At this point the volume turns to the link with the Sperlonga sculptures, with a brief overview of current scholarship by Ridgway. While some scholars, most notably Moreno and Andreae, suggest that these copy famous groups produced at Rhodes or Pergamon, R. urges caution, suggesting instead that the sculptures should be seen as new creations of the Roman period drawing on earlier artistic themes and styles without copying specific prototypes. The tangled question of the existence of a Rhodian school of sculpture forms the subject of the paper by Pollitt, which concludes that any rational analysis must leave the existence of such a school in the realm of 'pipe dreams' (p. 106).

With the Rhodian school despatched, the remaining papers turn to Italy. Anne Weis discusses the Sperlonga sculptures in their Italian setting, arguing that their scenes of Odyssean adventures reflect the *Aeneid* rather than the *Odyssey*. In particular, she suggests that Odysseus serves as a foil to the Roman hero Aeneas, whom she would see, along with the body of the dead youth, Lausus, in the Pasquino group (pp. 119–24). This suggestion finds a response in Peter Green's paper, who rejects the identification and tentatively suggests that these two figures may instead represent Ajax and Achilles (pp. 183–5).

The next two papers, by Marszal and Steingraber respectively, discuss more tangential issues. In line with the underlying tenor of many of the papers, Marszal advocates caution about the generally held view that sculptures such as the Ludovisi and Capitoline Gauls represent Attalid victory dedications, arguing that these particular pieces cannot, in fact, be assigned a place on any of the associated bases from the Pergamene acropolis. Steingraber, in contrast, outlines the possible Pergamene influences on Etruscan art. De Grummond's response suggests that many of these themes also have a long tradition in Italian imagery independent of any influences from the Greek east.

In conclusion, the papers in this collection actually suggest the opposite of its title. While previous scholars have sought to tie together the sculptures from Pergamon and Sperlonga as examples of 'Hellenistic Baroque', these papers caution against the urge to see all surviving pieces of evidence as interconnected. In all, this provides a welcome, if sometimes disconcerting, reminder that many of our assumptions about Hellenistic art have been based on rather shaky foundations. Rather than finding answers here, the reader is instead presented with stimulating suggestions and fresh avenues for research.

University of Warwick ZAHRA NEWBY

MANNERIST VASES

T. MANNACK: *The Late Mannerists in Athenian Vase Painting*. Pp. xviii + 153, ills, pls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-19-924089-2.

The conventional name given by Beazley to this group of Athenian vase painters was intended to evoke resonances with the art of more conventionally studied periods and places, especially sixteenth-century Italian painting, and with its critical reception. A mannerist style plays games with established subject matter, and with technique; it may also be allusive, obscure, and value the style of expression more than the material expressed. It will often be the work of artists who refer to each other's output, whether or not they are actually colleagues. The critic who is not a member of the coterie will view the results as signalling the end of painting as we know it; anyone

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.224 Published online by Cambridge University Press

who views the rise and fall of artistic movements as cyclical will tend to see mannerism as the natural end of a well-worn establishment. At the very least, there will be a set of well-understood conventions off which the mannerist can bounce.

Beazley's Athenian vase industry has mannerists both in black-figure and in red-figure; in both styles they surface well before either is on its last legs. The black-figure painters known to us as The Affecter and Elbows Out appear in the generation before the so-called Bilinguists; in red-figure the mannerist workshop appears to provide a stylistic thread which lasted for over a century, and could be read as a commentary on the development of more orthodox work, or perhaps a parallel strand of work which operates in a recognizably cohesive alternative mode. Beazley described them as 'one workshop, ... traced from the Archaic period down to the end of the fifth century or near' (*ARV* 562). The picture is complicated by his view of the most immediately recognizable mannerist, the Pan Painter, as a trainee of Myson, the founder of the workshop, but operating outside it. His structure does not include the Meidias Painter, working towards the end of the fifth century, although he was in fact the first hand described as a mannerist, by Nicole and Becatti in the first decade of the last century.

Thomas Mannack came into this territory via a thesis (of which this is a developed and revised version) on the later and latest mannerists, well aware that the earlier and more attractive ones had had much more attention, particularly as individual practitioners. In this monograph he is contributing to a more recent tendency to treat Athenian vase-painters as part of a craft tradition, in which a workshop can be viewed simply as a place of work providing an ongoing physical setting for practitioners over what may be an extended period of time. This may be a more realistic view of how the Athenian industry worked; M. is frank in saying that Beazley's 'elaborate system of relationships between different painters has been avoided, because his keen eye and vast knowledge could not be equalled'. It does, of course, also provide a setting in which those elaborate relationships are not ruled out, and the perceived trends towards reciprocal commentary on each other's work, and the reflection of influences from outside the workshop, could in fact have happened, to say nothing of internal training and professional inheritance.

M. gives a short account of the earlier and better-covered painters, before launching a more detailed discussion of the later ones. As a framework, the approach is an accommodating one; the family tree on p. 121, which has Myson at the top and the Painter of Athens 1183 some 90 years later at the bottom, acts as a sweeper for a detailed analysis of the pot shapes, figure style, iconographic practice, ornaments, and chronology of the workshop and its members. He can also point to inferences about findspots and the market enjoyed by the workshop—a gradually dwindling one as their preferred column krater went out of fashion, first in Greece and then in Italy. The subject matter displays a mixture of mannerist treatments of material current outside the workshop—with some obvious favourites such as the Return of Hephaistos—and rare, occasionally obscure, items such as the myth of Phokos. Odysseus' encounter with Nausikaa seems to have been introduced by the mannerists into the visual canon, perhaps a response to a growing interest in female subject matter. There are pictures which can plausibly be read as echoes of recognizable dramatic works, and of phenomena in other media, such as the Parthenon frieze. Scenes from everyday life tend to follow those from other workshops, with perhaps a higher incidence of generic figure types.

What emerges is a view of a trend in Athenian vase painting which avoids a hard definition of mannerism, but achieves an accessible account of a complex network of material from a starting point which was explicitly not the easiest one; it succeeds in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.224 Published online by Cambridge University Press

presenting a credible line of artistic descent within a humdrum succession of painters; this may be an important way forward in studying this particular craft industry, rather than concentrating on the celebrities.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

THE METHODS OF BEAZLEY AND POTTIER

P. ROUET: *Approaches to the Study of Attic Vases: Beazley and Pottier.* Translated by L. Nash. Pp. xii + 167, pls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-815272-8.

Here is another plank in the expanding platform of retrospective studies of classical scholars and their methods, this time of Edmond Pottier, who was the founding father of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, and John Beazley, the pioneering taxonomizer of Attic painted vases. If this sounds totally disingenuous to readers of *Classical Review*, they should be reassured that it tries to indicate the intentions of Philippe Rouet, who makes a serious attempt to present these two giants, not as polar opposites, but as two foci of methodologies in studying their material. In doing so, he also tries to contain the effects of fame, accretions of intellectual baggage, and the unreflective use of both scholars' work. As a long-time user of both the *CVA* and, of course, Beazley's catalogues and other output, and I hope not an unreflective one, I found this an interesting and informative exploration of approaches which the two champions wanted to pursue as their own separate angles, while making use of each other's information and frames of reference.

R. in fact does more than this—he provides a useful introduction and first chapter on the earlier history of collecting and publication of Greek vases, and particularly the publications which ignored the claims of faithful and complete reproduction in favour of presenting their pictures as works of flat art in a frame. There is a sharp account of D'Hancarville's catalogue of the Hamilton collection, with an amusing case-study of the treatment of the Meidias hydria; R.'s Plate 2, from the catalogue, is tellingly unrecognizable as a reproduction of its primary scene. R., like Michael Vickers, whose account of D'Hancarville's construction of a theory of vase value in the ancient world which fitted his view of fine art is acknowledged, sees this kind of publication as an important influence on Beazley's view of Attic pottery as art rather than craft. That said, R. also pays serious attention to the work of Hartwig and Furtwängler, both serious pioneers of accurate visual reportage, as well as of the empirical and visual research some associate more readily with Beazley. Klein's work on signatures is also seen as a contributor towards painter identification as a goal. The account of Beazley's debt to Morelli and Berenson perhaps breaks no new ground, nor does the reconstruction of his network of literary friends and acquaintances, both classicists and others, but it is a neat and accessible synthesis which does much to support a view of Beazley's preoccupation with attribution studies as the consequence of both networking and intellectual training, particularly the Greats of his day.

Pottier will probably be less familiar, even to the aficionados of the *CVA*. He is presented here as the inheritor of a rather different tradition of documentation, one which aimed to be comprehensive and descriptive, and to avoid value-judgements or art-historical speculation. He is seen here as an inheritor of a tradition in which Klein figures as much as he does in Beazley's intellectual lemma; the signatures Klein studied are part of a tangible framework of information on which a descriptive classification

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.224 Published online by Cambridge University Press