




























CHICAGO DEMOTIC DICTIONARY (CDD)







François Gaudard and Janet H. Johnson

This year has seen a change on the staff of the Demotic Dictionary, with Brittany Hayden joining Mary Szabady as graduate student assistants on the project. We have also been assisted by volunteers: Janelle Pisarik and Bryan Kraemer, both of whom are graduate students in Egyptology, checked the Text Information and Abbreviation Authors files, while Oriental Institute docent Larry Lissak scanned more photographs of Demotic papyri and inscriptions. Graduate students Humphrey H. Hardy II, Charles J. Otte III, and Benjamin D. Thomas helped us check some of the Hebrew and Aramaic references cited in the dictionary. Letter files W, P, M, H, and Š, a total of about 1,200 pages, were given to Thomas Urban, Senior Editor of the Oriental Institute Publications Office, for a final style check and will be posted online in the summer of 2009. The last three letters, namely ʾI, T, and S, are currently being worked on, as well as the numbers file. Janet Johnson and François Gaudard attended the 10th International Congress of Demotic Studies, held in Leuven and Brussels from August 26 to 30, 2008, where they both delivered papers. Janet Johnson took this opportunity to ask all the Congress participants to supply the Chicago Demotic Dictionary staff with their corrections and additions, as well as their comments on the “Problematic Entries” files.

Although ancient Egyptian contracts were dated and the parties involved identified, most ancient Egyptian texts were not dated and the scribe/author’s name not mentioned. Moreover, unless one knows the place and the archaeological context where a text was discovered, its exact provenance can also be difficult or simply impossible to determine. Because date and provenance can be important to our understanding of a text, scholars frequently resort to a paleographic study of the text.¹ The term “paleography” (from Greek *παλαιός* “ancient” and *γράφειν* “to write”), perhaps used for the first time in 1708 by the Benedictine monk Bernard de Montfaucon in his *Palaeographia Graeca*, designates the science of studying ancient writing systems, including the deciphering and dating of historical manuscripts. Besides allowing one to assign a text to a specific time period or geographical area, in a few cases paleography can also facilitate the identification of the author of a text. Now, let us see how paleography can be used in practice, starting with the dating of Demotic texts. Three major stages can be distinguished in the evolution of Demotic script, namely Early Demotic (ca. 650–ca. 400 B.C.), Ptolemaic or Middle Demotic (ca. 400–ca. 30 B.C.), and Roman or Late Demotic (ca. 30 B.C.–A.D. 452). Bold script is characteristic of Early Demotic. Since this stage of Demotic script is still close to its hieratic ancestor, the original hieroglyphic signs are usually a little easier to identify than in later stages. For example, in the following writings of the word *tw* “mountain”:  and  (Erichsen, *Glossar* [hereafter EG] 611), the hieroglyphic sign  is clearly recognizable. In Ptolemaic Demotic, the script becomes smaller in size and the signs much further removed from hieratic. It is uncertain whether the scribes themselves were still able to trace them back to hieratic. The same word *tw* “mountain” was then written, for example,  or  (EG 611). Finally, in Roman Demotic, the script is much thinner due to the fact that scribes began to use a pointed reed pen instead of the traditional brush. Therefore, the above-mentioned word *tw* could be written  (EG 611). Interestingly, in this late stage, hieratic or hieroglyphic signs could also be used in the writing of a Demotic word. Such is, for example, the case in the following writings of *sp* “time”:  and  (EG 425), which include the hieroglyphic sign of the “circular threshing floor covered with

grain" , and in writings of *Niwt* "the City" (= Thebes):  and  (EG 211), where the hieroglyphic sign of the "village with crossroads"  can be easily identified.

In some cases, as mentioned above, paleography can also help establish the provenance of a text, thanks to regional distinctions which find their origin in various scribal traditions. For instance, let us compare writings of the letter *b* in Roman papyri from two different areas. Most of the time writings of *b* follow the standard form , as is the case in the word  *šbt* "staff, scepter" in P. Magical (= P. British Museum 10070 + P. Leiden 383) 5/18, from Thebes. However, in some Roman texts from the Fayyum, a typical "disarticulated" writing of *b* is attested with three () or even only two strokes (), as in the personal name *Htb* "Satabous":  (P. Vienna 6344, 15) and  (P. Berlin 6848, 3/3). Another good example is the word *nfr* "beautiful, good" usually written  but also attested in the form , a scribal variant with a diagonal stroke typical of the Elephantine area, as demonstrated by Robert Ritner.² As a last example we discuss the ligature of the group  *ir=f* "he did," whose common writing looks as follows: . There are also forms where the tail of the *f* is very long:  (O. Ashmolean 17, 5) or practically non-existent:  (P. Berlin 8278a, x+16), but the point of interest for our discussion is the writing  which, according to Vos,³ is a regional scribal variant of this ligature, occurring typically in Memphite documents such as P. Brooklyn 37.1802, 22:  and P. Apis (= P. Vienna Kunst. 3873) ro, 3/6 (and passim): . This phenomenon is not specific to Demotic but, as one would expect, already occurred in hieratic as pointed out by Erman,⁴ followed by Möller.⁵

It is precisely in basing our argument on hieratic examples that we now discuss how in some cases paleography can also help identify individual hands, or in other terms, a person's handwriting. As noted by Bouvier,⁶ the famous corpus of more than sixty hieratic papyri known as *Late Ramesside Letters* is the ideal candidate for such a demonstration. Indeed, these letters, mostly published by J. Černý and translated by E. F. Wente,⁷ are contemporary with each other, homogenous in theme, and were composed by a relatively small group of Theban-based scribes. They tell us about events that took place in the last years of the reign of Ramesses XI (1099–1069 B.C.), when the Theban area was under the military control of General Piankh, who also assumed the function of high priest of Amun. But, according to Bouvier,⁸ even in such an apparently favorable context a comparative paleographic study between documents proves to be difficult and uncertain, since a scribe could adapt his handwriting depending on the type of text he wrote: he would indeed put much more care in composing a letter addressed to a high official than in preparing a draft. Thus, although two documents look very different from each other, they could have been written by the same scribe, and inversely, documents whose hands are similar could have been written by two different scribes trained by the same teacher. Even so, the peculiarity of a hand can sometimes be extremely helpful to identify the author of a text. This is particularly true in the case of the scribe Butehamon, who, among the writers of the *Late Ramesside Letters*, had a very distinctive habit.⁹ Indeed, Butehamon used to add systematically a diacritic dot as part of the writing of the group  *dd* "to say." Regular writings of this word would not include such a dot: . Some scribes tended to add a dot after  *dd* only when part of the expression  *hn' dd* "Quote:" used to introduce the subject of the letter itself. In this case the dot made it easier for the reader to identify this expression whose writing could be quite abbreviated. Butehamon, however, added a dot in practically every case, as in letters 16vo, 2:  and 29ro, 2: ,¹⁰ even when it was not required for the understanding of the text.

It is also worth noting that variations in script can reflect not only differences between time periods, regions, or individuals, but also various uses or calligraphic styles which can be observed in some languages. As a single example we will briefly compare writings of the sacred mantra *om̐ mani padme hūm̐*,¹¹ as rendered in some Tibetan scripts,¹² namely the sacred script *Lentsa*: ཨོཾ་མ་ཎི་པདྨེ་ཧཱུྃ།, the standard block script *Uchen*: ཨོཾ་མ་ཎི་པདྨེ་ཧཱུྃ།, the decorative script *Drutsa*: ཨོཾ་མ་ཎི་པདྨེ་ཧཱུྃ།, and the cursive hand script *Ume*: ཨོཾ་མ་ཎི་པདྨེ་ཧཱུྃ།.

In conclusion, one could say that paleography is a very useful tool, but it should be used with caution by scholars, who should always keep in mind the limitations of this method.

Notes

¹ For an introduction to ancient Egyptian paleography, see, e.g., G. Möller, *Hieratische Paläographie: Die ägyptische Buchschrift in ihrer Entwicklung von der fünften Dynastie bis zur römischen Kaiserzeit*, 3 vols. (Osnabrück: Zeller, 1965) (reprint of 1927–36 second edition, revised); O. El-Aguizy, *A Palaeographical Study of Demotic Papyri in the Cairo Museum from the Reign of King Taharka to the End of the Ptolemaic Period (684–30 B.C.)*, Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale 113 (Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1998); U. Verhoeven, *Untersuchungen zur späthieratischen Buchschrift*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 99 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001); D. Meeks, *Les architraves du Temple d’Esna: Paléographie*, Paléographie Hiéroglyphique 1 (Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 2004), esp. pp. i–xxv.

² See R. K. Ritner, “A Regional Variant in Demotic Orthography: Υ Λ as *nfr*,” *Enchoria* 12 (1984): 187–88.

³ See R. L. Vos, *The Apis Embalming Ritual: P. Vindob. 3873*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 1993), p. 270, note c to 2/23, who states that this “ligature is not so much a peculiarity, therefore, of a particular scribe, but rather a Memphitic spelling employed not only by scribes of everyday contracts, but also by scribes of religious texts,” such as the Apis Embalming Ritual.

⁴ See A. Erman, “Zur Erklärung des Papyrus Harris,” *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 21 (1903): 460ff.

⁵ See Möller, *Hieratische Paläographie*, vol. 2, pp. 2–3 and 12–13.

⁶ See G. Bouvier, “L’identification des rédacteurs des *Late Ramesside Letters*,” *Annales de la Fondation Fyssen* 20 (2005): 100–01.

⁷ See J. Černý, *Late Ramesside Letters*, *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca* 9 (Brussels: Édition de la Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1939); E. F. Wente, *Late Ramesside Letters*, *Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization* 33 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967).

⁸ See G. Bouvier, “Quelques remarques sur l’identification des ‘mains’ dans les documents hiératiques de l’époque ramesside,” *Annales de la Fondation Fyssen* 17 (2002): 13–14.

⁹ See Bouvier, “L’identification des rédacteurs,” pp. 103–05.

¹⁰ The facsimiles of Butehamon’s writings of *dd* are taken from Bouvier, “L’identification des rédacteurs,” p. 105, fig. 2.

¹¹ In Hinduism and Buddhism the term *mantra* (from Sanskrit मन्त्र) designates a word or phrase from a sacred text used as a prayer or incantation.

¹² See J. Stevens, “Asian Calligraphy,” in *The World’s Writing Systems*, edited by P. T. Daniels and W. Bright (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 247, from which these examples are taken.