to me and to them, I nevertheless feel that the book shows much promise and that its strengths make it worth considering as an introductory grammar.

MICHAEL BEETLEY

Chicago

————

Semitic Noun Patterns. By JOSHUA FOX. Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 52. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003. Pp. xix + 361. $39.95.

If there were a Nobel Prize in Comparative Semitics, this work would put the author in the running for an award in the near future. The nature of the research here is not, however, that of a single find or series of finds that constitute a breakthrough. The work consists, rather, of an erudite appraisal of a whole area of Semitic grammar based on a growing body of primary data and secondary studies and typified by careful formulations and good judgment tempered by common sense. It is not easy reading and will be avoided by most scholars who do not at least dabble in Comparative Semitics, but it is fascinating reading for anyone aware of the issues in the historical/comparative approach to one or more of the Semitic languages. It harks back to that classic of Comparative-Semitic research, J. Barth's *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig, 1889–90) but completely supersedes it both positively (many data, including entirely new languages such as Ugaritic, have come to light since Barth's time) and negatively (Fox rejects most of Barth's attempts to establish specific links between verbal forms and nominal patterns—with the obvious exception of verbal nouns and adjectives). One of the primary areas where the author's common sense shines through is his straightforward approach to variation within a given language and across languages, that is, two or more nouns from a given root that have the same meaning or divergent forms within what one would expect to be a single paradigm. Some more linguistically oriented scholars have attempted, particularly when treating a single language, such as Biblical Hebrew, to devise formal rules for every variation

or apparent irregularity. Though Fox is certainly not adverse to rule-writing, indeed he provides a good number of rules in this work, he is equally willing (probably more willing if that be expressed in statistical terms, i.e., raw numbers of solutions offered, or simply not offered, for cases of variation) to evoke analogy, dialectical variation, or faulty textual transmission as being at the origin of diverse data. Treating a very specific problem on p. 114, the author lays out in passing his methodology: "The best solution uses both sound rules and analogies, sound rules to explain the regular cases, the majority, and analogy, which is generally less regular than sound rules, to explain the exceptions." Reading through this book, one gets the sense that he was driven to such broad-mindedness by his very approach, both diachronic and cross-Semitic, for not only do Hebrew and Aramaic show much internal variation but so do Arabic and Akkadian, and in these cases the variations can often, though not always, be defined as dialectal in origin; in other cases, a "point of intersection" is plausibly identified as the origin of an analogical development.

The format is essentially to proceed from general to specific: first there are definitions; then "isolated nouns" (sometimes known as primitive or primary nouns) are distinguished from nouns clearly related to a verbal root; then there are discussions of internal inflection, mergers, and biforms; then most of the rest of the book is devoted to dealing with the various nominal patterns moving from simple (bases with a single vowel) to complex (bases with two syllables, long or short, and with gemination of the second or third consonant). In the chapters that deal with individual bases, the order of discussion is Akkadian, Arabic, Geez, Hebrew, Mehri (sometimes omitted for lack of relevant data), and Syriac. For all practical purposes, the book deals only with internal inflection; patterns defined by a prefixed or suffixed morpheme that is not a regular part of the nominal inflection pattern are not discussed.

Because I so often found myself agreeing with the author's conclusions, my first reaction is to recommend the book almost without reservation ('great minds think alike . . .'). But I cannot consider myself as being anywhere near the author's

league in Comparative Semitics and thus have to add the caveat that I am not fully qualified to pass judgment on the accuracy with which the data are cited nor on the validity of his conclusions. I do, however, claim some expertise in Northwest Semitics and found virtually nothing with which to quibble in the author's handling of these languages. I now append a list of those quibbles to allow the reader to gain a sense of how little really stands between us.

Pp. 107, 207. The author holds that the form of the infinitive with suffixes is "*qutl-*" and that cases of aspiration of *bgdkpt*-letters in third position (*koṯḇō͟ᵂ*, 'his writing') come "from analogy to the *qutul* forms." This conclusion is based explicitly on the fact that *qutul* common nouns show pretonic lengthening of the second /u/ (*bᵊ͟ḵōrō͟ᵂ*, 'his first-born'). Since, however, pre-tonic reduction in Biblical Hebrew is the norm for proto-Hebrew /u/, and its paradigmatic retention in *qatul*-base adjectives (*gᵊ͟dōlī͟ᵞm*, 'big ones') has already been explained as having arisen by analogy to *qatāl* (or *qatull*) substantives (pp. 175–77), it is not altogether implausible to suggest that the relatively few *qutul*-base common nouns behaved in the same manner, while the infinitive construct retained its 'normal' pattern because of its insertion in the verbal system. Another nonparadigmatic form of the infinitive, in which one encounters nonaspiration of the second root letter if that is a *bgdkpt*-letter and the infinitive is preceded by a proclitic preposition (*likṯōḇ* for *likṯōḇ*), is plausibly explained by the author as having arisen by analogy to the imperfect (*yikṯōḇ*). He does not, however, cite a single real *qutul* form attested for a Biblical Hebrew common noun bearing a pronominal suffix and showing an aspirated *bgdkpt* third root consonant (nor, for that matter, any form of the *qotlō͟ᵂ* type with a non-*bgdkpt* third root consonant). On what, therefore, would the "analogy" have been based that produced *koṯḇō͟ᵂ*? Finally, the author cites the existence of forms of the type *kᵊ͟ṯoḇ͟ḵā* ('your writing') for his expected *koṯḇᵊ͟kā* but does not remark that they illustrate clearly the use of the *qutul* base with pronominal suffixes (i.e., /o/ is the expected reflex of proto-Hebrew /u/ before the 2 m.s. pronominal suffix). These ambiguous data, with a clear case of "secondary closing" of an historically open syllable in *likṯōb*, seem

rather to point to *koṯḇō͟ᵂ* as the secondary form (i.e., the proto-Hebrew base of the infinitive construct would have been *qutul* alone, not *qutul* in the absolute and construct states but *qutl* in the pronominal state), though I have no specific origin to propose for the "secondary closing" of the first syllable in the *koṯḇō͟ᵂ* forms. The infinitive construct stands by itself descriptively (i.e., it does not behave like *qutul* common nouns), and its vocalic components are both provided by the least stable of the proto-Hebrew short vowels—reason enough for paradigmatic variability, though one would still like to be able to pin down the origins of these variations.

P. 116. "Even more extensive is the merger in the construct plurals of *qitl*, *qatal*, *qital*, and *qatil*, but not of *qatl*, to *qitlê.*" I miss three things here: (1) the mention of *qutl*, of which the plural construct is not *qitlē͟ᵞ* but *qotlē͟ᵞ*; (2) a specific statement to the effect that all three of the "segholate" noun types appear to retain the vowel of the first syllable in the plural construct, while nouns with bisyllabic singular stems normally show "attenuation" in this syllable (viz., *malḵē͟ᵞ* < *malakay*, *sip͟rē͟ᵞ* < *siparay*, and *qo͟dšē͟ᵞ* < *qudašay* as opposed to *dib͟rē͟ᵞ* < *dabaray*); (3) an explanation for the fact that proto-Hebrew *malakay* becomes *malḵē͟ᵞ* in Biblical Hebrew, while *dabaray* becomes *dib͟rē͟ᵞ*. The regularity with which the two types are reflected in the Massoretic vocalization points to an authentic ancient set of developments amenable to a rule-ordering solution. The fact that the *shewa* in both types of forms is "medial," that is, followed by an aspirated letter of the *bgdkpt*-class, shows that both types had conserved the vowel in the second syllable until late in the first millennium B.C. Since *dabar-* is the basic stem of that word and *malak-* as the 'broken-plural' stem of the singular *malk-* had apparently arisen very early (the type is attested in both Ugaritic and Aramaic; Fox believes that 'broken plurals' existed in proto-Semitic), what was it in the late first millennium B.C. that distinguished the two types allowing them to form two regularly differing patterns in Biblical Hebrew?

Pp. 162 and 240. The author proposes that in hollow roots (*QWL/QYL) the stative verbal adjectives of the types *qatal* and *qatil* as well as the active participle (*qātil*) developed

from a proto-Hebrew base form *qal/qil*, that is, the *qameṣ* in the active and stative forms (for example, *qām*, 'he is rising', and *rām*, 'he is high') and the *ṣere* in the **qatil* stative type (for example, *mēt*, 'he is dying/dead') are said to have developed from /a/ and /i/ respectively. This reconstruction appears to be belied by the fact that both the *qameṣ* and the *ṣere* in these forms are, to use traditional terminology, "unchangeably long": *qāmēʸ* YHWH, 'those who rise up against the Lord (lit. 'the arisers of YHWH'), *rāmēʸ haqqōʷmāʰ*, 'those who are rising on high' (lit. 'the rising ones of the height'), and *mētēʸ milḥāmāʰ*, 'those who have died in battle' (lit. 'the dead of war'). Since the author does not deal with the problem presented by these forms with "unchangeably long" vowels, one can say only that he has ignored one set of data in reaching his conclusion. Here also I do not have a solution to propose, but the general prevalence of long vowels in the hollow root forms—unless an environment can be predicated in which the vowel would shorten secondarily[1]—coupled with the

---

[1] Here I can only state my agreement with the author's solution (p. 162) for the *pataḥ* in the Hebrew perfect paradigm of hollow roots: *qamtā*, 'you arose', can only have arisen from **qām + ta*, where the hypothetically long vowel in the first syllable has become short because the syllable is closed. Subsequently, the rest of the paradigm, that is, the 3d-person forms, followed this pattern by analogy: *qām*, 'he arose', derives from proto-West Semitic **qāma*, which, however, had gone to **qam* in proto-Hebrew by analogy with forms of the **qamta*-type. This paradigm formation must have occurred at some stage of proto-Hebrew, since the vowels in Biblical Hebrew all correctly reflect developmental norms: proto-Hebrew /a/ becomes *pataḥ* in a doubly closed syllable, such as **qamta*, whereas the same proto-Hebrew vowel becomes *qameṣ* in an open or unique syllable, viz., all the 3d-person forms. The same process occurred in the stative paradigm: *mēt*, 'he died', derives from **mīta*, which had gone to **mit* in proto-Hebrew by analogy with the forms of the **mitta*-type (*máttā*, 'you died', can only have arisen from proto-Hebrew **mítta* by 'Philippi's Law'). The author does not, on the other hand, propose an explanation for the *qameṣ* characteristic of the entire perfect paradigm in Biblical Aramaic according to the Massoretic tradition. This, I would suggest, is owing to the paradigm having been formed on the 3d-person forms, where the historical /ā/ was preserved; this vowel was expanded to the 1st and 2d-person forms at a time when the rule according to which long vowels must shorten in closed syllables was no longer operative.

irreducible nature of the vowels in the forms cited cast great dubiety on a solution based on a reconstructed proto-Hebrew form with short vowels.

P. 165. The author would have been wise, I believe, to have avoided the use of the phrase "ergative predicative system" at this point in the book (here it is used in the introductory remarks to the **qatil* base). As becomes clear below, pp. 292–93,[2] the use of the term is based on the fact that in Akkadian the pronominal element of verbal forms in which that element is prefixed expresses the subject, while that element when it is suffixed expresses "the patiens" (p. 293). The basic paradigmatic forms in Akkadian are *yaparras*, present-future, and *paris*, permansive/stative. "Patiens" is defined on p. 28 as "a morpheme . . . which has an active meaning, representing the subject of an intransitive verb, and a passive meaning, representing the object of a transitive verb." Stativity is often grouped with passivity in this work, which explains why the Akkadian *paris* form, which is not primarily passive, can be identified simply as a "patiens." In the discussion on pp. 292–93, two principal points emerge: (1) the author is unwilling to come down strongly in favor of Akkadian, proto-Semitic, or an earlier form of the language as being the true home of ergativity, and (2) the *paris* forms are not truly verbal within the Akkadian verbal system and that verbal system cannot, therefore, be categorized as ergative in nature. It may be of interest that in the West Semitic languages, where the "perfect" is the formal heir of the Akkadian *paris*, activity and stativity are formally grouped, while passivity is expressed by a set of morphemes that are at a distinct remove from the active/stative distinguishing markers. In this particular work, of which the purpose is to present the substantival bases, the author considers the passive participial forms, **qatīl* in Aramaic and **qatūl* in Hebrew, to be simple developments of earlier **qatil/*qatul* and hence representative of the "patiens" category in its most basic form, a plausible view if "patiens"

---

[2] I found only the term "ergative" used one other time: on p. 255, with reference specifically to proto-Semitic—my apologies for any other uses of the term I may have missed.

is defined as including stativity. I must confess dubiety, however, as to whether the term 'ergative' is applicable to the Semitic languages at all, since it is commonly defined as expressing the divide between transitive and intransitive (see *The Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 2d ed.), not that between active and stative/passive; as is well known, in Akkadian the main divide is between fientive (in which transitive and intransitive/active have the same markers) and stative/passive (*paris*), while in West Semitic there are three principal divisions: fientive (in which transitive and intransitive/active have the same markers, such as **qatal*), stative (with a set of markers similar to the fientive ones, i.e., **qatil/*qatul*), and passive (with markers that are more similar to the stative than to the fientive)—in addition, of course, the N-forms and infixed-*t* forms add various nuances of the middle, passive, reflexive, and reciprocal.

P. 184. "**Qatāl* and **qutul* have a point of neutralization at construct state *qᵊtōl*, allowing **qutul* to take on the role of the construct of the infinitive" (one finds a similar statement on p. 205). This description assumes that the **qutul* pattern began to function as the infinitive of the G-stem only at a time after which both /ā/ and /u/ had shifted to /ō/ (the latter only in accented syllables) and both /a/ and /u/ in open unaccented syllables (the former only in open propretonic syllables) had merged into the brief neutral vowel that the Massoretes equated with zero-vowel and consequently represented by *shewa*. The author offers no arguments in favor of that function of **qutul* having arisen at so comparatively late a date. Indeed, the linguistic explanation smacks distressingly of the probable origin of the terms in the descriptive grammars of the Middle Ages: *qᵊtōl* (the infinitive "construct") looks for all the world like the construct form of *qātōl* (the infinitive "absolute"), which, however, never occurs in Biblical Hebrew because it is only used "absolutely." We appear, therefore, to be dealing with a quasi-descriptive set of terms that has stuck in spite of the fact that the "point of intersection" is not attested in Biblical Hebrew. It appears more plausible to describe the situation as follows: the nominal pattern **qutul*, which tended to express abstract notions, took on the function of the infinitive (i.e., the productive

verbal noun) at some point in time before the stage of the language that we know as Biblical Hebrew, when the functions of **qatāl* as an adverb and as a substitute for verbal forms marked for aspect and/or mood appeared to native speakers to have made it no longer suitable to function as the productive verbal noun.

P. 193. It is unlikely that Hebrew *šānī*ʸ, 'crimson (dye and dyed cloth)', is "an Akkadian loanword" because it appears already in Ugaritic as *ṯn*. The common writing with no graphic token of the original final weak consonant puts it, in Ugaritic terms, in the same class with *šd*, 'field' (Hebr. *śāde*ʰ) and *pr*, 'fruit' (Hebr. *pᵊrī*ʸ [**qitl*]; cf. *ḥᵃṣī*ʸ [**qatl*]).

P. 225. "**Qitāl* is a very limited group of nouns in all languages but Arabic." Though I certainly would not query the formulation in terms of its statistical basis, I have been struck by the fact that the nouns of this type cover several semantic fields and mostly express basic concrete entities. Moreover, it may be legitimate to query the well-foundedness of the following statement: "In other West Semitic languages [than Arabic], such nouns are found, but in much smaller number, so that only a limited semantic group can be reconstructed for Proto-West Semitic; the group is much expanded in Arabic." If "much expanded" means that the author believes that these nouns represent forms that were created in Arabic, it may be observed, in rebuttal, that the /i/ in the first syllable normally reduces in Hebrew and regularly does in all dialects of Aramaic (clearly described by the author), that the vowels of many Ugaritic vocables are unknown, and that the corpora of early Northwest Semitic texts are very small. So while there may have been a proclivity for common-noun formation on the base *qitāl-* in Arabic, it would be unwise to see that as the primary origin of the many words from the base that happen to be attested only in Arabic. I see no reason to doubt, for example, that Ugaritic *ṯḥl*, 'spleen',[3] shares the *qitāl* pattern with Arabic,

---

[3] The word, attested only once to date, appeared in a text that was discovered in 1961 (RS 24.247+) but did not receive its *editio princeps* until 1978 (A. Herdner, "Nouveaux textes alphabétiques de Ras Shamra—XVIVᵉ campagne, 1961," *Ugaritica* VII, Mission de

probably with Post-Biblical Hebrew (*ṭᵊḥōl*) and with Aramaic (Syriac *ṭᵊḥālāʾ*; the forms listed by Jastrow for Jewish Aramaic are *ṭaḥᵃlāʾ* and *ṭᵊḥōlāʾ*—the latter form would be a borrowing of the basic form from Hebrew, while the former would represent the frequent confusion of /a/-vowels encountered in the traditional manuscripts and printings[4]); without explicit internal data, this specific vocalization must, however, remain hypothetical for Ugaritic. If the author is correct that there are very few *qitāl-* forms in Akkadian (and I see no reason to doubt the assertion), a less negatively formulated description would say that the base is more typical of West Semitic than of East Semitic. The base is ancient in general Semitic terms (attested in Akkadian for nouns such as *imēru* (< *ḥimāru*), 'donkey'; *lišānu*, 'tongue'; and *tiʾamtu/tiʾāmat/tâmtu*, 'fresh-water sea, Tiamat') was apparently preferred in West Semitic (cf. the Akkadian word for 'spleen', *ṭulīmu*, which, though plausibly from the same root as West Semitic *ṭiḥāl-*, shows significant formal differences), and the nouns showing the base, while mostly concrete and reflecting basic elements of the universe, resist categorization into one or even a few semantic fields. This last fact might have received more attention—I had the feeling that the author's somewhat dismissive tone was perhaps owing to the resistance he met from this base when attempting to categorize its elements semantically. It would seem that when West Semitic and Akkadian separated from proto-Semitic, a very ancient tendency to form concrete nouns on the **qitāl* base continued in full force in West Semitic, while it soon fell into disfavor in Akkadian; this tendency was maintained and perhaps strengthened in Arabic, and the base may be considered characteristic of Arabic as compared with the other West Semitic languages because the full

Ras Shamra 18, Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 99 [Paris and Leiden, 1978], pp. 1–74, esp. pp. 44–60), and the reading was not at first universally accepted (see references in my *Les textes rituels*, Ras Shamra—Ougarit XII [Paris, 2000], pp. 540, n. 53 and 555, n. 203).

[4] Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan and Baltimore, 2002), p. 499, indicates the vocalization as *ṭᵊḥālāʾ*, but this is apparently a reconstruction, as no vocalized form is cited for Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.

form of the proto-Semitic base is retained there. This could not be the case to the same degree in the historical stages of Aramaic and Hebrew because the vowel changes characteristic of these languages resulted in the loss of the /i/ in both languages (the loss is more regular, however, in Aramaic than in Hebrew, where nouns of this type with first radical *aleph* show *ṣere* in the first syllable) and the shift of the /ā/ to /ō/ in Hebrew, obscuring the original form of the base and weakening it as a candidate for the formation of new words. Because of the dearth of ancient West Semitic sources, however, and the even greater dearth of evidence for vocalizations in the existing sources, one can be only relatively certain that an Arabic *qitāl*-form is indeed an Arabic creation if there are linguistic, cultural, or technological reasons for supposing that the word would not, or could not, have existed in old West Semitic. A detailed study of the Arabic *qitāl*-forms along these lines would provide a basis for assessment that should be more meaningful than the author's raw statistics or my impressions.

Pp. 247–48 with n. 10. The author here draws a comparison between the semantics of the nominal types with geminated double radical and the "**yvqattvl* imperfect aspect" and concludes that they both express "duration of an action or state." This is perfectly plausible when the Proto-Semitic verbal system is assumed to have been far more similar to the Akkadian system than to any of the attested West Semitic types. It might have been specifically observed, however, that the expression of aspect in the West Semitic verbal systems has shifted from the complicated mixed tense/aspect system known from Akkadian to a much simpler bipolar system in which all verbal stems have two primary forms that express perfective and imperfective aspect, even the D-stem with its pervasive doubled middle radical. In the languages with such systems, the expression of durativity by the nominal types *qvttvl* is but a remnant of an older system, and there is no systematic correlation between these types and the working verbal system. This remark is partially in reaction to attempts that one encounters occasionally in studies of the West Semitic languages (but not in the work under review) to classify verbal nouns and adjectives in aspectual terms. I believe it important

in describing these languages to distinguish between the marking of aspect, which is limited to the finite forms, and various semantic characteristics that may in many cases go back to an earlier stage of Semitic.

Pp. 258–59. Fox thoroughly presents the data for the problem of the Hebrew *nomina professionalis*, basically (1) that the most relevant comparative data lead to the expectation that the base form should be **qattāl*, but (2) the common form in Hebrew is itself *qattāl*, i.e., without the expected shift of /ā/ to /ō/, (3) the plural construct does not show reduction of the second vowel (it is *qattālēʸ*), whereas Tiberian *qameṣ* representing Biblical-Hebrew /ā/ normally becomes *shewa* in this environment, and (4) several singular construct forms are attested with *pataḥ* in the second syllable—this is the normal pattern for *qameṣ* that has arisen from proto-Hebrew /a/, but one does not expect historical /ā/ to have behaved identically (for example, the construct form of the Aramaic loanword *kᵉtāb*, 'writ', is identical to the absolute form). The only explicit arguments presented by the author, however, in favor of his conclusion that the Hebrew base should be identified as **qattal* are that the form *qattāl* is the expected outcome of that base and that "Akkadian has **qattal* nouns too." This is a clear case of cutting the Gordian knot, however, for **qattal* nouns normally do not retain the *qameṣ* of the singular form in the plural construct, and Fox himself recognizes (pp. 254–56) that distinguishing between /a/ and /ā/ in the corresponding Akkadian forms is a very difficult proposition. He seems to agree with W. von Soden's view that **qattal* is used primarily for adjectives, **qattāl* for substantives, which, if correct, would weaken the explanation of the Hebrew forms by Akkadian, for most of the relevant forms in Hebrew are substantives ('robber', 'judge', 'perfume-maker', etc.). I also find the appeal to the existence of **qattal*-forms in Akkadian to be of dubious value when several of the relevant Hebrew words have direct cognates in Aramaic, where the corresponding base form is **qattāl*. In my view, this linguistic/formal proximity must be the overriding argument, and the Hebrew base must be identified as identical with the Aramaic one. Moreover, the explanation of the "shortening" of the *qameṣ* to *pataḥ* in the singular con-

struct as an analogical development (most other tokens of *qameṣ* in that position behave in that manner) appears far more plausible to me than anything one might offer for the retention of the *qameṣ* as derived from /a/ (Fox offers no explanation), for there are very few forms to cite for such a retention (there are very, very few cases of unmotivated retention of *qameṣ*, though one might make something of the far more numerous cases of *qameṣ* that is the result of "compensatory lengthening" and which thereby becomes irreducible).

These points of disagreement are exceedingly few in number in comparison with the thousands of decisions that went into the crafting of this work and, further weakening their force as undermining the quality of the author's work, I have no alternative solution for the most important of these issues. In these last cases, my queries constitute more of a wish list than anything else, for they have been perennial problems in my own historical-grammar classes, and I would have been grateful for convincing solutions to them.

DENNIS PARDEE

The University of Chicago

───────────

The Wisdom of Ancient Egypt: Changing Visions through the Ages. Edited by PETER UCKO and TIMOTHY CHAMPION. Encounters with Ancient Egypt. London: UCL Press, 2003. Pp. xv + 225 + 27 figs. $47.50.

This book is one of eight titles in the series called Encounters with Ancient Egypt. The series resulted from a conference of the same title held at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London in 2000. The papers from this conference, revised and expanded by their authors, as well as additional essays commissioned by the editors, were grouped around themes both ancient and modern that examine both the reality and the perceptions of ancient Egypt. The individual volumes in the series were arranged by the editors to relate and refer to each other and also as a group in an "overall attempt to move the study of Ancient Egypt into the mainstream of recent advances in archaeological and anthropological practice and interpretation" (p. v).