



Right Reverend Franklin S. Spalding, who half a century ago sought the opinions of Egyptologists concerning the Book of Abraham.

Both the vignette and the rubric announce that this section of the Book of the Dead contains a "Speech for Taking the form of a Swallow," yet the chapter itself (No. 86) seems to say nothing whatever on the subject. This is part of the papyri, rediscovered by Dr. Aziz Atiya, that the Prophet Joseph Smith once owned.

A New Look at the Pearl of Great Price

By Dr. Hugh Nibley

Second String

● With the five giants accounted for, the other members of the team should not detain us long. But first, Theodule Deveria (1831-1871) deserves a word of notice because he wrote the first, the longest, and the most carefully considered report on the Facsimiles that has appeared to date.¹ Bishop Spalding gives short shrift to Deveria because, as he explains, "unquestionably, this matter is far too important to depend on the opinion of a youthful amateur. Such an important matter deserves the thoughtful consideration of mature scholars—of the world's ablest Orientalists."²

Youthful? When Deveria wrote his study of the Facsimiles he was 34—two years older than Mercer was when he did the same—fully matured and at the height of his powers.

Amateur? At 17, urged by the Egyptologist Jules Fequieres, Deveria had plunged into Egyptology while Charles Lenormand gave him Coptic

lessons and August Harle, the best Hebraist of his time, pushed him in Hebrew. At 19 he retranslated an important manuscript formerly rendered by Champollion; at 23 he was publishing in Egyptology and in the following year became attached to the Department of Antiquities of the Louvre, where he produced the first complete catalogue ever made of a major Egyptian collection. Still in his twenties, he succeeded the great Mariette as conservator of the Egyptian museum in the Louvre and, according to de Rouge, produced a work on the Turin Papyrus that "placed Deveria among the masters." It was only the jealousy of his superior at the museum, A. Mariette, that obscured his great contributions to Egyptology.³

Thoughtful consideration? Whereas Deveria wrote a long study, two of Spalding's experts dashed off notes of a hundred words only, and five of them wrote less than a page.

World's ablest Orientalists? Spalding deems superior to Deveria four men besides Mercer, whose combined output in Egyptology could not begin to approach that of the "youthful amateur." We have already considered Dr. Mercer; how about the others?

"Dr. John Peters, University of Pennsylvania. In charge of expedition to Babylonia, 1888-1895." In 1912 Dr. Peters (1852-1921) was pastor of a church in New York, and had not been at the University of Pennsylvania for 20 years. When Spalding's good friend, Professor Pack, discovered this, he was quite upset and wrote: "For an instant I was paralysed. . . . Could it be possible that Dr. Peters is not connected with the University of Pennsylvania, but is a rector in one of New York's fashionable churches? No. I could not believe it. . . . you had led the public to believe that Dr. Peters is at the University of Pennsylvania."¹ So while he was back East Dr. Pack

made a number of visits and inquiries, and summed up the results thus: "Now, Dr. Spalding, this looks like plain deceit. Am I mistaken? Why did you lead the public to believe that Dr. Peters is now at the University of Pennsylvania when you knew that he left there twenty years ago? Why did you hide from the public the fact that Dr. Peters is a rector in your own church and has been for years?"¹

To be sure, being the rector of anything need not prevent one from being also an Egyptologist, but Peters was never that. He had taught Hebrew at Pennsylvania for eight years, and he wrote popular books on the Bible and modern politics, but his name appears nowhere in connection with Egyptian studies. A career churchman, he had in 1912 just finished serving six years as canon-residentiary of the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C.⁵ He is another of those devoted churchmen who, like Sayce and Mercer, combine with the dignity of the cloth an intellectual contempt for the supernatural and an ill-concealed impatience with those who would interpret the Bible too literally. Dr. Peters, in fact, wrote a book showing that the ancient patriarchs were nothing but myths, legendary figures "generously clothed with personal traits by successive generations of narrators" by whom "striking episodes have been introduced into the stories and even romances which have no inherent connection with the original legends."⁶ Along with "racial and legendary" elements, the history of Abraham combines "features of a purely romantic character, in which we are to see no other meaning than the fancy of the story-teller. . . ."⁷ In all the story of the man Abraham, he claimed, there is not a word of real history.

With such a view of Bible history, is Dr. Peters the man to give serious attention to the Book of Abraham as history? Peters' ideas reflect the consensus of scholarly opinion in his day, and that of the Spalding jury in particular. At that time the establishment

"He combines with the dignity
of the cloth an intellectual contempt
for the supernatural. . . ."

was solidly against the whole concept of the Book of Abraham.

"Dr. Arthur C. Mace, Assistant Curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Department of Egyptian Art." Though he is not mentioned in any of the usual biographical sources nor in W. R. Dawson's *Who Was Who in Egyptology, 1910-1914*, Dr. Mace (1874-1928) had been a student of Petrie and had worked with the Hearst collection in Berkeley before going to the Metropolitan.⁸ His chance for immortality came when Howard Carter, overwhelmed with work and expense on the tomb of Tutankhamen, asked for the assistance of a Metropolitan Museum crew who were working close by; Mace at the time was taking Dr. Lythgoe's place in charge of the work, and on instructions from the latter he joined the Carter enterprise and thus had a part in the most sensational archaeological discovery of the century.⁹ Dr. Mace was an archaeologist and not a philologist. He assisted in the publication of discoveries by and for the museum, but when he came to inscriptions, even short and easy ones, he turned the work over to others.¹⁰ His one serious attempt to deal with documentary sources, a study called "The Influence of Egyptian on Hebrew Literature," (1922), is described by Raymond Weill as nothing but an inferior rehash of Herrman Gunkel's work of 1909 on the same subject.¹¹

"Dr. Albert M. Lythgoe, Head of the Department of Egyptian Art of the Metropolitan Museum," should be added to the list, since Bishop Spalding intended to consult him instead of Arthur C. Mace, who was his understudy while he was abroad. Like Mace,

Dr. Lythgoe (1868-1933) was a museum man and a collector who had been a pupil of Wiedemann at Bonn and assisted Reisner in the field. "His finest achievement," according to his obituary, ". . . was the arrangement of the Egyptian Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of New York."¹² Arranging collections is not the same thing as interpreting abstruse texts, and the long interview with Lythgoe in the *New York Times* reads almost like a burlesque of pompous scholarship: "To make very clear just how great a hoax the Mormon prophet perpetrated upon his people," Lythgoe explains to the reporters with magisterial ease exactly how Egyptian symbolism originated and just what Egyptian religion is all about, as he readily identifies solar hymns in the Facsimiles, and twice refers to Facsimile I as depicting the sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham. The whole baffling complex presented "no puzzle to Dr. Lythgoe," though his strange theories of Egyptian religion and his guesses about the Facsimiles found no echo even among the other members of the Spalding panel.¹³

"Dr. George A. Barton." When he was challenged by the Mormons, Bishop Spalding sought further support from the learned and got it from Professor Barton (1859-1942), acknowledged minister of the Society of Friends (orthodox) 1879-1922, deacon 1918, priest 1919, D.D. 1924.¹⁴ In 1912 Dr. Barton's book, *The Heart of the Christian Message*, had just gone into its second printing. "Permit me first to say," Professor Barton began his contribution to the Spalding cause, "that, while I have a smattering of Egyptology, I am not an Egypt-

tologist"¹⁵—and indeed we have already seen what Dr. Mercer thought of Barton as an authority on Egypt.¹⁶ But he *was* a minister, thus bringing to five the number of *non*-Egyptologist ministers sitting in judgment as Egyptologists on Joseph Smith.

Barton believed that the "faker" Joseph Smith merely attempted to "imitate Egyptian characters," the result being "untranslatable . . . as they stand they do not faithfully represent any known writing."¹⁷ As to the Facsimiles, the experts disagree about them, Mr. Barton explained, because "these pictures were differently interpreted at times by the Egyptians themselves," and some of the jury "have given the original interpretation of the symbolism, and some the later Egyptian interpretation."¹⁷ Odd, that that explanation should never have occurred to any of the experts themselves, who might have been very embarrassed had the Mormons chosen to exploit Professor Barton's foolish remarks.

P.S.: In 1915 the University of Utah brought in Edgar J. Banks, "one of America's most distinguished archaeologists," to put the final seal of authority on the Spalding enterprise.¹⁸ Banks (1866-1941) had already sounded off on the subject in the *Christian Herald* in 1913, and duly reported through the pages of the prestigious *Literary Digest* that Dr. Spalding's zeal had forever discredited Mormonism in the eyes of the world and the more intelligent Mormons.¹⁹ Mr. Banks pictured himself in *Who's Who* decidedly in the romantic tradition of Richard Haliburton. He had been U.S. consul in Baghdad in his youth, organized an expedition to excavate Ur, which, however, never got into the field, and claimed to have discovered in 1903 "a white statue of king David, a pre-Babylonian king of 4500 B.C. (oldest statue in the world)." While Spalding was working on his grand design in 1912, the dashing Banks, as he tells us, was climbing Ararat (17,210 feet high—he puts that

in *Who's Who* too), and crossing the Arabian Desert on a camel (from where to where he does not say).²⁰

It is amazing, unless one knows this type of glamor-mongering archaeologist, that Mr. Banks, after months in Salt Lake City as an expert on the subject, could come out with such howlers as that "Smith seems to have obtained the documents from a sea captain,"²¹ that it was the Mormon officials themselves who "turned the manuscripts over to Spalding" with the request that he investigate their authenticity,²¹ that hypocephali such as Facsimile 2 (of which less than 50 were known at the time) existed by the millions: "It has been estimated that something like 20,000,000 of Egyptian mummies have been discovered. . . . Beneath each mummy's head, [lay] a cushion. . . . The disks, found in great numbers, are nearly alike, varying only slightly with the period from which they come."²² Banks also announced that Joseph Smith had never possessed any papyri at all but only such little plaster disks.²³ Apparently nothing Mr. Banks could say was too absurd to be swallowed by the open-mouthed scholars on the Bench as long as the magic words "science" and "progress" were evoked with ritual regularity.²⁴

We should not leave our experts without a word about Sir E. A. W. Budge (1857-1934), who in 1903 had agreed with his colleague Woodward at the British Museum "in declaring the Prophet's interpretation bosh, rubbish. . . ."²⁵ This was a demonstration of Budge's "ferocious bark, which could turn to biting if need be."²⁶ Others could bark back, however, and when Budge gave the Englishman Thomas Young priority over Champollion in the translation of Egyptian, an eminent French Egyptologist quoted Peter Renouf: "No person who knows anything of Egyptian philology can countenance so gross an error."²⁷ Jean Capart noted that the highest praise of Budge must also be his severest criticism—the

phenomenal productivity for which he paid too high a price.²⁸ Animated by the laudable objective of providing as many texts as possible for students and as many translations as possible for the public, Budge dashed off the longest list of publications in the entire scope of *Who's Who*.²⁸ To do this he followed no plan, paid no attention to the work of others, never indicated his sources; "his interpretation of figures is extremely defective," wrote Capart, "and his translations are full of completely erroneous ideas."²⁹ "I can categorically declare," wrote the same critic, of Budge's *Gods of the Egyptians*, "that it is bad; the work lacks the necessary preparation."³⁰ As R. Campbell Thompson observed, Professor Budge was always "in too great a hurry to finish."³¹ Will anyone maintain that he was not in a hurry, his old impulsive blustering self, when he offhandedly condemned the interpretations of the Facsimiles?

It is still going on: If nothing else, our long involvement with the affair of 1912 has taught us something about the limitations of scholarship. We should know by now the meaning of the maxim, "there are no fields—there are only problems," with its corollaries that familiarity with a field does not mean mastery of all related problems, since no major problem is to be solved within the walls of any one department. Since closed systems are a fiction, the conclusions of science must remain tentative forever: ". . . the method of critical discussion does not establish anything [writes Popper]. Its verdict is always and invariably 'not proven.'"³²

Consider for a moment the scope and complexity of the materials with which the student *must* cope if he would undertake a serious study of the Book of Abraham's authenticity. At the very least he must be thoroughly familiar with (1) the texts of the "Joseph Smith Papyri" identified as belonging to the Book of the Dead, (2) the content and nature of the

mysterious "Sen-sen" fragment, (3) the so-called "Egyptian Alphabet and Grammar" attributed to Joseph Smith, (4) statements by and about Joseph Smith concerning the nature of the Book of Abraham and its origin, (5) the original document of Facsimile 1 with its accompanying hieroglyphic inscriptions, (6) the text of the Book of Abraham itself in its various editions, (7) the three Facsimiles as reproduced in various editions of the Pearl of Great Price, (8) Joseph Smith's explanation of the Facsimiles, (9) the large and growing literature of ancient traditions and legends about Abraham in Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, Greek, Slavonic, etc., (10) the studies and opinions of modern scholars on all aspects of the Book of Abraham.

It will not do to consider just one or two of these areas before passing judgment on the Book of Abraham; yet so far nobody has done more than that. Who *can* hope to cover all that ground? Only a lot of diligent students with plenty of time and big libraries at their disposal. That is why we cannot accept as final the brief and scattered departmental studies of the Book of Abraham. It is not because we do not respect the knowledge and ability of the experts or because we feel in any way superior to them (the world will not see another Eduard Meyer until the millennium), but because the nature of the problem calls for infinitely more care and study than has been put into it.

There are two propositions regarding the Book of Abraham that none can deny. The one is that Joseph Smith could not possibly have known Egyptian as it is understood today. The other is that the Prophet has put down some remarkable things in the pages of the Book of Abraham. Why should we waste time on Proposition Number 1? What can we say about a method of translation that completely escapes us? This writer is anything but an Egyptologist, yet he has stood on the sidelines long enough to know that there is no case to be made out

against the Book of Abraham on linguistic grounds for the simple reason that Joseph Smith did not commit himself beyond the interpretation of the Facsimiles.³³ We cannot pretend to understand *how* the Book of Abraham was translated, but that should not seriously disturb us, since nobody understands the method by which some of the greatest scholars were able to translate texts that no one else could read—one thinks of George Smith, Edward Hincks, and the late Francis Llewellyn Griffith. In their case, it was the result that justified the intuition, and not the other way around. So let it be with Joseph Smith: we must still take his word for it that he was actually translating, but the result of his efforts is a different matter—could such a monument be the result of trickery and deceit? It is Proposition 2 that provides us at last with firm ground to stand on—and none of the critics have ever given it a moment's thought!

What Joseph Smith tells us about Abraham in the book attributed to him can now be checked against a large corpus of ancient writings, unavailable to Joseph Smith, to which we shall often refer in the pages that follow. He has also given us, independent of any translated text, his interpretations of the three Facsimiles, and it is to these that we now address ourselves. It was in his explanation of the Facsimiles, it will be recalled, that our experts of 1912 were convinced that they had caught the Prophet out of bounds. But they were wrong: none of them knew nearly enough about the Facsimiles to pass judgment as they did. That *we* do not know the answers is beside the point, which is that present-day scholarship would reverse the fundamental principle on which the authorities of more than half a century ago rested their conclusions, namely, the conviction that Egyptian writing is a good deal harder to interpret than Egyptian pictures. Actually, Mercer got it backwards when he said that

"The largest part of the
consists of

"while the translation of ignorantly copied hieroglyphs is a precarious proceeding, the interpretation of Egyptian figures is a comparatively simple matter."³⁴ For the beginner, to be sure, this is true; but as the student gets more and more of the grammar and vocabulary, the writing naturally becomes increasingly easier to read; but the pictures that once looked so simple and obvious become, alas, ever more puzzling, until we finally get to the top of the ladder where the full-fledged Egyptologists frankly tell us that the reading of a text is far easier than the correct understanding of symbolic pictures.

A hundred years ago Maspero and Naville agreed that "a philologically easily understood sentence, the words and grammar of which give us not the slightest difficulty," often conveys ideas that completely escape all the experts, these being also the ideas behind the pictures.³⁵ And today Professors Wilson and Anthes would concur in the same view. The latter calls attention to our "helplessness in the face of these mythological records," both "texts and pictures,"³⁶ while Dr. John A. Wilson suggests the amusing analogy of an Eskimo who had never heard of the Bible trying to make sense of the old hymn "Jerusalem the Golden"; he "might grasp the individual meanings of all the words . . . but he would still be puzzled by the allusions. . . . We have similar troubles in trying to apply our understanding to the religion of the ancient Egyptians, which dropped out of human ken for more than 1500 years."³⁷ The ancient pictures have a face value that is clear enough to us and to the Eskimo, but what they said

...papyri in the possession of the Church fragments from the Egyptian Book of the Dead. . . ."

to an Egyptian is another matter.

The Mormons were not slow in calling attention to this fatal limitation to the understanding of the Facsimiles: "I repeat," wrote Dr. John A. Widtsoe, "that something more must be done than to label a few of the figures Osiris, Isis or Anubis before Joseph Smith can be placed in 'the same class of fakers as Dr. Cook.'"³⁸ The mere names tell us nothing unless we can also tell "who and what were Isis and Horus and all the other gods of Egypt? Not by name and relationship, but as expressing the Egyptian's vision of . . . the past, the present and the hereafter?"³⁹ Sjudahl and Webb asked similar questions, but the Mormons were ignored because they were not Egyptologists. Yet, shortly before, Georg Steindorff had written: "We know relatively little about Egyptian religion in spite of the abundance of pictures and religious texts of ancient Egypt which have come down to us. We know, it is true, the names and the appearances of a large number of divinities, we know in which sanctuaries they were honored, but until now we have but few notions about their nature, and the significance which the people and the priests gave to them and the legends attached to their persons."⁴⁰ And today Jaroslav Cerny can still write: "For the Old and Middle Kingdom there are hardly more than proper names to give us a glimpse into the beliefs of the common people and their relationships to the gods,"⁴¹ while Jequier points out that the "shocking contradictions" in the interpretation of religious imagery "show us that we have not yet found the truth."⁴² There is nothing for it, says

Jequier, but for each scholar to continue on his way, "each interpreting in his own manner and according to his means . . . and so gradually penetrate the mystery of the Egyptian religions."⁴² These were the very points that the Mormons were trying to make and that the opposition, determined at any price to give the impression of great and definitive knowledge, quietly ignored.

The Book of the Dead: The largest part of the Joseph Smith papyri in the possession of the Church consists of fragments from the Egyptian Book of the Dead, the fragments having been recently translated and discussed by no less a scholar than Professor John A. Wilson of the Oriental Institute.⁴³ "Scholars had barely begun the study of the Book of the Dead," Edouard Naville recalled, "when they saw that the text swarms with difficulties . . . the prevailing mysticism, the abundance of images, the oddity of the pictures, the impossibility of knowing how the Egyptians expressed even the simplest abstract ideas—all offer formidable obstacles with which the translator is continually colliding."⁴⁴

These points can be illustrated by the most easily recognized section of the Joseph Smith papyri, namely, the fragment with the picture of a swallow, Chapter 86 of the Book of the Dead. It is, according to the rubric (the title in red ink), "A Spell for Becoming a Swallow." But what do we find? To this day Egyptologists cannot agree on just what is meant by "spell"—is it a recitation? an ordinance? an act of meditation? an incantation? merely a chapter? Neither does

anyone know for sure in what sense the "transformation" is to be understood—whether it is a change of form, a transmigration, imitation, moment of transition, passage from one world to another, mystic identification, ritual dramatization, or what not. And what about this business of becoming a swallow? In the same breath the speaker announces that he is a scorpion, and after the title there is nothing in the text that even remotely suggests anything having to do with a swallow—literal, typological, allegorical, or mystical. Certainly what the subject does is most unswallow-like and unscorpion-like as he advances on his two legs and stretches forth his two arms in the accepted human fashion.⁴⁵ Strangely, the titles are often easier to understand than the sections that go with them, as if, Thomas George Allen points out, the two were of different origin and history.⁴⁶

Such confusion may in part be explained by the alarming fact that the ancient scribes who produced these documents were often unable to read what they were writing. By the twenty-first dynasty, Naville noted, the ignorance of the scribes reached the point (toward which it had long been steadily tending) of complete miscomprehension of their own texts, betrayed by the common habit of copying entire sections backwards!⁴⁷ "Even in their original state," however, Professor Allen assures us, "the sanctity of the spells proper was furthered by intentional obscurities,"⁴⁸ so that no matter how far back we go we will always be in trouble.

At all times, W. Czermak observes, "the concrete wording of the Book of the Dead is illogical and fantastic," but its religious sense, he insists, is not; if we confine our researches, therefore, to the examination of the text, as almost all students do, we are bound to get nowhere.⁴⁹ This is not a paradox: the divine words don't need to make sense in order to be taken seriously. For some years this

NON-DRINKING DRIVERS

ARE YOU GETTING ALL THE INSURANCE PROTECTION YOU ARE PAYING FOR?

The Preferred Risk "PLUS" auto policy offers all the protection of most standard policies—PLUS ADDITIONAL BROADER COVERAGES—AT LOWER PRICES than standard rates.

- **FOR TOTAL ABSTAINERS ONLY** (one beer a year is too many)
- **MORE PROTECTION** than offered in standard auto policies.



Ask for your personal rate. No obligation.

Look for your Preferred Risk Mutual agent under "Insurance" in the YELLOW PAGES



OR USE THIS COUPON NO OBLIGATION

Preferred Risk Mutual INSURANCE CO.
2150 So. 2nd. West Salt Lake City, Utah Dept. IE 8-68

Please send me, without obligation, complete information on your automobile insurance for Total Abstainers.

I am a total abstainer, and have had no accidents for the past 3 or 5 years. (Check one)

Name.....Address.....

I have had my driver's license.....years.

City.....State.....

Occupation.....No. of Cars in Family.....

I have taken a driver training course. Yes No

Make of Car.....Model.....Year.....No. of cyls.....

Car Is Used for:

Business

Pleasure

To and from work

.....miles one way

Circle Owner of This Car	MYSELF	PRINCIPAL DRIVER	ALL OTHER DRIVERS		
			1.	2.	3.
BIRTH DATE					
SEX					
MARRIED					

My Auto Insurance Expires:

Month.....

Day.....

Year.....

America's First Total Abstainer's Automobile Insurance Company
Not available in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, North Carolina, or Virginia.

Sales manager wanted for Southern California. Call or write Mr. W. Reid, 9617 Lakewood Blvd. Downey Calif. TO 1-2791

writer taught classes of Moslem students who gloried in the thrilling sound of the Koran while resenting, some of them fiercely, any suggestion that a mortal listening to those words might possibly understand their meaning—their incomprehensibility was a stamp of divinity.

The Book of the Dead is a huge Chinese puzzle. In the first place, no two copies are just alike and most of them differ widely, so widely, in fact, that if we were to gather together all the materials in all the various copies and reconstruct from them a single standard text, "the whole would make an ensemble that would be hard to reproduce and even harder to use."⁵⁰ The pictures often have nothing to do with the texts they accompany, and sometimes illustrate things not found in the book at all.⁵¹ Texts and pictures (they are usually called vignettes) were usually done by different persons, and "generally speaking, the beauty of the vignettes runs counter to the goodness of the text."⁵² By the same token some of the most beautifully written texts are among the worst in grammar and spelling, for everything seems to go by mere appearances, so that the relation between the effectiveness of a certain spell and the actual contents of the spell is "often incomprehensible."⁵³ Texts were valued long after their real meaning was lost from sight because "the magical use of these old religious texts is based on their external aspects; it is magic, not religion that loves learned obscurity, actually taking pleasure in what is incomprehensible because of its mysterious allure."⁵⁴ This means that the documents defy classification, each being "an agglomeration of texts related in content but coming from different epochs and backgrounds."⁵⁵

Anything Goes! Since the Egyptians were, as is well known, the most conservative of people, and since funerary rites, as is equally well-known, belong to the most tradition-bound and

“... each individual was free to impose his private taste and his personal history into the record whenever he saw fit.”

conservative department of human activity, it is quite baffling to find just in this particular branch of this particular culture what seems to be a total lack of official or social control. Everything is up to individual choice: some vignettes drawn to order for a particular buyer might in the end be bought by somebody else ordering completely different texts to go with them;⁵⁶ sometimes a text chosen by one person would catch the fancy of others who would order the same for themselves;⁵⁷ individuals would for their private funeral texts “borrow, apparently without a qualm, many of the Pyramid Texts, including their implications of royalty,” while at the same time blithely composing new chapters on the spot to suit their fancy.⁵⁸ If a person did not understand an old text, that made little difference—he would simply latch on to something in the manuscript that caught his fancy, even if it was only a single word or symbol, and put it down for its magical use.⁵⁹ “Sometimes a space was kept blank for a vignette which was to record some special feature of the deceased.”⁶⁰ As to the order in which the texts occurred, there was no fixed order, and different general arrangements were popular at different periods.⁶¹

It will be useful to keep all this in mind when we consider the Facsimiles, which have been brushed aside as “typical” Egyptian funerary documents, though uniqueness is a conspicuous characteristic of such documents, and the Facsimiles are among the strangest. Completely counter to what one would expect in an ancient and venerable tradition of ritual documentation, each individual

was free to impose his private taste and his personal history into the record whenever he saw fit: “. . . each copy,” according to T. G. Allen, “comprised a collection of spells both selected and arranged on a more or less individualistic basis.”⁶² And this goes for the oldest funerary monuments as well as the latest crude papyri: “Not one of the mortuary Temples hitherto excavated has proved to be an exact replica of any other known example.”⁶³ Typical is the representation of the rite of the opening of the mouth, depicted in some 80 tombs over a period of more than 1500 years: all but seven of the tombs offer only “an extremely curtailed representation,” no single tomb shows the entire rite, and what one tomb shows another does not; also, during the long centuries of transmission “no systematic variation” appears.⁶⁴

It was at first assumed that the Book of the Dead was a ritual text, and Champollion gave it the name of the Egyptian Funeral Ritual; but that interpretation was given up when it was recognized that no ritual is described: There is not a single mention in the Book of the Dead of anything that the dead person or any priest or any member of the family is required to do.⁶⁵ Taken as a whole or a part, “one gathers the impression that the compilers of the Book of the Dead included any religious material suitable for recitation as a spell regardless of its contents.”⁶⁶

As an illustration of this puzzling unconventionality, we may take the best-known picture from the Book of the Dead, the well-known judgment scene or “Psychostasy,” a fine example of which is found among the Joseph

Smith papyri. This judgment of the dead is the sort of thing that any amateur expert could explain at first glance, but those with experience tell us that “we do not even know what significance it may have had for the dead.”⁶⁷ Though the scene occurs in many copies of the Book of the Dead, it is by no means found in all of them, and it would seem that “not all the dead are required to stand judgment.”⁶⁷ What is more, there is no indication anywhere that standing trial successfully will lead to any kind of blessedness, nor any certainty whatever about what is supposed to happen to the wicked in the hereafter; and except for its occasional representation in the Book of the Dead, the idea of judgment is nowhere so much as hinted at in all of the Egyptian documents.⁶⁸ The dead person is tried for 42 sins: “How strange!” cries Naville, “the 42 sins are not the same in all the texts.”⁶⁹

We often read of transformations, the capacity of the dead to assume whatever form he will, “but not all the dead take advantage of this privilege and nothing obliges them to do so.”^{69a} Transmigration may be indicated, “but there is no doctrine of compulsory transmigration.”⁷⁰ In fact, in all this vast literature of the beyond, “there is neither a system nor any definite ideas about the fate of the dead beyond the grave. . . . In the Book of the Dead the goal is as uncertain as is the way to get there. . . . there is no compulsion and no necessity.”⁷¹ Down through the centuries of tradition there is not the slightest indication “of any authoritative transmission of theological interpretations.”⁷² And yet, in spite of this lack of controls, we cannot learn from these sources what the Egyptians really thought of death, for all thoughts on the subject such as occur in their secular writings have been rigidly excluded.⁷³ The one safe, or at least what Gardiner calls the “most valuable,” guideline to the understanding of Egyptian texts, that is, “the logic of the situation,” is denied

Put the magic of
Sugarplum Land

in your meals



Cynthia Scott

*suggests this
delicious,
easy to make
peach jam for
a real family
taste treat.*

FROZEN PEACH JAM

- 3 cups crushed peaches
(about 2½ pounds)
- 5 cups sugar
- 1 package powdered pectin
- 1 cup water

Sort and wash fully ripe peaches, remove pits and skins, and crush fruit. Measure peaches into a large mixing bowl. Add sugar. Mix well, and let stand for 20 minutes, stirring occasionally. Dissolve pectin in water; bring to a boil, and boil for 1 minute. Add pectin solution to the fruit and sugar mixture. Stir for 2 minutes. Ladle the jam into jelly glasses or freezer containers, leaving ½-inch space at the top. Cover the containers and let stand for 24 to 48 hours. Makes about 9 six-ounce glasses. Store uncooked jam in a refrigerator or freezer. It can be held for a few months in a refri-



gerator or up to a year in a freezer. If kept at room temperature, it will mold or ferment in a short time. Once a container is opened, the jam should be used within a few days.

NOTE: If jam is too firm for serving when opened, it can be softened by stirring. If it tends to separate, stirring will blend it again.

Where is Sugarplum Land? It's all around you if you live where sugarbeets are grown. U and I Sugar sweetens the economy of these areas.

UTAH-IDAHO SUGAR COMPANY

Factories in Garland and West Jordan, Utah;
near Idaho Falls, Idaho; Moses Lake and Toppenish, Washington.

us here in this timeless, spaceless story without a development and without a plot.⁷⁴

The Book of the Dead stands in line of descent of a very ancient corpus of writings beginning with the Pyramid Texts. The so-called Coffin Texts, standing midway between the Pyramid Texts and the Book of the Dead, "contain in about equal number" chapters found on the one hand in the Pyramid Texts and on the other in the Book of the Dead, while there are many passages in the Coffin Texts that are found in neither of the other two,⁷⁵ some of these being nonetheless just as old as the Pyramid Texts themselves.⁷⁶ "The Coffin Texts," says Lacau, "overwhelm us with unanswered questions,"⁷⁷ mostly the same questions that confront us in the Book of the Dead.⁷⁸ It seemed to Breasted that "the priests to whom we owe the Coffin Text compilations allow their fancy to roam at will," so that "it is difficult to gain any coherent conception of the hereafter which the men of this age hoped to attain."⁷⁹

Thus, we see that the problems of the Book of the Dead are not merely the result of decadent and sloppy thinking; in fact, the same problems meet us in the very beginning, where the priests of Heliopolis in compiling the Pyramid Texts selected those "sayings" which they considered most desirable for particular individual kings.⁸⁰ The Pyramid Texts were used in ritual, but already "the Coffin texts have deserted the firm ground of ritual," presenting a "kaleidoscope of ideas that do not reflect the cult but are very free."⁸¹ Though the Coffin Texts differ widely from coffin to coffin and follow no plan of organization, they do all have certain ideas in common, according to Louis Speleers, namely, (1) the idea of a physical resurrection and a spiritual existence in eternity, and (2) the reception of the dead by Osiris.⁸² The doctrine of Osiris lies at the heart of the business, yet in all of Egyptian literature "no

The view that "the Book of the Dead is nothing but...fantastic ideas" is the easy way of "escaping a humiliating confession of ignorance...."

systematic exposition of this myth is known,"⁸³ and we would know nothing whatever about it were it not for the remarks of some poorly informed Greeks.⁸⁴ As in the Book of the Dead, the coffin text owner is always going somewhere, "but where he is going on his long road is not to be clearly discerned from the spells."⁸⁵

"Yet there is method in 't': The scholars who condemned the Facsimiles in 1912 by labeling them scenes from the Book of the Dead never bothered to answer the urgent question of J. M. Sjodahl, "What is then the Book of the Dead?"⁸⁶ The question is still in order. Since the beginning, "the idea has prevailed that the Book of the Dead is nothing but a conglomeration of fantastic ideas," but that, as leading Egyptologists are pointing out today, was just the easy way of escaping a humiliating confession of ignorance and a crushing commitment to years of hard work.⁸⁷ As a result, "the 'illogic' of the Egyptians has almost become an article of faith in our science—much to its loss."⁸⁸ We have been told *ad nauseam* that things that supposedly intelligent Egyptians took seriously were "unmitigated rubbish,"⁸⁹ that Egyptian religion is "inarticulate, fuzzy, and incoherent from the logical point of view,"⁹⁰ that "the mentality of the East" will forever escape us logical Westerners,⁹¹ that the Egyptians "like all primitives emerging from the night of prehistoric times had yet to discover and explore the real world,"⁹² that "ancient Egyptian religion was a motley mixture of childish crude fetishism and deep Philosophic thought,"⁹³ ". . . a hotch-potch of warring ideas, without real

unity of any kind."⁹⁴

Perhaps the most enlightening discourse on this theme is that of Professor Louis Speleers, who in his work on the Coffin Texts takes the Egyptians to task with great feeling for holding religious beliefs that clash at every point with the teaching of Roman Catholic scholastic philosophy. He is shocked to find among the Egyptians "the total absence of the idea of an Absolute Being," but in its place the concept of a God who is "but man on a higher scale."⁹⁵ Their unpardonable sin is to prefer concrete to abstract terms: they "ignore the Absolute Good" to describe eternal bliss "in terms of earthly objectives."⁹⁶ In their thinking, "everything is as material and concrete as the Christian metaphysic is abstract and spiritual."⁹⁷ Even worse, if possible, they fail to place rigorous logic before all other considerations: "These ancients always proceed by simple affirmation and negation. . . . They don't think, they only 'feel' . . . no critical sense, no method."⁹⁸ Thus, they "expect to live forever with their neighbors and the delights of material things while at the same time sharing the life of gods and spirits."⁹⁹ "It is as if the principle of contradiction . . . did not exist for them."¹⁰⁰ Disgustingly egocentric, too, with the individual clinging to his personal identity throughout the eternities;¹⁰¹ which is highly unscientific to the bargain, what with the "transposition of earthly things to a divine existence and of a dead person to another world . . .," and otherwise "accepting the most improbable miracles, denying the laws of nature as we understand them."¹⁰² It all bespeaks "a disorder of the

brain . . . which provokes in us a horror of everything that offends our more or less innate sense of logic."¹⁰³ "As to their cosmology . . . there is nothing in common between certain of their cerebral conceptions and our own intellectual operations"; where Christian thinking "applies the most rigorous logic," the Egyptian "accepts the most shocking contradictions," of the most "rudimentary and childish thinking."¹⁰⁴

Significantly enough, Dr. Speleers admits that the early Christians were guilty of the Egyptian type of thinking, regarding heaven and hell, for example, as definite places, "and it was only in the course of the Middle Ages [that is, thanks to the efforts of Scholastic philosophy] that they were recognized as a 'psychic state' of human existence."¹⁰⁵ And even as the Egyptians could not think of existence without some physical base, "one must recognize that the Christians themselves could not free themselves from this idea until a certain period of time had passed, and even then only to a certain degree."¹⁰⁶ To bring out their glaring contrast, Professor Speleers places certain of his own beliefs side by side with their Egyptian opposites; and given the choice between the two, there can be little question but that the Latter-day Saint would choose the Egyptian version every time. Indeed, at the present time, Catholics are becoming rather cool to the appeal of Scholastic philosophy, and many Egyptologists are beginning to ask whether the Egyptians were such fools after all. As examples of some of his own impeccable logic, Speleers tells us how "God through the mediation of his creatures becomes aware of that which He is not,"¹⁰⁷ and how the human soul "requires to be resurrected in a body, but . . . purged of all necessity of organs."¹⁰⁸ And he calls the Egyptians confused!

From the very first there were eminent Egyptologists who suspected that people as clever as the Egyptians could not possibly have been as anti-logical

as they seem to be from their writings. What we have in the texts, they argued, must represent the breakdown of a religion which in the beginning was entirely logical.¹⁰⁹ The most widely accepted explanation for all the confusion was the well-known determination of the Egyptians to throw nothing away: ideas, images, and stories originating in remote times and places were all welcomed by the Egyptian community and retained side by side, with ingenious efforts to explain their clashing coexistence and, when these failed, a good-natured and permanent hospitality, that "liberal" or "additive" attitude that allowed room for everybody in the temple.¹¹⁰

Along with this, we have today an increasing tendency to seek the explanation of many paradoxes not in Egyptian intransigence but in our own ignorance of what was really going on. "We cannot subscribe," wrote Henri Frankfort, "to the prevalent view that . . . the Egyptians held a number of incompatible ideas in hazy or muddleheaded confusion," this false idea being "founded on a discrepancy between our own outlook and the views and intentions of the ancients."¹¹¹ Alan Shorter seconds this: "We are apt to stigmatize as 'contradictory' the apparently confused ideas which run through . . . many Egyptian texts, when perhaps it is ourselves who are interpreting them too literally."¹¹² F. Daumas lays down some rules to be observed in the reading of Egyptian religious texts: (1) Assume a minimum of errors in a text, always giving the Egyptians instead of ourselves the benefit of the doubt. (2) "Believe that if we do not understand it is because we are badly informed, rather than imputing a shortage of intelligence to the Egyptians. . . . Let us not be hasty to condemn what on first sight looks chaotic and confused."¹¹³ It was for failing to observe these principles, it will be recalled, that Professor Mercer was taken severely to task by his reviewers.¹¹⁴ "Our atti-

"I have never met a specialist,"
wrote Professor Anthes,
"who did not have the highest respect
for the Egyptian craftsman. . . ."

tude to the Egyptians," wrote Daumas, "has been that of children who find their parents to be outmoded and old-fashioned and conclude from that that they must be absolute nincompoops"; to fall back on Egyptian unreason to explain what we cannot understand is not a sound practice: "it is a vessel that leaks on all sides, and it leads quickly . . . to the conviction that the Egyptians were utterly stupid."¹¹⁵ In the same vein the eminent Egyptologist Adrian de Buck chided those who find fault with the Egyptian language as primitive and defective: the real fault with the language of the Egyptians, de Buck points out, is, after all, simply that it is not *our* language.¹¹⁶

"I have never met a specialist," writes Professor Anthes, "who did not have the highest respect for the Egyptian craftsmanship, and all agree in classifying the best Egyptian work as perfect in form and timeless in appeal." Moreover, Anthes continues, we judge Egyptian military and political history by the same measures we use for modern history, never claiming Egyptian leaders to be naive or primitive in their thinking. In everything militarily they come up to the highest standards and often surpass the best the later world can produce. Yet we give these same people no credit for brains whatever when it comes to the subject that interested them most, religion!¹¹⁷ A century ago E. Revillout called attention to this strange bias.¹¹⁸ What is behind it? Anthes and Frankfort suggest not a different level of intelligence but a different method of solving problems.

We get neat final solutions to our

problems by isolating them in artificially closed systems. Thus we find a tidy correlation between the consumption of cholesterol and heart disease and immediately announce that all cholesterol is deadly. We get quick answers by drastic oversimplification. The Egyptian, on the other hand, "did justice to the complexity of the problem by allowing a variety of partial solutions."¹¹⁹ After a statement in a funerary text, for example, it is common to find the phrase, "Some say this means so-and-so . . .," followed by another, "Others say it means so-and-so . . .," and so on, the reader being given his choice among a number of "official" explanations.¹²⁰ What we have here is "liberality in dogmatics rather than inability to think clearly."¹²¹ Why settle for a final answer before we know all the facts? If two pieces of the jig-saw puzzle did not fit together, the Egyptians did not, as we so often do, pronounce one of them to be a fraud and throw it away, but they allowed for the possibility that there might be missing pieces that in the end would link up the two apparent contradictions.

This attitude some have called the "multiplicity of approaches": "Ancient thought . . . admitted side by side certain limited insights which were held to be simultaneously valid."¹²² Hence, "quasi-conflicting images should not be dismissed in the usual derogatory manner,"¹²³ since they are expressions of "the habit of using several avenues of approach to subjects of a problematical nature."¹²⁴ The modern single-line approach is neater and easier to understand, but the history of Christian dogma has

shown only too clearly how brittle and bigoted its solutions are. ○

(To be continued)

FOOTNOTES

¹Theodule Deveria, "Fragments de Mss. Funeraires Egyptiens consideres par les Mormons comme les memoires autographes d'Abraham," in *Memoires et Fragments* (Paris: Leroux, 1896), published in *Bibliothèque Egyptologique*, Vol. 4 (1896), pp. 195-202; see also "Specimen de l'Interpretation des Ecritures de l'ancien Egypte," *ibid.*, pp. 165ff.

²Franklin S. Spalding, *Joseph Smith as Translator*, p. 19.

³All this from the biography by his brother, Gabriel Everia, "Notice Biographique de Theodule Deveria (1831-1871)," in *Bibliothèque Egyptologique*, Vol. 4 (1896), pp. i-xlvi.

⁴*The Improvement Era*, Vol. 16 (1913), pp. 703-4.

⁵*Who's Who in America*, 1912, p. 1648.

⁶J. P. Peters, *Early Hebrew Story* (New York: Putnam's, 1904), p. 129.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁸His work on mummy bandages while with the Hearst Egyptological expedition of the University of California is noted by G. E. Smith, in *Annales du Service*, Vol. 7 (1906), p. 157.

⁹Howard Carter and Arthur C. Mace, *The Tomb of Tutankhamen* (New York: Cooper Square, 1963), Vol. 1, pp. 107-9.

¹⁰Arthur C. Mace, *The Tomb of Senebtisi* (New York: Metropolitan Museum, 1916), p. 35, note 1: "The greater part of these translations is due to the kindness of Dr. Alan H. Gardiner." Since the only inscriptions in the tomb were very short and easy ones, one wonders why Dr. Gardiner was needed to translate "the greater part" of them, and how much would be left to the genius of Dr. Mace. So also Carter and Mace, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, 109: ". . . Dr. Alan Gardiner kindly undertook to deal with any inscriptional material that might be found."

¹¹Raymond Weill, in *Revue Egyptologique*, Supplement 1950, p. 48.

¹²Obituary in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 20 (1934), p. 107.

¹³*New York Times*, Dec. 29, 1912, magazine section.

¹⁴*Who's Who in America*, 1924-25, p. 331.

¹⁵*Era*, Vol. 16 (1913), p. 613.

¹⁶*Era*, Vol. 71 (May 1968), p. 57.

¹⁷George A. Barton, quoted in *Era*, Vol. 16 (1913), p. 774.

¹⁸Quote is from a *Christian Herald* article given at length in *Literary Digest*, July 10, 1913, p. 67, where also Banks is quoted: "Lately I have been delivering a series of lectures under the auspices of one of the departments of the University of Utah.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 66: "The knowledge of such facts is working like a leaven. . . The Board of Regents of the University of Utah, avers Professor Banks, is 'predominantly Mormon' and 'making desperate efforts to check the growth of progress,' etc.

²⁰*Who's Who in America*, 1924-5, pp. 303-4.

²¹Banks, *op. cit.*

²²Quoted in *Era*, Vol. 16 (1913), p. 774.

²³". . . the inscriptions are not upon papyrus, but upon small clay objects. . ." Banks, *loc. cit.*

²⁴See his sanguine remarks quoted in *Era*, Vol. 16, p. 774-75. "At the close of one of the lectures a bright young Mormon student accompanied me to the club where I was stopping. He asked about Joseph Smith's translation of the Egyptian inscriptions, for he remembered the discussion of two years ago. He is now a Mormon only in name. A Mormon gentleman . . . showed me about the Temple grounds. He was ashamed of his religion . . . and he represents the younger generation of Mormons," Banks, *op. cit.*

²⁵Reported in *Era*, Vol. 16, pp. 341ff, and *Deseret News*, Dec. 19, 1912, p. 4.

²⁶R. Campbell Thompson, in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 21 (1935), p. 69.

²⁷E. Andersson, in *Sphinx*, Vol. 12 (1909), p. 237.

²⁸Thompson, *loc. cit.*; J. Capart, in *Bulletin critique des Religions de l'Egypte* (Brussels, 1905-1913), p. 25.

²⁹Capart, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-28.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 25.

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 68f, noting that Budge "early relinquished" the writing of articles and turned out instead about 120 Oriental books; His work "undeniably does show this haste."

³²Karl R. Popper, *Federation Reports of the*

Two independent, growing oil companies — Husky and Frontier/Beeline — have joined hands to better serve motorists and truckers in Utah and Western North America.

Both companies are dedicated to the western tradition of friendly service and quality.

Husky, Frontier, and Beeline service stations are ready, willing, and able to prove the superiority of their service, gasoline, and lubricants.

HUSKY OIL
FRONTIER DIVISION / DENVER, COLO.

ALL CREDIT CARDS WELCOME



The Quality Gasoline YOU Can Buy at any Husky, Frontier, or Beeline Service Station

TEMPLES and the Latter-day Saints

50¢ a copy

40¢ a copy for 25 or more

Order from The Improvement Era
79 S. State • Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

WANTED

Piano Tuner-Technician

Willing to settle in Salt Lake Area. Excellent opportunity to work with prominent, well established Technician. Same selling experience helpful, but not necessary. Excellent future for the right man. Interested? Please send confidential letter giving qualifications, experience and age, to P.O. Box 17077, Salt Lake City, Utah 84117.

American Society for Experimental Biology, Vol. 22 (1963), p. 970.

³³In translating the Book of Abraham Joseph Smith apparently made no use of any of the fragments of the Book of the Dead now in possession of the Church; the so-called *Egyptian Alphabet and Grammar* has never enjoyed any official status; the connection between the Book of Abraham and the "Sen-sen" papyrus remains a mystery; see our preliminary remarks in *BYU Studies*, Vol. 8 (Spring 1968), pp. 245-54, and *Dialogue*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Summer 1968), pp. 99-105.

³⁴S. A. B. Mercer, in *Utah Survey*, Vol. 1, p. 25, and *Era*, Vol. 16, p. 612. Cf. Mercer in Spalding, *Joseph Smith as Translator*, p. 29.

³⁵Edouard Naville, *Das Aegyptische Totenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie. Einleitung* (Berlin, 1886), p. 2; Gaston Maspero, in *Bibliothèque Egyptologique*, Vol. 1 (1893), p. 22.

³⁶Rudolph Anthes, in *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 20 (1957), p. 92.

³⁷John A. Wilson, in *Dialogue*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Summer 1968), p. 71.

³⁸Widtsoe, *Era*, Vol. 16, p. 618.

³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 457.

⁴⁰Georg Steindorff, *Baedeker's Guide to Egypt and the Sudan* (Leipzig, 1908), pp. cxii-cxxvi.

⁴¹Jaroslav Cerny, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1952), p. 54.

⁴²Gustave Jequier, *Considerations sur les Religions Egyptiennes* (Neuchâtel: 1946), pp. 7-8.

⁴³Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-85.

⁴⁴Naville, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁴⁵Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

⁴⁶Thomas George Allen, *The Egyptian Book of the Dead* (University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 3.

⁴⁷Naville, *op. cit.*, p. 41; cf. E. A. W. Budge, *Egyptian Religion*, p. 45.

⁴⁸Allen, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁹W. Czernak, in *Ztschr. f. Aeg. Sprache*, Vol. 76 (1940), p. 10.

⁵⁰Naville, *op. cit.*, p. 11. The various texts and interpretations were introduced with no idea of trying to "add to a composite design," R. Anthes, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

⁵¹Naville, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39.

⁵²Theodore M. Davis, *The Funeral Papyrus of Ioutiya* (London: Constable, 1908), p. 1.

⁵³Hans Schack-Schackenburg, *Das Buch von den Zwei Wegen des seligen Toten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903), p. 9. Thus the magnificent Turin Papyrus "swarms with every kind of mistake," Naville, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁵⁴Schack-Schackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁵⁵Etienne Drioton, in *Archiv fuer Orientalforschung*, 12 (1959), p. 261. "... an arrangement of the manuscripts in classes and lines of descent is not possible, so that we must fall back on an eclectic method," Hermann Grapow, *Das 17. Kapitel des aegyptischen Totenbuches* (Inaugural-Dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universitaet, Berlin, 1912), p. 51.

⁵⁶Naville, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁵⁸Thomas George Allen, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. II (1965), p. 177.

⁵⁹Hermann Kees, *Der Götterglaube im alten Aegypten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1941), p. 254.

⁶⁰Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁶¹Naville, in *Bibliothèque Egyptologique*, Vol. 1 (1893), p. 25.

⁶²Allen, *loc. cit.*

⁶³I. E. S. Edwards, *The Pyramids of Egypt* (Penguin Books, 1952), p. 114.

⁶⁴S. Bjerke, in *Numen*, Vol. 12 (1965), pp. 202-3.

⁶⁵Richard Lepsius, *Aelteste Texte des Totenbuches* (Berlin, 1867), p. 6; Edouard Naville, *Das Aegyptische Totenbuch*, p. 19.

⁶⁶Alan Shorter, *The Egyptian Gods* (London: K. Paul, 1937), pp. 64-65.

⁶⁷Naville, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁶⁸*Loc. cit.*, and Alfred Wiedemann, *The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of Immortality of the Soul* (New York: Putnam's, 1895), pp. 55-57; Naville, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁷¹Wiedemann, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

⁷²Naville, *op. cit.*, p. 21; cf. Wiedemann, pp. 49f: "The Egyptians never attained to any clear idea of the Osirian underworld; the same confusion and obscurity reigned over it as over the whole conception of the unseen world and of deity. . . . each was at liberty to form for himself a more or less modified conception of the characters of the underworld."

⁷³Rudolph Anthes, in *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 20, p. 95.

⁷⁴E. Suys, in *Orientalia*, Vol. 1 (1932), p. 65, noting that the average Egyptian seems to have been rather skeptical about the whole business.

⁷⁵Alan Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 24.

⁷⁶Pierre Lacau, in *Recueil des Travaux*, Vol. 26 (1904), p. 59.

⁷⁷H. Kees, *Aegyptischen Totenglaube*, p. 255, noting that the content of the Coffin Texts in general suggests "freely selected pieces from a corpus of Pyramid Texts."

⁷⁸Lacau, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁷⁹Capart, *Bulletin Critique des Religions de l'Egypte* (1904) p. 31, quoting Lacau.

⁸⁰James Breasted, *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (London, 1912), p. 278.

⁸¹Kees, *op. cit.*, p. 15. According to Kees, not only the Book of the Dead but the Coffin Texts and Pyramid Texts as well are all "entirely disorganized collections of unrelated sayings," p. 14.

⁸²R. Anthes, in *Ztschr. fuer Aegyptische Sprache*, Vol. 82 (1958), pp. 7-8.

⁸³Louis Spieckers, *Textes des Cercueils* (Brussels, 1946), xxxii.

⁸⁴J. Cerny, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 35.

⁸⁵For a recent estimate of the limitations of Greek knowledge on the subject, see Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, pp. 1-10.

⁸⁶Hans Schack-Schackenburg, *Zweiwegebuch*, p. 15, noting also (p. 11) that the real meaning of the "Two Ways" was entirely lost by the Middle Kingdom.

⁸⁷M. Sjödh, in *Era*, Vol. 16, p. 331.

⁸⁸W. Czernak, in *Ztschr. f. Aeg. Sprache*, Vol. 76 (1940), p. 9.

⁸⁹Czernak, in *Archiv fuer Aegyptische Archäologie*, Vol. 1 (1938), p. 205.

⁹⁰Gardiner, speaking of certain hymns, in *Revue Egyptologique*, Vol. 11 (1957), p. 55.

⁹¹Weill, in *Egyptian Religion*, Vol. 3 (1935), p. 121.

⁹²Wilhelm Kaiser, in *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*, Vol. 58 (1963), p. 341, citing Hermann Junker.

⁹³Weill, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁹⁴Wiedemann, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

⁹⁵H. R. Hall, in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 1 (1914), p. 77.

⁹⁶Louis Spieckers, *Textes des Cercueils*, pp. lxii, lxx.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. lxx, xxxi, xix, xviii.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*, p. xxxii.

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, p. lxviii; also, "no concern for ontology or causality," p. lxix.

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*, p. xviii.

¹⁰¹*Ibid.*, p. lviii.

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, p. lxx.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, pp. lxii-lxiii, lxix.

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*, p. lxxiii.

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*, pp. lxiv, xxxi: In short, "their cosmology is simplistic; they do not state clearly what they mean by life and nature," but simply accept such things as given quantities.

¹⁰⁶*Ibid.*, p. xvii.

¹⁰⁷*Loc. cit.* They accept "the most improbable miracles" (p. lxix), and "persistently confound the body and soul" (p. lxx). These are stock charges of the ancient pagan philosophers against the early Christians.

¹⁰⁸*Ibid.*, p. xxx.

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, p. ix.

¹¹⁰S. G. Maspero, in *Bibliothèque Egyptologique*, Vol. 1 (1893), p. 124.

¹¹¹W. Kaiser, in *Oriental. Literaturzeitung*, Vol. 58 (1963), p. 342, discussing the theories of Herman Junker, *Die Geisteshaltung der Aegypter in der Frühzeit* (Vienna: Boehlau, 1961).

¹¹²H. Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, pp. 91, 125.

¹¹³A. Shorter, *The Egyptian Gods*, p. 86.

¹¹⁴F. Daumas, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 160 (1961), pp. 147-48.

¹¹⁵*Era*, Vol. 71 (June 1968), pp. 20-21.

¹¹⁶Danmas, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-40.

¹¹⁷Adrian de Buck, in *Chroniques d'Egypte*, Vol. 23 (1947), pp. 26, 28, 34.

¹¹⁸Rudolf Anthes, in *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, No. 96 (Sept. 1965), pp. 5-6; cf. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 74 (1954), p. 36.

¹¹⁹E. Revillout, in *Ancient Egypt*, Vol. 1, p. 103, noting also *ibid.*, pp. 31-65, that Egyptian piety in no way differs from orthodox Christian piety in nature.

¹²⁰Frankfort, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

¹²¹According to Anthes, in *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 20, p. 95, this formula is "no allusion to any authoritative transmission of theological interpretation," but rather acknowledges the validity of individual judgment.

¹²²Anthes, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 74, p. 39. "... it was dogma, and not the transmission of earlier myths. . . ."

¹²³Frankfort, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

¹²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹²⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 91f. The idea is discussed by R. Anthes, in *Zf. f. Aeg. Sprache*, Vol. 80 (1955), p. 85; and Vol. 78 (1954), p. 53; H. Kees, in *Totenglauben . . . der alten Aegypter*, reviewed by H. Wall-Gordon, in *Revue Egyptologique*, Vol. 13 (1961), p. 145.

Use today or store away!

Safeguard your family's health . . . now and later with a plentiful supply of:

- Vitamin C
- Multiple Vitamins and Minerals
- Multi-Purpose Food

HIGH POTENCY VITAMIN C tablets (Ascorbic Acid) supply adults with minimum daily requirement. Helps protect family during cold winter months. Big Savings!

MULTIPLE VITAMINS AND MINERALS contain 14 vitamins and 6 minerals. Be sure each member of your family takes a tablet a day for an essential dietary food supplement. You'll save more at Perma-Pak.

MULTI-PURPOSE FOOD . . . ideal as a low calorie complete diet, food supplement, extender or fortifier. Marvelous for storing, for mobile or outdoor living, for emergencies, for every day use. MPF is precooked. Add dry to soups, juices, stew, meat dishes, breads, fruits and dozens of other food items. Add boiling water to make delicious cereal or vegetable.

Compare prices - then make a better buy at Perma-Pak

Church, civil defense, government leaders urge greater personal preparedness. Plan to store and feel secure!

Write for prices on single and group orders. Pool your order with others to take advantage of low trucking rates.

Residents of Southern California contact: The Wheat Kernel, 7554 Katella Ave., Stanton, California 90680
Phone 635-1352, 828-8421



Telephone:
(801) 486-9671

PERMAPAK
PIONEERS IN PREPAREDNESS PRODUCTS

40 E. 2430 S., Salt Lake City, Utah 84115