etc., königliche Namen, Personennamen sowie Toponyme etc. einen Quellenindex geteilt in einen Museums- und Sammlungsindex sowie einen Texteditionsindex aufweist. Etwas unerwartet liegt die Rubrik zu ägyptischen Wörtern zwischen letzteren beiden Rubriken. Bei den übersichtlich gestalteten Teilindizes fällt angenehm auf, dass unterschieden wurde, wo allfällige ägyptische Namen in Transliteration (*en bloc* an den Anfang der Rubrik gestellt) oder in lateinischer Schrift aufgeführt bzw. diskutiert werden. Denkbar wäre gewesen, auf die Hinweise auf Götter-, Personen- und Ortsnamen in Transliteration zusätzlich in den Einträgen in lateinischer Schrift zu referenzieren. Weniger hilfreich ist der allgemeine Index, da kaum Querbezüge zwischen den Beiträgen zutage treten.

Leicht irritierend ist die Mischung aus teilweise ausführlichen und teilweise abgekürzten (nach dem Lexikon der Ägyptologie aufzulösenden oder im Anschluss an die Einzelbeiträge aufgelösten) Literaturhinweisen in den Fußnoten. Bei der thematisch breiten Streuung der Einzelbeiträge innerhalb des gemeinsamen Oberthemas ist die Entscheidung gegen eine gemeinsame Bibliographie durchaus leserfreundlich. Noch ausgeprägter wäre dies, wenn alle Beiträge eine abschließende bibliographische Übersicht aufweisen würden, die als kompakte Leseempfehlung für die nähere Beschäftigung mit dem behandelten Thema fungierte.

Insgesamt bietet der Symposiumsband vielfältige Einblicke in Spezialstudien, die an der Nahtstelle von Palast und Tempel angesiedelt sind – sei es auf geographischer, organisatorischer oder ideologischer Ebene.

Melanie Wasmuth (Basel)

Layton, Bentley: A Coptic Grammar. With Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect. 3rd edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011 (Porta Linguarum Orientalium; Neue Serie 20). XXV + 545 pp., 1 ill. ISBN 978-3-447-06200-8. 68,00 €.

When the first edition of this book appeared in 2000, it was welcomed with great enthusiasm. Since times sheer immemorial, the grammar of the Coptic language was presented in various textbooks, but not in a reference grammar of the linguistic standards of its time. The concluding remark in A. Shisha-Halevy's extensive account of it (*Orientalia* 71, 2002, 424-459) is to this effect: "… may I express a *grammaticus*'s gratitude for a work of consummate scholarship, with never an instance of shoddy thinking or sloppy treatment? … present and future scholars will stand in Bentley Layton's debt for supplying the definitive word on most of its features."

Nevertheless, it goes without saying that reviewers found this or that flaw, or even a downright mistake in this ample work. Coptologists may have been somewhat astonished that only four years later a new edition appeared that claimed to be "revised and expanded." Closer inspection showed, however, that the announced revision was somewhat limited: the major part of the remarks that were made by reviewers of the first edition did not leave any trace in the text. The preface of the new (the third) edition is here explicit: "In revising the grammar my approach has continued to be conservative, so that I have passed over many interesting but not-yet-proven hypotheses advanced by expert scholars who reviewed the work" (p. LX)

— certainly a wise attitude, adequate to a standard work like this. Yet, does the result comply with the intentions?

From my review of the first edition: "It is downright embarrassing that once again family affiliation with the otherwise 'red' Afroasiatic macrophylum is tacitly refused to the 'black' branch (using North-East African colour symbolism) etc." (translated from the German of *WZKM* 92, 2002, 226). The appurtenance of the Chadic language family to the Afroasiatic macrophylum, implying its genetic relationship with Egyptian and Coptic, may have belonged to the *not-yet-proven hypotheses* in the thirties of last century,[1] but it certainly does not do so today.

On the other hand, an absurd phonological view of long stress-bearing *ī* and *ū* being consonants (following Depuydt in *Orientalia* 62, 1993, 338ff.; cf. *WZKM* 92, 2002, 227; Peust, *OLZ* 97, 2002, 219) is still deigned worthy to be reported (§ 9; in § 16, an evident confusion of *phoneme* and *grapheme*).

In agreement with the general opinion, Layton assumes that a glottal stop after a vowel is expressed by doubling the vowel sign in writing, <CōōC>; thus, e.g., ϣωωτ would render [ʃoːʔt] (§ 36 (a)). If, however, the spelling is <CōōCe> he assumes that it is not a rendering of /Cō'C'/ (phonetic [Cō'Cə]), but rather of /CōC'/; e.g., ογωωτε not being /wō't'/ (phonetic [wō'tə]), but rather /wōt'/, with the glottal stop being rendered both by doubling the vowel sign and by final <e>; no statement is made as for the supposed phonetic realisation. Now it is true that the etymology of such words in many cases seems to support an assumption of this kind, as the third consonant is weak, or Aleph, or ʿAyin; cf. ογωωτε < **wā́ḏVʿ*. There is, however, a contrastive view of regarding the Coptic sequence of *vowel plus glottal stop* (V') as a diphthong, triggered by an original final glottal stop (whatever its origin, including 'Ayin).[2]

Some more items of not-so-not-yet-proven hypotheses that were mentioned in the reviews of editions 1 and 2:

The *anok pe* of pattern 10 of the nominal sentence does not seem to be an expression of "I am he, I am such", (§ 282), though it is the equivalent of French *je le suis*. It is to be rendered by "(So) I ám," with a stress on the verb *am* (Satzinger *WZKM* 92, 2002, 228). It is not a sequence of "Subject + Predicate". In a formal sense, *anok* may be called predicate (certainly not subject), though it is not the rheme. The rhematic element is rather the nexus, expressed by *am* in the English, and by zero in the Coptic. Cf., for the phenomenon in question Polotsky *Grundlagen* i § 31, with reference to Vergote *Grammaire copte* IIa, 211–212.

Not every stative "expresses being-in-the-state [and] … describes the enduring state of a subject" (§ 162; anyway, cf. § 309). Its dynamic use is not restricted to the five intransitive verbs of motion which Polotsky *Grundlagen* ii, 211-12 has enumerated (see § 309 (c): it can also be regularly found with the other intransitive verbs (Peust *OLZ* 97, 2002, 219), as static character and present tense are often coinciding.

---

1 Cf. the pioneering work of Werner Vycichl, „Hausa und Ägyptisch. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Hamitistik", in *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen* 37.3, 1934, 36–115.

2 H. Satzinger, „Koptische Vokalphoneme und ägyptische Pluralformation", in *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1999, Band 2, 365–374.

"The imperative … does not express nexus and so is not a clause …" (§ 364): this is not a conservative statement, it is neither a proven nor a not-yet-proven hypothesis, but simply wrong (cf. Shisha-Halevy *Orientalia* 71, 2002, 458; Satzinger *WZKM* 96, 2006, 383).

The *ntere-* conjugation (§ 344), otherwise called *temporalis*, does not express relative past, or anteriority, as the newly coined term *precursive* suggests. It does not render a 'when he had seen (etc.),' or even 'after he had seen (etc.),' but rather a 'when he saw (etc.)' (cf. Satzinger *WZKM* 92, 2002, 226).

Egyptian/Coptic is one of the languages in which the address is third person, rather than second (cf. ⲡⲉⲛ- ⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧ- ϩⲛ̄ ⲛ̄- ⲛⲏⲩⲉ, 'Our Father who is in the heavens !'); both the definite article and the demonstrative pronoun (or article) are pronouns of the third person.

ⲛ̄- /ⲛ̄ⲛⲟ⸗ certainly marks, apart from the direct object and the incidental predicative expansion, also the partitive relationship (§ 203). But ϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲛⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ *Acts* 17:26 is not a good example for it; in spite of πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων and its translations into other languages, the ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ of the Coptic is obviously attributive ('each human nation,' not 'each nation of human beings'). The same is true of the second element of ⲧⲁⲅⲉⲗⲏ ⲣ̄ⲣⲓⲣ *Mark* 5:13, 'the swine herd.' (A hint to this fact is given by B. Egedi *Coptic noun phrases*,[3] 71.)

Criticism like this, of an outstanding work of greatest merits, may appear rather niggling. It is, however, frustrating for the reader to have in hand the second and third editions of a book, having appeared within shortest time, in which the author and the publisher did not use the chance to emend severe mistakes. Nevertheless, all these critical remarks notwithstanding, the Coptological community is to be warmly congratulated to dispose of the excellent tool which Layton's work is; it is indeed a great reference grammar.

Helmut Satzinger (Wien)

Maeir, Aren (ed.): Tell es-Safi/Gath I. The 1996 – 2005 Seasons. 2 Volumes. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012 (Ägypten und Altes Testament 69). 932 pp., 240 ill., 149 tables, 229 plates. ISBN 978-3-447-06711-9. 172,80 €.

The publication, which comprises two volumes, namely text and plates, deals according to its title with the results from the 1996 – 2005 seasons of excavations. The first chapter, however, includes – in addition to the introduction – a synopsis of the results covering the period 1996 – 2010. It becomes soon clear that the editor wrote this chapter just before the volume was published, thereby including the most recent results and conclusions. It is stated by the editor in the lengthy introductory chapter that it is meant to tie the various chapters together and "… to place them in a wider perspective of other research conducted at the site, as well as within the broader framework of the state of research on relevant periods, cultures and topics…". This approach is reasonable – it is a matter of taste – but it might possibly have been better to summarise the various chapters at the end of the publication when the reader

[3] http://www.nytud.hu/oszt/elmnyelv/egedib/publ/11%20dissertation%20egedi%202012.pdf.