

cal mission. It was concentrated on the complete excavation of the temple and the settlement and publishing the decoration and inscriptions of the temple.

In the article "Lessons from the Upper Egyptian temple of el-Qal'a" (pp. 168-178), Claude Traunecker deals with the history, architecture and research of the temple at el-Qal'a in Upper Egypt built in the Roman Period as well as the interpretation and iconography of some deities preserved in the decoration of the temple.

In the paper titled "Slaughtering the crocodile at Edfu and Dendera" (pp. 179-203), Penelope Wilson devotes her attention to one of the most frequent and important scenes occurring on the walls of the temples at Edfu and Dendera. She presents the translations and analyses of the series of texts accompanying these temple scenes as well as the list of Egyptian terms used for "crocodile".

In his contribution titled "A painting of the gods of Dakhla in the temple of Ismant el-Kharab" (pp. 204-215), Olaf E. Kaper deals with some deities represented on the walls of the temples discovered in the Dakhla Oasis in recent decades. The decoration program of these temples is discussed in the context of the local cult topography and occurrence of some deities in the Roman period scenes.

John Baines concentrates his attention on the temples from the Early and Graeco-Roman Periods of Egyptian history. Based on the archaeological and written records, his essay "Temples as symbols, guarantors, and participants in Egyptian civilization" (pp. 216-241) discusses the relationship between temples and kingship and deals with the development and significance of the temples in their social context.

The book under review consisting of collected studies is a very informative and valuable volume appreciated by the scholars interested in ancient Egyptian temples, but available also for those dealing with the architecture and religion of the ancient Egyptians.

Dušan Magdolen

TAKÁCS, Gábor: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume One: A Phonological Introduction*. Brill – Leiden, Boston, Köln 1999. ISBN 90-04-11539-0; Handbook of Oriental Studies, Dept. 1, Tome 48, ISSN 0169-9423, 471 pp.

Compiling an etymological dictionary certainly requires monumental and toilsome work. We have seen recently the first part of such a work, the objective of which is to summarize the results of the comparison of the Old Egyptian language with related language families spread in a great part of Africa and the Middle East. The dictionary will probably please all those who are oriented to historical linguistics.

The underlying book starts with a brief review of the development of historical egyptology and Afro-Asiatic comparative studies, mentioning contributions of the particular authors.

The following chapter contains a detailed classification of the Afro-Asiatic language family (with several variants of Semitic classification).

Another chapter tackles the problem of the position of Egyptian within Afro-Asiatic and among African languages with a list of possible lexical isoglosses and touches the question of the Egyptian homeland.

Following is the largest chapter that is dedicated to the consonant correspondences between Egyptian and Semitic and other Afro-Asiatic branches. Egyptian consonants

are dealt with in separate sub-chapters arranged in the traditional order of the Egyptian alphabetical signs. Each sub-chapter contains numerous examples of Egyptian words with their Afro-Asiatic parallels. The chapter is closed with the tables of consonant correspondences and a discussion of several phonological problems.

The subsequent part of the book is dedicated to occasional consonant correspondences.

In the final parts of the Introduction, the author discusses incompatibility, suggests possible rules of assimilation and dissimilation and finally gives a survey of the alternative schools of Egyptian phonology (neuere Komparatistik).

Unfortunately, a review does not grant me enough space for remarks on every single remarkable item in the Introduction. What attracts me most in the book are the Egyptian-Semitic relations. To the asserted phonemic correspondences between those two I must note that some alleged Egyptian-Semitic correspondences are identical with the Semitic renderings of Egyptian phonemes. Especially interesting are the following:

Egyptian	Semitic correspondence (G. Takács, adapted)	Eg. borrowings into Sem. (J.E. Hoch, 1994)
s	*s, *š, *ṯ	*š, *š, *ś
t	*t, *ṯ	*t, *d, *ṯ
d	*d, *ṯ (rarely also *ḏ?)	*d, *t, *t
š	*ś	*š, *š, *ś
ḏ	*š, *z, *ḏ	*š, *z, *ḏ, *ḏ

  

Semitic	Egyptian correspondence (G. Takács, adapted)	Sem. borrowings into Eg. (J.E. Hoch, 1994)
*š	s	š, s
*ṯ	s	s, š
*z	ḏ	ḏ, ṯ
*ḏ	z (rarely also *d?)	ṯ, ḏ
*s	s	ṯ
*š	ḏ	ḏ
*z	z	ḏ
*t	t	t, ṯ, d
*ṯ	t, d	d, t, ḏ
*d	d	d, t, r
*ś	š	s, š
*ḏ	ḏ	ḏ

I intentionally left out some reflexes, e.g. three different *ḏ*'s in Egyptian.

As can be seen in the first table, the Egyptian *t* is a regular reflex of the Afro-Asiatic \**t* and \**ṯ* (Semitic \**t* and \**ṯ*). The same holds true for the Egyptian *d*. At the same time, Semitic languages render both Egyptian *t* and *d* with *t*, *d*, and *ṯ*. This means that some words that are regarded as cognates can be actually borrowings.

Similarly, many cases of Eg. *ḏ* = Sem. \**š* = AA \*[c] could be borrowings, mostly from Egyptian to Semitic, especially if the respective roots contain only one strong consonant. Such cases are, e.g., *wḏ*, *nbḏḏ*, *nḏ*, *rwḏ*, *ḏ3j* (early loans, before OEg. \**r* > OEg. *ʒ*?), *ḏ3r*, *ḏb<sup>c</sup>*, *ḏf*, and *ḏr*. My special attention was attracted by the word *ḏndr.w* [< \**c*. *ndl*] "Name einer auf dem Schlitten ziehenden Barke" ~ Ar. *ṣandal*- 'Boot, flache

Barke". I am a complete layman in navigation, but my idea of a "flache Barke" has always been as something that can be used on lakes or water streams which are not exactly superfluous in Sinai and the Arabic peninsula. The only Arabs (or their relatives) involved in navigation have lived in southern Arabia and they have had to do with an ocean and certainly have used ships with a keel (cf. the well-known dhows).

As it is impossible to comment on everything, I rather focused on the arguments against alternative Old Egyptian phonologies which are closely connected to the question of consonant compatibility.

Chapter six begins with the table of incompatibilities as taken over from Roquet and Kammerzell which contains modifications by the author. The modifications consist of adding a possibility of certain combinations (every note is followed by my comment):

– *bf* in *bfn* "Hund".

If the Berber connection and a possible origin of *f* in *s* do not prove to be right, it might be an onomatopoeic word, especially when it also means "bellen", confer English bow-wow, etc.

– *fs* in *fsj* "to cook".

See J. E. Hoch, 1994, p. 430 on a possible conditioned variation between /p/ and /f/ in the borrowings from Semitic languages and in Egyptian of the Old Kingdom and in native words, particularly in the word for "to cook".

– *ʕa* in *ʕa* [unless < \**ʕa*] "bleich werden (vom Gesicht)".

In my dictionaries found under *ʕa* (Hannig: New Egyptian variant *d*).

– *zi* in *zjt* "(a noun)", further in *zjt* "Nubia" and *z3t.1* ~ *z3t* "Teil eines Gebäudes".

According to Beinlich *zjt* "Substantiv in Zaubertext". If we consider the early variation *z* ~ *s* in writing, could it not be identical with *s3tj* "ein Zauberwort"?

Eg. *zjt* "Nubia" is a name of a foreign country and need not be a native Egyptian word.

According to Hannig *z3tw* "Fussbodenplatten", cf. *s3tw* (*z3tw*) "Erdboden; Fussboden, etc."

– *z'* in *zʕj* "to tremble".

In Hannig *sʕy* (*sʕy*) (written with *s*-). Could it be derived from an (unattested?) root identical with *ʕ* "schütteln (Knochen)?" For *ʕ* ~ *ʕ'* see, e.g. *ʕmw* ~ *ʕmw* "eine Pflanze"(?).

– *sh* in *sh3* "satt werden", *swhj* "brüllen, rühmen".

Although I have not found *whj* with a similar meaning, I think the word could be a derivative from one of such universal interjections as Eg. *hy* "Jauchzen", *hyhy* "jubeln".

– *ks* in *ks* "to pour", *k3s* "Kush".

The second word is a name of a country, that is, uncertain.

– *gt* in *gt* ~ *gt.1* "Kasten" (or NEg. *gt* < NEg *g3w.1* "chest, box").

Eg. *gt* is a New Egyptian word and can really come from *g3w.1* "Kasten".

– *gh* in *gnh.1* "star".

In Egyptian, *g* and *h* never occur in absolute sequence, so I am inclined to doubt of the nativeness of the word.

– *ht* in *ht* "schälen, enthülsen (von Früchten)".

In Hannig, the only two words with *ht* are marked as borrowings. Concerning the Cushitic support, I do not believe in the correspondence of Eg. *h* ~ Cu. *ḳ*.

– *hh* in *hnh* "Pinzette, kleine Zange".

Very exceptional (according to the author, as well).

The following combinations occur only once and represent, in my opinion, somewhat doubtful evidence:

- *t̥* in *w̥t̥* "to beget".
- *t̥q* in *tw̥q* "Art Schurz".
- *t̥g* in *tw̥g* "Art Kleid".
- *dz* in *d3z* "als ein Zubehör der Bogensehne".
- *h̥* in *h̥t̥* "(Flachs, Papyrus etc.)
- *h̥zj* "schwach, gering (sein)".

In the chapter dealing with "neuere Komparatistik", the author mentions Rössler's attempt to justify the dental character of OEg. *ʕ* by the incompatibility of OEg. *ʕ* and *t*, *d*, *z* and asks: "But shouldn't we then reinterpret OEg. *g* too as a dental stop because the sequences of OEg. *gt*, *gd*, *gʕ*, *gz*, *tg*, *zg* do not occur?" This argument loses much of its power if we consider the fact that Hebrew lacks the combinations of *gt*, *tg*, *kt*, *tk*, *qt*, *tq* and Arabic prohibits *tg*, *gt*, *tq*, *gt*, *tq*, *tq*, *tk*, *tk*, *kt*, *sg*, *sk*, and *gs*. The Arabic *ʕ* readily combines with anything except for *g*, *h*, *ʕ*, *h*, *ʕ*, and *h*, while the Egyptian *ʕ* does not occur with the dentals (and, quite interestingly, with *h*), but its co-occurrence with *h*, *h*, *h*, *ʕ* does not seem to be restricted.

I do not believe in the Rösslerian change OEg. [d] > NEg. [ʕ]. It is hardly imaginable how the change would have taken place. If the Semitic ears heard an *ʕajn* in Egyptian words, it must have been an *ʕajn* or something very similar, that is either a voiced pharyngeal fricative or a voiced epiglottal stop. But in the process of weakening, [d] is prone to change into [z], [j], [l], [r] or to disappear completely. So, if Eg. [ʕ] goes back to a dental, it was most probably an "emphasized" dental (alveolar, etc.). We can observe something similar, i.e. a change of an "emphasized" dental into a velar or pharyngeal in Aramaic (*d* > *ʕ*), Ugaritic (*z* > *g*). It can be added to possible sources of the *ʕajn*, that some Daghestan languages show the change *qʕ* > *ʕ* (epiglottal), that is, again a glottalized sound. In Arabic, *ʕajn* is sometimes a secondary variant of the glottal stop.

Concerning the notorious Eg. *ḏbʕ* and Sem. *\*šbʕ*, both "finger", the Semitic word is certainly borrowed from Egyptian. As I am rather close to the Semitic languages, I have a good idea of the shapes of Semitic words and the vocalization of the underlying one has an unusual pattern, while such a pattern was usual in Egyptian. (Compare also with Ar. *ʕitmīa* "antimony" < Eg. *sdmw* "Augenschminke" or Eg. *smṭj* "Schminke", cf. Gr. *siṓmmi* "antimony". < Eg.). By the time of the borrowing, Eg. *ʕ* was already [ʕ], of course. If I were to find a Semitic relative of Eg. *ḏbʕ*, I would venture comparison with Ar. *qbs* "to take up with finger and thumb" (cf. above on possible sources of *ʕ*).

For the alleged difficulty with borrowing basic words with no cultural impact as in Eg. *š3ʕ* > Sem. *šrʕ*, both "to begin", confer the Polish *zadecydować* "to decide" with no apparent necessity for such a loan. People just use some words, because they "sound better", because they are used by a privileged class. Could it have been similar in ancient times?

I created my compatibility theory on Semitic vocabularies and tested it on the Egyptian material and found a considerable number of roots that I supposed to be impossible. Soon, however, as I was penetrating into the language, many of them proved to be products of morphological augmentation of simpler roots that, in turn, conformed with the theory. Eventually, upon checking the whole bulk with another dictionary (Hannig), I found out that most of the words that stubbornly resisted my rules fall into the following categories:

1. Words beginning with *s*-. Even after eliminating all the more or less apparent instances of *s*-causatives and *t*/*ʃ* confusions, still enough cases of *st*- and *sT*- are left. Perhaps more of them contain the prefix *s*-.
2. Borrowings from various sources. Self-explaining.
3. Words of uncertain existence, uncertain writing or uncertain meaning. I have decided to wait for more evidence.
4. Names of deities. This group presents special problems as there are numerous examples of names that behave quite capriciously. Possible taboo-changes and/or artificial words? Compare with cabalistic names for spherical beings to which certain qualities are attached based on the sounds forming the name.

Concerning the permissible combinations in Afro-Asiatic, who can be sure, what was possible in AA and what was not? What if the items that seem to be reconstructable for AA, are results of assimilation (contrary to Eg. dissimilation) and vice versa? This is, by the way, one of those circumstances that make compiling a Semitic etymological dictionary a bit difficult. How, for instance, will one decide if a certain root contained a glottalized (implosive, emphatic) consonant, if there seem to be two such consonants in the root? On the basis of the majority-principle? Or the principle of probability? And which one of those two was originally glottalized? There are languages, such as pre-Proto-Indoeuropean, where combinations of two glottalized consonants seem to be excluded. Others behave in the quite opposite way (certain American Indian languages). For this reason I have serious doubts concerning the author's dissimilation rule OEg. *s-k/q/g* < AA \**c'ic'/c' -k/k'/g*. The examples from AA languages cited for the support of this process are not unequivocal.

The author states in his foreword that in the dictionary part (starting with volume 2) he will present "all alternative views about Egyptian historical phonology and all alternative etymologies of the discussed Egyptian roots". I am sure that such approach will be appreciated by every person working in the field of Egyptology and Afro-Asiatic studies.

*Edgar Jarúnek*

NUNN, John F.: *Ancient Egyptian Medicine*. British Museum Press, London, 1997, 240 Seiten, 80 schwarz-weise Abbildungen. ISBN 0-7141-1906-7, Preis 14,99 GBP.

In 1973 ist erschienen der letzte Band des großen ägyptologischen Werkes – „Grundriß der Medizin der alten Ägypter“. Ungefähr ein viertel des Jahrhunderts später erscheint das Buch von John F. Nunn, der sich über altägyptische Medizin als Arzt und Ägyptologe interessiert. Obwohl sein Buch nicht so detailliert das Thema behandelt als das obengenannte neunteilige Werk macht, die „Ancient Egyptian Medicine“ ist trotzdem sehr ausführliche Arbeit, die zu dem Bestem gehört was zu dieser Thema auf Englisch erschienen ist.

Das Buch ist im Grunde in 10 Kapitel und 4 Nachträge geteilt. Dabei muß man auch die Einführung erwähnen, wo ein sehr interessanter Satz eingetragen ist: „Indeed, the medical advances of the last century have been far greater than the changes between pharaonic times and the beginning of the Victorian era.“ Der Satz charakterisiert das ganze Buch, das ohne Vorurteile, praktisch und sachverständig geschrieben ist.