

G. Scott *Fore Dictionary*. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-62, 1980.
 Canberra: The Australian National University. xiii+243pp.

Reviewed by R.L. Brandson
 University of Manitoba

We are once again indebted to Graham Scott for a major work on a Papuan language. This is the second published dictionary of a language of the East-Central Family, East New Guinea Highlands Stock, and will likely soon be followed by several more dictionaries of other languages of this family.¹

There are approximately 3,600 entries in the Fore-English section of the dictionary, but this is not an accurate indication of the number of lexical items represented, as some 60% of the entries are duplicate listings of variant forms. By subtracting the number of duplicate listings from the total, we can estimate that there are some 2,400 lexical items represented.

Most of the duplicate entries are of Northern and Southern dialect variants, such as:

nayawawe N; nawaye S (my) tail'²
 pumpu'me nkinane N; obebe inane S 'weed type'

Others are not coded for dialect, and are apparently variants which are found in both dialects. Scott does not indicate whether or not the choice of forms reflects differences in register, speech habits

¹ The other published dictionary of an East-Central Family language is G.L. Renck's *Yagaria Dictionary* (PL C-37, 1977), based on the Move dialect of Yagaria. John Haiman's dictionary of Hua will likely appear in 1983. My own dictionary of Gende will be several years in preparation. Linguists are presently working on at least eight other East-Central languages, so it may be reasonably hoped that the next decade will see several more grammars and dictionaries of these languages in print.

² I have not indicated accent in the Fore examples, and have long 'a' with 'a:' rather than 'aa'. Otherwise I have used Scott's orthographic system.

of different generations, etc.:

atowe; atonene; atonempawe '(my) girl playmate'

kota:ne; ka:gowe 'goods, possessions'

Scott must be commended for his expenditure of time and effort in cross-referencing all these variant forms, which are of great value to comparative linguists.

The most serious fault of this work is an unfortunate choice of mode of presentation. Rather than using roots or the morphologically simplest occurring forms for citation purposes, Scott has used needlessly complex forms, without indicating morpheme boundaries. The reasons for doing this are neither stated nor obvious, and it creates many difficulties for the non-Fore speaker who wishes to consult the dictionary, which I shall describe in detail below.

Non-verbs (except a few particles and affixes) are given with an indicative mood suffix - apparently the usual elicitation form. The presence of this morpheme is informative inasmuch as its shape distinguishes class V morphemes from morphemes of classes Q and N.³

The form -we (varies with -ye) occurs with class V, -ne with class Q or N. Scott further distinguishes class N from class Q by marking class N entries with an asterisk:

Entry	Gloss	Underlying Form
yagawe	<i>pig</i>	yagaV-e <i>pig</i> -INDICATIVE
kanene	<i>lamp</i>	kaneQ-e <i>lamp</i> -IND.
pane*	<i>sun</i>	paN-e <i>sun</i> -IND.

This mode of presentation creates two minor inconveniences for the user. Firstly, one must always subtract the final syllable to produce the root (the most commonly used form). Secondly, the shape of the mood suffix affects the alphabetic placement of entries,

³ Classes V, Q, and N trigger different types of morphophonemic changes in the following morphemes. See the book under review, Scott (1980:vi) and Scott 1978, pp. 29-34, for descriptions of these changes.

so it is slightly awkward to look up words in the Fore-English section. If, for example, one wondered what yaga meant, one could not simply look up yaga, but would have to try yagane (in case it were a class Q or N morpheme) and yagawe (in case it were a class V morpheme). I would suggest that it would have been more practical to list it alphabetically under yaga, in a form such as yaga-we or yagaV or simply yaga. Since most morphemes are class V, one could assume class V (for the last suggested entry form) unless otherwise stated.

These are but minor irritations; more serious problems arise from Scott's decision not to indicate morpheme boundaries. For example, we are told in the preface (p.vii) that the underlying form of naba:nempawe '(my) father' is na-ba:-neN-ma-e 'my-father-my-DELINEATOR-IND'. The citation form is not very informative to anyone who has not studied Fore extensively. Scott should have at least marked morpheme boundaries, and preferably have provided some sort of formula which would distinguish root from affixes, such as (p)ba:(p)maV, where (p) indicates person agreement affix.

Verbal entries are given in non-future indicative with 1sg subject agreement and 3sg direct and indirect objects for transitive and ditransitive verbs. Typical entries and their underlying forms, as described on page v of the preface are:

Entry	Gloss	Underlying Form
nauwe	eat (vi)	na-u-e eat-I-IND
agauwe	see (vt)	a-ka-u-e him/it-see-I-IND
amuwe	give (vtt)	a-mu-u-e him/it-give-I-IND

These examples present no great difficulties; one need not be terribly well versed in Fore morphology and phonology to recognize the verb roots from the citation forms of these three verbs - but other examples are not so transparent. On page vi of the preface we are told that the citation form nabiye 'like (vt)' is derived from na-pu-y-e me-do-it-IND. While study of Scott 1978 (pp.11, 43)

will acquaint us with the rules $p \rightarrow b/V_V$ and $u \rightarrow i/_y$,⁴ it is still not at all obvious that the root of *nabiye* is *-pu-*. Nor does Scott explicitly identify *nabiye*, or any other impersonal verb, as being impersonal.

Even thorough study of Scott 1978 does not enable one to identify the roots of some entries, such as *waiyuwe* '*recline (vi)*', which is ambiguously derivable from either:

waiyu-u-e (vowel elision, Scott 1978:43)
or
wai-u-e (semivowel induction, Scott 1978:43)

One can probably assume that the shorter possible root is the correct one in most cases (in this case *wai-* is the correct root), but I do not see that one can assume this with complete confidence in all cases.

Comparative linguists will be disappointed that more effort was not made at identification of flora and fauna. Of the eighteen bird names given, only one is identified fully: *waene** '*white cockatoo*'. Eight others are given ambiguous definitions, such as *atokuwe* '*bird type, owl*', which leave one wondering whether this is a generic term for owls or the name of a particular type of owl. Four other bird names are given descriptive definitions, such as *kubo'yane* '*bird type, robin-type bird*'. The other four bird names are simply glossed as '*bird type*'.

Of the twenty-eight tree names listed, only four are identified fully:

ma:suwe '*tree type, coconut*'
ma:niwe '*tree type, hoop pine*'
kara:we '*tree type, casuarina*'
*intune** '*tree type, mango*'

Another six tree names are glossed as '*tree type, firewood type*', while another three are glossed simply as '*tree type*'. The remaining fifteen are given descriptive definitions such as *otoba:ne* '*tree*

⁴ The formalisations of these rules are my own.

type used for making axe handles' and a:munta:ne 'tree type (branches of which were waved at first aeroplanes sighted), decorations'.*

Identification of plants and animals in New Guinea is difficult at best, and often impossible, but Scott could surely have done better than this with a little effort. There are quite a number of illustrated books and booklets available which can be used for identification purposes, and the University of Technology in Lae will (or at least once would) identify suitably collected and prepared plant specimens.

I had expected that Scott would distinguish the "two types of noun root" (1978:71) in the dictionary. He describes these two types of noun roots as being characterised by vowel reduction and non-reduction when the root does not occur as the initial element in a noun phrase (1978:38,39,71), as illustrated by (1978:39):

kabewe	'door'	(reduction)
tabe kabiwe	'big door'	
kewe	'evil spirit'	(non-reduction)
tabe kewe	'chief evil spirit'	

Scott states (1978:38) that there are "no predictable features to say which roots will be affected," implying that this is lexically determined, yet fails to index it in the dictionary.

In spite of its faults this volume is an invaluable record of the Fore language, a welcome companion to Scott 1978, and an important addition to the available literature on Papuan languages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SCOTT, G., 1978. *The Fore language of Papua New Guinea. Pacific Linguistics B-47.*