impossible. But if we approach translation less idealistically and admit. yes, even celebrate difference, then the task becomes a world of possibilities'(224).

Both volumes are pregnant with fruitful and inspiring ideas and will be appreciated by all those seriously interrested in Semitic and Arabic linguistics, and Arabic literature.

Ladislav Drozdík

BOUDELAA, Sami (Ed.): *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XVI.* Papers from the Sixteenth Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics. Cambridge, March 2002. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006. p. 181. ISBN 90 272 4780 3.

The eight papers, selected for publication in the present volume, were presented at the sixteenth annual symposium on Arabic linguistics which took place in March 2002, in Cambridge University. Except one article, dealing with Maltese, the contributions cover a variety of interesting linguistic issues in Arabic.

Georges Bohas (École Normal Supérieure, Lyon, 'The organization of the lexicon in Arabic and other Semitic languages', p. 1-37), starting from the assumption that the (triliteral) root fails to account for phonetic and semantic relationships between lexical units, examines the problem of lexical organization in Arabic from a really vast and impressive perspective. The nearly synonymous group of words, labelled 'paradigm i', such as *matā, mata'a (2x), matana,* with a general meaning 'stretching and/or lengthening', is related to three different roots: √*mty,* √*mt'*(2x), and √*mtn.* To cure the discrepancy between the identity of meaning and the diversity of roots, a competitive notion of *etymon* is introduced. The latter denotes a binary composition of consonantal phonemes shared by all members of the group, in this case *mt* (p. 4). In what the author calls paradigm ii, the binary etymon is subsequently reduced to one-consonant common to a markedly larger group linked to the 'semic nucleus', in this case *m.* The paradigm i units, reappearing in paradigm ii, are completed by *madda, matta, matala* and *matā* (p. 5). The semantic contours of the semic nucleus are markedly mistier here and their features of identity are less convincing. At the root level, the author argues, these phonetico-semantic generalizations cannot be obtained (ibid.).

For all the innovative ideas emanating from this highly interesting reinvestigation and further elaboration of the time-honoured theories of biliteralism (Mayer Lambert, Gesenius, Philippi - to mention only some of their 19th century pioneers), it is hardly possible to accept the author´s characterization of the (consonantal) root in terms of an 'obsolete grammatical tool ... invented by Arab grammarians and used by them to describe their language' (p. 6). Ousting the root from the inventory of basic concepts in all branches of Semitic lingustics is thoroughly unacceptable:

- the root, and only the root, may be unambiguously distinguished from the ablaut-marking intra-root morpheme, mostly referred to as *pattern,* which is operative in internal processes of inflection and derivation; the IE ablaut is a one-morpheme internal process involving the root alone, while the Semitic ablaut, at the minimum stem level, is a matter of two autonomous morphemes: roots and patterns;

- furthermore, the root or rather its quadriliteral limit, signals the dividing line between internal (pattern-marked) and external (affix-marked) processes: at the quantitative upper end of four radicals, it closes the domain of internal processes and opens that of unsegmentable root-words with external processes as their unique option.

It cannot be denied that the 19th century fascination with the spectacular successes achieved in Indo-European linguistics left recognizable traces in the theory and methodology of Semitic linguistics. It is true that a depreciative attitude towards root, similar to that quoted above, may be found in several master-pieces of modern Semitic linguistics, among others in Brocklemann´s *Grundriss:* [1] ´Mit der ... "Wurzel" bezeichnet man die drei Konsonanten, an denen der gemeinsame Grundbegriff einer Wortgruppe haftet. ... Aber wie diese Reihenfolge für die wissenschaftliche Lautlehre nicht nur unpraktisch, sondern geradezu ein Hemmschuh wäre, so ist auch der Begriff der Wurzel für die Formenlehre unbrauchbar. Diese hat vielmehr auszugehn von den Wortformen, die nachweislich eine eigene Existenz geführt haben oder noch führen. Die Analyse der nominalen und der verbalen Ausdrucksmittel fürt uns schließlich auf gewisse einfache Grundformen, die wir nach dem Vorgang der Indogermanisten "Basen" nennen´.

Episodic adoption of the latter attitude had no lasting effect on Brockelmann´s work and, two years later, we read: "Almost all words in Semitic languages may be reduced to sets whose common fundamental meaning is attached to three consonants. This base is normally called the ´root´." [2]

Ignoring the root as an arrangement principle in lexicography would have, no doubt, rather unwanted consequences: introducing a large number of conjectural issues in the search for units displaying semantic identity or similarity and in their presentation as entries; eroding the root-based simplicity and transparency, the result of work protracted through several centuries. The root-based arrangement which clearly prevails in modern Arabic lexicons of Western provenance, was used successfully for the first time by Zamaḫšarī (1075-1144) in his somewhat specialized lexicon *Asās al-balāġa.*[3] Nevertheless, the latter did not succeed in replacing the earlier rhyme arrangement which survived through several subsequent centuries in great classical lexicons: *Lisān al-ᶜArab,* by Ibn Manẓūr (d. 1311), *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ,* by al-Fīrūzābādī (d. 1414) and *Tāǧ al-ᶜarūs,* by Murtaḍā az-Zabīdī (d. 1791). The first native lexicon to use the modern root arrangement is the famous *Muḥīṭ al-muḥīṭ,* by Buṭrus al-Bustānī (d. 1883). The prolog to the lexicon gives advice to all those who might experience problems in using the root-arranged lexicons with the author´s deep conviction that the users will be able to follow the instruction: *´iḏā ši´ta kašfa lafẓatin fa-´iḏā kānat muǧarradatan fa-ṭlubhā fī bābi ´awwali ḥarfin minhā wa-´iḏā kānat mazīdatan fa-ǧarridhā ´awwalan min az-zawā´id ṯumma-ṭlubhā fī bābi l-ḥarfi l-´awwali mimmā baqiya (Muḥīṭ al-muḥīṭ, Fātiḥat al-kitāb).*

---

[1] BROCKELMANN, C. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, p. 286-7.
[2] BROCKELMANN, C. Précis de linguistique sémitique, translated from German by W. Marçais et M. Cohen, p. 13, in the book reviewed p. 3.
[3] HAYWOOD, J.A. Arabic Lexicography, p. 106.

The plural of paucity and its treatment by Arab and Western scholars is studied by Ignacio Ferrando (University of Cadiz, 'The plural of paucity in Arabic and its actual scope', p. 39-61). Besides singular, dual and plural, Arabic has a special number category, known as plural of paucity (PP), to denote a small number of objects counted. The notion of 'small number' refers to an interval from 3 to 10. The study comes to the conclusion that despite the firmly rooted concept of PP in the minds of early Arab grammarians, the opposition PP-PA (plural of abundance, i.e. regular plural) covers only a very limited number of plural patterns which seems to prove that PP cannot be taken for a living and truly productive linguistic entity (p. 50).

Were it not better explained in phonetic terms, the relevance of the PP-PA opposition might perhaps be supported by the evidence drawn from some colloquial varieties of Arabic where two series of numeral phrases in the interval 3-10 co-occur:

Cairo Arabic:

PP: *talat t-ušhur*   PA: *talat šuhūr* '3 months'

PP: *ḫamas t-iyyām*   *ḫamas 'ayyām* (with the same theoretical PP unmodified). [4]

Andrew Freeman (University of Michigan, 'Why there is no koiné in Sanᶜā', Yemen', p. 63-82) tries to answer the question whether or not a koiné was in progress in Sanᶜā'. In spite of serious reasons for predicting koinéization in Sanᶜā', due to the massive migration through the last 30 years, the analysis of relevant data provided reliable evidence for the lack of koiné in the region examined. The data collected confirmed that no variety of Yemeni Arabic is deprived of recognizable traces of its local dialectal identity.

Two contributions by Michael Ingleby (University of Huddersfield) and Fatmah A. Baothman (King Abdulaziz University, 'Empty nuclei in Arabic speech patterns and the diacritic sukuun, p. 83-94) and ('Representing coarticulation processes in Arabic speech', p. 95- 102) deal with various phonological issues in Classical Arabic.

Salwa A. Kamel ('The textual component in Classical Arabic. Investigating information structure, p. 103-130) analyses characteristics of the information structure in Arabic and compares them with those in English. The comparison confirmed that, in creating focal emphasis in the message, Classical Arabic resorts to the process of preposing while English makes use of a phonological process of tonicity. The author's findings are confronted with the theories of native scholars as well as with those current in Western linguistics.

Gender differences in implementation of the phonemic opposition between the coronal plosive /t/ and its emphatic counterpart /ṭ/ in Jordanian Arabic are submitted to an auditory and acoustic analysis by Ghada Khattab (University of Newcastle), Feda At-Tamimi (Jordan University of Science and Technology) and Barry Heselwood (University of Leeds) in the paper 'Acoustic and auditory differences in the /t /-/ṭ / opposition in male and female speakers of Jordanian Arabic', p. 131-160).

In contrast to the Arabic phonemes, lost in Maltese pronunciation but maintained in spelling, such as /għ/ < Arabic /ᶜ/, voiced pharyngeal fricative, as in *boghod,* pronounced *boot,* < Arabic *buᶜd* 'distance', the Arabic consonant phonemes with

---

[4] For the examples quoted cf. MITCHELL, T.F. An Introduction to Egyptian Colloquial Arabic, p. 62-3; Woidich, M. Das Kairenisch-Arabische. Eine Grammatik, p. 129.

pharyngeal coarticulation, like ṣ, ṭ, ẓ, ḍ, disappeared in Maltese both as phonetic entities and as spelling symbols. And yet some secondary traces these emphatics have left in Maltese recall the Arabic etymology and constitute the topic of Mary Ann Walter´s (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) contribution ´Pharyngealization effects in Maltese Arabic´ (161-181).[5] The study provides evidence that the coarticulatory effect of pharyngealization of ´emphatic´ consonants on neighbouring vowels led to easily recognizable acoustic differences in these vowels. The newly developed phonemic contrast in the vowel inventory substituted for the etymological phonemic contrast in the consonant inventory (p. 163). As against Arabic, written in *scriptio defectiva*, deprived of short-vowel alphabetic symbols, Maltese is written in Latin script and a Romanized orthography which makes the control of the vowel-bound phonemic contrast perfectly possible:

vowel-bound contrast of Maltese: consonant-bound contrast in Arabic:

/a/ - /e/:   /ṣ/ - /s/:

saif   *ṣaif* ´summer´

seif   *saif* ″sword´

basal   *baṣal* ´onions´

kasel   *kasal* ´laziness´ (p. 164).

The study offers further details and surveys a number of older and recent studies dealing with this issue.

Finally, some words of value. The present volume, as a valuable piece of scholarship and a worthy contribution to the thematic and methodological innovation of Arabic linguistics, follows the challenging tradition of the *Perspectives* series. The phonological heritage of Arabic, observable in Maltese vocalism, will no doubt further widen the sphere of future readers.

LadislavDrozdík

REFERENCES

AQUILINA, J. *Maltese, Teach Yourself Books.* London : The English Universities Press Ltd. 1965. 240 p.

AQUILINA, J. *Papers in Maltese linguistics.* Valletta : The Royal University of Malta, 1961. 240 p.

BROCKELMANN, C. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, I Bd. Berlin : Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1908. 665 p.

BROCKELMANN, C. *Précis de linguistique sémitique, translated from German by W. Marçais et M. Cohen.* Paris : Geuthner, 1910

HAYWOOD, J.A. *Arabic Lexicography.* Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1965. 147 p.

MITCHELL, T.F. *An Introduction to Egyptian Colloquial Arabic.* London : Oxford University Press, 1960. 285 p.

---

[5] AQUILINA, J. Maltese, p. 14; cf. also AQUILINA, J. Papers in Maltese linguistics (Chapter: Some historical phonetic changes in Maltese).