

II on Hungary, it is necessary to add military expenses and involuntary credits to Germany. Reconstruction and war reparations have, however, also to be calculated.

In part III, the authors had to be careful, and this probably did not allow them to be objective. There is no doubt that when all owners and creditors, both national and foreign, are deprived of everything they own or are entitled to, the others must notice some improvement of their lot. This did not materialise as proved by the violent and bloody events of 1956, and by the necessity of stationing Russian troops permanently in the country. The first fact is mentioned but not the second. The tendency of the authors is to attribute all improvements—some of them are unavoidable under more or less normal conditions with any regime—to the measures of the Communists ruling Hungary since 1945, but this cannot be accepted. Let me add that the conditions prevailing in Hungary are better than in other countries under communist government, but they cannot be compared with those of Western countries. Some of the great difficulties are mentioned by the authors but of course not in the way they dealt with those of 1848-1944. Since 1956, the Hungarian government has become more interested in avoiding unnecessary hardships simply in order to enforce certain targets even if not realistic. The authors do not forget waste which is unavoidable in the public sector. They are right in stressing the virtual disappearance of illiteracy and the improvement of living conditions which, however, does not apply to the 350,000-400,000 families which were deprived of everything and even of the right to live in Budapest. This concerns roughly 20% of the inhabitants of Hungary. The authors dislike the growing importance of coal in Hungary but that does not seem justified because economic policy has to exploit all resources available even if this is not done in other countries.

Let me mention finally that the authors admit 1) that Hungary exports manufactured commodities to the Comecon countries whilst foodstuffs and raw materials are exported to the West as was happening more than a hundred years ago, 2) that the investments in infrastructure are inadequate inasmuch as the amounts allocated usually show violent swings, 3) that foreign capital is no longer needed. Let me say, however, that Hungary got loans in the Eurodollar market and in the Soviet Union; Hungary also is keen for the launching of joint ventures. The housing shortage is still acute.

I have to disagree with the authors' comparisons with Greece, where the achievements have been really spectacular (income per capita 1938 \$ 90 and 1973 \$ 1,300) without the imposition of any sacrifice on the people.

University of Thessaloniki

D. J. DELIVANIS

John Carswell and C.J.F. Dowsett, *Kütahya Tiles and Pottery from the Armenian Cathedral of St. James, Jerusalem*, London, Oxford University Press, 2 vols.

In the profuse and complex literature dealing with the history of ceramics in the Ottoman Empire, the ceramics of Kütahya, with their close links to the Armenian community of that city, have always occupied the place of country cousins to the famous and brilliant tiles and vessels assigned to the town of Iznik. A reassessment of the importance of the Kütahya tradition is proposed both implicitly and explicitly in this beautifully-printed two-volume study by John Carswell of the American University in Beirut and C. J. F. Dowsett of Oxford University; it comprises both a detailed study of the ceramics associated with the Armenian Cathedral of Jerusalem, and a general history of Kütahya ceramics from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries.

Using the tiles and wares of the Cathedral of St. James as the substantive and typological focal point of the study, Carswell and Dowsett in the first volume present a thorough analysis of documentary sources, epigraphical material, and stylistic evidence, related to the ceramic decorations and furnishings of the church. Professor Dowsett's epigraphy and translations are closely integrated with Professor Carswell's catalogue entries; the latter include profile and section drawings of vessels, so rarely encountered outside of archaeological studies these days, as well as that exemplary thoroughness which characterises John Carswell's work; a certain irony exists in the fact that the study of the major, Iznik, tradition in Ottoman pottery cannot boast a scholarly work to compare in thoroughness with the present effort. The whole of Volume I is a testament to a most fortuitous collaborative effort between two intersecting scholarly specialisations, far better integrated than its only comparable precursor in the field¹, and a model many Islamic scholars might well ponder to advantage.

Volume II of the study has drawn the most scholarly interest, largely due to John Carswell's opening chapter; before turning to the controversial section, however, it would be appropriate to note the extraordinary wealth of material included in this volume, ranging from a synthetic history of Kütahya ceramics to a catalogue of the Jerusalem tiles, an inventory of all monuments with Kütahya ceramic decorations, discussion of obscure genres of pottery, a compendium of pottery marks, and various kinds of technical information. One is reminded of those rooms in the Victoria and Albert Museum where everything from the greatest masterpieces to the humblest sherds is available in logical and relatively uncluttered order. That the Oxford press should make this very best of British scholarship available at what appears to be the worst in German prices is to be regretted, but the richness of the contents helps to mitigate the pain of purchase.

The introductory chapter to Volume II consists of six pages of text; the interest they have aroused is due to their cautiously revisionist approach to what has become sanctified as an «established periodization» in the history of Ottoman ceramics. After a laborious process of scholarly discovery stretching over many decades, the great British scholar Arthur Lane in the fifties finally established the history of Ottoman ceramics as being virtually synonymous with the history of ceramic production in the Bithynian town of Iznik, old Nicaea². The process of in-gathering brought to the Iznik rubric such groups of pots and tiles as the «Damascus», «Golden Horn», «Kütahya», «Rhodian», and «Miletus» families³. John Carswell now suggests that the historical trend of scholarship may have some flaws, and that many blue-and-white wares attributed to Iznik in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, in fact, the «severe style» of Ottoman ceramics, may have actually been produced in Kütahya.

The grounds for the argument, once the pertinent spectrographic data has been worked through to the inevitable inconclusiveness, or at best the qualified conclusions such data always seem to produce, are first epigraphical and then stylistic in nature. Professor Dowsett's readings of two famous inscribed pieces in the Godman Collection give us strong evidence for their fabrication by Armenian potters in Kütahya for Armenian patrons in that city. John Carswell then proceeds by stylistic inference to attribute a broader group of ceramics to this Kütahya purview, including in his list of tiled monuments in Appendix E most

1. Katharina Otto-Dorn and R. Anhegger in *Das Islamische Iznik*, Berlin, 1941.

2. The history of scholarship to that time is summarised by Arthur Lane in his article «The Ottoman Pottery of Iznik (*sic*)» in *Ars Orientalis II* (1957).

3. The most significant development in the field since Lane's work has been the inclusion of the «Miletus» ceramics in the Iznik tradition by Oktay Aslanapa, in *Türkische Fliesen und Keramik in Anatolien*, Istanbul, 1965.

of the blue-and-white tiles traditionally assigned to Iznik which utilize the «international style» decorations so popular around the year 1500.

The preoccupation with a home for orphan ceramics is a traditional one, especially in the study of Islamic ceramics which are so rarely signed or attributable to specific hands. Carswell's study, while cautiously constructed so as not to commit the very act of methodological *hybris* he calls into question, implies an interesting set of hypotheses; in the sixteenth century, in the Ottoman context, artist groups are comparatively mobile, as is technology, within a strong and flexible economy and a stable and well-organized state. Under these circumstances, perhaps the place of production has a relatively small importance stylistically in the artistic product. Could it be, under the circumstances of the time, that the notion of an indissoluble bond between a ceramic style and a place of production should be discarded? The «Iznik» and «Kütahya» rubrics may indeed be much broader and more diffuse than the «established periodization» has recognized. We do have the hypothesis of C. Kiefer of the Sèvres Museum that some of the «Rhodian» wares may have actually been produced in Rhodes¹, while a young Hungarian scholar has discovered «Iznik» ceramics of the «Rhodian» type evidently produced in Transylvania by an emigré Turkish potter².

Anomalies in «Iznik» pottery found in Adana and Jerusalem suggest perhaps that unbreakable pottery travelled more easily than breakable pottery, and that on occasion tiles may have been produced in or near a *chantier* like Gothic statuary. Under the circumstances, while Carswell's extensions of the Kütahya domains may overstate his case, the notion that Kütahya «partook» of the genesis of the Ottoman ceramic style's main-stream seems a sound hypothesis worthy of further investigation, while the two important vessels in the Godman collection must be considered well within the Kütahya orbit.

The documented emergence of Iznik in the mid-sixteenth century as the major center of production must be connected not to any distinctive style at that time (indeed one of much experimentation) but rather to the mechanics of the organization of work in Iznik, with its proximity to the wood of the Bithynian forests, and to the major market, the capital of Istanbul. The same great flood of Imperial patronage which brought Iznik to full flower by the seventies of the sixteenth century, while ignoring Kütahya, by 1600 began, curiously, to have an opposite effect. In the seventeenth century, the Iznik kilns, forced to sell their wares to Istanbul at an artificially low price set decades before, went bankrupt. Kütahya, free from this bureaucratic control, then began to produce for the free market those charming and even bourgeois wares which turned up in profusion in Jerusalem.

A final comment on Carswell's history of Kütahya ceramics would be a note of caution: it would be a serious error to abandon the entire edifice of Turkish ceramics scholarship simply because some of the foundation-stones heretofore assumed to be made in Iznik may indeed have been produced instead in Kütahya. Instead of viewing the present work as a revisionist, indeed revolutionary reappraisal of the entire history of Ottoman ceramics scholarship, based on inferences stemming from the two Godman objects, it makes much more sense to view John Carswell's work as yet another step in the evolutionary development of our ideas about how the Ottoman ceramic tradition was formed. In this sense, perhaps the most valuable aspect of the work is not a new set of labels for some blue-and-white ewers and bottles, but rather a model of methodological thoroughness which it sets for future stud-

1. Charles Kiefer, «Les céramiques siliceuses d'Anatolie» in *Bulletin de la Société Française de la Céramique*, XXX (1956).

2. Vera Gervers-Molnar, «A Sárospataki Bokályos Ház» in *Folia Archaeologica*, XXII (1971).

ies. No doubt these future studies will examine the controversial parts of Volume II in some detail. Whatever their arguments and conclusions, they would do well to emulate the full exposition of the evidence and the general aura of good common sense which make *Kütahya Tiles and Pottery* such an exemplary work of scholarship.

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

WALTER B. DENNY

Olga Santoyo Matamoros, *Las Atenas de los Dioses* (Athens of the Gods), Madrid, Ediciones Partenon, 1972, 16^o, pp. 345.

Olga Santoyo's first novel, *Las Atenas de los Dioses*, is something of an anachronism. Publishers especially are aware that the urgency of contemporary life has left few people—readers as well as authors—willing to expend the effort demanded by the historical novel. Hence it is a pleasant surprise to come upon a work of fiction inspired by ancient Greece, particularly when its author is not even a classicist and lives far from its geographical setting. After a brief stint in Mexico, Cuban-born Dr. Santoyo now works in the School of Spanish Literature at Puerto Rico's Interamerican University. But the thrall of the Eastern Mediterranean also pervades her *Fantasia Oriental*, an earlier volume of short stories.

The action is set in the Athens of 470 BC, after the Persian Wars and before the Athenian contest with Sparta for the hegemony of Greece. The author's history is impeccable, her imagination virile, and the dividing line between history and fiction is often obliterated by a convincing blend of both real and imagined characters and events. Leonidas and the very finely drawn Daphne conduct their love-affair amid the difficulties that arise from a background of political upheaval, intrigue, betrayal and patriotic self-sacrifice. Helen is a former slave secretly in love with Leonidas, her liberator, whom she ultimately repays by intercepting the knife thrust at him by his enemy, thus leaving him free to enjoy the love of her rival.

The treatment is romantic, at times reminiscent of turn-of-the-century historical romances such as Henryk Sienkiewicz's *Quo Vadis*, at others more akin to the exotic atmosphere of Gómez Carillo's works. The informed reader will perhaps find a little too much straight history (as at pp. 47-48, 81-84, 109-111, 165-170 etc.); he may also tend to skip flights of rhetoric lauding the Athenian democracy and its cultural achievements, although these passages arise very naturally from the dialogue. And the somewhat skimpy story-line, one suspects, is a mere pretext that allows the author to portray fifth-century Athens in vivid colours and to highlight its role in the evolution of European civilization.

All who are attached to the classical tradition will read this attempt with interest, and experience suggests that a modern Greek translation would be received with enthusiasm.

Thessaloniki

VICTORIA HASIOTIS