

- Prins, A.H.J. 1970. *A Swahili Nautical Dictionary*. Dar es Salaam: Chuo cha Uchunguzi wa Lugha ya Kiswahili, 96 p. [Cf. rev. Baldi, *AION* 1975, XXXV (2): 282–283.]
- Rechenbach, C.W. 1967. *Swahili-English Dictionary*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, xi-641 p.
- Toscano, Maddalena. 1992. *Dizionario italiano-swahili e italiano-swahili*. Milano: A. Vallardi, xlix-236 p. e lii-212 p.

**Review of Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Paul Eguchi & Roger Prafé & Megan Schwabauer, Dictionary of Hdi. A Central Chadic Language of Cameroon, Köln: Köppe 2015, viii+188 pages, ISBN 978-3-89645-299-3, € 34.80 by Carsten Peust, Konstanz**

After Z. Frajzyngier published a voluminous grammar of Hdi, a Central Chadic language spoken by approximately 10000–25000 people in the far north of Cameroon close to the Nigerian border, a couple of years ago (Frajzyngier 2002), a dictionary of this language has now followed which he compiled together with three co-authors.

The book starts with a grammatical introduction of 52 pages, which is in many respects an abridged version of Frajzyngier (2002), but also contains some modifications of analysis. The dictionary proper consists of about 1600 Hdi head entries together with a word class information as well as both English and French translations. The entries are frequently accompanied by phrases, which are helpful for defining the semantics more precisely. Not every entry, however, represents a lexeme on its own, since several of them are just morphological forms of verbs that are also listed in their turn. Furthermore, the dictionary contains some duplicates, since multiple sources were obviously used and lumped together in a somewhat mechanical way, such as *ávà* “love, like” ~ *ávà* “like, wish, love, accept” p. 66; *ghùzú* “wine, beer” ~ *ghùzú* “any alcoholic drink (local or bottled)” p. 74; *ghzlóŋ* “bed” ~ *ghzlóŋ* “bed made from the trunk of *Faidherbia (Acacia albida)*” p. 75; *xúlʔúá* “*Euphorbia kamerunica*” ~ *xúlʔúá* “unidentified plant” p. 120.

The authors did not make sure to systematically cover the most basic vocabulary. They obviously did not depart from an English or French word list trying to identify the Hdi equivalents, but rather from some corpus of Hdi phrases or texts, extracting those words that happened to occur therein. A considerable number of elementary terms are therefore missing. A researcher who, for example, would wish to assemble a Swadesh 100-item list will be disappointed to find that no less than 20 of them are absent: *ashes, bark (of tree), breast, claw, cold, feather, hair, man (male), many, moon, rain, root, seed, to sit, star, to swim, tail, tongue, tooth, warm*. Fortunately, all of these can be recovered in various ways. First of all, the numerous accompanying phrases as well as the

grammatical introduction of the book contain a number of additional words which are not included as head entries in the dictionary. The authors obviously did not even exhaust all the sources that were at their own disposal. This way, we gain – as far as detected by the reviewer – three more Swadesh-terms: “feather” *zlúzlúk* p. 109, “many” *ndghà* p. 45, “root” *hhráŋ* p. 38, alongside a number of other, more or less elementary words such as “car” *mótà* p. 55 ~ *mwótà* p. 98 ~ *mwátà* p. 96, “cloth” *dàwrà* p. 21, “fertilizer” *rgwá* p. 97, “husband” *zàʔál* p. 81, “to live” *zè* p. 13, “lungs” *búf* p. 110, “machine” *kèkì* p. 107, “money” *cééèdì* p. 84, “perhaps” *pàtək* p. 39, “saliva” *sárdək* p. 109, “stalk of corn” *hlká* p. 111, “sweet potato” *blíwá* p. 115.

A few more additions to the lexicon can be culled out of Frajzyngier’s grammar, such as “clan” *mndrá* (Frajzyngier 2002: 303), “intestine” *xàrí* (F. 2002: 264), “spade” *kálək* (F. 2002: 420), “urine” *kwàni* (F. 2002: 421). Furthermore, we learn from this source that the word *kúzún* “fresh leaves” (Dictionary of Hdi p. 83) also stands for “grass” (F. 2002: 181, here spelled *kzún*), that *ndírì* “alive” (p. 96) also means “raw (of meat)” (F. 2002: 292), and that *táŋtáŋá* not only means “difficult” (p. 109), but also “hard (e.g. of pot)” (F. 2002: 347, here spelled *tàntàngá*), which presumably is the more basic meaning. While the dictionary presents *dzáŋá* only as a noun “study; étude” (p. 62), it is attested as a verb “to study” in Frajzyngier (2002: 221), for which I assume “to read” as the more basic meaning in view of a participle *dzáŋá-f-dzáŋá* “having read” (p. 62) and the Fulfulde verb *janga* “to read”, from which the Hdi word was apparently borrowed; the semantic connection is the same as in Hausa *káŋántáá* “to read, to study”. The verb *ndzà* is translated as “to settle” (p. 97), but phrases provided under this very lemma as well as in Frajzyngier (2002: 222) suggest “to sit” as a more basic and probably preferable rendering (which is also the meaning of *nza* in closely related Lamang, Wolff 2015, II: 357).

The first lexical source on Hdi was a word-list published by Eguchi (1971). The dictionary under review claims (p. vii) to have incorporated Eguchi’s materials after cross-checkings with native speakers. For this reason, Eguchi, who has meanwhile deceased, was nominated as one of the co-authors of the dictionary. But it turns out that the incorporation has by far not been complete, so that Eguchi’s word-list still retains a considerable value on its own. For example, Eguchi’s list contributes the following items which can certainly be called elementary (several of them being members of the Swadesh list), but which are nonetheless missing from the dictionary (cited by me with normalized transliteration): “ashes” *xùtídíŋ*, “bark (of tree)” *bláká*, “beard” *ghòmáŋ*, “bitter” *dáxdáxá*, “breast (seins)” *wàwá*, “claw, nail” *dáxŋ*, “cold” *mtáhli*, “face, front” *kúmá*, “fingers (lit. children of hand)” *zwáni jəvú*, “flower” *vzližlá*, “hair” *sùdí*, “male person” *zùgúnŋ*, “moon” *tìli*, “narrow” *hlèxá*, “navel” *jimbíd*, “old (vieux)” *xàlà*, “rabbit” *vilók*, “ripe” *ndánátghà*, “seed” *xúlfá*, “tail” *xwtür*, “testicles” *kúdà*, “thigh” *ghùkóf*, “thirst” *ndálá*, “tongue” *ghànik*, “tooth” *hliʔiŋ*, “twins”

*bxáli*, “worm” *mtárák*. It is an enigma to me why so many ordinary lexemes, though known, were not included in the dictionary. Did it happen by oversight, or were they considered as not reliable enough?

With that, we have been able to cull together almost all Swadesh items with the exception of “rain”, “star”, “to swim” and “warm”. For “rain” and “warm” see below. The two remaining gaps can be filled from Bramlett (1996), another word-list of Hdi which does not note tones. Here we find *takwatsa* “star” and *xála imi* “to swim”, literally “to move aside water” (I stipulate the meaning “to move aside” from the related Lamang verb *xla*, Wolff 2015, II: 207), which suggests that Hdi does not possess a basic verb for this concept. On this occasion, I would also like to draw attention to yet another Hdi word-list provided by Langermann (1994: 57–66).

The Hdi-English-French dictionary is inverted by both an English-Hdi and a French-Hdi index. These generally agree quite well, but I notice that the entry “bush” is missing from the English index (while there is “brousse” in the French index), and “difficile” is missing from the French index (while there is “difficult” in the English index). Some words such as *kwítikw* “small”, *mbgá* “mouse, rat” and *tùghwázàk* “hibiscus” are not referenced in either index, nor is it indicated that *imi* “water” also serves as the standard term for “rain” (cf. p. 84, 92). While the index lacks entries for “warm”, “hot” or “chaud”, it becomes evident when reading the phrases that illustrate the verb *fwá* “reheat, réchauffer” that this is probably the closest Hdi approximation.

It is said (p. 1) that sound recordings of all dictionary entries are available from the Lexus database, as well as photographs which are referred to in the dictionary by an annotation “photo”. This must have been available on the internet in the past but is now no longer supported, so that the reviewer regrettably was unable to access these materials.

The Dictionary of Hdi represents the numerous exotic consonants of the language in a way that would also be usable as a practical orthography. Comparatists will have to note that the spelling conventions differ from the other sources of Hdi (Bramlett, Eguchi, Langermann) as also from those used by Wolff (2015) for his dictionary of closely related Lamang. With the exception of a limited number of IPA symbols that are widely used in the spelling of Nigerian languages (*ɓ*, *d*, *ŋ*), digraphs are given preference such as *gh* for */ɣ/* (= *ɣ* in Eguchi), *hl* for */h/* (= *h* in Eguchi, *sl* in Bramlett, Langermann and Wolff) and *zl* for */ʒ/*. The latter poses a theoretical danger of ambiguity, since a cluster *z + l* might also be possible in the language, but I assume that (almost?) all instances of *zl* found in the dictionary indeed represent the voiced lateral fricative */ʒ/*. The voiceless back fricative is generally written *x* (= *h* in Bramlett, Eguchi, Langermann and Wolff). There are, however, a number of cases where a letter *h* that must have been present in some of the used sources survives as such rather than being normalized to *x*, e.g. “belly” *húdí* p. 87 ~ *xúdí* p. 119,

“to close” *hà* p. 30 ~ *xà* p. 117, “to cough” *tsúhà* p. 112 (for \**tsúxà*), “flour” *hpú* p. 110 ~ *xpú* p. 119, “to sleep” *hàà* p. 28 ~ *xàà* p. 118, “three” *hkáŋ* p. 114 ~ *xkán* p. 119.

The phonological analysis of Hdi is not straightforward and poses various problems. As many other Central Chadic languages, Hdi has a large consonant inventory and furthermore makes frequent use of consonant clusters, while on the other hand the number of vowel phonemes seems to be small. A thorny question in Hdi, as in most other Central Chadic languages, is to decide which surface vowel distinctions are phonemic and which ones are predictable from surrounding or underlying consonants. A lot of discussion has been going on about this issue for several of these languages. In his influential grammar of Margi, Hoffmann (1963) interpreted the six surface vowels of this language (*a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, *ə*) as only four phonemes by reducing *e* and *o* to /*ya*/ and /*wa*/, respectively. Maddieson (1987) went still further by interpreting *i* and *u* as allophones of *ə* in the neighbourhood of palatalized and labialized consonants respectively, which left only two vowel phonemes /*a*/ and /*ə*/. Arguments along the same line have been forwarded with regard to the Kotoko languages by Tourneux (2003) and to Proto-Wandala-Lamang by Wolff (1983), among others. Even for Hdi itself, an analysis of this kind was presented by Langermann (1994), who assumes just two vowel phonemes *a* and *ə* alongside a phenomenon of palatal or velar “prosodies” that operate on the word level. Nothing of this is discussed or even mentioned in the Dictionary of Hdi, nor is it in Frajzyngier’s grammar, for that matter. Rather than following such a minimalistic route, the Dictionary of Hdi assumes an inventory of five “underlying vowels” *a*, *e*, *i*, *u*, and *ə* (p. 6), thus sticking more closely to the surface. This will presumably be convenient for practical purposes such as the use of the dictionary by native speakers. Nevertheless, a more abstract analysis might have had some advantages also for this language.

There are a large number of inconsistencies in the dictionary, which obviously derive from the fact that several issues of phonological analysis remained unresolved. This is a fact that I would have preferred to learn from one of the introductory sections of the book, rather than stumbling upon it as a reviewer. First, the above-mentioned issues in the segmental analysis shine through in alternations such as “bedroom” *dzùgùví* p. 35 ~ *dzùgí* p. 63 (better \**dzàgwàví* ?), “first” *tíngàl* ~ *tíngil* p. 109 (better \**táŋgyàl* ?), “to forbid” *lmá* p. 48 ~ *lámá* p. 86, “to plant” *hlgà* ~ *hlàgà* p. 76, “village” *lwá* ~ *lúwá* p. 87 (better \**lówá* ?).

The vowel *ə* seems to be rather labile and may be of little phonological value. It could therefore be a matter of debate whether or not to represent it in the transcriptions. However, there is a real loss of information when an *ə* that carries a distinct tone is omitted, as seems to have happened repeatedly. Consider alternations such as “beer” *ghùzú* p. 74 ~ *ghwzú* p. 87 ~ *ghzú* p. 34

~ *ghzù* p. 120 (better \**ghwàzù* ?), “bush” *mták* p. 9 ~ *mták* p. 94, “calabash” *kùwá* p. 83 ~ *kwà* p. 73 ~ *kwá* p. 96 (better \**kàwá* ?), “chief” *mghám* p. 13 ~ *mghám* p. 92, “hand” *dzàvú* p. 63 ~ *dzvú* p. 96 ~ *dzvù* p. 93 ~ *jùbù* p. 3, “hole” *ghrùm* p. 22 ~ *ghrúm* p. 72 ~ *ghùrúm* p. 73 ~ *ghúrúm* p. 99 (better \**ghwàrám* ?), “man” *mndú* p. 12 ~ *mndú* p. 94 ~ *mdú* p. 35.

Very generally, the analysis of tones, assumed to be two in number, must have posed severe problems to the authors since the number of contradictions is here at the highest. Some examples: “bat” *zvàxw* p. 25 ~ *zvàxw* p. 123, “book” *dèlèwèr* p. 47 ~ *dèlèwèr* p. 65, “to catch” *ksà* p. 38 ~ *ksá* p. 82, “child” *zwàŋ* p. 108 ~ *zwàŋ* p. 4 ~ *zwán* p. 123, “children” *zwànì* p. 27 ~ *zwànì* p. 4, “corn” *xiyà* p. 111 ~ *xiyá* p. 119, “food, mush” *dáfà* p. 34 ~ *dáfá* p. 64, “to go” *là* p. 47 ~ *lá* p. 85, “good” *iná* p. 78 ~ *inà* p. 88, “hard, difficult” *tàntàngá* p. 12 ~ *tántàŋ-á* p. 109, “head” *ghàŋ* p. 34 ~ *gháŋ* p. 72, “to hear, know” *sná* p. 49 ~ *snà* p. 105, “house” *xgà* p. 101 ~ *xgá* p. 118, “market” *lúmà* p. 84 ~ *lúmá* p. 87, “medicine” *ghwání* p. 74 ~ *ghwàní* p. 95, “to meet” *gúyà* p. 69 ~ *gúyá* p. 70, “milk” *ùʔwà* p. 108 ~ *ùʔwà* p. 113, “mother-in-law” *mijì* p. 88 ~ *miji* p. 93, “other” *sàni* p. 47 ~ *sáni* p. 104, “peanut” *ùrná* p. 113 ~ *urnà* p. 119, “sauce” *dàli* p. 64 ~ *dàli* p. 107 ~ *dàli* p. 108, “sheep” *twák* p. 48 ~ *twàk* p. 113, “stone” *pàlà* p. 75 ~ *pálà* p. 100, “wall” *máhlák* p. 88 ~ *màhlák* p. 112, “what?” *ná* p. 43 ~ *nà* p. 97, “wood” *xàsúʔú* p. 99 ~ *xàsúʔù* p. 118, “work” *hlná* p. 77 ~ *hlnà* p. 88. Some of these variations, but evidently not all, might be related to the fact that “[a]ll high tones in phrase-final position are lowered, but they do not become as low as low tone” (Frajzyngier 2002: 39). In a dictionary of a little-known African language that is Hdi, I would perfectly understand a number of uncertainties concerning tone in rare words that the researcher may not often have had the opportunity to record. But what we face here is a pervasive confusion of tones throughout all parts of the vocabulary. This indicates not only some isolated errors but fundamental problems in the phonological analysis and makes me skeptical regarding the reliability also of the tones of those items for which I cannot demonstrate contradictions within the dictionary itself. At the same time, there is little explicit discussion of any problems, uncertainties or possible alternative analyses, which creates a misleading impression concerning the soundness of the data. More first-hand fieldwork on Hdi tone definitely needs to be done; the only study dedicated exclusively to this topic (Gathman 1994) is interesting but still limited in scope.

Still other inconsistencies of various types not mentioned so far include: “bed” *zláŋ* p. 18 ~ *ghzláŋ* p. 75, “to bite” *xidà* p. 19 ~ *xíʔidá* p. 119, “bone” *ghùdzif* p. 73 ~ *ghùdíf* p. 110, “door” *txà* p. 30 ~ *tghà* p. 109, “grinding stone” *búnà* p. 56 ~ (presumably misprinted:) *xúnà* p. 119 (I conjecture that a hand-written *b* may have been misread as *h* and then retranscribed as *x*), “illness” *dángwà* p. 48 ~ *dàŋwà* p. 64, “leopard” *pákáw* p. 8 ~ *pákáʔw* p. 100, “lion” *rvèrè* p. 73 ~ *rvèrì* p. 102, “meat” *hlúi* p. 64 ~ *hlwí* p. 67 ~ *hlúʔwí* p. 78,

“money” *kóbù* p. 33 ~ *kwóbù* p. 48 ~ *kòbò* p. 82 ~ *kwábù* p. 84 (= Hausa *kwábò* “penny”), “new” *lfid* p. 9 ~ *lfíd* p. 86, “now” *ndánà* p. 46 ~ *ndánáná* p. 95, “stalk” *dùsúm* p. 55 ~ *dùssúm* p. 61, “to start, to pierce” *hldrá* p. 76 ~ *zldrá* p. 124, “tree” *fú* p. 153 ~ (presumably misprinted:) *sú* p. 22.

The closest relative of Hdi is Lamang, a neighbouring language situated to the west, on the Nigerian side of the border, which has recently received a thorough documentation from the same publishing house (Wolff 2015). Most of the basic vocabulary of both languages is clearly akin, though with various differences of the segments and particularly of tone. The massive tonal discrepancies between Hdi and Lamang, two languages so closely related, puzzled Wolff (2013) and made him posit that Proto-Lamang-Hdi was still non-tonal and tone evolved independently in the two daughter languages. But I suspect that we must first reach firmer ground regarding the documentation of the tones of Hdi (and perhaps of Lamang as well) until serious comparative work on them can begin.

There is certainly a lot of work to be done on comparative Lamang-Hdi phonology in the future, a task that has been initiated by Langermann (1991) and Wolff (2015, I: 345–386). I only wish to propose here one illustrative sound rule which has not been recognized so far, namely the correspondence of the Hdi vowel *i* to either *i* or *e* of Lamang. This may suggest that two formerly distinct vowels collapsed in Hdi. I give eight examples of either correspondence (all transcriptions adapted to the system of the Dictionary of Hdi):

	Lamang <i>e</i>	Hdi <i>i</i>		Lamang <i>i</i>	Hdi <i>i</i>
“dog”	<i>káré</i>	<i>kri</i>	“ant”	<i>fsígwəl</i>	<i>fsígwil</i>
“elder child”	<i>málé</i>	<i>màlí</i>	“belly”	<i>xúdí</i>	<i>xúđi</i>
“lion”	<i>árvàrè</i>	<i>rvèri</i>	“eye”	<i>ilí</i>	<i>iri</i>
“moon”	<i>tóré</i>	<i>tili</i>	“far”	<i>dídĩŋ</i>	<i>dì?ĩŋ</i>
“mouth”	<i>éwé</i>	<i>wi</i>	“horn”	<i>dùli</i>	<i>dúli</i>
“planting stick”	<i>mbébé</i>	<i>mbibi</i>	“night”	<i>árvídí</i>	<i>rvídik</i>
“two”	<i>xésá</i>	<i>xis</i>	“sun, day”	<i>fiti</i>	<i>fitik</i>
“way, road”	<i>távè</i>	<i>tvi</i>	“tooth”	<i>hládĩŋ</i>	<i>hli?ĩŋ</i>

It is noteworthy that while Frajzyngier calls the language Hdi, another traditional name of the same language is “hidé”, which also figures in the title of Eguchi’s (1971) paper. I suspect that this traditional term reflects a heard form /hədə/ that either derives from a time when /e/ was still distinct from /i/ or is an exonym from a dialect that has still preserved the /e/.

The Dictionary of Hdi will certainly be of some use to native speakers for whom, being experts themselves, the precision of the Hdi entries is not the topmost concern. But non-Hdi linguists will be somewhat disappointed to see that a work that started far back in 1991 (p. vii) did not produce a more careful result. Much of it has the character of field notes that are still in a state prior to a phonological analysis. While this is certainly not the definitive dictionary of Hdi, it is nonetheless one big step forward on the way of exploring this very interesting language.

### Bibliography

- Bramlett, Lee 1996: *Lexique Hdi-Français-Anglais*, Yaoundé: SIL.
- Eguchi, Paul K. 1971: *Matériaux pour servir à l'étude de la langue hidé: vocabulaire*, Kyoto University African Studies 6: 195–283.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt 2002: *A grammar of Hdi*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Gathman, Elisabeth 1994: *Some notes on tone in the Xədi language*, Yaoundé: SIL.
- Hoffmann, Carl F. 1963: *A grammar of the Margi language*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Langermann, Cindy 1991: *A preliminary comparison between Hide and Lamang phonology*, Yaoundé: SIL.
- 1994: *A phonological description of Hedi*, Yaoundé: SIL.
- Maddieson, Ian 1987: *The Margi vowel system and labiodoronals*, Studies in African Linguistics 18: 327–355.
- Tourneau, Henry 2003: *Le système vocalique dans le groupe “kotoko”*, in Lévikaza, Kézié (ed.): *Actes du 3<sup>e</sup> Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Africaine*, Köln: Köppe, 69–77.
- Wolff, Ekkehard 1983: *Reconstructing vowels in Central Chadic*, in E. Wolff & H. Meyer-Bahlburg (eds.): *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*, Hamburg: Buske, 211–232.
- 2013: *On the diachronics of Chadic tone systems: From pitch to tone in Lamang-Hdi*, in Tourneau, Henry (ed.): *Topics in Chadic Linguistics VII*, Köln: Köppe, 203–228.
- 2015: *The Lamang language and dictionary*, 2 vols., Köln: Köppe.

The SIL publications are accessible on <https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/1862>.

**Between Mycenae and Hattushas: The Emergence of the Luvian Civilisation, Eberhard Zangger, *Die Luwische Kultur. Das fehlende Element in der Ägäischen Bronzezeit*, Ege Yayınları Istanbul, 2017, ISBN 978-605-9680-21-9, 330 pp. (book review by T. Polański)**

In his captivating book E. Zangger, who specializes in historical landscape reconstruction, argues that an ancient and forgotten Luvian civilization once flourished between Mycenae and Hattushas in the Bronze Age. The Luvian civilisation developed its own original hieroglyphic and cuneiform script which preceded the Hittite and Mycenaean Greek writing systems and remained in use