spellings that are characteristic of given genres and the result of Amennakhte's deliberate choice.

As a first illustration, one may examine the variation found within substantives.[69] If we exclude some marginal cases, such as the variation between [hieroglyphs] (TA, 3.11) *vs* [hieroglyphs]/[hieroglyphs] (sg/pl systematic; *passim*), there is only one example of apparently unmotivated variation in the literary texts (143 lexemes; 33 occur in two texts or more [23%]) and one example in the documentary texts (172 lexemes; 32 occur in two texts or more [18.6%]):

- *imw* 'boat' [hieroglyphs] (T1L, 2; similar in other witnesses of T1) *vs* [hieroglyphs] (T3, 5);
- *šgr* 'wooden ?box?' [hieroglyphs] (TB, v° 5.15) *vs* [hieroglyphs] (TB, v° 5.11), certainly due to a lexical borrowing.[70]

---

[69] Proper names have been excluded here.

[70] See Janssen (1975, 200; 2009, 84), who does not acknowledge the spelling with [hieroglyphs] *ḥꜣ*. The alternation between [hieroglyphs] *ꜥ* (*Wb.* I, 208.11) and [hieroglyphs] *inr* (Wb. I, 97–98) is probably not to be considered as a case of graphemic variation within TB between a syllabic and an older spelling. Indeed, both lexemes are attested in Coptic, respectively ⲁⲗ 'pebble, stone' and ⲱⲛⲉ 'stone' (see Černý 1976, 4 and 228). The difference in the meaning of each word, however, is not self-evident in TB. In the same context, compare: *ḥr ptr, kfꜣ* PN₁ *ḥnꜥ* PN₂ *ꜥ* ([hieroglyphs]) *ḥr ṯbn n pꜣ is n Wsir* PN₃ 'but look, PN₁ and PN₂ removed a stone on the top of the tomb of the Osiris PN₃' (r° 4.4–6); *ḥr ptr=tn tꜣ s.t-ꜥḥꜥ* ([hieroglyphs]) *n tꜣty* PN *ḥr tꜣ s.t-in inr* ([hieroglyphs]) 'but you have seen (i.e. you are aware of) the position of the vizier PN regarding the removing of stones' (r° 4.10); *di ꜣ-n-is.t* PN, *pꜣy=i it, rmṯ r in(.t) inr im=s* 'the chief of the gang PN, my father, appointed someone to remove stones therein' (r° 4.11). Additionally, the phrase *in ꜥ* (parallel to *in inr* in TB) appears in another document related to the violation of a tomb: *ptr n={tw}tn r in ꜥ im=f r-bnr* 'pay attention, you_pl, not to remove stones therefrom to the outside' (Block Edinburgh Society of Antiquities 912.3 [DZA 21.900.630]) and, judging from Crum (1939, 3–4), the meaning 'hail stone' is still well attested in Coptic for ⲁⲗ. It is worth noticing here that, besides other occurrences in the Ramesside period (P.Anastasi I, 23.3; 24.2; P.Mag.Harris, 4.7; O.Cairo CG 25651 v° 2.2–2.3; O.DeM 1038, v° 3, probably written by the *idnw* Hay who was a contemporary of Amennakhte, see Dorn (2009, 77; 2011, 190–1)), sometimes related to Tomb Robberies (P.BM EA 10052, v° 14.4–5: *mtw=tw gm.t=i iw dgs(=i) pꜣy ꜥ m rd=i, iw=f r tp-ḫt* 'if one discovers that I trampled this stone with my foot, I will be impaled'; Block Edinburgh Society of Antiquities 912.7 [DZA 21.900.640]), it occurs in the letter possibly written by Amennakhte on the verso of P.Turin 1879 (I, 2.4; see Hovestreydt (1997) and here n. 59).

Except for these two cases, the spellings of the substantives are overwhelmingly regular. This phenomenon may be illustrated with three types of motivated variation at the graphemic level.

1. Number

The singular *vs* plural number is spelled consistently (even when quite infrequent 'orthographies' are used for the plural). For example, *s.t* 'place' is written ⌐ (both in literary and documentary texts) and the two occurrences of the plural are written the same way: ⌐ (TA, r° 4.10 & TB, r° 4.4; another occurrence of this spelling is P.Anastasi IV, 4.9 [= LEM 39.5]).

2. Feminine writings

The absolute *vs* suffixal states of the feminine substantives have different but coherent spellings. For example: *sbꜣy.t* 'teaching' ⌐ (T1A, 1) *vs* *sbꜣy.t=k* 'your teaching' ⌐ (T1A, 10; T1L, 5; etc.), here with the second person singular masculine suffix pronoun (2SG.M)

3. The influence of the discursive environment

The opposition between ⌐ (TB *passim*, TC, b, v° 1) and ⌐ (TB) is perfectly coherent. One always finds the first spelling in dates and the second when the lexeme is included in the main text; see, e.g., *twn ḥḳr.(wy)n, iw hrw 18 ꜥḳ m pꜣ ꜣbd* (⌐) 'we are hungry, the 18th day of the month is there (and no ration arrived)' (TB, r° 1.2).

The opposition between ⌐ (e.g., T1B, 2; TB *passim*; TC, b, v° 1, v° 7; etc.) and ⌐ (e.g., T1N, 5; TB, r° 1.3, v° 2.9, 3.26, 3.29, 4.15; etc.) or ⌐ (TC, r° 2, b, v° 8) and ⌐ (TB *passim*) follows the strict distribution <title in headings and 'signatures'> (*sš* PN; when it is written, the classifier A1 appears after the PN) *vs* <title or function in the main text> (e.g., *pꜣ sš n pꜣ ḫr* 'the scribe of the Tomb', *iry=k sš* 'may you be a scribe', etc.).

In TB, the word *is.t* 'gang' (⌐ or ⌐) appears without the quad ⌐ in the title *ꜥꜣ-n-is.t* 'chief of the gang' solely; ⌐ or ⌐ are spellings found in the phrase *pꜣ ꜥꜣ n is.t 2*, see v° 2.9, 3.25, 3.28, 4.14; ⌐ also occurs in *ꜥꜣ n is.t* PN, see v° 6.6; r° 3.7, 4.2. When Amennakhte refers