

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Grundlagen der Phonetik des Lhasa-Dialektes by Eberhardt Richter; A Manual of Spoken Tibetan (Lhasa dialect), by Kun Chang and Betty Shefts, with the Help of Nawang Nornang and Lhadon Karsip by Kun Chang; Betty Shefts

Review by: R. K. Sprigg

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Vol. 30, No. 1, Fiftieth Anniversary Volume (1967), pp. 210–216

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](http://www.cambridge.org) on behalf of [School of Oriental and African Studies](http://www.soas.ac.uk)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/611849>

Accessed: 17/10/2012 11:14

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and School of Oriental and African Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

T. N. MADAN: *Family and kinship: a study of the Pandits of rural Kashmir*. xix, 259 pp., front., 12 plates. London: Asia Publishing House, [1966]. 50s.

This book deserves the attention of all those interested in the study of family and kinship. The author notes the tendency on the part of many Indianists to base their analyses of the Hindu family on traditional Sanskritic texts, 'regarding them as the perennial source from which all the jural norms and ideals of Hindu kinship flow'. Dr. Madan insists that a proper understanding of the subject will only emerge from a series of detailed studies of kinship 'as it is in the villages of India today, rather than as it is portrayed in the relevant literature'. To this end, he offers us an absorbing and lucid account of family life among the Sarasvat Brahmins—called Pandits—of rural Kashmir.

Dr. Madan concentrates primarily on the patrilineal and patrilocal household (*chulah*), the most important group in Pandit society. Five chapters, comprising more than half the text, deal with the size and composition of the household, with the way in which it recruits its members (by birth, adoption, marriage, and incorporation), with its economic functions and with the processes underlying its growth and partition. His analysis is guided by Fortes's notion of a 'developmental cycle', so that each household group is seen to pass through a series of phases from its inception to its final disappearance as a separate unit.

One chapter then examines the household's relations with kin groups of a wider order, and another the importance of non-agnatic kin.

It is in his treatment of the external aspect of domestic relations that Dr. Madan's account appears to evoke a number of questions which are left unanswered. By confining his analysis to the interrelations between patrilineally-related households within the extended family and lineage he ignores many of the ties which may cut across and mitigate these structural alignments. When he notes the absence within the village of any groups or associations which are not based on kinship he leaves the impression that kinship is the sole articulating principle of social organization. Yet, we learn that disputes arise in the course of household partitions, and that the relations between patrilineal cousins are characterized by hostility; but we are not told how such disputes are waged and settled. This question is of some importance in the light of a number of recent studies of Indian villages which have noted the existence of non-permanent groupings recruited across both caste and kinship lines. The reader is also given to understand that wealth distinctions have created two classes of 'aristocrats' and 'commoners'

within Pandit society, but there is no indication of how such divisions affect the household's affiliation with wider kin groups. Far from being irrelevant to the study of kinship, it seems that the inclusion of such matters would have indicated the importance of Pandit kinship in the overall social context.

Still, these are minor irritants in an otherwise admirable contribution to the literature on the sociology of India. Dr. Madan has presented a considerable body of data to compare—although he avoids comparisons himself—with material on family and kinship from other ethnographic areas both within and outside the Indian subcontinent.

LIONEL CAPLAN

EBERHARDT RICHTER: *Grundlagen der Phonetik des Lhasa-Dialektes*. (Schriften zur Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung, Nr. 8.) viii, 271 pp. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964. DM 21.50.

KUN CHANG and BETTY SHEFTS: *A manual of spoken Tibetan (Lhasa dialect)*, by Kun Chang and Betty Shefts, with the help of Nawang Norngang and Lhadon Karsip. xiii, 286 pp. + tape-recording [two 7" reels, four hrs. playing time]. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964. \$6.50 + \$17.50.

These two books both deal with the same Tibetan dialect, but could hardly be more different in source of material, aims, and methods.

Dr. Richter is limited to a corpus of material recorded by Professor Schubert in China. Part of this material consists of 660 monosyllabic words, comprising the names of the symbols of the Tibetan script, the *gsal-byed sum-cu*, the *dbyangs bzhi*, and so on, with monosyllabic and disyllabic words to exemplify them; the rest comprises 308 colloquial sentences, each spoken twice slowly and once fast, arranged in 35 lessons ('35 Lektionen Lhasa-Grundkursus'), though these are exploited only as a source of phonetic data.

The 11 lessons of Professor Chang and Dr. Shefts's *Manual* are the outcome of research work with two informants carried out in the United States. They give detailed life histories of their informants, including such important information as their ages, sex, social status, and so on, and, especially, whether they were lay or clerical. All such details are important for a reliable evaluation

of spoken Tibetan material, and, especially, in estimating the degree to which utterances based on written texts have been influenced by the reading style of pronunciation. The authors have, further, been careful to note differences in the pronunciation of their two informants; and it is significant that there are not a few of these, even though both were close relations.

Dr. Richter, on the other hand, merely mentions that the source of his material was Professor Schubert's teacher in 1955 in Peking, and gives his name in Chinese as well as in Tibetan, though he describes him as 'der Lhasa-Tibeter'.

Richter is thus at a grave disadvantage as compared with Chang and Shefts: he had no contact with Schubert's teacher, and was prevented from pursuing the various lines of inquiry that must have suggested themselves to him in the laborious task of transcribing the phonic data; they, on the other hand, were in a position to elicit supporting and additional information at all stages of their work.

In fairness to Dr. Richter it should be said at once that he has resisted the temptation to generalize beyond the limits imposed on him by his restricted corpus of material. Only one exception occurs to me: 'die Verbindung *lha* + *a* fordert für die 1. Silbe den Vokal ϵ : bzw. ϵ !, z.B. *lha-sa* ϵ ! 2 *sa*, ϵ ! 2 *sa*!' (for typographical reasons I have generally transliterated from Richter's Tibetan script into the roman; I have also omitted his pitch-scale symbols, and give only the corresponding figures, there being no figure for his 'Leicht-ton'). His generalization here is an attempt to accommodate the phonetic forms ϵ : and ϵ ! to the orthographic form *lha*. Apart from a handful of examples on pp. 49 and 52 Dr. Richter nowhere gives a translation of his Tibetan forms; but here he obviously intends the place-name 'Lhasa'. While [ϵ :sə] is, in my experience, more common for 'Lhasa' in the Lhasa dialect than [ϵ !sə], the latter is a reputable pronunciation in the dialect, as Dr. Richter would probably have discovered if the source of his material had been within interrogating distance. This more usual pronunciation for 'Lhasa' is not the only place-name in the Lhasa dialect to be at odds with the corresponding orthographic form of the written language: 'Gyantse' and 'Shatra' are [gjanzi] (*rgyal-rtse*) and [jadrə] (*bshad-sgra*), not *[gje:dzi] and *[jɛ:drə].

Unlike Chang and Shefts, Richter gives great prominence to Tibetan orthographic forms; indeed the early part of his book ('die Grundzüge der Phonetik des Lhasa-dialektes', pp. 11-53) comes near to being a phonetic interpretation of Tibetan ortho-

graphy, and throughout the book every phonetic example is accompanied by a Tibetan orthographic form, in handwritten *dbu-can*. This heavy dependence on the orthography results from Dr. Richter's having attempted to limit his study to the phonetic level of analysis. He reserves 'das Phonem-system' (p. 25) and 'die "morphologischen", syntaktischen und die semantischen Daten des ... Materials' (p. 5, n. 1) for a later work, and allows himself only one excursion into phonemics: 'Der moderne Lhasa-Dialekt hat somit 4 toneme'. In consequence, apart from his four tonemes, he has no phonemic, or phonological, forms with which to associate his phonetic data, and is obliged to relate these, if to anything at all, to orthographic forms. Part of the ensuing phonetic description is presented entirely in terms of the orthography, e.g. 'die Systematik der Aussprache der (schrifttibetischen) einfachen Konsonanten (am Silbenanfang) und der (schrifttibetischen) zusammengesetzten Konsonanten [*mgo-can*, '*dogs-can*, '*brtsegs-yig*, präfigiert]'; in the rest, (1) Vokale, (2) Diphthonge, (3) Halbvokale, (4) Konsonanten', the various phonetic categories are each related to orthographic forms.

In the course of making these phonetic-orthographic associations Dr. Richter, it should be noted, occasionally resorts to combinations of symbols that are not in accordance with Tibetan orthographic practice: he combines subscript 'y' (*ya-btags*) with the thirtieth *gsal-byed* ལྷ, e.g. 'ལྷ + ཟ', though ལྷ is not one of the *ya-btags* *bdum*, the seven symbols that can combine with subscript 'y'. It is not difficult to guess at his reason for doing this: he wishes to indicate the five Tibetan orthographic vowels without specifying an initial consonant; but Tibetan orthography does not lend itself to such a purpose. By including ལྷ (transliterated here as *a*) in the *gsal-byed sum-cu* class Tibetan orthography treats it as CV just as much as *sha*, *da*, *pha*, or any other of the remaining 29 *gsal-byed sum-cu*, as indeed it is phonetically (the author himself transcribes it as ?a; pp. 23, 56); and to attempt to interpret it as V is to misconceive both its orthographic and its phonetic status.

Far more important than this criticism of a minor orthographic irregularity is the problem of the relations of the Lhasa dialect, or, for that matter, any other modern spoken Tibetan dialect, with the traditional Tibetan orthography. I understand that at the present time Tibetan refugees in Mussoorie are giving some thought to devising a systematic orthography for the Lhasa dialect; but, apart from this recent development, I believe that it is only

under pressure from foreigners that Tibetans have so far given orthographic form to contemporary spoken dialect material. H. E. Richardson writes: 'it is perhaps not strictly correct to say that utterances in Lhasa Tibetan are written down at all. Tibetans do not write what they say except for special purposes such as your research and our sentences' (i.e. Gould and Richardson, *Tibetan sentences*, 1943; cf. *BSOAS*, xvii, 1, 1955, p. 136, n. 3). Ordinarily, if they should need to write them down, Tibetans translate their utterances in the various spoken dialects into the grammar, vocabulary, and style of Written Tibetan, using for this purpose the orthographic forms of Written Tibetan. It is for this reason that Bell's *English-Tibetan colloquial dictionary* gives two orthographic forms for a number of entries, the former being a phonetic spelling, usually based on the Lhasa-dialect pronunciation, and the latter the corresponding Written Tibetan form.

In complete contrast with Richter, Chang and Shefts by-pass this problem of the orthography by all but ignoring traditional Tibetan orthographic forms. These, 'The written counterparts to the spoken forms', unattractively written, and in *dbu-can*, appear in an appendix. This appendix is far from easy to consult; for the entries are arranged not in the Tibetan order or even in an alphabetic order modified to include their extra-alphabetic symbols, but in an order of their own, beginning with the vowel letters 'i', 'è', 'e', etc. and ending with 'ph', 'm', and 'mh', the key to which I eventually discovered on p. xii. It almost looks as though they wished to discourage anyone from using the appendix, or associating the Tibetan script and orthography with the Lhasa dialect in any way; and this is not an unreasonable attitude to the traditional orthography if one looks at it from the standpoint of the phonology of the Lhasa dialect.

An orthography devised specifically to suit the needs of this dialect would be much less complex than the Written Tibetan forms hitherto diverted to this purpose. The orthographic distinction between final *s* and final *d*, for example, would be irrelevant to Lhasa Tibetan, unless the *s* were specialized in its lengthening and fronting function in such two-form verbs as *lta/bltas* 'look', *bzo/bzos* 'make', *zhu/zhus* 'request'; and the distinction between the *sgon-*'jug *g* and *d* and *ra-mgo* and *sa-mgo* would be superfluous (except for the velar stop in *bcu-gcig* 'eleven'): any one of these four symbols would serve to indicate the partial voicing of, for example, *gdung-ma* 'beam' ([**ḍ-**]), *dgon-pa* 'monastery' ([**ḡ-**]), and *rjes* 'track' ([**ḏḑ-**]), or, alternatively the high-tone classification of liquid-initial

forms such as *sman* 'medicine', *g.yu* 'turquoise', and *dbral* 'tear'.

For this reason one might question whether Dr. Richter's sections on the phonetic interpretation of certain orthographic symbols, and on the pronunciation of the names of the orthographic symbols and their combinations, is relevant to a study of the Lhasa dialect. These symbols are the common property of all literate Tibetans irrespective of dialect; and the phonetic features that the author attributes to them are by no means peculiar to Lhasa-dialect speakers: they are, or were until 1959, in use over a wide area of Tibet, and are also used by the Sherpas and Tamangs of Nepal. Furthermore, these Reading-style pronunciations differ from those of Lhasa Tibetan in such respects as the following: (i) word-initial nasality and full voicing in, for example, Dr. Richter's *mgo* ʔgo 43, 'dod ʔdø 43 (Lhasa Tibetan partial voicing without nasality: [**ḡ-**], [**ḏ-**]); (ii) word-final alveolar roll or friction, in, for example, the author's *dar* t'ar 43, *bzhar* caɹʰ 43 (Lhasa Tibetan backness and long duration, with no final consonant: [**-a:**]); (iii) word-final dental and glottal closures, in, for example, the author's *phud* pʰyʔ 23, *brgyad* ʃʰe.ʔ 43, *sras* se.ʔ 34 (Lhasa Tibetan frontness and long duration, with no final consonant: [**-y:**], [**-ɛ:**]).

In the examples just given it is possible to set up a regular correspondence of Lhasa Tibetan phonetic features with Reading-style features; but there are one or two of Dr. Richter's examples for which this is not possible. His *smra-ba* 'mã^wa, for example, is not in the vocabulary of the Lhasa dialect; nor is his *sgrung* ḑ^hũ, for which the Lhasa dialect has a labial nasal final ([**-m**]).

Briefly, it is important to distinguish the phonetic forms of Reading-style Tibetan from those of the Lhasa dialect, and to appreciate that the Reading style of pronunciation is associated with Tibetan when written; and experience has shown that a long and stern training is necessary before a literate Lhasa Tibetan can be made to read examples of the Lhasa dialect without introducing Reading-style pronunciations.

The authors of the *Manual* seem to have been very successful with their training: it is only in 'lesson I', which contains a large number of noun one-word sentences as illustrations of pronunciation, that tradition has sometimes clearly proved too strong for the informant. Thus, for example, a final long vowel is, presumably, indicated in thāpçêê, thāpçêê, and sêê; but the pronunciation of the tape-recording is of a short vowel and final glottal closure, i.e. Reading-style features; other forms, e.g. phũũ, lũũ, are a mixture of both, i.e. long vowel duration but

glottal closure. A long nasal vowel appears to be intended by *šāā*; but the pronunciation recorded is the Reading-style short vowel followed by a velar nasal consonant.

These differences between text and tape-recording will not concern the student who works from the book alone; but they may well prove baffling to anyone working from both book and tape-recording jointly: in default of any explanation of the difficulties arising out of confusion with the Reading-style pronunciation, such a student will either: (i) assume that his ear is at fault, and get discouraged; (ii) assume that the authors' ear had been at fault, and lose confidence in their phonetic analysis; or (iii) assume that he was the victim of printing errors, and lose confidence in the authors' control of the text. In fact the use of tape-recordings in language-teaching requires an altogether different technique of presentation from that of the printed word alone, if, that is, these three types of reaction to discrepancies between tape and text are to be avoided. Either the tape-recording must exactly correspond to the text down to the last phonetic detail (and this will be far from easy to achieve), or details of stylistic variation (occasional lapses into the Reading-style pronunciation, for example), of intonational variation, through alternation in emphasis, and of junctional variation must be explained, at least in the tape-recording, so that the listener shall be prepared for that degree of variation.

In the *Manual* the degree of variation between tape and text is quite enough, in my opinion, to arouse disquiet in a student, especially one with enough phonetic training to have developed some confidence in his own powers of perception and discrimination. What, for example, is he to make of such forms as 'qhi' and 'thi' when he regularly hears not the voicelessness and aspiration that he would seem to be entitled to expect but voice and non-aspiration? I should guess that the spellings with 'qh' and 'th' are generalized from so-called isolate pronunciations; but, since it is the grammatical function of these two forms to be closely associated with a preceding noun, the isolate pronunciations are very rarely to be heard indeed; and, in any case, the student should not be expected to know this.

Other instances of what is assumed to be conflict between the general adoption of an isolate form and the hard facts of perception concern the monosyllabic forms *reè*, *yöò*, *mèè*, and *tuù*, both as verbs complement and as verbal particles, and arise as early as 'lesson II'. All four are consistently symbolized with the tone-marking for 'Low-Falling'; but the first 13 examples of these yield only one

example of low and falling pitch. The majority (eight) are low and level; and four actually rise in pitch. The second syllable of *marèè* is symbolized as 'High-Falling'; but it is level in pitch in the first of two examples, and falling in the second. One remedy would be to mark pitch-behaviour in each case; but a better remedy would be to give as detailed an account of intonation in the dialect (and Lhasa Tibetan is highly intonational) as pitch variation in the examples requires.

Certainly some account, or some indication, should be given of emphatic intonation, especially for contrast. Any Tibetan word may be characterized by low and level pitch, irrespective of tonal classification, in the appropriate environment, i.e. in the part of the clause following an emphasized word. Examples of this occur as early as 'lesson II'. In 'ti *nūqū* *repèè*?' as spoken by Professor Chang and Dr. Shefts's informant the pitch of *nū*, the first syllable of the emphasized word, is not level but falling, and the pitch of all the following syllables is low (and level). In the next sentence but one, 'ti *ē* *nūqū* *repèè*?', in contrast, it is *ē* that is emphasized. It has, in consequence, a falling pitch, and all subsequent syllables, now including both syllables of *nūqū*, are low in pitch, and level. Corresponding features characterize a pair of sentences on the following page, in which 'qēsāā' is contrasted with 'John'.

The pitch behaviour symbolized by the tone-marking of Professor Chang and Dr. Shefts's text, which I take to have been generalized from word-isolate utterances, conceals too much of Lhasa Tibetan intonation; the tape-recording, on the other hand, probably gives more than the student should be exposed to in the early stages, especially when he is given no guidance in relating the pitch features to the tone-marking. Dr. Richter, by contrast, in his purely phonetic analysis, symbolizes pitch levels and contours of most syllables, and in formidable detail, borrowing for this purpose the Chinese five-level visual and numerical scheme first applied to Tibetan by Y. R. Chao (*Jaw Yuanren*) in *Love songs of the sixth Dalai Lama* (1930), but leaves certain syllables without any indication of pitch. These last he treats as examples of the 'Leichtton (qing-sheng), d.h. die betreffende Silbe liegt im Tonschatten der vorgehenden betonten Silbe(n)'.

I am not sure quite what pitch features are intended by 'Tonschatten': does it mean that the syllable concerned has the same pitch level as the final pitch of the preceding syllable, or that it continues the rise or the fall of a preceding syllable with rising or falling pitch, or that it duplicates the pitch features of the preceding syllable? In *ga-re* 'k'a 43 ɿ', is the

pitch of the syllable *ri* meant to be 3, or 32, or 43? In any case I am sceptical of the value of introducing this peculiarly Chinese phonetic (or phonemic) concept into the interlingual categories of general phonetics, and applying it to a language as different from Chinese as Lhasa Tibetan. This is admittedly a minor point; I mention it only to question whether it is necessary to supplement general phonetic categories with one familiar only to students of Chinese.

Of greater interest is the relation between the pitch features and Dr. Richter's four tonemes, his only piece of phonemic analysis: '1, der mittelhohe ebene Ton; 2, fallender Ton; 3, [mittel] steigender Ton; 4, mitteltiefer ebener Ton'. Inherent pitch features are assigned to these four tonemes as follows: toneme 1—2; toneme 2—23 and 34; toneme 3—43 and 54; toneme 4—4. These inherent pitches are then supplemented by a rather complicated set of 15 'Assimilationsregeln' stating the environments appropriate to change of pitch. This change of pitch sometimes amounts to change of toneme, as when the first syllable of *tshos-gzhi* changes from inherent pitch 23 (toneme 2) to pitch 2 (toneme 1) under the influence of the following pitch-43 (toneme 3) syllable; and that following syllable in turn changes from pitch 43 (toneme 3) to pitch 2 (toneme 1) under the influence of the preceding pitch-2 (toneme 1) syllable, inherently pitch-23 (toneme 2). There is no mention of clause intonation.

Detailed criticism ought, perhaps, to be postponed until the appearance of Dr. Richter's promised second volume; but just as he was himself unable to resist the temptation to introduce at least a draft tonemic analysis into what is otherwise purely a phonetic study, so it is difficult for me not to anticipate some of the problems that he will eventually have to deal with. One of these is that of pitch features not covered by either the inherent pitches of any of the four tonemes or by any of the 15 'Assimilationsregeln'. The inherent pitch of 'ʒá' (*nga*) and 'p'œ' (*bod*), for example, is 43 (toneme 3). On p. 73 they are shown with pitch 32; but toneme-3 syllables assimilate from 43 to 32 only when preceded by a toneme-4 syllable (which itself then changes to toneme 3), and on p. 73 these two syllables are sentence-initial and therefore without any preceding syllable at all. It would seem, then, that a further 'Assimilationsregel' will have to be added to account for the change of pitch of these syllables from the inherent 43 to the sentence-initial 32 of p. 73.

The great variety of pitch features attributed to particular syllables raises another problem. The syllable *nga*, for example, has ten: 54, 43, 32, 5, 4, 3, 2, 34, 35, 45; and these include the

inherent pitch of each of the four tonemes, with the result that *nga* has all four tonemic classifications. A closer examination reveals that there is more than one lexical item here: all three falling pitches, 34, 35, and 45, thereby excluding the inherent pitch of toneme 2, refer exclusively to the interrogative particle *nga*, as in *yong-nga* 'are there', and the remaining seven relate to the noun *nga* 'I'. This grammatical distinction reduces the problem somewhat; but, even so, it leaves the noun syllable *nga* with the three tonemic classifications 1, 3, and 4, and the 'Assimilationsregeln' do not provide at present for a change of pitch from its inherent pitch 43 (toneme 3) to either of the pitches 4 and 2 (tonemes 4 and 1 respectively). Again, the 'Assimilationsregeln' do not account for the change of pitch of *lnga* in *lnga-pa* from 2 (toneme 1) to 4 (toneme 4), thus resulting in a double tonemic classification, with either toneme on an equal footing with the other.

Enough has by now been written to show that Dr. Richter's very detailed pitch analysis is bound to lead to a complicated tonemic analysis in his further volumes; it will be most interesting to see how he tackles it. Clearly his promised grammatical analysis will dispose of some of the complications; a systematic statement of intonation should contribute towards disposing of the rest.

The high degree of detail shown in Dr. Richter's analysis of pitch features is characteristic of his phonetic analysis as a whole. Phonetic differences between the three utterances of each sentence in section IC, '35 Lektionen Lhasa Grundkursus (tibetischer Text mit Transkription)' are illustrated in an apparatus criticus at the foot of each page: 'beim erstenmal', 'beim drittenmal', etc. It is the third reading, the fast reading, that provides many of these alternative features, and is marked especially by the absence of the nasal on-glides and other Reading-style features referred to above that one sometimes finds in the first two (slower) readings.

Dr. Richter's transcriptions are handwritten in the symbols of the International Phonetic Association, with their accepted values apart from a handful of modifications. The only uncertainty arises from his practice of raising certain symbols above the line; it is not clear why these symbols, and the sounds they symbolize, should be treated differently from the others. There is no doubt, though, that this is an analysis at the phonetic level; and in this respect there is a major difference from Professor Chang and Dr. Shefts's symbolization.

The linguistic status of the symbols in the *Manual* is nowhere made clear: the authors dismiss them with the words 'we alphabetize

as follows: i, é, e, and so on. There are one or two references to morphophonemics; but I saw none to phonemics. The symbols are certainly not those of an orthodox phonemic analysis; for medial homorganic nasality is analysed independently of word-initial nasality, and symbolized by *tilde* rather than by η , n , m , or \tilde{n} , as appropriate. Bearing in mind the publisher's claim that 'the instructional manual represents the first comprehensive study of spoken Tibetan conducted in accordance with modern linguistic methods', I find it strange that the authors should be so indefinite.

The status of the tones, too, is not entirely clear to me. As I understand it, there are two independent systems, a two-term ('High', 'Low') for open syllables with 'single vowels', and a four-term ('High-High', 'High-Falling', 'Low-Low', 'Low-Falling') for all other types of syllable, with no connexion between them despite the fact that 'High' and 'Low', and corresponding symbols, are common to both systems, and could therefore be distinguished for all types of syllable.

Previous manuals such as Bell's, Hannah's, and de Roerich's, as far back as de Kőrös's (1834), provide the student with a phonetic description, however rudimentary, of the sounds and phonetic features to be associated with their symbols; but Professor Chang and Dr. Shefts give no phonetic description whatever. Consequently, a student who has not bought the accompanying tape-recordings (at nearly three times the price of the printed text) can have no certainty of the phonetic value or values of their symbols, and attempts to pronounce them at his own risk.

Indeed, some previous knowledge of phonetics may prove more of a hindrance than a help; for the authors have disregarded the traditional associations of 'k' with velarity, and have used it for palatal and palatalized velar initials ([**c**, **kj**]), presumably to avoid having to use two symbols (ky); velar plosion is symbolized by 'q', traditionally associated with uvularity. With the help of previous experience of Lhasa Tibetan, coupled with the translation, and subsequently confirmed by the tape-recording, I became aware of their usage; but what will those who do not share my advantages make of 'k' and 'q', not to mention the other symbols?

Before I received the tape-recording, I was also uncertain how to interpret word-initial 'p', 't', 'k', and 'q' phonetically in 'Low', 'Low-Falling', and 'Low-Low' syllables. In the absence of any phonetic description I had no means of knowing whether the authors intended to symbolize the initial voicelessness described by some (for which see Róna-Tas's

survey in *Tibeto-Mongolica*, 33-5, 187-90), or whether they were following the pioneer analysis by Y. R. Chao in *Love songs of the sixth Dalai Lama*, in which he reports both voiceless and partially voiced initial plosives in this position, and treats them as members of the same phoneme (pp. 5, 7, 26). The latter alternative corresponds more nearly to my own experience; and I now know from the tape-recording that it is nearer the mark than the former: in some words the symbols concerned correspond to completely voiceless and lax plosives and affricates; but in the rest of the words the plosives and affricates are partly voiced. I have the impression that the partial voicing correlates with the two nasal prefixes *m* and ' of the corresponding Written Tibetan forms.

While it is true that the quality of the recording is high, except, unfortunately, in ch. i, the chapter in which the sounds to be associated with the 'alphabet' are exemplified, the student should not be expected to make his own phonetic analysis. I regret having to make this criticism; for a number of the authors' orthographic forms suggest, if I interpret them correctly, a high level of phonetic perception; a pity that this should not have been made available to the student.

Students who have not bought the tape-recording escape the phonetic and phonological obstacles that I have mentioned in connexion with it, but at the price of having to treat 'Spoken Tibetan (Lhasa dialect)' as a dead language. Any attempt at pronunciation can only be guess-work; and those students will have to turn for guidance to earlier manuals that this book claims to have superseded.

All students, whether they have the tape-recording or not, will have an interest in the appearance of the printed page. The *Manual* is clear and well laid out, except that the letter ' η ' is disproportionately tall, and apt to merge with the superscript bar of certain of the tone marks. Clear though the actual printing is, certain combinations of symbols are complex: two superscript symbols commonly occur together, e.g. - $\dot{t}\ddot{o}$, - $\dot{t}\ddot{a}$, and three may do so, e.g. $\dot{t}\ddot{o}$. In comparison, even traditional Tibetan orthography loses some of its terrors. Indeed, a more morphophonemic orthography would not only remove some of the *Manual's* typographical complications but would also make the transition to Written Tibetan and its orthography much easier.

Of the conversational texts one, 'Finding a restaurant', is relevant enough to the circumstances in which an American or other foreigner might wish to speak Lhasa Tibetan, in the refugee camps in India and Nepal or with the very few Tibetans in America and Europe; but 'Moving from Shigatse to

Lhasa', 'Going on a pilgrimage to sām̄yēt̄' [Samye], and 'Monasteries in the Lhasa area' could profitably have been replaced by 'Moving from Seattle to Berkeley', for example, or other situations in keeping with the circumstances of Tibetan refugees.

At the grammatical and lexical levels the *Manual* has much to commend it. In the present climate of opinion the generative basis of the grammatical exercises should prove stimulating. An exemplary break with tradition, at the lexical level, is that the 'polite' vocabulary is given equal prominence with the 'non-polite'.

One final point: the *Manual* is entirely without indications of other work on Lhasa Tibetan; Dr. Richter includes a superb bibliography, covering not only Lhasa Tibetan but other Tibetan dialects, and even languages of the 'Tibeto-Himālaya Gruppe' as well.

In general I would say that the *Manual* falls between two stools: it is not linguistic enough for the professional linguist, who would rightly insist on being told what phonological units are being distinguished, and what the relations of each are with phonetic categories; it is too linguistic for the ordinary run of students, some of whom may well never have seen symbols such as 'ɔ', 'ŋ', and 'Δ' before. The authors suggest that 'ideally, a course in which it is used should be taught by a Tibetan'; but how many Tibetans are there with sufficient training in linguistics for this task?

The *Grundlagen* is addressed not to students but to a professional readership, who will now wait eagerly to see how the problems raised at the phonetic level are to be solved at the phonological, grammatical, and lexical levels. Indeed one could wish that Dr. Richter had attempted an integrated analysis at all these levels in one volume.

R. K. SPRIGG

A. RÓNA-TAS: *Tibeto-Mongolica: the Tibetan loanwords of Monguor and the development of the archaic Tibetan dialects.* (Indo-Iranian Monographs, Vol. VII.) 232 pp. The Hague, etc.: Mouton and Co., 1966. Guilders 28.

The Monguor dialect of Mongolian, through its numerous Tibetan loan-words, provides Dr. Róna-Tas with the occasion for a comparative phonetic study of data from a dozen or more Tibetan dialects. The 790 loan-words are examined as evidence for the pronunciation of Tibetan in adjoining dialect areas; and a comparison of the corresponding forms in these and other Tibetan dialects then furnishes the author with material for a historical study of the development of the contemporary

spoken dialects from his hypothetical Old Tibetan forms.

In his introductory remarks Dr. Róna-Tas places the Monguor dialect, spoken in the Chinghai province of north-west China, in relation to other Mongolian dialect material, and emphasizes its significance for both Mongolian-dialect and Tibetan-dialect studies, a significance due, on the one hand, to conservatism, and, on the other, to innovation under the influence of Tibetan. He discusses his sources, which, it should be noted, include Chinese and Russian works, in detail, and evaluates their systems of transcription, while carefully avoiding any attempt at unifying them.

Since his interest in Tibetan dialects is directed towards those which may be presumed to have acted as donors to Monguor, he finds it convenient to divide them into 'archaic' and 'non-archaic', taking as criteria for the 'archaic' category (i) the absence of 'pitch as a phonematic suprasegmental feature', and (ii) 'the preservation in a more or less complete form [of] the preradical system of Old Tibetan', and, as criteria for the 'non-archaic', (i) 'phonematic pitch', and (ii) the loss of 'the old preradical system'. While broadly efficient for this purpose, at least one of these criteria might be made more precise; and Dr. Róna-Tas himself refers subsequently to a characteristic that might be used to modify the second criterion of the 'non-archaic' category: 'the preradical is preserved in the second syllable if the first ends in a vowel also in the non-archaic dialects' (p. 134). Indeed maximum precision might require one to distinguish between consonant and phonetic feature; for, in the Lhasa dialect, which Dr. Róna-Tas classifies as 'non-archaic', the old 'preradicals' might be said to be preserved even in word-initial position in those words which are distinguished by the phonetic feature partial voicing (and therefore also non-aspiration) from those which have voicelessness and aspiration; e.g. *dgong-mo* [g-] 'evening', 'ja' [dz-] 'rainbow', *rdung* [d-] 'strike'; cf. *gong* [kh-] 'price', *ja* [tch-] 'tea', *dung* [th-] 'shell'.

Dr. Róna-Tas's criteria owe their importance to the fact that he uses them to limit his study to the 'archaic' dialects, together with the literary language, admitting forms from Central Tibetan or Lhasa Tibetan, as representatives of the 'non-archaic', only for some special purpose. The 'archaic' dialect material is divided into six categories in accordance with the six places in syllable structure that he distinguishes for Old Tibetan: 'preradical (C-), radical (C-), postradical (-C-), syllabic vowel (-V-), final (-C), postfinal (-C)'. Radical and postradical are dealt with simultaneously, absence of postradicals '-y-'