THE BAPTISM OF PHARAOH

By SIR ALAN GARDINER

In a recently written but not yet published article I was concerned to show that four sandstone blocks in the Vatican Museum emanate from the temple erected at Hermonthis (Armant) by Tuthmosis III in honour of Mont, the principal deity of that important Upper Egyptian town. One of the blocks bears the remains of a scene of well-known type: Tuthmosis III stands facing left, while streams of vivifying ‘ankh-signs are poured over his head by a destroyed god on either side of him. My attempt to provide a commentary led to developments which would have lengthened my article to an undesirable extent. The following pages are devoted to what had there to be omitted.

For information concerning Egyptian rites of purification one turns naturally to the important series of papers of which Blackman was the author. The ramifications of the subject are enormous, since all religious ceremonies of Pharaonic times, whether performed on behalf of a deity, a deceased noble, or the living king, were prefaced by some act of ritual cleansing of which the object was sometimes the officiant and sometimes the intended beneficiary. Happily I am not called upon to deal with this topic in more than a limited way. The royal purification in question can be segregated from the other similar rites in a manner that has not hitherto been properly recognized, and the texts accompanying the scenes where it is depicted yield a self-sufficient explanation of its purpose beyond which it is superfluous to look.

Before proceeding farther, it will be well to cast a comprehensive glance over the material available for the elucidation of this particular rite. I have here confined myself to pre-Ptolemaic representations. From various publications it proved possible to assemble eleven parallels to the Vatican fragment, these ranging from the reign of Hashepsowe to that of Philip Arrhidaeus. Though these sufficed to demonstrate my main contentions, it seemed advisable to seek the help of the best authority on such religious scenes. I confess my surprise at having received from Dr. Nelson a list of twenty-four still existing, though mostly unpublished, at Thebes alone, these excluding, moreover, the few scenes exhibiting deities other than those in which I was mainly interested, namely Horus, Seth, and Thoth. To Nelson’s list, here printed immediately after this paragraph, I have added the nine others previously utilized by me. The same scholar has added to my indebtedness by providing prints from the Chicago negatives of seven scenes at Thebes which for my particular purpose were more illuminating than the rest. This gift was accompanied by permission from Dr. Hughes, the Field-director of the Oriental Institute, to make whatever use of them I liked. To both colleagues I tender my sincerest thanks.

1 Description in Marucchi, Il Museo egizio Vaticano, p. 131, No. 129A. A photograph will appear in my article in vol. z of the Studi in memoria di Ippolito Rosellini, to be published by the University of Pisa.
2 See particularly Rec. trans. 39, 44 ff., where a résumé of the previous papers is given. Also to be consulted is his article Purification (Egyptian) in Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 10.
3 On his No. 9 see below, p. 4, n. 1.
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Scenes representing the Baptism of Pharaoh

Nos. 1-24, as well as No. 64, are those enumerated by Nelson, the indications in brackets after the serial number giving the position of the scene as shown in his work entitled Key Plans showing locations of Theban Temple Decorations. Nos. 25-32, together with No. 274, are those added by myself from various publications.

A. Theban scenes of the King being purified by two gods but containing text mentioning four gods:

1. (Gur. 160) Sethos I embraced by Amun, both together being purified by Horus and Thoth. (Temple of Sethos I, Theban necropolis, rear wall of second room on right opening off hypostyle hall. Unpublished.)
2. (KB 172) Ramesses II purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, hypostyle hall, east wall, 1st reg., south-east corner of hall. Unpublished.)
3. (MH. A 270) Ramesses III purified by Horus and Thoth. (Medinet Habu, Temple of Ramesses III, west side of second court on portico, 1st register, second scene on right of central axis. Unpublished.)
4. (Kh. 306) Ramesses IV purified by Horus and Thoth. (Temple of Khons, ambulatory about bark-shrine, east wall, 1st reg. See pl. I, top.)
5. (Kh. 274) Ramesses XI purified by Horus and Thoth. (Temple of Khons, east wall of hypostyle hall, 1st reg. Leps., Denkm. 111, 278a.)
6. (Kh. 209) Herihor purified by Horus and Thoth. (Temple of Khons, 1st court, west wall, 2nd reg., west end of portico. Unpublished.)

B. Theban scenes with text mentioning only the two deities depicted as participating:

7. (KD 458) Hashepsowt purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, room XII, north of granite shrine. Jacques, Temples Memphites et Thébaïdes, I, 24.)
8. Hashepsowt purified by Horus and Thoth. (On one of the blocks from Hashepsowt's red sandstone shrine, to be published by Lacau.)
9. (KD 514) Tuthmosis III purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, westernmost of the three rooms north of the court of the XIIIth Dyn. Unpublished.)
10. (KF 390) Tuthmosis III purified by two gods with small figure standing on smw-symbol immediately behind king. Upper half of the figures gone with the wall. (Karnak, Tuthmosis III's Festival Hall, room XXVI, north wall. Unpublished.)
13. (KB 290) Sethos I purified by Horus and Seth. (Karnak, hypostyle hall, east face of north tower of second pylon, 3rd reg. Leps., Denkm. 111, 124.)
14. (KB 293) Sethos I, kneeling on smw-symbol, purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, hypostyle hall, north wall, 2nd reg. Scene unpublished, but mentioned Champollion, Notes descriptive, II, 58, bottom.)
15. (KL 6) Ramesses II purified by two human-headed deities, names lost. Third scene in series of (1) king leaving palace, (2) king carried in chair by Souls, (3) king purified.
16. (KG 110) Ramesses III purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, 8th pylon, north face, 2nd reg. Scene unpublished, but mentioned Champollion, op. cit. II, 152 for text.)

Nelson's No. 9, said to be published Naville, Deir el Bahari, III, 64, appears to be a mistake.
Sethos I being purified by Horus and Seth. From a relief (now destroyed by fire) formerly in the Brussels Museum (No. 27 of the list).
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17. (MH. A 147) Ramesses III purified by Horus and Seth. (Medinet Habu (Chicago), iv, pl. 234.)
18. (Kh. 423) Ramesses IV purified by Horus and Thoth. (Temp. of Khons, room IV, north wall. Unpublished.)
19. (KG 179) Ramesses IV purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, 9th pylon, east tower, north face. Unpublished.)
20. (KG 180) Ramesses XI purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, 1st court of south extension, north wall. Unpublished.)
21. (KI. 118) Taharqa purified by two deities, heads and above lost with wall. (Karnak, edifice of Taharqa by lake, exterior, north side. Unpublished.)
22. (K1 278) King (Ramesses II or Taharqa?) purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, temple of Ramesses II between great temple and east gate of temple enclosure, screen between two of the columns in north row of portico, south face. Unpublished.)
23. (KD 114) Philip purified by Horus and Thoth. (Karnak, granite shrine, exterior, south face. Leps., Denkm. iv, 2, c, see too Porter and Moss, iii, 38 (84). Here reproduced in pl. II.)
24. (KI 140) Possibly a fragment of purification scene, Ramesside. (Karnak, small chapel of Tuthmosis III behind great temple, exterior, north end.)

C. Scenes depicting two of the gods Horus, Seth, or Thoth from sites other than Thebes:

25. Armant, now in the Vatican Museum. Scene figuring Tuthmosis III as described in the first paragraph of this article.
27. Heliopolis? Granite block showing in the centre Sethos I between (Seth) the Ombite on the left, and (Horus) the Behdetite on the right. Capart, Recueil de Monuments, i (1903), pl. 39. Here reproduced, pl. I, bottom.
28. Abydos, Sethos I. See below under E.
29. Abydos. Ramesses II between Thoth on the left and Harsibe on the right. Capart, Temple de Seth Ier (Abydos), pl. 5.
31. Wadi es-Sebou. Ramesses II between Horus the Behdetite on his left and Thoth on his right. Gauthier, Le temple de Ouadi es-Seboud, pl. 38, a, with p. 149.

D. Scenes where two gods other than Horus, Seth, or Thoth are shown:

32. Thebes, Dér el-Bahari. Hashepsowt, small and doubtless intended as an infant, between Amun on the right and Rê-Harakhti on the left. Naville, Deir el-Bahari (iii), pl. 56, left.
33. Thebes, Luxor temple. Amenophis III, similarly as infant between Mont on the right and Atum on the left. Gayet, Temple de Louxor, pl. 75, fig. 186.

E. Scenes undoubtedly belonging to the same category, but showing only one officiating deity:

34. Abydos, Temple of Sethos I. The king stands facing Horus wearing the side-lock, i.e. as 'Wen-merf' Pillar of His Mother', who pours over him encircling streams of rankh- and nsw-signs out of three hes-vases. Calverley and Broome, The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos, iii, pl. 35.

56. (MH 413) Ramesses III embraced by Atum receiving streams of water from a hes-vaese held by Horus wearing the side-lock. (Medinet Habu, rear room 21. Unpublished.)

* So according to Porter and Moss, vi, 6, top. Capart's photograph extends to the right no farther than the figure of the king.
In the following discussion the individual scenes will be quoted by their serial number. Most examples comprise four separate hieroglyphic legends, one over each of the two gods and often extending behind him, and one on each side between the god and the king. The former pair are referred to by the initial letter of the name of the god in question, followed by r or l according as the god in question stands to right or left of the king. The second pair are referred to by a capital K for King, followed by r or l as before. Thus in the scene reproduced photographically in pl. 1, top, the inscription over Horus is designated 4 HI, while the single column between Thoth and the King is given as 4 Kr.

The first thing to be determined is the context to which this type of representation belongs. In some cases the rite it depicts has been clearly recognized by scholars as an episode in the coronation ceremonies, or at least in a real or imaginative series where the royal prerogatives were bestowed or confirmed—in the latter event I am thinking of the Sed-festival. Owing to the piecemeal way in which our examples have been published, or in some instances (e.g. Nos. 8, 25, 27) because the picture stands on an isolated block or (No. 29) is without any informative context, it has not been realized that this generalization, at least so far as our material allows us to judge, is without exception. Blackman has failed to recognize this, and takes several of the examples above quoted (Nos. 13, 29, and even 23, where the evidence to the contrary is particularly clear) as depicting the king as in course of being purified before officiating in a temple. The absence of this scene from the six famous chapels in the temple of Sethos I at Abydos where the daily cult is depicted bears irrefutable witness against this contention, and if somewhat similar representations are found in the funerary cult of either deceased nobles or the Osirianized king, it is always the dead person, not the officiant, who is the recipient of the purifying streams. This does not mean, of course, that the officiant in temples had not likewise to undergo purificatory preparation for his priestly functions; all that is argued here is that the particular scene with which we are concerned in this article belongs to a wholly different set of ceremonies. It is a curious fact, for which no explanation seems forthcoming, that at these royal purifications it is the hes-vase (O.K. hes(t)), not the nemset-jar or any other, which is invariably used—this has been verified in Nos. 1–7, 13, 17, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 274, and 60, in fact in all properly visible pre-Ptolemaic examples accessible to me either through publications or in photograph. Cerny reminds me of the magnificent inlaid models of a hes-vase found in the funerary temple of Neferirkare; evidently this type of vessel was specially suited to ceremonies in honour of the king himself.

The analogy of our rite to that of Christian baptism is close enough to justify the title given to this article. In both cases a symbolic cleansing by means of water serves as initiation into a properly legitimated religious life. It must not, however, be assumed too hastily that the ceremony was always enacted on the actual day of coronation. Sometimes it may have been performed far earlier; sometimes it may not have been
performed at all. It is not mentioned in the Ramesseum dramatic papyrus; the purpose
and occasion of the ritual there commemorated are wholly obscure to me. In any case
it must never be forgotten that temple sculptures and tomb paintings are not neces-
sarily authentic records of real happenings, but may merely belong to the world of
imagination and make-believe. Are we to accept as gospel truth that Pharaoh's chariot
was always the first to dash into the midst of his enemies and that they always succumbed
at the first impact? But according to theory at least the hes-purification had its
definite place in a series of ritual acts culminating in the new king's presentation to the
supreme god of the realm. Though of very late date, the four episodes reproduced from
Lepsius in our pl. II admirably illustrate this conception. First comes the purifica-
tion by Horus and Thoth (No. 23 of the list above). Next the same two gods place the
crown of Upper Egypt upon the king's head. Then Mont of Thebes and Atum of
Heliopolis take Philip Arrhidaeus by the hand and, at the invitation of Thoth, lead him
into the presence of Amen-RE. Lastly, that august deity adjusts the crown anew, thus
acknowledging the coronation to have been properly accomplished, while behind him, quite unexpectedly, his spouse Atumu suckles the young monarch, for that very pur-
pose spirited back into babyhood. No. 13 of the list has a closely similar set of scenes,
as may be seen from the publication. At Dér el-Bahri and Luxor a famous sequence of
reliefs traces the careers of Hashepsowé and Amenophis III respectively from their
divine procreation to the actual accession. Here the baptism (Nos. 31, 32) is as
performed upon the person of an infant, so that there is no pretence of enactment on
the very day of coronation. Nevertheless, the accompanying words reveal that that con-
summation was already envisaged: both gods are accorded the same speech, as follows:
Words spoken: Be pure together with thy ka, (namely)
thy great dignity of King of Upper and Lower Egypt, thou living (eternally). It is
not often that the legends beside the picture of the hes-purification allude to its
ultimate purpose, but they do so in one Karnak example of the time of Sethos I
(13 SY), where we read: I purify thee with life and dominion, that thou mayst grow young
(tripl) like thy father RE and make Sed-festival like Atum, being arisen gloriously as

1 For the presence of Thoth here see below, p. 8, n. 1.
2 Sethe, op. p. 112 of his translation of Urk. IV, 243, renders: Du bist rein mit deinem Ka (in) deiner grossen
Würde eines Königs von Ober- und Unterägypten. Since the preposition m is omitted over both gods alike at
Dér el-Bahri and at Luxor there can be no justification for not regarding m(k) as m in apposition to
k'(k) in (4-9). The implication that the king's ka is identical with his kingly office is less startling than some
Egyptologists may find it. In my articles PSBA 37, 237; 38, 83, I pointed out that the word ka is sometimes
very nearly equivalent to our 'attribute'. Sometimes an object of verbs like mrt 'love' or h3 'praise' it seems
synonymous with our 'nature' or 'temperament'. And sometimes, even more strangely, the Egyptian word ka
appears to stand for something as external and fortuitous as a man's 'rank' or 'fortune'; so in the phrase where
be the lord of the Two Lands made (Urk. IV, 486, 3; Quibell, Tomb of Yuua (CCC), 2; Leps., Denkm. Text, III,
175): I believe too that the epithet m kft found in Middle Kingdom texts signifies linking or combining
attributes, whether those taken from others (Pyr. 5) or those acquired by personal effort (e.g. Cairo 20001;
Kerch. IV, 13, 14; Stlé, pl. 16, 5); cf. particularly the parallel expression m dbk 3w3 at Stlé, 1, 86h. We may ask
whether the English word 'personality' might not best embrace these various applications of the Egyptian word.
The main point in which the Egyptian conception of 'personality' would then differ from our own is that it
assumes a separation from the owner's physical person, just as was done with the kst and sometimes even
with the 'name' or the 'shadow'; see Davies and Gardiner, Tomb of Amenemhet, 99 f.
3 For this rendering of see below, p. 12.
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In the above statements I have naturally had to confine myself to what could be gleaned from the publications and from the photographs sent by Nelson; valuable confirmation, however, is afforded by the following extract from the letter with which that scholar accompanied his gift:

'I think it is certain that the purification rite is not part of the daily temple service. It frequently, perhaps generally, occurs as part of a series of acts culminating in the king kneeling before Amun as he receives regalia, jubilees, life, or the like. The series may include all, or some, of the following scenes: (1) The king leaves the palace, its door shown behind him. (2) The king is purified by the gods. (3) The king is led by two gods into the temple. (4) The king has the crown placed on his head by some god. (5) The king enters the shrine of Amun and, generally, kneels before the deity, while Thoth may write the royal titulary and /un-mwt/ announces the good things done for the king. The king is not the officiant in these rites as he is in the temple service, but instead is the recipient of the acts and of the favours of the gods.'

I pass now to a second question concerning the rite which is of equal, if not greater, importance. What is the reason that Thoth so often appears facing Horus as the second officiating deity? Earlier attempts to answer this question have all unwarrantably assumed that Thoth is here deputizing for Seth. Since in the examples enumerated above Thoth occurs twenty-two times and Seth only thrice it might seem more reasonable to suppose that in the rare cases where Seth is found he is deputizing for Thoth. Two of the three cases (Nos. 13, 27) belong to the reign of Sethos I, whose own name shows in what favour was then held the god of his home in the north-eastern Delta; but no such explanation will account for the third occurrence (No. 17). On the evidence before us we have every ground for believing that Thoth was the normal and original deity figured in this particular scene. Our oldest representations date back no farther than the Eighteenth Dynasty, where all six cases (Nos. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 26) depict Thoth. We have absolutely no right to assume that because Horus and Seth are the gods usually seen crowning the king therefore Seth must have been the original god in the purification ceremony; in that case the crowns to be presented were those of Upper and of Lower Egypt, and Seth was the god of the former half of the country, as Horus was of the latter. No such bipartite division of the country is to be assumed in the rite here discussed, and the presence of Thoth there will be seen to have been due to a different, if not entirely unrelated, reason.

The latest writer on this topic is E. Otto, and although he, like his predecessors, was obsessed with the notion that when Thoth is depicted he is a substitute for Seth, it seems desirable to summarize his argument. Starting from this false premiss and using inadequate material, he conjectured that the preference apparently shown to Thoth in the Eighteenth Dynasty was due to the hatred still felt for Seth as the god of the Hyksos, while the latter's return to acceptability, if not to popularity, in the Nineteenth Dynasty was accounted for by the reason mentioned in my last paragraph. Otto

1 For these locations see my article JEA 39, 23 ff. The reason why in the crowning seen in pl. II Thoth is the partner of Horus is doubtless that by the reign of Philip Arrhidaeus Seth had become so detested that the depiction of him was avoided wherever possible; Thoth had served as partner to Horus in the preceding purification, and accordingly seemed quite a suitable substitute for Seth here.

2 That als Stellvertreter des Seth, in Orientalia, 7 (1938), 69 ff.
recognized, however, that the assumed suppression of Seth would not provide a motive for the choice of Thoth as an alternative. He argued, accordingly, that between Seth and Thoth there must be some affinity which would make this choice a natural one, and following up that idea he thought himself able to discover half a dozen different points of resemblance or connexion. All of these except the first centre around the association of Seth and Thoth in Pyr. §§ 163, d; 175, a as deities inimical to Osiris. The obvious objection to any hypothesis of the kind is that in our purification rite the partner of Horus, whether Seth or Thoth, is manifestly functioning as a beneficent being. Moreover, Otto's grounds for the shadier side of Thoth's character are speculative and improbable in the extreme— I hesitate the less to express this opinion since I have now gratefully to acknowledge that in the earlier part of his paper he had taught me what will, I hope, henceforth be accepted as the true explanation.

The presence of Thoth in the scenes of the rite is, in fact, adequately explained by that god's status as one of the deities of the cardinal points. Having glimpsed this explanation, Otto should have halted there and have expanded his theme; to look farther afield was, as the French say, chercher midi à quatre heures. Like Kees before him, Otto quotes a formula of the Pyramid Texts (Spell 35, § 27, cf. too Spell 36, §§ 28-9) which names all four gods. This is a formula accompanying a rite of incense-burning, and its beginning reads

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Horus is ceasing,} \\
\text{Seth is ceasing,} \\
\text{Thoth is ceasing,} \\
\text{Dwen-anu (1)}
\end{align*} \]

Thy ceasing is the ceasing of Horus, thy ceasing is the ceasing of Seth, thy ceasing is the ceasing of Thoth, thy ceasing is the ceasing of Dwen-anu(2). In the Eighteenth Dynasty the same form of words, slightly varied, is found in a rite of purification performed before the statue of the deceased:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Horus is purified,} \\
\text{Seth is purified,} \\
\text{Thoth is purified,} \\
\text{Dwen-anu (1)}
\end{align*} \]

Thy purification is the purification of Horus, thy purification is the purification of Seth, thy purification is the purification of Thoth, thy purification is the purification of Dwen-anu. That the four gods here mentioned were the gods of the cardinal points was probable enough merely from their number, but as Otto has seen, following Kees and Sethe, Spell 217 of the Pyramid Texts (§§ 152-60) places the matter beyond all doubt. Here the arrival of the dead king before Re-Atum is to be announced to the gods of Upper Egypt by Seth and Nephthys, while Osiris and Isis are charged to make a similar announcement to the gods of Lower Egypt; Thoth is likewise dispatched to the West, and the falcon-god \( \text{\textnumero} \), to the East. Evidently each of the four quarters of the world was intended to receive the news from its own special deity or deities. Osiris is substituted for Horus in order to produce a conjugal pair parallel to Seth and Nephthys. As for \( \text{\textnumero} \), he is clearly identical with \( \text{\textnumero} \) in the above-mentioned Spells 35 and 36, see too Pyr. §§ 17. 1613. How exactly his name is to be read in its various writings is uncertain. The variant \( \text{\textnumero} \) without the standard in § 159 suggests that here he was conceived of as a Horus, but in the other places in Pyr. the standard serves to differentiate him from Horus, the god of Lower Egypt. It is perfectly certain that he is none other than the principal god of the XVIIIth nome of Upper Egypt on the east bank, since the later form in the above-quoted formula of

---

1 Horus und Seth als Götterpaar, 1, 58; also more positively ZÄS 56, 94.
2 Not quite the same rite, I think, as that discussed in this article, since a different type of jar is employed. At all events I do not feel called upon to follow up the underlying purificatory idea into the ceremonial of the Opening of the Mouth. For references, see Otto, loc. cit., 73, n. 2.
purification is $\text{Dwn-tnwi}$ as in the later nome-lists, while at least one Old Kingdom nome-list gives the form $\text{Dwn-rawey}$, which is the form in most Pyramid Text passages, as we have seen. It is possible that from the very start the name was read as $\text{Dwn-tnwi}$ 'Spreader of Wings', since that epithet occurs, not only spelt out $\text{Dwn-tnwi}$ on an Assyût coffin of the Middle Kingdom, but also written $\text{Dwn-tnwi}$ in Pyr. § 1098 (N). But we are not seriously concerned with the reading here; another possibility for the Old Kingdom is perhaps $\text{Anti}$. Kees had successfully demolished Sepa favoured by the older Egyptologists. All that for our particular purpose we required to establish is that he was the eponymous god of the XVIIIth Upper Egyptian nome, and by virtue of that a fitting representative of the East. Consequently Thoth must be the god of the West. Sethe, in his commentary on Spell 217, tried to explain this by reference to Thoth's Delta cults. Otto, much more sensibly, thought it due to his position as the principal deity of Khmuin (Hermopolis magna, El-Ashmunin). We shall see that the scenes of our rite confirm the latter hypothesis.

What convinced me from the start that Horus and Thoth, or much more rarely Horus and Seth, were envisaged in our rite as two of the four gods of the cardinal points was, firstly, the mention of all four in the legends of a published scene of the reign of Ramesses XI. Here, over Horus we read (5 Hr): *Words spoken by the Behdetite: Thy purification is the purification of Horus, thy purification is the purification of Seth, thy purification [sic]; opposite, over Thoth we find (5 Tl): Words spoken by the lord of Khmuin: thy purification is the purification of Thoth, thy purification is the purification of $\text{Dwn-tnwi}$. These inscriptions will be recognized as the exact counterpart of the later purification formula discussed by Otto—the formula which imitates that of the censing in the Pyramid Texts, where the four gods have been demonstrated to be those of the cardinal points. Nelson strengthened my surmise by adding six more examples where the four gods are named (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 6A); the earliest of these (No. 1) dates from the reign of Sethos I; a better preserved one of the time of Ramesses IV (No. 4) is here reproduced, pl. 1, top. I had also noticed that in certain cases (Nos. 26, 31, cf. too Nos. 3, 29) we sometimes find $\text{Dwn-tnwi}$. Words to be recited four times. As long ago as 1887 Maspero conjectured that this instruction

1. In his publication Chassinat-Palanque, Fouilles d'Assiout, 127, the determinatives look somewhat like the claw $\text{w}$. But De Buck confirms that they are certainly wings, and show the same forms as in the variant with the bird $\text{w}$ on another coffin from the same site (op. cit., 187). Also Br. V. 435 interprets $\text{rny} = \text{arms}$, but does not give any word as 'wing' in Wb. 1, 187-90.
3. SAI 58, 92.
5. Op. cit., 71. On the following page however, he appears to lose sight of this possibility.
6. The original $\text{rny}$ (see above) has been changed into $\text{rny} = \text{arms}$ doubtless because the former word had become obsolete and its meaning forgotten. The same change is found in an Edfu nome-list, Brugsch, Die papyri. 1385, under the XVIIth nome.
7. Here the complete formula with all four gods stands, not only over the head of Horus the [Behdetite, but also over the head of Thoth 'who is in Khmuin'].
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to the officiant—for such it is—indicates a rite to be performed consecutively at each
of the four cardinal points. The words to be spoken on these occasions are indubitably
those with which we first became acquainted in Pyr. § 27, varied slightly whenever
necessary and perhaps abbreviated at times. The fourfold performance and recitation
was of widespread usage, by no means confined to the rite alone studied in this article.

A last clue to the virtual presence in our rite of all four gods of the cardinal points is
to be found in the epithets accorded to three of them. Horus is often described as the
Behdetite (Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 17, 23, 26, 27) and it was by reason of his connexion with the
town of Behdet in the far north that he obtained his right to be the official representa-
tive of that region.1 In all three cases where Seth replaces Thoth (see above, p. 8) he is
designated Nbty ‘the Ombite’ in reference to his home at Ombo near the modern
Upper Egyptian town of Kus. Since these appellations belong to a genuine tradition
of very ancient date I see no justification for refusing equal credence to the epithets lord
of Khmun (Nos. 5, 6, 26) or who is in Khmun (No. 4) accorded to Thoth, even if in
regarding that god as owing his right to represent the West to his connexion with
Hermopolis Magna we have to reject Sethe’s verdict that Spell 217 of the Pyramid Texts
was a product of Lower Egypt in his postulated Heliopolitan period?2

To sum up the results of the foregoing argument, we find that in reality the hsr-
purification was quadrilateral, not bilateral. Why then were not all four gods depicted?
I believe it was because such a mode of depiction was not
artistically satisfactory. We have, indeed, pictures of the
closely analogous funerary purification performed by four
priests, see the annexed fig. 1.3 But this design is exceed-
ingly clumsy, and it is difficult to imagine that such
important deities as Horus, Thoth, and Seth would have
submitted to depiction in such miniature form. But if,
then, the scenes we have been studying are to be considered
as abbreviations and if all four gods were always implicitly
present, why was Thoth given the preference over Seth as
the partner of Horus? I believe it was because to an
Egyptian spectator the combination of Horus and Seth
would have suggested restriction to a north-south appli-
cation, as in the reliefs of the crowning. In the combination
of Horus and Thoth there would have been found a broad
hint of the virtual presence of the two missing members of
the four. We thus see that the notion that Thoth here re-
places Seth is an illusion.

Lastly, the meaning of the rite as a whole. When actually performed, what was in
fact poured over the king’s head was water, and this we find depicted in a few rare

1 See my article quoted above, p. 8, n. 1.
2 See the work cited above, p. 16, n. 4.
3 From the Theban tomb of Sennufe (No. 96B); reproduced from Rec. tray. 22, 91; two other examples of
the same design, Davies, The Tomb of Kenamun, pl. 63; id., The Tomb of Two Officials, pl. 15. The priests here,
of course, represented the four gods of our royal rite, and in the scene here shown four separate priests were
engaged in the ceremony, two ordinary lector-priests, the chief lector, and the setem-priest.
instances (Nos. 1, 6A, 23, 32). Usually, however, it was preferred to exhibit the symbols for the benefits which the purifying streams were supposed to confer; in some cases we find only the 'rankh', i.e. the symbol for 'life' (Nos. 5, 6, 7, 13, 26), but rather more often this alternates with another symbol (Nos. 2, 3, 4, 17, 27, 28, 29), the meaning of which is more disputed. Since this is regularly seen in the hands of divinities both male and female, it seems probable that it signifies 'divine power', and I propose the translation 'dominion' in the sense in which that word is employed in the Authorized Version of our Bible. Contexts are lacking in which the signification of this symbol, whether read as 'wts' or as 'gtr', is plain, but since it is shown erect between heaven and earth on each side of many royal monuments, once again probably to be interpreted quadrilaterally, I believe it may there be construed as the specific power of each of the gods of the cardinal points. It would appear, accordingly, that the rite was intended to transfer to the Pharaoh a goodly portion of the power of the divinities who presided over the four quarters of the globe. Perhaps their gift to the Pharaoh was not entirely unreciprocated, since after the words *Thy purification is the purification of X* we often find the expression $\text{m_bfr}$, lit. *utterance turned round*, the equivalent of our *and vice versa* (e.g. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4). Transactions in remote antiquity between god and king were habitually conducted on a business basis.  

1 The most complete discussion is that in Jéquier, *Les frises d'objets*, 176 ff., where the view taken by the author approximates to that here adopted. The sense given in *Wh. I*, 460, namely Wohlergehen, *Glueck* (in both cases with a note of interrogation) seems extremely unlikely, and would render superfluous *net-bt* sometimes found in the enumeration of kingly attributes.  

2 The only case known to me where this type of sceptre is seen in the hands of an ordinary human being is in a scene of measuring the crops, where an old man carries it while swearing to the boundaries of a corn-field, *JEA* 30, pl. 10, fig. 2.  

3 Perhaps the oldest example is on the comb figured *JEA* 30, pl. 6, fig. 4. Others are Borchardt, *Grabdenmal der Könige Sesostris*, 4, 45; Anthes, *Hatnub*, pls. 4, 5. Since this design regularly forms a framework to the name or names of the king, to which in addition the vulture-goddess is seen offering the symbols $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$, the whole may be taken to symbolize her gift to the king of all power even from the four corners of the world.
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