

Für den fremdsprachigen Benutzer wäre eine Zusammenfassung und auch knappe Benutzungsanweisung in Englisch wichtig gewesen. Dies hätte gleichsam auch als Referenz an die amerikanische Grabung in Troja aufgefaßt werden können, ohne deren exzellente Durchführung und Publikation dieses Buch nicht vorliegen würde. Auch ein Stichwortverzeichnis und eine Literaturliste am Schluß hätte jedem Benutzer weitergeholfen. So wäre ein schneller Überblick darüber zu gewinnen gewesen, welche Materialpublikation, aber auch Chronologiediskussion in diesem Werk nicht einbezogen ist.

Für die Zusammenfassung der publizierten keramischen Formen des Dreiecks Troja – Thermi – Poliochni sowie für die daraus resultierenden Anregungen sind wir Verf. mit Sicherheit verbunden.

Frankfurt a. M.

Manfred Korfmann

**Hartmut Matthäus, Die Bronzegefäße der kretisch-mykenischen Kultur.** Prähistorische Bronzefunde, Abteilung II, Band 1. C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München 1980. XII and 371 pages, 12 figures and 80 plates.

This handsomely produced volume in the well-established Prähistorische Bronzefunde series presents a definitive catalogue of over 600 complete or fragmentary bronze vessels from the Aegean Bronze Age, together with detailed drawings of many pieces, distribution maps, and brief discussions of materials and techniques of manufacture and the general development of Aegean bronze vessel production in the second millennium BC.

The first section of the book discusses the find-spots of the various items in the catalogue and immediately highlights one of the problems inherent in the study and analysis of these vessels – their uneven distribution. Only nine settlement sites have produced examples, of which seven are in Crete; the bulk of the finds have been made in graves, with all the problems that engenders for precise dating, due to the possibility of old vessels being placed in graves, or archaic forms being produced especially for funerary use. The author has therefore rightly spent considerable space discussing the date of the deposits in which the vessels were found in great detail, so that when one turns to the catalogue, and the summary chart of type-forms and their development (pl. 80), one can do so in the confident knowledge that the dates ascribed to the vessels there are the result of careful consideration rather than bland repetition of the dates first ascribed by the excavators.

The catalogue of vessels is comprehensive, providing all the information one would reasonably expect to need for further research, as well as a discussion of each form's dating as a group, appropriate discussion also of similar forms in gold and silver, and parallels from Cyprus and the east Mediterranean. The most immediate reaction to this catalogue is one of surprise and delight, that so much material survives. The author fully catalogues over 600 pieces, to which can be added another hundred examples briefly described in an appendix listing unpublished finds. With so much material to work with, albeit fragmentary in many cases, the author has been able to produce a detailed genealogy of Aegean bronze vessels which we can accept with some confidence. At the same time the quantity of material adds a new dimension to our understanding of the role and importance of the bronze-smith in Minoan and Mycenaean society, just as the quality of much of the work provides new insights into the technical skills of the craftsmen. The repertoire of the bronze vessel maker, however, seems somewhat limited, production concentrating very heavily on cups, handled jars and ewers, bowls and pans,

and tripod vessels. Most of these forms are utilitarian kitchen vessels, although some of the cups and ewers were clearly high-class tableware as their rich decoration reveals. In this respect the bronze vessel makers seem to work in a narrower field than the manufacturers of gold and silver vessels; they also seem to show fewer signs of cross-fertilisation with craftsmen working with other materials. Only the decorated ewers suggest connections with stone vases for example, and on present evidence Warren's type 19 stone ewers, dating to MM. III, would appear to have inspired Matthäus's type 22 bronze ones, belonging to LM. I/LH. I.

Although there are few signs of individual workshops distinguished by distinctive techniques and traits, what does emerge from Matthäus's detailed study and typology is that several type-forms have a restricted geographical distribution [see for example types 4 (pl. 65, B), 10 A (pl. 66, B), 6 (pl. 66, A)]. This is an important point to have demonstrated, and further research both of bronzework and other materials susceptible to typological and/or stylistic analysis might examine whether there is further evidence to suggest that these distributions reflect general patterns of trade and exchange in the Aegean Bronze Age. At least as far as bronzework is concerned, these approaches, old-fashioned as they may be, offer more useful approaches to the problems of exchange than does traceelement analysis.

In contrast, the short chapter on materials and techniques underlines how little analytical data we have on which to base any discussion of these topics. There are few analyses to provide information on metal composition, and no metallographic studies to throw light on casting, hammering and annealing techniques. This makes Matthäus's much needed discussion of the use of bronze-sheet and of rivetting sheet metal vessels, of limited value, since the primary data on which any discussion should be based is simply not available.

Matthäus makes the same point – the paucity of evidence – in his concluding chapter, when he approaches the problem of the origins of the Aegean bronze-vessel tradition and its relationship with the east Mediterranean. In general Matthäus is willing to admit to a heavy influence from the east, particularly on forms, which he unfortunately does not document at all. The reviewer, in the absence of documentation of near-eastern prototypes, prefers to place greater emphasis on the native Aegean contribution. The Aegean bronze-working industry as a whole appears to owe little to eastern inspiration, and Early Bronze Age metal vessels (almost entirely of gold and silver) are sufficiently numerous to suggest that the skills of making vessels from sheet metal had largely been mastered by 2000 BC. After this time, the relationship between Minoan and Mycenaean bronze industries is an important area of discussion, to which Matthäus devotes several pages. He argues that much of the material found in the Argolid was made there by Minoan craftsmen, rather than imported from Crete. The Minoan influence is undeniable, and the case for local production is sound, but whether one needs to invoke Minoan craftsmen employed by the rulers of Mycenae is more questionable. There is at present no evidence from the Mycenaean vessels to suggest the hand of Minoan craftsmen. On the other hand, Matthäus is surely right in claiming that bronze types had little impact on stone and pottery vase types in the Late Bronze Age, and there was remarkably little interaction even between bronze vessels and those of gold and silver.

The last few pages of the concluding chapter are devoted to an unconvincing attempt to relate the development of bronze vessel production in Bronze Age central Europe to influences flowing north from the Aegean. Until the late thirteenth and twelfth century BC, Aegean contact with central Europe seems to have been very irregular and sporadic – some would dispute that there was any contact at all. By this time the Aegean industry had all but run its course as Matthäus himself concludes, and it is difficult to see it

exerting any strong influences north of the Alps or along the Danube basin. The somewhat earlier Mycenaean involvement with southern Italy was an altogether more healthy situation in which to expect the transmission of ideas and techniques, yet, at least as far as bronze vessels are concerned we have no evidence that this occurred.

Differences of interpretation, however, should not be allowed to obscure the importance of the contribution which Matthäus has made to the study of Aegean metal industries in the Bronze Age. In producing such a comprehensive catalogue and study of a much-neglected group of material, Matthäus has added considerably to our understanding of Minoan and Mycenaean economy and society.

Sheffield

Keith Branigan

**Mitteleuropäische Bronzezeit.** Beiträge zur Archäologie und Geschichte. Im Auftrag der Historiker-Gesellschaft der DDR herausgegeben von W. Coblenz und F. Horst. 8. Tagung der Fachgruppe Ur- und Frühgeschichte vom 24.–26. April 1975 in Dresden. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1978. VI und 326 Seiten und 118 Textabbildungen.

Willkommen und sinnvoll ist die Zusammenstellung der in der DDR geleisteten Forschung zur Bronzezeit in dem von W. Coblenz und F. Horst herausgegebenen Tagungsbericht der Historiker-Gesellschaft, die durch einige Beiträge aus Polen und einen aus der Tschechoslowakei bereichert wird. Die Publikation enthält insgesamt 20 Einzelstudien, davon zunächst sehr allgemein und zum Teil populär gehaltene Zusammenfassungen über Probleme vom Vorderen Orient und der Ägäis bis zur „historischen Bedeutung der mittleren und jüngeren Bronzezeit in Mitteleuropa“. Dann folgen vier Artikel, die die Jungbronzezeit größerer Bereiche innerhalb der DDR zusammenfassend behandeln, vier weitere Beiträge diskutieren Teilaspekte der Bronzezeitforschung wie Sozialfragen, Umweltbedingungen, Siedlungswesen und Befestigungen in Teilen oder in der ganzen DDR, ehe vier Überblicksdarstellungen aus Polen folgen. Den Abschluß bilden drei Artikel zu Fragen der Bestattungs- und Kultbräuche.

Das Vorwort erläutert die Absicht der Publikation, nämlich in interdisziplinärer Zusammenarbeit ein Bild von den „kulturellen Erscheinungen und deren Grundlagen in Mitteleuropa“ zu zeichnen und dieses in Beziehung zum „Vorderen Orient und der Ägäis sowie zum südosteuropäischen Mittelmeerraum“ zu bringen. Tatsächlich liefert der Band dagegen eine Leistungsbilanz der Bronzezeitforschung in der DDR, wie sie von Zeit zu Zeit notwendig ist und als Rechenschaftsbericht für die zukünftige Forschung stimulierend wirken kann. Die Bilanz ist beachtlich und lesenswert, doch hat sie wenig mit der geschilderten Absicht und dem Titel des Buches zu tun. Es werden weder die gesamte Bronzezeit behandelt noch Mitteleuropa untersucht. Die geographische Bezeichnung Mitteleuropa ist zwar nicht eindeutig und von verschiedenen Autoren je nach Herkunft auch unterschiedlich benutzt worden, die Beschränkung auf die DDR mit dem, wie sich bei der Lektüre aufdrängt, „Anhängsel“ Polen zeugt jedoch von einer in unserem Fach neuen und fast peinlich egozentrischen Verwendung des Begriffs. Gehören die Tschechoslowakei, Bayern und Österreich etwa nicht zu Mitteleuropa? Man sollte das Werk jedoch nicht an seinem werbewirksamen Titel, sondern an seinem Inhalt messen.

Zu Anfang des Bandes betritt H. Klengel (S. 5–25) als „ein Vertreter der Keilschriftforschung“ das für ihn ungewohnte Feld archäologisch-historischer Interpretationen und gibt einen grob vereinfachenden und zusammenfassenden Überblick über den bronzezeitlichen Handel in Vorderasien und in der Ägäis. Das Wagnis verlangt Respekt, das Ergebnis kann angesichts der 10 Textseiten kaum mehr als stark verkürztes Handbuchwissen bieten.