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 ilxalīli "(as for) the man, I met him in Xān ilXalīli",

as against:

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

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 Andalusi 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 Andalusi 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 Andalusi dialectology, *zajal* poetry, popular proverbs, as well as anything produced in or only marked by Andalusi 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 Andalusi

Arabic, i.e., the middle and low registers of the Arabic language as used in Andalus. It is obvious that some high register items are highly suspected of having occasionally crept into lower registers without really acquiring that full-fledged status, but we have not deemed it advisable to exclude them from our corpus. . . " (xi).

The textual corpus evaluated is truly spectacular and manifold (cf. x) : manuscript and edited texts, such as *'azjāl* and dialectal poetry in general, proverb collections, personal and business letters, low register literary items, *laḥn al-ʿāmma* treatises, dialectal terms in scientific works of various types, etc., and even some relevant Western sources (e.g., Dozy 1881).

Lexical material is presented in a standardized graphemic transliteration of the Arabic spelling. Arabic materials, already edited in Latin script (Alcala), are given in their original shape with only slight modification (xi, note 1).

Some casual remarks that follow mostly refer to marginal formal aspects of lexicographical arrangement and suggest alternative solutions.

To maintain the uniformity of introducing root entries, genuine roots, that is products of morphemic segmentation along root-and-pattern structural boundaries, are listed side-by-side with morphemically unidentifiable phonemes constituting (consonantal) parts of nonsegmentable root-words. In this way, the *Dictionary* operates with two rather incompatible series of root-entry introducers:

(i) roots, introducing entries of segmentable (viz., multimorphemic) items, as in *(KTB): *katab, kātib, kitāb*, etc., and:

(ii) non-roots, introducing entries of nonsegmentable (viz., monomorphemic) units, such as *('SKNDR): *iskandar, alaskandar*, etc.; or *(QBLRS): *qabal(l)ayrisiyah, qabalayr.siyah*, etc. "stable" (> Cs. *caballeriza;* or *('SṬRLB): VA *usṭurlāb;* AL *aluzturláb* (< gr. *astrólobos*) etc.

The latter group mostly coincides with nonassimilated borrowings (as against fully assimilated units, such as *(ŠHMT): *nišaḥmat, šaḥmatah* "to checkmate"; *yaššaḥmat, aššaḥmat* "to be checkmated"). It would have been perhaps more consistent, even if less economical, to arrange them alphabetically into separate entries: *iskandar, alaskandar*, etc. It must be admitted, however, that the disjunction of many entries, affected by the presentation proposed, would somewhat increase the number of cross-references.

In the arrangement of root entries, in general, a slightly more refined classing of roots along the most outstanding homonymic or, in dubious cases, at least polysemic dividing lines would have apparently increased the transparency of the rich lexical corpus.

The root *(BṬL) , for instance, in spite of its dual presentation: *(BṬL)-i (see further on) and *(BṬL)-ii: *bwṭl(y)* 'water crowfoot, bot.', still seems to involve an undue homonymous relationship on the side of *(BṬl)-i: (suggested rearrangement of root entries will be introduced by a slant line (/) in what follows): /*(BṬL)-i-(a): *baṭālah*-related meaning group, and *(BṬL)-i-(b): *buṭūlah*-related meaning group.

Similarly:

(ḌʿF) > /(ḌʿF)-i: *ḍuʿf*-related group, and /*(ḌʿF)-ii: *ḍiʿf*-related group;

(XYL) > /(XYL)-i: *xayāl*-related group, and /*(XYL)-ii: *xayl*-related group;

Still another complication may occur with reconstructed roots. The root entry *(SKN)-ii, for instance, evidently contains two synchronically fully autonomous roots: /*(SKN)-ii-a: *(SKN), with a general root meaning 'inhabiting'; and /*(SKN)-ii-b: *(MSKN) 'becoming/making miserable', being a reconstructed root *(SKN) with radicalized prefix, that is *nimaskan* 'to make miserable', *maskana* 'misery', *miskīn* 'miserable, poor'. The alphabetically located root *(MSKN), devoid of its lexical content, is related to its *(SKN) basis by way of cross-reference only.

248

Or, on the contrary, some roots are disjoined by the mere impact of polysemy rather than homonymy, as it seems to be the case with *(SWQ)-ii: *sāq* (e.g., *al-dawābb*), and *(SWQ)-iii: *sūq* (*al-dawābb*). Since it is mostly impossible to establish the etymology of Arabic roots with workable trustfulness and accuracy, the dividing line between homonymy and polysemy is mostly hypothetical. It should be admitted, at the same time, that even polysemic stratification of some involved root entries may greatly facilitate the exploitation of the lexical material.

A number of polysemous lexical units may exhibit a twofold class membership, derivational and inflectional, formally marked by a different paradigmatical behaviour, frequently leading to another type of problems in arranging root entries. The Andalusi Arabic *karm* 'vine-stock; vineyard', for instance, as well as what may equal it in a number of modern dialects and even in the Standard Arabic itself, is member (i) of a derivational system of collective (CN) and unit nouns (UN), inclusive of its specific inflectional implications and, at the same time, (ii) of an exclusively inflectional system formally manifested in what we call here autonomous singular-plural relationship.

When disregarding Corriente's sources JM (1964) and DS (1881), on the ground of the *Dictionary* data we obtain the following picture:

AL *karm* + *kurmit* (*carm* + *curmit*),
IQ *karmah*,
VA *karm* + *kurūm* / *kurmāt* IH *kurmātun* LZ *karmāt* (read: *kurmāt*) ZJ 1288 *kurmāt* (pl.),
MT *karm* - *ah* + *kurūm* / *kurmāt*,
GL *karmun* vineyard / *ruknu 'lkarmi* row of vine-stocks in a vineyard (*Dict.* 459).

The CN-UN membership may seemingly be attributed to data presented by AL, IQ, and MT. Since CNs, forming part of the CN-UN system (i.e., *'asmā' al-jins* as opp. to *'asmā' al-waḥda*), do not denote places, localities, immovables etc., the cumulatively attributed equivalent, that is "vineyard" does not seem to be quite correct.

By analogy with the prevailing colloquial usage as well as that recently observable in Standard Arabic (even if not always adequately marked by lexicographers), incurring the risk of being misguided by my limited acquaintance with relevant Andalusi sources, I would propose the following presentation of *KRM: *karm* :

(i) CN: *karm* (& related variants) ḳ UN: *karma* (& r.v.); related plurals: *kurūm, karmāt* (& r.v.): AL "viña" /=vinestock, grapevine/ (Corriente 1988: 177); as against:

(ii) singular: *karm* (& r.v.) ḳ plural: *kurūm* (& r.v.): VA "viña" /=vineyard/ (Corriente 1989:263).

When reading (and rereading) Ibn Quzmān's verses (Corriente 1980: 603: IQ 90, 8/2), I had some difficulty to grasp the true meaning of *waḍrā* (*Dictionary* 566), resulting from the contamination of * *wḍr* / *bẓr*, despite the fact that this relationship is rightly explained under *(BẒR) (*Dict.*, 57, 1), but not also under *(WḌR). In this and similar cases two-sided cross-referrences would have been very helpful and, for some types of readers, very time-saving, too.

With *(Š°R), the *Dictionary* does not mention a highly curious * *š°r*-related *nomen loci* substitute *ša°°ārīn*, Alcala's *xaârīn* 'ceuaderia lugar donde se vende cebada', derived from *šaâár* 'ceuadero que vende ceuada', seemingly due to elliptical shortening of a multiword term, such as (*sūq*) *xaâárīn,* or the like (Corriente 1988: 108). A similar omission occurred with *(WZZ): *wazzāzīn* < *wazzāz* : Alcala's *guezizīn* 'ansareria' (ibid., 216).

Lexical material, collected in the *Dictionary*, offers invaluable data for the study of cultural and, in general, institutional development of the area. Some items seem to suggest

patent deviations from the state of affairs observable in the cultural scene of the genuine Arab world of the epoch, lexically represented thereby.

At least one example: Alcala's equivalent for *malʿab* , *maláâb* + *maláâyb* 'teatro do hazian juegos' (Alcala 1505/ Corriente 1988: 247) cannot be compared with anything produced up to Kazimirski (1875): 'lieu où l'on se livre à un jeu; théâtre'. Aṭ-Ṭahṭāwī in his famous *Taḫlīṣ* (1834 /1905: 111) overtly avowes that he knows no suitable Arabic word for *théâtre* : *walā 'aʿrif 'isman ʿarabīyan yalīq maʿnā l-sbektākl 'aw al-tiyātr*. For al-Bustānī (1866ḳ1869), *al-malʿab* is nothing more than a closer unspecified place of play or game (*al-malʿab mawḍiʿ al-laʿb*); the same for Freytag (1830ḳ1837): *locus, ubi luditur*. Both sources seem to betray al-Fīrūzābādī's patronage. Recent Standard Arabic *masraḥ* is still 'pasture, grazing land' (Bustānī, Kazimirski) and it is not until about the end of the century that it gains its modern meaning.

Horse-grooming and ruling (over humans), hidden in the root *(SWS), clearly reflects the mediaeval lexical heritage. Ibn Quzmān's *siyāsah*, however, seems to stand surprisingly close to the modern concept of 'politics'(though still quoted together with 'tact'). Bocthor's *siyāsa* (1828ḳ9) has still to be paralleled with *tadbīr al-mamālik, ḥukm al-mamālik*, and it operates as a synonym to *tatmīr ḥiṣān / ḫayl* 'grooming horses' ('pansement, soin qu'on prend d'un cheval').

It seems somewhat stange that the Cañes's (1787) *correo*-related *sāʿī*, lat. 'tabellarius, cursor', from which several Romance languages have derived their terms for 'post' (in the sense of an institution responsible for the delivery of mail), that is *correo, courrier*, etc., does not occur in any of Corriente's sources. The institution of 'postman' is here associated with *(BRD)ii: VA *barīd* , coinciding with the Standard Arabic 'post, mail' (for etymology cf. Dict. 44).

Assisted by Corriente's annotated editions of Ibn Quzmān (1980 and 1985) and, above all, his magnificent translation (1989), I had the opportunity to get some acquaintance with IQ's fascinating world of poetry. As expected, Corriente's *Dictionary* shed light on a number of obscure passages but one of them, stubbornly resisting to offer an acceptable reading (Corriente 1980: *zajal* 116/5, last but one verse, written in italics in what follows):

(jīt liḥibbi wanā faqīr
ʿan qubayla faqalli: ṭīr
'ajri ʿajjal lā tastadīr)
liḥadīdu (?) *man qabbalu*
(yarbaḥ alxayba walʿanā)

(I came to my love, longing
for a kiss, and I said to me: – Fly,
run away, hurry, and do not look back)
? to my/his ? iron ? kiss him ?
(to gain disappointment and trouble)

Corriente's translation (1989: 221):
Vine a mi amado mendigando
un besito; me dijo: "Vuela,
corre, pronto y sin volverte,
a mi hierro, pues besarlo
causa fatigua y desengaño."

Even if assuming, for *ḥadīd*, any sort of wild metaphor, the verse will still remain too confused to offer an acceptable reading. At the first glance, the *(ḤDD) entry in the *Dictionary* offers no clue to the problem. The Takrouna Arabic *lḥadd* "jusqu' à la limite de", paralleling the IQ-related *liḥadd* "up to the point", in the *Dict.*, may perhaps occur in diminutive form just like the substantive *ḥadd*, "limite dans l'espace", in its diminutive form *ḥdayyid*. Were this supposition true, the IQ's *lḥdyd-u* might well be read *liḥ(.) dayd-u* "up to him" (for Takrouna Arabic data, see Marçais & Guīga: *Textes arabes de Takrouna* ii, Gloss. tome 2, 745; allophonic diacritics ignored).

Relying on these speculations, the translation, no more than an hypothesis itself, would run as follows: ". . . fly, run away, hurry, and do not look back, up to him, and who kisses him, will be repaid (only) by disappointment and troubles."

At the end, I came to realize that my silence over the merits of the *Dictionary* is quite inadequate to its invaluable qualities. The conviction that a work like that of Corriente's can much better display its own merits than its reviewers is, of course, a poor excuse. I would like, therefore, to say quite explicitly that Corriente's *Dictionary* is one of the most important contributions to the Andalusi and, in general, Arabic lexicography and that it will maintain this qualification for many years to come. Of course, a work dealing with a variety of Arabic of top cultural importance, transmitted to our days only by texts whose production is since several centuries discontinued, cannot be free from casual errors, omissions and misinterpretations. It cannot avoid various disputable metalinguistic and methodological features that provoke alternative solutions. Here the best remedy is time and a protracted usage, irrespective of whether in the hands of the author and his contemporaries or owing to the work of the next generations of Andalusists and Arabists. The *Dictionary* considerably widens the horizon of Dozy's *Supplément* (1881) and it will be a helpful companion to Andalusists, Arabists, lexicographers and linguists, as well as to all those who can appreciate the miraculous world of Ibn Ḥazm and that of other pillars of Andalusi culture and scholarship.

Ladislav Drozdík

REFERENCES

ALCALA, Pedro de. 1505. *Arte para ligera mente saber la lengua arauiga y Vocabulista arauigo en letra castellana.* Granada > Corriente 1988.

BOCTHOR, Ellious. 1828–1829. *Dictionnaire arabe-français.* Revu et augmenté par Caussin de Perceval. 2 vols. Paris, Firmin Didot.

AL-BUSTĀNĪ, Buṭrus. 1866–1869/1977. *Muḥīṭ al-muḥīṭ.* i-ii. Beirut; quoted after one-volume edition of Librairie du Liban, Beyrouth 1977.

CAÑÉS, Fr. Francisco. 1787. *Diccionario Español Latino-Arabigo.* i-ii-iii. Madrid, Don Antonio Sancha.

CORRIENTE, Federico. 1980. *Gramática, métrica y texto del cancionero hispanoárabe de Aban Quzmán.* Madrid, Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura. Madrid.

CORRIENTE, F. 1988. *El léxico árabe andalusí según P. de Alcalá.* Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

CORRIENTE, F. 1989. *El léxico árabe andalusí según el "Vocabulista in arábico".* Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

CORRIENTE, F. (Editor). 1989 > Ibn Quzmān.

DOZY, R. 1881 (2nd ed. 1927). *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes,* i-ii. Leide-Paris.

IBN QUZMĀN. 1989. *Cancionero andalusí.* Edición de Federico Corriente. Madrid, Hiperion.

AL-ṬAHṬĀWĪ, Rifāᶜa Rāfiᶜ. 1834/1905. *Tachlīṣ al-'ibrīz fī talchīṣ Bārīz.* Būlāq 1834; Cairo 1905.

251