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

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

Andrzej Zaborski

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

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

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

(s.o) in/with (s.th.)' as expressing mutuality! In case of *taqātala* only less than two-thirds of 389 verbs have 'reciprocity' as the dominant meaning (Table 28.) As far as conativity is concerned, Danks says that no conativity ooccurs without mutuality while mutuality without conativity is encountered frequently and he pretends to have found only one example of allegedly conative meaning without mutuality feature, i.e. *wārā* 'to hide, conceal, try to keep secret (s.th.)' (p. 102). I can hardly agree with Danks' 'characterization of the function of the *ta-* prefix in pattern VI as detransitivising with few exceptions' (p. 129) – how reciprocal action can be intransitive? That many *qātala* verbs express features 'multiplication, frequency, durativity' etc. of action ('conative' feature being their secondary feature in case of telic verbs and especially with singular object, e.g. *qātala-hu* can mean only 'to repeat efforts to kill him') has been well-known since a long time. There are indeed traces of plurality of *qātala* class verbs and there are even *qātala* and *qattala* forms of the same verb having the same 'intensive/pluractional' meaning because at a prehistorical stage, already in Proto-Afroasiatic, *qattala* and *qātala* were variants or allomorphs. But I disagree with Danks when he says that "verbal plurality is a viable explanation of pattern III mutuality and pattern VI reciprocity". I do not think that it makes sense to look for a connection between long *-ā-* and 'activity', 'focus on process', 'internal temporal complexity' etc. in participles, verbal nouns, nouns of instrument and of occupation (pp. 143-154) at least in a synchronic analysis since there is a risk of sound symbolism ('Lautsymbolik') deviation. Diachronically it makes sense to compare III class Imperfect *yu-**qātil**-u* with the Active Participle *qātil* but this is quite another problem.

In Chapter 8. (pp. 157-187) Danks presents 'An aspectual model for Modern Standard Arabic' in which he takes for granted that *Aktionsart* and grammatical aspect must not be held as distinct and he concentrates on *Aktionsart* dubbed 'lexical aspect'. In Chapter 9. (pp. 189-211) he analyses different 'aspects' (actually *Aktionsarten*!) of *qātala* and *taqātala* like 'activity', 'surprise', 'giving', 'inception' , 'semelfactive' and comes to conclusion that "over 93% of actual usage of pattern III and pattern VI verbal forms is attributable to verbs in categories unmarked for telicity". Danks considers only one (sic!) verb as telic, i.e. *taʿāfā* 'to recuperate, recover, regain health' but the consequences drawn from the examples of usage (No. 255a and 25b on p. 210) are not correct since the imperfective meaning in No. 255a is due to the use of auxiliary *lā yazāl* and the Imperfect form *yataʿāfā,* and the perfective meaning in 255b is due to the use of *qad* with Perfect *taʿāfā!* I do not think that allegedly 'inceptive' verbs like *ʿāhada* 'to promise (s.o.) to do (s.th.)' or *ḥāsaba* 'to call (s.o.) to account/ hold (to s.o.) responsible' are simply atelic. They are rather neutral as far as telicity is concerned.

The book must be read by everybody interested in problems of the semantics of verbal derivation in Modern Literary Arabic in spite of several controver-

sies. The author has used arabiCorpus but for a thorough study of *Aktionsarten* the use of real texts with real examples of usage (*Belegstellen*) should be much more extensive. There is still much to do.

Andrzej Zaborski

Gunvor Mejdell, Lutz Edzard (eds), High vs. Low and Mixed Varieties – Status, Norms and Functions across Time and Languages. Wiesbaden 2012. Harrassowitz. 210 pp. = Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes Band 77. ISSN 0567-4980. ISBN 978-3-447-06696-9.

The volume under review is based on papers delivered at the 'Oslo Workshop on High and Low varieties, diglossia, and language contact : linguistic products and social processes' which was organized at the University of Oslo on June 14th and 15th, 2010.

Gunvor Mejdell in 'High and Low varieties, diglossia, language contact, and mixing: social processes and linguistic products in a comparative perspective' introduces the main concepts and summarizes the problems analyzed and results attained in the particular papers. The author is right saying (p. 10-11) that the term 'diglossia' should be used in the proper, i.e. a 'narrow' sense and not for situations like 'standard-with-dialects', bilingualism, high and low variety of the same language etc. Therefore two criteria are crucial: 1. a relatively very close genetic relationship, practically a relationship of a decisively older and a younger stage (or stages) of the evolution of the historically the same language, 2. secondary acquisition of the 'High' variety which is nobody's real native language so that this H variety is not used in spontaneous spoken communication. Already here there should be a mention (there is an outline of the history in the paper by Taine-Cheikh on p. 89) that the term 'diglossia' was used already in the 19th century for a classical diglossic situation in Greece where the high and the low varieties were not simply in complementary distribution but the separation of them in public life (till 1976) was enforced by law. William Marçais (see the reference on p. 107) actually took the term and the idea of diglossia from Greeks but it was Ferguson who made it popular in his rather overestimated paper of 1959. In any case both Greek (before 1976) and Arabic (continuing and still openly or tacitly enforced !) diglossias are prototypical! The idea of 'spectroglossia' introduced after el-Sa'īd al-Badawi's publication of 1973 should have been mentioned since it raised questions how complementary the complementary use of *al-fuṣḥa* and of spoken dialects, not to mention 'intermediate Arabic'