

Pierre Larcher, Le système verbal de l'arabe classique. 2^e édition revue et augmentée. Aix-en-Provence 2012. Presses Universitaires de Provence. 186 pp. ISBN 978-2-85399-841-3.

This is the second revised and augmented edition of the book which originally appeared in 2003 and was reviewed e.g. by Wolfdietrich Fischer (ZDMG 160, 2010, pp. 173-176). The main novelty is that the first chapter entitled 'Paradigms' has been considerably enlarged to give students of Classical and of the Modern Literary Arabic a detailed account of verbal paradigms in Arabic script and in transcription. By the way: is there an explanation for students why later in the book pausal forms are transcribed in case of participles and verbal nouns, e.g. *mufā'il*, *fi'āl*, *mufā'ala* etc. (p. 57)? On the other hand sometimes there are non-pausal forms, e.g. *'al-Qāhīrat* on p. 116 and *qāla* instead of *qāl* before the pause marking direct speech on p. 135, example No. 2. I think that the transcription of long vowels in *verba ultimae* *w* and *ultimae* *y* as <uw> and <iy>, e.g. *saru-w* instead of *sarū* (p. 27) is controversial. In the new edition in chapter No. X more attention has been devoted to the *iqṭalla* derived class and there is more on negation (especially *mā fa'ala*) in chapter No. XVI. There are also some modifications and additions elsewhere. There is no doubt that this is a very good synthesis and textbook especially as far as verbal derivation is concerned, although we have also the third volume devoted to the verbal group of the monumental syntax of the modern literary Arabic by Hashem El-Ayoubi, Wolfdietrich Fischer and Michael Langer (Syntax der Arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart, Teil II: Die Verbalgruppe, Wiesbaden 2010. Reichert Verlag) and an important big 'Modern Literary Arabic – a Reference Grammar' by Ron Buckley, Beirut 2004, Librairie du Liban Publishers.

I have some more and some less important remarks. P. 14: from a synchronic point of view it is possible to consider imperative and 'injunctive'/jussive of the 2nd persons as stylistic variants but not from a diachronic point of view! P. 17: variants like *yaqduru/yaqdiru* (with some verbs there are three possible vocalizations!) may show that at a prehistoric stage the vocalization of the preterite/jussive and of imperfect/'inaccompli' or of subjunctive was different. P. 48-49: there is a serious risk that some traditional examples of the 'intensive' meaning of *fa'ala* forms are to some extent artificial, created by grammarians to confirm the initial presumption, e.g. *qattala* 'to massacre' and *kassara* 'to break into many pieces'. To this subchapter I should have given the title 'Multiplicative function' rather than traditional 'Intensive'. There should be a mention of *Aktionsart* variants like in the example *gallaqtu l-abwāba* in which the 'distributive' meaning ('one after another', see also p. 51 and 60) is rather lexically conditioned. P. 50: factitive (which is not the same as causative!) verbs are denominative! P. 57-58: I do not think that a semantic difference between verbal nouns *fi'āl* and *mufā'ala* can be

ascribed simply to their different morphological derivation and shape or even syntactic relations. Derivation is largely irregular and the final semantic outcome depends on many factors, like chronology, morphological and purely semantic resemblance, frequency of use etc. E.g. *jihād* ‘holy war’ occurs in the Koran but *mujāhada* does not being probably later even in comparison with *mujāhid* which is found in the Koran; *jihād* is both morphologically and semantically connected with *qitāl* being its euphemistic variant. *Mufā‘ala* (identical with the feminine passive participle!) is usually considered to be more common than *fi‘āl* which is, by default, more expressive. P. 58-59: the author is right saying that the classical example *qātala-hu* ‘he was trying, making efforts to kill him’ is rather improbable. It is either a rather artificial construction of grammarians or it may illustrate a secondary use of original multiplicative and pluractional *fā‘ala* not with plural but with a singular subject. The meaning ‘insistence’ is one of the secondary features of the main features ‘repetition, durativity, continuity etc.’ which *fā‘ala* (in prehistorical period a variant of *fa‘ala*) still preserves. In case of telic verbs repetition, continuation of action, especially with singular object, may automatically mean ‘insistence, striving, perseverance’ etc. and this was the reason why *fā‘ala* has been given the label ‘conative’ although there are examples to the contrary, e.g. *qātala-humu llāh* ‘God confound them!’ (Koran 9:30). The French label ‘*action efficiente/action sur*’ applied by Henri Fleisch pertains to a lexically conditioned feature only of some verbs. In case of stative verbs *fā‘ala* forms are transitive with a clear causative and factitive tint which is a link with the causative and factitive functions of *fa‘ala*. P. 66: ‘*‘aqtaltu-hu* can be well translated into English as ‘I had him killed’. P. 68-69 class IV verbs with ‘*la valeur tropative*’ are transitive denominal verbs – ‘estimative’ function being a variant of factitive, see also p. 73. P. 89: ‘*valeur simulative*’ of, e.g. *tamārada* ‘to pretend to be ill; to feign illness, to malingering’ is not due to a double value of insistence and reflexivity but rather reflexivity and factivity while the feature ‘contrary to the actual state of affairs’ is also lexically conditioned. P. 94: ‘estimative’ *istaf‘ala* forms are denominative. Double meanings like in case of *istakbara* which with direct object can be transitive and thus factitive/‘estimative’ (*istakbara-hu* ‘he deemed him great/important’) but without direct object intransitive/self-estimative (*huwa stakbara* ‘he was/became proud, haughty; he displayed arrogance’) and this double function suggests that at a prehistoric stage there could be **istaf‘ala* and **itsaf‘ala* which coalesced due to phonetic reasons. On *istaf‘ala* there is also the article by Karel Keller ‘Der X. Verbalstamm und seine Funktion im modernen Arabisch’, in ‘Studies in Near Eastern Languages’ and Literatures – Memorial Volume of Karel Petrůček’, ed. by Petr Zemánek, Praha 1996, pp. 297-309. P. 119-120 : on *if‘alla* class going back not only to Proto-Semitic but also to Proto-Hamitosemitic/Afroasiatic, see now my paper ‘Towards a reconstruction of verbal derivation in Afroasiatic/Hamitosemitic: R3/D3 or *iqṭalla* class’, in ‘Archaism and Innovation in the Semitic Languages’, ed.

by J.P. Monferrer Sala and W.G.E. Watson, Cordoba 2013, 195-203. P. 144: the author correctly says that the future meaning of the Perfect *nādā* ‘he will shout’ (by the way: this is a good example of *fā‘ala* without any ‘conative’ feature!) is due to the adverb ‘on the day of Resurrection’ but I do not think that it is necessary to make a difference between a simple human prediction of possibility and a divine prophecy of irrevocable future. P. 147: I do not think that modal Subjunctive *yaf‘al-a* should be structurally opposed to *fa‘ala*. Modal uses of *fa‘ala* as optative are secondary, i.e. depend on the perfective function like in many other languages. P. 157: in Modern Literary Arabic *mā fā‘al(a)* and *lam yaf‘al* are stylistic variants (like in Classical Arabic of older periods) but *lam yaf‘al* has a decisively ‘literary’, ‘bookish’ and even ‘snobbish’ flavor not only because it has disappeared from spoken dialects. There is very little on the use of Energetics in the part on tense, aspect and mode (pp. 133-162) as well as active participles.

I can imagine a third edition of this very useful book with more examples from modern literary texts.

Andrzej Zaborski

Warwick Danks, The Arabic Verb – Form and Meaning in the Vowel-Lengthening Patterns. Amsterdam – Philadelphia 2011. John Benjamins. XVIII + 281 pp. ISBN 978-90-271-1573-4.

This is a revised version of a doctoral thesis and it deals with the subject indicated in the subtitle, i.e. the III or *qātala* and the VI or *taqattala* derived verbs in Arabic, practically in Modern Literary Arabic. The former verbs are usually defined as ‘conative’ and the latter are usually considered as their ‘reciprocal’ forms and there is an incomplete synopsis of opinions by different scholars on pp. 66-69 where, e.g. the basic studies by Henri Fleisch and Larcher, not to mention my 2006 paper, are not mentioned. Danks brings another statistical scrutiny of the actual occurrence of the derived verbs on the basis of the 4th edition of the English version of Wehr’s dictionary and the results differ very little from the results published by McCarthy and Prince (1990) as well as al-Qahtani (2003 and 2005). I do not think that Bohas’s theory of ‘Matrices, etymons and radicals’ really deserved discussion since it is basically wrong especially in its (pseudo)etymological part.

Danks assumes that the main semantic feature of *qātala* verbs is ‘mutuality’ and in Table 27. he suggests that out of 465 *qātala* forms 361 verbs have this feature while 104 do not. He himself admits that he has tended towards a liberal interpretation of mutuality, e.g. he has counted the form *‘āwana* ‘to help, assist