The fifth chapter deals with the dominant features of Kumandin vowel system (pp. 85 – 94). One of the most interesting features of this chapter are some unpublished ideas expressed by the late Vladimir M. Nadel'aev, who supposed that central articulation is the most characteristic for the Old Turks (p. 92). Sel'utina found the central articulation of vowels in Kumandin (p. 92) which means that Kumandin people preserved the Old Turkish manner of articulation, though she also found out a great influence of the Old Ugro-Samoyedic articulation (p. 93). The fact that modern Mongols also use central articulation of vowels according to V. M. Nadel'aev may mean that modern Mongols, i.e. Khalkha, have a great Old Turk substratum (p. 93). This bright idea of the late V. M. Nadel'aev is virtually unknown among the community of Mongolists, Turkologists and other linguists, though, in my mind, it deserves the greatest attention, since he was and is one of the few linguists who considers that the articulation base (p. 86) is the primary feature of the ethos of the articulatory effort. Therefore, he claimed that the dominant phonetic features appear in the articulation base as a result of the common structure of the movements of the active organs of speech of this ethnos, due to some psychological or physiological reasons. This is why, if some ethnos lost its language, it did not loose its articulation base. On the contrary, the articulation base serves further, now with a new acquired language. The old articulation base usually changes the phonetic system of this new language, adjusting it to the old sounds of the former language. So, it is possible to reconstruct the ethnic history of a language coming from the peculiarities of its articulation base. V. M. Nadel'aev considered the length, the height, the row, the tension, the labialization, the nasalization, and some other phonetic features to be the potential vocalic dominants which may help to trace the language contacts. It was very thoughtful of Sel'utina to discuss in great details Nadel'aev's theory which he usually spoke about during his famous lectures, but which is not known to the international community of linguists.

I hope that in spite of the stressful conditions in Russia now, more and more books of this sort shall be published. My less than complete treatment in no way impairs the overall excellence of what Irina Sel'utina has accomplished. I can highly recommend her book which is marked by a distinguished scientific level.

*Yuri Tambovtsev*

EDZARD, Lutz: *Polygenesis, Convergence, and Entropy: An Alternative Model of Linguistic Evolution Applied to Semitic Linguistics.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 1998. 207 pp. ISBN: 3-447- 04102-1. Price: DM 98,00.

The Neogrammarian vantage concept of *proto-language* was admirably materialized in the reconstruction of what was perceived as the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) phonological system. When further refined by de Saussure's *laryngeal theory* (1878) and, one century later, in *glottalic theory*, formulated by Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1973) and Hopper (1973), it opened an entirely new horizon to a much broader comparative research involving PIE and what was presented as Proto-Semitic. The comparative space has been subsequently further extended as to include hypothetic Proto-Afro-Asiatic (PAA), as lately attempted by Bomhard (1984) in his widely conceived PIE-PAA lexical comparison.

The 'starred' data, resulting from this ancestor-related comparative linguistics, irrespective of whether further refinable by using more sophisticated and more adequate techniques or not, are – and for some years to come will, no doubt, remain – the recognized basis of our recent knowledge in the field of historical linguistics.

Edzard's monograph is a revised version of the author's 1992 UC Berkeley doctoral dissertation. It is one of those which appear now and then to challenge the well-established principles and methods in any field of human knowledge. When constructively oriented and, moreover, supported by a soundly founded argumentation, as is the case of the present study, they may offer thought-provoking insights into decades of scholarly work with its achievements, unanswered questions and failures. And, of course, they may still do a little bit more: they may suggest new unexplored points of view and new methodological frameworks with hope to avoid oddities encountered in the earlier investigation.

The leitmotiv of the monograph is a critique of the family-tree model and, as an alternative, a polygenetic model of convergence and entropy is proposed. In the proposed model, *language families* 'embodying a spectrum of genetically or typologically related languages' or rather 'complexes of linguistic phenomena as observed at a certain point in the past . . . , beyond which one cannot look' (25) – are substituted for the monogenetic *proto-language*.

In the first chapter a detailed analysis of the monogenetic approach is followed by a discussion of a number of specific problems in Afro-Asiatic and Semitic linguistics.

The second chapter supports the advantages of the proposed polygenetic approach by way of opposing a formal model of the traditional family tree theory to that of the present alternative proposal.

In the third chapter, the polygenetic approach is presented in a less abstract way in depicting the linguistic situation of Semitic within Afro-Asiatic (the time depth of attestation of AA language families). Special attention is paid to sound inventories.

The fourth chapter is dealing with various persisting problems of Semitic languages in the framework of the proposed approach. The phenomenon of metathesis of root consonants is given due attention, too.

The fifth chapter is devoted to the problem of diglossia/polyglossia in Arabic.

In the last two chapters the problem of biradicalism vs. triradicalism is dealt with.

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>

The analysis of conceptual problems within the family-tree model (39 f.) seems to belittle the fact that the concept of proto-language (PL) is merely a hypothetical construct rather than a full-blown tool of communication in any given time and space. In this way, the PL is viewed through a prism of a number of contradictions and paradoxes, like:

- (terminology): with PL, 'the term "proto-" suggests that there was nothing (spoken) prior to the (proto-)language in question . . .';
- (problems with chronology): 'the question remains as to what happened before the emergence of these "proto-languages" . . . ';
- (problems with geographical distribution): were PLs, at a sufficient time depth, spoken 'just at certain settlement centers (which leaves the question open as to what was spoken elsewhere) or they were spoken throughout all settled areas (which is typologically unlikely');
- what criteria are to be used with the subsequent bifurcations and multifurcations within the tree? With respect to Afro-Asiatic, the time-honored bifurcation into a Semitic and a Hamitic branch, seems to be supported by psychological and theological rather than typological reasons (42).

<p style="text-align:center">215</p>

On the other hand, it must be recognized that, irrespective of the merits of the "proto-linguistics", the traditional approach is totally incapable to answer some of the very basic questions of the recent Semitology. In monogenetic terms, it appears indeed difficult to explain the amazing fact that the relatively young Classical Arabic started its attested lifetime as a fully developed synthetic language while a number of much older Semitic languages, such as Biblical Hebrew or the Aramaic language cluster, end their 'spoken' life at roughly the same evolutionary stage as that observable in recent *'i ʿrāb*-less Arabic dialects. The same paradox may be seen in the domain of phonology, as well.

Furthermore, the monogenetic framework frequently fails in dealing with problems specific to languages outside the Semitic or Afro-Asiatic genetic and typological space, as well. At least one example:

The hypothetical Ural-Altaic language grouping, for instance, involves languages that display a number of common features: agglutinative linguistic type, regressive (left-branching) syntactic organization which is responsible for the typical lack of subordinate clauses (compensated by regressively structured within-one-sentence nominalizations), etc.

On this general background, the 16th century Hungarian, widely attested in what is known as Codices (hence Codex Hungarian: CH), displays, unlike Altaic or even (proto- ?) Uralic, a twofold syntactic structuring, as may be seen in the following Gospel fragment: "A man was there with a withered hand" (Mathew 12:10):

1) regressive (left-branching), in organizing modifiers at a clause or a simple sentence level, still maintaining traces of the subject-predicate relationship *(keze meg azot /vala/)* of the embedded relative clause (RC):

   (es ott vala)    *eg    keze    meg azot    ember*    (MünchK. 86);
   (and there was) a/one his hand    withered    man

2) progressive (right-branching), in organizing main-clause – subordinate clause relationships at a complex-sentence level, as in:

   (es vala ot)    *egy ember, kynek    hew    kezee    meg azot    vala* (JordK. 460);
   (and was there) a/one man    to whom*    he his hand    withered    was

   The same verse in a somewhat modernized edition, more in tune with the recent Hungarian orthography:

   *egy ember, kinek keze megaszott vala* (Szántó ed. 1984; requoted after Károly 1956: 138; cf. also Károly in: Benkő & Imre, eds. 1972: 113; cf. also Jászó in: Benkő, ed. 1991: 338; 1992: 433, etc.);

   * the dative construction *to whom* is here compatible with the possessive "whose";

The regressive structure of CH is fully compatible with Altaic (here Turkish /T/) as well as with somewhat hypothetical Altaic-said languages (here Korean /K/ and Japanese /J/):

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CH: | (es ott vala) | *eg* | *keze* | *meg azot* | *ember* | |
| T (1993): | (orada) | | *eli* | *sakat* | *bir* | *adam* | (vardı); |
| | (there) | | his hand | withered | a/one | man | (was) |
| T (1997): | (ve işte) | | *eli* | *kurumuş* | *bir* | *adam* | (vardı); |
| | (and behold) | | his hand | withered | a/one | man | (was) |
| K: | | *han p'yŏn* | *sŏn* | *marŭn* | *sarami**\*\** | (innŭnjira); |
| | | one side | hand | withered | man | (is/was there) |
| J: (suru to, sono toki) | | *kata* ――― | *te no****\*\*\** naeta* | *hito* | (ga ita); |
| (suddenly, at that while) | | one side | hand | withered | man | (was there) |

216

**     *-i* in *sarami* is a subject marker roughly equalling the nominative of IE languages inflecting for case;

*** *katate* "one hand"; *katate no* "one-handed, having one hand";

The syntactic contour of RC is no longer discernable in another paraphrase of the above Gospel verse:

| (és ímé vala ott) | *egy* | *megszáradott* | *kezű ember* | (an early 20th century Bible); |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (and behold was there) a/one | withered | handed man****, or: | | |
| (és vala ott) | *egy* | *megszáradt* | *kezű ember* | (Káldi 1308); |

**** The subject of the embedded RC (*kez-e* 'his hand') of (1) above is adjectivized (*kez-ű*), mirroring the structure of the Ob-Ugric (Konda Vogul) version of the verse quoted:

(tat oles) *tošem katp* (*kat-p* = H *kez-ű*) *choles*, lit. "(there was) withered handed man" (Hunfalvy 1875: 151), in spite the fact that the (1)-type RC is still highly productive in the West Siberian Vogul (Mańśī), the closest sister language of Hungarian.

Assuming an Ural-Altaic linguistic unity, still reflected in a rather long list of common features, one might perceive the difference between the typical right-branching complex sentence structure in some (?) Uralic languages (Codex and Modern Hungarian) and their typical left-branching structural counterparts in Altaic languages, as overtly opposing this assumption. Hungarian, living for more than a millennium in the Carpathian Basin in close contact with the typically right-branching IE languages, underwent the same or nearly the same influence in this respect as, say, Turkish (or, more generally, Turkic languages) neighbouring for centuries a right-branching linguistic milieu (Semitic, Slavic, Iranian).

According to the dominant opinion in recent Hungarian historical linguistics, regressive nominalizations of the (1)-type above, involving various forms of verbonominals (H: *igenév*), are due to the modelling influence of the Latin original from which this and a number of other Biblical fragments have been translated. The following Bible verse: "I will fall upon them like a bear robbed of her cubs" (Hosea 13:8) is displaying the same twofold syntactic structure. In Codex Hungarian styling: (eleicbe kelec onekic mōnal) *kolkey elragadot noften medue*, lit.: (I will encounter them like) *(of her) cubs robbed female bear*, alternating, once again, with a right-branching complex sentence: (eleikbe futok mint) *a medve, melynek kölykeit elvették*, lit. (I will run to meet them like) *a bear to whom (of whom) her cubs they robbed* (20th century Bible) or (eléjük megyek, mint) *a nősténymedve, melynek elragadták kölykeit* (Káldi 1105).

The left-branching version above is said to follow the structure of the Latin "(occurram eis quasi) *ursa raptis catulis* (Jászó 1992: 433: ablativus qualitatis). The latter explanation, however, is somewhat doubtful: without a genetic predisposition of Hungarian (corroborated by a rather large number of structural atavisms in modern Hungarian, such as *ló forgató malom* "horse-driven (lit. driving) mill", *eszeveszett ember* (i.e. *esz-e* 'his mind' – *veszett* 'lost' *ember* 'man') "madman, lunatic", etc.) – would hardly be possible.

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>

Back to Semitic (Arabic) with a couple of minor remarks. The feminine marker, presented as having had " 'originally' a variety of functions, including that of 'noun of unity' (*baqara* '(single) cow' as opposed to *baqar* '(species) cow')" (122) *still* maintains not only all functions enumerated in § 4.4.7, but even more of them, viz. (intensiveness):

*rāwiya* (Blachère's 'grand transmetteur' /1952: 92, 99/ as against *rāwin* (Blachère's *rāwī*) 'transmetteur (of archaic poetry)'; (plurality/collectiveness): *ḫayyāla* 'riders/cavalry' (Fischer's plural-collectives: Pl.-Kollektive /1972:52/) as opp. to *ḫayyāl* 'rider', etc. The adverb "originally" in Edzard's quotation above seems to be largely superfluous.

The noun of unity *baqara* '(single) cow' as opposed to *baqar* '(species) cow' is certainly not an ideal example to represent the collective noun (CN) – unit noun (UN) relationship, since *baqara*, as an exclusive female-feminine entity may, alternatively, enter a sex-gender relationship to *ṯaur* 'bull', losing its CN-UN membership altogether. A similar reinterpretation may affect both members of an "original" CN-UN system, as in:

CN-UN:    *ḥamām* (CN) 'pigeon(s)'        – *ḥamāma* (UN) 'one pigeon'
          any number, of whatever sex     – one specimen, of whatever sex,
as opposed to:
sex-gender:  *ḥamām* (one, male-masc.)      – *ḥamāma* (one, female-fem.); cf.
Lane I, 636-7: *ra'aitu ḥamāman ʿalā ḥamāmatin* "I saw a male (pigeon) upon a female (pigeon)" or *wa-ḏakkaranī ṣ-ṣibā' baʿda t-tanā'ī * ḥamāmatu 'aikatin tadʿū ḥamāman* "and a female pigeon of a thicket, calling a male pigeon, reminded me of youth, after estrangement".

The usefulness of what Edzard calls ATR-distribution to refer to the traditional 'emphasis' (pharyngealization) (108) seems to be doubtful.

The Cairo Arabic /ṣāliḥīn/ > [SAALḥīn] 'good' (m. pl.), opposing one of the fundamental prosodic laws of Cairo Arabic, should correctly be written /ṣāliḥīn/ > [SALḥīn] (109).

Edzard's monograph, despite its too explicit rejection of the family-tree linguistics, is a highly useful work. As a critical review of a number of well-known methodologies, marked both by brilliant successes and frustrating failures, offers thought-provoking suggestions and quite fresh alternatives that might inspire Arabists, Semiticists as well as all those working in the field of historical linguistics.

*Ladislav Drozdík*

REFERENCES

BENKŐ, Loránd (ed.). 1991. *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana I* (Historical Grammar of Hungarian I). Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

BENKŐ. Loránd (ed.). 1992. *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/1*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

BENKŐ, L. & S. Imre (eds.). 1972. *The Hungarian Language*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

BLACHÈRE, Régis. 1952. *Histoire de la littérature arabe dès origines à la fin du XVᵉ siècle de J.-C.* Paris, Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.

BOMHARD, Allan R. 1984. *Toward Proto-Nostratic. A New Approach to the Comparison of Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Afroasiatic*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

de SAUSSURE, Ferdinand. 1878. *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes*. Reprinted 1968. Hildesheim, Georg Olms.

FISCHER, W. 1972. *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

Gamkrelidze, Thomas V. & V.I. Ivanov. 1973. "Sprachtypologie und die Rekonstruktion der gemeinindogermanischen Verschlüsse". In: Phonetica 27, 150-156.

HOPPER, Paul. 1973. "Glottalized and Murmured Occlusives in Indo-European". In: Glossa 7, 141-166.

HUNFALVY, Pál. 1872. *Kondai Vogul nyelv. A Popov G. fordításának alapján* (Konda Vogul Language. Based on G. Popov's translation). Budapest, Hoffmann & Molnár.

JÁSZÓ, Anna. 1991. "Az igenevek állománya az ősmagyar kor elején" (The state of verbo-nominals at the beginning of the earliest history of Hungarian). In: BENKŐ, L.1991: 319-352.

JÁSZÓ, Anna. 1992. "Az igenevek" (Verbonominals). In: BENKŐ, L. 1992: 411-454.

K (1993). *Selp'ŭ Sŏnggyŏng* (Self Study Bible). Korean Bible Compilation Committee.

KÁROLY, Sándor. 1956. *Igenévrendszerünk a kódexirodalom első szakaszában* (Our System of Verbonominals in the First Period of Codex Literature). Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

KÁROLY, Sándor. 1972. "The Grammatical System of Hungarian". In: BENKŐ, L. & S. Imre 1972.

LANE, Edward W. 1863-1874. *Maddu-l-Kamoos. An Arabic-English Lexicon.* (Quoted after the Beirut photomechanical edition. Beirut, Librairie du Liban 1968).

T (1977). *Incili şerif* (The Holy Gospel). İstanbul, Kitabı mukaddes şirketi.

T (1993). *Incil'in Matta Bölümü* (Mathew's Gospel). İstanbul, Yeni Yaşam Yayınları.

SCHULZ, E. – G. KRAHL – W. REUSCHEL: *Standard Arabic: An Elementary-Intermediate Course.* Revised English Edition by Eckehard Schulz, University of Leipzig. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2000. 641 pp. ISBN: 0 521 77465 9 (paperback). Price: £ 18.95 (US$ 29.95). ISBN: 0 521 77313 X (hardback). Price: £ 52.50 (US$ 85.00).

The present manual is a carefully revised English version of the Langenscheidt-Verlag Enzyklopädie manual *Lehrbuch des modernen Arabisch* (1995), by G. Krahl, W. Reuschel, and E. Schulz, which is, in turn, a substantially innovated version of the earlier original edition of Krahl-Reuschel's *Lehrbuch des modernen Arabisch. Teil I.* VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, Leipzig 1974 (reprint 1976). The original version of Part I forms part of an extensive course of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), subsequently completed by Part II/1 (1981) and Part II/2 (1981), by Blohm-Reuschel-Samarraie. Part I, constituting the grammatical core of the whole set, is in many respects a quite autonomous and self-contained unit that has been successfully used for several decades in college-level teaching of MSA. The same holds true of the lexically and methodically innovated *Lehrbuch* and the same may be expected from the present English edition which is, moreover, provided with a reliable key to the exercises and substantially expanded subject indexes of grammatical terminology, both in English and Arabic arrangement.

The book provides the student with grammatical and lexical basics which are necessary for mastering Arabic as a spoken and written language. The textual and lexical material faithfully reflects the Arab cultural and social scene and so do the stereotype phrases and conversational drills with a true-to-life idiomatic ring. The high-quality grammatical description is substantially that of the original German version. Nevertheless, even here some parts have been rearranged in accordance with the experience derived from use of the latter in teaching.

The book consists of 28 lessons which include the following parts: Grammar (G), Vocabulary (V), Text 1 and Text 2 (except Lesson 1) and various types of Exercises: lex-