who support the Pahawh Hmong feel that the Hmong are culturally cheated if they have to use one adopted from other languages" (p. 103).

Mother of Writing does an excellent job of explaining the original writing system created by Shong Lue known as the Pahawh Hmong as well as its three revisions by Shong Lue. In addition, the book explains Shong Lue yang's uniqueness as a creator of writing systems. In addition, Shong Lue's theological claims, his imprisonment, his persecution by both communist and anti-communist forces, the outlawing of his writing system, and his assassination by the government in mid-February 1971 are recounted in a clear and interesting fashion.

One of the most interesting aspects of the book is a number of speculations and reflections on how this illiterate farmer could create a writing system and improve it successfully in three revisions to arrive at a system which, linguists agree, adequately represents the Hmong language, a sophisticated tone language. That this is no mean feat is attested to by a linguist no less renown than William A. Smalley who writes in tribute: "I began this study out of curiosity, and I end it with admiration . . . I believe the creation of the Pahawh Hmong was a major intellectual feat, in some ways unparalleled in the world" (p. 182).

I was also impressed with the passion of Chia Koua Vang and others among Shong Lue Yang's associates as they taught and promoted the Pahaw Hmong. Their sustained efforts in this and in the development of a typewriter for the Pahaw Hmong (a process described in detail in the book), their loyalty to Shong Lue and their love and care for their beloved Hmong people all call for the reader's appreciation and admiration.

The co-authors have done an outstanding job of presenting Shong Lue's theological claims and his "messianic" role among the Hmong people, and have fairly evaluated his theological, linguistic, and (according to some) political achievements among the Hmong people.

This reviewer especially appreciated the fact that Mother of Writing offers something for everyone: theology for the specialist in word religions, complex linguistics for the linguist interested in the writing systems of tone languages, accounts of political persecution and intrigue for the historian or political scientist, and finally an intellectual achievement (perhaps an unparalleled one) by an uneducated illiterate farmer for those whose interests lie in the psychology of intelligence, the role of education, or in related fields.

The book is written well, well proof-read, and extremely well organized. It does an outstanding job of holding the reader's interest as well as obtaining the reader's admiration. The balanced treatment and fair representation of alternative points of view on numerous controversial interpretations are indeed welcome, especially in linguistics where polemics and propaganda for one's own point of view sometimes preclude a fair and balanced presentation.

In short, Mother of Writing is well worth the reading, even for those who might consider some of the linguistic sections too technical for their liking.

---


Reviewed by Brian D. Joseph, Ohio State University

Sanskrit has long held a certain fascination for western linguists. After all, as is well known, it was Sanskrit, through Sir William Jones' famous observation in 1786 concerning the relation of Sanskrit to various Indo-European languages of the west, that provided the springboard for the development of comparative linguistics in the 19th century, leading ultimately, as a consequence, to the founding of modern linguistics as an empirical science. Moreover, although the precise channels and extent of diffusion are a matter of some debate, no one can deny that the native Sanskrit grammatical tradition has had an influence on various western theories of linguistic analysis. It was only a matter of time, therefore, before generative grammar, as conceived of and developed in the 1950s and early 1960s by Noam Chomsky and his followers, would look to Sanskrit for data upon which to test aspects of the newly emerging theory of language. Modern Studies in Sanskrit (hereafter MSS) is a collection of complete articles, pieces of articles, and one dissertation excerpt that show how generative grammarians approached Sanskrit in the 1960s and early 1970s. The volume arose out of a seminar sometime prior to 1978 that the editors were involved in and thus both its conception and its execution have a pedagogical basis. Its publication in India was deliberate, a step designed to make contemporary western perspectives on Sanskrit available most directly to students in India.

There are twelve selections, covering mostly phonology and morphology, but with some on syntax as well. "On Grassmann's Law in Sanskrit" by Stephen R. Anderson, "Sanskrit Diaspares" by Elaine Phelps, "Pseudosolutions to the Pseudoparadox: Sanskrit Diaspares Revisited" by Ivan A. Sag, "Vowel Alternation in Sanskrit" by Patricia C. Stanley, "Exceptions and Synchronic Analogy in Sanskrit" by Hans H. Hock, "Metrics and Morphophonemics in the Rig Veda" by Paul Kiparsky, "A Modern Description of Nominal Composition in Sanskrit" by J.F. Staal, "Syntactic and Semantic Relations in Panini" by Paul Kiparsky and J.F. Staal, "Grassmann's Law in Sanskrit" by D. Gary Miller, "Problems of External and Internal Sandhi" by Theo Vennemann, "Exceptions and the Unity of Phonological Processes", by Margie O'Bryan, and "Sanskrit Roots in ks" by Arnold M. Zwicky. In addition, the editors have provided an introduction, a brief

---

1This trend has continued throughout the development of generative grammar. For instance, Sag (1976; reprinted in the volume under review) and Schindler (1976) seemed, to my mind at least, to have conclusively settled the status of Grassmann's Law and related aspiration phenomena in Sanskrit, a controversy whose early history is chronicled in here. Nonetheless, a treatment of the facts in terms of nonlinear phonology — a theoretical innovation postdating the mid-1970s — was given by Borowsky and Mester (1983) (though see Janda and Joseph 1989 for a critical review of their purely phonological account of Sanskrit aspiration alternations).
Abstract of each selection, and an annotated bibliography which — as they themselves state (p. 11) — “is neither intended to be nor is exhaustive” and is merely a way of recognizing various studies with value to understanding generative perspectives on Sanskrit that could not be included in toto. Finally, Paul Kiparsky contributed a brief but characteristically insightful and interesting foreword to the volume focussing mainly on various ways in which linguistics in the west has undergone “Pāṇinization”.

Among the twelve selections are a couple of seminal papers — Sag’s contribution to the Grassmann’s Law/Bartolomae’s Law controversy and Kiparsky’s study on Vedic metrics and morphophonemics — as well as a few that deserve a broader audience, most notably the works by O’Bryan and by Hock. Some might be argued to be of dubious value; Anderson’s work, for instance, has been superseded by subsequent research and is useful now mainly just in its historical context as one of a series of treatments of the Grassmann’s Law/Bartolomae’s Law interaction. Phonology and morphology predominate, with only two of the twelve pieces dealing with syntax in any sense and one of those two — that by Staal — dealing with nominal composition, an area on the borderline between syntax and morphology. The emphasis on phonology and morphology, however, is, according to the editors (p. 4), a “reflection of the state of the art”, though probably it is more a function of a greater interest by early generativists in these areas of Sanskrit grammar than of a rudimentary state of development at the time for theories of syntax, synchronic or historical, as the editors intimate (p. 4).

All in all, then, the selection of articles is a reasonably good one. The main question that must be asked, though, is whether there is any value to bringing out in the late 1980s such an anthology, reflecting only early generative work on Sanskrit. Originally, the volume was planned for publication in the late 1970s, but various (unnamed) events delayed its appearance for nearly a decade, resulting in a collection that the editors themselves (p. 12) realize contains parts with an “almost prehystoric” cast to them.

The answer, though, is “yes”, for several reasons. First and foremost, some of the issues touched upon in these articles are timely to linguists even now in the 1990s. Abstractness in phonology, an issue brought to the fore in the contributions by Anderson, Phelps, Sag, Venne, and Zwicky, for instance, is still a problem with many analyses presented in nonlinear phonological frameworks, even if it has not yet been fully recognized as a problem, much less resolved. Moreover, the question of where to draw the boundaries between phonology and morphology — a topic discussed in the Sag and Hock pieces — has yet to find a satisfactory answer.

Second, for anyone interested in the history of generative grammar, let alone the history of generative exploration of Sanskrit, this collection provides an interesting window on the theory during a significant formative period. In addition, the fact that some of the reprinted pieces, e.g., Stanley’s and O’Bryan’s, are not readily accessible makes the collection all the more useful.

For some discussion of the status of Sanskrit as a spoken language in ancient times, see Hock and Pandharipande (1976), and for an account of language-death phenomena in spoken Sanskrit today, see Hock (1983).

3

4 Though it is not possible here even to approach exhaustiveness concerning a listing of all generative work on Sanskrit since 1976, see footnote 1 and note the publication of Hock (1991) in which several studies are to be found on Sanskrit syntax from various perspectives, including more recent generative approaches, as well as fairly comprehensive bibliography on relevant syntactic studies.
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Having twice visited Bombay, I was naturally drawn to K.S. Rajyashree's paper dealing with the Bombay slum of Dharavi, the largest slum in Asia with a population of 350,000. The residents of Dharavi speak 13 different languages (such as Marathi, Tamil, Kannada, and Konkani), and one conclusion of the author's interesting research is the demonstration of "the presence of unexpected incentives for the learning and use of one language over another" (p. 369). I am not sure how (nor why) the author subdivided Hindi from Urdu, regarded as two distinct languages on a chart (p. 373) showing the distribution of households in terms of language, since both of them are practically synonymous (which is why most linguists refer to the language as Hindi-Urdu). Quite curiously, however, the author also remarks: "... the names Hindi, Urdu, Bombayiya Hindi, Dakhanî and Broken Hindi are taken by the researcher to refer to the same language" (p. 384). Another important conclusion of the article is that "language plays the most important role" (p. 391) in the community, more than religion, caste, sex or age. There are some interesting parallels cited to the research reported on, such as among the Chinese of Sarawak in which watch repairmen speak Cantonese whereas tinsmiths speak Hakka.

Although I have not visited Peru, I nevertheless found Leo A.W. Van Lier's "Puno: Teacher, School and Language" interesting reading. Puno is situated high in the Andes (3,800 meters), and the research accomplished there surveys the ethnolinguistic roles of its three main languages: Spanish, Quechua and Aymara. Spanish language learning is done largely through old-fashioned memorization techniques; however, there is often little actual comprehension of the individual Spanish morphemes being memorized making the situation similar, to some extent at least, to the memorization of Arabic, Hebrew, or Sanskrit for many who study those languages. Since the latter three languages are used liturgically, though, meaning is often a secondary consideration. One conclusion offered by Van Lier with which I am in agreement, is that "rural education is characterized by widespread failure" (p. 509).

Coleman states in his introduction that the volume is "a multidisciplinary survey, rather than an interdisciplinary synthesis" (p. 2). It would have been more beneficial to linguists, however, to have many of the papers written by non-linguists overlap more with linguistic concerns rather than deal so much with those of their own disciplines, such as sociology. As most of these papers stand, the majority of linguists will not take the time to read them due to this fact. Moreover, these linguists are perhaps justified in their decision.
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