Egypt Exploration Society

Atlas zur Altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte by Walter Wreszinski

Review by: F. Ll. Griffith

The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, Vol. 3, No. 2/3 (Apr. – Jul., 1916), pp. 224–225

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853763>

Accessed: 17/07/2013 21:57

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>

paper and illustrated by coloured and other photographic plates and by a page of actual samples woven in imitation of the Egyptian patterns. The coloured cover unfortunately is not an artistic success and is likely to be soon spoilt by use.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

Atlas zur Altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte. By WALTER WRESZINSKI. Lieferungen 1—5. Leipzig [1914—15].

Up to the present time five parts of this work have reached this country, containing a hundred plates. They furnish a large sample by which to test the merits of the whole of WRESZINSKI's ambitious undertaking. The form of the publication is peculiar. The size is that of a moderate quarto and it is made up entirely of separate loose plates; the peculiarity is that each "plate" is complete in itself, comprising description and numerous illustrative figures along with the main subject; this "plate" may fill one page, or two or even three pages in a folded plate, but whatever its extent it is printed on one side only so that the whole is visible at once. Besides the main picture all subsidiary figures in the text, both small and great, are photographic, and it is a triumph to have printed the typed text and photographic figures together with such accuracy and clearness. May the smooth hard paper not betray the trust reposed in it!

It is a wonderful collection of scenes and details regarding life in Ancient Egypt which WRESZINSKI has here gathered. Nine-tenths of the subjects are from tombs of New Kingdom officials at Thebes, chiefly of the Eighteenth Dynasty; a few date from the reign of Ramesses II, and there are, besides, the famous kitchen scene from the tomb of Ramesses II in the Twentieth Dynasty, and some extracts from the tomb of Aba of Dyn. XXVI. From Memphis there are two scenes of Dyn. XVIII and several out of tombs of the Old Kingdom, but of less importance, as most had already been published in full photograph by the Leyden Museum. Some of the Theban subjects were copied by the early explorers, WILKINSON, CHAMPOLLION, ROSELLINI, and PRISSE, but have been neglected since their time. It is very delightful to recognise in WRESZINSKI's photographs originals (now sadly mutilated) of those familiar drawings, showing that they were accurate in the main, though PRISSE alone had the patience and art to render the style with correctness. WRESZINSKI gives full descriptions and bibliographies; his principle has been, where possible, to introduce photographs of original objects or of figures in the round corresponding to those depicted in the flat painting or low relief of the scenes. Thoroughly carried out this principle would be of the highest value; unfortunately there are some serious defects in the execution of the plan. No one will deny the utility of many of WRESZINSKI's explanatory illustrations, convincingly proving to expert and layman alike what the artist meant. But there is throughout the publication a curious lack of feeling for age, material, and style, which seems to show not only personal limitations, but also how little the principles of archaeological research are as yet understood in some quarters. To illustrate without comment a British urn by a modern flower-pot of approximately the same outline would hardly be considered fair to the reader in an authoritative work on the history of pottery. Yet WRESZINSKI seems to think equal vagueness not inappropriate to our department. Thus, in a banqueting scene of the XVIIIth Dyn. bowls which the photograph shows clearly to have been of fluted design in some metal are illustrated by plain vessels obviously of the roughest pottery (Taf. 7, nos. 16, 19); a sickle of the composite jaw-bone type of the New Kingdom is represented by an iron sickle of the Roman age (Taf. 14, no. 4); a carpenter's stool by what looks like a Roman stand or grinding block of trachyte (Taf. 17, no. 5). Such vague or misleading illustrations, all the more startling because scrupulously given in photograph, can serve no useful purpose; if any of them were admitted, their differences of age, material, etc. should at least have been stated. After this it is not surprising to find the XXVIth Dyn. sculptures of Aba given with no insistence on the important particulars in which they are mere copies of Old Kingdom scenes that had long since passed out of practical life. Another surprising defect is that the subjects on the plates follow each other indiscriminately without any sort of grouping either by age or category, except perhaps in the last part. When the work is complete, a good index will doubtless obviate the worst effects of this unfortunate arrangement. WRESZINSKI acknowledges help from Mr N. de G. DAVIES in the selection and interpretation of the Theban scenes which he knows so well, and the tombs are easily found in GARDINER

and WEIGALL's *Catalogue*, which shows their situation and the titles of the owners. The photographs are good, though on a small scale; their frequent obscurities however prove how indispensable are the carefully worked out drawings in line and colour which Mr and Mrs DAVIES are gradually accumulating. WRZSZINSKI, who has laboured here and elsewhere with much energy and with admirable ideas, has not given himself time to work out his scheme in proper detail. All the same in this publication he presents us with a great treasure of archaeological material.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

The Influence of Ancient Egyptian Civilization in the East and in America. By G. ELLIOT SMITH. Reprinted from *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, January—March, 1916. Manchester, University Press, 1916. Pp. 32. Seven illustrations.

The present paper by Professor ELLIOT SMITH is closely related to his book on *The Migrations of Early Culture*, and with certain others of his writings, which should be taken together in attempting to survey the views which he expresses. The range which he covers is so wide and the number of points which he wishes to be considered, or rather accepted, is so great that it is impossible adequately to review his theory in a brief space. To examine critically the argument brought forward would involve careful investigation of the evidence upon which it is founded; not that the evidence is specially new, since it has chiefly been culled from the published works of others, but it is very necessary to sift the solid material and free it from any wild statements before the validity of the main assumption can finally be tested. Professor ELLIOT SMITH's thesis is a revival in elaborated and more clearly focussed shape of a proposition which has frequently and during a long period been discussed, and which has never really been lost sight of, though in recent years it has perhaps been less prominently to the fore than was the case during the latter half of last century. This has been due, no doubt, partly to the more careful and cautious methods of modern anthropological investigation, which require a very full and searching enquiry into the data, and careful diagnosis of statements previously made, before an important and far-reaching theory can be considered as tenable; and partly, perhaps, to the somewhat depressing effect produced by some of the wilder theorists who have dealt with the problem of Old- and New-world culture connections.

In a general way Professor ELLIOT SMITH may be said to be working on the right lines for his purpose, that is to say he has endeavoured to bring together a mass of facts calculated by their *cumulative* effect to indicate very strongly, or, as he thinks, prove that the essential elements of the ancient civilizations of India, Further Asia, the Malay Archipelago, Oceania, and America were brought in succession to each of these places by mariners, whose oriental migrations (on an extensive scale) began as trading intercourse between the Eastern Mediterranean and India some time after 800 B.C. He believes that the evidence proves that an elaborate culture-complex, associated with heliolithic ritual and practices, originating in the main in Egypt, was disseminated over an enormous area chiefly through the agency of the maritime trading enterprises of the Phenicians, and that by easterly dispersal this culture-complex eventually reached the New World. His collection of facts, derived principally from other writers, is an important and suggestive one, but he is less fortunate in the manner in which he presents his case. His work is marred by a dictatorial, one may even say hectoring tone, which is quite unjustifiable and wholly uncalled for. His writings are freely interlarded with invective against those who are not of his opinion and those who prefer to tread cautiously on possibly unstable ground. This is the more remarkable since he has himself vehemently inveighed against the reputed employment of similar invective by others. However, his methods are more likely to affect his own reputation than they are to cause a serious flutter among the opponents or critics of his main theory; and they need not be taken too seriously.

He has endeavoured to stiffen his argument by the statement (*Man*, 1915, p. 163) that "As to the possibility of any invention originating wholly independently in more than one centre, the facts of history no less than the common experience of mankind are fatal to any such hypothesis." This is a somewhat hazardous dogmatism, and it is open to question whether any physical anthropologist, however eminent he may be in his special branch, is justified in laying this down as an axiom to be accepted without reserve by those who have made a life-long study of cultural anthropology. The latter would without doubt be grateful to Professor ELLIOT SMITH if he will deploy his material in some form which admits of more convenient examination by those who wish to follow and evaluate his argument. Let him publish