

in: *Studies in Egyptology- presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, vol 1. edited by Sarah Israelit-Groll.
The Magnes press, the Hebrew University: Jerusalem, 1990. 200-240.

**ON THE CHOICE OF REGISTERS- STUDIES ON
THE GRAMMAR OF PAPYRUS ANASTASI I
ORLY GOLDWASSER**

pAn1, 5,2-3



it is both appropriate and gratifying to be able to honor the work done by Miriam Lichtheim, in the field of egyptian literature, by elucidating another as yet unstudied aspect of one of the most important and well known examples of that literature.

1. FOREWARD

1.1 Several studies have been published lately which question the very existence of Late-Egyptian (L.E.) as a separate stage of the egyptian language. Other studies do concede that such a language might exist, but deny the necessity of distinguishing between the 'so called' "Non-Literary Late Egyptian" and "Literary Late Egyptian".¹

The line between Literary and Non-Literary L.E. was drawn by Cerny and Groll in their fundamental study "Late Egyptian Grammar" in 1975. This study followed the "Saussurian revolution", which centralized the study of language around a synchronic analysis of "spoken language" (in contrast to diachronic studies of literary texts)- in an attempt to describe the **state** of a language as it is conceived by a native speaker, during certain period. All literary texts were excluded, since they were conceived as "historical knowledge" of the language.²

The concept, underlying Cerny and Groll's data-base structuralism of 20th Dynasty non-literary texts, echoes the Prague School concept of language, which attempts to mirror "all the phenomena of language that occur in the concrete utterances of all individual speakers, belonging at the

1. Junge, 1983; Junge 1987 ; Loprieno, 1988.

2. Saussure 1966, 99-100, 81, 20-21.

same time to the same broad language community"³; this also includes all the "synchronic oscillations" of the period⁴.

The division between the literary and non-literary was not entirely alien to Egyptian linguistics, even before the advent of Cerny and Groll. Stricker, in his ingenious article⁵, pointed towards the same direction; Posener's and Gardiner's differentiation between ostraca "littéraires" and "non-littéraires" was an *ipsa facto* recognition in the divergence between Ramesside literary and non-literary discourses.⁶

Yet, this binary situation is not universally accepted by all linguists and philologists in the field.⁷ In trying to define possible reasons for this unacceptability, two main questions emerge:

a) What are the boundaries of the "state of a language" in a synchronic description- in our case a synchronic description of a "dead" language?⁸ This question was recently raised by Junge⁹ (even though he terms it differently). Do certain literary texts exist within this boundary?

b) Which text is to be defined as a "literary text"? This comprehensive question is raised frequently with regard to Wenamun, considered by Cerny and Groll to be a non-literary, but suspected by Lichtheim and others as being a literary text.

1.2 What are the boundaries of the "state" of Non-literary L.E.?

Every L.E. text is *a priori* a "written text". Nevertheless, texts that might be defined as those "attempted to be written as is spoken" could be the closest parallel to the term "spoken language" of modern linguistics.¹⁰ This definition embraces all texts that are labeled "colloquial", "vernacular", and "educated vernacular". By genre classification they include letters, legal protocols, oracles, notes, etc. Under this general heading, we find alongside discourses of viziers and highly educated officials and scribes (probably "standard vernacular" which is very close to the "normative vernac-

3. Mathesius, 1964, 1.

4. Hasan, 1987, 113.

5. Stricker, 1945.

6. Posener, 1932-72; Cerny & Gardiner, 1957.

7. differences between non-literary and literary sources are discussed with great subtlety by Vernus in all his recent publications. for the latest one see Vernus, 1987. the differentiation is accepted by Silverman, 1984; Sweeney, 1986; and partially by Frandsen, 1974 and Borghouts, 1979. Other scholars deal with a mixture of L.E. texts. See Korostovtsev, 1973; Satzinger, 1976; Shisha-Halevy, 1978; Neveu, Doctoral dissertation.

8. Lyons, 1968, 46.

9. Junge, 1983, 1987.

10. Gregory, 1967, 188ff; Durant & Fabb 1987, 6ff.; Murray, 1988.

ular" known especially from "model letters" e.g. pAnastasi VI from the 19th Dynasty), discourses citing (how much editing is involved?) speeches of people from the lower social echelon.

(Can "restricted vernacular" be identified in L.E? No definite answer can be given, until further studies are carried out¹¹)

The question that stemmed from the Prague School, and has lately been revived (from a different angle) by Labov, is whether the "historical knowledge" of a language influences the "state" of the language of the individual speakers, and if it does, to what extent?¹² Synchronic studies of L.E. texts, belonging to the non-literary genres, described above, show a fixed inventory of grammatical forms and lexicon which typify the sphere of the "vernacular". No archaic form stemming from "historical knowledge" (e.g., archaic forms that did not survive as a part of the non-literary system) was allowed into the "written as if spoken" texts. An excellent example of this is "The Discourse of the Vizier T3", written in exquisite L.E., without any trace of Middle Egyptian or Literary L.E. forms.¹³ These results coincide perfectly with Lyons' confrontation of the problem, when he argues that "with regard to those few members of a speech community who do have some knowledge of previous states of the language, the following argument would seem to apply. Either their specialized knowledge has some effect upon the way they speak the language, or it does not. If it affects their usage, so that their speech is in some respect different from (presumably more 'archaic' than) that of other members of the community, it is to that extent a different language; and will not therefore fall within the scope of a description of the more typical usage of the speech community. And if it has no noticeable effect upon their normal speech, it is more clearly irrelevant to the synchronic description. In either case, therefore, synchronic analysis is independent of such knowledge of the history of the language as may exist in the speech community."¹⁴

The historical knowledge of the language finds its expression in the 'literary' literature of the period. From the grammatical point of view, these texts are a mixture of different phases, ranging from the older language (=historical knowledge) forms, to spoken language forms, and literary forms (i.e., forms appearing only in literary texts, see below).¹⁵ This last group of forms bears testimony to the highly creative force and deep understanding of the language possessed by certain groups, in the Ramesside community, who comprise the backbone of this form of expression.

It can only be guessed how many of these texts were comprehensible to all members of the community. Nevertheless, it is fair to assume that texts containing a higher percentage of "spoken

11. For "restricted vernacular", see Bernstein, 1971.

12. As summarized by Sampson, 1980, 129.

13. Vernus, 1980, 121ff.

14. Lyons, 1968, 49.

15. for a somewhat similar state existing in modern literature, see: Durant & Fabb, 1987.

language" forms (e.g., the Stories), were much more comprehensible than texts containing many old and literary forms (e.g., some historical and religious texts). Usually, it is the genre, registers, and potential audience which dictate the type of language used.¹⁶

1.3 "What is a literary text in Late Egyptian"

Here, we find ourselves ensnared by one of the oldest and most complicated questions in the field of literature. Roman Jakobson's question "what makes a verbal message a work of art"?¹⁷ has no unequivocal answer. Jakobson's own answer, "The set (Einstellung) toward the MESSAGE as such, focus on the message for its own sake, is the POETIC function of language"¹⁸, has not gone unchallenged, even though it has been broadly accepted by linguists and theoreticians of literature today.¹⁹ One might also mention Bloomfield's statement which focuses on the universality of literary discourse: "Literature, whether presented in spoken form, or as it is now our custom, in writing, consists of beautiful or otherwise notable utterances."²⁰ Literature involves "literary style", and, here, from among the many definitions for this term, one might select Seymore Chatman's statement: "As everyone knows, "style" is an ambiguous term. Among other things, it has been used to refer to the idiosyncratic manner of an individual or a group;...or to a kind of extra or heightened expressiveness, present in non-literary language as well." We hold the opinion that this is exactly the situation in Non-Literary L.E. there are instances, in this kind of text, where the speaker concentrates on the "MESSAGE" that consists of "beautiful or otherwise notable utterances", while using "extra-heightened expressiveness that might be found in nonliterary language as well."

We believe that Wenamun is one of the most prominent examples of these texts. By grammar and lexis, the text unmistakably belongs to the non-literary sphere. No definite archaic or Literary L.E. constructions can be identified in the papyrus. What Wenamun projects is **literary style**; as Miriam Lichtheim puts it: "What makes the story so remarkable is the skill with which it is told. The Late Egyptian vernacular is handled with great subtlety. The verbal duels between Wenamun and the prince of Byblos, with their changes of mood and shades of meaning that include irony, represent Egyptian thought and style at their most advanced. What Sinuhe is for the Middle Kingdom, Wenamun is for the New Kingdom, a literary culmination"²¹. Thus, Sinuhe is a literary (not written as if spoken) text, excelling in style, while Wenamun is a non-literary (written as if spoken) text, to which the dimension of "excellent style" was added.

16. Murray, 1988, 356; Culler, 1975, 145ff.

17. Jakobson, 1960, 350.

18. Jakobson, 1960, 356.

19. Attridge, 1987, 15ff; Hawks, 1977, 86-7.

20. Bloomfield, 1935, 21-22.

21. Lichtheim, 1974, 224.

2.1 We would like to suggest the following classification for dealing with L.E. texts:

2.1.1

Attempted to be written as if spoken	-literary style: most daily life documents, protocols, informative letters, notes, etc.
	+literary style: Rare cases: Wenamun, speech of the Vizier T3, several private letters

Not attempted to be written as if spoken	-literary style: some literary texts can be marked as Ø style addition. These are some normative administrative documents or literary texts based on frozen formulae required by the genre. (These cases stand in contrast to the above definition of "style").
	+literary style: most texts belonging to literary genres project different levels of style.

2.2 This Classification should by no means be viewed as a rigid means of separation. Within the "written as if spoken" sphere, some administrative notes and Wenamun represent the two poles, while many other texts fall in between; some closer to the "-literary style", others to the "+literary style".

The same situation apparently finds manifestation in the rich realm of texts labeled here "not attempted to be written as if spoken"- the traditional world of literature.

The provision of reasons for allotting each of the L.E. texts to its proper place, on the scale, should be left to a careful future study which would take into account contextual, functional, and semi-otic considerations.

3. INTRODUCTION TO PAPYRUS ANASTASI I

From the general remarks made above, let us now advance to an analysis of a specific text. Papyrus Anastasi I is one of the most interesting Rammeside literary texts. It makes use of the new-

ly introduced and very typical Ramesside literary genre- the Literary Letter.²² The referential context of the "letter of Hori", as it appears in pAnastasi I, is unequivocally Ramesside, leaving no doubt that this document is an original product of the Ramesside era and its weltanschauung²³.

Two major studies have been devoted - to date - to this papyrus and the other versions of the text (ostraca and papyri). The first, Gardiner's monumental study²⁴, although written in the beginning of the century, is fundamental for any further study. It includes a transliteration into hieroglyphics of pAnastasi I and all other versions known to him thenm translation, and commentary.

Fischer-Elfert, in a recent publication²⁵, sums up all the known published versions. Not only does he add a new translation, an explicit philological commentary and an innovating literary criticism, but he also presents a detailed comparison of the various versions of the text. Although Fischer-Elfert uses up-to-date grammatical criteria²⁶ for analyzing the Late-Egyptian text, he makes no attempt to trace the overall system in the grammatical framework of the text.

Gardiner, however, believed that the version which had reached us on the papyrus called Anastasi I is not the original composition, as the calligraphy of the hieratic points to the end of the 19th Dynasty, whereas the onomastics of the text is relevant to the time of Ramesse II. Gardiner nevertheless states that: "Both in respect of size and calligraphy, the papyrus is one of the finest specimens of a Ramesside book."²⁷

Fischer-Elfert shares Gardiner's views about the date and originality of the manuscript, but in his opinion, the version contains quite a number of "*Abschreibefehler*"²⁸, and therefore its interpretation cannot be considered reliable until these errors are accounted for.²⁹ These "errors" shall be dealt with elsewhere, but I strongly believe that the scribe of pAnastasi I was no mere copier, but rather an excellent scribe, and that he understood his "source" text well. There is thus no reason for the text or any other part of it to have been incomprehensible or misunderstood by this competent scribe. Even if pAnastasi I is not the "Ur" text, the "Ur" text was compiled not many years earlier, and the grammar and lexis are absolutely Ramesside (see below).

22. Caminos, in: LÄ I, 858; LÄ III, 1066.

23. for a detailed bibliography, see: Brunner, LÄ I, 647-9; Green, 1985, 49-52.

24. Gardiner, 1911.

25. Fischer-Elfert, 1983, 1986.

26. As defined by: Cerny & Groll, 1984; Frandsen, 1974; Satzinger, 1976.

27. Gardiner, 1911, 1*,4*.

28. Fischer-Elfert, 1983, 1986, 261-7.

29. Gardiner, is more careful on this matter, and acknowledges the limitations of the modern reader's comprehension ("code" differences), 1911, 5*.

In this study, I intend to build up a grammatical system which will bring into coherence the variant verbal forms which occur in this literary composition, as they are represented in the pAnastasi I version. This study is not concerned with tracing the version or versions of a possible "Ur" text, nor with "earlier" or "later" variations. Its interest lies rather in the definition of the idiolect of the scribe who put down, on papyrus, the "Letter of Hori" as it is mirrored in the syntax of pAnastasi I³⁰.

The term idiolect was advanced by Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens³¹. They wrote: "it is the individual who speaks and writes; and in his language activity dialect and register combine...The individual is, so to speak, the smallest dialect unit: each speaker has his own IDIOLECT." Thus, while dialect identifies the speaker/writer in terms of geography and time, the register describes the use and choices made by that speaker/writer in a given text.

The dialect of pAnastasi I is literary Late Egyptian, probably northern. It is to the definition of the registers used in the text that this paper is addressed.

3.1 The role of the registers in pAnastasi I

While studying pAnastasi I, I became aware of the fact that although the text as a whole was written in Literary Late Egyptian, grammatically it contains different layers of language. Furthermore, each of those layers is characterized by a different kind of literary language, that is, by different sets of grammatical formations.

There was a need for a definition of the systematicity of this phenomenon, that would explain its use. The term register, a well known expression in current linguistic and socio-linguistic studies, is eminently suitable. This term, first advanced in the 1960's³², has since been defined and elaborated upon, especially by Halliday³³, and Hasan³⁴. Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, in their earlier publication³⁵, has defined register as:

"The name given to a variety of language distinguished according to use...The category of register is needed when we want to account for what people do with their language. When we observe language activity in various contexts in which it takes place, we find differences in the type of lan-

30. For a more detailed description of factors concerning the users of a language, see: Gregory, 1967, 181-182; Lyons, 1981, 274.

31. Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens, 1964, 94-95.

32. for bibliography, see: Halliday, 1978, 110.

33. Halliday, 1978.

34. Hasan, 1971, 271ff. and *passim*.

35. Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens, 1964, 87-88.

guage selected as appropriate to different types of situation...the crucial criteria of any given register are found in its grammar and lexis".³⁶

Since, as has been stated above, lexis and semantics are elaborately discussed by Fischer-Elfert, we shall deal with the registers in pAnastasi I only with regard to its grammar. The lexicographical work is essential, as it enables us to approach the "code" of the ancient text, that is "...the principle of semiotic organization governing the choice of meanings by a speaker, and their interpretation by a hearer. The code controls the semantic styles of the culture."³⁷

3.2 The composition of a register

A. Hasan³⁸ distinguishes a set of five factors creating a register variation:

- 1) Subject matter of discourse³⁹
- 2) Situation-type for discourse⁴⁰
- 3) Participant roles within discourse
- 4) Mode of discourse
- 5) Medium of discourse

In the case of pAnastasi I, factors 2,3 and 5 remain unchanged:

- 2) Situation-type: A contention between two scribes (also defines the text as belonging to the sphere of "Rede" or "discussion-with".)⁴¹
- 3) Participant-roles: Two scribes of equal social status
- 5) Medium: Written text, literary composition, genre-letter.⁴²

36. Gregory gives examples from English to illustrate the connection between the register ("diatypic variety" in his terminology) and grammatical phenomena, 1967, 186-187.

37. Halliday, 1978, 111.

38. Hasan, 1971, 272.

39. "The subject matter controls the range of lexicon from which selection may be made." Hasan, 1971, 276.

40. See also Gregory, 1987, 177-8. Halliday and Hasan prefer a slightly different specification of the factors. See, "field", "mode", "tenor", in: Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 22.

41. See Hintze, 1950-1952. Our text lacks the detachment needed for the *Erzählung*. See also Groll, 1970, 8-9. Halliday believes that register and cohesion create a "text": "A text is a passage of discourse which is coherent...with respect to the context of situation, and therefore cohesive." Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 23.

42. The term "genre", or the "generic structure" of a text, is defined by Halliday as being "outside the linguistic system... The concept of generic structure can be brought within the framework of the concept of register, the semantic patterning that is characteristically associated with the "context of situation" of a text", Halliday, 1978, 134 (note 11).

Factors 1 and 4 undergo changes:

- 1) Subject-matter: Congratulations, adulations, daily-life problems, "the true scribe"⁴³, "wicked, yet well off", the competent scribe, solutions to geographical and mathematical problems, etc.
- 4) Mode: Differences occur among the congratulatory, adulatory, and subject-matter parts of the letter.

3.3 The division of pAnastasi I into registers

The master register of pAnastasi I is that of literature. However, it also contains three main "sub-registers", which vary according to subject and mode (factors 1 and 4 above). These are: register of adulation (1,1 to 2,7); register of congratulation (2,7 to 4,5); register of subject-matter of the letter (4,5 to end). This last sub-register might be further sub-divided according to subject-matter of the discourse (factor 1).

The grammatical forms constituting a register will be defined and examined in order to determine which forms typify each of the registers.

4. Papyrus Anastasi I and the Ramesside literary system

4.1 The literary system of the 19th Dynasty

The text of pAnastasi I is an eminent example of the type of language used in a literary text of the Ramesside era.

In texts dating to the beginning of the 19th Dynasty⁴⁴, two major types may be clearly differentiated: literary and non-literary.⁴⁵ It should be emphasized that the Egyptian system of this period very carefully guarded the distinction between the two types of texts, especially in that no "high" literary construction was allowed into the non-literary system. The situation regarding the literary system, however, was much more complicated. First, the literary norm allowed- and sometimes preferred- the use of the "high" older language. It also permitted the use of the non-literary language. In addition, a set of new constructions appears, one not found in the older texts, and different from the non-literary "spoken" language. These are the newly introduced Ramesside literary constructions. (see **FORWARD**, above).

43. See, Israeli, 1982.

44. The "linguistic revolution" took place during the Amarna period. On "Late-Egyptian" constructions before the Amarna period, (especially in non-literary texts), see Kroeber, 1970. For differences already existing in Middle Egyptian, see Vernus 1980, 118.

45. At least part of the non-literary system is suitable to the definition "what is written to be spoken as if not written", Gregory, 1967, 191.

S. Groll, in her article *The Literary and Non-literary Verbal Systems in Late Egyptian*⁴⁶ defines the study of Late Egyptian texts as diachronic-comparative.⁴⁷ She asserts, there, that these texts contain: "1. the pure Middle-Egyptian formations; 2. the specific Literary Late Egyptian formations; 3. the non-literary formations which occur in literary texts."

4.2 The method used for analyzing pAnastasi I

The method described in this paper is an amplification of Groll's theory. Categories of grammatical forms in the text were defined, the number of times each category appears in a given discourse⁴⁸ counted, and their frequencies compared (see **Tables 1,2 and 3**).

4.2.1 The "pure" Middle-Egyptian formations and earlier constructions

Gardiner's *Egyptian Grammar*⁴⁹ constitutes my basis for the morphological description of Middle-Egyptian forms, some 18th Dynasty forms, and a few Old Egyptian constructions.⁵⁰ For the syntactical status of the constructions, Polotsky's structuralist analysis was followed.⁵¹ For Old Egyptian constructions, Edel's formulations⁵², and Allen's accurate definition of the religious genre of the Pyramid Texts⁵³ were used.

Each construction was cross-checked (when possible) both syntagmatically and paradigmatically in order to determine whether its use was similar to that of the original language.

4.2.2 The non-literary formations which occur in literary texts

Cerny and Groll, in their definitive study, *A Late Egyptian Grammar*⁵⁴, provide a synchronical grammar of 20th Dynasty non-literary texts. All of the forms defined in this grammar are non-literary forms⁵⁵. Most of the constructions used in the 20th Dynasty had already made their appearance in the 19th Dynasty. However, we still lack a comprehensive grammar of the non-liter-

46. Groll, 1975/6, 237.

47. On the importance of synchronic analysis of "dead" languages, see, Lyons, 1968, chapt. 1.4.5.

48. The definition of "discourse" is still ambiguous; see: Schiffrin, 1987, 1-30.

49. Oxford, 1957.

50. It is impossible to cite here all works consulted on this matter. Several will be specified in individual cases. I owe much to the works of Allen, Borghouts, Cerny, de Buck, Edgerton, Erman, Gilula, Hintze, Junge, Peet, Sethe, Silverman, Vernus, Westendorf, and others.

51. Our main source is his latest study, Polotsky, 1976.

52. Edel, 1955, 1964.

53. Allen, 1984.

54. Cerny and Groll, 1984.

55. See also Groll, 1970 as well as Frandsen, 1974.

ary language of the 19th Dynasty, and many non-literary forms, typical of this dynasty, should be added.

In order to close this gap, we have used Groll's definition of 19th Dynasty constructions as presented in two other articles, *Late Egyptian of Non-Literary Texts in the 19th Dynasty*.⁵⁶ and *The sdm.n.f Formations in the Non-Literary Documents of the 19th Dynasty*⁵⁷, and some items from sporadic discussions in her two earlier books.⁵⁸ Other forms were compiled for this study from 19th Dynasty non-literary sources, with a preference for those dated by such means as royal names, prosopography, and so on⁵⁹, rather than by grammar alone.

4.2.3 The specific literary Late-Egyptian Formations

The definitive study of Ramesside literary forms as a **seperate unit**, within the literary framework, can be found in Groll's previously cited article The Literary and Non-literary Systems in Late Egyptian⁶⁰. Additional material can be found in her introduction to the third edition of Late Egyptian Grammar⁶¹.

Other forms may be found in Erman's monumental work, *Neuägyptische Grammatik*⁶². As this book deals simultaneously with both literary and non-literary texts, the literary formations may only be traced by a process of elimination: forms which are neither Middle-Egyptian nor Non-Literary Late Egyptian, are, by exclusion, literary forms. The grammars of Hintze⁶³, Satzinger and korosrovtsev⁶⁴, are dealt with in a similiar way.

4.2.4 Verbal formations which cannot be used as classification criteria

a) Verbal forms which are identical in morphology, and basically show the same syntactic behaviour (e.g., prospective *sdm.f* and perfect *sdm.f*), cannot serve as differential criteria for categorization, as the choice is completely dependent upon the decision of the modern scholar.

56. Groll, 1973, 67-70.

57. Groll, 1986, 167-179.

58. Groll, 1967 and Groll, 1970.

59. See also: Allam, 1981, 13; Goldwasser, 1985, 50-56.

60. Groll, 1975/6, 237-246.

61. Cerny & Groll, 1984.

62. Erman, 1979.

63. Hintze, 1950-1952. See also Kruchten, 1982.

64. Satzinger, 1976; Korostovtsev, 1973.

b) Verbal forms which remain unchanged through Middle Egyptian to Late-Egyptian (e.g., the non-initial prospective *sdm.f*).

4.2.5 Lexicographical criteria

Lexicographical elements such as a definite articles, possessive articles, words of negation (*nn*, *n, bn*, *bw*, etc.) and other special terms and expressions might reinforce or diminish the "Rameside" or "Classical" impression of a discourse.

TABLE 1

pAnastasi I

Verbal forms in the register of Adulation

(Frequency of Appearance as per Categories)

CLASSICAL FORMS	LITERARY FORMS	NON-LITERARY FORMS
<u>Participle</u> 25	<u>sdm.f</u> of the Simple present 2	<u>Emphatic i.iri.f</u> 1
<u>Emphatic sdm.f</u> 3	<u>nn hm.f</u> 2	<u>First present</u> 2
<u>Circumstantial sdm.f</u> 2	---	---
<u>nn sdm.f</u> as negation of <u>Circumstantial sdm.f</u> 2	---	---
<u>nn wn A</u> 1	---	---
<u>Relative sdm.f</u>	---	---
<u>hft sdm.tw.f</u> 1	---	---
<u>nn A n.f</u> 1	---	---

TABLE 2

pAnastasi I

Verbal forms in the register of Congratulation

(Frequency of Appearance as per Catagories)

CLASSICAL FORMS	LITERARY FORMS	NON-LITERAY FORMS
<u>Prospective Optative <i>sdm.f</i></u> 38	---	---
<u>Prospective Passive <i>sdm.f</i></u> 2	---	---
<u>Circumstantial <i>sdm.f</i></u> 2 (possibly more)	---	---
<u><i>nn sdm.f</i> as negation of Circumstantial <i>sdm.f</i></u> 4	---	---
<u>Relative <i>sdm.t.n.f</i></u> <u><i>l</i></u>	---	---
<u><i>nn A n.f</i></u> 1	---	---

TABLE 3
pAnastasi I

Verbal forms in the register of Subject Matter
(Frequency of Appearance as per Categories)

CLASSICAL FORMS	LITERARY FORMS	NON-LITERARY FORMS
<u>Prospective <i>sdm.f</i></u> undefinable	<u><i>sdm.f</i> of Simple Present</u> undefinable	<u><i>sdm.f</i> of Past</u> undefinable
<u><i>sdm.ti</i> Prospective Participle</u> 1-lit. sub-reg*	<u>Literary Emphatic <i>sdm.f</i></u> Approx. 11 7- non-lit. reg. 4- lit. reg.	<u><i>bwpw.f sdm</i></u> 2 (only!)- lit. reg.
<u><i>sdm.f</i> as "Objektsatz"</u> 4- all lit. sub-reg.	<u>Literary Emphatic <i>sdm.f</i> in weak verbs</u> 4- all lit. reg.	<u>Third Future</u> 8 5- lit. reg. 3- non-lit. reg.
<u>Ø-A <i>sdm.f</i></u> 1-non-lit. reg.	<u>Emphatic <i>i.šm.f</i></u> 2 1- lit. reg. 1-non-lit. reg.	<u>Third Future with Adverbial Phrase as Predicate</u> 4 3- non-lit. reg. 1- lit. reg.
<u>Emphatic <i>sdm.f</i></u> 7 5- non-lit. reg. 2- lit. reg.	<u>Circumstantial <i>sdm.f</i> (Pluperfect)</u> 2(?) -non-lit. reg.	<u>Negative Third Future</u> 1- lit. reg.

<u><i>ir sdm.f</i></u> 5 4- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.	<u><i>hr sdm.f</i></u> 1- lit. reg.	<u>First Present</u> 7 15- non-lit. reg. 8- lit. reg.
<u><i>mi sdm.f</i></u> 2- lit. reg.	<u><i>nn sdm.f</i></u> (=Classical <u><i>nn sdm.n.f</i></u>) 1- lit. reg.	<u>First Present in Pattern</u> <u><i>sw m šs+</i></u> Post extraposition 3- non-lit. reg.
<u><i>hft sdm.f</i></u> 2- lit. reg.	<u><i>bn Ø-A sdm.f</i></u> 1- lit. reg.	<u>First Present negated by</u> <u><i>bn</i></u> 7 5- lit. reg. 2- non-lit. reg.
<u><i>sdm.hr.f</i></u> 2 1- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.	<u>Relative Neuter</u> Approx. 13 8- lit. reg. 5- non-lit. reg.	<u>First Present negated by</u> <u><i>bn...iwn?</i></u> 1- lit. reg.(!)
<u>Independent Predicative</u> <u>Stative</u> 4 opening reg. of the paragraph	<u><i>bsy.k (hr) bs.t</i></u> 1- non-lit. reg.	<u><i>bw iri.f sdm</i></u> 4 3- non-lit. reg. 1- lit. reg.
<u>Emphatic <i>sdm.n.f</i></u> 1- lit. reg.	---	<u><i>bn sdm.f</i></u> 4 2- non-lit. reg. 2- lit. reg.
<u>Non-emphatic <i>sdm.n.f</i></u> 3(?) 2- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.	---	<u><i>i.sdm</i></u> (imperative) 2 1- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.

<u>Preposition+ sdm.n.f</u> 2- lit. reg.	---	<u>m iri sdm</u> 4 2- lit. reg. 2- non-lit. reg.
<u>tm.f sdm</u> 3- lit. reg.	---	<u>m iri di.t sdm.f</u> 2 1- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.
<u>imi.k sdm</u> 1- lit. reg.	---	<u>m dy sdm.f</u> 1- non-lit. reg.
<u>nn Ø-A sdm.f</u> 1- lit. reg.	---	<u>Emphatic i.iri.f sdm</u> 2 1- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.
<u>Circumstantial nn sdm.f</u> 6 <u>All</u> in lit. reg.	---	<u>Emphatic i.sdm.f</u> 2 1- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.
<u>nn hm.f</u> 1- lit. reg.	---	<u>m-dr sdm.f</u> 7 5- lit. reg. 2- non-lit. reg.
<u>n sdm.n.f</u> 1- lit. reg.	---	<u>iw.f hr sdm of the future</u> 1- non-lit. reg.
<u>sdm.ty.fy (?)</u> 1- lit. reg.	---	<u>mtw.f sdm</u> 1- non-lit. reg.
---	---	<u>p³-sdm - i.iri.f</u> 1- lit. reg.

---	---	<u><i>iw.f</i></u> + adverb as a Virtual Relative clause 1- non-lit. reg.
---	---	<u><i>iw sdm.f</i></u> (Pluperfect) 5 3- lit. reg. 2- non-lit. reg.
---	---	<u><i>bw sdm.f</i></u> of the Past 14 11- non-lit. reg. 3-lit. reg.
---	---	<u><i>iw bw sdm.f</i></u> of the Past 3 2- lit. reg. 1- non-lit. reg.
		<u><i>bw sdm.f</i></u> of the Present 3 All in non-lit. reg.
		<u><i>iw bw sdm.f</i></u> of the Present(?) 1- lit. reg.
		<u><i>bw rh.f</i></u> 7 5- non-lit. reg. 2- lit. reg.

*lit.=literary; reg.= register

5. CONCLUSIONS

THE REGISTERS AND THE VERBAL FORMS OF pANASTASI I

5.1 **The register of adulation and congratulation (1,1 to 4,5).**

These are the most "literary" registers in the papyrus (by subject and grammar). They are comprised of a mixture of the three categories of forms, the predominating form being the **classical**. Of the two, the register of congratulation is the more literary. No Ramesside "written as if spoken" or literary form, within it, was found to be unequivocally definable. The register of adulation, on the other hand, contains at least one conspicuous non-literary verbal form (Ramesside emphatic form- 1,3).

The register of congratulation is also the more literary when its subject is considered. It contains religious formulas almost exclusively. Both registers lack typical Ramesside lexical characteristics such as definite and possessive articles.

5.2 **The register of the subject matter (4,5 to 28,8)**

The part, which we called the "subject matter" of the letter, begins with a clear declaration of a transition into a different literary register. The opening *ky dd r-nty* is a salient initiality marker of the non-literary language, and immediately transfers us to a register which is much less literary in its nature than the preceding sections.

Together with classical archaic forms (e.g., independent stative), we encounter, for the first time in this papyrus, prominent Ramesside markers like *bn* and *bw pw.f sdm*. Definite and Possessive articles are common (appearing as early as the first word!)

Discourses dealing with literary subjects, in this part of the text, (e.g., "the true scribe", "wicked, yet well-off") include a different combination of verbal forms than do the registers of congratulation and adulation. Although these discourses also deal with literary subjects, their inclusion in the subject matter register permits the use of additional new Ramesside language, here, is thus much more prominent syntactically and lexically. Nevertheless, the classical language still remains unmistakably represented in these paragraphs, especially in constructions which include very characteristic classical markers like *nn* and *n*.

In the non-literary portions, which are most prominently represented by the geographical paragraph, there is a sudden change in style. These parts contain successive combinations of *bw sdm.f* constructions, adverbial sentences with extrapositions, imperative forms, and also *bn* negations. Nevertheless, in contrast to 'real' "spoken as if written" texts, the classical and literary forms are clearly found to be existing side by side with the colloquial forms. The many Ramesside articles help create the "Ramesside impression" in this paragraph.

If we had expected the non-literary registers of Papyrus Anastasi I to mirror the "spoken" language as we know it from non-literary texts, it now becomes very clear that this is not the case. Although the administrative sub-registers in this part of the text contain many prominent non-literary characteristics in syntax and in lexis, both Literary Ramesside and classical forms are present in these registers- and these forms were not allowed into the "true" non-literary texts.

It must be emphasized that these forms do not include the classical "markers" *nn* and *n*, resulting in a diminishing of the classical "impression".

We may conclude that the numerical correlation of the "high" and "low" forms, within a register, and the presence or absence of the prominent classical sign- the predicative *nn*- express the syntactic differences between the literary and non-literary sub-registers in the "subject matter" part of the letter.

EXCURSUS

A discussion on a select form in pAnastasi I:

The independent usage of the intransitive stative

The most prominent examples of this archaic form appear in the register "subject matter" of the letter, in a discourse belonging to a very "Ramesside" sub-register within the register itself.

*pAnI 4,5-4,7 ky-dd r-nty t3y.k-šct spr r.i m wnwnt nty (sic) shn n ḥc gm.i (sic) wpwty.k iw.i
sndm.k(wi) r-gs p3-ssmt nty m-dt.i ḥc.k(wi) rš.k(wi) hr.k(wi) r ḥsf ḥk.k(wi) r t3y.k-šmm r m33 šct.k*

Translation:

"Another subject: Your letter reached me in an hour of resting a while. It is while I was sitting beside the horse which is my charge that your messenger found me. I rejoiced and I was glad; I was ready to reply. I entered into your (my) stable to examine your letter".

The four statives (*ḥc.k(wi)*, *rš.k(wi)*, *hr.k(wi)*, *ḥk.k(wi)*), follow a typical Ramesside beginning formula, very much enhanced by the non-literary discourse marker *ky-dd r-nty*⁶⁵.

The Ramesside possessive article makes its appearance, here, for the first time in the text; its absence now become very conspicuous in the first two registers. *t3y.k-šct spr.Ø* is a first present, followed by an ungeminated *sdm.f*, which might either be a 19th Dynasty emphatic form, or a non-literary *sdm.f* of the past.⁶⁶

Following the *gm.i [w].i wpwty.k* (not *p3y.k wpwty* !) we find a circumstantial first present, followed by an adverbial phrase containing the defined noun *p3-ssmt*.

The four statives which appear, now, thus represent a drastic change. They announce, dramatically, that the discourse is nevertheless a literary (rather than a non-literary) text, and they most likely

65. pCairo 58059,2 (=Bakir, 1970, pl.7); Cerny & Groll, 1984, 10.10.1

66. An emphatic *sdm.f* still exists even in non-literary texts of the 19th Dynasty, e.g., KRI III,535 (=oDeM, 328); *hr ptr wrš.f iw.f hr in (sic) B inh.t*. "Now see, it is while carrying the jar that he spends the day." This ostrakon contains many 19th Dynasty grammatical forms, such as *sDm.n.f*, *nn wn* and *bw sDm.f*. Another example is pCairo 58053,4 (=Bakir, 1970, pl. 1): *ir sdm.(i) r-dd thi.tn r n3.n-rmt n p3 ntr*. "If I hear that it is against the people belonging to the god that you have acted." For the emphatic *sdm.f* in the literary system see, Groll, 1975/6, 243-5; Groll, 1985, 83. For *gmi* and *wrš* as emphatic forms, see Polotsky, 1971, 44, n.1; Groll, 1969, 189; *LRL*, 7,11.

cause an additional foregrounding of the events described by them, as they are strongly contrasted with the preceding and following grammatical formations of discourse.⁶⁷

These four statives also evoke connotations from other literary texts, perhaps even suggesting a comparison with the excitement of a lover:

ʕ3 wsy hpr.n.i hʕʕ.kwi hntš.kwi wr.kwi

"What has happened to me is great! I am happy; I am excited; I am big!"

(pChester Beatty I, 24,7)

The combinations *hʕʕ.kwi rš.kwi* or *hʕʕ.kwi hntš.kwi* are fixed units in Ramesside literary texts. The stative of the verb ʕk is characteristic, in this period, of historical texts, for example:

KRI II, 323, 9-10; *ib.i htp hr ir.t.n.k n.i h(ʕʕ).kwi hr wd.t (n.k) rš.kwi n ir.k (n).i m3ʕt*

"My heart is satisfied because of what you have done for me, I rejoice at what (you have) commanded, I am delighted because you do *m3ʕt* for me".⁶⁸

KRI IV, 110, 1; *....sip.(?) t3 mhw šmʕw n ity n k3.fhʕi.k(wi) hntš.k(wi) m mnt (. . .)... ʕk.k(wi) nn ky wtsn.k(wi) nn in.tw.(i)*

"I inspected upper and lower Egypt for my lord for his *k3*. I rejoiced, I was delighted daily. (. . .) ... I entered without another, I traveled freely without being brought."

KRI II, 85-86(=Qadesh, chaps. 278-280); *tw.i hr.kwi r ʕh3 mi k3 spd tw.i hʕi.kwi r sn mitt Mntw ʕpr.kwi m hkr n knt nht ʕk.kwi m skw hr ʕh3 mi ht bik*

"I was prepared to fight like a bull. I appeared to them like Montu, as I was equipped with the panoply of strong power. I entered among the troops, fighting like a dangerous falcon"

In pAnastasi I, at least two of the statives appear in the independent "foreground" use⁶⁹: [*hʕʕ.k(wi)* and *ʕk.k(wi)*] this use of the stative is very rare in non-literary texts of the period: a subjectless stative might be found, but always in an adverbial "background" function.⁷⁰

67. See, Wallace, 1982, 201-223, esp. 214, 216.

68. See, Sweeney, 1984, 167.

69. This foreground function stands in contrast to the "background function" of the stative as discussed by Loprieno, 1986, 262, 266-7.

70. E.g., Cerny & Gardiner, 1957 pl. 47,2 and Cerny & Groll, 1984, 12.6.

The use of the independent stative in the first person was in vogue in old Egyptian, but gradually became obsolete in Middle Egyptian.⁷¹ Still, scattered examples are found in the 18th Dynasty.⁷²

The use of the independent stative in adjectival verbs is known from the Old Kingdom biographies, and the Pyramid Texts.⁷³ The stative of the verb *ḥ* is the "narrative" use of the old perfective, also a well attested form in tomb-biographies of the Old-Kingdom⁷⁴. This small group of statives is embraced in pAnastasi I by very Ramesside elements, starting with *ky-dd r-nty*, and concluded by *bn st m ḥswt bn st m šhwri*.

I hope that I have succeeded in shedding some light on the reasons for the use of the stative here, as well as describing its possible effect on the potential reader.

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Allam, S 1981 = "Ostrakon Berlin P. 12398" *MDAIK* 37, 9-13
2. Allen, J. P. 1984 = *The inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*, Malibu
3. Attridge, D 1987 = "Closing statement: Linguistics and Poetics in Retrospect" in: N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant, C. MacCabe (eds.) *The Linguistics of Writing*. Manchester. 15-32
4. Bakir, A 1970 = *Egyptian Epistolography*, Cairo
5. Bernstein, B 1971 = *Class, codes and control, Vol. I: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*, London
6. Bloomfield, L 1935 = *Language*, London
7. Borghouts, J. F. 1979= "A New Grammar of Late Egyptian" *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 36,3,9-10
8. Cerny, J. & Gardiner, A. 1957= *Hieratic Ostraca*, Oxford
9. Cerny, J. & Groll, S. I. 1984= *A Late Egyptian Grammar*, (3rd. ed.), Rome
10. Chatman, S. 1971= *Literary Style*, A Symposium, London and New York
11. Culler, J. 1975= *Structural Poetics*, London
12. Doret, E. 1986= *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian*, Geneva

71. Cerny & Groll, 1984, 312.

72. Gardiner, 1957. For the latest discussion with extensive bibliography, see Doret, 1986, 57-66. See also: Habachi, 1972, fig. 20 line 2; Erman, NÄG, ch. 343.

73. Allen, 1984, 4060407, 508; E. Edel, 1955, 1964, Ch. 538; Pyr II, 110 (c); see also Edgerton, 1951, 9-12.

74. Allen, 1984, 206; Edel, 1955, 1964, 590; Doret, 1986, 57-66.

13. Durant, A. & Fabb, N. 1987= "New Courses in the Linguistics of Writing", in: N. Fabb *et.al* (eds.) *The Linguistics of Writing*, Manchester
14. Edel, E. 1955, 1964 = *Altägyptische Grammatik*, Rome
15. Edgerton, W. F. 1951= "Early Egyptian Dialect inetrrelationships" *BASOR*, 122, 9-12
16. Fischer-Elfert, H. W. 1983, 1986= *Die Satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I* (2 Bde.) Wiesbaden
17. Frandsen, P. J. 1974= *An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System*, Copenhagen
18. Fabb, N. & Durant, A. 1987= "Introduction: The Linguistics of Writing: Retrospect and Prospect after Twenty Five Years" in: N. Fabb *et.al* (eds.) *The Linguistics of Writing*, Manchester
19. Gardiner, A. 1911= *Egyptian Hieratic Texts I*, Leipzig
20. Gardiner, A. 1957= *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford
21. Goldwasser, O. 1985= "A Late Egyptian Epistolary Formula as an Aid to Dating Ramesside Texts" in: S.I Groll (ed.) *Pharaonic Egypt*, Jerusalem, 50-56.
22. Gregory, M. 1967= "Aspects of Varieties Differentiation", *Journal of Linguistics* 3, 177-198
23. Green, M. 1985= *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 42, 49-52
24. Groll, S. I. 1967= *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian*, London
25. Groll, S. I. 1969= "*iw sdm.f* in Late Egyptian", *JNES*, 28.
26. Groll, S. I. 1970= *Negative Verbal Systems of Late Egyptian*, London
27. Groll, S. I. 1973= "Late Egyptian of Non-literary Texts of the 19th Dynasty", in: H.A. Hoffner Jr. (ed.) *Orient and Occident, NeukirchenVluyn*. 67-70.
28. Groll, S. I. 1975/6= "The Literary and Non-Literary Verbal systems in Late Egyptian", *OLP* 6/7, 237-246.
29. Groll, S. I. 1985= "A Ramesside Grammar Book of A Technical Language of Dream Interpretation" in: S.I Groll (ed.) *Pharaonic Egypt*, Jerusalem, 71-118. .
30. Groll, S. I. 1986= "The *sdm.n.f* Formations in the Non-Literary Documents of the 19th Dynasty" in: G. Englund, P.J. Frandsen (eds.) *Crossroad*, Copenhagen
31. Habachi, L. 1972= *The Second Stela of Kamose*, Gluckstadt
32. Halliday, M. A. K., McIntosh, A. & Stevens, P. 1964= *The Linguistic Sciences, and Language Teaching*, London
33. Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. 1976= *Cohesion in English*, London.
34. Halliday, M. A. K. 1978= *Language as a Social Semiotic*, London
35. Hasan, R. 1971= "Code, Register and Social Dialect" in: B. Bernstein (ed.), *Class, Codes and Control*, London, 253-292

36. Hasan, R. 1987= "Directions from Structuralism" in: N. Fabb *et.al* (eds.) *The Linguistics of Writing*, Manchester, 101-122
37. Hawks, T. 1977= *Structuralism and Semiotics*, London
38. Hintze, F. 1950-1952= *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache Neuägyptischer Erzählungen*, Berlin
39. Israeli, S. 1982= "The True Prophet of the Old Testament, the Good Scribe of Anastasi I, and their Similiar Attitude towards Morality" in: S.I. Groll (ed.), *Papers for Discussion II*, 1983-5, Jerusalem, 97-133
40. Jakobson, R. 1960= "Linguistics and Poetics", in: T.A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language*, Boston.
41. Johnson, J. H. 1984= "The Use of the Particle Mk in Middle Kingdom Letters", in: *Fs. Westendorf*, Göttingen, 71-85
42. Junge, F. 1983= "Sprachstufen und Sprachgeschichte", in: Akten des 22 Deutschen Orientalistentages (ZDMG Supplement), Tübingen, 17ff.
43. Junge, F. 1987= "Morphology, Sentence Form and Language History", in: J.D. Ray (ed.) *Lingua Sapientissima*, Cambridge, 47-55
44. Korostovtsev, M. A. 1973= *Grammaire du Néo-Egyptien*, Moscou
45. Kroeber, B. 1970= *Die Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarna Zeit*, (Doctoral Dissertation), Tübingen
46. Kruchten, J. M. 1982: *Etudes de syntaxe Néo-Egyptienne*, Bruxelles
47. Lichtheim, M. 1974= *Ancient Egyptian Literature, Vol. II, The New Kingdom*, Berkeley
48. Loprieno, A. 1986= "Egyptian Grammar and Textual Features", in: G. Englund, P.J. Frandsen (eds.) *Crossroad*, Copenhagen, 255-287
49. Loprieno, A. 1988= "On the Typological Order of Constituents in Egyptian", *Journal of Afroasiatic Linguistics* 1, 25-55
50. Lyons, J. 1968= *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge
51. Lyons, J. 1981= *Language and Linguistics*, Cambridge
52. Mathesius, V. 1964= "On the Potentiality of the Phenomena of Language", in: J. Vahek (ed.) *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*, Indiana
53. Murray, D. 1988= "The Context of Written and Oral Language: A Framework for Mode and Medium Switching", *Language in Society*, 17, 351-373
54. Neveu, F Doctoral Dissertation= *La particule hr en Néo-Égyptien*, Paris
55. Poesener, G. (1932-72)= *Catalogue des ostraca hieratiques littéraires de Deir el Medineh, nos. 1001-1167*, Le Caire
56. Polotsky, H. J. 1971= *Collected Papers*, Jerusalem

57. Polotsky, H. J. 1978= "Les Transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique" *IOS*, 6, 1-50.
58. Sampson, G. 1980= *Schools of Linguistics*, Stanford
59. Satzinger, H. 1976= *Neuägyptischen Studien*, Wien
60. Saussure, F. de 1966= *Cours de linguistique general*, Paris, 1916 (Translation in english: *Course in General Linguistics*, New York)
61. Schiffrin, D. 1987= *Discourse Markers*, Cambridge
62. Shisha-Halevy, A. 1978= "Quelques thematisations marginales du verbe en neo-égyptien" *OLP* 9, 51-67
63. Silverman, D. P. 1984= "The Relative Past Future Form in Late Egyptian", in: F. Junge (ed.), *Fs. W. Westendorf*, Göttingen, 191ff.
64. Stricker, B. H. 1945= "De Indeelung der egyptische Taalgschiedenis" *OMRO* 25, 12ff.
65. Sweeney, D. 1984= "The Great Dedicatory Inscription of Ramses II at Abydos (lines 1-79)" in: S.I. Groll (ed.), *Papers for Discussion II*, 1983-5, Jerusalem, 134-327
66. Sweeney, D. 1986= "The Nominal Object Clause of Verbs of Perception in Non-Literary Late Egyptian", in: G. Englund, P. J. Frandsen (eds.) *Crossroad*, Copenhagen, 337-373
67. Vernus, P. 1980= "Études de philologie et de linguistique" *RdE* 32, 118-134
68. Vernus, P. 1987= "Études de philologie et de linguistique" *RdE* 38, 175-181
69. Wallace, S. 1982= "Figure and Ground: The Interrelationships of Linguistic Categories" in: P. J. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-Aspect Between Semantics and Pragmatics*, Amsterdam