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

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

In the texts related to the battle of Qadesh, n.t-Htr is sometimes accompanied by a possessive. When the possessor is pronominal, there are two possibilities: the possessor is directly suffixed to the noun, n.t-htrf, or the noun that encodes the possessum is preceded by a complex form whose first element – the base – is derived from the definite article (historically a demonstrative pronoun), followed by a bound person marker, tlf.f n.t-htr (Winand in press). This of course illustrates a basic evolution in the Egyptian language, which crystallized in the New Kingdom. While in the Old Kingdom the adnominal possession with a bound person marker (suffix pronoun) is used exclusively, it has almost completely disappeared in Coptic, except for some twenty nouns, most of them expressing body parts (Layton 2000: § 138). In this apparently straightforward evolution, Late Egyptian stands in the middle, with a more or less balanced proportion of both constructions. The suffix pronoun is still predominantly retained with some semantic classes, as nouns expressing body parts, family membership, symbolic entities, physical particularities and psychological states, and nouns in relation with royalty or religion (see Winand in press).

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

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

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

1 I warmly thank Stéphane Polis for his comments on a draft of this article.
3 References are made to Kuentz’s numbering system; the sigla on top of columns follow the abbreviations system found in Kitchen’s edition (KRI II: 2).
the sense of Benveniste 1971). In discourse (§169, 172, 184, 193, 240, and 254, in grey shading in the figure) the possessive article is systematically used, while in narrative both constructions can appear. This distribution is largely supported by the evidence from the Bulletin, where all relevant sections for our discussion belong to the narrative register.

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

![Fig. 1. Distribution of the pronominal possessor for n.t-htr in the Poem](image_url)
Ex. 1  jw h3w wi p3j.i m3s t3j.i n.t-htr (...)
    “... while my army and my chariotsy had abandoned me (...)
    (Bulletin § 107 [L 43 = R 1 25])

Ex. 2  jw h3w wi p3j.i m3s 53, bw nw.n w r.i m t3j.i n.t-htr
    “... while my army had abandoned me, and no one in my chariotsy was looking at me”
    (Poem § 113–114 epigraphic versions)

Ex. 3  jw h3w <wi> p3j.i m3s t3j.i n.t-htr (...)
    “... while my army and my chariotsy had abandoned me (...)
    (Poem § 113–114 pSallier)

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

As was already noted, the same sentence occurs again in pSallier, somewhat earlier in the text (§90), where it is once more at variance with the epigraphic versions. It is of course difficult to guess how it found its way in the text. It could be the result of an interpolation made by the scribe due to some carelessness (see Spalinger 2002: 19), but one can also turn to another kind of explanation. To start with, the version of pSallier is not completely farfetched: it makes an acceptable sense in context, not very different from what has been adopted by the epigraphic versions:

Ex. 4  jw bn w w n m3s, bn snj
    jw h3w wi p3j.i m3s t3j.i n.t-htr
    n smn.n w jm.sn r "h3 h3 sn.
    “there was no more soldier, no officer; my army and my chariotsy had abandoned me; no one among them could stand to fight with them (...)
    (Poem § 89–91 pSallier)

Ex. 5  jw bn w w n m3s, bn kr
    p3j.i m3s t3j.i n.t-htr m m3kht h3-3.t.sn
    n smn.n w jm.sn r "h3 h3 sn.
    “there was no more soldier, no shield bearer; my army and my chariotsy was disbanding before them; no one among them could stand to fight with them (...)
    (Poem § 89–91 epigraphic versions)

The reading of pSallier fits the context rather well: after deploring that there is no one left, neither soldier nor shield bearer (officer in pSallier), the king says that the army has abandoned him (§90), and that there is consequently no one left to fight the enemy (§91). The epigraphic versions (ex. 5) unanimously have m3kht, a word of Semitic origin, whose

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>SUF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>ARTPOS</td>
<td>ARTPOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*This section is missing in the Luxor versions (see Spalinger 1985: 69–70).*
etymology remains unclear. The word seems to be a hapax. Faced thus with an unknown word, the scribe of pSallier or of its Vorlage was apparently at a loss. The very common collocation *po.\* i ms\* \( (hn) \)* tij.i n-t-htr might admittedly have played a trick of memory and prompted the insertion of an expression, present elsewhere, that offered an acceptable sense. Substitutions like these in poetry are quite common in oral transmission (the best example remains of course the Homeric tradition), but also in literate societies where literature was memorized, as was the case in ancient Egypt.

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

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

\[ \text{Ex. 6} \quad p1 w_r \hsji n \hta ?'h\* m hr-jb ms* f h\* n-t-htr; f hnf \{nw tnh, jf bd\}, nn prn.f r \hta n sqn n hm.f \]

“…the despicable, fallen, Ruler of Hatti, was standing in the midst of his infantry and chariots, his face averted, shrinking away, his heart had become feeble. He could not come out to fight, because of fear of his Majesty” (Reliefs § 42 = KRI II: 139, 3–7)

\[ \text{Ex. 7} \quad lst p1 w_r \hsji n \hta ?'h\* hr-ib ms* f h\* t-n.t-htr; f hr prl p1 \hta n hm.f w\{w hr-tp.f, iw bn ms* f h\* f, bn n-t-t-htr, iw.f hr ?'h\* n tnh sqn.w \]

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

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

\[ \text{Ex. 8} \quad jw hm.f w\{w, n ms* [hn* f, m-htr rdi.n f m hr n h\*ti.w nb n ms*], fn t-htrf r-\dd; \]

“…and His Majesty was alone, having no army with him, when His Majesty commanded all the captain of his army, his chariots and his officers saying” (Reliefs: § 62 = KRI II: 143,2–4)

\[ \text{Ex. 9} \quad 'h\*, n rdi.n hm.i stf.tw n i h\*ty.w nb n ms* i h\*n* i n-t-htri, \]

“…Then My Majesty had caused to be ushered in to me all the captains of my infantry and my chariots” (Poem § 323)

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

\[ \text{Ex. 10} \quad jw.f hr hdb wr.w nb n his.w nb ni sn.w n pi hr n h\*ti hn* nj.f wr.w t.w nj.f ms* tij.f n-t-htr \]

“…as he killed all the princes of all foreign lands and the brothers of the enemy of Hatti and his great nobles, his armies and his chariots” (Reliefs § 19 = KRI II: 135,8–12)

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

\[ \text{Ex. 11} \quad 'h\*, n dd.n hm.f n pi'f ms* nj.f wr.w m-mjt.t tij.f n-t-t-htr \]

“…then His Majesty said to his army, his nobles and his chariots as well” (Poem § 252)
the First Marriage. In the first text, texts from the reign of Ramesses II, the Hittite treaty and the same kind of variations can be observed in two other cases used, as expected:

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

Ex. 13 "He, n § hm.f, w.s. n pjj.f m§ r-hn" tj.f n.t-htr m-mit.t nj.f wr.w

“and then His Majesty, l.p.h., called upon his army, his chariots and his nobles”  
(Poem § 223bis-ter)

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

The sensibility of the scribes to the variation of registers in one single text does not need to be demonstrated any longer (see Goldwasser 1990: 120–149). As regards n.t-htr, the same kind of variations can be observed in two other texts from the reign of Ramesses II, the Hittite treaty and the First Marriage. In the first text, n.t-htr once appears with a pronominal possessor; as the word occurs in a legal section, this is well in accordance with the observations made for the texts of Ramesses II:

Ex. 17 n.t-htr.f md m hfrw

“his whole chariotry by millions”  
(KRI V: 13,12)

Ex. 18 dj.f p§ wr n msw§ m dj.t.s hnr m§ f n.t-htr.f

“he put the prince of the Meshwesh in my hands together with his army and his chariots”  
(KRI V: 51,5)

Ex. 19 mnsf.t.f n.t-htr.f hr nh.t.w

“his infantry and his chariots carried power (or victory)”  
(KRI V: 61,2)

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

Ex. 20 n tj.s.n sn n.t-htr

“for his chariots”  
(LEM 20,4)

Ex. 21 tj.s.t jrt.s hfr.w n tj.s.k n.t-htr; tj.s.t snh pjj.k m§s

“the place of making the counsel for your chariots, the place of registering your army”  
(LEM 28,13–14)

Ex. 22 r sgnn m§s.f n.t-htr.f

“to anoint his army and his chariotry”  
(LEM 51,14)

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

---

8 The version of pSallier is rather chaotic as regards the beginning of the last sentence, see Spalinger 2002: 79.
9 On the correction, see Edel 1997: 93.
ception is precisely that of the nominal syntagm under consideration here, \( mH\text{f.t-htr.f} \), while elsewhere the possessive article is used throughout. The only explanation that comes to mind is a reminiscence of this phrase from the royal war inscriptions where it almost constitutes a refrain. In the Qadesh texts alone, the phrase is well represented, both in the Poem and in the Bulletin.\(^\text{11}\)

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

Ex. 23

\[
\text{sw t'k m-Hnw.sn mj s\text{f} nw.t, hdb(w).sn n hh.f m km j.t}
\]

“he has entered inside them like the son of Nut, they have been thrown down by his blast in a moment” \((\text{LEM 13,12})\)

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

Ex. 24

\[
jw j r t'k jm.sn mj hwt.t bj.k, jw j hr hdb hr w'w\text{f} hr \text{t'h} r jwtn
\]

“I shall enter inside them like when the falcon strikes, killing, cutting down, and throwing to the ground” \((\text{Poem} \ $216–217)\)

Ex. 25

\[
\text{Htr.f m-ib m-Hnw.p3 hjr r p3 nty zp n 6 n t'k im.sn, lw.i mi b'tl m-s3.sn m lt srm.f, lw.i hr hdb im.sn}
\]

“and then he entered in gallop inside the enemy for the sixth time of his entering inside them, I was like Baal after them in his time of power, killing among them” \((\text{Poem} \ $221–223)\)

Ex. 26

\[
gm.n.w hjs.t nb.t t'k.i im.sn sdr m hdbj.t hr snf.sn
\]

“they found all the lands I had entered inside lying in heaps in their blood” \((\text{Poem} \ $231)\)

The noun \( hdbj.t \) in the last example finds an indirect echo in the passage of the Miscellanies.\(^\text{12}\)

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

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

11 Poem. § 28: mH\text{f.t-htr.f} \( htr.f \); § 143: lst p1 wr hny n hnt t'k h'r'ib n't\text{f} \( htr.f \) \( n.t-htr.f \); § 145: lw bn mH\text{f.t-htr.f} \( htr.f \) bn \( n.t-htr.f \); Bulletin. § 22: lw.f lw hnt mH\text{f.t-htr.f} \( htr.f \); § 76: lw bn hr hny n lw lw lw lw lw mH\text{f.t-htr.f}.

12 The verb \( hdb \), which is far more common than the noun \( hdbj.t \), is always used to describe foes scattered around on the ground, most often with the adjunct \( snf.sn \). The whole expression is already attested in some inscriptions of Turinmose III (\( \text{Urkh IV} : 552 \)), it is found again during the reign of Seti I in a context very similar to that of the Poem (tij stj w pwt tsw, sm\text{f} wsr.sn hdb \( h\text{r snf.sn} \); \( t'k jm.sn mj n s f s zp \)), which was taken over almost verbatim by Ramesses III in Karnak (\( \text{KRI} : 87,8 \)). The collocation of \( hdb \) and \( hh \) appears again in the time of Ramesses III (m p1 hh t\text{st} t w t\text{s}t m\text{swt} n\text{ht} hdbw st, xfr sn n t\text{st}-m\text{j} “it is the blaze and the respect of the strong king that laid them down and befell them for Egypt”; a variant with the same theme: dj j hj j r tsw hjs wt, hdb j hj t\text{st} t k “I will set my blaze against the (foreign) lands and hills, I will lay down who will transgress your border”).

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