

Offprint

Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik
Journal of Arabic Linguistics
Journal de Linguistique Arabe

Herausgegeben von / Edited by / Edité par
Werner Arnold, Otto Jastrow, Shabo Talay

70 (2019)

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Beratendes Herausgeberremium / Editorial Board / Editeurs consultatifs:
J. Aguadé (Cádiz), H. Bobzin (Erlangen), S. Hopkins (Jerusalem),
S. Procházka (Wien), J. Watson (Leeds)

Manuskripte und Rezensionen werden erbeten an:
Please address manuscripts and book reviews to:

Prof. Dr. Shabo Talay
Freie Universität Berlin
Seminar für Semitistik und Arabistik
Fabeckstrasse 23-25, 14195 Berlin, Germany
Tel. +49 (0)30 838-603 63, Fax +49 (0)30 838-452698
E-Mail: shabo.talay@fu-berlin.de

Diese Zeitschrift kann auch in elektronischer Form über JSTOR (www.jstor.org)
bezogen werden.

This journal can also be accessed electronically via JSTOR (www.jstor.org).

Informationen zum Verlagsprogramm finden Sie unter
<http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>
For further information about our publishing program consult our website
<http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2019
Die Zeitschrift und alle in ihr enthaltenen Beiträge sind urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne
Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere
für Vervielfältigungen jeder Art, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und
für die Einspeicherung in elektronische Systeme.

Satz: Shabo Talay
Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.
Druck und Verarbeitung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0170-026X

Inhalt

Aufsätze

B. HESELWOOD: The term <i>mxrḡ al-harf</i> in medieval Arabic phonetics	5
C. BERLINCHES RAMOS: Idioms in Syrian Arabic: A First Approach towards a Lexico-Semantic and Grammatical Analysis	17
S. PROCHÁZKA & I. DALLAJI: A functional analysis of the particle <i>rā-</i> in the Arabic dialect of Tunis	44
V. NAUMKIN, M. BULAKH, D. CHERKASHIN, L. KOGAN, A. ISSA, I. GUMAAN, M. MOHAMMED: Studies in the Verbal Morphology of Soqotri III/2: a List of Sound and Weak Verbs Belonging to Second Stem in Soqotri	73

Buchbesprechungen

FRANK WEIGELT: <i>Einführung in die arabische Grammatiktradition.</i> (Y. Dror)	92
ANDREAS HALLBERG: <i>Case Endings in Spoken Standard Arabic. Statistics, Norms and Diversity in Unscripted Formal Speech.</i> (F. Weigelt)	94

of various historical periods because he notes on page 226 that the grammar books clearly describe the rules of Arabic grammar, but there are still many topics that have not been addressed or have been analyzed incorrectly. In my opinion, achieving a better understanding of Arabic grammar does not require the composition of large volumes but indeed small studies that examine the phenomenon in a specific corpus.

To summarize, WEIGELT asks if it is necessary to know the Arabic grammatical tradition when learning Arabic. The answer is decisively no. Considering the methods of teaching the verb in Arabic, this book shows clearly that parsing the verb in Arabic is very different from doing so according to Western Grammar. However, it still seems that Western students can easily learn the Arabic verbal system (i.e., the conjugation). Furthermore, as one who studied Arabic in a Hebrew-speaking school, I can attest that it is possible to learn Arabic with Hebrew grammatical terminology alone. Yet only when I began to develop as a researcher in the field of Arabic grammar did I realize how much knowledge was missing, so for years I pored over Arabic grammatical terminology and methodology. Along with this, no self-respecting researcher can compose studies on Arabic grammar without using Western terminology and theory. Hence the method of teaching Arabic cannot be addressed without consideration of the changes that must take place in schools and universities in the Arabic world. Simply acknowledging the Arabic grammatical tradition cannot lead to innovative research. The solution then is combining two traditions: Western terminology and Arabic terminology (as in the examples presented on pages 224-225), Western theories and Arabic theories, Western analysis and Arabic analysis. Of course there already are projects like this, such as Owens' book (1988), but WEIGELT's book is a good example of this type of combination and we should continue to develop books of this type for use by students in the Western and Arabic traditions.

Yehudit Dror
University of Haifa, Israel

ANDREAS HALLBERG: *Case Endings in Spoken Standard Arabic. Statistics, Norms and Diversity in Unscripted Formal Speech*, Lund 2016 (Studia Orientalia Lundensia, Nova Series 4)

Case and mood endings are an omnipresent issue in Arabic language classes. They are an inseparable part of the grammatical system of Classical and Modern Standard Arabic, and as a rule, it is expected of students in exams to read out texts with full vocalization. For native speakers of Arabic, the system of the case and mood endings, called *'irāb* in traditional terminology, has an even greater significance. In their conscience, the *'irāb* is the feature that distinguishes 'ungrammatical' dialectal speech from *fushā*, the normative high language that, according to traditional language ideology, every Arab should speak. This being said, it is a well known fact that there is an enormous cleft between theory and practice, which Hallberg illustrates as follows (p. 1): "When I asked about the case endings I got vague and contradictory answers: 'We don't use them, but we should', 'You need them for the sentences to make sense', 'It's very difficult', 'Only people who know proper Arabic use them correctly'."

For the foreign student, this situation is a challenge, since learning Arabic does not only mean learning rules and norms (i.e. how you *should* speak), but also acquiring the ability to communicate adequately within a given situation (i.e. how people *do* speak). Only during the last two decades has a reflection of this aspect, at least partly, entered the curricula of Arabic studies. It is now common to deal with the notion of a

diglossic continuum, which includes multiple possibilities of switching registers and of variation within a register.

However, despite many advances, there are still significant gaps. One of them concerns the question of how to use case and mood endings in Spoken Standard Arabic. It is true that in modern Standard Arabic speech these endings are only used sparsely, as for example Schulz writes in his textbook.¹ However, this remark is not a sufficient basis for learning authentic usage. In the book under review, Hallberg makes an important step to remedy the situation. Departing from the assumption “that case marking in Spoken Standard Arabic is in fact governed by a set of covered linguistic norms” (p. 4), he presents a corpus-based study that shows how case endings are used in practice.

The book deals with the highest register of spoken Arabic, which is mainly heard in broadcast interviews. It is based on about five and a half hours of interviews from Al-Jazeera’s programme *Liqā’ al-yawm* from 2010. The book is made up of three main parts: I. Background (p. 15–88), II. Method (p. 91–159), III. Analysis (p. 163–246). These are split up into eleven chapters, each of which can also be studied independently. The first part gives an insightful general introduction to diglossia and related issues and is also particularly well suited as teaching material.

The **first chapter** sets forth the objectives and the structure of the study. The **second chapter** deals with *Arabic as diglossia*, which explores the relation between the high and the low variants within the Arabic language continuum. The chapter as a whole is a superb introduction to previous research on the subject. It discusses the development of the theory of diglossia and its various alterations, and introduces significant literature in the field. Hallberg favors a model of diglossia as a process, as was proposed by Hawkins in 1983 (“Diglossia Revisited”). It implies that in a diglossic setting, the low variant (L) always forms the backdrop for producing any higher variant (H); hence, to produce speech in the high variant means to ‘process’ features that are typical for L into what is regarded as typical for H. With regard to case endings, this means that a word without endings is considered the initial form (as a lack of endings is typical for L), to which occasionally case endings are added (which is a characteristic feature of H). The task of the linguist is thus to find out under which conditions endings are added. This model turns upside down the impression a learner of Arabic usually has when taking written Modern Standard Arabic as a starting point for speaking: Because one has been taught that every word should have an ending, the learner tends to think that in Spoken Standard Arabic the case endings are *dropped*. From the perspective adopted here, the process is in fact reversed: The native speaker of Arabic starts from words that have no case endings and *adds* them in certain situations. The aim of the study at hand is to determine what these situations are.

According to Hallberg, two points that are crucial for analyzing Spoken Standard Arabic are not taken into account in any of the existing models. These are:

1. One must distinguish between extempore speech and texts that are read out, as for example in official speeches. The latter make much wider use of case endings.
2. The individual variation in Spoken Standard Arabic is considerable. As Hallberg points out, “Spoken Standard Arabic is not a highly conventional

¹ Eckehard Schulz, *Modernes Hocharabisch. Lehrbuch und e-Edition mit einer Einführung in Hauptdialekte*, Leipzig 2013, p. 68: „In der modernen Umgangssprache sind nur Teile der Kasusendungen zu hören“.

variety” (p. 41), which is in part due to the fact that it is relatively rarely used and not taught as a variety of its own right in schools.

Within the diglossic continuum, Spoken Standard Arabic represents the highest register of extempore speech. The **third chapter** (*Arabic as a Standard Language*, p. 43–59) aims at clarifying the relation of Spoken Standard Arabic to the general framework of Standard Arabic. The main question can be put as follows: What is the point of reference for someone who attempts to speak Standard Arabic in, for example, a television interview? The traditional view is that the point of reference is the grammatically perfect Arabic language, the *fushā*, as it is codified in grammar books and taught in schools. But since hardly anyone speaks in full accordance with these rules, one has to ask if the resulting speech should be termed “Standard Arabic” when it is actually rather an “attempt to speak Standard Arabic” or “more or less Standard Arabic”, as some researchers have put it (p. 56). This correlates with the perception of many Arabs that one *should* speak correct *fushā*, but in fact never does. The major methodological drawback with this approach is that scholars are relating an empirical, non-standardized oral variety at one end of the high-low spectrum to a linguistic ideal, which does not exist but in the heads of grammarians, at the other end of the spectrum. This obstructs objective research on the spoken variety, which in this model always stands in the shadow of the high linguistic ideal.

For this reason, Hallberg proposes another model: He treats spoken Standard Arabic as a variant of its own right, assuming that the point of reference for the individual speaker is not the codified system of prescriptive grammar, but rather the uncodified convention of Spoken Standard Arabic. According to this approach, the speaker does not aim at a *fushā* that abides by all rules prescribed in normative grammar, but at a Spoken Standard Arabic that is in accordance with the conventions of this particular variety. With this model, Hallberg adds a new, important aspect to the discussion of diglossia: As far as extempore speech is concerned, the upper end of the diglossic continuum is not the Standard Arabic ideal language (*fushā*), which does not exist as a spoken language, but Spoken Standard Arabic with its covert conventions (cf. p. 55–58). *Fushā* represents the codified norm, whereas Spoken Standard Arabic is an empirical entity. Spoken Standard Arabic is the way native speakers of Arabic *de facto* speak the standard variety.

Another important point Hallberg makes pertains to what is generally regarded as dialectal elements in Standard Arabic speech, such as the relative pronoun *illi* instead of the standard form *alladi* and its variations. In the corpus, 77% of all relative pronouns have the standard form, and 23% the dialectal form. The dialectal origin of *illi* is unarguable. However, as Hallberg points out, it is doubtful whether it is appropriate to assume dialectal influence every time this form is used. *Illi* is so prevalent in spoken Standard Arabic that one should rather regard it as a legitimate element of this variety — not used as often as the standard form *alladi*, but fully acceptable. As Hallberg states: “In observed use of Spoken Standard Arabic, some use of *illi*, as well as other dialectal features, is in fact the norm” (p. 57). This holds even truer for case endings: It is the norm not to use these endings, except in a relatively small number of instances that are explored in the course of the study. Consequently, if we accept these phenomena as variations of the conventional Spoken Standard Arabic, it is unnecessary to regard them as “mixing with the dialect or [a] failure to reach the target of prescriptive correctness” (p. 59). They are in fact an integral part of this specific variety of Arabic.

The **fourth chapter** introduces the actual subject of the study, namely “Case in theory, tradition, and practice” (p. 61–88). It “aims to map out linguistic and extra-linguistic

factors and circumstances that have a bearing on how the case system is used in speech" (p. 61). The chapter contains a number of remarkable points. One of them is that native speakers' attitudes toward the case and mood endings (*'i'rāb*) are largely determined by extra-linguistic factors. Hallberg illustrates this by describing from various angles the way Arabs are confronted with *'i'rāb*. He gives an overview of the major principles of Traditional Arabic Grammar and how these are taught to school children and students, including an annotated sample page from a contemporary Syrian school book (p. 69). He emphasizes the strong impact of the rigid, traditional teaching methods on Arabs' attitudes toward the standard language (p. 65–71). It conveys the notion that Arabic is so complex that even native speakers must make great efforts to master it. The fact that most Arabs find *'i'rāb* very difficult is first and foremost due to such extra-linguistic factors, whereas the system in and of itself is fairly simple compared with many Indo-European languages. Incidentally, references to Traditional Arabic Grammar can be found at various places throughout the book. Hallberg does a good job presenting the typical Arab approach and differentiating it from the Western one.

It is particularly noteworthy that traditional grammar lessons are exclusively focused on written texts. No strategies are taught of how to *speak* Standard Arabic, and most Arabs will probably never speak Standard Arabic in their life. Those who find themselves in a position where they are expected to do so will have to find their own ways, especially when it comes to the use of case endings. This is one of the reasons for the relatively large amount of individual variation in this field, as the following chapters reveal.

Hallberg mentions another issue which is usually marginalized in textbooks of Arabic, both in the Arabic world and in the West: the use of pausal forms versus contextual forms. This is especially relevant for "read speech" (cf. p. 78–80), where case endings have a major impact on the sound and the rhythm of the language. This can for example be observed in news broadcasts. Hallberg distinguishes between informal (or casual) and formal (or public) read speech (p. 79). He assumes that the latter functions as a point of reference for those who intend to speak Spoken Standard Arabic.

Chapters 5–7 present the methodological framework of the survey. In the **fifth chapter**, the selection of the material to be analyzed is explained. It sheds light on many significant aspects from the field of diglossia. Since there is no absolute point of reference for typical or "good" Spoken Standard Arabic, it is the responsibility of the researcher to select sources that are representative. Hallberg masters this task very well, and he gives convincing arguments for his selection. The corpus consists of about five and a half hours of interviews from Al-Jazeera. It includes 17 speakers from three dialectal groups, all of whom are public figures experienced in speaking Standard Arabic. The main criteria for the selection were that the interviews (a) are formal, (b) consist of extempore speech and (c) deal with similar topics. As the topic of the interview has considerable influence on the grade of formality of the speech, only "speech on serious and abstract topics with minimal digression into the personal or the mundane" was chosen (p. 96). A drawback of the corpus, of which Hallberg is aware (p. 104), is that all speakers are male.

Transcripts of the interviews were taken from al-Jazeera's website and compared with the audio files. For the analysis, they were adapted to the CHAT transcription and coding format. The details of how the text was prepared for electronic processing are explained in the **sixth chapter**.

The **seventh chapter** deals with the morpho-syntactic annotation of the text. The main tasks were (a) to identify the grammatical status of each noun and (b) to determine if and how this status is actually marked. An interesting issue arises: In phrases like ‘alā l-mawqif-i l-‘arabi ‘on the Arabic position’ it is impossible to decide whether the -i in *l-mawqif-i* is a consciously selected case ending or rather a neutral connecting vowel as used in various dialects (p. 150–151). Such ambiguous forms, which make up 17 % of all endings in the corpus (cf. p. 164), are not counted as case-marked.

It must be mentioned here that except for a brief remark on p. 65, Hallberg analyzes only the case endings of the noun, not the mood endings of the imperfect verb (*yaktub-u*, *yaktub-a*, *yaktub-ø*). Methodologically, this is fully acceptable, as including the verb would have exceeded the scope of the study. However it should have been made more explicit that the Arabic notion of *‘irāb* includes both the case and the mood endings. It is in fact one of the characteristics of Traditional Arabic Grammar that in this respect no differentiation is made between verbs and nouns. *‘Irāb* is the system of all case and mood endings together. In order to obtain a full picture of their use in Spoken Standard Arabic, and as a supplement to the study at hand, an analysis of the rules in which the mood endings of the verb are used remains a subject for future research.

Finally, the following three chapters (8–10) contain the analysis of the corpus. The **eighth chapter** (*Global measures and idiosyncratic variation*) provides a thorough, well-structured and relevant description of how case endings are used by each of the 17 speakers. The basis for the statistical evaluation are those word endings which were identified as unambiguously marked. As space does not allow for a detailed discussion of all findings, it may suffice to name the following points: Although all speakers have a similar educational background, social status, and rhetorical experience, the rate of case endings varies greatly between them. Whereas some of them use only a few endings in the whole interview, others have one or two in each sentence. As expected, the use of case endings correlates negatively with dialectal features, or in other words: the more a speaker tends to use case endings the less he uses dialectal features. One could suspect that many of the case endings appear in fixed expressions or frequent phrases, such as *bi-n-nisbat-i li-* ‘with regard to’, *fi-bayt-i ...* ‘in the house of ...’, and the like, but interestingly, this is not so: “In fact, the speakers seem to avoid re-using phrases with case marking (...). The case system, to the extent to which it is used by speakers in the corpus, is used productively.” (p. 251) This being said, most of the speakers use case endings only sporadically, the average percentage of marked case endings in the corpus being 8%. So the question arises, what governs the decision whether or not to mark a specific word for case? The two subsequent chapters provide the answer.

The **ninth chapter** (*Case marking and morphology*) and the **tenth chapter** (*Case marking and syntax*) treat the question in which morphological and syntactical environments-marked case endings are likely to be used. From an array of interesting results, we can mention some of the points that are particularly relevant in practice:

1. Case is usually *not* marked: (a) in words with the definite article (*al-amr*, *al-‘amal*). This is an important detail, as these words are among the most frequent; (b) on attributive adjectives (*‘amr-un muhimm*, *bi-šakl-in munazzam*); (c) in utterance final position, which is in accordance with prescriptive grammar.
2. Case may be marked: (a) in words with enclitic pronouns (*‘amru-na* ‘our issue’, *ši‘āru-ka* ‘your slogan’). Speakers with a high rate of case marking do

this in 50% of all instances; (b) in words where case is orthographically marked, especially with the indefinite accusative masculine ending *-an*, as well as the sound plurals and duals nominative endings *-ūn* and *-ān*. The genitive and accusative of these endings (*-īn*, *-ayn*) is ambiguous, as it overlaps with the dialectal forms. They thus do not count as marked. Speakers who make rather extensive use of case endings also occasionally use case endings in other contexts.

The book is concluded by a summary, which makes up the **eleventh chapter**. Here, the “pedagogical implications” (p. 255) are especially enlightening. They are of general relevance and should be read by everyone who is engaged in teaching Arabic as a foreign language. Hallberg recalls that “the primary motivation for conducting this study was to inform Standard Arabic pedagogy and curriculum development” (p. 255); the work has produced the following results: As a prerequisite, it was assumed that oral proficiency in Standard Arabic is a goal in most Arabic classes. However, none of the textbooks contains any substantial reflection on the actual characteristics of Spoken Standard Arabic. The study at hand proves that Spoken Standard Arabic is a linguistic variety of its own right and with its own covert rules. If it is a goal for teachers of Arabic to train students to use the language in an authentic way, they must teach this variety explicitly, especially with regard to the use or non-use of case endings. Authentic Spoken Standard Arabic has its own standard that includes features which are not in accordance with prescriptive grammar. It is to Hallberg’s merit that he has made the first significant contribution to the description of this standard.

A remark on terminology. The critical revision and modernization of the linguistic terminology in Arabic Studies is an urgent issue. In almost all textbooks, the terminology is based on Latin school grammar, the traditional European method that has been in use for several hundred years.² It is occasionally blended with concepts from Traditional Arabic Grammar — which often makes the situation worse instead of better. What we need instead is a terminology that enables the Arabic linguist to benefit from the progress that both Semitic studies and general linguistics have made through the past century. This terminology must allow for an accurate and practical description of all phenomena of the Arabic language and open up a dialogue with neighboring fields. Without making it an explicit issue, Hallberg uses a number of notions and terms that deserve to be listed here, as they meet these requirements. Most of them are generally known among linguists, and they can be found in other Arabic grammar studies. However, they have not yet made their way into Arabic language classes or reference grammars of Arabic; hence, they remain largely unknown among scholars of Arabic studies. The following set of technical terms, which Hallberg uses in a very consistent way, can be a starting point for a reform of terminology for Arabic linguistics, both on the level of research and teaching. As space does not allow for a detailed discussion of each item, I will confine myself to a list of some significant terms:³

Annexation (instead of *idāfa* or *genitive construction*, p. 236-237), VS sentence (= verbal sentence beginning with the verb), SV sentence (= verbal sentence beginning with the subject), TC sentence (= topic–comment sentence =

2 The only exception known to me is *Al-Kitāb al-Mufid* by Manfred Woidich and Rabha Heinen-Nasr (Cairo 2011), which uses a partly modernized terminology.

3 For detailed propositions for a reform of Arabic linguistic terminology, see Frank Weigelt, *Einführung in die arabische Grammatiktradition*, Wiesbaden 2017, p. 169-218. On the definitions of the various varieties of Arabic, see *ibid.* p. 41-48.

verbless sentence, instead of ‘nominal sentence’, which is often confused with the concept of *ğumla ismiya* from Traditional Arabic Grammar; see for all these terms p. 132), equational clause (p. 132), phrase, head and complement (p. 63, 225–226), prepositional complement (p. 137), attributive complement (p. 225), genitive complement / genitive annexation (p. 189), complementizer (p. 135), constituent (dialectal constituent: p. 135), state (definite, construct, indefinite, pausal; p. 127), CS-N/C (= construct state with annexed noun or clause; p. 129), argument structure (p. 65), core syntactic position (p. 231, 234–6), peripheral syntactic position (p. 231, 237–9).

Furthermore, these are some very useful terms for the various varieties of Arabic: Standard Arabic (= the standard language as a whole, especially with regard to its prescriptive grammar, similar to the traditional Arabic term *fushā*), Modern Standard Arabic (= the empirical modern variant), Spoken Standard Arabic (= the empirical spoken modern variant), Classical Standard Arabic (= the empirical classical variant), Traditional Arabic Grammar (= “the canonical, formalized and prescriptive grammar still dominating formal language instruction in the Arabic speaking world”; p. 49), The Arabic Linguistic Tradition (= “the whole range of development [of Traditional Arabic Grammar] including deviant theoretical interpretations”; p. 49).

In addition to the many benefits in terms on content, a word on the style and the outer form of the book is needed. The work as a whole is an exceptionally pleasant read. The style is straightforward and to the point, and the structure is so clear that the reader virtually never loses the thread. The summaries in the end of every chapter give excellent overviews. All chapters are easily accessible and well suited to serve as a reference for the respective subject.

The level of the typographic design seems to me unprecedented in books in our field. Of the many noteworthy features, most outstanding are the shrewd tables and Arabic citations in the margins and the burgundy chapter numbers, which match beautifully with the colored endpaper of the printed book. The book is also available digitally. In the digital version, every example is equipped with a link to the respective interview on YouTube, where the passage at hand can be immediately heard and seen.

Ultimately, Hallberg’s work is an exemplary and much-needed addition to the field of Arabic linguistics. The book provides a clear, informative introduction on the background of Modern Standard Arabic, while also contributing a significant new perspective on the understanding of Spoken Standard Arabic. It is a critical read for all Arabic studies scholars.

Frank Weigelt
(Halle/Leipzig)