

CHAPTER 2 PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

When J.D.S. PENDLEBURY published *Aegyptiaca* in 1930, he brought together for the first time a catalogue of artefacts of Egyptian origin to be found in mainland Greece, Crete and the islands of the Aegean (with the exception of Rhodes) dating to Dynasty XXVI and earlier.⁴ The format was simple, concise and informative: essentially a catalogue of objects was presented by find site, with brief historical description and introductory analysis of their importance to Aegean scholarship. Pendlebury recorded the then present location, find date and context circumstances, and date of manufacture for each object included, together with comparanda in Egypt. In addition, a short note on the contemporaneous Aegean objects found in Egypt was included,⁵ together with appropriate maps, photographs and drawings. In order to collect his material Pendlebury had scoured all available publications and personally had visited museums throughout Greece, for many of his objects had not previously been published. It was in every sense a pioneering study and, having excavated both in Egypt and Greece, he was an obvious candidate for the project and the project an obvious choice for him.

At the time, the most useful value of the catalogue was chronological, for it gathered together all the evidence known up to that time for relatively dating Aegean prehistoric development by linking Greek contexts with the most precise and only absolute chronology available for that era, the Egyptian. Not as appreciated at the time but equally important were Pendlebury's few preliminary observations regarding the type of material found, and the relationship between the Aegean and Egyptian cultures in the Bronze Age.

Although there were some quibbles regarding cer-

tain details of identification and dating, the book was rightly hailed as an original and indispensable work.⁶ So much so, it seems, that it was not until over two and a half decades later that a related but decidedly egyptocentric study appeared, *L'Égypte et le Monde égéen préhellénique*, written by an Egyptologist (VERCOUTTER 1956), that concentrated not on Egyptian exports in Greece but on Egyptian textual and pictorial material of Dynasty XVII–XIX relating to the people of the Aegean. Its intention and scope were underlined by its subtitle, *Étude critique des sources égyptiennes*.

For more than a half-century after *Aegyptiaca* was published little attempt was made to update Pendlebury's catalogue or re-evaluate his commentary, when much began to be accomplished in thesis work. During the 1960s, Gerald Cadogan compiled a catalogue of Egyptian artefacts found at Knossos for his thesis on Minoan foreign relations, but the thesis was not completed and the catalogue remains unpublished except for a few pieces that hint at the quantity and type of material found there.⁷ Peter Warren's thesis on Minoan stone vases, incorporating a typological catalogue of material from Crete and elsewhere, identified and distinguished imported Egyptian vessels on Crete and some derivative Minoan vessels. It was published (WARREN 1969), and included much previously unknown material, together with observations regarding their importance and possible cultural implications of their presence on the island. He also analysed the types of vessels found, their dates and means of manufacture and importation, and distinguished Minoan derivations and imports including genuine imports that had been altered to suit Minoan taste or requirements. It too was a pioneering and immediately indispensable work. Since

⁴ Rhodes was excluded for two reasons. The quantity of imported material found on the island was disproportionately excessive to that from the rest of Greece, and Pendlebury's report on the Rhodian objects was to have been published elsewhere (PENDLEBURY 1930b:vii). Unfortunately, it never appeared (BROWN 1975:i n. 1).

⁵ An intended companion volume on the Aegean material found in Egypt, to have been co-authored by his wife Hilda, never appeared. However, he expanded the theme of Aegyptio-Aegean relations during the LBA, in PENDLEBURY 1930a.

⁶ There were errors and omissions in the text as published: some were discussed and corrected by WAINWRIGHT (1932) and others corrected by Pendlebury himself, probably with the publication of a second edition in mind. This too did not materialise. Pendlebury's personal copy of *Aegyptiaca* with numerous corrections, emendations and additions in his own hand, is now in the Villa Ariadne library at Knossos.

⁷ CADOGAN 1976.

then, WARREN (1997) considered the means by which Egyptian vessels were converted by Minoan artisans and Christine LILYQUIST (1997) also commented on his observations, and (1996) has investigated Egyptian stone vessels abroad (including Crete) from an Egyptologist's perspective.

Paul Yule's thesis, a stylistic and chronological analysis of early Minoan seals to MM III employing a large but limited corpus, isolated scarabs of Egyptian origin from derivative Minoan pieces by exclusion: the latter were incorporated within his typology but the former were not discussed. This too was published (YULE 1981) and supplemented for the scarabs shortly thereafter (1983). Since then, Ingo PINI (2000) has isolated certain definitive distinctions between Egyptian and Minoan scarabs.⁸ On the Egyptian side, Stephen QUIRKE and Lesley FITTON (1997:442) briefly have commented on differences between the imports and indigenous scarabs in the Aegean.

On a more general note, Richard BROWN's unpublished thesis (submitted 1975) was the first attempt in over forty years to update Pendlebury's catalogue of Egyptian imports in Greece. Brown's catalogue is supplementary, and includes imported material from the Greek mainland and islands in the Bronze and Geometric/Archaic periods, again excluding Rhodes and (inexplicably) also Crete. His rather superficial commentary concentrates on the Post-Bronze Age period but offers little fresh insight into the material of either.

Nancy SKON-JEDELE has completed a monumental but unpublished thesis (submitted 1994) on the *aegyptiaca* – both imports and derivations – on Greece, Crete and the Aegean islands dating between 1100 and 525 B.C.; it is a major and pioneering study.⁹ Gail HOFFMAN's thesis (submitted 1990, published

1997) on Near Eastern artistic influence on Crete ca. 1100 – ca. 700 B.C., includes Egyptian material within her remit, and thus the two overlap for material found on Crete. Interestingly, neither of these two theses nor Hoffman's later publication refer to the other study. Long before either is M.M. AUSTIN's (1970) more general and text-based study of relations during this same period, and Veronica WILSON's (1975) examination of the Bes image on Iron Age Cyprus is an early cross-chronological study of an individual image beyond its homeland.

Connie LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON's thesis (submitted 1987, published 1990) is an overview of *aegyptiaca* and *orientalia* found in Bronze Age Greece. Unfortunately, it is full of errors, omissions, inconsistencies and other problems both major and minor in both detail and scope. †Perikles KOURACHANES, staff Egyptologist at the National Archaeological Museum, Athens, prepared a volume on the *aegyptiaca* found in Greece in its collection, unfortunately still unpublished.¹⁰ Eric CLINE's thesis (submitted 1991, published 1994) on Egyptian and Near Eastern relations with Late Bronze Age Greece has compiled a list of 1118 imported objects found in Late Bronze Age Greece. It is a major addition to the literature, although some of his choices are problematic and others are arguably indigenous; identifications generally are not critically reviewed but provenances of individual artefacts apparently are accepted as published.¹¹

Iconographical studies also have begun to appear. Theses by Nancy RHYNE (submitted 1970) and Lyvia MORGAN (submitted 1980, published 1988) have investigated the Aegean development of, respectively, the sphinx and various details of the Thera frescoes (including the cat image). The former concluded that the overwhelming but not restrictive influence came from the Near East rather than Egypt.¹² The latter

⁸ His (and others) systematic publication of seals and sealings in the *CMS* have made accessible to scholars numerous scarabs, other seal types and sealings (including imported examples) that otherwise would have remained unpublished.

⁹ See her comments on the dating of the Eleutherna scarab (HM 64) found by Xanthoudides (SKON-JEDELE 1994:1719–1724).

¹⁰ He died in July 1988 just as the study was near completion. I met him in Athens in December 1987, and he kindly showed me some of the material he had unearthed and identified from the museum storage rooms. It was an impressive collection and its posthumous publication would be a fitting tribute to its author. I was pleased to see that the catalogue of the recent Crete-Egypt exhibition in Herakleion (KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) was dedicated to him.

¹¹ See especially the review by WEINSTEIN 1995.

¹² The subject was treated exhaustively by Rhyne and will not be discussed in the present work. She also discussed the griffin and lion. On the griffin, see also EALS 1973:9–29, but note that the particular type of griffin that appears on Crete in “MM III” (p. 19) precedes in date the same type in Egypt (pp. 20, 24; beginning of Dynasty XVIII), so her argument that the griffin was adopted on Crete from Syria via Egypt is incorrect. Griffins actually are known in the MM IIB Phaestos sealing archive (YULE 1980:138 Motif 17.b, pl. 11 Motif 17.b; see Phaestos B), and both seem to have separately adopted this type from the Near East, or perhaps Egypt partly via Crete.

was not so concerned with origins as Aegean parallels and continuity but nonetheless addresses the question. Judith WEINGARTEN (1991) has studied the relationship between the Egyptian standing hippopotamus deity, commonly known as Taweret (*T3-wrt*), and the earliest examples of the Minoan ‘genius.’ Most recently, various authors in the volume of essays (KARETSOU 2000) published in association with the Κρήτη – Αίγυπτος exhibition at the Herakleion Archaeological Museum (November 1999–September 2000; KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) have considered various aspects of the topic.

More peripherally, Egyptian influences on Minoan architecture and wall-painting have been the subject of two unpublished theses by, respectively, Zbigniew JARKIEWICZ (submitted 1982) and Maria SHAW (submitted 1967). The former subject was exhaustively treated with an essentially negative conclusion, and the latter, after similarly minute analysis, indicated that positive influence consisted chiefly of technical details and some iconographic features. These topics will not be considered in depth in the present work, although they will be mentioned.

Reciprocally, the Aegean material in Bronze Age Egypt has been subjected to exhaustive study by Barry KEMP and Robert MERRILLEES (1980) and Martha BELL (thesis submitted 1991) for the Minoan and Mycenaean material respectively. The former chiefly attempted to define chronological limitations of the material contexts and in fact produced a more detailed version of the volume the Pendleburys doubtless intended to write. The latter is a stylistic and chronological analysis and catalogue (see also BELL 1982; 1983). Both also are conveniently listed by VINCENTELLI and TIRADRITTI (1986). MERRILLEES and WINTER (1972) and MERRILLEES and EVANS (1980) also investigated the unprovenanced Minoan pottery from Egypt, and attempted to further refine their provenance there (or elsewhere). Shelley WACHSMANN’s thesis (submitted 1983, published 1987) investigated the Egyptian tomb representa-

tions of the Keftiu in some detail, including their goods.¹³ Paul REHAK (1996) recently has specifically investigated clothing representations, as has Hartmut MATTHÄUS (1995; 1996) the representations of metal vessels in these scenes, both raising several chronological implications. The Keftiu vessels also are being studied by Ellen DAVIS, although her paper is not yet published. Most recently, relevant theses have been initiated by Margarita Nicolakaki-Kentrou (Oriental Studies, University of Cambridge; see NICOLAKAKI-KENTROU 2000; 2003) and Katerina ASLANIDOU (Institut für Ägyptologie, University of Vienna; submitted 2006). Aegean influence on Egyptian art was examined by H.R. HALL (1914a), Helene KANTOR (1947) and William Stevenson SMITH (1965), amongst others, and recently has been re-investigated by Janet CROWLEY (1989). Jean VERCOUTTER’s monumental volume (1956) has already been mentioned, and he (1954), Fritz SCHACHERMEYR (1952–1953; 1967) and Wolfgang HELCK (1979; 1983) have investigated the various possible trade routes between Crete and Egypt.¹⁴ These last also briefly discuss the imports and influences of Egyptian workmanship on Aegean art. Recently, Jean LECLANT (1996) and VERCOUTTER (1997) have provided summaries bringing up to date work since VERCOUTTER (1956) and other early research. The 1990 discovery of Minoan style (less likely, Minoan) fresco fragments at the Delta site of Tell el-Dab’a (Avaris) in the excavations of Manfred Bietak has initiated a veritable explosion of commentary on Egyptian and Minoan wall painting and iconographic cross-influence, which will continue in future.¹⁵ It was gratifying to see that the major exhibition Κρήτη – Αίγυπτος. Πολιτισμι-κοί δεσμοί τριών χιλιετιών in the Archaeological Museum of Herakleion in November 1999–September 2000 (KARETSOU *et al.* 2000) and several authors in its accompanying essay volume (KARETSOU 2000) made extensive use of my thesis to consider the subject in further depth and to present it to the general public.

¹³ See also comments by HELTZER 1988.

¹⁴ WATROUS 1992:176–178 recently has argued for the existence of a counter-clockwise route, west from the Delta and then directly north to Crete, and this seems to have become generally accepted as feasible; see, e.g., WARREN 1995:10–11. WACHSMANN 1998:298–299, 371 n. 35 generally refutes the possibility, and notes that, even although a direct Egypt to Cyprus route was theoretically feasible, there is no evidence to support it. Ancient ship technology also argues against the possibility of this route prior to the invention of the brailed sail (VINSON 1993; personal communications, 23 April 1999 and 20 February 2002), despite

prevailing wind and current. This invention seems to have occurred at some point during the Amarna period (i.e. LM IIIA2), on the basis of visual evidence. See also BOARDMAN 1968; WHITE and WHITE 1996, on the general lack of Bronze Age ports along the Marmarican and Cyrenaican coast east of Marsa Matruh, where they would be expected if this route had been employed.

¹⁵ See CLINE 1998 and BIETAK 2000 for commentary and synopses of the literature with extensive attendant bibliographies. *Ägypten und Levante*, continues to be a major source for publication of updated information from this site and related material investigations.

Egyptian imports normally are stressed in initial (site) publication, simply due to their chronological value and exotic nature, as are objects of real or perceived Egyptian influence. Thus, new material is likely to be found in publication, even if only passing mention is made in preliminary excavation reports or annual *χρονικά* of various journals (e.g., *AR*, *BCH*, *ADelt*); and new Egyptian finds on Crete (and other countries) are collated annually in *Orientalia*.

A large number of studies incorporating Egyptian imported material have been published over the years, but such subsequent published discussion of the material is dominated by chronological issues,¹⁶ and therefore has been limited to those imports found within stratigraphically narrow and stylistically limited dating parameters. In essence, this approach has concerned itself almost exclusively with scarabs, whilst the other imported goods have received little direct study.

To my knowledge, the only published additions to Pendlebury's original catalogue, for the imported Egyptian material on Minoan Crete, are HELCK's overview and enumeration of imports (1979:93–100), YULE's footnoted list of scarabs (1983:366 n. 22) and WARREN's catalogue of stone vessels (1969:105–115 Type 43), other than material incorporated within the LAMBROU-PHILLIPSON (1990) and CLINE (1994) lists already mentioned. Other material is scattered in various publications, usually on an individual basis and often as initial excavation or recovery reports.

My unpublished preliminary catalogue (PHILLIPS 1984) was, so far as I am aware, the first attempt to update Pendlebury's work in its intention and scope for Bronze Age Crete, and it has been far outstripped by further research by myself and others in the intervening years. My Ph.D. thesis (submitted 1991), of which the present volume is essentially an extensive revision, remains the only investigation of both imported and Minoan *aegyptiaca* for Bronze Age Crete. I have presented various aspects elsewhere whilst thesis research progressed and after its completion, both as lectures and published articles. Many are listed in the present bibliography but, in case of differing conclusions or information presented, the present volume now supersedes them.

In the seventy years since *Aegyptiaca* appeared,

the quantity of objects has more than quadrupled Pendlebury's corpus. Additionally, some of the artefacts listed by him as Egyptian are no longer regarded as imports, now being considered derivations, imports from elsewhere or of entirely Minoan conception.¹⁷ Much of his basic data and many of his conclusions have since been questioned or invalidated by further excavation and research. The greater knowledge and sharper focus inevitably accumulated in the past seventy-five years of scholarship have provided a basis both for re-evaluating Pendlebury's work and updating his corpus, and for employing this data to ask new questions of the material.¹⁸

This also is true for my own research in its various stages. I have decided, after much thought, to include all the material discussed in my thesis whether or not the object still remains identified as Egyptian or 'egyptianising' in origin, or even of Bronze Age date. Thus, objects now known to have alternative origins are included, as are others published elsewhere since it was completed. This is chiefly because I feel that their proper identification should be published in order to set the record straight.

The objects listed are available to me for inclusion, either because the relevant scholar has generously allowed me to do so, or because the object is at least *mentioned* in publication and thus is accessible for similar mention in the present catalogue. Other material, although known to me, is not included for reasons of scholarly etiquette. I have been told, for example, that there are as many *unpublished* as published scarabs in some museum collections, to which I have no access. Under these circumstances and with such a small quantity of material available, conclusions based on statistics are useless. The overwhelming hegemony of Knossos for most object types – 196 of 612, or nearly one third of the total number of catalogued items – is due at least partially to the number of relevant objects from that site available for the catalogue. Fragments of recognisably relevant stone vessels from certain excavations at Knossos, for example, are more intensively published than others there and elsewhere, simply due to the fact that Peter Warren was involved in the excavation and, as the authority on the subject of stone vessels, has published the fragments.

¹⁶ BRANIGAN 1968, WARREN 1980, CADOGAN 1983, and WARREN and HANKEY 1989 are some examples, as is the present study. Chronological issues are discussed elsewhere; see Chapter 3.

¹⁷ See Concordance VIII for objects in Pendlebury's catalogue discussed in the present study.

¹⁸ Some of these questions, and suggestions for further research, are outlined in WARREN 1985b.