

Andrzej Zaborski

Jagiellonian University  
Cracow

## WHAT TYPE OF TYPOLOGY OF AFROASIATIC?<sup>1</sup>

The volume pretends to provide “the first-ever typological survey of the language families belonging to the Afroasiatic phylum as well as a typological outline of the entire phylum” (p. 1). Fortunately enough, some of the chapters are not concentrated on typology and provide rather descriptive synchronic as well as diachronic (including comparative-historical) presentations. I am far from underestimating the importance of typological descriptive and comparative analyses which are a necessary supplement to other approaches but the problem is that typological linguistics has not worked out a method of overall systematic analysis and presentation of results and also here the typological survey is more or less chaotic, in the best case very impressionistic. We still do not have an up-to-date panorama of the whole macro-family and its branches and I am afraid that an opportunity to have such a synthetic volume in the renowned ‘Cambridge Language Surveys’ has been partially lost.

In the ‘Introduction’ (p. 2) we read that “The question ‘What is a typical Afroasiatic language?’ cannot, at this stage, be answered.” The question itself is senseless: there will never be an answer to it since the ‘phylum’ is immensely diversified! It does not make sense to ask also ‘What is a typical Semitic, Cushitic or Chadic language?’. Only in case of the least differentiated Berber branch such a question might have a certain justification although with numerous reservations. It is not true that ‘The typical evidence for genetic relationships within the phylum

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a review article of Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Erin Shay (eds), *The Afroasiatic Languages*. Cambridge 2012. Cambridge University Press. XX + 687 pp. Cambridge Language Surveys. ISBN 978-0-521-86533-3.

includes numerous comparative word lists showing etymologies across the Afroasiatic families.” (p. 3). The phonological (following sound laws!) and morphological identity (first of all pronouns!) has been and still is the most important proof. It is not true that there is no reconstruction of the grammatical system ‘available for any language family in the Afroasiatic phylum’ (p. 11) since even beginners know that generally detailed although naturally competing reconstructions of Proto-Semitic are available since a long time. Diakonoff’s allegiance to the old idea that the old Afroasiatic prefix-conjugation is a major isogloss has been distorted on p. 14 where we read that this isogloss connects “Semitic, Cushitic, and Omotic” although ‘Omotic’ does not have it while Berber with its so well preserved prefix-conjugation is totally disregarded by Frajzyngier and Shay. There is a genealogical tree based on Ehret’s 1995 quite unreliable classification (based on mistaken comparison and reconstruction of phonemes as well as of very few, mainly derivational morphemes) presented without any critical reflection not to mention total silence concerning other, much better hypotheses. By the way, at the same time C. Peust published the article ‘On the subgrouping of Afroasiatic’, *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 2012, 221-251, in which no less than twenty seven different genealogical trees of Afroasiatic are quoted and the author himself adds a new one. Peust’s approach is sound but even his tree is controversial in some points, e.g. because at least two thirds of the Chadic languages remain virtually undescribed. Some linguists would like to reject the genealogical tree model in general, but I think that in case of more distant branches it makes sense first of all as a kind of visual aid although the isoglosses are almost always contradictory. This is why I have used also another visual aid, that is overlapping circles.

The chapter on Berber (pp. 18-101) is well written by Maarten Kossmann. In my view the opinion that “linguistic variation inside Berber is roughly comparable to that found inside the Germanic or the Romance language families” is rather exaggerated. I would compare it rather to the variation within modern German only. It is true that there is no Berber *koiné* but there is quite a lot of the feeling of cultural and historical identity among the Berber people so that I still prefer to speak about a Berber language having different dialects. The problem is rather sociolinguistic than purely linguistic and I should expect linguists to explain to the general public that the label ‘dialect’ has nothing derogatory in itself, e.g. Classical Arabic is also a dialect although culturally the most important one. The overview of Berber grammar is good indeed although I would like to see more on the Northern Tuareg subdialects. One less felicitous case: I have been surprised that only Eastern Riffian pronominal forms are listed in spite of the fact that Kossmann himself (p. 58) says that “There is much dialectal variation ... and the examples ... from Eastern Riffian Berber are therefore far from representative for all Berber varieties”. There is a detailed survey of Berber pronouns by S. Chaker (‘Les paradigmes personnels du berbère’, in: ‘Systèmes de marques personnelles en Afrique’, ed. by D. Ibrizimow and G. Segerer, pp. 43-54) which

*What Type of Typology of Afroasiatic?*

should have been used or at least mentioned. A very minor remark: I do not think that in the morphological ‘translation’ of ‘the girl that married the man’ (in French “la fille qui a épousé l’homme”) the verb should be glossed as ‘bring’ – Kossmann himself gives the correct gloss ‘to marry’ on p. 515 (cf. p. 160) of his fundamental ‘Grammaire du parler berbère de Figuig’, Paris – Louvain 1997. There should also be an explanation that the so-called participle in Figuig indicates neither gender nor number so that there is a prefix (originally masculine!) *y-* in spite of the feminine gender of *t-wašun-t* ‘girl’. On p. 74 the phrase ‘*Fadna ut-’isa*’ is glossed as “Fadna daughter-Isa” but in Kossmann 1997, p. 86 (cf. p. 2 for *at*, i.e. ‘*ceux de*’ in the names of the names of Figuig villages) *ut* is explained only as a demonstrative “*celle de*”. On p. 65 there should be a mention that the adverbial *-i* goes back to Proto-Afroasiatic *nisba* suffix *-ī*. The use of the Arabic post-verbal negative *ša* together with Berber *u* preverbal negative marker (pp. 87-89) is due to contact with Arabic.

The next chapter by Antonio Loprieno and Mathias Müller is entitled ‘Egyptian and Coptic’ and it is the best short account of Egyptian that we have got recently. Actually ‘Coptic’ could have been skipped in the title because Coptic is Egyptian as well. Once again we read that Coptic “survives to the present time as the liturgical language of the Christian church of Egypt” but this is not true not only because Coptic is as dead as, e.g. Latin but also because Arabic is the liturgical language of the Coptic church since a very long time and Coptic is used only sometimes as a kind of nice but short and practically incomprehensible embellishment of the liturgy. Nothing like Latin in the Catholic church before Vaticanum Secundum! Coptic is only the language of Coptic tradition, and courses of ‘spoken Coptic’ are only valuable proofs of the living cultural tradition. I wonder whether Old Egyptian 1<sup>st</sup> person singular ‘I’ should be reconstructed (p. 117) as *\*/janak/* since there is *\*’anak-u* reconstructed for Proto-Semitic and in Coptic there is not only *anok* (cf. Biblical Hebrew *ānōkī*) but also more archaic *anak*.

As far as derived classes of verbs are concerned (p. 120), it should have been said that their limitation and considerable lexicalization was an Egyptian innovation in comparison with Semitic, Berber and Cushitic.

There is no mention of the problem of internal plural in older Egyptian in spite of the clear survival of this important Afroasiatic feature in Coptic. Internal (i.e. with *ablaut/apophony*) plural must have existed in older Egyptian and this has already been demonstrated by Schenkel and then by Quack. The fact that plural ending *-w* was frequently absent and there was nothing to indicate plural (or three strokes or ‘points’ were added) indicates that there must have been internal inflection used for number, sometimes together with *-w* (see A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, Cambridge 1995, 58-63). All Coptic internal plural forms cannot be explained only as innovations due to *umlaut*, i.e. vowel assimilation which was possible later.

There is practically nothing on genitive construction in Old and Middle Egyptian and when *nota genetivi* is very briefly mentioned (p. 121 and 124-125)

there is no mention that it has a cognate in Berber and Chadic *n*, although in Chadic it could be at least partially due to contact with Nilo-Saharan languages, some of which have the same *n* morpheme of genitive.

Not only general linguists but also Semitists will learn very little, if anything, about the Pseudoparticiple/Old Perfective/Stative which is a very important Egypto-Semitic link but which has been mentioned only in two rather general sentences with only one example of the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular (p. 127). There is a hypothesis that actually there were two different forms, i.e. one corresponding to West Semitic Perfect and another one to Akkadian Stative, or the Egyptian ‘Pseudoparticiple’ combined perfect and perfective functions which were separated in Proto-Semitic: the first continued in the West Semitic Perfect, the second in the Akkadian Stative. In my opinion the Old Egyptian verbal system is innovating, i.e. the prefix conjugation had been lost, the suffix conjugation (at least common to Egyptian and Semitic) survived in the Pseudoparticiple(s) and the new suffix conjugations going back to fully grammaticalized constructions of verbal nouns with possessive suffixes (corresponding to Ethiosemitic gerund, to the similar use of ‘absolute’ Infinitives e.g. in Biblical Hebrew etc.) were generalized. It is impossible to assume that Semito-Berbero-Cushitic prefix conjugations could be innovations, later than the system of Old Egyptian since their pronominal prefixes have no correspondents in the pronominal system of Old Egyptian which was clearly innovating in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> persons. Only in the suffixes of the Pseudoparticiple(s) we find the older 2<sup>nd</sup> person morphemes with *-t*. The Egyptian ‘suffix conjugations’ have a very ‘transparent’ morphological structure which supports the hypothesis that they are younger. Passive suffix *-tw* has a nice cognate in Berber and Cushitic Beja. The existence of internal passive (cf. Classical Arabic *qutla*, Biblical Hebrew *qutal*, several patterns to be reconstructed for Modern Semitic of Southern Arabia =MSSA, usually called ‘Modern South Arabian’) should also have been accepted. I do not think there is a serious evidence for an Indoeuropean adstratum in the Old Egyptian lexicon and the alleged loanwords or even alleged cognates adduced by Kammerzel (p. 143) are just accidental similarities.

Semitic languages have been presented by Gene Gragg and Robert Hoberman (pp. 145-235). I do not think it is correct to say that “Of these (i.e. “local vernacular forms” of Arabic – A.Z.), only Maltese has broken away from the model of Classical Arabic” (p. 147). Actually all the Arabic dialects do not follow Classical Arabic and many of them go back to Pre-Classical period being different since that period! I do not think that purely consonantal writing of the Ancient Semitic of Southern Arabia (=ASSA; usually misnamed ‘Epigraphic South Arabian’ but no language is ‘epigraphic’!) is a good excuse for a very rare use of ASSA to illustrate points of Semitic morphology and syntax, not to mention phonology. E.g. the prefixing Past is preserved in ASSA and in Classical Arabic and in Biblical Hebrew (not to mention Ugaritic!) and even if it is limited

*What Type of Typology of Afroasiatic?*

it cannot be dubbed ‘fossilized’ as stated on p. 149. The traditional use of the phonetic isogloss, i.e. of allophones [p] : [f] for the genetic classification of West Semitic has been simply unserious since the very beginning as this non-phonemic distinction is far too banal and the process very frequent (cf. p. 153 and 158). There is no Present *\*yiqattil* in MSSA as said on p. 150 – there is only *\*yVqātīl* which shows that *\*yV-qattVl* and *\*yV-qātVl* were allomorphs at a prehistorical stage. There should have been a mention of R. Stempel, *Abriss einer historischen Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, Frankfurt am Main 1999, of Kienast’s ‘Historische Semitische Sprachwissenschaft’, Wiesbaden 2001 which, although controversial in many details, is decisively superior to Lipiński’s uncritical and plagiarizing compilation, and also A. Rubin, ‘A Brief Introduction to the Semitic Languages’, Piscataway 2010 should have been quoted. There is no decisive proof that ASSA, Proto-Semitic and possibly Akkadian and the earliest Ugaritic, Canaanite and Aramaic ‘emphatic’ consonants were realized as glottalized. Glottalized and pharyngealized pronunciations were just non-distinctive features and I do not think that asking which phonetic articulation was ‘original’ makes much sense – they could be variants, i.e. allophonic already in Proto-Afroasiatic. In the discussion of nominal plural there is no mention of the *-an* suffix which occurs not only in Akkadian but also in Arabic, MSSA (e.g. Mehri) and in Berber as well as in Cushitic and Chadic. There is no mention of the diptote declension of the singular and of internal plural nouns in Arabic (pp. 170-171) which, in my opinion, goes back to Proto-Semitic for which we should reconstruct both triptote and diptote (not only in plural!) declensions going back to Proto-Afroasiatic in contradiction to Hasselbach (see my review of her ‘Case in Semitic’ Oxford 2013, in this volume). There is no mention on pp. 172-173 that originally nuna-tion/mimation most probably indicated definiteness and such a possibility is mentioned only on p. 193. It is not really true that “the Arabic prefixing forms are in fact jussive” (p. 178). Jussive is actually a modal function of the Past ‘tense’ which has good typological equivalents in many languages using the Past/Pret-erit for wishes, e.g. English ‘I wish he came’, Russian *pošli* ‘(pl. we/you/they ‘went’/let us go!) etc. There is nothing ‘surprising’ (p. 183) in that *iprus/yaqtul* survives in Classical Arabic in negative sentences – the same happened in later Akkadian under the pressure of *iptaras* Perfect! I think that the generalization of the gemination of the second root consonant in the Present *iparrVs(u)* might have been probably introduced by Assyriologists since it is not always graphically marked in Akkadian and in Ge‘ez it is only traditional but not marked in writing while in Berber and in Cushitic Beja only a part of verbs geminate the second root consonant in the Present. It is possible that the situation in otherwise very innovating Amharic and less innovating Tigrinya which have both *yänäggər* and *yänägrV* Present forms is older. Generalization of *iparrVs-u* (*iparrVs* before a pause) in Akkadian may be an Akkadian innovation. Akkadian Subordinative *iprus-u* is the case of the survival of the original Imperfect/Present (surviving in

Classical Arabic *yaqtul-u*) shifted to dependent clauses – an Akkadian innovation as demonstrated already by Kurylowicz. Since Akkadian changed the syntactic order to SOV, original Preterit *iprus* and Imperfect/Present *\*iprus-u* became indistinguishable due to the loss of final vowels before a pause and this caused the expansion of *iparrVs* as a new Present going back to multiplicative/intensive derivational form with gemination. Akkadian Ventive (p. 180) is an innovation, i.e. a case of limitation of the use of the original, prehistoric Past with *-an/-am* mainly to verbs of motion, probably under the Sumerian influence. This original Past survives in Arabic and Ugaritic, partially in Biblical Hebrew in a modal, i.e. ‘Energetic’ function while in Sabaic and Minaic it still occurs in main and dependent clauses while in MSSA it occurs residually in conditional sentences. Other innovations of Akkadian should have been mentioned, i.e. the loss of the Energetic imperative surviving in Classical Arabic, in Hebrew etc.; the loss of old Subjunctive *yaqtul-a* of which there are only some vestiges in Old Akkadian, the loss of L, i.e. *qātala* stem as well as of *iqtalla* verbs, the loss of internal passive, the limitation of verbal dual to the third persons etc.. This shows that in many instances Arabic (including all its archaic dialects!) is more archaic or conservative than Akkadian. There should be a mention (p. 182) that *sawfa/sa-* (also *saw-*, *sā* etc.) marking Future with Arabic *yaqtul-u* goes back to an adverb ‘finally’ (cf. Biblical Hebrew *sōf* ‘end’) and *qad* (marking the end of an action, a result with the Perfect and a possibility with the Imperfect) goes back to *qad(ama)* ‘to precede’. It is really surprising that the multiplying/frequentative/intensive function of *qattala* verbs is not mentioned on p. 185! *Qattala* makes denominal verbs already in the old Semitic languages and not just in Modern Hebrew (p. 185). It is mentioned (p. 185) that *qattala* and *qātala* are variants in Mehri but on p. 179 it is said that “it is an open question whether MSA present-tense forms lost gemination from a CVCCVC template, or never developed it from a CVCVC template” which is wrong since the existence of *qattala* and *qātala* variants of multiplicative/pluractional/frequentative/intensive (also causative and factitive!) goes back to Proto-Semito-Berber-Cushitic. I do not think that there is really an etymological connection between the causative *š-* and the third person pronouns (p. 186). In Classical Arabic *iqtatalla* derived verbs occur not only with the preposition *bi-* (p. 187)! Many of them are not passive/mediopassive-reflexive but active and transitive which means that the older Perfect *iptaras* known in Akkadian, in Beja and Berber survived mechanically classified in the one ‘class’ with passive/reflexive verbs. Internal passive has been preserved not only in Classical Arabic but also elsewhere in Semitic (see above), in Old and Middle Egyptian and probably also in Berber in which there are many verbs (called ‘reversible’ or ‘labile’ verbs) which can be either active or passive/stative. It is not true that the personal independent pronoun paradigm “is completely transformed in Mehri” (p. 189) since e.g. Mehri 2<sup>nd</sup> sing masc. *hēt* can be easily reconstructed as *\*'ēt* < *\*'ett* < *\*ent* < *\*'ent-a* < *\*'ant-a*. The definite arti-

*What Type of Typology of Afroasiatic?*

cle of MSSA *'a-/hə-/ħə-* is receding but it is clear that it is related to Arabic, Northern Proto-Arabic *hal-/han-* and to Hebrew and Phoenician *haC-*; certainly it is not a loan from Arabic just because it is disappearing (largely lexicalized) in spite of centuries of contact with Arabic. Direct object is marked with *IV-* not only in Ge'ez (p. 208) but also in Aramaic and in some varieties of Arabic. In purpose clauses in Mehri (p. 224) it is not 'Jussive' but the Old Preterit that is used. In Biblical Hebrew it is not *waC-* conjunction which indicates sequential actions (p. 231, see also pp. 18-181) with the Preterit but it is the conjunction *wa-* plus asserting particle *-la-* prefixed to the Preterit, so that *wat-tahar* 'she conceived' < \**wa-l-tahar* < *wa-la-tahar*.

The chapter on Chadic has been coauthored by Zygmunt Frajzyngier and Erin Shay. They tell us that out of some 160 Chadic languages "only about 40 have been described" (p. 142) and it is really surprising that out of this limited number the data of some 15 languages, some of them very important, e.g. due to their relative archaism, have not been used at all! E.g. very important Mubi and Mokilko are mentioned briefly only once, Tera, Ga'anda, Logone, Sura etc. do not appear in very unreliable (sic!) indices at all! Practically all the relevant data from all the approximately 40 languages could be easily arranged in tables. It is really irritating that so frequently there is 'information' like 'In some Chadic languages it is... but in other languages it is different', e.g. p. 301 on internal *-a-* plurals in Chadic. On p. 265 we read: "Very few languages (which languages? – A.Z.) have prefixed subject pronouns, and these are probably a relatively recent innovation". What is the basis of such a hypothesis? Actually we learn very little about Chadic retentions and innovations not simply because two thirds of the Chadic languages are virtually unknown but because the authors of the survey present unsystematically only some of the available data.

The chapter on Cushitic has been written well by Maarten Mous who had made basic contributions to the study of Southern Cushitic Iraqw and Alagwa as well, on a smaller scale, to Oromoid Konso. He has also made a great contribution to the study of Ma'a/Mbugu proving that this is only a variant of the Bantu Mbugu with some lexical traces of an extinct Cushitic language and not a mysterious 'mixed language' having two 'mothers' as taken for granted on the basis of ignorance of facts e.g. by Sarah Thomason in her publications on contact linguistics. The Cushitic branch is relatively the most differentiated within the Afroasiatic family (although Chadic is still largely unknown!), i.e. it comprises both very archaic or conservative languages (i.e. 'Afar-Saho and Beja) and very innovating ones (e.g. South Cushitic). The chapter is well written but it suffers to some extent from the lack of an adequate i.e. more detailed presentation of 'Afar-Saho and of Beja on which there is almost nothing (see p. 397 where it is not mentioned in the 'Indices'). E.g. there is nothing on 'Afar-Saho endings *-u*, *-a*, *-e* and *-an* which are good cognates of the endings of the Semitic *yaqtul-u*, *yaqtul-a*, *yaqtul-an*. I disagree with Hayward and I do not think that the big number of prefix-conjugated

verbs in ‘Afar can be due to the contact with Semitic (the opinion quoted on p. 391) since Somali has been in contact with Arabic for at least a millennium acquiring hundreds of loanwords but there is only a real handful of old Cushitic prefix-conjugated verbs in it. It is a pity that there is no table of pronouns. It was Leo Reinisch and not Franz Praetorius (p. 3987) who explained the origin of the main Cushitic innovation *vis à vis* other branches of Afroasiatic, i.e. the new suffix conjugation with the prefix conjugated auxiliary suffixed.

The chapter on the still enigmatic ‘Omotiic’ (pp. 423-504) has been written by Azeb Amha. She does not give a clear answer to the questions: 1. are the so-called ‘Omotiic’ languages really interrelated at all ?, 2. if so, are they really Afroasiatic ?, 3. if there are different independent groups, which of them can be Afroasiatic and which might belong to the otherwise also more or less enigmatic Nilo-Saharan family ?, 4. if some groups of ‘Omotiic’ are Afroasiatic can they be genetically classified as related to Cushitic, i.e. as West Cushitic ? One thing is clear: in case of ‘Omotiic’ there has been a rather strong interference between Cushitic and Nilo-Saharan. Bender’s and Fleming’s hypothesis of ‘Omotiic’ as an independent branch of Afroasiatic has been quite premature and very weak. Azeb Amha quotes my opinion that Aroid languages cannot be Afroasiatic because their pronouns are Nilo-Saharan but then she adds Bender’s opinion that allegedly these pronouns have been borrowed from Nilo-Saharan – a borrowing of all basic pronouns is unknown and quite improbable. But then there is a question what has not been borrowed from Nilo-Saharan and what is Afroasiatic except lexemes which might have been borrowed from Cushitic or even from other Afroasiatic languages much easier ? Thanks to Ahland’s great thesis on Mao (still unpublished!) it is clear that also Mao pronouns have nothing of Afroasiatic. The evidence of pronouns and of morphology in general is much more important than the evidence of loanwords, many of which are quite uncertain. The authoress says finally that “Pending further investigation the present writer supports the ‘Omotiic hypothesis’ while acknowledging that the external and internal relations among the languages may be somewhat obscured by a long and complicated history and intermingling of the people (singular! – AZ) of southwestern Ethiopia” (p. 433) and ‘the work does not present comparable data on grammatical features for all the languages’.

Minor comments: Maale Perfective -é- and Imperfective -á- resembles Cushitic but this needs further investigation. Dime personal pronouns (p. 476) do not show anything Afroasiatic and I do not think that the fact that Dime has unrelated forms for third person singular subject and object pronouns should be compared with the alleged ‘Afar ‘mismatch’ in second persons since ‘Afar *atu* ‘thou’ and *koo* ‘you (Object)’ are of Proto-Afroasiatic origin and there are innovations only in third persons including possessive pronouns.

The chapter ‘Typological outline of the Afroasiatic phylum’ (pp. 505-624) by Zygmunt Frajzyngier suffers heavily from the lack of a diachronic approach

*What Type of Typology of Afroasiatic?*

to typology. Languages evaluate changing also their type. Typological development of Egyptian during its very long history is a very important case and C.T. Hodge's article in *Language Sciences* 13, 1970, 1-7 should be used. E.g. the statement that "In all families of Afroasiatic, albeit not in all languages, nouns have a category 'gender'" (p. 522) is quite inaccurate and vague. Construct state exists not only in Semitic (p. 522). It is quite misleading to suggest that the so-called gender polarity (known also e.g. in Biblical Hebrew as mentioned on p. 538) is a feature of Cushitic in general (p. 523). Where is the proof (and an example!) that "The existence of independent pronouns, distinct from subject pronouns, constitutes a common characteristic of Afroasiatic languages" (p. 524)? There is no discussion of root structure and no mention that verbal roots can have a root vowel that can be partially reconstructed (cf. p. 524). There is no example to support the claim that allegedly "In Semitic, Cushitic, and Omotic languages there is a connection between case marking and definiteness in that nouns that are definite are more likely to be marked for case" (p. 536). It is quite astonishing that suffixation as means to make plural is attributed only to "Berber, Egyptian, Cushitic, Chadic" (p. 537) but not to Semitic! Prefixed plural does not really exist since in Berber it accompanies suffixation and/or apophony so that we must speak about circumfixes with apophony just like in Frajzyngier's examples sing. *bad-u* : pl. *i-bud-a* 'furrow' (p. 537). Even more misleading and internally contradictory is the statement (p. 537) that plural is made by "Infixation, i.e. insertion of an affix (certainly not consonantal! – A.Z.) in between the segments of the root (Semitic, Chadic); and vowel alternations (Cushitic, Chadic). Greenberg (1955) postulated that one of the means of forming the plural in Afroasiatic was through the infixation of vowel *a*. This means is productive in a number of Chadic languages and in Berber. It is possible that the phenomenon described as 'apophony' in Berber contains the traces of this old plural formation". Vowel alternation is a phonological process while apophony (called also *ablaut* or internal inflexion) is morphological and highly diversified, and numerous internal plural forms of Berber (cf. pp. 52 and 53 where Kossmann speaks about "Plural formation by means of the imposition of a vowel scheme" using an unnecessary circumlocution for internal inflection/apophony/*ablaut*) are not 'traces'. Making singulatives from collectives/plurals with *-a* is not restricted to Cushitic Bilin but it is of Proto-Afroasiatic origin (cf. p. 523 on Chadic Gidar). It is widely spread in Cushitic and also at least in many Ethiosemitic languages being an aerial feature. Gemination of final root consonants to make derived verbs occurs not only in Cushitic Konso and Gideo (p. 540) but also in Semitic (e.g. Arabic *iqṭalla* verbs) and in Chadic there are Imperfect forms of this type, e.g. in Migama *appall-á* 'to climb'. On p. 544 we read that "In some languages, e.g. in 'Afar, there is a separate marker for person (a prefix) and number (a suffix)" but this is the case of circumfixes typical of the prefix conjugation also in Semitic and in Berber, for which see also the statement on p. 530: "In some languages,

Andrzej Zaborski

e.g. Berber, scholars have postulated the existence of discontinuous morphemes” which is quite inaccurate because the existence of these morphemes in all the older Afroasiatic is not a postulate but a fact! But the next sentence is even more astonishing: “A similar phenomenon has been recorded in Egyptian and in Gidar and Giziga (Central Chadic).” There is no prefixed person marker in Egyptian! On p. 558 we read that “In Cushitic, determiners follow the noun, and in some languages they are suffixed to it”. As a matter of fact, definite article is prefixed in Beja and it is also inflected for gender, number and case like the original definite article of Berber reduced to the function of status marker. Concerning the final position of the verbal predicate attributed to contact (p. 562) it should be mentioned that also the Arabic dialects of Central Asia are S+OV due to interference with Uzbek and Tadjik. It is rather shocking to read (p. 574) that “The case markers of Akkadian are phonologically similar (they are identical! – A.Z.) to the case markers of Classical Arabic. Because of this similarity they are considered to be a retention from an earlier Proto-Semitic system. But given the fact that only two languages have this case system (Classical Arabic and Akkadian) and given the fact that in Classical Arabic there are caseless forms (see Owens 1998), the hypothesis that Akkadian represents the Proto-Semitic case system may be revisited.” This is all wrong, e.g. because case endings are attested also, e.g. in Ugaritic. Frajzyngier has been challenging the existence of apophony in the verbal inflexion in Chadic since a long time and he continues his stand (p. 594) forgetting that his rules of vowel raising and lowering, i.e. vowel assimilation under the influence of the plural suffix are not simply cases of phonological alternation (i.e. vowel assimilation or *umlaut*) but they are also morphologically conditioned, i.e. they are morphonological and not only phonological. Internal inflexion, i.e. *ablaut* in Old Chadic verb (also nominal derivation and number!) inflection goes back to Proto-Afroasiatic although there may be coexisting cases of a later, secondary *ablaut* as well.

Conclusion: this typological outline of the Afroasiatic languages and some chapters in the volume can be read only with utmost care and a big lot of supplementary data and analyzes is needed.