As a result of the under-differentiation of the vowels in the language, there are many wrong entries and the lexical distinctions such as *fʌ̀ŋ* 'fling' and *fə̀ŋ* 'unwrap', and *tʌ́d* 'swell' and *tɔ́d* 'stick something (e.g. a piece of meat) unto a thin object', that are found in many a dialect are completely obscured.

If the phonemic inventory is inaccurate, this is not remedied by information on pronunciations. For this reason, the reader is likely to mispronounce many of the entries with /*u*/ in closed syllables since many such entries are phonetically either [ʌ] or [ə]. Similarly many entries with /*i*/ in closed syllables are likely to be mispronounced since there is no /*ɨ*/ at all in her vowel inventory.

These problems would not have arisen if Kaufman had made use of the Standard Ibibio Orthography based on a ten vowel system given below and published in 1983, two years before the publication of her dictionary:

i			*u*
	ɨ	*ʉ*	
	e	*ə*	*o*
		ʌ	*ɔ*
		a	

The third major flaw is the omission of important affixes such as those of tense and aspect, which play very important grammatical and semantic roles in the language (cf. Essien 1983b and 1987). As most of these affixes can easily be represented segmentally, there ought to have been a section for them if they could not be treated along with other entries. Williamson (1972:297) has included Igbo affixes such as the derivative suffix *-na -rị* within her regular entries. For example, the future affix *yàá-* could be entered as a tense prefix thus:

yàá indef. fut. prefix (on the *yàá* page of the dictionary).

These flaws notwithstanding, Kaufman has made a very important contribution to Ibibio studies in her *Ibibio Dictionary* and the Cross River State University and the African Studies Centre, Leiden, deserve high commendations for publishing it.

NOTES

1. This and entries such as *àkúk ìtá* 'thirty' (i.e. ten in three places), and *àkúk dùòp* 'hundred' (i.e. ten in ten places), suggest some form of decimal system in Ibibio.
2. This explanation has been challenged by some native speakers.

REFERENCES

Bennett, P.R. 1986. Grammar in the lexicon: two Bantu cases. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 8:1-30.

Essien, O.E. (ed.). 1983a. *The Orthography of the Ibibio Language.* Calabar: PAICO Press and Books.

——. 1983b. The tense system in Ibibio. In *Current Approaches to African Linguistics (Vol. 2),* ed. by J. Kaye et al., pp. 329-44. Dordrecht: Foris.

——. 1986a. *Ibibio Names: Their Structure and Their Meanings.* Ibadan: Daystar.

——. 1986b. The future of minority languages in Nigeria. To appear in the *Proceedings of the 7th Annual Conference of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria*, University of Maiduguri, October 1986.

——. 1987. The aspectual system of Ibibio. In *Current Approaches to African Linguistics Vol. 4*, ed. by D. Odden, pp. 151-65. Dordrecht: Foris.

——. (forthcoming). A Grammar of the Ibibio Language.

Essien, O.E. et al. 1986. *Edikood Nwed Ke Ikọ Ibibio I.* Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Goldie, Rev. H. 1862. *Dictionary of the Efik Language.* Glasgow: Dunn and Wright. Reprinted by Gregg Press (Farnborough 1964).

Jeffreys, M.D.W. 1935. *Old Calabar and Notes on Ibibio Language.* Calabar: H.W.T.I. Press.

Williamson, K. (ed.). 1972. *Igbọ-English Dictionary.* Benin City, Nigeria: Ethiope Publishing Corporation.

Department of Languages and Linguistics
University of Calabar

Clinton D.W. Robinson, *Phonologie du gunu (parler yambassa), langue bantoue du Cameroun.* (Bibliothèque, 95.) Paris: SELAF, 1984. 92 pp. FF 90.

Reviewed by Maarten Mous

The book under review is the first substantial publication on the Gunu language, and is therefore very welcome, all the more since data on the A.60 group of Bantu languages is so scarce. Other publications on Gunu by the same author are a Gunu-French wordlist of about 1600 items, a booklet containing four short stories in Gunu with a translation in French, and a literacy manual in Gunu, all of which were published by the SIL in Cameroon.

The phonology of Gunu is presented in the Martinet framework. Chapter two, the main chapter of the book, contains an inventory of phonemes, with a careful demonstration of their distinctiveness by the familiar French technique of establishing series of minimal pairs (pp.19-40). In addition, the chapter contains a frequency list for consonants, in which there are some errors. The initial sequence *nk*, for example, has

a frequency 0 according to the list, but under the heading *nk* one finds an example *nkámáâ* 'calebasse pointue', and in the wordlist one finds *ŋkí* 'mouche' and thirteen other examples. Chapter three, on tone, tells us that Gunu is a two-tone language with automatic downstep. Furthermore, all possible tonal patterns are given for one-syllable, two-syllable, and three-syllable stems. Chapter four lists the possible syllable structures, N, V, and CV, and gives the frequency of their different combinations in stems. Chapter five discusses the phonological arguments for word division. Chapter six gives an impressionistic description of intonation, including downdrift, sentence-final devoicing and tonal lowering as well as question intonation. Chapter seven is dedicated to fast-speech phenomena. It is a nice feature of the book that intonation and fast speech phenomena receive at least some attention.

Two topics in Gunu phonology are discussed in greater detail by the author, namely nasal plus oral stop sequences and vowel harmony. I will return to these topics presently.

1. Homorganic nasal prefixes. The prefixes of class 9 and 10 nouns and the verbal prefix for first person singular subjects are expressed by a nasal which is homorganic with the following (stem-initial) consonant. The possible word-initial nasal plus obstruent sequences for these words are:

(mp)		*(nt)*		*(nc)*		*(ŋk)*	
mb ←	*N+b*	*nd* ←	*N+l*			*ŋg*	← *N+∅*
mm ←	*N+m*	*nn* ←	*N+n*	*ɲɲ*	← *N+ɲ*	*ŋŋ*	← *N+ŋ*
p ←	*N+p, f*	*t* ←	*N+t, d*	*c*	← *N+c, s*	*k*	← *N+k, g, h*

(Forms between brackets are restricted to nouns.)

The verbal prefix in concord with a first person singular subject is zero in combination with verb stems beginning in *p* or *f*, *t* or *d*, *c* or *s*, and *k*, *g* or *h*. *ŋg* occurs before vowel-initial verb stems. Nouns of class 9/10 which are derived from verbs undergo the same process. For other nouns of class 9/10 with an initial voiceless stop, there is no way to decide what the nature of the stem-initial consonant is underlyingly. This poses a problem for Robinson because he takes the stem as the unit of analysis, whereby the first element of the stem has phonemic status. Clearly, the problem is theory-specific; in a theory which allows for underspecification there is no need to make this choice.

A second and more interesting problem which Robinson signals is the difference in sound structure between nouns and verbs. The sequences nasal plus voiceless stop occur word-initially only in nouns, not in verbs. The author's solution is to assume that these nouns begin with a different

set of phonemes, namely the prenasalized voiceless stops ^{m}p, ^{n}t, etc. This is not a very elegant solution because the assumed voiceless prenasalized stops have a very limited distribution, occurring only in C_1 position for certain nouns in class 9/10. The readiness to assume a new set of phonemes as a solution to a morphophonological problem is astonishing after the earlier ample demonstration of phonemes by way of minimal pairs. Robinson discusses other possible solutions, but he does not consider the possibility of assuming a difference in form between the two morphemes, i.e. the first person singular verbal prefix and the class 9 noun prefix, nor does he permit a rule which is sensitive to morphological information.

There is some evidence that the nasal plus voiceless stop initial sequences are just another possible result of a class 9 prefix and a voiceless initial stem consonant. Compare *ŋkɔ́lɔ́ŋɔ́* 'coquille d'escargot' with *kɔ́lɔ́* 'escargot', *mpímí* 'colère, douleur' with *-hɛ́mà* 'gemir', *ŋkɔ̀* 'panthère' with Tunen *mɛ̀kɔ̀* 'léopard' (class 9).

2. Vowel harmony. Within Bantu linguistics the term vowel harmony often refers to an assimilation of the vowel of certain vowel suffixes to the preceding vowel. Gunu shows a much fuller vowel harmony system. Robinson gives the following alternations in affixes: *a~e, ɛ~i, o~u.* Vowels in roots belong to one of the two following series:

series 1: *i, e, o, u;*
series 2: *ɛ, a, ɔ, o*

Note that the vowel *o* can co-occur with vowels of both series, but that the possible combinations of other vowels with the *o* are rather restricted. In fact, the only possible combinations for disyllabic roots are: C*o*C*i*, C*i*C*o*, C*o*C*o*, C*o*C*a*. For certain speakers there is variation between C*o*C*a* and C*ɔ*C*a*. Robinson fails to mention the *ɔ~o* alternation in verb stems caused by the dominant causative suffix *-i*, which can be detected from his word list (Robinson 1979):

-hɔ̀nɔ̀	'rire, sourire'	*-hòniò*	'amuser, faire rire'
-dɔ̀mbɔ̀	'cesser, terminer, se fatiguer'	*-dòmbiò*	'fatiguer qqn'
-bɔ̀lɔ̀	'emprunter'	*-bòliò*	'prêter (argent)'

In Robinson's analysis, *i, e, u* are close vowels, *ɛ, a, ɔ* are open vowels, and *o* is half-close. This analysis is unsatisfactory because it does not satisfy the need to differentiate between *o* in recessive versus dominant morphemes. Compare, for example, *gɛ̀+fólá* 'souris' and *gì+góló* 'tam-tam' which are both class 7 nouns.

The vowel harmony system of Gunu is very similar to that found in Tunen, Mande, and Yambeta. These languages are all closely related. For an autosegmental account of Tunen vowel harmony, see van der Hulst, Mous, and Smith (1986).

REFERENCES

Robinson, C.D.W. 1979. *Petit lexique gunu-français*. Yaoundé: SIL.

van der Hulst, H., M. Mous, and N. Smith. 1986. The autosegmental analysis of reduced vowel harmony systems: the case of Tunen. In *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1986*, ed. by F. Beukema and A. Hulk, pp. 105-22. Dordrecht: Foris.

Department of African Linguistics
University of Leiden

Gérard Philippson, *"Gens des bananeraies" (Tanzanie): Contribution linguistique à l'histoire culturelle des Chaga du Kilimanjaro.* (Cahier, 16.) Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1984. 314 pp., 2 maps.

Reviewed by Karsten Legère

Chaga is, apart from Kiswahili naturally, among those few languages of Tanzania which in the past have repeatedly attracted the attention of researchers. In particular German missionaries and scholars conducted comprehensive studies on language and culture in the area of Mount Kilimanjaro. Accordingly, their publications have remained a stimulating source even in our days. As the language appellation is just a covering term, linguistic descriptions always had to focus on dialect forms which constitute what has been baptized Chaga. Hence, on the one hand we are faced with contributions which cope foremost with one of its major dialects, i.e. mochi or Moshi (which tends to be identified as Chaga as such), mashami (Machame), wunjo (Vunjo) etc. On the other hand, a negligible number of linguists have attempted to examine and to elucidate the intrinsic dialect continuum which is characteristic of the situation on the slopes of Mt. Kilimanjaro and which obviously, due to environmental factors, seems to be more clearly marked than elsewhere. In this field, several publications by D. Nurse, who worked with the author of the book under review in Tanzania, deserve our attention. On top of that, in recent years valuable papers on the Chaga dialect cluster have increasingly been compiled by young Tanzanian scholars like Temu (quoted also in the bibliography on p. 222), Mosha and Mcha (M.A. dissertations, University of Dar-es-Salaam) as well as by students of that university in the so-called independent studies.

During a stay in Tanzania lasting several years Philippson got interested in Chaga and the language situation in the Kilimanjaro Region. His research culminated in a Ph.D. dissertation defended at the University of Paris in 1981 on which the present work is based.

The book is divided into five chapters supplemented by conclusions, a large and illustrative appendix as well as a bibliographical part. Chapter I reviews relevant publications which have to do with the ethnic and linguistic classification of East African peoples. We should note that Guthrie's classification of Bantu languagues is discussed with particular reference to the area in question. As a result, after having demonstrated its inconsistencies and dubious assumptions in the light of data from East African languages, Ph. rejects that approach as being inadequate to reflect the genetic relationship as it is in reality.

Chapter II summarizes facts about the Chaga groups and their history, the natural environment as well as neighbouring ethnic groups of Bantu or non-Bantu origin. In addition, a brief account of phonological and morphological features which portray Common Chaga plus 12 (sometimes 9) distinct dialects is given. The material presented ranges from Gweno (which is considered a Chaga dialect) in the east via Machame or Vunjo to Siha and others in the west.

The principal part of the book (Chapters III to V) discusses the major aspects of the cultural vocabulary which illustrates the social life and economic activities within the Chaga communities. The analysis focuses on lexical elements which pertain to husbandry, agriculture, food stuff, hut building, weapons etc. and finally to kinship and the social structure. This has been done largely descriptively and reads (in its simpliest form) as follows:

"6.2. Le travail des peaux
On employait un racloir ma. *mbaʃo yesisya...*; la peau est mise à sécher et maintenue étalée par des chevilles ma. *uβambo...*" (p. 192).

In this way, the author ends up with a bulk of data loosely put together and supplemented by the equivalent expressions peculiar to the major dialects, i.e. Moshi, Gweno, Machame etc. The analysis takes into account would-be origins by making frequent reference to Proto-Bantu roots. On the strength of this approach, Ph. succeeds in demonstrating that the overwhelming number of the lexical items he looked into has originated from the common Bantu stock. Additionally, cognates were also traced in adjacent Bantu languages (e.g. gekoyo/Kikuyu and others) to prove the "Bantuness" of various elements. On top of that, the impact of non-Bantu languages on Chaga is reflected, as shown several times, in loanwords mostly borrowed from Maasai. These findings are summarized