

Egypt Exploration Society

Egypt and the External World in the Time of Akhenaten

Author(s): H. R. Hall

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 7, No. 1/2 (Apr., 1921), pp. 39-53

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853816>

Accessed: 18/05/2014 18:03

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>

EGYPT AND THE EXTERNAL WORLD IN THE TIME OF AKHENATEN¹

BY H. R. HALL, D.LITT.

THE Egypt Exploration Society has taken up the task of the German *Orient-Gesellschaft* in the excavation of the town of Akhetaten, the capital of the heretical king Amenophis IV or Akhenaten, at el-Amarna. Attention was drawn long ago to the remarkable art of the tombs and boundary-stelae at Amarna by Wilkinson and Lepsius, and stray antiquities in our museums were early identified as belonging to the "Disk-Worshippers." An influential Australian member of the Egypt Exploration Fund in its early days, the late Sir William Nicholson, was specially interested as an amateur of Egyptology in this curious period of Egyptian history, and devoted much time to its elucidation. The Fund, however, never bent its steps in the direction of Amarna until the present time. Professor Petrie excavated there in 1891, but at that time he was not commissioned by the Fund. No doubt his work there, the first important excavation attempted at Amarna, was prompted by the remarkable discovery in 1887 of the famous "Tell el-Amarna Tablets," that deeply interesting collection of cuneiform tablets, containing letters and despatches in Babylonian from the Egyptian court to the kings and governors of Western Asia, and from these last to one another, that have told us so much of the history of the times of Akhenaten and his contemporaries. Sir Ernest Budge has recently, in his book *By Nile and Tigris*, described the circumstances of the find, and how the precious tablets suffered from careless handling and destruction by the native finders, until eventually they found their way in three distinct batches to the museums of Berlin, London, and Cairo. At first considered for a moment to be forgeries (a common fate for unexpected finds), they were soon seen to be genuine antiquities of extraordinary historical importance, and we can only deplore the fate that decreed their discovery by ignorant and careless hands. Professor Petrie was no doubt in hopes of finding another deposit of tablets, nor was he altogether unsuccessful, as he recovered ten more, which are now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. Other sporadic tablets are in a few other collections, and one has been discovered recently by the German excavators. We are therefore not without hope that the excavators of the Egypt Exploration Society may, if not this year then perhaps in the next, find more, which may still further increase our knowledge of the foreign relations of Egypt in Akhenaten's time. We may also hope that further illumination as to the relations between Mycenaean Greece and Egypt at this time may be derived from our excavations. Professor Petrie found a number of fragments of pottery that are of Cyprian and mainland Greek origin, belonging to the Third Late Minoan period of Evans, and we know that precisely at this date the Bronze Age Greeks imported various kinds of Egyptian *objets d'art* into their own country. At Mycenae itself, as well as at Ialysos on Rhodes, have been found contemporary scarabs of the parents of Akhenaten, Amenophis III and Teie; and similar finds on a larger scale, including Egyptian necklaces of gold and fine stones, were discovered by the British Museum expedition at

¹ A lecture delivered before the members of the Egypt Exploration Society on January 20, 1921.

Enkomi in Cyprus in the "nineties." We see generally, from a hundred small pieces of evidence, that relations of considerable magnitude existed between Egypt and Greece in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C., and it would not be unexpected were we to discover in our new excavations further proof of this connexion.

This world of the eastern Mediterranean lands in the fifteenth century B.C., with its four juxtaposed and competing civilizations of independent character if not of origin (questions as to the possible ultimate Egyptian origin of certain features of the Minoan culture or of possible ultimate Babylonian origin of certain "Hittite" features need not be discussed here), is of extraordinary interest. We really know a considerable amount about it, thanks chiefly to the Amarna tablets. Four independent civilizations, the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Hittite, and the Minoan Greek, stood over against one another in close juxtaposition even for those days. Each was strongly national in its characteristics. Each had its own national costume, its own art, its peculiar writing, and its national gods. In the old days before the first Indo-European invasions had broken down the barriers of exclusivism all over this Near Eastern world (its result, the Hyksos conquest of Egypt, even destroying the previous isolation of the Nile-land), each of these cultures had pursued its own way, practically ignoring the other. We know little yet of the early history of the Hittite civilization of Anatolia, and can hardly guess at the date of its first appearance there. It may be as old as the others, it may be much younger. In any case it owed more than any of the others to foreign influence in its beginnings, though it always preserved its special national type, which clearly differentiates it from the rest and marks it out as a separate creation. The influence which modified it at an early period was that of Babylonia, for even as early as the middle of the third millennium B.C. Semites (as we know from recent discoveries of tablets) are found settled across the Taurus in the region of Argæus, with its centre the town Mazaka, later called Caesarea, the modern Kaisariyah. These Semites, if not actually Babylonians themselves, were Babylonians in culture. The Semitic world universally owed its civilization to the originally non-Semitic (Sumerian) inhabitants of Babylonia; the Sumerians invented the cuneiform syllabary in which the Semites wrote till their development in Syria and Phœnicia of the Aramaic-Phœnician alphabet, which Greece adopted to replace the forgotten sign-writing of the destroyed Minoan culture. Babylonian civilization had at an early date penetrated not only into Anatolia, but also into the more easily reached lands of Syria; and Sumerian kings like Lugalzaggisi (c. B.C. 3000) had planted their banners by the shores of the Mediterranean. A recent theory has even supposed that the Babylonian (Semitic) king Narâm-Sin (c. 2850 B.C.) to whom the North-Syrian coast (Yarmûti, the later Yarimûta) and probably Palestine also was subject, invaded Egypt. The king of Māgan, Manium or Mannu-dannu by name, whom Narâm-Sin mentions as defeated by him, is identified with the unifier of the Egyptian kingdom, Menes (Nārmerza) himself¹. But this theory, attractive as it may look at first sight, breaks down on the question of date, it being hardly possible to put Narâm-Sin earlier than 2850 B.C., or Menes later than 3300 (the present writer would prefer a date two or three centuries earlier for Menes). Also it is undeniable that Manium is a common Semitic name, and might belong to any king of Syria or Palestine. Māgan, "place of ships," "land to which ships went," might be Egypt, it is true; the Babylonians certainly went there by sea; and in later days the land of Melukhka, which is always mentioned with Māgan in later inscriptions, was probably Ethiopia. But at present it is safer to suppose that Māgan

¹ L. ALBRIGHT, in *Journal*, VI, 89.

was the Sinaitic peninsula or more probably the Arabian coast of the Red Sea, and that Manium was a king of those parts whom the Babylonian conqueror overthrew on one of his western razzias in search of stone for his buildings. In any case, Babylonian culture from the first dominated western Asia, and in the time of Akhenaten we find the Babylonian language and writing in general use in Syria and Palestine; any native culture of previous independent origin was practically absorbed.

But beyond the "river of Egypt" the Babylonian writ never ran. Egypt pursued her own course, undisturbed by the conquests of Sumerians and Semites, till the invasion of the Hyksos, driven forward by the pressure of the northern Indo-Europeans pushing south into Syria, overthrew her ancient polity, and for the first time, so far as we know, Semitic foreigners assumed the diadem of the Egyptian Pharaohs. That the Hyksos kings were Semites we know by their names, and no doubt the majority of their followers were Canaanites, but it is not impossible that there were Hittite and other non-Semitic elements in their following. The Amarna tablets have revealed to us the fact that in Akhenaten's days a number of the chieftains, even in Southern Palestine, bore Aryan appellations, such as Shuyardata (Sūrya-dāta, "the Sun-given," Ἡλιοδοτος)¹ and Yazdata (Yazd-dāta)². Further north, in the region of the Khabūr, we know from the same source of information that the state of Mitanni was ruled by a kingly house and aristocracy of Aryan origin, though the people itself (*Kharrī*) was neither Aryan nor Semitic. The Mitannian chiefs (according to Professor Winckler's interpretation of a tablet found by him at Boghaz-keui) venerated the gods Indra, Mitra, Varūna and the Nasātya-twins (Aśvins)³. They were to all intents and purposes Indian Aryans. Now, further east, in the twentieth century, six hundred years before, the Kassites had conquered Mesopotamia, coming from across the Zagros. They too seem to have been possibly Indo-Europeans, judging from the facts that they are supposed to have called the sun *suryash* and that their word for "god" was *bugash* (= bhāga, Βαγαιος, βογᾶ)⁴. Then we undoubtedly know that about 1950 B.C. Indo-Europeans had invaded Western Asia, and in the time of Akhenaten (c. 1350 B.C.), we find them still a distinct element in the population. The view is inevitable that the Hyksos invasion of Egypt (which must have taken place about 1800 B.C.) was a consequence of this foreign influx.

We seem now to have got a fifth culture-element, the Aryan, in Akhenaten's world; but this is hardly the fact, since these Aryans of Syria and Mesopotamia were never a separate nation, but formed nearly a ruling aristocracy, which itself by Akhenaten's time had no doubt largely adopted the gods and customs of the Semites, while retaining their own "for official purposes" only. The Kassites soon became entirely babylonized, the kings only retaining their characteristic non-Semitic names.

What influence these Aryan invaders may have had upon the Hittites we do not know. It has hitherto been supposed that the *Khatti* were a native Anatolian population, neither Semitic nor Aryan, and probably most nearly akin to the Minoan Greeks. But if the results of the recent researches of Professor Hrozný⁵ are accepted, and the Hittites wrote in cuneiform a West-Aryan tongue, akin indeed to Latin, we are faced with another Indo-European strain, this time of western, not eastern origin, coming doubtless to Asia by way of the Balkans, not, as the Kassites and Mitannians probably came, through Turkestan. In

¹ HALL, in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, XXXI, 234.

² WEBER, in KNUDTZON, *Amarna-Tafeln*, 1309.

³ MEYER in *Sitzb. K. preuss. Akad.* 1907; HALL in *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, XXIX.

⁴ HALL, *Ancient History of the Near East*⁵ (1920), p. 201.

⁵ *Die Sprache der Hethiter* (1917)

any case we again see the Aryan pressing south, but from another direction. But we can hardly think that the characteristic hieroglyphic writing of the Hittites was of Aryan origin. We see no trace of any particular characteristic culture brought into Western Asia by these Aryans, and it is more probable that the language of the hieroglyphs will turn out to be the native pre-Aryan idiom of Anatolia, whatever the language written in cuneiform may be. Nevertheless, the Italian connexion of this language, if proved, gives us much food for thought in connexion with the traditional relationship, borne out by archaeological comparisons¹, between the Hittites and the Etruscans. What if Etruscan should turn out after all to be Indo-European?

Into the Greek peninsula the Aryan Greek had probably not yet penetrated: at any rate we find as yet no direct proof of his existence there in Akhenaten's time.

The Aryan invasion was then but a transitory phenomenon. The invaders could not found a national civilization as they did in India or in Greece by amalgamating with the native population but keeping their own language dominant. In Western Asia they probably finally disappeared not long after the days of Akhenaten.

We have then in his time still the four great systems of culture, existing alongside each other, but now, as had not been the case in the days before the coming of the Aryans, connected with one another by close communications and constant ties. It must not be supposed that in the old days the one had never impinged on the other. That was not the case: Egypt for instance had relations with the Phoenician coast and the Lebanon district from time immemorial, and Greece with Egypt certainly as early as the time of the Sixth Dynasty (Third Early Minoan period), if not far earlier. But now it was not a case of precarious communications, often suspended. Akhenaten lived in a world of states as closely linked up as those of modern Europe; kings corresponded with kings and princes with governors; diplomats intrigued against one another and pompously concluded treaties meant only to be broken when it suited the interest of one or both of the parties to them; militarists schemed the conquest of weaker neighbours; imperialists planned to perpetuate their rule of peoples that did not want it, often, it must be confessed, justly enough in their own interests. Akhenaten himself, as king of Egypt, ruled a country that did not belong to his own Egyptian civilization at all: namely Babylonian Palestine and Syria. He ruled it quite justly and legally as the inheritor of a title that his forebears had won by the sword, when the reaction of Egypt against the Hyksos drove out the hated Semitic invaders, and patriotic revenge had in turn fixed the yoke of the erstwhile conquered on the necks of their former enslavers and the insolent insulters of their gods. His father Amenophis III was recognized by the whole world as the rightful ruler of Syria south of the dominion of Mitanni and west of that of the Babylonian Kassites. Akhenaten would have been perfectly justified in maintaining his legal right against insurrection. And he did so, in words. In fact, he abandoned it, and the reason was not mere indolence, but, apparently, a conscientious pacificism, a new phenomenon in the history of human thought. Akhenaten was an artist and a philosopher, who lived or aspired to live *au dessus du combat*, on a plane higher than that of the contending forces of his world. If we can hardly call him, as Professor Breasted

¹ Such as the common use of the *lituus* or curved wand and of the round skull-cap by the priests, and the identity in form of the figure-of-eight shield (shaped like an 8) used by the Hittites (as well as by the Minoans) and the Roman sacred shields or *ancilia*. Mr Forsdyke has pointed out to me the identity of the Minoan shields with the *ancilia*, and I can add a Hittite parallel on the relief figured by me in *Ancient History of the Near East*, Pl. XXIII (from Sinjirli).

does, "the first individual in history," we can certainly call him the first original genius in matters of speculation that we know. And like many geniuses, the youth was both a crank and a prig. But one with some engaging characteristics, nevertheless. The way in which in the sculptures of the tombs at Amarna he is constantly depicted enjoying his family life with his sister-queen and his evidently dearly loved little daughters, is most human. There is nothing of the inhuman prig and doctrinaire here. Yet this young man, whom we may believe to have been animated by the purest and most elevated motives, succeeded by his obstinate doctrinaire love of peace in causing far more misery in his world than half-a-dozen elderly militarists could have done. It is the usual tragedy of such men as he, the usual catastrophe when a philosopher rules, whether his philosophy takes the form of pacificism or any other doctrine. We can hardly doubt that Syria and Palestine were far happier under the *pax aegyptia* of Amenophis III than during the lawless chaos which was allowed to supervene by the well-meant inaction of his son.

Akhenaten's best wish for the rest of the world was that it should go its own way while he pursued his life devoted to his family and his "doctrine" of Aten-worship undisturbed. The results we know from the Amarna tablets. He founded his city of Akhetaten as a sort of non-migratory Laputa, where he and his philosophers and artists and courtiers, whether believers in the Aten or not, could live happily together in mutual love and trust, letting the rest of the world go where it would. One wonders how many of these "disciples" really believed in the young king's fads, and how many of them honoured the Aten with slyly winking eye and tongue in cheek. Such usually outnumber the others in similar cases. But some there were who certainly were believers, or the religion of the Aten would not have survived for even the short time that it did.

One must not suppose that the "doctrine," the "king's teaching," as it was called, was entirely the invention of Akhenaten. It was a development of Heliopolitan belief, the "wisdom of the Egyptians" that Moses learnt at On, that had gradually been coming to the front since the time of Tuthmosis III in opposition to the all-embracing claims of the Imperial Theban Amūn to worship, honour and the material wealth derived from the conquered lands. And it was well to the fore in the time of Amenophis III, who certainly favoured it. His son believed in it to the exclusion of all other religious belief, and not content with this attempted to make his subjects believe in it exclusively too and tried to abolish the whole pantheon by decree, chiselling out the names of the gods from the monuments (more especially that of Amūn), and compelling everybody to be a monotheist. The attempt failed of course, and the monotheism of the Aten remained an abortive phenomenon in the land of its birth.

It is however by no means impossible that its inspiration was not lost outside Egypt. In Nubia, where temples were erected to the Aten, it died; but in Palestine we cannot be certain that this was absolutely the case. Even in the midst of rebellion, a Palestinian *Khinatuni* seems to have been set up, as would naturally be expected from Egyptian officialism in the northern as in the southern external dominion; this would be entirely agreeable to the king: he would not fight, but he would teach. How do we know that the monotheistic doctrine of Heliopolis (again, Moses' "Wisdom of the Egyptians," learnt at On) did not survive at Khinatuni, whether that was at Jerusalem itself or possibly at Bethshemesh, "the House of the Sun," and that it was not the germ from which sprang the monotheism of the Hebrews, of ourselves, and of the Muslims?

Let it be remembered that Akhenaten did not worship simply the sun-disk alone. It

was the lord of the disk, the unseen One behind it, whose glory shone through the disk and so caused all light and life and joy in the world, that he worshipped and proclaimed to be the sole deity of the universe. This was no doubt the inner doctrine: the common man would venerate the actual Aten, as did the king himself publicly: but behind the Aten was in reality its lord.

The father of Akhenaten, Amenophis III, was a most magnificent oriental Sultan. The warlike enterprises of his forebears had given him at his accession an empire wide-spreading and at peace. He could hunt lions and wild bulls in the Syrian steppe, which was his imperial pleasure. He could make his progresses in state from Egypt to the bounds of Naharen, and none challenged him. The king of Karduniyash (Babylonia) fawned upon him for Nubian gold; the king of Mitanni was proud to call him his son-in-law. Only the king of Khatti, secure beyond the Taurus, dared to treat him coolly. But towards the end of his days the Egyptian peace in Western Asia began to be troubled. The great warriors and statesmen of the older generations, who had served Tuthmosis III and Amenophis II, were now dead. The last of them, the wise vizier Amenhotpe, son of Hapu, followed them to the grave. Amenophis was probably the son of a Mitannian mother, and if so, half an Aryan. To this may partly have been due the peace of the greater part of his reign. The Aryan barons were partly his blood-cousins, and both they and the Egyptians were united by their common dominance over the Semitic inhabitants of the land. To Aryan blood may also perhaps be attributed in part the king's predilection for the doctrine of the Aten, the sun-god who in his plain image of the disk would seem rather than Amen-Rē^c to be similar to the Aryan Sūrya.

As the king's life drew nearer its end and his hand weakened, the first mutterings of the coming storm were heard in the district of the Lebanon and on the North-Phoenician Coast, the land of Yarimūta¹, where the men of Arvad, who in the days of Tuthmosis had always given trouble to Egypt, conspired with a family of native chiefs of the Lebanon to throw off the yoke. They were encouraged to this course by the intrigues of Shubbiluliuma, the king of Khatti, a sinister figure always in the background of the troubles that ensued, always pulling the strings that were soon to bring the Egyptian empire in Syria to the ground in ruin, and ensure the triumph of his calculated policy in the complete destruction of Mitanni and the division of its territory between himself and the Assyrians, whom he supported in their defiance of the Babylonian king, who claimed to be their overlord, and generally encouraged for his own purposes as a weapon to his hand against his two powerful southern neighbours. While Amenophis yet lived, however, no general revolt was possible, and Egypt remained supreme. But the revolution of Akhenaten played directly into Shubbiluliuma's hands. The Syrian revolters gained ground everywhere. City after city of the Phoenician coast fell into their hands, in spite of the frenzied resistance of those native princes, like Rib-adda of Byblos, whose interests were bound up with those of Egypt. But without Egyptian help Rib-adda could do little. He sent letter after letter to Egypt, imploring Akhenaten to help his tortured subjects and to allow Yankhamu, the viceroy of Yarimūta, to come with his troops. But Yankhamu was kept in Egypt, perhaps out of royal jealousy. No help came. Akhenaten was too busy imposing the "doctrine" on his unwilling subjects and in designing new decorations for the tombs of his faithful followers. The Amorite chief of the Lebanon deceived him wofully with protestations of loyalty; he

¹ Yarimūta is now known not to be the Delta, but the North-Syrian coast, called Yarmūti by the Sumerians two thousand years before.

knew not what to think, and finally, after an explosion of bad temper (after the manner of his irritable kind), gave it up. "You know (he wrote in effect to the Amorite chief who, with his tongue in his cheek, was protesting his loyalty while hounding the unhappy Rib-adda from city to city) that I hate war and I don't want to come killing people in Asia; but if you don't behave nicely I shall really *have* to come and sacrifice you with my own hand!" He never came, of course, to perform this royal duty (part of his official functions as Pharaoh), and the whole of Syria and Palestine became a welter of chaos. The Egyptian officers did not know friend from foe, and attacked the former as often as the latter. Sudanese troops sent to Jerusalem attacked the inhabitants: Abdkhiba the local kinglest begs that the blacks may be withdrawn. Robbing and marauding bands of Beduins (Sutu) wandered over the land, while the tribes of the Khabiri were pushing onward everywhere. The king petulantly expected the tribute formerly sent to Amūn to be remitted now to the coffers of the Aten as if nothing were happening. And he was much more concerned to retrieve certain Amonist fugitives who had fled to Phoenicia from his persecuting intolerance (artist and seer though he was, he was as intolerant as his opponents), than to punish rebels: conformity to his spiritual doctrine was more important in his eyes than conformity to his temporal rule. No sense could be got out of him, and finally he abandoned the whole of his empire, which probably bored him to death. It was much more pleasant to forget the existence of all these bothering Hittites and Amorites and give oneself up wholly to the congenial life of art, philosophy, and petty persecution. When he died, possibly mad, no vestige remained of the empire of Amenophis III, and it was not till forty years later that a warlike monarch of a new dynasty, Sethos I, was able to recover the Egyptian dominion in Palestine. Syria had gone for ever: for all his boasts, the *miles gloriosus* of Egyptian history, Ramesses miscalled "the Great," the son of Sethos, was unable to recover the North, which fell to the Hittites at the expulsion of Egypt, and remained with them till the destruction of their state at the hands of the invading Westerners of the Aegean lands in the days of Ramesses III (*c.* 1196 B.C.).

We know very little of the actual civilization of Syria and Palestine in Akhenaten's day. To judge from the inscriptions of Tuthmosis III, the Canaanite chiefs of his time must have been highly civilized and wealthy: chariots adorned with gold are mentioned and weapons and horses of price. The war-booty of the reign of Tuthmosis and the exacting tribute of Amūn must have diverted much of this wealth to the coffers of Egypt, and the chaos of Akhenaten's day must have meant a loss of wealth and culture that was not replaced for centuries. Excavations in Palestine have had most disappointing results so far as discovery of works of art and culture are concerned.

Babylon pursued her steady way, dull and uninspired as it was. She worshipped the gods, observed the stars, engraved cylinder-seals, wrote millions of cuneiform tablets, and made money. Too far from Egypt to tempt conquering Pharaohs, also impressive with her old history and her imposing façade of widespreading power, Babylon seems to have kept western invaders at a distance. She had perennial trouble with Elam, with whom her relations much resembled those of England with Scotland during the Middle Ages. But her only great quarrel was with the Assyrians, who were impatient of her yoke, and in the troubles of Akhenaten's reign saw their opportunity to turn, in alliance with the Hittites, a nominal independence into a real one. Asshuruballit the Assyrian king appears as a sort of disciple of Shubuiluliuma, certainly during his equally long reign showing much the same statecraft as his apparent model. Both objected to the existence of Mitanni, and, in the

impotence of Egypt, to which Mitanni was closely bound by alliance and marriage, it was comparatively easy for the two conspirators to bring about her downfall and share her territories between them. Asshurballit thus avenged an old insult which the Assyrians, already a military nation, could ill brook: the sacking of Nineveh by Saushshatar of Mitanni and the carrying off of the gates of the temple of Ishtar to adorn Washukkani, his capital. The Assyrians appear now for the first time in a prominent *rôle* in history, and we find their warlike propensities already developed: the boy was father to the man. Of Mitanni we hear no more: she perished. One could wish that archaeological discovery would reveal some actual relics of this unexpected Aryan-ruled kingdom beyond a few tablets; one would like to know whether the Mitannians possessed any distinctive culture of their own. But the site of Washukkani is unknown, and we hardly know for certain what the confines of Mitanni were. Hitherto exploration along the course of the Khabūr has been restricted, and what has been discovered is mostly of a much later period than this.

Neither do we know the extent and frontiers of Shubbiluliuma's kingdom. To the east it marched with the land of Kizvadna, then tributary to Khatti, but later (in the time of Sethos I and the Hittite king Mursilis) practically independent under its king Šunaššura¹. In the west the Hittite monuments of Ionia, on the Karabel and Mount Tmōlos, give the impression of being memorials of victory; the signs-manual of a conqueror in a strange land. Yet we do not find many relics of the contemporary Minoan civilization on the Aegean coast of Asia. The Bronze Age "Greeks" did not settle there. There must have been a native culture there that was neither Hittite nor Minoan but perhaps formed a connecting link between the two. For that the Hittite and Minoan cultures were connected, even if remotely, one can hardly doubt. Have we a trace of this missing link in the famous Phaistos Disk, with its enigmatic inscription, stamped with types in a ribbon of signs that winds helically from circumference to centre of a flat circular clay disk², stamped when wet and thereafter baked? This actual specimen is three centuries older, it is true, than our period; but, as Sir Arthur Evans pointed out, it would seem to have come to its place of discovery in Crete from the south-west coast of Asia Minor, and the sign of the warrior's head upon it bears the crest characteristic of the Philistines of Caphtor (Keftiu no doubt extended from Crete to Cilicia) in the later days of Ramesses III and of the Lycians and Karians in the time of Herodotus, eight centuries later still. The house or shrine sign upon it is also completely reminiscent of the peculiar wooden-log architecture of Karia and Lycia, which we find imitated in stone for the houses of the dead in that part of the world in classical times. It is very probable that in Akhenaten's day the people of the coast, from Ionia round to Pisidia, wrote in this way, with a technique of manufacture derived (like that of the Minoan tablets themselves) from Babylonia through the early Semites of Asia Minor who taught the Hittites to use cuneiform, but written in a script and in a method peculiar to this part of the world alone, and symptomatic of a civilization with original characteristics, could we but discover them.

South-east of the Hittites were the undefined land of Mitanni and debatable territories such as Isuwa, and the semi-independent Hittite settlements in North Syria, such as Carchemish, the ancient city now under the rule of a Hittite (?) sub-king named Biyaššiliš³

¹ WEIDNER, *M.D.O.G.*, 58 (Aug. 1917), p. 59. The name Kizvadna may be the same as the *Kataonia* of classical times.

² EVANS, *Scripta Minoa*, 287.

³ WEIDNER, *l.c.* It is *primâ facie* probable that he was a Hittite, and his name is either Hittite or Mitannian with the Hittite nominative termination.

To the south, on the shore of the Mediterranean, was Cilicia, where we are now beginning to suspect the existence of a culture possibly less original than that which produced the Phaistos Disk, but still with characteristic peculiarities. Various objects of art, found in deposits of this period both in Cyprus and in Egypt, that have hitherto been indiscriminately classed as "Mycenaean" are probably to be assigned to Cilicia¹, which probably comprised the lands of Arzawa and Alashiya of the Amarna tablets (the identification of Alashiya with Cyprus will hardly hold water), and may have been included by the Egyptians in the name Keftiu, though the Islesmen and men of Keftiu depicted in the tombs of Rekhmirē and Sennemut at Thebes are distinctly Minoan Cretans and no others. Their dress, even to the details of the hairdressing, is proof positive of this. We have as yet no knowledge that the Cilicians (or Alashiyaans, if they were Cilicians) wore the characteristic Minoan waistclout and the long hair to the waist with the extraordinary curls and knots on the top of the head that the Cretan dandies affected and that evidently struck the attention of the Egyptian artist who so carefully reproduced them. That the patterns of the waistclouts in question do not seem specially Minoan may be due to a minor Egyptian inaccuracy: the crucial test is the coiffure—and the characteristic Minoan wasp-waist².

What the Cilicians looked like then, since we cannot accept Rekhmirē's Keftians as Cilicians or as any other than Minoan Cretans, we do not know. In the art which may be provisionally and hypothetically assigned to them we see a *Mischkunst* of Syrian (Babylonian), Hittite, and Minoan origin, with a certain characteristic "feeling" that serves to identify it. We see it in the Arimaspians fighting the griffon on the ivory mirror-handle from Enkomi³, in a strange carved wooden object from Egypt in the Berlin Museum from the tomb of the foreigner Sarobina at Memphis with its griffon, deer, goat, and lion among palm-trees⁴, and probably in the extraordinary little group of a bull attacked by a lion, cut in red jasper to act as the lid of a vase, which, though not often noticed, is one of the most interesting examples of the art of this period in the British Museum⁵. It was found at Amarna with the tablets of the royal cuneiform archive, and so is preserved in the Egyptian Department. But it is not purely Babylonian, nor is it at all Egyptian. Nor, as we can see now, is it Minoan; though twenty years ago, when I first published it, its freedom and originality of treatment and an undoubted Minoan-seeming quality about it led me to claim it tentatively as "Mycenaean." Nor is it Hittite. But to me now it appears to have just the intangible "feeling" that classes it with the two other objects I have mentioned and with others as probably Cilician. There is just that kinship to Minoan art on the one side and to Syro-Babylonian on the other that we should claim for a Cilician work.

The Cilicians, at this period at any rate, wrote their language in cuneiform characters on clay tablets just as the Mitannians and Hittites did also. We know nothing yet of any script of their own, but since the Hittites used a hieroglyphic writing as well as cuneiform, the Cilicians may also have done so. The names of the chiefs of Arzawa, Tarkhundaraush for example, are distinctly of Hittite type. This particular name perhaps contains the god (?)—name Tarku, always characteristic of this part of the world (*e.g.* Tarḫutumme, and later Tarkondemos and Trokombigremis in Roman days), and doubtless related to the Etruscan

¹ HALL in *Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Journal*, 1913, 41 foll.

² HALL, *Ancient History of the Near East*, 293; *Aegean Archaeology*, 58.

³ HALL, *Aegean Archaeology*, 202, Fig. 80.

⁴ HALL, *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, 188, Fig. 55.

⁵ HALL, *op. cit.*, 304-5, Figs. 70, 71.

Tarqu-inius. And the name of the Alashiyan queen Hatiba, known to us from the report of Wenamūn, the ambassador of Ramesses XI, about 1100 B.C., is also of distinctly Hittite type. That the Cilicians were closely related to the Khatti seems very probable. Owing to their position on the coast they were probably more highly civilized than their upland relatives.

It would appear that though Hittite as well as Iranian chieftains had early established themselves here and there in Syria and Palestine, as at Carchemish, the Hittites in bulk were still on the other side of the Taurus, and appeared in force south of it only as conquerors from time to time, as they had since their first great raid on Mesopotamia which reached Babylon and destroyed its dynasty *circa* 1925 B.C.

Five hundred years later then we find the Khatti still mainly a people of Anatolia, where they had to a large extent probably displaced the Semitic population that we find between Halys and Taurus, and specially in the Argæus region, as early as 2500 B.C. The idea that the Semite never crossed the Taurus must now be given up.

Bogház-keui, the centre of the Hittite kingdom, the later Pterion, was no doubt the capital of Shubbiluliuma, and here the phenomenally good luck that attended Prof. Winckler's excavation of one of the ancient buildings revealed to him a *cache* of cuneiform tablets hardly second to that of Amarna in importance, and of the same date and referring to many of the same actors in the world-drama of the time. It is these that have made clear to us the action of Shubbiluliuma himself in the drama. And now Prof. Hrozný in his examination of Winckler's tablets has restored to us the names of several of the predecessors of "the Hittite Bismarck" on the throne of Khatti. Khattusil his father is really the second of the name, and the names of Khuzziyash and Telibinush are new to us¹. The last appears to have been a monarch of importance. Of Prof. Hrozný's discovery that the tablets from Bogház-keui written in Hittite (some are in Babylonian) are in a West Indo-European tongue akin to Latin we have already spoken. It should be said that the learned Bohemian professor's conclusions as to the Aryan character of the language are not yet universally accepted²; but it must be noted that he is a well-known and thoroughly competent cuneiform scholar and his transcriptions cannot be doubted. It should not, therefore, be long before we are able to make up our minds one way or the other as to the linguistic affinities of Hittite.

I have never been an advocate of an Indo-European origin for the Hittites, which has been claimed already by others before Hrozný. It has always seemed more probable that this people of distinctly orientalizing culture, with the characteristic religion of Anatolia that persisted in classical days and seems first cousin to the cults of Canaan and of Minoan Crete, was non-Aryan. But if Prof. Hrozný proves to be right, this preconception must go by the board, and one must radically revise one's ideas³.

We can make out the sense of the Hittite tablets more or less, in spite of the fact that it is not certain what kind of language they are written in. This may be a hard saying to the ignorant, but those who are acquainted with the mysteries of the cuneiform writing will know well enough what I mean, and those who have some knowledge of Chinese or still better of the Japanese script with its mixture of Chinese ideograms and native Japanese signs of different kinds, will understand. We are helped by the fact that Babylonian Semitic

¹ HROZNÝ in *Hethitische Studien, Hethitische Keilschrifttexte* (1919).

² *E.g.* by COWLEY, *The Hittites* (Schweich Lectures for 1918), v.

³ *English Historical Review*, Jan. 1921, 100.

locutions of all kinds were lifted bodily into this Hittite written speech, much as Chinese expressions are used in written Japanese.

There is little doubt that the Hittites got their knowledge of cuneiform from the early Semitic colonies in Anatolia which they conquered and either absorbed or expelled. They used it in addition to the more clumsy hieroglyphic script of their own which they possessed. It has lately been argued¹ that because most of the extant monuments of the hieroglyphic script are probably rather late (those at Carchemish being perhaps as late as the tenth or ninth centuries B.C.), and because no similar inscribed monuments have been found at Bogház-keui or Euyük, the Hittites invented or adopted the hieroglyphic script *after* they were already acquainted with cuneiform. But an argument of this kind is very dangerous: it may be upset at any moment by a discovery of hieroglyphs leaving no room for doubt whatever as to their early date; and it is still more dangerous when, as in this case, it conflicts with all probability. Is it likely that a people acquainted with the developed and conventionalized cuneiform script would deliberately adopt a clumsy system of pictorial hieroglyphs having no relation whatever to the writing they had used for centuries? No: we can hardly suppose that these Hittite hieroglyphs, so characteristically Hittite in their artistic peculiarities, are not the national writing of the Anatolians. In older days they may, like the Minoans, perhaps not have had the idea of inscribing their hieroglyphs on walls. The Minoans never did so, so far as we know. The idea of mural inscription was very probably borrowed from the Assyrians, and so appears late. The Hittites of Akhenaten's day, when they used hieroglyphs, may have painted them on skins, as the Aztecs did². And in the climate of Anatolia all such records will long ago have perished. Still, one need not despair of finding one in Egypt one of these days. Ordinarily, they wrote in cuneiform.

The peculiar characteristics of Hittite art have been known to all of us for many years, largely through the special attention which it received at the hands of MM. Perrot and Chipiez. We probably have actual specimens of the work of Shubbiluliuma's day in the door-figures at Bogház-keui (one of which has with little justification been taken to be a woman, an Amazon!) and the religious processions and deities of Yasili Kayá.

From the Anatolian mainland we pass to the island of Cyprus. Cyprus itself, set in the midst of the sea, had recently been the scene of invasion and revolution. The native population, no doubt closely related in origin to the prae-Semitic inhabitants of Palestine on the one side and to the Aegeans on the other, had pursued the even tenour of their culture-development, always (characteristically) a stage behind the rest of the world (and this in spite of the attraction which their copper must from early times have been to commerce from over seas), until, probably early in the fifteenth century B.C., they were invaded and overrun by Cretan conquerors, who brought with them their civilization and art, and established a Minoan kingdom in Cyprus, the relics of which were discovered at Enkomi in 1894, and are now among the chief treasures of the British Museum. Among these relics were many articles imported from Egypt, including both jewellery and ceramic of the finest kinds. And Egyptian scarabs found with them bore the names of Amenophis III and Teie³. These two were not later "re-publications" of royal scarabs of this kind, not Saïte re-issues. The name of Amenophis himself occurs on Twenty-sixth Dynasty scarabs, because he was venerated then, by confusion with the deified Amenophis I and his own vizier

¹ COWLEY, *op. cit.*, 38.

² See *English Historical Review*, loc. cit.

³ EVANS in *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.* xxx (1900). On the whole find see POULSEN in *Jhb. Arch. Inst.* 1911, 215 foll.

Amenhotpe son of Hapu. But that of Teie never occurs: she was as forgotten then as was her heretic son. And by their types we know them to be characteristic scarabs of the Eighteenth Dynasty. There is no need to insist on this now, when the erstwhile question of the date of the "Mycenaean" period is no longer in debate; but twenty years ago it was amusing to see how some people tried by all means to avoid the dreadful conclusion that there was anything in Greece older than the year 776 B.C., how they twisted and wriggled in their vain endeavour to escape from the pitiless archaeological net that was being woven around them by discovery after discovery all pointing in the same direction of the fifteenth century B.C., and how they finally succumbed to the evidence of the facts.

In Akhenaten's day, then, Cyprus was the seat of a flourishing Mycenaean kingdom which evidently was in pretty close relations with Egypt. We have doubtless relics of traffic with Cyprus in the shape of many of the fragments of Mycenaean pottery found at Amarna, some of which was probably made in Cyprus, while some is of types associated with the mainland of Greece. There is little trace of direct connexion with Crete. In Akhenaten's time indeed the Minoan power had passed its zenith. The destruction of the palace of Knossos had occurred, and the kingdom of Minos probably had come to its end. Whether the colonization of Cyprus was a result of this catastrophe we do not know. But it seems more probable that the Cyprian Minoans came from mainland Greece than that they were dispossessed Cretans. Their pottery has much more of the mainland character than the Cretan. And this would agree with the legends of the mixed Arcadian and other origins of the Cypriotes. But, if not the direct result of the destruction of Knossos, the colonization of Cyprus was connected with it, since it was doubtless the final result of the movement from the mainland that incidentally destroyed Knossos and the thalassocracy of Crete.

The speedy collapse of Cretan culture and art after the destruction of the Labyrinth is remarkable, and we have not as yet sufficient data to explain it satisfactorily. Anyhow, the sceptre had passed from the mother-island to the colonies which she had established aforetime on the Greek mainland, to Mycenae and the rest, and from them came the impulse that took Minoan-Mycenaean culture to Rhodes and finally brought up in Cyprus. In the days of Hatshepsut and Sennemut, of Tuthmosis III and of Rekhmirē, the Minoans who brought their masterpieces of toreutic and of ceramic art to Egypt were Cretans of Knossos and Phaistos and no others, "the men of Keftiu and of the Isles in the midst of the sea." In the time of Akhenaten their place was taken by mainlanders of Mycenae, by Rhodians of Ialysos, and Cyprians of Enkomi. The period was that of the Aegean Bronze Age known to us as the "Third Late Minoan" (L. M. III), or newly by the appellation of "Third Late Helladic" (L. H. III), the term "Helladic" being considered more appropriate to a period whose centre of gravity was in Hellas proper, while "Minoan" is considered appropriate only to the Cretan post-Knossian culture. The convenient term "Late Minoan III," however, will probably survive as a name for the period, while the somewhat old-fashioned word "Mycenaean" has much to be said for it as a general term for the art and culture of this time. It must not, however, be forgotten in this connexion that the shaft-graves of Mycenae, with their magnificent contents, are considerably older than this period, being contemporary with the Cretan period L. M. I, which equates with the early Eighteenth Dynasty in Egypt and dates about 1600-1450 B.C. In Akhenaten's time the glory of these Perseid princes (or whoever they were), who were buried in the shaft-graves, had passed away; but Mycenae was still the seat of royal state, and now that the Minoan power

had vanished, was probably one of the most important centres of civilization in Greece. The princes of this time, the age of Akhenaten, may perhaps have been the house known to later legend as that of Atreus, so famous in tragic story. It is not yet certain whether the great *Tholos*-tombs below the citadel at Mycenae, the tombs of Atreus and Klytaimnestra, as they are called, are really to be assigned to this period and Dynasty, or are older¹.

We may hope that our new excavations at Amarna will reveal new evidence that shall make clearer the relations between the Greece of the age of the Atridae, when "golden Mycenae" ruled, and Egypt. It is very probable that there was a considerable colony of Greeks in Egypt at the time²; and far from improbable that their artists exercised some influence over their Egyptian *confrères*, so that when Akhenaten gave the word for the throwing off of the fetters of convention, it is no wonder that the resulting work shews occasional Minoan touches which had the era of freedom lasted would no doubt have been accentuated. It is, however, the fact that this influence was by no means so great as might have been expected; and the fantastic side of Minoan art never seems to have appealed even to Akhenaten's artists³.

Of the Italians at this date we know nothing but the types of their weapons. The Egyptians knew little of them. The Shardina mercenaries, if they were really Sardinians, were Italians; and they already took part in the fighting in Palestine as Egyptian hirelings, like the Shekhial or Sagalassians (?) of Pisidia, who are also mentioned in the Amarna letters⁴. But it is not really certain that the Shardina were Italians at all; they are much more likely to have been a people of Asia Minor (*cf.* the name of Sardis), and as depicted on the Egyptian monuments they carry exactly the same corselet, huge round shield, and great broad sword, as the warriors (such as the Arimasp slaying the griffon) on the ivory mirror-handle from Enkomi, to which we have seen reason to assign a Cilician origin. The Tursha, however, also already known in Egypt, no doubt were Tu(r)sci, Tyrrhenians, and so

¹ The question has been again raised by the recent excavation of Mr J. E. Wace and the British School at Athens at Mycenae, and is still *sub judice*. But one must admit that *primâ facie* one would refer such buildings as the "treasuries" of Atreus at Mycenae and of Minyas at Orchomenos to the early late Minoan period rather than "L.M. III."

² We find such foreign colonies in Egypt in this age. That at Gurob, of the time of Tuthmosis III, is a case in point. And the products of Greece were freely imported into Egypt, for the use of Egyptians as well as of the foreigners themselves. Thus hardly any decent burial of the XVIIIth Dynasty is without its *bügelkanne* or Mycenaean false-necked vase, no doubt when originally imported containing olive oil or some other Greek product. And we find the *bügelkanne* and the older "filler" vase imitated by the Egyptian in his characteristic blue faïence (Hall, *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, 52, 53), so that they became domiciled in Egypt, so to speak.

³ *Journal*, I, 202. I have often been censured for speaking of the inhabitants of Greece in Minoan days as "Greeks," and am told that they were not Greeks at all, but non-Aryan Mediterraneans. That they were not Aryans has always been my thesis, but it does not debar me from calling them Greeks, since they lived in Greece, and (it must not be forgotten) the classical Greeks were very largely of the old Mediterranean blood, and in the predominantly Aryan Greek language that evolved after the arrival of the Indo-Europeans there is undoubtedly a very large non-Aryan vocabulary, though the structure of the language and much of its vocabulary is Aryan. The Bengalis talk an Aryan language, but none would say that they are Aryan in blood. The classical Greeks were a half-Aryan people that talked a predominantly Aryan language. If they are Greeks, why not their non-Aryan ancestors too, the original inhabitants of Greece? My own practice is to restrict the term "Hellenes" to the classical Greeks, while using "Greeks" for the Bronze Age people as well as for their partial descendants.

⁴ HALL in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, XXXI, 231.

probably were Italians, though, again, we do not know for certain that in the fifteenth century B.C. had yet occurred the traditional migration of the Etruscans from Anatolia which is so strangely confirmed by the similarities of Etruscan art and culture to that of the Hittites. Italy therefore may still have remained a *terra incognita* to the Egyptians, and Italians *rarae aves*.

When we pass south over the Libyan Sea, turning our backs on the havens of Greece and on the stark mountain-wall of Crete, we come to the land of steppe afterwards rich in fleeces, and of stone, later useful for quarrying, which the Egyptians knew as Themeh and the later Greeks as Libya. It had early traditional connexions with Greece, and the Egyptians even under the Sixth Dynasty (c. B.C. 2700) do not speak of its people as if they were absolute barbarians. We know little, however, of its early culture; and in Akhenaten's day it was what it had been for centuries, a mere raiding-field for Egyptian slave-razzias. The time had not yet come for the Libyan upheavals that were to use Egypt so hardly in the days of Menepthah and Ramesses III, and, in alliance with the sea-pirates of the isles swarming over the ruins of the old power of Crete, for a moment to threaten a return of a foreign domination to the land. Yet it has been noticed by Prof. Newberry that during a great part of the Eighteenth Dynasty the ancient cities of the north-western Delta are hardly ever mentioned in the inscriptions, which looks as if during the Hyksos period Libyan tribes had overrun the marshes of the western Delta and had entered into a prolonged occupation of what had been Egyptian territory, being tolerated there by the Theban kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, who took little interest in the Delta, the North that was so closely identified with the Hyksos and was so deeply soiled with foreign blood, Libyan, Mediterranean, and Semitic. When, after Haremhab had restored the state when the mad episode of Akhenaten was over, the Nineteenth Dynasty ascended the throne, matters were different. The new royal house was of northern origin, and its home was in the district of Tanis and Pelusium, which became the chief seat of the court. So it may be imagined that the north-western Delta was now reclaimed for its ancient owners, and this fact may very likely account for the revolt and attack of the Libyans under Menepthah; the dispossessed Libyans waited till the fear of Ramesses II was stilled by his death, and then, when the throne was occupied by the weak and elderly man, his son, they struck. In spite of their defeat, the north-western nomes remained predominantly Libyan in blood. But the Egyptian authority and religious cults were restored there, and the people became egyptianized.

Haremhab had governed the North for Akhenaten during the Palestinian troubles loyally, though he was not an Atenist, apparently; and, when the generation of fainéant Amarnaites that followed Akhenaten on the throne was expended, he was the only possible candidate for the throne. By him "law and order" in church as well as state were restored; the episode of the heretic Akhenaten and his aesthetes was solemnly anathematized with bell, book, and candle, and after a deal of hard words about "that criminal of Akhetaten," society settled down again on traditional lines and worshipped Amen-Rē in a proper and decent manner. But all originality had abandoned Egypt with Akhenaten; and she became soon a mere museum of doddering priests and mummies and remained so, under the rule of Libyans or Ethiopians, till the artificial renaissance of the Saïtes endeavoured to rejuvenate her, but without originality or real inspiration. Saïte art could baldly imitate the very ancient or it could be pretty and graceful; it could not be really fine, though it must be admitted that success was achieved in the remarkable series of portrait-heads of elderly men (such as Montemhet the governor of Thebes under Tirhakah) that this period has

left. The greatness of Ptolemaic Egypt was the greatness of Greek Alexandria, not of Egypt. The only Ptolemaic art of any value was Greek; Egyptian art died with the Saïtes.

The experiment of Akhenaten was never repeated. He was the product of his peculiar circumstances, and these circumstances, the philosophical religious speculations of the priests of On, the probable religious laxity and eclecticism of his half-foreign father, his own doctrinaire conceit and the conscientious pacificism that handed over Palestine and Syria to chaos and misery and the rule of his intriguing Hittite enemy, we have seen in this survey of the relation of Egypt with the external world during his reign.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

As regards the Amonist fugitives mentioned on p. 45, l. 14, see HALL, *Ancient History of the Near East*, 350. The names of these people, supposed by Weber (in KNUDTZON, *Amarna-Tafeln*, 1268, *n*) to be Mitannian, are evidently in many cases Egyptian. Tuya, Leia, Vishiari, Mania, Pâlûma and Nimmakhê all look Egyptian; Tuya, Leia and Mania are easily explicable as the Egyptian names Tuye (Tui), Leie (Rui) and Meni; and Nimmakhê is a perfect transcription of Nebemḥêt, as that name was pronounced (probably as Nibmaḥê) under the Eighteenth Dynasty.