Demotic and Hieratic Scholia in Funerary Papyri and their Implications for the Manufacturing Process¹
Foy Scalf

Abstract: Many ancient Egyptian papyrus manuscripts inscribed with funerary compositions contain annotations within the text and margins. Some of these annotations relate directly to the production process for illustrating and inscribing the manuscripts by providing instructions for scribes and artists. Two overlooked examples, pKhaemhor (MMA 25.3.212) and pRyerson (OIM E9787), allow for new interpretations of parallel texts previously considered as labels or captions. An analysis of the corpus of scholia and marginalia demonstrates specific manufacturing proclivities for selective groups of texts, while simultaneously revealing a wide variety of possible construction sequences and techniques in others.

Résumé: Plusieurs manuscrits anciens de papyrus égyptiens sur lesquels sont inscrites des compositions funéraires contiennent des annotations dans le texte et dans les marges. Certaines de ces annotations sont directement liées au processus de production relatif à l’illustration et à l’inscription des manuscrits en donnant des instructions destinées aux scribes et aux artistes. Deux exemples négligés, le pKhaemhor (MMA 25.3.212) et le pRyerson (OIM E9787), permettent de nouvelles interprétations de textes parallèles précédemment considérés comme des étiquettes ou des légendes. Une analyse du corpus des scholia et marginalia démontre des tendances de fabrication spécifiques pour des groupes particuliers de textes, tout en révélant simultanément une grande variété de séquences et de techniques de construction dans d’autres cas.
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The production of illustrated funerary papyri in ancient Egypt was a complex and expensive process that often involved the efforts of a team of skilled scribes and artisans. The exact nature of their working habits remains only partially understood and is mostly obscured by the preserved evidence, which consists primarily of finished

¹ This short article would not exist without the help of Mark Smith who inspired it by drawing my attention to the Demotic note in pRyerson in comments on my University of Chicago dissertation (Passports to Eternity: Formulaic Demotic Funerary Texts and the Final Phase of Egyptian Funerary Literature in Roman Egypt, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 2014), which is currently being prepared for publication. He also graciously provided me with his translation of this Demotic note and suggested that it implied the text was inscribed before the images. Further impetus for writing this article I owe to Emily Teeter with whom I discussed several of these ideas pending the revision of her catalog entry on pRyerson for the second edition of OIMP 32. Gratitude is also owed to Robert Ritner who saved me from several unfortunate errors in interpretation. I would like to thank Brian Muhs and Sven Vleeming for reading an early draft of this manuscript. Finally, the comments of two anonymous reviewers allowed me to fix several blunders and clarify some aspects of my argument. Any errors in content or logic should be attributed solely to the author. It is an honor to have this article appear in a volume dedicated to the memory of Jack Foster, whom I remember fondly from his time spent with his daughter Ann in the Research Archives of the Oriental Institute.
products. However, these beautiful commodities retain clues to their material histories as fabricated artifacts in ancient workshops. A number of funerary papyri contain scholia, i.e. marginal notations for the application of vignettes, and several unfinished manuscripts bear fragmentary witness to the processes involved in their production. New readings for scholia in pRyerson and pKhaemhor are presented below and the implications of these new readings are discussed, including correcting published interpretations of manufacturing sequences for the texts in question. When these conclusions are applied to the Rhind Papyri manuscripts, appended textual elements that have long been considered “captions” to images can be reinterpreted as scholia, i.e. explanations for the placement of content and images appended during the course of drafting. A reexamination of these often unstudied scholia and marginalia attest to the implementation of sequential manufacturing techniques while simultaneously demonstrating the overall variability in the production process.

Two papyri are famous for how their “unfinished” states reflect the order of steps employed during their production. In both the papyrus of Nespasefy and that of Khaemhor the full text was laid out inside gridlines, but only some of the vignettes


3 I use the term scholia intentionally as these Egyptian texts perform many of the same functions as certain scholia in Classical texts, for which the term is more commonly applied in scholarly discourse. As noted by Eleanor Dickey, scholia has a wide usage, but in recent work means “commentary or notes written in the margins of a text.” See Eleanor Dickey, Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 11, n. 25.


5 As captions, the texts have long been understood as descriptions of the scenes in the vignettes. However, several lines of evidence discussed below, including re-interpreting these texts as instructional scholia, necessitate a reappraisal.


were ever added. The large empty spaces carefully laid out in preparation for the illustrator are an odd sight to an Egyptologist accustomed to looking at finished funerary manuscripts. Why the papyri were left in such an incomplete state is uncertain, but it was done despite a notation in Khaemhor’s manuscript to have the spaces filled with their respective images – the addition of the vignettes was clearly part of the original plan. A hieratic annotation in the papyrus of Khaemhor (selection from pMMA 25.3.212d) reads (figure 1): \textit{ir\textit{i} mi s\textit{sm} pn nty m s\textit{s}} “Produce according to this guide which is in writing,” i.e. draw the vignette(s) according to the description in the accompanying text.\footnote{Visible in the photograph in Forman and Quirke, \textit{Hieroglyphs}, 155, who provided the translation “Add the prescribed images.” For the interpretation of the well-known phrase \textit{mi s\textit{sm} pn} “according to this guide” (contra “images” in Forman and Quirke), see \textit{Wb.} IV, 289.14-15 (“nach diesem Muster” and “in (dieser) Weise”). The demonstrative pronoun clearly indicates that the noun s\textit{sm} is singular and the preceding preposition rules out the possibility of it acting as direct object of the verb. Based on the context and implicit meaning of this text, it is unlikely therefore that s\textit{sm} here refers to any “image” and there is no need to invoke the root s\textit{sm} that refers to cult statues, forms, and figures of gods (\textit{Wb.} IV, 290-291; Penelope Wilson, \textit{A Ptolemaic Lexikon: A Lexicographical Study of the Text in the Temple of Edfu}, OLA 78 (Lueven: Peeters, 1997), 925).}

Figure 1. Hieratic Notation from pMMA 25.3.212d\footnote{The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1925 (http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/590941).}

A comparison of pKhaemhor (MMA 25.3.212) and the later pRyerson (OIM E9787) demonstrates that scribes reflected the intended audience of their scholia by employing different scripts. The hieratic note in pMMA 25.3.212d matches the hieratic used throughout the papyrus, written in a hand very similar, if not identical to, that of the surrounding columns. However, such notes could also be written in scripts different from the main text, as shown by the Demotic note on pRyerson (OIM E9787), a famous Book of the Dead papyrus manuscript from the Oriental Institute.
Museum, inscribed for a man named Nesshutefnut, son of Asetreshti and Iunihor. The manuscript was purchased in Paris in 1919 and presented to the Oriental Institute by Martin A. Ryerson. Based on the titles of the owner, it has been suggested that the papyrus ultimately derives from Edfu. It is a remarkable example of Ptolemaic Period funerary production whose preservation, well organized text, and colorful vignettes have ensured that it remains a staple in exhibits and museum


12 *Nš-šw-Tfn.t*, Greek εστφηνις, see Hermann Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1935), 179; Erich Lüddeckens et al., *Demotisches Namenbuch* (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1980), 691 (hereafter *Demot. Nam.*).

13 *Ꜣs.t-rš.tỉ*, see Ranke, *Personennamen*, 9-10 (s.v. *Ꜣš-n-Wšỉr, Ꜣš-n-Wb*)

14 *Ỉỉ-n-Ḥr*, cf. Ranke, *Personennamen*, 9-10 (s.v. *Ꜣš-n-Wšỉr, Ꜣš-n-Wb*). The father’s name is mentioned only in column clviii (BD 191 rꜢ n ỉnỉ(t) bꜢ r ẖ(t) “spell for bringing the ba to the body”), while the mother’s name is mentioned throughout (Allen, *Egyptian Book of the Dead*, 16). Allen read the father’s name as ˹Zp˺-n-Ḥr, but suggested in a footnote the alternative Ỉỉ-n-Ḥr, for the hieroglyphic spelling 𓎆𓎈𓎄𓎃 (Allen, *Egyptian Book of the Dead*, 10 with n. 5, and pl. L; see also *Totenbuchprojekt Bonn*, TM 48470). The name should probably be read as ỉ(n=ỉ)-Ḥr, as hesitantly suggested by Allen, employing the jackal glyph (E17) for the value ỉ as common in contemporary hieroglyphic inscriptions (*Wb*. I, 37). Cf. the writing of Imhotep as 𓎄𓎄 on the inside of the northeast section of the enclosure wall at Edfu in Dietrich Wildung, *Imhotep und Amenhotep: Gottwerdung im alten Agypten*, MÄS 36 (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1977), 144-145, §98. For further discussion, see Dieter Kurth, *Einführung ins Ptolemäische*, Teil I (Hützel: Backe-Verlag, 2007), 202, with notes. It should be further noted that the mention of the father’s name appears in the first column of cursive hieroglyphs following the hieratic columns at the very end of the papyrus.

15 Listed as Edfu in Trismegistos (TM 48470) and as “unknown” in the databank of the *Totenbuchprojekt Bonn*. For the title of Nesshutefnut, *hm-nṯr n nꜢ bỉk.w ʿnḫ.w m ḫt=f* “priest of the living falcons in his tree,” see Foy Scalf, “The Role of Birds within the Religious Landscape of Ancient Egypt,” in Rozen Bailleul-LeSuer (ed.), *Between Heaven and Earth: Birds in Ancient Egypt*, OIMP 35 (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2012), 38 with fig. 2.7.

16 Various dates have been assigned to the manuscript: Persian-Ptolemaic in Allen, *Egyptian Book of the Dead*, 10; Late Period, Dynasty 31-early Ptolemaic Period, 4th century BC in Emily Teeter, *Ancient Egypt: Treasures from the Collection of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago*, OIMP 23 (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2003), 98; Ptolemaic, late third-second century BC in Christopher Woods (ed.), *Visible Language: Inventions of Writing in the Ancient Middle East and Beyond*, OIMP 32 (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2010), 163; BC 350-200 in Trismegistos; Dynasty 30-Early Ptolemaic in *Totenbuchprojekt Bonn*. The late third to early second century BCE date follows Malcolm Mosher’s examination of the format and layout of BD manuscripts, where he cited the issues in dating pRyerson: “The classic fault of using palaeography is well illustrated by Allen’s attempt to date Papyrus Ryerson. Observing the use of signs that ranged from the 20th Dynasty to 60 A.D., he opted for a general Persian-Ptolemaic designation, whereas, based on an examination of the document’s various features, Papyrus Ryerson cannot be dated earlier than the late third century, and may perhaps be attributed to the early second” (Malcom Mosher, Jr., “Theban and Memphite Book of the Dead Traditions in the Late Period,” *JARCE* 29 (1992), 169-170).
catalogs. However, the short Demotic note appended to pRyerson’s column cviii (after BD 140) has received relatively little attention. It is likely because an accurate reading of this inscription has yet to appear in the published literature, and therefore its important implications for the general production methods of Book of the Dead papyri have not been noted before now. In the original publication, Richard Parker provided Thomas George Allen with a reading of the Demotic text as “There is no lack of writing on it.” This interpretation can now be corrected with confidence.

Below the hieratic text for Book of the Dead spell 140 in pRyerson the short Demotic note reads (figure 2): “It is not an empty space for a picture.”

Several sign groups merit additional attention. The meaning of the word ṭk, “colored illustration,” which Mark Depauw recently suggested was a ghost word, has now been established beyond doubt by Kim Ryholt in his study of papyri from the Tebtunis.

---


18 I would like to thank Mark Smith for drawing my attention to this note. It has now been brought to my attention that a treatment of this Demotic note will appear in Sven Vleeming’s forthcoming Short Texts III, no. 1989 (Mark Smith and Sven Vleeming personal communication).

19 As suggested by Mark Smith (personal communication) and independently discovered when reading pRyerson during a class in 2006 with Robert Ritner where it was noticed that ink used for the vignettes overlapped ink of the text.

20 Allen, Egyptian Book of the Dead, 225 n. s. I had initially followed the reading of Parker for the final two Demotic groups in my dissertation (reading bn ṯk ḥr=f), for which see Scalf, Passports, 183 n. 118. An entry in Trismegistos (TM 48470) cites the following “[but Mark Depauw reads bn ṯk n-im=].”

21 I would like to thank Mark Smith for supplying me with his translation “There is no room for a picture” (personal communication). A true clause of negative existence (i.e. “there is no …”) would have been constructed with mn. Furthermore, ṯk means “emptiness, hole, lack,” not “space, room,” see Chicago Demotic Dictionary W 09.1, 171 (hereafter CDD) and Wolja Erichsen, Demotisches Glossar (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1954), 101 (hereafter EG). If the note indicated that space on the papyrus was insufficient, one would have expected something similar to mn ṯk “there is no space for a picture.” I would like to thank Robert Ritner for emphasizing this point in discussing this text with me.

temple library. The final two groups have posed the most trouble to previous editors, being interpreted as $hr=f$ and $n-im=$ respectively. However, the paleography does not support either reading. The penultimate group is certainly the negative particle $in$ that is used as the post-negation following $bn$ to negate present tense, non-verbal sentences with nominal predicates. The final group must then be the copula pronoun $pꜢy$, necessary here to complete the predication of the nominal sentence. Through this Demotic addendum, a scribe indicated that the space left at the bottom of BD 140 was not meant for the vignette associated with the next spell BD 141. BD 140, for which the correct vignette and title appear at the top of the papyrus, ended close to the bottom of the papyrus and two additional lines from BD 137 in the previous column have further encroached upon the empty space. As a result, the scribe deemed this space inadequate for the location of the BD 141 vignette and feared that the illustrated would mistake it as such (plate 1).

The Demotic note in pRyerson recalls the two hieroglyphic notes $gm$ $wš$ “found blank” in the papyrus of Gatseshen, which Rita Lucarelli believes were “likely to have been added by the illustrator on places previously left empty by the scribe.” In one particular section of pGatseshen, a scribe or artist has drawn these

---


24 See note 20.

25 For $in$ and $bn$, see EG, 32 and 115.

26 It is not surprising that previous interpreters confused this group with $-f$ as the orthography can be very similar, cf. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar*, 128.

27 For further examples of the sentence type $bn + NP + in + pꜢy$, see Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Demotische Grammatik* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1975), 211-212, §472.

28 BD 140: $mḏꜢ.t ỉr.t ḫft mḥ $wꜢḏ.t m$ $bꜢd 2$ prt $trqy$ “Book used when filling the sound eye on Mecheir day 30.” Cf. R. Lepsius, *Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter nach dem hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin* (Leipzig: Georg Wigand, 1842), pl. LVII.

29 See Allen, *Egyptian Book of the Dead*, pl. XXIX.


hieroglyphs at a large scale in place of the actual vignette. At this point, in pGatseshen, gm wš “found blank” is presumably a reference to a missing vignette in the source material used to compile the manuscript, while bn wš n ūk in pŠy “It is not an empty space for a picture” in pRyerson reflects a conscientious scribe who made an annotation for the artist that the “empty space” (wš) was not meant for a vignette. Despite mismatching of text and image elsewhere in pRyerson, the artist correctly skipped adding the vignette for BD 141 to this space and went on with his work. It seems unlikely that this Demotic note would have been added by the artist, for the vignette to BD 141 could have been easily squeezed into the available space and furthermore vignettes in pRyerson were never put at the bottom of a column when the text of the spell began at the top of the next column. Moreover, it implies that the source material used to compile pRyerson did not have a vignette associated with BD 141, a common occurrence with this particular spell.

These scholia have implications for how the papyri were manufactured. Despite published assessments otherwise, it now seems clear that the text and overall layout of Papyrus Ryerson were produced prior to the vignettes being added, a typical manufacturing sequence based on what is currently known from a survey of the surviving evidence. Malcolm Mosher had already noted in 1992 that the papyrus “is exceptional in that a large number of vignettes are misaligned with their respective spells, but even here the misalignment is so completely ordered that it is immediately apparent that the artist was off by one spell, sometimes two,” and “… the scribe undoubtedly entered the text first, leaving space for the vignettes to be added later by the artist.” Evidence for this manufacturing sequence is apparent in certain areas where the ink used to produce the vignettes overlaps and covers up the black ink used.

32 Lucarelli, Gatseshen, pl. VIII and XXVII. Lucarelli suggests that the two gm wš notes perform slightly different functions in pGatseshen: the first (pl. VIII) having been inspired by missing text (BD 162) and the second (pl. XXVII) by a missing vignette for BD 116. Cf. Lucarelli, Gatseshen, 202-205 and 213-215.


34 Allen, Egyptian Book of the Dead, pls. XIII-L. This is further evidence that the Demotic text does not mean “There is not room for the picture” as no vignette was meant to be placed there.

35 Richard Lepsius, Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter nach dem hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin (Leipzig: Georg Wigand, 1842), LVIII; Edouard Naville, Das aegyptische Todtenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie (Berlin: A. Asher & Co., 1886), CLIII.

36 Ragazzoli, “Book of the Dead of Ankhnesenaset,” 230: “In order to include pictures in a continuous hieratic text during the Third Intermediate Period, the most commonly adopted solution was to leave space for the image to be drawn in.” Cf. the comment in Woods, Visible Language, 163, that the “vignettes … on Papyrus Ryerson were apparently done first, for the text in some areas is crowded into the available space,” following Allen, Egyptian Book of the Dead, 19: “Most at least of the vignettes were evidently sketched in ahead of the text, and the latter did not always fit as the artist had planned.” A revised second edition of Woods, Visible Language, currently in preparation, will be amended to reflect more current research on pRyerson (personal communication by Emily Teeter).

37 Mosher, “Theban and Memphite Book of the Dead,” 146-147 n. 25.

for the text, a phenomenon also known from the famous papyrus of Iahesnakht where drips of color from the illustrator’s brush dripped upon the columns of text. The Demotic note in pRyerson provides further support to demonstrate that the hieratic text had already been written when it came time to add the vignettes. If any further proof of this sequence were needed, the empty space in pRyerson for the missing vignette of BD 37 is conclusive. Because BD 37 started in the middle of the papyrus, the illustrator accidentally missed adding the illustration and thereby caused the mismatching of text and vignettes previously cited when he went on to add the vignette for BD 37 to the text of BD 38. This follows the pattern of laying out the text prior to the vignettes reflected in the “unfinished” papyrus of Nespasefy and Khaemhôr.

Like the textual indications for the layout of vignettes, several manuscripts contain embedded notations describing in words the pictures found on a source text from which the scribe copied. Papyrus Bibliothèque Nationale 149 is not illustrated, but contains a selection of several Demotic compositions, including a Demotic translation of a funerary text often associated with the Book of Traversing Eternity, a textual description of the vignette of BD 125, a Demotic translation of BD 125, a description of a second vignette identified as the vignette for BD 148, a Demotic translation of BD 128, and a colophon identifying the scribe. The Demotic texts associated with BD 125 appear following a short blank space in the papyrus separating it from the previous funerary compositions. At this point, there is an introductory text “the writings which go to the hall of the gods who judge,” which is not a title for BD 125, but a description of where the text was positioned in the source material in relation to the vignette. This is followed by a lengthy Demotic description of the judgment scene associated with BD 125. Martin Stadler has shown how the subsequent Demotic translation of BD 125 in pBib Nat 149 was clearly copied and translated from a hieroglyphic original in columnar

39 Noticeable especially around the judgement scene where the baboons’ tails overlap text. See Woods, Visible Language, 164, fig. 84.

40 Ursula Verhoeven, Das Saitische Totenbuch der Iahtesnacht P. Colon. Aeg. 10207, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 41 (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt, 1993), 13-14. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer who pointed this out to me.

41 Franz Lexa, Das demotische Totenbuch der Pariser Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus des Pamounthes), Demotische Studien 4 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910); Martin Andreas Stadler, Der Totenpapyrus des Pa-Month (P. Bibl. nat. 149), SAT 6 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003); Mark Smith, Traversing Eternity: Texts for the Afterlife from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 437-454; Martin Stadler, Einführung in die ägyptische Religion ptolemäisch-römischer Zeit nach den demotischen religiösen Texten, EQA 7 (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2012), 132-133; Joachim Friedrich Quack, “A New Demotic Translation of (Excerpts of) a Chapter of the Book of the Dead,” JEA 100 (2014), 381-393. It should be noted that, simply by coincidence, a Demotic note indicating the number of columns is found below the vignette of BD 148 in pBerlin 10477. See Malcolm Mosher, Review of Barbara Lüscher, Das Totenbuch pBerlin P. 10477, JAOS 123 (2003), 894.

42 Joachim Quack, Review of Martin Stadler, Der Totenpapyrus des Pa-Month (P. Bibl. Nat. 149), WdO 35 (2005), 189, where comparative material is cited; Smith, Traversing Eternity, 440.
In this case the scribe decided to simply compose a description of the scene rather than illustrate the papyrus with a version from the source.

Similar notes from other papyri further reveal the compilation process in arranging the compositions of a given manuscript. While making no reference to illustrations (the manuscript is not illustrated), a short Demotic note from pLeiden T 32, column 7, demarcates the end of the previous hieratic composition: \( pꜢy=f \ mnq \ pꜢy \) “It is its end.” Like the more familiar \( iw=f \ pw \) “This means it ends,” \( pꜢy=f \ mnq \ pꜢy \) signaled the separation of the previous composition from its hieratic neighbors like the spaces and notations in pBib Nat 149 described above. Joachim Quack and Mark Smith have pointed out that a hieratic composition following this Demotic note, although included in the publication of the Book of Traversing Eternity by François René-Herbin, is only associated with that composition in roughly half the attested examples. The Demotic note and independent exemplars (including the Demotic copy at the beginning of pBib Nat 149) rather suggest that this was an independent composition, which would have been brought together with other compositions during manuscript preparation presumably in the scriptorium. The scribe of pLeiden T 32, perhaps the owner Harsiesis himself, therefore indicated his understanding of these texts as discreet units by adding this Demotic note, although it is uncertain why he would have added it in Demotic and not hieratic.

Several questions are raised by these interesting passages. Who wrote them and who were the intended readers? At first glance, one would presume that the Demotic

---

43 Stadler, Der Totenpapyrus des Pa-Month, 17-20.
44 It is important to note here the scribe’s role in composing the description of the vignettes in an attempt to interweave the compositions of pBib Nat 149 together. The main texts of the papyrus consist of Demotic translations of texts typically written in “l’égyptien de tradition.” Using these as a basis, the scribe not only translated them into Demotic, but composed freely the vignette descriptions, for which it is assumed he did not have a textual source.
46 Herbin, Le livre de parcourir l’éternité.
47 Joachim Quack, Review of Martin Stadler, Der Totenpapyrus des Pa-Month (P. Bibl. Nat. 149), WiO 35 (2005), 189; Smith, Traversing Eternity, 399-400, 438 n. 10. See also Martin Stadler Der Totenpapyrus des Pa-Month (P. Bibl. nat. 149), Studien zum altägyptischen Totenbuch 6 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 16-17; Scalf, Passports to Eternity, 50 n. 193.
48 Smith, Traversing Eternity, 399.
notes regarding the placement of illustrations and text were written by the scribes who produced the hieratic texts and were therefore written in Demotic since the contemporary vernacular would have been easier for the artist to comprehend than the archaic vocabulary, script, and grammar represented by the Middle Egyptian text in hieratic. This seems to be the most likely explanation for the note in pRyerson. The fact that the ink in the pRyerson Demotic text is a slightly different shade of black than the surrounding hieratic text suggests that it may have been added at a later time, probably by the scribe checking his work after copying out the hieratic columns from his sources. There are no other Demotic texts in pRyerson with which to compare, but the scribal hand is similar enough to the hieratic, although not identical. That the scribe wrote this note in Demotic would seem to indicate that the illustrator was literate in Demotic, but less familiar with hieratic, a circumstance that would also


50 A similar situation is attested in pBNF Égyptien 62-88, where the marginal notations for the vignettes are composed in Late Egyptian using the definite article and in a more cursive hieratic hand. See Ragazzoli, “Book of the Dead of Ankhesenaset,” 233-234. Cf. the habits of the scribe of pNu, who used wš to indicate lacunae in his source material and corrected missing text by inserting a sign in the text and added the missing text in hieratic in the margin (despite the remainder of the text being written in cursive hieroglyphs). See Günter Lapp, *The Papyrus of Nu (BM EA 10477)*, Catalogue of Books of the Dead in the British Museum 1 (London: British Museum, 1997), 54 (wš), 55 (in hieratic), pl. 58-59, pl. 56, pl. 21.

51 There may be a slight difference in hand from that of the hieratic text, especially in the form of k. If the Demotic is indeed in a second hand, it is possible, if perhaps unlikely, that the artist, having reached this section of the papyrus and realizing that the space was not appropriate for an image, wrote the note to indicate why no vignette appears. Cf. the comments of Mosher, “Theban and Memphite Book of the Dead,” 148 n. 28: “This does not imply that all of the text was added first, with all the vignettes added later, for one can occasionally observe errors that clearly indicate that the scribe entered a section of text and the vignettes were then filled in before the scribe moved on to the next section.” Unfortunately, there is nothing to be gained from comparing the paleography of the Demotic copular pronoun pšy with the hieratic Middle Egyptian pw of iw=fpw in BD 140 in column cviii above the Demotic notation.

52 Or perhaps that the scribe felt more comfortable composing freely in Demotic rather than hieratic.
explain the mismatched vignettes throughout pRyerson. One wonders if the artist
would have been provided with a separate list of spells in order to place the vignettes
in the appropriate position. A further complication is the lack of Neshutefnut’s name
and his mother’s name in the hieroglyphic text of the judgment scene. The image is
complete, but when the hieroglyphic text was applied, spaces were left for the
deceased’s name and matronym, which subsequently were never filled.53

The scholia and marginalia discussed above can be added to a growing body
of evidence revealing how funerary papyri were produced.54 Marginalia in pBNF
Égyptien 62-88 indicate the specific images the scribe intended to appear in the
accompanying vignettes, although according to Ragazzoli, the illustrations here were
added according to the marginalia before the main text.55 Similar Demotic notations
in the famous Rhind papyri56 should probably be considered likewise as instructions
for draftsmen rather than “captions” as they have generally been understood.57 That
these Demotic notations in pRhind I-II were written prior to the addition of the images
is suggested by their position above the ruled framing lines demarcating the area for
the vignettes. It is more difficult to discern the sequence employed for the further
“labels” accompanying the figures inside the frame of the vignette. However, the
hieroglyphic texts in the vignettes must have been added after, or simultaneously to,
the images as the epithet nb mꜢʿ.t “lord of truth” is carefully written around the
extended hand of Thoth in pRhind I, column 4 (figure 3).

Figure 3. Vignette from pRhind I, Column 458

54 For general comments, see Lucarelli, “Making the Book of the Dead,” 268-269. Hieratic and Demotic notes
on mummy labels also reveal manufacturing sequences, see Holger Kockelmann, Untersuchungen zu den
späten Totenbuch-Handschriften auf Mumienbinden, Band II: Handbuch zu den Mumienbinden und
56 Georg Möller, Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind des Museum zu Edinburg (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche
Buchhandlung, 1913).
57 Möller, Totenpapyrus Rhind; Smith, Traversing Eternity, 317, 332-334.
58 On the left, a facsimile from Samuel Birch and A. Henry Rhind, Facsimiles of Two Papyri Found in a Tomb
at Thebes (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863), pl. II. On the right is an image of
the papyrus from Möller, Totenpapyrus Rhind, pl. IV.
In contrast, Demotic “label” texts written within the framing lines must have been produced before the images, as suggested by the way that the funerary bier seems to overlap the Demotic signs in ḫḫpr 9 in the vignette to column 9 of Montusef’s papyrus, pRhind I (figure 4).

Figure 4. Vignette from pRhind I, Column 9

In addition, the vignettes in the Rhind papyri are occasionally mismatched, thereby indicating that a scribe was not “captioning” or “labeling” images that had already been produced, but that an artist was most likely painting them at a separate stage. Similar indications hinting at the order of production are missing from pRhind II, the papyrus for Montusef’s wife, where only true marginalia appear: notations outside of the border lines of the scenes where the scribe did not feel it necessary to add any further descriptions inside the vignette frame (figure 5). However, it is clear at the very least that the guidelines were drawn first with the text and images added second, for sections of the marginalia texts and images overlap the inked guidelines.

Figure 5. Vignette from pRhind II, Column 2

59 On the left, a facsimile from Birch and Rhind, *Facsimiles of Two Papyri*, pl. V. On the right is an image of the papyrus from Möller, *Totenpapyrus Rhind*, pl. IX. The facsimile shows the overlap more clearly.
60 Smith, *Traversing Eternity*, 317. Like pRyerson, the mismatched vignettes in the Rhind papyri are often one column off.
61 E.g., figure 5, from Möller, *Totenpapyrus Rhind*, p. XIII, where the down stroke of ḫ overlaps the upper border line.
62 From Möller, *Totenpapyrus Rhind*, pl. XIII.
What is revealed by the scholia discussed above are the complex, multidimensional processes involved in creating such elaborate funerary papyri whose contents include vast compilations of text and imagery. Much has been learned in the study of various “traditions” followed in Book of the Dead production, but more remains to be studied, especially about the actual manufacturing steps involved in preparing the finished products. It is still unclear how many individuals were involved, and the process was certainly not one-dimensional across space and time. For example, some manuscripts (such as pBNF Égyptien 62-88) had the vignettes added before the text, and some (such as pRyerson) after. Some manuscripts were produced with reference to source materials; others may have been made from scratch. The fact that multiple individuals participated in certain demonstrable cases is indisputable; in other cases, a single scribe was clearly responsible for an entire manuscript. The hieratic and Demotic marginalia imply a level of literacy among the funerary workshop staff, if we interpret these annotations as communication between personnel. For elaborate papyri compiled from source material, this is no surprise as their origins in the scriptoria have long been assumed, where scribes with skills in texts must have worked alongside artist scribes with talents in drawing and painting. Whether the procedures of the scriptoria pertained to the production of texts and images among the larger mortuary assemblage remain for further study.

---


64 For a discussion of producing Demotic funerary papyri outside of the scriptorium or formal workshop setting, see Scaife, *Passports*, 182-185.


66 For manuscripts produced by a single scribe, the notes are clearly for internal purposes only, such as those on pBib Nat 149 and pLeiden T 32. Rather than instructions, these are traditional scholia, explanatory notes or comments to the text.

67 Of course, in certain cases, a single scribe was competent enough to perform both tasks. See Ragazzoli, “Book of the Dead of Ankhesenaset,” 235, citing Jaroslav Černý, *A Community of Workmen at Thebes in the Ramesside Period*, 2nd Edition, BdE 50 (Cairo: IFAO, 2001), 193, for the instance of Harshire, a draftsman who later became a scribe.

Plate 1. Column cviii of pRyerson (OIM E9787G): Crowding from BD 137 and BD 140