



Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Brian D. Joseph

Reviewed work(s): Standard Albanian: A Reference Grammar for Students by Leonard Newmark ; Philip Hubbard ; Peter Prifti

Source: *Language*, Vol. 59, No. 4, (Dec., 1983), pp. 931-932

Published by: Linguistic Society of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/413398>

Accessed: 05/05/2008 11:07

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=lsa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We enable the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Chap. 5 (315–23) briefly summarizes the main results and points out areas for future research. This is followed by two appendices: the first deals with the use of *hay*, *estar*, and *ser*; the second investigates zero subject sentences. S hypothesizes that Spanish has three kinds of null subjects: PRO, trace, and \emptyset .

It is unfortunate that S uses different sources of data; this poses problems in a categorical rule analysis which does not formally incorporate the notion of stylistic variation. In addition, there is the usual lack of agreement on the grammatical status of some made-up examples, as S herself states in a footnote. But this does not detract from the undeniable merit of the book as an important contribution to studies of Spanish syntax and semantics, as well as to general syntactic and semantic theory. S is to be commended for her effort to take into account the speakers' communicative intentions in her analysis of presentational sentences. Given the nature of the study, this book will be very valuable in advanced Spanish syntax and semantics courses. [CARMEN SILVA-CORVALÁN, USC.]

Standard Albanian: A reference grammar for students. By LEONARD NEWMARK, PHILIP HUBBARD, and PETER PRIFTI. Stanford: University Press, 1982. Pp. xviii, 347. \$45.00.

English-speaking students of Albanian have long faced nearly insuperable obstacles in trying to learn about this rich and (at first) often perplexing language, since the best descriptions of the modern language are in Albanian itself. Few suitable materials are available in English; and those in other accessible languages are either somewhat old, and therefore not necessarily reflective of current usage (e.g. G. Meyer's 1888 *Kurzgefasste Albanesische Grammatik*), or else cover the Geg dialect (e.g. M. Camaj's *Lehrbuch der albanesischen Sprache*), which is not the one used now as the basis for standard Albanian. The book of Newmark et al. takes a giant step toward filling this gap.

The authors point out (v–vi) that their book is 'not a linguist's grammar ... nor a scholar's grammatical compendium ... [nor] a complete textbook for learning Albanian'; yet here is collected, for the first time in English, a usable and fairly complete description of Albanian. The twelve chapters contain such practical information as orthographic and punctuation con-

ventions, the pronunciation of larger numbers, and even facts about the country and people of Albania—but also detailed accounts of the form and function of the major parts of speech and of the several classes of 'small words' (prepositions, conjunctions, particles, and interjections). In addition, because the object of description is the developing literary standard, the authors include many important comments on usage, labeling forms or formations as colloquial, formal, obsolescent, gaining in currency etc.

Moreover, while addressing their work to both linguists and non-linguists, the authors provide a wealth of information, with something for everyone. For the language enthusiast, an extraordinarily large number of examples are given, usually whole sentences—often in context and all drawn from authentic Albanian sources. The historical linguist is given occasional asides on the diachronic background of synchronic patterns (e.g. p. 290, on the synchronic oddity of the nominative case governed by the preposition *nga* 'from, by'). A reader interested in contrastive analysis will find numerous explicit comments on key differences between Albanian and English usage (e.g. p. 159, with regard to the use of definiteness in generic nominal forms). The practical-minded reader will be especially glad for the explicit differentiation of formally identical words/phrases, e.g. *një palë* 'a few' vs. *një palë* 'one pair' (287) or the indefinite article *një* vs. the number *një* 'one' vs. the indeterminate pronoun *një* (151).

Despite these numerous positive features, the book does have a few failings. For instance, as the authors themselves recognize (vi), since the examples are not ad-hoc creations, their 'relevance ... may not be immediately transparent to beginners in the language'; this indeed is often so. Occasional unclarity of expression occur, as with the description (34) of passive forms: 'a verb is in the PASSIVE voice when it has a non-active form, which would be the object of the corresponding active verb and names an action experienced by the subject'—or the labeling of all Albanian clitics as proclitics (17) despite the enclisis of pronouns to imperatives (e.g. *sill më* 'bring to-me').

Such instances, fortunately, are relatively few. A somewhat more serious shortcoming is the repetition of material in different sections, with neither adequate cross-referencing nor a sufficiently detailed index. For example, the jussive particle *le* is discussed in three places

(90, 105, 321), but only p. 90 gives a cross-reference, and that is only to p. 105, even though p. 321 has more examples of its use. Similarly, *sa* 'so much' plus infinitive, which has a 'benefactive, modifying or predicative function' (314) is given both in the section on uses of the infinitive and in the section on *sa* itself—with no cross-referencing at all, and with the special emphatic use of *vetēm* 'just' mentioned only in the latter passage.

On the physical side, the book is nicely produced and extremely readable, because of the large print (with comparatively few typos, none of them major); however, the 8" × 11" format is somewhat unwieldy to use (in particular to thumb through, as one is wont to do with grammars). A useful supplement for future editions would be an index of individual words and idiomatic expressions.

These shortcomings are, by and large, quite minor, and in no way detract from the significance and over-all utility of this work. The authors are to be commended for producing a book which will be a standard reference tool on Albanian for some time to come. [BRIAN D. JOSEPH, *Ohio State University*.]

The prātiśākhyā tradition and modern linguistics. By D. D. MAHULKAR. Baroda: Dept. of Linguistics, M.S. University of Baroda, 1981. Pp. v, 155.

Though this ambitious book proposes to compare the contribution of the Prātiśākhyas with recent developments in phonetics and phonology, the first nine chapters hardly refer to those texts; one must wait till Chap. 10 to find anything significant about them. Nowhere in the book is there a clear description of the structure or contents of the various Śikṣā and Prātiśākhyā texts, but random passages are compared with theories in western linguistics. Thus the sense of individuality of these texts is lost to the reader. However, there are potentially valuable and promising discussions on topics like *abhini-dhāna* (Chap. 12), syllabication (Chap. 13), nasalization (Chap. 14), semivowels (Chap. 15), prosodies of voicing and aspiration (Chap. 16), retroflexion (Chap. 17), and 'Vedic and Sanskrit' (Chap. 18).

The first half of the book is devoted to the evolution of western phonetics and phonology, and its connection with the introduction of San-

skrit in the west. However, one must set aside a large mass of sweeping generalizations and inaccuracies; e.g., 'Realizing that the *k* is already modified by the lip-rounding feature of *u*: before its own articulation begins, the Indians represented their *k* as merging with *u*: in their writing of *coo*' (p. 27). No such intentionality can be imputed to the writing system, nor is any such explicit reasoning found in the Prātiśākhyas. Again, M says: 'The Śikṣā and the Prātiśākhyā works have no form or design' (38); but one needs to read these texts more carefully to see their design. M constantly contrasts Pāṇini and the Prātiśākhyas, often to an extreme. He is right in pointing out that, although Pāṇini used phonetic features to formulate his rules, he (unlike the Prātiśākhyas) was not interested in all aspects of the articulation of Sanskrit. But M claims that Pāṇini's grammar 'encouraged the tendency to keep away from the natural way in which Sanskrit was developing in the course of its history', while the Prātiśākhyā tradition 'tried to document the events in the actual performance of the community' (46). This statement ignores the fact that Kātyāyana and Pa-tāñjali successively modified Pāṇini's grammar, in part on the basis of the contemporary usage of Sanskrit. Actually, Pāṇini aimed at describing a language; but the Prātiśākhyas were composed not to describe a language, but to describe the proper recitation of particular Vedic texts, as then fixed by the tradition.

One must also distinguish between a description of articulatory processes and the statement of phonological rules. According to M, Pāṇini 6.1.77 says that *y v r* are substituted for *i u ṛ* respectively when the latter are followed by vowels, 'whereas the Ṛk-Prātiśākhyā states the same phenomenon in terms of articulatory process' (50). He then quotes Ṛk-Prātiśākhyā rule 2.8 as follows: 'The *samānākṣara* vowels other than *a* and *ā*, that is *i*, *u* and *ṛ*, obtain their own *antasthā* forms when followed by a vowel' (144). But apart from the difference in terminology, Pāṇini's rule is identical with this statement, which offers no articulatory logic whatever. A description is not a rule, and a rule is not an explanation. The intentionality of a text also needs to be distinguished from what a modern reader can derive from it. The Prātiśākhyas only intend to describe the recitation, in their time, of particular Vedic texts. However, we can build a whole series of inferences, theoretical and historical, on the basis of these texts, which we could not ascribe to the intention of