Egypt Exploration Society

The Tomb of Amenemhēt by Nina de Garis Davies; Alan H. Gardiner

Review by: T. E. Peet

The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Oct., 1915), pp. 260-261

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853483>

Accessed: 04/08/2013 12:50

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Egypt Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

its security and success in no small measure to Median protection. The intervention of Babylon in the conflict with Lydia after the battle on the Halys in 585 B.C. must have been undertaken in the Median interest, and it is possible that Cyaxares could count on Nebuchadnezzar for more than benevolent neutrality in case of need. The ease with which Cyrus possessed himself of the Median empire may be traced to disaffection on the part of the northern group of the Iranians, perhaps due to the favour shown by the Median kings to their Scythian subjects; and the rise of the southern or Persian Iranians, coinciding as it did with the westward expansion of Media, furnished the occasion for the fusion of the two branches under a southern dynasty. That Babylon should have made so feeble a defence of her own frontier after the fall of Sardis is certainly suggestive of former dependence on Median support. An interesting piece of new evidence in this connexion has been recovered since the publication of Mr Hogarth's volume last autumn. It points to the possibility that Gobryas may not have been a Persian but a native Babylonian general, who had in his younger days seen service under Nebuchadnezzar. With the disappearance of Media he may well have despaired of any successful opposition to the Persians on his country's part.

Mr Hogarth emphasizes the part played by sea-power in the dissolution of the Persian empire. In this connexion he points out that Egypt, which had been the weakest spot in the Assyrian empire, proved also the weakest in that of Persia. The natural barriers of desert, swamp and sea, set between Egypt and the neighbouring continent, are so strong that no Asiatic power which has attempted to conquer the Nile Valley has ever been able to keep it. All history, in fact, bears witness that no one, whether in Asia or in Europe, can hold Egypt unless he holds the sea. The loss of Egypt was not measured by the mere loss of her revenue, for she continued to help every rebel against the authority of the Great King. Alexander, too, appreciated the importance of sea-power in his design of conquering the East, and his delay in subjecting Syria proves that he realised he must hold all the ports before going up into Asia. We have not space to follow Mr Hogarth in his analysis of the steps by which Hellenism penetrated the East. The political victory was won by men of Greek civilization, but, as he points out, it was only to a very partial extent a victory of that civilization. The West at that time did not assimilate the East except in very small measure, and it has not assimilated it in any large measure to this day. The East on its side has always been obstinately unreceptive of Western influences, and Mr Hogarth is probably right in tracing this fact to certain geographical reasons, the most important being the large proportion of desert steppe in Western Asia and of the human type produced by such country.

In the course of this review it has been possible to do little more than glance at some of the more striking features of Mr Hogarth's work. But these will suffice to give some indication of the great value the book has, not merely for those who would make a first acquaintance with an unfamiliar subject, but for every serious student of ancient history, whether he approaches it from the classical or the oriental side.

L. W. KING.

The Tomb of Amenemhêt. By NINA DE GARIS DAVIES and ALAN H. GARDINER. The Theban Tomb Series. Published under the auspices of the Egypt Exploration Fund. pp. 132. 46 plates. London: 1915. 35s. nett.

The present volume is the first of a number which are to form a "Theban Tombs Series." This series, taken in conjunction with the Catalogue of Theban Tombs issued last year, may be considered as the second step in a Theban tomb programme for which we have to thank several people, not least among them being the joint authors of the present volume, and Mr Robert Mond, to whom it is very appropriately dedicated. The first step naturally consisted of the proper excavation and preservation of the tombs and their contents; the second, of which the first instalment is now before us, involves the copying and description of the various tombs.

Of the illustrations, whether in black and white or in colour, little need be said, Mrs de Garis Davies' name, like that of her husband, being a sufficient guarantee for accuracy of copying and insight into the feeling of the original.

As for the text, Dr Gardiner has quite naturally taken advantage of this first volume of the series to discuss Egyptian funerary methods and beliefs in general. In order to appreciate the value of his treatment of the subject it is necessary to take into account not only the rare qualifications of

the author for his task but also the present state of the science of Egyptology. The pressing need for excavation in Egypt has facilitated the accumulation of material while preventing its assimilation and digestion. The result is that the path of Egyptology is encumbered by masses of incorrect beliefs, often based on nothing more than the hypotheses of early investigators to whom the literary evidence was partly or wholly closed, hypotheses which evidence collected in later years shows in many cases to be utterly wrong. These fallacies disfigure our text-books and have become part and parcel of our science. For the present, however, excavation is at a standstill, and there was never a more favourable moment for calling a halt and purging Egyptology of this accumulation of error. Consciously or unconsciously Dr Gardiner has set himself to the task. He takes nothing for granted, allows himself to be biassed by no belief, however prevalent, and attacks every problem from first principles. Where the evidence shows the prevalent notion to be incorrect he rejects the notion; where the evidence, while not disproving it, cannot be regarded as conclusive he retains an open mind on the question. Thus, for example, the usually accepted explanation of the *hṯp dī nīswt* formula seems to him unsatisfactory, and so he does not hesitate to devote 15 pages of small print to an investigation of the question on linguistic and historical lines, so searching and complete that it puts any previous discussion of the subject completely into the shade. Similarly, Dr Gardiner refuses to adhere entirely either to the German or to the French point of view on the question of the magic value of the tomb-paintings, but after a careful and dispassionate discussion of their origin and history takes his stand midway between the two extremes. The closing pages of the book, which deal with the Egyptian conception of life after death, will be disconcerting to many of those who cherish the current beliefs on this point, but they are an excellent example of the fearless readiness of the author to throw over preconceptions and stand or fall by the actual statements of the Egyptian texts.

It must not, however, be forgotten that Dr Gardiner's ability to treat his subject in this penetrating manner is due above all things to his ability to translate the texts of the tomb *correctly* and to compare them with others of similar nature. And this prompts a somewhat disturbing reflection. As in classical archaeology the first appeal must always be to the literary evidence, so in Egyptology any discussion involving reference to what the Egyptians themselves believed must take account of all the known texts bearing on the point; of these not merely a translation but a correct translation must be obtained, and consequently only the advanced student of Egyptian philology is in a position to deal with such questions unaided and without some dependence on the translations of others, already perhaps coloured by their own ideas. This is a serious matter, and we may be the more glad that Dr Gardiner has on this occasion deserted philology to make so successful an incursion into the domain of Egyptian belief.

T. E. PEET.

Une Communauté Judéo-Araméenne à Éléphantine, en Égypte, aux VI^e et V^e siècles av. J.-C. Par A. VAN HOONACKER, Docteur en Théologie, Professeur d'Hébreu et d'Ancien Testament à l'Université de Louvain. The Schweich Lectures, 1914. London. Published for the British Academy. Oxford University Press. 1915. pp. xi, 91. 3s. nett.

Dr van Hoonacker, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in the University of Louvain, now, alas, an exile in our own land, is well known as an acute and independent scholar, particularly by his invaluable commentary on the Minor Prophets (Paris, 1908). Everyone therefore was glad that the British Academy appointed him to deliver the Schweich Lectures for 1914, and that he chose so involved and difficult, though so very fruitful, a subject as the Jewish-Aramaic community at Elephantine. For of all the discoveries made in the last few years affecting Biblical criticism none has given rise to a greater number of speculations than this. Our readers will probably be glad to have a succinct account of the facts as they appear to Dr van Hoonacker.

Some little time after the failure of a native Egyptian force to withstand at Elephantine and Assuan the influence of Ethiopia, in the reign of Psammetichus I (664-610 B.C.), and probably not long after 600 B.C., a body, consisting partly of Samaritans and partly of Jews, and mainly, but not exclusively, soldiers, was settled there. They spoke Aramaic of a Babylonian type, and brought with

34—2