

Impressive, too, is the range of languages from which related words have been cited. However, the non-Egyptian words should have been cited in transliteration, as well as in the original scripts, just as the Egyptian words are. In a dictionary of a stage of the Egyptian language one can assume knowledge of Egyptian scripts, but one cannot assume knowledge of other scripts used in the ancient or modern Near East. The book also suffers slightly from a lack of consistency in the presentation of the individual entries. For instance, spellings of the Coptic word in different dialects are sometimes indicated, sometimes not; when more than one spelling is given, the dialects are not always given in the same order. When a word is cited in an etymology which is not in the basic dictionary for that script (*Wörterbuch*, Erichsen, Crum), the source of the word is sometimes clearly indicated in the first paragraph where the etymology is given. Frequently, however, it is only noted in that paragraph that the word is not in the appropriate dictionary and it is only by noting the reference given in the following paragraph on the history of the discussion of the etymology that one can deduce what the source of the word is. Another indication of the lack of consistency is the fact that two or even three different abbreviations are used to refer to the same work (and some of the works cited in the text, in abbreviation, are not included in the abbreviations list). This presumably resulted from Černý's borrowing from the works of others, such as Dévaud, as mentioned above. Another source of abbreviations was Sir Herbert Thompson's demotic dictionary files (some are the unchanged, unusual ones found there), to which reference is occasionally given for unpublished materials but whose contents and presence in Cambridge should perhaps have been noted in the list of abbreviations.

However, these are minor flaws, which do not seriously impair the usability of the book or detract from the major contribution which it has made. It has already become an invaluable asset in the reading of Egyptian texts and can be recommended enthusiastic-

ally to Egyptologists, Copticists, and all others who wish to know the history or relations of Coptic words.

JANET H. JOHNSON

The University of Chicago

Siedlungsfunde aus dem frühen Alten Reich in Giseh: österreichische Ausgrabungen 1971–1975. By KARL KROMER. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften, vol. 136. Vienna: Verlag der österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1978. Pp. 130 + 39 figs. + 40 pls. + 4 maps. DM 58.

The Austrian excavations east of the Mykerinos pyramid at Giza present a relatively unusual problem. A potential settlement of early Old Kingdom age was selected on the basis of surface indicators. Eventually it became apparent that almost all of the loose rubble excavated had been transported there from as much as a kilometer away when the site of the pyramid was cleared. The 1580 inventoried "finds" indicate settlement during the first four dynasties and suggest specialized workmen's quarters related to the building activities of Chephren.

Under the direction of Kromer, ten units of 100 m² each (0.5 ha) were dug to bedrock during 7 seasons of 5 to 6 weeks each, with up to 120 workmen. The cultural deposits form part of a slope talus with an initial grade of 17 percent, below two flat-topped sandstone ridges. Work was complicated by the repeated collapse or slumping of the sediment, too loose to maintain a trench face. Only two general maps are provided (one with inconsistent contours and lacking a scale), and the surface microtopography prior to excavation is not elucidated. Except for a maximum thickness of 6.4 m for square B, no maximum or median sediment depths are given, so that the bulk of the deposit cannot even be guessed at. Profiles of only three unit faces are illustrated or referred to, and there are no general, drawn sections for the major site axes. Site photographs are not identified as to position. Finally, finds are reported by

10 × 10 m square, and no other provenience control is apparent.

Given the complexity of the geo-archeological problem represented by such an unusual site, excavation recording was patently inadequate to the task. Kromer correctly infers repeated episodes of dumping along the slope, gradually creating an extensive ledge of secondary habitation residues; but even the available sections suggest a more informative stratigraphic sequence in squares A and D: (i) a basal unit of 2 m of thick-bedded mud residues includes inclined lines of potsherds, with local concentration of mud-brick rubble; (ii) the next unit averages 1.5 m in thickness and follows conformably but is thin-bedded, with mud residues interdigitated with sand lenses (generally less than 5 cm thick); (iii) over a major erosional break, more than 1 m of thick-bedded sand or mud, admixed with sherds and brick rubble, fill a depression that cuts diagonally down the slope; (iv) a discontinuous veneer of rubble, possibly a lag horizon; and finally (v) sands, mixed with fine brick debris, up to 70 cm thick in some spots. Kromer believes that the sandy lenses are eolian, and the capping sands, dunes; the presence of minute rootlet horizons in the sandy lenses is felt to record annual rythmites, and he argues accordingly that some lenses mark breaks of 4 to 6 years in local dumping. Nonetheless, the sandy lenses thin out rather than thicken downslope, where they may grade into sherd horizons (SE of square A); also dunes should not be mixed with debris!

Lacking proper recording and analysis, the strata remain ambiguous. Kromer claims a single settlement that had segregated workmen's quarters during the Fourth Dynasty and that was later razed and dumped at the excavation site. My impression is that several settlements may well have been incorporated in the dump, including drift sand removed from the pyramid platform. The break between units (ii) and (iii) may record a debris slide following heavy rains, and the mechanics of subsequent dumping was substantially different. It is technically possible to determine whether mud residues come

from simple sun-dried mud, deteriorated mud-bricks, or intact bricks (see my comments in *Oriental Institute Communications* 23 [1978]: 188-90). By inference, it would have been feasible to distinguish deposits from the base of a long term site (or from a long abandoned settlement) as opposed to an active one and to isolate true eolian sand, local sandy slope wash, and dumped sands. As it stands, Kromer's interpretation of a single, antecedent town and its evolution is inferred more from established dynastic events than from in situ evidence.

These excavations stand as an example of what can be lost by inadequate procedures. The primary positive value of the report is in the large selection of well illustrated lithic artifacts, particularly the flints and stone bowls. The seal impressions and animal bone will be published elsewhere by P. Kaplony and M. Kokabi, respectively.

KARL W. BUTZER

The University of Chicago

Amarna, City of Akhenaten and Nefertiti: Key Pieces from the Petrie Collection. By JULIA SAMSON. Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips, 1972. Pp. 110 + 57 figs. \$28.50.

Egyptian Stelae, Reliefs and Paintings from the Petrie Collection. Pt. 1. *The New Kingdom.* By H. M. STEWART. Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips, 1976. Pp. x + 72 + 53 pls. \$27.50 [both distributed by ISBS, POB 555, Forest Grove, Oregon 97116].

It is well known that the Petrie Museum in the Department of Egyptology of University College, London houses one of the finest teaching collections of Egyptian artifacts extant. The collection's value to the scholar is enhanced by the high proportion of provenanced materials from the excavations of Petrie and others, but until now only a fraction of it has been published. It is thus a pleasure to welcome these two