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MUNDARTEN DER ZÁZÁ, HAUPTSÄChLICH AUS SIWEREK UND KOR,
Bearbeitet von KARL HADANK. Kurdisch-Persische Forschungen,
abt. III (Nordwestiranisch), Band IV. 1932.

To Oskar Mann we owe the collection of the material here edited by Dr. Hadank. It represents the first full account of the Zázá dialects. The main part is occupied with the dialects of Siwerek and Kor, but contributions from the villages of Bijaq, Čabakhčur and Kighi are also included. The editor has introduced the texts with an historical sketch of importance. Then each dialect is treated separately and with great care, so that we have for the Siwerek and Kor a brief account of the sounds, followed by a full morphology, syntax, glossary, and texts. The Bijaq material consists of glossary only. Considerably more is again offered of the Čabakhčur and Kighi. A sketch-map enables the reader to understand the relative positions of the villages. The editor's task has been by no means easy. It has been excellently accomplished as regards the editing of the material. From this book it is possible to get a clear idea of what the Zázá people speak. That the vowels are so distinctly divided into long and short we may find hard to believe. Certainly in other dialects in Persia one finds the distinction rather hard to seize. One matter in the treatment, which seems a little disappointing in a book otherwise so important, is the introduction of etymological comparisons which display a rather lawless freedom. It is hard, for example, to see why on p. 20, Kōsā Zázá zárē "Lüge" is compared with West Kurdish deraū "Betrug", and in the Siwerek Glossary, p. 173, zár "Lüge" is given with the remark: Dagegen Pers. دروغ. Two words are known as distinct as early as Old Persian zura and drauga. A more exact study of the phonology would have suggested to compare Kor példāk "purse", p. 295, rather with NPers. péla, pēl "purse" پئله, جب than with NPers. بلو. On p. 33 Kor vinī "loss" and zinā "sin" seem to be connected, and also with gunā, cf. on p. 305. Yet zinā recalls at once Arabic zinā "formation", while Siwerek bi-vinī, p. 171, suggests that a different

In the increasing complexity of Indo-Iranian studies it is of great service to have occasionally a summary of earlier treatments of any particular problem. The articles become easily inaccessible or accessible only with difficulty. New studies may appear reproducing unawares older discussions. In the present work the author has most fortunately thought fit to prefix a careful examination and criticism of all the earlier studies accessible to him of the word brahman before offering the justification of his own views. In the course of the study he has had occasion to touch frequently upon the Iranian side of the problem, the side particularly interesting to the reviewer. The full value of the work cannot indeed be gauged till the third part of historical character (Vorwort IV) is published. Professor Charpentier’s view of brahman is in accord with that of Haug and Hillebrandt among earlier scholars. This view (p. 58) sees in bráhman the identical word (both etymologically and semantically) which we have in the Avestan barsman—“bundle of twigs”. Here might be added in justification of the postulated form *barzman-, the word attested in Aramaic brzmdn’ that is *brzma-dāna-“holder of brzmn” (the vowel of the first syllable being uncertain: either barzman- or brazman- can be read) as recognized by Andreas in Lidzbarski Ephemeris, iii, 222. This form has the expected z (which may be the Aramaic notation of z or ẓ). For the vowel of the first syllable the earliest evidence is the Arm. barsmoun-k’, gen. pl. barsman-e in Eznik fifth century; see Hübsch. Arm. Gram., 119.

Almost fifty pages (10–58) are devoted to criticism of the views on bráhman expressed by J. Hertel in IF., 41, 206 fol. and later