The familiar ideologies of the Iliadic warriors’. The world of archaic epic and lyric) that problematizes that ‘The whole image playfully conveys a feeling be puzzled by this, and the best he can do is note Yatromanolakis concludes that Beazley was right to for one of the figures, which reads ευνομια, in the Metropolitan Museum on which the label gets inscribed, to the cautionary tale of the pyxis proceeds, after some general remarks about what ancient Greek vase-inscriptions’ (p.xi), and a thorough and epigraphically accurate database as ‘foregrounding the urgency of establishing this would have been a better paper had someone show that some inscriptions are unproblematic to what is written on pots and sound (it starts with and for ‘pictorial sounds’ (entries in which all the page references are to the editor’s own opening chapter), it has no entry for ‘nonsense inscriptions’, although there are major independent discussions of ‘nonsense inscriptions’ in chapter 1 as well as in chapter 5, which is devoted to them, and further comment elsewhere (e.g., in chapter 8). This collection of papers is not a book.

The first, and by some 25% the longest, paper is by the editor and addresses the relationship between what is written on pots and sound (it starts with three rather gratuitous examples of inscriptions which have nothing to do with sound, included to show that some inscriptions are unproblematic to understand – just one of several indications that this would have been a better paper had someone edited the editor). The first example of writing relevant to sound is a Tyrrhenian amphora ascribed to the Prometheus Painter showing a running warrior between two cocks holding out a lyre in each hand with ‘Ἀυρά εἶμι’ written next to them. Yatromanolakis concludes that Beazley was right to be puzzled by this, and the best he can do is note that ‘The whole image playfully conveys a feeling (expressed by ordinary craftsmen, outside the heroic world of archaic epic and lyric) that problematizes the familiar ideologies of the Iliadic warriors’. The second section of the paper is devoted to how Greek expresses sounds (we have seven pages on which pots do not figure), and turns to inscriptions which have often been regarded as nonsense but which express recognisable sound values – so a black-figure hydria with lots of λε-, λεο-, λει-, λι-, λες syllables and showing Herakles and a λιον – and to words or sequences of letters that can be vocalised that ‘spill out of’ the mouths of figures. Yatromanolakis notes in particular the use of vo and ve of λο and λε to express vocalised sounds. He ends his chapter with a discussion of the plain cup in Athens (NM 1104), signed by Exekias as potter on one side and with the letters ευοοοοοεν on the other, and argues that if one allows for haplography there are actually a large number of ways in which these letters can be construed to make sense. There is much to provoke thought in this chapter, though readers will end up quite bemused about what exactly the methodology being recommended is.

The second and third chapters explore use of kalos names (without cross-reference between the chapters). Thomas Mannack examines late sixth-century cups bearing the inscription Hipparchos kalos. He notes that this inscription was particularly popular with the painter Epiktetos, who is responsible for 15 of the 21 late sixth-century vessels (15 of them cups) bearing this inscription (there is also one mid fifth-century skyphos showing the Tyrannicides and bearing this inscription). Mannack explores connections with what he calls ‘aristocratic themes such as warriors, athletes and symposia’ but one must doubt whether fighting as hoplite, participating in the gymnasion or drinking in company were restricted to ‘aristocrats’ (if such a term can be applied to Athens). He concludes by comparing the use of the name Hipparchos by painters to their use of the names of other painters (e.g., Smikros). Guy Hedreen in the following chapter looks at kale inscriptions, and is particularly concerned to question the idea that kale names refer to contemporary Athenian prostitutes. He notes that tag-kale can be applied to mythical figures or indeed the goddess Aphrodite, and argues that the name Epilyke is an invention based on the name Epilykos used by the potter-painter who also signs as Skythes, that the name Korone is so widely used as a typical prostitute name that it is unlikely to refer to a particular prostitute, and that Rhodopis is used as the name of a ‘nymph’ associated with Dionysos, rather than as a prostitute name. He examines the names given to women in fountain-house scenes and argues that they fit poorly with names known to have belonged to women in Athens and should rather be seen as invented names, comparing the names given to ‘sile
nymphs’ on Athenian pots. Noting the use of *kale*

to describe objects as well as people, he argues that
it sometimes refers to the image being beautiful
rather than the figure imaged being beautiful. But
the arguments here are forced: when we have two
other instances of Ἡερας καλε (Heras being a known
Athenian woman’s name) it is implausible that in
a third case it should be understood as ‘this is a
beautiful image of Hera’. Even less is it possible to
construe Τιμυλλος καλος ηος τοδε το προοον as
‘Timyllos the handsome whose face this is’ (rather
than ‘Timyllos is as handsome as this face’ – the
inscription occurs on a head-kantharos). Hedreen
scores some effective points against other scholars
in this paper, but further work is clearly needed on
difficult category of inscriptions.1

The fourth chapter stays with names, but is
interested in mythical names. Burkhard Fehr notes
that around 570 BC there was a great upsurge in use
of mythical names on black-figure Athenian pottery
coinciding with the development of standardized
figures and schemata of interaction, and that both
use of mythical names and use of standardized
figures decline together around 530 BC. He argues
that the mythical names provide a ‘bridge’ between
image and poetry, and that the standardized figures
(often including standardized onlookers whom Fehr
thinks of as figuring the Athenian citizen and his
wife) provide a bridge to ‘patterns of behaviour that
referenced the polis and its system of values’. These
seem reasonable and necessary claims, but it is
quite unclear to me that either of them either needs
or is strengthened by the rest of the paper which
conjures up a world of rich and poor alike gathering
in the potter’s workshop and where writing on pots
is invested with the authority of public writing.

In the fifth chapter Pieter Heesen returns to
nonsense inscriptions. The bulk of the paper
catalogues 293 Little Master Cups with nonsense
inscriptions. Heesen shows that these occur on cups
sold in Athens as well as cups that were exported,
that some painters used more or less the same
string of nonsense letters not only on both sides
of a single cup but on different cups, and that such
close similarity between nonsense inscriptions can
be used to identify cups as from the same workshop
and even from the same find context. None of this
much helps us understand the phenomenon of
nonsense inscriptions, but it does show the value of
taking them seriously.

Chapters 6 and 7 relate to Apulian pots. John
Oakley’s survey notes that there are no potter’s or
painter’s signatures, no kalos inscriptions (though
there are a few in Lucanian), but quite numerous
names of gods and mythical figures, some pillars
inscribed variously with names, with the slightly
puzzling τερμιων, and with ηαιρον, some inscribed
objects and some dedications. There are a small
number of painted expressions of abuse and some
dialogues, including cases reproducing scenes in the
theatre. Unique is the Darius Painter’s name vase on
which letters are used to spell out a number. The
inscriptions are mostly Atticizing, but with influence
from local dialect. Thomas Carpenter then looks
more closely at the 25 (out of 132) Darius Painter
pots with inscriptions. Some of these inscriptions
were made by making small holes first and then
joining them up. Both letter forms and spelling
are inconsistent across these pots, and there is no
consistency as to whether the figures in complex
mythological scenes are named. Carpenter suggests
that presence or absence of writing depended on
whether those who commissioned the pots wanted
to emphasise their Greek connection or not.

In chapter eight Tyler Jo Smith looks at writing
on Archaic Corinthian and Athenian pots showing
dancing. Corinthian pots display a lot of ‘speaking
names’ relevant to the activity shown, Tyrrhenian
amphoras have many ‘nonsense’ inscriptions which
are ‘deliberately placed to interrelate with the
figures’, and not least with their sexual activity. A
not dissimilar pattern is found on other Athenian
amphoras showing dancing. Early red-figure cups
on which dancing was a popular scene often display
wit, both in what is shown and in how writing is used,
in particular how the words and letters are placed.
The conclusion that inscriptions in dance scenes
variously draw attention to particular figures,
 movement, bodily functions, noise or balance in
the composition seems fair enough, but has limited
interest unless writing is used differently in other
scenes: here, as elsewhere in the volume, we badly
need comparison. The rest of the volume offers
material for comparison, but the comparison is left
to the reader.

Chapter nine is concerned with a single pot and
its inscription. Georg Gerleign has a new
reading of the writing on the Eurymedon oinochoe
(with full illustrations). He points out that the
surviving letters (ευρυμέδ[ω]ν εἰμ[ι] κυβάδε ἕστηκα[c] (where κυβάδε is a head)), should
better be reconstructed as Εὐρυμέδ[ω]ν εἰμ[ι] κυβάδας ἕστηκα[c]. Since the inscription runs
from the aggressor’s head, and must be imagined
to be spoken by the aggressor, he is saying: ‘I am
Eurymedon, (but) you stand bent over’, a statement

1 For other issues with them, see Frontisi-Ducroux 1998: 173-185.
that perfectly fits what the image shows. Although
the absence of the final sigma makes this reading
less than definitive, and although this reading does
not do anything to explain the curious appearance
of Eurymedon, this is a valuable contribution to the
understanding of this much-discussed image.

In the final chapter Mary Moore also examines a
single well known inscription, the fragment of a dinos
signed by Sophilos found at Pharsalos which names
the funeral games of Patroklos (Athens NM 15499).
Moore reconstructs the full scene, on the basis of
the parallel scene on the François Vase, to show the
chariot of [Eume]los racing towards the grandstand,
and Achilles and a tripod standing behind it. She
argues that those who insist that we cannot have
here an illustration of iliad 23 have allowed too little
for the difference between art and text, and that
what the painter has done is to show Eumelos still
out in the lead – relying on his viewers to know what
happens next. The reconstruction here is carefully
done, and the implications for art and text important.

There is no conclusion to this book, and indeed
it is hard to write one. Certainly if the aim of the
volume was indeed to foreground ‘the urgency of
establishing a thorough and epigraphically accurate
database of ancient Greek vase-inscriptions’ that
aim has failed. Nothing here suggests that the
task is urgent. There are indeed corrections to
our understanding of particular inscriptions, but
if there are major consequences of those for our
understanding of ancient Greece, those are left
unexplored. Two of the papers, Yatromanolakis’
and Smith’s, complement each other well in
exploring how inscriptions work within a scene to
help the viewer experience what is going on. Other
papers advance our understanding of particular
pots or particular classes of inscription, but their
non-communicating juxtaposition either leaves
the reader frustrated (both papers on kalo/kale
inscriptions beg for fuller contextualisation) or
draw attention to the partial treatment each affords
(as with the two papers on Apulian inscriptions).
The urgency is not for a better database, it is to give
more thought to what questions even the existing
database might answer.
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Hellenistic

François Queyrel. La Sculpture hellénistique
1: forms, themes et fonctions. pp. 432, 415 b/w
illustrations, 53 colour plates. 2016. Paris:

Queyrel’s latest tome is a big, richly-illustrated one:
the first of two dedicated to Hellenistic sculpture
projected for Picard’s Les Manuels d’art et d’archéologie
antiques. The series, which already includes volumes
on the Bronze Age, on Classical Greek sculpture (by
†Claude Rolley, one of the persons to whom this
volume is dedicated), and on Greek architecture, has
become an essential tool for scholars, teachers, and
students.

As with the other volumes, the detailed Sommaire
gives a useful overview of the contents (a list of the
main headings appears below). The text is divided
into two parts—1) Caractères et approaches de la
sculpture hellénistique, and 2) Principales categories
de sculptures. These are further subdivided into
a total of 25 chapters (11 in the first part; the
remainder in the second). A planned subsequent
volume will present ancient places along with their
sculpture.

The Introduction explains that Rolley began work
on this Hellenistic sculpture volume before his
death (his notes on a first chapter, together with a
brief text on draped female figures, are incorporated
in the present work), yet Queyrel respectfully
makes clear that he has written the text according
to his own plan, not that of his predecessor. His
Introduction offers reflections on chronology
before giving a brief overview of recent scholarly
work on Hellenistic sculpture.

Each chapter sets forth the theme in general
terms, using specific examples to illustrate points,
then turns to various case studies to demonstrate
issues and problems, incorporating the author’s
own point of view. The text frequently challenges
earlier interpretations, such as that regarding the
dating of the Terme Boxer, which Queyrel would
place earlier (perhaps in the late third-early second
century B.C.) than Himmelmann or Ridgway (p.
85). While the focus is always first and foremost on
the sculpture, the works are examined in context—
historical, religious, political, spatial— depending
on the object.

Chapter 1 offers a very brief overview of the
term ‘Hellenistic’, (which was first articulated