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Roger Asambezo-Manyasi
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 clan and nomadic life, and they have created an inomissable 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 Asfu, Etienne de la Château restored the beautiful verses in which "Les Riverains" see Horus rise like Seth on New Year's Day and like the Moon in a wild night. By his happy coinage of "Les Riverains," for the Fellahen I was reminded of the story told by Kaspéro. When Kamil 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, inventing, cursing, threatening. In both scenes the Riverains catch 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 desert, 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 East to West as well as from West to East. 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 Aswan, 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 West-East and East-West motion 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 1930 A.D.

This experience is then "prehistoric" not only in the sense of prehistorical excavations. It is pre-historic for any child of men who enters life in Egypt tomorrow as well as
Since the term 'prehistoric' 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 unenumerated 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 much ado. The Riverains then, 2000 B.C. and 1800 B.C., are rocked 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 taxes 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 burned and understood before anybody in Egypt can interpret the meaning of their meanings either North or South of the navigating ships. Here, then, we have no direct, a-historic, preliminary experience. Because the Riverains themselves don't man these boats, nor does Pasha convey an experience only when their position in the organisation 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.
the next bend of the river. They take one 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 have sense.

To this day, then, the name Egypt as a historical name depends on the South-North experiences. These experiences need not be pure. 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 Sotnis alone could never do for the common man. Horus and Sotnis had to be reconciled time and again to the lords of daily life, to the march of life over the Horizon and the calling of the Fellaheen 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 that they remain outside history. The Horizon is the atonement between the individual trait 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 would expect to find the term "horizon" to be more than a cosmic or a political term, we should find it to be the "horizon" between nature and society. And so we find it indeed. In those states, this preoccupation with the Horizon is shown in our sources. But our 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
Niletic tributaries. The concept "Horizon" 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 Achmed and Moses, Egypt's growth was in the advance of civilization, and its conscience was clear. After Achmed'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 Horus and Moses. It loses its sting after Achmed's end. This is not without significance. After Achmed and Moses, Egypt had to go reactionary and counterrevolutionist, with the reign of Borsassh. For the first time, society and life had to be rejected. Deliberate efforts were made to exclude and to crush novelty. From 1320 B.C. to 338 A.D., Egypt could not advance but was on the defensive. It could only progress; it could not create.

If then the Horizon was a vital issue between the days of Horus 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 houses 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 not 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 that 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 "outside" into the jealously guarded community of experts.

Three phases of our question can be distinguished: the days of the sun horizon; the days of Horus, Shufru, and Shufru; the days of Achet. 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 Amenhotep around El Amarna.
Data Isotta 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 Akhnaton’s cult 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 strove off the tribulations of its neighbors and its own “River-people.” 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 “Selenists” 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 connected with the Horizon. The pre-Egyptian groups did not have it.
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 Sun-god Thoth must do this.

The Sun-god with whom we may conveniently deal first is Rehaton. 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 forswore his privilege of becoming Osiris after death and wanted to be buried on the easternmost line of the valley instead of at the eastern horizon. At the end of his reign he even gave up the dynamic pith of some east; up from the south against north.

But even Schafers did not simply prostrate himself before the sun. He built a temple of 1. kilometer square. This sanctuary he stood out by four sides on the edge of the desert. To this sanctuary he gave the name Akhet, Horizon. He took an oath not to depart out of this skirt. His god, then, was brought by him into this horizon. Schafers was the ruler of Egypt who did not wish to save 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.

Echnaton erected on his boundary stela that the distance from East to West, in his account, was the same in the North, in the South, and in the middle. Modern recounting has proven his point. His distance was less than 1/100. 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 will be easier for Echnaton's nome and the Great Pyramid, for one was meant to replace the other; nome was the name of the pyramid of Shafu. Echnaton's district took over the function of a pyramid, instead of a building erected on a base 700 feet square, a district was noted out 4000 cubits square. Hence the next question seems to wind. Since the early pyramidal Horizons stand near the point of union of the two lands, where did Echnaton 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 it came to him with any amount of certainty, but I venture to think that we may know more.

A. E. Waddell has remarked on Besam's statement that in the beginning the nome of Elephantine was perhaps not included in Egypt since its name means "Babylon land." Jeths thought that Egypt proper might have been demoted from the temple of Horus the Behdetite in Abydos, or thereabouts, instead of from the first cataract. A second point to be considered is that on the pyramidion of Menzzer of the XII Dynasty Horus the Behdetite 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 Achetaton was laid out with regard to the northernmost and the southernmost point of destination over which Horus the Behedite flew and progressed and carried the sun-disk on his wings. Actually, from the schuss of Aton to the city of Behedit on the Mediterranean the distance is 500 - 521 kilometers and the distance from Achetaton's district to Edfu is from 514.5 to 520.5 kilometers. Only these distances are the distances on the Nile. Achetaton then lies half-way between these two points which represent Horus the Behedite and his disk-carrying wings in Egypt's topography. Thus was Achetaton'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 Ed Aamma instead of Achetaton. Ed Aamma lies somewhere in Egypt between Memphis and Thebes. Achetaton lies half-way between Edfu and Heliopolis.

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 a different history. I cannot be fobbed 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 Achetaton. I have a right to assume that Achetaton placed his horizon in the abstract center of Egypt, 511 kilometers from both ends. In this
he acted very differently from the founder of Memphis. "Nemes" united Delta and Nile valley at the point where these two different landscapes meet. Akhnaton neglected the physical differences of the two regions. He computed the distances like the Frenchman of the Revolution of 1739, that is by the abstract standard of a geometrical unit, the itro, the "length of the Nile." But though Akhnaton's vision was abstract and that of Nemes concrete, neither paid homage to the sun or to the other direct forces of the cosmos. Both Akhnaton and Nemes 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 Akhnaton 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 tasted his computations.

The Horizon of Akhnaton 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 Akhnaton reacted in creating his god's "Achet."

Every pyramid is a horizon. "Horizon" was the name of Snefru's pyramid. "Priests of the Horizon of Cheop" 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 pyramids 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 "Harakhtia" does open the procession on the east side of the four sides of the pyramid. But we need a revision of our notions as to what Achet in the name Harakhte 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 northermost Delta and in southermost Edfu, 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 E. Schäfer a long time ago. It took an invention 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, Ra 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 out assessment of inferior and superior in the symbol of the winged disk? The wings were used first. The disk was put later to be carried by the falcon's wings.
wings are not the wings of Ra. The disk is not, as we say, "winged." The wings should be called "disk-laden" -- they carry the disk.

North! The pyramidia said just this in no less than three ways: first, the disked wings are attributed emphatically to Horus, not to Ra. 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 Sekhmet 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 Sekhmet 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 Berseba." 11 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 both. 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 Sekhmet could stand still. Actually Sekhmet 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.

11. 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 Faking. 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 affect the efficiency of government. But this symbol of monomania, this Aton without wings of the truthful reformer is a great help in our reading correctly the meaning of Horus the Beneficent, and of his "disk-laden" wings. When the wings ceased to carry the light North, when the sun-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 he 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 t
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 atomant 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. Everybody and Master One Man had to come to terms under one common faith.

We have shown that the "chast of Aton and the "chast 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 an 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 newborn 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 factitus 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 inaudulous, may look
at Zoser's tomb relief. In front of the Horus a gigantic high standard carries U upset's emblem. But of what is this Up set composed? Of the "placenta" and Anubis! And in back of Zoser the two wings of Horus are spread out; "Behedita" is written above the wings which do not yet carry a disk. Through the two symbols in front and in back of Horus, the dead Zoser is as much made a "skymaster" as the living Horus 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 acta.

To sharpen our own awareness, we began by pitting the lives of the divinities 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-Seta!" -- as the man 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 "Hiro" to whom they gave orders, became very plain whenever they died. Death made them into common people again. Then Harao 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. K. 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 Harao 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: Harao reached his historically created horizon by travelling on the eternal East-West falooka 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 Harao started East, was brought West, and then, when this transport was achieved, he had to be exposed 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 lead. But East was not privileged over any of the three other directions. The 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. The 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 monarch-dominated Achet. Down to Moses, however, the most advanced form of government was to establish Achte. And the reader knows that the last Achet broke down only in 1911 when the last skymaster left his temple of making. From Moses to Sunyateen, 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 “dyastole” 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 Beneficent, of the count-boat 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 hymn 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. Seth 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 asystyle god Sopet, 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

* Hoeder in Moscher gives this explanation.
The equation Soplit, Nophu, both written with △, 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 Dender 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. Elsewhere, 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 related spirits in Egypt.

Even more, the falconess was separated from the falcon, Horus. This separation is now so customary that Flinders Petrie, in order to be understood by his colleagues, had to translate "Horus" and "the falconess" in the main text, although the hieroglyphs give her and Horit. Obviously such usage entails a loss in conciseness. Horus and "the falconess" are apt to lose their congruity. But we often omit the falconess from our picture of Horus, in a directly destructive consequence. The central mystery of the Osirian cult, mother-Horit's conception from the dead Osiris, seems to be misunderstood. Yet it obviously forms 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 shot. 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 hold perversion. When Horit was omitted, scholars were able to draw a bridge 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 beginning 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 conceptrix from Osiris from beginning to end. Horit on the phallus of Osir was found in Beisan as from
the first dynasty. But no less-rooted is our prejudice that she
is described as Horus (Royal Excavations, 1917, Fig. 13, p. 167) and
the phallus here is taken by Juniper as the symbol of him. (in his
book of 1919 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 real official charismatic documents on Hor as the avenger of
his father Osiris. We have no two Horuses.

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

Hor and Osiris, merit 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 a answer is to see that the pharaonic relation
between the dead and the living reversed the relation between the
dead and the living, which pertains any pre-Egyptian society.

Strongly enough, this contrast of the Egyptian treatment
of the dead and the tribal attitude to the ancestors is universally
admitted. Even as 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 society the dead speak and speak to the living and must be recognized. Every breach of ancestral legislation is expected by unending blood sacrifices and varieties. The vampires, the spirits of the dead, dominate. The ranks of the dead are fastened on the living man's feet. While the shaman seizes his own self in a top and he impersonates the dead chieftains. Every tribe had and has a pole with totem signs, and the totem signs are very prone to attribute immemorial totems to the names 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 pole of a totem pole is the eye 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 'Habnet,' 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 counsel that makes his die full of joy.

If this has vanished in Egypt, no ancestral eye rests on Horus. No one vampire sucks the blood of the living. No orders are taken in the dead. The fantastic literature on the dead of the dead orders 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 totamvia. 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 one-sidedly treated when looked upon as script. Hiero-
glyphs, historically speaking, have quite another side. Hieroglyphs
were taboo! They transferred the taboo from the bodies of the
warriors to the buildings of Horus and his followers. The disappearance
of tattooed bodies to the hidden 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 eipires." There
was no evolution, no gradual transition from one to another. On
the contrary, we cannot exaggerate the sharpness of the conflict
which set clan against clan, hieroglyph against taboo, a divine
presence of the taboo against the worship of an ancestral past.

In Canaan or Megarian dialectic opposed the preceding
thesis but antithesis more sharply than the ka of Haruo opposed
the continuity of the previous generations of ancestors. The
Egyptian belief in unchanging eternity has often been stressed.
But that cult was so new that it had to be defended against an
older world in equally important. The new authority created
expressions for its faith: eternity, permanence, 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 land 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 afterworld, 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 clanish tribes, the nation 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 2300 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 work 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 rise into it on every 36th Year on the five great days when the gods of Egypt were reborn. The rule of Horus is an annual, a triennial rule. The Hob-Sol 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 or sheriff, 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. If we 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 decades were periods of ten days, the season had 120 da. The year was the practical minimum for the ruler. The Kalerno Stone proves rules by its treatment of a change on the throne. By legal fiction, Horus could not rule less than one heb-sed year. His whole rule, therefore, consisted of multiples of this unit of a year. And of this celestial cycle or Horus rule the heb-sed festivals were the public 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 Reon and
Horus. ("Upper" and "Lower" Egypt are not the right transla-
tions for the two Lands which Horus annually united.) All these
points had to be put before the reader lest he be mystified by
several things about Cairo recurring in our literature. Cairo
has a city called after him, Busiris, just as Horus is his city,
of Lower-Nile not far away. Therefore he had to come from Busiris,
and be a supremely holy, Anubis, in the nome of Anubis, 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 one, Horus was simply an expert in producing
incense.

Osiris also had a cult in Abidos. Here the incense was
not the one but rather the sublime ritual of the Osiris wedding
was celebrated. The rod of life of Osiris rose and entered the
womb of Do, the falconess. We have already stressed the in-
dissoluble unity of this Cairo ritual and the faith in Horus, as
expressed by the role of Horus. We may add that the perverse dis-
position of male and female in this act of conception is the best
illustration of the myth of Horus. Because Horus
had no authority unless he ascended the hill of the sky, even his
name thereto was placed above the earth and his mother was placed
in the sky. The mother, being what she was there, had to justify his
role, immediately reversing the position of Zeus and Hera back to
normal in their sacred wedding of Zeus and Hera on this.

In Memphis, the ritual of the dying Osiris was celebrated
when last year's sycamore was floored out by the inundation.
and the pyramid roofs were covered and put down by the knot which
Horus and Thoth tied around next year's Djed pillar. Then Osiris
would rise again as the green plant on top of the four baskets
of earth which form the four crossbeams of his Djed pillar.

The distinction between these rituals was such that
one man's position was never seated. How could a son regale his
relic to his father after the ancestral loyalty was replaced by
the astral?

Once this position is seen our texts and rituals give
the: unanswerable answer.

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

All the pyramid Texts say just this: Horus makes Osiris.
Horus is the wall of his mother. For given Osiris' eyes, for
otherwise the dead man could not see. Horus made the soul for him
in the sky as Orion, between Sothis and Sothis. Thus he explains
why Sothis (Selinus) and Sothis, the pyramidal light, have such
a closely related name. Their relation to Orion makes them akin
among the solars. This is not, as later thought, "a historical"
king. Osiris never said a word. He is lifeless and dead. And
he certainly is not given any authority over Horus. The predecessor
of the living Horus becomes Osiris by the appointment and good
services of Horus. This is expressed by the title Horus "the
avenger" of his father. The title "avenger" has already been
criticized by others: Osiris is seated by Horus. Thereby the
order of the tribal totem pole 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 'historicism' is a posthumous conception in the peculiar sense that the son is not only born after his father's death as in nature, to be 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 case -- 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 Seth 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 such horus had to "sacrifice" his predecessor by appointing him as his is not an arbitrary act of generosity. The living god Horus could convince all followers of his own divinity solely if his predecessor proves 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 Sirius, the northernmost stars, the full horizon and the inaccessibility of the whole sky. But it was all given him by the power of Horus! The dialectics to the totam worldview is complete. The revolutionary thought of today 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 us as well as taxes. 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 whose eye is set by the living Horus, because a dead Horus is a contradiction in terms. Both Osiris is made the divine father of the living divine Horus. The ritual by which this divine fatherhood is posthumously granted to Horus is the only source for its authority as fast as we were made 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 descent of Osiris at the end of one year and his birth of Horus at the beginning of the next complete the year. The festivals of the inundation period and the next were related to each other. This consideration perhaps throws light on the ceremony of the Djed.
scholars have not been in vain. The two great upheavals or the other two elements in the Egyptian complex, once we have inside the pharaonic frame of reference, the Egyptian texts offer all those facts. But if one relies 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 live beyond the tribes, how to become an empire.

Political and agricultural, funerary, royal and religious are instantaneous interweaves in the answer, not able to find in order to the answer. The answer was not arbitrary or accidental, in the permanent creations ofanking, necessarily alone ends. The empire could not be founded before man had learned to shake off ancestor worship and yet to strengthen continuity and perpetuity.

Empires also could not be founded before man had learned to reconcile the existence of Las Iberians -- 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. Ostrica and the Horizons were the two creations which exact the Egyptian achievement to an everlasting later in human evolution.

Therefore my two questions to Egyptology boil down to one: Is Egyptology a mere knowing of the events in the Nile valley? If so it will lead to petty nationalistic idolatry. Could this alone explain "the bag," as Long read the passion for ancient Egypt? Have the great and rich Egyptology has attracted over 150 years perhaps felt that Egypt is the one "incomparable" link between the eras of old and our own era?
filler, on the morning of its death, on the excited sign for action. So far cryptologists have looked only upon one single year, but the Osiris ritual connects two years. I can only point at the same questions contained in this remarks, but one other aspect of the Hor - Horus - Osiris question may deserve mentioning. Because Horus is actively creating Osiris, his relation to his mother receives the same strange coloring. Under the conception of reviving Osiris, Horus creates his divine mother too. That is the meaning of Kaunet, 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 measured.

A forum the temptation of joining religiously not with the Udjat Millor 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 "Deity in life" are not overlooked in my interpretation. Seth's Osiris is an "historical King"

read corrected: the predecessor of the present (historical) Horus. "Erlbussen" and Frankforta ("Osiris is death in life"

read 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 entitled 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 just 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, that mythology seems to degrade into a national science but must become more and more the center of a universal science of one certain phase in our human existence. If this globe, if all could have had to be "Egyptian," in one way or another, between 3000 and 1000 B.C. The judgment over the dead was an art of deliverance for a humanity which was thrust under the judgment of the dead over the living. We have inherited this deliverance throughout and must preserve it. Settlement, script, vases, tombs, palaces — all are needed to achieve this incomparable 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 sacredly basal-naked "The Egyptian" will be the outcome.

If Egypt has been an incomparable necessity, then we can say what is still valuable for us among its glories and what not. And then the Bible, or a manual of the faith of the Bible, will be the outcome. Furthermore, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, if not 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.