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it is arguable that the particular form of control through personnel which the author considers characterizes the period under study, may be a declining factor. A comparison with the relatively more advanced Uzbekistan during the same period would be illuminating.

Mention of Uzbekistan raises an important point which emerges from this study. In the 1920’s and 1930’s the alternative to Russian control for Tajikistan was not independence but rule by the Uzbekas. In effect, the Russians erected a protective umbrella which permitted the creation or reassessment (according to taste) of a Tajik nationalism. Tajik Soviet culture is the subject of a chapter, but the omission of any serious consideration of the position of Islam and the heavy reliance upon Gafurov’s Istoriya Tadzhikskogo naroda as an epitome of Tajik historical writing does reduce its value.

Dr. Rakowska-Harmstone’s book is therefore extremely interesting as a study of the political structure of Tajikistan during a particular period and is a considerable contribution to knowledge. One’s doubts centre on the general propositions about Russian imperialism which are derived from it.

M. E. YAPP


Dr. Bhat describes Tankhul Naga as spoken by about 45,000 persons to the north-east of Manipur valley on the Bharat-Burma border. The greater part of the Vocabulary (pp. 1–72) is a morpheme dictionary arranged according to ‘the alphabetical order of monosyllabic roots’, with every word containing a given root cited under the entry for that root. This arrangement will commend this section to comparatists in the Tibeto-Burman field, from whom the greater part of its readers are likely to be drawn. The ‘alphabetical order’, incidentally, is not the roman but the Devanāgari order, with modifications, running from k-, kh-, and p- to s- and h-.

Specialists in Tibeto-Burman languages will also be pleased to see that Dr. Bhat has been able, in this later work, to meet one of the criticisms levelled against his Boro vocabulary (reviewed in BSOAS, XXXIII, 2, 1970, 419–20): he has included, in a section ‘Root index of English meanings’ (pp. 84–100), a list of English glosses of the various Tankhul ‘roots’, which will make it possible for the comparatist to see at a glance whether items that he is interested in have been included, and to find the entry without a lengthy search. It is, of course, only by regular use that one can test these two sections; but, in a rough check, I was surprised to find ‘iron’ and ‘lead’ listed, but not ‘silver’ or ‘gold’. I was also puzzled to find ‘six’ given as thoruk on p. xi, but thorum on p. 48, and ru on p. 96.

However, the ‘Root index’ does make it easy to exploit particular correspondences with Burmese and Tibetan cognates. One such correspondence that comes readily to mind is of Tankhul th- with Burmese s- and with Tibetan (g)s- and sh_; a glance through the th- entries, for example, yields (ks)thi ‘die’, thim ‘tree’, (ks)thum ‘three’, thiar ‘new’, and that ‘kill’.

Between these two sections there is a further short vocabulary, ‘Additional vocabulary’ (pp. 73–83), in which the entries are not roots but unanalysed words, also in the Devanāgari order, and comprising, for the most part, names of animals, and of unidentified flowers and plants.

An ‘Introduction’ (pp. ix–xii) gives a brief phonetic description of the symbols used, too brief, really, for clarity. Pitch features are assigned to two of the tones (‘high falling’ and ‘low falling’); but the pitch features of the remaining tone (‘unmarked’) are not described. A more serious deficiency is that ‘since the tonal feature did not appear to be stable in word formation, and since no definite [sic] rule could be formulated for its alternation, it has been generally neglected in the identification of roots except when the difference in meaning appeared to be rather substantial’. When so much attention is now being given to tone in relation to syllable-final features and to such syllable-initial features as aspiration, glottalization, and non-aspiration in the Lolo-Burmese sub-group of languages and in Tibeto-Burman languages generally, it is important that the tonal characteristics of Tankhul should be adequately dealt with. One must hope that the author plans to remedy this defect in a separate study.

Another phonological feature that is touched on all too briefly is a ‘sandhi change’ by which prefixes that have their initials non-aspirated (ks, ps, ci) before roots with initial voicelessness have those initials aspirated (kha, pha) or fricative (si) before roots with initial voice; for this statement seems to conflict with an earlier statement that ‘p, t, and k become voiced intervocically especially before a vowel in low tone’. From that earlier statement one would expect root-initial p, t, and k to be voiced, intervocically, to b, d, and g after the prefixes k(h)a, p(h)a, and c(s)i, in which case the prefixes would need to have their matching aspirated and fricative alternatives (kha, pha, si); yet such examples as cikay and
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the root or a matching fricative initial \( \theta \) in the prefix.

Some account of the relations of syllable-final consonants \( p, t, k, m, n, g, r \) and of \( -y \) and \( -w \) with the vowels \( a, i, e, u, o, w \) would also have been useful. A brief analysis of the roots seems to show that \( w \) is alone in occurring only in syllable-final position. All the other vowels can not only occur finally in the syllable but also combine with each of the syllable-final consonants too, and with \( -y \) and \( -w \), except that \( -iy, -ey, -uw \), and \( -ow \) do not seem to occur. Of the initial consonants \( k \) and \( kh \) seem not to combine with the vowel \( i \), an instance of similarity with contemporary Burmese.

To summarize, then, Dr. Bhat's three pages or so of ' Introduction ' serve only to whet one's appetite for a fuller phonological analysis; but his Tankhul-English and English-Tankhul vocabularies should give wide satisfaction.

R. K. SPRIGG


The collection of aphorisms known generally to the Mongols as Erdeni-yin sang subasidi has been extremely popular among them, and among the Tibetans, for some hundreds of years. The original text was composed by the Sa skya Panḍita, who died in 1251. There is no reason to suppose that a Sanskrit original underlies the Tibetan version, even though the evidence of Indian influence is very strong. The book was translated into Mongol very early on, at latest towards the end of the thirteenth century or in the fourteenth. Mr. Bosson is by no means the first Western scholar to have worked on, or indeed to have translated in full, this interesting and attractive text. Csoma de Körös was, in this as in much else, a pioneer, and other scholars to have worked on the text include Foucaux, Schiefner, and Campbell, who published a complete translation from the Tibetan in 1925. Mr. Bosson's work, however, stands out from its predecessors by reason of its scope and accuracy, and also, indeed, by the clarity he has brought to the interpretation of what is frequently a puzzling original.

The core of Mr. Bosson's work is a trans-