language to date. Langdon's proximity, at La Jolla, California, to native speakers has given her the opportunity to continue her study of the Diegueño language and its dialects and to produce a very elegant and exhaustive account of this westernmost representative of the Yuman family. Descriptions of other Yuman languages exist either as articles (or series of articles) in journals¹⁾ or still as Ph.D. dissertations²⁾

The grammar consists of an 'Introduction', 'Bibliography', and 'Introduction to the grammar' (pp. 1-13), followed by nine chapters (pp. 14-189) which describe the language in a more or less traditional manner (with some leaning toward generative procedures) and a tenth chapter, a sample text and its analysis (pp. 190-200)

¹⁾ E.g. James E. Redden, 'Walapai I Phonology', 'Walapai II Morphology', *IJAL* 32, 1-16, 141-164 (1966), Werner Winter, 'Yuman languages II: Wolf's son - a Walapai text', *IJAL* 32, 17-40 (1966), A. M. Halpern, 'Yuma I, II, III', *IJAL* 12, 24-33, 147-151, 204-212 (1946), 'Yuma IV, V, VI' *IJAL* 13, 18-30, 92-107, 147-166 (1947)

²⁾ More or less adequate Ph.D. dissertations exist for: Cocopa (James M. Crawford, U.C. Berkeley, 1966), Havasapai [phonology and morphology] (William Souden, Indiana, 1963), Kiliwa (Mauricio Mixco, U.C. Berkeley, 1971), Paipai [phonology and morphology] (Judith Joel, U.C. Los Angeles, 1966), and Yavapai [phonology] (Alan Shatterian, U.C. Berkeley, 1971)

To my knowledge, nothing of consequence has yet been published or written on Maricopa or on Mohave