

THE TEMPLE: ANCIENT AND RESTORED



PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERPRETER
MATTHEW B. BROWN MEMORIAL CONFERENCE

THE TEMPLE ON MOUNT ZION

25 OCTOBER 2014

TEMPLE ON MOUNT ZION SERIES 3

EDITORS
STEPHEN D. RICKS
DONALD W. PARRY

MORMONINTERPRETER.COM

THE INTERPRETER FOUNDATION
EBORN BOOKS

2016

THE BOOK OF THE DEAD AS A TEMPLE TEXT AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE BOOK OF ABRAHAM

Stephen O. Smoot and Quinten Barney

The year 1842 saw the publication of *Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter*, Karl Richard Lepsius's pioneering contribution to Egyptology.¹ Since then the name of this important ancient Egyptian religious text has endured, the customary English title long referred to as "The Book of the Dead." As its name would imply, the standard Egyptological understanding of the Book of the Dead is that it consists of "magical texts and accompanying illustrations called vignettes which the ancient Egyptians placed with their dead in order to help them pass through the dangers of the Underworld and attain an afterlife of bliss in the Field of Reeds, the Egyptian heaven."² Accordingly, Egyptologists have summarized the Book of the Dead as "an essential part of the funerary equipment" for the ancient Egyptians, who were "buried with it close at hand for use in the afterlife."³

While this standard explanation of the Book of the Dead is correct, it is also somewhat inadequate. Recent scholarship now demonstrates that the Book of the Dead had a *Sitz im Leben* (setting in life) as much as it had a *Sitz im Tod* (setting in death) for the ancient Egyptians. As important as the Book of the Dead undoubtedly was as a funerary document for the ancient Egyptians, it can no longer be simply designated a "funerary text," as such a designation does not do full justice in describing its intended purpose and ancient use. As we will argue in this paper, the *Sitz im Leben* for the Book of the Dead was the temple, as evidence exists indicating the use of the Book of the Dead (or at least specific "sayings" or "spells" in the Book of the Dead) in a temple or ritual context. As such, we hope to demonstrate that one might appropriately say the Book of the Dead was used in both tomb and temple, among both the living and the dead. To that end, we shall review the recent scholarship on the use of the Book of the Dead by the living.

What's more, we will not only argue that an important *Sitz im Leben* for the Book of the Dead was the temple but will also discuss how this

understanding of the Book of the Dead has implications for the book of Abraham. We will argue that this understanding of the Book of the Dead as a temple text lends credibility to the idea proposed by some Latter-day Saint scholars that a (now lost) copy of the text translated by Joseph Smith as the book of Abraham could have been appended to or otherwise associated with the copy of the Book of Breathing found in the recovered Joseph Smith Papyri.

What Is the Book of the Dead?

We begin with a question even many skilled Egyptologists continue to ask: What exactly is the Book of the Dead? Actually, a more literal translation of what the Egyptians called the *rw nw prt m hrw* would be “spells of coming forth in the daytime.”⁴ In addition to the previously mentioned inadequacy of the modern title for this ancient text, the term “Book of the Dead” is also misleading. What Egyptologists frequently call a “book” is actually more of a collection, and unlike modern classics such as *Moby Dick* or *Oliver Twist*, which you can expect to contain basically the same text regardless of the edition you may be reading, the textual contents of copies of the Book of the Dead can vary, anywhere from nearly complete to surprisingly lacking. Criticizing the name “Book of the Dead” as misleading, Alan Gardiner explained that the Book of the Dead

is not really a book at all, but a heterogeneous assemblage of funerary spells of various dates, including also a few hymns to Re and Osiris, selections from which were written on papyrus and deposited in the tombs of most well-to-do Egyptians right down to the Roman period. The number of spells (wrongly called ‘chapters’) contained in individual copies, and the order in which they occur, vary greatly.⁵

Because of this variation among surviving copies of the Book of the Dead, Egyptologists have often attached the name of the owner as a part of the title, such as the Book of the Dead *of Ani*, or the Book of the Dead *of Sesostris*. Although some copies of the Book of the Dead contained much of the same material, they were largely unique to the owner they belonged to, with the scribe having roughly 200 available spells to choose from and the liberty to arrange them in no standardized order.⁶ That said, one should not suppose that there was absolutely no standardization for the Book of the Dead, as John Gee notes the standardization of the Book of the Dead “starting in Dynasty 26.”⁷

Because of this lack of uniformity, it is impossible to say definitively that further excavations will not unearth additional utterances that can be added to the known utterances of the Book of the Dead. In fact, such additions have occurred in the past. When Lepsius introduced a system of numbers to separate the utterances in the Book of the Dead, he initially noted 165 in total.⁸ Since then, as more copies of the Book of the Dead have been discovered, Egyptologists have increased the number of known utterances to 192.⁹ With excavations still taking place today throughout Egypt, it is not improbable that this might happen again. The possibility of more utterances needn't rely upon excavations alone, though. Egyptologists capable of translating such texts have had a hard time keeping up with the centuries of excavations that have already taken place in Egypt, resulting in plenty of papyri fragments housed in museums across the globe waiting to be translated.¹⁰

The Book of the Dead as a Ritual Text for the Living

Because of the connotations of the title “Book of the Dead,” many have simply assumed that the book’s context was limited to Egyptian burials and to be used strictly by the deceased in the afterlife. Lepsius, reacting against Jean-François Champollion’s description of the Book of the Dead as a *Rituel funéraire*, was adamant that the Book of the Dead had no ritual use. “Dieser Codex ist kein Ritualbuch” (this codex is not a ritual book), Lepsius insisted. This included even any burial ritual use, according to Lepsius, as the contents of the Book of the Dead were strictly for the use of the deceased “nach dem irdischen Tode” (after mortal death).¹¹ Egyptologists have largely taken this position for granted and have neglected study of the Book of the Dead in the context of its use by the living. Recently, however, this neglect to study the use of the Book of the Dead or even to consider a possible ritual use by the living has been corrected with the work of such scholars as Gee and Alexandra von Lieven.

As Gee explains in his 2004 study, “one purpose of the initiation [of a priest into the Egyptian temple] was to see the god, which is part of the daily temple liturgy. Seeing god also plays a role in the Book of the Dead.” Gee elaborates by indicating that “[t]he initiation element is most clearly seen in the vignette in the Papyrus of Neferwebenef, where Neferwebenef enters a shrine and emerges with shaved head and dressed in linen.” The connection between the Book of the Dead, specifically Utterance 125, and the temple liturgy is more explicit, however, as “[t]he standard initiation sequence, as illustrated in temples, for example, on

the exterior of the bark shrine at Karnak is washing, establishing regalia or insignia, and finally induction into the presence of the god in his shrine. Those steps also appear in Book of the Dead 125.¹²

Given this connection, Gee summarizes his argument by noting that “the general actions described in the text [of the Book of the Dead] coincide with the general actions depicted in ceremonies depicted on temple walls explicitly described as initiations.”¹³ Agreeing with Gee on this point is Robert K. Ritner, who indicates that “the concluding rubric provides instructions for utilizing Spell 125 [of the Book of the Dead] in ritual mysticism by the living.”¹⁴ The rubric in question reads as follows.

What should be done when being present in the Hall of Two Truths. A man should say this spell when pure and clean, dressed in clothing, shod in white sandals, painted with black eye-paint, anointed with the finest myrrh-oil, and having offered fresh meat, fowl, incense, bread, beer, and vegetables. Now make for yourself this image in drawing upon pure ground with Nubian ochre, overlaid with soil on which neither pig nor goats have trod. As for the one for whom this book is done, he will flourish and his children will flourish. He will be a confidant of the king and his entourage. There shall be given to him a cake, a jug of beer, a loaf and a large portion of meat from upon the altar of the great god. He cannot be turned back from any portal of the West. He will be ushered in with the kings of Upper and Lower Egypt. He will be a follower of Osiris. Truly effective, millions of times.¹⁵

That this utterance would be used in a ritual setting is understandable. Frequently called the “negative confessions” for its list of sins and misdeeds that the individual denies to have committed, the utterance includes not only said denials but also a proclamation of personal ritual purity, an affirmation of having accomplished righteous deeds, and an interview with various gods where specific keywords and secret names are divulged to prove the individual’s worthiness to enter into the presence of the deity. As has already been noted, it is apparent this utterance was used as an initiatory text in which the initiate would make an oath (apparently a recitation of the “negative confessions,” an affirmation of ritual purity [cf. Psalm 15, 24]), and subsequently become inducted into the cult. As Ritner notes, Utterance 125, a text that “reflects restrictions and abstinence preparatory for entrance into a sacred space and state,”

is attested “well into the Hellenistic period, when it appears ... in Greek translation as an initiatory recitation for priestly induction.”¹⁶

Gee has not simply limited his study to Book of the Dead 125, however. In an important study exploring the use of the Book of the Dead and other “funerary” literature by the living, Gee has catalogued not only additional utterances from the Book of the Dead but also parts of the Pyramid Texts and the Coffin Texts that were used in both cultic and non-cultic settings by living participants (e.g., in temple rituals and as “magical” amulets).¹⁷ As Gee explains, Egyptologists now recognize that “chapters from the Book of the Dead (chapters 26, 69, 125, 137, 148, 172, 178 and 180) were used in the *Stundenwachen* ritual on texts from the temples of Dendera, Edfu, and Philae.”¹⁸ In addition, Gee draws attention to “several chapters of the Book of the Dead [that] are specifically said to be used by the living” or are implied to be used by the living, including spells 1, 17, 18, 19, 20, 64, 70, 71, 72, 125, 128, 133, 136, 140, 148, 151, 162, 175, and 190.¹⁹ Given the number and range of utterances used by the living, we can see the use of the Book of the Dead by the living was not an isolated phenomenon. What’s more, a close reading of these spells indicate a range of use, including initiation, amulets, *Stundenwachen* rites, temple hymns, temple texts, and protection. “All told,” Gee concludes, “of the 192 chapters of the Book of the Dead, fifty-five, or twenty-nine percent, of the texts are known to have been used by the living.”²⁰

Von Lieven has very recently augmented Gee’s previous research. Specifically, Von Lieven has drawn attention to the ritual use of Book of the Dead 144, 145, and 146 in the cult of Osiris in the Greco-Roman Era.²¹ As with Book of the Dead 125, it is evident that these utterances from the Book of the Dead played an important role in Egyptian temple liturgy. “All three [utterances] occur in the third register on the walls of the second western roof chapel in Dendara,” notes Von Lieven.²² This carries significance for the use of these utterances in the Osirian temple liturgy.

Looking at the arrangement on the wall ... the situation is the following: Horus arrives at the first gate which parts him from his father [Osiris]. He addresses the keepers, legitimises himself as Horus, and enters. This he does with each of the following gates until he reaches his father and joins him. Behind the two gods, the newly closed gates are shown. This has its equivalent in the human sphere, in the cult. The priest legitimises himself by identifying with the appropriate god to

be allowed to enter the realm of the gods, as is known from other rituals, and as surely must have occurred in the cult of Osiris. It is clear from Egyptian texts that admittance to the Osirian holy mounds was severely limited.²³

Von Lieven's argument is supported by a "Ptolemaic papyrus contain[ing] six Osirian rituals which are only very superficially adapted for private funerary use" that includes a ritual that "the editor labels an adaption of BD 144 and 145."²⁴ That these utterances would be used in such a ritual is completely understandable. Utterance 144 contains instructions for the individual passing through seven gates watched by gatekeepers, including the secret names of the gatekeepers that must be divulged by the participant to gain access to Osiris.²⁵ "O you gates, O you who keep the gates because of Osiris, O you who guard them and who report the affairs of the Two Lands to Osiris every day: I know you and I know your names," exclaims the participant. "I have come like Horus into the holy place of the horizon of the sky; I announce Re at the gates of the horizon, the gods are joyful at meeting me, and the costly stones of the gods are on me."²⁶ As with Utterance 125, this utterance concludes with a rubric instructing the individual to "recite over these directions which are in writing, and which are to be inscribed in ochre with the two companies of the Bark of Re." Also like the concluding rubric for Utterance 125, this rubric directs the participant to offer "foodstuffs, poultry, and incense" in addition to cakes and oil during the ritual.²⁷ But perhaps the strongest clue that this utterance had a ritual use like Book of the Dead 125 are the final instructions of the rubric.

To be recited and erased, item by item, after reciting these directions, four hours of the day having passed, and taking great care as to the position (of the sun) in the sky. You shall recite this book without letting anyone see it; it means that the movements of a spirit will be extended in the sky, on earth and in the realm of the dead, because it will be more beneficial to a spirit than anything which is done for him, and what is needed will be at hand this day. A matter a million times true.²⁸

The concluding elements of the rubric strongly suggest a ritual setting, including the urge of secrecy, the guarantee of effectiveness, and the promise of rewards for the proper execution of the instructions.

Utterance 146, an utterance "for entering by the mysterious portals of the House of Osiris in the Field of Rushes,"²⁹ likewise informs the

participant of what he or she must say when wishing to gain entrance into one of the seventeen portals of Osiris. Although this utterance does not contain any concluding rubrics for ritual instruction, the content of the utterance would have easily lent itself to being adapted for ritual use. Each set of instructions in this utterance specifically reveals “what is to be said by N” when confronting the next portal: “Make a way for me, for I know you, I know your name, and I know the name of the god who guards you.”³⁰ With this instruction we once again see connections with typical ritual verbiage. Surely, then, it is not too difficult to imagine why the ancient Egyptians would have appropriated this utterance for use in a temple or cultic setting.

Von Lieven has provided additional examples of the use of different utterances from the Book of Dead (including 148, 168, and 182).³¹ Like Gee and Ritner, Von Lieven doesn’t fail to mention the ritual use of Book of the Dead 125, what she calls “[p]robably the best known instance of a BD vignette in a temple,” specifically the “Hathor temple of Deir el-Medineh.”³² At this temple “there is a depiction of rituals in front of the bark of Sokar: the king offering incense, and a priest masked as Anubis beating a round frame drum.” Von Lieven makes sure to inform her readers that “a masked priest and not the god himself” is depicted in the image, and that, as such, “[c]learly, this is intended to show an episode from the actual cult, rather than a mythical one.”³³ Not only that, but she also rebuts the proposition that “the whole scene should be explained ... as a necropolis,” and instead insists that “the evidence presented above demonstrates ... [that] the relief probably does not depict the judgment of a dead person, but the legitimation of a living priest officiating in the cult of Osiris and Sokar.”³⁴ Accordingly, whatever funerary purpose the Book of the Dead undoubtedly had, there was also an undeniable ritual or liturgical purpose for several utterances of the Book of the Dead.

Attestations of the Book of the Dead in Temple Reliefs

This naturally leads us to our next topic of discussion. If utterances from the Book of the Dead were used in ritual settings, the question might rightly be raised as to what archaeological evidence has survived attesting to this practice. In fact, as mentioned above, there exists plentiful attestation to the use of the Book of the Dead in a number of Egyptian temples. Furthermore, though it may be hard to argue that a roll of papyrus buried alongside a mummy had any type of benefit for anyone but the deceased, it can be equally argued that temple reliefs had little use to anyone besides the living. One of the most compelling

pieces of evidence for the Book of the Dead having a place among the living is the fact that a handful of the utterances have been found on the walls of numerous Egyptian temples. In her article arguing that “[s]everal temples, both in the New Kingdom as well as of the Greco-Roman period, contain spells from the Book of the Dead among their decorum,”³⁵ Von Lieven has collected all the known attestations of the Book of the Dead on the walls of ancient Egyptian temples. Included in her list of utterances found on the temple walls are utterances 110, 125, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 168, 178, and 182. Each of these utterances have been attested one to three times at various Egyptian temples, with the exception of Utterance 148, which has been attested a total of eleven times.³⁶

The twenty-five attestations noted can be found spread out among a total of ten Egyptian temples, all located in Upper Egypt. This archaeological evidence indicates that by no means was the use of the Book of the Dead limited to any one isolated temple. These ten temples, dating from the New Kingdom to the Late Period, are found at Medinet Habu, Deir al-Medina, Abydos, Dendera, El Khargeh, Deir el-Bahari, Philae, Edfu, Kom Ombo, and el Qala. While the remains of these temples attest to the fact that the Book of the Dead was incorporated into their temple setting, there are a few noteworthy issues regarding the purposes of these temples.

Of the above temples, the three located at Deir-el Bahari, Abydos, and Medinet Habu are the royal mortuary temples of Mentuhotep II, Ramesses II, and Ramesses III, respectively. At first glance this fact becomes problematic in regards to providing evidence for the Book of the Dead as used in temple liturgy for the living. Von Lieven is quick to remind us, however, that each of these three temples is considered to be separate from the tomb and that veneration in these temples was not limited to the worship of the Pharaoh.³⁷ Additionally, she notes the existence of the “cult of the royal *ka*” at the “clearly non-funerary temple of Luxor.” On this basis, Von Lieven has argued that “the idea of a specifically mortuary character of these temples should be abandoned, and different explanations for their use of the Book of the Dead must be sought.”³⁸

The Egyptian Mortuary Liturgy

As we can see from the evidence above, there seems to have been a blending of funerary and ritual uses of the Book of the Dead. That is to say, any rigid demarcation between tomb and temple, between the

funeral and the cultic liturgy, seems to be largely artificial. The ancient Egyptians themselves appear to have been less prone to delineate what was performed on behalf of the dead and what the living performed in a cultic setting. This is punctuated by what Jan Assmann and Katherine Eaton have called the “mortuary liturgy” present in ancient Egyptian religion,³⁹ or “*mortuary* liturgies which were performed in the cult of Osiris at Abydos and which have survived in tombs of Ptolemaic priests as *temple* liturgies.”⁴⁰ Explained another way, “At the beginning of the Ptolemaic Period, it became customary among the Theban clergy to take rituals and liturgies of the temple cult into the tomb. Sometimes these temple liturgies are annexed to the Book of the Dead ... but usually they are written on separate scrolls.”⁴¹ It thus appears that the boundary imposed by modern scholars on the funerary and temple cult does not fully reflect the religious attitudes of the ancient Egyptians themselves. Assmann therefore proposes a new genre of literature to account for this phenomenon. Concerning these texts, Assmann clarifies, “They did not serve the dead as a text to be read in the hereafter but are meant — at least were originally meant — for the use of the living, i.e. the mortuary priest performing his rites in the tomb.”⁴²

More recently, Eaton has expanded on this by explaining that “[t]he line between the ‘cult of the dead’ and the ‘cult of the gods’ was not always clear in ancient Egypt. Rituals often seem to have passed back and forth between the two contexts.”⁴³ For example, the rubrics for Book of the Dead 130, 133, 134, 135, 136A, 141-143, 148, and 190 contain instructions designating “specific days on which rituals were to be performed.”⁴⁴ What is especially pertinent for our present investigation is Eaton’s argument that this “group [of Book of the Dead spells] is clearly associated with temple contexts.”⁴⁵ Evidence for this, according to Eaton, can be seen in archaeological remains such as the presence of Book of the Dead 148 inscribed at the temple of Ramesses II at Medient Habu and the recovery of what appear to be samples of the ritual bowl described in the rubric of Book of the Dead 134.⁴⁶ Coupled with the text of the rubrics of these utterances that indicate their ritual use,⁴⁷ this evidence leads Eaton to conclude that this group of utterances “appears to have been a series of ritual episodes that were performed both in tombs for private individuals and in temples for deities.”⁴⁸ As such, whatever else they may have been, these “mortuary liturgies” included a synthesis of the rites of the temple and tomb that was performed by the living.

Modern Parallels

Using a sacred text in the context of both the tomb and the temple or sacred space is actually not as uncommon as some would think. A modern parallel of such use of a text can be found in our modern headstones. Typically, a headstone will contain some kind of inscription, including the name of the deceased person it stands to memorialize. Like the Book of the Dead, headstones come in varying sizes with varying amounts of text written on them. Both the content as well as the amount of text written on a modern day headstone (like a copy of the Egyptian Book of the Dead) would generally depend upon the personal preferences of the deceased (or the deceased's family) and the amount of money the deceased was willing to invest.

Occasionally, and especially on the headstones of deceased Christians, biblical passages can be found. Like the Book of the Dead, these passages on headstones could both vary from as well as overlap with other headstones. One popular biblical verse found inscribed on headstones is John 3:16, "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever would believe on him should not perish but have everlasting life." Such an inscription has the impression of a final testament of the deceased; though they may be dead now, through Christ they will live again. While the use of this passage is by no means inappropriate in the above setting, its original theological context had little to nothing to do with death. The passage in John, of course, also happens to be a common verse studied in Christian meetinghouses throughout the world during weekly worship services, giving the biblical text a place among both the living and the dead.

The same is true for the use of hymns in both funerary and liturgical settings. It is not uncommon, even among Latter-day Saints, for modern believers to sing hymns at a loved one's funeral that may originally have had no funerary context (e.g., "God Be with You Till We Meet Again"). Not only that, many hymns that can be found in the modern LDS hymnal and that are sung by LDS congregations in weekly worship services, such as "Oh, What Songs of the Heart," "Each Life That Touches Ours for Good," "Children of Our Heavenly Father," "O My Father," "Master, the Tempest Is Raging," and "Abide with Me!" were originally either composed for funerary services or inspired (at least in part) by death.⁴⁹ We moderns freely adapt and transpose funerary and liturgical hymns and texts such as these all the time. It shouldn't be too difficult imagining the ancients doing the same.

Implications for the Book of Abraham

With this understanding of the Book of the Dead as a temple text, we will now turn our attention to the implications this understanding holds for the book of Abraham. As explained in the superscription that accompanied the book of Abraham at its publication in 1842, this scriptural work is said to be “[a] translation of some ancient Records [sic] ... from the Catecombs [sic] of Egypt, purporting to be the writings of Abraham.”⁵⁰ In 2013 additional introductory material appended to the book of Abraham as it is canonized in the Pearl of Great Price identified the text as “[a]n inspired translation of the writings of Abraham. Joseph Smith began the translation in 1835 after obtaining some Egyptian papyri.” Beyond this, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has no official position on precisely how the book of Abraham was translated, other than it was done through the revelatory abilities of Joseph Smith.⁵¹ Considerable debate exists as to how Joseph Smith “translated” the book of Abraham, including whether his translation was of an actual ancient text that is now lost or whether the papyri he received in 1835 acted as a catalyst for him to simply reveal a text with no correspondence on any physical papyri in his possession.⁵² It is not within the scope of this paper to hash out the details of these competing theories.⁵³ Rather, we shall assume for the sake of this paper that Joseph Smith did translate an ancient Abrahamic text. While we acknowledge that the debate is far from settled, what we have to offer here lends plausibility to the argument that a copy of the book of Abraham could have been included among the Joseph Smith Papyri.

The first question to address is what texts are included among the papyri fragments given to the Church in 1967. As became quickly apparent even before the first round of translation,⁵⁴ the surviving papyri fragments do not contain the text of the book of Abraham.⁵⁵ Rather, they include a fragmentary copy of the “Book of the Dead belonging to Tshemmin[,] ... part of chapter 125 of the Book of the Dead belonging to Neferirnub[,]” and a copy of “the Book of Breathings belonging to Hor.”⁵⁶ The fact that the surviving papyri fragments do not match the text of the book of Abraham has led some critics of Joseph Smith to proclaim the Prophet’s incompetence or fraudulence.⁵⁷ Others, however, have argued for the likelihood that the surviving fragments constitute a minimal percentage of Joseph Smith’s original collection and that the text of the book of Abraham was included on the now missing portion,⁵⁸ or that the text is purely revelatory and as such has no correspondence

to any physical papyri lost or extant, thus rendering the question moot. Regardless, both Mormon and non-Mormon scholars are in agreement that none of the surviving fragments of the Joseph Smith Papyri translate as the book of Abraham but rather are copies of the Book of Breathings and the Book of the Dead.⁵⁹

So what is the likelihood that a copy of a text like the book of Abraham could have been appended to a text like the Book of Breathings? Said another way, is it at all possible that an ancient Egyptian living in Ptolemaic Egypt would have had any interest in including such a text in his personal collection?⁶⁰ To answer this question we must familiarize ourselves with the ancient owners of the Joseph Smith Papyri and their occupations. For the purpose of answering this specific question, we need to look at the life and occupation of Hor, the ancient owner of the Book of the Breathings that ended up in the possession of Joseph Smith.

We know that Hor was a member of a priestly family in Thebes and was involved in the temple liturgy at Karnak.⁶¹ Besides owning a copy of the Book of Breathings, Hor also owned an “abbreviated copy of the Book of the Dead” that now resides in the Louvre.⁶² As a priest in Ptolemaic Egypt, Hor would have enjoyed a relatively cosmopolitan lifestyle and very likely “would have been highly educated, literate, and likely conversant in several languages; he also would have had access to the great libraries of the temples in Thebes.”⁶³

This last point deserves special attention. As Kerry Muhlestein has shown, Egyptians during this time engaged in a well-attested syncretism of their religion with biblical figures. “[I]n Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt,” Muhlestein explains, “Biblical stories and characters were employed in Egyptian religious practice. These stories and characters were added to the already existing repertoire of Egyptian, Canaanite, and Greek gods and mythical characters.”⁶⁴ These “Biblical figures were used in a manner similar to Egyptian figures,” and “[t]wo of the characters who loom largest in the Jewish Canon — Abraham and Moses — were used in contexts that were in keeping with their Biblical stories.”⁶⁵ How is this significant for our present study? “Our current evidence indicates that a group of priests from Thebes possessed, read, understood, and employed Biblical and extra-Biblical texts, most especially texts about Abraham and Moses.”⁶⁶

In addition to this evidence for syncretism between Egyptian and Jewish (as well as Greek, for that matter⁶⁷) religious elements, there is also potential significance for the Book of Breathings as a ritual text. As Hugh Nibley was one of the first to note, “[t]he most important thing

about the Book of Breathings from the Latter-day Saint point of view is that it is far more than a funeral text.⁶⁸ “[I]f the mortuary use of at least some important texts [like the Book of the Dead and the Book of Breathings] is secondary,” Nibley asked, “what was their original primary function?” The answer: “They were temple texts used in the performance of ordinances.”⁶⁹ A perusal of Hor’s Book of Breathings supports this, as it includes elements common in other ritual texts (including the utterances from the Book of the Dead examined above) such as injunctions of silence or secrecy,⁷⁰ pronouncement of purification,⁷¹ expectation to enter the presence of the gods,⁷² the offering of libations,⁷³ and receiving ritual or sacred clothing.⁷⁴ Interestingly, a line from the Hor Book of Breathings resonates with Utterances 144, 145, and 146 from the Book of the Dead. “[You] shall not be turned back from the gates [of the hereafter.]”⁷⁵ Given Von Lieven’s discussion of the ritual use of these spells from the Book of the Dead, this may have significance for the Book of Breathings as a ritual text.

With this understanding we can now critically engage one of Marc Coenen’s arguments at the end of his recent treatment of the Book of Breathings. “No one denies that other funerary and/or ritual compositions were sometimes appended to a Book of the Dead or other funerary compositions,” Coenen remarks. “However, concluding that a record of Abraham or any other text foreign to Ptolemaic Egyptian funerary and/or liturgical practice was once attached to the Smith papyri is an assertion not based upon widely accepted Egyptological analysis.”⁷⁶ In light of the evidence examined above we feel Coenen’s conclusion requires qualification. Given that our Theban priest Hor “had a professional interest” in not only the temple but also human sacrifice,⁷⁷ and given what we have reviewed about the temple context of the Book of the Dead and its Greco-Roman descendent and eventual replacement the Book of Breathings⁷⁸ (a copy of both of which Hor possessed), we do not find it too much of a stretch to suppose a temple text like the book of Abraham attracting Hor’s fancy and thus ending up in his collection (perhaps snuggled right alongside his copy of the Book of Breathings).⁷⁹

Recalling Assmann’s point noted before that Theban priests in the Ptolemaic Era are known to have taken temple liturgies with them into their tombs, we feel it by no means improbable that a copy of the book of Abraham could have been buried with Hor either as an appendix to his Book of Breathings or as a separate scroll.⁸⁰ Add to this the fact that some Theban priests were actively syncretizing biblical figures with their native mythological figures (including syncretizing Osiris

with Abraham),⁸¹ and we feel a plausible case can be made for why and how a copy of the book of Abraham could have ended up among the Joseph Smith Papyri. We obviously cannot *prove* this occurred, as any hypothetical Abraham text among the Joseph Smith Papyri is now lost, but the evidence examined above suggests that this scenario is by no means impossible or implausible.

Conclusion

The Book of the Dead, often simply classified as a “funerary text,” had at least one actual *Sitz im Leben*: the temple.⁸² This is supported by archaeological data in the form of surviving inscriptions on temple architecture that complement the explicit ritual instructions contained in the Book of the Dead itself. “The above discussion suggests two different *Sitze im Leben* for BD texts in the temple: some spells are closely associated with the solar cult, whereas others are concerned with gaining admission into restricted areas, mostly in connection with Osiris. Both groups stem from a priestly milieu. There was nothing funerary about them originally.”⁸³ So concludes Von Lieven in her important study. Given the available evidence, we agree with her assessment.

With this evidence in mind we also feel it is important to reiterate what Gee indicated a decade ago:

Egyptian religion has been divided into a number of modern subcategories: funerary religion, temple religion, magic, and popular piety. . . . So-called “magical” texts and practices have been shown to have been composed in temple scriptoria and used by priests. In fact, there is no ancient distinction between “magic” and Egyptian religion. Furthermore all funerary equipment (with the exception of coffins and canopic jars) have been found in both temple and “magic” contexts. All these considerations raise the issue of whether the modern distinctions between temple, funerary, and “magic” religion are useful or even desirable, as they may constitute an impediment rather than an aid to understanding.⁸⁴

We must urge caution in simply identifying the Book of the Dead as a “funerary text,” as this term, while true in one sense, does not do full justice in describing how this important religious text was utilized by the ancient Egyptians. Also, with this evidence we can plausibly suggest why and how a text like the book of Abraham could have ended up in the collection of “funerary” Egyptian papyri acquired by Joseph Smith

in 1835. If in fact the Book of the Dead and its descendant, the Book of Breathings, were used as temple texts, as we feel we have shown, then it would make sense that a copy of another temple text like the book of Abraham could have been acquired by Hor, a Theban priest who may have indeed found interest in just such a text. With the evidence presented by Muhlestein on the Egyptian syncretism of Jewish religious figures, including Moses and Abraham during the time of the production of the Hor Book of Breathings, we feel this scenario is at least plausible. Thus, in addition to this research on the Book of the Dead as a temple text being interesting in its own right, this evidence also potentially carries significant implications for the book of Abraham.

Stephen O. Smoot graduated *cum laude* from Brigham Young University with Bachelor of Arts degrees in Ancient Near Eastern Studies and German Studies. His areas of academic interest include the Hebrew Bible, ancient Egyptian history and religion, Mormon studies, and German Romanticism.

Quinten Barney received a BA in Ancient Near Eastern Studies at Brigham Young University, where he studied Biblical Hebrew and Middle Egyptian. He has written articles on the Joseph Smith Papyri, the book of Abraham, Joseph of Egypt, and the Book of Mormon. He is currently employed with the Seminaries and Institutes program of the Church, and resides in American Fork, Utah, with his wife (Barbara) and their two children (Eli and Asher).

Endnotes

1. Karl Richard Lepsius, *Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter nach dem hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin mit einem Vorworte zum ersten Male Herausgegeben* (Leipzig, Germany: G. Wigand, 1842).
2. Carol A. R. Andrews, "Introduction," in *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead*, trans. Raymond O. Faulkner (Austin, TX: University of Texas, 2006), 11.
3. Andrews, "Introduction," 16. See also Ian Shaw, ed., *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 474. Shaw's characterization of the Book of the Dead as a "funerary

text ... [that] was usually written on papyrus and placed in the coffin, alongside the body of the deceased,” is fairly typical of other Egyptological definitions of this text.

4. James P. Allen, *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 377. Egyptologists use a number of words to describe the individual “chapters” of the Book of the Dead, including “spell,” “saying,” “utterance,” etc. For this paper we will eschew the use of “spell,” which comes loaded with certain baggage concerning the nature of “magic” versus “religion,” and will opt, as the Germans largely do by using the word *Spruch*, for the more neutral “utterance.”
5. Alan Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1999), 19.
6. John H. Taylor, *Journey Through the Afterlife: Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead* (London: British Museum Press, 2010), 13.
7. John Gee, “The Book of the Dead as Canon,” *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan* 15 (2010): 26. Gee’s entire article is worthy of consideration in approaching the Book of the Dead’s status in ancient Egyptian religion.
8. Lepsius, *Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter*, 21-24.
9. Raymond O. Faulkner, *The Egyptian Book of the Dead: The Book of Going Forth by Day*, ed. Eva Von Dassow (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2008), 18.
10. See Igor Uranić, “‘Book of the Dead’ Papyrus Zagreb 601,” in *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 33, no. 1 (2005): 357. Uranić cites a museum in Zagreb, Croatia as an example of at least one museum that contains numerous papyri fragments with portions of the Book of the Dead that had been published only in the library’s catalog until 2005. He also notes that there are papyri fragments that have yet to be read, as well as others that deserve restoration before being properly studied. Along with archaeological excavations, these types of cases of untranslated papyri no doubt have the potential to contribute to our understanding of ancient Egypt, including the possibility of containing unknown spells that can be added to the collection known as the Book of the Dead.
11. Lepsius, *Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter*, 3.

12. John Gee, "Prophets, Initiation and the Egyptian Temple," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 31 (2004): 101. See also the in-depth discussion on this same point in Gee, *The Requirements of Ritual Purity in Ancient Egypt*. Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University (New Haven, CT, 1998).
13. Gee, "Prophets, Initiation and the Egyptian Temple," 102.
14. See the introductory commentary in Robert K. Ritner, "Book of the Dead 125," in *The Context of Scripture: Volume II, Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, ed. William W. Hallo (Leiden, Germany: Brill, 2003), 60.
15. Ritner, "Book of the Dead 125," 63, notes removed. Ritner, 63, n. 41, indicates that the "image" meant to be drawn "upon pure ground" is probably the accompanying vignette of this spell.
16. Ritner, "Book of the Dead 125," 60.
17. John Gee, "The Use of the Daily Temple Liturgy in the Book of the Dead," in *Totenbuch—Forschungen: Gesammelte Beiträge des 2. Internationalen Totenbuch—Symposiums 2005*, ed. Burkhard Backes, Irmtraut Munro, and Simone Stöhr (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006), 73-86.
18. Gee, "The Use of the Daily Temple Liturgy," 73. The *Stundenwachen* rites (from the German "hourly guards") were performed at the temples in Dendera, Edfu, and Philae as part of the Osirian mysteries. They included rituals dramatically re-enacting the life, death, and resurrection of Osiris, in addition to the hourly recitation of spells and invoking gods (*Stundengötter* or *Schutzgeister*, "hourly gods" and "protective spirits," respectively) to protect Osiris from enemies and ensure his proper burial and resurrection. See Hermann Junker, *Die Stundenwachen in den Osirismysterien* (Vienna: Buchhändler der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1910), 2-9; Andreas H. Preis, *Die Stundenwachen im Osiriskult: Eine Studie zur Tradition und späten Rezeption von Ritualen im Alten Ägypten* (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011).
19. Gee, "The Use of the Daily Temple Liturgy," 75-80.
20. Gee, "The Use of the Daily Temple Liturgy," 81.

21. Alexandra Von Lieven, "Book of the Dead, Book of the Living: BD Spells as Temple Texts," *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 98 (2012): 258-259.
22. *Ibid.*, 258.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*, 258-259.
25. For more on this, see John Gee, "The Keeper of the Gate," in *The Temple in Time and Eternity*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1999), 233-274, esp. 239-244.
26. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead*, 133.
27. *Ibid.*, 135.
28. *Ibid.*, 135.
29. *Ibid.*, 135.
30. *Ibid.*, 135-137.
31. Von Lieven, "Book of the Dead, Book of the Living," 259-263.
32. *Ibid.*, 263.
33. *Ibid.*, 263-264.
34. *Ibid.*, 264.
35. *Ibid.*, 249.
36. See *ibid.*, 250-253. Von Lieven notes one attestation of spells 110, 125, 145, 178, and 172; two attestations for spells 144, 149, and 168; three attestations for 146, and eleven for spell 148.
37. *Ibid.*, 254.
38. *Ibid.*, 254.
39. Jan Assmann, "Egyptian Mortuary Liturgies," in *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, ed. Sarah Israelit-Groll (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1990), 1-45; Katherine Eaton, "A 'Mortuary Liturgy' from the 'Book of the Dead' with Comments on the Nature of the *sh*-spirit," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 42 (2005/2006): 81-94.
40. *Ibid.*, 4-5, emphasis in original.
41. *Ibid.*, 3-4. Mark Smith has identified a Demotic copy of Book of the Dead 171 that accompanies a copy of the "Liturgy for the Opening

the Mouth for Breathing,” a funerary rite “performed at the entrance to the tomb immediately before the burial.” Smith believes this Demotic spell would have been recited “to accompany the lighting of a torch in the tomb after the deceased ha[d] been laid to rest within it, the final act before the sepulchre was sealed up.” See Mark Smith, “New Extracts from the Book of the Dead in Demotic,” in *Actes du IXe congrès international des études démotiques*, ed. Ghislaine Widmer and Didier Devauchelle (Paris: Institut Français D’Archéologie Orientale, 2009), 347-357, quote at 355.

42. Assmann, “Egyptian Mortuary Liturgies,” 2.
43. Eaton, “A ‘Mortuary Liturgy,’” 81.
44. *Ibid.*, 81.
45. *Ibid.*, 83.
46. *Ibid.*, 84-86.
47. *Ibid.*, 86-89.
48. *Ibid.*, 94. Eaton elaborates, “It may even be that deification was the ultimate goal of all mortuary cult. Such was almost certainly the goal of all royal mortuary cult. Thus, mortuary rites would express the wish for deification through the use of the same rituals used for the gods. Conversely, deities were considered to have been ancestors at some point in the distant past. Thus, their temple rituals were based in part on their mortuary cult.”
49. Karen Lynn Davidson, *Our Latter-day Hymns: The Stories and the Messages* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2009), 314-315, 322-323, 328-329, 320-322, 147-148, 204-205.
50. “Book of Abraham,” *Times and Seasons* 3, no. 9 (1842): 704.
51. Joseph Smith himself said next to nothing about the translation method of the book of Abraham. Two of his contemporaries, including a scribe for the translation, however, did leave us some of indication that the translation was done by revelatory means. John Whitmer, acting as Church historian and recorder, wrote, “Joseph the Seer saw these Record[s] and by the revelation of Jesus Christ could translate these records ... which when all translated will be a pleasing history and of great value to the saints.” Karen Lynn Davidson, Richard L. Jensen, and David J. Whittaker, eds., *The Joseph Smith Papers, Histories, Vol. 2: Assigned Histories, 1831-1847* (Salt Lake City: The Church Historian’s Press, 2012), 86. Joseph

Smith's scribe Warren Parrish reported after his apostasy from the Church, "I have set by his side and penned down the translation of the Egyptian Hieroglyphicks [sic] as he claimed to receive it by direct inspiration from Heaven." Warren Parrish, letter to the editor, *Painesville Republican*, 15 February 1838, cited in John Gee, "Some Puzzles from the Joseph Smith Papyri," *FARMS Review* 20, no. 1 (2008): 115, n. 4. Other contemporary and near-contemporary sources spoke of Joseph Smith using the Urim and Thummim in the translation of the book of Abraham, but these accounts must be accepted cautiously (if at all) because of their second and tertiary nature. Scott G. Kenney, ed., *Wilford Woodruff's Journal* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1983), 2:155; Orson Pratt, "The Book of Mormon," *Journal of Discourses* (Liverpool: Latter-day Saints' Book Depot, 1880), 20:65.

52. The Church released an essay in July 2014 that laid out these two potential explanations for the translation of the book of Abraham. See "Translation and Historicity of the book of Abraham," online at <https://www.lds.org/topics/translation-and-historicity-of-the-book-of-abraham> (Accessed July 14, 2014).
53. For different perspectives on the nature of the book of Abraham, see generally Karl C. Sanberg, "Knowing Brother Joseph Again: The Book of Abraham and Joseph Smith as Translator," *Dialogue* 22, no. 4 (1989): 17-37. John Gee, *A Guide to the Joseph Smith Papyri* (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2000), 19-30; Richard D. Draper, S. Kent Brown, and Michael D. Rhodes, *The Pearl of Great Price: A Verse-by-Verse Commentary* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005), 242-43; Kerry Muhlestein, "Egyptian Papyri and the Book of Abraham: A Faithful, Egyptological Point of View," in *No Weapon Shall Prosper: New Light on Sensitive Issues*, ed. Robert L. Millett (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center at Brigham Young University, 2011), 217-243; Brian M. Hauglid, "Thoughts on the Book of Abraham," in *No Weapon Shall Prosper*, 245-258; David Bokovoy, *Authoring the Old Testament: Genesis—Deuteronomy* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2014), 191-214; John Gee, "Joseph Smith and Ancient Egypt," in *Approaching Antiquity: Joseph Smith and the Ancient World*, ed. Lincoln H. Blumell, Matthew J. Grey, and Andrew H. Hedges (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2015), 427-448; Kerry Muhlestein, "Joseph Smith's Biblical View of Egypt," in *Approaching Antiquity*, 449-473; Brian M. Hauglid, "The Book of Abraham and the Egyptian Project:

‘A Knowledge of Hidden Languages,’” in *Approaching Antiquity*, 474-511.

54. Very shortly after the Church acquired the Joseph Smith Papyri from the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the official organ of the Church, the *Improvement Era*, noted, “Some of the pieces of papyrus apparently include conventional hieroglyphics (sacred inscriptions, resembling picture-drawing) and hieratic (a cursive shorthand version of hieroglyphics) Egyptian funerary texts, which were commonly buried with Egyptian mummies. Often the funerary texts contained passages from the ‘Book of the Dead,’ a book that was to assist in the safe passage of the dead person into the spirit world. It is not known at this time whether the ten other pieces of papyri have a direct connection with the book of Abraham.” Jay M. Todd, “Egyptian Papyri Rediscovered,” *Improvement Era*, January 1968, 12-13.
55. Klaus Baer, “The Breathing Permit of Hôr’ A Translation of the Apparent Source of the Book of Abraham,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 3, no. 3 (1968): 109-34; Hugh Nibley, *The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri: An Egyptian Endowment* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1975).
56. Michael D. Rhodes, *Books of the Dead Belonging to Tshemmin and Neferirnub* (Provo, UT: Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship, 2010), 5. Rhodes, *Books of the Dead*, 5, also mentions a “third Book of the Dead belonging to an Amenhotep son of Tanoub, of which no fragments survive, although in the nineteenth century a hand copy of parts of it were made that allows us to determine the owner’s name. This original collection of ancient Egyptian documents also included a hypocephalus belonging to a man named Sheshonq, which has been lost, although we have two copies of it made in the early nineteenth century.” Gee has helpfully explained, “The Book of the Dead chapters covered [in the recovered papyri fragments] are BD 3-6, 53-54, 57, 63, 65, 67, 70, 72, 74-77, 83, 86-89, 91, 100-101, 103-6, 110, 125.” See John Gee, “Eyewitness, Hearsay, and Physical Evidence of the Joseph Smith Papyri,” in *The Disciple as Witness: Essays on Latter-day Saint History and Doctrine in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, ed. Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2000), 188.

57. Charles M. Larson, *By His Own Hand Upon Papyrus: A New Look at the Joseph Smith Papyri* (Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Religious Research, 1992); Robert K. Ritner, *The Joseph Smith Egyptian Papyri: A Complete Edition* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2013). For reviews of the first title above, see John Gee, "A Tragedy of Errors," *FARMS Review* 4, no. 1 (1992), 93-119; Michael D. Rhodes, "The Book of Abraham: Divinely Inspired Scripture," *FARMS Review* 4, no. 1 (1992), 120-126. For reviews of Ritner's earlier work on the book of Abraham, see Larry E. Morris, "The Book of Abraham: Ask the Right Questions and Keep on Looking," *FARMS Review* 16, no. 2 (2004): 355-80; Kerry Muhlestein, "The Book of Breathings in Its Place," *FARMS Review* 17, no. 2 (2005): 471-486.
58. The most outspoken proponent of this theory has been Gee, whose research has focused on trying to establish not only the size and content of Joseph Smith's original papyri collection, but also the presence of the text of the book of Abraham relative to the other Joseph Smith Papyri. See John Gee, "Eyewitness, Hearsay, and Physical Evidence of the Joseph Smith Papyri," 175-218; "New Light on the Joseph Smith Papyri," *FARMS Review* 19, no. 2 (2007): 249-255; "Some Puzzles from the Joseph Smith Papyri," 117-123; "Formulas and Faith," *Journal of the Book of Mormon and Other Restoration Scripture* 21, no. 1 (2012): 60-65. "Book of Abraham, I Presume," online at <http://www.fairmormon.org/perspectives/fair-conferences/2012-fair-conference/2012-book-of-abraham-i-presume> (Accessed March 27, 2014). See also Kerry Muhlestein and Rycejo Nordstrom, "'Beautifully Written Upon Papyrus': The Story of the Joseph Smith Papyri," *Insight* (Fall/Winter 2012): 47-53. It should be noted, in the interest of full disclosure, that Gee's arguments have recently been challenged. See Andrew W. Cook and Christopher C. Smith, "The Original Length of the Scroll of Hôr," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 43, no. 4 (Winter 2010), 1-42; Christopher C. Smith, "That Which Is Lost: Assessing the State of Preservation of the Joseph Smith Papyri," *The John Whitmer Historical Association Journal* 31, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2011): 69-83; Andrew W. Cook, "Formulas and Facts: A Response to John Gee," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 45, no. 3 (Fall 2012): 1-10. This topic, we feel, is far from settled, and we are aware of forthcoming scholarship on this topic that hopefully will shed further light on the question of how much papyri Joseph Smith possessed.

59. It should be remembered that the name “Book of Breathing,” or sometimes “Document of Breathing,” is, like the name “Book of the Dead,” a modern designation for the text that the ancient Egyptians appear to have called the “Letter of Fellowship made by Isis for her brother Osiris.” See John Gee, “A New Look at the ‘*nh p3* by Formula,” in *Actes du IXe congrès international des études démotiques*, ed. Ghislaine Widmer and Didier Devauchelle (Paris: Institut Français D’Archéologie Orientale, 2009), 135-138.
60. The Hor Book of the Breathing can be safely dated to the Ptolemaic Era. See Marc Coenen, “The Dating of the Papyri Joseph Smith I, X and XI and Min Who Massacres His Enemies,” in *Egyptian Religion: The Last Thousand Years, Part II*, ed. Willy Clarysse, Antoon Schoors, and Harco Willems (Leuven, Belgium: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1998), 1103-1115; Gee, *A Guide to the Joseph Smith Papyri*, 25-27; Michael Rhodes, *The Hor Book of Breathing: A Translation and Commentary* (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2002), 3; Marc Coenen, “The Ownership and Dating of Certain Joseph Smith Papyri,” in *The Joseph Smith Egyptian Papyri*, 69, 76-79. As an aside, the claim made in the 1842 heading of the book of Abraham that the text was written “by his [Abraham’s] own hand, upon papyrus” is in no way problematic for either the historicity of the book of Abraham or the proposition that a copy of the text could have appeared in papyri from the Ptolemaic Era. See Stephen O. Smoot, “By His Own Hand, Upon Papyrus: Another Look,” online at <http://www.mormoninterpreter.com/by-his-own-hand-upon-papyrus-another-look/> (Accessed March 27, 2014). See also Draper, Brown, and Rhodes, *The Pearl of Great Price*, 242.
61. Gee, “Some Puzzles from the Joseph Smith Papyri,” 123-130; Muhlestein, “Egyptian Papyri and the Book of Abraham,” 229-230; Coenen, “The Ownership and Dating of Certain Joseph Smith Papyri,” 71, 73-76.
62. Coenen, “The Ownership and Dating of Certain Joseph Smith Papyri,” 72-73; “Horos, Prophet of Min Who Massacres His Enemies,” *Chronique d’Égypte* 74 (1999): 257-260. Incidentally, Hor’s great-great-grandson’s copies of the Book of the Dead and the Book of Breathing have been identified in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. See Marc Coenen, “The Funerary Papyri of Horos son of Estneteretten in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna,” *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 130 (2003):

- 160-169. The identification of these papyri is not a mere triviality, as it helps us date the Joseph Smith Papyri.
63. Muhlestein, "Egyptian Papyri and the Book of Abraham," 229.
64. Kerry Muhlestein, "Abraham, Isaac, and Osiris-Michael: The Use of Biblical Figures in Egyptian Religion," in *Achievements and Problems of Modern Egyptology*, ed. Galina A. Belova (Moscow: Russian Academy of Sciences, 2012), 259. A version of this paper has been republished as Kerry Muhlestein, "The Religious and Cultural Background of Joseph Smith Papyrus I," *Journal of the Book of Mormon and Other Restoration Scripture* 22, no. 1 (2013): 20-33.
65. Muhlestein, "Abraham, Isaac, and Osiris-Michael," 259.
66. *Ibid.*, 259. John Gee has also identified Hor's participation in the worship of the syncretized deity Min-who-Massacres-his-Enemies, a "god [who] was a form of the old Canaanite deity Reshef syncretized with Min." John Gee, "History of a Theban Priesthood," in «*Et maintenant ce ne sont plus que des villages ...* » *Thèbes et sa région aux époques hellénistique, romaine et byzantine*, ed. Alain Delattre and Paul Heilporn (Bruxelles: Associations Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 2008), 70.
67. See Mark S. Smith, *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (Grand Rapids, MI.: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 277-283.
68. Hugh Nibley, *The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri: An Egyptian Endowment*, 2nd ed. (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2005), 12. In a letter to the anti-Mormon author Wesley P. Walters, Nibley's Egyptian teacher, Klaus Baer, included "those who want to see in the Book of the Dead a manual of initiation" among "semi-scholarly types (and crackpots) that hang around the fringes of Egyptology." Time, it seems, still vindicates Hugh Nibley. See Klaus Baer to Wesley P. Walters, 28 February, 1972, letter in our possession. Our thanks to Matthew Roper for alerting us to this letter.
69. Nibley, *The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri*, 13.
70. Rhodes, *The Hor Book of Breathings*, 28. "Hide (it)! Keep (it) secret! Do not let anyone read it, since [it is] effective [for a man in the god's domain so that he might live again] successfully millions of times."

71. Ibid., 28-29. “O [Osiris] Hor, justified, born of Ta[ykhebyt, justified, you have been purified. Your heart has been purified. Your front is in] (a state of) purity, and your back is in (a state) of cleanliness. Your midsection is (cleansed) with soda [and natron. There is no part of you (polluted) by sin. May the Osiris Hor,] justified, born of Taykhebyt, justified, be purified in that pool of [the Field of Offerings to the north of the Field of the Grasshopper.] May Wadjet and Nekhbet purify you in the fourth hour of the night and the [fourth] hour [of the day. Come, Osiris Hor, justified, born of Taykhebyt], justified. May you enter the Hall of the Two Truths, having been purified from every sin [and misdeed. Stone of Truth is your name.]”
72. Ibid., 29, 32. “May you be made happy in the presence of Re.] May your soul live in the presence of Amon. May your [body] be renewed in the presence of Osiris. ... May you enter into the god’s [very] great hall in Busiris, and may you see the Foremost of the Westerners at the Wag festival.”
73. Ibid., 30. “[May your soul make for you invocation offerings of bread, beer, beef, and fowl,] libations and incense during the course [of every day.]”
74. Ibid., 32. “[Come now Osiris Hor, justified, born of Taykhebyt, justified. You] have arisen in your form, complete in your royal regalia.”
75. Ibid., 30.
76. Coenen, “The Ownership and Dating of Certain Joseph Smith Papyri,” 83.
77. Gee, “Some Puzzles from the Joseph Smith Papyri,” 128. On Hor’s role as a prophet of Min-who-Massacres-his-Enemies, including his participation in the daily execration ritual at the temple in Karnak, see Gee, “History of a Theban Priesthood,” 67-69; “Execration Rituals in Various Temples,” in 8. *Ägyptologische Tempeltagung: Interconnections between Temples*, ed. Monika Dolińska and Horst Beinlich (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 67-80. See also Kerry Muhlestein and John Gee, “An Egyptian Context for the Sacrifice of Abraham,” *Journal of the Book of Mormon and Other Restoration Scripture* 20, no. 2 (2011): 70-77.
78. Marc Coenen, “An Introduction to the Document of Breathing Made by Isis,” *Revue d’Égypte* 49 (1998): 37-45. Note Coenen’s discussion, 40-41, of this text’s relationship to the Book of the Dead, the fact that

at least seven copies of this text are combined with other funerary and liturgical texts, 42-43, and Coenen's description, 41, of the vignette in P. Joseph Smith I as "a well-known scene of the Osiris mysteries." On this last point, compare Coenen's remarks here with his comments in "The Dating of the Papyri Joseph Smith I, X and XI," 1103, where he indicates this vignette is "frequently represented on temple walls," but has "no parallels on papyrus." Compare also Coenen's comments on the relationship between the Book of the Dead and the Book of Breathings with Gee, "The Book of the Dead as Canon," 27. See also Marc Coenen, "On the Demise of the Book of the Dead in Ptolemaic Thebes," *Revue d'Égypte* 52 (2001): 69-84.

79. Besides having served as an inspirational element in Joseph Smith's Nauvoo Temple liturgy (cf. Facsimile 2, Explanations 3, 7-11), the book of Abraham's narrative (cf. Abraham 1:1-3, 26-27) and cosmology (Abraham 3-5) also fits nicely in an ancient temple context. See generally Hugh Nibley, "The Meaning of the Temple," in *Temple and Cosmos* (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1992), 1-41; "Abraham's Creation Drama," in *The Temple in Time and Eternity*, 1-42; Matthew B. Brown and Paul Thomas Smith, *Symbols in Stone: Symbolism of the Early Temples of the Restoration* (American Fork, UT: Covenant Communications, 1997), 97-102; Matthew B. Brown, *The Gate of Heaven: Insights on the Doctrines and Symbols of the Temple* (American Fork, UT: Covenant Communications, 1999), esp. 1-55; Stephen O. Smoot, "Council, Chaos, and Creation in the Book of Abraham," *Journal of the Book of Mormon and Other Restoration Scripture* 22, no. 2 (2013): 28-39.
80. We are aware of forthcoming research being undertaken by Gee and Muhlestein that may shed significant light on which roll of papyrus may have been considered by Joseph Smith and his associates as having contained the book of Abraham. Suffice it to say for now that the assumption heretofore held by many that the scroll of Hor was the source of the book of Abraham may very well fall into question when this forthcoming research is published.
81. Muhlestein, "Abraham, Isaac, and Osiris-Michael," 251. Consider also Coenen's remark that "[t]he relationship between the vignettes and the text [of the Book of Breathings] is not straightforward. The Hathor-cow, for example, plays an important role in the end vignette typical of this composition, though this goddess is nowhere mentioned in the text of the Document of Breathings. The vignettes

are not meant to illustrate the content of the composition, but rather add new elements to the text.” See Coenen, “An Introduction to the Document of Breathing Made by Isis,” 41. Is it thus really so implausible to suggest the possibility that the book of Abraham, including one or more of its accompanying illustrations, was adapted as a “new element” for the eclectic Hor’s Book of Breathings or vice versa? On this point, see Kevin L. Barney, “The Facsimiles and Semitic Adaptation of Existing Sources,” in *Astronomy, Papyrus, and Covenant*, ed. John Gee and Brian M. Hauglid (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2005), 107-30.

82. Strictly speaking, Von Lieven is convinced the spells of the Book of the Dead had *Sitze im Leben*, or multiple uses by the living, including, but not limited to, the temple. See Von Lieven, “Book of the Dead, Book of the Living,” 264-67. Nevertheless, that the Book of the Dead had at least a *Sitz im Leben* in the temple is readily apparent.
83. Von Lieven, “Book of the Dead, Book of the Living,” 264.
84. Gee, “The Use of the Daily Temple Liturgy,” 86.