

BOOK REVIEWS

BENJAMIN H. HARY: *Multiglossia in Judeo-Arabic: with an edition, translation and grammatical study of the Cairene Purim Scroll.* (Etudes sur le Judaïsme Médiéval, Tome XIV.) xvii, 359 pp. Leiden, New York and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1992. Guilders 100, \$57.14.

The title and the subtitle of this work neatly divide it into its two parts: *Multiglossia in Judeo-Arabic* (=JA), points to part one, entitled 'The analytic introduction', chs. i-iv (pp. 1-114; ch. v, pp. 115-29, already belongs with the next section on the scroll itself), whereas the subtitle, *Edition, translation, and grammatical study of the Cairene Purim Scroll*, refers to the rest of the book, dealing with this scroll from the early sixteenth century.

The first part attempts to build a 'multiglossic' framework of JA, examines the various theories of the emergence of Neo-Arabic (=NA) and the linguistic factors reflected in Middle Arabic (=MA) texts in general and JA in particular. Hary has a lucid mind which enables him to analyse clearly the rather intricate problems of MA, and one takes intellectual delight in reading his exposition. On the other hand, he has an excessive predilection for coining new terms which do not always improve on the accepted ones, and are sometimes even inferior to them. The term multiglossia itself, to my taste, has serious disadvantages when compared with (Ferguson's) 'diglossia'. The latter designates two languages existing side by side, as against varieties of the same language (such as standard and regional dialects). The term multiglossia, on the other hand, as conceived for MA/JA, does not differentiate between the strata of the same language and different languages, as are Old Arabic (=OA) and NA, which are, in fact, the two poles about which all the varieties of MA/JA revolve. The introduction of the varieties of MA/JA by the term multiglossia has been achieved by blurring the special status of OA and NA, and, in my opinion, the price paid is too heavy.

It was H. Blanc who first clearly demanded that a strict distinction be made between the Arabic used in medieval texts and medieval dialects, which were not both to be designated by MA (*Tarbiz*, 36, 1967, 407). Since then I have carefully differentiated them, reserving MA for the first and dubbing the second Early NA. Hary (pp. 52ff.) has failed to note that books of mine have appeared in second editions with additional material, and has quoted my views expressed before Blanc had stated his strictures, without taking into account the additions in which I corrected the double usage of MA. H.'s proposed terminology (pp. 55 ff., Literary Written MA as against Dialectal Spoken MA) is generally speaking appropriate;

it has, however, the disadvantage of not bringing into relief the fact that Early NA (H.'s Dialectal Spoken MA) is the direct precursor of Modern NA. Therefore, I prefer my nomenclature to H.'s terminology.

Great linguistic and cultural change in the history of JA occurred in the fifteenth century. To a large extent, especially in the Maghreb, yet with the notable exclusion of Yemen, the ties connecting JA with Islamic-Arabic culture were severed; therefore, not only was Hebrew more and more used for cultural purposes, but JA, now especially addressing the lower layers of Jewry, became less and less connected with Standard Arabic and more and more influenced by NA. According to H. (pp. 75 ff.), however, there are five *main* (the emphasis is mine, J. B.) periods of JA: Pre-Islamic JA, Early JA (eighth/ninth-tenth centuries), Classical JA (tenth-fifteenth centuries), Later JA (fifteenth-nineteenth centuries), and Modern JA. Not only does this division blur the main change in the history of JA, viz. the transition from Classical JA to Later JA, but it unnecessarily constitutes a Pre-Islamic period of JA. Since, however, according to H. himself (p. xiii) JA is written by Jewish authors for Jewish readers, one must exclude Pre-Islamic JA from JA proper, because in its essence it did not differ from the language of non-Jews and addressed the same audience. Moreover, H.'s claim that a period of Early JA existed in which many works were in papyrus form and for the most part consisted of letters is based on a misconception. In the eighth-ninth/tenth centuries, indeed, Jews used phonetic spelling, diametrically opposed to standard JA orthography; yet letters written on papyri were a minority, and most texts composed in this spelling that have been preserved were literary works written on parchment. One must not consider those texts spelt phonetically to represent a chronological unit, since they are attested alongside texts stemming from the same period written in standard JA orthography. One should rather regard them as a separate subculture. So, since Modern JA does not in the main differ from Late JA, H.'s five periods boil down to two: Classical (or Standard) JA as against Late (or Modern) JA.

The Cairene Purim Scroll itself has been published several times (see H., pp. 127 ff.). It has, however, never received such a painstaking and exact linguistic treatment (although, to my taste, H. often cites a plethora of examples for commonplace phenomena, e.g. pp. 274-5 for the pronominal suffix *-hyy*, p. 296 for the absence of the indefinite accusative marker, etc.). The research of modern Arabic dialects is, in the main, strictly synchronic. The NA elements contained in MA/JA are, therefore, of extraordinary importance, since they enable us to add the diachronic dimension. H. has added an additional point to the map of ancient dialects, and we are obliged to him for it.

Some scattered remarks follow:

p. 41: in my opinion, the oral formulaic

theory does not explain the correct use of case-endings and mood-endings in poetry. It only accounts, e.g., for the use of any short vowel in *waladuka/waladaka/waladika* in order to preserve the metre, but not for the choice of the correct short vowel in accordance with classical grammar. Moreover, the Qur'ān also reflects correct case-endings and mood-endings.

pp. 63 ff.: I am puzzled as to what is new in H.'s treatment of the differences between hyper-corrections and hypo-corrections.

p. 88 (ii): in the system of standard Arabic orthography in which, as a rule, *ā* is marked by *alif*, the use of *alif* for marking every final *ā* is quite natural. It is clear therefore that already in Classical JA *alif* is often utilized for classical *alif maqšūra bi-šurat al-yā*. Accordingly, there is no reason to attribute this usage in Late JA to the influence of the Babylonian Talmud.

p. 89,2: 'ydh reflects 'aydā rather than 'aydan.

p. 106: since the anteposition of 'aydan is quite frequent in MA/JA, its occurrence in the Cairene Purim Scroll does not attest Hebrew influence.

p. 108: Blanc in his above-mentioned paper has found *nf 'l-nf 'lū* in non-Jewish Egyptian dialects, and it is now attested by P. Behnstedt-M. Voidich, *Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte* (Wiesbaden, 1985, Atlas, 2); cf. also *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik*, 1, 1978, 69. Therefore the separate standing of Egyptian JA texts, though by no means out of the question, is not clearly established.

p. 112 (iii): H.'s claim that orthodox Jews were especially exposed to the influence of the German orthography of Yiddish is erroneous.

pp. 300 ff.: in MA/JA hypercorrect 'ilā for *la* is quite frequent, see *Beer-Sheva*, 3, 1988, 39–40, where also *sefer pirqē 'abhōt* is quoted, which (see H., p. 273, n. 89) may already contain Late JA phenomena. It is for this reason that I suggest that the use of 'ilā for translating the Hebrew definite object marker 'et is a hyper-correct feature (instead of *la*, which is quite frequent as a marker of definite objects in MA/JA), which had become standardized.

JOSHUA BLAU

BERNARD SPOLSKY and ROBERT L. COOPER: *The languages of Jerusalem*. (Oxford Studies in Language Contact.) xiv, 166 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991. £30.00

Given the priority assigned by Israeli official policy to the creation of an all-Hebrew Jewish society, and its sweeping success, it is striking how little academic attention has been paid to this paradigm case of the 'melting pot'. Even less is known of the response of the non-Jewish

communities who are on the sidelines of this linguistic endeavour (while clearly involved in the political and economic train of events). Spolsky and Cooper's volume is in fact the first monograph to deal with this topic. They focus on the macro-sociolinguistics of the Old City of Jerusalem today, its four quarters (Jewish, Christian, Muslim and Armenian) making for a hotbed of political and religious conflict as well as just one more instance of what sociolinguists find most fascinating: the urban language-scape, where both levelling and diversification proceed apace. Close to half the inhabitants of the Old City of Jerusalem know three or more languages; meanwhile, Hebrew has steadily spread as a second spoken language and the chief *lingua franca* between Jew and Arab. The authors' imaginative and wide-ranging probe demonstrates how acute a profile of a society the sociolinguist can supply.

The authors' qualitative and quantitative survey forms the basis for the second half of the book. The first half fills in the background: a sociolinguistic history of the Old City and a broad sweep of Jewish sociolinguistics from Antiquity to the renaissance of spoken Hebrew (presumably the title *The languages of Jerusalem* was chosen with all this in mind, otherwise it strikes one as somewhat irrelevant), though one might have wished for a more finely-tuned picture of Hebrew-Aramaic diglossia. The portrait of the contemporary Old City begins with the authorities' choice of street signs. From this emerges a model of language choice, which they apply to the market place. The authors then address the general language-planning efforts of Israelis, committed to a Hebrew-using Jewish populace and a Hebrew-knowing Arab populace (perhaps a weak commitment in the latter case: the private schools at which most Arab children in the Old City are educated are not obliged to teach Hebrew and do not); language-planning by Palestinian Arabs is aimed at rejecting Israeli suzerainty, but not at furthering the campaign for autonomy. How Hebrew and Arabic are acquired or 'picked up' is the subject of the next chapter, followed by a statistical analysis of the spread of Hebrew.

As so often where sociocultural hostility conflicts with economic aspirations (see Macnamara's study of the Irish in Shuy and Fasold, *Language attitudes*, Washington, D.C., 1973), we find the latter dictating language choice: despite the long years studying English at school, it is the sheer opportunities for learning Hebrew 'hands-on' that make Hebrew, not English, the choice for communication between Arab and Jew. By contrast, few Jews in their sample knew Arabic, not so much because Israeli schools neglect it as because, once again, there is little incentive to pick it up (and every incentive to learn English)—a state of affairs that the authors overtly deplore, as they do the monolingual policies on street signs, although they are too sober a pair of sociolinguists not to admit that a sociolinguistic situation such as this 'reflects rather than directs social forces'. Corrigenda: p. 21 *mazaq* > *mazag*.

LEWIS GLINERT