



Type: Magazine Article

A New Look at the Pearl of Great Price: Part 7: The Unknown Abraham (Continued)

Author(s): Hugh Nibley

Source: *Improvement Era*, Vol. 72, No. 6 (June 1969), pp. 126–132

Published by: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

The Unknown Abraham

By Dr. Hugh Nibley

(Editor's Note: Continuing his imaginary discussion between two students and a museum curator, in order to help readers better understand the complex issues of the case, the author has just established "that this lion-couch business" takes place on "great ritual occasions" as described in the Book of Abraham; such an occasion was "the supreme moment of the Sed-festival.")

• *Dick:* If it was so important, why don't we find it everywhere?

Mr. Jones: We do, if we know what to look for, but they deliberately covered it up; our guidebook says the event "was perhaps rarely illustrated."³¹ It is only found in royal tombs and shrines that were strictly closed to the public.

Jane: What is the *Sed*-festival?

Mr. Jones: It was the greatest of all the Egyptian celebrations, "the great national *Panegyris*," when men and gods met at the sun-shrine of Memphis to renew the corporate life of the nation and the world.³² It was *the* year-rite, beginning on "the first day of the first month of the year,"³³ and the most ancient and venerable of rites, amply attested to in prehistoric documents;³⁴ it celebrated the founding of the kingdom and the creation of the world.³⁵ It was also the most persistent of traditions, and though, of course, during the many times it was put on, the five-day show was bound to undergo many alterations and adjustments,³⁶ by virtue of deliberate archaistic revivals based on the study of old records it was possible to celebrate the *Sed*-festival in the very last dynasties of Egypt in a manner "astoundingly" like that of the very first dynasties.³⁷ It was the king's own show: "For the nature of kingship in Egypt, it is, above all, the *Sed*

festival which is instructive," writes H. Frankfort; everything centers on "the solitary figure on the throne of Horus."³⁸ As "the founding of the kingdom, in which all the gods and potentates of the land participated," it corresponded, of course, to the coronation rites.³⁹ Every coronation could not be expected to fall smack on the 30-year Jubilee of the rule, but that was the sort of problem that gave the Egyptians no trouble.⁴⁰

Dick: Thirty-year Jubilee?

Mr. Jones: Yes, that is what the *Sed*-festival was. You will notice that Bonnet in the handbook lists it only under that title: Thirty-year Festival.⁴¹ The usual explanation is that originally, since the prosperity of the land in every sense depended on the king, he could not be allowed to become weak, so that when he showed signs of running down at the end of 30 years of rule, it was necessary to renew his powers, and so he was "ceremonially put to death."⁴²

Dick: That's a funny way to renew anybody's powers --to kill him!

Jane: Yes, what could he do if he was dead?

Mr. Jones: Well, he would just get up again, renewed and invigorated, succeeded by himself in the person of his son, in whom he was reembodyed. It was "abdication followed by replacement . . . a renewal," says Professor Moret.⁴³ According to Professor Frankfort, we should not even use the word succession. "It is not a succession," he said, "but a renewal . . . a true renewal of kingly potency, a rejuvenation of rulership."⁴⁴

It was especially the occasion on which the king's divine authority was proclaimed, "a periodic commemoration festival," as H. Kees puts it, "in which special rights were conceded and energetically brought to mind for the benefit of the ruling house."⁴⁵ Author-

ity is the big thing; the king always appears as a victor in the rites, and many scholars believe that the *Sed*-festival was, in fact, a prehistoric celebration of victory over the rebels of the North, with the king as the conquering Horus.⁴⁶ The other theory is that the *Sed*-festival originally belonged to Osiris, the king of the dead, which of course complicates things.

Dick: Why do they always have to drag that old Osiris into the picture?

Mr. Jones: Nobody drags him in—he is always there. But, as H. Schaëffer says, Egyptologists don't need to go overboard and think he is the whole show just because of that.⁴⁷ Some, like Moeller and Helck, think that the *Sed* originally belonged to the king alone and that Osiris later moved in on him; the king's rites were "reinterpreted in terms of Osiris."⁴⁸ Yet Moret saw in the *Sed*-festival nothing less than the "Osirification of the King."⁴⁹ The trouble is that in the earliest representations of the rites the king wears exactly the same festival costume as Osiris.⁵⁰

Dick: So the king is Osiris after all.

Mr. Jones: That is what Professor Frazer thought, of course, but Gardiner and Kees and Wainwright and others thought it was just the other way around—it is Osiris who is borrowing the king's costume; he came late and took it over. But there was nothing wrong with that, because *as a king* Osiris would have a perfect right to the royal duds as well as the privilege of "having 'countless *Sed*-festivals' " of his own.⁵¹

Dick: What difference does it make which comes first?

Mr. Jones: Bravo! That is just what an Egyptian would say. After all their arguing, the same experts agree: "Yet it seems likely that the accession of Horus was *equivalent* to renewal of the reign of Osiris himself, since . . . every Horus-king was a potential Osiris";⁵² Osiris and Horus, the royal funeral and the royal succession "coalesced into a single celebration,"⁵³ even though the king is no Osiris, "the two are thought of as equivalent [*entsprechend*]" in this particular operation.⁵⁴ King, Horus, Osiris—all the same. And you can see why, if you just think about the meaning of the rites. A *Sed*-festival had to be immediately preceded by a funeral: "The old king must be buried so that the 'new king' can mount the throne."⁵⁵ They had to come so close together as to belong to the same celebration.

Jane: Why so close? Couldn't they wait awhile after the funeral?

Dick: "Thrift, thrift, Horatio!"

Mr. Jones: No, it wasn't that. During the transition from one reign to another, there was always a moment during which the throne was empty, when the world

was without a ruler; it was, as H. Altermueller says, "the moment of utmost danger" to the whole world order, and so it had to be made as short as possible.⁵⁶ So the funeral impinges on the rites from the first, and that led scholars to confuse the *Sed*-festival with the mysteries of Osiris: From the very first, says Dr. Helck, "the old prehistoric mysteries of Abydos necessarily included both the funeral of the dead king and "the installment of his successor."⁵⁷ It was always assumed accordingly that the Osirian mysteries originated as prehistoric royal funeral rites, but "more recently," according to Professor Kemp, "connection with the *Sed*-festival has been suggested."⁵⁸ This is a recent development, as the man says, and it is an important one.

Dick: Why important?

Mr. Jones: Because it explains the lion-couch. To be renewed instead of succeeded, the king had to do two things. One, he had to stay alive, and two, he had to get a transfusion from somewhere. Remember, there *had* to be a funeral as part of the show, and it had to be his funeral: how do you think he could manage that and still stay alive?

Jane: By having a make-believe funeral. Kids like to play that.

Dick: By getting a substitute to get killed for him.

Mr. Jones: You are both right. Here we see King Seti I on his lion-couch; what the whole scene suggests to Professor Uphill is "that there was a mock funeral and burial, followed by a reawakening ceremony, taking place after the king had entered the tomb."⁵⁹ Even earlier, Dr. Edwards, the great authority on the pyramids, suggests, a special tomb-chamber connected with "the earliest stone building in the world" may have contained "a dummy, designed for use in the symbolic sacrifice of the king during the *heb-sed*. . . ."⁶⁰ So you see, the idea of an imitation sacrifice occurred to the Egyptians very early. So did the idea of a substitute, and that is not surprising either, for who, as Homer might say, enjoys being sacrificed?⁶¹ Already in the Pyramid Texts of the Old Kingdom we read of kings who were lucky enough or clever enough to "escape the days of death."⁶² Sometimes a king would pointedly ignore the priests who ordered him to submit to sacrifice, as did Pepi II, who "had no intention of being sacrificed,"⁶³ and sometimes a king would openly defy them, or even turn the tables and make *them* the sacrificial victims.⁶⁴ And why not, if the Pyramid Texts themselves are, as Professor Breasted called them, "a passionate protest against death"?⁶⁵ All the great Pyramid Builders from King Zoser on were able to beat the game and evade the summons of ritual death, until the last one, King Mycerinus, who gave in to the priests and got himself sacrificed.⁶⁶ As a reward, Mycerinus

was hailed forever after in the priestly annals of Egypt as the greastest, noblest, and holiest of all the kings, the restorer of the temples and the rites which those wicked apostate Pharaohs, Cheops and Chephren, had abolished.⁶⁷ Well, the one way a king could fulfill the funerary requirements of the *Sed*-festival and still stay alive was to have a substitute be put to death in his place, and this device was early adopted and forever retained. For you see, it fulfilled all the requirements at once: it got the king out of a tight fix, it supplied the blood necessary for his transfusion, and it gave him victory over his enemies—remember, the *Sed*-festival had to be a victory celebration.

Dick: But where does the victory come in?

Jane: And the transfusion?

Mr. Jones: It is the person of the sacrificial victim that makes all the difference. The most obvious substitute for a man is his son, and there are cases of pharaohs whose sons were sacrificed on their behalf.⁶⁸ But that was hardly more satisfactory than liquidating the king himself. No, there was a much better solution since time immemorial: "Foreigners, and especially prisoners of war all the world over have provided an obvious supply of substitutes."⁶⁹ The enemy, and especially the enemy chief, who had placed himself in open rivalry to Pharaoh, was a natural candidate for his sacrificial sword or ceremonial mace, and in many a monument the King of Egypt is seen personally dispatching his rival. Right out here in the hall you will see Rameses II personally executing defeated enemy kings and princes, and here are other Pharaohs doing the same thing, right back to the beginning. The scene "occurs again in reliefs of all periods."⁷⁰

Dick: Isn't that just for fun?

Mr. Jones: Hardly. For the Egyptians, there was a holy necessity behind it. Actually, the Egyptians did not like bloody sacrifice, and they detested human sacrifice, so that for a long time scholars seriously debated whether they ever practiced human sacrifice at all.⁷¹ But that question has been settled for good: they did, but it was a ritual business from which even cannibalism was not excluded.⁷² The idea centered around "the eating of the flesh and blood of the enemy, whose powers are regenerated in the eater."^{72a} That's well known. Look, here is the oldest of all the royal sacrifices, in which the king personally offers a gazelle; but from the liturgy that accompanies the rites, it is clear that the gazelle represented the enemy of the king, an enemy chief, in fact, nay, his arch rival Seth himself. During the sacrifice the king says: "Long live the fair god . . . the hero who slaughters his adversaries." And as the royal "butcher slaughters his enemy before the divine throne," the cry is raised:

"Long live the fair god . . . rejuvenated youth!"⁷³ The rite is entitled "Slaying the Antelope . . . that the King might be endowed with life," and in preparation the officiant says, to the king: "I sharpen thy knife to slay thine enemies," announcing that the officiant will be "appeased when she has drunk their blood."⁷⁴ As Moret puts it, "the King got a substitute for the *Sed* killing, whom he decapitated with his own hand, or had a priest shed the blood of a prisoner of war, whose throbbing life assured a new lease on life to the senile monarch."⁷⁵ Here we have the transfusion taken care of at the same time that the enemy is punished.

Jane: But if the victim is a substitute for the king, then the king must be killing himself!

Mr. Jones: That is another interesting thing. The victim is the substitute for the king. By his death he does the king a great service—only through him, in fact, can the king achieve his great goal; and so in dying he is purged of all the evil of his former nature; he has "atoned."⁷⁶ The qualifications for the royal substitute make that clear: he must be a stranger (thus representing the original hostility that Pharaoh is to subdue), he must be of royal blood (to be the real rival and substitute for Pharaoh),⁷⁷ and he must be blond or redheaded.

Dick: Come again?

Mr. Jones: From the earliest times the enemy of Horus who tried to slay him was his brother Seth, or Typhon, who is always represented as being redheaded. That is why redheaded victims were sacrificed "on the solar tomb" at Heliopolis and at Busiris.⁷⁸ These were the "Typhonian men put to death by Pharaoh";⁷⁹ this is what Professor Moret said: "A victim was sacrificed and its life taken, in order that its life . . . might enter the body of Osiris. Sometimes the victims were men, prisoners of war, Libyans with red hair, recalling the image of Seth, who had red skin and hair."⁸⁰ The Greeks told many stories of Pharaohs who seized noble Greek visitors to Egypt, where blonds were hard to come by, as sacrificial victims.⁸¹

Dick: Yes, but those are just myths.

Mr. Jones: Come over to the case here. Do you know what this is? This is a seal for marking sacrificial animals in Egypt, to show that they had passed the rigorous qualifications for a holy offering.

Dick: A sort of government meat inspection, eh?

Mr. Jones: Yes, and a very necessary one. A priestly medical doctor also examined the blood to make sure it was ritually "pure."⁸² Herodotus (II, 385) says that in his day it was a capital offense to sacrifice an animal that had not been properly stamped or sealed.

Jane: Why?

Mr. Jones: Because every animal had to be very

“...we are facing some royal lion-couch scenes that look just like” Facsimile No. 1

carefully inspected to make sure that it was the right color. If it had just *one* black or white hair, it was disqualified! It had to be all red—light brown.⁸³ Now what do you see on the seal?

Dick: A man kneeling down with his arms tied behind him and a great big knife—I guess it’s a knife—at his neck.⁸⁴

Mr. Jones: It is a knife, and you see that it means the victim was originally human.⁸¹ The Egyptians, like other people, early substituted cattle for people in their sacrifices (the gazelle, for example); Osiris is said to have abolished the sacrifice of humans and put oxen in their place, and finally the people ended up sacrificing wax models and even oxen made of bread—once you admit the principle of substitution, there is no limit to how far you can go.⁸⁵

Jane (yawning): What has all this to do with Abraham?

Mr. Jones: A great deal, as you will soon find out if you can only be patient. Let’s get back to the man on the lion couch. What is going on here is called the climax, the supreme moment of the *Sed*-festival, no less.⁸⁶ And the man who says that hastens to add that it is *not* a funerary scene, really: “Although the context of this scene is undoubtedly funerary, it also depicts a ceremony that would be difficult to enact unless the king was really alive. . . .”⁸⁶ It is a funeral with a happy ending, a funeral at which the king only pretends to be dead.

Jane: But why do they go to all that trouble—couldn’t they just say “Presto!” instead of making such a fuss?

Mr. Jones: Oh, but the fuss is the most important thing! That is what proves to the world that the king is the king; he proves that he has the life-sustaining power by overcoming the supreme enemy—death itself; he enters the dark chamber of the tomb, and he emerges triumphant.

Dick: That sounds like Easter to me.

Mr. Jones: Well, a highly respected Egyptologist recently put it this way: he said that the coffins and mummy cases of the Egyptians teach a double lesson, expressing the reality of both death and resurrection, “which can be summed up in the words of the Christian creed, ‘He descended into hell. The third day

He rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven.’”⁸⁷ After all, the primitive Christians did not hesitate to find the most convincing demonstration of the resurrection in Egypt.⁸⁸ Now here we are facing some royal lion-couch scenes that look just like the picture in the Joseph Smith papyrus; they are from the shrines of Niuserre, of Seti I, Tutankhamen, the tombs of nobles at Thebes, the temples of Opet and Denderah, and they are all found in dark inner chambers, secret crypts. The oldest one here is King Niuserre’s and represents “the climax of the festival”—the *Sed*-festival—when “the king goes down into his tomb” where a lion-couch awaits him, above which is a damaged inscription about the resurrection of the flesh.⁸⁹ Remember I. E. S. Edwards’s suggestion that the granite tomb-chamber of one of the earliest pharaohs was “designed for use in the symbolic sacrifice of the king during the *heb-sed*”; that shows how old the idea is. Both these chambers were found in complexes of what we have called the “Potiphar’s Hill” variety.⁹⁰ But for the climax of the whole business, the crypt was the thing, the tomb-chamber, the *abaton*.

Jane: What is an *abaton*?

Mr. Jones: The same as an *adyton*, the most inaccessible shrine of a temple; an inner chamber in which no mortal may set foot. In Egypt it represented the tomb of Osiris, the chamber between the upper and lower worlds, the place of both death and resurrection.⁹¹ Notice here how the tomb of Tutankhamen dramatizes the king’s rebirth by a series of chambers, passages, and doors—the king must pass through some sort of underworld before he can emerge triumphant; here King Tutankhamen “comes as Osiris to his tomb, where a cycle of transformation is going to begin again.”⁹² It is not just one event, but a series of events that takes place. Here at Denderah, for example, are three surviving tableaux showing funeral, resurrection, and coronation, in that order, though Professor Derchain reminds us that these pictures probably bear little, if any, resemblance to what really went on.⁹³

Dick: Why is that?

Mr. Jones: Because the scenes are very abbreviated—they haven’t any intention of being complete—and sometimes they are all jumbled around, being adapted to expressing several ideas at once.⁹⁴ Here are four successive scenes from the tomb of Rameses IX, where the king, who starts out as Osiris, is resurrected in four stages: first he is lying on his back, then he has turned over on his face, then he is moving his arms and legs, and finally he is standing upright.⁹⁵ A “very rare” vignette from the Book of the Dead shows such “rites of rebirth” using three lion-couches in succes-

sion.⁹⁶ A complete illustration would perhaps call for 24 pictures, because each hour of the day represented a phase in the rites of Osiris.⁹⁷

Dick: How can we really know what went on, then?

Mr. Jones: By the written records and by comparison with what went on in other places. Let us take this crypt business, for example. Many Greek and Roman writers tell us that it was still the custom in Egypt in their day for the people yearly to go into mourning for Osiris, hidden away in the earth in a dark crypt,⁹⁸ there is evidence for such practices at every period of Egyptian history—this crypt of Tutankhamen, for example, into which the king and even the sun-god Re himself must enter, is labeled “the cavern which is in the place of annihilation.”⁹⁹ In Babylonia the king at the great coronation and New Year’s rites was hidden away for three days in an underground chamber, where he suffered the utmost degradation; during that time a make-believe king sat on his throne; then the substitute (who, of course, was treated exactly like the real king) was put to death, and the real king emerged triumphant from the tomb, where he had suffered an imitation death. A. Moortgat noticed that many of the early royal graves of Sumer had the bricks removed from the crypt just over the king’s head, and that in every such case the king’s body was missing, even though the treasures of the tomb are left untouched—and this only happens in the case of kings, never of other people, including queens. Which suggests to Professor Moortgat that this is not the work of tomb robbers, but an attempt to make it look as if the king had indeed risen from the tomb.¹⁰⁰ After the sacrifice, when the coast is clear, “the old king who has been shamming dead in a tomb” emerges safe and sound.¹⁰¹ The same sort of thing seems to have been going on in Egypt from early times.

Dick: What makes you think so?

Mr. Jones: Well, look here, for example—the so-called Bent-Pyramid, one of the early experimental monuments of the pharaohs. Here the tomb-chamber was found broken open—but not robbed! And the king was missing.¹⁰² Here in a pyramid text a resurrection rite is compared with the removing of bricks from the royal vault.¹⁰³ Coming down a little later, here is a coffin text that reads, “O Osiris So-and-so [naming the king or noble] . . . the walls about thy tomb are knocked down. . . . Awake, arise! All thy members are restored. Thou art not dead!”¹⁰⁴ The Classical writers have described the wild rejoicings that followed the mourning for Osiris when his faithful followers discovered “the empty tumulus of Osiris.”¹⁰⁵ If this sounds surprisingly Christian, let me refer you

to a very early Jewish-Christian writing called the Epistle of Barnabas, which says that the king at the New Year had to be represented by *two* ritual animals because he “on the same day wore a royal robe *after* he had been cursed, ridiculed and crucified.”¹⁰⁶ That is, the old Jewish rites represented this very sort of thing, which in Barnabas’s belief prefigured the sufferings and victory of the Lord.

Dick: More Easter business.

Mr. Jones: The atmosphere of excitement and wonder in the rites of Osiris certainly does remind one of an Oriental Easter celebration of a medieval Holy Week. It is terribly dramatic and, in fact, took the form of a real play. I can’t tell you about it now, but the most dramatic moment of all, the crucial moment of truth on which the whole story hinges, was that unbearably tense instant in which the world held its breath awaiting the decision of eternal life or death. Come over here and look at these writings all over these big coffins: these are the Coffin Texts, and they tell us all about it. These texts on the wall from the Book of the Dead and the Classical writers will eke out the story. Let us take it step by step. ○

(To be continued)

FOOTNOTES

- ⁹⁶A. H. Gardiner, in *Jnl. Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 30 (1944), p. 28.
⁹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 30.
⁹⁸See the note in *Chron. d’Egypte*, Vol. 38 (1963), p. 73, and G. A. Wainwright, *The Sky-Religion in Egypt* (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 23f, 80.
⁹⁹S. Schott, in *Akad. der Wiss. u. Lit.* (Wiesbaden, 1954), No. 5, pp. 167f.
¹⁰⁰G. Moeller, *Aeg. Ztschr.*, Vol. 39 (1901), pp. 71f; W. Helck, in *Orientalia*, Vol. 23 (1954), pp. 385, 383; H. Altenmueller, in *Ex Or. Lux*, Vol. 19, p. 442; H. Kees, *Der Goetterglaube im alten Aegypten* (Leipzig, 1941), p. 379.
¹⁰¹H. Kees, *Totenglaube . . . der alten Aegypter* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 16; A. H. Gardiner, in *Jnl. of Egypt. Archaeol.*, Vol. 24 (1938), p. 165.
¹⁰²H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods* (University of Chicago, 1948), p. 79.
¹⁰³Kees, *Goetterglaube*, p. 296; though every Sed has a coronation, the reverse does not apply.
¹⁰⁴Altenmueller, *op. cit.*, p. 441.
¹⁰⁵H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der Aegyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 158-61.
¹⁰⁶Wainwright, *Sky Religion*, p. 4; quote is from I. Edwards, *The Pyramids*, p. 56.
¹⁰⁷A. Moret, *La Mise a Mort du dieu en Egypte* (Paris, 1927), p. 49.
¹⁰⁸Frankfort, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
¹⁰⁹Kees, *Goetterglaube*, p. 191.
¹¹⁰Bonnet, *op. cit.*, p. 159; Kees, *op. cit.*, p. 207.
¹¹¹H. Schaefer, *Mysterien des Osiris in Abydos* (Leipzig, 1904), p. 21.
¹¹²G. Moeller, in *Aeg. Ztschr.*, Vol. 39, p. 73; quote is from W. Helck, *Orientalia*, Vol. 23, p. 383; cf. C. de Wit, *Chron. d’Eg.*, Vol. 42, pp. 78ff.
¹¹³A. Moret, *Mysteres Egyptiens* (Paris: 1913), p. 73.
¹¹⁴Moeller, *op. cit.*, p. 74 & next note.
¹¹⁵A. H. Gardiner criticizes Frazer, and cites Kees, in *Jnl. Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 2 (1916), p. 124. Cf. Wainwright, *op. cit.*, p. 20, n. 1.
¹¹⁶Gardiner, *loc. cit.* J. Cerny, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 35, suggests that Osiris was “originally a human king who became deified after his death.”
¹¹⁷Frankfort, *Kingship*, p. 194.
¹¹⁸K. Sethe, *Komment. zu den Pyramidentexte*, Vol. 1, p. 84, on No. 219: 167b.
¹¹⁹Altenmueller, in *Ex Or. Lux*, p. 441.
¹²⁰H. Altenmueller, in *Chronique d’Egypte*, Vol. 42 (1967), p. 81.
¹²¹W. Helck, in *Archiv Orientalni*, 1952, pp. 72ff.
¹²²B. J. Kemp, in *Jnl. Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 52 (1966), p. 13.
¹²³E. Uphill, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 24 (1965), p. 379, *Pyramid Texts* 12-13, 17-21, 32.
¹²⁴I. E. S. Edwards, *The Pyramids* (Pelican, 1956), pp. 61-63; cf. A. Moret, *Le Culte Divin*, p. 224.
¹²⁵On “the sacred king’s unwillingness to resign” see R. Graves, *The Greek Myths* (Penguin, 1955), Vol. 1, p. 153, *passim*.
¹²⁶*Pyramid Texts*, No. 570: 1453-5, 1467-8, 1450. M. A. Murray, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1928, p. 8, was first to comment on the significance of these passages.

⁶³Wainwright, *Sky Religion*, p. 28.
⁶⁴*Ibid.*, p. 52. A dramatic turning of the tables is recounted in Diodorus III, 6.
⁶⁵J. H. Breasted, *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (Harper Torchbooks, 1959), p. 91.
⁶⁶Wainwright, *op. cit.*, pp. 88, 65f, gives sources.
⁶⁷Herodotus, II, 127-130.
⁶⁸C. A. Wainwright, in *Jnl. Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 26, p. 38. Conversely, Alexander the Great regarded himself as the son and reincarnation of Pharaoh Nectanebos, whom he sacrificed by throwing over a cliff, Pseudo-Callisthenes, I, 34, and I, 14. C. Alred notes that every king of the 18th Dynasty had a junior partner whom he completely ignored and who may have been his double and substitute in the *Sed*-festival, *Aeg. Ztschr.*, Vol. 94 (1967), pp. 2-3.
⁶⁹Wainwright, *Sky Religion*, pp. 60-61.
⁷⁰W. Wreszinski, *Atlas zur altäg Kulturgesch.*, Vol. 2, Pt. i, Taf. 57a, Pt. ii, Taf. 163, 164, 184a; quote is from Budge, *Osiris* (1961), Vol. I, pp. 197f.
⁷¹M. G. Kyle, in *Rec. Trav.*, Vol. 27 (1905), pp. 161ff, vigorously denied human sacrifice in Egypt. The idea of cannibalism at any time is rejected by G. Ebers, *Aeg. Ztschr.*, Vol. 36 (1898), p. 106f, by S. Schott, *ibid.*, Vol. 74 (1938), p. 93, and E. A. W. Budge, *Gods of the Egyptians* (London, 1904), Vol. 1, p. 28.
⁷²C. Maspero, in *Bibliothèque Egyptologique*, Vol. 1, p. 156: "Human sacrifice was never completely abolished in Egypt." Human sacrifice to Osiris is treated by M. Lefebure, *ibid.*, XXXVI, 287f. See the important studies of A. Moret, *Mysteres Egyptiens*, pp. 51-53, and Maspero, in *Memoires of the Inst. Francais d'Archeol. Orientale du Caire*, Vol. 5, pp. 439-46. The "immolation of servants" is apparently in early royal tombs of *abdyos*, A. H. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 409f. W. F. M. Petrie, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1914, p. 18, reports evidence of cannibalistic rites, as does J. Garnot, *Vie Religieuses*, p. 3; cf. Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*, I, 2, pp. 91f, and especially J. Baillët, in *Bulletin de l'Inst. Fr. d'Arch. Orientale*, Vol. 30 (1931), pp. 61-72. The fullest treatment is in E. A. W. Budge, *Osiris* (N.Y.: University Books, 1961), Vol. 1, pp. 167-230.
⁷³G. Thausing, *Der Auferstehungsgedanke in aeg. religiösen Texten* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1943), p. 25, citing *Pyr. Text* No. 460.
⁷⁴Ph. Derchain, *Rites Egyptiens, I Le Sacrifice de l'Oryx* (Brussels, 1962), p. 55, cf. *Pyr. Text* 510: 1138.
⁷⁵Derchain, *op. cit.*, p. 53, cf. p. 40.
⁷⁶A. Moret, *Mysteres Egyptiens*, p. 191.
⁷⁷A. Varille, in *Annales du Service*, Vol. 53, p. 117; the victim becomes the benefactor of gods and men, Ph. Derchain, *op. cit.*, pp. 21ff. Though according to K. Sethe, in *Aeg. Ztschr.*, Vol. 50 (1912), pp. 57-60, the idea of blood-vengeance (*Blutschande*) was not Egyptian, the earliest Egyptian sacrificial victim was treated as a kind of scapegoat, Ph. Derchain, *Rites Egyptiens*, Vol. 1, p. 17, citing Herodot. II, 39. "Smiting a man, or animal . . . was an act of consecration or dedication" imparting special virtue to the victim, E. A. W. Budge, *The Book of Opening the Mouth* (London, 1909), Vol. 1, p. 39. In Babylonian, cir. 1800 B.C., a "purely human victim" was "slain as atonement (zur Strafe) and for the creation of new beings." D. Opitz, in *Archiv fuer Orientforschung*, Vol. 5 (1928-9), p. 88. The word *hotep* in its meaning of "peace" or "satisfaction" may "point to a remote period when the true idea of expiation . . . may have been represented in the Egyptian sacrifices," M. T. Kyle, in *Rec. Trav.*, Vol. 27, pp. 169. The idea of expiation is clear in *Coffin Texts* I, 295, "The wounding [of the Eye] which is in thee is made good by him who caused it." See A. Moret, *Mysteres Egyptiens*, pp. 43-44, 191, 193.
⁷⁸If a real king was not available, the substitute would still have to dress up in the proper royal regalia—a substitute substitute king! Wainwright, p. 4.
⁷⁹C. Lefebure, in *Bibliothèque Egyptol.* Vol. 36, pp. 280-83, 287, citing Manetho and Plutarch, *de Iside*, 73; cf. Athenaeus, IV, 72;

Herodot., III, 28.
⁸⁰A. Moret, *Culte Divin*, p. 135, n. 1; Plut., *de Iside*, 32; Diodor., I, 45, 83; Strabo, XVIII, 1, 3; Lefebure, *op. cit.*, pp. 288f; Wainwright, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
⁸¹A. Moret, *Kings and Gods of Egypt*, p. 85.
⁸²J. G. Griffiths, in *Annales du Service*, Vol. 48 (1948), pp. 410-16; Lefebure, *op. cit.*, pp. 301, 294f; Wainwright, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-45.
⁸³J. Leibovitch, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 12 (1953), pp. 59f.
⁸⁴Plutarch, *de Iside*, 31, discussed by Th. Hopfner, *Plutarch ueber Isis und Osiris* (Prague: Or. Inst., 1940), pp. 23-25.
⁸⁵Plut., *loc. cit.*, describes the seal, for which T. Hopfner, *Der Tierkult der alten Aegypten* (Vienna, 1913), pp. 72f, supplies illustration. Manetho reports that at Heliopolis human victims were examined and stamped exactly like the animals, G. Lefebure, *op. cit.* 36:281.
⁸⁶In *sacra simulata pro veris accipi* is the universal rule, Servius, *ad Aen.* II, 116; Athenaeus, *Deipnos*, IV, 172D, etc. The use of wax images is the commonest aspect of Egyptian magical practices.
⁸⁷E. Uphill, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 24, p. 379; G. Jequier, in *Rec. Trav.*, Vol. 37, p. 122, says that this particular scene "is not funerary at all."
⁸⁸J. Bennett, in *Journal of Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 53 (1967), p. 166.
⁸⁹Clement, *Epist. to the Corinthians*, I, 25, and *Apostolic Constitutions*, V, 7 both use the death and resurrection of the Phoenix-bird "on the so-called altar of the Sun at Heliopolis" as the most potent proof of the resurrection of the flesh.
⁹⁰Uphill, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-78.
⁹¹At Abydos in predynastic times the rites were held at such a complex, the prototype of the step pyramid, B. J. Kemp, in *Journal of Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 52 (1966), pp. 21f. There are also in prehistoric times "allusions to the Osiris cult celebrated in front of the necropolis mounds" at "the Field of the Ancestors," E. A. E. Raymond, in *Journal of Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 53 (1967), p. 106. The mound was a form of the Primeval Hill, "from which creation proceeded . . . obviously a depository of creative energy . . ." Frankfort, *Kingship*, pp. 152-53.
⁹²H. Junker, *Das Goetterdekret ueber das Abaton* (Vienna, 1913), pp. 21-24, 31, 86. The concept intrigues the Classical writers, e.g. Lucan, *Phars.*, X, 323; Virgil, *Aeniad.*, VI, 329; Diodor., *Lib.*, I, 22, 3; Seneca.
⁹³A. Piankoff, *The Shrines of Tut-an-kh-amon* (Harper Torchbooks, 1962), p. 33.
⁹⁴Ph. Derchain, in *Revue d'Egyptologie*, Vol. 15 (1963), p. 19.
⁹⁵Derchain, *Rites Egyptiens*, Vol. I, pp. 23, 25, following Junker.
⁹⁶F. Guilmant, "Tombeau de Ram. IX," in *Memoires de la Mission Archeol. Francaise*, Vol. 15, Pl. lvi; the upright figure being a mummy may not belong to the series.
⁹⁷A. Moret, *Mysteres Egyptiens*, p. 57, fig. 19, after Naville, *Todtenbuch*, Ch. 158a.
⁹⁸Moret, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 21-23.
⁹⁹Firmicus Maternus, *de error. profan. rel.* 2:1-7, in Hopfner, *Fontes Hist. Relig. Aegyptiacae*, pp. 518f; In *adytis idolum Osiridis sepultum, cum annuis luctibus plangunt*. Cf. below, note 105.
¹⁰⁰Piankoff, *op. cit.*, p. 125, No. 2. For the prehistoric rites, see E. Raymond, in *Journal of Eg. Arch.*, Vol. 53, p. 106; A. Schaff, *Das Grab als Wohnhaus* (Munich, 1947).
¹⁰¹A. Moortgat, *Tammuz* (Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1949), pp. 53-80; discussed by E. D. Van Buren, *Or.* 18, 1949, p. 499.
¹⁰²Graves, *The Greek Myths*, I, 153. Cf. W. Helck, *Orientalia*, 1950, p. 430.
¹⁰³E. S. Edwards, *Pyramids*, p. 72.
¹⁰⁴*Pyramid Text* No. 335: 572.
¹⁰⁵*Coffin Texts* (De Buck), I, 60f, Spell 79.
¹⁰⁶Minucius Felix, *Octav.*, 22:1-2; Firmicus Maternus, in Hopfner, *Fontes Hist. Relig. Aegyptiacae*, pp. 519f; *Carmen in Paganos* (Hopfner, p. 719); *Mythographus Vaticanus*, Proem. 91 (Hopfner, p. 728), etc.
¹⁰⁷Barnabas, *Epist.*, 7.

The Sea Gull

By Stella McGuire

*It circled with a plaintive cry, the gull beside the sea,
 Wings spread against a misty sky, white breasts all silvery.
 The breakers beat against the shore—the winds blew raw and chill;
 And yet he circled more and more, above the rocky hill.
 There were no children on the beach; there were no boats at sea;
 The only things within eye's reach were the shores, the gull, and me.
 Oh gull, with eyes that search the sands, why circle high and low?
 Can it be food that lures demands, or do you really know?*

*I sit here, too, without a friend, and watch your soaring flight;
 I'm wondering if you feel the wind ushering in the night.
 Where will you go when cold gray fog blots everything from view?
 Have you some nest behind a log, or are you homeless, too?
 You seem so lonely as you glide—a creature set apart;
 Above the roar, each time you've cried, your voice has pierced my heart.
 One thought, as evening turns to night, brings warmth despite the spray:
 God watches o'er the sparrows' flight; are we not more than they?*