The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for ***The Classical Review***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Discoveries in Crete *The Discoveries in Crete and their bearing on the history of Ancient Civilization.* By Prof. R. M. Burrows. London : Murray. Pp. 244. 5s.

H. R. Hall

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 08 / December 1907, pp 237 - 239

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00180369, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00180369

How to cite this article:

H. R. Hall (1907). The Classical Review, 21, pp 237-239 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00180369

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

n which the Grenfell papyrus, containing lists of Olympic victors, has settled the dates of the activities of Myron and Polycleitus, and shown the erroneousness of recent theories on the subject, which have been based on intrustworthy data.

It is exceedingly difficult to follow much of the criticism of Dr. Lermann without reference to the originals, or at least to casts. He gives small engravings of some of the most important figures; but of course not of all. And such vague references as 'No. 56 des ath. nat. Mus.' and 'zwei in Charchel aufgefundene weitere Repliken des Werkes' are trying to a man whose time is limited.

The task which Dr. Lermann has attempted in his plates of preserving for posterity the rapidly vanishing colouring of the archaic ladies of Athens is one of considerable importance; and for the attempt he cer-

tainly deserves our gratitude. His colours are somewhat harsh; how far they are faithful it would only be possible to judge in the Museum of the Acropolis. I have compared the plates with Pls. 18 and 39 of the *Antike Denkmäler* of the German Institute, and with the coloured cast published by Miss Ingrid Kjaer, who is now Dr. Lermann's wife; and found many differences, the colours blue and green in particular being frequently transposed. Dr. Lermann claims greater accuracy than his predecessors; and no doubt his plates embody the latest and most detailed examination.

It is in these plates, and in the very detailed examination of figures in the Athenian museums, that the value of Dr. Lermann's work mainly consists, rather than in his attempts to assign works to particular schools.

P. GARDNER.

THE DISCOVERIES IN CRETE.

The Discoveries in Crete and their bearing on the history of Ancient Civilization. By Prof. R. M. BURROWS. London: Murray. Pp. 244. 5s.

CAREFUL consideration of Prof. Burrows's book is calculated to deepen our impression of its value, not so much to the general reader (who would demand more illustrations) as to the general archaeologist. Prof. Burrows's book is an up-to-date critical discussion of the main problems of 'Mycenaeology' or 'Minöology' as they stand today, now that the lull in Cretan excavation enables us to look about us and see where we are. That such a commentary is of use to all archaeologists outside the circle of those actually engaged in these excavations (and even to them also as shewing them how their arguments present themselves to the minds of others) is indubitable. And the absence of illustrations will not be felt by archaeologists, who will know where to look for them.

Prof. Burrows plunges into the middle of things in his first chapter, which is occasion-

ally somewhat dithyrambic in tone. But with the third chapter our author becomes less picturesque, and settles down into a steady gait, broken only by occasional Wegg-like droppings into poetry in the course of his 'declining and falling off' the Minoan Empire (*e.g.* pp. 144, 206). These jerky little quotations from the poets, apt though they may be, are unrestful in effect.

The general position taken up by Prof. Burrows in regard to the Cretan discoveries is one of agreement with Dr. Evans's dating and arrangement, as confirmed from the Egyptian side, and therefore of disagreement with the novel and revolutionary proposals of Dr. Dörpfeld, which apparently do not take the Egyptian evidence into much consideration. It is probable that in Germany the orientalists do not come into such close contact with the Greek archaeologists as they do here, where constant interchange of opinion and consultation between the 'Mycenaeologues' and the Egyptologists has become the order of the day, and the archaeology of both Egypt and early Greece

is becoming more and more treated from a common 'Mediterranean' point of view. In fact here the theory of an ultimate common origin for both Nilotic and Aegean civilization in Africa, towards which Dr. Evans's own conclusions have always tended, is gradually gaining more adherents. In his recent articles on 'Cretan Palaces' in the *Annual of the British School at Athens*, Dr. Mackenzie advocates it, and brings forward the argument, which is difficult for the apologists of an entirely northern origin of Aegean culture to answer, of the Mycenaean waistcloth. This comes from a hot climate, not from a cold one.¹

Prof. Burrows, while acknowledging in a final appendix that Dr. Mackenzie's argument about the waistcloth is convincing, yet in the main body of his book seems to hanker after an alternative theory of an Italic origin for the Minoan civilization, which would fit in with Prof. Conway's belief that the Eteocretan language of Praesos was Indo-European and specially kin to Venetic. Prof. Burrows discusses this possibility thoroughly and fairly, and quite rightly points out that it would be an error to regard 'Eteocretan' as necessarily identical with 'Minoan': the Eteocretans may have been an Italian colony of the Late Minoan III time. We certainly have traditional connexions between Minoan Crete and Italy; and should Prof. Conway's

¹ On p. 220 of the last number of the *Annual of the British School at Athens*, Dr. Mackenzie says that my use of the 'designations "kleinasiatisch" and "Asianic," as well as other statements in the passage cited' ('The Two Labyrinths,' *J.H.S.* xxv. p. 323), 'would seem to indicate an underlying belief on Mr. Hall's part that the primary movement of the Aegeo-Pelasgian people was from an initial centre of departure in Asia.' I should have thought that the concluding sentences of my article (*loc. cit.* p. 337) would have shewn that I did not believe anything of the kind. I have never thought that the Mediterraneans (Aegeans and Egyptians) came from Asia Minor, and for some time past it has seemed to me that the place of common origin was Africa, perhaps the Nile-valley itself rather than 'Libya.' I used the words 'kleinasiatisch' and 'Asianic' of language, not of race, simply because Lycian and Carian are the best-known examples of the non-Aryan language-group to which I believe 'Minoan' belonged, and they have naturally been called 'kleinasiatisch' and 'Asianic,' because they were spoken in Asia Minor. It seems to me that if we are to regard the Carians and Lycians as akin to the Minoans, they came from the west and south, like them.

view that there was an Italic language element in Crete be confirmed, these traditions may combine with the Egyptian records of Shardana, Shekelsha, and Tuirsha to indicate vaguely to us an Italian overrunning of the Aegean at the time when the 'isles were restless,' and before the North-erners came down into continental Greece. I have preferred to regard Shardana as Sardians and Shekelsha as Sagalassians, and I still think they were; but it may be that Sardians were Sardinians, and Sagalassians were Sikels, originally, all the same. The sea-rovers settled on all the Levantine coasts: we find Danuna, whom all agree to regard as Danaans, on the coast of Palestine as early as the time of the Tell el-Amarna letters.

There is no doubt that the great age of Knossos, the period of those Keftians who took gifts to Hatshepsu and Thothmes III, came to an end at the beginning of the long strife in the Mediterranean, which may well have begun with a swarming eastwards of the Italians, presumably already Aryanized but still bronze-using, in the fifteenth century B.C. To these 'Völkerschaaren' streaming and storming by the overthrow of the native Aegean dominion of the non-Aryan Keftians was no doubt due. And to this age of 'Sturm und Drang,' and consequent lowered civilization, corresponds in point of time the period of artistic development which Dr. Evans calls 'Late Minoan III'; the period which we used to know as 'Mycenaean,' and may still call so, in contradistinction to the older true 'Minoan' period of the Keftians. At this time the centre of the Aegean culture probably shifted out of the way of the sea-rovers to safe holds on the mainland of Greece: the ancient Cretan colony of Tiryns gave birth to the new Achaean Mycenae, perhaps. In the islands, a new Italian element of population, bringing Indo-European tongues for the first time into the Aegean, settled now among the older inhabitants, and in the eastern end of Crete one of their dialects remained untouched by either the ancient non-Aryan tongue of the old Aegeans or the later Aryan speech of the true Greeks from the north into classical times. On this theory the true Greek

element will be that of the later comers (the 'Dorians' of tradition) who brought with them the use of iron, and made the geometrical pottery. I imagine that Prof. Burrows would be inclined to agree with me in some such explanation as this. It would be interesting if the Achaean name (*Akaiwasha*) really came from Italy!

The date of the Italian incursion would have to be placed roughly between 1450 and 1400 B.C. As Prof. Burrows shews, the date of the Rekhmarā fresco at Thebes, in which Cretans of Late Minoan II are depicted, is about 1450 B.C. at latest, while at Tell el-Amarna about 1400-1350 B.C. we find Late Minoan III (true Mycenaean) pottery.

Prof. Burrows's discussion of the Egyptian chronology is very good, but I can object that he is too much inclined to give his allegiance to chronological systems which provide absolutely definite dates. It is perhaps natural that a Greek archaeologist, used to an exact chronology, should be discontented with the vaguely approximate dates which Egyptologists have until lately, and I think with wisdom, preferred, and should be inclined to regard as a heinous error the continued acceptance of an approximate date which is perhaps half-a-century or so earlier than that which the latest evidence seems to indicate as the real one. But an approximate date is an approximate date, and is not intended to be anything else. And an approximate date is safest, even for the XVIIIth Dynasty, of which we now know so much. Prof. Burrows prefers to use for this dynasty the very definite system of Prof. Eduard Meyer. There are one or two objections to Prof. Meyer's system, as regards the XVIIIth Dynasty, apart from its unsafe definiteness of date. It assumes, for instance, as certain a theory, maintained by Prof. Breasted, which swallows up the reigns of Thothmes II and Hatshepsu in that of Thothmes III. This theory is not yet

accepted by Prof. Naville, so that it may yet be shewn that Meyer's date for the beginning of the dynasty is several years too low. In any case an approximate system based on Meyer's dates would be the lowest possible.

As regards the application of Egyptian dates to the chronology of the Cretan artistic styles, Prof. Burrows, following von Bissing, is inclined to dissociate Middle Minoan II from the XIIth Dynasty, and make it with Middle Minoan III, equivalent rather to the Hyksos period. If the Hagios Onouphrios deposit is really contemporaneous with the XIIth Dynasty, this would seem an almost necessary proceeding. But now Prof. Garstang has discovered in an untouched grave at Abydos, a Middle Minoan II pot with cylinders of XIIth Dynasty kings. The grave is no doubt contemporary with the cylinders, so that Middle Minoan II cannot be later than the XIIth Dynasty. We have still to explain the evidence of Hagios Onouphrios.

I regret that considerations of space do not allow me to discuss other questions raised by Prof. Burrows. He has not convinced me that my defence of Mayer's theory of the meaning of the 'Labyrinth' name was wrong; and I doubt if he is right in thinking that the giving of the name 'Labyrinth' to the Temple of Hawara is as old as the Minoan period. It seems to me more probable that there was a Greek tradition of the many passages and shining walls of the Knossian Labyrinth, and that the Greeks who visited Egypt under the Saïtes first gave the name of *λαβύρινθος* to the Egyptian maze of shining walls at Hawara. On the point as to Egyptian wall-building, as compared with that of Knossos, about which he asks for information (p. 104, n.²), the stones of the great XIth Dynasty walls at Deir el-Bahari are set in a thin bonding of clay or mortar, like those of Knossos.

H. R. HALL.