

'agitators dangerous to the Allied cause.' After a month of detention, which I spent among German workers and sailors, the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies of Petrograd claimed my release through the Provisionary Government of Russia, whose Foreign Minister was Mr. Miliukov, and I regained my freedom.

Upon my return to Russia I devoted myself to organizing the United Inter-

national Social-Democrats, and to the cause of their speedy union with the Bolsheviks, from whom no important differences separated us any longer. Common effort was imperative.

After the July revolt of 1917 the Kerenskii-Tseretelli-Skobelev Government caused me to be arrested on a charge of high treason. I spent some two months at the Kresty in Petrograd.

The rest is known.

EGYPT AND THE GREEKS

BY J. ALBERT FAURE

[M. Faure's article is especially interesting at this time when excavations of early Egyptian civilization in the Valley of the Kings and of pre-Greek civilization at Knossos are dividing the attention of the world. His view of the interrelationship of the two civilizations is not, however, so entirely new as he appears to believe. Certainly it was shared by that ancient Egyptian priest who remarked to Herodotus that the Greeks were merely imitative children — an opinion which Herodotus, like an honest man, reported.]

FROM *La Nouvelle Revue*, February 1
(LITERARY AND POLITICAL SEMIMONTHLY)

WHEN an idea has got its roots into men's minds by a long tradition and generations of instruction, no matter whether it is intellectual, æsthetic, moral or anything else, it is no longer examined to see whether it is sensible or not. From that time onward it has entered the domain of sanctified beliefs and attained the rank of a dogma, which it is sacrilege to discuss. That is the reason why so many famous men, so many scientists and philosophers, so many writers and thinkers, have held views of the origins of Hellenic civilization whose obvious falsity would instantly have struck minds less carefully prepared.

By virtue of this principle, it has

long been held that Greek civilization, the mother of our Western civilization, was indebted to nothing save itself, underwent in its origin and during its later developments practically no influence coming from without. With varying degrees of emphasis, it has been repeated that in this privileged corner of the earth alone a chosen portion of humanity drew from its own inner depths all the marvels of art, literature, science and philosophy. It is the object of this article to show that it was not so, and that, especially in the field of philosophy, Greece was in a certain measure tributary to Egypt.

A complete demonstration is impossible, for the problem cannot be

wholly solved to-day; but is it not something to explain the basis on which it rests, and is it not something to bring even a single stone toward the structure that others will complete in times to come, when the science of Egyptology shall have made all the progress that we have a right to hope in view of the accomplishments of the men who have followed up Champollion and the earlier students?

Three great races, preëminent for their creative ability, worked together toward the founding of civilization: the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, and the pre-Greek peoples. It is to them that Greek culture properly so-called goes back; and in this collective work Egypt played a large part, its influence being exercised first of all upon the pre-Greek peoples, whose heirs were the Greeks of Ionia and the Greeks of classic times. Successful excavations in the island of Crete, in the Peloponnesus, and in Asia Minor on the site of the ancient city — or rather the ancient cities — of Troy, bear witness to the existence of civilizations already advanced at a period in the second and third milleniums before our era. These civilizations — or perhaps this civilization, for they have clearly characteristics in common — reveal an Oriental influence more or less marked. Thus, for example, one finds numerous resemblances between objects of Mycenæan art and specimens of Egyptian art, whether decorative or industrial.

There is definite proof that relations existed between the dwellers in continental Greece and the Egyptians, even if one prefers to regard Mycenæan art as influencing Egyptian, rather than the reverse. The palace at Knossos in Crete, which was laid bare by M. Evans, was probably constructed after an Egyptian model, and in conformity to the principles of Egyptian architecture. This palace must have been

built between 2500 and 1800 years before our era, — probably about 2200 or 2000 within a few centuries, — which indicates that relations between the Greeks, or at least between their predecessors and the Egyptians, were very ancient. But there is more to come. Some 1200 or 1300 years B.C. — certainly sometime between 1000 and 1400 years, or during, before, and after the Trojan War — we see the peoples of Asia Minor joining in several leagues against Egypt. These were the Teucrians, the Danaeans, the Tyrrhenians, the Achæans, and the Siculi. It has even been asserted that the epic made in honor of a victory over the Syrians by the Pharaoh known as Rameses II, or Sesostris of the Nineteenth Egyptian Dynasty, must have inspired Homer's *Iliad*.

No doubt this epic must have made a great stir first of all — as is natural — in Egypt itself, since the text has been carved on several temples either in whole or in part, and then also because Asiatics who came in contact with the Nile civilization through war, trade, or simple treaties must certainly have carried echoes of it to the ears of the Greeks, who were then beginning to enter upon their historic rôle. But to conclude from this that the Egyptian epic necessarily influenced the formation of the *Iliad* is a very different thing; and in this respect an influence exercised by Egypt over Greece is so purely problematical that it is useless to attempt to discuss it.

But we leave hypothesis and enter the realm of fact when we observe a close likeness between the standing statue of Apollo found at Tenea near Corinth and Egyptian statues of the old empire — that is to say, the most ancient known period of Egyptian history. Now as an archaic style was fashionable in the later periods of Egyptian history, and as artists copied

the masterpieces executed by their ancestors, the Greeks had every opportunity to imitate Egyptian models of every period and every school, even before King Psammetichus gave them free access to the Nile Valley. But still more striking is the almost identical pose of the seated statues called Branchides, which lined the Sacred Way leading to the temple of the Didymian Apollo at Miletus, and the seated statues of Egypt, some of which go back to the most distant ages, like those of Khephren of the Fourth Dynasty. The Milesian statues, like the Egyptian, have their hands on their knees, and hold their legs one against the other. One can easily see it by comparing them with the statues of Memnon set up by Amenophis III of the Eighteenth Dynasty, which antedated the Greek copies by several centuries, perhaps as much as eight hundred years. Such examples enable us to see how the early Greek civilization, or the pre-Greek civilization, and later on the brilliant Ionian civilization, were influenced by that of Egypt.

Thanks to Champollion's deciphering of the hieroglyphics, and thanks also to the work of the scientific men who after him gave their energy to bring old Egypt back to life, we are to-day in a position to form some idea of the texts that are written on stone or engraved upon papyrus. An ample collection of documents of every sort has been made by several generations of Egyptologists, who have enriched science by their discoveries and have set right numerous errors that had gained credence with regard to Egyptian civilization. Unfortunately, these documents, however abundant, certainly constitute no more than a little part of the numerous quantity of books heaped up in the libraries and temples of the Pharaohs; and so the task of filling up the gaps remains. That is why

we find authors giving such different interpretations to Egyptian religion.

We are compelled to fall back on the documents that are at our disposal, and to draw from them such conclusions as in the present state of our knowledge may be considered probable, if not final. At least, we may be able to give a fairly satisfactory idea of the moral and intellectual civilization of Egypt in the first thousand years before our era, more especially in the seventh and sixth centuries — that is to say, at the time when the Greeks were finally coming into relations with the Egyptians. Let us then sketch in a general picture of this brilliant civilization; but before we do so, let us examine how the Greeks gained access to the Nile.

About the year 650 B.C., for political reasons which do not concern us here, the Pharaoh Psammetichus I, founder of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, called in the Greeks from Asia Minor to his aid. From that time on, under this king and his successors, certain territories were granted to them at the mouths of the Nile. In the sixth century, the Pharaoh Amasis was especially noted for his phil-Hellenic policy. He assigned a district to the colonists on which they set up a whole Greek city called Naucratis. The Greeks, however, established themselves almost everywhere: at Memphis, at Abydos, and in the great oases. So Greeks of every origin — Ionians and Kariens from Asia Minor, island Greeks and Greeks from the continent itself, as well as Greeks from Cyrene — spread over all Egypt, since it was a favored land of amazing fertility, where life was very pleasant and very easy, not only in material resources but also in the peaceful and highly civilized character of the inhabitants. As M. Milhaud has said, it is a fact of supreme importance that only after this migration took

place did Greek science and philosophy begin to flourish.

At this time Egyptian civilization was the wonder of foreign travelers. In spite of a previous political decadence that had lasted several centuries, and that made itself felt in all fields of human activities (though it has been somewhat exaggerated), the accession of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty was the signal for a veritable Renaissance of art, science, and literature, which recalled the flowering-time of Pharaohs of the past.

Lofty moral conceptions dominated society, inspiring a whole group of civil and criminal laws which were wisely arranged and won the admiration of all antiquity. Chapter 125 of the Book of the Dead, which includes the justification of the soul — the so-called negative confession before the tribunal of Osiris — and which provides us moderns with a summary of Egyptian morality, shows us how fine and lofty that moral sense was. With good reason this negative confession has been compared to the Decalogue of the Hebrews; and in the ancient authors who have come down to us, especially Herodotus and Diodorus, we find proof that this moral code had its reflection in Egyptian institutions. Diodorus would even have us believe that Solon borrowed some of his laws from the Egyptians, and this is indeed highly probable, in view of Egypt's overwhelming superiority to neighboring peoples, and the irresistible attraction which it could not fail to exercise over a young people eager to learn and endowed with the richest gifts, who had never yet given free rein to their creative power, but whose marvelous genius was to bloom a century after Solon.

Before the Greeks appear in authentic history, it was certainly the Egyptians who brought into the ancient world its most complete, most brilliant,

and most charming civilization. Let us add that education was widely spread throughout the country. In addition to the priestly class, who had a monopoly in science and letters, a great number of scribes and state officials represent the cultivated element in the population. Each great city possessed one school or several, which were connected with the temples and formed real priestly colleges. It was to these famous cities, tradition says, that the greatest scholars and philosophers of Greece went. The most frequented were Saïs, Bubastis, Tanis, Heliopolis, Memphis, Hermoupolis, Abydos, and Thebes. The priestly college of Heliopolis had a reputation everywhere and the most illustrious Greeks went there as part of their education.

Under the Twenty-sixth Dynasty — that is from the accession of Psammetichus I to the death of Amasis and the taking of Egypt by the Persians, in other words, from 650 B.C. to 525 B.C. — the Greeks could visit the Valley of the Nile, live there, and study under the best conditions. And even later, under Persian domination, nothing prevented travelers, historians, and statesmen from traveling at ease through Egypt, studying its customs, arts, and religious beliefs, as the example of Herodotus shows.

Once we have shown the possibility of intellectual relations between Egypt and Greece, we must examine the nature of these relations. Of course it is not a question of establishing a direct inheritance of Egyptian ideas and conceptions by the early Greek philosophers. That is something we can hardly dream of in the present state of our knowledge. It is simply a matter of showing that Egyptian thought must have exercised some influence over Greek thought. On the other hand, it is equally necessary to avoid the opposite blunder of denying any

relationship of one country with those that surround it, or even with distant countries, especially when the latter are the homes of letters, art, and science, and when relations between them are easy, frequent, and exist during centuries.

In their ideas of a future judgment the Greeks certainly took over something from the Egyptians. Like the Egyptians, they believed in the existence and immortality of a winged soul. On Egyptian monuments and in the tombs, the soul has often been represented in the form of a bird with a human head. The Greeks must also have found the prototype of Elysium in the realm of the dead where Osiris reigned. Even the Greek name for it is curiously like the Egyptian word: Ialou, Aalou, or Ailou. Certainly there is no denying that there is a resemblance and almost a similarity of sound between a number of Egyptian words and a number of Greek words which stand for the same objects. Moreover, the Nile and the canals which the Egyptians imagined in the other world, in imitation of the real Nile and its earthly canals, served as models for the infernal rivers of the Greeks. The Egyptian origin of the Greek name for the dead, 'Rhadamanthus,' can hardly be doubted. It is exactly the Egyptian phrase 'Ra in Amenti' — that is to say, Ra, the Sun-God, in Amenti, the Egyptian future life. The Greek word, 'Charon,' for the infernal boatman on the Styx, is derived from the Egyptian word, 'Karon,' and it means a boat or a boatman. The judgment of the dead

before the tribunal of Osiris and the stage properties of the judgment inspired similar beliefs which one discovers again among the Greeks. Above all, the weighing of the souls seems to have echoes in Homer.

The decorations on the shield of Achilles seem to have been suggested by Egyptian bas-reliefs. Numerous Greek legends seem to have been made out of elements borrowed from Egypt, such as the legend of Hercules, where the Egyptian sources are clear, or the legend of Atlas bearing the world on his shoulders — an idea whose origin seems to turn up again among the chief myths of the Egyptians.

The Greeks in their travels through Egypt had perpetually before their eyes the scenes painted or carved on the monuments, especially the temples. These representations were all they needed to exercise their imaginations, always so keen, so rich, and so plastic.

If from legends and religious beliefs we pass to more philosophic ideas, we shall still find traces of Egyptian influence over the Greeks. The idea of a justice above, which we find in Hesiod, is a highly Egyptian conception. The Greek Themis is nothing but the Egyptian Ma, the goddess of Truth and Justice, personification of the moral law and the rules that govern all society, the goddess to whom Pharaoh himself must yield obedience as to a transcendent and imperious will. Hesiod also makes us think of Egypt when he praises the life of toil, the practice of virtue, and when he advises brave and persevering endeavor.

THE GOSPEL OF MOLIÈRE

BY PAUL GSELL AND FIRMIN GÉMIER

[The French Academy has just admitted the word 'interview' to its dictionary as an official part of the French language, not without indignant outcry from those purists who call it English perversion of a French original. Whatever the word may be, the thing itself is popular enough in France. The present article is an interview by the distinguished critic Paul Gsell with the director of the second state theatre, the Odéon. Gémier is still more famous as an actor than he is as a producer. He was one of the first to take steps toward linking the relations with Germany, broken by the war, when he invited Max Reinhardt, the famous German producer, to direct the Wallenstein trilogy at the Odéon. His generous move, however, was blocked by the Ministry of Fine Arts. Gémier is the leading French practitioner of Reinhardt's method.]

From *La Revue Mondiale*, February 1
(PARIS CURRENT-AFFAIRS SEMIMONTHLY)

THE performance of *Tartufe* at the Odéon was just coming to an end; Gémier, who had acted the leading rôle, had gone to his dressing-room.

It overlooked the Luxembourg — it was the second window on the façade — a thick curtain concealed it because it would not be fitting to have people in the street see an actor making faces in a mirror.

He had taken off his maroon costume, removed his wig, and was rubbing from his cheeks the vermilion paint with which he had given the impression of the 'vermilion mien' of *Tartufe*.

He did not speak. He was panting, as he generally does after most of his great rôles, in which the intellectual tension exhausts him at least as much as the mimicry of the drama. He asked, briefly, 'Did it go all right?'

For he is always afraid that he has not come up to the expectations of the public.

We reassured him.

Some time passed before he had entirely come back to earth. He throws himself so completely into his acting, he gets so deeply under the skin of the character, that it always takes him a

little while after the play to shake himself free from this borrowed personality.

Having regained his breath, he explained his interpretation.

'I did not want to play *Tartufe* in a costume that reminded people of the clergy. Some actors have done this. Furthermore, they have been able to call to witness the intention of the author himself, who originally clothed his impostor in the fashion that many laymen who were affiliated with religious bodies used to affect. In one of his petitions to the King, Molière said that in order to pacify the susceptibilities of devout people he had changed the knave's appearance and had disguised him as a man of the world, with a little hat, long hair, a broad collar, sword at his side, and lace on his clothing.

'That new decking-out of a character was simply a concession of Molière's to his opponents.

'But I think that this generalizing of the *Tartufe* type amplifies the character much more than it weakens him.

'Because *Tartufe* is not to be found only among the devout. He is everywhere, in all conditions, in every path of life. How much do people in every