dafür, daß dies neue Ansätze ausgegrenzt hätte. Meine Kritik richtet sich infolgedessen weder an die Beiträge selbst, noch an den Versuch, neue Theoriekonzepte in die Ägyptologie einzuführen (ich bin auch der Meinung, daß die Ägyptologie dringend neue Blicke braucht). Ich bedauere nur, daß die Herausgeber nicht die Gelegenheit genutzt haben, aus dieser Zeitschrift die Referenzschrift der ägyptologischen Kunstwissenschaft gemacht zu haben, da diese Spezialität bisher nicht die ihr gebührende Anerkennung erfahren hat.

Benoît LURSON

Joffrey SEGUIN, *Le Migdol du Proche-Orient à l'Égypte*. Paris, Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2007. 1 vol. in-8°, 161 pp., ill. Prix: €22,80.

This slim volume presents a helpful analysis of one major cultural interaction between Egypt and Western Asia. Not surprisingly, despite the author's attempt to date the introduction of the term "migdol" before the New Kingdom, this architectural fortified "tower" strikingly reflects the imperial era of Egypt. Indeed, the word became frequent enough in the Ramesside Age to enable us to ponder its then contemporary importance. The "migdol" thus reflected the increased predominance of Asiatic influences upon Egypt during the late New Kingdom.

Naturally, any discussion of the word must reflect a modern linguistic survey of the material, and one would have expected, despite the useful studies of James E. Hoch and Dimitri Meeks, the "New Comparativist" approach would have been taken. A helpful overview is that of Thomas Schneider, "Beiträge zur sogenannten 'Neueren Komparatistik'," *LinAeg* 5 [1997]: 189-209. In addition, note Antonio Loprieno, "On the contribution of phonology to Egyptian philology," in Josep Autouri and Alberto Álvarez [eds.], *...ir a buscar leña: Estudios dedicados al Prof. Jesús López* [Barcelona: Aula Aegyptiaca Fundación, 2001], 108.)

For example, some of the very helpful analyses of Carsten Peust (see below) are missing even though the word *mgdl*, as is to be expected, is one of the frequent *militarily associated lexical items* that came into Egypt from the Second Intermediate Period onwards. In this context, see Hoch's *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 462-3 — 13.4% of the total that he assembled, a major result with which one can add other items of daily life that Egyptian soldiers abroad in Asia used (pots, pans, etc.). I can also refer to Carsten Peust, *Egyptian Phonology: An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language* (Göttingen: Peust and Gutschmidt, 1999), 307-10. Of the loan words that persisted from the New Kingdom to Coptic, 1/6 are "pure" military terms. This percentage, assembled by Peust, is also remarkable. The situation needs to be examined more thoroughly.

The opening sections of the work skims over related terms in Egyptian for fortresses, edifices, towers, and the like. Here, commencing on page 84 Seguin

adumbrates the important term *jnbt*. Oddly, he places little faith in the recent compendium of Ellen Fowles Morris, *The Architecture of Imperialism: Military Bases of Foreign Policy in Egypt's New Kingdom* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004) — see his page 13 note 12. She also gets short shrift on page 53 with note 83. This I found quite remarkable. In similar fashion, if the author is going to run through other significant terms such as *bḫḥ*, "villa," then some references outside the *Wörterbuch* are needed.

In this case, see David O'Connor, "The geography of settlement in ancient Egypt," in Peter J. Ucko, Ruth Trinhgham and G. W. Dimbley (eds.), *Man, Settlement and Urbanism* (London and Cambridge MA: Duckworth and Schenkman, 1972), 693; with Barry Kemp, *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), 311-2. For the term, *nḫtw*, "stronghold," one might consult my recent comments in *The Transformation of an Ancient Egyptian Narrative: P. Sallier III and the Battle of Kadesh* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), 359-65 and the older remarks of Ricardo Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), 258. The term applies mainly to the Sherden military centers in Egypt during Dynasties XIX-XX. Moreover, for *sg(3)/sgr*, "keep," or "fortress," see O'Connor's analysis cited above with Yoyotte, *GLECS* 8 (1957-60): 78 ("hill", reference to Jaroslav Cerny, *BIFAO* 57 [1958]: 209-10 and *Coptic Etymological Dictionary* [Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976], 264). All in all, the closely connected *military applications* of each of these terms, especially in the connection to the term "migdol," should have been more carefully addressed than the author has done here. Perhaps Seguin can apply himself to these issues in a later study.

His opening sections also cover the famous Ugaritic Kirta text, for which the setting is clearly a tower-fortress. In light of the common New Kingdom iconic representation of a fortified bastion resisting Pharaoh, perhaps these scenes should have been given more prominence by Seguin in his discussion. (Pages 78-83 address the issue.) Egyptian reliefs show the sacrifice of a young male by the chiefs of the foreign Asiatic cities that are under siege. This is a depiction that is extremely common in the battle scenes of the Ramesside Period: Spalinger, "A Canaanite Ritual Found in Egyptian Military Reliefs," in *JSSEA* 8 [1978]: 47-60). Hence, I feel that further discussion of the Kirta text was necessary. Note that Denis Pardee, in William W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* I (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003), 285 with note 23, feels that the Ugaritic textual evidence for a sacrifice of the "first-born" (male) during a siege is not clear.

The follow-up analysis covering the presumed architectural and archaeological evidence, both from inland Syria as well as from Ugarit in particular, remains equivocal. Seguin's rather thin coverage of the roots *mgdl* and *mgdl* cannot resolve the intricate questions that he and others have proposed. (By the way, could not the obvious Afro-Asiatic root of *dgl* have been explored further in respect to the Egyptian verb *dg3* > *dgj*? All of this is covered by Peust.) That is to say, portions of this study leave the reader in an open-ended situation, on an arid plain so to speak, where one hopes to see a welcome oasis, a mouth-watering scholarly source bubbling with textual and archaeological data. Unfortunately there is none. Granted, at the end of the work Seguin covered the site of Tell el-Herr, wherein a

clear-cut case of a "midgol" fortress is evident; and this analysis is extremely important to the author's argument. (See pages 119-21.) Likewise, Seguin's overview of the recent Sinai excavations of James Hoffmeier, the joint studies of Dominique Valbelle and M. Abd el-Maskoud, as well as the independent fieldwork of Eliezer Oren, were included. These separate archaeological projects have not only complemented each other but also have allowed us to expand, even further, our knowledge of the fortress situation just outside of Egypt in the Sinai to the northeast.

Yet Seguin seems to rely heavily upon those Ramesside details in temple pictures and texts that often are unclear in details if not stereotypical in design. (This will be addressed in a forthcoming study entitled *Icons of Power: A Strategy of Reinterpretation.*) A presentation of mine at the Swansea conference "Walls of the Ruler: Fortifications, Police Beats, and Military Checkpoints?in Ancient Egypt," May 22-5 2006, "Fortresses as Ideological Images of Power," covers just that. Namely, the difficulty of empirically "taking to heart" such representations with an approach that is baldly observational. The same applies to the reasonable number of literary sources, such as P. Anastasi V, a text that Seguin uses more than once, in order to reconstruct, in an accurate fashion, the specific Egyptian determinants of a "migdol." In fact, the "wall" versus "fortification" dichotomy remains a thorny one, although the author provides the reader with a faithful study of the terms *sbty* (add Yoyotte, GLECS 9 [1960-3]: 8), *ṯsmt*, and the like on pages 88 and following. Unfortunately missing is the chapter of John Coleman Darnell, "Two Sieges in the Aethiopic Stelae," in Daniela Mendel and Ulrike Claudi (eds.), *Ägypten im afro-orientalischen Kontext* (Cologne: Institut für Afrikanistik, Universität zu Köln, 1991), 73-92. Somehow I also would have liked to see Gary Beckman, "The Siege of Uršu Text (*CTH* 7) and Old Hittite Historiography," *JCS* 47 (1995): 23-34, if only as Seguin refers to some Hittite data in his volume (pages 27-8 in particular).

There is an intriguing discussion of possible earlier borrowings of the term *mgdl* predating the end of Dynasty XVIII on pages 67 and following. Once more, however, the evidence is not totally clear and the hypothesis proffered remains, at least to this writer, to be *sub judice*. Seguin is on more secure ground when he covers the use of migdol architecture in the Levant (pages 95-109) and also when he analyzes the situation at Medinet Habu and elsewhere (pages 109-17). In this context, an interesting and thought-provoking contribution by O'Connor can be added: "The Eastern High Gate: Sexualized [sic.!] Architecture at Medinet Habu?," in Peter Jánosi (ed.), *Structure and Significance: Thoughts on Ancient Egyptian Architecture* (Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 439-54.

All in all, I found this study too slim to permit a full discussion of the complexity of the subject. Seguin is at ease with the core archaeological, textual, and linguistic data from Egypt and its immediate Asiatic neighbors. His analysis, however, remains disappointing. An overarching nature of the cultural interconnections of the migdol in the Ancient Near East is still needed. Perhaps Seguin can write such a detailed work and hence "touch the superlative," as Justice Holmes would say.

Anthony SPALINGER