The book is a fine work, providing valuable insights and guideposts on the arduous journey beyond Orientalism.

Jarmila Drozdíková

EDZARD, Lutz and Mohammed NEKROUMI (Eds.): *Tradition and Innovation. Norm and Deviation in Arabic and Semitic Linguistics.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag 1999. 208 pp. ISBN 3-447-04185-4.

The present collection of studies follows the general theme of the 27th Deutscher Orientalistentag (Bonn, September 30, 1998) "Norm und Abweichung", further reflected in the panel "Tradition und Innovation – Norm und Abweichung in der arabistischen und semitistischen Linguistik".

The volume is introduced by a short Preface (in English). The articles, dealing with a wide range of problems, are divided into three section: I. Modern Perspectives on Comparative Semitic and Afroasiatic (9–52); II. Modern Perspectives on Native Arabic Grammatical Theory (53–100); III. Modern Linguistic and Literary Theory Applied to Arabic (101–204). From a total of eleven articles, seven are presented in English, three in German and one in French. The volume is closed by an Epilogue (205–208), in French.

I.

Olga Kapeliuk (Jerusalem; *Regularity and Deviation in Peripheral Neo-Semitic*) examines innovative features in what she calls Peripheral Neo-Semitic, referring thereby to the North-Eastern and South-Western extremities of the Semitic language area. The former group is represented by the Eastern Aramaic dialect cluster (to the exclusion of the Ṭuroyo variant), the latter by the Semitic languages of Ethiopia. By comparative parallels with their respective linguistic ancestors, old Syriac and Geᶜez, this peripheral linguistic area is integrated in the general domain of Semitic linguistics.

What R. Voigt (Berlin; *Die Präpositionen im Semitischen – Über Morphologisierungsprozesse im Semitischen*) describes the prepositional complexes with affixal pronouns, such as the Syrian *menhon* '(some) of them' (25), in terms of their substantival status (die Position eines Substantivs). Their *word status* might have been a more insightful labelling, cf., also the stress-contoured phonological word, marked by {} in the following Cairo Arabic examples, e.g.:

{*luhum*} in {*'ultⁱ*}{*luhum*} "I/you said to them" (the stressed syllable is marked by underlining), as against clitics in {*'ultⁱ-lu*} or neg. {*ma-'ulti-līš*}.

The inclusion of the Hungarian *-ban* (<*ban* 'interior, inside'), in e.g. *ház-ban* (31), among the Semitic prepositions of a substantival background seems to be somewhat misleading: while the Arabic *bi-*, for instance, can operate as a local (*bi-baitihi*), temporal (*bi-l-laili*) or even a (syntactic) indicator of causativity (*nahaḍa bi-šai'in,* roughly equivalent to the derivative *'anhaḍahu* or to a lexical periphrasis *ǧaᶜalahu yanhaḍ,* the Hungarian *-ban,* as well as all other agglutinative grammatical indicators, has *only* one function, here, to mark the (stative) locative case (Tompa 1985: 114 f.: Kasussuffix der Deklination: *inessive case*)).

The study provides a nearly exhaustive stock of carefully classified set of Semitic prepositions and examines the process of their grammaticalization.

Andrzej Zaborski (Cracow/Vienna; *Remarks on Derived Verbs in Hamitosemitic*), on the ground of rich comparative material re-examines a number of dubious hypotheses in the domain of verbal derivation (e.g. 'deverbal hypotheses' of the Semitic causative prefixes).

237

Michael G. Carter (Oslo; *The Struggle for Authority: A Re-examination of the Baṣran and Kūfan Debate*) studies the history of the controversy between two grammatical schools on the methodological principle of induction, *'istqrā'*. The traditional picture, substantially derived from the *Inṣāf* of Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 1181), is re-examined in the light of the newly published earlier work, *Kitāb al-Intiṣār*, by Ibn Wallād (d. 943).

It might have been interesting to examine the evolution of the *qiyās - samāᶜ* dichotomy up to the present time where it might be reworded, in many contexts, in terms of a bipartition between 'productiveness'and 'unproductiveness', namely Ismāᶜīl Maẓhar's opposition of *qiyāsīya* vs. *samāᶜīya* (cf.: . . . *'asmāᶜ al-nabāt wal-ḥayawān ṣiyaġ samāᶜīya wa maᶜnā 'annahā samāᶜīya 'annahu mamnūᶜ ᶜalayka 'an taqīs ᶜalayhā wa 'an taṣūġ ᶜalā ġirārihā 'asmā' ǧadīda* (Cairo n.d.: 56; Maktabat al-nahḍa al-miṣrīya).

The paper proposes a chronology of the dispute and tries to explain the analogy between the Baṣran points of view and those of the contemporary Islamic jurisprudence.

Rafi Talmon (Haifa; *From the History of the Study of Qur'ānic Syntax*) confronts, in his study of Classical and, especially, Qur'ānic Arabic, the results attained by the most prominent German Arabists with those of the early Arab grammarians.

Another confrontation of 'modern' with 'traditional' is initiated by Mohammed Nekroumi (Bonn; *Zur Syntax und Semantik der Fragepartikeln 'a und hal im Lichte der traditionellen arabischen Grammatik*). In the paper a new *Beschreibungsmodel* to deal with the interrogative particles *'a* und *hal* is proposed.

Pierre Larcher (Aix-Marseille I; *Vues "nouvelles" sur la dérivation lexicale en arabe classique*) presents an entirely new picture of the lexical derivation in Classical Arabic. The *base* substituted for the more 'traditional' *root/racine*, irrespective of the neglect of the clearly defined concept of *root* with early grammarians dealing with *ištiqāq*, is no more than a misleading episode in Semitic linguistics (Brockelmann GvG I, 1908:286-7; Kuryłowicz 1961:174), evidently inspired by the fascinating achievements of the Indo-European linguistics. The assertion that a word such as *barnāmaǧ* "programme" has neither *root/racine* nor *form* (104), that is, Cantineau's *schème* (i.e., pattern /P/+ affixation /A/), cannot reasonably be accepted, no matter what type of metalanguage is actually used, unless thereby destabilizing the whole hierarchy of basic notions that have since long proved their validity. Sure, the word *barnāmaǧ*, in its position of a non-assimilated *root-word*, has no *segmentable* morphemic constituents: R-P-A, as against its segmentable inflectional (*b-r-m-ǧ + CaCāCiC = barāmiǧ*) or derivational (*barmaǧa, mubarmiǧ*, etc.) counterparts. It seems (even with the knowledge of Saussure 1916) that the Hamitosemitic (quite surely Semitic) languages are really "langues à racine apparente" and that even without waisting one's life in making their roots apparent.

The distinction between polysemous and homonymous roots (113) would really be simple (admittedly elegant, as well), if it would be possible as simply as that to establish the *etymology* of all different lexical morphemes synchronically relatable to the same root. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case.

Utz Maas (Osnabrück; *Die Entwicklung des neuarabischen Verbalsystems am Beispiel des Marokkanischen*) offers a detailed description of the Moroccan Arabic verbal systems. The wealth of carefully classified linguistic data are presented in an easily identifiable transcription, neither entirely phonetic nor consistently phonemic, still reasonably workable. In spite of the fact that the linguistic type of Moroccan Arabic is in quite substantial details somewhat different from that of the other Arabic dialects, some methodological

issues, adopted by the author, might be helpful in dealing with other colloquial varieties of Arabic, as well.

Jeffrey Heath (Michigan; *Sino-Moroccan Citrus: Borrowing as a Natural Linguistic Experiment*) presents another study devoted to Moroccan Arabic. In this study, based on a fieldwork carried out in Morocco in 1986, language-contact phenomena between Moroccan Arabic dialects and several Romance languages are examined.

Lutz Edzard (Bonn; *Comparable Problems in the Reconstruction of "Proto Languages" and the Reconstruction of Arabic "Urtexts"*) addresses the problems of linguistic and textual reconstruction with special reference to Arabic. The main argument of the study, closely related to that of Edzard's monograph *Polygenesis, Convergence, and Entropy: An Alternative Model of Linguistic Evolution Applied to Semitic Linguistics* (Wiesbaden 1998) boils down in the assertion that the idea of monogenesis cannot be upheld in the domain of the Semitic, especially Arabic texts.

As a translator of Ibn Ḥazm's *Ṭawq al-ḥamāma fī l-'ulfa wal-'ullāf* into Slovak (Holubičkin náhrdelník, 1984) I have read with a deal of nostalgia J. N. Bell's interesting article (Bergen; *False Etymology, Fanciful Metaphor, and Conceptual Precision: Some Medieval Muslim Definitions of Love*). Bell's sources, despite their representative structure, might have contained more samples of the mystical poetry and, in general, more attention might have been paid to the spiritualization of erotic notions and imagery. I was somewhat surprised to miss (in studies like the present one it is always easy to miss what one had expected to see) any trace of Ibn al-ᶜArabī and his collection of mystical poems *Tarǧumān al-'ašwāq*.

The volume is a valuable contribution to the scholarly exchange of methods and ideas in the field of Arabic and Semitic linguistics. Creative integration of innovative aspects into the topics examined characterizes all the papers included in the collection.

Ladislav Drozdík

BELNAP, R. Kirk & Niloofar HAERI (Eds.): *Structuralist Studies in Arabic Linguistics. Charles A. Ferguson's Papers, 1954–1994*. Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln 1997. XII+276 pp. ISBN 90-04-10511-5.

Who is Charles Ferguson (1921–)? Having received his Ph.D. degree in Oriental studies (1945: The phonology and morphology of Standard Colloquial Bengali; unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania), Ferguson taught languages at the Foreign Service Institute, Washington, D.C. (1946–1955); was appointed first director of the newly established Center for Applied Linguistics (1959); since 1967 professor at Stanford University.

An orientalist, or a linguist, or a skilled teacher of languages and a renowned adviser in this domain? No doubt, all of these. And much more than that: Ferguson is a keen observer of and an enthusiastic and rarely original contributor to the development of the 20th century linguistics and Arabic-related scholarship. Moreover, he is a highly efficient builder of bridges between the linguistic theory and domains of its application in practical life. Ferguson is one of the most prominent representatives of the American scholarly scene, personally witnessing all important events connected with linguistics and languages: he was present at the birth of the Institute (now School) of Languages and Linguistics, in Washington, D.C.; he was present there at the first Georgetown University Round Table on