final *-ā* of the emphatic state), and the forth, according to Karbstein, goes back to Catalan 'estaca-rossí', literally 'whip-the-[small]-horse', a term for a variety of different plants, but not hemlock. He points out that according to Ibn al-Baiṭār [ed. A. Dietrich, *Die Dioskurides-Erklärung*, AAWG, ph.-hist. 3. Fol. 191 (Göttingen, 1991), no. iv. 71, p. 244], the term '*ḥarmal baladī* (local mountain rue)' is used for hemlock 'by the inhabitants of North-Africa (*ahl Ifrīqiyā*)'. It seems that since *ceguta* generally, and *ḥarmal* sometimes designate hemlock, Karbstein feels justified in putting the heading 'Schierling, *Conium maculatum L.*' above this entry. It is, however, far from certain whether the author of this glossary, whoever he might have been, equalled all these four terms with what we know as hemlock today. This suggests a botanical exactness which, given the nature of the text, lacking any botanical description and simply providing synonyms, could not have been achieved. This confusion between different names for *materia medica* pervades the glossary and can be illustrated by another example. On fol. 97b7, *kahrabā* (amber) is explained as senna (*wa-huwa s-sannā*), and on fol. 111b4, 'senna from Mecca and Medina (*sannā ḥaramī wa-Makkī*)' as amber (*wa-huwa l-kahrabā*). Moreover, many of the lemmas are not actually truly Arabic words, but Arabised forms of Greek, Persian, Syriac, and even Indian terms; conversely some synonyms introduced by *ʿağamīya* are not 'aljamiado', but Arabic, Greek, or even Aramaic, as is the case in the example just cited.

The opening line of the text shows the idiosyncratic nature of the vocalisation (fol. 83b1):

وَّهَذَهِ أَسماءَ إِلَاَّدْوِيَةٍ عَلَى حُرُفِ الاَّلِفُ

The vowels and especially the endings appear to be completely random, which would suggest that the author of the glossary had an extremely limited knowledge of Arabic grammar and *iʿrāb*. The whole text is teaming with hypercorrect forms which betray a desire to write 'classical Arabic', but also a complete inability to do so. The editor strives to reproduce this vocalisation faithfully in his edition, and sometimes uses it to argue points of phonology or morphology; given its peculiar character, one sometimes wonders whether this vocalisation really represents actual pronunciation.

Manfred Ullmann [*Welt des Orients* 34 (2004), p. 235] has recently quoted the proverbial expression "*akḏabu min qarābāḏīni l-aṭibbā'i*" (more deceptive than the physicians' formulary)" in order to illustrate the difficulties which one faces when editing and translating Arabic pharmacological texts. Karbstein had to confront many of these same difficulties and strove to overcome them by drawing on a limited number of primary and secondary sources, without always being able to come to an independent judgement, especially in the area of Oriental languages (see, for instance, his explanation of *bušūš*, alluded to above, on p. 130; or on fol. 118r17, the correct reading is certainly *tuṣbaġu* 'was dyed', and his remarks in notes 5 and 6 on pp. 297–8 are not to the point). As a linguist, his concern is not primarily with matters of medical history, but Romance philology. Even in this area, however, one sometimes has trouble following his explanations. For instance, he wants to derive '*barīš*', one of the '*ʿağamīya*'-synonyms for fern (*ušna*, fol. 83v20), from Greek βρύον on p. 34, without spelling out, however, how this phonetic shift should have occurred.

Given that this is a doctoral dissertation in the field of Romance philology, one ought to recognise the effort which went into writing it, and applaud the interdisciplinary character of the work. The author certainly has made accessible an intriguing and interesting text, which ought to stimulate further scholarly debate.

London, Warburg Institute, March 2006 — Peter E. PORMANN

SEMITICA

FOX, J. — Semitic Noun Patterns. (Harvard Semitic Studies, 52). Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN, 2003 (24 cm., xx + 362). ISBN 1-57506-909-1. $ 39,95.

The complex system of patterns by which abstract roots materialize into concrete words with specific meanings, be it nouns or verbs, is generally thought to be a distinctive feature of the Semitic language type. It received much attention at the end of the 19th century, culminating in Jacob Barth's *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig ²1894) and its reviews, but was soon overshadowed by other issues, most notably the discussion of the verbal system. Since Barth (B.), however, much progress has been made, both in the description of languages previously unknown, or largely ignored, and in the development of linguistic method. In the course of time, it has become clear that the extent to which words are formed on the basis of patterns varies considerably between, say, Arabic on the one hand and formerly less prominent members of the Semitic family on the other, such as Neo-Aramaic or modern Ethio-Semitic languages. Hence, a new comprehensive treatment was long overdue. Joshua Fox (F.) in his fine Harvard dissertation from 1996, vetted by John Huehnergard, has now faced part of the task by analyzing afresh from a historical-comparative perspective the "internal" patterns of triradical roots (also called "derivatory ablaut"), i.e., those without further inseparable morphological elements pre- or affixed to them. He thus discusses patterns like **qvt(t)(v)l*, but not, e.g., augmented forms like **maqtal*, **taqtul(t)*, **qat(a)lān* or reduplicated ones such as **qulqul*, **qatlal* etc. In Barth, this material merely corresponds to an "Erster Haupttheil" (B. 1–208: "Nomina ohne äussere Vermehrung"), and F. never defends his decision to limit himself to one particular sub-group (he has rightly chosen the most obvious one: F. 40f), although this is understandable: *vita brevis, ars longa*.

It becomes clear from the introductory chapters that F. has in general reflected carefully on how to undertake this work. True, in a book on historical morphology one would have expected something more sophisticated than the confusion of transcription and transliteration (xvii-xix) which has unfortunately become conventional. On the one hand, F. uses historically informed normalizations of Akkadian as well as Ugaritic forms and applies some "internal reconstruction" to Tiberian Hebrew in order to sketch a stage "immediately before" the Masoretic system, even though the principles of his reconstruction are unclear (what are the hallmarks of the system which he thinks normative and why?); in any case they would have to be defended in the light of important secondary literature on this subject (see now: K. Beyer, "Das biblische Hebräisch im Wandel", forthc. Heidelberg 2006 in:

R. Reichman [ed.], *"Der Odem des Menschen ist eine Leuchte des Herrn." — Aharon Agus zum Gedenken*, 159–180). On the other hand, F. does not consistently give the historical vowel quantities in the case of Hebrew, but, for example, consistently transliterates *ṣērē* with *ē* or *ḥōlem* with *ō*, even though these Tiberian vowel signs of course only serve to distinguish /ẹ/ from /ę/ and /ọ/ from /ǫ/ respectively, regardless of the quantity; except for *a* and *ā*, set apart in writing, he does not give the vowel length for Syriac either. At the same time, his transliteration reflects the corresponding *matres lectionis* in Hebrew, but not in Syriac, by using a circumflex; he also copies historical spellings in Hebrew as well as in Syriac, despite the fact that they are purely orthographical devices. For the time being, these problems could be avoided by using the original scripts, as Barth and other grammarians of his generation did–until a consistent way of transcription for Comparative Semitics, which of course presupposes such historical studies, finally sees the light of day.

The review of scholarly literature, by contrast (5–23), shows that a traditional arrangement of the patterns by merely formal criteria has not yet been replaced by more ambitious approaches: Barth and already de Lagarde desired to deduce the individual nominal forms from an opposition of verbal conjugations, i.e., from the "imperfect" (or the imperative in the case of de Lagarde, but the unmarked form *par excellence* is of course the infinitive) and the "perfect". This theory has not stood the test of time, as the opposition between "perfect" and "imperfect" is now rightly considered to be a Central Semitic innovation, although the idea that nominal patterns derive from verbal forms as such seems to anticipate, albeit mistakenly, the current avant-garde topics of "grammaticalization" and "lexicalization" (likewise, de Lagarde's erroneous view that the "perfect" *kataba* originally expressed "eine Anschauung" meaning "er schreibt, wie ich das vorhin gesehen habe" touches on the concept of evidentiality *avant la lettre*!). Surely it would have been exciting to contextualize de Lagarde's and Barth's respective methodologies within their work as such, i.e., their tendency to explain historical linguistic developments by abstract logical derivation alone. F., however, is thus much closer to a "Post-Romantic" combination of Brockelmann's *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, Berlin 1908–1913, and the Hebrew grammar of Bauer/Leander: the first presents a list of reconstructed patterns together with selected comparative Semitic data, the latter gives a comprehensive overview of the pattern system in one particular language within its diachronic context.

As the following two chapters demonstrate, F. pays considerable attention to a clear and compelling terminology, both in general (25–35) and for Semitic languages in particular (37–46). Fundamental to a treatment of Semitic noun patterns is the distinction between "isolated" (or "primary") nouns (cf. 61f), which do not share a root with another word with a similar meaning in Proto-Semitic, and "(root-)derived" nouns, which are based on a verbal root ("deverbal") or, more rarely, on another noun ("denominal"). The former is subdivided into "actant nouns" (the focus is on the subject or the object of the verb) and "action nouns" (expressing the action itself–some would call it the *Verbalinhalt*–as a noun), while "verbal noun" refers to the syntactic function of a deverbal noun: a "participle" is a verbal noun and an actant noun, an "infinitive" is a verbal noun and an action noun. Contrary to older dictionaries especially, it is now evident that a (supposed) verbal root in the G-stem (which F. calls "stirps") is not the most basic unit of the Semitic lexicon. There are some loose ends, such as the puzzling remark on "some such [i.e., verbal; HGz] nouns that have aspectual semantics" (30, n. 20: does he mean the lexical *Aktionsarten*, such as durativity [247f], or situation types of certain verbal nouns which then have a particular affinity to either the perfective or the imperfective aspect?), *yvqtvl* (206.247) and *yvqattvl* (247.253ff) being naively called "aspects", the use of "prefix", "suffix", and "infix" versus "preformative", "sufformative", and "in-formative" (33; many grammarians apply these terms exactly the other way round), or the classification of verbs as "strong" and "weak" (34; these labels have precisely the opposite meaning in Indo-European linguistics and should therefore be replaced by "regular" and "irregular"). However, there are several improvements in comparison to traditional terminology, such as the use of "stirps" instead of "(derived) stem" which avoids confusion with a technical word already utilized for a different morphological category in many other languages, or the sharp distinction between patterns, templates and melodies (i.e., the sequences of vowels with regards to their quality only). Note, however, that **qatīl*-adjectives denoting the "possibility of an action" ("-able", 33) are not restricted to Israeli Hebrew, but occur much earlier, especially in Aramaic (cf. my *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen*, Wiesbaden 2004, 179–181); they may thus have spread from there via Mishnaic Hebrew to the modern idiom, their noteworthy productivity perhaps being the result of immediate contact with European languages? Actually, the coexistence of "active" and "passive" meanings may sometimes question such a conceptual distinction.

In his remarks on reconstruction (47–55), F. shows himself aware of the fact that a genealogical model ("tree structure") on its own cannot explain every feature of phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon, but that borrowing due to language contact must be taken into account as well. The identification of loan words, however, is not always easy, especially in languages as closely related as the members of the Semitic family– which are often but partially documented (cf. already M.L. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch*, Berlin 1966, 11–13). F. follows the internal sub-classification advocated for by his supervisor (see now especially J. Huehnergard, "Features of Central Semitic", in: A. Gianto [ed.], *Biblical and Oriental Studies in Memory of William L. Moran*, Rome 2005, 155–203, with my review in: *BiOr* 62 [2005], 570–576) and rightly gives more weight to historically better known languages instead of simply lumping together, for example, data from Hebrew and Argobba–even though Johnstone's studies on Modern South Arabian, to which F. regularly refers, may not yet provide a solid basis for consultation without first-hand experience with the living language; A. Sima's new description of Mehri, based on fresh fieldwork during which he died in a car accident, will hopefully be published posthumously some time in the near future.

The author also emphasizes the abstract and theoretical nature of "Proto-Semitic" (53) which leads to the important distinction between a common root and a common pattern, both of which can rarely be reconstructed together for the same noun (except the isolated nouns), while the pattern as

such is "a flexible method of word formation" (57). Hence, he concentrates on tracing "patterns as entities in their own right" (54), thereby shedding some light on the Proto-Semitic pattern system. Here the methodical advances over Barth, to say nothing of de Lagarde, are most obvious, even though F. could have pointed out the problems of a straightforward triradicalism to which he subscribes (54f; cf. xix, n. 12) more clearly, especially since this affects his manner of grouping patterns together: *qvll* patterns are thus subsumed under *qvtl*, even though long and double consonants are synchronically not treated in identical ways: Akkadian, like most Semitic languages, does not have *qatl* adjectives (the few examples attested in Arabic are surely exceptional, perhaps being the result of analogy), but it does have *qall* adjectives; cf. also *BiOr* 62 [2005], 575 and especially the excellent remarks by R.M. Kerr, *DS-NELL* 4 [2001], 129, n. 2. In the end, the canon of those languages referred to in the first place, on the basis of standard dictionaries, remains much the same as in Barth, since their vocalization is overt and their historical phonology by and large well understood: Biblical Hebrew, Classical Syriac, Classical Ethiopic, and Classical Arabic (missing from the discussion on pp. 52f), to which F. now adds Old Babylonian as a representative of East Semitic. Other members of these languages groups are considered in individual cases; including data from the broader Afroasiatic phylum in the discussion remains a challenge for the future and will surely become more important in due course.

As confirmed by statistics (57–60; but note A. Müller, *ZDMG* 45 [1891], 232), the isolated nouns, being a subset of those nouns actually reconstructible (adjectives are excluded due to their connection with the verbal category of the stative), betray the greatest concentration of genuine cognates (61–68); their special status is further emphasized by the fact that they can, e.g., contain homorganic consonants which is not the case for verbal roots, even though they can serve as the basis for deriving verbs and further nouns. They are listed according to their reconstructed Proto-Semitic form (69–87; *qatul* being notably absent: cf. 173), which is of course at variance with the shape of the word actually attested in most or many individual languages ("common Semitic form"); sometimes well-attested cognates are missing, as in the case of *‘*aqrab* "scorpion" (86) which is also known in Aramaic. Here the idea of a purely consonantal root can be misleading, because, e.g., the word for "dog" is */kalb/ as such, which does not allow for extracting a "root" *k-l-b*, so the vowel invariably belongs to the word. But what is more, it always seems problematic to demonstrate that a particular noun is "isolated", since either a possible underlying root may have been lost (cf. R. Voigt, "Semitische Verwandtschaftstermini", in: A. Zaborski [ed.], *New Data and New Methods in Afroasiatic Linguistics. Robert Hetzron in memoriam*, Wiesbaden 2001, 205–218, here 215), or the word in question can perhaps be further broken down. This latter option has been explored by Hans Bauer for various examples (**mar’* "man" [76] < **r’y* "ansehlich" and **’almanat* "widow" [86] < **’al-mar’*+(*a*)*tu* "die keinen Mann hat": *ZDMG* 67 [1913], 342–344; the respective lemma in F. seems confused: it is hard to see how Aramaic *mārē* could be considered a cognate of a Proto-Semitic *qatl*-noun **mar’*, since it derives from the *qātel*-form *māre’* "well-fed" documented by cuneiform transcriptions: K. Beyer, *ATTM* I [1984], 629f; the Syriac emphatic state *māryā* does not only refer to God [*pace* F., 76, n. 29], but also to Christ–unless one is a monophysite, of course; the /’i/ in the indeterminate Arabic form *’imru’*[un] [n. 28: "(*i*)*mru’*[un]"] can best be explained as a prosthetic glottal stop with an auxiliary vowel). Also the alleged *qatalid*-form **γarapil* "cloud" (87) rather seems to be a simple *qatal* with an affix *-el* (as in the name of the mountain Karm-el) and may, in the light of its likely connection with *‘rp* "to trickle", not be isolated anyway (cf. Beyer [1984] s.v., 664f). The elenchus given by F. as such is hardly exhaustive: the letter name *taw*, for example, could probably furnish yet another primary noun /taww/ "sign" (corresponding to the principle that the letters are named after the things they represent, which in this case would be some default mark or token, that is, a cross), while the etymology of *g* /gū/ "voice" attested in Ugaritic (66, n. 19) is wholly uncertain: despite the similarity with *pū* "mouth", it could just be a Sumerian loan.

However that may be, many details would require a more extensive and precise treatment than the one given: the *Urformen* of the words for, e.g., "son" and "name" are imprecisely rendered as **b*(*i*)*n* and **š*(*i*)*m* (73 with n. 13), but instead of "a word-initial consonant cluster with a consonantal or semi-vocalic second element" one should rather speak of a syllabic second consonant, thus **bn̥* and **šm̥*; the vocalic constituent of the syllable was originally an undistinguished central vowel then realized as a full vowel with varying quality in the respective individual languages. — Likewise, the treatment of the kinship terms with a long vowel in the construct forms remains ahistorical: F. places the short unbound form (*/’ab/ etc.) and the long construct form (*/’abū/) side by side, while they may either both derive from a *Tiefenform* with a semivowel (*/’abw/, so Voigt, *op. cit.*, 213), or, perhaps more plausible, */’abū/ is a secondary development of an original */’ab/ conditioned by the inherent tendency towards triradicalism (Bauer traces these longer forms, not altogether implausibly, to old vocatives: *ZDMG* 89 [1915], 561; cf. Th. Nöldeke, *ZA* 30 [1915/16], 165, and note W. von Soden, JSS 31 [1986], 83). — Furthermore, it would be interesting to know where the /a/ in Syriac *’alāhā* (transcribed as *’allāhā* and listed under **qil* by F., 73, even though it is of course a *qitāl* pattern in earlier Aramaic [so rightly on p. 226]; Bauer, loc. cit., considers this, too, as some kind of vocative) comes from: cuneiform transcriptions with *i* point to an etymological /i/ then realized as [e] in the older manifestations of Aramaic, hence *’elāh* (whose [e] could not have been reduced together with the other vowels in open syllables, since a glottal stop cannot be part of a word-initial consonant cluster in Aramaic); the possible explanation of Syriac *’allāhā* as a loan from Arabic (hence the /l/ would be geminate) accounts for the /a/, but falls short of making plain why precisely the name of God should at some stage, presumably already in pre-Islamic times, have been taken over from the Arabs; Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik*, [10]1965, §56aβ, in any case thinks the change */i/>/a/ is conditioned by the following /l/, even though this is hard to square with the strong tendency of the glottal stop in an open syllable to take [e] as an auxiliary vowel. In short, the form remains a mystery (cf. also Brockelmann [1908] 334). — The remark "Syr *’a*(*n*)*ttṯā* [*’attā*]" (78), by contrast, is not wrong, but cryptic: *’attā* would be the expected pronunciation (cf. Brockelmann [[10]1965] §27), yet the spirantization of the final /ṯ/ in *’attṯā* (hybrid forms like *’a*(*n*)*ttṯā* muddle up transliteration with transcription and should not be used) is clearly indicated by the Syriac Masoretes, perhaps as an artificial hypercorrection in order to avoid confusion

with the *status absolutus* form *'attā*? — For the irregular feminine *štayim* "two" (74), a reference should be added to: A. Spitaler, "Das Femininum des Zahlworts für zwei im Hebräischen und für sechs im Syrischen", in: A.S. Kaye (ed.), *Semitic Studies*, Wiesbaden 1991, 1493–1498 (confirming Barth's idea that *štayim* replaced the expected **šit-tayim* due to rhyme with the corresponding masculine form *šnayim*); Syriac *ḥammeš* "five" (84) instead of the expected **ḥmeš* has been correctly explained by W. Diem, "Syrische Kleinigkeiten", in: M. Macuch et al. (eds.), *Studia Semitica*, Wiesbaden 1989, 65–78, here 67–72 (with additions by Spitaler [1991] 105 with n. 15), as a masculine analogon to a feminine form *ḥamšā* reanalyzed as *ḥammšā*. — A *qitl* form of **'udn* "ear" can also be found, e.g., in the Galilaean Targum on Ex 21,6A (cf. Beyer [1984] s.v., 505) and is thus not restricted to Syriac, hence the explanation given by F. (81, n. 49) cannot be correct. — Sometimes the relationship between the supposed etymological pattern and its various synchronic attestations is much less clear than the author seems to assume: the Syriac and Arabic realizations of **śim'āl* "left" (87) do not automatically point to an original *qitlad* (*sic*!, with /a/ instead of /ā/) pattern, since cuneiform transcriptions prove that at least the older Aramaic form was *śam'āl* (cf. S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*, Neukirchen 1970, 301); Syriac *šemšā* (79), too, is clearly secondary (see below on /a/>/e/ before sibilants in post-3rd c. BC Aramaic) and does not point to an original *qitl* pattern for this word. — The decision between *malk* or *milk* (76) appears to be even more complex; cf. now the material presented by W.H. van Soldt, "The Vocalization of the Word *mlk* 'King'", in: M.F.J. Baasten/W.Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill*, Leuven 2003, 449–471. Evidence from Eblaitic and Arabic suggests an original form /malik/ which then presumably became /milk/ in Canaanite (as evidenced by the element /milk/ in Phoenician personal names, at least if one accepts that it corresponds to the word for "king") and /malk/ in Aramaic, hence the Canaanite form may have been replaced by the Aramaic one in Tiberian Hebrew. — Lastly, it is interesting to see how many names of *smaller* animals are based on four-radical patterns (86f; the /n/ in the Arabic and Geez *Tiefenform* **qunpuð* "hedgehog" may be due to dissimilation of geminate consonants, cf. Brockelmann [1908] §90b; the irregular consonant correspondence in the Hebrew cognate *qippōḏ* could point to a loan from Aramaic: ibid., §187).

What F. then says on internal inflection systems (87–99) is strongly determined by the idea that "broken plurals" can be reconstructed for Proto-Semitic. This idea rests on the belief that especially Canaanite and 2nd millennium West Semitic show certain remnants of a broken plural system, even though possible collective singulars in, e.g., Hebrew and Aramaic are very few in number. So he also connects the bisyllabic plural base *qvtal-* for the *qvtl* nouns, which is clearly documented in Ugaritic and the West Semitic substratum at Emar, with the Arabic broken plural pattern *qatal* (cf. also 160). However, the insertion of this anaptyctic vowel in West Semitic may be a purely phonetic process to expand a monosyllabic base in the plural, perhaps comparable to the tendency of certain biradical nouns to take plural forms expanded by /h/ or reduplication.

Some general, although at times redundant observations on mergers and biforms (99–105) mark the transition from the abstract reconstruction to the actual pattern systems documented synchronically in Akkadian, Arabic, Geez, Hebrew (where F. is at his best), and Syriac: due to sound change, such as the reduction of the short unstressed vowels in open syllables to zero in Aramaic, several etymologically distinct proto-patterns can partially or totally merge into one synchronic pattern. Here the author pays less attention to detail than one would desire; so he states that "In Syriac, too, gemination is not indicated" (100; cf. 248), but it would be more precise to mention that the East Syriac pronunciation tradition has kept gemination, while it has been simplified consistently in the West Syriac tradition. As to the biforms, however, he does rightly stress that many of them are dialectal or merely artificial and conditioned by metrical requirements (in the case of Arabic poetry), although in cases like Judg 5:8 one must, unlike F. (104, n. 12), also take textual corruption into account (cf. Gesenius[18] III, 605f; moreover, see E.A. Knauf, "Deborah's Language", in: B. Burtea et al. [eds.], *Studia Semitica et Semitohamitica*, Münster 2005, 167–182, here 175, who mentions the possibility that *lḥm* in this verse could be the form of a verb meaning "to stick together"). Altogether, his remarks are far from exhaustive, and many other forces besides mergers and biforms contribute to changes in synchronic pattern systems: disambiguation may be an important reason why a word migrates from one pattern to another or at least exhibits irregular sound correspondences (cf. H. Bauer, "Einige Fälle absichtlicher Umgestaltung von Wörtern im Semitischen", *Islamica* 2 [1926], 5–10.323); another type of pattern rearrangement is substitution, such as the evidence for the gradual replacement of the usual active participle of the G-stem by the noun form *qāṭōl* in Western Aramaic and, under Aramaic influence, apparently also in later Hebrew, at least to some extent (see A. Tal, "Observations on word formation in Samaritan Aramaic II", in: M. Bar-Asher/S.E. Fassberg [eds.], *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew*, Jerusalem 1998, 349–364). In general, some thoughts on defectivity and suppletion, a universal reality within the languages of the world, but less known among Semitists, could illuminate the fact that very different stems or patterns are used for the same slot within a paradigm, such as the various construct infinitives for a number of irregular Hebrew verbs (206) or the plural forms of certain irregular nouns which are not based on the singular.

Since the **qvtl* (which for F. also comprises **qvll*, although here consistent triradicalism becomes problematic) and **qatv̆l* patterns are most strongly affected by mergers and coexisting lexical biforms (especially in Arabic), their semantics and the respective phonological processes leading to overlaps are treated separately (107–121; 123–127; on anaptyxis in Aramaic [110ff] a reference might be added to Beyer [1984] 112–115), while **qatāl*/**qatīl*/**qatūl* mostly keep their distinctive shape (129f). The subsequent chapters on the realizations of each pattern in the individual languages treated, albeit with some repetition, also discuss the meaning: ***qatl* (131–139)** is the least marked for meaning as a non-productive pattern and designates action nouns when it is derived (the alleged *qātel* for Hebrew [136] is strange: instead of *māweṯ*, original */mawt/ may rather have become *moweṯ* with */aw/ > /ow/ due to assimilation of /a/ to /w/ [so already G. Bergsträßer, *Hebräische Grammatik* I, Leipzig 1918, §23i], which is also in line with the short /a/ in the many context forms like *bayiṯ* < */bayt/ [only in pausa it is *bāyiṯ*] etc.; the monophthongization in *yōm* does not have to be a Northern dialectal feature, but can just as well result from Aramaic influence, which for some reason did not affect

*/mawt/ and perhaps the absolute form *tāweḵ*/*toweḵ* — a development that cannot be explained on the basis of sound laws alone); non-isolated ***qitl* (141–148)** represents nouns of action and result (being situated halfway between action and actant noun); non-isolated ***qutl* (149–155)** nouns of action (*qutl*-fraction words are not only native to Syriac [155], but also occur in earlier varieties of Aramaic, at least those for 1/3, 1/4, 1/5, and 1/7, likewise nouns for measures and dimensions). — The **qatv̆l* group deserves special interest because its members, patiens adjectives, have given rise to the "perfect" in Central Semitic (the lengthening of the vowel in the second syllable of these nouns and adjectives in Tiberian Hebrew, unexplained by F., may result from an original pausal form which has then been taken over into context, with /i/ > /ē/ and /u/ > /ō/, because /ĭ/ and /ŭ/ were presumably pronounced as [ĕ] and [ŏ]): ***qatal* (157–164)** was to become the normal form for fientic verbs and has but a few static adjectives and some action nouns (the possible dissimilation **qatal* > **qital* [> *qitlum*] in Akkadian [158] could provide some background to the Barth-Ginsberg-Law which later became operative in West Semitic; *qatal*-plurals in Arabic [160] are unlikely to have developed from *qatlat*-singulars by dropping the feminine ending and an anaptyxis of /a/, since a) the relationship between sg. *qatl*- and pl. *qatal*-patterns is a characteristic trait of 2nd millennium West Semitic and its Canaanite and Aramaic successors only and b) such a hypothesis would hardly account for *qatalat*-biforms of several *qatlat*-words, including the examples *ḥal(a)qat* and *bak(a)rat* [see Lane s.vv.; I owe this latter suggestion to my colleague Martin Baasten]; the "perfect" *qāl* in Tiberian Hebrew [162], however, is most likely due to Aramaic influence, as has been seen long ago by Bauer who nonetheless did not draw the right conclusions in his theory of an *original* Hebrew-Aramaic *Mischsprache*, while the original Canaanite "perfect" *qal* with a short /a/ rather derives from an analogy with the regular verb than with forms like *qaltā*, cf. K. Beyer, *Althebräische Grammatik*, Göttingen 1969, 62; Aramaic *qetlaṯ* for Proto-Semitic **qatalat* [164 with n. 38; F. should have referred to Brockelmann [[10]1965] §48 where this idea seems to come from] has probably nothing to do with the well-known change from /a/ to /e/ before sibilants from the 3rd c. BC onwards–on which cf. Beyer [1984] 115f– but results from an auxiliary vowel [< **qtlaṯ*], since otherwise suffixed forms like **qatalak* > *qatlak* which never dropped the /a/ in the first syllable would be inexplicable, see ibid. 145; in any case the new sound law postulated could be disproved by Syriac *ʿeqḇā* < **ʿaqib* "heel", but cf. F. 171 with n. 27); ***qatil* (165–171)** regularly denotes patiens adjectives, from which the intransitive (very rarely also transitive) "perfect" (often for temporary qualities, cf. Spanish *estar*) has emerged, and various body parts, while the few corresponding actant and action nouns in Hebrew are the result of an internal semantic development (on a possible etymology of Akkadian *kašādu* [166] cf. Bauer, *ZA* 30 [1915], 106f); ***qatul* (173–177)** is a rare actant noun and verbal adjective for stative verbs (often denoting permanent qualities, cf. Spanish *ser*), merging with reflexes of a supposed **qatull* (but see below) and **qatāl* in Hebrew (possible suggestions for some isolated nouns: Beyer [1969] 49, but none of them is beyond doubt; the few theological terms in **qatul* present in Qumran Aramaic seem to be Hebrew loans: Beyer [1984] 432). — ***qatāl* (179–186)** frequently denotes the G infinitive (replaced by various verbal noun patterns in Arabic and most Aramaic languages), some actant and a number of action nouns (on *qtāl* nouns in Hebrew as Aramaic loans [185] cf. Wagner [1966] s.vv. and 122; *contra* 186, the Gozan-inscription [KAI 309] from ca. 850 BC makes it now plain that infinitives with an *m*-prefix which become dominant from Imperial Aramaic onwards occur already in Old Aramaic [ll. 7.14: *wlmʾrk*; l. 9: *wlmld*; *wlmšmʿ*; ll. 9f: *wlmlqḥ*], hence both forms coexisted in the oldest texts; Brockelmann [1908] §133b and [[10]1965] §126c analyzes Syriac adjectives for bodily characteristics and defects [186] as *qitāl* and not as *qatāl*); ***qatīl* (187–196)** serves for substantives (in Hebrew often political functions and agricultural terms: 192f), adjectives and especially passive participles, being highly productive in Aramaic (cf. rec. [2004] 172–184; Hebrew *qtīl* forms, instead of the usual *qātīl*, are presumably Aramaisms [so, too, R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik*, Berlin [3]1969, §37.4b and Gesenius[18] s.vv.] rather than dialectal or reanalyzed on the basis of the construct or the plural [193f]); ***qatūl* (197–202)** denotes a few action nouns in Akkadian and patiens actant nouns elsewhere, but often active "intensives" in Arabic (199f: via "a tendency toward a behaviour"; some also posit *qatūl* as a pattern for Aramaic colour terms: Beyer [1984] 434); the rare ***qutul* (203–208)** can best be traced in Arabic (for any noun category); in Hebrew it is presumably productive for the unsuffixed G infinitive used in the construct state (but the suppletive form *tilt* for verbs *Iw, *ntn*, *hlk* etc. [205; 206 with n. 11] should best be described as a feminine verbal noun, just as a few other replacement patterns: 206; the suffixed form follows *qutl*: 207; the origin of the infinitive construct of some /a/-"imperfect" verbs is unclear: 216 [*qital*?]); ***qutūl* (209–212)** is a very common broken plural pattern in Arabic (the alleged Hebrew collectives [211f] can be explained otherwise and do not furnish evidence for fossilized broken plurals in that language); ***qital* (212–217)**, ***qutal* (219–221)**, and ***qitāl* (223–227)** are too rare to permit any conclusions about the semantics (on *ʾalāhā* [226] see above); ***qutāl* (229–235)** is frequently used for deminutiva and deteriorativa (*contra* 235, it does *not* fully merge with **qatāl* and **qitāl* in Aramaic, because the /u/ occasionally causes a shift /ā/ > /ō/: Brockelmann [[10]1965] §51, n. 2; Beyer [1984] 137); ***qātil* (237–243)** is productive for the G active participle of mostly fientic (in Aramaic also for stative) verbs throughout, thus being the only reconstructible pattern with a long vowel in the first syllable (the "specifying" meaning of *-ān* in Akkadian [242, n. 27] has been refuted: M.P. Streck, forthc. in: *Babel und Bibel* 2; the /ō/ in the corresponding Aramaic *nomen agentis* form *qātōl* [242f] seems indeed inexplicable).

Various, generally speaking very rare patterns with geminate middle radicals (245–248) are treated in the last few chapters. F. distinguishes sharply between D patterns (249–252: mostly infinitives; gemination is replaced by a long vowel plus simple radical in the L "stirps") with separable gemination and the other nominal patterns semantically unrelated to the D "stirps" where the gemination is an essential component, such as **qattal*/**qattāl* (253–261, often used for *nomina professionis*, which F. wishes to explain in the light of the durative present *yvqattvl*, even though the association of this conjugation with the D stirps postulated by some scholars might be used as an argument against too clear-cut a distinction); moreover: **qattil*/**qattul* (263–266: mostly personal characteristics); **qattīl* actant nouns (267–269:

appearing as *qittīl* in Arabic); **qattūl* (271–273: no common semantics identifiable, but this pattern seems to cover forms of endearment in Aramaic: Beyer [1984] 436.445); **quttul/*quttūl* (275–277: rarely attested, but mostly D-related); **qittal/*qittāl/*quttal/*quttāl* (279f) are not reconstructible. The last chapters are devoted to patterns with a geminate third radical (281–286: this is plausible for the IXth and XIth stem in Arabic, but alleged **qatvll* forms like Tiberian Hebrew *gāmāl*, only identified by a *dageš* with the third radical in the plural, are generally not acknowledged by traditional Hebrew or Aramaic grammar; they would require some more comment–a different approach focussing on the vocalization rather than the historical-comparative perspective, by contrast, could explain this gemination as secondary just in order to keep the short vowel in the ultima, as already suggested by Barth [27], see also Müller, *ZDMG* 45 [1891], 234 and especially Meyer [^{3}1969] §§35.3 and 50.2c; on degemination in word-final position in Aramaic and Tiberian Hebrew [281] cf. in any case Beyer [1984] 120–122); finally, F. presents some further non-reconstructible patterns (287–290) and his conclusions (291–296).

The book has been carefully produced; there are only few printing-mistakes: p. viii, heading of Chapter 13: read "*Qatv̄l*"; p. 29, par. 2, penultimate line: read "form"; p. 45, l. 2: read "from"; p. 57, n. 2: l. 2 is mutilated; p. 110, par. 2, l. 1: read "reconstruct"; p. 136, l. 6: delete "´"; p. 147, n. 39: perhaps read "340 (§124)." (though the reference is opaque); p. 148, n. 45: read "117 (§77b)."; p. 194, n. 52: read "*honos*" (the form in *-os* is actually attested in Latin); p. 269, l. 2: read "Both a"; bibliography, *passim*: read "Niemeyer"; p. 309: "Huehnergard 1995" is misplaced; pp. 309f: the item referred to on p. 285, n. 17 is missing; p. 320, s.v. "Stroomer": read "Rijksuniversiteit" [now: "Universiteit"]; p. 321, s.v. "Voigt 1994", l. 4: read "*Südsemitistik*"; *passim*: "von Soden". "Indexes" covering the individual topics and the various words treated, arranged by language, allow for quick consultation. Unfortunately, the book, while being published in 2003, still reflects the state of research of the original dissertation from 1996 (this may explain the passing references to the "ergative hypothesis" on pp. 165, 255, 292f which was very much *en vogue* at that time!). Hence, the author has not made any use of those many important reference works which have appeared in the meantime, such as Gesenius[18], Hoftijzer and Jongeling, Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, Sokoloff, the new editions of Friedrich/Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, and von Soden's *Grundriß*, the published version of Ratcliffe's monograph on the Arabic broken plurals, the English edition of Sivan's *Ugaritic Grammar* or the recent comparative grammars, not to mention various individual contributions to relevant topics.

All in all, however, F. has indeed succeeded in writing a much-needed reference work: even though his method and basic assumptions are not always compelling and his notes, especially on the "isolated nouns", less extensive than one sometimes wishes, it must be emphasized that he tackled his material, especially with regards to Hebrew, in an intelligent and useful way. Alternative explanations on various matters of historical phonology would result from an approach based less on internal developments, but more on the Aramaic influence on the Tiberian vocalization: it is of course the underlying paradigm which determines the answer. *Semitic Noun Patterns* thus demands and rewards serious study–hopefully, it will give new life to the discussion of the nominal system in historical Semitic philology. Paul de Lagarde proudly said about his own *Übersicht über die Bildungen der Nomina* from 1889: "Jetzt ist ein neuer Tag angebrochen, und ich freue mich, daß ich ihn heraufgeführt habe" (*apud* L. Schemann, *Paul de Lagarde. Ein Lebens- und Erinnerungsbild*, Leipzig/Hartenstein ^{2}1920, 137, footnote). Nonetheless, it was almost immediately eclipsed by Barth's contribution. While *Semitic Noun Patterns* will no doubt keep its value much longer than de Lagarde's book, it may not achieve the longevity of Barth's *Nominalbildung*: further work is now needed, for example, on the reduplicated and augmented nominal forms (on those with *ma*-prefixes in Akkadian see M.P. Streck's paper in: *Neue Beiträge zur Semitistik*, Wiesbaden 2002, 223–257), on the examination of non-mainstream data from other Semitic languages, on a more precise semantic analysis (especially concerning diathesis) as well as the relationship between certain patterns and other linguistic sub-systems, or on the behaviour of non-Semitic loans within the pattern system. But whoever embarks on such tasks will gratefully refer to Fox.

Leiden University, March 2006 Holger GZELLA

PERSICA

HILLENBRAND, R. (Ed.) — Shahnama. The Visual Language of the Persian Book of Kings, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, Hampshire, 2004. (25 cm, XVI, 184). ISBN 0-7546-3367-5. £ 55,-.

The study of the *Shahnama* received a great impetus through the efforts of the Cambridge Edinburgh *Shahnama* Project that was started at the universities of Cambridge and Edinburgh in 1999. The main objective of this ongoing project is to create a database of the thousands of illustrations to be found in the *Shahnama* manuscripts produced over the centuries. So far, a large number of these manuscripts have been described in the *Shahnama* Pictorial Corpus Database. The manuscript descriptions from the database, together with a variety of illustrations, are accessible through the website www.shahnama.caret.cam.ac.uk.

The *Shahnama*, or Book of Kings, is a landmark in Persian culture and in particular in the Persian epic tradition. It has played a fundamental role in the shaping of the self-identity of the Persian-speaking people in present day Iran, Afghanistan and Central Asia. Composed around AD 1010 by the Persian poet Firdausi, it can be seen as a poetic reflection of the legends and history of the Iranian people from creation until the coming of Islam. The *Shahnama* consists of 50,000 verses of epic poetry, and has been preserved in a large variety of manuscripts, many of which are illuminated by first-rank miniature painters. It was not only regarded as a work of literature and mythology, but also as a political document and a tool of propaganda. As a normative text in Persian history and literature, the *Shahnama* soon became a living epic poem, subject to change and adaptation.

Within the context of the *Shahnama* project, the directors Charles Melville and Robert Hillenbrand have organised a number of conferences on the subject of the interplay between text and image in the *Shahnama*, bringing together a variety of scholars, working on both art history and in the literary field. The twelve articles in *Shahnama — The Visual*