

Review

Author(s): T. Eric Peet

Review by: T. Eric Peet

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Jul., 1914), pp. 229-230

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853649>

Accessed: 14-12-2015 08:13 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>

*Essays and Studies, presented to William Ridgeway, Sc.D., F.B.A.* Edited by E. C. QUIGGIN, M.A., Ph.D. pp. v-xxiv + 656. Plates 19. Figs. in text 82. Cambridge University Press, 1913.

The volume presented to Professor Ridgeway by his friends on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday contains a vast amount of matter varying in range as widely as the recipient's own interests. Naturally Egyptological studies are far less strongly represented there than those connected with classical and prehistoric Greece. But as there is no branch of archaeology or ethnology which has not in some way felt the influence of Professor Ridgeway's inspiration and enthusiasm, it would have been an error if one of the largest and oldest branches of archaeological research had found no place in the volume. Accordingly we find some half dozen papers more or less directly connected with Egyptology.

Professor Petrie publishes five royal signets purchased by him in Egypt. In dealing with the first of these, which bears the name and titles of Khufu, he takes the opportunity to discuss the meaning of the words *neter nefer*, "the Good God," which stand at the head of the royal titulary. He compares these with the **ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲧⲁⲃⲟⲥ** with which Coptic formulae often begin, and with the Arabic *bismillah* and the Latin *in nomine Deo*, and suggests that they contain not a title of the king but an equivalent of the English phrase "By the grace of God." To this suggestion there are one or two possible objections. In the first place the words are occasionally found in the middle of the titles, not at the beginning; further they are often governed by a preposition, as for example in the phrase "Year 10 under the majesty of the Good God..."; and finally the frequent reference to the king as the god (cf. "the majesty of this god") makes it probable that "the Good God" is to be taken as one of his titles. The most important of the other signets is that of a king Khandy, which is a cylinder distinctly Babylonian in technique, though the scene is conceived in the Egyptian fashion. The king appears to wear the white crown with the front projection of the red crown added. The appearance of this foreigner as a king of Egypt points probably to the period between the VIth and XIth Dynasties. I believe Gardiner was the first to suggest that this was a period of Asiatic incursion into the Delta, a conjecture which has been brilliantly confirmed by one of the lately published St. Petersburg papyri.

F. W. Green describes a vase now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, incised with a hieroglyphic group consisting of the Set animal preceded by the reversed *ka*-arms with an oval sign between the hands. This he compares with similar vases from the "main deposit" at Hierakonpolis, where the same group occurs with the scorpion or with the Horus bird over a crescent replacing the Set animal.

In a long paper Professor Elliot Smith works out in detail his now well-known hypothesis that the megalithic monuments are nothing more than attempts on the part of primitive peoples to imitate the various forms of Egyptian tomb and tomb-chapel. He is prepared to find the origin of almost every detail of megalithic architecture in some form of Egyptian or Nubian tomb. The hole found in one of the slabs in so many dolmens in various parts of the world is for him nothing more than a copy of the hole in the *serdab* of the mastaba through which the spirit came and went. Other features of the megalithic monuments are similarly explained, and indeed if we have a criticism to make of an admirable paper it is that it explains too much. Nevertheless even those of us who entirely disagree with Professor Elliot Smith's theory will admit that in this paper he has put it excellently and with an adequate knowledge of the literature connected with the problem. It is very much to be doubted whether a detailed criticism of his views would at this juncture serve any good purpose. Whether the author be right or wrong, he has done archaeology a great service in bringing up for fresh discussion a much neglected subject. He has put his case, and put it well. Archaeologists now have the facts before them and may take their choice, or, perhaps better still, wait for more evidence, for there is still much to come. The real difficulty in discussing the problem lies in the fact that the whole solution is dependent on our personal ideas as to what primitive Mediterranean man would or would not do under certain circumstances, and this, despite the researches of ethnology, is a subject on which agreement seems impossible.

It is in this relation that the essay which in the volume appropriately precedes that just mentioned is of most interest, for it shows us that even could we make up our minds as to the way in which things did happen among primitive mankind this knowledge will not always solve our problem. This essay is by Dr. Rivers and is entitled "The Contact of Peoples." The hypothesis on which the paper is based is that in the movements of races quite small numbers of immigrants are able to produce profound

modifications in peoples whose state of material culture is very inferior to their own. This hypothesis is based on the observation of comparatively recent movements of peoples, and seems well founded. The writer then applies it to the megalithic monuments, and shows that the diversity of physical characteristics among the peoples who constructed them does not preclude the idea of their having been spread by a single race, for that race may have travelled in such small numbers as not to influence perceptibly the physical type of the peoples among whom it settled, though at the same time possessing sufficient superiority in material civilization to enable it to impose its own culture. This is a good answer to those who deny that the megalithic idea *could* have been carried by a single people, though at the same time it does not prove that it was so carried. Even if it was, these people may have been either immigrants or merely traders, they may have been Egyptians or they may not. In other words Dr. Rivers's hypothesis can be reconciled with any of the most commonly held theories of the megalithic monuments. We have mentioned this point at some length because it is an excellent illustration of a truth which appears more than once from a juxtaposition of archaeological and ethnological essays such as that contained in this volume, the disappointing truth that ethnology is often powerless to help its sister science just at those very points where assistance was most to be looked for. And doubtless archaeology just as frequently disappoints the ethnologist.

A short paper by Dr. Seligmann brings us down to modern Egypt, pointing out several ancient Egyptian beliefs which still seem to survive there. Dr. Seligmann, doubtless rightly, sees survivals in the various boat ceremonies and in the popular modern calendar. He is inclined to see the ancient *ka* surviving in the modern *qarîna*, of which he gives some interesting details. We should have liked even more evidence on this point, but it is not easy to gather, for the Arabs themselves are not very clear with regard to the *qarîna* and the beliefs vary considerably from village to village. To this collection of modern beliefs concerning the spirit might be added that recorded by Newberry from the village of Qârna, where the natives believe that the swallow embodies the spirit of their deceased fellow villagers. Is this a survival of the *ba*?

T. ERIC PEET.

*The Miraculous Birth of Amon-hotep III and other Egyptian Studies.* By the Rev. COLIN CAMPBELL, D.D. pp. i—xiv+204. 46 photographs. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1912. 7s. 6d. nett.

Dr Colin Campbell gives us in this book a succinct and popular description of several monuments which have hitherto been somewhat inadequately or imperfectly treated. Dr Campbell is greatly interested in Egyptian religion, and especially in the conception of the divinity of the pharaoh, the fiction of his divine parentage and birth, and the representations of this on the monuments. He has studied the splendid series of representations, published by Professor Naville for the Fund, of the divine birth of Queen Hatshepsut at Dêr el-Bahri, and has used his knowledge of them to elucidate more accurately than has been done before the similar series of pictures relating to King Amenhetep III on the walls of the sanctuaries at Luxor. All visitors to that temple will remember its sanctuary, with the great Ptolemaic *naos* of Alexander the Great which fills up its centre. The reliefs of Amenhetep III on the walls of the chamber have been much damaged, with the result that former descriptions of them have suffered in the point of accuracy. Dr Campbell has gone through them all with care, and has thus been able to supply many gaps in the accounts of his predecessors, whom he is at times obliged to criticize. The exception he takes to some of the descriptions of M. Gayet seem quite justified, and in several points (*e.g.* the identification of the scorpion-goddess Serqet or Selkit in the upper left-hand corner of the relief illustrated opposite p. 42) he has settled points left undetermined by others. After describing these Luxor reliefs he gives us an account of the festal representations (processions of boats, *etc.*) on the walls of the Colonnade of Tutankhamen, and concludes his work with descriptions of two very fine painted tombs at Dêr el-Medînah on the western bank, those of Sennezem and Pashedu (Nos. 1 and 3 of Dr Gardiner's list, *A Topographical Catalogue of the Private Tombs at Thebes*; see the April number of the *Journal*, p. 154). Dr Campbell illustrates the whole of his work with a complete series of photographs taken by himself, which are usually adequate, sometimes (in the case of the two tombs especially) very good, sometimes not good: that opposite p. 168 for instance is very much out of focus. Generally speaking, Dr Campbell has done his work very well, though he sometimes expresses opinions which will not be shared by all.