Der dritte Abschnitt behandelt eine Reihe von Inschriften aus Saqqara und Hagarsa. Gegenüber den bisherigen Publikationen stützt sich der Verf. dabei auf eigene, vollständigere Abschriften, in einem Fall (*Mḫj*) auf eine vollständigere Abschrift von B. Gunn, und daneben auf eine umfassende Auswertung von Paralleltexten. Damit wird ein besseres Verständnis für alle behandelten Texte gewonnen: die Grabinschrift des älteren *Mrjj* aus Hagarsa (hierzu inzwischen noch H. G. Fischer in *Göttinger Miszellen* 42 [1981] 19-21) und für Saqqara Opfertext und Geflügelliste auf einer Opfertafel des *Jšt(·j)–mꜣ'* aus dem Grab des *Ḫntj-kꜣ / Jḫḫj*, ein hier komplettiertes Inschriftfragment eines *jmj-r' st ḫntjw-š Ḥnw* "Vorstehers des Büros der (Palast/Pyramiden-)Angestellten *Ḥnw*" mit einem Bericht über Schiffstransporte von Elephantine und Hatnub (?) nach Memphis, das gleichfalls komplettierte Stelenfragment eines *Mḫj* (Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam) mit einer interessanten schematisierten Abfolge von Titeln, Beiworten und Namen, sowie die Idealautobiographien des Wesirs *Mrrj*, des *Nfr-sšm-ptḥ*, Untervorstehers der Priester an der Teti-Pyramide, und des *Ḫntj-kꜣ / Jḫḫj*.

Ägyptologisches Seminar   Jürgen OSING
Regina-Pacis-Weg 7
D-5300 Bonn

Orientalia 55, 1986

David P. SILVERMAN, *Interrogative Constructions with* jn *and* jn-jw *in Old and Middle Egyptian*. Bibliotheca Aegyptia, Volume One. Malibu, Undena Publications, 1980. VI-144 p. 28 × 21,5. $14.00 cloth, $10.50 paper.

In Old and Middle Egyptian, questions for corroboration may be introduced by either *in* or *in iw*. The use of these particles is treated by grammars in a rather unsatisfactory way. Gardiner states that *in iw* is to be considered "as a special interrogative phrase [and not as a *iw*-phrase introduced by *in*], for it occurs even in constructions which, if they contained statements instead of questions, could not employ *iw*" (*Grammar* §§ 491-493): statements that have the structure of nominal sentences are not preceded by *iw*; as questions, they are to be segmented [*in-iw*] + [Nominal Sentence]. In consequence, the element *iw* is assumed by Gardiner to be part of the interrogative phrase *in-iw* even in sentences with adverbial or verbal predicate, which would have initial *iw* if they were (independent) statements. On the other hand, Gardiner states that *in* alone "naturally does not occur where the corresponding statement would contain *iw*" (ibid., § 493).

In his book — a revised version of his doctoral dissertation (University of Chicago, 1975) — David P. Silverman deals with the problems mentioned above. He presents an exemplary study of syntax which is richly documented. Since Gardiner conceived his *Grammar*, we have learnt from Polotsky's œuvre to understand the nature of the "emphatic forms" and to recognize several constructions preceded by *iw* as parts of the paradigm of the independent statement. Silverman is fully aware of the bearing which these insights have on the problem of *in(-)iw*, and he takes due account of them.

The book is divided into two main chapters: I. "The uses of interrogative *jn*", and II. "The use of interrogative *jn-jw*". Chapter III is a kind of excursus: "The

use of the enclitic particles *rr, rf* and *tr* in questions introduced by *jn*". A chapter of synthesis concludes the main body of the book, supplemented by an Appendix on "evidence from later periods", an Index of Citations, and a Bibliography.

These are the morpho-syntactic contexts in which the two interrogative phrases seem to be concurring (numbers refer to pages of the book under review):

1) Verbal Sentences

    in sḏm.f (15.20)   vs.   *in(–)iw sḏm.f* (30.73)
    in sḏm.n.f (2)   vs   *in(–)iw sḏm.n.f* (9.69)

2) Nominal Sentences

    in ṯwt NP (60)   vs.   *in(–)iw ntk* NP (83)
    in NP *pw* (62)   vs   *in(–)iw* NP *pw* (85)

Right from the beginning, Silverman goes one step beyond such a preliminary analysis. Thus, his chapter on the uses of *in* also contains constructions that are treated by Gardiner as *in-iw* constructions. Since, e.g., *in iw sḏm.n.f* "did he hear?" corresponds to a statement *iw sḏm.n.f* "he heard", the former is segmented [*in*] + [*iw sḏm.nf*]; accordingly, *in iw.f* + old perfective is segmented [*in*] + [*iw.f* + old perfective], etc. Thus, rather little remains to be recorded in Chapter II as containing the interrogative phrase *in-iw*. If, on the other hand, constructions like *in sḏm.n.f* are encountered, one will *a priori* expect these to contain an "emphatic form". Morphology (cf. intransitive verbs of motion), structure, and meaning corroborate this assumption for most of the examples (pp. 2-9), while a few others (pp. 13-14) remain ambiguous.

There are, however, a few examples (pp. 69-72) that display *in(–)iw sḏm.n.f* ... where the verb has to be regarded as "emphatic". Generally, this is based not only on the semantic structure, but also on morphological criteria: intransitive verbs of motion would appear in the construction *iw.f* + old perfective if they were predicative (i.e., non-"emphatic"): see exx. 1 (*Mutter und Kind*), 4 (*Pap. Nu*), 5 (*Urk. IV*). However, most of these examples "are from a period late enough to make us suspect the possible influence of Late Egyptian" (p. 73).

Neglecting this marginal evidence, one is led to the conclusion that *in*, and not *in-iw*, is the interrogative phrase for questions containing *iw sḏm.n.f*, as well as for questions containing the "emphatic" *sḏm.n.f*. This issue is further strengthened by the evidence of the passive construction that corresponds to active *iw sḏm.n.f*, passive *sḏm.f*, which appears in an interrogative construction *in iw sḏm.f* (p. 32). The passive "emphatic" past, *sḏm.n.tw.f*, is not attested in Silverman's data; interrogative *in sḏm.n.tw.f* is to be expected.

The problem of *in sḏm.f* vs. *in(–)iw sḏm.f* is not quite the same as the one discussed above. Here it is the former that is ambiguous: Some examples are to be analyzed as [*in*] + [(independent) prospective *sḏm.f*] ("will/shall he hear?" — see pp. 15-20), others as [*in*] + ["emphatic" *sḏm.f*] ("is it ... that he hears?" — see pp. 20-25). We lack a morphosyntactic criterium for the *sḏm.f* forms, such as whether or not certain verbs employ the old perfective instead of a suffix-conjugated form. On the other hand, stem-forms of the mutable verbs offer mophological criteria in addition to the semantic ones.

Here, a remark on the "emphatic *sḏm.f*" is in order. "Emphatic form" is primarily a term of syntax, not of morphology. Egyptology will have to suffer for many years to come from Polotsky's decision to preserve a traditional term, though

filling it with a new significance. An "emphatic form" is, in fact, a *that*-form (*forme substantive personnelle*; see H. J. Polotsky, *Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique* [1976]) that functions as subject clause to an adverbial predicate: the same form (speaking in terms of morphology) may, eventually, serve any other nominal function in a sentence, e.g., as object, or dependent upon a preposition, etc.

Still speaking in terms of morphology, it is not justified to speak of t h e "emphatic *sḏm.f*". Although what is mostly encountered in the "emphatic" function is the geminating *sḏm.f*, other forms may have to be used, such as — above all — the prospective *sḏm.f* (for this form being used as a potential *that*-form, cf. its use as subjunctive after *rdi*, and others). Silverman, however, in analyzing *in* + *sḏm.f*, seems to lay much more weight on the morphological argument than on the semantic one (cf. p. 22: "... several other questions ... which, since the verbs are not mutable, cannot be used as certain examples."). Yet, an example like no. 18 (p. 22), of immutable verbs, is a more obvious case of "emphatic forms" than any other of the foregoing, of mutable verbs; cf. especially *iw ibkꜣ znbꜣ(.w); in* [[*znbꜣ.f*] [*sk wy znbꜣ.ki*]] "'Ibkꜣ has slipped; is it when I shall have slipped that he will slip?".

Speaking of sentences with adjectival predicates, one should focus on the *nfr sw* pattern (cf. pp. 58-59, exx. 3-4). The only example for *in(-)iw nfr sw* quoted by Silverman (p. 82, ex. 2) is from the Ḳadesh Poem. Here, the *in-iw* of the semi-Late Egyptian inscription variants is paralleled by a of the papyrus variant. The spelling *in-iw* of the inscriptions may be taken as a false classicism.

Nominal Sentence: the pattern *in ink* NP ("am I ...?") is attested in the Pyramid Texts and in the Coffin Texts (pp. 61-62, exx. 1-4, all *in ṯwt* ... "are you ...?"). This is in contrast to *in-iw ntṯ* NP in *Mutter und Kind* (p. 83, ex. 1), a text written down in the 2nd Intermediate Period (cf. pp. 41-42). The pattern *in* NP *pw* ("is he/she/it ...?") is attested in the Pyramid Texts and in the Coffin Texts (p. 62, exx. 6-7). Both *in* NP *pw* AP ("is it the case that NP is ...?"; p. 63, ex. 8, Peasant B 1, 311-313; this is the reviewer's analysis: "Is it the case that a balance cannot tilt? Is it the case that a scale cannot incline to one side?" — For the construction NP *pw* + negative clause of circumstance, cf. Polotsky, op. cit., 44 [§ 3.10.8.]) and *in* NP₁ *pw* NP₂ ("is NP₁ NP₂?"; p. 62, ex. 10; cf. ex. 9) are found in *Peasant*, whereas *in-iw* NP₁ *pw* NP₂ is found in *Pap. Westcar* (p. 85, ex. 3) and *Lebensmüde* (p. 86, ex. 4). The latter attestation is rather unexpected, since this text seems to be largely void of intrusions of colloquial speech. It may be noted that in both cases the first noun phrase is an abstract noun: *mꜣꜥt, ḳsnt*. The semantics of such utterances are close to adjectival sentences.

Silverman concludes (p. 86): "Because we do have two examples of *jn-jw* + nominal sentence with *pw*, we can see that *jn-jw* was indeed employed in the Middle Kingdom. It is likely, therefore, that *jn-jw* in other texts written later than the Middle Kingdom, where the grammar was predominantly Middle Egyptian, was understood as a valid Middle Egyptian interrogative ...".

This is not the place to go into details concerning Chapter III which deals with the enclitic particles *rr*, *rf*, and *tr*. It is held that all three, in principle, mark questions as rhetorical (K. Baer, *ÄZ* 93 [1966] 8; W. K. Simpson, *JEA* 56 [1970] 59). Moreover, they seem to convert questions from positive to negative, v.v.: for positive questions with *rr* of *rf* (when immediately following *in*) the expected answer is

"yes"; for negative questions it is "no". Silverman stresses the fact that neither is to be regarded as an interrogative particle.

In non-literary Late Egyptian there is no *in-iw* (see p. 110). Exx. 3-5, p. 114, are future: *n iw.i (r) šsp.w* "shall I put up with it" etc. (In the Late Egyptian Stories, however, *in-iw* is found several times; I have noted *LES* 5,7 [*Prince* 6,10]; 19,3 [*P. d'Orbiney* 9,4; quoted by Silverman, p. 113]; 79, 6-7 [*Astarte*, 2,x+19]).

The interrogative phrase *in* appears in the spellings 〰〰 , 𓆓 , 𓈖〰 and, esp. in indirect questions, 𓇋𓀁〰 (see M. Korostovtsev, *Grammaire du néo-égyptien* [1973] 149 ff. [§§ 165-167]; J. Černý – S. I. Groll, *A Late Egyptian Grammar* [1975] 552-3). The latter is also the spelling of the conditional particle 𓇋𓀁〰 which is thought to be an orthographic variant of *in* in its specialized use of introducing clauses of condition (see J. Osing, *SAK* 1 [1974] 267 ff.).

Krieglergasse 17/29   Helmut SATZINGER
A-1030 Wien

Jean-Marie DURAND, *Textes babyloniens d'époque récente.* Études assyrio-
   logiques. Recherche sur les civilisations, Cahier n° 6. Paris, Éditions
   A.D.P.F., 1981. 6 p., 95 pl. 21 × 29,7.

Francis JOANNÈS, *Textes économiques de la Babylonie récente (Étude des
   textes de TBER – Cahier n° 6).* Études assyriologiques. Recherche sur
   les civilisations, Cahier n° 5. Paris, Éditions A.D.P.F., 1982. [v]-VII-450
   p. 21 × 29,7.

The two books under review are the Cahiers n°s 5 and 6 in the new series, Recherche sur les civilisations. This series, which has mushroomed suddenly in the past few years, is a welcome addition to the assyriological scene, since it is at the same time of high scholarly quality and reasonable in price.

The first of the two books (*TBER*, actually number 6 in the series) is from the pen of J.-M. Durand, who once more provides us with evidence of his remarkable and admirable versatility. Though not a specialist in Late Babylonian material his copies betray an intimate understanding of the material. This is not surprising for, in addition to his extensive experience as a copyist, Durand says in his introduction that he has spent more than ten years in preparing the volume.

The volume is made up of copies of all the unpublished Late Babylonian economic and epistolary material in the Louvre collections. In addition a small number of miscellaneous texts are included. These consist of a few "Kassite" and "technical" texts scattered throughout the collections.

Durand states in his introduction that he has eschewed any normalisation of the signs in his copies. While this is an admirable principle it might be pointed out that any copy by an Assyriologist necessarily involves some degree of interpretation and conventionalisation; the former because the copy is done by someone