ANDREAS JOSWIG, SIL (Summer Institute of Linguistics) Ethiopia

Review

Byzance, 2007); cp. also [but *non vidi*] JEAN-FRANÇOIS SALLES – ALEKSANDR V. SEDOV, *Qāni'. Le port antique du Hadramawt entre la Méditerranée, l'Afrique et l'Inde. Fouilles russes 1972, 1985–1989, 1991, 1993–1994* (Indicopleustoi 6. Archaeologies of the Indian Ocean, Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).

If compared to the extent of the work, errors, although occasionally present, are few: cp. p. 12, l. 24, "ist" (instead of "is"); p. 12, l. 25, "indicatedd" (instead of "indicated"); p. 21, l. 7, "the the" (instead of "the"); p. 25, l. 8, "Casearaugusta" (instead of "Caesar–") etc. In some occurrences, the reader realizes that final checks of internal references could not be made: cp., e.g., p. 2, n. 2, where reference to "p. 186" should be to "p. 185" instead; p. 110, 4th paragraph, the reference to "the genitive absolute at the end of the preceding passage in *Bios* 10.50–52 lost its connection" etc. should be to "*Bios* 10.45–46", cp. p. 408; p. 801, apparatus at *Dialexis* E 734, "Σέρδιδος μ] Σέρδιδος cett." should be "Σέρδιδος μ] Σέριδος cett.", and *ibid.*, the transl. has "Serdidos", but the Summary on p. 115 has "Seridos" (cp. p. 69, and n. 134, where Σέρδιδος, i.e. ΣΕΡΔΙΔΟΣ < ΣΕΡΑΙΔΟΣ, is interpreted as a true rendering of Arabic *Šarāḥīl*, and therefore as a reading better than Σέριδος of the majority of the families) etc.

Apart from these very minor shortcomings, this wonderful volume offers a new reliable critical basis, and is therefore an invaluable service, to all those – Ethiopicists included, and in the forefront – who will have to cope with the Gregentios dossier.

Alessandro Bausi, Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale"

DAVID L. APPLEYARD, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 2006. 200 pp. Price: € 34,80. ISBN: 3–89645–481–1

To many scholars interested in Agaw languages or in Proto-Cushitic reconstruction this will be a long awaited book. Twelve years ago[1] David Appleyard already provided a small glimpse of what he was up to and now he has finally delivered the product. It is good to look back at the author's 1996 article to understand the rationale for the project – an aspect he strangely leaves out in the introduction to the current book. Then, he wrote (1996, p. 191): *"The objective of the Dictionary is not only to provide comparative data for reconstruction, but also to give an overall picture of the vocabulary distribution across the languages"*. The motivation for the project is therefore as much descriptive as it is comparative.

---

[1] DAVID APPLEYARD, Preparing a Comparative Agaw Dictionary, in: CATHERINE GRIEVENOW-MEVIS – RAINER M. VOIGT (eds.): *Cushitic and Omotic Languages – Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium, Berlin (March 17–19, 1994)*, pp 185–200. (Köln 1996).

Appleyard's book consists of three parts. The first is an introduction which gives a lot of information about the linguistic and even ethnographic context of the Agaw languages. This can be used as a helpful update to Hetzron's 1976 article[2] as it adds the results of thirty more years of research on languages, dialects and typology. Also included in this introduction is a guide to the dictionary. This is followed by the most ambitious part of the project – Appleyard's proposal for a Proto-Agaw sound inventory including the regular sound correspondences leading up to it. It may be noted here that the list of Proto-Agaw phonemes does not deviate substantially from Appleyard's previous attempt at creating such an inventory[3]. The only notable exception is the inclusion of the glottal phoneme /*ʔ/.

The second part is the dictionary itself, with roughly 720 entries. These are ordered by their English gloss, assuming that this is the end from which most users will approach the dictionary. Perhaps some comparativists would have preferred to have the dictionary ordered according to the Proto-Agaw reconstructions for easy reference. This, however, would have been problematic due to the fact that Appleyard does not offer such reconstructions for all entries. The English headwords are followed by the glosses in the four principal Agaw languages – Bilin, Xamtanga, Kemant and Awngi (in that order). If any glosses are available from some minor dialects (Kaïliña, Kunfäl, Quarenya) or if any other glosses are provided by sources which are deemed "secondary" by the author (like the old wordlists by Reinisch, Conti-Rossini or others), then these are added below the four primary languages. This descriptive part of the entry is followed by the comparative discussion, if applicable. If there are cognates from Southern Agaw and any other language, then the author proposes a Proto-Agaw reconstruction based on the sound correspondences outlined in the introduction. If there are only cognates from languages other than Awngi and Kunfäl, then Appleyard restricts himself to proposing a Proto-Northern-Agaw reconstruction. When appropriate, he then places the reconstructions into the wider Cushitic or even Afro-Asiatic context. This is not the place to challenge any of these reconstructions in detail. It is to be expected that Appleyard's work will now spark a new round of discussion regarding the reconstruction of Proto-Agaw or even Proto-Cushitic word forms.

[2] ROBERT HETZRON, The Agaw Languages, *Afroasiatic Linguistics 3/3*, pp. 31–75 (1976).

[3] DAVID APPLEYARD, The Internal Classification of the Agaw Languages: A Comparative and Historical Phonology. in: JAMES BYNON (ed.): *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics – Papers of the Third International Hamito-Semitic Congress.* pp. 33–67. (Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1984).

The third part of the dictionary consists of language specific word lists. It begins with the Proto-Agaw or Proto-Northern-Agaw reconstructions followed by the four individual principal languages. This time the word lists are ordered alphabetically according to the respective language, which provides the comparativists with the tool they are looking for. The book concludes with a bibliography, which is by no means comprehensive. It is regrettable that the author made no use at all of Frank Palmer's writings on Bilin and Awngi[4], although they certainly provide data of the highest linguistic standards.

As can be judged from the comparatively small number of entries, Appleyard's greatest difficulty in compiling this valuable dictionary was certainly the lack of good and reliable data on the Agaw languages. This is by no means his fault. The Agaw languages still lack descriptions which can lay any claim on "completeness". Published sources so far do not provide more than a few hundred lexical entries for any of the Agaw languages. Surely there is a lot more data out there waiting to be published. Had the author had access to any of that unpublished data, it would certainly have improved the results of his efforts. Therefore, this book is also a reminder to those of us working on Agaw languages who are hoarding our data to finally make it available to others.

In his introduction, and even more so in his 1996 article (p. 190), Appleyard complains rightly about the difficulty of using data that has been transcribed to various standards without any clear indication of how these transcriptions are to be interpreted. Unfortunately, he himself is at least partly guilty of the same negligence. The field of Ethiopian linguistics has so far largely ignored the existence of an international standard for sound transcriptions (the IPA). Granted, it is difficult to break out of such a long tradition, but a monograph giving lexical comparisons for at least four languages would have been a good opportunity to leave behind this bad habit. Following the IPA would have made the book a lot more useful for a wider linguistic audience. It is to Appleyard's credit, however, that he has provided IPA illustrations to some non-standard consonant symbols in the introduction, but the same is lacking for the especially tricky vowel system of the Cushitic languages. After going through the introduction, the reader is left in a complete haze about the real value of vowels like *ä*, ɑ and ə in

---

[4] "The Verb in Bilin", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (*BSOAS*) XIX/1, p. 131–159, SOAS (London, 1957). – "The Noun in Bilin", *BSOAS* XXI/2, p. 376–391, SOAS (London, 1958). – "The Verb Classes of Agaw (Awiya)", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 7, 2, p. 270–97 (Berlin, 1959). – "An Outline of Bilin Phonology", in: Academia Nazionale dei Lincei (ed.): *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Etiopici* (*Roma 2–4 aprile 1959*), p. 109–115, Academia Nazionale dei Lincei (Roma, 1960).

some of the languages. All in all, it would be nice if the whole field of Ethiopian linguistics could abandon this unhelpful tradition and agree to use the internationally accepted standard of the IPA.

In spite of this little shortcoming, the *Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages* is an excellent resource. It defines a new step in the reconstruction of Proto-Agaw, which can be used even for comparative work on all Cushitic languages. It is also a priceless documentation of the combined lexicon of the Agaw languages, as far as it has been published in various sources to date. The author is to be commended for this diligent and time-consuming work. It will be an asset to anyone who wants to study the Agaw languages, be it from the descriptive or from the comparative perspective.

Andreas Joswig, SIL (Summer Institute of Linguistics) Ethiopia

RONNY MEYER, *Wolane. Descriptive Grammar of an East Gurage Language* (*Ethiosemitic*). Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, Köln. 2006. 340 pp. Price: € 39,80. ISBN: 978–3–89645–547–5

Wolane (also Wäläne) is an unwritten language with around 70,000 speakers belonging to the East Gurage branch of South Ethiopic or Ethiosemitic (ES). Some classifications of ES consider Wolane to be a dialect or variant of Səlṭe, whilst others regard it as a separate language. Though Meyer states that Səlṭe and Wolane are mutually intelligible, which on purely descriptive linguistic grounds would make them varieties of the same language or dialect continuum, he prefers to consider them as two distinct languages on sociolinguistic grounds, as the two groups of speakers themselves stress the cultural differences between them.

The present grammar does not follow a single linguistic or theoretical model, but is expressly descriptive, using a structural approach in identifying phonemes and morphemes and a functional approach in describing morpho-syntactic and discourse-pragmatic features. As such it is readily accessible and allows the reader easily to discover and grasp relevant facts about the language. To this end the copious examples are given in a fourfold format: (a) the word or words as spoken, in a broad transcription marking sub-phonemic features, followed (b) by a morpheme analysis, (c) a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, and finally (d) an English translation. The distinct utterance format is necessitated insofar as there is a not inconsiderable degree of allophonic variation in Wolane, for instance where the ending of the 1s perfective of verbs, underlyingly /-h^w/, can surface as [-ku], [-hu] or [-^wx] according to environment, or the consonant /q/ surfaces either as ejective [k'] or glottal stop [ʔ] in strictly defined positions. Data in tables and