

à Monsieur le G.^{ral} E. Briot

434

Caire

April 5, 1950

Sun and Horizon:

The Distribution of Cosmic
and of

Historical Facts in Ancient Egypt

Dear Mr. Briot,

In your treatment of the Dramatic Texts in Edfu, you have restored the beautiful verses in which "Les Riveraines" see Horus rise like Sothis on New Year's Day and like the Moon in a mild night.

Reading you, I was reminded of the story told by Maspero. When Emil Brugsch, on a government boat, carried the royal mummies from Thebes off to Cairo, "Les Riverains", man and women alike, stood on the banks of the Nile, lamenting, cursing, threatening. In both scenes, Les Riveraines watch a spectacle beyond their reach. In both scenes, the cosmic and the historical directions of Egypt stand out in wonderful contrast. Let me begin then by underscoring this contrast.

For the Riveraines, the Nile divides their lands, their Movements, their daily lives into an Eastern and a Western part. The deserts press so closely on the ribbon of cultivation from both sides that the Nile, which halves this ribbon, does not act as a barrier. Always the boats ferried the people hither and thither. As the sun goes from East to West, as the moon and the stars, so do the prehistorical 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 cradles goes on in Cairo and Asswan, in Abydos and Thebes. It is ubiquitous and it does not depend on any history of ^{the} central government or of 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 any historical man who finds himself placed in the space of the Nile valley. *He crosses both banks of his river.*

This experience is then "pre-historic" not only in the sense of prehistorical excavations. It ^{Riverains} is pre-historic for any child of man who enters life in Egypt tomorrow as well as yesterday. 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 experience of the river, never leaving their neighborhood yet perfectly accustomed to crossing the Nile. Innumerable peasants have never been twenty miles to the North or South. But they ^{do} cross the River without much ado. The Riverains then, 2800 B.C. and 1380 A.D. are rocked between East and West, Sunrise and Sunset.

This they act themselves.
 But they watch a very different spectacle which goes on on their river. It does not go on every day *and they have a case in point, fluence on it.*
 Neither the government from Cairo nor the Union of the two Lands from Memphis can be experienced directly by the Riverains. The names for Memphis, for Cairo, for government, for Union, ^{at any specific place} aye for Land, must first be heard and understood before anybody in Egypt ^{at any specific place} can interpret the meaning of these navigating ships. Here, then, we have no direct, a-historic, preliminary experience. Horus and Brugsch 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 take men beyond the ~~expanse~~ ^{expanse} of their five senses, far beyond the next bend of the river. They take men into the frame of a space which is abstruse, of movements which threaten change, of history which happens neither everyday nor to everybody. All the experiences of the Nile as a challenge between North and South are spectacle to the Riverains and therefore something indirect. It must be mediated to them by faith in

others, by names and holydays, signs and rites. Horus, Sothis, the central government and the very concept of Egypt are indirect and purely historical experiences. Here the word must precede the act while in 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 individual and direct experience, since sun and day are experienced directly and individually. Any South-North and North-South movement on the other hand, will have to be supported by collective and mediated experience.

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 Asswan to the Delta, and 2) to reconcile this collective and historical experience which combines South and North with the individual sensual experiences which connect 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 into the Nile valley to lift 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 lord of daily life, to Ra, in the Horizon.

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 these 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.

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 a "peace-~~ful~~ term" between nature and society. And so we find it indeed. In three stages, this preoccupation with the Horizon is shown in our sources. But two prejudices have obscured this. "Solarists" declared that "Horizon" was a purely solar term. Anthropologists tried to explain the Pyramids and the Hieroglyphs of Egypt by Nilotic tribalisms. 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.

Down to the days of Echnaton and Moses, Egypt's growth was in the advance of civilization, and its conscience was clear. After Echnaton'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.

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 Echnaton's end. This is not without significance. After Echnaton and Moses, Egypt had to go reactionary and counterrevolutionist, with the reign of Horemhab. For the first time, younger ways 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 at-

tempt^{to make} Egyptology conscious of its omnipresence in the field. But let me repeat that I am an outsider of your science. I have therefore not as great an interest in my answer as in the introduction of my question 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 reorganise 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 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 "outside" into the jealously guarded community of experts.

Three phases of our question can be distinguished: the days of Menes and Narmer; the days of Zoser, Snofru and Chufu; the days of Echnaton and Moses. The concept of the Horizon takes three widely differing forms in these three periods. The first form is the standards around 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 Echnaton 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. The standards around the ruler have been explained as the emblems of the nomes or by comparisons with the degenerate modern tribes of Africa.

Since the pyramids have 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. (J. Wilson)

Since Echnaton'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 not much was made of it 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 appears in the exodus of Israel from Egypt. It led Moses outside Egypt. Still, it had originated in Egypt. Moses is an Egyptian in the same sense in which Marx is a Hegelian. The Horizon is the driving power behind the first sentence of Genesis. The question of the Horizon, then, connects Egypt and post-Egypt. But it also relates Egypt to all tribal life. With the help of a "Horizon" Egypt erects its structure. By its mastery of the horizon it staves off the tribalisms of its neighbors and its own "Riverains".

What is pre-Egyptian and what is post-Egyptian, then, is bound up with the Horizon. The pre-Egyptian groups did not have it. Moses transcended it. Then what is it? Must one not be eager to know this one differentia specifica which makes 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 Echnaton. 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 eastern^Nmost line of the valley. At the end of his reign he even gave up the dynamic ritual of Horus coming up from the South against Seth.

But he did not simply prostrate himself before the sun. He built a sanctuary 14 kilometers square. This sanctuary he staked out by famous stelae on the edge of the desert. To this sanctuary he gave the name Achet, Horizon. He took an oath not to budge outside this Achet. His god, then, was with him in this Horizon. Echnaton 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 the horizon. He had determined for Aton.

The breadth and the length of this his haven was the extent of the Nile valley from cliff to cliff of the deserts. Echnaton 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. A modern remeasurement 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.

We do right to compare Echnaton's Achet and the Great Pyramid. For one was meant to replace the other: Achet was the name of the pyramid of Chufu. Echnaton'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 comes to mind. 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 we cannot say more with any amount of certainty.

However Sir. A.H. Gardiner has reminded us recently of Sethe's statement that in the beginning the Nome of Elephantine was perhaps not included in "Egypt" since its name means Nubian land. Sethe thought that Egypt proper may have been computed 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.

These two points have made me think that perhaps the Horizon of Echnaton was laid out with regard to the northernmost and the southernmost point

the southern^mmost 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 Echnaton's district to Edfu is from 514.5 to 528.5 kilometers. Achetaton then lies half-way between the two points which represent Horus the Behedite and his disk-carrying wings in Egypt's topography. Thus was Echnaton'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 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 halfway between Edfu and Bhdt.

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 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 Echnaton. I therefore assume for the time being that Echnaton placed his horizon in the abstract center of Egypt. 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 Frenchman 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 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

of surveying which elicited unbounded admiration from the British surveyors who tested ~~this~~ computations.

One Horizon of Echnaton is, then, the most perfect stonement cosmic East and West and historical North and South ever achieved in Egypt. It was a static Horizon burying a immobilized Pharaoh, it is true, But just the same, it teaches us that the Horizon ^{is} 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 the 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" was not 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 pyramidia most instructive. The Horizon is made to speak. Horus of the Horizon says to the Pyramid builder: I give you the good horizon and the Horizon himself then becomes vocal and continues. 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.

Horus of the Horizon opens the procession of the gods who collaborate in this making of the Horizon. Mr. Kuentz has tried 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 worshipped in the northernmost Delta and in southernmost Edfu sponsors the Horizon of the Pyramid. If this has not impressed modern scholars, the answer may be that they have underestimated the 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. The sun has no power nor way ever to reach the North! Horus, on the contrary, Throws his lance against the Big Thigh in in the true North, and this Ra can never do. Horus connects the halves of the sky that neither sun nor moon are able to connect. 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 way was a static conception to be sure. Nevertheless it constitutes a historical creation, not a natural fact. In all the forms of the Horus mythe, Re and Toth 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 Toth-Moon can never take by themselves. ~~Is it~~ ~~is~~ than 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 Ra. The disk is not winged. The wings are disk-laden -- they carry the disk North! They pyramidia say just this in no

less than three ways. First, the disked wings are attributed emphatically to Horus, not to Re. Second, under the sign "the two eyes of Horus", sun and moon are placed. And underneath the two eyes the disk of the daily sun is depicted explicitly with its dot for "day" in it, which the disked wings do not have.

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, bearing the disk over 700 miles, remain in use as long as Pharaoh remains mobile. If a Pharaoh wants to drop the wings of Horus, he must 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 Duci to Berseba". The omnipresence and identity of the gods of the sky needed perpetual enactment by processions, the Progress through the empire, 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. 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 the universe. It is this feature, by the way, which was successfully emphasized a few centuries later by the emperor of China, the Son of the Sky! In Egypt the static of a disk without wings, which meant the condemnation of Pharaoh to eternal confinement, was felt to be a political and religious disaster. And so it could not help but be. But the disk without wings of the truthful Echnaton is a great help in our reading correctly the meaning of Horus the Behedite, and of his "disk-laden" wings.

Beautifully, one text says: "Horus gives Re his daily life." A correct Egyptian text could never say that Ra gave his daily life to Horus. The life of Ra 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 once, 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. Therefore 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, as a 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 witless imitation of a political ritual of central importance. The lance of Horus dynamically and concretely united the split and divided universe. It made Horus into the one god whom only a man could incarnate since nothing else in the cosmos could go north. We have treated the Horizon first, as the atonement of cosmic East and West and historical South-North movement. And only now have we reached Horus. But logically, in our introduction, we listed the steps in the opposite order:

Step one was the direct experience of the Riverains:
East-West.

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

Step three was the atonement of East-West and South-North
movements.

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 rule of Horus. We shall see the "Horizon" not as an accomplished fact but as a rudimentary challenge.

And so we find it indeed. The first king 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 Narmer. Anubis for the West, the 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 the Seligmans. 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 are 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. But Shedshed is used in the Pyramid Texts as the term for placing the King in the position of a newly born star. And this is the factivum of shed. It means "to make a shed", to care for somebody as for a baby.

That Anubis is the god of the West is not doubted. Why the falcons mean Horus and Seth, just as the two eyes mean sun and moon, Mr. Kuentz has masterfully explained in his monograph on Harakhte. The four emblems around Pharaoh make 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! The two wings of Horus are spread out in Back of Zoser and "Behedite" is written above the wings which do not 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 for the four emblems. The god of the Horizon is satisfied in both cases. For in both cases the complete unity of the four houses of the sky, as Maspero called them, is established. This then may be called the right definition of Achet. But some 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 ~~skyes~~ of day and night and the perpetual re-establishment of this unity is achieved in an "Achet".

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.

To sharpen our own awareness, we began by simply opposing the lives of the Riverains ferrying on the Nile in the East-West direction and 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 man of 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. Mr. 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 mastery of the South and 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). Pharaoh reaches 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 is preceded by the non-historical sun-like traverse across the Nile. In other words Pharaoh starts East, is brought West, and then is also empowered to begin as Orion in the South and to end as the circumpolar star in the at the northern pole. He 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 is 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 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 this requirement.

or desire to become an Osiris after his death, is well known.

Is there, then, a connection, between his renouncing Horus and renouncing Osiris? Is there an innate and indisponible 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 the direct cosmic and collective historical experiences. But we shall have to make distinction of the same decisive sharpness. For the anarchy in the treatment of Horus' relation to Osiris is even greater than in the interpretation of the pyramids.

Question 2

Eye of Horus? Eye of Osiris?

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 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 Soptet, 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 the equation Sopdit, 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 off or down. On the Narmer 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 artefacts 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. celestial building, and before gods replaced spirits in Egypt.

Even worse, the falconess was separated from the falcon Horus. This is now so well established that you yourself, in order to be understood by your colleagues, had to translate "Horus" and "the Falconess" in the Edfu text, although the hieroglyphs give Hor and Horit. Obviously this translation entails a loss in concinnity. That we often omit the falconess from our picture of Hathor has a directly destructive consequence. The central mystery of Osirian myth, Hathor's conception from the death of 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 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. After it 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. 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 archaic element of the whole cult, and in Horit they are united.

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 Osir 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.15, 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 of 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 a king as Scharffe 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 question 1. the prerequisite was to distinguish between individual and collective experience. For question two, 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 canting a man as A.H. Gardiner in his pamphlet on *Dead in Egyptian Belief* exclaims: The Egyptian did not fear their dead. But the dead were immeasurable 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 order the living around; the dead judged and judge the living and must be reconciled. Every breach of ancestral legislation is expiated by unending blood sacrifices and vendettas. 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 chieftains. Every tribe had and has a pole with totem signs. Egyptologists are very prone to attribute innumerable totems to the nomes 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 "Rabinal", 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 Book 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 unitor of the Two lands, is god and god-inspired in the presence of eternity. He has emerged from the rule of the eyes on the totem pole. 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 organisations of clans or moieties. A study of all the ways in which his splendid isolation was achieved do not belong in this question 2. 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 tatoo! They transferred the tatoo from the bodies of the warriors to the buildings of Horus and his Followers. The disappearance 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 empire against clan, hieroglyph against tatoo, a divine presence of the ruler against the worship of an ancestral past.

No Marxian or Hegelian dialectic opposed the preceding thesis by an antithesis more sharply than the Ra 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, Horus above the sky 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 tatoos 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 no 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 ^{the eruption of the} 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 authorisation. 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 New 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-Sed festivals were so important in Egypt because jubilees of years in the sky, not generations of man 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 Pharaoh, 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. But 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. Now year lasted five days as though they were one. The seasons were periods of ten days, the season had 100 years. 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 Egypt 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 sublime vision of a Horus who is a member of the divine presence and who does not rule as his father's son. His throne is 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 terms for the Two Lands which Horus annually unites.) All these points had to be said before the reader lest he be mystified by several points about Osiris stressed in our literature. Osiris has a city called after him, Busiris, just as Horus has his city of Heliopolis not far away. Therefore he had to come from Busiris, and be a shepherd king, Andj, in the name of Andj, 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 stressed 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 indisputable 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 base for the Horus-Empire. Because Horus had no authority unless he executed the will of the sky,

even his conception was placed above the earth~~t~~ and his mother's womb placed in the sky. The greeks, among whom no Tharao had to justify his role, immediately reversed the position of Zeus and Hera back to normal in the sacred wedding.

In Memphis, the ritual of the dying Osiris was celebrated when last year's **Djed** pillar was flooded out by the inundation. And his murderer Seth was conquered and held down by the knot which Horus and Toth tied around next year's Djed 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 distinguished between these rituals as 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 unanimous answer.

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

All the pyramid text say just this. Horus makes Osiris. Horus is the bull of his mother. Hor gives Osir his eyes. For otherwise the dead man could not see. Horus makes the seat for him in the sky as Orion, between Sopdit and Sopdu. And this explains why Sopdit (Sirius) and Sopdu, the pyramidal light, have such closely related names. Their relation to Orion makes them akin among themselves. Osir is not, as Sethe thought, a historical king. Osir never says ~~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 term Horus "the avenger" of his father. The order of the tribal totempole 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. He presents his father with the eye of Horus. The predecessor of each historical Horus must become Osiris in death. The term gamos is a posthumous conception in the peculiar sense that the son is not only born after his father's death but he must be begotten after his

father's death! That is the startling solution by which the fact is conveyed that the dead Horus becomes the living king'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 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.) To the contrary 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 was only half wrong in using the term "historical". Osiris is "historical" because he is the projection from the skyworld of Horus upon his 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 solely if his predecessor proved to be an eternal member of the skyworld.

If the living king followed the dead king under the name of Horus, the living king could not call the dead "Horus" without abdicating his own divinity. Even less, however, could he allow his followers, or himself, to believe that the dead king had never really been a god of the sky. For then the authority of the living king, 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 totempole is complete! The revolutionized masses 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. The authority of which the predecessor must be deprived is the authority of an ancestor. For this reason, Horus does not depend on his father as his physical begetter at all. But the father's divinity must go on 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. Osiris is also 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 Uged Pillar, on the meaning of its shape, on the related sign for Anon. So far we have looked only upon one single year. But the Osiris ritual connects two years. I can only point at one 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 consideration of revivifying Osiris, Horus creates his divine mother too. What is the meaning of Mentef, Bull of his Mother.

In the tribes the past, through its dead, ruled the living. There, no present exists. In Egypt the present is the actual point from which the past as well as the future are created.

I forego the temptation of telling copiously now with the Uged Pillar or the other rituals of Osiris. I must stress however, that the feelings of our best scholars for Osiris as the god of vegetation or as "Death in life" are not overlooked in this consideration. Osiris' "historical king" reads corrected: a dead ancestor from the past is placed into the eternal present. Osiris as the god of vegetation reads corrected: The annual life of the Nile valley is extended to the dead Horus of the previous year. Osiris as the god of the power of inundation reads corrected: On annual basis of the authority of Horus juts out

must preserve it. Settlement, script, gods, temples, priests -- all were needed to achieve this ineliminable 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 sins and achievements, its horrors and its blessings. The scandalous best-seller "The Egyptian" will be the outcome.

If Egypt has been an ineliminable necessity, then we can say what is still valuable for us among 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.