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Aethiopica 17 (2014)
As a general remark, Fassum’s work is very useful for a general readership and provides fairly good information on the subjects, highlighting various aspects of their lives.

Abreham Adugna, Universität Hamburg


The profile of this book is not immediately apparent from the title. It presents in concise and overview form extremely dense grammatical sketches of languages from the whole spectrum of Afroasiatic, namely Egyptian, Berber, Cushitic, Chadic, and though shortly also Omotic (sub indicio, but cautiously included), along with sample texts for each language with linguistic annotation and interlinear translation. The Semitic is excluded and no sketch of any Semitic language is given (only a few basic features are presented in the introduction and passim in each chapter, sometimes in the footnotes, mainly from a contrastive point of view). This is due to the fact that the target reader are the Semitists themselves, who are invited to look at their own data from a wider and new perspective, by getting acquainted with the essentials of linguistic structures from the whole range of Afroasiatic. There is no prejudicial statement or hypothesis, however, on the nature of Afroasiatic as such, its classification and internal affinities or its history and development, and even much diverging hypotheses are presented as neutrally as possible.

The book includes an “Introduction: Semitic and Afroasiatic” (pp. 23–58) by the editor, Lutz Edzard; and then chapters on “Egyptian” (Earlier and Later Egyptian; pp. 59–130) by Ruth Kramer; “Berber” (pp. 131–198) by Mohamed Elmedlaoui; “Cushitic” (Overview, Beja, Bilin, Oromo, Somali, Sidaama, Iraqw, pp. 199–295), by David Appleyard, with “Sidaama” (pp. 262–277) by Kjell Magne Yri; “Chadic” (Overview, Kulere, Mubi, Mushere, Tangle, pp. 296–368) by Herrmann Jungraithmayr; “Omotic” (pp. 369–384) by Rolf Theil with a “Sketch Grammar of an Omotic Language: Koorete” (pp. 385–398) by Binyam Sisay Mendisu. Every grammatical sketch is accompanied by a short section on the lexicon. The bibliography follows each chapter. After the table of contents (pp. 5–13) there is a list of tables (pp. 14–17) and of abbreviations (pp. 18–20), mostly consisting of the abbreviations for internal annotation that are oriented to the “Leipzig glossing rules”. An index of subjects (pp. 399–410) and of authors (pp. 411–414) complete the volume.
With respect of these premises, the book is of innovative conception, although the structure of a series of grammatical sketches plus sample texts (as the editor declares, p. 21) is directly inspired by the model of Gotthelf Bergsträsser’s *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen: Sprachproben und grammatische Skizzen*, but the perspective it offers to the general Semitist and Afroasiatist is of a completely different scale.

A few more detailed remarks: p. 30: (table 10) it escapes the reader why it seems necessary to adduce an example from an Amerindian language (diyil / diyil-inay / diyiil-‘a-n, etc.) to demonstrate that the principle of “a consonantal root, modified by template affixes is not restricted to Afroasiatic”: the example provided resembles Indo-European apophony, cf. Greek *leip-*, *elp-*on, *leloip-*a and the question of the vocalic element also in Semitic cannot be ruled out so simply, cf. the old but still valid contribution by Pelio Fronzaroli.2—p. 34, (d): there are a few errors in the verbal tables: the s-t-G (= Dillmann IV,1) perfect form is not, or not as a rule, a-s-t-iCïGâCïG; it is rather a-s-t-iCïGâCïG (for example *astágála*, always with an astá–prefix) or a-s-t-iCïGâCïG, the 3-D (= Dillmann II,2) imperfect form is not yaCïCïCïCï but yaCïCïCïCï; the s-t-L (= Dillmann IV,3) perfect form is not a-s-t-iCïGâCïG but a-s-t-iCïGâCïG. — p. 40: “hezb” for “hazb”, “kanafer” for “kanafer”, “mawâ’d” for “mâwâ’d” do not make clear which transcription system is adopted for Gǝzǝ (whether a/â or a/â for first and fourth order, and o or e for the sixth), with all previous examples adopting a different transcription system than the one adopted here. – p. 41, l. 3 from the bottom (no. iv): Amh. “awnt-w’en” for “swnt-w’en”, and l. 6 (no. iii): the expression can be considered adverbial only in a contrastive or cross-linguistic perspective: it is actually an object. — p. 42: here tacitly emerges an “original Afroasiatic” (p. 42, “originally Afroasiatic”), that contradicts some of the premises of the introduction (pp. 25–26). — p. 46: the idea that the Sudan Nubian is the ultimate responsible for the SOV structure of Amharic via Cushitic intermediary seems to belong to another sphere of reflections than that adopted for this volume. — p. 47: the Cushitic etymology of “ate” (Apleyard) remains a possibility, but among other, cf. the comprehensive presentation by D. Nosnitsin, “Aše”.3—p. 48: the negation “ay” is attested exactly in this form in Ethio-Semitic (for example in Tогроша).4—p. 50: the famous Italian scholar in Indo-European linguistics is “Vittore Pisani” (1899–1990), not “Vittorio”.—p. 68, n. 7: “verbal nouns in the adverbial accusative” in Gǝzǝ hint at the gerundive or converb; the gerundive, however,  
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also exists in Ethio-Semitic, besides accusative, from a nominative basis (for example in ṭagrānā). The volume has a certain series of trivial errors, for example p. 37, l. 18: “qualitative of quantitative”, for “qualitative or quantitative”; p. 39, l. 11: “prefect” for “perfect”; again, also in the tables, p. 39, l. 22: “her forgets” for “he forgets”; p. 97, no. (42): “he-gospel” for “the-gospel”; less trivial, unfortunately, is p. 97, no. (43): ṭmaxārive for ṭmaxārive (scil. from Greek νοῇς); what is worse, the verb form is transcribed “f-na-čarize” as according to the wrong Coptic spelling, instead of “f-na-čarize”.

From an editor who is well known for having stressed the importance of polygenesis, convergence, and entropy,5 one would have expected more consideration for “drift” and internal development phenomena, and for interference as well, not only from within the Afroasiatic macrofamily. For example, the gemination of the types Akkadian iparras, Ethiopic ʔaqattal (pp. 37–38) are considered only in the Afroasiatic and specifically Semitic dimension, without taking into account parallel convergence phenomena, as supposed by David Cohen, who suggests a secondary gemination for ʔaqattal. To stress the limits and the caveat towards a hazardous comparison would have not been superfluous: at a conference on Afroasiatic I eye-witnessed debates concerning the non-Semitic and possibly Egyptian or Cushitic origin of the ṭagrānā genitive particle nay-, definitely to be explained as an internal development from naway, “goods, property”, as stated as early as by Fr. Praetorius,6 and as is confirmed by a well known typology of parallel genitive constructions.

All in all, this book soundly reminds all specialists of single Afroasiatic languages, and Semitic in particular, that a comprehensive consideration of Afroasiatic is fruitful and seminal for understanding better particular phenomena, be it from a historical comparative or typological linguistic point of view. There is no need to say that this is particularly true for specialists in Ethio-Semitic, since the relatively narrow and small Ethiopian linguistic area uniquely includes three of the Afroasiatic linguistic families (namely, Semitic, Cushitic, and Omotic, plus non-Afroasiatic languages). With respect to this, the very fine chapter by David Appleyard – one of the few scholars really able to encompass masterly Cushitic and Ethio-Semitic languages basing on first-hand sources – recommends itself as one of the pièces de résistance of the volume.

Alessandro Bausi, Universität Hamburg

6 F. Praetorius, Grammatik der Tigriñasprache in Abessinien, Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Weisenhauses, 1871, p. 211.