



HIMALAYA, the Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies

Volume 8
Number 3 *Himalayan Research Bulletin*

Article 7

1988

Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/himalaya>

Recommended Citation

. 1988. Reviews. *HIMALAYA* 8(3).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/himalaya/vol8/iss3/7>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the DigitalCommons@Macalester College at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in HIMALAYA, the Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.



BOOK REVIEWS

Niels Gutschow, Bernhard Kölver and Ishwaranand Shresthacarya.

Newar Towns and Buildings, An Illustrated Dictionary: Newārī-English. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag (Nepalica 3). 293pp. illustrations (721 black and white photographs, diagrams and maps). ISBN: 3-88280-028-3.

The urban architecture of the Kathmandu Valley has understandably excited great interest on the part of Western researchers. Its buildings and townscapes are inherently beautiful and, for Westerners disillusioned with modern planning and industrial cities, Newar cities seem to have a magical ability to fit the social needs and cultural values of the people who live in them. If one looks at the list of foreign researchers working in the Kathmandu Valley published by the **Himalayan Research Bulletin** (II, 3:43-50) in 1983 one gets some idea of the scale of Western interest: of 56 researchers listed almost half were interested in the architecture of Newar cities or in the craftspeople who create them.

The two German members of the team which has produced this dictionary have been involved in research on Newar cities from the beginning, and they co-authored the pioneering study which inspired all subsequent work (**Ordered Space, Concepts and Functions in a Town of Nepal**, 1975). That early work was a manifesto. This dictionary is a mature and substantial reference work, which is unlikely ever to be replaced, unless by an updated version of itself.

The superb photographs, diagrams and maps of Niels Gutschow take up almost three-quarters of the book. This section is much more than just pictures. It includes diagrams naming all the parts of a stūpa or caitya; accompanying photographs illustrate the different types. Other sections explain, with economical diagrams and photographs, how roofs are built, bricks baked and plaster made and applied. Over several pages all the different decorations and motifs used in Newar woodcarving are illustrated and named. Numerous photographs demonstrate the amazing variety of design in the carved wooden windows for which the Newars are famous. These are just a few of the riches awaiting the reader.

The actual dictionary of architectural and artisan-related words includes most of the terms used in explaining the pictures and diagrams, and many more besides. This, one assumes, is largely the work of the renowned lexicographer of Newari, Ishwaranand Shresthacarya. The introduction was presumably written by Bernhard Kölver.

Any dictionary of Newari raises certain general issues over which scholars may legitimately differ; some of these I discuss below. First it is necessary to point out the dictionary's one apparent flaw: it seems to have lacked a single editor to act as go-between among the three co-authors and take responsibility for the coherence and consistency of the whole work. To show what might have been picked up by such an editor, let me cite as an example the entry for a relatively well-known Newari word:

बाहः bāhāḥ, n (•hāla-, -gū) (var bāhā, bāḥ) one of the two types of Buddhist monasteries (cf bahī) (cf for kinds: kaca-; cī-; mū-). (3-6), 121-126, 137) -pujā, n (-gū) procession to all monasteries.

"•hāla" means that the oblique form of bāhāḥ is bāhāla; and "-gū" means that it is counted using the classifier -gū. (These conventions are not explained to the reader and have to be deduced; nor, by the way, is the list of abbreviations complete.) The numbers refer one to the illustrations, but 3-6 are

maps, 121-3 illustrate mandalas and firepits, 126 is a photograph of the Hārītī temple in Svayambhū, and 137 shows a shelter in Bhaktapur. Only 124 and 125 are indeed pictures of monasteries.

Quite rightly, the entry refers one to bahī and to three sub-types of monastery. "Kaca" should however be kacā. Cībāhāh appears as cībhāh on p.33 in the main entry, and as cibhāh on p.119 in the caption of an illustration. T.L. Manandhar's dictionary gives the etymology as ceta-bhalād, which itself derives from caitya-bhaṭṭāraka; so it is in fact controversial to give cībhāh as a form of bāhāh. On the sub-entry, to be absolutely precise, a bāhāh pūjā (or bāhā pūjā as one would normally see it written) is a procession to all the monasteries of a given city.

One final point on the bāhāh entry. A very common variant, bahā, is not cited. This is not just being pedantic. Newar culture is extraordinarily rich and complex, and one crucial factor underlying this is the evident desire of Newars of different cities, different localities, different castes and even different families to distinguish themselves from others. Newars themselves are well aware of the fact that language acts as a crucial marker of difference. It seems to me that variations of this sort - surely very frequent in the technical vocabulary which makes up the bulk of the dictionary - are underrepresented and, where they are given, are rarely located in space. To take the example most often cited by Newars themselves, the entry for nāh, water, omits to inform the reader that this is a Bhaktapur form.

A separate issue, which must be confronted by all those who attempt to write or write about Newari, is that of Sanskrit loanwords. The introduction argues eloquently and cogently as follows:

It will take a practised eye to interpret nāhgvah or bhailah and recognize them as vernacular equivalents of nāga-, the serpent, and Bhairava, the God. The matter is complicated by language politics... Some solution, however, had to be found ... Consider the lintels of Plate [sic] 584-588. Is it Newar or Sanskrit lions and demons which are being depicted? This question will not make sense to most, including the authors. Yet we had to decide whether to write śīha or simha, daite or daitya... We have thought it no part of our task to create, or widen, a gap... a spelling like nāgah, 'serpent' will, we hope, not be considered an intolerable distortion of Newarī: it perpetuates what always was the practice of sizeable numbers of Newar scribes. We trust this procedure will not be construed into an undue bias for Sanskrit, and a prejudice against vernaculars in general, or Newari in particular: it is neither (pp.12-13).

This seems to make it clear that the dictionary's policy is to give loanwords in their original Sanskrit form, for the good reason that this form is more widely recognized (one might add: by Newars themselves as well). The Sanskrit form is how scribes in the past intended to write, even if they failed to do so. Only a few (largely politically motivated) people wish to "create a gap." Imagine one's surprise therefore to find that the dictionary has debī but not devī, bajra but not vajra, maṃdah but not maṇḍala, simgaḥ but not simah, sarādhā but not śrāddhā. Once again, one feels that a strong editor was needed.

Transliteration is another thorny question where experts rarely agree. The authors have decided to represent both candrabindu and anusvāra by a tilde in the romanized version of each entry "chiefly, perhaps, so as not to overburden vowels with diacritics." Since the main dictionary entries (though not the captions to the illustrations or the sub-entries) give the Devanagari form one might think that this hardly matters. But in the typeface used it is often easy, at first glance, to mistake the tilde for a macron. Although the Sanskrit transliteration convention looks ugly, I for one have reluctantly come to accept that it is necessary in this case. Conversely, however, and unlike the authors of this dictionary, I think it is unnecessary to use 'v' for व in Newari words, except in the case of Sanskrit tatsamas; 'w' is how it is pronounced and there is no good reason that I can see not to use it.

I have mentioned what may appear like shortcomings, but I must emphasize that they are in fact minor in the light of the overall achievement that the dictionary represents. It will be an absolutely essential vade mecum for all those who work on the material culture of the Kathmandu Valley - and there will be many of those, one can be sure. It will also be a standard reference work for many other scholars.

A book such as this takes many years to complete. This one has clearly benefited from, and surely would not exist without, the long-term commitment of the West German government to research

in Nepal. The facilities and achievements of the Germans are admired by all those who work in the Valley. It is therefore sad to hear - if word of mouth is reliable - that the German government's funding is to come to an end very soon. It is ironic that this should be happening just as their investment in long-term research is beginning to bear permanent fruit and just when the value of cooperative but pure research is so clearly demonstrated. If the Germans succumb to the global trend for bureaucratic supervision of academic research, with its insistence on quick and supposedly applicable wealth-creating results, it will be a sad day indeed.

David N. Gellner
St. John's College, Oxford

Satya Mohan Joshi, ed.

1987/88 (N.S. 1107)

Ba:cādhamgu Newā: Khaingwa: Dhukū (A Concise Dictionary of the Newar Language).
Kathmandu: Lacoul Publications. 685 pages. Price: NRs. 120.

Thakur Lal Manandhar, with Dr. Anne Vergati, ed.

1986

Newari-English Dictionary: Modern Language of Kathmandu Valley. Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient, New Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan. 284 pages plus 49 pages of introductory text and bibliography. Price: IC Rs.400.

Iswaranand Sresthacarya

1987

Concise Dictionary (Newar-English). (pre-publication draft) Kathmandu: Kaanibhaa Publication. 317 pages, plus 12 pages of introduction and 24 pages of appendices.

The recent publication of three Newari dictionaries marks a turning point for scholars involved in the study of Newar culture. Prior to the 1986 publication of Manandhar's Newari-English dictionary, the only substantial Newari dictionary produced in the last half-century was that published by the late Vaidya Pannaprasad Joshi in 1955/56 (Nepal Sambat 1076), a now rare Newari-Nepali volume of about 10,000 entries which his heirs have reportedly been reluctant to republish. The Danish linguist Hans Jørgensen's 6,400 entry dictionary of classical Newari, published in 1936, has been more widely available to western scholars. This work, however, is based entirely on textual studies, the author never having visited Nepal, and is of limited usefulness for the scholar who wishes to understand conversational Newari.

During the decade and a half before 1986, vocabulary lists and a limited 1971 edition of Sresthacarya, Maskey, and Hale's Conversational Newari were the only reference works generally available to the scholar interested in Newari. Some of these vocabulary lists, such as Śabda Saṅgraha, by Gokulprasad Sharma; Nepālbhāsā Śabda-Saṅgraha by Sugat Das Tuladhar; and the aptly entitled, Multifarious Current Nouns, by D.B. Shrestha, are extremely rudimentary. None of these brief lists exceeds 2,000 entries. Most include only synonymns, and they are generally organized according to principles which are highly idiosyncratic, to say the least. One of these slim pamphlets, for example, includes one section devoted to "Different Soils" and another devoted to the "City and its parts," the latter including entries for "archives" and "life insurance company" (Shrestha 1981:57, 65). As limited in scope and inconvenient these lists may have been to use, this reviewer is grateful to their authors for having provided at least a few straws at which to grasp in what was, prior to 1986, a very barren field.

Austin and Magrit Hale's 1971 publication of A Vocabulary of the Newari Language is probably the first published non-indigenous attempt to assemble a list of critical Newari spoken vocabulary, and is one of the earliest of their extensive publications on the subject of the Newari language.¹ Unfortunately, their system of orthography presented an unnecessary challenge to the user; another language to be learned in addition to Newari itself. The Hales, for example, rendered the phrase, "to turn sour," as "pha:tphw!;" a romanization that, if pronounced intuitively, undoubtedly reproduces the kinaesthetic effects of consuming something past its prime, but is far more difficult to process than the more conventional "phātā pule," as cited by Manandhar (1986:162).² Several intrepid students have, nonetheless, clearly benefited from Sresthacarya, Maskey, and Hale's 1971 Conversational Newari which shares the method of romanization used by the Hales in their Vocabulary.

Sresthacarya and Tuladhar's Jyāpu Vocabulary, published in 1976, is a faithful and systematic, though brief, lexicographic analysis of conversational Newari. It provides detailed definitions of approximately 1,000 words as well as notations of variation of meaning and pronunciation among the several dialects of the Kathmandu valley. Sresthacarya's later Newari Root Verbs (1986), extracted from his out-of-print dictionary of Newari verbs (Dhukū pikū, nepāl bhāsay mukha kriyāvā dhukū), "attempts to solve the structural problems of regular and irregular verb forms by displaying them in paradigms and diagrams" (Sresthacarya:1981). Though these efforts by the Hales, Sresthacarya, Tuladhar, and Maskey have been invaluable to the researcher, they did not, either collectively nor individually, comprise anything like a comprehensive dictionary.

It is in this context that one must greet the arrival of these three dictionaries with enthusiasm, disappointment, and hope. Any work which has been anticipated and sorely needed for as long as these tomes have is bound to be greeted with joy followed by dismay upon making the discovery that they do not live up to the expectations one has had so long to develop. It can be said at the outset that they are all more substantial than their most extensive predecessor, the 1955/56 volume by Joshi. Manandhar's volume includes approximately 16,000 main entries and sub-entries, Sresthacarya's lists about 11,000 entries, and Satya Mohan Joshi's (1987/88, N.S. 1107) work includes over 21,000.

Before proceeding with further comparisons, I should make it clear that no two of these three works are fully comparable. Joshi's work is monolingual, Manandhar's work is a finished Newari-English edition, and the Sresthacarya volume at the disposal of this reviewer is a pre-publication draft, and described as "concise," being extracted from a much more comprehensive work in progress. This caveat having been provided, I will first briefly describe the Newari-English offerings, pointing to their differences and similarities as appropriate.

Both Manandhar and Sresthacarya have collaborated with Austin Hale, and though they both (thankfully) use different roman spelling conventions than did Hale in the works mentioned above, both present paradigmatic material in strikingly similar ways. Manandhar's volume includes an introductory essay by Hale on this very subject, and is, as stated in Manandhar's preface, an enlarged and revised edition of a manuscript begun by Hale. Austin Hale, who refers to Manandhar as his "esteemed teacher and guide," remained instrumental in producing this dictionary, having established the entry format, "provided the phonological analysis upon which the romanizations are based, helped with the wording of many of the English glosses" and even typed two complete drafts (Manandhar 1987:vi).

The introductory "User's Guide" by Hale in Manandhar's dictionary not only explains the entry format, but in a matter of a very few pages provides an elegant (if somewhat spare) overview of Newari pronunciation and parts of speech. The utility of this section for the non-specialist would have been

¹For a good overview of the scholarship on the Newari language, including theoretical works as well as the references of concern in this review, see the bibliography of Austin Hale's introduction to Manandhar (1986).

²This one example reveals not only variation in transcriptional conventions, but in basic orthography, a problem which reflects the lack of uniformity in Newari spelling and plagues any effort to produce vocabularies or dictionaries in the language.

enhanced by including more examples in English to ease the way for those for whom the "ablative case," for example, is not a familiar designation. It is also surprising that Hale did not any explanation of the logic behind Newari numeric classifiers here, an interesting aspect of the language. Provided with only one example of each classifier (e.g. laddu cha-gaa, "one bread ball"; swāā cha-phwaa, "one flower," etc.) the reader is not equipped to derive the principles for using the classifiers in other contexts (i.e. -gaa generally pertains to rounded objects, -phwaa generally pertains to convex objects, etc.).

Manandhar also includes a brief essay written by himself on the history of the Newar language, and a brief "ethnohistorical summary" of the Kathmandu Valley Newars by Anne Vergati, who is also cited as editor of the volume. This summary covers both Newar ethnography and history, a daunting task to perform in the eight pages it occupies. In any overview of great ambition and small size, some over-generalization is to be expected. However, many factual errors also appear here (viz. the prevalence of territorial endogamy among the Newar, that the Nayar are similar to the Newar by virtue of their customs relating to divorce and remarriage, that Rajopadhyay are always attached to Taleju temples, that the Kumari is one goddess attached to one bāhā, that all Newar castes consume alcohol, etc.).

Vergati also states several contentious theories as fact (viz. the nature of the conversion of celibate monks to priest-like ritualists, the identity of Patan as the oldest city of the Kathmandu valley). Some concepts cited in the essay are ill-defined or simply inappropriately used (e.g. the description of the Magars and the Limbu, among others, as "tribes"). If future editions of this work include such a "summary," it would surely benefit from the substantial number of publications on the Newar which have appeared since the 1982 date of this piece, including works by the author herself.

The entries in Manandhar and Vergati's dictionary are quite detailed, each entry providing Devanagari, roman, and phonetic transcriptions, an indication of the part of speech, morphological information, and the appropriate numerical classifier where appropriate. Examples of usage are also often provided. Most striking is the considerable ethnographic detail that finds its way into the definitions, and, for a dictionary of its modest proportions, the obscurity of some of the lexical items included. The following definition of a numeric classifier, -thā, serves as an example of both of these observations:

(classifier - unique to - puja) puja chathā, -oñe puja (This word has a very restricted, specific usage. Ex. Hariti is a female goddess in Swayambhu. Near the place where puja is offered to Hariti there is a stone with a row of holes in it. Parties intending to offer puja to Hariti indicate their intention by placing an earthen jar in line in one of the holes. The order in which puja is performed is determined by the position of one's jar - the party whose jar is in the first hole has his puja performed first. In counting such jar's [sic] one counts, cha-thā, ni-thā, swa-thā...; if ones asks a man from Swayambhu, thau gwaa-thā du. ["what number is your place (to do puja)"])

Manandhar and Vergati also include a wealth of idiomatic expressions the meaning of which is impossible to ascertain from merely consulting the definitions of their components. Expressions containing the verb taye ("to put"), for example, take up two full pages of the dictionary. Manandhar and Vergati's dictionary unfortunately contains numerous typographical errors, though I have encountered only one instance in which such an error results in an incorrect definition.

Sresthacarya has remained faithful to the organization principle which he has used in previous works on Newari, citing root morphemes as major entries, and relegating many words which he views as derived from the root to subentries. This occasionally makes his dictionary more difficult to use, and in some instances the status of the first syllable of a word as a morphemic root seems dubious. For example, the word for asparagus, dukāa, is to be found, along with 48 other subentries, under the root du-, which Sresthacarya defines as an adverb meaning "in." The etymological value of entering du-kāa, as well as other words such as du-gan-e ("duplicate"), as subentries under du remains unclear. Though this presentation provides abundant opportunity for etymological speculation, as the author suggests is intended, it sometimes complicates the task of simply finding the meaning of a word.

Sresthacarya provides extensive cross-referencing, so that under dukaa, for example, one finds a cross reference to the root kaa, under which the entry for a "bound formative particle" kaa is defined as "eatable (sic) thorn, c.f. ikaa, dukaa." This thorough cross-referencing is commendable (if not astonishing) and useful to the student of Newari in instances where the etymological derivation is thereby clarified.

Because the Sresthacarya volume is a xerographically produced "Pre-publication Draft," it is premature to review it fully here. It differs from the Manandhar and Vergati volume in several important respects in its current form: it includes only single lexemes and no idiomatic expressions; it provides simple definitions, primarily synonyms, without elaboration; it more rigorously employs the principle of breaking words down into their most fundamental roots; and it is extensively cross-referenced.

Sresthacarya has also provided supplementary information in appendices, including a reworked version of his 1977 article on Newari kinship terms and his essay on "Verb Paradigms" which appeared in Newari Root Verbs. In addition to this previously published material he includes an essay on Newar noun, pronoun and adjective paradigms, several lists of Newar cultural features (rites of passage, festivals, given names), and a list of Newar place names in Kathmandu which will hopefully be located on a map in the final edition.

The volume by Joshi shares with that of Manandhar and Vergati an ethnographic quality. Though Manandhar and Vergati's prose is ethnographic by virtue of its expository nature, Joshi's serves as a kind of ethnographic text by including meanings which are not literal, but which are carried by words as they are apprehended within Newar culture. The definition for kapam ("rainbow") thus includes not only an explication of the phenomenon of light refracting through water droplets after a shower, but its association with Indra and Bungadya as well (p. 62).

This volume is by far the most comprehensive with respect to the number of entries. Joshi provides examples of usage, including proverbial expressions in some instances as noted above. Unfortunately, entries rarely include morphological information. This constitutes a significant shortcoming for two major reasons. In order to produce some constructions it is important to know the oblique stem of a noun if it differs from the lexical entry. As Hale rightly points out in his introduction to Manandhar's dictionary (p. xxiii), it is also necessary to provide the past disjunct form of certain classes of verbs to serve as a guide to the inflectional pattern they take. Unfortunately, Joshi does not always enter irregular forms under separate headings either. Numerical classifiers are not provided, though this is a relatively minor complaint given that a certain proficiency in Newari and, presumably, the logic of numerical classifier usage, is required in order to use this dictionary at all.

Joshi does provide alternate spellings, a very useful feature in a language in which little consensus concerning spelling exists. One example of this which sets Joshi apart from both Manandhar and Sresthacarya concerns the debate over the existence of the vowel "o" in Newari. The latter two authors rigorously exclude "o" from their spellings (except for loan words and some place names), using wa in its stead, producing oddities such as jwagi instead of the more conventional jogi. Joshi notes this variation, but often includes spellings using "o" under main headings, conforming more with modern usage. In keeping with his concentration on modern usage and his intent to "give within a small compass all that a general reader, a student or a scholar may ordinarily require" (p. 5), Joshi also includes English loan words such as telibhijan (television) and tralibas (trolley bus).

Another feature of Joshi's dictionary which distinguishes it from the other two is the inclusion of illustrations. These simple pen and ink drawings are both charming and informative. Joshi provides illustrations for terms which refer to things which are either peculiar to Newar culture, such as the lasakus ceremonial welcoming ritual and the khā:dalū lamp, or exotic to Newar culture, such as telibhijan.

These three dictionaries will hopefully serve to inform the production of future dictionaries. One feature of the Newari which poses a significant problem, acknowledged to some degree by Manandhar and Joshi, is the variation in vocabulary and usage which exists from locality to locality, caste to caste. It would be helpful if locale-specific variants would be included in future works under all entries, including the entry of the variant most common used. The systematic morphological

information included by Manandhar and Vergati; the extensive cross-referencing provided by Sresthacharya; and the (greater) comprehensiveness, alternative spellings, and illustrations included by Joshi should all be incorporated as features of future dictionaries.

This reviewer would also like to see the ethnographic detail provided by both Manandhar and Joshi, as well as the interpretive connotations presented by Joshi included in future works. Though these features contribute to the unwieldiness of any volume, they are appropriate for the portrayal of the language of the Newar: a singularly exegetical people fascinated by their mother tongue.

B.McC.O.

Sources Cited

Hale, Margrit and Austin

1971 A Vocabulary of the Newari Language. Kirtipur: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Institute of Nepal Studies.

Jørgensen, Hans

1936 A Dictionary of the Classical Newari. Det. Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historiskfilologiske Meddelelser 27.3. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.

Joshi, Vaidya Pannaprasad

1955/56 [N.S. 1076] Samkṣipta Nepāl bhāṣā Sabdakōṣa (Nepāl bhāṣā Nepālī artha) [Newari - Nepali Dictionary]. Kathmandu: Nepal Press.

Sharma, Gokulprasad

n.d. Śabda Saṃgraha (Nepālī, Hindī, Aṃgrejī, ra Nepāl Bhāṣā). Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.

Shrestha, D.B.

1981 Multifarious Current Nouns used in Nepali, English, Hindi, Samskrit and Nepal Bhasa. Kathmandu: (published by the author).

Sresthacharya, Iswaranand

1981 Newari Root Verbs. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.

Sresthacharya, Iswaranand and Nirmal Man Tuladhar

1976 Jyāpu Vocabulary (Preliminary Report). Kathmandu: Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.

Sresthacharya, Iswaranand, Jagan Nath Maskey, and Austin Hale

1971 Conversational Newari. Kirtipur: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Institute of Nepal Studies.

Sresthacharya, Iswaranand

1977 "Newar Kinship Terms in the Light of Kinship Typology." Contributions to Nepalese Studies; 4(2): 111-128.

Tuladhar, Sugat Das

1978 Nepāl bhāṣhā Śabda-Saṃgraha, or a Collection of Colloquial Newari Words, Phrases and Sentences with their Equivalents in English, Nepali, and Hindi. Kathmandu: Bi. Ar. Tuladhar.