

CHAPTER THREE

CATEGORIES OF PYRAMID TEXTS

The first chapter showed that the texts of later Egyptian ritual documents possess structures of performance particular to their settings, and the expectation was raised that such associations may also be present in the pyramids of the Old Kingdom. It was also pointed out that there are differences between operative ritual scripts and non-performed, monumental texts, and that the latter are often derived from the former. The second chapter isolated groups of Pyramid Texts. While they are monumental objects, it may be assumed that they had their origins in texts recited outside of the architectural contexts in which they are attested. So far, this is indicated especially by the connection between Group A to offering lists and by the phenomena of displacement and exchange. Thus remaining alert to the transformative affects of entextualization, one may expect that the groups of texts will somehow reflect their settings of origin.

Whereas the performance settings of the temple sanctuary ritual and Nu's Book of the Dead were clear due to external and paratextual information, the settings of the Pyramid Texts groups are generally not: this is the central problem tackled by this book. To surmise the performance settings of Pyramid Texts, one may begin by identifying structures of performance among them. When that has been done, their distributions may be considered while remaining on the lookout for patterns. Certain performance structures were found to be particular to collective ritual as opposed to individual rites. If similar distributions are found in the pyramids, then one will have a basis from which to view their original settings of performance—and the relationship between those settings and the monuments where they are at last attested.

To that end, the present chapter identifies the structures of performance among Pyramid Texts. Along the way, certain crucial lines of inquiry will come forth, to be carried forward into the following chapter, where the results concerning performance structure will be cross-referenced against the groups. Further, the details arising in the present chapter will provide a foundation for more observations on the nature of the inscribed Pyramid Texts. Above all, the evidence encountered here will reaffirm that they had their original settings of performance outside the sepulcher.

A. Methodology

The methodology of the division into two categories will now be described in detail. First, a Pyramid Text will be understood to belong to the sacerdotal category if it lacks signs of edited person and if it situates the beneficiary strictly in the second person or if it switches between the second and third. Second, a Pyramid Text retaining an original first-person beneficiary or showing clear signs of having been edited away from it will be understood to belong to the category of personal texts.

It was seen in the first chapter that texts in the third person are, of themselves, neutral in respect to performance structure: third-person texts were found in collective services performed by officiants for the beneficiary, thus sacerdotal, and they were found in sets of individual rites performed by the beneficiary for himself, thus personal. This makes one

complication. Another, for the pyramids, is that there was an ancient program to modify first-person pronouns referring to the text owner to, especially, the third person. As the existence of this program is known mainly through scribal error and inconsistencies between exemplars, it may be assumed that a great many third-person texts not showing such signs had previously been in the first, but were edited completely. Such transformations will be effectively invisible. In view of these complications, it is necessary to assign third-person texts to the sacerdotal and individual categories by other criteria.

There are two criteria which will be leveraged to accomplish this: 1) immediate context of transmission, or recurring series, and 2) repeated propositional content, or motifs. Examination of these is enlightening not merely in permitting the distinction of third-person texts, but also in showing that the categories of sacerdotal and personal texts actually reflect two separate genres of discourse, ways of speaking and things to be said which are appropriate to situated modes of human action. Person in the Pyramid Texts is intimately associated with genre.

Recurring series are fixed units of transmission. They reflect ancient patterns of organizing texts prior to modern interpretation of their contents. Comparative examination of the core texts of the sacerdotal and personal categories will show that there are many recurring series bearing the one or the other, whereas only a fraction contain a mix of both. This point is of profound importance, because it suggests that the division made purely on the basis of second person versus first actually reaches into anciently separate genres of discourse. As a universal textual rule, genres are not mixed, and as a particular rule for the ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts, the core sacerdotal texts are not found mixed with the core personal ones.

The distinctiveness of these two genres of discourse is confirmed by consideration of content. Comparison of the content repeated among the core texts of the two categories shows that there are many motifs particular to the core sacerdotal texts but not to be found in the personal ones, and vice versa. That is not to say that all motifs are associated with one category or the other. The two categories obviously had common ground, a point which may be already inferred from the fact that both were inscribed in a single tomb. But the motifs particular to the core sets are not petty; they have to do with the primary substance of the Pyramid Texts as such, the building blocks of the texts as intertextual productions, the very fabric of their identities. That is of tremendous importance, since the restricted deployment of primary content between two categories shows that there are statements particular to each manner of performance. Once more, the division made purely on the basis of person is seen to correlate with a nontrivial dimension of evidence.

Because there is concord among the core sets of texts along three avenues of analysis—person, transmission, and content—and because this confluence actually distinguishes the one set from the other, it is indisputable that the categories are representative of particular, ancient genres of discourse. This is to say that the categories of sacerdotal and personal texts existed prior to the identifications carried out in the present work. The identifications must be regarded as reflecting the ancient sensibility as to sameness and differences between texts: the process yields an emic set of distinctions, rather than an artificially superimposed, modern, and etic set of divisions.

Further still, the confluence of the three dimensions of evidence permits recurring series and propositional content to be leveraged in order to separate purely third-person texts into one or the other category. When found in recurring series alongside second-person texts with none of them showing signs of editing, they can be assigned to the sacerdotal category, and third-person texts with motifs from the core set of sacerdotal texts can be, too. Similarly, third-person texts in series with other texts showing certain signs of editing can be assigned to the personal category, and ones with motifs from the core personal texts can be as well. In this

way, a total of 494 texts will be determined to belong to the sacerdotal category and 313 to the personal category. It means that, out of a total of 821 Pyramid Texts in the examined corpus, only fourteen are left unclassified.⁴⁹³

Besides setting up the basis for identifying the original settings of the groups, to be performed in the subsequent chapter, this procedure has the effect of drawing out evidence which is directly relevant to our understanding of the fundamental nature of the Pyramid Texts in their attested forms. Again, above all it will be seen that none of the Pyramid Texts was composed as decoration for the tomb walls on which they are preserved. They were secondarily adapted from other contexts of performance to serve as monumental decoration. This is an important finding, because it has the effect of changing a prevailing supposition about the origins of the mortuary literature tradition.

B. *The Core Set of Sacerdotal Texts*

1. *Texts with the Beneficiary in the Second Person and Switching*

The temple sanctuary ritual of Papyrus Berlin 3055 is dominated by rites situating the beneficiary Amun-Re in the second person. They were performed by priests who directly addressed the inert image of the deity. This same format occurs with the text owner in numerous Pyramid Texts. The following will serve as an example:

PT 425 § 775 (P)

dd-mdw

wsir P. nd.ti

rdi.n(=i) n=k ntr.w nb.w (i)w^c.t=sn ist dβ.w=sn ist is.wt=sn nb(.wt) ist
n mwt=k

Recitation.

O Osiris Pepi, who is saved,

I have given to you all the gods, and their inheritance, and their provisioning, and their rites, even that you not die.

The text opens with a vocative to the beneficiary, and goes on to speak about him in the second person—*nd.ti*, *n=k*, and *n mwt=k*, “who is (lit. you being)⁴⁹⁴ saved,” “to you,” and “that you not die.” That the text was to be performed by someone else for the text owner, who was its beneficiary, is made especially clear by the presence of the first person in reference to the speaker.

These kinds of texts represent rites which were originally recited by priests who directly addressed the text owner as beneficiary. The important detail in the definition is the separation of the beneficiary from the performer. Therefore we must anticipate that our core set of sacerdotal texts might also include rites performed by a text owner for a deity or a dead person, so long as they do not show signs of edited person. Since texts of the personal category will be found to have been subjected to such editing, and since this can in some few cases be to the second person, it is methodologically necessary to consider the edited texts

⁴⁹³ They are PT 12, 19, 105, 394, 410, sPT 502G, 502I, 586A, PT 594, sPT 655C, 738A, 739B, 1030, and 1047. See also below at nn. 755–756.

⁴⁹⁴ A virtual relative clause. Alternatively, an exclamation can be understood.

individually. That will be done later on. The core set will consist of texts which show no signs of modification.⁴⁹⁵ They may be deemed as provisionally certain instances of sacerdotal texts.

Out of the dataset analyzed for content, consisting of 821 Pyramid Texts, there are 348 which situate the beneficiary strictly in the second person:

PT 13	PT 412–413	PT 628–630	PT 693
PT 15	PT 414	PT 632	sPT 694A
PT 20	PT 420–426	fPT 634	PT 699
PT 22	PT 437–438	sPT 635A–B	PT 700
PT 25–45	PT 441	PT 636–639	sPT 701A
PT 47–49	PT 446–447	PT 641	PT 703
PT 51–57	PT 449	PT 643	sPT 716A–B
fPT 57B–C	PT 451–454	sPT 645A–B	fPT 717–719
fPT 57E	PT 459	PT 646–649	sPT 721B
fPT 57H–I	PT 461–462	PT 651–654	fPT 723
PT 58–59	PT 464	PT 658	fPT 734
PT 61–70	PT 488	PT 661	fPT 746–749
fPT 71	PT 497–498	hPT 662B	fPT 752–753
fPT 71A–E	PT 537	PT 663	fPT 755–756
fPT 71G	PT 547	fPT 664	fPT 759
PT 72–76	PT 552	fPT 664A–B	sPT 1001–1004
PT 78–80	PT 557–559	fPT 665	sPT 1008–1014
PT 84–104	PT 578	fPT 665A	sPT 1016–1018
PT 107–171	PT 588–591	fPT 665C	sPT 1020
PT 173–199	PT 593	fPT 666	sPT 1022–1023
PT 201–203	PT 595–597	fPT 666B	sPT 1052
PT 213–214	PT 604	fPT 667	sPT 1054–1055
PT 224	PT 608	fPT 667B–D	sPT 1059
PT 244	PT 610	PT 671	sPT 1062
PT 246	PT 612	PT 673–675	sPT 1069
PT 355–356	PT 614	PT 680	sPT 1071
PT 358	PT 617	PT 687	
PT 364–374	PT 619–623	sPT 692A	

None of these shows a meaningful sign of editing, and it is assumed that they represent the formats of their prior versions. (Once more the reader is referred to the second volume continuously for details about texts, series, and motifs.)

There are, however, two among this list which exhibit signs of edited person which do not appear to have been motivated by an interest in altering structure of performance. One instance is in PT 366, which poses a sign of mistaken editing in one version. In a statement addressed to the beneficiary, an embedded quote appears in the exemplars of Teti and Pepi II at Pyr. §627a; sim. 627b: $\beta n=k wr ir=k i.n=sn ir=f m m=k n(i) it\beta-wr$ “‘Lift up one who is greater than you,’ say they to him (sc. your enemy) in your (sc. the beneficiary’s) name of ‘(house of) the great saw.’”⁴⁹⁶ But in the exemplar of Merenre an editor changed the third person of the enemy to the second, making the pronoun now refer to the beneficiary: $i.n=sn ir=k m m=k n(i) it\beta-wr$ “say they to you in your name of...” The “to you” of Merenre’s version should have been “to him,” because the enemies of the beneficiary are the ones who

⁴⁹⁵ To signal in advance the edited sacerdotal texts situating the beneficiary in the second person (to be encountered later in this chapter): PT 456, 487, 540, sPT 561B, PT 581, fPT 691B, and sPT 1058. These, it will turn out, are uniformly personal services.

⁴⁹⁶ See Assmann 2001a, pp. 85–86, where this text is proffered in illustration of the general Egyptian practice of applying names. See also Assmann 1995a, p. 99, where the cited passage is advanced in indicating a hypothetical origin of the $m m=k$ formula in a ritual ‘Vermerk.’

are supposed carry him.⁴⁹⁷ He is not supposed to carry them. Thus, by the conversion of the pronoun, the identity of beneficiary was mistakenly assimilated with that of his opponent.

There is one other mistaken act of editing causing disagreement between exemplars in a text of the preceding list. Where preserved, in Pepi II's version of PT 674 the beneficiary is everywhere in the second person except for one place. At Pyr. §1995a (N), one finds: *ph=f m qbh.t* "his (sc. the beneficiary's) rear is (that of the goddess) Qebehut." While switching between the second and third person is, as we have seen, permissible in Egyptian sacerdotal texts, the version of Queen Neith shows a disagreement with *ph=k m qbh.t* "your rear is (that of) Qebehut."⁴⁹⁸ The disagreement between exemplars shows that editing had taken place at some point. But because the version of Pepi II displays fifteen instances of the second-person pronoun and no cases of the third, it may be supposed that his sole third-person pronoun was mistaken; at least I can think of no practical reason for the discrepancy.

Thus, many Pyramid Texts situate the beneficiary in the second person, just like most of the rites of the temple sanctuary ritual.

And just as in the temple sanctuary ritual one finds texts switching between the second and the third, so also in the Pyramid Texts. In the next example, it is clear that the text is performed by someone other than the beneficiary:

PT 450 §832–833a (P)

dd-mdw

*z*⁴⁹⁹ *hr k3=f z wsir hr k3=f*

z stš hr k3 z hnti-ir.ti hr k3=f

z P. hr k3=f

h3 P. pw šm.n=k nḥ=k n šm.n=k is m(w)t=k...

Recitation.

The one who would go is gone to his Ka: Osiris is gone to his Ka:

Seth is gone to his Ka: Khentirti is gone to his Ka;

let Pepi go to his Ka!

O Pepi, you have gone alive: you have not gone dead!...

The presence of the vocative and the second person in the last quoted sentence indicates that, as the text presents itself, the beneficiary is not the reciter. Thus, it begins in the third person and switches to the second. Texts like this one represent rites originally recited by an officiant, who alternately addressed the beneficiary directly and spoke about him. Again, the important characteristic is the separation of the beneficiary from the performer. Sacerdotal texts with switching appear also in the Book of the Dead. Therefore the core set being developed could include rites with switching performed by the text owner as officiant for someone else, so long as they do not show signs of edited person. Again, as a point of methodology

⁴⁹⁷ For Seth and the enemies (*hftiw*) lifting (*włz, fbi, stz*) the deceased up, see PT 356 §581b (T); PT 357 §588a (T); PT 366 §627a (T); PT 369 §642b (T); PT 371 §649a (T); PT 510 §1148a (P); PT 532 §1258c (N); PT 606 §1699c (M); PT 673 §1993d (N); CT 838 VII 40q (B10C).

⁴⁹⁸ For the body parts of the deceased elsewhere identified as this goddess, see PT 582 §1564a (P) in the third person and PT 619 §1749a (M) in the second person. See also fPT 691B §2128b (Nt): *ph=k m qbh.t* "your (sc. Osiris as such) rear is (that of) Qebehut."

⁴⁹⁹ Reading the verb *zi* in this particular passage with J. Allen 1984, §309. The verb *zi* is accepted beyond its occurrence in imperatives by Edel 1955/1964, §§39, 44, 62, 180, 425, 517, 675, 727, and 742.1. Wb iii 424.13, meanwhile, is uncertain as to the proper reading of the word ("vielleicht *sj* zu lesen ist"), while directing attention to *zbi* at Wb iii 429. For translating the participle literally, i.e. with its semantic content left uneffaced, see the translation of Otto 1960, vol. ii, p. 40, for PT 25 §17a: "Es eilt ein Eilender mit seinem Ka."

the edited texts will be considered later on. The core set, then, consists of texts which show no meaningful signs of modification.⁵⁰⁰

A total of fifty-four Pyramid Texts show switching and are assigned to the sacerdotal category:

PT 21	PT 337	PT 543	fPT 667A
PT 46	PT 357	PT 545	PT 672
fPT 71H	PT 417	PT 553–554	PT 676–677
PT 106	PT 435–436	PT 556	PT 682
PT 172	PT 450	PT 568	PT 685
PT 215	PT 455	PT 603	PT 690
PT 221–223	PT 457–458	PT 605	sPT 715A–B
PT 225	PT 460	PT 611	fPT 722
PT 245	PT 468	PT 660	sPT 1005
PT 247	PT 482	fPT 664C–B	sPT 1021
PT 323	PT 534–536	fPT 666A	sPT 1053

None of the texts listed above shows an intelligible sign of editing to the person of the beneficiary, and therefore they may be assumed to represent the performance structures of their prior forms. To be sure, two of them show mistaken signs of editing, PT 357 and PT 468. PT 357 shows switching in its exemplars, which are in agreement with one another except in one passage. In the mistaken version of Teti, Pyr. §588a reads: *nbi=k⁵⁰¹ hr=f wtz=f wr ir=f im=k* “May you (sc. Teti) swim bearing him (sc. the opponent), while he lifts up one who is greater than himself in you.” This causes disagreement with the correct text in the exemplars of Pepi I and Pepi II: *nb=f hr=k wtz=f wr ir=f im=k* “Let him (sc. the opponent) swim bearing you (sc. Pepi), with him lifting up one who is greater than himself in you.” The disagreement between the versions shows that editing of person had taken place. But since—as with PT 366—Seth and other enemies are the ones who are supposed to carry the beneficiary, the former version cannot be correct. It is once more a case of the assimilation of the identity of the beneficiary with that of his opponent.

PT 468 switches between the second and third person in the versions of Pepi I and Pepi II, everywhere in agreement between them except in one place. In the version of Pepi II, a second-person pronoun is once transformed to the third person at Pyr. §900c–e (N): *di=s s̄.t=k Ne. pw m ir.ti ntr.w nb(.w) m ir.ti 3h.w nb(.w) i.hm.w-sk šb.w s.wt m ir.ti h.t nb(.t) m33.t(i)=sn tw sdm.t(i)=sn m=f ist* “Let her put dread of you, O Neferkare, in the eyes of all the gods, in the eyes of all the Akhs, the imperishable stars, those hidden of places, in the eyes of everything which will see you, and which will hear his name.” The vocative *Ne. pw* is interjected inside the statement, which begins by referring to the beneficiary in the second person (*s̄.t=k* “dread of you”) and should have maintained concord throughout it, not only with *m33.t(i)=sn tw* “which will see you” but also with *sdm.t(i)=sn m=f* “which will hear his name.” And indeed the version of Pepi I gives the correct rendering of this last part, with *sdm.t(i)=sn m=k* “... your name.”

It is clear by the disagreements among the exemplars that editing had been undertaken at some point, but, as they do not appear to have been motivated by an interest in altering performance structure, PT 357 and PT 468 are considered to belong to the core set of sacerdotal texts.

⁵⁰⁰ To signal in advance the edited sacerdotal texts with switching (to be encountered later in this chapter): PT 477, 483, 512, 532, 577, 579, 606, and 670. These will turn out uniformly to be personal services.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. M: *nb=f k(w) hr=f*.

To summarize the preceding, 402 Pyramid Texts are regarded as the core set of sacerdotal Pyramid Texts. This is due to the interpersonal situation they presuppose in respect to their beneficiary's relationship to the texts' performance: as they present themselves, he was not to recite them, but they were recited on his behalf. They consistently show no intelligible signs of editing, and for this reason it is assumed that they represent the formats of the source manuscripts prior to them.

2. *Vocatives to the Text Owner and Quotations*

Before developing the core of the category of personal texts, vocatives to the text owner deserve some consideration, because they, like the second-person pronoun, show when a statement is addressed to him. Now, to be precise, all Egyptian nouns including proper names are in the third person. But since the present inquiry is concerned with differentiating between texts where the beneficiary is himself the speaker versus those where he is addressed, the vocative is, by the present work's convention, understood as marking statements in the second person (though in fact they are in the third).

With this expedient in mind, it may be said that there are two kinds: unpreceded vocatives and vocatives preceded by particles.

a. *Unpreceded Vocatives and Quotations*

In the Pyramid Texts, unpreceded vocatives to the text owner by far outnumber any other vocative mode. There are 294 texts with them out of this study's examined corpus of 821 Pyramid Texts.⁵⁰²

It is doubtless the case that virtually all were present in the texts' original forms. A *locus classicus*⁵⁰³ relevant to this point is a passage from Unas's version of PT 215: *n(i) kw mn ntr pw* "You, O whoever, belong to that god."⁵⁰⁴ The word *mn* "whoever" was used in manuscript religious texts and elsewhere for the notion 'insert name,'⁵⁰⁵ and indeed where this text is later preserved the name of the text owner replaces *mn*.⁵⁰⁶ By mistake, *mn* was not replaced with the name of Unas in the cited passage. In another text in the pyramid of Unas, the word *ni-sw.t* "king" was initially carved, and it was later recarved to the king's name.⁵⁰⁷ After the Old Kingdom, non-royal copies uniformly give the name of the text owner there.⁵⁰⁸ One may assume that unpreceded vocatives and other instances of the named text-owner were generally represented by the form *mn* or *ni-sw.t* in the manuscripts from which the Pyramid Texts were drawn. Their replacement by the proper name was a natural part of the process of transcription and of course did not alter the performance structure of the text.

Nearly all cases of unpreceded vocatives occur in the core set of sacerdotal texts just now identified.⁵⁰⁹ Assuming that the great majority of them were present in manuscript, these

⁵⁰² See Listing Four, under the motif 'Vocative to (No Particle).'

⁵⁰³ PT 215 §147a is cited already at Breasted 1912, p. 99 n. 2, in the context of a discussion like the present one.

⁵⁰⁴ Pyr. §147a (W).

⁵⁰⁵ See Wb ii 64.13–15–65.1–2.

⁵⁰⁶ For some of the Middle Kingdom exemplars, see J. Allen 2006, pp. 98–99.

⁵⁰⁷ PT 23 §16a and §16b; see Sethe 1908–1922, vol. iii, p. 1.

⁵⁰⁸ For some of the Middle Kingdom exemplars, see J. Allen *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁵⁰⁹ There are five texts later to be identified as sacerdotal which have unpreceded vocatives: PT 218, 477, 579, 606, and 697. Of them, PT 218 actually figures the beneficiary in the third person; the vocative to him is within quoted speech (Pyr. §162c, an epithet). The others show editing to the person of the text owner and therefore have been excluded from the core set. There are ten texts later identified as personal which have unpreceded

texts were automatically tailored to display the name of the text owner at the moment of their inscription in the tomb. The reason for including the proper name is self-evident from the effects of the vocative: although the referent of the second person is established by the speech act itself, the vocative singles out a particular addressee and gets his or her attention. One general effect of the vocative is to establish, clarify, or intensify the identity of the referent. The other is to invoke his or her presence.

Assuming that the inclusion of the vocative was already indicated in the source copies of sacerdotal texts, the addition of further vocatives was not really necessary to establish reference. Still, the interpolation of vocatives does occur—both in sacerdotal and in personal texts. By interpolation, I mean the secondary introduction of a vocative into an attested exemplar, presumably not in the source manuscript. Interpolation is inferable when a vocative is present in one version of a text while it is absent in others. There are fifteen texts with instances of interpolated vocatives from the Old Kingdom material.⁵¹⁰ Eight occur in sacerdotal texts⁵¹¹ and seven in texts to be assigned to the personal category.⁵¹² With every case but one,⁵¹³ it is a question of an unprecedented vocative. The ease of introducing the simple, unprecedented name explains the disparity. The interpolation of a vocative preceded by a particle involves the introduction of a lexical element in addition to the proper name itself, and therefore slightly more effort and a greater degree of tampering with the integrity of the text. It was easier to simply insert the name.

It is an important detail that all the vocatives to the text owner in personal texts were interpolated, embedded within a quotation, or both. Quoted speech embeds statements and therefore modes of speaking made by someone else.⁵¹⁴ Consequently it is not useful in determining performance structure. For instance, if I say, “He said to me, ‘You better do it,’” the referent of “you” is actually the speaker of the whole statement, who is me. So far as indicating the speaker of the whole statement, the first person “me” is what matters and not the quoted element “you.”

vocatives: PT 254, 305–306, 310, 474, 508, 521, 523, 525, and 609. All are interpolations and/or appear in quotations.

⁵¹⁰ This count excludes vocatives interpolated in Middle Kingdom exemplars, for instance the sacerdotal PT 63 §44a (Sq3C), PT 220 §194a (BH5C), PT 222 §199a (BH5C), and PT 579 §1539a (Sq3C) and §1541c (B10C).

⁵¹¹ PT 323 §519b (T); PT 442 §820d (M); PT 512 §1162d (P); PT 532 §1260b and §1261c (N); PT 558 §1391 (N); PT 606 §1684b (N); PT 610 §1719c (N); and PT 697 §2171a (N). Of these, PT 323, 512, 532, 558, and 610 have already been assigned to the core set of sacerdotal texts. PT 442, 606, and 697 show signs of editing to the person of the text owner and so have been excluded from that set; they will later be assigned to the sacerdotal category based on their possession of motifs particular to the core set.

⁵¹² PT 306 §479a (W), §480c (N), and §481d (W); PT 310 §494a (W); PT 474 §945a (P); PT 521 §1225c–d (MN); PT 523 §1232a–b (N); and PT 525 §1246b (P). The personal text PT 609 also shows unprecedented vocatives at Pyr. §1703a and §1703c (M), but this text’s other exemplar N is not preserved in these places; by the content of the text, it is assumed that they also represent interpolations.

⁵¹³ At PT 442 §820d (M): *h3 M.n.* “O Merenre,” not found in PN.

⁵¹⁴ On this point, see Irvine 1996, pp. 146–147, with notice thereafter of the possible effects—or ‘leakages’—that the quotation might have on speech.

The Pyramid Texts show no special punctuation to indicate the extent of a quotation, but the presence of certain lexical formulae is very useful for signaling it—*dd*,⁵¹⁵ *i*,⁵¹⁶ *hrw*,⁵¹⁷ and *k3*,⁵¹⁸ all meaning “to say.”⁵¹⁹ There are also less obvious lexical implications of speech, for instance *m r3* “is in the mouth,”⁵²⁰ *whm* “repeat” as in *whm in.w i3b.tiw t=k pw* “let the eastern bearers repeat, ‘It is your bread,’”⁵²¹ or *iri* “perform” as in *iri=sn i ntr i ntr* “they perform ‘The god comes, the god comes!’”⁵²² and *iri=sn n P. pn šwi.w h3 P. pn m wi3=k pw n(i) r^c hnn.w ntr.w šwi P. pn* “with them performing the ‘Rise!’ for Pepi when Pepi boards this your bark of Re which the gods row: the ‘Rise, O Pepi!’”⁵²³ But it was not necessary to mark or lexically imply quoted speech at all. As an unmarked and unimplied example (a personal text):

PT 310 §493b–494b (W)

hr=f-m-hnt=f hr=f-m-mh3=f in nw n W.⁵²⁴

in.t(i) n=k W. zy mhn.t

in n W. i.p3=s hnm=s

O Herefemkhenetef, O Herefemmehaf, bring this to Unas!

“Which ferryboat, O Unas, should be brought to you?”

Bring to Unas Just-as-it-flies-so-does-it-alight!

The second statement is a quotation within the body text, quite similar to what was encountered in Chapter One with a ferryman text from the New Kingdom Book of the Dead, BD 99. It is not differentiated from the statements made before and after it in any special way. In Chapter One, quoted statements were not usually directly excluded from the analysis of performance structures, though they could well have been, since the person of the pronouns in quoted statements is not helpful in determining the relation of the beneficiary to the performance of the text. Especially as the material from the Pyramid Texts is more obscure than that from the Book of the Dead, it is useful to now be more precise. Thus, where it has an impact on assessing performance structure, Listing One indicates when a text contains quoted speech.

⁵¹⁵ At PT 215 §147a; PT 218 §162b; PT 219 §179a; PT 220 §195b; PT 249 §264a; PT 254 §282c; PT 262 *passim*; PT 437 §795a; PT 442 §820b; PT 467 §886a; PT 477 *passim*; PT 480 §998a; PT 482 §1005d; PT 483 §1013a; PT 485 §1031b; §1032a; PT 507 §1102a; PT 510 §1130a; §1130c; PT 518 §1198b; PT 519 §1201b; PT 532 §1256c; sPT 570A *passim*; sPT 570B §1461a; PT 574 *passim*; PT 579 §1540a; PT 582 §1565a–c; PT 599 §1646a; PT 606 §1696b; PT 610 §1712a; PT 648 §1829a; PT 659 §1862a; PT 660 §1871b; PT 663 §1882b; PT 670 §1975a; PT 683 §2047a; fPT 691 §2120a and §2123a (Nt); sPT 694A §2145c; PT 697 §2174b; fPT 755 §2285a (Nt); sPT 1005 P/S/Se 90.

⁵¹⁶ PT 215 §147b; PT 218 §162c; PT 254 *passim*; PT 257 §304b; PT 305 §473b–c; PT 306 §476a and §479b; PT 366 §627a–b; PT 403 §700a; PT 467 §886a–b; PT 470 *passim*; PT 473 §930d–931b; PT 474 *passim*; PT 478 §975b; PT 479 §986a; PT 484 §1021a–b; PT 485 §1031b; PT 508 §1109b and §1115a; PT 510 §1141b; PT 513 *passim*; PT 518 §1198a; PT 535 §1289a; PT 536 §1292a; PT 548 §1343c; PT 553 §1362a; PT 572 §1472a and §1473a; PT 575 *passim*; PT 577 §1525 and §1526b; PT 603 §1676c; PT 606 *passim*; PT 669 §1966b and §1967; PT 676 §2009c; sPT 694A §2144a; sPT 1009 P/S/Se 99.

⁵¹⁷ PT 451 §840b–c; PT 452 §843a–b; PT 453 §845b; PT 509 §1127b; PT 537 §1300b; PT 683 §2047b.

⁵¹⁸ fPT 667 §1940b and §1940d (Nt).

⁵¹⁹ On the verb forms of such indications of speech in the Pyramid Texts, see J. Allen 1984, §204–211.

⁵²⁰ PT 218 §162b.

⁵²¹ PT 209 §125c.

⁵²² PT 422 §754b.

⁵²³ PT 525 §1245c–1246b (P). Other implications of quoted speech, with the quotations immediately following, occur at PT 264 §348c; PT 302 §460b; PT 419 §744b; PT 480 §993c; PT 483 §1014b–1015a; PT 517 §1189c–f; PT 518 §1195b; PT 523 §1231c–d; PT 525 §1246b–d; PT 577 §1523a; PT 659 §1863a. And quotations immediately precede these less direct marks: PT 553 §1364c; sPT 570A §1449b–c; PT 581 §1555b and §1556b.

⁵²⁴ Cf. the typical Middle Kingdom formulation *in n=i nw* “bring this to me,” as at CT 182 III 77q (S10C) and CT 396 V 73o (B9C).

Forty sacerdotal texts identified in this chapter contain quoted speech⁵²⁵ and thirty-eight personal texts.⁵²⁶ Nine texts of the former contain quoted vocatives to the text owner⁵²⁷ and seven of the latter, including two vocatives by epithet.⁵²⁸ None of the quoted vocatives in the sacerdotal texts are interpolations—they are present in all exemplars. But of the unprecedented vocatives in personal texts, they are all interpolated, embedded in a quotation, or both.⁵²⁹ As a matter of fact, it is remarkable that, with personal texts, four out of seven instances of interpolated vocatives occur in texts with quoted speech. The presence of such speech in the personal texts' prior forms abetted the secondary introduction of vocatives. As will later be seen, the personal texts were subjected to an extensive program of modification. The presence of quoted statements gave the editors more options in how a text could be re-presented, for instance in expanding the scope of a quotation and anchoring it to its target with a newly introduced vocative.

But the vocatives interpolated in the sacerdotal texts cannot be explained in this way. Vocatives have the effect of establishing, clarifying, or intensifying the referentiality of a statement. With the sacerdotal texts, this referentiality was already generally present through the natural tailoring of place-holders such as *mn* and *ni-sw.t* to the proper name. But it is an important detail that five out of the seven sacerdotal texts with such interpolations will turn out to have been, in their prior forms, personal services to beneficiaries other than the text owner.⁵³⁰ In their prior forms, the text owner was officiant. In their converted forms, he was put in the status of beneficiary. In order to secure this transplantation, it was necessary to establish his new status, and one method of doing so was to introduce a vocative not present in the source manuscript.

In sum, it will emerge that unprecedented vocatives occur by far most frequently in sacerdotal texts, and since their various exemplars consistently render them, it may be assumed that they were an original part of the text and its corresponding representation—presumably represented in the source manuscripts by marks such as *mn* and *ni-sw.t*. Since sacerdotal texts generally included vocatives anyway, there was no need to further establish, clarify, or intensify referentiality to the text owner. Therefore, when exemplars show variation between themselves, with one showing a vocative and one not, the interpolation is a significant act. Indeed, about half of the interpolated vocatives stem from personal texts, and as a category these were subjected to other editorial modifications. And of the sacerdotal texts with such interpolations, five out of seven were converted from being personal services done in their prior forms by the text owner for another, into texts directed to him, and these also were subjected to other editorial modifications. What this all finally shows is that interpolated vocatives as a rule occur in precisely those texts which were already being changed for other reasons; it was not a random act. It is one of several consistencies among the data.

⁵²⁵ PT 215, 218–220, 366, 419, 422, 437, 442, 451–453, 477, 482–483, 532, 535–537, 548, 553, 577, 579, 581, 599, 603, 606, 610, 648, 659–660, 663, fPT 667, PT 670, 676, sPT 694A, PT 697, fPT 755, sPT 1005, and 1009.

⁵²⁶ PT 209, 249, 254, 257, 262, 264, 294, 302, 305–306, 310, 403, 467, 470, 473–474, 479–480, 484–485, 507–510, 513, 517–519, 525, sPT 570A–B, PT 572, 574–575, 582, 669, 683, and fPT 691.

⁵²⁷ PT 218 §162c (by epithet); PT 442 §820b–c (by epithet); PT 451 §840a and c; PT 532 §1256c; PT 577 §1525 (by epithet); PT 579 §1540b; PT 606 §1699c; PT 670 §1975a; and sPT 694A §2145c (by epithet).

⁵²⁸ PT 254 §282c–283a (an epithet); PT 305 §473b (notably absent in the Middle Kingdom exemplar T3Be); PT 306 §479a, §480c, and §481d (all interpolated); PT 310 §494a (interpolated); PT 474 §945a (interpolated); PT 508 §1109c (an epithet); and PT 525 §1246b (interpolated).

⁵²⁹ See above n. 512 (interpolated vocatives in personal texts) and the immediately preceding note (vocatives in quotations). In summary: PT 254 (epithet in quotation), PT 305 (quotation), PT 306, 310, 474 (all interpolated in quotations), PT 508 (epithet in quotation), PT 521, 523 (both interpolated), PT 525 (interpolated in a quotation), and PT 609 (presumably interpolated).

⁵³⁰ PT 323, 512, 532, 606, and 697.

b. *Vocatives Preceded by Particles*

Because there is only one case where a vocative preceded by a particle was interpolated, the preceded vocatives more effectively highlight the performance structure of a sacerdotal text. In the Old Kingdom exemplars, the presence of a vocative preceded by a particle is a solid indication of the manner in which the text was originally performed.

There are three principal vocative particles employed in the Pyramid Texts: *h3*, *i.nd-hr* (= *k/t/tn*), and *i3*.⁵³¹ The particle *h3* “O” is particular to mortuary texts spoken by priests for the deceased, as observed by Assmann for the category of rituals he calls ‘mortuary liturgies.’⁵³² The unit *i.nd-hr* “hail” is often used in later texts in hymns,⁵³³ which in such a context entailed performance by a human for a god. A further vocative particle found among the Pyramid Texts—and sometimes alternating with *h3*⁵³⁴—is *i3* “greeting.” Additionally, there is at least one instance of the vocative particle *i* “O” preceding the name of the deceased.⁵³⁵

There is a high correlation between the occurrence of these particles and the sacerdotal texts listed above. Eighty-six of them have *h3*,⁵³⁶ and several others have *i.nd-hr*⁵³⁷ or *i3*.⁵³⁸ Altogether there are about a hundred texts with vocative particles involving the text owner as beneficiary. They all occur in texts belonging to the core set of sacerdotal texts. None of them occurs in any of the texts to be assigned to the personal category.

It may be incidentally pointed out that vocative particles are also used in addressing figures other than the beneficiary. In order of frequency, gods and officiants are addressed via *i*,⁵³⁹ *i.nd-hr=k/tn*,⁵⁴⁰ *i3*,⁵⁴¹ and *h3*,⁵⁴² as well as through two other particles not found applied to the text owner: *hi* “hail!”⁵⁴³ and *wy* “O!”⁵⁴⁴ These usages occur in either category of text, sacerdotal or personal.

⁵³¹ The term ‘vocative particle’ may be understood to be a subset of the category ‘Interjektionen’ of Edell 1955/1964, §§859–867. For the texts bearing them, see Listing Four under the motifs ‘Vocative to...’

⁵³² Assmann 2002, pp. 32 and 40–41. His assertion of the exclusive use of the particle *h3* in a mortuary context is not entirely accurate: it appears in vocatives to the god Amun-Re in the temple sanctuary ritual at TSR 20 (pBerlin 3055 VII, 3); TSR 49 (pBerlin 3055 XXVII, 10); TSR 50 (pBerlin 3055 XXVIII, 10); and TSR 54 (pBerlin 3055 XXXII, 3). On this particle, see also below at n. 542 and n. 696.

⁵³³ *Ibid.*, p. 41. Cf. Franke 2003a, p. 130, and Mathieu 2004, p. 255.

⁵³⁴ As at PT 558 §1390a (N) *h3* versus P and M with *i3* in the same passage; similarly CT 47 I 204c (B10Cb and c) *h3* versus B12C, B16–17C, and B1Y with *i3*.

⁵³⁵ With the sacerdotal texts PT 671 §1987a and PT 424 §769c, in the latter case used jointly with *h3*. See also the exclamatory particle *hwi* “O!,” as it may be understood to introduce the name of the beneficiary as addressee in the sacerdotal texts PT 224 §218c (cf. the clear unpreceded vocative at source S5C); PT 225 §222a; PT 628 §1786a; fPT 664 §1884.

⁵³⁶ See the motif ‘Vocative to (*h3*)’ in Listing Four.

⁵³⁷ See the motif ‘Vocative to (*i.nd-hr=k*).’ This motif does not count the formulation *nd hr=k* at PT 682 §2042a (N) since it is not used there as a vocative; see its parallelism with *i^c hr=k* of Pyr. §2042b (N).

⁵³⁸ See the motif ‘Vocative to (*i3*).’

⁵³⁹ PT 83 §58c; PT 204 §118a; PT 205 §120a and §122b; PT 206 §123f; PT 230 §231a; PT 243 §248b; PT 249 §264a; PT 251 §269a; PT 254 §276c and §277a; PT 255 §296b; PT 260 §316a and §321a; PT 282 §423a; PT 283 §424b; PT 285 §426b; PT 300 §445a; PT 316 §506a; PT 345 §560a–b; PT 347 §564b; PT 349 §566a–b; PT 350 §567a–b; PT 403 *passim*; PT 405 §703a; PT 410 §719a; PT 475 §946a; PT 476 §952a; PT 478 §975c; PT 495 §1064a–b; PT 499 §1070a; PT 516 §1183a; PT 517 §1188a–b; PT 518 §1193a; PT 519 §1201a; PT 522 §1228a and §1229b; sPT 586D §1585a (Nt); PT 616 §1743a; hPT 662A §1875a; and fPT 758 §2288a (Nt).

⁵⁴⁰ PT 304 *passim*; PT 308 *passim*; PT 324 *passim*; PT 334 §543a; PT 336 §547a and §548a; PT 344 §559a–b; PT 348 §565a–b; PT 406 §706a–b; PT 415 §738a–b; PT 418 §742a–b; PT 456 *passim*; PT 478 §971a–b; PT 486 §1039a–b; PT 493 §1059a–c (Nt); PT 519 §1207b; PT 522 §1230a; PT 530 §1253a; PT 574 §1485a; PT 587 §1587a–b and §1588a; PT 624 §1758b–1759a (Nt); sPT 1053 P/Ser/S 10.

⁵⁴¹ PT 337 §550a; PT 465 §879a; PT 575 §1496a; PT 601 §1660a.

⁵⁴² PT 529 §1252a; PT 592 §1616a; PT 599 §1647a; PT 600 §1654a, 1655a, and §1657a; PT 640 §1810a; PT 660 §1872a; sPT 1015 P/S/Ne 81. Cf. also PT 254 §281a and Hays 2005, pp. 51–56.

⁵⁴³ PT 221 §196a–b and §198a.

⁵⁴⁴ PT 467 §886a; fPT 691 §2120a (Nt); §2120a (Nt); §2123a (Nt).

3. Imperatives to the Text Owner

Imperatives to the text owner are commands to him. While technically the Egyptian imperative—like the English one—does not actually contain an overt indication of person, the agent of the verb is understood to be the one to whom the imperative is addressed. Imperatives to the text owner are thus also a useful indication that a text was not performed by him, but to him. Brief consideration of them consequently strengthens the assignment of texts to the core set of sacerdotal texts.

Given that *personal* texts were regularly edited away from the first person, it is theoretically possible that there are instances where a conjugated *sdm=f* verb form in the first person =*i* “I” was converted to an imperative “you” simply by removal of the pronominal subject. Such a modification would have transformed a text originally performed by the beneficiary himself into a text presenting itself as if performed by another. To be sure, there are rare instances of shifts between imperatives and *sdm=f* forms involving personages other than the text owner,⁵⁴⁵ but I have identified no clear instances of this activity in association with him.

Naturally, imperatives addressed to the beneficiary in quoted speech are not useful in determining a text’s structure of performance. These occur with some frequency in both sacerdotal⁵⁴⁶ and personal texts.⁵⁴⁷ But there are no texts to be assigned to the personal category where an imperative is certainly applied to the beneficiary outside of quotations. Outside of quotations, the presence of an imperative to the beneficiary is a confirming sign of the sacerdotal structure. 263 members of the core set have them.⁵⁴⁸

All told, there are 360 texts of the core sacerdotal set with vocatives to the beneficiary, with imperatives to him, or with both. This number approaches the 402 for texts that have been identified as belonging to the core set of sacerdotal texts. Outside of quotations and interpolations, they are exclusively found in this core set.

C. The Editing of Grammatical Person

1. Maintenance of the First Person Throughout

Books of the Dead are dominated by rites casting the text owner in the first person. In most cases he is both performer and beneficiary, and such texts are deemed representative of the personal performance structure. Pyramid Texts which uniformly cast the beneficiary in

⁵⁴⁵ PT 345 §560c (TN) involves an imperative to an ethereal provisioner (*im(i) n Ne. wr* “give Neferkare meat!”), while this form is converted to a second-person *sdm=f* with jussive force in M (*ḏi=k n M.n. wr* “may you give Merenre meat!”). In another text, an imperative to a deity is converted to the third-person *sdm=f* or vice versa; see PT 361 §604c (N): *im(i) wn.t(i) n Ne. <ṣ.wi> p.t ipf* “cause that those <doors> of the sky be opened to Neferkare!” versus Pyr. §604c (T): *ḏi=f i.wn.ti ṣ.wi p.t ipf n T.* “let him (sc. Shu) cause that those doors of the sky be opened to Teti.”

⁵⁴⁶ PT 215 §147b; PT 218 §162b; PT 451 §840b; PT 452 §843a; PT 453 §845b; PT 482 §1006 and 1007a–b; PT 532 §1256c; PT 536 §1292a; PT 548 §1343c; PT 577 §1525.

⁵⁴⁷ PT 254 §282c, §283b, and §284b; PT 294 §436b; PT 305 §473b; PT 306 §479a; PT 470 §912a and §913a; PT 485 §1031c; PT 508 §1109b–c; PT 513 §1169b, §1170b, and §1171a; PT 525 §1246b and §1246d; and sPT 1046 P/A/N 44.

⁵⁴⁸ PT 26–30, 32–33, 39–43, 45–47, 49, 51, 53–57, fPT 57B–C, 57I, PT 58–59, 61–63, 66–70, fPT 71, 71A, 71D–E, 71G–H, PT 73–76, 79–80, 84–96, 99, 102, 106–112, 114, 116–142, 144–166, 168–170, 174, 177–178, 180–195, 199, 201–203, 213–214, 222–225, 246–247, 355–357, 364–366, 369–373, 412–414, 417, 420, 422–424, 436–438, 441, 450–454, 457–462, 468, 482, 534–537, 543, 545, 547, 553, 556–557, 559, 578, 591, 593, 596–597, 604, 608, 610–612, 619–621, 623, 628, 636–637, 639, sPT 645B, PT 651–652, 660–661, hPT 662B, fPT 664, 664B, 665, 665A–C, 666, 666A–B, 667, 667A–D, PT 673–677, 680, 690, sPT 701A, PT 703, sPT 716B, fPT 717–718, sPT 721B, fPT 722–723, 734, 752–753, 755–756, 759, sPT 1009, 1018, and 1023.

the first person match the performance structure of this kind of Book of the Dead rite. For example:

PT 227 § 227a–c (W)

dd-mdw
hsq(=i) m tp k3 km wr
hpnw dd(=i) nn r=k
hsr-ntr srq(.t) dd(=i) nm r=k
pn^c tw hhh {n}<t3>⁵⁴⁹
dd.n(=i) nm r=k

Recitation.

The head of the bull, the great black one, will I cut off!
 O serpent, against you do I say this!
 O god-beaten one, O scorpion, against you do I say this!
 Overturn yourself; slither into <the earth>,
 for I have said this against you!

As written, the speaker addresses himself to another, securing the benefits of the recitation through his own performance. Casting the beneficiary in the first person, such a text may be said to possess a personal structure. Texts like this may be contrasted with those exhibiting the sacerdotal one. The difference in manner of performance is indicated in an opposition between the first-person beneficiary (personal) and second person (sacerdotal).

As simple as this contrast is, the circumstances of person in the Pyramid Texts are usually much more complicated. As is well known,⁵⁵⁰ many personal texts were edited away from the first person at or around the time they were transcribed to tomb walls. As a result of this program of modification, texts casting the beneficiary in the first person throughout are actually quite rare. Since there was a program to modify originally first-person texts, and since the evidence of this program consists largely of mistakes and inconsistencies, it may be assumed that texts preserving the beneficiary in the first person throughout are only attested because they were overlooked or not fully understood. There are only twenty, and just over half are members of the most obscure type of Pyramid Text, the apotropaic texts to be discussed in the Coda.⁵⁵¹ It was probably due to their opaque character that first-person texts are concentrated in this type.

That said, texts placing the text owner as *reciter and beneficiary* in the first person throughout may be summarized. There are twenty, and citations illustrating their structure are given in Listing One of the second volume:

PT 207 (W)	PT 281 (WT)	PT 287 (WT)	sPT 502E (P)
PT 208 (TN)	PT 282 (WTN)	PT 312 (W)	PT 551 (P)
PT 227 (WPN)	PT 283 (T)	PT 354 (T)	sPT 625A (Nt)
PT 232 (W)	PT 284 (WP)	PT 407 (P)	sPT 625B (Ibi)
PT 241 (W)	PT 286 (WTP)	PT 499 (PN)	fPT 691 (Nt)

In their structure of performance, these texts are like the ones dominating Books of the Dead: they involve a reciter who is the beneficiary of the text's performance.

But, as shown in Chapter One, Books of the Dead contain a small proportion of other kinds of texts, including iconic (non-performed) texts, reframed personal services to the dead,

⁵⁴⁹ For the emendation *hhh {n}<t3>*, see §676a (T): *hhh t3*. In §227c, it is a mistake from the hieratic, as observed by Mathieu 1996, p. 290 with n. 5.

⁵⁵⁰ See already Sethe 1931, p. 525, and Sander-Hansen 1956, §1. On the editing from the first person to the third in the Books of the Netherworld, see Werning 2007, p. 1938.

⁵⁵¹ See below at nn. 623 and 989.

and personal services to gods. The latter two can possess the sacerdotal structure, and in them the text owner himself can take the role of officiant to a separate beneficiary. With BD 173 for instance the god as beneficiary was in the second person while the text owner as officiant was in the first. In view of what is found in the later material, it would not be surprising to find sacerdotal texts like this in the Pyramid Texts. Three may be mentioned at the start—PT 456 (P), PT 540 (Nt), and fPT 691B (Nt)—because they situate the text owner in the first person in performing service for another. But since other exemplars of these texts show various signs of editing to the person of the text owner, they are better discussed in that context, and thus to it one may now turn.

2. *Texts Edited away from the First Person*

Pyramid Texts casting the text owner in the first person were regularly edited away from it, normally to the third. This program was carried out both on personal texts, where he was simultaneously officiant and beneficiary, and on sacerdotal texts like personal services seen in the Book of the Dead. In the latter, the text owner was first-person officiant to a separate beneficiary.

This program of modification has two impacts on the present work's inquiries. First, in order to understand the history of the corpus, the edited texts must be identified and the reasons for their modification ascertained. Second, and more practically, texts edited away from the first must be differentiated from the rest of the corpus so as to determine the core membership of the category of personal texts. The two problems are interdependent.

The phenomenon of editing the person of the text owner is well attested through several different signs: recarving, vacillation, doubling, residue, advanced noun, and exemplar disagreement. The first four signs preserve the first-person pronoun in some form and are therefore regarded as relatively certain indications of a text's prior form. The last two signs only show that some form of editing of person had taken place, but they are useful in confirming a text's editorial treatment. In nearly every case, the signs are manifest in texts where the text owner was both reciter and beneficiary, thus personal texts, but (as mentioned a moment ago) there are some personal services showing editing as well. The present section will consider each sign of edited person in turn, progressively expanding the membership of the core set of personal texts from twenty to a total of ninety-eight.

a. *Recarving*

The clearest indication that a text was edited away from the first person is where a passage was physically recarved, resulting in a palimpsest: after its initial chiseling upon a tomb wall, a text could be recarved once or even twice.⁵⁵² This left a final version superimposed upon one or more earlier renditions. Epigraphic traces of the earlier versions are sometimes still visible in whole or part, as well as traces of the erasure in the shape of a slight recess in the surface plane. Recarving has a history nearly as long as monumental relief decoration in ancient Egypt, and so there is nothing extraordinary in and of the act itself. But the nature of this particular kind of change and its results are significant for what they tell about the history of the corpus.

⁵⁵² As noted for the pyramid of Pepi I by Pierre 1994, p. 306.

In the Pyramid Texts, recarving was employed to produce several different kinds of modifications,⁵⁵³ such as the correction of a transcriptional error, the revision of a word or phrase, the conversion of the proper name to the third-person pronoun,⁵⁵⁴ the conversion of a third-person pronoun⁵⁵⁵ to the proper name, the removal of the proper name,⁵⁵⁶ the alteration of the person of the text owner,⁵⁵⁷ and, in the pyramid of Pepi I, the recarving of whole wall sections so as to reduce the size of hieroglyphs involved.⁵⁵⁸ Given that grammatical person can reveal the beneficiary's relationship to the text's performance, the phenomenon of recarving is of special importance. It establishes in an unequivocal way a pattern of editing applied to some Pyramid Texts at their introduction to the tomb. It shows that *and* how they were reshaped to be fit into the grave environment.

An example from PT 503 as found in the pyramid of Pepi I is shown in Figure 12. It was initially carved to read $\underline{dd} n=i nw tp(i)-c.wi=i pr=i r=i ir p.t$ "let speak to me (sc. Pepi) this ancestor of mine, that I may thus ascend to the sky,"⁵⁵⁹ but the suffix pronouns $=i$, "me/I," were later erased and replaced with $=f$, "him/his/he." Thus the final version of the passage reads $\underline{dd} n=f nw tp(i)-c.wi=f(i) pr=f r=f ir p.t$ "Let speak to him this ancestor of his, that he may thus ascend to the sky."⁵⁶⁰ As one can see in the figure, traces of the initial first-person form of the suffix pronouns are still visible as palimpsest,⁵⁶¹ as well as the final third-person forms.

The two tombs with the greatest frequency of recarving of person are those of Pepi I and Unas, although there is evidently at least one case in Merenre's. The recarving of person is found exclusively in antechambers and corridors. The other signs of edited person are concentrated in these locations, but they also occur in the passageway and vestibule, and—rather infrequently—in the sarcophagus chamber.

Recarving shows that the program of editing texts away from the first person was not always executed completely. In some texts recarving is applied to convert just one passage, as all⁵⁶² or most⁵⁶³ of the rest of the appearances of the text owner already showed him in the third person in the text's initially carved form. It may be assumed that a process of editing had taken place prior to or at the moment of the initial carving and that this process had

⁵⁵³ See Mathieu *op. cit.*, pp. 293–311, for a categorized presentation of the different kinds of recarving evident in the pyramid of Unas.

⁵⁵⁴ In the pyramid of Unas, noted at *ibid.*, p. 291. For instance, the *sw* of the final form of PT 252 §272b (W final): *i.n W. m3=ln sw hpr m ntr ʿ3* "Unas has come, even that you see him transformed into the great god" was a recarving from an original *W.*, with a similar alteration in the same text at Pyr. §274a; see Sethe 1908–1922, vol. iii, p. 16. Similarly PT 268 §372e (W; Sethe 1908–1922, vol. iii, p. 19); PT 269 §378a (W; Sethe 1908–1922, vol. iii, p. 20); and PT 281 §422c–b (W; Sethe 1908–1922, vol. iii, p. 23).

⁵⁵⁵ In what follows, the general term *pronoun* will be used to indicate not only the suffix, dependent, and independent pronoun series, but the stative endings as well. Technically, for the last one should say something like 'person-number-gender marker.'

⁵⁵⁶ Once, at PT 281 §422c (W), observed at Sethe 1908–1922, vol. i, p. 23.

⁵⁵⁷ The instances of recarving in Sethe's publication of the Pyramid Texts are distributed among the epigraphic notes to individual passages in *ibid.*, vol. iii, pp. 1–114a.

⁵⁵⁸ On this conversion, see Pierre 1994, pp. 299–314.

⁵⁵⁹ PT 503 §1079a (P initial).

⁵⁶⁰ PT 503 §1079a (P final).

⁵⁶¹ See Leclant *et al.* 2001, pl. 18 (P/C med/E) 5, where the signs of the initial form of the passage are represented as dashed lines, with the final form superimposed over them represented with continuous lines.

⁵⁶² As with PT 514 §1176b (M initial): *my iwy wi* "do not strand me," recarved to (M final): *my iwy sw* "do not strand him." Wherever the beneficiary appears in the remainder of this text, it is in the third person in its initially carved form.

⁵⁶³ For example, there is recarving at PT 311 §495c (W final): *n hm=f* "he (sc. Unas) would not forget" versus (W initial): *n hm(=i)* "I would not forget." The text elsewhere typically casts the beneficiary in the third person, except at §499a (W), where an unmodified first person remains: $\underline{dd}(=i) n=k$ "me saying to you"; (an unmodified lapse to the first person is labeled 'vacillation'). Compare Pyr. §499a (TT 57, unpublished MMA photos 840 and 841): $\underline{dd}=f n=k$ "him saying to you"; (a difference in person between two exemplars—here the first versus the third—is labeled 'exemplar disagreement').

In sum, recarving was employed to correct overlooked passages in texts that had been incompletely edited prior to their transcription to the wall, and it was used to correct overlooked texts that had not been edited at all at the moment of transcription. Moreover, the process of recarving could itself overlook first-person passages.

Altogether, there are twenty-six texts with recarving to modify the person of the text owner, whether *reciter and beneficiary* or *reciter to a separate beneficiary*:⁵⁶⁵

PT 283 (W)	PT 311 (W)	sPT 491A–B (P)	sPT 1025 (P)
PT 296 (W)	PT 322 (P)	PT 494–496 (P)	
PT 303 (W)	PT 333 (P)	PT 503–513 (P)	
PT 306 (W)	PT 408 (P)	PT 515 (M)	

Since it is a question of physical change, the data with recarving are certain and are therefore of the highest importance. Indeed, by consulting them one gets an impression of the basic pattern of modifications, which will be found to hold with the remaining signs also. The pattern is that the modification of a pronoun referring to the text owner nearly always happens in texts where he is both beneficiary and reciter and was originally cast in the first person, thus personal texts, and normally it concerns the modification to the third person.

There are two exceptions to this pattern among the recarved set. One is a recarved sacerdotal text in which the text owner was first-person officiant to a separate beneficiary, and the other has an exemplar in which the prior first-person forms were converted to both the third *and* second persons.

But before considering the exceptions, an example from the majority will be presented in illustration. The beginning and end of the personal text PT 511 is as follows:

PT 511 §1149–1161 (P, initial form)

zbt gbb nthth nw.t tp-^c.wi=i
pr=i r=i r p.t
nhm n=i p.t sd3.i n=i B hsr.i n=i sni.t
nhmhm=i m stš

...

i.nd.ti(=i)
im(i)=k dd wi
ink z3=k ink iw^cw

Geb laughs and Nut cries out for joy before me,
 as I ascend⁵⁶⁶ to the sky.
 The sky roars for me, the earth trembles for me, the storm is broken for me,
 and I roar as Seth.

...

Let me be saved,
 and do not speak of me (badly),
 for I am your son;
 I am the heir.

⁵⁶⁵ Not quite the same is recarving to correct a mistake in the personal text PT 267, an address to the sun god. In the initial version of the passage Pyr. §367b (W initial; Sethe 1908–1922, vol. iii, p. 19) one reads: *hms W. pn m s.t=k hny=k m p.t m wi3=k* “let Unas sit in your place, so that you (sc. Re) may row in the sky in your bark.” This was recarved to Pyr. §367b (W final): *hms W. pn m s.t=k hny=f m p.t m wi3=k* “let Unas sit in your place, so that he (sc. Unas) may row in the sky in your bark.” Originally the second-person *hny=k* “that you may row” incorrectly referred to the sun god. Recarving changed the pronoun so that now the beneficiary was the subject of this action, which is what is expected when it is a matter of the text owner, the god Re, and the verb *hni* “to row.” See the motif ‘Rows Re’ in Listing Four. Note that this particular modification did not actually affect the performance structure of the text.

⁵⁶⁶ The meaning “to ascend” or “go up” for *pr* was observed already by Breasted 1912, p. 276 n. 1, and is maintained at e.g. J. Allen 2000, p. 458.

The reciter begins by speaking about the gods Geb and Nut in a ‘mythological’ introduction,⁵⁶⁷ and he ends addressing Geb directly. Thus that god is figured in the second and third person indeed, but he is not the beneficiary. Rather, nearly every statement in the text concerns actions done by or for the reciter himself: the first person “I/me” is at the center of attention and is the object of action. The reciter is the beneficiary.

The referent of the first-person pronouns is the text owner. The first recarving makes that clear:

PT 511 §1149–1161 (P, first recarving)

zbt gbb nthth nw.t tp-^c.wy=f(i)
pr=f r=f r p.t
nhm n=f p.t sd3.i n=f t3 hsr.i n=f sni.t
nhmhm{i}=f m stš
 ...
i.nd.ti=f
im(i)=k dd sw
P. pi z3=k P. pi iw^cw=k

Geb laughs and Nut cries out for joy before him,
 as he ascends to the sky.

The sky roars for him, the earth trembles for him, the storm is broken for him,
 and he roars as Seth.

...
 Let him be saved,
 and do not speak of him (badly),
 for Pepi is your son;
 Pepi is your heir.

Here, every instance of the first-person pronoun was made into the third. And in every case except for two, it is particularly a matter of the third-person pronoun. The exceptions are at the end. As if in exegetical punctuation, there the name of the text owner is put. “I am your son” is applicable to anyone who says it, and the referent of “*he is your son” is not recoverable from the statement itself. But “Pepi is your son” is applicable to just one personage.

The thirty-nine pronouns are instructive, for the changes made to them cannot have been motivated by the desire to establish for whom the text’s meaning is applicable. On the contrary, since for instance both *pr=i* and *pr=f* refer to the same personage (by context, Pepi I), the only thing that has been accomplished by the change is a shift in deixis. Instead of the text owner himself performing the text, as in its original form, its performance is now independent of him. Taken as a representation of a speech act, the meaning of a statement like “I ascend” is necessarily related to whomever makes it, whereas the “he” of a statement like “he ascends” is not. The one is related to its performer; the other is not.

Two facts thus emerge from the modifications to PT 511, and they are paradigmatic for the program of editing the person of the text owner in the Pyramid Texts: it was a matter of displacing the “I” of the beneficiary to a “he,” and it was a matter of establishing the referentiality of the beneficiary.

Different pyramids and different texts place varying emphasis on these two features. For instance, while Pepi I’s exemplar of PT 511 mostly made changes into the third-person pronoun, the pyramid of Pepi II mostly shows the proper name. In the latter pyramid, the establishment of reference was evidently highly important. Thus, there were different editorial

⁵⁶⁷ On these, see Assmann 2002, p. 94.

treatments between pyramids. Different editorial treatments are at hand within individual pyramids as well.⁵⁶⁸ For instance, in the case of PT 511 in the pyramid of Pepi I, the very first sentence was recarved a second time to finally make *pr P. ir p.t* “Pepi ascends to the sky.” In this way, referentiality was established at the very beginning; in the text’s final form, one knew from the start who the text was about, rather than having to wait until the end to find out. The second act of recarving, changing the third-person pronoun to the proper name, suggests that within the same pyramid different editorial perspectives were at play.

The fact that one exemplar of a text may show signs of editing while others do not is an important datum. For instance, the final third-person format of PT 303 as recarved in the pyramid of Unas matches the exemplars of the same text in the pyramids of Pepi I and Pepi II, which show no physical changes. This indicates that they had already been subjected to editorial treatment prior to or at the moment of their transcription. Since the pattern of editing had the target of putting the text owner in the third person, and since there are many texts in the third person without any sign of editing in any exemplar, one is forced to assume that among them are some which had been edited completely. They must be identified as personal texts through other means.

Having made this point, the two exceptional texts may be considered.

Unlike its fellows with recarving, PT 512 is a sacerdotal text. In fact, it is a personal service to the dead, and in this respect it is very like the reframed rites found in Nu’s Book of the Dead—texts performed as by a close family member for the deceased. In its prior form PT 512 was recited by the text owner as officiant to a separate beneficiary. The text bore first-person pronouns, and these referred to the text owner, who addressed a second party, his father. But in its final, modified form the text owner was now cast as beneficiary. The editors transplanted his role, in the process leaving the identity of the reciter indeterminate. Examination of a single passage among its different versions makes this clear:

PT 512 §1164a

P initial	<i>ḏz ḏw it=i</i>	“Raise yourself, O my father!”
P second	<i>ḏz ḏw it{=i}=f</i>	“Raise yourself, O his father!”
P final	<i>ḏz ḏw P.</i>	“Raise yourself, O Pepi!”
N	<i>ḏz ḏw it Ne.</i>	“Raise yourself, O father of Neferkare!”

The initial version in the pyramid of Pepi I was recarved twice. Originally the *=i* “my” of *it=i* “my father” referred to the text owner, who speaks to a beneficiary separate from himself. That the referential value of *=i* was indeed the text owner is evident from the exemplar of Pepi II: “O father of Neferkare.” The editor of the latter version simply replaced the “my” with the proper name. A similar treatment is at hand in the second stage of Pepi I’s version, with the target being the third-person pronoun.⁵⁶⁹

It would not be a strong argument to claim that the identity of the father was, in the text’s prior form, intended to be the text owner himself and that the changes at hand simply reflect a bungled job. Changes from *it=i* to *it=f* are not mistakes of comprehension. There are thirty-one other texts where the text owner was indeed the father in the term *it=i* in the texts’ prior forms, and the scribes understood this perfectly well and left the form intact.⁵⁷⁰ Cases like the present one are quite exceptional. The exemplar of Pepi I, with the initial conversion of *=i* “my” to *=f* “he,” together with the conversion of Pepi II, make it plain that

⁵⁶⁸ See similarly Pierre 1994, p. 306, who observes that the manner in which modifications were carried in the pyramid of Pepi I (in the “*grand module*”) was not systematic.

⁵⁶⁹ For similar modifications to the original *it=i* in this text, see Pyr. §1162a, §1163a, §1163c, and 1167c.

⁵⁷⁰ See Listing Four, under the motif ‘Is My Father (*it=i*).’

two different editors understood that the prior =i was supposed to refer to the text owner. He was not the father; he was the my. And since the text owner was addressing someone else in its prior form, commanding him to rise up, then the text was to be recited by him as officiant to a separate beneficiary.

But finally the text was modified again so as to bring about a transplantation of roles: an editor of the version of Pepi I once more recarved this passage, replacing the vocative with Pepi I's name, thereby making *him* the beneficiary. This was probably done because the first-person officiant of PT 512 does not actually receive any stipulated, reciprocal benefit in this text. So, while the initial recarving did have the effect of making the text independent of the owner's performance of it, this simple change did not yield any express gain to him. The final act of recarving in the exemplar of Pepi I transplanted the role of the text owner to beneficiary, thereby making him the object of the text's benefit.⁵⁷¹ The point of the text in its prior form was to benefit another, but the monument had to do entirely with the text owner. Its new context predicated this profound modification.

This restructuring of a sacerdotal text is analogous to the reframing of personal services to the dead in the Papyrus of Nu. There, paratextual instructions and introductory recitation marks, when coupled with the status of Nu as beneficiary within the text itself, made it clear that such rites were reframed from prior versions. With PT 512, it is the recarving of personal pronouns which makes the restructuring evident. This particular case is quite transparent, as it exists in two exemplars and exhibits recarving together with role transplantation. But the latter phenomenon, role transplantation, occurs with several other texts, too. Defined as the conversion of the text owner from the status of officiant to the status of beneficiary, it necessarily only happens in sacerdotal texts, and specifically with personal services to gods or to the dead.⁵⁷²

In the pyramid of Pepi I, PT 512 is transmitted within a long string of recarved personal texts, PT 503–511 and 513, all of which originally cast the text owner in the first person. The difference between them and PT 512 is in the role played by him. While in the prior form of PT 512 he was officiant to a separate beneficiary, in the others of this string he originally took both roles: he was both officiant and beneficiary; they are personal texts. But with all of them the basic rule was to convert the first-person text-owner to the third. If the texts had been left in the first person, then their performance would have been dependent upon the text owner. The change to the third meant that they no longer presented themselves as being done by him. The texts converted not only pronouns to pronouns, but also pronouns to the proper name. The inclusion of the proper name meant that the reference was now expressly the text owner. Finally, in the exceptional case of PT 512, the transplantation of roles meant that he was now also the object of the rite represented by the text, thereby securing for him its benefit.

As may have been felt in the citation from PT 512, a vocative such as it=f “O father of him” or it Ne . “O father of Neferkare” seems awkward. Some consideration is worthwhile in order to pin down the feeling of strangeness it may give so that it can be understood in context.

⁵⁷¹ This transplantation was elsewhere achieved in the version of Pepi II through the means of the interpolation of unprecedented vocatives, as at Pyr. §1162d. It also created a logical paradox in that exemplar, evident in other personal services as well, as will be addressed presently.

⁵⁷² Besides in the personal service to the dead PT 512, role transplantation occurs in the personal services to the god Osiris PT 477, 483, 532, sPT 561B, PT 577, 579–581, 606, 670, and sPT 1058.

In the first place, the term $it=f$ as a vocative does indeed have a precedent in legitimate uses in the Pyramid Texts,⁵⁷³ for instance in the sacerdotal text PT 676 §2014c (N): $i.n=f$ $hr=k$ $it=f$ $i.n=f$ $hr=k$ gbb “To you has he come, O his father; to you has he come, O Geb.” The priestly reciter addresses the earth god, and he speaks about the text-owning beneficiary in the third person. Doubtless it was under the influence of such usages that changes were made in PT 512 from $it=i$ to $it=f$. But the critical difference of the legitimate uses is that the father whom they name is not the beneficiary. The legitimate uses are vocatives made by an officiant separate from the text-owning beneficiary and have the effect of establishing a filial relationship between father and text owner. It is a filiation in which the speaking officiant has no part. Such statements therefore presuppose three separate parties: first person (priestly speaker), second (divine addressee as father), and third (text-owning beneficiary as son).

The awkward conversions began more simply, as intelligible vocatives *by* the text-owning officiant *to* a separate beneficiary, thus two parties. They had the effect of establishing a filial relationship between audience and speaker as father and son: thus, first person (text-owning speaker as son) and second person (addressed beneficiary as father). Rote conversion of the $=i$ to $=f$ maintained the filial relationship between text owner and addressed beneficiary. But it also displaced the text owner from the role of speaker. In the case of a sacerdotal text, it meant that the text owner’s relationship to the rite was now neither as beneficiary nor officiant. This is the difference between the proper instances of $it=f$ in PT 676 and conversions like that of PT 512. The text owner in the former is supremely relevant; the text owner in the latter, after rote conversion from $=i$ to $=f$, is irrelevant to the statement’s execution and ends up playing only an incidental role in the text as a whole. That difference is what makes the vocative $it=f$ in the converted passages feel awkward. And it was due to that difference that the text was changed a second time in the pyramid of Pepi I.

There are only a few Pyramid Texts where the term $it=f$ seems at odds with the text around it. Four are in personal texts with other signs of editing,⁵⁷⁴ and three are in sacerdotal texts.⁵⁷⁵ Under the influence of the general pattern of modification, their prior first person referring to the text owner was converted to the third. As the sacerdotal texts in question situated the text owner as first-person officiant in their prior forms, these rites were to be performed by him: they were personal services to others like PT 512.

In sum, the changes made to PT 512 are best interpreted as intentional acts. They had to do with making the performance of the text independent of the text owner by conversion to the third person, establishing him as referent, and (with the final recarving of Pepi I) ensuring that he was the recipient of its benefits.

The first two effects of recarving are applicable to the majority of texts listed above. Including the sacerdotal PT 512, the conversion of the first-person text-owner to the third pertains to twenty-five out of twenty-six texts. There is one text which does not quite fit, and that is the remaining exception to the whole set, the personal PT 505. To be precise, its deviation from the pattern is not quite through how it was recarved, but in the disagreement in person between a recarved exemplar and another, non-recarved version. But in any event its deviation is in the pronouns into which the first-person, prior forms were changed.

⁵⁷³ PT 222 §200a, b, d and 201a, b, c, d, and PT 676 §2014c $it=f$ “O father of him,” and PT 573 §1479c and §1481a (P) it $n(i)$ P. “O father of Pepi.”

⁵⁷⁴ PT 362 §605a–b (T) (vocatives); PT 474 §939c (P) (in a quotation); PT 513 §1168a (P) (in a quotation); and sPT 1064 P/V/E 41 (vocative).

⁵⁷⁵ Besides PT 512—for its passages see n. 569 above—PT 540 §1328a (P); and sPT 1058 P/V/E 26 (both vocatives).

The pyramid of Pepi I has the recarved version of PT 505. It was initially in the first person throughout, but it was recarved entirely to show the proper name and third-person pronoun. The exemplar of this same text in the pyramid of Merenre shows no sign of recarving, and all throughout it is in the third person—except in one place. At Pyr. §1090e–f (M) one finds: *nw.t dī=s ʕ.wy=s(i) ir=k mr nw ir.n=s n wsir hrw pw mni.n=f im* “Nut puts her hands upon you, just like this which she did for Osiris on this day on which he moored.” For this same passage, the initial version of Pepi I shows: *nw.t dī=s ʕ.wi=s(i) ir=i mr nw ir.n=s n wsir hrw pw mni.n=f im* “Nut puts her hands upon me...”, and this was recarved to: *dī=s ʕ.wi=s(i) ir=f mi nw ir.n=s n wsir hrw pw mni.n=f im* “Nut puts her hands upon him...” It cannot be other than the case that the =k “you” refers to Merenre himself, since he is receiving the beneficial action of the goddess Nut and is placed in parallel to the god emblematic of resurrection, Osiris. And because Merenre’s exemplar elsewhere refers to him in the third, the effect of this particular change was to make the text exhibit switching. And since the initial version of Pepi I showed the first person throughout, it means that a text originally in the personal structure was changed to the sacerdotal.

This change in deixis adds a wrinkle to the program of editing, and consideration of it sharpens our assessment of its effects. It has to do with the nature of the first and second-person pronouns versus the third. According to the pattern, usually the person of the text owner was changed from the first to the third, and this—as observed already—had the effect of making the text’s performance independent of him. But the change to the third also had the concomitant effect of removing him from the here and now.

One of the central differences between the third person and the first and second is the former’s ambiguous status in terms of presence in respect to a communication act.⁵⁷⁶ A third person, be it a noun or pronoun, can be right here in front of us while I’m talking about it, or it could be in the next room. In other words, it is not necessarily anchored to the place of communication in the way that the first- and second-person pronouns are. When I part my lips and tell you that you will be all right, then you must be present, and I must also be here somehow because I am saying it right in front of you—the validity of this is in virtue of your hearing it. So grammatical person has to do with presence. It also has to do with time. You are reading this right now, and if I write “You have read this” or “You will read this,” you are still reading it now.⁵⁷⁷ But the pronouns in “He is reading this right now” and “He has read this” are not anchored in time to the communication act by their pronominal nature. Their relationship in terms of mediacy is dictated by the tenses of the verbs and other information besides the pronouns themselves. The temporal relation of a “he” to communication is contingent on things besides the innate quality of the pronoun itself. In sum, felicitous statements with the first and second-person pronouns are immediate and present, while of itself the third is ambiguous. The first and second-person pronouns anchor their reference to the here and now at the moment of transmitting and at the moment of receiving. The third-person pronouns and nouns do not.

⁵⁷⁶ See Halliday 2004, p. 551: whereas the third person pronouns are employed both to refer (usually) to previously introduced entities in a text itself or (less often) to entities in the immediate environment in which a text or statement is produced, the first and second persons normally refer to people in the field of perception shared by speaker and listener; “their meaning is defined by the act of speaking.”

⁵⁷⁷ To be sure, there is a natural difference between the spoken text versus the written text in that the former is evanescent, whereas the latter is simultaneously preterite and future, inasmuch as it was inscribed in the past but perdures (Ong 1977, pp. 421–426), but it is also present from the point of view of the reader at the moment of reading, of actualization.

And they thereby potentiate the detachability of a rite from its original context.⁵⁷⁸ Thus, while the pattern of modification accomplished the task of removing the beneficiary's involvement in performance and linking the text to a particular personage, a byproduct was to remove a relation of immediate presence between text owner and text. A lack of immediacy is not infinite repetition; it is infinitely not present. But actually performed acts are anchored to a particular time and place. The core sacerdotal texts possessed native anchors to the here and now via their possession of second-person pronouns for the beneficiary and, when he appears, the first person for the officiant. Their statements are not ambiguous of time and place but are immediately present, and in this respect they are intrinsically performative at actualization. In contrast, the program of modification for the personal texts removed them from the moment.

That is, except through deviant cases like PT 505 in the pyramid of Merenre. In it, the alteration of the original first person to the second maintained the immediate connection of presence.

To be sure, out of all the personal texts with the various signs of editing, only nine were converted into what is effectively the sacerdotal structure,⁵⁷⁹ (and of them only PT 505 shows the sign of recarving). One motive behind the particular change of PT 505 may be presumed to have been the effect achieved by the change, and that effect, by context, would have been applicable to the texts among which it was transmitted.

Also contributing to the permissibility of the conversion would have been the disengagement of the text from its operative origins upon its transcription to the monumental wall. Practical action is constrained by logistical factors; it is ruled by the physicality of existence. To separate a text from its role as a support in such matters and make it into decoration was to free it from physical constraints: the freedom of the monument permitted the editor to make a statement originally said *by* the text owner into a statement said *to* him. Though not at hand in PT 505, a further factor permitting modification to the second person rather than the third was the presence of quoted speech in the text's prior form.⁵⁸⁰ This last point will be addressed momentarily.

But it is a pity that exceptions to the rule must receive such belabored discussion. The danger is that it occludes the majority of evidence, which deserves now to be stressed.

The evidence of recarving forms a strong impression of the basic pattern of modification of person in the Pyramid Texts, and this pattern will be resonated in the remaining signs as well. The modification of a pronoun referring to the text owner nearly always happens in texts where he is both beneficiary and reciter and was originally situated in the first person, thus personal texts, and it normally involves the modification of a first person to the third.

The usual pattern of modification had the twin effects—and thus one may presume the intentions—of making the performance of the text independent of the text owner's performance and (via the proper name) of establishing his referential relation to it. A byproduct of this program, however, was to displace the beneficiary's presence, to ambiguously leave him here or there, now or then. This was overcome in cases like that of PT 505 by changing the first person to the second.

⁵⁷⁸ For the phraseology, see Bauman and Briggs 1990, p. 74.

⁵⁷⁹ See Listing One, under PT 264, 306, 474, 505, 521, 523, 525, 572, and 609.

⁵⁸⁰ See Listing One, under PT 264, 306, 474, 525, and 572.

b. *Vacillation to First Person*

When a text usually puts the text owner in the third person but suddenly slips to the first, it may be said to vacillate in grammatical person. Presumably such a text was originally composed in the first. Incomplete editing overlooked or did not grasp the significance of the slender reed-leaf =*i* “I/my” or absence of suffix pronoun (=i) “I/my” and let the text stand. Vacillation to the first person is one of the proofs that the process of editing was not executed with completeness. This is most palpable where vacillation occurs in texts which elsewhere show signs of recarving:⁵⁸¹ the recarving editors did not complete their task with thoroughness.

A concrete example will illustrate. The initially carved version of a text in the pyramid of Unas shows:

PT 311 §495a–496b (W, initial version)

si3 r^c W. n(i) sw i.rh.w tw
i.rh.k(i) ir pr nb(=i)n hm(=i)htp di
i.wn iw.t-iw=s 3.wi 3h.t n pr.w m^cnd.t
i.rh.k(i) zh mn(i)w hr(i)-ib ht.iw izkn pr.w=k im=f

Recognize Unas, O Re, for he is one of those who know you!

I know that, if my lord ascends, I will not forget the offering which is to be given when Yutyus opens the doors of the horizon for the ascent of the day-bark, and I know the booth of the herdsman in the center of the dais of the Yezken from which you ascend.

After an address to Re, the beneficiary is referred to in the first person: “I know,” “my lord,” “I will not forget,” and “I know.” The passage was later recarved as follows:

PT 311 §495a–496b (W, recarved version)

si3 r^c W. n(i) sw i.rh.w tw
i.rh.sw ir pr nb(=f)n hm(=f)htp di
i.wn iw.t-iw=s 3.wi 3h.t n pr.w m^cnd.t
i.rh.k(i) zh mn(i)w hr(i)-ib ht.iw izkn pr.w=k im=f

Recognize Unas, O Re, for he is one of those who know you!

He knows that, if his lord ascends, he will not forget the offering which is to be given when Yutyus opens the doors of the horizon for the ascent of the day-bark, and I know the booth of the herdsman in the center of the dais of the Yezken from which you ascend.

The modifications changed the beneficiary to the third person in three places—“he knows,” “his lord,” “I will not forget”—but neglected the last. Where preserved, the corresponding passage of this text in the pyramid of Pepi I⁵⁸² uniformly places the beneficiary in the third person, including the instance neglected in Unas: *i.rh.P. zh mn(i)w hr(i)-ib ht.iw /// /// ///* “and Pepi knows the booth of the herdsman . . .”

To be sure, one might suppose that the absence of an expected third-person pronoun was really the result of an accidental omission of a non-first-person pronoun that had been present in the source manuscript. But for my part I know of but a few cases like this in the Pyramid Texts, for instance in the sacerdotal PT 659 §1863a (N): *sdm=k mdw<=f> r^c ntr is* “May you hear <his> words, O Re, (he, sc. the beneficiary) being a god.” The phrase *ntr is*

⁵⁸¹ PT 311, 333, 408, sPT 491A–B, PT 503–504, 507–509, 515.

⁵⁸² P/V/E 30.

“being (lit. as) a god” should have an antecedent internal to the sentence, and the expectation is that this antecedent be the text owner as beneficiary, rather than the god Re.⁵⁸³

It may be observed that the phenomenon of switching in sacerdotal texts is superficially similar to that of vacillation. However, the difference between vacillation to the first and switching from second to third is the effect on performance structure. Situating the beneficiary in either the second and third person is suitable for sacerdotal texts, and therefore alternating between these two possibilities does not change the relationship between the beneficiary and the text’s performance; he still is not the speaker. But, as far as the Pyramid Texts go, changing the first-person pronoun to either the third or second has the effect of shifting a text’s presented manner of performance away from the beneficiary. Thus, when an editor changed a Pyramid Text away from the first person but neglected one or more passages, its final form is inconsistent in how it presents the text as being done. The inconsistency is a product of incomplete editing; it is a mistake.

Naturally one can imagine hypothetical situations where a Pyramid Text might *intentionally* alternate between the third and first person: above all, one may suppose in *a priori* fashion that the alternation was meant to be a rhetorical device. In fact, alternation from the third to the first happens with some Book of the Dead rites, as pointed out in Chapter One (but with quoted speech, actually). But, as to the evidence from the pyramids, it is important to realize that neither the sign of vacillation nor any of the others occur in a vacuum: the various signs of editing are very often found together in the same texts, and they tend to cluster together in recurring series. Indeed, out of forty-seven personal texts with vacillation, twenty-one are found in recurring series alongside texts with other signs of editing,⁵⁸⁴ and fully forty-three of them show some other sign of editing,⁵⁸⁵ yielding a total of forty-four out of forty-nine with corroboration of their edited status. This makes the phenomenon of unintentional, mistaken vacillation to the first person absolutely certain in the Pyramid Texts, while there is not even a single case of intentional alternation from the first to the third.

There are a total of forty-nine texts showing vacillation to the first person in respect to the text owner. Pepi I’s pyramid has the most examples, but all pyramids possess at least two. The exemplars exhibiting this sign may be summarized as follows:

PT 254 (W)	PT 439 (P)	PT 508–509 (P)	sPT 570A (P)
PT 260 (W)	PT 469–470 (P)	PT 515 (P)	PT 573 (M)
PT 262 (TW)	PT 473 (P)	PT 519 (N)	PT 574 (N)
PT 299 (W)	PT 476 (PMN)	PT 521 (P)	PT 609 (M)
PT 311 (WP)	PT 477 (MN)	PT 524 (P)	PT 626 (P)
PT 327 (T)	PT 485 (P)	PT 528 (P)	hPT 662A (Ibi)
PT 328 (P)	PT 486 (N)	PT 539 (P)	PT 696 (N)
PT 330 (TN)	sPT 491A–B (P)	PT 555 (PMN)	sPT 1058 (P)
PT 333 (P)	sPT 502H (P)	PT 562–563 (P)	sPT 1070 (P)
PT 346 (TMN)	PT 503 (PN)	PT 565 (P)	
PT 359 (N)	PT 504 (P)	PT 567 (N)	
PT 408 (P)	PT 507 (N)	PT 569 (P)	

⁵⁸³ As is clear from PT 659 §1862a–b. Two other cases are at PT 696 §2168a (N) (sim. §2168b): *tzy n<=f> Ne. {tz} /// ... ///* “Let Neferkare raise for <himself> /// ... ///” versus Pyr. §2168a (P/A/N 41): *tzy n=f P. pn in* “Let Pepi raise up for himself that which is brought” and PT 512 §1162a (N): *ir.n n<=f> it.Ne. ib=f* “The father of Neferkare has made his heart for <himself>” versus Pyr. §1162a (P): *ir.n n=f it=f ib=f* “His father made his heart even for himself.”

⁵⁸⁴ See Listing One, under PT 254, 260, 262, 299, 311, 327, 359, 485, sPT 502H, PT 515, 519, 521, 528, 562, 565, 569, sPT 570A, PT 573–574, and 626.

⁵⁸⁵ See Listing One, under PT 254, 260, 262, 299, 311, 327–328, 333, 359, 408, 439, 469–470, 473, 476, 485, 486, sPT 491A–B, PT 503–504, 507–509, 515, 519, 521, 528, 539, 555, 563, 565, 567, 569, sPT 570A, PT 573–574, 609, 626, hPT 662A, PT 696, and sPT 1070.

Vacillation to the first person conforms to the pattern of editing seen with recarving. The modification of a pronoun referring to the text owner virtually always happens in texts where he is both beneficiary and reciter originally in the first person, thus personal texts, and it almost always involves the modification of a first person to the third person.

There are two exceptions to the first element of the pattern. One is particularly complicated, but worth the extra discussion. With both it is a matter of role transplantation with sacerdotal texts, specifically personal services to the god Osiris.

Attested in three pyramids, PT 477⁵⁸⁶ is a sacerdotal text which originally situated the god Osiris as its beneficiary, switching in reference to him between the second and the third persons. And the text owner was cast in the first as officiant in the text's prior form, usually converted to the third.

The relationship between the text owner and Osiris is apprehensible in a refrain. In the pyramid of Pepi II it usually appears as *i.n Ne. hr=k nb=f i.n Ne. hr=k wsir* "To you has [Neferkare] come, O lord of [him] to you has [Neferkare] come, O Osiris."⁵⁸⁷ This statement casts the text owner in the third person and the god Osiris in the second. But the text shows multiple signs of editing—vacillation, residue, disagreement, and advanced noun—and from them it is evident that, in the text's prior form, the text owner was in the first person "I," rather than the third "Neferkare" and "him." For instance, one of the iterations of the refrain vacillates from the awkward *nb=f* "lord of [him]" to *nb(=i)* "[my] lord." That is in the pyramid of Pepi II. In all of Merenre's renditions of the refrain, there is vacillation to the first person at this point (*nb=i* "my lord"), while the remainder of his version has the king in the third.

The variation between *nb=f* "lord of [him]" and *nb(=i)* "[my] lord" is precisely analogous to what was seen earlier with PT 512: there, an original *it=i* "[my] father" was converted according to the usual pattern of modification to the awkward *it=f* "father of [him]." Together with other signs of editing, this information establishes that the prior form of PT 477 had the text owner as first-person reciter to the god Osiris as beneficiary. The latter dominates the text as an entity separate from the text owner and is the main object of attention.⁵⁸⁸

Having established that much, the role transplantation may now be considered. It occurs in Pepi II's exemplar. In an extraordinary instance of the refrain, the text owner merges with the god:

PT 477 §966a–c (N)

i.n Ne. hr=k nb(=i)
i.n Ne. hr=k wsir Ne.
i.ski=f hr=k
hbs=f tw m hbs ntr
w^cb {n} =f n=k m i3di
wnm=i .t m hft(i)=k
hnti(=i) s(i) n wsir
d=f wi m-hnt hnt.tiw

To you has [Neferkare] come, O [my] lord:
 to you has [Neferkare] come, O [Osiris Neferkare],
 that [he] dry your face,
 [he] clothe you in the clothing of a god
 and [he] perform service for you in Iadi,

⁵⁸⁶ On a passage of this text, see Mathieu 1998, pp. 71–78.

⁵⁸⁷ At Pyr. §964a, §966a, §967a, and §968a. See also similarly Pyr. §963b, §963c (N), and §965c (N): *iw=f hr=k* "when he (sc. Pepi II) comes to you (sc. Osiris)."

⁵⁸⁸ See Osiris at Pyr. §956b, §957b–c, §960a, §960c, §963b, §963c, §964a, §966a, §966c, §967a, §968a, and §970c.

me eating a limb from your enemy.
 I butcher it for Osiris,
 and he places me before the butchers.

The passage shows vacillation at a number of points, making it rather difficult to follow. The difficulty doubtless arose from a paradox created by the interpolation of the name of the text owner after the name of the god Osiris. By this move, the text owner now approaches himself, and it also transplants him (not fully out) from the role of officiant (but entirely) into that of beneficiary. Thus, in PT 477's prior form, it was like BD 173 in Nebseni's Book of the Dead: the text owner performs a service for the god and expects to reap a reciprocal benefit. But in the process of editing this Pyramid Text, the name of the text owner was inserted after the god's even while keeping him as agent of the text's described actions. And just as a disjunction in logic was perceived in the reframed texts of the Book of the Dead, so also is a disjunction evident here.

That the name of the text owner was secondarily introduced rather than being an original element is clear not only from the paradox it creates, but also from the absence of his name in Pepi II's other iterations of the refrain, and from the absence of his name in this particular place in the exemplars of Pepi I and Merenre. Likewise, there is one other case of the interpolation of the text owner's name after that of Osiris in Pepi II's exemplar;⁵⁸⁹ it is again absent in the versions of Pepi I and Merenre.

The move of interpolating the name of the text owner after the name of the god Osiris is found in other texts as well, and always in personal services.⁵⁹⁰ A similar circumstance appears to be at hand with the other vacillating text deviating from the pattern, the fragmentary personal service sPT 1058.⁵⁹¹ It is not necessary to negate the phenomenon by claiming that it is simply the result of mistaken editing. Rather, this kind of transformation made the text owner secure both the scattered reciprocal benefits (for instance, being placed at the head of butchers) as well as the text's direct ones. The ensuing paradox is a sign of how the texts were being monumentally treated. Chiseled on the wall, the text was now divorced from the physical practices which were its original reason for being, and therefore it had more freedom in what it could say. Human action must obey physical laws, and it is at least difficult to say that you have approached yourself and mean it as a physical fact. Divorced from physical reality, the paradox is achievable in the realm of words.

PT 477 was a personal service to a god, converted in the pyramid of Pepi II to make the text owner both officiant (the original form) and beneficiary (here, a paradox), and similarly sPT 1058, though apparently without paradox. The remaining forty-seven texts showing vacillation were personal texts in their prior forms, with the text owner as both beneficiary and reciter. In this, they conform to the pattern seen with recarving.

The second element of the overall pattern of editing is the conversion of the first person to the third. This holds for forty-seven texts with vacillation. The exceptions are PT 521 (P) and PT 609 (M). PT 521 shows various signs of editing: vacillation, residual first-person pronoun, and exemplar disagreement. In the pyramid of Pepi I, where it does not slip back to the first person, it switches between the second and third-person pronoun. In the pyramid of Pepi II, it also switches. In the pyramid of Merenre, it casts the beneficiary solely in the

⁵⁸⁹ At Pyr. §960c.

⁵⁹⁰ These services are mentioned above at n. 572.

⁵⁹¹ See sPT 1058 P/V/E 26–27: *it n(i) P. [wsir] P. wr [qdd]=f ʕ3 b3gi* “O father of Pepi [Osiris] Pepi, whose sleep is great, great of inertness.” The space between the two preserved instances of P. has room enough for [wsir], and nothing else would make sense there. The presumed prior form is thus **it=i wsir wr qdd=f ʕ3 b3gi* “O my father Osiris, whose sleep is great, great of inertness,” with =i replaced by P. and P. inserted after wsir as well. The first person emerges at P/V/E 29 as well as in the other exemplar of this text at P/Cpost/E x+7.

second person. The pyramids of Merenre and Pepi II show the further sign of editing in the interpolation of vocatives in different positions at Pyr. §1225c. PT 609 shows vacillation, exemplar disagreement, and an agrammatically advanced noun. In the pyramid of Merenre, where it does not slip back to the first person, it switches between the second and third person. In the pyramid of Pepi II, the beneficiary is strictly in the third person. The rationale for the attempted conversion of these two texts from the personal to the sacerdotal structure may be surmised to be the same as those with PT 505 above.

Now having pointed out deviant cases, it is time to rehearse the rule. As with recarving, vacillation to the first person nearly always happens in texts where the text owner is both beneficiary and reciter and is in the first person, thus personal texts, and it normally involves the modification of a first person to the third person.

c. *Doubling of Pronouns and Nouns*

With vacillation, one encounters a situation where the ancient editor inadvertently left an original first person intact. A related phenomenon is the doubling of the first-person pronoun with a proper name or the third-person pronoun: the beneficiary's first-person pronoun is immediately followed by either the third-person pronoun or his name. In such instances, the first person of the transcriptional source was inadvertently maintained.⁵⁹²

For example, a passage from a personal text reads *n {wi} Ne. ir B* “{I} Neferkare is not for the earth.”⁵⁹³ In this instance, the imperfect process of editing presumably took place somewhere between the source manuscript and the actual carving. Both the prior form “I” and the target form “Neferkare” coexist without correction. How doubling can come about may be seen from a recarved passage. For example, an initial stage of a personal text's passage *w^cb=i m sh.t-i3r.w* “I have been made pure in the field of rushes”⁵⁹⁴ was recarved to *w^cb={i}=f m sh.t-i3r.w* “{I} he has been made pure in the field of rushes.”⁵⁹⁵ The editing added a new pronoun without replacing the original.

To my knowledge, there is no sound case of doubling to show editing away from a grammatical person other than the first. The closest that comes is a passage from a sacerdotal text. One version of it reads:

PT 611 §1725c–1726c (M)

dhw.ti pi it(=i) M.n. (i)m(i)-^cb=tn ntr.w
wn.i n=k z m zr.wi hsf.w(i) rh.wt
tn=k h3.w

[My father Merenre] is Thoth, the one who is among you, O gods!
 For [you] is opened the bolt from the gate which keeps out the people,⁵⁹⁶
 that [you] may reckon the thousands.

This is ordinary enough, but the version of Pepi II gives:

PT 611 §1725c–1726c (N)

dhw.ti pw it(=i) Ne. (i)m(i)-^cb=tn ntr.w
wn n=k n Ne.⁵⁹⁷ z m zr.wi /// ///
 /// ///

⁵⁹² The phenomenon of doubling has been observed with later texts; see the comments of Quack 2006b, p. 67.

⁵⁹³ PT 467 §890b (N).

⁵⁹⁴ PT 510 §1135b (P initial).

⁵⁹⁵ PT 510 §1135b (P final).

⁵⁹⁶ On this passage, see Leclant 1985, pp. 83–92.

⁵⁹⁷ In this position, the insertion of preposition plus noun qualifies as an instance of an agrammatically advanced noun, a phenomenon which is discussed below.

My father Neferkare is Thoth, the one who is among you, O gods!
 For you, for Neferkare, is opened the bolt from the gate /// ///
 /// ///

Obviously a process of editing has engaged the text since the two exemplars differ. However, the passage from Pepi II is not the same as the phenomenon of doubling in two respects. First, the preposition *n* “for” is also repeated rather than operating on both the pronoun and the noun, so it is actually the repetition of a whole prepositional phrase. Second, the text as preserved in Pepi II elsewhere maintains the second person throughout,⁵⁹⁸ showing no other potential sign of editing from the second person to the third. These two differences suggest that something else is at hand with this passage.

Returning to it for a closer inspection, one can see that the interpolation of *n Ne* “for Neferkare” may be owed to a desire to clarify the referent of the pronoun: the passage switches from addressing gods to addressing the beneficiary, without an intervening vocative for the latter to signal the change in address. In order to clarify the referent of the second person =*k*, an editor inserted a dative with the proper name. It is an instance of exegetical anaphora.

The sign of doubling, then, only occurs in personal texts, and it therefore conforms without exception to this aspect of the pattern seen with recarving. As to the second element of the pattern, there is only one text which shows a change from the first person to a format other than the third. That is PT 505, discussed above, which exhibits switching in the exemplar of Merenre.

Altogether there are seventeen texts with the phenomenon of doubling. All but two are found in conjunction with other signs of editing,⁵⁹⁹ and four are found in recurring series alongside texts with other signs.⁶⁰⁰ The corroborating evidence actually accounts for all seventeen; none of them are cases of epexegetis. As before, it is the pyramid of Pepi I which delivers the most evidence for this sign of editing. The texts exhibiting it may be summarized as follows:

PT 269 (P)	PT 439 (P)	PT 505 (P)	hPT 662A (Ibi)
PT 270 (MN)	PT 467 (N)	PT 506 (N)	sPT 1070 (P)
PT 336 (M)	PT 469 (P)	PT 508–511 (P)	
PT 407 (P)	PT 473 (N)	sPT 570A (P)	

d. *Residual -y and -i with Third-weak Verbs*

A phenomenon closely akin to doubling is residue of the original first person, evidenced in the expressed final *-y* or *-i* of verb forms from third-weak verbs. One example with recarving will suffice to show how this sign of editing was produced. The initially carved stage of PT 510 §1135b in Pepi I shows *h3i=i* “that I descend,” but it was recarved to *h3y=f* “that he descend.” The *-y* ending in the recarved version is residue of the original first person. With the edited addition of a non-first-person subject, the *-i=i* of the original (written in hieroglyphs with two reed-leaves) now represented the expressed and final weak radical *-y* of the verb stem. This was acceptable enough, since *-i* and *-y* were to some extent interchangeable in Old Egyptian.⁶⁰¹

While it is true that a final *-y* could in ordinary circumstances be written for third-weak verbs with suffix pronoun, no matter the person,⁶⁰² data for expressed final *-y* gathered by

⁵⁹⁸ Namely, at §1727b–1728a.

⁵⁹⁹ See Listing One, under PT 269, 407, 439, 467, 469, 473, 505–506, 508–511, sPT 570A, and hPT 662A.

⁶⁰⁰ See Listing One, under PT 269–270, 336, and sPT 570A.

⁶⁰¹ See more precisely Edel 1955/1964, §137–140.

⁶⁰² As observed by Doret 1986, pp. 87 and 115 (Table 1), a final *-y* can occur especially in the ‘subjunctive *sḏm=f*.’ In Old Egyptian, a final *-y* appears in the *sḏm=f* virtually always with third-weak verbs alone, and

J. Allen reveals that it usually appears when it is a question of the text owner: forty-nine cited lines with royal subject versus fourteen with subjects other than him.⁶⁰³ The statistic is remarkable in its disparity, and the disparity may be explained by understanding that the prior form of the text actually had him in the first person, as indeed Allen does.

Though less reliable, there are also instances where a third-weak verb shows a single reed-leaf alone as residue of a prior first-person pronoun. To consider J. Allen's data again,⁶⁰⁴ there are about forty-five cited lines with non-royal subject versus sixteen with the king. This is a situation the reverse of endings with *-y*: one presumes that in the majority of cases, the final *-i* cannot in fact be the residue of a prior form but rather must ordinarily represent the final consonant. Nevertheless again a recarved passage from Pepi I indicates that some instances can be understood to be the result of editing, with *nmi=f* "let him traverse" recarved from an original *nm=i* "let me traverse."⁶⁰⁵

Altogether, residue is an imperfect indication of editing away from the first person, and it therefore requires a greater degree of interpretation. But twenty-six of the thirty-five personal texts with residue show other signs of editing,⁶⁰⁶ and twelve are found in recurring series alongside other texts with signs of editing,⁶⁰⁷ corroborating all but five of the total instances of texts counted as exhibiting this sign.

Residue conforms to the pattern seen with other signs of editing. The modification of a pronoun referring to the text owner nearly always happens in texts where he is both beneficiary and reciter originally in the first person, thus personal texts, and it usually involves the modification of a first person to the third person.

But there are four exceptions to this pattern.

In two of them, it is a matter of a personal service to a god. One is a case of residue in the sacerdotal PT 477, already discussed above. It was shown that the text owner was, in that text's prior form, its first-person officiant to a separate beneficiary. The other is in the sacerdotal PT 456. It, too, is a text which placed the text owner as first-person officiant in its prior form. The body of this text is a proto-hymn to the sun god, its primary beneficiary, and in fact the body text makes no mention of the text owner at all, unless he is referred to periphrastically in one place as Horus.⁶⁰⁸ The residue actually occurs outside the text proper, in a rare paratextual annotation expressing the reciprocal benefits of the proto-hymn's recitation. In Pepi II's version of Pyr. §856b, one finds: *[iry Nē.] hk3.w ipn n(i)w hr 3h.ti* "and [Neferkare] performs this magic of Harakhti." In Pepi I's version of the same passage, it is: *[iri=i] sn hk3.w [ip]n n(i)w hr 3h.ti* "and [I perform]..." In fact, in the paratext of Pepi I's exemplar one finds the first person maintained throughout,⁶⁰⁹ and that version consequently points toward the origin of the residue in the exemplar of Pepi II. So, taking PT 477 and PT 456 in sum, the first two exceptions to the pattern are in modifying sacerdotal rather than personal texts.

consequently one may regard it in those cases as a representation of the final consonant. The sole exception known to me involves the final geminating verb *phrr* at PT 673 §1991a (N): *phr.y sin.w=k* "let your runners race." But, as kindly suggested to me by P. Dorman in a personal communication, one might interpret the final *-y* as having been written for geminated *-r*. Then the example would neither be a subjunctive *sdm=f* nor an exception to the morphological rule for Old Egyptian. In view of the *-y* and *-r* exchange, cf. PT 302 §461a (W initial, Sethe 1908–1922, vol. iii, p. 24): *pr=f r=f* "thus does he ascend" recarved to Pyr. §461a (W final): *pry r=f W*. "thus let Unas ascend."

⁶⁰³ See J. Allen 1984, §777 A. (5) and (6).

⁶⁰⁴ See *ibid.*, §777 A. (1–3).

⁶⁰⁵ PT 509 §1121b (P).

⁶⁰⁶ See Listing One, under PT 260, 266, 359, 456, 467, 469, 471, 473, 477, 481, 485, 504, 508–511, 519, 521, 523, 528, 539, 555, 563, 569, 681, and 696.

⁶⁰⁷ See Listing One, under PT 260, 268, 271, 359, 471, 485, 519, 521, 523, 527–528, and 569.

⁶⁰⁸ PT 456 §853b.

⁶⁰⁹ This text was signaled above at n. 495.

Otherwise their modifications are in line with the rule of changing from the first person to the third.

The other two exceptions are with PT 521 and 523, which were converted from a personal performance structure to a sacerdotal one. PT 521 was mentioned above in conjunction with vacillation, and PT 523 is found together with it in a recurring series. The version of Pepi I, which is the exemplar with residue, was converted to the third person. But both the exemplars of Merenre and Pepi II converted the text to the second person. It may be mentioned that the latter also exhibits editing in that it has an interpolated vocative in one passage, Pyr. §1232a, absent from the other two exemplars.

It is worth pointing out that this text includes quoted speech. The quotational status of the statement is obliquely indicated by a preceding sentence and its context. In the pyramid of Pepi I, the entire text is as follows:

PT 523 §1231–1232 (P)

snḥt.n p.t i3ḥw n P.
i.šwy r=f P. pn ir p.t ir(.t) r^c is
ḥ^c r=f P. pn ir ir(.t) tw i3b(.i)t n(i)t hr sdm.t mdw ntr im=
ḥ^c.ti ḥnti 3ḥ.w mr ḥ^c hr ḥnti ḥnḥ.w
ḥ^c r=f P. pn ḥnti 3ḥ.w i.ḥm.w-sk mr ḥ^c wsir ḥnti 3ḥ.w

The sky has made the light strong for Pepi,
 and Pepi thus rises to the sky as the eye of Re,
 and Pepi thus stands for this left eye of Horus, that by which the words of the gods are heard—
 “Stand before the Akhs, just as Horus foremost of the living stands!”

Pepi thus stands before the Akhs, and the imperishable stars, just as Osiris stands before the Akhs.

The verb form with residue is found in the statement *i.šwy r=f P. pn* “and Pepi thus rises.” As to the quotation, it is obliquely introduced by making note of hearing the words of the gods—in other words, recited writing. The quoted speech begins with an exclamatory stative, which is equivalent to an imperative. Its content: the beneficiary is *ḥ^c ḥnti 3ḥ.w* “to stand before the Akhs.” And so in the next sentence, it is declared that the beneficiary does indeed *ḥ^c ḥnti 3ḥ.w*. The exhortation to stand is a quotation, and as such it is appositional to the words of the gods. The quoted exhortation is accomplished in the immediately subsequent statement.

Having dwelt a little on the exceptions, the pattern of the majority should be stressed. Residue nearly always happens where the text owner is both beneficiary and reciter originally in the first person, thus personal texts, and it usually involves the modification of a first person to the third person. Keeping in mind the two personal services with the sign of residue, the thirty-three personal texts showing it may now be summarized:

PT 260 (W)	PT 471 (N)	PT 519 (PMN)	PT 571 (P)
PT 266 (P)	PT 473 (N)	PT 521 (P)	PT 576 (P)
PT 268 (Nt)	PT 481 (PN)	PT 523 (P)	PT 669 (N)
PT 271 (N)	PT 485 (P)	PT 527–528 (M)	PT 681 (N)
PT 359 (N)	PT 504 (MN)	PT 539 (P)	PT 684 (N)
PT 362 (T)	PT 508–509 (P)	PT 555 (MN)	PT 696 (P)
PT 467 (PN)	PT 510 (PM)	PT 563 (PMN)	sPT 1064 (P)
PT 469 (P)	PT 511 (PN)	PT 569 (M)	

e. Exemplar Disagreement

Whereas the preceding four signs of editing of themselves maintain the prior first person in some form, the remaining two signs—exemplar disagreement and advanced noun—do not.

Consequently they only show that some form of editing of person had taken place. For this reason they are not relied upon in order to identify personal texts but are consulted to corroborate other indications of editing.

To consider exemplar disagreement first, sometimes two or more versions of the same passage of a text do not cast the beneficiary in the same grammatical person. Because there is lack of concord between them, it is clear that the original person had been altered at some point in the history of the text. An example of disagreement was discussed above under recarving, with PT 505. All told, there are fifty-two texts showing disagreement, with or without one of the clear signs of editing away from the first person.

Thirty-eight cases occur in conjunction with one of the clear signs. With them, it was already determinable that the prior form of the text situated the text owner in the first person. Examination of his role showed whether the text was personal or sacerdotal. Thirty-three cases like this involved personal texts,⁶¹⁰ while five involve sacerdotal ones. The five sacerdotal texts are all personal services to the gods or to the dead: PT 456, 477, 512, 540, and fPT 691B. PT 456, 477, and 512 were discussed above in association with other forms of editing. Discussion of PT 540⁶¹¹ and fPT 691B,⁶¹² which uniformly situate the text owner in the first person throughout in at least one exemplar of each, has been deferred until now.

Both of these texts were, in their prior forms, personal services to a god. In all exemplars, the text owner is said to act for the god Osiris. The latter appears throughout as the object of the undertaken deeds: he is the principal beneficiary. As to the text owner, in the kingly pyramids he appears in the third-person pronoun and proper name. In effect, the kingly exemplars state that the text's actions are being done by the king on behalf of the god.

But the pyramid of Queen Neith preserves the original forms for the text owner, who is the first-person officiant. In her pyramid, the two texts are immediately adjacent to one another. In neither of them does her name properly⁶¹³ appear, though that of the god Osiris does. A passage from each will be cited in turn, comparing it to the same from a kingly pyramid:

fPT 691B §2127b

Nt *m-k w(i) {b} <l>s i.ki in.n(=i) n=k it.t.n=f im=k*

Behold: [I]am come, [I]having brought you what he (sc. Seth) took from you.

N⁶¹⁴ *[m-k] Ne. i.y in.n=f n=k it.t.n=f [im=k]*

[Behold:] [Neferkare]is come, [he]having brought you what he took [from you.]

PT 540 §1328a-b

Nt *i.n(=i) hr=k it(=i) i.n(=i) hr=k wsir in.n=i n=k k3=k pw*

To you have [I]come, O [my]father: to you have [I]come, O Osiris, [I]having brought you this Ka of yours.

P *i.n P. pn hr<=k> it=f i[n=f] hr=k wsir in.n=f n=k k3=k pw*

To <you> has [Pepi] come, O father [of him]: to you [has [he]] come, O Osiris, [he] having brought you this Ka of yours.

⁶¹⁰ See above and in Listing One, under PT 254, 262, 299, 306, 311, 327–328, 407–408, 439, 470, 473, 476, 486, 505, 519, 521, 523, 528, 555, 565, 567, 569, sPT 570A, PT 573–574, 609, sPT 625A–B, PT 626, hPT 662A, fPT 691, and PT 696.

⁶¹¹ On this text, see Sethe 1934, pp. 51–56; Fischer-Elfert 1998, pp. 3 and 52–57; and Hays 2002, p. 156 n. 16.

⁶¹² On this text, see Assmann 1976, p. 38.

⁶¹³ To be sure, in PT 540 there is a spurious conversion of the name of one deity into what must be another one. The proper form of this statement is given in the pyramid of Pepi I, with Pyr. §1329c: *wp r3=k in dw3-wr m hwe.t-nb* “your (sc. Osiris’s) mouth has been opened by Duawer in the house of gold,” but in the pyramid of Neith the mouth of the god is opened *in n.t wr(.t)* “by Neith the Great.”

⁶¹⁴ Jéquier 1936, pl. ii, 1009.

Neith's versions of fPT 691B and PT 540 conform precisely to the initial version of PT 512 in the pyramid of Pepi I, discussed above: the text owner is first-person officiant to someone separate from herself. The kingly versions of fPT 691B and PT 540 correspond precisely to Pepi I's second version of PT 512, prior to its final recarving and role transplantation, including the awkward *it=f* "O father of him" in PT 540. The consistent replacement of the first-person pronouns of the adjacent texts fPT 691B and PT 540 with the third-person text-owner in two different pyramids—therefore by two different editors—shows beyond doubt that s/he was the officiant in the texts' prior forms. Thus the changes in the kingly pyramids were not mistaken, as has been assumed since the time of Sethe,⁶¹⁵ but conform to the usual pattern of modification. The editors of the kingly exemplars chose to maintain the original relationship between the text owner and the god but liberated him from the responsibility of performance and explicitly established the reference.

As to the texts which show disagreement but do not have one of the signs certainly showing a modification away from the first, the lack of concord is necessarily always between the second and third person. Unfortunately, such disagreements do not of themselves indicate the prior form.

Although it was seen above that most frequently the third person was the terminus of the program of editing, it was also seen that an originally personal text could be converted to show second-person forms; this was most strongly apparent in a case with a recarved text, two cases with texts showing vacillation to the first person, and another case with residual first person. Even so, it of course cannot be *a priori* ruled out that an original second-person text-owner of a sacerdotal text could, in one or more exemplars, be modified to the third person or vice versa. Indeed, this will ultimately turn out to be the case for a scant few.

Consequently the remaining texts with the sign of disagreement are indeterminate. Their performance structure must be ascertained through consideration of other evidence. To signal in advance the results of this process, there are four personal texts showing disagreement but none of the clearer signs of editing: PT 264, 474, 525, and 572. There are six others which will later be identified as personal services, thus sacerdotal texts: PT 466, 579, 581, 606, 679, and 697. And there are four more whose contexts of performance will be seen to be collective: PT 419, 442, 463, and 659. Finally, there is one text which will remain unclassified: PT 594.

f. *Advanced Noun*

Some texts show the name of the beneficiary in a syntactic position grammatically unsuitable to a noun but suitable to a pronoun. It is an indication that an ancient editor substituted a proper name for a pronoun without adjusting the order of words so as to conform to grammatical rules.

The incorrect advancement of the dative is the most frequent manifestation of this sign of editing.⁶¹⁶ Less common are violations of other grammatical rules dictating different positions for pronouns and nouns in other situations.⁶¹⁷ All cases are centered on the proper name.

⁶¹⁵ Cf. e.g. J. Allen 2005, p. 205 n. 139 and p. 307 n. 105.

⁶¹⁶ Twenty-three instances are known to me: PT 265 §355b–c (P); PT 266 §360b–d (P); PT 321 §517a (W); PT 332 §541c (T); PT 344 §559c (N); PT 345 §560c (N); PT 349 §566c (N); PT 361 §604c (N); PT 471 §921c (P); PT 473 §927a (P); PT 478 §975a (N); PT 480 §993a (N); PT 572 §1473b (P); PT 518 §1193b (M); PT 511 §1151a (N); PT 515 §1181a (N); PT 519 §1208a–b (M) and §1216d (M); PT 520 §1222a (M); PT 531 §1254c (M); PT 573 §1480a (P); PT 587 §1597d (N); PT 681 §2036c (N).

⁶¹⁷ Consequently, a modification of person is at hand also with noun subject advanced ahead of an enclitic particle (e.g. PT 659 §1862b: *ḥ^c Ne. r=f m itr.ti 3ḥ.t* "let thus Neferkare stand at the two chapel rows of the horizon"), noun object advanced to take position of dependent pronoun (e.g. PT 260 §317a: *iw wd^c.n W. tḥn ḥm^c tḥn.t* "Tefen

A passage from PT 511 where an exemplar shows recarving will illustrate how this sort of violation came about. As initially inscribed, the exemplar of Pepi I reads in part *i.wn* *n=i* *ir(i)w* *ʕ.wt p.t* *ʕ3.w p.t* “Let the keepers of the parts of the sky open the doors of the sky for me,”⁶¹⁸ with the first-person suffix pronoun preserving what is presumably the original form. The pronoun was later recarved to show the third person *n=f*⁶¹⁹ “for him,” conforming to the pattern of adjusting the person of the beneficiary away from the first. Since the change was simply to another suffix pronoun, this stage of recarving yielded a passage that continued to conform to grammatical rules: the pronominal dative remained advanced ahead of the subject of the verb, *ir(i)w* *ʕ.wt p.t* “keepers of the parts of the sky” as well as the direct object of the verb, *ʕ3.w p.t* “doors of the sky.” The violation of proper word order occurs in the exemplar of this text found in the pyramid of Pepi II. Its corresponding passage reads *i.wn* *n.Ne* *ir(i)w* *ʕ.wt p.t* *ʕ3.w p.t* “let the keepers of the parts of the sky for Neferkare open the doors of the sky.”⁶²⁰ As in Pepi I, the dative in Pepi II’s version remains ahead of the subject and object of the verb, and that is the problem: *n.Ne* “for Neferkare” consists of preposition plus noun, and as such its proper syntactic position is after the subject and object of the verb.

Given the pattern of modification attested through other signs of editing, the unusual position of the noun in Pepi II is really suggestive that the text was originally composed in the first person, later imperfectly edited to the third. Even so, in isolation of other evidence, the possibility would have to remain open that the proper name had replaced an original second or third-person pronoun. Thus this particular sign only shows that editing had taken place without indicating the original form.

Still, with a text like PT 511, one is able to conclude that the original form was in the first person based on the evidence of one of the clearer indications of editing, so an instance of agrammatical advancement is useful in corroborating that it had been editorially manipulated. As a matter of fact, out of thirty-eight cases of advanced nouns, seventeen occur in conjunction with one of the clear signs. Sixteen cases involved personal texts,⁶²¹ while one involved the sacerdotal text PT 477, a personal service to Osiris discussed above.

But the performance structure of the remaining twenty-one is indeterminate and must be ascertained through consideration of other evidence. To signal the results of this process in advance, twenty will be identified as personal texts⁶²² and two as sacerdotal texts from a collective context, PT 463 and 659.

3. Summary of the Core Set of Personal Texts

Examination of the editing of the person of the text owner has revealed a pattern of modification. Nearly always, it concerns the alteration of pronouns referring to the text owner where he is simultaneously beneficiary and reciter and was originally cast in the first person, thus personal texts, and normally the change was to the third person. The program of

and Tefenut have judged Unas”), and advancement of noun subject to take position of suffix subject (e.g. PT 477 §968c: *wʕb Ne. n=k* “with Neferkare performing service for you.”) Although the word order of adjectival phrases is more flexible in Old than in Middle Egyptian (see in the present context Edel 1955/1964, §321 and §359), one may wish to see instances such as PT 407 §710b: *i.mn s.wt T. nʕi.t* “let the beautiful places of Teti remain” as an indication of an original suffix pronoun, with its conversion to the proper name leaving it in advance of a participle.

⁶¹⁸ PT 511 §1151a (P initial).

⁶¹⁹ PT 511 §1151a (P final).

⁶²⁰ PT 511 §1151a (N).

⁶²¹ See above and in Listing One, under PT 266, 269, 359, 407, 469, 471, 473, 481, 504, 511, 515, 519, 563, 573, 609, and 681.

⁶²² PT 265, 301–302, 321, 332, 344–345, 349, 361, 406, 474, 478, 480, 518, 520, 525, 531, 572, hPT 694B, and fPT 725.

editing was executed incompletely, and it is through that incompleteness that we are aware of its existence at all. In some cases, recarving was employed to correct overlooked passages or overlooked texts, and even that process could itself overlook first-person passages.

The purpose of the program of modification can be gauged by its effects. To modify the text owner's first person to the third was to make a shift in deixis, and this had the effect of making the text independent of his performance of it. It had to do with agency of execution. But in point of fact, there are very few texts with signs of editing which do not also exhibit the name of the beneficiary in at least one exemplar. Personal texts lacking the proper name as a rule maintain the first person throughout and are from the most obscure type in respect to their propositional content, apotropaic texts.⁶²³ More commonly, texts also replace at least one instance of an original first-person pronoun with the name of the text owner, thereby making the text's relevance to him explicit. It appears that different editors placed different emphases on these two purposes.

A byproduct of this program was to displace the beneficiary's presence, ambiguously leaving him here or there, now or then. This was sometimes overcome by making sporadic changes to the second person, thereby making the edited text match the sacerdotal structure. By virtue of the innate qualities of the second person, changes from the first person to the second maintained their relation of immediate presence to the text owner. One may go on to suggest that the juxtaposition of such texts to others following the basic pattern also had the effect of grounding them to the moment as well. Further, the texts with instances of change to the second person are mostly in texts with quoted speech. More on this will be said below, but for the moment it suffices to say that the presence of quoted speech gave more freedom to the editors, since a statement originally made by the text owner as beneficiary could now be absorbed into the quoted words of a deity addressing him.

Alteration of an original first person to the second is one exception to the general pattern. The other concerns the alteration of sacerdotal texts. Out of 104 texts retaining the original first person or showing one of the clear signs of editing, only six are sacerdotal, and all of those are personal services to the god or to the dead.⁶²⁴ In their prior forms, the text owner was the first-person officiant to the exalted beneficiary. The program of modification generally changed that. In some exemplars the text owner was transplanted to the role of beneficiary, thereby ensuring that he was the recipient of the text's benefits. In fact, he could both remain in the role of principal agent of actions done on behalf of a separate beneficiary and be put in the role of the beneficiary, too, thereby creating a paradoxical situation. The breach in logic is a sign of how the texts were being treated as monumental objects, because the paradox created by such a text divorced it from the physical practice to which the operative script was composed to be a support. Human action and metaphors based on it must obey physical laws, but the imagined world need not.

The first three signs of editing—recarving, vacillation, and doubling—all involve mistakes or corrections of some kind, and it was shown that the program of modification was not always thorough. Further, many texts exhibit editing in only one exemplar, while other exemplars of the same show no signs. As a result, one must expect that some texts had been edited completely. The challenge, then, will be to identify them. Their identification will extend our collection of personal texts beyond the core set that has just now been identified.

This core set contains ninety-eight personal texts retaining the first person and/or showing one or more of the four clear signs of editing.

⁶²³ Thirteen texts, namely PT 207–208, 227, 232, 241, 282, 286–287, 312, 499, 523 (M), 525 (MN), and 551. All except for PT 207–208, 312, 523, and 525 are of the apotropaic type.

⁶²⁴ In summary, they are PT 456, 477, 512, 540, fPT 691B, and sPT 1058.

Since the effect of altering the first person to the third was to disengage them from the sphere of performance, the term *personal text* applies not so much to their modified, attested forms, but to their forms prior to inscription. Properly speaking, the term looks through the monumental evidence of editing to the operative texts from which they were derived.

With this caveat made, the core set of personal texts may now be summarized. In the following, generally only one passage per source exhibiting the relevant datum is shown:

PT 207	1st throughout: §124a (W)	PT 354	1st throughout: §571a (T)
PT 208	1st throughout: §124e (TN)	PT 359	vacillation: §601b (N)
PT 227	1st throughout: §227b (WPN)		residue: §596a–b (N)
PT 232	1st throughout: §236c (W)		advanced: §599b (N)
PT 241	1st throughout: §246b (W)	PT 362	residue: §606a–b (T)
PT 254	vacillation: §288c (W)	PT 407	1st throughout: §710a (P/S/E)
	disagree: §288c (T)		disagree: §710a (TPPMN)
PT 260	residue: §317c (W)		doubling: §710a (P/A/W)
PT 262	vacillation: §329c (TW)		advanced: §710b (T)
	disagree: §329c (TP)	PT 408	recarved: §714a (P)
PT 266	residue: §358h (P)		vacillation: §716b (P)
PT 268	residue: §370a (Nt)		disagree: §716b (T)
PT 269	doubling: §378a (P)	PT 439	doubling: §812c (P)
	advanced: §378a (W)		vacillation: §813c (P)
PT 270	doubling: §386a (M)		disagree: §813c (MN)
	doubling: §386b (N)	PT 467	doubling: §890b (N)
PT 271	residue: §390a (N)		residue: §889c (PN)
PT 281	1st throughout: §422c (WT)	PT 469	vacillation: §909c (P)
PT 282	1st throughout: §423b (WTN)		doubling: §909a (P)
PT 283	1st throughout: §424a (T)		residue: §906d (P)
	disagree: §424a (W final)	PT 470	advanced: §907a (N)
	recarved: §424a (W initial)		vacillation: §911b (P)
PT 284	1st throughout: §425e (WP)	PT 471	disagree: §911b (PN)
PT 286	1st throughout: §427d (WTP)		residue: §922b (N)
PT 287	1st throughout: §428b (WT)	PT 473	advanced: §921c (P)
PT 296	recarved: §439a (W)		vacillation: §927c (P)
PT 299	vacillation: §444c (W)		disagree: §927c (MN)
	disagree: §444c (WT)		doubling: §930f (N)
PT 303	recarved: §465a (W)		residue: §927d (N)
	disagreement: §465a (P)		disagree: §927b (MIbi)
PT 306	recarved: §478a (W)		advanced: §927a (P)
	disagree: §478a–b (WM)	PT 476	vacillation: §954a–b (PMN)
PT 311	recarved: §495c (W)		disagree: §952a (PMN)
	vacillation: §499a (W)	PT 481	residue: §999b (N)
	vacillation: §500c (P)		residue: §1000b (P)
	disagree: §496b (WP)		advanced: §1000a (M)
PT 312	1st throughout: §501 (W)	PT 485	residue: §1036b (P)
PT 322	recarved: §518c (P)		vacillation: §1030c (P)
PT 327	vacillation: §536b (T)	PT 486	vacillation: §1040a (N)
	disagree: §536b (TN)		disagreement: §1040a (P)
PT 328	vacillation: §537c (P)	sPT 491A	residue: P/A/E 6
	disagree: §537c (T)		vacillation: P/A/E 7
PT 330	vacillation: §539b (TN)	sPT 491B	recarved: §1057a (P)
PT 333	recarved: §542c (P)		vacillation: §1058b (P)
	vacillation: §542b (P)	PT 494	recarved: §1063c (P)
	disagree: §542b (T)	PT 495	recarved: §1064c (P)
PT 336	doubling: §548a (M)	PT 496	recarved: §1066a (P)
PT 346	vacillation: §561d (TMN)	PT 499	1st throughout: §1070b (PN)

sPT 502E	1st through: §1074d (P)	PT 555	vacillation: §1373b (PM)
sPT 502H	vacillation: §1076 (P)		disagree: §1373b (N)
PT 503	recarved: §1079a (P)		vacillation: §1376a (PN)
	vacillation: §1079b (P)		disagree: §1376a (M)
	vacillation: §1080a (N)		residue: §1374a (MN)
PT 504	recarved: §1083a (P)	PT 562	vacillation: §1406a (P)
	vacillation: §1086a (P)		disagree: §1406a (N)
	residue: §1087a (MN)	PT 563	vacillation: §1419c (P)
	advanced: §1087a (N)		disagree: §1419c (MN)
PT 505	recarved: §1090e (P)		residue: §1409d (P)
	doubling: §1093d (P)		residue: §1416b (MN)
	disagree: §1090e (PM)		advanced: §1419b (M)
PT 506	recarved: §1094a (P)	PT 565	vacillation: §1423a (P)
	doubling: §1100d (N)		disagree: §1423a (PMN)
PT 507	recarved: §1104a (P)	PT 567	vacillation: §1430e (N)
	vacillation: §1106a (N)		disagree: §1430e (PN)
PT 508	recarved: §1107a (P/Cmed/E)	PT 569	vacillation: §1440c (P/V/W)
	residue: §1112c-d (P/Cmed/E)		residue: §1442c (M)
	vacillation: §1113c (P/Cmed/E)		disagree: §1440c (MP/Dpost/W)
	doubling: §1116d (P/Cmed/E)	sPT 570A	vacillation: §1443b (PP)
PT 509	recarved: §1120c (P)		doubling: §1451b (P/Dpost/W)
	residue: §1123a (P)		disagree: §1443b (PPM)
	doubling: §1125a (P)	PT 571	residue: §1467a (P)
	vacillation: §1126a (P)	PT 573	vacillation: §1484d (M)
PT 510	recarved: §1133a (P)		disagree: §1484d (MN)
	doubling: §1135b (P)		advanced: §1480a (P)
	residue: §1143b (M)	PT 574	vacillation: §1491a (N)
	residue: §1135b (P)		disagree: §1491a (P)
PT 511	recarved: §1149b (P)	PT 576	residue: §1517b (P)
	doubling: §1150c (P)	PT 609	disagree: §1707a (MN)
	residue: §1158b (P)		vacillation: §1708a-b (M)
	residue: §1159c (N)		advanced: §1708c (N)
	advanced: §1151a (N)	sPT 625A	1st throughout: §1762b (Nt)
PT 513	recarved: §1174b (P)		disagree: §1762b (NNt)
PT 515	recarved: §1176b (M)	sPT 625B	1st throughout: §1765c (Ibi)
	vacillation: §1181a (P)		disagree: §1765c (NIbi)
	advanced: §1181a (N)	PT 626	vacillation: §1770c (P)
PT 519	residue: §1204a (PMN)		disagree: §1770c (PN)
	advanced: §1216d (M)	hPT 662A	vacillation: §1874b (Ibi)
	vacillation: §1206f (N)		doubling: §1876a (Ibi)
	disagree: §1206f (PM)	PT 669	residue: §1971 (N)
PT 521	disagree: §1225c-d (PMN)	PT 681	residue: §2037a (N)
	vacillation: §1226e (P)		advanced: §2036c (N)
PT 523	disagree: §1231a (PM)	PT 684	residue: §2054 (N)
	residue: §1231b (P)	fPT 691	1st throughout: §2121a (Nt)
PT 524	vacillation: §1242b (P)		disagree: §2121a (N)
PT 527	residue: §1249c (M)	PT 696	vacillation: §2167 (N)
PT 528	vacillation: §1251a (P)		disagree: §2167 (PN)
	residue: §1251a (M)		residue: §2168a (P)
	disagree: §1251a (PMN)	sPT 1025	recarved: P/A/S 7
PT 539	vacillation: §1323d (P)	sPT 1064	residue: P/V/E 42
	residue: §1303b (P)	sPT 1070	vacillation: P/V/E 83
PT 551	1st throughout: §1351c (P)		

4. *Editing of Person with Figures Other than the Text Owner*

a. *Influenced by the Pattern of Editing*

It is instructive to consider changes to the grammatical person of figures other than the text owner. In some cases, they were predicated by or were done under the influence of the pattern of editing discussed above, and in others they were motivated by the assimilation of the text owner with gods.

PT 572 presents a case of modification of grammatical person for a figure other than the text owner. This text will later be identified as a personal text, by virtue of sharing propositional content with other personal texts. Additionally, it appears in a section of a group dominated by personal texts, many of them showing signs of editing. The text and its three variants⁶²⁵ are replete with quoted speech, and the passage of interest is at the interstices of a pair of quotations. And precisely here the text shows exemplar disagreement concerning the text owner.

Some discussion of quoted speech is warranted. Above it was observed that, in simply removing an operative recitation from the mouth of the text owner, the editor had some freedom in how the propositional content could be related to him in the monumental context. While the tendency was to put him in the third, the second was also an option. Texts with quotations gave even more freedom, because already in their prior forms they could make quoted statements directly to him. With them, the editor had play by which he might convert a prior first person to become a neutral, third-person statement, or he could simply absorb the prior form into an adjoining quotation addressed to the beneficiary. Such a modification reflects a reinterpretation of the extent of a quote, concomitant with the modification to suit the text to its monumental environment. There was also the potential to make the conversion from the first-person text-owner to a second-person other, created by the prior presence of a party being addressed in the text, as frequently happens in quoted speech, but such changes were not limited to it.⁶²⁶

With Merenre's exemplar of PT 572, the editor chose the route of absorbing prior first-person forms into the quotations, thereby converting them to the second person. The editors in the pyramid of Pepi I chose a different option, replacing all first pronouns throughout with the third person or the proper name. Consequently the text shows disagreement between the two exemplars at several points.

⁶²⁵ Namely, PT 306, 474, and 480. See also PT 335, which bears much of the same content but unlike them does not possess any explicit marks of quoted speech. A Middle Kingdom descendant of the four variants is CT 832; on this text and its Old Kingdom heritage, see Assmann 2002, pp. 421–425. Notably, CT 832 is transmitted in Sequence 156 and Subsequence 213, with all of the texts therein being sacerdotal in structure. While the Old Kingdom forebears of CT 832 were all personal in structure, they were also dominated by quoted speech, which helped its transfer in setting from an originally individual context to a collective one. In Sequence 156, CT 832 is immediately followed by PT 670 and PT 532, both of which in the Pyramid Texts were personal services to a god and, like PT 306, 474, 480, and 572, will eventually be found to belong to individual rather than collective groups. These texts, too, enjoyed a transfer in setting.

⁶²⁶ Thus in texts already containing direct addresses made by the text owner, at its conversion to the monumental actions formerly attributed to him can be attributed to other parties. See for instance PT 475 §947b (M): *stꜥ=k hmꜥ=s* “you (sc. the ferryman) leap up with it” versus (NP): *stꜥ Ne hmꜥ=s* “Neferkare leaps up with it.” This and the next statement were apparently transformed from a presumed prior first-person text-owner as agent, thus **stꜥ=i* “*I leap up” to now refer to the ferryman, who is addressed in the second person at Pyr. §946a–c and again via *m-k(w)* at Pyr. §949a. The action of *stꜥ* “leaping up” is not appropriate to the ferryman, but to the text owner; see PT 270 §387a and PT 478 §980c. Similarly PT 505 §1090e–f (M): *nw.t di=s ꜥ.wy=s(i) ir=k* “Nut puts her hands upon you,” in an exemplar with the text owner everywhere else in the third person; here the change was made to the second person under the influence of a direct address to the ferryman at Pyr. §1091a. Exemplar P, prior to recarving to the third person, shows Pyr. §1090e–f in the first.

Having presented this view of PT 572's history, the passage showing the conversion of a person other than the text owner may be considered. As a result of Merenre's conversion to the second, the grammatical person of the beneficiary's enemies had to be adapted. The passage is as follows:

PT 572 §1477a

P *in ir.n=tn ir=f dd.n=tn mwt=f*

M *in sm3.n=sn tw dd.n=sn mwt=k n=sn*

P Have [you (pl.)] acted against [him] (sc. the beneficiary) or have [you (pl.)] said that [he] is to die?

M Have [they] slain [you] (sc. the beneficiary) or have [they] said that [you] will die because of them?"

Assuming that the text's prior form situated the beneficiary in the first person, the transformation to the third in the exemplar of Pepi I had no impact on the intelligibility of the statement. The prior form would thus have been: **in ir.n=tn ir=i dd.n=tn mwt=i* "have you (pl.) acted against me or have you (pl.) said that I am to die?" But since the copyist of Merenre chose to make the beneficiary into an addressee, the rote replacement of a first person =*i* with the second person =*k* would have resulted in an impossible combination: **in ir.n=tn ir=k dd.n=tn mwt=i* "have you (pl.) acted against you (sg.) and you (pl.) said that you (sg.) are to die?" To avoid this, the editor of Merenre's version dramatically modified the sentence, substituting a statement found in the text's parallels.⁶²⁷ Consequently, the second person plural of the hostile beings, the 'confederates' of Seth, was transformed into the third person and the problem was solved.

The difference between the two passages is significant indeed, because it corroborates the view of PT 572's history. The assumption that the prior form was in the first-person accounts for both attested exemplars, but assuming that the prior form was in the second does not. If Merenre's *sm3.n=sn tw dd.n=sn mwt=k n=sn* had been the prior form, the editor of Pepi I's version could have easily changed it into **sm3.n=sn sw dd.n=sn mwt=f n=sn* "have they slain him or they said that he will die because of them?" But this is not what is found at all. As a result, the assumption that the text had been converted from a prior first person explains the attested forms of both exemplars, explains why the text is found among other texts showing various signs of edited person, and explains why it shares content with other texts of the personal category. It is consistent with all the facts.

The remaining modifications concerning figures other than the text owner have to do with priestly officiants who make reference to themselves in the first person. Some of them do not actually affect or involve the performance structure of the text, but they are topical and so will be reviewed. One case occurs in the sacerdotal text PT 690, where the officiant addresses the text owner and says in the version of Pepi II, *iw.t=k hr(=i)* "May you (sc. the beneficiary) come to [me]."⁶²⁸ The earlier version in the pyramid of Pepi I also addresses the deceased but reads *[i]w[.i]=k hr hr n d.t d.t* "[May] you [come] to [Horus] for ever and ever."⁶²⁹ The disagreement in person shows a difference in the identity of the speaking officiant. In the later version, the speaker is in the role of Horus. In the earlier, someone other than Horus is doing the talking.

Another instance of disagreement in priestly person appears to emerge through comparison of a text in the pyramid of Pepi I to later versions. The text in question, PT 427, has

⁶²⁷ Cf. the parallels at PT 306 §481a and PT 474 §944a, especially P's treatment of the latter. The parallels are from quoted speech.

⁶²⁸ Pyr. §2119.

⁶²⁹ See P/S/Se 89.

not yet been assigned to the sacerdotal category, because it uniformly casts the text owner as third-person beneficiary. This will be done later on the basis of its transmission and content. But for the moment the relevant passage can be considered:

PT 427 §777b–c (P)

hnm sw nw.t
iw.n=ṯ s(d)ṯ=ḥ z3=ṯ
iw.n=ṯ is hnm=ṯ wr pn

Join him, O Nut!

You have come, even that you cover your son.
You have come, indeed precisely that you join this great one.

PT 427 §777b–c (M, sim. N)

hnm sw nw.t
iw.n=ṯ sdṯ=ḥ z3=ṯ
*iw.n(=i) is hnm(=i) wr pn*⁶³⁰

Join him, O Nut!

You have come, even that you cover your son.
I have come, indeed precisely that I join this great one.

The statement in Pepi I is addressed to Nut herself, while its correspondent in the pyramids of Merenre and Pepi II is spoken by the priestess in her role.⁶³¹ The difference would imply that more than one officiant performed PT 427 as it is represented in the tombs after Pepi I.

Still, most changes to the person of a priestly officiant are a collateral consequence of the general program of modification. These are, naturally enough, almost entirely found in sacerdotal texts, where separate officiants are involved, but there are four such instances in personal texts, and they all concern conversions of the phrase *it=i* “my father.” In two texts it is merely a matter of an *it=i* “my father” which seems to have been interpolated secondarily.⁶³² These changes were part of the conversion of the performance structure of a

⁶³⁰ Cf. the translation of J. Allen 2005, p. 347, Spell 33b: “and conceal your son as he who comes for it. Join this great one!” That entails a wholesale transformation of structure between exemplars, a transliteration eliding a reed-leaf—as *sdḥ=ṯ z3=ṯ iw n(i)=s hnm wr pn*—and a referent for =s “it” neither in this text or the ones transmitted in proximity to it. A further problem is that, while there are two instances in the Pyramid Texts where the beneficiary *iw* “comes” to Nut (PT 245 §250a and PT 576 §1516a), normally it is a matter of Nut *iw* “coming” to him (see the motif ‘Nut, Mother Comes’ in Listing Four), including another text where she comes in order to *hnm* “join” him, as here (PT 451 §838a–b; see further the motif ‘Nut Protects [*hnm, sdḥ, hwi*]’ in Listing Four). Combined, these points tend toward treating the exemplars as having an identical structure, and therefore a transliteration like what is presented here. Solving the problems of parallelism, modern elision, lack of referent, and semantics now creates a syntactic problem in respect to the particle *is*, in that it does not now conform to the usual patterns. For them, see Vernus 1996, pp. 173–182 and Depuydt 1993, pp. 21–24 (and see el-Hamrawi 2007, pp. 545–565, and Schenkel 2005, §9.1.1.b for the particle’s non-verbal usages). But the problem is not ineluctable. Here it is understood that the particle performs a pragmatic function in explicitly marking the stressed adverbial (the ‘pivot’) as described at Borghouts 2010, §32.b.15 and §68.c; (the example proffered at the latter place is, however, susceptible to an alternative interpretation, namely the particle’s common substantivizing usage).

⁶³¹ For this phraseology applied to Nut in other texts, see the motifs ‘Nut, Mother Comes’ and ‘Nut Protects (*hnm, sdḥ, hwi*)’ in Listing Four.

⁶³² See PT 264 §344a (T): *d3.t(i) d3.wt T. im ir gs pf 3b.ti n(i) p.t* “that Teti’s ferrying might be ferried thereon to that eastern side of the sky” versus Pyr. §344a (P): *sd3.t(i) sd3y.t it=i im r 3h.t n(i)t p.t* “that my father’s traveling might be traveled thereon to the horizon of the sky.” This text will be assigned to the personal category by virtue of possessing multiple motifs found in the core set of personal texts, and it is also discussed in some detail in the following chapter; see below at n. 785. The other text is PT 609. It has already been assigned to the core set of personal texts since it shows vacillation to the first person, indicating that the text owner was first-person beneficiary in its prior form. Its instance of *it(=i)* occurs at Pyr. §1703e (M), a passage not preserved in the exemplar of Pepi II.

personal text, making it into a sacerdotal one. Two others have already been noted; in them the actual referent of the first person is someone other than the text owner, and the statements are made in quotations.⁶³³

Also as a result of the program, there are a few mistaken modifications of first-person pronouns referring to priestly reciters, as Sethe long ago observed.⁶³⁴ Very rarely, they were converted to the proper name of the text owner. This activity is distinguishable from the phenomenon labeled as role transplantation. That occurs where a text situates the text owner as officiant in its prior form and an editor moves him to the role of beneficiary. With the mistaken changes, the text owner was already the beneficiary in the text's prior form, and now he is moved by accident to the role of officiant. There are only three texts where such a mistake occurs, and one of them attests to it only in the Middle Kingdom.⁶³⁵

Altogether, modification to the person of a priestly officiant is an exceedingly rare phenomenon: there are 341 cases among 121 sacerdotal texts where the first-person pronoun of a priestly officiant tending to the text owner as beneficiary is correctly left intact.⁶³⁶ Mistaken or intentional, the isolated modifications to the first person of priestly officiants are of far less significance to the present inquiry than the much more common practice of leaving them in place. The contrast of this practice, against the program of changing the text owner's name away from the first person, could not be more striking. In every single case where the first-person pronoun representing the non-beneficiary speaker is original and is left in place, which is to say in over 340 instances, it is a matter of a sacerdotal text. One sees in the different treatment a different ancient judgment of the appropriateness of the first person. It was acceptable to maintain the first-person priest, so long as he was not the text owner; it was preferable to modify the first person of the text owner away from it. It was acceptable to have a text represent itself as if being recited by someone other than the beneficiary; it was preferable to release the text owner from the burden of performance. The performance structure of sacerdotal texts was left intact; the performance structure of personal texts was transformed.

The contrast is of critical importance, and it will receive considerable discussion at the conclusion of this chapter.

⁶³³ See above at n. 574.

⁶³⁴ See Sethe 1931, p. 525, and cf. Mathieu 1996, pp. 290–292, though not all of the interpretations of the former are correct.

⁶³⁵ As at PT 216 §150a (Ab1Le, following Sethe 1935, vol. i, p. 46, and *pace* J. Allen 1994, p. 16 n. 18); PT 355 §574a (T); PT 418 §742c (T).

⁶³⁶ Citing only one instance per text: PT 13 §9b; PT 14 §9c; PT 20 §11a; PT 21 §13a; PT 22 §15; PT 25 §18c; PT 29 §20a; PT 32 §22b; PT 36 §29b; PT 37 §30a; PT 38 §30b; PT 39 §31a; PT 48 §36c; fPT 57A §40+1 (Nt); fPT 57E §40+5 (Nt); fPT 57F §40+6 (Nt); fPT 57G §40+7 (Nt); fPT 57H §40+8; PT 63 §44a (Ibi); fPT 71F §49+6 (Nt); fPT 71H §49+8a (Nt); fPT 71I §49+9 (Nt); PT 72 §50b; PT 77 §52b; PT 78 §54a; PT 99 §66a; PT 100 §67b; PT 102 §68a–b; PT 106 §69a–b; PT 107 §71a (B16C); PT 115 §74c; PT 167 §99a; PT 193 §110; PT 197 §113a; PT 199 §115b; PT 200 §116b; PT 201 §117a; PT 202 §117b; PT 216 §150a; PT 223 §216a; PT 244 §249b; PT 355 §573c; PT 413 §734a; PT 418 §742c; PT 419 §743a (M); PT 425 §775a–c; PT 427 §777c; PT 433 §783a–b; PT 435 §786a; PT 438 §809a; PT 455 §849b–c; PT 534 §1266a; PT 541 §1334c; PT 542 §1336a; PT 543 §1337b–d; PT 545 §1339a; PT 546 §1341a–b; PT 547 §1342a–b; PT 552 §1352; PT 556 §1379a; PT 595 §1639b–c; PT 603 §1675a; PT 604 §1680a; PT 605 §1681a–b; PT 609 §1703c (M); PT 611 §1724a; PT 612 §1730a; PT 619 §1748b (M); PT 620 §1753a; PT 622 §1755a–b; PT 623 §1756; PT 628 §1786b; PT 629 §1787; PT 631 §1789; fPT 634 §1792 (Amenirdis); sPT 635A §1794a–b; PT 636 §1796; PT 637 §1800b–c; PT 639 §1808a; PT 641 §1813a; PT 652 §1839a; hPT 662B §1877c; PT 663 §1882a; fPT 664 §1884; fPT 664A §1886a; fPT 664C §1892a; fPT 665 §1898a (Nt); fPT 666 §1923b–c (Nt); fPT 666A §1929a (Nt); fPT 667 §1936a (Nt); fPT 667A §1945e (Nt); fPT 667B §1950a (Nt); PT 673 §1990a; PT 674 §1994a; PT 700 §2182a; fPT 717 §2229d–2230a; fPT 718 §2232a; fPT 748 §2278a (Nt); fPT 759 §2291a (Nt); sPT 1009 P/S/Se 97; sPT 1010 P/S/E 39; sPT 1018 P/S/Ne IV 90; sPT 1019 P/S/Ne IV 92; sPT 1021 P/S/Ne IV 96; sPT 1053 P/Ser/S 10–12; sPT 1056 P/Ser/N 2; sPT 1069 P/V/E 71.

b. *Influenced by Assimilation of the Text Owner with Gods*

The text owner assumed the identity of several gods in the Pyramid Texts, above all the chthonic Osiris. The importance of his relationship with him is so great that it deserves separate discussion. But there are other gods with whom the text owner was associated, and under that influence texts could be modified. Most simply, the association could lead to an interpolation. For instance, in two exemplars of the personal text PT 359 (TP), there is a participial phrase at Pyr. §598b (TP) with: *dw3.w r^c im* “those who adore Re there,” but a later exemplar interpolates the proper name of the text owner (N): *dw3 Ne. r^c im* “who adore Neferkare and Re there.”⁶³⁷

In a more pronounced form, the insertion becomes an actual replacement and could consequently affect the person of the deity involved, in the sense of eliding him completely. This was noticed already above with two sacerdotal texts, PT 357 and 366, in which the identity of the beneficiary was mistakenly assimilated with that of his opponent. Intentional, or at least positive, assimilation also occurs. In the personal text PT 510, the statement at Pyr. §1142a (P final) *ir=sn m3^c.iw n wsir P.* “that they perform service for Osiris Pepi” had been recarved from §1142a (P initial): ... *n it=i* “for my (sc. Pepi’s) father.”⁶³⁸ Pepi I’s initial form is matched by §1142a (M): ... *it=f gbb* “for his (sc. Merenre’s) father Geb.” Thus, in the final version of Pepi I, the text owner has taken the place of the god.

In close proximity to PT 510 in the pyramid of Pepi I is PT 513, which concerns how the text owner joins the sun god in his nautical circuit. The text shows recarving from the first person, for instance at Pyr. §1174a (P initial): *in wr p[f] ir n=i nw* “It is that great one (sc. the sun god) who did this for me,” with the first person pronoun later replaced by the third. The text opens with a statement by the text owner concerning the initial phase of the circuit: Pyr. §1168a (P initial): *pr r=f it=i ir p.t* “Let my (sc. Pepi’s) father (sc. Re Atum) ascend to the sky among the gods who are in the sky.” A first recarving changed *it=i* “my father” to “his father,” and a second and final recarving assimilated the text owner into the role of the ascender. Thus Pyr. §1168a (P initial): *pr r=f {i} P. ir p.t* “Let Pepi ascend to the sky.” Afterwards the sun god finds the text owner in the sky in a quoted statement: Pyr. §1169a–b (P): *gm tw r^c hr idb.w n(i)w p.t m hn.ti imi nw.t... i.n ntr.w* “‘Re will find you upon the banks of the sky, as he of the swamp, one who is in Nut,’ ... say the gods.”⁶³⁹

A further case of assimilation of divine roles resulting in a change of person appears at the personal PT 301 §453b (P/A/S 17): [*l*]*r P. pn im=s m m=s pw n(i) tr.t* “May Pepi be red by it in its name of ‘willow,’” even though the version of Unas makes it clear that originally the subject of the verb *trw* “to be red” was the god Horus. A transformation of person is also at hand here, since Pyr. §435b (W) shows *trw=k im=s* “May you (sc. Horus) be red by it.” Thus the change is twin: a shifting of a god’s grammatical person from the second person to be replaced by the third person of the text owner, and the conversion of the god as addressee into the spoken-about beneficiary. But the original text had the beneficiary in the first person throughout, so the exemplars of Unas and Pepi I have still changed the text in such a way that it is no longer spoken by the text owner himself.⁶⁴⁰

⁶³⁷ It is also possible in this last example that the copyist mistook the participial ending *-w* for *w(i)* “me.”

⁶³⁸ See P/Cmed/W 23 in Leclant *et al.* 2001.

⁶³⁹ The series of events where the sun god ascends (*pr*) and then finds (*gm*) the text owner is matched at PT 470 §919a (N): *pr r^c m i3b.t gm=f Ne. im* “Re ascends in the east, finding Neferkare there.”

⁶⁴⁰ In the context of changes to the person of deities, see also above at n. 545.

5. *Osiris and the Role of the Text Owner*

But above all the text owner is identified as the god Osiris. It is important to consider their relationship because, as has been indicated, some sacerdotal texts in their prior forms were personal services to a deity, composed so as to be performed by the text owner. Thus in some texts the text owner is found as Osiris, and in others one may expect him to interact with Osiris as an entity separate from him, as was also seen in the Book of the Dead. The focus of the present section is to provide the evidential basis for distinguishing such personal services, where the text owner originally served the deity, from texts where priests served the deceased as Osiris. In the following chapter, further details about the identity of the text owner as this god will be considered.

In the New Kingdom Book of the Dead, the formula Osiris + the proper name of the text owner (i.e. *wsir* NN, or “Osiris NN”) was employed both in texts recited by him and in texts recited by others for him,⁶⁴¹ thus in personal texts and in sacerdotal texts alike. But the use of Osiris NN was much more restricted in the pyramids. Before considering that, it is necessary to pin down the meaning of the formula. Mark Smith has shown that the genitival adjective *n(i)* “of” is introduced between the two elements of the formula Osiris NN—thus *wsir n(i)* NN—and has rightly concluded that the relationship between them was anciently interpreted as genitival.⁶⁴² But the adjective does not appear in the formula before the Twenty-first Dynasty—thus some 1,200 years after its attested advent in the Old Kingdom, in the pyramid of Unas. If it is permissible to make this observation, then it is a matter of hypothesis rather than proof to assert that it was a matter of the genitive from the beginning.

Ancient Egypt was not a static world. And for that reason one must be sensitive to the inevitability of cultural change. In the present case, the historical emergence of the grapheme *n* within the *wsir* NN formula occurs roughly contemporaneously with its introduction to another traditional religious phraseology, namely the offering formula. As Detlef Franke has shown, it is not until the Nineteenth Dynasty that an *n* properly appears before the name of a god after the phrase *hṯp-dī-ni-sw.t*, thus making “the offering which the king gives to” the deity. But the evidence from the Old and Middle Kingdoms decisively shows that in those times there was no question of the dative—despite the customary translation of Egyptologists. So in its original form, it is a matter of an offering not given by the king *to* the god, but an offering given by both king *and* god. As Franke argues, the introduction of the *n* to the offering formula reflects a cultural change, a reinterpretation.⁶⁴³ What this case illustrates is that evidence emerging in late texts need not reveal something always present in the deep structure; what it indicates here is a cultural change, one that affected the very meaning of an ancient formula. It ended up distancing the recipient from the royal award; now it was given first to the gods.

One must look at what emergent evidence means, and measure it against what is known from the earlier periods to see whether what is at hand is after all a historical change. The idea of an ‘Osiris of Rekhmire’ is slightly different than the idea of an ‘Osiris Rekhmire.’ The former distanced the text owner from the performance of the text; it was addressed in the first place to a god. The second made the name of the god into a title; it indicated a role filled by the text owner, one exercised in certain circumstances upon death. There is an immediacy of identity

⁶⁴¹ As for instance in the Papyrus of Nu, as indicated by Lapp 1997, p. 34. In the Eighteenth Dynasty, the formula is comparatively rare, while its use increases in the Nineteenth to become nearly regular; see Naville 1971, Einleitung, p. 52; Milde 1991, p. 5; in detail Munro 1987, pp. 184 and 237–239, and Quack 2000, pp. 57–59.

⁶⁴² M. Smith 2006, pp. 325–337; for further references and comment, see Quack 2009a, p. 615 with nn. 110–111.

⁶⁴³ Franke 2003b, pp. 41–43.

predicated by the apposition of Osiris as title versus a distance between the two parties in the idea of an Osiris of a person: the latter kind of text is only indirectly applicable to the text owner as such.

There is no doubt but that, in the Old and Middle Kingdoms, the dead expected to assume the role of Osiris. This is clear from sacerdotal and personal texts alike, in both Pyramid and Coffin Texts, where the text owner is several times identified as this god by statements of a predicative kind.⁶⁴⁴ The predicative statements are not susceptible to reinterpretation of ambiguous grammatical syntax. (And, conversely, there are no statements to corroborate a genitival interpretation, nor would there be for another twelve centuries.) In short, the predicative statements, along with other details, indicate that the formula was appositional at its advent.

Alongside the statements of identity and the appositional formula Osiris NN, in the Pyramid Texts the name *wšir* “Osiris” often stands as an entity separate from the text owner.⁶⁴⁵ The tension between identity and distinction created a fluid situation, contributing to the role transplantation of PT 477 discussed above. It was mentioned that there are other texts exhibiting this kind of transformation, where the text owner as officiant is moved into the role of Osiris as beneficiary. Although they represent only a fraction of the corpus, they have to do with editorial treatment and are therefore connected with the present discussion. Further, the identification of texts where this occurs will ultimately bear upon their *Sitz im Leben*, and so it is necessary to examine them a bit more closely.

The problem of distinguishing between text owner versus the deity as beneficiary of a text may be taken apart under the headings of four recurring units of meaning. As they have to do with propositional content and as they recur, they will be called ‘motifs.’ The specific passages bearing these motifs can be tracked down in Listing Four. In these motifs, the beneficiary of the text:

- a) Is Osiris NN
- b) Is Osiris (NN)
- c) Is Osiris (Deity)
- d) Is Osiris + Interpolated NN

The first motif, in which the beneficiary of a text is referred to by the formula Osiris NN, occurs in 208 texts of the core sacerdotal set and in none of the personal texts. After texts casting the beneficiary in the third person have been divided between sacerdotal and personal texts, twelve more sacerdotal texts will turn out to bear it⁶⁴⁶ and still no personal ones. Moreover, no text with this motif shows any sign of editing.

The second motif has the beneficiary of a text referred to as Osiris without the immediate apposition of the text owner’s name, and consequently it is labeled ‘Is Osiris (NN).’ But

⁶⁴⁴ To cite non-verbal clauses with nominal predicates, adverbial phrases with *m wšir*, and the phrase *wšir is*, they are PT 93 §63b; PT 219 §178a; PT 258 §308a; PT 259 §312a; PT 437 §793b; PT 461 §872b–c; PT 466 §884a; PT 468 §895c–d; PT 600 §1657a; PT 624 §1761d (Nt); PT 650 §1833a and c; PT 684 §2054; PT 687 §2076c; PT 690 §2097a, §2103c–d, and §2108a–b; sPT 1005 P/S/Se 91; CT 42 I 178d; CT 227 III *passim*; CT 237 III 309b–c; CT 269 IV 7k; CT 507 VI 92b; CT 577 VI 193c; CT 599 VI 215g–h; CT 666 VI 293d; CT 828 VII 28v, q. CT 227 is most notable in this regard, since the title given to it in one of its exemplars is *hpr.w m wšir* “Becoming Osiris.” The Pyramid Texts statements are dealt with in more detail below at n. 818.

⁶⁴⁵ As for instance at PT 23, 217–219, 260, 264, 267, 310, 410, 419, 442, 466, 468, 477, 485, 510, 512, 518–519, 540, 553, 559, sPT 561B, PT 563, sPT 570A, PT 574, 576–577, 581–582, sPT 586B, PT 606, 659, fPT 665B, PT 679, 684, 690, fPT 691B, PT 703, and sPT 1064.

⁶⁴⁶ Namely PT 427–428, 541–542, 544, 546, 548, 592, 640, 642, 644, and sPT 1015.

their identity is recoverable from the text or context. The following extract from PT 93 will serve as illustration:

PT 93 §62–63b (W)

β hr=k wsir

β hr=k h3 W. pw z 3h=f

...

W. wp=k r3=k m ir.t hr

dwī=k k3=k wsir is

...

Lift up your sight, O Osiris (Unas)!

Lift up your sight, O Unas, whose Akh has gone!

...

O Unas, open your mouth by (i.e. eat) the eye of Horus,
and summon your Ka as Osiris.

...

The parallelism of the first two sentences achieves an identification between the text owner and the god, and the last sentence confirms it. But the association would be transparent even without the parallelism, since PT 93 is transmitted among many others which employ the formula Osiris NN.

There are only twelve texts with the motif ‘Is Osiris (NN)’ in the core set of sacerdotal texts and none among the personal texts.⁶⁴⁷ After dividing third-person texts between the sacerdotal and personal categories, two of the former will also turn out to bear it⁶⁴⁸ and still none of the latter. Again, no text with this motif shows any sign of editing to the person of the text owner.

The distribution of the motifs ‘Is Osiris NN’ and ‘Is Osiris (NN)’ so far as the categories are concerned is one of many correlations between propositional content and grammatical person. Not only do the motifs signify that the text owner is Osiris, but every single instance of the 233⁶⁴⁹ texts with them is sacerdotal in performance structure with the text owner as beneficiary. The narrow distribution of the formula is one of the indications that the divisions abstractly made on the basis of grammatical person actually reach farther, into the participant roles of the rites which the texts represent. The practical value of the apposition between the formula’s elements matches the symbolic substrate: it situates the text owner Osiris NN in the role of recipient of service by his son, who represents the god Horus.⁶⁵⁰ The reason that the formula is restricted to sacerdotal texts is that the participation framework it implies is restricted to them. This, then, is a specific application of a general rule: certain situations of human action have certain manners of speaking appropriate to them, certain things appropriate to say in them, and certain roles appropriate to them.

The participation framework implicit in the formula Osiris NN is also at hand in the other two motifs, ‘Is Osiris (Deity)’ and ‘Is Osiris + Interpolated NN.’ But the relationship in the last is specific to the monumental context. It is not native to the texts in which it is found, but is the result of the texts’ manipulation at the time of transcription. It had its origin in the participation framework of actual performance, where the beneficiary ‘Is Osiris (Deity),’

⁶⁴⁷ This count concerns Old Kingdom exemplars of the Pyramid Texts, excluding later evidence such as PT 63 §44a = CT 858 VII 60q (Sq3C).

⁶⁴⁸ Namely PT 81 and 416.

⁶⁴⁹ PT 223 exhibits both the motif ‘Is Osiris NN’ and ‘Is Osiris (NN).’

⁶⁵⁰ On the role of Horus adopted by officiants in mortuary cult, see already Rusch 1917, p. 76 n. 2; Assmann 1976, pp. 30–33; *idem* 2001a, p. 51; and Hays 2002, pp. 164–165 with nn. 85–86.

but adaptation of the text to the monument removed it from that domain—or rather, the removal of the text from the domain of physical practice to the context of monumental decoration permitted it to be dramatically modified. The interpolation of the proper name of a human after the deity moved him into the role of beneficiary.

The motif ‘Is Osiris (Deity)’ has the god as such in the role of the text’s beneficiary. There are about eleven texts preserving it in one or more passages. Three have already been encountered, PT 477, 540, and fPT 691B. As already discussed, the first of these transplanted the text owner from the role of officiant into that of beneficiary. With the last two, Neith’s exemplars kept the first-person text-owner in the role of officiant and the god in the role of beneficiary.⁶⁵¹ Meanwhile the exemplars of Pepi I and Pepi II replaced the first person with the proper name, releasing him from the burden of actual performance. But still the god remained the object of PT 540 and fPT 691B. These three treatments represent the different editorial options for handling texts with this motif: full or partial role transplantation, maintenance of text owner as first-person officiant, and conversion of first-person text-owner to the third.

The last option revealed the text to be a monumental, non-performed entity. The second option maintained the original relationship between text owner and divine beneficiary. The first option is what the other texts with the motif ‘Is Osiris (Deity)’ all show in at least one exemplar: role transplantation. They convert, therefore, the original relationship of text owner as officiant (NN) to the god as beneficiary (Osiris) and forge an identity between them. In short, these texts were all originally personal services to that god, modified at the time of transcription, as evidenced by inconsistencies among the attested sources. As NN is made into Osiris the beneficiary, these exemplars are regarded as displaying the motif ‘Is Osiris + Interpolated NN.’ Three will be considered as illustrations.

PT 483, preserved in three exemplars, situates the beneficiary in the second person throughout. The text is badly damaged in Merenre’s exemplar, but that of Pepi II is entirely intact. Neither mentions the text owner, but a vocative to the god appears in Pepi II’s version at Pyr. §1012a (N): *tz tw wsir z3 gbb tpi=f* “Raise yourself, O Osiris, son of Geb, his first.” The text owner is nowhere mentioned, but the god is. Unlike the circumstances with the motif ‘Is Osiris (NN),’ it cannot be argued by textual context that the name of the deity refers to the text owner. PT 93, for example, appears among many texts using the Osiris NN formula, and on that basis as well as inclusion of the name of the text owner as beneficiary within the text, it was not merely assumable but fully evident that there was an identity between the god and the man. But with Pepi II’s version of PT 483, neither of these circumstances pertains.⁶⁵² The absence of specification, lack of internal reference to the text owner, and paucity of use of the Osiris NN formula around this text contrast PT 483 from the circumstances of PT 93. Here, it is a matter of the motif ‘Is Osiris (Deity).’ Having established this, one may now consider the exemplar with interpolation. In the pyramid of Pepi I, the vocative has *wsir P. z3 gbb tpi=f* “O Osiris Pepi...” The difference between the versions suggests that the name of the text owner was interpolated in this exemplar. Here, it is a matter of the motif ‘Is Osiris + Interpolated NN.’ Two further texts present analogous circumstances.⁶⁵³

⁶⁵¹ This was similarly done with the personal service to the god Re in Pepi I’s exemplar of PT 456, although the first person technically appears outside the body text and in the paratext.

⁶⁵² See Group J, Section 3, for the texts in proximity to it at N/A/W.

⁶⁵³ PT 670 §1973a, 1975a, and 1986b (N) makes reference to *wsir Ne.*, but Pyr. §1978b–c (N) differentiates between the god and the text owner: *mdw wsir n hr fd.n=f dw.t [ir(it) Ne. m] fd-nw=f hrw* “Let Osiris speak to Horus, for he (sc. Horus) has removed the evil [which pertains to Neferkare in] his fourth day.” The differentiation between the two personages suggests that the instances of *wsir Ne.* at Pyr. §1973a, 1975a, and 1986b are a matter of ‘Is Osiris + Interpolated NN.’ This is corroborated by Middle Kingdom versions of this text, as they

Complete role transplantation occurs in PT 532. Attested in the pyramids of Pepi I and Pepi II, it begins by speaking about the god Osiris and saying of him at Pyr. §1256a–b (PN): *gm.n=sn(i) wsir ndi.n sw sn=f stš r t3 m ndi.t* “They have found Osiris, even after his brother Seth cast him down in Nedit.” But this statement is not a mythological point of departure for the remainder of a text revolving around the text owner. Indeed, the exemplar of Pepi II does not mention him in the first half of the text. Rather, switching to refer to Osiris in the second person, it goes on to make three vocatives to the god before the text owner finally appears. Moreover, all of the vocatives to the god in the version of Pepi II are in disagreement of identity with those of Pepi I. And further, all of the unprecedented vocatives to Pepi II as such are absent in the version of Pepi I. In fact, of the six passages making reference to the text owner where both are intact, there is only one where the identity of the beneficiary is in accord:

Pyr. §1256c (N): <i>wsir</i> “O Osiris”	versus (P): <i>wsir P.</i> “O Osiris Pepi”
Pyr. §1258c (N): <i>wsir</i> “O Osiris”	versus (P): <i>wsir P. pn</i> “O Osiris Pepi”
Pyr. §1259b (N, B10C, T9C): <i>wsir z3 gbb tpi=f</i> “O Osiris, son of Geb, his first”	versus Pyr. §1259b–c (P): <i>wsir P. pn z3 gbb tpi=f</i> “O Osiris Pepi, . . .”
Pyr. §1260b (N): <i>Ne.</i> “O Neferkare”	versus (P, B10C, T9C): –
Pyr. §1261c (N): <i>Ne.</i> “O Neferkare”	versus (P, B10C, T9C): –
Pyr. §1262a (N): <i>Ne.</i> “O Neferkare”	not preserved in P
Pyr. §1262b (N): <i>wsir Ne.</i> “O Osiris Neferkare” and (P) <i>wsir P. [p]n</i> “O Osiris Pepi”	

Only the last passage agrees between the two Old Kingdom exemplars. The exemplar of Pepi II does not add his name after Osiris in the first three passages, and it interpolates the bare proper name in three passages thereafter. The latter act indicates an effort to establish reference, as does the interpolation of the name of the text owner after that of Osiris in the first three statements of Pepi I’s version. Especially there, the change results in transplanting the text owner to the status of beneficiary. Since so far as may be seen all references to the text owner leading up to the final statement are interpolations, it may be presumed that it also was secondarily introduced.

The attested forms of PT 532 are similar to that of PT 93, which has the motif ‘Is Osiris (NN).’ However, in PT 532 the interpolation of bare vocatives shows that the establishment of referentiality to the text owner was of special interest and not native to the prior form of the text. Further, discord in appellation between the exemplars also suggests that the identity of the beneficiary had been modified. As a result of these points, its vocatives are reasoned to be examples of the motif ‘Is Osiris + Interpolated NN.’ A further text presents a similar case.⁶⁵⁴

As to the motif ‘Is Osiris (Deity)’ and its transformations, the final text to be considered, sPT 561B, is heavily fragmentary in its published versions, and of them only that of Pepi I is of much utility. But the text is of singular importance because it is one of only two Pyramid

inconsistently include or omit the name of the text owner amongst themselves in these places (B10C, T1C, T9C, and T1L). The second text is PT 487. Its exemplar in the pyramid of Merenre makes no mention of the text owner. In those of Pepi I and Pepi II, the text owner’s name is interpolated after the vocative *it=i* “my father” at Pyr. §1046a. That the referent of this term is the god is evident by its juxtaposition to PT 483 in the pyramid of Pepi II, where only the god is mentioned.

⁶⁵⁴ PT 579, attested in the Old Kingdom in the pyramids of Pepi I and Pepi II, presents a similar case, together with exemplar disagreement in person of the text owner between them. At Pyr. §1539a, the version in the pyramid of Pepi I invokes the text owner by *wsir M. pn* “O Osiris Merire,” while the corresponding passage in the pyramid of Pepi II names only *wsir* “O Osiris.”

Texts which provide paratextual notation of the reciprocal benefits accrued by someone who performs a rite for a separate beneficiary.

As a matter of fact, the body text nowhere preserves the name of the god Osiris as a personage separate from the text owner. Rather, wherever intact, it uses the Osiris NN formula, indeed casting Osiris Pepi as the text's beneficiary.⁶⁵⁵ For instance at P/V/E 23–24: *rdi.n nw.t c.wy=s(i) r=k i.rs i.rs /// wsir P*. “Nut has given you her hands. Awaken, awaken, /// O Osiris Pepi!” However, it must be that all of these instances are really a matter of the interpolation of the text owner's name after that of the god as such. This is obvious from the content of the paratextual notation coming after the body text proper:

sPT 561B P/V/E 26

[*dw3.*] *t(i)=f(i) r-r wsir*
ir=f n=f hk3 pn
wnn=f cnd h.t
in P. dw3 tw wsir
i[n P. i]r n=k hk3 [pn]
[wnn=f] cnd h.t

As for the one who will truly [hymn] Osiris
 while performing this magic for him,
 he will live for ever.

It is Pepi who hymns you, O Osiris.

I[*t* is Pepi who perfo]rms [*t*his] magic for you,
 and [*h*e will] live for ever.

The structure of this statement is precisely the same as what is found in PT 456, a proto-hymn to the sun god mentioned above:

PT 456 §855a (N)

rh sw r-r {i} r3 {n} pn n(i) r^c
ir=f sn hk3.w ipn n(i) hr 3h.t(i)
wnn=f m rh in r^c
wn(n)=f m smr n(i) hr 3h.ti
i.rh sw Ne. r3 pn n(i) r^c
iry Ne. hk3.w ipn n(i)w hr 3h.ti
wnn Ne. m rh.i n(i) r^c
wnn Ne. m smr n(i) hr 3h.t(i)
i.ndr^c n(i) Ne. ir p.t m-m sms n(i) r^c

As for the one who truly knows it, this utterance of Re,
 and does it, this magic of Harakhti,
 he will be one known by Re;
 he will be a companion of Harakhti.

Neferkare knows it, this utterance of Re,
 and Neferkare performs this magic of Harakhti:

Neferkare is one known of Re,

and Neferkare is a companion of Harakhti,

with the hand of Neferkare grasped at the sky among the followers of Re.

In the paratextual notations of both sPT 561B and PT 456, a generic declaration is made about the one who does the preceding body text. In the case of PT 456, the body text is an address to the sun god, and that is how the paratextual notation describes it: it is *r3 {n} pn n(i) r^c* “this utterance of Re” and *hk3.w ipn n(i) hr 3h.t(i)* “this magic of Harakhti.” The paratext of PT 456 then goes on to syllogistically declare that the text owner knows and does it. In

⁶⁵⁵ In four places, at P/V/E 23, 24, 25, and 26.

the case of sPT 561B, the generic performer of the body text is designated as $[d\omega\beta.]t(i)=f(i)$ $r-r \text{ } \omega\text{sr } \text{ir}=f \text{ } n=f \text{ } h\text{k}\beta \text{ } p\text{n}$ “the one who will truly [hymn] Osiris while performing this magic for him.” It then goes on to address that god as an entity separate from the text owner and to syllogistically declare that the text owner is the one who hymns him and does the magic for him. The problem, of course, is that the god Osiris appears nowhere in the body text at all. It is only $\omega\text{sr } P. \text{ } p\text{n}$ “Osiris Pepi” who is present there.

It is another instance of paradox. The name of the text owner was interpolated after that of the god. He is said to perform the text, and, in doing so, he addresses himself. The paradox shows how the text was treated as a monumental object. By the conflict between the text’s paratextual notation and body text, it is evident that it was reframed, in the process creating the kind of logical conflict observed with reframed Book of the Dead rites. Here, the source of the conflict is due to incomplete role transplantation: the text owner remains officiant to himself as separate beneficiary. But the blatant paradox was fully acceptable in a monumental context. The version inscribed in stone was not meant to be the support for an operative script. And the logical conflict apprehensible in sPT 561B is evident in four other personal services to Osiris as well.⁶⁵⁶

More, the paratextual notations of sPT 561B and PT 456 are of critical significance, because their declarations show beyond all doubt that the Pyramid Texts contained personal services to deities, just as was found in Books of the Dead with hymns to the sun god and rites done for Osiris. These services were sacerdotal in their structure, with the text owner as officiant in their prior forms.

In consideration of where such personal services are found in the later religious literature, and in connection with the motifs ‘Is Osiris (Deity)’ and ‘Is Osiris + Interpolated NN,’ it stands to reason that they should first of all be found transmitted among texts from an individual setting rather than a collective one. That will turn out to be precisely the case. It is not a matter of misunderstanding but full awareness of their prior contexts of performance which motivated these particular modifications. Such changes were not made to rites originating in collective rituals where the text owner already was identified as the god Osiris. The changes were made to rites which, in their prior forms, were performed by the text owner to the god. The detachment of the monument from the texts’ operative origins allowed the conversion to take place. The result was a transplantation of role, the adaptation of a text aimed at the benefit of a god into a text aimed at the benefit of a man.

It may finally be noted that the interpolation of the name of the text owner after the name of the god Osiris generally occurs in sacerdotal texts, with one partial exception. The personal PT 510, discussed above in the context of the assimilation of divine roles by the text owner,⁶⁵⁷

⁶⁵⁶ At PT 577 §1523c–1524c (P) the text owner is assimilated with Osiris by the Osiris NN formula, but the immediately subsequent statement differentiates between the two: $ip.n \text{ } sw \text{ } tr=f \text{ } sh\beta.n \text{ } sw \text{ } nw.w=f \text{ } ip \text{ } P. \text{ } in \text{ } tr=f \text{ } hm^c=f \text{ } sh\beta.n \text{ } sw \text{ } nw.w=f \text{ } hm^c=f$ “His (sc. Anubis’s) season(s) have reckoned him (sc. Osiris): his times have remembered him (sc. Osiris), and Pepi is reckoned by his seasons with him (sc. Osiris), his times having remembered him with him (sc. Osiris).” In PT 581 §1555a (P), the text owner is distinct from Osiris and is supposed to act for him, but they are assimilated by the Osiris NN formula at §1551a, while the exemplar of N names only the god in that place. At PT 606 §1685a–b (N), the text owner is identified as the god Horus, the one who smites (hwi) the smiter of Osiris. But this exemplar goes on to state: $iw \text{ } nd.n(=i) \text{ } tw \text{ } it(=i) \text{ } Ne. \text{ } m^c \text{ } \text{ir } mr.t \text{ } \text{ir}=k$ “I (sc. Horus) have saved you, O my father Neferkare, from the one who did ill against you.” Exemplar N thus maintains the text owner’s identity as Horus, though in the next breath differentiating that god from him. In contrast, exemplar M has a first-person officiant as Horus and maintains the distinction between him and the text owner, who is referred to by the Osiris NN formula in this passage. In short, the prior form of the text had the text owner in the first person, editing it uniformly to the third, while simultaneously situating the text owner as beneficiary—a separate role. For sPT 1058, see the discussion of its unintelligible vocative P/V/E 26–27 $it \text{ } n(i) \text{ } P. \text{ } [\omega\text{sr}] \text{ } P.$ “O father of Pepi [Osiris] Pepi” above at n. 591.

⁶⁵⁷ See above at n. 638.

differentiates between the god Osiris⁶⁵⁸ and the text owner as beneficiary,⁶⁵⁹ but in one passage the text's original *it=i* 'my (sc. text owner's) father (sc. Osiris)' was recarved with *wsir P*. "Osiris Pepi." Taxonomically it is not quite the interpolation of the proper name of the text owner after a prior form's name of the deity, but the effect is essentially identical. This modification indeed changes the meaning of the passage, in that it now makes it applicable to the text owner. But he was already the beneficiary in the remainder of the text, so this particular adjustment did not affect its overall performance structure.

6. *Summary of Edited Sacerdotal Texts*

The focus of investigating the editing of the person of the text owner has been to identify texts where he appeared in the first person. As we have seen, most of these concerned texts where he was originally officiant and beneficiary, thus personal texts. But along the way several edited sacerdotal texts have been identified. Since the core set of personal texts has already been assembled as a result of the main inquiry, it is appropriate to do the same with these as well.

To be sure, it would seem best to leave these edited texts out of the core sacerdotal set upon which the subsequent work will depend. They are therefore enumerated here only as reference, though later they will indeed be considered again.

So far, several sacerdotal texts were determined to be personal services to deities and the dead. These services were identified by discord in reference between exemplars (for instance *wsir NN* versus *wsir*),⁶⁶⁰ the presence of the awkward *it=f* as vocative,⁶⁶¹ internal logical conflict predicated by the text owner simultaneously holding the role of Osiris as well as a role separate from the god (usually the officiant),⁶⁶² and explicit paratextual notations.⁶⁶³ Altogether there are fifteen texts like this, of which half display overt signs of edited person or retention of the first person of the text owner throughout.⁶⁶⁴ Twelve out of fifteen texts were seen to exhibit role transplantation.⁶⁶⁵ One of the fifteen, PT 512, was deemed to be a personal service for the dead. The rest were services to the gods Osiris and Re.

But, by the nature of the manner in which the texts were identified—recarving and inconsistencies—it should be supposed that there could be (indeed are) other texts like them in the sacerdotal category, with their inconsistencies fully ironed out. Thus three more sacerdotal texts with the ambiguous sign of exemplar disagreement will later be interpreted as personal services: PT 466, 679, and 697. They will be interpreted as such due to their contexts of transmission, and their inconsistencies contribute to understanding them as having originally been personal services. Alongside these are a number of other texts showing no signs of editing which can, after close examination of their contexts and very clear patterns of transmission, also be deemed to have been personal services in their prior forms.

After these, there are four more texts which will later be assigned to the sacerdotal category based on content, though they show overt signs of edited person: PT 419, 442, 463, and 659. All four exhibit exemplar disagreement, while the last two also have noun advance-

⁶⁵⁸ See PT 510 §1128a–b (P).

⁶⁵⁹ See for instance PT 510 §1133a–b (P initial).

⁶⁶⁰ PT 477, 483, 487, 512, 532, 540, 579, 581, and 606.

⁶⁶¹ PT 512, 540, and sPT 1058.

⁶⁶² PT 477, 512, sPT 561B, PT 577, and PT 581.

⁶⁶³ PT 456 and fPT 691B.

⁶⁶⁴ PT 456, 477, 512, 540, 579, 606, fPT 691B, and sPT 1058. The ones without such overt indications of the text owner's original role as first-person officiant are PT 483, 487, 532, sPT 561B, PT 577, 581, 670, and sPT 1064.

⁶⁶⁵ The four which were not are PT 456, 540, fPT 691B, and sPT 1064.

ment. With all but PT 463, there is at least one exemplar which does not exhibit the name of the text owner. The discrepancies in person were due to the insertion of the proper name. It was inserted to establish reference.

D. *Recurring Series with the Core Texts*

A core set of 402 sacerdotal texts and a core set of ninety-eight personal texts have been identified, and they may now be cross-referenced against their patterns of transmission. Restricting attention to non-titulary texts first attested in Old Kingdom kingly pyramids,⁶⁶⁶ Listing Two identifies 148 sequences and Listing Three has 211 subsequences of particular concern.

As presented in Chapter Two, a recurring series consists of a set of texts which is transmitted in at least two sources with precisely the same constituents in precisely the same order. The term sequence indicates a recurring series which is not subsumed by a longer one, while a subsequence is. By the strictness of the definition, the identifications of these series are regarded as empirical facts, matters of objectively verifiable observation rather than the results of argumentation. The motivations which generated the recurring series are not at issue; it is enough to understand by the attribute of repetition that they were generated by dynamics of cultural reproduction. Here, they are consulted because the affinity of their member texts for one another is emic, an association intrinsic to Egyptian culture.

Because it is demonstrable that the members of the core sets of sacerdotal and personal texts are segregated among the recurring series, one may propose that the categories identified by grammatical person are intrinsic to ancient Egyptian culture. Simply put, since texts of particular structures of performance were transmitted together, it is evident that they anciently belonged together.

1. *With the Core Sacerdotal Texts*

The core set of sacerdotal texts consists of 402 texts, some situating the beneficiary strictly in the second person and some switching between the second and third. None of the texts in this core set shows a meaningful sign of editing. The sacerdotal texts which have been observed to show such signs—most are personal services—are excluded from the core set as a point of methodology.

Among the 359 examined series of Listings One and Two, 234 contain one or more texts of the core sacerdotal set. Of these, ninety-eight series also include one or more texts strictly in the third person or making no mention of the beneficiary, with none showing editing. The third-person and null texts have not been assigned to any category yet, so these ninety-eight are set to one side for now. Also set apart are two more recurring series possessing one of the texts identified as a personal service to someone else⁶⁶⁷ and seven containing texts with

⁶⁶⁶ In other words, to set aside recurring series consisting only of titulary texts (Sequence 1), recurring series with a Pyramid Text not attested in a kingly pyramid (Sequences 18–19), and recurring series containing Coffin Texts which are not found in the Old Kingdom: Sequences 42, 45, 84A, 93, 118, 156–157, 159, 188, and 224, and Subsequences 104, 167, 185A, 213, 215–216, and 293.

⁶⁶⁷ Sequence 155 (with PT 581) and Subsequence 168 (with PT 579). To be clear, these series have a core sacerdotal text together with a text already identified as a personal service.

only unclear signs of editing.⁶⁶⁸ The reason for temporarily setting these aside is to focus on the transmitted interaction between the core sacerdotal and personal sets.

That leaves 127 out of the 234 series with one or more texts of the core sacerdotal set. Of them, 121 consist entirely of texts from it.⁶⁶⁹ Only six contain texts from both the core sacerdotal and the core personal set.⁶⁷⁰ Altogether, the homogeneous sacerdotal series contain 236 of the core set of 402 texts, or nearly 60%. The heterogeneous series account for only six of them,⁶⁷¹ or less than 2%. The disparity is striking. Mathematically, it is a question of dependence, a statistical relationship between two sets of different kinds of data. The correlation indicates that the evidence of performance structure, a typological characteristic, is interrelated with patterns of transmission, a dispositional characteristic. This is not a statement of opinion; it is to describe what has been shown.

In summary, texts identified as certainly having the sacerdotal performance structure are very often transmitted together. They are very rarely transmitted alongside texts certainly having the personal performance structure.

As an avenue of analysis, typology has to do with the intertextual nature of texts, developed independently of transmitted context. Disposition has to do with transmitted context, identified independently of textual content. And yet the results of these analyses converge. It is just a matter of simple statistical distribution which makes the following statement a descriptive conclusion: the ancient Egyptians segregated sacerdotal texts from personal ones. The fact that the texts of the two categories are separated from one another shows—with certainty—that the typological assignments, based strictly on the abstract characteristic of grammatical person, are interrelated with ancient practices of association. Grammatical person is a function dependent on common transmission, and vice versa.

Supported by this realization, one is empowered to return to the ninety-eight recurring series where texts from the core sacerdotal set appear alongside texts which are strictly in the third person or make no mention of the beneficiary. By virtue of their contexts of transmission, and by virtue of the understanding that context of transmission is interrelated with structure of performance, it is reasonable to surmise that the third-person and null texts also belong to the same category. Similarly in the temple sanctuary ritual, one found such texts alongside the strictly second person ones and ones with switching. This surmise will be brought into effect in due course.

⁶⁶⁸ Sequences 102, 120, 126, and 139, and Subsequence 173. Added to them are Sequences 9 and 158, each containing exemplars of CT 530. This text is not evaluated for person in its Old Kingdom exemplars and is therefore set apart.

⁶⁶⁹ The following recurring series homogeneously consist of texts from the core sacerdotal set: Sequences 8, 10–14, 17, 21–22, 31–33, 48, 76, 78–84, 87, 89–90, 98–99, 114, 124–125, 127–129, 132, 136–137, 140–142, 144, 146–147, and 153; and Subsequences 1–2, 9–10, 12–13, 15–17, 21, 28–39, 42–43, 47–50, 63–68, 80–81, 90–91, 94, 106, 139–142, 151, 156, 158–159, 173, 178, 181–199, 201, and 203–209.

⁶⁷⁰ Namely Sequences 7, 53, 75, and 131, and Subsequences 108–109. It may be added that three of the heterogeneous series are attested only after the Old Kingdom—Sequences 7 and 53 and Subsequence 109—and thus they may be manifestations of the mutability of tradition rather than reflecting the sensibilities of the age which generated the Pyramid Texts. The heterogeneous Old Kingdom series are Sequences 75 and 131 and Subsequence 108. Note that the identifications of Subsequences 108–109 are both dependent on the identification of the Middle Kingdom Sequence 53. One other series may be mentioned, Sequence 155; it contains a personal service (PT 581) and was therefore excluded from consideration, but it has both a core sacerdotal text (sPT 1071) and a core personal text (sPT 1064). After the membership of the two categories has been expanded beyond the core sets, only five more heterogeneous series will emerge among the 360 recurring series consisting entirely of texts first attested in kingly pyramids: Sequences 52, 104–105, 126, and 143. Sequence 126 is attested only in the Middle Kingdom, and the sacerdotal texts in the other four will be identified as personal services. Cf. above at n. 492.

⁶⁷¹ Specifically PT 25, 32, 247, 357, and 558–559.

2. *With the Core Personal Texts*

The core set from the personal category consists of ninety-eight texts. All of these texts exhibit at least one of the clear signs of editing away from the first person (referring specifically to the text owner simultaneously in the roles of beneficiary and performer) or maintain the first person throughout. Naturally the sacerdotal texts with signs of editing are excluded from this set, as are texts only showing the ambiguous signs.

It was pointed out that the signs of editing owe their existence, in the main, to scribal oversight and correction. Especially the evidence of recarving, vacillation to the first person, and doubling are the products of mistakes and efforts to correct mistakes. Alongside this, it was shown that the pattern of modification was to convert texts situating the text owner in the first person into texts showing the third. The conclusion to be drawn from the combination of these two observations is that one should not expect the mistakes to appear in every modified text. It should be expected that some originally first-person texts were edited completely and are therefore attested only in third-person forms. It follows from this conclusion that recurring series containing texts from the core personal set should also contain a number of third-person texts not showing signs of editing.

That is the case. Among the 359 examined Pyramid Texts series of Listings One and Two, seventy-six contain one or more texts of the core personal set. Of these, as noted a moment ago, only six have texts from both the core sacerdotal and the core personal set. Besides them, there are three others which contain one text identified as a personal service.⁶⁷² The six and the three are set aside for the time being, and I focus on the remaining sixty-seven.

Of them, there are nine short series consisting exclusively of texts from the core personal set,⁶⁷³ and there are fifty-eight of varying lengths with core texts alongside one or more strictly in the third person or making no mention of the text owner.⁶⁷⁴ As explained, there is good reason to regard these together as homogeneous in composition. Among them, there are fifty-two texts from the core personal set, about 53% of the total.

Among them are also ninety-two more texts strictly in the third person or without explicit reference to the text owner. By virtue of their contexts of transmission, and by the understanding that context is interrelated with structure of performance, it is reasonable to surmise that they belong to the same category. That surmise will be applied in due course.

3. *Recurring Series with No Members of the Core Sets*

To this point, 304 Pyramid Texts series have been accounted for,⁶⁷⁵ with only six of them containing a mix of texts from both categories—a ratio of 51:1. Proportionally, there are fifty-one times as many series homogeneous in performance structure than there are series with a mix. One may suppose from this disparity that the remaining fifty-six recurring series—the ones without any members of the core sets—are also homogeneous in composition. Because nearly all of their texts also appear in other series where members of the core sets appear,

⁶⁷² Sequences 104–105, and 143. These have a core personal text together with a personal service. Already set aside for the moment was Sequence 150; see above at nn. 667 and 670.

⁶⁷³ Namely Sequences 58, 111, 116; and Subsequences 41, 118, 120, 124, 130, and 165.

⁶⁷⁴ Namely Sequences 34, 55, 57, 59, 61, 64–65, 68–71, 86, 103, 107, 109–110, 112–113, 115, 117, 119, 133–134, 148–149; and Subsequences 40, 69, 113–114, 116–117, 122–123, 126–127, 129, 133, 137, 160–164, 166, 202, 217, 218–226, 228–229, and 231.

⁶⁷⁵ Here is the accounting. With core sacerdotal texts: $98 + 2 + 7 + 121 + 6 = 234$. With core personal: $6 + 3 + 9 + 58 = 76$. Note that the value 6 is common to both (series with members of both core sets). Thus the total is $234 + 76 - 6 = 304$.

and because nearly all of them share propositional content particular to one core set or the other, their typological natures can be determined with confidence.

Since they do not contain any members of the core set, the texts of these fifty-six series strictly situate the beneficiary in the third person with no sign of editing, do not mention him, or show only one of the ambiguous signs of editing.⁶⁷⁶ (None of the texts identified as personal services appears.)

E. *Interim Conclusions*

The preceding has shown that performance structure is interrelated with patterns of transmission. The convergence is significant, because the dimensions of data they concern were traversed along different analytical avenues. The data of transmission are of particular importance, because texts are juxtaposed to one another in the recurring series, and therefore have a synchronic association by physical proximity, and they are transmitted together in this way repeatedly, and therefore have a diachronic association by presence on two or more source documents. Since these associations are apparent in the ancient evidence, they are necessarily intrinsic to Egyptian culture. What they reflect are ancient patterns of disposition.

Since it has been found that the series are, as a rule, homogeneous in performance structure, it follows that performance structure was one of the dynamics contributing to the formation of the series in the first place. Texts with certain properties of performance were placed together and kept together, and kept apart from those with others.

F. *Motifs Exclusive to the Core Texts*

1. *Theory*

The next step is to see whether structures of performance converge with propositional content. Barta was the first scholar to draw serious attention to the repetitiveness of content in the Pyramid Texts, assembling a directory of many parallel passages and attaching it as an appendix to his monographic account of the corpus. It is an impressive index of the addresses of intertextual links.⁶⁷⁷ But perhaps because this collection of facts consists merely of the ‘chapter and verse’ without telling what is said at the indicated passages, it has remained fallow to this day. More recently an important article by Roeder showed how such stock phraseology and synonymous semantic content—*Motiven*—might be leveraged to draw Pyramid Texts together, thereby taking a step beyond data collection and into the theory of how facts might be systematically combined.⁶⁷⁸ How do similar statements travel together throughout the corpus and bind texts together? Roeder explored a small set of motifs found in just a handful of texts. Now one can take the idea further, even cross-referencing content against performance structure and transmission.

⁶⁷⁶ They are Sequences 35–36, 49–51, 54, 56, 60, 62–63, 66–67, 72–74, 77, 85, 92, 100, 106, 108, 130, 145, and 150; and Subsequences 62, 70–74, 85–86, 107, 110–112, 115, 119, 121, 125, 128, 131–132, 134–136, 138, 144–147, 210–212, 227, and 230.

⁶⁷⁷ Barta 1981, pp. 151–160.

⁶⁷⁸ Roeder 1993, pp. 81–119, with the definition of a *Motiv* at p. 84: “eine textuelle Einheit, ein Wort, das auf einen zentralen Begriff in einem bestimmten Text oder Spruch verweist.”

The Pyramid Texts are profoundly repetitive. This may be owed to their origins in narrowly circumscribed settings:⁶⁷⁹ it is a case of the focused and formalized use of language.⁶⁸⁰ The formality and repetition are one of several indications of a ritualized field of production. Derived from performed scripts, the place in which the Pyramid Texts were culturally experienced was in ritual action, and in that context freedom of production was more tightly constrained.

As a consequence of the repetition, the Pyramid Texts are a supremely intertextual corpus. By *intertextuality*, I mean the tangible and proximate relations a text has with other texts, thus a relationship of copresence.⁶⁸¹ Most Pyramid Texts have few of the more clear-cut boundaries drawn by comparatively unique sentences and turns of phrase. In contrast, Old Kingdom autobiographies contemporaneously transmitted outside the pyramids were tailored in selection of verb forms and precise choice of words to represent particular past events, qualities, and identities of mundane human experience: they exhibit a broader register of syntagmatic construction and through this they are able to narrow down the field of potential denotation: they seek to enclose the witnessed, unique event. Fundamentally different in spirit are the Pyramid Texts,⁶⁸² nearly all of which have one or more statements which are parallel in meaning to one or more texts in its corpus. Synonymous or verbatim configurations of verbs, nouns, roles, and so forth: these are the formulaic units of its discourse. In making repeated use of such statements, a Pyramid Text is not a self-contained unit but is an entry into a network which has thousands of exits;⁶⁸³ the text is a node seeking to reach out into a discursive formation⁶⁸⁴ rather than to carve out a separate identity for itself by claims of particularity of individual experience.

Coupled with a lack of narrative or argumentative linkages between the statements in any given Pyramid Text,⁶⁸⁵ the effect of this enormous web of connections was to construct meaning by way of allusion and connotation rather than internal specification, explication, and denotation of 'truth.'⁶⁸⁶ It is a question of an instantaneous and perpetual deferral of meaning, a deferral which contributes to the mystification and social alchemy of significance.⁶⁸⁷ Coupled yet again with a vocabulary populated by extraordinary, superhuman beings, actions, and landscapes, the deferral set the system's significance apart from the mundane world, signaling significance though indefinitely postponing it, opening channels of meaning instead of closing them, symbolically gesturing at unseen reality by analogy, and in the process signifying anything and everything except for the ordinary.⁶⁸⁸ The Pyramid Texts'

⁶⁷⁹ For repetitiveness in ritual, see the reference above at n. 232. By C. Bell 1992, pp. 90–92, repetition is a common strategy (as opposed to universal characteristic) of ritualized actions, a means whereby it differentiates itself from quotidian practices.

⁶⁸⁰ Cf. Bloch 1974, pp. 56, 58–64, the commentary thereon at C. Bell 1992, pp. 120–121, the critique thereof at Tambiah 1981, p. 151, and the critique of Tambiah's critique of Bloch at Janowitz 1985, pp. 155–157 and 172–173, with further references to this discussion at Asad 1993, p. 132 n. 10.

⁶⁸¹ The cue for the concept of intertextuality is taken from Genette 1997, p. 1.

⁶⁸² Strudwick 2005, p. 2.

⁶⁸³ Cf. Barthes 1974, p. 12.

⁶⁸⁴ Cf. Foucault 1972, p. 23.

⁶⁸⁵ The typical lack of such linkages internal to a text is matched by the variable position of texts within the groups and the variable location of groups in the pyramids; see also the reference above at n. 467. On the other hand, obviously not all is free play, and thus some groups have fixed locations, and there are many recurring series of texts. The lack of narrative or argumentative closure in the Pyramid Texts deserves further study; see Assmann 2001a, pp. 111–113, the remarks of Hays 2009d, pp. 198–199, and cf. Hénaff 1998, p. 184.

⁶⁸⁶ To be clear, truth or reality is a cultural construct and is therefore propositionally meaningful only in relation to its situation of origin. What the actual nature of external or ultimate reality may be is a subject on which judgment is suspended in this work. On 'truth,' see also the two following notes and further at n. 812.

⁶⁸⁷ Cf. the discussion of semantic misdirection at C. Bell 1992, pp. 87–88, 105–109, 113–116, and 127.

⁶⁸⁸ Cf. the discussion of Claude Lévi-Strauss's concept of the *valeur symbolique zéro* at J.Z. Smith 1987, pp. 107–108.

formulaic units of discourse were neither explicitly defined nor intrinsically anchored to the mundane world, and for this reason they recursively developed a postponed propositional meaning within a closed system of interconnected chains of oppositions and affinities.

In short, through their antilogical structure, charismatic⁶⁸⁹ content, and intertextual deferral, the Pyramid Texts created sheer difference between the mundane world of lived, human experience and the transcendental⁶⁹⁰ affairs which they presented themselves as representing. And in applying their repertoire of statements as predicate to personages with human identities, personages who were physically anchored to the real world, they imparted their transcendental signification to them. Attached to him or her, the text projected the meaning of the human personage outside of the mundane world and into a world separate from human experience.⁶⁹¹ That was the performative value of what they said.

Despite their recursive and deferred meaning, the repetitive statements are certainly not as elementary as the other dimensions of analysis, namely grammatical person and recurring transmission. They are the very substance of the meaning of the corpus, or at least they provide the most direct path to meaning's vanishing point: they tell precisely what extraordinary attributes, actions, and locations were customarily applied to personages who had identities in the mundane world, above all the one at the center of the text, the text owner himself. For this reason they are of paramount importance. To identify them is to trace out the structural skeleton of the very meaning of the corpus.

And in their repetition they are genetically important as well. Recurring expressions, distinguishing textual elements—one might say 'repeated semes,' where *seme* means 'a unit of signification'⁶⁹²—are the coin in the economy of the corpus's meaning as well as a component of its DNA. To pin down the connections between texts is to open up paths of meaning, and it is also to identify features of familial resemblances and to draw lines of rupture between them. These intertextual connections are here given the imperfect label of *motif*.

2. Methodology

Whereas the analytical dimensions of person and transmission are relatively simple in their contours, the concatenation of the Egyptian lexicon into the manifold statements of the Pyramid Texts makes the enterprise of identifying all the strands of connection considerably more complicated. Moreover, cross-referencing the connections between texts, performance

⁶⁸⁹ The use of Weberian *charisma* is based on the simple formulation of Riesebrodt 1999, p. 12, in its reference "to any belief in extraordinary, superhuman powers residing in people or objects."

⁶⁹⁰ I oppose the term *transcendental* to *mundane* in their phenomenological-sociological senses. In the present work, the mundane (concrete) world is that which is within human experience, in the first instance what is felt through the five senses. The transcendental (abstract) world is an object of human imagination lying outside of sensory experience; the object of contemplation is simply a circumstance not pertaining to the past or present experience of mundane affairs; the means of contemplation is the brain. In between these poles is language, always symbolic by degrees, and nevertheless the principle means by which experience is mediated in human consciousness. In evaluating language in respect to its concern for one world versus the other, it is a matter of the proximity of its index to what can be apprehended by the senses. As ground for this dichotomy and their interpenetration, see Luckmann 1967, pp. 50–68. See also the "third utile sense" of transcendence as described by Saler 1993, p. 62: "beings that are conceptualized as radically different from human beings... may be held to be 'beyond' understandings grounded in routine experiences." See also above at n. 79: what is under discussion is the supposed location of the texts' referents in respect to ordinary human experience.

⁶⁹¹ Cf. Silverstein 2004, pp. 626–627, who describes the transposition of indexed subjects along a cosmic axis of knowledge and belief as "ritual transubstantiation." Anthropologically described, as by Silverstein, it is a universal. In Egyptology, this act of ritual attribution of meaning is theologically called 'sakramentale Ausdeutung (sacramental exegesis)' by Assmann 1977b, pp. 15–25; *idem* 1992, pp. 87–109; and *idem* 1995a, pp. 97–99. The difficulty with the term *sacrament* is that it has been a site of polemical controversy between Protestants and Catholics, and from the former perspective may be construed as connoting a pejorative.

⁶⁹² Barthes 1974, p. 17.

structure, and recurring series geometrically increases the complexity of the problem quite beyond Barta's ten-page directory of connections.

But such things are not insoluble. To identify motifs, I entered the transliteration, translation, and grammatical parsing of my corpus of 821 Pyramid Texts into a relational database. This database connects the inflected forms of 47,016 written words of 11,017 individual lines (generally corresponding to phrases and clauses) with a concordance of 2,351 Egyptian lemmata. With it I was able to create a cross-referenced hyperlist of bigrams, combinations of every two words appearing in a line. Armed with this list and knowledge of Egyptian synonyms, I proceeded line-by-line through the Pyramid Texts and tagged meaningful associations between lines.⁶⁹³ The connections were called motifs, and I applied an English label to each of them. The global execution of this procedure is assumed to counterbalance the human factor of deciding which words or combinations of words constitute a motif. A different researcher might construe different connections in some cases, but such quibbling will not have an impact on the overall results, because it is not a question of two or ten or even a hundred associations of syntagmata, but thousands.

Altogether, 1,476 motifs were identified as manifest in 9,057 lines. Two thirds of these were found to have strong correlations with the categories of sacerdotal and personal texts in their full plena. By the qualitative *strong*, I quantitatively mean that 1,014 motifs are attested at least three times more frequently in one category versus the other. In other words, most motifs are found in at least three texts of one category versus just one text in the other, i.e. a ratio of at least three to one. But in the interests of space and expedience, only the strongest of the strong are invoked in the present work. According to certain methodological rules to be noted presently, 531 motifs represented in 5,190 lines have been selected and assembled in Listings One and Four of the second volume of this work. The motifs possessed by each text are indicated in Listing One, and the transliterations and translations of the specific passages are collected in Listing Four.

These two listings include the results of the procedures to be carried out in this chapter. It will be mentioned also that the Coda of the present volume will make a subdivision of the two categories. The schematic Figure 18 preceding Listing One shows how the categories are subdivided, and Figure 19 displays the set-subset relationships in another way.

The upshot is that the motifs comprise a set of empirical connections in propositional content between texts. Just as texts situating the beneficiary in the same grammatical person are empirically related, and just as texts which are transmitted together in the same recurring series are empirically related, so also are the texts bearing motifs empirically related. Nearly as much in practice as in the ideal, the motifs are supposed to be prior to interpretation. In noting the possession of the same kind of statement by two texts, it is not an argument but an observation that they are connected.

3. *Sacerdotal Texts*

The intertextual linkages, or motifs, displayed by the core set of 402 sacerdotal texts may be compared to those displayed by the core set of ninety-eight personal texts. For the purposes of discerning the clearest distinctions between them, the examination can initially be narrowed to identify statements repeated in the former and not found at all in the latter, a ratio of infinity to one. Now, by definition a motif must be shared by at least two texts. Applying

⁶⁹³ When this project was begun in the year 2000, the practice of text-mining, or the application of certain computer algorithms to a digitized corpus, was still in its infancy and unknown to me.

it yields 456 motifs exclusive to the core set of sacerdotal texts—a number too large to be manageable in the space of one work. To tighten the scope still further, and therefore limit the yielded number, the definition for the core set of sacerdotal motifs will include only those attested in at least three sacerdotal texts, with none in the core personal set. According to this rule, then, 233 different kinds of statements are especially distinctive to the sacerdotal category.

Altogether, the core sacerdotal motifs are found distributed among 375 texts of the core sacerdotal set. Simply put, virtually all of the core sacerdotal texts are related to one another by especially distinctive content. They display numerous stock statements and sentiments which are not to be found in members of the core personal set. As to the twenty-seven which do not share such linkages,⁶⁹⁴ there are five which are after all attested in one of the homogeneous recurring series noted above.⁶⁹⁵ That leaves only 5% of the core set without some empirical connection to the others besides the second-person pronoun.

Once more, different avenues of analysis converge. The categories were established simply on the basis of grammatical person, but then a correlation was found between the categories and their ancient patterns of association. And now a second correlation is found: between the categories and content. This is really what has happened: the identification of the categories was actually the identification of an emic dichotomy, a system of oppositions manifest in multiple aspects of the evidence. Person is related to transmission and content because the texts—the monumental reflections of operative scripts—were generated by different modes of human action, where different things were appropriate to each.

Now, the core sacerdotal motifs are of paramount importance to the identity of the Pyramid Texts. In their order of frequency, they concern the beneficiary's identity as the object of religious service via the Osiris NN formula (202 texts), commands that he take the eye of Horus (105 texts), vocatives to the beneficiary with the particle *h3* (noted to be particular to mortuary services performed by priests,⁶⁹⁶ 82 texts), instructions to priests to lift items in presentation (64 texts), commands to the beneficiary that he raise himself via the resurrection formula *ꜥꜣꜣ ꜥꜣꜣ* "raise yourself!"⁶⁹⁷ (41 texts), stipulation of items of bread as instructional notation to priests (37 texts), the summoning of the beneficiary by Isis and Nephthys (18 texts), the exhortation⁶⁹⁸ that the beneficiary is to live (18 texts), the "saving" (*nd*) of the beneficiary by a priest in the role of the god Horus (17 texts), the self-identification of the priestly officiant as the god Horus (13 texts), the specification of offerings given (*hꜥꜥ-dꜣ*) of the king or the gods Geb and Anubis (11 texts)⁶⁹⁹ and so on in a web of bonds linking virtually all the members of the core sacerdotal set. At the same time that these particular motifs unite its members,

⁶⁹⁴ PT 41–42, fPT 57B, 57H, 71G, PT 323, 421, 441, 464, 554, 614, 630, 632, 671, 682, sPT 692A, PT 693, fPT 719, 747, 753, sPT 1001–1002, 1010–1011, 1016, 1059, and 1062. Later on further motifs particular to sacerdotal texts will be identified, and all but PT 554, 614, 632, 671, sPT 1002, 1011, 1059, and 1062 be seen to possess them.

⁶⁹⁵ PT 41–42, 464, 671, and sPT 1002.

⁶⁹⁶ See above at n. 532.

⁶⁹⁷ Mathieu 2004, p. 255 (cf. already Szudłowska 1990, p. 7, and Assmann 2001a, p. 128), refers to a possible genre of Pyramid Texts with the command *ꜥꜣꜣ ꜥꜣꜣ* in incipit position, including PT 365–366, 437, 451, 460, 497, 603–604, fPT 665A–B, 667B, 667D, PT 675, fPT 723, and sPT 1009. He is correct about the typological significance of the phraseology, but it does not only appear in initial position.

⁶⁹⁸ Motifs which include a hortatory component 'Exhortation' in their labels possess perlocutionary force originating in a speaker other than the agent of the verb and are directed at an audience. For instance, it is not the same to be commanded to live as it is to assert that the self or a third party lives or is to live.

⁶⁹⁹ See Listing Four, under the motifs 'Is Osiris NN,' 'Takes (*im*) Eye of Horus,' 'Vocative to (*h3*),' 'Lifting Four Times,' 'Raises Self (Exhortation),' 'Bread Offering Direction,' 'Lives (Exhortation),' 'Isis, Nephthys Summons,' 'Offering of the King, Geb, Anubis,' 'Priest Is Horus,' and 'Horus Saves (*nd*).'

they also distinguish them from those of the core personal set—because the latter do not have them at all.

The following summarizes the core sacerdotal motifs in alphabetical order according to the English labels given them. The beneficiary is present in most, and so normally he is not mentioned in the labels. Usually pregnancy of subject or object indicates him. Thus the passive ‘Adorned with Eye of Horus as Cloth’ implies a subject, and that subject is the beneficiary. After the label, the number of core sacerdotal texts bearing the motif is given in parentheses.

Action Instruction (Miscellaneous) (8)	Filled with Eye of Horus (4)
Adorned with Eye of Horus as Cloth (5)	Fruit Offering Direction (14)
Akhs Given (6)	Geb Brings Horus to (3)
Announced (<i>hwi sdb</i>) (4)	Geb Delegates to Other God (5)
Anubis Commands (4)	Geb Protects (<i>hwi, stp z3</i>) (4)
Arises, Awakens to Offerings (3)	Given Head (4)
Awakens to Horus (6)	Gives Hand to Horus, Priest (5)
Ba to (3)	Gods Brotherly to (4)
Ba within (3)	Gods, Ennead Saves (<i>nd</i>) (4)
Betake Self to Other (5)	Goes around, Traverses, Sits on Mounds (9)
Beware the Great Lake (4)	Goes as Horus (5)
Body Joined (<i>i^cb</i>) (7)	Goes to, with (<i>hr, hm^c</i>) Ka (4)
Body Part as Jackal (Not Face) (4)	Grain Offering Direction (5)
Bread Offering Direction (37)	Grasps Hand of Imperishable Stars (7)
Censing Instruction (5)	Great One Is Fallen (3)
Children of Horus Raise up (6)	Greater than Enemy (4)
Come in Peace to God (4)	Hand over Offerings (4)
Cross (Exhortation) (3)	Has Bread from Broad Hall (6)
Dance Performed for (7)	Has Meat from Slaughter-block (6)
Day of Reckoning, Binding Bones (3)	Has No Father, Mother among Men (5)
Does Not Cry out (5)	Has Power through (Children of) Horus (3)
Does Not Lack (9)	Has Warm Bread (<i>t srf</i>) (4)
Door Bolts Opened (<i>nhbbh, wn z</i>) (5)	Heart Brought, Given (4)
Doors Which Exclude (6)	Herdsmen Attend (5)
Efflux Be Yours (4)	Himself Collects Body (<i>s3q</i>) (7)
Embraces Gods, Everything (3)	Himself Draws (<i>inq</i>) Bones Together (6)
Embraces Horus (3)	His Purification Is That of Gods (5)
Enduring Eye (3)	Horus Assembles Gods (4)
Enemies Brought, Given by Horus (6)	Horus Causes to Arise (3)
Enemies Brought, Given by Other (3)	Horus Fills (5)
Enters into Protection (3)	Horus Makes Gods Ascend to (3)
Exhorted to Beware (4)	Horus Offers (<i>rdi</i>) (12)
Exhorted to Maintain Enemy (6)	Horus (Priest) Gives Heart or Hearts (4)
Exhorted to Maintain Item (3)	Horus Protects (<i>hwi</i>) (3)
Eye, Crown Wrested away (7)	Horus Reckons (5)
Eye of Horus Filled (3)	Horus Saves (<i>nd</i>) (17)
Eye of Horus Joined to (5)	Horus Smites Enemy (6)
Eye of Horus Returns (5)	Horus Who Smites, Drowns, Destroys (3)
Eye of Horus Tasted (3)	In His, Your Name of God (7)
Eye of Horus Torn out (<i>ith</i>) (5)	In Name of Horizon of Re (4)
Eye of Horus, Your Pat-cake (3)	Is among Akhs (5)
Eyes Opened (9)	Is Appeared as Wepiu, Geb, Jackal (7)
Face Is Brightened (4)	Is Arisen to Seth (4)
Face Knit Together (4)	Is Around Haunebu (3)
Fear (<i>s^c.t</i>) Inspiring (6)	Is Ba Foremost of Living (4)
Festival Performed for (6)	Is before Gods (6)
Fetters Released (11)	Is Beloved of Horus (4)

- Is Beloved of Isis (3)
 Is Clothed (*db3*) with Cloth (3)
 Is Clothed with/by Tait (5)
 Is Cool (3)
 Is Drawn Together (*dmd, i^cb, inq*) by God (9)
 Is Father of Horus (6)
 Is Foremost of (His) Ennead (7)
 Is God (by Verb *ntr*) (5)
 Is Great (*wrr*) (Exhortation) (3)
 Is Greatest of Nut's Children (4)
 Is Herdsman (5)
 Is Hidden of Place (4)
 Is His Father (*it=f*) (9)
 Is in/at God's Booth (4)
 Is Ka of (All) Gods (3)
 Is Ka of Horus (8)
 Is (Like) He Who Stands Tirelessly (3)
 Is (One Who Is) in Nedit (5)
 Is Osiris NN (202)
 Is Osiris (NN) (9)
 Is Power (4)
 Is Power before Living (3)
 Is (Power) before Powers (4)
 Is Power/Osiris Foremost of Akhs (4)
 Is Pure, Appeared at Festival (3)
 Is Raised (*tzi, ni*) (6)
 Is Round (3)
 Is Sacred (3)
 Is Satisfied with Eye (6)
 Is Satisfied with Offerings (6)
 Is Sleeper (*i.b3n*) (6)
 Is Sole Star (7)
 Is Successor of Osiris (3)
 Is upon Throne of Osiris (*hr ns.t wsr*) (3)
 Is Wepiu (6)
 Is Who Is in Henet (5)
 Is Who Is in His House (6)
 Isis, Nephthys Bring Heart (3)
 Isis, Nephthys Mourns (7)
 Isis, Nephthys Summons (18)
 Issues Commands to Hidden of Place (3)
 It Is Akh for (7)
 Knife Gone forth from Seth (3)
 Libation Instruction (3)
 Lifting Four Times (64)
 Lifting Instruction (3)
 Lifts up Sight (3)
 Lives (Exhortation) (18)
 Made an Akh (6)
 Made to Rise to Horus, Nut (5)
 Member Is Atum (4)
 Mourning Prevented/Ceased (6)
 Mouth Is Opened by Eye of Horus (8)
 Mouth Is Opened by Horus (5)
 Mouth Is Opened by Priest (1cs) (5)
 Natron Offering Direction (4)
 No Disturbance in (4)
 Not Rot, Decay, Stink (2nd Person) (3)
 Not to Be Distant (5)
 Nut as Shetpet (3)
 Nut Gives Heart (3)
 Nut Makes a God to Enemy (5)
 Nut, Mother Comes (3)
 Nut Protects (*hnm, sdh, hwi*) (9)
 Nut Spread over (4)
 Nuteknu Nullified (6)
 O! Hail! (3)
 Offering of the King, Geb, Anubis (11)
 Offerings Raised (3)
 Oh, Ah! (*hwi h3/3*) (7)
 Oil, Eye-paint, Cloth Offering Direction (8)
 Osiris Is Your Father (*it=k*) (6)
 Other at Place of Drowning through Horus (3)
 Other Cultivates Grain (8)
 Other Gone to, with (*hr, hn^c*) Ka (4)
 Other Put under (by Horus) (8)
 Other Saves (*nd*) (4)
 Others Not Distant from Benef (9)
 Paint Eye of Horus (3)
 Place in His Hand (3)
 Power in Body (5)
 Power over Gods (*sh^m m ntr.w*) (4)
 Powerful through Eye of Horus (3)
 Priest (1cs) Brings Eye of Horus (9)
 Priest (1cs) Gives Bread (5)
 Priest (1cs) Gives Offerings (7)
 Priest Is Horus (13)
 Priest Is Thoth (3)
 Primogeniture (3)
 Provided as God (*ntr*) (7)
 Provided with Eye of Horus (9)
 Provided with Flow (5)
 Putrefaction of Osiris (3)
 Quickens (Exhortation) (3)
 Raised from (Left) Side (9)
 Raises Self (Exhortation) (41)
 Receives Bread (7)
 Receives Staff, Crook, Flail (9)
 Rises (*swi r=k*) (Exhortation) (3)
 Royal, Divine Offering Direction (4)
 Scent, Air to Nostrils (5)
 Scent Diffused (*pd*) (5)
 See by Eye (7)
 See What Is Done (5)
 Service Performed (*shm*) for (3)
 Set on Right Side (7)
 Seth Acts against (Someone) (4)
 Sister Grasps Hold of (4)
 Sisters Come (7)
 Sisters Find (7)
 Sits before, beside Gods (Exhortation) (5)
 Sits (Exhortation) (4)
 Son, Heir upon Throne, Place (3)
 Spit of Horus, Seth (3)
 Staff before Living, Akhs, Stars (4)
 Structure Founded, Built for, Given to (3)

Take, Receive Efflux (5)	Was Smitten, Slain (<i>hwi, smʒ</i>) (5)
Take, Receive Head (7)	Water, Flood Be Yours (6)
Takes Flow (Exhortation) (5)	Water Gone forth (3)
Takes (<i>im</i>) Eye of Horus (105)	What Anubis Should Do for (3)
Takes (<i>im</i>) Water (4)	What Pertains Is Destroyed, Ceases (3)
Takes (Miscellaneous) Eye of Horus (13)	What Went forth from Osiris (10)
Throw off Dust, Sand, Earth (11)	White Eye of Horus (4)
Vegetable Offering Direction (6)	Without Cease for Ever (3)
Vocative to (<i>hʒ</i>) (83)	Your Going Is by Horus (3)
Vocative to Horus Who Is in Osiris NN (5)	Your Thousands of (Thing) (8)
Vocative to (<i>iʒ</i>) (6)	Zizyphus Bows, Turns Head to (3)
Voice, Words Go forth to (6)	

None of these motifs is displayed by any of the members of the core personal set. But that does not mean they are not found in texts which have not yet been assigned. Indeed, based on the possession of these motifs, one is in a position to associate an unassigned text with the sacerdotal category. When coupled with membership in a recurring series alongside the core sacerdotal texts, such an identification is especially strong. After performing a similar operation with the core assemblage of personal motifs, to be developed momentarily, it will turn out that only seven of the 234 core sacerdotal motifs are ever found in a personal text.⁷⁰⁰

4. *Personal Texts*

There are not nearly as many texts in the core personal set—only ninety-eight. This is in large part due to the program of modification. The core set includes only those texts with clear signs of editing away from the first-person beneficiary and those retaining the first throughout, though without a doubt many other personal texts are concealed by complete editing. The practical impact of this detail is that, all other things being equal, there will necessarily be fewer motifs among the core set of personal texts than were found in the sacerdotal one: all else equal, statistically there are more opportunities for the members of the sacerdotal core to display connections between themselves.

In awareness of this difference, the assemblage of core personal motifs will include all instances that are shared by at least two texts of the core personal set. Again they must not be found among any of the core sacerdotal texts. According to this rule, 124 different motifs are especially distinctive to the personal category. Altogether, they are found distributed among eighty-two texts of the core personal set. Thus, nearly all of the core personal texts are related to one another by especially distinctive content. They display numerous stock statements and sentiments which are particular to them. As to the sixteen which do not share such linkages,⁷⁰¹ only five are not actually attested in one of the recurring series assumed to be homogeneous.⁷⁰² That leaves only 5% of the core set without a distinctive connection to the others besides structure of performance.

The motifs they bear are the warp from which the identity of the Pyramid Texts was woven. In their order of frequency, they concern addresses by the beneficiary to hostile

⁷⁰⁰ The personal texts are PT 308, 340, 385, 387, 516, 538, and 582. See Listing Four, under the motifs 'Action Instruction (Miscellaneous)' (ultimately 11 sacerdotal texts to 1 personal), 'Great One Is Fallen' (4 to 1), 'Horus Smites Enemy' (9 to 2), 'Is Herdsman' (7 to 1), 'Is among Akhs' (6 to 1), 'Power in Body' (6 to 1), and 'Voice, Words Go forth to' (10 to 1).

⁷⁰¹ PT 284, 333, 362, 471, sPT 491B, 502E, 502H, PT 511, 521, 527–528, 562, 574, sPT 625B, PT 626, and sPT 1025. Later on further motifs particular to personal texts will be identified, and many of these will be seen to possess them.

⁷⁰² The five are PT 333, 362, sPT 491B, PT 511, and sPT 625B.

serpents (10 texts), addresses to ferrymen and gatekeepers (8 texts), the bestowal of reed-boats to third parties (7 texts) and to the beneficiary himself (6 texts), the involvement of divine personages upon their staves (6 texts), the beneficial involvement of the wings of Thoth or Seth (6 texts), the beneficiary's adornment of his throne in the bark of the sun god (5 texts), his being true of voice (5 texts), the text owner's identity as the fourth of four gods (5 texts),⁷⁰³ and so on in a network of semantic associations permeating nearly all members of the core personal set. These motifs also distinguish the personal texts from the core sacerdotal ones, since the latter have none of them.

The following summarizes each of the core personal motifs in alphabetical order according to their English labels, giving the number of core personal texts bearing it in parentheses:

Adores God (2)	Is a Noble (2)
Adorn Throne in Bark (5)	Is a Pure One (2)
Announced to Nehebkau (2)	Is at Prow (2)
Anointed by God's Anointing (2)	Is Belted (<i>št</i>) as Horus (4)
Arises at Place (3)	Is Bound for God (2)
Ascends from/upon Thighs (2)	Is Conceived to Re (2)
Attacks (<i>ikt</i>) Enemy (3)	Is Conveyed (<i>sd</i>) (2)
Atum/Shu Takes (<i>šdt</i>) out (to sky) (2)	Is for Sky (4)
Behold, Is Ascended (2)	Is Fourth of Four Gods (5)
Belly of Nut (2)	Is in Chemmis (2)
Boat Assembled (3)	Is in Egg (2)
Born before Sky, Earth, Discord Exist (2)	Is Not against King (3)
Comes from, out of Buto (2)	Is Not Burned (2)
Does Not Forget (4)	Is Not Hindered (<i>šnt</i> , <i>sšnt</i> , <i>hsb</i>) (2)
Doors, Sky Opened to Other (4)	Is Not Stranded (<i>iwt</i>) (2)
Drinks What Gods Drinks (2)	Is Not Weak, Feeble (2)
Earth Is Opened (2)	Is Protected (<i>mk</i>) (2)
Eats of What You Eat (2)	Is Protected (<i>nhy</i> , <i>sn</i>) (2)
Embalmed (2)	Is Scribe (2)
Enemy Exhorted to Go (3)	Is Served (<i>hnt</i>) (2)
Enemy Turns back (Exhortation) (2)	Is Son of Re (Predication) (5)
Exhortation to Be Overturned (3)	Is Steering-oar (<i>hmw</i>) (2)
Eye Is His Strength (2)	Is Strong (<i>nht</i>) (2)
Fall, Lie Down, Slither away (2)	Is Summoned (2)
Ferryboat Which Ferries Gods/Akhs (2)	Item to Me (4)
Fighting, Disorder Ended (2)	Knows Other, Other's Name (4)
Finds Other in Way (2)	Knows Re (2)
God Awakens in Peace (4)	Land Not Free of (2)
Goes to Field of Offerings (3)	Libates (for God) (2)
Hand Raises up (2)	Limbs Are Imperishable Stars (2)
Has, Is Given Forked Staff (2)	Made to Rise (to Other) (2)
Has White Crown (<i>hdt</i>) (2)	Mythological Precedent: Osiris and Nut (2)
Has Writ of Re (2)	Nekhet Speaks (2)
Henu to Beneficiary and Ka (3)	Night-, Day-Bark Brings, Conveys (2)
Himself Does Henu-gesture (2)	Not Rot, Decay (3rd Person) (3)
Himself Opens Doors, Sky (2)	Number above, below (2)
Horns Are Grasped (2)	Offspring is Morning God (4)
Hungers (3)	Other Commends to God (4)
I Am NN (<i>ink NN</i>) (4)	Other Crosses to God (4)
Injury (<i>it</i>) Dealt (2)	Other Exhorted to Beware (2)

⁷⁰³ See Listing Four, under the motifs 'Vocative to Serpent,' 'Vocative to Ferryman, Gatekeeper,' 'Reed-Boats Given to Other,' 'Reed-Boats Given,' 'Those upon Their Staves,' 'Adorn Throne in Bark,' 'True of Voice,' 'Wing of Thoth/Seth,' and 'Is Fourth of Four Gods.'

Other Flies (3)	Sister is Sothis (4)
Other Informed (<i>wḏb ib</i>) Concerning Him (2)	Speaks against Inimical Being (2)
Other Is Burned (2)	Taken to Field of Offerings (2)
Performs <i>stp z3</i> for Re (3)	Takes Self away (3)
Place is Broad (2)	Those upon Their Staves (6)
Plowing of Land (Enter Earth) (2)	Threat (2)
Possession of Magic (2)	Travels (<i>sdB</i>) (3)
Raises Self (Not Exhortation) (2)	True of Voice (5)
Re Commends to God (4)	Vocative to Butler (<i>wḏpw</i>) (2)
Re Gives Hand to (3)	Vocative to Ferryman, Gatekeeper (8)
Re, Thoth Takes (to sky) (3)	Vocative to God (<i>ntr</i>) (2)
Reaches (<i>ph</i>) Sky, Height (2)	Vocative to Gods of Cardinal Points (2)
Reed-Boats Given (6)	Vocative to Hepatj, Hepaf, Heneni (2)
Reed-Boats Given to Other (7)	Vocative to Inimical Being (Not Serpent) (4)
Rises (<i>šwi</i>) (4)	Vocative to Men (3)
Rows Re (3)	Vocative to Morning God (2)
Sails (<i>sqḏi</i>) (2)	Vocative to Nu (2)
Sees Re (2)	Vocative to Providers (4)
Serpent Attacked (2)	Vocative to Serpent (10)
Seth Escapes, Rejects Death (2)	Vocative to Those in the Netherworld (2)
Shank and Roast (2)	Water Poured (<i>ḥb3 mw</i>) (2)
Sight of God Opened (<i>wn hr</i>) (2)	Wing of Thoth/Seth (6)

None of these motifs is displayed by any of the core sacerdotal texts, but they are found among texts which have not yet been assigned—those strictly in the third person or not mentioning the beneficiary, and those with only ambiguous signs of editing. Based on their possession of one of these motifs, the unassigned ones can be associated with the personal category. When coupled with membership in one of the recurring series presumed to homogeneously consist of personal texts, the identifications are especially strong. When a parallel operation will have likewise been done with the core sacerdotal motifs, it will turn out that only three of the 124 core personal motifs are ever found in a sacerdotal text.⁷⁰⁴

G. The Sacerdotal and Personal Categories as Discourse Genres

If one were to begin with a corpus such as the Middle Kingdom mortuary literature, several texts would be found where the text owner (almost universally the beneficiary, as in the pyramids) is situated among the various exemplars in every grammatical person.⁷⁰⁵ A case in point is the text most frequently attested in the Middle Kingdom, CT 335. Exemplars bearing it situate him or her in the first, second, and third persons alike. Take the following passage:

CT 335 IV 186/7b

B9C *ink rḥ m ḥḥ.w=f tp*i*w*
I was Re at his first appearances.

Sq4Sq *nl[k] rḥ m ḥḥ.w[=f] tp(i)w*
You were Re at his first appearances.

B3C *NN tn rḥ m ḥḥ.w=f tp(i)w*
NN was Re at his first appearances.

⁷⁰⁴ See Listing Four, under the motifs ‘Belly of Nut’ (ultimately 4 personal texts to 1 sacerdotal), ‘God Awakens in Peace’ (ultimately 4 to 1), and ‘Is Son of Re (Predication)’ (ultimately 5 to 1).

⁷⁰⁵ In addition to CT 335, see for instance CT 51, 165, 167, 173, 271, 281, 359, 490, 831, and 906.

If one were to begin here with inquiries into the relationship between the person of the beneficiary and propositional content, the first impression would be that there is none. Perhaps the inquiries would end very quickly, leaving person aside in determining genre and the setting in life of the rites represented by the texts. These things would have to be achieved by other means. Synchronically examining only evidence like the deviations between exemplars of CT 335, one could well be led inexorably to Gérard Genette's bold assertion,⁷⁰⁶ that poetical *lexis*, the situation of enunciating—reflected at the start in grammatical person—has little to do with genre. This is a point raised in Chapter One;⁷⁰⁷ it is the premise of the notion that grammatical person does not point toward the manner in which a text was performed.

Genette's position, at least, is an arch-structuralist one, focused on the properties of speech as reflected in the suprasensible structure of language, *langue*. It occupies a place where manifest language, discourse, is generated by an idealized and systematic architecture derived from or in close relation with the semantic content of words as such; by his position, meaning is generated through the relationships between linguistic signs rather than by its application in practical situations or in reflecting reality. It is created through systems of opposition and difference within itself.

The hurdle to these ideas is in genre's ontological position: texts are always fixtures in social space, and they are generated by people working within that space.⁷⁰⁸ That is the terrain of *parole*, where language has social as well as linguistic meaning.⁷⁰⁹ Those concerns are effectively off-limits to structuralism. To reduce the problem to a pair of clauses: *langue* lacks a subject; the question "Who is speaking?" does not apply to it.⁷¹⁰ As an exponent of structuralism, in his inquiries Genette must negate the possibility of a genuine consideration of situation of deployment, the human space in which a text is produced. And, making no genuine recourse to language architecture, he goes over to semantics. For him genre, the architext, must reside strictly in propositional content, in the lexical meaning of verbs, nouns, and so forth.⁷¹¹

But "utterances are part of social projects, not merely vehicles for expressing thoughts," according to William Hanks.⁷¹² The domain of language-in-use encompasses the field formerly called rhetoric, and the minimal level of analysis within it is the identification of the participants involved in a speech act and their socially determined relationships to it. To the extent "that certain forms of language code indexical-referential categories, their meaningfulness in propositional terms cannot be identified independent of some specification of the context in which the forms are uttered," according to Michael Silverstein. He continues,

⁷⁰⁶ See the reference above at n. 111.

⁷⁰⁷ See the references above at n. 117.

⁷⁰⁸ It is due to genre's social position that the seminal discourse of genre, that found in Plato's *Republic*, was broached in the context of political philosophy, as observed by Selden 1994, p. 39: ancient genres originated in recurrent, real-world situations, and their institutionalization therefore helped construct a foundation for social authority. On genre and social order, see further Briggs and Bauman 1992, p. 160.

⁷⁰⁹ For the contrast drawn here, cf. Bauman and Briggs 1990, pp. 78–79.

⁷¹⁰ Ricoeur 1971, pp. 530–531; a parallel tension is at play between Chomskyan bias toward competence at the expense of performance.

⁷¹¹ Cf. Selden 1994, p. 39: there are differences in genre—in particular, the genre of Greek productions—at every level of discourse: the pragmatic, syntactic, and semantic.

⁷¹² Hanks 1996, p. 168. The seminal work which stimulated this approach is Austin 1962; for references to foundational works appearing thereafter and critical modulations of it, see Bauman and Briggs 1990, pp. 62 and 64–65. For an approach in contrast to the one taken here, where instead written language is taken as a representation of thought and not as a social production, see Hays 2004, p. 176 n. 10, and cf. Silverstein 1979, p. 196, and further the discussions of Rousseau and Derrida on this subject at Ong 1982, pp. 166–167. For yet another position on writing, see Jespersen and Reintges 2008, where it is sought to show that all the elements of the hieroglyphic script—including non-phonetic determinatives—are derived from speech, not thought.

To the extent that we can give rules that tell us the regularities of indexical reference-and-predication, this will involve some theory of kinds of recurrent contextual conditions. For example, the social role of speaker, independent of what individual speaks an utterance, is the minimum recurrent contextual feature necessary to define the propositional contribution of the English class of indexical forms of I/me.⁷¹³

The meaning of a particular pronoun is necessarily related to its situation of deployment. From that, it follows that the selection of the grammatical form of a pronoun is localized in the region of *parole*. And so the bond between person and situation cannot be legitimately negated out of hand. As the grammatical morphology of indexical forms is dependent on the persons involved in statements and their circumstances of utterance, and as the meaning of a text is in part dependent on its indexical forms, it is after all necessary to connect a text to its situation of utterance, including reference to pronouns, *pace* Genette.

Inasmuch as genre is a function of common textual morphologies, then their commonality is the result of habituated manners of expression, and their location must include consideration of patterns of indexical reference. By Silverstein, “Dialectically produced, such higher-order indexical forms frequently become little detachable design elements for text building that are, in essence, ready-made texts or text-chunks.”⁷¹⁴ Habituated patterns of the usage of deictic forms can be a foundational element in the construction of discourse genres. And this chapter has just demonstrated this to be the case with the Pyramid Texts. Person is a feature of genre with them.

Social context is also something key in assessing entextualization, since the process of transcription must (by definition) involve a change of context. And the texts new to the Middle Kingdom mortuary literature were not synchronically generated in a vacuum. Elsewhere it has been shown that the new Middle Kingdom material possessed genetic links to the texts first attested in the Old Kingdom, the Pyramid Texts: the authors of the Middle Kingdom were steeped in the earlier material and drew heavily from it.⁷¹⁵ That is far from saying that there are no differences. One of them may be perceived in seemingly defiant exemplars such as those of CT 335. But it is important to recall that the period in which they were produced is temporally bookended. For the Old Kingdom, it has been seen above that there was a pattern of modification in which originally first-person texts were converted away from that to the third, and sometimes to the second as well. At the other end of the spectrum, in the New Kingdom Book of the Dead, a diametrically opposite tendency has been elsewhere observed—to convert texts over to the first person, and thus away even from such prior forms as the second.⁷¹⁶ Temporally, the Middle Kingdom mortuary literature lies between these two opposed patterns of treatment. It was precisely between the two poles that customs changed, and it is due to on-going changes in custom that different practices of entextualization can be evinced among different exemplars of the same text, for instance CT 335.

In all three periods, the modifications performed on them were processes of entextualization, adaptations to other roles apart from their prior settings in life. These patterns must

⁷¹³ Silverstein 1979, p. 205. Cf. Bourdieu 1977a, p. 648, in respect to the obligation of an “adequate science of discourse” to “establish the laws which determine who (*de facto* and *de jure*) may speak, to whom, and how”; with Bourdieu it is more broadly a question of social role coupled with authorization: it is a matter of who can legitimately be an I.

⁷¹⁴ Silverstein 1998, pp. 129–130.

⁷¹⁵ This point is drawn out in a tactile way at Hays 2004 and Hays 2007.

⁷¹⁶ For references, see above at n. 289. Servajean 2003, p. 9, mistakenly represents the history of shift in deictic preference in the mortuary literature as a “transition du *il* au *je*, commence avec les Textes des Pyramides, en cours avec les Textes des Sarcophages, achevée avec le Livre des Morts.” As shown in this work, it was a shift from *je* to *il* within the Pyramid Texts themselves, and, as is shown in the references indicated at n. 289, in the New Kingdom there are even instances of shifts from *tu* to *je*.

be investigated source by source, and provenance by provenance. It was local practice in the form of editing that generated the discrepancies between the sources, and not a prior disengagement of a ritual text's indexical features from its setting of performance in the world where text was 'originally' manifest in recited script. In short, the profound exemplar disagreements evinced in texts like CT 335 are to be attributed not to total freedom in ritual practice in respect to the pronominal forms that could be used, but to changing traditions in how ritual scripts were entextualized to non-performed, monumental media.

As content, transmission, and performance structure have been shown to converge in the Pyramid Texts, it is clear that they were not generated along the axis of propositional content alone. Their discourse did not occupy the space of isolated, speculative denotation. Rather, their production was a function of semantic content, performance structure, and context of deployment, with these dimensions inextricably interwoven. They were composed to reside in the environment of the interactional event. The aspects of performance structure and context of transmission are shadows of the settings in which the texts were to be used, and certain kinds of statements were appropriately said in one and not the other.

Where one deals with a language terrain governed by systems of difference, by regularities of division and dispersion, then one is dealing with a discursive formation.⁷¹⁷ The morphological distinctions drawn within the Pyramid Texts, and forming the features of its two component genres, follow the fault-lines of the discourse's rules of formation: mode of statement, conceptual and thematic choice, and environmental conditions of existence. By these measures, what has just been done was to sketch the outlines for an archaeology of knowledge of ancient Egyptian mortuary literature by person, motif, and transmission. The preceding has not sought to define the theology of the representations or to reconstruct what mythology might have informed the presentations, but to define the limits of the discursive body within itself, and to show that it was constrained by certain rules.⁷¹⁸

But, in practice, what is not absolute is the governance of these rules, no more so here than with other bodies of literature. The strength of association between any given text and the rest of the members of its category, its genre, is not uniform. That is precisely because they all belonged to a single discursive formation, surviving to us in part in the Pyramid Texts, the monumental texts as transcribed artefacts, and it was due to this cultural unity that they were inscribed in the same place, the crypt. But the more attributes a text shares with others, the more strongly it may be said to belong together with them; this is how human classification works.⁷¹⁹ Texts are not exemplars of biological species, reproduced by combination of genetic material from just two immediate sources, but are produced by human authors, who draw upon a finite but still vast body of materials.

To speak of genre as an object of taxonomy rather than production, it is a question of proximity to a conceptual or prototypical center, at which reside the texts which are quintessentially representative of it. Those at the center exhibit more of the features, while other texts of the same class share fewer. The farther one moves from the center, the more likely a text is to incorporate attributes of another class.

⁷¹⁷ Cf. Foucault 1972, pp. 37–38.

⁷¹⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 138.

⁷¹⁹ See Lakoff 1987, esp. pp. xii, 7, 95–96, and 103. The concept of centrality puts a prototypical member of a class at its center, which is in turn linked by sharing some of its attributes with other members, in turn linked to others less similar to the central member, and so forth—like links in a chain. By chaining, some members of a category will be less similar to the prototypical one at the center, and others more like it. Cf. the Wittgensteinian concept of 'family resemblances,' applied to the problem of genre for the past half-century; Fowler 1982, pp. 40–43.

The indeterminacy of a genre, inasmuch as it possesses edges which blur into other genres, is a problem which makes it impossible to hermetically divide the Pyramid Texts into autonomous parts. That does not mean it is methodologically forbidden to point out concrete associations like those which have been made above. On the contrary, without tactile knowledge of the divisions, the dynamics of the textual economy—the coin of which was content, form, and context—cannot be perceived. Thus, an awareness of the fuzzy edges of natural categories impels one to move out from the center and toward the boundaries in an effort to find them. While it is methodologically useful to begin with attributes restrictively constitutive of one core set versus the other, it is also important to incorporate those which draw texts away from the prototypical center, toward its periphery, and above all toward but not fully into the opposing category.

Accordingly the next step to be taken is to expand the core categories by admitting to them texts which possess characteristics shared by both. Chief of these are texts which are attested only in the third person, as it has been shown that this neutral format can be found in either category, and moreover it was into this format that personal texts were generally converted. The step thereafter is to expand the motifs particular to the categories, by including those which are predominantly found in one but nevertheless sometimes make an appearance in the other. The core motifs together with the others can be called ‘typological motifs’ since they point to the classification of the texts—bearing in mind that the classification is based on divisions emic to the material itself.

H. *Expansion of Identifications*

That means it is now the occasion to complete the identifications of sacerdotal and personal texts. The methodology to be followed has been signaled and argued above, and so this portion of the discussion will be performed expeditiously.

1. *Further Sacerdotal Texts and Sacerdotal Motifs*

a. *Further Sacerdotal Texts*

Recurring series containing one or more members of the core sacerdotal set but no texts from the core personal set, and no other texts with any signs of editing, can be assumed to homogeneously consist of more sacerdotal texts. There are ninety-eight series like this,⁷²⁰ and they contain an additional thirty-nine texts. Twenty-three of the additional texts have at least one of the core sacerdotal motifs.⁷²¹ All necessarily place the beneficiary in the third person or make no mention of him:

PT 23–24	fPT 71I	PT 443–444	PT 631
PT 50	PT 77	PT 448	PT 650
fPT 57A	PT 81–83	PT 465	fPT 754
fPT 57D	PT 216–220	PT 560	sPT 1007
fPT 57F–G	PT 418	PT 587	N 306+11–14
fPT 71F	PT 427–434	PT 592	

⁷²⁰ Namely Sequences 2–6, 15–16, 20, 23–30, 37–40, 41, 43–44, 46–47, 88, 91, 94–97, 101, 121–123, 135, 138, 151–152, and 154; and Subsequences 3–8, 11, 14, 18–20, 22–27, 44–46, 51–61, 75–79, 82–84, 87–89, 92–93, 105, 143, 148–150, 156–157, 174–177, 179–180, and 200.

⁷²¹ The sixteen which do not are fPT 57D, 57F–G, 71I, PT 217, 418, 430, 432–433, 443–444, 465, 560, 631, fPT 754, and sPT 1007.

Independently of membership in a recurring series, texts strictly in the third person or making no mention of the beneficiary can be cross-referenced against the core sacerdotal motifs. This time texts with ambiguous signs of editing as well as the texts identified as personal services will also be consulted. Doing so yields sixty-nine identifications, and, again, twenty-three of these are attested in one of the ninety-eight recurring series noted a moment ago:

PT 14	PT 431	PT 546	PT 670
PT 17	PT 434	PT 548	PT 679
PT 23–24	PT 442	PT 577	PT 686
PT 50	PT 448	PT 580	fPT 691B
fPT 57A	PT 456	PT 587	PT 697
fPT 57F	PT 463	PT 592	sPT 1006
PT 77	PT 466	PT 598–602	sPT 1015
PT 81–83	PT 477	PT 606	sPT 1019
PT 200	PT 483	PT 633	sPT 1056
PT 216	PT 487	PT 640	sPT 1058
PT 218–220	PT 512	PT 642	N 306+11–14
PT 415–416	PT 532	PT 644	CT 530
PT 419	PT 540–542	PT 650	CT 862
PT 427–429	PT 544	PT 659	

Earlier, fifteen sacerdotal texts were identified as personal services to deities and were excluded from consideration in the determination of the core sacerdotal motifs. It has turned out that twelve of them possess one or more of these: PT 456, 477, 483, 487, 512, 532, 540, 577, 606, 670, fPT 691B, and sPT 1058. The remaining four texts already identified as personal services will be attributed to the category after loosening the rules for the identification of typological motifs.

It was also stated that three texts showing ambiguous signs of editing will eventually be best understood as personal services as well, and that they are sacerdotal texts. The last aspect of this attribution is supportable at this moment, with PT 466, 679, and 697. Finally, there are four other texts showing ambiguous signs of edited person that are assigned to the sacerdotal category on the basis of their possession of core motifs: PT 419, 442, 463, and 659. As a postscript, CT 530 and CT 862, which are attested in fragmentary states in the pyramids, are now attributed to the sacerdotal category based on their content as displayed in later exemplars. One of them, CT 530, is found in two short series with PT 25, and these may also now be included in the homogeneous set of series.⁷²²

Altogether, at this point 487 texts have been determined to belong to the sacerdotal category.

After performing a parallel cross-referencing for homogeneous personal series and core personal motifs, two conflicts will emerge. Their attribution to the sacerdotal category rests on their stronger associations with it. The third-person PT 81 does have the core personal motif ‘God Awakens in Peace,’ but against that it has two core sacerdotal motifs, ‘Is Osiris (NN)’ and ‘Oil, Eye-paint, Cloth Offering Direction,’ and it is found in twelve series understood to homogeneously consist of sacerdotal texts.⁷²³ Even though PT 430 displays the core personal motif ‘Belly of Nut,’ it is attested in eight sacerdotal series.⁷²⁴ The repeated context of deployment suggests its association.

⁷²² Sequences 9 and 158.

⁷²³ Sequences 25, and 27–30; and Subsequences 53, 55, and 57–61.

⁷²⁴ Sequences 91, 94, 97, and 121; and Subsequences 143, 156, and 176–177.

Texts are not biological species. The incorporation of otherwise alien motifs into these texts can be interpreted in several ways. From an intertextual point of view, they make some reference to ideas more typically particular to the personal category. These references constitute openings out of their own genre to another, not violating the significance of their contexts of deployment but pointing out from one setting to elsewhere. That the motifs in question are contrastive in isolated cases does not negate the method employed in their assignment. On the contrary, it is only through the identifications of the divisions that the transgressions become perceptible, and through that the individual genius of the texts bearing them becomes more tangible.

Having made observance of the exceptions—which are statistically quite rare—it is important to reiterate what has been shown above. Different avenues of analysis converge. The categories were established on the basis of grammatical person, correlations were found between the categories and their ancient patterns of association, and correlations were found between the categories and content. The convergence of three different avenues of analysis shows that the identification of the categories was after all the identification of an emic dichotomy. Person is related to transmission and content because the texts were generated in the context of different modes of human action, where different things were appropriate to each. But though it has been shown that there is an empirical dependence between different kinds of data, it is still the case that we do not expect the divisions between the categories to be absolute—especially in regard to their propositional content. Texts are human products, and though genre must follow rules, it also seeks to subvert them in the act of genius.

b. *Further Sacerdotal Motifs and Yet Further Texts*

Having expanded the category to include more sacerdotal texts, there is occasion now to once more cross-reference it against motifs, and in this way to expand our knowledge of the genre's characteristic propositional content. As texts are not hermetically sealed off from one another, neither are the two categories, as the cases of PT 81 and PT 430 show. To account for the rare use of statements in one category more particular to another, the rules must be relaxed.

The total set of typological motifs appropriate to sacerdotal texts will thus consist of the core motifs, together with motifs found in a ratio of four-to-one or higher. That means at least four times as many sacerdotal texts must possess a certain kind of statement for it to be considered distinctive. Naturally, this is an arbitrary, digital criterion. The evidence itself is analog in nature. Shared content of lower ratios, down to anything slightly over one-to-one⁷²⁵ could be deemed distinctive. But the cut-off is made as much out of expedience as clarity in the context of the present purpose.

Now, one could attempt to frame an argument to the effect that, since there are indeed motifs in equal distribution between the two categories, it really must be that the divisions perceived here are somehow artificial. And, to be sure, relative to that datum alone, they would seem artificial. But that datum does not exist in a vacuum: there are merely thirty-three out of 1,476 motifs in the Pyramid Texts which show a nearly even balance of distribution.⁷²⁶ The propositional content of the Pyramid Texts is not at all indiscriminately

⁷²⁵ More precisely, 1.6 sacerdotal texts to 1 personal text. See the following note.

⁷²⁶ This calculation is based on a normalization for the total sets of texts to eventually be assigned to the sacerdotal and personal categories, thus 494 to 313 respectively. It means that, to be in precisely equal distribution, a motif must appear in a ratio of 1.6 sacerdotal texts to 1 personal text. But my calculation has added a slight

distributed. It is most definitely biased and is in conjunction with the other empirical measures, as has been repeatedly shown.

Still, in expanding the scope of identification through including motifs found concentrated in one category—but still infrequently in the opposing one—a consequence will obviously be that some texts will be found to possess content particular to both categories. Indeed, there will ultimately be 123 texts with motifs of both kinds. Thus it is necessary to keep in mind the relative weight of the texts' characteristics. A clear sign of editing away from the first person is a very strong trait, as is membership in a homogeneous recurring series. Next is the possession of core motifs, since these by definition are exceptionally restrictive in deployment. And the secondary motifs come last in strength of association, simply by virtue of their capacity to appear in both categories. Out of the 123 texts which will turn out to bear both kinds of motifs, there will actually be only seven which do not otherwise possess one of the stronger indications.⁷²⁷ In my opinion, that is a remarkably low proportion.

Having made clear that this next step will not violate the integrity of the results, the set of typological motifs for the sacerdotal category will now be extended by the criteria stated a moment ago. There are ninety-seven more to be added, and they are distributed among 446 of the 487 texts which have so far been assigned to the category. In the forty-one texts of the difference, thirty-one nevertheless display a core sacerdotal motif. That leaves ten texts with only non-semantic connections to the category.⁷²⁸

The following lists the additional motifs and the number of texts bearing them, with sacerdotal texts counted first versus personal texts second.

Akh before/more than Akhs (7 vs. 1)	Given Eye of Horus (32 vs. 1)
Announced to Re, Harakhti, Horus (8 vs. 1)	Given Eyes (Dual) (6 vs. 1)
Arises, Stands (Exhortation) (40 vs. 1)	God Satisfied upon (4 vs. 0)
Ascends, Descends as Morning God, Star (4 vs. 1)	Gods Brought, Given by Horus (12 vs. 1)
Ascends (<i>pri</i>) (Exhortation) (17 vs. 2)	Gods Brought, Given by Other (4 vs. 0)
At Great Stair (8 vs. 1)	Goes (<i>zi</i> , <i>zkr</i>) (Exhortation) (6 vs. 1)
Atum on High (4 vs. 0)	Going forth from the Mouth (7 vs. 1)
Awakens (15 vs. 1)	Has Eye of Horus in Brow (5 vs. 0)
Bathes Self (5 vs. 1)	Has Jackal-face (12 vs. 3)
Before Living (4 vs. 1)	Has Wereret-crown (15 vs. 3)
Body Bound up (<i>tz</i>) (6 vs. 1)	Horus Comes (30 vs. 1)
Body Collected (<i>s3q</i>) (5 vs. 1)	Horus Finds (4 vs. 1)
Children of Horus Set out (<i>iz3</i>) Bearing Him (4 vs. 0)	Horus Raises up (4 vs. 1)
Comes (Exhortation) (13 vs. 2)	Horus Seeks Osiris (8 vs. 1)
Does Not Suffer (6 vs. 1)	Ihi-exclamation (4 vs. 1)
Doors of Earth, Geb, Aker Opened (4 vs. 0)	In His, Your Name of (34 vs. 2)
Eats Sethian Part (4 vs. 0)	In Other's Name of (26 vs. 6)
Embraced by Atum (5 vs. 0)	Is Akh in the Horizon (7 vs. 1)
Enemy Raises up (9 vs. 1)	Is Anubis (18 vs. 2)
Eye Gone forth from His Head (4 vs. 0)	Is Born/Conceived with/as Orion (4 vs. 0)
Eye of Horus in Brow of Horus (4 vs. 1)	Is Brushed/Dried (8 vs. 2)
Eye of Horus Nekhekh-*given (12 vs. 1)	Is Drawn Together (<i>dmd</i> , <i>ifb</i> , <i>inq</i>) by Goddess (9 vs. 1)
Geb Commands (4 vs. 0)	Is Greeted (<i>izw</i>) (8 vs. 2)
	Is Imperishable (6 vs. 1)

margin to actually increase the number of evenly distributed motifs in its report; in practice, it means that the ratio employed to yield the amount of 33 was 1.7 to 1.5 sacerdotal texts to 1 personal text.

⁷²⁷ They are PT 323, 421, sPT 502I, PT 682, sPT 692A, fPT 719, and sPT 1047.

⁷²⁸ PT 554 (switching), PT 560 (membership in recurring series), PT 614 (second person), PT 632 (second person), PT 671 (second person and recurring series), sPT 1002 (second person and recurring series), sPT 1007 (recurring series), sPT 1011 (second person), sPT 1059 (second person), and sPT 1062 (switching).

Is Jackal (10 vs. 1)	Officiant Establishes (4 vs. 1)
Is Khentimentiu (10 vs. 1)	Plural Priest (6 vs. 0)
Is Mourned (15 vs. 3)	Priest Is Geb (1cs) (5 vs. 1)
Is My Father (<i>it=i</i>) (32 vs. 2)	Priest Is Son (14 vs. 0)
Is Not Weaned (4 vs. 1)	Provided with Life (5 vs. 0)
Is Official (6 vs. 1)	Pure by, Receive Jars (8 vs. 2)
Is Osiris (Deity) (12 vs. 0)	Re Grasps, Receives Hand (4 vs. 1)
Is Osiris + Interpolated NN (18 vs. 1)	Recite Four Times (77 vs. 5)
Is Pure (Exhortation) (9 vs. 1)	Regalia Offering Direction (38 vs. 1)
Is Strong (<i>ph.ti</i>) (4 vs. 1)	Saved from Obstructor, Restrainer (4 vs. 1)
Issues Commands to Akhs (4 vs. 1)	Saves (<i>nd</i>) Self (5 vs. 1)
Issues Commands to Gods (<i>ntr.w</i>) (4 vs. 0)	Scent Is Sweet (5 vs. 1)
Jars Filled (<i>ch</i>) (4 vs. 1)	Scent Is toward (<i>r</i>) Him (13 vs. 1)
Judgment in House of the Noble (5 vs. 1)	Scent of Eye of Horus (14 vs. 2)
Libation (<i>qbhw</i>) (9 vs. 2)	Sit on Khened-Throne (22 vs. 3)
Libation (<i>z3t</i>) (5 vs. 0)	Stands before/among Gods (10 vs. 1)
Liquid Offering Direction (32 vs. 2)	Thoth Exhorted to Go (<i>zi</i>) (4 vs. 0)
Made to Come to Life (6 vs. 0)	Tomb, Sarcophagus Opened (7 vs. 1)
Maintain Own House, Gate (8 vs. 1)	Turns about (<i>hwi inni</i> , Exclamation) (5 vs. 1)
Meat Offering Direction (19 vs. 2)	Turns Self (<i>wdb, phr, mdr</i>) (5 vs. 1)
Mouth Is Opened (9 vs. 1)	Vocative to Children of Horus (4 vs. 1)
Mythological Precedent: Horus & Osiris (16 vs. 3)	Vocative to (<i>i.nd-hr=k</i>) (7 vs. 0)
None Depart (<i>hmi, psd</i>) (5 vs. 0)	Vocative to Isis (5 vs. 1)
Nut Has Power (6 vs. 0)	Vocative to Nephthys (6 vs. 1)
Object Direction (179 vs. 3)	Vocative to (No Particle) (284 vs. 9)

By means of the additional complement of motifs, one final pass may be made among the unassigned texts to find six further texts belonging to the category. PT 16, 18, and 60 may be associated in this way, as well as three texts previously identified as personal services to the god Osiris, sPT 561B, PT 579, and 581. An additional text, PT 445, can be attributed to the category due to its copresence together with two of the texts assigned above, PT 443–444, in Sequence 92, consisting of these three texts, all of which are in the third person.

c. *Summary of the Sacerdotal Category*

This brings the membership of the category to a grand total of 494. It turns out that, except for eleven,⁷²⁹ they all possess concrete links in semantic content annotated as 333 typological motifs. 402 of them situate the text owner as beneficiary strictly in the second person or switch between the second and third. 277 of them are transmitted together in 224 recurring series deemed to homogeneously consist of sacerdotal texts. All of the texts determined to belong to the category possess at least one connection in performance structure, fixed transmission, or propositional content with the others. These three criteria have been shown to be intertwined and are regarded as the salient characteristics of a genre of discourse in the discursive formation from which the Pyramid Texts were derived.

2. *Further Personal Texts and Personal Motifs*

The same procedure can be carried out to expand the category of personal texts and the motifs particular to it.

⁷²⁹ See the preceding note, and add to the list PT 445, mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

In addition to the nine series consisting exclusively of texts from the core personal set, it was noted that there are fifty-eight series of varying lengths with core texts alongside one or more strictly in the third person or making no mention of the text owner.⁷³⁰ As they contain none of the texts identified as sacerdotal, there is reason to regard them as homogeneous in composition. In addition to the fifty-two texts from the core personal set, the fifty-eight series yield an additional ninety-two personal texts:

PT 204–205	PT 277–280	PT 338–345	PT 525–526
PT 209–212	PT 285	PT 400	PT 529–531
PT 226	PT 288–295	PT 406	sPT 570B
PT 228–231	PT 297–298	PT 472	PT 575
PT 233–240	PT 300	PT 474–475	PT 582
PT 242–243	PT 301–302	PT 484	PT 624
PT 255–258	PT 304–305	PT 500	sPT 627A–B
PT 261	PT 307–310	sPT 502B	sPT 729B
PT 263	PT 326	sPT 502D	fPT 730–732
PT 267	PT 331	sPT 502F	
PT 272	PT 335	PT 516–518	

Sixty-six of these have at least one of the core personal motifs.⁷³¹

Independently of membership in a recurring series, texts strictly in the third person or making no mention of the beneficiary can be cross-referenced against the core personal motifs. This time texts with ambiguous signs of editing as well as the texts identified as personal services will also be consulted. Doing so yields 161 more identifications, and, again, sixty-six of these are attested in one of the recurring series noted above:

PT 205–206	PT 304	PT 474–475	PT 613
PT 210	PT 307	PT 478–480	PT 615–616
PT 212	PT 309–310	PT 493	sPT 655B
PT 226	PT 314–315	PT 500–501	PT 668
PT 229–230	PT 320–321	sPT 502A–B	PT 678
PT 233–238	PT 324–326	PT 514	PT 688–689
PT 240	PT 334	PT 516–518	fPT 691A
PT 242–243	PT 339	PT 520	hPT 694B
PT 248	PT 341	PT 522	fPT 704
PT 250–253	PT 344–345	PT 525–526	fPT 726–727
PT 255–259	PT 347–350	PT 529–531	sPT 729B
PT 263–265	PT 353	PT 538	fPT 730–732
PT 267	PT 360–361	PT 549–550	sPT 738B
PT 273–278	PT 363	PT 564	sPT 1035
PT 280	PT 375–380	PT 566	sPT 1037
PT 285	PT 382–393	sPT 570B	sPT 1046
PT 288–289	PT 395–406	PT 572	sPT 1048–1049
PT 291–294	PT 409	PT 575	CT 208
PT 297–298	PT 440	PT 583	
PT 300–302	PT 472	sPT 586D	

In fact, none of the fifteen texts so far determined to be personal services bears one of the core personal motifs. Altogether, to this point 285 texts have been determined to belong to the personal category.

⁷³⁰ See above at n. 674.

⁷³¹ The twenty-six which do not are PT 204, 209, 211, 228, 231, 239, 261, 272, 279, 290, 295, 305, 308, 331, 335, 338, 340, 342–343, 484, sPT 502D, 502F, PT 582, 624, and sPT 627A–B.

Having expanded the category to include more personal texts, they can be cross-referenced against content even beyond the core personal motifs so as to expand our knowledge of the genre's characteristic propositional content. Doing so will increase the size of the total set of typological motifs, to now consist of the core motifs together with motifs found in a ratio of four-to-one or higher. There are seventy-seven more to be added, and they are distributed among 217 of the 285 texts which have so far been assigned to the category. In the sixty-eight texts of the difference, fifty-nine nevertheless display a core personal motif. That leaves nine texts with only non-semantic connections to the category.⁷³²

The following lists the additional motifs and the number of texts bearing them, with personal texts counted first versus sacerdotal texts second.

Advances (<i>hnti</i>) (4 vs. 1)	Is Questioned (Non-rhetorical) (7 vs. 1)
Alights (4 vs. 1)	Is Sobek (4 vs. 0)
Ascends to (<i>pri r</i>) Sky (36 vs. 9)	Is Strong (<i>wst</i>) (4 vs. 0)
Bestows, Takes away Kas (4 vs. 1)	Is Uraeus, Falcon which Came forth (6 vs. 0)
Climbs (<i>hfd, b3d</i>) (4 vs. 1)	Is Young, a Youth (4 vs. 0)
Cobra for Sky (5 vs. 0)	It Is NN (13 vs. 1)
Comes to Addressee = Horus (4 vs. 0)	Ladder Is Set up (12 vs. 2)
Conceived at Night (5 vs. 0)	Lamp, Fire Lit (4 vs. 1)
Cross, Ferry (16 vs. 1)	Lives from What Gods Live (12 vs. 2)
Cross, Ferry to Horizon, Sky (16 vs. 2)	Mafdet Acts Violently for (8 vs. 0)
Does Not Eat, Drink Detestable (5 vs. 0)	Name Said to Re, Harakhti, Horus (6 vs. 0)
Eats of What Gods Eat (5 vs. 0)	<i>NN pw A</i> (88 vs. 5)
Eats Person (4 vs. 1)	Osiris Ascends (5 vs. 0)
Enemy Bound (<i>bi</i>) (4 vs. 0)	Other Is Bound (7 vs. 0)
Enemy Is Questioned (7 vs. 0)	Other (Not Eye of Horus) Trampled (<i>ti</i>) (4 vs. 0)
Enthroned, Throne Established (10 vs. 1)	Other Opens, Makes Way (13 vs. 2)
Fear (<i>sc.t</i>) at Side, before Him (4 vs. 0)	Other Removed from Place (4 vs. 1)
Ferryboat Brought (18 vs. 2)	Passes (<i>sw3</i>) (13 vs. 2)
Figs and Wine (4 vs. 1)	Pelican Is Fallen (4 vs. 0)
Flies (13 vs. 3)	Pure in the Field of Rushes (12 vs. 2)
Flourishes, Is Green (Predication) (9 vs. 1)	Re Appears (5 vs. 1)
Four Gods/Akhs Brought (5 vs. 0)	Re Crosses, Ferries (10 vs. 1)
Given Offerings by God (5 vs. 0)	Re Is Pure (6 vs. 1)
Go forth from Earth (4 vs. 1)	Reciprocal Violence (4 vs. 0)
God Gives Hand to (9 vs. 1)	Rises (<i>it</i>) (5 vs. 1)
Gods Witness Ascent (6 vs. 0)	Sees God (5 vs. 0)
Goes up to Sky on Ladder (6 vs. 1)	Serpent Is Fallen (4 vs. 0)
Hand of Beneficiary Comes against (5 vs. 0)	Seth's Testicles Seized, Lost, Injured (4 vs. 1)
Has Abundance (<i>3gbi</i>) (4 vs. 0)	Shu Lifts up (<i>3bi, s3wi</i>) (6 vs. 1)
His Place Made (4 vs. 1)	Sight Is Upon Another (11 vs. 0)
Horus Fallen (4 vs. 0)	Sit before, beside Gods (7 vs. 1)
Is Appeared (14 vs. 2)	Those Who Have Gone to Their Kas (4 vs. 1)
Is before, beside Re (9 vs. 2)	Turns about (<i>inni</i>) (4 vs. 0)
Is Bull (21 vs. 5)	Vocative to Horus (20 vs. 5)
Is Fiery (4 vs. 0)	Vocative to Ladder (4 vs. 0)
Is Flower, Plant (4 vs. 0)	Vocative to (Non-inimical) Bull (5 vs. 1)
Is Living One (4 vs. 0)	Vocative to Re (35 vs. 4)
Is Not Crossed (5 vs. 1)	Vocative to Stars (4 vs. 0)
Is Not Seized by Other (Non-Aker) (4 vs. 1)	

⁷³² PT 574 and sPT 625B by clear signs of editing and recurring series; PT 204, 231, 239, 340, 343, sPT 502D, and 502F by recurring series only.

By means of the additional complement of motifs, one final pass may be made among the unassigned texts to find twenty-eight further texts belonging to the personal category:

PT 249	PT 351–352	PT 607	sPT 738C
PT 313	PT 381	PT 683	sPT 739A
PT 316–319	PT 489	PT 702	fPT 740
PT 329	PT 533	fPT 725	sPT 1031–1032
PT 332	sPT 586B–586C	fPT 736–737	sPT 1041–1042

This brings the membership of the category to a grand total of 313. All but nine possess concrete links in propositional content annotated as 202 motifs. Ninety-eight of the texts show clear signs of editing the beneficiary away from a prior first person. 144 of them are transmitted together in sixty-seven recurring series deemed to homogeneously consist of personal texts. All of the texts determined to belong to the category possess at least one connection in performance structure, fixed transmission, or propositional content with the others. These three criteria have been shown to be intertwined and are regarded as the salient characteristics of a genre of discourse in the discursive formation from which the Pyramid Texts were derived.

I. *The Entextualization of the Pyramid Texts*

Prior to this study, the ‘prehistory’ of the Pyramid Texts had been taken as an apodictic point. It was generally believed that the discursive formation represented by the corpus had existed prior to its actual attestation in the pyramids.⁷³³ While the significance of this assumption has not heretofore been explored, the lines of investigation drawn in this and the previous chapter bear right upon it. The details make it possible to transform assumption into evidentially supported argument, and thus to move from belief to knowledge. More importantly, they elucidate the historical significance of the invention of the mortuary literature tradition.

In Chapter Two, it was observed that there was a single—and crucial—contextual connection between Pyramid Texts and contemporary evidence to give an indication of the roles played by the texts in the Egyptian world. Texts of Group A are directly connected with offering lists. These lists are attested prior to the Pyramid Texts, they are representations of mortuary service, and this service had its place of performance in above-ground cultic installations. According to the pictorial representations accompanying the lists, they represented a series of offering rites performed by priests on behalf of the dead, while the corresponding texts of Group A represented the recitative component of the rites. It therefore followed that texts of Group A had been transposed from a setting of human practice where they filled the role of scripts in cultic service, to become representations of that ritual in their monumental environment. There, they no longer served as supports to the performances of their origin. The ritual script had become a decontextualized expression of ritual.

In short, the texts of Group A were not composed with the purpose of decorating the tomb. This much is clear from their connection with contemporary evidence. It remains to infer the historical relationship between text and monument for the other texts in the pyramids. This can be achieved through consideration of uniformity of performance structure

⁷³³ For instance at J. Allen 1988, pp. 38–39 with nn. 2–3; Mathieu 1999, p. 15; and with great clarity *idem* 2002, pp. 188–189.

in Group A and through consideration of the pattern of editorial treatment carried out on the personal texts.

It turns out that the texts of Group A are entirely homogeneous in performance structure. There are 266 different texts in it, and all intact⁷³⁴ members have been identified as sacerdotal texts: 222 strictly in the second person, thirteen with switching, and the remainder in the third, with these last having been associated with the category based on transmission and content. For Group A, the situation of officiant-to-beneficiary is corroborated by the connection with the offering list's meaning; it is juxtaposed and expands on pictorial images of priests performing rites for the dead.

The sacerdotal category represents a distinct genre of discourse. It presupposes a particular situation of performance, namely one where an officiant acts for another personage, and it entails limitations on the kinds of statements said in it, for instance restrictions on phraseology. As the mortuary service represented by Group A was conducted in an above-ground setting, it follows that other texts in the pyramids presupposing the same manner of performance and employing the same kinds of statements likewise had their original situation outside of the tomb. In sum, as the texts of Group A had a prior situation of performance outside of the tomb in the sense of being performed by an officiant for a separate beneficiary, and as they uniformly belong to a single genre of discourse, it follows that other texts of this discourse genre shared the same, prior manner of execution.

That is not to say that all sacerdotal texts are members of cultic service. What it means is that the sacerdotal texts attested in the pyramids were not composed for the purpose of decorating tomb walls. Their basis for existence did not reside in architecture. They were derived from operative scripts to be read by officiants in religious performances done on behalf of others. They were secondarily adapted to a monumental purpose. The physically attested sacerdotal texts do *reflect* operative ritual scripts, but as attested they are neither the rituals themselves nor their supports. They are one step further removed than the source manuscripts from which they were transcribed.

The process of transferring a text from being a script for an aurally experienced spoken rite to becoming a visually experienced written word is an act of entextualization, and the procedure of transfer implies adaptation: decontextualization and recontextualization. The adaptation of a text to a new medium can affect—sometimes strongly—its form and content in its new environment, and consequently its meaning. As to the sacerdotal Pyramid Texts, a prevalent alteration was indeed to establish referentiality of the text owner, to replace the source manuscripts' *mn* "whoever" or *nī-sw.t* "king" to the proper name. These two terms were placeholders in the manuscripts, where it was expected to substitute the name of the text owner. But it must also be that this tailoring was done when the rites were spoken in their primary and original use. The establishment of reference must have been a part of the production of the text from operative manuscript to speech, as it was from manuscript to monument. This activity, then, was not properly an adaptation affecting the text's situatedness, since it was part of the original design of the text itself.

As to their pronominal forms, and the participant roles implied by them, the sacerdotal texts were hardly touched. There are only a few showing such modifications, and most of these were personal services composed to be done by the text owner for another. With these personal services, the text owner was generally transplanted from the role of officiant into that of beneficiary.

⁷³⁴ Three texts of the group are unclassified: PT 12 and 19 (lost), and PT 105 (heavily fragmentary).

But the great majority of sacerdotal texts already configured him as beneficiary, and neither that status nor that of the officiants separate from him was altered. In view of their slight editorial treatment, it is correct to say that their new medium in stone had little impact on their formal structure. The deceased king was neither an active participant in the performance of the texts in their prior, operative forms, nor was he one in their attested, monumental forms. He was the object of the rites from which they ultimately derived, and he was the textual object of their monumental manifestations.

Things are entirely different with personal texts. While but a fraction of the sacerdotal texts show modifications impacting the implied relationship between officiant and beneficiary, worshipper and worshipped, the personal texts were subjected to a program of modification which had the effect of converting them in such a way that the text owner was no longer both officiant and beneficiary, but only represented as the object of benefit. This was achieved by conversion of the first-person pronoun almost always to the third person, either the pronoun or proper name.

Sethe was the first to comment on the phenomena of the editing of the person of the text owner in the Pyramid Texts. As a springboard for further discussion, it is useful to consider the three possible rationales he offers: 1) the person of the text owner was edited so as to make a text's recitation independent from him,⁷³⁵ 2) or rather, since the deceased did actually intend to read the texts himself, he had his name inserted so as to affect the appearance of objectivity in doing so, adumbrating the manner of Julius Caesar in his Gallic battle accounts,⁷³⁶ 3) or instead, by having his name inserted in the texts, the deceased sought to attain a kind of immortality, expecting that the texts would someday be exposed for the historical edification of posterity.⁷³⁷ Unpacked from the motives of affecting objectivity or seeking archaeological immortality, the rationales of the last two explanations are resonated elsewhere and stand as the accepted understanding of the motive behind the editing program: in effect, it was a matter of introducing the name of the owner in order to personalize his texts.⁷³⁸

The circumstances are not quite as simple as that. Excluding texts with substantial damage, there are seventy-five Pyramid Texts which, in at least one exemplar, refer to the text owner by pronoun alone. What is most remarkable is that fifty-nine of them, or nearly 80%, are sacerdotal.⁷³⁹ So from this category come the great majority of texts lacking modifications to establish referentiality. This same category shows by far the fewest instances of modifi-

⁷³⁵ Sethe 1931, p. 526: Is it to be thought "daß die Texte auch, wenn der Tote selbst sie nicht las, durch ihr bloßes Dasein in Kraft treten sollten, sich gleichsam selbst läsen und dadurch dem Toten verschafften, was in ihnen für ihn gewünscht oder von ihm erzählt wird?"

⁷³⁶ Sethe 1931, p. 526: "Will der Verstorbene, wenn er von sich in der 3. Person redet und sich immer wieder mit Namen nennt, den Schein der Objektivität erwecken, etwa wie Caesar in seinen Kriegsberichten?" Cf. the difference between biographical and autobiographical texts pointed out by L. Morenz 2005, p. 137.

⁷³⁷ Sethe 1931, p. 527: "Für wen waren also die Königsnamen in die Texte gesetzt, in denen sie uns heute nach der gewaltsamen Öffnung der Pyramiden... entgegenprangen und ihren mutmaßlichen Zweck, uns den Namen des betreffenden Königs einzuhammern, so vortrefflich erfüllen, daß mehrere von jenen Königen, von denen sonst wenig oder gar nichts bekannt ist, eben dadurch nach mehr als 4000 Jahren noch zu einer gewissen Berühmtheit gelangt sind? Man darf sich angesichts dieses Widerspruches wohl fragen, ob die alten Könige nicht geradezu mit einer solchen Möglichkeit gerechnet haben und eben deshalb für eine solche Verewigung ihres Namens in ihren Grabbauten gesorgt haben."

⁷³⁸ See S. Schott 1964, p. 47; J. Allen 1994, p. 17 n. 19; *idem* 1999, p. 445; *idem* 2005, p. 5; and Mathieu 1996, p. 291.

⁷³⁹ To the thirteen texts not mentioning the text owner by name in the core personal set (see above n. 623), three additional texts strictly in the third person were added (PT 291, 387, 514). The fifty-nine sacerdotal texts referring to the text owner only by pronoun are PT 13–14, 17–18, 35–36, 41–44, 52, fPT 57B–C, 57H, 71G, PT 83, 86, 95, 174–175, 178–183, 185, 187–192, 195–196, 220 (W), 416–417, 419 (M), 441, 442 (P), 456 (P), 464, 483 (MN), 487 (M), 536, 540 (Nt), 593, 596, 598, 631–633, 659 (P), 679 (N), fPT 691B, 753, sPT 1010, and 1053.

cation to person deixis—only fifteen⁷⁴⁰ out of 494, or about 3%. And it is in this category that first-person references to separate officiants were virtually never touched. In sum, the pronouns of the sacerdotal texts were generally not subjected to modification, neither to alter their structure of performance nor to establish referentiality.

The program of modification focused its attention on the personal texts. Out of 313 in the category, 122⁷⁴¹ exhibit signs of editing of person, in the process leaving only sixteen making reference to the text owner by pronoun alone. The disparity in editorial treatment between the two categories cannot quite be accounted for by an interest in establishing referentiality. If this had been chief, then neither category would retain texts making reference solely by pronoun, nor yet again would there be so many more sacerdotal texts than personal ones like this.

There are strong differences between the categories in editorial treatment, and they must have to do with differences in the natures of the categories themselves. Greg Urban has proposed that discourse more coded as a universal instance, as with traditional knowledge or something produced by a group rather than an individual, is subjected to less editorial modification by its copiers. But where the copyist feels that he has an authoritative or egalitarian relationship to his source, he will subject it to greater change.⁷⁴² Understanding the differences in treatment in this way, the more faithful replication of the sacerdotal texts may be owed to their cultural relationship to the beneficiary: they had culturally recognized forms which permitted less tampering; they were comparatively inviolable due to the fact that they were owned, as it were, by tradition and society. On the other hand, the personal texts were subjected to modification because they were felt to reside in the province of the individual. Under the text owner's control by virtue of their singularity of participation, their ubiquitous "I," they were mutable. They were not changed in order to make them particular to the text owner; they were changed precisely because they already were particular to him.

Whether to the third-person pronoun or the proper name, the effect of the program of modification on the personal texts was to remove the text owner from the speaking role. In displacing him from it, and by not introducing a new, explicit reciter, their status was made indeterminate in respect to the representation of the agents responsible for their execution. In that, what became common between the two categories was the text owner's status as an inactive participant, an object as inert as the statues and images approached by priests in the course of cultic service. The resulting commonality may be regarded as the central aim of the program to which they were subjected.

Whereas in their prior forms the texts had served as scripts for recitation in ritual practice by human performers, on the tomb walls they served a monumental function divorced from it. Within the tomb, no human eyes read the inscribed lines so as to remember what words were to be said in a rite, and the text owner is not represented as reading his texts. They had gone from being ritual scripts to being one step further removed from the rites, to being representations of them.⁷⁴³ By their transposition to a sealed environment and by the program of editorial modification, their function had become independent of performance by living people and independent of the text owner's personal action. They were decontextualized to a non-performed status.

⁷⁴⁰ This figure includes texts showing ambiguous signs of edited person.

⁷⁴¹ Again, this figure includes texts showing ambiguous signs of edited person.

⁷⁴² Urban 1996, pp. 34–37. Cf. Bauman and Briggs 1990, p. 77, who observe that an authoritative, 'canonical' text is maximally protected from compromising transformation.

⁷⁴³ Adopting an assumption of Berlev 1998, cols. 774–775, Quack f.c. assumes that the Pyramid Texts were intended to be somehow heard rather than spoken by the dead. But this supposition neglects the visual properties of hieroglyphs as discussed in Chapter Two.

Moreover, the program of modification to texts of the personal category decisively shows that they, like the sacerdotal texts, had not been composed specifically for the purpose of being inscribed as tomb equipment. If they had been, there would have been no reason to modify them when actually applied to their originally intended design. The fact of their ubiquitous conversion is the sufficient proof of their having been transposed from another situation into the tomb. Like the sacerdotal texts, the personal texts were not conceived of and composed to be monumental, subterranean decoration; that role was an adaptation.

What, then, was their place in their prior forms? To answer this question, one has a culturally emic, interpretive lens in the New Kingdom Book of the Dead. Its paratextual notations made it clear that learning and performing the texts in life was in preparation for a desired afterlife. So also with the personal Pyramid Texts: if not composed originally for the dead in the tomb, then for the living in anticipation of death. Prior to their transposition, the living learned personal Pyramid Texts through their recitation in order to become an Akh after death. As was argued and by definition, this activity was separate from cultic action. It belonged to the domicile or the appropriated public place.

Neither of the two categories of Pyramid Texts was composed for tomb decoration. This conclusion strongly revises the assessment of the history of the mortuary literature tradition developed by Assmann. As noted at turns above, he has perceptively made a division into two categories.⁷⁴⁴ That dichotomous typological division has been seen to be perfectly accurate. Further, in his presentation, collections of texts of his first category, the inappropriately termed ‘Totenliturgien,’ belong to the accessible ‘outside’ of a tomb, its cultic area. By him, they were performed by priests for the deceased,⁷⁴⁵ and they were not composed to serve the dead as a text to be read in the hereafter.⁷⁴⁶ According to him, when texts of this category are found in burial chambers, it is through a secondary use,⁷⁴⁷ an adaptation of purpose.⁷⁴⁸

This all is in conformity with what has been found above for sacerdotal texts.

But by Assmann’s interpretation, the second category consists of texts intended to be magical tomb equipment, ‘Totenliteratur’ proper. According to him it is a magical tomb-supplement meant to equip the dead with afterworld-knowledge;⁷⁴⁹ it properly belongs to the inaccessible ‘interior’ of the tomb, its sepulchral chambers;⁷⁵⁰ it belongs precisely where it was inscribed.⁷⁵¹ The category of Totenliteratur is to be distinguished from Totenliturgien also on the basis of function; while Totenliturgien stood as an artificial *voice for priests*, Totenliteratur stood as an artificial *memory for the deceased*, designed “à équiper le mort d’un répertoire de textes dont il aura besoin dans l’autre monde. Il s’agit donc de pourvoir le mort comme «esprit *akh* qui connaît ses formules», de ces formules mêmes qu’il est supposé connaître.”⁷⁵²

When Assmann speaks of Totenliteratur, he is speaking of texts of the personal category. But there are profound conflicts with what he intuitively asserts and what has been seen here.

While it is easy to see that features of the so-called Totenliturgien correspond to texts of sacerdotal structure, Assmann’s category of Totenliteratur proper, the magischen Grab-

⁷⁴⁴ And see for instance Assmann 1986b, cols. 1000, 1004 n. 4, and 1005 n. 29; *idem* 1990, p. 2; *idem* 2000, pp. 31–32; *idem* 2001b, pp. 322, 335, and 338; and *idem* 2002, pp. 13 and 18. The distinction is already nascently signalled at *idem* 1970, p. 57 n. 2, in comparing the Book of Two Ways to Amduat.

⁷⁴⁵ Assmann 2002, pp. 13 and 18; similarly *idem* 2001b, p. 322.

⁷⁴⁶ Assmann 1990, p. 2.

⁷⁴⁷ Assmann 1986b, col. 1005 n. 29.

⁷⁴⁸ Assmann 2002, pp. 13 and 18.

⁷⁴⁹ Assmann 1986b, col. 1005 n. 29; similarly *idem* 2001b, p. 322.

⁷⁵⁰ Assmann 2002, p. 13; similarly *idem* 2001b, p. 322.

⁷⁵¹ Assmann 2001b, p. 322.

⁷⁵² Assmann 2000, p. 32; similarly *idem* 2001b, p. 335.

beigabe, is not to be found in the pyramids—not by his description. Though his category of Totenliteratur must correspond to personal Pyramid Texts, his assessment of them is in conflict with the history of their transmission as seen through the pattern of editorial treatment. The personal texts, like Pyramid Texts of a sacerdotal structure, belonged to the tomb only through a secondary use. The editorial modifications wrought upon them shows beyond doubt that they were not prepared in the first place to be tomb equipment, magical or otherwise. Indeed, with them and generally not with texts of a sacerdotal structure was there an overt redesign of purpose.

Similarly to Assmann, Siegfried Morenz once held that the tradition of inscribing texts in tombs was invented “so that the dead themselves could ‘proclaim the provision of supplies (*nis dbht-htp*)’ instead of this being done by unreliable priests.”⁷⁵³ On the contrary, it is clear from the program of modification that the deceased was to proclaim none of the inscribed texts for himself.

Rather, at its origins in the reign of Unas the mortuary literature tradition was a tradition invented by adaptation.⁷⁵⁴ It took pre-existing cultural fixtures—the textual supports to religious practices, from both collective and individual venues—and reworked them to a new purpose. The practices had their place and origin outside of the tomb. Their textual supports, once brought into it, served a monumental function. Alongside the deceased’s having learned personal texts in life and by the performance of sacerdotal texts for him by others in above-ground settings, the Pyramid Texts now appeared on the walls of his tomb in forms separate and separated from his mouth. By virtue of their new location and by virtue of the alterations made to them, their efficacy was caused to reside in the inscribed hieroglyphs alone: as aesthetic decoration, as monumental actualization.

⁷⁵³ S. Morenz 1973, p. 229. The Egyptian phraseology he cites comes not from a religious text but, as it appears, from *Sinuhe* B 195.

⁷⁵⁴ Similarly the concurrent introduction of offering lists to non-royal burial chambers, observed above at n. 19, was an adaptation, but after a different manner. In that case, offering lists as such had already been displayed in above-ground cult areas. In the case of the Pyramid Texts, the texts had not been.