

reading of the book in Augsburg University, where likewise the ancient historians were sceptical of its conclusions but found that the book was an ideal basis for discussion and debate.

What then about its arguments? Basically Democracy is a 'good thing' and it fosters technical innovation and free market economics (which are assumed also to be 'good things'). Since Greece pushed way ahead of the rest of the world in inventing, and elaborating on, democracy, we should all pay homage, and it is worthwhile inspecting how such a society emerged out of a quite different Archaic world and then fell back into a more oligarchic or dynastic world during Hellenistic times. As usual, the devil is in the detail. The case is not helped by the fact that the book essentially focusses on the unparalleled world of Classical Athens, of course almost all our sources are there, but also imperial high democratic Athens is unique in the Aegean world. It is true that perhaps some half of the Greek states at one time or another had a moderate democratic constitution (ie the upper half at least of the male citizens had political power), but indeed it also seems likely both from the sources and archaeological survey that states with a democracy had higher population levels per sq km and a greater GDP.

However in a classic and provocative paper Michael Jameson had argued decades ago, that in essence the Athenian state was basically organised in socioeconomic reality like its complete opposite – the Spartan state. In both some half of the population or less were citizens, and they built their wealth on a lower half of society: the latter were agricultural serfs (helots) or unenfranchised craftsmen or traders (perioeci) for the Spartan state, and for the Athenian state these were agricultural and other slaves and metics (non-citizen resident aliens) (Jameson, M. H. (1977-78). 'Agriculture and slavery in Classical Athens.' *The Classical Journal* 73, 2: 122-145.) The fact that Athens invested its wealth in art as well as war, whereas the Spartans focussed primarily on militarism, is correct, but at the same time it is hard to argue that Greek art is a creation of democracy (especially when we consider its elite aristocratic origins and the undeniable achievements of Hellenistic art).

Innovation is also hard to track in this volume. It remains the case that Roman technology is a more dramatic set of changes, notably in the sphere of practical applications, while Late Iron Age Gaul seems to have had more advanced agricultural tools and machines than either Greek or Roman society when it came to be conquered by Rome.

As for health and demography, one questions the wisdom of the parallels drawn. Is it sensible to compare the physical state of army recruits of

19th century North-West Europe with Classical and Hellenistic individuals? The state of the European peasantry and the urban proletariat in that stage of Early Modern Europe (despite the wonderful 'innovations' being introduced in technology) is notoriously poor, but doesn't that support Ober's case, that Greek democracy was ahead even of that recent age when universal suffrage was still far off? Unfortunately a quick glance at the height and health of Anglo-Saxon males from excavated cemeteries in Britain reveals that they are in better physical shape than our ancient Greek males, and no-one would class them as free-market democrats.

One can go on in this vein with all the themes in this stimulating book, but in fact I hope to have shown that this well-written and provoking book is 'good for thinking with', and challenges you to engage with its approach, data and viewpoint.

JOHN BINTLIFF
EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY/ LEIDEN UNIVERSITY
johnbintliff@gmail.com

The Banquet God. Fifth Century and After

Alexander Heinemann. *Der Gott des Gelages. Dionysos, Satyrn und Mänaden auf attischem Trinkegeschirr des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* pp xiv+787, 450 b/w figures, 20 colour figures. 2016. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter. ISBN 978-311022-223-4 hardcover €129.95 / £97.99.

Heinemann's lavishly illustrated book aims first and foremost to study the images of Dionysos and his cortège on symposium ware during the 5th century BC in their social and ritual contexts. The *rationale* behind the research is the belief that the decoration deployed on figured pottery is not arbitrary but is intimately and meaningfully intertwined with the use of the vase. Furthermore, the meanings of such imagery are not *a prioristic* but need to be retrieved by the viewer every time s/he interacts with the object, in an everlasting 'battle' between object and subject. Retrieving the potential resonance of such iconography to a given viewer requires in turn an examination of the communication processes—i.e. rituals, plays, etc.—in which the symposium ware is inserted and the particular needs it helped fulfill, which are, unfortunately, lost to us.

Focusing this research on the images of Dionysos and his *thiasos* as well as on scenes of worship of the god makes methodological sense because this material

lends itself pretty well to the investigation of the relationship between shape and decoration; it is a type of ware which to a large extent was intended for the consumption of wine and is decorated with scenes of the wine god. The juxtaposition of constant and changing functions that come into play in the interaction between vessel and decoration offer perfect ground to the analysis that Heinemann intends to perform. His approach, whereas reminiscent of the French School and indebted to François Lissarrague's *oeuvre*,¹ tries to move from a culture-anthropological view of the artefacts to offer a more diachronic interpretation of the phenomenon, which transpires in the chronological arrangement of the figures.

The book is structured in eight thematic sections. After the foreword (p. xi) and preface (pp. 1–11) comes the introductory chapter which addresses the contexts of use and appreciation of Athenian vases and a discussion of various methodologies used to study their images (pp. 11–67). The question of the use/uses of Athenian pots has entertained scholars for quite a while now. It is common knowledge that most of the vases in today's museums come without any context attached to them or just a vague indication of where they come from, which makes it difficult to move from mere generalizations about the use of the vase derived from observation of the shape itself to a more specific discourse. The function of the vase and its images cannot be dislocated from the questions of who was actually using and viewing them and to which extent the users could have influenced the iconographical choices of the painters. Heinemann touches upon the usual suspects of current research in this field in this introductory chapter, which can serve as a useful stand-alone introduction to the subject.² He discusses aspects ranging from the geographical distribution of Athenian pots and the export markets, the value of pottery in antiquity, gendered uses of vases (mainly the common and misleading rigid division between 'female' and 'male' vases), Athenian painters and their clients, and the use and experience of vases in the performative context of the symposium in the space of the *andron*. He adopts a rather Athenocentric approach and considers that it is not possible to speak about a differentiated pottery production for the export market because the potter/painter in the Kerameikos most often than not did not know where his vases would end up (p. 21) and would therefore be producing iconographies embedded in the Athenian *Bildwelt* for an ideal customer, Athenian or otherwise. This

stance might be surprising to scholars working with pottery assemblages in archaeological contexts in particular geographical areas that do show patterns suggestive of an adaptation of the Athenian workshops to their foreign consumers' preferences—middlemen notwithstanding—but Heinemann solves this potential problem adopting a pluralistic approach that allows for multiple, very different meanings of the same image existing simultaneously. Although he does consider the existence of one best viewer, the Athenian male who participates in the symposium, he draws a comparison with the modern Hollywood cinematography industry and speaks of a fluid iconography potentially attractive to societies of various sorts (p. 21).

The remaining chapters are organized thematically according to specific iconographical aspects. Chapter II (pp. 67–161) addresses the semiotics of physiognomy, i.e. the physical appearance of Dionysos and the satyrs in vase painting and to which extent this is expressive of contemporary views about the human body. Together with the well-known change in the iconography of Dionysos that takes place c. 420 BC in vase painting under the influence of the beardless Dionysos of the east pediment of the Parthenon, comes a new thematic repertoire for the god, i.e. he sits or reclines quietly while his entourage performs around him. In contrast with the early scenes of the god in motion and embedded in specific mythical and ritual narratives, the new beardless god is recognizable by his lack of action. This will be very typical of the iconography of the god in the 4th century BC, as we shall see below. Heinemann moves away from the traditional teleological understanding of the rejuvenation of Dionysos as indicative of the degeneration of Greek gods (Ernst Langlotz) to consider both iconographies as expressive of a similar idea conveyed in two different ways as a result of particular historical processes (Persian vs. Peloponnesian Wars). Despite the physiognomic differences of the two types, which Heinemann understands in the context of the contemporary *habitus* of the elites, both the bearded and the beardless Dionysos embody a similar 'soft' lifestyle devoted to sensual pleasures (p. 99). This way of living is also shared by his faithful companions, the satyrs, who partake of a constant and intrinsic festiveness. Heinemann addresses several aspects of their physiognomy, including the intriguing occurrence of the *kynodesme* or infibulation, which he interprets in a novel way, and concludes that satyrs are not just the 'others', the counterpoint to the Athenian citizen, but also conspicuously similar to fellow symposiasts.

Athenian vase painting conveys the relationship between male and female followers of Dionysos in different ways. While violent/sexual confrontation

¹ Lissarrague 1990, 2013.

² Note 24 for example gives a comprehensive list of works addressing the trade in Greek pottery.

seems to be the norm, there are variations and changes to this iconography that do not follow a linear chronological pattern. The nature of the relationship of Dionysos' companions is the subject of Chapter III (pp. 161–223), where he also touches on the controversy about the name of the god's female followers: Nymphs or Maenads? He chooses the latter but points out that both terms are not mutually exclusive, but highlight different aspects of Dionysos' female followers and therefore both can be applied to them. The main types used to picture the relationship between satyrs and maenads are the physical confrontation along the lines of a wrestling match and the erotic pursuit from c. 480/70 BC onwards. Both ways are not exclusive to Dionysos' followers and do not differ much from other divine encounters like those of Peleus and Thetis, Zeus and Ganymede, Poseidon and Amymone, or Boreas and Orithya, as well as anonymous erotic pursuits of the mid-5th century BC. These themes have received a fair deal of attention in recent years from various perspectives and Heinemann shows that the scenes of satyrs and maenads contribute to the general discourse of powerful men taming women, a characteristically excessive and wild 'animal' whose very reticence makes her even more desirable (p. 185). The vehemence and noisiness of the satyrs contrasts with the calm scenes of the encounter of Dionysos and Ariadne, the bride who is given to the god without a fight. From the methodological point of view, section 2 of Chapter III (pp. 205–210) is interesting insofar it moves away from the normative understanding of imagery that has been popular in the last decades. While fully acknowledging that imagery is heavily informed by contemporary social values and behavioural norms, Heinemann positions himself strongly against the idea that the main function of the images on pots is to communicate and endorse such values, and exemplifies his stance by reviewing three well-known instances of 'satyr excess': the cup by the Epeleios Painter in Perugia (BAPD 30692), the cup from the circle of the Nikosthenes Painter in Berlin (BAPD 275638), and Douris' psykter in the British Museum (BAPD 205309).

Since some of the images of satyrs have been interpreted as representing satyr plays, Heinemann devotes chapter IV (pp. 223–259) to this subject. He explores the relationship between the satyr in vase-painting and on the stage through images that make explicit reference to the context of the satyr-play by means of props such as masks, costumes or stage architecture, leaving aside the highly hypothetical cases where a particular scene on a vase might have been influenced by a satyr-play. Methodologically relevant is Heinemann's rejection of the purported

subordinate position of visual arts to literary sources in that regard (pp. 228–229). The increasing number of scenes from the second half of the 5th century BC which juxtapose men dressed as citizens and as satyrs are taken to be of particular relevance in a sympotic context, insofar as the drinking party is an ideal occasion for transcending one own's identity in various ways. Heinemann looks at one of the most conspicuous props depicted in vase-painting, the *perizoma*, and calls attention to the fact that it might also characterize performers other than actors. In this sense, he offers a suggestive comparison of the female dancer with *perizoma* on a well-known cup by the Q-Painter (BAPD 275635) with the pyrrhic dance performers who danced to entertain the guests in a symposium context and connects the popularity of such scenes (*perizoma*-wearers dancing in front of Dionysos) with a new connoisseur-like way of envisaging sympotic entertainment culture.

Dionysos and the *thiasos* is one of the favourite subjects of vase painters in the 5th century BC. While in many instances it is only generic scenes like the *komos* that get represented, there is also a good number of scenes that can be related to specific mythical narratives involving Dionysos and/or his followers. The boundaries between both types often blur. The relevance of the representations of myth lies in that they include a great deal of content, the understanding of which presupposes some degree of familiarity on the part of their contemporary viewer with the wider complex narrative in which it belongs and which the modern scholar needs to reconstruct. Generic images on the contrary, while also fully embedded in the contemporary *Vorstellungswelt* of the viewer, are not as hermeneutically demanding. In Chapter 5 (pp. 259–325) Heinemann reviews five myths involving Dionysos and his entourage as they appear on symposium ware. The popularity of the first of them, the return of Hephaistos (pp. 263–73), on sympotic vessels has to do with the emphasis on the re-establishment of harmony through merrymaking that the myth implies. The birth of Dionysos and his delivery to the nymphs of Nysa by Hermes (pp. 276–284) enjoyed popularity in the first half of the 5th century and Heinemann understands these images as reinforcing the intrinsic bond between the *oikos* and Dionysos' proper veneration. Next, the author decouples a number of scenes of satyrs harassing women while they fetch or carry water with *hydriae* from the myth of Amymone (pp. 284–293). While ancient viewers might on some occasions have projected such a narrative onto the images, the author finds that there is nothing in their iconography that prompts such identification. He rather sees these scenes as allegories that refer to the mixing process inherent to any consumption

of wine, thus providing the banqueters with an ironic representation of one of the key moments of the sympotic experience itself. Similarly, the author explains the relative popularity of scenes of the myth of Prometheus bringing the fire to the satyrs (pp. 294–303) from 440 BC onwards through the analogy of fire and wine rather than as quotes from Aischylos' satyr-play *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*. In the same way that Prometheus distributed the fire among humans the wine is distributed among the symposiasts from the krater in an egalitarian manner. The shape is here important, for most of the scenes of this myth (80 %) actually occur on kraters. The final myth of the chapter is that of Marsyas (pp. 303–318). Following the path opened earlier with the interpretation of the *perizoma*-wearing dancers, the images of Marsyas in fifth-century BC vase painting, characterized by their elusiveness as regards to the outcome of the contest, i.e. Marsyas' skinning, are understood in the larger context of contemporary scenes of performers in vase painting as examples of musical entertainment within and out the symposium.

In the mid fifth century BC there is an interesting phenomenon that is the subject of chapter 6 (pp. 325–427): the popularity of scenes of satyrs playing out different roles, among them, that of a citizen, but also as mythical heroes, craftsmen, and athletes. These instances have usually been explained as a 'humanization' or 'civilization' of the satyrs as opposed to the wildness they showed in late archaic and early classical iconography. Heinemann takes here a different path. He finds the term 'humanization' not adequate because the change that the satyrs experience at this time is not really a change in physical substance but in *habitus* (p. 329) and works out a classification model for these scenes by distinguishing between parodies, travesties, and persiflage, taking the viewer's expectations as a reference point (pp. 362–366). Likewise, in the case of the 'citizen-satyrs' (pp. 386–425), Heinemann's emphasis drives away from the nature of the satyrs itself to the human practices they engage in, for it is mostly flirting and courtship rituals that Dionysos' followers take up, both heterosexual and paederastic. The citizen satyr would therefore parody contemporary Athenian society and its ritualized forms of interactions, which, as these images seem to imply, are informed by the same kind of desires that drive the relationship between satyrs and maenads.

The images of Dionysos worship are the subject of chapter 7 (pp. 427–503). The hermeneutic difficulty of this type of imagery lies in the fact that most often than not it is not clear to which ritual, if any at all, a given scene refers to and the degree of accuracy of the representations regarding the actual ritual.

This problematic is exemplified by means of the so-called 'Lenean Vases' (pp. 429–433). Heinemann follows here the distinction between *bildimmanenten* and *außerbildlichen* signifiers established in earlier scholarship:³ on the one hand mainly the identification of iconographical elements that can be linked to specific rituals or festivities with a degree of accuracy through other sources (i.e. objects that have a specific function within the ritual action, such as altars, Dionysos monuments on Lenean Vases, etc.), on the other hand evidence suggesting that the vessel was used in a ritual context. Therefore, he distinguishes between scenes *of* ritual and *for* the ritual, i.e. representations of rituals on vases (*Ritualdarstellungen*) and representations on ritual vases (*Ritualgefäßen*). The themes of the chapter are a group of late fifth-century BC images showing swings, some of which can be linked to the prenuptial ritual of the *aïora* (pp. 434–442), the *hieros gamos* of Dionysos and the *basilinna* (the wife of the *archon basileus*) in the context of the Anthesteria (pp. 442–452), and most particularly the iconography of the *choes* in the last half of the 5th century BC. The little children depicted on these special vessels behave as undomesticated beings, that puts them in close connection with the satyrs and therefore makes them a suitable subject for the symposium.

A last section, chapter 8 (pp. 503–511) touches briefly upon the representations of satyr children. Heinemann observes a recurrent motif of the scenes depicting father satyrs and their sons: that many involved games of lifting, carrying, and balancing on various extremities. This would recall a similar behaviour on the part of the symposiasts with regard to the vessels used in the symposium. The author therefore proposes to understand those scenes as articulating fundamental notions of sympotic culture and not just as portraits of family bliss. The concluding remarks follow in pages 511–535.

The book is accompanied by a massive reference apparatus (pp. 533–787), including a list of works/museum index, list of abbreviations, c. 150 pages of endnotes with bibliographical references, illustration credits, brief English summary, and indexes. The list of works and its relationship with the vases illustrated in the text is not as straightforward as it might seem at first glance and it is strongly advisable to read the instructions of use in the introduction (p. 8) before jumping to the text. The list of works provides all the basic information about the given vase: museum, shape description, and primary bibliography. The reader is referred to the *Beazley Archive Pottery Database* for further bibliography. The vases that were not yet

³ Hamilton 1992; Scheibler 2000; Schmidt 2005.

in the BAPD have been added to the database upon publication of Heinemann's book. When a vase is illustrated in the text and also included in the list of works, a reference to the list is given in brackets in the relevant caption; when the work is not included in the list, the BAPD number is provided instead.

Heinemann's *Der Gott des Gelages* is successful in its exploration of the relationship between shape and decoration and manages to show how the images deployed on symposium ware are of immediate relevance to the viewer in the specific context of the Athenian drinking party. It makes clear that the figures of Dionysos and his entourage, mainly satyrs and maenads, play a far more important role than just that of the 'others' which has traditionally been granted to them, and provided that one agrees with Heinemann's Athenocentric view, the work highlights once more the central place of the symposium in the polis in Classical times. It is a finely documented, exquisitely presented and stimulating book that will bring delight to scholars working in the field of Athenian vase-painting and to those interested more generally in images as a *Kommunikationsmedium*.

A Dionysos for Iberia

As a counterpart to Heinemann's Athenian symposium I would like to sketch here a few lines from my own expertise, about the aftermath of Dionysos iconography in the 4th century BC in a rather different context: the Iberian Peninsula, where Dionysiac scenes appear in overwhelming quantities during the first three quarters of the century. One defining and well-known characteristic of fourth-century iconography is the tendency towards vague, open-ended scenes, the so-called process of de-mythologization, i.e. non-narrative references to myth. What matters now is not so much the identification of a particular scene within a cycle, but the symbolic value of the image and the connotations and second readings that it may trigger, a subject explored by Henri Metzger long ago.⁴ This tendency is particularly obvious in one of the commonest iconographic cycles of this century, that of Dionysos, especially the *thiasos* and the encounter with Ariadne. The main difference between the fifth- and the fourth-century Dionysos is the new character that the god adopts among his entourage. What is original now is, as Metzger put it, 'avoir isolé le dieu au milieu de son thiasos, de l'avoir opposé par son attitude calme et immobile aux transportes frénétiques de ses compagnons'.⁵

The images of Dionysos and his *thiasos* are the most popular scenes that decorated the Athenian vases exported to the Iberian Peninsula, followed by representations of banquets and amazonomachies.⁶ Dionysiac iconography usually appears on bell-craters, which, together with the cups of the Group of Vienna 116 are the most common exports in the area of the High Andalusia, in the southeastern part of Spain.⁷ They were mostly used as ash-urns and received the cremated bones of prominent members of Iberian society. As the research of several scholars has been able to elucidate,⁸ the vast majority of Athenian images in the Iberian Peninsula acquires meaning in funerary terms. Dionysiac iconography must therefore be interpreted within this particular context of use of the vases and offers an interesting case to study the transformations experienced by material culture and its images when they cross cultural boundaries. The Athenian krater, a 'communal vessel' *par excellence*, turns now into a private object, which is further strengthened when one looks at the remarkable decrease in size of the kraters that arrive in the Peninsula in the second half of the 4th century BC, mainly those from the El Sec shipwreck, which are closer in size to a skyphos rather than to a proper krater.

One salient feature of Dionysiac iconography in the 4th century BC is the focus on Ariadne, who is depicted either alone or reclining with Dionysos. She is figured as a bride, often performing the *enkalypsis* or *anakalypsis* gesture while an entourage of maenads and satyrs dance around her or bring fruit trays lavishly decorated with ribbons and garlands. Satyrs now give up their persecution of maenads and they all dance together celebrating the *hierogamia*. The focus is on the happy end of Ariadne's story, her encounter with Dionysos and the achievement of immortality through love, through her wedding with the god. But the main difference with previous iconography is that the 4th century BC scenes of Dionysos and his companions move from the narrative to the symbolic mode: they do not tell a myth anymore but create an atmosphere of bliss, eroticism and ecstasy. Indeed, it is tempting to liken this type of iconography to modern 'ambient music'. The supernatural presence of Dionysos permeates these scenes, even when the god himself is absent. Furthermore, the boundaries of what can be identified as 'pure' Dionysiac imagery become much blurrier and an array of previously

⁴ Metzger 1951.

⁵ Metzger 1951: 373.

⁶ Sánchez Fernández 1992; Domínguez Monedero and Sánchez Fernández 2001: 434–39.

⁷ On the cups of Vienna 116 in the southeast of Spain, see Rouillard 1975.

⁸ Cabrera Bonet 1997 and 1998; Cabrera Bonet and Rouillard 2003; Cabrera Bonet and Sánchez Fernández 1998; Sánchez Fernández 1992, 1997 and 1998, Olmos 1990.



Figure 1. Red-figure bell-krater by the Toya Painter. C. 350 BC. From the Chamber Tomb of Toya, Jaén. Madrid, National Archaeological Museum inv. n. 1986/149/2. Photo by the author.

unrelated gods and heroes such as Apollo, Eros or Herakles start to populate Dionysos' world. The iconographies of the wine-god and of Apollo are highly intertwined now and the presence of either the *thyrsus* or the *erisone* is quite often the only sign that makes the identification possible. The two gods appear together on a bell-krater attributed to the Oinomaos Painter that was used as an ash-urn for one of the deceased buried in tomb 43 of the necropolis of Baza (Granada).⁹ Likewise, the worlds of Aphrodite and Dionysos conflate in the 4th century BC; Eros, a figure traditionally ascribed to the realm of Aphrodite, is ever more present in the 'garden' of Dionysos and contributes to load the scenes with erotic overtones.

As Carmen Sánchez has rightly seen, naming individual figures within the scenes becomes increasingly difficult at this time and the number of 'unexplained subjects' for this period in Beazley's lists is overwhelming.¹⁰ The krater from the Chamber Tomb of Toya serves to illustrate what has been explained so far (Figure 1). The scene has an undoubtedly Dionysiac flavour to it, suggested by the presence of *thyrsos* and *tympanoi* and follows a typical compositional pattern of the time: a

prominent central figure, often seated, who is approached by the members of the *thiasos* carrying crowns, vine branches, and garlands. This is not an 'illustration' of a myth but a scene of apotheosis: the deceased whose cremated body was deposited in the krater-urn is identified with the heroified figure who is being crowned by the winged beings.¹¹ As Olmos has pointed out, this is an image of the blessed state achieved by the deceased 'beyond the grave, his initiation into that world of plenty and light, a sort of *laetae sedes* where he is welcomed'.¹² Building on these ideas, I have recently offered a similar interpretation for a chariot scene depicted on a red figure bell-krater from Los Nietos (Cartagena).¹³

Fourth-century BC Dionysiac scenes become rather stereotyped images of bliss populated by anonymous figures that elude any attempt of categorization. Now, vase painters choose 'suggestion' rather than 'narration', and in doing so they create open-ended images that depend on the viewer more than ever to acquire meaning. Iberians will understand and assimilate them within

their own visual culture and in rather creative ways. These images are not to be talked about or experienced in the performative context of the Athenian symposium, as it was the case of the iconography presented by Heinemann in the book under review. We move from the noise of the *andron* to the silence of the tomb, a space where classification and 'names' of iconographic types are not relevant anymore. There, we only need to sit back, relax, and enjoy the journey.

BAPD: Beazley Archive Pottery Database <http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/xdb/ASP/dataSearch.asp>
Cabrera Bonet, P. 1997. El viaje al allende a través del mar: un 'ascos de Escila' en el M.A.N. *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 15 (1-2): 77-90.

— 1998. Dioniso en un jardín: el espacio de la iniciación en la iconografía de los vasos apulios, in P. Cabrera Bonet and C. Sánchez Fernández (eds) *En los límites de Dioniso: Actas del simposio celebrado en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional (Madrid, 20 de junio de 1997)*: 61-87. Murcia: Caja de Ahorros.

Cabrera Bonet, P. and Rouillard, P. 2003. L'Épave d'El Sec, dans la baie de Palma de Majorque (Milieu

⁹ BAPD 6345

¹⁰ Sánchez Fernández 1992: 27.

¹¹ Sánchez Fernández 1992: 32.

¹² Olmos 1990: 159.

¹³ Rodríguez Pérez 2014.

- du IV^e siècle av.J.-C.), in P. Rouillard and A. Verbanck-Piérard (eds) *Le vase grec et ses destins*: 125–131. Munich: Biering and Brickmann.
- Cabrera Bonet, P. and Sánchez Fernández, C. 1998. *En los límites de Dioniso. Actas del simposio celebrado en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional (Madrid, 20 de junio de 1997)*. Murcia: Caja de Ahorros.
- Domínguez Monedero, A. and C. Sánchez Fernández 2001. *Greek Pottery from the Iberian Peninsula. Archaic and Classical Periods*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hamilton, R. 1992. *Choes and Anthesteria. Athenian Iconography and Ritual*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lissarrague, F. 1990. Why Satyrs are Good to Represent, in J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (eds) *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*: 228–236. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lissarrague, F. 2013. *La cité des satyres: une anthropologie ludique (Athènes VI^e-Ve siècle avant J.-C.)*. Paris: Éditions Ehes.
- Metzger, H. 1951. *Les représentations dans la céramique attique du IV^e siècle, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Olmos, R. 1990. Orgiastic Elements in Iberian Iconography? *Kernos* 5: 153–171.
- Rodríguez Pérez, D. 2014. ¿La apoteosis de Heracles o una escena de apobates? A propósito de una cratera de campana procedente de La Loma del Escorial de Los Nietos (Cartagena, Murcia). *Archivo español de arqueología* 87: 59–74.
- Rouillard, P. 1975. Coupes attiques à figures du IV^e s. en Andalousie. *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 11.1: 21–49.
- Sánchez Fernández, C. 1992. Imágenes de Atenas en el mundo ibérico: análisis iconográfico de la cerámica ática del siglo IV a.C. hallada en Andalucía Oriental. *Anuario del Departamento de Historia y Teoría del Arte* 4: 23–34.
- 1997. Imágenes de la muerte en una tumba ibérica. El ajuar ático de la tumba 43 de Baza (Granada). *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 15: 37–48.
- 1998. Dioniso en el paraíso o el privilegio de la muerte, in P. Cabrera Bonet and C. Sánchez Fernández (eds) *En los límites de Dioniso. Actas del simposio celebrado en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional (Madrid, 20 de junio de 1997)*: 105–18. Murcia: Caja de Ahorros.
- Scheibler, I. 2000. Attische Skyphoi für attische Feste. *Antike Kunst* 43: 17–43.
- Schmidt, S. 2005. *Rhetorische Bilder auf attischen Vasen: visuelle Kommunikation im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Berlin: Reimer.

John H. Oakley (ed.). *Athenian Potters and Painters* Vol. 3. pp. viii + 272, 32 colour plates, 228 b/w illustrations, 30 drawings, 6 maps and 4 graphs. 2014. Oxford: Oxbow Books. ISBN 978-1-78297-664-6 e-publication £37.50; ISBN 978-1-78297-663-9 hardback £75.00.

This volume, dedicated to Alan Shapiro, follows the format of the two previous volumes of *Athenian Potters and Painters* (and, as in volume 2, with 32 splendid pages of colour plates). This is unfortunate. The papers appear in alphabetical order of their author, regardless of chronology or subject-matter, with no attempt to shape the book to make papers that talk to each other appear next to each other. Bibliographical references are buried in the notes at the end of each chapter, with no consolidated bibliography. Most extraordinary of all, there is no index. For those professionally interested in Greek painted pottery (the volume does not in fact limit itself to Athenian potters and painters and shows rather minimal interest in potters), it is no doubt convenient to have these papers between a single set of hard covers, but for any Greek archaeologist or historian who wants to know whether there is anything here for her, there is no way of telling. They would have a better chance of finding what is interesting here if these papers had been in a journal whose text could be searched online.

What are they going to be missing? Most importantly, a paper by Philip Sapirstein (whose name is misspelled in the contents list), which is a companion piece to his paper on 'Painters, potters and the scale of the Attic Vase-Painting Industry'.¹ Sapirstein charts the numbers of attributions to particular black- and red-figure painters against the number of years they are thought to have been in operation and shows that the average number of pots a year for the more prolific painters is 8.2 (not including Makron, for whom the number is 20.7, a figure inflated by the identification of his hand on a large number of fragments). Sapirstein then points out that many painters, who are believed to have worked over a number of years, have nevertheless had many fewer pots ascribed to them. When painters who also pot or who always work with the same potter are compared with painters who work with a number of potters, a consistent pattern emerges, in which the former produce on average 5.5 surviving pots a year, the latter 8 a year. Chronologically the former dominate black-figure vase-painting, the latter become important in red-figure vase-painting. Sapirstein estimates annual pot-production at Athens at 50 000 at its height, but produced by as few as 120–200 workers.

¹ Sapirstein 2013