

sprüngliche Funktion der Postpositionen darin bestand, einen peripheren, dezentralen Agens in eine intransitive Konstruktion mit resultativ-stativer Bedeutung einzuführen“ (S. 225). Diese intransitiven Resultativ-Konstruktionen hätten ursprünglich weder ein Auxiliar noch einen Prädikatsmarkierer aufgewiesen, ein Stadium, das gegenwärtig noch in der Nordwest-Mande Sprache Bozo belegt ist. Die Variation der transitiven Perfektiv-Prädikatsmarkierer innerhalb des Manding (*yé, dí, kà*) wird damit erklärt, dass unterschiedliche Postpositionen die Quelle der Agensmarkierung waren: sie dienten der Instrument-, Ursache- bzw. Komitativmarkierung.

Als möglichen Grammatikalisierungspfad der Subjunktiv-Prädikatsmarkierers nimmt der Vf. wiederum eine Postpositionalphrase zum Ausdruck des Agens + einen Infinitiv des Verbs, möglicherweise mit dessen Objekt als Genitiv.

Die formale Ähnlichkeit oder gar Homonymie in vielen Manding-Varietäten zwischen Prädikatsmarkierern in Sätzen mit statischen Verben und Perfektiv-Prädikatsmarkierern transitiver Verben (affirmativ *ká, kà*; negativ *má, mán*) erklärt der Vf. als einen „empirisch abgesicherten Grammatikalisierungspfad [...] von Perfektivität via Stativität bzw. Resultativität und Perfekt“ (S. 246). Diese Hypothese wird untermauert durch das Fehlen einer Kategorie von stativen Verben in einigen wenigen Manding-Varietäten. Prädikative Zuschreibung von Eigenschaften wird in diesen Varietäten entweder mittels eines resultativen Partizips oder mit Hilfe des intransitiven perfektiven Prädikatsmarkierers gekennzeichnet.

Die allgemeine sprachgeographische Beobachtung, wonach auf der einen Seite Innovationen im Zentrum eines Dialektgebiets ihren Ursprung nehmen, ohne jemals bis an die Peripherie zu dringen, und auf der anderen Seite ältere Formen an der Peripherie beobachtet werden können, sind nicht für alle untersuchten Prädikatsmarkierer des Manding hilfreich. Zwar trifft sie für die Prädikatsmarkierer in präsentierenden identifizierenden Sätzen zu: der Prädikatsmarkierer *mú* wird als der älteste angenommen, und er erscheint nur an der Peripherie des Dialektkontinuums. Bei dem Prädikatsmarkierer des Perfektivs ist die geographische Verteilung der Perfektiv-Markierer *yé* und *kà* nicht so eindeutig: einerseits sind die kognaten Formen beider Morpheme – also auch des innovativen *yé* – nur an der Peripherie des Dialektgebiets belegt, andererseits ist die vermutlich ältere Form *kà* nicht in allen peripheren Varietäten vorhanden.

In den letzten Kapiteln versucht der Vf., eine Erklärung für die Entstehung des Sprachtyps der „Split-Predicate“-Sprachen zu geben. Das Manding weist nur im perfektiven Aspekt einen Transitivitätssplit auf; im Imperfektiv werden transitive Konstruktionen genauso kodiert wie intransitive. Die Konzepte, mit deren Hilfe diese Situation erklärt wird, sind Patiensorientierung und „Viewpoint“. Im Manding gibt es, wie in den Ergativsprachen, eine Patiensorientierung im perfektiven Aspekt, während Konstruktionen im Imperfektiv Agens-orientiert sind.

Quint, Nicolas: *The Phonology of Koalib*. A Kordofanian Language of the Nuba Mountains (Sudan). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe 2009. XVIII, 206 S, 59 Tab. 8° = Grammatische Analysen afrikanischer Sprachen 36. Brosch. 48,00 €. ISBN 978-3-89645-552-9.

Bespr. von Don Killian, Helsinki.

Nicolas Quint's investigation of Koalib phonology presents a vital step in Kordofanian language description, focusing on the phonology of the Koalib language. *The Phonology of Koalib* is foremost targeted towards anyone with an interest in Kordofanian languages, secondarily towards those with an interest in phonology and/or African language description. The first version, published in 2006 in French by L'Harmattan, Paris, was entitled *Phonologie de la langue koalibe*. In 2009, a translation by Philip Baker into English was published by Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, Cologne. Quint himself also plays an active role in the second version, including some updates on information, and changing some views from the original 2006 publication. This review is primarily of the English translation, and only minimal reference will be made to the original, except in situations where there is a clear difference needing to be made.

Kordofanian languages are a small group of languages spoken in central Sudan, forming what most linguists consider a primary branch from Niger-Congo.¹ There are four to five primary groups under Kordofanian, depending on the source consulted; Quint recognizes five distinct branches:² Rashadian, Talodian, Lafofa, Katla-Tima, and Heibanian, the last of which Koalib may be placed in. As Quint himself quotes from Schadeberg, Kordofanian language description is still in its infancy. There are no fully complete grammatical descriptions of any Kordofanian language, and some of the languages have nearly no material whatsoever. Koalib's previous grammatical description is minimal, with two primary sources: Schadeberg (1981a)³ has some small remarks on the grammar and phonology of the language, and Stevenson (1957)⁴ uses Koalib material in his description and classification of the language family. Quint's description is thus a first step in trying to have a more comprehensive description of Koalib, his future plans including syntactic and morphological descriptions.

¹ E.g., Greenberg, Joseph, 1963: *The Languages of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

² Quint takes a skeptical view on Katla-Tima, but withholds judgment for the time being on its exclusion.

³ Schadeberg, Thilo C., 1981a: *A Survey of Kordofanian*. Volume 1: The Heiban Group. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

⁴ Stevenson, Roland, 1957: *A survey of the phonetics and grammatical features of the Nuba Mountain languages, with particular reference to Otoro, Katcha, and Nyimang*. *Afrika und Übersee* 40, 73–84, 93–115; 41: 27–65, 117–152, 171–196.

Quint's approach in the description is primarily pragmatic, and does not easily fit into any sort of established framework; it is readily apparent that he does not subscribe to any particular theory regarding language description, including using at times idiosyncratic terminology and methods. Most of his phonological description is based on the lexicon, and he does not deal with phrasal or clausal level phenomena. Quint also prefers a phonological over phonetic approach, and a great deal of the phonological section consists of evidence for phoneme contrasts by way of minimal and near minimal pairs.

Quint presents the phonology of Koalib in a familiar manner for phonological descriptions, beginning with an introduction to the language, its genealogical position, and current state of description. He continues with the main crux of the book, that of the phonology, with 5 separate chapters: Vowels, Consonants, Tonology, Syllabic Structure, and Orthographic Transcription.

The introduction focuses on introducing the language within its context, describing the family, previous work and historical development, as well as the aim of the study and its methods.

After the introduction, the first part of the phonological description is that of vowel description. Quint uses a phonemic chart to summarize Koalib's vowels, then uses contrastive lexemes and minimal pairs phoneme by phoneme to demonstrate that each vowel is distinctive. Quint then goes on to discuss Koalib's vowel harmony, which he views as a height-based system. This was one area I found problematic; his description of vowels sounded more like that of an 8-vowel type ATR system with a contrast in high vowels (e.g. +ATR *i, u, ʌ*, –ATR *ɪ, ʊ, ɛ, ɔ, a*), which is commonly found in the region,⁵ and in fact how it was initially described by Schadeberg.⁶ Furthermore, Tira, a Heiban language spoken in the vicinity of Koalib, has been analyzed to have a vowel system of +ATR *i, u, (ə)*, –ATR *ɪ, ʊ, ɛ, ɔ, a*.⁷ This would easily correspond to Quint's High set of *i, u, ɐ*, and Low set of *e, o, ɛ, ɔ, a*. Other evidence for ATR being involved includes the fact that vowel harmony shifts from Low into High functions grammatically to increase the valency of verbs. If one were to take an auto-segmental approach with ATR, then a floating +ATR would mark the grammatical change, a plausible theory considering the historical aspects of +ATR causatives in Niger-Congo.⁸ Quint does mention that other linguists have suggested, at times quite strongly, that ATR could

play a role in Koalib's system, but his own interpretation is strictly that of height differences. As the issue appears controversial, future detailed acoustic and articulatory data could be worth looking into, to clear up some of the problems regarding the vowel system. Quint's analysis in terms of vowel height also invites an interesting path towards the diachronic aspects of how ATR and vowel height systems may be historically connected.

After discussing vowel harmony, Quint moves on to length, as well as some aspects of phonological restrictions regarding length. He also discusses phonetic aspects of vowel pronunciation, such as centralization in certain situations, or velarization in labialized or labio-velar contexts. He ends the section with a discussion on vowel sequences.

After discussing the vowels, Quint moves on to discuss an unusual type of consonant system, in which individual phonemes have numerous allophones depending on their position in the word, and overlap significantly with each other. His description tends towards being idiosyncratic with labels such as 'plain', 'strong', and 'weak', but he also does present convincing evidence that Koalib has a consonant system challenging to describe with canonical categories. For instance, Quint's strong /*t*/ is realized word-initially and word-finally as [t], inter-vocally as [tt]. Weak /*t*/ on the other hand is realized word initially and finally as [t], but inter-vocally as [ð]. Other languages in the area have also been described with similar variations, e.g. Dagik,⁹ as well as most languages in the Heiban group,¹⁰ and other researchers have also run into similar problems in describing the consonant systems.

The majority of the consonant section consists of example lexemes of minimal and near-minimal pairs. This is followed by a discussion on gemination, and then on some problematic phonemes. He parallels his vowel section with continuing on phonetic comments of certain consonants, and then on positional constraints and consonant sequences.

For the most part, his segmental analysis seems sound, although more explicit phonetic descriptions would be useful regarding individual phonemes. In certain cases, not being explicit about the articulation makes it difficult to assess whether a given phoneme is characterized in the most adequate way. An example illustrating this problem is Quint's description of what he calls a labiovelar plosive, /*kw*/. The use of the term labiovelar implosive evokes /*k̠p̠*/, rather than a labialized velar /*kʷ*/ or the phoneme sequence /*kw*/. In fact, a phoneme sequence is the original analysis Schadeberg took in his analysis of Koalib,¹¹ due to the fact that *kw* can alternate with *ku* (e.g. *kwáyu* vs. *kumay* 'He is

⁵ Casali, R. F., 2008: ATR Harmony in African Languages. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2: 496–549.

⁶ Schadeberg, Thilo C., 1981a: A Survey of Kordofanian. Volume 1: The Heiban Group. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

⁷ Watters, Kathie Swanson, 1993: The Status and Function of Tone in Tira. Unpublished MA dissertation. University of Nairobi.

⁸ E.g., Hyman, Larry, 2003: Sound Change, Misanalysis, and Analogy in the Bantu Causative. *JALL* 24, 55–90.

⁹ Norton, Russel. 1994. The Phonology of Dagik. Unpublished.

¹⁰ Schadeberg, Thilo C., 1981a: A Survey of Kordofanian. Volume 1: The Heiban Group. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

¹¹ Schadeberg, Thilo C., 1981a: A Survey of Kordofanian. Volume 1: The Heiban Group. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

dead'). Quint uses the same symbols as Schadeberg to represent the sound, but he appears to consider it a single phoneme rather than a sequence of phonemes. If Quint considers /kw/ to be a phoneme, both his label and his symbol could be updated to be a labialized velar /kʷ/, not a labiovelar /kw/. Furthermore, if his analysis differs from that of earlier analyses, an explicit reason would make his analysis more compelling. Quint does mention that Koalib does not generally have word-initial consonant sequences, evidence suggesting that it is rather a single sound instead of a consonant sequence. However, Schadeberg's example still needs to be accounted for, and more evidence for Quint's analysis of labialization would have been helpful.

After discussing the consonants, Quint continues with an analysis of Koalib tone, as well as combinatorics, patterns, and changes. His analysis is somewhat brief, primarily that of surface lexical tone, so it is difficult to assess this section in great depth. Standard tonological phenomena are left undiscussed, such as the possibility of downstep, upstep, tone sandhi, downdrift, floating tones, etc. He does give isolated examples of grammatical tone, but these are not presented in a systematic fashion. Quint's later works involving the morphology and syntax of Koalib hopefully will help in understanding of tonal phenomena more thoroughly, particularly when dealing with grammatical tone and phrasal-level phenomena.

Quint follows this section by analyzing the syllabic structure of Koalib. In actuality, much of what could be considered part of this section was already presented in the consonant and vowel sections, such as possible combinations of consonants and vowels, combinatorics, etc. His focus is instead on individual lexical phenomena, such as vowel sequences and tonal interactions. This section appears somewhat haphazard; a more organized approach would have benefited the reader. His justification for syllabification in terms of morphology in section IV.2.3.2.1.2, for instance, is limited to 4 individual verb forms, without glossing or segmentation.

Quint concludes the book with an explanation on orthography, contrasting earlier analyses of the phonology of the language with his own analysis, and this is partially done through orthographic analysis. A minor issue with this section concerns Quint's slightly idiosyncratic use of characters and symbols. It is only on page 186, the second to last page, that Quint mentions that some of his own phoneme representations differ from the IPA, such as using ʈ in place of ʨ. As his description of consonants does not really include articulatory explanations beyond a phoneme chart, the reader is left wondering if ʈ is somehow distinct from ʨ, and if so, how. It is only on the second to last page that the reader understands that this is simply the author's way of typing ʈ. His chart on page 186 could have been included on page xiv, which already has a chart discussing Arabic transcriptions differing from that of the IPA, and cleared up some potential misunderstandings with consonants. Using more standardized terminology

also could have helped with misunderstandings; occlusive is regularly used throughout the book in place of plosive, for instance, despite the fact that the word is not used in English.

Regarding the editing, fonts are unfortunately regularly mixed within the same word throughout the text. More attention to editing and typesetting could have taken care of this, to improve the overall visual impression.

Providing a translation of this work which first appeared in French is laudable, and will certainly help in disseminating Quint's insights, particularly in Sudan and among Sudanese scholars. However, the translation does suffer from minor drawbacks; many small words scattered throughout the book were left untranslated. While words like *et* 'and' and *ou* 'or' are not difficult to grasp, after a certain amount it does detract from the book as a whole. Furthermore, the maps of Sudan are left untranslated, a strange choice considering English maps of the area should not have been difficult to find.

The merits of the book are numerous; Koalib is a heavily underdescribed language, and its phonological system in consonants is rare enough that it could be of interest also for descriptive linguists and typologists outside the area of the Nuba mountains. Quint presents much of the data and his analysis in a clear manner, and extracting data from his description would not be difficult. However, his analysis rarely connects to existing literature on similar phenomena, making it at times difficult to follow; his decision not to include phonetic evidence for much of his approach further compounds the problem. Furthermore, his methodology and theoretical frameworks are not stated clearly enough, and many of the sections appear like they are presented in a haphazard manner. Adding glossing and segmentation also would have improved readability, as would fixing minor details such as mixed fonts and untranslated words. Quint's *The Phonology of Koalib* offers a promising start to Kordofanian language description, but one hopes that in the forthcoming volumes on syntax and morphology, more contextualization and evidence are used to highlight phenomena within Koalib.