

work in such adverse areas and on what methods will not work. "Terrain evaluation" includes ways of evaluating and interpreting characteristics of landscapes in the Arctic, especially features which are unique and may be of particular concern to those persons working in the region. The discussion of "route or site selection and development" includes step-by-step suggestions on how to choose routes or sites, and the information needed that will save construction and maintenance costs.

Valuable information on engineering soil testing in the Arctic and monitoring soil and structural behavior is in the first two appendices. Linell and Tedrow have included sources of more technical literature about the Arctic in the third appendix.

Although the monograph contains excellent practical and applied information on soil and permafrost surveys in the Arctic, there are some minor drawbacks. One can question the organization: the chapter on "thermal stability" comes six chapters after the one on "thermal regime"; the chapter on "northern agriculture and conservation" is sandwiched between chapters on soil engineering; and the chapter on "soil mechanics" is too short (2½ pages) to stand alone and might better be included in the chapter on "engineering characteristics of soils in cold regions". The fact that the discussion of Canadian soils does not use the latest nomenclature (cryosols) is unfortunate, because the change in nomenclature came in 1978 and because a number of the soil examples come from the Canadian Arctic.

The drawbacks are inconsequential, and overall the chapters are well written and contain quite useful information. The monograph is an excellent starting point for those persons embarking on arctic endeavors involving soils and permafrost.

Arthur Limbird
Department of Geography
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
T2N 1N4

THE LANGUAGE OF THE INUIT: HISTORICAL, PHONOLOGICAL AND GRAMMATICAL ISSUES. Edited by LOUIS-JACQUES DORAIS. Québec: Laval University, 1981. *Études/Inuit/Studies* 5 (Suppl.). 124 p. \$8.00.

The book consists of seven articles, with an introduction by the editor, who is also one of the contributors. They cover the gamut of Eskimo linguistics, both areally and topically. The book could be characterized by the now standard "slender volume", but it makes up in quality for quantity. The articles are almost uniformly good and instructive and of high quality. The study of Eskimo linguistics is most definitely advanced by this publication.

The first article ("Endoactive-Exoactive Markers in Eskimo-Aleut, Tungus and Japanese — An Investigation into Common Origins", by Michael Fortescue, 36 pp.) deals with deep-level historical linguistic of the Eskimo family. As the author admits, and as Dorais adumbrates in the introduction, it does not prove anything, but it certainly is thought-provoking and very strongly indicative of long-standing and deep-level culture contacts of Eskimos and Proto-Eskimos over a wide area. It should be required reading for all anthropologists.

The second ("Some Notes on the Language of East Greenland" by Louis-Jacques Dorais, 37 pp.) deals with East Greenlandic. It is well and meticulously done. Its major contribution, this reviewer thinks, is in the socio-linguistic realm, though the close attention to phonetic details should not be slighted. Dorais's explanation of lexical differences, centering on the need to control (in this case by linguistic means) the very precarious environment, is excellent and, in my view, in keeping with Eskimo culture, personality and religion. It is a good revision of the older, much too crude, formulation that all lexical substitutions could be attributable to 'taboos' associated with death.

"Greenlandic as a Three-Vowel Language" by Jørgen Rischel, the third paper (9 pp.), deals with the phonemics of Greenlandic as related to the phonemics of Eskimo languages generally. It uses diachronic and synchronic evidence and makes a convincing case for development of the Greenlandic dialects' system(s) in situ.

"On Yupik-Inupiaq Correspondences for *i*: A Case of Inupiaq Innovation" (the fourth article, 8 pp., by Lawrence Kaplan) deals with somewhat the same materials, but in the western end of the language area, where the ubiquitous *i* archophoneme is still alive. Kaplan comes to the conclusion that Yuxpiq preserves an older (fourth vowel) form.

The fifth paper ("Place of Articulation Assimilation and the Inuktitut Dialect Continuum", 8 pp., by Chet Crieder) traces the distribution of some phonological distinctions, determines which are innovations, and then maps them. He reinforces Rischel's contention that innovation went on in the East.

The sixth contribution (Lawrence R. Smith's "Passive as a Two-Cycle Process in Inuktitut", 12 pp.) deals with a favorite of linguistically inclined Eskimologists, or Innuktitun-oriented linguistics, i.e., the much-discussed subject of the passive and/or passive-like expressions, and is as much an exercise in generative/transformational grammar using Eskimo materials as it is the investigation of Eskimo linguistics. As such, it again examines the problem of how to handle passive or passive-like expressions of Eskimo.

The final piece ("The Logical Semantics of Only: Tuaq, Innaq and Tuinnaq", 9 pp., by J. Peter Denny) is semantic in content and demonstrates that semantic domains can vary from language to language, demonstrating very cogently and correctly that what we gloss as 'only' (and differentiate into a congeries of linked domains by where we position 'only' in the sentence) can mean three distinct things in Eskimo. He uses glosses valid from the Bering Straits to Greenland to demonstrate the distinctness of the three different dictionary entries found in the title. Use of "logical grammar" as an analytical tool is productive.

At this juncture I will avail myself of the reviewer's prerogative to make a few negative remarks. First article (Fortescue): Some of the 'genealogical bridges' he builds are a bit shaky. I am intrigued by the Eskimo-Aleut *immuk*, 'cheese/milk'; why cheese in a historical article? Third article (Rischel): No mention of M. Swadesh who gave some attention to this problem quite early on? Fourth article (Kaplan): Again no credit given to Swadesh's priority. Is the Diomedean dialect 'retention', or could it be (re)borrowing from across the Straits? As a linguist well versed in phonological matters, how does he motivate 'an' before 'history'? Fifth article (Crieder): Still uses Swadesh's outmoded 'Inupik' (which Swadesh gathered in the Eastern U.S. from a Yuxpiq-speaking member of a traveling sideshow). Is the 'h' of 'hinik' really an 'h' or an 'x'? Overall criticism: Why should an excellent book such as this one perpetuate the inappropriate use of the R (R, r) symbols to a predominantly English audience who will, because of their perception of English orthography, be reinforced in their penchant to commit such barbarities as pronouncing Birnik "Beer-nik"?

Overall conclusion: anthropological linguistics has for too long been in the doldrums of safe particularism, and it is about time we again try out some ventures into real theory, coupled with good scholarship. This book does so.

Albert C. Heinrich
Department of Anthropology
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
T2N 1N4

THE TRADITIONAL ESKIMO HUNTERS OF POINT HOPE, ALASKA: 1800-1875. By ERNEST S. BURCH, JR. Barrow: North Slope Borough, 1981. x + 89 p., 12 illus., 25 figs., 16 tab., bib. Paperbound, US \$10.00. (Order from North Slope Borough, P.O. Box 69, Barrow, Alaska 99723.)

In the spring of 1980 the author was commissioned by the North Slope Borough, an organization of Alaska natives, to produce a base-line study of land use by the Tikerarmiut of Point Hope in northwest Alaska. The Borough could not have selected a more dedicated or qualified student of Alaskan Eskimo culture. This opportune selection provided the author with an opportunity to pull together the results of more than ten years of field and ethnohistorical research centered on the native inhabitants of northwest Alaska.

The stated purpose of this study is to present a comprehensive account of land use by the people of the Point Hope region between about 1800 and 1875. This period was chosen because it is the latest in which native activities reasonably can be considered to have occurred with a minimum of Euro-American influence. Burch emphasizes, however, that his study is actually a model of traditional Point Hope land use rather than a true description since the nature of his research and the limitations inherent in his methodology preclude the compilation of an historical account satisfying all the criteria of the western European intellectual tradition.