

say, have "evoked some comment"—perhaps enough to have justified a word or two more; and at this time of day, the section on the early history of the island would be the better for critical revision by an Aegean expert like Prof. J. L. Myres. But for the rest we have nothing but praise. This handbook ought to be in the pocket of every visitor to Cyprus, and in the libraries of all who take interest in the past, present, or future of one of the smallest but also most curious of our dependencies.

D. G. H.

Der Orient und die frühgriechische Kunst. By F. POULSEN. Pp. vi. + 195; 197 illustrations. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. M. 12.

The author, well known already for studies on the Early Greek Iron Age, now writes a treatise to dispel what he holds to be the Minoan Mirage. We should guess that he has been incited thereto less by the writings of Cretan explorers than by Loewy's articles on *Typenwanderung*. In M. Poulsen's view Minoan civilisation was a brief growth which struck no deep roots in the Greek area, and the subsequent florescence of art in Hellas owed its impulse and most of its motives to West Asiatic culture, in particular to the *Mischkultur* of the Phoenicians, and to Hittite art.

M. Poulsen develops his attack by citing first three groups of objects which he believes to illustrate Phoenician art at its full vigour, in and about the 9th century B.C., when Tyrian sea-faring was at its boldest, and the Ionian and Carian cities were beginning reciprocally to explore eastward. These groups are, first, the chased bowls found in numbers at Nimrud, in Assur-natzirpal's palace, and sporadically on Greek and Italian soil; they are continued by a later class (8th and 7th century) found mainly in Cypriote and Italian graves. Second, the well-known ivories from Nimrud, now in the British Museum, grouped with ivories from Spain and others of uncertain provenance in the Louvre. Third, the class of engraved *tridachna* shells, coupled with goldwork (e.g. the Aegina Treasure), bronzes, terracottas, etc. Then the author turns to results—to certain groups of objects in which the Early Hellenic art shows itself in his opinion a pupil of Syrian. First, the Idaean shields and other bronzes from Crete. Second, Rhodian, Ephesian and Spartan ivories, gold plaques, vases, terracottas, etc. Third, Early Greek Geometric Art. Fourth, Etruscan and Cypriote. Finally he collects objects from all parts to illustrate the wide range of one Phoenician artistic type, the ribbed wig (*Etagenperücke*) and its derivative, the beaded wig (*Perlenperücke*), and has his final fling at the Minoan pedigree of Greek art by arguing a Phoenician pedigree for the archaic style of Crete itself.

This minute study of the stylistic features of Early Iron Age work in the eastern Mediterranean imposes a much-needed precision into the archaeology of that class of antiquities and brings to the notice of students what will be very suggestive and valuable to them. But the hypotheses on which the author frames his study and his deductions seem to the present reviewer unconvincing for several reasons. To take hypotheses first. The author assumes as self evident that all works of a *Mischkultur*, which combined Egyptian and Mesopotamian motives and treatment, were produced by either Syrians or their pupils: but this hypothesis is neither proved nor perhaps probable. It runs counter to the opinions of experts in Egyptology, who supported by metal work bearing decoration of meaningless hieroglyphs found in the Delta (e.g., at Tell Basta), regard as Egyptian the *Mischkultur* of the very bowls which are Poulsen's primary *pièces de conviction*. It runs counter also to the opinions of others, who cite the Nimrud and Enkomi ivories to show that both Assyria and Cyprus, where groups of these bowls have come to light, bred *Mischkultur* styles of their own. Lastly, it leaves on one side the very serious objection that Phoenician, and indeed Syrian, soil has not yielded up any notable products of the particular type of *Mischkultur* on which M. Poulsen builds his theory. In fact, there is practically no object of importance used by him as evidence

which can be traced to a find-spot in Phoenicia or its neighbourhood or its colonies; though it is true that about eight of the metal bowls bear names (probably of owners or dedicators) which are Phoenician or Aramaic.

Again, the author begins and ends with another unacceptable assumption, that the taking over of artistic motives, or even only of details of treatment, implies an artistic indebtedness sufficient to justify the affiliation of one art to another. In his desire to expose the *mirage Minoen* he relegates archaic Greek art, and especially early Ionian art, to the position of *enfant de miracle* in which Brunn left it. Its putative parents are to be a hybrid Phoenician culture, on whose lifelessness M. Poulsen is never tired of insisting and the heavy wooden art of the Hittites, also, to a considerable degree, hybrid. In dealing with the Ephesus ivories, our author's own artistic sense compels him to exclaim that the Ionian craftsmen had indeed left their Hittite models out of sight. By what virtue had they done this? Surely the borrowing of details of dress and hair will not explain the so rapid rise of a higher art from a lower.

Nor is it only M. Poulsen's hypotheses which suggest that the author is taking a side rather than examining a problem impartially with full sense of all that requires explanation; but also his deductions from details. If he has ignored the general identity of Minoan and archaic Hellenic arts in respect of spirit and methods, he has also ignored the prior claim of the former to many details of treatment which, appearing in the latter, are put by him to the credit of Phoenician art—as he believes it to be—and of Hittite art, whose products, used as evidence, are of much later date than the Minoan. Did space allow, a long list of these details could be given; but it must suffice to point out that the sphinx with erect wings or with spiral lock, the lion with open jaws, the "echt hittitisch" conical helm with plume, the bird attribute of divinity, the *πόρνια θηρῶν* group with differing pairs of animal supporters, the *polos*, the coil ornaments over the ears of women—these and many other details communicated, according to M. Poulsen, directly by the East to Archaic Hellas, were features of Aegean artistic treatment and could have been communicated by less lengthy and arduous routes. When we consider the date of the Hittite art of North Syria or of the Phoenician of mid Syria or even of the Assyrian of the Middle and Late Kingdoms, it is more reasonable to suppose that details of treatment, found in Minoan art and found also in West Asian and Archaic Hellenic arts, were derived alike by each of the later arts directly from a common Minoan parent, than that archaic Hellas had to recover from the East what had pre-existed in the Aegean. One often wonders indeed, in reading M. Poulsen's pages, whether he is quite conscious how late most of his cited Syrian, and even Mesopotamian, monuments really are. At the same time, although we do not feel that M. Poulsen has reestablished the Semitic ancestry of Hellenic art, he has rendered excellent service by reopening a question which, in any case, is not free from difficulty. Especially are we grateful for his rediscussion of the Dipylon style, which still remains, on the whole, the most detached and unexplained phenomenon in early East Mediterranean art.

D. G. H.

Forschungen in Ephesos veröffentlicht vom Österreichischen Archäologischen Institute. I and II. Wien: Alfred Holder, 1906 and 1912.

After a six years' interval, the second volume of the Austrian Institute's magnificent publication of Ephesus has appeared. The Austrian excavation in, and exploration of, Ephesus began as long ago as 1895, and, except for three seasons (1908-1910), during which friendly relations with the Ottoman Service of Antiquities were interrupted by political complications, they have been carried on with exemplary consistency. The Institute has had the run of the whole site and its immediate neighbourhood with two important exceptions. The first was the ground bought by the British Museum some