

- 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 verbonominals 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. *Igenévrendszeriünk 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). *İncil şerif* (The Holy Gospel). İstanbul, Kitabı mukaddes şirketi.
- T (1993). *İncil'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. Krahle, W. Reuschel, and E. Schulz, which is, in turn, a substantially innovated version of the earlier original edition of Krahle-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-

ical (L) and grammatical exercises (G), conversation drills (C), from Lesson 4 onwards, and a Final exercise in each lesson except the first.

In spite of the fact that the book is marked by a high-level of originality and innovation, the impact of the Orientalistic tradition, perpetuated through centuries in the European centres of Arabic studies, may still be felt in some of its paragraphs:

In the list of emphatics (Lesson 1: The Alphabet) the phoneme *ḍ* (*ḍād*) is presented as a voiced dental stop, like an English /d/ articulated with emphasis. An occlusive rendering of *ḍād* occurs only in the urban centers of Egypt and the Syro-Palestinian linguistic area. No hint has been made to the fricative realization of this phoneme, as postulated by the orthoepic standard in the greatest part of the Arab world in both urban and rural areas.

Another feature sanctioned by the tradition may be found in the presentation of annexion-type head-modifier constructions (genitive construction, '*iḍāfa*', 68-70) which fails to explain the difference between the *syntagmatic* and *paradigmatic* definiteness value in annexions with an indefinite final term. The nonfinal term(s) of an annexion, the final term of which is indefinite, should be regarded as *indefinite*, in a syntagmatic context (*baitu rajulin kabīrun*) while, from a paradigmatic point of view, it (they) should be regarded as *definite* (viz., triptotizing of diptota: *maṣānī'u*, *-ī*, *-a madīnatin*). The relation between the latter process and the definiteness state of the underlying noun is firmly established in all grammatical descriptions of Arabic.

Unless we take into account the latter distinction, the following '*iḍāfa*-related statements are somewhat misleading:

73: A noun is definite if it is construed with – the article (*al-baitu*), – a subsequent genitive (*baitu r-rajuli*), an affixed pronoun (*baituhu*); and:

69/70: If the 2nd term of the *Idāfa* is indefinite, the 1st term in the construct state is regarded as indefinite: *baitu ṭalabatin* a students' hostel. An adjectival attributive adjunct ascribed to the 1st term of *Idāfa*, that is to *bait*, follows indefinite: *baitu ṭalabatin jadīdun* a new students' hostel.

*

Further, in describing these annexion-type constructions, two different types of the latter have been presented:

- annexions involving lexically free constituents: *baitu rajulin* the house of a man / *baitu r-rajuli* the house of the man, and
- those made up of lexically bound constituents: *baitu ṭalabatin* a students' hostel / *baitu ṭ-ṭalabati* the students' hostel.

The former assigns to its constituents a full paradigmatic autonomy which can clearly be seen on the number paradigm: *baitā rajulin*, *baitu r-rijālī*, etc.

The latter, as a lexicalized unit, allows of no such freedom: in the singular-plural (S-P) structural pattern of *baitu ṭ-ṭalabati* only the head is carrier of an autonomous number marker, while that of the modifier is paradigmatically bound. All this may be deduced from Lesson 6, §§ 1 and 1.1. Nevertheless, the distinction between the two types might have been supported by some guiding formal criteria by way of confronting different number-concord patterns displayed by each of them:

While, in a non-lexicalized annexion of the type *baitu rajulin* a man's house, no number agreement is possible (*buyūtu rijālin* / *ar-rijālī* is a mere matter of an extra-linguistically motivated coincidence), in lexicalized annexions of the (S-S) type, unless prevented by semantic factors, only a (P-P) plural pattern is possible (henceforward the examples will be pausally presented):

Non-lexicalized (S-S) constructions:

ġurfat al-mudīr “the director’s room” (casually occupied, say, in a winter-resort cottage):

all available number combinations in accordance with the actual extra-linguistic situation may occur with the plural head; as against:

Lexicalized (S-S) constructions:

ġurfat al-mudīr “the director’s office” (e.g. the headmaster’s office in a school): only a (P-P) plural pattern is possible: *ġuraf al-mudarā’*.

Similarly:

rabbat al-bait / rabbāt al-buyūt “landlady”;

sā’iq as-sayyāra / suwwāq as-sayyārāt, sā’iqū ~ “car driver”;

the same holds for prepositional constructions:

al-hābiṭ bil-miżalla / al-hābiṭūn bil-miżallāt “paratrooper”;

as well as for nouns with affixal modifiers:

wajhuhu / wujūhuhum.

If venturing, however, to include some traces of this number-agreement discussion in the book, a short account of number-agreement restrictors, operating in modifier slots of the lexicalized units, would have been appropriate. Some of them:

- abstractness: (S-S) *ġurfat an-naum* / (P-S) *ġuraf* ~ “bedroom(s)”;
sayyārat al-’is’āf / *sayyārāt* ~ “ambulance(s);
- mass-noun featuring: *ka’s an-nabīḍ* / *ku’ūs* ~ “wine glass(es)”;
nāqilat al-bitrūl / *nāqilāt* ~ “tanker(s);
- notional uniqueness: *burj as-samā’* / *burj* ~ “sign(s) of the zodiac”, etc.

*

The formal relationship between the *ḥāl*-type modifier and its respective nominal head is correctly identified with the gender-number agreement (393). Somewhat misleadingly, however, the same interpretation of facts is given with the *ḥāl*-verb relationship, too. Here, as is evident, the formal evidence consists in the invariable accusative that points to the verb, with a simultaneous lack of the case agreement.

*

The description of the *nisba*-derivation (60, 265-6), as well as many other parts of the manual, is carefully adapted to the needs of English-speaking users. Nevertheless, some gaps that can after all be filled in by the teacher as progressing through the course, might appear perplexing to the learners at the first glance. It would have been worth reminding the students that a simultaneous co-occurrence of different derivational procedures may prevent, in some cases, the formal identifiability of the derivational basis. The *nisba*-adjective *bašarī*, for instance, may alternatively be derived:

either from *bašar* “man, human being; mankind” (additive process: *bašar* + *ī*), i.e. “human”, possibly substantivized to “human being”;

or from *bašara* (*bašar-a*) “epidermis; skin; complexion” (substitutive process: the *nisba*-suffix *-ī* is being substituted for the feminine marker *-a*), i.e. “epidermal, skin (adj.)”.

The same problem may arise from the collision of progressive and regressive (back-formation) procedures, as in: *‘askarī*, that can be derived:

either from *‘askar* “army” (progressive / additive process: *‘askar* + *ī*), i.e. “military, army (adj.)”; by adding the feminine marker, the same process may further be extended to *‘askarīya* “militarism”;

or from *‘askarīya* (see above) (regressive / subtractive process: *‘askarīya* – (minus)-a), i.e. “militaristic; militarist”.

In all these and similar cases the semantic evaluation is the only clue to establish the identity of the latter type of formally coinciding *nisba*-derivatives.

*

The use of *bi-* as a transitivizer seems to be mentioned just once and even then in an indirect way only (Note A5, p. 76): *qāma bi-* "to carry out, to undertake". In view of the high frequency of its application in the latter sense, the importance of this syntactic transitivizer is nearly matching that of the derivational means of conveying transitivity, mostly bound with causativity. Syntactic constructions of the type *ḥaraja bi(hi)* "to get out, take out; to turn out" or *taqaddama bi(hi)* "to present", as in *taqaddama bi-wizāratihī 'ilā l-barlamān* "he presented his cabinet to the Parliament" (Schregle 1974, 1355), roughly correspond to the derivationally conveyed *ḥarraja* / *'ahraja(hu)* and *qaddama(hu)* respectively.

*

The active-passive dichotomy in presenting the participial shortening of attributive relative clauses (RC) does not seem to be happily chosen (285-287):

There is hardly any structural difference between:

- (a) **active** constructions (the subject not being the same) with participles derived from *intransitive* (inclus. of reflexive) verbs, like *al-wafdu l-muntahijatu ziyāratuhu*, and:
- (b) **passive** constructions (the subject not being the same) with participles derived from *transitive* verbs, such as *ar-rajulu l-mabī'atu kutubuhu* or *al-mašna'u l-muḡlaqatu 'abwābuhu*.

The syntactic structure starts varying only with:

- (c) **active** participles (the subject being the same) derived from *transitive* (inclus. of causative) verbs, as in: *ar-rajulu l-bā'i'u kutubahu* or *al-wafdu l-munhī ziyāratuhu* or *al-mašna'u l-muḡliqu 'abwābahu*.

Technically, the criterial distinction between *the subject being/not being the same* might, as well, be somewhat confusing since it implies the idea of **two** subjects while, with regard to the clause fragments quoted, there is only **one**: that of the participially shortened RC, and the antecedent noun (*al-wafdu* in *al-wafdu l-muntahijatu ziyāratuhu*) is no more than an antecedent noun possibly operating in whatever syntactic function (286-287).

Of course, all these remarks merely reflect slightly different points of views and personal preferences and they do not impair, in any way, high qualities of the manual intimately known to the reviewer from his own teaching with the full-length original German version. As a highly valuable teaching and learning device, the book offers a neat and precise grammatical description (with a well-balanced first-step introduction into the realistic oral usage of prestigious Arabic), a fresh lexical and textual corpus and a number of quite new methodic procedures backed by the long and fruitful scholarly and educational tradition of Leipzig University.

Cambridge University Press, the home of many valuable editions designed for the study of Standard Arabic, both Classical (W. Wright 1896-1898; A.F.L. Beeston 1968, 1969) and Modern Standard (D. Cowan 1958/1964/1968), has recently made another important step to this effect. By publishing *Standard Arabic. An Elementary-Intermediate Course*, one of the most up-to-date and most reliable tools for the study of MSA, an entirely new horizon has been created for all serious learners of this rich and viable language which has managed to maintain its identity in a substantially unaltered form for more than 1,500 years.

With a deal of enthusiasm and creative optimism it would perhaps be possible to initiate a truly ambitious plan that would follow the pioneering work of Professor Schulz:

the revision of the lexical and textual material of the two additional volumes of the *Lehrbuch* (Part II/1 and Part II/2) and freeing it from the ideologically enforced *ostblock*-atmosphere of the late GDR. High-quality grammatical parts, completed with ingeniously organized highly efficient drills, would harmoniously complete the grammatical and lexical core provided by the German Langenscheidt-edited *Lehrbuch* as well as its revised English version under review.

Ladislav Drozdík

OLIVERIUS, Jaroslav: *Kapitoly ze syntaxe moderní spisovné arabštiny* (Chapters from the Syntax of Modern Written Arabic). Praha, Karolinum 1998. 255 pp. ISBN 80-7184-785-2.

There is no great assortment of scholarly works and manuals dealing with the syntactic structures of Modern Written Arabic. D.V. Semenov's book *Sintaksis sovremennogo arabskogo literaturnogo yazyka* (1941) is, for all its merits, definitely obsolete since it is based on texts roughly delimited by the last decades of the 19th and the thirties of the 20th centuries. It is the period of searching for one's way in construing MWA sentences and in adopting more flexible and less burdensome modes of expression. The tentativeness of this period, often unsuccessful and fallacious, is reflected both in the lexicon and, even more patently, in the instability of sentence structures. Vincente Cantarino's *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose* (1969; 1974-75) was probably the first large-scale syntactic description to cover the first half of the 20th century in its entirety.

It was about this time that the first version of Oliverius's book appeared in Romanized transcription, still in the form of a modestly duplicated university textbook. By the richness of material collected and its linguistically consistent classification, it proved to be of enormous help to the university students and their teachers alike. Already in this form it would have deserved to be made accessible to a larger body of learners in a foreign language version, since by far not all students in European universities possessed a manual specifically designed for the study of the MWA syntax. After more than two decades the textbook acquired quite a new shape, both in its graphical presentation (rewritten in Arabic script) and thematic organization.

The book is divided into two main parts: 1. (simple) sentences, and 2. complex sentences (CS), with further subdivisions: 1.1. noun; 1.2. verb, for the former, and 2.1. coordinate CS; 2.2. subordinate CS, for the latter. The neatly presented syntactic description is relatively concise but transparent and self-sufficient. Syntactic phenomena dealt with are supported by a wealth of really modern and well-chosen material.

The new version offers numerous improvements in classifying syntactic phenomena which are more in accordance with recent developments of linguistic theory. In the domain of subordination, perhaps one of the most important improvements concerns relative clauses (RCs) which are treated, in the old version (144 f.), under the common heading of *vedlejší věty doplňovací vztažné* (complementary relative clauses) while, in the new version, they are already subdivided into *vzažné věty ajektivní (věty přívlastkové)* (adjectival relative clauses /attributive clauses) (183 f.) and *vztažné věty substantivní* (substantival relative clauses) (193 f.).