

TWO REFLECTIONS ON THE ROLE
OF
EGYPT

- I. Sun or Horizon?
The Distribution of Cosmic and Historical
Facts in Egypt's Orientation
- II. Eye of Horus? Eye for Osiris?
The Dialectics between Clans and
Empire in Egypt's Liturgy

* * *

Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy

Preface

The two following Reflections were written after nine years of extensive research in the sources and intensive study of the whole literature, and after an intensive stay in the Nile Valley. Although presented in two parts, they are meant to form a unity. They deal with the two most controversial topics of Egyptology: Why Pyramids? and, Who is Osiris? The result is: the orientation of the pyramids and the liturgy of Osiris are inseparable. Both together have lifted Egypt above clans and nomadic life, and they have created an inmissible phase of our own cultural development.

* - *

First Reflection:

Sun or Horizon?

The Distribution of Cosmic
and of
Historical Facts in Egypt's Orientation

In his treatment of the Dramatic Texts in Edfu, Etienne Beaton has restored the beautiful verses in which "Les Riverains" see Horus rise like Sothis on New Year's Day and like the Moon in a mild night. By his happy coinage of "Les Riverains," for the Fellaheen I was reminded of the story told by Maspéro. When Emil Brugsch, on a government boat, carried the royal mummies from Thebes off to Cairo, "Les Riverains," men and women

alike, stood on the banks of the Nile, lamenting, cursing, threatening. In both scenes Les Riverains watch a spectacle beyond their reach. In both scenes, the cosmic and the historical directions of Egypt stand out in wonderful contrast. Let us begin then by underscoring this contrast.

For the Riverains the Nile divides their lands, their movements, their daily lives into an Eastern and a Western part. The deserts, however, press so closely on the ribbon of cultivation from both sides that the Nile, which halves this ribbon, cannot act as a barrier. It remains a bridge. Always the boats ferry the people hither and thither. As the sun goes from East to West, as the moon and the stars go, so do the unhistorical settlers in the Nile Valley find themselves in a perpetual movement across the river. But their movements always proceed in both directions, from West to East as much as from East to West. Hence the attribution of a West-East movement of the sun during the night is a natural projection of any "Riverain's" experience with his river. The same rocking movement of the cradle goes on in Cairo and Assuan, in Abydos and Thebes. It is ubiquitous and it does not depend on any history of central government or political or religious institutions. It does not depend on the existence of a common faith or language or script. The East-West and West-East crossing is the immediate cosmic experience of "a-historic" man who finds himself placed in the space of the Nile valley, whether in 7000 B.C. or in 1950 A.D.

This experience is then "pre-historic" not only in the sense of prehistorical excavations. It is pre-historic for any child of man who enters life in Egypt tomorrow as well as

Since the term 'pre-historic' is laden with scientific connotations, and since 'a-historic' is perhaps obscure, I shall simply call this experience 'direct experience.' By direct experience I mean: a man can have it without anybody having to interpret it to him beforehand, without his having to develop a theory about it, without his having to express its meaning to others. Millions of people live by this unencumbered experience of the Nile, never leaving their neighborhood yet perfectly accustomed to crossing the river. Innumerable peasants have never been twenty miles to the North or South. But they do cross the River without such ado. The Riverains then, 2800 B.C. and 1880 A.D. are rooted between East and West, Sunrise and Sunset. But they watch a very different spectacle which goes on on their river. It does not go on every day. This spectacle for their eyes takes them beyond the ordinary. The government from Cairo or the Union of the Two Lands from Memphis can only be experienced in extraordinary ways as they cannot be experienced directly by the Riverains. The very names for Memphis, for Cairo, for government, for Union, eye for Land, must first be heard and understood before anybody in Egypt can interpret the meaning of their movements either North or South of the navigating ships. Here, then, we have no direct, a-historic, preliminary experience. Because the Riverains themselves don't mean these boats Dorus and Drugsch Pasha convey an experience only when their position in the organization of Egypt is explicitly stated and told to every new generation of "Riverains." It has to be made explicit while the East-West bridge is implicit. The South-North navigation and the North-South Navigation

take men beyond the expanse of their five senses, far beyond the next bend of the river. They take men into the frame of a space which is abstract, of movements which threaten change, of history which happens neither every day nor to everybody. All the experiences of the Nile as a challenge between North and South are a spectacle to the Riverains and therefore something indirect. It must be mediated to them by faith in others, by names and holidays, signs and rites. Horus, Sothis, the central government and the very concept of Egypt are indirect and therefore purely historical experiences. They must be explicitly stated. Here the word must precede the act while in a direct and cosmic experience the act may seem to precede the word. Hence any solar cult in Egypt cannot help being predominantly supported by everybody's tacit, individual and direct experience, since sun and day are experienced tacitly, directly and individually. Any South-North and North-South movement on the other hand, will have to be supported by collective and mediated experience and it must be stated and expressed before it can make sense.

To this day, then, the name Egypt as a historical name depends on the South-North experiences. These experiences need not happen. The union can be destroyed. Nubia or the Delta can be cut off. Then the very name of Egypt is in danger.

The problems of Egypt therefore are always twofold: 1) to create a collective explicit experience from Assuan to the Delta, and 2) to reconcile this collective and historical experience which combines South and North, with the individual sensual experiences in the sky and on the Nile which go on incessantly between East and West. For this reason, Horus, not Ra, Sothis the star of the year, not the star of the day, had to be injected historically

into the Nile valley to life it above accident. On the other hand, Horus and Sothis alone could never do for the common man. Horus and Sothis had to be reconciled time and again to the lords of daily life, to the march of Ra over the Horizon and the sailing of the Pellaheon across the Nile.

Horus and horizon are two responses to the historical challenge of creating an Egypt at all. Horus and Horizon, therefore, were not ideas or gods in Egypt, but the two perpetual steps which had to be enacted to lift the children of the sun and the River into history.

The Horizon reconciles the daily experiences of the Riverains and the historical movements of a central government. Horus represents the first specific historical movements which have to be superimposed on the "solar" horizon of the Riverains lest they remain outside history. The Horizon is the atonement between the individual tacit experiences of the anonymous millions and the collective explicit enactments of the noble Followers of Horus. These elements had to be blended to create the concept which we call Ancient Egypt.

Hence we should expect to find the term "horizon" to be more than a cosmic or a political term. We should find it to be the "peace term" between nature and society. And so we find it indeed. In these studies, this preoccupation with the Horizon is shown in our sources. But two prejudices and one scientific concept have obscured this. Prejudice one: "Solarists" declared that "Horizon" was a purely solar term. Prejudice two: Anthropologists tried to explain the Pyramids and the Hieroglyphs of Egypt by

Nilotic tribalism. The concept "skyworld" finally, which has been employed, is not found in our sources. In the first case, "Horizon" was a mere appurtenance of sun worship. In the second case, the early signs for the followers of Horus and for the horizon became tribal emblems and the symbols of pre-dynastic religions. In the third case, the philologists and excavators balked at the "arbitrary" modern concept of a "skyworld." Is it possible to unite us all?

Down to the days of Rahnaton and Moses, Egypt's growth was in the advance of civilization, and its conscience was clear. After Rahnaton's reform failed and Moses had left Egypt, Egypt was visited by one restoration after another. Its good conscience as the standard bearer of truth and discovery was gone. If we listen to the whole history from the first dynasty to Moses, we may find a uniform vocabulary for the three elements we have been looking for.

The phenomenon of which I have to speak, "the Horizon," plays a decisive role in the whole period between Menes and Moses. It loses its sting after Rahnaton's end. This is not without significance. After Rahnaton and Moses, Egypt had to go reactionary and counterrevolutionist, with the reign of Horehab. For the first time, every ray of life had to be rejected. Deliberate efforts were made to exclude and to crush novelty. From 1320 B.C. to 395 A.D. Egypt could not advance but was on the defensive. It could only preserve; it could not create.

If then the Horizon was a vital issue between the days of Menes and Moses it was vital to the whole period in which Egypt grew and its faith unfolded. The Horizon stands in the center of all formative processes in Egypt. The decision to call this dominating concept "achet," "Horizon," is made by any scholar who deals with Egyptian sources. It is not necessary that he knows the significance

of Achet. Simply by the way he speaks of pyramids or nomes or temples or the sun he implicitly passes judgment on the question: Was Achet a solar concept or was the Horizon a further concept beyond the sun, in its own right?

I shall now offer my own answer to this question in an attempt to make Egyptology conscious of its omnipresence in the field. But let me repeat that I wish to proceed as an outsider of your science. I have therefore not as great an interest in my answer as in the introduction of my questions into the field. Although I have to speak for a moment armed with as much of the scholarship of Egyptology as I can muster, I shall gladly lay down my arms as soon as "Horizon" is recognized by all Egyptologists as a central problem. And what is a central problem? It is central if it can move the specialists out of their appointed grooves and reorganize research on new and promising lines. Hence it is not as a logical center of any system, but as a dynamic centripetal force in the search of the truth that the question of the relation between Horus, Ra, and Achet appears to me as an urgent problem. I myself then shall be happy to be defeated in my answers if the question penetrates from my voluntary "outsider" into the jealously guarded community of experts.

Three phases of our question can be distinguished: the days of Aha and Harer; the days of Esmer, Snefry and Chufu; the days of Schematon and Amen. The concept of the Horizon takes three widely differing forms in these three periods. The first form is that of the standards which surround the ruler in the first dynasty. The second form is the pyramids in the great days of the Old Kingdom. The third form is the District City built by Schematon around El Amarna.

This identity has not played a part in the scholarly treatment of any of these three forms. The three phenomena have been isolated from each other. What were the results? 1) The standards around the ruler have been explained as the emblems of "local" gods or by comparisons with the degenerate modern tribes of Africa.

2) Since the pyramids had to be explained out of themselves, they were either hailed as the key to the world's secrets, or -- by pragmatic cynics -- they were dismissed as the attempt of primitive man to build a mountain!

3) Since Akhenaten's work was isolated, his city of El Amarna and the style of his art received the lion's share of attention. His "Horizon" was, of course, mentioned and examined but it was not put to use as a further proof for the compulsory force of the "Horizon" in Egypt's history.

A fourth and even more revolutionary form of the same question appeared in the exodus of Israel from Egypt. It led Moses outside Egypt. Still, it had originated in Egypt. Moses was an Egyptian in the same sense in which Marx was a Hegelian. "The Horizon" was the driving power behind the first sentence of Genesis. The question of the Horizon, then, connects Egypt with post-Egypt. But it also relates Egypt to all tribal life. With the help of a "Horizon" Egypt erected its structure. By its mastery of the horizon it staved off the tribalisms of its neighbors and its own "Rivergods." In the term "Achet," by which we replace "Skyworld," we reconcile the efforts of modern research with the terminology of our sources. With the term "Achet" we also challenge the "Solarists" who see nothing but sun cults and the anthropologists who explain Egypt by the primitive orders which she superseded.

What is pre-Egyptian and what is post-Egyptian, then, is bound up with the Horizon. The pre-Egyptian groups did not have it.

learn to read it. When that is the case one must not be eager to know this one differentia specifica which made Egypt into Egypt?

Was this specificum just sun worship, solar beliefs and rites? Or was the horizon some much more comprehensive order than the prostration of superstitious savages before the star of every day?

Heinrich Schäfer has drawn attention to a text which neatly sums up the problem. It says of the sun: "He traverses the breadth of the length of the sky!" the length of the length of the sky, in other words, is not for the sun to traverse. The Man-God Pharaoh must do this.

The Man-God with whom we may conveniently deal first is Akhnaten. If anybody worshipped the sun, he did. And we do read in the books that he was monotheistic in his cult of the solar disk. He forwent his privilege of becoming Osiris after death and wanted to be buried on the easternmost line of the valley instead of the Western Horizon. At the end of his reign he even gave up the dynamic ritual of Horus coming up from the south against Seth.

But even Akhnaten did not simply prostrate himself before the sun. He built a temple of 1.1 kilometers square. This sanctuary he started out by famous statues on the edge of the desert. To this sanctuary he gave the name Akhet, Horizon. He took an oath not to build outside this Akhet. His god, then, was brought by him into this Horizon. Akhnaten was the ruler of Egypt who did not wish to move his horizon perpetually during life, like Horus, or to rest after death inside his horizon, like Osiris. Instead he decided to act like a man already dead and to remain inside a stabilized horizon which he had determined for Aton.

"The breadth of the length" of this his heaven was the

extent of the Nile valley from cliff to cliff of the deserts. Amenhotep III. asserted on his boundary stelae that the distance from East to West, in his Achet, was the same in the North, in the South, and in the middle. Modern measurement has proven his point. His mistake was less than 1/1000. This feat of surveying was accomplished in a most irregular terrain. It demonstrates well the steady increase of knowledge and techniques in the art of contemplation achieved since the Great Pyramid was laid out.

It is no point to compare Amenhotep III's Achet and the Great Pyramid. For one was meant to replace the other: Achet was the name of the pyramid of Chufu. Amenhotep III's district took over the function of a pyramid. Instead of a building erected on a base 768 feet square, a district was meted out 4000 cubits square. Hence the next question seems to arise. Since the early pyramidal Horizons stand near the point of union of the two lands, where did Amenhotep III place his Horizon? He tells us that he acted under god's command. Also, Horus of the two Horizons of Light was his god when he selected the site. Hence our preliminary answer may well be: the choice of the site cannot have been an accident. It is possible that we cannot say more with any amount of certainty. But I venture to think that we can know more.

A. J. Huxford has reminded us recently of Setna's statement that in the beginning the Nome of Elephantine was perhaps not included in "Egypt" since its name means "Nubian land." Setna thought that Egypt proper might have been constituted from the temple of Horus the Behedite in Edfu, or thereabouts, instead of from the first cataract. A second point to be considered is that on the pyramidion of Khenzer of the XII Dynasty Horus the Behedite appears twice on each side, eight times in all, as securing the

Horizon, in which Horus wished to rest.

These two points point to the solution. Perhaps the Horizon of Akhnaton was laid out with regard to the northernmost and the southernmost point of domination over which Horus the Behedite flew and progressed and carried the sun-disk on his wings. Actually, from the Achet of Aton to the city of Behedit on the Mediterranean the distance is 500 - 521 kilometers and the distance from Akhnaton's district to Edfu is from 514.5 to 528.5 kilometers. Only these distances are the distances on the Nile. Akhnaton then lies half-way between the two points which represent Horus the Behedite and his disk-carrying wings in Egypt's topography. Thus was Akhnaton's worship of the Horus of the Two Horizons of the Disk translated into reality.

Of course, it is possible to treat this equation of the two gigantic distances as an accident. If as the habit is, a scholar specializes in the New Kingdom, he will not think that I have proven anything and will go on to speak to his readers of El Amarna instead of Achetaton. El Amarna lies somewhere in Egypt between Memphis and Thebes. Achetaton lies half-way between Edfu and Thebes.

The question is insoluble within the frame of reference given by the period of the New Kingdom. As a rank outsider of Egyptology, I am trying to ask a question which connects Egypt with universal history. I cannot be fought off by a New Kingdom logic, since I want to learn the specific Egyptian quality which I, per hypothesis, hope to find in the term Achet used by Akhnaton. I have a right to assume that Akhnaton placed his horizon in the abstract center of Egypt, 514 kilometers from both ends. In this

he acted very differently from the founder of Memphis. "Menes" united Delta and Nile valley at the point where these two different landscapes meet. Echnaton neglected the physical differences of the two regions. He computed the distances like the Frenchmen of the Revolution of 1789, that is by the abstract standard of a geometrical unit, the itro, the "length of the Nile." But though Echnaton's vision was abstract and that of Menes concrete, neither paid homage to the sun or to the other direct forces of the cosmos. Both Echnaton and Menes envisaged the historical union of Noon Egypt and Midnight Egypt, of South and North. The sun goes from East to West everywhere. The sun's "Horizon" then, could not reveal to Echnaton the choice of the god's Horizon. Only the respect for the historical creation of Egypt from Behedit to the Behedite could lead to the feat of surveying which elicited unbounded admiration from the British surveyors who tested his computations.

The Horizon of Echnaton is, then, the most perfect atonement between the cosmic East-West and the historical North-South ever achieved in Egypt. It was a static Horizon burying an immobilized Pharaoh, it is true. But just the same, it teaches us that the Horizon is a more elaborate concept than has hitherto been recognized.

This becomes clearer still when we go backward in time and ask ourselves against which Horizon Echnaton reacted in creating his god's "Achet."

Every pyramid is a horizon. "Horizon" was the name of Snofru's pyramid. "Priests of the Horizon of Chufu" were in charge of the Pyramid of Cheops. It has often been noted that the entrance of the pyramids was to the north. Perhaps we should more correctly

say that its exit was to the north, as the term "entrance" may not have been in the mind of the builders as much as the freedom of the builder of the pyramid to go true north. The pyramidions tell us this eloquently. Because of the "solar" preconception, the inscriptions on these capstones of the pyramids have not drawn much attention. Neither do the wild speculations on the mysteries of the pyramids mention these sober inscriptions nor do the scientific books on the pyramids (Lauer, Edwards, Grinsell) waste any time on them.

I find these inscriptions most instructive. Here the Horizon himself is made to speak! Horus of the Horizon first says to the Pyramid builder: I give you the good horizon. But, then, this Horizon himself becomes vocal, and he continues to address Pharaoh. The Pharaoh is made free to move in any direction from the point of his pyramid: up as high as Orion who indeed at sunset often stands near the zenith, north as far as the circumpolar stars, East and South and West where the sun travels.

Furthermore, in these inscriptions of the pyramidia, Horus of the Horizon opened the procession of the gods who collaborated in this making of the Horizon. Mr. Kuentz has tried in 1921 to show that Horus came from the eastern horizon. Now it is true that "Harakhtis" does open the procession on the east side of the four sides of the pyramidion. But we need a revision of our notions as to what Achet in the name Herakhte means. This is especially suggested by the fact that on several pyramidia Horus the Behedite is invoked no less than eight times; twice on each side of the pyramidion Horus with two wings, i.e. Horus as worshipped in the northernmost Delta and in southernmost Sifu, sponsors the Horizon of the pyramid. If this has not impressed modern scholars, the answer may be that they have underestimated the supernatural feat of Horus the Behedite

and of the two wings of Horus. They felt too strongly that the sun was responsible for the sky and that "the sky" was one and the same for sun, moon and stars.

But such is not the case. We have been far too glib about presupposing that the whole sky ever *was* given to the sun. Neugebauer has shown that Nut was not the goddess of the whole sky but only of that part of the sky which the sun can touch in his traverse. This is simply another way of saying that the sky of Horus is more comprehensive than the sky of Ra. How obvious! The sun has no power or way ever to reach the North! Horus, on the contrary, throws his lance against the Big Thigh in the true North, and this Ra can never do. Horus then connects the halves of the sky that neither sun nor moon are able to align. He is the greatest god because he does in a historical act the epoch-making deed of which the cosmic forces are incapable. His journey from Elephantine to the Delta is that spectacle for the Riverains, the unhistorical dwellers on the Nile, which started us on our reassessment of sun and horizon. That the two wings of Horus mean the unity of the sky even before the sun-disk is placed inside of them was shown by H. Schäfer a long time ago. It took an echnaton to place the cosmic East-West sun at the right center of Egypt, half way between South and North. This was a static conception to be sure; nevertheless, it constituted a historical creation, not a natural fact. In all the forms of the Horus myth, Re and Thoth are taken by Horus from the South to the North. They owe it to Horus that they move in the one direction which Re-Sun and Thoth-Moon can never take by themselves. Is it then not advisable to reverse our assessment of inferior and superior in the symbol of the winged disk? The wings were used first. The disk was put in later to be carried by the falcon's wings. The

wings are not the wings of Re. The disk is not, as we say, "winged." The wings should be called "disk-laden" -- they carry the disk North! The pyramidists said just this in no less than three ways: first, the disked wings are attributed emphatically to Horus, not to Re. Second, under this sign, "the two eyes of Horus," sun and moon were placed. And underneath the two eyes, the disk of the daily sun was depicted explicitly with its dot for "day" in it, while the disked wings carry the same disk of light which Hathor carried between her horns. Can the comprehensiveness of Horus be more spectacularly expressed?

At this point we may once more look at Echnaton and his achet. The disked wings on the capstone of the pyramid and the wingless disk of Aton teach us something by comparison. The wings of Horus, carrying the disk over 700 miles, remained in use as long as Pharaoh remained mobile. If a Pharaoh wanted to drop the wings of Horus he had to become immobile! The strange decision of Echnaton to become static and to bury himself in El Amarna seems no longer strange to me. It was the condition for his eliminating Horus that wings no longer should be needed for making the sun omnipresent "from Dan to Beersaba." * The omnipresence and identity of the gods of the sky needed perpetual enactment by processions, by the "Progress" through the empire, and the ritual of Hathor and Horus and Seth. If however, Pharaoh and the sun could be gathered in one spot of impeccable selection, into the right spot, then the disk as well as its high priest Echnaton could stand still. Actually Echnaton did not suppress the cult of Horus of the Two Horizons until he had definitely taken up his eternal residence in the center of his universe. It is this feature, by the way, which was successful.

* Breasted's felicitous term as quoted by Gardiner in his Horus essay.

emphasized a few centuries later by the emperor of China, the Son of the Sky in his temple of Peking. In Egypt this static solution of a disk without wings condemned Pharaoh to eternal confinement. Therefore it was felt to be a political and religious disaster. And so it could not help but effect the efficiency of government. But this symbol of Akhnaton, this Aton without wings of the truthful reformer, is a great help in our reading correctly the meaning of Horus the Behedite, and of his "disk-laden" wings. When the wings ceased to carry the light North, when the man-god tried to evade his role, the whole Horizon of Egypt threatened to collapse.

Beautifully, one text says: "Horus gives Re his daily life." A correct Egyptian text could never say that Re gave his daily life to Horus. For the life of Re is a daily event; but Horus' life runs the course of a whole year; he rides out the inundation and the dessication. The Noon Horizon of Horus and the Midnight Horizon of Seth must be made one, not every day but once every year. They are made one when Horus' spear quivers in Seth's thigh. The lance is truly magic. For she must be believed to be in Horus' hand and in Seth's thigh at the same moment.

When the sun's cult was developed in great detail in the Fifth Dynasty, this ritual had to match and to outrun every detail of the Horus rite. The pyramidion then was placed on the obelisk. Also, the sun had now to fight a daily monster, Apophis, on his East-west course, as Horus had to fight the annual resistance of Seth. Accordingly Seth was placed in Re's boat that he might spear Apophis daily, in an obvious parallel to Horus' annual spear-throw against Seth. Only to a superficial eye will Seth's fight against Apophis compare in relevancy to the great liturgy of

the Followers of Horus. Seth's fight against Apophis is a purely rational imitation of a political ritual of central importance. The spear of Seth is an afterthought as it did not make history. But the lance of Horus dynamically and concretely united a split and divided universe. It made Horus into the one god whom only a man in the glory of his inspiration could incarnate since nothing else in the cosmos could go north. We have treated the Horizon first, as the atonement between cosmic East-West and historical South-North movement. And only now have we reached Horus' specific role. We did this because of the situation in Egyptology. But logically, in our introduction, we listed the place of Horus in the opposite order:

Step one we called the direct experience of the Riverains:

East-West. "Direct" was a daily, unstated experience of everybody.

Step two was the collective explicit, extraordinary progress on the Nile by the Followers of Horus under the authority of Horus.

Step three was the atonement of East-West and South-North movements because Mr. Everyman and Master One Man had to come to terms under one common faith.

We have shown that the Achet of Aton and the Achet of the Pyramids bear out this order.

When we now turn to the days of origin, the days before any pyramid could be built, before any good and beautiful horizon could reconcile the life of the Fellaheen and the acts of an Egyptian government, we shall expect to find the greatest stress placed on the role of Horus. We shall see the "Horizon" not as an accomplished

fact but as a rudimentary challenge, in the first dynasty.

And so we find it indeed. The first ruler has not yet built a pyramid; let alone surveyed 1100 kilometers. However he is represented with his horizon just the same. Four standard bearers surround him: Anubis for the West, Shedshed for the East, the two Horus' for Horus and Seth, for Noon and Midnight sky. The Shedshed, the placenta, is found in Negro Africa to this day, as a misunderstood potsherd of Egypt's great structure. How useful that these modern placentas were discovered by anthropologists to show us the permanency of Egypt's authority over Africans; how preposterous to "explain" the birth of a star in Egypt out of the shedshed by its degradation in Central Africa. The Negroes never built Egypt. But of course they cling to the rags of Pharaoh's elaborate ceremonial. The four standards around Pharaoh gave him the four directions of the sky. They were the future pyramids in statu nascendi. For the rising as a star, hieroglyphs never fail to use the terms for birth. I do not know whether the shedshed of Upwaut signifies the placenta or the diapers of the new born star to whom Upwaut opens the celestial quarters; for "shedshed" is used in the Pyramid Texts as the term for placing the King in the position of a newly born star, and this word is the factivum of shed. It means "to make a shed," to care for somebody as for a baby. But in both cases, the symbol created the new star, "whose name his earthly mother did not know"!

That Anubis is the god of the West is not doubted. Why the two falcons mean Horus and Seth, just as the two eyes mean Sun and Moon, Mr. Kuentz has masterfully explained in his monograph on Herakhte. These four emblems around Pharaoh then made him "the skymaster" of the horizon. He who remains incredulous, may look

at Zoser's tomb relief. In front of the Pharaoh a gigantically high standard carries Upwaut's emblem. But of what is this Upwaut composed? Of the "placenta" and Anubis! And in back of Zoser the two wings of Horus are spread out; "Behedite" is written above the wings which do not yet carry a disk. Through the two symbols in front and in back of him, the dead Zoser is as much made a "skymaster" as the living Narmer is through the four emblems. The god of the Horizon was satisfied in both cases. For, in both cases the complete unity of the four houses of the sky, as Maspero called them, was established. This then might be called the right definition of Achet. Achet is "The established Horizon," not simply the horizon! By the way, legitimate scruples may make us hesitate to retain Maspero's term "Four Houses." And we also may look for a better term than horizon. The establishment, by human action, of unity and harmony otherwise lacking in the divided skies of day and night and the perpetual re-establishment of this unity is achieved in an "Achet." "Established Horizon" does not go beyond our texts but adopts the kernel of the "skyworld" idea of establishment.

Because Achet, then, is not a fact but an act, the directions East, West, South, North should not be treated as mere fragments of space but as paths of movement to be trodden one after the other. They were not in situ, but in actu.

To sharpen our own awareness, we began by pitting the lives of the diversions ferrying on the Nile in the east-west direction against the authoritative utterances of Horus and of the followers of Horus flying northward or sailing upstream. Now the full understanding of "Achet" requires from us one more step. Horus and his followers and the queens "who saw Horus-Seth" -- as the men in the Cairo government of today -- were themselves ordinary people besides being

supermen. That they were not only gods and spirits, but at the same time poor mortals like the "Riverains" to whom they gave orders, became very plain whenever they died. Death made them into common people again. When Pharaoh died, he had to pay his tribute to the East-West direction of everyday life, of every-night life, of sun and moon, before he could take his place facing north. Dr. M. A. Shoukry is preparing a paper of great importance; he will show that all statues originally faced North. In the pyramid inscription the last line achieves the greatest mastery by giving to Pharaoh the mastery of the South and the North as well. But as a mortal, the conqueror of South and North first had to cross from Memphis to Sakkara. There is, then, not merely an opposition between cosmos (east-west) and history (south-north). No, there also existed a sequence: Pharaoh reached his historically created horizon by travelling on the eternal East-West falouka across Egypt's stream. We have here a sequence in which the historical entrance into the South-North horizon was preceded by the non-historical sun-like traverse across the Nile. In other words Pharaoh started East, was brought West, and then, when this transport was achieved, he had to be empowered to begin as Orion in the South and to end as the circumpolar star at the northern pole. His body therefore describes a figure from East to West to South to North. The Pyramid Texts are full of descriptions of this figure of his movements. In such a configuration, the East leads. But East was not privileged over any of the three other directions. Its opening by the East reflects merely the actual procession from residence into horizon. The horizon itself is absolutely impartial. The secret of the pyramid is no secret.

secret but a profound truth is expressed in it. No side of the compass must be privileged. The form of the pyramid is the only form that meets this requirement. That the pyramids began their inscription on the eastern side had a chronological reason. Pharaoh began his last journey in the East. The usual interpretation that the East side was superior is not born out by the facts. The impeccable equality of all four directions established the ruler of Egypt in his true position.

To this challenge of the perfect Achet, the founding fathers, the flowering and the decay of Egyptian history had to respond. Egypt always had to be the perfect Horizon whether the Horizon of the four standards of Narmer or the Horizon of Chufu or the Horizon of Echnaton. They all established the same order. And the first man to break down the spell of the Achet, Moses, had to shout: In the beginning God created heaven and earth. In this sentence, the front against any Achet was taken. Moses did away with any man-dominated Achet. Down to Moses, however, the most advanced form of government was to establish Achets. And the reader knows that the last Achet broke down only in 1911 when the last skymaster left his temples of Ieking. From Menes to Sunyatsen, every pre-Christian established order boasted of an orderly established Horizon!

What, then, was so indispensable about the skymaster's good Horizon that it should be the Alpha and Omega of any pre-Christian empire?

To this one question the Egyptian problem may be condensed. I have already stressed why I made out of many questions, one. This is my function as an outsider. And without this "diastole," and systole, this alternation between the oneness of the outsider's

question and the multiplicity of its inside answers, no science remains alive; I intentionally have stressed the unity of this problem. I shall be satisfied if the promiscuous usage of "solar" for "horizon," of "winged disk" for the disked wings of Horus the Behedite, of the east-west concept for the more complex task of superimposing a human action from South to North on the divided skies, disappears. The promiscuous simplification will never explain the true divinity of Horus. Horus was a god in Egypt in all truth. He would have been so for you and me, then, too. For he did the one thing the gods of heaven and earth could and cannot do. For this reason, the Pantheon of Egypt had Horus as its keystone. Echnaton fell when he rejected Horus. He did this only at the very end. It is well known that he renounced all hope or desire to become an Osiris after his death.

Is there, then, a connection between his renouncing Horus and renouncing Osiris? Is there an innate and indispensable unity between Horus and Osiris? This is the second question which I now raise from the outside. This second question will not be based on the distinction of direct cosmic and collective historical experiences. But we shall have to make a distinction of the same decisive sharpness. For the anarchy in the treatment of Horus' relation to Osiris is even greater than in the interpretations of the pyramids.

Second Reflection:

Eye of Horus? Eye for Osiris?

The Dialectics between Clans and Empire in Egyptian Liturgy

Osiris' name is written with the two signs of a seat (as for Isis) and an eye. The eye at first seems to have been placed below the seat. Sethe therefore allowed the interpretation "seat of the eye." He himself suggested "eye's delight." "Maker of the seat" was an older reading. But this is improbable enough since in the liturgy Osiris never acts, never "makes" anything. Can we separate the signs for Isis and for Osiris? This has been done often enough. The proximity of the signs was explained by the Egyptian love of play.* Methodically, this is hardly a sound argument on two central hieroglyphs. But this unsound method has been allowed to creep in in similar instances.

Sopdu and Sopdit, for instance, have been separated. Sopdu, an integral member of the first layer of gods, has been declared even in the latest translation of the Pyramid Texts to be an Asiatic god Soptot, somewhat in line with the famous remark that in etymology the vowels did not matter at all and the consonants only a little. Thus a phenomenon in the sky of the first order, which is seen by every Egyptian about 250 days of the year, remained without its legitimate name of Sopdu, because

* Roeder in Roscher gives this explanation.

the equation Sopit, Sopu, both written with Δ , could not even be debated, because of a mistake in method. We shall have to say more about these two names later on.

The goddess Seshat was written with Hathor's horns in reverse, and she is called for this reason "the goddess with the horns down." On the Harmer palette, Seshat and Hathor both appear. But Flinders Petrie preferred to see in the seven-leaved flower of Seshat the Babylonian royal star of eight rays. Miss Murray, on the other hand, because the perverted horns had to be rendered by some artefact of reeds, made the goddess of the temples and of orientation into a tribal spirit and dated her from the times before the beginning of architecture, i.e. of celestial building, and before gods replaced spirits in Egypt.

Even worse, the Falconess was separated from the falcon, Horus. This separation is now so customary that Etienne Drioton, in order to be understood by his colleagues, had to translate "Horus" and "the Falconess" in the Edfu text, although the hieroglyphs give Her and Horit. Obviously such usage entails a loss in concinnity. Horus and "the Falconess" are apt to lose their congruity. That we often omit the Falconess from our picture of Hathor has a directly destructive consequence. The central mystery of the Osirian myth, Hathor's-Horit's conception from two dead Osiris, ceases to be understood. Yet it obviously formed the central ceremony of the Osirian mysteries. Many books have been written on Osiris; none treats this act as the central ritual of his cult. The few who mention it put it in one paragraph as a side issue. Usually it is said that Isis conceived Horus. Liturgically this is simply not true. The Falconess conceived in the ritual, as

all representations show. The understanding of the Osirian creed hinges on the recognition of Horit's place in it. For, she was placed above the dead Osiris, in a more than bold perversion. When Horit was omitted, scholars were able to drive a wedge between Horus religion and Osiris religion. Then and only then, when the Falconess was forgotten, could it be said: Osiris "is" a vegetation god; he is a popular god; a pre-dynastic god etc. etc. And, on the other hand: Horus "is" a political god, a court god, a dynastic god. Or by the opposite deduction one could say: Osiris "was" a historical personage, Horus on the other hand "was" the sky.

In these two manners of explanation, Horus and Osiris represented two unconnected types of Egyptian religion. And lo and behold, we actually have books which put the plural "Egyptian Religions" in their title. Naturally, Horus himself was and is split into an older and a younger Horus, one without Osiris and one connected with Osiris.

If Hor-it had been allowed to stand with Hor, the abstruse feature that the Falconess, not Isis, was conceiving the seed of Osiris into her womb would have made it transparent that no Egyptian ever thought of Osiris and Horus in separation. For this ritual is the most arcane element of the whole cult, and in Horit they are united. She is the Falconess because she is the feminine of Horus. She is the center of the mysteries because she conceives of Osiris' seed!

I reject all attempts to go beyond our source material. We find the name "Son of Isis" in the first dynasty; we find Horit as the mother of Hor and the concepatrix from Osiris from beginning to end. Horit on the phallus of Osiris was found in Helwan as from

the first dynasty. But so deep-rooted is our prejudice that she is described as Horus (Royal Excavations, 1947, Fig. 13, p. 167) and the phallus here is taken by Junker as the symbol of Min. (In his book of 1949 on Egyptian Religion.) But the truth is that we now have five pieces from the first dynasty of the great mystery of Osiris allegedly celebrated in Abydos. In the face of these pieces, the separation of an Osir religion and a Horus religion is a mere illusion. We have no popular texts on or of Osiris that are older than the most official pharaonic documents on Hor as the avenger of his father Osir. We have no two Horuses.

I reject the nice game of saying one day that Osir was a king and Hor the sky and of saying on the next that Osir was vegetation and Hor was asking as Scharff now wants us to believe.

Horus and Osiris, Horit and Isis, by the writing of their names, by the mysteries of their ritual, share a common fate. They must be interpreted in unity or not at all.

This, however, can be achieved if we fulfill one condition. In our reflection 1, on the Horizon, the prerequisite was to distinguish between individual and collective experience. For reflection 2, the prerequisite of an answer is to see that the pharaonic relation between the dead and the living reversed the relation between the dead and the living which permeates any pre-Egyptian society!

Strangely enough this contrast of the Egyptian treatment of the dead and the tribal attitude to the ancestors is universally admitted. Even so cautious a man as A. H. Gardiner in his pamphlet on the Dead in Egyptian Belief exclaims: the Egyptians did not fear their dead; but the dead were immeasurably afraid of the living. Exactly. The unheard-of innovation of Egypt consisted in the deliverance of the living from the rule of the dead. In all pre-

Egyptian societies the dead spoke and speak to the living and must be reconciled. Every breach of ancestral legislation is expiated by attending blood sacrifices and veilettas. The vampires, the spirits of the dead, dominate. The masks of the dead are fastened on the medicine man's face, while the shaman sends his own self on vacation he impersonates the dead chieftains. Every tribe had and has a pole with totem signs. Egyptologists are very prone to attribute innumerable totems to the noxes cut out by the pharaonic system of irrigation. They would not do so if they knew why Pharaoh abhorred all totems and totem signs. The core of a totem pole is the eyes of the ancestors. To become an eye on this totem pole, to be carved on it as one more eye, is the great ambition of any warrior. For this he gladly gives his life. In the immortal liturgical play 'Inabinal,' which a heroic French explorer discovered in Guatemala, the hero is led to his death by the enemies who have captured him. What does he shout in his last hour? "The eyes of my ancestors look at me from the pole. My grandchildren will look at my eye carved on the totem pole next to the eyes of my ancestors." This is the comfort that makes him die full of joy.

All this has vanished in Egypt. No ancestral eye rests on Horus. No dead vampires suck the blood of the living. No orders are taken from the dead. The fantastic literature on the subject of the dead omits the simple fact that the dead in Egypt no longer interfere with the living, that the dead are brought under judgment! This is the stupendous step forward made by Egypt, beyond the ancestor worship. Horus, the uniter of the Two Lands, is god and god-inspired in the presence of eternity. He is emancipated

from the rule of the eyes on the totemoid. He does not take orders from them. Egyptian rulers, from the first day, violate every law sacred to the tribe. They marry their sister. They do not derive their right from the rights of their father. They are not initiated at the orgies of the tribe. Horus stands aloof from the organizations of clans or moieties. A study of all the ways in which his splendid isolation was achieved do not belong in this reflection. But we must mention one fact. The hieroglyphs of Egypt are very onesidedly treated when looked upon as script. Hieroglyphs, historically speaking, have quite another side. Hieroglyphs were tattoo! They transferred the tattoo from the bodies of the warriors to the buildings of Horus and his Followers. The disappearance of tattoos from the human body, the sudden cult of this body's integrity and the introduction of hieroglyphs on the solid bricks of the cosmos are two aspects of the same step. This one example may illustrate the radical change "des clans aux empires." There was no evolution, no gradual transition from one to another. On the contrary, we cannot exaggerate the sharpness of the conflict which set on foot against clan, hieroglyph against tattoo, a divine presence of the ruler against the worship of an ancestral past.

No Marxian or Hegelian dialectic opposed the preceding thesis but antithesis more sharply than the Ka of Pharaoh opposed the authority of the previous generations of ancestors. The Egyptian belief in unchanging eternity has often been stressed. But that this was so new that it had to be defended against an older world is equally important. The new authority created expressions for its faith: eternity, permanency, millions of years, the Ka name which Pharaoh's earthly mother did not know, and a

majestic Horus above the sky so as to oppose the previous rule of the dead over the living by the new belief in a cyclical presence.

The new body politic was in mortal danger if it did not succeed in extirpating the tribal jargon and the tattoos and masks of yore. The gods and the skyworld, the horizon and the coronation, the stone building and the (at first annual, later biennial) progress of Horus through Egypt, were not luxuries but acts of self-defense and a perpetual struggle for survival. Amid an ocean of clannish tribes, the Manhattan called Egypt was, at its beginning, a fantastic enterprise in which nobody from the outside could believe and which as we know remained a never-understood mystery to the outside world for 2000 more years. With the violence of the eruption of Vesuvius we see the first dynasties create all the new symbols of this eternal presence.

The relation of the ruler to his father was obviously one of the two central dogmas which had to come out of the crucible of the new creed completely changed. Horus could not derive his authority from his father as the chieftains of the tribes had done. The second central tenet of the creed had to state whence Horus did derive his authority. This second tenet was worked out as an annual authorization. The new eternity was distributed into years. The ruler rode upon the flood into his realm and he therefore had to ride into it on every Heb-Seed Year on the five great days when the gods of Egypt were reborn. The rule of Horus is an annual, a triagesimal rule. The Heb-Seed festivals were so important in Egypt because jubilees of years in the sky, not generations of men in the tribe, organized society. Of course, Horus was not murdered every seven years by Anubis, the god of the embalming-house, as Miss Murray believes. Jackals don't murder men, let alone Pharaohs. The

priest of Anubis to whom Miss Murray attributes the role of executioner of Pharo, was in charge of the western horizon. But as the "placenta" is misunderstood and degraded in Central Africa, so we find in Frazer's Golden Bough evidence that the Heb-sed festival of Egypt has been misunderstood in foreign lands. And the very fact of such misunderstandings shows how deep an impression the new basis of government made on the world. Egypt laid a new foundation of rule. It based government on the movements in the sky. The smallest unit of these movements that at first mattered politically was the year. The Egyptian year began its career not as the largest unit of time, as our mathematicians and astronomers think, but as the smallest unit of eternity. All the subdivisions of the year came later. We who pay a man by the hour proceed in our thinking from second to minute to hour to day to year, and then we stop. So atomized is our concept of time. Not so the Egyptians. The word for the day they wrote with the sun sign, and at first neither sun nor day had political status. New Year lasted five days as though they were one. The decans were periods of ten days, the season had 120 days. The year was the practical minimum for the ruler. The Palermo Stone proves this by its treatment of a change on the throne. By legal fiction, Horus could not rule less than one Sopdet year! His whole rule, therefore, consisted of multiples of this unit of a year. And of this celestial basis of Horus rule the Heb-sed festivals were the precise expression. "Millions of years" is the hieroglyph which is a wonderfully clear interpreter of Egypt's central vision. It had the sublime vision of a Horus who was a member of the divine presence and who does not rule as his father's son. His throne was based on his role in the sky. Since his role in the sky is to do what no other god can do -- to spear the North, and to become Horus-Seth

in the act -- his throne must be the double throne of Noon and midnight. ("Upper" and "lower" Egypt are not the right translations for the Two Lands which Horus annually unites.) All these points had to be put before the reader lest he be mystified by several phrases about Osiris recurring in our literature. Osiris has a city called after him, Busiris, just as Horus has his city of Darian-Nor not far away. Therefore he had to come from Busiris, and be a shepherd king, Anij, in the nome of Anij, the province of Busiris. In fact, Busiris, by the time the annually crowned coffin of Osiris reached this city, had the honor to cover it with incense. For the alleged shepherd king was simply an expert in producing incense.

Osiris also had a cult in Abydos. Here the incense was not strewn but rather the sublime ritual of the sacred wedding was celebrated. The rod of life of Osiris rose and entered the womb of Horit, the falconess. We have already stressed the indissoluble unity of this Osiris ritual and the faith in Horus, as expressed by the role of Horit. We may add that the perverse disposition of male and female in this act of conception is the best illustration of the new basis for the Horus-mystic. Because Horus had no authority unless he executed the will of the sky, even his conception was placed above the earth and his father's seat placed in the sky. The Greeks, among whom he came to justify his role, immediately reversed the position of Zeus and Hera back to normal in their sacred wedding of Zeus and Hera on Ida.

In Memphis, the ritual of the dying Osiris was celebrated when last year's djed pillar was floated out by the inundation.

And his marriage with her comes and is held down by the knot which Horus and Thoth tied around next year's life pillar. Then Osiris could rise again as the grain planted on top of the four baskets of earth which form the four crossbeams of his famous pillar.

One has difficulty between these rituals so much that our main question was never asked. How could a Horus regulate his relation to his father after the ancestral loyalty was replaced by the astral?

Once this question is asked our texts and rituals give the unambiguous answer.

Horus is the baptizer of his father's position as Osiris and of his mother's position as Isis.

All the Pyramid Texts say just this. Horus makes Osiris. Horus is the bull of his mother. Hor gives Osiris his eyes. For otherwise the dead man could not see. Horus makes the seat for him in the sky as Orion, between Sopdet and Sopha. And this explains why Sopdet (Sirius) and Sopha, the pyramidal light, have such closely related names. Their relation to Orion makes them akin among the selves. Osiris is not, as Betha thought, "a historical" king. Osiris never says a word. He is lifeless and dead. And he obviously is not given any authority over Horus. The predecessor of the living Horus becomes Osiris by pre-appointment and good services of Horus. This is expressed by the term Horus "the avenger" of his father. The term "avenger" has already been criticized by others: Osiris is seduced by Horus. Thereby the order of the tribal totipotency is reversed. The living Horus has power over the dead, the cyclical and the eternal present, does triumph over the past, giving it a safe place within this newly

created present. Horus presents his father with the eye of Horus. The predecessor of each historical Horus must become Osiris in death. The term hierogamos is a posthumous conception in the peculiar sense that the son is not only born after his father's death as in nature. He also must be begotten after his father's death. That is the startling solution by which the fact is conveyed that the ruler who has died becomes the living ruler's divine father by the living Horus' creation. The predecessor cannot appear -- as in the tribe -- to Horus in a dream saying: "I am the father of your humanity. Obey my orders." (The two or three cases where such a dream of a Pharaoh is told, prove my argument. They are exceptional concessions to a most normal influence of father on son which as a rule is completely absent or repressed.) On the contrary, in our texts Horus appears to the dead predecessor and says: "I shall make you into Osiris and as such you shall become the father of my divinity." This shows that Sethe is only half wrong in using the term "historical." Osiris is "historical" because he is the projection from the immortal skyworld by the present Horus upon his mortal predecessor. Naturally the fact that each Horus had to "avenge" his predecessor by appointing him as Osiris was not an arbitrary act of generosity. The living god Horus could convince his followers of his own divinity solidly if his predecessor proved to be an eternal member of the skyworld.

If the living ruler was to ascend his throne under the name of Horus, the dead ruler could no longer be called "Horus" without infringing on the present rule. The dead Pharaoh had to be divested of his Horus power. Even less, however, could Horus allow his followers, or himself, to believe that the dead Pharaoh had

never really been a god of the sky. For then, the authority of the living ruler, as Horus, was nullified too. This is the highly realistic dilemma which the making of Osiris by Horus did solve.

Osiris was given the eye of Horus and a seat higher than Orion and ahead of the northernmost stars, the full horizon and the franchise of the whole sky. But it was all given him by the power of Horus! The dialectic to the totipode is complete. The revolutionists of to-day would only think of the negative side of this dialectic: how to get rid of the old man. The osirian solution is a responsible solution. It gives as well as takes. The quality of which the predecessor had to be deprived was the authority of an ancestor. For this reason, the living Horus never depended for his divine right on his father as his physical begetter at all. But the father's divinity must be continued after death lest the son's divinity be devaluated. The dead Horus must be made into Osiris, the seat on whom the eye is set by the living Horus. Because a dead Horus is a contradiction in terms. Ergo Osiris is made the divine father of the living divine Horus. The ritual by which this divine fatherhood is posthumously created draws on the same source for its authority as that which empowers Horus himself: the annual events in the sky and on earth. This annual cycle is seen as the shortest epoch in the cycle of the eternal present. Therefore the death of Osiris at the end of one year and the birth of Horus at the beginning of the next connect the years. The festivals of one inundation period and the next were related to each other. This consideration perhaps throws light on the ceremony of the Djed.

scholars has not been in vain. They all have upheld one or the other true element in the Osirian complex. Once we move inside the pharaonic frame of reference, the Osirian texts offer all those facets. But if one looks upon the pharaonic frame of reference from the outside, all the many facets form part of the answer which Egypt gave to its single great problem: how to rise beyond the tribes, how to become an empire.

Politics and agriculture, funerary rites and skyworld are inextricably interwoven in the answer Egypt had to find in order to become Egypt. The answer was not arbitrary or accidental. In the permanent creations of mankind, necessity alone wins.

The pyramids could not be founded before man had learned to shake off ancestor worship and yet to strengthen continuity and perpetuity.

Empire also could not be founded before man had learned to reconcile the existence of Les Rivaieras -- those who lived in units of some hundred or some thousand people -- with the existence of ruling classes and unified government over vast stretches of land. Osiris and the Horizon were the two creations which exalt the Egyptian achievement to an everlasting layer in human evolution.

Therefore my two questions to Egyptology boil down to one. Is Egyptology a mere knowledge of the events in the Nile valley? If so it could lead to petty nationalistic idolatry. Could this alone explain "the bug," as Rouge called the passion for ancient Egypt? Have the great men whom Egyptology has attracted over 150 years perhaps felt that Egypt is the one "incomissible" link between the clans of old and our own era? If

pillar, on the morning of its death, on the related sign for Amon. So far Egyptologists have looked only upon one single year. But the Osiris ritual connects two years. I can only point at the many questions contained in this remark. But one other aspect of the Hor - Horit - Osiris question may deserve mentioning. Because Horus is actively creating Osiris, his relation to his mother receives the same strange coloring. Under the compulsion of revivifying Osiris, Horus creates his divine mother too. That is the meaning of Khatuf, Bull of his Mother.

In the tribes the past, through its dead, rules the living. There, no present exists. In Egypt the present is the archimedean point from which the past as well as the future are mastered.

I foresee the temptation of dealing copiously now with the Djed pillar or the other rituals of Osiris. I must stress however, that the deep feelings of our best scholars for Osiris as the god of vegetation or as "Death in Life" are not overlooked in my interpretation. Sethe's Osiris is an "historical king" reads corrected: the predecessor of the present (historical) Horus. Christensen's and Frankfort's "Osiris is death in life" reads corrected: a dead ancestor from the past is placed into the eternal present. "Osiris as the god of vegetation" reads corrected: the annual new life of the Nile valley is extended to the dead Horus of the previous year. "Osiris as the god or the power of the inundation" reads corrected: the annual basis of the authority of Horus juts out under the authority of the Horus of the previous year and gives him a place in the coming year. Therefore the whole tug-of-war over the dead body of Osiris between so many

they have been right, then Egyptology cannot be degraded into a national science but must become more and more the center of a universal science of one certain phase in our human existence on this globe. We all - could have had to be "Egyptians," in one way or another, between 5000 and 1500 B.C. The judgment over the Dead was an act of deliverance for a humanity which was thwarted under the judgment of the dead over the living. We have inherited this deliverance from Egypt and must preserve it. Settlement, script, tools, temples, priests -- all were needed to achieve this inquisitive step. This gives them to this day meaning and dignity. If Egypt were a historical accident, we would have no criteria to distinguish between its aims and achievements, its horrors and its blessings. Then, the scandalous best-seller "The Egyptian" will be the outcome.

If Egypt has been an inescapable necessity, then we can say what is still valuable for us today, its glories and what not. And then the Bible, or a renewal of the faith of the Bible, will be the outcome. For Moses, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, did just that. He sifted the chaff from the wheat when he left Egypt. Neither did he destroy it nor did he forget it. He purified its eternal achievements. But this is another tale.