



HAL
open science

Beyond authors and copyists. The role of variation in Ancient Egyptian and New Kingdom literary production

Chloé Ragazzoli

► **To cite this version:**

Chloé Ragazzoli. Beyond authors and copyists. The role of variation in Ancient Egyptian and New Kingdom literary production. T. Gillen, D. Laboury, S. Polis, J. Winand (éd.), (R)eproductive Traditions in Ancient Egypt, *Ægyptiaca Leodiensia* (10), Presses universitaires de Liège, p. 95-126, 2017. hal-03941257

HAL Id: hal-03941257

<https://hal.science/hal-03941257>

Submitted on 3 Feb 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Collection *Ægyptiaca Leodiensia* 10

(Re)productive Traditions in Ancient Egypt

Proceedings of the conference held at the University of Liège,
6th-8th February 2013

Todd GILLEN (ed.)

Presses Universitaires de Liège

2017

Beyond authors and copyists

The role of variation in Ancient Egyptian and New Kingdom literary production*

Chloé C.D. RAGAZZOLI

Université Paris-Sorbonne, CNRS UMR 8167 composante 'Mondes Pharaoniques'

I. INTRODUCTION

When it comes to literature, tradition is often expressed in terms of a binary system comprised of those who are exclusively authors or exclusively copyists, or, to put it in the terms of this volume, those who practice either dynamic productivity or static re-productivity. In the world of Egyptologists this binary vision posits unfathomable writers *versus* a multitude of sloppy school pupils.

This paper is about the material and human processes of textual transmission in the New Kingdom, from a vantage point as close as possible to that of the writing hand. I develop the hypothesis that 'variation,' which straddles the boundary between the two benchmarks 'reproduction' and 'production,' is a central and defining aspect of Egyptian textual practices.

1.1. *Textual transmission in recent scholarship*

Over the last thirty years in classics and medieval studies, textual transmission has been the focus of discussion and re-evaluation. Scholars have pointed out the limitations of models that assume the existence of an original text, which could be retrieved from the faulty copies that have been transmitted to us. Proceeding further, 'new philologists' have drawn on the cultural specificities of scribal cultures where all texts are the work of individual copyists and readers.¹ In a deliberately polemical pamphlet aimed at challenging the dominating preconceptions of what a text is, B. Cerquiglini praised 'variance' as defining medieval textual transmission. This variance was to be seen neither as a defect nor the reflection of scribal incompetence but as a functional aspect of textual practices, and of the attitude of scribes towards the texts they read and copied. "Medieval writing does not produce variants; it is variance," according to Cerquiglini.² Away from the oral word of Occitan

* I owe grateful thanks to Fredrik Hagen for reading through this article and coming up with many corrections and suggestions. I also thank Jean Winand for thought-provoking comments. Any mistakes it may still contain remain my responsibility alone.

1. Cerquiglini 1989; Canfora 2002.

2. Cerquiglini 1999: 77-78.

troubadours, the classical philologist L. Canfora underlines how often in Athens and in Rome authors would change their texts: for each ‘edition,’ even each new ‘copy.’ In some cases, the notion of authorship itself is very fuzzy: it has been proven for example that several of the speeches attributed to Demosthenes had actually been written in a workshop context and were probably the result of group practice.³ Similar statements can be found in biblical or Assyriological studies.⁴ Before the invention of printing, “only on very rare occasions are copies of a parent text identical to the parent text itself, or to each other.”⁵ The polemic has now been toned down and material philology is an accepted tool. This can be used to write the cultural history and the anthropology of the literary practices surrounding manuscripts, while textual criticism is still valid and useful for understanding variants between manuscripts.

Material philology is indeed focused on the practical and historical conditions of textual production. It draws a very thin line between authors and copyists in scribal worlds. While textual criticism can explain the differences between texts that were intended to be transmitted identically,⁶ it shows its limitations when the source of textual information is plural, which leads scribes into the practices of collation (which can result in contamination).⁷

This is true of Ancient Egypt too. If textual criticism can be used to compare manuscripts and in some cases to reconstruct stemmas,⁸ concurrent versions of literary texts are often attested, as well as their scribal emendation, edition and collation, which make the stemmatic approach unusable.⁹ Egyptian scribes themselves could point out and add variations with the mention *ky dd*, “variant.” In the Middle Kingdom the variant and coexisting manuscripts of works such as *Ptahhotep* or *The Eloquent Peasant* show how different versions of the same text could exist ‘side by side.’¹⁰ During the active life of texts (when their language is active and not fossilised as classic), the productive aspect of their transmission has often been noted by scholars.¹¹ Manuscripts, whether papyri or ostraca, bear the only material evidence of the practices that produced them. In this paper I examine the question of the (re)production of literary texts through their transmission. My point is not to discuss stemmatic approaches to textual transmission, which remain a useful set of tools in many instances, but to adopt an approach which is less centred on the text as a virtual entity and more focussed on practices and manuscripts as material artefacts. I take as a point of departure the New Kingdom *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, which can be considered as a model and a *vade mecum* of the textual production of this time. My purpose is to show that the distinction of production *versus* reproduction can be subsumed into the broader category of variation, to be understood as the paradigm of creation and transmission of texts in Ancient Egypt. The main character of this play is neither the author nor the copyist; it is the scribe. I would like to offer a scribal understanding of Egyptian literature with a focus on actual

3. Canfora 2012: 22–23.

4. E.g. Martin 2010; Delnero 2012.

5. Martin 2010: 3.

6. E.g. Maas 1958.

7. *Ibid.*, 3.

8. For a presentation of the use of textual criticism tools in Egyptology, see e.g. Quack 1996: 13–18 and Fischer-Elfert 1996. Example of a stemmatic reconstitution of a text (*Sinuhe*): Kahl 1998. See also Peust 2012.

9. On collation, see for example the scribal glosses *ky dm^c* (“another book”) to introduce variants in P. Jumilhac or in P. Leyde I 384 (Spiegelberg 1917: 160; Tait 1976: 35, n. 15).

10. Parkinson 2001: 52–53 and most importantly Hagen 2012: 26–28; 216–239.

11. *Ibid.*, 51.

practices and on scribal craft in the New Kingdom, a period when scribes came to the foreground of representations.

1.2. *The Late Egyptian Miscellanies as a case study*

The Ramesside period witnessed a flourishing of manuscripts known as the *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*. They were first published in hieroglyphic transcription by A.H. Gardiner in the 1930s,¹² with the addition of P. BM EA 10 085 recently edited by C. Leitz.¹³ These hieratic manuscripts constitute in quantity (and as we will see in quality too) a massive corpus in the literary landscape of the New Kingdom. Twenty-one papyri are known to this day, most of them several meters long.¹⁴ These manuscripts were put together by individual and eminent scribes. They constitute collections of literary and administrative texts, and contain models and references for scribal writing. From that point of view, they mirror the textual production of their time.¹⁵

The short texts are often set in an epistolary frame as if they were the subject matter of letters exchanged between scribes, or as if they were freestanding paragraphs from such letters. Some of these texts are what could be called *natural letters*, copied or archived real letters; they usually contain instructions on various administrative and private matters. Some of them even include in their copy in the miscellanies punctuation, a literary feature showing that even these texts have been recategorised.¹⁶ The other texts, which constitute the lion's share of the corpus, are literary pieces that may appear in several miscellanies. Both kinds of texts may contain lexical lists reminiscent of the encyclopaedic collections of words thematically organised and known as *onomastica*. The following table gives the tables of contents for two manuscripts of Late Egyptian miscellanies:

P. Anastasi III	P. Sallier I
1. Epithets and praise of the master	1. Soldier's plight
2. Praise of Per-Ramses	2. Letter: instructions for deliveries
3. Instructions to the scribe	3. Letter: report on agricultural matters
4. Wishes addressed to the master	4. Instructions to the scribe
5. Hymn to Thoth	5. Peasant's plight
6. Soldier's plight	6. Superiority of the profession of scribe
7. Army officers' plight	7. Satire of the dissipated scribe
8. Administrative letter: order to demand taxes	8. Prayer to Thoth
9. Praise of Merenptah and of his Delta Residence	9. Praise of Merenptah

12. Gardiner 1935; 1937. See also Caminos 1954.

13. Leitz 1999: 85–92, pl. 47–51.

14. P. Anastasi II (BM EA 10243); P. Anastasi III et IIIA (BM EA 10246); P. Anastasi IV (BM EA 10249); P. Anastasi V (BM EA 10244); P. Anastasi VI (BM EA 10245); P. Sallier I (BM EA 10185); P. Sallier IV (BM EA 10184); P. Chester Beatty IV (BM EA 10684); P. Chester Beatty V (BM EA 10685); P. Chester Beatty XVIII (BM EA 10698); P. Lansing (BM EA 9994); P. BM EA 10085; P. Koller (Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung inv nr. 3043); P. Leiden I 348 (Rijksmuseum van Oudheden); P. Rainer 53 (Vienna, Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek); P. Bologna 1094 (Museo Civico Archeologico, B3162); P. Turin A (Museo Egizio CGT 1882); P. Turin B (Museo Egizio CGT 1881); P. Turin C (Museo Egizio CGT 1917/177+2093/167); P. Turin D (CGT 2087/199). Bibliography and general presentation in Hagen 2006.

15. A complete study of the manuscripts, the genre and the scribal world it reflected on was the subject of my doctoral dissertation, whose publication is in preparation (Ragazzoli 2011a). Overview of New Kingdom literature in Moers 2010.

16. Cf. Tacke, 2001. I thank J. Winand for drawing my attention to this feature.

<u>Verso: jottings</u>	10. Letter: complaint about fields
1. Entry of a book of account	11. Satire of the dissipated scribe
2. Letter on work done in the royal workshops	
3. Extract from border logbook	
4. List of persons and amounts	

Fig. 1. Table of contents of the miscellanies recorded on P. Anastasi III, r^o and P. Sallier I, 3,4–9,11.

These literary pieces belong to various genres and subgenres, most of which are specific to the miscellanies. They are listed below. The figures are only indicative since the generic nature of some of the texts can be multiple (see *infra*):

<i>Superiority of scribedom</i> (Satires of various trades, soldier's and peasant's plights)	16 compositions
<i>Instructions to scribe</i>	14 compositions
<i>Praises of scribe</i>	8 compositions
<i>Satire of the dissipated scribe</i>	10 compositions
<i>Prayers and divine praises</i>	12 compositions
<i>Royal eulogies</i>	6 compositions
<i>Royal protocols</i>	7 compositions
<i>Praises of the cities</i>	7 compositions
<i>Lexical lists</i>	11 compositions
<i>Natural letters</i>	45 compositions

Fig. 2. Generic typology of the texts collected in the miscellanies.

Some sub-genres can be put together in the same categories: Praises of scribes, Satires of the dissipated scribes, Instructions to scribes, the superiority of scribedom. All belong to the same group of texts on the superiority of the scribal profession, a nebulous Late Egyptian heir to the Middle Kingdom *Satire of the Trades*. Royal praises, protocols and praises of the city of Per-Ramses all belong to the genre of royal eulogies. Together, texts on the superiority of scribes, royal eulogies, divine prayers, lexical lists and model letters cover a substantial part of the textual production of the time, thematically focussed on scribes as cultural figures. The figure of the scribe as well as his activities are central themes in the miscellanies, which I consider as a space for scribes rather than mere school exercises. I define miscellanies as *scribal literature*, made by scribes, for scribes, and about scribes. The scribes of the miscellanies are indeed very skilled and masters of their art, which a mere look at the fine quality of the manuscripts can confirm. The latter were obviously parts of private libraries as the examples of Inena and Qenherkhepeshef show, both being the owners of several manuscripts of miscellanies.¹⁷ Qenherkhepeshef passed his library to his heirs but other manuscripts of miscellanies

17. Quirke 1996: 391; *idem* 2004: 17–18; Ragazzoli 2012: 223; Hagen forthcoming.

seem to have been retrieved from tombs. For some individuals to have included manuscripts of miscellanies in their funerary equipment shows that they associated this category of texts with values of identity and self-presentation.¹⁸

Although the literary texts can reappear from one collection of miscellanies to another, each collection is still a unique composition. From this point of view, the miscellanies constitute literary manuscripts not subject to the usual conditions of literary transmission, unlike for example the *Satirical letter* of P. Anastasi I, which is transmitted as an established text. Yet, the corpus shows a certain coherence. The miscellanies constitute both a genre and a practice, and this composite aspect is one of their defining features. The miscellanies constitute therefore a remarkable example of productive transmission.

These texts played a central role in the scribal and literary landscape of the New Kingdom. They therefore represent a good case study for examining the conditions of production and transmission. To the objection that their unique position makes them an exception rather than a representative example, it is possible on the contrary to see them as archetypal of the literary production, at least of their time. They indeed contain ‘exemplifications’ of most of the practised genres of the period.

II. CLOSED AND OPEN TRANSMISSION¹⁹

In this section I consider how texts circulate and are transmitted within the corpus of miscellanies through the comparison of similar compositions reappearing within different collections of miscellanies. The dissimilarities between these texts can vary both in importance and in degree, from differences between single forms and words to the inclusion, exclusion or displacement of entire sections. The latter case leads me to distinguish between closed texts, which reappear as duplicates, with the same structure, content and length from one collection to another, versus open texts, which are very frequent in the corpus. My purpose is to track any evidence of the attitudes of scribes towards the texts that they have left on papyrus, whether they were engaged in copying, composing or varying their texts. Thus I move from the ‘paradigm of errors’ to a ‘paradigm of variants’ as opening up an avenue to “the psychological and creative aspect of the act of copying.”²⁰

2.1. *Mechanical mistakes and conceptual variants*

Next to the mistakes that hinder the meaningfulness of the text and therefore its understanding, other readings have much to tell us, whatever they may say about the stemmatic position of the text they appear in. They show that the scribe understood and was involved in what he was writing down, that the copying/composition was at the same time an appraisal of a certain text and its appropriation. Indeed when a text is rendered from memory, meaningful addition and subtraction, displacement and lexical and grammatical variants are very likely to happen. As in Sumerian studies, methods for copying and compiling texts are rarely discussed in the study of Ancient Egypt.²¹ Most studies on textual transmission have taken into consideration only mechanical mistakes, categorising them as

18. On tomb material as “reflecting individual life experiences and personal choices rather than standard responses to death and the afterlife,” see Meskell 1999: 179; Pinch 2003; Seidlmayer 2001. Specifically on manuscripts in the funerary equipment, see Parkinson 2007: 128; Ragazzoli 2011a: 180–182.

19. For these categories, see Quack 1996: 18–22.

20. McGillivray 1990: 4.

21. Parkinson 2001: 50–51.

errors that are aural, visual or due to false memory.²² One can think for example of G. Burkard's analysis of variants and/or errors in mostly New Kingdom manuscripts (1977: 322f.) which indicates that most non redactional variants were due to copying from an original manuscript or copying from memory, not dictation.²³ As pointed out by the Assyriologist P. Delnero, "three primary methods of compiling a copy [...] were possible in antiquity—copying directly from another textual exemplar, copying from dictation, and copying from memory."²⁴ Here I consider mechanical mistakes globally versus conceptual mistakes, the latter being often left aside by philological studies orientated towards textual criticism because of the lack of available data for stemmatic arrangement.

Conceptual variants (mistakes or not) show understanding on the part of the scribe. They also hint at memory process. In a very recent study Delnero indeed drew on the results of research in the cognitive sciences as well as from Medieval and Early Modern literature to show that conceptual variants were mainly due to memory processes. He drew the following conclusions about the importance of memorisation in the transmission of Sumerian literary texts:

The errors that are likely to occur when copying from memory differ significantly from other types of copying mistakes. Reproducing a text entirely on the basis of how well it is stored in the mind, without being able to see or hear the text while copying, typically leads to the occurrence of errors that are causally linked to this process. Even when a text has been memorized well, it can rarely be reproduced perfectly, as certain details, if not entire words and phrases, will inevitably be forgotten or inaccurately recalled. Although a systematic study of the types of mistakes that can be expected to result from memory errors has not been undertaken for Sumerian texts, memory and the process by which the mind remembers and forgets has been investigated extensively for over a century by cognitive psychologists. The findings of these studies provide a valuable framework for identifying memory errors in the duplicates of Sumerian literary compositions.²⁵

One should therefore look at the evidence, *i.e.* the dissimilarities between duplicates within the miscellanies, to learn what the attitudes of the scribes to their texts were. Following Delnero I distinguish between two types: on the one hand there are mechanical mistakes characteristic of direct copying such as missing or extra words (including haplography, dittography and parablesis, see below), lexical and grammatical confusions. On the other hand there are conceptual variants, which are due to the use of memory and a more active process of copying, such as meaningful lexical and grammatical variants, additions and omissions. Indeed these variants show that the scribe remembered the structure and the general meaning of a text—the gist of it²⁶—but also that elements could be placed in different places, exchanged or augmented with an element from a different source or replaced with an element with which it is associated.²⁷ This is what textual criticism fears most and calls 'contamination',²⁸ which is actually so characteristic of the Late Egyptian miscellanies and of a horizontal pattern of transmission.

22. On this categorisation, see Burkard 1977: 3; van de Walle 1948: 23–25.

23. Burkard 1977: 3. See also Schenkel 1978.

24. Delnero 2012: 191; Burkard 1977: 2.

25. Delnero 2012: 192.

26. *Ibid.*, 194.

27. Van de Walle in his seminal work on literary transmission already underlined the importance of memory to explain brevity of passages, oral mistakes, substitutions and omissions (van de Walle 1948: 24).

28. Maas 1953.

2.1.1. Mechanical errors

Besides the familiar haplography (a missing word or expression which occurs near a similar one), dittography (writing the same word or expression twice, usually when changing lines or a page on Egyptian manuscripts) and the not-so-rare parablesis (the unintentional omission of everything between one occurrence of a word and the next occurrence of the same word), mechanical errors include omission, addition and confusion that alter or hinder the meaningfulness of a clause. I do not analyse here whether they can be put down to visual or oral devices.

Lexical errors cover omissions of nouns, necessary prepositions (*versus* the common absence of first present *hr* or third future *r*),²⁹ confusions between words phonetically close, or additions, which make the sentence meaningless.

P. Anast. III, 5, 9	<i>mj n.k <r> p3y.f šm r H3r</i>	“Come then, <to> his mission to Khatti”	missing preposition
P. Anast. IV, 9,7–8	<i>mj n.k <r> p3y.f šm r H3r</i>	“Come then, <to> his mission to Khatti”	missing preposition
P. CB V, 7,4–5	<i>jw³⁰ n.k r p3y tsy H3r</i>	“Go then to this Khatti expedition”	
P. Anast. IV, 8,9	<i>jw.f hr s3wt njwt.k</i>	“(an estate) which is on the soil of your town”	
P. Lansing, 11,3	<i>jw.f <hr> s3t {nb.k} <njwt.k></i>	“Which is <on> the soil of your {master} <town>”	missing preposition + lexical confusion
P. Anast. IV, 9,1	<i>n3y.k b3k mh(.w)</i>	“Your breeding cows are pregnant”	
P. Lansing, 11,7	<i>n3y.k b3k <mh.w></i>	“Your breeding cows <are pregnant>”	missing verb
P. Anast. V, 15,7	<i>js bw sh3.k q3j n(y) ḥwtyw</i>	“Don’t you remember the look of peasants?”	
P. Sallier I, 6,2	<i>jst bw sh3~n.k p3 {qnjw} <qjw> ḥwtyw</i>	“Don’t you remember the {embrace} <look> of peasants?”	lexical confusion
P. Anast. V, 15,4–5	<i>jw.k mn.tw hft.k hr.w {hr.w}</i>	“You will be standing, your enemy fallen {fallen}”	dittography
P. Anast. IV, 3,11	<i>jw.k mn(.tw) hft(.k) hr.w</i>	“You will be standing, the enemy fallen”	

Fig. 3. Examples of lexical errors in the miscellanies.

Grammatical errors include variants that hinder the meaning of a sentence such as the use of the wrong pronoun, wrong construction, etc.:

P. Anast. IV, 8,10	<i>n3y{k} <.f> jh3yt m-hnw</i>	“<His> cows are inside”	pronominal confusion
P. Lansing, 11,4	<i>n3y.f jh3yt m-hnw.f</i>	“His cows are inside”	
P. Anast. IV, 9,8–9	<i>jw p3y.f ḥw p3y.f mw hr rmn.f</i>	“With his bread and his water on his shoulder”	
O. DeM 1030, 6	<i>jw p3y.f ḥw {jw} p3y.f hr rmn.f</i>	“With his bread and his water on his shoulder”	superfluous circumstantial <i>jw</i> ³¹

29. Winand 1995.

30. This is a strange variant, perhaps not correct grammatically since *jw* is not attested as an imperative in Late Egyptian.

31. According to J. Winand, the repetition of *jw* is indeed not necessary from a grammatical point of view, but this sometimes occurs when there are coordinated subjects.

P. Anast. V, 7,7	{jw}<bw> ḥw n.f p3 ḥꜣpy	“{While} the flood does <not> hit for him”	confusion circumstantial/negation
P. CB V, 6,10–11	bw ḥw n.f p3 ḥꜣpy	“The flood does not hit for him”	

Fig. 4. Examples of grammatical errors.

2.1.2. Conceptual variants

In the category of conceptual variations, grammatical variants include changes of tense, mood, quantity and the structure of clauses, as in the examples below. Pronouns can be used instead of nouns and *vice versa*. Changes include variation in the nature of determinants of nouns. Genitive varies from direct to indirect constructions:

P. Anast. III, 5,7	ddḥ.f m tpg	“So as to be locked up in a barrack”	non-initial prospective
P. Anast. IV, 9,5	r ddḥ m tpgp	“To be locked up in a barrack”	infinitive final clause
P. CB IV v° 5,7	ddḥ.w m n3 tpgw	“Being locked up in the barracks”	circumstantial stative
P. Anast. III, 6,1	sw mr(.w) t3 sw t3 sdr	“He is sick, prostration has seized him”	sequential clause
P. Anast. IV, 9,11–12	jw.f mr(.w) t3y sw t3 sdr	“While he is sick and prostration has seized him”	circumstantial clause
P. Anast. III, 5,6–7	jn.tw.f m nḥn n(y) nbjw	“ He is taken away as a child of a cubit”	pronoun
P. Anast. IV, 9,5	jn.tw.f jw.f m nḥn	“ He is taken away when he is a child”	pronoun
P. CB IV, v° 5,7	jn.tw wꜣw m nḥny n(y) nbj	“ The soldier is taken away as a child of a cubit”	noun
P. Anast. III, 5,11–12	spr.f r p3 ḥrwy	“When he reaches the battle”	definite article
P. Anast. IV, 9,10	spr.f r ḥrwy	“When he reaches a battle”	no definite article
P. Anast. III, 5,10	mj 3tpy n(y) ʕ3	“like the load of a donkey”	indirect genitive
P. Anast. IV, 9,9	mj 3tpy n(y) ʕ3t	“like the load of a donkey”	indirect genitive
P. CB V, 7,6	mj 3tpw ʕ3	“like the load of a donkey”	direct genitive
O. DeM 1030, 6	mj 3tpw n(y) ʕ3	“like the load of a donkey”	indirect genitive

Fig. 5. Examples of grammatical variants.

Lexical variations often refer to the substitution of words or expressions by a homonym or an equivalent: the scribe respects the meaning of a sentence but renders it with different words. The changes can encompass a whole sentence. The substitutions sometimes seem to follow phonetic associations while other examples show the substitution of a generic synonym by a more specific one:

P. Anast. III, 5,7–8	šḥt n(y) pḥ3 ḥr jnḥwy.f	“A stroke that rips open his eyebrows”	pḥ3, “to rip open”
P. Anast. IV, 9,6	šḥt n(y) prš dd jnḥwy.f	“A breaking open stroke is placed (on) his eyebrows”	prš, “to break open” ³²
P. Anast. III, 5,12–6,1	jw.f mj ḥt wnmw sw t3 tkk	“He is like worm-eaten wood”	kk, “worms” (generic)
P. Anast. IV, 9,1	jw.f mj ḥt {m} wnmw sw t3 jnr	“He is like <i>iner</i> -worm-eaten wood”	jnr, “worms” (specific?)

Fig. 6. Examples of lexical variants.

32. *prš* is a loan word from Semitic (Hoch 1994, no. 153, 120–121), which is common in the miscellanies since scribes display there their linguistic competence.

Non-essential words, usually corresponding to a qualification, can be omitted. The classification of a variant as an ‘omission’ or ‘addition’ is slightly arbitrary since an omission in one text can be an addition in another.

P. Anast. III, 5,6–7	<i>jn.tw.fm nhn n(y) nbjw</i>	“He is taken away as a child of a cubit”	genitive
P. Anast. IV, 9,5	<i>jn.tw.fjw.fm nhn</i>	“He is taken away when he is a child”	omission
P. CB IV, v° 5,7	<i>jn.tw w^cw m nhny n(y) nbj</i>	“The soldier is taken away as a child of a cubit”	genitive
P. Anast. II, 8,5	<i>wpt sš ntf hrp</i>	“Except the scribe, who is a controller”	omission
P. Anast. V, 17,1–2	<i>wpt sš ntf hrp n(y) bw-nb</i>	“Except the scribe, who is a controller for everyone (else)”	
P. Anast. I, 6,8	<i>wpt sš ntf hrp b³kw n(y) bw-nb</i>	“Except the scribe, who is the controller of the works of everyone (else)”	addition

Fig. 7. Examples of additions and omissions.

Variations can be global and cover whole sentences, conveying the same meaning but through different constructions and choices of words. It seems that the scribe only kept the ‘gist’ of the section of the text:

P. Anast. III, 5,6	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p³ šhrw n(y) w^cw</i>	“Come and I shall tell you the condition of the soldier”
P. Anast. IV, 9,4–5	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p³ šhrw w^cw</i>	“Come and I shall tell you the condition of the soldier”
P. CB IV, v° 5,6–7	<i>d.j rh.k šsrw w^cw m k³t nbt jr(r).f</i>	“I want you to know the lot of the soldier in all the works he does”
P. CB, 6,13	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p³ šhrw n(y) w^cw</i>	“Come and I shall tell you the condition of the soldier”
P. Anast. III, 5,8	<i>d³d³.f ph³(.w) m wbn</i>	“His head is ripped open with a wound”
P. Anast. IV, 9,6–7	<i>d³d³.f ph³(.w) m wbn</i>	“His head is ripped open with a wound”
P. CB IV, v° 5,9	<i>dw³.f r sšp qnqn r ph³.f m wbn</i>	“He gets up (only) to get blows until he is ripped open with a wound”

Fig. 8. Compound variants.

Below I examine the composition of the collections of miscellanies from this point of view. Two types of texts must be distinguished: the lesser group of fixed compositions that reappear in their entirety in more than one manuscript and the more abundant category of compositions that circulate through the corpus but in expanded or diminished forms.

2.2. Closed texts in the Late Egyptian miscellanies (duplicates)

Some of the texts that circulate in the corpus of miscellanies seem to be transmitted in a fixed form. We do not have enough copies of the same text at our disposal to reconstruct a stemmatic arrangement, but we can compare these texts and see how they vary from the point of view of conceptual variants and mechanical mistakes. The corpus of duplicates consists of the following:

1.	P. Bologna 1094, 1,7–2,7 = P. Anastasi II, 6,5–7	<i>Prayer to Amun-Ra</i>
2.	P. Anastasi II, 1,1–5 = P. Anastasi IV, 6,1–10	<i>Praise of Per-Ramses</i>
3.	P. Anastasi II, 5,6–6,4 = P. Anastasi IV, 5,6–12	<i>Praise of Pharaoh</i>
4.	P. Anastasi III, 3,9–4,4 = P. Anastasi V, 8,1–9,1	<i>Instructions to a scribe</i>
5.	P. Anastasi IIIA = P. Anastasi IV, 15,11–16,7	<i>Lexical list</i>
6.	P. Anastasi IV, 2,4–3,2 = P. Koller, 2,2–3,3	<i>Dissipated scribe</i>
7.	P. Anastasi IV, 8,7–9,4 = P. Lansing, 10,10–11,7	<i>Praise of the master</i>
8.	P. Anastasi V, 7,5–8,1 = P. Chester Beatty V, 6,7–11	<i>Soldier’s plight</i>

9.	P. Anastasi IV, 11,8–12,5 = P. Sallier I, 9,9–11	<i>Dissipated scribe</i>
10.	P. Koller 3,3–5,4 = P. Turin C, 2,3–v° 2,4 = P. Turin D, 1,2–2,5	<i>Tributes</i>
11.	P. Anastasi V, 15,6–17,3 = P. Sallier I, 5,11–6,9	<i>Peasant's plight</i>
12.	P. Anastasi IV, 4,8–11 = P. Chester Beatty V, 8,14–v° 1,5	<i>Report on a successful mission</i>
13.	P. Anastasi V, 10,3–11,1 = P. Turin C, 1,1–2,2 = P. Sallier I, 3,6–3	<i>Soldier's plight</i>
14.	P. Koller, 5,5–8 = P. Anastasi IV, 13,8–11	<i>Dissipated scribe</i>

Fig. 9. Duplicates in the miscellanies.

Two of these compositions are integrated wholly into texts that are actually longer: this is the case for nos. 5 and 14. In the former case, P. Anastasi IIIA is a sheet of papyrus that was found inside P. Anastasi III when it was unrolled;³³ it contains a list of goods, which reappears identically on P. Anastasi IV (15,11–16,7), a much longer text that puts together several such lists (13,8–17,9). The case of text n° 14 is similar: P. Koller, 5,5–8 corresponds to the beginning of a longer collection of lists. Interestingly, it finishes with the end of the scroll and the (admittedly struck out) word *m-mjtt*, meaning “similarly” (P. Koller, 5,8), as if acknowledging a longer version.

Here I consider the variants and their qualitative nature in duplicate texts of the miscellanies, specifically with a view to establishing whether they are conceptual and make sense or are mechanical and should be considered as mistakes. The latter indicates a lack of understanding or attention from the scribe. When dating is known and precise enough, the more ancient version is taken into account first. It must be acknowledged that this is partly arbitrary: the versions must be considered simultaneously and without inferring any primacy of one over the other (or any stemmatic arrangement). As a result, the categorisation of meaningful variants can be slightly arbitrary: an omission in text B can be an addition from the point of view of text A. Nevertheless they are both indicative of the level of variation between several versions of the same composition. In the case of mechanical mistakes, the situation is easier since it is possible to set a faulty version against a correct one. We only need to keep in mind that the correct version is not necessarily a model corrupted by the second version: it could equally be a correction of a faulty version (*emendatio*). In any case, if within the two general categories of conceptual and mechanical variants there is more to say about the nature of the individual mistakes and variants, the overall categorisation remains sound and has much to tell us.

Mechanical errors	68	31 %
additions	11 ³⁴	
omissions	26	
grammatical mistakes	8	
lexical confusions	9	
Conceptual variants	151	69 %
additions	9	
omissions	25	
lexical variants	26	
grammatical variants	52	

Fig. 10. Balance of mechanical errors and conceptual variants in duplicate texts in the miscellanies.

33. Gardiner 1937: xiv.

34. Including two dittographies.

Most mistakes and variants bear on single words (change of pronouns, insertion of circumstantial *iw*, change of verbal forms, word substitutions, etc.), so the texts are very similar. It is very rare indeed to find dissimilarities spanning a whole clause.³⁵

2.3. Open texts

In the previous section, I considered texts that were identical and which constitute whole compositions within the miscellanies. Yet most transmitted texts in the miscellanies are not reproduced verbatim but reappear with the same formulae and verse lines that are then rearranged or expanded with new formulae. This situation says something important about how New Kingdom scribes put together manuscripts of miscellanies; this process was not primarily about copying and putting together short texts. We should also note that only literary compositions circulate in this way between the different manuscripts, not copies of letters. The latter were probably borrowed from the immediate professional environment of the copying scribe. A prosopographical study of the miscellanies, manuscript by manuscript, shows that each individual manuscript refers to coherent social worlds, such as the Treasury (*e.g.* P. Anastasi VI) or the military offices of Per-Ramses (P. Bologna 1094) for example.³⁶

1.	P. Anastasi II, 6,7–8,5 = P. Sallier I, 6,9–7,9 = P. CB IV, v° 3,11–4,1 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7,9–11	<i>Superiority of scribedom</i>
2.	P. Anastasi III, 1,11–3,9 = P. Rainer 53 = O. Queen's College 1116	<i>Praise of Per-Ramses</i>
3.	P. Anastasi III, 5,5–6,2 = P. Anastasi IV, 9,4–10 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 5,6–6,1 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7,4–7 (= O. DeM 1030)	<i>Soldier's plight</i>
4.	P. Chester Beatty V, 5,5–9 = (P. Anastasi V, 10,3–11,1 = P. Turin C, 1,1–2,2 = P. Sallier I, 3,6–3,11) (O. Petrie 8; HO 18)	<i>Soldier's plight</i>
5.	P. Bologna 1094, 11,7–9 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 1,3–4	<i>Instructions to the scribe</i>
6.	P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 4,3–6 = P. Lansing, 7,6–8,7 = P. Turin D, 2,6–10	<i>Superiority of scribedom</i>
7.	P. Lansing, 5,7–7,6 = (P. Anastasi V, 15,6–17,3 = P. Sallier I, 5,11–6,9) ³⁷	<i>Peasant's plight</i>
8.	P. Chester Beatty V, 5,5–9 = (P. Anastasi V, 10,3–11,1 = P. Turin C, 1,1–2,2 = P. Sallier I, 3,6–11) ³⁸	<i>Superiority of scribedom and soldier's plight</i>
9.	P. Anastasi IV, 13,8–17,9 = P. Koller, 5,5–8 + P. Anastasi IIIA	<i>Instructions to the scribes and foreign tributes</i>
10.	P. Anastasi V, 14,6–15,5 = P. Anastasi II, v° 4–5 = P. Anastasi IV, 3,11–4,15 (= O. Gardiner 28; O. Petrie 33; O. Petrie 72)	<i>Wishes to high officials</i>

Fig. 11. Texts openly transmitted through the corpus of miscellanies.

This state of affairs possibly indicates the existence of a shared set of resources, elements and units, possibly memorised by the scribes. The function of these elements is precisely that they should be reused and reorganised. The formulae are transmitted flexibly and are open to grammatical variations such as a change of tense or mood, change between singular and plural or lexical variations with the substitution of one word with an equivalent. Most variations make sense and seem to be the result of a

35. P. Anastasi IV, 17,1 has an extra clause compared to P. Sallier I, 6,8.

36. Complete prosopographical study in Ragazzoli 2011a: 139–156 (“Structure sociale et prosopographie des miscellanées.”).

37. P. Anastasi V, 15,6–17,3 and P. Sallier I, 5,11–6,9 are duplicates of each other.

38. Same for P. Anastasi V, 10,3–11,1 = P. Turin C, 1,1–2,2 = P. Sallier I, 3,6–11.

free variation from a scribe working from memory within a set model. Here again this might come as a surprise in the context of the accepted modern contempt for ancient scribes.

Mechanical errors	17	12 %
addition		
dittography		
grammatical mistake		
lexical confusion		
omission		
Conceptual variants	124	88 %
addition		
subtraction		
lexical variant		
grammatical variant		

Fig. 12. Balance of mechanical errors and conceptual variants in open texts in the miscellanies.

The disparity between mechanical errors and conceptual variants is here even greater than in the case of duplicates, showing that the attitude of the scribes towards these two categories of texts is not the same. This makes a lot of sense if we consider that these open texts are precisely the result of much interference and contamination, or to put it in another way, of input by a scribe who understands what he is copying and is freely modifying a model, the rules of which are fully understood by him. Miscellanies seem to be ruled by variability.

2.4. Material evidence of scribal involvement: ink density and reed dipping

Most variants make sense and can be seen as the result of free variations by a scribe working from memory within a set of rules. Besides the degree of variation, whether mechanical or conceptual, the involvement of a scribe in a text can be detected in various aspects of material evidence such as the density of ink and the rhythm of ink dipping. This consists of looking at where the scribe interrupted himself and his writing to refill his pen with ink, by dipping his reed in a water pot and brushing it against the cake of ink on his palette. This approach relies on the following observation: when one concentrates on the formal aspect and the regularity of a text, one pays much less attention to its meaning and can interrupt oneself at any place; on the contrary, when one is involved in the meaning of what one writes, the tendency will be to stop at meaningful places, with the risk of a less regular ink density or some fading of this density. This is a phenomenon well known to forensic handwriting analysis³⁹ and used for other scribal cultures.⁴⁰ In Egyptian manuscripts one finds examples from opposite ends of that spectrum, with Books of the Dead that are mechanically reproduced with regular dipping on the one hand, and administrative letters that are calligraphically irregular on the other. Observing dipping rhythms was first suggested by J. P. Allen,⁴¹ followed by R.B. Parkinson who applied the technique to Middle Kingdom literary manuscripts. In this way, Parkinson was able to distinguish between personal copies and more professional ones, which tend to be copied more mechanically.⁴²

39. Berrichon-Sedeyn 1990.

40. Beit-Arie 1990.

41. Allen 2002: 77.

42. Parkinson 2007: 153.

It has been possible to investigate the whole corpus of miscellanies in this way. I compared the type of dipping between the various manuscripts, noting how often the scribe would re-dip at the beginning of a clause or a nominal group (meaningful dipping) or within a nominal group or even within a word (calligraphic dipping).⁴³

P. Anastasi II	Meaningful	P. BM EA 10 085	Mixed
P. Anastasi III	Meaningful	P. Koller	Mixed
P. Anastasi IIIA	Meaningful	P. Leiden I 348	Calligraphic
P. Anastasi IV	Calligraphic	P. Rainer 53	Meaningful
P. Anastasi V	Calligraphic	P. Bologna 1094	Meaningful
P. Anastasi VI	Meaningful	P. Turin A	Meaningful
P. Sallier I	Calligraphic	P. Turin B	Meaningful
P. Chester Beatty IV	Mixed	P. Turin C	Meaningful
P. Chester Beatty V	Calligraphic	P. Turin D	Meaningful
P. Lansing	Meaningful		

Fig. 13. Type of dipping in the manuscripts of miscellanies.⁴⁴

One can use these results to compare texts in relation to their types of variants. The positions and proportions of conceptual variants *versus* mechanical mistakes can vary across different compositions. For example, the praise of Per-Ramses identically recorded on P. Anastasi II, 1,1–2,5 and P. Anastasi IV, 6,1–10 contains, besides nine conceptual variants, eleven mechanical mistakes (including a dittography), in the P. Anastasi IV version. This is strikingly consistent with the meaningful dipping pattern of the former and the mechanical dipping pattern of the latter.

III. PATTERNS OF (OPEN) TRANSMISSION: EXPANSION AND REWRITING

As a practice, miscellanies rely on an open pattern of transmission: the copying of a collection of miscellanies is largely an exercise in variation, based on active writing. In this section I examine how this variation actually took place and what rules it followed, using, by way of example, a narrative on the soldier's plight. Versions of this soldier's plight are recorded on two Memphite manuscripts, two Theban manuscripts and at least one ostrakon: P. Anastasi III, 5,5–6,2; P. Anastasi IV, 9,4–10; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 5,6–6,1; P. Chester Beatty V, 7,4–7 and O. DeM 1030. The first two papyri, possibly from Saqqara, belonged to the scribe Inena, while the other two were part of Qenherkhepeshef's library (see above). The ostrakon is also from Ramesside Deir el-Medineh.

3.1. *Composition and compilation*

This text can be divided into thematic units that are more or less freely associated and circulate from one text to another. We could perhaps even compare these textual components to the iconographic units that compose the decoration programs of tombs, which are each time uniquely associated within a fairly established frame and set of specifications.

43. For complete results and figures, see Ragazzoli 2011a: 78–89.

44. This examination cannot be conducted on P. Sallier IV, of which the verso is glued on a semi-transparent paper. P. Chester Beatty XVIII, too fragmented, is not included either.

P. Anast. III, 5,5–6,2 Memphis: Merenptah (yr 3) 32 verse-lines	P. Anast. IV, 9,4–10,1 Memphis: Ramses II 28 verse-lines	P. CB IV, v° 5,6–6,2 Deir el-Medineh: 19 dyn. 21 verse-lines	P. CB V, 6,12–7,9 Deir el-Medineh: Merenptah 31 verse-lines
Epistolary frame			
Praise of scribedom	Praise of scribedom	Praise of scribedom	Praise of scribedom
Incipit of soldier's plight	Incipit of soldier's plight	Incipit of soldier's plight	Incipit of soldier's plight
Ages of soldier's life	Ages of soldier's life	Ages of soldier's life	Ages of soldier's life
Beating up	Beating up	Beating up	
			Parade
March	March	March	March
Physical decay	Physical decay	Physical decay	
			Dissipated scribe
	Be a scribe	Be a scribe	

Fig. 14. Textual components common to a variation of soldier's plight common to several manuscripts of miscellanies.

This layout enables us to compare the texts and the variations at work. They all present the incipit and the motif of a march. P. Anastasi III, IV and P. Chester Beatty IV follow a very similar structure while P. Chester Beatty V drops certain of the motifs of the soldier and expands the structure with two extra motifs, the military parade and a motif borrowed from the other sub-genre of the satire of the dissipated scribe.

In that composition, most variants between the parallel versions belong to the conceptual field. Among the few mechanical mistakes, some come under phonetic confusions, which are not necessarily indicative of an oral context but could also be explained by way of inner dictation:

P. Anast. III, 5,8	<i>w3h.tw.fjw.fhw(.w) mj ʕwtj</i>	“He is laid down and beaten like a papyrus”	<i>w3h</i> , “to lay down”
P. Anast. IV, 9,7	<i>w3h.tw.fjw.fhwny mj ʕwtj</i>	“He is laid down and beaten like a papyrus”	<i>idem</i>
P. CB IV, v° 5,11	<i>whʕ.fjw.fhw.w mj ʕwtj</i>	“He fishes and is beaten like a papyrus”	<i>whʕ</i> , “to fish, to fowl”
P. Anast. III, 5,9	<i>p3y.fmsʕ hr n3 tst</i>	“His march in the hills”	<i>msʕ</i> , “march”
P. Anast. IV, 9,8	<i>r p3y.fmhy hr n3 tst</i>	“to his march in the hills”	phonetic confusion <i>mhy</i>
P. CB V, 7,5	<i>p3y.fmsʕ hr n3 tst</i>	“his march in the hills”	<i>msʕ</i>

Fig. 15. Phonetic substitutions.

Another striking aspect is the variations bearing on whole lines between the Theban and Memphite manuscripts:

P. Anast. III, 5,6	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p3 shrw n(y) wʕw</i>	“Come and I shall tell you the condition of the soldier”
P. Anast. IV, 9,4–5	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p3 shrw wʕw</i>	“Come and I shall tell you the condition of the soldier”
P. CB V, 6,13	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p3 shrw n(y) wʕw</i>	“Come and I shall tell you the condition of the soldier”
P. CB IV, v° 5,6–7	<i>d.j rh.k šsrw wʕw m k3t nbt jr.f</i>	“I shall make you know the thoughts of the soldier in all the work he does”
P. Anast. III, 5,8	<i>d3d3.fph3(.w) m wbn</i>	“His head is ripped open with a wound”
P. Anast. IV, 9,6–7	<i>d3d3.fph3(.w) m wbn</i>	“His head is ripped open with a wound”
P. CB IV, v° 5,9	<i>dw3.fr šsp qnqn r ph3.f m wbn</i>	“He gets up only to receive blows, until he rips open with a wound”
P. Anast. III, 5,10	<i>p3y.fʕqw p3y.fmw hr rmn.f</i>	“His bread and his water are on his shoulder”
P. Anast. IV, 9,8–9	<i>jw p3y.fʕqw p3y.fmw hr rmn.f</i>	“With his bread and his water on his shoulder”
P. CB V, 7,5–6	<i>p3y.fʕqw p3y.fmw hr rmn.f</i>	“His bread and his water are on his shoulder”
P. CB IV, v° 6,1	<i>j.d.tw n.fʕqw m b3 mh3t</i>	“It is measured with a scale that bread is given to him”

Fig. 16. Macro-variants in the sample text.

Yet the general structure and order of the motifs are respected, which is mostly the case in the miscellanies. It seems that the scribe freely elaborated or condensed his text but still followed a canonical outline, fairly flexible since the scribe can weave together motifs and units belonging to different sub-genres (here a praise of the scribal profession and the soldier's plight).

This text, like many others in the miscellanies, is attested by a version on an ostrakon, on which the theme of a military unit on a forced march is to be found, following lines of a praise of scribedom. A study of miscellanies-type texts on ostraca is still to be conducted. The term 'miscellanies' is specific to longer manuscripts since it refers *par définition* to an assortment of texts, likely to be found mainly on papyri. Yet generically similar (and shorter) texts can be found on ostraca, whether duplicates exist in the known collections of miscellanies or not. Whilst widely open to variation, textual arrangements on ostraca mirror those on papyri, as if some maxims or themes were canonically associated. This is the case of O. Gardiner 28,⁴⁵ which carries parallels to two consecutive texts of P. Anastasi V, no. 5 (Prayer to Amun) and no. 6 (Wishes to a high official). A lost ostrakon, mentioned by Gardiner⁴⁶ and identified recently by F. Hagen in the collections of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford associates the five texts recorded on P. Chester Beatty V, r^o 8,14–v^o 2,6. As on P. Chester Beatty V, the texts are separated by the epistolary mention *hn^c dd*.⁴⁷

Miscellanies testify to the practice of excerpting, which is central to the scribal culture of the New Kingdom, as the thousands of literary excerpts copied on ostraca attest. This aspect could also be extended to Egyptian literature in general, structurally 'episodic,' as C. Eyre has recently emphasised.⁴⁸ A large study of the duplication of miscellanies texts on ostraca can be hoped for and one can wonder whether a functional link exists between copies on ostrakon and larger compositions on papyrus. It also seems—and this is only intuition at this stage—that texts on ostraca are often shorter, as if they only recorded a paradigmatic version of the text that was to be expanded through variations. It is helpful here to consider a few ostraca which record parallels to a popular composition of the miscellanies, a variation on the soldier's plight, found within the collection of miscellanies of P. Lansing:

Soldier's plight (P. Lansing 8, 7–10,10)	8,8 = O. Cairo CG 25 771 ⁴⁹ 8,8–9 = O. Nash 13 = EA65 945 ^{*50} 8,8–9,1 = O. DeM 1044 ⁵¹ 8,8–9,2 = O. DeM 1601 r ^{o52} 9,3–8 = O. Florence 2619 ⁵³ 9,7–10 = O. DeM 1664 ⁵⁴ 10,7–9 = O. Dem 1597 ⁵⁵
--	---

Fig. 17. Parallels of P. Lansing, 9,7–10, 10 on ostraca.

45. Černý & Gardiner 1953: 3, pl. CXIII.

46. Gardiner 1937: 39.

47. My thanks go to Fredrik Hagen, who is editing this text for publication, for sharing this information.

48. Eyre 2013: 136–137.

49. Černý, *Ostraca hiératiques*, 84, 96*.

50. Černý & Gardiner 1953: 12, pl. XLI–XLIA (1); Demarée 2001: 43, pl. 197.

51. Posener 1938: 12, pl. 24–24a.

52. Posener 1978: 79, pl. 50–50a.

53. Erman 1880: 96–97.

54. Posener 1980: 96, pl. 76–76a.

55. Posener 1978: 78, pl. 47–47a.

In several cases (marked with *) the ostraca show compositions presented as complete, even though they are much shorter than the equivalent text on P. Lansing, as if the scribe of this later papyrus had extended the model. One of these texts on ostraca has the title of miscellanies, followed with a text presented as whole:

<i>ḥ3t-ᶜ m sb3yt šᶜwt°</i>	“Beginning of the teaching of letters
<i>jr~n sš nswt (j)m(y)-r(3) pr Py3y n(y)°</i>	Made by the royal scribe and steward Pyay of
<i>Pr-Rᶜ-ms-sw mr Jmn°</i>	Per-Ramesses Beloved-of-Amun,
<i>p3 k3 ʕ3 n(y) P3-Rᶜ-Ḥr-3ḥty°</i>	The great ka of Pra-Horakhty,
<i>ḥnᶜ dd°</i>	To say:
<i>[mk wj] ḥr mtry.k r swd3 ḥᶜwt.k°</i>	“[Look, I] show you how to make your limbs healthy,
<i>[...] t3y.k gstj m wstn°</i>	[...how] to hold your palette with ease,
<i>rdt [...] mh jb n(y) nswt°</i>	How to gain the trust of the king.’
<i>3bd 1 šmw sw 11 m st tn°</i>	(made on) the 11th day of the first month of shemu in this place.”

(O. Nash 13 = O BM EA 65 945)⁵⁶

This text could indicate that P. Lansing is based on a pre-existing work, by this Pyay, integrated in a new collection of miscellanies. This time the work is Theban, of a larger length, and attributed to the royal scribe Nebmaatrenakht, overseer of the cattle of Amun-Re and addressed to his assistant, the scribe Wenwemdiamun. The titles of the scribe of O. Nash would place this original collection of miscellanies in Lower Egypt. Yet, there exists no other papyrus that indeed attests the existence of a collection of miscellanies that the scribe of P. Lansing would have ‘usurped’ and extended. This parallel on an ostrakon shows first and foremost the process of how miscellanies were composed through archiving and variation: the scribe gathers and weaves together texts.

If this were to be confirmed, it could usefully be compared to the situation of the *Satirical Letter*, about which H.-W. Fischer-Elfert formulated the hypothesis that the archetype was probably shorter than most recorded versions.⁵⁷ While memory transmission usually leads to omission and shortening, this would show the availability of the text for variation and expansion, which might well be one of the principles of scribal writing and (re)production in Ancient Egypt.

3.2. Generic variations, ‘paragenres’ and borrowings

There is a framing structure to the miscellanies: each collection is indeed presented either as an ensemble of letters exchanged between a network of different people, who usually all belong to the same administration, or between a senior scribe and his junior in that administration, or as the successive points of a single (and very long) letter. In the case of our sample text on the soldier’s plight, two versions contain an epistolary introduction:

<i>sš Jmn-m-Jpt° (ḥr) dd n sš P3y-bs°</i>	“Scribe Amenemope says to scribe Paybes:
<i>r-nty: jn.tw n.k sš pn n(y) dd ḥnᶜ dd</i>	This letter was brought to you to say, subject matter:”
(P. Anastasi III, 5,5)	
<i>ḥnᶜ dd</i>	“Subject matter:”
(P. Chester Beatty V, 6,12)	

56. Demarée 2001: 43, pl. 197.

57. Fischer-Elfert 1986: 250–251.

Within these letters or sections of letters, the actual literary text appears as the subject matter but is generically independent and self-contained. Incipits play a very dynamic role in the generic definition and the transmission of literary genres. The importance of incipits in a manuscript culture where texts are written continuously, without page layout or title page, cannot be ignored. The compositions of the miscellanies belong to a range of subgenres such as ‘the instructions to a young scribe,’ ‘the satire or rebuke to a dissipated scribe,’ ‘praise of the scribal master,’ and ‘new satires of the trades’ including ‘soldier’s plights’ and ‘peasant’s plights.’ Each text is an autonomous composition, a variation on the chosen theme, which follows an accepted set of rules. This mode of writing appears in the usage made of *incipits*, which in the absence of a title announces which category of text is coming and sets the rules which are to be followed by the writer as well as the reader. That each sub-genre has its own incipit is shown by the example below:

Soldier’s plight:	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p3 shr n(y) w^cw</i> , “Come and I shall tell you about the condition of the soldier”
Instructions:	<i>jh d.k hr.k r jrt ss</i> , “Please do turn your attention to becoming a scribe”
Dissipated scribe:	<i>dd.tw n.j h3^c.k ssw</i> , “I am told you have abandoned writings”

Fig. 18. Generic incipits in the miscellanies.

These incipits are open to variation; it even seems as if they kick off the variations. Below are the beginnings of the versions of our sample texts to which other examples could be added:⁵⁸

P. Anast. III, 5,5–6	P. Anast. IV, 9,4–5	P. CB IV, v ^o 5,6–7	P. CB V, 6,12–13
<i>dd(w): jh d.k hr.k r jr sš</i> <i>ndm gm sš</i>	<i>y3 jh p3y.k dd hr.tw</i> <i>ndm w^cw r sš</i>		
<i>mj sdd.j n.k p3 shr w^cw</i> <i>p3 s3 dnn</i>	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p3 shrw w^cw</i> <i>p3 s3 dnn</i>	<i>d.j rh.k šsrw w^cw</i> <i>m k3t nbt jr.f</i>	<i>mj sdd.j n.k p3 shrw n(y) w^cw</i> <i>p3 s3 dnn</i>
“Saying: you will give your attention to becoming a scribe, It is a sweet thing to be found worthy of (being a scribe) Come and I shall tell you (about) the condition of the soldier, Someone with many torments.”	“Hey, what is that saying of yours, they say, That it is a sweeter thing to be a soldier than a scribe? Come and I shall tell you (about) the condition of the soldier, Someone with many torments.”	“I want you to know the ways of the soldier, In all the works he does.”	“Come and I shall tell you the condition of the soldier, Someone with many torments.”

Fig. 19. Incipits of a text of ‘soldier’s plight.’

These subgenres identified by their incipits all belong to a textual web on the superiority of the scribal trade and can be seen as the New Kingdom heir to the *Teaching of Khety*.⁵⁹ Within that ensemble the categories are not watertight, and the interpenetration of sub-genres can occasion more variations. This is the case with the P. Chester Beatty V version, which adds to the soldier’s plight a motif on the

58. In two other variations on the soldier’s plight: P. Anastasi III, 6,3–4: *jm jb.k r sš / hrp.k t3-tmm / mj sdd.j n.k j3wt gb / snny n(y) t-n(y)t-htrj*, “Give your attention to becoming a scribe, / And you will lead mankind. / Come and I shall tell you (about) a miserable office, / The officer of cavalry.” P. Lansing, 9,4–5: *mj <sdd.j> n.k mry w^cw / mj s3 n3y.f hryw*, “Come and <I shall tell> you (about) the suffering of the soldier, / as someone with many superiors.”

59. E.g. Guglielmi 1994.

superiority of scribedom. The version recorded on ostrakon DeM 1030 seems to start with a similar section before moving to the soldier's theme, the transition being provided by the incipit of that sub-genre:

(x+1) [...]f [...]k.jw.tw [...]	“[...] ? [...]
(x+2) [...] gm.tw.k.j3wt nfrt	[It is sweet?] for you to be found worthy of the perfect office,
(x+3) [...]jrt.st sr]	[...]
3 st {n} r.j3wt [nbt]	It is greater than any office,
[...](x+4) m p3 nty hr [...]	[...] the one who [...]
3h st r.j3wt nb[t]	It is more beneficial than any office.
(x+5) jm p3 jr w6w [...]	Consider the action of the soldier! [...]
(O. DeM 1030, x+1–5) ⁶⁰	

This initial section seems to develop a maxim already present in the papyrus versions, *ndm gm sš*, “it is sweet to be found worthy of being a scribe” in P. Anastasi III, 5,6 and the questioning of the statement that *ndm w6w r sš*, “it is sweeter to be a soldier than a scribe” in P. Anastasi IV, 9,4.

The awareness of genres and their rules explains the extreme intertextual richness of the different sub-genres in the miscellanies. Indeed, all the genres active in the New Kingdom make an appearance. A striking example is the so-called Longing for Memphis of P. Anastasi IV, 4,11–5,4, that can be considered as a pastiche on a Theban genre, ‘the nostalgic praises of Thebes.’⁶¹ It takes on the generic features of that genre while playing with other genres fashionable in the Ramesside period, such as love songs and personal piety texts.⁶² Love poetry for example is present in the text through the topos of the absent heart that follows its real desires:

<i>mk.jb.j pr. {t}w m t3wt</i>	“Behold, my heart has left furtively,
<i>šw hn.w (r) bw 6m.f</i>	It hastened to a place it knows
<i>šw hnty{ty} m33.f Hwt-k3-Pth</i>	it sailed south to see Hutkaptah:
<i>bsj jnk ntj</i>	May I be him!”
[...]	[...]
<i>h3ty.j tf.y hr st.f</i>	“My heart has left its place.”
[...]	[...]
<i>h3ty.j nn sw m ht.j</i>	“My heart, it is not in my body.”
(P. Anastasi IV, 4,11; 5,2; 5,3)	

A heart that gives way to the real passions and desires of the individual is one of the favourite themes of love poetry:⁶³

<i>jfd sw jb.j 3s</i>	“My heart, it has fled in haste
[...]	[...]
<i>sw tf.y (m) mkt.f</i>	It escaped from its place.”
(P. Chester Beatty I, v° C, 2,9–10)	

The same text can also be read as a personal piety prayer, the heart having left to visit the temple of Memphis in Hutkaptah. This textual realm is conjured up through topoi such as ‘seeing the god’:

60. Posener 1938: 8, pl. 17–17a.

61. Ragazzoli 2008: 131–134; Verhoeven 2005.

62. Ragazzoli 2008: 135–139.

63. Mathieu 1996: 165.

mj n(.j) Pth r jtt.j r Mn-nfr “Come to me Ptah, to take me to Memphis,
d.k m33(.j) tw m wstn To let me see you freely.”
 (P. Anastasi IV, 5,2–3)

Here the role of incipits should once again be underlined, the formula *mj n.j N šd.k wj* being a common formula in the texts of personal piety,⁶⁴ in literary texts⁶⁵ as well as in votive statues and artefacts.⁶⁶

Textual circulation goes even further. Scribes also borrow and rework, *re-appropriate* monumental discourse, especially in the royal eulogies contained in the miscellanies, what P. Vernus calls “littérature par détournement.”⁶⁷ This acts as a reminder that where we see strict textual boundaries, scribes did not: the same people were probably responsible for composing all these types of texts.

P. Anastasi II⁶⁸ conjures up this realm of monumental discourse and royal actions. The title plays an important role, whether it is the title of the first composition or the title of the whole scroll:

H3t-^c sdd nhtw^o “**Beginning of the narration** of the accomplishments⁶⁹
n(w) p3 nb n(y) Kmt^o Of the lord of Egypt”
 (P. Anastasi II, 1,1)

As L. Coulon and Ph. Collombert showed in an article,⁷⁰ *sdd nhtw* refers to a very specific field of discourse, the royal gest, usually monumental, dated from the reign of Thutmosis III onwards. Among many examples, there is that of the Israel Stele, which is thus introduced:

sdd n3y.f nhtw m t3w nbw “Narrating his accomplishments over all the countries,
r dt ^cm t3 nb dmd To make the entire country understand,
r dt ptr.w nfrw m n3y knw To make (people) see (his) valiant actions.”
 Cairo CG 34025, v^o 1–2,21(= KRI IV, 13,8)

As is the Poem of Qadesh:

h3t-^c m (sdd) p3 nhtw n(y) nswt bjty “Beginning of the (relation of the)⁷¹ the accomplishments of the
Wsr-m3^ct-R^c Stp~n-R^c s3 R^c R^c-ms-sw king of Upper and Lower Egypt Usermaatre Setepenra, the son
Mr-Jmn (d ^cn^h dt) jr(w)~n.f m p3 t3 of Re Ramses Meryamon (given life forever), which he achieved
n(y) Ht3 in Hatti [...].”
 (KRI II, 3,2–5)

The Qadesh example is a particularly good one, since this composition, recorded in hieroglyphs in the temple of Ramses II in Abydos, in Karnak, in Luxor, in the Ramesseum and in Abu Simbel is also

64. Williams 1978: 134.

65. See for example Amun Prayer O. Petrie 39,1 = O. DeM 1594,1, cf. Černý & Gardiner 1957: pl. VIII, n^o 3; Posener 1978: 77, 46, 66, 66, 39; O. Caire CG 25766, 2–3; Černý & Gardiner 1957: pl. XCVIII; Ragazzoli 2008: 39–41; P. Chester Beatty XI, v^o 2–3, cf. Assmann 1999: 418–420; P. Chester Beatty IV, 1 (Assmann 1999: 430).

66. Stele Berlin 20377, cf. Assmann 1999: 372; KRI I, 388,1 (Assmann 1999: 394).

67. Vernus 2010: 88–112.

68. Full commentary in Ragazzoli 2011a. See also Spalinger 2003.

69. On this word, see Collombert & Coulon 2000, 224–225.

70. Collombert & Coulon 2000: 224–225.

71. I owe this suggestion to B. Mathieu (personal e-mail of 9 February 2011).

recorded in hieratic along with other texts in P. Chester Beatty III,⁷² which also belonged to the library of Qenherkhepeshef (see above).

Conforming to this incipit, P. Anastasi II is thematically centred on the royal gest, with royal eulogies followed by prayers and hymns to the royal gods Amun (three texts) and Pra-Horakthy (four texts), after a variation on scribedom. Therefore its links with monumental genres should not be too surprising, and other themes on this scroll seem to have been borrowed from the monumental royal discourse too, like the wedding stele of Ramses II celebrating his marriage with Pudukhepa, daughter of Hattusili III:⁷³

<i>h3b p3 wr 3 n(y) Ht3°</i>	“The great chief of Hatti wrote
<i>n p3 wr n(y) Kdy°</i>	To the chief of Cilicia:
[...]	[...]
<i>h3st nb(t) hpr m mrwt.f°</i>	All foreign countries have come to be in his love,
<i>Ht3 m b3w.f wty°</i>	Only the Hatti suffers from his wrath.
<i>bw sšp ntr dnw.f°</i>	The god does not take his offerings anymore,
<i>bw ptr.f mw nw pt°</i>	And he does not see the rain of sky.”

(P. Anastasi II, 2,1–2; 2,3–4)

This sounds like an echo of the inscription in the temple of Abu Simbel:

<i>h~n dddw p3 3 n(y) Ht3 n mš.f wrw.f</i>	“Then the great chief of Hatti says to his army and nobility:
<i>(r)-dd</i>	
<i>phryt n3 jw t3.n fh</i>	‘What a time, with our country devastated!
<i>nb.n Swth šp.w m-dj.n nn 3n pt mw m</i>	Our lord Seth is angry with us, and the sky above us does not
<i>q3.n</i>	bring water anymore.”

(KRI II, 246, 7,10)

This inscription explains indeed the diplomatic good will of the Hatti as induced by the sudden wrath of Seth.

IV. REFLECTIONS ON TRANSMISSION AND VARIATION IN NEW KINGDOM LITERATURE AND BEYOND

This examination of the process of transmission and variation in the Late Egyptian Miscellanies reveals important aspects of literary production and the reproduction of texts in Egypt. The miscellanies hold a central position in the literary landscape of the New Kingdom, both quantitatively through the number of manuscripts they represent (see above), and qualitatively through the generic echoes that they have with many active genres of that time. In this more speculative section I attempt to examine the salient features of textual production identified in the miscellanies in a wider literary field.

4.1. Open transmission

The different manuscripts of Egyptian literary works can be examined in the light of open/free transmission *versus* closed transmission. A complete investigation of this is yet to be conducted. Even

72. See Spalinger 2002.

73. KRI II, 233–256.

so, open transmission has been noted in some cases.⁷⁴ For C. Eyre, model phraseology and use of formulae in many Egyptian texts can explain open transmission and inter-textuality.⁷⁵

I consider below an example from the *Teaching of Ani*, which can be seen as belonging to the same cultural world as the miscellanies; two maxims are even integrated in the collection of miscellanies of P. Chester Beatty V.⁷⁶ In fact, among the manuscripts collated by J. Quack in his edition, none can be said to have been copied from one another.⁷⁷ The editor even noticed that most variants between the manuscripts are actually meaningful (what I have called here ‘conceptual variants’), and are likely to be the result of a free pattern of transmission.⁷⁸ This can be seen in the maxims below:

B	<i>r rdt rh.k hr tp-t3⁷⁹ (ny) s</i>	To inform you about the life of a man
D	<i>mj d(.j) sm.k m tp-rd n(y) s</i>	Come and I shall make you know about the state of a man
L	<i>ptr tw.j hr mtr.k r p3 shr n(y) rmt</i>	Look I teach you the condition of a man
OD ₂	<i>[...] hr mtr.k [...]</i>	[... look I] teach you
B	<i>jw.f wh3 grg m pr.f</i>	Who wants to be established in his house
D	<i>hr wh3 (2,3) grg pr</i>	Who wants to establish a house
L	<i>jw.f wh3 (2,9) grg pr</i>	Who wants to establish a house
OD ₂	<i>[...] wh3 grg pr</i>	[...] wants to establish a house
B	<i>jry n.k h<s> bw</i>	Make for yourself a plot of land
D	<i>jr n.k hspt</i>	Make for yourself a plot of land
L	<i>jr n.k hsbt</i>	Make for yourself a plot of land
OD ₂	<i>jr n.k hsbt</i>	Make for yourself a plot of land
B	<i>(19,2) jnh n.k b(n)dt m-h3t t3y.k sk3</i>	Plant cucumbers in front of your field
D	<i>jni n.k bndw m-h3w t3y.k st-sk3</i>	Put cucumbers around your field
L	<i>jni n.k bndw m-h3w t3y.k sk3</i>	Put cucumbers around your field
OD ₂	<i>[...b]ndw m-h3w t3y.k sk3</i>	[...] cucumbers around your field

Fig. 20. A section of the *Teaching of Ani* on four manuscripts.⁸⁰

In his edition of P. Anastasi I, H.-W. Fischer-Elfert makes similar observations about the variants of the text among the various manuscripts.⁸¹

The situation might not have been substantially different in the Middle Kingdom. *The Teaching of Ptahhotep* seems to be a prime example of this, as shown by F. Hagen.⁸² For the manuscripts known for the *Eloquent Peasant*, R. Parkinson speaks of “versions” rather than copies, two “versions” having seemingly even been “owned and read side by side by a single individual,” as the papyrus deposit of

74. Willems 1988.

75. Eyre 1991.

76. P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 2,6–8 and 2,8–10 correspond to P. Boulaq 4 (= P. Cairo CG 58042), 16,1–3 and 19,1–4, cf. Quack 1996: 11.

77. *Ibid.*, 17.

78. *Ibid.*, 24.

79. On this writing, see *ibid.*, 56.

80. For text, see *ibid.*, 297–298.

81. Fischer-Elfert 1986: 250; Quack 1996: 20.

82. Hagen 2012: 212f.

the Ramesseum tomb tends to show.⁸³ The same can be said of *Sinuhe*.⁸⁴ It is only in the New Kingdom, when these texts belong to fixed and edited classics and do not participate anymore in a scribal culture of active production, that they seem to have been transmitted in fixed versions. New Kingdom copies of classical works such *The Loyalistic Teaching*, *The Teaching of Ptahhotep* or *The Tale of Sinuhe* are more fixed and edited, indicating that copying was “less free and more rigidly reproductive.”⁸⁵

On the contrary, in the period where a literary work is active in the minds of its readers and copyists, the principle of the unity of the work as well as the paradigm of a single original vs. many (faulty) copies is not operative.

4.2. *Compilation and miscellaneity*

I showed above that the miscellaneity of the *Late Egyptian miscellanies* appears on two levels: on the macro level, in the association of short texts, and on the micro level, with the weaving, addition or subtraction of textual units. Now we can wonder whether a substantial part of Egyptian literature is not bordering on miscellaneity, as a consequence of scribal culture. What I would like to suggest here is that these manuscripts reveal and stage a miscellaneity, which is a core principle of literary writing in Ancient Egypt. The composite character of Egyptian literary texts appears through the association of heterogeneous units but also generic variations. Miscellaneity appears at two levels: first these manuscripts were called *Late Egyptian Miscellanies* because they are a collection of miscellaneous texts, but miscellaneity also appears within the various pieces of work.

Close to the miscellanies, Fischer-Elfert noted the composite character of the *Satirical Letter of Hori*, which integrates units belonging to different genres,⁸⁶ such as onomastica (lexical lists), royal annals, official and private reports or geographical lists from temples. B. Mathieu has similarly studied what he called the “proliferation of genres” (“foisonnement des genres”) and “paragenres” in love poetry⁸⁷ in the forms of borrowings from religious hymns, magical texts, teachings and narratives. Such intertextuality testifies to functional and genetic aspects.

Eyre for his part makes similar comments in his study of the Semna Stele.⁸⁸ He noted that the inscription borrowed from “narrative, autobiography, wisdom, declarations of policy, and direct address to an audience.”⁸⁹ This can be said of many texts, the *Eloquent Peasant* being a mixture of teaching and narrative combining various styles and registers,⁹⁰ with a poet who “seems to draw on all principle genres of contemporaneous literature, and his juxtaposition of genres and styles creates a work of shifting tones and registers.”⁹¹ Such an aspect of Egyptian literature might be part both of its origin and its definition, if one considers that it was born in a monumental context, in the tomb, and

83. Parkinson 2007: 2.

84. Parkinson 2010.

85. Van de Walle 1948: 182.

86. Fischer-Elfert 1986: 274.

87. Mathieu 1996: 217 and *passim*.

88. Eyre 1991.

89. *Ibid.*, 135.

90. Parkinson 2001: 3.

91. Parkinson 2012: 4.

evolved from Old Kingdom biographies, which were already composite, mixing together narratives, discourses and even documents such as letters.⁹²

Eyre interpreted this phenomenon in terms of “formulaic writing [...] used [...] in more sophisticated a fashion, with greater diversity in content, and influenced by a wider range of literary genres.”⁹³ This aspect seems to me to give an answer to this scribal paradigm of transmission I am studying; it also casts light on the importance of memory. It is to be linked to the pragmatic conditions of textual production.

Yet, this feature seems even stronger in the New Kingdom, which might be linked with the emergence of a scribal culture,⁹⁴ where professional scribes are the central figures of literary production, after the *seru*-officials of the Middle Kingdom.⁹⁵ New Kingdom literature, with the exception of tales—we only have a single copy of virtually all Late Egyptian stories—is indeed extremely open to variation and is multiform, and the miscellanies can be considered both as the symptom and the tool of such a mode of writing. One of the purposes of the miscellanies may indeed have been to process the textual stock of the scribe of the time, to record, archive and produce more texts. Many compositions of the miscellanies are close to ritual and official texts, the production of which could have been part of the responsibility of scribes⁹⁶ such as eulogies of the king, speeches of welcome as the king enters,⁹⁷ and the praise of officials which come close to the biographical inscriptions.⁹⁸

V. CONCLUSION: REDEFINING THE CONDITIONS OF TEXTUAL (RE)PRODUCTION IN ANCIENT EGYPT

If the paradigm of variation is adopted for the appraisal of literary writing and transmission in Ancient Egypt, several of the terms of debate need to be re-evaluated, in particular those of intertextuality and quotations, and of authorship.

5.1. *Intertextuality and quotations*

Once we set aside the concepts of original work *versus* faithful duplication in favour of the concept of variation, intertextuality and quotes become much less relevant. Quotes and intertextuality⁹⁹ are used in relation to two different types of text circulation. On the one hand intertextuality refers to the compositional context, the network of texts “that surrounds and influences the creation of any new text”;¹⁰⁰ intertextuality triggers and builds up a virtual network of texts. Quotes and allusions on the other hand refer to and conjure up a specific text.

92. E.g. Assmann 1983.

93. Eyre 1991: 156.

94. Ragazzoli 2011a; 2011b; 2013.

95. Parkinson 1996: 140–141.

96. Coulon 2009–2010: 253.

97. P. Turin CG 54 031: Condon 1978. See Fischer-Elfert 1999; Ragazzoli 2008: 157–160.

98. Coulon 2009–2010.

99. On this question see bibliography in Eyre 1991: 155, n. 75. See also Derchain 1994; Jansen-Winkeln 1996.

100. Hagen 2012: 137.

There are some quotations and allusions in the miscellanies, but very few,¹⁰¹ while the intertextual range is remarkable. Quotations and allusions can sometimes be difficult to distinguish from mere intertextuality since the difference relies merely on the writer's intention: quotation and allusion are intentional while intertextuality is not; the writer's intention is naturally very difficult to grasp for the modern commentator and can only be the object of assumptions. Free variation bridges the gap.

5.2. *Authors and copyists*

If variation is to be considered as the main mode of transmission, the author moves into the shadows, as well as the copyist, to the benefit of the scribe, the textual craftsman. The absence of 'authors' in Egypt is often noted:¹⁰² scribes did not sign their texts and most authorial figures until the New Kingdom are pseudepigraphs. Rather than a deficiency of Egyptian literature, this phenomenon must be read as paradigmatically and functionally linked to the conditions of the production and reception of texts in Ancient Egypt. However, this is not necessarily specific to Egypt; the notion of the author is a very modern one, linked to a very specific vehicle of textual (re)production, the printed book. In a manuscript and scribal culture, the pairing of an author with his work is much less relevant than processes such as 're-creation,' 're-writing,' 're-appropriation' and 'reading-writing.'¹⁰³ The concept of *scribe* actually gives rise to a full range of attitudes towards texts. The spectrum of authorship in a manuscript culture is much wider than in a printed text culture. In the Middle Ages, Bonaventure identified in the 13th century four levels of authorship: *scriptor*, *compilator*, *commentator* and *auctor*.¹⁰⁴

The novelty of the miscellanies is that they are the product of such a process that is clearly detectable in their textual history. The Late Egyptian miscellanies are more than a genre; they are a practice. Just as with parietal decoration and the iconographic programs of tombs,¹⁰⁵ literature can be considered as a performative art. Scribes, like draughtsmen, have virtual libraries at their disposal, in their minds: miscellanies are the actualisation of such an individual mental library.

101. A possible allusion is a passage of P. Chester Beatty V, 6,6: [p3] sš hms m t3rt, jw msw srw hr hn tw.f, "The scribe sits in the cabin, while the children of dignitaries row him," which could allude to some versions of the incipit of the *Satire of the Trades*, h3t-^c m sb3yt / jrt-n s m t3rt / Dw3w.f Hty rn.f / n s3.f Ppy rn.f / jst rf m hntyt r Hnw, "Beginning of the teaching made by a man in the cabin, whose name is Khety son of Duaf, for his Son, named Pepy, while sailing upstream to the Residence" (*Khety I*). Another clear case is the two maxims from the Teaching of Ani (P. Boulaq 4, 16,1-2 and P. Boulaq 4, 16,1-2) reproduced contiguously on P. Chester Beatty V, 2,6-7.

102. Quack 1996: 18; Derchain 1996. On the author as a notion to be historicised, see the now classic article by Foucault 1983.

103. Dagenais 1994: xvi-xvii.

104. Saint Bonaventure 1882: 14; cf. Chastang 2008.

105. *E.g.* Laboury in this volume.

Appendix 1: Variants and errors in duplicate texts

Mechanical errors

Additions

P. Bologna 1094, 2, 4 vs. P. Anastasi II, 6, 5; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 5 vs. P. Anastasi II, 1, 5; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 9 vs. P. Anastasi II, 2, 4; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 10 vs. P. Anastasi II, 6, 2; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 11 vs. P. Anastasi II, 6, 3¹⁰⁶; P. Koller 2, 4 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 2, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 2, 11 vs. P. Koller, 2, 9; P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 9–10 vs. P. Anastasi V, 7, 7 P. Sallier I, 9, 10 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 11, 8 = P. Anastasi V, 16, 6 = P. Anastasi V, 6, 1 (incipit); P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 1 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 4, 8; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 8 vs. P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 1; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 10 vs. P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 3; P. Sallier I, 3, 8 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 6 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 8 = P. Turin C, 1, 6; P. Sallier I, 3, 9 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 8 = P. Turin C, 1, 8 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 9; P. Koller, 5, 5 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 13, 9; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 2 vs. P. Anastasi II, 1, 2 (dittography); P. Anastasi V, 16, 4 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 4 (dittography); P. Sallier I, 3, 8 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 5 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 7 (dittography)

Omissions

P. Anastasi II, 6, 6 vs. P. Bologna 1094, 2, 5; P. Bologna 1094, 2, 5 vs. P. Anastasi II, 6, 6; P. Anastasi II, 6, 7 vs. P. Bologna 1094, 2, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 2 vs. P. Anastasi II, 1, 2; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 5 vs. P. Anastasi II, 1, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 9 vs. P. Anastasi II, 2, 3; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 10 vs. P. Anastasi II, 2, 4; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 9 vs. P. Anastasi II, 6, 1; P. Anastasi V, 8, 6 vs. P. Anastasi III, 3, 3; P. Anastasi V, 8, 7 vs. P. Anastasi III, 4, 1; P. Anastasi V, 9, 1 vs. P. Anastasi III, 4, 3; P. Anastasi IV, 2, 7 vs. P. Koller, 2, 5; P. Anastasi IV, 8, 9 vs. P. Lansing, 11, 3; P. Lansing, 11, 3 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 8, 9; P. Anastasi IV, 8, 9 vs. P. Lansing 11, 3, 4; P. Lansing, 11, 3, 4 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 8, 9; P. Lansing, 11, 7 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 9, 1; P. Lansing, 11, 7 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 9, 2; P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 10 vs. P. Anastasi V, 7, 7; P. Anastasi IV, 11, 9 vs. P. Sallier I, 9, 11; P. Sallier I, 6, 1 vs. P. Anastasi V, 15, 6; P. Sallier I, 6, 2 vs. P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Anastasi V, 16, 3 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 4; P. Sallier I, 6, 4 vs. P. Anastasi V, 16, 3; P. Anastasi V, 16, 3 + P. Sallier I, 6, 4; P. Anastasi V, 16, 7 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 7; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 10 vs. P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 3 P. Sallier I, 5, 5 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 3 = P. Turin C, 10, 3 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 5; P. Sallier I, 3, 8 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 5 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 7; P. Sallier I, 3, 8 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 6 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 8

Grammatical mistakes

P. Anastasi IV, 6, 8 vs. P. Anastasi II, 2, 2; P. Koller, 2, 7 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 2, 9; P. Koller, 3, 1 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 2, 12; P. Anastasi IV, 8, 10 vs. P. Lansing, 11, 4P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 7 vs. P. Anastasi V, 7, 5; P. Anastasi V, 7, 7 vs. P. Chester Beatty V, 6 10; P. Sallier I, 9, 10 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 11, 8 = P. Anastasi V, 6, 1; P. Anastasi V, 15, 6; P. Sallier I, 9, 11 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 11, 10; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 7 vs. P. Sallier I, 3, 10 = P. Anastasi V, 10, 8; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 8 vs. P. Sallier I, 3, 10 = P. Anastasi V, 10, 8

Lexical confusions

P. Lansing, 11, 3 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 8, 9; P. Lansing, 11, 5 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 8, 11; P. Lansing, 11, 7 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 9, 2; P. Anastasi V, 7, 5 vs. P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 8; P. Anastasi IV, 11, 10 vs. P. Sallier I, 9, 11; P. Sallier I, 6, 2 vs. P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Anastasi V, 16, 3 + P. Sallier I, 6, 4; P. Sallier I, 6, 4–5 vs. P. Anastasi V, 16, 4; P. Anastasi V, 17, 1 vs. P. Koller, 6, 8

Meaningful variants

Omissions

P. Anastasi II, 6, 5 / P. Bologna 1094, 2, 4; P. Anastasi V, 8, 2 / P. Anastasi III, 3, 10; P. Anastasi V, 8, 8 / P. Anastasi III, 4, 2; P. Koller, 2, 8 / P. Anastasi IV, 2, 9; P. Koller, 2, 8 / P. Anastasi IV, 2, 10; P. Chester Beatty

106. P. Anastasi IV, 5,11: *jr mdt, jw r(3) m qrrt {hr} h3y m msdrt.k*; P. Anastasi II, 6,3: *jr mdt.tw, jw r(3) m qrrt, h3w.w m msdrt.k*.

V, 6, 8 / P. Anastasi V, 7, 5; P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 9/P. Anastasi V, 7, 6; P. Sallier I, 9, 10 / P. Anastasi IV, 11, 9; P. Sallier I, 6, 3/P. Anastasi V, 16, 2; P. Sallier I, 6, 4/P. Anastasi V, 16, 2; P. Sallier I, 6, 5/P. Anastasi V, 16, 5; P. Lansing, 11, 3 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 8; P. Lansing, 11, 4 / P. Anastasi IV, 10; P. Lansing, 11, 7 / P. Anastasi IV, 9, 1; P. Lansing, 11, 7 / P. Anastasi IV, 9, 2; P. Turin D, 2, 1/P. Koller, 4, 7; P. Koller, 5, 1 / P. Turin D, 2, 2; P. Koller, 5, 2/P. Turin C, v^o1, 7; P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 2 / P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 4, 9; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 10 / P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 1, 4; P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 5 / P. Anastasi V, 10, 3 = P. Turin C, 1, 3 = P. Sallier I, 3, 6; P. Anastasi V, 10, 4 = P. Sallier I, 3, 7/P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 6 = P. Turin C, 1, 3; P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 6/P. Sallier I, 3, 7 = P. Anastasi V, 10, 4; P. Sallier I, 3, 7/P. Anastasi V, 10, 5 = P. Turin C, 1, 5 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 7; P. Koller, 5, 8 / P. Anastasi IV, 13, 10

Additions

P. Sallier I, 6, 3/P. Anastasi V, 16, 1; P. Sallier I, 6, 8/P. Anastasi V, 17, 1; P. Sallier I, 6, 8/ P. Anastasi V, 17, 2; P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 8/P. Sallier I, 3, 8 = P. Anastasi V, 10, 6; P. Sallier I, 3, 10/P. Anastasi V, 11, 1 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 8; P. Anastasi V, 17, 1/P. Sallier I, 6, 8; P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 4–5/P. Anastasi IV, 4, 10 (2 lines)

Grammatical variants

P. Anastasi V, 8, 3 / P. Anastasi III, 3, 11; P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 8 / P. Anastasi V, 7, 5; P. Koller, 5, 1–2/P. Turin D, 2, 3; P. Koller, 5, 1/P. Turin C, v^o 1, 8–2,1 = P. Turin D, 2, 5; P. Sallier I, 6, 2/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Sallier I, 6, 4 / P. Anastasi V, 16, 3; P. Sallier I, 6, 5/P. Anastasi V, 16, 4; P. Koller, 5, 2/ P. Turin D, 2, 3; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 10 / P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 3; P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 7/P. Sallier I, 3, 7 = P. Anastasi V, 10, 5 = P. Turin C, 1, 5; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 1 / P. Anastasi II, 1, 1; P. Lansing, 11, 6 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 12; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 3 / P. Anastasi II, 1, 3 (2 x); P. Anastasi IV, 6, 4 / P. Anastasi II, 1, 4 (2 x); P. Anastasi IV, 5, 6 / P. Anastasi II, 5, 7; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 9 / P. Anastasi II, 6, 1; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 10 / P. Anastasi II, 6, 2; P. Anastasi V, 10, 4/P. Turin C, 1, 5 = P. Sallier I, 3, 7 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 7 / P. Anastasi II, 5, 7; P. Koller, 3, 3 / P. Anastasi IV, 3, 1; P. Lansing, 11, 4 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 10; P. Sallier I, 6, 6/P. Anastasi V, 16, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 6 / P. Anastasi IIIA, 7; P. Koller, 5, 4/ Turin D, 2, 5; P. Sallier I, 6, 5/P. Anastasi V, 16, 4; P. Sallier I, 6, 8/P. Anastasi V, 17, 1; P. Anastasi V, 10, 8 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 9/P. Turin C, 1, 8 = P. Sallier I, 3, 9; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 6 / P. Anastasi II, 2, 1¹⁰⁷; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 8 / P. Anastasi II, 2, 3; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 7 / P. Anastasi II, 5, 7¹⁰⁸; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 7 / P. Anastasi II, 5, 8 ; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 8 / P. Anastasi II, 5, 8; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 11 / P. Anastasi II, 6, 3(2 x); P. Anastasi V, 8, 3–4 / P. Anastasi III, 3, 11; P. Anastasi V, 8, 5 / P. Anastasi III, 3, 12; P. Koller, 2, 4 / P. Anastasi IV, 2, 6; P. Koller, 2, 5 / P. Anastasi IV, 2, 6 (2 x); P. Koller, 2, 9 / P. Anastasi IV, 2, 11; P. Anastasi IV, 3, 1 / P. Koller, 3, 2; P. Lansing, 11, 2 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 8; P. Lansing, 11, 3 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 8; P. Lansing, 11, 7 / P. Anastasi IV, 9, 1; P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 11 / P. Anastasi V, 7, 8; P. Sallier I, 9, 11 / P. Anastasi IV, 11, 9–10; P. Koller, 5, 3/P. Turin D, 2, 4; P. Sallier I, 6, 2/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Sallier I, 6, 3/ P. Anastasi V, 16, 1 (x2); P. Sallier I, 6, 3/ P. Anastasi V, 16, 2 (x2); P. Sallier I, 6, 4/P. Anastasi V, 16, 3; P. Sallier I, 6, 5/P. Anastasi V, 16, 4; P. Sallier I, 6, 5/P. Anastasi V, 16, 5; P. Sallier I, 6, 6/P. Anastasi V, 16, 6; P. Koller, 5, 2/P. Turin C, v^o1, 8 = P. Turin D, 2, 3; P. Koller, 5, 2/ P. Turin D, 2, 3; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 9 / P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 2; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 9 / P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 2; P. Anastasi IV, 4, 10 / P. Chester Beatty V, v^o 1, 3; P. Anastasi V, 10, 4 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 6/P. Turin C, 1, 5 = P. Sallier I, 3, 7; P. Turin C, 1, 7/P. Anastasi V, 10, 6 = P. Sallier I, 3, 9 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 8; P. Anastasi V, 10, 7 = P. Sallier I, 3, 9/P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 9; P. Sallier I, 3, 10/P. Anastasi V, 11, 1 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 8; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 7 / P. Anastasi II, 2, 1; P. Anastasi IV, 6, 10 / P. Anastasi II, 2, 4; P. Anastasi V, 8, 5 / P. Anastasi III, 3, 13; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 7 / P. Anastasi IIIA, 8; P. Koller, 2, 3 / P. Anastasi IV, 2, 5 v; P. Lansing, 11, 3 / P. Anastasi IV,

107. Noun clause vs. *m* predication.

108. P. Anastasi II, 5,7: *hr.k n.j p3 šw hr wbn*; P. Anastasi IV, 5,7: *hr.k n.j p3 šw wbn*: the omission of *hr* in the second example can be interpreted either as an omission if we consider that it introduces a sequential clause or a variant if we consider that *wbn* is in the second case a participle (“the light that rises.”)

8, 8; P. Koller, 4, 7/P. Turin C, v° 1, 5; P. Turin D, 2, 5/P. Koller, 5, 4; P. Sallier I, 6, 2/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 8/P. Anastasi V, 10, 6 = P. Sallier I, 3, 8; P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 10 / P. Anastasi V, 7, 7

Lexical variants

P. Bologna 1094, 2, 5 / P. Anastasi II, 6, 6; P. Anastasi V, 8, 7 / P. Anastasi III, 4, 1¹⁰⁹; P. Lansing, 11, 1 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 7; P. Lansing, 11, 4 / P. Anastasi IV, 10 (2x); P. Lansing, 11, 6 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 12 (2x); P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 9 / P. Anastasi V, 7, 6; P. Sallier I, 9, 10 / P. Anastasi IV, 11, 9; P. Koller, 3, 7/P. Turin D, 1, 6; P. Koller, 4, 4/P. Turin C, v° 1, 2; P. Koller, 5, 2/P. Turin C, v° 2, 1 = P. Turin D, 2, 3; P. Sallier I, 6, 7 / P. Anastasi V, 16, 7; P. Sallier I, 6, 8/P. Anastasi V, 17, 1; P. Koller, 5, 2/P. Turin C, v°1, 8 = P. Turin D, 2, 3; P. Anastasi V, 10, 3/P. Turin C, 10, 3 = P. Sallier I, 5, 5 = P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 5; P. Anastasi V, 10, 3 = P. Turin C, 1, 3/P. Chester Beatty V, 5, 6 = P. Sallier I, 3, 6; P. Anastasi V, 11, 1/P. Sallier I, 3, 10 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 8; P. Bologna 1094, 2, 6 / P. Anastasi II, 6, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 6 / P. Anastasi II, 5, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 5, 8 / P. Anastasi II, 5, 8; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 4 / P. Anastasi IIIA, 5; P. Anastasi IV, 2, 9 / P. Koller, 2, 7; P. Lansing, 11, 1 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 7; P. Lansing, 11, 2 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 7; P. Lansing, 11, 2 / P. Anastasi IV, 8, 8; P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 11 / P. Anastasi V, 7, 8; P. Sallier I, 9, 11 / P. Anastasi IV, 11, 9; P. Koller, 5, 2/P. Turin C, v° 2, 1; P. Sallier I, 6, 2/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 4, 3/P. Lansing, 7, 7 (2x); P. Turin D, 2, 7/P. Lansing, 8, 5 (2x); P. Turin D, 2, 9/P. Lansing, 8, 6 (2x); P. Lansing, 5, 7 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 1/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Lansing, 5, 8 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 1/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7 (2x); P. Lansing, 7, 3 / P. Sallier I, 6, 7; P. Lansing 7, 5 / P. Sallier I, 6, 8 / P. Anastasi V, 17, 1; P. Anastasi II, v° 4–5/P. Anastasi V, 14, 7; P. Anastasi V, 2, 1/P. Anastasi IV, 4, 1–2; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 8 / P. Anastasi V, 11, 1 = P. Sallier I, 3, 10 (2 x); P. Rainer 53, 2/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1; P. Rainer 53, 4/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1; P. Rainer 53, 4/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2; P. Rainer 53, 5/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2; P. Rainer 53, 6/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2 ; P. Rainer 53, 9/P. Anastasi III, 2, 4; P. Rainer 53, 10/P. Anastasi III, 2, 6; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 5, 6/P. Anastasi III, 5, 6 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 4 = P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 13; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 5, 6/P. Anastasi III, 5, 6 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5 = P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 13

Appendix 2: Variants and errors in open texts

Mechanical errors

Additions

P. Lansing, 8, 3 vs. P. Turin D, 2, 6 (2x); P. Lansing, 5, 7 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 1/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 11 vs. P. Anastasi III, 6, 1; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 3, 11 vs. P. Anastasi III, 6, 7–7, 1 = P. Sallier I, 6, 10 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 9; P. Anastasi V, 15, 5 vs. P. Anastasi IV, 3, 11 (dittography)

Omissions

P. Rainer 53, 7 vs. P. Anastasi III, 2, 3; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 6 vs. P. Anastasi III, 5, 8; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 3, 11 vs. P. Anastasi III, 6, 7–7, 1 = P. Sallier I, 6, 10 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 9

Grammatical mistakes

P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 7 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 8 = P. Sallier I, 3, 10; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 8 vs. P. Anastasi V, 10, 8 = P. Sallier I, 3, 10; P. Sallier I, 7, 8/P. Anastasi II, 8, 4

Lexical confusions

P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 8 vs. P. Anastasi V, 11, 1 = P. Sallier I, 3, 10; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 10 vs. P. Anastasi III, 5, 11; P. Sallier I, 7, 8/P. Anastasi II, 8, 4; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 5, 11 vs. P. Anastasi III, 5, 8 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 7; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 11 vs. P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 3, 11 = P. Anastasi II, 7, 1

109. P. Anastasi III, 4, 1: *hpr [n].k m 3hw*; P. Anastasi V, 8, 7, *gm.k sw m 3h*.

Meaningful variants

Omissions

P. Rainer 53, 1/P. Anastasi III, 1, 12; P. Rainer 53, 3/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1 (2x); P. Rainer 53, 5/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2; P. Rainer 53, 9/P. Anastasi III, 2, 3–4; P. Rainer 53, 9/P. Anastasi III, 2, 4–5 (4 verse-lines); P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5/P. Anastasi III, 5, 7 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 7; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 1/P. Anastasi IIIA, 1; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 2/P. Anastasi IIIA, 3–4 (2 verse-lines); P. Sallier I, 7, 1/P. Anastasi II, 7, 3; P. Sallier I, 7, 8/P. Anastasi II, 8, 3; P. Anastasi II, 8, 5/P. Anastasi V, 17, 2/P. Sallier I, 6, 8

Additions

P. Anastasi II, v^o 4–5/P. Anastasi V, 14, 7 (2x); P. Rainer 53, 1–2/P. Anastasi III, 1, 12 (1 verse-line); P. Rainer 53, 3/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1; P. Rainer 53, 7/P. Anastasi III, 2, 3 (1 verse line); P. Rainer 53, 7–8/P. Anastasi III, 2, 3 (1 verse-line); P. Rainer 53, 12/P. Anastasi III, 2, 6 (1 verse-line); P. Rainer 53, 13/P. Anastasi III, 2, 7; P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 7/P. Anastasi III, 5, 6 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5 = P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 13 (1 verse-line); P. Anastasi IV, 9, 6/P. Anastasi III, 5, 8; P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 9/P. Anastasi III, 5, 8 = P. Anastasi IV, 8, 6–7 (1 verse-line); P. Sallier I, 7, 9/P. Anastasi II, 8, 4; P. Sallier I, 6, 8/P. Anastasi II, 8, 5/P. Anastasi V, 17, 2

Grammatical variants

P. Turin D, 2, 7 / P. Lansing, 8, 4 (2x); P. Lansing, 7, 3 / P. Sallier I, 6, 7; P. Anastasi II, v^o 4–5/P. Anastasi V, 14, 7; P. Anastasi V, 15, 4/P. Anastasi IV, 3, 11; P. Rainer 53, 1/P. Anastasi III, 1, 12; P. Rainer 53, 2/P. Anastasi III, 1, 12; P. Rainer 53, 3/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1 (2 x); P. Rainer 53, 3–4/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1; P. Rainer 53, 4/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2; P. Rainer 53, 5/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2 (2x); P. Rainer 53, 6/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2; P. Rainer 53, 6/P. Anastasi III, 2, 3; P. Rainer 53, 8/P. Anastasi III, 2, 3 (2 x); P. Rainer 53, 9/P. Anastasi III, 2, 4; P. Rainer 53, 10/P. Anastasi III, 2, 5; P. Rainer 53, 11/P. Anastasi III, 2, 6; P. Rainer 53, 12/P. Anastasi III, 2, 6; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5/P. Anastasi III, 5, 6 = P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 13; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5/P. Anastasi III, 5, 6 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 7; P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 7/P. Anastasi III, 5, 6 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5/P. Anastasi III, 5, 7 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 7; P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 7/P. Anastasi III, 5, 7 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5; P. Anastasi III, 5, 7/P. Anastasi IV, 9, 6 P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 9/P. Anastasi III, 5, 8 = P. Anastasi IV, 8, 6–7 ; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 5/P. Anastasi III, 5, 9 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 8; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 8/P. Anastasi III, 5, 9 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 5; P. Anastasi IV, 9, 8/P. Anastasi III, 5, 10 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 5; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 6/P. Anastasi III, 5, 10 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 9; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 6/P. Anastasi III, 5, 11 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 10; P. Anastasi III, 5, 12/ P. Anastasi IV, 9, 10; P. Anastasi III, 6, 1/ P. Anastasi IV, 9, 12; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 4/P. Anastasi IIIA, 4; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 6/P. Anastasi IIIA, 7; P. Anastasi IV, 16, 7/P. Anastasi IIIA, 8; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 9/ P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 3, 11= P. Anastasi III, 6, 7–7, 1 = P. Sallier I, 6, 10 (2x); P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 9/ P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 3, 11 = P. Anastasi III, 7, 1 = P. Sallier I, 6, 10; P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 3, 11/P. Anastasi II, 7, 1 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 10; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 10/P. Anastasi II, 7, 2 = P. Sallier I, 6, 10 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 3, 12; P. Anastasi II, 7, 2/P. Sallier I, 6, 10 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 3, 13 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 11; P. Sallier I, 7, 1/P. Anastasi II, 7, 3; P. Sallier I, 7, 1/P. Anastasi II, 7, 4 (3x); P. Sallier I, 7, 6/P. Anastasi II, 7, 6; P. Sallier I, 7, 6/P. Anastasi II, 7, 7; P. Sallier I, 7, 7/P. Anastasi II, 7, 7 (3x); P. Sallier I, 7, 7/P. Anastasi II, 8, 1 (2x); P. Sallier I, 7, 8/P. Anastasi II, 8, 3 (3x); P. Sallier I, 7, 8/P. Anastasi II, 8, 4 (2x)

Lexical variants

P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 4, 3/P. Lansing, 7, 7 (2x); P. Turin D, 2, 7/P. Lansing, 8, 5 (2x); P. Turin D, 2, 9/P. Lansing, 8, 6 (2x); P. Lansing, 5, 7 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 1/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7; P. Lansing, 5, 8 vs. P. Sallier I, 6, 1/P. Anastasi V, 15, 7 (2x); P. Lansing, 7, 3 / P. Sallier I, 6, 7; P. Lansing 7, 5 / P. Sallier I, 6, 8 / P. Anastasi V, 17, 1; P. Anastasi II, v^o 4–5/P. Anastasi V, 14, 7; P. Anastasi V, 2, 1/P. Anastasi IV, 4, 1–2; P. Chester Beatty V, 7,8 / P. Anastasi V, 11, 1 = P. Sallier I, 3, 10 (2 x); P. Rainer 53, 2/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1; P. Rainer 53, 4/P. Anastasi III, 2, 1; P. Rainer 53, 4/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2; P. Rainer 53, 5/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2; P. Rainer 53, 6/P. Anastasi III, 2, 2 ; P. Rainer 53, 9/P. Anastasi III, 2, 4; P. Rainer 53, 10/P. Anastasi III, 2, 6; P. Chester Beatty IV, v^o 5, 6/P. Anastasi

III, 5, 6 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 4 = P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 13; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 5, 6/P. Anastasi III, 5, 6 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 5 = P. Chester Beatty V, 6, 13; P. Anastasi III, 5, 8/P. Anastasi IV, 9, 6; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 4/P. Anastasi III, 5, 9 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 7; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 5/P. Anastasi III, 5, 9 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 8; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 6, 1/P. Anastasi III, 5, 10 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 8–9 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 5–6 (2x); P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 6/P. Anastasi III, 5, 11 = P. Anastasi IV, 9, 10; P. Anastasi III, 6, 1/ P. Anastasi IV, 9, 10; P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 3, 11/P. Anastasi II, 7, 1 = P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 10; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 11/P. Anastasi II, 7, 2 = P. Sallier I, 6, 11 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 3, 12; P. Chester Beatty V, 7, 11/P. Anastasi II, 7, 2 = P. Sallier I, 6, 11 = P. Chester Beatty IV, v° 3, 13; P. Sallier I, 7, 2/P. Anastasi II, 7, 4; P. Sallier I, 7, 2/P. Anastasi II, 7, 6; P. Sallier I, 7, 7/P. Anastasi II, 7, 7; P. Sallier I, 7, 3/P. Anastasi II, 8, 1; P. Sallier I, 7, 8/P. Anastasi II, 8, 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLEN, James Peter. 2002. *The Heqanakht Papyri*, New York (= Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 27).
- ASSMANN, Jan. 1983. Schrift, Tod, und Identität. Das Grab als Vorschule der Literatur im alten Ägypten, in: Aleida ASSMANN, Jan ASSMANN and Christof HARDMEIER (eds), *Schrift und Gedächtnis*, Munich, 175–193.
- BEIT-ARIE, Malachi. 1990. Stéréotypes et individualités dans les écritures des copistes hébraïques du Moyen Âge, in: Colette SIRAT, Jean IRIGOIN and Emmanuel POULLE (eds), *L'écriture : le cerveau, l'œil et la main; Actes du colloque international du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, Collège de France 2, 3 et 4 mai 1988*, Turnhout (= *Bibliologia* 10), 201–209.
- BERRICHON-SEDEYN, Marie-Jeanne. 1990. Acte mécanique ou présence vivante?, in: Colette SIRAT, Jean IRIGOIN and Emmanuel POULLE (eds), *L'écriture : le cerveau, l'œil et la main; Actes du colloque international du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, Collège de France 2, 3 et 4 mai 1988*, Turnhout (= *Bibliologia* 10), 221–235.
- BONAVENTURE. 1882. *Opera Omnia*, vol. 1, Quaracchi.
- BURKARD, Günter. 1997. *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu ägyptischen Weisheitslehren des Alten und Mittleren Reiches*, Wiesbaden (= *Ägyptologische Abhandlungen* 34).
- CAMINOS, Riccardo A. 1954. *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, London.
- CANFORA, Luciano. 2002. *Il copista come autore*, Palermo.
- . 2012. *Le copiste comme auteur*. transl. Laurent CALVIÉ and Gisèle COCCO, Toulouse.
- ČERNÝ, Jaroslav. 1935. *Ostraca hiératiques*, Cairo (= *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire* Nr. 25501–25832).
- ČERNÝ, Jaroslav and GARDINER, Alan Henderson. 1957. *Hieratic Ostraca*, Oxford.
- CERQUIGLINI, Bernard. 1989. *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie*, Paris.
- . 1999. *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*, Baltimore and London.
- CHASTANG, Pierre. 2008. L'Archéologie du texte médiéval. Autour de travaux récents sur l'écrit au Moyen Âge, in: *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 2, 245–269.
- COLLOMBERT, Philippe and COULON, Laurent. 2000. Les dieux contre la mer. Le début du 'papyrus d'Astarté' (pBN 202), in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 100, 193–242.
- CONDON, Virginia. 1978. *Seven Royal Hymns of the Ramesside Period. P. Turin CG 54 031*, Munich (= *Münchener Ägyptologische Studien* 38).
- COULON, Laurent. 2009. Célébrer l'élite, louer pharaon : éloquence et cérémonial de cour au Nouvel Empire, in: Juan Carlos MORENO GARCIA (ed.), *Élites et pouvoir en Égypte ancienne*, Villeneuve d'Ascq (= *Cahiers de Recherche de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Égyptologie de Lille* 28), 211–238.

- DAGENAIS, John. 1994. *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro de Buen Amor*, Princeton.
- DELNERO, Paul. 2012. Memorization and the Transmission of Sumerian Literary Compositions, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 71/2, 189–208.
- DEMARÉE, Robert J. 2002. *Ramesside Ostraca*, London.
- DERCHAIN, Philippe. 1994. Allusion, citation, intertextualité, in: Martina MINAS and Jürgen ZEIDLER (eds), *Aspekte altägyptischer Kulture: Festschrift für Erich Winter zum 65. Geburtstag*, Mainz, 69–76.
- . 1996. Auteur et société, in: LOPRIENO 1996, 83–97.
- ERMAN, Adolf. 1880. Hieratische Ostraka, in: *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 18, 93–99.
- EYRE, Christopher J. 2013. The Practice of Literature: the Relationship between Content, Form, Audience, and Performance, in: Roland ENMARCH and Verena LEPPER (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Literature. Theory and Practice*, Oxford, 101–142.
- . 1991. The Semna Stelae: Quotation, Genre, and Functions of Literature, in: Sarah ISRAELIT-GROLL (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, vol. 2, Jerusalem, 134–165.
- FISCHER-ELFERT, Hans-Werner. 1986. *Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I.: Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Wiesbaden (= Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 44).
- . 1996. Die Arbeit am Text: Altägyptische Literaturwerke aus philologischer Perspektive, in: LOPRIENO 1996, 499–513.
- . 1999. Die Ankunft des Königs nach ramessidischen Hymnen et cetera, in: *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 27, 65–85.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. 1983. Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?, in: *Littoral* 9, 3–38.
- GARDINER, Alan Henderson. 1935. *The Chester Beatty Papyrus*, London (= Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum 3).
- . 1937. *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, Brussels (= Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 7).
- GUGLIELMI, Waltraud. 1994. Berufsatiren in der Tradition des Cheti, in: Manfred BIETAK (ed.), *Zwischen den Beiden Ewigkeiten. Festschrift Gertrud Thausing*, Vienna, 44–72.
- HAGEN, Fredrik. 2006. Literature and Transmission in the Late Egyptian Miscellanies, in: Rachel J. DANN (ed.), *Current Research in Egyptology 2004*, Oxford, 38–51.
- . 2012. *An Ancient Egyptian Literary Text in Context: The Instruction of Ptahhotep*, Leuven (= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 218).
- . forthcoming. Libraries in Ancient Egypt, c. 1600–1000 B.C., in: Kim RYHOLT and Gojko BARJAMOVIC (eds), *Libraries before Alexandria*, Oxford.
- HOCH, James Eric. 1994. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*, Princeton (N.J.).
- JÄGER, Stephan. 2004. *Altägyptische Berufstypologien*, Göttingen (= Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 4).
- JANSEN-WINKELN, Karl. 1996. Zitierform und Kontextform, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 154, 45–48.
- KAHL, Jochem. 1998. 'Es ist vom Anfang bis zum Ende so gekommen, wie es in der Schrift gefunden worden war': Zur Überlieferung der Erzählung des Sinuhe, in: Manfred DIETRICH (ed.), *'Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf: Festschrift für Oswald Loretz zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres*, Münster, 383–400.
- LEITZ, Christian. 1999. *Magical and Medical Papyri of the New Kingdom*, London.
- LOPRIENO, Antonio (ed.). 1996. *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and Forms*, Leiden (= Probleme der Ägyptologie 10).
- MAAS, Paul. 1958. *Textual Criticism. Translated from the German by Barbara Flower*, Oxford.
- MARTIN, Gary D. 2010. *Multiple Originals: New Approaches to Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism*, Atlanta.

- MATHIEU, Bernard. 1996. *La poésie amoureuse de l'Égypte ancienne: recherches sur un genre littéraire au Nouvel Empire*, Cairo (= Bibliothèque d'Étude 115).
- MCGILLIVRAY, Murray. 1990. *Memorization in the Transmission of the Middle English Romances*, New York and London.
- MESKELL, Lynn. 1999. *Archaeologies of Social Life: Age, Sex, Class et Cetera in Ancient Egypt*, Oxford.
- MOERS, Gerald. 2010. New Kingdom Literature, in: Alan LLOYD (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*, vol. 2, Oxford, 685–708.
- PARKINSON, Richard. 1996. Types of Literature in the Middle Kingdom, in: LOPRIENO 1996, 292–312.
- . 2001. *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A Dark Side to Perfection*, London and New York.
- . 2009. *Reading Ancient Egyptian Poetry: Among Other Histories*, Chichester.
- . 2010. La mort de la poésie: l'histoire des Mémoires de Sinouhé, in: *Bulletin de la Société française d'égyptologie* 176, 7–29.
- . 2012. *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant: A Reader's Commentary*, Hamburg (= Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 10).
- PINCH, Geraldine. 2003. Redefining Funerary Objects, in: Zahi A. HAWASS (ed.), *Egyptology at the Dawn of the 21st Century*, vol. 2, Cairo, 443–447.
- POSENER, Georges. 1938. *Catalogue des ostraca hiératiques littéraires de Deir el Médineh*, Cairo (= Documents de fouilles de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale 1).
- . 1978. *Catalogue des ostraca hiératiques littéraires de Deir el Médineh*, Cairo (= Documents de fouilles de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale 20/1).
- . 1980. *Catalogue des ostraca hiératiques littéraires de Deir el Médineh*, Cairo (= Documents de fouilles de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale 20/2).
- QUACK, Joachim Friedrich. 1994. *Die Lehren des Ani. Eine neuägyptischer Weisheitstext in seinem kulturellen Umfeld*, Freiburg and Göttingen (= Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 141).
- QUIRKE, Stephen. 1996. Archive, in: LOPRIENO 1996, 379–402.
- . 2004. *Egyptian Literature 1800 BC: Questions and Readings*, London.
- RAGAZZOLI, Chloé. 2008. *Éloges de la ville en Égypte ancienne histoire et littérature*, Paris.
- . 2011a. *Les artisans du texte. La culture des scribes de l'Égypte ancienne d'après les sources du Nouvel Empire, thèse de doctorat inédite*, publication in preparation.
- . 2011b. 'Weak Hands and Soft Mouths.' Elements of a Scribal Identity in the New Kingdom, in: *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 157–170.
- . 2012. Un nouveau manuscrit du scribe Inéna? Le recueil de miscellanées du P. Koller (P. Berlin 3043), in: Verena LEPPER (ed.), *Forschung in der Papyrussammlung – Festschrift für das Neue Museum*, Berlin, 207–240.
- . 2013. The Social Creation of a Scribal Place: the Visitors' Inscriptions in the Tomb of Antefiqer (TT 60) (with Newly Recorded Graffiti), in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 42.
- SAUNERON, Serge. 1968. Les désillusions de la guerre asiatique (Pap. Deir el-Médineh 35), in: *Kemi* 18, 17–27.
- SCHENKEL, Wolfgang. 1978. Kritisches zur Textkritik: Die sogenannten Hörfehler, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 29, 119–126.
- SEIDLMAYER, Stefan. 2001. Die Ikonographie des Todes, in: Harco WILLEMS (ed.), *Social Aspects of Funerary Culture in the Egyptian Old and Middle Kingdoms. Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Leiden University 6–7 June 1996*, Leuven (= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 103), 204–252.

- SPALINGER, Anthony J. 2002. *The Transformation of an Ancient Egyptian Narrative: P. Sallier III and the Battle of Kadesh*, Wiesbaden (= Göttinger Orientforschungen 40).
- . 2003. Encomia and Papyrus Anastasi, in: Stephen QUIRKE (ed.), *Discovering Egypt from the Neva: The Egyptological Legacy of Oleg D. Berlev*, Berlin, 123–144.
- SPIEGELBERG, Wilhelm. 1917. *Der Ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenauge, der Papyrus der Tierfabeln-‘Kufi’: nach dem leidener demotischen Papyrus I 384*, Strassburg.
- TACKE, Nikolaus. 2001. *Verspunte als Gliederungsmittel in ramessidischen Schülerhandschriften*, Heidelberg (= Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 22).
- TAIT, John. 1976. The Fable of Sight and Hearing in the Demotic Kufi Text, in: *Acta Orientalia* 37, 27–44.
- VERHOEVEN, Ursula. 2005. Literarische Ansichtskarte aus dem Norden versus Sehnsucht nach dem Süden, in: Gunter BURKARD (ed.), *Kon-Texte. Akten des Symposions ‘Spurensuche – Altägypten im Spiegel seiner Texte,’* Wiesbaden (= Ägypten und Altes Testament 60), 65–80.
- VERNUS, Pascal. 2010–2011. ‘Littérature,’ ‘littéraire’ et supports d’écriture. Contribution à une théorie de la littérature dans l’Égypte pharaonique, in: *Egyptian and Egyptological Documents, Archives, Libraries* 2, 19–146.
- WALLE, Baudouin van de. 1948. *La Transmission des textes littéraires égyptiens. Avec une annexe de G. Posener*, Brussels.
- WILLEMS, Harco. 1988. *Chests of life. A Study of the Typology and Conceptual Development of Middle Kingdom Standard Class Coffins*, Leiden.
- WILLIAMS, Ronald J. 1978. Piety and Ethics in the Ramesside Age, in: *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 8(4), 131–137.
- WINAND, Jean. 1995. La grammaire au secours de la datation des textes, in: *RdÉ* 46, 187–202.
- ZAUZICH, Karl-Theodor. 1974. Zu einigen demotischen Glossen im Papyrus Jumilhac, in: *Enchoria* 4, 159–161.