ON THE MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC SYNTAX

Ladislav DROZDÍK
Institute of Oriental and African Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Klemensova 19, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia

The author deals with the Modern Written Arabic syntax. The book under discussion is: EL-AYOUBI, Hashem – FISCHER, Wolfdietrich – LANGER, Michael: *Syntax der arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart* (Syntax of Modern Written Arabic), Part I, vol. 1. Das Nomen und sein Umfeld (Noun and its Syntactic Context). In collaboration with Dieter Blohm and Zafer Youssef produced and edited by Wolfdietrich Fischer. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag 2001. xxiv + 543 pp. ISBN: 3-89500-220-8.

Syntax der arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart (*Syntax*, in what follows) is a well-documented description of the Modern Written Arabic syntax. The attribute Modern (*Gegenwartssprache*), associated with Written Arabic (*Arabische Schriftsprache*), does not merely mark a distinction from Classical Arabic, it locates the language described to the real time within an interval between 1950 and the date of completing the volume. Modernity, as defined by this interval, is strictly observed and the chronological limit of 1950 is violated only in a few exceptional cases.

As an empirically based systematic description of the MWA syntax, the work follows the best German tradition in analysing and systematizing grammatical, inclusive of specifically syntactic phenomena of synthetic Arabic (for Classical Arabic syntax, Reckendorf 1898, 1921; comparative Semitic, Brockelmann 1908, 1913; as well as excellent, pedagogically minded essentials from the Porta linguarum orientalium series: Socin 1899, or its innovated versions, appearing in numerous editions in both parts of postwar Germany). 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 systematized phenomena, based on sound methodological principles. The way it distinguishes between what can be accepted as standard and what cannot is another feature worth following. The present volume offers an entirely new approach to the MWA syntax, both conceptually and methodologically, and it cannot be viewed as merely

a chronological extension or material completion and refreshment of a few earlier works (D.V. Semenov 1941; V. Cantarino 1974-1975).

The monograph consists of the following paragraphs:

(1) With substantives (1.1), the highly problematic subclass of compounds (nominale Komposita (1.1.2)) is presented. In principle, compounds are incompatible with the root-and-pattern system of Semitic and they are largely avoided in Arabic word-formation. Assuming that nominal compounds consist of several autonomous nominals (in Arabic never exceeding two), identifiable by their roots (Greenberg IJAL, 1960) , a number of examples quoted do not seem to satisfy this assumption, namely nominal or verbal units incorporating various types of particles, pronouns and prepositions, like:

yā + naṣīb > (*al-*) *yānaṣīb*;

mā + ǧarā > (*al-*) *māǧarayāt* (no structurally equivalent singular is possible);

lā + /adjective/ or substantive: *lā + šuʿūr* > (*al-*) *lāšuʿūr* ; *lā + šay'* > (*al-*) *lāšay'* ; *lā + dīnī* > *lādīnī* (unquoted); similarly: (*al-*) *lā'inḥiyāzī*, equalling the syntactic *ǧayr (al-)munḥāz;* (*al-*) *lā'inḥiyāzīya,* co-occurring with its syntactic counterpart *ʿadam al-inḥiyāz*, etc.

As against the traditional interpretation in terms of compounding (Bieławski, Rocz. Orient. 1956; Monteil 1960; Fleisch 1956-1968; 1961; including myself in *Asian and African Studies* 1967), all these and similar units seem to be more consistently treated as rootwords, like any other units going beyond the quadriliteral limit, i.e. structures no longer segmentable into roots and patterns.

As evident, there are problems even with some true compounds, like *ra'smāl* whose compoundness may be attested both structurally (two roots : one word) and distributionally (*ar-ra'smāl,* as against the syntactic *ra's al-māl; ra'smāl-ī, -īya*). Affected by the impact of quadriliteral constraint, *ra'smāl* is incapable of forming a structurally equivalent plural of its own, the latter being supplemented by a quadriliteralized noncompound *rasāmīl* (Wehr) or a syntactic *ru'ūs al-'amwāl.* The same holds true of some other compounds of similar pattern.

For Arabic, an even higher level of consistency could apparently be attained by ignoring the acknowledged structural definition of compoundness (several roots within one word) altogether, at least so with lexical units exceeding the quadriliteral limit, like *ra'smāl, ʿirqsūs, qā'im-maqām / qā'imaqām,* etc., and by requalifying them in terms of (monomorphemic) rootwords, too. In the latter case, compounds could possibly be included in an accessory, hierarchically lower classification of rootwords as one of their structural types.

A similar approach to compounding would create a new, classificatorily highly relevant duality around the quadriliteral limit, as its criterial point. The classification of compounds based on this bipartition, would yield the following picture:

(monomorphemic) rootwords:	(multimorphemic) quadriliteralized structures:
ra'smāl	*rasmāl,* and its (internal) inflections (i) and derivations (d):
	(i): *rasāmīl*
	(d): *rasmal* (v), *rasmala* (vn), *tarasmal, tarasmul,* etc.

(*al-*) *lāšay'*   (d): *lāšā, mulāšāh, talāšin,* etc.;
yānaṣīb, ʿirqsūs, etc.   no quadriliteralized structures available.

In this way, the compounds-related dichotomy of mono- and multimorphemic units would extend the list of words, mostly terms of foreign origin, undergoing the process of quadriliteralization (the term is here synonymously used with that of 'structural assimilation'), like:

kardīnāl   (i) *karādila*
tarǧumān   (i) *tarāǧima*
                                        (d) *tarǧam, tarǧama, mutarǧim, mutarǧam*
televizyōn, talavizyōn   (d) *talfaz, talfaza, tilfāz,* etc.

(2) The term *Prädikament* (0.3.2.3. Verbalgruppe /24/) is a relatively acceptable, even if not quite ideal, modern substitute for the traditional 'Zustandsakkusativ' (*ḥāl*). Arabists, publishing in English, are still in search for a way to free themselves from mediaeval relics (cf., e.g. the Cambridge edition of Schulz-Krahl-Reuschel 2000: 393: the *ḥāl* accusative). Conceived as a supplementary or accessory predicate (*Nebenprädikat*), the term finds both conceptual and terminological support in its close association with the predicate. And yet it substantially differs from the latter and the distinction between the two crucial terms, *prädikament* and *prädikat,* does not seem to be sufficiently clear and explicit in its *Syntax* presentation (at least in the evidence provided in Vol. i).

Prädikament /P/ is said to refer to a nominal: subject, object or other sentence part (24). A *Prädikament,* however, is a sentence part of double reference: (1) to a nominal /N/ (of whatever syntactic function: *syntactic substantive,* in the Czech terminological tradition); formal evidence: its agreement with the coreferential nominal in all noun-related inflectional categories subject to agreement), and (2) to the verb /V/ (*fiʿl*), as far as we are speaking about a verbal sentence; formally attested by an invariable (indefinite) accusative.

The N/V – P relationship is that of modification.

Prädikat, here nominal predicate (Pn) in verbalized nominal sentences (*ḥabar kān*), is a term of single reference to the subject (S). The coreference with the verbal component of Pn /VPn/ (*kāna wa 'aḫawātuhā*), though also formally marked by an invariable accusative, is actually prevented by the semantic vacancy of the VPn.

The S – Pn relationship is that of predication.

From this point of view, we find somewhat disturbing to see both these radically different relationships, N/V – P and S – Pn, indiscriminately united under the common formal marker *prädikative Akkusativ:* "Der prädikative Akkusativ . . . markiert die nominalen Prädikate bei Prädikationsverben sowie die nominalen Prädikamente – *kāna l-wazīru ǧā'iban / daḫala l-wazīru mubtasiman*" (1.2.1.3. B. Der prädikative Akkusativ /56/).

Unless interpreting *Prädikament* formally, as a sentence part merely operating in the predicative context, the possibility of a misleading functional implication may cast some shadow even on this innovative term.

(3) Several important conceptual and terminological innovations have also been introduced to the structural domain of complex sentences which have re-

ceived quite noteworthy attention even in the present, noun-related volume of the *Syntax*. Syntactic structures, associated with relativization, seemingly display the major part of innovative elements: redefinitions of a number of basic concepts, their hierarchical rearrangement with a subsequent adjustment of the related terminology. Some attention will be paid to the relative structures in the present review, too.

(3.1) The following list of symbols, reflecting the way of dealing with the relative structures we find optimal, has to secure verbal economy and to add some transparency to the following comments:

A : antecedent, head noun / *Bezugsnomen, Kernnomen (Syntax)*;

The term and related symbol are used conventionally, irrespective of the order of coreferential term, A and R, with regard to each other:

A...R (postnominal, progressive, typical of Arabic);

R...A (prenominal, regressive, atypical of Arabic and, moreover, largely hypothetical). Since R, as a semantically void structural element whose unique function is to secure the linkage of clauses in a complex sentence, is here typically absent; it represents, in the R...A syntactic structures, the A-preceding (attributive) modifier itself, in whatever form compatible with this function (see further on in the text).

The position of A in the complex sentence depends on the structural type of the RC that modifies it: the A belongs to the main clause in A~R syntactic contexts while, in AR contexts, it is a member of the RC in the form of an (AR) complex;

R : (a) relative pronoun *alladī*, written unhyphenated /*Relativpronomen, Satzdeterminator (Syntax)*/, operating in A~R – RCs, may be expressed in two different ways in accordance with the definiteness state of A:

A definite: R = R,
A indefinite: R = 0;[1]

---

[1] The definiteness-state dependence constraint may be represented by various other constraints, accidentally occurring across languages, that Arabic deals with by means specific to its structural type. In English, for instance, the occurrence of R or its deletion is controlled by the syntactic function it plays in the RC:

(R/object): the R may be either explicitly expressed or deleted, as in:

　(R): *the man who/that X saw;*

　(0): *the man X saw;* as against:

(R/subject): the R cannot be deleted unless thereby inactivating relativization:

　(R): *the man who/that saw X;*

　(0): * *the man saw X* (Borsley 1999: 128, 208, adapted).

In Arabic, the function-dependence of R is satisfactorily treated by the presence or absence of pronominal back-reference indicators (illustrated on AR-RCs):

(AR) *alladīna* : subject/subject (those/who) – no back reference needed:

　alladīna kafarū bi-llāhi wa rusulihi . . . 'ulā'ika humu l-kāfirūna ḥaqqan "those who believe not in God and His apostles . . . are verily the real unbelievers" (GvG 2: 579 /shortened/: Q 4: 149);

(b) relative pronouns, operating in AR – RCs, like *alladī, man* or *mā,* are not subject to the latter definiteness-state constraint;

R, in A~R syntactic environments, is treated as a constitutive part of the subordinate clause (viz., RC, see below), as against some opposite theories (Reckendorf 1921: 426; *Syntax* 29) that classify it as a member of the main clause);

AR : conjunctive syntactic context in which coreferential terms, A and R, are fused together in one single structural unit referred to as (AR) complex;

A~R : disjunctive syntactic context where coreferential terms, A and R, represent autonomous structural units;

(AR) complex : see AR above;

AR – RC : conjunctive relative clause, i.e. RC operating in an AR syntactic context /AR – RCs: *Relativsätze* (*Syntax* 29; Fischer 2002: 131, 187); *substantivische Relativsätze* (Reckendorf 1921: 420, 435); *Relativsätze welche keinem Nomen beigegeben sind* (Socin 1899: 124-125; Brockelmann 1969: 185-186); AR-RCs display a variety of syntactic functions including that of an attributive modifier;

A~R – RC : disjunctive relative clause, i.e. RC operating in an A~R syntactic context / A~R – RCs: *Attributsätze* (*Syntax* 29; Fischer 2002: 131, 187); *adjektivische Relativsätze* (Reckendorf 1921: 420, 435); *Relativsätze welche die Qualifikation eines Nomen bilden* (Socin 1899: 124-125; Brockelmann 1969: 185-186);

RC – relative clause; RCs may be subdivided into two basic structural types: AR – RCs (see above), and
A~R – RCs (see ibid.);

RP – referent pronoun, back-reference marker: a pronoun referring back to A / *rückbezügliches Pronomen* (Socin 1899: 126); *rückweisendes Personalpronomen* (Reckendorf 1921: 415); *zurückweisendes Pronomen* (*GvG* 2: 556); *Rückweis (im Relativsatz)* (ibid. 556, 557, 582);

*

(4) Relying on the above conception of relativization, as reflected in its very basic notions and related structural types, we cannot fully agree with certain classificatory issues and terminological innovations occurring in the *Syntax.*

(4.1) The incorporation of R (*Satzdeterminator: alladī,* etc., /412; 29/) in the main clause (MC) in what we classify as A~R syntactic contexts, seems to create a number of theoretical problems. The theory is apparently based upon a

---

(AR) *alladayni :* object/subject (those/who) – no back reference needed:
'arinā lladayni 'adallānā min al-ǧinni wa l-'insi "show us those among the jinns and men who had led us astray" (Reckendorf 1921: 441: Q 41: 29);

(AR) *alladīna :* subject/object (those/to whom) – back reference needed:
alladīna 'aʿṭaynāhumu l-kitāba yaʿrifūnahu "those to whom We have given the Book know it distinctly" (*GvG* 2: 567: Q 6: 19), etc.

96

unique argument: the agreement of the 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 immovability of the R, within what we classify as (AR), from the subordinate clause (SC) can be seen even more convincingly in AR – syntactic contexts where the (AR) complex is inseparably bound with the structural domain of the SC:

alladīna kafarū bi-llāhi wa rusulihi . . . 'ulā'ika humu l-kāfirūna ḥaqqan "those who believe not in God and His apostles . . . are verily the real unbelievers" (*GvG* 2: 579 : *Q* 4: 149),[2] etc.

The agreement of *alladī* with the coreferential A, irrespective of the function it plays in the SC (*ḫilāla s-sanatayni llatayni talatā-ntihā'a l-ḥarbi* /412/), does not seem to be a really compelling argument for a consequential structural reshaping of the theory of complex sentence in the A~R syntactic context, like that suggested in the *Syntax* (29).

Furthermore, in RCs with topicalized sentence parts, the agreement modelled by the priority of form over the function is being regularly inactivated, as in *'inna ᶜammayya lladāni qatalā l-mulūka* "my two uncles (are those who) killed the kings" (*GvG* 2: 565: Aḫtal).

The theoretical relocation of *alladī* from the SC to MC, in A~R syntactic contexts, would lead 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. Not to speak about the undue addition of a lexically void linking element to the semantic content of the MC.

It seems that it would be less disturbing to offer another explanation of the somewhat atypical behaviour of *alladī,* as formally attested by its dual-related case-agreement. Perhaps the simplest (the question is whether acceptably consistent) solution would perhaps be to recognize the priority of form, imposed by the A to the R across the clause boundaries, while the true function-carrying substitute of the formally-featured *alladī* would only be tacitly assumed, as in: *ra'aytu r-raǧulayni lladayni (humā) fī baytikum* (with a cross-clausal boundary between *ar-raǧulayni* and *alladayni*). It must be recognized, however, that the gain achieved, if any, does not seem to be particularly significant. A fully consistent solution of this problem apparently does not exist at all.

(4.2) The concord-based theory of the MC membership of *alladī* makes it somewhat difficult to argue against granting the same dominant competence to the agreement of another type of determinator modelled by not quite unambiguous concord patterns, like the definiteness marker *al-,* for instance, operating in the structural domain of *Satzadjektive* /*Syntax* 35/ or what Diem calls *adjektivische Sätze* (1998). Since the bound-morpheme status of *al-* , as against the free-morpheme *alladī,* prevents a direct comparison, *al-* will be analysed as a part of the nominals it introduces.

---

[2] See note 1 above.

Both types of determinator reflect a sort of concord with the A:

alladī, as a definiteness marking element, agrees with the A in definiteness (indefiniteness being signalled by its deletion), number (singular, dual, plural), and gender (masculine and feminine); the case agreement is limited to the dual (nominative and oblique);

al- , as a definiteness marker, introduces nominals that agree with the A in definiteness and case, and with the subject of what *Syntax* qualifies as *Satzadjektiv,* in gender and number.

The reduced range of agreement in *alladī* (the full agreement being restricted to the dual) is faced, with the *al-*introduced nominals, with a split agreement, as indicated above. If the formally limited agreement of *alladī* can support a hardly acceptable theory (apparently shared also by Reckendorf 1921: 426), what can be deduced from the split agreement of the *al-*introduced relative structures? In the following examples the R will be marked by underlining:

(a) R~A – RCs (*Attributsätze*):

allatī : al-fawākihu llatī taʿmuhā ḥulwun (411), definite,

        fawākihu taʿmuhā ḥulwun /ibid./, indefinite, contrasting with:

(b) sentence-type head-modifier relative structures (*Satzadjektive*):

al-: al-fawākihu l-ḥulwu taʿmuhā, in: *'uḥibbu l-fawākiha l-ḥulwa taʿmuhā* (35), definite,

        fawākihu ḥulwun taʿmuhā /ibid./, indefinite, or, for gender contrast:

        ra'aytu l-mar'ata l-ǧamīla waǧhuhā (187),

        zurnā l-qaṣra l-muqīmata fīhi l-'amīratu (36), etc.

At least some (unanswered) questions related to the (b)-type relative structures:[3] Is the definiteness- and case-agreement equivalent to that based on gender and number? Is this equivalence (or its lack) reflected in that of the syntactic relationships it represents?

(4.2.1) As trivial as these questions may appear at the first glance, they will certainly reappear, even with more insistence and legitimacy, with constructions of similar type whose A is deleted, as in:

(*lā taṭlubhu min*) *al-qāsiyati qulūbuhum* "don't ask it from those whose hearts are hardened (*GvG* 561: Ġazālī, *'Iḥyā* iii, 291,8), or:

(*mā 'antum bi-*) *l-manqūṣati ʿuqūlukum* "you are not those whose intellect had been shattered" (ib. 562: *'Iḥyā* iii, 244, 21);

Since the A left its trace in the form of a back-reference pronominal indicator (*-hum, -kum* in the above examples), functioning now as an A-substitute preceded by an attributive modifier, a sort of atypical prenominal (R...A) structure will be the result. Since, in terms of this assumption, there is no explicitly expressed R in this syntactic context either, the feature of prenominalness, i.e. the

---

[3] The latter class of attributive modifiers will include a variety of structural types obtained by nominalization of RCs, known as 'attraction' (*Attraktion:* Reckendorf 1921, Brockelmann 1913), *conversion* (Holes 1995), *reduction* (Wise 1975) or, finally, as 'embedding by means of adjectivizing' (*Syntax 34: Einbettung durch Adjektivierung*).

regressive nature of these structures, is derived from the position of the attributive modifier in front of the pronominal A-substitute, represented by a bound morpheme.

The concord-independence of *al-* of the assumed A-substitute (*-hum /-kum* in the previous examples) may convincingly be attested by the indefinite variants of these and similar relative structures, like *qawla ḥazīnin qalbuhu* "in the words of that whose heart is grieved" (*GvG* 2, 561: Abū Firās).

Of course, the prenominal structure presented, actually no more than a tentative construct of an assumption, cannot bear comparison with regressive structures compatible with the typological characteristics of some left-branching languages, like those known, say, in the Altaic linguistic family.[4] The comparison, if ventured for all that, can never go beyond a quite accidental structural likeness. In the linguistic awareness of the Arab language users, the A will invariably be present and located in front of what is modified, irrespective of whether explicitly expressed or not. The statement holds for all evolutional variants of Arabic and knows of no exception. The previously quoted Classical Arabic example *qawla ḥazīnin qalbuhu,* will be, with a high degree of certainty, perceived by a native speaker in its progressively structured A-integrated transform, like *qawla* (raġulin/ṣadīqin/fulānin...) *ḥazīnin qalbuhu.*

(5) The avoidance of the traditional term of 'relative clauses', as valid for both structural types thereof, has led to a not really happy duality of attributive

---

[4] In the following example, the Arabic postnominal RC is confronted with the corresponding prenominal relative structures in Turkish and Korean (the latter in McCune-Reischauer system of Romanization):

– progressive relative structures (RCs):

Arabic: *'abānā lladī fī s-samawāti* "Our Father which art in heaven" (Mathew 6: 9, the Lord's Prayer);

– regressive relative structures (possibly interpreted as RCs or adjectival attributive modifiers embedded in the main clause):

Turkish: *ey gök-ler-de ol-an Baba-m ız* (ey göklerde olan Babamız):
    voc heaven plur loc dwelling Father our
    ey : vocative and addressing particle; *gök* "heaven"; *-ler :* plural suff.; *de-:* locative: "in"; *olan :* present participle of *olmak* "to be, dwell"; *baba* "father"; *-mız :* possessive suffix "our";
    (*İncili Şerif, Yeni Ahit Kitabı*, Stuttgart 1977, Matta 6: 9), or:
    gök-ler-de-ki Baba-m ız (göklerdeki Babamız):
    -ki : adjectivizer; verb of existence is deleted;
    (*İncil'in Matta Bölümü*, Yeni yaşam yayınları, Istanbul 1993).

Korean: *han ŭr-e kyesi-n uri ab ŏji-yŏ* (hanŭre kyesin uri abŏjiyŏ):
    heaven loc dwelling our Father honor
    han ŭl "heaven"; *-e –* locative; *-n* with processive verbs, past participle marker; with qualitative verbs and verbs of existence, time-independent adjectivizer: *kyesin* "being in, dwelling" from *kyesida,* honorific lexical variant of *itta* "to be in, dwell", *ab ŏji* "father"; *-yŏ* honorific suffix.
    (*Selp'ŭ Sŏnggyŏng – Self Study Bible,* Korean Bible Compilation Committee 1993, Mat'ä 6: 9).

clauses (*Attributsätze*), our A~R – RCs, and relative clauses (*Relativsätze*), AR – RCs, in our symbols. The traditional distinction between *substantival* and *adjectival* relative clauses seems to have been more consistent in the sense of a higher degree of specificity, at the very least. The functionally modelled *Attributsätze* can hardly be qualified as specific in view of an irrefutable attributiveness quite freely occurring beyond their own structural domain, as in the following series of what *Syntax* classifies as *Relativsätze*: (*ihdinā ṣ-ṣirāṭa l-mustaqīma*) *ṣirāṭa llaḏīna 'an ᶜamta ᶜalayhim / ġayri l-maġḍūbi ᶜalayhim walā ḍ-ḍāllīn* "(Guide us /O Lord/ to the path that is straight) the path of those You have blessed, not of those who have earned Your anger, nor those who have gone astray" (*Q: al-Fātiḥa* 5-7). At any rate, the functionally motivated *Attributsätze* can hardly be accepted as a harmonious and well-balanced terminological counterpart of the structurally modelled *Relativsätze*.

*

In general, however, it must be said that the terminological innovation offered by the *Syntax* is really inspiring. The student will find here a modern unambiguous terminology covering equally well basic syntactic concepts as the slightest niceties of the finely structured system of the MWA syntax. Only those who know the chaotic labyrinth of medieval, semi-medieval, modern and semi-modern terms, derived partly from the native, partly from the European scholarly tradition, will be able to rightly appreciate the contribution of the present work to the long overdue improvement of the metalanguage used in Arabic linguistics.

The technical quality of the edition leaves nothing to be desired. Some minor oversights, evidently due to the routine work with the text editor, like 'Über substantivierte Adjek . . . zierender Appositionen s. 6.3.2.3' (p. 397) are rather exceptional.

The fact that the evidence, provided by the Vol. i, is expected to be substantially expanded in the three forthcoming volumes (see References), makes it somewhat difficult to rightly appreciate the treatment of the Vol. i phenomena in its entirety. The same reason prevents any valid statement about the contribution of the Vol. i to the whole ambitious research programme.

Irrespective of some alternative solutions, suggested in our comments (limited, after all, to only a negligible part of this inspiring work), we are firmly convinced that *Syntax* will remain the model work, in the structural domain examined, for many years to come. The rate of its antiquation will mostly be derived from that of the sources evaluated that, in turn, parallel the linguistic development of Arabic itself. *Syntax,* with its truly enormous scope of inquiry, highly consistent architecture of systematized phenomena, expertly innovated terminology and sound methodology, succeeded in overcoming the doctrinary pettiness and self-assertive exclusiveness, so frequent in the 20th century linguistics, in favour of the hard labour which was necessary for bringing to the successful end its challenging goal.

The book will be of invaluable help to research work in the field of Arabic linguistics, quite particularly in the structural domain of the MWA syntax. It

will equally be used with profit by the university- and college-level teachers and students of Arabic. In an Arabic version, the book might be of interest to the norm-giving authorities in the linguistic sections of the Arab Academies, as well.

REFERENCES

BIEŁAWSKI, J. 1956. "Deux périodes dans la formation de la terminologie scientifique arabe". In: *Rocznik Orientalistyczny,* xx, 263-320.

BROCKELMANN, C. 1908, 1913. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen.* Bd. i: Laut- und Formenlehre; Bd. ii: Syntax. Berlin, Verlag von Reuther & Reichard.

BROCKELMANN, C. 1969. *Arabische Grammatik.* 17. Aufl. besorgt von M. Fleischhammer. Leipzig, VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.

DROZDÍK, L. 1967. "Compounding as a second-order word-formational procedure in MWA". In: *Asian and African Studies,* iii, 60-97.

FISCHER, W.: 2002. *Grammatik des Klassischen Arabisch.* 3., verbesserte Auflage. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag.

FLEISCH, H. 1956-1968. *L'arabe classique. Esquisse d'une structure linguistique* (1956; 1968: Nouvelle édition, revue et augmentée). Beyrouth, Dar El-Machreq Éditeurs.

FLEISCH, H. 1961. *Traité de philologie arabe.* Vol. i. Beyrouth. Imprimerie catolique.

GREENBERG, J. H. 1960. "A quantitative approach to the morphological typology of language". In: *IJAL,* xxvi, 3, 178-194.

GvG 2 > Brockelmann 1913.

HOLES, C. 1995. *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions and Varieties.* London and New York, Longman.

MONTEIL, V. 1960. *L'arabe moderne.* Paris, Klincksieck.

RECKENDORF, H. 1921. *Arabische Syntax.* Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

WISE, H. 1975. *A Transformational Grammar of Spoken Egyptian Arabic.* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

SCHULZ, E, KRAHL, G., REUSCHEL, W. 2000. *Standard Arabic. An Elementary-Intermediate Course.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

*

Syntax der Arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart (the whole research programme as specified in Vol.i; Vol. ii is now in preparation):

Part I, Vol. i: Einleitung: Grundlagen der descriptiven Syntax des Arabischen,

Das Nomen und sein Umfeld

Die autonomen Wortarten des Nomens: Substantiv und Adjektiv

Das Vorfeld der Nominalgruppe: Partitive, Quantitative, Numeralia

Das Nachfeld der Nominalgruppe: Attribut, Quasi-Attribut

Apposition, referentielle Genitivannexion

Part I, Vol. ii: Die konnektiven Wortarten des Nomens: Pronomina, Adverbien und

(For the English translation of Koranic verses (*Q*), see *Al-Qur'ān. A Contemporary Translation by Ahmed Ali,* Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1984).