



HAL
open science

**Introduction (à Approaches to the History and
Dialectology of Arabic in Honor of Pierre Larcher,
Manuel Sartori et al. (éds.), Leiden, E. J. Brill, coll.
“Studies in Semitic Language and Linguistics” 88)**

Manuel Sartori, Manuela E.B. Giolfo, Philippe Cassuto

► **To cite this version:**

Manuel Sartori, Manuela E.B. Giolfo, Philippe Cassuto. Introduction (à Approaches to the History and Dialectology of Arabic in Honor of Pierre Larcher, Manuel Sartori et al. (éds.), Leiden, E. J. Brill, coll. “Studies in Semitic Language and Linguistics” 88). Approaches to the History and Dialectology of Arabic in Honor of Pierre Larcher, 2017. hal-03911581

HAL Id: hal-03911581

<https://hal.science/hal-03911581>

Submitted on 23 Dec 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

INTRODUCTION

Sagittarius luminum de thesauris linguae et de clari sermonis mari,¹ one can not fail to notice the important place that Pierre Larcher occupies within our sciences, and especially with reference to Arabic Grammar and Arabic Linguistics. Author of approximately 200 items in this field (not to mention his output in the literary domain), he has been described as the *alter ego* of Raḍī al-Dīn al-ʿAstarābādī (d. 688/1289)² of whom he is, without any doubt, the best interpret. Thus it appears more than natural that leading scholars and distinguished young researchers come together to pay homage to Pierre Larcher for a life devoted to the enlightening exploration of the ‘ocean’ of Arabic and Semitic Linguistics in the broadest and deepest sense ever reached.

What strikes one about Pierre is the fact that his research interests are extraordinarily wide-ranging and that at the same time he shows an extremely high level of specialist skill in handling with them: from pre-Islamic poetry to linguistics, from morphology to logic, from lexicography to semiology, from Indo-European to Semitic, from epigraphy to history of language, from theology to philology, from philosophy to political theory, from Qurʾānic studies to sociolinguistics, from *fushā* to *ʿammiyya*, and from ‘Arab linguistics’ to ‘Arabic linguistics’. Even more striking is the fact that Pierre was able to isolate some issues of pivotal interest within such an immense universe, notably that of pragmatics, and that of ‘Arab metalanguages’. It seems that nothing relevant could ever escape his keen sight and sharp intellect. One sees this for example in his work on the relationship between linguistics and the other sciences in the Arab-Islamic society, and also in his treatment of the concepts of semantic ‘coordination’ and semantic ‘subordination’, in his deep reflections on *moyen arabe* and *arabe moyen*, and also on ‘enunciation and interaction’ in Oswald Ducrot’s theory, as well as on the grammatical works of a rhetorician such as ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Ġurġānī (d. 471/1078).

Last but not least, Pierre is not only an accomplished scholar, in the fields of both linguistics and poetry; he is also a great man of culture, in every sense and acceptance of this word. He is an incomparable scientific partner, responsive and open to ideas that complement his, and at the same time vigorous in defending his own views. For some of us, Pierre is not only a model but also a catalyst for ideas in the positive sense, and more, he is a creator, allowing the creativity of colleagues with whom he works. In sum, he is an example to follow.

¹ We are more than indebted to our colleagues and friends Claude Gilliot and Francesco Zappa for their kind support in composing the Latin title – starting from the editors’ idea of *Rāmī al-lumaʿ fi ʿulūm al-luġa* – which perfectly suits the scientific dignity of Pierre Larcher.

² As Antoine Lonnet writes in the review he made for *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* (39/2, 1994, 355) of the special issue of *Bulletin d’Études Orientales*, ‘De la grammaire de l’arabe aux grammaires des arabes’ (*B.E.O.*, 43, 1991) edited by Pierre Larcher.

The first section of the present dedicated volume, *Semitic Linguistics*, proposes a journey *From Sem to Qedar*, from Biblical Hebrew to Semitic and Afroasiatic passing by Arabic and Early Aramaic.

Philippe Cassuto, in 'Few Switching of Labials in Biblical Hebrew', takes further some ideas from his article 'The expression of peace in Hebrew' in *Redefining Peace in the Twenty-first Century* (Nancy, 2001). Pierre Larcher had written in the same vein an article entitled 'The expression of peace in Arabic.' However, Pierre considered two such expressions in Arabic: *Silm* and *Salam*, whereas in Hebrew Philippe Cassuto noted only the traditional *Shalom*. In the present chapter, Cassuto argues that *Shalom* and *Shabwa* had very similar meanings, and the contrast between them is purely lexical. It consists in switching the letters *mem* and *waw*, two labial letters. In considering the question, it appears that many of these permutations exist in Semitic languages; and the object and focus of Cassuto's contribution is about this phenomenon: it is possible to trace the etymology of the Jewish month *Marheshwan* by comparing with the Akkadian. Another example is in Ugaritic. In the cuneiform tablets, the deity *Shpsh* is mentioned. By swapping *p* with the labial *m*, it is easy to identify *Shpsh* with the Hebrew Shemesh, sun, equivalent of the Arabic word *šams*. This article proposes to consider other examples and, if possible, to establish whether or not rules for the labial permutations in Semitic languages can be defined.

Joseph Dichy argues in 'The Analytics of Writing, Exemplified by Arabic, the Youngest of Semitic Scripts' that the categorization of Semitic writings as alphabetic, consonantal or even syllabic still remains problematic. The alternative "analytic paradigm" considers that writing systems result from metalinguistic abilities at work in the linguistic community. It involves two interwoven aspects: (a) analyzing language, according to pleremic and cenemic conventions and (b) representing the result through a visual artefact (semiographic characterization). The basic secondary convention is that of the graphic word-form, a complex unit related, in the semiography of Arabic writing, to variation in the shape of letters, fundamentally divided into final vs. non-final.

In 'Arabian *fahṛ* and *mubālaḡa* of High Rhetorical Value: a New Comprehensive View of Nemara Inscription' Manfred Kropp recalls that the inscription of Nemara has been, ever since its discovery in 1902, object of scientific research in more than 100 contributions. Part of a cenotaph dedicated to the Arab king Mar' al-Qays Ibn 'Amr, dated 328 AD, the text of five lines engraved in a *tabula ansata* on a lintel of basalt is written in late (Classical) Nabataean script but exhibiting transition to early Arabic script. The language, though, is clearly Arabic, even if not identical with later Classical Arabic. The document is a primary source for events in the Arabian Peninsula and its adjacent regions in the fourth century AD as well as for the history of the Arabic script and language. Thus the study of it concentrated mainly on elucidating the precious historical and linguistic details. What has been neglected to a certain extent is the general character of the text and its evident function for the contemporary reader. The article proposes to interpret it as an early and already accomplished masterpiece of Arabian *fahṛ* and *mubālaḡa* of high rhetorical value. From this the author derives two guidelines for reading the passage. The function requires a fluent and well constructed syntactical texture concentrated without deviations on the deeds and

exploits of this “accomplished” Arab king. As for the historical facts they have to be taken under the cautious premises of being reported in the context of Arabian *mubālaḡa*.

In ‘Dia-planar diffusion: Reconstructing early Aramaic-Arabic Language Contact’, Jonathan Owens gives three explanations for relatedness between historical linguistic stages: inheritance, diffusion or independent parallel development. In his paper he argues that in the period leading up to and entering the early Islamic era, Aramaic played an important role in influencing different variants of Arabic. By focusing on the phonological domain, he adduces data from all varieties of Arabic, as well as — on the Aramaic side — from Old and Middle Aramaic eras.

Next, Lutz Edzard presents in ‘The *mas’ala zunbūriyya* in a Semitic and Afroasiatic Perspective’ the comparative Semitic and Afroasiatic scenario on the one hand and the typological comparison with Germanic and Romance on the other. As for the initial *mas’ala*, the solution offered by al-Kisāī clearly must be admitted at least as a valid alternative. Sībawayhi was bound by the Baṣran tradition, which would not tolerate *’iyyā-* in predicate position, and simply could not allow for a variety of possibilities, in the way that al-Kisāī could. In sum, the *mas’ala zunbūriyya* continues to be relevant for modern linguistic theory, and vice versa.

The second section of the present volume, *Arabic Grammatical Tradition*, is a *Travel along Grammar and its Representations*, and is dedicated to matters of morpho-syntactic, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, rhetoric and logic nature, the treatment of which reveals how ‘grammar’, and the place it occupies within the system of the sciences of language, is related to ‘models of representation’, *i.e.* the philosophical and hermeneutical presuppositions underlying any analyses.

In an article following the theme developed by L. Edzard on case ending, Jean-Patrick Guillaume’s ‘« *Man Zaydan ?* » À propos de quelques cas curieux de *ḥikāya* chez Sībawayhi’ argues that the concept of *ḥikāya* (“literal quotation”) plays a minor role in the Arabic grammatical theory, usually in order to explain an anomaly in the distribution of case markers. In many cases, the data treated in this context are inherited from Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb*, and reflect a living, spontaneous oral usage characteristic of Old Arabic, a fact which became increasingly difficult for later grammarians to grasp as Old Arabic evolved into Classical Arabic, a purely scholarly language. Guillaume’s paper focuses on two different sets of facts mentioned by Sībawayhi, in which *ḥikāya* functions in a dialogue in order to point a violation of the relevance principle, usually with a nuance of ‘disapprobation’ (*’inkār*). It aims to show that Sībawayhi’s analysis, in spite of the rather primitive metalanguage he uses, is quite self-consistent and shows a remarkable perceptiveness of the pragmatic dimension of language.

In ‘Inflectional Ending by Means of Short Vowels Among Arab Grammarians: Clues for the Deconstruction of a Grammatical Ideology’, Manuel Sartori aims to give his own argument, based on some Arab grammarians, to show how the sacrosanct desinential inflection (*’i’rāb*) would

actually be a grammar construct, a *creed* which grammarians, whether believers or convinced disciples of believers, invite us to take as an untouchable reality. Dealing only with inflectional endings by means of short vowels, Sartori's paper recalls the strength of the pause (*waqf*) compared to effective realization of the inflection and focuses its analysis on the rules of case ending agreement between the noun and the attributive qualifying adjective. It shows then that the Ancient grammarians, whether Zaġġāġī (d. 337/949), Fārisī (d. 377/987), Ibn Ġinnī (d. 392/1002), or 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Ġūrġānī (d. 471/1078), when addressing an agreement that was already well-known and highly regulated, demonstrate other possibilities, the number and variety of which show how little relevance the inflectional endings have, thus providing arguments for those sceptical about *īrāb*.

Ramzi Baalbaki's 'One Word, two Functions. The Concept of Functional Replacement in Traditional Syntactic Analysis' starts with the observation that, according to the Arabic rules of parsing, each noun, and by extension each nominal or verbal sentence which fulfils a grammatical function that can be expressed in the form of a noun (*e.g. muḥḥad*), is assigned one, and only one, *maḥḥal*. Thus the notion of *maḥḥal* represents a specific grammatical function performed by one element of the construction. However, Baalbaki notes there are constructions in which one noun apparently performs two functions and thus occupies two *maḥḥals*. In the frequently cited construction *ḍarbī l-'abda musī'an, musī'an* is a circumstantial accusative (*ḥāl*) which also fulfils the function of the predicate (*ḥabar*), hence the expression *ḥāl saddat masadd al-ḥabar*. Functional replacement, expressed by terms such as *sadda masadd, nāba manāb, 'aġnā*, etc., has its roots in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*. Baalbaki's paper discusses Sībawayhi's use of this analytical tool, traces its expansion in the Arabic grammatical tradition, and identifies thirteen types of constructions which grammarians interpret based on it. In line with their interest in standardization and rule formulation, later authors in particular introduce complex rules pertaining to some of these types. Constructions that are extremely unlikely to be used in actual speech were also made up in order to examine the theoretical implications of functional replacement. The paper also argues that the main purpose of the grammarians in introducing the notion of functional replacement is to defend the theory of 'one-element-one-*maḥḥal*' since the admission that one element can have two *maḥḥals* would shatter one of their most essential axioms in syntactical analysis.

Francesco Binaghi's '*Zarf* and *maf'ūl fi-hi*: Really Two of a Kind? Some Notes on Zaġġāġī's Treatment' investigates the categories of *zarf* and *maf'ūl fi-hi* as they occur in the Arabic grammatical tradition. The analysis of some passages and examples from Ibn al-Sarrāġ's *Uṣūl* and Zaġġāġī's *Ġumal* leads to conclude that these two terms are not synonyms: *zarf* indicates the semantic role of locative and temporal, whereas *maf'ūl fi-hi* designates a syntactic function and thus represents only a subset of all the possible occurrences of *zarf*. Ibn al-Sarrāġ defines the *maf'ūl fi-hi* as the verbal adjunct of time and place in the accusative case, whereas Zaġġāġī defines it in terms of the scope it has (the predicative core of the sentence). Zaġġāġī also makes use of these

two terms for the definition of the noun as a part of speech, especially in his *ʿĪdāh*. At this level of linguistic analysis, the two terms reverse their extension: in Zağğāğī's theoretical structuration of the different occurrences that define a noun, the *ṣarf* becomes a subset of *mafʿūl fī-hi* since the *mafʿūl* (in the broader sense) constitutes one of the possible occurrences of the noun.

The travel continues with Nadia Anghelescu's 'The Role of the Metaphor in the Interpretation of Prepositions: the Arabic *min* and the French *de*'. Her chapter contains an interpretation of the manner in which specialists in the science of language, old Arab grammarians and modern French researchers, have analyzed prepositions with similar functions: Arab *min* and French *de*. Anghelescu is concerned with the way in which these grammarians approach grammaticalization within a category of linguistic elements which already fulfil a certain grammatical function, *i.e.* prepositions. Prepositions with a similar initial meaning (beginning in space and then in time) acquire new meanings, of a similar type in both languages, among which the indefinite quantifier function takes an important place. All these evolutions result from the conceptualization of space. Research itself resorts to the spatial metaphor, and the ingenious interpretation of the preposition *min* delivered by a 13th century author, Raḍī al-Dīn al-'Astarābādī, is conclusive in that respect.

Next, Catherine Pinon's 'Une corrélation retrouvée : nécessaire *vs* possible' directly echoes a major chapter of Pierre Larcher's *Le système verbal de l'arabe classique*: « Une corrélation oubliée : nécessaire *vs* possible ». By focusing on the expression of 'possibility' and 'necessity' within a digital corpus of contemporary written Arabic, the paper shows that the perfect *kāna* is used to mark 'necessity', whilst the imperfect, in its three forms, is used to mark sometimes 'necessity' and sometimes 'possibility'. It is argued that utterances can be modalized to different degrees and that modalization can be lexically or structurally reinforced. As an example, *qad yakūnu* and *rubbamā yakūnu* structures are examined in detail and hypotheses are proposed about the nuances in expressing the modality of 'possibility'. The paper observes also the presence, in contemporary written Arabic, of apocopated verbal forms *yakun* used with a modal value of 'necessity' in utterances that would previously resort to the perfect form. As for negations, it is noted that *lā yakūnu* appears as strongly modalizing *vis-à-vis laysa*, and that the negation *lān yakūna* sometimes carries a modal value in addition to the temporal value of 'future'. Although fundamental, the issue of 'modalities' is rarely present in grammars. Pinon's study comes complete with a review of the issue in Arab and Arabic grammars, which she compares with the results of her analysis.

Manuela E.B. Giolfo and Wilfrid Hodges' 'The System of the Sciences of the Arabic Language by Sakkākī: Logic as a Complement of Rhetoric' finds its inspiration in Pierre Larcher's chapter 'Arabic Linguistic Tradition II: Pragmatics', in J. Owens (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics* (2013). In Sakkākī's (d. 626/1229) *Miftāḥ al-'ulūm* "The key to the sciences", the sciences of language are presented as a complex system whose core includes the two sciences of morphology (*ṣarf*) and of syntax (*naḥw*), that is to say grammar; the two sciences of meanings (*ma'ānī*) and of expression (*bayān*) — that is to say rhetoric —, and the two sciences of definition

(*ḥadd*) and of argumentation (*istidlāl*) — that is to say logic. The complexity of the system lies in the fact that syntax (*‘ilm al-naḥw*) finds its complement (*tamām*) in semantics (*‘ilm al-ma‘ānī*) which in turns finds its complement in logic (*‘ilmā al-ḥadd wa-l-istidlāl*). An axis ‘syntax-semantics-logic’ is thus drawn which brings logic within the field of linguistics. The ‘systemic’ intersection between rhetoric and grammar, and the ‘meta-systemic’ intersections between rhetoric and literature from one part and that between rhetoric and religious sciences from the other have been a subject of strong interest. However, the same cannot be said for another intersection, ‘systemic’ by Sakkākī: that between rhetoric, namely semantics (*‘ilm al-ma‘ānī*) and logic (*‘ilmā al-ḥadd wa-l-istidlāl*). This latter is what Giolfo and Hodges explore in their paper, mainly basing themselves on Sakkākī’s *Miftāḥ*, on Rāzī’s (d. 606/1209) logic (*Mulaḥḥaṣ*), as well as on Ibn Sīnā’s (d. 428/1037) logical works.

Finally, this section ends with a grammatical discussion between ‘Abū al-‘Alā’ al-Ma‘arrī (d. 449/1058) and some angels in Martino Diez’s ‘Teaching Arabic to the Angels: a Scherzo by al-Ma‘arrī on Heavenly Morphology’. In his paper, Diez translates and comments on a section of the introduction to the *Risālat al-Malā’ika* where the poet, together with some men of letters, tries to convince the Guardian of Paradise to grant them access to heavenly joys because of their linguistic skills. He discusses in particular the derivation and the morphological behaviour of some objects that can be found in Heaven, such as the *Tūbā* tree or the houris. This introduction, a deeply ironic text, targeting Islamic popular beliefs concerning the Afterworld, grammar and grammarians and, most importantly, the author himself, offers an interesting picture of the method followed in *‘ilm al-taṣrīf* (‘morphology’), a field of scholarship which received considerable attention by the first generations of grammarians, but came later to be partially neglected in favour of other disciplines.

As a follow-up to the previous contribution, the third section of this dedicated volume, *Arabic and Semitic Lexicology* could have been entitled *In a Garden paved with Words*. In this *Garden*, three topics in relation with lexical issues are discussed: first etymology, then the issue of synonymy or polysemy, and finally the question of Arabic as a medium for other languages as well as its writing in Latin characters. Georgine Ayoub first, with ‘L’emprunt dans le dictionnaire arabe des premiers siècles’, examines the treatment of loanwords in some theoretical works of the first three centuries AH. Between anthropological considerations (that of the relation to the other) and religious ones (that of the sacrilegious relation to the sacred text), this study shows how two complementary approaches are drawn at the end of the 8th century, the first proposing to detect by a phonological characterization the neologism (*muḥdat*, *muwallad*) whether foreign or forged, the second to describe the linguistic process at work in “Arabization” understood as the linguistic integration of a foreign word. Ayoub shows how lexical study is part of the cultural context in religious sciences of the time to explain the vocabulary of the Qur’ān and studies in three dictionaries the analysis of twelve terms the first exegetes said foreign.

In 'The Noun Pattern *'ufūlatun* in Arabic Philological Tradition', Reinhard Weipert focuses then on another kind of dictionary work referred to as *muṣannaf* containing sometimes collections of words based on particular noun patterns and not only according to the root of the word. Based on sources like the *K. al-Ġarīb al-muṣannaf* by 'Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām (d. 224/838), the *K. Ġamharat al-luġa* by Ibn Durayd (d. 321/933) and the *Dīwān al-'adab* by al-Fārābī (d. 350/961), Weipert conducts a semantic study that reveals that more than two-thirds of *'ufūlatun* pattern words belong to a single semantic field related to speech acts and human forms of verbal expression. He then shows that the last third is in fact composed by quite a few old genuine Arabic words of unknown etymology, some foreign words, and a small number of feminine nouns or singulatives (*nomina unitatis*) derived from the noun form *'ufūlun*. Here he indicates that words with the most diverse meanings are formed on this latter pattern and should be strictly kept separated from the invariable *'ufūlatun* form.

Echoing the preface to the present volume, and thanks to his translation of an unpublished manuscript, that of Hanna Diyab, the aleppine interpreter of doctor Paul Lucas (1664-1737), Elie Kallas invites us, in 'Gerboise : l'entrée du terme arabe *ġerbū'* à la cour de Louis XIV', to reconsider the origin of the term 'gerboise' (jerboa) in French. Indeed in the description of his travel from Aleppo to Versailles, Diyab provides more details about the introduction of the jerboa, both the animal and the term, at Louis XIV court. Kallas shows here that the introducer might not be Paul Lucas and furthermore that the form of the term in French might be linked to the identity of the jerboa presented to Louis XIV.

In the same vein, but this time for English, Fabrizio A. Pennacchietti's 'On the Semitic Origin of the English Word *fustian*' addresses the etymology of the English term 'fustian' and its cognates, and explores three possible origins including Arabic, French and Semitic. With evidence, he traces the history of the import of that word and its cognates in English through other languages and shows that only the Semitic origin would be valid.

Turning to synonymy issues, Lidia Bettini focuses in 'La lexicographie arabe entre *'adab* et *falsafa* : Les questions lexicales du *Kitāb al-hawāmīl wa-l-šawāmīl*' on the lexical questions which 'Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī (d. 414/1023) asks 'Abū 'Alī Miskawayh (d. 421/1030) in their *Kitāb al-hawāmīl wa-al-šawāmīl*. What is at stake here is to determine, if possible, the nuance (*farq*) existing among words perceived as semantically close. After examining the theoretical views of Miskawayh on the question of synonymy, Bettini focuses on five couples of considered synonyms compared to the analogous data offered by authors such as 'Askarī (d. after 400/1010), Rāġib al-'Iṣfahānī (d. late 5th/11th) and Kaffawī (d. 1094/1683).

Marie Baize-Varin in '« Traitement » de l'« organisation » en arabe moderne de presse, ou le point de vue d'une linguiste sur l'apparente synonymie *'ilāġ/mu'ālaġa* et *tanzīm/munazzama*' revisits an earlier paper of hers and addresses once more the issue of the apparent synonymy existing between pairs like *'ilāġ/mu'ālaġa* and *tanzīm/munazzama*. She shows that within these

pairs, new occurrences challenge the non-synonymy conclusion based on morphology and indicates that the distinction should be made in terms of cultural considerations, particularly in relation to pairs like specificity / generality and legitimacy / illegitimacy.

In ‘*Ḥaytu* : une inextricable polysémie ?’, after a first pessimistic report on *ḥaytu* and *bi-ḥaytu* and their inextricable polysemy, Alain Girod aims to explore, thanks to a new corpus consisting of a special issue of the Financial Times devoted to Egypt, written in English but translated into Arabic by *al-Maṣrī al-yawm*, a surprising track that allows us to account for the multiplicity of uses of this word in the Arabic contemporary press.

Finally, the fourth and last section of this volume, *Arabic and Semitic Dialectology*, leads to *A Ramble into Dialectology*. George Grigore presents with ‘*Fuṣḥā* Arabic Vocabulary Borrowed by Mardini Arabic *via* Turkish’ the Mardini Arabic. Spoken in Mardin, a little town in South-eastern Turkey, it has been influenced — at all levels — by the Turkish language, the official language of the area, replacing, for the Arab inhabitants of Mardin, the *Fuṣḥā* Arabic in all its social functions. This dialect massively borrowed Arabic words from Turkish, which in their turn were borrowed by Turkish from Classical Arabic. These Classical Arabic words entered Mardini Arabic *via* Turkish language, which gave this Peripheral Arabic dialect an odd image resulting from the mixing of a vocabulary of dialectal and Classical Arabic.

In ‘Aspect Marking in Juba Arabic and Ki-Nubi’, Kees Versteegh studies the development of aspect markers in an Arabic pidgin, Juba Arabic, spoken in South Sudan, and an Arabic creole, Ki-Nubi, spoken in Kenya and Uganda, both deriving from the 19th century contacts between the Anglo-Egyptian army in the Sudan and the indigenous recruits. He claims that the earliest varieties of Arabic used in communication in this area did not have any grammaticalized aspectual markers. At a later stage, a general modal marker, BI, was borrowed from Sudanese Arabic. When a second marker, GI, was introduced for the marking of non-punctuality, it took over the marking of habituality from BI.

In ‘Jewish Writing in Arabic in Arabic Characters in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries’, addressing the issue of Arabic as a medium for other languages as well as the writing of Arabic in other characters, MariaLuisa Langella describes a linguistic, literary and graphic practice consisting of the use of Arabic language and characters by Jews during the 19th and 20th centuries. This practice is one aspect of the long-standing relationship between the Jews and the Arabic language, and constitutes a distinctive phenomenon which has so far been little researched. Langella shows that its analysis has revealed the limited scope of the phenomenon from a chronological and geographical point of view, as well as from the point of view of the number of writers concerned, but that, however, these limitations seem to be offset by a certain dynamism, which can be observed through the variety of the types of writings listed.

Arkadiusz Płonka's 'Between Linguistics, Poetry, and Ideology: The Literary Periodical *L-'Arzyāda* in the *Lebanese Language* (June 2009 – October 2014). General Presentation, Ideological Impacts, Index of Authors, and "Lebanese" Lexis' offers us a presentation of the literary monthly periodical *l-'Arzyāda* which is the only journal published in Lebanese since 2009 June 1st. The journal is a rare and valuable corpus of poetry and prose written by nearly 90 authors. It also contains metalinguistic essays, translations of mainly European poetry and a directory of proverbs and words considered in the journal as typically "Lebanese". Płonka considers the Sa'īd 'Aql's use of the Latin alphabet as a vehicle for writing Arabic, and in particular provides an index of the authors, most of them little-known to specialists of Arabic/Lebanese literature. He also provides a Lebanese language glossary.

Finally, Michael G. Carter's 'The Seven Deadly Sins of Arabic Studies' concludes the present volume by discussing a number of features of the study of Arabic linguistics over the last two and a half centuries or so, which, in Carter's opinion, have had negative effects both on our understanding of the Arabs' own grammatical theory and on the teaching and learning of Arabic. After eliminating some well-known topics, namely Flügel's renumbering of the verses of the Qur'ān, the invention of Middle Arabic, and the introduction of the notion of diglossia into pedagogy, the paper looks at seven broad themes which might be considered deadly sins in this context; these, if not corresponding to all seven ethical categories directly, may at least represent the sin of pride. They are (1) transliteration issues, (2) the case and mood names, (3) word classes and parts of speech, (4) verb morphology, (5) definiteness, *tanwīn* and inflection, with digressions on patterns of definiteness marking, and relative sentences, (6) "government", (7) predication and sentence structure, with digressions on cohesion, and adjectival agreement.

In conclusion, we wish to salute the memory of our colleague Andrzej Zaborski, Professor of Afroasiatic linguistics, Jagiellonian University (Krakow), who passed away on September 30, 2014. We take this occasion to express our sadness at losing him, and our respect for his achievements. He was a great creative scholar. He had intended to contribute to the present volume a chapter entitled 'The Verb in Akkadian and in Classical Arabic – Innovation and Archaism', but the was never completed. His provisional abstract read as follows:

Although Akkadian has the oldest records, nevertheless it represents many innovations in phonology, morphology and syntax. Classical Arabic and some non-classical dialects have preserved archaisms which had been lost in Akkadian. Several Akkadian verbal categories are rather innovations both in a Semitic and Hamitosemitic/Afroasiatic perspective and only some of them are retentions. Parallels between Akkadian *iparrVs-u* and Ethiopian *yeqattel* as well as *yeqotel* of the Modern Semitic of Southern Arabia are only partial. The more diversified system of Classical Arabic is older, *e.g.* the Arabic (and West Semitic in general) Perfect is not an innovation. Classical Arabic is not 'Jungsemitisch' but 'Old Semitic'. The new relative chronology imposes

changes in the genetic classification of the Semitic languages.

Philippe, Manuela, and Manuel