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1. INTRODUCTION

To different degrees, all the great Underworld Books have been transmitted and received after their creation in the later 2nd millennium BCE until late in the 1st millennium BCE. In this article, we will explore the modes of reception of, mainly, the Book of Caverns in the 13th century (19th dynasty), in the 8th/7th century (25th/26th dynasties), and in the 4th century BCE (30th dynasty) with a special focus on traits relating to reproduction, moderate update, and free creativity.

After the Amduat and the Book of Gates, the Book of Caverns is the latest of three great Underworld Books that reasonably qualify for the label 'book.'1 The topic of these books is the travel of the sun god through the underworld and, more importantly, the interaction between him and its inhabitants. The books include images, annotations to the images, descriptive texts, offering statements and/or litanies, as well as personalised additions for the respective book owners. (The historically later date of the latter will play a role in the discussion below.) The primary cultural context of the Underworld Book is to be identified as the storage of theological knowledge; as well as, I presume, the use of this knowledge in rituals of the nocturnal sun cult. A secondary context is their use as decoration in the kings’ tombs. An important purpose of this secondary use is, I believe, the equation of the king’s sarcophagus chamber with Osiris’ place in the underworld.3

Originally, the Book of Caverns has to be imagined as a long papyrus with seven large image tableaus including ca. 80 scenes and accompanying texts.4 Between the tableaus, there were long texts with 21 great litanies. Furthermore—and most important for the following discussion (§§4, 6.1, 7.3 below)—, some text witnesses had many personalised textual additions for the book owner, mainly

---

1. Hornung 1999. For the character of a loose set of scenes of the traditionally called Book(s) of the Earth, see Roberson 2012: 8f.
2. rhy. cf. the title of the Amduat, Amd. 102–109.
distributed over the various litanies. There are hints that these papyri were written in cursive hieroglyphs with some hieratic sign shapes.\(^5\)

The individual text witnesses of Caverns deviate in certain respects. We find differences among the text witnesses as far as the images are concerned, as well as differences in the texts. Besides some accidental mistakes, we can also observe some changes that were obviously intentional. For our interest in reproductivity and creativity, it seems useful to differentiate between:

- accidental deviations (omissions, additions, or changes),
- intentional omissions of text passages/images,
- intentional additions of phrases/images,
- intentional alterations of words/images, and
- intentional (ancient) emendations by conjecture.

This article is concerned with the latter three. In order to properly evaluate and to approximately date the processes behind the observed deviations, we need to take the network of ‘genealogical’ interdependencies of the text witnesses into account. These were reconstructed by the means of textual criticism and were visualised in the form of so-called stemmata.\(^6\)

The method of textual criticism is a philological algorithm based on the observation of differences between text witnesses. One output of this algorithm is the stemma, a genealogical tree of its tradition. The nodes of this tree stand for text copies, the existence of which is postulated by the method, but which usually have not come down to us. Given the actual surviving text witnesses and the stemma, the method also allows us to reconstruct the content of each of the postulated copies between the archetype and the text witnesses (within certain limits). This is how we may pinpoint the date of certain observable deviations within certain margins. The application of the algorithm, however, has its limits. The algorithm works well only with reproductive traditions; it cannot handle very creative traditions. The traditions of the Underworld Books, however, are predominately reproductive. Even in


the cases of comparably creative receptions (to be discussed below), there are usually enough reproductive parts so that the algorithms may be applied to those parts.

2. TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF CAVERNS

The textual history of the Book of Caverns has been reconstructed in Werning (2011.I: ch. III). Fig. 2 shows a slightly abridged and updated version of the corresponding stemma.¹ We can observe three main lines of tradition. The first starts with the copy in the subterranean complex of the Osiris temple in Abydos, the Osireion (late 13th century BCE). A second covers the tomb decoration in the Valley of the Kings at Thebes (12th century). And a third leads to a papyrus of queen Nedjmet in the 11th century (Third Intermediate Period). The first line of tradition to the Osireion later leads to the Theban tomb decoration in the 7th century (25th/26th dynasties) and further to a sarcophagus production in Saqqara in the 4th century BCE (30th dynasty).

The stemma, however, also exhibits a case in which not one but two copies served as the basis for the creation of a new copy. Obviously, scribes in the early Late Period compared two copies and took information from both in order to produce a new, somewhat ‘mixed’ version. This phenomenon is commonly called ‘collation.’

---

¹ For the copies of the variant of the final tableau of Caverns in TT 33 and TT 197, see Roberson 2012: pls. 26 and 32.
3. ANCIENT COLLATION: REESTABLISHING AN ‘AUTHENTIC’ TEXT

Acts of collation have already been revealed by means of textual criticism in the textual histories of the Underworld Books and the Litany of the Sun, as well as in the textual histories of individual Coffin Text and Book of the Dead spells. The process of collation may be classified as rather reproductive. It usually aims at (re)creating a most authentic, intact text. The case of collation in the textual history of

---

8. Cf. the reviewed stemmata in Werning 2007: with fig. 1.
Caverns is a very remarkable one, especially because some conclusion can be drawn as far as the motivations and the corresponding processes are concerned.

A thorough analysis revealed that the 7th century copy in tomb TT 33 of Petamenophis—apparently the chief librarian (*hr.i-hiš hr.i-dp*) of his time—is a result of such a collation of two older copies. The larger part of Petamenophis’s copy came from a copy similar to the one in the Osireion, and selected parts came from a copy similar to the one in the tomb of Ramses VI (KV 9). A few very self-evident hints exemplify this collation process. A first hint is the evidence from scene XXI of Caverns.

Fig. 3. Transmission of scene XXI from Caverns (schematic; cf. Werning 2011.I: 69, fig. 6).

Scene XXI displays a casket of Osiris with some gods and emblems around it. As testified by numerous text witnesses from all three branches of the textual transmission of Caverns, the original version had 4(!) adoring gods standing around it. In the tomb KV 9 (Ramses VI), however, the decorators made a mistake. The scene is located partially inside a niche in the wall and partially outside the niche. At the very edge of this niche, the decorators accidentally doubled two of the adoring gods beside the casket. So KV 9 exhibits 6 instead of 4 adoring gods. Remarkably, we find the same mistaken number of gods in Petamenophis’s tomb (TT 33). This proves that a copy directly for, or rather from, the tomb of Ramses VI served as one source for Petamenophis’s copy. This copy, however, cannot be the only one. By chance this is even apparent in the very same scene XXI. Namely, it happens to be the case that all text witnesses from the kings’ tombs exhibit a common mistake.

---

Originally, scene XXI also included four heads of Ra with red suns next to it and four ‘necks’ of Ra with black discs with some kind of red ‘rays’(!) coming down from it. In the initial master copy γ for the decoration in the Valley of the Kings, the copyist accidentally forgot or overlooked the red rays and left them out. So, if the Late Period scribes had used a copy from the kings’ tombs as the only source, Petamenophis’s tomb would have lacked the rays as well. But it doesn’t. It testifies the rays, which the scribes obviously copied from a second master copy, a copy from the Osireion (as proven by other observations too; cf. below).

Another hint to this collation process is the combined evidence from scene no. II and the attestation of certain common personalised textual additions for the book owner. In order to appreciate this evidence, however, we first need to look at the distribution of personalised additions more generally.

4. THE TEXTUAL HISTORY OF PERSONALISED ADDITIONS FOR THE BOOK OWNERS

As stated above, the tradition of the Underworld Books was predominately reproductive, i.e. the copyists were trying to copy the text without any ‘substantial’ changes. A specific, ‘licensed’ mode of creative alteration, however, was the addition of new personalised text passages for and/or images of the book owner. Textual additions are much more frequent than additions of images.

An important observation is that the personalised additions that are attested in the Underworld Books are indeed ‘additions,’ i.e. they are generally secondary. This can clearly be seen if one locates the respective additions on the respective transmission stemmata. In all of these cases, it turns out that none of the archetypes (α) contain any of these personalised text passages and images. They are secondary, i.e. ‘additions’ in the original meaning of the word. The function of the additions was, obviously, to involve the book owner in the circumstances and interactions described in the Underworld Books.

Moreover, we observe that specific personalised additions only rarely reoccur identically in more than one tomb. Obviously, they were only included in specific decoration master copies for specific tombs, which were not usually reused for another tomb. There are, however, some cases in which such decoration master copies were reused. For tomb KV 14 (Ta/Se), copy ε of Gates for KV 8 (Mer) was reused; in tomb KV 2 (RIV), we find the same additions to Gates as in the Osireion (copy ι); in tombs KV 9, KV 1, and KV 6 (RVI, RVII, and RIX), we find the same textual additions to Caverns as in KV 2 (RIV) (copy γ); and in tomb KV 6 (RIX) we also find the same textual additions to the Amduat as in KV 9 (RVI) (copy ν). As a rule, the names and titles of the former ‘owner’ were always replaced by those of the new owner.

12. Black(!) discs with red rays are – as far as I know – highly unusual in Egyptian iconography. Therefore I take it as very unlikely that the redactor of Petamenophis’s copy added rays to the bare black-filled discs that he would have found in his master copy based simply on his familiarity with other black discs with red rays.


14. For the cases of the Amduat, the Litany to the Sun, and the Book of Gates, see Werning 2007: fig. 1; for the case of Caverns, see the discussion in Werning 2011.I: 68–73, 330f.

15. Thinking about reproductive and creativity, another interesting observation is that the additions normally are neatly separable from the original texts/images. The original texts/images themselves were not normally changed. The additions are, to put it differently, neatly separable creative additions to a (usually) reproducitvely transmitted kernel text; but compare the case of the sarcophagus of Tjhorpto from the 4th cent. BCE in section 7 below.

In the textual history of Caverns, there are some quite remarkable observations to make as far as personalised additions are concerned. First of all, the repeated reuse, described above, of the personalised copies of Caverns in the kings’ tombs is exceptional. Most remarkably, however, the copy of Caverns in TT 33 (Petamenophis) exhibits the same exceptional image addition as the Osireion copy as well as the same set of textual additions as tomb KV 9 (RVI). Evaluated against the background of the stemma of Caverns as reconstructed by other pieces of evidence, this clearly indicates that the scribes collated two copies from both these sources.

This collation process is even apparent in one specific litany verse in TT 33 (Hb. 25.21). This verse includes two instances of the phrase htm hft(i).w “to destroy someone’s enemies” directly following one another. The first instance is as part of the kernel text of Caverns, and the second instance is as part of a personalised textual addition.

The remarkable phenomenon is that the lexeme htm “to destroy, to terminate” is spelled with the phono-classifier ḫ (Gardiner no. G38/G39) in the main text, but with a ḫ (variant of G41) in the addition. The form in the main text corresponds to the usual, default form as found e.g. in the Osireion (in a cursive hieroglyphic shape). The form ḫ in the addition, on the other hand, is a marked one that is characteristic for the text witnesses in the Valley of the Kings, especially also for Caverns in KV 9. That the verse in TT 33 exhibits the form ḫ in this text addition, and only in this single text addition, but not in any instance of the main text, proves that the textual additions come from a source (← Valley of the Kings) other than the main text (← Osireion). (It also testifies to the diligent philological work of the early Late Period scribes responsible.) But what was the exact source for these two copies?

---

17. In addition to the inherited additions, the copy of Caverns in KV 6 (Ramses IX) exhibits an individual pictorial addition. The sarcophagus of Tjihorpto also exhibits a series of new individual text additions (see below).

18. Translations: β “O Osiris, lord of the assembly of gods, whose words have destroyed his enemies!”; RVI/KV 9 “O Osiris, lord of the assembly of gods, whose words have destroyed his enemies! May you destroy the enemies of king […] Ramses […] – justified!”; Pet/TT 33 “O Osiris, lord of the assembly of gods, whose word has destroyed his enemies! May you destroy the enemies of Petamen[ophis – justified!].”
5. Transmission bridging centuries: Library traditions and ancient ‘archeo-philologists’

Naturally, we would like to know whether the scribes of the 8th/7th centuries were using secondary copies drawn from the finished monuments or whether they had copies of the original decoration master copies for the monuments. Since the mistaken number of 6 adorants attested in Petamenophis’s tomb can only be explained by the very specific architectural setting with the niche in the tomb KV 9 (see §3 above), I would guess that the early Late Period copy that was similar to KV 9 was a copy drawn from the finished monument itself. (It seems less likely that the location of the niche and the subsequent mistake were already reflected in a fit-to-wall decoration master copy.) That the Egyptians entered ancient tombs and copied images and texts from the walls becomes clearer and clearer in current research.19 For those who copied relatively long texts, I propose the label ‘archaeo-philologists.’

In the case of the early Late Period copy that was similar to the Osireion copy, on the other hand, there is no comparable hint of archeo-philological endeavors. At the current state of research, it therefore may seem more reasonable to assume that it was a copy of the original decoration master copy that made it into the early Late Period.

![Diagram of copies for an early Late Period tomb decoration copy of Caverns.](image)

Apart from copying and collating ancient copies, the ʿḥbdꜥ (‘scribes,’ ‘decorators,’ ‘painters,’ …) involved also made some moderate changes to the texts and images. In the following, we are going to explore some of the changes.

---

19. Cf. the discussions and references in Werning 2011.I: 71 with fn. 31, 73, 81.
6. MODERATE CHANGES TO THE TEXTS AND IMAGES

Most of the changes discussed in the following sections may be classified as updating processes, rather than reproductive or creative processes. We begin with the somewhat mandatory updates of personalised additions for reuse by a concrete new ‘owner.’

6.1. Adaptation of personalised phrases and images

It has been mentioned above that we find the same set of personalised text additions in the copies of Caverns in tombs KV 2, KV 9, KV 1, and KV 6 (RIV, RVI, RVII, and RIX). We also find that most, but not all(!), of the personalised phrases that are attested in KV 9 (RVI) appear likewise in TT 33 (Petamenophis) as the outcome of a collation process. In all these cases, the phrases generally remain the same, but they always exhibit the titles and names of the respective tomb owner. Obviously, at some point someone had replaced the titles and names of the former owner by those of the new owner. Given that we cannot find a single mistake in this context, e.g. a wrong name or an unresolved dummy “so-and-so,” it is not very likely that the changes were made as late as during the (sometimes hurried) decoration of the tomb. Rather we would assume that the changes were made by a competent scribe while creating a new copy of a papyrus manuscript intended as a master copy for the decoration of the respective tomb.

The question remains whether a) the manuscripts from which the decoration copy was made only contained a dummy, like mn “so-and-so,”20 or whether b) they contained an actual name. This is directly related to the question of whether the manuscripts from which the decoration copy was made were a) multi-purpose ‘models,’ or whether they were b) individual copies that had once been made for a specific purpose, e.g. a concrete monument.21 Since (apart from the personal names themselves) the selection of royal titles and the occurrences of mš ḫrw interjections in all copies of Caverns in the kings’ tombs are remarkably similar,22 I take it as more likely that we are dealing with actual fit-to-purpose tomb decoration copies including full names (like e.g. nzw ḥqꜣ-mš.t R R ṣp.n ḫmn mš ḫrw “king Ḥeqa-maat-ra-setep-en-ra, justified”), rather than with ‘model’ copies that contained a full dummy like mn “so-and-so.”23

But also pictorial additions of specific individuals were updated. The copy of Caverns in the Osireion is unique in that it exhibits a king entering the underworld behind the sun god in scene II. But, in the tomb of Petamenophis (TT 33), we also find an individual entering the underworld behind the sun god. A caption identifies this individual as Petamenophis himself.24 Analogous to the replacement of the king’s titles and names by Petamenophis’s title(s) and name in the textual additions, the (named) pictorial representation of the king in scene II has also been replaced by a (named) representation of Petamenophis.

20. Wb. II, 64f.
23. One might still consider a less general model with partially fixed wordings like nzw mn mš ḫrw “king so-and-so, justified.”
24. Cf. Werning 2011.II: 2. In the Osireion, there is another king, Merneptah, squeezed in among the gods that welcome the sun god in scene II. However, the section that mirrors this part of the Osireion is lost in TT 33. So we cannot know what the early Late Period collators did with that one.
While these updates were somewhat mandatory to prevent a foreign person rather than the proper new owner from being addressed in a tomb, most of the changes to be discussed in the next section seem less necessary.

6.2. Orthographical, lexicographical, and grammatical changes

In this section, we are going to explore intentional changes to the texts, like systematic orthographical changes, changes of lemmata, as well as morpho-syntactic changes. Most often the new spellings, words, or grammatical features seem to be closer to the respective contemporary Égyptiens de tradition or even to the contemporary written language than the old ones. At the same time, the content of the text is almost never changed in a ‘substantial’ way. These changes may, therefore, be classified as updates, rather than as creative processes. It seems to be the purpose of these updates to make the text slightly easier to understand.

Some changes, on the other hand, seem to be more or less arbitrary. They may be triggered by considerations of available decoration space, by the taste of the owner, copyist, or decorator, or even simply by the skills of the latter.

6.2.1. Orthographical and lexicographical changes in the 13th/12th centuries

Already the text witnesses of the 19th/20th dynasties exhibit some systematic deviations. In the copies from the kings’ tombs, we observe some usages of ‘modern,’ Ramesside hieroglyphic sign shapes, e.g.

\[(\text{Ex-1}) \ ٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓ (\alpha; = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\beta} (\text{KV 9/RVI}),\]

\[(\text{Ex-2}) \ ٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓ (\alpha; = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\beta} (\text{KV 2/RIV; KV 9/RVI}),\]

\[(\text{Ex-3}) \ ٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓ (\alpha; = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\beta} (\text{KV 9/RVI}).\]

We also find the replacement of specific Égyptien de tradition spellings of the archetype of Caverns with more compact and more iconic and therefore—if I may say so—more attractive spellings in the kings’ tombs, e.g.

\[(\text{Ex-4}) \ ٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓ (\alpha; = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\beta} (\text{KV 9/RVI}) \text{“king,”}\]

\[(\text{Ex-5}) \ ٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓ (\alpha; = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\beta} (\text{KV 9/RVI}) \text{“ruler,”}\]

\[(\text{Ex-6}) \ ٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓ (\alpha; = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\beta} (\text{KV 9/RVI}).\]

28. From a methodological point of view, we cannot always prove which of the different forms are the primary ones (to be appointed to the archetype α) and which are the secondary ones. But, given that the archetype was written with cursive hieroglyphs with some hieratic signs (see fn. 5 above) and that the hieroglyphic spellings in the kings’ tombs seem to be partially influenced by the decorators, the directions of change are likely, as suggested below.
29. The cursive hieroglyphic sign shapes are taken from various sheets of the papyrus of Ani (Budge 1913).
A rather curious habit is the following occasional graphical **merge of two signs** into a single combined sign:

- (Ex-7) \( \overline{\text{h}} \to \overline{\text{k}} \) in \( \delta s \) “to hurry” (*cf. Gardiner no. O35),

- (Ex-8) \( \overline{\text{i}}\overline{\text{i}} \to \overline{\text{k}} \) in \( \text{hd}. \text{wt} \) “light” (*cf. Gardiner no. N8).  

Most of these changes may be attributed to the (wider) decoration process, *i.e.* the creation of a decoration master copy and the actual execution of the tomb decoration itself. The following changes, however, are apparently part of a more systematic, philological recension most likely to be located in a scribal office.

One remarkable spelling change incorporates contemporary **syllabic spelling habits**:

- (Ex-9) \( \overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{r}}\text{t} \) (\( \alpha \) \( \to \)) \( \overline{\text{w}}\overline{\text{g}}\text{r}-\text{t} \) “realm of silence, netherworld” (*RIV, RVI, RVII, RIX*).

A similar explanation might explain the following curious change:*32

- (Ex-10) \( \overline{\text{j}} \) \( \overline{\text{i}} \) \( \overline{\text{i}} \) \( \overline{\text{i}} \) \( \text{k} \) \( \text{k} \) \( \text{w} \) \( \text{t} \) (\( \alpha \) \( \to \)) \( \text{k} \) \( \text{k} \) \( \text{w} \) \( \text{t} \) “darkness.”

Besides the latter, we find one more case of the **update of a lemma**:

- (Ex-11) \( \overline{\text{h}} \) \( \text{c} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \gamma \) \( \alpha \) \( \beta \) \( \to \) \( \overline{\text{h}} \) \( \text{c} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \gamma \) \( \beta \) “body” (*RVI, RIX*).

Another remarkable change is the observable fluctuation between the designations

- (Ex-12) \( \text{hnti-} \overline{\text{l}}\text{mnt}(\text{i}) \) \( \text{w} \) \( \alpha \) \( \beta \) “chief of the westerners, Khontamenti” (*tO, RIV; more rarely RVI*)

and

- \( \text{hnti-} \overline{\text{l}}\text{mn}(\text{t}) \) \( \alpha \) \( \beta \) “chief of the west” (*RVI, RIX; more rarely tO*)

in different text witnesses.*34 Unfortunately it is hardly ever clear which of the two readings was the original.

We see that these more or less systematic changes in the 13th/12th centuries are far from ‘substantial,’ the only creative aspect being the addition of personalised phrases for the king to the tomb decoration master copy \( \gamma \), probably for Ramses IV.

**References to examples**: (Ex-1) *e.g.* Hb. 80.29,31ff; (Ex-2) *e.g.* Hb. 80.20,21,31ff; (Ex-3) *e.g.* Hb. 96.26, 97.16–18; (Ex-4) *e.g.* Hb. 25.17, 81.46; (Ex-5) rarely, *e.g.* Hb. 25.12, 15, 19; (Ex-6) Werning 2011.I: 327–329 (tab. 31); (Ex-7) *e.g.* Hb. 24.33, 57.55ff, 79.12; (Ex-8) Hb. 45.17; (Ex-9) *cf.* Werning 2011.I: 333ff., tab. 2, note a; (Ex-10) *cf.* Werning 2011.I: 178ff./§105; (Ex-11) *cf.* Werning 2011.II: 499; (Ex-12) Werning 2011.I: 340 (tab. 8).

### 6.2.2. Orthographical, lexicographical, and grammatical changes in the 8th/7th century

The picture gets a little more exciting when we look at the reception in tomb TT 33 of the chief librarian \( \text{hhr}(\text{i})-\text{h}(\text{i})\text{b} \) \( \text{hhr}(\text{i})-\text{dp} \) Petamenophis in the 7th century BCE (late 25th or early 26th dynasties).

---

One particular orthographical change, the spelling of the theonym “Osiris” with the classifier [DIVINE] (see below), points to the later 8th century as a terminus ante quem non for at least parts of this reception process.35 Since there does not seem to be any hint of textual copying activity between the 11th and the middle of the 8th century, we may for the time being attribute all the following changes to the later 8th or (probably more likely) to the 7th century BCE.

First of all, we find some characteristic hieroglyphic renderings of sign shapes here also:

(Ex-13) * mr (Hieroglyphica no. D129),
(Ex-14) * m / m (Gardiner no. N38, and variant; Schweitzer 2005: 358f.).

Differently than in the 13th/12th centuries, however, some of these shapes resemble those that are commonly held to be characteristic for the time of the Old Kingdom (2nd half of the 3rd mill. BCE), e.g.

(Ex-15) * k (= ) → k (Gardiner no. W12),
(Ex-16) * n (= ) → n, n (cf. Gardiner no. T33 k vs. T31 c;
Schweitzer 2005: 428f.),
(Ex-17) * k (= ) → k (Hieroglyphica no. D286, Schweitzer 2005: 253, cf.
Lincke 2011: 74–76; the shape, however, is not clearly distinctive in TT 33).

These cases are, however, not necessarily meant to resemble Old Kingdom forms. They may rather reflect characteristics of the cursive hieroglyphic forms ( n, n) or may be rather accidental ( n).

Also in TT 33, we occasionally find the graphical merging of two signs into a single combined sign:

(Ex-18) → in “to transit” and “to hurry” (cf. Gardiner no. O35),
(Ex-19) → e.g. in “light” and “shine” (cf. Gardiner no. N8).

The occasional omission of the ‘grammato-classifier’ [PLURAL] in personal pronouns seems to emulate orthographic habits of the 3rd mill. BCE.38

(Ex-20) → n “1PL: you, your,”

Another spelling change might, on the other hand, rather reflect orthographic habits of the 1st millennium than of the late 3rd mill. BCE:39

(Ex-21) · k as ‘grammato-classifier’ [1SG] in w(l) and for “1SG: I, me, my.”41

35. According to Leahy (1979: 142, 149), this classifier is rarely attested in the theonyms ‘Osiris’ and ‘Isis’ on royal sarcophagi in the time of Hatshepsut and Thutmosis III, i.e. definitely before the creation of copy ζ of Caverns. Later, however, it is almost unattested until the reign of Pije (with one single exception). (I thank John Taylor and Karl Jansen-Winkeln for having pointed this out to me.)

36. Cf. the attestation of (Y2) in text witnesses from the 6th cent. BCE (Der Manuelian 1994: 66).

37. For the term ‘emulation’ (French ‘émulation’), cf. Stauder 2014.


For selected lemmata, we find changes of spellings comparatively often, e.g. 

(Ex-22) $\text{w}r \rightarrow \urcorner (W)sr(w)$ “Osiris” (cf. the comment above; also note that this is the only word in which the classifier $\text{GOD}$ was replaced by $\text{DIVINE}$),

(Ex-23) $\text{b} / \text{mr} / \text{w} \rightarrow \text{b}$ “ba, manifestation,”

(Ex-24) $\urcorner \text{dw} \rightarrow \text{dw}$ “netherworld, underworld,”

(Ex-25) $\text{nm} \rightarrow \text{nm}$ “slaughtering places,”

(Ex-26) $\text{m} \rightarrow \text{m}$ “see.”

There is a tendency to omit certain phonetic complements. This is especially frequent with the phonetic complement $\text{r}$, e.g.

(Ex-27) $\text{w}$ (e.g. in $\text{w}i$, $\text{d}w$, $\text{hw}$); $\text{t}$ (e.g. in $\text{st}$, $\text{st}$); $\text{m}$ (in $\text{mi}$); $\text{z}$ (e.g. in $\text{zi}$);

Other omissions of phonetic complements are much less frequent, e.g.

(Ex-28) $\text{m}$ “the one in, the one in the form of.”

There are, on the other hand, also two cases in which a phonetic complement is occasionally added:

(Ex-29) $\text{ir}$ in $\text{ir}$ “form”

(Note that this phonetic complement already occurs twice in RVI [Hb. 100.9,14] and may have been spelled this way in the archetype a in these instances.),

(Ex-30) $\text{h}$ “on, above.”

The omission of the phonetic complement $\text{r}$ and the addition of a phonetic complement $\text{r}$ may reflect different reactions to the general sound changes of $\text{r} > [r] \sim [\text{r}] \sim [j] \sim \varnothing$ and $\text{r} > [l] \sim [\text{r}] \sim [j] \sim \varnothing$. The $\text{hr}$ might have been deleted, since its spoken correspondence has become rather variable. In contrast, the addition of the phonetic complement in $\text{ir}$ and $\text{h}$ might signal that the $\text{r}$ was still pronounced as $\text{r}$ in the respective words. At least in the case of $\text{ir}$, the addition of an $\text{r}$ may, however, simply disobey the Middle Egyptian orthographic habit that this sign is normally not accompanied by a phonetic complement. This phenomenon is indeed somewhat exceptional in Middle Egyptian if one compares $\text{r}$ with the majority of other bi-consonantal signs. Therefore, the spellings $\text{ir}$ and $\text{h}$ simply treat $\text{r}$ and $\text{h}$ analogous to most of the other multi-consonantal signs.

40. For the term ‘grammato-classifier’ (German ‘Grammato-Klassifikator’), see Werning 2011.I: 102–104/§6.
42. For the meaning “the one in the form of” (German “in Form von jemandem”) of $\text{im}$, cf. Werning 2011.II: 478.
44. Cf. the occasional spelling of the infinitive $\text{ir}$ “to do” as $\text{ir}$ and $\text{h}$ in text witnesses from the 26th dynasty (Der Manuelian 1994: 244, 253, 255). For the spellings of various verbal forms of $\text{ir}$ “to do” with either $\text{r}$ or $\text{h}$ in Late Egyptian, cf. Winand 1992.
Besides deviations in respect to the phonetic complements, we also find some other changes, which clearly reflect changes in the pronunciation of specific lemmata:

(Ex-31) /t/ → /t/, e.g. occasionally in
\[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

(Ex-32) /r/ → /ʔ/, usually in
\[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

(Ex-33) /w/ → /w/, e.g.
\[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

(Ex-34) \[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

Note that there is rather a different explanation for the omission of \(w\) in plural forms that are spelled with a ‘grammato-classifier’ (or equivalent) \(\text{PLURAL}\). There the grammato-classifier simply substitutes for the \(w\), which is still meant to be present:

(Ex-35) \[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

(Ex-36) \[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

As in the 12th cent. BCE (see above), we occasionally find the update of the lemma

(Ex-37) \[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

and, similarly, we find the comparatively systematic change

(Ex-38) \[\text{the pronunciation of specific lemmata:}\]

Above the level of individual words, we find one systematic phraseological alteration:

---

45. For the meaning “to care for” (German “sich kümmern um jemanden”) of \(n\), cf. Werning 2011.II: 495–497.
46. Cf. Werning 2011.I: 179/§§106f. Note that the spellings of ‘t’s are generally to be taken seriously in all copies of Caverns. There is no such phenomenon like ‘superfluous’ ‘t’s as e.g. in Late Egyptian.
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(Ex-39) $\text{hft(ī), w} \overset{2}{\text{sr(w)}}$ “enemies of Osiris” (‘direct genitive’)

→ $\text{n(ī) } \overset{48}{\text{sr(w)}}$ “enemies of Osiris” (‘indirect genitive’).

Most remarkable, however, is a frequent morpho-syntactic alteration that affects reduplicating verbal forms. The archetype of Caverns contained many such reduplicating forms, namely ‘distributive participles’ (irr(ī) “doing” / irr.w “done”), the ‘imperfective relative form’ (irr.w “done, doing”), and the morphologically related ‘imperfective nominal verb form’ (irr “doing”). (The authors still had a good idea of the morphologies and functions of these earlier Egyptian forms). In the copy in TT 33, however, many of these reduplicating forms have been changed to simple non-reduplicating forms, e.g.

(Ex-40) $\text{opp} \overset{º}{\text{p}}$ “passing” (> 20×; 10× left unchanged),

(Ex-41) $\text{s:qd} \overset{º}{\text{d}}$ “traveling” (1×; none left unchanged),

(Ex-42) $\text{prr} \overset{º}{\text{p}}$ “coming forth” (4×; 3× left unchanged),

(Ex-43) $\text{irr} \overset{º}{\text{r}}$ “doing” (1×; 4× left unchanged).

Der Manuelian researched texts in Égyptien de tradition from the early Late Period. He observed that reduplicating ‘nominal verb forms’ seem to disappear completely between the 25th dynasty and the 26th dynasty (middle of the 7th cent. BCE); and reduplicating adjectival verb forms are somewhat underrepresented as well. Through the observations on the contemporary reception of Caverns in TT 33, we may now confirm that the ‘missing’ of these forms is indeed triggered by conscious decisions made by the scribes of the late Third Intermediate Period and the Late Period. Looking at

48. Note that attributive nisbe $n(ī)$ usually displays number and gender inflection in the original, kernel text of Caverns (cf. Werning 2011.I: 131/§48). Therefore, the regular use of the uninflected form n(ī) in this phrase clearly stands out as secondary.

49. ‘Reduplicating’ verb forms (like mrr) are not to be confused with ‘geminating’ verb forms (like mmm). While ‘reduplication’ is a way of morphological inflection of lexemes without doubled consonants (e.g. mrl/mrVr(V) “love” vs. mrr/mrVr(V)/ “loving”), ‘gemination’ is an orthographical effect exhibited by lexemes with two identical consonants next to each other (imm/immVrV/ “to grasp” vs. im/mVmVrV/ “shall grasp”).


51. Werning 2011.I: 181f./§109. Note that it is theoretically possibly that the spellings $\text{prr}$ and $\text{s:qd}$ may be read as pr$^\Delta$ and s:qd$^\Delta$, respectively (omission of phonetic complements; see above). This, however, is unlikely, since a) the omission of phonetic complements other than $\text{r}$ are comparatively rare and b) forms like *$\text{prr}$ or *s:qd$^\Delta$ never occur, so that one would have to assume that e.g. $\text{prr}$ can represent prr$^\Delta$ as well as pr$^\Delta$, which would be consequently ineffective. Therefore, we have reason to interpret $\text{prr}$ and s:qd$^\Delta$, respectively. The case of $\text{prr}$ vs. $\text{pr}$ is somewhat different. A spelling $\text{prr}$ is not attested in any text witness. But there are occasionally spellings of certain words, like $\text{dr(ī), w}$ “form” (cf. above), in which $\text{prr}$ is to be interpreted simply as $\text{pr}$. It is, however, unclear whether this also applies to verb forms proper. In the discussion on verb forms below, $\text{prr}$ is generally taken as a spelling for irr. The data for zi(w) “to guard,” on the other hand, are left out here. In this case it is indeed difficult to interpret the spelling $\text{zī}$, which is attested besides $\text{zi}$ and $\text{zī}$.


the number of changed forms more closely, we can even confirm that the scribes did not treat all reduplicating verb forms in the same way. They more often changed the ‘thematic’ ‘nominal verb forms’ than the adjectival verb forms. Furthermore, they (still) generally left the stems \( \text{\textit{dd'}} \) and \( \text{\textit{wdd'}} \) unchanged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributive participles / Imperfective relative forms</th>
<th>Nominal verb forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unchanged : changed</td>
<td>unchanged : changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{\textit{cpp'}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{p'}} )</td>
<td>1 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{\textit{prr'}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{pr'}} )</td>
<td>2 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{\textit{s:qdd'}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{s:qd'}} )</td>
<td>(no example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{\textit{irr} \rightarrow \text{\textit{ir}}} )</td>
<td>4 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{\textit{dd'}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{d}} )</td>
<td>8 : 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{\textit{wdd'}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{wd'}} )</td>
<td>1 : 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 : 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1: Treatment of reduplicating verb forms in the 7th cent. BCE (TT 33).

References to examples: (Ex-13) Hb. 21.1,8,23,48; (Ex-14) e.g. Hb. 1.19, 2.31; (Ex-15) e.g. Hb. 1.2, 76.58; (Ex-16) e.g. Hb. 20.59; (Ex-17) Hb. 34.21; (Ex-18) e.g. Hb. 29.29, 39.25, 76.58, 81.84; (Ex-19) e.g. Hb. 31.8,12,16, 43.10; (Ex-20) Hb. 32.28,29, 97.26,27; (Ex-21) e.g. Hb. 32.18,20,28, 76.54,55,63; (Ex-22) e.g. Hb. 52.12, cf. also Ex-39 below; (Ex-23) e.g. Hb. 20.31,43, 29.16; (Ex-24) e.g. Hb. 2.23, 24.12, 20.1; (Ex-25) e.g. Hb. 2.19; (Ex-26) Werning 2011.I: 327–329 (tab. 31); (Ex-27) e.g. Hb. 2.3; (Ex-28) e.g. Hb. 2.18; (Ex-29) Hb. 8.1, 101.21; (Ex-30) e.g. Hb. 32.8, 40.27, 99.8; (Ex-31) e.g. Hb. 76.62,66, 81.84,89; 1.12,15,19; (Ex-32) e.g. Hb. 21.8,34; (Ex-33) e.g. Hb. 2.31, 97.12, Werning 2011.I: 179/§105; 34.3, 64.5, 78.4ff; 92.21 (Ex-34) e.g. Hb. 21.48, 32.25; 2.19, 45.13; 44.19; 25.23, 19.7; 32.12, 76.6, 104.1; (Ex-35) Werning 2011.I: 179/§106; (Ex-36) Werning 2011.I: 179/§106; (Ex-37) cf. Werning 2011.II: 499; (Ex-38) Werning 2011.I: 179/§107; (Ex-39) e.g. Hb. 80.7,8,12; (Ex-40–Ex-43) Werning 2011.I: 181f./§109.

6.2.3. Orthographical and lexicographical changes in the 4th century

On the sarcophagus Cairo CG 29306 of Tjihorpto from the 4th century BCE (30th dynasty), we observe some of the changes that we already observed in TT 33 (see above). Leaving those mostly aside, I would like to highlight the following.

We find the replacement of phonological spellings of the root by specific logographical spellings, which are characteristic for this text witness of Caverns, e.g.

\[ \text{\textit{z}#(w).w} \rightarrow \text{\textit{z}#(w)} \]

\[ \text{\textit{z}#(w.t)} \rightarrow \text{\textit{z}#(w.t)} \]

\[ \text{\textit{|r.(~)w}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{|r.}} \text{\textit{w}} \]

\[ \text{\textit{Xnt~}, \text{\textit{Xnt(~)}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{Xnt(~)}} \] \text{\textit{in m-Xnt(~)}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{Xnt(~)}} \]

\[ \text{\textit{pr(|.w)}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{pr(|.w)}} \]

\[ \text{\textit{pr(|.w)}} \rightarrow \text{\textit{pr(|.w)}} \]

(Ex-48)  \( \text{im} \rightarrow \text{im} \) “there,”

(Ex-49)  \( \text{im} \rightarrow \text{im} \rightarrow \text{m} \) besides also—by confusion—\( \text{m} \) “to see,”\(^{30}\)

(Ex-50)  \( \text{Ra} \rightarrow \text{Ra} \) “(god) Ra, sun god.”

The omission of phonetic complements is sometimes different from that in TT 33 (cf. above), e.g.

(Ex-51)  \( \text{im.}(i)t \rightarrow \text{im.}(i)w \) “the ones in.”

Some spellings reflect the changed pronunciation of certain lemmata even closer than in TT 33, e.g.

(Ex-52)  \( \text{haf} \text{Vw} \rightarrow \text{hf} \text{V} \) “snake,”

(Ex-53)  \( \text{tpVh} \rightarrow \text{tpH} \) “cavern, cavity, pit.”

And similar reasons might have contributed to the occasional change

(Ex-54)  \( \text{p} \rightarrow \text{p} \) “this, you!”\(^{55}\)

As far as the replacement of reduplicating verb forms by non-reduplicating ones is concerned, we find that—differently to in the 7th cent. BCE (cf. above)—now also the verb form \( \text{dd} \) “doing” is affected.\(^{56}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributive participles / Imperfective relative forms</th>
<th>Nominal verb forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unchanged : changed</td>
<td>unchanged : changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no example)</td>
<td>0 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{d}\rightarrow \text{d} )</td>
<td>1 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{d}\rightarrow \text{d} )</td>
<td>0 : 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2: Treatment of reduplicating verb forms in the 4th cent. BCE (sTjihorpto).

References to examples: (Ex-44) Hb. 7.3, 13.3; 18.5, 15.16; 15.9, 18.5; (Ex-45) e.g. Hb. 2.12, 18.4; 21.1; 19.8; (Ex-46) Hb. 25.14, 17, 22.23, 25.11; 101.8, 22; 101.29; (Ex-47) Hb. 26.16; (Ex-48) Hb. 1.12; (Ex-49) Werning 2011.I: 327–329 (tab. 31); (Ex-50) Hb. 1.23; 10.2; (Ex-51) Hb. 12.2; (Ex-52) Hb. 15.5; 15.8, 22.23; (Ex-53) e.g. Hb. 18.4, 20.48, 21.1; (Ex-54) e.g. Hb. 101.18ff.

6.3. Emendations by conjecture

Most of the changes described in the preceding section (§6.2) were not substantial in so far as that they do not affect the reading of the respective passages. They also don’t seem to have been immediately necessary. At best, the update of certain spellings may have facilitated the reading. There were, on the other hand, also occasions in which a responsible scribe seems to have felt the need to ‘correct’ or better emend a passage by ‘conjecture.’ In this section, we explore some of these ancient emendations.\(^{57}\)

---

57. Cf. Werning 2011.I: 333 [tab. 1], 341 [tab. 9].
6.3.1. Emendations of images

It has been mentioned above that scene XXI displayed 4 adoring gods, 4 heads of Ra and 4 necks of Ra next to the casket of Osiris (cf. Fig. 3 above). Before the 4 necks there were 4 black discs with rays; but before the 4 heads there were only 3(!) sun discs. This apparent asymmetry is ‘healed’ in the copy in KV 9 (RVI). There is a sun disc before each of the 4 heads. The same ‘healed’ number of sun discs made it into the tomb of Petamenophis (TT 33) via the collation process described above (§3 and §5).

6.3.2. Emendations of texts

In concrete contexts, mistakes concerning single signs are often very apparent. Many copyists still left them uncorrected; but some scribes took the opportunity to correct them, e.g.

(Ex-55) Erroneous flipping of signs:
\[
\text{Erroneous flipping of signs:} \quad (Hb. 1.10, \gamma) \rightarrow (Hb. 1.14; \alpha) \rightarrow s:rq^\dagger "(your throats) may breath" (RIV.1, RVII, \zeta).
\]

There were also some convincing attempts to heal partially incomprehensible passages with two or more signs missing or corrupted:

(Ex-57) (Hb. 8.5, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (Hb. 2.30, \alpha) \rightarrow mdw(.w)\perp \text{the matters for his suite} (tO, conjecture).

(Ex-60) \text{In a very disturbed passage (Hb. 50.5–17) a copyist tried to heal parts of it by simply adding one sign:}

\[
\text{(Ex-66) } \text{and I hurl{their bas are pacified} try by [...] (Hb. 50.5, a) } \rightarrow \text{mdw(.w)}\perp \text{the matters for his suite (c)} (\beta, \text{conjecture}).
\]


59. The archetype (a) will likely have read *\|\| A wtT.w \perp O begetter, […]!" (\zeta/sTji).

60. The original text as intended by the author (a\dagger) will likely have read *\|\| \text{mdw(.w)}\perp \text{the matters for his suite (c)} (\beta, \text{conjecture}).
Comparably, scribes came up with plausible emendations for passages in which single words were apparently missing:

(Ex-61) \[\text{TR} \leftarrow \text{tn} \ \text{p} \ \text{rn} \ \text{Hb. 88.10, a} \]
\[\rightarrow \text{TR} \leftarrow \text{tn} \ \text{p} \ \text{Hb. passim};\]

(Ex-62) \[\text{TR} \leftarrow \text{Hbr(w) <…> irw} \ \text{Hb. 104.11, a} \]
\[\rightarrow \text{TR} \leftarrow \text{Hbr(w) 'nh irw} \ \text{Hb. 104.10}.\]

The Égyptien de tradition of the Underworld Books exhibits a peculiar use of the singular demonstrative pronouns \text{tn} and \text{tw}, and \text{tw}. Used as determiners, not only can they follow a noun, but they may also precede a noun, e.g. \text{tn hry.ri} “this oven” (Hb. 67.7), or—more frequently—a nominalised adjective, e.g. \text{tn htm.} \text{htf} “the one who destroys my enemies” (Hb. 56.20). Moreover, these pronouns also seem to be used autonomously. The copyists, however, obviously were not all fully aware of the grammar of this corpus, since occasionally we find these passages unnecessarily emended:

(Ex-63) \[\text{TR} \leftarrow \text{tn} \ \text{Hb. 88.24, a} \]
\[\rightarrow \text{TR} \leftarrow \text{tn} \ \text{Hb. 88.24, a} \]

(Ex-64) \[\text{TR} \leftarrow \text{O you(SG), [...]!} \ \text{Hb. 52.15,17, a} \]
\[\rightarrow \text{TR} \leftarrow \text{O Anubis, [...]!} \ \text{RV1; similarly Pet [by collation?]};\]

These emendations require some kind of creative reckoning on the part of the scribe. But still the process is part of a reproductive working mode, rather than of a creative one. The scribe does not aim at creating an innovative text, but at recreating a wording that he believes to be along the lines of the ‘authentic’ original. In the next section, we are going to explore some receptions that are more clearly to be classified as creative.

7. Creative receptions

Apart from the more or less reproductive modes of reception, \textit{i.e.} authentic copying, emendation, and moderate updating (see above), we also find cases in which images or texts of Caverns have obviously inspired works that may be classified as innovative or creative.

7.1. Creative reception of images

A rather limited act of creativity may be seen in the assimilation of the final tableau of Caverns to the final tableau of Gates in the Osireion. While the final tableau of Caverns had a rectangular shape in the archetype (as testified by RV1, pNedjmet, and TT 33/Pet), the copy in the Osireion is oval like that of Gates on the opposite wall; so that both are in symmetrical ‘harmony.’

61. This is an influence of the Late Egyptian first language of the authors, namely of \text{p/it} and \text{p/ittu}; cf. Werning 2011.I: 186–191/§§112–119, Werning 2013: §2, case 27.

But already in the late 13th century, we find a really creative adaptation of the final tableau of Caverns for the decoration of the sarcophagus hall of king Merneptah (KV 8). The orientation has been changed by 90°, parts of the image have been rearranged or altered, and the texts are completely different to those in the archetype of Caverns. Roberson counts it as scene no. 22 of the scene collection nowadays labeled as Books of the Earth. In the 12th century, some other scenes of Caverns seem to have inspired underworld scenes that became part of this scene collection. Compare

- Caverns sc. XLI and Earth sc. 14 [RVI] (Isis and Nephthys raise the curling Osiris),
- Caverns sc. XLVIII and Earth scenes 13 [RVI] and 21 [RVII] (lying god and two divinities),
- Caverns sc. LX and Earth sc. 39 [RIX] (oval and flesh in a sarcophagus between two gods):

![Fig. 7: Cavern scenes XLI, XLVIII, and LX compared with Earth scenes 14, 13, and 39](cf. Werning 2011.II: 184, 202, 266; Roberson 2012: 171, 173, 225).

There also seems to be a connection in one or the other direction between

- Caverns sc. L and Earth sc. 56 [*RIII?, RVI; sarcophagi between Siptah and Ramses IV] and furthermore sc. 71 [RIX] (“Cavern of the Shetit/Mysterious (Netherworld)”)

Compare also elements of

- Caverns sc. XXVII and Earth sc. 66 [RVI] (two hills with ram-headed mummies),
- Caverns sc. XVIII and Earth sc. 18 [RVI] (Khepri surrounded by a snake),
- Caverns scenes LVII and LXXIII and Earth sc. 32 [RVI] (cauldrons with heads, god(s) with knife, goddess(es) guarding heart(s)),

63. Compare Werning 2011.I: pls. I and II.
64. Roberson 2012: 192–195. This new version was part of a compilation of scenes reused for all subsequent tombs that exhibit a comparable sarcophagus hall until the time of Ramses III, i.e. for KV14 (Tawosret/Sethnakht) and KV 11 (Ramses III) (Roberson 2012: §5.3 “Merneptah Template”). Furthermore, the scene was also received in two Late Period tombs (TT 33/Petamenophis and TT 197/Padineith; Roberson 2012: 496 [pl. 26], 502 [pl. 32]).
65. Some of these similarities were already collected by Abitz 1995: 158–163. In addition to some of the connections drawn below, he also points to similarities in the compositions of Caverns sc. XXXII and Earth scenes 2 plus 68 in KV 9 [RVI], as well as elements from Earth sc. 74 in Caverns scenes IX, XXIX, and XXI (shrine and guarded casket of Osiris).
• Caverns sc. LXXVIII and Earth sc. 53 [RVI] (mound with disc),
• Caverns sc. LXVII and Earth sc. 49 [RVI, RVII] (bent god with scepter, adorers, hills),
• Caverns sc. LXX (and LXXVI) and Earth sc. 76 [RVI, RVII] (Tatenen/god coming out of the ground),
• Caverns sc. XLIII and Earth sc. 42 [RIX] (heart and discs in a sarcophagus).

A similarly creative adaptation of a scene is the reception of scene LIX (“Cavern of Osiris”) on an undated mummy cartonnage in the Louvre.67 Here the snake has been turned towards Osiris and has been equipped with arms and legs. It holds a round object to Osiris’ nose (compare the sun in the original scene). A new identifying caption seems to read nb.w-tš “Lords of the earth.”

As opposed to these cases, four other receptions of scenes in the 11th and 4th centuries BCE are rather examples of only recontextualisation without innovation: the first and the final tableaus and scene XXI on papyrus BM 10490 (Nedjmet), scene L (“Cavern of the Shetit/Mysterious (Netherworld)”) on papyrus Turin 1858 (Butehamun), the same scene L on sarcophagus Berlin ÄM 29 (Petiese), and parts of the first and second tableaus on Cairo CG 29306 (Tjihorpto).68

7.2. Creative reception of texts

The intertextual connections between texts of the Underworld Books and other texts have not yet been well researched. In this section, however, we will explore a remarkable case of creative reception of Caverns in the 4th century (30th dynasty): the decoration of the sarcophagus lid of the minister of economy Tjihorpto (Cairo CG 29306).69

Besides a rather reproductive reception of large parts of the first and second tableaus on the outer surface of the main body of the sarcophagus, we find different parts of texts from Caverns on the lid which were creatively recompiled, updated, and expanded.70 After Books of the Dead spell 89,71 two great litanies of Caverns provide the main part of the large main text: litany 19 (“My corpse and my head are in its cavern,” Hb. 84) and the great name litany no. 21 to the divinities of the 6th tableau of

---

68. See Werning 2011.I: ch. II.
Caverns ("O you manifestation of [...]—his divine body, his image, his corpse!", Hb. 101). Both have been creatively expanded and ‘glued’ together with wholly new phrases and bits and pieces from other parts of Caverns (Hb. 82, 83, 87). The process may be described as ‘cut and paste,’ expansion, and gluing together (with new phrases).

The following table gives an impression of the philological work that was done by the author of the sarcophagus decoration (mistakes, alterations, and creative authorship are underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy ζ (reconstructed)</th>
<th>( \sim sTji^{13} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 84.2 \ htp=f ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 ; \text{dp}=f )</td>
<td>( \sim htp ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; \text{dp}=f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.13 \ m^3 ; T ; w(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; hr=\text{t}(i) )</td>
<td>( \sim p(i) ; R^\circ ; t. ; {pt}&lt;tp ; h^3 ; \text{dp}=(i) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.20 ; b\beta=(i) ; w^3 ; s ; f ; h ; \text{hr} ; \text{t} ; =f )</td>
<td>( b\beta=(i) ; w^3 ; s ; f ; h ; \text{hr} ; \text{t} ; =f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.42 ; w(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{tph.} ; h^3 ; \text{dp}=(i) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.28 ; \text{ip}=(i) ; d ; t=(i) ; \text{im}(i)^{-}==(i) ; \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.29 ; \text{im}(w) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.30 ; \text{id}(i) ; \text{ngm}. ; \text{b}=(i) ; \text{w} )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.31 ; \text{id}(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.32 ; \text{n}(i) ; \text{h}(i).w ; \text{d}(w) ; h^3 )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.33 ; \text{id}(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.34 ; \text{im}(i) ; w^3 ; t ; h^3 ; m ; \text{h}^3 = (i) )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.35 ; \text{id}(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.36 ; \text{b}(w) ; \text{d}(w) ; \text{t}(w) ; \text{hff}(i).w^3 ) [ ; \text{syn} )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.37 ; \text{id}(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.38 ; \text{hff}(i).w^3 ) [ ; \text{syn} )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.39 ; \text{id}(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.40 ; \text{hff}(i).w^3 ) [ ; \text{syn} )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.41 ; \text{id}(i) ; \text{dp}=(i) ; m. ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.42 ; \text{hff}(i).w^3 ) [ ; \text{syn} )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 10.25 \ h_{\text{syn}} ; \text{w} ; \text{sn} )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.8 ; \text{sns}(i) ; w^3 ; /[\ldots] ; ; 84.2 ; /[\ldots] ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 ; \text{dp}=f ; /[\ldots] )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 84.46 ; \text{hwn}^3 = \text{sn} ; /[\ldots] ; ; 83.1 ; /[\ldots] ; \text{tph.} ; h^3 =s ; /[\ldots] )</td>
<td>( \sim \text{hff}(i).w^3 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In addition to the abovementioned great name litany no. 21 to the divinities of the 6th tableau of Caverns, which is situated in the main text field, the lid also exhibits a table of the very same names. Each name accompanies one of a set of icons for a "ba", manifestation," e.g., , , , and one similar to . This list is roughly comparable to the list of divinities from the Amduat in the tomb of Thutmosis III (KV 34, 15th cent. BCE). While the making of this list alone is already a kind of creative reception, there are two interesting observations to make. Firstly, four bas that are identified as the "first," "second," "third," and "fourth" "transformation" on the lid seem to correspond to the bas of "Atum," "Khepri," "Shu," and "Geb" in the litany, respectively (Hb. 101.16–19). And, secondly, the "ba of Osiris" (Hb. 101.20) and the "ba of (Osiris,) the corpse of Orion with w/s-scepter" (101.34) from the litany are obviously represented by the ba of "Osiris, minister of economy, Tjihorpto" on the lid. This and several other observations demonstrate that the author of the sarcophagus decoration for Tji-horpto was not simply recompiling bits and pieces of ancient texts semi-mechanically, but that he was really engaged with the meaning of it. Interestingly, we might even know the name of this author. On the rear part of the sarcophagus we find an inscription saying:

"Regnal year 15, 3rd month of akhet under the Majesty of the Great King, son of Re, Nectanebo (II), beloved of Onuris, son of Re, living forever. The copying (s:pxr) of the scripture of the Chamber of the West by the commander in Khent-en-Tjaru, kheper-priest of the eastern Horus nome, wer-tjehenu-priest of the western Horus nome, scribe of the god, Hor(enta)bat, possessor of veneration, in order to protect the Osiris, count, overseer of Upper Egypt, chief of the banks, overseer of fields, Tjihorpto, possessor of veneration, so that his corpse might become divine in the necropolis, so that he might make any manifestation which he desires forever and ever!"

(translation adapted from Manassa 2007.I: 283)

It is tempting to think of this 'scribe' not only as a 'copyist' but as the actual author of the sarcophagus decoration.
7.3. Creating new personalised phrases and inclusion of images of book owners

In various sections above, most of the creative acts of adding personalised phrases and images of the book owners to the Underworld Book in general and to Caverns specifically have already been mentioned and discussed. Altogether, we find in Caverns:

- the addition of a king behind the sun god entering the netherworld and another king welcoming both of them to scene II in the Osireion (late 13th cent. BCE),
- the addition of hundreds of personalised text phrases for the king in the decoration master copy γ most probably originally for tomb KV 2 (RIV, middle of the 12th cent. BCE),
- the addition of a king who offers to the sun god as he enters the tableau of the “fourth cavern” (scene XLIV) in tomb KV 6 (RIX, late 12th cent. BCE), and
- the addition of personalised text phrases to litany no. 21 on the sarcophagus of Tjihorpto (Cairo CG 29306, 4th cent. BCE).

8. Conclusions

With the help of the method of textual criticism, we are able to classify and date deviations that we observe in various text witnesses of the Underworld Books more precisely. The method works best for reproductive transmissions but also for transmissions that are partially reproductive and partially innovative. In addition to applying it to texts, we can also fruitfully apply it to images as demonstrated in Werning (2011.I: ch. III).

The following table summarises intentional changes as observed in the text witnesses of the Book of Caverns and modes of receptions in different periods.

---

78. See Werning 2011.II: 2.
80. See Werning 2011.II: 442–457. Cf. also the display of the ba of “Osiris […] Tjihorpto” ‘instead’ of two bas of Osiris on the lid, mentioned in §7.2.
First of all, the traditional impression that the Underworld Books have been transmitted predominately in a reproductive mode is not completely misleading. The act of collation and the ‘archeo-philological’ endeavors testified by the copy of Caverns in the tomb of the chief librarian Petamenophis (7th century) obviously aim at reestablishing an ‘authentic’ text. Almost always, however, moderate changes or updates of spellings are also part of this reproductive mode. (Some changes of sign shapes and spellings may be attributed to the artifact production process.) These, however, do not normally change the interpretation of the text. And also the conjectures behind the occasional emendations of words and phrases or images always seem to aim at ‘reestablishing’ an authentic text. In the 7th and 4th centuries BCE, besides some of these emendations, we observe the deletion of verbal reduplication, i.e. an update of morpho-syntax. This is obviously still not intended to change the reading, but to keep the text understandable in times of a changed concept of Égyptien de tradition grammar.

Parallel to this (more or less) reproductive mode of transmission (copying, emendation, and updating), we nevertheless also find a good amount of (more or less) creative traits in the textual history of Caverns.

On the one hand, there are personalised additions for specific book owners, texts as well as images. These, however, generally do not affect the original texts or images, but rather serve to involve the book owner in the processes described in the book. In respect to such additions, it is worth

81. The marks ‘++’, ‘+’, ‘(+), and ‘((+))’ differentiate different degrees or relative frequencies.

Tab. 3: Comparison of deviations as attested by text witnesses of Caverns81.
highlighting the fact that, for the copy of Caverns in the tomb of Petamenophis, such additions had been carefully collected by collation, but no new additions were created.82

On the other hand, we find cases in which images or texts of Caverns have been received creatively. This already starts immediately after its creation in the 13th cent. BCE, as testified by various scenes on the kings’ sarcophagi and in their sarcophagus halls (scenes from the scene collection “Books of the Earth.”) Another example for a creative reception of a scene from Caverns is the scene on an undated mummy cartonnage in the Louvre (fig. 8 above).

The sarcophagus of Tjihorpto from the 4th cent. BCE offers an exceptional case in which not only parts of Caverns have been copied reproductively (1st and 2nd tableaus), but at the same time parts of Caverns have been used creatively to produce a very innovative text. This creation involved cutting and pasting, expanding, and gluing together with new phrases. This endeavor, however, stands out as an exceptional case in the textual history of the Book of Caverns.
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