

EL-AYOUBI, Hashem – FISCHER, Wolfdietrich – LANGER, Michael: *Syntax der arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Teil 1, Band 2 (Syntax of Modern Written Arabic, Part I, vol. 2). In collaboration with Dieter Blohm and Zafer Youssef, compiled by W. Fischer and M. Langer. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag 2003. XIV+617 pp. ISBN: 3-89500-358-1.

Syntax der arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart (Syntax, in what follows) is a well-documented description of the Modern Written Arabic syntax. As already said in the review of Part 1, vol. 1 (AAS 12/2003, 1, 91-102), it locates the language described to the time interval between 1950 and the date of completing the volume.

For MWA, be it grammar or syntax, in particular, there is nothing that could match the present work in the wide range of phenomena analysed, in the well-balanced selection of sources and the admirable hierarchy of systemized phenomena. The present volume, as after all, all hitherto published parts of this truly monumental collective work, offer an entirely new approach to the MWA syntax, both conceptually and methodologically.

In general, the Vol. 2 is concerned with connective word-classes of the noun: pronouns, adverbs and prepositions, arranged in three separate sections:

§ 7. Pronouns (Pronomina, 1 – 274);

§ 8. Adverbs (Adverbien, 275 – 460), and

§ 9. Prepositions (Präpositionen, 461 – 601).

The volume further contains a list of textual sources (Verzeichnis der Quellentexte, 602 – 608) and a bibliography (Sekundärliteratur, 609 – 617).

The neatly classified section dealing with pronouns is one of the most complete ever written. Particular classes are presented in the following paragraphs: 7.1. Personal pronouns; 7.2. Demonstrative pronouns; 7.3. Interrogative pronouns; 7.4. Relative pronouns; 7.5. Pronominal adverbs, and 7.6. Indefinite pronouns.

In connection with what *Syntax* terms anaphoric pronouns reflexively referring to the subject (anaphorische Pronomina in reflexiver Referenz auf das Subjekt), as part of 7.1.2.2. Das Personalpronomen in anaphorischer Referenz (9 ff.), the use of the identity noun *nafs* '(one)self' is examined. Its use is said to be obligatory only when the personal pronoun coincides with an object (complement) in the accusative or in the form of a prepositional phrase governed by a verb of the same sentence ('Die Verwendung von *nafs* ist jedoch nur obligatorisch, wenn das Personalpronomen das Akkusativ- oder Präpositionalobjekt des Verbs des gleichen Satzes darstellt' /13/), as in:

ḥāwala l-muṣawwiru 'an yaṣḡala nafsahu bi-'ayyi šay'in 'Der Photograph versuchte, sich mit irgendetwas abzulenken', or:

yuhāwīlu 'an yadūra ḥawla nafsihī 'Er versucht, sich um sich selbst zu drehen' (ibid.).

In some cases, however, *nafs* can signal what could perhaps be called *syntactic* reflexivity to keep it apart from derivative or affix-and-pattern-marked reflexivity. Structurally, the former type (illustrated by verbal abstracts) is a sequence starting with a reflexive or passive-reflexive derivative (e.g. *al-infirād* 'state of/ being isolated, secluded; /act of/ isolating, secluding oneself', hence 'isolation', etc.) whose primary stem meaning is invalidated by an intervening syntactic transitivizer (*bi*), and this transient state of transitivity is finally reverted back to reflexivity by *nafs*, the final member of the sequence, in harmony with the primitive stem meaning of the derivative. In the case that the addition of the lexical reflexivizer *nafs*, does not take place, the resultant stem value of the sequence is transitive. Both cases can be illustrated by the following sentence from Ibn Ḥaldūn's Muqaddima:

fa-'idā rasaḥa 'izzuhu wa-šāra (al-maliku) ilā l-infirādi bi-l-maḡdī wa-ḥtāḡa 'ilā l-infirādi bi-nafsihī 'ani n-nāsi li-l-ḥadīti ma'a 'awliyā'ihī fī ḥawāṣṣi šu'ūnihi (Muq. 259) 'Then,

when his power is firmly established, he comes to claim all the glory for himself. He needs to keep away from the people and to remain aloof with his friends, in order to be able to talk with them about his special (private) affairs' (Ros., ii, 111-112).

When agreeing to use the symbol *r* for reflexivity and *t* for transitivity, and avoiding the tautological equation $r=r$ for the derivative *al-infirād*, the two cases may be presented as follows:

$r + t = t$: *al-infirād bi-l-mağd* 'claiming the glory for himself', as against:

$r + t + r = r$: *al-infirād bi-nafsihi* (*ʿani n-nās*) 'keeping away, secluding oneself (from the people)'.

It should be noted, however, that these and similar aspects of the *nafs*-reflexivity are likely to be treated, possibly in different terms or under different headings, in the forthcoming *Band ii* (?), as hinted at in the above quoted paragraph: 'Sofern Reflexivität nicht lexikalisch durch interne Derivation zum Ausdruck kommt (Bd. ii 3.2.2), wird hierfür in der Regel das Identitätsnomen *nafs* 'selbst' (Bd. ii 3.2.2.3) als externer Ausdruck von Reflexivität verwendet' (13).

N.B. The reference to Bd. ii 3.2.2 and 3.2.2.3 is erroneous, since Bd. ii contains no such paragraphs; the reference had to point, in all probability, to the Teil ii-related paragraphs.

A similar error occurs in *Inhaltverzeichnis* where *Band i, 2. Teil* should be corrected to *Teil i, Band 2*, as well.

Vol. 2. introduces a number of useful terminological innovations and their innovative application to the syntactic phenomena of Arabic. The notion of *Horizontpronomen*, examined in § 7.1.2.6 Kontextreferente abhängige Pronominal der 3. Pers. Sg. (dependent pronouns of the 3rd pers. sing. referring to the context) is just one of them.

The connective word-classes of the noun, examined in the present volume, take the form of a coherent, wide-coverage description of unprecedented richness and innovative taxonomic architecture. The depth of well-documented details is the most characteristic feature of this descriptive work.

In 9.3.1. *Einfache Präpositionen*, the transitivity function of the preposition *bi-* is presented in finely graded qualities starting from the 'plain' transitive *ğā' bi-šay'in* 'he brought something', associated with non-personal entities, through transitivity triggered by an abstract actor (*al-istiḥfāf bi-l-mašīr*) up to structurally identical *bi*-constructions where transitivity is semantically prevented (the *bi*-introduced object represents a /body/ part of the actor (*'aqbala /ʿamm 'abduh/ bi-ğasadihi ṭ-ṭawīl*). The latter non-transitive function found its attribute in what might be translated 'ornamental' (*ornamentive Bedeutung*) (475).

Furthermore, the *ğā'a bi-šay'in* (non-personal) / *ğā'a bi-hi* (personal) transitivity is semantically related to the so-far terminologically unspecified feature of what would be possible to call *participativeness* (actor's taking part in the transitivized action). The latter feature is, however, unambiguously expressed by paraphrasing, as in *ğā'a bi-šay'in* "er kam mit einer Sache" = "er brachte eine Sache". An even more convincing evidence of the usefulness of this feature may be seen in the personal variant of this transitivity, as, say, in *dahaba bi-hi* "he led him away; he escorted him" as against the derivational *'adhaba-hu* "he expelled him, made him disappear, he forced him out", etc.

As already hinted at in our review of Vol. 1, the incorporation of Rel (*Satzdeterminator*) *allaḏī* to the main clause (MC) in what we classify as disjunctive Ant-Rel syntactic contexts, seems to create a number of theoretical problems. In spite of all arguments advanced in favour of this theory, this particular issue is, once again, the main point of our

disagreement with the *Syntax*-adopted classificatory premises, argued for in the Vol. 2 as well:

“Anders als beim Relativsatz in den indogerman. Sprachen ist das Relativpronomen im Arab. kein Satzglied des ihm zugeordneten Attributsatzes, sondern ein syntaktisches Glied des übergeordneten Satzes. Der Bezug des Attributsatzes auf das Relativpronomen wird durch ein kopulatives Personalpronomen . . . hergestellt. Das Kopulativpronomen vertritt im Attributsatz das Relativpronomen und steht jeweils an der Stelle, an der das Relativpronomen stehen müßte, wenn es Glied des Attributsatzes wäre” (145).¹

The theory is apparently based upon a unique argument: the agreement of R with the coreferential A irrespective of the function it plays in the subordinate clause (SC) (the latter feature being formally supported by the dual-related case agreement only).

The highly specific agreement strategy in the Arabic *alladī* clauses we call disjunctive, markedly differs from that used in relativization by many inflected languages of the world. To present this strategy comprehensibly enough there is no need to draw a fine line of distinction between Modern Standard and the true Classical Arabic of the Koran and canonized literature of the Middle Ages since, in its basic structures, it is substantially the same.

In the light of frequently discussed assumptions, alternatively argued for or against, or simply ignored, any Arabic sentence with a RC of the type we call disjunctive may be segmented in one of the following ways.

- (1) *‘araftu r-rağul-a llađī māta*
I knew the man (acc) who died
- (2) *‘araftu r-rağul-a llađī māta*

The two frames mark main clauses as opposed to their respective RCs or, in other words, delimit structural boundaries of each of these four clausal segments. Each way of segmenting results from primary theories about what a (complex) sentence is and what it may consist of.

The former way of determining structural limits between MC and RC, that is the sentence segmenting (1), with a RC whose Rel is incorporated therein, will readily be accepted by any linguistically aware speaker of most, perhaps all inflected IE languages as something intuitively natural and compatible with his linguistic insight.

The Rel as a member of the RC apparently dominates both the theory and descriptive practice in most/all languages with formally marked Ant-Rel coreferentiality (cf. Down-

¹ Nearly the same explanation is provided in Vol. 1, 29 n.1: “Attributsätze haben in indogermanischen Sprachen ihr Äquivalent im Relativsatz. In vielen Darstellungen der arab. Grammatik wird diese Bezeichnung auf den Attributsatz des Arabischen übertragen. Die Struktur des arab. Attributsatzes ist von der des Relativsatzes indogermanischer Sprachen jedoch grundsätzlich verschieden, und zwar auch im determinierten Attributsatz mit sog. Relativpronomen. Anders als im Relativsatz indogermanischer Sprachen ist das Relativpronomen *‘al-ladī* kein Bestandteil des Attributsatzes. Das Relativpronomen ist im Arabischen ein Attribut des Kernnomens und fungiert als Allomorph des Determinators, der am Nomen als Artikel *‘al-*, am Satz als *‘al-ladī* erscheint. Daher ist die Bezeichnung ‘Relativsatz’ für die Syntax des Arabischen ungenau und wenig geeignet, obwohl sie sich in den meisten Darstellungen eingebürgert hat. Wir unterscheiden zwischen ‘Attributsätzen’, die als Attribut eingebettet sind, und ‘Relativsätzen’, bei welchen das Relativpronomen selbst das Kernnomen darstellt, dem ein Attributsatz appliziert wird” (*Syntax 2001*: 29, n. 1).

ing, in Greenberg 1978: 375-418).² Neither is this structural feature put into question in recent works, at least some of them, dealing with Arabic, notwithstanding the fact that the origin of the Arabic relative clause has to be sought for in the primitive coordination syntax (Beeston 1970: 49) or perhaps 'apposition syntax'. For the English 'a man whom I met yesterday told me', Arabic offers as its equivalent *la man – I met him yesterday – told me*, and this RC structure is still in force with indefinite Ant's (ibid.), as might be seen also in some of the examples introducing the present study: *rağulun mātā ...* 'a man who died ...', structurally rewritten: 'a man – he died'.

Another part of both earlier and recent studies in the Arabic relative-clause syntax advances quite a different theory that overtly opposes the conceptual and methodological basics traditionally applied to the syntactic analysis of IE languages, as well as the widely accepted linguistic insights and intuitive knowledge about language. It must be recognized, however, that reasons for relegating the Rel to the structural domain of the MC as one of its constituents are worth consideration, let alone the still influential tradition established by the early Arab grammarians.

Incorporation of *alladī* into the MC-structure creates a number of theoretical problems touching on the very nature and operative capability of (disjunctive Ant-Rel) RCs. The counterproductive concentration of both coreferential terms, Ant and Rel, in one single clause, namely the MC, is seemingly the most serious out of the set. A similar assumption necessarily comes to oppose the primary and fundamental linking function of coreferentiality that underlies and supports the very modifying function of the RC.

The priority of the MC-government, formally expressed by the Arabic Ant-Rel agreement, does not seem to be a really compelling argument in favour of such a radical and disturbing assumption, not to speak about an even more disturbing addition of a lexically void linking operator to the MC that might be able to function as a self-contained syntactic unit, as an independent sentence complete in itself.

At any rate, extending the range of the MC-governed Ant-Rel agreement beyond the structural limits of the MC seems to be less harmful to the theory of relativization than invalidating the coreferential link between the two clauses by moving the Rel out of the RC.

When leaving aside intuitive feeling about how language works in complementing, exacting and refining crude facts by the vast stock of verbal, phrasal or clausal modifiers, and when passing over well-established linguistic facts and related meta-assumptions about modifying and, in particular, modifying through relativization, we may still find a subsidiary domain to look for answers to still unanswered questions. Textual and stylistic analysis seem to be such a promising field for examining the relative integrity and autonomy of sentences and sentence-constituting clauses. The crucial problem of the Rel's membership of one or another clause of a RC-containing complex sentence or, more explicitly, the question of its disconnection from the structure of a MC (in opposition to the Arab linguistic tradition), may be examined on stylistically modelled anaphoric chains of *alladī*-RCs. Except the first RC, immediately following its MC, all other RCs may form an indefinitely long series of appositions, related 'from distance' to the unique MC at the beginning of the chain. Since all RCs but the first are separated from their respective MCs (and so are Rel's from their respective Ant's) by progressively increasing inter-clausal distances, the assumption of the Rel's status as constituent of the MC structure seems to lose thereby a part of its cogency.

In symbols adpoted, an anaphoric chain of *alladī*-clauses would yield the following picture: $MC_1 + (Rel + RC)_1 + (Rel + RC)_2 + \dots + (Rel + RC)_n$.

Some examples (for the sake of transparency, each RC but the first, of the continuous text quoted, will be written in separate lines):

minhum hādā l-ḥāḡḡu ... al-ḥayyātu (1) *llaḏī kāna dukkānuhu yaqādu yuqābilu l-kuttāba*,
 (2) *wa-llaḏī kāna n-nāsu muḡmi'ina 'alā waṣfihi bi-l-buḥli wa-š-ṣuḥḥi*,
 (3) *wa-llaḏī kāna muttaṣilan bi-šayhin min kibāri 'ahli t-turuqi*,
 (4) *wa-llaḏī kāna yazdarī l-'ulamā'a ḡamī'an li-'annahum ya'ḥudūna 'ilmahum min(a)*
l-kutubi lā 'an(i) š-šuyūḥi,

(5) *wa-llaḏī kāna yarā 'anna l-'ilma š-ṣaḥiḥa 'innamā huwa l-'ilmu l-ladunīyu llaḏī*
yahbiṭu 'alā qalbika min 'inda llāhi ... (al-'Ayyām, 83-4).

"Among them (the religious scholars) was this Mecca pilgrim ... the taylor (1) whose shop stood almost opposite the Koran school, (2) who was unanimously described by (his fellow-) men in terms of avarice and greed, (3) who maintained relation with one of the most renowned Sufi sheiks, (4) who despised all scholars because they drew their knowledge from books and not from sheiks, (5) who believed that the true scholarly knowledge is only the God-inspired knowledge descending from God to your heart ...".

With a theoretical relocation of *allaḏī* from the SC (RC in our classification) to MC, in an Ant-Rel syntactic contexts, the definiteness-controlling function of Rel would have to be performed from beyond the structural boundaries of the SC. An even more serious consequence of this theory would lead, as already hinted at, to the concentration of both coreferential terms, A and R, in one single clause, and to the subsequent inactivation of the linkage between the two clauses.

In closing, we can only repeat our words of appraisal already uttered in our review of Vol. 1 (AAS, 12/2003,1). The Vol. 2 of the Part I, as well as all parts of this monumental *Syntax* published so-far, will be exploited as an invaluable reference book by the researchers and serious students of Modern Standard Arabic.

When having in mind the recent linguistic standard of MSA amidst an impenetrable diglossic space with its ever fluctuating and highly diffuse contours, the primary descriptive structure of the *Syntax* might, in a sense and under favourable conditions, fulfil even a sort of prescriptive task to the benefit of this standard.

Ladislav Drozdík

REFERENCES:

- Downing, B.T. 1978. "Some universals of Relative Clause Structure", in: J.H. Greenberg (ed.): *Universals of Human Language*, vol. 4. *Syntax*. Stanford University Press.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1978 > Downing.
- Ḥusayn, Ṭāhā. 1936 (4th ed.), *al-'Ayyām*, Cairo.
- Muq.* – Ibn Ḥaldūn: *al-Muqaddima* (recent Egyptian edition based on the critical text edited by Laḡnat al-bayān al-'arabī, under the supervision of 'Alī 'Abdalwāḥid al-Wāfi. Cairo, Dār aš-ša'b (non-dated).
- Ros. – Rosenthal, Franz. 1967: Ibn Khaldūn, *The Muqaddimah*. An Introduction to History. 3 vols. Translated from Arabic by F.R. Princeton University Press.

² B. T. Downing: "... a relative clause incorporates, as one of its terms, a nominal which is coreferential with a nominal outside of the clause. Neither nominal need be expressed overtly, although presumably one or the other must". "Some universals of Relative Clause Structure", in: J. H. Greenberg (ed.) 1978: *Universals of Human Language*. Vol. 4. *Syntax*, pp. 375-418.

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED:

Ant – antecedent, head noun;

Rel – relative pronoun

AR RC – conjunctive RC where Ant and Rel are fused together in one single structural unit; variants: substantivische Relativsätze (Reckendorf), Relativsätze (*Syntax*);

A-R RC – disjunctive RC in which Ant and Rel represent autonomous structural units; variants: adjektivische Relativsätze (Reckendorf), Attributsätze (*Syntax*);

MC – main clause;

RC – relative clause;

SC – subordinate clause, in the present context mostly synonymous with RC.

OLIVERIUS, Jaroslav: *Kapitoly z frazeologie a idiomatiky moderní spisovné arabštiny* (Chapters from the Phraseology and Idiomatics of Modern Written Arabic). Praha, Ústav srovnávací jazykovědy FF UK 2003. 147 pp. ISBN 80-86277-37-2.

The students and lovers of Arabic have another valuable tool for enhancing their knowledge of this language and their ability to use it in very various situations of everyday life. Oliverius' classified collection of lexicalized phraseological units, well established formulaic expressions and highly useful idioms, is all the more valuable because it covers the so far neglected domain of phraseology and idiomatics of Modern Standard Arabic, a language still struggling for its indisputable place in oral usage.

The book consists of seven principal parts along with the strategies exploited: nominal (A), verbal (B), adverbial (C), prepositional (D) and syntactical (E). The remaining two parts are labelled by their method of arrangement: thematic (Tematické okruhy/Thematic classes (F)) and alphabetic (Další idiomy a frazémy v abecedním pořadí/Other alphabetically arranged idiomatic and phraseological units (G)). At the end of the book another collection of selected sayings and proverbs is added.

At the first glance, it might appear somewhat strange that the marvellously rich and elaborate system of the God-related sayings and formulaic expressions covering the vast domain of greetings, good wishes, oaths, curses, imprecations, etc. has been practically omitted or reduced to minimum, in spite of the whole web of interpersonal social relationships being impregnated by them. The number of expressions like *al-insān yufakkir wa-llāh yudabbir*; *tuwuffiyya ilā raḥmat allāh* or *ḍahaba ilā ḡiwār allāh* (145) might have been perhaps somewhat expanded. It must be recognized, however, that the degree of intimacy and social closeness, associated with expressions, like *wi-ḥyātak*, *win-nabī*, *allāh yiḥallik*, *allāh yisallimak*, *yihrib bētak*, and hundreds of others, falls exclusively in the domain of the local colloquials, and the divided system of diglossic communication leaves, for Standard Arabic, no great space to fill.

The user will certainly appreciate lexical and/or constructional variants of the key word or expression, with most examples quoted, as in *aṭlaqa l-muḥtafiḥūn sarāḥ ar-rahā'in / qad ufrīḡa 'an kull ar-rahā'in* (106) or *lam yuhmilū furṣa wāḥida / lā tada' al-furṣa tafūtuka / lā yufawwit furṣa illā wa-yusarriḥ bi-'anna ...* (108). Even when such variation cannot be found in one single entry, the user has a good chance to hope that he will come across some synonymic terms, words or stems, in some other entries while going through the book, e.g. the verb *ḡālā* in: *lastu uḡālī in (iḍā) qultu* (107) is followed, somewhat later, by the verbal abstract derived from the synonymous verb *bālaḡa: kāna mayyālān ilā l-mubālaḡa* (115), and the like.