

# RICH and GREAT

Studies in Honour of Anthony J. Spalinger  
on the Occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> Feast of Thoth

**edited by Renata Landgráfová  
and Jana Mynářová**

Charles University in Prague  
Faculty of Arts  
2016



The book was published through a non-investment subsidy of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic for the purpose of the development of international cooperation with the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Republic of the Sudan.

Reviewed by G. Pieke and B. Vachala

Contributors: L. Bareš, M. Bárta, V. G. Callender, F. Coppens, L. Depuydt, T. Dobbin-Bennett, E. Froot, O. Goelet, Jr., C. R. Hamilton, J. Hellum, C. A. Hope, J. Hsieh, D. Kahn, M. I. Khaled, R. Landgráfová, A. von Lieven, E. A. Mackay, J. Malek, M. Megahed, J. Mynářová, H. Navrátilová, A. Niwiński, J. F. Quack, K. Smoláriková, D. Sweeney, K. Szpakowska, M. Verner, H. Vymazalová, J. Winand

Cover: Drawing of the image of Amun-nakht in the gateway at Ayn Birbiyeh, Dakhleh Oasis, courtesy of Olaf Kaper; a photo of a statuette of an Asiatic captive, Abusir (Archive of the Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague).

Type-setting layout: Agama<sup>®</sup> poly-grafický ateliér, s.r.o., Praha  
Print: TISKÁRNA PROTISK, s.r.o.

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Arts, 2016

ISBN 978-80-7308-668-8

## CONTENTS

Contents	3
List of abbreviations	4
JAROMIR MALEK, Rich and Great	6
LADISLAV BAREŠ, A Rare Late Period Attestation of the Counting of the Year's Seasons Scene	9
MIROSLAV BÁRTA, "Dummy Mummification" in the Old Kingdom: A New Intact Case from the 5 <sup>th</sup> Dynasty, Abusir	15
VIVIENNE G. CALLENDER, It's all in the Family: a 6 <sup>th</sup> Dynasty Conundrum	19
FILIP COPPENS, <i>Hb šsp mnḥ.t</i> . A Feast of Re-Harsomtus of Khadi on Mesore 29	29
LEO DEPUYDT, The Regnal Years of the "Mathematical Astronomical" Demotic Papyrus Carlsberg 9 Reinterpreted	39
TASHA DOBBIN-BENNETT, "Stretching out a Contraction, Softening Stiffness". Identifying Rigor Mortis in Ancient Egyptian Religious Texts	61
ELIZABETH FROOD, Role-play and Group Biography in Ramessid Stelae from the Serapeum	69
OGDEN GOELET, Jr., Reflections on Papyrus Rochester MAG 51.346.1 and the End of the 20 <sup>th</sup> Dynasty	89
CALEB R. HAMILTON, Conflict in the Iconography of the Protodynastic and Early Dynastic Periods	99
JENNIFER HELLMUM, The King, His Body, and His Relatives in the Pyramid Texts	115
COLIN A. HOPE, Reconstructing the Image of Seth, Lord of the Oasis, in his Temple at Mut el-Kharab in Dakhleh Oasis	123
JULIA HSIEH, Where is the City of Eternity?	147
DAN'EL KAHN, The Historical Background of a Topographical List of Ramesses III	161
MOHAMED ISMAIL KHALED, The Donation of Royal Funerary Domains in the Old Kingdom	169
RENATA LANDGRÁFOVÁ – JANA MYNÁŘOVÁ, Some Points about Structuring Points: Aspects of the Uses of the Egyptian <i>Verspunkte</i>	187
ALEXANDRA VON LIEVEN, The Movement of Time. News from the "Clockmaker" Amenemhet	207
E. ANNE MACKAY, The Baneful Hedgehog of Ancient Greece	233
MOHAMED MEGAHED, The <i>Antichambre Carrée</i> in the Old Kingdom. Decoration and Function	239
HANA NAVRÁTILOVÁ, Khaemwaset in Dahshur: The Prince and the Stones	259
ANDRZEJ NIWIŃSKI, Where and for whom did Ineni Excavate the Royal Tomb? <i>No one seeing, no one hearing</i> reconsidered.	267
JOACHIM F. QUACK, Zur Frage der botanischen Natur des <i>b3k</i> -Baumes und des von ihm gewonnenen Öls mit einem Anhang: pBM 10085 „2–3“ rekto. Ein schnippischer Dialog zwischen Mann und Frau?	275
KVĚTA SMOLÁRIKOVÁ, Ashurbanipal and Cambyses – Two Different Approaches to the Conquest of Egypt	291
DEBORAH SWEENEY, Family Gods at Deir el-Medina?	299
KASIA SZPAKOWSKA, Feet of Fury: Demon Warrior Dancers of the New Kingdom	313
MIROSLAV VERNER, <i>Pr-twt</i> – The Cult Place of Raneferef's Statues	325
HANA VYMAZALOVÁ, Feasts in Written Evidence from the 5 <sup>th</sup> Dynasty Royal Necropolis of Abusir	331
JEAN WINAND, The Chariots, the Hittites and the Grammar	V
Indices	341

---

## The Chariots, the Hittites and the Grammar

JEAN WINAND<sup>1</sup>

Deeper acquaintance with texts is always rewarding. A trivial statement like this takes even an axiomatic value with well-known texts, which, because of their very familiarity, might give the impression that they have nothing left to tell us. The small study presented here once again reconsiders the texts related to the famous battle of Qadesh, namely the so-called *Poem* and the *Bulletin*. It focuses on what might *a priori* seem to be a mere trifle: the expression of the possessive with the Egyptian noun for chariotry, *n.t-ḥtr*. I hope that this study, which is at the intersection of some emblematic fields of research that have always been close to his heart – the army, the relations between Egyptians and Hittites, and the grammar of texts – will attract Anthony Spalinger’s attention.<sup>2</sup>

As may be guessed, chariots are everywhere in the Ramesside war texts, for they often constituted the key element that played a decisive role in the final result of a battle. The compound *n.t-ḥtr* is formed on *ḥtr*, which basically refers to entities that are considered as pairs (Kruchten 1980: 39–52). In the New Kingdom, *ḥtr* can specifically refer to a chariot, and, by extension, to the horses, challenging the noun *ssm*, which exclusively refers to the animal, never to the artefact (see Vernus 2010: 1–46). In Late Egyptian, maybe contrary to some expectation, one must note that *n.t-ḥtr* is not that common outside the royal war texts (see *infra*).

In the texts related to the battle of Qadesh, *n.t-ḥtr* is sometimes accompanied by a possessive. When the possessor is pronominal, there are two possibilities: the possessor is directly suffixed to the noun, *n.t-ḥtr:f*, or the noun that encodes the possessum is preceded by a complex form whose first element – the base – is derived from the definite article (historically a demonstrative pronoun), followed by a bound person marker, *ḏj.f n.t-ḥtr* (Winand in press). This of course illustrates a basic evolution in the Egyptian language, which crystallized in the New Kingdom. While in the Old Kingdom the adnominal possession with a bound person marker (suffix pronoun) is used exclusively, it has almost completely

disappeared in Coptic, except for some twenty nouns, most of them expressing body parts (Layton 2000: § 138). In this apparently straightforward evolution, Late Egyptian stands in the middle, with a more or less balanced proportion of both constructions. The suffix pronoun is still predominantly retained with some semantic classes, as nouns expressing body parts, family membership, symbolic entities, physical particularities and psychological states, and nouns in relation with royalty or religion (see Winand in press).

The case of *n.t-ḥtr* “chariotry” does not belong to any of the semantic classes listed above. In the Qadesh texts, the distribution of the data according to the form of the pronominal possessor is summarized into the two following figures. The first one gives the statistics for the *Poem*, the second one for the *Bulletin*.<sup>3</sup>

At first sight, the distribution does not seem to follow any clear pattern. Such a feeling is particularly strong in the *Poem*, where all versions can have both constructions. As a preliminary observation, there is a very strong agreement between the versions if one looks at the data horizontally. The two constructions never appear concurrently in the same passage, except in one case: in §28, the version of pChester Beatty opted for the possessive article whereas the two relevant epigraphic versions here (K2 and L1) have a suffix pronoun. Although pChester Beatty is almost always in lacuna for the passages that are of interest in this study, one can plausibly suggest that the presence of the possessive article is another case of the well-known “linguistic modernization”, whose different manifestations have been exhaustively studied by Anthony Spalinger (see Spalinger 2002: 99).

One would probably be hardly pressed to find any semantic significance for explaining the variations in the expression of the possessor. As is clear from the data, there is no difference either according to the support (temple walls versus papyrus) or the writing system (hieroglyphic versus hieratic). Nevertheless a meaningful distribution suggests itself when one considers the role of the registers or, more correctly, of the levels of enunciation (narrative vs. discourse in

<sup>1</sup> I warmly thank Stéphane Polis for his comments on a draft of this article.

<sup>2</sup> Spalinger 1985: 43–75; Spalinger 2002; Spalinger 2003: 163–199; Spalinger 2013: 237–256.

<sup>3</sup> References are made to Kuentz’s numbering system; the sigla on top of columns follow the abbreviations system found in Kitchen’s edition (*KRII*: 2).

	<b>K1</b>	<b>K2</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>L1</b>	<b>L2</b>	<b>ChB</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>R</b>
22	ARTPOS	-	-	-	ARTPOS			
25	ARTPOS			ARTPOS	ARTPOS	[ARTPOS]		
28		SUF		SUF		ARTPOS		
50								
90	ARTPOS	[ARTPOS]		ARTPOS			ARTPOS	
114	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	ARTPOS	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	ARTPOS
143	SUF				SUF			SUF
145	SUF		SUF	SUF	SUF		SUF	
168							ARTPOS	
169							ARTPOS	
172	ARTPOS				ARTPOS			
184	ARTPOS			ARTPOS	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	
193	ARTPOS				ARTPOS		ARTPOS	
223b							ARTPOS	
224	ARTPOS			ARTPOS	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	
237	ARTPOS			ARTPOS			ARTPOS	
240	ARTPOS			ARTPOS	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	
252	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	ARTPOS	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	
254	ARTPOS			ARTPOS	ARTPOS			
323				SUF	SUF			
333	[ARTPOS]	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	ARTPOS		ARTPOS	

Fig. 1. Distribution of the pronominal possessor for n.t-ḥtr in the Poem

the sense of Benveniste 1971). In *discourse* (§169, 172, 184, 193, 240, and 254, in grey shading in the figure) the possessive article is systematically used, while in *narrative* both constructions can appear. This distribution is largely supported by the evidence from the *Bulletin*, where all relevant sections for our discussion belong to the *narrative* register.

The suffix pronoun is consistently used except in §107. This exception can be easily explained as a reminiscence of a similar passage in the *Poem* (ex. 1). The tradition here splits between the epigraphic versions (ex. 2) and the version of pSallier (ex. 3):

	L1	L2	R1	I
21	SUF	SUF	-	
24	SUF	SUF	SUF	SUF
48	SUF			SUF
76	SUF	SUF		SUF
100	SUF	SUF		
107			ARTPOS	ARTPOS
110			SUF	SUF

Fig. 2. Distribution of the pronominal possessor for *n.t-ḥtr* in the *Bulletin*

- Ex. 1 *jw ḥ3<sup>c</sup> wi p3j.i mš<sup>c</sup> t3j.i n.t-ḥtr (...)*  
 “... while my army and my chariotry had abandoned me (...)” (*Bulletin* § 107 [I 43 = R1 25])<sup>4</sup>
- Ex. 2 *jw ḥ3<sup>c</sup> wi p3j.i mš<sup>c</sup> ʿš3, bw nw.n w<sup>c</sup> r.i m t3j.i n.t-ḥtr*  
 “... while my army had abandoned me, and no one in my chariotry was looking at me” (*Poem* § 113–114 epigraphic versions)
- Ex. 3 *jw ḥ3<sup>c</sup> <wi> p3j.i mš<sup>c</sup> t3j.i n.t-ḥtr (...)*  
 “... while my army and my chariotry had abandoned me (...)” (*Poem* § 113–114 pSallier)

The text of pSallier might of course be corrupted at this point (see Spalinger 2002: 25), but it is interesting to note the convergence of its reading with the *Bulletin*. As shown by the history of the transmission of some classical texts, like *Sinuhe* or *Ptahhotep*, the necessity of reconstructing one and only one *Urtext* as the source of the whole manuscript tradition has recently been subjected to intense scrutiny (Parkinson 2009; Winand 2014: 215–243). In this respect, the way literary pieces were created and then circulated differs from the model one has inherited from Greek and Latin philology. This passage could thus shed an interesting light upon the possible existence of more than one authorial source in the textual tradition (see already the discussion by Spalinger 2002: 101–103).

As was already noted, the same sentence occurs again in pSallier, somewhat earlier in the text (§90), where it is once

more at variance with the epigraphic versions. It is of course difficult to guess how it found its way in the text. It could be the result of an interpolation made by the scribe due to some carelessness (see Spalinger 2002: 19), but one can also turn to another kind of explanation. To start with, the version of pSallier is not completely farfetched: it makes an acceptable sense in context, not very different from what has been adopted by the epigraphic versions:

- Ex. 4 *jw bn w<sup>c</sup> n mš<sup>c</sup>, bn snj*  
*jw ḥ3<sup>c</sup> wi p3j.i mš<sup>c</sup> t3j.i n.t-ḥtr*  
*n smn.n w<sup>c</sup> jm.sn r ʿḥ3 ḥn<sup>c</sup>.sn*  
 “there was no more soldier, no officer; my army and my chariotry had abandoned me; no one among them could stand to fight with them (...)” (*Poem* § 89–91 pSallier)
- Ex. 5 *jw bn w<sup>c</sup> n mš<sup>c</sup>, bn kr<sup>c</sup>*  
*p3j.i mš<sup>c</sup> t3j.i n.t-ḥtr m mrḳḥt hr-ḥ3.t.sn*  
*n smn.n w<sup>c</sup> jm.sn r ʿḥ3 ḥn<sup>c</sup>.sn*  
 “there was no more soldier, no shield bearer; my army and my chariotry was disbanding before them; no one among them could stand to fight with them (...)” (*Poem* § 89–91 epigraphic versions)

The reading of pSallier fits the context rather well: after deploring that there is no one left, neither soldier nor shield bearer (officer in pSallier), the king says that the army has abandoned him (§90), and that there is consequently no one left to fight the enemy (§91). The epigraphic versions (ex. 5) unanimously have *mrḳḥt*, a word of Semitic origin, whose

<sup>4</sup>This section is missing in the Luxor versions (see Spalinger 1985: 69–70).

etymology remains unclear.<sup>5</sup> The word seems to be a hapax. Faced thus with an unknown word, the scribe of pSallier or of its *Vorlage* was apparently at a loss. The very common collocation *p3j.i mšc (hn<sup>c</sup>) t3j.i n.t-ḥtr* might admittedly have played a trick of memory and prompted the insertion of an expression, present elsewhere, that offered an acceptable sense. Substitutions like these in poetry are quite common in oral transmission (the best example remains of course the Homeric tradition), but also in literate societies where literature was memorized, as was the case in ancient Egypt.

There are also three passages in the small texts – captions – that go with the scenes where *n.t-ḥtr* has a pronominal possessor: one with the possessive article, and two with a suffix pronoun. All passages are in narrative sections. As has been observed above, both constructions can appear in narrative, so that one does not need to take any trouble at explaining the variations in the expression of the pronominal possessor. My guess here is that the composition of these ‘captions’ is to some extent dependent on the redaction of the *Poem*; in other words, these small texts are not necessarily genuine compositions. This seems to be more particularly the case for the longer texts, which precisely have to be discussed here.

Our first case is quite easily explained in this respect. The caption closely resembles a passage from the *Poem* (§143). This is evident from the context and the general tone, but one will note more particularly the presence of the very rare word *tnbh*.<sup>6</sup> In both passages, the pronominal possessor of *mšc* and *n.t-ḥtr* is expressed by a suffix pronoun:

Ex. 6 *p3 wr ḥr ḥsj n ḥt3 ḥc m ḥr-jb mšc.f ḥn<sup>c</sup> n.t-ḥtr:f,*  
*ḥr:f<sup>c</sup>nw tnbh, jb.f bdš,*  
*nn pr.n.f r ḥ3 n snd n ḥm.f*  
 “...the despicable, fallen, Ruler of Hatti, was standing in the midst of his infantry and chariotry, his face averted, shrinking away, his heart had become feeble. He could not come out to fight, because of fear of his Majesty” (*Reliefs* § 42 = *KRI* II: 139, 3–7)

Ex. 7 *išt p3 wr ḥsy n ḥt3 ḥc ḥr-ib mšc.f ḥn<sup>c</sup> t-n.t-ḥtr:f ḥr ptr p3 ḥ3 n ḥm.f w<sup>c</sup>w ḥr-tp.f,*  
*iw bn mšc.f ḥn<sup>c</sup>.f, bn t-n.t-ḥtr:f,*  
*iw.f ḥr ḥc n tnbh snd.w*

“...now the despicable Ruler of Hatti was standing in the midst of his infantry and chariotry, watching the fighting by His Majesty, being alone, on his own, having with him neither his infantry nor his chariotry; and he (i.e. the Ruler of Hatti) began to turn back and shrink away, full of fear” (*Poem* § 143sq)<sup>7</sup>

The next case is very similar to the preceding one. The caption is once more strongly reminiscent of another passage from the *Poem*. The army and chariotry are in both cases related to *ḥ3tj.w nb* “all the captains”; the possessor is in each case expressed by a suffix pronoun.

Ex. 8 *jw ḥm.f w<sup>c</sup>.w, n mšc [ḥn<sup>c</sup>.f] m-ḥt rdj.n.f m ḥr n ḥ3t[j.w nb n mšc<sup>c</sup>].f n.t-ḥtr:f r-dd:*  
 “...and His Majesty was alone, having no army with him, when His Majesty commanded all the captain of his army, his chariotry and his officers saying” (*Reliefs*: § 62 = *KRI* II: 143,2–4)<sup>8</sup>

Ex. 9 *ḥc.n rdi.n ḥm.i sβ.tw n.i ḥ3ty.w nb n mšc.i ḥn<sup>c</sup> n.t-ḥtr.i,*  
 “...Then My Majesty had caused to be ushered in to me all the captains of my infantry and my chariotry” (*Poem* § 323)

The first one belongs to a long rhetorical text that accompanies the representation of the king in a chariot:

Ex. 10 *jw.f ḥr ḥdb wr:w nb n ḥ3s.wt nb n3 sn.w n p3 ḥr n ḥt3 ḥn<sup>c</sup> n3j.f wr:w ḥ3.w n3j.f mšc t3j.f n.t-ḥtr*  
 “... as he killed all the princes of all foreign lands and the brothers of the enemy of Hatti and his great nobles, his armies and his chariotry” (*Reliefs* § 19 = *KRI* II: 135,8–12)

In the last case, there is no precise relation with the *Poem*, but one may compare our passage with the only two sections of the *Poem* where the sequence *ḥ3.w – mšc – n.t-ḥtr* is found; in each case, the possessive article has been used. Once again, this probably made a rhythmic unit, that could be easily memorized, and thus be made available for other uses:

Ex. 11 *ḥc.n dd.n ḥm.f n p3j.f mšc n3j.f wr:w m-mjt.t t3j.f n.t-ḥtr*  
 “...then His Majesty said to his army, his nobles and his chariotry as well” (*Poem* § 252)

<sup>5</sup> Hoch 1994: No. 185. See already Gardiner (1960: 17), who was the first to suggest that *mrḥt* should be a verb of motion rather than a noun meaning “booty”.

<sup>6</sup> See *wn.jn wr:w ḥ3j.w n t3 nb sw3.sn ḥr.sn tnbh ḥr ḥnw bdš m-ḥt m33.sn* “... then the ruling (great) chiefs of every land that they (= the cavalcade) passed by – they cringed, turning away fainting, when they saw the people (*rmt*) of the Hatti-land joining with the king’s army” (*KRI* II: 251,12 – transl. K.A. Kitchen).

<sup>7</sup> On the pattern *jw.f ḥr ḥc* + pseudo-participle, see Kruchten 1982; Winand 2006: 329–333.

<sup>8</sup> The two epigraphic versions (A and K<sup>2</sup>) are not in complete agreement here: I mainly followed K<sup>2</sup>, except for the end where I followed A by adding *n.t-ḥtr:f wr:w.f*, which are absent in K<sup>2</sup>.



- Ex. 12 *ḥs.t m htp <r> t3-mrj ḥn<sup>c</sup> n3j.f wr.w p3j.f mš<sup>c</sup> t3j.f n.t-ḥtr*  
 “return in peace to Egypt with his nobles, his army and his chariotry” (*Poem* § 333 pSallier)<sup>9</sup>

To this, one must add a last parallel, only found in pSallier:

- Ex. 13 *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n ḥm.f<sup>c</sup>.w.s. n p3j.f mš<sup>c</sup> r-ḥn<sup>c</sup> t3j.f n.t-ḥtr m-mit.t n3j.f wr.w*  
 “and then His Majesty, l.p.h., called upon his army, his chariotry and his nobles”  
 (*Poem* § 223bis-ter)

To come back to the expression of possession, the systematic presence of the possessive article – a form largely marked as a Late Egyptianism (see above) – in the discourse sections is in accordance with other observations that have already been made as regards the first attestations of Late Egyptian in some 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty epigraphic texts. While the narrative parts are usually written in Classical Egyptian, a.k.a. *Égyptien de tradition*, discourse, even put in the royal mouth, can have a definitely Late Egyptian flavour, as witnessed, among others, in some workmen’s speeches found in the tombs.

The sensibility of the scribes to the variation of registers in one single text does not need to be demonstrated any longer (see Goldwasser 1990: 120–149). As regards *n.t-ḥtr*, the same kind of variations can be observed in two other texts from the reign of Ramesses II, the Hittite treaty and the First Marriage. In the first text, *n.t-ḥtr* once appears with a pronominal possessor; as the word occurs in a legal section, heavily influenced by Late Egyptian, the possessive article was used, as expected:

- Ex. 14 *ḥr jr jw bn jb n p3 wr ḥ3 n ḥt3 šm.t jw.f {ḥ}r<sup>10</sup> di.t ḥn p3j.f mš<sup>c</sup> t3j.f n.t-ḥtr mtw<.w> ḥdb p3j.f ḥrw*  
 “but if the great prince of Hatti does not wish to go, he will send his army and his chariotry, and they will kill his foe”  
 (*KRI* II: 228,5–6)

In the first Hittite marriage, *n.t-ḥtr* appears twice with a suffix pronoun to express the pronominal possessor. The first instance is at the beginning of the text, in the royal eulogy, a composition that is traditionally composed according to the rules of *Égyptien de tradition*. The noun appears a second time in a narrative section, after the *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n sdm.n.f* pattern, which is of course indexical of classical literature:

- Ex. 15 *mk n.t-ḥtr.f*  
 “who protects his chariotry” (*KRI* II: 235,8)

- Ex. 16 *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n spd.n.f mš3.f n.t-ḥtr.f*  
 “and then he made his army and his chariotry ready” (*KRI* II: 243,11)

Finally, to conclude this short note, it was also interesting to have a look at Ramesses III’s Medinet Habu war inscriptions, which, in many respects, tried to emulate the texts of his glorious eponymous predecessor. The noun *n.t-ḥtr* appears only three times with a pronominal possessor. Each time, the suffix pronoun was used. As the noun was always in a narrative section, this is well in accordance with the observations made for the texts of Ramesses II:

- Ex. 17 *n.t-ḥtr.f dmd m ḥfnw*  
 “his whole chariotry by millions”  
 (*KRI* V: 13,12)
- Ex. 18 *dj.f p3 wr n mšwš m dr.t.j ḥn<sup>c</sup> mš<sup>c</sup>.f n.t-ḥtr.f*  
 “he put the prince of the Meshwesh in my hands together with his army and his chariotry” (*KRI* V: 51,5)
- Ex. 19 *mnf3.t.f n.t-ḥtr.f ḥr nḥt.w*  
 “his infantry and his chariotry carried power (or victory)” (*KRI* V: 61,2)

If one moves outside the royal war inscriptions, *n.t-ḥtr* is not very common. To complete the review of the available evidence, three examples from the *Miscellanies* can be added. In this corpus dated slightly after the reign of Ramesses II (Merenptah – Seti II), *n.t-ḥtr* is used three times with a pronominal possessor, once with a suffix pronoun and twice with a possessive article:

- Ex. 20 *n t3j.sn n.t-ḥtr*  
 “for his chariotry” (*LEM* 20,4)
- Ex. 21 *t3 s.t jr.t šhr.w n t3j.k n.t-ḥtr; t3 s.t snh p3j.k mš<sup>c</sup>*  
 “the place of making the counsel for your chariotry, the place of registering your army”  
 (*LEM* 28,13–14)
- Ex. 22 *r sgnn mš<sup>c</sup>.f n.t-ḥtr.f*  
 “to anoint his army and his chariotry”  
 (*LEM* 51,14)

The first two examples come from texts that are largely set in the Late Egyptian business language (especially the second one, which is a letter of instructions). The presence of the possessive article does not come as a surprise. The last case is more problematic. It comes from a very long instruction text – extending over 4 columns – that ends the recto of pAnastasi IV. This text is essentially an opportunity of giving long lists of products and commodities. From a linguistic viewpoint, it seems quite homogeneous. The sole ex-

<sup>9</sup> The version of pSallier is rather chaotic as regards the beginning of the last sentence, see Spalinger 2002: 79.

<sup>10</sup> On the correction, see Edel 1997: 93.

ception is precisely that of the nominal syntagm under consideration here, *mš<sup>c</sup>.f.n.t-ḥtr:f*, while elsewhere the possessive article is used throughout. The only explanation that comes to mind is a reminiscence of this phrase from the royal war inscriptions where it almost constitutes a refrain. In the Qadesh texts alone, the phrase is well represented, both in the *Poem* and in the *Bulletin*.<sup>11</sup>

More generally, members of the middle elite class in Memphis (and later in Piramesse), to which the scribes responsible for the compilation of the *Miscellanies* belonged, were also acquainted with some pieces of royal literature like the compositions about the Qadesh expedition, which undoubtedly had a great and lasting impact, as witnessed by the private copies of the *Poem* that have come down to us. For instance, in a text compiled by the redactor of pAnastasi II (“praise of Ramesses II as a warrior”), the following sentence can be read:

- Ex. 23 *sw ʕk m-ḥnw.sn mj s3 nw.t, ḥdb(w).sn n hh.f  
m km j3.t*  
“he has entered inside them like the son of  
Nut, they have been thrown down by his  
blast in a moment” (*LEM* 13,12)

This is of course reminiscent of some close formulations found in the Qadesh texts as illustrated by the following examples that show some shared phraseology:

- Ex. 24 *jw.j r ʕk jm.sn mj ḥwt.t bjk, jw.j ḥr ḥdb ḥr  
w<sup>c</sup>w<sup>c</sup> ḥr ḥ3<sup>c</sup> r jwtn*  
“I shall enter inside them like when the fal-  
con strikes, killing, cutting down, and throw-  
ing to the ground” (*Poem* § 216–217)
- Ex. 25 *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n.f ḥr ʕk m ifd m-ḥnw p3 ḥrw r p3 nty zp  
n 6 n ʕk im.sn, iw.i mi b<sup>c</sup>l m-s3.sn m 3.t  
šhm.f, iw.i ḥr ḥdb im.sn*  
“and then he entered in gallop inside the  
enemy for the sixth time of his entering in-  
side them, I was like Baal after them in his  
time of power, killing among them”  
(*Poem* § 221–223)
- Ex. 26 *gm.n.w ḥ3s.t nb.t ʕk.i im.sn sdr m ḥdbj.t ḥr  
snf.sn*

“they found all the lands I had entered inside  
lying in heaps in their blood” (*Poem* § 231)

The noun *ḥdbj.t* in the last example finds an indirect echo in the passage of the *Miscellanies*.<sup>12</sup>

The issue raised in this paper had its origin in a detail question: the expression of pronominal possessor with *n.t-ḥtr* “chariotry” in a well-delineated corpus, the official texts that were composed on the battle of Qadesh. In the so-called *Poem* and the *Bulletin*, the suffix pronoun and the possessive article are both attested. The scribes thus could deliberately shift from the classical way of expressing possession to the new standard set by the introduction of Late Egyptian in royal epigraphy. As no semantic difference between *n.t-ḥtr:f* and *t3j.f.n.t-ḥtr* can be shown, one must look elsewhere for explaining the scribes’ choices. In the *Poem* and the *Bulletin*, the distribution of the data is largely a matter of register, as it follows the distinction between discourse and narrative. In some cases, the solution that was adopted was influenced by other factors. Scribes could reproduce sections or parts of them taken from related texts. This is probably what happened for the texts of the captions, which seem to pay some tribute to the *Poem*.

The version of pSallier sometimes significantly differs from the epigraphic versions. As was amply demonstrated, this can be explained by some well-known mechanisms of corruption or linguistic adaptation to the new Late Egyptian standard. But this kind of explanation does not always do complete justice to the facts. As one knows, composition of literary texts is never a simple and straightforward process. When faced with variants that seem equally acceptable, one must reconsider the necessity of positing for ancient Egyptian literature one and only one *Urtext*, which would be the unique source for the text tradition. Furthermore, in the process of creating new texts based upon a previous corpus, as was possibly the case for the captions, or of transmitting well-known texts, the scribes could inadvertently re-arrange some sections, or transform some passages by relying too confidently upon their memory rather than carefully following a written master copy (*Vorlage*).<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *Poem*: § 28: *mš<sup>c</sup>.f.n.t-ḥtr:f ḥn<sup>c</sup>.f*; § 143: *ist p3 wr ḥsy n ḥt3 ḥ<sup>c</sup> ḥr-ib mš<sup>c</sup>.f ḥn<sup>c</sup> t-n.t-ḥtr:f*; § 145: *iw bn mš<sup>c</sup>.f ḥn<sup>c</sup>.f, bn t-n.t-ḥtr:f*; *Bulletin*: § 22: *iw.f iw ḥn<sup>c</sup> mš<sup>c</sup>.f n.t-ḥtr:f*; § 76: *iw p3 ḥr ḥsy n ḥt3 iw ḥn<sup>c</sup> mš<sup>c</sup>.f n.t-ḥtr:f*.

<sup>12</sup> The verb *ḥdb*, which is far more common than the noun *ḥdbj.t*, is always used to describe foes scattered around on the ground, most often with the adjunct *ḥr snf.sn*. The whole expression is already attested in some inscriptions of Tuthmose III (*Urk.* IV: 552), it is found again during the reign of Seti I in a context very similar to that of the *Poem* (*tjt stj.w ptp t3š.w, sm3 wr.sn ḥdb ḥr snf.sn, ʕk jm.sn mj ns.t n sḏ.t*), which was taken over almost *verbatim* by Ramesses III in Karnak (*KRI V*: 87,8). The collocation of *ḥdb* and *hh* appears again in the time of Ramesses III (*m p3 ḥh t3 šf.t nsw.t nḥt ḥdbw st, šhr st n t3-mrj* “it is the blaze and the respect of the strong king that laid them down and befell them for Egypt”; a variant with the same theme: *dj.j ḥh.j r t3.w ḥ3s.wt, ḥdb.j th3 t3š.k* “I will set my blaze against the (foreign) lands and hills, I will lay down who will transgress your border”).

<sup>13</sup> More generally, new texts in ancient Egypt much often integrated parts taken from older or closely related compositions. A case study on a magical text is presented by Winand – Gohy 2011: 175–245.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

BENVENISTE, E.

(1971) *Problems in General Linguistics* [Miami linguistics series 8], Miami (transl. by Mary Elizabeth Meek).

EDEL, E.

(1997) *Der Vertrag zwischen Ramses II. von Ägypten und Hattušili III. von Hatti* [Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 95], Berlin.

GARDINER, A. H.

(1960) *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*, Oxford.

GOLDWASSER, O.

(1990) "On the Choice of Registers – Studies in the Grammar of Papyrus Anastasi I", in: S. I. Groll (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, Jerusalem, 120–149.

HOCH, J.

(1994) *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*, Princeton.

KRUCHTEN, J.-M.

(1980) "Le verbe *htr* et ses dérivés jusqu'à la fin du Nouvel Empire: sens et traduction", *AIPHOS* 24, 39–52.

(1982) *Études de syntaxe néo-égyptienne. Les verbes 'h<sup>c</sup>, h<sup>m</sup>si et sdr en néo-égyptien. Emploi et signification* [Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves Suppl. 1], Bruxelles.

LAYTON, B.

(2000) *A Coptic Grammar* [Porta linguarum orientalium, neue Serie 20], Wiesbaden.

PARKINSON, R.B.

(2009) *Reading Ancient Egyptian Poetry: Among Other Stories*, Chichester – Malden.

SPALINGER, A.

(1985) "Remarks on the Kadesh inscriptions of Ramesses II: the 'Bulletin'", in: H. Goedicke (ed.), *Perspectives on the Battle of Kadesh*, Baltimore, 43–75.

(2002) *The Transformation of an Ancient Egyptian Narrative: P.Sal-lir III and the Battle of Kadesh* [Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 40], Wiesbaden.

(2003) "The battle of Kadesh: the chariot frieze at Abydos", *ÄuL* 13, 163–199.

(2013) "Egyptian chariots: departing for war", in: A. Veldmeijer – S. Ikram, (eds.), *Chasing chariots: proceedings of the First International Chariot Conference (Cairo 2012)*, Leiden 237–256.

VERNUS, P.

(2010) "Réception linguistique et idéologique d'une nouvelle technologie: le cheval dans la civilisation pharaonique", in: M. Wissa (ed.), *The knowledge economy and technological capabilities: Egypt, the Near East and the Mediterranean 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C. - 1<sup>st</sup> millennium A.D.*, *Proceedings of a conference held at the Maison de la Chimie, Paris, France 9–10 December 2005* [Aula Orientalis Supplementa 26], Barcelona, 1–46.

WINAND, J.

(2006) *Temps et aspect en égyptien. Une approche sémantique* [Probleme der Ägyptologie 25], Leiden – Boston.

(2014) "The Tale of Sinuhe. History of a literary text", in: H. Hays – F. Feder – L. Morenz (eds.), *Interpretations of Sinuhe. Inspired by Two Passages (Proceedings of a Workshop held at Leiden University, 27–29 November 2009)* [Egyptologische Uitgaven 27], Leiden, 215–243.

(in press) "Pronominal non-predicative possession in Late Egyptian", in: E. Grossman – S. Polis (eds.), *Possession in Ancient Egyptian* [Mouton Companions to Ancient Egyptian 1], Berlin.

WINAND, J. – GOHY, S.

(2011) "La grammaire du Papyrus Magique Harris", *LingAeg* 19, 175–245.

## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AIPHOS</i>	Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves
<i>ÄuL</i>	Ägypten und Levante
KRI	Kitchen, K. A. (1975–1991), <i>Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical</i> , 8 vols., Oxford.
LEM	Gardiner, A. H. (1937), <i>Late Egyptian Miscellanies</i> [Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, Vol. 7], Brussels.
<i>LingAeg</i>	Lingua Aegyptia
<i>Urk. IV</i>	Sether, K. – Helck, W. (1906–1958), <i>Urkunden der 18. Dynastie</i> , Leipzig – Berlin.