

account was written later, under the assumption that Taharqo was already king of Egypt in 701 B.C. (*OLA 153*, pp. 144–145). He was well-known in the Levant, since he even imported cedar and juniper wood from Lebanon (cf. p. 146 with former D. Kahn's publications): Taharqo's setback in Egypt occurred only in 671 B.C., following the Assyrian invasion. He retired then to Nubia. The discovery of inscribed evidence with the name of Taharqo inside the exceptional pyramid W T1 at Sedeinga, to the north of the third cataract, suggests that he has been buried there. His mention in the II Kings 19, 9 and in the parallel passage of Is. 37, 9 is thus based on an account apparently postdating the events of 701 B.C. by several years. Taharqo's name could no longer be spelled properly at that time (*OLA 153*, p. 144, n. 271).

K.A. Kitchen's translation of "king of Meluhha/Cush" by "prince in Nubia" (p. 163) and D. Kahn's hypothesis of Taharqo's command at Eltekeh seem to aim at defending, at any cost, the historicity of a detail in the biblical account. The use of the term "Cush" in this context corresponds to the terminology of Gen. 10, 7 and I Chron. 1, 9, where Shebitko (*Sbtk'*) is listed among the sons of Cush, probably after Shabako (*Sbth*, a possible misspelling for *Sbkh*).

The Libyan Period in Egypt is undoubtedly an important tool for all scholars dealing with Egypt in the 10th–7th centuries B.C. Not only chronology, but also history of art, law, and religion are treated in valuable contributions, published less than two years after the Leiden conference. The editors and the publisher should be thanked for their endeavour and congratulated.

Edward Lipiński

Zygmunt Frajzyngier, *Studies in Chadic Morphology and Syntax* (Collection Afrique et Langage 4), Peeters, Louvain-Paris 2002, XII + 295 pp.

Zygmunt Frajzyngier is a well-known specialist of Chadic languages, working since almost half a century on these idioms, which constitute the largest family of the Afro-Asiatic phylum. His first publication, known to the reviewer, appeared in "Rocznik Orientalistyczny" 29/2 (1965), pp. 31–51. Its subject was the intensive form in Hausa verbs. The volume under review reproduces fourteen comparative and descriptive studies dealing with the syntax and morphology of the simple clause in Chadic, first published between 1977 and 1987 in various journals, proceedings of conferences, and collective works. Among the issues discussed in the volume is the basic or underlying form of verbs in West Chadic (pp. 1–26). The Author proposes that it was made of the consonants and of one vowel, thus having one of the forms CV, CVC, CVCC, or CCVC. This is an important issue, which also concerns the Semitic verbs, for the reviewer regards the current conception of three-, eventually two-consonantal roots as inadequate. The following paper on *West Chadic Verb Classes* (pp. 27–42) provides support for the hypothesis about

the grammatical role of verb final vowels in Chadic. The case of monoconsonantal verbs (CV) is different, because they never lose the final vowel in the process of suffixation, as if this vowel was belonging to the basic form of the verb. The chapter *Plural in Chadic* (pp. 43–60) deals with the fact that some Chadic languages have no category of nominal plural. The Author thinks that its presence in other languages of the family represents a relatively recent grammaticalization, based on the plural verb formations through reduplication, gemination, or use of the /a/ vowel. In other words, Proto-Chadic had no formal category of nominal plural.

In the article *On the Proto-Chadic Syntactic Pattern* (pp. 61–82), the Author discusses some of the ergative characteristics of a reconstructible system. This is also the topic of the next chapter on *Ergative and Nominative-Accusative Features in Mandara* (pp. 83–96). Ergativity is an important problem of the whole Afro-Asiatic phylum, since its traces are at present recognized also in Semitic, Egyptian, and Libyco-Berber. In the reviewer's opinion, ergativity has far-reaching consequences for the understanding of later linguistic features, for instance the absence of an univocal concept of "subject" in mediaeval Arabic linguistic theory. The logical subject of the verbal clause, *al-fā'il*, "the acting one", seems in fact to go back to the *casus agens*, while the subject of the nominal clause, *al-mubtada' bihi*, "the one with whom one begins", goes apparently back to the *casus patiens*.

In the article *Marking Syntactic Relations in Proto-Chadic* (pp. 97–116), Frajzyngier regards the word order as the main device to mark syntactic relations. He assumes that Proto-Chadic had a verb-subject-object (VSO) word order rather than subject-verb-object (SVO), as represented by the majority of contemporary Chadic languages. Each Semitist will notice that the VSO sequence parallels the basic word order of the verbal sentence in Semitic, while the SVO order corresponds to the construction of Semitic nominal clauses with their subject called *al-mubtada' bihi* in Arabic. The next chapter *On Intransitive Copy Pronouns* (pp. 117–133) describes the function of this class of morphemes and claims that they have an inceptive or destativizing function. "*Causative*" and "*Benefactive*" in *Chadic* (pp. 135–156) deals with the marker *-s*, realized as [s], [r], [d], [n], and [m]. The Author postulates that its basic function was to indicate the presence, in the clause, of an additional argument beyond the plain, unmarked frame for a given verb. Several authors describe this marker *-s* as causative and compare it to causative *s* in other Afro-Asiatic languages, like Berber, Egyptian, Semitic. Frajzyngier considers this similarity to be accidental, but his relation of the *-s* marker to the 3rd pers. sing. masc. pronoun **sV* in Hausa shows precisely that this parallelism is rooted in Afro-Asiatic. In fact, the 3rd pers. sing. pronoun or pronominal suffix of the Semitic languages is *š(V) > h(V)*. The same suffix occurs in Tuareg, in some Cushitic languages, in Egyptian as independent possessive pronoun and in the feminine, also as personal or suffixed pronoun. It is quite possible that the Afro-Asiatic causative marker is, on the one hand, related to the 3rd pers. sing. masc. pronoun and that it correlates, on the other hand, with the ability of the verb to occur with an additional argument, eventually a second direct object.

The aim of the article *Encoding Locative in Chadic* (pp. 157–178) is to show that Proto-Chadic had only one stative preposition *a*, the function of which was to indicate the

locative meaning of the sentence. Directional and spatial relationships, like “in”, “out”, “under”, “behind”, were signified with the help of nouns derived from body parts and of serial verb constructions. The latter device preceded the formation of verbal extensions, two of which are dealt with in *Ventive and Centrifugal in Chadic* (pp. 179–195). Franzyngier postulates that they derived respectively from the verbs “to come” and “to go”. The next article deals with *Interrogative Sentences in Chadic: Reconstruction and Functional Explanation* (pp. 197–214). There were two devices used to form them: one was the final interrogative marker, derived from a copula, and the other consisted in tonal changes. The chapter *Logophoric Changes in Chadic* (pp. 215–231) refers to syntactic contexts most often known as “indirect speech”. Some Chadic languages have a rich correlated system, but the Author judges that no evidence supports its existence in Proto-Chadic.

The article *From Preposition to Copula* (pp. 233–250) provides evidence for the use of a verb “to be at a place” as a locative preposition, which in turn became an equational copula. The last chapter, *Theory and Method of Syntactic Reconstruction: Implications from Chadic* (pp. 251–271), discusses the implications of the reconstruction of various Proto-Chadic syntactical elements for the general theory and methodology of syntactic reconstruction. A useful bibliography (pp. 273–283), an index of subjects and geographical names (pp. 285–290), and an index of modern authors cited (pp. 291–293) close the volume, which contains a series of inspiring studies. They are of interest to scholars of Afro-Asiatic linguistics, especially to Semitists, who often regard Chadic as a quite distant language family.

Edward Lipiński

Yosef Garfinkel and Saar Ganor (eds.), *Khirbet Qeiyafa. Vol. 1. Excavation Report 2007–2008*. Israel Exploration Society & Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 2009, XIX + 304 pp.

The lavishly illustrated volume under review contains the report of the excavations conducted by the editors in 2007 and 2008 at Khirbet Qeiyafa, a site located on the northern side of the Valley of the Terebinth (Wadi as-Sanṭ, Emeq ha-Elah), some 30 km south-west of Geba of Benjamin, king Saul’s residence. This is a 2.3 hectare site surrounded by massive fortifications of megalithic stones that still stand to a height of 2–3 m. The particular importance of the archaeological site results from the quite accurate dating of its Iron Age stratum at the end of the 11th or in the first half of the 10th century B.C., and from the Hebrew inscription on an ostrakon, which “is the earliest witness of the institution of the monarchy by the people of Israel”, at the time of Saul, as rightly stressed by Émile Puech, “L’ostrakon de Khirbet Qeiyafa et les débuts de la Royauté en Israël”, “Revue biblique” 117 (2010), pp. 162–184. A slightly different reading and translation