

The Dendera Light Theory:

A Refutation

by Keith A. Seland

May 19, 2024

Abstract

The story of Egypt is one example of many ancient civilizations who left a vast cultural knowledge footprint on the history of our humankind species. This vast story was told to us through the conduit of semiotics, a system of symbolic representations whose ideological and cognitive creation, evolution and social practice were universally developed by civilizations worldwide through antiquity.

The semiotics used by ancient Egypt is more accomplished and phonetic language more articulate than most other examples of such. This offers us a most opportunistic model with which to study and understand the purpose and worldviews of one of our species' more prolific cultures in snapshot form. The many sites in Egypt are adorned with uncounted numbers of stories understandable by us as told in hieroglyphic phonetic language and related symbolism.

One example is the Dendera crypt at the Edfu complex, Temple of Hathor and is the subject of this investigation. This paper will explore the nature of the story depicted on one of the Dendera panels. The methodology and discussions which follow will offer new refutations to the Dendera Light Theory and explore latest information and details about the accurate representational meaning that have not been considered before. While investigating this site's data in situ, my fascination with a peripheral but potentially larger experimental regime was rekindled in conjunction with the study of the current topic. These additional observations involve the nature and provenance of more broad questions regarding the mechanisms evolved by both the Egyptians and our ancestors that explain the global spread of cognitive and anatomical processes of symbolic representation and cultural evolution. I will explore the nature of the latter postulation under another title to be published separately. I will investigate in this paper the nature, support for and refutation of the Dendera Light Theory.

Interpretations of the Dendera crypt panel stories have been argued since their earliest discovery in the 1840's. The pro-light advocates infer that ancient Egypt inscribed about the possession of the technological knowledge with which to manufacture and use an electric light apparatus. This theory was championed in the 20th century and has taken on a cultural popularity of its own ever since. A comprehensive empirical study of the true nature of the Dendera Crypt panels is lacking in literature. My field study investigations offer new insights that find the theory of the Dendera Lights having no reasonable foundation in fact and accuracy for

explanations I will offer here to the endpoint of clarifying some of those arguments and for additional knowledge and interpretation that refutes this theory.

Introduction

The Dendera Light theory was created from an unrelated sequence of inventions that, in their totality, became the pieces that led to its development. The first of these developments was the 1840 invention of a ‘bulbous’ vacuum tube by British scientist Warren de la Rue. He enclosed a coiled platinum filament in this tube and passed an electric current through it, thus creating a foundation for the later establishment of the theory.

A second invention occurred in 1869, that of a working electrical discharge Crookes Tube by physicist William Crookes. This invention evolved from earlier work on the development of the Geissler Tube in 1857 by physicist and glassblower Heinrich Geissler. The shape of that glass tube most visually resembles those depicted on the Dendera panels. All that was needed to seed the theory was an eventual popular adoption of the assembled apparatus into society. The work of American inventor Thomas Edison, among others, encouraged this adoption. The subsequent road created and paved to demonstrate the importance of the electric light bulb revolution to today’s culture is obvious. With this the foundation for blossoming of a light theory was fully assembled. Many contributions from both scientific and popular culture communities helped build advocacy for the theory.

Overall support for the argument that the Dendera panel is not a depiction of an advanced (in Egypt time) electrical light apparatus starts here. To begin I analyze the argument from the perspective of the “entire theatre of operations.” When analyzing details of this theory two errors of omission become apparent. First, when collecting and then undertaking an analysis of data contained on the panel, an investigation of this type and scope must involve an inspection of the entire panel under consideration, not just preferred selected parts. When undertaking an archaeological study most often each symbol, figure and artifact are inextricably part of a larger story as being told by the scribes.

The Dendera panel is a case in point. The parts consist of figures and hieroglyph inscriptions that inevitably work together to depict the entire panels’ real meaning and interpretation. The figures and hieroglyph inscriptions are well-known to represent the identities of an assemblage of gods and goddesses that work together to tell a profound story. I will analyze each sector of a representative panel below. Despite experiments that have described a feasibility for modern humankind to create the comparable shapes and functionality that constitute an electric light bulb, the advocating theory fails to consider any of the other evidence in the panel that is obviously ‘the other parts of the story.’ These other parts constitute the majority of what the scribes were attempting to tell the reader and serve as missing text that, when considered, help refute the theory. This is a typical factor indicating the presence of confirmation bias.

A second error of omission for refuting the light theory from this perspective is that an error-of-time exists within the analytical framework. The analysis must study the entire panel contents from a temporal frame of reference with which the panels' creators existed. I call this an error "modern cultural time bias" and describe it in greater detail below. Support for the theory would gain a little more validity among its proponents if other examples of a light bulb were to be found in archaeology. However, to-date none are known to have been discovered.

A third support for refuting the theory involves an inspection of the human psychological phenomenon called *pareidolia*. This phenomenon describes a behavior where one sees within an image some attribute that the viewer either wishes to see, has planned to see on a predetermined agenda or has patterned from his mind and critical thinking prior to the visualization. Examples of this include things people see in clouds or bodies of water or when studying a painting at an art gallery.

If these three refutation points are considered together, the sum would equate to a significant failure to consider the errors and omissions that are the entire "theatre of operations," a failure to investigate from the temporal perspective of the indigenous, and a potential fallacious episode of *pareidolia*. All these introductory factors contribute to a potentially less-than-valid advocacy and therefore fail to support the Dendera Light theory as is. I next identify the data points obtained during this investigation and an analysis of these data points.

Methodology

There are six panels at the Dendera crypt in the basement of the Hathor Temple complex at Edfu. In each of the two rooms are situated three panels. These rooms are identified as 'C' and 'G.' The six panels embody a central contextual theme while depicting slightly different scenes. A logical place to begin this study is to separate a panel into descriptive parts. The panel I am using in this analysis is C-1, located on the north wall of the Dendera crypt in the room designated as 'C'. This is the panel depicted as the basis for the Light Theory.

There are some conceptual thinking cues mentioned in this paper that represent significant contributions and that have a universal meaning to all the symbols and figures illustrated in the panel. These concepts include; creation, birth, death, resurrection, reincarnation, infinity, the universe, and ancient Egypt as a nation of people. The celebration of Harsomtus, the son of Hathor and Horus; also known as Horus the Younger, exemplifies all these thinking cues and is the recurring story line within the crypt complex. Decipherment work has been documented of the various inscriptions and cartouches in circumference around each panel. This 'part of the story' assists one in the most empirical, and correct, interpretation of the magnificent inscription work. The decipherment suggests that the existence of Harsomtus, deity of the earth and of floods, was recorded in this way to celebrate the annual ritual ceremony of his existence, at the time of the Egyptian New Year. This ceremony was timed to coincide with the annual June and July (using Today's calendar) flooding of the river Nile; itself a metaphor of the resurrection

and reincarnation themes. The panels also serve a metaphorically social bonding function that secures the cultural cohesion of the Egyptian community.

When Dendera was first discovered, in the middle 1800s, numerous cult objects were found stored within the crypt rooms. These were ritual artifacts that were studied and eventually associated with other known ceremonial histories within the Hathor Temple at Edfu.

When considering these concepts together, a richer awareness and understanding of what the scribes were thinking and knowledge of the script they used is obtained. This drives the investigator to a correct conclusion and serves as core-essence and objective to investigations of this type.

An annotated image of panel C-1 is depicted below as Figure I. Explanation of each symbol follows the image in order. Discussion and conclusion will follow.



Figure 1

1 – The “bulb”. The conscious life of the Dendera Light Theory is created on this symbol. This object is the first of three main antagonists to this investigation. While visually it does

resemble a bulb conducive to a basic application and functionality of radiating light, a preliminary basis for refuting the theory is supported by noting my three preliminary introductory refutations. The theory's proponents have introduced two errors of omission into their analysis. The first error is by not properly correlating their mindset and critical thinking into consideration of the other contents on the panel. The argument does not recognize the numerous symbolic, figure and story-telling hieroglyphs and inscriptions that appear on and around the panels. The panels are depicted together to tell a detailed story and are indispensable to that story.

A second error of omission, noted as a modern cultural time bias, is introduced when the argument fails to consider the temporal "theatre" in which the creators of the panel existed. The argument forcefully imposes the existence of a modern-day technology, documented to have been created in modern times, into the analysis theatre of a much different world and temporal existence rather than reflecting on the data evidence that is presented in situ. This indictment is closely aligned with a third error, which I describe next as the pareidolia effect.

There exists no other record in the ancient Egyptian archives to date of any artifacts or any other elements that could together form a relationship with anything resembling the construct of such a light technology. The evolution of the light bulb apparatus into plausible elements of the Light Theory represents here a bias introduced by the modern researcher. This means that, just because the Dendera symbol (something inside a tube-like structure that looks like a filament and is a bias accomplice) visually resembles a modern-day technology (the bulb and another bias accomplice) that it must be a light bulb (completion of the pareidolia effect). The result of this failed analysis is that those who believe this theory on that basis are at fault for fallaciously imposing modern cultural bias onto a historical investigation.

Opposing arguments have offered an alternative explanation; that being the body or the belly of a sky goddess (Waitkus, p. 375). The primordial goddess Nut is well-adorned in this way as the goddess of the sky and a seminal part of the Egyptian creation story. This creation story is also known as Zep Tepe, the 'Time of the Beginning,' in the time when the first elements of land peaked through the river Nile. This explanation aligns successfully when a more detailed analysis of the entire panel is undertaken.

I offer an additional interpretation, which is aligned better to a more comprehensive and accurate explanation of the entire panel's contents; that being of the cosmos itself. When the Egyptians, just as we do today, looked up at the night sky they saw our neighboring star constellation and galactic neighborhoods. The collection of these neighborhoods made up our Milky Way galaxy. What exists here is a dual representation. While other arguments have indicated a classical depiction of the body of Nut stretching across the sky (the bulb), or of the god Atum, a more accurate interpretation, and a second member to that dual representation, would be explained as that of the cosmic portrayal of the night sky and the Milky Way in Sagittarius. The goddess Nut, then would be depicted elsewhere on the panel as symbol #3 in Figure 1. A compare-and-contrast between this symbol (the bulb) and the Milky Way is illustrated in Figure 2. Additional support to the bulb being a representation of the cosmos will

be offered within an analysis of symbol #10, the filament inside the “bulb”. These elements will be addressed later.

2 – The Pedestal and Occupant. This is identified as the square box ‘container’ atop who sits a deified figure appearing to “hold up” the bulb. It is a second antagonist to this investigation. The Light Theory infers that this container is a type of electric capacitor that stored the energy electrons that powered the light.

The evidence presented on panel C-1, and all other panels in both the C and G crypts, presents a different analysis and conclusion. The “container,” as a first in a tripartite attribution, portrays a pedestal, known as Serech, from which the primordial god Heh is both assisting in the support of the “bulb” as well as piloting a day barge in celebration of the ritual creation ceremony and the separation of the heavens from earth. Heh is known as the god of the primordial waters as evolved from the original meaning of “flood.” In this panel Heh is also being depicted as the “bearer of heaven.” Heaven, as I will explain later, is attributed to the filament of the “bulb.” This has attributions both to the infinite chaos that existed before the creation of the world and the finite order established afterwards (Allen, 1988). Among the other relevant attributions to the panel’s information, Heh also represents eternity and infinity. Contemporary popular culture study has transferred the meaning of ‘Heh’ to mean “millions;” an equivalent of “infinity.”

As a second attribution in a tripartite assembly a Late Period interpretation of Heh is accorded the dual epithet of Shu, primordial god of peace, the air, the wind, and atmosphere (Waitkus, p. 380). Shu was also a facilitator to the separation of earth and sky during the Creation story and metaphorically as facilitator of truth, order, and balance in the Ma’at ritual regime, as well as the father of Nut and great, great grandfather of Harsomtus, a main protagonist to the panel stories. Separately a most rigid observation of the Heh figure shows a circle above his head. As a third potential attribution in a tripartite assembly to the identity and purpose of this figure this is a predominant representation of Ra, the god of the sun and a most important deity in Egyptian history. Support for this third semiotic representation derives from a meaningful synergy to the panel C-1 story and the themes of all the panels, as well as the weight of Ra’s importance to all stories of honor, glory, and worship in Egypt. The lack of palm branch(es) and an ankh, popular attributes to Heh, in the portrayal on the C-1 panel, in contrast, detracts slightly from an unequivocal identification but portrayals on the other panels in both the C and G rooms and hieroglyphs in the cartouches and inscriptions which accompany all six panels provide much opposing empirical support to the confirmed identity of Heh.

3 – Goddess Nut. Nut is known as the primordial goddess of the sky, cosmos, astronomy, and the universe. The granddaughter of the sun god Ra, daughter of Shu and Tefnut, sister, and wife of Geb, and mother to Osiris, Isis, Set and Nephthys, Nut was worshipped as far back as the creation story of Heliopolis.

Some support exists as to the Djed Pillar, at the location of this symbol under discussion, being identified as the entirety of the figure. (Waitkus, 2002, pp. 375, 376) Here I support an alternative framework. A closer inspection of the figure shows the Djed Pillar, whose identity

and purposes of its inclusion in this panel will be discussed next, being portrayed as overlaying another anthropomorphic figure. This anthropomorph has shoulders, arms and articulated human hands. Also, the base of the Djed Pillar has been modified, from its predominant depiction, to appear like the typical dress of a primordial goddess.

I agree with the research discourse that the Djed Pillar is an accurate description of part of the figure. However, the figure overlaid by the Djed Pillar, and not the bulb, as noted earlier represents the goddess Nut. This evidence interfaces more congruently and completely into the overall story of the panel. Nut, being the sky, cosmos and astronomy goddess is thus seen holding up not the filament of a light bulb, but the Milky Way and the Great Rift (the “serpent” as symbol 10 to be discussed later); labels modern man has placed on these celestial objects, but that ancient Egypt, and by extension and agreement, universally among all ancient worldwide cultures, worshiped as concepts of heaven and hell; places where the departed soul traveled to live in eternity.

4 – The Djed Pillar. As attributions to the common purpose of a pillar suggest, the Djed Pillar was the cultural spiritual ‘footprint’ of the god Osiris. As told in the story of the Resurrection of Osiris, after his bodily remains were scattered into the river Nile, he was miraculously revived by his sister/wife Isis and produced their son, Horus. The Osiris divine connections to strength and spine came from the majesty of the Nile River geography as it was known as the most dependable and structurally necessary “backbone” to the existence of the Egypt civilization. His majestic resurrection to new life ensured the eternal worship of Osiris as the God of the Dead, the underworld, and the afterlife, as well as being bestowed the symbolic representation of the Djed Pillar. For future Egyptian royalty it is the process to where all pass through upon their death; the underworld and the afterlife, to be administered the 42 Rules of Ma’at as overseen by Osiris upon passing judgement.

The Djed Pillar is an Egyptian universal symbolic representation and its presence on the panel does favor a meaningful refutation in any accurate way. The Dendera panel utilizes the semiotics of the Djed as an additional means of support for the goddess Nut to successfully hold up the cosmic platforms of creation, reincarnation, and eternal resurrection. These metaphors are known today as the Milky Way and the Great Rift.

5 – Lone Female Kneeling. This figure is portrayed with an unarticulated body, however the presence of breasts and what appears to be an impregnated abdomen provide clues as to an identity and purpose within the panel. The figure is also displayed in the classic Egyptian hieroglyphic ideography usage as that of a determinative. This dual usage suggests that the profile pose position indicates she is a goddess and its’ purpose as a determinative has additional explanatory elements attributed to the two kneeling figures immediately to her left. An explanation of the two kneeling figures is noted next.

The identity of the figure, taken in context within the story, is an epithet of Hathor. Being the mother of Harsomtus and the goddess of motherhood, a dual context identity of Hathor also is a reasonable determinative of the two kneeling figures adjacent to her and their purpose within the panel. This representation of Hathor, without the customary royal headdress and other deified

articulations common to her biography, is accurate to conclude. The overarching context of the ceremony depicts a celebration of the birth, life, death, and resurrection of the soul. In this example, it is the course of the life and soul of Harsomtus that is being celebrated. Also, because the panel resides in her temple of worship, Hathor becomes the de facto attribution. It is also reasonable to suggest that, because of the spatial positioning of the Hathor figure within the barge itself, this figure can also serve as a pilot of the barge in assistance to Heh.

6 – Two Kneeling Figures. The male and female figures kneeling and facing each other illustrates an epithet of context illustrating both the dualistic nature of the universe and serves as a biological representation of parents depicting the powerful sign of creation and birth; in this case the birth of a person as the new home for a soul, or ba. The ideographic determinative of Hathor as the pregnant female figure positioned to the right of the kneeling couple cohort suggests the description of a birth sequence. In this panel, it is of the child Harsomtus.

7 – Lotus Flower. This is the third antagonist to this investigation. The Light Theory, in support of its explanation as an electrical light apparatus, describes the Lotus flower system as the power cord conduit that routed power to the bulb. The flower part is explained as the light socket. The presence of the other elements on this panel, and all other panels in both crypts, provide significant support, however to this analysis that refutes the theory.

Known also as the Sesen, the lotus was depicted on the Dendera Panels as the hull of the Egyptian day and night barges, traversing from the bow to the stern. The bow, in refutation to a significant support for the Dendera Light Theory, is not an electric capacitor of any type. Rather it serves as a similar functional support pedestal (Serech) to the Djed Pillar, for the god Heh to assist in holding up the cosmic platforms of the Milky Way and the Great Rift. The lotus flower, as a symbolic representation of birth, regeneration and resurrection, gains this meaning from its biological and life characteristics. These include, a long stem attached to the mud on the bottom of a water body, and a leaf apparatus that opens upon each dawn and closes each night. The Egyptian blue lotus gained divine status as a primordial emergence from the waters of the Nile at the time of Zep Tepe, the creation of the current world, and represents the concept cues of birth and rebirth.

The birth, regeneration and resurrection themes are harmoniously continued through its' stem (the hull) to the leaf apparatus that is portrayed as the stern of the day and night barges of Harsomtus. The lotus leaf connects to the cosmos, the stars, and ultimately to the Milky Way and the Great Rift. Together the lotus leaf system drives the path of the departed soul, the Egyptian 'ba' in this way. The ba is escorted from bodily death, the misidentified "electric capacitor" of the Light Theory, to the temporary storage of the soul, the day and night barge's bow compartment, as protected by the god Heh. As the barge is ceremoniously directed across the river Nile, the ba descends temporarily into the underworld, where judgement of its admittance to eternal afterlife is passed. Upon a successful judgement the ba is then assisted by Heh down the stem (hull) of the lotus. This is the path that the ba successfully drives to the afterlife, represented in the panel by the Milky Way. One gains a sense of both validity and quintessential harmony by both the details of and the telling of the story in the way it is depicted on the panels.

8 – “Lone Figure Holding Up Base of Bulb”. A metaphor for the Egyptian ancestry. The figure is a representative symbol to the eternal life of both the Egypt royalty and all its people of the great nation of Egypt; recognition that the great nation will live eternally only from the contributions of both the royalty and the citizens themselves. It is imperative to note that this figure is the largest single symbol representative on the entire panel. The ancestry of all the Egyptian people therefore is perhaps the most significant protagonist to this entire celebration story.

9 – The “Baboon with Knives”. The Egyptian animal deity, Babi, is depicted with two knives and is watching over the bow of the day barge. This is the section where both the Djed Pillar and Heh with the compartment of the ba are situated, at the source of the lotus “road” system. Babi is an epithet of the baboon animal, specifically as the “alpha male” of all baboons. As potential genealogical ancestral relatives of the homo genus family, the baboon is a primordial animal to which is attributed great strength and aggressiveness. Its portrayal on the Dendera Panel symbolizes that strength and is portrayed to detect and destroy the bad souls of the unrighteous that try to pass through the Ma’at; the Osiris 42 Ideals of Judgement; and when called upon, to destroy the enemies of the Sun, thereby further protecting Harsomtus.

Additional support to the story of Babi in this panel is exemplified in a cohort of Babi; identified as Thoth. As one of the primordial gods and lord of the ogdoad, Thoth represented the architect of the cosmos, stars, and heavens, among many other attributes, and was born from the heart of Ra (Budge, 1904, p. 401). He was often depicted as the cohort with Ma’at who accompanied the boat of Ra at the creation time (p. 400). The presence of Babi here correlates to the most popular Thoth imagery used in the culture, that of the baboon.

10 – The Serpent. The snake is the fourth and last antagonist to this investigation. The Light Theory describes this as the filament for the light bulb apparatus. Without this filament the apparatus, as we know of it in modern times, cannot successfully operate. This identification can be refuted and done in such a way to eliminate the cultural bias and pareidolia effects present when analyzing the entirety of the panel’s symbolic representations. Therefore, I am eliminating the explanation of a light filament as empirical in nature.

Waitkus (2002, 1997) suggests that the serpent refutation to the theory depicts the deity Harsomtus, a similar attribution to Horus, god of the earth and the Lord of Khadi of Hathor, as the comprehensive symbolic representation. Further analysis enriches the work of Waitkus to provide a more detailed and efficacious explanation.

The serpent can be depicted as a symbolic representation of not only the life, death, and resurrection of Harsomtus, son of Hathor and Horus, in conjunction with the great Egyptian Creation and separation story but also of a real natural phenomenon. This is identified as the Milky Way and the Great Rift. Ritual behavior is universally documented among all ancestral cultures. The most existential phenomenon to the survival of ancient civilizations on all levels is the night sky. The Milky Way and Great Rift to all was epithetic of heaven (and hell to many). Figure 2 represents a visual correspondence between this filament and what all the Egyptian royalty and people saw every night throughout their entire existence.



Figure 2

All four antagonists, the “bulb,” the “container,” the lotus flower “cord and socket” and the “filament” form the basis of the Dendera Light Theory’s argument. The body of evidence presented here leads me to conclude that this theory can be dismissed as a speculative postulation among popular culture lacking in factual foundation and with no empirical basis for validity, credibility, or reliability. There is no comprehensive argument offered by advocates to the Theory as to what capacity this light generation system would have been used. Further the symbolic representations present within and amongst the rest of the six panels and their accompanying inscriptions and cartouches do not support the theory; in fact, as I have presented here, they have a different explanation.

At this point I reiterate that efficacy to the Dendera Light Bulb Theory would be enriched if empirical evidence to the existence of an apparatus as theorized or any remnants of a tangible unit had been discovered elsewhere in Egyptian archaeology. I acknowledge that, while during any investigative study of this kind, there must be a “first” discovery before there can be a second, the possibility exists that there may be a future discovery that accurately depicts a working light generation system of this type.

Discussion

The ancient Egypt civilization is an extraordinary example where the resourcefulness, intelligence, ingenuity, and advanced thinking processes of the homo sapien-sapien species has been documented in a magnificent manner. The incalculable number of accomplishments was seminal to and made possible the longevity of the Egyptian culture. The millions of inscriptions they left to us, depicted as stories of ritual, worship, belief, practice, performance, and play offer our species a magnificent window of inspection into many core essences of some of our ancestors.

The conduct of the Dendera Light Theory investigation has allowed to gain more certain knowledge from inspecting a ‘snapshot’ example to the protocols of the Egyptian scribes while at the same time enjoying the study of an exquisitely weaved tapestry of one such story. The stories

told on the six panels of the Dendera Crypt, and a close inspection of panel, C-1 in particular, tell us of the highly moralistic, holistic, proud, harmonious, and quintessential honor and reverence the Egyptians had for their royalty and dedication to their people at-large. The conclusions used to refute the Dendera Light Theory also suggest that their intuition and intelligence show an acute awareness of such profound knowledge as the eschatology, cyclical nature to and existence of a soul and cosmic awareness to judgement, reincarnation, resurrection of and eternal purpose of that soul.

A script written from an interpretation of panel C-1 of Dendera reads like this. A New Year's procession, ritualized annually in June or July of today's calendar, celebrated the flooding of the river Nile in tribute to Harsomtus, god of the earth. Known as Horus the Younger, the son of primordial deities Hathor and Horus, in the temple home of Hathor at Edfu complex, the ba (soul) of Harsomtus serves metaphorically to represent the cyclic nature, life, harmony, holism and balance of all the universe's components the earth, underworld, sky, cosmos and heaven. The magnificence in the creation and separation of heaven, sky, and earth is celebrated. A ceremonial procession includes the representative parade of a day and night barge to celebrate the cyclic nature inherent in these Egyptian traditions. The barge is symbolically built from the lotus flower and stores the departed ba of Harsomtus for the ceremonial voyage across the river Nile and as piloted by Heh, the deity of primordial waters. Possible tripartite semiotic representations of Heh and the gods Shu and Ra can synergize as meaningful protagonists to the C-1 panel story, as well as the accompanying stories on the other panels in the crypt. These are all epithets to the Egyptian traditions of recognizing and honoring the majestic creation of the universe, the cyclic nature of life, reincarnation, and resurrection of the soul. His soul is accompanied and secured by many symbolic royals in dedication to the Egyptian people. Harsomtus' life is examined, his soul is judged worthy and is given guided escort to heaven. His soul is then tended to every day and year by ritual worship as an epithet for its eternal life. The list of worshiped royalty includes Nut, goddess of the sky and the cosmos, Hathor and Horus the parents, Heh, the concept of Zep Tepe; the "first time" creation scene when land first appeared from primordial waters after the flood (the river Nile), Osiris (Djed pillar and Judgement of Harsomtus' soul) and Isis, Babi and Thoth, protectors to the ba of Harsomtus, and the serpent, representative of heaven and eternal life for the ba (the Milky Way).

It can be shown by knowledge available to us today that a light bulb does not need a filament such as what has been symbolized by the Dendera Light Theory to operate. This is proved by the existence of LED bulb technology. However, use of this argument alone as refutation against the theory is not efficacious. Modern humankind had to endure the use of a filament light bulb apparatus for hundreds of years until the LED bulb was invented. The possibility still exists that the Egyptians, or another ancient culture, may have obtained possession of this technology at a point in their history to where it has not yet been discovered by us. Perhaps such a discovery will happen at some time in the future. At that time new "light" will be shed on the subject.

Bibliography

Allen, James P. *Genesis in Egypt: The Philosophy of Ancient Egyptian Creation Accounts. Yale Egyptological Seminar, 1988.*

Budge, E.A. 1904. *The Gods of The Egyptians, Volume 1. London, Methuen and Co. 1904.*

Waitkus, Wolfgang. *The birth of Harsomtus from the flower On the meaning and function of some cult objects in the temple of Dendera.* *Studies on Ancient Egyptian Culture*, 2002, Vol. 30 (2002), pp. 373-394. Published by: Helmut Buske Verlag GmbH