

As a rule, reviews concern themselves with the work that has been accomplished, and not the work that could have been accomplished, and in the former regard Gzella demonstrates a magisterial control over a vast span of the history of this language, and the questions that motivate scholars to keep returning to it, frequently with a courageous indifference to social and professional considerations, as well as those that occasionally captivate a broader public: how long did Hebrew survive as a spoken language? just what was the language of Jesus? (For the answers to these questions and more, you'll have to read the book).

His contribution provides a solid foundation for the further study of the numerous issues it both adumbrates and illuminates in greater detail and is certain to become a standard reference. In addition, it will serve as an excellent introduction to the scholarship of the past century for scholars in allied fields, and particularly for sociolinguists interested in the phenomenon of the standardization of language and the ageless interplay between the vernacular and the literary. As dry as these subjects may occasionally seem to the uninitiated, Gzella is engaging in his presentation, and at times even a bit jocular (e.g., on p. 265 he dismisses the sporadic occurrence of isolated features that would appear in later years among texts we deem "Eastern Aramaic" with the proverb, "one sparrow does not make a summer," and on p. 286 he compares Aramaic dialectology to "playing piano with gloves on"). No other work comparable in its scope yet exists, at least not in the English language, and I am confident that it will stimulate and guide future inquiries into the phenomenon of Aramaic for years to come.

CH. G. HÄBERL

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

Non-Textual Marking Systems in Ancient Egypt (and Elsewhere). Edited by JULIA BUDKA; FRANK KAMMERZELL; and SŁAWOMIR RZEPKA. *Lingua Aegyptia, Studia Monographica*, vol. 16. Hamburg: WIDMAIER VERLAG, 2015. Pp. x + 322, illus. €59.

The richness and diversity of hieratic and hieroglyphic texts from the roughly 3600 years of continuous written tradition of Egypt's hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic scripts—not to mention the wealth of Coptic inscriptional material—can overwhelm the historian and archaeologist. As the editors of the volume under review observe, it comes as little surprise that only in the last ten years have volumes dedicated to "non-textual marking systems" in Egypt begun to appear with frequency (Haring and Kaper 2009; Andrásy, Budka, and Kammerzell 2009). The volume under review complements and expands upon those slightly earlier studies, presenting nearly two dozen articles under the headings "Methods & Semiotic," "Architecture & Builders' Marks," "Deir el-Medina," and "Pot Marks" (each with a short introductory overview). The subjects of the various contributions range in date from the Naqada III period to the Graeco-Roman era, with the majority dealing with material of New Kingdom date. The geographical range of the various studies covers the Nile Valley, including sites in the Delta (Tell el-Iswid), the Memphite region (Saqqara), Middle Egypt (Dayr Abu Hinnis, Abydos), the Thebaid, and Gebel Silsila. The parenthetical "and Elsewhere" in the title of the volume does not seem to apply, although the discussions contained within certainly have implications for understanding non-textual marking systems outside of Egypt.

One of the remarkable aspects of the study of non-textual marking systems is the diversity of media on which the ancient Egyptians recorded such systems: stone (natural rock surfaces, quarries, and ostraca), faience, ceramics, and mud brick. In one case, a pot mark may even be present on a papyrus: Andrásy's study of a pottery account from the Gebelein administrative papyri suggests that a large *mr*-hoe sign drawn between two sections of the account references a pot mark; this article provides a tantalizing piece of evidence for the oft-mentioned identification of pre-firing pot marks as part of the process of inspection at ceramic workshops. Nearly all of the articles in the volume under review are similarly attentive to the interdisciplinary nature of research into non-textual marking systems and pseudo scripts.

Another thread running through the articles is their sensitivity to archaeological context and spatial distribution, for which two examples provide useful illustration. Rzepka's article addresses "funny signs"—personal marks associated with members of the Deir el-Medina community—in Theban graffiti, and discusses the issue of dating these non-textual marks by creating maps that compare the distribution of dateable New Kingdom textual graffiti with the distribution of those "funny signs"; the greatest similarities between the locations of the two corpora is the mid Twentieth Dynasty to the early Twenty-First Dynasty, and it is only through such collocation of sources that otherwise non-dateable material might be assigned a chronological position (as Rzepka notes on p. 161: "There are good reasons to be cautious in assuming *a priori* that the corpus of textual graffiti is contemporary with the corpus of 'funny signs' graffiti.>").

Engel's work on Early Dynastic pot marks employs geographical distribution to test theories about the function and meaning of pot marks during the formative period of the pharaonic state. As she notes, several nuances must be considered in the use of the corpus, from the impact of modern activities on the location of sherds with pot marks in the much desecrated and now re-excavated necropolis of Umm el-Qa'ab (p. 217) to the diversity of orthographies within the corpus of pot marks deriving from an individual reign (using Semerkhet as an example, p. 219). Turning then to the distribution of First Dynasty pot marks throughout the entire Nile Valley, Engel observes that particular pot marks may be "independent of individual activities, but result of some institutional practice" (p. 224), and concludes that the pot marks may provide evidence for the increasingly wide regional reach of nascent pharaonic institutions—and thus tangible evidence for processes of state formation—in Early Dynastic Egypt.

Most of the articles in the volume take a standard Egyptological approach to the material, combining relevant archaeological and textual sources to create hypotheses about non-textual marking systems. Kyra van der Moezel's article, "Signification in Ancient Egyptian Builders' Marks," presents the most in-depth theoretical framework, followed by an analysis of builders' marks from the Old Kingdom through the New Kingdom; her conclusions regarding "signifier" and "signification" provide a useful guide to the diversity of builders' marks, and although other authors in the volume do not explicitly mention the theoretical framework, those two basic categories appear operative in most articles.

For example, in Kuraszkiewicz's study of the marks on the faience tiles from the Step Pyramid complex of Netjerykhet (Djoser), the "signifiers" are hieroglyph-like images (including some numbers) that mostly "do not conform [to] any known toponym or any other word or phrase that could be understood as a designation of a workshop, a person or quality of the product" (p. 47). The "signification," Kuraszkiewicz proposes, is a marker of a "batch" of tiles, which accords with the very low percentage of marked faience tiles (approximately 80, which is 0.2% of the estimated 40,000 that were present in the underground chambers).

Another example of the "signifier"—"signification" duality is the study of marked mud bricks from the Temple of Millions of Years of Thutmose III carried out by Álvarez and Campuzano: their analysis indicates that nearly all of the bricks (approximately 90%) bore maker's marks, which are most often lines (straight or curving), points, or a combination of the two. The marks could be made with the brick maker's finger or a stick, and the authors' careful recording of each brick (they provide an example of one of their digital reference cards on p. 64) allowed them to estimate that about 25–30% of the bricks were also stamped with a seal (most often containing the name of the temple: "Menkheperre, beloved of Amun-Re, (she) who offers life"). The continuing work at the site will hopefully offer further insight into the work processes behind the marks and stamps.

The collection of articles in *Non-Textual Marking Systems in Ancient Egypt (and Elsewhere)* provides an up-to-date presentation of an important sub-field in Egyptology that straddles literate and non-literate culture, and provides yet further evidence for the large number of semi-literate members of pharaonic society. The applicability of this research will be particularly strong in the further study of rock inscriptions outside the Thebaid that qualify as "non-textual marks" or pseudo scripts. Within the concession of the Elkab Desert Survey Project, rock inscription sites within the Wadi Hilal (east of the ancient city of Elkab) illustrate future avenues for research. A series of deeply carved signs at the Borg el-Hamam (at the southeast portion of the mouth of the Wadi Hilal) are similar in style and patination to the inscription of a late Old Kingdom priest named Hornakht at the site; within the Wadi Hilal,

additional signs—only some of which are related to known hieroglyphs—appear in association with dateable Old Kingdom inscriptions (Vandekerckhove and Müller-Wollermann 2001: 65 [inscription N 29]; compare also Inscription N 40, correcting the description in op. cit. 59). Distant desert sites, such as those along the road leading southwest from Dakhla Oasis, can also bear such marks, which may themselves be related to pot marks (cf. Förster 2015: 218). The sum of evidence reveals a consistency of site-marking activities between the Eastern and Western Deserts during the late Old Kingdom—a conclusion that benefits from the excellent scholarship in the volume under review.

JOHN COLEMAN DARNELL
YALE UNIVERSITY

REFERENCES

- Andrássy, P., J. Budka, and F. Kammerzell, eds. 2009. *Non-Textual Marking Systems, Writing and Pseudo Script from Prehistory to Modern Times*. *Lingua Aegyptia, Studia Monographica*, vol. 8. Göttingen.
- Förster, P. 2015. *Der Abu Ballas-Weg: Eine pharaonische Karawanenroute durch die libysche Wüste*. *Africa Praehistorica*, vol. 28. Cologne.
- Haring, B. J. J., and O. E. Kaper, eds. 2009. *Pictograms or Pseudo Script? Non-Textual Identity Marks in Practical Use in Ancient Egypt and Elsewhere*. Leuven.
- Vandekerckhove, H., and R. Müller-Wollermann. 2001. *Elkab VI: Die Felsinschriften des Wadi Hilal*. Turnhout.

Divine Creatures: Animal Mummies in Ancient Egypt. Edited by SALIMA IKRAM. Cairo: THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN CAIRO PRESS, 2015. Pp. xxi + 274, illus. \$24.95 (paper).

The second edition of *Divine Creatures* retains the original concept of the first as “. . . an initial attempt to begin to understand the Egyptian phenomenon of mummifying animals.” It begins with the four types of animal mummy that appear in ancient Egypt—pet, victual, cult, and votive—alongside contextual explanations of these. As an introduction to animal mummies, this section is succinct. The second edition would have benefitted from an explanation, however brief, of those animal mummies which do not seem to fit into these categories (McKnight et al. 2015). In addition, usage of the phrase “ancient fakes” (see this volume pp. 14, 203) to describe those animal mummies without a single, complete individual could be considered a little dated. Ikram’s evidence for the “trickery of the priests” derives from the Archive of Hor (Ray 1976), textual evidence from a single site, Saqqara. This deserves mention but it could mislead new readers to think that this was the case for every animal cult in Egypt. Ikram does consider alternative theories, with particular reference to that proposed by Kessler and Nur el-Din (p. 156), but it would be useful to state that animal cults seem to have operated at regional level with well-noted variations occurring at different sites.

Ikram continues with the mummification methods observed in animals, which include post-dispatch bodily treatment through to the final wrapping stages. Relevant comparisons with materials and methods found in human mummies (which, in the history of mummy studies, have been researched much more than those of animals), as well as species and animal mummy type-specific mummification methods, are discussed under five themes: evisceration and desiccation, desiccation and anointment, enemas, defleshing, and immersion.

A brief discussion of victual mummies is welcome here to highlight that while these are indeed animal mummies, they have a different purpose and are thus prepared in a manner appropriate to their purpose. An overview of the last rites, wrapping styles, and orientation evident in animal mummification is based on the findings from Ikram’s research (Ikram and Iskander 2002) as part of the Animal Mummy Project, with particular reference to examples in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo. Importantly, this section is completed by including a valuable discussion of experimental mummification. Again, this is similar