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(etwa über Schuldenerlass) sehr wohl zum regelungsbedürftigen Politikum geworden sein könnte.¹

Die Kritik an einzelnen Interpretationen und Schlußfolgerungen ändert nichts an dem insgesamt positiven Gesamteindruck, den das Buch hinterläßt – auch bei dem erwähnten professionellen Althistoriker, der nicht nur F.’s souveräne Sachkenntnis, sondern auch seinen Mut zu pointierten Urteilen einerseits und zur großen Synthese andererseits anerkennen muß. Für uns alle bleibt die Vor- und Frühgeschichte der ‘imperialen’ Republik das, was sie seit Niebuhr immer war – ein weites Feld, auf das man sich immer wieder und immer neu wagen muß.

Köln

Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp


What constitutes publication is not only a technical matter but an academic question as well. In his Preface to ‘Cypriot Antiquities in Dublin’ Karageorghis places the volume in the context of the project initiated by the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis for «the publication and presentation of the main collections of Cypriot antiquities in foreign museums. Already an important number of illustrated catalogues (catalogues raisonnés) have been published.....» (p. iv). The author, Ch. Souyoudzoglou-Haywood (hereafter S.-H.), specifies that «the publication of the Dublin collections would neither have been conceived nor carried to completion were it not for the vision and perseverance of Vassos Karageorghis» (p. vi), and goes on to say that «only a small number of objects [in the volume] have been properly published. In choosing the objects for this catalogue our objective has been to include not only the ‘best’ pieces, but also objects of all the categories, types and dates in the collections» (p. 6). According to the entries in the catalogue, the vast majority of items have been «unpublished».

The author notes, however, that «the pottery from the Early Bronze Age to the Cypro-Classic Period was listed in the publication of Greek pottery in public collections in Ireland by A. W. Johnston (1973) [A Catalogue of Greek Vases in Public Collections in Ireland (Dublin)]» (p. 6). Johnston himself makes no superior claims for his work, noting that «this list does not pretend to be a full and definitive publication of the vases» (p. 339). The implication of S.-H.’s remarks is that Johnston’s listing is not a «proper publication». This begs the question of what kind of catalogue the volume under review purports to be, for «raisonné» it certainly is, but ‘complet’ it certainly is not. Of the approximately 600 objects in the National Museum of Ireland (NMI) and the Classical Museum, University College Dublin (UCD), only 253 have been included. Johnston’s
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listing is much more extensive, at least for the Cypriote pottery in Dublin, and is no less of a legitimate publication for being without illustrations.

The reasons for this selective approach are indirectly given by Karageorghis in his Preface to 'Cypriot Antiquities in Dublin' but more explicitly set out in his critique of the all-inclusive policy followed by Åström in Volume XX of 'Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology' devoted to a 'Corpus of Cypriote Antiquities'. In a review of P. Villa, Early and Middle Bronze Age Pottery of the Cesnola Collection in the Stanford University Museum, the first fascicle of the 'Corpus', in JHS 90, 1970, Karageorghis wrote that «much as we share Dr Åström’s love for Cypriote pottery, there is hardly any single object out of the 134 items in this catalogue which adds anything really new in the field in which he himself is such a great expert. The catalogue could serve as an inventory for use in the University Museum by students following practical courses in archaeology, but to publish it so lavishly in a book is not, we believe, fully justified.... Dr Åström would have offered a great service to students of Cypriote archaeology if he collected and published the best specimens» (p. 260).

In this regard it should be noted that Karageorghis considers that the volume under review «will no doubt bring to light new material for the study of Cypriot art and archaeology, which by now has been considerably upgraded thanks to the catalogues which have been published. It will also be useful for students and laymen who visit the collections» in Dublin (p. iv). There can be little doubt that the aims of both Åström and Karageorghis, through the catalogues for which they are respectively responsible, are essentially the same. The publication of little known or under-appreciated archaeological material from Cyprus in museum and private collections around the world serves the threefold purpose of making the artefacts available to the widest possible scholarly audience, informing the local public about the history and significance of the relics, and promoting the image of ancient Cyprus as an independent, self-respecting and distinctive creation of early man and woman in the eastern Mediterranean. Each of these purposes has equal validity.

In this ambitious undertaking S.-H.’s catalogue has largely but not wholly succeeded. It is not, and does not set out to be an exhaustive study of all the Cypriote antiquities in the two Dublin museums. While giving the benefit of the doubt to the author’s competence and taste in the matter of making the selection, the value of «properly» publishing everything lies in making all the objects accessible to experts both now and in the future who may be able to discern elements of historical importance overlooked or not evident to S.-H. and her collaborators at the time of composition. In that respect Johnston’s work has by no means lost its relevance or utility and will continue to be an indispensable ‘vademecum’ for archaeologists researching the collections of Cypriote pottery in the NMI and UCD. By the same token there can be no justification for omitting all reference to his catalogue in the entries in ‘Cypriot Antiquities in Dublin’, for the vases at least have been published, even if not «properly». The fact that many of the items lack an established provenance makes it even more imperative to ensure that those which do are adequately documented, especially in view of the excellent essay by S.-H. on the history of the collections (pp. 1–7). The Base-ring vases said to be from Egypt illustrate this point well.

Catalogue No. 50, a Base-ring I juglet (NMI 1913: 241), which has not been listed by Johnston, was found in Egypt at Abydos Cemetery D Tomb 114 (p. 34), though the con-
tents of Tomb 114 were not in the distribution list for Dublin (T. E. Peet and W. L. S. Loat, The Cemeteries of Abydos Part III – 1912 – 1913 (London 1913), p. 49). It should be one of Abydos Nos. 34–37 in R. S. Merrillees, The Cypriot Bronze Age Pottery Found in Egypt (Lund 1968), p. 114, and illustrated in Peet and Loat, op. cit., Pl. XII. 2 (not Pl. 1 – Cypriot Antiquities in Dublin, p. 34). Catalogue No. 51, unregistered in the NMI, is not recorded by Johnston. It was part of the Lady Kavanagh collection and said to have come from Egypt (p. 35). Catalogue No. 52, a Base-ring I tankard, also belonged to the Lady Kavanagh collection and was bought in Egyptian Thebes (p. 35). S.-H. gives it the NMI registration number 193027, whereas Johnston has 1930.17 and does not mention the place of acquisition (p. 35 No. 103). The fact that the type is attested in Egypt (Merrillees, op. cit., p. 167) and its dimensions are close to those of the securely prov-

enced specimens makes it likely that Catalogue No. 52 was found in the Nile Valley. Johnston also lists NMI 1030. 73, a «Jug; canonical shape..... On loan from Kavanagh collection. Bought in Egyptian Thebes» (p. 350 No. 124). In a volume produced for use by specialists in Cypriote archaeology, this piece should also have been included.

The value of ‘Cypriot Antiquities in Dublin’ for students and the wider public is obvious. It contains a history of the collections, a representative selection of artefacts arranged in descending chronological order from the Early and Middle Bronze Ages down to the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and introductory essays to each section which set the historical scene for the ensuing catalogue entries. There is evidently nothing in the collections in Dublin belonging to the Stone Age in Cyprus. As a means of informing non-specialists and sensitising them to the particular features of ancient Cypriote civilisation, the book could not have been more appropriately designed. Its impact will undoubtedly be fur-
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The particular features of ancient Cypriote civilisation, the book could
time it as well.

For example, Catalogue No. 55, a Base-ring II crater (NMI 1934: 33) (Johnston, op. cit., p. 351 No. 113) is not unique amongst Base-ring shapes as it belongs to Åström’s Base-

ring II Type IIa (Swedish Cyprus Expedition IV. 1C, p. 180), though half the size of the only other recorded specimen. Nor is there only one example of a metal vessel in the shape of a Base-ring type, as S.-H. has overlooked the reviewer’s article on ‘Metal Vases of Cyp-

riot Type from the 16th to 13th Centuries B.C.’ in: J. D. Muhly, R. Maddin and V. Kara-


Likewise the exceptional tripod Base-ring I juglet Catalogue No. 76 (UCD 492) is said by S.-H. to have no known provenance, whereas Johnston assigns it to Amathus (op. cit., p. 442 No. 865). However improbable such a findspot may be, this question should have been addressed in the catalogue under review, even if it could not be resolved. While the form of the body is unparalleled, early Base-ring juglets with three feet are not unknown (e.g. L. Quilici, La tomba dell’età del bronzo tardo dell’abitato di Paleokastro presso Ayia
Irini (Rome 1990), p. 57 Fig. 149, pp. 56 f. No. 162; E. D. T. Vermeule and F. Z. Wolsky, Toumba tou Skourou. A Bronze Age Potters’ Quarter on Morphou Bay in Cyprus (Boston 1990), p. 230 T. I. 304, p. 316 Fig. 44. T. I. 304). Given the nature of its fabric and the style of its snake decoration in relief, the latter of which closely resembles that on the two Proto Base-ring juglets said to have been found together near Larnaca (Catalogue Nos. 48 and 49), it could hardly be later than Late Cypriote IA. With their flat bases, Catalogue Nos. 48 (NMI 1934: 26) (Johnston, op. cit., p. 350 No. 106 – without provenance) and 49 (Johnston, op. cit., p. 350 No. 105 – said to be from near Larnaca) have been wrongly classified as Base-ring I and dated to Late Cypriote I–II, instead of Late Cypriote IA.

As a demonstration of the originality of Cypriote civilisation S.-H.’s catalogue fulfils every expectation and helps contribute to our appreciation of the singular nature of the island’s achievements within the cultural milieu of the eastern Mediterranean to which it was inseparably linked. Imports and influences were transmitted from the Aegean and further west, Egypt and the Levant during the second half of the second millennium B.C. and the whole of the first millennium B.C., without diluting the island’s individual cultural identity, and attest to the vitality and adaptability of the native Cypriote character which have continued to this day in every sector, with the notable exception of contemporary politics. We are all indebted to the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis, Vassos Karageorghis, and Christina Souyouzdoglou-Haywood for reminding us in such an informative and handsome format how much we still have to learn from the collections of Cypriot antiquities abroad.
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