

fal-naʿt bil-hāʾ, miṭl: al-marʾah, faʾidā qult: yuʾannaṭ fal-naʿt miṭl al-rijl, biḡayr hāʾ, kaqawlika: muʾannaṭah wa muʾannaṭ (358).

Where:

muʾannaṭah (E: *muʾannaṭ* + I: *-ah*) obviously has to be interpreted as ‘a feminine noun with an explicitly expressed feminine marker’ while:

muʾannaṭ (E: *muʾannaṭ* + I: *zero*) as ‘an implicitly feminine noun’.

Incidentally, *H*’s *naʿt* is certainly a term that deserves closer attention. Currently, ‘attribute’ (in syntax) or ‘adjective’ (in morphology and part-of-speech hierarchy), seems to coincide with a ‘substantive’ or, more generally, with a ‘noun’, in *H*’s usage. Patient readers will probably find answer to this terminological puzzle in one of the relatively numerous *naʿt*-related references in the *Fihris*.

Fihris al-muṣṭalahāt is certainly of great help to the reader. Were it more complete, than it actually is, it would render invaluable services to all those who have no direct access to *H*’s lexicon. Confronting *qarīb*-related reference (5:154, p.331): *wal-qarīb naqīḍ al-baʿid yakūn taḥwīlan yastawī fīh al-ḡakar wal-ʾunṭā wal-fard wal-jamīʿ*... with *Fihris*, I was somewhat astonished to discover that from all these terms only *jamīʿ* can be really found under its own root-entry JMʿ. The term *fard*, theoretically retrievable in the entry FRD, cannot be located in the text 8:204, the unique in this entry. The remaining two items, *ḡakar* and *ʾunṭā* are not mentioned at all.

In Appendix One, the *qarīb*-related reference, is correctly introduced by 5:154, p. 331. The 5:154 indication is mistakenly repeated also on the page 330 instead, evidently, of the correct 5:145.

Talmon’s monograph offers the reader an impressive stock of information supported by an uncommonly rich amount of sources. The access to most of them is far from easy. It will be a helpful guide to Arabists, lexicographers, linguists and to all those interested in the evolution of the grammatical methodology in the Arab cultural area, in the relatively short interval between semi-legendary Abū l-Aswad al-Duʾalī and Sībawayhi, Ḥalīl’s most prominent disciple.

Ladislav Drozdík

REFERENCES

- BLACHÈRE, R. 1952. *Histoire de la littérature arabe des origines à la fin du XV^e siècle de J.-C.* Paris, Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient.
 GREENBERG, J.H. 1960. “A Quantitative Approach to the Morphological Typology of Language”, In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* xxvi, 3: 178–194.
 THORBECKE, H. 1886. *Miḥāʾil Šabbāḡ’s Grammatik der arabischen Umgangssprache in Syrien und Aegypten*. Strassburg, Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.

EISELE, John C.: *Arabic Verbs in Time: Tense and Aspect in Cairene Arabic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 1999. XIII + 264 pp. ISBN 3-447-04062-9.

Eisele’s monograph is the revised version of a doctoral thesis completed at the University of Chicago in 1988. Devoted to the analysis of temporal and aspectual functions in Cairo Arabic, it is a welcome scholarly contribution to the study of this important Arabic dialect.

The book consists of eight Chapters, Bibliography and an Index.

I (1-25) Introduction: General information on the language data; Previous works on tense and aspect in Arabic;

II (26-40) Tense and time reference in English: Analyses of tense in Generative grammar; Tense vs. time reference; Time reference, tenses, and time adverbs; Time reference as a discourse phenomenon;

III (41-59) Formal aspect: event, process, state: Formal aspect vs. lexical aspect; Aspect of English verb forms; Aspect taken as time reference; Time reference taken as aspect;

IV (60-98) Temporal and aspectual characteristics of the basic morphological verb forms in CA;

V (99-147) Present time copular sentences in CA;

VI (148-213) Compound tenses and complement types in CA;

VII (214-252) Lexical aspectual classification of verbs and predicates in CA;

VIII (253-256) Summary: The interaction of time reference, lexical aspect, and formal aspect in CA.

As for the formal presentation, the restriction of represented phonemes to the etymological stock of LA, 'trying to reproduce the alphabetical relationship of the Arabic script, in order to simplify the understanding of the transliterated examples for readers who are familiar with Cairene Arabic and Arabic script'(2), conceals some very essential phonological characteristics of CA: among them, first of all, the 'emphatic' /r/, one of the most powerful CA pharyngealizers out of the whole 'emphatic' inventory.

The notation of epenthesis is, in general, more consistent than that of vowel elision and vowel shortening. The undue fluctuation may be observed even here: the cluster-preventing vowel:

(a) is noted in superscript: *kullⁱ yōm tīgi mit'axxara* "every day she comes late" (82); *kuntⁱ rāyih il-madrassa bukra* "I was going to go to school tomorrow" (144);

(b) in superscript and on the line level: *ruḥtⁱ 'ulti-lu* "I up and told him" (155);

(c) on the line level: (*'and-aha*) in: *huda kān 'and-aha kitāb* "Huda had a book";

(d) is not noted at all: *kull yōm* "every day" (17); *iftakart 'ulti-l-u* "I thought I told (to) him" (155), instead of the expected *iftakartⁱ 'ultⁱ-lu*, etc.

The word-initial (etymological) glottal stop is always treated as a consonant in spite of its free alternation with *zero* in internal juncture: *bahibbⁱ 'aštaḡal* (149) / *bahibb aštaḡal*.

Marking morphemic boundaries is, to a considerable extent, inconsistent as well:

'ulti-l-u vs. *'ulti-lu* "I told him" (155).

It is probably for the sake of uniformity of notation and an easier identifiability of the forms described that the author decided to ignore the notation of most morphophonemic phenomena, that is vowel elision, vowel shortening and related processes of syllabic restructuring. Vowel elision, for instance, is noted but in close transition within the limits of a word, e.g.: *'āyiz+v = 'ayz+v*, as in: *'ana 'ayz-u yisra' il-firāx* (155) "I want him to steal the chicken". Beyond these limits, in internal junctures, vowel elision is left unnoted: *rāyih + il-* in e.g.: *'ana rāyih il-gam'a ba'd id-ḡuhr* "I am going to the university this afternoon" (140: quoted without bracketing), instead of the possible alternant *'ana rayh-il-gam'a ba'd id-ḡuhr*; or *v+ yirūh* in e.g.: *šagga't-u yirūh* (149) "I encouraged him to go", instead of the expected *šagga'lu-yirūh*.

Of course, there is another acceptable argument for neglecting the latter type of vowel elision and subsequent syllabic reconstruction: while cases like *'āyiz > 'ayz-a*, *'ayz-īn*, *'ayz-u*, etc. are obligatory, cases of vowel elision exceeding word limits are not.

Vowel shortening due to the shift of stress is another neglected morphophonemic feature, e.g.: *kātīb-lu = katīb-lu* (stress-contoured phonological word stressed on the penultima) in: *'ana kātīb-lu-mbārīh* (128) "I wrote to him yesterday", instead of the correct *'ana katīb-lu-mbārīh*, etc., etc.

It must be stressed, however, that neither of these aspects of formal presentation impairs the general validity of Eisele's analysis.

Before embarking on his own analysis, the author gives in Introduction an extensive survey of earlier approaches to the study of verbal categories. For tense and/or aspect, Eisele rightly distinguishes between what he calls 'aspectualists' (like M. Cohen 1924; Fleisch 1957; Jelinek 1981) and 'tense-aspectualists' (such as Gaudefroy-Demombynes et R. Blachère 1942; Kuryłowicz 1973; Comrie 1976). For colloquial Arabic (Mitchell 1952, 1978; Cowell 1964; al-Tonsi 1980). Eisele's monograph reflects the conviction that CA verbs and, seemingly, Arabic verbs in general, denote both tense and aspect.

Subsequent chapters present a fine analysis of the part played by CA verbs in determining the temporal and aspectual reference of a sentence. The inclusion of Slavic material would, no doubt, offer another dimension to the study of tense aspect interaction (incompatibility of perfective verbs with the present tense; affixal marking of perfective verbs (*robit'* > *urobit'*); thematic modifications marking continuativeness/iterativeness (*robit'* > *robievat'*); lexicalized marking of perfectiveness (*robit'* > *zarobit'*, *vyrobit'*, *dorobit'*, *odrobit'*, *obrobit'*, *nadrobit'*, etc.); thematic marking of continuativeness/iterativeness in lexicalized perfective verbs (*zarábat'*, *vyrábat'*, *dorábat'*, *odrábat'*, *obrábat'*, *nadrábat'*, etc.), etc.

The analysis of topicalization is one of the most insightful parts of Eisele's monograph. In spite of the lack of a morphological marking of topic-comment structures (in contrast to e.g. Korean or Japanese), thematization is a relatively frequent procedure in CA. In this context, it would have been perhaps useful to support the description of the Type IIb: Topic is not logical subject, esp. the final paragraph, with linguistic data. Contrastive parallels with relative clauses might have contributed to the clarity of exposition:

'*irrrāgil 'abiltu-f xān ilxalīlī* " (as for) the man, I met him in Xān ilXalīlī",

as against:

(*hina*) *rāgil 'abiltu-f xān ilxalīlī* " (here is) a man I met in Xān ilXalīlī".

Eisele's monograph is a valuable contribution to the study of the Cairo Arabic verbal system in its temporal and aspectual manifestations. Its methodological innovations might be of interest to both dialectologists and general linguists.

Ladislav Drozdík

CORRIENTE, Federico: *A Dictionary of Andalusī Arabic*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies I. The Near and Middle East, vol. 29). xxi, 623 pp. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill 1997. ISBN 90-04-09846-1.

Corriente's *Dictionary of Andalusī Arabic* – a dead variety of Arabic which is nevertheless an admirable linguistic medium of a non-negligible part of Spanish-Arabic cultural heritage – closes the series of great 20th-century lexicographical achievements in the linguistic domain of Arabic. As a *mustašriq* with no native knowledge of any Arabic vernacular, I do not feel competent to judge the merits of Corriente's interpretation of the lexical material collected in the *Dictionary*, in any conclusive details, but I am quite sure about one essential point: without Corriente's invaluable contribution to the Hispano-Arabic linguistics and lexicography, inclusive of its philological aspects, the direct access to the Andalusī dialectology, *zajal* poetry, popular proverbs, as well as anything produced in or only marked by Andalusī Arabic would be definitely missing for many of us.

The *Dictionary* offers a continuum of registers rather than single ones, if they can be singled out at all as fully autonomous and clearly identifiable entities. Or, in author's words, it intends to include "only those items that constituted the lexicon of Andalusī