



La langue hayu

Review Author[s]:
George Van Driem

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Volume 53,
Issue 3 (1990), 565-571.

Stable URL:
<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0041-977X%281990%2953%3A3%3C565%3ALLH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London is published by School of Oriental and African Studies. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/soas.html>.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
©1990 School of Oriental and African Studies

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

suggesting the usefulness of various conceptual apparatuses in the analysis of Japan. Thus, for example, Sone (p. 286) deals with a certain formulation about Japan—the interlinkages of the LDP, big business, and bureaucracy—and goes on to outline alternative explanations for a certain facet of Japanese politics. Similarly, Koike (p. 111) argues against the cultural explanations of Japanese workplace behaviour as put forward by earlier scholars of this society. In these kinds of examples the elaboration of alternative explanations is actually governed by the group model of Japanese society itself, i.e. by the most prevalent formulation about Japan.

Other scholars use general constructs in order to highlight the special (but, of course, not unique) circumstances of Japanese society and culture. Thus for instance, Befu (p. 50) mobilizes exchange theory in order to illuminate practices associated with corruption, while Atsumi (p. 140) uses findings and theories about friendship developed outside Japan to explain internal change and variation within it. This kind of exercise is most evident in the piece by Mouer and Sugimoto, which argues for the essential comparability of Japan and cases taken from Japan. This is no mean point for many areas in Japanese studies which have been characterized by a certain parochialism and 'imperviousness' to external intellectual developments. In this respect many of the essays which appear in this volume are clear exemplifications of the way in which Japanese studies have begun to open up to wider theoretical currents.

Yet for all this, two contributions—the ones by Plath and by Pharr—seem to be of more lasting significance not only for 'Japan specialists' but for anyone interested in the social sciences. Both essays—although each in its own way—show how Japan can serve as a strategic case not only for comparative purposes but also for the reformulation of theory. Plath (p. 69) does this by explicating how certain Japanese conceptions of the self may uncover Western theoretical biases and fascinations with the individual as a monad entity, while Pharr (pp. 244-7) demonstrates how the special manner in which status shapes conflicts in Japan may prod us to modify conflict theory and to generate new hypotheses for research around the world. It is these kinds of works, I would cautiously suggest, that will stand at the forefront of future Japanese studies. It is in these kinds of interpretations that the substantial contribution of studies of and about Japan will be found.

Let me conclude with a point that is related to something that the editors (pp. 23-7) very correctly point to as a lacuna in research about Japan (and that has always fascinated me about edited volumes based on conferences or meetings). This point involves the need to engage in a serious sociology of Japanology in order to understand the limits or potentials of Japanese studies: i.e. the patterns of resource exchange, organizational and government interests, and academic politics that underly the processes of producing and propagating knowledge about Japan.

Sugimoto and Mouer suggest that we should be fully aware of the links between vested governmental interests and the promotion of

certain 'correct' understandings of Japan. Interestingly, in one of the marginal parts of the text—the preface (p. xiv)—we are told that among other funding bodies, the Japan Foundation made the book (and the colloquium on which it is based) possible. If this is so, then any serious sociology of Japanology promises to be both complicated and fascinating.

EYAL BEN-ARI

BOYD MICHAÏLOVSKY: *La langue hayu*. (Collection Sciences du Langage.) 234 pp. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1988. Fr. 210.

Hayu is a western Kiranti (Nepali: *Kirāntī*) language spoken in *Rāmechāp* district and neighbouring portions of *Kābhre Pālañcok* and *Sindhulī* districts in eastern Nepal. The Hayu are known in Nepali as *Hāyu* but in their own language call themselves *wājor*. Extant ethnic Hayu villages are to be found in an elongated region along the *Mahābhārat* range following the course of the *Rosī Kholā* above its confluence with the *Sun Kosī*, whence the Hayu homeland extends down the *Sun Kosī* as far as the latter's confluence with the *Likhu Kholā*. Amongst the settlements of ethnic Hayu, the Hayu tongue only survives as a living language in one community at *Murājor* and *Bar Dādā*, a few km. south of the district centre of *Rāmechāp*, and at a second community at *Māneḍihī* and *Adhamarā*, on the southern slopes of the *Mahābhārat Lek*. Michailovsky's grammar is based on the dialect of *Murājor*, where he conducted field work accompanied by his wife and colleague Martine Mazaudon, but Michailovsky also devotes attention to the dialect of the community at *Māneḍihī* and *Adhamarā*, particularly in his chapter on Hayu phonology.

Michailovsky's book is a reworked version of his doctoral thesis, 'Grammaire de la langue hayu' (1981), based on additional field-work at *Murājor* in 1984. *La langue hayu* is an exquisite work of descriptive linguistics and consists of five chapters which consecutively deal with the Hayu people and their language, Hayu phonology, the verbal morphology, the non-verbal morphology and the syntax of the language. The book is richly illustrated with examples and diagrams and includes two native texts complete with interlinear morpheme glosses and translations. Although the book lacks a glossary, all Hayu items and utterances are glossed wherever they occur, and both a concise index of important Hayu words, particles and morphemes as well as a well-done subject index are provided by the author. The generous use of tables and diagrams, especially in ch. iii, along with the clarity of Michailovsky's expository prose make the vagaries of Hayu grammar, especially its complex morphology, readily accessible to the reader.

In his avant-propos, Michailovsky indicates his adherence to Prague School structuralism in matters of phonology and his theory-neutral but structuralist-inspired approach to morphology and syntax. The author explains this choice of framework as follows: 'Dans notre

étude de la morphologie et de la syntaxe, nous n'avons pas cherché à adhérer à un cadre théorique précis, aucun des cadres actuellement existant ne nous semblant offrir l'équivalent du cadre pragois en phonologie, c'est-à-dire une théorie générale sur la structure des systèmes qui permette d'appréhender plus clairement les faits, même et peut-être surtout quand on est amené à transgresser la théorie cadre.' In view of the goals a linguist sets himself in writing a grammar, the integrity of such an approach certainly recommends it as the ideal framework for any descriptive linguist.

Chapter i is a general introduction to the Hayu and their language. The author's factual descriptions of the indigenous death ritual and other Hayu traditions provide detailed data on the Hayu variety of indigenous Kiranti shamanism, furnishing valuable material for those who study the indigenous Kiranti religions in the context of pre-Buddhist, pre-Hindu Asian shamanism. In this chapter, the author explains his methodology with vivid descriptions (pp. 41-4) of what it is like to work with Nepalese informants in the Himalayan cultural context. The chapter also includes an excellent survey of Tibeto-Burman subgroupings in Nepal and of work which has been done in this field (pp. 36-41). The author also broaches the subject of typological comparison between indigenous Tibeto-Burman languages, such as Hayu, and Nepali, the Indo-Aryan *lingua franca* of Nepal. Michailovsky's appreciation of Himalayan areal norms (pp. 34-5) is reminiscent of Kirsten Refsing's experience (*The Ainu language*, 1986, 49-50, and personal communication of April 1986) with Ainu which, she recounts, generally translates more readily into some close Japanese equivalent than into either Danish or English. Certainly, the efficacy of Michailovsky's employing four different systems of transcription for Nepali in a scholarly publication of this type is questionable, particularly when some of these systems do not enable an unambiguous rendering of either the native orthography or the phonological make-up of Nepali words (pp. 11-12), e.g. 'Manedihī' (Nep. *Mānedihī*), 'bhalā' (Nep. *bhalā*). On the other hand, Michailovsky provides a concise and highly relevant explanation of Nepali phonology in his discussion of Nepali loans in Hayu (pp. 73-4).

Chapter ii is not only a phonology of the language but also a thorough and enjoyably lucid account of morphophonological processes in *Hayu*, complex regularities of great interest which give the appearance of being quintessentially Kiranti in character. For example, the assimilation and allophony of Hayu finals operate according to three distinct systems of regularities, depending on whether these finals occur (1) word-finally, (2) morpheme-finally in word-internal position or (3) syllable-finally in morpheme-internal position.

In ch. iii, the author provides a description of Hayu verbal morphology. Like most Kiranti languages, Hayu distinguishes eleven pronominal categories. In addition to the three persons, there is a dual alongside the singular and plural, as well as an inclusive/exclusive distinction in the first person. Hayu intransitive and reflexive verbs show agreement with one actant, whereas

the transitive verb agrees with both the agent and the patient (or beneficiary) of the action.

In his table of morphemes in section 3.10, Michailovsky identifies elements in the complex, but segmentable, conjugational endings of the Hayu verb. In an article on the verbal morphology of Proto-Kiranti (Van Driem, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 22/2, 1990), I provide a somewhat different morphemic analysis of Hayu verbal inflection based on what I believe to be a more thoroughgoing segmentation of the Hayu endings and on the identification of discrete functional positions or 'slots' occupied by these morphemes in the affixal string of inflected verb forms. I rely entirely on the data provided by Michailovsky (*Grammaire de la langue hayu*, 1981) for my morphemic analysis, drawn up in order to isolate and formally and semantically define discrete entities required for a systematic comparison of the Hayu verb with the conjugations of other Kiranti languages. Since the minor differences in detail in Michailovsky's and my approach to the morphemic analysis of the Hayu verbal data are made amply clear in that article (where I adhere to Michailovsky's 1981 orthography for the Hayu half-closed back vowel, i.e. /ɔ/ instead of /o/, I shall limit myself here to the following five observations on several interesting topics addressed by the author in this third chapter.

First, although Michailovsky, in his typological discussion in section 5.11, claims 'Nous n'avons trouvé aucune construction syntaxique en hayu qui traite S[ujet d'un verbe intransitif] et O[bj et d'un verbe transitif] de la même façon et A[gent d'un verbe transitif] différemment, sauf évidemment l'attribution des marques casuelles. [...] Toutefois nous croyons utile de signaler que l'ergativité du hayu ne va pas au-delà des marques casuelles sur le plan syntaxique, non plus qu'elle ne pénètre le système d'accord verbale' (p. 202), the Hayu verb does in fact code differently for a first singular agent (in the form of the *portemaneau* morphemes <-ŋ ~ -N ~ -soŋ> 1s→3 and <-no> 1s→2) than it does a first singular subject or patient (<-soŋ> in the past and <-no> in the non-past), as Michailovsky points out in section 3.10. Whereas ergativity manifests itself morphologically in the Hayu verbal agreement system only in the way the verb codes for a first singular actant, this morphological feature of Hayu reflects a far more widely attested split ergative system in Tibeto-Burman in which first and second person actants are encoded in the verb according to an ergative system (patient/subject vs. agent), whereas third person actants are encoded in the verb according to an accusative system (agent/subject vs. patient). Number is also encoded in Kiranti verbal agreement systems differently for first and second person actants than it is for third person actants, and outside of Kiranti a first and second versus third person split-ergative system is reflected in the verbal morphology of *rGya-roñ* (Van Driem, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 22/2, 1990; 'Le proto-kiranti revisité; morphologie verbale du lohörung', forthcoming).

Secondly, in discussing Hayu transitive verb forms, Michailovsky (*La langue hayu*, 1988, 83, 113-4) distinguishes between *inverse* forms expressing the transitive relationships 3→1, 3→2 and 2→1 in which 'l'action se déroule, en

quelque sorte, vers le locuteur or, dans le cas de 3→2, de l'extérieur vers l'interlocuteur' and direct forms expressing the transitive relationships 1→2, 1→3, 2→3 and 3→3 in which 'l'action verbale se déroule en partant du locuteur ou de son interlocuteur vers l'extérieur'. Michailovsky adopts the terms *inverse* and *direct* from Hockett (*International Journal of American Linguistics*, 32/1, 1966) who uses the terms for Algonquian. The typological phenomenon of just such a dichotomy in the transitive scenarios in the conjugation has long been described by Uralic linguists, using terms such as *tárgyas* and *tárgyatlan*, *Objekt-konjugation* and *Subjekt-konjugation* or *centripetal* and *centrifugal* (Castrén, *Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*, 1854; Collinder, *Comparative grammar of Uralic languages*, 1960; Kortlandt, *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 1983; Van Driem, art. cit., forthcoming). The relevance of the inverse vs. direct distinction to Hayu is that the endings of inverse transitive forms are identical to those of the corresponding intransitive forms. So, although the inverse/direct dichotomy is particularly clear-cut in Hayu, Michailovsky (p. 113) clearly points out that there is no morphological marker for either a direct or inverse scenario. A similar phenomenon is observed in Limbu where the endings of 3s→1 and 3s→2 are identical to those of intransitive first and second person forms. As I argue elsewhere (Van Driem, art. cit., forthcoming), the Hayu situation does not reflect an underlying distinction between inverse and direct forms in Kiranti but demonstrably reflects the split-ergative system discussed above. Michailovsky is therefore quite right to point out that the person hierarchy which manifests itself in the apparent inverse/direct dichotomy as well as in a certain degree of formal symmetry between the inverse and the corresponding direct forms is connected with the precision with which specific morphemes encode person and number of actant in Hayu and, I might add, in Kiranti languages in general.

Thirdly, Michailovsky explains that, within the transitive conjugation, Hayu differentiates between a regular transitive and an applicative conjugation. On the basis of this criterion, Hayu transitive verbs may be divided into three groups (p. 91): (1) transitive verbs distinguishing a regular and an applicative conjugation, (2) transitive verbs lacking an applicative conjugation, and (3) transitive verbs conjugating only according to the applicative paradigm. In the applicative paradigm, the verb shows patient agreement not with the object of the action, but with the beneficiary, e.g. non-applicative <puk- + -ko> [puxkoʃ] 'il le lève' vs. applicative <puk- + -ta> [puktoʃ] 'il le lève pour lui' (p. 89). With the exception of verbs with open stems or verbs with alternation between an open stem and a stem-final /t/ (discussed on pp. 99–103), the endings of the applicative paradigm are identical to those of the regular transitive paradigm except in 1s→3, 1pi→3, 1pc→2/3, 2s→3 and 3→3 forms (p. 89).

In his elaborate presentation of Limbu reflexes of the Tibeto-Burman directive *-t suffix, Michailovsky (in J. A. Matisoff and D. Bradley (ed.): *Linguistics in the Sino-Tibetan area*, 1985, 366) describes the category directive

in Tibeto-Burman as covering a range of related meanings from 'causative' to 'applied', 'benefactive' and 'malefactive'. From Michailovsky's excellent discussion of ditransitivity and actant coding in Hayu transitive verbs (*La langue hayu*, 1988, 139–44), it is clear that just such meanings are those conveyed by the Hayu applicative in /-t/. In a previous publication, Michailovsky (art. cit., in Matisoff and Bradley (ed.), 1985, 368) notes that Hayu applicative /-t/ reflects the same Tibeto-Burman directive *-t suffix which Michailovsky was the first to see reflected in the Limbu material. Moreover, Michailovsky clearly points out that the difference between the applicative and non-applicative meaning of a verb is lexeme-specific (*La langue hayu*, 1988, 91, 140ff.) and that the relationship between the non-applicative and applicative meaning of a verb is sometimes highly specialized and verb-specific (*La langue hayu*, 1988, 143–4).

All this would corroborate an alternative approach whereby, rather than assuming distinct applicative and non-applicative transitive conjugations in Hayu, one might argue that the transitive verbs 'qui distinguent un paradigme applicatif d'un paradigme non-applicatif' are in fact pairs of lexically distinct allofamic verbs, viz. (of a non-applicative) verb and its directive (applicative) derivative. The fact that verbs with an open stem show /a ~ o/ apophony in their non-applicative conjugation, whereas their applicative counterparts show no such apophony, strongly suggests that there exist pairs of lexically distinct verbs, e.g. <to- + -soŋ> [to-soŋ] 'il m'a placé (comme berger)' with the apophonic open stem <ta ~ to> vs. <ta-t + soŋ> [ta-soŋ] 'il me l'a posé' with the stem /ta-t/ (example from p. 103). Also in cases when a particular verb, e.g. si(t) 'savoir' or mo(t) 'chercher' gives the appearance of having a stem-final /t/ in reflexive forms only (p. 100), there are semantic reasons for assuming two separate allofamic verbs, e.g. a non-applicative transitive verb <mo> 'chercher' vs. an applicative (directive) reflexive <mo-t> 'se chercher'. This would leave us with two classes of verbs in Hayu, one of verbs which show a simple pattern of paradigmatically conditioned stem alternation and another of verbs which do not.

Pairs of 'verbes vt, vt à racine alternante en /-(t)/', i.e. pairs consisting of an open stem verb and its applicative counterpart with stem-final /-t/, preserve entirely distinct paradigms, e.g. <bu- + soŋ> [bu-soŋ] 'tu me portas' vs. <but- + soŋ> [busoŋ] 'tu me le portas' (p. 100), <hu- + -na> [hu-no] 'je te cherche' vs. <hut- + -no> [huno] 'je te le cherche' (p. 101). Such verbs show no stem alternation.

On the other hand, the class of applicative verbs of which the non-applicative derivand is not an open stem verb as well as the applicative verbs which lack a non-applicative counterpart preserve the applicative final /t/ only in 1s→3, 1pi→3, 1pe→2/3, 2s→3 and 3→3 forms. In other words, this class of applicative verbs in final /t/ exhibits a simple pattern of paradigmatically conditioned stem alternation, e.g. non-applicative <puk- + -kuŋ> [puxkuŋ] 'je le levai' vs. applicative <pukt- + -kuŋ> [puktuŋ] 'je le levai pour lui' in contrast to non-applicative <puk- + -soŋ> [puksoŋ] 'tu/il me

levas/leva' vs. applicative <pu:k- + -suy> (alternatively: <pu:k- + -suy>, although I shall not adopt this analysis) [pu:ksoj] 'tu levas/ il leva pour moi' (re-analysed examples from pp. 84-90). The paradigmatically conditioned stem alternation explains the homophony in 1→2, 2→1, 3→1/2, 1d→2/3 and 2dp→3 forms between a verb like <pu:k> 'lever quelqu'un' and its allofamic applicative (directive) derivative <pu:k- + -suy> 'lever pour quelqu'un'.

In this approach, one must presume that the final /t/ in this class of applicative verbs causes the /k/ of the first plural preterit suffix <-ki> to elide (in 1pi→3 and 1pe→2/3) as well as the /k/ in the third person patient preterit portemanteau morpheme <-ka> (in 1s→3/PT, 2s→3 and 3→3 forms) and the /s/ of the 1s→3 portemanteau morpheme <-suy> (in 1s→3/NPT forms), e.g. <sitt ~ sit> 'tuer', <sitt- + -ko + -m> [suxtom] 'il le tua' (re-analysed example from p. 140); <ha:t ~ ha> 'donner', <ha:t- + -suy> [ha:tsuy] 'je lui donne' and <ha:t- + -kuy> [ha:tkuy] 'je lui donnai' (re-analysed examples from p. 91). Elsewhere in the paradigm, this does not happen, for example, before the 1sPS/PT portemanteau morpheme <-suy>, e.g. <ha- + -suy> / ha:suy/ 'il me donna' (re-analysed example from p. 160); <gu sek sit- + -suy> [gu sek sutsuy] 'tue-moi mes poux' (example from p. 142), or before the 1s→2 portemanteau <-no>, e.g. <sit- + -no> [sitno] 'je te tue' (example from p. 142), <ha- + -no + -m> [ha:nom] 'je te donne (assertif)' (re-analysed example from p. 156). (For the morphemic analysis used here, cf. Van Driem, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 1990.)

The difference in semantic content between a non-applicative verb and its applicative derivative in Hayu (pp. 139-44, 191) is of the same nature as the difference in meaning in comparable pairs of Limbu verbs studied by Michailovsky (1985). Since a Hayu dictionary would have to specify this difference in meaning for all verbs 'qui distinguent un paradigme applicatif d'un paradigme non-applicatif' or, as I contend, between all such non-applicative/applicative pairs of verbs, I propose that it would be more satisfactory to list separately as distinct entries non-applicative verbs and their applicative <-t> derivatives, e.g. <khu> 'steal something' vs. <khut> 'rob someone, steal something from someone' (p. 108), <hu> 'look for something or someone' vs. <hut> 'look for something on behalf of or for the benefit of someone (=patient)' (pp. 101, 109). The lexical entry of a transitive verb would have to specify whether the verb showed stem alternation (e.g. <ru:k ~ ru:k> 'utiliser un animal (=patient) pour labourer, labourer un champ pour quelqu'un (=patient)', <ha:t ~ ha> 'donner') or whether it did not (e.g. <bu> 'porter sur le dos', <but> 'faire porter quelque chose par quelqu'un (=patient)', <ru:k> 'labourer').

The fact that Hayu verbs, such as 'to give' or 'to kill', invariably conjugate as applicatives would support a specification of their stems in the lexicon as <ha:t ~ ha> and <sitt ~ sit>. The vowel length in Hayu <ha:t ~ ha> 'give' would in this way also be a feature of the lexeme, rather than being exclusively the result of morphophonological processes. Recall that

vowel length in Hayu is only distinctive in an open first syllable of a polysyllabic word (pp. 47, 54-6) and that when such an open first syllable is the stem of a verb, it is automatically long (p. 68), e.g. <ha dak-mi> [ha dakmi] 'il faut (assertif) donner' (re-analysed example from p. 157) and <āsik ha-ha po-tshe> [āsik ha-ha po-tshe] 'ils se sont bēnis mutuellement' (re-analysed example from p. 160). Specified this way, the long vowel in the Hayu verb 'to give' is also more in line with the long vowels in its Limbu cognates <-ha-s/-ha-> 'apportion, share, distribute something' and <-ha-tt/-ha-> 'deal, portion out to, distribute amongst, share between'. The fact that Hayu <ha:t ~ ha> 'give' invariably shows patient agreement with the beneficiary, in which respect Hayu <ha:t ~ ha> resembles English 'endow' more than English 'give', is likewise a morphosyntactic and semantic feature to be specified in the lexicon. Alternatively, it might prove expedient to accurately define the semantic function of the syntactic category of patient for Kiranti languages (cf. Wierzbicka, *The semantics of grammar*, 1988, 391).

In addition to Michailovsky's elaborate treatment of the semantics and morphophonology of the non-applicative/applicative distinction, the author provides a list of 54 intransitive/transitive and non-causative/causative pairs of Hayu verbs reflecting an ancient prefixing process (pp. 106-10). If we adhere to Benedict's reconstruction of Tibeto-Burman derivational affixes, the prefix suggested by Michailovsky's list is the Tibeto-Burman causative *s- prefix (cf. Benedict, *Sino-Tibetan: a conspectus*, 1972, 105-6; Michailovsky, art. cit., 1985, 367-8, 374-5; Van Driem, *A grammar of Limbu*, 1987, 245-7, 266-7). Michailovsky also provides a very interesting discussion of Hodgson's work in the middle of the last century on the Hayu verbal paradigm (pp. 104-6).

Fourthly, the diagram on page 102 of Michailovsky's book would suggest that there exist in Hayu independent verb forms to designate the transitive relationship between a first person inclusive (dual and plural) agent and a second person patient. I have not been able to find an example of such a form in any of the many examples Michailovsky provides in *La langue hayu* and have indeed never been able to detect or elicit such forms myself in the Limbu, Dumi or Lohorung languages. In response to my attempts to elicit in Limbu, for example, 'you^{di} see us^{di} in the mirror' or 'we^{di} see you^{di} in the mirror', I have only attested circumlocutions of the type:

Khene² anchi aina-o² a-dha-p-si-ba
you^{di} see^{di} mirror-LOC 1-be visible-d-NOM
ke-ni
2-see
'You^{di} see us^{di} (literally: the fact that we^{di} are visible) in the mirror.'

More often, informants will go to great lengths to point out the absurdity of my wishing to express a transitive scenario between a first inclusive and a second person actant, arguing quite convincingly of course that a first inclusive (dual or plural) reflexive meaning is more plausible. My understandable scepticism on this score leads me to wonder whether the transitive forms suggested by the diagram on page 102 are

determinative suffix in nominals <-*mu*> (~ <-*mi*> in adjectives denoting colours) in its determinative function, the Hayu assertive suffix in verbs <-*mi* ~-*m*> and the Hayu nominalizing suffix <-*m*> reflect the same etymon, whereas the Hayu genitive/determinative suffix <-*mu*> in its genitive function probably reflects a distinct etymon denoting genitive case.

Chapter iv comprises a succinct treatment of both derivational and flectional endings in Hayu nominal parts of speech. A more elaborate discussion devoted to Hayu case endings is given in the fifth chapter under section 5.3. on 'Le syntagme nominal'. The absolutive case in Hayu is unmarked, as is the case in other attested Kiranti languages. The suffix of the ergative case is <-*ha*>, evidently cognate to the Dumi ergative case marker <-*ʔa*> and the Lohorong ergative suffix <-*ʔe*>. Remarkably, although Hayu possessive pronouns are highly specific as to person and number, distinguishing all eleven pronominal categories, the free forms of the pronouns are only specific for number in the second person: *gon* 'you' (singular), *gon-sche* 'you' (dual), *gone* 'you' (plural). There is only a single pronoun to express a first person actant *gu* ~ *guu*, covering the meanings 'I' and 'we' (both dual and plural, both inclusive and exclusive), and number is not distinguished in the third person: *komi* 'he/she/they' (human), *mi* ~ *mii* 'he/she/it/they' (human and non-human) and *i* ~ *ii* 'he/she/it/they' (proximal, human and non-human). The interesting Hayu phenomenon that the first person (*gu* 'I/we') and second singular (*gon* 'you') pronouns have special ergative forms, *ga* 'I/we(erg.)' and *gona* 'you(erg.)', has a parallel in Dumi and Lohorong. In Dumi, the singular pronouns *ay* 'I', *an* 'you' and *im* 'he/she' have ergative forms *aya*, *ana* and *ima*, with the special allomorph <-*a*> of the ergative suffix which elsewhere, in nouns but also in other pronouns, has the form <-*ʔa*>. In Lohorong, the six of the eleven personal pronouns which end in [-*a*] have special ergative forms in [-*e*], e.g. *kayka* 'we (plural exclusive)' vs. *kayke* 'we (plural exclusive ergative)', and third singular pronoun *kho* 'he/she' has a special ergative form *kho-se* 'he/she (ergative)', with the ending <-*se*> whilst elsewhere, in nouns but also in pronouns, the ergative suffix is <-*ʔe*>.

Chapter v is a veritable treasure-trove of fascinating data and descriptions of grammatical and semantic categories and phenomena in Hayu. Not only the structure of Hayu sentences is dealt with in this chapter, but the internal syntactic structure and morphosyntax of syntactic constituents, large and small, is exhaustively treated with the aid of numerous well chosen examples. There is a lucid section on reflexivity in Hayu (pp. 144-6), following the section (5.1.5.) on ditransitivity discussed above. The author provides descriptions of many periphrastic constructions of the Hayu verb, including a range of modal constructions, a true passive (where the agentive actant cannot be expressed in the syntagm) and different types of causative. The finite modal in Hayu periphrastic constructions governs either the bare stem of the main verb or, as in the case of *hɔ* 'obtenir de' and *bi* 'demander de', the genitived stem of the main verb, which in Hayu is the same thing as the infinitive.

The variety of subordinating suffixes or postpositions in Hayu is of great interest to the comparative study of Kiranti syntax. Of these verbal postpositions Michailovsky says: 'Pour la plupart, ces postpositions sont les mêmes que celles qui s'emploient avec les syntagmes nominaux' (p. 179). Indeed, the nominal suffix <-*boŋ*> 'jusqu'à' (pp. 178-9) appears to be the same morpheme as the verbal subordinator <-*boŋ*> 'aussi longtemps que' (p. 183). However, the subordinator <-*noŋ*> (p. 182), which might justifiably be termed a coordinator, the linear order of the coordinated arguments reflecting the chronological order of the events they denote, appears to be cognate to Limbu <-*aŋ*> which has the same function, whereas the 'locatif-sociatif' nominal suffix <-*noŋ*> (p. 176) would appear to be cognate to the Limbu comitative suffix <-*nu*>, in both its locative and sociative senses. Have two Proto-Kiranti suffixes, still distinct in Limbu, coalesced to form the Hayu morpheme, or is the etymological relationship, if any, between Hayu <-*noŋ*> and the corresponding Limbu suffix more complex?

The Hayu suffix <-*ken*>, which functions both as an ablative suffix in nouns (pp. 175-6) and as a perfect gerund suffix when affixed to verbs (pp. 182-3), appears to be cognate with the Bahing 'gerund of past time' <-*ko*> which is suffixed to both preterit and non-preterit finites (Hodgson 1858: 411-12) and the Dumi perfect gerund suffix <-*ka*>, attached to both verbs and, in an ablative sense, to adverbs. Likewise, the Hayu suffix <-*nana*> is attached to verbs, yielding a progressive gerund which can either function as a clause modifier or combine with an auxiliary to form a periphrastic progressive sense (p. 148). This Hayu suffix <-*nana*> is cognate with the Bahing 'gerund of the present and future time' <-*na*>, which is suffixed to both preterit and non-preterit finites (Hodgson, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xxvii, 1858, 411-12).

First person plural inclusive is used in an impersonal sense in Hayu as it is in Limbu, Lohorong and Dumi (pp. 173, 171, 153) like French *on*, but also in much the same way as the second person is used in an impersonal, non-literal sense in colloquial Dutch or English. The Hayu phenomenon of an impersonal first plural inclusive appears to be a widespread phenomenon in languages with a first plural inclusive category, not limited to the Kiranti area of the eastern Himalayas. A similar impersonal usage is, for example, attested for the first plural inclusive pronoun, *ni* in the Mesoamerican Otomangue language Popoloca (J. W. Veerman-Leichsenring, 'Metzontla Popoloca', Ph.D. thesis, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 1990).

Hayu has several distinct negative morphemes: <*tha*> in the imperative, <*ma*> in the indicative, <*maay*> negator of gerunds, nouns and attributes. Unlike the negative affixes one observes in most other Kiranti languages, the negative morphemes in Hayu behave like particles. A parallel for the differentiation of negative morphemes in the Hayu fashion can be found in Lohorong where the prefix <*a*> is used in the negation of infinitives, adjectives and imperatives, whereas indicatives are negated by the prefix <*ma*> in

the preterit and perfect and by the suffix <-ni> in the non-preterit.

The affixes of the Hayu negative gerund <ma-stem-sa> (p. 161) appear to be cognate to the Limbu negative perfect gerund <men-stem-^{2e}>, the Lohorong negative perfect gerund <me-stem-le/-re> and perhaps also the Dumi negative perfect gerund <ma-stem-na>. Certainly the Hayu negative perfect gerund is virtually identical in function to these, as Michailovsky's examples (p. 184) show, and perhaps here the Hayu negative morpheme <ma-> functions, or *still* functions, as a prefix in these forms. As Michailovsky remarks, 'Il est curieux de trouver toujours la particule négative [ma] dans cette construction et non [maay], qu'on attendrait avec le gérondif' (p. 184).

La langue hayu is a major contribution to Sino-Tibetan linguistics and to our knowledge of the indigenous Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal. In producing this detailed, well-written state-of-the-art grammar of a language on the verge of extinction, Michailovsky has preserved part of the rich linguistic and cultural heritage of the Himalayas for posterity.

GEORGE VAN DRIEM

AUNG TUN THET: *Burmese entrepreneurship: creative response in the colonial economy*. (Berträge zur Südasiensforschung [Heidelberg], 126.) xvi, 197 pp. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1989. DM 36.

Aung Tun Thet tackles one of the most important, and intractable, issues in the economic history of Burma under British rule—the essential absence of Burmese from the dominant entrepreneurial positions in the colonial economy. He advances two main ideas. First, that 'the apparent absence of Burmese entrepreneurship can be directly attributed to deliberate colonial policies' (p. 42): that the British administration provided no encouragement to indigenous enterprise while favouring foreign economic interests. Second, that despite the 'decapitation' of Burmese entrepreneurship by the colonial administration, during the colonial period a considerable number of indigenous entrepreneurs did emerge and indeed thrive: however, they were concentrated in specific activities—in up-country rice milling, moneylending/landowning, brokerage, printing. And, of course, resourceful, energetic Burmese agriculturalists were the crucial element in the spectacular growth of the province's major industry—the cultivation of rice for export.

Aung Tun Thet draws on a very wide range of official colonial sources and on the limited body of Burmese materials relevant to this theme. As a result he provides much valuable information, particularly with respect to the Burmese business class (the individuals involved and the nature of their commercial interests) during the colonial period. However, it is by no means clear that Aung Tun Thet has satisfactorily established his opening, principal thesis. Although the British administration may well have sought to suppress Burmese entre-

preneurial activity, it does not follow that the essential absence of Burmese from the commanding positions in the economy can be directly attributed to colonial policy. The subordinate position of indigenous entrepreneurship clearly reflected a number of influences, of which the intervention of the colonial state was simply one—and not necessarily a central one. Indeed, it might be argued that a more important consideration here was the fact that foreign business concerns operating in colonial Burma had, in contrast to most indigenous interests, the advantages of long-established international trading connexions and ease of access to major, external sources of capital.

IAN BROWN

H. F. TILLEMA: *A journey among the peoples of Central Borneo in word and picture*. Edited and with an introduction by Victor T. King. xvi, 251 pp. Singapore, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. £40.

Hendrik Freerk Tillema (1870–1952) was a Dutch pharmacist who spent nearly 40 years working, travelling and researching in the Netherlands East Indies. Although describing himself as a 'consummate layman', Tillema published some fifty articles and more substantial works covering such diverse subjects as public health and hygiene, tattooing, religion and other cultural phenomena among peoples of Central Borneo. He was also a meticulous photographer; and this finely illustrated volume constitutes an English edition of the results of his expedition to Apo Kayan in 1931–32, first published in Dutch in 1938 as *Apo-Kajan. Een filmreis naar en door Centraal-Borneo*.

The Apo Kayan is an area of Central Borneo at the head of the Kayan River, populated largely by Kenyah who had displaced Kayan groups during the first half of the nineteenth century. Its isolation and difficulty of access, and the apparent relative purity of Kenyah traditions, appealed to Tillema, whose express purpose was 'to record on film and in photographs strange customs, usages, and so on'. Although he concentrated on the immediately visual richness of Dayak culture, and tended to describe the Dayaks as 'men of nature', he made valuable observations on agriculture, demography, health, technology, social structure and symbolism.

Tillema's text is in two parts: 'The Apo Kayan in word and picture', which is primarily an account of his 44-day journey up-river and his stay in the area; and 'The Apo Kayan in picture and word', which is devoted solely to photographic records. His descriptions of the arduous journey through rapids are evocative and will strike a familiar chord with those who have travelled similarly. On the way, incidents such as that of a snake falling from branches overhead prompt Tillema to digress about the effects of trade in snake skins on populations of grain-eating mice, and to conclude that 'The balance of nature in the tropics is being disturbed by European ladies' (p. 66). In general, however, his concise account of slash-and-burn