

hardly a breakthrough. Careful textual analysis, eye for detail and nuance—all that is present in profusion. But the book does not tell the story of the genesis of an idea.

An intriguing point Joseph Lam discusses in several places is the porous boundary between metaphor and what he calls the “lexicalization” of the metaphor. A case in point is the verb *nāsāʾ*, literally “to carry, to carry away.” The notion is at home in the burden metaphor. However, Lam argues that the verb at some point developed the lexical meaning “to forgive.” In other words, the use of *nāsāʾ* does not automatically require us to think in terms of a burden to be lifted (pp. 21–65). This argument is similar to the one made by James Barr against the etymology and the “root fallacy.” Lam mentions Barr in the opening chapter but does not discuss his views in any great detail (mainly p. 222 n. 18). But the significance of etymology might have merited a more extensive discussion. Etymologically, *nāsāʾ* means “to carry, to carry away.” The etymology reads like an embedded metaphor. When people use the term with the meaning “to forgive,” they are no longer alive to the metaphor. Does this mean it has become irrelevant? I am not certain. Metaphorical phrases, too, can lose their metaphorical meaning to users of the language, as many traditional sayings demonstrate. How can we be certain that “walking in the ways of sin” continued to have the power of a metaphor rather than being a conventional phrase? Still Lam is right to take the metaphor seriously. But perhaps he has made too sharp a contrast between studies of biblical terms for sin (ʿāwôn, ḥēʾ, and the like) on the one hand, and biblical metaphors for sin on the other.

KAREL VAN DER TOORN
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

Das Balsamierungsritual: Eine (Neu-)Edition der Textkomposition Balsamierungsritual (pBoulaq 3, pLouvre 5158, pDurham 1983.11 + pSt. Petersburg 18128). By SUSANNE TÖPFER. Studien zur spätägyptischen Religion, vol. 13. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ, 2015. Pp. xii + 440, 53 pls. €89.

This book deals with the so-called embalming ritual, which dates to the Roman Period (end of the 1st century AD; for this, see also the sign list in chap. 6.1). Until now, the three sources of this particular text—pap. Boulaq 3, pap. Louvre E 5158, pap. Durham 1983.11 + pap. St. Petersburg DB 18128—have never been examined in one proper edition, so that working with the *Balsamierungsritual* was not easily done (for former publications on these papyri, see pp. 1–2 and chap. 1).

In chapter 1 the author gives a brief introduction to the papyri and their owner, then discusses in two elaborate excurses on the one hand the owner of pap. Boulaq

3 and the history of his family (excursus I) and on the other the relationship of the rather fragmentary papyri pap. Louvre E 51518 and pap. Durham 1983.11 + pap. St. Petersburg DB 18128 (excursus II). On pp. 12–13, she discusses the variations of the Hieratic spelling in pap. Boulaq 3, stating correctly that in the word *ḥty(.t)* (x + 7.21) the determinatives Y1-U22 (numbering after Gardiner, reading from right to left) were mistaken for X1-F10, but on pl. 15, it appears in the Hieroglyphic transliteration as in her expected writing (X1-F10). The same can be said on commentary x + 9.7 where erroneously D3 is used as determinative in *wʿ.tj* instead of G37 (pl. 19), probably by mistake.

This is followed by a description of the text’s structure, a translation with an enclosed transcription, and a very detailed and well-thought-out commentary on grammatical and textual aspects of the *Balsamierungsritual* (chap. 2). Sometimes, recurring phrases in the *Rezital* are too freely interpreted (e.g., *jr n=k mr=k ...; jy n=k sp-2*, passim), which is in contrast to the otherwise accurate translations. On p. 132 au and 145 dg, the terms *ʿnh-jmj* and *snw-p.t* are discussed. (For further information on this, see most recently Th. Bardinet, *Médecins et magiciens à la cour du pharaon: Une étude du papyrus médical Louvre E 32847* [Paris: Éditions Khéops and Louvre Éditions, 2018], 100–102.) A slight correction has to be made concerning the reading of pap. Leiden I 347 R:XII9 (p. 181 l): the reading is not *ssd n p3k.t* but *stp n p3k.t*. This has no consequences for the content of this commentary. Furthermore, the author gives a very profound analysis of the different language styles used in the *Manual* and the *Rezital* (as she calls it). She points out that the *Manual* is related to medical texts and the *Rezital* to hymns and liturgies. The use of the negation *tm* for the future *sdm=f* is hardly surprising since it is used as negation in an object clause (p. 210).

In the following section, the author discusses the significance of the text (chap. 3). Töpfer starts with the *Manual*, analyzing these instructions and showing, for example, the relationship to the *Gefäßbuch* in Eb 854/856 and Bl 163. At the end of this paragraph, a comparison is made with archaeological finds (mummies and their embalming procedure; chap. 3.1.2). Graphics illustrate this part and provide a better understanding (e.g., pp. 230, 234).

Afterwards, the *Rezital* is discussed in detail, taking into account the extent to which the *Rezital* refers to the *Manual* (chap. 3.2). The author is also able to demonstrate a relationship to other funerary texts, especially the liturgy CT.2 and BD spell 172 (chap. 3.2.2). The synoptic tables given at the end of every sub-chapter of the *Rezital*, which summarize the main structure and topics of the verses, are a very nice feature. Furthermore, she analyzes the priests’ titles which appear in the text, the different places where the embalming ritual takes place, as well as the materials used in the process. Here once more the author considers the archaeologi-

cal finds (embalming pots with inscription and content) coming from Abusir, Saqqara, and Thebes. The chapter ends in a third excursus, which studies mummification in relation to the duration of the process, the ritual practice, and the inscriptions on the embalming pots, which mention the day when the material in the vessel was used.

Thereafter, the author analyzes the composition of the text (*Manual* versus *Rezital*; chap. 4) and its origin, discussing to what extent the *Balsamierungsritual* was secondarily annotated with comments to increase the user's understanding. Furthermore, the function and usage of the text in daily life—or better in death—is presented.

In the last chapter (chap. 5) Töpfer briefly summarizes her findings and also discusses how far the title given to the text (*Balsamierungsritual*) is indeed suitable for this composition.

The reading direction of the hieroglyphs inserted in the text is peculiar, from left to right instead of right to left. It can be assumed that the author's intention was to enhance the flow of reading, but still one would expect

it to be the other way around. Very useful tools are the glossary of the embalming ritual (pp. 380–90) as well as the indices, which list general information, discussions of Egyptian vocabulary, and the sources used (pp. 418–38). The plates give photographs of pap. Boulaq 3, pap. Louvre E 5158, and pap. Durham 1983.11 + pap. St. Petersburg ДВ 18128 in high resolution combined with a Hieroglyphic transliteration (pls. 1–37). Both are well arranged in relation to each other, which makes it easy to work with the text (line counts on the photographs would have been desirable). After that follows a synopsis of the different texts (pls. 39–53).

All in all, the author provides the reader with a good transcription, translation, and commentary for the *Balsamierungsritual*, having given a lot of thought to related areas such as other texts and archaeological finds. This book closes a gap in the research of late Egyptian religious studies.

SUSANNE BECK
 INSTITUT FÜR DIE KULTUREN DES ALTEN ORIENTS,
 TÜBINGEN
