The theme of *Palimpsests*, which recalls the work of Gérard Genette and which was purposefully chosen by Armin Lange for this conference, compels us to consider our textual approach to ancient Egypt from an angle different from that adopted by classic Egyptology. It is assumed that the subject matter here relates to Egyptian priestly texts, although from the writing, it can be difficult to distinguish a single author, particularly in the case of a writing process of a text which belongs to a literary tradition requiring a common editorial standpoint. That does not exclude the notion of the author in Egypt. On the one hand, wisdom sayings are instantly identified by a specific paratext—which is in fact an epitext or a pseudo-epitext—such as *Beginning of the Teaching written by Untel.* On the other hand, other works—prophecies and epics—are also signed by their authors or their supposed authors. Whatever they are, all Egyptian compositions are based on literary memory and very complex writing mechanisms, and they lead in turn to new perspectives that facilitate paratextual deciphering, codification and reading techniques. With the aim of responding to the question posed by Armin Lange, I intend to recall the general nature of this process, ensuring that I situate my response within the inter-disciplinary framework of this meeting.
Before going into detail on the subject, I will make some general remarks. Hieroglyphic writing, by its very nature and the number of the symbols it uses, provides many possibilities for the written presentation of texts. Because of the complex nature of non-alphabetical writing, it often resorts to using an explicit iconography, which is itself a paratext, itself based on the existence of other textual paratexts. Now I will look in detail at the question of the composition of Egyptian priestly texts. My approach will lead me first to examine the transmission methods used by Egyptians in traditional literary production, in particular relating to the funerary texts which constitute the corpus, whose textual mass is undoubtedly the most extensive in ancient Egypt. Then, in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, I will consider the principle which guided the rewriting of the main priestly texts, taking the example of an important text—the Myth of Horus at Edfu—which led to a mural text which constitutes a multi-dimensional paratextual space. Finally, I will present certain aspects of later documents, from the Jumilhac Papyrus to the Tebtunis Papyri. These latter papyri have generated philological and didactic paratexts. This will lead me to determine the impact of the spoken language on the written language of these periods, by way of a brief analysis of late phonological encodings implying a transliteration transfer.


6 As a consequence, in certain types of compositions, notably in the case of liturgical works, the text can paradoxically be reduced to an epitext—the title—as the iconography which corresponds to a piece of direct speech can replace the text.