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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. 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."

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 Feuquieres, Deveria had plunged into Egyptology while Charles Lenormand gave him Coptic lessons and August Harle, the best Hebrew 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.

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." So while he was back East Dr. Pack

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 Atya, that the Prophet Joseph Smith once owned.
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?".

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. 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." 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. . . ." 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 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. 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. 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. 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.

"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." 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.

"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. 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 Egyp-
ologist”17—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,22 that hypooephalus 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.29 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 “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 limita-
tion to the understanding of the Fac-
similes: "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.'" 48
The mere names tell us nothing un-
less we can also tell "who and what
were Isis and Horus and all the other
gods of Egypt? Not by name and rela-
tionship, but as expressing the Egyp-
tian's vision of . . . the past, the
present and the hereafter?" 49 Sjodahl
and Webb asked similar questions,
but the Mormons were ignored be-
cause 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 hon-
ored, 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." 50 And to-
day 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;" 51 while Jequier points out that the
"shocking contradictions" in the in-
terpretation of religious imagery "show
us that we have not yet found the
truth." 52 There is nothing for it, says
Jequier, but for each scholar to con-
tinue on his way, "each interpreting
in his own manner and according to
his means . . . and so gradually pene-
trate the mystery of the Egyptian
religions." 53 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 Insti-
tute. 43 "Scholars had barely begun
the study of the Book of the Dead,"
Edouard Naville recalled, "when they
saw that the text swarms with diffi-
culties . . . 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 coll-
liding." 54

These points can be illustrated by
the most easily recognized section of
the Joseph Smith papyri, namely, the
fragment with the picture of a swal-
low, 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 ordi-
nance? an act of meditation? an incan-
tation? merely a chapter? Neither does
anyone know for sure in what sense
the "transformation" is to be un-
derstood—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 scor-
pion, and after the title there is
nothing in the text that even remotely
suggests anything having to do with
a swallow—literal, typological, alle-
gorical, or mystical. Certainly what
the subject does is most unsuitable-
like and unscorpion-like as he ad-
vances on his two legs and stretches
forth his two arms in the accepted
human fashion. 55 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 his-
tory. 56

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! 57
"Even in their original state," how-
ever, Professor Allen assures us, "the
sanctity of the spells proper was fur-
thered by intentional obscurities," 58 so
that no matter how far back we go
we will always be in trouble.

At all times, W. Czernak 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. 59 This is not
a paradox: the divine words don't
need to make sense in order to be
taken seriously. For some years this
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writer taught classes of Moslem stu-
dents 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 mean-
ing—their incoprehensibility 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.”

The pictures often have nothing to do
with the texts they accompany, and
sometimes illustrate things not found
in the book at all. Texts and pic-
tures (they are usually called
vignettes) were usually done by dif-
ferent persons, and “generally speak-
ing, the beauty of the vignettes runs
counter to the goodness of the text.”

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 be-
tween the effectiveness of a certain
spell and the actual contents of the
spell is “often incomprehensible.”

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.”

This means that the documents defy
classification, each being “an agglom-
eration of texts related in content
but coming from different epochs and
backgrounds.”

Anything Goes! Since the Egyptians
were, as is well known, the most con-
servative 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; sometimes a text chosen by one person would catch the fancy of others who would order the same for themselves; 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. 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. Sometimes a space was kept blank for a vignette which was to record some special feature of the deceased. As to the order in which the texts occurred, there was no fixed order, and different general arrangements were popular at different periods.

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." And this goes for the oldest funerary monuments as well as the latest crude papyrus: "Not one of the mortuary Temples hitherto excavated has proved to be an exact replica of any other known example." 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.

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. 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."

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." 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." 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. The dead person is tried for 42 sins: "How strange!" cries Naville, "the 42 sins are not the same in all the texts."

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." Transmigration may be indicated, "but there is no doctrine of compulsory transmigration." 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." Down through the centuries of tradition there is not the slightest indication "of any authoritative transmission of theological interpretations." 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. 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.
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us here in this timeless, spaceless story without a development and without a plot.\(^1\)

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,\(^2\) some of these being nonetheless just as old as the Pyramid Texts themselves.\(^3\) “The Coffin Texts,” says Lacau, “overwhelm us with unanswered questions,”\(^4\) mostly the same questions that confront us in the Book of the Dead.\(^5\) 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.”\(^6\)

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.\(^7\) 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.”\(^8\) 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 Speeers, namely, (1) the idea of a physical resurrection and a spiritual existence in eternity, and (2) the reception of the dead by Osiris.\(^9\) 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," and we would know nothing whatever about it were it not for the remarks of some poorly informed Greeks. 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." "Yet there is method in 't': The scholars who condemned the Fac-similes 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?" 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. As a result, "the 'illogic' of the Egyptians has almost become an article of faith in our science—much to its lose." We have been told ad nauseam that things that supposedly intelligent Egyptians took seriously were "unmitigated rubbish," that Egyptian religion is "inarticulate, fuzzy, and incoherent from the logical point of view," that "the mentality of the East" will forever escape us logical Westerners, that the Egyptians "like all primitives emerging from the night of prehistoric times had yet to discover and explore the real world," that "ancient Egyptian religion was a motley mixture of childishly crude fetishism and deep Philosophie thought,"... a hotch-potch of warring ideas, without real unity of any kind.

Perhaps the most enlightening discourse on this theme is that of Professor Louis Speeiers, 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." Their unpardonable sin is to prefer concrete to abstract terms: they "ignore the Absolute Good" to describe eternal bliss "in terms of earthly objectives." In their thinking, "everything is as material and concrete as the Christian metaphysic is abstract and spiritual." 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." 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." "It is as if the principle of contradiction... did not exist for them." Disgustingly egocentric, too, with the individual clinging to his personal identity throughout the eternities 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." 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." "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."

Significantly enough, Dr. Speelleer 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." 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." To bring out their glaring contrast, Professor Speelers 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, Speelers tells us how "God through the mediation of his creatures becomes aware of that which He is not," and how the human soul "requires to be resurrected in a body, but... purged of all necessity of organs." 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. 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.

Along with this, we have today an increasing tendency to seek the explanation of many paradoxes not in Egyptian intrinsigence 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.” 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.” 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.” It was for failing to observe these principles, it will be recalled, that Professor Mercer was taken severely to task by his reviewers. “Our attitude 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.” 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.

“I have never met a specialist,” wrote Professor Anthes, “who did not have the highest respect for the Egyptian craftsman . . .”
shown only too clearly how brittle and ignited its solutions are.

(To be continued)

FOOTNOTES


2Franklin H. Young, "Joseph Smith as Translator," p. 19.

3All this from the biography by his brother, Gabriel Evers, "Notice Biographique de Theodote Deveria (1831-1871)," in Bibliotheca Egyptologica, Vol. 4 (1896), pp. 138-188.


Ibid., p. 143.

7His work on manyum bandages while with the Hearst Egyptological expedition of the University of California is noted by C. E. Vermeule, in Aaules du Service, Vol. 7 (1906), p. 157.


9Arthur C. Mace, The Tomb of Senekht (New York: Metropolitan Museum, 1916), p. 35, note 1. The greater part of these translate is due to the kindness of Dr. Alan H. Gardiner. Since the only inscriptions in the tomb were very short and copy once, one wonders why Dr. Gardner was needed to translate "the greater part of them, and how much would be left to the genius of Dr. Mace, so his, Carter and Mace, op. cit., Vol. 1, 190_,4._... Dr. Alan Gardiner kindly undertook to deal with any inscripational material that might be found.


17Quote is from a Christian Herald article given at length in Library Digest, July 10, 1915, p. 67, where also Banks is quoted: "Lately I have been delivering a series of lectures in the absence of all the departments of the University of Utah."

18Ibid., p. 68, where the knowledge of such facts is working like a lever, the Board of Regents, of the University of Utah, Professor Banks, is 'predominantly Mormon' and 'making desperate efforts to check the growth of progress,' etc.


20Banks, op. cit.


22The inscriptions are not upon papyrus, but upon small clay objects.

23Banks, op. cit.

24See his magazine 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 staying. 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 'temples in California. He was ashamed of his religion... and he represents the younger generation of Mormons," Banks, op. cit.


30Ibid., pp. 61, noting that Budge "early relinquished" the writing of articles and turned out instead about 120 Oriental books. His work "undeniably does show this haste.

31Karl F. Roemer, Federation Reports of the
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