

and sandals is part of wedding- rather than mourning-imagery, and sign of the exiles' transformation and election. Finally, Odell compares the genre of Ezekiel as a whole to the Mesopotamian genre of "building inscriptions," especially to an inscription of Esarhaddon's, which she believes could have provided Ezekiel with its literary model. This last point is appealing but ultimately unconvincing; as Odell would have it, both Ezekiel and Yahweh take the place of Esarhaddon in different parts of the pattern, producing a convoluted, theologically convenient result.

Corrine L. Patton turns to the metaphor of anti-female sexual violence in Ezekiel 23. She seems to be the first commentator to suggest that these passages probably elicit horror not only through the psychic castration and feminization of the reader in the reader's identification with the personified cities who are molested in the text, but also through the possibility of real physical sexual brutality against not only women but also against men in time of war. She relates this to the limited evidence in the Near East and the Bible for sexual and other types of mutilation of male victims, such as that found in Neo-Assyrian texts and iconography, or Jeremiah 50:37, in which the sword turns soldiers into "females." One could also add Egyptian examples of severing the phalluses of fallen enemies after a battle; e.g., in reliefs and inscriptions of Merneptah, Ramses III, etc. See James Henry Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents* (Chicago, 1906), 3: §§587–88; 4: §§42, 52, and 54.

This book represents some of the recent important work on Ezekiel and will be much appreciated. In the words of Klein from his introduction, "No one would dare imagine how a similar collection of essays would read a century from now" (p. 11).

TAWNY L. HOLM  
INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

*Semitic Noun Patterns.* By JOSHUA FOX. Harvard Semitic Studies, vol. 52. Winona Lake, Ind.: EISENBRAUNS, 2003. Pp. xix + 361. \$39.95.

This book, originally the author's Ph.D. dissertation, deals with noun patterns in the Semitic languages, such as *qatl*, *qitl*, and *qutl*, etc. (chapters 11–38 are listings of the various patterns, with copious examples). After three pages of discussion on the transliteration systems in vogue for the various Semitic languages (pp. xvii–xix), chapter 1 presents an introduction and summary of the work. Chapter 2 discusses the published literature in this domain, especially Jacob Barth's classic *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1889–90); however, the author uses many other sources as well (see the rather extensive bibliography, pp. 297–322). In addition to other names of yesteryear, notably Carl Brockelmann, Gotthelf Bergsträsser, Theodor Nöldeke, Wilhelm Czermak, August Dillmann, Edward William Lane, and William Wright, modern-day Semitic linguists are quoted: Jerzy Kuryłowicz, Wolf Leslau, Wolfdietrich Fischer, Otto Jastrow, T. M. Johnstone, and Otto Rössler. There are also references to several contemporary general linguists, e.g., Noam Chomsky, whose "Morphophonemics of Modern Hebrew" (M.A. thesis, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1951) could have been cited in its published version (New York: Garland, 1979), P. H. Matthews, Joan L. Bybee, and Mark Aronoff, to name but a few.

Chapter 3 wrestles with the all-important matter of terminology. The author is right to judge that the terminology for the semantic categories of the patterns is woefully inconsistent in the voluminous literature. An important term introduced is "isolated noun," which is defined as "one which does not share a root with another word, particularly in reconstruction to PS" (= Proto-Semitic) (p. 29), on which see further below.

Chapter 4 takes up the notion of root and pattern morphology. The author states that "the Semitic root is the sequence of consonants that stay constant in a set of nouns with meanings in some semantic field" (p. 37). Needless to say, Semitic has many homophonous roots, and it is often difficult, if not impossible, to relate the meanings of some roots in one distinct semantic field. A good example

of this is the root Arabic *'nd*: *'ind* "beside," *'anid* "obstinate," and *'anūd* "gazelle" (see Bruce Ingham, *Najdi Arabic* [Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994], 21, who states these are from the same root). Insofar as I am concerned, these are three different roots.

Fox refers several times to the *nisbe* (*sic*) (p. 39, p. 40); e.g., *mišr* "Egypt" and *mišriyy* "Egyptian" (p. 39). This Arabic term for relative adjective is normally cited with its Modern Standard Arabic vocalization, viz., *nisba* (*nisbe* is the Levantine colloquial Arabic pronunciation).

Well-known information is sometimes presented, and when a revised version of this work is published, statements such as the following can be eliminated: "The root in Semitic is usually triradical and quadriradical isolated nouns are found" (p. 38). (Also, for some unexplained reason, the normal word order "root and pattern" morphology is occasionally referred to as "pattern-and-root," pp. 37, 53, 54, 57.)

Chapter 5 deals with comparative reconstruction. It follows John Huehnergard's Semitic tree, which, in turn, is based on the ideas for a Central Semitic branch first promulgated by the late Robert Hetzron. This view groups Arabic with Old South Arabian and Northwest Semitic, with Modern South Arabian under a different node along with Ethiopic in the South Semitic subbranch.

Let us turn to the notion of isolated and derived noun (chapters 7 and 8). Isolated nouns do not participate in the typical root and pattern morphology. Derived nouns do just the opposite. It is striking that phonological constraints serve to demarcate both categories. By this I mean that in the derived noun there is a co-occurrence restriction on root consonants, which Joseph H. Greenberg first brought to the attention of general linguistics in "The Patterning of Root Morphemes in Semitic," *Word* 6 (1950): 162–81. Not so for the isolated noun, like PS *\*riḡl* "foot," which has initial /r/ and final /l/, both liquids (p. 63). It is important to note that, synchronically speaking, modern Semitic languages have, for the most part, derived words from these isolated nouns via the normal Semitic mechanisms available. The author cites *kaliba* "be rabid" from *kalb* "dog" (p. 64). The *Hans Wehr Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, ed. J. Milton Cowan (Ithaca: Spoken Language Services, 1974), 836, gives many meanings: "be seized by hydrophobia, become mad, crazy, to covet greedily."

Some interesting statistics are presented on the structure of Proto-Semitic; e.g., 54% of isolated nouns are monovocalic, and 68% of these are *\*qatl* formations, with *\*qul* accounting for only ten percent. These data surely must be related to other morphological facts of the language (not mentioned by the author), such as the verbal type represented by Classical Arabic *ḥasuna* "be good" being the rarest of the three Form I perfect types: *fa'ala*, *fa'ila*, and *fa'ula*. These numbers are also, in my view, connected with the observation that PS does not have any *\*qatul* isolated nouns, with the possible exception of PS *\*šabu'* "hyena" (p. 66). Proto-Hebrew *\*qutul* is also rare, if, in fact, it does occur (*ḥālōm*), and I agree with Fox that PS does not have *\*qutul* (cf., however, Arabic *ḥulm* "dream," p. 67 n. 20).

Chapter 8 contains a long list of isolated nouns. Fox is correct to opine that "we can never know the full lexicon of the language spoken by the linguistic ancestors of the Semites" (p. 69). He is also right in his assertion that some of the cognate sets are not perfect cognates, and we are occasionally faced with a pattern replacement. Thus, as the author recognizes, no reconstruction is possible. Even though the data are accurate, I must note Arabic *ḥawl* and *ḥayl* "horses, cavalry" < PS *\*ḥ/xayl* "strength" (p. 75). The Arabic words cited also mean "strength, power" thus matching the PS gloss (Wehr, 217).

With regard to the fascinating cases of what is called the biform (pp. 102–5), PS reconstruction is made even more difficult in cases such as *katif* ~ *kitf* "shoulder" or *faxiḏ* ~ *fixiḏ* ~ *faxḏ* ~ *fixḏ*. As the author correctly notes: "Arabic is particularly abundant in lexical biforms" (p. 105). I have always thought that most biforms represented different dialectal pronunciations—a phenomenon much alive in contemporary Arabic dialects, as one compares, e.g., Egyptian Colloquial Arabic *biḡḡbi* "exactly" with Syrian *biḏḏabəṭ*.

Finally, let us examine the conclusions (chapters 39 and 40), one of the most important of which is that certain patterns are not reconstructible in PS; e.g., sequences of two high vowels, ultralong syllables, two long vowels, and a long vowel plus a short vowel, with the exception of *qātil*.

Let me take up the fascinating PS *\*ālam* "world." I do not see why Fox thinks that Ge'ez borrowed this word from Arabic, and that Arabic borrowed it from Aramaic. Rather, it is much more

likely that the PS word developed along normal lines, yielding the forms in the various daughter languages, including Hebrew *‘ōlām* (with the expected correspondence of \**ā* = *ō*). The other hypotheses of derived \**‘ālam* “world” from the Ge‘ez root *w‘l* < *‘əlat* “day” or from \**‘awlām* with an infix *w* (p. 290) appear far-fetched to me, even though the author could have mentioned support obtained from Arabic *‘awlamatun* “globalization,” a recent coinage.

Finally, there are some inconsistencies in the citation of data; e.g., why is the Akkadian word for “blood” cited in the nominative with *mimation*—*damum*, paralleling the citation of the Ugaritic *damu*, yet Arabic is cited in its pausal form—*dam*—rather than with the matching *damun* in the nominative indefinite?

There are a few typographical and other errors: the name J. Payne Smith should not be hyphenated (pp. xvii and 316); *from* is correct for *froim*, p. 45; there is almost a full extra line in p. 57 n. 2; Joshua Blau is referred to as that as well as J. Blau and Yehoshua Blau (p. 300); Aharon B. Dolgopolsky is also referred to as Aron Dolgopolsky (p. 304); the (1983) Leslau Festschrift entitled *Ethiopian Studies Dedicated to Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday November 14th, 1981, by Friends and Colleagues*, was only one volume, and thus referring to vol. I results from a confusion with the two-volume Leslau Festschrift of 1991.

ALAN S. KAYE  
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

---

*A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by BILLIE JEAN COLLINS. Handbook of Oriental Studies, vol. I, 64. Leiden: BRILL, 2002. Pp. xxii + 620, illus. \$164.

There is something obviously special about animals. People love, fear, keep, and eat them; they depict them in art, compose stories about them, and invent fantastic new creatures; they endow them with human characteristics and dress up as beasts themselves. No one will dispute the importance of trees and rocks, houses and boats, or cabbages and kings, but fauna are different, providing a mirror of the human in culture after culture, from mundane activities to the most ceremonial ones. This large “handbook” provides a useful introduction to ancient Near Eastern zoology, concentrating on the depiction and use of animals in the art, literature, and broader cultural (especially religious) practices of Anatolia, Egypt, Iran, Mesopotamia, and the Syro-Palestine area. Though not a volume that many will choose to read straight through (and one that few individuals will be able to afford), the book deserves to be widely known. Ably edited by the Hittitologist Billie Jean Collins and supported by a fine index, it will be one of the first places to which scholars will turn when they want to find something out quickly about the Egyptian cult of the Apis bull, the evidence for porcine bones in the Levant, or the status of the ostrich in the Hebrew Bible.

The book is divided into five parts, with a total of seventeen chapters by fourteen authors: I, “The Native Fauna” (which consists of a single paper, Allan S. Gilbert’s extraordinarily learned “Native Fauna of the Ancient Near East”); II, “Animals in Art” (five papers); III, “Animals in Literature” (four); IV, “Animals in Religion” (five); and V, “Studies in the Cultural Use of Animals” (two). There is also a short introduction, as well as Gilbert’s very useful, sparsely annotated “Appendix: Bibliography of Near Eastern Zoology,” which overlaps to some extent with the lengthy list of references cited in the volume as a whole. Although there is some cross-referencing, both across topics (note that three of the four authors of papers on literature have papers on religion in the next section) and across languages, each contribution stands alone, perhaps a bit more than is ideal. It is not obvious to me that it was a wise choice to solicit separate chapters on art, literature, and religion and then arrange them into discrete sections: it would be unfortunate if anyone thought that one could get a proper picture of falconry and the role of the eagle in Anatolia (to choose a topic in which I have a certain interest) without considering all the cultural spheres in which raptors appear, as well as their natural habits and

Copyright of Journal of the American Oriental Society is the property of American Oriental Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Copyright of Journal of the American Oriental Society is the property of American Oriental Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.