

## Bibliographical Notes

**Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé, Ziony Zevit (eds). *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake 2012. Eisenbrauns. XVIII + 525 pp. ISBN 978-1-57506-253-2. *Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic Languages* Vol. 8.**

The volume contains papers directly or indirectly responding critically to the rather extravagant hypothesis presented by I. Young and R. Rezetko with M. Ehrens-vård in ‘Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts’ (=LDBT), vol. 1-2, London 2008, Equinox, claiming that linguistic dating is either impossible or unreliable and that Early Biblical Hebrew and Late Biblical Hebrew allegedly represent only coexisting styles of literary Hebrew throughout the biblical period. The authors of the papers included in the volume rather politely acknowledge some positive effects of the stirrup provoked by LDBT but quite unanimously and with good reasons maintain that reconstructing history of Biblical Hebrew and linguistic (in my opinion linguistic and philological!) dating of the Biblical text is both feasible and necessary.

Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé has written an ‘Introduction’ entitled “Diachrony in Hebrew: Linguistic Perspectives on Change and Variation” (pp.3-15). She provides a solid panorama of recent developments in diachronic linguistics and discusses the methods and results of the particular papers included in the volume.

B. Elan Dresher with ‘Methodological Issues in the Dating of Linguistic forms’ Considerations from the Perspective of Contemporary Linguistic Theory’ (pp. 19-38) in a polemic with LDBT argues very well for rationality of a diachronic analysis and linguistic dating of texts based on the example of the chronology of *mamlākā* and *malkūt*.

Talmy Givón in ‘Biblical Hebrew as a Diachronic Continuum’ (pp. 39-59) provides a brilliant discussion of change of word order, tense-aspect, attrition of lexemes into bound morphemes and the transfer of morphosyntactic patterns from relative clauses to verbal complements as parameters for diachronic change.

Jacobus A. Naudé in one of the best papers in the volume entitled ‘Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew and a Theory of Language Change’ (pp. 61-81)

applies to Biblical Hebrew and develops new theories of language change and diffusion.

John A. Cook in 'Detecting Development in Biblical Hebrew Using Diachronic Typology' (pp. 83-95) opposing LDBT analyses the development of aspect to tense and the decline of stative adjectives and thus shows that chronology of Biblical Hebrew can be reconstructed.

Robert D. Holmstedt in 'Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew' (pp. 97-124) provides a new discussion of methods of dating Biblical texts and a well founded refutation of the claims of LDBT.

Dean Forbes, Francis I. Andersen in 'Dwelling on Spelling' go back to their 1986 and 1992 books (pp. 127-145) try to demonstrate how statistical and distributional analysis of *plene* and defective spelling can be used for dating texts.

Yigal Bloch in 'The Third-Person Masculine Plural Suffixed Pronoun *-mw* and Its Implications for the Dating of Biblical Hebrew Poetry' (pp. 147-170) concludes that the use of *-mw* continued at least until the mid-eighth century B.C.E and the use of short prefixed forms of verbs to express complete situations in the past without *w-* continued at least until the sixth century B.C.E. In my opinion it would be important to try to detect when these features acquired a status of stylistic variants and of archaisms.

Steven E. Fassberg in 'The Kethiv/Qere *hw*'. Diachrony, and Dialectology' (pp. 171-180) assumes that the 3<sup>rd</sup> fem. sing written as *hw* in the Pentateuch is evidence for an early dialectal form (\*hīw) that later disappeared in BH. In my opinion, the problem is that no such a form is known in other Semitic languages and the evidence of Akkadian oblique case forms adduced by Tropper in 2001 is not decisive at all.

Martin Ehrensverd in 'Discerning Diachronic Change in the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System' (pp. 181-192) discusses the appearance of the 2<sup>nd</sup> masc. sing. with simple *Waw*, i.e. *wetiqtol* in Early and Late Biblical Hebrew, the use of Lamed + Infinitive Construct, Passive Infinitive Construct with Prepositive Subject and Predicative Infinitive Absolute as indicators of language change.

Tania Notarius in "The Archaic System of Verbal Tenses in 'Archaic' Biblical Poetry" (pp. 193-207) concentrates on the imperfective *yqtl* used as a present progressive tense in conversation and on the use of the suffix conjugation *qtl* which in narrative is limited to indicate anterior perfect in relative clauses.

Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal in 'Diachronic Syntactic Studies in Hebrew Pronominal Reciprocal Constructions' (pp. 209-244) presents the development of reciprocals from Biblical to Mishnaic Hebrew.

Na'ama Pat-El in 'Syntactic Aramaisms as a Tool for the Internal Chronology' (pp. 245-263) attributes the marginalization of the use of *nota accusativi* with suffixed pronouns and the introduction of a causal conjunction *b-dyl d-* 'because' to the syntactic influence of Aramaic. In my opinion the use

of the *nota* with suffixed pronouns was typical of emphatic, elevated style and Aramaic influence could be only another factor influencing its marginalization in less elevated not to mention 'natural' style.

Avi Hurvitz in "The 'Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts' : Comments on Methodological Guidelines and Philological Procedures" (pp. 265-279) examines the history of 'iggeret 'letter, epistle, edict' as well as of *midraš* and *daraš* to show the method of philological and linguistic dating.

Jan Joosten in 'The Evolution of Literary Hebrew in Biblical Times: The Evidence of Pseudo-Classicism' (pp. 281-292) shows that "The presence of pseudoclassicisms in the Hebrew literature of the Second Temple period strongly favors the chronological approach developed by Wilhelm Gesenius and continued in our times by Avi Hurvitz and others" (p. 290).

Shalom M. Paul's 'Signs of Late Biblical Hebrew in Isaiah 40-66' (pp. 293-299) is a short but detailed linguistic analysis of the text which is most representative for the period.

Frank H. Polak in 'Language Variation, Discourse Typology, and the Sociocultural Background of Biblical Narrative' (pp. 301-338) analyses both purely linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of different styles in biblical narrative prose using a wealth of data.

Gary A. Rendsburg in 'Northern Hebrew through Time: From the Song of Deborah to the Mishnah' (pp. 339-359) provides a long history of a number of grammatical features.

Chaim Cohen in 'Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography and Its Ramifications for Textual Analysis' (pp. 361-375) discusses textual history of *nota accusativi* and of the *-ūt* suffix for abstract nouns.

Michael Sokoloff has given us an 'Outline of Aramaic Diachrony' (pp. 379-405) which is a very useful synthesis of the evolution of the Aramaic languages and dialects through the first millennium A.D.

Joseph Lam and Denis Pardee in 'Diachrony in Ugaritic' (pp. 407-431) deal with the difficult problem of history of the language known from texts recorded during a relatively short period. Some archaisms must have been used in poetic texts.

N.J.C. Kouwenberg in 'Diachrony in Akkadian and the Dating of Literary Texts' (pp. 433-451) presents a short but very concrete history of Akkadian and concludes that nonliterary texts show clear dialect differences and are easy to date but the literary 'dialect' of Standard Babylonian, a learned language, shows little internal evolution over time and literary texts cannot be dated on the basis of linguistic criteria. I should add A. George's 'Babylonian and Assyrian: a History of Akkadian', in. J. N. Postgate (ed.) 'Languages of Iraq', pp. 31-71. 2007. Oxbow.

Ziony Zevit in 'Not-So-Random Thoughts Concerning Linguistic Dating and Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew' (455-489) is a very serious and deep review-

article of LDBT. The author rejects the idea that a linguistic history of Hebrew from the iron Age through the Persian period cannot be recovered but he emphasizes several positive results the LDBT volume.

This is a valuable collection of papers. One thing is certainly clear for the authors involved in the publication but could be better highlighted: 1. there can be no good linguistics without good philology and *vice versa*; 2. only a massive and joined application of philology (including text criticism and literary studies), linguistics and history can provide serious relative (rarely absolute!) chronology and a new really historical grammar which is a desideratum.

Andrzej Zaborski

**Mohammed Sawaie, Fundamentals of Arabic Grammar. Padstow 2014. Routledge. xxvi + 457 pp. ISBN: 978-0415-71003-9.**

The book is a new and rather detailed traditional grammar of Modern Literary/Standard Arabic and “it is intended for a special audience: students learning Arabic as a foreign language at university level. One of its major goals is to present the fundamentals of Arabic grammar to those in the process of acquiring the language in an easy-to-read format” (p. xxii). In the author’s opinion it is also “not intended to replace instructional textbooks” but rather “to supplement and to reinforce them; to function as a resource book, a reference tool providing a holistic presentation of grammar” and allegedly it “is well suited for an independent grammar course at university level” (p. xxiii). It should be emphasized that practice sheets, exercises and verb tables are available for free download at <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415710046/>. The idea of a pedagogical reference grammar of Modern Literary/Standard Arabic is very sound but there have been rather serious problems with the execution of the ambitious plan. In short: the book is good for people who already know basic Arabic but it is, in my opinion far too difficult for learners, even for advanced students. Of course we have to remember that Arabic is not an easy language at all but exactly for this reason any pedagogical grammar must be especially easy and well balanced. The main problem with this grammar is that the presentation and explanations are very logical but extremely condensed and thus not very clear for students at all. Practically almost every sentence is a definition and this definition depends on other definitions appearing elsewhere with cross references which do not help much because they do not protect the beginner from being constantly bombarded with both generalizations and details. The author himself warns that the first (!) chapter on verbs (p. 1-14) “is too detailed to present to a beginning-

level class in one sitting”. As a matter of fact the dose of grammatical rules in this opening chapter (many basic facts that should be given first, e.g. on the use of ‘tenses’ appear much later on pp. 111-250) could be rather killing, i.e. it could scare even very motivated students. I have to emphasize that the arrangement is neither pedagogical (there is a very limited gradation of difficulties) nor that of a systematic descriptive grammar, not to mention minor flaws. A student looking both for a ‘holisitic’ vision and for a precise information on a precise point should dare turning to standard grammars, i.e. mainly Elsaid Badawi, M. Carter, A. Gully ‘Modern Written Arabic – a Comprehensive Grammar’, London 2004, Routledge and to undeservedly neglected (not even mentioned on pp. 446-447) grammar by R. Buckley ‘Modern Literary Arabic – a Reference Grammar’, Beirut 2007, Librairie du Liban, not to mention textbooks like K. Ryding’s ‘Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic’, Cambridge UP 2005 or even, as far as really Classical Arabic is concerned, to W. Fischer’s ‘Grammar of Classical Arabic’, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 2001, Yale University Press, and even to Alan Jones ‘Arabic through the Qur’ān’, Cambridge 2006, The Islamic Texts Society. The standard grammars may be too bulky for beginners who must cleverly select the basic things but they provide clear and systematic presentation of facts. To learn to read, write and speak Modern Literary Arabic good practical textbooks are needed and they are available. Learning grammar as such is another thing and the book under review will not be very helpful.

Andrzej Zaborski

**Pablo Sánchez. El árabe vernáculo de Marrakech – análisis lingüístico de un Corpus representativo. Zaragoza 2014. Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza. 492 pp. Estudios de Dialectología Árabe 8. ISBN 978-84-16028-31-3.**

This is one of the most important publications not only dealing with the traditional variety of Arabic spoken in the historical center of the city of Marrakesh (rather neglected by Arabists!) but concerning Moroccan dialects in general. The author has worked in the city on several occasions between 2008 and 2011 using altogether twelve native informants. The book consists of a historical introduction, grammatical analysis of the corpus, of texts provided with translations and notes and finally there is an ample glossary of the corpus.

Andrzej Zaborski

**Takamitsu Muraoka. Classical Syriac for Hebraists. Second, revised edition. Wiesbaden 2013. Harrassowitz Verlag. XXI + 161 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-10046-5.**

This is not a reprint but a really new, i.e. corrected and slightly revised edition of the book published in 1987. The main novelty is that the Estrangela script used in the first edition has been largely replaced by the Jacobite Serto.

As in the first edition, there is a part on orthography and phonology, a part on morphology, then on morphosyntax and syntax where comments and references to scholarly literature are especially rich and illuminating, and finally there are paradigms and a short ‘Chrestomathy’ (the first text, i.e. Gen. 39.7-23 transcribed) with ample comments and explanations and a short Syriac-English glossary.

The author mentions ‘rival’ textbooks for beginners by John F. Healey (*Leshono Suryoyo – First Studies in Syriac*, Piscataway 2005, Gorgias Press), Wheeler M. Thackston (*Introduction to Syriac*, Bethesda 1999, IBEX Publishers) and Massimo Pazzini (*Grammatica siriaca*, Gerusalemme 1999, Edizioni Terra Santa) but it would have been better to give full bibliographical descriptions and to mention also the very good reader by Martin Zammit entitled *‘Enbe men Karne Suryoyo – a Syriac Chrestomathy* (Piscataway 2006, Gorgias Press) which has very good annotations and two glossaries, and *The New Syriac Primer* by George A. Kiraz (Piscataway 2007, Gorgias Press, 3<sup>rd</sup> revised edition reprinted 2013) as well as Daniel M. Gurtner’s *Key to Exercises & English-Syriac Vocabulary* (Bethesda 2006, IBEX Publishers) which is a useful supplement to Thackston didactically remarkable ‘Introduction’. There should also be information on J.F. Coakley’s edition of *Robinson’s Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., Oxford University Press 2002; as well as on Pazzini’s *Lessico conordanzionale del Nuovo Testamento siriano* (Gerusalemme 2004, Edizioni Terra Santa). All these books can be very useful not only for Hebraists but for Semitists in general ‘attacking’ Syriac. It is not true (see p. 1) that “only in the present work and the other one by the present author (his *Classical Syriac: a Basic Grammar with a Chrestomathy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Wiesbaden 2005, Harrassowitz Verlag) the chosen texts are annotated” since they actually are at least in Healey 2005 and in Zammit 2006.

There is no doubt that Professor Muraoka’s textbook remains one of the best introductions to Classical Syriac not only for Semitists.

Andrzej Zaborski

**Henri Mercier. Textes berbères des Ait Izdeg (Moyen Atlas marocain) Textes originaux en fac-similé avec traductions. Traduit par Claude Béringué avec l'aide des formateurs de l'Association Amal à Midelt, édité par Harry Stroomer. Köln 2013. Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. XII + 169 pp. Berber Studies Vol. 39. ISBN 978-3089645-939-8.**

This is a facsimile edition of forty texts in a variety of Tamazight Berber spoken by Ait Izdeg in Morocco (Middle Atlas) published by Henri Mercier in his 'Vocabulaires et textes berbères des Ait Izdeg', pp. 451-512, Rabat 1937, René Céré. Now the texts have been translated and provided with some commentary. This is a valuable collection of ethnographic texts (with some forty photos!) which is now more accessible both to linguists and anthropologists. It is a pity that notes explaining linguistic and anthropological problems could not be more extensive.

Andrzej Zaborski

**Luciano Rocchi, *I Repertori Lessicali Turco-Ottomani di Giovan Battista Montalbano (1630 ca.)*, EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste, Trieste 2014, 230 pp, ISBN 978-88-8303-546-3.**

The so-called "transcription texts" are very important for all scholars dealing with various aspects of Ottoman Turkish, and especially so for those who research historical phonology and linguistics. Having been written by non-Ottoman Turkish speakers, mostly Europeans, these sources have an obvious advantage over the texts having been originally written in the Arabic script: they were written down in alphabets that could note all sounds of the Ottoman-Turkish language, especially the vowels. Since these works were often compiled as grammars and dictionaries, they record not only the pronunciation of Ottoman Turkish words but also their translation into European languages.

Of course, Turkologists aiming at synthesis based on such works do face some problems. One of them is the availability of the texts themselves. Since they were written between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries their few copies are presently being kept at various libraries and thus are not always easily accessible. Authors of the transcription texts were not native users of the Ottoman Turkish language, so they obviously used a specific spelling when transcribing the Ottoman words. Considering this, the significance of scholarly editions of the transcription texts is unquestionable.

Over the last few years Luciano Rocchi has published several books which are editions of the Ottoman Turkish transcription texts. The work presented here is the most recent publication in the series. The manuscript of Giovan Battista Montalbano's *Turcicae linguae per terminos latinus educta Syntaxis [...]* was written in Latin probably between 1625-1632. It consists of three main parts, namely: the grammar of the Ottoman Turkish, the Ottoman Turkish – Latin dictionary, and the collection of 144 proverbs that are alphabetically ordered and translated into Latin. The manuscript is kept at the National Library in Naples and until now, it has only been known to scholars from some articles about it written by Aldo Gallotta. Rocchi's work is the first edition of vocabulary recorded by Montalbano. Its main part – "Corpus lessicale turco" – is preceded by an introduction (pp. 7–12), a short description of Montalbano's graphemes (pp. 13–16), and some remarks on phonology/phonetics (pp. 17–24), morphology (pp. 24–28), and syntax (p. 28) of Ottoman Turkish recorded in Montalbano's work. Each entry in the vocabulary (pp. 43–215) begins with an Ottoman word in contemporary Turkish spelling. It is followed by Montalbano's original spelling, his Latin translation and the attestations in other Ottoman Turkish transcription texts, mainly Hieronymus Megiser's *Dictionarium Latino-Turcicum*, *Turco-Latinum* which served as a basis for Montalbano's grammar (cf. p. 10). However, Montalbano also referred to Meninski, Argenti, Ferraguto etc. Montalbano's words that differ from the literary Ottoman Turkish forms are listed in the last part of the book (pp. 291–230).

Marzanna Pomorska