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grammatisch — syntaktisch volledig kodierden A.T.s. Vorliegende Modellkonzordanz einer im allgemeinen fast unmissbaren literarischen Einheit (Deut.) weist einige selbiger zitierte Beispiele anlässlich Jes. 40, 11 (cf. A. 2) imitativer in einem Vers (S. 11f.; z.B.: Jes. 40,1,2,26; 41,21; 42,18; 44,23; 45,20,21,22; 48,6 usw.); B. Kombination von imdaw und -bird in einem Vers (S. 3: Jes. 40,1; 49,13; 52,9); C. Selektion mit mo (S. 4f.); D. Die Kombination *in* und Jerusalem in einem Vers (S. 6, nur Jes. 52,9); E. Eine der Partikel *ki* folgende Ablativkonjunktion in einem Vers (S. 7f.; 33 mal). Eine der Partikel *in* folgende Präpositionalkonjunktion in einem Vers (S. 9f.). In der Studie wurde eine Art Predestinationsglau -


Badhoevedorp, Oostern 1980

M. J. MULDER

L. KOOP, Studies in Arabic and Hebrew Lexicography (Mekarim be-millatim ve-teviti we-Tev'iti); edited by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein with the assistance of S. Assif, Jerusalem, Magness Press, The Hebrew University, 1976 (25 cm., 261 hebr. pp., introduction by Goshen-Gottstein pp. 7-14 or pp. 7-12 hebr.); s. 30.00.

Mr. M. Hoshen-Gottstein has recently brought together some of Kop's publications in the above mentioned volume (March 1976).

Kop was a well-known scholar not only for his publications in the field of Arab science (especially biology): for instance many zoologic items from his hand are found in the Encyclopedia of Islam (Leiden), eg. 1 pp. 215, 239, 795, 951; II pp. 71, 76, 223, 248, 275, 455), but also for those in the field of lexicography, both Hebrew and Arabic (but mainly Arabic).

During the last period of his life (from the end of the forties until his death, 23 August 1964, he was born in Upper Silesia, 23 Sept. 1917) he worked at the National and University Library at Jerusalem, where he became head of the oriental division. From this period is the bulk of his writings. Between his studies in the two fields, lexicography and biology, there are connections: some of his writings are found in the Encyclopedia of Islam (Leiden), eg. 1 pp. 215, 239, 795, 951; II pp. 71, 76, 223, 248, 275, 455), but also for those in the field of lexicography, both Hebrew and Arabic.

In one of his articles ("The Bird 'Anilq; A Lexicological Study Concerning Arabic Zoology," in JRA 15 [1956]: 157-164), in the present collection (pp. 125 sqq) he stresses the unreliability of Arabic lexicography in the zoological field: his conclusions are that the mysterious 'anilq bird, and likewise the layl and nahd bird didn't really exist except in the imagination of the Arabic lexicographers. They came into being by a misinterpretation of proverb and poetry.
The choice Mr. Goshen-Gottstein has made in this collection are from Kopf's already published articles in reviews and from his hitherto unpublished dissertation. Mr. Goshen-Gottstein stresses Kopf's importance as a lexicographer. From his dissertation (Arabic Lexicography — its Origin, Development, Sources and Problems: in Hebrew) Goshen-Gottstein chose three chapters which Kopf judged in the preface of his dissertation the most important ones, i.e. ch. 11 „The Word-Definitions in the Indigenous Arabic Lexicons“; ch. 8 „Scribal Errors and Their Prevention“ and ch. 8 k „Free use of Analogy“.

Some articles, collected in this volume, are more or less rewritings of his dissertation, such as „Das Arabische Wörterbuch als Hilfsmittel für die Hebräische Lexicographie“, from Vetus Testamentum, VI, 1956, pp. 286-302; in the present collection, pp. 229f.; „Religious influences on Medieval Arabic Philology“ from Studia Islamica V, 1956, pp. 33-59 — in the present collection, pp. 19f.; and „The Treatment of Foreign Words in Mediaeval Arabic Lexicology“, from Scripta Hierosolymitana IX, 1961, pp. 191-205 — in the present collection pp. 247f.

Kopf's work and especially his dissertation is characterized by Goshen-Gottstein (p. 11) as follows: „one cannot but realize that this is the most comprehensive and profound theoretical study on the problem of classical lexicography“. Although „some of the dissertations written since have developed or rectified certain aspects of his work“ (and in this connection he quotes a.o. F. Corrente, Journal of Semitic Studies 20, 1975, 38ff.; Manfred Ulmann, Untersuchungen zum Arabischen, Wiesbaden, 1966, which has drawn attention to the spurious overrichness of classical dictionaries partly achieved by including „nonce forms“ by Raguapootis — leaving out alone ghost entries born out of misplaced diacritic points —; and S. Wild, Das Kasidah al-An und die Arabische Lexicographie, Wiesbaden, 1965) „Kopf’s work — even after all these works — stands out as a major achievement in the critical analysis of the sources of Arabic lexicography“ (p. 12).

About Kopf's efforts to review problems connected with the lexicography of Biblical Hebrew in the light of his knowledge of Arabic sources, Goshen-Gottstein remarks i.a. the following: „Kopf did not waste his time tracing how bible scholars copied Arabic etymologies from each other. His world was that of the excitement of the first discoverer, and he tried to make his readers participate in his etymological adventures“ (p. 11) (e.g. his articles „Arabischen Etymologien und Parellelen zum Bibelwörterbuch from Vetus Testamentum“ VIII, 1958, pp. 161-215; IX, 1959, pp. 247-287).

Kopf's main ideas about the use of the Arabic dictionaries are to be found in his article „Das Arabische Wörterbuch als Hilfsmittel für die Hebräische Lexicographie“.

One of his arguments is the deceitful character of the vocabularies, which are always compilations. In this regard he had a predecessor in Dozy who was the first to be aware of the fact that an Arabic dictionary should not be based exclusively on the deficient mediaeval Arabic dictionaries (Dozy severely criticized Freytag because of his uncritical use of sources, and his lack of method; „Il n’a dépouillé rigoureusement aucun livre“ he said of him in the preface, p. VI, of his Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes I, Leiden-Paris, 1927), while in recent times we find i.a. Manfred Ulmann who confirms Kopf’s point of view by expressing the same idea (Ragaz-Poesie p. 231; my translation): „It is not possible, as Barth and Freytag and Heni Fleisch, L’Arabo Classique, Esquisse d’un structure linguistique, Beyrouth 1956, have done, to use Belot as basis for his studies. Only when one takes into account the linguistic situation which one really comes across can one get reliable and conclusive results... Freytag and Lane reproduce all the words mentioned in the Arabic Lexicons, without indicating if they are really found and to which field of the literature they belong. They are represented along with usual forms and other forms which seem to be equivalent but which owe their existence only to poetical necessity. In connection with Ulmann we should mention the Wörterbuch der Klaasische Arabischen Sprache, which has appeared recently (Wiesbaden 1960 and ff.) and of which M. Ulmann is one of the collaborators, which promises to fill the gap in this field. Kopf was one of the first who had a detailed view about the kinds of deficiencies and mistakes the Arabic lexicons bristle with, „It goes without any doubt, that most medieval Arabic dictionaries lack any linguistic foundation. Arabic lexicography developed in a complicated manner. The method and the tools of the research and the criticism were inadequate and by the juxtaposition of materials derived from different sources they developed a rather complicated network of which the separate threads are not to be distinguished from each other and it is unthinkable to isolate therein the true from the false“ (p. 238 my translation). One of his famous examples is from the Qámis, a vocabulary by Firízábadi, in which the sources are represented in a very abridged form: the example he cites is the word kursí which means “chair“. In the Qámis is also given the meaning: ‘ilm “knowledge“ (p. 238; see also p. 31 hebr., note 17).

This way of giving the meaning of the word kursí “knowledge“ traces its origin back to the tafsí on the Quranic verse: “His throne extendeth over the heavens and the earth (II:250)“. To avoid an anthropomorphic explanation of the passage, some religious tendencies tried to get out of this by explaining it as “knowledge“. So this meaning (which was not a real existing meaning) entered the vocabularies, which were compilations of all kinds of poetic sharí’s, tafsí’s etc.

Other wrong explanations are due to a special context (often a particular verse of poetry) in which the word occurred and the philologist who did not know the word tried to explain it by means of this context without any certitude or system. (p. 46 hebr. sqq.) In many cases the given words are explained in a too specific way, while the real signification is a generic one (loc. cit.). So Kopf concludes that the mediaeval Arabic dictionaries can not be used at random for comparative purposes. One should first check if a word has ever had the meaning as given in the dictionary.

The dictionaries based on mediaeval Arabic dictionaries such as Golins, Freytag, Lane, Belot lack scientific foundation, although for practical use they were during quite a period the only means and to some extent sufficient for
inductive use. With his ouvre Kopf can be situated between Dozy, Fischer, the collaborators at the Wörterbuch der Klassischen Arabischen Sprache such as Klaeber, Götze, Spitaler, Ullman and others. (However, the other recent Dictionnaire Arabe-Francois-Englais by R. Blachère, M. Chouémi, C. Détente, Paris, 1967) and F. is based mainly on medieval vocabularies and only to a lesser degree on literary sources. His main concern hereby was the usefulness of the Arabic dictionary for comparative purposes (within the field of Semitic languages). The value of the republication of Kopf's writings lies in the fact that he demonstrated clearly to scholars of Semitic studies the danger of relying any more on dictionaries like Belot (as for instance Von Soden did when he compiled his Akkadisches Handwörterbuch; see Orientalia 28 (1959) 26 sqq.).

The present book contains a picture of the late L. Kopf, but a complete list of his publications is missing.

Leiden/Amsterdam, 30 januari 1980

A. SCHIPPERS

--


Chapter I. The purpose of this study is to characterize the lexical relationships that exist among the major urban Syro-Lebanese varieties of Arabic. (The author prefers the term variety instead of dialect). X6 informants were consulted. Two analytical lists were used for the elicitation of data, the Swadesh and the modified Ferguson-Sa'id lists.

Chapter II. Compatible items have the same meaning in different varieties. On the other hand, synonymous items have the same meaning in one single variety. Compatible items are contrastive, when the two words have different, and non-contrastive, when they are variants of the same original word. In the last case they are cognate. A cognate form in another variety may have a different meaning than the two cognate items are not compatible. The structural dialectologist collapses two sets, e.g. lemons/oranges, into a contrastive compatible system, e.g. one variety has laymin/burd'an, another judin/brud'in. In this way the author can distinguish four major groups of varieties. Lexical evidence delineates major divisions; phonological evidence may be used to delineate subdivisions.

The phonemes of the examined varieties are summarized in chapter III. Also the development of the Kitāb phonemes into their modern counterparts is taken into consideration.

In chapter IV it is shown that the lexical relationships establish the close relationship that exist among the Syro-Lebanese varieties. The diagnostic list used for this analysis is the 'Swadesh Basic Vocabulary List'. The urban Syro-Lebanese varieties constitute a homogeneous unit within the whole context of urban varieties of the Arabic speaking world.

Chapter V gives an analysis of contrastive compatible sets to determine degree of heterogeneity within the group of Syro-Lebanese varieties, which permit their classification. Here the modified Ferguson-Sa'id List is used. The varieties, which are under discussion belong to four groups: The central and Eastern groups, the North-Western group and the South-Western group.

Chapter VI. Conclusions and Outlook. This study has introduced a new lexical concept - compatibility. The variety groups are repeated and discussed. The urban varieties are not as homogeneous as has been maintained, but only constitute an independent linguistic entity vis-à-vis the rural varieties.

My general impression is that this study, thanks to its rigid method, arrives at convincing results.

Ghent, April 1980


Apart from Ibn Ginni, the discovery of the “Baghdadian” grammarians is a recent one. Several works of al-Zaghāqī, among them the invaluable Kitāb fi ḫal al-naww, have now been published, and the same applies to some smaller works e.g. by Ibn al-Sarrāq and to the Uṣūl al-naww by the same author (ed. A. al-Fatah (?), vol. 1 Nāṣir 1973; vol. 2 Baghdad 1973). Many works, however, are still unpublished, and the two major gaps in our knowledge of the 10th century Arabic grammar are probably the large commentaries of Siwawayhi’s Kitāb, by al-Sirāfī and by ar-Rummānī. One is, therefore, most grateful to Edith Ambros for having published at least part of the latter’s Sharī‘.

Not much is known about the author of the Sharī‘, who died in 134/954; we possess his treatises on the Sharī‘ al-Qur‘ān, and two smaller treatises concerned with grammar, the Maqāṣid al-hurūf and the Ḫudūd al-naww, edited by Muṣṭafā Qawālī and Yūsuf Ya‘qub al-Masḵūnī, Baghdad 1969 (this edition was apparently not known to A.). The Sharī‘ itself has been preserved in two manuscripts, one containing the paragraphs 411 till the end (Öster­reichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien), the other the par­agraphs 75 till the end (Millet Kütüphanesi, Istanbul). It is illegible that precisely the commentary on the first, most important paragraphs of the Kitāb is missing, but still, the remaining paragraphs are interesting enough in them­selves. Previously, the only parts of the Sharī‘ which were available were a non-critical edition of the section on istihlā‘ in Mazīn Muṣṭafā’s al-Rummānī al-naww fi dav‘ sharḥiḥ bi-Kitāb Siwawayh (Dimashq, 1963), and some passages edited by Vera Quittner in her dissertation on al-Rummānī’s Sharī‘ (Das Fragment des Commentators zum Kitāb Siwawayh von ar-Rummānī, Wien 1955).