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The Swiss scholar (Henri-)Edouard Naville is best known for his early philological studies and excavations on behalf of the British-based Egypt Exploration Fund (Naville 1870; Naville 1875; Hall 1927, 1–6; James 1982). He also played a major role in the history of Book of the Dead scholarship, his contribution providing the critical edition for over a century until the advent of the Swiss Totenbuchtexte project in 2004. A supplementary project initiated in 2009 focuses on the archival material associated with Naville’s work on the Book of the Dead. Thus, the current article’s title, ‘In the Footsteps of Edouard Naville,’ has a double meaning. While our re-edition of his Todtenbuch can be seen as following in his footsteps towards the future, this second project leads back into the past.

Naville and the Book of the Dead

Educated in Geneva, London, Paris and Bonn, Naville travelled to Berlin in order to study with the renowned scholar (Karl) Richard Lepsius (1810–1884), who had been appointed Professor of Egyptology at Berlin University after having successfully led the famous Prussian Expedition to Egypt and Nubia between 1842 and 1845. In the following years, Naville became one of Lepsius’s most ambitious students and a regular guest at his house, even accompanying him to Egypt in 1869 for the festivities related to the opening of the Suez Canal (Staehelin 1988, 85). Later, he was entrusted with the first comparative text edition of the Theban recension of the Book of the Dead. Later, assisted by Ludwig Borchardt and others, Naville edited the five text volumes (1897–1913) that followed from Lepsius’s famous twelve folio volumes entitled Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien (1849–1859).

The first facsimile of a complete Book of the Dead manuscript from the Ptolemaic period had been published in 1805 by J. M. Cadet (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 1–19)\(^1\) and reprinted in the famous Description de l’Egypte (Pancoucke 1809–1822: Antiquités vol. 2 [1821], pls. 72–75).\(^2\) It was Lepsius who, with his 1842 edition of the Late Ptolemaic papyrus of Iuefankh in the Turin Museum (inv. 1791), introduced the name ‘Todtenbuch’ for Champollion’s Rituels funéraires and established the standard numbering of spells still in use today (Lepsius 1842). Lepsius considered the Book of the Dead to be ‘das einzige grössere altägyptische Literaturwerk’ (1867, 21). According to his announcement at the Second International Congress of Orientalists in London 1874, Lepsius planned a full edition of this textual corpus through all periods of Egyptian history with his young Genevan colleague and former student Naville as its primary editor (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 5–6). Despite Lepsius’s original plan, Naville decided to limit the corpus to New Kingdom manuscripts, both due to

\(^1\) For an earlier facsimile of a Book of the Dead papyrus fragment, see de Maussion de Favières 1994, 192.

\(^2\) For other (late) Book of the Dead manuscripts published in the Description, see the preceding pls. 60–71 in the same vol. II and pls. 44–46 in vol. V.
the enormous quantity of Book of the Dead material and the perceived higher relevance and reliability of the earlier manuscripts (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 7ff.). As a result of more than a decade’s work of collecting, studying and copying the relevant documents either directly, in the museums, or by retracing the texts from photographs and facsimiles provided by other scholars, Naville presented his edition in 1886 and his work became the standard for more than 120 years.

Naville himself stressed his attempt to attain the highest accuracy in his copies (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 14–15), but scholars have since criticized several aspects of his publication and called for a new edition. The main critical points are the lack of a true synopsis (aside from the one full version he only noted the more relevant variations), a rather high percentage of misspellings or omissions, and a lack of information about the rubric passages (de Buck 1935, xiv–xv).

The Swiss Totenbuchtexte project

The sheer amount of Book of the Dead source material has multiplied since Naville’s time and now vastly exceeds the number of surviving copies of the Pyramid or Coffin Texts. A re-edition had been long regarded ‘eine Aufgabe, welche die Kräfte eines Einzelnen wohl weit übersteigt’ (Hornung 1986, viii). Nevertheless, in 2004, Günther Lapp and the present author established the groundwork for a new edition (Lüscher 2005, 213–219). From the outset, several obstacles had to be overcome, the foremost being the creation of computer software, Günther Lapp’s VisualGlyph 2.0, to accurately transcribe and format the synoptic text editions.

Now, roughly six years later, the first few volumes have appeared in a new series (Totenbuchtexte, abbreviated TbT) published by Orientverlag (Basel). With this ‘remake’ we follow in the footsteps of our earlier Swiss colleague. In contrast to Naville’s edition, however, ours provides the complete text for each document with all of the rubrics noted and with the original arrangement of signs. We have also introduced a new system of sigla following the general model used by de Buck for the Coffin Texts (1935).

One of the main problems was (and partly still is) access to source material, which, as mentioned above, has significantly increased since Naville’s time. Therefore we have been committed from the beginning to find a balance between an ideal world, in which we had access to all known sources, and reality, in which, for various reasons, a number of known documents are unavailable to us. Most sources, distributed throughout museums and collections all over the world or locked away in tombs, are still unpublished. Although the project aims to make as complete a record as possible, we are well aware that new material will continue to turn up sporadically in museums, archives, private collections, auction sales, and as the result of new excavations. Therefore, where we could not include all sources for a particular spell, we have listed them for further reference. More volumes can still be added at a later stage of our project when new material might become available (Lapp 2006, foreword). We must also contend with the serious issue of limiting publication costs. Nevertheless, given

3 Naville’s publication consists of two edition volumes and one unnumbered introductory volume entitled, ‘Einleitung,’ and hereafter cited ‘Naville 1886 (Einleitung).’
the fragile condition of many of the original sources and their uncertain futures, we decided to make a start.

To begin the series, we have focused on a set of well-attested spells: BD 17 (TbT 1), the transformation spells BD 76–88 (TbT 2), and BD 125 (TbT 3), as well as the ferryman spells BD 98 and 99 (TbT 4), and BD 18 and 20 (TbT 5). Planned forthcoming volumes will cover BD 149/150 (TbT 6), BD 64 together with a selection of other peret-em-heru spells (TbT 7), and the spells of knowing the souls (TbT 8). Many more volumes are planned to follow.4 By providing a new and much broader text-basis we hope to initiate further studies and new translations.

Full synoptic editions can also produce results of unexpected value. The decision to include not only papyri and linen shrouds, but also texts on tomb walls and funerary equipment, has proved especially important and fruitful, as demonstrated in the first volume of our new monograph series Beiträge zum Alten Ägypten (BAÄ) where a particular local Deir el-Medina tradition and workshop(s) could be identified (Lüscher 2007). While it is widely known that the decoration programme of the Deir el-Medina workmen’s tombs reflects a special iconographic tradition (Saleh 1987; Milde 1991), a critical comparison of their texts has made it clear that, in the Ramesside period, the workmen’s community had also developed its own text tradition. This is perhaps unsurprising given the community’s exceptionally high literacy rate. In addition to the well-known papyrus of Neferrenpet (owner of Theban tomb 336), several more papyri and papyrus fragments can be provenanced confidently to Deir el-Medina by virtue of the special text formulae they contain. One group of papyri have almost identical vignettes and texts, and share the same palaeographical details, textual omissions, differing text-versions, and scribal misspellings. While we have known that the local workmen were busy decorating their own or their colleagues’ tombs and funerary equipment in their spare time, it is quite a new revelation that they included papyri in their work as well.5

Once attuned to the peculiarities of the Deir el-Medina corpus, it becomes relatively easy to identify local text versions among the material. Even sources not belonging to that special group of papyri mentioned above still show the same text variations, which clearly differ from those on other contemporary Theban material. Further, this local tradition cannot only be found on papyri but also on Deir el-Medina coffins, sarcophagus-shrines, stelae, and other funerary equipment. For example, the texts of TT 218 (tomb of Amunnakht), TT 1 (tomb of Sennedjem), TT 290 (tomb of Irinefer), the sarcophagus shrine of Khonsu (a son of Sennedjem, from TT 1), the sarcophagus of Pashed (from TT 3) as well as the stela of Hui (Museo Archeologico di Torino, Suppl. 6148bis), all from Deir el-Medina, show the same text variants of BD 1 (Lüscher 1986). The proposed provenance is confirmed by additional sources for BD 1 known to have come from Deir el-Medina, for example the British Museum stela of the workman Neferabu (BM EA 305, probably from TT 5; Bierbrier 1982, 57, fig. 38) or the Papyrus of Pashed (BM EA 9955, probably belonging to the tomb owner of TT 3; Lüscher 2007, 30, 40, pl. 38a). The latter shows the same local text-tradition, and the

4 For regular updates on the available volumes, see: www.orientverlag.ch. Provisional corrigenda to the volumes already published can be found there as well.

5 In contrast with comments by K. Cooney, in which she deduces from the very few known examples of Book of the Dead papyri from Deir el-Medina that ‘painting papyri was not an obvious part of their decorative niche’ (2007, 32).
scribe of the manuscript even chose the motif of Anubis at the bier in the accompanying vignette—the typical illustration for BD 1 in Deir el-Medina tombs replacing the funeral procession usually found on papyri. This example therefore clearly reveals provenance by combining the local iconographic and text traditions (Lüscher 2007). This study is a first and preliminary step towards a closer and more detailed investigation of this particular local tradition—preliminary because so far the majority of tombs and other textual material from Deir el-Medina remain unpublished and are not yet available for further critical comparison.

The Making of Naville’s *Toottenbuch*

Since undertaking the Swiss Book of the Dead Project, it has become clear that there is much to learn from nineteenth century archival sources. Under the working title *Auf den Spuren von Edouard Naville*, the new project retraces Naville’s steps towards his edition by working through his hand-written notes, drawings, and extensive correspondence with scholars and museums, part of which was left to the Bibliothèque de Genève together with his extensive private library. The most important documents will be published as *Toottenbuchtexte (TbT) Supplementa 1*. The material can be divided into three main parts:

- The preprint of Naville’s Book of the Dead edition from 1886 (vols 1 and 2), with original French titles in handwriting (later translated into German by the Berlin professor Ludwig Stein).
- Letters to and from international scholars, among them many to and from Richard Lepsius.
- Some of Naville’s personal notes, drawings and hand copies of several documents made by himself, his wife Marguerite, and others.

Many of the original sources he used are still unpublished and some have partly suffered from deterioration or even disappeared completely. Thus, such a collection of early notes and facsimile drawings is of particular value today. A selection of the most interesting items will be discussed and photographically reproduced in the forthcoming monograph. What follows is a preliminary outline of the techniques employed by Naville and his contemporaries and a demonstration of the usefulness of such archival material for Book of the Dead studies in general.

Tools and techniques

Just as the Swiss Book of the Dead project’s editions depend on a special computer program for transcribing and accurately formatting text, it is useful to recognize the tools

---

6 Catalogue 1926. In 2006 the Naville family gave more archival material to the Musée d’art et d’histoire de Genève, Département d’archéologie, where J.-L. Chappaz and his team are in the process of cataloguing and studying it. We would like to express here our gratitude to J.-L. Chappaz for his very generous and open exchange of information and material. For a detailed article on Naville and his wife Marguerite and their relationship to the Musée d’art et d’histoire, Genève, see his article, Chappaz 2009. I also would like to thank Frédéric Naville, president of the Naville Foundation, for kindly giving me access to his collection of private photographs from the Naville family.
and techniques available to our predecessors in the nineteenth century. When Lepsius led his Prussian Expedition to Egypt and Nubia between 1842 and 1845, photography was a new technology and he evidently did not use it. Instead, Lepsius relied on skilled and specially trained painters and artists, like Jacob Frey and the brothers Ernst and Max Weidenbach. Facsimiles of monuments or objects were made using semi-translucent paper (‘Kalkierpapier,’ ‘papier calque’) or taking squeezes (‘Abklatsche’). In his biography of Lepsius, G. Ebers states that ‘Lepsius der Erste gewesen ist, welcher die treffliche Kopirmethode des Papierabklatsches glücklich und in ausgiebiger Weise anwandte’ (Ebers 1885, 200–201).

As a student in Berlin, Naville learned these techniques directly from Lepsius: ‘Bientôt Lepsius l’introduit au musée où il dispose d’un cabinet particulier et lui donne des papyrus à copier. Il lui apprend aussi à faire des estampages’ (van Berchem 1989, 38). Before Naville left for Egypt, Lepsius reminded him, in a letter dated 13 September 1868, to take good equipment for making squeezes.

Vergessen Sie nicht eine tüchtige Quantität festes ungeleimtes Papier, Schwamm und mehrere Bürsten mit gleichmässig vertheilten Haaren und einem Stile mitzunehmen zum Abklatschen, was Sie bald Ihrem Zeichner überlassen werden, den Sie natürlich auch sonst sehr nützlich verwenden können, wenn er sich erst in den Stil der ägyptischen Figuren gefunden haben wird (Bibliothèque de Genève, Département de manuscrits, Ms. fr. 2527; van Berchem 1989, 122).7

Another famous scholar, Emmanuel de Rougé (1811–1872), gave Naville similar advice in a letter of 1 October 1868.

Comme préparation au voyage, ce que je vous recommanderais avant tout, c’est de vous exercer à copier les inscriptions d’après les monuments; quand on n’a pas cette fortune on fait une foule de fautes de copie. … Je recommande, quand une inscription vous paraîtra neuve et intéressante, pour peu qu’elle vous semble un peu difficile à copier, n’hésitez pas à en prendre des bonnes empreintes en papier; exercez vous avant de partir, vous et votre aide, afin de bien choisir votre papier et vos brosses: c’est très essentiel d’être bien outillé (Bibliothèque de Genève, Département de manuscrits, Ms. fr. 2535; van Berchem 1989, 135–36).

Naville recognized the disadvantage of the technique and the obvious damage it caused to the monuments. In a letter he wrote to his parents during his first trip to Egypt in 1868, he states, ‘Mon papier est peut-être un peu mince, et les estampages se déchiraient facilement; mais ils n’ont que trop bien réussi; car ils ont emporté avec eux beaucoup de couleurs’ (van Berchem 1989, 64.)

For his work on funerary papyri, Naville mainly used semi-translucent tracing paper to produce his facsimiles. He drew some facsimiles himself directly from the objects or from photographs, while others were provided by colleagues and then re-copied by Naville or his wife, Marguerite de Pourtalès (1852–1930). Often it is not clear whether a given drawing was

7 This letter is among the 66 letters from Lepsius to Naville, now in Bibliothèque de Genève, Département des manuscrits.
made by Edouard or Marguerite, also a talented artist. He mentions in his introduction that, at least for the first volume of his edition, his wife drew and prepared for publication all texts and vignettes using a so-called pantograph (‘Storchenschnabel’) to reduce the drawings to scale (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 14–15).

Naville’s editing process: The Papyrus of Nebseni and its parallels

The starting point for Naville’s Book of the Dead project began with the first photographic reproduction of the London Papyrus of Nebseni (BM EA 9900, Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 48). The value of the photograph of the papyrus for Naville’s process is demonstrated by extracts from several letters he wrote to Lepsius in 1875. All of these letters are held in the Bibliothèque de Genève, Département des manuscrits, under the siglum Ms. fr. 2547.

Après ce que j’ai vu à Leyde, je suis toujours plus convaincu de la nécessité d’avoir une reproduction du pap. de Nebseni de Londres, calque ou photographie, il est bien supérieur comme corrective aux papyrus de Leiden; et il devra nous servir de base pour beaucoup de chapitres (1 August 1875).

Quant à Mr. Birch, j’ai reçu il y a quinze jours une lettre me demandant de répondre par le retour du courrier sur cette question ci: à savoir si une photographie du papyrus de Nebseni de la grandeur de celui de Hunefer publié précédemment était suffisante pour le travail, pour qu’il voulait proposer aux trustees de le publier de cette manière. J’ai répondu aussitôt que oui, puis Mr. Birch m’a écrit que les trustees avaient accepté, et il m’a envoyé hier un spécimen photographique, que je trouve remarquablement bien réussi (25 October 1875).

In a footnote at the bottom of this letter he adds after his signature: ‘Mr. Birch me dit qu’il vous envoie aussi un spécimen de Nebseni. Le mien est fort bien réussi.’

J’ai examiné avec grand soin l’épreuve photographique du pap. de Nebseni que m’a envoyé Mr. Birch, elle est vraiment réussie d’une manière remarquable, et sera d’une grande importance pour l’édition thébaine (8 November 1875).

After general approval of this first photographic test, the Trustees of the British Museum granted permission for the official publication of Papyrus Nebseni: ‘Le British Museum ayant décidé la publication du papyrus de Nebseni, c’est le moment je crois de reprendre le programme que je vous avais soumis, et de le publier’ (22 November 1875). Here Naville refers to the circulaire, a flyer that was printed in December of 1875 and sent out to the various museums and private collectors announcing ‘la grande édition du livre des morts,’ and signed by a committee of four scholars: ‘S. Birch, British Museum, London. F. Chabas, Châlons-sur-Saône, France. Lepsius, Bendlerstrasse, 18, Berlin. Ed. Naville, Cour St-Pierre, Genève’ (Bibliothèque de Genève, Département des manuscrits, Ms. fr. 2547/112–113).

With the Papyrus of Nebseni as his texte de base for the majority of spells, Naville began travelling to different museums in 1877 to collect material. He compared each new version against the Nebseni text, noted the textual variants and palaeographic details, and copied
unusual or new vignettes. Only those spells that did not occur on the Papyrus of Nebseni were copied in full from other papyri (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 11). Therefore his notes regarding other documents mainly consist of comments on special passages or written descriptions, rather than full copies of the texts. He made particular use of the Louvre Papyrus of Mesemnetjer (Louvre E.21324; Naville’s siglum Ca) and the Papyrus of Neferoubenef (Louvre N.3092; Naville’s siglum Pb) as complementary versions to Nebseni.

In several cases Naville relied on drawings given to him by other scholars. The importance of these copies is aptly illustrated by the facsimile of a Hannover papyrus fragment, which is discussed and reproduced here for the first time (Fig. 8). This facsimile belongs to a set of documents to be addressed in Totenbuchtexte (TbT) Supplementa 1 (Lüscher forthcoming) and nicely demonstrates the potential of archival papers for establishing a corpus of material, which, when studied together, can be attributed to an ancient centre of production.

Again, the London Papyrus of Nebseni (BM EA 9900) plays a central role. According to Sotheby’s 1836 auction catalogue, this famous manuscript originates from Memphis, a provenance confirmed by the deceased’s titles and the names of his children (Lapp 2004, 22).

One of its special features, perhaps also a criterion for a Memphite origin, is the arrangement of some vignettes in two registers (Lapp 2004, pls. 4–14). Known parallels are very rare. A comparable arrangement in two registers, along with many other similarities to the Papyrus of Nebseni, occurs in the Papyrus Bakai/Amenemope in Warsaw (Museum Narodowe Inv. Nr. 237128; Andrzejewski 1951), and discussed by I. Munro (Munro 1988, 133–34). A second parallel is the recently published Papyrus Princeton pharaonic roll 5, which was only unrolled in 1999 (Lüscher 2008). Lepsius and Naville identified a third parallel over a century ago, the Hannover fragment mentioned above, which was apparently lost or destroyed. It is represented by Naville’s siglum Ha (for Hannover) and listed in his introduction under ‘Fragment Kestner in Hannover’ (Naville 1886, 83), referring to the following comment by Lepsius:


Naville himself had never seen the original papyrus fragment: ‘Ich kenne dieses Bruchstück nur aus einer Durchzeichnung von Lepsius, die mir derselbe gütigst mitgetheilt hat’ (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 83). Nevertheless, he recognized that the fragment belonged to a manuscript in Florence and that both show ‘in den Vignetten und in der Anordnung der Kapitel eine ausserordentliche Ähnlichkeit mit Aa’ [= Nebseni], and therefore might have been copied ‘sehr wohl nach demselben Original’ (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 49). The Florence part of the papyrus, originally produced for a man called Senemnetjer, is now in the Egyptian collection of the Museo Archeologico di Firenze (Inv. no. 3660A) and is dated by I. Munro to the time of Hatshepsut/Tuthmosis III (Munro 1988, 285, no. 42).9 Naville lists this fragment under his siglum Ib with the following spell sequence: BD 134–114–112–113–108. He mentions further that ‘Herr Dr. Schiaparelli hat die Güte gehabt mir eine Durchzeichnung dieses

8 For the special arrangement of vignettes in two registers see Lüscher 2008, chapter 4.12 and pls. 3–5, 10–14.
9 Note that the inv. no. given in Munro 1988 (250, no. 42) as 3630 is incorrect; the correct no. is 3660A.
Papyrus zu liefern’ (Naville 1886 [Einleitung], 85). Fortunately, this drawing of the Florence fragment—or perhaps a copy of it actually made by the Navilles—is among Naville’s papers (Bibliothèque de Genève, Département de manuscrits, Ms. fr. 2549/4) and, like the Hannover fragment facsimile, is also reproduced here for the first time, side by side with the modern photograph of the original papyrus (Figs. 1–6). A comparison of the facsimile with the original papyrus reveals that the drawing is accurate and reliable. Some passages of the text were clearly better preserved some 130 years ago than they are today, demonstrating the importance of publishing nineteenth century copies.

The titles of both papyrus owners, Nebseni (ḥḥ špr. w m ḫw.t-Prḥ / pr-Prḥ, ṣs kdw.t m ḫw.t-Prḥ / pr-Prḥ) and Senemnetjer (ḥṛ ḫny.t n pr-Prḥ), with their connection to the temple of Ptah, clearly point to a Memphite origin. Unfortunately the Florence fragment does not show the special arrangement of vignettes in two registers mentioned above as a common feature of the three other Memphite papyri belonging to Nebseni, Bakai/Amenemope and Princeton pharaonic roll 5; but, the Hannover fragment of the same papyrus does. The original Hannover fragment may be lost, but fortunately not its copy! Again, it was preserved as a facsimile-drawing among Naville’s papers and thus conveys valuable information. I. Munro tried without success to locate the papyrus fragment and summarizes her search:


U. Luft has also stated that ‘Das Stück in Hannover ist verschollen nach Auskunft von Peter Munro’ (Luft 1977, 73). Thus, the coloured facsimile drawing on tracing paper is one of the ‘hidden treasures’ to be found among Naville’s papers (Bibliothèque de Genève, Département de manuscrits, Ms. fr. 2549/4; Fig. 8). It is in fact the copy of a copy, which was originally lent to him by Lepsius and then retraced either by Naville himself or by his wife Marguerite. The original drawing by Lepsius also survives and can be consulted in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin (to be published in Lüscher forthcoming).

Now, for the first time in roughly 120 years, we can confirm the common features of the Memphite group of papyri, particularly with regard to the arrangement of some vignettes in two registers. A comparison between the corresponding part in the Papyrus of Nebseni and the Kestner fragment makes it clear that both were based on the same local text and vignette tradition (Figs 7 and 8).

What happened to the original papyrus fragment in Hannover after Lepsius examined and copied it remains uncertain. The Kestner family at the time consisted of several members (among them Charlotte Kestner, Goethe’s famous ‘Lotte’ and mother of August Kestner, for whom, see Jorns 1964), all of them personally known to Lepsius, and it cannot be confirmed

10 It seems that Edouard and Marguerite Naville used to make their own copies of drawings given to them by other scholars.

11 The writing of the title ‘Fragment Kestner’ on the tracing paper looks quite similar to Marguerite’s own handwriting.
that the papyrus ever formed part of the Kestner museum since Lepsius only speaks of the ‘Kestner collection in Hannover.’ Perhaps it was destroyed during a time of war, or perhaps it has remained in the private possession of one of August Kestner’s relatives. The discovery of this long-missing textual part of Papyrus Senemnetjer, however, shows once again how fruitful it can be to rummage through libraries and archives where certainly more ‘wonderful things’ await their re-discovery.
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Fig. 6: Facsimile-drawing of Papyrus Seneferu (Bibliothèque de Genève, Département des manuscrits, Ms. fr. 2549/4, summary siglum) © Bibliothèque de Genève, Département des manuscrits.
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Fig. 7: Papyrus Nebseni (British Museum EA 9900) © The Trustees of the British Museum.
Fig. 8: Facsimile-drawing of the ‘Fragment Kestner’ (Bibliothèque de Genève, Département des manuscrits, Ms. fr. 2549/4, summary siglum) © Bibliothèque de Genève, Département des manuscrits.