

THE

BABYLONIAN & ORIENTAL RECORD:

A Monthly Magazine of the Antiquities of the East.

DIRECTOR:

PROF. TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE, Ph. & Litt.D.

CONSULTING COMMITTEE:

THEO. G. PINCHES, WM. C. CAPPER, W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN,
and PROF. C. DE HARLEZ, LL.D. (CONTINENTAL CORRESPONDENT.)

ASSISTANT EDITOR: REV. H. M. MACKENZIE.

VOLUME SEVENTH.—September, 1893, to August, 1894.

LONDON.

D. NUTT,
FOREIGN AND CLASSICAL BOOKSELLER,
270, STRAND, W.C.

LUZAC & CO.
46, GREAT RUSSELL ST., W.C.
(Opposite the British Museum).

PARIS: Ernest Leroux, 28, rue Bonaparte. LOUVAIN: J. B. Istaș.

Yearly Subscription 12/6.

- has been preserved to the present day.
- 1075) *Liang shu*, 54, 1. Cf. supra note 912 on an introduction of Buddhist Books in 2 B.C.; and par. 233.
- 1076) *Hou Han shu*.—Pauthier, *Examen Methodique*, p. 266.—The place of arrival in this case is not mentioned. It may have been inland.
- 1077) An Shi-kao, a Buddhist Missionary from Parthia who had arrived in China by the North in 149 A.D., went before 170 A.D. to Canton to see other Missionaries, but he was killed there by the people. Cf. S. Beal, *Buddhist Literature*, 7; Bunyu Na jio, *Tripitaka*, 381.
- 1078) *Hou Han shu*: Hitan-ti tchuan.—W. Williams, *Middl Kingdom*, ii, 409.—Subsequent arrivals are noticed in 357, 428, 477, 502, 504, 507, 508, 515, 571, 641, &c. The gap between 159 and 357 is rather remarkable.
- 1079) Cf. Ed. Balfour, *Cyclop. Ind.*, ii, 481.
- 1080) Cf. A. Weber, Ueber das *Çatrunjaya Mahatmyam*; Abh. D.M.G. 1858, i, 4, p. 43; L. Redatsek, *Emporia*, p. 111.
- 1081) Modern *O-wen*, crow-ornament.—Cf. Ts'ui Pao, *Ku kin tchu*.—Kang-tai, *Funam tu suh tchuan*.—T.P.Y.L. 961, 9 v.; 787, 4.

TERRIEN DE LACOPERIE.

(To be continued).

THE GREAT PYRAMID AND THE BOOK OF THE DEAD.

THE December number of the *New Review* contained a curious and interesting article by Mr. Marsham Adams entitled "The Mystery of Ancient Egypt." After so much that has been said and written on the occult significance of the Great Pyramid, it is astonishing to find a perfectly new and original theory propounded on the subject, and defended with no small amount of ingenuity and learning. According to Mr. Adams the Great Pyramid, more particularly in its interior arrangements, symbolises the doctrines contained in the "Book of the Dead," in the order in which those doctrines are presented to us in the well-known Turin papyrus. Such a theory necessarily requires an immense amount of elaboration and sustained proof before it can be accepted, and we may take it for granted that Mr. Adams does not wish to rest his case on this article alone, but intends to supplement it by others. It would therefore be premature as yet to attempt a complete refutation of his arguments, but I wish to

point out in this paper a few facts concerning the nature of the "Book of the Dead," which tend to show that he is mistaken.

THE TITLE OF THE BOOK OF THE DEAD.

In the pictorial representations of Egyptian funerals which have come down to us, it is not an uncommon thing to see a priest depicted reading from a papyrus, which no doubt contains some Funeral Ritual. In the early days of Egyptology this Ritual was identified by scholars with the "Book of the Dead," many chapters of which are certainly fitted for such a purpose; some of them even possessing rubrics which give directions for their recitation. But this idea is now generally abandoned, for the reasons that all the copies we know have invariably been found deposited in the interior of coffins, or carved on the sides of sarcophagi, or on the walls of tombs; and that it is evident from the wording of the chapters that they were, for the most part, intended to be recited by the deceased in the other world. The idea of a Ritual having therefore been rejected, the work has, for the sake of convenience, been vaguely designated by modern writers, "not very happily," Mr. Adams thinks, "The Book of the Dead." There is, however, another possible title, which may very likely have been given to it at one time by the Egyptians themselves. The first chapter of the Turin papyrus is headed "Beginning of the chapters of *per em hru*," and the chapters which follow the hundred and sixty second are said to be "appended to the *per em hru*"; so that it would seem the scribe used *per em hru* as the title of by far the greater part of the book, namely, chapters I-CLXII. The exact meaning of this title is however somewhat doubtful. Mr. Adams, departing from the usual translation, renders it "Way of Illumination," but this seems hardly to be correct.

The sense of an Egyptian word or phrase is determined by a comparison of the different contexts in which it occurs, and for such a comparison there is fortunately abundant material for the phrase in question. The following examples, taken from the headings of chapters in the Book of the Dead, suffice to prove the correctness of the usual interpretation, "Coming forth by Day."

I. Beginning of the chapters of coming-forth by day (*per em hru*).¹

XII. Chapter of going-in and coming-forth (*āq per*).¹

XIII. Chapter of going-in after coming-forth (*āq emkhet per*).¹

1) Lepsius, Todtenbuch, Plates, I., III., IV., VII.

XVII. Chapters of raising up the blessed, of coming-forth from, and entering the under-world (*per ha em neter kherti*).¹

XVII. Chapter of coming-forth by day from the under-world (*per em hru em neter kherti*).²

The two variants of Chapter XVII are very important, for while one shows the meaning of *per* to be "coming-forth" by the antithesis of *ha*, "entering," the other in the same passage, employs the full phrase *per em hru*. It may perhaps be thought that after all "Coming forth by Day" does not yield such good sense as "Way of Illumination," but it is nevertheless an expression quite in accord with what we know of the mythology of the Ancient Egyptians. Their religious ideas were entirely centred in sun-worship, and their belief concerning the after-life was that the righteous dead were associated with the sun-god and shared his existence. So when the sun set they too entered the under-world, and when he rose again they came forth by day. Thus the *Shai-an-Sensen* declares that the dead man "sees the sun in its setting," and "enters the horizon with the sun;" his face "is illuminated near the sun;" each day he awakens, he sees the rays of the sun, and "comes on earth: each day."³

The chapters of the "Book of the Dead," therefore, which are entitled chapters of *per em hru* have no deep occult significance such as seems to be implied by the translation "Way of Illumination"; they simply contain a number of magic formulas, which if thoroughly well known by the deceased will enable him to enter the under-world and to come forth from it as the sun does.

THE BOOK OF THE DEAD NOT AN ORGANIC WHOLE.

Although scholars speak of the "Book of the Dead" as if it were a clearly defined work with a recognised number of chapters, all contributing to form an organic whole, this is only for the sake of convenience, and has no foundation in actual fact. The different funeral papyri which we class under the heading of the "Book of the Dead" bear to one another almost exactly the same relation as exists between the different hymn books in use in England. The collection called "Church Hymns"

1) Lepsius, *Todtenbuch*, Plates II., III., IV., VII.

2) Lepsius, *Aelteste Texte*, p. 26, and Plate I., line 1.

3) See *Records of the Past*, Vol. IV, pp. 121-128. Perhaps instead of "thy face is illuminated near the sun" we should read "thy soul gives light near the sun;" cf. Brugsch, "*Sai-an-Sinsin*."

omits some of the hymns contained in "Hymns Ancient and Modern," and vice versâ. Even those hymns which are common to both do not occur in the same order in each collection, and there are also sometimes verbal differences between them. But these are only two books out of an immense number, each of which possesses certain points of agreement with some of the others, and at the same time presents certain differences. It is the same with the different copies of the "Book of the Dead." There is always omitted from any given copy a large number of chapters which are found in others, and chapters which are found in others, and chapters which are common to two papyri do not occur in the same order in each. So far as we know the Egyptians possessed no such thing as a standard edition; that is, one containing all the chapters arranged in a certain recognised order. Yet Mr. Adams appears to treat the Turin papyrus as if it were such an edition. "Book in hand," he says, "let us ascend the western side of the northern face" of the Great Pyramid. "Then reciting chapter by chapter as we mount course by course, we approach at the fifteenth step a gateway two courses yet above us, just as the Departed in the fifteenth chapter" (i.e. of the Turin papyrus) "approaches the 'Gate of the Gateway,'" and so forth. But suppose that instead of taking the Turin papyrus in hand we took the important papyrus of Ani, and recited that chapter by chapter. Then at the fifteenth step we should be reading not the fifteenth chapter of the Turin papyrus, but either the sixty-first or the fifty-eighth,¹ while at the seventeenth step we should come to either the twenty-ninth or the forty-fourth chapter.¹

This would at once destroy the whole theory. On what grounds then does Mr. Adams make use of the Turin papyrus instead of that of Ani, or any other copy of the Book of the Dead? Presumably, as I have already said, he considers it a standard edition, possessing an authority superior to that of every other. We must therefore submit the copy to a short examination in order to ascertain whether there is any reason for so regarding it.

THE TURIN PAPYRUS.

The Museum of Turin contains a very important collection of Egyptian antiquities. Among these Champollion, the great pioneer of hier-

1) I do not know whether Mr. Adams would recognise the initial chapters in the papyrus of Ani, and am therefore unable to tell which of the alternative numbers given in the text he would consider correct.

oglyphical interpretation, discovered an exceedingly lengthy funeral papyrus, the value of which he was not slow to recognise. In 1842 a copy of this papyrus was published by Lepsius, who divided it according to the data supplied by the manuscript itself, into 165 chapters. The length of the text, the comparatively careful style of the script, and the convenient form in which it is published, have given this copy so great a reputation among Egyptologists, that it certainly has become, for them, what may be called a standard edition. At one time it was thought to be of great antiquity, in which case it might possibly have held a similar position among the Ancient Egyptians. But this idea is now quite exploded, and no scholar, at the present time, would think of dating it earlier than the seventh century B.C. Still, whatever may be the date of the actual manuscript, it might of course be an exact copy of a much older one; but even this theory will not stand a strict examination. I have already shown the great difference between the order of the chapters in the Turin papyrus and those in the papyrus of Ani. Now this latter is seven hundred years older than the Turin copy.¹ Besides this, a large number of papyri, some of about the date of the papyrus of Ani and others a little later have been collated by M. Naville, and a comparison of the result of this collation with the Turin papyrus reveals the following curious facts. There are more than twenty chapters in the older manuscripts which do not appear in the Turin copy, while the latter inserts thirty which are unknown to the others. Is it more reasonable, in face of these facts, to suppose that the Turin papyrus is a copy of an older "standard" edition, the authority of which, for some reason or other, is not recognised by manuscripts which we know to be of early date, or that it is a collection made in comparatively recent times of most, but not all, of the chapters known to be ancient, combined with some of later origin?

There can surely be but one answer to this question. Our conclusion moreover is confirmed by internal evidence from the Turin papyrus itself. I have said above that it is composed of 165 chapters, but of these no less than six are duplicates. Thus

Chapter 48 is identical with Chapter 10

111	„	„	108
120	„	„	12
121	„	„	13

1) See Renouf, Facsimile of the Papyrus of Ani, pp. 5, 6.

129	„	„	100
139	„	„	123. ¹

This is exactly what we might expect to find in the work of an unskilful compiler, nor can it be easily accounted for in any other way.

Again, it has been almost universally recognised that the first sixteen chapters form a complete book in themselves. Chapter I as we saw above, has no special title of its own, but only the general heading "Beginning of the chapters of coming forth by day." This heading is evidently intended to include all chapters up to the fifteenth which concludes the work with a hymn in praise of the solar gods. Chapter XVI contains no text at all, but merely consists of a few vignettes, conspicuous among which are views of the rising and setting of the sun, which serve to illustrate the "coming-forth from and entering the underworld" spoken of in the preceding chapters. A doubly-ruled line sharply divides Chapter XVI from Chapter XVII. This again like the first chapter has no special title of its own, but only a general heading for a number of chapters; but how far this fresh book extends it is impossible to say precisely. The title of Chapter LXIV. seems to imply that it was considered complete in itself, for it is called a "Chapter of coming-forth by day, *in one chapter.*" Many of the other chapters are not so styled at all in the Egyptian, but "books"; a title which clearly shows that at one time they must have been regarded as separate and independent compositions.

Thus we see from an inspection of the Turin copy itself that it is a compilation made from many different sources, a fact which necessarily implies its comparatively late origin. I have moreover shown above that the order of the chapters which it adopts rests on no ancient authority whatever, but on the contrary is in very many respects at variance with what we find in much earlier copies. It is not too much to say that the arrangement which prevails in the Turin papyrus is three thousand years later than the time when the Great Pyramid was built; and any theory which attempts to connect the two is inevitably fore-doomed to failure.

THE RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES OF THE BOOK OF THE DEAD.

We have seen above that the cardinal doctrine of the eschatology of the Egyptians was the association of the righteous dead with the sun. Now the idea of the Sun as god presented itself to their minds in many

1) There are sometimes slight verbal differences between these parallel chapters, but to all intents and purposes they are identical.

different aspects, and for each of these aspects they imagined a more or less independent divinity. Thus it comes about that most of the Egyptian gods have a solar basis, and many even of those which were originally of an entirely different origin, came at length to be identified with the Sun. To this latter class probably belongs the god Ausari (the Osiris of the Greek writers), who is unquestionably the most important of the numerous deities who are mentioned in the "Book of the Dead." It would doubtless be not impossible to point out here and there isolated passages in which the dead man is identified in turn with each of the solar gods, but his identification with Ausari is permanent. Wherever his name occurs the name Ausari is written in front of it. "I am yesterday" he declares, "I am kin to the morning";¹ by which is meant that he is Ausari, the sun which has set, and the father of Heru, the sun which has risen high in the heavens. If the goddesses Ausit and Nebit-hat (Isis and Nephthys) weep over him, it is because he is their brother Ausari; if Heru assists him against his enemies, it is because Heru is the son of Ausari. In the judgment scene in the papyrus of Ani we see "Ausari" Ani after he has been acquitted of sin, introduced by Heru into the presence of Ausari. The identification of the deceased with this particular god runs in fact right through the "Book of the Dead," and is one of the best established facts in connection with the Egyptian religion. And yet it seems probable that there was a time in the history of Egypt when men did not think of Ausari as god of the dead, but that office was held by another deity. It was the pious custom of the Egyptians to carve over the entrance to the tomb or upon some memorial tablet an inscription praying some particular god or gods to grant refreshment to the ghost of the deceased. In later times these prayers were addressed to any deity whom the relatives of the dead man preferred; but the earliest are all addressed to the jackal god Anpu. The titles which are given him place his funeral character beyond a doubt. He is called "dweller in the necropolis," and "ruler of the great hall," that is, of the under-world. The prominence given to him in this connection effectually precludes the idea that in very early times, say down to the end of the Fourth Dynasty (circa B.C. 3566); Ausari was considered the god of the dead, or that the dead could have been thought of as identified with him. It is quite possible that he was worshipped at that period, but the idea which the Egyptians had of him was not the same as that

1) Lepsius Todtenbuch Chap. XVII line 5; Chap. LXIV line 1.

which they held later. Until very recently this view could not have been maintained, for on the coffin of Menkaurā (who reigned circa B.C. 3633-3600) the deceased monarch is expressly identified with Ausari, but this coffin has now been shown to be of very late date¹.

Let us now sum up this portion of the argument. I have shown that the identification of the deceased with Ausari forms the key-note of the entire "Book of the Dead," and that this doctrine cannot be supposed to have existed before circa B.C. 3566. The Book of the Dead cannot therefore have existed in any form before that date. But Mr. Adams fixes the date of the foundation of the Great Pyramid circa B.C. 3700. How then can the Great Pyramid symbolise doctrines which had no existence until about a century and a half later?

THE PYRAMID TEXTS.

In his article Mr. Adams deals with the Great Pyramid only, and pays no attention to the numerous other pyramids which are scattered over the plains of Lower Egypt. But from the time of Khufu down to the end of the Sixth Dynasty every king who reigned over Egypt built one of these vast edifices to serve as his final resting-place, and there seems no reason why in this any more than in any other branch of study, the *comparative* method should be ignored. If then, instead of examining one of the pyramids only, we study them collectively, we notice a development in the minds of the builders, which is parallel to what we know of the development of Egyptian civilisation in other directions. The very earliest pyramids are absolutely devoid of any inscriptions, (unless we count a few rude masons' scrawls as such,) and even the coffins which reposed in them bore only a simple architectural ornamentation, without any trace of those numerous funeral texts which were afterwards so common among the Egyptians. But towards the end of the Fifth Dynasty, that is to say, circa B.C. 3383, the custom arose of adorning the interior of the royal tombs with long texts having reference to burial and the after-life. Now if the theory propounded by Mr. Adams were correct, and the interior of the Great Pyramid really symbolised to the initiate the doctrines contained in the "Book of the Dead," should we not expect these later-pyramid texts to tell us in plain words what before had only been dimly shadowed forth in masonry? Instead of this, however, the pyramid texts afford us what Mr. Adams is so eager to discover in the

1) "Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache," 1892; and "Knowledge," Dec. 1893.

“Book of the Dead,” namely, a true Funeral Ritual. “They formed part” says M. Maspéro, “of one of the most complicated of rituals, whose directions were scrupulously observed in everything relating to the consecration of the tomb, the ceremonies of burial, and those of the commemorative services which were celebrated every year on a fixed date in honour of the dead.¹ Prescribed prayers and invocations to the deceased are amusingly jumbled up with ceremonial directions to the officiating priests. “Perfume, perfume! Open thy mouth, oh! Unas—*perfume of the South, three grains of Nekheb*—and taste the taste of the perfume in the divine dwellings.”² In another place, in the midst of a solemn assurance to the deceased that his sins are taken away is a direction for the use of water as an emblem of purification, and many other similar instructions, inserted in the text which is to be recited, leave no doubt as to the ritual and ceremonial character of the whole. These important inscriptions contain doctrines, ideas, and phrases which are to be met with in Egypt through all the succeeding ages, even down to the times of the Roman dominion. It is surely a significant fact that they are found written on the walls of the chambers and corridors of not one but many pyramids, all of which were built at a time to which we cannot refer one single copy of the “Book of the Dead,” whether written on papyrus or carved on the sides of a coffin. Can we believe that another pyramid, built three centuries and a half previously, had ignored these favourite texts, and was constructed instead so as to symbolise the doctrines of a book which we have no grounds for believing to have been yet in existence?

MINOR CRITICISMS.

Before concluding, there are one or two slips in Mr. Adams' article, to which I should like to call attention. Thus, for instance, he is by no means happy in his statement that the pyramidal form enters into the hieroglyphic name of the star Sothis or Sirius. This is most certainly incorrect, as a careful comparison of the respective forms will show. The hieroglyph for pyramid [not for the pyramid of Khufu specially] is usually an equilateral triangle standing on a platform. Sometimes the triangle may approximate to the form found in the name of Sirius, but it is never found without its distinctive platform. The hieroglyph forming part of the name of Sirius is however an isosceles triangle, and

1) *Revue de l' Histoire des Religions*, XV, p. 159.

2) *Recueil de travaux*, III, p. 183.

does not stand on a platform. This fact alone would be sufficient to show that the two signs referred to by Mr. Adams cannot be identical. But there is a stronger argument still. These signs belong to different classes, one being ideographic or pictorial, and the other syllabic. The pyramidal form is simply a picture of a pyramid, but the triangle *in the name of Sirius* is expressive of the sound *sept*, which is the Egyptian word for that star, and has no ideographic value whatever. Like all the hieroglyphs, the triangle is doubtless primarily an ideographic sign; but it is only ideographic when it means a triangle. Its use in spelling the name of Sirius is an example of a law which is universally recognised by Egyptologists. An ideographic sign must of course be pronounced in reading, and in this way comes to be the representative of the sound so given to it, quite apart from its original ideographic value. Thus the word *sept* meant not only a "triangle" and "Sirius," but also "protection" and "wheat"; and accordingly the triangle appears in the spelling of each, obviously expressing in all but the first simply the sound *sept*. I may observe that this argument also shows us that even if the pyramidal form were found in the name of Sirius it would not necessarily follow from that fact that there existed any rational relationship between the star and the Great Pyramid.

It should also be pointed out that the pyramidal form can hardly be said to be used in the *name* of Khufu, nor was its use at all peculiar to him. He simply wrote the name of his pyramid after his own, as did most of the kings of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Dynasties.

Mr. Adams has also fallen into a somewhat curious blunder in his first quotation from the "Book of the Dead." He quotes correctly enough "This book is the Greatest of Mysteries. Do not let the eye of anyone see it: that were abomination." This appears, however, in Chapter CLXII, that is to say the *last* of those which the writer of the Turin manuscript classed among the *per em hru*, and not in the *first* chapter as Mr. Adams states. Of the existence of this hundred and sixty-second chapter in early times there is not the slightest trace. It is of so late a date that not one of the papyri used by M. Naville contains it, although he brought his investigations down to such a comparatively late date as the Twentieth Dynasty (circa B.C. 1200-1100). This chapter, indeed, appears to form one group with those three others, CLXIII—CLXV, which are expressly stated to form a book "appended to the *per em hru*," and are thus stamped as of late date. They belong to a time when magic had to a large extent usurped the place of religion, and when secrecy,

so utterly at variance with what we know of the spirit of the early times, was gradually establishing itself in the temples and in the sacred writings.

CONCLUSION.

In the preceding pages I have endeavoured to show from an examination of the "Book of the Dead," why in the present state of our knowledge the theory propounded by Mr. Adams appears to me to be improbable, if not impossible. But in a study like Egyptology, which is still in a somewhat unsettled and tentative state, it would be highly unsafe to dogmatise. Future discoveries may perhaps teach us new facts which will throw quite a different light on the subject. But it must be remembered that until the discoveries are made the facts must not be assumed.

ALFRED C. BRYANT.

NOTES AND NEWS.

MIGRATIONS FROM WEST TO EAST.—The Migration of the TORGUTHS in 1772 from Russia to China has been quoted as evidence in favour of the Migration of the BAK SINGS from Anterior Asia to China about 2300 B.C. But as the people in question had been banished from the Chinese dominion only some time before, and as they came back to their ancient possessions on the invitation of the Chinese Emperor, their case is somewhat different from that of the early civilisers of the Middle Kingdom. Another instance much more satisfactory in that respect is that of the TURKS SALAR. Their bulk forms still at present one of the Eight Nations of the Turkomans, east of Meshed, on the Road to Bokhara. During the MING dynasty a part of them, driven from their country by internal discords, migrated to the Tibetan borders of N. China. In 1370 three or four of them arrived from Samarkand to the banks of the Yellow River, and founded the present Salar head-village of Katze kun (about 80 miles from Kimbun-Lusar); they were rapidly followed by others of their countrymen, and now the villages they occupy are 75 or 100 in number, with a population estimated at 8000 families at the lowest. (Cf. *Description de la Chine Occidentale*, trad. Gueluy : Muséon, Avril, 1886, p. 238-46; Girard de Rialle, *Asie Centrale*, 2, p. 105; Woodville Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, and *J.R.A.S.* Jul. 1892, p. 592). T. de L.