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The tradition presented here is attested through nine primary and two secondary documents:

**Primary documents**
- P. BM EA 10086
- P. BM EA 10088
- P. Cairo JE 97249
- P. Christchurch EA 1988
- P. Louvre N 3082
- P. Louvre N 3142
- P. Milan E 1023
- P. Sydney
- P. BM EA 10047.1–4 and Getty 83.AI.47.2.1–4

**Secondary documents**
- P. Louvre N 3087
- P. Louvre E 6130

**Primary documents**

Before discussing the specifics of the tradition, a brief summary of each document is provided, with an accompanying schematic diagram and a representative photograph of the document. These schematic diagrams do not convey proportions or dimensions but rather serve to indicate the overall layout and general condition of each document, and the contents per column with regard to texts and vignettes of spells. The following conventions are used:

- Numbers refer to the BD spell.
- Suffix ‘c’ indicates continuation of the text from the previous column.¹
- Suffix ‘v’ indicates that the vignette for the spell is presented with the text.
- Suffix ‘z’ indicates that only the vignette is present (e.g., 16z and 110z in P. BM EA 10086); in the case where vignettes were presented continuously across the top of the texts, the vignette is numbered with a ‘z’ and the text is also listed by itself in the column below (e.g., col. 18 in P. BM EA 10086), or where the vignette is not directly aligned with the text or was presented without text (e.g., cols. 28–29 in P. BM EA 10086).
- ‘/’ indicates a broken area of the document.
- Independent fragments stand by themselves (e.g., P. Sydney).

In Late Period Books of the Dead, the vignette of a spell is not always correctly aligned with the text, and this is particularly true where vignettes are strung continuously across the top of a document and have no direct alignment with the texts below. While the latter does

¹ The case of BD 15c is special, where the continuation of this text in the next column is 15cc.
not pertain to the primary or secondary documents listed here, it does apply to some other documents discussed in this paper. Identification of vignettes is based on overwhelming statistics in documents where vignettes and texts were correctly aligned, coupled with the fact that the illustrations for the different spells in the Late Period were standardised, even where different versions of vignettes were used for a spell (Mosher 2002, 96).

Finally, each column in the diagram is numbered below the column. In the interest of brevity, where a spell exclusively takes up two or more columns, only a single column is presented in the diagram, but the number indicates the range of columns consumed by the spell (e.g., BD 17 in P. BM EA 10086).

*P. BM EA 10086* (Figs. 1–2).
Quirke designated this unpublished document in the British Museum as no. 258 (Quirke 1993, 65–66). The deceased was Tentameniy (*T3-imn-li-w*), whose mother was the mistress of the house, Neschorpakhered. It follows a format I have previously identified as Style 1 and it is an abridged Book of the Dead in that many spells from the Late Period corpus were omitted (Fig. 2; Mosher 1992, 145–46).

*P. BM EA 10088* (Figs. 3–4).
Quirke designated this unpublished document in the British Museum as no. 262 (Quirke 1993, 66). The deceased is identified as Tentdjehuty (*Tnt-Dhwty*), whose mother was Tadineferhotep. It is a highly abridged Style 1 Book of the Dead, containing only a relatively small number of spells (Fig. 4).

*P. Cairo JE 97249*
This published document is a badly damaged Style 1 Book of the Dead that appears also to have been abbreviated, but less so than the other documents discussed in the current study (Burkard 1986, 68–71, no. 17). Indeed, the document is in such poor condition that a schematic diagram is not possible, and the best one can do is list the spells it contains. The deceased was creator of the god’s body, Nesmin, whose mother was the mistress of the house, Tasheritmin. The sequence of its texts is as follows: BD 2///15///17–23///31–32//34–35//38, 39//43///51–55, 57, 59–60, 62, 61//65///68, 71–75, 77–81//85, 90–91///94–101, 110z, 111–116, 120, 122, 124–133///137z, 140///142//146–147, 148z, 149, 150z///151–152, 156–159///163–165, 162.

*P. Christchurch EA 1988.73–76* (Figs. 5–6).
This unpublished document in the Canterbury Museum (Christchurch, New Zealand) was recently brought to my attention by Tamás Mekis. The deceased was Takerheb, whose mother was the mistress of the house, *Nbt-dnh-lyt*. The initial column is preserved, but this section of the document is damaged and it is difficult to say how many columns originally existed between the initial column and that containing BD 10 and 15a–b. It is a highly abridged Style 1 document (Fig. 6). One can readily observe unusual peculiarities in the sequence of spells, and several illustrations have no relationship with the spells with which they are paired. In column n+12, both illustrations are either fanciful creations by the particular artist responsible for the document, or were perhaps mistakenly misplaced from their proper location: the upper
Illustration might have been misplaced from BD 18, and the lower illustration might have been a corrupted variation of the scene from the upper register of the vignette known as BD 16. Similarly, the illustration at the top of column \( n+15 \) might also have been misplaced from BD 18, a proposal that is supported by the fact that only four of the ten individual scenes normally used for BD 18 were given with the text of BD 18 in this document. Only the first half of the text of BD 54 is presented, concluding with a few phrases from BD 56.

\textit{Gotty 83.AI.47.2.1–4 and P. BM EA 10047.1–4 (bandages of Padiusir)}

For this unpublished collection of mummy bandages, only five of the original set have been located. The bandages that originally formed numbers 1, 3, 4, and 9 are now located at the J. Paul Getty Museum in Malibu, California (Fig. 7), and the bandage that was originally number 2 is located at the British Museum. The deceased was Padiusir, whose mother was Nainesbastet. Because of one special consideration pertaining to this document, a schematic diagram for the surviving set of bandages is both difficult and impractical. Typically, a ‘page’ on a mummy bandage, appearing as a column of horizontal lines, tends to be fairly wide when no vignettes are involved (e.g., de Caluwe 1991, pls. I–III). Where vignettes were placed with the texts, the width of the page can be reduced, sometimes leaving space sufficient for as few as 10–12 characters per line (Fig. 8).

The unusual characteristic of Padiusir’s mummy bandages is that the majority of ‘pages’ have a width that typically allowed only 7–12 characters per line, even where no vignettes are involved (Fig. 7). Therefore, producing a schematic diagram was pointless for this type of layout. Instead, the contents of each bandage are listed below, where it can be readily noticed that the vignettes were not aligned with the texts.

- Bandage 1 BD 11c, 12, 13, 14 (with vignette of 16), 15g and 15h (with vignette of 17), 15i, 17.
- Bandage 2 BD 18v.
- Bandage 3 BD 18 conclusion, 19 (with unusual vignette - necklace instead of wreath), 20 (with vignette of 20), 21 (with unknown vignette), 22, 23, 25 (with vignettes of 26 and 27), 26 (with vignette of 28).
- Bandage 4 BD 26c, 27 (with vignette of 30 and then vignette of 64), 28 (with vignette of 43), 19 (with vignette of 45), 38 (with vignettes of 47, 50, 51, and 52), 43 (with vignette of 54), 44 (with vignette of 59), start of 45 (with vignette of 60).
- Bandage 9 Part of BD 145 with scenes.

The documents making up the primary set of this tradition are Theban, yet the style of these bandages is clearly Memphite, though of more narrow width than was typical. Examples associated with Thebes typically consist of a thin bandage that permitted only one to three lines of text, thereby allowing only a few spells per bandage (e.g., Burkard 1986, pl. 86).

The provenance of the bandages is unknown; if they were produced in Memphis, how did a Theban tradition arrive in Memphis? Perhaps the deceased moved north and brought a copy of the Theban tradition with him for his own funerary arrangements. Alternatively, if they were produced in Thebes, then perhaps the deceased was from the Memphite area,
moved south, and had a Book of the Dead written on mummy bandages for his own funerary arrangements. Both suggestions represent speculation, but the fact remains that we have a Theban textual tradition written on a Memphite medium.

P. Louvre N 3082 (Figs. 9–10).
This papyrus is an abridged Style 1 document, having only a handful of spells after the text of BD 64 (Fig. 10; Rougé 1861–79, pls. I–IV). The deceased was the $ry-tp-nsw, divine father, prophet of Amen-Re king of the gods, Hnk-nwn of Hermonthis, Harsiese, whose mother was Takhybiat.

P. Louvre N 3142 (Figs. 11–12)
This papyrus is a highly abridged, unpublished, Style 1 document (Fig. 12; Devéria 1872, 109; Bellion 1987, 204). The deceased was the sistrum player of Amen-Re and Chantress, Tadit, whose mother was Nestefnut.

P. Milan E 1023 (Figs. 13–14)
Given the damage along the bottom, this abridged Style 1 document may have contained more spells than those listed in the diagram (Fig. 14; Vandoni 1969, 77–85). Fragments of BD 127, 129, 142, 144, 149, 150, 151, and 152 also exist but have been excluded from the diagram because it is impossible to know what the latter part of the document looked like from these fragments. The deceased was the prophet, Hornefer, whose mother was the mistress of the house, Takerheb (Clarysse 1981, 68, no. 5476a).

P. Sydney (Figs. 15–16)
The owner of this abbreviated Style 1 Book of the Dead (Fig. 16; Nicholson 1891; Bellion 1987, 264) was the divine father, prophet of Amen-Re king of the gods, prophet of Neferhotep, scribe of Amen of the third phyle, Nesmin, whose mother was the mistress of the house and sistrum player of Amen-Re, Asetweret, also named Nesweret (Clarysse 1981, 84, no. 5581a). The document has suffered damage, and its sequence is clearly peculiar. With regard to the vignette of BD 110, this scene was neatly cut on each side and it is difficult to say where it originally belonged. I have placed it after column 13 because the left edge of column 13 and the right edge of column 15 seem to match up with the sides of the vignette of BD 110. On the other hand, this is a best guess, and it is possible that it could have originally been located after column 17.

2 See also Devéria 1872, 68 and Clarysse 1981, 69, no. 5484b; Bellion 1987, 196.
3 Additional fragments are in the Vatican: Gasse 1993, 45, no. 31; Bellion 1987, 231.
4 This otherwise useful publication contains several minor errors. BD 59 is misidentified as BD 69. The vignettes in column n+20 are misidentified as those of BD 61 and 63, but each illustration was incorrectly aligned so that it followed its text, and thus the illustrations are those of BD 60 and 61. This is made certain by the fact that a fragment of the actual vignette for BD 63 survives and was incorrectly mounted in modern times after the vignette of BD 126; it was originally located, in all likelihood, towards the bottom of column n+20. The text and vignette of BD 77 is misidentified as BD 78. For BD 89, the vignette is correctly identified, but the text is incorrectly identified as BD 99. The vignettes in column n+27 are not identified, but the first is undoubtedly that of BD 95 and the second is likely that of BD 100. The deities in the vignette of BD 113 are incorrectly identified as Horus, Anubis, and Horus, but in fact they are Horus, Duamutef, and Qebehsejnuef. The deities in the vignette of BD 114 are also incorrectly identified as Thoth, a man, and Re of Upper and Lower Egypt, but in fact they are Thoth, Sia, and Atum.
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The secondary documents

Two documents are relevant to this tradition as they contain features of the tradition but also contain aspects related to other traditions.

P. Louvre E 6130
This papyrus is an unpublished abridged document of Style 2, a style associated with many Saite documents, but also Memphite documents of the Ptolemaic Period (Fig. 17; Devéria 1872, 75; Bellion 1987, 220). The texts of the majority of spells belong to the Saite-Memphite tradition, but the following range of spells belong to the Theban tradition under discussion here: BD 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 44, 45, 50, 51, 52, 53, 47, 54, 59, 60, and 63. Regarding BD 50, 52, and 53, the text of each was highly abbreviated and one cannot determine what tradition they followed, although presumably each followed the Theban tradition as with the other spells in this range. Thus the texts of the initial and final sections followed the Saite-Memphite tradition, while the texts in the middle section followed the Theban tradition under discussion here. The deceased was Asetreshi, whose mother was Setjairetbint.

P. Louvre N 3087 (Fig. 18)
This unpublished document is an abridged Style 1 Book of the Dead (Fig. 18) that contains the following spells: BD 6–14, 15a–d, 16V, 15g–i, 17–20, 43–48, 52–54, 56, 65, 67, 66, 72–77, 79, 110–111, 113–114, 117–120, 122, 121, 123–136, 140, 137–138, 141–142, 165, 162. The beginning is lost. The texts of most spells belong to other Theban traditions, but BD 15b, 15c, 15g, 15i, 17, 18, and 19 follow the tradition being discussed here. Since these represent such a small percentage of spells contained in the overall document, there is no value in presenting a schematic diagram. The deceased was the sistrum player of Amen-Re, Nehemesretawy, whose mother was the mistress of the house, Tasheritmin (Devéria 1872, 83; Bellion 1987, 197).

Definition of this Theban tradition

Turning attention now to the specifics of this tradition, one may ask what defines it. Indeed, what defines any of the Late Period traditions for the Book of the Dead? In response, there are five basic factors that define any tradition: the versions of text they contain, the versions of vignettes they contain, the corpus of spells used by the tradition, the sequence of spells, and the style of layout used for the document.

Style
Regarding style, with the exception of the mummy bandages of Padiusir and P. Louvre E 6130, all documents were constructed with the general layout of Style 1 found in Thebes. By itself, style is not a defining factor for the tradition under discussion here because other Theban traditions also used Style 1.

5 On Style 2, see Mosher 1992, 149–50.
Corpus

Regarding corpus, all eleven documents were abridged to varying degrees, with some so abridged that they only contain a relatively small number of spells (e.g., P. Christchurch and P. Sydney). Therefore, deductions based on the selection of spells used in the documents listed above are not really possible, but one can nevertheless make several interesting observations.

BD 50 follows BD 47 in four of the six documents having BD 47, thereby omitting BD 48 and 49. P. Louvre E 6130 has the text of BD 47 out of sequence but still excludes BD 48 and 49. While the text of BD 47 is lost from the mummy bandages of Padiusir, the sequence of vignettes has 47, 50, 51, and 52 contiguous to each other (Fig. 19), clearly omitting the vignettes of BD 48 and 49. In P. BM EA 10088, the texts jump from BD 43 to 54 and 59, while in P. Louvre N 3142 the texts jump from BD 43 to 59, not allowing one to draw a conclusion about BD 48 and 49. In P. Cairo JE 97249, the section containing BD 43 and 50 is badly damaged and no traces of any intervening spells survive. P. Christchurch is the exception because it does contain BD 48 and 49, but one must also observe the jumbled sequence of texts (Fig. 5), where BD 47 and 50 were not included. Further, since this document has only come to my attention recently, I have not had the opportunity yet to examine the texts for the spells beyond the range of BD 1 to 64. In summary, it would seem that BD 48 and 49 were normally omitted from the tradition, but P. Christchurch is the exception.

The second interesting observation that one can make is the omission of BD 56 and 58. P. BM EA 10086, P. Cairo JE 97249, and P. Louvre N 3082 contain the following sequence of spells: BD 54, 55, 57, and 59, clearly omitting 56 and 58. P. Milan E 1023 has the same sequence although BD 55 was omitted as well. P. BM EA 10088 and P. Louvre E 6130 jump from BD 54 to 59, and the same jump can be seen for the vignettes in the mummy bandages of Padiusir. Similarly, P. Christchurch has only BD 54 and 57, but curiously the text of BD 54 is abbreviated and a line from BD 56 was appended to the end of 54, thereby making it clear that BD 56 was known, even if not used by the tradition. Finally, P. Louvre N 3142 has only BD 59. Thus, while some variation exists with regard to the omission or inclusion of BD 54, 55, 57 and 59, it seems BD 56 and 58 were not included, as least based on the evidence of the documents discussed herein.

As stated above, the omission of BD 48, 49, 56, and 58 is of interest, but it is not sufficient to state anything definitive about the tradition.

Sequence

Two peculiarities regarding the sequence of spells are apparent: the placement of the vignette known as BD 16 before the text of 15g, and the inversion of BD 62 before 61.

Regarding the placement of BD 16, the sequence of texts in P. BM EA 10086 and P. Louvre N 3082 is: BD 15a–f, vignette of BD 16, and the texts of BD 15g–i. Variations on this are: (a) BD 15a–15d, vignette of BD 16, and BD 15g–h (P. BM EA 10088, P. Christchurch, and P. Louvre N 3087), and (b) BD 14, vignette of 16, and 15g–i (mummy bandages of Padiusir). Damage to P. Cairo JE 97249, P. Louvre N 3142, and P. Milan E 1023 prevent one from determining the sequence in these documents. With regard to P. Sydney, a portion of the document is now lost after BD 15a, but it is unlikely that it contained more than a single column of text, and we cannot be sure that another column even followed. Assuming there

---

was a following column, spatial limitations would not likely have allowed all of BD 15b–f. The BD 16 vignette survives, but the vignette of BD 17 above the text of BD 18 follow, with the texts of BD 15g–i and 17 omitted. Thus, the arrangement in this document differs from that in the other documents, but this was likely the result of the aforesaid omissions. This peculiarity in sequence stands out quite strikingly when viewing the graphic layout of the different documents, as can be observed in figures 18 and 20–24.

The second peculiarity is the sequence of BD 60, 62, and 61, which can be observed in P. BM EA 10086, P. Cairo JE 97249, and P. Louvre N 3082. In P. Louvre N 3142, we find the text of BD 59, followed by the vignette of BD 61, and then the text of BD 62; given the abridged nature of this document, it may well have been the case that the vignette for BD 61 was intended to deliver the magic of the spell, without the text, and thus the same basic sequence is evident. In P. Milan E 1023, the text of BD 61 follows that of BD 60, but this document omitted BD 62 and thus its sequence does not contradict the special sequence above, nor does P. Louvre E 6130, which omitted both BD 62 and 61. For the remaining primary documents, all either omitted these spells or they are now lost.

The texts

While the corpus and sequence found in these documents suggest a special tradition, it is the versions of the texts that make this tradition stand out in high relief because they often differ dramatically from the versions of texts found in other Theban traditions.

When comparing versions of texts of one tradition against another, one can observe four basic types of changes:

1. Introduction of one or more new passages of text.
2. Enhancements or embellishments to the existing text.
3. Reworking of the existing text for improvement, possibly to achieve new meaning.
4. Rework of the existing text for improvement, possibly based on a misunderstanding of the original text or meant as a correction to text perceived as incorrect or insufficient.

When one consistently finds the same changes to the text of an individual spell in a reasonable number of documents, then one is justified in stating that these changes represent a version, as opposed to changes that can only be found in a single document. Secondly, when one consistently observes the same versions of texts across all spells in a group of documents, then one is justified in stating that the group represents a tradition. Because each document consistently used the same versions and texts across the common sets of spells found in the documents as a group, this group clearly represent a Theban tradition.

A detailed discussion of the text in every spell is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, a small selection of spells are considered, which illustrate the different types of changes mentioned above and that illustrate the unique nature of the texts of this tradition.

With regard to the first type of change, many spells in this tradition contain new passages. For two simple examples, the conclusion of BD 44 concludes with two new statements not found in other Late Period traditions: ‘One shall not cut off my head in the necropolis. I am
Atum." Given the fact that the purpose of BD 44 is to prevent the deceased from dying a second time, the first statement fits well into this context, and the deceased's identification with Atum strengthens the claim. One might suggest that the first statement was derived from BD 43, whose title is ‘BD for not allowing one to cut off the head of a man in the necropolis,’ but the statement is new to the conclusion to BD 44, and the additional statement wherein the deceased is identified with Atum cannot be traced to any surrounding spells. Both statements add new support to the purpose of BD 44, expressed in its title, ‘Spell for not dying again in the necropolis.’

Similarly, the text of BD 59 concludes with ‘I am Atum,’ an ending that can be found in five of the six documents that contain the spell. The sixth document, P. BM EA 10086, concludes with ‘I am N, the great god, lord of the westerners and the great Ennead who are with them [in] the sacred land, N.’ The spell was included in P. Milan E 1023, but the conclusion of the text is lost. In considering that BD 54–55, 57, 59–62 form a cohesive set that pertain to providing the deceased with air and water, that BD 54 and 62 involve Atum, that BD 55, 57, 60–62 involve Hapi, and that BD 59 does not mention either deity in the other Theban traditions, the decision by the master scribes of this tradition to involve Atum in BD 59 was a clever means of tying this spell to the others of the set by assigning one of the two patron deities of the overall set to the spell.

BD 31 offers a far more interesting example of a combination of new text, enhanced text, and reworked text. BD 31 and BD 69 are related because they contain some passages in common, and both ultimately go back to CT 227 and 228. Four versions of BD 31 are attested in the Late Period, with translations of the first and fourth provided by Verhoeven and Allen respectively (Verhoeven 1993, 125–27; Allen 1960, 116–17). Allen, in his translation, broke the spell down into three sections (a, b, c). While revisions were made to section a in all versions, the main revisions of interest for the tradition under discussion here are those that follow. Specifically, a new section of text was inserted between sections a and b, section b was reworked, section c was omitted, and the text concludes with a new statement. With regard to the new section, much derives from BD 69, a spell not surprisingly unrepresented in any of the documents of the tradition, but the text was significantly revised from the text of BD 69. Below is the translation of BD 31 from the new section down to the end of the spell.

I am Aseby, the conjuror of Asebyt. I am Osiris, the conjuror of Isis. I have come to seek the son of Horus along with his mother Isis. He has protected me from the performing...
of this diseased trouble against me. I, moreover, place the bonds against his arms, namely he who creates more than his inheritance. It is I, I am Osiris, the elder of the womb, the elder of the five gods, the heir of his father Geb, stout of phallus, weak of legs, lord of the flame, the rampant of mankind. O, I am the bull, foremost of his fields. It is I, I am Osiris, whose father Geb and whose mother Nut were sealed. I am Horus the elder on the day his appearance. [I am] Anubis on the day of the examiner. It is I, I am Osiris, the elder who assembles, who speaks the doorkeeper of Osiris.

13 Dty.n.f wi m-5 iry 3h3 pn mr rỉ. This and the previous statement were completely reworked from the text in BD 69.

14 iw.i irf wd nTtw r c.wy km3 r iw$t.f. This statement was partially reworked from the text in BD 69 and represents the whole new idea of binding up who seeks more than his share, presumably at the expense of the deceased.

15 P. Sydney varies this, stating ‘It is I, I am Osiris, the heir… .’

16 P. Sydney varies this, stating ‘It is I, I am Osiris, stout of phallus… .’

17 ‘Flame of the flame’ in P. Sydney.

18 ink pw ink Wsir i$w n hî i$w n n$p 5 iw$ n.î.t.f Gb n$h t hun gm rdwy nb nhî imd$r rhyt. Part of the paragraph was derived from BD 69, while the part about the legs, the flame, and the rampant represent new ideas. The text in P. Sydney terminates here.

19 This paragraph follows the general text for section b found in the other Late Period Theban Books of the Dead, although with revisions.

20 ħnty mistaken in P. Milan E 1023 as m-5, although even so the essential meaning is the same: ‘I am the bull in charge of his fields.’

21 i ink kî ħnty sht.f: so P. Louvre N 3082 and P. Milan E 1023, although the area with the opening i in P. Milan E 1023 and P. Cairo JE 97249 is lost.

22 ink pw ink Wsir $tn.î.t.f Gb h$mî mwt.f Nwî, in P. Milan E 1023. P. Louvre N 3082 adds ‘on the day of the great slaughter’ (hrw pfy s’d 5?), as found in the text of BD 69; the rest of the paragraph was omitted in this document and the text resumes at ‘O he who drags …’ P. Milan E 1023 becomes the only source for the remainder of the paragraph, with parts found in P. Cairo JE 97249.

23 Ink Hr smsw hrw $b$, surviving in P. Milan E 1023.

24 [ink pw] Inpw hrw sip, P. Milan E 1023, where ink pw is lost but assumed by virtue of the same passage being found in BD 69. Regarding ‘examiner,’ the word in CT and some New Kingdom Books of the Dead is sp$ ‘centipede,’ but the word is spelled differently in P. Milan E 1023 (Fig. 25), which is partially like sip and partially like sp$. The signs fit Wb III, 441.11, but that does not seem to have relevance to the context of this passage. Verhoeven (1993, 126) reads an almost identical spelling as ‘Abrechnung,’ and it is clearly not sp$ ‘centipede,’ as found in P. Ryerson (Allen 1960, 116 and 144). The statement was included in P. Cairo JE 97249, but the word in question is lost, although it does appear to have the divine determinative and might not have had the reed leaf. Hence, with the word surviving in only one document, it is difficult to be certain what the scribe intended.

25 Ink pw ink Wsir i$w f$b dd … iry$ Wsir. All text after f$b is lost in P. Cairo JE 97249. The text immediately following f$b in P. Milan E 1023 is also lost, but it can be partially reconstructed based on the text of BD 31 and 69 from other Theban traditions: ink pw ink Wsir i$w ‘k dd f$b s$w iry$ Wsir; ‘It is I, I am Osiris. Elder one, enter and tell the assembler of writings… ’, but the order of the words in P. Milan E 1023 and P. Cairo JE 97249 differs with regard to what directly follows i$w and to the placement of dd. Thus this passage seems to show some reworking, but with some of the text now lost, it is impossible to determine if the revision represented new ideas, or rather represented an attempt to make sense out of a
O he who drags when searching, he having performed ... (?), may you rescue N from the elders who are in this month of offerings.

BD 33 offers a simple and brief example of new and revised text. Three versions can be observed in the Late Period, with the main difference between the first and third versions involving the opening invocation. In Version 1, the serpent Rerek is addressed, while in Version 3 the invocation is either ‘every hrr-snake’ or ‘every rr-snake’ (Allen 1960, Verhoeven 1993). For Version 2 (Fig. 28), found in five of our 11 documents, the entire opening has been revised with a new concept. Further on, the passages dealing with the mouse and the bones of the putrefied cat have been reworked into a conditional statement that serves as an abominable threat to the serpent in question. The complete text of this short version is as follows:

I know your name, Hhbw-snake. Do not go against me! Behold, Geb and Shu have stood up against you. If you bite into me, you will have eaten a mouse, the abomination of Re, and you will have chewed the bones of an afflicted cat.

The change to the opening of this spell renders it more personal than Versions 1 or 3, with the Gnostic knowledge of the serpent’s name making the subsequent imperative more commanding. The use of the conditional statement extends the notion of the threat introduced at the start of the spell. The apodosis should not be taken to infer that the deceased is a mouse or an injured cat; rather, it would seem to involve intelligent subterfuge played on the snake; if the snake thinks it is biting the deceased, it will actually be biting a mouse or a sick cat, not the deceased.

misunderstanding of the original source text.

26 i stb m hh; see Fig. 26a for the text in P. Milan E 1023 and Fig. 26b for the text in P. Louvre N 3082. The opening I was omitted in P. Louvre N 3082, whether intentionally or by mistake. It is difficult to say who is invoked here.

27 ir.n.f pp(?) in P. Louvre N 3082, where the reading of the final word is, frankly, a guess (Fig. 27). The two p-signs are certain, and the determinative is certain, but what is the lexical item? In P. Milan E 1023, the same word appears although the determinative is lost.

28 The last part of the text in P. Cairo JE 97249 is lost, but it is present in both P. Louvre N 3082 and P. Milan E 1023: nhtm.k N m-i dw imyw 3bd pn htw. The entire statement is completely new text, without precedent in BD 31 and 69.

29 For the former, see Wb III, 150; for the latter, see Wb II, 438.12. Quite possibly the latter was actually meant to be the former, with the h-sign omitted.

30 P. BM EA 10086, P. Louvre N 3082, P. E. 1023, P. Sydney (most now lost, but surviving portion shows this version), and P. Louvre E 6130.

31 lw.i rh.kwi rn.k hfb’ m sm r.i mk Gb Šw ‘hfr c.k ir psh.k im.i iw wwm.n.k pw nbt Rc’ iw ws.n.k ksw miw hbw. P. Louvre N 3082 has nr n and omits the r of r.i in the first statement; P. Louvre E 6130 confused the hieratic for the suffix singular pronoun with the walking legs, while the scribe of P. BM EA 10086 added a stroke after the r of r.i, perhaps mistakenly thinking it meant ‘my mouth.’ For the final word, hwz ‘putrefied’ is to be expected, and this is found in P. Louvre E 6130, but P. BM EA 10086, P. Louvre N 3082 and P. Milan E 1023 spell it consistently as hbw. Either we regard this as an error for hw1 or we read it as a variation of hbt ‘afflicted’ or ‘injured’ (Wb III, 7). In either case, the unpleasant nature of the statement is clear.
The text of BD 39 offers another example of a variety of different types of changes that define the tradition under discussion.\textsuperscript{32} Five versions of this spell can be observed in the Late Period, and each shows revision and reorganization. For four of the five, the text consists of a lengthy address by the deceased to the serpent mentioned in the title and then Re, followed by dialog from Atum, Geb, Hathor, Nut, gods in general, and Nut. In Version 2, however, the text was considerably shortened, now consisting of just an address by the deceased to the serpent referenced in the title, a short revised statement by Atum, and a revised statement by the gods in general, followed by an entirely new concluding statement.

The opening statement in the Saite P. Louvre N 3091, representing Version 1, reads as follows (Fig. 29):

\begin{quote}
Back you! Glide away! Withdraw with Apophis! May you swim to the pool of Nun, to the place where your father has commanded to make your slaughter.\textsuperscript{35}
\end{quote}

In Version 2, a revision intended to provide new clarification is readily apparent (Fig. 30):

\begin{quote}
Back you! Glide away with Apophis!\textsuperscript{34} May you swim to the pool,\textsuperscript{35} to the place your father has commanded, in the windings that belongs to your father,\textsuperscript{36} in order to make your guarding.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

Two statements later we can observe further changes based on the reworking, either for new clarification or perhaps based on a misunderstanding. From P. Louvre N 3091 we find this passage (Fig. 31):

\begin{quote}
Back you! Sharp is your discharge. Fall to Re! Your face is turned upside down by the gods, your heart is cut out by Mafdet.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

In Version 2, we find that the entire passage has been reworked although the essential meaning remains unchanged (Fig. 32):

\begin{quote}
Back you from the knife! Re has hurled down your face. It is the assembled gods who order your slaughter.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{32} For a recent study of BD 39 that is primarily focused on New Kingdom versions of the spell, see Borghouts 2007.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{hš.k sbn inty m-x ṣpp mh.t r š Nw r bw wd.n it.k r ir šd.k im.}

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Inty} was deemed expendable and thus eliminated.

\textsuperscript{35} The association of Nun with the pool was dropped.

\textsuperscript{36} m ḳḥb ny.it.k; where ḳḥb is perhaps a reference to a winding waterway?

\textsuperscript{37} r ir šw.k. Apparently this is a holding area before the actual slaughter takes place, an action mentioned later in the text.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{hš.k mds šp.k shr n R= pn hr.k in nṯw ṣdi hšty.k in Mfḥdt.}

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{hš.k m ds shr:n.R= hr:k in nṯw dmd wd šd.k.}
The initial basis of the change involves reinterpreting $mds\; sp.k$ in the Saite text. It is impossible to say whether the root of the change was a misreading of the term $mds\; as\; m\; ds$, but it is of no consequence as the master scribes correctly dropped $sp.k$ that would have caused a problem with $m\; ds$. The next phrase was then changed from the Saite version by reinterpreting the imperative $shr$ as $shr.n.f$ and dropping the subsequent verb $pn^r$, with the resulting text making intelligent sense. Then in was changed from the Saite specification of agency attached to $pn^r$ to fronting $nprw$ for emphasis. Now while one might argue that all of these changes came about from the initial misunderstanding of $mds$, which then led to further misunderstanding of the Saite text, the final phrase was not the result of any confusion but is instead an intelligent ending that also works in the slaughter of Apophis. When reflecting on the entire passage, I am more inclined to accept that the master scribes responsible for Version 2 did not like the Saite text and therefore revised it for better sense, at least in their opinion.

The remaining text of Version 2 follows, with the conclusion of the address to Apophis, followed by the statements from Atum and the gods, and finally a concluding new statement I have not observed in any other versions of BD 39.

The gods of the south, north, west, and east, their fetters are on you. You are overthrown. You are thrown down [by] Aker, and you are fettered [by] he-who-is-over-the-coloured-inks. The heart is preserved in peace, in peace. Re, Apophis is fallen and the enemies of Re.

Says Atum: Raise up ye faces, millions.

Say the gods: Receive ye offering cakes and travel around the pool of turquoise! Come we to he-who-is-in-his-shrine. Give ye adoration to him.

May ye rescue me from every $hfrw$-snake and every $ddfr$-snake that is in the necropolis like ye did on behalf of Osiris Wennefer, justified.

With regard to this new text that concludes the spell, its more general nature serves to protect the deceased not just from Apophis but from every other serpent as well. Further, there is no question that the sense expressed therein was derived from intelligent and informed thinking.

There is much more to be said about the texts of this particular Theban tradition under discussion here because many of the spells were revised to varying degrees. I have already

40 The text stops here in P. BM EA 10086, and the remaining text is lost at this very point in P. Sydney.
41 nprw\; rsy\; mhty\; inmny\; iltby\; kls\; sn\; im.k\; shr.twk\; (in)\; klr\; kls.twk\; hry-ryt\; wqd\; lr\; m\; htp\; sp-sn\; Rr^p\; pp\; hr\; hftyw\; n\; Rr. With regard to ryt, see Wb II, 399, 9. It seems to be a reference to Thoth, as pointed out by Allen (1960, 123, n. f), where the divine determinative follows the word.
42 i-in\; lm\; is\; hctn\; hh. Regarding the i-in construction, the actual writing is rendered like the interjection i ‘O’ in P. Louvre N 3082 (Fig. 33), but in the next statement it is i-in, and it thus appears that the scribe mistakenly omitted the in element in the first statement.
43 i-in\; nprw\; $sp\; phwyw$.\; tn\; pfr\; $s\; mkkpt\; mi\; n\; imyw\; krt.t\; rd.ln\; n.f\; fsw$.
44 nhm.tn\; wi\; m\; $hfrw\; nb\; ddfw\; nb\; nty\; m\; hr-t-nr\; mi\; ir.tn\; hr\; Wsir\; Wn-nfr\; mfr$-$hrw$. This statement is only found complete in P. Louvre N 3082 and P. Louvre E 6130, but the fragments in P. Cairo JE 97249 indicate that it too had the statement.
discussed some spells elsewhere, and it is hoped that the discussions presented above will whet
the interest in a coming publication that will address all versions of texts. A point has been
made above to observe that the changes made in this tradition were typically executed with
full understanding of the subject matter, and the results demonstrate intelligent thinking on
the part of the master scribes who were responsible for assembling the texts of the tradition.
This is a vital point to bear in mind because one continues to read statements implying that
the Late Period texts, if they diverged from New Kingdom paradigms, were the result of
corruption and scribal confusion. On the contrary, each of the Late Period traditions often
demonstrates thoughtful intelligence behind their respective revisions. This is not to say that
one does not find occasional confusion in passages that seem to ignore grammatical rules or
are difficult to comprehend. In some cases, scribal errors committed by the master scribes are
certain, but in other instances the problems encountered in texts might be due to our own
shortcomings. For example, grammar for texts written in Middle Egyptian style might well
have evolved considerably by the era of the Late Period, and the rules of Middle Egyptian
that we would like to impose on Late Period texts might no longer be valid.

The vignettes
The use of specific versions of vignettes provides supporting evidence of the tradition,
although to a much lesser degree than the versions of texts. Indeed, the versions of vignettes
used by this tradition were not exclusive to the tradition but were rather used by one other
Theban tradition as well as by a subset of documents that belonged to a third Theban
tradition, as will be come clear in the examples that follow. Further, it is not the case that
versions of vignettes were so firmly fixed that individual artistic expression was stifled.
One can occasionally observe vignettes that reveal individual artistic expression added to
a standardized illustration. Further, in some cases one might argue artistic error instead of
individual variation. See, for example, figure 34, which represents the common illustration
used for BD 131, and figure 35, which perhaps offers an embellished individual variation,
although with the sun-disk omitted, perhaps by error.

As with the texts, the scope of this publication does not permit a discussion about each
vignette used by the tradition, thus a small set of representative examples is provided to
demonstrate some of the versions of vignettes used, with comparison to other versions
of vignettes used by other Theban traditions. Since this portion of this essay introduces
other Theban traditions, all Late Period Book of the Dead traditions are listed below with
a subset of documents that belong to each. As stated further above, the primary criteria for
identifying each tradition is based on the versions of texts used by each tradition, with other
aspects forming secondary criteria. This list of traditions will be referenced for each version
of vignette discussed.

45 BD 15a–b, 15g, 15i and 72 were translated in Mosher 2002, 72–95; BD 19 was translated in Mosher
2008. The future publication will be a multi-volume set, with the initial volume covering BD 1 to 64, and
subsequent volumes dealing with the remaining spells.

46 See Borghouts 2007, 10, where he states that his synoptic transcriptions of the text of BD 39 reflect the
‘vicissitudes of the text through time,’ further stating that the Late Period texts ‘were generally disregarded.’
**Saite-Memphite Tradition**  
P. Louvre N 3091, P. Vatican 48823, P. Nespasef, P. Iahtesnacht, P. Louvre N 5450, P. Louvre N 3084.47

This tradition was used in Thebes as well as Memphis during the Saite Period, and it continued to be used in the Memphite area throughout the Ptolemaic Period. At some point during Dynasty 30 in Thebes, however, this tradition was replaced by the Theban examples that follow. Thus, features that might have been used in Theban and Memphite areas during the Saite Period often only appear in Memphite documents during the Ptolemaic Period.

**P. BM EA 10086 group**  
The full set of documents belonging to this group has been presented further above.

**Louvre N 3152 group**  
P. Louvre N 3152, P. Louvre N 3232, P. Louvre N 3143, P. BMFA 92.2583, P. Louvre N 7716, P. Louvre N 3087.48

The texts of this Theban tradition are usually based on Saite tradition, but occasionally show elements of the tradition represented by the P. BM EA 10086 group.

**Louvre N 3079 group**  
P. Louvre N 3079, P. Louvre N 3086, P. Louvre N 3129, P. Louvre N 3249, P. BM EA 10087, P. Leiden T16.49

The texts of this Theban tradition are usually based on the Saite tradition and occasionally that of the Louvre N 3152 group. The documents P. Louvre N 3079 and P. Louvre N 3144 form a special subset because they typically used vignettes used by the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups, whereas the greater subset of documents for the Louvre N 3079 group typically used different versions, versions also found in the Louvre N 3089 and Ryerson groups.

**Louvre N 3089 group**  

The texts of this Theban group are usually based on the tradition represented by the Louvre N 3079 group.

**Ryerson group**  
P. Ryerson, P. Louvre N 3145, P. Louvre N 3255, P. BM EA 10311.50

The texts of this Theban tradition are usually based on that represented by the Louvre N 3089 group, but occasionally they show a preference for the older Saite texts, thereby omitting changes introduced in the traditions represented by the Louvre N 3152, Louvre N 3079, and Louvre N 3089 groups. It must also be admitted that the boundary lines between the Louvre N 3089, Ryerson, and Hieroglyphic groups are not hard and fast. For example, P.

47 For P. Nespasef, see Verhoeven 1999; for P. Iahtesnacht, see Verhoeven 1993.
48 P. Louvre N 3087 is listed further above as a secondary document that contains a small set of texts that belong to the P. BM EA 10086 group, but it also contains some spells that belong to this tradition, as well as other spells that belong to later Theban traditions.
49 The only published documents are P. Louvre N 3079 (de Rougé 1861–76) and P. Leiden T16 (Leemans 1869).
50 The only published document of this group is P. Ryerson (Allen 1960).
Detroit 1988 has texts that usually follow those of the Louvre N 3089 group, but occasionally they follow those of the Ryerson group. Having a mixture of texts from the current and preceding traditions is not surprising, if documents were produced during the transitional periods between one tradition and the next.

**Hieroglyphic group**

P. Turin 1791, P. BM EA 10017, P. Louvre N 3094, P. Louvre N 3096, P. Louvre N 3100.

The texts of this Theban tradition more often than not appear to be based on the Saite traditions, but also often show elements from the Louvre N 3089 and Ryerson groups.

The first vignette for discussion is that of BD 27, for which two versions were used in the Late Period. In Version 1, the deceased kneels or stands in supplication, holding his/her heart, before the Four Sons of Horus (Fig. 36). There are two possibilities regarding whom the Four Sons of Horus represent. The spell opens with an address: ‘O seizer of hearts, who break open breasts…’ Alternatively, a little further along in the text a second invocation occurs: ‘Hail to ye lords of eternity, who establish everlasting, seize not this my heart…’ While I have only had the opportunity to examine one Saite document with this illustration, this basic illustration can be observed in P. BM EA 10097, a seemingly fourth century BC document that appears to follow the Saite texts and presumably the Saite illustrations (Fig. 37), as well as in later Memphite documents. Curiously, in these same documents the vignettes for BD 26 and 27 were often paired together, where the deceased, holding his/her heart, is depicted in supplication before his/her ba, representing BD 26, followed by the Four Sons of Horus representing BD 27 (Gasse 2001, PI VII; see Fig. 38 for a variation on this). This pairing can also be observed in the mummy bandages of Padiusir (Fig. 39) and the secondary P. Louvre E 6130 (Fig. 40), two documents that belong to the P. BM EA 10086 group and that have connections to the Memphite tradition.

The other documents of the P. BM EA 10086 group, however, used Version 2 of the illustration: the deceased, holding his/her heart, kneels or stands in supplication before the three mummiform male deities seated on a plinth. Undoubtedly, they represent the same personages as Version 1, although here their identity has been removed (Figs. 41–44). Further, this version can also be observed in documents belonging to the Louvre N 3152 group as well as the two documents belonging to the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 subgroup (Figs. 45–48). It would seem that the Saite vignette was re-evaluated, that the Four Sons of Horus were no longer considered appropriate for the context of the spell and its illustration, and that the three unmarked deities replaced the Sons. Version 1, however, was revived and used once again for the other documents of the greater subset of the Louvre N 3079 group as well as for the Louvre N 3089, Ryerson, and Hieroglyphic groups (Fig. 49).

There is another curiosity associated with Version 2. For those documents that used it, the vignette was commonly placed with the text of BD 26, with the vignette of BD 26 placed with the text of BD 27, a reversal that can be observed in the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N

---

51 *i t ib w ngi hštyw*. The forms of *i t* and *ngi* appear to be singular, but the use of the second person plural pronoun further on indicates that they were understood as plural.

52 *inḏ hr.tn nšt nbw hh gṛg dt m t ib.i pn.*

53 de Meulenaere 1989, 63–73.
3152 groups, and the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079. Why the vignettes should have been reversed and thereby placed with the wrong text is difficult to explain because the vignette of BD 27 has no connection with the text of BD 26, whereas the correct pairing of the vignette to the text of BD 27 has direct bearing. Perhaps this was a mistake that crept into the original master manuscript of the tradition when Version 2 was introduced, and was then dutifully copied to all subsequent documents of the tradition, as well as to other traditions that used Version 2.

BD 28 is another heart spell, and the text begins with an invocation to Ruty, followed shortly after by a reference to the warrior (or warriors) in Heliopolis who seizes hearts. Two versions of the vignette exist that depict the same basic scene, the deceased in supplication before a seated mummiform god on a plinth, who likely represents the warrior, with a representation of the heart of the deceased resting on a plinth between them. The title of the spell is ‘Spell for not allowing the heart (\textit{h3ty}) of a man to be seized from him in the necropolis,’ and to this end the deceased is depicted in supplication to the potential seizer of his/her heart. The difference between the two versions rests on the depiction of the heart. In Version 1, found in Saite and later Memphite documents, the heart appears generalized as an oval shaped object with a generalized anatomical depiction of the vena cava and pulmonary arteries resting over the top (Figs. 50–51), an illustration that can also be seen in P. BM EA 10097 from Thebes (mid-fourth century BC, Fig. 52). In Version 2, found in the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups as well as the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079, the representation of the heart has greater definition with regard to the incoming veins and the outgoing arteries, with what seems to be a generalized view of the blood vessels exterior to the heart (Figs. 53–54). The same definition of the heart appears in figures 55–57, but the depiction of the vessels has partial resemblance to the generalized vessels of Version 1. As was the case with BD 27, the greater subset of the Louvre N 3079 group reverted back to Version 1, as did the documents of the subsequent traditions (Fig. 58). Further, as was the case with BD 27, the mummy bandages of Padiusir and P. Louvre E 6130 once again used Version 1, found in other Memphite documents (Figs. 59–60).

BD 35 belongs to the set of serpent spells and is entitled ‘Spell for not allowing a man to be eaten in the necropolis by any snake (\textit{hj\textbar{}w}).’ I have not had the opportunity to observe a Saite or later Memphite document with the vignette of this spell. The familiar illustration one expects is Version 1, which can be observed in the Louvre N 3089 and Ryerson groups as well as in the greater subset of the Louvre N 3079 group, where the deceased is depicted spearing an advancing serpent, a scene clearly based on the title of the spell, where one can also observe artistic variety in the depiction of the serpent (Figs. 61–64). In contrast to these scenes, Version 2 appears to have been based on the importance of Osiris, where a passage early in the text states that Osiris is gladdened. Accordingly, we see the deceased standing in adoration before Osiris, who is typically depicted standing and holding a \textit{w\textbar{}s}-scepter, crook, and flail. Version 2 can be observed in the BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups, as well as in the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group (Figs. 65–69).

The text of BD 39 has been discussed further above, and two versions of the vignette for this spell can be observed in the Late Period. Once again, I have not been able to observe a vignette for the spell in the Saite documents I have seen, but Version 1 can be seen in later Memphite documents as well as in P. BM EA 10097 (mid-fourth century BC). While the title...
of the spell does not mention Apophis, the text in all versions of the spell largely concerns the driving off and slaughtering of this fearsome enemy of Re. Accordingly, we see the deceased spearing and driving back an enormous snake that doubtless represents the monstrous Apophis (Figs. 70–72). Version 1 can also be observed in the greater subset of the Louvre N 3079 group as well as in the subsequent Louvre N 3089, Ryerson, and Hieroglyphic groups (Figs. 73–77). In contrast to this, Version 2 was based on the passage translated further above, wherein the gods of the four cardinal points are said to have fettered Apophis. Accordingly, we see a generalized scene of the deceased spearing and driving back four serpents, each doubtless representing an advancing serpent from one of the four cardinal points (Figs. 78–83). Version 2 once again is found in the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups as well as the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group. As was the case with vignettes for other spells discussed above, P. Louvre E 6130, a document with a clear Memphite connection, features Version 1.

For the final example, one can observe two versions of the vignette for BD 63 in the Late Period, both of which are based on the title of the spell: ‘Spell for drinking water and not being parched by fire.’ While the Late Period text of BD 63 was ultimately derived from two New Kingdom spells identified as BD 63A and 63B, these two references no longer make sense in the context of Late Period Books of the Dead because the texts of the two were clearly regarded as a single spell in the Late Period. One can observe five versions of the text in the Late Period. With four of the five, the text does consist of two parts that were based on the earlier BD 63A and 63B, but there was only a single title in the Late Period, and the second part, revised from the earlier BD 63B, was preceded by ky dd (‘variant’). This issue is of even greater relevance to the tradition discussed here because this version of the text collapsed both parts into a contiguous set of statements without the intervening ky dd, where the text was also revised and shortened, clearly being regarded as a single spell.

Once again, I have not had the opportunity to observe Saite vignettes for this spell, but the vignette in P. BM EA 10097 may very well have been based on the Saite version, as with the other illustrations discussed above. Unfortunately the right side of this illustration is now lost, but on the left side we can see a fire pot and the missing part was very likely the same as that seen in later Memphite documents (Figs. 84–86). Indeed, P. BM EA 10558 and P. Louvre N 5450 both used the same sign for a brazier with flame, in contrast to the more common sign for a fire pot that was widely used for the illustration, as seen in that of P. BM EA 10097. With regard to the overall illustration, identified as Version 1, the fire pot and deceased receiving water illustrate the title of the spell; in spite of the presence of the fire sign, the deceased receives an abundance of water, graphically illustrating that the deceased will never be parched by the fire. The same illustration can also be observed in documents for the greater subset of the Louvre N 3079 group as well as in documents from the Louvre N 3089, Ryerson, and Hieroglyphic groups (Figs. 87–91). A new variation can be observed in four documents that will be discussed a little further below (Figs. 92–95).

In contrast, Version 2 completely omits the element of fire and focuses instead on the deceased receiving water from a sycamore, a scene that was doubtless derived from the illustrations used for BD 57 and 59. Version 2 can be observed in P. BM EA 10086 and P. Louvre N 3082 (Figs. 96–97) as well as in the Louvre N 3152 group (Fig. 98) and the lesser subset of the N 3079 group, including P. BM EA 10087, a document that belongs to the
greater N 3079 subset (Figs. 99–101). Curiously, the illustration in P. Christchurch follows the similar variation of Version 1 that one can observe in P. Louvre N 5450 (Fig. 86), where the goddess offering water to the deceased might in fact have been understood as the goddess often depicted in the tree of Version 2 (Fig. 101), although P. Christchurch included the additional figure of the seated mummiform god with \( \text{w}s\)-scepter (Fig. 103). More likely, the latter deity was added to fill out the space allocated for the vignette because the column over which the vignette appears was too wide for Version 1 or Version 2 by itself. Similarly, the illustration in P. Milan E 1023 also follows that of Version 1 (Fig. 103), although the right side of the scene is now lost. The fact that these two documents used a different illustration to that of the other documents in the tradition is discussed further below.

Any discussion of the vignette used for BD 63 inevitably invites a discussion of BD 61, for which two versions of the vignette existed in the Late Period. The more common Version 2 shows the deceased standing and holding an air-sign. This illustration has no bearing at all on the text of the spell, but seems to have been indirectly based on its title, ‘Another spell.’ This generic title points to the preceding spell, but BD 60 has the same title, which then points back to BD 59. The title of BD 59 in Saite and later Memphite documents, as well as in Theban documents of the P. BM EA 10086, Louvre N 3152, and Hieroglyphic groups was ‘Spell for drinking water in the necropolis,’ but the title was revised to ‘Spell for breathing air in the necropolis’ in documents of the Louvre N 3079, Louvre N 3089, and Ryerson groups. With regard to BD 59, however, one main version of the vignette can be observed: the deceased receiving bread and water from a sycamore tree, within which the goddess Nut or Hathor (the regalia is typically that of Hathor) was often depicted, owing to the opening invocation of the spell, ‘O sycamore of Nut’ (Figs. 104–5). It should also be noted that this goddess was not exclusively used for BD 59 because she can also often appear in the vignette of BD 57. When the title for BD 59 was revised to ‘Spell for Breathing Air in the Necropolis,’ it seems that the vignette was also revised by adding the air-sign to the hand of the deceased, as can be seen in many, but not all, of the documents with the revised title (Figs. 106–7). In these same documents, the illustration used for BD 60 and 61 was based on the revised title of BD 59, and thus we see the deceased depicted with the orientation of one having gone forth and holding an air sign (Version 2, Fig. 108). With regard to the Hieroglyphic group, the title for BD 59 appears to have reverted back to the Saite title, but the vignettes for BD 60 and 61 continued to be based on the revision of the title of BD 59 found in the Louvre N 3079, Louvre N 3089, and Ryerson groups, at least as regards the only hieroglyphic document with certain vignettes for BD 60 and 61 that I have seen, P. Turin 1791 (Iwefankh).

The issue of interest involving Version 1 of the illustration for BD 61 is its very representation. For the documents of the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups, as well as the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group, a different illustration was used (Version 1, Figs. 109–12). This illustration can also be observed in P. BM EA 10097 (mid-fourth century BC), where it precedes the illustration of BD 63, thereby making it absolutely clear that this illustration and that of BD 63 represented different spells (Fig. 113). Neither illustration is aligned with the texts of these two spells in this document, but these were standardized vignettes and were doubtless immediately recognized by the Egyptians for the spells they represented, just as they are for the modern scholar.
This same illustration can also be observed in P. Iahtesnacht (Dynasty 26), where it precedes the illustration of BD 64. Verhoeven identified the illustration not as that of BD 61 but rather of BD 63A–B (Fig. 114; Verhoeven 1993, 54). Neither of these two illustrations is aligned with the text of these two spells; in fact they appear above the tail end of the text of BD 68 and BD 69–71. Hence, there is no reason to take the illustration as that of BD 63 based on alignment. Similarly, in the mummy bandages that belonged to a man named Hor, a string of vignettes occur that have been identified as illustrations for BD 54, 59, 57, and 63A (Kockelmann 2008, pl. 53). The reason for identifying the second and third illustrations for BD 59 and 57 appears to have been entirely based on the presence of the goddess within the sycamore, who dispenses bread and water to the deceased, leading Kockelmann to identify the first as the vignette of BD 59 and the second, without the goddess, as BD 57. As stated above, however, the goddess can often be observed frequently in the vignette for BD 57, the sequence of texts in the document is linear (BD 57 to 63), and thus there is no valid reason not to identify these scenes as vignettes for BD 57 and 59, respectively. With respect to the vignette Kockelmann identified as BD 63A, there is no reason to assume it is the illustration of BD 63. Indeed the aforementioned string of vignettes appears above the texts of BD 59, 60, 61, and 62. Finally, in the hieroglyphic Book of the Dead of yet another Hor we can observe the same two illustrations found in P. BM EA 10097 presented side by side; the first (Version 1 of BD 61 above) was identified as the vignette of BD 63A, and the second (Version 1 of BD 63 above) as the vignette of BD 63B (Munro 2006, 60, pl. 5). As stated above, the designations of BD 63A and 63B have no bearing in the Late Period because it was recognized as a single spell with two parts, and in all documents I have seen, only a single illustration was ever used for BD 63, either Version 1 or Version 2 listed above. The second illustration in the Book of the Dead of Hor (Munro 2006) is unmistakably that of Version 1 of BD 63, even though it stands above the text of BD 85 in her document. Should the first illustration, located above the text of BD 63 be identified as that of BD 63 simply because it stands above the text of BD 63? Indeed, other clearly identifiable vignettes in this document are not aligned with their texts either: the vignette of BD 64 appears above the text of BD 80, and the vignettes of BD 47, 50, and 51 appear above the text of BD 85. Since examples of misalignment between illustrations and texts can be observed in this same area of the papyrus, one can equally argue that the illustration above the text of BD 63 was also misaligned. Two facts stand out: we have no clear example of any Late Period document giving two vignettes for BD 63, and the illustration in question is indeed found clearly associated with the text of BD 61 in the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups as well as the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group. Therefore, in this document, it is preferable to regard the illustration above the text of BD 63 as the vignette of BD 61, and identify the vignette above the text of BD 85 as the illustration for BD 63. This makes sense for P. BM EA 10097, and does for the manuscript of Hor (Munro 2006). In the case of the other Hor (Kockelmann 2008), the illustration does in fact occur above the text of BD 61 and 62, but since BD 62 was rarely accompanied by a vignette in the Late Period, there is no reason to identify the illustration in question as any other than that of BD 61. Similarly there is no reason to accept the illustration in P. Iahtesnacht as representative of anything other than BD 61, particularly where we have clear examples of that illustration aligned with the text of BD 61.
In three documents from Memphis that give every indication of being late Ptolemaic, based on the poor quality of their texts and their paleography, Version 1 of BD 61 occurs above the text of BD 63. Three possibilities can explain this: (1) the vignette of BD 61 had been reassigned to the text of BD 63, (2) the artist made a mistake, or (3) the vignette for BD 61 was knowingly presented over the text of BD 63 to deliver the magic of both spells in a single column. With regard to the first of these (Fig. 115), P. Louvre N 3081 contains a number of problems involving vignettes aligned with the wrong texts: vignette of BD 68 over text of BD 51, vignette of BD 71 over text of BD 52, vignette of BD 73 over text of BD 53, vignette of BD 132 over text of BD 134. Therefore, the presence of the vignette of BD 61 over the text of BD 63 is very likely evidence of yet another mistake of misalignment between text and vignette. In fact, since the texts of BD 61 and 132 were not included in the document, one might also argue that the scribe and artist intended the magic of BD 61 and 132 to be provided only by illustration, a concept that is obvious in many abridged documents from the late Ptolemaic Period (for example, Mosher 1992, 171). With regard to the second document, P. Vienna Nationalbibliothek Aeg 65 (Fig. 116), any of the three explanations given above might apply here too. For example, the vignette of BD 100 is presented over the text of BD 96, vignettes of BD 101, 104, 105, and 108 are given over the text of BD 99, vignette of BD 130 over the text of BD 127, vignettes of BD 134 and 138 over the text of BD 128, and part of the vignette of BD 140 over the text of BD 129. These might be the result of errors, but one might equally argue that these vignettes, whose texts were not given in the document, were intended to deliver the magic of their spells by illustration alone.

The third document is P. Louvre E 6130 (Fig. 117), one of the two secondary documents associated with the tradition discussed here. As with the previous two documents, one of the same three arguments listed above may explain why the vignette identified here as Version 1 of BD 61 appears above the text of BD 63. Given the presentation of a number of vignettes over the wrong texts in all three documents, there is absolutely no concrete evidence to conclude that the vignette of BD 61 was reassigned to the text of BD 63 any more than all the other misplaced vignettes had been reassigned to different texts.

As for the illustration itself, it is directly based on the text of BD 61, for which I have only observed a single version of this very short text in the Late Period:

It is I. I am he who came forth from the flood waters given to him as the inundation, that he might have power over it (i.e., the flood waters) as Hapi.

Accordingly, we see two streams of water rising up from a large bowl, like the rising waters of the inundation, pouring forth to the deceased. In the illustrations of P. BM EA 10097 (Fig. 113) and P. Louvre E 6130 (Fig. 117), the deceased holds a vase. This could represent water of the inundation being poured from the vase, but it could also represent the water of the inundation flowing up from the bowl into the vase.

One final topic regarding BD 61 and 63 remains with respect to the Ryerson, Detroit, Louvre N 3145, and Louvre N 3090 papyri (Figs. 92–95). Recall that each of these used Version 2 of the vignette for BD 61 with the text of that spell. In looking at the illustrations for BD 63 in these documents, it would seem that Version 1 of BD 63 was merged with Version 1 of BD 61, doubtless serving the same purpose as in the latter: the waters of
the inundation rising up to the deceased and thereby preventing the deceased from being parched, as the title of BD 63 proclaims.

**Dating the tradition**

Dating any tradition, or even an individual Book of the Dead manuscript, is a complex and potentially controversial topic, and one need only reflect on three opinions for the Akhmim Books of the Dead. I have proposed a late Ptolemaic date, perhaps late first century BC, for this group (Mosher 2002). In contrast, De Meulenaere proposed an early to mid-third century BC date (2002, 492–93), while Derchain-Urtel prefers a late first century AD date (Derchain-Urtel in Lüscher 2000, 44–45). This current essay is not the forum for further discussion on that topic, but the latitude of opinions on the Akhmim documents serves to illustrate the problems one faces when attempting to date Late Period Books of the Dead.

As has been stated above, one can observe six general Theban traditions from the fourth century down to the late Ptolemaic Period. The fundamental question one must ask oneself is whether these traditions represent chronological evolution over time, or whether some might have been in use concurrently with others. In general, it seems that most scholars who have developed typologies for the different styles of funerary equipment tend to view differences in style as representative of chronological evolution, and admittedly the current author had assumed the same with regard to the different traditions of the Book of the Dead in the Late Period without ever considering the possibility of concurrent usage for some traditions. If one can demonstrate concurrency with regard to some Books of the Dead, why should the same not also apply to other types of funerary equipment during the Late Period? With regard to the texts, one can see a clear succession of traditions from the Louvre N 3079 group to the Louvre N 3089 group because the texts of the Louvre N 3089 group were based on changes introduced in the Louvre N 3079 group. Similarly, one can observe that the changes introduced in the Ryerson group were largely based on changes introduced in the Louvre N 3089 group, along with the start of an archaizing trend wherein some older Saite passages were restored. The Hieroglyphic group introduced new variations based largely on changes introduced in the Ryerson group, although by this time the archaizing trend was in full force. The relationship between P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups, however, is much less clear, although both were clearly derived from the Saite Tradition.

It is appropriate here to discuss some of the preliminary findings resulting from a collaboration between Tamás Mekis, who is developing a typology for hypocephali, and myself. These findings may stimulate others into reflecting on the issue, not just with regard to Late Period Books of the Dead but with regard to other types of contemporary funerary equipment. The first topic for discussion involves the family tree of Djedhor, the deceased of P. Louvre N 3079 (Fig. 118; de Meulenaere 1994, 216–20).

The Book of the Dead of Djedhor obviously belongs to the Louvre N 3079 group, the Book of the Dead of Nestanetjereteten belongs to the Louvre N 3152 group, and the Book
of the Dead of Nehemesretawy belongs to the Louvre N 3079 group. If this family tree cannot be disproven, then we have clear evidence that the Louvre N 3152 and Louvre N 3079 groups were used concurrently. Further, recall that the versions of vignettes found in the Louvre N 3152 group could also be observed in the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group, specifically P. Louvre N 3079 and P. Louvre N 3144, even though the texts in these two documents contain the same texts found in the other documents of the Louvre N 3079 group.

Interestingly, P. Leiden T16 belongs to the Louvre N 3079 group, and Raven has provided reasonable evidence to date this document to the turn of the fourth to third centuries BC (1980, 28–29). If this timeframe for P. Leiden T16 holds up, then it also provides a general timeframe for both the Louvre N 3079 and Louvre N 3152 groups.

A second family tree, that of the brothers Nesmin and Hornefer, also has significant bearing on the dating of the traditions discussed here (Fig. 119; Kákosy 2003, 207). This Nesmin was a royal scribe and is well known to us today, with his name appearing on documents that date from 305–264 BC (Clarysse 1981, 83, no. 5569a). His brother is none other than the Hornefer of P. Milan E 1023, a document that belongs to the P. BM EA 10086 group under discussion here. It would also seem that fragments of the Book of the Dead for Nesmin have survived: P. Vatican 38572/1 and possibly P. Vatican 38572/2 (Gasse 1993, 43–45, nos. 28 and 30). Unfortunately this Book of the Dead is highly fragmented, with only parts of BD 51, 54, 74, 77, 109, and 100 having been published. While the surviving texts of BD 77, 109, and 100 reveal nothing about the versions selected, enough of the text for BD 54 survives to indicate that it followed the same version of text as that in Hornefer’s Book of the Dead (P. BM EA 10086 group). Regarding BD 51 and 74, too little survives to be certain about the versions of texts they had, but enough survives to indicate that they may also have followed the same versions as those found in Hornefer’s. It should not be surprising that both brothers would have had Books of the Dead produced from the same tradition, but one can also point out that the Books of the Dead for Djedhor and his sister Nestanetjeretten came from different traditions.

Regarding Nesmin’s nephew, Paheb appears with his uncle on a tax document dated to 278 BC, indicating that he was active in his career at least by this time (Muhs 2005, 69–70, with further references). The Book of the Dead for Paheb appears to be P. Milan E 1204, but unfortunately only a small portion of the text of BD 15g is preserved along with the vignette known as BD 16. Enough of the text of BD 15g survives, however, to indicate that it did not follow the text of the P. BM EA 10086 group. Indeed, it clearly follows the textual tradition found in the Louvre N 3079 and Louvre N 3089 groups. Further conclusions cannot be drawn from this one fragment of the papyrus.

Given the range of dates that can be attributed to Nesmin and the general dates we have for the members of the two family trees presented above, it becomes immediately clear that the Theban traditions represented by the P. BM EA 10086, Louvre N 3152, and Louvre N 3079 groups must have coexisted in the Theban area and were thus in use concurrently. In reflecting back on the versions of vignettes examined above, it is not surprising that the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups as well as the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group

---

54 P. Louvre N 3204 B also belongs to P. Louvre N 3149 and the Bonn database adds P. Louvre N 3123 *bis* and N 3213. I have not seen these last two documents.
typically used the same versions of vignettes. Whether these three traditions were produced concurrently in the same workshops or in different workshops in the greater Theban area remains uncertain. It would seem probable that different workshops were involved, but this is conjecture. Further, while we can observe the tradition of the Louvre N 3079 group being replaced by the tradition of the Louvre N 3089 group, we have no evidence to indicate when the tradition of the P. BM EA 10086 group ended, nor for that matter when the tradition of the Louvre N 3152 group ended.

With regard to the issue of concurrency involving other funerary objects, one can mention the funerary stelae of two individuals named in the two family trees above. The stela of (Ta) Hereret, sister of Nesmin and Hornefer, has been designated as Theban Type IV A, which Munro dates to the general range of 300–250 BC. The funerary stela of Nestanetjeretten (Munro 1973, pl. 20, fig. 73) belongs to Theban Type IV E, a type for which he gave a general range of dates from the mid- to late Ptolemaic Period. From the two family trees presented above, however, we know that these two women were doubtless contemporaries. Thus, it appears that we have a clear case of two different types of stelae used concurrently in Thebes during the first half of the third century. Since the validity of these two types representing chronological change is no longer the case, one must reconsider the other aspects of Munro’s chronological typology for all stelae. Further, if concurrency applies to Books of the Dead and stelae, one must ask whether concurrency might also apply to existing chronological typologies for other funerary objects.

Conclusion

The P. BM EA 10086 group is set apart from the other Theban traditions first and foremost by the versions of the texts it contains. More conclusions can doubtless be drawn from the texts, but the texts of some spells still require analysis and hence the conclusions presented here should be viewed as preliminary in nature. On the other hand, BD 1 to 100 have been studied, along with a number of random spells from BD 101 to 165, so the claims made above are not based on analysis of just a small sample of spells. The texts that were discussed above were not singled out for any special reason because the types of changes observed above can be seen in the majority of spells found in the tradition. In all texts examined thus far, they were modified from Saite versions, not from versions of any other Theban traditions. As for the relationship between this tradition and those of the other Theban groups, further discussion will appear in a future publication.

We have observed several interesting variations in sequence for the tradition, particularly the location of the vignette for BD 16, and to a lesser extent the inverted sequence of BD 60, 62, and 61. We have also observed some consistency with regard to the omission of BD 48, 49, 56, and 58, but P. Christchurch is the exception, having both BD 48 and 49, as well as having part of the text of BD 56 merged into the text of BD 54, using a version of BD 56 that belongs to the Louvre N 3079 group.

55 For the stela of (Ta)Hereret, see Kákosy 1992, 311–15 and pl. IV. For type IV A, see Munro 1973, 235–37 and pls. 18–19 for examples.
56 Mekis has prepared an extensive article on the funerary equipment of Nestanetjeretten, to appear in CdE.
57 iw.i ir.k b3.i nb.i Tm pfr Zjt wr pn hr rn n N, after which the text terminates in P. Christchurch.
For the vignettes used by the tradition, many represent different versions from those used during the Saite Period and later in the third century BC, and these versions were also used in documents belonging to the Louvre N 3152 group and the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group. This indicates that during the late fourth century BC and into the early third century BC, one common set of vignettes was used in Thebes for all three traditions, and that these illustrations were revised to reflect different perspectives on the associated spells, whose texts were also revised.

One peculiarity that needs to be accounted for is the fact that the lesser subset of the Louvre N 3079 group used the same versions of vignettes as the P. BM EA 10086 and Louvre N 3152 groups, but the texts in these two documents follow those of the greater subset of the Louvre N 3079 group. One suggestion seems possible. It may well be the case that P. Louvre N 3079 and P. Louvre N 3144 were among the earliest documents produced by the new tradition represented by the Louvre N 3079 group, that the texts of the tradition were developed first, and that initially the same versions of vignettes used by the other two traditions were employed. The vignettes were then revised by the master scribes and artists responsible for the new tradition, who often chose to revert back to Saite illustrations or sometimes chose new illustrations to reflect their re-evaluation of the texts and their individual purposes.

A second peculiarity concerns the mummy bandages of Padiusir and P. Louvre E 6130. As stated above, both have obvious connections to the Memphite tradition. The mummy bandages follow the same versions of texts as the other documents of the P. BM EA 10086 group. For P. Louvre E 6130, a secondary document, only a range of spells followed these versions of texts, with the majority following the texts of the Memphite tradition. Both documents, however, employed versions of vignettes used in the Memphite tradition, not those of the P. BM EA 10086 group. With regard to the mummy bandages, an explanation is difficult. Perhaps the deceased was originally from the north, he moved south to Thebes, and he had a Book of the Dead inscribed on mummy bandages following the Memphite practice he had been accustomed to, and he used the Theban texts while preferring the Memphite vignettes. This is admittedly speculation. Regarding P. Louvre E 6130, the quality of texts in this document is poor and the texts are highly abbreviated, sometimes consisting of only a few lines per spell. Since one encounters excellent texts in Memphite documents during the third century, one can speculate that this document was produced later in the Ptolemaic Period, when perhaps a manuscript from Thebes was brought to Memphis? It is clear that when this document was produced, the scribe or scribes responsible for the texts used both the Memphite tradition as well as that of the P. BM EA 10086 group, but why the one range of texts were reproduced from a manuscript of the P. BM EA 10086 group, when all other texts and indeed all vignettes were taken from the Memphite tradition remains a mystery.

P. Louvre N 3087, the other secondary document, must also be accounted for. Interestingly, this document has only a small set of texts that follow those of the P. BM EA 10086 group; other texts follow those of the Louvre N 3152 group, and yet other texts follow those of the later Theban groups. The majority of its vignettes, however, follow the versions used by the P. BM EA 10086 group. The fact that this document contains texts from different Theban versions hints that it was likely produced later in the Ptolemaic Period. Clearly the vignette

58 For example, it has the same version of text for BD 54 as that used by the Louvre N 3079, Louvre N 3089, and Ryerson groups.
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tradition found in the P. BM EA 10086 group was used, but the texts must have been taken from different manuscripts from different Theban traditions to have such a cross-section of versions. Given the jumbled sequence in P. Christchurch, this document might also have been produced later in the Ptolemaic Period, which might also account for the presence of BD 48 and 49, as well as the merged texts of BD 54 and 56.

As stated early on, the discussions contained herein are somewhat preliminary. A number of interesting issues and questions have been raised, some of which might never be fully resolved while others might be clarified when the remaining unexamined texts have been studied and analysed.
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Fig. 113: Version 1 of vignette for BD 61 in P. BM EA 10097.

Fig. 114: Version 1 of vignette for BD 61 in P. Iahtesnacht.

Fig. 115: Version 1 of vignette for BD 61 in P. Louvre N 3081.

Fig. 116: Version 1 of vignette for BD 61 in P. Vienna Nationalbibliothek Aeg 65.

Fig. 117: Version 1 of vignette for BD 61 in P. Louvre E 6130.
Fig. 118: Family tree of Djedhor with Books of the Dead.

Fig. 119: Family Tree of Nesmin with Books of the Dead.