since 1999, with some attention to its historical context. It is well presented as a conflict between the local socio-political interests of the Baloch and the larger strategic interests of the government in Islamabad. The second chapter, by Sabir Badalkhan, is the most comprehensive description of the Zikri confessional community in Makran yet to be published, and for this reason alone particularly valuable. It is an excellent account of the history, beliefs and practices of the Zikris, by an author already well known for his publications on Baloch culture. His last sentence is tantalizing: “The only counterforce to Sunni fundamentalism... [in its opposition to the Zikris] is the Baloch nationalists, who see Zikrism as an integral part of Baloch national identity and, as such, worthy to be protected.” The next chapter is the first publication on Baloch involvement in the East African slave trade, and is valuable for that reason, even though it is not as comprehensive as it might be. The fourth of this section, on Power and Religion, by Noraiee, introduces the radicalization and politicization of religion since the 1979 revolution, with some attention to its earlier history. Next is a well organized discussion, by Nina Swidler, of what can be known from historical sources about diversity in Baloch society in the pre-British period. Paul Titus ends the volume with an essay on External Influences on the Baloch National Movement that introduces some new details relating to the evolution of modern Baloch ethnic awareness.

It is a pleasure to read a collection of essays that bring out such a variety of different social and cultural features in a historical perspective of some three and a half centuries. However, I found the use of “pluralism” confusing. The concept is not directly discussed and no reference is given to the literature on pluralism in any discipline. Although the term can be used in various senses it usually implies some degree of formal recognition of social difference and related rights. The differences that are covered in the various chapters of this volume are not legally or otherwise formally recognized in either of the two countries. These chapters seem more concerned with informal variation and structured differentiation of various types than what is usually discussed under the heading of pluralism.

Was it self-consciousness over pluralism that led the editors to refer to “multiple religious faiths” in the Preface? Surely, only the Zikri phenomenon could be called a different faith. There was no mention of the presence of Hindus and Sikhs who had played an important economic role in the region before the creation of Pakistan. There is much in this volume that the editors could have used to make the collection attractive to a wider audience beyond Baloch studies, and to get the Baloch out of their academic ghetto. Several of the authors could have given more attention to the relationship between what they were presenting and what was known from earlier publications, and the editors in their introduction could have set the whole in a larger context of Iranian and South Asian Studies, or other disciplinary interests, as well as theoretical issues such as pluralism or diversity in comparable societies.

Despite these comments, overall the editors deserve to be complimented on their success in producing a valuable volume with a rich diversity of material and authorship, including participation of local scholars from Iran and Pakistan. There is enough valuable material here to reward the attention of anyone with an academic interest in the Baloch or their neighbors.

Brian Spooner, University of Pennsylvania


Aspects of Iranian Linguistics is a volume of twenty papers which were presented at the First International Conference with the same title held at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, Germany, June 17–19, 2005. The invited keynote speakers were Dr.
Gilbert Lazard and Dr. Mohammad Reza Bateni. The volume is dedicated to the latter for “…his impressive contribution to modern linguistics in Iran.” (p. 1).

The volume contains papers from diverse branches of linguistics such as lexicography, computational linguistics, syntax, morphology, agrammatism, and historical issues, and that are written within different theoretical frameworks, e.g. descriptivism, functionalism, generativism, and typology. Out of these twenty papers, fifteen deal with an issue related to Persian (modern or ancient) and the rest with other Iranian languages. The titles of the papers and the names of their authors are as follows: “Recent advances in Persian lexicography” (Mohammad Reza Bateni), “A link grammar parser for Persian” (Jon Dehdari and Deryle Lonsdale), “Classifiers, plural and definiteness in Persian” (Lewis Gebhardt), “Optionality and variation: a stochastic OT analysis of M/p-echo reduplication in Colloquial Persian” (Saeed Ghaniaabadi), “Markedness and bare nouns in Persian” (Jila Ghomeshi), “Expressions of future in Classical and Modern New Persian” (Carina Jahani), “Raising and control in Persian” (Simin Karimi), “Event structure of verbal nouns and light verbs” (Gholamhossein Karimi-Doostan), “Differential object marking in a Medieval Persian text” (Gregory Key), “Inversion and topicalization in Farsi discourse: A comparative study” (Shahrzad Mahootian), “Aspects of agrammatic language in Persian” (Reza Nilipour), “The individuating function of the Persian ‘indefinite suffix’” (Daniel Paul), “Mood and modality in Persian” (Azita Taleghani), “The Ezafe as a headmarking inflectional suffix: evidence from Persian and Kurmanji Kurdish” (Pollet Samvelian), “The emergence of ergativity in Iranian: reanalysis or extension” (Geoffrey Haig), “The noun phrase in Hawrami” (Anders Holmberg and David Odden), “Marking of arguments in Balochi ergative and mixed constructions” (Agnes Korn), “Two sets of mobile verbal person agreement markers in the Northern Talysh language” (Donald Stilo), and “On ergativity in Pamir languages” (Antje Wendland). The papers are arranged alphabetically according to the author’s last name. I think a more appropriate arrangement could have been on the basis of the theoretical framework of the papers or on the basis of those dealing with aspects of Persian and those which are concerned with aspects of other Iranian languages.

In this review, I will present a sketch of the contents of two papers, the first with a functional orientation dealing with an aspect of Persian, and the second with a typological perspective describing another Iranian language.

Shahrzad Mahootian begins with a description of inversion in English. Following Birner (1994) she suggests that “Inversion in English fronts a postverbal constituent, X, so that it precedes the verb, while the logical subject of the utterance appears in postverbal position. The resulting linear order is XVS.” (p. 275). Sentence (1), example (3) in her article, shows inversion.

1. On the counter are loaves – whole wheat, cinnamon, raisin, oatmeal, rye, soy, sunflower, corn meal.

Then, she presents the following “Farsi [Persian] sentence…which appears as the first [my emphasis] sentence in Ebrahimi’s Qeseye Golha-ye Qali (“The story of the Carpet’s Design”).” (p. 275). The transcription of the mid-front vowel in this and many other Persian examples in Mahootian’s paper is unconventional.

2. dær dehkæræ–ye kuček-i pir-ē mænd-i Zendægi mikærd
   in village-EZ small-indef old-indef man-indef live did

‘In a small village lived an old man.’

Mahootian conjectures that “Structurally, the linear order XSV in 11 [2 above] is identical to what has been shown to be topicalization in both Farsi [Persian] and English. Functionally, however, the ordering of X and S is the DN-DN [Discourse New] combination which is permitted in inversion but prohibited in topicalization.” (ibid). As Persian is a scrambling language, the author should have first argued that what she calls inversion in Persian is distinct
from scrambling. I believe this is a serious shortcoming in this paper which casts doubt on her treatment of the Persian data.

The article by Donald Stilo is highly illuminating. It describes many issues surrounding his main objective which is an account of Person Agreement Markers in the Northern Talyshi. He first shows that “The verbal system of Northern Talyshi has two different sets of Person Agreement Markers that encode agreement with the subject/agent, corresponding to a tense-based split between Nominative-Accusative and Ergative-Absolutive alignments.” (p.366). Examples (3)a and (3)b below, sentences (1)a and (1)b in the article, summarize this observation (p.378).

(3) a. Nominative-Accusative:

\[
\begin{array}{rlll}
æv & tolïši & zïvon-í & o-bæ-müt-é=Ø \\
\text{He.Dir} & \text{Talyshi} & \text{Language-OBL} & \text{PREVERB-TAM-learn-INF} & =3S_1
\end{array}
\]

“He’ll learn Talyshi (language).”

b. Ergative

\[
\begin{array}{rlll}
æy & tolïši & zïvon-Ø=iš & o-m’üüt-i \\
\text{He.OBL} & \text{Talyshi} & \text{Language-DIR} & =3S_2 & \text{PREVERB-learn-?3S.AUX}
\end{array}
\]

“He learned Talyshi (language).”

Stilo’s next highly interesting discussion is on “The leftward mobility of both Set1 and Set2 PAM [Person Agreement Markers] clitics.” (p. 378). Earlier in the article he divides Set1 PAM into Set1a which “function solely as suffixes… in the verbal system…and are not at all mobile or detachable in any environment.” And “Set1b, the enclitic forms, […] [that] are highly mobile and are commonly ‘fronted’…” (p. 366). He presents many convincing examples to substantiate his fronting analysis (p. 378–383). However, the title of section 2.3 of the article is “Tense-by-Tense Documentation of the Fronting of Set1a Enclitics” (p. 385) which contradicts the above-quoted classification of the PAM – more specifically the fact that Set1a markers are solely suffixes in the verbal system.

All in all, the volume is a remarkable contribution to Iranian linguistics and it is certainly a source of inspiration for scholars and students interested in this promising research area.

Mohammad Dabir-Moghaddam, Department of Linguistics, Allameh Tabataba’i University, Tehran
