THE TWO LABYRINTHS.

[PLATE XIV.]

φασὶ δέ τινες καὶ τὸν Δαίδαλον εἰς Αἴγυπτον παραβάλοντα, καὶ θαυμάσαντα τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τέχνην, κατασκευάσαι τῷ βασιλεύοντι τῆς Κρήτης Μίνωι λαβύρινθον ὅμοιον τῷ κατ' Αἴγυπτον.

DIOD. SIC. i. 61.

PERHAPS the most salient feature of the recent development of knowledge in regard to prehistoric Greece is the peculiar connexion which has been shewn (chiefly by the discoveries of Dr. Arthur Evans) to have existed between the oldest Greek culture and the ancient civilization of Egypt. As far back as the time of the Hyksos and the XIIth Dynasty the connexion is certain. We now know that during the XVIIIth Dynasty (seventeenth to fifteenth century B.C.) Egypt maintained regular relations with the Cretan Mycenaeans of the great period of Knossos and Phaistos: the 'Late Minoan' period of Evans. This much the incontrovertible evidence of the Egyptian tomb-paintings at Thebes has told us, to say nothing of the numerous pieces of minor evidence from both Greece and Egypt. The corroborative evidence of the alabastron-lid of the Hyksos king Khian, and the figure of the Egyptian Abnub (who certainly lived during the Hyksos period), which have been found at Knossos, take us two centuries or more further back; and the remarkable parallels between the Cretan seal-designs and the Egyptian scarab-designs of the XIIIth Dynasty, which Dr. Evans was the first to point out, shew us that the connexion was older than the days of the Hyksos. The Egyptological literary evidence on the subject indicates that the Egyptians had dealings (often of an unfriendly kind) with the seafaring peoples of the Mediterranean certainly as early as the XIIth Dynasty (Middle Kingdom), possibly as early as the VIth. But now we are pursuing the voyage of discovery into remote and little known seas, so that progress must be slow and cautious, and careful soundings must constantly be taken. The Egyptian literary evidence of knowledge of the Northerners (*Ha-nebu*) under the Old Kingdom (up to about the twenty-fifth century B.C.) is of the scantiest and vaguest character, and can be made to mean almost anything the investigator wishes. The archaeological evidence is also very scanty, but, such as it is, it must be said that it is not vague, and that such

1

2

EGYPTIAN AND CRETAN SQUARE PILLARS.

bits of evidence as the finding of a very primitive Egyptian stone vase and a fragment of a IIIrd-IVth Dynasty diorite bowl at Knossos and the remarkable analogy of the light-blue Knossian glazed faïence to the similar faïence of the earliest Egyptian dynasties,¹ make it impossible to deny off-hand that any connexion between Greece and Egypt existed before the XIIth Dynasty. For the XIIth Dynasty it is certain, however we may square the apparent contemporaneity of the primitive Amorgian cist-grave period in *Crete* and the XIIth Dynasty² with the equally apparent contemporaneity of the 'Middle Minoan' (Kamáres) period in the same island with the same dynasty.³ For the earlier period the evidence of the faïence is striking. In Egypt the light-blue faïence is characteristic only of the early dynasties, and of the XXVIth, the Saïte age of the seventh to sixth centuries B.C., whose potters archaized in this matter of glaze just as their sculptors archaized in the style of their reliefs. In *Crete* it is characteristic of the early Minoan period. This is certainly, when taken in conjunction with the other evidence, in favour of the contention that the connexion between *Crete* and Egypt went back further than the time of the XIIth Dynasty. Of course the preference for the light-blue glaze may have lasted in *Crete* when it had died out in Egypt; but the diorite fragment and the primitive vase from Knossos, which were imported Egyptian objects, not copies of Egyptian technique, are witnesses for a connexion under the earliest dynasties. It cannot be maintained that these two objects were imported a thousand years after the time of their manufacture. The ancients did not collect antique 'curios,' at any rate not till the time of the Saïtes in Egypt, and the Romans in Europe. It cannot be conceived that to a Keftian of the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty Egyptian objects of the days of the Third and Fourth Dynasties would have been of the slightest interest, any more than they would have been to an Egyptian of the same period. Dr. Evans and Prof. Petrie also connect

¹ See Evans, *B.S.A.* ix. p. 62 f.

² Evans, *Pictographs*, p. 105 ff. These Agios Onouphrios scarabs cannot be earlier than the XIIth Dynasty. If they are not XIIth Dynasty, they can only be early XVIIth. And this would agree still less with the probable date of objects with which they were found. We can hardly assume that not merely in the islands, but in *Crete* itself, and within a stone's throw of Phaistos, there existed at the same time as the fully developed Minoan civilization a tribe which retained the culture of the sub-Neolithic period.

³ Petrie, *Ithahun*, Pl. I. Dr. Mackenzie says (*Phylakopí*, p. 261) that the polychrome (Kamáres) ware from *Crete* found in Egypt is 'assigned by Flinders Petrie in view of all the evidence to about 2500 B.C.' In view of the evidence from *Crete* it is true that the contemporaneity of the Kamáres ware found at

'Kahun' with the XIIth Dynasty town of Het-hetep-Senusret seems extremely probable, but when the polychrome fragments were found their discoverer was by no means convinced of their early date. On p. 43 of *Kahun* he says: 'As they (the fragments of foreign pottery found at Kahun) were none of them on the floors of the chambers, or in unequivocally early positions, they may be later intrusions and dropped by chance passers, and some are almost certainly late.' Cf. also p. 31. It was in view of this uncertainty expressed by Prof. Petrie that four years ago I classed the Kahun evidence as weak (*Oldest Civilization*, p. 67). But our present certainty that the polychrome ware was in use in *Crete* at a date long anterior to the Great Palace period (Third *Phylakopí*), which was contemporary with the XVIIIth Dynasty, shews that Prof. Petrie's doubts were probably not justified.

certain bowls and vases of black pottery found at Abydos and dating to an even more remote period (Dyns. I.-II.) with the late Neolithic black pottery of Knossos⁴; but here we seem to be dealing with stuff less markedly characterized than light-blue glazed pottery, and the stone bowls and vases of the Old Kingdom, which are unmistakable. Prof. Petrie further maintained⁵ that in the boats depicted upon the Egyptian vases of the praedynastic period we ought to see the actual sea-going galleys in which the primeval commerce of the Mediterranean was carried from Egypt to Greece and *vice versâ*, but it must be said that this conclusion is by no means probable or in the least justified by the appearance of the boats in question: they are quite evidently but ordinary Nile-boats, the praehistoric ancestors of the dahabiyas and felukas of to-day. They have deck-shelters just like the model funerary boats of the Middle Kingdom tombs, and they carry women on board, and on one vase a woman is depicted wailing, with her hands above her head: it may well be that they actually represent the ferry-boats of the dead. They carry purely Egyptian emblems. Now we know of the Egyptians that they were never seafarers: they disliked the sea, and they held the seafaring inhabitants of the Delta-coast in abomination; it was never the Egyptians who went to Crete in the early days or later. Just as the Milesians came to the Nile-mouths in the eighth century, so the Keftians had come to Egypt in the sixteenth, and the Ha-nebu in the old time before them; but as far as we know, no Egyptian ever returned the compliment, unless driven from the Palestinian coast by stress of wind and waves.⁶ So that if we ever find Egyptian representations of the ships that took the stone vases of the early dynasties to Crete we shall see that they were neither Egyptian nor carried Egyptian emblems. And as for the oars of the praehistoric boats, the Nile-boats had many oars. Finally, these boats are represented amid ostriches, oryxes, mountains, and palm-trees: that is to say they are sailing on the Nile, with the desert-hills and their denizens on either hand.

But, although we do not know what the ships were like in which this early commerce between Egypt and Europe was carried on, we have enough evidence to shew that this commerce had existed for centuries before the 'Palace' period in Crete, when the Keftians brought gifts to the court of Hatshepsu and Thothmes III at Thebes. When Dr. Evans publishes Knossos in full we shall find all this evidence marshalled in order, and with the distinction fully marked between the evidence which points to a mere general sea-connexion and culture-exchange between Egypt and Crete, and that which seems to indicate something more, possibly an ultimate common origin for the Egyptian and Aegean civilizations. Meanwhile, further corroborative evidence may be sought, and one point which seems to bring certain

⁴ Petrie, *Abydos* ii. p. 38.

⁵ *Egypt and Early Europe* (Trans. R. Soc. Lit. xix. p. 61).

⁶ Like Uenuamen, the Egyptian envoy to Phoenicia in the eleventh century (*Oldest*

Civilization, p. 321). But he was cast away on Cyprus only and the ship he sailed in was Phoenician. There were no Egyptian merchant-ships on the 'Great Green' sea.

architectural ideas of the Minoans into connexion with certain similar ideas of the XIIth Dynasty Egyptians may be worth raising.

This point arises in connexion with the probable resemblance of the Egyptian and Cretan Labyrinths. That the great palace discovered and excavated by Dr. Evans at Knossos is the Cretan Labyrinth of the ancients is generally admitted. Generally accepted, also, is Mayer's brilliant suggestion with regard to the word *Λαβύρινθος*, that it is the same as the Carian *Λάβραυνδα*, which is probably *λάβρυς* 'Double Axe,' plus the Asianic termination *-νδα*, which is the same as the Greek *-νθος* (of *Κόρινθος*, for example), claimed by Kretschmer in his epoch-making *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* as one proof of the existence of a prae-Aryan and specifically 'kleinasiatisch' element in Greek place-names. In view of the fact of the constant recurrence of the double-axe sign at Knossos, this explanation was adopted by Dr. Evans.⁷ It has commended itself to all except those who dislike the idea of a prae-Aryan population and speech on the sacred 'Aryan' soil of Hellas. To those, however, who have no particular prejudices in favour of the 'Indo-Europeans' or their group of languages, the supposition that the 'Minoan' originators of Greek civilization were not Indo-Europeans, and did not speak any form of the Greek language, but an 'Asianic' idiom akin to those of the Lycians and Carians, seems not only a probability, but a far more interesting probability than the other. The barbarian Scyths, the unintelligent Persians, were pure Aryans. The originators of human culture in Egypt and Mesopotamia were the non-Aryan non-Semitic Nilotes and Sumerians. In India it is possible that a Dravidian civilization existed before the coming of the primitive Aryans, and that the later culture of India was strongly influenced by the traditions of the conquered civilization. We know that the Semitic culture of Mesopotamia was almost wholly of non-Semitic (Sumerian) origin; the conquerors imposed their language on the conquered, but wrote it in the writing which had been invented by the latter. The theory which would regard the Mycenaean culture as of non-Aryan origin, and the later civilization of Greece as a blend of the ideas of the conquered 'Mycenaeans' with those of the conquering Indo-Europeans from the north, who imposed their Aryan language on the conquered, has therefore analogies in its favour. It seems to be rendered necessary by various considerations. The ethnologists⁸ have shewn us that the dark dolichocephalic Mediterranean peoples, whether they be Italians, Greeks, or Egyptians, form a race by themselves, in complexion and skull-form radically differing from the fair brachycephalic 'Alpine' peoples of Central Europe, who have the best right to be regarded as the original speakers of 'Indo-European.' Kretschmer⁹ has pointed out that many Greek place-names are evidence of a language-stratum in Greece which is related to the ancient languages of Caria and Lycia, which he believes to be non-Aryan.

⁷ *Mycenaean Tree and Pillar-Cult* (J.H.S. xxi.) p. 109, n. 6.

⁸ Sergi, *Mediterranean Race*.

⁹ Kretschmer, *op. cit.*

This belief will probably be shared by those philologists who know something of non-Aryan as well as of Aryan tongues. And it agrees with the demands of the ethnologists, who find the main stock of the Greek race dolichocephalic and dark, that is to say, non-Alpine. The tall, fair-complexioned, red-headed people who formed the upper stratum of the old Hellenes, and were probably dying out about the time that the Greek became the 'Graeculus esuriens,' were the Alpine conquerors who imposed their Aryan tongue on the old Mediterranean Greek stock, which has survived them. Further, Greek tradition agrees with this view: the Pelasgi were the Dravidians of Greece as far as their relations with the later conquerors were concerned. The conclusion that they were also the Sumerians of Greece, that the pre-historic civilization of Greece, to which her later Aryanized culture owed so much, was the product of non-Aryan 'Asiatic' Mediterraneans (akin racially to the ancient Egyptians among others), who were probably the 'Pelasgi' of legend, is at least justified by analogy, and agrees with the demands of Sergi and Kretschmer from the view-points of ethnology and philology. The less cultured but more energetic Aryans, coming from the Alpine regions with their iron weapons (as Prof. Ridgeway said), overthrew the ancient civilization of the Mediterraneans, and in the time of barbarism which ensued (dated by archaeological discovery accurately to the twelfth to ninth centuries B.C.), imposed their language on the conquered, but at the same time drank in the knowledge of their more developed culture, with the result that in the eighth century Greek civilization was re-born altered and transformed by the new racial element in the land. It is thus that we see nothing strange in the idea that in the sixteenth century B.C., when the Minoan civilization was at its height, a language was spoken in Greece as different from Aryan Greek as ancient Egyptian was (and quite possibly more akin to the latter than to the former). Nor need we wonder if the Cretan hieroglyphs, when they are read, prove to express a language of the Asiatic non-Aryan type, in no way related to Greek except in so far as words of the old language were adopted into the speech of the Aryan conquerors. Probably there are many such originally non-Aryan words in Greek.¹⁰

¹⁰ In articles in *B.S.A.* viii. p. 125 ff. and x. p. 115 ff. Mr. R. S. Conway supposes that the Eteocretan tongue, as shewn on the 'nomos,' 'barxe,' and 'neikar' inscriptions from Praesos, is Indo-European, and suggests that an Indo-European language was spoken by the Minoans. In effect his article is an apology for Aryanism in respect of the 'Minoans' and so indirectly for the Aryan character of Minoan civilization. This goes against all the archaeological evidence, which gives a non-Aryan impression of the Minoans. Mr. Conway does not believe in Kretschmer's theory that the Asiatic languages were non-Aryan; but at the same time says 'I know nothing about Lycian.' The arguments for the non-Aryan character of

the prae-Hellenic language-stratum in Greece (the existence of this Mr. Conway fully admits) rest chiefly on the apparently non-Aryan character of Lycian (in conjunction with the ethnological evidence), yet their critic admits that he knows nothing about that language. On his pp. 154, 155 Mr. Conway does not disprove Kretschmer's theory with regard to the non-Aryan origin of the Greek words in *-vθ(os)*: he merely says he has 'never been able to see any ground' for accepting it. The only answer is that others have been able to see many grounds for doing so. Mr. Conway notes as a most interesting fact that the *-vθ-* words (other than place-names) such as *ἐλμυς*, *πεῖρις*, *βόλυνθος*, *κήρινθος*, *ὑλυνθος*, *ἐρέβινθος*, *τερέβιν-*

The word Labyrinth then we may regard with Mayer as a prehistoric form, itself dating from Minoan times, and meaning 'Place of the Double Axe' in the Asianic tongue of the Minoan Cretans; and we may with Dr. Evans regard the Knossian palace, the chief 'Place of the Double Axe' in Crete, as the Cretan Labyrinth.¹¹ Why was the Egyptian Labyrinth

θος, λέβινθος, ἀδάμινθος, ἀψίνθιον, κόρυνθος, αἴγινθος, are 'all earthy of the soil; they represent exactly the type of words which come into language from the speech of the countryman, *adscriptus glebae*.' They are, as he says, the words that the Achæan warriors learnt 'from their Mycenaean servants and tenants' after the conquest. But they are for him of Indo-European origin. Were this so, we should expect these words of the peasants to resemble words of the same signification in other Aryan tongues. If Mr. Conway can shew us that they do he will have proved a point in favour of his view. Meanwhile, one may be pardoned for believing that these are examples of non-Aryan words in Greek. Κήρινθος, ἐρέβινθος, αἴγινθος may be instances of Indo-European words with the -νθ termination added, though in the case of the two last the Indo-European origin of ἐρέβ- and αἴγ- seems open to question.

¹¹ In *J.H.S.* xxi. (ii.) pp. 268-274 Mr. W. H. D. Rouse makes a vigorous attack on these conclusions. Since (in a footnote to p. 268) he has mentioned me personally as having adopted them, perhaps I may be allowed the license of a somewhat lengthy note in which to comment upon some of his arguments. Vigorous criticisms of this kind are both useful and salutary, but they lose much of their force when they do not take account of all the evidence. (i) Mr. Rouse says that 'no attempt is made to analyse the word Labyrinth, to explain the ending, to explain the metathesis of ν which is unexampled.' This must have been written without due regard to Kretschmer's work, although a reference to it was given by Mr. Evans. Why the metathesis of ν should be important when we are dealing in the case of λαβύρινθος with a pre-Hellenic word surviving in Greek, and in the cases of λάβρυς and λάβρυανδα with Carian words more or less imperfectly transcribed in Greek characters in comparatively modern times, is not apparent. The difference is remarkably slight; and those, who from a certain knowledge of Semitic tongues have learnt the true unimportance of vowels in the construction of words, will not be able to see that whether the word is written λαβύρινθος or λαβρύνθος makes much odds: the important things are the λ-β-ρ and the νθ- or νδ-, and their collocation in this

particular instance when taken in conjunction with the fact that both at Knossos and at Labraunda the double-axe occurs and *is* the symbol of a god. (ii) Mr. Rouse does not believe that the double-axe was specially venerated at Knossos or by the Minoans generally. He makes merry over the idea of 'Greeks' venerating a symbol at all: 'the Greeks,' he writes, 'would be as likely to worship a trident or a bunch of grapes as to worship a pair of top-boots; and to regard these things as symbolically sacred would be to worship them. Savages may make a fetish of a collar-stud or a knife, but there is no reason to doubt that such exaggerated superstition was alien to the Greek intellect. Isolated indications of the ruder superstition cannot outweigh the general tendency of Greek worship towards sanity and away from symbolism.' The 'isolated indications' are quite sufficient to give Mr. Rouse's case away. The fact is that there was in Greece as much underlying barbarism as anywhere else: even the 'Aryan' Greeks were savages once. But, apart from this, Mr. Rouse begs the question when he assumes that the Greeks who built Knossos were those idealized paragons who would have turned with graceful loathing from the commission of so unintellectual an act as the veneration of a double-axe as the symbol of the divine power. It seems most probable that the Minoans were not 'Greeks' in Mr. Rouse's sense at all, but a non-Aryan race with religious ideas akin to those of the Egyptians or the Canaanites; of their religious ideas many traces survived in the religions of later Greece and Asia Minor. All arguments against the worship of the double-axe by the Minoans which are based on the supposition that their mental type was identical with that of the later Greeks are beside the mark. The fact that the double-axe *was* actually venerated by the Minoans is shewn by (among other things) the discovery of a scene of its being worshipped, on a sarcophagus from Agia Triada. This being so, Dr. Evans's conclusion that it was the emblem of a god, who is the same as the god of Labraunda, is evidently entirely justified. The Carian god was identified with Zeus: the great god of Crete was Zeus. The double-axe god of the

called by the same name? The old explanation, due to Brugsch but afterwards abandoned by him, was that the word was originally Egyptian, being '*Ro-per-ro-henet*,' which might mean 'Temple-mouth-canal,' and that the Knossian Labyrinth derived its name from the Egyptian one. *Ro-henet* ('Canal-mouth') or **La-hene*, as it would have been pronounced in the dialect of the Fayyûm, is certainly the original form of the name of Illahun

Labyrinth was the later Zeus Kretagenes, just as the double-axe god of Labraunda was the Karian Zeus. (iii) Mr. Rouse does not believe that the double-axe had any particular connexion with Knossos or that the Knossian palace has any special claim to the title of 'House of the Double-Axe': other signs besides the axe occur on its walls, the signs were all possibly never intended to be seen, having been covered with plaster, and the double-axe occurs at Phaistos and at other places as well as at Knossos; there ought therefore to be 'Houses of the Double-Axe' and 'Labyrinths' too. Other signs certainly occur at Knossos: but the continued excavations shew that the double-axe is the commonest, and from the way in which it is inscribed it seems to have a special significance there which the others have not. That the signs were in many cases originally covered up with plaster or gypsum slabs is very probable, but this would not affect the argument. They must have been intended to mean something, or they would not have been cut on the blocks at all. It seems to me (as I pointed out in *Nature*, Nov. 20, 1902) very probable that the sign was cut on these blocks as an intimation to the quarrymen or masons as to the destination of the blocks in question—they were intended for the 'House of the Double-Axe'—just as in Egypt blocks intended for the temple called 'House of Millions of Years,' or (at Deir el-Bahari) *Nefer-renput*, 'Beautiful of Years,' would have the signs
 ♂ { { { or what not painted on each as an intimation to the masons. This may well be one of the many small points in which Minoan practice resembled the Egyptian. But I do not quite gather from Dr. Evans's report on the excavations for the year 1901 (*B.S.A.* vii. p. 112) whether he considers that the fine limestone wall at the western end of the 'Megaron of Double-Axes,' on which the double-axe is most in evidence, was ever masked by gypsum-slabs or plaster at all. In *B.S.A.* viii. p. 66, in dealing with the distaff signs on another similar wall, he inclines to the view that they had been covered with plaster, as at Phaistos. The pillar illustrated in *Mycenaean Tree and Pillar-Cults* (Fig. 5) and other

gypsum pillars and door-jambs which are inscribed with the double-axe sign were surely, however, never covered up by facing-slabs or plaster any more than were the gypsum pavements. As regards Mr. Rouse's denial of the exclusive claim of Knossos to be a 'place of the Double-Axe,' certainly Phaistos, for instance, may just as well have had its shrine with the emblem of the common god of the Cretans as any other Cretan city or palace, and this may have been called its *labraunda* or *labyrinth*, its 'place of the Double-Axe.' But the Labyrinth of the Greeks was 'in the Knossian territory'; Minos, the king who owned the Minotaur (Dr. Evans compares the bull-frescoes of Knossos), was king of Knossos: Knossos was traditionally the chief city of the island and the centre of the Minoan thalassocracy, therefore it was probably also the chief centre of the worship of the God of the Double-Axe, Zeus Kretagenes, wherefore Dr. Evans is again justified in regarding it as the 'Place of the Double-Axe' *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the Labyrinth *par excellence*. That there may also have been confusions with the Gortynian cave, which may have been called the 'Labyrinth' on account of its many windings, and become regarded as the true Labyrinth of the Minotaur, is possible. Mr. Rouse quotes from Strabo (viii. 369) a catacomb near Nauplia which was called 'the Labyrinth,' so that the name was evidently generally used in late times for labyrinthine caves, just as it might be now. Mr. Rouse says that the Knossian palace is neither mazy nor labyrinthine, but I for one have found it satisfy all reasonable demands in this respect: there is much more at Knossos than 'fine open courtyards and straight corridors,' as a glance at the plan will shew. A point on which Mr. Rouse seems, however, to have some justification for his criticism is in respect of the pillars of the Pillar-Rooms. He denies their sacred character: that may pass, though most of us will think Dr. Evans is right on the point; but his contention that they did not stand free, but, whether also cult-objects or not, in every case performed an architectural function in upholding the roof, seems extremely probable.

(*el-Lahun*), close by at the opening of the Hawara Canal into the Bahr Yusuf, but '*Ro-per-ro-henet*' is a purely hypothetical form, which is not known to have existed, and in any case would have been pronounced by the people of the district **Elpi-la-hene*, which is not much like *Λαβύρινθος*, while *Labraunda* is.

Prof. Spiegelberg, regarding the Egyptian as the original Labyrinth, from which the Greek one took its name, suggested that it was derived from the Graecized Egyptian royal name *Λάβαρις*, given by Manetho in this dynasty, the original of which he considers to have been the praenomen of the builder of the Egyptian Labyrinth, King Amenemhat III,

Ne-maat-Rā.¹² Dr. Evans, not questioning the Egyptological identification, but at the same time believing that the word was of 'Greek' prae-Aryan origin, suggested that 'it is quite natural to suppose that the Greeks, having taken over the word *Λαβύρινθος* applied by the earlier race to the Cretan building, should by a kind of *Volksetymologie* transfer the term to the temple of "Labaris."' ¹³ This seems very probable. But it is to be noted that in the actual list of kings Labaris is the equivalent, not of Amenemhat III, who is *Ammeres*, but of his predecessor Usertsen or Senusret III. Manetho makes Senusret the builder of the Labyrinth, not Amenemhat. Nevertheless it is more than probable that 'Labaris' and its variant 'Lamaris' are intended for the throne-name of Amenemhat, the real builder of the Labyrinth: phonetically the name agrees with *Ne-maat-Rā* absolutely: ¹⁴ the placing of him in the position of Senusret III is due to a confusion with the throne-name of the latter (*see below*, p. 330). It is quite possible that the likeness of the name caused Manetho to take away the great building from its rightful owner in his list, Ammeres, to give it to his predecessor, whose name, as Manetho thought it to be, so closely resembled *Λαβύρινθος*. And no doubt others also believed that the name of the Egyptian Labyrinth was connected with that of the King Labaris or Lamaris.

It is most probable that in reality it received its name merely on account of a supposed resemblance to the original Labyrinth in Crete, and that a popular etymology assisted the identification. This resemblance may have been striking.

The position of the Egyptian Labyrinth at Hawara, close to the opening of the Fayyûm, its character, and date, have been well known since the investigations of Lepsius¹⁵ and Petrie.¹⁶ Little or nothing remains of it now, but in the old days it had been the theme of wondering comment by Greek visitors to Egypt. Herodotus makes much of it, and so do Diodorus, Strabo, and Pliny. It finally disappeared in Roman times: the brick chambers which Lepsius thought were its foundations are those of a late Roman village

¹² *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Dec. 1900, pp. 447-449.

¹³ *J.H.S.* xxi. 109, n. 6.

¹⁴ *Ne-maat-Rā* would have been pronounced something like **Nemari*, as *Neb-maat-Rā*, the praenomen of Amenhetep III, was, we know,

pronounced **Nimmarî* (Babylonian form *Nim-murtya*), and the interchange of *n* with *l* is usual: cf. e.g. *nas* tongue; Coptic *las*.

¹⁵ *Denkmäler*, i. 47, 78; Text ii. p. 11 ff.

¹⁶ *Hawara, Biahmu*, and *Arsinoe*, p. 4 ff.

which was built on its ruins. The extent and position of the original building were made out by Lepsius, and a restoration of the plan has been attempted by Prof. Petrie from the scanty evidence as to its construction given by the Greek and Roman writers. It was a great temple,¹⁷ with magnificent pillared halls, side-chambers, and outbuildings, erected by the greatest pharaoh of the Twelfth Dynasty, Amenemhat III (circa 2200 B.C.), immediately in front of his pyramid at Hawara: there is no doubt that it was the funerary temple of the pyramid, erected by the king for the due performance of the funeral rites after his death. But unlike the temples of previous kings of the Dynasty at Lisht or Dashur, the pyramid-temple of Amenemhat III was of enormous size and splendour. That it was a temple was not generally realized by the Greek visitors to it. Strabo knew that the king who built it, whom he calls Maïndes or Imandes, was buried not in the Labyrinth, as Diodorus says, but in the pyramid, and that the halls of the Labyrinth had been built for some sort of religious purpose.¹⁸ For most of the other writers it was the king's tomb itself: Diodorus calls it the sepulchre of Mendes or Marros, the copyists of Manetho that of Lamaris, Labaris, or Lachares. Pliny quotes Lyceas as saying that it was the tomb of Moiris, and Demoteles as saying that it was the 'palace' of king Moteris. The various forms of the name of the king who built it are interesting, and can mostly be traced back to that of its actual builder. Even Pliny's 'Petesouchis or Tithoes' is evidently Amenemhat III: the name *Petsouchis* being 'He who is given by Sebek,' the crocodile-god of the Fayyûm, the land of the lake Moeris for which Amenemhat did so much. Lyceas, as quoted by Pliny, actually ascribes the building of the Labyrinth to king Moiris the lake-maker. The name *Moiris* is probably the word *Mer-uer*, 'Great Lake' (the king being a sort of eponymous hero of the lake), confused with the actual praenomen of the king , which, as the form *Moteris* shews, was in the late period read *Maāt-n-Rā* (**Materi*'), as well as (properly) *Ne-maāt-Rā*.¹⁹ Diodorus's name, Marros, is evidently *Ma-Rā* or *Ma-n-Rā* uncontaminated by *mer-uer*, and as a matter of fact he separates the Maker of the Lake from the Builder of the Labyrinth, calling the former Moiris. Herodotus evidently knew of the king Moiris, but forgets to insert him in his historical sketch, speaking merely of the lake as 'called that of

¹⁷ Its size may be judged from Prof. Petrie's remark (*loc. cit.* p. 5) that 'all of the temples on the east of Thebes [all Karnak and Luxor, that is] and one of the largest on the west bank [the Ramesseum] might be placed together on the one area of the ruins at Hawara.'

¹⁸ xvii. 1. 37. Πειοῖσθαι δὲ φασὶ τὰς ἀλλὰς τοσαύτας, ὅτι τοὺς νομοὺς ἔθος ἦν ἐκείσε συνέρχεσθαι πάντας ἀριστίνδην μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων ἱερῶν καὶ ἱερῶν, θυσίας τε καὶ δικαιοδοσίας περὶ τῶν μεγίστων χάριν.

¹⁹ Cf. Griffith, *Ag. Zeits.* xxxiv. (1896) pp. 49,

50: 'On substantive compounds formed with adjectival .

'Possessing the justice of Rā,' like *Nekau* (Νεχαώ); 'Possessing Doubles.' *Maat-n-Rā* would mean 'Justice of Rā' simply. It is more than probable that the name was in later times often read *Maat-n-Rā* or simply *Maat-Rā*, 'Justice of Rā' (**Ma-Rā*'), *Māppos*, *Moīpis*) as well as *Ne-maāt-Rā*, 'Possessing the Justice of Rā' (**Nemari*'), *Nāmapis*, *Admapis*).

Moiris,' and assigning the Labyrinth to his 'Dodekarchy,' the semi-independent princes under the Ethiopians and Assyrians. He seems then to have been unaware of any connexion between the builder of the Labyrinth and the Moiris who created the lake. Is Diodorus swayed by the authority of Herodotus when he, too, assigns them to two different kings? He was aware that Herodotus was in error in assigning the Labyrinth to the Dodekarchy, but makes the king Mendes²⁰ or Marros who built it a totally different person from Moiris. His information was evidently correct, since Marros is a form of the praenomen of the real builder, but, being misled by Herodotus, he did not identify Marros with Moiris. Manetho might have been suspected of a similar exaggerated respect for the authority of the classic Herodotus,²¹ for he appears at first sight to have attributed the Labyrinth to Senusret (Usertsen) III, the predecessor of Amenemhat who built the lake. But this is only apparent: in all probability, as we shall see, he stated both the name of Amenemhat and the fact that he built the Labyrinth very plainly: it is his copyists who have garbled him here as elsewhere. Manetho's name for the Labyrinth-builder is, as we have seen, *Lamaris* or *Labaris*: a third form, *Lachares*, is also given by the copyists. The lake is not ascribed to this king. According to the order of the kings, he ought to be, not Amenemhat III, but his predecessor, Senusret III, the Manethonian representative of Amenemhat III being *Ammeres*. It has therefore been generally supposed that Manetho had simply erred in attributing the building of the Labyrinth to Senusret (Usertsen) III. Prof. Spiegelberg, however, following Unger, has preferred to suppose that *Lamaris* is really the representative of Amenemhat III, owing to the similarity of his name to the praenomen of that king (*see above*, p. 327). *Ammeres* and *Ammenemes*, his successors, therefore must, if Spiegelberg's view be accepted, both = Amenemhat IV, since †*Skemiophris*† (read *Skenophris*), the third from *Lamaris*, is evidently the queen Sebekneferu-Râ (pronounced **Skenofrerê**). It seems, however, that although *Lamaris* = Ne-maat-Râ (Amenemhat III), it is unnecessary to suppose that Senusret III is unrepresented in the Manethonian list or that *Ammeres* as well as *Ammenemes* = Amenemhat IV. A way out of the difficulty is shewn us by the variant form of the name *Lamaris* which is also given us, namely *Lachares*. Now the praenomen of Senusret III is *Kha-Kau-Râ* (**Khakarî**), and Prof. Petrie has pointed out²² that *Xαχαρης* is probably a corruption of this, the mistake of λ for χ being easy. Since the Manethonian list of the kings exactly tallies with that of the monuments on the supposition that *Lachares* = Senusret III, we may agree that Prof. Petrie

²⁰ *Mendes* is a confused interpolation like that of the name of the pharaoh Sheshonk (Shishak of the XXIIInd Dynasty) into the list of XIIth Dynasty kings as 'Sesongosis,' instead of the true name Sesostri (Senusret I). Strabo's name for the king, *Maindes* or *Imandes*, is the same: he calls Memnon (Amenhetep III) also *Smandes*. The original

of this name is the later king *Nesi-ba-neb-dad* (pron. **Nsvindidi*?) of the Tanite XXIst Dynasty.

²¹ On the probable influence of the Herodotean authority on later writers see *J.H.S.* xxiv. 'Nitokris-Rhodopis.'

²² *Hist. Eg.* i. p. 178.

is right, and that Manetho wrote the name of Senusret III *Χαχαρης* or *Χακαρης*. Why then is he also called *Λαμαρις* or *Λαβαρις*, which is the name of Amenemhat III, and given the building of the Labyrinth, which was Amenemhat's work? The solution is that Manetho's original list gave after Sesostri II (*Senusret* II):—Khakhares (*Khā-kau-Rā* Senusret III), Lamaris (*Ne-maat-Rā*), *ὃς τὸν ἐν Ἀρσενούτῃ λαβύρινθον ἐαυτῷ τάφον κατεσκεύασεν*, who was also called Ammeres (*Amenemhat* III), followed by Ammenemes (*Amenemhat* IV) and Skenophris (*Sebek-neferu-rā*). The double name of the king who built the Labyrinth confused the copyists, and when the barbarous-sounding *Χαχαρης* had become corrupted or (quite possibly) emended into *Λαχαρης*, it was an obvious way out of the difficulty to suppose that *Λάχαρης* was the same person as *Λάμαρις*, the builder of the Labyrinth, Ammeres being a separate king. Thus Senusret III appeared to be the builder of the Labyrinth according to Manetho. We see, however, that in reality Manetho knew perfectly well that Amenemhat III was the builder of it, and mentioned both his praenomen (in a more accurate form than that current in his day) and his nomen. The latter he may very well have given originally as 'Ammenemes, called also Merres, Marros' (or some such form); this the later copyists combined and compressed into *Ammeres*. The influence of a popular etymology, based on the name *Λάβαρις* or *Λάμαρις*, in definitely fixing the name 'Labyrinth' on the temple at Hawara, has already been noticed. May the form *Λάβαρις* be itself a result of the conferring of the name Labyrinth on the temple of Lamaris?

Strabo describes the position of the building very accurately; in his and Pliny's time its ruins appear to have been still remarkable, though the latter notices its increasing destruction by the ravages of the surrounding people, who found in it the usual convenient quarry of ready cut and polished stone which every Egyptian temple has been to the later inhabitants of its vicinity.²³ He also notes that 'one person, and one only, has made some slight repairs to the Labyrinth; this was Chaeremon, an eunuch of King Necthebis, who lived five hundred years before the time of Alexander the Great.' The only Egyptian kings with a name resembling 'Necthebis' are Nekht-her-hebet and Nekhtnebf of the XXXth Dynasty, the last native rulers of Egypt, who lived only half-a-century before Alexander. The mention, however, of Alexander in connexion with 'Necthebis' makes it very probable that there has been some confusion as far as the date is concerned, and that slight repairs to the Labyrinth were really attempted by some Asiatic Greek chamberlain of Nekht-her-hebet's (Necthebis = **Nekht-hebe*), who as a Greek would feel the same interest in the world-renowned Egyptian Labyrinth as his fellow-countrymen. In Herodotus's time the vaults had been used to bury the sacred crocodiles in.

Both Pliny and Strabo remark the wonderful polished stonework of the place, and the former notices a thing which surprised him, namely that at the

²³ The neighbouring pyramid of Usertsen II at Illahun was raided for stone as early as the time of Ramses II.

entrance it was constructed of Parian marble, while the rest was of syenite. This 'Parian marble' is interesting. It was of course not really Parian marble, but evidently some kind of local crystalline marble or quartz-veined limestone; Lepsius, during his investigation, discovered what are undoubtedly remains of the actual marble mentioned by Pliny, in the 'grossen Säulentrommeln und die mächtigen Architrav- oder Mauerstücke . . . aus einem sehr harten marmorartigen Kalkstein, der zuweilen Quarzadern hat und öfters ziemlich grau wird, im Ganzen aber von schöner weissen Qualität ist (das marmor Parium des Plinius).' This use of fine and bright white stone seems characteristic of this particular period of Egyptian history: shining white quartzite was much used then, as for instance by the same king Amenemhat III for his twin colossi on the 'pyramids' of Biahmu, which are described by Herodotus (ii. 149). It may well be that this beautiful material was also used in the construction of the Labyrinth. Pliny notes that all the Labyrinths of the ancient world, of Lemnos and of Italy, as well as of Crete and Egypt, were covered with arched roofs of polished stone. It is easily comprehensible that to those who first compared their mazes of corridors, courts, and stairways, and had seen the shining white limestone portals and walls of the one and seen or heard traditions of the glittering gypsum floors, walls, and pillars of the other,²⁴ the temple of Hawara and the Knossian Labyrinth may have seemed by no means unlike. There is no need then to seek for any far-fetched Egyptian derivations for the word 'Labyrinth.' This and the other labyrinths were so called on account of their real or supposed resemblance to the original Labyrinth, the 'Place of the Double Axe,' at Knossos.

The actual resemblance must not be pressed: one was a funerary temple, the other, though it may have partaken to some extent of the character of a temple of the God of the Double Axe, was primarily a royal palace,²⁵ and no doubt there was a radical difference of plan and purpose between them; but the superficial resemblance, the resemblance of the materials and general appearance of both, was enough to make the Greeks give the one the name of the other.

This resemblance of outward appearance is extremely interesting, in view of the probable nearly contemporary date of the two buildings. The Egyptian Labyrinth may have been older, but we do not know that it was so very much older than the Greek one, in which have been found Egyptian

²⁴ I am assuming that much of the plaster coating of the stuccoed gypsum walls which were uncovered had disappeared in antiquity as now. But not all the gypsum blocks were covered up with stucco, apparently. Many of the fine facing-slabs cannot have been, nor can most of the pillars; while the gypsum pavements were certainly never plastered. It is true that Diodorus speaks of the Cretan labyrinth having wholly disappeared (ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὴν Κρήτην ἠφανίσθη τελῶς, εἶτε δυνάστου τινὸς κατασκάψαντος εἶτε τοῦ χρόνου τοῦργον λυμνημένου· ὁ δὲ κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἀκέραιον τὴν ὅλην κατασκευὴν

τετήρηκε μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς βίου, i. 61), but the tradition of its characteristics had evidently survived and, since the site was always kept clear of later buildings (*B.S.A.* x. p. 51), bits of the palace may have been seen from time to time. Diodorus's statement is a curious reversal of the actual facts. Now it is the Egyptian labyrinth which has totally disappeared, while the Cretan one has been discovered and proves to be comparatively well preserved.

²⁵ The Minoan King may also have been high-priest of the Pelasgian Zeus of the Double Axe.

relics which are not more than a couple of centuries later than the time of Amenemhat III. We may not without reason compare the Egyptian use of the white 'Marmor Parium' and quartzite in his reign with the nearly contemporary use of white selenite (crystalline gypsum) by the Minoans. Gypsum itself occurs in Egypt on a XIIth Dynasty site: I found several fragments, which looked as if they had been worked, last year close to the southern pyramid of Dashur. They possibly came from its temple. And in the excavation of the funerary temple of Mentuhetep III, of the XIth Dynasty, last year, were found two fragments of actual thin facing-slabs of polished white crystalline marble, of a kind which Mr. Somers Clarke informs me is found near the Thebaïd; these I believe to be, from the position in which they were found, parts of the XIth Dynasty fabric, and not of later

FIG. 1.—ELEVENTH DYNASTY WALL, DEIR EL-BAHARI.

date. In them we have a precise parallel to the gypsum facing-slabs of Knossos.

This contemporary use of shining white stone in architecture in Crete and Egypt seems to me to be more than a mere coincidence, and to point to a connexion in this matter as in others. The idea probably came to Crete from XIIth Dynasty Egypt: the Egyptian instances are, if anything, earlier, not later, than the Cretan; the fashion is not seen in any later period in Egypt, so far as is known, so that Crete probably did not give it to Egypt.

This resemblance makes it conceivable that other apparent similarities between details of Minoan architecture and that of Egypt under the Middle Kingdom are more than mere coincidences. The finest stonework, as regards blocks of white limestone for walls, in Egypt is that of the Middle Kingdom. The newly-discovered facing walls (Fig. 1) of the Northern Court

of the Temple of Mentuhetep III at Deir el-Bahari, already mentioned, are the chief specimens of this splendid Middle Empire stonework in Egypt. The somewhat later remains of masonry at Dashur are another instance of this work. The masonry of the XVIIIth Dynasty in the Great Temple at Deir el-Bahari, which has hitherto been considered good, is quite poor in comparison with that of the Mentuhetep temple. Other fine limestone walls in Egypt are so rare, owing to the depredations of later stone-hunters, who have used ancient limestone buildings as quarries from the days of Ramses II. to those of Abbas II., that the great Temple of Deir el-Bahari must be taken as the chief specimen of limestone masonry later than the Middle Kingdom. The XIXth Dynasty work at Abydos is good, but the blocks are small and irregularly fitted, as in the XVIIIth Dynasty Deir el-Bahari temple. It is the size, regular laying, and fine jointing of the Middle Kingdom blocks that are so remarkable. When the XIth Dynasty walls at Deir el-Bahari were found, those who had seen all three were immediately struck with the outward resemblance of the first not only to the Dashur walls, but also to the best masonry at Knossos, especially that of the North Gate. When we remember that they are nearly contemporary, the similarity of the sizing and spacing of the blocks in the Egyptian and Cretan masonry in question becomes suggestive. Of course the Egyptian masonry of the Mentuhetep temple of Dashur, and probably of the Hawara Labyrinth also, is better than that of Knossos, but the resemblance remains, especially when we take into consideration another fact: the collocation in both cases of square pillars with the fine masonry. This third resemblance may be purely accidental, but it is interesting when taken in connexion with the above. Very characteristic of Minoan architecture is the use of the simple square pillar. We see it in the Portico (Fig. 2)²⁶ of the North Gate at Knossos, the resemblance of whose walls to the stonework of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom we have already noticed; in the Northern Building at Knossos,²⁷ which had two very perfect pillars of this type in one room (Pl. XIV. 2); and in the pillar-rooms of Phylakopí,²⁸ Zakro,²⁹ and Palaikastro.³⁰ References to other examples at Knossos and Phylakopí are given in *Phylakopí*, p. 261, note 1. 'All the Cnossian pillar-rooms,' says Dr. Mackenzie (*loc. cit.*), 'belong in construction to the first great period of the palace; and the occurrence of such pillars on other Cretan sites goes to show that by this time they had become a regular fashion based probably on a long previous history. The cumulative evidence from Crete is sufficient warrant for assigning the Melian pillar-houses to the same general era and to the same Aegean style of architecture.' At Phylakopí they belong to the Second City: that is to say they were a feature of Aegean architecture in the early Minoan period, not so very long after the time of the XIIth Dynasty.

Now square pillars were probably a feature of Egyptian architecture

²⁶ *B.S.A.* viii. Fig. 3.

²⁹ *B.S.A.* vii. 131.

²⁷ *ib.* p. 6; ix. Pl. IV. 4.

³⁰ *ib.* viii. 316.

²⁸ *Phylakopí*, Figs. 8, 9.

FIG. 2.—PORTICO OF THE NORTH GATE OF KNOSSOS. (From *B.S.A.* viii. Fig. 3.)

in all ages, but it is noticeable that some of the best specimens we have are of the period of the Middle Empire. Pl. XIV. 1 and Fig. 3 shew pillars of this type from the lower colonnade of the Mentuhetep temple at Deir el-Bahari (which was probably imitated by the builders of the colonnades of the later Hatshepsu temple in the same place), and the well-known Temple of the Sphinx at Giza, which is very probably a work of the end of the XIIth Dynasty. The resemblance of the Mentuhetep pillars in Pl. XIV. 1 to those of the Northern House at Knossos (Pl. XIV. 2), may be merely fortuitous, but it is at any rate striking. The construction

FIG. 3.—TEMPLE OF THE SPHINX AT GIZA.

is the same. In several instances at Deir el-Bahari the lowest portion of a pillar is in one piece with the pavement block on which it stands, as in the Knossian example. The size is also about the same in both cases.

The photograph of the Temple of the Sphinx (Fig. 3) shews the XIIth Dynasty combination of square pillars with splendid wall-masonry on a grand scale. This instance is especially interesting, since it seems highly probable that this temple was the work of Amenemhat III, the king who built the Egyptian Labyrinth,³¹ and it may well be that the Labyrinth was built in much the same simple but grandiose style. This is very possible, since

³¹ That some considerable work was done at Giza under the XIIth Dynasty which involved the destruction of more ancient buildings there is proved by the fact that fragments of a lintel and walls bearing the name of Khāfrā (whose statues were found thrown down a well of the Sphinx Temple) were used in the construction

of the southern pyramid of Lisht. And a theory has lately been put forward which argues that the face of the Great Sphinx is a portrait of Amenemhat III. This king was extremely fond of sphinx making, and it is well known that the strange sphinxes found at Tanis, which used to be considered to belong to the

it is noticeable that none of the ancient writers who refer to it seem to speak of the walls of the Egyptian Labyrinth as decorated with anything much in the way of inscriptions;³² and this unusual absence of inscriptions is one of the most striking features of the Temple of the Sphinx and of the little temple of Kasr es-Sagha, near the northern shore of Lake Moeris, which is probably of Middle Empire date, and may well be also the work of Amenemhat III. The resemblance between the two Labyrinths which so struck the old observers as to induce them to give the name of the original Labyrinth, the old 'Place of the Double Axe,' to the Egyptian building of Moeris, may then not have been confined to complexity of plan and to portals and roofs of shining stone, but have extended to the combination of fine masonry and square pillars; the uninscribed masonry, so different from the richly-hieroglyphed walls of the later Egyptian temples which they saw elsewhere, may also have reminded Greek visitors of the simple and unadorned stonework of Greece.

At all events it is curious to find that the presumed ancient resemblance of the Egyptian XIIth Dynasty Labyrinth to that of Minoan Crete (since the one took its name from the other), is more or less borne out by an actual superficial resemblance of some of the architecture of the XIth and XIIth Egyptian Dynasties (of which we know little more than the examples to which I have referred above) to characteristic features of the probably nearly contemporary architecture of Minoan Greece. Superficial resemblances were no doubt enough to attract the attention of the old Greek visitors to Egypt, as well as of the modern archaeologist who is not at the same time an architect; but the resemblances in question seem to me very probably more than superficial. Their actual contemporaneity, which is known to us but was not known to Herodotus and his contemporaries, seems to me to be a cogent argument in favour of this view. If an architect is disposed to dismiss them forthwith as no more than skin-deep, he should remember this fact, that the early Minoan architects were either actually contemporaries with or but little posterior to the Egyptian architects of the Hawara Labyrinth, the Temple of the Sphinx, and the XIth Dynasty colonnades and walls at Deir el-Bahari, and suspend his judgment. Diodorus may well have been near the truth when he said that Daedalus came to Egypt, admired the Labyrinth, and built one like it for Minos.³³ Just as

Hyksos period, have now been proved by M. Golenishtchev to be undoubtedly the work of Amenemhat III. It is by no means impossible that not only the Labyrinth, but also Kasr es-Sagha, the Temple of the Sphinx, and even the Great Sphinx itself, are all the work of this great king. His sphinxes at Tanis, his conception of the Labyrinth, as well as his work in connexion with Lake Moeris, shew that he was a man of original mind, and it may be that he had some puritanical ideas of his own on matters pertaining to religious art,

which led him to insist on an entire absence of inscriptions from the walls of the temples which he built, as well as to strike out an unconventional and peculiar line in his sphinxes.

³² Few fragments of inscriptions have been found, but enough to shew that the Labyrinth was not so entirely uninscribed as the Temple of the Sphinx. In comparison with the Ptolemaic and Roman temples, however, it probably seemed simple and unadorned.

³³ Cf. Plin. *N.H.* xxxvi. 75.

the prehistoric Aegeans resembled the early Egyptians in their love of fine stonework in the small matter of bowls and vases, so may they also have resembled them in their love of fine stonework in the large matter of building. And the resemblance which the Greek visitors traced between the two Labyrinths may not have been so very wide of the mark after all. How far this resemblance is to be traced to Egyptian influence in Greece remains doubtful. At any rate we know that this influence existed earlier than the time of the XIIth Dynasty. How far resemblances of this kind are to be traced to 'influence' rather than to the closer connexion of a common origin of the two civilizations is a point which probably will not be settled for many years to come. It is now evident that the prehistoric civilization of Greece had a very close connexion with that of Egypt, and that the Egyptian archaeologist must have much to say in the discussion of it. If ancient Egyptian civilization was oriental, that of prehistoric Greece was oriental also: its religion seems Canaanitish, its language was probably not Indo-European, its writing is hieroglyphic and resembles Egyptian hieratic scratched on Babylonian clay tablets, and if its art seems unorientally free and even beautiful in comparison with that of Egypt, the fact is that it seems so only to those who do not know that Egyptian art was neither so fettered nor so ugly as the superstition of the schools would have it. That there is, notwithstanding, *something* 'Hellenic' in Minoan or Mycenaean art is undoubted. If we were to suppose that the prehistoric Greek and the Egyptian civilizations had a common origin back in the darkness of the Age of Stone, that they were twin cultures of the same Mediterranean stock, the one having developed, however, amid the diverse isles and changing seas and skies of the Aegean, the other on the monotonous banks of the Nile, we can see how the northern culture would naturally shew greater freedom and variety, often running off into mere bizarrerie, but as often exhibiting something of that spirit which we, knowing it in the nascent Aryanized civilization of the later day, call 'Greek.'

H. R. HALL.