

each of which is accepted by the social group as conveying a given meaning or meanings" (p. 111). Operating with such a definition, the whole problem of the function of language in culture, as developed for example by the late Benjamin Whorf, can scarcely be attacked.

In conclusion, then, though Pei's book has many points of interest, it will probably be more misleading than useful to the beginner in linguistics, and it may not, as the dust jacket claims, convey to the layman "the basic information about language without which he may hardly be called educated." We still need a sound, authoritative, and truly complete popular work on the science of language—one that will do for the layman and beginning student what Bloomfield's *Language* has done for the discipline itself.

HARRY HOIJER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

REVISTA DO MUSEU PAULISTA. Nova série, volume 2, São Paulo, 1948. 331 p.

This volume contains nine articles in Portuguese on various aspects of Brazilian anthropology and one in Spanish on the state of anthropology in Mexico (by Juan Comas). There are also reviews, news items, and a list of publications received in 1947. The volume is well printed on much better paper than volume 1 and the articles maintain a high standard of quality.¹ Only the articles of linguistic interest will be reviewed here.

Darcy Ribeiro, *Sistema familiar Kadiuéu*, pp. 175-192. This is a competent ethnological study of the family system of the Caduveo (a Guaycurú band settled in Mato Grosso). A list of kinship terms in Caduveo is given (pp. 182-3, 186-7) in a Portuguese orthography modified only by the addition of h, "pronounced as in English," and a dash for the glottal stop. This type of transcription is of almost no linguistic value, but it is probably better for an ethnologist without linguistic training to give his minimum of

native text in the orthography of his own language than for him to try to write it in half-understood phonetic symbols for which the reader may have different referents.

Arion Dall'Igna Rodrigues, *Notas sobre o sistema de parentesco dos índios Kiriri*, pp. 193-205. Cariri is an independent language family of eastern Brazil made up, according to the author, of four languages: Kipea, Dzubukua, Camurú and Sapuya (p. 195; see also Lowie in BAE-B 143, 1.557-558). All four of these languages are either extinct or on the point of becoming so and are known only from 17th and 18th century grammars and catechistic works. Curiously enough, such material on the languages is fairly abundant while the culture of the Cariri speaking Indians is virtually unknown. Rodrigues points out that a considerable amount of important ethnographic information is contained in P. Luis V. Mamiani's grammar and catechism for Kipea which were published in Lisbon in 1699 and 1698 respectively, and he cites from Mamiani a considerable vocabulary and two texts with interlinear translations, all in the original orthography. The bulk of the study consists of an ethnological analysis of the kinship data contained in this material.

Curt Nimuendajú and R. F. Mansur Guérios, *Cartas etno-lingüísticas*, pp. 207-241. Under this title Sr. Guérios, who is Assistant in Linguistics in the Museu Paraense in Curitiba, presents six letters on ethnological and linguistic subjects which he wrote to Curt Nimuendajú in 1943-45 and Nimuendajú's replies. This correspondence is interesting both for the light it throws on the interests and theoretical views of the two writers and because it is a mine of information on the native language of Brazil.

Nimuendajú was primarily interested in Brazilian Indians and their languages and was concerned with general theory only in so far as it furnished him with a useful and necessary tool. He combined a fine critical faculty with an acquaintance with Indians and ethnological literature that none of his

¹ Vol. 1 of this series was reviewed by G. L. Trager in IJAL 15.246-248 (1949).

contemporaries could match and the reader of these letters will acquire a great respect for Nimuendajú as a linguist. When a sound classification of Brazilian Indian languages is made it will have to be done primarily on the basis of Nimuendajú's work.²

Guérios has a much stronger interest in theoretical matters than Nimuendajú and is strongly influenced by Trombetti. He has also worked with Indian informants, however. The two correspondents discuss the value of certain vocabularies, informants available for some of the less well known Brazilian languages, sound correspondences and sound changes in South American Indian languages, and problems of language classification. With all due respect to Guérios, who displayed great courage and intellectual honesty in publishing this correspondence, the reviewer is inclined to agree with Nimuendajú about most of the matters under discussion.

The Brazilian Indian languages which figure most prominently in this correspondence are Caingang, Camacan and Otí. A hitherto unpublished Caingang vocabulary collected by Nimuendajú in 1909 is reproduced on pp. 221-224 with some substitution of symbols (see also Nimuendajú's comments on it, pp. 214, 228). On p. 212 Nimuendajú lists the original material he has collected on Tupí-Guaraní languages: published material on 15 languages; unpublished material on 6 of the same languages and on two more (Cocama and Guajajara, including a Cocama grammar).

The file of correspondence closes with a letter from A. D. Rodrigues to Nimuendajú and the latter's reply written only three days before his death. Rodrigues inquires what became of the rest of the group of Nimuendajú's vocabularies which Métraux started to publish in the last number of the *Revista del Instituto de Etnología* of Tucumán in 1932 and Nimuendajú replies that unfortu-

² The reader's attention is called especially to Nimuendajú's criticism of Rivet's classificatory methods (pp. 233-234).

nately he does not know. It happens that I can answer this question: the missing vocabularies are in my office waiting for some attention. Métraux gave them to R. H. Lowie who entrusted them to me last year. There are 20 in all, 8 of Eastern Tucano languages, 3 of Macú, 3 of Carib languages (Macushí, Wapishana, Maquiritare) 2 of Tupí languages (Tupí of the Machado and Itogapuk) and one each of Shiriana, Puinave, Ipuriná and Capishaná.

JOHN HOWLAND ROWE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

AUTO REPRESENTADO NA FESTA DE SÃO LOURENÇO, by José de Anchieta. Peça trilingüe do séc. XVI, transcrita, comentada e traduzida, na parte Tupí, por M. de L. de Paula Martins. São Paulo, Museo Paulista 1948. Boletim 1, Documentação Lingüística 1. viii + 143 pp. Paper.

With this work the Department of Linguistic Documentation of the Museu Paulista initiates a new series of publications. This first number is attractively printed on good paper with wide margins and furnished with 12 plates and rice paper interleaving.

P. José de Anchieta S. J., who wrote a famous Tupí grammar, was also a prolific writer of autos (religious dramas). He flourished in Brazil in the second half of the 16th century. Much of his work remains unpublished in the Jesuit archives in Rome. Paula Martins has prepared a critical edition of two texts of an auto of his in honor of St. Laurence which was performed in 1583-84. The play is in verse, mostly in the Tupí language but interspersed with passages in Portuguese and Spanish. The first text consists of 1489 lines and the second, which is a summary of the first, contains 492 lines. The editor prints the original text on the left page and her reconstruction on the right; a Portuguese translation of the Tupí appears on the interleaved sheets of rice paper. There are 14 pp. of notes and bibliography at the end.

The transcription used for Tupí is the one