



The Mycenae Siege Rhyton and the Question of Egyptian Influence

Author(s): J. T. Hooker

Source: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 71, No. 3 (Jul., 1967), pp. 269-281

Published by: Archaeological Institute of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/501560>

Accessed: 06/07/2010 03:02

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://dv1litvip.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aia>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

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.



Archaeological Institute of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Archaeology*.

<http://dv1litvip.jstor.org>

The Mycenae Siege Rhyton and the Question of Egyptian Influence*

J. T. HOOKER

The silver rhyton engraved with a warlike scene¹ (Karo's no. 481), from Shaft Grave IV at Mycenae, presents so many interesting features that we cannot be surprised at the number of discussions it has provoked. The latest, and one of the most important, is contained in Smith's *Interconnections*, especially pp. 65-68. The identification of the place and the groups of people represented on the rhyton is only the first point to be considered; we may go on to wonder whether, in the light of our answers to this question, it is possible to deduce anything about the cultural contacts of the Mycenaeans in the Shaft Grave era; finally, the unique character of the representation is noted, standing as it does at the head of the tradition of narrative art in mainland Greece and lacking any close parallel among the Shaft Grave treasures. The present study is concerned with some of these wider problems, notably the source of the immense wealth contained in some of the Shaft Graves and the nature of Mycenaean intercourse with other Mediterranean peoples. Although the rhyton is thus only the starting-point for discussion, a brief description of it is given here together with a few comments: for details see Karo, pp. 106-108, and for a good drawing Vermeule, *GBA* pl. xiv. Of the rhyton itself only a few fragments survive. The largest of these shows four olive trees to the left,

while to the right towers rise on a steep slope, with several women gesticulating on the battlements. A battle is in progress on the slope: warriors are defending the fortress with slings and cross-bows. Their hair is dressed in a kind of "crew-cut," and they are all naked except two figures on the extreme right, who appear to be in command and wear short, stiff cloaks (unless these are shields²). Their antagonists are not visible on this fragment, but at the lower edge can be seen the upper part of a man: he is wearing a helmet with a flowing plume and a short-sleeved chiton, and he is apparently punting a boat to the left—the boat itself has not survived. Four boar's tusk helmets belong, presumably, to occupants of the boat. The smaller fragments have been discussed by Staïs:³ one of these shows another part of the fortified towers with a man whose hair resembles that of the warriors on the slope (the Minoan character of the towers is further emphasized by the presence of horns of consecration); on a second fragment six naked figures are seen, perhaps swimming in the water; still other fragments are engraved with a pattern representing shallow water and a rocky seabed.

Widely differing interpretations have been placed upon these fragments, but at least it is agreed that the conventions of drawing show the rhyton to be

*I am very grateful to Miss J. A. Jastram and Professor T. B. L. Webster for making many improvements to this paper.

¹ The following abbreviations have been used:
CMS. *Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel I* (ed. Agnes Sakellariou) (1964).
Evans, *PM* I, II, III, IV. A. J. Evans, *The Palace of Minos at Knossos* I (1921), II (1928), III (1930), IV (1935).
Furumark, *Chron.* A. Furumark, *The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery* (1941).
Furumark, *Ialysos*. "The Settlement at Ialysos and Aegean History c. 1550-1400," *OpusArch* 6 (1950) 150-271.
Furumark, *MP.* *The Mycenaean Pottery* (1941).
Karo. G. Karo, *Die Schachtgräber von Mykenai* (1930).
Lorimer, *HM.* Hilda L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* (1950).
Persson, *NT.* A. W. Persson, *New Tombs at Dendra* (1942).
Persson, *RT.* *Royal Tombs at Dendra* (1931).
Schachermeyr, *Ereignisse*. F. Schachermeyr, "Welche geschicht-

lichen Ereignisse führten zur Entstehung der mykenischen Kultur?" *AO* 17 (1949) 331-350.

Schachermeyr, *Kultur.* *Die minoische Kultur des alten Kreta* (1964).

Schachermeyr, *Streitwagen*. "Streitwagen und Streitwagenbild im Alten Orient und bei den mykenischen Griechen," *Anthropos* 46 (1951) 705-753.

Smith, *Interconnections*. W. Stevenson Smith, *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East* (1965).

Snijder, *KK.* G. A. S. Snijder, *Kretische Kunst* (1936).

Vermeule, *GBA.* Emily Vermeule, *Greece in the Bronze Age* (1964).

² Karo, p. 107, dismisses too brusquely the suggestion that they may be shields; they certainly resemble the shields worn by a helmeted warrior on the gold ring from the same Shaft Grave, Karo's no. 241 = *CMS* no. 16.

³ "Das silberne Rhyton des vierten Grabes der Burg von Mykenai," *AthMitt* 40 (1915) 45-52, 112; esp. 46-47.

a product of Cretan art.⁴ One very common explanation of the scene must be treated with great reserve: namely, that an episode of a *siege* is being depicted. In fact, the vessel is often referred to as the Siege Rhyton or Rhyton with Siege Scene. Some scholars, following Evans, have related the architectural features shown on the rhyton with the towers and houses of a fortified city on the Town Mosaic from Knossos.⁵ It is to be noted, however, that Evans produces no real evidence (except from analogies) for his assertion that the fragments of this mosaic depict a siege scene; still less are we obliged to regard warriors hurling javelins on two fragments of the Miniature Frescoes⁶ as inevitably connected with a siege. Turning to the rhyton itself, we find nothing which necessarily points to a siege—rather, the arrival of warriors by sea (an event which the artist seems to have placed in juxtaposition with the fight on the slope) suggests a sudden landing by pirates and a hastily organized defense. This was Reichel's view (followed by Staïs, *op.cit.* supra n. 3, 48), and it seems to me preferable to the one more generally accepted. Evans thought the artist was representing an attack by barbarians on a civilized settlement, shown by the architecture to be a Minoan outpost; although the colony is Minoan, its defenders are clearly not Minoans, and they are receiving reinforcements from a body of men arriving by sea.⁷ According to Marinatos, on the other hand, the men coming up by sea are "Creto-Mycenaeans" who have tried to disembark warriors for the siege of the city; they are being attacked by native barbarians and are forced to make their escape by sea.⁸ If a scene can be interpreted in two such different ways, it is clearly not going to be easy to arrive at its meaning with any certainty; but I believe one fact should be emphasized before an attempt at interpretation is made. Three distinct ethnic groups are represented on the rhyton, and it is difficult to reconcile this fact with any of the suggestions so far offered. In the first place, the women on the battlements must be Minoans, as Evans recognized: their style of dress⁹ and, even

more, the architectural features of the towers (closely paralleled in Cretan art¹⁰) lead irresistibly to this conclusion. The identification of the "occupants of the boat" as mainland Greeks seems equally secure, in view of the chiton (a non-Minoan feature¹¹) and especially of the helmets: the plumed type of helmet is closely similar to those worn by the warriors on the gold ring, Karo's no. 241, while plates of boar's tusk for the construction of the second type also come from Grave IV (Karo's nos. 521-531). Finally, the warriors on the slope can be neither Minoans nor Mycenaeans because of their naked appearance, their close-cropped hair,¹² and above all their weapons. Slings were not used by Cretans or by mainlanders so far as we know, and, to judge from the monuments, the use of bows and arrows seems to have been confined to hunting¹³—although no doubt the archers among the Homeric heroes are remembered from Mycenaean times.¹⁴ I think the interpretations of Evans and Marinatos fail to give a satisfactory account of the picture because they have allowed the distinction between the three groups to become blurred. Evans' description of a barbarian assault on a civilized settlement lacks confirmation, since we cannot identify the opponents of the naked warriors. Judging from the extant fragments alone, we have to say that the barbarians are defending, not attacking, the Minoan settlement. The further assumption is that this colony is in Asia Minor, which would provide a suitable locale for the employment of the weapons already mentioned. The fact that no fortified Minoan city of the type depicted has yet been found in Asia Minor, or indeed anywhere else, throws doubt on the whole theory, quite apart from the very dubious construction placed on the role of the Mycenaeans arriving by sea. If Evans attaches too much importance to the Minoan character of the fortress, Marinatos does not make sufficient allowance for it. His suggestion that a "Creto-Mycenaean" force is making an attack on a city is not consistent with the fact that the city is, to all appearance, a Minoan one; the issue is further confused by calling the

⁴ Cf. Marinatos, *Néa éρμενεύει τοῦ ἀργυροῦ ῥυτοῦ τῶν Μυκηνηῶν*, *ArchDelt* 10 (1926) 78-90 (p. 85); V. Müller, *Jdl* 40 (1925) 114-115; Staïs, *op.cit.* (supra n. 3) 49-51.

⁵ *PM* I 301-314. Cf. Smith, *Interconnections* 42, 67.

⁶ *PM* III 82 fig. 45. ⁷ *PM* III 89-99.

⁸ *Op.cit.* (supra n. 4) 84-85.

⁹ *PM* III 94.

¹⁰ *PM* III 86 fig. 48a.

¹¹ A chiton is worn also by soldiers on a fresco fragment from Tiryns; Rodenwaldt, *Tiryns* II (1912) pl. i:6.

¹² The suggestion of Hall, *JHS* 31 (1911) 120, that the warriors are wearing feather headdresses, has not won general acceptance; but he is probably right in placing them in Anatolia.

¹³ Buchholz, *Jdl* 77 (1962) 1; Lorimer, *HM* 276-279.

¹⁴ Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (1959) 278; Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (1964²) 104-105.

men Creto-Mycenaeans—they are Mycenaeans, for reasons given above. It remains just possible that Smith is correct in thinking the naked defenders are on the same side as the men in the boat.¹⁵ In that case, the Mycenaeans would be landing to give aid to a Minoan outpost against a barbarian attack. This view, however, gives rise to some difficulties. As with the Evans theory, we cannot be sure that the attackers *are* barbarians, and the fact that no actual example of a fortified Minoan outpost has ever come to light remains an objection. In any case, there seem to be no sure indications of a Minoan-Mycenaeon “alliance” of the kind postulated by Smith.

Unless part of the rhyton now lost contained some vital clue to the meaning of our large fragment, it must be allowed that it is simply not possible to reconcile the three ethnic elements in the same scene. In other words, no actual historical event is being depicted here, or at least none in the recent, well-remembered past; rather, the rhyton illustrates a legendary battle set, in all likelihood, in Anatolia. I therefore think Marinatos’ conclusion correct,¹⁶ even though I cannot agree with some of his arguments. So far as I can see, it is only by denying the historicity of the scene that we can explain the defense of a Minoan citadel by barbarian warriors. The striking appearance of these men, so different from anything known in Aegean art, and the outlandish weapons they use may have been important features of a legend or, possibly, details of a remote historical event that were still remembered. The actual construction of the city, however, was not of such moment in the story or was not so clearly remembered, with the result that when the Cretan artist came to engrave the scene he simply followed the conventions already established at Knossos for representing a citadel. In her *GBA*, Mrs. Vermeule takes a somewhat similar view: she too rejects the interpretation of the rhyton as a historical document and sees it as an expression of “a generalized tradition of battle imagery which may be attached to different historical events through succeeding generations” (p. 102).

The Siege Rhyton was found in one of the rich-

est of the graves, and it raises in an acute form the question of the provenience of the Shaft Grave treasures. In an eloquent passage of his *Schachtgräber*, pp. 341-342, Karo refuted the view that the Minoan appearance of many objects in the graves points to the occupation of Mycenae by a conquering Cretan dynasty. Actual Cretan imports are found only rarely in the graves, while the small number of religious monuments from the mainland at this time contrasts with the situation in Crete. The gold masks, which form such a striking part of the furniture of the Shaft Graves, have only remote parallels in Crete (Karo, p. 180). Some of the gold cups, notably nos. 220 and 627, are coarse local work of “Minyan” shape. The great Lion’s Head Rhyton in gold plate from Grave IV (no. 273) gives an impression of brutal strength very different from the representation of lions in Cretan art.¹⁷ The Yellow Minyan and matt-painted pottery has no Cretan connections but continues a long-established native ceramic tradition; despite the mainlanders’ associations with Crete, and the undoubtedly strong Cretan influence on some schools of mainland pottery manufacture, pure Middle Helladic pottery remains in use throughout the Shaft Grave era, and is found in the latest grave as well as in the earliest. The engraved stelae found over some of the graves suggest a similar conclusion. Monumental work of this kind, decorated in low relief, is quite alien to Crete; but the situation is complicated by the fact that the later stelae bear decorative motifs derived from Cretan art.¹⁸

Evans had found the strongest support for his theory of a Cretan conquest in the coincidence of the very rich offerings in the Shaft Graves and the beginning of Cretan influence on the mainland. The coincidence remained, and called for *some* explanation. Karo explained the apparently sudden accession of wealth, as well as the heterogeneous nature of the Shaft Grave treasures, by supposing that many of the objects found in the graves were plundered from Crete by raiders from the mainland who took advantage of the devastation caused by earthquakes toward the end of the Middle Minoan period.¹⁹ In Karo’s view, many works of

there is nothing that points to an incursion from outside. This is one of the facts which have to be kept in mind when evaluating the suggestion that in the Shaft Grave era the lords of Mycenae pursued a policy of military aggrandizement overseas. Rodenwaldt considered the Siege Rhyton itself an illustration of the “warlike expansion” of Mycenae at this period, *op.cit.*

¹⁵ *Interconnections* 68.

¹⁶ *Op.cit.* (supra n. 4) 89-90.

¹⁷ Snijder, *KK* 118.

¹⁸ Heurtley, *BSA* 25 (1921-1923) 144-146.

¹⁹ For the documentation, see *PM* II 287-289. The Temple Repositories do show signs of plundering, pp. 288-289, but

art in the graves which are Minoan in style and technique but Mycenaean in subject matter were produced by Cretan craftsmen, captured during the raids and set to work on the mainland as slaves. This theory appeared the more plausible because, so far as was known, the lords of Mycenae were lacking in natural resources and so could not have acquired their wealth by way of trade. Willamowitz thought this proposition so self-evident that he was content to assert it without argument or proof,²⁰ while Schachermeyr considered any other explanation impossible.²¹

Later discoveries must necessarily modify Karo's conceptions about the rise of Cretan influence on the mainland. The Middle Helladic people were not quite so isolated from the rest of the Mediterranean as has sometimes been supposed. Middle Helladic pottery has been found in Sicily and the Aeolian Islands, giving way to Mycenaean I and II types and suggesting that even at this early period the Greek mainland had some interest in seaborne trade.²² The presence of Minyan pottery in the Cyclades testifies to mainland trade in that direction also.²³ It is possible that Phylakopi, in particular, was in some sense a meeting-place of mainland and Cretan traders.²⁴ It now appears from other evidence as well that there was some intercourse between the mainland and Crete long before the mature Shaft Grave era, and this fact militates against the assumption that the growth of royal power at Mycenae was connected with the plunder of treasures from Crete. The Shaft Graves may represent, rather, an intensification of commerce with Crete, of which there is slight, but not negligible, evidence in the Middle Helladic period.

Although mainland pottery in Middle Helladic contexts shows little sign of contact with Crete,²⁵ there may have been scattered Cretan settlements on the mainland even in Middle Helladic times.²⁶

The discovery of a second group of graves at Mycenae abutting on, and rather earlier than, Schliemann's Grave Circle is of great interest in a discussion of the affinities of the grave-goods. In this second Grave Circle, known as B to distinguish it from the A tombs excavated by Schliemann, a large number of burial-offerings was found, but little sign of the massive deposits that characterize some of the graves of Circle A. In details of construction, however, the graves of the two circles are similar, and there is no essential difference between the grave-gifts found in B and those from A. Some of the objects in B, indeed, have close analogues in A, as may be seen from Table 1.²⁷

It may be noted further that the stele associated with Grave Gamma belongs to a well-recognized class which includes the stelae found over Graves II and V in Circle A.²⁸ The pottery of Circle B can be assigned safely to Middle Helladic, though in some cases to very late Middle Helladic. The typical ceramic shape is that of the Minyan stemmed goblet, which has nothing to do with Crete,²⁹ while the dark-on-light decoration of some of the vessels so far illustrated by Mylonas has parallels on Middle Helladic matt-painted ware from Korakou.³⁰ The pottery, then, gives no evidence of direct contact with Crete; on the other hand, there are signs of strong influence from the Cyclades.³¹ These Cycladic connections are doubly important. They confirm the probability, suggested

(supra n. 11) 203 n. 2. He thought that the scene on the rhyton depicts an expedition of the prince, in whose tomb it was found, against a foreign city. While the warlike interests of the Shaft Grave princes are undeniable, there is no evidence that they ever embarked on schemes of foreign conquest; nor is there any parallel at Mycenae for an attempt by a prince to immortalize his exploits in the way suggested.

²⁰ *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I (1931) 57-58.

²¹ *Ereignisse* 338. It must be said in fairness that Schachermeyr's later statements, at *Kultur*, pp. 93-94, and *Gnomon* 38 (1966) 483, are less dogmatic.

²² Taylour, *Mycenaean Pottery in Italy* (1958) 182.

²³ Cf. Dawkins and Droop, *BSA* 17 (1910-1911) 16-18.

²⁴ Scholes, "The Cyclades in the Later Bronze Age," *BSA* 51 (1956) 9-40.

²⁵ Furumark, *MP* 229. But see Blegen, *Korakou* (1921) 32, and Caskey, *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 299.

²⁶ Blegen, *Hesperia* 23 (1954) 158-162.

²⁷ The statements about Circle B are made on the authority of Mylonas, *Ancient Mycenae* (1957) 128-175; the same author's

monograph, *Grave Circle B of Mycenae* (1964), and *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age* (1966) add nothing fresh. The striking continuity of burial customs shown by the two Circles proves that it is quite wrong to speak of "a sharp contrast in burial rites" between Middle and Late Helladic, as Palmer continues to do in *Mycenaeans and Minoans* (1965²) 350. In his discussion of Circle B, Mylonas gives a clear picture of a grave circle in continuous use over a long period, with the bodies interred in different types of tombs. See further Mylonas, *Hesperia* 31 (1962) 296-299. Even before the discovery of Circle B, there were strong reasons for believing in the continuity of burial customs at Mycenae; see especially Blegen and Wace, *SymbOslo* 9 (1930) 32. R. J. Buck, *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 207, emphasizes that the transition between MH and LH is not marked by any cultural break.

²⁸ Heurtley, *op.cit.* (supra n. 18) 128-132.

²⁹ Furumark, *MP* 56-57.

³⁰ Blegen, *Korakou*, figs. 27, 34, 35, 36.

³¹ Scholes, *op.cit.* (supra n. 24) 38.

TABLE I

Object	Circle B	Circle A
Swords of Karo's Type A	Delta	IV, V
Arrangement of bronze jug within crater	Epsilon	IV
Ivory pommel on swords	Delta, Iota, Nu	IV
Ribbed cup with high-flung handle	Iota (silver)	IV (gold)
Bronze pins with rock-crystal heads	Omicron, Upsilon	III
Full-bellied jug with spiral decoration	Gamma	I
Masks	Gamma (electron)	IV, V (gold)
Engraved gems	Gamma, Mu	III
Gold ornaments	Alpha, Gamma, Epsilon, Iota, Lambda, Nu, Xi, Omicron, Upsilon	I, III, IV, V

above, that mainlanders were already in contact with Cretans in some parts of the Aegean at least, for by the time that Cycladic influences are seen on the pottery of Circle B at Mycenae a Cretan colony had been established at Phylakopi. In the second place, the links with the Cyclades are continued in Circle A: a number of the matt-painted vessels in Grave VI are assigned by Karo to the Cyclades (though not to Thera or Melos) (p. 254). Insofar as the pottery of Circle A points to trade or other contacts with the Cyclades, these contacts seem to indicate continuance of the intercourse of the preceding period rather than a sudden commercial expansion. Even more significant are the swords found in some of the graves of Circle B. The sword-shapes of Circle A were broadly divided by Karo into Types A and B (p. 201); and the same two types are found in Grave Circle B, especially in Tomb Delta. No examples of Type B have come from Crete as early as the Shaft Graves, but Type A is present there,³² and there seems little doubt that it originated in Crete.³³

Karo's theory may now be considered in the light of these antecedents. It is of course perfectly possible that some of the precious objects in the Shaft Graves are the proceeds of loot, but it must be repeated that there is no trace in Crete of any incursion from the mainland. I suggest, however, that the Karo theory does not provide a complete

explanation. Unfortunately, many of the objects themselves tell us little about the circumstances in which they were made. Such splendid artefacts as the inlaid dagger-blades (especially nos. 394, 395, 396, 764, 765) are thought to have been produced by Cretan craftsmen working to the order of Mycenaean princes, but it cannot possibly be inferred whether the craftsmen were slaves or members of a guild who had come to the mainland of their own free will. For the most part, we must be content to say that this kind of Minoan-Mycenaean work is found side by side with objects of purely native type. An examination of the pottery, based mainly on Karo's own account (pp. 252-258), may be of greater value. Table 2 gives a conspectus of the ceramic material, following Karo's numeration and his chronological order of the graves.³⁴

Thus, in addition to a solitary Cretan import and a number of vessels (some of excellent workmanship) rooted in Helladic tradition, there is pottery of a new style, Mycenaean I, created on the mainland in imitation of Minoan models.³⁵ From a chronological point of view, the three crucial pots in the Shaft Graves are no. 956 from Grave VI, no. 221 from II, no. 197 from I. Karo, p. 254, sees in no. 956 the very beginning of Minoan influence, an impression confirmed by the red-and-white decoration on this vessel, since only the earliest

³² *PM* IV 846 with suppl. pl. lxxviii.

³³ Cf. Nancy K. Sandars, *AJA* 65 (1961) 25.

³⁴ No differentiation is made here between the first and the

second deposition in Grave VI; Furumark, *Chron* 46.

³⁵ Furumark, *MP* 477.

TABLE 2

Grave	Myc. I pottery	Imported Minoan pottery	MH pottery (Yellow Minyan) ³⁶	MH pottery (matt-painted) ³⁸
VI	941 943? 944 945 954? 956		942 955	946-951 953
II		221		222
IV			590 611-615	591
V	856			857 858
III	156			
I	190-192 194- 197 199			198 200 ³⁷

Late Minoan I pottery has details painted in red.³⁸ Next in Karo's system comes no. 221, the import from Crete, which likewise belongs to a very early phase of LM Ia; Karo however puts it later than no. 956, presumably because two graves cannot be contemporaneous and because, early as the decoration of no. 221 shows it to be, it cannot antedate no. 956. Finally, no. 197, with its floral and marine motifs, is held to be an imitation of a late stage of LM I (Karo, p. 256). If the chronological sequence is soundly based,³⁹ the Shaft Graves of Circle A span the ceramic period lasting from late MM IIIb to early LM Ib, with the massive deposits in IV and V coming somewhere in the middle of the series. It is this *gradual* development that argues against the explanation of the Shaft Grave treasures as the proceeds of plunder. Examination of the pottery leads to the conclusion that, while the native ceramic tradition retained its full vigor, some mainland craftsmen were beginning to imitate (not always with great success) the decorative patterns of the MM III and LM I repertory. The appearance of a new pottery style, arising from a fusion of Helladic and Minoan elements, is not easy to reconcile with the suggested presence of Cretan slaves on the mainland. They would have been much more likely to go on making pottery in the traditional Minoan style than to attempt the very uneasy compromise represented by much of the Mycenaean I ware in the Shaft Graves. On the other hand, if the "slaves" had been set to work to adapt Minoan decoration to

Helladic shapes, workmanship of a higher order would be expected. When all the obvious differences between pottery manufacture and the production of the other artefacts are allowed for, it remains true that in the one field where external tests can be applied both looting from Crete and manufacture by Cretan slaves seem to be ruled out. The most probable explanation of the origin of Mycenaean I pottery is that it was made by mainlanders who had not yet mastered the techniques of the new style; these techniques must have been learned from Minoan craftsmen who, had they been slaves, would have been ordered to make the required pots themselves. It may be suggested, therefore, that, at least in respect to pottery manufacture, there was some degree of peaceful contact between Cretans and mainlanders in the Shaft Grave era, although we cannot tell if such contact was confined to the migration of guilds of Minoan craftsmen to the mainland.⁴⁰

The theory of plunder may perhaps explain the wealth and promiscuous nature of the Shaft Grave treasures; what it cannot explain are the traces of a gradual development of mainland art within Grave Circle A itself. Another very serious objection to the theory becomes evident as soon as the phenomena of the Shaft Graves are compared with the history of the subsequent period. There would be no reason to expect continuation of the Cretan traits seen in the Shaft Graves if these had resulted merely from plundering raids by Mycenaean princes. The well-known fact is that influences from

³⁶ For the classification of these wares, see Wace and Blegen, *BSA* 22 (1916-1918) 175-189, and Buck, *Hesperia* 33 (1964) 231-313.

³⁷ Unless this belongs to Grave II.

³⁸ Cf. *PM* I 611.

³⁹ See Popham, *AJA* 68 (1964) 349-354, against Levi, *Parola del Passato* 17 (1962) 219-222, and 19 (1964) 161-163.

⁴⁰ Cf. Furumark, *Ialysos* 251-252.

Crete not only continue but become overwhelmingly strong in the two generations or so after the Shaft Grave era.⁴¹ A "Mycenaean" culture, combining Helladic and Minoan features, now penetrates parts of Greece outside the Argolid.⁴² The mainland artists who initiated the Mycenaean I pottery style borrowed only a few conventional motifs from the MM III-LM I repertory; but in Mycenaean IIa a large number of motifs are completely assimilated, and marine and plant life is depicted with greater fidelity to nature than at any earlier or later time on Mycenaean pottery. We may infer from the expert use of the marine and plant styles, as well as from much other evidence, that the period following the Shaft Graves marks the culmination of Minoan influence on the mainland. The tholoi at Rutsi and Vaphio give some indication of the flourishing state of Mycenaean culture and the depth of Minoan penetration in this later period. In the second tomb at Rutsi were found two very fine inlaid daggers of the same style and technique as those in the Mycenaean Shaft Graves: one shows leopards stalking their prey, a reminiscence of no. 765 from Shaft Grave V.⁴³ The development of miniature arts within the period is illustrated by the seals and rings from Rutsi and Vaphio.⁴⁴ In contradistinction to the situation in the Shaft Graves, the subsequent period sees explicit statements in visual form of Minoan cults, suggesting that these were by now well known on the mainland, even if not actually practiced there.⁴⁵ A number of fresco fragments have survived from the early palaces at Tiryns, Orchomenos, and Mycenae: these are thoroughly Minoan in style and technique, but in subject matter they correspond more closely to mainland taste. Rodenwaldt considered that the earliest paintings in all three palaces were executed by Cretan artists.⁴⁶ More recently, Miss Reusch has shown the very close connection between the frieze of women in the Theban Cadmeion and the school of Minoan

fresco-painting which produced the "Ladies in Blue" at Knossos.⁴⁷ The evidence from the palace frescoes confirms that of the other arts: even from the sparse remnants left to us, we can deduce a blending of the Helladic and the Minoan in which neither is completely dominant.

The history of the mainland subsequent to the Shaft Grave era can be explained only on the supposition of a long period of peaceful intercourse between Mycenaeans and Cretans. Again there is no sign of an invasion of Crete from the mainland, and the circumstances in which Minoan traits manifest themselves in Greece preclude any theory of plunder. On the other hand, there seems no reason to suppose that the Mycenaeans had greater resources at their disposal than at the time of the Shaft Graves. Of the scholars who believe that the plunder theory explains the treasures in the Shaft Graves, Miss Lorimer is the only one, so far as I know, who has tried to resolve the difficulties which arise when the Shaft Graves are compared with phenomena of the subsequent period. She writes: "Plausible, however, as the explanation is [namely that the Shaft Grave treasures are the result of plunder], it does not account for the spread of Minoan influence in Greece in the period which immediately succeeds that of the Shaft Graves, even allowing for the extraordinarily quick recovery achieved by Knossos. It is conceivable that large numbers of wealthy Knossians, warned perhaps by preliminary earth tremors, escaped to Greece, taking as much as possible of their portable property with them; in such circumstances they might be able to purchase permission to settle. Artists and craftsmen might follow, bringing the implements of their callings" (*HM*, p. 19). In this way, *two* hypotheses become necessary to explain the Cretan influences in the Shaft Graves and those which appear just after the Shaft Grave period: the second hypothesis is, moreover, rather involved. I shall try to show below that it is much simpler to

but it is not possible to say whether they were produced locally or were imported from Crete. The gold cups from Vaphio, Tsountas, pl. 9, are well within the tradition of Cretan art; cf. now the bull scene from Katsambas, *ILN* (14th Aug. 1965) 32-33.

⁴⁵ Compare especially: *CMS* no. 17 (Mycenae); no. 179 (Tiryns); nos. 219, 220, 221, 223, 225, 226, 231, 232 (Vaphio); no. 279 (Rutsi); no. 292 (Pylos).

⁴⁶ *Op.cit.* (supra n. 11) 202.

⁴⁷ *Die zeichnerische Rekonstruktion des Frauenfrieses im böotischen Theben* (1956) 45-52. Cf. Smith, *Interconnections* 86-87.

⁴¹ For a recent survey, see Vermeule, *GBA* 112-136.

⁴² In Messenia, tholoi at Kakovatos and Rutsi have yielded especially important examples of Furumark's Mycenaean IIa pottery style, which is very close to LM Ib but is not identical with it; *MP*, 477-486. In the opposite direction, a tholos with Mycenaean IIa pottery has been excavated at Thorikos; Staïs, *ArchEph* (1895) coll. 221-234, and Servais, *AntCl* 34 (1965) 9-15.

⁴³ *ILN* (6th Apr. 1957) 541. Cf. Blegen, *Prosymna* (1937) 332.

⁴⁴ Many of the seals and rings in the Vaphio tholos illustrated by Tsountas, *ArchEph* (1889) pl. 10, have a strong affinity with Cretan glyptic in both style and subject matter,

work with one explanation, whereby the Shaft Grave era and the period immediately following it are seen as one historical unit, throughout which trade relations with Crete (and with other areas) were gradually developed. Meanwhile, it may be useful to compare the situation in Greece at the time of the Shaft Graves with the situation at the end of the fifteenth century. In an interesting passage of his *Ialysos*, pp. 264-265, Furumark points to the significance of the rich mainland tombs containing Mycenaean IIIa1 pottery.⁴⁸ The impact of Crete on the mainland at the end of the fifteenth century is quite different in character from the Minoan influences at work in the Shaft Graves. In the latter, as we have seen, the influence from Crete became gradually stronger over a long period and was moreover the prelude to a phase of Greek history in which intercourse between Crete and the mainland was extremely close. On the other hand, Crete imports and signs of Cretan influence appear quite suddenly in the mainland tombs of the early fourteenth century, but these Cretan traits rapidly die out, leaving the arts and practices of the mainland to develop along independent lines.⁴⁹

An alternative explanation of the origin of the Shaft Grave treasures remains to be discussed. The classic statement of this second theory is found in Persson's *NT*, pp. 178-196. The theory has been accepted and extended by Marinatos in a number of publications which will be considered shortly; more qualified support has come from Schachermeyr. According to Persson's theory, princes from the Greek mainland led forces of mercenaries to assist the Egyptians in the expulsion of the Hyksos early in the sixteenth century. After the Hyksos had been driven out, the Egyptian king rewarded the Greeks with gifts of precious metals: these were taken back to Mycenae and were used by Cretan and Helladic craftsmen to make the gold and silver objects ultimately placed in the Shaft Graves as burial offerings. On their expedition to

Egypt, the mainlanders could well have seen horses and chariots for the first time, which they later depicted on the stelae associated with Grave V. The evidence adduced in support of this theory falls into three classes. First, and most important, some of the objects in the Shaft Graves are regarded as actual imports from Egypt, while others betray so strong an Egyptian influence as to argue close connections with Egypt in the Shaft Grave period. In the second place, the word *Hau-nebwet*, referred to in Egyptian texts from the IV Dynasty onward, is taken to mean "inhabitants of the Greek mainland." Lastly, the Greek legend of Danaos is considered to enshrine a reminiscence of dynastic relationships between Egypt and Greece at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age.

In her *GBA*, p. 109, Mrs. Vermeule has dismissed the "Egyptian" theory as entirely without foundation. I agree so completely with her judgment that I wish it could be allowed to die a natural death. Unfortunately, however, writers on Mycenaean history still sometimes refer to the theory as if it were a proved and generally accepted account of Egyptian-Mycenaean relations at the time of the Shaft Graves, and an inquiry into its basis may therefore be of some use. It is better to deal first with the questions of *Hau-nebwet* and Danaos, and then to examine some of the objects from the Shaft Graves themselves.

There is no evidence that Egyptians of the Dynastic period understood anything by *Hau-nebwet* other than "the islands of the Mediterranean" or sometimes, perhaps, the people living there.⁵⁰ The sole reason for identifying the word with mainland Greece⁵¹ is that it bears this meaning in Ptolemaic administrative texts,⁵² the writers of which were not always well acquainted with the meaning of ancient geographical terms; for this term *is* ancient, and ought for that very reason to be treated with the greater suspicion: there is no guarantee that a geographical term which remained in use for nearly three thousand years kept

⁴⁸ Especially the tholoi at Berbati, Dendra, and Tragana and the chamber tombs at Dendra and Athens. Renewed influences from Crete are seen on some pithoid jars at Berbati and Asine; see, respectively, Säflund, *Excavations at Berbati* (1965) 45-46 fig. 29, and Frödin and Persson, *Asine* (1938) 378 fig. 248:1; 419-420 fig. 272. Some of the finds from the Dendra tholoi bear unmistakable traces of Cretan workmanship. The great gold cup is dated by its excavator to ca. 1500. He thinks it is part of the king's share of loot plundered from Crete in an expedition of ca. 1400, just after the fall of Knossos; Persson, *RT* 43-46. See also *RT* 54.

⁴⁹ Fresco painting: Snijder, *KK* 127. Pottery: Furumark, *MP* 521, 540; Mackeprang, *AJA* 42 (1938) 538-546; Snijder, *KK* 123-126; Vermeule, *GBA* 203-206. Seal engraving: Kenna, *AA* (1964) col. 943; Agnes Sakellariou, *Die mykenische Siegelglyptik* (1964) 7; *Μυκηναϊκή Σφραγιδογλυφία* (1966) 112-118.

⁵⁰ Cf. Vercoutter, *Égyptiens et Préhellènes* (1954) 37-47.

⁵¹ It is worth remembering that Meyer, with no less confidence, identified *Hau-nebwet* with Crete; *Geschichte des Altertums* II, 1 (1953³) 54. Cf. Smith, *Interconnections* 28.

⁵² Cf. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica* I (1947) 208.

the same meaning throughout that time. More than a hundred instances of the word occur in Dynastic texts, but in none is there any indication that it refers even to a well-defined place.

The Danaos legend has equally little to contribute to the present discussion. It is probably never legitimate to relate legends and historical events in the Bronze Age, unless the events are well attested and the legends of unimpeachable antiquity. The Danaos legend cannot be so described. It is true that the prevailing version of the legend brings Danaos from Egypt to the Argolid. From the account in Apollodorus 2.1.4-5 it appears that Agenor and Belos were twin sons of Poseidon by Libye: Agenor went to Phoenicia, and his sons became the founders of dynasties. Belos remained in Egypt, where his sons Aigyptos and Danaos held sway over different parts of the country; after a quarrel between the brothers, Danaos built a boat and fled to Argos, where he displaced the ruling king Gelanor⁵³ and named the inhabitants Danaoi. We owe a rival version of the legend to the scholiast on Eur. *Hec.* 886. According to this, Danaos is a *Greek* king, who expels his brother Aigyptos from Argolis. It cannot be contended that this version is necessarily older than the one offered by Apollodorus,⁵⁴ but the very existence of such a version, which knows nothing of the coming of Danaos from Egypt, must be taken into account in assessing the worth of Apollodorus' narrative. Danaos is completely unknown to Homer, who however uses Danaoi beside Argeioi and Achaioi as a generic for the Greeks. Nor does Homer make any connection between the Danaoi and Argolis: there is even some reason to place the Danaoi in the north of Greece.⁵⁵ On the other hand, the tradition represented by the Euripides scholion makes no mention of Danaoi. Thus, Danaos and the Danaoi are never brought into explicit connection by any source with a claim to be considered old. Megas has argued very convincingly that in origin the Danaos

legend was only a fairy tale.⁵⁶ Why was the legend of Danaos and Aigyptos superimposed on this tale? The answer is plain when Apollodorus' account is seen as an attempt to bring into relationship the great peoples of the eastern Mediterranean: a connection is established not only between Greeks and Egyptians but between both peoples on the one hand and Phoenicians on the other, and, as so often happens, a god is brought in as grandfather of the principal heroes. The whole structure looks so much like an example of rationalization, the aetiology typical of the Greek and especially of the Hellenistic mind, that it is devoid of value as historical evidence.⁵⁷

A number of objects from the Shaft Graves have been thought to attest direct relations with Egypt. The difficulty is, as Furumark pointed out in *Ialysos*, p. 222, that whenever Egyptian traits appear in the Shaft Graves they are accompanied by Minoan features. This is only to be expected, in view of the powerful influence exerted on Minoan art by Egypt from MM II onward.⁵⁸ If Minoan motifs rendered in an Egyptian manner appeared in the Shaft Graves, it might be possible to argue that the mainlanders borrowed only their themes from Crete and then gave them a treatment which they had learned in Egypt. In fact, of course, the opposite is true: some subjects of Shaft Grave art may, others certainly do, derive from Egypt, but they are always rendered in a typically Minoan manner. The Siege Rhyton itself is claimed by Persson to support his theory of a Mycenaean expedition against the Hyksos.⁵⁹ He rightly observes that the type of fortification depicted on the rhyton cannot be paralleled at Troy or at any other site yet known in Crete or on the Greek mainland. It does not follow, however, that we must suppose the type of fortification which appears at Avaris in the Nile Delta. Even if my own tentative suggestions about the rhyton are not accepted, and the possibility is admitted that the scene is set in Egypt, Persson's theory seems to have met with a fatal

⁵³ No reason is forthcoming for this transfer of power or for Gelanor's acquiescence: the Greeks themselves were puzzled, if we may judge from the elaborate account in Pausanias 2.19.1-4.

⁵⁴ Nor is the reverse susceptible of proof. Wilamowitz, *Aischylos Interpretationen* (1914) 23 n. 1, cannot believe that the scholiast's account represents the oldest tradition because Aigyptos plays a leading part in the story; but this seems to beg the question, for if we *knew* what was expressed by the oldest tradition we should not be obliged to assess the respective merits of the different versions. Cf. also Deubner, *Philologus* 64 (1905) 489 n. 25.

⁵⁵ Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* (1923³) 282-283.

⁵⁶ "Die Sage von Danaos und den Danaiden," *Hermes* 68 (1933) 415-428.

⁵⁷ Kretschmer, *Glotta* 29 (1936) 15-37, discusses the possibility that the Danaos legend recalls the battle between Ramesses III and the Peoples of the Sea. Parallels between the legend and the Ugaritic story of Danel are treated by Astour, *Hellenosemitica* (1965) 71-80; but these do not quite prove that the legend "betrays its origin in the Semitic East" (p. 79).

⁵⁸ Cf. *PM*, index, s.v. "Egypt, connexions of, with Crete."

⁵⁹ *NT* 182-186.

objection in Schachermeyr's remark that the terrain of the Delta does not offer a steep slope near the sea.⁶⁰ In any case, the indisputably Minoan treatment of the theme makes its place of origin largely irrelevant for the present argument.

Persson sees in the wooden box with ivory dogs attached (Karo's no. 812 from Shaft Grave V) further evidence of direct relations with Egypt.⁶¹ But here also the workmanship is purely Minoan: that fact is made clear by Schweitzer, who however regards the theme as Egyptian.⁶² I myself see very little similarity between the type of dog commonly represented in Egyptian art (Schweitzer's figs. 2-4) and the creatures on the box from Mycenae. Not one of the salient features of the Egyptian dog (pointed head, long sharp ears, bushy tail) appears at Mycenae. If the parallelism were much closer, the Egyptian motif rendered in a Minoan manner would confirm the Cretan-Egyptian connection, but it would still provide no argument in favor of direct relations between the mainland and Egypt.

Persson mentions also the dagger-blade from the same grave (Karo's no. 765), pointing out that some of the motifs are borrowed from Egypt, especially the papyrus reeds growing along a river bank and the Egyptian wild cats stalking duck.⁶³ But we know that the motif of a cat stalking its prey had been taken over by Cretan artists at least as early as the Shaft Grave period, for it appears on one of the Knossos frescoes belonging to Evans' "transitional style";⁶⁴ even before that, the papyrus motif had been assimilated into Minoan art.⁶⁵

The silver pin with gold decoration, Karo's no. 75 from the Third Shaft Grave, raises problems of a different sort. A woman wearing a full "Minoan" skirt stands with her arms stretched out on either side; she is holding a double chain, which falls in a loop in front of her. The head of the figure is surmounted by an enormous double scroll, and above that are papyrus flowers, from which an elaborate threefold floral motif curves round to the woman's skirt. V. Müller argued that the pin represents a Minoan artist's interpretation, or

rather misinterpretation, of a motif familiar in Hittite art.⁶⁶ With admirable methodology, he pointed to the important part played by Babylonian and Hittite cylinder-seals in the cultural commerce from Asia Minor to the Aegean world (p. 155). Some of these cylinders depict a goddess with arms extended to the sides and two curving bands about the hips, while a kind of half-bow surmounts the whole design. Thus, all three main elements of the pin are found in Hittite art in the sixteenth century (p. 156). This observation is the more interesting because an Anatolian origin has been suggested for some of the numerous gold ornaments in the same grave.⁶⁷ Unfortunately, Marinatos' attempt to interpret the pin as the adaptation of an Egyptian allegory⁶⁸ seems too far-fetched to deserve serious consideration. Even if we grant Marinatos' premises, that Egypt more than any other land influenced the Minoan-Mycenaean civilization, and that the free adaptation and fusion of Egyptian motifs was a phenomenon typical of Aegean art and mentality (and these *are* acceptable, if we read "Minoan" for "Minoan-Mycenaean"), the difficulties inherent in a transfer of allegory of the kind postulated remain insuperable unless convincing parallels can be found. In fact, we are asked simply to take it on trust that Egyptian motifs like the *waz* sign, the bundle of lilies, and the papyrus ever had more than ornamental significance for the Cretans. If there were the slightest evidence of this, it would still be necessary to establish some connection between an Egyptian squatting god with his double *Kerbstock* and a Minoan standing goddess (if she is a goddess) holding a double chain.

Among the gold cups from Shaft Grave IV, Karo's no. 412 is of exceptional interest because of the birds on the handles.⁶⁹ These have often been taken to be doves, and if this identification were sure the motif would seem to derive from the eastern Mediterranean.⁷⁰ The birds, however, are not certainly doves, and they have been interpreted by Marinatos as falcons; he sees them as the royal birds of Egypt heraldically disposed

300.

⁶⁷ Cf. Akurgal, *Neuere Hethiterforschung* (*Historia Einzelschrift* 7) (1964) 75; Erlenmeyer, *Kadmos* 3 (1965) 177-178; Higgins, *Greek and Roman Jewellery* (1961) 69, 71, 72, 83.

⁶⁸ "Numerous years of joyful life" from Mycenae," *BSA* 46 (1951) 102-116.

⁶⁹ Furumark, *Eranos Rudbergianus* 45 (1946) 41-53; Karo, p. 100; Lorimer, *HM* 328-335; Parlasca, *Jdl* 78 (1963) 270-274.

⁷⁰ *HM* 329.

⁶⁰ *Ereignisse* 345. The warlike scene on another fragment from Shaft Grave IV, Karo's no. 605a, is also, apparently, set in a hilly landscape.

⁶¹ *NT* 179-181.

⁶² "Hunde auf dem Dach," *AthMitt* 55 (1930) 107-118.

⁶³ *NT* 178-179.

⁶⁴ *PM* I 538-541.

⁶⁵ Furumark, *MP* 138-140.

⁶⁶ "Die Ziernadel aus dem III. mykenischen Schachtgrab," *AthMitt* 43 (1918) 153-164. Cf. also K. Müller, *Jdl* 30 (1915)

on the cup, and the cup itself as a reward given by the Egyptian king to one of the Mycenaean mercenaries who had helped him in the campaign against the Hyksos.⁷¹ But the birds on the cup are not particularly close to the falcons which Marinatos illustrates from Egyptian art in his fig. 1; indeed it seems doubtful if they can be identified with sufficient certainty to allow such a far-reaching theory to be sustained. Nor can the crude workmanship and poor proportions of the cup be reconciled easily with the origin claimed for it by Marinatos.⁷²

Persson claims that Mycenaean mercenaries learned the use of the horse and chariot in Egypt, where also they saw stelae for the first time.⁷³ As stated above, we cannot yet assign a place of origin to the Shaft Grave stelae. In view of the stelae found in Circle B, however, the Mycenaeans seem to have used this kind of grave-marker before the postulated expedition to Egypt, for the earliest examples from this Circle surely antedate the expulsion of the Hyksos. It may well be idle to look outside Mycenae itself for the origin of the stelae, since a people capable of building and furnishing the Shaft Graves would certainly have had the capacity of commemorating the occupant of the tomb by erecting over it a rather crude slab of stone. No trace of Egyptian influence appears in the drawing conventions, and there is not much similarity between the stelae themselves and those found in Egypt.⁷⁴ The question of horses and chariots is more complicated, and reference must be made to Schachermeyr's *Streitwagen*. The war chariot made its appearance in western Anatolia during the first half of the second millennium, whence its use passed to the Hyksos, reaching the Egyptians just before 1570 (*Streitwagen*, 707-710). The question arises whether the Mycenaeans learned the use of the chariot directly from Asia Minor or by way of Egypt (p. 713). Next, Schachermeyr distinguishes three attitudes in which animals in motion are depicted in Aegean art: the *fliegende Galopp*, the *Aufsprunggalopp*, and the reverse of the latter, the *Absprunggalopp*. Apparently all three types are seen for the first time in the Aegean in Minoan art, but only in connection with wild creatures; the Cretans preferred to depict horses in chariot-scenes with all four hoofs on the ground. However, when the horse-drawn

chariot is represented on the Shaft Grave stelae, the horse is shown in the *Absprunggalopp* position. This convention, according to Schachermeyr, cannot have originated in Crete, in view of what has just been said, while Mycenae itself is ruled out as the place of origin by the fact that the *Absprunggalopp* is seen there only at the beginning of the Mycenaean period, after which it disappears. Nor can the motif of a horse in this attitude have come from Asia Minor, where it is not seen until after the end of the Shaft Grave era (pp. 730-738). Egypt alone is left; and in fact everything points to Egypt as the origin of the Mycenaean representations of war chariots. In Egypt the Mycenaeans would have become familiar with Minoan pictures of the gallop as early as the Hyksos period; so much is evident from the Sakkara dagger, on which a gazelle (?) is represented at the *Absprunggalopp*.⁷⁵ A scarab of Tuthmosis I shows how the Minoan convention was used in an Egyptian chariot-scene.⁷⁶ This scene was transferred to Mycenae (but not to Crete), where it was rendered on the Shaft Grave stelae. The following facts, in Schachermeyr's opinion, support this historical reconstruction. On three stelae associated with Grave V the chariot is shown in warlike scenes; on the first (Heurtley's no. I) the opponent of the man in the chariot lies, already dead, under the hoofs of a horse moving at the *Absprunggalopp*, while on nos. IV and V the enemy is seen in front of the horse which approaches at a gallop. All these motifs may be traced back to Egyptian art (pp. 737-739). Since the Mycenaeans borrowed the chariot as an artistic theme from Egypt, they probably, but not quite certainly, borrowed the war chariot itself from the same source (p. 740).

The great weakness in this argument lies in Schachermeyr's insistence that the Shaft Grave horses at the *Absprunggalopp* must have been derived *in that attitude* from some foreign source. If, as Schachermeyr acknowledges, the Minoans had already introduced this type of gallop into Egypt, where it was subsequently absorbed into the tradition of Egyptian art, there is no reason why they should not have taken it direct to the Greek mainland as well: the application of a Minoan convention to a Mycenaean theme finds many parallels among the artefacts in the Shaft

⁷¹ "Der 'Nestorbecher' aus dem IV. Schachtgrab von Mykenae," *Festschrift Schweitzer* (1954) 11-18.

⁷² *HM* 331.

⁷³ *NT* 187.

⁷⁴ Helene Kantor, *AJA* 51 (1947) 40.

⁷⁵ *PM* I 717 fig. 540.

⁷⁶ Smith, *Interconnections* fig. 34a.

Graves. Another objection to Schachermeyr's theory is that, while claiming that the mainlanders must have seen chariot-scenes with *Absprung-galopp* in Egypt at the time of the Hyksos campaign, he can point to no representation of this type from the Hyksos period itself: the earliest one he can quote, on the scarab of Tuthmosis I, must be about fifty years later than the expulsion of the Hyksos. There seems nothing in all this which even suggests direct contact between mainlanders and Egyptians in the Hyksos period. It is significant that in the course of his *Streitwagen* Schachermeyr makes three separate references to *Ereignisse*, in which he claims to have proved the existence of such a direct connection; but those earlier arguments themselves depend, at least in part, on the assumption that Mycenaean princes saw horses and chariots for the first time in Egypt (pp. 344-345). Consequently, in spite of the valuable collection of material it contains, *Streitwagen* cannot be considered the final, unprejudiced word on the derivation of the Mycenaean chariot.

The evidence so far given shows that there is very little in the archaeological record either in Egypt or in Greece which would support the theory of direct and intimate relations between the two cultures as early as the Shaft Grave period. More general questions about the affinities of the Shaft Grave people may now be considered. When faced with the postulated expedition of Mycenaean mercenaries to Egypt we must ask, first, if it is likely and, second, if it is possible, given the conditions in the Mediterranean at the time. In a discussion of the first question, Stubbings rightly points to a weakness in the Marinatos-Persson theory, namely that it is hard to believe that the inhabitants of the Argolid in the late Middle Helladic period could have been useful and acceptable allies of the Egyptians against the Hyksos.⁷⁷ This is indeed an important objection, which suggests another: *could* there have been the suggested intercourse between Greece and Egypt, seeing that Crete lay between them, at this period approaching the acme of its power and prosperity?

In his *Ereignisse*, p. 341, Schachermeyr dealt with this problem by saying that the severe earthquake which devastated the palace at Knossos toward the end of the Middle Bronze Age was accompanied by a flood: this caught the Minoan fleet in the harbors along the northern coast of Crete and destroyed it. Events in the Mediterranean in the Shaft Grave era do not call for such drastic and speculative explanations: they are interpreted better as a growing participation in trade by Cretans and Egyptians and, to a lesser extent, by mainland Greeks as well.

No doubt Evans was wrong to believe in the existence of a Cretan political hegemony in the Aegean from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age. It is clear, however, that there was a great expansion of Cretan trade and some degree of actual colonization from the start of Late Minoan I. The contents of the graves of Circle A as well as the earliest tholoi and chamber tombs at Mycenae show that in the intercourse between Crete and the mainland the whole cultural initiative came from the Cretan side, while the mainland contribution to Minoan life was negligible compared with Cretan influence on the mainland. Apart from Phylakopi and Kastri, where the long-established Minoan settlements continued to flourish, at least two Minoan colonies were settled in distant parts of the Mediterranean in Late Minoan I. A settlement founded at Trianda is proved to be Minoan by the pottery, architecture, and frescoes found there.⁷⁸ At Miletus, Minoan pottery of a transitional MM IIIB-LM Ia type was discovered alongside Mycenaean I ware.⁷⁹ At another point in Anatolia, a number of Mycenaean I sherds have been discovered in the Middle Sixth City at Troy.⁸⁰ In the western Mediterranean, mainland Greece continued to exert an influence far stronger than was felt from Crete. Taylour has reasonably suggested that it was just because of Cretan superiority in the Aegean that the mainlanders used a trade outlet to the west.⁸¹

With the expulsion of the Hyksos, the power of Egypt was on the increase throughout the six-

⁷⁷ "The rise of Mycenaean civilization," chap. xiv of the *CAH* II (1963²) 11. Unfortunately, Stubbings goes on to equate the legendary conquest of the Argolid by Danaos with the arrival of a new dynasty at Mycenae (the latter being, in fact, Hyksos refugees). It is strange to find in a standard history such a mixture of dubious fact and irrelevant legend; cf. Catling, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 832-833.

⁷⁸ Furumark, *Ialysos* 176, 177, 180.

⁷⁹ Weickert, *IstMitt* 9-10 (1959-1960), illustrates the following pottery types: MM III, pl. 33; LM I and Myc. I, pll. 6, 7, 32, 35, 36; LM I-II, pll. 8, 9, 10, 12; LM II-III, pl. 18; LM IIIa, pll. 10, 11.

⁸⁰ Blegen *et al.*, *Troy* III (1953) 181, 194, 207, 209, 211. The possibly Minoan objects from Troy VI are described and discussed on p. 17.

⁸¹ *Op.cit.* (supra n. 22) 182. The presence of amber in the

teenth century and the early part of the fifteenth. The first rulers of the New Kingdom pursued an aggressive policy abroad, especially in the Levant. During the reign of Tuthmosis III, Egyptian naval power became paramount along the Syrian coast, and Egypt exercised a general suzerainty over the Syrian princes. At the same time, Egyptian sea-borne trade became increasingly important.⁸² Very few Aegean imports of the Late Minoan I and II periods have been found in Egypt. Evans thought that all the pottery imports from the Aegean came from Crete, but it has since been demonstrated that many of the pots once thought to be Cretan are in fact of mainland fabric.⁸³ The provenience of the relevant pottery is given by Furumark, *Ialysos*, p. 213, as follows:

Myc. I: 0	LM Ia: 1
Myc. IIa: 9	LM Ib: 5
Myc. IIb: 6	LM II: 0

Clearly, no far-reaching conclusions should be drawn from these very small quantities: by themselves they cannot possibly prove that during this period Mycenaean trade with Egypt was steadily increasing at the expense of Minoan. The most we can infer from the pottery is that by the middle of the fifteenth century the mainlanders were perhaps making some incursion into the Egyptian market. There is no deposit of Mycenaean pottery in Egypt which would point to substantial trade until the Amarna period, while the earliest Egyptian inscriptions yet found at Mycenae date from the reigns of Amenophis II and Amenophis III.⁸⁴ By contrast, and in spite of the sparse finds of Minoan pottery in Egypt, relations between Crete and Egypt remained close until the end of the fifteenth century.

Mainland trade with the western Mediterranean, the very close relations with Crete, and the slight

but certain contacts with regions of Asia Minor suggest that we need not fall back on a hypothesis of plunder or warlike expansion to explain the presence of massive wealth in the graves of Circle A. Such theories arose partly because the Shaft Graves were seen in too narrow a context. Now, the discovery of an earlier Grave Circle has suggested that the princes buried in Circle A were not members of a new, aggressive dynasty previously unrepresented on the mainland. Their culture was substantially the same as that of their predecessors, and we have no reason to think that the differences arose in any way other than by peaceful and commercial relations with other peoples. For a long time, the appearance of the treasures of Circle A did look like the sudden accession of wealth on a large scale; it remains possible, however, that the lords of Mycenae did not acquire their wealth when Graves IV and V were constructed, but only then began to devote it to the manufacture of rich artefacts. That this was not an isolated phenomenon in contemporary Greece is indicated by the gold treasures which Marinatos has reported from graves at Peristeria.⁸⁵ In fact, the poverty of the mainland at this time has often been exaggerated. In an important passage of his *Prehistoric Foundations of Europe* (1940) 351-352, Hawkes has pointed to the strategic position of Mycenae, controlling the trade routes between the Isthmus and the Argive plain. Greece in the Late Bronze Age possessed adequate resources of copper to pay for imports of precious metals,⁸⁶ but gold mines and placers were not wanting in Greece itself, and there is thus no support for the suggestion that the princes of Mycenae were forced to get their supplies of gold from Egypt.⁸⁷

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

Shaft Graves suggests trade with the Baltic; cf. Blegen, *Prosymna* 286. This trade was continued in the subsequent period, K. Müller, *AthMitt* 34 (1909) 278-282; for the comparative rarity of amber in Crete, cf. *PM* II 174. Beck, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 208-211, rightly comments that "Baltic" in this context may be a much larger area than has been thought, and suggests that the amber could have reached Greece either by sea (by way of the Aeolian Islands) or overland. From time to time, cultural links between the Shaft Grave people and the Balkans have been inferred from the similarity of artistic motifs: such links seem possible, but not certain; Bouzek, *Listy Filologické* 88 (1965) 245, and Lorimer, *HM* 16.

⁸² Sève-Söderbergh, *The Navy of the Eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty* (1946) 33-70.

⁸³ Wace and Blegen, *Klio* 14 (1939) 135-145. Cf. Schacher-

meyr, *JOAI* 45 (1960) 48.

⁸⁴ Vermeule, *GBA* 153 figs. f, g; *BCH* 88 (1964) 721 fig. 3.

⁸⁵ *ILN* (4th Dec. 1965) 32-33.

⁸⁶ Cf. Davies, *JHS* 49 (1929) 89-99.

⁸⁷ Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology* VIII (1964) 163-164; cf. Davies, *Nature* 130 (1932) 985. If Egypt had really been the origin of the first massive deposits of gold to be found in Greece, it is surprising that the Greek word for gold, which is represented by Linear B *kuruso* scarcely a century after the end of the Shaft Grave era, is a loan-word from West Semitic; cf. Benveniste, *Hittite et Indo-Européen* (1962) 131, and Mayer, *RendistLomb* 94 (1960) 315-319. The word may have entered the Greek language at a time of direct contact with Ugarit or, more probably, it was introduced by way of Minoan; cf. Peruzzi, *Word* 15 (1959) 323.