sents a local view, as it is not repeated in Lord Hailey’s conclusions—deserves mention in this journal. It is suggested that they are apt to produce information with little practical relevance, and so should be employed ‘on terms which will secure their collaboration in enquiries the scope of which has been determined in advance’ (Part I, p. 190). It is incontrovertible that an anthropologist who is financed by official funds in order to study a problem posed by a Government must obtain all the data relevant to that problem that he can. But the suggestion that if he obtains any other information he must have been wasting his time implies a misconception of the conditions under which he must work. In the first place, he must understand the social organization of the people studied; unless the view is accepted that this knowledge is relevant to the understanding of the narrower problem, there is no case for employing an anthropologist. In the second, he cannot always insist that his informants discuss one subject and one only; he would waste far more time by rejecting information on matters lying outside a strictly circumscribed field than any anthropologist has ever done by recording what was offered him. The most that can be asked of anyone working in the conditions inherent in a field study in anthropology is that he should lose no opportunity of obtaining information bearing on his central problem. To suggest that he should not collect, or should not publish, any other data would be to limit the contribution he can make to general knowledge of African society without in any way ensuring that he would study the central problem more closely. It is reasonable to ask that he should give priority in publishing his results to the subject he was commissioned to study, and should present his report on that subject in readily intelligible form, but it is surely not justifiable to demand that he shall write nothing for professionals or on any other subject. As for the assertion, which has been made in this connexion, that publications by anthropologists are usually about sex, it would surprise anyone who had looked through, say, the recent bibliographies in Africa, and can only be explained as indicating what type of anthropological publication catches the attention of the layman.

L. P. MAIR


The purpose of _Tone Languages_ is to present a methodology, applicable to all tone languages, of analysing the number and nature of tones and of determining their functions and distributions within any one language. In the author’s words, ‘the procedure indicated is basically a method of controlling free, conditioned, key, mechanical, morphological, and sandhi tonal changes by inserting lists of words into selected contexts so as to reduce the number of variables at any one time and give the instructor the opportunity of observing the significant linguistic pitch in its simplest contrasting forms’ (p. vii).

Dr. Pike’s suggestions are not speculative. He has personally worked on a number of tone languages, most of which are indigenous to the western hemisphere. This fact, however, should not exclude him from the African field, for the methodology he describes is manifestly applicable to all languages. Moreover, considerable note is taken of African languages when the reference is pertinent.

Although the work is not a critical treatment of the whole field of tone languages, it constitutes one of the first generalized works on the subject. Part I describes the ‘Characteristics of Tone Languages’. Of extreme practical value are Parts II and III, the first of which describes the ‘Steps in Determining the Number and Kind of Tonemes in a Language’, i.e. the procedure of determining the phonemic tones. ‘The Analysis of Tonemic
Substitutions in Phrases’ (i.e. ‘the systematic interrelations of tonemes with each other and with the grammar’, p. vii) is discussed in Part III, in which Mixteco and Mazateco (languages from Mexico) are extensively outlined as illustrative material.

The purely descriptive manner in which Dr. Pike describes Mixteco and Mazateco tonemic perturbations (i.e. changes of the significant tones) should once and for all repudiate the view that ‘the African languages are so difficult that no white man can master them’. He has proven that the exotic languages—including their tonal phenomena—are as amenable to scientific (therefore systematic and economic) description as are the classical languages.

Although he recognizes the fact that new data might necessitate the alteration of the definition of a tone language, the author suggests that it be defined as a ‘language having lexically significant contrastive, but relative pitch on each syllable’ (p. 3). By limiting the contrast in this way he distinguishes between tonal and intonational phenomena, a distinction hitherto not often made. The rest of the definition reveals its basis on phonemic theory. These tones—whether register or contour—are only relative to each other and not to any absolute scale.

Students of African languages should find this volume of extreme practical value. What Professor Ward and her colleagues have done in alerting Africanists to the importance of tone in African languages, Dr. Pike has done in suggesting a methodology of studying tonal data. The only limitation of the book is that it presumes a knowledge of phonemics (and descriptive linguistics in general). This is an unfortunate but inescapable situation. But if one has not mastered phonemic theory and methodology, he probably is not ready to analyse tone at all!

William John Samarin


This volume is the record of the Phelps-Stokes Lectures given two years ago at the University of Cape Town by the former editor of this Journal, Dr. Edwin Smith. It may be remarked that the lecturership was founded in part by the trustees of the estate of Miss Caroline Phelps-Stokes of New York, who was especially solicitous that her benevolences might ‘assist in improving the condition of the negro’. If for ‘negro’ is substituted the ‘native races of South Africa’ then Dr. Smith has fulfilled the law in a sense: his lectures deal briefly with the part played in South Africa by Christian missionaries, and then go on to the part to be played by the churches they have founded. Whether all his audience agreed that missionary work is beneficial to the natives is a matter of speculation; nevertheless, those who would refute the arguments adduced must be diligent if they are to find rebutting evidence or they will be in danger of defeat, so carefully are chapter and verse set out.

The title of the book may repel some persons, but would-be readers may be reassured. Blessed Missionaries have nothing in common with Blessed Saints and Martyrs. In our outspoken age we should probably employ a far less elegant adjective than the ‘blessed’ used by Sir Harry Smith in reference to the missionaries—when he was exasperated!

In the first chapters the author keeps to historical records to show that Christian missionaries have contributed towards the improvement of the native races. He names the early missionaries ‘Introducers’: men who introduced to the world Bantu and Bushman, their land, their customs, and their problems, and who also introduced some of the world to Bantu and Bushman.

For example: Dr. Smith holds that where African languages are studied and taught the professors are either men or women with missionary experience or else are building on