

Texte im arabischen Beduinendialekt der Region Douz (Südtunesien). By VERONIKA RITT-BENMIMOUN. (*Semitica Viva*, ed. by Otto Jastrow, 46). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011. 554 p., 15 Abb. ISSN 0931-2811 ISBN 978-3-447-06530-6

The book under review contains an admirably vast number of orally recorded texts in about 240 pages in the Southern Tunisian Bedouin dialect of the Dūz region, together with a similar amount of pages with the German translations. The Introductory chapters are, on the contrary, too brief to help the reader to appreciate the texts. It has a geographic description of the region in 14 pages with only 7 pages of a linguistic or grammatical description which is astonishing. Between the two sub-chapters there is a state of the art summary called “Forschungsstand” in one page about the Tunisian dialectology. At the end of the book there is a glossary of difficult words not translated in the texts but interpreted here in 7 pages. The bibliography unnecessarily fills 16 pages with many items not referred to in the volume.

Many problems and questions arise during the reading of this book. One of the major problems is connected to the inconsistencies of the transcription. It is stated in the Introduction (4. “Transkription”) that the author used what she called a “morphophonemisches Transkriptionssystem” (whatever it means in practice) “um die morphologische Zusammenhörigkeit von Lexemen sichtbar zu erhalten”. However, even this very obscure principle has not been adhered to. Some words are transcribed according to their supposed original lexeme (to wit, *mā*, *kān*), some others are transcribed according to their actual pronunciation (e.g., ^o*džī*). A good example for this is the case of the genitive construction with *mtā^c*. On p. 202, no. 5. it is written as *ntāḥ* in the word *ntāḥḥum* giving the actual pronunciation instead of retaining the morphophonological constituents (from *ntā^c?*/*mtā^c?* + *hum*), whereas, for example, on p. 258, no. 8 it is given as ^o*mtā^c*. Without a somewhat detailed explanation one cannot accommodate the co-occurrence of *mtā^c* and *ntā^c*.

In other places the translation is based on the superficial understanding of the structure of the phrase. E.g., pp. 502-3, no. 1: “*yūldu l-mi^oza nxallōhum līl yak^obru*” = “Wenn (die Ziegen) Nachwuchs bekommen, behalten wir sie, bis sie groß werden.” The verb *hall(a)*, however, generally serves as an auxiliary verb in the meaning “to let”. A transcribed text naturally cannot be without errors but if one and the same grammatically important particle is written in two variants it is difficult to find out which of them is the right one in lack of a concise grammar of acceptable size in the book: p. 502, l. 1 “*līl yak^obru*” and l. 2: “*līl yak^obru*”. It is also difficult to understand, why the insertion of an automatic ultra brief vowel seemed to be necessary between two consonants in word final pausal position (*kal^ob*) – it being the rule of almost all Bedouin dialects, East and West, not to allow a two consonant closure –, while at the same time doubled consonants re-

mained written even before a third consonant which cannot be pronounced in this way (^o*nsaddru*). However, she does not seem to adhere to her rules, and writes *mā-^eādš* in pause (p. 258, no. 9) instead of *mā-^eād^š*. Alongside ^o*nsaddru* we also encounter ^t*badd^llat* (p. 132, no. 26). She gives the form *w-^eadd^lmōha* (p. 136, no. 12) alongside *mḡammōa* (p. 134, no. 9). One has a feeling of uncertainty because with the various forms it is difficult to glean the rules, since one cannot know for certain whether in a given form a certain rule is being followed or the actual pronunciation.

One could list a great number of further problems and errors along the same lines. In my view the use of a simple term “morphophonological transcription system” cannot substitute a more refined, well considered and logical transcription. The lack of marking the emphasis and the preservation of the lexical length of the vowels in all environments also cause great problems in interpreting the linguistic data. That is why one cannot use these texts as a linguistic estimation of the Southern Tunisian Bedouin dialects till the publishing of an accompanying grammar book promised in the Introduction, and one can only hope that this grammar will soon see the light. Until then the German translations can be used on their own as an anthropological collection.

Kinga Dévényi

Abū Nuwās in Übersetzung. Eine Stellensammlung zu Abū Nuwās-Übersetzungen vornehmlich in europäische Sprachen. By EWALD WAGNER. (*Arabische Studien*, ed. Hartmut Bobzin and Tilman Seidensticker, 7.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012. 218 p. ISSN 1860-5117, ISBN 978-3-447-06638-9

Ewald Wagner, the well known and recognized editor of the *Dīwān* of Abū Nuwās in its entirety, as a culmination of his lifelong research in the poetry of this ^eAbbāsīd poet compiled a comprehensive collection of the translations of his poems in 32 different languages. He does not only give the data of appearances but also the original titles of the translated poems which is not an easy task considering the sometimes fundamental changes the translators made in the meaning of the Arabic text. He arranged the translations according to his five volume edition of the Arabic text, giving not only the data of the translated poem and the translation but also telling whether the translation is complete or only partial. This book is an indispensable tool to the European cultural history and to the estimation of how Arabic literature has become known in the world during the centuries.

Kinga Dévényi