

ing. Some cups (ca. 550–525 B.C.) are of better quality, perhaps brought as votives, but otherwise the vase painting runs from average to abysmal. The very earliest includes cup fragments by the Heidelberg Painter (560–550 B.C.), a large band cup by Lydos and krater fragments from Lydos's Circle (550–540 B.C.), but the majority are lekythoi of the late sixth to first quarter of the fifth century (Class of Athens 581 and Haimon Painter Workshop are common; the best is by the Athena Painter). The latest are palmette lekythoi reaching beyond the mid fifth century. No special or common themes stand out on the vases.

Kunze-Götte provides an index of all Laconian vases she cites as comparisons, as well as a general index and plate index for her contribution. A concordance of inventory numbers to catalogue numbers for all three studies is found at the end, as is a list of negative numbers for each plate. Notably absent, however, is a list of painters and workshops for each of the studies.

Vase descriptions are commendably complete in the catalogue entries. Photographs are excellent; profiles and drawings are useful, especially for the Corinthian. We must indeed be grateful to all three scholars for the care they have taken in publishing at last this large body of fine ware pottery from such an important site.

GERALD SCHAUS

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND
CLASSICAL STUDIES
WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY
WATERLOO, ONTARIO N2L 3C5
CANADA
GSCHAUS@WLU.CA

CORPUS VASORUM ANTIQUORUM. DEUTSCHLAND 72.

HANNOVER, KESTNER-MUSEUM 2, by *Alexander Mlasowsky* (Union Académique Internationale.)

Pp. 88, pls. 63, Beilage 13. C.H. Beck, Munich 2000. DM 142. ISBN 3-406-46822-5 (cloth).

The first volume of the *CVA* devoted to the Kestner Museum in Hanover appeared in 1971 (not 1976 as stated in the preface of this volume under review) and included the Attic Geometric, Black-figure, Red-figure, and White-ground vases. This second volume is a potpourri of some 149 vases, old and new acquisitions, Greek and non-Greek, in many styles: Late Helladic, Boeotian, Attic (Geometric, Black-figure, Red-figure), Corinthian, East Greek, South Italian Red-figure (Apulian, Campanian, Paestan), Etruscan Corinthianizing, Daunian, and Gnathian, Black-glaze, and Hellenistic relief-ware.

This volume also marks the end of a long tradition for the German volumes of the *CVA*: the plates are now printed on both sides and bound in with the text and profiles. Doubtless economic necessity has forced this change, but it is a pity, especially for those interested in style. The quality of the plates is generally excellent. Only about one quarter of the vases have their profiles included, however. If the art of the potter is to be considered on an equal footing with that of the painter, should not more vases have profile drawings? They are particularly important for dating nonfigured work (for example, the

Protocorinthian skyphos and cup, pls. 6.6 and 6.7). Those that are published are at 1:1, not always necessary, indeed on occasion causing confusion (see Beilage 9).

The descriptions of the scenes are generally accurate and easy to read, but there is little analysis of iconography. The author has included many references for the more ambitious vases, but the bibliography might be more selective. A useful addition here, as in some previous volumes of the German *CVA* (e.g., Würzburg 4), is the provision, wherever possible, of capacities and weights. The Munsell soil color chart or the CEC chart would have provided a more objective description of the color of the fabric. Moreover, use of diluted glaze and accessory color should have been more carefully detailed.

Because the vases cover such a diverse range, one cannot expect the author to be an expert in all areas. We, therefore, offer the following comments in the hope that they may increase the usefulness of this volume.

Pl. 7.1–5 (1960.29): the author cites as comparandum an olpe in *CVA Turin* (Torino) I—it is in fact in *Turin II*. The accepted citation for Amyx, *Corinthian Vase-Painting of the Archaic Period* (Berkeley 1988) is *CorVP*, not *CVP*.

Pl. 9.11–14 (1966.27): an aryballos with a very common motif (palmette with felines either side). The author compares this with work by both the Reggio and Borowski painters, but the vases assigned to these two hands vary considerably (Benson vs. Amyx). Attribution of such generic work is very difficult.

Pls. 21–24 (L9.1989): a fragmentary dinos with stand, attributed to the Kyllenios Painter by Moore (but see D. Williams on the Sophilos dinos, "Sophilos in the British Museum," *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 1 [1983] 30, who cites von Bothmer). The attribution needs more explicit argument, as the proportions of the animals seem different from other vases attributed to this hand. The subjects show an equestrian race (with tripods) below a centauromachy, which might have had Kaineus in the missing section on one side. It is interesting that the height of the bowl (38.5 cm) is very close to that of the Louvre dinos (38), which also has an equestrian race (with many tripods) below a gigantomachy.

Pl. 29.5–6 (1992.202): Beazley, *ARV* 225.7 and p. 1636, states that this cup was in the Lucerne Market (*Ars Antiqua, Auktion* 3 [*Antike Kunstwerke aus Sammlung Prof. B. Meissner*] 1961, 101 and pl. 43); this should have been mentioned.

Pl. 38.1–3 (R 1906.159): the author may be correct in identifying the scene on side A as "Dionysos and Maenads," but Trendall was more cautious. The object above the head of the youth is not a "flower" but a stylized goat skull, presumably indicative of a sanctuary.

Pl. 40.1–3 (1966.76): this small red-figure bell-krater is listed as Apulian, perhaps from a local workshop, datable to the third quarter of the fourth century, but the vase is Attic of the very end of the fifth century, probably a minor, late work by the Kadmos Painter, showing the relationship between him and the Painter of London F 64.

Pl. 41.1–4 (775): Hermes does not wear "Oriental headgear," just a normal (for Apulian) *petasos* (the front part of the brim is lost in the break). The description should indicate that this must be the meeting at Sparta.

Pl. 45.1–3 (782): this kantharos is by the Baltimore Painter; the only doubt expressed in *RVAp* (p. 882) about

these small vases was whether they were by the painter himself or one of his associates. Are the appliquéés really “Frauenköpfen”? Each wears an oriental cap: Adonis?

Pl. 45.4–7 (R 1906.165): Workshop of the Baltimore Painter? The lines on the chest of the male figure suggest that he was wearing a petasos (cf. *RVAp* 2, pl. 378.7).

Pl. 48.3–4 (1926.91): this owl-skyphos is listed as Apulian, “Circle of the Farwell Group,” and a very similar example in Worcester is noted. In fact both skyphoi are Lucanian and belong to the “Spanner” group (see A.D. Trendall, *Red-figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily*, Suppl. 3 [London 1983] 9–10).

Pl. 51.3–5 (1956.1): this red-figure pelike is not Campanian but Apulian, as the parallels cited for shape and decoration, all Apulian, ought to have suggested.

Pl. 55 (1973.16): this oinochoe of shape 3 was considered to be Campanian by A.D. Trendall and Campanian under Paestan influence by Schauenburg (“Unteritalische Kentaurenbilder,” *ÖJh* 51 [1976–1977] 30–1). Mlasowsky documents this but catalogues the vase as Etruscan, without argument. He notes that it was found in Campania, and it looks Campanian to us.

IAN MCPHEE

ARCHAEOLOGY AND ART HISTORY
LA TROBE UNIVERSITY
BUNDOORA, VICTORIA 3083
AUSTRALIA
I.MCPHEE@LATROBE.EDU.AU

ELIZABETH PEMBERTON

SCHOOL OF FINE ARTS, CLASSICAL STUDIES,
AND ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE
PARKVILLE, VICTORIA 3010
AUSTRALIA
E.PEMBERTON@ARTS.UNIMELB.EDU.AU

HELLENISTIC SCULPTURE. Vol. 2, THE STYLES OF CA. 200–100 B.C., by *Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway*. (Wisconsin Studies in Classics.) Pp. xix + 374, ills. 24, pls. 82. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison 2000. \$45. ISBN 0-299-16710-0 (cloth).

In this book, Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway continues her study of Hellenistic sculpture, focusing primarily on work from the second century B.C.E. As with her other books, her discussion is detailed and stimulating, forcing the reader to reconsider the monuments in depth, aided by the thorough and extensive review of previous scholarship in the text and chapter notes.

At first glance, the second century might seem an arbitrary range, but Ridgway justifies it by seeing the art of this period as transitional. The political instability of the period means that there is a relative lack of public art, and at the end of the period Rome had come to dominate not only the politics of the Greek world, but also artistic patronage. In this light, she sees Pliny's comment that “art ended” in the third century and was only revived in the later half of the second as reflecting the shift in the artistic landscape.

This landscape has been dominated in the literature by the Pergamon Altar, and Ridgway devotes two chapters to it. Regarding the Gigantomachy frieze, she raises a number of questions about the firmness of our knowledge of this monument, and consequently of second-century sculpture in general. She reviews the evidence on dating, particularly the ambiguity of the inscriptions, and favors re-dating the work from 180/160 to 165/140 (see S. Rotroff's review of G. de Luca and W. Radt, *Sondagen im Fundament des Grossen Altars*, *AJA* 105 [2001] 129–30; and N.T. de Grummond and B.S. Ridgway, eds., *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: Sculpture and Context* [Berkeley 2000]). She questions too whether the monument is an altar, and favors the suggestion that it is a heroon without an altar in the center, since the findspots of many pieces attributed to the altar were widely scattered. Her detailed discussion of the style of the frieze emphasizes its classical elements, with the result that its style is no longer the epitome of the Baroque. Given the key position of the work in histories of Hellenistic sculpture, these challenges, particularly the dating, will generate some controversy. Without diminishing its artistic achievement, Ridgway rightly questions the overwhelming degree of the monument's importance and influence in art historical discussion.

This reassessment is also important for our understanding of the Telephos frieze in the next chapter. She emphasizes the Baroque qualities of its style, arguing more for its similarity rather than its dissimilarity to the Gigantomachy, based on details of renderings. Indeed, if we consider the monument as a whole, both in terms of workshop and patronage, then we should expect more stylistic affinity. In this light, she attributes the differences between the two to considerations of subject matter, scale, and placement.

The use of continuous narrative in the Telephos frieze has also magnified its importance for the development of narrative Greek art, but Ridgway points to several precedents for this type of narrative structure. I agree that this type of multiple scene narrative became more widespread under Roman patronage, and would favor not attributing undue influence to the Telephos frieze for its development. Looking at other sculptural narratives, Ridgway also questions how much we know in fact about the Aemilius Paulus monument at Delphi and whether it is the representation of the Battle of Pydna with its riderless horse. She would argue that the battle scenes are more formulaic in composition and motifs, and that the monument was appropriated by the Roman general rather than built for him. If so, then it is likely that continuous narration is not present. In discussing the Iphigeneia frieze at Termessos, Ridgway sees continuous narration as occurring mostly in connection with temples and with epic/tragic subjects, a point that I find convincing. Indeed, continuous narration places clear structural demands on composition and framing, which limits its use in a sculptural context.

In her review of other architectural sculpture in chapter 4, Ridgway notes that the dominant type of sculptural decoration is the continuous frieze. She minimizes the stylistic and iconographic impact of Pergamon on these works, such as the Temple of Artemis at Magnesia and the Hekateion at Lagina. She emphasizes the decorative and generic quality of the architectural sculpture of this period, rather than its propagandistic or political intent.