The Relations of Aegean with Egyptian Art (Continued)

Author(s): H. R. Hall

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Jul., 1914), pp. 197-206

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853642>

Accessed: 04-01-2016 09:36 UTC

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>

THE RELATIONS OF AEGEAN WITH EGYPTIAN ART

By H. R. HALL, M.A., F.S.A.

(Continued from page 118)

[See Plates XXXIII, XXXIV]

WITH the Late Minoan Age, to which we now come, such wholesale borrowings cease. No absolutely unprecedented foreign artistic idea, such as the spiral in Egypt or the blue glaze in Crete, seems (unless we except the Aegean *Bügelkanne* in Egypt or such inventions as the Egyptian sistrum and mirror in Greece) to have been taken over any more. Egyptian architectural ideas found now no second home in Crete, where as early as the Middle Minoan period a native architecture of real magnificence had been developed on native lines. We see what it was like at Phaistos and in the earlier portions (when they can be disentangled from the later) of the Knossian palace. And the "treasuries" of Mycenae and Orchomenos have always remained above ground to testify to the skill of the Aegean architect.

But it would have been strange if in the Middle Minoan period there had been no connexion between the two architectures, and it is only at that period that we may possibly be able to make one or two comparisons that seem to point to connexion or imitation here and there. The Labyrinth of Amenemhat III at Hawara seems to have reminded later observers of what they had heard in tradition of the magnificence of the original Labyrinth of "Minos" at Knossos, and there may be more in the comparison than we might be inclined to think. One curious identity of architectural custom both in Crete and in Egypt is the cutting of the lowest drum of a square pillar in one piece with the paving-slab below it; this is noticeable both at Knossos and in the Eleventh Dynasty Temple at Dêr el-bahri¹. But the most distinctive features of Egyptian architecture were never copied by the Minoans; we never see in Crete any imitation of the papyrus and lily-columns of Egypt, for instance. Nor did the peculiar Minoan column, with its heavy capital and its shaft diminishing towards the stylobate (for it had no base), ever find favour in Egypt. And though we might see a resemblance between the wall-paintings of the two lands, this resemblance is really a superficial one, and does not imply any particular influence of the one art upon the other, since the technical processes were different in the two countries. The Minoan technique of wall-painting was not of Egyptian origin. The Aegean wall-decorations were always executed in true *fresco*², the Egyptian in *distemper*³. The Aegean painted straight on his plaster when it was wet:

¹ HALL, "The Two Labyrinths," *J.H.S.* xxv. (1905), p. 335.

² RODENWALDT, *Tiryns*, ii. p. 205 ff.; N. HEATON, *ibid.* p. 211 ff.

³ Mr Heaton tells me that the Egyptian process should be described as *distemper*, rather than *tempera*, painting.

hence the often very sketchy nature of his pictures. Neither felt called upon to abandon his process in favour of the other's. It is of course not impossible that the original inspiration of the Aegean fresco-painting was derived from Egypt, but its method was indigenous. The Cretan artists often modelled their plaster ground in relief, not seldom very high, as in the case of the Knossian bull's head and other fragments discovered by Sir Arthur Evans¹. This was their usual substitute for the Egyptian painted relief sculpture in fine white limestone, which was so beautiful in the time of the Middle Kingdom. No doubt it was invented as an imitation of this, as plaster was the best substitute for the Egyptian limestone. Relief sculpture on the large scale in stone was not unknown, but was rare and not good. No attempt whatever was made by the Minoans to imitate the art, known to the Egyptians from the time of the Fourth Dynasty, of making great portrait statues in the round, whether in hard stone or in bronze. This was inimitable. It has been supposed that the beautiful inlaid metal-work of the Mycenae dagger-blades was of Egyptian origin, but although the design of the cat hunting wildfowl on one of them is of course as directly Egyptian as is the Hagia Triada fresco shortly to be mentioned, the technique of the metal inlay is not certainly Egyptian, though it may have been: the Egyptians made weapons inlaid with gold under the Twelfth Dynasty. But we cannot on the strength of this fact and the supposed resemblance of the technique of the dagger of Queen Aahhetep to that of the Mycenaean daggers regard the beautiful Minoan art of inlaying metal on metal, this "painting with metal" as it has been described, as a process taken over from Egypt: the Minoan metal-workers were such masters of their art in small matters (though they could not make great statues) that we may well regard their process as an independent invention of their own.

Egyptian influence is totally absent from the decoration of pottery, as it always had been, though Egyptian forms had occasionally been copied (p. 114). The poor and jejune art of the Egyptian vase-decorators never appealed to the Minoans. At this time (L. M. I) the Minoan vase-painters passed from a certain formal simplicity with naturalistic plant-motives, which in the Third Middle Minoan period had succeeded the somewhat garish polychromy of the Second (Kamárais) period, to a riot of naturalism, painting on their pots with great freedom scenes of marine life for preference, so that on one vase discovered at Gournià by Miss Boyd (Mrs Hawes)² one seems to be looking through the glass of a tank in the Naples Aquarium: a great octopus glares at us from the water and seems to be preparing to shoot away into some corner: round it are sea-pens and algae on the fantastic seaworn rocks which are so characteristic of the coarse limestone shores of Crete (*cf.* the British Museum vase, illustrated in Part ii, Pl. XVI. 1). The Egyptians never did anything like this. Pottery they never ornamented in this way at all; and when on the walls of their tombs they shew us birds and insects, often with Japanese fidelity in form and colour, these have still a formality about them, a stiff arrangement that is unknown to the freedom-loving Cretan artists. Yet even in his freedom the Cretan could imitate something Egyptian that caught his eye. So formal an ornament as the rows of *rekh*-birds, symbolizing "all mankind," that are often found as

¹ *B.S.A. Ann.* vi. Fig. 10; vii. Figs. 6, 29.

² BOYD HAWES, *Gournià*, pl. H.

a frieze-like decoration in Egypt¹, attracted the attention of a Melian potter of the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty, and were translated by him into a most quaint pot-decoration². He does not here simply imitate the Egyptian form, as the earlier decorator of the faïence snake-goddess had taken over the papyrus-plant (p. 117); he adapts it with a free hand, so that the *rekhiu* are no longer birds, but in one example have become a running spiral with eyes and legs (Figs. 4 and 5)! So much for strictly formal and non-naturalistic models; though Egyptian naturalistic representations were also formal, yet in so far as they were naturalistic they pleased the Aegean artist so that he imitated or rather adapted them also. The head of a goose among water-plants (on a fragment of a large

Figs. 4 and 5. Decoration on Melian vases derived from *rekhiu*-motive (after Phylakopi, Figs. 89, 87; by permission of the Hellenic Society).

pot or bath) (Fig. 6) which was found at Phylakopi in Melos³ is obviously of Egyptian origin. The Egyptian formality is closely imitated here, and badly. Compare with it the wonderful little sketch of a swallow in flight found at the same place (Fig. 7)⁴. This is purely Aegean, quite un-Egyptian. The swallow is carelessly, even badly, drawn, but it is a flying, swooping swallow, represented as no accurate Egyptian could have represented it: it is an impression of a swallow. The goose is a careless copy of a very dull portrait of a goose. That typically Egyptian animal the cat had, though perhaps later than his fellow-countryman the goose, found many an Egyptian tomb-painter to copy his lithe and graceful person. We have a good Middle Kingdom example at Beni Hasan (Plate XXXIII, Fig. 2)⁵. The Cretan master who decorated the royal palace at Hagia Triada (excavated by the Italians) knew Egyptian cat-pictures, and executed a fresco

¹ Cf. HALL, *Hieroglyphic Texts* (Brit. Mus.), pt. iv. pl. 9.

² EDGAR, *Excavations at Phylakopi*, p. 117, Figs. 87, 89.

³ *Excavations at Phylakopi*, Fig. 115.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Fig. 92.

⁵ *Beni Hasan*, I. pl. xxxiv.

panel in which we see a cat, intent upon his prey, stalking over the typically Cretan rocks a stupid pheasant standing stock-still amid the undergrowth (Plate XXXIII, Fig. 3)¹. He is about to spring. There is more life in this picture than in the Middle Kingdom Egyptian one of the cat purring and lazily waving his tail amid papyrus-plants or the well-known later one (Eighteenth Dynasty) in the British Museum of the very well-fed animal catching birds while a noble, standing with his wife and daughter in a small papyrus-bark near by, aims his throw-stick at them². We see the difference at once. The Minoan borrowed his idea from Egypt, and his cat is in one sense a better cat than the Egyptian, in another a worse one. It gives the idea of the cat, its cruelty and stealthiness, better than the Egyptian pictures, which hardly give any such idea

Fig. 6. Wall-painting of a goose, from Phylakopi (by permission of the Hellenic Society).

Fig. 7. Wall-painting of a swallow, from Phylakopi (by permission of the Hellenic Society).

at all. But they are far more accurate in detail: they are correct portraits of the animal taken from him in repose, and in the Eighteenth Dynasty example clumsily put into a scene meant to represent action, though all the actors with the possible exception of the butterflies are as calm and reposeful in gesture as is the cat. Compare the Cretan cat, which is incorrectly drawn, but gives a masterly and true impression of the animal when hunting. This difference between Cretan and Egyptian ideals in art we see always. The octopods and dolphins of the vases of the First Later Minoan period (= first half of the Eighteenth Dynasty) are not correctly drawn, but are splendid impressions of the living beasts. The Red Sea fish and crabs of Queen Hatshepsut's relief at Dér el-bahri³ are as accurate and as lifeless as the diagrams of trilobites in

¹ *Mem. dell' Istituto Lombardo*, xxi. 5, pll. i—iv; *Rendiconti dell' Accad. dei Lincei*, xiv. (1905), Figs. 2—4.

² Brit. Mus. no. 37977; *Guide to the Third and Fourth Egyptian Rooms*, pl. ii.

³ NAVILLE, *Deir el-Bahari*, III, pl. lxxii ff.

Fig. 1. Robert Hay's drawing of the Senmut-fresco; 1837. (*B.S.A. Ann. xvi, pl. xiv.*)

Fig. 2. Wall-painting of a cat at Beni Hasan; from a painting by Mr Howard Carter in the possession of the Egypt Exploration Fund.

Fig. 3. Wall-painting of a cat from Hagia Triada (Italian Excavations).

a text-book of palaeontology. The Minoan combined accuracy of imitation with accuracy of impression best, perhaps, in the dolphin-fresco at Knossos or the beautiful fresco of the flying-fish¹, discovered at Phylakopi in Melos. This was certainly a Cretan masterpiece, imported into the island as a picture might be imported from France into England to-day. We do not see that the Egyptians ever imported Cretan masterpieces at this time: perhaps some of the old liberal appreciation of foreign art which we see under the Twelfth Dynasty had become clouded by the egotistic ideas born of foreign conquest and dominion. The Egyptians of the Empire liked to see the Great Men of Keftiu and the Isles in the midst of the Sea² bringing objects of Aegean art as "tribute" to the court of Pharaoh (Pl. XXXIII, Fig. 1), but they probably only appreciated these artistic gifts when they were made of gold and silver, and could be regarded as tangible additions to the treasures of the king or of the rapacious priesthood of Amon. The diligent but unartistic *kâtibs* and *nâsirs* of the "double house of silver" or of the temple-treasures were quite as likely as not to melt down such splendid examples of Minoan metal-working as the Vaphio cups, and then use the gold to plate wooden images which were sent as pure gold to stop the mouths of the greedy princes of the Semites: "for gold is as the dust in thy land, my brother.....send thy brother gold, yet more gold³."

The wild yet splendid revolution of Akhenaten the Heretic introduced for a moment purer ideals of religion and morality into Egypt, and tried to introduce freer ideals in art. For a moment the Egyptian artist was freed from the shackles that had fettered his art in some respects (though by no means so much as is usually supposed) since the time of the Fifth Dynasty. It has been supposed that Minoan influence contributed to this transient naturalistic movement. It is, however, difficult to see

¹ *Phylakopi*, pl. iii.

² I have not space here in which to refer at any length to Mr G. A. WAINWRIGHT's view (*Liverpool Annals*, vi. (1913) p. 24 ff.) as to the precise signification of the name *Kefti* or *Keftiu*, which he takes to mean Cilicia, and even eastern Cilicia, only, entirely dissociating it from the Isles of the Sea, which included Crete. Though fully agreeing that the Keftian name may have covered western Cilicia, it seems to me that it covered Crete also. I cannot separate the Mycenaeans in the tomb of Rekhmara into two parties and say, as Mr Wainwright does, that these are "Keftians"=Cilicians or Syrians, and those are "Men of the Isles"=Aegeans. They are all dressed alike in Minoan costume. Variations in Minoan kilts prove nothing: no doubt there were plenty such variations. The criterion is the general appearance, and especially the peculiar *coiffure*, which in the case of the Keftians and the Peoples of the Isles (whether the two were identical or distinct) is Minoan. And we can hardly admit Minoans in eastern Cilicia till we have some archaeological proof of their existence. Western Cilicia is another matter, and a culture bridging the gap between the Minoan and the Syrian and closely related to the former may well have existed there (*Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Journal*, 1913, p. 41; see p. 204). Such Syro-Minoans may well have been included in the term "Keftiu," which in the tomb of Rekhmara is placed above and presumably refers to persons wearing Minoan costume. It may be that the land of Alashiya, the current identification of which with Cyprus I doubted in 1909 (*P.S.B.A.* xxxi. p. 228) and now feel I can no longer at all support (*M.E.O.J. ibid.* p. 43; cf. WAINWRIGHT in *Klio*, xiv. (1914), p. 1 ff., who takes much the same view), is to be placed in this West Cilician region. Rekhmara's Keftians may have come thence, but it seems to me more likely that they came from Crete, as Senmut's Minoans certainly did. The illustration on Plate XXXIII, Fig. 1, is a photograph of a drawing by Robert Hay, made in 1837, of the Senmut-fresco, now in the British Museum MSS Department (*B.S.A. Ann.* xvi, pl. xiv). The photograph was published by the British School at Athens in company with a colour-photograph of the fresco itself by Mr Robert Mond.

³ See KNUDTZON, *Die Amarna-Briefen*, *passim*.

anything particularly Minoan in it. There is nothing specifically Minoan in the splendid little picture at Berlin of the heretic-king standing cross-legged and leaning on a staff, while he smells a flower presented to him by his consort¹. One can see its more formal ancestors in many an older Egyptian picture. And one must be on one's guard against the errors of supposing that Egyptian art was always formal and of attributing anything free in it to Minoan influence. For instance, the Egyptian was always fond of representing the gambolling calf. These Egyptian calves are under the Eighteenth Dynasty often naturalistic enough to make us suspect Minoan influence upon the artist. But there is no proof of it, and it is not likely. Even when we get such a remarkable piece of naturalism (for an Egyptian) as the Twentieth Dynasty portrait of the painter Hui, drawn by himself (Fig. 8), which makes him look very like a mediaeval Japanese poetess², we can hardly suppose that he had studied in the Quartier Latin of Knossos, although he seems to affect a *coiffure à la Minos*! And in decoration (turning from naturalism) when we see an identical spiral and lily pattern in use in a Theban tomb and in the Treasury of Minyas at Orchomenos in Boeotia³, we need not assume a direct Egyptian borrowing under the Eighteenth Dynasty. That design was an Egyptian modification of a Minoan original, and had been borrowed by the Cretans long before, in the freer and more imitative days of the Middle Kingdom (see p. 116).

We could believe in Minoan influence under Akhenaten if we saw any Egyptian imitation of the fantastic character of much Minoan art at this time. But such fantasies of art as are revealed by the seal-impressions found by Mr Hogarth at Zakro⁴ would hardly have been approved even by Akhenaten's artists. There was a sense of order in Egyptian art, despite its love of caricature, which would hardly have tolerated the wild fancies of the Cretan seal-maker. Egyptian artists could be comic (I mean intentionally comic)⁵, but never really fantastic, even under Akhenaten. The naturalism of Akhenaten's artists was a native one, and owed little or nothing to their fellows in Crete.

And it is not likely that it would do so, for Egyptian art was greater, when all is said, than Aegean art even at its apogee, and the Egyptians probably knew it. Despite all its freedom, beauty, variety, and fantasy, Aegean art was not such a "great" art as was that of Egypt. The Cretan could produce the wonderful little relief of the drunken harvest procession on the vase from Hagia Triada, with its peasants, howling like their modern descendants on St George's Day, stamping along in chorus after their grinning old coryphaeus in his shaggy capote⁶. He

Fig. 8. The Egyptian painter Hui (after *Ä. Z.* xlii, p. 130).

¹ STEINDORFF, *Blütezeit des Pharaonenreichs*, Fig. 128; HALL, *Anc. Hist. of the Near East*, pl. xix. 1.

² *Ägyptische Zeitschrift*, xlii, p. 130.

³ TSOUNTAS-MANATT, *Mycenaean Age*, Fig. 48.

⁴ *J.H.S.* xxii. pll. vi—x.

⁵ This we know from the "satiric" papyri and from many sketches on ostraka. We have nothing intentionally comic in Aegean art yet, so far as we can see, unless the queer demons of *Phylakopi*, pl. xiv, 6b, 6c, and 9 are meant to be funny.

⁶ SAVIGNONI, *Mon. Ant.* xiii. pll. i—iii; BURROWS, *Discoveries in Crete*, frontispiece.

Fig. 1. Faience Snake-Goddess: Knossos.
(M. M. III.)

Fig. 2. Egyptian wooden figure holding snakes:
Thebes. (XIIth Dynasty.)

Fig. 3. Egyptian faience from Enkómi, Cyprus. (XVIIIth Dynasty.)

could produce the extraordinarily dignified little scene of the king and the warrior on the "Chieftain" Vase¹. But in spite of the superiority of the relief of the "Harvesters" vase to anything Egyptian, is either of these the product of so "great" an art as is the procession of the mourners in the relief from the tomb of a Memphian high-priest, at Berlin?² And how was it that, though the Egyptians could make the great bronze statues of King Pepi and his son (at Cairo)³ as early as the Sixth Dynasty, the Aegeans never made any statue in the round at all? Their sculpture in the round, like their good relief-work, was all on a small scale. The little ivory leapers from Knossos are *chefs d'oeuvre* of such work; the small bronze figures of men and women with their hands raised in prayer which have been found (a man from Tylissos is at Candia, a woman is at Berlin) are splendid examples of vigorous modelling. The faience snake-goddesses or sorceresses from Knossos (Part ii, p. 117; Plate XXXIV, Fig. 1) are only on a level with hundreds of Egyptian works of similar size and intention; one may wonder whether, for instance, the Knossian snake-goddess is any finer than the wooden doll representing a lion-masked sorceress with bronze snakes, now in the Manchester Museum (Plate XXXIV, Fig. 2), whom she resembles, and with whom she was contemporary⁴. And, naturalistic though it was, Minoan art produced nothing so natural as the heads from the sculptor's workshop at el-Amarna, now in Berlin (see p. 150).

Aegean art was less accurate in detail, more accurate in giving an impression of life, than the Egyptian, but this very lack of accuracy denies to it the greatness of the Egyptian. Very often, the Aegeans "couldn't draw." The Egyptians always could. The Aegean could produce marvels of art side-by-side with the crudest and most childish attempts. The Egyptian could only be crude and childish in times of barbarism and civil war. He could not be good and bad at the same time. The Aegean could. Perhaps the Aegean was the truer artist of the two: the Egyptian more a trained artistic craftsman. But the training was there; and that is why the art of Egypt was really greater than that of the Aegeans.

But though new ideas in artistic methods were no longer taken over absolutely by either country from the other, the constant connexion which was maintained between the two during the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty resulted no doubt in the adoption by the Aegeans now and then of some Egyptian invention which commended itself to them. The sistrum is seen in the hands of one of the men on the "Harvesters Vase." The bronze mirror with its ivory handle was introduced at this time⁵, and the designs of ivory mirror-handles found at Mycenae⁶ and in Cyprus⁷ look as if they were of Egyptian origin filtered perhaps through a Syrian medium. But it is not absolutely certain that these ivory carvings are genuinely Minoan or Aegean at all, though they

¹ HALL, *Anc. Hist. of the Near East*, pl. iv, 4.

² BREASTED, *History of Egypt*, Fig. 132, pp. 346, 347.

³ QUIBELL, *Hierakonpolis*, ii. pl. 50. These statues are now known to be of bronze, not of copper, as was originally supposed (Mosso, *Origini della Civiltà Mediterranea*, p. 20).

⁴ This Egyptian snake-goddess or sorceress (we cannot identify her with any particular deity) is of the Twelfth Dynasty. She was found in the Ramesseum diggings by Petrie (*Ramesseum*, pl. iii, 12). There should be some connexion between these two very similar and roughly contemporary figures. It is true that the similarity in pose is superficial, and due merely to the stiffness of the arms in both figures: it is the similarity of idea that is undeniable.

⁵ EVANS, *Prehistoric Tombs of Knossos* (*Archaeologia*, vol. lix.), p. 115.

⁶ TSOUNTAS-MANATT, Fig. 84.

⁷ *Excavations in Cyprus* (*Brit. Mus.*), pl. ii.

are, if not truly Minoan, probably products of an art, perhaps in West Cilicia, which was akin to the Minoan¹.

The carved wooden roundel found in the tomb of the foreigner Sarobina (now at Berlin²), with its gryphons like those of the Enkomi mirror-handles, may (with the somewhat similar ivory object found at Menidi³) just as well belong to this hypothetical semi-Minoan art as be genuinely Minoan. Genuine Egyptian ivories were exported to Cyprus, as we see at Enkomi, and beautiful gold and enamel necklaces also⁴, besides scarabs and gold rings⁵. The connexion was constant: common objects of Egyptian art, especially alabaster vases, were imported into Greece, just as Minoan and Mycenaean pottery was imported into Egypt, until the twelfth century, when the great Aegean culture came to an end. There are the Middle Kingdom and Eighteenth Dynasty Egyptian alabaster vases found in the royal tomb at Isopata near Knossos, with its M. M. III and L. M. II burials⁶. There is the fine L. M. I pot, with designs of argonauts and rocks on it, in the British Museum, which was found at Erment (Plate XVI, Fig. 1, page 110). There is the fragmentary L. M. II Cretan vase (Plate XVI, Fig. 2) lately found in a tomb at Egyptian Thebes by Mr de Garis Davies⁷, and now in the Ashmolean Museum (see pp. 146, 155). There is the L. M. I—III or Early Mycenaean vase with ivy-leaves that Prof. Petrie found in the tomb of the Lady Maket at Gurob⁸ (temp. Thutmes III), which is also in the Ashmolean. And there are the hundreds of *Bügelkannen* or "stirrup-vases" of the L. M. III period which have come from Theban tombs into the various museums of Europe. These *Bügelkannen* were commonly imported into Egypt, and the Egyptians imitated them (though not their decoration, which did not appeal to Egyptian taste) in blue faïence⁹, in alabaster¹⁰, and perhaps even in the precious metals¹¹. The Cretan "filler" type, too, which the Keftians and Princes of the Isles had brought to Egypt with fine golden vases of the Vaphio type¹², was also imitated in blue faïence¹³. But this is the sum-total of Egyptian imitation of Aegean art at this time. And, on the other hand, the fine Egyptian faïence that was imported into Cyprus under the Eighteenth Dynasty (Plate XXXIV, Fig. 3)¹⁴ was not imitated

¹ See p. 201, n. 2.

² STEINDORFF, *Blütezeit des Pharaonenreichs*, Fig. 60.

³ PERROT-CHIFFEZ, *Hist. de l'Art*, vi. Fig. 408.

⁴ *Excavations in Cyprus*, pl. v.

⁵ HALL, *Catalogue of Scarabs*, i. nos. 1944, 2660, 2678.

⁶ EVANS, *Prehistoric Tombs*, Fig. 125, p. 146 ff.

⁷ *Five Theban Tombs*, pl. xli.

⁸ *Illahun, Kahun, and Gurob*, p. 21 ff., pl. xxvi, 44.

⁹ HALL, *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, Fig. 52.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Fig. 56.

¹¹ The *Bügelkannen* in the tomb of Rameses III; *ibid.*, Figs. 26, 27.

¹² These vases were of course not really of the enormous size that the Egyptian artist ascribes to them in the Senmut tomb (see Pl. XXXIII, Fig. 1). The handles show that they were really of ordinary size, and we cannot suppose that the Minoans ever made such useless objects as cups adapted only for the use of giants! The Egyptian possibly enlarged them in this way because he had before him in the tomb not the originals themselves to copy, but sketches of them which did not indicate their size, or else he exaggerated their size in order to show clearly their designs of spirals, bulls' heads, and rosettes.

¹³ Brit. Mus. no. 22731; HALL, *Oldest Civilization*, Fig. 53.

¹⁴ The Egyptian dish with the representation of a fisherman has been regarded as a local imitation, on account of a certain coarseness in its faïence and the execution of the painting, but I am inclined to think that it is an imported Egyptian object. The design is purely Egyptian, and a Mycenaean artist would never have copied an Egyptian original slavishly.

by the Cyprians. The Cyprian Mycenaean preferred his own faïence, in which the splendid rhytons of the British Museum (p. 117) were executed¹.

The representations of golden *Bügelkannen* in the tomb of Rameses III (c. 1172 B.C.) and of what look like a degenerate "Vaphio" cup in the tomb of a certain Imadua at Thebes (c. 1140 B.C.) are (if the text is not a mere copy of a representation in the old decoration of the tomb, which was originally made perhaps under the Eighteenth Dynasty) the last proofs of any connexion with the Aegean culture. The Greek civilization of the Bronze Age had now fallen into decadence. Its art, after passing from the naturalism of L. M. I (early Eighteenth Dynasty) to the baroque and affected, though splendid style of L. M. II (middle Eighteenth Dynasty), entered in the Third Late Minoan period (=end of Eighteenth to Twentieth Dynasty) a static period which succeeded the dynamic age which had seen its strange and beautiful but erratic and unequal bloom. Now, conventionalized, stylized, losing all freshness and spontaneity, it was falling into decadence. The collapse of civilization followed in the twelfth century, when Egypt, too, sank into degeneracy. And though we can speak of a trace of connexion here and there in the following centuries, of Egyptian faïence scaraboids found in geometric graves at Vrokastro in Crete², of scarabs from Eleusis³ and from a Boeotian tomb⁴, yet we never find a geometric sherd of the "Dipylon" period in Egypt. The old constant connexion had gone with the energetic Aegean civilization, which in its restless youth had knocked at the doors of Egypt, and had during its splendid life derived many an inspiration from the Nile-land and given much in return.

POSTSCRIPT:—I ought not perhaps to close this lecture without a special reference to the brilliant paper which was read by Professor Baron von Bissing before the Royal Bavarian Academy on March 9, 1912, on the part played by Egyptian art in the artistic life of the nations ("Der Anteil der ägyptischen Kunst im Kunstleben der Völker")⁵, which deals in part with the question we have been discussing. Baron von Bissing and I would agree on most points, I fancy, except that of the connexion of Egypt and Greece under the Old Kingdom, as to which he remains a sceptic. But of this further on p. 225 ff. of this number of the *Journal*, where will be found a review by Baron von Bissing of my recent book *The Ancient History of the Near East*, chiefly dealing with this matter of the early Mycenaean-Egyptian connexion, an answer by me, and further comment on the matter by Sir Arthur Evans, whom Dr von Bissing has criticised in the course of his review of me. And I do not think that spirals were indigenous in both Egypt and the Aegean, as Bissing does (p. 8 of his paper read before the Bavarian Academy): I can see no connexion between the rude quirks and coils on predynastic pots and the fine spirals of Twelfth Dynasty scarabs, which seem to me to be obviously of Aegean origin (see p. 115, above). To say, therefore, that there was no connexion between Egyptian and Aegean art before 2000 B.C. seems to me

¹ *Excavations in Cyprus*, pl. iii. The form of the rhyton with its human or animal-head butt was possibly of Syrian origin, a borrowing from Asia. KARO ("Minoische Rhyta" in *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* xxvi. (1911), p. 245 ff.) seems to regard it as purely Minoan, like the "filler."

² Miss E. H. HALL, *A.J.A.* 1913, p. 91; *Excavations in E. Crete (Vrokastro)*, Phila. 1914, p. 136, fig. 81.

³ *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*, 1898, col. 120.

⁴ Brit. Mus. First Vase Room, Case D.

⁵ Festrede gehalten in der öffentl. Sitzg. der Kgl. Akad. der Wissenschaften, 9 März, 1912; München.

impossible. Professor von Bissing himself refers (*loc. cit.* p. 5) to the vases of Mochlos. And how like Cretan and Egyptian stone pots can be we can see from the illustration on p. 227, appended to my comment on Professor von Bissing's review¹. Evidently the Minoan form was copied from the older Egyptian model.

Another point on which I have not commented in referring to the possible very early connexion of Greece and Egypt is the supposed evidence of the "Aegean" pottery found by Professor Petrie in tombs of the First Dynasty at Abydos, and now by Professor Steindorff at Abusir. Neither the black² nor the white-faced vases with red zigzag and spot decoration³ correspond in form to anything Aegean, and the decoration of the red-on-white pots is paralleled in the Aegean area only in the early Iron Age, when some Boeotian pottery occurs that bears very similar decoration (Brit. Mus. First Vase Room, Case 42). The Abydos and Abusir pots are certainly early: they are hand-made⁴. But they are not Aegean. They have no Aegean look or "feel." Their relations seem to be rather with the early pottery of Asia Minor. They do not prove connexion with the Aegean, but with Asia Minor, more probably through Syria than by sea. The early Cretan-Egyptian connexion (by this I mean connexion before the time of the Fourth Dynasty) is probable for other reasons than these pots, of which the Aegean character has yet to be proved, and seems unlikely.

As further examples of Minoan vases found in Egypt, I may mention that found by Maciver and Woolley at Wadi Halfa (*Buhen*, Pl. 50, 10738), and that from Anibe, in Nubia (WOOLLEY, *Philadelphia Museum Journal*, i (1910), p. 47, Fig. 31). These are interesting on account of their having been found so far south. The Anibe specimen is of a transitional style between M. M. III and L. M. I, and the Buhen one is of an Aegean type not otherwise known.

¹ On a minor point, as to which Professor von Bissing has criticized me in his Munich paper (p. 29), I refer to *M.E.O.J.* 1914, p. 39, n. 1. I was surely quite right in saying that a ring of Akhenaten in the British Museum (from Enkomi) dates from the early years of his reign; for it bears not only the name of Horakhti but also that of Ptah, as was pointed out by EVANS, *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.* 1900, p. 205, on Professor Petrie's authority. Dr POULSEN was then quite correct in stating ("Zur Zeitbestimmung der Enkomifunde," *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* 1911, p. 221) on my authority that the ring is to be dated early in the reign.

² *Royal Tombs*, ii, p. 46, pl. liv; *Abydos*, i, p. 6, pl. viii; Brit. Mus., nos. 35547-9.

³ *Royal Tombs*, ii, p. 46, pl. liv; fragments in Brit. Mus.; whole pot from Abustr.

⁴ I wish to modify thus what I have already said on the subject in *P.S.B.A.* xxxi (1909), p. 48, n. 45.

CORRIGENDA.

p. 112, n. 6, read *Ann. Brit. Sch. Ath.*, vol. xviii, etc.

p. 118, n. 1, for "*Oldest Civilisation*," etc., read *Anc. Hist. Near East*, etc.