International Journal of American Linguistics

PM 101

, I6

V, 52

1986

RRS

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 52 (1986)

1

2

3

4

In short, Wescott's article offers little support either for the monogenesis of language itself or for any of the wider genetic affiliations now being proposed.[5]

CATHERINE A. CALLAGHAN, *Ohio State University*

[5] An example of such a proposal is Otto J. von Sadovszky's claim that the Ob-Ugrian languages of Northwest Siberia are closely related to the Penutian languages of Central California ("The Discovery of California: Breaking the Silence of the Siberia-to-America Migrators," *The Californians* [November/December 1984]: 9–20).

———

AN ANALYTICAL DICTIONARY OF NAHUATL. By Frances Karttunen. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983. Pp. xxxiv + 349.

Introduction. Frances Karttunen's *Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl* is the first Nahuatl–*English* dictionary; it will be a valuable research tool for Nahuatl scholars, as well as for new students in the field, and bring the study of Nahuatl within reach of all those who may not yet have mastered Spanish or French. Given that it will remain the only English dictionary of Nahuatl for years to come, it calls for a thorough scrutiny and informative criticism, which I attempt to give below.

Sources and aim. The primary sources from which material for the dictionary was drawn are Horacio Carochi's grammar (1645); a seventeenth-century text, "Huehuetlatolli" 'Sayings of the Elders' (referred to as the Bancroft manuscript), which also employs Carochi's diacritics; plus dictionaries of two quite divergent, modern dialects (Zacapoaxtla in the Sierra de Puebla area and Tetelcingo, Morelos). This peculiar selection of sources stems from Karttunen's principal motivation: to make available extant information on vowel length and glottal stop, two features not usually represented in the traditional orthography. This goal is laudable and of great significance; we can hope that the many Nahuatl scholars who are not linguists will learn to appreciate the importance of these phonetic features for the interpretation of the inestimable colonial Nahuatl texts.

However, the disparateness of sources and Karttunen's focus on vowel length and glottal stop have resulted in distortions and make one ask, what language is this a dictionary of? Karttunen does not discuss this question and seems to be unaware of some of the problems it creates; she rather dismisses it by stressing the similarities between the three dialects, stating "the Tetelcingo dictionary is remarkably consistent with Carochi and the Bancroft manuscript" (p. xxi), and about the other modern dialect, "judging from the *Vocabulario mejicano de la Sierra de Zacapoaxtla, Puebla*, by Harold Key and Mary Ritchie de Key, it is not distant, at least lexically, from the Nahuatl described by Carochi" (p. xxi). Thus she clearly implies that her dictionary deals with the Nahuatl described by Carochi, i.e., that which is traditionally called Classical Nahuatl. That it is not

meant to represent an abstraction from two time periods and the three localities is emphasized by the author: "the canonical form of this dictionary is not identical with a phonemic or a historically prior proto-form" (p. xxiii) and "It [the canonical form] leans to the conservative Nahuatl of the central Mexican highlands and includes some historical innovation of form from that area. Nonetheless, the canonical form can to a high degree be related in a regular fashion to even the most peripheral of the regional dialects of the contributing sources" (p. xxiv).

So long as we use the dictionary in accordance with Karttunen's intentions—to establish the phonetic form of the words—we are very well served. However, the many other uses that such a dictionary invites and should promote are less adequately served precisely because the sources are so heterogeneous, and because Karttunen is less concerned with these other functions. She calls it an "analytical" dictionary and tells us that "the analytical aspect of the dictionary [is] expressed both in the English glosses and in the references between entries" (p. xv); and yet, the semantics and the morphological information are problematic and less well founded. (See below for details.)

Entries. The dictionary comprises some 9,000 entries. Entries contain: a Nahuatl word; one or more English glosses; a Spanish gloss cited from the earliest available Nahuatl dictionary, Alonso de Molina's "Vocabulario en lengua mexicana y castellana," first published in 1571; references to the sources from which Karttunen has cited the form; occasional commentary concerning inconsistency in attestation or other kinds of problems; wherever relevant or necessary, cross-references to words formed from the same root and some morphological or grammatical information.

Orthography. Karttunen has chosen to use Andrews's (1975) orthography, which in turn agrees on the whole with traditional orthographic conventions. However, while this orthography is unambiguous, it is not unproblematic. It uses *h* to represent ʔ, and Karttunen explains and justifies this choice by referring to a convention going back to Molina: "Although glottal stops are not consistently indicated in Molina's 1571 dictionary, he uses *h* for the ones he does indicate" (p. xii). This convention is in fact even older; in a long and interesting chapter on conventions of orthography Andres de Olmos, in his grammar from 1547, has this amusing and revealing remark: "es de notar que en todos los plurales, que no se diferencian en la boz ni pronunciacion de sus singulares, pondremos una *h*, y esto no porque en la pronunciacion se señale la *h*, sino solamente para notar esta diferencia del plural al singular" (Olmos 1547:200) [it should be noted that in all plurals, which are not differentiated from the singulars as to voice or pronunciation, we add an *h*, and we do this not because the *h* is indicated in the pronunciation, but only in order to note this difference between the plural and the singular (translation mine)]. His examples are *tlaqua* 'he eats' and *tlaquah* 'they eat', which according to Carochi's description and to a number of modern dialects must be phonetically interpreted as [ƛakʷa] and [ƛakʷaʔ].

Even though *h* is thus a well-established symbol for glottal stop, it is still somewhat of a troublemaker because it conflicts with the *h* which, in the

Andrews/Karttunen orthography, either before or after *u*, contributes to the representation of *w*, *huēhuehcāuhtica* [we:we?ka:wtika] 'occasionally'. It has led astray as respectable a scholar as Langacker (1977), who systematically transcribed Andrews's *iuhqui* [iwki] 'thus' as *yu?ki* (Langacker 1977:117, 119, 188).

Through this use of *h* the alphabetization has also become more complicated and laborious than would seem justifiable in a dictionary. Karttunen is well aware of this problem: "The use of the letter H for glottal stop, which traditionally has been indicated with a diacritic or omitted, really does make the search for Nahuatl words in this dictionary more difficult, since the presence of an H will upset the expected alphabetical order and put a word elsewhere than where one would look in the dictionaries of Molina and Siméon. If the user fails to find a word on the first search, that does not necessarily mean that the word is missing from the dictionary. The burden is on the user to search again for the word with an H at the end of the first syllable, then the second, etc., until all possibilities have been exhausted" (p. xii).

In Nahuatl it is not unusual to find two words derived through reduplication from one root, one with a long vowel, CV:-, and one with a glottal stop after the vowel, CV?-, e.g., *teki* 'cut': *te:-teki* 'slice' and *te?-teki* 'cut to pieces'; the two words in such a pair are not located close to each other in this dictionary.

These consequences of the use of H are not only burdensome but impractical. It would seem more appropriate simply to disregard *h* [?] in alphabetizing the words.

Another feature of the alphabetical ordering which is confusing is that the following digraphs—*ch* [č], *cu* [kʷ], *hu* [w], *qu* [k], *tl* [λ], and *tz* [¢], which are alphabetized as units word-initially, i.e., they have their own sections in the dictionary—are "for the user's convenience" (p. xi) treated as sequences when occurring word-medially.

One wonders whether we owe some of these problems to the computer; would it—considering the many different uses of *h*—have been too much to ask the computer to disregard *h* [?] in the process of ordering the words alphabetically and to alphabetize the digraphs as units also medially?

The phonetics of Nahuatl present another problem which Karttunen does not confront squarely: phonetically there is no distinction between morphophonemically distinct *ia* and *iya*, but alternating forms or paradigm relationships will in most cases reveal what should be posited in the underlying structure; however, in a few cases we have no criteria for determining. This problem is only touched upon in the concluding section of Karttunen's introduction, and the indeterminable cases are not all treated in the same way in the dictionary: some are entered only with *ia* and some only with *iya*, e.g., *ahhuiāya* 'to be fragrant', *ciahu(i)* 'to get tired'; *chiyan-tli* 'chia', *piyāzoā* 'to make something long and straight'; and a few are found both under *ia* and under *iya*: *miyac* see *miac* 'very much', *miāhua-tl* see *miyāhua-tl* 'the tassel and flower of maize', and *quiāhua-tl* see *quiyāhua-tl* 'entrance'. Most—but not all—of these indeterminable cases are accompanied by a comment stating that they are in fact indeterminable, but that is unsatisfactory if they are not also found under the alternative forms.

From a more general point of view the choice of phonemically accurate orthographic symbols for Classical Nahuatl is an insoluble dilemma: on the one hand we as linguists would want the lettering to be unambiguous and clear, with one symbol for each phoneme; on the other hand, out of consideration for scholars who are not particularly well acquainted with linguistics, we must stay as close to the traditional orthographic conventions as possible. Many linguists use a phonetic notation which is unambiguous, but which is visually very difficult to relate to the traditional graphic picture of Classical Nahuatl. Andrews and Karttunen have tried to strike a middle course, but as explained above, their course is not unproblematic. Personally I think much could be gained if *h* were used only for [?] (and disregarded in the alphabetical ordering), and if *v* alone represented [w] (the older convention in Classical Nahuatl texts, used before the *hu/uh* for [w] came into use). That would make *huēhuehcāuhtica* [we:we?ka:wtika] 'occasionally' appear as *vēvehcāvtica*, which is unlikely to estrange any Nahuatl scholar. I would also suggest that *s* be used everywhere to represent [s], rather than *c* before *e* and *i* and *z* elsewhere; *c* would then stand only for [k] and—in combination with *u*, *cu/uc*—for [kʷ]; and *z* would occur solely in connection with *t* (i.e., *tz*) for [¢]. These suggestions are moderate enough, I believe, not to alienate the nonlinguists.

Vowel length. Carochi has given us excellent source material; he not only had a sharp ear, he was also a splendid linguist and formulated a few very clear rules concerning vowel length. Andrews has used these rules and the examples for formulating some of his own, as has Karttunen. Nevertheless, we still need a general and comprehensive presentation and discussion of the problem of vowel length in connection with Nahuatl morphology. Andrews and Karttunen do not argue for, question, or discuss their notions of which vowels are long and which are short; and yet they do not agree completely, neither do they explain or defend their disagreements with Carochi. I limit myself here to a few general examples to illustrate this point.

Andrews and Karttunen mark words differently from Carochi if—according to his own rules—they are incorrectly written. For example, the word *iztlacatihua* 'people tell lies' (Carochi 1645:f. 36r; 1892:436) exemplifies a rule by which the *i* preceding *hua* should be long, and—justifiably assuming a mistake in Carochi's marking—Andrews and Karttunen write it with a long *i*.

In the case of *-ixítia* 'awaken someone' (Carochi 1645:f. 61v; 1892:465), Andrews and Karttunen also agree to "correct" Carochi by marking the *i* preceding *tia* long and write *ihxītia* [i?ši:tia], but by so doing they contradict Carochi's explicit statement that it is short in this very word.

Karttunen unquestioningly follows Carochi's marking in writing *netēcuit-lahuiliztli* 'care of someone' which—consistent with a less explicit rule—should have the *i* that precedes *liztli* marked long; here Andrews marks the *i* long in agreement with the rule.

Andrews leaves out length on the *a* preceding *lia* in *māmālia* 'carry something for someone' (Carochi 1645:f. 64v; 1892:467), even though Carochi, in agreement

with an unformulated rule, marks it long. Here Karttunen agrees with Carochi, and she makes use of the same rule in marking the *a* of -*çomalia* 'frown at someone' (Carochi 1645:f. 64v; 1892:467) long where Carochi has left the macron out.

According to a strict interpretation of a statement by Carochi, Andrews keeps the vowel of $k^w a$ 'eat something' long in the words *tlaqualiztli* 'eating' and *tlaqualizpan* 'mealtime' (Carochi 1645:f. 42r; 1892:444), which Carochi himself writes with a short *a*; Karttunen follows Carochi's way of writing these words. I also miss arguments here in favor of one or the other of the two interpretations.

Carochi has formulated a precise rule concerning the length of a vowel in the passives formed from verbs ending in -*ia* or -*oa*:

la penultima syllaba del passiuo es breue, quando la antepenultima que la precede es larga, ò tiene dos consonantes, como del verbo *icnēlia*, hazer bien à otro, y de su futuro *icnēliz* sale el passiuo *icnēlilo*, cuya penultima, *li*, es breue, por que *ne*, antepenultima es larga. De *ilhuia* dezir algo à otro, futuro *ilhuiz*; y el passiuo *ilhuilo* el *hui* es breue, por que le anteceden dos consonantes. Si la antepenultima syllaba del passiuo destos passiuos fuere breue, serà de ordinario larga la penultima, como de *àhuilia* regar, sale el futuro *àhuiliz*, y el passiuo *àhuilīlo in mīlli* se riega la sementera. (Carochi 1645:f. 34v; 1892:434.)
[the penultimate syllable of the passive is short, when the antepenultimate which precedes it is long or has two consonants, like the verb *icnēlia* 'do good to someone'; and from its future *icnēliz* comes the passive *icnēlilo*, whose penultimate, *li*, is short because *ne*, antepenultimate, is long. From *ilhuia* 'say something to someone', future *ilhuiz*, and the passive *ilhuilo* the *hui* is short because it is preceded by two consonants. If the antepenultimate syllable of the passive from these passives (*sic!*) were short, the penultimate would normally be long, like from *àhuilia* 'to water' comes the future *àhuiliz* and the passive *àhuilīlo in mīlli* 'people water the field' (translation mine).]

Andrews has partially taken over this rule (Andrews 1975:71); however, Karttunen consistently opposes the rule and marks the vowel in question long in all the passive forms included in the dictionary. She comments on this decision only under the entries for (I)CNĒLILŌ: "C[arochi] specifically says that the I of the third syllable is short by contrast with the Ē of the preceding syllable, but this is probably the result of some secondary shortening. By general rule this should be (I)CNĒLĪLŌ. nonact. (I)CNĒLIĀ," and "(I)LHUĪLŌ C[arochi] specifically states that the vowel of the second syllable is short through the influence of the preceding two consonants, but this is probably due to some superficial neutralization of length distinctions." All the other entries with such long-vowel markings receive no comment: (I)LPĪLŌ, (I)LNĀMICTĪLŌ, NEHTŌLTĪLŌ, TĪLĪNĪLŌ, CHĪCHĪTĪLŌ, CUĒCHŌLŌ, CUECHĀHUĪLŌ, etc.

Semantic and morphological information. It would be naive to expect comprehensive coverage of semantics or derivational morphology in the entries of a dictionary based on the four sources employed here. Nevertheless, it is very tempting to regard Karttunen's dictionary as a regular, all-round dictionary and attempt to use it as such, even though it proves incomplete and unsatisfactory. However, it is more problematic for the semantic and morphological aspects of the dictionary that it is inconsistent, does not represent one dialect, and that the

dialectal differences are nowhere plainly presented or discussed. Unfortunately, dialectal differences are only dealt with individually in cases where a word diverges morphologically from the form expected for Classical Nahuatl, and generally these cases are simply relegated to variation.

For example, the few applicatives from verbs in -*oa* that are included in the dictionary are all formed regularly, but the formation in the Zacapoaxtla dialect differs from the one found in Classical Nahuatl and Tetelcingo (cf. Canger 1980:118–31). In Zacapoaxtla they end in -*ōwilia*, whereas in Classical Nahuatl they end in -*ilhuia*, -*olhuia*, or -*huia*; for example (from the dictionary):

	Zacapoaxtla	Classical Nahuatl and Tetelcingo
pepechoā	*pepechōhuiliā*	*pepechilhuiā*
piloā	*pilohuiliā*	*pilhuiā*
tlapoā	*tlapōhuiliā*	*tlapolhuiā*
(i)hcuiloā	*tlahcuilohhuiliā*	*(i)hcuilhuiā*
nepanoā	*nepanohuiliā*	

However, Karttunen does not seem to recognize this regularity. *pepechōhuiliā* and *pilohuiliā* are not marked as applicatives; she says that *tlapōhuiliā* is an applicative formed from *tlapohu(i)*, a word which is not attested in Zacapoaxtla; and about the entry *tlahcuilohhuiliā* she has a cryptic commentary: "The glottal stop of the third syllable is not attested, and the vowel before it is unmarked for length. If there is not glottal stop, then O should be long" (p. 261). In fact, the form is regular and exactly the one to be expected: *qui-tajcuilohuilia* in the original source, corresponding to *tlahcuilohuiliā* in Karttunen's transcription; and it is most likely that the *o* should be short in all applicatives of this type in Zacapoaxtla, as it is in other dialects that share this formation (Mecayapan [Isthmus], and Xalitla and Zitlala in Central Guerrero). Why Karttunen inserted an unattested *h* (glottal stop) is unclear. This case illustrates the problem of lumping distinct dialects together.

In a second example, Karttunen (p. xxx) writes about a construction ending in either -*ti-ka*ʔ (Tetelcingo) or -*t-ok* (Zacapoaxtla): "Throughout this dictionary there is a systematic split in glosses for two grammatically equivalent derivations . . . this dictionary glosses -TICAH constructions as though they were verbs and -TOC ones as substantives," e.g., "TĪLĪNTICAH to be tightened, pressed down, constricted/está apretado" (p. 241), "TĪLĪNTOC something tightened, compressed/apretado" (p. 241). However, this construction, which expresses the result of an action, is new in the modern dialects, modeled after Spanish *está apretado*, like English *is tightened*, where -*ti-ka*ʔ and -*t-ok* correspond to *está* 'is'. In Classical Nahuatl such forms exist, but they are verbal compounds expressing that the action is taking place, and they are inflected for tense; -*ti-ka*ʔ and -*t-ok* as well as a number of other positional verbs indicate the position which the subject assumes in the course of the action, thus *ti:li:n-t-ok* would mean 'is becoming tight while lying' and *ti:li:n-ti-ka*ʔ 'is becoming tight while being'. However, the word in Classical Nahuatl which corresponds to modern *ti:li:ntika*ʔ and *ti:li:ntok* is *ti:li:n-ki* 'tightened'. In other words, neither of the two

translations given for the "grammatically equivalent derivations" would be adequate for Classical Nahuatl.

It is easy to see how the existing verbal compound could come to express the result of the action. And it is natural that the examples of this construction included in the dictionary are formed from intransitive verbs; corresponding constructions formed from transitive verbs, e.g., *λa-kʷaʔ-t-ok* 'he is eating while lying down' has taken over a simple progressive function, also inspired by Spanish, *está comiendo*, but that is productively formed and is therefore not expected to occur in a dictionary. However, a few cases of a related but puzzling construction appear: "ILPITOC someone, something bound/amarrado, atado, nudo" from Zacapoaxtla is formed from the transitive verb *ilpia* and should therefore never be expected to occur without an object prefix (in Nahuatl it is absolutely obligatory for transitive verbs to have some object prefix in all forms); it is probably modeled on the Spanish expression *está amarrado* 'it is tied', parallel with the intransitive 'it is tightened', etc.; Karttunen is unhappy with the corresponding form from Tetelcingo: "ILPIHTICAH to be bound/está amarrado, está atado ... T[etelcingo] is missing the internal glottal stop." So she has added it, but the construction is new in Nahuatl, and in fact it is found in a number of modern dialects, always WITHOUT that glottal stop. In "TETZĪLPITICAH to be fastened with a knot/nudo, está bien amarrado" Karttunen has not inserted *h*. This example illustrates the problem of treating together colonial and modern sources.

Third, in the "Introduction" we are told that:

It may strike the user as odd that there are no adjectival English glosses, although the Spanish gloss may be an adjective. For example, in the Zacapoaxtla dictionary TLĪLTIC is glossed as 'negro', but the English gloss in this dictionary is not 'black' but 'something black'. The reason for this practice is that there is no morphological distinction in Nahuatl between nouns-substantives and adjectives, as there clearly is in Spanish, where nouns have gender and adjectives agree in gender with the nouns they modify. As a result, the criterion for distinguishing between nouns and adjectives in Nahuatl would be semantic, a distinction that Molina eschewed in his dictionary. His gloss of TLĪLTIC is 'cosa negra de etiopia', and in general he uses 'cosa' glosses of words we might be inclined to gloss adjectivally. (P. xxix.)

But Spanish does NOT distinguish clearly between nouns and adjectives. The very example Karttunen has chosen illustrates this: *negro* is ambiguous; it can mean 'black', 'black one', 'black man'; that is presumably why Molina wrote 'cosa negra', to indicate more directly that the adjective was intended. English does distinguish nouns from adjectives, so why transfer this specific feature of Molina's Spanish gloss into English? Most important, Nahuatl does indeed differentiate morphologically between nouns and adjectives. Nouns typically end in the absolutive suffix, e.g.. *kal-li* 'house', *λa-kʷal-li* 'food', while adjectives (mostly derived from verbs) typically end in *-ki*, *-k*, or *-tik*: *yama:n-ki* 'soft', *toma:wa-k* 'fat', *λi:l-tik* 'black'.

Finally, in using the dictionary I have constantly come across forms, translations, or comments which seem to ignore systematic relations or to disagree with the sources and other kinds of information. Some examples follow.

A group of adjectives in *-ki* in the peripheral dialects regularly end in *-ik*: *šošo:wki : šošo:wik* 'green'; *toto:nki : toto:nik* 'hot'; *λapa:nki : λapa:nik* 'broken'; *λaλa:wki : λaλa:wik* 'red'; *wa:kki* : wa:(k)ik 'dry'; *yama:nki : yama:nik* 'soft'; *yaya:wki : yaya:wik* 'black' (Canger 1980:81–82). Since Zacapoaxtla represents a peripheral dialect, such forms, foreign to Classical Nahuatl, will occur in the dictionary, in some cases as the main form. It is thus confusing, I think, to find the common Classical Nahuatl word *šošo:wki* 'green' not as a separate entry but only under *šošo:wik* as a "variant form" from Xalitla. Under TLAPĀNQUI we are mistakenly told that "Z[acapoaxtla] has a less regular variant TLAPĀNIC" (p. 290).

Under "IZTLĒHU(I) to turn pale/se pone pálido T[etelcingo]" we are told that "This appears to be synonymous with C[arochi]'s and M[olina]'s IZTALĒHUA" (p. 124). Again, this is a perfectly regular feature of the Tetelcingo dialect—and of several other dialects—that intransitive inchoatives which in Classical Nahuatl end in *-wa* in these other dialects end in *-wi*. There are at least a dozen more such regular pairs in the dictionary, for example: CHIPĀHU(I)/CHIPĀHUA 'for something to become clean', PITZĀHU(I)/PITZĀHUA 'to get thin', TOMĀHU(I)/TOMĀHUA 'to grow fat'.

TĒCCIZTLI is translated by "conch, the shell of which was used as a trumpet, or shell in general, including egg shell/caracol grande" (p. 215). In none of the cited sources do we find any evidence for the meaning of eggshell. In La Huasteca dialects, however, the word means 'egg', and that may be what Karttunen bases this interpretation on.

MŌLCAX(I)-TL does not mean "stone mortar and pestle" as given, but only 'mortar'.

CHICĀUHTICAH is cited with Molina's translation "something strong, healthy, stable/cosa firme, estable y permaneciente" both in the "Introduction" (p. xxx) and under the entry (p. 47), even though such a form does not exist in Molina's dictionary; rather we only find the corresponding form, *chicauatica* (CHICĀHUATICAH), which is not included in Karttunen's dictionary.

"MIYEX(I) to break wind/despide pedos (T[etelcingo])" (p. 149) is a reflexive verb in which M- is the regular form of the reflexive prefix as found with vowel-initial verb roots (Molina 1571:36: "Yexi.nin.peerse. prete. oniniex. Yexi.nite. peer endisfauor. desprecio de otro. pret. oniteiex."), and it should accordingly be entered in the dictionary under *i*.

Why was Zacapoaxtla (*qui*)*pipi:na* 'chupar' (suck), corresponding to Molina "pipina. nitla. comer y chupar" (eat and suck), not included?

How can Karttunen render "voz fuerte, voz respetuosa," a translation for TLAHTŌLCUAUHTIC, into English "someone with a strong, commanding voice"? It means 'strong, commanding voice'.

Under TETECUĪNŌL-LI Kartunnen cites Molina for translating *tetecuintic* as "something trimmed down, with all projections removed"; however, Molina's Vocabulario has "cosa roma despuntada, o mellada" which means 'blunt, dull, or notched thing'.

The verb YAUH is not "suppletive with HU(I)"; the basic verb is *yawi* (YAHUI), but in Classical Nahuatl it has some strongly syncopated forms.

Concluding remarks. It should be obvious to the reader that I am a frequent user of Karttunen's dictionary. What may by now be less clear is that I find it extremely useful, indispensable, and basically reliable when used for the purpose for which it was intended. However, I have felt obliged to present such a careful review of problems in orthographic representation, alphabetical order, meaning and morphology, and in the lumping together of material from different times and distinct dialects precisely because the book will be highly used, and the reader should be aware of exactly these limitations, even though Karttunen does achieve her main goal of getting vowel length and glottal stop represented and of providing us with a valuable basic reference and research tool.

UNA CANGER, *University of Copenhagen*

REFERENCES

ANDREWS, J. RICHARD. 1975. Introduction to Classical Nahuatl. Austin: University of Texas Press.
BREWER, FORREST; AND JEAN G. BREWER. 1971. Vocabulario mexicano de Tetelcingo, Morelos. Mexico City: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
CANGER, UNA. 1980. Five Studies Inspired by Nahuatl Verbs in *-oa*. Travaux du cercle linguistique de Copenhague, no. 19. Copenhagen: Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen.
CAROCHI, HORACIO. 1645. Arte de la lengua mexicana con la declaracion de los adverbios della. México. [Reprint ed., Colección de gramáticas de la lengua mexicana, pp. 396–536. México: Imprenta del Museo Nacional, 1892.]
"Huehuetlatolli." Early seventeenth-century manuscript, M-M 458, Bancroft Library. University of California, Berkeley.
KEY, HAROLD; AND MARY RITCHIE DE KEY. Vocabulario de la Sierra de Zacapoaxtla, Puebla. Mexico City: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
LANGACKER, RONALD W. 1977. An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar. Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar, vol. 1. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
MOLINA, FRAY ALONSO DE. 1571. Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana y mexicana y castellana. Mexico City: Antonio de Spinoza.
OLMOS, FRAY ANDRES DE. 1547. Arte para aprender la lengva mexicana. [First published by Rémi Siméon as Grammaire de la langue Nahuatl ou Mexicaine. Paris, 1875.]

———

EDWARD SAPIR'S CORRESPONDENCE: AN ALPHABETICAL AND CHRONO-LOGICAL INVENTORY, 1910–1925. Edited by Louise Dallaire. National Museum of Man, Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper no. 97. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1984. Pp. xii + 278. Free on request (paper).

Sapir spent approximately half of his professional career in Canada, as Chief of the Division of Anthropology, Geological Survey of Canada, from 1910 to

1925. Perhaps due to the remoteness of Ottawa from the major centers of academic and intellectual life at that time, Sapir's correspondence during his Canadian years was voluminous. Furthermore, as a civil servant, Sapir was obliged to file and preserve all of the letters that crossed his desk, however remote their content from his official concerns. Bureaucratic procedure has in this case preserved a small historical treasure, which now, thanks to this complete inventory diligently compiled by Louise Dallaire, Archivist of the Canadian Ethnology Service, is fully accessible to scholars. Particularly important for our understanding of the history of twentieth-century anthropology and linguistics are Sapir's letters to and from Franz Boas (475 items in the file) and his correspondence with other major figures of the Boasian cohort (Goldenweiser, 162 items; Kroeber, 237 items; Lowie, 174 items; Radin, 330 items; Speck, 294 items; Wissler, 104 items). Only carbons of Sapir's outgoing (typewritten) letters are preserved here—although some of the originals can be found in other collections — but the incoming correspondence is relatively complete, including many handwritten items, and brims with scholarly gossip.[1] Less chatty, but still full of personal particulars, is Sapir's correspondence with J. Alden Mason, Wilson Wallis, Jaime de Angulo, Leslie Spier, and a few other younger scholars. Of unique interest are the 25 letters exchanged between Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield in 1924–25, at the beginning of their acquaintance. Not surprisingly, the correspondence with anthropologists, linguists, and enthusiastic amateurs working in Canada is vast, including large files of in-house correspondence between Sapir and his assistants, Marius Barbeau and Diamond Jenness, and a remarkably large file of correspondence (350 items, running to nearly 600 pages) with James Teit. Here also are numerous letters to and from Canadian Native people, most notably the Nootka informant-scholar Alex Thomas (64 items), and a great deal of technical correspondence with fellow linguists on Athapaskan (Pliny Earle Goddard, 187 items; Father Morice, 72 items) and Algonquian (Truman Michelson, 74 items). Connected with Sapir's Athapaskan work too is much of the correspondence with the orientalist Berthold Laufer (80 items), with whom Sapir explored the possibility of a link between Na-Dene and Sino-Tibetan. Besides his North American correspondents, Sapir also kept in contact with a number of European colleagues, including Otto Jespersen, Antoine Meillet, Paul Rivet, C. C. Uhlenbeck, the sinologist Bernhard Karlgren, and the ethnomusicologist von Hornbostel. The only side of Sapir's work that is scantily attested in the Ottawa correspondence files is the literary, artistic one. There are a few letters to or from such figures as Clarence Day or Stephen Leacock, but

---

[1] The letters from Radin and Kroeber are especially candid. In Kroeber's case, the preservation of many of Sapir's personal letters to Kroeber in the A. L. Kroeber Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, allows a fairly complete reconstitution of the texture of their intellectual relationship during Sapir's Ottawa years. See my *The Sapir–Kroeber Correspondence: Letters Between Edward Sapir and A. L. Kroeber, 1905–1925*, Report no. 6, Survey of California and Other Indian Languages (Berkeley: Department of Linguistics, University of California, 1984).