

tinguished from those of any other conventional language . . .” (p. 176). For the Yogācāra philosopher, on the other hand, “[W]hile language does not truly represent reality in any respect, its denotative function and the very conditions of its meaningfulness require us to presuppose extralinguistic underlying conditions as its ‘support’” (p. 176). Tzohar adds, in a footnote, that the use of the word “support” here means “that linguistic phenomena are causally grounded—which in the Yogācāra context also means that they are ontologically grounded” (ibid.).

It is worth noting, first of all, that Nāgārjuna explicitly states in the *Vigrahavyāvartanī* that he has no theoretical position to assert or defend. The salvific power of the Madhyamaka’s discourse rests not on doctrinal claims, but rather on language that self-consciously eschews reliance on any ontological or epistemological foundation; hence the (in)famous “emptiness of emptiness.” In simply referring to “the school’s own claims”—as if the content of such “claims” were obvious—neither Sthiramati nor Tzohar acknowledges, much less directly engages with, the central element of the Madhyamaka’s soteriological project. It is also worthy of note that in making clear that Sthiramati’s theory of meaning relies on the positing of an extralinguistic, ontological ground (i.e., the “transformation of consciousness” that provides the locus of reference for all metaphorical language, which is to say, all language whatsoever), Tzohar appears to run up against his own repeated assertion that the dispute between the Yogācāra and the Madhyamaka, as defined by Sthiramati, “turns on linguistic rather than ontological issues” (p. 154 and *passim*). But the most trenchant point to be raised in this context is the following: if one accepts the pan-metaphorical theory of meaning, namely, that all language is metaphorical, then this theory must apply equally to Sthiramati’s own technical vocabulary. In which case the primary reference of the metaphorical expression “transformation of consciousness” must be absent from *its* locus of reference, which is to say, it must be absent from *itself*. Perhaps something like this is implied when the transformation of consciousness is ambiguously described both “as an underlying causal reality on the one hand and a conceptual construct [*vikalpa*] on the other” (p. 169). The effort to decipher all this elicits a kind of intellectual vertigo, as if one were witnessing some kind of linguistic sleight of hand, or a virtuoso performance of the old ball and cups trick—which is, in so many words, exactly how Candrakīrti characterized the Yogācāra’s convoluted metaphysics in his famous critique. It’s not obvious to me how Sthiramati succeeds in evading that critique, nor do I understand how he hopes to secure the meaningfulness of his discourse by anchoring it in what ultimately amounts to a rhetorical abstraction. If anything—again, as Candrakīrti pointed out—such language lends itself all too easily to reification and, therefore, to continued suffering.

Which leads me to one final, perplexing consideration.

Oddly enough, once all the smoke and mirrors are cleared away, I find myself hard pressed to see any fundamental difference between Sthiramati’s pan-figurative theory and the Madhyamaka’s radical conventionalism. At first I found this troubling. But then it occurred to me: maybe that’s actually the genius of the whole thing, for “smoke and mirrors” *could* just be another name for “skillful means” (*upāyakaūśalya*). If, however, that’s what this is really about, then neither Sthiramati nor Tzohar is letting on.

Regardless, I thoroughly enjoyed this book. It is an impressive piece of scholarship, a complex, multifaceted work that will certainly become compulsory reading for anyone with a serious interest in Yogācāra studies.

C. W. HUNTINGTON, JR.  
HARTWICK COLLEGE

---

*The Medinet Habu Records of the Foreign Wars of Ramesses III.* By DONALD REDFORD. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, vol. 91. Leiden: BRILL, 2018. Pp. xi + 197. \$122.

This scintillating volume by Donald Redford covers two major themes. The first deals with the texts and scenes at Medinet Habu, whereas the second covers the identification of the Sea Peoples. This reviewer feels that although they are harmoniously integrated, the latter issue, especially, deserves

more study and explication, if only because of its complexity. If anything, it highlights the need for more study.

In essence, the volume deals with the foreign relations of Egypt under Ramesses III and the evidence which Medinet Habu presents on this question. Redford covers all of the relevant campaigns, whether any were fictive (such as the Nubian War) or not. He provides more than ample explications of the historical validity of the scenes, but tends to downplay their artistically rendered depictions. I noted, for example, that Redford's opinion that the "specific details" (his words) are "lacking" in these compositions quite properly enters into his discussions. Moreover, he deals with the encomia present in the various accounts, such as the First Libyan campaign, which he calls a "Song-encomium" following one of his previous studies.

The reader immediately will see that a further bifurcation has taken place in his analysis: namely, that the pictorial appreciation is set close to the textual. Often, however, Redford treats linguistic details of the historical narratives a little superficially, and the artistic renderings need fuller valuation. He does not, for example, stress the difference between the account of Year 5 and the later narrative ones, even though Thomas Van der Way and I have covered the key parameters of contrast. In like manner, the narrative verbal style at Medinet Habu, as shown by its verbal formations, is passed over, despite recent research which has concentrated upon these very details.

Redford provides a new and fresh series of translations. This was necessary, but one would like to know how much they differ from Alexander Peden and Kenneth Kitchen's recent attempts (among others). How correct are these in comparison? Such issues are not minor, and I can refer the reader to my recent overview which covers them. For example, how differently were the Libyans portrayed in thought, word, and deed within the lengthy Year 5 historical record from the description of Sea Peoples with their "show of force" in the Year 8 narrative account? And if there are differences, we must ask, Why?

Connected to this are the various literary studies of Jan Assmann—see especially his comments in *Hymnen und Gebete*—most of which are overlooked here. Then too, the encomia style has likewise been discussed by many scholars with respect to the New Kingdom and the Ramesside Period. They should also have been consulted and referenced. In essence, I did not find that an up-to-date literary analysis of the Egyptian approach was thoroughly examined in this volume. This is not to say that the literary aspects of trope and imagery are ignored or (perhaps all too briefly) discussed. It is possible that owing to the powerful historical vector at work in this study, the literary analyses tend to be more historically based, and, as a result, the social background of Egyptian literature, especially during the Ramesside Period, tends to be circumscribed.

On the other hand, Redford provides the reader with many helpful charts (see p. 31 for example) that enable the outsider to grasp more conveniently the various terminologies used, the structures of the texts in relation to the enemies of Egypt, and so forth. I follow the author, when discussing the two major texts covering the Year 8 warfare, that "[t]he description of the enemy and their fate differs somewhat between the two texts" (page 41). This is well supported. One may observe that the key contrast is between the enemy residing close to Egypt—Libya—and the ones not adjacent to the homeland—the Sea Peoples.

By and large, Redford's coverage of the main historical texts in combination with the visual imagery serves the study well. However, the reader will have difficulty in analyzing the placement of each scene or inscription within the architectural layout of Medinet Habu. True, Fig. 1 presents a simplified bird's eye view of the temple and contains the "official" Medinet Habu locations (from the original publications of the University of Chicago). Nonetheless, this reviewer found it difficult to coordinate the coverage of Redford with the actual location.

In chapter 5 will be found a detailed and concluding commentary on this material. Calendrics is discussed on p. 75, but further commentary could have been added. I think that the analysis adheres to a historical and structural outline that remains traditional, and I only wish that a more prescient approach had been taken, perhaps following my *Icons of Power*. The discussion of antecedents, to take a case in point, is rather limited. I would further argue that Redford's metrical analysis remains somewhat elementary, and I was surprised that even Kitchen's detailed study of ancient Egyptian poetry and

hymnics is not covered, not to mention the modern literary research undertaken in the schools of Basel, Göttingen, and Heidelberg. The same may be said with regard to Redford's discussion of *encomia*. As a result, one feels that many secondary scholarly arguments have been sidestepped.

Redford concludes that "the primary purpose of the records is oral celebration within a cultic context" (p. 103). He grapples with this perception and succeeds by indicating the speeches present within the various compositions, great and small. Yet one can make a riposte: These were already drawn up (in soft copy) for events of celebration or triumph preceding the decision to emblazon them on the walls of Medinet Habu. Therefore, the king or his assistants purposely used those pre-existent texts, modified from the original settings, to describe the campaigns. But once we enter this realm of analysis, the issue must turn to literary perceptions, manners of writing in a contemporary "high style," and the avoidance of certain linguistic patterns. I would mention a clear case of not relying upon a colloquial idiolect or a "refined" idiolect of the time. Here, I prefer to follow Friedrich Junge rather than Redford.

It is accurate to state that I am not overly concerned about the "underlying historical reality" (p. 111), as is Redford. This is, however, my personal feeling and one based on the necessity of pursuing the underlying Egyptian conceptions of enemies, their ranking at this time, their actual threat, and the socially conditioned aspect of "Us versus Them." For me, it was the decision to avoid the narrative strategies so prominent in the Eighteenth Dynasty as well as that in the Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II that is intriguing. One must surely add the linguistic discourse of the Late Egyptian Miscellanies to this literary brew. To some degree, we can see this historically late Ramesside approach as determined by the religious aspects of the Libyan campaigns, those of both Merenptah and of Ramesses III. With regard to the former, note that the account in the Israel Stela parallels to no small extent the narrative approach of the lengthy Year 5 inscription, a point earlier analyzed in detail by Thomas von der Way. Nevertheless, following Redford's stress on the oral aspects of these war records of Ramesses III, we can see more clearly the literary orientation of the author as well as the *Sitz im Leben* of the speeches, addresses, and "songs"—if his term is appropriate.

One important point can be brought up in this context: namely, the unexpected discovery of a papyrus fragment relating to the Libyan wars. This was first discussed by me in 2002 in the light of Ramesside war literature (hymns and songs, *encomia*, stories), and subsequently commented upon twice by Colleen Manassa, most recently in her "historical fiction" volume. Its importance in the context of this review is that once more we possess an additional Ramesside literary narrative that deals with campaigns of the pharaoh. Its style and literary register parallel the accounts of Merenptah and Ramesses III. Therefore, and somewhat in the footsteps of von der Way, one must deal with the narrative set-up of these texts with an approach more oriented to verbal patterns and the syntactical make-up of each.

The second half of this important study concerns the identification of the Sea Peoples. To Egyptologists, it may appear to be the more difficult topic to grasp, especially as recent studies have focused more and more upon Anatolia and the "ground" for archaeological and textual interpretation. I was particularly struck by Redford's equation of the Aq(i)owasha with the Ionian island of Koos (p. 116), as well as his judicious approach to the vexed question of a "land of Palistin" (pp. 118–20). Quite rightly, the author argues for a "place of settlement." On pp. 123ff. there is a useful discussion of the Sea Peoples "proclamation" (*Šdt*), a word which to him implies a decision to unify all forces, with a goal in mind. Furthermore, the Greek history of Mopsos enters on pp. 128ff., wherein Redford argues for a possible connection to Moschos/Moschion. In this light, as well as in reflecting upon Cilician origins, the important study of Itamar Singer (2013a) needed to be discussed.

In the notes and bibliography, one finds that many of the recent studies in the Killebrew-Lehmann volume have not been critiqued. (The essay of Tristan Barako is, but not the works of Michal Artzy, Hermann Genz, Mario Benzi, or Elizabeth French [on Cilicia again].) Most recently, and appearing a tad earlier than Redford's volume, but too late to be assimilated, is the monumental Vienna publication on the Sea Peoples. Therein the interested scholar will find Gunnar Lehmann's attempted refutation of Singer's study, wherein a reflection of the Mopsos "dynasty" at Adana is ably given.

This segment of the work, I feel, may be the one most discussed, especially because the subsequent portions of this volume cover quite sufficiently, to say the least, the northern peoples. Hence, my concluding position is that the two-pronged approach of Redford can only be appreciated if the

researcher is able to deal with a gamut of different historical sources, both archaeological and textual to be sure, but also with material encompassing different aspects of Egyptian civilization as well as foreign peoples. Somehow, I wished for more on the Libyans, but that might have been due to my predilection for those nearby groups to the west. The Sea Peoples, on the contrary, still remain an ever-expanding topic of scholarly research swimming in a sea of disputation. To me, it remains the case that a more linguistic-literary approach was needed here to the narrative accounts of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu. Yet at the same time I assert that Redford's book will help all of us to understand better the phenomenon of the end of the Bronze Age.

ANTHONY SPALINGER  
UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND

ADDITIONAL SOURCE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Artzy, M. 2013. On the Other Sea Peoples. In Killebrew and Lehmann 2013. Pp. 329–44.
- Assmann, J. 1999. *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*<sup>2</sup>. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- Bachhuber, C., and R. Roberts, eds. 2009. *Forces of Transformation: The End of the Bronze Age in the Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Benzi, M. 2013. The Southeast Aegean in the Age of the Sea Peoples. In Killebrew and Lehmann 2013. Pp. 509–42.
- Fischer, P., and T. Bürge, eds. 2017. *“Sea Peoples” Up-to-Date: New Research on Transformations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 13th-11th Centuries BCE*. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- French, E. 2013. Cilicia. In Killebrew and Lehmann 2013. Pp. 479–83.
- Genz, H. 2013. “No Land Could Stand before Their Arms from Hatti . . . on . . .”? In Killebrew and Lehmann 2013. Pp. 469–77.
- Gillen, T. 2014. Ramesside Registers of Égyptian de tradition: The Medinet Habu Inscriptions. In *On Forms and Functions. Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar*, ed. E. Grossmann et al. Pp. 41–86. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- Junge, F. 1984. Sprache. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* V.8, 1176–1211. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. Sprachstufen und Sprachgeschichte. In *Akten des 22. Deutschen Orientalistentages Tübingen 1983. Supplement VI: XXII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 25. März 1983 in Tübingen. Ausgewählte Vorträge*, ed. W. Röllig. Pp. 17–34. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Killebrew, A., and G. Lehmann. 2013. *The Philistines and Other Sea Peoples in Text and Archaeology*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Kitchen, K. 1999. *Poetry of Ancient Egypt*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *Ramesside Inscriptions: Translated & Annotated; Translations* V. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lehmann, G. 2017. The Late Bronze-Iron Age Transformation and the Problem of the Sea Peoples Phenomenon in Cilicia. In Fischer and Bürge 2017. Pp. 229–55.
- Manassa, C. 2013. *Imagining the Past: Historical Fiction in New Kingdom Egypt*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Mountjoy, P. 2005. Mycenaean Connections with the Near East in LH IIIC: Ships and Sea Peoples. In *Emporia: Aegeans in the Central and Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. R. Laffineur and E. Greco. Pp. 39–43. Liege/Austin: Histoire de l'art et archéologie/Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory.
- Peden, A. 1994. *Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Twentieth Dynasty*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms.
- Singer, I. 2013a. “Old Country” Ethnonyms in “New Countries” of the “Sea Peoples” Diaspora. In *AMILLA: The Quest for Excellence. Studies Presented to Guenter Kopke in Celebration of His 75th Birthday*, ed. R. Koehl. Pp. 321–33. Philadelphia: INSTAP.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013b. The Philistines in the Bible: A Short Rejoinder to a New Perspective. In Killebrew and Lehmann 2013. Pp. 19–27.
- Spalinger, A. 2002. *The Transformation of an Ancient Egyptian Narrative: P. Sallier III and the Battle of Kadesh*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. New Kingdom Eulogies of Power. In *Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück: Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. N. Kloth et al. Pp. 415–29. Hamburg: Buske.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *Icons of Power. A Strategy of Reinterpretation*. Prague: Charles University Faculty of Arts.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2017. Ramesses III at Medinet Habu: Sensory Models. In 8. *Symposium zur ägyptische Königsideologie: Constructing Authority*, ed. T. Bács and H. Beinlich. Pp. 241–66. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- von der Way, T. 1992. *Göttergericht und "Heiliger" Krieg im alten Ägypten: Die Inschriften des Merenptah zur Libyerkrieg des Jahres 5*. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag.
- Woudhuizen, F. 2006. *The Ethnicity of the Sea Peoples*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University.

---

10. *Ägyptologische Tempeltagung: Ägyptische Tempel zwischen Normierung und Individualität*. Edited by MARTINA ULLMANN. *Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft Früher Hochkulturen*, vol. 3.5. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2016. Pp. xiii + 194, illus. €48 (paper).

This multifaceted volume focuses on the emergence, development, and application of norms in ancient Egyptian temple programs and was inspired by ancient Egyptian temple programs in the areas of architecture, images, ritual performance, landscape, cult, and private devotion. There is strong focus on the Greco-Roman period, with five of the eleven articles devoted to that era. These are also the contributions that deal most innovatively with the topic at hand.

Silke Caßor-Pfeiffer, in "Ausnahmen von der Norm oder normierte Ausnahmen? Abweichende Bezüge der Randzeilen in den Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Zeit" (pp. 49–70), explores some unusual compositions in the Temple of Isis at Philae. She divides the exceptions which form the core of her question into two categories: The first group is ritual-related or thematic exceptions. These relate to exceptions within a single scene. At first glance, these look like typical scenes in which a ritualist performs before two deities. However, Caßor-Pfeiffer argues that the central figure is the focus of cult, and that the second deity is, in fact, playing a role as ritualist. She analyses two, quite different examples, both from the Temple of Isis at Philae. Briefly, an enthroned Thoth lifts his hands in adoration before Isis, behind whom Geb lifts one hand, ritually framing the goddess. The king offers milk before Osiris. Isis stands behind, with one hand raised with a speech that indicates she is supporting the milk offering to Geb.

The second group encompasses exceptions due to architectural context. Caßor-Pfeiffer examines the west door of the first pylon, south side, arguing that unusual features of its composition were meant to refer to the entrance to the Mammisi and to underscore the role of the goddess Hathor in that context. She concludes that non-normative assignment of the fringes was meant to emphasize certain elements of the scene for internal (content) or external (context) reasons.

In "Wem gehören die Götter? Die Verwurzelung ägyptischer Kulte zwischen mythischer Norm und lokaler Exegese" (pp. 81–97), Holger Kockelmann explores mythical norms and local interpretations for the siting of temples, shrines, and the like, asking: "Was teilt in solchen Fällen die Priesterschaft eines Tempels X selbst darüber mit, woher die jeweilige Lokalform ihres Gottes stammt, wie ihr lokaler Tempel zum betreffenden Kult gekommen ist? Waren die Abgrenzung gegen andere Kultorte mit Lokalformen desselben Gottes und die Frage, wer—frei nach Lessing—den 'echten, den ursprünglichen Ring' besaß, überhaupt besonders relevant?"

He outlines the following four reasons why certain places come to be considered to have special proximity to the divine: as sites of miracles, striking natural formations, due to revelation by animal behavior, and due to visions or dreams. He then explores the roots of ancient Egyptian cults, as described in texts of the Greco-Roman period, focusing on the temple as the point of origin of the cosmos and the temple as the place of a deity's birth.

Kockelmann describes three superregional traditions surrounding the births of deities in southern Egypt in the Greco-Roman period—Osiris, Isis, and Horus. Of course, Osiris' cult places are more usually associated with the burials of his various body parts. However, the Opet Temple at Thebes was associated with the god's birth, a tradition also referred to in inscriptions at Edfu and Dendera. Horus' local forms are each joined to the myth of his birth in the marshes of Chemmis. Isis' birthplace was reputed to be at Dendera, as referenced not only there, but at Thebes and Philae as well. So, Isis' birth