

rewards loyal and competent officials with burial in his vicinity in the royal necropolis, as I hope to demonstrate in a forthcoming study. Private persons in their inscriptions are typically said to be *mry* "beloved" of the king and others as a result of their good conduct and beneficent deeds, while the presumed opposite of this would be expressed by *msdī* "to hate." The emotional states described in the passage can thus be viewed as reactive and not causal. As Fecht points out, statements that a king has been chosen by the gods to rule have no bearing, in the Egyptian context, on the general question of predestination. Otherwise, Fecht finds references to the concept only in the single passage from the Admonitions discussed below and in three passages from Ptahhotep. The remaining two passages from the latter text are inconclusive. Verses 217-219 state, in reference to a bad son, *wdd sdb n-f pw m ht nn nm-n sšm(w)·sn n gm-n iww·sn dī* "It means that obstacles are placed (i.e., he is cursed, or the like) in the *ht* (lit. "body"): One whom they (the gods) lead does not wander, while those whom they leave boatless do not find a crossing." The first verse is somewhat obscure and could refer to bodily distress; there is no need to take *ht* as "womb," as does Fecht (thus also, e.g., Žába, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep*, 80). The entire passage could be viewed as funerary, referring to the journey to the necropolis by those to whom permission for burial has been granted. Similarly, the statement *nn wn is 'wn-ib* "There is no tomb of a rapacious man" (verse 315) can be viewed as reactive rather than prescriptive. Verse 560 is somewhat unclear, as Fecht recognizes, but there is no compelling reason to take the *ht* which appears as a reference to the "womb."

PAPYRUS AND TABLET by A. Kirk Grayson and Donald B. Redford. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973. \$6.95.

The goals of the authors of this volume are to give the general reader a taste of ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian literature and culture and to encourage further reading on this subject. In introducing the material, they have wisely chosen to use select topics rather than attempt to cover the whole range of ancient literature. The latter could, in many cases, overburden the casual reader. The subject matter is divided rather evenly between Egypt and Mesopotamia, comprising six topics in each area. Items discussed include kingship, imperialism, strikes, narrative and sex. Each topic contains pertinent texts (free translation by the authors) separated by the authors comments and

observations. Their commentaries are well-suited to the task and do not distract from the ancient texts.

The book includes a map, a chronological chart, glossaries, bibliography and citations of all the works translated. All these elements make it a most appropriate and useful work for the layman. Within the goals set by the authors, this is a most satisfactory volume either as an introduction to the general public or as supplementary materials for a course in ancient Near Eastern history. If this little book does not help foster a greater interest in early man's achievements and thoughts, it will not be the fault of the authors.

Otto J. Schaden

University of Minnesota

SYNTAX OF THE NEGATIVE PARTICLES BW AND BN IN LATE EGYPTIAN, by Virginia Lee Davis. Pp. 8 + 409, tbs. 10. Deutscher Kunstverlag, München und Berlin, 1973 (= Münchner Ägyptologische Studien, 29).

During the past years a number of works on Late Egyptian grammar have appeared, proving a vigorous revival of Late Egyptian studies after many years of stagnation. This is largely to the merit of Jaroslav Černý. It was his teaching that called forth most of the recent contributions to a field in which he took such a vivid interest. Černý is in fact the first person to be mentioned in the preface of the book under discussion, a Yale dissertation (1971).

This study of the "Syntax of the Negative Particles *bw* and *bn*" is based upon a scrupulous search in all kinds of Late Egyptian texts, in the broadest sense of the term, yielding source material of approximately 2500 citations of negative sentences. The author made use of a computer for processing the data which she gained from this material.

The main part of the book is an annotated presentation (in ten chapters) of a choice of citations, grouped according to 25 sentence types. Four supplementary chapters are: "*m-bis*" (the expression for 'no!'), "*bn* *iwnz*," "Frequency and Distribution," and "Form and Writing." In the appendix, account is given of "Computer Processing of Data" and the "Output Format," explaining to the reader the structure and the symbols of the code

used. Furthermore, the whole source material is listed in no less than 119 pages, grouped primarily according to the nature of the language (e.g., formal, or colloquial), and secondarily according to grammatical categories.

The system of the 25 negative sentence types is the very skeleton of the main part of the work. Unfortunately indeed, this system is problematic in several important details. The main mistake is to be found in chapter VII, which deals with sentence types 15 to 20:

15. *bn i-sdm-f im*
16. *bn i-iryw-f sdm im*
17. *bw sdm-f im*
18. *bw ir(r)-f sdm im*
19. *bw sdm-n-f im*
20. *bw ir-n-f sdm im*

According to Davis, these constructions have in common that they "are adverbial sentences in which the subject is a noun phrase containing a nominalized verb form and the predicate is an adverb phrase" (p. 71). In other words, Davis regards the verb forms involved in their entirety as "emphatic." While this is clear for nos. 15 and 16, the reader is somewhat startled by the inclusion of the other constructions. His curiosity will climax when he learns that "in sentence types 17, 18, and 19 (20 is practically unattested, cf. p. 358: note 176) the adverb phrase *predicate* receives *little or no emphasis* and is often *omitted*" (p. 74); my italics). Since "predicate" must also be understood in the sense of "logical predicate" ("logical" and "grammatical" generally coinciding in Egyptian grammar, especially so in emphatic [expressive] constructions; cf. Polotsky, *Orientalia* 31 [1962], 414ff.; Davis, p. 37ff.), a "predicate without emphasis," as well as a "predicate omitted," is a *contradictio in adiectu*. Of course the author has noticed that the sentence types in question are not "emphatic" in the proper sense, or preferably, in her own terms, "emphasizing:" "The primary function of these sentence types is generalization" (p. 74). This, unfortunately, is a return to "pre-Polotsky" views of Egyptian grammar. This is not the place for reopening a discussion that should by now be closed. It will suffice to recall that the basic function of the "emphatic" forms was only regarded as a semantic one (e.g., generalization) as long as their true character—nominalized verb forms functioning as a subject for an adverbial predicate—was not yet recognized. In all stages of the Egyptian

language, recourse was only made to the use of "emphatic" forms or Second Tenses when syntax demanded it, but not for semantic reasons. Generalization is never the motive for their use, but rather an accidental by-product—the "emphatic" construction is part of the "'discussion-with' mood," and not of the "'saying-to' mood" (cf. S. I. Groll, *The Negative Verbal System of Late Egyptian*, 7); it never relates an event, but states a fact. If, therefore, a form is found that is obviously used for general statements but lacks the syntactic peculiarities of an "emphatic" form, there is no reason whatsoever to see in it an "emphatic" form.

The author herself clearly sees that Late Egyptian offers no argument for putting sentence types 17–20 under the same heading as sentence types 15–16. But she believes to be compelled to do so for historical reasons: "In Old Egyptian, however, the emphasizing function is common to all constructions in sentence types 15–20" (p. 81); "the situation in Middle Egyptian is similar to that in Old Egyptian" (p. 84). But these statements are based on too superficial an analysis and a forced interpretation of the pertinent passages.

In Old and Middle Egyptian, sentences containing "emphatic" forms are negated by means of *n* . . . *is* (see Gilula, *JEA* 56, 209ff.), e.g., ex. 2651 (*Urk* I, 224, 18; p. 81).¹ A verb form combined with bare *n* (Old Egyptian: *n*₁) is, however, to be regarded as predicative (non-"emphatic", indicative), while verb forms combined with *nn* (Old Egyptian: *n*₂) are to be regarded as nominal (but not "emphatic", i.e. not in subject function to an adverbial predicate; e.g., the "prospective" *sdm-f*); see Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen*, §§ 1. 5. 20. 57ff.; *id.*, *MDIK* 22, 87. Thus all the examples quoted in pp. 81ff. which contain either *n* or *nn* (but not the clitic *is*) must be regarded as non-"emphatic." Actually, the context contradicts rather than strengthens an "emphatic" conception. (2)

To sum up: only sentence types 15 and 16 are to be regarded as "emphatic," while 17 to 20 should have been treated together with sentence types 3 and 4 (*bw sdm-f*, *bw pwi-f sdm*). Sentence types 3 (*bw sdm-f*) and 17 ("*bw sdm-f im*") are, in fact, identical. Sentence type 18 ("*bw ir(r)-f sdm im*") is badly needed in chapter II, alongside with types 3 and 4. The element *im* of types 17 to 20 is not essential (i.e., predicative) but accidental (i.e., an adverbial complement). It does not belong to the basic pattern and should be omitted. |en

The strange topic of a predicate adverb being omitted already occurs in chapter IV (see p. 53). The author correctly recognizes the complementary relationship of:

m-(w)n + indefinite subject *versus* *bn* + definite subject. But she denies existence of sentence type *bn sw*, regarding pertinent attestations as sentence type 10 (*bn sw im*), the adverbial predicate being omitted. To the Middle Egyptian *nn* (Old Egyptian *n2*) I have generally assigned predicative force. Following Gunn, I have regarded *nn m3' tyw* 'no righteous exist' *Lebensm.* 122, and *n2 tn* 'you (fem.) do not exist' *Pyr* 738c, as a sentence type closely related to *nfr sw*. I denied predicative force to any adverbial phrase following *nn* + subject, but regarded it as an adverbial complement. This statement² must now be modified, since a better description is suggested by W. Schenkel's recognition of the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ constructions in Egyptian (*ZÄS* 92, 49–52 and 67–68; *JEA* 52, 53 ff.). If we apply this concept to our *nn* problem, we will analyse a sentence like *mn mnšw dy* 'there are no ships here' (cf. *Wenamun* 2, 23) as a combination of *mn mnšw* 'no ships exist', and *mnšw dy* 'ships being here'; *bn n3-h3styw dy* 'the foreigners are not here' (Botti and Peet, *Giornale*, IV, 10, quoted by Davis, p. 52) is to be regarded as a combination of *bn n3-h3styw* 'the foreigners don't exist', and *n3-h3styw dy* 'the foreigners being here'. Each element has a predicate of its own (*mn/bn, dy*), but they share the subject (*mnšw, n3-h3styw*). The resulting construction is a combination of some kind of adjectival sentence ('non-existent is') and an adverbial sentence. Both the negative and the adverb phrase are predicative. Having added this improvement, I do not think that the doctrine of the predicative nature of the negative *nn* is 'unfortunate' (Davis, p. 351, note 108) anymore, in any case less so than a doctrine of omitted predicates.

Since the author does not recognize a sentence type *bn* + subject, she again meets with difficulties when dealing with the pattern *iw bn* + Infinitive (Middle Egyptian *nn* + Inf.; see pp. 63 ff.). When explaining an expression like *iw bn h3b* 'without sending (it)' (Černý and Gardiner, *Hieratic Ostraca*, XLVII, 1, 10, quoted on p. 64, no. 693), she has to assume that this is sentence type 12: *bn sw hr sdm*.

Although the misunderstanding of the nature of the "emphatic" constructions impairs the full appreciation of this book, this certainly does not

completely negate its scientific value. It will prove useful in many respects to a reader who is aware of the necessity of re-arranging the basic pattern. The great amount of source material, mostly taken into account for the first time, led the author to many an important observation. An interesting theory concerning the phonetic aspects of the Egyptian negatives is to be found in chapter XIV.

Helmut Satzinger
Kunsthistorisches Museum

¹ Besides, the "emphatic" form itself may be negated by means of the negative auxiliary *tm*, see Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen*, §67, 1.

² Satzinger, *op. cit.*, §§53–54.

DIE NUNSCHALE — EINE GEFÄSSGRUPPE
DES NEUEN REICHES, by Elisabeth-
Christine Strauss (Münchener Ägyptologische
Studien Heft 30). 80, Pp. 95 + 15 pls. Deutscher
Kunstverlag, München 1974. DM 20.—.

The purpose of the book is basically the publication of eighteen fayence vessels in the "Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst in München." Three pieces are more or less complete; the remaining fifteen are fragmentary to a different degree. The actual catalogue of the fully documented pieces comprises almost half the book, accompanied by appercus concerning "Egyptian fayence," the iconography of the decorations and an excursus about the results of the chemical analysis of the glaze. A quarter of the book is devoted to meaning and symbolism of the vessels, which looms greatly in the author's concern.

While the publication of material is *eo ipso* a meritable undertaking, the significance of the pieces offered here hardly justifies the extensive form in which they are represented. It is surprising that these pieces are catalogued without any reference to Nagel, *La céramique de Nouvel Empire*, to mention only one. A possible symbolic significance of the decoration of the vessels does not have to be denied in order to reject the interpretations assigned to them. Egyptian religion, as any religion, is a little more complex than the author's idea of it seems to