

Peter Dils und Lutz Popko (Hrsg.). 2016. *Zwischen Philologie und Lexikographie des Ägyptisch-Koptischen, Akten der Leipziger Abschlusstagung des Akademienprojekts Altägyptisches Wörterbuch* (Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig – Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 84, Heft 3). Stuttgart/Leipzig: 220 pages. ISBN 978-3-7776-2657-4.

The publication presents the proceedings of the colloquium “Das Altägyptische Wörterbuch und die Lexikographie der Ägyptisch-Koptischen Sprache,” which was organized on 29-30 November 2012 in Leipzig and marked the official end of the *Altägyptisches Wörterbuch* project of the *Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften*. The book contains the following contributions:

Ingelore Hafemann (7-28) goes into details of polysemy and polyequivalence. The historical development of polysemy is traced back to such factors as metaphors, metonymy, archaisms, and technical terminology of the language (7; for polysemy, cf. Köhler 2016: 43–45). The polyequivalence is explained by the tendency of a certain word in one language to have several translation possibilities in another (8). The lack of the meaning “front side of a house“ of *ḥꜣ.t* is considered as highly interesting (10), which seems to be somewhat arbitrary. The same use in English *land*, French *terre* and Egyptian *tꜣ* is adduced (11) – which might be somewhat overvalued. The selection of examples for *pr.w* (15-26) is not impressive in originality.

Jochem Kahl (29-55) takes position for what concerns the age of coffin text-artefacts from Assiut. The overall regional peculiarities in Assiut are recalled, which are demonstrated *inter alia* by the statue type of a man sitting on a low throne (33). The achievements in the chronology of the rulers of the nome of Assiut and their tombs, made possible thanks to newer research, are exemplified in table form (34-35). The 1359 hieroglyphs executed in fine relief from tomb V/III/IV of the First Intermediate Period and tomb I of the time of Senuseret I are compared palaeographically, with the two oldest tombs V and III which show the largest similarity – 98.8% (38). The integration of the coffins of Mesehti (S1C=CG 28118; S2C=CG 28119) in the investigation is said to result in a stronger similarity near tomb I, but the argumentation does not seem to be wholly free of contradictions (38). The palaeographic comparison of the coffin of Nachti (S2P= Paris, Louvre 11936) may hint at its setting in the First Intermediate Period (39).

Matthias Müller (56-81) develops case studies for grammaticalisation phenomena in Egyptian-Coptic. The genesis of a (position)-free negation word *iwꜣ* in Late-Egyptian is described, for which an origin in a sentence enlargement element is held possible (58). The partial loss of an initial negation word in Coptic is alluded to (58). The seeping in of the negation **AN** to hitherto closed environments of other negation patterns in Nitric Bohairic and late-Bohairic sources of the Old Testament is

clarified (59). The formation of the perfect scheme of verbs of more than three radicals on the basis of the auxiliary verb *iri* “to do” (and its derivatives) is recapitulated in Late Egyptian, Demotic, and Coptic (61). Evidence for the change of the demonstrative pronoun *pw* to a subject element/copula is marshalled (61-65). The replacement of non-congruent subject elements through the congruence-marking morphemes *pi/ti/ni* in Late Egyptian and Demotic is observed (63). The rareness of the use of the Coptic verb **ϩⲱⲛ** “to draw near” as auxiliary verb + preposition **ϵ** + infinitive with the meaning of “almost” is stressed (69). The nearly exclusive limitation of the construction **(ϵ)ⲣ-ⲛⲁⲱϩ** “to halve” followed directly or indirectly by connected infinitives with the special meaning “to be half dead” is mentioned (70). The use of future-like verbal forms like Future I and III as well as the infix -**ⲭⲛⲓ-** or **ϩⲁⲛⲓ** + **ϵ** + infinitive for “to have to” in Coptic is introduced (73-75).

Tanja Pommerening searches for the possibility to identify Old Egyptian drug names. The insight that drug names can stand either isolated or in combination with adjective and genitival attributes respectively (85) makes a rather trivial impression. The so-called lack of code names of Old Egyptian drug names (87) should have been improved by further arguments. The statement that *irt.t* “milk” is to be found alone or together with certain other expressions (86-87) comes dangerously close to a quibbling. The linkage of the slaughtered animals to the area of materia medica (95) can hardly be said to inspire much confidence. The classification of the determinatives of drug names does not go beyond mere generalities (94). The doubts about the usefulness of Coptic for the semantic determining of Egyptian words (97-98) cannot be shared unrestrictedly, the analysis of the *mst.t*-plant as celeriac being – by the way – bedeviled by a contradiction at p. 99. On p. 84, for the drug *ḏrn* cf. Helck (1971: 510) and Westendorf (1999: 497) and for *rdnw* “ladanum” cf. Vycichl (1957: 72), Vittmann (1991: 241) and Vittmann (1996: 440).

Joachim Friedrich Quack puts special emphasis on the potential weakness of the traditional categorisation of the Egyptian language history. The advantages and disadvantages of the previous lexica are balanced critically to one another (113-119). The occasionally claimed culture break between the Demotic and older phases of the language is strenuously denied (118-119). The meaning of “ḏ” is zeroed in on “shore, place at the river” with good arguments (122-128). On p. 120, for *blḏ* “pottery sherd” in Hieratic cf. now Guermeur (2015: 31); for the verb *grm* “to seize” cf. Osing (1976: 821), who favours the meaning “to capture, to rapture;” for the verb *ḏrp* “to stumble” cf. Černý (1976: 319) and Jasnow (1992: 123); and for the verb *nʿn* “to repel” cf. Hornung (1982: 67, fn. 167).

Tonio Sebastian Richter offers an overview of Arabic words in Coptic texts. The material assembled so far consists of ca. 500 examples, one half stemming from two handfuls of scientific texts and recipe collections of the 10.-11. c. AD and the other from 100 documentary texts of the 8.-11. c. AD

(138). The Arabic words in Coptic texts prove helpful for a better understanding of Arabic lexicography (139). The relatively firm conventionality of Coptic writings of Arabic words in the 9.-10. centuries is discussed (110) and the interpretation of the double vocal as standing for a long vocal in Coptic of the 10. century is advocated (144). The overwhelming majority of Arabic words in Coptic is built by substantives (144). The exclusive use of Arabic colour adjectives and place-*nisbas* in terms for mineral ingredients is stated (146). The Arabic conjunction *wa-* “and” reappears in Coptic writing as **ⲱ** or **ⲟϣ** (147-148).

Wolfgang Schenkel plunges into questions of Old Egyptian colour conceptions. The basic colour spectrum is subdivided in the components *km* “black,” *ḥd* “white,” *dšr* “red” and *wḏ* “green” (164). The difference between “black” and “white” is related to the light/dark contrast (165). The connection between *dšr* “red” and *dšr.t* “desert” is exemplified (166). The name *wḏ-wr* for the Red Sea is interpreted as “darkgreen one”/“dark-blue one,” the addition *wr* being seen as attributive participle with the meaning “very” (166-167). The words “red” and “green” are analyzed as typical expressions for warm and cold colours (168). The deduction of certain colour terms from minerals is examined (170). The issue of the possible differentiation in the plurality of colour words especially in the red-/yellow sector is pursued (170-171). The colour terms *km* “black” “*ḥd* “white,” *dšr* “red” and *wḏ* “green” are explained morphologically as verbs, all other ones being understood as adjectives (179-180). The Hamito-Semitic (Afroasiatic) cognates of the basic colours terms are listed (180-181).

Simon D. Schweitzer introduces the concept of “lexical gravity” in Egyptology. The following main characteristics of lexical gravity are highlighted: a) specific influence of every word on its environment, b) different gravity diagrams of different words, c) upper limit of the influence, d) specific span of influence depending on the specific word, e) separation of lexical gravity in a semantic and grammatical form (190). The asymmetry of the gravitation changes depending on the word class, being in the case of substantives/verbs right-orientated and in the case of adjectives/suffixes left-orientated (196). The scientific value of the method has yet to be shown in the future. However, already at the present stage, the integration of prepositions like *m-bḥ* “before,” *m-ḥnw* “inside” and *ḥr* “on, by” in the investigation has to be seriously questioned. The frequency of suffixes after prepositions could have been inferred easily without large calculations.

The book has to be viewed with some ambivalence. One part of the contributions reveals a good quality, while the expectations in other parts are not completely fulfilled. In too many cases marginal facts are exaggerated without justification. The philological yield is rather meager if measured according to the usual standards. The observations in particular about lexical questions – one of the

main focus areas of the volume – often turn out to be less substantial. This negative view applies mainly to a fraction of the Egyptological contributions, while the Coptological ones are indeed quite convincing. The critical examples have already been remarked on above, during the discussion of individual contributions. Therefore, the book can be recommended only with hesitation.

## References

- Černý, Jaroslav. 1976. *Coptic etymological dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guermeur, Ivan. 2015. Les papyrus hiératiques de Tebtynis, Un aperçu du matériel issu des fouilles 2008-2010. In: Nadine Quenouille (ed.), *Von der Pharaonenzeit bis zur Spätantike, Kulturelle Vielfalt im Fayum, Akten der 5. Internationalen Fayum-Konferenz, 29. Mai bis 1. Juni 2013, Leipzig*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz: 17-37.
- Helck, Wolfgang. 1971. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr., 2., verbesserte Auflage, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 5*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hornung, Erik. 1982. *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh, Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Band 46)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jasnow, Richard. 1992. *A Late Period Hieratic Wisdom Text (P. Brooklyn 47.218.135)*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Köhler, Ines. 2016. *Rage like an Egyptian, Die Möglichkeiten eines kognitiv-semantischen Zugangs zum altägyptischen Wortschatz am Beispiel des Wortfelds [Wut]*. PhD Dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin.
- Osing, Jürgen. 1976. *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen, Anmerkungen und Indices*. Mainz: von Zabern.
- Vittmann, Günther. 1991. Review of: Sauneron, Serge, *Un traité égyptien d'ophiologie. Papyrus du Brooklyn Museum N° 47.218.48 et .85* (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Bibliothèque Générale, t. XI). Le Caire: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale: 1989 (XI+243pages; 21-pages appendix with unnumbered tables and hieroglyphic transcriptions). *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 81: 237-241.
- Vittmann, Günther. 1996. Semitisches Sprachgut im Demotischen, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 86: 435-447.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1957. Notes on the Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor, *Kusch* 5: 70-72.
- Westendorf, Wolfhart. 1999. *Handbuch der altägyptischen Medizin* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Band 36). Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Stefan Bojowald,

Ägyptologisches Seminar, Universität Bonn

(stefan.bojowald@t-online.de)